

1. INTRODUCTION

Lethabo Power Station is a coal-fired power station located in Free State Province, South Africa. It comprises six 618MW production units (i.e., installed capacity of 3 708MW). The power station's operational functions require a supply of spares utilized in the primary function of energy production and other related functions.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document provides the tender technical evaluation strategy for the supply of spares at Lethabo Power Station. The document provides annexure schedule A and B (attached) developed to address various aspects required to perform the technical evaluations with reference to applicable Eskom technical standards.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this tender technical evaluation strategy is to define the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria and TET member responsibilities for tender technical evaluation. The technical evaluation strategy serves as the basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document applies to Lethabo Power Station only.

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] 240-70240749: Strategic and Critical Spares Policy
- [3] 32-1033: Eskom Procurement and Supply Chain Management Policy
- [4] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement and Supply Management Procedure

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.

2.2.2 Informative

[1] 240-48197042 Procedure for the Identification and Planning of Plant Asset Obsolescence

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Term	Description
Spare	An item intended to replace a corresponding item to retain or maintain the original required function of the item or process.

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
MW	Megawatt
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

N/A

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

N/A

3. 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 80%.

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.

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Bert Kolker	Snr Advisor Engineering
TET 2	C. Wood	Engineer
TET 3	M. Phadi	Maintenance

3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	Tenderer to submit completed Schedule A&B form	A/B schedule All thermocouples and PT100's tendered for must be fully completed under schedule B. Supplier will be deemed non-compliant if any of the items tendered for is not completed (NB! Do not Tick or Cross, complete text on Schedule B with the actual specification of the items to be supplied and not a copy and paste from Schedule A , if its clear that the supplier only copied text from A to B it will be considered as non-compliant). Note that the submitted product specifications will form part of the contractual agreement thus will need to be adhered to throughout the contract period/duration	To ensure that the tenderer knows which spares will be supplied, and for the employer to verify that the tenderer understands and confirms the scope of work and technical specification requirements of the list of spares.

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 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)
1.	PROOF OF CAPABILITY AND EXPERIENCE TO SUPPLY REQUIRED SPARES Proof of at least 3 years verifiable relevant experience in supplying Thermocouples and RTD's stipulated in Schedule B. (NB: Proof can be a previous Purchase Orders with contact details of the company supplied, preferably in Eskom or similar industry) Scoring Criteria: 0 = Not provided 2 = Verifiable Purchase orders but less than 3 years' experience. 4 = Verifiable Purchase orders with 3-5 years' experience 5 = Verifiable Purchase orders and more than 5 years' experience.	Copies of previous PO's or contracts	20
2.	Submitted AB schedule evaluation Compliance to schedule A as required spares vs what is offered in schedule B Scoring Criteria: 0 = Totally inadequate information supplied 2 = Compliant to < 75% of all spare items 4 = Compliant to >75% but < 95% of all items 5 = Compliant to >95% of all items	Schedule A&B	80
		TOTAL	100

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria Scoring

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.
		NON-COMPLIANT

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	40	- 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.		

3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

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

3.5.1 Foreseen Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications

3.5.1.1 Risks

Table 6: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Equivalent alternative supplied with higher specifications where supplier cannot meet exact specification in A. (i.e. TC heads or material)

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Non-Equivalent products of inferior quality or specification supplied where supplier cannot meet required specifications as in A.

3.5.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
------	-------------

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.	As per the requirements set out under the Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria section 3.4 of this document.
----	---

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Deviations to any part of the technical schedules without providing alternate solutions.
2.	The bid submission is generic, incomplete, and not tailored to address the specific objectives and scope.

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.