

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 220000000914

The Department of Technology, Management and Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal No. 220000002425, IT Asset Disposal Services, and has recommended an award to Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc., in the amount of \$0.00, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State's rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Nichole Harrell, Solicitation Manager.
 Harrelln@michigan.gov
 (517) 449-9245

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide IT Asset Disposal Services for the State. The term of this contract is five (5) years, with up to five (5) additional one-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on June 6, 2022, for thirty-three (33) days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of July 8, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Sigma Wireless, Inc.	326 West Cordova St., Vancouver, BC V6B 1E8 Canada	No
Valley City Electronic Recycling	2929 32 nd St. SE, Kentwood, MI 49512	No
CDM Technologies LLC	14335 Industrial Center Dr., Shelby Township, MI 48326	No
Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc.	1250 Allen Dr., Troy, MI 48083	No

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Vendor Questions Worksheet (except experience)	5
2.	Vendor Questions Worksheet (experience)	30
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 (General Requirements)	11
4.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 (Pick-Up Requirements)	8
5.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3 (Additional Requirements 1-7)	30
6.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 2 (Acceptance)	1
7.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3 (Staffing)	14
8.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (Project Management)	6
9.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5 - 8 (Ordering thru Specific Standards)	5
	Total	110

Proposals receiving 88 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The State may utilize all bidder information, without regard to a proposal’s technical score, to determine fair market value for goods or services sought. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. If applicable, the State’s evaluation will include consideration of a bidder’s qualified disabled veterans/service-disabled veteran owned business(QDV/SDVOB) status under MCL 18.1261(8). Additional information on the SDVOB preference is available at: Michigan.gov/SDVOB.

The State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Contract Terms. The State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to accept the Contract Terms, Nevertheless, the bidder may submit proposed changes to the Contract Terms in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the bidder’s need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the bidder’s need for the proposed change constitutes the bidder’s acceptance of the Contract Terms. General statements, such as that the bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may be considered non-responsive.

The State may but is not required to conduct an on-site visit to tour and inspect the bidder’s facilities; require an oral presentation of the bidder's proposal; conduct interviews, research, reference checks, and background checks; and request additional price concessions at any point during the evaluation process.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the Solicitation Manager in collaboration with a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Seth Wright, State Administrative Manager, Department of Technology, Management and Budget, Logistics and Operations Support	N/A
Nichole Harrell, Category Analyst, Department of Technology, Management and Budget (DTMB)	N/A

III. Evaluation Results

A. Sigma Wireless, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Sigma Wireless, Inc., based on a score of 86, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (except experience)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 2. Company Background and Information – Bidder mentioned how the company has accomplished their growth but did not provide any company history.
- b. Section 9. Supplier Diversity – Bidder does not have a supplier diversity program or training.

3/5

2. Vendor Questions Worksheet (experience)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Experience 2 – Experience provided would be considered more of a recycling program and not an IT asset management and sanitization program.
- b. Experience 3 - Experience provided would be considered more of a recycling program and not an IT asset management and sanitization program.

18/30

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1. General Requirements

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

11/11

4. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.2. Pick-Up Requirements

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

8/8

5. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.3. Additional Requirements

Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 1) Service Components, j.) – Bidder does not mention that hard-drive shredding will take place on-site at the bidder's location and on camera.
- b. Sub-section 1) Service Components, k.) – Bidder does not mention that certificates of disposal will be submitted to the Program Manager as part of the annual audit.
- c. Sub-section 5) Audit Requirements – Bidder does not provide detail regarding the audit criteria listed; company HR policies, their facility building security, operational procedures, employee background checks, etc.

27/30

6. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 2. Acceptance

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

1/1

7. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3. Staffing

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 3.1. Contractor Representative, 1) – The Contractor Representative listed is available 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Work hours for DTMB begins at 8:00 a.m. and ends at 5:00 p.m. ET. This would leave an hour with no one to contact in the event of a serious issue.
- b. Sub-section 3.1. Contractor Representative, 2) – Bidder provided very little detail regarding Security Awareness training and there is no mention of confidentiality training. This training portion does not sound very organized and there is no mention of this training occurring annually and being tracked.
- c. Sub-section 3.2. Customer Service Toll-Free Number – Bidder responded that they do not have a toll-free number but will obtain one if selected. There may also be associated charges for the State since Bidder is outside of the U.S.
- d. Sub-section 3.4. Organizational Chart – Bidder responded that the Organizational Chart was included with their proposal as an attachment, however, chart was not included.
- e. Sub-section 3.7. Security and Background Checks – Bidder responded that they desired to work with their local police department. The State requires employee background checks to be performed by Michigan State Police (MSP). Bidder did not provide much detail regarding their employee background check process as a whole. They also do not mention affidavits of confidentiality.

