

 <b>Eskom</b>	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Technology</b>
--	-----------------	-------------------

Title: **TECHNICAL EVALUATION  
CRITERIA FOR ESKOM  
DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS  
HARDWARE AND FITTINGS**

Unique Identifier: **240-143804436**

Alternative Reference Number: **<n/a>**

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Documentation Type: **Standard**

Revision: **1**

Total Pages: **15**

Next Review Date: **September 2024**

Disclosure Classification: **Controlled  
Disclosure**

**Compiled by**



**Shabnum Behari  
Senior Engineer**

Date: 24/07/2019

**Approved by**



**Vinod Singh  
Design Base Design  
Manager**

Date: 25/07/2019

**Authorized by**



**Amelia Mtshali  
DBOUS Senior Manager**

Date: 26/07/2019

**Supported by SCOT/SC**



**Riaz Vajeth  
DBOUS Senior Manager**

Date: 27/08/2019

## Content

	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 .....	4
2.3.1 General .....	4
2.3.2 Disclosure classification .....	4
2.4 Abbreviations .....	4
2.5 Roles and responsibilities .....	4
2.6 Process for monitoring .....	4
2.7 Related/supporting documents .....	4
3. Technical Tender Strategy and Criteria .....	5
3.1 Technical Tender Enquiry Strategy .....	5
3.1.1 Technical Evaluation Team Strategy .....	5
3.1.2 Technical Tender Evaluation Strategy .....	6
3.2 Technical Tender Criteria .....	7
3.2.1 Level 1 Gatekeeper Criteria .....	7
3.2.2 Level 2 Scoring Criteria .....	9
3.2.3 Level 3 Sample Evaluation Criteria .....	11
3.2.4 Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification Criteria .....	12
3.3 Technical Tender Documentation .....	13
3.4 Summary Table of Technical Tender Process .....	14
4. Authorization .....	14
5. Revisions .....	15
6. Development team .....	15
7. Acknowledgements .....	15

## **1. Introduction**

This document establishes the standard technical evaluation criteria to be used when evaluating the submissions by prospective suppliers in response to formal Commercial Enquiries issued for various Eskom distribution systems hardware and fittings used on networks within Eskom Distribution.

This document details the technical strategy, method of evaluation and the evaluation criteria, which includes the Enquiry returnable necessary to conduct the desktop evaluation, the product sample evaluation and the requirements for the Factory Assessment and Verification.

There are numerous and varied Eskom distribution systems hardware items published on the Eskom Buyer's Guide, each with unique standards and testing requirements. The intention of this document is to set-out the generic process to be complied with across the array of items that are the object of the formal open Enquiry and the specific requirements shall be stated in the Technical Schedules related to the specified item.

## **2. Supporting clauses**

### **2.1 Scope**

This document encompasses the evaluation strategy and criteria for various items of Eskom distribution systems hardware and fittings used on power networks within Eskom Distribution. It does not specify the requirements of each item as the specific requirements for the items are contained within the Technical Schedules that are attached to the respective Commercial Enquiries. This document covers only the evaluation strategy and criteria for various Line Hardware and Fittings used on Overhead Lines within Eskom Distribution. It does not specify the technical requirements of each item.

#### **2.1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to standardise the technical strategy and evaluation criteria for application during formal Commercial Enquiry processes for Eskom distribution systems hardware and fittings in alignment with Eskom Holdings SOC (Ltd) policies.

#### **2.1.2 Applicability**

This document shall apply throughout Eskom Holdings Limited Divisions when formal Commercial processes are undertaken for distribution hardware and fittings.

## **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] ISO 9001, Quality Management Systems.
- [2] 32-1034 - Eskom Procurement And Supply Chain Management Procedure
- [3] 240-48929482 rev 1 - Tender Engineering Evaluation Procedure
- [4] 240-51757553 - Provide Engineering during Project Sourcing
- [5] SANS61284 - Overhead lines - Requirements and tests for fittings
- [6] 240-75883154 - Current Carrying Compression Fittings for Overhead Sub-Transmission Systems

### **2.2.2 Informative**

None

## **2.3 Definitions**

### **2.3.1 General**

<b>Definition</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Buyer's Guide</b>	A list or catalogue of SAP numbers and associated material descriptions.
<b>Desktop evaluation</b>	An evaluation of the documentation included in the tender returnable.
<b>Enquiry returnable</b>	Items stipulated in the Tender Enquiry, defined as mandatory, to be submitted as part of the tender submission.
<b>Eskom Assessment Representative(s)</b>	The person(s) appointed by Eskom to perform evaluation of tender submission(s) in line with Eskom requirements.
<b>Eskom distribution systems Hardware and Fittings</b>	Hardware components and assemblies used for the construction of powerlines and substations.
<b>Non-returnable</b>	May not be returned to the tenderer.
<b>Supplier</b>	Means a current or potential Supplier, vendor, contractor, consultant, or service provider.

