



5 FREE PROMPTS FROM THE PROPOSAL MANAGER'S AI TOOLKIT

Proposal Manager AI Starter Kit

aitoolkitshop.com →

Proposal Manager AI Starter Kit

5 Free Prompts from The Proposal Manager's AI Toolkit

This is a sample of The Proposal Manager's AI Toolkit — 5 prompts pulled from the full collection of 31. Each one covers a different stage of the proposal lifecycle.

Why these aren't generic prompts. Most AI prompts for proposal writing are variations of "write a persuasive paragraph about our capabilities." The output reads like a corporate brochure — buzzwords, no proof points, completely disconnected from evaluation criteria. Every prompt here is built for a specific proposal task — the structure, evaluation alignment, and compliance awareness are already baked in. That's why the output moves the proposal forward instead of creating more editing work.

What's inside:

- 1. Executive Summary Generator** — Turn win themes and solution overviews into structured, customer-focused summaries
 - 2. RFP Shredder & Compliance Matrix Builder** — Extract every requirement into an organized compliance matrix in minutes
 - 3. Win Theme Developer** — Build discriminating themes from evaluation criteria and competitive position
 - 4. Bid/No-Bid Scoring Framework** — Score opportunities against weighted criteria for better pursuit decisions
 - 5. AI Speak Detector & De-Genericizer** — Purge vague filler language and replace with specific, provable claims
-

How to use: Copy the prompt, paste it into ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, or any AI tool, replace the [BRACKETED_PLACEHOLDERS] with your details, and run it. Never paste proprietary pricing or classified content into public AI tools.

Opportunity Assessment

#1 Bid/No-Bid Scoring Framework

Opportunity Assessment

- An RFP hits your desk and leadership wants a recommendation by end of day. Instead of relying on gut feel or a shouting match in a conference room, use this to build a structured scoring matrix that forces an honest evaluation of your competitive position.

THE PROMPT

I'm a proposal manager evaluating whether my organization should bid on an opportunity. Build me a weighted bid/no-bid scoring framework that I can fill out and present to leadership.

The framework should include these evaluation categories, each with 3-5 specific scoring criteria rated 1-5:

1. Strategic alignment (does this fit our growth plan, target client list, and contract vehicle portfolio?)
2. Competitive position (incumbency, past performance relevance, key personnel availability, teaming arrangements)
3. Win probability factors (customer relationship strength, solution maturity, price competitiveness)
4. Resource assessment (proposal team availability, level of effort vs. current workload, time until due date)
5. Risk factors (contract type risk, performance risk, organizational conflict of interest concerns)

For each criterion, provide:

- A clear definition of what a score of 1, 3, and 5 looks like
- The recommended weight (all weights should sum to 100%)

Include a scoring interpretation guide:

- What total score range = strong bid (proceed)
- What range = conditional bid (proceed with mitigation plan)
- What range = no-bid (decline professionally)

Also include 3 automatic no-bid triggers – conditions where the score doesn't matter because the risk is too high.

Opportunity details:

[OPPORTUNITY_DETAILS]

Our company profile:

[COMPANY_PROFILE]

EXAMPLE INPUT

Opportunity: USDA IT modernization support services, 5-year IDIQ with task orders, best value selection. Estimated ceiling \$45M. Due in 38 days. Full and open competition. Requires CMMI Level 3 and FedRAMP moderate authorization.

Company: Mid-size IT services firm, 250 employees. Strong USDA past performance on a \$12M O&M contract ending next year. CMMI Level 3 appraised. No FedRAMP authorization but teaming partner has it. One previous win with this contracting office.