8/14

8. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 4. Project Management

Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 4.3. Reporting – Very little detail provided regarding their reporting capabilities. Response provided is just a rewording of the State's requirement.

5/6

9. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 5. Ordering thru Section 8. Specific Standards
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

5/5

Total Score: 86/110

B. Valley City Electronic Recycling

The Evaluation Team determined that Valley City Electronic Recycling, based on a score of 84, did not meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (except experience)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Section 2. Company Background and Information – Bidder provided a response of “organic growth” when asked to discuss company history.
 - b. Section 2. Company Background and Information – Bidder does not discuss relationships or partnerships that bring significant value to the State.
 - c. Section 9. Supplier Diversity – Bidder did not provide a response.

1/5

2. Vendor Questions Worksheet (experience)
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. Experience 3 - Does not mention data destruction or sanitization as being a part of this experience. Would not be considered similar in scope.

28/30

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1. General Requirements
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

11/11

4. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.2. Pick-Up Requirements
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

8/8

5. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.3. Additional Requirements
 Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 1) Service Components, j.) – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- b. Sub-section 1) Service Components, k.) – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- c. Sub-section 5) Audit Requirements – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.

24/30

6. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 2. Acceptance

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

1/1

7. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3. Staffing

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 3.1. Contractor Representative, 1) – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- b. Sub-section 3.1. Contractor Representative, 2) – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- c. Sub-section 3.2. Customer Service Toll-Free Number – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- d. Sub-section 3.4. Organizational Chart – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- e. Sub-section 3.6. Key Personnel - Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.
- f. Sub-section 3.7. Security and Background Checks - Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.

2/14

8. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 4. Project Management

Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 4.3. Reporting – Bidder did not provide a detailed response as required.

4/6

9. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 5. Ordering thru Section 8. Specific Standards

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

5/5

Total Score: 84/110

C. CDM Technologies LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that CDM Technologies LLC, based on a score of 102, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (except experience)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 2. Company Background and Information – Relationships/partnerships listed are not those that the State would consider of significant value.

4/5

2. Vendor Questions Worksheet (experience)

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience - Bidder does not have experience in the public sector. Understanding the workings of Government and how they operate is very important. State governments operate a lot differently than private businesses. Governments handle very sensitive taxpayer PII, which would be a huge issue if there was a data breach.

28/30

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1. General Requirements

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

11/11

4. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.2. Pick-Up Requirements

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

8/8

5. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.3. Additional Requirements

Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 1) Service Components, k.) – Bidder responds that they use R2 certified recycling “companies” meaning several. This can become problematic in terms of maintaining the Chain of Custody. It is important for the State to know who these downstream companies are because they would need to be vetted and occasionally audited by the State.
- b. Sub-section 5) Audit Requirements – Bidder agrees without exception. However, respond that they go through similar audits regularly as part of R2 and ISO certifications and that they will comply and provide necessary demonstratives and documentation. Bidder does not provide much detail about their policies and procedure, if any, that are related to the criteria mentioned.

28/30

- 6. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 2. Acceptance
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

1/1

- 7. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3. Staffing
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Sub-section 3.1. Contractor Representative, 2) – Bidder states they provide initial and ongoing training on their many data and material safety and security protocols. However, Bidder does not detail what this training consists of or that this happens on an annual basis.

13/14

- 8. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 4. Project Management
 Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Sub-section 4.3. Reporting – Utilize Razor ERP Software, which allows them to pull each of the requested reports on demand. Also, can share up to the minute reporting and data on demand. Is the State familiar with Razor ERP and will it produce reports that satisfy the State's needs? Did not discuss Chain of Custody document. More detail regarding reporting capabilities since this is a program that the State is not familiar with.

5/6

- 9. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 5. Ordering thru Section 8. Specific Standards
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

5/5

Total Score: 102/110

D. Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc., based on a score of 106, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- 1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (except experience)
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section.

5/5

- 2. Vendor Questions Worksheet (experience)
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section.

