Real Quote-Based Cost Benchmark

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE REPORT Format demonstration only - supplier identities and pricing are fictional

Client / Company	Illustrative consumer-goods brand
Product	Powder-Coated Steel Desk Shelf / Monitor Riser
Target market	United States
Annual volume	20,000 units / year
Benchmark date	August 2026
Prepared by	China Manufacturing Intelligence

Commercial decision

RENEGOTIATE BEFORE RE-SOURCING

Three comparable factory quotations indicate that the current EXW price is above the normalized market corridor. The first move is to use verified quote evidence to renegotiate the incumbent supplier. Re-sourcing becomes rational only if the incumbent remains above the walk-away threshold and an alternative supplier passes sample and quality validation.

CURRENT EXW	NORMALIZED BENCHMARK	POTENTIAL SAVING	ANNUAL OPPORTUNITY
$18.40	**$15.95-$16.55**	**10.1%-13.3%**	**$37k-$49k**
per unit	EXW, comparable basis	before switching costs	at 20,000 units

Evidence / decision item	Result	Confidence	Analyst note
Comparable supplier quotes	3 accepted / 1 excluded	Medium-High	Quotes normalized to the same material, finish, packaging, inspection and EXW basis.
Current cost position	$18.40 EXW	High	Customer baseline supported by incumbent commercial evidence.
Negotiation target	$16.60-$17.20	Medium	Leaves room for incumbent continuity value while moving materially toward market evidence.
Walk-away threshold	$17.60 EXW	Medium	Above this level, validated re-sourcing economics become increasingly compelling.
Recommended next gate	Renegotiate, then verify alternate sample	High	Do not switch on price alone; quality and process evidence must clear first.

§ 01

Current Cost Baseline & Benchmark Scope

Define exactly what is being compared before using supplier quotes as cost evidence.

Baseline item	Current position
Current supplier	Incumbent export manufacturer - Guangdong
Current EXW unit price	$18.40 at 1,000-unit order quantity
Annual volume	20,000 units
MOQ	1,000 units
Payment terms	30% deposit / 70% before shipment
Production lead time	35-40 days
Product basis	1.5 mm SPCC fabricated steel; welded frame; matte black powder coat; silicone feet; printed retail carton
Quality basis	AQL General II, 2.5 major / 4.0 minor; cosmetic finish standard; carton drop-test expectation
Quote basis used for benchmark	EXW, 1,000 units, same core material/finish/packaging/quality requirements

Evidence reviewed

- Customer-provided incumbent price evidence and current commercial terms.
- Product drawing / dimensions, material callout, finish requirement and product weight.
- Packaging specification and inspection expectations supplied for RFQ comparability.
- Direct supplier outreach log plus four written quotation responses to a consistent benchmark brief; three retained as comparable and one excluded.

Scope limits

- Benchmark is EXW only. Freight, duty, tariffs, taxes and domestic fulfillment are not included in the headline savings figure.
- No supplier should be selected on quoted price alone. Production capability, quality evidence and sample validation remain separate gates.
- Quote validity, raw-material movements, exchange rates and order timing can change the final commercial position.

§ 02

Supplier Outreach & Quotation Evidence

Show the direct supplier market work and actual quotation evidence before drawing a cost conclusion.

Supplier Outreach & Verification Record

This benchmark is based on direct supplier screening, outreach and clarification - not desk research alone.

Outreach item	Illustrative result
Candidate factories screened	12
Factories directly contacted	7
Contact methods	Phone / WeChat / Email
Suppliers responding	5
Written quotations received	4
Comparable quotations retained	3
Quotation excluded	1 - non-comparable process / specification
Supplier clarification follow-up	3 clarification calls + 2 commercial clarification rounds
Resulting evidence confidence	Medium-High

Live-report rule: record actual outreach counts, dates and contact methods. Supplier response rates vary by product and market; if three comparable quotations cannot reasonably be obtained, document the outreach performed, evidence obtained and resulting confidence level.

Supplier	Region / profile	Raw EXW	MOQ	Lead time	Payment	Quote status
Factory A (redacted)	Zhejiang / metal fabrication + powder coat	$15.40	1,000	32-35 d	30/70	Comparable
Factory B (redacted)	Jiangsu / sheet-metal export factory	$16.05	500	30-35 d	30/70	Comparable
Factory C (redacted)	Guangdong / mixed metal assembly	$16.35	1,000	28-32 d	50/50	Comparable
Factory D (excluded)	Shandong / trader + subcontracted fabrication	$14.70	1,000	25-30 d	30/70	Excluded

Quote integrity checks

Check	Factory A	Factory B	Factory C	Analyst note
Material thickness confirmed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Matches 1.5 mm SPCC basis.
Powder-coat specification confirmed	Partial	Yes	Yes	A requires normalization for stated coating basis.
Retail packaging included	No	Yes	Partial	A and C require packaging adjustments.
Inspection / testing allowance	No	Partial	Yes	Normalized to common QA basis.
Factory identity / process fit	Yes	Yes	Yes	All three appear directionally capable; formal validation still required.

