

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Staffing

Pros

Mitretek performed a detailed analysis to determine the level of staffing required. This reflected Mitretek's complete understanding of the requirements and industry needs.

Mitretek's suggested levels of staffing should be sufficient to assure that the CO Code administration and NPA Relief Planning demands of the industry, including new entrants, will be met.

Mitretek has already hired industry numbering experts with NANPA, CO Administration, and NPA Relief Planning experience. These experts and responsible management helped prepare Mitretek's proposal and two of these individuals participated in the Evaluation Team's respondent meeting.

Cons

Mitretek's proposed level of staffing (53 total), although sufficient, may be excessive (compared to Lockheed's proposed initial staffing level of 25 employees) and could impose unnecessary costs on the industry.

Mitretek's industry experts represent numbering experience from specific areas in the NANP and may not represent the NANP area as a whole.

Innovation

Pros

Mitretek proposed a mechanized CO Code administration tool, a forward-looking forecasting tool, a future on-line access capability for CO Code application and a proposed procedure for resolving code conflict problems.

Computer Systems/Technology

Pros

Mitretek proposed the use of state of the art computer and communications systems and software.

A Mitretek NANPA web site has already been established.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Communication

Pros

Mitretek provided a detailed comprehensive proposal with extensive supporting documentation.

Price

Pros

The Mitretek cost per person was comparable to other respondents.

Mitretek has committed to perform all of the NANPA functions contained in the Requirements Document for the firm fixed price.

Cons

The total cost of the Mitretek proposal is \$22.5M higher (double) than Lockheed's over the five-year period.

These higher costs appear to reflect Mitretek's inability to absorb monetary risk due to their not-for-profit status and government contract orientation.

Mitretek's indirect costs (e.g., overhead expenses, fringe benefits, locations and occupancy costs and general and administrative costs) accounted for 53% of their total costs.

Intellectual Property Rights

Pros

Mitretek stated it will make available to the NANC all systems and software. Specifically, Mitretek stated two ways to allow this transfer: Mitretek will, at their option, either 1) transfer all systems, software, documents and data to the NANC or another NANC designated organization or 2) issue a no-cost, non-exclusive license for the systems, software, documents and data. This transfer will involve no cost to the NANC, or other designated organization which could serve as the future NANPA.

Miscellaneous

Pros

Mitretek's awareness of current numbering issues acquired through attendance at recent INC meetings should enhance their ability to assume NANPA duties (e.g., demonstrated the willingness to work with the industry and the flexibility to change based on industry preferences and concerns).

Cons

Mitretek's proposal may have been influenced by industry experience in California and, based upon this experience, their proposal may have over-estimated the required resources.

Summary

The price associated with the Mitretek proposal was the primary concern. The majority of the evaluation team, however, believes that the significant beneficial attributes of the proposal far outweigh this concern. Specifically, Mitretek's commitment to transfer all Intellectual Property Rights mitigates future potential costs and risks to the industry, should the NANPA transfer to another entity. Further, the level of staff proposed by Mitretek should ensure timely number resource assignment and relief planning thereby making adequate numbering resources available to all entities including new entrants. Finally, because Mitretek will only be performing NANP administration and not other types of numbering administration (i.e. LNP NPAC and 800 SMS), its selection as the NANPA should not present the industry with any concerns relative to a lack of leverage which might be associated with a "monopoly" provider.

3.2 NANPA Recommendations and Rationale (Continued)

Lockheed

A minority of the evaluation team preferred Lockheed as the NANP and CO Code administrator. The advantages of the Lockheed proposal are: 1) it is half the cost (\$22.5M less) of the Mitretek proposal; 2) it commits to meeting the required functions at the quoted price; 3) it reflects Lockheed's experience with numbering issues relative to LNP NPAC and the 800/888 Help Desk, and 4) that there is potential to achieve synergy associated with the future consolidation of numbering administration systems and/or processes (e.g., number pooling).

There were concerns regarding the ability of Lockheed to perform the NPA Relief and CO Code administration functions in an efficient and effective manner because of their proposed small proposed staff (i.e., 11 people). In addition, Lockheed's centralized staff

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

in Tarrytown, New York raised concerns about their ability to obtain personnel necessary to perform the NPA Relief and CO Code functions. Lockheed's indication in retaining intellectual property rights over systems, software and support documentation required to perform their NANPA duties may potentially result in additional costs when selecting a different NANPA in the future. Because Lockheed already performs 800/888 Help Desk and LNP NPAC functions for the industry, there was a concern that Lockheed might have a significant amount of leverage and a potential monopoly position on number administration, thereby subjecting the industry to the risks associated with relying on a single provider of number administration services.

Organizational Structure

Pros

Lockheed possesses the labor and capital resources to manage potential fluctuations in workload or funding.

Lockheed has proposed a centralized NPA Relief Planning and CO Code Administration for efficiencies which could simplify new entrant/national carrier access (one number to call) and lead to consistency in assignment procedures.

Cons

Lockheed's proposed centralization may cause difficulty attracting qualified people and an increase in travel requirements.

Lockheed proposes not to assign staff to geographic regions, which may lead to a lack of local expertise in those regions and may decrease a company's ability to reach the same person every time.

Staffing

Pros

Lockheed agreed to expand their staff as necessary at the firm fixed price quoted.

Lockheed demonstrated an understanding of NANPA demand and workload.

Lockheed is experienced in operating the 800/888 Help Desk.

Lockheed is experienced with contentious industry LNP meetings.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Cons

Lockheed's staff lacks number assignment and administration experience.

There were concerns that should Lockheed be selected, they would not have appropriate experienced staff in place to meet the required NANPA transition time frames.

Approximately 33% of Lockheed's proposed initial staffing level of 25 employees is administrative rather than line staff.

Lockheed appeared to rely extensively on mechanized systems and processes in lieu of personnel. Therefore, Lockheed may lack the staff to deal with numbering issues requiring human intervention and judgment.

Innovation

Pros

Lockheed proposed use of advanced automated on-line access systems for entry, validation, tracking and management for all application processing.

Lockheed proposed to develop an advanced forecasting model to assist the industry in COCUS and NPA relief timing based on industry input.

Computer Systems/Technology

Pros

Lockheed proposed a state of the art computer system with advanced security and disaster recovery to assure reliability in their database management.

Lockheed displayed extensive database management experience and expressed a willingness to incorporate "flags" to identify abuses in assignment processes.

Communication

Pros

Lockheed's proposal is succinct and easily understood.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Cons

There was a heavy reliance on a consultant to respond to questions during the respondent meeting.

Price

Pros

Lockheed's price proposal was half the price of Mitretek's.

Lockheed is committed to expand its staff to provide the NANPA/CO Code Administration function including transition, if necessary, within its firm fixed price.

Lockheed is willing to consider upon further discussion distributing personnel (NPA Relief and CO Code Administration) across three existing Lockheed locations (East coast, West coast and Mid-west locations) without any increase to its price.

Cons

The Lockheed cost per person was the highest when compared to other respondents.

Lockheed's price does not include intellectual property rights for the systems and software they will use to perform the NANPA and CO Code functions.

Intellectual Property Rights

Cons

Lockheed did not commit to provide intellectual property rights for certain systems, software and support documentation used in NANP/CO Code administration and requested further discussions with NANC regarding this matter.

Miscellaneous

Pros

Lockheed's approach does not attempt to create numbering policy without industry consensus.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Cons

Lockheed perceived that they have a right to further negotiations, postponing decisions on potential critical issues (e.g., intellectual property rights) to a later time and therefore subjects their proposal to possible changes. Some evaluators were concerned that Lockheed may lack flexibility in future negotiations.

Lockheed has only participated in the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) and NANPA Working Group on a limited basis.

Because Lockheed already performs 800/888 Help Desk and LNP NPAC functions for the industry, there was a concern that Lockheed might have a significant amount of leverage and a potential monopoly position on number administration, thereby subjecting the industry to the risks associated with relying on a single provider of number administration services.

