Functional Evaluation Criteria for Enquiry No: 12008 Hardened Water Supply								
	Requirements	**Criteria**	**Deliverables**	**Scoring Methodology**	**Yes**	**No**	**[Supplier Name] Response**	**Eskom Comments**
Mandatory Requirements	Main Contractor reinforced concrete or post tensioned reservoir construction experience.	Evidence of three (3) reinforced concrete or post tensioned reservoirs previously constructed by the Main Contractor. At least one reservoir larger than 5Ml.	Provide three (3) project reports or similar of previously constructed reservoirs.	Yes - Project reports or similar of three (3) or more of previously constructed reservoirs submitted. With at least one reservoir larger than 5Ml. No - Insufficient evidence provided of previously constructed reservoirs submitted.				
	Main Contractor CIDB rating.	Main Contractor CIDB grading for CE and GB of 8 or higher.	Provide valid CIDB grading certificate.	Yes - Main Contractor CIDB grading certificate with grading for CE and GB of 8 or higher provided. No - No certificate supplied, or certificate with CE and GB rating less than 8, or registration with CIDB has expired.				
	Main Contractor or Sub-Contractor experience with installation of butt fused underground HDPE pipelines.	Evidence of three (3) underground butt fused HDPE pipelines (independent projects) previously installed by the Main Contractor or Sub-Contractor with a pipe length ≥300m and pipe OD ≥ 400mm.	Provide three (3) project reports or similar of previously installed underground butt fused HDPE Pipelines with a pipe length ≥300m and pipe OD ≥ 400mm.	Yes - Project reports or similar of three (3) or more of previously installed underground butt fused HDPE Pipelines with a pipe length ≥300m and pipe OD ≥ 400mm No - Insufficient evidence provided of previously installed HDPE pipelines.				

Category	**Requirements**	**Criteria**	**Deliverables**	**Scoring Methodology**	**Weighting**	**Rating**	**% Rating**	**% Score**	**[Supplier Name] Response**	**Eskom Comments**
1. PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE	Main contractor previous experience on Koeberg projects	Main / sub-contractor in 3 projects on-site (within ACP-2 boundary) at Koeberg.	List projects and role in the projects.	100% - Evidence submitted of involvement in ≥3 projects 75% - Evidence submitted of involvement in 2 projects 50% - Evidence submitted of involvement in 1 project 0% - No evidence, or non submitted	**10%**	0	0%	0%		
	Success of previously constructed reinforced concrete or post tensioned reservoirs.	Review of previously constructed reinforced concrete or post tensioned reservoirs. Including quality management issue resolution (Non-conformances and early warnings).	Project portfolio (Brag sheet) of previously constructed reinforced concrete or post tensioned reservoirs showing at least three (3) relevant projects including evidence of quality management issue resolution (Non-conformances and early warnings) for each project. Include contactable references.	100% - Three (3) or more relevant projects in the portfolio and quality management effectively implemented. 75% - Two (2) relevant projects in the portfolio and/or quality management partially implemented. 50% - One (1) relevant project in the portfolio or quality management not implemented or supplied. 0% - No feedback from previous projects	**45%**	0	0%	0%		
	Success of previously installed underground butt fused HDPE pipelines.	Review of previously installed underground butt fused HDPE pipelines. Including quality management issue resolution (Non-conformances and early warnings).	Project portfolio (Brag sheet) of previously installed underground butt fused HDPE pipelines showing at least three (3) relevant projects including evidence of quality management issue resolution (Non-conformances and early warnings) for each project. Include contactable references.	100% - Three (3) or more relevant projects in the portfolio and quality management effectively implemented. 75% - Two (2) relevant projects in the portfolio and/or quality management partially implemented. 50% - One (1) relevant project in the portfolio or quality management not implemented or supplied. 0% - No feedback from previous projects	**30%**	0	0%	0%		
	Success of previously installed steel piping and pumps.	Review of previously installed steel piping and pumps. Including quality management issue resolution (Non-conformances and early warnings).	Project portfolio (Brag sheet) of previously installed steel piping and pumps showing at least three (3) relevant projects including evidence of quality management issue resolution (Non-conformances and early warnings) for each project. Include contactable references.	100% - Three (3) or more relevant projects in the portfolio and quality management effectively implemented. 75% - Two (2) relevant projects in the portfolio and/or quality management partially implemented. 50% - One (1) relevant project in the portfolio or quality management not implemented or supplied. 0% - No feedback from previous projects	**15%**	0	0%	0%		
	TOTAL WEIGHTING				**100%**	**Does not meet**	**0%**	0.0%		
2. PROJECT TEAM STRENGTH	Resident engineer(s) qualifications & experience with similar industry reservoir projects.	Professional Engineer / Technologist. Years of experience with similar industry reservoir and piping projects.	Provision of brief CVs	100% - CV(s) provided. Most experienced engineer > 15 years experience 75% - CV(s) provided. Most experienced designer > 10 years experience 50% - CV(s) provided. Most experienced designer ≤ 5 years experience 0% - No CV(s) provided.	**45%**	0	0%	0%		
	Resident engineer(s) qualifications & experience with similar industry piping projects.	Professional Engineer / Technologist. Years of experience with similar industry reservoir and piping projects.	Provision of brief CVs	100% - CV(s) provided. Most experienced engineer > 15 years experience 75% - CV(s) provided. Most experienced designer > 10 years experience 50% - CV(s) provided. Most experienced designer ≤ 5 years experience 0% - No CV(s) provided.	**35%**	0	0%	0%		

