The Capital Gap in Federal Contracting

Why Existing Financial Products Fail This Market

Published by Parabilis | 2026
parabilis.com

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

Federal contractors operate in a market with strong demand but face a persistent capital gap driven by a mismatch between when work must be funded and when payment is received. Contractors are required to cover upfront costs, such as payroll, materials, and compliance, while navigating delayed and often unpredictable payment cycles, leaving many constrained not by lack of opportunity but by lack of capital. Existing financial products are structurally incompatible with this environment: traditional bank financing is often inaccessible and slow, invoice factoring is reactive and reduces profitability, merchant cash advances impose high costs and strict repayment schedules, and general private credit does not align with contract timing and risk. As a result, contractors experience operational strain, limited growth, and margin erosion, with small and mid-sized contractors disproportionately affected. Addressing this challenge requires a new approach to capital, one designed specifically for the structure of federal contracting. This paper introduces Federal Market Credit (FMC) as an emerging model built to close the capital gap by aligning financing with the timing, scale, and realities of government contracts.

II. Reality of Operating in the Federal Marketplace

A. Opportunity Within the Federal Marketplace

Federal contracting is often viewed as a space defined by stability and scale, driven by consistent government spending across defense, infrastructure, and emerging technologies. Demand for smaller or more agile firms has increased as agencies seek innovation and efficiency beyond traditional large-scale contractors. Yet a contradiction persists. While many contractors are successfully winning government contracts, they often lack the financial capacity to execute them effectively. Cash flow gaps, delayed payments, and limited access to flexible capital create barriers that constrain performance and growth. In this sense, federal contracting is not capital-poor; it is structurally poorly capitalized.

B. Delayed Payments and Operational Pressure

At its core, the capital gap in federal contracting is a timing mismatch, one that is both predictable and persistent. Government contractors are required to fund the execution of their work before receiving payment. This creates a structural disconnect between when capital is needed and when revenue is realized.

Government payment systems require contractors to complete work, submit invoices, and wait for approval before receiving funds. Under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), federal payment rules provide timelines that may extend to 30 days after receipt of a proper invoice or government acceptance, whichever is later (FAR, Subpart 32.9). In other words, even the baseline framework assumes a lag between performance and payment. However, this timeline depends on multiple administrative steps, including invoice validation, contract compliance checks, and formal acceptance by the agency. If there are errors in documentation or delays in approval, payment timelines can extend beyond the standard window.

C. Upfront Investment and Contract Execution

At the same time, contractors face immediate and ongoing financial obligations. Payroll must be met on fixed schedules, and materials and equipment must often be purchased up front. Operational infrastructure must be maintained throughout the contract period. In addition, contractors must comply with regulatory requirements, which can include reporting standards, cybersecurity measures, and audit readiness. These introduce additional costs that must be covered before revenue is received.

D. Capital Constraints on Growth

For many contractors, especially small and mid-sized firms, this gap creates a significant barrier to execution and growth. Winning a contract does not guarantee the ability to perform it effectively if the necessary capital is not available at the right time. In this sense, the capital gap represents the space between opportunity and execution. As a result, capable businesses are constrained not by demand but by access to capital.

III. Structural Drivers of the Capital Gap

The capital gap in federal contracting is not caused by a single issue, but by a combination of structural factors that consistently create pressure on cash flow. These factors are embedded in how federal contracts are awarded, executed, and paid, making the gap a recurring challenge rather than a temporary one.

A. Delayed and Unpredictable Government Payments

One of the most significant drivers of the capital gap is the delay between contract performance and payment. While the FAR outlines a general expectation of payment within 30 days of invoice submission or acceptance, the actual timing may vary due to administrative processes. Invoices must go through multiple steps, including validation, review, and approval by the contracting agency. If there are discrepancies, such as billing errors, incomplete documentation, or disputes over deliverables, payments can be delayed beyond the standard timeframe. In practice, contractors often experience variability in when payments are received, even when work is completed on time. This unpredictability makes it difficult for contractors to plan cash flow with confidence. Even short delays can create strain when businesses are operating on tight margins or managing multiple contracts simultaneously.

B. Upfront Cost Burden

At the same time, contractors are required to take on significant upfront costs. These costs are unavoidable and often substantial. Notably, payroll is often the largest expense for businesses, with labor costs representing up to 70 percent of total operating costs (Paycor). In today's competitive labor market, attracting and retaining top talent has further increased these expenses. Labor expenses alone require consistent cash outflows, as employees must be paid regardless of whether the contractor has been reimbursed. Additionally, contractors may need to invest in equipment, technology, or specialized systems to meet contractual obligations. Beyond operational costs, compliance requirements add another layer of financial burden. Federal contractors must adhere to regulatory standards, maintain documentation, and ensure audit readiness, all of which require time, resources, and capital. These expenses occur early and continuously, further widening the gap between spending and revenue.