Summary

The primary concerns with the Lockheed proposal are staffing, intellectual property rights, and lack of vendor diversity. Lockheed has provided written assurances that could alleviate the staffing concerns (e.g., amount and location). It is recognized that “intellectual property rights” and “monopoly” concerns are issues that can be addressed by NANC. To alleviate staffing concerns, Lockheed’s written responses and presentation material clearly offer to expand the size of its staff and number of locations at the firm fixed price quoted, if necessary. Accordingly, a minority of evaluators submits that the lower Lockheed price (\$22.5M savings) outweighs the concerns identified.

4.0 Recommended Billing & Collection Agent and Rationale

The following is a discussion of the recommended Billing and Collection Agent and associated rationale.

4.1 Rationale for Selection

Subject to the implementation of the neutrality cure identified below, the Evaluation Team recommends that NECA be the Billing and Collection Agent for the following three major reasons:

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

1. NECA has cost recovery expertise (e.g., TRS)

The recommended cost recovery mechanism mirrors the TRS model of which NECA is the current administrator of the TRS fund. It is the conclusion of the Evaluation Team, that this fact makes them eminently qualified to manage NANPA cost recovery.

2. NECA has experience in telephone industry billing (e.g., TRS)

The NANPA billing and collection function as specified in the requirements document matches NECA's experience with TRS.

NECA has a long standing relationship with U.S. Telecommunications carriers. Further, their experience with the TRS fund has them well positioned to assume this new function without a transition phase.

3. Price is lower with the same quantity of staff

Based on a comparison with another finalist with equal staffing levels, NECA's price was one-third less.

4.2 Neutrality Cure

The recommended neutrality cure is for the FCC to order NECA to create an independent board exclusively for the Billing and Collection Agent.

The Evaluation team further recommends that the Billing and Collection Agent Board have the following characteristics:

- Broad based, with representation from the NANP Community.
- At least one International (Non-US Entity) representative.

NECA has stated that it would place the NANPA Billing and Collection Agent responsibilities under the USAC (Page 9, Legal and Regulatory Proceedings of the NECA Proposal). The suggestion of the USAC Board by NECA as a cure for neutrality is considered insufficient and inadequate to the concerns of all parties. In its May 2, 1997 presentation (to the Evaluation Team), NECA stated that it would be responsive to a specific request by the FCC for a separate Billing and Collection Agent Board.

Consistent with CC Docket No. 97-21, the Evaluation Team recommends that the Billing and Collection Agent Board of Directors be:

1. Neutral and impartial;

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

2. Not advocate specific positions to the Commission in non-administration-related proceedings;
3. Not be aligned or associated with any particular industry segment; and
4. Not have a direct financial interest in support mechanisms established by the Commission.

4.3 Additional Concerns

While NECA is the recommended Billing and Collection Agent (BCA), there were concerns related to the selection of NECA as the BCA as follows.

- NECA is deficit in international experience when compared against the alternative respondent.
- NECA has indicated an unwillingness to handle shortfalls in collections; "NECA as a not-for profit association, can not risk losses through such borrowing, however small, that risk might be." (Footnote 9, page 18 of NECA proposal).
- There are concerns with one organization collecting funds for the Universal Service Fund, TRS, Carrier Common Line and NANPA.
- NECA did not provide a firm price quote, charging extra for non-routine reports, testimony and litigation.

5.0 Recommended Alternate Billing & Collection Agent and Rationale

The following is a discussion of the recommended alternate Billing and Collection Agent and associated rationale.

5.1 Rationale for Selection

It should be noted that Lockheed did not bid to perform the BCA functions as a separate function and has made its performance of those functions dependent upon its selection as the NANPA.

It is recommended that Lockheed be the alternative Billing and Collection Agent for the following reasons:

1. Lockheed has the resources to handle shortfalls

Lockheed clearly indicated in their proposal that they had the full resources of the Lockheed Corporation to provide funding on a temporary basis in the event that revenue shortfalls occur and are corrected in order to provide timely payments to

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

the NANPA. It cited the \$ 26 billion in revenue and \$ 29 billion in assets as proof of Lockheed's Corporate financial strength.

