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| ***Specification Reference*** |
| FS900244 |
| ***Specification Title*** |
| Monitoring and Evaluation Partner for PATH-SAFE |
| **Contract Duration** |
| November 2022 – June 2024 |

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

1. **SPECIFICATION:** An outline of the requirement
2. **PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE:** An estimated timetable for the procurement of the proposed requirement
3. **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](about:blank). 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 an independent Government department working across England, Wales and Northern Ireland to protect public health and consumers wider interest in food. We make sure food is safe and what it says it is.

The Agency is committed to openness, transparency and equality of treatment to all suppliers. As well as these principles, for science projects the final project report will be published on the Food Standards Agency website ([www.food.gov.uk](about:blank) ). For science projects we will encourage contractors to publish their work in peer reviewed scientific publications wherever possible. Also, 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. Data should be made freely available in an accessible format, as fully and as promptly as possible. Consideration should be given to data management as new contracts are being negotiated. Resource implications for this should be taken into account. The mechanism for publishing underpinning data should allow the widest opportunity to enable its re-use. Where possible, underpinning data should be included in the final project report. Where data are included in the final report in pdf format, they should also be published separately in a format that can be used for further analysis. Large data sets can be provided separately in an annex to the report, and published, where possible, alongside the final report online Where it is more appropriate to publish underpinning data in an existing database, archive, repository or other community resource, or for data to be saved in a specialist proprietary format, information will be provided on how the data can be accessed. There will be some circumstances where release of data may need to be restricted or anonymised for reasons of commercial and/or personal sensitivities.

The FSA’s overarching mission is food we can trust and its strategic priorities 2021-22 include ensuring food is safe. This includes protecting consumers from unacceptable risks which may arise in connection with the consumption of food (including risks caused by the way in which it is produced or supplied) and otherwise to protect the interest of consumers in relation to food.  This includes measures to reduce foodborne disease in the UK.

**A. THE SPECIFICATION**

The PATH-SAFE programme[[1]](#footnote-2) will pilot a national surveillance network, using the latest DNA-sequencing technology and environmental sampling to improve the detection, and tracking of foodborne human pathogens through the whole agri-food system from farm-to-fork.

The FSA wishes to appoint a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) partner for the PATH-SAFE programme running until June 2024. PATH-SAFE is a cross-government collaboration consisting of four workstreams and the successful supplier will work with the PATH-SAFE team, and specifically the PATH-SAFE Evaluation Lead advisor, to design and deliver M&E activity at both workstream and programme level. The M&E project will run until June 2024 and consist of 3 objectives:

* Objective 1: Design of M&E
* Objective 2: Process and Output monitoring & evaluation (workstream level + programme level)
* Objective 3: Programme level outcome evaluation + feasibility study for impact evaluation approaches

**Background**

The Pathogen Surveillance in Agriculture, Food and the Environment (PATH-SAFE) programme will develop a pilot national surveillance network, using the latest DNA-sequencing technology and environmental sampling to improve the detection, and tracking of foodborne human pathogens through the whole agri-food system from farm-to-fork.  The heart of this virtual network will be a new data system that will permit the analysis, storage and sharing of pathogen sequence and source data, collected from multiple locations across the UK by diverse government and public organisations[[2]](#footnote-3).  This single, user-friendly data system will enable rapid identification and tracking of foodborne pathogens, with the ultimate aims of improving public health and minimising the economic impact of outbreaks.

Foodborne disease (FBD) is a major public health risk with an estimated 2.4 million individual illnesses and more than 16,000 hospitalisations per year.  Most FBD is caused by a handful of pathogens which, in most cases, enter the food chain from farmed animals or the environment.  In addition to FBD, the agri-food supply chain also poses a risk for the transmission of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) as it is transmitted through food, animals, humans, or water.  The ability to detect and identify pathogens early and to accurately trace FBD outbreaks to their source are critical steps to improve public health and reduce the economic costs associated with them.