C. Contract-Based Revenue Volatility

Federal contracting also introduces variability in how and when revenue is received. Unlike businesses with steady, recurring income, contractors often rely on contract awards and milestone-based payments. Revenue is tied to specific deliverables, approvals, or funding cycles, which means cash inflows may not occur evenly over time. There may be periods where multiple payments are received at once, followed by gaps where little to no revenue is coming in. This uneven cash flow makes it difficult to forecast financial needs and manage liquidity effectively. Additionally, external factors such as federal government shutdowns and reliance on continuing resolutions can further delay contract awards and payments, creating additional uncertainty for contractors. During these periods, funding disruptions can pause new obligations and slow reimbursement cycles. This can exacerbate existing cash flow gaps and create a domino effect across operations. Traditional financial planning tools are often designed for businesses with stable revenue streams, making them less effective in a contract-driven environment.

D. Growth Amplifies the Gap

While growth is typically viewed as a productive outcome, in federal contracting it can intensify the capital gap. As contractors win additional contracts, their upfront financial commitments increase. Each new contract requires additional hiring, expanded operations, and higher working capital to support execution. However, payment timelines do not accelerate with growth. Instead, the delay between performance and payment persists, meaning contractors must finance a larger volume of work before receiving payment. This creates a paradox: the more successful a contractor becomes in securing work, the greater the financial strain they may experience. Without access to sufficient capital, firms may be forced to limit growth or decline new opportunities altogether.

E. Who Is Most Affected

The capital gap in federal contracting disproportionately impacts small and mid-sized contractors, as these firms typically operate with limited cash reserves and less access to institutional sources of capital. Unlike larger contractors that can rely on retained earnings, diversified revenue streams, or established credit facilities, smaller firms are more dependent on consistent cash flow to sustain operations. This makes them especially vulnerable to delays in government payments and the upfront cost burden of executing contracts. Access to traditional financing is also more constrained, as lenders often require predictable revenue, strong balance sheets, or collateral, conditions that many smaller contractors do not meet due to the irregular and contract-based nature of their income (U.S. Small Business Administration). As a result, these firms may struggle to finance ongoing work, limiting their ability to scale or take on additional contracts. This dynamic has broader implications, as federal data show that small businesses play a critical role in government contracting yet face persistent barriers to growth and participation, including financial constraints tied to cash-flow timing and access to capital (U.S. Department of Defense, 2023). Ultimately, the capital gap restricts not just individual firms, but the overall competitiveness and diversity of the federal contractor base.

IV. Why Existing Financial Products Fail This Market

Existing financing solutions were not designed for the structural realities of federal contracting. While options such as traditional bank financing, invoice factoring, and merchant cash advances each provide access to capital, they differ significantly in how they function, and more importantly, in how well they align with the timing, risk, and cash flow dynamics of government contracts. When evaluated in this context, each of these solutions reveals clear limitations.

A. Traditional Bank Lending: Misaligned Risk Models

Traditional bank financing, such as loans and lines of credit, is typically the most affordable form of capital, offering relatively low interest rates and flexible use of funds. These products are designed for businesses with stable revenue and strong credit profiles. However, federal contractors often do not meet these criteria. Their revenue is contract-based and irregular, and their cash flow depends on delayed government payments rather than consistent incoming sales. As a result, banks apply strict underwriting standards that require collateral, financial history, and demonstrated stability. This makes approval difficult, particularly for small and mid-sized contractors. In fact, approval rates for small business loans and lines of credit have declined in recent years, reflecting tighter lender conditions (Federal Reserve, 2023). Even when approved, bank financing is often too slow to meet the needs of contractors who must act quickly to fund payroll, materials, and execution. The result is a mismatch: bank financing is cost-effective, but often inaccessible or ultimately unsuitable for the federal contracting environment.

B. Factoring: Liquidity at the Expense of Profitability

Invoice factoring provides fast access to capital by allowing businesses to sell their unpaid invoices to a third party at a discount. Typically, a contractor receives 80 to 90 percent of the invoice value upfront, with the remainder paid after the customer settles the invoice, minus fees (U.S. Chamber of Commerce). This structure makes factoring attractive for addressing delayed payments, as it accelerates access to funds tied to completed work. However, it does not address the most critical phase of the capital gap: the need for capital before and during contract execution. Because factoring depends on issued invoices, it is inherently reactive rather than proactive. In addition, factoring introduces a significant cost burden. Fees and discount rates reduce the total value of each invoice, directly impacting profitability. Over time, reliance on factoring can erode margins and limit a contractor's ability to reinvest in growth. Research on small business financing notes that factoring, while useful for liquidity, can become expensive when used as a long-term financing strategy (U.S. Chamber of Commerce). Factoring can also reduce financial control. Because funding is tied to specific invoices, contractors may face constraints in how and when they access capital. This can create dependency, where businesses must continuously factor receivables to maintain liquidity, reinforcing the very cash flow instability they are trying to manage.

