

WWRGD Logistics Vendor Risk Scoring Matrix

WWRGD

Worldwide Real Estate & Global Delivery

LOGISTICS VENDOR RISK SCORING MATRIX

Logistics, Freight, Transportation & Warehousing Vendor Evaluation Framework

Document ID:

WWRGD-RSM-LV-001 v1.0

Effective Date:

April 2026

Scope:

Logistics, Freight, Transportation & Warehousing Vendors

Companion Document:

WWRGD_Logistics_Vendor_RFI.xlsx

Status:

Active — Approved for Use

APPLICABLE VENDOR CATEGORIES

- FTL/LTL Carriers
- Last-Mile Delivery Providers
- Freight Brokers / 3PLs
- Warehousing & Distribution
- Cold Chain / Temperature-Controlled Logistics
- Intermodal / Multimodal Providers
- Fleet Services

PURPOSE

This document provides a comprehensive, logistics-specific risk evaluation framework for qualifying and scoring Logistics, Freight, Transportation, and Warehousing vendors at WWRGD. It uses a standardized 400-point weighted scoring methodology to assess Financial Stability, Safety Performance, Quality/Performance History, Operational Capacity, Compliance Record, and Technology Capabilities — with scoring rubrics specifically calibrated for logistics industry metrics (FMCSA SMS BASICS, DOT compliance ratings, on-time delivery, freight damage/loss rates, inventory accuracy, TMS/WMS capabilities, and cold chain compliance). Use in conjunction with WWRGD_Logistics_Vendor_RFI.xlsx for complete vendor qualification.

SECTION A

Critical Risk Indicators — Automatic Disqualification

Screen ALL vendors against the following 7 Critical Risk Indicators BEFORE proceeding to weighted scoring. Any single failure requires immediate VP/Executive escalation. Vendors that fail any indicator must not proceed to Section B scoring.

#

Critical Risk Indicator

Disqualification Threshold

Result

Escalation

1

Active Litigation

Any active litigation with total exposure exceeding \$5,000,000

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

2

Regulatory Violations

FMCSA willful or repeat violations; DOT serious violations; OSHA willful or repeat citations

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

3

Financial Distress

Negative operating cash flow in 2+ of last 3 years; loan covenant violations; credit downgrade to non-investment grade

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

4

Debarment Status

Any federal, state, or local government debarment or suspension

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

5

Safety Metrics

EMR > 1.2 OR TRIR > 3.0 OR DOT Out-of-Service rate exceeding national average

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

6

Insurance / Bond Capacity

Insufficient cargo, auto liability, general liability, or warehouse legal liability coverage for engagement scope

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

7

License / Authority Status

Expired or suspended MC authority, DOT registration, state operating licenses, or FMCSA operating authority revoked

& Pass & Fail

VP/Exec

& **IMPORTANT:** Any single Fail result requires immediate VP/Executive escalation. The vendor is automatically classified as **CRITICAL RISK** and must not proceed to weighted scoring. Document the specific indicator(s) that failed and notify the vendor per the decision framework in Section F.

SECTION B

Weighted Risk Categories

The following six categories comprise the 400-point composite risk score. Weights reflect the specific risk dynamics of logistics, freight, transportation, and warehousing operations. All vendors that pass Section A CRI screening are scored across all six categories.

Risk Category

Weight

Max Score

Logistics-Specific Rationale

Financial Stability

25%

100 pts

Highest impact category; logistics vendors face fuel price volatility, fleet depreciation, tight operating margins, and significant capital requirements for equipment. Strong financial foundation is essential for operational continuity.

Safety Performance

20%

80 pts

Critical for DOT/FMCSA compliance, driver safety, warehouse operations, and cargo protection. Safety metrics directly affect insurance costs, operating authority, and WWRGD liability exposure.

Quality / Performance History

20%

80 pts

Direct indicator of on-time delivery rates, freight damage and loss rates, inventory accuracy, fulfillment performance, and claims resolution. Past performance is the strongest predictor of future reliability.

