

**Functional Evaluation Criteria for Enquiry No: KBG2041**

**SGR Implementation Services**

Functional Evaluation Criteria		Weighting	Tenderer deliverable	Eskom acceptance criteria	Supplier 1	Comments	Rating	% Rating
1. Organisational Proficiency	1.1	25%	Proof of documented screening process	Tenderer to provide a company document generated and authorised.				0.0%
	1.2	25%	An extensive database or pool of staff from which to access to provide services	List with names, ID no's, Qualifications, related experience, skills and attributes and registrations.				0.0%
	1.3	20%	Communication plant between client and supplier	Tenderer to provide a company document generated and authorised.				0.0%
	1.4	20%	Communication plan between supplier and staff	Tenderer to provide a company document generated and authorised.				0.0%
	1.5	10%	Documented, accepted and communicated conditions of service / rules of employment	Tenderer to provide a company document generated and authorised.				0.0%
	<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>NOT MEET</b>
2. Sustainable service delivery	2.1	30%	Demonstrate the capability of providing a service as opposed to being a labour broker	A method statement outline how the service is delivered during extensive periods off of the tenderers staff.				0.0%
	2.2	40%	Demonstrate ability to deliver to meet typical project milestones. Using a scenario provide a typical project plan for a complex capital project describing the effort required of the contract management skill. This needs to follow a logical sequence and durations are to be realistic for a complex project. Use appropriate planning software for the compilation and generate a PDF thereafter.	Submit a PDF of the project plan for the scenario sketched in the appropriate software				0.0%
	2.3	30%	Proof of previous similar projects / contracts for contract management support in the petrochemical or nuclear environment.	Company portfolio				0.0%
	<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>NOT MEET</b>
3. Quality assurance programme	3.1	100%	Quality Assurance Programme	Quality Assurance Programme that meets the intent of a typical Quality Management system (QMS) or requirements as identified on Appendix A of 238-103 Rev 2.				0.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>							<b>NOT MEET</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Final Analysis	
1. Organisational Proficiency	30%
2. Sustainable service delivery	40%
3. Quality assurance programme	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	

0.00%
0.00%
0.00%
<b>0.00%</b>

The scoring of the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria is conducted as follows:  
 A supplier is given a score in each of the sub-categories, based on the suppliers response. These sub-categories are requirements detailed in the specification or contract. Scores are allocated as follows:  
 0 : 0% - Totally Deficient Or Non-Responsive  
 2 : 40% - Non-Compliant  
 4 : 80% - Compliant With Associated Qualifications  
 5 : 100% - Compliant

The score is then summed to a weighted average per category. The category scores are analysed as follows:  
 0% - 79% - Does not meet  
 80% - 100% - Meet

The category scores are summed to a weighted average, and the average is subject to the criteria as detailed above, thus indicating which suppliers meet the technical requirements.

The following eliminating criteria will apply and will result in the tenderer not meeting the requirements of the technical evaluation:

- If the tenderer can not show or provide adequate evidence related to the product/service the technical assessment will be marked as a DOES NOT MEET.
- If there are significant differences, as judged by the Eskom technical team, between the product/service specified in the URS and the product/service specified in the tender, the technical assessment will be scored as a DOES NOT MEET.

**Does not meet**