

<b>Specification Reference</b>
FS301042
<b>Specification Title</b>
Insights on global food system risks and their implications for FSA
<b>Contract Duration</b>
<i>Five months</i>

This specification, which forms part of the Invitation to Tender (ITT), comprises of three individual sections: -

- A. SPECIFICATION:** An outline of the requirement
- B. PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE:** An estimated timetable for the procurement of the proposed requirement
- C. TENDER REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA:** Provides guidance to applicants on the information that should be included within tenders and on the evaluation criteria and weightings used by appraisers when assessing and scoring tenders

Tenders for FSA funded projects must be submitted through the FSA E-sourcing and contract management system, ECMS, using the following link: <https://food.bravosolution.co.uk/web/login.html>. Failure to do so may result in the tender response not being processed by the system or the response being automatically disqualified during the evaluation stage of the tender process.

# THE SPECIFICATION, INCLUDING PROJECT TIMETABLE AND EVALUATION OF TENDERS

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Food Standards Agency is a non-ministerial government department governed by a Board appointed to act in the public interest, with the task of protecting consumers in relation to food. It covers England, Wales and Northern Ireland and has offices in London, Cardiff, Belfast and York.

The Agency is committed to openness, transparency and equality of treatment to all suppliers. For science projects the final project report will be published on the Food Standards Agency website ([www.food.gov.uk](http://www.food.gov.uk)), and we encourage contractors to publish their work in peer reviewed scientific publications wherever possible.

In line with the Government's Transparency Agenda which aims to encourage more open access to data held by government, the Agency is developing a policy on the release of underpinning data from all of its science- and evidence-gathering projects. Underpinning data should also be published in an open, accessible, and re-usable format, such that the data can be made available to future researchers and the maximum benefit is derived from it. The Agency has established the key principles for release of underpinning data that will be applied to all new science- and evidence-gathering projects which we would expect contractors to comply with. These can be found at <http://www.food.gov.uk/about-us/data-and-policies/underpinning-data>.

**This study will gather, synthesise and analyse evidence and insights on global food system risks to 2030 from existing studies, reports and scans and draw out the key issues and their implications for the UK and for food safety and authenticity.**

This work is being commissioned through the FSA Chief Scientific Adviser's Strategic Evidence Fund which aims to develop strategic insight, understanding and capability to understand longer-term risks and opportunities to build FSA resilience and its ability to harness innovation.

## A. THE SPECIFICATION

### Introduction

The FSA wishes to develop its approach to identifying risks and issues across the food system. Our current and developing approaches to surveillance and horizon scanning provide us with some capabilities to identify specific new and emerging risks in the near- and medium-term. But they do not, on their own, deliver an informed and integrated view of the global food system and of systemic risks and issues over the next five to ten years. The development of such a capability is a medium-term objective and will support development of FSA's future strategy and contribute to our ambition of being an excellent, accountable and modern regulator.

The FSA has tasked its new Science Council to advise on '*What should the FSA do to improve its horizon scanning and its understanding of global food systems risks (and opportunities)?*'

In order to inform the Council's advice we are commissioning this study to gather, synthesise and analyse evidence and insights on global food system risks from existing studies, reports, scans and insights and to draw out the key issues and their implications for the UK and for food safety and authenticity.

There is a large body of evidence and insights from reports, studies, scans and other materials that consider or have relevance for global food system risks. However these do not always consider or focus on the food system, or consider it as a system; and they may not focus in the evidence or analysis on the issues and risks of most relevance to the UK and to the FSA (such as food safety and authenticity and their regulation, or impacts for and perspectives of UK consumers).

Further, while the existing body of work is extensive, little has emerged to guide the application of systems approaches/network science to the evaluation and management of food risks. There may be opportunities to apply learnings from other sectors to provide insights on the food system, food safety or its regulation (e.g. from finance, economics, other regulatory domains).

Further background to the FSA's ambitions in this area and the Science Council's role are set out in a paper for the FSA Board meeting in June 2017<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fsa170606.pdf>

## The Specification

Tenders are invited to carry out a desk-based study, and to participate in a workshop with the Science Council and relevant experts and stakeholders which will further elaborate the key issues and the implications for FSA, based on the study's findings.

### Part 1: Desk study and production of evidence report

The study will identify, synthesise and analyse evidence and insights from existing reports, studies, scans and other materials. It is not expected to include original primary research (but if the contractor has carried out such research they can draw on evidence or insights from that work).

