Shawnee Mission School District
RFP 26-013 – Information Technology (IT) Asset Disposal Services
October 22, 2026

Addendum No. 1

The following response addresses question(s) submitted by vendor(s) on October 16, 2026 and October 21, 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. Did the District decide to hold on disposal of iPads for now?

   iPads have historically been refreshed on a 3-year cycle. The District is currently in year one of the latest cycle, and iPads are not included in the current 2027 refresh list.

2. Do you have any details beyond what is posted, such as device volumes and types, pickup timing, or how resale value will factor into the evaluation?

   The RFP currently lists device volumes and types for the 2027 refresh on page 8 (see estimates in potential refresh scenarios). Regarding how resale value will factor into the evaluation, please see the point allocation outline for "Ability to Maximize Resale Value" under the "Method of Selection" section on page 2 of the RFP. Pickup timing is generally on an ad hoc, as-requested basis during the school year, with refresh pickups usually taking place May through August.

3. Would you be open to a quick call this week to discuss the RFP?

   The District would prefer that any questions regarding the RFP be emailed to purchasing@smsd.org so that these questions may be addressed via publicly posted addenda.

4. Scope of Work item 8 and the Attachment C Services Checklist reference R2v3 certification. Would the District accept a proposal in which the prime Proposer is not itself R2v3-certified but performs data sanitization (NIST SP 800-88 Rev. 1), recycling, and e-waste handling through a clearly identified R2v3-certified subcontractor, with that subcontractor's R2v3 certificates and audit reports provided to the District as required? If so, would the Proposer be considered compliant with the R2v3 requirement for purposes of the Services Checklist and evaluation?

The District desires tight controls on property asset disposal and related reporting on appropriate data destruction. With that understanding, the District is hesitant to select a firm that is unable to perform such asset disposal and reporting directly, without the need for third-party contractors. Therefore, firms unable to directly meet the R2v3 requirement (without the need for third-party contractors) will not be considered compliant with the R2v3 requirement for purposes of the Services Checklist and evaluation.

5. If the above arrangement is acceptable, does the District require the R2v3-certified subcontractor to be named in the proposal, and would the District's written approval of that subcontractor be handled as part of contract negotiation or prior to proposal submission?

   Per the District's answer to Question 4 above, this question is moot.

End of Addendum No. 1