

# Electronic Presentment and Payment: Selecting the Right Vendor

*Penny Gillespie*

*Contributing Analysts: Andrew Bartels, Steve Hunt and Mike Gilpin*

## Giga Position

Selection of an electronic presentment and payment (EPP) vendor (which includes both the consumer electronic bill presentment and payment (EBPP) products and the business electronic invoice presentment and payment (EIPP) products) can be quite a daunting task, since vendors in their respective EBPP and EIPP categories appear quite similar. In fact, EBPP and EIPP product features and functions are very similar, since minimum requirements and standards have emerged over time. The only exception to this lack of differentiation in product offerings is in the case of EIPP providers, which are starting to distinguish themselves based on the sophistication of their integration into back-office accounting systems such as enterprise resource planning (ERP), accounts payable (AP) or accounts receivable (AR) applications. Otherwise, vendors distinguish themselves from competitors in areas other than features and function, such as technology, scope of offering and financial viability. Therefore, when considering a vendor for EPP, Giga believes companies should make a vendor selection based on underlying technology, product scope, geographic breadth, interface capabilities, financial viability, vendor focus on EPP as a core or noncore part of its business and, of course, price.

Today, considering the uncertain economic times, we believe financial viability is critical — especially since no pure-play EPP vendors are making money. The only profitable vendors in this space are those that can support their EPP losses with revenue from other product lines. Therefore, we assigned a double weight to financial viability by evaluating both short-term and long-term viability. For vendors subsidizing EPP losses with profits elsewhere, an additional criterion is important — the strategic importance of EPP endeavors to the vendor's core business. With a market shakeout coming, companies without a very strategic fit of EPP to core business are likely to drop off as the market consolidates. With these criteria in mind, we believe the top EPP vendors will be **Pitney Bowes docsense** and **Alltel** with **edocs**, **EDS**, **Avolent** and **BCE Emergis** and **Mobius** closely following. Other vendors worth considering include **Metavante**, **Your Accounts.Com**, **BillServ** and **iPlanet** — though each has some outstanding issues that need to be resolved. As for the current market leaders, **CheckFree** and **Princeton eCom**, each must think about expanding its scope and improving its technology or else run the risk of becoming a niche player and giving up its current market share, while Princeton eCom must alleviate financial concerns (due to its private company status).

## Proof/Notes

Giga's categories for accessing EPP vendors and our ratings of vendors against these criteria came about during a series of interviews with 19 vendors that are either current market leaders or are believed to have characteristics that could contribute to a market leadership position. Information from Planning Assumption, [Market Overview: Electronic Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie, was also taken into consideration in evaluating the current key vendors. The fact that the industry is so young with many potential winners, each with their own set of strengths and weaknesses, makes it important to view vendors holistically in addition to the specific product feature function set, which often appears non-distinguishable.

## The Evaluation Criteria

Giga recommends potential buyers evaluate vendors on the following criteria:

1. **Underlying technology** becomes very important as technology advances continue to take place that improve

time to market and allow for integration with other internal applications. Considering the nature of EPP and its reliance on and support for other internal applications (such as customer service and accounting), the ease and ability of the application to be integrated with other applications make the underlying technology even more critical. Therefore, the technology evaluation includes: incorporated standards, infrastructure and platform compatibility, use of Java 2, Enterprise Edition (J2EE), security standards and data retrieval methods. Back-up and recovery capabilities were also taken into consideration for application service providers (ASPs). Points were removed for lack of J2EE, lack of security standards and/or other key standards such as Open Financial Exchange (OFX), inability to support a data-centric model and weak back up and redundancy for ASPs.

