Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy – DHP Blowers Spares supply and refurbishment.**	Unique Identifier:	**N/A**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**1**
		Total Pages:	**9**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
.....	.....	.....
PG van Biljon	**LD Zuma**	**S Hlongwa**
DHP System Engineer	**Auxiliary Engineering Manager**	**Acting Engineering Manager**
Date: 2024-11-22	Date: 2025-03-11	Date: 2025.03.16

CONTENTS

Page

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

The Medupi Power Station Dust Handling & Conditioning Plant (DHP) makes use of Blowers across the plant for various processes, including fly ash aeration in the PJFFP Hoppers, Fly Ash Silos and airslides. These Blowers are regarded as essential components within DHP to ensure consistent removal of Fly Ash from the station.

These blowers are subject to increased wear and tear due to the aggressive operating environment. As such, Medupi is in the need to establish a contract for the supply as well as refurbishment of different Blowers for the Dust Handling and Conditioning Plant.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The document describes the acceptable and unacceptable risks and qualifications and /or conditions.

The Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy will define the following technical evaluation criteria:

- Mandatory Evaluation criteria
- Qualitative Evaluation criteria
- TET Member Responsibilities
- Acceptable/Unacceptable Qualifications

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 applies to the Tender Evaluation Team for Regulators in accordance with the authorised procurement strategy.

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] 241-2022862: Medupi Power Station DHP Blower Supply and Refurbishment SOW.

2.2.2 Informative

[3] NEC 3 Supply Contract

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Definition	Explanation
Controlled Disclosure	Controlled Disclosure to external parties (either enforced by law, or discretionary).
Contractor	Service provider contracted for the works as specified in this scope
Mandatory Evaluation Criteria	'Must meet' criteria (gatekeepers)
Employer	Eskom Medupi Power Station
Qualitative Evaluation criteria	Weighted evaluation criteria used to identify the highest technically ranked tenderer after determining that all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria have been met

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
NEC	New Engineering Contract
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

N/A as per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

N/A

3. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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.

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%. The tenders must achieve a weighted score of 70% or more to qualify for further evaluation. The table used for scoring is given in Table 1 below:

Score	(%)	Definition
5	**100**	Fully Compliant
4	**80**	Compliant with associated qualifications
2	**40**	Non-compliant
0	**0**	Totally deficient or non-responsive

Table 1: Scoring Table

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Hardus van Biljon	System Engineer
TET 2	Lihle Cingo	MMD Technician Snr

3.3 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The mandatory technical evaluation criteria is indicated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	**Like-for-like replacement of spares.**	Submit GA Drawings with relevant data sheets for each of the Blowers on the Scope of Works with specific reference to the OEM name, OEM part number, and any specific requirements on the Blowers.	Specific OEM and part number of blowers is an essential part of the design base. An Engineering Change will be required for deviations from the OEM as per original installation which is not handled as part of this SOW.
2.	**Agreement letter from OEMs to supply Contractor for the duration of the contract.**	Submit letter from each OEM indicating that they will supply the contractor with the applicable new blowers and where applicable, OEM spares, for the duration of the contract, if the contractor were to be successful.	If there is no agreement with the OEM's, the successful contractor might struggle to obtain the required blowers or spares putting the contracted supply and pricing at risk.
3.	**Quality assurance for refurbishment.**	Submit proof of ISO 9001 accreditation for blower refurbishments or alternatively an agreement letter from the OEM's confirming that applicable blowers from the contractor will be refurbished by the OEM, for the duration of the contract, if the contractor were to be successful.	ISO accreditation or doing refurbishment at the OEM will ensure that the quality of the refurbishments will be done consistently to a high standard.

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Qualitative technical evaluation criteria as indicated in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Score	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
4.	**Supply experience and capabilities**			**10%**		
	4.1.	**Proof of supply experience of spares**	Tenderer to submit a list of complete blower systems or bare shaft blowers spares orders with ESKOM or other companies in the last 5 years: • Order number (Eskom one, if applicable) • Blower specification • Date of supply • Quantity Supplied	more than 25 orders	5	**100%**
				Between 15 and 25 orders	4	
				Between 5 and 14	2	
				Less than 5 orders	0	
5.	**Refurbishment experience and capabilities**			**90%**		
	5.1.	**Proof of refurbishment of Blowers**	Tenderer to submit a list of blowers refurbished inhouse in the last 2 years. • Order number (Eskom one, if applicable) • Blower specification • Date of supply • Quantity Alternatively, the Tenderer supplies an agreement letter from the OEM's confirming that applicable blowers from the contractor will be refurbished by them, for the duration of the contract, if the contractor were to be successful.	more than 40 orders or OEM letters submitted	5	**100%**
				Between 20 and 40 orders	4	
				Between 10 and 20 orders	2	
				Less than 10 orders	0	
				TOTAL: 100		

TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2
1	X	X
2	X	X
3	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**
4	X	X
5	X	X

3.5 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.5.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	**N/A**

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

3.5.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Louis Snyman	Auxiliary Senior Engineer	
Lihle Cingo	MMD Technician Snr	

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
August 2024	1	PG van Biljon	Technical evaluation for supply of spares and refurbishment.

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

N/A

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Johann Claassen.
- Louis Snyman