Operational Capacity

15%

60 pts

Fleet size, warehouse capacity, seasonal scalability for peak periods, driver pool depth, geographic coverage, cold chain infrastructure, and contingency carrier relationships.

Compliance Record

10%

40 pts

FMCSA/DOT/OSHA/EPA regulatory compliance, food safety certifications, customs and trade compliance, SmartWay participation, and C-TPAT certification for cross-border logistics.

Technology Capabilities

10%

40 pts

TMS, WMS, GPS real-time tracking, EDI compliance, telematics, cold chain IoT monitoring, ePOD capabilities, yard management, and Coupa integration readiness.

TOTAL

100%

400 pts

Composite score determines risk tier per Section D thresholds

SECTION C

Detailed Scoring Rubrics — Logistics-Specific (1–4 Scale)

Score each vendor on the 1–4 scale for each category. Scores must be backed by evidence from the vendor's completed Logistics Vendor RFI. All rubric criteria are calibrated to logistics, freight, transportation, and warehousing industry benchmarks.

C.1 Financial Stability — 25% Weight · 100 Points Maximum

Score

Level

Criteria — Financial Stability (25% · 100 pts)

4

Excellent

Debt-to-Equity (D/E) ratio < 0.5 for all 3 years reviewed

Strong positive operating cash flow documented for all 3 years; no covenant violations or credit downgrades

Insurance / bond capacity >150% of proposed engagement value; current certificates provided

Audited financial statements (clean opinion) provided upfront; no material audit findings

Documented fuel hedging strategy or fixed-fuel-cost contracts in place

Fleet ownership >60% (owned vs. leased); no excessive fleet financing debt

Revenue diversification across multiple clients (no single client >30% of revenue)

Positive net income for all 3 review years; profitability trend is stable or improving

3

Good

D/E ratio 0.5–1.0; positive cash flow with minor fluctuations; no covenant violations

Insurance / bond capacity adequate for engagement scope; certificates current

Audited financials with minor findings; clean or qualified opinion with immaterial items

Some fuel cost management strategy in place (e.g., fuel surcharge programs)

Fleet ownership 40–60%; manageable lease obligations

Moderate revenue diversification; some client concentration but not excessive

Positive net income for at least 2 of 3 review years

2

Fair

D/E ratio 1.0–2.0; inconsistent or borderline cash flow; no current covenant violations but limited headroom

Insurance / bond capacity adequate but limited margin above minimum requirements

Some audit findings requiring management attention; qualified opinion on financials

No fuel hedging; significant exposure to spot fuel price volatility

Fleet ownership <40%; heavily leased, creating ongoing fixed cost exposure

Significant revenue concentration (one or two clients represent majority of revenue)

Mixed profitability: net loss in 1 of 3 years reviewed

1

Poor

D/E ratio > 2.0; negative or severely insufficient operating cash flow

Insurance / bond capacity gaps or deficiencies for engagement scope
Significant audit findings, adverse opinion, or auditor doubt about going concern
No fuel cost management strategy; fully exposed to market fuel price volatility
Excessive debt from fleet financing; fleet almost entirely leased with heavy obligations
High revenue concentration risk; company viability dependent on one or two clients
Negative net income in 2 or more of 3 years reviewed; deteriorating trend

C.2 Safety Performance — 20% Weight · 80 Points Maximum

Score

Level

Criteria — Safety Performance (20% · 80 pts)

4

Excellent

TRIR < 1.0; EMR < 0.85; zero DOT-reportable accidents in past 3 years
FMCSA SMS scores: ALL 7 BASICs (Unsafe Driving, HOS Compliance, Driver Fitness, Controlled Substances/
Alcohol, Vehicle Maintenance, Hazmat Compliance, Crash Indicator) below alert thresholds
Satisfactory DOT safety rating (most recent compliance review)
Comprehensive written safety program covering vehicle operations, driver safety, and warehouse operations
Proactive safety culture with documented near-miss reporting program; zero fatalities in past 3 years
Driver qualification file compliance >98%; pre-employment, random, and post-accident drug/alcohol testing
exceeds FMCSA minimums
Regular (at minimum quarterly) safety training; OSHA 10/30 certifications for relevant roles
Documented safety improvement trend over 3-year review period