2. **Product scope** is the number and type of models supported (ASP, in-house, hybrid, etc.) as well as the market segment served (i.e., EBPP or EIPP or both). Companies supporting multiple models enable a company to get a fast start using an ASP model while working toward a longer-term goal of migrating to an in-house solution. Companies that support both consumer and corporate recipients allow for one-stop shopping and less integration work. In addition, these companies have larger market share opportunities, which could make them more financially viable in the long term.
3. **Geographic breadth** is the countries and/or regions where the product works today or where the product can be regionalized or localized with minimal effort. This becomes increasingly important as geographical boundaries become smaller and companies become more international, if not global. Plus as multinational and global companies look to consolidate processes and add uniformity across boundaries, geographic breadth becomes even more of a factor. Vendors operating in one country were seen as limited and were therefore rated fair. Additional points were added for presence in two countries, or multiregional or global (defined as being in most, if not all, of the major continents) companies.
4. **Interface capabilities** include ease of connectivity with such applications as customer relationship management (CRM), ERP, AP, AR or in-country payment systems. Integration with CRM applications has become critical as recognition has grown that a well-planned EPP application can result in reduced call center calls (which translate into direct cost savings) and that bills (or invoices) are sometimes the only direct and consistent communication with the customer. Integration into accounts applications (ERP, AP, AR, etc.) improves the value proposition for both supplier and buyer. This is particularly true in EIPP because many buyers want consistent payment methods for all suppliers and desire to continue with current payment processes already in place, and both buyer and seller are attempting to streamline processes in the movement toward straight-through processing (STP). The number of in-country payment systems to which a vendor has connectivity has a direct correlation to the price of payment transactions, as in-country systems are usually much cheaper than the cross-borders ones, such as SWIFT (formally the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication). Points were deducted for lack of or minimum CRM interfaces for EBPP providers, lack of or minimum ERP interfaces for EIPP providers and minimum payment interfaces for both EBPP and EIPP providers.
5. **Financial viability** is a big question today. Many players exist within the industry and several announcements have been made of others to come. The expectation of increased competition coupled with the fact that most EPP vendors are losing money on their offerings makes the industry risky and ripe for consolidation. Today, only those vendors offering multiple product lines (in addition to and outside the scope of EPP) appear to be making money. Recognize, however, that a sound technology could possibly compensate for poor financial viability as acquirers will be looking for technology improvements and buying is often cheaper than developing — especially when buying also increases market share, as in the case of Metavante's purchase of **Derivion** (see IdeaByte, [Metavante Acquisition of Derivion Predominately Good News for All](#), Penny Gillespie). To correctly reflect financial viability and not unduly penalize privately funded or startup companies, both short-term and long-term viability have been rated and will carry equal weights on the scoring scale. They are defined as follows:
  - Short-term viability looks at the next year and reviews profitability and cash. Companies reflecting profitability on a sustained basis are rated as high, whereas companies reporting intermittent profits but with a strong cash position are seen as good. Companies losing money but with a strong cash position are

seen as fair whereas companies losing money with small cash reserves are viewed as poor.

- Long-term viability is largely determined from past financial performances (i.e., is revenue increasing, operating costs decreasing), which are expected to continue, and the type of funding. Without verification of audited financial statements, the financial viability of private companies is always questionable.
6. **EPP fit to core business** depends on a company's focus and how well EPP fits into the overall corporate strategy; some vendors are more likely to fund non-profitable operations for a longer period of time. The tighter the fit between EPP and strategic initiatives, the more willing a vendor will be to accept short-term losses for long-term gains (i.e., profitability). It will also be less likely to put aggressive profit goals on the EPP operation and, therefore, lose investment interest if the operation is unable to deliver early in its life cycle. This is especially critical today because EPP has not grown and reached the critical mass it was anticipated to reach early in its tenure. Therefore, companies are being forced to finance money-losing operations longer than anticipated. And, although EPP is poised to take off, profitability may be a few years away for most of the players. Therefore, if EPP was the core business, the company received a high rating. The company also received a high rating if EPP was either extremely strategic (and necessary) to replace potential lost revenues from highly concentrated paper businesses.
  7. **Price** is always of interest and often a differentiator. Today, two pricing models exist: a service-oriented one for a hosted solution (i.e., ASP providers) and a software licensing or in-house one. These are reviewed and rated separately. Vendors were asked to provide starting prices, recognizing many variables constitute an EPP implementation — such as number of billing systems, number of interfaces, complexity of bill, bill volume, etc. Pricing was viewed as low, medium and high. In the case where a vendor did not provide pricing, the assumption was made that the vendor was at the high end of the pricing scale, which translates into a low score. The lower the price, the higher the rating.

## The Rating

Each vendor was rated in each of the eight categories: underlying technology, product scope, geographic breadth, interface capabilities, short-term financial viability, long-term financial viability, EBPP fit to core business and price. (Of course when seeking vendors in the space, always review their customer list for experience in your particular vertical market to benefit from previous lessons learned.)

