Eskom	Tender Evaluation	Engineering

Title:	**Technical Evaluation Strategy for the Unblocking & CCTV inspection of Tutuka Drainage, Sewage Systems and Maintenance of Tutuka Stormwater Channels**	Unique Identifier:	**15ENG GEN-2283**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**TE**
		Revision:	**4**
		Total Pages:	**14**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
O Monare	**P Sithole**	**L Masote**
Civil Engineer	**Civil Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Date: 03/10/2025	Date: 03/10/2025	Date: 03/10/2025

CONTENTS

Page

No table of figures entries found.

FIGURES

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Tutuka Power Station is a coal fired power station and has 3600MW installed capacity and was constructed in the mid 1980's. The Tutuka Power Station is located within the Standerton magisterial district, approximately 21 km northeast of the town Standerton in the Mpumalanga Province.

The dirty water drainage at the station has recurring blockages which results in ash, water and steam flowing into the cable tunnels and station's MV switchgear rooms thus posing a safety and production risk to the station. Blockages inside the dirty water drains pose a risk of further compromising the structural integrity of the concrete pipes with the possibility of developing sinkholes, pollution to underground water and unwanted leakages and overflows. Furthermore, the outside drainage also has recurring blockages, which prevents the stormwater and dirty water drainage system running effectively and efficiently. The drainage system at Tutuka Power Station consist of underground concrete piping, trenches, concrete culverts, concrete surface channels and earth channels It is critical for the Tutuka Power Station drainage system to be unblocked and CCTV inspected regularly.

The purpose of this document is to develop the mandatory and qualitative technical evaluation criteria required to place a contract for a contractor to execute Unblocking & CCTV inspection of Tutuka Drainage, Sewage Systems and Maintenance of Tutuka Stormwater Channels. Technical evaluation criteria will be used to evaluate all tenders received from the Service Provider(s) in response to the Enquiry.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

Contractor refers to the Employer's Scope of Work for the Evaluation of Unblocking & CCTV inspection of Tutuka Drainage, Sewage Systems and Maintenance of Tutuka Stormwater Channels **[15ENG GEN-2282]** for the detailed scope of work.

All technical queries to be directed to the Civil Engineer.

Tenderer/Contractor to provide tender returnable submissions in accordance with the Employer's Technical Evaluation Strategy **[15ENG GEN-2283]** and Scope of Work **[15ENG GEN-2282]**.

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 is applicable to all appointed and involved in the technical tender evaluation of tenders received from the Service Provider(s) in response to the required scope of works **[15ENG GEN-2282]**.

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) 15ENG GEN-2282: Scope of Work for the Unblocking & CCTV inspection of Tutuka Drainage, Sewage Systems and Maintenance of Tutuka Stormwater Channels
2) 240-48929482 Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
3) 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results
4) 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form
5) 32-1034: Procurement and Supply Chain Management Procedure

2.2.2 Informative

1) ISO 9001: 2015 Quality Systems Standard
2) OHSA: Occupational Health and Safety Act No. 85 of 1993Health and Safety requirements: Construction 2014

2.3 CLASSIFICATION

a. **Confidential:** the classification given to information that may be used by malicious/opposing/hostile elements to **harm** the objectives and functions of Eskom Holdings Limited.

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Table 1: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
QCP	Quality Control Plan
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

The tender returnables will be evaluated by the Employer's various functions in accordance with the issued tender evaluations i.e. technical and SHEQ

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

As per section 2.2

3. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

The evaluation criteria will be based upon a two-step process:

Mandatory Criteria Evaluation

All TET members as defined in the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy (and specifically TET member responsibilities) shall independently evaluate each tender in terms of compliance to the defined Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Each TET member shall provide an individual scoring form on the compliance / non-compliance of all tenderers' responses to the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Each TET member shall provide clear justification(s) for each Mandatory Criteria evaluated as non-compliant ('NO'). All individual scoring forms shall be evaluated to check for consistency in scoring of the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Should there be inconsistency in the scoring, an internal clarification meeting shall be conducted with all TET members (who performed the evaluation) in the presence of the Commercial Representative. This meeting shall aim to jointly establish which of the tenderers qualify for the next phase of Qualitative Technical Evaluation. In the case where no tenderer meets all Mandatory Evaluation Criteria this shall be formally escalated to the Commercial Representative who shall guide the subsequent process. All meeting minutes shall be recorded and distributed to the Commercial Representative and included in the Tender Technical Evaluation Report.

Qualitative Criteria Evaluation

Tenderers that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Criteria as defined in the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy. The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements. A score shall be allocated as per Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table, for each technical qualitative criterion. Each TET member shall populate a Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form [2] for each tenderer. Note: Individual Qualitative Criteria scores shall only be finalised after all clarification sessions have been concluded.

Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table

Score	%	Definition
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.		

Note 2: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.2 TET MEMBERS

The technical evaluation team will be composed of a minimum of two members per discipline from the table below with at least one being professionally registered per discipline.

Table 3: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Omphile Monare	Engineering Prof
TET 2	Bonga Mthembu	Senior Supervisor Tech
TET 3	Vusi Mhlari	Senior Engineering Prof
TET 4	Clarrisa Wilson	Engineering Prof

3.3 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Gatekeepers identified in the tender document will be "must meet" criteria identified in tabular questionnaire form. The *Contractor(s)* tender will be assessed based upon questionnaire seeking **YES** or **NO** response from the *Contractor(s)* with no point scores or weighted averaged assigned to the response.

