

	<b>Work Instruction</b>	<b>Kusile Power Station</b>
---	-------------------------	-----------------------------

Title: **Kusile Power Station Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Contactless Fingerprint Scanner**
 Document Identifier: **KUS-20250331**

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Kusile Power Station**

Functional Area: **Engineering**

Revision: **1**

Total Pages: **11**

Next Review Date: **March 2028**

Disclosure Classification: **Controlled Disclosure**

<b>Compiled by</b>	<b>Supported by</b>	<b>Functional Responsibility</b>	<b>Authorized by</b>
<b>System Engineer</b>	<b>Manager</b>	<b>C &amp; I Engineering Manager</b>	<b>Engineering Group Manager</b>
Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES</b>	<b>3</b>
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 Enquiry	3
2.3.2 Tender	4
2.4 CLASSIFICATION	4
2.5 ABBREVIATIONS	4
2.6 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	4
2.7 PROCESS FOR MONITORING	4
2.8 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	4
<b>3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	5
3.2 WEIGHTED SCORECARD	5
3.3 TET MEMBERS	5
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	9
3.7 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	10
3.7.1 Risks	10
3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions	10
<b>4. AUTHORISATION</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. REVISIONS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>11</b>

## TABLES

Table 1: Assessment scorecard	5
Table 2: TET Members	5
Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	7
Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities	9
Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks	10
Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks	10
Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	10
Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions	10

1.

**Controlled Disclosure**

## **1. Introduction**

2. An invite will be issued for interested Contractors to submit proposals for contactless fingerprint scanner project. This document sets out the method and criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenders that will be submitted from this pre-qualification invite.

## **2. Supporting Clauses**

### **Scope**

3. This strategy defines the technical evaluation team (TET) and their responsibilities regarding this request for proposals. The mandatory and qualitative evaluation criterion used to evaluate the submitted tenders is also included in this report.

### **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.

### **Applicability**

4. This document shall apply to Eskom Kusile Power Station.

## **Normative/Informative References**

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

### **Normative**

1. KUS-202411111 Kusile Power Station Contactless Fingerprint Scanner Scope of Work
2. 240-48929482 Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
3. 474-59 Internal Audit Procedure

### **Informative**

- [1] 32-1034 Eskom Procurement Policy
- [2] 240-48929482 Tender Engineering Evaluation Procedure
- [3] 240-55410927 Cyber Security Standard for Operational Technology

## **Definitions**

### **Enquiry**

A competitive or non-competitive request for information, interest, quotations or proposals made to a supplier, a group of suppliers or the market at large.

### **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.

## **Tender**

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

## **Classification**

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

## **Abbreviations**

<b>6. Abbreviation</b>	<b>7. Description</b>
CIDB	Construction Industry Development Board
CV	Curriculum Vitae
ITP	Inspect and Test Plan
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
QCP	Quality Control Plan
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

## **Roles and Responsibilities**

The roles and responsibilities are as per the Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure [2].

## **Process for monitoring**

8. The Internal Audit Procedure [3] shall monitor this procedure.

## **Related/Supporting Documents**

1. Not applicable.

## **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 Technical Evaluation Strategy

#### 3.1 Technical Evaluation Threshold

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

#### 3.2 WEIGHTED SCORECARD

10. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tenders against the Employer's requirements. The following scoring method will be used. The individual scores from the TET members on each evaluation criteria will be added and averaged to obtain a final score.

**Table 1: Assessment scorecard**

SCORE	PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION
5	100	<b>COMPLIANT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Meet technical requirement(s) AND;</li><li>No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.</li></ul>
4	80	<b>COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Meet technical requirement(s) with;</li><li>Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR;</li><li>Acceptable exceptions AND/OR;</li><li>Acceptable conditions.</li></ul>
2	40	<b>NON-COMPLIANT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR;</li><li>Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR;</li><li>Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR;</li><li>Unacceptable conditions.</li></ul>
0	0	<b>TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE</b>

#### 3.3 TET memberS

**Table 2: TET Members**

11. TET number	12. TET Member Name	13. Designation
TET 1		Control & Instrumentation Engineer
TET 2		Control & Instrumentation Engineer
TET 3		Project Manager
TET 4		Electrical Engineer

#### **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**

Tender must submit a signed letter stating full compliance to the scope of works.

### **3.5 Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria**

14. Requirements from the tenderer:

1. An undertaking is required that resources identified would not be changed on award of the Contract.
2. The CV's of key personnel should have experience which is comparable in nature to the works specified in this tender.
3. Proof of experience must be provided in a form of CV's, certified copies of ID, qualifications and professional registration, where applicable, **not** older than 3 months.
4. It is a requirement that the key personnel have good communication skills in the English language.
5. Where no information is offered by the Tenderer no points shall be scored.

**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.

**Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria**

No	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (100%)	Scoring			
				0	2	4	5
1	Company Experience						
1.1	Comprehension of Scope	Submitted a comprehensive method statement covering all areas of scope of works	50	No method statement provided and not all costs are included (Quoted <60% of the list)	Submitted a high-level method statement covering all areas of scope of works and the costing covers 60- 79% of the list	Submitted a comprehensive method statement covering all areas of scope of works with acceptable technical risk, and the costing covers 80-95%	Submitted a comprehensive method statement covering all areas of scope of works with no foreseeable technical risk, and the costing covers > 95%
1.2	Company Track Record & Organogram	<p>Past projects related to access control systems, especially those similar in scale and complexity, that have been successfully completed within the past 10 years.</p> <p>Client references demonstrating successful outcomes.</p> <p>The following information must be submitted for each project for evaluation purposes:</p> <p>a) Name of company where project was executed</p> <p>b) Contact person</p> <p>c) Completion certificate</p>	10	No completed projects of similar nature	<p>One completed projects of similar nature.</p> <p>References and completion certificates included</p>	<p>Two completed projects of similar nature.</p> <p>References and completion certificates included</p>	<p>Three or more completed projects of similar nature.</p> <p>References and completion certificates included</p>

**Kusile Power Station Dirty Drains Recovery System Request  
for Proposals Technical Evaluation Strategy**

Unique Identifier: **KUS-20250331**

Revision: **1**

Page: **8 of 11**

<b>2</b>	<b>Technical Information</b>						
2.1	System Design	<p>The system design must include, as a minimum, the following points, in accordance with the required output:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Integration and Interoperability</li> <li>b) Power requirements</li> <li>c) Anti Spoofing</li> <li>d) Operational Requirements</li> <li>e) Data Security</li> <li>f) Environmental Tolerance</li> <li>g) Data capturing speed</li> </ul>	30	Fails to meet design requirements.	Meets design requirements with clear documentation but only 1 – 3 minimum points have been covered.	Meets design requirements with clear documentation but only 4 – 5 minimum points have been covered.	<p>Meets or exceeds required design requirements with a well-documented approach.</p> <p>All minimum points have been covered.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>Project Execution Plan</b>						
	Execution Plan	<p>Detailed project schedule, with realistic times frames, with all major phases of the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Conceptual design</li> <li>b) Detailed design</li> <li>c) Reviews and approvals</li> </ul> <p>Ensure that the milestones follow a logical sequence, with each phase building on the previous one.</p>	10	No schedule provided	Submitted a full schedule with start and completion date to complete the scope	Submitted a full schedule with start and completion date to complete the scope. The plan shows some level of effort, and it includes some skill and equipment required to complete the scope	Submitted a full schedule with start and completion date to complete the scope. The plan shows proper level of effort, and it includes skill and equipment required to complete the scope.



### 3.6 TET Member Responsibilities

**Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities**

15. Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4
1.1	X	X	X	X
1.2	X	X	X	X
2.1	X	X	X	X
3.0	X	X	X	X

### **3.7 Foreseen Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications**

#### **3.7.1 Risks**

**Table 5: Acceptable Technical Risks**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Description</b>
2.	Alternative solutions with similar or improved performance

**Table 6: Unacceptable Technical Risks**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Description</b>
1.	Exclusions to the specified scope

#### **3.7.2 Exceptions / Conditions**

**Table 7: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Description</b>
1.	Acceptable deviation with technical justification

**Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Description</b>
1.	Deviation without technical justification

#### **4. Authorisation**

This document has been seen and accepted by:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
	Risk and Assurance
	Engineering Manager
	Maintenance Manager

#### **5. Revisions**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Compiler</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
	1		First Issue

#### **6. Development team**

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

a)

#### **7. Acknowledgements**

17. None.

#### **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.