


| | | |
|---|--|--|
|  | <p style="text-align: center;">Strategy</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Hendrina Power Station</p> |
|---|--|--|

Title: Tender Evaluation Strategy for the Maintenance of The Fire Protection System at Hendrina Power Station for the period of 5 years

Document Number: **380-137445**

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Functional Area: **All**

Revision: **0**

Total Pages: **14**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **Controlled Disclosure**

Compiled by

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 authorized version on the system.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 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 | 4 |
| 2.3.1. Classification..... | 4 |
| 2.4. Abbreviations | 5 |
| 2.5. Roles and Responsibilities | 5 |
| 2.6. Process for Monitoring | 5 |
| 2.7. Related/Supporting Documents | 5 |
| 3. Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy..... | 5 |
| 3.1. Technical Evaluation Method..... | 5 |
| 3.1.1. Qualitative Criteria | 5 |
| 3.2. Technical Evaluation Threshold | 11 |
| 3.3. TET Members | 11 |
| 3.4. TET Member Responsibilities | 12 |
| 3.5. Foreseen Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications..... | 13 |
| 3.5.1. Risks | 13 |
| 3.5.2. Exceptions / Conditions..... | 13 |
| 4. Authorization | 14 |
| 5. Revisions | 14 |
| 6. Development Team..... | 14 |
| 7. Acknowledgements | 14 |

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 authorized version on the system.

1. Introduction

An open enquiry invite will be issued calling for tenderers to participate in the tender process for the maintenance of the fire protection system at Hendrina Power Station as and when required for a period of 5 years. This document sets out the method and criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenders that will result from this open enquiry invite.

2. Supporting Clauses

2.1. Scope

The scope of this document is to capture the technical tender evaluation strategy which will be used to evaluate the bidders for maintenance of the fire protection system at Hendrina Power Station as and when required for a period of 5 years. The scope of the project is as described in the scope document for the maintenance of the fire protection system at Hendrina Power Station as and when required for a period of 5 years.

2.1.1. Purpose.

The purpose of this tender technical evaluation strategy is to define 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 Technical Evaluation Team for the maintenance of the fire protection system at Hendrina Power Station as and when required for a period of 5 years.

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] 240-48929153: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure.

2.2.2. Informative

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 authorized version on the system.

- [1] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems
- [2] 32-1033: Eskom Procurement and Supply Chain Management Policy
- [3] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement and Supply Chain Management Procedure

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 authorized version on the system.

2.4. Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Description |
|--------------|---|
| EDWL | Engineering Design Work Lead |
| PS | Power Station |
| SDL&I | Supplier Development Localization and industrialization |
| TES | Technical Evaluation Strategy |
| TET | Technical Evaluation Team |

2.5. Roles and Responsibilities

As per 240-48929153: 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

3.1.1. Qualitative Criteria

The weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications.

The technical criteria and weighting are broken down as follows:

- Criteria 1: Company Experience = 35%
- Criteria 2: Key Individuals Responsible for Contract Work = 30%
- Criteria 3: Method Statement = 25%
- Criteria 4: Quality Control Plan = 10%

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the above requirements. Tenderers need to have an overall weighted score of 70% or more to technically qualify for further evaluation, which are not covered in this scope. However, in cases where tenderers do not meet the 70% threshold tenderers which obtained a weighted score of 60% and above will qualify for further evaluation.

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 authorized version on the system.

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications.

The scoring method will be as follows for the qualitative evaluation criteria:

| Score | Percentage | Description |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 5 | 100 | Compliant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet technical requirement(s) AND; • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements. |
| 4 | 80 | Compliant with Associated Qualifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet technical requirement(s) with. • Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR. • Acceptable exceptions AND/OR. • Acceptable conditions. |
| 2 | 40 | Non-Compliant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | | |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Table 3: Criteria 1: Qualitative technical evaluation criteria

| | Qualitative Technical Criteria Description | Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable | Criteria Weighting (%) | Criteria Sub Weighting (%) |
|-----------|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | Criteria 1: Company Experience | | 35 | |
| | <p>1.1</p> <p>Proof of experience in maintenance of fire systems (as defined in the scope of work).</p> <p>Scoring Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $X \geq 5$ number of completed work = 5 points (35) • $2 < X \leq 4$ number of completed work = 4 points (28) • $0 < X \leq 2$ number of completed work = 2 points (14) • $X = 0$ number of completed work = 0 points (0) <p>*Note: 'x' is the number of completed work.</p> | <p>Signed, completion certificate of previous work of similar scope with the following information: Name of company where work was executed, Project, Description, Contract period & Contact person.</p> <p>NB!! PO number without the PO document will not be accepted</p> | | 35 |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

