Eskom	Standard	Technology

Title: **TECHNICAL EVALUATION STANDARD FOR SUBSTATION STRANDED CONDUCTOR CLAMPS**

Unique Identifier:	**240-84512873**
Alternative Reference Number:	**<n/a>**
Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
Documentation Type:	**Standard**
Revision:	**3**
Total Pages:	**18**
Next Review Date:	**December 2026**
Disclosure Classification:	**Controlled Disclosure**

Compiled by	Approved by	Authorized by
Mohamed Khan	Theunus Marais	Naresh Hari
Senior Engineer, SI KZN OU, CentralEast Cluster	Chief Engineer, Operations Enablement	General Manager, Transmission Engineering
Date: 2021/12/07	Date: 2021/12/07	Date: 2021-12-09

Supported by SCOT/SC

Subhas Maharaj
Substation SC Chairperson

Date: 2021/12/09

PCM Reference: **Substation Design**
SCOT Study Committee Number/Name: **Substation**

Content

1. Introduction

This document has been developed in accordance with Eskom Procurement and Supply Management Procedure 32-1034 and is used to define the standard technical evaluation criteria to be used when evaluating pre-qualification submissions.

The document defines various aspects required to perform the technical evaluation and contains the evaluation criteria used at paper evaluation and the associated sample/factory evaluation. Contractors/Consultants who are sourcing material for use on self-build infrastructure projects are encouraged to use this evaluation criteria, to ensure compliance of products to the applicable Eskom standard.

2. Supporting clauses

2.1 Scope

The scope of this document is to provide the framework wherein the substation connectors or clamps for stranded conductors may be effectively evaluated against the applicable standard.

This document does not specify the requirements of each item as the specific requirements for the items are contained within the Technical Schedules that are attached to the respective Commercial Enquiries. This document covers only the evaluation strategy and criteria for substation stranded conductor clamps used in substations within Eskom Distribution.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to standardise the technical strategy and evaluation criteria for application during formal Commercial Enquiry processes for Eskom Distribution substation stranded conductor clamps in alignment with Eskom Holdings SOC (Ltd) policies.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document shall apply throughout Eskom Holdings Limited Divisions. It is also applicable for all external parties constructing substation infrastructure projects that will be handed over operationally to Eskom.

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] 32-1034, Eskom Procurement and Supply Management Procedure

[2] 240-48929482, Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[3] 240-83534936, Tubular and Stranded Conductor Clamps Additional to the Existing Standards

[4] 240-53113927, Specification for Substation Clamps for Stranded Aluminium Conductors

[5] ISO 9001, Quality Management Systems.

2.2.2 Informative

None

2.3 Definitions

2.3.1 General

Definition	Description
Accredited testing laboratory/authority	A laboratory which is ISO/IEC 17025 accredited and/or that holds valid certification issued by ILAC (International Laboratory Accreditation Corporation) or one of its members.
Certified test report	A certificate of tests performed as specified within the standard and carried out by an accredited authority or by the manufacturer and witnessed by an accredited authority that has been accredited in accordance with ISO/IEC 17011.
Eskom assessment / evaluation representative(s)	The person(s) appointed by Eskom to perform evaluation of tender submission (s) in line with Eskom requirements.
Routine test	Tests done to verify the quality and uniformity of the workmanship and materials used in the manufacture of equipment.
Type test	Tests done on the completion of the development of a new design to establish representative performance data. They need to be repeated if the design is changed to modify its performance or there is a change in the manufacturing process.

2.3.2 Disclosure classification

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

2.4 Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
NEC	New Engineering Contract
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
SAP	Systems Application Processes
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 Roles and responsibilities

Suppliers are responsible for manufacturing, testing and supplying products in accordance with document [3]. Personnel involved with the design, procurement and construction of Eskom substations shall ensure compliance to these requirements and that clamps for stranded conductors are evaluated in accordance with this document.

2.6 Process for monitoring

All clamps for stranded conductors to be supplied to Eskom shall be in accordance with [3] and shall be evaluated against the criteria as stipulated in this document. It will be communicated via the TCIF structures to affected departments for noting and compliance. The Substations COE will ensure that it is updated should it be required with the support of the Substations Products Care Group.

