

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

Appointment of a Programme Management and Delivery Integration Firm for Work Packages 1 and 2 of the Municipal Distribution Just Energy Transition (MDxJET) Initiative

Contracting authority	African Climate Foundation
Implementing partner	JET Project Management Unit (JET PMU), The Presidency of South Africa
Contract period	Twenty-seven-month period (last quarter-2026 to 31 December 2028)
Estimated level of effort / budget	The exact budget for this assignment cannot be disclosed, as price forms part of the evaluation criteria. Bidders are encouraged to review the RFP in full and to use the contents hereof to inform the costing of their proposals.
Location	South Africa, list of municipalities provided
Mandatory Briefing session	27 August 2026 15h30 – 16h30 SAST Bidders can register for briefing by emailing essrfp@africanclimatefoundation.org by no later than 26 August 17h00 SAST
Submission portal	RFP-27-JETPMU
PLEASE NOTE NO SUBMISSIONS VIA EMAIL WILL BE ACCEPTED	
Proposal submission deadline	30 September 2026 (17h00 SA standard time)
Queries	For any technical queries, please contact essrfp@africanclimatefoundation.org via email with subject: <i>RFP27 - Programme Management and Delivery Integration for Work Packages 1 and 2 of the Municipal Distribution Just Energy Transition (MDxJET) Initiative</i> . For technical assistance with the portal, please reach out to grants@africanclimatefoundation.org
Deadline for queries	3 September 2026 (17h00 SA standard time)
Queries posted link	RFP27 - Questions and Answers - Google Docs

1. INTRODUCTION

The African Climate Foundation (ACF), acting in its capacity as fiscal host to the Just Energy Transition Project Management Unit (JET PMU) in The Presidency of the Republic of South Africa, invites suitably qualified firms

to submit proposals for the provision of programme management services for delivery of the IKI¹-funded Municipal Distribution Just Energy Transition (MDxJET) Initiative from third quarter 2026 to 31 December 2028.

The MDxJET forms part of the Municipal JET Portfolio of South Africa's Just Energy Transition Implementation Plan (JET IP)², seeking to strengthen the readiness of municipalities to plan, prepare and access investment for electricity distribution modernisation and participation in the evolving electricity market. The Municipal JET Portfolio lead institution is the South African Local Government Association (SALGA). This IKI-funded MDxJET Initiative is managed by the JET PMU, supported by a steering committee, and will report into the multi-stakeholder JET Municipal Council which is chaired by SALGA.

This Request for Proposals (RFP) relates specifically to Work Package 1 (Municipal Readiness Assessments) and Work Package 2 (Capability Support Planning and Implementation Roadmaps) of the MDxJET. The successful bidder will be appointed as the Programme Management and Delivery Integration Firm (PMDIF), responsible for programme coordination and integration, delivery partner model design and execution, methodology governance, and assisting the ACF with procurement of municipality-specific delivery partner firms for the delivery of the Work Packages at 20 municipalities, thereafter, providing programme management, integration, oversight, and quality assurance of each delivery partner firm.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

South African municipalities which are licensed by the National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) for electricity distribution play a critical role in the country's energy transition. As the electricity sector evolves toward a more decentralised and market-oriented model, municipalities will increasingly be required to operate not only as infrastructure owners and service delivery institutions, but also as more sophisticated energy system actors capable of integrating distributed generation, facilitating wheeling arrangements, improving network resilience, and expanding access to underserved communities.

Despite this strategic role, many municipalities face significant institutional, technical and financial constraints that limit their ability to attract investment or deliver complex infrastructure programmes. These challenges include ageing distribution infrastructure, high levels of debt to Eskom, weak utility governance, limited project preparation capability, electricity losses, revenue leakage, constrained procurement capacity, and varying readiness for market reforms such as embedded generation and wheeling.

¹ The International Climate Initiative (IKI) is an international funding programme of the German Federal Ministry for Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation, and Nuclear Safety.

