

	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Engineering</b>
---	-----------------	--------------------

Title:	Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy for Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme <b>Bronze Wearing Parts</b>	Unique Identifier:	<b>31A/11111-P1-C</b>
		Alternative Reference Number:	<b>27265637, 27265823, 27265825 &amp; 27265826</b>
		Area of Applicability:	<b>Engineering</b>
		Documentation Type:	<b>Strategy</b>
		Revision:	<b>1</b>
		Total Pages:	<b>16</b>
		Next Review Date:	<b>N/A</b>
		Disclosure Classification:	<b>CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE</b>

## **CONTENTS**

	<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 .....	4
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES.....	4
2.2.1 Normative.....	4
2.2.2 Informative .....	4
2.3 DEFINITIONS .....	4
2.3.1 Batch Definitions .....	4
2.3.1.1 Batch 1.....	4
2.3.1.2 Batch 2.....	5
2.3.1.3 Batch 3.....	5
2.3.2 Classification .....	5
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS .....	6
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	6
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING.....	6
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS .....	6
<b>3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD.....	6
3.2 TET MEMBERS .....	7
3.3 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	8
3.4 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	9
3.5 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES.....	12
3.6 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS.....	13
3.6.1 Risks .....	13
3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions .....	15
<b>4. AUTHORISATION .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>5. REVISIONS.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>16</b>

## **TABLES**

Table 1: <i>Goods</i> to be supplied .....	3
Table 2: Batch 1 Quantities .....	4
Table 3: Batch 2 Quantities .....	5
Table 3: Batch 3 Quantities .....	5
Table 4: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Guideline .....	7
Table 5: TET Members.....	7
Table 6: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	8
Table 7: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria.....	9
Table 8: TET Member Responsibilities.....	12
Table 9: Acceptable Technical Risks (Scoring 4 out of 5) .....	13
Table 10: Unacceptable Technical Risks (Scoring 2 out of 5).....	14
Table 11: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions (Scoring 4 out of 5) .....	15
Table 12: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions (Scoring 2 out of 5) .....	15

## **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**

Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme consists of four pumped storage units. Each unit has a main unit shaft as one of the major components. The shaft rotates by means of water flowing through a runner of the turbine, which turns the rotor of the generator and generate electricity to the national grid of South Africa. The flow rate of the water is controlled with guide vanes in conjunction with a governor system.

The governor systems consist of various wearing components to allow the guide vane servomotors, operating ring and guide vanes to move. These wearing components are planned to be replaced during the upcoming Turbine Refurbishment outages planned for Drakensberg PSS. New wearing components are required to be procured to be able to perform the Turbine Refurbishment outages.

This document discusses the tender technical evaluation strategy for the supply and delivery of bronze wearing parts.

## **2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES**

### **2.1 SCOPE**

The scope of work includes the following:

- The *Supplier* manufactures, inspects, supplies and delivers the following components to the *Employer's* site (Eskom Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme):

**Table 1: Goods to be supplied**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Qty.</b>	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Reference Drawing*</b>
1	84	Bush - Bottom Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5899
2	84	Bush - Middle Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5898
3	84	Bush - Top Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5894
4	168	Thrust Collar Wear Strip Halves – Guide Vane	18.48/5911
5	1000	Twist-off Bolt – Guide Vane Thrust Collar Insert	18.48/6235
6	168	Bush – Guide Vane Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5902
7	26	Horizontal Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5900
8	26	Vertical Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5901
9	20	Bush – Governor Servomotor Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5903
10	10	Bush – Governor Servomotor Piston	18.48/6338

*\*Refer to the latest revision of these drawings. Drawings will be made available to the Supplier by the Employer, subject to the signing of an NDA.*

- The *Supplier* repairs all defects.

The technical specification of the *goods* is thoroughly discussed in the Technical Specification Document 31A/11111-P1-A.

#### **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.

### **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.

### **2.1.2 Applicability**

This document applies to the Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme Turbine System. The project applies to the Turbine Engineering Department, Drakensberg Mechanical Maintenance Department, Materials Management Department, Procurement Department, Outage Department and Drakensberg Pumped Storage Scheme.

## **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] Doc. No. 31A/11111-P1-A - Technical Specification – DRP – Bronze Wearing Parts
- [3] All drawings as referenced in Doc. No. 31A/11111-P1-A - Technical Specification – DRP – Bronze Wearing Parts

### **2.2.2 Informative**

- [4] N/A

## **2.3 DEFINITIONS**

### **2.3.1 Batch Definitions**

#### **2.3.1.1 Batch 1**

Batch 1 includes one quarter of all components, including the spares as listed in Table 2 below. This list of quantities is drafted to be ready for the first Turbine Refurbishment outage at Drakensberg Unit 3, which is currently planned to start on 20 August 2025 and therefore need to be on site on 20 July 2025.

**Table 2: Batch 1 Quantities**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Qty.</b>	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Reference Drawing</b>
1	24	Bush - Bottom Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5899
2	24	Bush - Middle Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5898
3	24	Bush - Top Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5894
4	48	Thrust Collar Wear Strip Halves – Guide Vane	18.48/5911
5	280	Twist-off Bolt – Guide Vane Thrust Collar Insert	18.48/6235
6	48	Bush – Guide Vane Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5902
7	8	Horizontal Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5900
8	8	Vertical Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5901
9	8	Bush – Governor Servomotor Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5903
10	4	Bush – Governor Servomotor Piston	18.48/6338

## **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.

### 2.3.1.2 Batch 2

Batch 2 includes one quarter of all components, excluding the spares as listed in Table 3 below. This list of quantities is drafted to be ready for the second Turbine Refurbishment outage at Drakensberg Unit 4, which is currently planned to start on 2 October 2025 and therefore need to be on site on 2 September 2025.

**Table 3: Batch 2 Quantities**

Item	Qty.	Item Description	Reference Drawing
1	20	Bush - Bottom Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5899
2	20	Bush - Middle Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5898
3	20	Bush - Top Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5894
4	40	Thrust Collar Wear Strip Halves – Guide Vane	18.48/5911
5	240	Twist-off Bolt – Guide Vane Thrust Collar Insert	18.48/6235
6	40	Bush – Guide Vane Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5902
7	6	Horizontal Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5900
8	6	Vertical Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5901
9	4	Bush – Governor Servomotor Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5903
10	2	Bush – Governor Servomotor Piston	18.48/6338

### 2.3.1.3 Batch 3

Batch 3 includes the remainder of all components as listed in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Batch 3 Quantities**

Item	Qty.	Item Description	Reference Drawing
1	40	Bush - Bottom Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5899
2	40	Bush - Middle Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5898
3	40	Bush - Top Guide Vane Journal	18.48/5894
4	80	Thrust Collar Wear Strip Halves – Guide Vane	18.48/5911
5	480	Twist-off Bolt – Guide Vane Thrust Collar Insert	18.48/6235
6	80	Bush – Guide Vane Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5902
7	12	Horizontal Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5900
8	12	Vertical Wear Plate – Operating Ring	18.48/5901
9	8	Bush – Governor Servomotor Link Straight & Eccentric Pins	18.48/5903
10	4	Bush – Governor Servomotor Piston	18.48/6338

### 2.3.2 Classification

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

**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.

## **2.4 ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Description</b>
Doc. No.	Document Number
N/A	Not Applicable
PSS	Pumped Storage Scheme
QCP	Quality Control Plan
Rev.	Revision

## **2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **Tender Technical Evaluation Team Members:**

These members are responsible to study the Technical Specification, develop the Tender Engineering Evaluation Strategy as well as to review and evaluate technical aspects of the tender documentation as per the Tender Engineering Evaluation Strategy.

## **2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING**

N/A

## **2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

All referenced documents as per Section 2.2.

# **3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY**

## **3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD**

A weighted score-card approach is used to evaluate the technical compliance of tenders against the technical specification. Tenders need to have a minimum weighted score of 70% to technically qualify for further evaluation. The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on the tender's ability to meet the technical requirements.

Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (gatekeepers) are 'must meet' criteria. These criteria shall not be weighted or scored any points but shall be assessed on a Yes/No basis as to whether or not the criteria are met. An assessment of 'No' against any criteria shall technically disqualify the tender and further evaluation against the Qualitative Criteria will therefore not be performed.

Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria is a weighted evaluation used to identify the highest technically ranked tender after determining that all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria have been met. The Qualitative Evaluation Criteria are weighted to reflect the relevant importance of each criterion. The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for the tender to be consider from the technical perspective is 70%.

**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 5: Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Scoring Guideline**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>	<b>Definition</b>
5	100	COMPLIANT Meet technical requirement(s) AND; No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS Meet technical requirement(s) with; Acceptable technical risk(s) 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.

Note 2: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.

**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.

### 3.2 MANADATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 7: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
3.3.1	Material Confirmation.	<p>The bronze wearing parts' material specification is: CuSn11P as per BS EN 1982:2024 [either Ingot CuSn11P-B (CB481K) or Casting CuSn11P-C (CC481K) to be used].</p> <p>The <i>Supplier</i> submits written confirmation of CuSn11P (as per BS EN 1982:2024) availability to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance as part of the tender returnable documents. The submission of the material availability is mandatory.</p> <p>A detailed quote stating the material as CuSn11P (as per BS EN 1982:2024) will also be accepted by the <i>Employer</i>.</p>	<p>The Drakensberg wearing components as per Table 1 has the following material specification: CuSn11P as per BS EN 1982:2024 [either Ingot CuSn11P-B (CB481K) or Casting CuSn11P-C (CC481K) to be used].</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>



### 3.3 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Table 8: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
3.4.1	<p><b>Draft Measurement Check Sheets.</b></p> <p>The draft measurement check sheets must be aligned to all sizes on the drawings for all components listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Refer to Document 31A/11111-P1-A for the requirements regarding the dimensions.</p> <p>Acceptable and unacceptable risks for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.1.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> provides draft measurement check sheets to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance as part of the tender returnable documents.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>	20%	N/A
3.4.2	<p><b>Proof of similar work executed and capabilities.</b></p>		25%	N/A
3.4.2.1	<p><b>Proof of similar services provided.</b></p> <p>The <i>Supplier</i> supplies a list of services provided, similar to supplying of the components as listed in Table 1, as evidence. The similar services provided should cover at least 80% of the specified dimensions of the items as listed in Table 1.</p> <p>Acceptable and unacceptable risks for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.1.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> supplies a list of phosphor bronze parts or guide vane thrust collars supplied to the <i>Employer</i> (or other companies), as part of the tender returnable documents, to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>		60%
3.4.2.2	<p><b>Capabilities.</b></p> <p>The <i>Supplier</i> supplies a company profile stipulating their capabilities as a company, including photos of the <i>Supplier's</i> workshop to indicate the company's capabilities which is in line with the scope of work.</p> <p>The <i>Employer</i> reserves the right to visit the <i>Supplier's</i> premises (including the premises of possible subcontractors) for evaluation purposes.</p> <p>Acceptable and unacceptable exceptions for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.2.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> submit a company profile, including photos of their workshop to indicate their capabilities as a company, as part of the tender returnable documents to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>		40%

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
<b>3.4.3</b>	<p><b>Proof of technical services company.</b></p> <p>The <i>Supplier</i> provides proof that the Engineering manufacturing and machining are provided by the company internally and not sourced out by a labour broker.</p> <p>Acceptable and unacceptable risks for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.1.</p> <p>The <i>Employer</i> reserves the right to visit the <i>Supplier's</i> premises (including the premises of possible subcontractors) for evaluating purposes.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> provides the proof to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance, as part of the tender returnable documents.</p> <p><b>Motivation:</b> A labour broker must not be used for this specialized service that is required. The <i>Supplier</i> must provide the technical services themselves.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>	15%	
<b>3.4.4</b>	<b>Quality control plan.</b>		15%	N/A
<b>3.4.4.1</b>	<p><b>Detailed quality control plan</b></p> <p>The <i>Supplier</i> submits a detailed Quality Control Plan (QCP) as part of the tender returnable documents to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance.</p> <p>The <i>Employer</i> reserves the right to revise the QCP after purchase order placement.</p> <p>Acceptable and unacceptable risks for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.1.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> submits a detailed Quality Control Plan (QCP) as part of the tender returnable documents to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance.</p> <p>The QCP must include the high-level scope as per the Technical Specification (Document 31A/11111-P1-A):</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>		30%
<b>3.4.4.2</b>	<p><b>Method statement</b></p> <p>The method statement must include the <i>goods</i> as per the Technical Specification (Document 31A/11111-P1-A).</p> <p>The high-level <i>goods</i> as described below are included in the Technical Specification (Document 31A/11111-P1-A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Contractor</i> manufactures, inspects, supplies and delivers the components as listed in Table 1 to the <i>Employer's</i> site (Eskom Drakensberg PSS).</li> <li>The <i>Contractor</i> repairs all defects.</li> </ul> <p>Acceptable risks for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.1.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> submits a method statement to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance as part of the tender returnable documents.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>		50%

	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting (%)	Criteria Sub Weighting (%)
<b>3.4.4.3</b>	<p><b>Intervention points</b></p> <p>The QCP must include intervention points (including hold and witness points) indicating the quality control planned for this project.</p> <p>A hold point is a predetermined stage beyond which work may not proceed without the attendance of the relevant personnel, as indicated on the QCP. Further work may not be carried out until the inspection or event has been completed and signed off by the relevant personnel, as indicated on the QCP.</p> <p>A witness point is a predetermined stage beyond which work may continue, provided that the relevant personnel, as indicated in the QCP, has been notified in writing of the witness point.</p>	<p>The <i>Supplier</i> submits intervention points (within the QCP) as part of the tender returnable documents to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>		20%
<b>3.4.5</b>	<p><b>Lead Time</b></p> <p>The <i>supplier</i> provides written confirmation of the lead time for each batch as part of the tender returnable documents for the <i>Employer's</i> acceptance.</p> <p>The lead time starts at Purchase Order placement and finishes when the <i>goods</i> are delivered by the <i>Supplier</i> and accepted by the <i>Employer</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Batch 1 lead time = 2 months or less</li> <li>• Batch 2 lead time = 3 months or less</li> <li>• Batch 3 lead time = 9 months or less</li> </ul> <p>The lead time specification for the delivery of the <i>goods</i> is as follows.</p> <p>Acceptable and unacceptable risks for this qualitative technical criterion can be found in Section 3.6.1.</p>	<p>The lead time specification for the delivery of the <i>goods</i> was determined to ensure readiness for the Turbine Refurbishment outages planned for Drakensberg PSS.</p> <p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>	20%	
<b>3.4.6</b>	<p><b>Deviations.</b></p> <p>The <i>Supplier</i> lists all their technical deviations from the Technical Specification document (31A/11111-P1-A). If there are none, the Supplier must clearly indicate this in writing for the <i>Employer's</i> review, as a non-response will be evaluated as non-responsive (Score = 0).</p>	<p>A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i>, without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.</p>	5%	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>100%</b>	N/A



### 3.4 FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS

#### 3.4.1 Risks

**Table 10: Acceptable Technical Risks (Scoring 4 out of 5)**

Risk	Description
1.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.1 – Draft measurement check sheets. The risk of the <i>Supplier</i> only submitting measurement check sheet drafts for some of the items as listed in Table 1, will be seen as an acceptable risk.
2.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.1 – Proof of similar services provided. The <i>Supplier</i> supplies a list of services provided, similar to supplying of the components as listed in Table 1, as evidence. The similar services provided should cover at least 70% of the specified dimensions of the items as listed in Table 1. It will be an acceptable risk if the proof of previous bronze wearing parts supplied has sizes of between 70% and 80% of the specified dimensions of the items as listed in Table 1.
3.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.2 – Proof of similar work executed. The <i>Supplier</i> provides photo evidence of similar work executed, similar to the specified dimensions of the items as listed in Table 1, as evidence for the <i>Employer's</i> acceptance.
4.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.3 – Proof of technical services company. The <i>Supplier</i> can be a technical services company (with a company profile as evidence for the <i>Employer's</i> acceptance), but sub-contracts the entire scope of work to a technically acceptable company as per the evaluation. A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i> , without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.
5.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.4.1 – Detailed quality control plan. The risk if the <i>Supplier</i> submit a basic QCP (Quality Control Plan) including the high level scope of work as described in qualitative technical criteria 4.2 will be acceptable.
6.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.4.2 – Method statement. The risk if the <i>Supplier</i> submit a detailed QCP (Quality Control Plan) including the entire method statement as per the scope of work in the Technical Specification (Document 31A/11111-P1-A).
7.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.5 – Lead time. It will be an acceptable technical risk if the <i>Supplier</i> provides written confirmation of the different batches to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance with the following lead times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Batch 1 lead time = 2 to 3 months</li> <li>Batch 2 lead time = 3 to 4 months</li> <li>Batch 3 lead time = 9 to 12 months</li> </ul>

**Table 11: Unacceptable Technical Risks (Scoring 2 out of 5)**

Risk	Description
1.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.1 – Draft measurement check sheets. The risk of a different measurement check sheet (compared to the components as listed in Table 1) being submitted by the <i>Supplier</i> is an unacceptable risk and will be assessed by the <i>Employer</i> to determine if the <i>Supplier</i> can score a 2 out of 5 for this criteria item.
2.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.1 – Proof of similar services provided. The <i>Supplier</i> supplies a list of services provided, similar to supplying of the components as listed in Table 1, as evidence. The similar services provided should cover at least 50% of the specified dimensions of the items as listed in Table 1. It will be an unacceptable risk if the proof of previous bronze wearing parts supplied has sizes of between 50% and 70% of the specified dimensions of the items as listed in Table 1.
3.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.2 – Proof of similar work executed. The risk of the <i>Supplier</i> submitting proof of work executed which is not similar to the components as listed in Table 1 is an unacceptable risk. The <i>Employer</i> will determine if the <i>Supplier</i> can score a 2 out of 5 for this criteria item.
4.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.3 – Proof of technical services company. The <i>Supplier</i> is not a technical services company, but sub-supplies the entire scope of work to a technically acceptable company as per the evaluation. A potential sub-supplier will be scored as per the evaluation criteria stipulated for the <i>Supplier</i> , without any exceptions, except if an exception is clearly stated.
5.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.4.1 – Detailed quality control plan The risk if the <i>Supplier</i> submit a QCP (Quality Control Plan) with a completely different scope of work will be seen as an unacceptable risk. The <i>Employer</i> will determine if the <i>Supplier</i> can score a 2 out of 5 for this criteria item.
6.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.5 – Lead time. It will be an unacceptable technical risk if the <i>Supplier</i> provides written confirmation of the different batches to the <i>Employer</i> for acceptance with the following lead times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Batch 1 lead time = 3 to 4 months</li> <li>• Batch 2 lead time = 4 to 5 months</li> <li>• Batch 3 lead time = 12 to 15 months</li> </ul> Any lead time duration above the listed duration above will be scored as a non-compliant returnable and therefore score 0 for this criterium.

### 3.4.2 Exceptions / Conditions

**Table 12: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions (Scoring 4 out of 5)**

Risk	Description
1.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.2 – Proof of similar work executed. The <i>Supplier</i> supplies a list of machining and manufacturing work executed, similar to the components as listed in Table 1, as evidence, without photo evidence of the specific project/s. This exception will be seen as an acceptable exception.
2.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.3 – Capabilities. It will be an acceptable exception if the <i>Supplier</i> supply a company profile as evidence of their capabilities, which is in line with the scope of work, without sending photos of their workshop.

**Table 13: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions (Scoring 2 out of 5)**

Risk	Description
1.	Refer to qualitative technical criteria number 3.4.2.3 – Capabilities. It will be an unacceptable exception if the tenderer supply photos of their workshop and/or a company profile as evidence of their capabilities, which is not in line with the scope of work.

#### **4. AUTHORISATION**

In addition to the title page, this document has been seen and accepted by:

#### **5. REVISIONS**

#### **6. 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.