2. Lockheed has expertise in billing & collections

Lockheed cited that it has the ability to manage the Billing and Collection Agent functions, highlighting its role as a Third Party billing and collection agent for more than 140 clients, collecting and processing more than \$2 Billion in payments annually.

3. Lockheed has international experience and have handled foreign currencies

Lockheed cited its worldwide presence and experience in dealing with foreign countries and currencies.

4. Lockheed is completely neutral

Lockheed is viewed by the Evaluation Team as neutral, with no cure being required.

5.2 Additional Concerns

Lockheed was not recommended as the Billing and Collection Agent primarily due to its higher cost to perform the BCA function with the equivalent headcount. Lockheed's costs were one-third higher than the recommended respondent.

In addition, while Lockheed was viewed as experienced and capable in billing and collection services, it lacked experience specific to the Telecommunications Industry. Furthermore, Lockheed does not have long-standing relationships with US Telecommunication Carriers, unlike the recommended respondent.

6.0 Rationale for Conclusions Reached on Other Respondents

The following is a discussion of the rationale for the conclusion by the Evaluation Team not to select Bellcore or CCMI as the new NANPA, and CCMI and Lockheed as the Billing and Collection Agent.

6.1 Bellcore

Bellcore's scoring on the evaluation matrix was virtually equivalent to Mitretek and Lockheed. However, in selecting the first and second choices for the new NANPA, Bellcore was not selected as one of the two finalists for the following reasons.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

The Evaluation Team acknowledged the experience that Bellcore has acquired in its role as the current NANPA. This experience, however, was not considered sufficient to rank Bellcore as a "finalist" in the selection process by a majority of the Evaluation Team.

It was recognized that this experience is not directly relevant either to the administration of CO Codes or to NPA Relief Planning, two major areas of responsibility for the new NANPA. Although Bellcore has performed CO Code assignment for the 809 NPA, this effort was considered to be significantly distinct from domestic CO Code administration and NPA relief so as to be of minimal value.

Second, when compared with the Mitretek and Lockheed proposals, Bellcore's proposal was lacking in its description of systems, models, and innovative options that might be applicable to current and future needs. Specifically, Mitretek and Lockheed differentiated themselves by providing innovative ideas and forward-looking state-of-the-art administration systems and tools that the Evaluation Team considered essential for effective administration in accordance with the Requirements Document.

Third, a concern was raised with NANPA Inc.'s apparent plans to use personnel from the Bellcore's Numbering Strategies Organization for consulting and technical support. This concern was the perception of potential undue influence by one particular industry segment.

Fourth, Bellcore's proposal to provide centralized CO Code administration but distributed NPA Relief Planning (two locations outside New Jersey) was considered less than optimum. The separation of these functions was thought to minimize any synergies that might otherwise be obtained.

The Bellcore proposal was fully evaluated using the objective rating tool developed for the selection process. Bellcore's rating was minimally less than that of either Mitretek or Lockheed. The final evaluation step, which combined the objective data with important subjective considerations, placed the Bellcore proposal lower than those of Mitretek and Lockheed.

Finally, although not considered in the Evaluation Team's process to determine the two finalists, serious concern was raised relative to the issue of neutrality. Bellcore's proposed compliance with the neutrality requirements is based on its sale to SAIC and the establishment of a separate subsidiary – NANPA Inc. – to oversee NANPA operations. Specific questions were raised regarding the closing of the sale, the composition and selection of the Board of NANPA Inc. These issues should be reviewed by NANC in the consideration of Bellcore as the new NANPA.

6.2 The Center for Communications Management information

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

This section contains the rationale and specific issues that led the evaluation team to unanimously agree to eliminate CCMI from further consideration as the new NANPA and the Billing and Collection Agent.

There was unanimous agreement that the CCMI proposal was the weakest proposal submitted to the NANC for consideration. This conclusion was reached after all evaluators conducted their initial rating of the proposals. All evaluators confirmed this conclusion in their final ratings for CCMI which occurred after the respondent meetings.