For each category, a maximum score of 10 was possible for a total possible score of 80. In applying numerical ratings, the following correlations were taken into consideration and should be used for interpreting score results:

**Table 1: Vendor Ranking System**

Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
Single Category	Total Rating	Single Category	Total Rating	Single Category	Total Rating	Single Category	Total Rating
1-2	8-20	3-5	21-44	6-8	45-68	9-10	69-80

## The Results

Each vendor is assessed below in the following order of categories: EPP, EBPP, and EIPP; Non-ASP and ASP vendors are assessed separately within each category except for EIPP vendors. For each category, the strengths and potential weaknesses of each vendor are identified and the detailed vendors' ratings within a given category are compared ([click here for Table 2: EPP \(Non ASP\) Vendors](#); [click here for Table 3: Comparison of EPP Vendors](#)).

Companies wanting to use the same vendor for both consumer and corporate invoices should consider any of these vendors except for BCE Emergis as it does not do all functions in both countries. Customers requiring J2EE architecture should avoid Avolent or iPlanet at this time. The other vendors have incorporated Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) and Java into their applications and have tested with a minimum of one vendor. Mobius, edocs and docsense

have tested with multiple J2EE application servers. Companies requiring global reach should consider Pitney Bowes docsense, edocs, EDS or iPlanet. **Alltel** is a good choice for financial institutions currently engaged with **Spectrum**, since it provided the underlying switch software, so its technology should be very compatible. It would also be a good choice for existing financial services customers or customers in the telecommunications industry, since it has expertise in both. BCE Emergis appears to be a good choice for large financial institutions based on its current customer list and perhaps for anyone in the health care industry due to its involvement in the field with other product lines. Likewise, it could be a good fit for any entity currently using its e-procurement software. Customers concerned about managing print cost while migrating to electronic format should consider **Avolent**, EDS or **Mobius**, since these provide printed copy as well. Mobius is certainly a good bet for its existing printed-form customers and its arrangement with Princeton eCom make both more likely to succeed ([click here for Table 4](#): ASP EPP Vendors; and [click here for Table 5](#): Comparison of ASP EPP Vendors).

Companies considering an ASP model should not be dissuaded by the lower scores of ASP providers unless the company has a multinational or global need for EBPP. In fact, Princeton eCom and YourAccounts.Com are fairly equally ranked across the board, except for financial viability and price. Since Princeton eCom is private, its financials are unknown, whereas the DST Systems parent of YourAccounts.Com is public and financially strong. YourAccounts.Com is also a good choice for companies interested in managing the cost of printed bills and invoices while migrating to an electronic medium. It is also an obvious choice for existing **Output Technology** customers comfortable with an ASP model. However, for companies seeking an ASP solution and one vendor for EPP as well as a pays-all provider, Princeton eCom is the only choice ([click here for Table 6](#): EBPP (Non ASP) Vendors (Excludes EPP Vendors) ; and [click here for Table 7](#): Comparison of EPP Vendors).

Companies seeking an EBPP solution will find Metavante a good bet — particularly if financial viability is an important selection criterion. Other candidates in the category suffer from long-term financial woes and lack of profitability. However, if the EPP market continues to soar and CheckFree is able to maintain its market position, while managing its costs and possibly reducing its acquisition costs, it may be able to improve its long-term financial viability. **Intelidata**, however, has hitched its wagon to Spectrum (which also brought it into the EBPP space) and its success hinges largely on the success of Spectrum and the fortitude of financial institutions in playing a key role in EBPP. On the other hand, **BroadVision** clients could achieve greater product synergy by using the BroadVision EBPP product just as banks currently using Intelidata middleware could also gain product synergy by using the Intelidata EBPP product — especially banks currently engaged with Spectrum. Although BroadVision's EBPP product is highly compatible with its own product lines, it was not designed to plug or play well with others, which makes its success largely contingent on the success of its one-to-one marketing products. Because it relies heavily on CheckFree technology, its EBPP product success also hinges on CheckFree's success ([click here for Table 8](#): ASP EBPP Vendors (Excludes EPP Vendors); and [click here for Table 9](#): Comparison of ASP EBPP Vendors).

