



TSA IV Standard Evaluation Criteria

2026 STCF Industry Panel



CUI

TSA IV Standardized Criteria



AFLCMC... Providing What the Warfighter Needs When They Need It

STEP 1	Criteria Description	Rating	Proposal Artifacts
Gate*	Technical approach for a platform/program-specific area	Outstanding/Acceptable/Not Acceptable	Briefing (45 min) plus meeting transcript OR 10-page white paper

***Most promising approaches invited for further consideration to submit a proposal to compete in Step 2**

STEP 2	Criteria Description	Rating	Proposal Artifacts
Technical Approach	Sound approach provided to demonstrate meeting up to three platform/program-specific technical evaluation items and may include technical advantage(s)	Significantly Exceeds/ Exceeds/Meets/ Does Not Meet	Technical Approach plus additional artifacts as requested in the Instructions to Offerors (e.g., Staffing Matrix, etc.)
Focused Past Performance	Focused Past Performance for highest priority platform/program-specific focus area(s)	High/Moderate/ No Record/Low	Focused Past Performance Worksheet (offerors provide artifacts to support recency, relevancy, and quality)
Price	Complete, Reasonable, and Not Unbalanced	No rating	Total Evaluated Price (TEP) Worksheet

Your Panel Members



Rick Goree (moderator) – Akima / Pinnacle Solutions
Director Training Systems Business Development / Capture



John Little – American Systems
Technical Products Manager



Jennifer Carter – LSI Inc.
Vice President, Business Development & Contracts



Josh Estevez – Akima
Senior Manager, Contracts (FSG)



Steve Godby – AFLCMC / Advanced Training Capabilities Division
Contracting Officer

Panel Format

- We have 5 topics keyed up to discuss (time permitting)
- After each topic discussion with the panel, we will solicit verbal questions from the audience
- Slido is available for questions
- There will be time set aside to provide for more questions; even if we do not get to all the topics
- We will read and address as many Slido questions at the end of the panel as time permits

Topic 1: Technical Down-select (Core of the Model) Gating

Step One asks industry to respond to a specific problem set and then down-selects based on the ‘most promising approaches.’ That places a lot of weight on how companies articulate their technical solution early.

Key Question

- What does an ‘Outstanding’ technical approach actually look like in practice versus ‘Acceptable’?

Topic 2: Data Availability & Incumbency Advantage

Industry often argues that late release of technical data drives risk pricing. Government often argues data rights and classification constraints.

To present a credible technical approach, industry needs data. But in many cases, incumbents naturally have more of that insight.

If industry doesn't receive enough technical data early, they price risk. If they price risk, they have a price disadvantage. If they don't price risk, programs struggle later. So, what are some ways to close that gap?

Key Question

- How much data is enough and how much advance to final FOPR release for industry to provide a credible technical solution in Step One?

Topic 3: Ensuring Industry Is Bidding Pricing Correctly

Price is mandatory under this structure. If industry underprices due to incomplete information, tricky practices, or misinterpretations, everyone loses. How do we create conditions for correct pricing?

Key Question

- Is there a risk that Step One rewards the most compelling story—and Step Two deals with the consequences?

Topic 4: Step 2 Tradeoff & Limiting Strengths

In Step Two, the Government performs a best value tradeoff. One question that's come up is whether limiting the number of strengths considered in that tradeoff could constrain meaningful differentiation.

Key Question

- Does limiting strengths in a tradeoff simplify evaluation—or oversimplify it?
- Should technical approaches be platform-specific, or should the government evaluate the soundness of a systems approach that can scale across platforms?

Topic 5: Who Actually Wrote the Technical Approach?

Another reality in today's environment is that technical and program approaches can be heavily supported by consultants or even generated with AI tools. That raises the question of how well Step One reflects a company's actual execution capability.

Key Question

- How can the Government distinguish between a polished proposal and a team that can actually execute?



Let's get to some questions