The mapping problem in question, and our desired solution, may be motivated and described as follows:

1. TPA 1 (sender) and TPA 2 (receiver) need to exchange information (this may be because they have a common counterparty, because an employer is changing TPA's, or for other reasons).  They have approximately the same information set in their respective databases, but with somewhat different organization: In particular, let us say that TPA 1 and TPA 2 have different database schemas.
2. The overarching goal is to build a semantic mapping capability that accurately and automatically translates between the two.  This is beyond the scope of the challenge.
3. In an attempt to facilitate this process, USG attempted to put in place standardized forms for the most-used information subsets (the terms "834", "835", "837" refer to these forms).  Because the forms have become ingrained and so many different players use them, the proper formulation of the problem is as a mapping from a TPA's database to one of these forms (and vice versa, but the forward direction is more important).
   1. In other words, we are attempting to achieve a transfer of information from TPA 1's database to TPA 2's database; because everyone already uses these forms and coördination is difficult, our working assumption will be that the process operates as: TPA 1 --> Form (e.g. 834) --> TPA 2.  We will focus on the first leg.
   2. Further, because there is still some remaining flexibility/discretion within the framework of a given form, each TPA requires it to be filled out slightly differently; these expectations are captured in a Companion Guide.  (This is also why the process of populating the form is more interesting for us, as it is more difficult, since the process caters to the receiving TPA's expectations.)
4. Now, in more specificity, the challenge is to produce a system that conducts the following mapping:
   1. Inputs:
      1. TPA 1 DB dump
         1. A set of files under MemberData
      2. Helper mapping files regarding codes, organization of TPA 1’s DB tables, etc.: Relationship.csv, Relationships.png, Tier.csv
      3. TPA 2 Companion Guide: Layout.pdf
   2. Output:
      1. Properly filled-out Form, according to TPA 1's data and TPA 2's Companion Guide
5. From a data-preparation point of view, we need a set of correct (input, output) pairs for evaluation (and maybe even training/finetuning).