² <https://justenergytransition.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/JET-Implementation-Plan-2023-2027-1.pdf>

In response to these challenges, the JET PMU, through its fiscal host, the ACF, has secured funding from IKI for the JET PMU to implement a structured municipal support initiative (the MDxJET Initiative) aimed at improving municipal investment readiness and accelerating implementation capability to fulfil their electricity distribution roles.

The MDxJET Initiative will be implemented with the following 20 licensed electricity-distributing municipalities, delivered in phased cohorts over the period mid-2026 to 31 December 2028. These 20 municipalities collectively account for approximately 74.7% of municipal electricity distribution revenue, demonstrating that the MDxJET Initiative is targeting the majority of South Africa's municipal distribution market while maintaining geographic representation across all provinces.

Top 20 municipalities by share of electricity sales in the FY ended 30 June 2023 (s71 data from National Treasury database).

	MUNICIPALITY	% SHARE	Province
1	Ekurhuleni	12.9	Gauteng
2	City of Johannesburg	11.8	Gauteng
3	City of Cape Town	11.6	Western Cape
4	eThekweni	11.0	KwaZulu Natal
5	Tshwane	7.3	Gauteng
6	Nelson Mandela Bay	3.2	Eastern Cape
7	Rustenburg	2.4	North West
8	Emfuleni	2.1	Gauteng
9	Mangaung	2.0	Free State
10	Umsunduzi	1.9	KwaZulu Natal
11	Buffalo City	1.5	Eastern Cape
12	uMhlathuze	1.2	KwaZulu Natal
13	Drakenstein	1.0	Western Cape
14	Mbombela	0.9	Mpumalanga
15	Polokwane	0.8	Limpopo
16	Mogale City	0.8	Gauteng
17	Emalahleni	0.7	Mpumalanga
18	City of Matlosana	0.6	North West
19	Stellenbosch	0.5	Western Cape
20	Kimberley	0.5	Northern Cape
Total		74.7	

The broader MDxJET Initiative architecture is structured as follows:

Work Package	Description	Delivery Model
WP1	Municipal Readiness Assessments	Managed through this procurement
WP2	Capability Support Planning and Implementation Roadmaps	Managed through this procurement
WP3	Project Preparation	Separate procurement/s

The outputs of Work Packages 1 and 2 are intended to provide a structured pathway toward investment readiness and create a pipeline into downstream project preparation and financing.

3. PROCUREMENT MODEL

This procurement model is intended to balance programme oversight, delivery quality, efficiency, scalability, and inclusive and localised participation.

Rather than directly appointing a single firm to undertake both Work Packages in all 20 municipalities under one scope of work, the JET PMU intends to appoint a PMDIF that will work with the ACF and the JET PMU to prepare tailored terms of reference per municipality and assist the ACF to procure appropriately qualified, locally based firms in accordance with the agreed partner delivery model (*see section 6 of this RFP*). In addition to preparing the Terms of Reference, the PMDIF will advise on the procurement process, advertising methods, and undertake the initial screening of suitable firms for consideration by ACF, who will conduct the final review and make the appointment. The delivery partner firms will be appointed for the tailored terms of reference to deliver the Work Packages concurrently across the 20 municipalities. The municipality-specific activities of Work Packages 1 and 2 will thus be undertaken through municipality-level delivery partner firms operating under the supervision of the PMDIF. The PMDIF will be responsible for programme governance, methodology development, delivery coordination, technical quality assurance, stakeholder management, and performance oversight. The exact process for the contracting and payment of each delivery partner firm shall be undertaken within the framework of the pre-determined budgets and performance-based protocols agreed between the JET PMU, ACF, and the PMDIF.

This model has been intentionally designed to achieve multiple strategic objectives. It allows each Work Package to be scoped appropriately for the conditions of each municipality, it reduces supplier concentration risk, improves scalability across a geographically dispersed programme, embeds contextual delivery capacity closer to municipalities, and creates meaningful participation opportunities for smaller and emerging firms

that may otherwise be excluded from large programme management procurements. The model also supports transformation, supplier development, localisation, and capability building within the broader municipal infrastructure advisory ecosystem.

