Eskom	Strategy	Peaking

Title:	**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Remedial Works at Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme**	Unique Identifier:	**31A/4868-F**
		Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
		Area of Applicability:	**Generation Engineering**
		Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
		Revision:	**1**
		Total Pages:	**16**
		Next Review Date:	**N/A**
		Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

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 4
2.2.1 Normative 4
2.2.2 Informative 4
2.3 DEFINITIONS 4
2.3.1 Classification 4
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS 4
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 5
2.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS 5

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY 5

3.1 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING 5
3.2 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING 5
3.3 TET MEMBERS 6
3.4 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA 6
3.5 QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORING TABLE 6
3.6 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 8
3.7 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING MEASURES 10
3.8 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES 13
3.9 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS 14
3.9.1 Risks 14
3.9.2 Exceptions / Conditions 14

4. AUTHORISATION 16

5. REVISIONS 16

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM 16

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 16

TABLES

Table 1: Core TET Members 6
Table 2: Optional TET Members 6
Table 3: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria 6
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria 6
Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria 8
Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria - Scoring Measures 10
Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities 13
Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks 14
Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks 14
Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions 14
Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions 14

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

This document establishes the Technical Evaluation Strategy for the evaluation of tenders that will be submitted in response to the Drakensberg Pump Storage Scheme (DPSS) Remedial Works enquiry.

The scope is inclusive of the following:

LIFT SHAFT:

Maintenance Works consisting of sealing of water leaks, replacing gutters and downpipes in the Lift Shaft.

Inspection of dewatering and inwatering pipe supports as well as cable racks and producing reports.

MACHINE HALL:

Maintenance Works consisting of establishing a drainage system along the roof of the Machine Hall cavern, repairing of damaged walls, and cleaning and unblocking drainage lines.

EXPLORATORY TUNNEL:

Maintenance Works consisting of replacing corroded vertical and horizontal steel supports to sewer pipe with new steelwork and replacing corroded light brackets and cable ladders with new steelwork.

Workshop & Stores

The works required at stores entail removal of decommissioned aircon units and bricking up of openings, waterproof plastering as well as painting of damaged areas. The tenderer shall also replace some damaged doors at the stores building.

This document seeks to provide clear mandatory and qualitative evaluating criteria that will be used during technical evaluations. The document has been developed in accordance with the Eskom Technical Evaluation Procedure 240-48929482.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

This document covers the tender evaluation requirements that will be applied during the technical evaluations to evaluate the proposals received from the market. The Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy (TES) defines the following with regards to this project.

- Mandatory Evaluation Criteria
- Qualitative Evaluation Criteria
- Technical Evaluation Team (TET) Members Responsibilities
- Acceptable & Unacceptable Qualifications

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 Drakensberg Power Station only.

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 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] 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form

[3] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results

2.2.2 Informative

[4] 160A-1547 Scope of Works for Remedial Works at Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme

[5] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems

[6] 240-53114190 Internal Audit Procedure

[7] 240-141007195 Electronic Signature Usage Policy

[8] 240-156280553 Procedure for signing documentation electronically using the Eskom Electronic Signing System

2.3 DEFINITIONS

Definition	Description
Tender	Refers to a written or electronic offer, tender, bid, quotation or proposal made by a supplier, in a prescribed form according to the issued enquiry, for the provision of assets, goods, works or services, and/or disposals (Investment Recoveries).

2.3.1 Classification

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

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ECSA	Engineering Council of South Africa
N/A	Not Applicable
PSS	Pumped Storage Scheme
QCP	Quality Control Procedure
SHE	Safety, Health and Environmental
SoW	Scope of Work
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

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.

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Engineering Manager: All Engineering Managers throughout Eskom shall ensure that all staff, in their respective areas understand and adhere to the technical evaluation procedure.

Professionally Registered Engineering Practitioner (PREP): The PREP is responsible to manage the execution and adherence to the evaluation procedure. Typically, on New Build projects the PREP role is fulfilled by the Lead Discipline Engineer (LDE) and on existing asset projects the PREP role is fulfilled by the relevant System Engineer/Plant Engineer.

Technical Evaluation Team (TET) member: The delegated technical representatives/end users/engineers/technical specialists who are responsible to review and evaluate technical aspects of the tender documentation as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy. The TET members need to comply with the requirements as stipulated in the [13] 240-106871290: Technical Evaluation Team Member Appointment Letter Template.