EXAMPLE OUTPUT

```
## Bid/No-Bid Evaluation: USDA IT Modernization Support Services

### Scoring Matrix

**Category 1: Strategic Alignment (Weight: 20%)**

| Criterion | 1 (Poor) | 3 (Moderate) | 5 (Strong) | Score |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Growth plan fit | Outside target agencies/domains | Adjacent to strategy | Core to 3-year growth plan | ___ |
| Client relationship | No relationship with agency | Some agency experience, different office | Active contract with same office | ___ |
| Vehicle portfolio | Would need new vehicle qualification | Leverages existing but underused vehicle | Expands a high-priority vehicle | ___ |

**Category 2: Competitive Position (Weight: 25%)**

| Criterion | 1 (Poor) | 3 (Moderate) | 5 (Strong) | Score |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Incumbency/access | Incumbent is entrenched, no intel | No incumbent advantage, level field | We are the incumbent or have inside track | ___ |
| Past performance | No relevant past performance | Related but not direct match | Direct, recent, same-scope performance | ___ |
| Key personnel | Must recruit externally for leads | Have some, must recruit 1-2 | All key personnel identified and committed | ___ |
| Teaming strength | No teaming partners identified | Partners identified, no agreements | LOIs/TAs signed with proven partners | ___ |

**Category 3: Win Probability (Weight: 25%)**

| Criterion | 1 (Poor) | 3 (Moderate) | 5 (Strong) | Score |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Customer intelligence | No insight into buyer priorities | General knowledge of agency needs | Specific insight into evaluation priorities | ___ |
| Solution readiness | Must develop from scratch | Existing framework needs adaptation | Proven solution deployed in similar environment | ___ |
| Price competitiveness | Likely 15%+ above market | Within market range | Cost advantage through efficiency or rates | ___ |

**Category 4: Resource Assessment (Weight: 15%)**
```

Criterion	1 (Poor)	3 (Moderate)	5 (Strong)	Score
Proposal team capacity	Team fully committed elsewhere	Can staff with overtime/reprioritization	Team available with bandwidth	___
Level of effort	Requires full proposal center mobilization	Moderate effort, 3-4 dedicated writers	Manageable within current capacity	___
Timeline adequacy	<21 days, no pre-positioning	30-45 days, some capture work done	>45 days or extensive pre-positioning	___

****Category 5: Risk Factors (Weight: 15%)****

Criterion	1 (High Risk)	3 (Moderate)	5 (Low Risk)	Score
Contract type risk	FFP on undefined scope	T&M or hybrid with known scope	Cost-plus or well-scoped FFP	___
Compliance gap risk	Missing mandatory certifications	Gaps closable before submission	Fully compliant today	___
OCI concern	Potential conflict requiring mitigation	Minor concern, easily addressed	No conflict identified	___

Preliminary Assessment: USDA IT Modernization

- Strategic Alignment: Strong (active USDA relationship, IT services is core)
- Competitive Position: Moderate-Strong (good past performance, FedRAMP gap mitigated by teaming)
- Win Probability: Moderate (customer relationship exists, need intel on evaluation priorities)
- Resources: Moderate (38 days is tight but workable with pre-existing USDA knowledge)
- Risk: Moderate (FedRAMP through teaming partner adds dependency risk)

Automatic No-Bid Triggers

1. Missing a mandatory certification with no compliant teaming partner available
2. Due date is <14 days away with no capture work completed
3. Organizational conflict of interest that cannot be mitigated

Score Interpretation

- 4.0-5.0: Strong bid – allocate full resources
- 3.0-3.9: Conditional bid – identify and mitigate top 3 weaknesses before committing
- Below 3.0: No-bid – decline and redirect resources to higher-probability pursuits

★ The scoring framework is only useful if you're honest with it. The most common failure mode is inflating scores to justify a bid that leadership already wants to chase. If you find yourself rationalizing a "3" that should be a "2," that's a signal. Run the framework with your capture manager and at least one person who has no emotional investment in winning.

Proposal Planning & Kickoff

#4 RFP Shredder & Compliance Matrix Builder

Proposal Planning

- The RFP just dropped. It's 200 pages. You need to extract every requirement, build a compliance matrix, and identify the evaluation criteria before your kickoff meeting — ideally in hours, not days. This is the foundational analysis that everything else builds on.

THE PROMPT

I need you to act as an RFP analyst. I'm going to provide the text of an RFP (or key sections). Extract and organize every requirement into a structured compliance matrix.

