Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for PM Correlation and Gaseous parallel tests for Units 1- 6 at Tutuka Power Station**	Unique Identifier:	**15ENG GEN-3085**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**3**
		Total Pages:	**10**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
M Ramatshela	LM Molepo	G. Ledwaba
Engineer	Senior Chemist: Boiler Plant Engineering	Engineering Manager (Acting): Tutuka Power Station
Date: 2026/01/28	Date: 2026/01/28	Date: 2026/01/28

CONTENTS

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Tutuka Power station is a solid fuel combustion installation and is equipped with an Automated Measuring System (AMS) on both its east and west stacks for the continuous online monitoring and reporting of several pollutants during operation as obligated by the National Environmental Management Air Quality Act No 29 of 2004. These pollutants include Particulate Matter, Sulphur dioxide and oxides of nitrogen amongst others.

Full Dust Correlation and Gaseous Verification tests of the emissions monitors are necessary to ensure the integrity of the data produced and reported through the AMS.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The project covers the correlation and parallel tests of dust and gaseous monitors to be performed at Tutuka Power Station for units 1-6 over a period of five years.

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 the proposal received for PM Correlation and Gaseous parallel tests for Units 1- 6 at Tutuka Power Station.

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] 240-168966153: Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[2] 240-53716726 Technical Scoring Form

[3] 240-53716712 Technical Evaluation Results

2.2.2 Informative

[4] N/A

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa

Abbreviation	Description
ESP	Electrostatic precipitator
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
SANAS	South African National Accreditation System
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-168966153: Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure for Generation

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- 240-53716746: Tender Technical Evaluation Report
- 240-53716712: Tender Technical Evaluation Results Form
- 240-53716726: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria 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 unless set otherwise. 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%.

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Mthoko Dlamini	Chief Engineer, Mechanical, Pr. Eng.
TET 2	Lesiba Molepo	Senior Chemist, Cert.Nat.Sc.
TET 3	Mmakwena Ramatshela	Mechanical Engineer

3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	**Reference to Technical Specification/ Tender Returnable**	**Motivation for use of criteria**
1.	SANAS Accreditation: The service provider submits proof of SANAS accreditation for emissions testing.	Valid certification	Compliance to Emissions Monitoring and Reporting Standard requirements

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)
1.	Method Statement .	Provide a description of dust/ particulate matter correlation and gaseous parallel (QAL2) scope of work method statement, containing all related major activities including all necessary equipment, tools, apparatus, and consumables for the tests. **Points to be allocated using the following criteria:** • No Method Statement or a method statement that is not relevant to the scope and lack technical details. **(0 %)** • Detailed method statement provided but lacks at least one of the following all necessary equipment, tools, apparatus, and consumables for the test. **(50%)** • Detailed method statement that outlines technical know-how for conducting dust emissions correlations tests as well as gaseous parallel tests and includes all necessary equipment, tools, apparatus, and consumables for the test. **(100%)**	**45**
2.	Company Experience – Similar Work	Provide records of experience of performing dust correlation tests as well as gaseous parallel tests using isokinetic measurement methods in accordance with VDI, EN or ISO standards. The related testing experience shall be within the last 5 years and must be of coal fired power plant. Proof should be in a form of an appointment letter with the following details as a minimum: • Project Name • Contact Person • Contact Number **Points to be allocated using the following criteria:** • No previous purchase order/ contract. **(0 %)** • One previous purchase order/contract. **(20 %)**	**15**

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	**Tender Returnable**	**Criteria Weighting (%)**
		• Two previous purchase order/ contract. **(80 %)** • Three or more purchase order/ contract. **(100%)**	
3.	Execution Program	Provide a detailed execution program plan to carry out the tests and submission of detailed final report. The program must include the test plan requirements and technical operating instruction. **Points to be allocated using the following criteria:** • No program or program that lacks details and does not clearly indicate test plan requirements and technical operating instruction. **(0 %)** • Program that includes the test plan requirements and technical operating instruction but does not specify the final report submission timelines. **(50%)** • Program that includes the test plan requirements, technical operating instruction, and submission of the detailed final report within 4 weeks from the last test date. **(100%)**	**15**
4.	Equipment Calibration	Provide relevant and valid calibration certificates for all equipment used as per the method statement. **Points to be allocated using the following criteria:** • No equipment calibration certificates submitted. **(0 %)** • Not all equipment calibration certificates submitted. **(50%)** • Calibration certificates provided for all equipment. **(100%)**	**25**
		TOTAL:	**100**
		Minimum Threshold	**70**

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1. Valid SANAS Accreditation	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**
1. Method Statement	X	X	X
2. Company Experience – Similar Work	X	X	X
3. Execution Program	X	X	X
4. Equipment Calibration	X	X	X

3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.6.1 Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description	
1.	Method Statement	Method statement demonstrates that the service provider understands the scope of work
2.	SANAS Accreditation	Service provider not accredited but submits SANAS Accreditation application
3.	Company Experience	Service provider has no experience on coal fired power plant but provides records of experience from industry
4.	Execution program	Program with longer turnaround times for report but with justification given.
5.	Equipment Calibration	Equipment calibration certificates included in the submission but not for all equipment

Table 6:Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description	
1.	Method Statement	Method statement does not demonstrate that the service provider understands the scope of work
2.	SANAS Accreditation	Service provider not accredited and does not submit SANAS Accreditation application
3.	Company Experience	Service provider fails to provide records of experience
4.	Execution program	No program provided
5.	Equipment Calibration	No calibration certificates provide or state to be provided later

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

N/A

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Mthoko Dlamini	Chief Engineer, Mechanical, Pr. Eng.	
Lesiba Molepo	Senior Chemist, Cert.Nat.Sc.	
Mmakwena Ramatshela	Mechanical Engineer	

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
March 2025	1	Lesiba M Molepo	First draft TES
September 2025	2	M. Ramatshela	TES updated
January 2026	3	M. Ramatshela	TES updated to include mandatory technical evaluation criteria.

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

L.M. Molepo

M. Ramatshela

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A