While delivery execution will be distributed, overall accountability for programme performance will remain with the appointed PMDIF.

4. OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The objective of this assignment is to appoint a suitably qualified PMDIF to oversee the implementation of Work Packages 1 and 2 across the 20 participating municipalities.

The appointed PMDIF will establish a consistent but appropriately scoped, programme-wide implementation methodology, assist in procurement of delivery partner firms, coordinate and manage the delivery partner firms, ensure quality assurance and comparability of outputs, oversee stakeholder engagement, manage programme performance and delivery risk, and support the progression of municipalities toward investment readiness.

The assignment is expected to create a coherent bridge between municipal diagnostics, institutional capability strengthening, and downstream project preparation and financing pathways.

5. SCOPE OF SERVICES

The scope of services to be performed by the PMDIF comprises two interrelated components: programme management and delivery integration, and technical oversight of Work Packages 1 and 2.

5.1 Programme Management and Delivery Integration

This includes responsibility for programme mobilisation, implementation planning, cohort sequencing, municipality-specific terms of reference for Work Packages 1 and 2, procurement of municipality-specific delivery partners in line with IKI and ACF procurement guidelines, governance support, performance monitoring, issue escalation, risk management, stakeholder coordination, and programme-wide reporting.

Following their procurement by ACF (with assistance from the PMDIF), each delivery partner firm will be contracted on terms to be finalised between the PMDIF, JET PMU, and the ACF.

A critical aspect of the assignment will be the PMDIF's effective management of the delivery partner firms once they are procured. The PMDIF will be required to onboard, coordinate, support and oversee these delivery

partner firms, ensuring consistent application of programme methodologies and quality standards per defined terms of reference for Work Packages 1 and 2 at each municipality.

The PMDIF will also be responsible for programme-wide knowledge management, including benchmarking, synthesis of municipal findings, lessons learned, and generation of insights to inform appropriate support programming for Work Package 3.

The PMDIF shall implement a formal quality assurance (QA) system for all programme outputs. At minimum, each municipality-level deliverable shall pass four quality gates: methodology approval, draft technical review, municipal validation, and final JET PMU acceptance. The QA system must include approved templates, review checklists, technical sign-off, version control, evidence files, comment-resolution logs, cross-municipality consistency checks, and escalation procedures for quality failures.

Given the intended progression of municipalities into downstream distribution systems investment preparation, the PMDIF will thus manage the interface between the outputs of Work Packages 1 and 2 and their handover to JET PMU for the procurement by ACF of project preparation services under Work Package 3 (WP3).

For each municipality, the PMDIF shall prepare a WP3 Handover File to support downstream project preparation. The WP3 Handover File must include prioritised project concepts, readiness status, evidence base, technical assumptions, financial assumptions, municipal approvals or endorsements, safeguards risks, Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) or Gender Lens Investing (GLI) considerations, implementation dependencies, financing pathway, recommended next steps and suggested scope for downstream project preparation procurement.

The principal programme management responsibilities of the PMDIF are summarised below:

Functional Area	Responsibility
Programme Mobilisation	Inception planning, municipal onboarding, implementation scheduling, terms of reference scoping per municipality for Work Packages 1 and 2
Procurement	Assist ACF in procurement of delivery partner firms per municipality (or group of municipalities) in line with IKI and ACF procurement guidance. This includes preparing the ToR, advising on the procurement process, advertising methods, and undertaking the initial screening of suitable firms for consideration by ACF, who will conduct the final review and make the appointment. The exact process for the contracting and payment of each delivery partner firm shall be agreed with the appointed PMDIF.
Governance & Controls	Performance oversight, milestone management, issue escalation

Delivery Integration	Coordination and management of municipality-level delivery partner firms
Quality Assurance	Methodology governance, review processes, scoring consistency
Stakeholder Management	Engagement with municipalities and ecosystem stakeholders
Reporting	Progress reporting, dashboards, risk registers, governance reporting
Knowledge Management	Benchmarking, synthesis, lessons learned
WP3 Interface	Handover and integration for downstream project preparation

5.2 Work Package 1: Municipal Readiness Assessments

Work Package 1 is intended to establish a robust understanding of each municipality's current readiness to plan, prepare and implement electricity distribution modernisation.