CCMI failed to submit their company financial information and evidence of their bondability in their initial proposal submission. In the opinion of many evaluators this indicated a non-compliant status for the CCMI proposal. In addition, the lack of this information prevented the evaluation team from making a clear determination of the neutrality status of the CCMI proposal.

Another concern related to the perceived lack of numbering expertise demonstrated in the proposal as well as in the proposed plan for obtaining such expertise. No consultants, early hires or definitive plans for obtaining this expertise were described in any detail. The Evaluation Team perceived that CCMI had a narrowly focused view and a lack of understanding of the complexity and controversial nature surrounding NPA relief activities. The entire Evaluation Team agreed that selecting CCMI as the new NANPA would jeopardize the industry's ability to obtain critical numbering resources and negatively impact the administration of these resources, regardless of the price that CCMI had quoted.

The final decision to eliminate CCMI from further consideration was not reached until after the respondent meeting in order to allow CCMI the opportunity to further define and clarify its proposal. Although the presentation provided additional details, it did not provide enough additional information to change the Evaluation Team's assessment of CCMI's NANPA and Billing and Collection Agent capabilities.

Finally, CCMI's proposal specified that it would only accept the Billing and Collection Agent if it was selected to serve as the new NANPA. Since CCMI was eliminated from consideration as the new NANPA, it was therefore eliminated from further consideration as the Billing and Collection Agent.

**NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on
a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)**

Appendix A

**NANC North American Numbering Plan Working Group
Evaluation Team**

| Name | Company/Association |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pat Fleck | Ameritech |
| Charlene Meins | AT&T |
| Shawn Murphy | AT&T |
| Robert Hirsch | AT&T |
| John Manning | ATIS (Facilitator) |
| Jo Gallagher | Bell Atlantic |
| Alfred Oyog | Cable and Wireless Cayman Islands |
| Trent Boaldin | Elkhart Telephone |
| Norm Epstein | GTE |
| Jane Brownley | Lucent |
| Steve Engelman | MCI |
| Karen Mulberry | MCI |
| Ben Childers | NARUC |
| Jim Castagna | NYNEX |
| Anna Miller | Omnipoint |
| John Banuelos | SBC |
| Mark Welch | SBC |
| Doug Birdwise | Stentor |
| Pamela Kenworthy | Worldcom |

Note: Companies with multiple representatives provided a single position.

Evaluation Process

The following information describes the process as defined in the Requirements Document and used by the Evaluation Team in the review of the responses and the development of a recommendation to NANC. The timeline below describes each of the events in the process.

Timeline

Event: Public Announcement of Requirements Document by the FCC

Date: February 20, 1997

Description: NANC Requirements Document made available to the public to allow for its review by the telecommunications industry and potential respondents.

Event: Respondent Preparation of Written Questions

Date: February 28, 1997

Description: Potential respondents to the NANC Requirements Document submitted questions concerning the Requirements Document to clarify their understanding and seek further information from the NANC.

Event: NANC's NANPA Working Group Distribution of Written Responses to Respondents' Questions

Date: March 19, 1997

Description: NANC approved written responses to the questions submitted on February 28, 1997 distributed to all of the respondents.

Event: NANPA Working Group Information Meeting with Respondents

Date: March 26, 1997

Description: Face-to-face meeting with the potential respondents to the NANC Requirements Document to review any additional questions. Potential respondents participating included , Bellcore, CCMI, Lockheed, Mitretek and NECA.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Event: Respondent Proposals Submitted

Date: April 3, 1997

Description: Respondents submitted to the FCC their proposals for NANPA/CO Code Administration and Billing and Collection Agent functions. Proposals submitted by Bellcore, CCMI, Lockheed, Mitretek and NECA.

