

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Construction of 25m Tower at Kingswood Radio Site and 40m Excelsior Radio Site**

Unique Identifier: **N/A**

Alternative Reference Number: **NPAE ETX 002**

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Documentation Type: **Strategy**

Revision: **1.0**

Total Pages: **16**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

---


**Compiled by**  
**K. Radebe**  
**NPAE Senior Engineer**



**Functional Responsibility**  
**T. Mahlangu**  
**NPAE Network Development Manager**



**Authorised by**  
**B. Nala**  
**NPAE Group Engineering Manager**



Date: 17 February 2022

Date: 18 February 2022

Date: 18/02/2022

---

## **CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
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.....	3
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
<b>3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD.....	4
3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD .....	5
3.3 TET MEMBERS.....	6
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	8
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	9
3.5.1 Qualitative Technical Criteria- Scoring Range .....	10
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES.....	13
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS.....	15
3.7.1 Risks.....	15
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions.....	15
<b>4. AUTHORISATION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5. REVISIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## **TABLES**

Table 1: Core TET Members .....	6
Table 2: Optional TET Members .....	7
Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	8
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	9
Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities.....	14
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks.....	15
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks .....	15
Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions.....	15
Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions .....	15

### **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This technical evaluation document will be used by Eskom Holding (the Employer) to technically evaluate potential contractors for Construction of 25m tower at Kingswood Radio Site and 40m tower at Excelsior in the North West Province.

## **2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES**

### **2.1 SCOPE**

The document provides the tender technical evaluation strategy for *240-59967638: General Tower Specification for New Installations of Eskom Telecommunications Radio Towers*

#### **2.1.1 Purpose**

This document outlines the criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenderers that will result from the Request for Proposal. This technical evaluation strategy defines the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Qualitative Evaluation Criteria and Technical Evaluation Team (TET) member responsibilities for tender technical evaluation. The technical evaluation strategy serves as a basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

#### **2.1.2 Applicability**

This document applies to the Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd Transmission Division and Telecommunications Division.

## **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] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems
- [3] 32-1034 Eskom Procurement Policy
- [4] 240-138083932: Geotechnical Analysis Specification

### **2.2.2 Informative**

- [5] 240-53113685: Design Review Procedure
- [5] 240-53114026: Project Engineering Change Management Procedure

## **2.3 DEFINITIONS**

<b>Definition</b>	<b>Description</b>
-------------------	--------------------

### **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.

Tender	A tender refers to an open or closed competitive request for quotations/ prices against a clearly defined scope/ specification.
Contractor/Tenderer	Refers to the corporation appointed to perform the engineering, procurement, and construction works required for the project.
Employer	Refers to Eskom Holdings State Owned Company

### 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
CIDB	Construction Industry Development Board
SL	Structural steelwork fabrication and erection
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

## 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

None

# 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 are not weighted or point scored but; are assessed on a Yes/No basis to ascertain whether or not the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any mandatory criterion will disqualify the tenderer and the tenderer will not be evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

**Stage 2:** Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria are weighted evaluation criteria used to identify the highest technically ranked tenderer. The Qualitative Evaluation Criteria are weighted to reflect the relevant importance of each criterion.

### **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

The technical criteria and weighting is broken down as follows:

- a) Engineering: 100%

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.

The scoring method will be as follows:

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

The evaluation scores will be weighted as follows:

<b>Engineering (100%)</b>	
Engineering	100%
<b>TOTAL (100%)</b>	
<b>Overall minimum threshold for qualification (70%)</b>	

### **3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD**

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 technical specifications (as outlined within the scope of works). Tenderers need to have a weighted score of 70% overall or more to technically qualify for further evaluation.

#### **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

The evaluation strategy for Safety, Health and Environmental as well as Quality is not included in this document as it does not form part of the Engineering scope.

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering and planning requirements.

### **3.3 TET MEMBERS**

The full time core technical evaluation team will consist of the following team members (in-line with the Tender Engineering Evaluation Procedure, 240-48929482) in Table 1.

