Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Supply & Delivery of MAGNET ELCTRO:380V;900GS;1500 KW;41 A as and when required**	Unique Identifier:	**15ENG GEN-1325**
		Alternative Reference Number:	
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**2**
		Total Pages:	**15**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
……	……	……
Systems Engineer	**Electrical Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Date: 01/03/2025	Date: 07/04/2025	Date: 22/04/2025

CONTENTS

TABLES

1. SCOPE

The scope of this document is to capture the technical tender evaluation strategy for procurement of new Electromagnet at Tutuka Power Station. This evaluation strategy is to ensure the correct specifically supplied goods and equipment into the plant and ensure transparency of the process in procuring equipment that is up to standard and as per the plant specification.

1.1 APPLICABILITY

This document is applicable to Tutuka Power station coal handling plant

1.2 PURPOSE

The purpose of the 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.

1.2.1 Normative

[1] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems

[2] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[3] SANS 10142-1 The wiring of premises Part 1: Low-voltage installations

[4] 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form

[5] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results

1.2.2 Informative

[1] SANS 10142-1 The wiring of premises Part 1: Low-voltage installations

1.3 DEFINITIONS

a. **Confidential:** the classification given to information that may be used by malicious/opposing/hostile elements to harm the objectives and functions of Eskom Holdings Limited.

b. **Works:** Refers to the Works information for the Outside Plant Electrical Maintenance Contract at Tutuka Power Station

c. **Contractor:** Refers to the entity/party which has submitted information for the Tender Requirements for the Works

1.4 CLASSIFICATION

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

1.5 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
A	Electrical Current Amperes
AC	Alternating Current
CAD	Computer-Aided Design
CIDB	Construction Industry Development Board
CT	Current Transformer
CV	Curriculum Vitae
DB	Distribution Board
DC	Direct Current
DOL	Department Of Labour
ECSA	Engineering Counsel of South Africa
EMD	Electrical Maintenance Department
GO	General Overhaul
HZ	Hertz
ISO	Internal Organization For Standard
KW	Kilowatts
LV	Low Voltage,
m	Meters
MTBF	Mean Time Between Failures
N/A	Not Applicable
SANAS	South African National Accreditation System
SANS	South African National Standard
SHE	Safety, Health & Environmental
SOW	Scope Of Work
TET	Technical Evaluation Team
V	Volts

1.6 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

as per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

1.7 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

as per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

1.8 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

as per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALAUTION STRATEGY

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications or ability to perform the work Tenderers need to have a minimum weighted score of 70% overall or more to technically qualify for further evaluation.

2.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on mandatory and qualitative evaluation criteria. This is to determine the tenderer's ability to meet the technical requirements. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tender submission against the standards/specifications and Employer's requirements.

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.		

2.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1		Snr Electrical Engineer
TET 2		Engineer in Training
TET 3		Mechanical Engineer

2.3 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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').

This part of the evaluation starts when submissions are opened and assessed for the first time. The Eskom evaluation team will go through the details of the returnable submissions that are required and will be ensured that all the mandatory requirements are met. Submissions that receive a 'NO' for any of these requirements will not be able to proceed to the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria stage and therefore will fail the 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.

Mandatory 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 the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any criterion shall technically disqualify the tenderer and shall not be further evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

Ref #	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification /Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	The tenderer to supply equipment that complies with the standard for the Magnetic Separators and Metal and supported by the OEM. Detectors:240-55864553	Written confirmation letter	To ensure proper equipment is reliable and of acceptable quality.

2.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

In accordance with 240-48929482, tenders that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria will be evaluated against the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria defined in Table 3 below. The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements defined in Table 3. Each item shall have the specific sub-weighting criteria that shall be scored in accordance with Table 2 of 240-48929482. The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for the tenderer to be considered FUNCTIONALLY ACCEPTABLE from a technical perspective is 70%.

The recommendation on the highest technically ranked tenderer shall be based on the final scoring comparisons and the tenderer with the highest score shall be recommended from a technical perspective, if the weighted final score exceeds the defined threshold.

2.4.1.1.1 Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Criteria Ref #	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting	Score	Sub - Criteria Weighting (%)
1.	The new electromagnet to be 100% interchangeable (Electrical and mechanical) with currently installed	Tender returnable	100% interchangeable	5	80
		Tender returnable	Motor KW not the same as existing	4	
		Tender returnable	Not fitting in the plant	2	
2.	Delivery period	Tender returnable	Within 12 weeks	5	20
			Within 18 weeks	4	
			More than 18 weeks	2	

2.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**
1	X	X	X
2	X	X	X

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

2.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

2.6.1 Risks

Table 3: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Motor Kw rating lower than the existing

Table 4: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Inadequate tender returnable.
2.	Mandatory criteria 1 not evaluated and/or satisfied

2.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Declining to provide technical details accurately deemed intellectual proprietary.

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

3. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
	Electrical Engineering Manager
	Electrical Engineer
	Systems Engineer Aux

4. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
August 2021	1		Draft
February 2025	2		Revision

5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

The TET members as listed in Table 1 were involved in the development of this document.