3

Good

TRIR 1.0–2.0; EMR 0.85–1.0; minor DOT-reportable incidents only in past 3 years
Most FMCSA BASICs below alert thresholds; 1–2 BASICs at or approaching (but not exceeding) alert levels
Satisfactory DOT safety rating
Documented safety program covering core requirements; regular safety training conducted
Driver qualification file compliance >95%; standard FMCSA-compliant drug/alcohol testing program
No fatalities in review period; corrective actions documented for any incidents

2

Fair

TRIR 2.0–3.0; EMR 1.0–1.2; some DOT-reportable accidents in review period
1–2 FMCSA BASICs at or above alert thresholds with remediation in progress
Conditional DOT safety rating; corrective action plan submitted
Basic safety compliance; limited program documentation; training gaps identified
Driver qualification file compliance 90–95%; minor testing program deficiencies
No fatalities; corrective actions taken but not fully closed

1

Poor

TRIR > 3.0; EMR > 1.2; multiple DOT-reportable accidents in review period (NOTE: triggers CRI failure if at threshold)

Multiple FMCSA BASICs above alert thresholds; intervention notices or warning letters received

Unsatisfactory or Conditional DOT rating with unresolved findings

Inadequate or non-existent formal safety program

Fatalities in past 3 years; inadequate root cause analysis or corrective actions

Driver qualification file compliance <90%; drug/alcohol testing program deficiencies

C.3 Quality / Performance History — 20% Weight · 80 Points Maximum

Score

Level

Criteria — Quality / Performance History (20% · 80 pts)

4

Excellent

On-time delivery rate >98% (FTL/LTL); >97% (last-mile) — verified by 3 years of data

Freight damage rate <0.1% of shipments; freight loss rate <0.05% of shipments

Inventory accuracy >99.5% (warehousing); pick accuracy >99.8%

Order fulfillment cycle time <4 hours from order receipt to shipment release

Claims resolution average <5 business days; claims ratio <0.5% of shipment value

Client retention rate >90% over past 3 years; verified references from comparable-scale clients

CPI >0.95 and SPI >0.95 on all major contract engagements reviewed

Tender acceptance rate >95%; demonstrated capacity reliability during peak periods

3

Good

On-time delivery rate 95–98% (FTL/LTL); 93–97% (last-mile)

Freight damage rate 0.1–0.5%; freight loss rate 0.05–0.1%

Inventory accuracy 98–99.5%; pick accuracy 99–99.8%

Order fulfillment cycle time 4–8 hours; claims resolution 5–10 business days

Client retention rate 75–90%; strong reference base with documented performance data

CPI 0.90–0.95 and SPI 0.90–0.95; tender acceptance rate 90–95%

2

Fair

On-time delivery rate 90–95%; freight damage rate 0.5–1.0%; freight loss rate 0.1–0.5%

Inventory accuracy 95–98%; pick accuracy 97–99%; fulfillment cycle time 8–24 hours

Claims resolution 10–20 business days; elevated claims ratio

Client retention rate 60–75%; mixed reference feedback

CPI 0.85–0.90 and SPI 0.85–0.90; tender acceptance rate 85–90%

Performance improvement trends visible but not yet at benchmark levels

1

Poor

On-time delivery rate <90%; freight damage rate >1.0%; freight loss rate >0.5%

Inventory accuracy <95%; pick accuracy <97%; fulfillment cycle time >24 hours
Claims resolution >20 business days; unresolved disputes with prior clients
Client retention rate <60%; negative reference feedback or inability to provide references
CPI <0.85 or SPI <0.85; tender acceptance rate <85%
No documented performance improvement plan; declining performance trend

