

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)

1.0 Executive Summary

This report provides a recommendation and the associated rationale regarding the selection of a new administrator for the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) and U.S. Central Office (CO) codes, including a Billing and Collection Agent, in accordance with FCC CC Docket No. 92-237, Report and Order, FCC 95-283, CC Docket N.96-98, FCC 96-333. The report is provided to assist the NANC in making a recommendation to the FCC.

The NANC received four proposals in response to the request for a new NANPA (Bell Communications Research - Bellcore, the Center for Communications Management Information - CCMI, Lockheed Martin - Lockheed and Mitretek) and three proposals for the Billing and Collection Agent (CCMI, Lockheed and National Exchange Carrier Association - NECA) based upon the Requirements Document developed by the NANC and issued by the FCC on February 20, 1997 in News Release 97-8.

The NANPA Working Group Evaluation Team reached consensus to recommend two respondents, Mitretek and Lockheed, as the preferred choices for the new NANP Administrator and NECA as the primary choice for the Billing and Collection Agent. Although the Team could not achieve a consensus on a single respondent for the new NANPA, a majority preferred Mitretek.

The selection process was based on the Requirements Document which identifies the NANP/Central Office Code Administration and Billing and Collection Agent responsibilities and functions, respondent information, NANPA qualities and attributes, dispute resolution, enterprise services and pricing.

The Evaluation Team concluded that the proposals made by Mitretek and Lockheed presented the best solutions for the new NANPA because they were fully compliant with the NANC Requirements Document. Both organizations demonstrated compliance with the Neutrality Criteria set forth in Section 1.2 of the Requirements Document. Each displayed a firm understanding and appreciation for the numerous complexities associated with administering the North American Numbering Plan. Finally, these two respondents differentiated themselves from the other respondents 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.

In a direct comparison of the Mitretek and Lockheed proposals, a majority of the Evaluation Team preferred the Mitretek proposal. This report describes the rationale for the majority and minority preferences, identifying the pros and cons of each of the proposals in order to assist the NANC in making its recommendations to the FCC.

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)

Subject to the implementation of the neutrality cure identified in this report, the Evaluation Team recommends that NECA be the Billing and Collection Agent. This recommendation is based upon NECA's significant experience in cost recovery mechanisms and billing for the telecommunications industry (e.g., Telecommunications Relay Service - TRS) and the fact that NECA's price is lower than the other qualified respondent's price.

2.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a recommendation including supporting rationale to the NANC from the NANPA Working Group Evaluation Team regarding the selection of a new administrator for the North American Numbering Plan and U.S. Central Office (CO) codes, including a Billing and Collection Agent.

Background

On July 13, 1995, a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) order established the North American Numbering Council to assist in adopting a new model for the administration of the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) (CC Docket No. 92-237, Report and Order, FCC 95-283, CC Docket N.96-98, FCC 96-333).

The NANC is chartered to assure that NANP administration supports the following policy objectives: (1) that the NANP facilitates entry into the communications marketplace by making numbering resources available on an efficient, timely basis to communications services providers; (2) that the NANP does not unduly favor or disfavor any particular industry segment or group of consumers; (3) that the NANP does not unduly favor one technology over another; (4) that the NANP gives consumers easy access to the public switched telephone network; and (5) that the NANP ensures that the interests of all NANP member countries are addressed fairly and efficiently, fostering continued integration of the NANP across NANP member countries. The NANC has oversight responsibility for the new NANPA and the Billing and Collection Agent.

The NANC will make a recommendation to the FCC on the selection of a new administrator of the NANP and Billing and Collection Agent. Under the auspices of the NANC, the NANP Working Group was formed to develop a Requirements Document and an evaluation process to assess candidates for the new Administrator and the Billing and Collection Agent. A primary requirement of the process is to select an Administrator who must be fair, impartial, not aligned with any particular telecommunications industry segment and meets all the requirements stated in the February 20, 1997 NANC Requirements Document.

The selection process is based on the Requirements Document which identifies the NANP/Central Office (CO) Code Administration and Billing and Collection Agency

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)

responsibilities and functions, including respondent information, NANPA qualities and attributes, dispute resolution, enterprise services, and pricing.

On February 20, 1997, the FCC issued a public announcement to solicit responses to the Requirements Document by April 3, 1997. The NANC formed an Evaluation Team (Appendix A) representative of the telecommunications industry to assess the merits of the responses and to make a recommendation to the NANC. The process used by the Evaluation Team to evaluate the respondents' proposals is outlined in Appendix B.

3.0 Analysis and Recommendations

The following is an overview of the Evaluation Team analysis of the respondent proposals, including pros and cons, and the conclusions reached by the Team.

3.1 Overview

After careful consideration of the four proposals to perform the functions associated with NANP/CO Code administration, the Evaluation Team concluded that the proposals made by Mitretek and Lockheed presented the best solutions for the new NANPA.

Each of these two respondents provided proposals that were fully compliant with the NANC Requirements Document. Both organizations demonstrated compliance with the Neutrality Criteria set forth in Section 1.2 of the Requirements Document. Both displayed a firm understanding and appreciation of the numerous complexities associated with administering the North American Numbering Plan. Finally, these two respondents differentiated themselves from the other respondents 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.

In the direct comparison of the Mitretek and Lockheed proposals, a majority of the Evaluation Team preferred the Mitretek proposal. A minority of the Team preferred the Lockheed proposal. The following sections discuss the rationale for these preferences, identifying the pros and cons of each of the proposals, and are provided to assist the NANC in their review and discussion.

However, these pros and cons do not represent the consensus of the Evaluation Team; rather, they represent the thoughts and opinions of individual members of the Evaluation Team and are provided to assist the NANC in their discussion of this report.

3.2 NANPA Recommendations & Rationale

Mitretek

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)

A majority of the evaluation team favored the Mitretek proposal. In addition to having met all the requirements, the proposal was given strong marks for its detailed analysis and understanding of the requirements, the numbering expertise of the staff recently acquired by Mitretek, Mitretek's willingness to make available all intellectual property rights to any successor and their participation in recent Industry Numbering Committee (INC) and NANPA Working Group activities.

Concerns were raised regarding the significantly higher price of the Mitretek proposal which reflected Mitretek's larger staff relative to other respondents' proposals. Further, concerns were raised about a lack of corporate experience related to number administration. Although Mitretek provided a firm fixed price, some evaluators interpreted certain Mitretek comments to mean that Mitretek may seek additional funding.

Following is a detailed summary of the evaluation team's assessment of the Mitretek proposal:

Organizational Structure

Pros

Mitretek will only be performing NANP administration and not other types of numbering administration (i.e. Local Number Portability Number Portability Administration Center - LNP NPAC - and 800/888 Help Desk). The selection of Mitretek as the Administrator of the NANP would provide the industry with another supplier of numbering administration services, thus enhancing vendor diversity and a competitive market for such services in the future (e.g., fair prices, choice, innovation). This should also ensure that Mitretek's performance of the NANP administration will not be unduly influenced by those parties who have contracted for LNP NPAC and 800/888 Help Desk services.

Decentralized CO Code and NPA Relief Planning will enhance Mitretek's ability to attract experienced personnel and to more easily acquire understanding of local numbering needs and issues.

Cons

Mitretek's decentralized CO Code and NPA Relief Planning may negatively affect their consistency in applying industry numbering guidelines among the different central office code administration centers. There is no consensus in the industry that such a decentralized organizational structure is necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of NPA Relief Planning and CO Code administration.

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.

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)

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.