FIVE 9S DIGITAL · APRIL 2026

Why the Data Center Tier System Is Broken.

A critique of the industry's dominant evaluation standard — and the framework we believe will replace it.

Every major data center transaction, lease, and loan still references a rating system designed for a world that no longer exists.

The Uptime Institute published its first Tier Performance Standards in 1995 to answer one specific, well-defined question: can a data center survive common failure modes without service interruption? The standard was elegant precisely because it measured one thing well — redundancy topology at design time.

That same standard now underwrites cap rates, sizes loans, sets insurance premiums, and writes lease covenants. The gap between what the rating measures and what it is being asked to signal is where systemic mispricing lives — and the cost of that anachronism is already measurable.

This brief makes the case for why the Tier system has failed as a market signal, what it is costing investors and operators, and what the next decade of evaluation must look like. It closes with the Five 9s Framework — five dimensions, one scorecard, designed for the workloads, capital, and operational realities of 2030.

01 · THE PROBLEM

A single rating is doing too much work.

The Tier rating has become the data center industry's credit score — with none of the predictive power.

The credit-score analogy is not rhetorical. It is diagnostic.

Credit scores have predictive power because they are continuously updated, multi-factor, and based on observed behavior over time. A FICO score is designed to predict the future probability of default; the system is disciplined by its own backtest. Tier ratings have none of these properties. They are assigned once at design time, rarely re-audited, based on a single factor (redundancy topology), and — outside of Uptime Institute's certification track — often self-applied. They describe a facility's diagram, not its outcomes.

The drift happened in four stages.

The Tier Performance Standard began as an engineering specification — a rigorous vocabulary used by architects and consultants to define topology. In the 2000s, colocation providers discovered it as a sales differentiator. By the 2010s, master lease agreements were routinely referencing Tier III as the operating standard. Today, cap-rate spreads, loan covenants, and insurance premiums are priced off a rating whose rigor was enforced only in stage one. 'Tier III equivalent' — self-applied, uncertified — has become a commercial adjective, not a classification.

THE TAKEAWAY

Markets that price assets on static, single-variable ratings are markets waiting for a repricing event. The decoupling between Tier designation and real-world outcomes is an arbitrage opportunity for informed capital — and a systemic risk for uninformed capital.

WHAT THE TIER RATING ACTUALLY DOES — AND DOESN'T — ANSWER

What Tier measures	What markets treat it as
Redundancy topology at design time.	Operational reliability, workload fit, investment quality.

02 · WHERE THE SIGNAL FAILS

Three ways the Tier rating misses what drives outcomes.

Each failure mode is visible in the public record. None is priced.

01

Operations, not design, cause most outages.

Uptime Institute's *Annual Outage Analysis 2024* attributes 66–80% of downtime incidents to direct or indirect human error. Among human-caused outages, staff failing to follow established procedures is the leading factor at 48%[1]. The dominant failure mode is operational — a dimension Tier ratings do not evaluate. Uptime itself addresses this through its *Management & Operations (M&O) Stamp of Approval*, a distinct certification introduced in 2010[2] — yet the market continues to price off Tier, not M&O.

02

Modern workloads stress dimensions Tier doesn't measure.

Uptime's *Global Data Center Survey 2024* reports an average rack density of ~8 kW[3] — but the upper tail is moving fast. NVIDIA's GB200 NVL72, now the reference AI training platform, draws ~120 kW per rack and mandates direct liquid cooling[4]. A Tier IV facility designed for 12 kW air-cooled racks may be Tier IV on paper and structurally unusable for the tenant base that will define demand for the next decade.

03

Within-class variance exceeds between-class variance.

If the Tier rating were the dominant driver of outcomes, you would expect tight clustering of incident frequency inside each class and clear gaps between classes. The observed pattern is the reverse: facilities with identical Tier ratings exhibit outage frequencies varying by more than 5x. The signal is noisy relative to the signal investors are pricing off of. This is the empirical core: the rating is not wrong; it is under-powered for the job the market has assigned it.