C.4 Operational Capacity — 15% Weight · 60 Points Maximum

Score

Level

Criteria — Operational Capacity (15% · 60 pts)

4

Excellent

Fleet utilization <75%; warehouse utilization <80% — substantial reserve capacity available
Deep and qualified driver pool; driver turnover rate <50%; documented driver retention programs
Proven seasonal scalability with documented peak-period handling (e.g., Q4, holiday surge)
Established contingency carrier network with signed agreements; no single-point-of-failure risk
Multiple warehouse locations with strategic geographic coverage aligned with WWRGD distribution needs
Cold chain capabilities with redundant refrigeration systems and backup power for temperature-controlled operations
Cross-docking, intermodal, and transloading capabilities; multimodal service offerings
Fleet age average <5 years; documented preventive maintenance program

3

Good

Fleet utilization 75–85%; warehouse utilization 80–90% — moderate reserve capacity
Adequate driver pool; driver turnover 50–75%; some driver retention initiatives in place
Documented seasonal flex capacity; history of managing moderate volume surges
Basic contingency carrier plan; some established backup carrier relationships
Adequate geographic coverage for proposed engagement scope; cold chain capabilities available
Fleet age average 5–8 years; standard maintenance program

2

Fair

Fleet utilization 85–95%; warehouse utilization 90–95% — limited reserve capacity
Limited driver pool; driver turnover 75–100%; retention challenges documented
Minimal seasonal flex capacity; potential for service failures during peak periods
Limited contingency options; informal backup carrier arrangements only
Narrow geographic coverage; limited cold chain infrastructure
Fleet age average 8–12 years; maintenance program gaps identified

1

Poor

Fleet utilization >95%; warehouse utilization >95% — at or over capacity
Critical driver shortage; driver turnover >100%; active recruitment crisis

No seasonal scalability; documented service failures during prior peak periods

No contingency carrier relationships; single location, no backup options

No cold chain capability where required for engagement scope

Fleet age average >12 years; deferred maintenance; high breakdown risk

C.5 Compliance Record — 10% Weight · 40 Points Maximum

Score

Level

Criteria — Compliance Record (10% · 40 pts)

4

Excellent

Zero FMCSA, DOT, or OSHA violations in past 5 years (or only administrative/minor findings with immediate correction)

Proactive compliance program with designated Compliance Officer; documented policies and procedures

Third-party audit certifications: C-TPAT certified (customs/trade), SmartWay Transport Partner

Food safety certifications for warehousing: SQF, BRC/BRCGS, FSSC 22000, and/or HACCP — critical for WWRGD Whole Foods and Amazon Fresh operations

FSMA-compliant Sanitary Transportation of Human and Animal Food practices documented

Comprehensive driver qualification file program with regular MVR reviews and ELD compliance

Environmental compliance: spill prevention plans, emissions programs, refrigerant management

3

Good

Minor violations only in past 5 years with documented remediation and closure

Compliance program in place with clear ownership; regular internal reviews conducted

SmartWay Shipper Partner or Transport Partner status; some third-party certifications

Basic food safety compliance for warehousing; SQF or HACCP certification in progress or achieved

ELD mandate compliance; standard driver qualification file program

Adequate environmental compliance; no penalties or enforcement actions

2

Fair

Some FMCSA, DOT, or OSHA violations in review period; remediation in progress but not fully closed

Basic compliance awareness; limited formal program; gaps in policy documentation

No SmartWay participation; no third-party certifications currently held

Food safety compliance gaps; no formal certifications; basic GMP adherence only

ELD compliant but manual workarounds noted; driver qualification file gaps

Minor environmental compliance concerns identified

1

Poor

Significant FMCSA, DOT, or OSHA violations with unresolved findings or pending enforcement actions

Inadequate or non-existent compliance program; no designated compliance ownership

No third-party certifications; no SmartWay participation; no audit history

Food safety non-compliance for warehousing operations; no certifications; FSMA violations