	Project Manager experience	Experience with similar sampling construction projects.	Provision of brief CV	100% - CV provided. Project manager > 10 years experience 75% - CV provided. Project manager > 8 years experience 50% - CV provided. Project manager ≤ 6 years experience 0% - No CV provided.	**20%**	0	0%	0%		
	TOTAL WEIGHTING				**100%**	**Does not meet**	***0%***	0.0%		
3. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	Earthworks Methodology	Method statement for the planned earthworks.	Provide method statement for the planned earthworks as per drawings, including piping trenches and spoiling plan.	100% - All methodology statements provided - > 80% compliant 75% - Some methodology statements provided - > 50% compliant 50% - Some methodology statements provided - ≤ 50% compliant 0% - No methodology statements provided	**20%**	0	0%	0%		
	Reinforced Concrete Works Construction Methodology	Method statement for the planned concrete works.	Provide method statement for the planned concrete works with sections for: * Reservoirs * Valve Room * Filtration Room Include concrete casting and quality control plan for working inside ACP-2.	100% - All methodology statements provided - > 80% compliant 75% - Some methodology statements provided - > 50% compliant 50% - Some methodology statements provided - ≤ 50% compliant 0% - No methodology statements provided	**30%**	0	0%	0%		
	HDPE Outlet and Inlet Pipe installation methodology	Method statement for the planned HDPE piping installation works.	Provide method statement for the planned HDPE piping installation works. Including butt fusion quality control.	100% - All methodology statements provided - > 80% compliant 75% - Some methodology statements provided - > 50% compliant 50% - Some methodology statements provided - ≤ 50% compliant 0% - No methodology statements provided	**20%**	0	0%	0%		
	Steel Piping and pump installation methodology	Method statement for the planned Steel piping installation works.	Provide method statement for the planned Steel piping installation works. Including welding quality control.	100% - All methodology statements provided - > 80% compliant 75% - Some methodology statements provided - > 50% compliant 50% - Some methodology statements provided - ≤ 50% compliant 0% - No methodology statements provided	**15%**	0	0%	0%		
	Document Quality	Quality of contractors technical proposal (clear, concise, professional, accurate etc)	High quality technical proposal	100% - High quality technical proposal (binded hard copies, searchable soft copies, layout of information clear and concise) 75% - Good quality technical proposal (stapled hard copies, non-searchable soft copies, layout of information less clear and concise) 50% - Fair quality technical proposal (loose hard copies, non-searchable soft copies, layout of information somewhat confusing) 0% - Bad quality technical proposal (loose hard copies in random order, no soft copies, layout of information very confusing)	**15%**	0	0%	0%		
	TOTAL WEIGHTING				**100%**	**Does not meet**	***0%***	0.0%		
4. PRELIMINARY PROGRAMME	Preliminary programme	Materials delivery to site	Preliminary plan	100% - Preliminary plan showing delivery to site before start date of Koeberg installation planned date. 75% - Preliminary plan showing delivery to site before start date of Koeberg installation planned date. 50% - Preliminary plan showing delivery to site on or after start date of Koeberg installation planned date. 0% - No preliminary plan.	**30%**	0	0%	0%		
	Preliminary programme	Installation phase no impact on outage critical path (for all work in an outage)	Preliminary plan showing no impact on critical path and/or production	100% - Preliminary plan showing no impact on production or outage duration. 50% - Preliminary plan showing possible impact on production or outage duration. 0% - No preliminary plan	**70%**	0	0%	0%		
	TOTAL WEIGHTING				**100%**	**Does not meet**	**0%**	0.0%		
	QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	A Quality Assurance Programme that meets the intent of a typical Quality Management System (QMS) or requirements as identified on Appendix A of 238-103 rev2	The returnable is a document or method statement describing the supplier Quality Programme that provide a description of the processes and supporting information that reflects how processes are managed and work/operation is prepared, reviewed, carried out, recorded, assessed and improved . Examples of processes to be described can include Resource Selection, Quality Control, Receipt Inspection, Purchasing, etc.		**35%**	0	0%	0%		

5. QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAMME	QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM	Quality Control Plan (QCP) or Inspection and Test Plan (ITP) or Quality Plan : A supplier document specifying the work or production activities to be performed throughout the execution of the product realization works inclusive of test methods, procedures and acceptance criteria. (238-103 rev 2, Section 3.2. refers).	Returnable is an example of a QCP or Quality Project Plan for a similar service or product, identifying sequential operations and indicating inspection and test points (hold and/or witness points) and areas where reports are required .		**35%**	0	0%	0%		
	NONCONFORMING PRODUCT/SERVICE	Control of nonconforming product or service and application for concession.	Submit a Method Statement or documented procedure, including example, that defines processes followed for dealing with nonconforming product/service.		**30%**	0	0%	0%		
					100%	**Does not meet**	**0%**	0.0%		

Final Analysis						
1. PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE			**25%**	**0.0%**		
2. PROJECT TEAM STRENGTH			**10%**	**0.0%**		
3. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL			**25%**	**0.0%**		
4. PRELIMINARY PROGRAMME			**10%**	**0.0%**		
5. QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAMME			**30%**	**0.0%**		
TOTAL			**100%**	**0.0%**		

The scoring of the Quality Evaluation Criteria is conducted as follows:
A supplier is given a score in each of the sub-categories. These sub-categories are requirements detailed in the specification or contract. Scores are allocated as follows:
0 - 0% - Does not meet
1 - 50% - Partial meet (Large gap)
2 - 75% - Partial Meet (Small gap)
3- 100% - Meet
The overall score for functionality criteria is analysed as follows:
0% - 79% - Does not meet
80% - 100% - Meet

NOT MEET

COMPILER TECHNICAL : S. Kriel

SIGNATURE:

COMPILER QUALITY: P. Xotyeni

SIGNATURE:

REVIEWER: E. Venter

SIGNATURE: