

 Eskom	Instructions	Hendrina Power Station
---	--------------	------------------------

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for the Supply and Delivery of Antiscalant Chemical for Cooling Water and Ash Water System as and when Required for a Period of 5 Years at Hendrina Power Station**

Document Number: 380-136656

Alternative Reference Number: N/A

Area of Applicability: **Engineering**

Functional Area: **All**

Revision: **0**

Total Pages: **13**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **Controlled Disclosure**

Compiled by



**R. Tsotetsi**

System Engineer

Date: 08/01/2024

Functional Responsibility  
(Engineering)



**L. Kubheka**

Aux Eng Manager (Acting)

Date: 08/01/2024

Functional Responsibility  
(Chemical Services)



**J. Moola**

Chemical Service Manager

Date: 09/01/2025

Authorised by



**I. Manwatha**

Engineering Manager

Date: 2025/01/09

**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.

## **Contents**

<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 .....	4
2.3. Definitions.....	4
2.3.1. Classification .....	4
2.4. Abbreviations.....	5
2.5. Roles and Responsibilities .....	5
2.6. Process for Monitoring .....	5
2.7. Related/Supporting Documents .....	5
<b>3. Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1. Technical Evaluation Method .....	5
3.1.1. Mandatory Criteria.....	5
3.1.2. Qualitative Criteria.....	6
3.2. Technical Evaluation Threshold .....	10
3.3. TET Members.....	10
3.4. TET Member Responsibilities .....	11
3.5. Foreseen Acceptable / Unacceptable Qualifications.....	12
3.5.1. Risks .....	12
3.5.2. Exceptions / Conditions.....	12
<b>4. Authorization .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5. Revisions .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6. Development Team .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7. Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>13</b>

### **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**

An open enquiry invite will be issued calling for tenderers to participate in the tender process for the supply and delivery of anti-scalant chemical for cooling water and ash water system as and when required for a period of 5 years at Hendrina Power Station. This document sets out the method and criteria that will be used to evaluate the tenders that will result from this open enquiry invite.

## **2. Supporting Clauses**

### **2.1. Scope**

The scope of this document is to capture the technical tender evaluation strategy which will be used to evaluate the bidders for the supply and delivery of anti-scalant chemical for cooling water and ash water system as and when required for a period of 5 years at Hendrina Power Station. The scope of the project is as described in scope document for the supply and delivery of anti-scalant chemical for cooling water and ash water system as and when required for a period of 5 years at Hendrina Power Station.

#### **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 the Tender Technical Evaluation Team for the supply and delivery of anti-scalant chemical for cooling water and ash water system as and when required for a period of 5 years at Hendrina 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] 240-48929153: 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.

### **2.2.2. Informative**

- [1] ISO 9001 Quality Management Systems
- [2] 32-1033: Eskom Procurement and Supply Chain Management Policy.
- [3] 32-1034: Eskom Procurement and Supply Chain Management Procedure.

## **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
PS	Power Station
SD&L	Supplier Development and Localization
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

## 2.5. Roles and Responsibilities

As per 240-48929153: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure.

## 2.6. Process for Monitoring

N/A

## 2.7. Related/Supporting Documents

None

# 3. Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy

## 3.1. Technical Evaluation Method

The technical evaluation criteria are divided into two, There is the qualitative criteria and the quantitative criteria.

### 3.1.1. Mandatory Criteria

The tenderer needs to pass the mandatory evaluation before being evaluated qualitatively.

Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation to use criteria
Transportation of Dangerous Goods Certificate	Driver certificate for dangerous goods transportation	Required by law

### 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.

### 3.1.2. Qualitative Criteria

The weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications.

The technical criteria and weighting are broken down as follows:

- Criteria 1: Company Experience = 40%
- Criteria 2: Key individual responsible for the work = 15%
- Criteria 3: Quality Control Plan = 10%
- Criteria 4: Lead Times = 15%
- Criteria 5: MSDS = 20%

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tenderer's ability to meet the above requirements. Tenderers need to have an overall weighted score of 70% or more to technically qualify for further evaluation, which are not covered in this scope. However, in a case where no tenderer meets the 70% threshold, tenders who obtain 65% will qualify for further evaluation.

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of the tenders against the specifications.

