Eskom	Strategy	Engineering

Title:	**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Matimba Power Station Cation/Anion Tekapor/Sinert Base Repairs/Replacement Works**	**Unique Identifier:**	
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**0.1**
		Total Pages:	**13**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by	Supported by	Functional Responsibility	Authorised by
.....	.....	.....	.....
RE Chuma	**K Matloga**	**GN Nkuna**	**NJ Mathobela**
Auxiliary Engineer	**Maintenance Middle Manager**	**Auxiliary Engineering Manager**	**Engineering Manager**
Date: 2026/09/10	Date: 2026/09/11	Date: 2026/09/11	Date: 2026/09/14

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 3
2.2.1 Normative 3
2.2.2 Informative 3
2.3 DEFINITIONS 3
2.3.1 Classification 3
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS 3
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 4
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING 4
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS 4

3. TENDER TECHNICIAL EVALUATION STRATEGY 5

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD 5
3.2 TET MEMBERS 5
3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 5
3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 6
TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES 11
3.5 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS 12
3.5.1 Risks 12
3.5.2 Exceptions / Conditions 12

4. AUTHORISATION 13

5. REVISIONS 13

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM 13

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 13

TABLES

Table 1: TET Members 5
Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria 6
Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria 7
Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities 11
Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks 12
Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks 12
Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions 12
Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions 12

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

Matimba Power Station makes use of raw water that undergoes treatment through the ion exchange vessels. Currently, Cation 1/A has been found to have a damaged tekapor base and is therefore due for replacement. This arises a need to have both Cation and Anion vessels' tekapor/sinert base repairs, including ring repairs, as well as replacement works. The purpose of this document is to outline the technical evaluation strategy that will be undertaken to evaluate tenderers for the Tekapor/Sinert base floor replacement scope.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The document covers the tekapor replacement for Cation and Anion vessels at Matimba Power station. It outlines the technical evaluation process to be undertaken to get a suitable contractor for the repairs/replacement SoW.

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 applies to Matimba Power Station.

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 Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[2] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure (Transmission and Distribution)

2.2.2 Informative

[3] 240-126475828: Guideline for the Generic Scope of Work for the Refurbishment of the Ion Exchange Vessel in the Demineralisation Plant

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
DP	Differential pressure
ITP	Inspection and Test plan
NDT	Non-Destructive Testing
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer

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.

OTS	Operating and Technical Specification
P&ID	Piping and Instrumentation diagram
PM	Planned maintenance
PVC	Poly vinyl chloride
QC	Quality Control
QCP	Quality Control Plan
SE	System Engineer
SoW	Scope of Work
SS	Stainless Steel

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-168966153: Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure for Generation

System Engineers (SE)

- Will be required to use this document as the basis to compile their refurbishment SoW for scheduled planned maintenance as well as abnormal once off refurbishment.
- Must ensure that all required disciplines and subject matter experts are consulted for their input into both the SoW and for the inspections.
- Will be responsible to obtain the applicable design documentation required for the compilation of the SoW.
- Is responsible for the development of a spares list which captures all the required and necessary spares to do maintenance as required.
- Is responsible for reviewing, editing and accepting the quality control plan (QCP). The SE will indicate the hold points required and will sign off on these hold points. If the system engineer is not competent to sign off on certain hold points, then it is his/her responsibility to identify a competent person to sign off those hold points.
- Is responsible to clearly stipulate the returnables within the tender contract strategy if the work is outsourced i.e. Method statements, Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) requirements etc.

Maintenance

- If the work is done inhouse then it is the responsibility of the maintenance manager to ensure that there are enough spares and resources available to execute the scope of work.
- Since they execute PM's, they are to input in terms of plant operability and defects history.
- It is the responsibility of the maintainer to develop QCP's and documents.
- It is the responsibility of the supervisor to execute the quality control (QC) points as stated by the approved quality control plan (QCP).

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

- Pressure drop across the vessel and process flows to be used as process monitoring parameters.

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

[1] Matimba Power Station Cation Tekapor/Sinert Base Replacement scope of work.

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. TENDER TECHNICIAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.2 TET MEMBERS

Table 1 summarizes the Technical Evaluation Team (TET) members that will be involved in the evaluation process.

