

AMENDMENT #1: NO. 2026-11007A: Nigeria: AFRIDATA Nigeria Data Center Feasibility Study

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 Nigeria: AFRIDATA Nigeria Data Center 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 attached.

1. Team experience requirements — Sections 2.2 and 4 Section 2.2 include subcontractors within the Offeror definition, and Section 4 describes the consulting firm as inclusive of subcontractors. Please confirm whether the proposed team may satisfy the experience minimums through a committed subcontractor with the required five-year experience, a team member with the required Sub-Saharan African ICT experience, and two qualifying contracts performed by one or more team members, with each firm's experience tied to its assigned scope. Please address each experience minimum separately and identify the evidence and commitments required for reliance on a subcontractor. If an experience minimum must be met by the prime independently, would the Grantee consider a published amendment allowing it to be satisfied by a committed subcontractor responsible for the corresponding work, with the prime retaining full contractual accountability? Please specify any conditions or limitations.

Response: The Offeror definition suggests the consulting firm (inclusive of subcontractors) - “a single consulting firm (Prime contractor) or a Consortium of Prime and subcontractors” for the assignment must possess substantial and actual experience for the assignment. The Prime Contractor must be seen to contribute significantly (more than 50% of the requirements) and will be ultimately responsible for the final work production including management of and appropriate experience of any and all personnel working under the contract. Prime Contractor acting merely as a project manager is strongly discouraged. The approval of subcontractors must be agreed upon with the Grantee and approved in writing by USTDA.

2. Revenue and alternative financial-capacity evidence — Section 4 and Appendix 5. Must the average annual revenue of at least \$500,000 over the last three years be demonstrated by the prime legal entity alone, or may committed team members' revenues be considered? Please specify the measurement years, acceptable financial evidence and, if team revenues may be considered, the calculation method. If the prime must meet the revenue threshold alone, would the Grantee consider a published amendment permitting alternative evidence of financial capacity, such as an enforceable guarantee or financial-support commitment from a qualified U.S. team member, subject to USTDA approval? If so, please specify the required documentation, financial standards for the supporting entity and enforceable obligations. We recognize that such support is not itself revenue and would require an expressly permitted alternative; Appendix 5 financial-capacity review would still apply.

Response: Evidence of Revenue would be based on Audited financial statements or other industry verifiable standards. The Prime Consultant will be required to contribute significantly to the revenue requirement (more than 50% of the requirement). The use of subcontractors to meet the revenue requirements listed is discouraged. The Prime Contractor will ultimately be responsible for the final work product and as such must have the capacity to manage any and all work associated with the Terms of Reference. Applicants may propose a team of subcontractors to satisfy the minimum experience requirements, but the approval of subcontractors must be agreed upon with the Grantee and approved in writing by USTDA.

3. Qualifying contract scope, value and dates — Sections 3.5 and 4. For the two contracts of at least \$200,000 each, please clarify how similarity in scope and complexity will be assessed. Must each qualifying contract demonstrate all principal disciplines of this study, or may each cover a substantial, comparable component of the assignment, with the two references together

demonstrating the required breadth? For work performed as a subcontractor, please confirm whether the threshold applies to the value of that firm's performed scope. Please identify the three-year lookback date and whether qualifying work must have been completed in that period or may include client-accepted performance under an earlier-starting or ongoing contract. Please specify acceptable evidence of successful performance.

Response: Offerors are strongly encouraged to include in their own experience summary primarily those projects that are similar to the Feasibility Study as described in this RFP. The evaluation criteria are listed in section 4 of the RFP. If the applicant does not possess the relevant experience they may provide their most relevant experience. There are no thresholds related to this RFP for subcontractors. USTDA discourages the use of subcontractors to meet significant portions of the listed requirements.

4. Evaluation of team experience — Section 4. Please confirm whether relevant experience of committed subcontractors, aligned to their assigned scope, will be considered alongside the prime's experience under Firm Technical Capability and Past Performance (35 points) and Geographical Experience (10 points). Please identify any prime-specific limitation within those scored criteria, distinct from the minimum qualifications addressed above.

