Have been working on our models for EDI agency and trading partner agreements. Uncovered the issue below in the process.

If you have time, I'd like to run some of my assumptions by you regarding the level at which EDI agents are defined.

Let me know where to fax the information.

----------
From: Arthur, Lisa
To: Crawford, Steve; Shields, Linda
Cc: Stockton, Steve (Consultant); Gerould, Romy; Morgan, Derzyl
Subject: GISP Trading Partner Agreement
Date: Monday, November 18, 1996 5:44PM

I am trying to determine whether or not 4.3.12, below, would prevent us from naming Wichita as our designated site for nomination, allocation and invoicing transactions, and someone like TransCapacity as our designated site for capacity release transactions. Given my assumption that KGFC might enter into multiple trading partner agreements (TPA's) with the same business party - one for each type of EDI transaction, then this would not be a problem, because each TPA would only list a single "designated site" for KGFC.

If, however, the proposed TPA that GISP plans to standardize requires that all activity between KGFC and a specific shipper be covered by a single agreement, then we would have to receive all transactions here, and then perhaps re-route transactions such as capacity release on to someone like TransCapacity. This could hurt our chances of meeting the GISP required response time.

>From looking at the TPA information I sent you, do you know whether or not this is a potential problem?

4.3.12
Standard
As a minimum, within a trading partner agreement, one designated site for receipt should be identified for each trading partner. That site should be identified by a specific Uniform Resource Locator, (URL).
Arthur, Lisa, 05:44 PM 11/18/96, FW: GISP Trading Partner Agree

This does not preclude multiple designated sites being mutually agreed to between trading partners.

<<Remember that we can not require that anyone Mutually Agree in order to implement the GISP standards>>