30/30

- 3. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1. General Requirements
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

11/11

4. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.2. Pick-Up Requirements

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

8/8

5. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 1.3. Additional Requirements

Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 1) Service Components, k.) – Notes documents, which the Bidder attached to their proposal, in their response and also notes relationship with Great Lakes Recycling as helping them meet this requirement. No mention of Certificates of Disposal being submitted to Program Manager.
- b. Sub-section 5) Audit Requirements – Bidder only notes attached documents and does not provide a detailed response as required.

28/30

6. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 2. Acceptance

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

1/1

7. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 3. Staffing

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Sub-section 3.1. Contractor Representative, 2) – No mention of Confidentiality Training. Bidder provides copies of policies and procedures noting security awareness training put on by Paylocity Learning Center but does not detail the training itself.
- b. Sub-section 3.7. Security and Background Checks - Have current system in place with MSP conducting background and fingerprint. Provided FOB Access log and Annual background check and Security Training. Only provided attachments and no detail regarding their process or confidentiality agreement. You could infer that since they are the incumbent, all of this is in place. However, Bidder does not provide a detailed response considering this is a new bid.

12/14

8. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 4. Project Management

The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

6/6

9. Schedule A – Statement of Work, Section 5. Ordering thru Section 8. Specific Standards
 The Evaluation Team determined that the Bidder met all requirements of this section with no exceptions.

5/5

Total Score: 106/110

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		Sigma Wireless	Valley City Electronic Recy.	CDM Technologies	Re-Source Partners
1	Vendor Questions Worksheet (except experience)	3	1	4	5
2	Vendor Questions Worksheet (experience)	18	28	28	30
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 (General Requirements)	11	11	11	11
4	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.2 (Pick-Up Requirements)	8	8	8	8
5	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1.3 (Additional Requirements 1-7)	27	24	28	28
6	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 2 (Acceptance)	1	1	1	1
7	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 3 (Staffing)	8	2	13	12
8	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4 (Project Management)	5	4	4	6
9	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5 - 8 (Ordering thru Specific Standards)	5	5	5	5
	Total	86	84	102	106

V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical and compared. See attached document for the side-by-side price proposal comparisons.

Bid Day Pricing: See Attachment 1

VI. Negotiations

Second-round pricing clarifications and offers were requested from the Bidders that passed the technical evaluation and their final pricing is reflected in the attachment provided.

Second Round Pricing: See Attachment 2

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Re-source Partners Asset Management, Inc., received the highest technical score (106/110), and provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include providing the best description of their data sanitization process, auditing process and validation procedure. This Bidder possesses a robust security awareness training program and well-established audit requirements. They have maintained a successful partnership with the State, and thus have established a 12-year, well-preserved chain of custody. Re-source Partners Asset Management, Inc. recently expanded into a larger, more modern facility. This space provides an estimated 40,000 square feet of production space; approximately 25% of which is a designated de-sanitization area. They currently possess enough fully trained staff to manage the large volume of State IT assets requiring data sanitization. This Bidder also has beneficial partnerships with Great Lakes Recycling, a Michigan-based RIOS/R2 certified recycler, and AMI Asset Track, which is an asset management tool utilized for establishing and maintaining the chain of custody. All of these factors combined, work together to maintain a proper chain of custody and protect the State of Michigan from a catastrophic data breach.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award as both bidders are Michigan based companies.

Award Recommendation is made to Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc. in the amount of \$0.00.

Award Recommendation and Synopsis – RFP 220000002425 – Attachment 1

RFP 220000002425 – Bid Day Pricing Comparison

SECURED ITEMS				
Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc.			CDM Technologies LLC	
Description and Estimated Qty.	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PIECE	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PIECE	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE
Computers - 9,000	\$20.00	\$180,000.00	\$25.00	\$225,000.00
Laptops – 6,000	\$30.00	\$180,000.00	\$50.00	\$300,000.00
Servers - 100	\$20.00	\$2,000.00	\$40.00	\$4,000.00
Output Devices - 100	\$10.00	\$1,000.00	\$20.00	\$2,000.00
Flat Panel Monitors - 100	\$5.00	\$500.00	\$5.00	\$500.00
Media Disposal – 100	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Smart Phones - 100	\$30.00	\$3,000.00	\$35.00	\$3,500.00
Tablets – 50	\$30.00	\$1,500.00	\$35.00	\$1,750.00
iPads - 50	\$30.00	\$1,500.00	\$35.00	\$1,750.00
Total 1 Yr. Revenue	\$369,500.00		\$538,500.00	
Total 3 Yr. Revenue	\$1,108,500.00		\$1,615,500.00	
NON-SECURED ITEMS				
Scanners, Monitors, Cords, Etc. on a 4x4x2 Pallet Qty. 380	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PALLET	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PALLET	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE
Total 1 Yr. Revenue Non-Secured items	\$10.00	\$3,800.00	\$10.00	\$3,800.00
Total 3 Yr. Revenue Non-Secured Items	\$11,400.00		\$11,400.00	
Total Estimated 1 Yr. Revenue for Secured and Non- Secured items	\$373,300.00		\$549,900.00	
Total Estimated 3 Yr. Revenue for Secured and Non- Secured items	\$1,119,900.00		\$1,649,700.00	

