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| ***Specification Reference*** |
| **FS301051** |
| ***Specification Title*** |
| Barriers to and Enablers of the Reporting of Intelligence Regarding Food Crime |
| **Contract Duration** |
| May 2018 – March 2019 |

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>. 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**

# Summary

The National Food Crime Unit (NFCU), a component of the Food Standards Agency (FSA), wishes to commission social and behavioural science research examining the factors which encourage or impede the reporting of intelligence regarding criminal activity to the NFCU by individuals and organisations. The aims of this research are to identify enablers and barriers which support or impede the reporting of criminal intelligence (phase 1), and to devise and trial potential means of overcoming these barriers to increase the volume and improve the quality of intelligence about food crime received by NFCU (phase 2).

The first phase of this project will include a review of academic and policy literatures dealing with influences on the reporting and sharing of criminal intelligence, the role of intermediaries and brokers in facilitating intelligence reporting, and the characteristics, motivations and behaviours of whistleblowers. It will also incorporate a programme of interviews with actors involved in existing intelligence reporting initiatives, which will examine each initiative’s history, structure, reporting processes, governance and relationship with potential intelligence sources.

An interim research report will be produced at the end of phase 1, on the basis of which the NFCU will assess whether further research is required. If further research is approved then the outputs of this first phase of research will be used in phase 2 of the project to inform the selection and trialling of behavioural interventions designed to facilitate increased reporting of food crime intelligence to the NFCU. However, tenderers should note that this second phase of the project will be subject to a break clause.

Successful delivery of this research is expected to require familiarity with academic literatures in criminology and business ethics, experience of conducting evidence reviews, knowledge of behaviour change approaches and qualitative social science research methodologies.

Proposals are required by 23rd April and we intend to appoint a contractor by 7th May, with a view to the project starting later in May.

# 1. 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 is a UK-wide body with offices in London, Cardiff, Belfast and York.

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](http://www.food.gov.uk) ). 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. 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>

## 1.1 National Food Crime Unit (NFCU)

Established in 2014 following the Elliott Review into the horsemeat scandal, the NFCU focusses on identifying, analysing and bringing about an effective response to serious dishonesty relating to the safety or authenticity of food, drink and animal feed in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Critical to this response is the receipt of information from a variety of sources to enhance the intelligence picture, and to identify issues requiring exploration, analysis and potential enforcement intervention. In identifying and trialling initiatives capable of expanding and refining these intelligence flows, this project will help the NFCU to achieve its objective of identifying and combating food crime. In so doing, it will ultimately assist the FSA in achieving its overarching strategic objective of ensuring that food is safe and what it says it is.

# 2. Background

The National Food Crime Unit, established in 2014 as part of the Food Standards Agency, works to identify and develop intelligence around serious dishonesty relating to the safety or authenticity of food. The NFCU then uses this intelligence to inform criminal investigations by law enforcement partners, and works with these partners to bring about meaningful and effective responses to identified crime threats.

The Unit’s activities include the receipt, review, storage and sharing of information from a wide variety of stakeholders, from members of the public to regulatory partners and the law enforcement community. This also includes industry, whether through overt engagement by businesses and trade associations, or through information supplied anonymously or by whistleblowers. Information reaches the Unit via a number of routes including email, face-to-face engagement at events and meetings and also a reporting hotline, Food Crime Confidential.

Broadly speaking, the intelligence the Unit receives falls into one of four categories:

* intelligence from members of the public who have concerns or suspicions about a product, business or witnessed activity;
* intelligence from food businesses around the activities of their competitors;
* intelligence from persons within (or formerly within) a food business about the illicit activity of that business;
* intelligence from businesses which relates to the industry in broader terms, or to live issues which the food businesses have identified. This could be, for example, around suppliers whose products have generated concerns over their integrity.

However, external partners (especially those within the food industry) have sometimes been reluctant to share information regarding serious and current wrongdoing within the food industry with the Unit. As such, the Unit is eager to understand the social, behavioural and institutional factors which might motivate potential partners to share intelligence with it, or conversely deter them from doing so, and to develop more effective means of eliciting information from external partners. In so doing, it hopes to identify measures which could be taken to improve intelligence collection in this area and also to learn from approaches which have worked successfully in other, comparable contexts.

The FSA, in partnership with the NFCU, therefore invites tenders to carry out social and behavioural research consisting of a desktop review and qualitative interviews examining the social, behavioural and institutional factors which might encourage or impede the reporting of intelligence regarding criminal activity within the food industry to law enforcement agencies, at both an individual and business level. This research project should also consider the state of existing evidence regarding actors’ motivations for sharing or withholding information, best practice in promoting and facilitating the reporting of intelligence, and best practice in the governance of intelligence reporting arrangements, learning from other sectors where relevant. The first phase of this research will comprise:

1. **A desktop review of academic and policy literatures** relating to intelligence reporting behaviour. Specifically, this review should consider academic evidence regarding the characteristics and motivations of individuals and organisations (including whistleblowers, aggrieved competitors and other actors) which report criminal activity within businesses to law enforcement agencies, and investigate the factors which encourage such sources to report criminal activity or deter them from doing so.It should also examine regulatory mechanisms to provide protection for those providing intelligence, and policy documentation relating to initiatives taken by other law enforcement agencies (both in the UK and overseas) to encourage whistleblowers, industry partners and other parties to share criminal intelligence regarding illicit practice and economic crime with them. This review should also examine the governance arrangements through which these initiatives manage, utilise and share intelligence and as a result identify case studies of best practice in encouraging and facilitating the reporting of criminal intelligence.

Tenderers are encouraged to explain in their responses to this specification how they might approach the review to ensure that evidence from across disciplines is captured robustly and can be validated.

As an additional optional component, this first phase of research may also include:

1. **A programme of interviews** with representatives of organisations which have established, or are involved in operating or maintaining, successful initiatives to encourage the reporting of intelligence regarding illicit practice and economic crime. These interviews would seek to establish what measures these initiatives have put in place to encourage potential partners to report information to them regarding criminal activity, what challenges they have faced in persuading them to report such information, and how they have overcome these challenges.

The FSA will be able to provide some contact details for relevant organisations to interview, but tenderers’ suggestions are also welcome. The final list will be agreed with the FSA.

Tenderers are encouraged to explain carefully in their responses to this specification how they might address the methodological and ethical challenges of conducting primary research on this highly sensitive and confidential topic. Tenderers are also encouraged to provide separate costings for this element of the project.

Following completion of this first phase of research, and the production of an interim research report, the need for a further research on this topic will be assessed. If further research is approved then a second phase of work will be carried out building on the key findings of the interviews and review of documentary evidence. This second phase of research will be focused on:

1. **Developing and trialling behavioural interventions**: building on the findings of phase 1 of the research, behavioural interventions designed to increase the quantity and quality intelligence reported to NFCU will be explored, with the possibility of testing some interventions using experimental or quasi-experimental methods.

# 3. Research Aims

This research project will aim to:

* Assess the current state of evidence regarding the characteristics and motivations of individuals and organisations that report criminal activity (especially regarding illicit practice and economic crime) to law enforcement agencies;
* Identify social, behavioural and institutional factors which impede or conversely encourage the reporting of intelligence regarding criminal activity to law enforcement agencies;
* Identify best practice in facilitating the reporting of criminal intelligence to law enforcement agencies, and in the processing, governance and protection of sensitive information within intelligence reporting arrangements;
* Examine and evaluate the implications, advantages and disadvantages of involving external intermediaries and brokers in facilitating the reporting of criminal intelligence to law enforcement agencies;
* Design and trial behavioural interventions through which external partners might be encouraged to report intelligence regarding food crime to the NFCU and its partner agencies, and through which any barriers to intelligence sharing might be overcome.

In so doing this research seeks to equip the NFCU with the most robust and up-to-date evidence on barriers and motivations to reporting of food crime, with the aim of identifying and developing interventions and governance arrangements capable of increasing the volume and/or improving the quality of intelligence regarding food crime reported to the NFCU by external partners (and especially those within the food industry). In so doing, it will assist the FSA in achieving its overarching strategic objective of ensuring that food is safe and what it says it is.

# 4. Research Approach

The FSA suggests that this research project should be carried out through the following methodological approach and should consider the evidence sources detailed below. However, other approaches and methodologies will be welcomed provided that they are justified with a compelling rationale.

## 4.1 Review of Academic and Policy Literatures

This literature review should examine academic research which addresses the following topics:

* Characteristics and motivations of individuals and organisations which report criminal activity (particularly illicit practice and economic crime) to law enforcement agencies;
* Institutional and contextual factors within organisations which encourage or deter the reporting of criminal behaviour by their employees and affiliates;
* The role of different models for the structure and governance of intelligence reporting arrangements in encouraging or discouraging the reporting of criminal intelligence to law enforcement agencies. A focus on the implications, advantages and disadvantages of arrangements involving independent intermediaries and brokers of intelligence is particularly encouraged;
* Governance arrangements regulating the processing, anonymization protection and sharing of information within intelligence reporting processes, and their role in either deterring or encouraging the reporting of criminal intelligence.
* Theoretical frameworks from behavioural science, psychology, criminology, and other relevant fields, which might be applied to identify barriers to and/or enablers of the reporting of intelligence regarding food crime, and to design possible future interventions to promote intelligence reporting.
* Any examples of existing interventions used with the intention of encouraging the reporting of criminal intelligence both within organisations and to enforcement agencies.

A large proportion of relevant research is likely to be located within the disciplines of criminology, behavioural science and business administration (especially the sub-discipline of business ethics). However, relevant insights are likely to be dispersed across a range of disciplines and interdisciplinary fields, and tenderers are encouraged to use their discretion and expertise in seeking out other relevant literatures.

The literature review should also incorporate a structured desktop analysis of documentation relating to initiatives and institutional arrangements implemented by UK and overseas law enforcement agencies to encourage the reporting of intelligence regarding illicit practice and economic crime by parties including whistleblowers, aggrieved competitors or public-spirited parties. Analysis of these initiatives should investigate the history, circumstances, goals and procedures of these initiatives, and should also seek to offer an assessment of their effectiveness in encouraging the reporting and/or sharing of intelligence.

Desktop analyses of these initiatives should examine:

* Documentation published by the law enforcement agencies involved in the initiatives;
* Analyses and reviews of these initiatives that determine their effectiveness that are published by other government institutions or law enforcement actors where these are available;
* Related documentation and analysis published by partner organisations in intelligence reporting or sharing initiatives (for instance independent intelligence intermediaries), or institutions representing the economic sector on which these initiatives focus (e.g. trade associations, professional bodies);
* Secondary analyses performed by academic institutions, policy institutes and think tanks (where these are available).

Whilst a fully systematic review is out of scope for this project, the review should be conducted using robust methodology, covering a wide range of disciplines and focussing on the most reliable evidence available. The winning contractor will be expected to work closely with the FSA team to refine search terms and criteria for inclusion in the review. There has been no focus on particular products or supply chains of interest in this tender, but the winning contractor is expected to have considered the specificity and alternatively the generalisability of their proposed plan of work in their submission.

## 4.2 Interviews

A programme of key informant interviews should be conducted with representatives of organisations that have established, or help to maintain and facilitate, arrangements for the reporting of criminal activity within particular industries or economic sectors. Where these initiatives are associated with independent intelligence intermediaries, industry ‘safe spaces’ or formal intelligence sharing networks, tenderers may also wish to interview members of these bodies. The FSA will be able to provide some contacts for these interviews, but the winning contractor will be expected to expand on this sample. We envisage up to ten face-to-face interviews, which will seek to:

* Build up a picture of the aims, histories, intelligence reporting procedures and governance arrangements of these intelligence reporting initiatives;
* Explore the roles of the different organisations participating in these intelligence reporting initiatives, and especially to understand whether (and if so why) the involvement of neutral intermediaries might encourage or impede the reporting of intelligence;
* Examine any challenges (at organisational, as well as individual level) that these initiatives have faced in persuading potential partners to report intelligence;
* Investigate whether these initiatives have overcome any such challenges and barriers, if so, explore how they achieved this and how their success in doing so was evaluated.