In contrast, the ASP providers in the space have limiting characteristics. Billserv, for example, is struggling financially; we were very concerned about its financial viability until it received its latest round of funding in November 2001. Perhaps the infusion of \$2.5 million coupled with its continued revenue growth and continued reduction of cash burn rate could improve its long-term viability. The fact that it has expanded to Australia should increase its revenue potential, as well as offer expansion into other countries since often the first geographical expansion is the hardest — except for migration into countries using double-byte languages. **Symcor**, although backed by strong players, has only recently changed ownership, so the honeymoon continues. Although it serves a very limited geographic market, it appears to be a strong player in the market for B2C billing.

Vendors in the EIPP space are relatively new and have minimum market share (see Planning Assumption, [Market Overview: Electronic Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie). One is focused domestically and two have focus abroad, as well as in the US. Both **BottomLine** and **Clarus** have a presence in Europe, thanks to previously made acquisitions and BottomLine is madding inroads in Latin America as well as Canada. Both are behind in implementations, which is insignificant at this point. Clarus could be a good choice for any existing Clarus customers (i.e., those using its e-procurement or settlement software). And, Clarus is one of the few providers (along with Alltel, Avolent, BCE Emergis, CheckFree and Mobius) that can support the **Microsoft** platform. **BillingZone**

could be a good low cost choice; its B2B market share is currently ahead of its EIPP competitors focusing exclusively on the B2B space—although it is far too early to be comfortable with a lead in the EIPP space today ([click here for Table 10](#): EIPP Vendors (Excludes EPP Vendors); and [click here for Table 11](#): Comparison of EIPP Vendors).

## Alternative View

If economic and market conditions change, then evaluation criteria would be impacted. For example, the criteria of vendor viability and strategic fit to core business are largely due to the current market conditions of having many vendors in the space with none of them making money on EPP endeavors. With EPP poised to take off and demand expected to increase, companies in the space could become profitable sooner than expected. If EPP providers become self-sustaining sooner than expected (i.e., within the next two to three years), then long-term financial viability of the company could become somewhat of a moot point. Long-term viability is only an issue if vendors need either additional revenue or cash supplements until their EPP operations become profitable.

Quicker-than-expected profitability also has a similar impact on companies with subsidiaries engaged in EPP or sponsoring EPP joint ventures, since the same would be true for the criteria of strategic fit to core business. If EPP suddenly becomes profitable, companies with other revenue-generating business lines are less likely to drop it, even if it is not a strategic fit for the company.

The introduction of EPP products by providers with other industry expertise — e.g., ERP application providers — could introduce new feature sets into the current market that would make the actual product offering more of a selection criteria than it is today. Likewise, if vendors introduce new and innovative features to differentiate themselves or develop significant vertical expertise, this could make the actual product offering more critical in the evaluation.

## Findings

Numerous choices exist for EPP solutions and only two vendors come close to being stars at this point and they are closely followed by another cluster of highly rated vendors. Both Pitney Bowes docsense and Alltel are top-tier in their ranking and show exceptional promise in their technology and funding. Edocs has additional merits of the EPP offering being closely aligned strategically with a global focus whereas Alltel shines additionally in the areas of interface capabilities and remains focused in the US. Both offer good product scope although Alltel is lacking somewhat in geographic breadth.

Edocs leads the next tier following closely behind and trailing only by a few points as does EDS, Avolent, Mobius, and BCE Emergis. Edocs leads the group due to its excellent technology and interface capabilities where as EDS stands out due to its broad product offering (numerous models) and strong financial viability.

Avolent, BCE Emergis and Mobius are fairly consistent in their capabilities with some subtle differences. Avolent lacks J2EE technology today, which leaves them behind the pack as the use of J2EE technology is becoming widespread online services. Both Avolent and Mobius serve the paper and electronic markets where as BCE Emergis is strictly electronic, offering other electronic products as well. All three serve as complements to other related industry products. For the most part, these players dual-market focus (EIPP and EBPP) — although in the case of BCE Emergis, the focus is country specific. Avolent maintains a regional present and is a well-respected player in the industry. Mobius has a global presence. Although the BCE Emergis name may be fairly new in the industry, some of the individuals behind the name are well known in the industry. Mobius's greatest strength may be its product vision of desktop aggregation — if it can only find the appropriate channels for fast client growth and market adoption. It has done a good job of translating customer needs and desires into products but has not done a good job at identifying distribution channels or potential customers with broad consumer reach to take advantage of the product