The PMDIF will be responsible for designing the programme-wide assessment methodology, municipality-specific terms of reference scoping, and ensuring consistent implementation through the municipality-specific delivery partner firms.

The Readiness Assessments must consider institutional, technical, financial and market readiness, as well as implementation delivery capability per municipality.

The readiness framework is expected to include, at minimum, the following dimensions:

Assessment Dimension	Indicative Focus Areas
Institutional Readiness	Governance, operating models, leadership capability, internal delivery structures
Technical Readiness	Asset condition, substations, feeders, maintenance systems, digitisation maturity
Financial Readiness	Revenue collection, tariff adequacy, cost recovery, capital planning, financing constraints
Market Reform Readiness	Embedded generation, wheeling, Small Scale Embedded Generation (SSEG) capability, hosting capacity, South African Wholesale Electricity Market (SAWEM) preparedness
Energy Access Readiness	Electrification backlog, informal settlement access, decentralised energy opportunities
Delivery Readiness	Procurement maturity, supply chain readiness, safeguards, implementation risk

The PMDIF shall develop a Readiness Scoring Guide for approval by the JET PMU before fieldwork begins. The Guide must define scoring levels, evidence requirements, scoring criteria, validation steps and treatment of missing or conflicting evidence. No readiness score may be assigned solely on the basis of self-assessment. Each score must be supported by municipal documentation, technical data, financial data, interviews, site observations or other verifiable evidence.

Moreover, the PMDIF shall integrate Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) and Gender Lens Investing (GLI) considerations into all relevant methodologies, diagnostics, readiness scorecards, capability support plans, stakeholder engagement processes, project prioritisation outputs and programme reports. Deliverables must identify inclusion-related risks, beneficiary considerations, disaggregated data needs, gender-responsive investment opportunities, and evidence required to assess alignment with the programme's GLI criteria.

The output of Work Package 1 should provide both municipality-specific diagnostics and programme-wide comparative insights.

Expected WP1 Outputs

Output	Description
Municipal Readiness Assessment Report	Full municipal diagnostic
Readiness Scorecard	Structured scoring framework
Gap Analysis	Priority constraints and intervention areas
Investment Readiness Profile	Summary municipal positioning
Comparative Benchmarking Report	Cross-municipality analysis
Programme Findings Report	Strategic programme synthesis

5.3 Work Package 2: Capability Support Planning

Building on the diagnostic outputs of Work Package 1, Work Package 2 will support the development of practical, sequenced capability strengthening pathways for participating municipalities.

The purpose of this Work Package is to provide a realistic roadmap for progression toward implementation readiness and investment mobilisation.

Capability Support Plans should address institutional strengthening, governance improvements, technical capability development, procurement strengthening, project management capability, financial management interventions, reform readiness, and delivery pathways for energy access implementation.

Each municipal plan should clearly articulate intervention sequencing, indicative resource requirements, dependencies, risks, and implementation milestones.

Programme-wide synthesis should also identify recurring capability constraints and inform future ecosystem interventions.

Expected WP2 Outputs

Output	Description
---------------	--------------------

Capability Support Plan	Municipality-specific intervention plan
Implementation Roadmap	Sequenced progression pathway
Municipal Readiness Advancement Framework	Pathway toward investment readiness
Programme Capability Synthesis Report	Cross-cutting programme insights

5.4 Deliverables, Acceptance Criteria and Sign-off

The PMDIF shall submit a Deliverables and Acceptance Matrix. The matrix must identify each deliverable, due date, responsible party, minimum content requirements, evidence requirements, review authority, acceptance authority, revision process, quality standard and payment linkage. Submission of a deliverable shall not constitute acceptance. A deliverable shall only be considered complete once it has met the agreed acceptance criteria, incorporated required revisions and been formally accepted in writing by the JET PMU.