## 4.3 Behaviour change

It is envisioned that behavioural interventions will be designed to assist the NFCU in eliciting either a larger quantity or an improved quality of intelligence from potential sources within the food industry. These behavioural interventions will be developed and tested using an experimental or quasi-experimental research design. The specific focus and design criteria for the trial interventions is expected to emerge from analysis of the results of the first phase of research. However, indicative categories of intervention which are of interest to NFCU might include:

* Use of novel media or approach strategies to communicate with and establish a relationship with potential intelligence sources;
* Alterations to the context and content of NFCU’s messaging to potential intelligence sources which might increase the volume or quality of intelligence reported;
* Alterations to NFCU’s intelligence processing arrangements which might increase the quantity or quality of intelligence reported regarding criminal activity within the food industry;
* Trials of new modes of engagement with independent intelligence processing intermediaries (e.g. the Food Industry Intelligence Network) which might increase the volume or quality of intelligence supplied to NFCU.

# 5. Deliverables and timing

The following outputs are required:

* An interim report of research findings, to be submitted at the conclusion of phase 1 of the research. Based on the findings of the first phase of research, this report should propose behavioural interventions with the potential to increase the quality and quantity of criminal intelligence received by the NFCU which might be trialled during phase 2 of the project;
* A workshop with the research team and NFCU colleagues at the FSA to discuss potential interventions to be taken forward in phase 2.
* A final report of research findings to be submitted following the conclusion of phase 2 of the research. This report should both summarise the key findings of the project and evaluate the effectiveness of the behavioural interventions trialled during phase 2.
* An end of project presentation summarising the key research findings of the two phases of research.

Usually reports require two rounds of substantive comments by FSA officials (and any other parties involved in the project as appropriate) and a final round to finalise minor outstanding comments. Unless otherwise agreed, the project manager will co-ordinate comments and provide them to the contractor and all responses will be recorded. The final report will be subject to external peer review, following which further amendments may be required. Contractors should agree the timetable for reporting and publication with the project officer but should note that the FSA normally expect two weeks to provide a co-ordinated response. Please confirm in your proposal how you will meet the FSA’s requirements for reporting.

The final report will be published by the FSA, and will need to meet minimum accessibility requirements as detailed in the Social Science Research teams style guide, please see Annex A.

Bidders are requested to provide a detailed timetable as part of their response. A high-level suggestion is as follows, with the entire project to be completed by early 2019:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contractor appointed and set-up meeting | Mid May 2018 |
| Literature review | May 2018 – Mid July 2018 |
| Interim report | Mid July 2018 |
| Workshop session | Late July 2018 |
| Designing behavioural interventions | August – October 2018 |
| Trialling interventions | October – December 2018 |
| Final presentation and report | January 2019 |

# 6. 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**  |
| 4th April 2018 | Invitation to Tender (ITT) issued by the Agency  |
|  4th April 2018  | ITT Clarification period opens\* |
| 20th April 2018 | ITT Clarification period closes\*\* |
| 1st May 2018 | Closing date for submission of ITT responses\*\*\* |
|  1st-8th May  | Evaluation of ITT responses  |
| W/c 8th May | Appraisal panel meeting held to consider ITT responses |
| W/c 14th May  | Tenderers notified of outcome of appraisal and preferred Tenderer (or Tenderers) identified |
| w/c 14th May  | Contract awarded, project initiation meeting arranged 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 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

# 7. Form of Response

Proposals should include the following information:

1. Demonstration of an understanding of the research background and objectives;
2. A recommended research design and methodology;
3. A named contract manager who will be fully accountable for the delivery of the project against the contract, provide regular verbal updates on progress and issues arising to the nominated FSA project officer, and meet the FSA at the start of the project to discuss the proposed approach;
4. Evidence of relevant experience and expertise on similar projects (please provide 2 or 3 examples);
5. Details of all personnel who will be involved with this project, their grade, daily rate, number of days’ input, relevant skills and experience (including a brief CV). The proposal should also include who would be drafting the report;
6. If relevant, details of sub-contractors appointed by the contract manager should be included along with the experience and services of the company sub contracted to;
7. A quality plan demonstrating internal quality assurance procedures and how they will achieve high quality outputs to time and budget;
8. Summary of how data security and ethical issues will be addressed (see below);
9. A risk management plan;
10. A timetable of key dates;
11. All anticipated costs of conducting the work, providing a breakdown of staff involvements and days dedicated to the project for each staff member, and all other associated overheads and expenses (see below);
12. Summary corporate information e.g. contact details, incorporation/ status, registration (VAT and data protection) numbers, profit and loss statements or at least approximate turnover figures for the last 2 years, a list of internal staff and social responsibility polices underpinning your business practices;
13. Amendments / queries on the FSA standard terms and conditions.