The next group of high-ranked, clustered vendors includes: Metavante, YourAccounts.Com, Billserv and , iPlanet. Interestingly enough, two of the three vendors in this segment focus exclusively on EBPP (Billserv and Metavante)

and two are ASPs (Billserve and YourAccounts.Com). Only one is a global player. Billserve has a strong market lead, as an ASP, rivaling Princeton eCom, whereas YourAccounts.Com is just getting started. Billserve, closely coupled with CheckFree, has done well since it got its foot in the Australian market and may continue to do well; it must do well to get its financials in order. However, with ASP competitors, like YourAccounts.Com, that focus on both markets and have strong financials behind them, it may be no contest. iPlanet, perhaps the sleeping giant finally awakened, could be a good bet for multinational and global companies — especially those using **Sun** hardware and other iPlanet software and seeking one EPP vendor—although it is not too late for someone like BottomLine or Clarus Corporation to catch-up. On the other hand, iPlanet does have an advantage due to its compatibility with **Identrus**, which could make it a good choice for banks participating with Identrus. Metavante is definitely a good bet in the US market for EBPP (and small business EIPP). And considering its aggressive acquisition and growth strategy, we anticipate that Metavante will add EIPP to its portfolio of offerings and understand it is currently negotiating pilots. Therefore, it could be a good choice for US companies seeking to implement a “pays-all” bill payment.

The next cluster of high-ranked vendors includes CheckFree, Billing Zone, Clarus and Symcor. All vendors in this cluster have limited geographic reach and limited product scope, which affects their ratings and may require their expansion in these areas to obtain new market share and become big-league players. Customers who are indifferent to product breadth and geographic scope could find these vendors attractive candidates.

CheckFree is the market leader and it will be fighting hard to maintain the space. And it certainly has a head start in the EBPP space with its pays-all capabilities and new person-to-person (P2P) innovations. To maintain its market share, it will need to move more into the EIPP space or expand its geographic reach at a minimum (if not both) or it could end up a niche player. Although financial institutions, such as Bank of America, which struck a deal with CheckFree in 2000, can consider different EBPP and EIPP vendors for their consumer and corporate customers, other banks will probably not do the same or attempt to do more on their own using the emerging connectivity hubs — such as Spectrum and **MasterCard RPPS**. Also, it’s a question of how long CheckFree’s shareholders will be content to finance its acquisitions, which has been its strategy for market penetration. Most of its market share has been won by acquisition, which does not necessarily equate into good, quality products and services.

BillingZone has been busily gathering customers and does not seem to be impeded by its exclusive ASP offering, which could make it a good bet for a low-cost, EIPP solution. Although Clarus is very new to the EPP space (first implementations still in progress), its broad geographic reach and e-procurement experience could possibly make it a long-term player, particularly for customers on the Microsoft platform, which are likely to be small and midsize companies. How well it does with large players not traditionally standardizing on the Microsoft platform remains to be seen. Although Symcor is limited to the Canadian market, it could still be a good bet for e-Route participants.

So what about Princeton eCom — one of the top four market leaders today? (See Planning Assumption, [Market Overview: Electronic Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie, for more information on market share.) Princeton remains one of the three existing providers of a “pays-all” environment (with CheckFree and Metavante being the others). It is the only choice for companies seeking an ASP, “pays-all” solution that supports EPP. Its largest issue, however, is its private backing. No one really knows how well the company is doing.

## Recommendations

Multinational/global companies requiring the same vendor for all their EPP services should strongly consider Pitney Bowes docsense or edocs or Mobius; iPlanet could be a reasonable choice as well — especially if it migrates its technology to J2EE. BottomLine could become a potential choice as well for multinational and global players.

Alltel is a good choice for any US company — particularly those in the financial services and telecom industries. Edocs has also developed experience in the financial services and telecom industry as well. Thanks to its focus on CRM application interfaces, it is also a good choice for any company looking to incorporate EPP into its CRM strategy. BCE Emergis is a good choice for those interested exclusively in the EIPP space; it might also be a good bet for the insurance industry considering its experience in the industry. Mobius is a good bet if you ultimately

believe the consumer will do his or her own consolidation.

