GREEN PPAS · STEP 03 · COMPETITIVE PROCESS · REPORT

RFP document and bid evaluation matrix

Standardised RFP pack issued to developers plus a normalised, weighted scoring matrix used to compare all received bids on tariff and non-tariff parameters.

Worked example (anonymised): Group-captive solar-wind hybrid RFP · 80 MW hybrid (60 MW solar + 20 MW wind, ~30% CUF blended) · Karnataka, group-captive structure. A manufacturing group targeting 25% open-access renewable coverage ran a competitive RFP across nine developers to benchmark hybrid tariffs before committing to a 15-year PPA.

Illustrative sample image

Sample excerpt · Bid evaluation matrix (illustrative, top 5 of 9 bidders)

Bidder	Tariff (Rs/kWh, Yr1)	Escalation	CUF guarantee	Weighted score
Bidder A	3.42	3%/yr, 5 yrs	29.5%	87/100
Bidder B	3.38	Flat	28.0%	84/100
Bidder C	3.55	3%/yr, 3 yrs	30.5%	81/100
Bidder D	3.47	Flat	27.5%	78/100
Bidder E	3.60	2%/yr, 5 yrs	31.0%	75/100

Notes

• Tariffs are illustrative and normalised to a common CUF/escalation basis for comparability
• Scoring weights (tariff 50%, track record 20%, financial strength 15%, flexibility 15%) agreed with client before bid opening

What happens in this step

1. Draft and issue a structured RFP to a shortlist of 8-12 pre-qualified developers with standardised technical, commercial and legal submission templates
2. Host a bidder query window and pre-bid clarification call to align assumptions on connectivity, land, evacuation timelines and payment security

3. Receive sealed bids and normalise them onto a common basis (capacity utilisation factor, degradation, escalation, banking charges) to enable true tariff comparability
4. Run tariff benchmarking against recent DISCOM tenders, IEX/GTAM trends and captive/group-captive precedents in the same state
5. Score bids on a weighted matrix covering tariff, developer track record, financial strength, land/connectivity readiness and contract flexibility
6. Shortlist top 2-3 bidders for a negotiation round on tariff, change-in-law pass-through and termination payments
7. Present a recommendation memo with sensitivity analysis to support final developer selection

Outcomes

• A transparent, defensible record of how the preferred developer and tariff were selected
• Tariff outcomes tested against real market benchmarks, avoiding overpayment or unfavourable long-term escalation terms
• Key risk items (termination liability, change-in-law, delay LDs) improved through structured negotiation before contract drafting
• A shortlisted, credit-checked developer ready to proceed directly into contracting and connection

Want this for your project? Write to info@growthifye.com or use the Contact page — we will scope the real deliverable set for your capacity, state and lender requirements.

ILLUSTRATIVE