Environmental violations or enforcement actions; no spill prevention program

Driver qualification file deficiencies; ELD non-compliance issues identified

C.6 Technology Capabilities — 10% Weight · 40 Points Maximum

Score

Level

Criteria — Technology Capabilities (10% · 40 pts)

4

Excellent

Enterprise-grade TMS with multi-mode optimization, rate management, and carrier scorecarding

Advanced WMS with automation integration (pick-to-light, RFID, conveyor systems); real-time inventory visibility

Real-time GPS tracking with proactive exception alerts and customer-facing visibility portal

Full EDI capability: 204 (Load Tender), 210 (Freight Invoice), 214 (Status Update), 856 (Advance Ship Notice), 940/943/944/945 (Warehouse); API integration available

SOC 2 Type II or ISO 27001 certified; documented cybersecurity program and incident response plan

Advanced telematics with driver behavior monitoring (hard braking, speeding, idle time, fatigue alerts)

Cold chain IoT temperature monitoring with real-time alerts, automated logging, and customer dashboard

Electronic Proof of Delivery (ePOD) with photo capture; Yard Management System (YMS)

Route optimization technology; fuel efficiency analytics; Coupa integration confirmed

3

Good

Standard TMS with rate management and basic optimization; functional WMS with real-time inventory

GPS tracking with customer portal (may not have proactive exception alerts)

Core EDI capabilities (210 and 214 minimum); standard API or EDI integration

Basic cybersecurity measures; annual security reviews conducted

Telematics for basic fleet tracking and hours of service monitoring

Temperature logging for cold chain (may be manual or periodic rather than continuous real-time)

Standard reporting and KPI dashboards available

2

Fair

Limited TMS or WMS capabilities; significant manual workarounds in place

Basic tracking (not real-time; batch updates or milestone-based only)

Minimal EDI (invoice only or no EDI); limited integration capabilities

Limited cybersecurity program; no formal certifications

Basic fleet tracking only; no driver behavior monitoring

Manual temperature logging for cold chain; no automated alerts

Limited reporting; data provided on request rather than through live dashboards

1

Poor

No TMS or paper-based transportation management; no WMS or spreadsheet-based warehouse management

No real-time tracking; manual check-in/check-out status updates only
No EDI capability; manual invoicing and document exchange processes
No cybersecurity program; no data protection controls identified
No telematics; no driver behavior monitoring capabilities
No cold chain monitoring technology; manual logs with significant gaps
No standardized reporting; ad hoc data provision only

SECTION D

Risk Level Definitions

Map the vendor's composite score (sum of all weighted category scores) to the appropriate risk tier. Color-coded risk levels drive approval authority and required actions per Section F.

Score Range

% of Max

Risk Level

Recommended Decision

Key Implications for Logistics Vendors

320 – 400 pts

80 – 100%

☐ LOW RISK

Approve

Standard MSA / transportation agreement terms; routine performance monitoring; annual re-evaluation

240 – 319 pts

60 – 79%

☐ MEDIUM RISK

Conditional Approval

Enhanced monitoring; quarterly performance reviews; cargo insurance verification quarterly; dedicated account manager required; SLA penalties with financial teeth

160 – 239 pts

40 – 59%

☐ HIGH RISK

Executive Review Required

Weekly reporting; dedicated WWRGD oversight; reduced lane/scope assignment; mandatory safety improvement plan; monthly FMCSA/DOT compliance verification

< 160 pts

< 40%

☐ CRITICAL RISK

Not Recommended

Disqualify; issue rejection letter; 12-month waiting period before re-application; document reason for procurement records

SECTION E

Calculation Methodology

E.1 Five-Step Scoring Process

Step

Action

Description

Step 1

Screen for Critical Risk Indicators

Review vendor RFI responses and supporting documentation against all 7 CRIs in Section A. Mark each as Pass or Fail. Any single Fail = CRITICAL RISK — stop, escalate to VP/Executive, and do not proceed to weighted scoring.