Avolent has been a long-time and well respected player in the industry. Although there are some outstanding questions on technology (lack of J2EE) and finances (due to its private status), it could be appropriate for organizations in the regions it covers. The fact that the company managed to obtain capital in a tight economic market speaks well for the quality of products and services as well as its management team. Of course, the fact that EPP is poised for takeoff had to have assisted in the fund raising as well.

EDS may be the best bet for any highly customized work due to its minimum interfaces to application servers for J2EE compliance and its lack of CRM integrations. On the other hand, it offers a great way to get jump started in the space with its ASP offering and would allow leisurely pursuit of an in-house solution. Companies with a multinational presence and considering initially using an ASP strategy and then migrating to an in-house strategy could also consider Avolent, edocs or EDS. Companies with a US focus wanting to start with an ASP strategy and then migrate to in-house could also consider Alltel and Metavante.

## References

### Related Giga Research

#### Planning Assumptions

[Electronic Bill and Invoice Presentment: Move Over B2C, Here Comes B2B](#), Penny Gillespie

[Market Overview: Electronic Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie

#### IdeaBytes

[Emerging Minimum Standards for Electronic Bill Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie

[Minimum Product Requirements for Electronic Invoice Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie

[Introduction of New Role in EBPP: Connectivity Hub](#), Penny Gillespie

[Defining the Roles of the EBPP Players](#), Penny Gillespie

[EBPP/EIPP: Drop a P Depending on the Country or Market](#), Penny Gillespie

[Choosing an Application Service Provider or an In-House Solution for Electronic Bill or Invoice Presentment and Payment](#), Penny Gillespie

[Defining the Roles of Electronic Invoice Presentment and Payment Players](#), Penny Gillespie

[Metavante Acquisition of Derivion Predominately Good News For All](#), Penny Gillespie

### Relevant Links and Other Sources

Use NACHA (the Electronic Payments Association that was formerly known as the National Automated Clearing House Association), to identify best practices. The organization has completed best practices for both EBPP and EIPP. <http://www.nacha.org>

## Glossary

**Application service provider (ASP):** Indicates service arrangement with software hosted by provider or third party

**Bill consolidator:** A bill service provider that consolidates bills from other bill service providers or billers and delivers them for presentment to the customer service provider.

**Bill detail:** Information from a biller that provides invoice line-level information to a customer. This may include specific billing event information such as credit card charges, telephone calls or kilowatts used. (Bill detail is also

known as invoice detail.)

**Bill summary:** Summary information from a biller that is essential to a customer to understand what is owed. Typical information may include the amount owed, date the amount is due and the customer's account number with the biller. (Bill summary is also known as summary record, summary, invoice summary, invoice summary record, bill summary record.)

**Biller:** Company or organization that sends a bill or statement, usually a request for payment for a product or service previously provided to a customer. The customer may be a consumer or another business.

**Biller payment provider (BPP):** An agent of the biller that accepts remittance information on behalf of the biller.

**Biller service provider (BSP):** An agent of the biller that provides EBPP service for the biller.

**Customer payment provider (CPP):** An agent of the customer that originate payments on behalf of the customer.

**Customer service provider (CSP):** An agent of the customer that provides an interface directly to customers, businesses or others for bill presentment. CSPs enroll customers, enable presentment and provide customer care — particularly in the B2C space.

**In-house (IH):** Indicates software licensing arrangement with the application hosted by the customer.

## Tables

**Table 1: Vendor Ranking System**

Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
Single Category	Total Rating	Single Category	Total Rating	Single Category	Total Rating	Single Category	Total Rating
1-2	8-20	3-5	21-44	6-8	45-68	9-10	69-80

**Table 2: EPP (Non ASP) Vendors**

Company	Focus	Rating	Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
Alltel	EPP IH/ ASP US/Canada Expanding	66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expertise in fin services &amp; telecom</li> <li>• J2EE with BEA</li> <li>• Strong on payment interfaces</li> <li>• Channel integration for existing customers</li> <li>• Certified BSP for Spectrum</li> <li>• Financially strong</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak on CRM interfaces</li> <li>• Late start</li> </ul>
Avolent	EPP IH-ASP Multi-region	61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long standing player</li> <li>• Heavily focused on standards</li> <li>• Strong supporting relationships</li> <li>• Expertise in fin services</li> <li>• Paper &amp; electronic delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>• Proprietary application may not be portable</li> <li>• Funding (i.e., private)</li> </ul>

