

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORECARD

Solicitation Number: W56KGU-25-R-0042 (Project Information) **Program:** Advanced Logistics Management System (ALMS) (Project Information) **Offeror:** [Offeror Name] **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 (Project Information)

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(a))
2. Assess against evaluation criteria and subfactors (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)
3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies (FAR 15.305(a)(3))
4. Assign adjectival rating (FAR 15.305(a)(1))
5. Provide supporting rationale (FAR 15.308)
6. Assess risk level (FAR 15.305(a)(4))

1. OFFEROR INFORMATION

Offeror Name: [Offeror Name] **DUNS/UEI:** [To be provided from SAM.gov registration] **Business Size:** [To be verified per SAM.gov registration] **Socioeconomic Status:** Small Business Set-Aside (Project Information)

Proposal Volume Evaluated: Technical Approach Volume **Page Count:** [To be determined from submitted proposal pages] **Proposal Date:** [To be determined from proposal submission date]

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 (Project Information)

2.2 Factor Weight

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

2.3 Evaluation Criteria

Per Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 for ALMS program requirements (Project Information)

3. SUBFACTOR EVALUATIONS

3.1 Subfactor: System Architecture and Design

Weight: 25%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against ALMS technical requirements]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(iii)]

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High per FAR 15.305(a)(4)]

3.2 Subfactor: Development Methodology

Weight: 20%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against 36-month performance period requirements (Project Information)]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(iii)]

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High per FAR 15.305(a)(4)]

3.3 Subfactor: Integration Approach

Weight: 20%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against 15 Army installation deployment requirements (Project Information)]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(iii)]

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High per FAR 15.305(a)(4)]

3.4 Subfactor: Cybersecurity Implementation

Weight: 20%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against DoD cybersecurity requirements]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(iii)]

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High per FAR 15.305(a)(4)]

3.5 Subfactor: Testing and Quality Assurance

Weight: 15%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for this subfactor]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against IOC June 2026 and FOC December 2026 requirements (Project Information)]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(3)(iii)]

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High per FAR 15.305(a)(4)]

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(a)(3)(i)).

Identified Strengths

[Evaluator: Document specific strengths with rationale per FAR 15.308]

Total Strengths: [Evaluator: Document total number of identified strengths]

5. WEAKNESSES

Definition

A weakness is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (FAR 15.305(a)(3)(ii)).

Identified Weaknesses

[Evaluator: Document specific weaknesses with impact analysis per FAR 15.308]

Total Weaknesses: [Evaluator: Document total number of identified weaknesses]

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(a)(3)(iii)).

Identified Deficiencies

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.308 evaluation guidelines]

Total Deficiencies: [Evaluator: Document total number of identified deficiencies]

7. RISK ASSESSMENT

7.1 Overall Risk Rating

Risk Level: [Evaluator: Assess risk level per FAR 15.305(a)(4): Low/Moderate/High]

Risk Color Code: [Evaluator: Assign color code per evaluation guidelines]

- ■ **Green:** Low Risk
- ■ **Yellow:** Moderate Risk
- ■ **Red:** High Risk

7.2 Risk Analysis by Category

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

[Evaluator: Complete risk assessment per FAR 15.305(a)(4)]

7.3 Risk Narrative

[Evaluator: Provide risk narrative supporting 2,800 user deployment across 15 Army installations (Project Information)]

7.4 Risk Mitigation Approach (if applicable)

[Evaluator: Document risk mitigation strategies per evaluation guidelines]

8. ADJECTIVAL RATING

8.1 Overall Factor Rating

Rating: [Evaluator: Assign rating per FAR 15.305(a)(1):
Outstanding/Good/Acceptable/Marginal/Unacceptable]

Rating Definitions (FAR 15.305(a)(1)):

- **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: Provide rationale supporting assigned rating per FAR 15.308]

8.3 Supporting Analysis

[Evaluator: Complete supporting analysis per evaluation guidelines]

9. NUMERICAL SCORE (if applicable)

9.1 Scoring Method

[Evaluator: Document scoring methodology per Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

9.2 Subfactor Scores

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

[Evaluator: Complete scoring per evaluation methodology]

TOTAL	100%	-	[Evaluator: Calculate total weighted score]
--------------	-------------	---	--

9.3 Score Rationale

[Evaluator: Provide rationale for assigned scores per FAR 15.308]

10. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

10.1 Comparison to Requirements

[Evaluator: Compare proposal to ALMS program requirements (Project Information)]

10.2 Discriminators

[Evaluator: Identify proposal discriminators per evaluation guidelines]

10.3 Notable Features

[Evaluator: Document notable proposal features]

11. PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE

11.1 Compliance Checklist

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

[Evaluator: Complete compliance assessment per Section L of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

11.2 Non-Compliances

[Evaluator: Document non-compliances per FAR 15.306(a)(2)]

11.3 Material Omissions

[Evaluator: Document material omissions per evaluation guidelines]

12. EVALUATOR COMMENTS

12.1 General Observations

[Evaluator: Provide general observations on proposal quality]

12.2 Key Concerns

[Evaluator: Document key concerns regarding contract performance]

12.3 Outstanding Aspects

[Evaluator: Highlight outstanding proposal aspects]

12.4 Areas Needing Clarification

[Evaluator: Identify areas requiring clarification per FAR 15.306(a)]

13. RECOMMENDED CLARIFICATIONS/DISCUSSIONS

13.1 Questions for Offeror

[Evaluator: Prepare questions per FAR 15.306(a)]

13.2 Areas for Oral Presentation

[Evaluator: Identify oral presentation topics per evaluation plan]

13.3 Written Clarifications Needed

[Evaluator: Document written clarifications per FAR 15.306(a)(2)]

14. EVALUATION SUMMARY

14.1 Overall Assessment

[Evaluator: Provide comprehensive technical assessment for ALMS program]

14.2 Key Findings

[Evaluator: Summarize key evaluation findings]

14.3 Recommendation

[Evaluator: Provide recommendation for source selection authority]

15. EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that (FAR 15.305(b)):

- I have reviewed the offeror's complete proposal for this factor
- My evaluation is based solely on evaluation criteria in Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042
- I have identified all strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(3)
- My ratings and scores are supported by documented rationale per FAR 15.308
- I have no organizational conflict of interest with this offeror
- I have completed required source selection training per FAR 15.303

Evaluator Name: [Evaluator Name] **Evaluator Title:** Technical Evaluator **Organization:** PEO Combat Support & Combat Service Support Evaluation Team (Project Information)

Signature: _____ **Date:** December 18, 2025

16. QUALITY REVIEW

16.1 Peer Review (if applicable)

Reviewed by: [To be completed per evaluation plan] **Date:** [To be completed per evaluation plan] **Comments:** [To be completed per evaluation plan]

16.2 Technical Advisor Review (if applicable)

Reviewed by: [To be completed per evaluation plan] **Date:** [To be completed per evaluation plan] **Comments:** [To be completed per evaluation plan]

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Detailed Subfactor Analysis

[Evaluator: Complete detailed analysis per evaluation guidelines]

Appen

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 21:29:02* *Program: Advanced Logistics Management System*