

 Eskom	Strategy	Generation
---	----------	------------

Title: Coating and Lining for Kriel Condensers, coolers, associated large bore pipework, waterboxes and tubesheets - Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy	Unique Identifier:	559-476546478
	Area of Applicability:	Engineering
	Documentation Type:	Strategy
	Revision:	1.0
	Total Pages:	17
	Next Review Date:	N/A
	Disclosure Classification:	CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

Compiled by  Gontse Mathibedi Snr Engineer Date: <u>24/02/2026</u>	Functional Responsibility  pp.... Zacharia Ledwaba Line Manager Date: <u>24/02/2026</u>	Authorised by  pp..... Rofhiwa Nelwamondo Engineering Manager Date: <u>2026/03/17</u>
--	---	---

CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES.....	3
2.1 SCOPE	3
2.1.1 Purpose	3
2.1.2 Applicability.....	3
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES.....	4
2.2.1 Normative	4
2.3 DEFINITIONS.....	4
2.3.1 Classification	4
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS.....	4
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	5
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING.....	5
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....	5
3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD.....	5
3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	6
3.3 TET MEMBERS.....	6
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	8
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	12
3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: PHASE 2 – SITE VISIT	14
TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	15
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS.....	15
3.7.1 Risks.....	15
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions	16
4. AUTHORISATION.....	17
5. REVISIONS	17
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	17
7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	17

TABLES

Table 1: Definition of Terms	4
Table 2: List of abbreviations.....	4
Table 3: Technical Evaluation Scoring Method	6
Table 4: Core TET Members	6
Table 5: Optional TET Members	7
Table 6: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria Submission Table	9
Table 7: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	12
Table 8: TET Member Responsibilities.....	15
Table 9: Acceptable Technical Risks.....	15
Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Risks	16
Table 11: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions.....	16
Table 12: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	16

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

1. INTRODUCTION

Kriel Power Station consists of 6 generating units, each equipped with condensers for the main and the boiler feed pump turbines. This scope covers coating of turbine related components that are exposed to corrosive cooling water at Kriel. The following are covered in the scope:

- a) Main turbine and BFPT condenser tubesheets, that are currently coated.
- b) Main turbine and BFPT condenser waterbox that are currently rubber lined
- c) Main turbine and BFPT oil coolers tubesheets and waterboxes that are currently coated
- d) Stator cooler tubesheets and waterboxes that are currently coated
- e) Hydrogen coolers waterboxes that are currently coated.
- f) CW auxiliary and primary cooling strainers are coated

The waterboxes and associated cooling water and crossover pipework is either coated, rubber lined, or a combination thereof.

The scope is for repairs on the existing tubesheets coating where there are defects, full coating or coating patch repairs on the waterboxes and associated cooling water pipework where the current corrosion protection has failed. **Any existing rubber lining will be removed and corrosion protection shall be by organic coatings.**

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document outlines the technical evaluation strategy that will be followed when evaluating the technical portion of submitted tenders for: Coating for Kriel Condensers, other coolers, associated large bore pipework, waterboxes and tubesheets. This evaluation will follow a two-phased approach, where the first phase will entail a desktop evaluation of the mandatory evaluation criteria and the qualitative evaluation criteria. The second phase will entail a workshop evaluation of the tenderers that passed phase 1, to ensure the equipment, standards and capabilities are in line with the requirements.

2.1.1 Purpose

This document outlines the criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenderers that will result from the Request for Quotation. This strategy defines the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria. The technical evaluation strategy serves as basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document applies to the Kriel Power Station only.

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

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] 240-168966153: Generation Technical Tender Evaluation Procedure
- [2] 32-1034 Eskom Procurement Policy
- [3] 32-727 – Eskom Safety, Health, Environment and Quality (SHEQ) Policy
- [4] National Environmental Management Waste, Act 59 of 2008
- [5] Occupational Health and Safety Act (Act 85 of 1993)
- [6] Scope of Work: Coating and Lining for Kriel Condensers, associated large bore pipework, waterboxes and tubesheets Informative

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Table 1: Definition of Terms

Definition	Description
Clarified Cooling Water	The operating medium of the components related to this scope.
Contractor/Tenderer	Refers to the corporation appointed to perform the engineering, procurement, and construction works required for the project.
Employer	Refers to Eskom Holdings State Owned Company
Technical Specification	The document/s forming part of the contract in which the technical requirements for the goods to be supplied, are set out
The Client	The end user will be Eskom who will be represented by Kriel Power Station throughout the duration of the Project.

2.3.1 Classification

Controlled Disclosure: Controlled Disclosure to external parties (either enforced by law, or discretionary).