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Rirhandzu Chuma	Auxiliary System Engineer
TET 2	Munene Losaba	Seniour Auxiliary System Engineer
TET 3	Gift Nkuna	Auxiliary Engineering Manager
TET 4	Sivuyile Khwezi	Seniour Mechanical Technician
TET 5	Biko Mukhomi	Seniour Supervisor Mechanical Technician
TET 6	Kenneth Matloga	Mechanical Maintenance Manager

3.3 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

No Mandatory Evaluation Criteria to be used as well as the reference to the specification and motivation for Criteria use. Only qualitative criteria will be 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.

3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

During the tender evaluations the following table shall be used by the TET members to score each criterion on a scale of 0 to 5 as per Table 2.

Table 2: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria

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.
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**
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.		

Table 3 indicates the qualitative technical evaluation criteria that shall be used by the technical tender evaluation team for scoring the tenderers.

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Totally deficient (0)	Non-compliant (2)	Compliant with associated qualifications (4)	Compliant (5)
1. CONTRACTORS EXPERIENCE AND ORGANOGRAM								
1.1	CONTRACTOR'S TECHNICAL EXPERIENCE: The main contractor is applicable and listed in the Invitation to Tender. Technical experience is used to demonstrate that the contractor has the technical capability and proven track record to execute the tekapor/sinert base repair/replacement works.	For each tekapor/sinert base repair/replacement works that is referenced, the following must be included in the summary as a minimum: 1. Title with short description of the repairs scope of work 2. Contract or order number 3. Signed completion certificate(s) 4. Client name(s) and contact details 5. Start date and end date of contract 6. Tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works value.		70	No proof of work experience in Tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works.	One to Two (1 to 2) proof of work experience in Tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works.	Three to four (3-4) proof of work experience in Tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works.	Five or more (5≥) proof of work experience in Tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works
1.2	CONTRACTOR'S ORGANOGRAM: The organogram demonstrates how the contractor will technically and operationally control the repair/replacement works.	In reference to the Tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement scope of works, the following must be included as a minimum: Site specific organogram specifically stating names, experience and qualifications of the following: 1. Appointed site manager/supervisor with project management skills with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works. 2. Thermoplastic welder that is both qualified and experienced with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works. 3. Skilled labourers with experience with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works.	**40**	30	No submission at all, or the submitted Site-specific organogram is not relevant to the tekapor/sinert base replacement works. Site manager/supervisor not	Submitted Site-specific organogram has: appointed site manager/supervisor with only One to two (1-2) years' experience in project management skills with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works; thermoplastic welder either not qualified or only	Submitted Site-specific organogram has: appointed site manager/supervisor with Three to Four (3-4) years' experience in project management skills with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works; Thermoplastic welder is qualified or has Three to Four (3-4) years' experience with regards to tekapor/sinert base	Submitted Site-specific organogram has: appointed site manager/supervisor has Five or more (5≥) years' experience in project management skills with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works; Thermoplastic welder is qualified or has Five or more (5≥) years' experience with

					qualified, or thermoplastic welder not qualified, or zero experienced labourers with regards to tekapor/sinert repairs/replacement works.	One to two (1-2) years' experience with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works. Skilled labourers have only One to two (1-2) years' experience with regards to tekapor repairs/replacement works.	repairs/replacement works. Skilled labourers Three to Four (3-4) years' experience with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works.	regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works. Skilled labourers have Five or more (5≥) years' experience with regards to tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement works.

Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		**Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable**	**Criteria Weighting (%)**	**Criteria Sub Weighting (%)**	**Totally deficient (0)**	**Non-compliant (2)**	**Compliant with associated qualifications (4)**	**Compliant (5)**
2. SCOPE OF WORK COMPLIANCE/PROCESS REQUIREMENTS								
2.1	METHOD STATEMENTS: This is used to verify, before the tekapor/sinert base repairs/replacement work commence, that the proposed repair/replacement work will be technically sound, safe, controlled, and compliant with the technical specification.	Detailed procedure/method statement shall be submitted to Eskom detailing ALL steps, procedures and activities of repair/replacement works to be executed for: 1. Tekapor floor ring repair method statement 2. Tekapor floor replacement method statement (i.e., this is inclusive of casting, layers required, testing, curing environmental conditions, lining application process, lateral system etc.).	**20**	100	NO information regarding the tekapor floor ring repair method statement and NO tekapor floor replacement method statement included. Deviations and non-compliant.	ONLY high-level method statement included information regarding BOTH the tekapor floor ring repair method statement and NO tekapor floor replacement method statement included. The method statement is missing ALL detailed steps included. The method statement is missing at least Three (≥3) detailed steps.	The method statement includes Most **comprehensive,** and **crucial steps** regarding BOTH the tekapor floor ring repair method statement and tekapor floor replacement method statement. The method statement is missing ONLY one to two (1-2) detailed steps.	On the information submitted. The method statement includes ALL comprehensive, and crucial steps regarding BOTH the tekapor floor ring repair method statement and tekapor floor replacement method statement. The Method statement included ALL detailed steps. No deviations.