### **2.3.2 Disclosure classification**

**Controlled disclosure:** controlled disclosure to external parties (either enforced by law, or discretionary).

## **2.4 Abbreviations**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>DTI</b>	Department of Trade and Industry
<b>OEM</b>	Original Equipment Manufacturer
<b>SAP</b>	Systems Application Processes
<b>TET</b>	Technical Evaluation Team

## **2.5 Roles and responsibilities**

All the Eskom employees and/or appointed bodies involved in the technical tender evaluations for Eskom distribution systems hardware and fittings shall make use of this document when preparing the technical documentation for the commercial process, as well as during the execution of technical tender evaluations for these products.

## **2.6 Process for monitoring**

This document is applicable to current initiatives related to the procurement of Eskom distribution systems hardware and fittings for Distribution Overhead Lines. The document shall be monitored to ensure alignment with the documents as stated in the Normative References.

## **2.7 Related/supporting documents**

Not applicable.

### **3. Technical Tender Strategy and Criteria**

#### **3.1 Technical Tender Enquiry Strategy**

The evaluation criteria will be used to measure the suppliers ability to supply Eskom with Eskom distribution systems hardware and fittings for Distribution Systems in compliance with the specific requirements as stated in Eskom's Standards, Eskom's Buyer's Guide Documents, South African National Standards, International Standards (if there is no South African Standard available) and specific user stipulations, as included in the Commercial strategy.

This will be achieved by conducting the desktop evaluation of a specified enquiry returnable and a product sample evaluation. In addition, it may be deemed necessary by the technical evaluation team to undertake a Factory Assessment and Verification to review the production plant wherein the items are manufactured.

Suppliers who are tendering but are not the OEM of the product must source the required technical returnable from the OEM where relevant. Missing information will not be requested after the Enquiry closing date.

If any part of the production process is outsourced, the Tenderer shall retain full and complete accountability for the product.

**Note:** Eskom distribution systems hardware items are allocated a specific designation by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) which is included in the Commercial section of the enquiry. The technical evaluation process shall only proceed when the DTI designation requirements are met.

##### **3.1.1 Technical Evaluation Team Strategy**

The Technical Evaluation Team (as per 240-48929482) will evaluate the submissions.

The submissions shall be subjected to a progressive series of evaluation levels. Passing of each level is a prerequisite for proceeding to the next evaluation level.

The evaluation levels are as follows:

- Level 1 Gatekeeper Criteria
- Level 2 Scoring Criteria
- Level 3 Sample Evaluation Criteria
- Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification (where applicable)

Level 1 and Level 2 criteria will be evaluated independently by a minimum of 2 evaluators. Clear justification will be required for concluding that any criterion is not met. The independent results will be compared after both the Level 1 and Level 2 evaluations are completed. Differences in scoring between evaluators for criteria shall be clarified by the Technical Evaluation Team in order to reach consensus on the specific disparity identified. Consensus shall be reached in accordance with clause 3.4.2.3 of Procedure 240-48929482. The outcome of each Level will determine if the submissions will proceed to the next level for evaluation.

If the submission proceeds, the Level 3 criteria will be evaluated independently by a minimum of 2 evaluators. Clear justification will be required for concluding that any criterion is not met. The independent results will be compared after the Level 3 evaluations are completed. Differences in scoring between evaluators for criteria shall be clarified by the Technical Evaluation Team in order to reach consensus on the specific disparity identified. The final outcome will determine if the submissions will proceed to the Level 4 Factory Assessment.

The Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification will require the Evaluation Team together with other required Eskom Stakeholders to inspect the production facility. The Factory Assessment and Verification shall be conducted as a team and a single assessment result will be produced.

### 3.1.2 Technical Tender Evaluation Strategy

The desktop evaluation will require the submission of evidence demonstrating compliance to the Mandatory Technical Criteria. This will be known as the **Level 1 Gatekeeper Criteria**. This aspect of the desktop assessment determines if the requirement as set for the mandatory tender returnable has been met, by assessing if all the mandatory documentation is included in the submission. The content of the document is not scrutinized at this level.

Submissions meeting 100% of the Level 1 requirements will proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.

Submissions failing to meet 100% of the Level 1 requirements will be deemed non-responsive; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

The desktop evaluation shall also require evidence demonstrating compliance to the Scoring Technical Criteria. This forms **Level 2 Scoring Criteria**. This aspect of the desktop assessment determines the compliance of the submission to specific technical criteria, by evaluating the content of the technical tender returnable.

- The technical criteria set for Level 2 shall be allocated scores. Final scores shall be stated in percentage terms.
- The submissions are assumed to have a score of 100% prior to evaluation commencement. Negative marking will apply for any non-compliance to the stipulated criteria i.e. marks shall be deducted (as defined in Section 3.2.2) from the starting score of 100% until a final Level 2 score is achieved for that submission.
- The Level 2 Threshold is 90%. Compliance to the technical standards included in the criteria is critical, due to the high risk introduced by non-compliance. Eskom distribution systems hardware items are considered high risk items, meaning that when component failure occurs, serious harm, injury or death may be caused to the public, animals or the environment. It also places the network at risk and could adversely affect both the performance as well as continuity of supply.
- Submissions meeting 90% of the Level 2 requirements will proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.
- Submissions failing to meet 90% of the Level 2 requirements will be deemed non-compliant; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

If no supplier meets the stipulated Level 2 threshold, Eskom reserves the right to reduce the functionality threshold to 85%.

The product sample assessment shall be undertaken, only if the Level 2 threshold is met. The non-returnable sample will be requested by the responsible Buyer after Level 2 requirements are met. For those samples that are deemed by the Evaluation Team to be unduly large for delivery to the respective Eskom offices where the evaluation is being conducted, the Technical Evaluation Team may opt to perform the sample evaluation at the manufacturing plant. All other smaller samples shall be delivered to the Designated Eskom Commercial office responsible for that particular product within 14 calendar days from the date of request.

- If the Level 2 scoring is less than 100%, but meets the threshold requirement, the following approach shall be adopted with the sample assessment:
- The deviations that will impact the sample assessment must be noted, and must be formally recorded in the final technical report.
- The sample assessment must allow for the noted deviations. Points may not be deducted again for deviations accepted in the Level 2 evaluation. This will be recorded in the evaluation report as a clarification.

- 
- Should the submission be deemed successful at the conclusion of the evaluation process, the manufacturer of the product shall be notified of the deficiencies and shall be requested to undertake corrective action within a reasonably stipulated time. Thereafter the supplier is required to demonstrate the corrective action undertaken to Eskom as a condition of the product being considered acceptable for procurement.

The Product Sample Criteria will be known as the **Level 3 Sample Evaluation**. This aspect of the evaluation determines the compliance of the manufactured product to the manufacturing standards as stated in the Level 2 criteria. As an example, the product sample will be assessed for compliance to aspects such as dimensions, galvanising, markings, accessories etc. These will be known and sourced from the measurable criteria stated in the Level 2 criteria. No new criteria will be introduced at this stage.

- The Level 3 Threshold is 100% (with consideration of the points raised above). Full compliance to the technical standards included in the criteria is critical due to the high risk introduced by non-compliance. Eskom distribution systems hardware items are considered high risk items, meaning that when component failure occurs, serious harm, injury or death may be caused to the, public, animals or the environment. It also places the network at risk and could adversely affect both the performance as well as continuity of supply.
- Submissions meeting 100% of the Level 3 requirements shall proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.
- Submissions failing to meet 100% of the Level 3 requirements shall be deemed non-compliant; the submission shall be disqualified and not evaluated further.

Submissions satisfying the Level 3 requirements shall be considered for the Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification. The Technical Evaluation Team and Eskom Assessment Representatives shall determine if a Factory Assessment and Verification is required. If the Factory Assessment and Verification is not required then the evaluation may be concluded with the Level 3 result.

