

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation
Strategy for Repair Of Damaged
+38.340m Level Platform At
Surge Bin 2**

Unique Identifier:

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Documentation Type: **Strategy**

Revision: **3.0**

Total Pages: **15**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED
DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by



Redz Pillay
Civil Engineer

Date: 03.05.2022

Functional Responsibility



Maxwell Makhanya
Senior Technologist

Date: 03/05/2022

Authorised by pp



Gerhard Ferreira
**Acting Auxiliary Engineering
Manager**

Date: 03/05/2022

CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES.....	3
2.1 SCOPE	3
2.1.1 Purpose	4
2.1.2 Applicability.....	4
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES.....	4
2.2.1 Normative	4
2.2.2 Classification	4
2.3 ABBREVIATIONS.....	4
2.4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	4
2.5 PROCESS FOR MONITORING.....	5
2.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....	5
3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	5
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD.....	5
3.3 TET MEMBERS.....	6
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	7
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	8
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES.....	12
FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS.....	13
4. AUTHORISATION.....	14
5. REVISIONS	14
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	14
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	14
APPENDIX A: LIST OF TENDER TECHNICAL RETURNABLES.....	15

TABLES

Table 1: TET Members	6
Table 2: Optional TET Members	6
Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	7
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	8
Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities.....	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

A collapse of a portion of the +38.340m level platform occurred on 05.04.22 due to excessive overloading of coal deposits. The damaged beams and checker-plate has been removed, except 1 x 6.3m beam which is still in place (in a deformed and twisted state) and the area barricaded. Other beams that require replacement due to stability concerns have been identified via a rope access inspection. This SoW details the safe repair of the platform.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The *Contractor* is responsible to firstly do a thorough inspection and assessment of the platform, which includes beams, checker plate, support structure/frame and its associated bracing members and connections at the +38.340 m level for planning and execution purposes.

The *Contractor* also inspects the B stream, after Permits have been obtained, to assess if the condition of the beams. The 406x140x30 UB adjacent to the chutes, it is suspected to be corroded, however the *Contractor* is required to assess.

The *Contractor* immediately informs the *Project Manager* of the additional structural members and/or connections that require replacement or repair.

From a visual inspection on site from the platform and via rope access, structural members that were affected by the incident was identified. The *Contractor* is responsible to replace the damaged structural members, and associated connections. The required structural members identified from the visual and rope access inspection to be replaced, but not limited to this list, are as follows:

A stream:

- 2 x 7.7m Beam – 610 x 229 x 101 UB – Beam No. 1
- 2 x 6.3m Beam – 406x140x30 UB (Both still in place, however 1 is twisted and deformed state) – Beam no. 2
- 1 x 6.3m Beam – 406x140x30 UB (removed from position) – Beam no. 2
- 10 x 2.7m Beams – 200 x100 x 22 IPE – Beam no. 4
- 5 x 1.15 m Beams – 200 x100 x 22 IPE – Beam no. 4
- 2 x 1.210 m Beams – 152 x 76 channel section – Beam no. 8
- 3 X 1.15 m Beams – 203 x133x25 UB – Beam no. 6
- 1 x 1.97 m Beam – Beam no. 5
- Checker plate for the affected area
- All affected connections (plates, bolts and welding)

B stream:

- 1 x 6.3m Beam – 406x140x30 UB (still in place, suspected to be corroded) – Beam no. 2

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.

2.1.1 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 Kendal Power Station only.

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] 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
- [2] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems
- [3] 32-1034 Eskom Procurement Policy
- [4] Scope Of Works Repair Of Damaged +38.340m Level Platform At Surge Bin 2

Definitions

Definition	Description
Tender	A tender refers to an open or closed competitive request for quotations / prices against a clearly defined scope / specification

2.2.2 Classification

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

2.3 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
EDWL	Engineering Design Work Lead
LDE	Lead Discipline Engineer
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

N/A, as per 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.

2.5 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

None

2.6 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

None

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications. Tenderers need to have a weighted score of 70% overall or more to technically qualify for further evaluation.

The technical criteria and weighting is broken down as follows:

- a) Civil Engineering: 100%

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the Engineering requirements. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tender submission against the specifications and Employer's requirements.

The scoring method will be as follows:

SCORE	PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION
5	100	COMPLIANT <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meet technical requirement(s) AND;• No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meet technical requirement(s) with;• Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR;• Acceptable exceptions AND/OR;• Acceptable conditions.
2	40	NON-COMPLIANT <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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

The evaluation scores will be weighted as follows according to disciplines:

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.

Engineering (100%)	
Civil Engineering	100%
TOTAL (100%)	
Overall minimum threshold for qualification (70%)	

3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

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

3.3 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) in Table 1:

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Redhavan Pillay	Civil Engineer, Auxiliary Engineering
TET 2	Maxwell Makhanya	Senior Civil Engineer, Auxiliary Engineering
TET 3	Kellie Kwinika	Civil Engineer, Auxiliary Engineering
TET 4	Madumetja Mashaba	Maintenance Department

The part time/support team member shall be required to fill in a technical evaluation form, if their names are marked as mandatory (X), next to a criterion. The part time/ support team member may not be required to fill in a technical evaluation form, if their names are marked as optional (O) next to a criterion, but shall assist the main members where necessary. These members may be as follows in Table 2:

Table 2: Optional TET Members

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.