BCE Emergis	EBPP/EIPP IH/ASP US/Canada	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Supports numerous payment types</li> <li>• Strong cash position</li> <li>• Strengths in payments &amp; processing</li> <li>• Developing expertise in fin services</li> <li>• Initial clients are well-recognized</li> <li>• Working on multi-currency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all services available in both supported countries</li> <li>• No support for OFX</li> </ul>
Pitney Bowes docsense	EPP IH Global	68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good technology breadth</li> <li>• J2EE with BEA &amp; IBM</li> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Good product breadth &amp; reach</li> <li>• Supports multiple payment systems</li> <li>• Financially strong</li> <li>• Developed expertise in utilities</li> <li>• Paper and electronic delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak on CRM interfaces</li> <li>• No support of document centric model</li> </ul>
Edocs	EPP IH/ASP Global	63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good product breadth &amp; reach</li> <li>• J2EE with BEA, IBM &amp; iPlanet</li> <li>• Many CRM &amp; related relationships</li> <li>• Developed expertise in telecom &amp; fin services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding (i.e., private)</li> </ul>
EDS	EPP IH/ASP Global	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good product breadth &amp; reach</li> <li>• J2EE with HP Bluestone</li> <li>• Financially strong</li> <li>• Developed expertise in telecom &amp; utilities</li> <li>• Paper &amp; electronic delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No OFX usage</li> <li>• CRM support is a proprietary target marketing application</li> </ul>
iPlanet	EPP IH Global	55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compatible with iPlanet products</li> <li>• Global in design</li> <li>• Developed expertise in fin services</li> <li>• Numerous payment provider options</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>• Financials fair</li> <li>• JV backers may tire of losses</li> </ul>
Mobius	EPP IH US/Europe	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• J2EE with BEA, IBM, iPlanet, Jrun, and Tomcat</li> <li>• Supports numerous ERP interfaces</li> <li>• Siebel interface certified</li> <li>• Paper &amp; electronic delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports print stream files only</li> <li>• Financials need improvement</li> </ul>

**Table 3: Comparison of EPP Vendors**

Company	Alltel	Avolent	BCE Emergis	Pitney Bowes docsense	edocs	EDS	iPlanet	Mobius
Technology	9	7	8	9	9	8	6	8
Product Scope	7	7	8	8	8	9	7	7
Geographic Breadth	6	7	6	8	8	8	8	7
Interface Capabilities	9	8	7	8	9	5	8	8
ST Financial Viability	9	7	8	9	8	9	8	7
LT Financial Viability	9	6	8	9	8	9	7	7
EPP Fit	8	10	9	10	10	8	8	10
Price	9	9	6	7	3	6	3	6
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>60</b>

**Table 4: ASP EPP Vendors**

Company	Focus	Rating	Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
Princeton eCom	EPP ASP US	48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expertise in payments</li> <li>Best of breed security</li> <li>Offers a pays-all solution</li> <li>ASP Market leader</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>Limited models &amp; geo reach</li> <li>Lack of profitability</li> <li>Funding (i.e., private)</li> </ul>
Your Accounts.com	EPP ASP US	57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>Paper and electronic delivery</li> <li>Financially strong</li> <li>Developed expertise in financial services &amp; utilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>Limited models &amp; geo reach</li> <li>No CRM interfaces</li> </ul>

**Table 5: Comparison of ASP EPP Vendors**

Company	Princeton eCom	YourAccounts.Com
Technology	7	6
Product Scope	7	6
Geographic Breadth	4	6
Interface Capabilities	5	5
ST Financial Viability	7	9
LT Financial Viability	5	9
EPP Fit	10	10
Price	3	6
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>57</b>

**Table 6: EBPP (Non ASP) Vendors (Excludes EPP vendors)**

Company	Focus	Rating	Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
BroadVision	EBPP IH Multiregion	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>Compatibility w/other BroadVision products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>Limited payment choices</li> <li>Recent financial losses</li> <li>Limited interface capabilities</li> </ul>