The study should include relevant published and unpublished work. Applicants will need to set out their approach to identifying and accessing relevant materials, as well as to assessing their relevance and quality, and the confidence with which conclusions may be drawn from them with regard to FSA's areas of interest. They will also need to set out how they will identify and assess issues and their relevance to the UK and to food safety and authenticity.

The principal output will be a report to the Agency that will include the following:

- (i). A short executive summary setting out the key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- (ii). An explanation of how sources were identified and which were used (and not used) and why, where possible providing links to original material.
- (iii). An assessment of the relevance, strength and quality of its sources and the confidence which can be placed on their findings and on the conclusions which can be drawn from them with regard to the implications for the UK and for food safety and authenticity.
- (iv). A reasoned, evidenced assessment that identifies the key drivers in the global food system, the potential trends, changes or risks in the system, and the main implications of these drivers, changes and risks for the UK, focusing on implications for food safety and authenticity and their regulation, and impacts on and perspectives of UK consumers. This assessment should reflect what the evidence allows us to conclude with regard to the likelihood, plausibility or (un)certainly of these changes occurring (and to what timescale). It should include issues or impacts which may be unlikely or highly uncertain but which would have a significant impact should they occur.

The analysis should provide among other things a response to these questions:

1. *What are the key novel or emergent features of the potential future food system to 2030?*
2. *Which potential features, changes, trends or dynamics in the system have the most significance for the UK and why?*
3. *What are the main challenges and opportunities relating to food safety and authenticity in response to the issues identified in Q1 and Q2?*
4. *What sources of evidence can the FSA draw on to better understand, prioritise and respond to these issues?*
5. *What approaches and inputs could FSA have access to in order to implement an ongoing capability for horizon scanning and foresight?*

The final report will be 30-40 pages long (excluding annexes) and will be circulated in draft to a range of key experts and stakeholders in FSA and externally for peer review and to help identify and additional sources, insights. The FSA will identify these contacts and provide support for this consultation process. The contractor will then produce a final report, drawing on this input, by the end of month four.

Part 2. Participation in expert workshop to elaborate implications and recommendations for FSA

The successful contractor will participate in a one-day workshop with members of the FSA Science Council and relevant experts and stakeholders. This workshop will discuss the key issues and implications identified in the desk study report and elaborate possible actions and recommended actions for the FSA, based on the study’s findings. The contractor will need to participate in fully in the workshop.

The FSA will organise the workshop and write up its outcomes, working with the Science Council, but we will expect the contractor to contribute ideas to the planning of the workshop in order to identify useful inputs and maximise useful outputs from the discussion.

Other inputs

The successful contractor will work closely with the Science Council Chair (Professor Sandy Thomas), the Chair of the Council’s Working Group on horizon scanning (Professor John O’Brien) particularly in the early stage of the project, to develop the detail of the material to be sourced and used and of the approach. The contractor will also need to work with the independent peer reviewer(s) who will be identified by FSA to provide commentary on the draft report. Your tender and timeline should reflect this.

Outline of expected timeline

Submission of draft report	by end month 2
Iteration to refine draft report	Month 3
Submission of final report	Mid-month 4
Participation in workshop	Month 4 or 5
Finish	By end month 5

*If you believe a longer timescale is needed or can be justified in terms of producing a more robust and useful report, you can outline this as an alternative option but in any case this should complete in no more than six months.*

## B. PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE

Table 1 details an **estimated** project timetable for the project. Tenderers should however be aware that the Agency needs to acquire the evidence outlined in this ITT in a timely manner and you should justify your timings in your work plan.

TABLE 1. ESTIMATED PROJECT TIMETABLE	
EXPECTED DATE	INVITATION TO (ITT) TENDER
27 October 2017	Invitation to Tender (ITT) issued by the Agency
27 October 2017	ITT Clarification period opens*
10 November 2017	ITT Clarification period closes**
24 November 2017	Closing date for submission of ITT responses***
By 1 December 2017	Evaluation of ITT responses
By 8 December 2017	Appraisal panel meeting held to consider clarified ITT responses
By 15 December 2017	Tenderers notified of outcome of appraisal and preferred Tenderer identified
By 31 December 2017	Contract awarded and signed
1 January 2018	Project initiation meeting takes place and project commences
2 March 2018	Submission of initial draft report to FSA
13 April 2018	Submission of final report to FSA
April-May 2018 (TBC)	Participation in workshop with Council and invited experts
Within 2 weeks of workshop date	Submission of contribution to the workshop report

\* If a Tenderer wishes to raise any points of clarification over the procurement process, the actual project objectives or any other query these must be raised through the ECMS by the date specified.

