

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Expression of Interest for Design, Construction and Commissioning of Coal and Ash Conveyor Belts to be Executed by Eskom RoteK Industries at Various Eskom Power Stations**

Unique Identifier: **ERI-CS-BMH-JN002**

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Documentation Type: **Technical Evaluation**

Revision: **1.0**

Total Pages: **16**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by
Khomotso Mothata

**Project Manager – ERI CS
BMH**



Functional Responsibility

Cliffot Rakgoale

**Mechanical Engineer – ERI
CS BMH**



Authorised by

Koos Radebe

**Head of Department – ERI
CS BMH**



Date: 30/06/2023

Date: 30/06/2023

Date: 30 June 2023

CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES	4
2.1 SCOPE	4
2.1.1 Purpose	4
2.1.2 Applicability	4
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES	4
2.2.1 Normative	4
2.2.2 Informative	4
2.3 DEFINITIONS	4
2.3.1 Classification	4
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS	5
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 METHOD	5
3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	6
3.3 TET MEMBERS	6
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	9
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	10
3.5.1 Qualitative Technical Criteria- Scoring Range	11
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	14
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	15
3.7.1 Risks	15
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions	15
4. AUTHORISATION	15
5. REVISIONS	15
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	16
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	16

TABLES

Table 1: Core TET Members	7
Table 2: Optional TET Members	8
Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	9
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	10
Table 5: Qualitative Technical Criteria	11
Table 6: Scoring Range for Qualitative Technical Criteria	11
Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities	14
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks	15
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks	15
Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	15
Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	15
Table 12: List of Tender Technical Returnables	16

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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is to give an insight on the Technical Evaluation Criteria and the Tender Evaluation Team members. It also discusses the mandatory and quantitative criteria's to be followed during Technical Evaluation from the returnable.

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

Eskom Rotek Industries SOC Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of Eskom Holdings and is seeking information on how it can populate bill of materials for works various Eskom Coal fired power stations. A Contractor must have adequate experience and knowledge to provide construction support, supply of spares and materials and commissioning for construction and refurbishment of coal and ash conveyors on when and as required for a period of 4 years.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The document provides the tender technical evaluation strategy for document numbered **ERI-CS-BMH-JN001**

2.1.1 Purpose

This document outlines the criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenderers that will result from the Request for Proposal. This technical evaluation strategy defines the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Qualitative Evaluation Criteria and Technical Evaluation Team (TET) member responsibilities for tender technical evaluation. The technical evaluation strategy serves as a basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document applies to Kusile 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] See documents listed on section 2.1.1 in the SoW

2.2.2 Informative

[5] N/A

2.3 DEFINITIONS

N/A

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.

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
SOC	State Owned Company
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

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

None

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

The basic steps for a technical evaluation must be followed as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure [1].

A two stage Technical Evaluation Strategy is set out.

Stage 1: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (gatekeepers) are 'must meet' criteria. These criteria are not weighted or point scored but; are assessed on a Yes/No basis to ascertain whether or not the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any mandatory criterion will disqualify the tenderer and the tenderer will not be evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

Stage 2: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria are weighted evaluation criteria used to identify the highest technically ranked tenderer. The Qualitative Evaluation Criteria are weighted to reflect the relevant importance of each criterion.

The technical criteria and weighting is broken down as follows:

- a) Civil Engineering: 100%

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

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering requirements.

The scoring method will 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.

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

The evaluation scores will be weighted as follows:

Engineering (100%)	
Civil Engineering	100%
TOTAL (100%)	
Overall minimum threshold for qualification (70%)	

3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the technical specifications (as outlined within the scope of works). Tenderers need to have a weighted score of 70% overall or more to technically qualify for further evaluation.

The evaluation strategy for Safety, Health and Environmental as well as Quality is not included in this document as it does not form part of the Engineering scope.

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering and Planning requirements.

3.3 TET MEMBERS

The full time core technical evaluation team will consist of the following team members (in-line with the Tender Engineering Evaluation Procedure, 240-48929482) in Table 1.

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.

Table 1: Core TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Cliffot Rakgoale	Project Engineer
TET 2	K Mothata	Project Manager
TET 3	TBC	TBC

The part time/support team member shall be required to fill in a technical evaluation form, if their names are marked as mandatory (X), next to a criterion. The part time/ support team member may not be required to fill in a technical evaluation form, if their names are marked as optional (O) next to a criterion, but shall assist the main members where necessary. These members may be as follows in Table 2.