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Table 2: List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
CCW	Clarified cooling water, also referred to as “cooling water”
CW	Cooling Water
TTES	Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

Abbreviation	Description
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-168966153: Generation Technical Tender Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Not Applicable

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUTION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

A two stage Technical Evaluation Strategy is set out, with the phases consisting of the following:

- Phase 1: Desktop evaluation consisting of the evaluation of the mandatory gatekeepers, followed by qualitative evaluation of the tenders that passed the mandatory gatekeeper's requirements
- Phase 2: Workshop 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 by the lead evaluator to check for consistency in scoring of the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Should the lead evaluator find any inconsistencies 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 Qualitative Technical Evaluation of Phase 1. 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.

The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements. The scoring approach to all evaluation phases have been set out in this document to provide guidance for the evaluation team members.

A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tenders against the Employer's requirements. The following scoring method will be used in general. It will be specified where other scoring methods is used.

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

Table 3: Technical Evaluation Scoring Method

SCORE	PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION
5	100	COMPLIANT - Meet(s) 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

3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.3 TET MEMBERS

Table 4: Core TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation	Signature
TET 1	Gontse Mathibedi	Lead Evaluator, O&M Engineer	

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

TET 2	Noko Pheta	Senior Advisor	
-------	------------	----------------	--

Note: In the event of the unavailability of a TET member, coinciding with the unavailability of optional TET members, the section manager may delegate a stand-in to perform the evaluation

Table 5: Optional TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation	Signature
TET 3	Solomon Seloba	O&M Engineer (TPE)	
TET 4	Keith Northcott	Senior Consultant	
TET 5	Francois du Preez	Cooperate Consultant	

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Gatekeepers identified in the tender document will be “must meet” criteria identified in tabular questionnaire form. The tenderer’s submission will be assessed based upon questionnaire seeking **YES** or **NO** response from the tenderers with no point scores or weighted averaged assigned to the response.

Response of **NO** against any criteria will be elimination of the tenderer’s submission 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 RFQ.

The *contractor* shall provide a verifiable reference list of previous projects performed since 2021, involving submersed internal coatings (3 references) of industrial components. The reference list shall be provided in the format as shown in table 6.

IMPORTANT NOTES:

Comparable environment refers to water-immersed environments. That is, a vessel, tank or large bore (800NB+) pipeline containing water (clean or dirty) at all times while in operation. Work is done on the plant, in-situ.

The *employer* reserves the right to contact the references provided to verify the work that was done and the quality and validity thereof. Projects that were unsatisfactorily completed or could not be verified as authentic, will not count towards the mandatory threshold of 3 projects for each system.

The following shall **NOT** be accepted as valid references:

1. Work done was not in comparable environments
2. Reference could not be verified with the details that were supplied
3. Work was performed earlier than 2021

4. Components were coated/lined in a workshop/highly controlled environment
5. Copies of previous purchase orders will not be acceptable
6. Vague references for corrosion protection applied on non-specific components or surfaces or environment
7. Any coating not considered to be a tank or pipe lining system

Table 6: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria Submission Table

Solvent Free Epoxy Coating Reference 1		
No	Description	Contractor to Complete all the rows below
1	Project Description: Explain what work was done that relates to this scope of the work. (Example: Surface preparation and corrosion protection application)	
2	Description of the component/pipe/vessel in which the corrosion protection system was applied	
3	Name of product used	
4	Environment in which the applied corrosion protection system operates	
5	Company name of the client	
6	Client engineer or quality control representative details	Name and Surname: Contact Number: Company Email Address:
7	Date when the work was completed in line with document submitted.	

Solvent Free Epoxy Coating Reference 2		
No	Description	Contractor to Complete all the rows below
1	Project Description: Explain what work was done that relates to this scope of the work. (Example: Surface preparation and corrosion protection application)	
2	Description of the component/pipe/vessel in which the corrosion protection system was applied	
3	Name of product used	
4	Environment in which the applied corrosion protection system operates	
5	Company name of the client	
6	Client engineer or quality control representative details	Name and Surname: Contact Number: Company Email Address:
7	Date when the work was completed in line with document submitted.	

Solvent Free Epoxy Coating Reference 3		
No	Description	Contractor to Complete all the rows below
1	Project Description: Explain what work was done that relates to this scope of the work. (Example: Surface preparation and corrosion protection application)	
2	Description of the component/pipe/vessel in which the corrosion protection system was applied	
3	Name of product used	
4	Environment in which the applied corrosion protection system operates	
5	Company name of the client	
6	Client engineer or quality control representative details	Name and Surname: Contact Number: Company Email Address:
7	Date when the work was completed in line with document submitted in line 8.	

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Tenderers who passed the mandatory gatekeepers will be subjected to a qualitative technical evaluation. For the qualitative technical evaluation, a minimum score of 70% has to be obtained in order to gain further consideration for this transaction. The contractor shall submit their own application method statements for the work, in line with the provided specification.

