NextGen EIS Project

Findings and Recommendations to Inform a Post-2032 EIS Successor

Led by the ACT-IAC Networks & Telecommunications Community of Interest (N&T COI)
January 2026

NextGen EIS Project Team Goals

Provide Initial Stakeholder Feedback

- Gather feedback to inform GSA in shaping the EIS succession contract vehicle
  - Include Industry representatives
  - Include Government agency representatives
  - Summarize Feedback & Recommendations

Hold Comprehensive Discussion Forums

- Hold Interactive Panel Session(s) with federal agency and industry representatives
  - Acquisition/Procurement
  - Future Technology Requirements
  - Other – TBD

Provide Dynamic Support to GSA

- Provide ongoing support to GSA during the development of a modern, acquisition framework for IT infrastructure and telecommunications requirements

EIS Contract Details

$50B EIS Contract

- Replaces Networx Contract
- Recommended Contract Vehicle for Enterprise Telecom & Networking services
- Period of Performance: July 2017 to July 2032 (Options years at 2022 & 2027)

Awarded Vendors

- **Large Businesses:** AT&T, BT Federal, Comcast, Granite, L3Harris, Lumen, Verizon
- **Small Businesses:** AOC Connect, MetTel

Services Offered

- Multiple Award IDIQ
- Voice & data transport
- Cloud & Managed Services
- VPNs & Ethernet solutions

Advantages

- Best in Class Service - pre-screened vendors
- Fair Opportunity Required Among Vendors; enables competitive pricing and service
- Flexibility of standard offerings & ability to adapt to new unanticipated requirements
- Inclusion of Small Business

NextGen EIS Project Team Recommendations

- Streamline the proposal requirements; EIS proposal requirement is complex and burdensome (EIS vs. MAS)
- Rationalize EIS fee of 4.75% to be competitive with MAS – Reference Artifact #1
- Avoid transitioning all agencies at one time, creating a bottleneck; consider staging transition by agency, tech stack, or region
- Design NextGen EIS to incentivize cost savings, modernization and/or early tech adoption
- Increase flexibility to include service components such as pre-award inventory support, flexible operating models or fully managed service models
- Maintain Vendor Diversity; attract small business participation
- Increase GSA oversight by maintaining regular training and feedback loops with stakeholders

Summary of Project Team Feedback – Acquisition/Procurement Topic

Contract Structure & Flexibility

- Use modular task orders to avoid sole-award dependency
- Consider adding flexibility with an option to award shorter base periods with option years
- Create SLAs with measurable performance metrics
- Efficient Vendor Incorporation; 6+ months to integrate new CLINs into systems creates delays and risks
- Include fixed, per unit-as-a-service pricing options at the TO level to promote outcome-driven consumption under "Anything as a Service" (XaaS)
- Ability to add LCATS to keep pace with evolving technologies and skills
- Structure contract for Operating Models – Contract should support gov-owned, hybrid, or fully managed services

Vendor Diversity & Competition

- Accommodate multiple awardees per agency (limit sole-source)
- Increase small business set-asides (currently 2 of 10 vendors)
- Provide transparent evaluation criteria to reduce protests & speed acquisition
- Consider rolling on ramp process for new vendors

Acquisition & Procurement

- Streamline RFP & award processes
- Consider including bundled pricing solutions and/or standardized products and solutions for cost savings
- Require common terminology to avoid complexity
- Increase agility for service ordering - avoid task orders being as complex as full competitions
- Host a panel discussion with Industry and federal agency representatives; Panel will be scheduled in mid-January

Summary of Project Team Feedback – Pricing & Cost Structure Topics

Pricing & Cost Structure Feedback

- Design NextGen EIS pricing to incentivize cost savings, IT modernization, and early adoption of emerging technologies.
- Agencies must produce an accurate inventory to appropriately establish technical refresh requirements and accurate cost estimates.
- Consider promoting shared services for volume discounts
- Considering flexibility and/or alternatives to Firm Fixed Price TO's
  - Firm Fixed Price TO's present a risk to the vendor; drives up price
  - Require a breakout of fixed costs
  - Allow for other types of TO's, such as Time and Material & Cost-type, as needed, similar to GSA OASIS
  - Consider using catalog pricing that is not specific to the EIS Agency Pricer
- Eliminate the CBSA's - neither the referenced 2015 CBSA nor the recent 2023 CBSA span the entire US; CBSA changes annually and does not cover the entire US

