

Same book. Same agents. More cash collected.

A North American collection agency split a telecom book in two, at random, before anyone dialed. One half went to the agent BestPair matched it to. The other half ran on the usual process. Same dialer, same agents, same weeks.

\$98.76

Collected per account reached, matched by BestPair

\$79.17

Collected per account reached, on the usual process

25%

More collected per account reached (24.7%, rounded)

170,000

Telecom accounts, split 50/50 at random before the first call

The question

One question, asked the way an owner would: did pairing produce more cash when everything else stayed the same?

Vendor results usually compare different books, different agents or different months. This test changed one thing only: which agent was matched to which account.

The book

170,000 telecom accounts at one agency, split 50/50 at random before the first call: 84,762 to BestPair and 85,119 to the usual process. Balances were matched across both halves. Nobody chose which accounts went where.

What changed, and what did not

Only the pairing of account and agent. The dialer, the agents, the weeks and the outbound process stayed as they were.

- **BestPair recommends, the dialer decides.** For each account, BestPair named the best-matched agent. The dialer routed the call to that agent when they were free, and to whoever was free when they were not.
- **BestPair never dials.** It did not choose who got called, or when.

How it was counted

- **Real cash.** Cash collected in the 30 days after each account's first real conversation.
- **Every reached account counts.** Each account stayed in the half it was assigned to, whether or not the dialer followed the recommendation: 1,082 reached accounts in the BestPair half and 1,058 in the usual process.
- **No single payment decides it.** The largest 1% of payments were trimmed, so one large payment cannot swing the result.

The result

\$98.76 collected per account reached in the BestPair half, against \$79.17 on the usual process: 24.7% more.

Across the month that came to \$23,096 more cash from the matched half: \$106,858 from 1,082 reached accounts, against \$83,762 from 1,058.

The difference came from more cash from the accounts that paid, not from more people paying.

Where the difference came from

A longer read of the same test, through 7 July 2026, split the reached accounts by the size of their instalment, the best measure of account size this book holds. It counts the 2,661 reached accounts whose 30-day payment window had closed, so its dollar figures are not the May result above, but they show where that result came from.

Across the whole book, the share of reached accounts that paid was about the same in both halves: 1.8 percentage points higher in the BestPair half, a gap chance alone could produce. What changed was the size of the account, and the larger the account, the bigger the gap.

INSTALMENT	USUAL PROCESS	BESTPAIR	ACCOUNTS THAT PAID, BESTPAIR HALF
Under \$168	\$33	\$31	5.5 points fewer, within chance
\$168 to \$617	\$71	\$87	3.5 points more, within chance
\$617 and over	\$139	\$179	7.2 points more, a clear difference
\$1,000 and over	\$141	\$199	33.8% against 21.9%, a clear difference

Dollars collected per account reached, with the largest 1% of payments capped. "Points" are percentage points of reached accounts that paid. Instalments of \$617 and over hold about 60% of all dollars collected, and \$1,000 and over is part of that group.

On the smallest accounts the two halves were level. On instalments of \$1,000 or more, about one in three reached accounts paid in the BestPair half, against about one in five on the usual process.

What we think is happening

This is our reading of the pattern, a hypothesis rather than a finding: the more persuasion an account needs, the more it matters who is on the call. A small instalment tends to be paid, or not, whoever asks for it. A large one takes a conversation that some agents handle far better than others, so putting those accounts in front of those agents raises the chance of a yes, and the amount paid with it.

It comes from this one test: one telecom book at one agency. It does not show that the same pattern will hold on other books or other floors. Whether it holds on yours is what the Floor Assessment looks for in your own history.

The recommended agent took only half the calls

Adherence is how often the agent BestPair recommended was the agent who actually took the call. In this test it was about 50%.

BestPair named the best-matched agent for every account, but it never controlled the dialer. When that agent was free, the dialer put the call through to them. When they were busy, the call went to whoever was free, as it always had. So about half the calls in the BestPair half were not taken by the agent BestPair picked.

Those calls still count in the BestPair half. Every result on this page was earned with the match reaching the call only about half the time; the other half was worked much as it would have been anyway. The test did not measure what happens when the recommended agent takes most of the calls. That is the next thing to measure, and it is why Stage 2 requires at least 70% of BestPair-group contacts to reach the assigned agent.

What it shows, and what it does not

- **One book, two reads.** The headline result covers May 2026 only, the cleanest month. The breakdown by account size comes from the longer read through 7 July 2026, which takes in weeks when routing delivery and the agent roster were less clean.
- **The recommendation reached the call about half the time.** Every reached account still counts in its own half, so that shortfall is inside the result, not excluded from it.
- **Half the book was the control group.** In Stage 2 it is 20%.
- **One telecom book at one agency.** It shows that pairing works when everything else is held still. It is not a forecast for your floor.

What it means for your floor

Your number comes from your own history, and that is what the Floor Assessment measures: four weeks, on up to 24 months of your own data, with nothing changed on your floor. If you go on to Stage 2, it is measured the way this test was, every month, against a control group on your own floor.

What would your own floor show? At bestpair.ai, watch the two-minute explainer, try the calculator on your own numbers and see the sample report. Or book a 45-minute fit call at bestpair.ai/book, or email kevin@value-ad.com.

Read it online at <https://bestpair.ai/case-studies/telecom-may-2026/>. BestPair is a product of Datamize, Inc.