Event: Evaluation Team Meeting

Date: April 7- 11, 1997

Description: Activities included the following:

1. The Evaluation Team members, approved by the NANC, signed a non-disclosure agreement developed by NANC's Legal Experts Group.
2. Each Evaluation Team member independently reviewed each of the respondent proposals for compliance with Step 1 of the Evaluation process. Per the Requirements Document, Step 1 consisted of the review of the respondent proposals to determine if the proposal complied with the schedule for assuming NANPA responsibilities ordered by the FCC (see Sections 4.3 and 5.3 of this Requirements Document and CC Docket No. 92-237, FCC 95-283; CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 96-333). Respondents' proposals that did not meet this criterion were to be eliminated. None of the respondents were eliminated.
3. Per Step 2 as described in the Requirements Document, the Evaluation Team members reviewed the respondent proposals in order to assess the responses submitted. The Compliance Matrix was used to ascertain whether the respondents met the requirements. Once compliance was confirmed, the evaluation of the detailed information was conducted.

For every response evaluated, evaluators completed the Evaluation Table with their grade of 1-5 for each evaluation criteria per section. Each candidate's score was obtained by multiplying the evaluation grade by the respective weighting factor for that particular section/requirement. A total score for each proposal was derived. It should be noted that this quantitative analysis was intended as an aid in the evaluation process and was not to be the only assessment tool used in the selection of the new NANPA.

4. Per Step 3 of the evaluation process in the Requirements Document, the pricing information was taken into account.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

5. The Evaluation Team generated a list of questions for the respondents that have not been eliminated.

Event: Distributed Questions to Individual Respondents

Time: April 17, 1997

Description: Specific questions were formulated for each respondent based on their individual proposals. These questions sought clarification and/or additional information about their respective proposals on functional and pricing issues.

Event: NANC Meeting

Date: April 23, 1997

Description: NANC agreed to sign a non-disclosure agreement in order to facilitate their discussion of the recommendation developed and submitted by the Evaluation Team.

Event: Submission of Responses to Evaluation Team Questions

Date: April 24, 1997

Description: Respondents submitted their responses to the Evaluation Team questions distributed on April 17, 1997.

Event: Evaluation Team Meeting

Date: April 30 - May 1, 1997

Description: Reviewed written responses to the questions submitted by the respondents. The Evaluation Team developed additional questions for each of the respondents in preparation for the May 2, 1997 individual meeting with respondents. The NANC Legal Experts Group assisted the Evaluation Team with a discussion of the Requirements Document as it related to neutrality. The Team also discussed how to evaluate each respondent with regard to pricing.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Event: Individual Meeting with Respondents

Date: May 2, 1997

Description: Individual respondents gave presentations to the NANPA Evaluation Team for prescribed periods of time. Each NANPA/CO respondents had a 15 minute opening statement. Forty minutes were dedicated to a question and answer session where one evaluation team member asked the questions that had developed by the Evaluation Team. Then the respondents made a 5 minute closing statement. A similar process was followed for the Billing and Collection Agent respondents (CCMI, Lockheed and NECA) with a 10 minute opening presentation, 15 minute question and answer session and a 5 minute closing statement.

Event: Final Evaluation Meeting

Date: May 5-8, 1997

Description:

Based on the written answers and the meeting with the respondents, the Evaluation Team re-evaluated the Respondents by re-scoring the respective proposals per the Evaluation Table and the current pricing information (using the process as defined in Step 3).

As stated in the Requirements Document, the Evaluation Team proceeded with Step 6 of the evaluation process. The team then broke into subgroups and listed the pros and cons for the preferred candidates for the new NANPA. Major attributes of each candidate were identified.

The Evaluation Team members identified their 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice for the new NANPA. A final evaluation was conducted to identify the top two choices.

Next, the Evaluation Team discussed the Billing and Collection Agent respondents using a process similar to NANPA selection.

The Evaluation Team concluded its discussions and developed a report to the NANC providing their recommendations and rationale on the new NANPA and Billing and Collection Agent.

NANC Requirements Document

February 20, 1997

Section 1.9.1 Evaluation Process

Step 1

The first step in the review of the respondent proposals will be to determine if the proposal complies with the schedule for assuming NANPA responsibilities ordered by the FCC (see Sections 4.3 and 5.3 of this Requirements Document and CC Docket No. 92-237, FCC 95-283; CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 96-333). Respondents' proposals that do not meet this criterion shall be eliminated.