Response of **NO** against any criteria will be elimination of the *Contractor(s)* tender for further consideration or short listing for detailed technical evaluation. Gatekeepers will be minimum criterion elements with most significant and critical parameters applicable to the successful execution of the RFP.

- **Not applicable**

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	**Civil / Structural/ Geotechnical**	**Technical returnables document**	**70**	

	1.1	Provide detailed method Statement specifying and showing ability to perform the required Scope of works. Listing sequence of activities (site investigation/assessment, tools, unblocking works, CCTV inspections, equipment, skills, specialists, and general labour. Detailed method statement must demonstrate compliance and understanding of the required works. • Sound method statement detailing how the full scope, which include the Unblocking & CCTV inspection of the Station Drains, Sewage Systems and Maintenance of Tutuka Stormwater Channels at Tutuka Power Station will be met and provides comprehensive methodology of approach (5/5 points) • Acceptable method statement but has omitted certain scope tasks and/or has unclear points (4/5 points) • Method statement does not contain methodology of approach but reiterates to scope of works (2/5 points) • No Method statement/ Not satisfactory (0/5 point)	Method Statement As per Scope of Works [15ENG GEN-2282]		20%

	1.2	Provide previous experience of completed projects related to Unblocking & CCTV inspection of industrial drains and/or sewage pipes. (work must be related/similar to the SOW) • 5 or more referable contracts (5/5 points) • 3 to 4 referable contracts (4/5 points) • Less than 2 contracts (2/5 points) • No experience (0/5 points) Contractor's number of completed related to HP jet cleaning and unblocking of drainage, and CCTV inspection. List of verifiable references signed off by the clients serviced must be provided	As per Scope of Works [15ENG GEN-2282] List of similar projects and signed references Work experience must demonstrate competency in executing Unblocking of the Station Drains		30%
	1.3	CV of competent Supervisor experienced in operating, maintaining stormwater drainage systems and sewage networks who has a Minimum Qualification of a Diploma in civil engineering and experience in stormwater drainage and sewage networks • Above 10 years relevant experience (5/5 points) • 5 to 9 years relevant experience (4/5 points points) • 3 to 4 years relevant experience (2/5 points) • Not submitted/Experience less than 3 years (0/5 points)	CV Inclusive of Work Experience As per Scope of Works [15ENG GEN-2282]		35%
	1.4	Contractor to submit technical specification data of the machinery and equipment that is going to be used for unblocking of the station drains, CCTV inspection of the drains, assessment and maintenance of the stormwater channels and trenches. • Technical data and equipment going to be used submitted (5 points) • Not submitted/Not satisfactory (0 points)	As per Scope of works [15ENG GEN-2282]		15%
2.	**General**		**Technical returnables document**	**30%**	

	2.1	Provide schedule baseline plan/programme detailing how the works will be executed including lead times to complete the Scope of Work timeously. This should include the milestones completion dates. • Sound Projects schedule with all milestones (5/5 points) • Project scheduled submitted but not sound (2/5 points) • No Projects schedule (0/5 points)	Programme/Plan as per Scope of Work		30%
	2.2	Provide Quality Control QCP detailing **all** activities in detail and intervention points to prevent rework and quality work according to the Scope of Work (This must include all processes and procedures to execute Unblocking & CCTV inspection of the Station Drains and Outside Station Drains) • Provided sound QCP (5/5 points) • QCP submitted but not sound (2/5 points) • NO QCP (0/5 points)	Provide QCP As per Scope of works		30%
	2.3	An organogram for the 4 core crew, in particular the names and qualifications of the civil engineer, site supervisor, CCTV inspector(s), unblocking operators involved with executing the works. • Organogram submitted showing the names and qualifications of the 4 core crew members that will be involved with the execution of the works (5/5 points) • Organogram submitted showing the names and qualifications of the 1-3 core crew members that will be involved with the execution of the works (2/5) points • Organogram not submitted (0/5 points)	Provide Project organogram as per Scope of Work		40%
				TOTAL: 100	

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
N/A	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**	**TET 4**
1.1	X	X	X	X
1.2	X	X	X	X
1.3	X	X	X	X
1.4	X	X	X	X
2.1	X	X	X	X
2.2	X	X	X	X
2.3	X	X	X	X

3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.6.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Mandatory technical requirements not submitted [Table 4]
2.	Inability to execute the required works as per scope of work issued [1]

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Inability to execute the required works as per Scope of Work issued [1]

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Phathamandla Sithole	Civil Engineering Manager
Vusi Mhlari	Senior Civil Engineer
Bonga Mthembu	Senior Supervisor Tech
Clarissa Wilson	Civil Engineer

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
22 February 2022	0	C Chetty I Patel	Document issued for review
28 February 2022	1	C Chetty I Patel	Final Document
31 August 2022	2	C Chetty I Patel D Nkosi	Document inclusive of the Tutuka sewage network submitted for Review
19 April 2023	3	C Chetty I Patel D Nkosi	Final Document inclusive of the Tutuka sewage network
03 October 2025	4	O Monare	Final Document

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- Imraan Patel

- Clarissa Wilson
- Doctor Nkosi

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A