3.4 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 3: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

A CIDB rating of 3CE is Mandatory, however this will be evaluated under the commercial section.

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	Civil Engineering			100	
	1.1	<p>Organograms and CV's of key personnel which reflects site supervisor with minimum of 5 years' experience.</p> <p>Key personnel includes qualified Professional Civil Engineer/Technologist and skilled artisans i.e Boilermaker, Fitters, Riggers, Civil artisan and Site Supervisor. Each individual to have relevant experience in the similar repair work and certified copies of relevant qualification included in CV's.</p> <p>I. Demonstrate how the key personnel have worked on similar repair work and have relevant experience.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Resources, as per the organogram, have relevant experience in repair of steel structures and organograms submitted = 5 • Key Resources have relevant experience in repair of steel structures, no organogram submitted = 4 • Organogram submitted, but Key Resources experience in assessment and repair of steel 	<p>As per the List of Technical Tender Returnable:</p> <p><i>"Organograms and CV's of all personnel, confirming that the personnel have the relevant construction experience"</i></p>		20

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Repair Of
Damaged +38.340m Level Platform At Surge Bin 2**

Unique Identifier:

Revision: **3.0**

Page: **9 of 15**

		<p>structures omitted = 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key resources do not have relevant experience in repair of steel structures and no organograms submitted = 0 			
	1.2	<p>Method statement for the works including the construction approach and construction methodology which demonstrates understanding and compliance with the full scope of work.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method statement details fully how scope will be met and provides comprehensive methodology and details of approach for supervision and close-out as listed below = 5; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Details provided for inspection and assessment of damaged platform, connections and takes into account access ○ Rigging study submitted, inclusive of temporarily supporting platform • Method statement describes how scope will be met and includes minor details on approach for supervision and close-out as listed below = 4; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minor details provided for inspection 	As per entire Works Information		40

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Repair Of
Damaged +38.340m Level Platform At Surge Bin 2**

Unique Identifier:

Revision: **3.0**

Page: **10 of 15**

		<p>and assessment of damaged platform, connections and takes into account access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Basic rigging study submitted • Method statement does not contain methodology of approach but contains high level descriptions of how construction supervision will be conducted OR Technical proposal reiterates scope of works = 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No details of inspection and assessment of damaged platform, connections and takes into account access. No rigging study submitted. The M.S merely stating that the SoW will be executed • No submission made = 0 			
	1.3	<p>Relevant company experience (track record). Has the Tenderer submitted a list of traceable references, which adequately proves that the Tenderer has completed at least two (2) contracts successfully of similar scope in the last five (5) years?</p> <p>References include the following as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project name 	<p>As per the List of Technical Tender Returnable: <i>"Relevant company experience (track record) i.e. List of traceable references which adequately proves that the Tenderer has at least completed two (2)</i></p>		30

**Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Repair Of
Damaged +38.340m Level Platform At Surge Bin 2**

Unique Identifier:

Revision: **3.0**

Page: **11 of 15**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client • Description of work performed • Project cost (only for scope performed) • Project start and end date <p>Name, designation and contact number of reference person.</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) contracts over the past five (5) years = 5 • One (1) Contract in the past five (5) years = 4 • One (1) contract in the past ten (10) years only = 2 • No previous experience = 0 	<i>contracts successfully of similar scope in the last five (5) years"</i>		
	1.4	<p>Has the tenderer has provided a programme showing activities of the entire project work to be done by the contractor?</p> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program submitted = 5 • No Program = 0 			10

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 5: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1.				
1.1	X	X	X	X
1.2	X	X	X	X
1.3	X	X	X	X
1.4	X	X	X	X

FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

It is anticipated that various risks, exceptions and conditions will be identified during the clarification and negotiation process. Each of those will be considered and evaluated individually to determine whether they are acceptable, unacceptable or whether suitable mitigation measures can be agreed upon.

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation	Signature
Gerhard Ferreira	Acting Auxiliary Engineering Manager	

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
April 2022	1.0	R. Pillay	Final document
April 2022	2.0	R. Pillay	Maintenance included in TET member list
May 2022	3.0	R.Pillay	Updated after rope inspection

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

- R. Pillay

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.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF TENDER TECHNICAL RETURNABLES

- Mandatory

CIDB Rating, however that will be evaluated under commercial.

- Qualitative

Item	Title	Details
1.1	CV's & qualifications of key personnel	Item identifies relevant experience profile of individuals to execute the Scope.
1.2	Method statements	Item identifies approach to the requested scope of works and assists in evaluating the method which will be applied to execute the scope of works.
1.3	Relevant experience	Experience profile to demonstrate level of experience of the tenderer.
1.4	Program	Items identifies if the tenderer has scoped for the entire works and within the required timeframe for execution.

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.