Eskom	Strategy	Majuba Power Station

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Majuba Power Station Unit 6 Cable Basement Fire Protection System Sprinkler Pipe Replacement**

Document Identifier:

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd**

Functional Area: **Engineering**

Revision: **1**

Total Pages: **17**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **Controlled Disclosure**

Compiled by	Supported by	Functional Responsibility	Authorized by
Nqobizizwe Shange	**Sipho Masango**	**Sinothi Buthelezi**	**Johan Swanepoel**
System Engineer Low Pressure Services	**Senior Engineer**	**Auxiliary Engineering Manager**	**Middle Manager Engineering**
Date: 10/07/2025	Date: 2025/07/10	Date: 10/07/2025	Date: 2025/07/10.

Content

Tables

1. Introduction

An open enquiry invite will be issued calling for tenderers to participate in the tender process for Majuba Power Station Unit 6 Cable Basement Fire Protection system Sprinkler Pipe Replacement. This document sets out the method and criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenders that will result from this open enquiry invite.

2. Supporting Clauses

2.1 Scope

The scope of this document is to capture the technical tender evaluation strategy for Majuba Power Station Unit 6 Cable Basement Fire Protection system Sprinkler Pipe Replacement. The scope of the project is as described in the Majuba Power Station Unit 6 Cable Basement Fire Protection system Sprinkler Pipe Replacement Scope of Work.

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 the Majuba Power Station Unit 6 Cable Basement Fire Protection System Sprinkler Pipe Replacement Project.

2.1.3 Effective date

The document is effective from the authorisation date.

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] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[3] 240-44682850: PCM - Provide Engineering During Project Sourcing

[4] 32-1033: Eskom Procurement and Supply Chain Management Policy

[5] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement and Supply Management Procedure.

2.2.2 Informative

[6] 474-59: Internal Audit Procedure

[7] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems.

[8] Majuba Power Station Majuba Power Station Unit 6 Cable Basement Fire Protection system Sprinkler Pipe Replacement Scope of Work.

2.3 Definitions

Definition	Description
Project Engineering Team	Eskom Majuba Power Station Engineering representative
Employer	The person named as the *Employer* in the Appendix to Tender and the legal successors in title to this person.
Contractor	The person(s) named as *Contractor* in the Letter of Tender accepted by the *Employer* and the legal successors in title to this person(s).
Project Engineering Team	Eskom Majuba Power Station Engineering representative
Project Manager	The person appointed by the *Employer* to act as the *Project Manager* for the purposes of the Contract and named in the Appendix to Tender, or other person appointed from time to time by the *Employer* and notified to the *Contractor* as per NEC procedures.
Works Information	The document/s forming part of the contract in which are described the methods of executing the various items of work to be done, and the nature and quality of the materials to be supplied and includes technical schedules and drawings attached thereto as well as all samples and patterns.
Competent Person	A person who is qualified by virtue of his education, training, experience and contextual knowledge to make a determination regarding the performance of a building or part thereof in relation to a functional regulation or to undertake such duties as may be assigned to him in terms of these regulations.
Tender	A tender refers to an open or closed competitive request for quotations / prices against a clearly defined scope / specification

2.3.1 Document:

N/A

2.4 Abbreviations

TET	Technical Evaluation Team
SOW	SCOPE OF WORK
PS	Power Station

2.5 Roles and Responsibilities

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 Process for Monitoring

Not Applicable

2.7 Related/Supporting Documents

Refer to section 2.1

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATIONS STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

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

- The technical criteria and weighting is broken down as follows:

a) Engineering: 90%

b) Planning: 10%

- The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the engineering requirements. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tender submission against the specifications and Employer's requirements.

3.1.1 QUALITATIVE CRITERIA EVALUATION

The scoring method will be as follows:

Table 1: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table

SCORE	PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION
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		

The evaluation scores will be weighted as follows according to disciplines:

Engineering (90%)	
Civil	90%
Planning (10%)	
Project Controls	10%
TOTAL (100%)	
Overall minimum threshold for qualification (70%)	

3.1.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.1.3 TET MEMBERS

Table 2: Core TET Members

TET number: Section to be evaluated	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1: Auxiliary Engineering	Nqobizizwe Shange	Mechanical Engineer
TET 2: Auxiliary Engineering	Sipho Masango	Senior Mechanical Engineer
TET 3: Auxiliary Engineering	Zimele Ngcobo	Mechanical Engineer
TET 4: Auxiliary Engineering	Sinothi Buthelezi	Line manager
TET 5: Mechanical Maintenance	Bongani Msimango	Senior Supervisor

3.1.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

In order to be eligible for evaluation, the tenderer shall meet the following gatekeepers.

N/A

3.1.5 Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Notes to tenderer:

1. The Tenderer shall note that where proposed key personnel are no longer available to undertake the work, the Tenderer shall provide suitably qualified and experienced replacement with equivalent or higher qualifications, competence and experience. The replacement is subject to approval by the Employer's Project Manager.

2. The curriculum vitae (CV's) of key personnel shall include relevant experience which is comparable to the Works specified in this tender. Low points will be allocated where relevant experience is not demonstrated.

3. Where no information is offered by the Tenderer no points shall be scored.

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Range	Score
1.	**Engineering**		**90**		
1.1	**Technical Proposal with Method Statements**				
	The Tenderer shall submit a proposal/method statement detailing all provisions, activities, deliverables, design reviews, testing, investigations, functions, quality, critical, construction monitoring and other aspects in accordance with the scope of services. The proposal method statement shall clearly highlight the approach and process of, inter alia, design reviews and assuming professional design responsibility for the existing design information and providing technical assurance during execution. • The Tenderer shall submit a signed letter confirming full compliance with the Scope. The Tenderer shall demonstrate quality assurance plan relative to the scope.	Method statement/Scope of Work	30	No method statement submitted	0
				NON-COMPLIANT Not relatable or not from another project OR non-compliance to the SOW Does not meet technical requirements(s) AND/OR; contains Unacceptable technical risk(s) Proposal and/or methodology is poor/is unlikely to meet project requirements. Signed letter confirming compliance with full scope not submitted. Unacceptable exceptions	2
				COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS Partial deficiency AND compliance to the SOW. Technical approach is tailored to address specific project requirements, address the main aspects of the scope. Method Statement/Proposal omits some critical activities but meets key dates.	4

				Complete compliance to the SOW. • Method Statement/proposal address the specific project requirements. • Exceeds requirements whilst adding value. • No unforeseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements. • Meets technical requirements,	5
1.2	**Tenderer's Experience**				
	The Tenderer shall provide past track record of at least **two (2)** completed projects in the past 10years as a minimum for the design of projects similar/comparable to the works specified in the Tender (minimum Class C barrier system as per Norms and Standards for Waste Disposal) Provide Client reference letter and/or completion certificates for completed project of consisting of the following minimum information: • Contact Person • Contact Number • Project description • Construction period • Contract Value	A list of previously accomplished tasks with comparable scope and references, including signed reference letters/certificates for each project.	40	TOTALLY DEFICIENT 0 completed projects or approved designs that are similar or comparable to the scope	0
				1 completed similar project. Project related information is mostly not verifiable/ listed/ submitted	2
				2 completed similar project. Project related information is mostly but not fully submitted/verifiable.	4
				COMPLIANT 3 or more completed projects. Project related information is fully submitted/verifiable.	5
1.3	**Organogram**				

	Project Organogram • The organizational structure of the Consultant's key individuals must be submitted by the tenderer	Project organogram	5	No project organogram is submitted	0
				The project organogram do not cover all the necessary members/skillset relevant to the scope	2
				The project organogram minimally covers the necessary project members/skillset relevant to the scope	4
				The project organogram comprehensively covers all the necessary project members/skillset, to successfully execute the scope of work	5
1.4	**CVs of Key Personnel**				
	The Tenderer shall provide CV's (including tertiary qualifications and professional registrations certificates) of key staff, namely Design Engineer(s), Project Technical Director/Project Lead/Senior Supervisor, Designer Site Representative(s), as specified below to demonstrate level of experience and competencies, relevant qualifications. a) Copy of professional registration with statutory body (i.e., professional registration certificate) with exception of the one provided on Mandatory	Certified Qualifications and ECSA registration Certificates and CVs Refer to section 4 of the SOW for the minimum requirements of the key resources	20	Experience has no overlap to match the role and responsibility of the Professionally Registered Engineers or team	0
				NON-COMPLIANT CV Of Proposed Dedicated Professionally Registered Persons With no Organogram Of CV's Of Proposed Full Time Project Team • Key staff has limited experience. • Failed to comply with requirements. • Signed letter not submitted.	2
				CV Of Proposed Dedicated Professionally Registered Persons With Organogram • Design Engineer has minimum 4-6 years' experience. • Project Director has minimum 10 years' experience.	4

	Technical Criteria. b) Experience of key staff in relation to the scope of the works. c) Relevant certified copies of tertiary qualification. d) The Tenderer shall submit an organogram of key personnel and project professional team. The organogram shall include as a minimum: Project Technical Director (Pr. Eng)/ Project Lead (Pr. Eng)/Specialist, Design Engineer(s) and Designer Site Representatives(s). The Organogram clearly indicate the project role and name(s) of individual(s). e) The Tenderer shall submit a signed letter confirming resources availability for the Project. Note: The Project Director/Lead shall be Pr. Eng Design Engineer (responsible for certifying the works as per ECSA Regulation or requirements) shall be Pr. Eng and active on ECSA. **Key required resources**			Letter confirming resource availability submitted	
				CV Of Proposed Dedicated Professionally Registered Persons With Organogram Has fully met the requirements. Compliant organogram • Design Engineer has 6 years or more experience. • Project Director has 10 years or more experience. Letter confirming resource availability is complaint.	5

