

THE REACTIVE VS. PROACTIVE PITCH

Thanks for calling the Federal Contracting Center, this is _____ - are you calling in reference to an email you received about federal contracting?

Great – I'd like to start by pulling up your federal profile – may I have either your 5-digit CAGE Code or your 9-digit DUNS Number?

And may I have your first name? Thank you. Again, my name is _____.

Let me explain why we sent that email.

We've been studying the primary differences between small businesses that consistently win federal contracts vs. those that have been registered for some time and either haven't won any or haven't had sustained success in the federal market.

And what we've found is that there is one overarching theme that all the companies that are winning share, that most of the other companies do not.

*The companies winning federal contracts have a proactive strategy, while the companies that are not successful in the federal market are reactive. **Has anyone ever reviewed the specific differences in these two approaches with you?***

Well, most are reactive, because that's what you're taught when you first enter the market. Once you're registered, you're told to review the SAM.gov website and look for opportunities to be posted. When they are, you're told to react (submit a bid). That's how most companies approach federal contracting.

There's a big problem with this approach – these are the hardest contracts to win. They have the most competition, the lowest margins, require the most effort...

Meanwhile, the companies that are consistently winning are largely ignoring the SAM.gov bid market – instead, they're investing in market research to identify the agencies that are awarding contracts for exactly what they do, then zeroing in on the specific agencies that have less visibility, less competition, higher margins...they're meeting with buyers, building their brand and trust, and developing long-term relationships that result in repeat federal business.