Response: The evaluation of the team experience will be carried out on the consulting firm as indicated in RFP. The Prime Contractor will ultimately be responsible for the final work product. Applicants may propose a team of subcontractors to satisfy the minimum experience requirements, but the approval of subcontractors must be agreed upon with the Grantee and approved in writing by USTDA.

5. Personnel commitment letters — Sections 3.3 and 3.5. Will individually signed letters committing proposed consultants and contingent hires to their stated roles and availability upon contract award satisfy the commitment requirement where those individuals are not currently employed by the prime or a proposed subcontractor? Please specify any required form or additional evidence.

Response: Any personnel working on this study who are not currently employed by a prime or subcontractor would not be approved to work on this activity and thus no payment would be made for work completed by such personnel. Please refer to section 3.3 for guidance on requirements for submission of supporting documents for personnel.

6. Capacity, FEED deliverables and certification — TOR Tasks 5 and 6. Do the stated 60–70 MW initial capacity and potential 100 MW expansion represent IT load or total facility electrical demand, and do the stated rack counts relate to initial or ultimate capacity? Task 6 specifies FEED-level work sufficient to support EPC RFQs/RFPs. If an existing required drawing/calculation deliverable schedule supplements Task 6, please make it available to offerors. Please clarify whether the study scope includes formal third-party Tier certification submissions, services or charges, in addition to specifications and planning for the stated Tier objectives.

Response: All consulting works, FEED and technical designs must take into account the 100MW target critical IT load expansion with an initial capacity roll out of 60-70MW critical IT load. The rack configuration is proposed on the initial capacity roll out. The optimal configuration mix will be defined during the kick-off meeting and work Finalization task and confirmed based on the output of the technical task. The Offeror is free to provide suggestions or innovations for the Grantee's consideration in line with or within the parameters of the project objectives. The FEED output must meet international, and hyperscaler standards required for inclusion in EPC and O&M RFQ and RFP process.

7. Site data and investigations — TOR Tasks 1, 5 and 6 Task 5 requires the Client to confirm the parcels and provide parcel documentation, cadastral maps and surveys before assessment begins. Please identify which supporting topographic, geotechnical, flood/environmental and utility/connectivity studies currently exist and whether any new intrusive investigations must be commissioned within the study. For proposal planning, should detailed assessment cover one Lagos parcel and both identified Delta alternatives, or one Client-selected parcel in each state? Please confirm how site access will be arranged.

Response: In line with the RFP the detailed site assessment covers all land already identified for the project in Lagos and Delta states. The Grantee will make available land location, maps, and preliminary site assessment information to the preferred bidder.

8. ESIA and regulatory responsibilities — TOR Task 11; grant tax provisions Task 11 provides for the Client to confirm applicable DFI requirements before the ESIA begins. Which requirements and existing baseline studies should offerors assume for proposal planning, and are seasonal fieldwork or consultation requirements already known? Please clarify whether regulatory filing, responses to regulator comments and support through issuance of environmental approval are included, in addition to preparation of the full ESIA. Please identify the non-grant funding responsibility for any required host-country regulatory fees or levies excluded by the grant tax provisions.

Response: ESIA shall be conducted according to DFI standards – Please refer to Task 11, which contains the expected standards.

9. Duration and customer-engagement acceptance — TOR Tasks 8, 10, 15 and 16. What overall study completion period should offerors use, given Task 10's maximum eighteen-month duration? Tasks 8 and 10 require active financing/customer engagement and support, including efforts to secure customer commitments. Please confirm whether acceptance and payment for completed task deliverables are contingent on third parties executing financing or offtake agreements, or on satisfactory performance and documentation of the specified services. The proposed work would include all engagement and presales-support activities specified in the TOR.

Response: As listed in task 10, this study has an 18-month duration. In addition, Annex 3 contains the estimated project completion date. Per section 3.4 applicants are expected to develop a technical approach and workplan and prepare a detailed schedule of performance in line with the listed ToR. Per Annex 3 Section 2, Terms of Reference: the Contractor will be paid

in accordance with the payment schedule set forth in the Contract. The Grantee will discuss with the Preferred bidder the critical milestone deliverables during the kick-off meeting.

