

	Strategy	Engineering
---	-----------------	--------------------

Title: **Rosherville Super Store Fire Protection Project Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy**

Unique Identifier: 15239180

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: Engineering

Documentation Type: **TE STRATEGY**

Revision: **3.0**

Total Pages: **18**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by



**Jaco Prinsloo
Fire Engineer**

Date: 10/07/2026

Functional Responsibility



**Jaco Prinsloo
Fire Engineer**

Date:10/07/2026

Authorised by



**Andre Swanepoel
Project Manager**

Date:10/07/2026

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	3
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 METHOD.....	5
3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	6
3.3 TET MEMBERS	6
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	7
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	9
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	14
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS.....	16
3.7.1 Risks	16
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions.....	16
4. AUTHORISATION	17
5. REVISIONS.....	17
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	18
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	18

TABLES

Table 1: Abbreviations.....	4
Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table	5
Table 3: Evaluation Score breakdown	6
Table 4: TET Members.....	6
Table 5: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	9
Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities	14
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks	16
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks	16
Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	16
Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	16

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

1. INTRODUCTION

The proposed procurement strategy for the Rosherville Super Store Fire Protection Project is to issue an open enquiry to the market. The scope includes supply, installation and commissioning, of the fire protection upgrade and associated work at the Rosherville Super Store building.

The purpose of this document is to develop the mandatory and qualitative technical evaluation criteria that will be used to evaluate all tenders received from the market.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document details the technical evaluation strategy that will be followed to evaluate the tenders received from the tenderers for Rosherville Super Store Fire project.

The scope of work to be conducted by the contractor to supply, install and commission an upgraded fire protection system that shall have a dedicated hydrants and fire hose reels water storage tank and pumps as primary fire-fighting systems to support the existing sprinkler installation. The replacement of the sprinkler tan to be done by others. The scope shall also include some detection and fire alarm system for the whole warehouse and office space. Fire extinguishers and statutory fire signage installation shall form part of the scope of work.

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 will apply to all appointed resources involved in the technical tender evaluation of tenders received from the market for the Rosherville Super Store Fire Protection 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] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
- [2] 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form
- [3] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results

2.2.2 Informative

- [4] Scope of Work: Rosherville Super Store Fire Protection Project.

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CNC	Customer Network Centre
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
TET	Technical Evaluation Team
QCP	Quality Control Plan
ITP	Inspection and Test Plan

Table 1: Abbreviations

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 15239180: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

N/A

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

The basic steps for a technical evaluation must be followed as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure [1].

A two-stage Technical Evaluation Strategy is set out.

Stage 1: 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.

Stage 2: 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%.

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications.

The technical criteria and weighting are broken down as follows:

- a) Fire Engineering: 100%

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering requirements. The scoring method will be as follows:

Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table

SCORE	PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION
5	100	COMPLIANT - Meet 6/6 technical requirement(s) AND; - No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS - Meet 4/6 technical requirement(s) with; - Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; - Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; - Acceptable conditions.
2	40	NON-COMPLIANT - Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; meet less than 4 of the technical items. - Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR; - Unacceptable conditions.
0	0	TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

The evaluation scores will be weighted as follows:

Table 3: Evaluation Score breakdown

Engineering (100%)	
Fire Engineering	100%
TOTAL (100%)	
Overall minimum threshold for qualification (70%)	

3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is **70%**.

3.3 TET MEMBERS

The technical evaluation team will be composed of a minimum of two members per discipline from the table below with at least one being professionally registered per discipline.

Table 4: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Jaco Prinsloo	Fire Engineer Pr Eng
TET 2	Jaco Prinsloo	Mechanical Engineer Pr. Eng
TET 3	Andre Swanepoel	Project Manager (Optional)

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Gatekeepers identified in the tender document will be “must meet” criteria identified in tabular questionnaire form. The *Contractor(s)* tender will be assessed based upon questionnaire seeking **YES** or **NO** response from the *Contractor(s)* with no point scores or weighted averaged assigned to the response.

Response of **NO** against any criteria will be elimination of the *Contractor(s)* tender for further consideration or short listing for detailed technical evaluation. Gatekeepers will be minimum criterion elements with most significant and critical parameters applicable to the successful execution of the RFP. Table 4 lists the mandatory gatekeepers identified.