[1] Uptime Institute, Annual Outage Analysis 2024. See also Data Center Dynamics coverage at datacenterdynamics.com.
[2] Uptime Institute, Management & Operations Stamp of Approval product overview, introduced 2010. uptimeinstitute.com/tiers/management-operations.
[3] Uptime Institute, Global Data Center Survey 2024. intelligence.uptimeinstitute.com.
[4] NVIDIA GB200 NVL72 product specifications; Supermicro SuperCluster datasheet; The Register, March 2024. nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/gb200-nvl72.

The mispricing is real. And it's getting larger.

When a rating system loses its discriminating power, it creates arbitrage. In data centers, the arbitrage is now running at scale.

Three patterns are visible across recent transaction activity. Each compounds into capital moving to the wrong assets at the wrong prices.

The Tier premium on cap rates.

Institutional capital typically prices a 75–150 bps tighter cap rate on Tier IV vs Tier II/III assets of comparable market and tenancy. The empirical support for that premium — i.e., evidence that Tier IV facilities produce measurably more stable NOI — is thin. Sophisticated buyers have been acquiring well-run Tier II/III assets the market misprices through its Tier-IV bias.

The lease premium without the contractual protection.

Tenants routinely pay 15–25% rent premiums for Tier III over Tier II designation. In a dispute, the Tier rating is legally inert; remedies live in the SLA schedule. The rating commands pricing; it does not carry liability.

The workload-fit time bomb.

AI tenants who signed 2022–2024 leases on 10–15 kW air-cooled facilities are now facing 50–120 kW liquid-cooled requirements. Many of those leases reference Tier designation but are silent on density, cooling, and power upgrades — setting up a wave of retrofit disputes over the next 24 months.

AND THE NEW VARIABLE THE TIER SYSTEM DOESN'T PRICE AT ALL

Dominion Energy acknowledges up to seven-year waits for new large-load interconnections in Northern Virginia[1]; LBNL's *Queued Up 2025* finds median IR-to-COD has doubled to 4+ years industry-wide[2]. Tier ratings are silent on MW secured, entitled, or connected — now the variable that determines whether a site is viable.

[1] Bloomberg, "Virginia Data Centers Face Seven-Year Wait for Power Hookups," Aug 2024. Dominion Energy statement; Data Center Dynamics coverage.
[2] Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, Queued Up 2025 Edition, emp.lbl.gov/queues. Median IR-to-COD has risen from <2 years (2000–2007) to >4 years (2018–2024).

04 · COUNTERARGUMENTS

Why the system persists — and why that doesn't justify it.

Criticism is cheap. Replacement is hard. The honest counterarguments deserve honest rebuttals.

COUNTER

“It's standardized.”

A shared vocabulary reduces transaction friction. Tier ratings accelerate RFPs, leases, and underwriting. Incumbency is a real feature of any market standard.

REBUTTAL

True — but a standard is only as useful as its discriminating power. When 80%+ of multi-tenant colocation claims the same rating, the standard has stopped doing its job. We argue for layering, not abolition.

COUNTER

“Insurance, lenders, and procurement reference it.”

Tier designations are embedded in insurance underwriting, lender covenants, and enterprise procurement. Replacing the standard requires moving three layers simultaneously.

REBUTTAL

Layering is easier than replacing. ASTM material standards coexist with LEED, USGBC, and WELL in construction — each answers a different question. Data center evaluation should layer the same way, with Tier as one input inside a broader assessment.

COUNTER

“Alternatives have tried and failed.”

ANSI/TIA-942, BICSI, and regional standards exist. None have achieved market share comparable to Uptime's Tier system. The bar for replacement is high.

REBUTTAL

The sophisticated end of the market — hyperscalers, top infrastructure funds, specialist REITs — has already moved past Tier-as-the-standard. They run proprietary multi-dimension audits. The published market standard is already, de facto, not the standard allocating capital.

The question is not whether Tier survives. It is whether it remains a five-factor rating hidden in a one-factor label — or one input in a framework that actually reflects how the market values assets.

05 · THE FUTURE OF EVALUATION

Four forces Tier was never designed to evaluate.

Any framework fit for 2026 underwriting must price all four as first-class inputs — not footnotes.

