C-8 Common Concerns for Each Methodology

It is important to understand and consider the benefits and possible down-sides of each approach in order to ensure you select the one that will help you achieve best value for the customer/program. Below are some of the common concerns.

COMPARING COMMON CONCERNS

TRADEOFF	LPTA
Will the Government Get What It Is Paying More For?	**Will the Government Get What It Needs At the Price Proposed?**
The government shall incorporate evaluated strengths as a contractually binding requirement to the greatest extent possible (particularly when offeror was selected under VATEP). Post-award management must follow through to ensure receipt of the anticipated benefits.	The government sometimes has difficulty identifying with enough clarity and specificity what its requirements are (even when we think we've done a good job). If this occurs, the contract may require modifications to ensure the government's needs are met, which may increase the price over time. Thorough, upfront analysis is essential. Careful post-award management is equally as important. Apply lessons learned to appropriately determine the source selection methodology for follow-on contracts.
Ensure the Tradeoff Decision Is Sound	**Low Acceptability Standards/Evaluation Criteria Increase Performance Risk**
Does the order of importance of factors and subfactors reflect the goals of the program, and what is most important to the customer and the end user/warfighter? Was the order of importance adequately described in the RFP? Did the evaluation follow the Source Selection Plan and RFP?	Acceptability standards that are set too low can result in low prices that are also too low, resulting in award to the wrong Offeror at increased performance risk. LPTA should not mean buying cheaper goods or services. Minimum requirements does not mean "bare bones". No additional credit for exceeding standards

Parent topic: Appendix C Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable Source Selection Process