For each requirement found, capture:

1. Requirement ID (create a sequential numbering system: REQ-001, REQ-002, etc.)
2. RFP section and page reference
3. Requirement text (verbatim quote)
4. Requirement type: **[Mandatory/Desired/Informational]**
5. Compliance category: **[Technical/Management/Past Performance/Pricing/Administrative/Personnel]**
6. Response section (which proposal section should address this)
7. Compliance approach: **[Comply/Partially Comply/Exception/Not Applicable]**
8. Assigned writer
9. Notes (cross-references to other requirements, ambiguities, questions for the CO)

Also extract and list separately:

- All evaluation factors and subfactors with their relative weights or importance order (Section M or equivalent)
- All page limits, font requirements, and formatting constraints (Section L or equivalent)
- All submission logistics (due date, delivery method, number of copies, file naming conventions)
- All certifications, representations, and organizational qualifications required
- Any ambiguities or contradictions between sections that may warrant a question to the Contracting Officer

Present the compliance matrix in a table format I can paste into Excel or Google Sheets.

RFP text:

[RFP_TEXT_OR_KEY_SECTIONS]

EXAMPLE INPUT

[Paste of Section C (Statement of Work), Section L (Instructions to Offerors), and Section M (Evaluation Criteria) from a DOD IT services RFP – typically 30-80 pages of the most critical content]

EXAMPLE OUTPUT

Compliance Matrix: DOD IT Modernization Services (Solicitation W911-XX-R-0042)

Submission Requirements (Section L)

- Due date: April 15, 2026, 2:00 PM EST
- Delivery: Electronic via DOD SAFE (max 500MB per volume)
- Volumes: I (Technical/Management, 80-page limit), II (Past Performance, 30-page limit), III (Pricing, no page limit)
- Font: Times New Roman 12pt, 1-inch margins, single-spaced
- File naming: [Company]_Vol[X]_[Section]_[Date]

Evaluation Criteria (Section M)

1. Technical Approach – Most Important
 - a. Understanding of requirements
 - b. Methodology and tools
 - c. Innovation and efficiency improvements
2. Past Performance – Important (significantly less than Technical)
 - a. Relevance of past contracts
 - b. Quality of performance (CPARS ratings)
3. Key Personnel – Important (equal to Past Performance)
 - a. Qualifications and experience
 - b. Availability and commitment
4. Price – Lowest importance, evaluated for reasonableness

Compliance Matrix (First 10 of 67 Requirements)

Req ID	RFP Section	Page	Requirement Text	Type	Category	Response Section	Compliance	Writer	Notes
REQ-001	C.3.1	12	"Contractor shall provide help desk support with Tier 1, 2, and 3 capabilities, operating 24/7/365"	Mandatory	Technical	3.1	Comply	[TBD]	Cross-ref REQ-023 (SLA metrics)
REQ-002	C.3.1.1	12	"Tier 1 support shall achieve first-call resolution rate of 70% or higher"	Mandatory	Technical	3.1.1	Comply	[TBD]	Need to cite past performance metric
REQ-003	C.3.2	14	"Contractor shall develop and maintain a Configuration Management Plan (CMP) IAW ITIL v4 framework"	Mandatory	Technical	3.2	Comply	[TBD]	Do we have an ITIL-aligned CMP template?
REQ-004	C.3.3	16	"Contractor shall provide a Program Manager with minimum 10 years IT project management experience and PMP certification"	Mandatory	Personnel	4.1	Comply	[TBD]	PM identified: J. Smith (PMP, 14 yrs)
REQ-005	C.4.1	19	"Contractor should demonstrate experience with Agile/DevSecOps methodologies"	Desired	Technical	3.3	Comply	[TBD]	"Should" = desired, not mandatory
REQ-006	C.4.2	20	"Contractor is encouraged to propose innovative approaches to reduce total cost of ownership"	Informational	Technical	3.4	Comply	[TBD]	Opportunity for discriminator
REQ-007	C.5.1	22	"All contractor personnel shall hold minimum Secret clearance at time of proposal submission"	Mandatory	Administrative	1.2	Comply	[TBD]	Verify all proposed personnel clearance status

