

Strategy

Tutuka Power Station Engineering

Title:

Service and **Certification of Analytical Equipment** (Autotitrators, Mettler Toledo (T5/T7T9) at **Tutuka Power Station** Tender Technical **Evaluation Strategy**

15ENG GEN-3011 Unique Identifier:

N/A Alternative Reference

Number:

Area of Applicability: **Tutuka Power Station**

Chemical Services Functional Area:

1 Revision:

12 **Total Pages:**

N/A **Next Review Date:**

CONTROLLED Disclosure **DISCLOSURE**

Classification:

Compiled by

Supported by

Functional Responsibility

by

Authorized

Ziphezinhle Promise Mbatha

Snr Supervisor

MU HIOAMPE

Matlale Venice Ntoampe

Snr Chemist

Nnditsheni Michael

Mukwevho

Chemistry Manager

Lele Moses Masote

Engineering Manager

Date: 24/10/24

Date: 24/10/2024

Date:

24/10/2024

Date:

25/10/2024

Supply, installation, training, 3-years' service contract and delivery of Sulphur analyser Template ID: 32-4 (Rev 11) Document template (for procedures, manuals, standards, instructions, etc.

Formatted by: EDC_14.06.2024

Service and Certification of Analytical Equipment (Autotitrators, Mettler Toledo (T9 Model) at Tutuka Power Station

Unique Identifier: 15ENG GEN-2902

Revision:

1

Page: 2 of 11

CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	
2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES	3
2.1 SCOPE	3
2.1.1 Purpose	3
2.1.2 Applicability	3
2.1.3 Effective Date	
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES	
2.2.1 Normative	
2.2.2 Informative	
2.3 DEFINITIONS	
2.3.1 Classification	
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS 2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING	
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	
3. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	4
3.1 MANDATORY CRITERIA EVALUATION	4
3.2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA EVALUATION	
3.3 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	
3.4 TET MEMBERS	
3.5 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	
3.7 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	
3.8.1 Risks	
4. ACCEPTANCE	
5. REVISIONS	
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	11
TABLES	
Table 1: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table	
Table 2: TET Members	
Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	
Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks	
Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks	
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	

Revision: 1

Page: 3 of 11

1. INTRODUCTION

Eskom water laboratories uses different equipment to analyse water samples depending on the specific analysis required and concentration levels, in order to monitor water quality for various processes within the water treatment plant and cycle chemistry. The instruments need to be reliable and meet core instrument availability at all times, this is achieved by ensuring that instruments are replaced within a 10 year replacement plan as per the OEM to avoid obsolescence.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

Service and Certification of Analytical Equipment, 3 x T9 titrators, 3 x Dosing Unit, 6 x Autosampler, 6 X Burette (Mettler Toledo T9 Model)

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 to evaluate all tenders received from the Service Provider(s) in response to the Enquiry

2.1.2 Applicability

This document is applicable to all appointed and involved in the technical tender evaluation of tenders received from the Service Provider(s) in response to conduct Service and Certification of Analytical Equipment, 3 x T9 titrators, 3 x Dosing Unit, 6 x Autosampler, 6 X Burette (Mettler Toledo T9 Model)

Effective Date

When the document is authorised.

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.
- [4] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure.
- [5] 32-1034 Eskom Procurement Policy.
- [6] Occupational Health and Safety Act No. 85 of 1993
- [7] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the document management system, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorized version on the system. No part of this document may be reproduced in any manner or form by third parties without the written consent of Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd, © copyright Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd, Reg No 2002/015527/30

Revision:

Page: 4 of 11

2.2.2 Informative

1] Analytical Chemistry equipment user requirement specification guideline (Unique identifier: 240-165441379)

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Definition	Description
Employer	Tutuka Power Station
Principal Contractor	a. As per OHS Act (85/1993)

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
P&ID	Piping and Instrumentation Diagram
PS	Power Station
QCP	Quality Control Plan
Rev	Revision
SANS	South African National Standard

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

As per section 2.2

3. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

The evaluation criteria will be based upon a two-step process:

3.1 MANDATORY CRITERIA EVALUATION

All TET members as defined in the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy (and specifically TET member responsibilities) shall independently evaluate each tender in terms of compliance to the defined Mandatory

Revision: 1
Page: 5 of 11

Evaluation Criteria. Each TET member shall provide an individual scoring form on the compliance / non-compliance of all tenderers' responses to the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Each TET member shall provide clear justification(s) for each Mandatory Criteria evaluated as non-compliant ('NO'). All individual scoring forms shall be evaluated to check for consistency in scoring of the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Should there be inconsistency in the scoring, an internal clarification meeting shall be conducted with all TET members (who performed the evaluation) in the presence of the Commercial Representative. This meeting shall aim to jointly establish which of the tenderers qualify for the next phase of Qualitative Technical Evaluation. In the case where no tenderer meets all Mandatory Evaluation Criteria this shall be formally escalated to the Commercial Representative who shall guide the subsequent process. All meeting minutes shall be recorded and distributed to the Commercial Representative and included in the Tender Technical Evaluation Report.