AMR exists in natural environments around the world, but a broad range of human, animal and agricultural activities is increasing its prevalence and therefore posing a potential health risk to people, animals, food sustainability and ecosystems. The role of the natural environment in the dissemination of AMR has received less attention than the human and veterinary medicine sectors yet is an important reservoir.  Unless this threat is understood and interventions are put in place, treatments for many common human and animal infections will fail, with an estimation that annual global death rates from resistant infections will rise to over 10 million per year by 2050. Consequently, there is an urgent need for environmental surveillance and action to minimise the ongoing development and spread of AMR.

For these reasons, various government departments already undertake surveillance activities to identify the pathogens causing an illness, to assess levels of contamination or trace the source and transmission pathways of FBD pathogens and AMR.  These activities are critical to effecting better control strategies, but recent advances in technology and data management offer the opportunity to create a step change in surveillance, to protect public health.  With this pilot project, we aim to significantly improve existing surveillance activities by testing if new technologies (e.g. whole genome sequencing (WGS)) and a national sampling database can make the diagnosis of pathogens more accurate, more rapid, and more efficient. The programme is keen to bring together and build on existing initiatives and to understand what the end-user really needs to improve how they work in this space.

**Overall aim of PATH-SAFE:**

* To pilot a better national surveillance system for the monitoring and tracking of foodborne disease (FBD) and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in the environment and agri-food system, taking a “One Health Approach”.

**Fund and Timelines:**

* The programme began in 2021 and will run to March 2024.
* The overall fund value is £19.2 million from phase 2 of the [Shared Outcomes Fund](about:blank).

**PATH-SAFE Workstreams:**

**Workstream 1: Establish a curated, national foodborne disease genomic data platform**

The UK is a recognised global leader in genomic database systems. We will utilise this existing expertise, working with academic colleagues and major ‘big data’ stakeholders to create a ‘user-friendly’ platform for the rapid interrogation and archiving of genomic data. We will build on ‘dashboard’ approaches to create powerful, but easily understood, interfaces that can be used by decision makers (e.g., food inspectors or healthcare professionals). A key element of the data platform development will be allowing the integration of sample data with other existing data sources to create new knowledge.

### **Workstream 2: Develop a pilot infrastructure for regular, multi-location sampling**

The programme will develop a pilot infrastructure to provide high granularity WGS data from regular, multi-location sampling of wastewater (at primary production sites and environmental water sources); and food products.  This work will build on existing networks and infrastructure in each of the four nations, such as that already in place for water sampling, including recent UK-wide COVID-19 testing initiatives.

### **Workstream 3: Understand the feasibility of using portable diagnostics as inspection tools**

The programme will investigate the technology readiness levels (TRL) of new portable diagnostics. The results of these studies will inform options for in-field testing and/or development. The co-design of applications with end-users (e.g., policy teams/inspectorates) will be critical to ensure real-world applicability. The workstream will also undertake a pilot study investigating the feasibility of using wastewater approaches with complimentary diagnostic technology to understand Norovirus outbreaks in a contained setting.

### **Workstream 4: Develop a pilot environmental AMR Surveillance system**

The overall aim in WS4 is to create a scientific and evidence-based understanding of the nature and extent of AMR in the environment and the drivers that influence this. This pilot will deliver an agreed and tested methodology for environmental AMR surveillance, as well as an environmental IT platform that will enable a scaled-up surveillance programme to be undertaken. This IT platform will be designed and developed so that it will have the capability to integrateAMR surveillance data collected from humans and animals so that the ambition of having a UK One Health surveillance system for AMR can be realised.

**Workstream Status:**

This specification is for a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) partner for the remainder of the PATH-SAFE programme; however, each workstream is at a different stage of development so supplier will need to factor this into their planning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Workstream** | **Status** |
| 1 | Discovery began in May 2022 to conclude in September, tendering for delivery of the system to commence in September for delivery in January 2023. |
| 2 | Delivery began in May 2022. |
| 3 | Delivery expected to begin in Summer and Autumn 2022. |
| 4 | Delivery underway. |