	• **Design Engineer** 10 years relevant experience BSc/ Btech Professional registration with ECSA (PrEng or PrTechEng) • **Senior Supervisor** 5 - 10 years relevant experience BSc/ Btech Civil Eng Professional registration with ECSA (PrEng or PrTechEng) • **Supervisor** 5 - 10 years relevant experience BSc/ Btech/ ND Eng • **Assistant Supervisor** 3 - 5 years relevant experience ND Eng • **Project Manager** 5 - 10 years relevant experience BSc/ Btech Professional registration with ECSA (PrEng or PrTechEng) • **Surveyor** 5-year relevant experience				
2.	**Project Controls**		**5**		
	High level programme: Tenderer shall submit a high-level schedule with completion dates and durations indicating how the tenderer intends complying with the scope of work and Employers sectional completion dates and other applicable durations/dates: Program in Primavera Project P6 XER and PDF	Project program/schedule	5	TOTALLY DEFICIENT or NON-RESPONSIVE	0
				NON-COMPLIANT • 40% of program requirements met AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) • Key dates are not met or partially met. • Does not indicate critical path. Program omits some activities buts partially compliant to Employer's dates and requirements.	2

	format showing activities of all the project work to be done by the Consultant, and the other work covered by the contract that is being done by the sub-contractors (i.e. is the entire scope of the works represented). The schedule shows a logical links/ sequence/ relationships that connect the various activities together. The CPM (Critical Path Method) technique is used for programme and planning. Design review timelines and modification, as applicable, and submission of construction drawings (as per Works Information) with milestone dates that are consistent with Employers sectional completion dates. The programme shall include all relevant activities required (as per the Works Information/scope).			COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIICATION • Program partially met (80% of requirements). • Meet technical requirement(s) with acceptable: technical risk(s) AND/OR exceptions AND/OR conditions. • Program omits some activities buts mostly compliant to Employer's dates and requirements.	4
				COMPLIANT • Fully compliant to requirements. • Program meets key dates and sectional completion dates and requirements with no technical risks. • Detailed program supplied without deviations to the design and complies to Employers objective.	5
		TOTAL	100		

3.2 TET Member Responsibilities

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
1	X	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X	X

3.2.1 Foreseen Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications

3.2.1.1 Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1	Value Engineering proposals highlighting the benefits to the proposal to the Project in terms of cost, time and/or quality. The submission of alternatives is subject to the Tenderer submitting the main options. The changes align to Client objectives
2	Non-substantive changes with minor schedule impact and no impact to design approval.

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
3.	Consultant not able to take accountability for constructed works
4	The Tenderer submits methodology/approach that is generic and not tailored to address specific project requirements and objectives. The approach does not contain all critical aspects of the project.
5	The Tenderer does not show understanding and/or appreciation of the regulatory and legislative requirements for the scope.
6	The Project staff organogram is unclear (i.e., staffing plan is weak and does not demonstrate position and responsibilities.)
7	Project Director and Design Engineers are not professionally registered with Engineering Council of South Africa
8	Noncompliance with the Scope of Work requirements, entirely or parts thereof, National Standards, Employers Requirements, Regulations and Legislation
9	Unreasonable risks mitigation strategies and assumptions
10	Major deviations/substantive design changes with impact on EIA and Environmental Authorizations
11	Does not align to Client/Eskom objectives
12	Major design changes without valid justification or with no benefits to the Employer.

3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1	There are minor inconsistencies between timing, project deliverables and the proposed methodologies, which are deemed not to result in project delays once addressed.
2	Deviations with technical qualifications that align to Client objectives (minor changes with no impact on design authorisation)

Table 08: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1	The method statement is generic, incomplete and not tailored to address the specific project objectives, scope and constraints. It does not deal with the critical constraints and hazards of the project.
2	Deviations without technical qualifications
3	Noncompliance, entirely or parts thereof, with the Scope of Work requirements, National Standards, Employers Requirements, Regulations and Legislation

4. Acceptance

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Full Name and Surname	Designation
Zimele Ngcobo	Auxiliary Civil Engineer
Sinothi Buthelezi	Auxiliary Engineering Line Manager
Bongani Msimango	Senior Supervisor Mechanical Maintenance
Sipho Masango	Auxiliary Senior Engineer

5. Revisions

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
July 2025	1	Nqobizizwe Shange	First issue

6. Development Team

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

- Nqobizizwe Shange

7. Acknowledgements

N/A