Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy – SO3 Sulphur Plant Spares**

Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
Revision:	**1.0**
Total Pages:	**13**
Next Review Date:	**N/A**
Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
.....	.....	.....
J Van Der Walt	**Riaan Nel**	**J Mathobela**
System Engineer	**Boiler Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Date: 18/05/2026	Date: 2026/05/18	Date: 2026/05/18

CONTENTS

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

Matimba Power Station consists of the SO_3 Plant, which is installed on all six units to improve the performance and efficiency of the electrostatic precipitators (ESPs) by enhancing ash particle collection within the flue gas path. The SO_3 Plant operates by generating and injecting sulphur trioxide into the flue gas stream to improve ash resistivity and optimise dust collection efficiency. The plant comprises various systems including sulphur storage systems, sulphur burners, converter vessels, SO_3 pumps, and injection systems, air blowers, piping, valves, instrumentation, and control systems required for the safe and efficient operation of the plant.

This strategy serves as the Technical Evaluation Strategy for the procurement of the SO_3 Plant spares to ensure that all technical and operational requirements are met.

1.1 SCOPE

The scope of work provides for the SO3 Sulphur plant spares as per the list below and covers the technical requirements that will be applied during the technical evaluations phase of the tender to guide in evaluating the possible tenderers received from the market to appoint the suitable contractor to supply and deliver the spares.

Technical Evaluation Strategy (TTES) defines the following with regards to this work:

- Qualitative Evaluation Criteria
- Technical Evaluation Team (TET) Member Responsibilities
- Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications

1.1.1 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 basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

1.1.2 Applicability

This document applies to the Matimba Power Station

1.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES

Parties using this document shall apply the most recent edition of the documents listed in the following paragraphs.

1.2.1 Normative

[1] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[2] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems.

[3] 240-6219227, Life Safety Rules

[4] Occupational Health and Safety Act, Act 85 of 1985

1.2.2 Informative

[5] 240-53716726: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form Template

1.2.3 Classification

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

1.3 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
ISO	International Organization for Standards
SoW	Scope of Work
QCP	Quality Control Plan
TET	Technical Evaluation Team
TTES	Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy
SO3	Sulphur
ESP	Electrostatic precipitators

1.4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Technical Evaluation Team (TET) will be responsible for setting up the technical evaluation criteria and evaluating the bidding candidates' submissions. The TET will perform their duty as prescribed and dictated by the guidelines of the Eskom's Tender Evaluation Procedure with the intent of appointing a competent contractor to execute the works.

Below are some of the key roles and responsibilities as prescribed in the Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure:

- **Engineering Manager:** All Engineering Managers throughout Eskom shall ensure that all staff, in their respective areas understand and adhere to this procedure.
- **Technical Evaluation Team (TET):** The delegated engineers/technical specialists who are responsible to review and evaluate technical aspects of the tender documentation as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

1.5 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

The TET will perform their evaluations and provide their recommendations as per the Eskom's Tender Evaluation Procedure.

1.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Not Applicable

2. TENDER TECHNCIAL EVALAUTION STRATEGY

2.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is minimum of 80%.

2.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Johan Van Der Walt	System Engineer
TET 2	Sipho Honono	Senior Technician Maintenance
TET 3	Paul Hlolo	Senior Technician Maintenance

2.3 MANADATORY 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.	N/A		

2.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA - SULPHUR (SO3) PLANT SPARES

Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)		Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Acquired Score (%)
Past Performance / Relevant Experience	Proof of previous contracts, orders and delivery notes accepted, stamped and signed by the Client, relevant to the scope of work.	10 or more spares contract, orders delivered and accepted by the client.	40	**40**	
		5 or more spares contract, orders delivered and accepted by the client.	20		
		0 to 5 spares contract, orders delivered and accepted by the client.	10		
		No submission or submitted with deviations.	0		
Visiting Workshop	Eskom evaluating team to visit the supplier's workshop/workplace before the commencement of the fabrication.	Proof of calibrated equipment and tools that supplier will be using to perform the work. Provide proof of ownership of the workshop. If the premises are rented, a signed rental agreement or letter between the supplier and the property owner to be submitted.	10	**10**	
		No submission or submitted with deviations.	0		
Understanding and Compliance with requirements	The Method Statement should clearly indicate that the Supplier has performed adequate planning to accomplish the operation/ fabrication tasks as defined in the Scope of work.	Does the proposal include a complete plan to accomplish each requirement, including subcontracting if applicable	10	**20**	
		Does the Supplier's plan demonstrate that appropriate personnel and equipment will be positioned efficiently to carry out the requirements	10		
		No submission or submitted with deviations.	0		
Delivery Lead Times	Confirmation letter indicative of duration to be submitted.	Lead time ≤ 6 weeks.	10	**10**	
		Lead time > 6 weeks ≤ 8 weeks.	8		
		Lead time > 12 weeks.	4		
		No submission or submitted with deviations.	0		
Material data sheets	The supplier shall provide the data sheet as minimum and relevant to the scope of work. Containing the following: **Material certificate, QCP, Welding procedure, Risk assessment, Welders Qualifications, Consumable Certificates, Welding Quality Plans, NDT reports, machining reports, and drawings**	All required data sheet documents submitted.	20	**20**	
		Only of the required documents submitted.	15		
		Less than 4 required documents submitted.	10		
		No submission or submitted with deviation	0		
Score for General:				**100**	

Final Technical Evaluation Score:	
Note: *These criteria will be used in the evaluation to assess and document the basis to which a proposal meets, fails to meet, or usefully exceeds the minimum requirements contained in the work statement. The above factors will be considered when evaluating proposals.* ***Supplier with a Score of 80 % or above is technically accepted*** ***Supplier with a Score of below 80 % is not technically accepted***	
CONCLUSION	

2.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2
N/A		
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**
1.	X	X
2.	X	X
3.	X	X
4.	X	X
5.	X	X

2.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

2.6.1 Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	**None**

2.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	None

3. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Johan Van Der Walt	System Engineer
Riaan Nel	Boiler Engineering Manager
Jacky Mathobela	Engineering Manager
Sipho Honono	Senior Technician Maintenance
Paul Hlolo	Senior Technician Maintenance

4. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
14 May 2026	0	J Van Der Walt	

5. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- Johan Van Der Walt
- Sipho Honono
- Paul Hlolo

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Not Applicable