Why Factory D is excluded

The lowest response is not used in the benchmark because the supplier could not provide a sufficiently comparable process basis: fabrication was subcontracted, material grade was ambiguous, and the quoted finish standard was not aligned with the brief. A low number without comparable evidence is not a valid benchmark.

§ 03

Apples-to-Apples Quote Normalization

Convert raw supplier numbers into a comparable commercial basis.

Supplier	Raw EXW	Material / finish adj.	Packaging adj.	QA / test adj.	Tooling amort.	Normalized EXW
Factory A	$15.40	+$0.20	+$0.25	+$0.10	+$0.00	$15.95
Factory B	$16.05	+$0.00	+$0.00	+$0.15	+$0.00	$16.20
Factory C	$16.35	+$0.00	+$0.10	+$0.10	+$0.00	$16.55

Normalization evidence rule: every adjustment should be tagged as Supplier-quoted, Customer-provided, or Analyst estimate. Estimated adjustments must be clearly separated from supplier-stated pricing.

Normalized benchmark corridor

$15.95 - $16.55 EXW

This corridor is the usable cost benchmark because all three retained quotes are adjusted to the same commercial scope. It is not the same thing as “the cheapest quote.”

Normalization logic

- Material / finish: adjust where coating or material callouts were below the requested specification.
- Packaging: add the quoted or estimated cost required to match the existing retail and export-pack basis.
- QA / testing: add inspection or test allowances when omitted from the raw quote.
- Tooling amortization: include only where a supplier requires dedicated fixtures or tooling attributable to the benchmark order.
- Incoterm: all headline figures are shown on EXW basis; no freight or duty advantage is embedded in the supplier comparison.

Interpretation

The current $18.40 EXW baseline sits $1.85-$2.45 per unit above the normalized market corridor. That gap is large enough to justify a commercial intervention, but not large enough to justify an automatic supplier switch without quality and transition evidence.

§ 04

Cost Drivers, Savings Bridge & Scalability

Identify which savings are commercially credible and which depend on product or supplier changes.

Savings lever	Current basis	Benchmark / action	Estimated effect	Confidence
Supplier margin / conversion cost	Embedded in $18.40	Use comparable RFQs to reset conversion economics	$0.80-$1.20 / unit	Medium-High
Powder-coat / finishing	Current single finish standard	Maintain standard; no quality downgrade assumed	$0.15-$0.30 / unit	Medium
Packaging	Current retail carton + export pack	Right-size carton and confirm board grade without lowering test requirement	$0.10-$0.20 / unit	Medium
Volume leverage	1,000-unit PO cadence	Negotiate 2,500 / 5,000 tier pricing against annual forecast	$0.20-$0.40 / unit	Medium
Payment terms	30/70	Use annual volume and forecast visibility to improve terms	Cash-flow benefit, not counted in EXW saving	Low-Medium
Material substitution	1.5 mm SPCC	No substitution recommended without load / stiffness validation	Excluded from headline saving	High

Savings bridge

Commercial position	Unit economics	Annual effect at 20,000 units
Current baseline	$18.40 EXW	$368,000 annual EXW spend
Incumbent negotiation target	$16.60-$17.20 EXW	$24,000-$36,000 annual saving
Normalized re-source benchmark	$15.95-$16.55 EXW	$37,000-$49,000 annual saving
Headline opportunity	10.1%-13.3% below current	Before one-time validation / switching costs

Savings evidence rule

Headline savings should include only levers supported by comparable quotations or direct supplier clarification. Do not double-count overlapping savings, and keep cash-flow benefits or speculative design changes outside the headline EXW saving.

Scalability assessment

At annual demand of 20,000 units, the buyer has enough volume to request tier pricing and forecast-based capacity commitments. The strongest savings should come from conversion economics, supplier competition and order structure rather than from weakening the product specification.

§ 05

Quality, Compliance & Supply Risk

Protect the economics by making the cost benchmark conditional on measurable release criteria.

Critical control	Benchmark requirement
Material	1.5 mm SPCC or approved equivalent with traceable mill / grade evidence
Finish	Matte black powder coat; defined appearance standard; adhesion and coverage expectations
Dimensions / stability	Key load-bearing dimensions and flatness within controlled drawing tolerance
Packaging	Retail carton + export protection; drop-test basis maintained
Inspection	AQL General II; 2.5 major / 4.0 minor plus defined cosmetic defects
Change control	No material, coating, process or sub-tier substitution without buyer approval

Risk	Impact	Control	Release evidence
Lower quote hides thinner material	High	Verify material grade / thickness before sample approval	Material cert + dimensional inspection
Finish quality varies by powder / pretreatment	Medium-High	Approve golden sample and coating standard	Sample approval + finish test evidence
Supplier subcontracts welding / coating	Medium	Map sub-tier process ownership	Process evidence + supplier declaration
Switching creates launch / stockout risk	Medium	Use overlap inventory and staged qualification	Approved sample + production readiness
Quoted price changes after RFQ	Medium	Lock quote validity and tier assumptions	Signed commercial quotation / PO basis

Cost benchmark rule

A lower quote is not a saving until the specification, quality controls and supply conditions are comparable.

The $15.95-$16.55 corridor should therefore be treated as a commercial benchmark and negotiation lever first, then as a re-sourcing target only after alternate-supplier validation. No compliance, testing, material or inspection requirement is assumed away simply to create a lower headline price.

§ 06

Negotiation Strategy & Re-Sourcing Gate

Turn the benchmark into a controlled commercial decision rather than an automatic supplier switch.

Decision point	Recommended position
Primary decision	RENEGOTIATE FIRST
Opening anchor	$16.20 EXW - supported by normalized comparable quote evidence
Preferred settlement corridor	$16.60-$17.20 EXW
Walk-away threshold	$17.60 EXW, subject to alternate-supplier validation
Re-source trigger	Incumbent remains above threshold AND at least one alternate passes sample / quality / capacity gates
Do not trade away	Material thickness, coating quality, packaging performance, inspection criteria, change control

Switching economics

Item	Illustrative planning range	Treatment
Sample / first-article validation	$500-$1,200	One-time switching cost
Quality / process verification	$1,000-$2,000	One-time switching cost
Inventory overlap / transition buffer	$3,000-$4,500	Working-capital / transition cost
Total transition allowance	$4,500-$7,700	Compare against annual savings before switching
Simple payback	~1.1-2.5 months	Using $37k-$49k annual gross EXW opportunity

Negotiation message

“We have benchmarked the current specification on a comparable EXW basis and are seeing validated market evidence materially below our current $18.40 unit cost. We prefer continuity, but pricing needs to move into a commercially defensible corridor before the next order.”

Decision rule

KEEP if the incumbent closes enough of the verified market gap to justify continuity value. RENEGOTIATE if the incumbent remains above the evidence-backed corridor but the relationship still has economic value. RE-SOURCE only when price, quality, capacity and transition economics all clear the gate.

30-Day Action Plan & Decision Record

Convert quote evidence into a timed negotiation, validation and supplier decision.

Timing	Action	Owner	Evidence / output
Week 1	Close quote gaps; confirm validity, exact specification and normalization assumptions	Buyer / analyst	Comparable quotation pack
Week 2	Present benchmark to incumbent and request revised tier pricing	Buyer	Revised incumbent quotation
Week 3	Order / evaluate sample from strongest alternate if incumbent remains above target	Buyer / QA	Approved or rejected alternate sample
Week 4	Decide KEEP / RENEGOTIATE / RE-SOURCE and document commercial threshold	Decision owner	Signed decision record / next PO path

Decision conditions

- Do not treat a raw low quote as a valid benchmark unless commercial scope and product specification are comparable.
- Do not re-source until a replacement supplier clears sample, quality, capacity and change-control requirements.
- Do not count annual savings until the negotiated or re-sourced unit cost is commercially confirmed.

Sources and evidence register - illustrative

Evidence	Example record
Customer baseline	Current supplier commercial evidence; current product specification; annual volume assumption
Supplier quotation A	RFQ response - Zhejiang - quote date / validity / scope recorded
Supplier quotation B	RFQ response - Jiangsu - quote date / validity / scope recorded
Supplier quotation C	RFQ response - Guangdong - quote date / validity / scope recorded
Analyst normalization	Adjustment log for finish, packaging, QA and commercial basis
Supplier outreach log	Candidate screening, contact dates, channel used, response / no-response status
Supplier clarification notes	Phone / WeChat / email notes resolving material, packaging, MOQ, process and commercial scope

Analyst / human review

Prepared by	China Manufacturing Intelligence
Reviewed by	Human analyst review
Review date	August 2026
Report version	Sample v3.0

Important: This sample demonstrates the format of a real quote-based cost benchmark. Supplier identities, outreach counts, quotations, savings figures and commercial assumptions in this sample are fictional. A client report should distinguish customer-stated evidence, supplier-stated quotation evidence, direct outreach / clarification records and analyst normalization. Supplier quotations are time-sensitive and do not guarantee production performance, final landed cost, regulatory compliance or future pricing.