| REQ-008 | L.5.2 | 45 | "Offeror shall provide exactly three (3) past performance references of similar scope and complexity within the last 5 years" | Mandatory | Past Performance | Vol II | Comply | [TBD] | Pull from CPARS – need 3 contracts >\$5M IT services |

| REQ-009 | L.5.3 | 46 | "At least one past performance reference must be with a DOD component" | Mandatory | Past Performance | Vol II | Comply | [TBD] | Army ITES-3S contract qualifies |

| REQ-010 | M.2.1 | 52 | "Technical approach will be evaluated for depth of understanding of current IT environment" | Informational | Technical | 3.0 | N/A | [TBD] | Need customer intel on current environment |

Ambiguities and Questions for the Contracting Officer

1. Section C.3.1 requires 24/7/365 help desk, but Section H.12 references "core hours of 0600-1800 EST." Clarification needed on after-hours staffing expectations.
2. Section C.3.2 requires "ITIL v4 framework" but Section M evaluates "industry best practices" – confirm ITIL v4 is mandatory or if alternative frameworks are acceptable.
3. Section L states 80-page limit for Volume I but does not specify whether fold-out pages count as one or two pages.

- ★ Run this prompt in sections — don't paste the entire 200-page RFP at once. Start with Section C (SOW/PWS), then Section L, then Section M, then any attachments. This gives you cleaner output and lets you cross-reference across sections. The compliance matrix is a living document: assign requirement IDs on Day 1 and use them throughout the entire proposal lifecycle — in writer assignments, review comments, and the final compliance check.

- You've done the bid/no-bid analysis, you know you're going after this opportunity, and now you need to articulate why you should win — not just that you can do the work, but why your approach is the evaluator's best choice. This prompt generates discriminating win themes tied to evaluation criteria, not generic "we're great" statements.

THE PROMPT

I need to develop win themes for a proposal – not generic strengths, but discriminating themes that directly address the customer's priorities and separate us from competitors.

For each win theme, provide:

1. Theme statement (one sentence, customer-focused, specific)
2. The customer priority or pain point it addresses
3. The evaluation criterion it maps to (from Section M)
4. Three proof points that substantiate the theme (specific metrics, contract references, personnel qualifications)
5. The competitor vulnerability it exploits (without naming competitors)
6. A "so what" test – why should the evaluator care about this theme?
7. How to weave this theme throughout the proposal (which sections, graphics, callout boxes)

Develop 3-5 win themes total. Rank them by discriminating power (how much they separate us from competitors).

Ground rules:

- Every theme must be provable with data. No "world-class" or "industry-leading" without evidence.
- Themes must be customer-focused, not company-focused. "We have 20 years of experience" is not a theme. "20 years of [Agency] mission support means zero ramp-up time" is a theme.
- Each theme should be expressible in a single sentence that an evaluator could underline.

Opportunity details:

[OPPORTUNITY_DETAILS]

Customer priorities and known pain points:

[CUSTOMER_INTEL]

Our strengths and discriminators:

[OUR_STRENGTHS]

Competitor landscape:

[COMPETITOR_LANDSCAPE]

Evaluation criteria:
[EVALUATION_CRITERIA]

EXAMPLE INPUT

Opportunity: EPA environmental remediation support services, 3-year base + 2 options.

Best value. Technical approach (50%), past performance (30%), price (20%).

Customer priorities: EPA has been burned by contractors who proposed strong teams

then swapped personnel after award. Also concerned about data quality – previous

contractor had sampling QA issues. Want innovation in site characterization but not at the expense of regulatory compliance.

Our strengths: 12 EPA remediation contracts over 15 years. 3 of our proposed key

personnel have worked on EPA contracts for 8+ years. Developed a proprietary field data validation app that catches sampling errors in real-time. OSHA EMR rate of 0.6 (industry average is 1.0).

Competitors: Large environmental firm with broader geographic coverage but high personnel turnover. Small firm with innovative technology but limited EPA-specific past performance.