C. Merchant Cash Advances (MCAs): Speed Without Sustainability

Merchant cash advances (MCAs) provide rapid access to capital by offering a lump sum in exchange for a portion of future revenues. Unlike traditional loans, MCAs are repaid through daily or weekly deductions from a business's incoming cash flow, often at fixed percentages until the agreed amount is repaid (Federal Trade Commission, 2020). However, this accessibility comes at a high cost. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has identified merchant cash advances and similar online lending products as high-cost financing options that can include complex pricing structures, a lack of transparency, and repayment terms that are difficult for small businesses to manage. In many cases, the true cost of capital is not clearly expressed as a traditional interest rate, making it harder for borrowers to fully understand the agreement's financial impact.

D. General Private Credit: Not Built for Government Contractors

Beyond traditional bank lending and alternative financing products like factoring and merchant cash advances, many contractors turn to general private credit as a potential source of capital. Private credit, typically provided by non-bank lenders such as private equity firms, direct lenders, or specialty finance companies, has grown significantly in recent years as an alternative to traditional banking. These lenders often offer more flexible structures and faster access to capital, making them an appealing option for contractors who do not qualify for conventional loans. However, despite this flexibility, private credit is not designed specifically for the federal contracting environment. Most private credit models are built around businesses with predictable revenue and consistent cash flow. Federal contractors, by contrast, operate with contract-based revenue and delayed, irregular payments, which creates a mismatch between how financing is structured and how cash is received. As a result, private credit is often structured with repayment expectations that assume steady inflows, which create pressure during periods when government payments are delayed. While these lenders may better accommodate risk than traditional banks, they often lack a deep understanding of federal contracting dynamics, leading to financing that does not fully align with contract timing. Private credit also tends to carry higher costs than traditional bank financing, reflecting the increased risk lenders assume. As noted by the International Monetary Fund, private credit markets typically offer higher yields and operate with less standardization than traditional lending, which can translate into more expensive capital for borrowers (International Monetary Fund, 2024).

E. Private Equity: Misaligned Incentives and Limited Accessibility

Private equity represents another potential source of capital, but it is largely inaccessible and often misaligned with the needs of federal contractors. Unlike debt-based financing, private equity requires firms to give up ownership in exchange for funding, resulting in equity dilution and reduced control over business decisions. In addition, private equity investors typically target companies with scalable, predictable revenue and clear exit opportunities, such as acquisitions and public offerings. Private capital markets, including private equity, are characterized by higher return expectations and are generally directed toward firms with strong growth potential and stable cash flow profiles. The process of raising private equity is also time-intensive, involving extensive due diligence and negotiations, which limits private equity's usefulness in addressing immediate liquidity needs. As a result, while private equity may support long-term growth in select cases, it does not effectively solve the core challenge of timing mismatches between upfront expenses and delayed government payments.

V. Real-World Impact of the Capital Gap

A. Operational Strain

The capital gap creates immediate operational challenges for federal contractors, particularly when it comes to maintaining day-to-day business functions. As discussed across multiple Spilling the Tea on GovCon podcast episodes, contractors must fund payroll, subcontractors, and materials while waiting extended periods for government reimbursement. This creates a constant balancing act where firms must manage obligations with limited liquidity. Even short delays in payment can disrupt operations, forcing contractors to prioritize expenses, delay internal investments, or rely on short-term financing simply to keep projects moving forward. In practice, this turns contract execution into not just an operational challenge, but a financial one too.

B. Growth Limitation

The capital gap also directly limits a contractor's ability to grow. Podcast discussions frequently highlight that winning additional contracts does not always translate into expansion, as firms must have sufficient capital to support increased workload. Without access to flexible financing, contractors may be forced to turn down new opportunities or avoid bidding on larger contracts altogether. This creates a paradox where businesses with strong performance and demand are unable to scale, not due to a lack of capability, but due to insufficient capital to fund execution. Over time, these financial barriers limit overall market participation and the ability of smaller firms to compete.

