

	Strategy	Peaking
---	-----------------	----------------

Title:	Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Repair of Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station	Unique Identifier:	167A-19438-B
		Alternative Reference Number:	N/A
		Area of Applicability:	Generation Engineering
		Documentation Type:	Strategy
		Revision:	1
		Total Pages:	16
		Next Review Date:	N/A
		Disclosure Classification:	CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

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	4
2.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	5
3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
3.1 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING	5
3.2 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING	5
3.3 TET MEMBERS	5
3.4 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.5 QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORING TABLE	6
3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
3.7 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING MEASURES	9
3.8 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	13
3.9 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	14
3.9.1 Risks	14
3.9.2 Exceptions / Conditions	14
4. AUTHORISATION	16
5. REVISIONS	16
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	16
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	16

TABLES

Table 1: Core TET Members	5
Table 2: Optional TET Members	6
Table 3: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria	6
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	6
Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria - Scoring Measures	9
Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities	13
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks	14
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks	14
Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	14
Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	15

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

This document establishes the Technical Evaluation Strategy for evaluating tenders received for the execution of the remedial works of Clean & Dirty Water Dams, Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station.

The purpose of the evaluation is to identify a contractor with proven experience and capability in undertaking remedial civil engineering works involving:

- Concrete rehabilitation,
- Water-retaining structures,
- Pollution control facilities,
- Fuel containment systems,
- Structural assessments,
- Stormwater infrastructure rehabilitation, and
- Bunding for Waste Management.

This document seeks to provide clear mandatory and qualitative evaluating criteria that will be used during technical evaluations. The document has been developed in accordance with the Eskom Technical Evaluation Procedure 240-48929482 and shall be used by the Technical Evaluation Team (TET) during tender evaluation.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document covers the tender evaluation requirements that will be applied during the technical evaluations to evaluate the proposals received from the market. The Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy (TES) defines the following with regards to this project.

- Mandatory Evaluation Criteria
- Qualitative Evaluation Criteria
- Technical Evaluation Team (TET) Members Responsibilities
- Acceptable & Unacceptable Qualifications

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 document is applicable to Ankerlig 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

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] 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form
- [3] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results

2.2.2 Informative

- [4] 167A-19438 Scope of Works for Remedial Repairs of Pollution Control Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig & Gourikwa Power Stations
- [5] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems
- [6] 240-53114190 Internal Audit Procedure
- [7] 240-141007195 Electronic Signature Usage Policy
- [8] 240-156280553 Procedure for signing documentation electronically using the Eskom Electronic Signing System

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Definition	Description
Tender	Refers to a written or electronic offer, tender, bid, quotation or proposal made by a supplier, in a prescribed form according to the issued enquiry, for the provision of assets, goods, works or services, and/or disposals (Investment Recoveries).

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
N/A	Not Applicable
QCP	Quality Control Plan
SHE	Safety, Health and Environmental
SHEQ	Safety, Health, Environmental and Quality
SoW	Scope of Work
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

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 the technical evaluation procedure.

Professionally Registered Engineering Practitioner (PREP): The PREP is responsible to manage the execution and adherence to the evaluation procedure. Typically, on New Build projects the PREP role is fulfilled by the Lead Discipline Engineer (LDE) and on existing asset projects the PREP role is fulfilled by the relevant System Engineer/Plant Engineer.

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.

Technical Evaluation Team (TET) member: The delegated technical representatives/end users/engineers/technical specialists who are responsible to review and evaluate technical aspects of the tender documentation as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy. The TET members need to comply with the requirements as stipulated in the [13] 240-106871290: Technical Evaluation Team Member Appointment Letter Template.

2.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- [9] 240-53716746: Tender Technical Evaluation Report Template
- [10] 240-53716712: Tender Technical Evaluation Results Form Template
- [11] 240-53716726: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form Template
- [12] 240-53716769: Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy Template
- [13] 240-106871290: Technical Evaluation Team Member Appointment Letter Template

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING

Tenderers shall attend the mandatory site clarification meeting as detailed in the tender documents.