**The Monitoring and Evaluation Specification**

1. **Summary**

Tenders are invited to carry out monitoring and evaluation activity across the PATH-SAFE programme. The overall aim for the M&E work is to build the evidence base and knowledge around the delivery of the PATH-SAFE pilot to inform decisions and adaptive management about the delivery of the pilot during and following its operation, as well as to understand success of the programme. This will be achieved through monitoring delivery and systematically and robustly undertaking a: (a) process evaluation, b) output evaluation) and the impact (outcome evaluation and impact feasibility study) of the PATH-SAFE programme. The generated evidence will provide a learning process loop to aid the delivery of a successful pilot project. The outcome and impact evaluation work provide evidence as to the success of the pilot project, providing key insights into any potential continuation. In particular the successful supplier will deliver three objectives:

**Objective 1: Design phase - Develop a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation plan:** including finalising a theory of change for the programme, logframes for each workstream (to include SMART outputs and outcomes), workstream output and process evaluation plans including identifying suitable metrics and data, programmatic outcome evaluation plans including identifying metrics and data, refine list of evaluation questions, designing an outcome evaluation and an approach to testing impact evaluation approaches. Please note this will be a highly collaborative endeavour, working closely with programme partners to codesign the M&E plan.

----------------------- *Project Break Point* *with Go / No-Go decision on continuation, at this point the design will be subject to external peer review*. *We may decide to re-procure the M&E project based on success of the M&E contract. You should provide indicative costs for Objective 2 and Objective 3 as part of their proposal, but these will be reviewed and confirmed at the end of Objective 1 to take account of design suggestions.*

**Objective 2: Process and output monitoring and evaluation:** Delivering M&E for each workstream, and a process evaluation of the programme. A process evaluation will be developed with workstream partners and will allow for self-monitoring to track activities, governance, risks/issues, providing evidence of enablers and barriers to delivery and progress, allow the programme to adapt where possible, and build knowledge to improve future delivery. An output evaluation will demonstrate output progress at workstream level. Collecting and working with delivery partners to collect baseline data necessary for Objective 3.

**Objective 3: Deliver a programme-level outcome evaluation with a feasibility study of impact measures:** Undertake an evaluation of outcome measures identified in Objective 1 and deliver a feasibility study to test the approach to measuring overall impact of the programme. You should develop and utilise robust evaluation methodologies that will help us understand causality, including how you will deal with confounding variables and counterfactuals.

1. **Potential Evaluation Questions**

We expect evaluation questions to be fully developed by the supplier as part of Objective 1. The below list presents our current draft thinking:

1. **Process and Output Evaluation**
   1. To what extent are the workstreams on track to deliver expected outputs?
   2. Is the governance/management of the programme and workstreams effective at supporting delivery? Could improvements be made?
   3. Has the pilot created efficiencies for participant departments?
   4. Are data sharing/data access issues effectively resolved? What can we learn about improving this process?
   5. Is Cross-Gov Collaboration working effectively? What are enablers and barriers to further collaboration?
   6. Who are the future beneficiaries of the programme?
   7. Are/were the inputs (people, time, money, resources) to the process enough to deliver the project’s objectives?
2. **Outcome Evaluation**
   1. Has data quality, access and use been improved? Including beyond participant departments
   2. Are data quality, access and use improvements likely to lead to a reduction in public health risks?
   3. Has the pilot shown potential to increase investment in UK Science Excellence and associated private sector funding?
   4. Has the programme provided better evidence for policy interventions? Is it likely to?
   5. Has the programme generated data to better monitor the effects of interventions, as judged by likely data users?
   6. Is the programme on track to develop a national/international reputation in whole genome sequencing science and database management?
3. **Impact feasibility study**
   1. What impacts should we be measuring from the programme?
   2. How can we measure these impacts?
   3. What approaches can we use to understand causality
      1. Is a counterfactual/experimental/quasi-experimental approach possible?
   4. What time frames and budget would an impact evaluation need to work to?
4. **Suggested Approach**

PATH-SAFE is a truly transdisciplinary programme of work, integrating health, veterinary, environmental, economic, social, technical and scientific aspects. Due to the diverse array of topics covered and the need to have in-depth skills in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis, we would accept a bid from a consortium of M&E partners. The supplier should be comfortable dealing with complex scientific and biological topics and data, and have an understanding of how to use these data to track progress.

