

	<p style="text-align: center;">Strategy</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Generation</p>
---	---	---

Title: **Kriel Power Station Electronic Board Maintenance Contract Technical Evaluation Strategy** Unique Identifier: **559-439654610**

Alternative Reference Number:

Area of Applicability: **Safety Department**

Documentation Type: **Strategy**

Revision: **3**

Total Pages: **10**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Approved by	Authorised by
		
<p>Collen Mathebula Senior Advisor</p>	<p>Rofhiwa Nelwamondo Middle Manager Engineering</p>	<p>Thabitha Mpoyi Safety Manager</p>
<p>Date: 13/01/2026</p>	<p>Date: 13/01/2026</p>	<p>Date: 14/01/2026</p>

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.....	3
2.3 DEFINITIONS	3
2.3.1 Classification	3
2.3.2 Enquiry	4
2.3.3 Tender	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	4
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	4
3.2 EVALUATION SCORING TABLE	4
3.3 TET MEMBERS.....	5
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	6
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	7
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES.....	9
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS.....	10
3.7.1 Risks.....	10
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions.....	10
4. AUTHORISATION	11
5. REVISIONS	11
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	11
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	11

TABLES

Table 1 Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table.....	5
Table 2: TET Members	5
Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	6
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	7
Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities.....	9
Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks.....	10
Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks	10
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions.....	10
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	10

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 describes the process to be followed in performing technical evaluations during the tender evaluation for the Kriel Power Station Electronic Board Maintenance Contract for 36 months.

The evaluation of tender is based on the tenderer's ability to meet both mandatory and qualitative requirements specified for the supply and delivery of spares. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tenders against the *Employer's* requirements.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The purpose of this document is to provide the technical evaluation strategy for the Kriel Power Station Electronic Board Maintenance Contract for 36 months tenders.

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 Kriel 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] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
- [2] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems

2.2.2 Informative

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

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.

2.3.2 Enquiry

A competitive or non-competitive request for information, interest, quotations, or proposals made to a supplier, a group of suppliers or the market at large.

2.3.3 Tender

A tender refers to an open or closed competitive request for quotations / prices against a clearly defined scope / specification.

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- Access Control Maintenance Scope
- 240-53716746: Tender Technical Evaluation Report Template
- 240-53716712: Tender Technical Evaluation Results Form Template
- 240-53716726: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form Template
- 240-53716769: Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy Template

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.2 EVALUATION SCORING TABLE

Tenderers that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Criteria as defined in this Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements. A score shall be allocated as per Table 1 below: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table, for each technical qualitative criterion.

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.

Each TET member shall populate a Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form for each tenderer.

Note: Individual Qualitative Criteria scores shall only be finalised after all clarification sessions have been concluded.

Table 1 Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table

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		

3.3 TET MEMBERS

Table 2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation	Signature
TET 1	Collen Mathebula	Senior Advisor	
TET 2	Gift Mamize	Officer Safety Health	

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 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 2 defines all Mandatory Evaluation Criteria to be used as well as reference to specification and motivation for use of criteria. These criteria will not be scored. Each tender will be assessed on a YES/NO basis. If any answer below is NO the tenderer may be eliminated from the tendering process.

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1	The tenderer provides previous or currently running order or contract where they are maintaining electronic boards with similar specification as to the one installed at Kriel power Station for duration exceeding 12 months	Order or Contract number with a high-level scope	To ensure validate the Tenderers history or track record on similar scope

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Compliant tenders will be evaluated against a set of weighted qualitative evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria have been broken down into sections and a percentage weighting for each section is allocated. The Tenderer must ensure that his submission/proposal contains all relevant data/proof to substantiate the Employer's weighted criteria as populated in Table 3 Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria. If no information from the submission file is available per criteria to be evaluated, the weighted score for those criteria will result in a zero without further clarification. Only information, which is presented, but ambiguous to the evaluators, will be allowed for further clarification.

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)
1.	General requirements		100
1.1	Tenderer to provide CV of the technical personnel intended to maintain the board	Provide at least 1 (one) CV (Curriculum Vitae) 5 and more years of experience – Score of 5 3 to 4 years of experience – Score of 4 2 years of experience – Score of 2 0 to 1 year of experience – Score of 0	40%
1.2	Tenderer to provide a previous or currently running order or contract where they are providing services with similar specifications with those required by candidates at Kriel Power	Provided order scope alignment to Kriel issued scope: 76 – 100% – Score of 5 51 – 75% – Score of 4 26 – 50% – Score of 2 0 – 25% – Score of 0	40%

13	Tenderer to provide a maintenance philosophy for the electronic aligned to this project	Provided order scope alignment to Kriel issued scope: 76 – 100% – Score of 5 51 – 75% – Score of 4 26 – 50% – Score of 2 0 – 25% – Score of 0	20%
----	---	--	-----

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

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

3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.7.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1	None

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1	Contractors or Suppliers not having proven experience nor expertise on the Electronic Board Maintenance

3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1	None

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1	None

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name & Surname	Designation
Gift Mamize	Safety Manager
Thabitha Mpoyi	Officer Safety Health
Sandile Sikhakhane	Procurement Manager
Boitumelo Moroe	Snr Advisor Compliance and Governance

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
March 2025	1	C Mathebula	First Issue
September 2025	2	C Mathebula	Changing the contract duration from 36 to 60 months.
December 2025	3	C Mathebula	Amendments of the Quantitative Evaluation Criteria

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- G. Mamize
- C. Mathebula

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Zakhele Nkosi
- Sandile Sikhakhane
- Clementine Mbokane
- Boitumelo Moroe

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.