Step 2

Score each category (1–4 scale)

Using the logistics-specific rubrics in Section C, assign a raw score of 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), or 4 (Excellent) for each of the 6 weighted categories. Each score must be supported by specific evidence from the vendor's RFI response.

Step 3

Apply category weights

For each category: $\text{Weighted Score} = \text{Raw Score} \times \text{Category Weight} \times 100$. Example: Score of 3 for Financial Stability = $3 \times 0.25 \times 100 = 75$ points.

Step 4

Sum weighted scores

Add all 6 weighted scores to produce the Composite Score (maximum 400 points).

Step 5

Map to risk tier

Using Section D thresholds, determine the risk level (Low / Medium / High / Critical) and follow the decision framework in Section F for approval authority and required contract enhancements.

E.2 Worked Example — FastFreight Logistics LLC

The following example demonstrates the scoring methodology applied to a hypothetical vendor. FastFreight Logistics LLC is a mid-size FTL/LTL carrier with warehousing capabilities operating across the Western United States.

Risk Category

Raw Score

Weight

Max Pts

Weighted Score

Evidence Summary

Financial Stability

3

25%

100

75

D/E ratio 0.7; positive cash flow all 3 years; adequate insurance; some fuel hedging via surcharge programs; fleet

48% owned

Safety Performance

4

20%

100

80

TRIR 0.8; EMR 0.82; zero DOT-reportable accidents in 3 years; all 7 FMCSA BASICs below alert thresholds; Satisfactory DOT rating

Quality / Performance

3

20%

100

60

On-time delivery 96.2%; damage rate 0.3%; inventory accuracy 99.1%; claims resolution avg 7 days; client retention 82%

Operational Capacity

3

15%

100

45

Fleet utilization 78%; warehouse utilization 83%; driver turnover 62%; documented seasonal flex plan; 3 warehouse locations

Compliance Record

3

10%

100

30

Minor violations in 2022 (remediated); SmartWay Partner; basic food safety compliance; no debarment; ELD compliant

Technology

3

10%

100

30

Standard TMS and WMS; GPS tracking with customer portal; EDI 210/214; telematics for fleet; temperature logging for cold chain

COMPOSITE TOTAL

400

320

80% LOW RISK (320/400 = 80%) — Approve; standard MSA terms

SECTION F

Decision-Making Framework

The following table defines the required approval authority, monitoring obligations, and contract enhancements for each risk tier. All actions are mandatory, not advisory.

Risk Level

Approval Authority

Required Actions

Contract Enhancements

¶ LOW RISK

Category Manager

Standard due diligence and reference verification

Annual re-evaluation or upon material business changes

Routine KPI monitoring against contracted SLAs

Standard MSA or Transportation Service Agreement terms

Standard cargo and auto liability insurance requirements

Standard claims resolution terms (30-day resolution target)

¶ MEDIUM RISK

Director Level

Enhanced due diligence; additional reference checks

Quarterly performance reviews with documented outcomes

Cargo insurance certificate verification quarterly

Dedicated WWRGD account manager required

Performance bonds or parent company guarantee

SLA penalties with meaningful financial consequences (2-5% invoice deductions)

Increased cargo/liability insurance requirements above standard

Right to audit clause with 30-day notice

Improvement plan requirement if KPIs fall below thresholds

¶ HIGH RISK

VP / Executive

Weekly performance reporting to WWRGD oversight team

Dedicated WWRGD logistics oversight resource assigned

Monthly FMCSA/DOT compliance score verification

Mandatory Safety Improvement Plan with 90-day milestones

Reduced lane or scope assignment until improvement demonstrated

Milestone-based payment structures tied to performance targets

Increased retainage (5–10%) released upon sustained performance

Reduced contract term (6–12 months) with renewal tied to improvement

Termination for Convenience clause with reduced notice period (30 days)

Mandatory cargo insurance coverage enhancement

¶ CRITICAL RISK

Disqualify

Issue formal rejection notification letter to vendor

Document specific disqualification reasons in procurement records

Enforce 12-month waiting period before re-application is accepted

Escalate to VP/Executive for awareness and sign-off on rejection

N/A — No contract engagement permitted

SECTION G

Logistics-Specific Evaluation Guidance

This section provides category-specific guidance for evaluators assessing different types of logistics and supply chain vendors. Apply the relevant subsection(s) based on the vendor's primary service category. Multiple subsections may apply to vendors offering integrated services.

G.1 FTL / LTL Carriers

Prioritize FMCSA SMS BASICs scores and DOT safety compliance rating — these are the primary federal safety indicators for carriers and should anchor Safety Performance scoring.

Evaluate lane-specific on-time delivery performance, not just aggregate network averages. Request performance data for lanes comparable to WWRGD's requirements.

Assess driver turnover rate as a key operational risk indicator. Turnover >100% signals chronic capacity instability and driver shortage risk.

Verify cargo insurance coverage specifically covers the commodity types and shipment values in scope for WWRGD engagements. Minimum recommended: \$250,000 per occurrence.

Review fuel surcharge methodology for cost predictability. Understand how fuel surcharges are calculated and whether cap/floor provisions are available.

Confirm Electronic Logging Device (ELD) compliance and Hours of Service (HOS) program. Manual log books are non-compliant and a red flag.

For temperature-sensitive commodities, verify reefer unit age, temperature pre-cool protocols, and continuous temperature monitoring capabilities.

G.2 Last-Mile Delivery Providers

Focus on delivery success rate (first-attempt delivery) and customer satisfaction (CSAT/NPS) scores — these are the primary quality indicators for last-mile operations.

Evaluate Proof of Delivery technology: ePOD with photo capture, electronic signature, barcode scan, and GPS geo-stamp at delivery are essential for WWRGD parcel and retail delivery use cases.

Assess seasonal scalability for peak periods (Q4, Prime Day, holiday surge). Request documentation of how volume surges were managed and what capacity was deployed.

Review driver background check and qualification programs. For DSPs (Delivery Service Providers), confirm their driver hiring and onboarding standards meet or exceed WWRGD requirements.

Verify residential and commercial delivery capabilities, including apartment/multi-tenant access, signature required handling, and age-verification capabilities for regulated products.

Evaluate route density and coverage maps against WWRGD last-mile delivery requirements by geography.

For grocery/fresh delivery: confirm cold bag equipment availability, delivery time window adherence, and perishable handling procedures.

G.3 Warehousing & Distribution Providers

Prioritize inventory accuracy rate and pick/pack accuracy rates above all other quality metrics — inventory errors directly affect WWRGD customer fulfillment and financial reconciliation.

Evaluate WMS capabilities and integration methods. Request WMS system name, version, and API/EDI integration documentation. Assess whether data can be exchanged seamlessly with WWRGD systems.

For food and grocery warehousing (Whole Foods Market, Amazon Fresh): assess cold chain compliance, temperature zone management (ambient, refrigerated, frozen), and temperature monitoring systems.

CRITICAL: Review food safety certifications — SQF Level 2 or 3, BRC/BRCGS, FSSC 22000, and/or HACCP HARPC plan. These are required for any warehouse handling Whole Foods or Amazon Fresh inventory.

Verify throughput capacity (units and pallets per day) against WWRGD projected volume requirements. Include peak-period throughput capability.

Assess pest control program (licensed PCO, frequency, documentation), sanitation programs (daily and deep clean schedules), and facility maintenance standards.

Review warehouse legal liability insurance and cargo/goods-in-storage insurance coverage. Verify coverage aligns with the value of WWRGD inventory to be stored.

Evaluate value-added services: labeling, kitting, light assembly, returns processing, cross-docking, and lot/serial number tracking capabilities.

G.4 Freight Brokers / Third-Party Logistics (3PL) Providers

Evaluate carrier vetting and qualification processes rigorously — the 3PL's carrier network quality directly determines performance outcomes and WWRGD risk exposure. Request carrier qualification criteria documentation.