## Objective 1: Design Phase

The first phase of work will be focussed on M&E design and involve developing a detailed M&E plan. This will require suppliers to:

* Work with stakeholders and partners across multiple government departments and externally to build a detailed understanding of the programme and the four workstreams.
* Use this knowledge to develop/refine the draft programmatic theory of change (see Annex A).
* Develop a comprehensive logic model/logical framework (logframe) for each of the four work packages to inform the M&E plan, identify all the necessary inputs/data/metrics/targets and activities required, including when they will be delivered and by whom.
* Refine the list of evaluation questions.
* Identify suitable output, outcome and impact measures, list existing data that these can be monitored, and create a plan for further data that needs to be collected to monitor progress.
* Bring together the above into a clear, executable M&E plan for the programme, based on impact evaluation best practice, such as the [HMG Magenta book](about:blank). This should include plans for research design, data collection, analysis and synthesis of evidence. Tenderers should suggest a suitable evaluation methodology.

**Potential data collection methods:** stakeholder workshops, stakeholder interviews, iterative development (e.g. Delphi Method), desk-based research and documentation review, evaluation methods review and selection (e.g. through APPEASE criteria)

*After the design phase there will a project break point where we will formally approve moving on to the subsequent phases. At this point the design will be subject to external independent peer review*

## Objective 2: Process and Output Monitoring and Evaluation

The evaluation plan should detail an approach to deliver an output evaluation for each workstream, alongside a process evaluation that will provide adaptive management to aid the delivery of the programme. As outlined above, PATH-SAFE ultimately aims to improve the UK’s surveillance capability and infrastructure, so that we can identify and trace foodborne pathogens more effectively and hence reduce the negative impact of disease and AMR. Monitoring the impact that the pilot project will have on these outcomes is difficult, because these outcomes will be subject to a wide range of independent impacts and confounding variables that lie outside of the programme, including consumer behaviours (e.g. shifts in dietary and eating habits), industry practices (e.g. livestock management practices), shifts in international trade (e.g. the opening of new markets), environmental changes (e.g. extreme weather) and the emergence of new pathogens. In addition, the impact of improved technologies on the level of FBD and AMR will only establish in the medium-to-long term, and hence impacts are unlikely to be observed during the pilot project period (which is 2.5 years’ duration in total). An important part of the evaluation will therefore be to monitor and measure the success at output level. To support effective outcome and impact evaluation, this objective will also need to conduct baseline data collection.

This objective should also provide a process evaluation for the PATH-SAFE programme as a whole. This should consider whether the programme is designed and is being delivered in a way which is likely to achieve the desired outcomes by considering governance arrangements, collaboration, delivery barriers and enablers, risks, unintended consequences, and internal and external stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences of the programme.

**Potential data collection methods:** Stakeholder workshops, interviews, data collection/collation against logical frameworks, case studies, documents review, governance review, baseline data collection, quantitative and qualitative dataset analyses e.g. of UKHSA hospitalisation data due to FBD. It is likely these data will include social, economic, environmental, health and veterinary aspects.

## Objective 3: Outcome and Impact Evaluation

The design work (Objective 1) and subsequent process/output evaluation work should all feed into a summative outcome evaluation framework, which includes testing future impact measures. The design phase should identify suitable outcome and impact methodologies to allow robust evaluation and understand probable causality of the programme. This third phase of evaluation activity should draw together the output evaluation work undertaken on the four work streams into a summative report, and add additional analyses of the outcome measures.

Whilst we expect suppliers to work with us to identify potential outcome measures (including drawing on the draft theories of change created) some indicative suggestions are:

* *Monitoring the proportion of FBD attributed to a specific foodborne disease pathogen, on an annual basis. Previous modelling work has shown that the majority of foodborne disease is unattributed. Currently, only 38% of foodborne disease cases can be attributed to a specific foodborne disease pathogen. This could also extend to an impact measure over time.*
* *Frequency and environmental distribution of key foodborne pathogens*
* *Occurrence and spread of AMR genes within environmental pathogen populations*
* *Linked demographic and pathogen data on livestock and food transport patterns*
* *Baseline ‘rate of evolution’ data for key foodborne pathogens.*

**Potential data collection methods:** data collection against logical frameworks, case studies, interviews; document review, data analyses of pre-existing datasets e.g. UKHSA datasets on hospitalisations. It is likely these data will include social, economic, environmental, health and veterinary aspects.