CheckFree	EBPP IH/ASP (for bill enablement only) US	53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market leader</li> <li>• Long standing player</li> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Expertise in payments</li> <li>• Offers a pays-all solution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>• Limited models &amp; geo reach</li> <li>• Lack of consistent profitability</li> </ul>
InteliData	EBPP IH US	49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J2EE w/ WebLogic</li> <li>• Expertise in fin services</li> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• CSP certified for Spectrum</li> <li>• Numerous partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited models &amp; geo reach</li> <li>• Lack of profitability</li> <li>• Lagging in implementations</li> </ul>
Metavante	EBPP IH/ASP US/Canada	58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expertise in fin services</li> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Financially strong</li> <li>• Developed utilities experience</li> <li>• Offers a pays-all solution</li> <li>• Paper &amp; electronic delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>• Limited geo reach</li> </ul>

**Table 7: Comparison of EPP Vendors**

Company	Broadvision	CheckFree	Intelidata	Metavante
<b>Technology</b>	5	6	7	6
<b>Product Scope</b>	6	7	6	7
<b>Geographic Breadth</b>	7	6	5	6
<b>Interface Capabilities</b>	2	6	5	6
<b>ST Financial Viability</b>	7	7	7	9
<b>LT Financial Viability</b>	5	5	5	9
<b>EPP Fit</b>	7	10	9	10
<b>Price</b>	3	6	5	5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>58</b>

**Table 8: ASP EBPP Vendors (Excludes EPP vendors)**

Company	Focus	Rating	Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
Billserve	EBPP ASP US/Australia	56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed expertise in fin services &amp; utilities</li> <li>• Multiple partners for payment</li> <li>• Market leader in EBPP ASP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-J2EE technology</li> <li>• Lack of profitability</li> <li>• Heavy reliance on CheckFree</li> <li>• Heavy reliance on Net Agent</li> <li>• Limited models &amp; geo reach</li> </ul>
Symcor	EBPP ASP Canada	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JV backers financially strong</li> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Paper &amp; electronic delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliance on others technology</li> <li>• Limited model and geo reach</li> <li>• New joint venture funding</li> </ul>

**Table 9: Comparison of ASP EBPP Vendors**

Company	Billserv	Symcor
<b>Technology</b>	6	8

<b>Product Scope</b>	6	6
<b>Geographic Breadth</b>	6	4
<b>Interface Capabilities</b>	7	5
<b>ST Financial Viability</b>	7	8
<b>LT Financial Viability</b>	5	8
<b>EPP Fit</b>	10	10
<b>Price</b>	9	3
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>52</b>

**Table 10: EIPP Vendors (Excludes EPP vendors)**

Company	Focus	Rating	Strengths	Potential Weaknesses
BottomLine Technologies	EIPP IH /ASP (Non-hosted by vendor) US, Europe, Central America	47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong background in payments</li> <li>• Good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Planned migration to J2EE</li> <li>• Strength in payments &amp; processing</li> <li>• Multi-currency and multi-lingual product</li> <li>• Numerous channel partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financials poor but improving</li> <li>• Lagging in implementations</li> <li>• Success contingent on channel partners</li> </ul>
Clarus	EIPP IH  US, Europe	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPP good strategic fit with company</li> <li>• Compatibility w/other co. products</li> <li>• Supports many payment methods</li> <li>• Can use EIPP app for 2-way matching (PO and invoice)</li> <li>• Supports many payment interfaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology may be best suited for small to midsize companies</li> <li>• No download to ERP</li> <li>• Financials fair but improving</li> <li>• Lagging in implementations</li> </ul>
BillingZone	EIPP ASP US	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• J2EE with Weblogic</li> <li>• Invoice consolidation</li> <li>• Initial clients are well recognized</li> <li>• Numerous channel partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JV may tire of funding if too long to profitability</li> <li>• Limited models &amp; geo reach</li> <li>• No support for document-centric model</li> <li>• Corporate America may show some resistance to a nonbank ASP model</li> <li>• Success may be contingent on channel partners</li> </ul>

**Table 11: Comparison of EIPP Vendors**

Company	BottomLine Technologies	Clarus	BillingZone
<b>Technology</b>	5	6	7
<b>Product Scope</b>	6	6	6
<b>Geographic Breadth</b>	7	7	4
<b>Interface Capabilities</b>	7	8	7
<b>ST Financial Viability</b>	5	5	7

<b>LT Financial Viability</b>	6	6	6
<b>EPP Fit</b>	8	8	6
<b>Price</b>	3	6	9
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>