Eskom	Strategy	Kriel Power Station

Title: **Technical evaluation strategy for Supply and delivery of mill reject chamber brushes on an as when required basis for a period of 5 years**

Document Identifier:	**559-672158174**
Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
Area of Applicability:	**Kriel Power Station**
Functional Area:	**Engineering**
Revision:	**1**
Total Pages:	**13**
Next Review Date:	**N/A**
Disclosure Classification:	**Controlled Disclosure**

Compiled by	Supported by	Functional Responsibility	Authorized by
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
System Engineer	**Senior Engineer**	**BPE Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Date: 29 September 2025	**Date:** 2025/09/29	Date: 29/09/2025	Date: 29/09/2025

Content

Page

1. Introduction 3
2. Supporting Clauses 3
   2.1 Scope 3
      2.1.1 Purpose 3
      2.1.2 Applicability 3
      2.1.3 Effective date 3
   2.2 Normative/Informative References 3
      2.2.1 Normative 3
      2.2.2 Informative 4
   2.3 Definitions 4
   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 5
   3.1 TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD 5
   3.2 TET MEMBERS 5
   3.3 TENDER RETURNABLES/TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS 5
   3.4 Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria 7
   3.5 Qualitative technical evaluation criteria 8
   3.6 TET Member Responsibilities for Part 1 11
   3.7 Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks 11
   3.8 Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks 11
4. Acceptance 12
5. Revisions 12
6. Development Team 12
7. Acknowledgements 12

Figures

Tables

1. Introduction

This technical evaluation strategy is for Supply and Delivery of Mill reject brushes and brush carriers' spares, on an "as and when" required basis for a period of five years to Kriel Power Station. This applies to the 10.8E and 12.9E mills used at Kriel power station's milling plant.

Kriel Power Station is situated approximately 10 kilometres from the town of Kriel in Mpumalanga. Access to the station is by road. The purpose of this scope is to briefly outline the listed components' requirements and specifications which any potential service provider will need to be able to present them to us with an offer of supply. Itis also essential to note that, this scope is only applicable to Kriel Power Station.

2. Supporting Clauses

2.1 Scope

Strategy for technical evaluation on the refurbishment, supply and delivery of mill reject brushes and carriers for 5 years at Kriel Power Station.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this tender technical evaluation is to define the mandatory evaluation criteria, qualitative evaluation criteria and technical evaluation team (TET) responsibilities for tender technical evaluation. The technical evaluation strategy serves at basis for the tender technical evaluation process

2.1.2 Applicability

This document is applicable to all relevant stakeholders involved with the technical tender evaluation process for the procurement of milling plant reject chamber brush spares.

2.1.3 Effective date

This document is effective from the day of authorisation.

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] 240-168966153 Generation Tender Technical

[2] QM 58: Supplier Contract Quality Requirements

[3] 559-672398086

ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems

[4] 32-1034: Eskom procurement and supply chain management procedure

[5] 32-1033: Eskom's procurement and supply chain management policy

2.2.2 Informative

[6] 240-105658000: Supplier Quality Management Specification

[7] BS EN 10204:2004 Metallic Products: Types of Inspection Documents

2.3 Definitions

Term	Description
Mill Reject Brush	Brushes used to sweep coal pyrites into a mill reject box.

2.4 Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
OEM	Original equipment manufacturer
QCP	Quality control plan
ITP	Inspection & test plan
TET	Technical evaluation team
TES	Technical evaluation strategy

2.5 Roles and Responsibilities

All responsibilities have been defined in the Generation Tender Evaluation Procedure (240-168966153).

2.6 Process for Monitoring

N/A

2.7 Related/Supporting Documents

[8] 240-168966153 Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is 70% as per 240-168966153 Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure. Mandatory Information (as per section 6.1 from BS EN 10217-3)

3.2 TET MEMBERS

TET member	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	[redacted]	System Engineer – Milling Plant
TET 2	[redacted]	Senior Engineer – Boiler Engineering
TET 3	[redacted] (Optional)	System Engineer – Process (Unit 2)
TET 4	[redacted]	System Engineer – Boiler Pressure Parts

3.3 TENDER RETURNABLES/TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

3.3.1. Proof of previous experience of manufacturing/supplying similar brushes

- To ensure that the supplier has practical capacity and resources to deliver as required.
- To ensure reliable performance which will minimise risks such as delays or cost overruns.
- To verify that the supplier demonstrated the ability to meet required quality, standards and technical specifications.
- The supplier offers value for money rather than just the lowest price, the supplier satisfies non-price criteria such as technical ability and track record**.**

3.3.2. Quality management system

- Submit a Signed off Quality Management System (QMS) Policy

3.3.3. Valid proof of workshop Ownership/Lease Agreement

- Valid proof of ownership or lease agreement must be provided. If other components are subcontracted by the supplier, proof of ownership from the contractor must be provided.
- If the company is a sole agent for the relevant OEM or OEM representative: A letter from the OEM or OEM representative stating that the third party is a sole distributor for their equipment.