Summary of Project Team Feedback – Service Delivery Transition Topic

Recommended GSA Actions

- Continue/Increase support to vendors and customer agencies with training, communications, and transition guides
- Consider requiring ATO testing to begin within a specified time period
- Encourage customer agencies to complete the award process at least three years before the end of the current contract
- Continue best practice of providing migration frameworks for data, security, and interoperability
- Consider addressing risk mitigation, Zero Trust, FedRAMP, FISMA, and CMMC compliance for cutover
- Consider requiring/encouraging agencies to complete an inventory assessment of equipment/services during transition preparation
- Publish an EIS Lessons Learned
    - When is it appropriate to use a TUC and what are the challenges (i.e, TUC can provide flexibility, but they can delay smooth and orderly transitions)
    - Agencies will need to facilitate communication between vendors and LECs
    - A site survey will be required from demarc to computer room if construction is required before circuit installation
    - Include full cost of construction in quote–this would require a longer quote timeline
    - Inadequate agency inventory drives up the cost to vendors and agencies
    - Agencies struggle with pricing estimates; create an agency pricing tool

Recommended Training for Agencies

- Begin ATO testing; Encourage multi-agency use of contracts
- Establish department transition managers with clear feedback loops to GSA
- Ensure legacy systems can coexist smoothly with modern solutions
- Promote shared services for volume discounts
- Balanced risk/reward terms

Summary of Project Team Feedback – Improve Contract Oversight Topic

Industry Outreach & Engagement

- Conduct Regular Industry Engagement – Industry Days
- Provide accurate reports from industry partners to agencies in line with SLAs

Risk Management & Oversight

- Create structured governance & regular reporting
- Conduct annual reviews for scope, pricing & evolving needs
- Align DCMA/IG audit & compliance
- Address vendor readiness – Require proof vendors can scale staff & expertise before award
- Move beyond “Best Effort”; require proposals to include measurable SLAs for bandwidth, equipment, and security services

Eliminate Overhead Costs – Remove/Address the following requirements from the contract

- Conexus
- BSS
- Annual Security Documentation
- ATO and Assessment every 3 years

Summary of Project Team Feedback – Incorporate Future Tech Requirements

Future Tech Requirements - Telecom and Networking

Reference industry roadmaps to determine capabilities:

- Emerging Capabilities include: Artificial Intelligence, Immersive Communication, Integrated Sensing and Communication, Massive Communications, Ubiquitous Connectivity, 6G, Hyper Reliable Low Latency Communications (HRLLC)
- Specific industry technology requirements include 5G/6G LANs, XR, holographic communications, digital twin, private networks, health monitoring, immersive gaming/training, utility infrastructure monitor and control, mobile robots, smart bases/depots/ports/cities
- Consider industry roadmaps related to AI, Cloud/Edge Services, Fiber Networks, Data Centers, and Security

Design EIS to Align Agency Mission & Emerging Needs – Consider:

- Emerging technology such as drones, robots, AI
- Fully Managed Services and hybrid operating models
- Integrating TIC 3.0 features into network infrastructure
- Voice Service Integration that allows for more integrated solutions such as Teams on other platforms
- Modernization options; ie., use of internet as transport over choices like MPLS
- Secure network options

Reference Artifact 2 for Listing of Future Technology Requirements

Project Team will Host a Panel Discussion on Future Technology Requirements

NextGen EIS Project Team Next Steps

Phase 1

Initial Stakeholder Feedback

- Approved by ACT-IAC Leadership Team
- Submit to GSA in December 2025

Phase 2

Hold Comprehensive Discussion Forums

- Hold Interactive Panel Session(s) with federal agency and industry representatives in January/February 2026
  - Acquisition/Procurement
  - Future Technology Requirements
  - Other – TBD, as needed

Phase 3

Provide Dynamic Support to GSA

- Provide follow up White Paper or other project deliverables, as needed, following Discussion Forums
- March/April 2026

Artifact 1 – Fee Comparison

Team Recommendation – Lower & Transparent EIS Fee Structure

Fee Structure Comparison

EIS

- $50B ceiling | **4.75% CAF**
- Telecom, network & IT infrastructure
- Highest fee among GWACs

Other Major GWACs

- Alliant 2, Polaris, 8(a) STARS III, VETS 2, OASIS – $6.1B–$82.5B ceilings | 0.75% CAF
- IT services, emerging tech, and professional services

NASA SEWP V

- $50B ceiling | 0.34% surcharge
- IT products & solutions

NITAAC (CIO-SP3 / CIO-SP3 SB)

- $20B each | 0.65% CAF
- IT services & solutions

Other Vehicles (MAS IT, COMSATCOM, Army CHESS)

- Flexible ceilings / fees vary
- IT products, comms, and Army-specific solutions

Artifact 2 – Future Technology Requirements

Applications & Services

Future Connectivity Needs

- Ecosystem-of-ecosystems: interop across domains requires common data models and governance
- Network-of-networks orchestration across fixed, mobile, satellite, and enterprise fabrics
- Reference architectures so apps/services bind to capabilities via uniform APIs
- Built-in policy, identity, and data-protection primitives exposed by the network
- Programmable QoS/SLA and event-driven service exposure for cross-ecosystem workflows

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- API-first network exposure services vs. circuit-centric ordering
- Integrated identity/policy/data governance add-ons vs. stand-alone tools
- Cross-domain orchestration/assurance as-a-service vs. siloed NMS
- Standardized partner interconnects vs. bespoke integrations
- Experience-based SLAs vs. throughput/availability only

Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning

Future Connectivity Needs

- AI-native RAN/core/edge for closed-loop optimization beyond classical KPIs
- AI-defined radios & RIC policy control for real-time spectrum/beam/power reconfiguration
- Generative/semantic networking to improve effective throughput
- Digital twins for intent-based planning, testing, and resilience
- AI-native security/assurance and model governance in the fabric

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- AIOps-managed services vs. manual monitoring & break/fix
- RIC/xApp/rApp services within Open RAN vs. proprietary tuning
- Semantic/GenAI traffic optimization add-ons vs. static QoS
- Network digital-twin services vs. spreadsheet-based planning
- Model-governed security SLAs vs. device/config compliance alone

Edge Service & Platform

Future Connectivity Needs

- Sub-ms latency and ~10× per-user bandwidth gains at the edge
- Observability-by-default (OpenTelemetry), SLOs, closed-loop automation
- Edge cache/compute and precision time (PTP) for time-sensitive apps
- Heterogeneous accelerators and policy-driven workload placement
- High east–west bandwidth (200–400 Gbps) in regional edge clusters

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- Managed MEC/edge with transport vs. centralized DC-only hosting
- Edge observability & SLO-backed services vs. best-effort measures
- Time-sensitive networking & precision timing vs. generic NTP reliance
- Policy-based placement/orchestration vs. static site builds
- Edge CDN/data caching vs. core-only caching

Massive MIMO

Future Connectivity Needs

- Hundreds–thousands of antennas from sub-6 GHz to mmWave/THz (5G-Adv/6G)
- AI-driven beam management; user-/cell-free MIMO; C-RAN/virtualized RAN
- Hybrid fiber–wireless fronthaul; multi-band indoor/outdoor deployments
- Open interfaces (O-RAN) for multi-vendor interop and lower TCO
- Security-by-design and open performance metrics for assurance

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- Private 5G with Massive MIMO vs. Wi-Fi-first or DAS-only builds
- O-RAN components & integration services vs. single-vendor stacks
- Fronthaul/backhaul upgrades (fiber/mmWave) vs. limited backhaul buys
- Beamforming optimization & coverage SLAs vs. signal-strength baselines
- User-/cell-free architecture pilots vs. sectorized macro-only planning

Optics

Future Connectivity Needs

- Scale DCIs to 800G→1.6T; co-packaged optics to cut power/latency
- DWDM xHaul upgrades for higher-rate fronthaul/midhaul/backhaul
- Access evolution (XGS-PON+) and LiFi for in-building capacity
- Parallel/multi-core fibers; multi-band/hollow-core transmission
- AI-assisted optical KDN for QoT prediction and assurance

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- 800G/1.6T-ready transport & DCI vs. 100G/400G baselines
- xHaul DWDM for 5G/6G densification vs. generic metro circuits
- PON-based access & LiFi pilots vs. copper/legacy runs
- Optical telemetry & QoT assurance vs. manual OTDR tests
- Co-packaged optics planning vs. discrete optics refreshes

