



Strategy

Research, Testing and Development

**Title: TENDER TECHNICAL
EVALUATION STRATEGY FOR A
VERTICALLY INTEGRATED SOLAR
PV MANUFACTURING FACILITY
FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Unique Identifier:

RES/TES/27/1977555

Alternative Reference
Number:

N/A

Area of Applicability:

**Research, Testing
and Development**

Documentation Type:

Strategy

Revision:

1

Total Pages:

16

Next Review Date:

N/A

Disclosure Classification:

**CONTROLLED
DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by

Functional Responsibility

Authorised by

LAMOUmakoe.....

p.p

Janine Jagers

**Lesego Moumakoe-Leshika
Chief Engineer**

**Motlalepula Dlamini
Gas and Renewables
Manager**

**Mfundo Verby
Gx Delivery Senior Manager**

Date: 16/04/2026.....

Date: 16/04/2026.....

Date: **2026.04.16**.....

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES	3
2.1 SCOPE	3
2.1.1 Purpose	3
2.1.2 Applicability	3
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES	3
2.2.1 Normative	3
2.2.2 Informative	4
2.3 DEFINITIONS	4
2.3.1 Classification	4
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS	4
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	4
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING	4
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	4
3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	5
3.2 TET MEMBERS	6
3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	8
3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	12
3.4.1 Risks	13
3.4.2 Exceptions / Conditions	15
4. AUTHORISATION	16
5. REVISIONS	16
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	16
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	16

TABLES

Table 3-1: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring	5
Table 3-2: TET Members	6
Table 3-3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 3-4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	8
Table 3-5: TET Member Responsibilities	12
Table 3-6: Unacceptable Technical Risks	13
Table 3-7: Acceptable Technical Risks	14
Table 3-8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	15
Table 3-9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	15

1. INTRODUCTION

Eskom aims to localise the Solar PV panel manufacturing value chain and establish a facility at one of its existing sites in Mpumalanga, fostering domestic value addition and job creation. The project supports the initiative of a broader strategy to localise the renewable energy value chain, reduce reliance on imports, create green jobs, and enhance industrial competitiveness.

There is a critical need to assess the technical, financial, regulatory, and market conditions required to develop a domestic solar PV manufacturing facility, anchored in the upstream extraction and processing of silicon and to determine whether such an initiative is feasible, competitive, and aligned with national development priorities.

In alignment with national policy instruments such as the Just Energy Transition Investment Plan (JET), Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Procurement Programme (REIPPPP), the Green Economy Masterplan, and the National Infrastructure Plan 2050, there is a compelling case to explore the feasibility of establishing a fully integrated PV manufacturing value chain.

The primary objective is to appoint a Transactional Advisor (TA) to deliver a robust, bankable feasibility study including all supporting documentation, analysis, conceptual engineering, costings, and legal-structural frameworks, required for Eskom to secure board, governmental, and investor approvals for the PV manufacturing facility.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The scope of this document is to capture the tender technical evaluation strategy for the feasibility study for a vertically integrated Solar PV manufacturing facility.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this tender technical evaluation strategy is to define the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Qualitative Evaluation Criteria and TET member responsibilities for tender technical evaluation. The technical evaluation strategy serves as basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document shall apply to all parties involved in the Solar PV Manufacturing Facility Project.

2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES

Parties using this document shall apply the most recent edition of the documents listed in the following paragraphs.

2.2.1 Normative

- [1] 240-168966153: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
- [2] RES/TS/27/1977554: Feasibility study for a vertically integrated PV Manufacturing Facility Technical Specification

- [3] RES/RR/26/1975055: Pre-feasibility study for localised Solar PV Manufacturing in South Africa: A Strategic Initiative for Eskom

2.2.2 Informative

- [4] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

Controlled Disclosure: Controlled Disclosure to external parties (either enforced by law, or discretionary).

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
EPCM	Engineering, Procurement and Construction Management
IP	Intellectual Property
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
PS	Power Station
PV	Photovoltaic
TA	Transactional Advisor
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-168966153: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

N/A

Controlled Disclosure

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (gatekeepers) are 'must meet' criteria. These criteria shall not be weighted, or point scored but shall be assessed on a Yes/No basis as to whether or not the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any criterion shall technically disqualify the tenderer and shall not be further evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria are weighted evaluation criteria used to identify the highest technically ranked tenderer after determining that all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria have been met. The Qualitative Evaluation Criteria are weighted to reflect the relevant importance of each criterion. The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is 70%.

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering requirements. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tender submission against the specifications and Employer's requirements.

The scoring method will be as shown Table 3-1.

