

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORECARD

Solicitation Number: W56KGU-25-R-0042 (Project Information, 2025) **Program:** Advanced Logistics Management System (ALMS) (Project Information, 2025) **Offeror:** [Offeror Name] **Evaluation Factor:** Technical Approach **Evaluator:** [Evaluator Name] **Date:** January 15, 2026 **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED

EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

Evaluation Methodology

Source Selection Method: Best Value Trade-Off (FAR 15.101-1, 2023)

This Scorecard Evaluates: Technical Approach

Evaluation Standard: Per Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 (Project Information, 2025)

Rating Scale

Best Value Trade-Off Rating Scale (FAR 15.305, 2023):

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), 2023)
2. Assess against evaluation criteria and subfactors specified in Section M (Project Information, 2025)
3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(2) (FAR 15.305, 2023)
4. Assign adjectival rating based on merit and risk assessment (FAR 15.305, 2023)
5. Provide supporting rationale with documented basis (FAR 15.305, 2023)
6. Assess risk level for contract performance (FAR 15.305, 2023)

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 per NAICS 541512 (Project Information, 2025)

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

2. EVALUATION FACTOR: Technical Approach

2.1 Factor Description (from Section M)

Evaluation of Technical Approach for ALMS implementation across 15 Army installations supporting 2,800 users (Project Information, 2025)

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 36-month performance period (Project Information, 2025)

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 ALMS system architecture supporting 2,800 users across 15 installations (Project Information, 2025)]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against Section M criteria]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths that exceed requirements per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses that increase performance risk per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List material failures to meet requirements per 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 of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed development methodology for 36-month performance period (Project Information, 2025)]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against IOC date of June 2026 and FOC date of December 2026 (Project Information, 2025)]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths that exceed requirements per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses that increase performance risk per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List material failures to meet requirements per 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 of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed integration approach for Fort Lee, VA and CONUS installations (Project Information, 2025)]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against integration requirements]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths that exceed requirements per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses that increase performance risk per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List material failures to meet requirements per 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 of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed cybersecurity implementation approach]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against DoD cybersecurity requirements]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths that exceed requirements per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses that increase performance risk per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List material failures to meet requirements per 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 of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

Offeror's Approach:

[Evaluator: Summarize offeror's proposed testing and quality assurance approach]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against testing requirements for 2,800 users (Project Information, 2025)]

Strengths:

[Evaluator: List strengths that exceed requirements per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i)]

Weaknesses:

[Evaluator: List weaknesses that increase performance risk per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)]

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List material failures to meet requirements per 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), 2023).

Identified Strengths

[Evaluator: Document specific strengths with rationale based on Section M criteria]

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)(2)(ii), 2023).

Identified Weaknesses

[Evaluator: Document specific weaknesses with impact analysis on 36-month performance (Project Information, 2025)]

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)(2)(iii), 2023).

Identified Deficiencies

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305 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 based on FAR 15.305 criteria: 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: Assess risk categories for ALMS implementation]

7.3 Risk Narrative

[Evaluator: Provide risk narrative for 36-month contract performance (Project Information, 2025)]

7.4 Risk Mitigation Approach (if applicable)

[Evaluator: Document risk mitigation strategies if required]

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, 2023):

- **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 based on Section M evaluation criteria]

8.3 Supporting Analysis

[Evaluator: Complete analysis per FAR 15.305 evaluation guidelines]

9. NUMERICAL SCORE (if applicable)

9.1 Scoring Method

[Evaluator: Document scoring method 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 numerical scores assigned]

10. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

10.1 Comparison to Requirements

[Evaluator: Compare proposal to ALMS requirements for 2,800 users across 15 installations (Project Information, 2025)]

10.2 Discriminators

[Evaluator: Identify key discriminating factors per Section M criteria]

10.3 Notable Features

[Evaluator: Document notable features relevant to ALMS implementation]

11. PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE

11.1 Compliance Checklist

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

[Evaluator: Complete compliance assessment per Section L requirements]

11.2 Non-Compliances

[Evaluator: Document non-compliances with solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

11.3 Material Omissions

[Evaluator: Document material omissions per FAR 15.305]

12. EVALUATOR COMMENTS

12.1 General Observations

[Evaluator: Provide observations on proposal quality and completeness]

12.2 Key Concerns

[Evaluator: Document concerns regarding contract performance risk]

12.3 Outstanding Aspects

[Evaluator: Highlight exceptional proposal elements]

12.4 Areas Needing Clarification

[Evaluator: Identify areas requiring clarification per FAR 15.306]

13. RECOMMENDED CLARIFICATIONS/DISCUSSIONS

13.1 Questions for Offeror

[Evaluator: Document questions per FAR 15.306 clarification procedures]

13.2 Areas for Oral Presentation

[Evaluator: Identify topics for oral presentation if applicable]

13.3 Written Clarifications Needed

[Evaluator: Document written clarifications required per FAR 15.306]

14. EVALUATION SUMMARY

14.1 Overall Assessment

[Evaluator: Provide comprehensive technical assessment for ALMS program]

14.2 Key Findings

[Evaluator: Summarize key evaluation findings per Section M criteria]

14.3 Recommendation

[Evaluator: Provide recommendation based on evaluation results]

15. EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that:

- I have reviewed the offeror's complete proposal for this factor per FAR 15.305 (FAR 15.305, 2023)
- My evaluation is based solely on evaluation criteria in Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 (Project Information, 2025)
- I have identified all strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(2) (FAR 15.305, 2023)
- My ratings and scores are supported by documented rationale (FAR 15.305, 2023)
- I have no organizational conflict of interest with this offeror per FAR 9.5 (FAR 9.5, 2023)
- I have completed required source selection training per FAR 15.303 (FAR 15.303, 2023)

Evaluator Name: [Evaluator Name] **Evaluator Title:** Technical Evaluator **Organization:** U.S. Army Contr

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: 2026-01-15 09:18:48 Program: Advanced Logistics Management System