3.2 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA EVALUATION

Tenderers that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Criteria as defined in the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy. The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements. A score shall be allocated as per Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table, for each technical qualitative criterion. Each TET member shall populate a Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form [2] for each tenderer. Note: Individual Qualitative Criteria scores shall only be finalised after all clarification sessions have been concluded.

Table 1: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table

Score	%	Definition
5	100	COMPLIANT
		Meet technical requirement(s) AND;
		No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	70	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS
		Meet 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;
		Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR;
		Unacceptable conditions.
0	0	TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE

Note 1: The scoring table does not allow for scoring of 1 and 3.

Note 2: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

Revision:

Page: 6 of 11

3.3 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.4 TET MEMBERS

Table 2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Zinhle Mbatha	Senior Supervisor Chemistry
TET 2	Nthabiseng Ntoampe	Senior Chemist Chemistry
TET 3	Michael Mukwevho	Chemistry Manager
TET 4	Muhle Gina	System Engineer C&I engineering

Service and Certification of Analytical Equipment (Autotitrators, Mettler Toledo (T9 Model) at Tutuka Power Station

Unique Identifier: 15ENG GEN-2902

Revision: 1

Page: **7 of 11**

3.5 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria-N/A

Revision: 1

Page: **8 of 11**

3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

		Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	Service a	nd Certification of Analytical Equipment (Auto titrators, Mettler Toledo T9 Model)			
1.1.	Technical i	information	Technical returnables document	65%	
	1.1.1.	Competence Certificate of the service technician/engineer on the Servicing of Autotitrators (Mettler Toledo T9 Model)	Provide Competence certificate of the service technician on the service of Autotitrators (Mettler ToledoT9 Model) =5 points Score distribution No submission of Competence	6	65%
			certificate of the service technician/engineer on the service technician on the service of Autotitrators (Mettler Toledo T9 Model)=0 points		
1.2	Experience		Technical returnables document	35%	
	1.2.1	Company must supply 3 referrals/ previous purchase orders from different customers were the service of Autotitrator (Mettler Toledo T9 Model) was done.	Submission of proof of experience (reference letter or purchase orders from 3 different customers) where servicing of		35%

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the document management system, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorized version on the system. No part of this document may be reproduced in any manner or form by third parties without the written consent of Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd, © copyright Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd, Reg No 2002/015527/30

Service and Certification of Analytical Equipment (Autotitrators, Mettler Toledo (T9 Model) at Tutuka Power Station

Unique Identifier: 15ENG GEN-2902

Revision: 1

Page: 9 of 11

	Mettler Toledo Autotitrat Model) was done = 5 po No submission of proof of experience (reference le purchase orders from 3 of customers) where service Mettler Toledo Autotitrat Model) was done = 0 po	nts f ter or lifferent ng of ors (T9
		TOTAL: 100

3.7 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1.1.1	X	X	X
1.2.1	X	X	X
1.2.2	Х	Х	Х

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the document management system, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorized version on the system. No part of this document may be reproduced in any manner or form by third parties without the written consent of Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd, © copyright Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd, Reg No 2002/015527/30

Service and Certification of Analytical Equipment
(Autotitrators, Mettler Toledo (T9 Model) at Tutuka Power
Station

Revision: 1

Page: **10 of 11**

3.8 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.8.1 **Risks**

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Contractor supplying instrument that is unsuitable for coal sulphur analysis at a power generating industry

3.8.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description	
1.	Inability to execute the required works as per scope of work issued [1].	

Revision:

Page:

11 of 11

4. ACCEPTANCE

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Nthabiseng Ntoampe	Senior Chemist Chemistry
Zinhle Mbatha	Senior Supervisor Chemistry
Muhle Gina	System Advisor C&I Engineering
Michael Mukwevho	Chemistry Manager

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
01 July 2024	1	Zinhle Mbatha	Requirement as part of the procurement procedure

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A