

 Eskom	Request for proposal	Kusile Power Station
---	----------------------	----------------------

Title: **Kusile Power Station Proposal evaluation strategy for MPS265 grinding elements** Document Identifier: **240-**

Alternative Reference **Not Applicable**
Number:

Area of Applicability: **Kusile Power Station**

Functional Area: **Engineering**

Revision: **1**

Total Pages: **14**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **Controlled Disclosure**

Content

Page

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Supporting Clauses	3
2.1 Scope.....	3
2.1.1 Purpose.....	3
2.1.2 Applicability	3
2.1.3 Effective date.....	3
2.2 Normative/Informative References	3
2.2.1 Normative.....	3
2.2.2 Informative.....	3
2.3 Definitions	4
2.3.1 Contractor: Service provider contracted for supplying specific service to Eskom, Kusile Power Station.....	4
2.3.2 Employer: Eskom Kusile Power Station	4
2.3.3 Enquiry	4
2.4 Classification:	4
2.5 Abbreviations	4
2.6 Roles and Responsibilities	4
2.7 Process for Monitoring.....	4
2.8 Related/Supporting Documents.....	4
3. PROPOSAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
3.1 EVALUATION THRESHOLD.....	5
3.2 WEIGHTED SCORECARD	5
A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate proposals. The individual scores from the TET members on each evaluation criteria will be added and averaged to obtain a final score.	5
3.3 TET MEMBERS	6
3.4 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
3.6 TET MEMBER EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITY	11
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	11
3.7.1 Risks	11
4. Acceptance.....	12
5. Revisions.....	13
6. Development Team	13
7. Acknowledgements	13
Appendix A	14

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

1. Introduction

An invite will be issued for interested contractors to propose their products for improved MPS265 mill grinding elements [1]. This document sets out the method and criteria that will be used to evaluate the proposals.

2. Supporting Clauses

2.1 Scope

The scope of this document is limited to the proposals received for improved MPS265 mill grinding elements.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to define the technical evaluation team (TET), their responsibilities and the criteria that will be used for evaluating grinding element proposals.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document shall apply to Eskom Kusile Power Station.

2.1.3 Effective date

Document is effective from 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] Kusile Power Station Request for proposal for MPS265 grinding elements rev1
- [2] 240-48929482 Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
- [3] 474-59 Internal Audit Procedure

2.2.2 Informative

- [4] 32-1034 Eskom Procurement Policy
- [5] 240-48929482 Tender Engineering Evaluation Procedure

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

2.3 Definitions

2.3.1 Contractor: Service provider contracted for supplying specific service to Eskom, Kusile Power Station.

2.3.2 Employer: Eskom Kusile Power Station

2.3.3 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.

2.4 Classification:

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

2.5 Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
QA:	Quality Assurance
QC:	Quality Control
QCP:	Quality Control Plan
QMP:	Quality Management Programme
SHE:	Safety, Health, Environment
SOW:	Scope of Work
TES:	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET:	Technical Evaluation Team

2.6 Roles and Responsibilities

The roles and responsibilities are as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure [2].

2.7 Process for Monitoring

The Internal Audit Procedure [3] shall monitor this procedure.

2.8 Related/Supporting Documents

Not Applicable

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

3. PROPOSAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The minimum weighted final score (i.e. threshold) required for a proposal to be considered for testing is 70%.

3.2 WEIGHTED SCORECARD

A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate proposals. The individual scores from the TET members on each evaluation criteria will be added and averaged to obtain a final score.

Table 1: Assessment scorecard

SCORE	PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION
5	100	ACCEPTABLE FOR TESTING -No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	ACCEPTABLE WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS Meet technical requirement(s) with; Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; Acceptable conditions.
2	40	NOT ACCEPTABLE FOR TESTING

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

		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

3.3 TET MEMBERS

Table 2: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1		
TET 2		

3.4 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	N/A		

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Scoring			
				0	2	4	5
1	Company profile						
1.1	Development and supply capability and experience of MPS-type Mill grinding elements Three traceable references/completion certificates that adequately prove that the company has completed similar work.	The following information must be submitted for each project for evaluation purposes: 1) Detailed description of grinding elements or solution supplied 2) Name of company where grinding elements are used 3) Contact person	20%	No completed projects of similar nature	One completed projects of similar nature.	Two completed projects of similar nature.	Three or more completed projects of similar nature.

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

1.2	Proof of foundry or factory that will be used to supply the proposed components	Adequate proof of industrial facilities	10%	No proof of facilities	A Letter of intent for a Joint Venture.	A signed rental agreement in a form of letter between the Supplier and Landlord stipulating form of agreement and duration. OR A Contract or Joint Venture agreement with the Foundry that will be used to supply the proposed components.	Proof of Ownership of a Foundry or Factory (Utility bill or deeds certificate).
1.3	Compliance to International standards for technology used in the proposal	Internationally Recognised Standard Used (ISO/IEC 17025)	10%	Internationally Recognised Standard is not Used (ISO/IEC 17025).			Internationally Recognised Standard is Used (ISO/IEC 17025)

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

1.4	License agreements	If the proposal uses licensed or patented technology, proof must be submitted that a license agreement with the OEM or patent holder exist.	5%	Licensed or patented technology proposed, but no agreement for use of technology exist.			No licensed or patented technology proposed. OR Licensed or patented technology proposed, and agreement for use of technology in place.
2.	Proposal evaluation						
2.1	Completeness of proposal	The proposal should cover both the grinding roller and grinding segments, their mounting methods installation and removal (if different from original)	5%	Grinding rollers or grinding segments omitted from proposal			All components evaluated and covered in proposal
2.2	Wear study	A wear study should compare the current wear rates for High Chrome grinding elements with the proposed solution. All claimed wear rates to be backed up with real world examples/references.	25%	No wear study done or wear study not in reference to High Chrome grinding elements.	Wear rates similar to original high chrome grinding elements. (1 to <1.5x wear life)	Wear life moderately higher than the original grinding elements. (1.5 to 2 times the wear life)	Wear life significantly higher than the original grinding elements. (>2 times the wear life)

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

2.3	Lifecycle cost analysis	The proposal should evaluate the estimated lifecycle cost of a set of proposed grinding elements compared to the original grinding elements	5%	No lifecycle cost analysis			Lifecycle cost analysis with
2.3	Manufacturability	The proposal should include the manufacturability of the components, considering the size and weight.	10%	No manufacturability study			Study shows consideration for component size and show proof that components of similar size and weight has been manufactured as supplied.
2.4	Risk	The proposal should evaluate the risks that might be associated with the proposal. (Optimization required, differences in mounting method, increased crack probability, increased weight, etc.)	5%	No risks considered or declared.			Risk assessment with mitigation strategies for all significant risks
2.5	Schedule	A schedule needs to be submitted for design, manufacturing, and supply of a test set of grinding elements.	5%	No schedule.			Schedule with lead times for all parts of the design, manufacturing, supply and test of the proposed grinding elements.

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

3.6 TET MEMBER EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITY

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2				
1						
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2				
1						
2						

3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS**3.7.1 Risks**

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Alternative solutions with similar or improved performance

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Risk	Description
1.	Exclusions to the specified scope

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Acceptable deviation with technical justification

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Deviation without technical justification

4. Acceptance

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Name	Designation

5. Revisions

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
November 2022	01	JA van Antwerpen	First Issue

6. Development Team

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

Name	Surname	Designation
1.		
2.		

7. Acknowledgements

N/A

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Appendix A

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE