

Account prioritization scorecard

Which accounts deserve your best people? Rate evidence, access, mission fit and pursuit cost before assigning scarce capture resources.

01 WHY THIS IS VALUABLE

A shared scorecard makes staffing tradeoffs explicit: prioritize credible, actionable opportunities instead of chasing the largest announced programs or contract ceilings.

BETTER RESOURCE USE
Concentrate BD, capture and technical time.

EVIDENCE OVER HYPE
Distinguish budget signals from funded need.

DECISIONS YOU CAN REVISIT
Reallocate when facts and access change.

02 DEFINE THE ACCOUNTS

Score a specific buyer + mission need + buying route, not a department-wide revenue target.

ACCOUNT A _____ ACCOUNT B _____ ACCOUNT C _____

03 SCORE WITH CURRENT EVIDENCE

Rate each factor 1-5: 1 = weak or unproven; 5 = strong, verified fit. Use the same rubric for all accounts.

DECISION FACTOR / EVIDENCE TO CHECK	WT.	A	B	C
Funding confidence Identified funds, buying timeline, documented need	35%	----	----	----
Customer access / buying route Verified buyer access and eligible contract path	25%	----	----	----
Competitive position / mission fit Relevant capabilities, references and partners	25%	----	----	----
Cost to pursue (reverse scored) Capture effort and opportunity cost are manageable	15%	----	----	----
WEIGHTED SCORE / 100 (Funding x 35 + Access x 25 + Fit x 25 + Pursuit efficiency x 15) / 5		----	----	----

04 INTERPRET AND DECIDE

80-100 INVEST 60-79 DEVELOP BELOW 60 MONITOR

Check eligibility, required capabilities and delivery economics before assigning resources. Document the evidence behind each rating; review quarterly or when funding, contract access or competitors change.

IMPORTANT This is a comparative management tool, not a forecast of contract awards or a statistically validated probability of winning.

Worked defense-sector example

One hypothetical cybersecurity integrator. Three accounts. Capacity to staff one fully, develop one selectively and monitor the third.

01 ILLUSTRATIVE SCORES - NOT ACTUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS

The fictional scores below reflect assumed account-level access and funding, not independently verified conditions of the named defense programs.

A / EXISTING ARMY Cyber sustainment		B / ARMY COUNTER-UAS Integration teaming		C / AIR FORCE CCA Support market entry	
FACTOR	WEIGHT	A	B	C	
Funding confidence	35%	4	2	2	
Customer access / buying route	25%	5	4	2	
Competitive position / mission fit	25%	4	4	3	
Cost to pursue (higher is better)	15%	4	3	2	
TOTAL / 100		85	63	45	

INVEST 85 / 100	DEVELOP 63 / 100	MONITOR 45 / 100
--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

02 WHAT THIS OUTCOME DEMONSTRATES

INVEST IN A	An existing customer, verified access and relevant proof justify a named BD owner, capture lead, executive sponsor and scheduled solution support.
DEVELOP B	Counter-UAS is credible acquisition activity, but this potential teammate still needs verified task-order funding, workshare and prime interest.
MONITOR C	A large emerging mission is not yet an actionable service pursuit; track requirements, qualified partners and a feasible contracting route.

NEED HELP PRIORITIZING YOUR ACCOUNTS?

Government Contractors LLC | 703-996-9029 | team@governmentcontractors.com