2.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

[9] 240-53716746: Tender Technical Evaluation Report Template

[10] 240-53716712: Tender Technical Evaluation Results Form Template

[11] 240-53716726: Tender Technical Evaluation Scoring Form Template

[12] 240-53716769: Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy Template

[13] 240-106871290: Technical Evaluation Team Member Appointment Letter Template

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING

Tenderers shall submit all documentation and evidence as specified in **Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria**. These criteria shall be evaluated on a compliance basis (Yes/No).

- Failure to meet any mandatory requirement at tender closing shall result in disqualification from further evaluation.
- Tenderers who **do not meet all mandatory criteria** shall **not proceed to the technical (qualitative) evaluation stage.**

3.2 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA ON TENDER CLOSING

Tenderers who meet all mandatory criteria shall be evaluated against the Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria, as defined in the tender documentation.

- Evaluation shall be based on a weighted scoring system.
- A **minimum threshold score of 70%** must be achieved to be considered technically acceptable.

The Employer reserves the right to:

- Request further clarification or substantiating evidence during this stage.
- Disqualify the tenderer if:
  - Adequate evidence is not provided, or
  - Submitted information is materially inaccurate or misleading, regardless of the initial score.

The Employer reserves the right to verify any information submitted by tenderers, through both desktop review and physical verification measures including, but not limited to, interviews with proposed key personnel, site or plant inspections, reference checks, and direct confirmation with OEMs or recognised

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.

certification bodies. Any tenderer whose submission is found to contain false, materially inaccurate, or misleading information shall be disqualified irrespective of the technical score achieved. Where the highest-ranked qualifying tenderer is disqualified on this basis, the Employer shall proceed to the next-ranked qualifying tenderer and repeat the verification process, continuing sequentially until a compliant tenderer is confirmed or the tender is cancelled

3.3 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: Core TET Members

The full-time core technical evaluation team will consist of the following team members (in-line with the Tender Engineering Evaluation Procedure, 240-48929482).

3.4 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	The Tenderer attends a compulsory site clarification meeting.	As per Technical Specification	Tenderer's must assess the site conditions, constraints and submit his tender accordingly

3.5 QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORING TABLE

During the tender evaluations, Table 4 shall be used by the TET members to score each criterion on a scale of 0 to 5.

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Score	Percentage	Description
5	100	**COMPLIANT** • Meet technical requirements and • No foreseen technical risk(s)in meeting technical requirements
4	80	**COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS** Meet technical requirement(s) with, • Acceptable technical risk and/or • Acceptable exceptions and/or

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.

		• 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.		

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.

3.6 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.	**Tenderer's Experience**			**30%**	
	1.1	References of relevant work experience: The tenderer shall demonstrate experience on similar projects by submitting five or more completed projects within the last five years from the date of tender closing on of the following categories: • Structural concrete repairs • Structural steel works The list **must** indicate: • Project Name • Contactable reference (phone number, email, etc.) • Detail description of work performed. • Project Value (only for scope performed) • Project Start and End Date These must be completion letters or reference letters from the previous clients.	Work Experience & Referee List Works Information		100%
2.	**Technical Approach & methodology**			**30%**	
	2.1	Provide a high-level method statements for the execution of the works. This must include the following as minimum: • Rope Access Methodology • Water ingress remediation • Installation of gutters, downpipes and weepholes drilling • HDPE Butt welding procedure	Works information		100%

		• NDT Testing • Maintaining potable water supply during the cleaning of the buffer tank and replacing of the pipe • Inspection & Reporting on defects. • Concrete repairs. • Concrete repairs in areas requiring rope access and scaffolding etc. • Installation of structural steelwork • Temporary works			
3.		**Quality Management**		**10%**	
	3.1	Tenderers provide a quality control plan for the works, material approval procedures and quality assurance for concrete and structural steel works.			100%
4.	**Provide CVs and qualifications of Key Personnel**			**20%**	
	4.1	Construction Manager			25%
	4.2	Pr Eng / Pr Tech Eng Civil/ Structural			25%
	4.3	Structural steel Foreman			20%
	4.4	Concrete Foreman			20%
	4.5	Organogram			10%
5.	**Programme & resourcing**			**10%**	
	5.1	Provide feasible programme showing critical path, sequencing, hold points, resourcing plan and the duration for the execution of works.	Works information		100%
				TOTAL: 100%	

3.7 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – SCORING MEASURES

Table 6: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria - Scoring Measures

Criteria No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Criteria sub-Weighting	Range	Score
1.1	Tenderer's Experience	30	No projects submitted; OR projects unrelated to the Scope of Works	0
			Less than three (3) projects submitted and are inline with the Scope of Works	2
			Three (3) to five (5) projects submitted and are in line with the Scope of Works	4
			More than five (5) projects submitted and are in line with the scope of works.	5
2.1	Technical Approach & Methodology	30	No method statement provided	0
			Method statement provided but incomplete, partially detailed and has major deviation with the scope of works	2
			Method statement provided detailed but has minor deviation with the scope of works	4
			Comprehensive, project-specific methodology with risk controls, testing regimes, and best-practice detailing.	5
3.1	Quality Management	10	QCP submitted but addresses none of relevant tasks OR no QCP submitted	0
			High level QCP submitted with major deviations of the works to be done	2
			QCP submitted with minor deviations of the tasks required for conducting works and all the inspections required, but showing all work activities, procedures, risks and intervention points	4

			Detailed QCP addressing all tasks required for conducting the works and all the inspections required, showing the intervention points, check sheets/check lists for work activities and procedures	5
4.1	Construction Manager	5	CV missing OR person not proposed or no proof of registration is provided	0
			CV provided but the candidate is registered as a candidate with SACPCMP	2
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with SACPCMP and has less than three (3) years' experience post registration.	4
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with SACPCMP and has more than three (3) years' experience post registration.	5
4.2	Pr Eng / Pr Tech Eng Civil/ Structural	5	CV missing OR person not proposed or no proof of registration is provided	0
			CV provided but the candidate is registered as a candidate with ECSA	2
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with ECSA and has less than three (3) years' experience post registration.	4
			CV provided and the candidate is professionally registered with ECSA and has more than three (3) years' experience post registration.	5
4.3	Structural steel foreman	4	No CV provided or resource not proposed	0
			CV provided and the resource have less than 5 years' experience	2
			CV provided and the resource has five (5) to ten (10) years' experience	4
			CV provided and the resource has more than ten (10) years' experience	5
4.4	Concrete Works foreman	4	No CV provided or resource not proposed	0
			CV provided and the resource have less than 5 years' experience	2
			CV provided and the resource has five (5) to ten (10) years' experience	4
			CV provided and the resource has more than ten (10) years' experience	5
4.5	Organogram	2	The tenderer does not submit the organogram	0

			The tenderer submitted the organogram, or the structure is not relevant to the SOW	2
			The tenderer submitted the organogram in line with the SOW and shows the links and direct reports on the organogram	4
			The organogram shows all the Key personnel, and the roles indicated and shows the links and direct reports on the organogram	5
5.1	Programme & resourcing	10	No programme OR schedule provided i.e. Total deficiency AND non-compliance to the key measures	0
			Partial deficiency OR non-compliance to the key measures	2
			Partial deficiency AND compliance to the key measures	4
			Complete compliance to the key measures	5
	Total	100		

3.8 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Key: X = Mandatory; O = Optional

Table 7: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1	X	X	X	O
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**	**TET 4**
1.1	X	X	X	O
2.1	X	X	X	O
3.1	X	X	X	O
4.1	X	X	X	O
4.2	X	X	X	O
4.3	X	X	X	O
4.4	X	X	X	O
4.5	X	X	X	O
5.1	X	X	X	O

3.9 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.9.1 Risks

Table 8: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	The tenderer provides a clear, structured deviation list indicating minor technical deviations that do not affect performance, safety, or durability of the works.
2.	The tenderer proposes subcontracting of non-critical or specialist portions of work (e.g., minor repairs, access works), provided that subcontractors are suitably qualified and managed.
3.	Minor sequencing or scheduling differences that do not impact the overall project duration or critical path.

Table 9: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	The tenderer or proposed key personnel lack demonstrated experience in similar works
2.	Method statements lack sufficient detail, omit critical activities (e.g., rope access procedures, water ingress control), or present unsafe or impractical approaches.
3.	Programme that is not feasible, omits critical activities, or underestimates durations and lead times.

3.9.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 10: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Tender submission includes clearly stated assumptions that do not conflict with the Scope of Works and can be validated during due diligence.
2.	Tenderer proposes alternative methods that achieve the same performance

Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description

1.	Scheduling/Program of works errors i.e., not indicating lead time for material to site
2.	Alternative proposals submitted without sufficient technical justification

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.