Step 2

The second step in the review of the respondent proposals will be to assess the responses submitted. The Compliance Matrix (see description in Section 2.1.3 and Attachment 4, which is to be completed by the respondent) will be used to ascertain whether the respondents meet the requirements. Once this compliance has been confirmed, then the evaluation of the detailed information will be conducted. The various sections referenced in the Evaluation Table in Section 1.9.4, indicate the relative weighting factors allocated to each section. The weighting indicates the relative importance allocated to a particular section.

For every response evaluated, evaluators will complete the Evaluation Table with their grade of 1-5 for each evaluation criteria per section. Each candidate's score will be obtained by multiplying the evaluation grade by the respective weighting factor for that particular section/requirement. A total score will be derived for each proposal. This quantitative analysis is intended as an aid in the evaluation process and may not be the only assessment tool used in the selection of the new NANPA.

Step 2 also consists of a review of compliance with the Neutrality Criteria set forth in, or asserted under authority of, Section 1.2 of this Requirements Document. The NANC may recommend elimination of any respondent deemed not to satisfy these criteria.

Step 3

In the third step of the evaluation process, the pricing information will be taken into account. The pricing information will have a weighting of 50% and all the other evaluation information have a weighting of 50%.

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Step 4

The NANC, with input from the NANPA WAG, will then generate a list of questions to respondents that have not been eliminated. The respondents will answer in writing.

Step 5

After the evaluators have received and reviewed the answers to the questions, the respondents will participate in individual meetings with the evaluators. Based on the written answers and the meeting with the respondents, the evaluators may re-evaluate the finalists by re-scoring the respective proposals per the Evaluation Table and the current pricing information (using the same weightings as in Step 3 above).

Step 6

Using the information gathered in Steps 1-5, the evaluation team will discuss the proposals and reach consensus on a recommendation to the NANC.

1.9.2 Evaluation Criteria

Compliance

Requirements in this Requirements Document that are not complied with or that are only partially complied with will negatively impact the evaluation. Exceptions and deviations from these requirements will be viewed objectively as long as they do not change or alter the overall required specification significantly.

Experience

The respondent should demonstrate that the necessary skills and accumulated knowledge described in Section 3.0 (Qualities and Attributes) and adequate staffing are met. This experience will be necessary to perform the functions and responsibilities outlined in Sections 4.0 to 9.0.

Completeness

Compliance with recommended format and completeness with respect to providing a comprehensive response to the requirements will be evaluated. Failure to adhere to this objective will diminish a respondent's rating.

Communication Effectiveness

Many of the functions require the new NANPA to communicate clearly and concisely to broad audiences with varying degrees of knowledge. There will be an evaluation of the respondents' written communication skills as well as responsiveness.

**NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on
a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)**

Innovation

In evaluating responses, consideration will be given to the creative nature of a response taking into account its efficiency and flexibility.

**NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan
(NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)**

Appendix B

1.9.4 Evaluation Tables

Table A - NANP/CO Code Administration

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | RES-PONDENT | | | | | SCORE TOTAL |
|---|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| SECTION 1: 5% | Compliance | Experience | Innovation | Communications | Completeness | |
| GENERAL INFORMATION (excluding Section 1.2 - Neutrality) | | | | | | |
| SECTION 1 SCORE | | | | | | |
| SECTION 2: 5% | | | | | | |
| PROPOSAL OUTLINE AND RESPONDENT INFORMATION | | | | | | |
| SECTION 2 SCORE | | | | | | |
| SECTION 3: 15% | | | | | | |
| NANPA QUALITIES AND ATTRIBUTES | | | | | | |
| SCORE 3 SCORE | | | | | | |
| SECTION 4: 25% | | | | | | |
| NANPA FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS | | | | | | |
| SECTION 4 SCORE | | | | | | |

**NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan
(NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)**

Table A - NANP/CO Code Administration

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SECTION 5: 35% | | | | | | |
| CENTRAL OFFICE CODE | | | | | | |
| ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| SECTION 5 SCORE | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| SECTION 6 and 7: 5% | | | | | | |
| DISPUTE RESOLUTION | | | | | | |
| ENTERPRISE SERVICES | | | | | | |
| SECTION 6/7 SCORE | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| SECTION 9: 10% | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | | | | | |
| SECTION 9 SCORE | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | |

NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan (NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)

Table B - Billing and Collection Agent

| EVALUATION CRITERIA | RES-PONDENT | | | | | SCORE TOTAL |
|---|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| SECTION 1: 5% | Compliance | Experience | Innovation | Communications | Completeness | |
| GENERAL INFORMATION (excluding Section 1.2 - Neutrality) | | | | | | |
| SECTION 1 SCORE | | | | | | |
| SECTION 2: 5% | | | | | | |
| PROPOSAL OUTLINE AND RESPONDENT INFORMATION | | | | | | |
| SECTION 2 SCORE | | | | | | |
| SECTION 8: 80% | | | | | | |
| BILLING AND COLLECTION AGENCY FUNCTION | | | | | | |
| SECTION 8 SCORE | | | | | | |
| SECTION 9: 10% | | | | | | |
| MISCELLANEOUS | | | | | | |
| SECTION 9 SCORE | | | | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | | | |

**NANP Working Group Evaluation Team Report to the North American Numbering Council (NANC) on a North American Numbering Plan
(NANP) Administrator and Billing and Collection Agent (BCA)**

Pricing Tables

| TABLE 1 - To Perform NANP & CO Code Administration Only | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Function | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
| NANP Administration | | | | | |
| CO Code Administration | | | | | |

| TABLE 2 - To Perform Billing & Collection Only | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Function | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
| Billing & Collection | | | | | |

| TABLE 3 - To Perform All 3 Functions as a Total Solution | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Function | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 |
| NANP Administration | | | | | |
| CO Code Administration | | | | | |
| Billing & Collection | | | | | |

NANC Requirements Document

February 20, 1997

1.2 Neutrality

As stated in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Section 251(e)(1)), the FCC is required to "create or designate one or more impartial entities to administer telecommunications numbering and to make such numbers available on an equitable basis." Further, as stated in CC Docket No. 92-237, the new NANPA "should be a non-governmental entity that is not aligned with any particular telecommunications industry segment." Accordingly, the NANC, acting through its NANPA Working Group ("NANPA WG"), shall apply the following Neutrality Criteria to determine the neutrality of any respondent:

- 1) a respondent may not be an affiliate of any telecommunications service provider(s) as defined in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. "Affiliate" is a person who controls, is controlled by, or is under the direct or indirect common control with another person. A person shall be deemed to control another if such person possesses, directly or indirectly, (i) an equity interest by stock, partnership (general or limited) interest, joint venture participation, or member interest in the other person ten (10%) percent or more of the total outstanding equity interests in the other person, or (ii) the power to vote ten (10%) percent or more of the securities (by stock, partnership (general or limited) interest, joint venture participation, or member interest) having ordinary voting power for the election of directors, general partner, or management of such other person, or (iii) the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of such other person, whether through the ownership of or right to vote voting rights attributable to the stock, partnership (general or limited) interest, joint venture participation, or member interest) of such other person, by contract (including but not limited to stockholder agreement, partnership (general or limited) agreement, joint venture agreement, or operating agreement), or otherwise;
- 2) a respondent and any affiliate thereof may not issue a majority of its debt to, nor may it derive a majority of its revenues from any telecommunications service provider. "Majority" shall mean greater than 50 percent, and "debt" shall mean stocks, bonds, securities, notes, loans or any other instrument of indebtedness; and
- 3) notwithstanding the Neutrality Criteria set forth in 1) and 2) above, a respondent may be determined to be or not to be subject to undue influence by parties with a vested interest in the outcome of numbering administration and activities. NANC may conduct an evaluation to determine whether a respondent meets the undue influence criterion.

In addition to the Respondent Information described in Section 2.0, NANC and/or the FCC may request and consider additional information from the respondent for purposes of applying the Neutrality Criteria in this Section 1.2.