

### **3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY**

#### **3.1 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING**

Tenderers shall submit all documentation and evidence as specified in **Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria**. These criteria shall be evaluated on a compliance basis (Yes/No).

- Failure to meet any mandatory requirement at tender closing shall result in disqualification from further evaluation.
- Tenderers who **do not meet all mandatory criteria** shall **not proceed to the technical (qualitative) evaluation stage**.

#### **3.2 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING**

Tenderers who meet all mandatory criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria, as defined in the tender documentation.

- Evaluation shall be based on a weighted scoring system.
- A **minimum threshold score of 70%** must be achieved to be considered technically acceptable.

The Employer reserves the right to:

- Request further clarification or substantiating evidence during this stage.
- Disqualify the tenderer if:
  - Adequate evidence is not provided, or
  - Submitted information is materially inaccurate or misleading, regardless of the initial score.

#### **3.3 PRE AWARD DUE DILIGENCE FOR TECHNICALLY COMPLIANT TENDERERS**

Tenderers who achieve the minimum technical threshold of **70% or above** in the qualitative technical evaluation (**3.2**) shall undergo a **risk-based due-diligence verification** prior to any contract award. This due-diligence stage forms part of the deferred mandatory compliance process.

- The Employer will issue a written Due Diligence Notice to the highest-ranked qualifying tenderer (or to the next highest-ranked tenderer, where applicable).
- The tenderer must submit all requested due diligence documents within five (5) calendar days of the notice.
- The Employer may undertake any necessary verification actions, including but not limited to:
  - Interviews with proposed key personnel
  - Site or plant inspections
  - Reference checks
  - Direct verification with OEMs or recognised certification bodies
- Where justified, the Employer may grant a one-time short extension (e.g., up to 3 calendar days) at its sole discretion. Any extension will be consistently applied and recorded for audit purposes.

#### **3.4 RISK BASED DUE DILIGENCE AND DEFERRED MANDATORY COMPLIANCE PRIOR TO CONTRACT AWARD**

To safeguard the integrity of the appointment process, the Employer defers most mandatory compliance verifications to the pre-award stage.

Only the **compulsory site visit** is mandatory at tender closing. All responsive tenders will proceed to qualitative technical. Tenderers scoring **70% or above** in the qualitative technical evaluation shall be subject to **due diligence** prior to contract award. The Employer will issue a written request to the highest-ranked qualifying tenderer (or next in rank, as needed), requiring submission of the following within **five (5) calendar days** (without limitation):

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

- Any additional compliance documents specified in the tender schedule.
- Confirmation of **key personnel** qualifications and availability
- Evidence of **equipment/facilities** and quality controls
- Any other mandatory compliance documents specified in the tender schedule

Failure to submit complete, accurate, and satisfactory evidence within the timeframe will result in **disqualification**. The Employer reserves the right to:

- Verify all submitted information through inspections, reference checks, interviews, or OEM confirmations
- Reject any submission found to be **materially inaccurate or misleading**
- Proceed to the **next qualifying tenderer**

A one-time short extension (up to 3 calendar days) may be granted at the Employer's sole discretion, applied consistently and recorded for audit purposes.

### **3.5 TET MEMBERS**

### **3.6 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**Table 3: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria**

	<b>Mandatory Technical Criteria Description</b>	<b>Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable</b>	<b>Motivation for use of Criteria</b>
1.	The Tenderer attends a compulsory site clarification meeting.	As per Technical Specification	Capability Constraint

**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.

### 3.7 QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORING TABLE

During the tender evaluations, Table 4 shall be used by the TET members to score each criterion on a scale of 0 to 5.

**Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Description</b>
5	100	<b>COMPLIANT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meet technical requirements and</li><li>• No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements</li></ul>
4	80	<b>COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS</b> Meet technical requirement(s) with, <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Acceptable technical risk and/or</li><li>• Acceptable exceptions and/or</li><li>• Acceptable conditions</li></ul>
2	40	<b>NON-COMPLIANT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR</li><li>• Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR</li><li>• Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR</li><li>• Unacceptable conditions.</li></ul>
0	0	<b>TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE</b>

Note 1: The scoring table does not allow for scoring of 1 and 3.

**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.

**3.8 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria**

	<b>Qualitative Technical Criteria Description</b>		<b>Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable</b>	<b>Criteria Weighting (%)</b>	<b>Criteria Sub Weighting (%)</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Tenderer's Experience</b>			<b>20%</b>	
	1.1	References of relevant work experience: Provide minimum of three (3) projects with proven experience in similar waterproofing works on concrete roofs. The projects must have been completed within the last five years from the date of tender closing.  The list <b>must</b> indicate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Name</li> <li>• Contactable reference (phone number, email, etc.)</li> <li>• Detail description of work performed.</li> <li>• Project Value (only for scope performed)</li> <li>• Project Start and End Date</li> </ul> These must be completion letters or reference letters from the previous clients.	Work Experience & Referee List  Works Information		100%
<b>2.</b>	<b>Technical Approach &amp; methodology</b>			<b>20%</b>	
	2.1	Provide detailed method statements for the execution of the works. Also include the proposed waterproofing system & material with manufacture's specifications.	Works information		100%
<b>3.</b>	<b>Waterproofing System Applicator</b>			<b>30%</b>	
	3.1	Tenderer submits proof that they are certified and approved applicator of the specified waterproofing membrane system. must be submitted	Capability constraint		100%
<b>4.</b>	<b>Provide CVs and qualifications of Key Personnel</b>			<b>20%</b>	
	3.1	Site Agent			25%

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Waterproofing of Vanderkloof Surface Building and the Repair of Resultant Damages**

Unique Identifier: **160A-1547-A**

Revision: **1**

Page: **9 of 15**

	3.2	Foreman			25%
	3.3	Supervisor			25%
	3.4	Organogram			25%
<b>5.</b>	<b>Programme &amp; resourcing</b>				<b>10%</b>
	Provide feasible programme showing critical path, sequencing, hold points, resourcing plan and the duration for the execution of works.		Works information		<b>100%</b>
				<b>TOTAL: 100</b>	

**3.9 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING MEASURES**

**Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria - Scoring Measures**

Criteria No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Criteria sub-Weighting	Range	Score
1.1	Tenderer's Experience	20	No projects submitted; OR projects unrelated to waterproofing; OR no completion letters.	0
			One (1) to three (3) projects submitted and are in line with the waterproofing of concrete roofs	2
			Four (4) to five (5) projects submitted and are in line with the waterproofing of concrete roofs	4
			More than six (6) projects submitted and are in line with the waterproofing of concrete roofs.	5
2.1	Technical Approach, Methodology & QCP	20	No method statement or QCP provided and/ or no waterproofing system proposed	0
			Method statement and QCP provided but incomplete, partially detailed and has major deviation with the scope of works	2
			Method statement and QCP provided detailed but has minor deviation with the scope of works	4
			Comprehensive, project-specific methodology and QCP with risk controls, testing regimes, quality control plans, and best-practice detailing.	5
3.1	Waterproofing System Applicator	30	No manufacture certified proof submitted	0
			Proof of valid and current manufacturer-issued applicator certification provided	5
4.1	Site Agent	5	CV missing OR person not proposed or resource does not have civil engineering qualification.	0

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Waterproofing of Vanderkloof Surface Building and the Repair of Resultant Damages**

Unique Identifier: **160A-1547-A**

Revision: **1**

Page: **11 of 15**

			CV provided but candidate lacks waterproofing/remedial experience (<3 years) and has civil engineering qualification (Diploma minimum)	2
			CV provided and the candidate have waterproofing/remedial experience (3 to 5 years) and has civil engineering qualification (Diploma minimum)	4
			CV provided and the candidate have waterproofing/remedial experience (more than 5 years), has a strong track record on similar waterproofing experience with civil engineering qualification (Diploma minimum)	5
4.2	Foreman	5	CV missing OR person not proposed	0
			CV provided but candidate lacks waterproofing/ remedial works experience (<3 years)	2
			CV provided and the candidate have waterproofing/ remedial works experience (3 to 5 years)	4
			CV provided and the candidate have waterproofing/remedial experience (more than 5 years), has a strong track record on similar waterproofing experience	5
4.3	Supervisor	5	CV missing OR person not proposed	0
			CV provided but candidate lacks waterproofing/remedial experience (<3 years) and has National certificate or diploma in building construction/ civil construction, construction supervision	2
			CV provided and the candidate have waterproofing/remedial experience (3 to 5 years) and has National certificate or diploma in building construction/ civil construction, construction supervision	4
			CV provided and the candidate have waterproofing/remedial experience (more than 5 years), has a strong track record on similar waterproofing experience and has National certificate or diploma in building construction/ civil construction, construction supervision	5
4.4	Organogram	5	If the tenderer does not submit the organogram	0

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Waterproofing of Vanderkloof Surface Building and the Repair of Resultant Damages**

Unique Identifier: **160A-1547-A**

Revision: **1**

Page: **12 of 15**

			The tenderer submitted the organogram, or the structure is not relevant to the SOW	2
			The tenderer submitted the organogram in line with the SOW and shows the links and direct reports on the organogram	4
			The organogram shows all the Key personnel, and the roles indicated and shows the links and direct reports on the organogram	5
5.1	Programme & resourcing	10	No programme OR schedule provided i.e. Total deficiency AND non-compliance to the key measures	0
			Partial deficiency OR non-compliance to the key measures	2
			Partial deficiency AND compliance to the key measures	4
			Complete compliance to the key measures	5
	Total	100		