

TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of tenders against the technical specification. Tenders need to have a minimum weighted score of 70% to technically qualify for further evaluation. The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tender's ability to meet the technical requirements.

Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (gatekeepers) are 'must meet' criteria. These criteria shall not be weighted or scored any points but shall be assessed on a Yes/No basis as to whether or not the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any criteria shall technically disqualify the tender and further evaluation against the Qualitative Criteria will therefore not be performed.

Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria is a weighted evaluation used to identify the highest technically ranked tender 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 the tender to be considered from the technical perspective is 70%.

Table 1: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Guideline

Score	Percent (%)	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.

MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER EVALUATION

Table 2 define all Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria to be submitted by the *Contractor* before the contract award date. Any outstanding or unclear information, related to the mandatory technical evaluation criteria stipulated in **Table 2**, identified by the *Employer* during the technical evaluation, shall be requested from the *Contractor* by the *Employer* (in writing) and must be submitted by the *Contractor* within 5 calendar days from the request to the *Employer* for acceptance. If the *Contractor* doesn't provide the requested information within the 5 days to the *Employer*, the *Contractor* will be disqualified.

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria on Tender Evaluation

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1	<p>Supplier to submit proof of registration as Approved Professional Person (APP) as defined in Section 117(a) of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act 36 of 1998) as a person registered as a professional person with the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) and approved by the Minister after consultation with ECSA.</p> <p>Supplier to submit proof of registration as APP (Evaluation) for Category 3 Embankment dams (Maximum wall height of 41m)</p> <p>Supplier to submit proof of registration as APP (Evaluation) for Category 3 Concrete gravity dams (Maximum wall height of 32m)</p>	The tenderer submits proof of registration as the APP with the DWS.	Compliance Requirement

QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3 define all Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria to be submitted by the *Contractor* by the tender closing date. Should the *Contractor* fail to submit these criteria by the tender closing date, the *Contractor* will score zero for each of the criterion stipulated in the table below.

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

No.	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	Qualifications of Key Personnel The tenderer submit the CVs of the proposed key resources each registered as Professional Engineer or Technologist and have relevant experience on the dams. The tenderer shall also provide the Organogram of the proposed resources.		The tenderer submits the CVs of the key personnel to be supporting the APP in doing the evaluations	40	
	1.1	Hydromechanical Engineer/ Technologist			10
	1.2	Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer/ Technologist			10
	1.3	Structural Engineer/ Technologist			10
	1.4	Organogram showing the key resources of the tenderer including the resources from 1.1 to 1.3			10
2.	Provide traceable evidence of completed APP services with completion certificates in the last 10 years.		The tenderer submits the completion letters of completed services for APP in the stipulated period	30	
3.	High level method statements of how the tenderer intends to conduct the Dam Safety Assessment.		The tenderer submits a method statement to indicate how he intends to carry out the works	20	
4.	Programme for the execution of the works i.e dam safety inspections & evaluations. A programme shall include when each dam to be inspected and evaluated and include producing a report for the next dam safety evaluation reports.		The tenderer submits a programme to demonstrate how he plans to carry out the works	10	

				TOTAL: 100	
--	--	--	--	-------------------	--

QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING MEASURES

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria – Scoring Measures

Civil & Structural				
Criteria No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Range	Score
1.1	Hydromechanical Engineer/ Technologist	10	No information provided or the resource is not registered as a Professional Eng/Tech	0
			The resource is Professionally registered but has no experience relevant to the scope of works	2
			The resource is Professionally registered and has completed 1 to 3 projects that are relevant to the scope of works	4
			The resource is Professionally registered and has completed more than 3 projects that are relevant to the scope of works	5
1.2	Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer/ Technologist	10	No information provided or the resource is not registered as a Professional with ECSA or SACNASP	0
			The resource is Professionally registered but has no experience relevant to the scope of works	2
			The resource is Professionally registered with ECSA or SACNASP and has completed 1 to 3 projects that are relevant to the scope of works	4
			The resource is Professionally with ECSA or SACNASP registered and has completed more than 3 projects that are relevant to the scope of works	5
1.3	Structural Engineer/ Technologist	10	No information provided or the resource is not registered as a Professional Eng/Tech	0
			The resource is Professionally registered but has no experience relevant to the scope of works	2

			The resource is Professionally registered and has completed 1 to 3 projects that are relevant to the scope of works	4
			The resource is Professionally registered and has completed more than 3 projects that are relevant to the scope of works	5
1.4	Organogram for the APP and his professional team		If the tenderer does not submit the organogram	0
			The tenderer submitted the organogram, or the structure is not relevant to the SOW	2
			The tenderer submitted the organogram in line with the SOW and shows the links and direct reports on the organogram	4
			The organogram shows all the Key personnel, and the roles indicated and shows the links and direct reports on the organogram	5
2	Provide traceable evidence of completed APP services with completion certificates in the last 10 years.	30	Projects submitted are not inline with the scope of works or no projects submitted	0
			The tenderer has one completed project for the APP services	2
			The tenderer has two to three completed projects for the APP services	4
			The tenderer has more than three completed projects for the APP services	5
3	High level method statements on the execution of the works	20	The method statement is not provided/ it is not in line with the dam safety inspection & evaluation or scope of works in general	0
			The method statement is general and has major deviations from the scope of works	2
			The method statement is detailed but has minor deviations from the scope of works	4
			The method statement is detailed and covers all the key measures which includes dam break analysis, assessment of the gates & valves, etc. and is in line with the scope of works.	5
4	Programme or schedule for the execution of the works	20	No programme OR schedule provided i.e. Total deficiency AND non-compliance to the key measures	0
			Partial deficiency OR non-compliance to the key measures	2

			Partial deficiency AND compliance to the key measures	4
			Complete compliance to the key measures	5