Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy – Supply and Refurbishment of Pulleys**	Unique Identifier:	**N/A**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**1**
		Total Pages:	**10**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
…….	…….	…….
Johann Claassen	**Langa Zuma**	**Jabulani Mkhatshwa**
Coal Plant System Engineer	**Auxiliary Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Group Manager**
Date: 2024-07-09	Date: 2024-07-11	Date: 2024-07-11

CONTENTS

Page

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Conveyor pulleys are an essential part of the coal, ash and milling plants. The spares availability of conveyor pulleys is critical to ensure the plants can be maintained within the design base. A Scope of Works has been compiled and in order to technically evaluate all tenders received from the market, a Technical Evaluation Strategy is required to ensure a fair and transparent evaluation process.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The document describes the acceptable and unacceptable risks and qualifications and /or conditions.

The Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy will define the following technical evaluation criteria:

- Mandatory Evaluation criteria
- Qualitative Evaluation criteria
- TET Member 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 applies to the Tender Evaluation Team for Regulators in accordance with the authorised procurement strategy.

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] 241-2022858: Medupi Power Station – Supply and Refurbishment of Pulleys

2.2.2 Informative

[3] NEC 3 Supply Contract

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.3.2 **Mandatory Evaluation criteria:** (gatekeepers) are 'must meet' criteria

2.3.3 Qualitative 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.

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
NEC	New Engineering Contract
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

N/A as per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

N/A

3. TENDER TECHNCIAL 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 80%.

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Johann Claassen	Coal plant System Engineer
TET 2	Xolani Nalomo	Mixed Ash Plant System Engineer
TET 3	Siya Kuzwayo	Milling Plant System Engineer

3.3 MANADATORY 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.	**Original Manufacturer of Pulleys**	Proof of manufacturing facility with reference to manufacturing capability, including authorised letter signed by the company director. Physical visits may be required if deemed necessary during evaluation phase should the proof be found inconclusive.	To ensure efficient and effective service during the contract duration, it is essential to only consider the actual manufacturers of pulleys. This will further ensure best pricing and turn-around times of any queries or works required.
2.	**ISO 9001: Quality management systems**	Proof of current ISO 9001 certification	To ensure constant supply of quality components on time and auditability

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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. **Note 2**: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.		

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	**Supply experience and capabilities**			**30%**	
	1.1	**Proof of pulley manufacturing and supply experience**	Relevant documentation for proving pulley manufacturing experience i.e. • Contract detail • Contact number • Contract close out letter		**60%**
				4 or more references	100% = 5
				Less than 4 references	80% = 4
				1 or more and less than 4 references	40% = 2
				0	0% = 0
	1.2	**Proof of pulley refurbishment experience**	Relevant documentation for proving pulley refurbishment experience i.e. • Contract detail • Contact number • Contract close out letter • Sample refurbishment report		**40%**
				4 or more references	100% = 5
				Less than 4 references	80% = 4
				1 or more and less than 4 references	40% = 2
				0	0% = 0
2.	**Technical requirements**			**70%**	
	Data sheets/Drawings				**60%**

		• At least 2 sample drawings of T-Bottom type pulleys • At least 2 sample drawings of Turbine type pulleys • Other relevant documentation	Drawings with relevant documentation for both T-Bottom and Turbine type pulleys	100% = 5
			Drawings with relevant documentation for only T-Bottom type pulleys	80% = 4
			Drawings with relevant documentation for only Turbine type pulleys	20% = 2
			No Data sheets with relevant documentation for Spares	0% = 0
3.	**Supplier delivery of new pulleys**	• Delivery Schedule • Lead time schedule • Any form of committed delivery date (average to be evaluated)		**40%**
			Less than 6 weeks	100% = 5
			Less than 12 but more than 6 weeks	80% = 4
			Less than 16 but more than 12 weeks	40% = 2
			More than 16 weeks	0% = 0
			TOTAL: 100	

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 4: 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	X	X	X
2	X	X	X

3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.6.1 Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	**N/A**

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Technical specification that does not meet the scope of work.

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	In case of an obsolete specification, the supplier may provide proof from the manufacturer about obsolescence and new data sheets for the new specification will be acceptable.

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Deviation without technical qualification not accepted.

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Johann Claassen	Coal Plant System Engineer	
Xolani Nalomo	Mixed Ash Plant System Engineer	
Siya Kuzwayo	Milling Plant System Engineer	p.p

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
July 2024	1	JF Claassen	Technical evaluation required for SOW

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

Johann Claassen

Kenneth Ndumo

Xolani Nalomo

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None