

	Strategy	Generation
---	-----------------	-------------------

Title:

TES for the provision of Events Planning Planning and Brading Services to Kriel Power Station for a period over 5 years (60 months) on as and when required basis

Unique Identifier:

559-324320572

Alternative Reference Number:

Area of Applicability:

HR Stakeholder Management

Documentation Type:

Strategy

Revision:

2

Total Pages:

11

Next Review Date:

N/A

Disclosure Classification:

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Compiled by  Collen Mathebula Senior Advisor Date: 2026/03/02	Approved by  Teboho Ntshabiseng Middle Manager Engineering Date: 2026/03/02	Authorised by  Lebo Machobane Middle Manager Human Resources Date: 04.03.2026
---	---	---

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 provision Events Planning and Brading Services to Kriel Power Station for a period over 5 years (60 months) on as and when required basis.

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 tools and equipment. 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 provision Events Planning and Brading Services to Kriel Power Station for a period over 5 years (60 months) on as and when required basis.

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
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
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

- 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	Teboho Ntshabiseng	Snr Advisor Stakeholder Management and Communication	<i>teboho ntsabiseng</i>
TET 2	Precious Magatsela	Stakeholder Management and Communication Practitioner	
TET 3	Collen Mathebula	Senior Advisor	

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 tenders must have a certificate of acceptability	R918 OF 2018 for licence of building (certificate of acceptability)	To ensure that we have the service provider that is accredited, that has a full understanding of food hygiene.

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 (%)
	General requirements		100
1.	Tenderer to provide a Purchase Order (PO)/ Completion Certificate/Invoice/Contract. To prove the experience in event planning by having served 1000 meals in an event in the last 3 years prior to this tender submission deadline.	Ten (10) Events serving 1000 meals and more in the last 3 years = Score 5 Five (5) – nine (9) events serving 1000 meals in the last 3 years = Score 4 One (1) – four (4) events serving 1000 meals in the last 3 years = Score 2 No evidence of serving 1000 meals in the last 3 years = Score 0	30%
2	Tenderer to provide stamped reference letter from the client, confirming the quality of service and meals served in an event. To prove the experience in event planning by having served 1000 meals in an event in the last 3 years prior to this tender submission deadline.	Ten (10) or more reference letters = Score 5. Five (5) – nine (9) reference letters = Score 4 One (1) – four (4) reference = Score 2 No reference = Score 0	10%
3		Ten (10) or more required proof over a two (2) year period = Score 5.	30%

For the provision of Events Planning and Brading Services to Kriel Power Station for a period over 5 years (60 months) on as and when required basis

Unique Identifier: **559-324320572**

Revision: **2**

Page: **8 of 11**

	The tenderer to provide proof of corporate branding work (Purchase Order, Contract, Completion Certificate) with one (1) signed reference letter from the client, confirming the quality of branding service. As proof of service rendered for branding with a minimum experience of 2 years in corporate branding.	Five (5) – nine (9) required proof over a two (2) year period = Score 4 One (1) – four (4) required proof over a two (2) year period = Score 2 No required proof over a two (2) year period = Score 0	
4	The tenderer to provide sample Curricula Vitas (CVs) of Event planner & Supervisor. To prove the Event planner and Supervisor with years' experience in the Event planning/ Catering Industry)	Ten (10) or more average experience with certified copies of qualifications = Score 5. Five (5) – nine (9) years average experience with certified copies of qualifications = Score 4 One (1) – four (4) years average experience with certified copies of qualifications = Score 2 No experience and qualifications = Score 0	30%

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1.	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1.	X	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 without proven track record for the of Events Planning/Brading or both Services.

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
Lebo Machobane	Middle Manager Human Resources
Teboho Ntshabiseng	Snr Advisor Stakeholder Management and Communication
Precious Magatsela	Manager Maintenance

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
May 2025	0	Teboho Ntshabiseng	Compiled this document
June 2025	1	Teboho Ntshabiseng	Draft finalisation
February 2026	2	Collen Mathebula	Document review and template change.

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- Teboho Ntshabiseng
- Precious Magatsela
- Collen Mathebula

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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.