Section M– EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD

This procurement is being conducted using formal source selection procedures as part of an Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 (Revised, May 2003) cost comparison and is being conducted on a Low Cost Technically Acceptable (LCTA) basis. Award will be made on the basis of the lowest evaluated price of proposals meeting or exceeding the acceptability standards for the non-cost factors.

M.2 AWARD--SINGLE AWARD FOR ALL ITEMS

Due to the interrelationship of services and/or supplies to be provided hereunder, the Government reserves the right to make a single award to the SP whose offer is considered in the best interest of the Government, price and other factors considered. Therefore, offerors proposing less than the entire effort specified herein shall be determined to be unacceptable and not considered for award.

M.3 TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT EVALUATION FACTORS

The technical/management evaluation factors are listed below.

Technical Proposal (Volume II Section 1)

This factor and sub factors evaluate the SP's approaches and processes to perform the services to achieve the required outcomes as described in the performance requirements document.

Factor 1. Technical Approach.

Sub factor 1. Evaluation of Overall Understanding and Approach will be based upon the extent to which the SP clearly understands all of the requirements set forth in RFP and proposes acceptable methods for measuring and ensuring the quality of deliverables, improving employee performance, quantity and quality of training, and demonstrates understanding of concepts of records management services and public service. The standard is met when the SP provides a sound technical approach which reflects their understanding of all the requirements in the RFP and proposes acceptable methods for measuring and ensuring the quality of deliverables, improving employee performance, quantity and quality of training and demonstrates an understanding of the concepts pertaining to records management services and public service.

Sub factor 2. Phase-In Plan.

This sub factor evaluates the SP's proposal for a sound phase-in plan.

Section I: The Transfer of Operations will be evaluated to determine the extent of the SP's understanding of what actions will be required to allow for changeover of operations from IRS Files Activities to the SP without degradation to service; the SP's approach for minimal disruption to IRS employees, their respective customers, and other affected Government agencies; and the SP's understanding of the level of IRS involvement required to support the transition. The standard is met when the SP provides an approach that demonstrates extensive understanding of the actions required to allow an expedient changeover of operations from IRS Files Activities to the SP without degradation to service and provides minimum disruption to IRS employees, their respective customers, and other affected

Section M– EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

Government agencies as well as the SP's understanding of the level of IRS involvement required to support the transition.

Section II: The Timeline will be evaluated to determine the extent of the SP's plan to identify the procedures necessary to convert and assume the Files Activity function within the six month phase-in period. The standard is met when the SP provides a sound business approach that demonstrates how the phase-in will be completed within 6 months.

Sub factor 3. Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP)

The Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) will be evaluated to determine the extent of the SP's actions to be taken in contingency situations including as a minimum, the delineation of responsibilities between Government and private Service Provider, the coordination to take place between the Government and the SP, the extent of workload processing, response to customer inquiries, receipt of incoming mail, file services, and retirement of files available under contingency circumstances, and the specific timeframes required for establishing these capabilities. The COOP shall also be evaluated for soundness, comprehensiveness, and reflecting an understanding of the RFP. The standard is met when the COOP provides sound contingency situation actions to include delineation of responsibilities between the Government and private SP, the coordination to take place between the Government and the SP, the extent of workload processing, response to customer inquiries, receipt of incoming mail, file services, and retirement of files available under contingency circumstances, and the specific timeframes required for establishing these capabilities. In addition, the standard is met when the SP provides a sound and comprehensive COOP that demonstrates an understanding of the RFP.

Sub factor 4. Quality Control Plan (QCP)

The QCP will be evaluated relative to the degree in which the SP can demonstrate its methodologies for ensuring sustained quality improvement. The SP shall submit a QCP for measuring and attaining quality of performance under this contract. The SP's QCP shall explain the manner in which the SP shall ensure all contract requirements are being accomplished in accordance with the contract. A sustaining focus throughout the QCP shall be the attainment of continuous quality improvement. The standard is met if the SP's approach for quality control is sound, comprehensive, and reflects an understanding of the RFP requirements.

Sub factor 5. Safety Plan

The SP's safety plan shall be evaluated for compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Service and OSHA regulations and directives. The standard is met if the SP's approach for safety is sound, comprehensive, meets all safety regulations and polices listed and reflects an understanding of the RFP requirements.

Factor 2 . Management Plan (Volume II, Section 2)

The Management Plan assesses the SP's approach for structuring and staffing key personnel to effectively accomplish the work under this RFP. The Government will evaluate the SP's approaches for effectively planning, controlling, directing, and accomplishing the services under this contract.

Section M– EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

Sub factor 1. Staffing Plan.
The Staffing Plan will be evaluated based on the extent to which the SP demonstrates sound business practices in response to the requirements in Sections C and L. In terms of the staffing portion of the plan, the evaluation will be based on the extent to which the SP clearly demonstrates an ability to staff the non-key personnel portion of the contract with personnel who meet the minimum personnel qualifications, both initially and over the life of the contract. (Primary preference for initial staffing of non-key personnel at time of contract award is with current federal employees (FAR 52.207-3) whom the SP has binding contingency hiring agreements versus recruiting.)

Evaluation of Key Personnel will be based on the extent to which personnel submitted by the SP clearly as a minimum meet, or exceed, the education and experience required by the labor category qualifications in Sections C.1.3.1.2.1, C.1.3.1.2.2, and Section H.14. To be considered, all key personnel must be available full-time and otherwise comply with the requirements in Section L for Key Personnel. A letter of intent shall be provided for all key personnel as defined in Section L.

All non-key personnel must meet minimum personnel qualifications. Also the plan must describe the SP's proposed recruiting/hiring program for staffing the contract with qualified personnel over the life of the contract, with examples of previous successful recruiting/staffing efforts on contract(s) of similar magnitude. In addition, the plan must also describe how the SP will minimize personnel turnover of key and non-key personnel over the life of the contract to ensure timely delivery of services.

Personnel submitted by the SP must meet or exceed the minimum personnel qualifications set forth in Section C.1.3.1.2.1, C.1.3.1.2.2 and C.1.3.7. The same person cannot be proposed for more than one labor category.

New hires shall not be proposed. A new hire is defined as a specified or unspecified individual to fill an empty billet who is neither identified as a current employee of the SP (or proposed subcontractor) nor as a contingency hire. A contingency hire is defined as an individual who has signed a commitment to work in the event the contract is awarded to the SP.

Sub factor 2. Strike Contingency Plan
Not applicable to the Government MEO.

The Strike Contingency Plan will be evaluated to determine the extent of the SP’s actions to be taken in a strike situation including as a minimum, no degradation of timely workload processing, response to customer inquiries, receipt of incoming mail, file services, retirement of files and the specific timeframes required for establishing these capabilities.

Sub factor 3. Subcontracting Plans
Not applicable to the Government MEO.

Section M– EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

This subcontracting plan evaluates the soundness of the SP's proposed subcontracting efforts for the basic contract period and all option periods. Should a small business propose on this acquisition, the factor would receive a rating of "Not Applicable." *A subcontracting plan is not required from JWOD organizations submitting a proposal as a prime contractor.* The Subcontracting Plan shall provide a clear, detailed, logical and realistic approach to meet or exceed the IRS small business subcontracting percentage goals described below.

Large businesses shall provide a small business-subcontracting plan with the hard copy of the cost and price proposal and representation and certifications. The purpose of the subcontracting evaluation is to determine whether the SP will assist the IRS in meeting its small business subcontracting goals and whether the proposed subcontracted items and services are realistic and reasonable. Failure to realistically propose subcontracting efforts that meet the goals stated below may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition. The IRS reserves the right to evaluate and give evaluation credit for the proposed features that is either in addition to the thresholds and objectives or that exceed the stated objectives listed in the standard below.

The standard is met when the Subcontracting Plan provides:

1. Identification of the names and addresses of the subcontractor firms proposed, the specific supplies and/or services to be subcontracted to each and the dollar amount for each category for each period of the contract.

2. Of the total amount the SP plans to subcontract for this contract as a minimum goal (see Section J.3):

41% to small business	5% to women owned small business
5% to small disadvantaged business	3% to Hub zone small business concerns
1% NISH organization	
3% Service disabled veteran-owned small business concerns	

3. Compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, 52.219-9, 52.219-23 and 52.219-24 See Section I and Section J.

Factor 3. Section 508 Plan (Volume II, Section 3)
The Section 508 plan assesses the SP's compliance with the Section 508 compliance requirement in Section H and their approach for remaining compliant throughout the performance period of the contract.