- Failure to attend the mandatory site clarification meeting shall result in disqualification from further evaluation.
- Tenderers who **do not meet this mandatory criterion shall not proceed to the technical (qualitative) evaluation stage.**

3.2 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING

Tenderers who meet all mandatory criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria, as defined in the tender documentation.

- Evaluation shall be based on a weighted scoring system.
- A **minimum threshold score of 70%** must be achieved to be considered technically acceptable.

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.

3.4 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	The Tenderer attends a compulsory site clarification meeting at Ankerlig Power Station.	As per Technical Specification	Tenderer's must assess the site conditions, constraints and submit their tender accordingly

3.5 QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORING TABLE

During the tender evaluations, Table 4 shall be used by the TET members to score each criterion on a scale of 0 to 5.

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Score	Percentage	Description
5	100	COMPLIANT • Meet technical requirements and • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements
4	80	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS Meet technical requirement(s) with, • Acceptable technical risk 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.

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.

3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	Tenderer's Experience			30.00%	
	1.1	References of relevant work experience: The tenderer shall demonstrate experience on similar projects by submitting five or more completed projects within the last five years from the date of tender closing on of the following categories: • Structural concrete works & repairs, • Water retaining concrete structures, and • Joint sealant replacement works. The list must indicate: • Project Name, • Contactable reference (phone number, email, etc.), • Detail description of work performed, • Project Value (only for scope performed), and • Project Start and End Date. These must be completion letters or reference letters from the previous clients.	Work Experience & Referee List Works Information		100.00%
2.	Technical Approach & Methodology			30.00%	
	2.1	Provide a high-level project specific methodology for the condition assessment. This must include the following as minimum: • Concrete Assessments for Dams & Fuel Tank Bunds ○ Structural assessment procedures including Non-Destructive Testing of concrete,	Works information		50.00%

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Repair
of Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station**

Unique Identifier: **167A-19438-B**

Revision: **1**

Page: **8 of 16**

		○ Defect mapping & identification, ○ Condition rating, and ○ Reporting methodology. ● Stormwater Systems ○ Inspection procedures, ○ Cleaning processes, and ○ CCTV inspections. ● Berms, drains and containment infrastructure			
	2.2	Provide a high-level project specific methodology for the concrete repairs. This must include the following as minimum: ● Repairs of cracks, ● Spalling defects, ● Delamination defects, ● Joint seal replacements, ● Fuel tank bund remediation, and ● Proposed repair products and curing times.	Works information		50.00%
3.		Quality Management		10.00%	
	3.1	Tenderers shall submit a project-specific Quality Control Plan covering: ● Condition assessments, ● Concrete repairs, ● Crack injection works, ● Joint sealant replacement, ● Fuel bund remedial works, ● Berm construction, ● Earthworks and compaction testing, ● Stormwater drain inspection and flushing			100.00%

Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Repair of Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station

Unique Identifier: **167A-19438-B**

Revision: **1**

Page: **9 of 16**

		- Material approvals, - Hold points, - Witness points, - Inspection and test plans, - Check sheets, and - Handover records.			
4.	Provide CVs and Qualifications of Key Personnel			20.00%	
	4.1	Construction Manager.			30.00%
	4.2	Pr Eng / Pr Tech Eng Civil/ Structural with experience in water-retaining structures, concrete rehabilitation, containment structures, dams or bunded facilities.			40.00%
	4.3	Site Supervisor.			20.00%
	4.4	Organogram showing construction team, including SHEQ personnel.			10.00%
5.	Programme & resourcing			10.00%	
	5.1	Provide feasible programme showing critical path, sequencing, hold points, resourcing plan and the duration for the execution of works.	Works information		100.00%
				TOTAL: 100.00%	

3.7 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING MEASURES

Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria - Scoring Measures

Criteria No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Criteria sub-Weighting	Range	Score
1.1	Tenderer's Experience	30.00	No projects submitted; OR projects unrelated to the Scope of Works	0

Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Repair of Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station

