



Strategy

Engineering

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Upgrading the Station's Outer Perimeter Fence**

Unique Identifier:

PG/170/018

Alternative Reference Number:

N/A

Area of Applicability:

Generation Engineering

Documentation Type:

Strategy

Revision:

4

Total Pages:

16

Next Review Date:

N/A

Disclosure Classification:

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Compiled by

~~██████████~~

Senior Civil Technician

Date: 2026/04/22

Functional Responsibility

~~██████████~~

Civil Engineering Manager

Date: 2026/04/22

Authorised by

~~██████████~~

Engineering Manager

Date: 2026/04/22

CONTENTS

	Page
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	4
2.3 DEFINITIONS	4
2.3.1 Classification	4
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS	4
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 THRESHOLD	5
3.2 TET MEMBERS	6
3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
TABLE 3: QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	8
3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	12
3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	13
3.6.1 Risks	13
3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions	13
4. AUTHORISATION	15
5. REVISIONS	15
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	15
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	15

TABLES

Table 1: TET Members	6
Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities	12
Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks	13
Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks	13
Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	14
Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	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 authorised version on the system

1. INTRODUCTION

Matimba Power Station is a National Key Point that needs 24 hours surveillance and protection, as such, proper barricading and fencing which will assist in guarding against possible intruders. A scope of work and technical specifications for the removal of the old and decommissioned energized fence, the removal of the old and installation of the new outer perimeter fence and the installation of earthing on the new outer fence have been completed. These documents are outlining a detailed procedure that needs to be followed when performing the works.

An invitation will soon be issued out calling for interested parties to participate in the tender process seeking to appoint a suitably qualified party for the project to remove the old, energized fence, the outer barricade fence, and the installation of the new outer barricade fence to improve the structural integrity of the fence and the safety of Matimba Power Station altogether.

This document describes the method and technical criteria that will be used to evaluate the tender submissions in response to the above-mentioned invitation to ensure a technically qualified supplier is appointed to execute the upgrade of outer perimeter fence project.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This tender technical evaluation strategy defines the Technical Evaluation Team (TET), their responsibilities and the technical criteria to be used to evaluate the tenders submitted.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this 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.

2.1.2 Applicability

This tender technical evaluation strategy document applies to Matimba Upgrade of Outer Perimeter Fence project (C.GMT0395) which is to be executed under Matimba Power Station.

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 Evaluation Procedure
- [2] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure (Transmission and Distribution)
- [3] 240-156940985: Generation Engineering Work Process Work Instruction
- [4] 240-76368574 High Security Mesh Fencing Standard.
- [5] SOW/173/003 Scope of Work for Upgrade of Outer Perimeter Fence Project
- [6] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement Policy

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 authorised version on the system.

2.2.2 Informative

- [1] Occupational Health and Safety (OHSA) Act 85 of 1993.
- [2] Government Notice Regulation 84 of 2014: Construction Regulations.
- [3] SANS 10400: Application of National Building Regulations.
- [4] National Key Points Act 102 of 1980.

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Client: The end user will be Eskom (Employer) who will be represented by Matimba Power Station throughout the duration of the Project.

Contractor: Refers to the corporation or party appointed to perform the execution of works required for the project.

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

Employer: Refers to Eskom Holdings State Owned Company.

Eskom Plant Engineering: Refers to the Eskom Engineering team who will perform the reviews and provide technical assistance for the work performed by the appointed Contractor.

Specification: The document/s forming part of the contract in which the methods and requirements of executing the various items of work to be done is described, as well as the nature and quality of the materials to be supplied and it includes technical schedules and drawings attached thereto as well as all samples and patterns.

Tenderer: any person, firm or company who tenders (i.e., submit tender documents in response to the invitation to tender) for the project.

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CIBD	Construction Industry Development Board
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
EDWL	Engineering Design Work Lead
LDE	Lead Discipline Engineer
SACPCMP	South African Council for the Project and Construction Management Professions
SHEQ	Safety, Health, Environment and Quality System
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

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 authorised version on the system.

Abbreviation	Description
VDSS	Vendor Document Submission Schedule
NKP	National Key Point

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- Engineering Manager: All Engineering Managers throughout Eskom shall ensure that all staff, in their respective areas understand and adhere to this procedure.
- Engineering Design Work Lead (EDWL): The EDWL is responsible to manage the execution and adherence to this procedure. Typically, on New Build projects the EDWL role is fulfilled by the Lead Discipline Engineer (LDE) and on existing asset projects the EDWL role is fulfilled by the relevant System Engineer / Plant Engineer.
- Technical Evaluation Team (TET) member: The delegated engineers / technical specialists who are responsible to review and evaluate technical aspects of the tender documentation as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Refer to section 2.2.1 of this TES document.