**Table 1: Core TET Members**

<b>TET number</b>	<b>TET Member Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
TET 1	Koos Radebe	Senior Engineer
TET 2	Blessing Buthelezi	Senior Engineer
TET 3	Morake Maboane	Project Manager

The part time/support team member shall be required to fill in a technical evaluation form, if their names are marked as mandatory (X), next to a criterion. The part time/ support team member may not be required to fill in a technical evaluation form, if their names are marked as optional (O) next to a criterion, but shall assist the main members where necessary. These members may be as follows in Table 2.

### **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

**Table 2: Optional TET Members**

<b>TET number</b>	<b>TET Member Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
TET 4	Khulani Gasa	Senior Technician
TET 5	Ndangi Muthadi	Senior Engineer

The core members' and the optional members' responsibilities are described in Table 5.

**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

**Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria**

	<b>Mandatory Technical Criteria Description</b>	<b>Reference to Technical Specification/ Tender Returnable</b>	<b>Motivation for use of Criteria</b>
1.	Submit completed Annex A - Compliance Schedule of 240 – 59967638. <b>No sections may be left blank.</b> <i>Since Eskom is providing the designs, the supplier must simply fill “as per Eskom design” where applicable.</i>	240 – 119380820 structural inspection, analysis strengthening, design and certification of telecommunication tower& mast infrastructure standard.	Objective Criteria and a pledge to perform the work as per Eskom Standards, Procedures and requirements
2.	The use of AutoCAD/Microstation to conduct tower detailing process (proof of ownership of AutoCAD/Microstation or letter of intent to acquire the software when tender is awarded)	Eskom Requirement	Eskom has licence for AutoCAD & Microstation.
3.	Contractor to provide commitment letter and high level programme that he has the capacity and capability to construct 25m Tower at Kingswood Radio Ste and 40m Tower at Excelsior Radio Site	Eskom Requirement	Objective Criteria and a pledge to perform the work as per Eskom requirement

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**



### 3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

During the tender evaluations, Table 4 will be used by the TET members to score each criterion on a scale of 0 to 5.

**Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria**

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

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

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

### 3.5.1 Qualitative Technical Criteria- Scoring Range

Table 6 below describes how the tenders will be evaluated and scored in terms of the scoring rang of 0, 2, 4 and 5.

**Table 6: Scoring Range for Qualitative Technical Criteria**

Civil Engineering				
Criteria No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Range	Score
1.	<p>List of at least 3 projects references for similar work done and successfully completed in the past 5 years. The Contractor must have completed the works which include all following type of works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Foundations work</i></li> <li><i>b) Tower assembly work</i></li> <li><i>c) Tower erection work</i></li> <li><i>d) Tower Earthing</i></li> <li><i>e) Tower lights</i></li> </ul> <p>Ongoing work may not be included on the list, see below on how the marks will be awarded (full marks = 5).</p>	30	No references provided / Contractor completed 1 or 0 projects in the last 5 years	0
			<p>Contractor has completed 2 projects in the last 5 years which covered the following items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Foundations work</i></li> <li>- <i>Tower assembly work</i></li> <li>- <i>Tower erection work</i></li> </ul> <p><i>If no references are provided irrespective of number of projects provided a score of 2 will be awarded</i></p>	2
			<p>Contractor has completed 3 or more projects in the last 5 years. Works completed include the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Foundations work</i></li> <li>- <i>Tower assembly work</i></li> <li>- <i>Tower erection work</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Where the Contractor sub-contracted the or did not perform the following works</i></p>	4