5.5 Secretariat and Programme Coordination Support

The PMDIF shall provide secretariat and programme coordination support to the JET PMU for the duration of the assignment. This entails but not limited to:

- Coordinating programme governance structures, meetings, and engagements;
- Preparing of meeting agendas, reports, and supporting documentation;
- Recording of proceedings and preparation of minutes and action registers;
- Tracking the implementation of decisions and agreed actions;
- Coordinating reporting inputs from delivery partner firms and municipalities;
- Maintaining programme records and document repositories;
- Supporting stakeholder engagements and communication activities;
- Preparing periodic progress reports, dashboards and briefing materials;
- Providing logistical and administrative support for programme governance forums, workshops and engagements.

5.6 MEL Alignment and Evidence Requirements

The PMDIF shall align programme monitoring, reporting and deliverable tracking with the approved MEL Framework for the JET Municipal Portfolio. This includes maintaining municipal pipeline data, readiness milestones, implementation evidence, data quality records, GESI/GLI-related information, and learning products required for utilisation-focused monitoring and implementation evaluation. The PMDIF shall support

data quality assessments and ensure that reported results are valid, reliable, timely, precise and supported by auditable evidence.

5.7 Indicative Downstream Project Opportunity Areas

A core objective of the MDxJET Initiative Workstreams 1 and 2 is to support participating municipalities in progressing beyond diagnostic assessment toward the identification and maturation of credible infrastructure interventions capable of advancing into downstream project preparation and financing pathways (Workstream 3).

While the specific pipeline emerging from the programme will be informed by municipality-specific diagnostics, readiness findings, institutional priorities, and governance processes, bidders should recognise that the MDxJET Initiative is intended to drive a broad municipal energy transition infrastructure agenda rather than produce a narrow technical assessment exercise.

The intention is to create a practical bridge between municipal capability development and infrastructure investment mobilisation.

As such, bidders should demonstrate an understanding of the types of interventions likely to emerge from participating municipalities and should ensure that proposed methodologies, technical expertise, and delivery partner models are capable of supporting these pathways.

Indicative downstream project opportunity areas are outlined below.

Project Opportunity Area	Indicative Intervention Types	Strategic Objective
Distribution Network Modernisation	Substation refurbishment and expansion, transformer upgrades, feeder rehabilitation, switchgear modernisation, Medium Voltage (MV)/Low Voltage (LV) network strengthening, protection systems	Improve network reliability, resilience and operational performance
Utility Digitisation & Smart Grid Systems	Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA), Advanced Distribution Management System (ADMS), Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping, digital control rooms, smart sensors, forecasting systems, network visibility tools	Improve operational efficiency, system intelligence and planning capability
Revenue Enhancement & Loss Reduction	Smart metering, Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), billing modernisation, tamper detection, energy balancing, technical and non-technical loss reduction interventions	Improve municipal utility financial sustainability and strengthen bankability

Embedded Generation & Renewable Integration	SSEG integration upgrades, hosting capacity upgrades, voltage management, inverter compatibility, bi-directional network upgrades	Enable decentralised energy integration and support municipal energy transition readiness
Market Reform & Wheeling Readiness	Wheeling settlement systems, energy accounting platforms, time-of-use systems, market participation infrastructure	Prepare municipalities for participation in evolving electricity market reforms
Energy Storage & Grid Flexibility	Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), peak demand management infrastructure, resilience storage, microgrid integration support	Improve flexibility, resilience and renewable integration capability
Energy Access & Electrification	Mini-grids, microgrids, last-mile electrification, informal settlement electrification, decentralised community energy solutions	Expand inclusive energy access and support just transition outcomes

6. DELIVERY PARTNER MODEL REQUIREMENTS

Bidders are required to propose a delivery partner model for the MDxJET aligned with the procurement approach outlined above.

The proposed delivery model must demonstrate how delivery partners will be procured, integrated, governed and supported throughout the programme. Bidders may propose municipality-specific delivery partner models, regional delivery partner models, thematic delivery partner models, or other aggregation approaches that they believe will optimise programme delivery, quality assurance, cost efficiency and local participation. The contracted PMDIF will be responsible for establishing and managing the delivery partner network in accordance with the approved delivery model. This includes assisting ACF with procurement, onboarding, performance management and quality assurance of the delivery partner firms. Contracting of and payments to delivery partner firms will be administered by the ACF in accordance with performance-based protocols agreed between the PMDIF, JET PMU and the ACF.

Notwithstanding ACF's role in administering contracting and payments, the PMDIF shall remain accountable for the coordination, onboarding, technical guidance, performance monitoring, and quality assurance of all delivery partner firms. The PMDIF shall review delivery partner firms' outputs, require corrections or rework where outputs do not meet approved standards, maintain a delivery partner firms' performance dashboard, and make recommendations to the JET PMU and ACF regarding acceptance, rejection, rework, escalation, payment approval or payment withholding. Each payment authorisation to a delivery partner firm will require prior sign-off by the PMDIF, the JET PMU, and the ACF. The JET PMU intends this model to create meaningful

opportunities for smaller, specialist and historically under-represented firms. As such, bidders should demonstrate a credible and intentional approach to inclusive market participation, with specific attention to transformation, gender inclusion, local participation, and supplier development.

7. TEAM REQUIREMENTS

Bidders should demonstrate a multi-disciplinary programme leadership team with experience spanning municipal infrastructure delivery, electricity distribution, finance, organisational capability development, programme governance, and stakeholder management. Indicative core expertise will include:

- Programme Management
- Procurement experience
- Municipal Finance
- Electricity Distribution Infrastructure design, development, operations
- Electricity Utilities
- Organisational and Capability Development
- Quality Assurance and Controls
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Monitoring and Evaluation

8. Request for Proposals (RFP)

Proposal Submission

Qualified firms are invited to submit electronic proposals outlining their approach to fulfilling the requirements of this RFP. Proposals addressing points 8.1 to 8.5 below should not exceed fifteen (15) pages. Documents submitted for points 8.6 to 8.8 are additional submission requirements.

Proposals must be structured to cover the following:

8.1 Understanding of the MDxJET Initiative

Insights into the municipal electricity systems' JET challenges that this initiative seeks to address and how the firm's specific proposal sets out to achieve the MDxJET Initiative's intended results across the targeted municipalities.

8.2 Programme Management Integration Methodology

Inception approach, deliverables and acceptance management, cohort sequencing, governance, risk and issue escalation, decision logs, stakeholder engagement, communications plan, MEL alignment, evidence management, and WP3 handover planning

8.3 Delivery Partner Model

Describe the proposed model for assisting in procurement of delivery partner firms to cover the work packages with the specified municipalities. This includes amongst others, writing the terms of reference, procurement advertising methods, initial screening of suitable firms for consideration by ACF, the role allocations between the delivery partner firms, their onboarding, governance, supervision, performance quality controls, rework management, payment recommendation processes, and capability development.

8.4 Quality assurance plan

Submit a QA framework, including amongst others, quality control gates for deliverables and processes for reviews, technical sign-offs, evidence filings, version controls, comment logs, consistency checks and corrective actions.

8.5 Team composition and competencies

- Brief profiles of proposed team members and outlines of their specific roles and responsibilities in this assignment.
- Summary of each team member's relevant experience with reference to detail in annexures (see 8.7)
- Team structure and management accountabilities.

8.6 Costing (not included in 15-page proposal limit)

- Detailed budget in ZAR for PMDIF fees, inclusive of VAT;
- Breakdown of professional fees by team member, hours, and activity;
- Disbursements and other direct costs (e.g. travel, workshops, communications);
- Assumptions relating to disbursements.
- **Use pricing template provided on the submission portal and upload in MS Excel format.**

8.7 Additional documents in annexures (not included in 15-page proposal limit)

- CVs of each team member (max three pages each).
- Two relevant examples of each team members' prior work experience in a project of similar type and complexity, with the name and dates of each assignment, the contract value, the contracting party, performance quality assessment.
- At least two externally issued references for the firm, detailing quality track record and timelines of past work.