Table 5: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.1	Key staff 1 member competency: Proof of Registration with ASIB and SAQCC is to be submitted. Certificates must be provided, and certified within 6 months of submission	Ensure designs are checked and meets minimum safety requirements	- Registered Engineer/Technologist/Designer required for sign-off of design and installation drawings - Demonstrate that the Tenderer's key staff members possess the necessary qualification
1.2	Key Contractor competency: Proof of Professional Registration with FDIA is to be submitted. Certificates must be provided, and certified within 6 months of submission	Ensure designs are checked and meets minimum safety requirements	- Registered Engineer/Technologist/Designer required for sign-off of design and installation drawings - Demonstrate that the Tenderer's key staff members possess the necessary qualification (Professional Mechanical/Electrical Engineer/technologist registered with ECSA.)

1.3	Equipment selection:	The supplier must submit a full set of equipment selection to the Engineer for review. This is to include as minimum the following, and is to demonstrate compliance with the technical specification (refer to returnable schedule) • Pump curve, supplier and selection • Tank supplier and selection (hydrant and sprinkler) • Equipment selection (FH, FHR, Fire extinguishers, valves) • Detection system brand, and proposed equipment	• Demonstrate that the Tenderer's proposed equipment and suppliers conform to technical specification.
-----	-----------------------------	---	--

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

2	Mechanical Engineering Criteria	Technical Returnable Document	Weighting	Scoring Criteria
	2.1 <u>Method statement for Design and Installation</u> The contractor provides a method statement detailing as per stated in the SoW, covering; fire alarm system, the installation of the tank, in rack sprinklers, hydrants and fire hose reels and extinguishers including signage. The Contractor includes and motivates any additional investigations that may be required on the existing water supply system. The contractor provides a list of equipment to be used, in accordance with the proposed methodology, and an indication of the availability of equipment (Does the bidder own the required equipment and plant or intend to hire). Contractor to submit soft copies of the equipment documentation (e.g. user manuals, technical datasheets, etc.) Reproduction of the Employer's scope will not be acceptable.		30%	5 = 100% = COMPLIANT - Meet 6 out of 6 technical items and no foreseen technical risk. - Construction methodology is detailed and addresses as per the SoW, - Signed letter confirming plant availability for the project is provided. - Typical Inspection and test plan is detailed and addresses key aspects of the project. 4 = 80% = COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS - Meet technical item(s); meets 4 or more of 6 - Construction methodology details 4 or more of 6 technical items and/or requirements. - Typical inspection and test plan partially addresses key aspects/characteristics of the project. - Acceptable technical risk(s) - Signed letter confirming plant availability 2 = 40% = NON-COMPLIANT - Construction Methodology is poor/is and only 3 out of 6 technical items is met and unlikely to meet the project requirements/objectives. - Typical inspection and test plan is poor/is unlikely to meet the project requirements/objectives. - Unacceptable technical risks - With or without signed letter confirming plant availability for the project is provided.

Rosherville Fire Protection Project
Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy

Unique Identifier: **15239180**
Revision: **3.0**
Page: **10 of 16**

					0 = 0% = TOTALLY DEFICIENT - Construction Methodology not submitted and/or copying/reproduce the SoW. - Typical inspection and test plan not provided. - Totally deficient or non-responsive - No signed letter confirming plant availability for the project is provided. - Add -reproduction of SoW
	2.2	<u>List Of Completed Similar Installation Projects with Partnership Agreement/Letter of Intent If Applicable:</u> The Contractor must provide a track record of <u>three</u> completed projects value R8m as a minimum for design & install that is equivalent to the works required in this scope of work. The Contractor submits the following information with each reference project: - Description - Value - Date - Client Contact details - Letter of completion In the case that the tenderer intends to subcontract or form a joint venture, a partnership agreement/letter of intent, together with individual track records of each party involved is to be provided. The Technical Returnable Schedule must be completed (Mandatory)		20%	5 = 100% = COMPLIANT - Submitted 3 or more similar projects 4 = 80% = COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS - Submitted 2 or more similar projects 2 = 40% = NON-COMPLIANT - Submitted 1 or more similar projects 0 = 0% = TOTALLY DEFICIENT Did not submit any similar projects (this includes projects that are submitted but not structural design related).