If the manufacturer has supplied Eskom with Distribution Systems Hardware for a period of 5 years or more, the respective technical evaluation team shall decide at their discretion whether or not to undertake a Factory Assessment and Verification. If a manufacturer has not previously supplied Eskom with Distribution Systems Hardware, such a manufacturer shall be subjected to a Factory Assessment and Verification. Factory Assessment and Verifications shall only be undertaken with OEM's and not Redistributors.

The scope and criteria of the Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification will be defined by the Technical Evaluation Team and the Eskom Assessment Representatives, prior to the assessment. The assessment checklist may be shared with the tendering company prior to the assessment. The Level 4 threshold is 80%. The Level 4 result will represent the final result for the submission.

A final result per submission shall be determined and shall be stated as follows in the evaluation report:

- Non-compliant
- Compliant with qualifications
  - This means that there may be deficiencies that need to be addressed prior to contracting or procuring. The terms of this will be stated in the tender strategy document.
- Fully compliant

## **3.2 Technical Tender Criteria**

It is a mandatory requirement that the technical returnable be contained within the technical section of the submission and the inclusion of any technical returnable in any other segment of the submission shall not be considered for assessment.

### **3.2.1 Level 1 Gatekeeper Criteria**

This evaluation will be conducted per SAP number. The following evidence is required to meet the Level 1 Gatekeeper Criteria:

**ESKOM COPYRIGHT PROTECTED**



Level 1 Gatekeeper Criteria			
All evidence stated below must be included in the tender returnable for the submission to be considered complete.			
No	Submission Requirements	Mandatory	Notes
1	Technical A&B Schedules for each SAP number – completed and signed	Y	<p>The A&amp;B Schedule documents will be provided by Eskom. Each SAP number will require the submission of its respective schedule. The SAP number is stated on the schedule. Evidence for any other SAP number will not be accepted.</p> <p>This schedule is considered completed when the Supplier includes the product specific information into the Schedule B column for all criteria.</p>
2	Deviation Schedule for each SAP number – completed and signed	Y	<p>The Deviation schedule shall be provided by Eskom. Each SAP number shall require the submission of its respective deviation schedule. The SAP number is stated on the schedule. Evidence for any other SAP number will not be accepted.</p> <p>If no deviations exist then none need to be listed, however the evidence of the Deviation Schedule must still be signed and submitted with a “nil” record.</p>
3	Approved Manufacturer Drawings – completed and signed	Y	<p>The drawings must be provided for each unique SAP number. The SAP number may be stated on the drawing or the document title can describe the product. The drawings must have the Manufacturer’s name included.</p> <p>“Approved” means there is an approval signature on the drawing.</p> <p>Evidence for any other SAP number will not be accepted.</p>
4	Test Report Schedule, including copies of stated tests IN ENGLISH, for each SAP number – completed and signed	Y	<p>The Test Schedule Template will be provided by Eskom. Each SAP number will require the submission of its respective test schedule. The SAP number is stated on the schedule. Evidence for any other SAP number will not be accepted.</p> <p>A copy of the test report must be included in the submission for each Test Report number stated by the Supplier on the Test Report schedule.</p>

- Submissions meeting 100% of the Level 1 requirements will proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.
- Submissions failing to meet 100% of the Level 1 requirements will be deemed non-responsive; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

**Clear justification will be required for concluding that any criterion is non-compliant.**

**ESKOM COPYRIGHT PROTECTED**



**3.2.2 Level 2 Scoring Criteria**

This evaluation shall be conducted per SAP number.

The weighting per section is as follows:

Criteria	Maximum Score	Weight in %
Completeness and compliance of the evidence stated in the Schedule B column of the A&B Schedules	5	20
Completeness and compliance of Manufacturer's Drawings to the Eskom standards as stated in the schedule and Buyer's Guide Document.	5	15
Completeness of Testing Evidence Reports	5	15
Compliance of Testing Evidence	5	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>

The following evidence is required to meet the Level 2 Scoring Criteria:

Level 2 Scoring Criteria			
All evidence stated below will be scored. Negative marking applies.			
Completeness and Compliance of Schedule B evidence			
No	Criteria	Maximum Score	Scoring Method
1	Completeness and compliance of the evidence stated in the Schedule B column of the A&B Schedules	5	5 – Fully Compliant 4 – Compliant with qualifications 2 – Non-Compliant 0 – Deficient or non-responsive
<b>Negative marking will be applied as follows:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Points will not be deducted for fully compliant submissions. Fully compliant means that the evidence stated in the Schedule B column of the Technical A&amp;B Schedule complies with specified requirements in Schedule A; there are no deviations, omissions or incomplete/blank/irrelevant responses.</li> <li>1 point will be deducted (resulting in a score of 4) if the submission demonstrates compliance to higher risk criteria (e.g. mechanical and electrical properties, coupling requirements, corrosion protection and tests) however there are deviations on some lower risk criteria (e.g. general and packaging) (and these deviations are noted on both the Technical A&amp;B Schedule and the Deviation Schedule).</li> <li>3 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 2) if the submission shows deviations to most, or higher risk criteria (and these deviations are noted on both the Technical A&amp;B Schedule and the Deviation Schedule)</li> <li>5 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 0) if the evidence is completely non-compliant, significantly deficient or deviations have not been noted on the deviation schedule.</li> </ul>			

Completeness and Compliance of the Manufacturer's Drawings			
No	Criteria	Maximum Score	Scoring Method
1	Completeness and compliance of Manufacturer's Drawings to the Eskom standards as stated in the schedule and Buyer's Guide Document.	5	5 – Fully Compliant 4 – Compliant with qualifications 2 – Non-Compliant 0 – Deficient or non-responsive
<p><b>The following drawing elements will be evaluated:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed Drawing Title</li> <li>Drawing Number</li> <li>Revision Number</li> <li>Revision Date</li> <li>Dimensions and/or tolerances if applicable (in compliance to the Technical Schedule)</li> <li>Markings (in compliance to the Technical Schedule)</li> <li>Manufacturer's Name</li> <li>Approved with signature and date</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative marking will be applied as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Points will not be deducted for fully compliant submissions. Fully compliant means that the evidence required is identifiable on the drawing submitted and it meets the required Eskom standard.</li> <li>1 point will be deducted (resulting in a score of 4) if the submission demonstrates compliance to most criteria however there are deviations/omissions on some criteria.</li> <li>3 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 2) if the submission shows deviations or omissions for most criteria.</li> <li>5 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 0) if the evidence is completely non-compliant.</li> </ul>			
Completeness and Compliance to Testing Requirements			
No	Criteria	Maximum Score	Scoring Method
1	Completeness of Testing Evidence Reports	5	5 – Fully Compliant 4 – Compliant with qualifications 2 – Non-Compliant 0 – Deficient or non-responsive
2	Compliance of Testing Evidence	5	5 – Fully Compliant 0 – Deficient or non-responsive
<p><b>Criteria 1: Completeness of Testing Evidence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test reports will be considered complete if the following is stated in the report:</li> <li>The test facility at which the test was conducted</li> <li>The product that was tested</li> <li>The standards against which it was tested</li> <li>The test name/details</li> <li>The test result/outcome</li> <li>Date of test/Date of report issue</li> </ul> <p>Individual test reports per test requirement as well as consolidated test reports containing all the test results will be accepted.</p>			

**Negative marking will be applied as follows:**

With consideration of all test reports as a singular, consolidated reports (i.e. this scoring does not need to be repeated for each test, but for the testing evidence as a whole):

- Points will not be deducted for fully compliant submissions. Fully compliant means that the evidence stated in the details of the criteria above have been met.
- 1 point will be deducted (resulting in a score of 4) if the submission demonstrates compliance to most criteria however there are deviations/missing information for some criteria.
- 3 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 2) if the submission has deviations/missing information for most criteria.
- 5 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 0) if the evidence completely non-compliant.

**Criteria 2: Compliance of Testing Evidence**

Test reports will be considered compliant if the report conclusion indicates compliance to the testing standard requirements and the acceptable results as stipulated in those standards.

**Negative marking will be applied as follows:**

- Points will not be deducted for fully compliant submissions. Fully compliant means that all test reports have conclusions stating compliance for all tests conducted.
- 5 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 0) if any or all the test results are non-compliant.

The final Level 2 scoring shall be determined by summing all the scores allocated per criteria. The score shall be converted to a percentage.

The independent results shall be compared after both Level 1 and Level 2 evaluations are completed. Differences in scoring between evaluators for any criterion shall be clarified by the Technical Evaluation Team in order to reach consensus. The final outcome shall determine if the submissions will proceed.