Quantum Information Technology

Future Connectivity Needs

- Quantum-safe networking: PQC and QKD across optical/satellite
- Quantum timing/sensing and DC interconnect implications
- Integration points with xHaul, optical underlays, and NTN routes
- Pilot programs with expert partners to de-risk adoption
- Governance for crypto agility and enterprise key management

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- PQC migration & crypto-agility toolkits vs. fixed-suite crypto
- QKD pilot links (optical/satellite) vs. no quantum keying
- Quantum-ready KMS & policy services vs. static KMS footprints
- Quantum-safe assessments & roadmaps vs. ad hoc refreshes
- Time/sensing augmentation trials vs. GNSS-only timing

Satellite NTN

Future Connectivity Needs

- Multi-orbit NTN (LEO/MEO/GEO) + HAPS/UAV for global coverage & xHaul
- NTN–terrestrial interop aligned to 3GPP Rel-19/20; Open RAN integration
- AI-optimized waveform/protocol/mobility & routing for capacity/efficiency
- Interference mitigation, universal sync, and anti-jamming resilience
- Policy-based multi-network routing across space/ground segments

GSA EIS: What to Buy Next & How It Differs

- Multi-orbit SATCOM with terrestrial integration vs. single-orbit SATCOM
- Direct-to-device/NTN mobility pilots vs. dish-only endpoints
- Managed interference mitigation & assured PNT vs. basic availability SLAs
- Multi-path routing across SATCOM/fiber/microwave vs. single-path MPLS
- Integrated O-RAN + NTN for remote campuses vs. separate SATCOM & LTE buys

Artifact 3 – Alternatives to EIS 2.0

Interactive Panel Discussion Forthcoming – Summary & Recommendations will be provided post-panel

NextGen EIS Project Team Participants

Federal Agency Participants

Blu Brown, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
John Dobriansky, U.S. Department of Defense
Dwayne Gist, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Kelsey Lassich, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Michael Maglione, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
David Naugle, U.S. Social Security Administration
Jeffrey Koenig, U.S. Social Security Administration
Jean Tischhauser, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Michael Catania, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Eric Taylor, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Ron Wuthrich, U.S. Department of the Treasury
Jeffrey Mazzella, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Tim Howard, U.S. National Science Foundation
La Shura Ford, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Dustin Sampson, U.S. Department of Defense
Keith Caldwell, National Defense University
Zachary Kanode, U.S. Department of the Navy
Paula Simmons, U.S. Department of Defense, NC3 Cybersecurity Architecture & Engineering

Former Federal Government Officials

Mahesh Choksi, Formerly U.S. Food and Drug Administration
Kevin Gallo, Formerly U.S. General Services Administration
Fred Haines, Formerly U.S. General Services Administration
Monica Pardon Harris, Formerly U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Antony Arcadi, Formerly U.S. Department of the Treasury
Karen Matragrano, Formerly U.S. Department of the Interior

Industry Participants

Erika Dinnie, MetTel
Bill Reynolds, AOC Connect
Sam Hugues, Hughes BD Consulting
Meghan Daly, Maximus
Glenn Sturgill, BT Federal
Brett Barganz, Verizon
Amy Fadida, A.M. Fadida Consulting
Pierre Bowery, TekSynap
Demetrius Davis, MITRE
Justin Fessler, LogicMonitor
Amit Kumar, IBM
Gloria Frieson, Seventh Sense Consulting
Sonia Walia, Trustwave
Andres Vivas, Teksynap Corporation
Megan Mattingly, K3 Solutions
Mary Beth Jones
Lisa Zellers, ViaTrie
Sue Lucidi, AT&T
Chris Schuster, Teksynap Corporation
Doug Thomas, AOC Connect
Ellen Litman, AT&T
Aaron Cooperman, Carahsoft
David Masterson, AT&T
Andrew Schrock, AT&T
Deirdre Murray, Deirdre Murray & Associates
Sam Wu, SavForce
Asa Rubman, Lumen
Ryan Kranenberg, Peraton
Daniel Kwong
Jenny Acot, EverSource Solutions
Fatena El-Masri, FATin.AI
Alton Cheaves, VALIDATEK
James Dimmer, TTG
Glenndale Rogers
Manu Chopra
Daniel Kwong
Narendra Mangra, GlobeNet