M.4 EVALUATION
Each of the above technical/management factors will be scored on a Pass/Fail basis. A passing score for each factor is required for an offeror's proposal to receive further consideration. Failure to receive a passing score for any technical evaluation factor or subfactor will result in rejection of an offeror's proposal notwithstanding passing scores for other technical factors and/or lowest reasonable price.

Section M– EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

M.5 Factor 4. EVALUATION OF PRESENT AND PAST PERFORMANCE (Volume III)

Not applicable to the Government MEO.

The Government will review and evaluate information about each offeror's past performance and will rate offerors as pass or fail based on their documented past performance. Based on the offeror's past performance record, if the Government determines that significant doubt exists that the offeror will successfully and satisfactorily perform the required effort, the offeror will be deemed technically unacceptable. By acceptable past performance, the Government means the offeror's reputation for satisfying its customers by delivering quality work in a timely manner at a reasonable cost. Past Performance also includes the offeror's reputation for integrity, reasonable and cooperative conduct, and commitment to customer satisfaction. In reviewing and evaluating an offeror's past performance, the Government will consider information obtained from the offeror; from other sources, including past and present customers and their current and former employees; past and present subcontractors and their current and former employees; current and former employees of the offeror; Federal, State and local government agencies; private consumer protection organizations; and external databases. The Government will evaluate this information and will rate the offerors as pass or fail. Offerors are encouraged to submit evidence of past performance for work similar to work included in this solicitation. Note that unavailability (due to nonexistence) of past performance records or information cannot result in failure of this element, but will result in a neutral rating of this element. Evidence that an offeror has poor past performance in any area will result in failure of the entire element, subject to the requirements of FAR 15.306 if discussions are conducted.

The Government will use the following definitions as guidelines in evaluating Present and Past performance.

RATING	DEFINITION
PASS "P"	Minimum to moderate risk anticipated with delivery of timely and quality performance, and of degradation or lack of customer satisfaction (or cost growth if applicable) based upon the Service Provider's Present and Past performance.
FAIL "F"	Significant risk anticipated with delivery of timely and quality performance, and degradation of customer satisfaction based upon the Service Provider's Present and Past performance.
NEUTRAL "N"	No relevant present and past performance available for evaluation. SP has asserted that it has no directly related or similar Present and Past performance experience.

M.6 PRICE EVALUATION (Volume IV)

The MEO will submit their COST ESTIMATE using COMPARE Version 2.0.

For award purposes, the Government will use the offeror's proposed price for purposes of evaluation and to determine the low cost offeror. The total proposed amount of each offer will be the sum of the offeror's proposed firm-fixed-price for the phase-in period and for the basic and option periods. The purpose of the price evaluation is to determine the realism and adequacy of the offeror's proposed price in relation to the solicitation and the offeror's technical proposal, and to provide an assessment of the overall reasonableness of the proposed price.

Cost Realism. The proposed price shall be evaluated to determine if the price is realistic for the work to be performed, reflects a clear understanding of the requirements, and is consistent with the offeror's technical proposal.

Price Reasonableness. The cost or price evaluation of an offeror's price will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1). Reasonableness of an offeror's price may be evaluated through price and/or cost analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404-1.

M.7 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (July 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

M.9 OMB CIRCULAR A-76 CONTRACT AWARD – LOW COST TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE (MAY 2003)

(a) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with SPs. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if later determined by the Contracting Officer to be necessary. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the SP's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint.

(b) During the source selection process, the CO shall open and evaluate all offerors and tenders (including the agency tender) to determine acceptability. The performance decision shall be based on the lowest cost of all offerors and tenders determined to be technically acceptable.

(c) Each technical proposal will be evaluated qualitatively and categorized as pass or fail in relation to the evaluation factors and sub-factors set forth in this RFP. A finding of fail for one technical factor shall result in the entire technical proposal being found to be unacceptable. The Present and Past Performance factor will be evaluated qualitatively and categorized as pass, fail or neutral.

Section M– EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

The responsible offeror who provides a proposal offering of pass , a present and past performance rating of pass or neutral and is the lowest overall cost to the Government in accordance with the standards set forth in the revised OMB Circular A-76 (revised) May 29, 2003 will be eligible to receive award of this contract, letter of obligation or fee-for service.