Award Recommendation and Synopsis – RFP 220000002425 – Attachment 2

RFP 220000002425 – 2nd Round Pricing Comparison

SECURED ITEMS				
Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc.			CDM Technologies LLC	
Description and Estimated Qty.	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PIECE	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PIECE	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE
Computers - 9,000	\$20.00	\$180,000.00	Class A: \$80.00 Class B: \$25.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$225,000.00
Laptops – 6,000	\$30.00	\$180,000.00	Class A: \$100.00 Class B: \$50.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$300,000.00
Servers - 100	\$20.00	\$2,000.00	Class A: \$75.00 Class B: \$40.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$4,000.00
Output Devices - 100	\$10.00	\$1,000.00	Class A: \$40.00 Class B: \$20.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$2,000.00
Flat Panel Monitors - 100	\$5.00	\$500.00	Class A: \$10.00 Class B: \$5.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$500.00
Media Disposal – 100	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Smart Phones - 100	\$30.00	\$3,000.00	Class A: \$50.00 Class B: \$35.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$3,500.00
Tablets – 50	\$30.00	\$1,500.00	Class A: \$50.00 Class B: \$35.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$1,750.00
iPads - 50	\$30.00	\$1,500.00	Class A: \$50.00 Class B: \$35.00 Class C: \$0.00	\$1,750.00
Total 1 Yr. Revenue		\$369,500.00		\$538,500.00
Total 3 Yr. Revenue		\$1,108,500.00		\$1,615,500.00
NON-SECURED ITEMS				
Scanners, Monitors, Cords, Etc. on a 4x4x2 Pallet Qty. 380	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PALLET	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE	PRICE PAID TO THE STATE PER PALLET	ESTIMATED 1 Yr. REVENUE TO THE STATE
Total 1 Yr. Revenue Non- Secured items	\$10.00	\$3,800.00	\$10.00	\$3,800.00

Total 3 Yr. Revenue Non-Secured Items	\$11,400.00	\$11,400.00
Total Estimated 1 Yr. Revenue for Secured and Non-Secured items	\$373,300.00	\$549,900.00
Total Estimated 3 Yr. Revenue for Secured and Non-Secured items	\$1,119,900.00	\$1,649,700.00

- I. Section 1.3.1.g. of the Schedule A – Statement of Work provides condition codes for all laptop, desktop, tablet and smart phone/iPad devices for resale purposes. The condition codes are as follows:
- a. Class A or Retail = Used equipment, complete and functional with normal wear and tear.
 - b. Class B or Wholesale = Used equipment missing components or with cosmetic damage that is in excess of normal wear and tear.
 - c. Class C or Consumption/Parts = Used equipment that must be recycled as the most economical method of disposition. Equipment is no longer marketable, is missing major components or is cosmetically damaged so that it cannot be resold.

II. Additional offers provided:

a.) Re-Source Partners Asset Management, Inc.

Quick payment terms: 2% discount off invoice if paid within N10 days after receipt of invoice.

Bidder includes that if the State elects to implement all five (5) one-year options available upon initial Contract implementation, they will offer a 3% discount off invoice if paid within N10 days after receipt. The rebate schedule will then adjust as follows:

Year six: 4%

Year seven: 4%

Year eight: 4%

Year nine: 4%

Year ten: 5%

b.) CDM Technologies, LLC

There will be zero fees charged to the State of Michigan by CDM Technologies for one-time or set-up charges, potential costs (e.g., shipping and handling, per piece pricing, and palletizing), data destruction, recycling, or any other work performed in association with the execution of this contract. As we are not charging any fees associated with the execution of this contract, we do not anticipate receiving funds from the state, and therefore, no discount is applicable for quick payment terms.

CDM has provided Class-Based pricing using the above definitions for “Class A or Retail” and “Class B or Wholesale”. We will refer to the above guidelines in determining the Class and subsequent value associated with each device received.