Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Kriel Power Station Effluent Dam Fencing Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy**	Unique Identifier:	**555-EAP2041**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**3**
		Total Pages:	**12**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorized by
N Hadzhi	**N. Muthavhine**	**R. Nelwamondo**
Civil Engineer	**Auxiliary Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Kriel Power Station	**Kriel Power Station**	**Kriel Power Station**
Date: 31/01/2023	Date: 2023/01/31	Date: 2023/01/31

CONTENTS

TABLE

1. INTRODUCTION

Kriel Power Station has been in operation since 1979. It is a National Key Point, generating 3000MW of electricity daily for South African households. As a result, station security is critical for the station's continued operation and functionality.

The environmental management team at Kriel Power Station conducted a risk analysis on the potential for unauthorized access to the station's effluent dams. The assessment emphasized the danger to the lives and livelihoods of community members living close to the dams, the effects of unauthorized access to these facilities, and the loss of operational capability at Eskom Kriel Power Station. The assessment also revealed that the region is not legally recognized as a National Key Point and is not protected. Consequently, a fence is necessary as a safety precaution and to satisfy national standards.

The Eskom Kriel Power Station Ash Dams and servitudes are still open and easily accessible to the public. As a result, the fence will serve as a barrier to protect Eskom property as well as to protect members of the public who may be injured on Eskom property.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document provides the tender technical evaluation strategy for all the activities necessary for the provision of a secure fence around the effluent dams at Kriel Power Station.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this tender technical evaluation strategy is to define the 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 shall apply to the Kriel Effluent Dam Fencing Project at Kriel Power Station.

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

2.2.2 Informative

[3] 240-165917769: Dam Fencing Scope of Work

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
C&I	Control and Instrumentation
CoE	Centre of Excellence
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
EDWL	Engineering Design Work Lead
LDE	Lead Discipline Engineer
LPS	Low Pressure Services
Pr. Eng.	Professional Engineer
Pr. Tech.	Professional Engineering Technologist
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

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

Not applicable.

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

The basic steps for a technical evaluation must be followed as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure.

A two stage Technical Evaluation Strategy is set out.

Stage 1: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (gatekeepers) are 'must meet' criteria. These criteria shall not be weighted, or point scored but shall be assessed on a **Yes/No** basis as to whether the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any criterion shall technically disqualify the tenderer and the tenderer shall not be further evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

Stage 2: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria are weighted evaluation criteria used to identify the highest technically ranked tenderer after determining that all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria have been met. The Qualitative Evaluation Criteria are weighted to reflect the relevant importance of each criterion.

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is 70%.
A weighted scorecard approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications.
The technical criteria and weighting are broken down as follows:

a) **Civil Engineering: 100%**

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Ntanganedzeni Hadzhi	Civil Engineer
TET 2	Sanele Msibi	Senior Civil Engineer
TET 3	Mphokuhle Khohliso	Civil Engineer
TET 4	Lesley Mafefe	Civil Engineer

3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 2: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	Tenderer's project manager's accreditation: The tenderer is to submit proof of professional registration for the project manager with either ECSA or SACPCMP (as a Professional Construction Project Manager)	Tender Returnable – Proof of professional registration	Criteria assists to mitigate risk of tender putting forward key personnel that are not experienced enough to carry out the works correctly, cost-effectively, and timeously.
2.	Tenderer's CIDB Grading: To be considered for this project, the tenderer must be registered with CIDB Grade 5SQ or higher. Proof must be provided.	Tender Returnable - Proof of CIDB grading demonstrating the necessary grading in accordance with the description	To comply with Act 38 of 2000, which established CIDB for construction industry regulation.

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation - Prompt for Judgement

PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION	Rating
100	**COMPLIANT- C** • Meet technical requirement(s) AND; • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.	**Very good response**
80	**COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS - CWAQ** • Meet technical requirement(s) with; • Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; • Acceptable conditions.	**Satisfactory Response**
40	**NON-COMPLIANT- NC** • Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR; • Unacceptable conditions.	**Poor Response**
0	**TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE -TD/NR**	**No Response**

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Functionality Criteria			Max number of points percentages	Bidders will be expected to score minimum threshold to proceed to the next phase
Civil & Structural Engineering			**100%**	**70%**
Item	**Weight**	**Description**		
2.1. PROJECT EXECUTION PLAN AND PROJECT PROGRAM	20%	**Provide a typical program listing all fence installation activities required to execute the full scope of work including all major milestones, from contract award to handover, in a logical and realistic manner.**		
		Program with clear sequence of construction	10	
		Progress tracking and reporting plan	4	
		Quality Control Plan	6	
2.2. TENDER'S RELEVANT EXPERIENCE	10%	**Tender's relevant experience, as the main contractor, in the installation of industrial fences.**		
		Completion certificates for 3 fencing projects	4	
		Project Construction works Cost	3	
		Brief description of work performed	3	
2.3. METHOD STATEMENT FOR POLES AND MASH INSTALLATION	25%	**A Steelworks Method Statement, which describes the following:**		
		Method of fabrication and storage on site.	6	
		Transportation to site laydown/storge areas and to site for installation.	4	
		Procedure for the cutting and handling of steel and mesh wire.	4	
		Corrosion protection and painting.	5	

		Risk Assessment (Including relevant standards)	6	
2.4. METHOD STATEMENT FOR SMALL CONCRETE WORKS	25%	**A Concrete Works Method Statement, which describes the following as a minimum: Concrete sourcing, testing facilities, testing procedures, concrete placing and curing.**		
		Risk assessment (Including Health and safety plan) (detailed)	12	
		Testing procedures and facilities	8	
		Concrete sourcing, placing, and curing	5	
2.5. METHOD STATEMENT FOR EARTHWORKS	20%	**An Earthworks Method Statement which describes the following as a minimum: Excavation procedure**		
		Risk Assessment (Including Health and safety plan)	10	
		Services protection procedure	6	
		Dealing With Water	4	

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
2.1	x	x	x	x
2.2	x	x	x	x
2.3	x	x	x	x
2.4	x	x	x	x
2.5	x	x	x	x

3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.6.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	The tenderer has minor deviations in terms of fencing experience, tasks that are required by the works and experience of staff.

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Non-compliance or deviation with sections of the technical specifications and standards without adequate explanation or alternatives
2.	Exclusions of scope specified in the Technical Specifications
3.	The approach is generic and not tailored to address the specific project objectives and requirements. The approach does not consider all the critical
4.	The Contractor does not show a full understanding of the scope of work
5.	The Contractor does not have the required experienced resources
6.	Key construction personnel have less than 5 years' relevant experience
7.	Change of Sub-Contractors after Tender award

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None.

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Deviations to any part of the technical specifications without providing alternate solutions
2.	The technical proposal/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.

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Initial And Surname	Designation
R Nelwamondo	Kriel Engineering Manager
N Muthavhine	Kriel Auxiliary Plant Engineering Manager
S Msibi	Senior Civil Engineer
N Hadzhi	Civil Engineer

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
January 2023	3	N Hadzhi	Second Revision
June 2022	2	N Hadzhi	First Revision
September 2021	1	MN Abdoola	New Document

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- Mohammed Nabeel Abdoola
- Ntanganedzeni Hadzhi

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Acknowledgements to everyone that participated in the development of this document.