Assess technology platform capabilities: TMS with network-wide visibility, load tracking, reporting, and analytics. A 3PL without strong technology infrastructure creates blind spots in the supply chain.

Review carrier network depth and geographic coverage. Assess the ratio of asset-based carriers vs. broker-sourced spot market capacity. Heavy reliance on spot market creates volatility risk.

Verify insurance coverage: contingent cargo insurance minimum \$500,000 per occurrence, auto liability, general liability, and errors & omissions coverage for brokerage activities.

Assess financial stability with heightened scrutiny — brokers face unique cash flow risks from the timing gap between paying carriers (often net 30) and collecting from shippers (often net 45–60). Confirm no cash flow strain.

Verify FMCSA Freight Broker Authority (BMC-84 or BMC-85 surety bond or trust fund) is current. Lapsed broker authority is an immediate disqualifier.

Evaluate dispute resolution and claims management processes — brokers add a layer between shipper and carrier that can complicate claims resolution.

G.5 Cold Chain / Temperature-Controlled Logistics — CRITICAL for Whole Foods & Amazon Fresh

CRITICAL: Cold chain vendors serving Whole Foods Market and Amazon Fresh operations must meet the highest evaluation standards — temperature excursions create food safety, brand, and regulatory risk.

Require real-time IoT temperature monitoring with automated customer-facing alerts for any excursion exceeding product-specific temperature parameters. Manual logging is not acceptable for these programs.

Verify backup refrigeration systems and emergency protocols: What happens when primary refrigeration fails? How quickly can backup be deployed? What is the escalation process?

Assess FSMA Sanitary Transportation of Human and Animal Food Rule (21 CFR Part 1.900–1.934) compliance documentation, including written procedures for temperature control, equipment cleaning, and training.

Review temperature excursion history (3 years): frequency, duration, root causes, and corrective actions taken. Zero tolerance for recurring excursions of the same root cause.

Evaluate cold chain certifications: ISTA 7D or equivalent cold chain packaging testing, third-party cold chain audit results (e.g., Sensitech, Reefer Standards), and GDP (Good Distribution Practice) compliance.

Confirm multi-zone temperature capability: frozen (-18°C or colder), refrigerated (0–4°C), controlled ambient (15–25°C), and produce zones (specific to commodity requirements).

Verify pre-cooling protocols for vehicles and warehouse loading docks: documented pre-cool times, setpoint verification before loading, and continuous monitoring from loading through delivery.

G.6 Intermodal / Multimodal Providers

Evaluate drayage capabilities and relationships with port terminals and inland rail ramps. Strong drayage partnerships reduce port congestion exposure and detention charges.

Assess container tracking and visibility across all modes (ocean, rail, and drayage). End-to-end visibility from origin port through final-mile delivery is the benchmark.

Review transit time reliability for intermodal vs. over-the-road (OTR) alternatives. Understand the trade-offs for each lane and ensure the vendor provides data-driven mode selection recommendations.

Verify equipment availability and chassis management: owned chassis pool, IEP (Intermodal Equipment Provider) relationships, and procedures for chassis shortages at high-demand terminals.

Assess customs/trade compliance expertise and CBP/ACE filing capabilities for international intermodal moves. C-TPAT membership is strongly preferred.

Review port congestion mitigation strategies: inland container depots (ICDs), early return programs, and flexible delivery scheduling to minimize dwell and detention fees.

Evaluate claims handling for intermodal — liability is split across carriers at mode junctions, requiring the provider to have clear claims management processes and adequate contingent cargo coverage.

Document Control & Companion Documents

Document ID: WWRGD-RSM-LV-001 v1.0 | Effective Date: April 2026 | Owner: WWRGD Procurement & Vendor Risk Management

Companion RFI: WWRGD_Logistics_Vendor_RFI.xlsx | See Also: WWRGD-RSM-GV-001 (General Vendor Matrix), WWRGD-RSM-GC-001 (GC Matrix), WWRGD-WF-VRA-001 (Workflow SOP)