

PROOF-LED TEASER BRIEF

Shareable proof asset

Bridge into the entry engagement

VENDOR / EPC TEASER BRIEF

# Which named AI or data-center pursuits look grounded enough to justify more commercial or engineering effort now?

A short proof-led brief built from the current public AI Power & Site Readiness snapshots.

For vendors, EPCs, electrical integrators, equipment suppliers, and partner-development teams.

QUICK BRIEF

USE

**Short proof-led collateral**

PROOF BASE

**Current public AIPSR snapshots**

NEXT STEP

**Project Reality Check Brief**

WHO THIS IS FOR

## Built for teams deciding which named pursuits deserve effort now

This brief is for teams that sell into AI and data-center buildouts and have to decide which named pursuits are worth pursuing now, which ones look real but delayed, and which ones may be more narrative than deliverable project.

- Vendors

- EPCs

- Electrical integrators

- Equipment suppliers

- Partner-development teams

## WHY THIS MATTERS

# False positives are expensive

If a named campus or project is not actually grounded in power-path reality, schedule credibility, or site-readiness evidence, commercial teams can waste proposal time, engineering bandwidth, scarce capacity, and internal attention that should have gone elsewhere.

The purpose of this brief is to show how an outside-in read can sharpen that decision before a team commits too much effort.

## WHAT THE CURRENT PROOF BASE SHOWS

# The method is not to predict the future. It is to separate stronger signals from weaker ones.

The existing public snapshots already demonstrate the kind of outside-in questions this work can answer: does the public power and schedule story hold together, where does confidence look strong versus weak, what appears ready on paper but still carries meaningful delivery risk, and which signals matter enough to change pursuit posture.

- Gather public evidence
- Score what is knowable
- Separate stronger signals from weaker ones
- Translate that into a commercial decision

## NAMED EXAMPLES FROM THE PROOF BASE

# Concrete examples already visible in the public proof set

### NAMED EXAMPLE

#### Applied Digital - Ellendale, ND - Phase 1

Highlights the gap between headline readiness and actually deliverable capacity under real-world constraints.

- A project can look commercially exciting and still need more scrutiny on the power-path story.
- Schedule confidence and electrical deliverability do not always move together.
- That difference matters for pursuit qualification.

[Open the Applied Digital proof page](#) →

#### NAMED EXAMPLE

### Amazon - PECO TSA / Falls Township, PA

Shows how public infrastructure, local delivery conditions, and project timing can create a more complicated readiness picture than the headline narrative suggests.

- A large customer name does not remove infrastructure or timing uncertainty.
- Teams still need a disciplined way to judge whether the pursuit deserves more effort now.

[Open the Amazon proof page](#) →

#### NAMED EXAMPLE

### Broader public proof set

Across Amazon, Applied Digital, xAI, Meta, and Microsoft, named-campus analysis can be standardized, confidence can be expressed explicitly, and site-readiness questions can be turned into a forwardable decision artifact rather than a loose market opinion.

[Browse the full proof base](#) →

#### RECURRING PATTERNS THAT MATTER

## What vendors and EPCs should keep pressure-testing

- Power-path reality matters more than headline demand.
- Long-lead equipment and infrastructure constraints should be treated as first-order signals, not afterthoughts.
- Confidence and evidence quality matter as much as the score itself.
- A named pursuit can be commercially attractive and still deserve slower, more conditional pursuit.

## DECISION SUPPORT

# The decision this supports

THIS KIND OF ANALYSIS HELPS ANSWER A PRACTICAL QUESTION:

**Should we pursue, slow-play, escalate internal review, price for risk, or walk?**

The brief is not meant to replace inside knowledge. It is meant to sharpen judgment early enough to matter.

## WHAT COMES NEXT

# Continue into the entry engagement when one named live pursuit matters

LINKED PROOF

## Project Reality Check Brief

One named target, ten business days, executive readout plus named-target snapshot plus decision memo.



## PROOF LINK

# Current public proof base

LINKED PROOF

## AI Power & Site Readiness

Current public snapshot library supporting this teaser brief.



CAVEAT

## Proof-led on purpose

This teaser brief is intentionally proof-led and built from public examples. It is not a substitute for a customer-specific brief on a named live pursuit.

NEXT STEP

### If this proof pattern is useful, start with one named target.

The next step is a Project Reality Check Brief that turns the proof pattern into a customer-specific decision brief.

[Start with the entry engagement](#)

[Open the proof base](#)