| Eskom | Report | Hendrina Power Station |
|---|---|---|

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Supply of Electrical Cables Supply Contract**

| | |
|---|---|
| Reference №: | **380-136224** |
| Alternative Reference Number: | **N/A** |
| Area of Applicability: | **Hendrina Power Station** |
| Functional Area: | **All** |
| Revision: | **03** |
| Total Pages: | **13** |
| Next Review Date: | **None** |
| Disclosure Classification: | **Controlled Disclosure** |

| Compiled by | Functional Responsibility (Engineering) | Functional Responsibility (Maintenance) |
|---|---|---|

# Content



**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

When downloaded from the document management system, 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

This document has been developed to set the technical evaluation criteria to be used when evaluating the tender submissions for supplying of electrical cables in Hendrina Power Station. The evaluation of tender will be based on tenders' ability to meet the requirements specified on this document. A weighted scorecard approach will be used to evaluate the tenders against the Employers requirements.

Hendrina Power Station came into operation by the end of 1976. It is located on the N11 between Middelburg and Hendrina. The facility is situated South-West of Optimum Colliery, which historically supplied most of the coal to the power station.

# 2. Supporting Clauses

## 2.1 Scope

This document describes how tenders received for supply of electrical cables required by Hendrina Power Station will be technically evaluated and scored. The team members are listed in this document along with their responsibilities. The document also describes the acceptable and unacceptable risks and qualifications and/or conditions.

The Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy will define the following technical evaluation criteria:

- Mandatory Evaluation Criteria
- Qualitative Evaluation Criteria
- TET Member Responsibilities
- Acceptable/Unacceptable Qualifications

No changes will be permitted to be made to the evaluation criteria once the Technical Evaluation Strategy is approved by the Engineering Manager.

### 2.1.1 Purpose

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

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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

### 2.1.2 Integrated Business Improvement objectives

Management, assurance, and independent oversight control to ensure that the procurement process is adequately followed and that all the documentations are traceable and auditable.

## 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: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

### 2.2.2 Informative

[2] 240-56030635: General information and requirements for medium voltage cable systems

## 2.3 Definitions

None

## 2.4 Abbreviations

| Abbreviation | Explanation |
|---|---|
| TET | Technical Evaluation team |
| MV | Medium Voltage |

## 2.5 Roles and Responsibilities

As per 240-168966153: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure.

## 2.6 Process for Monitoring

N/A

## 2.7 Related/Supporting Documents

N/A

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

When downloaded from the document management system, 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. Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy

## 3.1 Technical Evaluation Threshold

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) of 70% is required for a tenderer to be considered for next level of evaluation. The 70% is due to that this kind of service require precision and skill. The evaluation criteria have been broken down into sections and a percentage weighting for each section is allocated.

The tenderer must ensure that his/her submissions contain all the relevant data/proof to substantiate the Employer's weighted criteria as populated on table 3.

## 3.2 TET members

Table 1: TET members

| TET Member | TET Member Name | Designation |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |



When downloaded from the document management system, 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 Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

In accordance with 240-48929482, an assessment of 'NO' against any criterion referenced # 1 in Table 2 below shall disqualify the Tenderer from further Qualitative Evaluation.

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

| Ref # | Mandatory Technical Criteria Description | YES/ NO | Reference to Technical Specification/ Tender Returnable | Proof to be submitted |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | None | | | |

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

When downloaded from the document management system, 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

In accordance with 240-168966153, tenders that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria will be evaluated against the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria defined in Table 3 below.

The recommendation on the highest technically ranked tenderer shall be based on the final scoring comparisons and the tenderer with the highest score shall be recommended from a technical perspective, if the weighted final score exceeds the defined threshold.

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

| # | Qualitative Technical Criteria Description | Reference to Technical Specification/ Tender Returnable | Criteria Weighting (%) | Criteria Sub-weighting (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Company experience on electrical cable supply. | Provide five (5) long term purchase orders/ contract of 12 or more months as reference for the supply and delivery of electrical power cables | 50 | 100% - Five purchase orders submitted.<br>(Fully compliant) |
| | | | | 80% - Four purchase orders submitted.<br>(Compliant with associated qualifications) |
| | | | | 40% - Three to two purchase orders submitted.<br>(Compliant with delivery risk) |

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 0% - One purchase order submitted.<br>(Non-compliant) |
| 2 | Lead time - 15 days after receipt of an official purchase order) | The service provider should demonstrate to Hendrina of how long the cables were delivered to the client after receipt of the purchase order. The delivery note corresponding to the purchase orders provided on point 1 above should be attached as proof. | 50 | 100% - Delivery note submitted with lead time of 15 days maximum.<br>(Compliant) |
| | | | | 80% - Delivery note submitted with lead time of more than 15 days but less than 20 days.<br>(Compliant with associated qualifications). |
| | | | | 40% - Delivery note submitted with lead time of more than 20 days but less than 30 days.<br>(Compliant with delivery risk). |
| | | | | 0% - Delivery note submitted with lead time of more than 30 days or non-submission.<br>(Non-compliant). |

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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

The scoring of the qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements.

A score is allocated as per below table.

| Score | (%) | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | 100 | COMPLIANT<br>• Meet technical requirements.<br>• No foreseen technical risk in meeting the technical requirements. |
| 4 | 80 | COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS<br>Meet technical requirements with:<br>• Acceptable technical risk<br>• Acceptable exceptions<br>• Acceptable conditions |
| 2 | 40 | NON-COMPLIANT<br>• Does not meet technical requirements.<br>• Unacceptable technical risk<br>• Unacceptable exception |

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Unacceptable condition |
| 0 | 0 | TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE |
| Note 1: The scoring does not allow for score of 1 and 3.<br>Note 2: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk, exception and condition shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant tender technical evaluation strategy. | | |

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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

### 3.5 TET Member Responsibilities

| Mandatory Criteria Number | TET 1 | TET 2 | TET 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Qualitative Criteria Number** | **TET 1** | **TET 2** | **TET 3** |
| 1 | X | X | X |
| 2 | X | X | X |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

### 3.6 Foreseen Acceptable/ Unacceptable Qualifications

#### 3.6.1 Risk

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

| Risk | Description |
|---|---|
| 1 | Inviting Suppliers without an Eskom technically prequalified factory, provided that the factory availability is a tender evaluation criterion. Eskom reserve the rights to inspect the factory before contract award to verify the information. |
| 2 | Tendering without conducting Site visit/s for items described in the Scope of Work template provided by Eskom |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the document management system, 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 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

| Risk | Description |
|---|---|
| 1 | Mandatory criteria 1 – 3 not evaluated and/or satisfied |

### 3.6.2 Exceptions/ Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions/ Conditions

| Risk | Description |
|---|---|
| 1 | Declining to provide technical details accurately deemed intellectual proprietary. |

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions/ Conditions

| Risk | Description |
|---|---|
| 1 | Failure to provide manufacturing factory name, and documents for assessing compliance with mandatory technical evaluation criteria. |

## 4. SHEQ requirements

None

## 5. Records to be kept.

The document details the technical criteria's to be used to evaluate the tender submission for the MV motor repairs and refurbishment. All records to be kept as per the procurement protocols.

## 6. Annexures

Technical Schedule A and B.

## 7. Acceptance

This document has been seen and accepted by:

| Name | Designation |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

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

## 8. Revisions

| Date | Rev. | Compiler | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

## 9. Development Team

## 10. Acknowledgements

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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