2.7 Related/supporting documents

This document must be read in conjunction with document 240-53113927.

3. Requirements

3.1 General

The technical evaluation for the substation stranded conductor clamps shall be composed of two main parts namely documentation evaluation and a factory evaluation (if applicable/required). If the tender being evaluated is for a National Contract, then a factory evaluation would be deemed compulsory and is highly recommended for Provincial or Cluster Contracts. The criteria for the technical evaluation are based on the specified requirements in the Eskom Standard 240-53113927: Specification for Substation Clamps for Stranded Aluminium Conductors.

All documentation for this tender shall be in English.

For the supplier's submission to be compliant all tender technical returnables must be submitted as required and score at least 85% in the qualitative evaluation.

Suppliers who are tendering but are not the OEM of the product must source the required technical returnable from the OEM where relevant. Missing information will not be requested after the Enquiry closing date.

If any part or sub-component of the production process is outsourced, the Supplier shall retain full and complete accountability for the (entire) product.

Note 1: Eskom Distribution systems hardware items are allocated a specific designation by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) which is included in the Commercial section of the enquiry. The technical evaluation process shall only proceed when the DTI designation requirements are met.

Note 2: Where the Factory Assessment and Verification is a requirement it must be clearly stated as such in the Commercial Strategy documentation. However, the Technical Evaluation Team may, in consultation with Eskom SMEs, determine that no further assessment is needed. This will be determined after the qualitative assessments.

3.2 Desktop Evaluation

The desktop evaluation shall be conducted by the Eskom assessment representatives. This part of the evaluation will start when submissions are opened the first time. It begins with the confirmation that all tender technical returnables have been submitted. Total compliance with the stipulated criteria in Level 1, will result in the tender submission moving on to the qualitative criteria in Level 2. (Refer to Annex A). Tenderers that do not submit all the required tender technical returnables will be disqualified and will not proceed to the qualitative part of the assessment.

- Submissions meeting 100% of the Level 1 requirements will proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.
- Submissions failing to meet 100% of the Level 1 requirements will be deemed non-responsive (non-compliant); the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.
- Where clarifications are required, the rules as per 32-1034 are to be applied and no tender is to be made responsive via the clarification process.

During the qualitative assessment, the Eskom evaluating representatives will go through the qualifying submissions in detail and score each item evaluated. Refer to Annex B. The tender submission must score a minimum of 85% in the qualitative evaluation to be considered as technically qualified. If required, these tenders will then move on to the next phase of the evaluation i.e. Factory Evaluation. The requirement for a factory evaluation will be made by the cross functional team at Tender Strategy Phase.

3.3 Sample Evaluation

As part of the qualitative tendering criteria suppliers are required to submit samples for evaluation. The samples should be the exact products that will be supplied in the event that the supplier is awarded the tender.

The sample evaluation determines the compliance of the manufactured product to the manufacturing standards as stated in the Level 2 criteria. As an example, the product sample will be assessed for compliance to aspects such as dimensions, galvanising, markings, accessories etc. These will be known and sourced from the measurable criteria stated in the Level 2 criteria.

A list of samples of clamps to be submitted during tendering shall be included in the tender enquiry documents.

NB: A factory evaluation will only be conducted if the supplier has met the requirements in Level 1 and 2.

3.4 Factory Evaluation

This assessment is performed on the basis of assessing the supplier's capability to enter into a contract with Eskom with respect to a specific product or service.

This report and any actions that are listed or recommended as a result of this assessment, is by no means a confirmation or guarantee that any contract will be entered into by Eskom and the supplier or that post contract performance has been achieved.

Any actions undertaken by the supplier as a consequence of this report is for the supplier's account. Any liability for the said actions undertaken by the supplier is not transferrable to Eskom in any way.

The assessment team has no authority or responsibility in the decision taken by Eskom with respect to contracting for a product or service.

Any statements, intentions and/or actions expressed by the assessment team during the assessment and post the assessment has no effect and does not constitute any liability to Eskom with regards to contract placement or post contract performance guarantees.

Eskom evaluating representatives will contact and arrange to visit the factory of the tenderers whose submissions have passed the desktop and sample evaluation.