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tower Earthing</li> <li>- Tower lights</li> </ul> <p><i>List of traceable references provided</i></p>	
			<p>Contractor has completed 3 or more projects in the last 5 years. Works completed include the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Foundations work only</li> <li>- Tower assembly work only</li> <li>- Tower erection work only</li> <li>- Tower Earthing</li> <li>- Tower lights</li> </ul> <p><i>List of traceable references provided</i></p>	5
2.	<p>Contractor to submit detailed step by step method statements detailing how s/he will perform or execute the following works:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tower foundation</li> <li>- Tower earthing</li> <li>- Tower erection</li> <li>- Tower assembly</li> <li>- Tower painting (painting data sheet sufficient)</li> <li>- Tower lights</li> <li>- Tower mounting brackets, landing platforms &amp; ladder</li> <li>- Tower painting</li> </ul>	40	<p>No method statements submitted or method statement is irrelevant to scope of work</p>	0
			<p>Tenderer submitted method statements but omitted one of the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tower foundation;</li> <li>- Tower erection;</li> <li>- Tower assembly;</li> <li>- Tower painting (painting data sheet sufficient); and</li> <li>- Tower mounting brackets, landing platforms &amp; ladder.</li> <li>- Equipment list</li> </ul>	2

	Contractor to provide list of all equipment to be used.		<p>Tenderer submitted the following method statements and provided the equipment list to perform the following works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tower foundation</li> <li>- Tower erection</li> <li>- Tower assembly</li> <li>- Tower painting (painting data sheet sufficient)</li> <li>- Tower mounting brackets, landing platforms &amp; ladder</li> </ul> <p>But omitted the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tower lights</li> <li>- Tower earthing</li> </ul>	4
			<p>Tenderer submitted the following method statements and provided the equipment list to perform the following works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tower foundation</li> <li>- Tower erection</li> <li>- Tower assembly</li> <li>- Tower painting (painting data sheet sufficient)</li> <li>- Tower mounting brackets, landing platforms &amp; ladder</li> <li>- Tower lights</li> <li>- Tower earthing</li> </ul>	5
3.		20	No Organogram or detailed CV's of the Proposed Project Manager, Site Manager	0

	Contractor to provide proposed Organogram and relevant experience of core team (Project Manager and Site Manager and Safety Officer)		and/or Safety Officer or one of the core team members has < 2 years	
			Organogram and detailed CV's of the Proposed Project Manager, Site Manager and Safety Officer has 2 – 5 years	2
			Organogram and detailed CV's of the Proposed Project Manager, Site Manager and Safety Officer has 5 -6 years	4
			Organogram and detailed CV's of the Proposed Project Manager, Site Manager and/or Safety Officer has ≥7years	5
4.	The Tenderer has provided a level 4 programme, showing activities of all the project work to be done by the Contractor, clearly indicating all required tasks.		Total deficiency AND non-compliance to the Scope of Works, Cannot meet targets	0
			Partial deficiency (>40%) OR non-compliance to the Scope of Works, No Recovery Plan	2
		10	Slightly deficiency (<40%) AND compliance to the Scope of Works, Includes Recovery Plan (if no recovery plan is provided score will be downgraded to next weighting)	4
			Complete compliance to the Scope of Works, indicating all targets met and recovery plan for anticipated slippage (if no recovery plan is provided score will be downgraded by 1 point)	5

**3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES**

Key: X = Mandatory; O = Optional

**Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities**

<b>Mandatory Criteria Number</b>	<b>TET 1</b>	<b>TET 2</b>	<b>TET 3</b>	<b>TET 4 (O)</b>	<b>TET 5 (O)</b>
1	X	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Qualitative Criteria Number</b>	<b>TET 1</b>	<b>TET 2</b>	<b>TET 3</b>	<b>TET 4 (O)</b>	<b>TET 5 (O)</b>
1	X	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X	X
3	X	X	X	X	X
4	X	X	X	X	X
5	X	X	X	X	X
6	X	X	X	X	X

### 3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

#### 3.7.1 Risks

**Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks**

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

**Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks**

Risk	Description
1.	Tenderer does not meet mandatory requirements

#### 3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

**Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

**Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

Risk	Description
1.	Tenderers technical submission does not address entire scope required

Risk	Description
2.	N/A

## 4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Blessing Buthelezi	Regional Engineering Head : Limpopo
Thabo Morule	Regional Manager : Limpopo, North-West & Mpumalanga

## 5. REVISIONS

### 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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Compiler</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
14 February 2022	0.1	K. Radebe	Draft document for review
15 February 2022	1.0	K. Radebe	Final Draft

## **6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

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

- Koos Radebe

## **7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

- N/A

### **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.