Unique Identifier: **167A-19438-B**

Revision: **1**

Page: **10 of 16**

			Less than three (3) projects submitted and are in line with the Scope of Works	2
			Three (3) to five (5) projects submitted and are in line with the Scope of Works	4
			More than five (5) projects submitted and are in line with the scope of works.	5
2.1	Condition Assessment Methodology	15.00	No method statement provided	0
			Method statement provided but incomplete, partially detailed and has major deviation with the scope of works	2
			Method statement provided detailed but has minor deviation with the scope of works	4
			Comprehensive, project-specific methodology with risk controls, testing regimes, and best-practice detailing.	5
2.2	Concrete Repair Methodology	15.00	No method statement provided	0
			Method statement provided but incomplete, partially detailed and has major deviation with the scope of works	2
			Method statement provided detailed but has minor deviation with the scope of works	4
			Comprehensive, project-specific methodology with risk controls, testing regimes, and best-practice detailing.	5
3.1	Quality Management	10.00	QCP submitted but addresses none of relevant tasks OR no QCP submitted	0
			High level QCP submitted with major deviations of the works to be done	2
			QCP submitted with minor deviations of the tasks required for conducting works and all the inspections required, but showing all work activities, procedures, risks and intervention points	4
			Detailed QCP addressing all tasks required for conducting the works and all the inspections required, showing the intervention points, check sheets/check lists for work activities and procedures	5

Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Repair of Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station

Unique Identifier: **167A-19438-B**

Revision: **1**

Page: **11 of 16**

4.1	Construction Manager	6.00	CV missing OR person not proposed or no proof of registration is provided	0
			CV provided but the candidate is registered as a candidate with SACPCMP	2
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with SACPCMP and has less than three (3) years' experience post registration.	4
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with SACPCMP and has more than three (3) years' experience post registration.	5
4.2	Pr Eng / Pr Tech Eng Civil/ Structural	8.00	CV missing OR person not proposed or no proof of registration is provided	0
			CV provided but the candidate is registered as a candidate with ECSA	2
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with ECSA and has less than three (3) years' experience post registration.	4
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with ECSA and has more than three (3) years' experience post registration.	5
4.3	Site Supervisor	4.00	No CV provided or resource not proposed	0
			CV provided and the resource have less than 5 years' experience	2
			CV provided and the resource has five (5) to ten (10) years' experience	4
			CV provided and the resource has more than ten (10) years' experience	5
4.4	Organogram	2.00	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
5.1	Programme & resourcing	10.00	No programme OR schedule provided i.e. Total deficiency AND non-compliance to the key measures	0

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Repair
of Dams and Fuel Tank Bunds at Ankerlig Power Station**

Unique Identifier: **167A-19438-B**
Revision: **1**
Page: **12 of 16**

			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
	Total	100.00		

3.8 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Key: X = Mandatory; O = Optional

Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
1	X	X	X	X	O
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
1.1	X	X	X	X	O
2.1	X	X	X	X	O
2.2	X	X	X	X	O
3.1	X	X	X	X	O
4.1	X	X	X	X	O
4.2	X	X	X	X	O
4.3	X	X	X	X	O
4.4	X	X	X	X	O
5.1	X	X	X	X	O

3.9 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.9.1 Risks

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	The tenderer provides a clear, structured deviation list indicating minor technical deviations that do not affect performance, safety, or durability of the works.
2.	The tenderer proposes subcontracting of non-critical or specialist portions of work (e.g., CCTV inspections of stormwater lines), provided that subcontractors are suitably qualified and managed.
3.	Minor sequencing or scheduling differences that do not impact the overall project duration or critical path.
4.	The tenderer subcontracts a consultant to conduct assessments on the dams.

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	The tenderer or proposed key personnel lack demonstrated experience in similar works.
2.	Method statements lack sufficient detail, omit critical activities, or present unsafe or impractical approaches.
3.	Programme that is not feasible, omits critical activities, or underestimates durations and lead times.
4.	No ECSA registered engineering resource.

3.9.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Tender submission includes clearly stated assumptions that do not conflict with the Scope of Works and can be validated during due diligence.
2.	Tenderer proposes alternative methods that achieve the same performance.

Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Scheduling/Program of works errors i.e., not indicating lead time for material to site.
2.	Alternative proposals submitted without sufficient technical justification.