

Functional Evaluation Criteria for Plant Enquiry No: KBG2495 The provision of continuous Marine Engineering, Monitoring and Evaluation on an as and when required basis at Koeberg Operating Unit for a period of 5 years

Requirement	Criteria	Deliverable	Weighting	Rating	% Rating	% Score	[Supplier Name] Response	Eskom Comments
1. COMPANY PROFILE	This organisational structure is well balanced and shows the function areas from CEO/MD down to the site management and the roles each member plays in delivering the specific required <i>services</i> .	Provide organisational structure of multi-disciplinary company highlighting key positions and how they will interface with Employer.	10%		0%	0.0%		
	This submission includes customer surveys, referrals and traceable references. The references include a clear description of the <i>services</i> that was rendered by the Tenderer, including location and the client's contact details. Project cost/price.	Submit a portfolio of previous projects / <i>services</i> rendered in the civil engineering industry, or as a minimum in highly regulated industries which shows relevant past experience.	40%		0%	0.0%		
	This submission needs to show that the resources have relevant experience and that the Succession and Retention Strategy does not expose Eskom to risk.	Submit a detailed list of experiences and skills of resources in the form of CVs of the Tenderer's core team for design and execution and a Succession and Retention Strategy on sustaining these permanent skilled resources for the duration of the contract. Submit all the certificates of the project team as part of tender return.	40%		0%	0.0%		
	The submission proves that the resources are registered with the required institutions. Including sub-contractors and SME (Subject Matter Expert).	Submit a list of the resources that are registered with ECSA and/ or relevant that will provide a service to the project. If the Tenderer is not South African or makes use of international resources, then the Tenderer submits a list of resources that are registered with similar/relevant international organisations that will provide a <i>service</i> for the duration of the contract.	10%		0%	0.0%		
	TOTAL WEIGHTING			100%	NOT MEET	0%		
2. ENGINEERING AND EXECUTION STRATEGY	The Execution Strategy is tailor made for the required <i>services</i> showing how the Tenderer has considered each portion of the scope and how he plans to deliver. The Tenderer includes a list of exclusions and deviations. This list explains the proposed exclusion/deviation, the rationale for the exclusion/deviation, any technical data supporting the exclusion/deviation and historical experience supporting the exclusion/deviation.	Engineering Execution Strategy	10%		0%	0.0%		
	The Tenderer shows in his Execution Strategy that all the requirements listed can be achieved.	Engineering Execution Strategy	10%		0%	0.0%		
	The Tenderer provides a risk register which addresses the key risks and constraints of the <i>services</i> . The register includes a clear description of the risk, the root cause, a risk ranking and a mitigation plan, including a rating on the effectiveness of the mitigation plan.	Engineering Execution Strategy	30%		0%	0.0%		
	The Tenderer's submission includes a section on training and skills transfer which shows how the Tenderer plans to carry out training and skills transfer.	Engineering Execution Strategy	20%		0%	0.0%		
	The Execution Strategy lists the documents that the Tenderer plans to submit throughout the duration of the contract.	Engineering Execution Strategy	20%		0%	0.0%		
	Certified Tools/software/personnel capable of meeting the design, analysis and project management requirements.	Engineering Execution Strategy	10%		0%	0.0%		
TOTAL WEIGHTING			100%	NOT MEET	0%			

Functional Evaluation Criteria for Plant Enquiry No: KBG2495 The provision of continuous Marine Engineering, Monitoring and Evaluation on an as and when required basis at Koeberg Operating Unit for a period of 5 years

Requirement	Criteria	Deliverable	Weighting	Rating	% Rating	% Score	[Supplier Name] Response	Eskom Comments
3. QUALITY	A Quality Assurance Programme that meets the intent of a typical Quality Management System (QMS) or requirements as identified on Appendix A of 238-103 rev2	The returnable is a document or method statement describing the supplier Quality Programme that provide a description of the processes and supporting information that reflects how processes are managed and work/operation is prepared, reviewed, carried out, recorded, assessed and improved . Examples of processes to be described can include Resource Selection, Quality Control, Receipt Inspection, Purchasing, etc.	35%		0%	0.0%		
	Quality Control Plan (QCP) or Inspection and Test Plan (ITP) or Quality Plan : A supplier document specifying the work or production activities to be performed throughout the execution of the product realization works inclusive of test methods, procedures and acceptance criteria. (238-103 rev 2, Section 3.2. refers).	Returnable is an example of a QCP or Quality Project Plan for a similar service or product, identifying sequential operations and indicating inspection and test points (hold and/or witness points) and areas where reports are required .	35%		0%	0.0%		
	Control of nonconforming product or service and application for concession.	Submit a Method Statement or documented procedure, including example, that defines processes followed for dealing with nonconforming product/service.	30%		0%	0.0%		
TOTAL WEIGHTING			100%	NOT MEET	0%			

Final Analysis								
1. COMPANY PROFILE			30%		0.0%			
2. ENGINEERING AND EXECUTION STRATEGY			40%		0.0%			
3. QUALITY			30%		0.0%			
TOTAL			100%		0.0%			

The scoring of the Functional Evaluation is conducted as follows:
 A supplier is given a score in each of the sub-categories. These sub-categories are requirements detailed in the specification or contract. Scores are allocated as follows:
 0 - 0% - Does not meet
 1 - 50% - Partial meet (Large gap)
 2 - 75% - Partial Meet (Small gap)
 3 - 100% - Meet

The score is then summed to a weighted average per category. The category scores are analysed as follows:
 0% - 79% - Does not meet
 80% - 100% - Meet

Compiled by: Mmamotiti Rahube
 Signature: 
 Date: 2024-04-10

Reviewed by: Shandré Brown
 Signature: 
 Date: 2024-04-10