At the factory of each supplier, the Eskom evaluating representatives will conduct the evaluation using the factory evaluation criteria in Annex C. The criteria for the factory evaluation are not point scored but are assessed on a Yes/No basis on whether or not they have been met satisfactorily. An assessment of 'No' against any criterion will eliminate the tenderer from further consideration, unless the tenderer agrees to resolve the issues identified, in a manner which is acceptable to the technical evaluation team.

At the end of this exercise, the Eskom evaluating representatives will list all the deviations, if any, on the factory evaluation document. The Eskom representatives will conduct a formal discussion with the tenderer on these deviations. Herein, the tenderer will be given an opportunity to express whether they agree or disagree with Eskom's findings and if they will meet Eskom requirements before/upon the contract being awarded. At the end, Eskom and the representatives of the tenderer will sign the factory evaluation document which will be used to conclude the technical evaluation report. Where the tenderer has agreed to meet Eskom requirements, all of these will form part of the contract and the verification that will be conducted afterwards.

4. Authorization

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name and surname	Designation
Alex Ndlela	Senior Manager – Distribution Division, Engineering
Subhas Maharaj	Senior Manager – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Athelene Gouws	Senior Engineer – Distribution Division, Gauteng Cluster
Best Khoza	Engineer – Distribution Division, Cape Coastal Cluster

Name and surname	Designation
Christy Thomas	Senior Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Derrick Delly	Chief Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Dickey van Eeden	Senior Technician – Distribution Division, CentralEast Cluster
Enderani Naicker	Chief Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Jason Blaauw	Senior Engineer – Distribution Division, Cape Coastal Cluster
Mark Peffer	Chief Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Payoyo Bukhosini	Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Percy Seboco	Chief Technologist – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Rukesh Ramnarain	Chief Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Sipho Zulu	Chief Engineer – Transmission Division, Substation Engineering
Stefan Terblanche	Senior Advisor – Distribution Division, Cape Coastal Cluster

5. Revisions

Date	Rev	Compiler	Remarks
Dec 2021	3	MF Khan	Updated Evaluation Criteria Inserted clause that National Contracts must include a factory/sample evaluation Increased Qualitative Pass mark for desktop evaluation to 85 % Scored Type Tests separately Removed scoring for History of Supply and NCR's
Oct 2017	2	TJ Marais	1. Introduction: Reference to clause 3.7.3.4 of Procedure 32-1034 removed. 2.2.1 Normative: Added 32-1034, Eskom Procurement and Supply Management Procedure 2.2.1 Normative: Added 240-48929482, Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure. 2.2.1 Normative: Updated 474-218 to 240-53113927. 2.3.1 General: Definitions added as applicable. 2.5 Roles and responsibilities: Updated. 2.6 Process for monitoring: Updated As per the requirements of Eskom document 32-1034 (Eskom Procurement and Supply Management Procedure) all references to mandatory evaluation criteria has been removed and replaced with tender technical returnables. 3.3 Sample Evaluation: Section reworded. 3.4 Factory Evaluation: Section updated.

Date	Rev	Compiler	Remarks
			Original Annex A (Technical Tender Evaluation Criteria) reformatted and split into Annex A (Desktop Documentation Evaluation: Tender Technical Returnables) and Annex B (Desktop Documentation Evaluation: Qualitative Criteria) Scoring table in original Annex A (now B) aligned with table 2 in 240-48929482. Original Annex B (Samples to be Submitted) removed, applicable information is covered in 240-53113927. Annex C title changed and updated, reference to welded couplers removed, pad connections added and In Factory Product Assessment Evaluation Agreement added.
Nov 2014	1	I Chauke	Converted from old draft (never formally published), formatted into a new template and allocated a new number.

