

AMENDMENT #1: 2025-11012A, REGIONAL SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: MEDUSA AFRICA SUBSEA CABLE SYSTEM

POC: Anna Amaya, USTDA, 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1100, Arlington, VA 22209-3901, Tel: (703) 875-4357, Fax: (703) 775-4037, Email: RFP@ustda.gov.

Please note that the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Feasibility Study for the Medusa Africa Subsea Cable System Project is amended, as follows:

Questions, Answers and Clarifications: This amendment consists of clarifying questions and answers submitted by potential Offerors regarding the RFP packet. Responses to submitted questions are below.

Question	Answer
Could you please confirm whether the Preliminary Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (PESIA) will cover all 22 countries collectively, or if separate PESIAs will need to be developed for each individual country?	We will accept a unique PESIA covering all the 22 countries. The main purpose is that the PESIA must reference the Host Country's and each Target Country's national, provincial, and municipal requirements, and that it must include steps that the Client will need to take after the completion of the Activity and prior to Project implementation. This purpose can be covered by a unique PESIA, but it must consider the specific conditions of the 22 countries.
Task 6: Local Tax Assessment requires assessment of 22 countries, but the budget is not commensurate to the level of effort.	We are requesting a high-level analysis.
Could USTDA please clarify whether interviews with customers or stakeholders that operate across multiple countries may be counted toward the interview requirement for each relevant country? For example, if a potential customer has operations in several of the target markets, would a single interview with that customer satisfy the requirement for each country in which they operate, or does USTDA require 44 distinct, country-specific interviews to meet the total specified in the RFP?	A potential Customer with interest in several countries can be approached with a single interview, but the Customer must provide insights for the different countries in which they operate.
Could USTDA please clarify the protocol in situations where the required goods or services are highly specialized and fewer than five qualified U.S. suppliers exist globally? The RFP requests identification of at least	The Contractor would need to complete the terms of reference as stated.

<p>five U.S. suppliers per category (e.g., submarine equipment and deployment, active equipment, marine survey, consulting, project management). However, for several subsea-specific categories, the global supplier base is extremely limited and may not include five U.S. companies.</p>	
<p>Can a summary of the TORs or scope of the existing desktop study be provided? This will help calibrate and better define the work plan.</p>	<p>The TORs provided are what is available.</p>
<p>Will the Client provide access to baseline data (e.g., current service coverage, user statistics, or previous pilot outcomes)? This will also better define the work plan.</p>	<p>This is not available.</p>
<p>How will success of the Medusa Africa Subsea Cable System be measured (e.g. market adoption or impact terms)? This will help us in the design of the feasibility study.</p>	<p>Success will be measured in terms of profitability.</p>
<p>From the RFP instructions, we understand that the specific billing milestones will be based on delivery of each Task report but subject to negotiations after award. Is that correct? Are bidders expected to submit suggested billing milestones as part of the offer? Is there any other clarity on milestones which can be provided at this stage?</p>	<p>The payment milestones will be discussed following the selection of the contractor and the total amount will not exceed the grant amount stated in the RFP.</p>
<p>We understand that estimated values in the table included as part of Appendix 4 will only be used in the event of contract termination prior to completion. If we believe that the allocation of the grant percentage should be different for each task, we understand that will be subject to discussion/negotiation after award. Is this understanding correct?</p>	<p>The percentage could vary for each task, but the total grant amount is fixed.</p>
<p>The total value of the amounts from the table in Appendix 4 add up to \$1,520,878 (\$100 more than the indicated grant amount). We assume a typo in the table. Please confirm.</p>	<p>Correct, this is a typo. The grant amount is as indicated in the RFP.</p>
<p>The RFP does not indicate a suggested or expected project duration or timeline to meet each task. Is there any guidance that can be provided or should bidders propose their own plan of work?</p>	<p>We expect the feasibility study to be completed in 6 months. Anyway, the duration of the works will be considered in the criteria ‘#1. Proposed Technical Approach’.</p>
<p>Does USTDA have any specific resume format that it wishes to see for the Key Personnel identified as part of our bid?</p>	<p>This is not available.</p>