3.3.4. Manufacturing process

The brush bristles must be securely bonded on the brush base. The means of bonding can be welding or any other adhesive/method of securing the bristle and the base together. Any adhesive or bonding method must be able to withstand operational temperatures of above 240 ^{o}C.

3.3.5. Method statement

The tenderer shall submit a detailed methodology of how the tenderer will:

- Supply and deliver order to specification as per the SOW and handle defective material and premature failure of components.
- Perform quality verification.
- Provide onsite and offsite material storage procedure as per the equipment manufacturer requirements.
- Perform safe stock handling and transportation of critical components.
- Provide technical support to Eskom of delivered components as per the SOW in liaising with respective equipment manufacturer.
- Transport and provide technical support.

3.3.6. QCPs

QCPs must be submitted, with clear step-by-step tasks stipulated in the Quality Control Plan. Preferably three historically fully signed-off plans to be submitted/comprehensive new template with all stakeholders to sign-off. Quality control plan (QCP). This must provide assurance in terms of the inclusion of the services of:

- Materials controller
- Quality controller
- Material supervisor

To make sure that all material handling (from purchasing, transportation, packaging to delivery) is done with all safety risks managed using a standardised risk assessments and controls. The service providers are then required to have in their position, the 45001 certification – this will ensure that their OH&S Management Systems are within recognised and standardised practices.

Referenced document: 240-105658000: Supplier Quality Management Specification: referred sections/paragraphs:3.4.11, 3.4.12; 3.4.4.be included as minimum.

3.3.7. Proof Of Historical Supply Projects

The tenderer to submit 10x proof of previous successfully executed supply and delivery works within the last 5 years: Submits proof of order and proof of delivery accepted and stamped by the Client (Any industry). Proof must be in the form of a combination of the following:

- Valid purchase orders (PO),
- Signed off delivery notes (by supplier and client) associated with purchase order.

3.3.8. Customer satisfaction survey form from previous clients.

The tenderer to submit customer satisfaction survey from previous clients excluding Kriel power station. If no customer satisfaction survey readily available, the tenderer should request feedback from previous clients in writing and submit with the tender documents. This information will be subjected to verification with the supplier's client.

3.3.9. Material Preservation and Storage

The service provider team must provide a signed off onsite and offsite storage procedure.

3.3.10. Guarantee/Warranty on the product supplied

The supplier must provide in detail the guarantee on the product to avoid situations where the brushes fail prematurely. According to Kriel maintenance strategy, the brushes must be changed every mill service, which happens every 5000 hours of mill service. This warranty should be assumed for a mill running at maximum capacity continuously.

3.3.11. Transportation and technical Support

As part of the method statement section 3.3.6, a detailed methodology on how the transportation of the material and provision of technical support will be carried out should be outlined. This should include but not limited to:

- Use of appropriate/suitable transportation,
- Material safety during transportation,
- Driver fitness for duty,
- Providence of technical support as and when required.

3.4 Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	**Reference to Technical Specifications/Tender returnable**	**Motivation for use of criteria**
1.	Proof that the company/Service Provider owns or in partnership with a workshop or OEM that can supply/manufacture the components and that the company will only use the said workshop to service the tendered components.	**3.3.6**	To ensure constant supply of quality components at most economical cost

3.5 Qualitative technical evaluation criteria

Qualitative Technical Criteria Description									
	TECHNICAL INFORMATION		**Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable**	**Criteria Weighting (%)**	**Criteria Sub Weighting (%)**	**Evaluation Scoring Breakdown**			
						0	**2**	**4**	**5**
1.	1.1	The tenderer to submit 3x proof of previous successfully executed supply and delivery works within the last 5 years: Submits proof of order and associated delivery notes accepted and stamped/signed by the Client	Section 3.3.7	**10**	**10**	Nothing provided. refer to SOW Spares list	Submits 1 proof of order and proof of delivery accepted and stamped by the Client	Submits 3 proof of order and proof of delivery accepted and stamped by the Client	Submits >3 proof of order and proof of delivery accepted and stamped by the Client.
	1.2	The tender submits a detailed methodology of how the tender shall: • Supply and deliver order to specification as per SOW and handle defective materials and premature failures of components. • Perform quality verifications.	Section 3.3.1, 3.3. and Section 3.3.7	**15**	**15**	No information submitted	Submitted with major gaps and major risks identified. Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR. Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR. Unacceptable conditions.	Submitted with sufficiently detailed with Minor omissions, Meets technical specification and Acceptable technical risks identified	Submitted detailed covers entire SOW • Meet technical requirement (s) AND; • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.