Workload evolution.

Average rack density is drifting upward and the tail is moving sharply. NVIDIA's GB200 NVL72 — now the reference AI training platform — draws ~120 kW per rack and mandates direct liquid cooling. Facilities underwritten without reference to density, cooling topology, and power-upgrade paths will be mispriced in both directions over the next cycle.

Hyperscale dominance.

CBRE reports 74.3% of under-construction capacity in U.S. primary markets was preleased as of H1 2025, overwhelmingly to hyperscalers; primary-market vacancy hit a record-low 1.6%[1]. Hyperscale procurement specs bypass Tier entirely — they evaluate on proprietary criteria covering power, thermal, commissioning, and M&O contracts. As their share of demand grows, the gap between their standards and the industry's vocabulary widens.

Power as the binding constraint.

Power, not space, is the binding constraint in every U.S. primary market. Dominion Energy's acknowledged seven-year interconnection wait in Northern Virginia is the clearest signal; LBNL's queue analysis confirms median interconnection timelines have more than doubled industry-wide[2]. Site value is now determined primarily by MW secured, entitled, and connected. Tier ratings say nothing about any of this.

Operational transparency.

Airlines publish on-time statistics. Hospitals publish infection rates. Data center operators publish design certifications. The next decade's standard will be observable rather than designed — verified uptime history, M&O rigor, incident response cadence. Operators who move first will earn the premium the market currently overpays to Tier IV.

[1] CBRE North America Data Center Trends H1 2025. cbre.com/insights/reports.
[2] See footnotes on page 4.

Five 9s, redefined.

For two decades, 'five nines' meant one number: 99.999% uptime. That number obscures more than it reveals. We reclaim the phrase. Five 9s is five dimensions — each a non-negotiable standard for modern data center value.

P.O.W.E.R

01

Power Architecture

MW secured. Expansion entitled. Source mix and PPA tenure. Rack density supported and upgradable. Grid interconnection status and utility relationship. The dimension Tier most conspicuously ignores — and the dimension that determines whether a site is viable at all in 2026.

02

Operational Execution

3–5 year incident log, independently verified. M&O program maturity. Staff tenure, coverage, and certification. Incident response benchmarks. Commissioning rigor. The dimension where 66–80% of outage risk actually lives — yet the dimension Tier under-weights most severely.

03

Workload Fit

Density supported and upgradable. Cooling topology (air / liquid / DLC). Network fabric and carrier density. Latency profile. Scalability under density evolution. Converts a facility from an asset into a platform — or reveals a misfit the Tier rating cannot see.

04

Economic Durability

Tenant credit and concentration. Lease WALT, structure, escalators. Downside re-lease scenarios. CapEx reinvestment needs. Contractual protections. Where the investment-grade thesis actually lives — and where the Tier system is structurally silent.

05

Resilience

Design topology (Tier as one input). Fiber path diversity. Climate risk and mitigation. Cybersecurity posture. Physical security and continuity of operations. Absorbs what Tier measures well and extends to the risks Tier does not.

HOW TO USE IT

Each dimension scored 1–5. Weighting tailored to use case: an AI tenant weights P and W with O as a gate; an investor weights E and O as structural; an operator uses all five as a roadmap. Tier sits inside Resilience — bounded to what it measures well.

CLOSING · APRIL 2026

The market will price on these dimensions by 2030. The only question is when you start.

WHAT TO DO WITH THIS

For investors — stop pricing off the Tier rating alone. The arbitrage against Tier-biased pricing is visible to any buyer willing to diligence operations, workload fit, and power position.

For tenants — stop paying a Tier premium for what your SLA schedule actually contracts for. Negotiate on density roadmaps, cooling upgrade paths, power expansion rights, and operational reporting — the dimensions your lease is probably silent on.

For operators — publish what you can verify. Observed uptime, M&O rigor, incident response. The first mover on operational transparency will own the next premium — and the Tier IV premium you currently overpay will come from somewhere.

FIVE 9s DIGITAL

Doug Hollidge · Founder
704.651.2210 · Doug@Five9sDigital.com
www.Five9sDigital.com