- Submissions meeting 90% of the Level 2 requirements will proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.
- Submissions failing to meet 90% of the Level 2 requirements will be deemed non-compliant; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

**Cear justification will be required for concluding that any criterion is non-compliant.**

**3.2.3 Level 3 Sample Evaluation Criteria**

This evaluation will be conducted per SAP number. A sample will be evaluated as follows:

<b>Level 3 Sample Criteria</b>			
<b>Compliance to Measureable Technical Standards</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Score</b>	<b>Scoring Method</b>
1	Compliance of the Manufactured product to the measurable standards included in the Technical A&B Schedules and the Manufacturer's drawings included in the submission.	5	5 – Fully Compliant 0 – Deficient or non-responsive

The specific requirements for the purpose of the evaluation will be sourced from the Technical A&B Schedules and Manufacturer's Drawings per SAP number.

**Negative marking will be applied as follows:**

- Points will not be deducted for fully compliant submissions. Fully compliant means no deviations from the specified criteria were identified.
- 5 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 0) if the sample is non-compliant.

- The Level 3 Threshold is 100%. Full compliance to the technical standards included in the criteria is critical due to the high risk introduced by non-compliance.
- Submissions meeting 100% of the Level 3 requirements will proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation i.e. the Factory Assessment and Verification or the evaluation will be concluded at this stage as per the decision from the Technical Evaluation Team.
- Submissions failing to meet 100% of the Level 3 requirements will be deemed non-compliant; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.

### **3.2.4 Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification Criteria**

The Factory Assessment and Verification is a major milestone in the assessment of Eskom distribution systems hardware material manufacture and supply where the production facility demonstrates that the product design and manufacturing processes meet Eskom's standards (derived from the functional requirements as specified in the Technical Schedules).

The Factory Assessment and Verification aims to review a production facility's quality systems, workplace environment and capabilities in order to manufacture Eskom distribution systems hardware materials as required by Eskom. It ensures that the manufacturers are able to process orders as per Eskom's requirements.

The Factory Assessment and Verification provides assurance that the manufacturer has the design and manufacturing capability to produce a product according to normative requirements specified. It also provides assurance that the manufacturer can deliver quality products, undertake continuous improvements and operate efficiently. The Factory Assessment and Verification provides insight and confidence on a manufacturer's structure, organisation, quality process and experience in possessing the capability to process Eskom's orders.

The Factory Assessment and Verification shall include a review of the following factors:

- a) Demonstrate that there are good manufacturing practices (factory production technology) established, to assess the degree of automation, sophistication and precision of the production assets installed to produce the required products in a high volume operation i.e. is the production more reliant on manual methods or fully automated processes;
- b) There are technical work instructions and supporting technical documents in place ensuring that every product adheres to the required standards, also ensuring that technical changes are controlled and managed from design to manufacturing, and ensuring consistency and repeatability in the production process;
- c) There is a product control system in place ensuring testing of raw material and testing (sample and routine) of finished products, ensuring compliance to Eskom standards, and such test certification is retained in archives and available for inspection;
- d) That production personnel are competent and imbued with the necessary skills by means of certification and specialised training (certificates from approved authority and skills training certificates), demonstrate the technical design capability of design and production personnel;

Level 4 Factory Assessment and Verification Criteria			
Compliance to Factory Assessment and Verification Criteria			
No	Criteria	Maximum Score	Scoring Method
1	Compliance to Factory Assessment and Verification Criteria	5	5 – Fully Compliant 4 – Compliant with qualifications 2 – Non-Compliant 0 – Deficient or non-responsive
<p>The specific requirements for the purpose of the evaluation will be sourced from the Factory Assessment and Verification checklist prepared by the Factory Evaluation Team.</p> <p><b>Negative marking will be applied as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Points will not be deducted for fully compliant production facilities. Fully compliant means no deviations from the factory evaluation criteria were identified.</li> <li>1 point will be deducted (resulting in a score of 4) if the production facility demonstrates compliance to defined criteria however there are deficiencies that are considered by the Factory Evaluation Team to be low risk criteria.</li> <li>3 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 2) if the production facility demonstrates deviations to most criteria.</li> <li>5 points will be deducted (resulting in a score of 0) if the production facility is completely non-compliant.</li> </ul>			

- The Level 4 Threshold is 80%.
- Submissions meeting 80% of the Level 4 requirements will be awarded a result of Fully Compliant or Compliant with Qualifications, as determined by the Technical Evaluation Team.
- Submissions failing to meet 80% of the Level 4 requirements will be deemed non-compliant; the submission will be awarded a result of non-compliant.

