



PORTFOLIO TITLE: Computer Equipment,
Peripherals & Related
Services

LEAD STATE: Minnesota

PORTFOLIO SNAPSHOT

OVERVIEW:

The State of Minnesota in partnership with NASPO ValuePoint has awarded cooperative Master Agreements for Computer Equipment, Peripherals & Related Services.

The Master Agreements allow Participating Entities that include but are not limited to states and local governments, to purchase computer hardware and associated accessories and services from properly evaluated and awarded computer hardware manufacturers.

Portfolio product offerings: Windows and non-Windows desktops, laptops, and tablets, servers and storage devices, and other commodities related to computer equipment purchases.

KEY BENEFITS:

This re-solicited NASPO ValuePoint portfolio will continue to provide users across the nation with a broad range of quality product offerings from leading manufacturers in the computer equipment industry. The new RFP also included language allowing for potential participation by Canadian entities.

While the previous portfolio was divided into six Bands, the RFP for this new portfolio was restructured and organized into three Bands, offering additional flexibility and reducing potential confusion in categorizing similar types of devices (i.e., servers and storage devices). The merging of desktops, laptops, and tablets into the same Band and creation of a new Band specifically for non-Windows desktops, laptops, and tablets also better reflects the current market for personal computing devices.

PRODUCT CATEGORIES:

Band 1 - Personal Computer Devices - Windows Operating Systems: Desktop, Laptops, and Tablets

Band 2 - Personal Computer Devices - Non-Windows Operating Systems: Desktop, Laptops, and Tablets

Band 3 - Servers and Storage

INITIAL TERM:

July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2025

TOTAL POSSIBLE TERMS:

Up to June 30, 2028

CATEGORY DETAILS:

BAND 1:

Product offerings that utilize the Windows operating system. This Band includes:

- Zero clients;
- Thin clients;
- All-in-ones;
- Workstations;
- Notebooks;
- Mobile thin clients; and
- Ruggedized equipment

BAND 2:

Product offerings that utilize an operating system that is not Windows. This Band includes:

- Zero clients;
- Thin clients;
- All-in-ones;
- Workstations;
- Notebooks;
- Mobile thin clients; and
- Ruggedized equipment

Band 3:

This Band includes:

- Servers and storage devices (physical or virtual computer dedicated to run one or more services or applications, as a host, to serve the needs of the users of other computers on a network);
- Server and storage appliances (devices, hardware, and software preconfigured by the manufacturer); and
- Embedded networking components such as those found in blade chassis systems.

PRICING:

Master Agreement pricing will be based on the pricing catalogs and minimum category discounts submitted to the Lead State in each Offeror's proposal. Any device offered by a Contractor for which pricing is found to be unreasonable, not best-value, or not in the best interest of the Lead State or Participating Entities may be rejected by the Lead State and excluded from the Contractor's Master Agreement.

RFP INFORMATION:

- Solicitation Number: RFP 29720
- Released: 11/4/2020
- Closed: 3/18/2021
- Total Days Publicly Posted: 135 days
- Number of Amendments Posted: 5
- Pre-Proposal Conference 11/20/2020
- Supplier Attendance: 104 attendees

STATES ON SOURCING TEAM:

- Minnesota (Lead State)
- Alaska
- Arkansas
- California
- Delaware
- Iowa
- Louisiana
- South Carolina

VENDOR RESPONSES:

A total of 28 proposals were received, and of those proposals, 24 suppliers were recommended for award across the 3 Bands based on responsiveness and final rankings against the pre-established evaluation criteria. One awardee rescinded its proposal and will not be awarded for a final total of 23 awarded suppliers.

EVALUATION INFO:

Virtual evaluations were led by the Lead State of Minnesota. The evaluation was completed by the Sourcing Team on 12/17/2021.

Responses were evaluated based on the following Evaluation Criteria:

The Sourcing Team evaluated proposals in multiple phases and steps. The evaluation criteria for each phase and scoring step were as follows:

- Phase 1: Responsiveness (pass/fail). Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness to determine if the responder satisfied all mandatory requirements. The Lead State evaluated the requirements on a pass/fail basis.
- Phase 2: Evaluate Responses.
 - Step 1: Weighted scoring of the technical criteria - Product Deployment and Ability to Perform
 - Step 2: Responders were shortlisted for each Band based on the scores awarded in Step 1 and the ability of responders selected for the shortlist to meet the needs of anticipated Participating Entities. Responders with a Step 1 total score of at least 60% of the highest-scoring Responder advanced to Step 3, at which time scores were reset to 0.
 - Step 3: Weighted scoring of the criteria - Accessibility, Environmental, Business Capabilities, Customer Support, and Cost Proposal. Responders with a Step 3 total score of at least 50% of the highest-scoring Responder are being recommended for a contract award.

Cost made up 40% of the points possible in Phase 2 Step 3 and was evaluated using a market basket composed of multiple standard device configurations. Cost scores for each Band and device configuration were based on the responder's cost relative to the lowest-cost responder and the extent to which devices offered by the responder matched the provided standards. Responders offering devices partially matching the standard device configurations were given a cost score equal to the lowest score for each configuration. Responders offering devices that did not match the standard device configurations were given a cost score of 0.

Three proposed awardees in Band 2 offer specialized devices (e.g., Chromebooks and ruggedized tablets) that did not match the standard device configurations in the market basket and therefore received a cost score of 0. However, each responder scored strongly in the technical evaluation and earned enough points to meet the established threshold for contract award. All proposed awardees were required to submit complete pricing catalogs and minimum category discounts to the Lead State. Regardless of cost score, any device offered by a Responder for which pricing is found to be unreasonable, not best-value, or not in the best interest of the Lead State or Participating Entities may be rejected by the Lead State and excluded from the responder's Master Agreement.

AWARD SUMMARY:

OFFEROR	BAND 1	BAND 2	BAND 3
Ace Technology Partners	✓	✓	✓
Acer America Corporation	✓	✓	
Apple, Inc.		✓	
Dell Technologies	✓	✓	✓
Durabook Americas, Inc.	✓		
Dynabook, Inc.	✓		
Getac, Inc.	✓		
Hewlett Packard Enterprise			✓
Hitachi Vantara, LLC			✓
Howard Technology Solutions	✓		
HP, Inc.	✓	✓	
IBM			✓
Lenovo (United States) Inc.	✓	✓	
Lenovo Global Technology (United States) Inc.			✓
Microsoft Corporation	✓		
NetApp, Inc.			✓
New Tech Solutions, Inc.			✓
Oracle America, Inc.			✓
Panasonic Connect North America, Division of Panasonic Corporation of North America	✓	✓	
Pure Storage, Inc.			✓
Quantum Corporation*			✓*
Transource Services Corp	✓		✓
Zebra Technologies Corporation	✓		

*Quantum and the Lead State mutually agreed to terminate the MA negotiation process after Quantum was recommended for award. There will not be a Master Agreement executed with Quantum.