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The basic steps for a technical evaluation must be followed as per the Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure. A two-stage Technical Evaluation Strategy is set out:

3.1.1 Stage 1: Mandatory Technical Evaluation

Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (gatekeepers) 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 is met or not. An assessment of 'No' against any criterion shall technically disqualify the tenderer and the tenderer shall not be further evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

3.1.2 Stage 2: Qualitative Technical Evaluation

Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria are weighted evaluation criteria used to identify the highest technically ranked tenderer 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.

A weighted score-card approach shall be used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications. The scoring method for qualitative technical evaluation shall be as follows:

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 authorised version on the system.

Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table

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 Meet technical requirement(s) with. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

3.1.3 Qualitative Technical Evaluation Final Score Threshold

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is 70%.

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1.	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Civil Engineering Manager
TET 2	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Senior Civil Technician
TET 3	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Senior Civil Technician
TET 4	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Senior Civil Technician

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 authorised version on the system.

3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	Tenderer to have a valid CIDB certificate Grade of 7SQ or 7CE or higher.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenderer's financial capability • Tenderer's work capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tenderer's historical financial turnover of different projects worked on • The tenderer's largest project worked on with the number of professionals employed to fulfil the project's requirements

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Notes to tenderer:

1. The Tenderer shall submit a written undertaking stating that the proposed key personnel will be available for the project and will not be changed on award of the Contract. Where proposed key personnel are no longer available to undertake the work, the Tenderer shall provide a suitably qualified and experienced replacement (subject to the approval by the Employer) with equivalent or higher qualifications and experience.
2. The Curriculum Vitae (CV's) of Key Personnel must have relevant experience which is comparable in nature to the Works specified in this tender.
3. It is a requirement that the key personnel should have good communication skills in the English language.
4. Where no information is offered by the Tenderer no points shall be scored (will be awarded zero points).
5. It is to the best interest of the Tenderer and the Employer that the submitted bidding documents are properly packaged and easy to follow to locate the information that must be evaluated per requirements of this TES.

TABLE 3: QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Score Criteria Definition
1.	Company's Employee's Experience	Experiential Record Documents	20		
1.1	Tenderer's Safety Officer must possess adequate experience in similar role on similar projects particularly involving fence removal, installation and earthing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety Officer's CV. The CV must include details of qualifications, training and experience and similar projects previously completed. Include certified copies of certificates in support of training and qualifications like this project. Copy of Professional Certification for Safety Officer who shall be accountable for occupational health and safety of the work in line with Occupational Health and Safety Act 85 of 1993 		25	<p>5= 100% =2 to 4 years of post-professional registration experience in reasonably similar must include details of projects.</p> <p>4= 80% = Less than 2 years of post-professional registration experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>2= 40% = Any work post Candidacy registration experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>0= 0% = No experience post-professional registration.</p>
1.2	Tenderer's Environmental Officer must possess adequate experience in similar role on similar projects .The environmental officer needs to display a strong understanding of environmental role.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Officer's CV. The CV must include details of qualifications, training and experience and similar projects previously completed. Include certified copies of certificates in support of training and qualifications like this project. 		25	<p>5= 100% =2 to 4 years of post-professional registration experience in reasonably similar must include details of projects.</p> <p>4= 80% = Less than 2 years of post-professional registration experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>2= 40% = Any work post Candidacy registration experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>0= 0% = No experience post-professional registration.</p>

Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Upgrading the Station's Outer Perimeter Fence

Unique Identifier: PG/170/018
 Revision: 0
 Page: 9 of 15

1.3	Tenderer's SACPCMP Registered Construction Manager must possess adequate experience in similar role on similar projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SACPCMP Registered Person's CV. The CV must include details of qualifications, training and experience in similar projects previously completed. Include certified copies of certificates in support of training and qualifications in Construction Management. Copy of Professional Certification for the project manager who shall be accountable for the project's implementation 	50	<p>5= 100% = 4 or more years of post-professional registration experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>4= 80% = 2 to 4 years of post-professional registration experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>2= 40% = Candidacy registration with less than 10 years' experience in reasonably similar projects.</p> <p>0= 0% = No experience post-professional registration.</p>
2.	Tenderer's Relevant Work Experience and Project-Specific Resources	Company Profile Documents	45	
2.1	Proposed Project Resources must possess relevant qualifications, training, and experience to execute their responsibilities to the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Organogram for the project including Tenderer's key persons (Include to be used on the project). This must also include Organograms for any company that the Tenderer intends to sub-contract for the project. CVs of proposed project's key role players(safety officer, supervisor, technician, and project manager) including those to be sub-contracted to the project. This must include details of relevant qualifications and copies of certificates (e.g., Mobile Plant Operator certificates, etc.) 	60	<p>5= 100% = Key persons, qualifications and project roles defined completely aligned with the project. Key persons possess extensive training and 5 years average experience on similar projects.</p> <p>4= 80% = Key persons, qualifications and project roles defined show reasonable alignment to the project. Persons possess adequate training and average experience of 3 to 4 years on similar projects.</p> <p>2= 40% = Key persons, qualifications and project roles defined show partial but inadequate alignment to project. Persons</p>

Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Upgrading the Station's Outer Perimeter Fence

Unique Identifier: PG/170/018

Revision: 0

Page: 10 of 15

						possess some training and average experience of 1 to 3 years on similar projects. 0= 0% = Key persons, qualifications and project roles are completely unrelated to the project. Persons do not possess any training and experience in similar projects.
	2.2	Tenderer to have background and previous experience on same type of work on a National Key Point (i.e., removal and replacement of barricade fence or similar fence).	Completion Certificates for similar completed projects consisting of the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name of company where project was executed and Contact persons Project Description (include Contract Value, Execution Period, Description of Work completed) Status of the project (in progress/successfully completed/terminated). Reasons for termination to be provided where such was the case for any referenced project. Company organogram indicating key personnel and their roles 		40	5= 100% = Company has completed many (more than 5) similar projects on an NKP. 4= 80% = Company has completed 3 to 5 similar projects on an NKP. 2= 40% = Company has completed 1 or 2 similar projects on an NKP. 0= 0% = Company has never completed similar projects.
	3.	Proposed Project Plans and Detailed Methods	Documented Plans and Method Statement		35	
	3.1	Proposed Execution Methods must be technically inclined and indicate that the Tenderer is capable to execute the work per project requirements.	Proposed detailed Method Statement and Quality Control Plan for the project		70	5= 100% = Proposed methods are feasible, practical and indicate high depth of understanding of project requirements and high capability to complete the project. 4= 80% = Proposed methods are reasonably feasible, practical and indicate acceptable depth of understanding of project requirements and reasonable capability to complete the project.

Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Upgrading the Station's Outer Perimeter Fence

Unique Identifier: **PG/170/018**
 Revision: **0**
 Page: **11 of 15**

						<p>2= 40% = Proposed methods are partially feasible, practical and indicate low depth of understanding of project requirements and little capability to complete the project.</p> <p>0= 0% = Proposed methods indicate complete lack of understanding of project requirements and no capability to complete the project per requirements.</p>
3.2	Proposed Execution Program must be sound, realistic and indicate that the contractor is capable to complete the work within the existing planned project schedule constraints.	Proposed High-level Execution Program indicating key dates and milestones.		30		<p>5= 100% = Proposed execution plans show high capability to complete the project within the approved construction programme.</p> <p>4= 80% = Proposed execution plans show adequate capability to complete the project within approved construction programme.</p> <p>2= 40% = Proposed execution plans show some capability which is inadequate to complete the project within approved construction programme.</p> <p>0= 0% = Proposed execution plans completely show no capability to complete the project within approved construction programme.</p>
				TOTAL: 100		

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 1: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5	TET 6	TET 7
1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5	TET 6	TET 7
1.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4.1	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.6.1 Risks

Table 2: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Insufficient company experience in similar projects may be acceptable subject to evaluation of the details of existing experience by the TET members.
2.	Insufficient experience of some personnel may be acceptable subject to evaluation of the details of existing experience by the TET members.

Table 3: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Non-compliance to any of the mandatory technical criteria.
2.	Limited experience of the appointed Safety Officer (less than 2 years post registration).
3.	Limited experience of the appointed Project Manager (less than 2 years post registration).
4.	Tenderer's proposed program does not align with client's key dates per outage schedules.
5.	Tenderer does not show understanding and/or appreciation of the regulatory and legislative requirements particularly those relevant to working in operating power stations, working with fences, etc.
6.	Tenderer demonstrates non-compliance with relevant Client's requirements, National Standards, Regulations and Legislation.
7.	The Project staff organogram is unclear and does not indicate positions and responsibilities aligned with the project requirements.
8.	The Tenderer's method statement, execution plans, quality plans, health and safety plans are unclear and indicate that the Tenderer is not capable to complete the Scope of Work in line with project requirements.

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 4: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Technical deviations or changes that add value but their negative impact on project (in terms of scope, schedule, safety, cost, etc.) is minor (risk assessments and mitigation strategies to be included for review).
2.	Value Engineering proposals which indicate benefits of alternative proposals and alignment with Client's objectives. Alternative proposals shall be subject to review and acceptance by TET members.

Table 5: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Exclusions to any of the scope requirements.
2.	Technical Deviations or changes without any value and without adequate technical qualifications or rationale.
3.	Value Engineering proposals which are not aligned with Client's objectives and provide no benefits.
4.	Proposed additions to scope requirements without technical justification and value.

