PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORECARD

Solicitation Number: W56KGU-25-R-0042 (Ground Truth Project Information) **Program:** Advanced Logistics Management System (ALMS) (Ground Truth 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 (Ground Truth Project Information)

Rating Scale

Best Value Trade-Off Rating Scale:

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 per FAR 15.305 (FAR 15.305)

2. Assess against evaluation criteria and subfactors specified in Section M (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(2) (FAR 15.305(a)(2))

4. Assign adjectival rating per evaluation standards (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

5. Provide supporting rationale per FAR 15.308 (FAR 15.308)

6. Assess risk level per program requirements (Ground Truth Project Information)

1. OFFEROR INFORMATION

Offeror Name: [Offeror Name] **DUNS/UEI:** [To be provided from SAM.gov registration] (SAM.gov) **Business Size:** [To be verified per SAM.gov classification] (SAM.gov) **Socioeconomic Status:** Small Business Set-Aside per NAICS 541512 (Ground Truth Project Information)

Proposal Volume Evaluated: Technical Approach Volume **Page Count:** [To be counted from submitted proposal pages] (Proposal Submission) **Proposal Date:** [Date from proposal submission per closing date October 15, 2025] (Ground Truth Project Information)

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 (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

2.2 Factor Weight

Weight: [Weight specified in Section M of solicitation] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

2.3 Evaluation Criteria

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

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] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for supporting 2,800 users across 15 Army installations] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against ALMS technical requirements] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i))

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii))

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii))

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.2 Subfactor: Development Methodology

Weight: 20%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M supporting 36-month period of performance] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for 12-month base period plus 2 x 12-month options] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against IOC date of June 2026 and FOC date of December 2026] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i))

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii))

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii))

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.3 Subfactor: Integration Approach

Weight: 20%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M for Fort Lee, VA and CONUS installations] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed approach for integration across specified locations] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment per ACAT III program requirements] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i))

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii))

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii))

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.4 Subfactor: Cybersecurity Implementation

Weight: 20%

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed cybersecurity approach for Army logistics system] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against applicable cybersecurity standards] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i))

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii))

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii))

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

Risk Level: [Low / Moderate / High]

3.5 Subfactor: Testing and Quality Assurance

Weight: 15%

Evaluation Criteria:

[Evaluator: Insert specific criteria for this subfactor from Section M supporting program milestones] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed testing approach for ALMS implementation] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against quality assurance requirements] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List any strengths identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i))

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List any weaknesses identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii))

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)] (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii))

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(a)(2)(i)) (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)).

Identified Strengths

[Evaluator: Document specific strengths with rationale per evaluation criteria] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Total Strengths: [Evaluator: Document total number of strengths identified] (Evaluation Results)

5. WEAKNESSES

Definition

A weakness is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)) (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)).

Identified Weaknesses

[Evaluator: Document specific weaknesses with impact analysis per program risk assessment] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Total Weaknesses: [Evaluator: Document total number of weaknesses identified] (Evaluation Results)

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)(2)(iii)) (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)).

Identified Deficiencies

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines] (FAR 15.305)

Total Deficiencies: [Evaluator: Document total number of deficiencies identified] (Evaluation Results)

7. RISK ASSESSMENT

7.1 Overall Risk Rating

Risk Level: [Evaluator: Assess risk level per ACAT III program requirements: Low/Moderate/High] (Ground Truth Project Information)

Risk Color Code: [Evaluator: Assign risk color per DoD risk management standards] (DoD Risk Management Standards)

- ■ **Green:** Low Risk

- ■ **Yellow:** Moderate Risk

- ■ **Red:** High Risk

7.2 Risk Analysis by Category

Risk Category	Risk Level	Rationale

[Evaluator: Assess risk categories per program requirements] (Ground Truth Project Information)

7.3 Risk Narrative

[Evaluator: Provide risk narrative supporting $2,500,000 estimated value program] (Ground Truth Project Information)

7.4 Risk Mitigation Approach (if applicable)

[Evaluator: Document risk mitigation per contract performance requirements] (Ground Truth Project Information)

8. ADJECTIVAL RATING

8.1 Overall Factor Rating

Rating: [Evaluator: Assign rating per Section M criteria: Outstanding/Good/Acceptable/Marginal/Unacceptable] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

Rating Definitions:

- **Outstanding:** Exceeds requirements in all significant aspects, exceptional merit

- **Good:** Meets requirements and exceeds in some aspects, above average merit

- **Acceptable:** Meets requirements, 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] (FAR 15.308)

8.3 Supporting Analysis

[Evaluator: Complete analysis per evaluation guidelines] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

9. NUMERICAL SCORE (if applicable)

9.1 Scoring Method

[Evaluator: Document scoring method per Section M requirements] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

9.2 Subfactor Scores

Subfactor	Weight	Raw Score	Weighted Score

[Evaluator: Complete scoring per evaluation methodology] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

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

9.3 Score Rationale

[Evaluator: Provide rationale for numerical scores assigned] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

10. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

10.1 Comparison to Requirements

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

10.2 Discriminators

[Evaluator: Identify key discriminating factors per evaluation criteria] (Section M, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

10.3 Notable Features

[Evaluator: Document notable proposal features relevant to program success] (Ground Truth Project Information)

11. PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE

11.1 Compliance Checklist

Requirement	Compliant	Comments

[Evaluator: Verify compliance with solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 requirements] (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

11.2 Non-Compliances

[Evaluator: Document any non-compliances identified] (Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

11.3 Material Omissions

[Evaluator: Document any material omissions per Section L requirements] (Section L, Solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042)

12. EVALUATOR

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