EXAMPLE OUTPUT

Win Themes: EPA Environmental Remediation Support Services

Theme 1: Personnel Continuity (Discriminating Power: HIGHEST)

Theme statement: "Our team of EPA remediation specialists – averaging 10 years of continuous EPA service – provides mission-ready expertise from Day 1, with contractual key personnel retention commitments that protect EPA's investment in team knowledge."

Customer priority addressed: EPA's documented concern about bait-and-switch staffing after award.

Evaluation criterion: Technical Approach (50%) – specifically "understanding of requirements" and "key personnel qualifications."

Proof points:

1. Three proposed key personnel have 8, 11, and 14 years of continuous EPA service
2. Our personnel retention rate on EPA contracts: 94% over the past 5 years
3. We will include a contractual commitment: 12-month key personnel retention guarantee with defined replacement procedures

Competitor vulnerability exploited: Larger firms with high turnover cannot make credible retention commitments. Evaluators should ask: "What is this offeror's actual retention rate on similar contracts?"

****"So what" test:**** Every time EPA loses an experienced contractor employee, they lose institutional knowledge of site histories, regulatory relationships, and remediation approaches that took years to develop. Continuity isn't a nice-to-have – it's a project risk mitigator.

****Proposal integration:****

- Executive Summary: Lead with personnel continuity theme
- Section 2.1 (Understanding): "Our team's combined 33 years of EPA experience means..."
- Section 4 (Key Personnel): Individual continuity narratives for each person
- Section 3 (Management): Personnel retention plan with contractual commitments
- Graphic: Timeline showing continuous EPA service for each key person
- Callout box in Executive Summary: "94% Key Personnel Retention Rate"

Theme 2: Data Quality Assurance (Discriminating Power: HIGH)

****Theme statement:**** "Our proprietary field data validation system catches sampling errors in real-time – before they become data quality incidents – reducing resampling rates by 35% and protecting the defensibility of EPA remediation decisions."

[Continues for Themes 3-4...]

Theme Ranking and Integration Strategy

Rank	Theme	Primary Sections	Callout Box Metric
1	Personnel Continuity	Exec Summary, Key Personnel, Management	94% retention rate
2	Data Quality Assurance	Technical Approach, QA Plan	35% fewer resamples
3	Safety Excellence	Management, Technical	0.6 EMR vs. 1.0 average
4	Regulatory Relationship Depth	Past Performance, Technical	15 years / 12 contracts

Theme Weaving Schedule

Each theme should appear minimum 3 times in Volume I:

1. Introduced in Executive Summary (theme statement + key metric)
2. Substantiated in the relevant technical/management section (full proof points)
3. Reinforced in a different section with cross-reference

Evaluators skim. If a theme appears only once, they may miss it.

★ Win themes are not marketing slogans. They're evaluator ammunition. When an evaluator is scoring your proposal, they need to justify their rating in writing. A strong win theme gives them the exact sentence they can quote. Test every theme with this question: "Could an evaluator copy this sentence into their evaluation notes as a strength?" If not, it's too vague.

Content Development

#9 Executive Summary Generator

Content Development

- You need to write the most important 3-5 pages of your proposal. The executive summary is often the only section every evaluator reads in full. It must communicate your win themes, demonstrate customer understanding, and preview your solution — all within a tight page limit. Write this last, after the technical and management volumes are complete.

THE PROMPT

I need to write a proposal executive summary. This is the most evaluated section of the proposal – every evaluator reads it, and it frames their perception of everything that follows.

Write an executive summary that includes:

1. Opening paragraph: Customer-focused problem statement (NOT about us – about the customer's challenge and why this contract matters to their mission). Reference specific customer priorities or pain points.
2. Solution overview: 2-3 paragraphs summarizing our technical approach, demonstrating we understand the scope and have a concrete plan – not vague promises.
3. Win theme paragraphs: One paragraph per win theme (3-4 themes), each containing:
 - The theme statement
 - A specific proof point with a metric
 - Why this matters to the customer (the "so what")
4. Key discriminators callout: A formatted callout box or table summarizing our 3-4 top discriminators with supporting metrics.
5. Past performance summary: 2-3 sentences referencing our most relevant contracts with results.
6. Closing paragraph: Forward-looking statement about partnership and commitment, referencing the contract period of performance.

Constraints:

- Page limit: [PAGE_LIMIT] pages
- Tone: Confident and specific, not salesy. Write for evaluators, not marketers.
- Every claim must be backed by a fact. No "world-class," no "industry-leading," no unsupported superlatives.
- Mirror the customer's language from the RFP – use their terminology, not

ours.

Opportunity details:
[OPPORTUNITY_DETAILS]

Win themes and proof points:
[WIN_THEMES]

Technical approach summary:
[TECHNICAL_APPROACH_SUMMARY]

Relevant past performance:
[PAST_PERFORMANCE_SUMMARY]

Customer priorities:
[CUSTOMER_PRIORITIES]

EXAMPLE INPUT

Opportunity: FEMA disaster response logistics support, 5-year contract, \$60M ceiling.

Page limit: 3 pages for exec summary.

Win themes:

1. Mobilization speed – we deployed 200+ personnel within 72 hours during Hurricane response (competitors averaged 7-10 days)
2. Scalability – our logistics platform handled 3x surge capacity during simultaneous disaster events without service degradation
3. Local workforce – 80% of our disaster response personnel live within 150 miles of FEMA regional offices, reducing mobilization cost and time

Technical approach: Tiered response model (Tier 1: 24-hour advance team, Tier 2: 72-hour full deployment, Tier 3: sustained operations), cloud-based logistics tracking platform, pre-positioned supply caches in all 10 FEMA regions.

Past performance: FEMA Region IV logistics support (\$18M, 5 years, Exceptional CPARS), Army Corps of Engineers disaster logistics (\$22M, Exceptional), State of Florida emergency management support (\$8M, reference available).

Customer priorities: Speed of mobilization is #1 priority – FEMA has publicly stated that response time is the most critical performance metric. Also concerned about cost efficiency and ability to scale down after events.

Executive Summary

When disaster strikes, every hour of delayed logistics response translates directly to lives at risk, communities without supplies, and public confidence eroding. FEMA's mission depends on logistics partners who can mobilize at the speed of the disaster itself – not days later. The Disaster Response Logistics Support contract is the operational backbone of that capability, and the selected contractor must deliver speed, scalability, and sustained performance across simultaneous, unpredictable events.

[Company] has provided exactly this capability to FEMA and federal disaster response agencies for the past 12 years. Our approach to this contract is built on a proven tiered response model: a 24-hour advance team to establish logistics coordination within the first day, full 200+ personnel deployment within 72 hours, and a sustained operations posture that scales up and down as disaster conditions evolve. This is not a theoretical framework – it is the same methodology we executed across 14 federally declared disasters under our current FEMA Region IV contract, earning Exceptional CPARS ratings every year for five years.

****Mobilization Speed: 72-Hour Full Deployment.**** FEMA's most critical performance requirement is response time. Under our current FEMA contract, [Company] deployed 212 logistics personnel to support Hurricane [Name] response operations within 68 hours of activation – while the national average for contractor mobilization during the same event was 7-10 days. We achieve this through pre-positioned response teams in all 10 FEMA regions, pre-negotiated transportation agreements, and a mobilization protocol rehearsed quarterly. For FEMA, this means logistics operations begin while other contractors are still booking flights.

****Surge Scalability: 3x Capacity Without Degradation.**** Disasters don't wait their turn. During the 2024 hurricane season, [Company] simultaneously supported operations in three FEMA regions – scaling from a baseline of 85 personnel to 340 – while maintaining 99.1% supply delivery accuracy. Our cloud-based logistics tracking platform provides real-time visibility across all active operations, allowing FEMA coordinators to allocate resources dynamically without losing situational awareness.

****Local Workforce: 80% Regional Presence.**** Eighty percent of our disaster response personnel reside within 150 miles of a FEMA regional office. This means lower mobilization costs, faster on-ground response, and personnel who understand the geography, infrastructure, and community dynamics of the regions they serve. For FEMA, this translates to an estimated 30% reduction in mobilization travel costs compared to nationally centralized staffing models.