**Potential Causal analysis approaches:** Process tracing, contribution analysis, outcome mapping/harvesting; quasi-experimental approaches (Note: these will need to be developed and selected during Objective 1)

## Data availability

Currently data collection is delegated to individual workstream leads, and then collated in

* Monthly workstream reports (internal to the programme)
* Monthly programme reports (internal to the programme)
* Quarterly programme report (to Shared Outcome Fund)
* Quarterly finance deep dives (internal to the programme)

Data collected includes:

1. Monthly finance position (allowance, actuals, forecasts).
2. Monthly RAG ratings and trends for delivery confidence (finance, resource, time, benefits, dependencies).
3. Monthly overall delivery RAG rating.
4. Monthly narrative updates per deliverable in each workstream.
5. Monthly risk/issue/dependency awareness/escalations (mitigations, likely impacts)
6. Quarterly finance deep dives by funding line (profiled monthly actual and forecasted spend).

Part of the role of the supplier would be to understand the existing datasets and ongoing data collection by partners and other stakeholders that could be used to monitor progress, as well as to identify further data that needs to be collected to measure impact. Further data of relevance includes health datasets listed on UKHSA [Research and statistics - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](about:blank) and the historic PHE website [Research and statistics - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](about:blank).

1. **Reporting and Communications**

Final reporting requirements will be dependent on the proposed M&E design work in objective 1. However, we envisage reporting to include:

Table 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Outputs** | **Expected deliverable date** |
| **1** Design Phase | Theory of change for programme  Logframes for each workstream  Comprehensive M&E plan (including logic models) | Nov 2022  Dec 2022  Jan 2023 |
| **2** Process and Output Monitoring and Evaluation | Process and Output Evaluations:   * Interim report 1 * Interim report 2 * Final report | Mar 2023  Sep 2023  Mar 2024 |
| **3** Programme level outcome evaluation with feasibility study for impact evaluation | Outcome Evaluation  Impact Feasibility Study | March 2024  March 2024 |
| Regular short updates/reporting | Update strategic and delivery board and shared outcome funds (SOF) on ongoing progress of evaluation. | Quarterly |

*Communication*

In line with FSA’s commitment to openness and transparency, we generally publish all of our research on our website and make the underlying data available through our data catalogue. Reports for publication must meet the accessibility criteria mentioned below. Each objective will have tailored outputs as per the specification; this will include both written reports and presentations.

*Accessibility*

All outputs should meet the Agency’s minimum accessibility requirements and be written to a high standard in clear English.

1. **Wider Considerations**

**Cost**

The onus is on the applicant(s) to provide costings that they believe are reasonable to meet the evidence gap as outlined in this specification and provide the justification of this within their proposal. The applicant(s) should be aware that one of the key criteria that all research proposals are evaluated against is ‘value for money’, which is delivering the M&E at a competitive price.

The programme has the below funding available in FY22/23 and FY23/24:

Table 2: PATH-SAFE Funding Profile

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Financial Year** | **Available Funding** |
| 2022/2023 | Up to £200,000, excluding VAT |
| 2023/2024 | Up to £200,000, excluding VAT |

Funds **must** be spent within the allocated financial year and cannot be reprofiled.

**Project Management**

The evaluation will be overseen by the PATH-SAFE Evaluation Lead, Dr Niki Rust, with input from the rest of the PATH-SAFE team and FSA Analytical Unit colleagues who collectively support the PATH-SAFE programme. Tenderers should specify their proposed project management arrangements to ensure that objectives and deliverables will be achieved on time and on budget. On appointment, the successful contractor will be required to attend an initial start-up meeting with the FSA. The successful contractor should ensure that they keep in regular contact with the FSA representative, allowing sufficient time for the programme team to sign off materials (e.g. sampling plans, topic guides, questionnaires, draft reports etc).