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.

Table 2: Optional TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 5	Elijah Kisaame	Chief Civil Engineer

The core members' and the optional members' responsibilities are described in Table 6.

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 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification/ Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	CIDB 7ME or higher	N/A	Statutory Requirement as per CIDB regulations
2	Contractor to have successfully completed three or more projects in the last three years. Contractor to provide list of projects which must indicate project name and reference.	N/A	To ensure that the Contractor has adequate experience

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.

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

During the tender evaluations, Table 4 will 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 <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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet technical requirement(s) with; • 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
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.

3.5.1 Qualitative Technical Criteria- Scoring Range

Table 5 below describes how the tenders will be evaluated and scored in terms of the scoring rang of 0, 2, 4 and 5.

Table 5: Scoring Range for Qualitative Technical Criteria

Mechanical Engineering				
Criteria No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Range	Score
1.1.1	Proposal on how the following works will be executed:- i. Mechanical BMH ii. Mechanical Fire System iii. Civil Structural Steel iv. Control & Instrumentation v. Electrical -	20	No technical proposal submitted or technical proposal insufficient	0
			Proposal does not contain methodology of approach OR proposal reiterates scope of works. No relevant standard mentioned. A score of two will be awarded if one of the following is missing in the proposal:- i. Mechanical BMH ii. Civil Structural Steel iii. Control & Instrumentation iv. Electrical	2
			Proposal describes how works will be executed in sequential order. The following were covered i. Mechanical BMH ii. Civil Structural Steel iii. Control & Instrumentation	4

			iv. Electrical	
			Proposal describes how works will be executed in sequential order. The following were covered i. Mechanical BMH ii. Mechanical Fire System iii. Civil Structural Steel iv. Control & Instrumentation v. Electrical	5
1.1.2	Tenderer has provided a detailed list of bill of materials covering the following disciplines. Proposal on how the following works will be executed:- i. Mechanical BMH ii. Mechanical Fire System iii. Civil Structural Steel iv. Control & Instrumentation v. Electrical List of resective OEMs or reputable suppliers must be provided, if more than one OEM or supplier exists particular equipment/material such info should also be provided.	70	No bill of materials / Bill of materials insufficient/ No names of OEMs provided	0
			Bill of materials provided but is having insufficient OEMs or reputable suppliers	2
			N/A	4
			Bill of materials provided and it has OEMs or reputable suppliers and covering the following disciplines i. Mechanical BMH ii. Mechanical Fire System iii. Civil Structural Steel iv. Control & Instrumentation v. Electrical	5
1.1.3		5	Professional Registration < 2 years	0

	Professional Registration Requirement of key Lead Mechanical Engineer, Structural Engineer and Control and Instrumentation Engineer and Electrical Engineer provided to perform the designs provided. A score of 0 will be awarded for missing one or more discipline		Professional Registration 2 – 5years	2
			Professional Registration 5 -6 years	4
			Professional Registration ≥7years	5
1.1.4	The tenderer has provided a level 4 programme, showing activities of all the project work to be done by the Contractor, clearly indicating all required tasks.	5	Total deficiency AND non-compliance to the Scope of Works, Cannot meet targets	0
			Partial deficiency (>40%) OR non-compliance to the Scope of Works, No Recovery Plan	2
			Slightly deficiency (<40%) AND compliance to the Scope of Works, Includes Recovery Plan (if no recovery plan is provided score will be downgraded to next weighting)	4
			Complete compliance to the Scope of Works, indicating all targets met and recovery plan for anticipated slippage (if no recovery plan is provided score will be downgraded by 1 point)	5

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Key: X = Mandatory; O = Optional

Table 6: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1	X	X	X
2	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1.1.1	X	X	X
1.1.2	X	X	X
1.1.3	X	X	X
1.1.4	X	X	X

3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.7.1 Risks

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Not having adequate experience
2.	Failing mandatory

3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 9: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Tenderers technical submission does not address entire scope required

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Koos Radebe	Middle Manager – Bulk Materials Handling
Khomotso Mothata	Project Manager – Bulk Materials Handling
Tshepo Motlhabane	Mechanical Engineer – Bulk Materials Handling

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
March 2023	0.1	K Mothata	Draft document for review

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.

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
March 2023	1.0	K Mothata	Final Draft

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- K Mothata

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A

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.