10. Regional specialist eligibility — nationality/source provisions. Is any country other than Nigeria identified as a Target Country for this activity under the definition requiring that country to be integral to the Project's scope and its local labor required for the Activity? For work otherwise qualifying under the thirty-percent allowance, please clarify the treatment of reimbursed expenses and subcontract markups when calculating that allowance across contracting tiers. If a necessary regional specialist falls outside the existing nationality provisions, may a request for USTDA's written exception be considered before proposal submission, and what evidence and timing would apply?

Response: As listed throughout the RFP and all annexes, the Host Country is Nigeria. No target countries have been identified. Please see USTDA's publicly available nationality, source and origin requirements. All personnel must be approved by the Grantee and USTDA will not consider written exceptions prior to acceptance of the proposal by the Grantee.

11. IPP scope. Appendix 2 describes the Activity as assessing data center capacity backed by a dedicated independent power plant (IPP). In Annex I, Task 5 addresses proximity to a potential IPP site, and Task 6 specifies primary and backup power sources. Please confirm whether conceptual design, environmental and social assessment, economic analysis, and financing of a dedicated IPP fall within the Terms of Reference.

Response: A separate workstream is being undertaken for the IPP scope. However, this assignment covers all power requirements for Datacenters in lieu of the dedicated provision of power from the IPP.

12. Capacity basis. Please confirm whether the 60 to 70 MW combined capacity refers to critical IT load or total facility power, and whether the Client has an intended capacity split between the Lagos and Delta sites.

Response: All consulting works, FEED and technical designs shall take into account the 100MW target critical IT load expansion with an initial capacity roll out of 60-70MW critical IT load. Capacity split has been intended for both locations and will be discussed with the preferred bidder.

13. Task 9 model commercial agreements. Please specify which model commercial agreements are contemplated under Task 9 (e.g., shareholders' agreement, master colocation agreement and SLA, hyperscaler wholesale terms, DCI fiber and IRUs) and the expected level of depth (e.g., term sheets, initial draft of key terms, or execution-ready drafts).

Response: All of the above. Execution ready draft expected.

14. ESIA endpoint. Please confirm whether the Contractor is to prepare the ESIA for the Client's submission or manage the Federal Ministry of Environment process through to issuance of an EIA certificate.

Response: Please refer to the Terms of Reference, Task 11 for ESIA requirements.

15. Parcels in scope. Section 1.1 identifies two candidate parcels in Delta State. Please confirm (a) whether Task 5 requires assessment of the Lagos parcel and both Delta parcels, and (b) whether Task 11 requires a full ESIA for the Lagos site and the **selected** Delta parcel only.

Response: Yes.

16. Target Country. Please confirm whether any Target Country has been designated for this Activity under Annex II Clause C(F) (such as South Africa).

Response: No Target Country has been designated for this activity.

17. Benchmarking in Task 2 - Bordering countries. Please confirm the country set is Benin, Niger, Chad and Cameroon and whether that definition of "bordering countries" could be expanded to include Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire to the pricing benchmark set since they have more data centers than the direct neighbors and are still geographically close.

Response: Please refer to the ToR Task 2 for the definition of bordering countries.

18. Could you please clarify if the elements of the proposed data center concept should be treated as fixed Client requirements versus starting assumptions to be tested and potentially revised through the Study? Specifically, are the 60-70 MW initial combined capacity / 100 MW expansion target, the proposed CPU/GPU rack mix, Lagos as the primary site, Delta as the secondary/disaster-recovery site, and the Tier classifications fixed requirements, or should the Consultant independently validate and recommend alternatives?

Response: Please refer to the Grantee's requirements for the assignment. The Offeror is free to provide suggestions or innovations for the Grantee's consideration in line with or within the parameters of the project objectives.

19. Could you please clarify any key deadlines, milestones, dependencies, or target dates that Offerors should consider in developing the proposed project approach and Work Plan, including the anticipated commencement and overall duration of the Study and any required timing or sequencing of individual Tasks and Deliverables?

Response: Please refer to the Terms of Reference, Task 10 for the duration of the study. In addition, Annex 3 contains the estimated project completion date. Per section 3.4 applicants are expected to develop a technical approach and the associated workplan in their proposal and prepare a detailed schedule of performance in line with the listed ToR. The Grantee will discuss with the Preferred bidder the critical milestone deliverables during the kick-off meeting.