**Governance**

The evaluation will be subject to a high level of internal and external scrutiny, so regular interaction with FSA officials will be required. Draft outputs, including fieldwork materials and reports, will be reviewed by members of the FSA Analytics Unit and the PATH-SAFE Programme Team, as well as an appointed external advisor (where appropriate). Enough time will need to be built into the timetable to enable this (with a suggested guide of at least 2 weeks); contractors must factor in time to submit drafts for comment then to update deliverables based on feedback to ensure final deliverables are submitted on time. It is anticipated there will be two rounds of substantive comments for final reports.

**Risk**

Tenders should identify any typical risks in delivering projects on time and to budget, outlining what steps will be taken to minimise these risks and how they will be managed by the contract team. Risks associated with Covid-19 should be identified alongside detailed mitigation strategies. These include possible need to maintain social distancing, adapt to tiered regulations across the UK, and manage infection risk for both researchers and participants, as well as ensuring that delivery is not significantly delayed by absences resulting from illness or self-isolation.

**Quality Management**

Tenders should provide details of the measures that will be taken to manage and ensure the quality of work. Please include details of the quality assurance policies in place and how this will ensure the quality of projects and robustness of data. Tenderers should take note of the FSA’s quality assurance processes. The project will also have independent peer review arranged by the FSA. Proposals will be expected to align with the central government guidance on evaluation, the [Magenta Book.](about:blank)

**Ethics**

Tenders should identify any ethical issues relevant to this project and give details of how any specific risks will be addressed. Tenders should refer to the five principles outlined in the [GSR Professional Guidance – Ethical Assurance](about:blank):

1. Sound application and conduct of social research methods and interpretation of the findings

2. Participation based on informed consent

3. Enabling participation

4. Avoidance of personal and social harm

5. Non-disclosure of identity Tenders should provide details of any ethical review and research governance arrangements that would apply to the project.

**Data security**

Please confirm in your tender that you have in place, or that you will have in place by contract award, the human and technical resources to perform the contract to ensure compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation and to ensure the protection of the rights of data subjects.

Please provide details of the technical facilities and measures (including systems and processes) you have in place, or will have in place by contract award, to ensure compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation and to ensure the protection of the rights of data subjects.  Your response should include, but should not be limited to facilities and measures:

* + to ensure ongoing confidentiality, integrity, availability and resilience of processing systems and services;
  + to comply with the rights of data subjects in respect of receiving privacy information, and access, rectification, deletion and portability of personal data;
  + to ensure that any consent based processing meets standards of active, informed consent, and that such consents are recorded and auditable;
  + to ensure legal safeguards are in place to legitimise transfers of personal data outside the EU (if such transfers will take place);
  + to maintain records of personal data processing activities; and
  + to regularly test, assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the above measures.’

**Sustainability**

The Food Standards Agency is committed to improving sustainability in the management of operations. Tenders should demonstrate a clear approach to sustainability, in particular how it will be applied in practice to the project, taking into account economic, environmental and social aspects.

**Social value**

Social value has a lasting impact on individuals, communities and the environment. The Government has an opportunity and responsibility to maximise benefits effectively and comprehensively through its commercial activity. To be effective, it is essential that the FSA considers social value at all stages of the procurement life cycle. In order to do this, the FSA is applying the Government Commercial Functions social value model [PPN 06/20 Procurement Policy Note](about:blank) from 1st January 2021. The complete set of documents can be found on the [Social Value webpage](about:blank).

Using a maximum of 3000 characters describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver the **Policy Outcome** and **Award Criteria**.

The **Policy Outcome** selected for this tender is **‘Wellbeing – Improve health and wellbeing’.** Tenderers should describe how they will demonstrate action to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce (**Award Criteria**).

Please include:

* Your ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Award Criteria, and
* a timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when. Also, how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. You should include but not be limited to:
  + timed action plan
  + use of metrics
  + tools/processes used to gather data
  + reporting
  + feedback and improvement
  + transparency

Examples could include:

* Understanding of issues relating to health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce.
* Actions to invest in the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the contract workforce. Illustrative examples:
  + implementing the 6 standards in the Mental Health at Work commitment and, where appropriate, the mental health enhanced standards for companies with more than 500 employees in Thriving at Work with respect to the contract workforce, not just ‘following the recommendations’
  + public reporting by the tenderer and its supply chain on the health and wellbeing of staff comprising the contract workforce, following the recommendations in the Voluntary Reporting Framework
  + engagement plans to engage the contract workforce in deciding the most important issues to address

1. **PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE**

Table 2 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 3. ESTIMATED PROJECT TIMETABLE** | |
| **EXPECTED DATE** | **INVITATION TO (ITT) TENDER** |
| 15 July 2022 | Invitation to Tender (ITT) issued by the Agency |
| Immediately as above | ITT Clarification period opens\* |
| 22 August 2022 | ITT Clarification period closes\*\* |
| 2 Sept 2022 | Closing date for submission of ITT responses\*\*\* |
| w/c 5 Sept | Evaluation of ITT responses |
| w/c 12 Sept 2022 | Tenderers notified of outcome of appraisal and preferred Tenderer (or Tenderers) identified |
| 26 Sept 2022 | Contract awarded and signed |
| As soon as possible following contract award but by November 2022 at the latest | Project initiation meeting takes place and project commences |

\* 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 electronic contract management system, Bravo (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.

§ These stages are optional

**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

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.

# EVALUATION OF TENDERS

The Tenderers Application consists of the:

* Technical envelope (70% of overall value), in which applicants should detail the approach, the work plan and their ability to undertake the work, and
* Commercial envelope (20% of overall value), in which applicants should outline all costs to conduct the proposed work, and
* Social value envelope (10% of overall value), in which applicants should demonstrate how they might improve social value aspects in the duration of the proposed work, and
* Any other relevant supporting information

Tenders will be evaluated by FSA internal appraisers and external experts using a numerical system. Table 4 below shows the weightings that have been allocated to each section of the application form and these will be used by the appraisers:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 4. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SUCCESSFUL TENDERER** | |
| **CRITERIA** | **PERCENTAGE WEIGHTINGS** |
| TECHNICAL CRITERIA – **70% overall Value** | Made up of |
| 1. Your approach/scope of work | 15% |
| 1. Your proposed plan to deliver the work, including a Gantt chart with deliverables and milestones | 20% |
| 1. Teams’ relevant past experience, expertise and staff effort | 20% |
| 1. Project management | 10% |
| 1. Quality management, ethics, data protection, and sustainability | 5% |
| COMMERCIAL CRITERIA – **20% overall value** | 20% |
| SOCIAL VALUE CRITERIA – **10% overall value**  A. WELLBEING: IMPROVING HEALTH AND WELLBEING: Provide evidence of how you will demonstrate action to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce. | 10% |

## 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 Commercial Envelope

The Commercial 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 commercial 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 commercial envelope**

Please complete the Commercial 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 commercial envelope**

**Commercial criteria will be evaluated as follows:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCORE | DESCRIPTION FOR SCORE OF THE CRITERIA |
| 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 |

## The Social Value Envelope

Guidance on how to complete each section is provided within the actual application form.

Appraisers will allocate a score to the social value envelope, depending on the quality and relevance of evidence provided.  The scores will then be subjected to the weightings given in Table 5: Evaluation of Social Value Criteria.

All social value criteria will be evaluated as follows:

**Table 5: Evaluation of Social Value Criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 social value evaluation they will be automatically eliminated from the process.

**Annex A: Draft programmatic Theory of Change of PATH-SAFE**

Timeline

Description automatically generated

1. [PATH-SAFE: Tracking foodborne pathogens and antimicrobial-resistant microbes - Food Standards Agency (blog.gov.uk)](about:blank) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. including Food Standards Agency, Food Standards Scotland, Department of Health and Social Care, UK Health Security Agency, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Environment Agency and Veterinary Medicines Directorate and others across the devolved administrations [↑](#footnote-ref-3)