Table 3-1: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring

Score	(%)	Definition
5	100	COMPLIANT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet technical requirement(s) AND; • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS Meet technical requirement(s) with; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; • Acceptable conditions.
2	40	NON-COMPLIANT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; • Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR; • Unacceptable conditions.
0	0	TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE

Controlled Disclosure

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 3-2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Kgaugelo Sokhulu	Senior Engineer, RT&D
TET 2	Lesego Moumakoe-Leshika	Chief Engineer, RT&D
TET 3	Shaun Pershad	Chief Engineer, RT&D
TET 4	Sibusiso Maphumulo	Contracts Manager, RT&D
TET 5	Bathandwa Cobo	Senior Manager, RT&D
TET 6	Sheldon Beangstrom	Senior Engineer, Gx New Business Development
TET 7	Kammy Young	IP Manager, RT&D

Controlled Disclosure

3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3-3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	Demonstrate a proven track record in transaction advisory, project development, feasibility studies, commercial structuring, and investment case preparation for large industrial, infrastructure, energy, or manufacturing projects	1.1 Project Portfolio & Case Studies (verifiable)> 10years experience as a transactional advisor with recent work within the last 5 years (total number of projects, total number of projects completed successfully and rand value of each project) 1.2 Signed Confirmation letter from client indicating completion of the feasibility study.	This gatekeeper ensures that any potential supplier has already successfully navigated the challenges and can provide credible, experience-based insights.

Controlled Disclosure

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3-4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Reference to Scope of Work	Scoring Criteria	Criteria Weighting (%)
2.	Firm competency, institutional capability, and relevant experience					
	2.1	Institutional capability and multidisciplinary coverage	<p>The tenderer provides a detailed organogram for the entire Project. The organogram shall indicate the Job positions as well as the names of the key personnel for the Project. The Tenderer shall demonstrate that it has, whether as a single firm or consortium, the collective capability to perform the full Scope of Work. The Tenderer shall submit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1 CVs for all key personnel 2.1.2 Signed statements of exclusivity and availability for all key experts 2.1.3 Certified or acceptable copies of qualification 2.1.4 Copies of professional registrations, where applicable 2.1.5 Supporting documentary evidence substantiating the experience claimed in each CV 	Refer to Section 5.1.2.	As per Table 3-6 and Table 3-7	20
	2.2	Proven track record in transaction advisory and feasibility work	<p>The Tenderer shall demonstrate a proven track record in transaction advisory; project development; feasibility studies; commercial structuring; and investment case preparation for large industrial, infrastructure, energy, or manufacturing projects.</p>	Refer to Section 5.1.2	As per Table 3-6 and Table 3-7	25

Controlled Disclosure

			<p>The Tenderer shall provide contactable project references for comparable assignments completed within the last 10 years. References shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2.1 Project title and location 2.2.2 Client name 2.2.3 Nature of the services provided 2.2.4 Project value and/or scale, where applicable 2.2.5 Duration of the assignment 2.2.6 Role of the Tenderer; and 2.2.7 Project outcome. 			
	2.3	Previous experience in engagement with relevant market participants	<p>The Tenderer shall demonstrate that it has, whether as a single firm or consortium, the collective capability to perform the full Scope of Work, including expertise in PV Manufacturing (Completed and/or in progress projects with contactable references). The Tenderer demonstrates experience in structured engagement with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3.1 OEMs and Local manufacturers. 2.3.2 Technology licensors 2.3.3 Industrial partners 2.3.4 Investors and/or development finance institutions 2.3.5 Public sector institutions 	Refer to Section 5.1.2	As per Table 3-6 and Table 3-7	10
3.	Feasibility Study Experience and Methodology					
	3.1	Study Methodology, Approach and Understanding of the Scope of Work	<p>The Tenderer shall submit a detailed technical proposal describing its methodology and approach to the execution of the Scope of Work.</p> <p>The proposal shall address the following:</p>	Refer to Section 5.2	As per Table 3-6 and Table 3-7	40

Controlled Disclosure

			<p>3.1.1 Understanding of the Project and Eskom's objectives</p> <p>3.1.2 Understanding of the role of the TA as an independent advisor</p> <p>3.1.3 Approach to full PV value chain assessment.</p> <p>3.1.4 Approach to mineral beneficiation assessment</p> <p>3.1.5 Approach to local industry development assessment</p> <p>3.1.6 Approach to Camden as the reference site and to the independent optimum Eskom site assessment</p> <p>3.1.7 Approach to modular financial modelling by stream and for the integrated value chain</p> <p>3.1.8 Approach to ownership, partnership, and commercial structuring options, including JV options</p> <p>3.1.9 Approach to business case and investment case preparation</p> <p>3.1.10 Approach to the preparation of Works Information for the future EPC contractor appointment</p> <p>3.1.11 Approach to EPC-phase consultation / advisory support, if required by Eskom</p> <p>3.1.12 Proposed work plan (in gantt format?), sequencing and phasing, integration of workstreams, and programme; and dependencies</p> <p>3.1.13 Proposed quality assurance and risk management approach.</p> <p>3.1.14 Proposed IP licensing terms, technology transfer, knowledge sharing frameworks, IP protection mechanisms.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Controlled Disclosure