### 3.3 Technical Tender Documentation

The Criteria tables contained throughout section 3.2 shall be converted into evaluation sheets by the Technical Evaluation Team for the purpose of conducting the evaluations and for creating a record of the evaluation conducted per submission, per evaluator.

The Technical Evaluation Team shall provide Commercial with a formal report containing the details of the technical outcome of the evaluations.

As per the PCM, Provide Engineering during Project Sourcing, the report may contain the following content:

- Details on the implementation of Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy
- List all tenders (tenderer name, etc.) received and evaluated
- Summary of all clarification questions and responses received
- Summary of evaluation results
- Clarifications related to the product sample evaluation scoring
- Interpretation of evaluation results (mandatory and scoring criteria)
- Final conclusions and recommendations
- All individual scoring forms and consolidated results
- Minutes of all meetings during evaluation process (internal clarification sessions, tenderer clarification sessions, etc.)

The report must be signed and authorised by appropriate representatives.

**ESKOM COPYRIGHT PROTECTED**

### 3.4 Summary Table of Technical Tender Process

The following table provides a high level overview of the process described in sections 3.1 and 3.2

Level	Level Description	Threshold	Maximum Score	Minimum Score	Outcomes
1	Gatekeeper Criteria	100%	Pass/Fail – no scoring	Pass/Fail – no scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submissions meeting 100% - will proceed to the next level.</li> <li>Submissions failing to meet 100% - deemed non-responsive; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.</li> </ul>
2	Scoring Criteria	90%	20	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submissions meeting 90% - proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation.</li> <li>Submissions failing to meet 90% - deemed non-compliant; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.</li> </ul>
3	Sample Evaluation Criteria	100%	5	5	<p>The Level 3 Threshold is 100%. Full compliance to the technical standards included in the criteria is critical due to the high risk introduced by non-compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submissions meeting 100% - proceed to the next level of the technical evaluation i.e. the Factory Assessment and Verification or the evaluation will be concluded at this stage as per the decision from the Technical Evaluation Team.</li> <li>Submissions failing to meet 100% - deemed non-compliant; the submission will be disqualified and not evaluated further.</li> </ul>
4	Factory Assessment and Verification Criteria	80%	5	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submissions meeting 80% of the Level 4 requirements will be awarded a result of Fully Compliant or Compliant with Qualifications, as determined by the Technical Evaluation Team.</li> <li>Submissions failing to meet 80% of the Level 4 requirements will be deemed non-compliant; the submission will be awarded a result of non-compliant.</li> </ul>

## 4. Authorization

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name and surname	Designation
Vinod Singh	Design Base Design Manager - Design Base and OU Support
Riaz Vajeth	Lines Engineering Services Senior Manager
Amelia Mtshali	DBOUS Senior Manager
Deidre February	SI Manager WCOU

**ESKOM COPYRIGHT PROTECTED**

<b>Name and surname</b>	<b>Designation</b>
Stephen Nkwane	SI Manager GOU
Rudi Kleinhans	SI Manager FSOU and NCOU
Vusi Phiri	SI Manager MOU
Henry Jordaan	SI Manager ECOU
Mmedi Motaung	SI Manager LOU
Riaz Asmal	SI Manager KZNOU

## **5. Revisions**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Rev</b>	<b>Compiler</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Sept 2019	1	S Behari	First issue - Review of first draft with development team. Addressed comments received as follows: Comments received via June 2019 SCOT Comment process: Added Normative References 5 and 6 Added section 3.4 Renamed document from TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR POWERLINE HARDWARE to TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR ESKOM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS HARDWARE AND FITTINGS Minor word changes throughout document in order to standardise the language used. Changed "Factory Assessment" to "Factory Assessment and Verification" throughout the document. Added weight table in section 3.2.2 Updated bullet points in section 3.2.4

## **6. Development team**

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

- Henry Jordaan
- Riaz Asmal
- Shabnum Behari
- Jason Blaauw

## **7. Acknowledgements**

Not applicable.