

	<b>Tender Evaluation</b>	<b>Engineering</b>
---	--------------------------	--------------------

Title: **Technical Evaluation Strategy for Rehabilitation of Access Roads at Tutuka Power Station** Unique Identifier: **15ENG GEN-1475**

Alternative Reference Number:

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Documentation Type: **TE**

Revision: **4**

Total Pages: **13**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 SCOPE .....	3
2.1.1 Purpose .....	3
2.1.2 Applicability .....	3
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES .....	3
2.2.1 Normative .....	3
2.2.2 Informative .....	4
2.3 CLASSIFICATION .....	4
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS .....	4
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	4
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING .....	4
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS .....	4
<b>3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD .....	6
3.2 TET MEMBERS .....	6
3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	7
3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	8
3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES .....	12
3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS .....	13
3.6.1 Risks .....	13
3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions .....	13
<b>4. AUTHORISATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5. REVISIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## FIGURES

No table of figures entries found.

## TABLES

Table 1: Abbreviations .....	4
Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table .....	5
Table 3: TET Members .....	6
Table 4: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria .....	7
Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria .....	8
Table 6: TET Member Responsibilities .....	12
Table 7: Acceptable Technical Risks .....	13
Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Risks .....	13
Table 9: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions .....	13
Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions .....	13

### CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Tutuka Power Station is a coal fired power station and has 3600MW installed capacity and was constructed in the mid 1980's. The Tutuka Power Station is located within the Standerton magisterial district, approximately 21 km northeast of the town Standerton in the Mpumalanga Province.

This document outlines the technical tender evaluation criteria requirements to place a Contractor to rehabilitate the access roads at Tutuka Power Station.

The condition of the access roads at Tutuka Power Station has deteriorated to unacceptable conditions therefore urgent repairs are required to remedy the existing failures.

The contractor will be responsible to repair the roads using techniques of existing damaged pavement layer removal, base construction by bitumen and cement stabilization as well as asphalt inlay.

The purpose of this document is to develop the mandatory and qualitative technical evaluation criteria required to place a contract for executing the Rehabilitation of Access Roads at Tutuka Power Station. Technical evaluation criteria will be used to evaluate all tenders received from the Service Provider(s) in response to the Enquiry.

## 2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

### 2.1 SCOPE

Contractor refers to the Employer's latest Works Information for the Rehabilitation of Access Roads at Tutuka Power Station [15ENG GEN-1405] for the detailed Works Information.

All technical queries to be directed to the Civil Engineer.

Tenderer/Contractor to provide tender returnable submissions in accordance with the Employer's Latest Technical Evaluation Strategy [15ENG GEN-1475] and Latest Works Information [15ENG GEN-1405].

#### 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 is applicable to all appointed and involved in the technical tender evaluation of tenders received from the Service Provider(s) in response to the required works [15ENG GEN-1405].

## 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] 15ENG GEN-1405: Works Information for the Rehabilitation of Access Roads at Tutuka Power Station
- [2] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation 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.

- [3] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results
- [4] 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form
- [5] 32-1034: Procurement and Supply Chain Management Procedure

### 2.2.2 Informative

- [1] ISO 9001: 2015 Quality Systems Standard
- [2] OHSA: Occupational Health and Safety Act No. 85 of 1993 Health and Safety requirements: Construction 2014

## 2.3 CLASSIFICATION

- a. **Confidential:** the classification given to information that may be used by malicious/opposing/hostile elements to **harm** the objectives and functions of Eskom Holdings Limited.

## 2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Table 1: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
SHEQ	Safety Health Environment Quality
RFQ	Request For Quote
QCP	Quality Control Plan
TET	Technical Evaluation Team
CIDB	Construction Industry Development Board
SOW	Scope Of Work

## 2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

## 2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

The tender returnables will be evaluated by the Employer's various functions in accordance with the issued tender evaluations i.e., technical and SHEQ

## 2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

As per section 2.2

## 3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

The evaluation criteria will be based upon a two-step process:

### Mandatory Criteria Evaluation

### CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

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 to check for consistency in scoring of the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria. Should there be inconsistency 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 next phase of Qualitative Technical Evaluation. 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.

### Qualitative Criteria Evaluation

Tenderers that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Criteria as defined in the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy. The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements. A score shall be allocated as per Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table, for each technical qualitative criterion. Each TET member shall populate a Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form [2] for each tenderer. Note: Individual Qualitative Criteria scores shall only be finalised after all clarification sessions have been concluded.

**Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Table**

Score	%	Definition
5	100	<b>COMPLIANT</b> Meet technical requirement(s) AND; No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	<b>COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS</b> Meet technical requirement(s) with; Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; Acceptable conditions.
2	40	<b>NON-COMPLIANT</b> Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR; Unacceptable conditions.
0	0	<b>TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE</b>
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		

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

unambiguously defined in the relevant 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 70%.

### 3.2 TET MEMBERS

The technical evaluation team will be composed of a minimum of two members per discipline from the table below with at least one being professionally registered per discipline.

**Table 3: TET Members**

<b>TET number</b>	<b>TET Member Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
TET 1	Imraan Patel	Civil Engineer
TET 2	Obert Matodzi	Civil Engineer
TET 3	Riaan Venter	Senior Civil 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.

### 3.3 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Response of **NO** against any criteria will be elimination of the *Contractor(s)* tender 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 RFP. Table 4 lists the mandatory gatekeeper questionnaires identified for the subject RFQ.

**Table 4: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria**

	<b>Mandatory Technical Criteria Description</b>	<b>Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable</b>	<b>Motivation for use of Criteria</b>
1.	Contractor must appoint a Professional Civil PrEng/PrTech registered with ECSA.	ECSA registration number and certificate must be submitted	Relevant expertise and qualifications to minimize the risk and be compliant with good industry practices

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	<b>Civil / Structural/ Geotechnical</b>		<b>Technical returnables document</b>	<b>70</b>	
1.1	<p>Provide detailed method Statement specifying and showing ability to perform all the required works as described in the Works Information. Listing sequence of activities (site investigation/assessment, surveys, geotechnical investigations tools, machinery/equipment, skills, specialists, and general labour etc.</p> <p>Detailed method statement must demonstrate compliance and understanding of the required works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound method statement detailing how the full works information will be met and provides comprehensive methodology of approach <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Acceptable method statement but has few unclear points <b>(4/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Method statement does not contain methodology of approach but reiterates to scope of works <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• No Method statement/ Not satisfactory <b>(0/5 point)</b></li> </ul>	<p>As per Works Information 15ENG GEN-1405</p>		40%	
1.2	<p>Provide Contractor's previous work experience with proof that the contractor has previously executed rehabilitation of roads. (Work must be related/similar to the Works Information)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 or more referable contracts <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• 3 to 4 referable contracts <b>(4/5 points)</b></li> <li>• 1 to 2 contracts <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• No work experience submitted <b>(0/5 points)</b></li> </ul>	<p>As per Works Information 15ENG GEN-1405</p> <p>List of similar projects and signed references including signed project completion forms stating the work was completed as per the client's time duration</p>		25%	

			and quality requirements must be submitted		
	1.3	<p>The Contractor shall provide a plant list indicating the application i.e. which plant will be utilised as per the chosen methodology described in the Method Statements.</p> <p>Furthermore, indicate either the Contractors' possession of plant and/ or hiring agreements in place for plant and equipment for the works, to reduce start-up time/ delays during works.</p> <p><b>The minimum plant required are but is not limited to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Grader X1</li> <li>➤ Pneumatic Roller Compactor X1</li> <li>➤ Asphalt Paver X1</li> <li>➤ Bulldozer X1</li> <li>➤ Smooth Drum Roller Compactor X2</li> <li>➤ TLB X1</li> <li>➤ Tipper Trucks X3</li> <li>➤ Asphalt Milling Machine X1</li> <li>➤ Water Cart X1</li> <li>➤ Mechanical Road Sweeper X1</li> <li>➤ Road Recycler or Road Reclaimer X1</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Certificates of Ownership And/or lease agreements submitted for all 100% of the above listed minimum plant required <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Less than 100% Certificates of Ownership And/or lease agreements Submitted for the above listed minimum plant required <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Certificates of Ownership And/or lease agreements Not submitted <b>(0/5 points)</b></li> </ul>	<p>As per Works Information                  15ENG GEN-1405                  Contractor to attach certificates of Ownership or a lease agreement with the plant hire company signed by both parties</p>		10%

	1.4	<p>CV of competent Site Manager experienced in Road Rehabilitation and/or Bulk Earthworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Above 10 years relevant experience <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• 5 to 9 years relevant experience <b>(4/5 points points)</b></li> <li>• 4 years relevant experience <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Not submitted/Experience less than 4 years <b>(0/5 points)</b></li> </ul>	<p>As per Works Information 15ENG GEN-1405</p> <p>Work Experience must include competency in Road Rehabilitation and/or bulk earthworks</p>		25%
<b>2.</b>	<b>General</b>		<b>Technical returnables document</b>	<b>30%</b>	
	2.1	<p>Provide schedule baseline plan/programme detailing how the works will be executed including lead times to complete the Scope of work timeously. This should include the milestones completion dates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitted Project's schedule with all milestones as per the Works Information <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Submitted Project's schedule with incomplete milestone as per the Works Information <b>(4/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Project scheduled not related to the Works Information <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Projects schedule not submitted <b>(0/5 points)</b></li> </ul>	<p>As per Works Information 15ENG GEN-1405</p>		40%
	2.2	<p>Provide Quality Control (QCP) detailing <b>all</b> activities in detail and intervention points to prevent rework and quality work according to the Works Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided QCP with defined activities aligning with the Works Information <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Provided QCP with incomplete activities as per the Works Information <b>(4/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Provided QCP not related to the Works Information <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• NO QCP Submitted/Incorrect Format with no intervention points <b>(0/5 points)</b></li> </ul>	<p>As per Works Information 15ENG GEN-1405</p>		40%

	2.3	<p>An organogram for the core crew, in particular the names and qualifications of the following members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project Manager,</li> <li>2. Site Manager,</li> <li>3. Design Engineer,</li> <li>4. Safety Officer, and</li> <li>5. Quality Officer</li> </ol> <p>That will be involved with executing the works, as described in the Works Information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organogram submitted showing the names and qualifications of all 5 members as listed above Officer <b>(5/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Organogram submitted showing the names and qualifications of 4 of the five members listed above <b>(4/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Organogram submitted showing the names and qualifications of 1-3 of the five members listed above <b>(2/5 points)</b></li> <li>• Organogram not submitted/Does not contain the names and qualifications of any of the 5 members listed above <b>(0/5 points)</b></li> </ul>	<p>Project organogram As per Works Information                  15ENG GEN-1405</p>		20%
				<b>TOTAL: 100</b>	

**3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES**

**Table 6: 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
1.1	X	X	X
1.2	X	X	X
1.3	X	X	X
1.4	X	X	X
2.1	X	X	X
2.2	X	X	X
2.3	X	X	X

**3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS**

**3.6.1 Risks**

**Table 7: Acceptable Technical Risks**

Risk	Description
1.	None

**Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Risks**

Risk	Description
1.	Mandatory technical requirements not submitted [Table 4]
2.	Inability to execute the required works as per scope of work issued [1]

**3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions**

**Table 9: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

Risk	Description
1.	None

**Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

Risk	Description
1.	Inability to execute the required works as per the issued Works Information[1]

#### **4. AUTHORISATION**

This document has been seen and accepted by:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
Imraan Patel	Civil Engineer
Obert Matodzi	Civil Engineer
Riaan Venter	Senior Civil Engineer

#### **5. REVISIONS**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Compiler</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
July 2020	0	I Naidu	First draft for review and comments
August 2020	1	I Naidu	Final Document for Issue
June 2021	2	N Dlamini	Amended Final Document for Issue
26 January 2024	3	I Patel	Revised and Submitted for Review
13 February 2024	4	I Patel	Final Document for Issue

#### **6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

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

- Imraan Patel

#### **7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

N/A

**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.