Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title: **Kendal Disc and Diaphragm Supply Technical Evaluation Strategy**

Unique Identifier:	**1038266**
Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
Revision:	**N/A**
Total Pages:	**13**
Next Review Date:	**N/A**
Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
.....	.....	.....
R Nkosi	**S Nhlapo**	**K Moodley**
System Engineer	**Senior Engineer**	**Turbine Engineering Manager**
Date: 18/03/2022	Date: 18/03/2022	Date: 18/03/2022

CONTENTS

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

The intent of this document is to align Procurement Process at Kendal Power station on how the bidders will be assessed based on the technical requirements for the supply of valve discs and diaphragms for the turbine, boiler and balance of plant.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document discusses the different technical aspects that will be evaluated and scored by the multi-disciplinary Technical Evaluation Team (TET) to complete the technical evaluation for Kendal Power Station for the supply of valve discs and diaphragms. The team members who will be involved in the evaluation are listed and appointed in this document along with their responsibilities. This document also describes the acceptable and unacceptable risks and qualifications and/or conditions that will be applicable to the Scope of Work. Once the Technical Evaluation Strategy is authorised, no changes will be made to the evaluation criteria without the appropriate authorisations.

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 applies to Kendal 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] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems.

[3] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems.

2.2.2 Informative

[4] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems.

[5] 474-59: Internal Audit Procedure

[6] EAP 0304-1: Required Operational Capability Report

[7] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement Policy and supply chain management policy

[8] 240-53114002: Engineering Change Management Procedure

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
N/A	Not Applicable
QMS	Quality Management System
SWL	Safe Working Load
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

N/A as per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

[9] [11] 240-53716746: Tender Technical Evaluation Report

[10] [12] 240-53716712: Tender Technical Evaluation Results Form

[11] [13] 240-53716726: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form

[12] [14] 240-53716769: Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy Template

2.8 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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 or not the criteria are met unless set otherwise. An assessment of ‘No’ against any criterion shall technically disqualify the tenderer and shall not be further evaluated against Qualitative Criteria.

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%.

2.9 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Fulufhelo Nganke	System Engineer
TET 2	Raymond Nkosi	System Engineer
TET 3	Thinga Tshikovhi	System Engineer
TET 4	Sipho Nhlapo	Senior Engineer

2.10 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	Provide demonstrable proof that the business is in the business of supply of discs and diaphragms.	Name, street and postal address, contact names and telephone numbers of the Warehouse. Provide list of current discs and diaphragms stock holding or service level agreement with OEMs.	To verify existence of the company and capacity to supply discs and diaphragms as per the SOW.

2.11 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 2: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description			Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	**Technical capability**					
	1.1	Supplier capability	Provide a full list of discs and diaphragms that will be supplied as per the scope of work (include material specification).	Provide documentation with the tender returnable	**40**	60
	1.2	Handling, Storage, Tagging and Preservation procedure.	Provide, storage, handling, transportation and preservation procedure. (Refer to relevant OEM manuals)	Provide documentation with the tender returnable		40
	1.3	Experience for services supplied to Eskom and other	Provide order numbers and traceable references contact details	Provide documentation with the tender returnable	**10**	100

		industries for similar work, (List such Power Plants/Industries & Orders issued in the last 3 years)				
2.	**Workshop Technical Assessment – Workshop Visit**		**N.B: Only service providers that get a minimum total weighted score (threshold) of 40% in all the other criteria's will qualify for a Workshop Visit**			
	2.1	Supplier Capability Assessment at Supplier Premises	a) Provide detailed design drawing or specification of each discs and diaphragm as per SOW	a) Documentation check at the supplier premises	**30**	80
			b) Stock holding check at supplier premises	b) Assessment to be done at the supplier premises		20
3.	**Quality Control (Execution)**					
	3.1	QCP and Check Sheets	Provide sample of a signed quality control plan and check sheet documents for discs and diaphragms that will be supplied. Looking at quality, correctness, material certificates, assembly and machining tolerances as well as FAT's. As a minimum the quality control plan must comply with the requirements stated in the ESKOM supplier quality management system/QM58 (240-105658000)	Provide documentation with the tender returnable	**20**	67

	3.2	Non-conformity Management	Provide company`s non-conformity/NCR reporting procedure.	Provide documentation with the tender returnable		33
					TOTAL: 100	

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria Scoring

Criteria Number	Score Percentage Description
	5 (100% of weight) COMPLIANT • Meet technical requirement(s) AND; • No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements. **4 (75% of weight) COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS** • Meet technical requirement(s) with; • Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; • Acceptable conditions. **2 (40% of weight) NON-COMPLIANT** • Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; • Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; • Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR;

	• Unacceptable conditions. **0 (0% of weight) TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE**
1.2	**0% for no Submission** **50% for storage handling procedure submitted with no consideration for transportation and predervation** **100% for storage handling, transportation and preservation procedure**
1.3	**0% weight for no orders in the last 3 years** **50% weight for one order in the last 3 years** **75 of weight for two to three order in the last 3 years** **100% weight for more than 3 orders in the last 3 years**
1.1 % 2.1	**0% weight for no coverage of the SOW** **50% weight for 50% coverage of the SOW** **75 of weight for 75% coverage of the SOW** **100% weight for 100% coverage of the SOW**
3.1	**0% for no QCP template submitted** **40% for QCP template submitted with only activities but not relevant to scope** **75% for QCP template that is relevant to the SOW submitted with only activities and without intervention points** **100% for QCP template relevant to the SOW submitted with proposed interventions points = 100%**
3.2	**0% for no NCR procedure submitted**

	100% for NCR procedure submitted

2.12 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**	**TET 4**
1	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X
3	X	X	X	X

2.13 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

2.13.1 Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	

2.13.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	

3. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Raymond Nkosi	System Engineer	
Sipho Nhlapo	Senior Engineer	
Kubashan Moodley	Turbine Engineering Manager	

4. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
March 2022	N/A	S Nhlapo	Final issue

5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

Thinga Tshikovhi

Fulufhelo Nganke

Raymond Nkosi

Sipho Nhlapo

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None