Eskom	Strategy	Peaking

Title: **Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Acacia Power Station Enclosure Refurbishment**

Unique Identifier:	**150A/3920-D**
Alternative Reference Number:	**N/A**
Area of Applicability:	**Generation Engineering**
Documentation Type:	**Strategy**
Revision:	**1**
Total Pages:	**14**
Next Review Date:	**N/A**
Disclosure Classification:	**CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE**

CONTENTS

Page

1. INTRODUCTION 3

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES 3

2.1 SCOPE 3
2.1.2 Purpose 3
2.1.3 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 4
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 4
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 PRE-AWARD DUE DILIGENCE FOR TECHNICALLY COMPLIANT TENDERERS 5
3.4 RISK-BASED DUE DILIGENCE AND DEFERRED MANDATORY COMPLIANCE PRIOR TO AWARD 6
3.5 TET MEMBERS 7
3.6 MANDATORY EVALUATION CRITERIA 8
3.7 QUALITATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA SCORING TABLE 8
3.8 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 9
3.9 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES 12
3.10 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS 13
3.10.1 Risks 13
3.10.2 Exceptions / Conditions 13

4. AUTHORISATION 14

5. REVISIONS 14

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM 14

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 14

TABLES

Table 1: Core TET Members 7
Table 2: Optional TET Members 7
Table 3: Mandatory Evaluation Criteria 8
Table 4: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria 8
Table 5: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria 9
Table 6: TET Member Responsibilities 12
Table 7: Acceptable Technical Risks 13
Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Risks 13
Table 9: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions 13
Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions 13

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

Acacia Power Station was commissioned in 1976 to support the grid with electricity, voltage stability and being the off-site supply for Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. At the LOPP challenge on 23 July 2024 it was highlighted that the decommissioning dates for Acacia and Port Rex Power Stations will be extended from 2026 to 31 March 2030.

Given the envisaged low load factors of these stations and the need to optimise future capital expenditures, the proposed LOPP strategy emphasizes sustaining these stations by prioritising safety and statutory compliance projects, supported by appropriate inspections, maintenance, and repairs regime.

The content of this document therefore provides the minimum requirements for a Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for the corrosion protection coating and waterproofing systems of steel components of the generator and turbine enclosure, air intake structures, exhaust stack, MCC, Busbar, Fuel storage tanks and critical plant, to ensure continued availability of the units until the 2030 decommissioning of Acacia Power Station.

This document establishes the Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for the evaluation of tenderers that will be submitting in response to the advertised tender.

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 Responsibility
- Accept / Unacceptable Qualifications

2.1.2 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.

2.1.3 Applicability

This document is applicable to Acacia 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] 240-168966153: Generation Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

[2] 240-53716726: Technical Scoring Form

[3] 240-53716712: Technical Evaluation Results

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

[4] 150A/3920 Technical Specification (ECC3) for Acacia Power Station Enclosure Refurbishment

[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
OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
PSS	Pumped Storage Scheme
QCP	Quality Control Procedure
SACPCMP	South African Council for the Project and Construction Management Professions
SHE	Safety, Health and Environmental
SoW	Scope of Work
TES	Technical Evaluation Strategy
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

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 this procedure.

Professionally Registered Engineering Practitioner (PREP): The PREP is responsible to manage the execution and adherence to this 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.

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.

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.**

3.3 PRE-AWARD DUE DILIGENCE FOR TECHNICALLY COMPLIANT TENDERERS

Tenderers who achieve the minimum technical threshold of **70% or above** in the qualitative technical evaluation **(3.2)** shall undergo a **risk-based due-diligence verification** prior to any contract award. This due-diligence stage forms part of the deferred mandatory compliance process.

- The Employer will issue a **written Due Diligence Notice** to the highest-ranked qualifying tenderer (or to the next highest-ranked tenderer, where 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.

- The tenderer must submit all requested due diligence documents within **five (5) calendar days** of the notice.
- The Employer may undertake any necessary verification actions, including but not limited to:
  - Interviews with proposed key personnel
  - Site or plant inspections
  - Reference checks
  - Direct verification with OEMs or recognised certification bodies
  - The Employer may conduct interviews, site/plant inspections, reference checks, or OEM confirmations as part of verification.
- Where justified, the Employer may grant a **one-time short extension** (e.g., up to **3 calendar days**) at its sole discretion. Any extension will be **consistently applied** and **recorded** for audit purposes.

3.4 RISK-BASED DUE DILIGENCE AND DEFERRED MANDATORY COMPLIANCE PRIOR TO AWARD

To safeguard the integrity of the appointment process, the Employer defers most mandatory compliance verifications to the pre-award stage.

Only the **compulsory site visit** is mandatory at tender closing. All responsive tenders will proceed to qualitative technical. Tenderers scoring **70% or above** in the qualitative technical evaluation shall be subject to **due diligence** prior to contract award. The Employer will issue a written request to the highest-ranked qualifying tenderer (or next in rank, as needed), requiring submission of the following within **five (5) calendar days** (without limitation):

- Certification as an **authorised applicator** for paint, corrosion protection, or waterproofing coating systems (issued by OEM or recognized industry authority e.g., SAPMA, NACE, or equivalent)
- Any additional compliance documents specified in the tender schedule.
- Confirmation of **key personnel** qualifications and availability
- Evidence of **equipment/facilities** and quality controls
- Any other mandatory compliance documents specified in the tender schedule

Failure to submit complete, accurate, and satisfactory evidence within the timeframe will result in **disqualification**. The Employer reserves the right to:

- Verify all submitted information through inspections, reference checks, interviews, or OEM confirmations
- Reject any submission found to be **materially inaccurate or misleading**
- Proceed to the **next qualifying tenderer**

A one-time short extension (up to 3 calendar days) may be granted at the Employer's sole discretion, applied consistently and recorded for audit purposes.

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.

3.5 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) in Table 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.

3.6 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	Capability Constraint

3.7 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 • 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.

3.8 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.	**Structural Engineering Criteria**			**100%**	
	1.1	References of relevant work experience: Provide, min. 3 projects, verifiable references and sources of evidence from the product supplier (or similar suppliers) that applicator/contractor have successfully applied (external) corrosion protection/waterproofing coating system to plant/equipment equal to the surface areas as defined in the enquiry and Scope of Work (SOW) as well as cutting out, removal/replacement and welding of steel members/sections and plates within the last 5 years 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	Work Experience & Referee List Works Information		30%
	1.2	Product Application and uses experience: Supply of the latest revisions of the specified Material Product technical Data Sheets and Material Safety Data Sheets which shall contain the following as a minimum: Present under the following headings. • A description of the generic type of product of each component in the system. • Recommended and non-recommended uses. • Service temperatures and chemical resistance limits. • Further surface preparation procedures, such as surface cleaning and profiling of the above	Works Information		20%

		substrate shall be for the responsibility of the applicator/contractor. The surface preparation methods are to be provided in the method statement as requested further below in this document. • Application conditions and details of each of the components of the system including, spreading rate of primers and topcoats. • The thicknesses of the coatings. • Primer and topcoat over-coating times, compatibility, application temperatures, dilutions, application techniques and curing times. • Curing time of complete system.			
	1.3	Detailed Method Statement: • Substrate surface preparation and coating applications conditions. • Repair procedure in the event of damage during application. • Quality control steps, testing and interventions aligned to the method statement. • Recording the specified/required environmental conditions. Repair procedure for steel plate replacement as per WI.	Works Information		20%
	1.4	Quality Control Plans (QCP): Quality Control Plans (QCP) shall be submitted at the tender stage and shall detail all inspections and tests with acceptance criteria required to control the quality during the application process and shall include • Surface preparation. • Steelwork to replace steel plates i.e., welding on-site etc. • Environmental parameters. • Coating properties. • Coating product batch and equipment calibration certificates. • Application visual and continuity tests/inspections.	Works Information		10%

	1.5	Resource: Key Personnel: Provide CVs of all key personnel • Project manager/Construction manager, • Site Agent/Engineer • Certified Fabricators/Applicators All with at least 5 years of relevant experience. Construction manager to be registered as a Professional Construction Project manager with SACPCMP.	Works Information		10%
	1.6	Project Organization: Proposed organogram showing organisation structure for the works and interrelation with Head office and Site team.	Organogram		5%

	1.7	Scheduling:
		Understanding of the complete Works (Scope):
		Programme (schedule) inclusive of all works associated with the scope for each unit i.e.
		• Unit 1 (aligned to the allocated time allowed as per the contract)
		  ○ Exhaust Stack
		  ○ Air Inlet Structure
		  ○ Turbine Engine Section A
		  ○ Turbine Engine Section B
		  ○ MCC
		  ○ Bus Bar
		• Unit 2, etc….
			Schedule inclusive of all works associated with the Works.		5%

				TOTAL: 100	

3.9 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Key: X = Mandatory; O = Optional

Table 6: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5	TET 6	TET 7	TET n
1	X	X	X	O				
2	X	X	X	O				
Qualitative Criteria Number	**TET 1**	**TET 2**	**TET 3**	**TET 4**	**TET 5**	**TET 6**	**TET 7**	**TET n**
1.1	X	X	X	O				
1.2	X	X	X	O				
1.3	X	X	X	O				
1.4	X	X	X	O				
1.5	X	X	X	O				
1.6	X	X	X	O				
1.7	X	X	X	O				

3.10 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

3.10.1 Risks

Table 7: Acceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	The Contractor provides a letter stating technical deviations or no technical deviations

Table 8: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Contractor's timelines (schedules) not as per the Works Information
2.	Contractor has not work with corrosion protection systems before as the applicator.
3.	Contractor has never been the main contractor

3.10.2 Exceptions / Conditions

Table 9: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	Building contractor with strong experience in structural steel and steel roof sheeting

Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	No reference to corrosion protection system products and understanding its application processes
2.	Scheduling/Program of works errors i.e., not indicating lead time for material to site
3.	Program not aligned to allocated outage time per unit.

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

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

N/A

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.