



| 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