| | Qualitative Technical Criteria Description | | Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable | Criteria Weighting (%) | Criteria Sub Weighting (%) |
|-----------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2. | Criteria 2: Key Individuals Responsible for Contract Work | | | 30 | |
| | 2.1 | <p>Site Manager: Copy of CV and Technical National Diploma (NQF 6) with experience of 5 years’.</p> <p>Scoring criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $X \geq 5$ years of experience = 5 points (10) • $3 < X \leq 5$ years of experience = 4 points (8) • $0 < X \leq 3$ years of experience = 2 points (4) • $X = 0$ years of experience = 0 points (0) <p>*Note: x’ is the number of years of experience</p> | Certified copy of certificate (certified within 3 to 6 months of the closing date) and CV showing years of experience with traceable references. | | 10 |
| | 2.2 | <p>Artisan Fitter: Minimum N3 technical qualification and Trade test including 3 years’ post trade test experience</p> <p>Scoring criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $X \geq 3$ years of experience = 5 points (10) • $X = 2$ years of experience = 4 points (8) • $X = 1$ years of experience = 2 points (4) • $X = 0$ years of experience = 0 points (0) <p>*Note: x’ is the number of years of experience.</p> | Certified copy of certificate (certified within 3 to 6 months of the closing date) and CV showing years of experience with traceable references. | | 10 |
| | 2.3 | <p>Diesel Mechanic: Minimum N3 technical qualification and Trade test including 3 years’ post trade test experience</p> | Certified copy of certificate (certified within 3 to 6 months of the | | 10 |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|-----------|----|
| | | <p>Scoring criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • X ≥ 3 years of experience = 5 points (10) • X = 2 years of experience = 4 points (8) • X = 1 years of experience = 2 points (4) • X = 0 years of experience = 0 points (0) <p>*Note: x' is the number of years of experience.</p> | closing date) and CV showing years of experience with traceable references. | | |
| | Criteria 3: Method Statement | | | 25 | |
| 3. | 3.1 | <p>Provide detailed method statement of the following maintenance activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintenance of diesel engines 2. Replacement and overhauling of centrifugal pump <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not submitted or related to the scope of work = 0 points • Method statement is basic, vague, or does not cover most of the scope of work = 2 points • Method statements is clear, has minimal errors, and covers majority of the scope of work = 4 points • Method statement is clearly defined, detailed, comprehensive and cover the full scope of work = 5 points | Detailed method statement must include, but not limited to frequency, resources required, estimated time, resource planning. | | 25 |
| 4. | Criteria 4: Quality Control Plant | | | 10 | |
| | 4.1 | <p>Quality Control Plan (QCP) Showing all the points for maintenance for the follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintenance of diesel engines 2. Replacement and overhauling of centrifugal pump <p>Scoring criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QCP includes all necessary steps to evaluate quality and includes reference to supporting | Drafted QCP indicating all hold points and steps taken to ensure that quality is controlled during delivery of the maintenance activities. | | 10 |

Title: Tender Evaluation Strategy for the Maintenance of The Fire Protection System at Hendrina Power Station for the period of 5 years

Document No.: **380-137445**

Revision: **0**

Page: **10 of 15**

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | documents and intervention points (i.e. hold, witness etc.) = 5 Points <ul style="list-style-type: none">• QCP is generic (does not include all steps) = 3 Points• QCP is not submitted, or documents submitted does not qualify as QCP = 0 Points (0) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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 authorized version on the system.

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

Table 1: Core TET Members

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

3.4. TET Member Responsibilities

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

| Qualitative Technical Evaluation | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Qualitative Criteria Number | TET 1 | TET 2 | TET 3 |
| 1.1 | X | X | X |
| 2.1 | X | X | X |
| 2.2 | X | X | X |
| 2.3 | X | X | X |
| 3.1 | X | X | X |
| 4.1 | X | X | X |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

3.5. Foreseen Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications

3.5.1. Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

| Risk | Description |
|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. | N/A |

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

| Risk | Description |
|-------------|--|
| 1. | Contractor not able to take accountability for contracted works |
| 2. | Contractor has not done any maintenance on a fire protection system |

3.5.2. Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

| Risk | Description |
|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. | N/A |

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

| Risk | Description |
|-------------|--|
| 1. | Technical submission does not address entire scope of work required |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

4. Authorization

This document has been seen and accepted by:

5. Revisions

6. Development Team

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

7. Acknowledgements

- N/A

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE