

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation
Strategy for Tutuka Multi Jet
Controller (MJC) Replacement**

Unique Identifier: **15ENG GEN -817**

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Documentation Type: **STR**

Revision: **3**

Total Pages: **13**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED
DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by




M Maunye

**Fire Protection System
Engineer**

Date: 15/04/2021

Functional Responsibility



M Mokoena

**Auxiliary Engineering
Manager**

Date: 2021.04.15

Authorised by



Ntombifuthi Ngcobo

**Power Station Engineering
Manager**

Date: 16-04-2021

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	3
2.3.1 Classification	3
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	4
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD	4
3.1.1 Mandatory Criteria Evaluation	4
3.1.2 Qualitative Criteria Evaluation	5
3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	6
3.3 TET MEMBERS	6
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	11
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	12
3.7.1 Risks	12
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions	12
4. AUTHORISATION	13
5. REVISIONS	13
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	13
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	13

TABLES

Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table	5
Table 1: TET Members	6
Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	6
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities	11
Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks	12
Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks	12
Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	12
Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	12

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

This document provides the technical mandatory and qualitative criteria on which to evaluate potential contractors for the design, supply and installation of the Tutuka Multi Jet Controllers.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document will only cover the technical tender evaluation criteria for the Tutuka Multi Jet Controller replacement project.

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

The document will apply to the Tutuka Multi Jet Controller Replacement project only.

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: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form
- [3] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results

2.2.2 Informative

- [4] 360-TUT-AABZ28-SP0004-11: Tutuka PS Multi Jet Controller (MJC) Replacement Technical Specification

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

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.

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
FDT	Destructive Testing
EDWL	Engineering Design Work Lead
ISO	International Standards Organisation
NDT	Non Destructive Testing
OHSA	Occupation Health and Safety Act
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure [1].

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 evaluation criteria will be based upon a two-step process

3.1.1 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 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 by the EDWL to check for consistency in scoring of the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Should the EDWL find 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

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.

3.1.2 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	80	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.		

The evaluation method will be based on similar projects done by the tenderers in the past. The tenderers will need to perform a complete detailed design (including supply bill of quantities), removal of existing system, supply and install new system as well as commission and test new system. A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications. Tenderers need to have a weighted score of 70% overall or more to technically qualify for further evaluation.

The technical criteria and weighting is broken down as follows:

- a) Engineering: 100%

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 of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering requirements. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tender submission against the specifications and Employer's requirements.

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 2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Mary Maunye	System Engineer
TET 2	Egard Janse van Rensburg	Mechanical Engineer
TET 3	Niloshen Moodley	Civil Engineer
TET 4	Suven Govender	Civil Engineer

3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Motivation for use of Criteria
1	CIDB 5ME/SF or higher	Risk mitigation

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.

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Tender Returnable	Reference to Works Information (Refer to Section C3.1 of the contract)	Criteria Weighting (%)	Score	Sub Criteria Weighting (%)
	Mechanical Scope				90%		
1.	Experience				35%		
	1.1	How many fire projects of similar nature has the contractor designed and constructed? As a minimum the reference list must contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contact person(s) - Contact Number(s) - Project Description - Construction Period - Contract Value 	Project references	2.5	5 Projects	5	70
					3-4 Projects	4	
					1-2 Projects	2	
					0 Projects	0	
	1.2	Years' experience in fire engineering	Company established date	2.5	5 Years	5	30
					3-4 Years	4	
					1-2 Years	2	
					0 Years	0	
					Sub Score:		
2.	Technical Team				30%		
	2.1	Registered Pr Eng (Mech) and ASIB registered as designer	ECSCA Registration and ASIB	2.5	ECSCA Registration and ASIB qualification supplied	5	70
					Either only ECSCA registration or only ASIB qualification supplied	2	

			qualification as designer. Supply certificates as proof or registration.		Neither ECSA registration nor ASIB qualification supplied	0	
	2.2	Organogram indicating each role of the project team related to this project - Qualifications and experience must also be indicated with organogram.	Organogram to be supplied	2.5	Organogram supplied	5	30
Organogram not supplied					0		
Sub score:							
3.	Method Statement and QCP				25%		
	3.1	Valves – drawings of proposed valves with dimensions, capacity, rating and qualification (FM, UL or ISO 6182 approved)	Drawings and data sheets	3.2.3.1	Drawings showing dimensions, capacity, rating and qualification (data sheet)	5	25
					Qualification (datasheets) supplied but no drawings showing dimensions, capacity and rating.	4	
					Either only drawings supplied or only qualification (datasheets) supplied	2	
					Neither drawings nor qualifications (datasheets) are supplied	0	
	3.2	Detection bulbs – ratings and FM or UL approved	Data sheets	3.2.2.1	Datasheets supplied	5	25
					Datasheets not supplied	0	
	3.3	Drawing examples (Isometric, General arrangement, node diagrams)	Drawings	3.4	Iso, GA and node drawings examples supplied	5	25

					Only 2 examples of out of Iso, GA and node drawings supplied	4	
					Only 1 example out of Iso, GA and node drawings supplied	2	
					No example supplied	0	
	3.4	Method statement for design and construction to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic project program showing duration of each activity, - Installation procedure - Commissioning procedure - Quality Control Plans including hold points - Proposal to reduce the amount of MJC's currently used/installed 	Method statement	3.3	Program, installation and commissioning procedure, QC plan and proposal supplied	5	
					2-3 items out of the program, installation and commissioning procedure, QC plan and proposal supplied	4	
					1 item out of the program, installation and commissioning procedure, QC plan and proposal supplied	2	
					No method supplied	0	
					Sub score:		
					TOTAL: 100		

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Tender Returnable	Reference to Works Information	Criteria Weighting (%)	Score	Sub Criteria Weighting (%)
4.	Civil and Structural				10%		
	4.1	Method statement for the works clearly demonstrating compliance with the full scope of work as detailed in the Works	Method statement	3.3	Method statement provided with all minimum requirements discussed/addressed	5	60

		Information. As a minimum, the method statement should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consideration of the project constraints ▪ Position and type of anchorage system ▪ Technical specifications for the various pipe supports solutions ▪ Constructability of the system 			Method statement provided with 3-2 minimum requirements discussed/addressed	4	
					Method statement provided with 1-2 minimum requirements discussed/addressed	2	
					No method supplied	0	
	4.2	Registered Professional Engineer (Civil) with the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA)	Supply proof of registration certificate with ECSA	2.5	Registration and qualification supplied	5	40
					Registration and qualification not supplied	0	

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1.1	X	X		
1.2	X	X		
2.1	X	X		
2.2	X	X		
3.1	X	X		
3.2	X	X		
3.3	X	X		
3.4	X	X		
4.1			X	X
4.2			X	X

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.

3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.7.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Contractor not being ASIB certified as a designer
2.	No project experience designing and installing fire protection systems

3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Material not meeting Eskom standards
2.	Unsafe work practices

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.

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Mary Maunye	System Engineer	
Egard Janse van Rensburg	Mechanical Engineer	
Monyane Mokoena	Auxiliary Engineering Manager	
Niloshen Moodley	Civil Engineer	
Suven Govender	Civil Engineer	

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
May 2019	1	K Enslin	As per procedure
February 2020	2	K Enslin	Mandatory changed to include SF
April 2021	3	M Maunye	CIDB changed from 7ME/SF to 5ME/SF

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

N/A

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NA

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.