Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy - Camden Power Station Design of New Chlorine Dosing Systems and Plant Safety Upgrade Project**	Unique Identifier:	**240- 167136664**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**2**
		Total Pages:	**12**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
		p.p
N. Naidu	**O. Tilodi**	**M. Mathabatha**
Auxiliary System Engineer	**Auxiliary Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Date: 13/04/2022	Date: 13/04/2022	Date: 13/04/2022

CONTENTS

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Camden Power Station is obliged to comply with all applicable regulatory requirements, such as SANS 10298:2009 for small to medium sized chlorine gas installations and Occupational Health and Safety Act 85 of 1993. There are two Chlorine dosing systems on site i.e. at the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and at the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) which do not comply with aforementioned standards. The main objective of this project is therefore to outline the necessary upgrade of existing plant/infrastructure required to ensure compliance to regulatory requirements, without changing the process or overall design of the plant.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document covers the different aspects that will be evaluated and scored by the multi-disciplinary Technical Evaluation Team (TET) to complete the technical evaluation of the Camden Power Station Design of New Chlorine Dosing Systems and Plant Safety Upgrade Project enquiry. The team members are listed and appointed in this document along with their responsibilities. The document also describes the acceptable and unacceptable risks and qualifications and/or conditions.

Once the Technical Evaluation Strategy is authorised no changes will be made to the evaluation criteria without appropriate authorisation.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this tender technical evaluation strategy is to define the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Qualitative Evaluation Criteria and Technical Evaluation Team (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 the Camden Power Station Design of New Chlorine Dosing Systems and Plant Safety Upgrade Project.

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] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement Policy

[3] Contract Strategy

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
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

N/A

3. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALAUTION 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%.

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

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Natasha Naidu	Auxiliary System Engineer – Camden
TET 2	Nkanyiso Shozi	Auxiliary System Engineer – Camden
TET 3	Bernie Jansen	Electrical System Engineer – Camden

3.3 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable
1.	The detailed design in terms of this Contract is to be executed by a qualified professional, who is a professional registered member of Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) in Mechanical Engineering/Technologist	Certified copy of the lead mechanical engineer's ECSA registration certificate to be submitted i.e. Pr Eng or Pr Technologist in Mechanical Engineering

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	**Criteria 1: Mechanical Works**			**55**	
	1.1	Technical deviations from the Works Information • No deviations or qualifications scores 5 • Minor deviations or qualifications (acceptable changes) scores 4 • Major deviations or qualifications scores 2 • Major changes, No response scores 0	Letter either confirming compliance to Works Information or deviations thereof		20
	1.2	Relevant Experience -Company's experience in similar projects i.e. design of Chlorine dosing systems: • >5 completed projects scores 5 • >3 completed projects scores 4 • <3 completed projects scores 2 • 0 completed projects scores 0	Proof to be submitted as completion certificates OR copies of purchase orders / contracts for the similar / same SOW that clearly indicate the past projects time period etc. with traceable references		40
	1.3	-Key resources relevant experience: CV's of key resources : • >5 years scores 5 • >3 years scores 4 • 3 years scores 2 • 0 years scores 0	CV of key resources to be submitted		40

		Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
2.	**Criteria 2: Civil and structural Works**			**25**	
	2.1	A list of traceable references which adequately proves that the tenderer has at least completed two (2) reinforced and structural steel design contracts	Proof to be submitted as completion certificates, etc. OR copies of purchase orders / contracts for the similar / same SOW that clearly indicate the past projects time period with traceable references		35
	2.2	A copy of the lead design engineer/s Pr. Eng./Pr. Tech. Eng. Certificate in Civil Engineering	Certified copy of lead civil design engineer's ECSA registration certificate to be submitted i.e. Pr Eng or Pr Technologist in Civil Engineering		30
	2.3	Key resources experience: CV's of key resources : • >5 years scores 5 • >3 years scores 4 • 3 years scores 2 • 0 years scores 0	CV of key resources to be submitted		35

		Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
3.	**Criteria 3: Electrical Works**			**20**	
	3.1	Provide a design approach indicating how the tenderer will perform the required scope	Method Statement		25
	3.2	Tenderer to have a track record of 5 completed projects for a similar scope of work. In the case of sub-contracting or joint venture, a letter of agreement, together with track record of all parties involved to be provided ➢ 5 projects scores 5 ➢ >3 projects scores 4 ➢ <3 projects scores 2 ➢ 0 projects scores 0	Proof to be submitted as completion certificates, etc. with traceable references		75
				TOTAL: 100	

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1	X		
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**
1.1 to 1.3	X		
2.1 to 2.3		X	
3.1 to 3.2			X

X – Mandatory

3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.6.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Failure to provide spares lists

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	No information on adherence to Eskom Standards provided.

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Professional Technologist is utilised and not Professional Engineer as deemed by ECSA

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Failure to meet plant performance requirements in terms of reliability and availability
2.	

4. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
January 2022	1	N. Naidu	Original Issue
April 2022	2	N. Naidu	Changes to Qualitative Criteria Weighting

5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

- Nkanyiso Shozi

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A