4.	Independence, conflict management, and role clarity				
4.1	<p>The Tenderer shall demonstrate that it understands and accepts the requirement that the TA must remain independent and shall not be appointed under this contract as the OEM, technology licensor, EPC Consultant, or implementing entity for the Project. The Tenderer shall provide:</p> <p>4.1.1 A statement confirming its independence</p> <p>4.1.2 A conflict-of-interest disclosure for the lead firm, consortium members, subconsultants, and key experts, that ensures current and future conflicts of interest are identified and managed</p> <p>4.1.3 A description of how conflicts will be identified, disclosed, avoided, mitigated, and managed; and</p> <p>4.1.4 Confirmation that its proposed approach will preserve procurement fairness, competition neutrality, and transparency.</p>	Refer to Section 4.2	As per Table 3-6 and Table 3-7	5	

Controlled Disclosure

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 3-5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5	TET 6	TET 7
1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5	TET 6	TET 7
1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Controlled Disclosure

3.4.1 Risks

Table 3-6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
2.1	0: Organogram not provided
2.2	0: The Tenderer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides no comparable project experience; and/or • Provides no usable reference information; and/or • Submits insufficient information to permit evaluation.
2.3	0: Demonstrates no experience engaging relevant stakeholders
3.1	0: The Tenderer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides no meaningful methodology; and/or • Fails to demonstrate understanding of the Scope of Work; and/or • Submits insufficient information to permit evaluation.
4.1	0: The Tenderer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides no independence statement; and/or • fails to disclose conflicts of interest; and/or • provides no meaningful response to this criterion.

Controlled Disclosure

Table 3-7: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
2.1	2: 5 ≥ specialised expertise areas shown and CVs provided 4: 6 ≤ specialised expertise areas shown and CVs provided ≤10 5: All required specialist areas expertise presented and CVs provided
2.2	2: Provides only limited, weak, or indirectly relevant comparable project experience; and/or Provides reference assignments that do not sufficiently match the nature or complexity of the required scope; and/or Fails to demonstrate adequate experience in comparable feasibility, commercial structuring, or industrial project assignments 4: The tender demonstrates comparable project experience that is generally relevant, but not fully aligned in scale, scope, sector, or complexity. 5: Demonstrates strong and directly relevant experience in one or more comparable assignments involving industrial project feasibility, manufacturing project development, or large-scale energy / infrastructure commercial structuring or Provides multiple highly relevant reference projects of similar complexity, scale, and scope;
2.3	2: Demonstrates some experience engaging relevant stakeholders (OEMs and/or local manufactures, technology licensors, industrial partners, investors and public sector institutions) with general assembly and manufacturing experience. 4: Demonstrates strong experience engaging relevant stakeholders (OEMs and/or local manufactures, technology licensors, industrial partners, investors and public sector institutions) with general assembly and manufacturing experience 5: Demonstrates strong experience engaging relevant stakeholders (OEMs and/or local manufactures, technology licensors, industrial partners, investors and public sector institutions) with PV (assembly or Manufacturing) experience
3.1	2: Demonstrates a general sound understanding of the Scope of Work and present a methodology that addresses ≤ 6 work streams. 4: Demonstrates a generally sound understanding of the Scope of Work and present a methodology that addresses ≥ 6 work streams but ≤11. 5: Demonstrates a clear, detailed, and coherent understanding of the full Scope of Work and presents a well-structured methodology that fully addresses al the required workstreams

Controlled Disclosure

4.1	<p>2: The Tenderer: Does not clearly demonstrate independence from OEM, licensing, EPC, EPCM, or implementation roles; and/or provides incomplete, weak, or concerning conflict-of-interest disclosures; and/or presents arrangements that may compromise procurement neutrality, advisory independence, or governance integrity; and/or</p> <p>4: The Tenderer generally demonstrates independence and acceptable role clarity, but with minor qualifications, clarifications, or conditions.</p> <p>5: The Tenderer: Clearly demonstrates understanding of the requirement that the TA must remain independent and may not act as OEM, technology licensor, EPC Consultant, EPC contractor, EPCM contractor, or implementing entity under this appointment and provides clear and credible conflict-of-interest disclosures for the lead firm, consortium members, subconsultants, and key experts.</p>
-----	---

3.4.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 3-8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 3-9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

Controlled Disclosure

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Bathandwa Cobo	Senior Manager, RT&D
Dana Gampel	Corporate Specialist, JET
Kammy Young	IP Manager, RT&D
Kgaugelo Sokhulu	Senior Engineer, RT&D
Menzie Sithole	Project Manager, Gx
Mfundo Verby	Senior Manager, RT&D
Motlalepula Dlamini	Middle Manager, RT&D
Natasha Krige	Chief Advisor, Corporate Finance
Nombulelo Lukhele	R&R Representative, Camden P/S
Ouma Bosaletsi	Senior Manager, RT&D
Shaun Pershad	Chief Engineer, RT&D
Sheldon Beangstrom	Senior Engineer, Gx New Business Development
Sibusiso Maphumulo	Contracts Manager, RT&D
Viren Heera	Chief Engineer, Gx Engineering

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
April 2026	0.1	L Moumakoe-Leshika	New document (draft for review)
April 2026	1	L Moumakoe-Leshika	Approved Final Document

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

The following people were involved in the development of this document:

- Kgaugelo Sokhulu
- Lesego Moumakoe-Leshika

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A

Controlled Disclosure