2.	**Quality Management System**		**Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable**	**Criteria Weighting (%)**	**Criteria Sub Weighting (%)**	**Evaluation Scoring Breakdown**			
						0	**2**	**4**	**5**
	2.1	QCPs must be submitted, with clear step-by-step tasks stipulated in the Quality Control Plan. Preferably three historically fully signed-off plans to be submitted/comprehensive new template with all stakeholders to sign-off. Quality control plan (QCP).	Section 3.3.6	**10**	**10**	None	Inadequate/Incomplete QCP	Non-Comprehensive QCP Template	Three Comprehensive QCP submitted
3.	**Assurance Requirements**		**Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable**	**Criteria Weighting (%)**	**Criteria Sub Weighting (%)**	**Evaluation Scoring Breakdown**			
						0	**2**	**4**	**5**
	3.1	Name, street, and postal address, contact names and telephone numbers of the plant (site of manufacturing, inspection, testing, and release – if any activity is done at a different plant, it must be listed) where the material will be manufactured, must be supplied with the tender submission. Note that Eskom reserves the right to audit the facilities (or arrange for it by a third party). Under no circumstances can material be manufactured elsewhere without Eskom's written approval	OEM Information	**10**	**10**	No Information Provided	-	-	Verifiable list of Manufactures provided.
	3.2	Letter of commitment/mention in the declaration form that all material will have as a minimum, material datasheet.	Section 3.1	**10**	**10**	Not stated in the letter/form	-	-	Stated in the Signed Commitment letter/declaration form
	3.3	Customer satisfaction survey form from previous clients 3X.	Section 3.3.8	**30**	**30**	No Information	1X Verifiable surveys	2X Verifiable surveys	3X Verifiable surveys submitted

						Provided	submitted	submitted	
	3.3	A detailed methodology on how the transportation of the material and provision of technical support will be carried out should be outlined.	Section 3.3.9	**5**	**5**	Not stated in the letter /form	Methodology not Comprehensive	Only met minimum requirements as in section 3.3.9	Comprehensive Methodology
	3.4	Delivery lead time for the brushes and carriers	Section 3.3.5	**5**	**5**	lead time greater than 12 weeks.	lead time greater than 10 weeks but less than 12 weeks	lead time greater than 8 weeks but less than 10 weeks	lead time less or equal to 8 weeks
	3.5	Guaranty/Warrant offered on the brushes.	Section 3.10	**5**	**5**	Warranty less than 5000 hour/ Not stated	-	-	Warranty greater or equal to 5000 hours
		TOTAL = 100%							

Score	%	Definition
5	100	**Compliant** • Meet technical requirement(s) AND; • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	**Compliant with association qualifications** • Meet technical requirement(s) with; • Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; • Acceptable conditions
3	60	**Partial-Compliant** • Less than 10% outside technical requirement(s)
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

Note 2: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

3.6 TET Member Responsibilities for Part 1

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities for Part

Mandatory Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET3**
Proof of ownership	X	X	X
Commitment Letter/Declaration form	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**
The 3.1 Material Certificate	X	X	X
Compliance to the Specification	X	X	X

3.7 Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	**Description**
1.	None

3.8 Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	**Description**
1.	Material Delivery without Certificates/Datasheets
2.	Material not marked properly and without name tags

4. Acceptance

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
[redacted]	Kriel Engineering Manager
[redacted]	Boiler Engineering Manager
[redacted]	Senior Engineer
[redacted]	Boiler System engineer
[redacted]	Boiler System engineer
[redacted]nal)	System Engineer – Process (Unit 2)

5. Revisions

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
September 2025	0	[redacted]	New document draft compilation
September 2025	1	[redacted]	Costumer satisfaction report added as a requirement on section 3.

6. Development Team

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

- [redacted]
- [redacted]

7. Acknowledgements

I Would like to acknowledge Mr Tivane for assisting in compiling this document