8.8 Mandatory submissions (not included in 15-page proposal limit)

- Signed conflict of interest declaration (completed on portal)
- Tax Compliance Status verification document, together with a valid tax PIN. The tax PIN must be active and unexpired at the time of submission and throughout the evaluation process
- Company registration document
- Valid BB-BEE certificate
- Last 3 years audited financial statements
- Confirmation of valid professional indemnity insurance

9. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation process will follow a three-stage evaluation methodology comprising an Administrative compliance review, Technical Evaluation and a Financial Evaluation:

Stage 1: Administrative Compliance

The following criteria will be applied to determine whether a proposal has met the mandatory administrative requirements of the RFP:

- The bidder registered for and attended the mandatory briefing session.
- The proposal was submitted on or before the specified closing date and time, and was submitted via the prescribed ACF portal.
- The proposal is complete, with all sections fully completed, and includes all mandatory documents as outlined in the RFP (mandatory documents are listed in Section 8.8).
- Bidders are required to be legally registered in South Africa and have an operational presence in South Africa.
- The proposal is submitted by an individual who is authorised to represent the bidding organisation and commit the organisation to the terms of the submission. The bidder provides the required declaration or evidence of authorisation.

Only proposals that fully comply with the above administrative requirements will proceed to Stage 2 of the evaluation process.

Stage 2: Technical Evaluation

At this stage, proposals will be evaluated against the functionality (technical) criteria using the weighting system set out below. Each criterion will be scored according to the allocated weighting, and the total technical

score will determine whether a proposal meets the minimum technical threshold required to proceed to the next stage. Each criterion and sub-criterion shall be scored using the following standard evaluation rubric.

Score	Description	Interpretation
5	Excellent	Proposal significantly exceeds requirements and demonstrates exceptional understanding, capability, robustness and credibility. Minimal or no weaknesses identified.
4	Good	Proposal fully meets requirements and demonstrates strong capability and credibility, with only minor weaknesses.
3	Acceptable	Proposal adequately meets requirements but contains some weaknesses, limitations or areas requiring clarification.
2	Weak	Proposal partially meets requirements but demonstrates notable deficiencies, material gaps or limited credibility.
1	Poor	Proposal materially fails to meet requirements, with significant weaknesses, major omissions or low confidence in deliverability.
0	Non-responsive	No response provided, or response materially non-compliant with the requirement.

	Descriptor	Weight
1	Programme Management Integration Methodology This criterion will assess the bidder's proposed methodology for managing and integrating the programme across participating municipalities, ensuring coherent delivery, effective governance, and progression toward programme objectives.	25%
1.1	Understanding of programme objectives, municipal context, and implementation environment	20%
1.2	Proposed programme management and implementation methodology, including cohort sequencing and delivery planning	30%
1.3	Secretariat coordination, stakeholder management, and governance, including coordination with JET PMU, municipalities, and relevant ecosystem stakeholders	20%
1.4	Risk management, issue escalation, and programme controls methodology	15%
1.5	Reporting, monitoring, knowledge management and programme-wide synthesis approach	15%
2	Delivery Partner Model This criterion will assess the credibility and robustness of the bidder's proposed delivery model and procurement for municipality-level implementation.	20%
2.1	Relevance and feasibility of the proposed delivery model, including experience and capability to support the procurement and screening of delivery partner firms	25%
2.2	Delivery governance and subcontract performance management model	20%
2.3	Geographic spread, scalability and resilience of the delivery model	20%
2.4	Inclusion, localisation and meaningful participation of smaller/emerging firms	15%
2.5	Supplier development, mentorship, and capability building approach	20%
3	Quality Assurance Methodology This criterion will assess the bidder's proposed quality assurance approach to ensure consistency, comparability, and technical integrity for all deliverables.	20%
3.1	Controls framework and standardisation methodology (including in respect of deliverables integrity, MEL data quality, GESI/GLI integration, evidence management).	30%
3.2	Quality review and approval processes for all Works Packages 1 and 2 deliverables, and Work Package 3 handover.	25%