\*\* Queries will not be answered after this date.

\*\*\* Submissions must be uploaded onto the ECMS before the closing date and time.

### **Further Information**

For any technical queries or issues regarding the use of ECMS please contact the eSourcing Helpdesk:

Phone: 0800 368 4850

Email: [help@bravosolution.co.uk](mailto:help@bravosolution.co.uk) .

For any points of clarification regarding this specification or the FSA's procurement procedures please submit through ECMS.

### **Closing Date**

Tenders should be submitted on ECMS **by the date specified on ECMS.**

**Tenders received after this time will not be considered or evaluated. Please allow sufficient time to upload your tender and all supporting evidence before the closing date.**

### **Notification of Submission of Tender**

On successfully submitting your tender you should see a popup box appear on the screen indicating that your tender has been successfully submitted. In addition you will receive an automatic email from ECMS with a reference code.

## **C. EVALUATION OF TENDERS**

The Tenderers Application consists of the:

- Technical envelope (80% of overall value), in which applicants should detail the approach, the work plan and their ability to undertake the work, and
- Financial envelope (20% of overall value), in which applicants should outline all costs to conduct the proposed work, and
- Any other relevant supporting information

Tenders will be evaluated by FSA internal appraisers and external experts using a numerical system. The table below shows the weightings that have been allocated to each section of the application form and these will be used by the appraisers:

**TABLE 2. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SUCCESSFUL TENDERER**

CRITERIA	PERCENTAGE WEIGHTINGS
<b>TECHNICAL CRITERIA – 80% overall Value</b>	Made up of
1. The approach/scope of work	20%
2. The plan and deliverables	20%
3. Organisational experience, expertise and staff effort	20%
4. Project and risk management	10%
5. Quality management, ethics, data protection, dissemination and sustainability	10%
<b>FINANCIAL CRITERIA – 20% overall value</b>	20%

### ***The Technical Envelope***

The Technical envelope is split in to 7 sections for evaluation. Guidance on how to complete each section is provided within the actual application form.

A numerical appraisal scoring system will be used to assess the information given in the Technical envelope of the tender. Appraisers will allocate a score of 0, 30, 60, 80 or 100 to each part of the Technical envelope, depending on the quality and relevance of evidence provided. The scores will then be subjected to the weightings given in Table 2.

All technical criteria will be evaluated as follows:

SCORE	DESCRIPTION FOR SCORE OF EACH CRITERIA
100	Tender fully meets or exceeds the criteria set
80	Tender would require minor modification but almost fully meets the criteria with only a few gaps in the evidence remaining
60	Tender would require some modification but addresses most of the criteria, but may not be detailed enough and/or has several gaps remaining
30	Tender would require significant modification due to significant gaps
0	Tender does not meet the specification or policy

If the applicant does not reach a minimum score of 30 in the technical evaluation they will be automatically eliminated from the process.

## ***The Financial Envelope***

The Financial envelope is split in to 5 sections. Guidance on how to complete each section is provided within the actual application form.

A numerical appraisal scoring system will be used to assess the information given in the financial envelope of the tender. Appraisers will allocate a score of 0, 30, 60, 80 or 100 to the financial envelope, depending on the quality and relevance of evidence provided. The scores will then be subjected to the weighting given in Table 2.

### **Requirement for the financial envelope**

Please complete the Finance template provided. Costs should be quoted excluding VAT for the purpose of comparison of tenders. The Agency's financial year runs from 1 April to 31 March. All costings should be recorded in line with this timescale.

### **Evaluation of the financial envelope**

#### **Financial criteria will be evaluated as follows:**

<b>SCORE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION FOR SCORE OF THE CRITERIA</b>
100	There is full justification for the costs and the overall resources are appropriate. The tender is the best value for money for the work proposed to meet the specific evidence requirement advertised
80	There is some justification for the costs and the overall resources requested. The tender is reasonable value for money for the work proposed to meet the specific evidence requirement advertised.
60	Limited rationale is given for the resources requested and/or the tender does not offer very good value for money, but is not poor value
30	The tender is relatively poor value for money with little/no justification for costs or resources requested.
0	The tender costs are not considered value for money and the applicant provided no rationale for costs or resources requested