C. Margin Erosion

To manage cash flow challenges, contractors often turn to financing options such as factoring or high-cost lending, which can significantly reduce profitability. Podcast insights emphasize that while these solutions provide short-term liquidity, they often come at the expense of long-term financial health. Fees, interest, and repayment structures can eat into already tight margins, which makes it difficult for businesses to reinvest in operations or build financial stability. In this way, the capital gap does not just create a funding problem; it reduces the overall value contractors are able to retain from their work.

D. Strategic Consequences

Beyond immediate operations and growth, the capital gap has broader strategic implications for contractors. As discussed in podcast episodes focused on long-term planning and partnerships, persistent financial constraints can limit a firm's ability to invest in innovation, workforce development, and strategic positioning. Contractors may focus on short-term survival rather than long-term value creation, reducing their competitiveness over time. At the market level, this dynamic can discourage participation by smaller firms and concentrate opportunities among larger, better-capitalized players, ultimately affecting the diversity and resilience of the federal contracting system.

VI. Transition: The Need for a New Capital Model

The limitations of existing financial products in federal contracting are not the result of isolated inefficiencies, but of a broader structural mismatch. As demonstrated, traditional bank financing is often inaccessible or too slow, invoice factoring is reactive and reduces profitability, merchant cash advances impose unsustainable repayment burdens, and general private credit lacks alignment with contract timing and risk. While each option provides access to capital in some form, none are designed specifically for the unique demands of federal contracting.

This misalignment has meaningful consequences. Contractors are left to navigate delayed payments, upfront costs, and uneven cash flow with financial tools fundamentally built for different business models. This results in a system in which access to opportunity does not guarantee the ability to execute, and where financial constraints, not operational capability, become the primary barrier to growth.

Addressing this challenge requires more than incremental improvements to existing financing options. It demands a fundamentally different approach to capital, one that is structured around the timing, scale, and reliability of federal contracts. Rather than forcing contractors to adapt to rigid financial products, the solution must adapt to the realities of the federal market itself. This need points to the emergence of a new capital model, one designed specifically to align with federal contracting.

This new capital model is called Federal Market Credit (FMC), a new category of financing designed at the intersection of private credit, federal contracting, and non-bank capital solutions. Unlike traditional financing models, FMC is built around the realities of the federal marketplace. It provides capital before and during contract execution, scales with contract growth, and aligns repayment with the actual timing of government payment cycles. By structuring capital this way, FMC directly addresses the core drivers of the capital gap rather than working around them. Understanding FMC as a distinct category is essential to resolving the challenges outlined above. It represents a shift from adapting contractors to existing financial tools, to designing financial tools around the contractors themselves. This enables more efficient execution, sustainable growth, and broader participation in the federal marketplace.

VII. Conclusion

The capital gap in federal contracting is not a temporary challenge, but a structural issue rooted in the mismatch between when contractors must spend and when they are paid. As demonstrated, existing financial products, from traditional bank lending to private equity, fail to align with the timing, risk, and cash flow realities of government contracts. This leaves contractors, particularly small and mid-sized firms, constrained not by opportunity but by access to capital. Addressing this gap requires a fundamental shift in how financing is structured. Models like Federal Market Credit (FMC) represent this shift by aligning capital with the realities of contract execution, enabling contractors to operate more efficiently, scale sustainably, and fully participate in the federal marketplace.

VIII. References

Congressional Research Service. (2020). Continuing resolutions: Overview of components and recent practices (R46595). https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46595

Federal Acquisition Regulation. (n.d.). Subpart 32.9 — Prompt payment. https://www.acquisition.gov/far/subpart-32.9

Federal Reserve System. (2023). Small business credit survey. https://www.fedsmallbusiness.org/

First Business Bank. (n.d.). Factoring vs. line of credit. https://firstbusiness.bank/resource-center/factoring-vs-line-of-credit/

International Monetary Fund. (2024). Global financial stability report. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/GFSR

Paycor. (n.d.). A closer look at labor costs. https://www.paycor.com/resource-center/articles/closer-look-at-labor-costs/

U.S. Chamber of Commerce. (n.d.). Invoice factoring vs. invoice financing. https://www.uschamber.com/co/run/finance/invoice-factoring-vs-invoice-financing

U.S. Department of Defense. (2023). Small business strategy. https://media.defense.gov/2023/jan/26/2003150429/-1/-1/0/small-business-strategy.pdf

U.S. Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy. (n.d.). Advocacy. https://advocacy.sba.gov/

U.S. Federal Trade Commission. (2020). Report on online small business lending. https://www.consumerfinancialserviceslawmonitor.com/2020/03/new-ftc-report-highlights-benefits-risks-in-alternative-and-online-small-business-lending/