

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:** January 15, 2026 **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:

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
2. Assess against evaluation criteria and subfactors per FAR 15.305 (FAR 15.305)
3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies
4. Assign adjectival rating
5. Provide supporting rationale
6. Assess risk level

1. OFFEROR INFORMATION

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

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

2.3 Evaluation Criteria

Per Section M of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 for ALMS program (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 requirements]

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%

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 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%

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 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%

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 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%

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 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 based on ALMS requirements]

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

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 on 2,800 user deployment (Project Information)]

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

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]

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

7. RISK ASSESSMENT

7.1 Overall Risk Rating

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

Risk Color Code: [Evaluator: Assign color code based on risk assessment]

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

7.2 Risk Analysis by Category

Risk Category	Risk Level	Rationale
Technical	[To be determined]	[Based on ALMS technical requirements assessment]
Schedule	[To be determined]	[Based on 36-month performance period (Project Information)]
Cost	[To be determined]	[Based on \$2,500,000 estimated value (Project Information)]

7.3 Risk Narrative

[Evaluator: Provide risk narrative based on ALMS program requirements and 15 installation deployment scope (Project Information)]

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:

- **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 evaluation against Section M criteria of solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042]

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
System Architecture and Design	25%	[TBD]	[TBD]
Development Methodology	20%	[TBD]	[TBD]
Integration Approach	20%	[TBD]	[TBD]
Cybersecurity Implementation	20%	[TBD]	[TBD]
Testing and Quality Assurance	15%	[TBD]	[TBD]
TOTAL	100%	-	[To be calculated]

9.3 Score Rationale

[Evaluator: Provide scoring rationale per evaluation methodology]

10. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

10.1 Comparison to Requirements

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

10.2 Discriminators

[Evaluator: Identify key discriminating factors per evaluation criteria]

10.3 Notable Features

[Evaluator: Document notable proposal features relevant to ALMS implementation]

11. PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE

11.1 Compliance Checklist

Requirement	Compliant	Comments
Technical Volume Format	[TBD]	[Per Section L requirements]
Page Limitations	[TBD]	[Per Section L requirements]
Required Certifications	[TBD]	[Per solicitation requirements]
Small Business Status	[TBD]	[Per NAICS 541512 requirements (Project Information)]

11.2 Non-Compliances

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

11.3 Material Omissions

[Evaluator: Document any 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 ALMS implementation capability]

12.3 Outstanding Aspects

[Evaluator: Highlight exceptional proposal elements]

12.4 Areas Needing Clarification

[Evaluator: Identify areas requiring clarification during discussions]

13. RECOMMENDED CLARIFICATIONS/DISCUSSIONS

13.1 Questions for Offeror

[Evaluator: Prepare questions for oral presentations or written clarifications]

13.2 Areas for Oral Presentation

[Evaluator: Identify topics for oral presentation per FAR 15.102]

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 against ALMS program objectives]

14.2 Key Findings

[Evaluator: Summarize key evaluation findings and their impact on program success]

14.3 Recommendation

[Evaluator: Provide recommendation for source selection decision]

15. EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that:

- 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
- My ratings and scores are supported by documented rationale
- 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:** January 15, 2026

16. QUALITY REVIEW

16.1 Peer Review (if applicable)

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

16.2 Technical Advisor Review (if applicable)

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Detailed Subfactor Analysis

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 09:22:34 Program: Advanced Logistics Management System