The scoring method will be as follows for the qualitative evaluation criteria:

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 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>
<b>Note 1:</b> The scoring table does not allow for scoring of 1 and 3. <b>Note 2:</b> Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy		

#### CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

**Table 3: Criteria 1: Qualitative technical evaluation criteria**

1	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
1.	Criteria 1: Company Experience			40	
	1.1	<p><b>Previous experience on supplying and delivering of chemical.</b></p> <p><u>Scoring Criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>X \geq 5</math> number of completed work = <b>5 points</b></li> <li>• <math>2 &lt; X \leq 4</math> number of completed work = <b>4 points</b></li> <li>• <math>0 &lt; X \leq 2</math> number of completed work = <b>2 points</b></li> <li>• <math>X = 0</math> number of completed work = <b>0 points</b></li> </ul> <p>*Note: 'x' is the number of completed work.</p>	<p>Signed, completion certificate of previous work of similar scope with the following information: Name of company where work was executed, Project, Description, Contract period &amp; Contact person.</p> <p>NB!! PO number without the PO document will not be accepted</p>		40

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
2.	<b>Criteria 2: Key Individuals Responsible for Contract Work (Technical Support on chemical performance)</b>			15	
	2.1	<p><b>Chemical Analyst: Minimum N6 relevant qualification and 3 years' experience as a quality controller.</b></p> <p>Scoring criteria:</p> <p>X ≥ 3Yrs of experience = <b>5 points</b>  X = 2 Yrs. of experience = <b>4 points</b>  X = 1 Yrs. of experience = <b>2 points</b>  X = 0 Yrs. of experience = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>*Note: 'x' is the number of years of experience.</p>	<b>Certified</b> copy of certificate and CV showing years of experience with traceable references.		15
3.	<b>Criteria 3: Quality Control Plan</b>			10	
	3.1	<p><b>Quality Control Plan (QCP) Showing all the points</b></p> <p>Scoring criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QCP includes all necessary steps to evaluate quality and includes reference to supporting documents and intervention points (i.e. hold, witness etc.) = <b>5 Points</b></li> <li>QCP include all steps but no does not reference supporting documents and intervention points (i.e. hold, witness etc.) = <b>4 Points</b></li> <li>QCP is generic (does not include all steps) = <b>2 Points</b></li> <li>QCP is not submitted, or documents submitted does not qualify as QCP = <b>0 Points</b></li> </ul>	Drafted QCP indicating all hold points and steps taken to ensure that quality is controlled.		10



	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description		Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
4.	<b>Criteria 4: Lead time for delivery of chemicals from the time the order is received.</b>			<b>15</b>	
	4.1	<b>Lead times</b>  Scoring Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>X \leq 48</math> hours = <b>5 points</b></li> <li>• 48 hours &lt; <math>X \leq 72</math> hours = <b>4 Points</b></li> <li>• 72 hours &lt; <math>X \leq 96</math> hours = <b>2 Points</b></li> <li>• <math>X &gt; 96</math> hours = <b>0 Points</b></li> </ul> *Note: 'x' is the lead time in hours.	Signed letter with company letterhead confirming that chemicals are to be delivered at Hendrina Power Station within 48 hours of the placing of an order.  Confirmation letter to be used as a legal document forming part of the NEC.		15
5.	<b>Criteria 5: MSDS (Material Safety datasheet)</b>			<b>20</b>	
	5.1	<b>MSDS (Material Safety Datasheet)</b>  Scoring criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSDS includes all necessary information as stipulated in the OSH Act = <b>5 Points</b></li> <li>• MSDS submitted in insufficient (does not include all information) = <b>4 Points</b></li> <li>• MSDS is generic (does not indicate all chemical properties to verify the chemical to be supplied) = <b>2 Points</b></li> <li>• QCP is not submitted, or documents submitted does not qualify as QCP = <b>0 Points</b></li> </ul> *Note: <u>ALL</u> material datasheet for chemicals in the scope must be submitted if the MSDS submitted are not complete tenderer will receive a score of zero (0) in this criterion.	MSDS with the company letterhead stipulating all the chemical properties as per the OSH Act,		20

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

### 3.2. Technical Evaluation Threshold

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is 70%. However, in a case where no tenderer meets the 70% threshold, tenders who obtain 60% will qualify for further evaluation.

### 3.3. TET Members

**Table 1: Core TET Members**

<b>TET number: Section to be evaluated</b>	<b>TET Member Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
TET 1	Lwazi Kubheka	System Engineer (EDWL)
TET 2	Khetha Madlala	System Engineer
TET 3	John Selepe	Senior Supervisor

### 3.4. TET Member Responsibilities

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

No Mandatory Technical Evaluation			
Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
Qualitative Technical Evaluation			
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3
1.1	X	X	X
2.1	X	X	X
3.1	X	X	X
4.1	X	X	X
5.1	X	X	X

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

### 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.	Contractor not able to take accountability for contracted works
2.	Contractor unable to provide required certifications and hand-over

#### 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.	Technical submission does not address entire scope of work required

**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

## 4. Authorization

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
John Selepe	Senior Advisor
Junaid Moola	Chemical Services Manager
Itani Manwatha	Group Engineering Manager
Relebohile Tsotetsi	System engineer (AED)
Lwazi Kubheka	Auxiliary Engineering Line Manager (Acting)

## 5. Revisions

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
January 2025	0	Relebohile Tsotetsi	New Document

## 6. Development Team

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

- Relebohile Tsotetsi
- John Selepe

## 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.