Table 7: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Weight, %	Score				
		0	40		80	100
Application procedure/method statement (surface preparation including decontamination and washing, dust and debris removal, coating application, curing, and testing) in line with GE/MAT/26/007 and product manufacturer's recommendations. Minimum requirements: - Names of products used - Surface Preparation - Application - Inspections and testing (for surface preparation, product application, quality control) - Standards, specifications and quality control limits followed during the process	45	Non-responsive	Method statement provided with unacceptable risks and/or omissions		Method statement provided with acceptable risks and/or omissions	Method statement provided is fully compliant according to the specification GE/MAT/26/007
Application procedure/method statement (surface preparation including decontamination and washing, dust and debris removal, coating application, curing, and testing) in line with	45	Non-responsive	Method statement provided with unacceptable risks and/or omissions		Method statement provided with acceptable risks and/or omissions	Method statement provided is fully compliant according to the specification GE/MAT/26/008

GE/MAT/26/008 and product manufacturer's recommendations. Minimum requirements: - Names of products used - Surface Preparation - Application - Inspections and testing (for surface preparation, product application, quality control)					
Provide a list of deviations or exclusions from Eskom SOW, Standard and specifications	10	No statement of deviations provided or deviations that will affect corrosion protection			Statement provided indicating no deviations / deviations that will not affect performance of corrosion protection system

NB: A minimum total of 70% is required in this section for further consideration.

3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: PHASE 2 – SITE VISIT

Tenderers who passed the gatekeepers and obtained a score of 70% or higher for the evaluation performed in table 7, will be subject to a visit at their works, from the technical evaluation team. During this site visit, the following will be evaluated and scored:

Criteria	Weight, %	Score				
		0	40	80	100	
1. The contractor shall demonstrate that the following standards are available at their facilities and that the technicians have a basic working knowledge of it: a. GE/MAT/26/006, GE/MAT/26/007, GE/MAT/26/008 & GE/MAT/26/009 ISO 8501-1 Preparation of steel substrates before application of paints and related products — Visual assessment of surface cleanliness — Part 1: Rust grades and preparation grades of uncoated steel substrates and of steel substrates after overall removal of previous coatings b. ISO 8502-6 Preparation of steel substrates before application of paints and related products — Tests for the assessment of surface cleanliness Part 6: Extraction of water-soluble contaminants for analysis (Bresle method) c. ISO 8502-3 Preparation of steel substrates before application of paints and related products — Tests for the assessment of surface cleanliness — Part 3: Assessment of dust on steel surfaces prepared for painting (pressure-sensitive tape method)	20%	Deficient/ non-responsive	Non-compliant / Unacceptable risks present	Compliant with acceptable risks present	Compliant	
1. A visual inspection will be conducted on the following equipment: a. Blasting pots, hoses and nozzles b. Heavy duty portable airless spray pumps, spray hoses, nozzles c. Calibrated measuring equipment: Temperature, humidity, dust, surface profile, salt, DFT, spark/holiday, etc.	40%	Deficient/ non-responsive	Non-compliant / Unacceptable risks present	Compliant with acceptable risks present	Compliant	
2. The contractor shall demonstrate in the workshop the surface preparation and coating application on a flat steel plate of a minimum surface area of 0.5m ² , as specified in either GE/MAT/26/007 or GE/MAT/26/008. The minimum length of air hoses shall be 30m, to simulate the distance that the equipment is likely to be from the point of application. The function of the equipment, safety aspects, operator/applicator skills will be evaluated as part of this demonstration. After surface preparation, the contractor's technicians will measure and report on the following: a. After blast: Cleanliness, profile, dust & salt b. After coat: Wet film thickness	40%	Deficient/ non-responsive	Non-compliant / Unacceptable risks present	Compliant with acceptable risks present	Compliant	

TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 8: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
ALL	X	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
ALL	X	X	X	X	X
Site Visit Evaluation	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
ALL	X	X	X	X	X

TET member 1 will be responsible for the consolidation of scores as well as the clarification of discrepancies and disagreements in scoring within each discipline, in line with the

3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.7.1 Risks

The risks listed in tables 9 and 10 contain anticipated acceptable and unacceptable risks, however, in the event that unforeseen risks are picked up during the evaluation process, the discretion of the evaluation team will be relied upon to reach a conclusion.

Table 9: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	During the site visit, extensive knowledge of standards and quality control measures are displayed even though the standards are not all readily available at the tenderers workshop
2.	Minor deviations from the scope of work are noted, but the deviations will not affect the overall quality of the corrosion protection system

3.	There are minor omissions in the provided returnables, that can easily be cleared up during the formal method statement and QCP approvals
----	---

Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Contractor submits a plagiarised version of the employer's specification as a method statement.

3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 11: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	

Table 12: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Significant deviations from the specification without informing the client
2.	

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Gontse Mathibedi	Snr Engineer
Zacharia Ledwaba	Turbine Plant Engineering Manager
Solomon Seloba	System Engineer
Motsie Montshiwagae	System Engineer
Rofhiwa Nelwamondo	Engineering Manager
Justice Leswiswi	Execution Manager
Thamsanqa Sibanda	Outage Manager

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
Dec 2025	0.1		First Draft for comments
Feb 2026	1.0		Final version to be used for tendering

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- TET members

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- TET members

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.