<p>Section 3.5 requires “as many as possible but not more than six (6) ... references”. Please clarify if these are references per Key Personnel or per company.</p>	<p>The wording is clear: <i>six (6) relevant and verifiable project references must be provided for each of the Offeror and any subcontractor.</i></p>
<p>Are there an expected number or type of Key Personnel? Are there a list of specific skills, experience, education, or other professional certifications that are required for each person?</p>	<p>There is no specific list. We expect references in <i>projects that are similar to the Feasibility Study as described in the RFP.</i></p>
<p>The RFP is not clear with respect to how many in-person visits are required, at which locations, and what the expected duration of these trips are. Is there any guidance that can be assumed for bidding, given that travel expenses could consume a significant portion of the allocation depending on the frequency, location, and number of staff?</p>	<p>No in-person visit is required. Anyway, the more in-person visits will be considered in the criteria ‘#1.Proposed Technical Approach’</p>
<p>Subtask 3.1: Demand Analysis: For the following forecasts, are you expecting such a forecast for all 22 Target countries? A. W.r.t the Forecasts for international bandwidth over a ten-year period, including: “A "bottom-up" estimate utilizing assumptions about <u>growth in mobile and fixed broadband subscriptions</u> , as <u>well as per-subscriber data usage</u>”, B. W.r.t the Identification and description of potential major international data customers and global customers with connectivity needs, including, for each potential customer, C. An estimate of the potential customer's international data transport needs and the service type likely to be of most interest to the customer (e.g., full fiber pair, half fiber pair, or spectrum service).</p>	<p>The TORs provided are what is available.</p>
<p>For this particular request, there will be multiple customers / whole sellers and hyperscalers per landing with traffic needs across multiple routes. Are you looking for an estimate of the traffic needs for all identified parties across the 22 landings and an interview with each or 2 per landing (ie. 44 total) as well as their 10 year forecast)?</p>	<p>Yes. But if a Customer has interests in several Countries, only one interview is required.</p>

<p>Subtask 3.2: Supply Analysis: Comparison of the Project's value proposition against all identified existing and planned cable systems serving the Host Country and each Target Country Planned cable details especially architecture and capacity deals of planned cable owners are proprietary; terrestrial backhauls negotiated in some of these landings are too. Which level of details do you expect from this task across the 22 landings?</p>	<p>We expect high-level analysis. Anyway, the more provided information will be considered in the criteria ‘#1.Proposed Technical Approach.’</p>
<p>Task 5: Technical Due Diligence Review: This assumes that the Grantee has already performed a preliminary design of the system and received quotes from suppliers? Please confirm. Will this information be provided during Task 1 – Research Phase?</p>	<p>Confirmed. There will be a preliminary design of the system. Not sure if it will be provided during Task 1.</p>
<p>Task 7: Economic Analysis: Could you please confirm that which is required is in essence 22 business cases/economic analysis over a 30-year period, one for each landing, along with an analysis of the economic viability of the 27 branches and an economic analysis for the entire system, with different P&L for the owner and other investor parties?</p>	<p>The TORs provided is quite clear: one business case for the whole system, a business case for any open access branch and a business case for any private branch.</p>
<p>Appendix 4. Reference Task Value: We understand these prices are for reference. Is there a limit to how we reallocate the compensation for each task?</p>	<p>There is no limit.</p>
<p>Scope Depth vs. Breadth (Tasks 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11): The RFP requires detailed analysis for the Host Country and each of the 22 Target Countries. Does the Grantee prioritize any specific "anchor" markets for more in-depth analysis, or is the expectation that the Contractor provides an equal level of assessment for all 22 markets?</p>	<p>The purpose of the Action is the validation of the feasibility of every branch of the subsea cable. If the feasibility of a branch is secured with a low level of assessment, it will work.</p>
<p>Degree of Interest or Commitment (Task 3 & 8): The RFP mentions ‘customer interviews’ and ‘financial bankability’ to achieve the Client's goals through the Study. Does the Feasibility Study need to deliver signed Expressions of Interest (EOI) or Letters of Intent (LOI) from potential financiers and anchor customers in the Target Countries, or is the deliverable limited to a strategic</p>	<p>EoI and LoI are not requested. I don’t see that <i>demonstrated history of securing financing for similar projects</i> is a scoring criteria.</p>

identification of these targets? How is demonstrated history of securing financing for similar projects evaluated in the scoring criteria?	
--	--