Shawnee Mission School District
RFP 26-007 – Information Technology (IT) Asset Disposal Services
April 9, 2026

Addendum No. 5

The following response addresses question(s) submitted by vendor(s) on April 8, 2026; responses to the question(s) are indicated in **bold**. If you feel that a question has not been addressed, please contact Reed Beebe at purchasing@smsd.org as soon as possible.

1. Could the District provide an example of what a proposal earning the full 30+ points for Service Approach would look like, or share how the evaluation grading scale is applied? Specifically, what criteria or benchmarks are used to determine if a proposal is considered 'ideal' in this category?

   The District is unable to provide a past proposal sample from a previous RFP, as this is the first time that the District has issued an RFP for ITAD services. Regarding how the evaluation grading scale is applied, District-issued RFPs typically ask staff evaluators (composing a committee generally ranging from 3 to 6 staff) to individually/independently rate a proposal based on the criteria listed in the RFP, generally on a scale of 0 to 5 points.

   These points are then added together and divided by the total possible number of points. For example, if three evaluators score the proposal, there is a possible total of (3 evaluators x 5 points =) 15 points; if the combined scoring totals 12 points, the 12 points are divided by 15 points to get at percentage of 0.8. This percentage is then multiplied by the weighted points listed for each criterion in the RFP; for example, "Service Approach" has a weighted score of 35 points, so the vendor's percentage of 0.8 is multiplied by 35 to garner a total of (35 x 0.8=) 28 points for the vendor in that category.

   In terms of the benchmarks used by evaluators to score the "Service Approach" category, the scoring is subjective to each evaluator, although vendors who provide a clear, detailed outline of a robust service model that meets the District needs outlined in the RFP tend to receive higher scoring.

2. If the District were to transition to a new vendor, what elements of service are most critical to ensure continuity and minimize disruption? Are there any specific elements we should include in our proposal to address these priorities?

Regardless of whether the District transitions to a new vendor, the District desires secure, simple, reliable, and regular asset recovery while maximizing revenue return; these factors are critical for the District. These and other beneficial service elements that a responding vendor would like to outline for the District's consideration may be included in the submitted proposal.

3. In past ITAD procurements, has the District ever selected a vendor other than the incumbent, and if so, what factors contributed to that decision?

   The District has not selected another vendor other than the incumbent vendor. This is the first time that the District has issued an RFP for ITAD services.

4. How frequently has the District adjusted scope of services in past contracts, and in what situations?

   The District has never formally adjusted the scope of services with its current service provider.

5. Does the District have benchmarks for typical resale recovery percentages or strategies that have been successful in the past?

   At this time, the District has no specific resale recovery percentage benchmarks. The District desires asset resale solutions that will maximize value to the District.

6. Are there particular challenges or priorities vendors should address in the Service Approach, including any areas where past vendors have historically faced difficulties?

   At this time, the District is not aware of any service areas where a past vendor has faced difficulty in providing ITAD services. The "Service Approach" questions listed in the Attachment B Questionnaire provide good guidance regarding the information the District is seeking regarding a vendor's respective service approach.

7. Does the District have a preference between a revenue-share model versus upfront purchase/guaranteed pricing for resold assets, or is the District open to either?

   The District currently utilizes a revenue-share model, but the District is open to considering an upfront purchase/guaranteed pricing model. The District desires an asset resale/Buyback model that offers the best value to the District. All the "Costs (Commissions, Fees, etc.)" section of the Attachment B Questionnaire asks all vendors to propose pricing in a particular format for "apples to apples" comparison, vendors

may also propose alternative cost structure proposals for the District's consideration, and a vendor may also provide detailed information about various asset resale strategies in its response to the "Ability to Maximize Asset Resale Value" section of the Attachment B Questionnaire.

8. Does the District have benchmarks for resale recovery percentages from past Buybacks? (E.g., iPads, Macbooks, etc.)

   At this time, the District has no specific resale recovery percentage benchmarks. The District desires Buyback solutions that will maximize value to the District.

9. Are there specific elements within the Service Approach (e.g., Buyback planning, logistics, communication, reporting) that the District prioritizes most when assigning scores?

   As outlined in Addendum 5, Question 1 (see above), scoring is subjective to each evaluator, although vendors who provide a clear, detailed outline of a robust service model that meets the District needs outlined in the RFP tend to receive higher scoring.

10. When evaluating proposals, does the District place greater emphasis on guaranteed financial return versus potential for higher resale value through revenue-sharing models?

    The District desires solutions that maximize value to the District. For the District, selecting the financial and service models that provide optimal value to the District is a goal of this RFP process.

11. For large Buyback events (E.g., the 18,200 iPad 9's this summer) what factors have been most critical to the District's success in past refresh cycles?

    Security, accuracy, recovery speed and simplicity.

12. Across all evaluation categories, what differentiates a high-scoring proposal from one that is simply compliant?

    As outlined in Addendum 5, Question 1 (see above), scoring is subjective to each evaluator, although vendors who provide a clear, detailed proposal that addresses the District needs outlined in the RFP tend to receive higher scoring.

13. Are there any nuances in the scope of services listed that have historically been challenging for vendors to execute?

    This District is unaware of any current service points that have been historically challenging for vendors to execute.

End of Addendum No. 5