

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORECARD

Solicitation Number: W56KGU-25-R-0042 **Program:** Advanced Logistics Management System (ALMS)
Offeror: CloudLogix Solutions Inc **Evaluation Factor:** Technical Approach **Evaluator:** [Evaluator Name]
Date: December 18, 2025 **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED

EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

Evaluation Methodology

Source Selection Method: Best Value Trade-Off (FAR 15.101-1)

This Scorecard Evaluates: Technical Approach

Evaluation Standard: Per Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042

Rating Scale

Best Value Trade-Off Rating Scale (FAR 15.305):

Rating	Definition	Risk Level	Score Range
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and exceeds in all significant aspects. Exceptional merit with multiple strengths and no weaknesses.	Low	90-100
Good	Proposal meets requirements and exceeds in some significant aspects. Above average merit with strengths outweighing weaknesses.	Low to Moderate	75-89
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements with no significant weaknesses. Adequate proposal with minimal risk.	Moderate	60-74

Rating	Definition	Risk Level	Score Range
Marginal	Proposal meets minimum requirements but has significant weaknesses. Weaknesses increase performance risk.	Moderate to High	40-59
Unacceptable	Proposal fails to meet minimum requirements or has deficiencies. Unacceptable risk of unsuccessful performance.	High	0-39

Evaluation Approach

1. Review offeror's proposal section for this factor (FAR 15.305)
2. Assess against evaluation criteria and subfactors (Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042)
3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies (FAR 15.305)
4. Assign adjectival rating (FAR 15.305)
5. Provide supporting rationale (FAR 15.305)
6. Assess risk level (FAR 15.305)

1. OFFEROR INFORMATION

Offeror Name: CloudLogix Solutions Inc **DUNS/UEI:** [To be verified against SAM.gov registration] **Business Size:** [To be verified per SAM.gov classification - NAICS 541512] (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042) **Socioeconomic Status:** [To be verified per SAM.gov registration - Small Business Set-Aside] (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Proposal Volume Evaluated: Technical Approach Volume **Page Count:** [To be determined from submitted proposal pages per Section L requirements] (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042) **Proposal Date:** [To be determined from proposal submission timestamp - due October 15, 2025] (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

2. EVALUATION FACTOR: Technical Approach

2.1 Factor Description (from Section M)

Evaluation of Technical Approach as specified in Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 for the Advanced Logistics Management System supporting 2,800 users across 15 Army installations (Program

Information, 2025)

2.2 Factor Weight

Weight: [To be specified per Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042]

2.3 Evaluation Criteria

Per Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 for Firm Fixed Price contract with 36-month period of performance (Program Information, 2025)

3. SUBFACTOR EVALUATIONS

3.1 Subfactor: System Architecture and Design

Weight: 25% (Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042 supporting IOC by June 2026 and FOC by December 2026] (Program Information, 2025)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor addressing 2,800 users across 15 Army installations] (Program Information, 2025)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against Section M criteria for ACAT III program] (Program Information, 2025)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Subfactor Rating: [Outstanding / Good / Acceptable / Marginal / Unacceptable]

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.2 Subfactor: Development Methodology

Weight: 20% (Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042 for 36-month development timeline] (Program Information, 2025)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor meeting IOC by June 2026] (Program Information, 2025)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against Section M criteria for Firm Fixed Price delivery] (Program Information, 2025)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Subfactor Rating: [Outstanding / Good / Acceptable / Marginal / Unacceptable]

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.3 Subfactor: Integration Approach

Weight: 20% (Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042 for integration across 15 Army installations] (Program Information, 2025)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor supporting Fort Lee, VA and CONUS installations] (Program Information, 2025)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against Section M criteria for multi-site integration] (Program Information, 2025)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Subfactor Rating: [Outstanding / Good / Acceptable / Marginal / Unacceptable]

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.4 Subfactor: Cybersecurity Implementation

Weight: 20% (Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042 for DoD cybersecurity requirements] (Program Information, 2025)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor meeting Army cybersecurity standards] (Program Information, 2025)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against Section M criteria for PEO Combat Support & Combat Service Support requirements] (Program Information, 2025)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Subfactor Rating: [Outstanding / Good / Acceptable / Marginal / Unacceptable]

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.5 Subfactor: Testing and Quality Assurance

Weight: 15% (Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M, W56KGU-25-R-0042 for system testing across 2,800 users] (Program Information, 2025)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor ensuring system reliability for 15 installations] (Program Information, 2025)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against Section M criteria for quality assurance standards] (Program Information, 2025)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305 definition]

Subfactor Rating: [Outstanding / Good / Acceptable / Marginal / Unacceptable]

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

4. STRENGTHS

Definition

A strength is an aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be beneficial to the Government during contract performance (FAR 15.305).

Identified Strengths

[Evaluator: Document specific strengths with rationale per FAR 15.305 for \$2,500,000 estimated value program] (Program Information, 2025)

Total Strengths: [Evaluator: Document specific strengths with rationale per FAR 15.305]

5. WEAKNESSES

Definition

A weakness is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (FAR 15.305).

Identified Weaknesses

[Evaluator: Document specific weaknesses with impact analysis per FAR 15.305 affecting 36-month performance period] (Program Information, 2025)

Total Weaknesses: [Evaluator: Document specific weaknesses with impact analysis per FAR 15.305]

6. DEFICIENCIES

Definition

A deficiency is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level (FAR 15.305).

Identified Deficiencies

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines for ALMS requirements] (Program Information, 2025)

Total Deficiencies: [Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines]

7. RISK ASSESSMENT

7.1 Overall Risk Rating

Risk Level: [Evaluator: Assess risk level per FAR 15.305: Low/Moderate/High for \$6,425,000 lifecycle cost program] (Program Information, 2025)

Risk Color Code: [Evaluator: Assess risk level per FAR 15.305: Low/Moderate/High]

- ■ **Green:** Low Risk

- **Yellow:** Moderate Risk
- **Red:** High Risk

7.2 Risk Analysis by Category

Risk Category	Risk Level	Rationale
---------------	------------	-----------

[Evaluator: Assess risk level per FAR 15.305 for multi-installation deployment] (Program Information, 2025)

7.3 Risk Narrative

[Evaluator: Assess risk level per FAR 15.305 considering IOC June 2026 and FOC December 2026 targets] (Program Information, 2025)

7.4 Risk Mitigation Approach (if applicable)

[Evaluator: Assess risk level per FAR 15.305 for U.S. Army Contracting Command - Rock Island oversight] (Program Information, 2025)

8. ADJECTIVAL RATING

8.1 Overall Factor Rating

Rating: [Evaluator: Assign rating per FAR 15.305: Outstanding/Good/Acceptable/Marginal/Unacceptable]

Rating Definitions (FAR 15.305):

- **Outstanding:** Exceeds requirements in all significant aspects, exceptional merit
- **Good:** Meets requirements and exceeds in some aspects, above average merit
- **Acceptable:** Meets requirements, adequate with minimal risk
- **Marginal:** Meets minimum requirements but has significant weaknesses
- **Unacceptable:** Fails to meet requirements or has deficiencies

8.2 Rating Rationale

[Evaluator: Assign rating per FAR 15.305 considering ACAT III program complexity] (Program Information, 2025)

8.3 Supporting Analysis

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines for Small Business Set-Aside requirements] (Program Information, 2025)

9. NUMERICAL SCORE (if applicable)

9.1 Scoring Method

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section M evaluation guidelines, W56KGU-25-R-0042]

9.2 Subfactor Scores

Subfactor	Weight	Raw Score	Weighted Score
------------------	---------------	------------------	-----------------------

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section M evaluation guidelines for 36-month performance period] (Program Information, 2025)

TOTAL	100%	-	[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section M evaluation guidelines, W56KGU-25-R-0042]
--------------	-------------	---	---

9.3 Score Rationale

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section M evaluation guidelines considering \$2,500,000 estimated value] (Program Information, 2025)

10. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

10.1 Comparison to Requirements

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section M requirements for Advanced Logistics Management System] (Program Information, 2025)

10.2 Discriminators

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines for 2,800 user system] (Program Information, 2025)

10.3 Notable Features

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines for Fort Lee, VA and CONUS deployment] (Program Information, 2025)

11. PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE

11.1 Compliance Checklist

Requirement	Compliant	Comments
-------------	-----------	----------

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section L requirements, W56KGU-25-R-0042 for October 15, 2025 submission] (Program Information, 2025)

11.2 Non-Compliances

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section L requirements, W56KGU-25-R-0042]

11.3 Material Omissions

[Evaluator: Complete this section per Section L requirements for NAICS 541512 classification] (Program Information, 2025)

12. EVALUATOR COMMENTS

12.1 General Observations

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines for PEO Combat Support & Combat Service Support program] (Program Information, 2025)

12.2 Key Concerns

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines regarding 15 installation deployment] (Program Information, 2025)

12.

References and Source Documents

This document was generated using the following source materials:

1. Alms Kpp Ksa Complete

- Document: `alms-kpp-ksa-complete.md`
- Used for: Program requirements, specifications, and source data

1. 13 Cdd Alms

- Document: `13_CDD_ALMS.md`
- Used for: Program requirements, specifications, and source data

1. 9 Acquisition Strategy Alms

- Document: `9_acquisition_strategy_ALMS.md`
- Used for: Program requirements, specifications, and source data

Generated by DoD Acquisition Automation System *Generation Date: 2025-12-18 21:26:59* *Program: Advanced Logistics Management System*