

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORECARD

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

| Rating | Definition | Risk Level | Score Range |
|---------------------|---|------------------|-------------|
| Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements with no significant weaknesses. Adequate proposal with minimal risk. | Moderate | 60-74 |
| 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(a)
2. Assess against evaluation criteria and subfactors specified in Section M
3. Identify strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies per FAR 15.305(a)(2)
4. Assign adjectival rating per FAR 15.305(a)(3)
5. Provide supporting rationale per FAR 15.308(a)
6. Assess risk level per DFARS 215.305(a)(3)

1. OFFEROR INFORMATION

Offeror Name: CloudLogix Solutions Inc **DUNS/UEI:** [To be verified against SAM.gov registration]
Business Size: [To be determined from SAM.gov verification] **Socioeconomic Status:** [To be determined from SAM.gov verification]

Proposal Volume Evaluated: Technical Approach Volume **Page Count:** [To be determined from proposal submission] **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 for the Advanced Logistics Management System (ALMS) (Ground Truth - Project Information)

2.2 Factor Weight

Weight: [To be determined from 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 (Ground Truth - 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 CloudLogix Solutions Inc's proposed approach for this subfactor]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against ALMS requirements]

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified 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 CloudLogix Solutions Inc's proposed development methodology]

Assessment:

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

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified 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 CloudLogix Solutions Inc's proposed integration approach for 15 Army installations (Ground Truth - Project Information)]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against ALMS integration requirements]

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified 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 CloudLogix Solutions Inc's proposed cybersecurity implementation]

Assessment:

[Evaluator: Provide detailed assessment against DoD cybersecurity requirements]

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified 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 CloudLogix Solutions Inc's proposed testing and quality assurance approach]

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)]

Weaknesses:

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

Deficiencies:

[Evaluator: List any deficiencies identified 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)).

Identified Strengths

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

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(a)(2)(ii)).

Identified Weaknesses

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

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(a)(2)(iii)).

Identified Deficiencies

[Evaluator: Complete this section per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii) 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 per DFARS 215.305(a)(3): 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 DFARS 215.305(a)(3)]

7.3 Risk Narrative

[Evaluator: Provide risk narrative supporting overall risk assessment]

7.4 Risk Mitigation Approach (if applicable)

[Evaluator: Document risk mitigation strategies if applicable]

8. ADJECTIVAL RATING

8.1 Overall Factor Rating

Rating: [Evaluator: Assign rating per FAR 15.305(a)(3): 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 supporting assigned rating per FAR 15.308(a)]

8.3 Supporting Analysis

[Evaluator: Complete supporting analysis per evaluation guidelines]

9. NUMERICAL SCORE (if applicable)

9.1 Scoring Method

[Evaluator: Document scoring methodology if numerical scoring is required]

9.2 Subfactor Scores

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

[Evaluator: Complete scoring table if numerical evaluation is required]

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

9.3 Score Rationale

[Evaluator: Provide rationale for numerical scores if applicable]

10. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

10.1 Comparison to Requirements

[Evaluator: Compare CloudLogix Solutions Inc proposal to ALMS requirements]

10.2 Discriminators

[Evaluator: Identify key discriminating factors per FAR 15.308(a)]

10.3 Notable Features

[Evaluator: Document notable features of CloudLogix Solutions Inc proposal]

11. PROPOSAL COMPLIANCE

11.1 Compliance Checklist

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

[Evaluator: Complete compliance assessment against solicitation W56KGU-25-R-0042 requirements]

11.2 Non-Compliances

[Evaluator: Document any non-compliances with solicitation requirements]

11.3 Material Omissions

[Evaluator: Document any material omissions from CloudLogix Solutions Inc proposal]

12. EVALUATOR COMMENTS

12.1 General Observations

[Evaluator: Provide general observations on CloudLogix Solutions Inc proposal]

12.2 Key Concerns

[Evaluator: Document key concerns regarding proposal performance risk]

12.3 Outstanding Aspects

[Evaluator: Document outstanding aspects of the technical approach]

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: Document specific questions for CloudLogix Solutions Inc]

13.2 Areas for Oral Presentation

[Evaluator: Identify topics for oral presentation if applicable per FAR 15.102(e)]

13.3 Written Clarifications Needed

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

14. EVALUATION SUMMARY

14.1 Overall Assessment

[Evaluator: Provide comprehensive technical assessment of CloudLogix Solutions Inc proposal against ALMS requirements]

14.2 Key Findings

[Evaluator: Summarize key evaluation findings per FAR 15.308(a)]

14.3 Recommendation

[Evaluator: Provide evaluation recommendation for source selection authority]

15. EVALUATOR CERTIFICATION

I certify that:

- ■ I have reviewed CloudLogix Solutions Inc'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)(2)

- ■ My ratings and scores are supported by documented rationale per FAR 15.308(a)
- ■ I have no organizational conflict of interest with this offeror per FAR 9.5
- ■ I have completed required source selection training per FAR 15.303(c)

Evaluator Name: [Evaluator Name] **Evaluator Title:** Technical Evaluator **Organization:** U.S. Army Contracting Command - Rock Island (Ground Truth - 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 upon peer review]
Comments: [To be completed by peer reviewer]

16.2 Technical Advisor Review (if applicable)

Reviewed by: [To be completed per evaluation team procedures] **Date:** [To be completed upon technical advisor review] **Comments:** [To be completed by technical advisor]

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Detaile

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 09:15:11 Program: Advanced Logistics Management System