6. Development team

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

- Athelene Gouws, Senior Engineer
- Cobus Bosch, Senior Engineer
- Isaac Chauke, Senior Engineer
- Ian Hill, Senior Engineer
- Jason Blaauw, Senior Engineer
- Theunus Marais, Chief Engineer

7. Acknowledgements

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

- Athelene Gouws
- Jason Blaauw
- Stefan Terblanche
- Theunus Marais

Annex A – Desktop Documentation Evaluation: Tender Technical Returnables

Tender technical returnables are not point scored. These are assessed on a Yes/No basis as to whether or not all required technical returnables have been submitted. An assessment of 'No' against any criterion will eliminate the tenderer from further consideration. All submissions must comply with [3], 240-53113927 Specification for Substation Clamps for Stranded Aluminium Conductors. The tender technical returnables are:

LEVEL 1 CRITERIA	CLAUSE in [3]	YES	NO
Is all information supplied in English?			
Has completed technical schedule B per clamp type been submitted?	3.12 (a)		
Has a full set of drawings per clamp type been submitted?	3.5; 3.12 (b)		
Has a list of all type test certificates and reports specified in the standard been submitted?	3.12 (c)		
Has copies of all type test certificates and reports specified in the standard been submitted?	3.4.9; 3.12 (c)		
Has manual(s) for handling, storage, installation and inspections of the clamps been submitted?	3.9; 3.10; 3.11; 3.12 (d)		
Has samples as per the requested list been supplied?	3.7		

QUALIFYING FOR FURTHER QUALITATIVE EVALUATION?	YES	NO

Annex B – Desktop Documentation Evaluation: Qualitative Criteria (Level 2)

After it confirming that all the tender technical returnables have been submitted and that critical requirements have been met, the submission will be assessed against the following criteria (shown below) with detail as stipulated in [3], 240-53113927 Specification for Substation Clamps for Stranded Aluminium Conductors and/ or [4], 240-83534936 Tubular and Stranded Conductor Clamps additional to the existing Standard.

Criteria	Section	% weight	Weighted Score
Clamp Range	B1	15	
Technical Schedules	B2	50	
Outline Drawings	B3	20	
Welding	B4	5	
Sample Impression	B5	10	
Total		**100**	

For each evaluation criteria, the extent to which submissions comply with the requirements shall be scored based on the following, with a maximum score of 100

5	**COMPLIANT** Meet technical requirement(s) AND; No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	**COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS** Meet technical requirement(s) with; Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; Acceptable conditions.
2	**NON-COMPLIANT** Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR; Unacceptable conditions.
0	**TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE**

Threshold: The score that each tenderer receives will provide a numeric basis for tender comparison. The minimum weighted average score required for a stranded conductor clamp to be considered must be 85% or above.

B1	**CLAMPING RANGE**			
ITEM NO	**DESCRIPTION**	**UNIT**	**CRITERIA**	**SCORE**
B1.1	Does the supplier supply all the clamps required as per this tender?	% of required clamps listed	> 90 %	5
			80 – 90%	4
			60 – 80%	2
			< 60%	0
Clamping Range (maximum points: 5)			Score	
CLAMPING RANGE (section weight: 15%)			Weighted Score = $(\mathbf{Score}) * \left(\frac{\mathbf{15}}{\mathbf{5}}\right)$	

B2	**TECHNICAL SCHEDULES**			
ITEM NO	**DESCRIPTION**	**UNIT**	**CRITERIA**	**SCORE**
B2.1 Compliance with Technical Requirements (15%)	Does the supplier comply with the technical requirements as stipulated in the Technical Schedules? (Excluding Type Tests)	% compliance	> 95 %	5
			85 – 95%	4
			70 – 85%	2
			< 70%	0
	Technical Schedules (maximum points: 5)		Score 1	
	Technical Schedules (sub-section weight: 15%)		Weighted Score 1 = $(\textbf{Score 1}) * \left(\frac{15}{5}\right)$	
B2.2 Deviation schedule provided (5%)	Has a deviation schedule been completed and accepted for deviations from the standard?	% compliance	100 %	5
			80-99%	4
			60 -79 %	2
			< 60%	0
	Deviation Schedule (maximum points: 5)		Score 2	
	Deviation Schedule (sub-section weight: 5%)		Weighted Score 2 = $(\textbf{Score 2}) * \left(\frac{5}{5}\right)$	
B2.3 Type Tests Submission (30%)	Have the type tests as specified in the standard been passed as required. Note: If the type test specified below is not applicable to the clamp, then the evaluator will award the points for that particular type test e.g. An electrical test for a support clamp.			
	Heat (Current)-Cycle test		Yes	5
			No	0
	Temperature Rise Test		Yes	5
			No	0
	Corona and RIV test		Yes	5
			No	0
	Short Circuit Withstand Test		Yes	5
			No	0
	Bolt-tightening torque test		Yes	5
			No	0
	Slip/Pull-out strength test		Yes	5
			No	0
	Cantilever strength of bus supports test		Yes	5

		No	0
	Type Tests (maximum points: 35)	Score 3	
	Type Tests (sub-section weight: 30%)	Weighted Score 3 = $(\textbf{Score 3}) * \left(\frac{30}{35}\right)$	
TECHNICAL SCHEDULES (section weight: 50%)		Weighted Score 1 + Weighted Score 2 + Weighted Score 3 =	

B3	**OUTLINE DRAWINGS**			
ITEM NO	**DESCRIPTION**	**UNIT**	**CRITERIA**	**SCORE**
B3.1	Clamp description	% drawings correct	100 %	5
			95 – 99.9%	4
			90 – 95%	2
			< 90%	0
B3.2	Eskom code	% drawings correct	100 %	5
			95 – 99.9%	4
			90 – 95%	2
			< 90%	0
B3.3	Drawing number	% drawings correct	100 %	5
			95 – 99.9%	4
			90 – 95%	2
			< 90%	0
B3.4	Ratings	% drawings correct	100 %	5
			95 – 99.9%	4
			90 – 95%	2
			< 90%	0
B3.5	Dimensions including weight (in kg)	% drawings correct	100 %	5
			95 – 99.9%	4
			90 – 95%	2
			< 90%	0
Outline Drawings (maximum points: 25)			Score	
OUTLINE DRAWINGS (section weight: 20%)			Weighted Score = $(\textbf{Score}) * \left(\frac{20}{25}\right)$	

B4	**WELDING**			
ITEM NO	**DESCRIPTION**	**UNIT**	**CRITERIA**	**SCORE**
B4.1	Has the welding procedure been submitted		Yes	5
			No	0
B4.2	Has proof of accreditation of the OEM welder been submitted		Yes	5
			No	0
Welding (maximum points: 10)			Score	
Welding (section weight: 5%)			Weighted Score = $(\mathbf{Score}) * \left(\frac{5}{10}\right)$	

B5	**SAMPLE IMPRESSION**		
ITEM NO	**DESCRIPTION**	**CRITERIA**	**SCORE**
B5.1	Surface finish impression	Acceptable	5
		Not acceptable	0
B5.2	Dimensions according to standard?	Yes	5
		No	0
B5.3	Identification marks: Manufacture's identification Eskom clamp code number Nominal size or range of sizes of conductors with which the clamp is intended to be used	Yes	5
		No	0
B5.4	For bolted clamps: (if applicable) Contact surface of current-carrying clamp grooved Bolt diameter ≥10mm Nuts, bolts and washers galvanized Bolts not protruding to potentially cause corona Bolt torque stamped on clamp	Yes	5
		No	0
B5.5	For compression clamps: (if applicable) Sleeve tubing diameter according to spec Compression sleeve tube marked with position and number of compressions and die size Compression sleeve tube marked with conductor diameter and legible Quality of welds (no cracks, voids, incomplete penetration, incomplete fusion, undercutting or inclusions) Drilled hole of Ø4mm	Yes	5
		No	0

B5	**SAMPLE IMPRESSION**		
ITEM NO	**DESCRIPTION**	**CRITERIA**	**SCORE**
B5.6	Are pads serrated machined	Yes	5
		No	0
Sample Impression (maximum points: 30)		Score	
SAMPLE IMPRESSION (section weight: 10%)		Weighted Score = $(\mathbf{Score}) * \left(\frac{\mathbf{10}}{\mathbf{30}}\right)$	

Annex C – In-Factory Product Assessment

Eskom	**SUBSTATION STRANDED CONDUCTOR** **IN-FACTORY PRODUCT ASSESSMENT CHECK SHEET**

TECHNICAL EVALUATION TEAM

Name	Signature	Date

DOCUMENT REQUIREMENTS

The following documents must be provided by the supplier at the factory before the start of the assessment:

- Welding procedure,
- Accreditation of welder/s,
- Routine tests records,
- Storage and handling procedures,
- Inspection manual/s.

C1 WELDING

ITEM	CLAUSE in [3]	EVALUATION ASPECT	YES/NO
C1.1	3.3.5	Is welding done using a tungsten inert-gas-shielded arc or a metal inert-gas-shielded are process?	
C1.2	3.3.5	Are welding jigs used to ensure the correct alignment of sleeves?	
C1.3	3.3.5	Are welds clean, sound, smooth, and uniform without overlaps, properly fused and completely sealed?	
C1.4	3.3.5 3.12 (e)	Is there a welding procedure?	
C1.5	3.3.5 3.12 (f)	Is the welder accredited? Verify certificate against employee identity.	
Comment/s:			

C2 COMPRESSION CLAMPS

ITEM	CLAUSE in [3]	EVALUATION ASPECT	YES/NO
C2.1	3.3.4	Are compression sleeves manufactured from extruded tubing to suit specified conductors?	
C2.2	3.3.4	Is line boring or drilling techniques used? If yes, is the tolerance on the wall thickness less than 5%?	
C2.3	3.3.4	Are compression sleeves pre-greased and have a dust cap applied?	
C2.4	3.3.4	Do the compression sleeves have a 4mm diameter whole drilled to serve as a passage for the flow of excess grease during compression?	
C2.5	3.3.4	Are the compression sleeves marked externally with the position and number of compressions required?	
Comment/s:			

C3 BOLTED CLAMPS

ITEM	CLAUSE in [3]	EVALUATION ASPECT	YES/NO
C3.1	3.3.3	Do the bolts comply with the requirements of NEMA CC 1-2009?	
C3.2	3.3.3	Do the nuts and washers comply with the requirements of SANS 1700?	
C3.3	3.3.3	Do the bolts have hexagonal heads?	
C3.4		Are the bolts treated to prevent seizure? What is the method of treatment?	
Comment/s:			

C4 PAD CONNECTIONS

ITEM	CLAUSE in [3]	EVALUATION ASPECT	YES/NO
C4.1	3.1	Are pad dimensions according to standard?	
C4.2	3.1	Are pad thickness and hole sizes according to standard?	
C4.3	3.4.5	Are pad terminals serrated-machined?	
Comment/s:			

C5 SAMPLE AND ROUTINE TEST RECORDS

ITEM	CLAUSE in [3]	EVALUATION ASPECT	YES/NO
C5.1	3.4.5 3.4.6 3.4.7 3.4.8	Are there procedures available to conduct sample and routine tests?	
C5.2		Are records of sample and routine tests available?	
C5.3		Are sample and routine tests conducted regularly and as per the suppliers' procedure?	
Comment/s:			

C6 PACKAGING

ITEM	CLAUSE in [3]	EVALUATION ASPECT	YES/NO
C6.1		Are the clamps marked with the following identification marks: Manufacturer's identification Eskom clamp code number Nominal size or range of sizes of conductors with which the clamp is intended to be used	
C6.2	3.8	Are individual clamps packaged in sealed, heavy duty, UV stabilized bags?	
C6.3	3.8	Are the sealed clamps packaged for delivery in strong durable containers?	
C6.4	3.8	If wooden crates are used, are they treated?	
C6.5	3.8	On the container, is there a label with the following: Eskom's order number Eskom SAP number Eskom clamp designation/code; Manufacturer's name Content of crate/container (i.e. a parts list) Overall dimensions of crate/container Total mass of the crate/container Pictograms/symbols showing correct storage and stacking Instructions of the crates/containers Delivery address	
Comment/s:			

IN FACTORY PRODUCT ASSESSMENT EVALUATION AGREEMENT

Eskom	**SUBSTATION STRANDED CONDUCTOR CLAMP FACTORY PRODUCT and ASSESSMENT EVALUATION AGREEMENT**

Item	Deviation Description	Response	Tenderer		Eskom		Target Date
			Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	

MAIN REPRESENTATIVES

Company			Enquiry #	
Eskom	Name		Signature	
	Designation		Date	
Tenderer	Name		Signature	
	Designation		Date	
Factory	Name		Signature	
	Designation		Date	