2.2	MECHANICAL/PROCESS COMPONENTS AND RELAVANT DOCUMENTS: This is used to assess the proposed rubber-lining system before being awarded and to determine whether the materials, installation methodology, quality controls and deviations from the specification are technically acceptable. These include MSDS, rubber lining method statement, QCP, and list of deviations if any.	2.2.1. Material safety data sheet (MSDSs) for the materials to be used for tekapor/sinert base floor and the MSDS for material to be used for rubber ling; i.e., all products that comprise the system i.e. rubber lining, adhesives, tack coats.	**40**	40	No information provided, or irrelevant information is provided as per the required MSDSs.	Information provided as per the required MSDSs., with three or more (3≥) deviations for tekapor ring repairs/replacement works.	Information provided as per the required MSDSs., with Only one or two (1 or 2) deviations for tekapor ring repairs/replacement works.	Information provided as per the required MSDSs., with zero (0), or no deviations at all, for tekapor ring repairs/replacement works.
		2.2.2. Method statement for Vessel rubber lining.		**30**	No method statement submitted, Or irrelevant method statement submitted.	Detailed Rubber lining method statement submitted, with three or more (3≥) crucial missing steps.	Detailed Rubber lining method statement submitted, Only one or two (1 or 2) crucial missing steps.	Detailed Rubber lining method statement submitted, with zero (0), missing steps. No deviations recorded.
		2.2.3. Quality Control Plan (QCP) inclusive of all steps involved in both repair/replacement of the tekapor/sinert base, and the rubber lining works.		**20**	No QCP submitted, Or irrelevant QCP submitted.	Submitted QCP is High-level, missing: ≥3 Steps or tests or ≥3 Missing standards or ≥3 Acceptance criteria.	Submitted QCP is missing: 1 - 2 Steps or tests or 1-2 Missing standards or 1-2 Acceptance criteria.	Submitted QCP is very detailed, indicating all steps, tests, standards, inspections criteria and interventions. Zero deviations recorded.
		2.2.4. List of deviations from the ESKOM specification		**10**	No list of deviations was declared; with a detrimental impact, technically unacceptable deviations or exclusions from the ESKOM Specification.	List of deviations were declared, however the specification has detrimental impact, technically unacceptable deviations or exclusions from the ESKOM Specification.	List of a few deviations were declared, with nondetrimental impact, technically acceptable, with few recommendations to conform to ESKOM specifications.	No list of deviations was declared. All specifications are met and technically acceptable and no exclusions; all conform to ESKOM specifications.

Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)	Totally deficient (0)	Non-compliant (2)	Compliant with associated qualifications (4)	Compliant (5)
		TOTAL:	**100**					

TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

In Table 4 identify the TET members allocated to review/evaluate each Qualitative criterion (minimum 2 evaluators per criteria / sub-criteria)

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5	TET 6
1	X	X	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**	**TET 4**	**TET 5**	**TET 6**
1.1	X	X	X	X	X	X
1.2	X	X	X	X	X	X
2.1	X	X	X	X	X	X
2.2	X	X	X	X	X	X

3.5 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.5.1 Risks

Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	**N/A**

Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	**Unavailability of the cation vessel due to the replaced tekapor defects**
2.	**Unreliable rubber-lining installed during the execution of the scope of work (SoW)**

3.5.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	**N/A**

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	**Unreliable tekapor/Sinert base during operation**
2.	**Unreliable rubber-lining during operation**

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Rirhandzu Chuma	Auxiliary System Engineer	
Munene Losaba	Seniour Auxiliary System Engineer	
Gift Nkuna	Auxiliary Engineering Manager	
Sivuyile Khwezi	Seniour Mechanical Technician	
Biko Mukhomi	Seniour Supervisor Mechanical Technician	
Keneth Matloga	Mechanical Maintenance Manager	

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
February 2025	0.0	Rirhandzu Chuma	To stipulate technical requirements for the evaluations during the tendering process for the tekapor/Sinert base repairs/replacement scope at Matimba Power Station
September 2026	0.1	Rirhandzu Chuma	Updated TES for rectifications before sending out for tender enquiries.

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

Munene Losaba

Gift Nkuna

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.