2.3	<u>Organogram reflecting the key project staff together with CV's of Key Members of staff</u> Provide complete project team structure (organogram) based on the full scope of work. The organogram must be accompanied by a letter confirming the availability of project team for the duration of the project. It is noted that team members may only be replaced with individuals of equal or higher level of competence, after Client approval. The CVs of all project staff members in organogram must be submitted.		25%	5 = 100% = COMPLIANT • Key staff members have relevant qualifications and extensive (10+ years) experience relevant to the nature of the project. • Compliant organogram (relevant to this project; generic company organograms will be deemed inadequate). • Installation Manager has 10 (or more) years' experience in relation to the scope of services. Engineer/Technologist has 10+ years' experience in relation to the scope of works and is not registered with ASIB/FDIA /SAQCC. 4 = 80% = COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS • Key staff has relevant qualification and reasonable experience (6 to 8 years) relevant to the nature of the project. • Organogram is detailed and clear; and staff composition is adequate and satisfactory. • In installation Manager has 6 to 8 years' experience in relation to the scope of works. • Engineer/Technologist has 4 to 8 years' experience in relation to the scope of work and is not registered with ASIB/FDIA/SAQCC.. • A signed letter confirming staff availability is submitted. 2 = 40% = NON-COMPLIANT • Key staff has limited experience (0 to 2 years) relevant to the nature of the project. • Organogram lacks detail and is incoherent. No details in allocation of tasks and responsibilities. • Construction Manager has 1 to 4 years' individual experience in relation to the scope of works. • Engineer/Technologist has 1 to 4 years' experience in relation to the scope of works and is not registered with ASIB/FDIA/SAQCC. • With or without a signed letter confirming staff availability.
-----	--	--	-----	---

					0 = 0% = TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON- RESPONSIVE • Key staff do not have experience relevant to the nature of the project. • Organogram not provided. • Construction Manager and Civil Engineer has no experience in relation to the scope of work. • Totally deficient or non-responsive.
	2.4	<u>Project Programme</u> Submit (as a minimum) • A proposed project execution plan for the entire scope of works. • A preliminary programme (in PDF format and digital/primavera)	The Tenderer demonstrating full understanding of the scope and how the Tenderer intends to execute the project in accordance with the Employer's key dates.	25%	5 = 100% = COMPLIANT • 100% of tender returnable received AND • The project execution plan is tailored to address the specific project requirements. • Project execution plan is project specific and indicates that the Tenderer has outstanding knowledge on the approach and fully addresses the key aspects and project objectives. • Preliminary project programme meets the Employer's key dates. • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements. 4 = 80% = COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS • 80% of Tender returnable received. • The project execution plan is generic and not tailored to address project requirements. • The project execution plan does not adequately address the key aspects of the project. • Preliminary project programme has omitted some critical activities but meets the Employer's key dates. • Meet technical requirements with acceptable technical risk(s). • Signed letter confirming plant availability for the project is provided.

Rosherville Fire Protection Project
Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy

Unique Identifier: **15239180**
Revision: **3.0**
Page: **13 of 16**

					2 = 40% = NON-COMPLIANT • Portion of tender returnable not received. • Does not meet technical requirement(s). • Unacceptable technical risk(s). • Project Execution plan is poor/is unlikely to meet the project requirements. 0 = 0% = TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON- RESPONSIVE • Project execution plan and preliminary project programme not provided. Totally deficient or non-responsive.
		<u>TOTAL</u>		100%	

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1.1	x	x	x

Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
2.1	x	x	x
2.2	x	x	x
2.3	x	x	x
2.4	x	x	x
2.5	x	x	x

3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.7.1 Risks

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Not resolving water ponding and associated problems
2.	Safety risks to Eskom or Contractor personnel

3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Different solution offered to address problems – Details must be provided to show that the offered solution will address the problems.
2.	

Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Not all problems listed in the Scope of Work is addressed
2.	

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Kith Maitisa	Regional Manager	
Phumzile Mlangeni	Project Manager	
Andries Pretorius	Site Supervisor	
Bonolo Mathipa	GIT	
Jaco Prinsloo	Fire Engineer	
Andre Swanepoel	Project Manager	

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- Stenford Mutaringe-Fire Engineer
- Julian Raphasha-Project Manager

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people were involved in reviewing this document:

- Chris Du Toit-Corporate Consultant