KEY DISCRIMINATORS
72-hour full deployment (vs. 7-10 day industry avg)
3x surge capacity with 99.1% accuracy maintained
80% local workforce – 30% lower mobilization cost
5 consecutive Exceptional CPARS (FEMA Region IV)

Our past performance demonstrates consistent, measurable results at the scale FEMA requires: \$18M FEMA Region IV logistics support (Exceptional CPARS, 5 years), \$22M Army Corps of Engineers disaster logistics (Exceptional), and \$8M State of Florida emergency management support with zero missed deployment deadlines.

[Company] is committed to serving as FEMA's logistics backbone for the full

five-year performance period – delivering the mobilization speed, operational scalability, and cost efficiency that FEMA's disaster response mission demands.

- ★ The executive summary should be written last but read first. If your executive summary doesn't make the evaluator want to keep reading, the detailed technical sections won't save you. One test: hand your exec summary to someone who hasn't read the RFP. Can they tell you what the contract is for, why you should win, and what makes you different? If not, rewrite it.

Review & Quality

#20 AI Speak Detector & De-Genericizer

Review

- Your draft reads like it was written by AI — or by a proposal writer on autopilot. Evaluators can spot generic language instantly, and it signals that you didn't take the effort to tailor your response. This prompt identifies vague, generic, or obviously AI-generated language and rewrites it with specific, customer-relevant content.

THE PROMPT

I need you to review this proposal section for generic, vague, or AI-sounding language and rewrite the weak passages with specific, customer-relevant content.

Flag and rewrite any text that:

1. Uses unsupported superlatives ("world-class," "industry-leading," "best-in-class," "cutting-edge," "state-of-the-art")
2. Makes claims without evidence ("we have extensive experience," "our proven track record," "our team of experts")
3. Uses filler phrases that add no information ("in today's rapidly evolving landscape," "we understand the importance of," "leveraging our deep expertise")
4. Could appear in any proposal for any customer (not specific to this RFP or customer)
5. Uses passive voice to avoid commitment ("efforts will be made," "consideration will be given")
6. Repeats the RFP requirement back without describing HOW we'll meet it

For each flagged passage:

- Quote the original text
- Explain why it's weak (what's missing or vague)
- Provide a rewritten version with specific content
- Identify what data point or proof is needed to make the rewrite complete

Also provide:

- A "genericity score" from 1-10 (10 = could be submitted for any proposal, 1 = highly tailored)
- The top 3 changes that would most improve the section's scoring potential

Proposal section to review:

[PROPOSAL_TEXT]

Customer name and context:

[CUSTOMER_CONTEXT]

Available proof points:

[PROOF_POINTS]

EXAMPLE INPUT

Text to review:

"Our team of highly experienced professionals brings a wealth of knowledge and expertise to this critical mission. We understand the importance of delivering quality results on time and within budget. Our proven methodology, honed over years of successful project delivery, ensures that we will meet and exceed expectations. We leverage industry best practices and cutting-edge technology to provide innovative solutions that drive mission success. Our commitment to excellence is reflected in our track record of satisfied customers and successful contract performance."

Customer: U.S. Army PEO Soldier, for a body armor testing and evaluation contract.

Available proof points: 12 years of ballistic testing experience, tested 340,000+ armor units, 99.97% testing accuracy rate, 4 Army contracts including current PEO Soldier contract, NIJ-certified testing lab, 23 test engineers on staff.

EXAMPLE OUTPUT

AI Speak / Generic Language Review

Genericity Score: 9/10 – This paragraph could be submitted for literally any proposal in any industry. Not a single word is specific to PEO Soldier, body armor, ballistic testing, or the Army.

Flagged Passages

**1. "Our team of highly experienced professionals brings a wealth of knowledge and expertise" – Problem: "Highly experienced" and "wealth of knowledge" are meaningless without specifics. Every proposal claims this.

- Rewrite: "Our team of 23 ballistic test engineers – including 8 with NIJ certifications and an average of 14 years in body armor testing – brings direct PEO Soldier testing experience from our current contract, where we have tested 340,000+ armor units."