3.3	Technical assurance and corrective action approach with delivery partner firms	30%
3.4	Continuous improvement, lessons learned, and corrective action mechanisms.	15%
4	Team Experience and Capability This criterion will assess the experience, capability and suitability of the proposed team to deliver the assignment.	25%
4.1	Programme leadership experience in managing complex, national, multi-year, multi-stakeholder programmes	20%
4.2	Procurement experience	5%
4.3	Municipal infrastructure / utility expertise	20%
4.4	Electricity distribution / energy systems expertise	20%
4.5	Municipal finance / project preparation / investment readiness expertise	15%
4.6	Organisational capability development / institutional strengthening expertise	10%
4.7	Team structure, role clarity and deployment appropriateness	10%
5	BB-BEE Level	
	This criterion will assess the bidder’s verified BB-BEE contributor status.	
	PMDIF BB-BEE Contributor Level	Points
	Level 1	5
	Level 2	4
	Level 3	3
	Level 4	2
	Level 5 or below	1
	Non-compliant/ no certificate	0
Total Technical Score		100%

The Bid Evaluation Committee reserves the right to interview bidding firms during the Technical Evaluation stage. Where interviews are conducted, a separate interview scoring matrix will be used. The interview score will form part of the overall Technical Evaluation and will be incorporated into the final technical score for Stage 2.

Stage 3: Financial Evaluation

Only proposals that achieve a minimum technical score of 75% in Stage 2 (Technical Evaluation) will be considered for Financial Evaluation.

At this stage, proposals will be assessed for cost competitiveness, transparency, and value for money, considering the proposed methodology, personnel, and level of effort. The Financial Evaluation will consider the total cost of the proposal in relation to the quality and feasibility of the proposed approach.

Where the Evaluation Committee considers a proposal to contain pricing that is materially higher than the market, the available budget, or competing proposals without adequate justification, the Bid Evaluation Committee may request clarification of the pricing assumptions. Where the pricing remains demonstrably unreasonable, disproportionate to the proposed scope, or inconsistent with achieving value for money, the

proposal may be rejected. The ACF reserves the right not to award the contract to the lowest-priced proposal, but rather to the proposal that demonstrates the best overall value for money.

Final Evaluation Weighted Score

The final weighted score shall be calculated as follows:

Stage	Domain/Descriptor	Weight
Stage 02	Technical Evaluation	80%
Stage 03	Financial Evaluation	20%
Total		100%

10. IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD

The assignment is expected to be implemented over an indicative 28-month period (fourth quarter 2026 to 31 December 2028), delivered through phased municipal cohorts.

11. CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONDITIONS

11.1 Confidentiality: All information submitted in response to this RFP will be treated as confidential and used solely for the purposes of evaluating the proposal.

11.2 Language: Proposals, documents and correspondence must be submitted in English.

11.3 Validity of Proposals: All pricing and conditions contained in the proposal shall remain valid for a minimum of 90 calendar days from the closing date of submission. Any deviation from this must be clearly stated and may affect the evaluation outcome.

11.4 No Obligation to Award: The ACF reserves the right not to award a contract in respect of this RFP and is under no obligation to provide reasoning or feedback for its decision. The ACF may cancel or modify this procurement process at any time.

11.5 Due Diligence: ACF reserves the right to conduct due diligence on any firm submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, including requesting additional information, reference checks, or interviews.

11.6 Conflicts of interest: Firms submitting proposals in response to this RFP must declare any actual or potential conflicts of interest. Failure to disclose such conflicts may result in the disqualification of the proposal or termination of any subsequent contract.

11.7 Cost of submission: The ACF shall not be responsible for any costs incurred by firms in preparing and submitting their proposals. All such costs will be borne solely by the firms themselves.

11.8 Ethical Conduct: The ACF expects all firms to adhere to ethical business practices, including compliance with applicable anti-bribery and anti-corruption laws and regulations. Failure to adhere to such practices may result in the disqualification of the proposal or termination of any subsequent contract.

11.9 Amendments and Clarifications: The ACF may issue amendments or clarification to the RFP. These will be communicated to all bidders who submitted queries or expressed intent in submitting proposals.