- Data needed: ✓ All proof points available

**2. "We understand the importance of delivering quality results on time and within budget" – Problem: This sentence contains zero information. It tells the evaluator nothing they don't already assume.

- Rewrite: "Our NIJ-certified testing laboratory has maintained a 99.97% testing accuracy rate across 340,000+ armor units, with zero schedule overruns on our current PEO Soldier contract – because testing accuracy and schedule reliability directly impact Soldier protection timelines."

- Data needed: ✓ Available

**3. "Our proven methodology, honed over years of successful project delivery" – Problem: "Proven methodology" without naming it is an empty claim. "Honed over years" is vague.

- Rewrite: "Our testing methodology follows MIL-STD-662F and ATP 10-100 protocols, refined through 12 years and 340,000+ ballistic test events. Each protocol is documented in our ISO 17025-accredited test procedures."

- Data needed: Confirm specific MIL-STDs and ISO accreditation status

4. "leverage industry best practices and cutting-edge technology"

- Problem: "Industry best practices" and "cutting-edge technology" are the two most overused phrases in proposal writing. They tell the evaluator nothing.

- Rewrite: "We employ high-speed photographic capture at 1,000,000 fps for ballistic impact analysis and digital clay measurement systems that reduce behind-armor deformation assessment time by 40% compared to manual measurement."

- Data needed: Confirm specific technology names and performance metrics

5. "Our commitment to excellence is reflected in our track record of satisfied customers"

- Problem: "Commitment to excellence" and "satisfied customers" are noise.

- Rewrite: "PEO Soldier has exercised every option year on our current contract and rated our performance Exceptional in the two most recent CPARS evaluations."

- Data needed: Confirm CPARS ratings

Rewritten Paragraph (Complete)

"Our team of 23 ballistic test engineers – including 8 NIJ-certified specialists averaging 14 years in body armor testing – brings direct PEO Soldier testing experience from our current contract. Over 12 years, [Company] has tested 340,000+ armor units with a 99.97% accuracy rate, following MIL-STD-662F and ATP 10-100 protocols in our ISO 17025-accredited laboratory. Our high-speed photographic capture (1M fps) and digital clay measurement systems reduce assessment time by 40%, accelerating the testing cycle without sacrificing precision. PEO Soldier has exercised every option year on our current contract, with Exceptional CPARS ratings in both of the most recent evaluation periods."

Top 3 Changes for Scoring Impact

1. Replace every superlative with a metric (biggest single improvement)
2. Name the customer in every paragraph – this is for PEO Soldier, make it read that way
3. Cite specific standards, certifications, and tools by name – evaluators in this domain know the difference between real expertise and marketing language

★ Generic proposal language isn't just weak — it's actively harmful. When an evaluator reads "industry-leading" or "best-in-class" without supporting data, they don't think "wow, impressive." They think "this team didn't bother to write a real response." Every sentence in your proposal should pass the "name and number" test: does it include a specific name (customer, standard, tool, person) or a specific number (metric, date, quantity)? If neither, rewrite it.

Want the Full Toolkit?

The full Proposal Manager's AI Toolkit covers your entire proposal lifecycle — from opportunity assessment to lessons learned.

Standard — \$39

- 31 copy-paste AI prompts (including FAR compliance checks)
- Real examples with every prompt
- Pro tips grounded in APMP and Shipley best practices
- Workflow map, prompt chains, and quick-reference cheat sheet
- Customization guide for adapting prompts to your organization

Pro — \$69

Everything in Standard, plus 30+ advanced prompts (60+ total):

- Advanced opportunity assessment: win probability, customer intelligence, incumbent analysis
- Advanced planning: writer's guides, multi-volume coordination, graphics concepts
- Advanced content: QA plans, security sections, small business participation plans
- Advanced review: Red Team score sheets, comment resolution tracking, scoring predictors
- Advanced post-submission: orals slide decks, discussion/negotiation prep
- Context-specific variations for government, commercial, and professional services

Get the toolkit at: aitoolkitshop.com/proposal-managers/

Built by AI Toolkit Shop — professional AI toolkits for specific industries. aitoolkitshop.com