# 8. Personnel

* This project is likely to be well suited to multi-disciplinary staff experienced in conducting evidence reviews, qualitative research and with an understanding of food crime and behavioural insight approaches. It might be beneficial to appoint an external advisor to complement in house staff expertise, for example an academic (e.g. criminologist, psychologist) who could act as an advisor during the project.

# 9. Ethics

* The content of interviews for example is likely to be sensitive, and participants are likely to be cautious of the impact of their involvement in this study.
* Tenderers are asked to identify the ethical concerns for this project, especially as regards information provided in confidence by participants and data protection issues, and the safety of interviewers and other project team members and to outline how these issues would be addressed.
* Tenderers are asked to consult the *Government Social Research Guide for Ethical Assurance for Social Research[[1]](#footnote-1)*.
* Due to the nature of the work it would be highly advisable to appoint an ethical advisor.

# 10. Risk

* Tenders must include a risk register detailing high, medium, and low risks, tailored to this specification, e.g. including what action will be taken in the event of difficulty accessing interviewees or in the event of undertaking an interview and discovering illegal activity.
* It is desirable but not essential for tenderers to hold ISO 31000 - Risk management.[[2]](#footnote-2)

# 11. Data issues

## 11.1 Data security

Please refer to the Framework Standard Terms and Conditions on data security and outline in your tender any specific data security issues related to this project. The successful tenderer will be asked to complete a Data Security Questionnaire which will be reviewed by the FSA data security team and will form part of the contract. In doing so FSA would like to draw particular attention to the Framework Standard Terms and Conditions on data security and the commissioning authority’s role as the ‘data controller’ and the contractor’s role as the ‘data processor’.

In line with the Data Protection Act (DPA) 1998, any information collected, processed and transferred on behalf of the Agency (the data controller), and in particular personal information, must be held and transferred securely. Tenderers must provide assurances of compliance with the DPA and set out in their proposals details of the practices and systems they have in place for handling data securely including transmission between the field and head office and then to the Agency. Contractors will have responsibility for ensuring that processing or handling of information by themselves, and any sub-contractors on behalf of the Agency, are conducted securely.

Tenderers should also note that the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) will enter into force in the UK from the 25th of May 2018. Tenderers are therefore asked to consider what additional measures may need to be taken in order to comply with the new regulatory regime for data protection, and to include in their proposals an explanation of how they intend to implement these measures.

In particular, the processor must: -

● process the personal data only on the documented instructions of the Controller;

● comply with security obligations equivalent to those imposed on the Controller

(implementing a level of security for the personal data appropriate to the risk);

● ensure that persons authorised to process the personal data have committed

themselves to confidentiality or are under an appropriate statutory obligation of

confidentiality;

● only appoint Sub-processors with the Controller’s prior specific or general written

authorisation, and impose the same minimum terms imposed on it on the

Sub-processor; and the original Processor will remain liable to the Controller for the

Sub-processor’s compliance. The Sub-processor must provide sufficient guarantees

to implement appropriate technical and organisational measures to demonstrate

compliance. In the case of general written authorisation, Processors must inform

Controllers of intended changes in their Sub-processor arrangements;

● make available to the Controller all information necessary to demonstrate compliance with the obligations laid down in Article 28 GDPR and allow for and contribute to audits, including inspections, conducted by the Controller or another auditor mandated by the Controller - and the Processor shall immediately inform the controller if, in its opinion, an instruction infringes GDPR or other EU or member state data protection provisions;

● assist the Controller in carrying out its obligations with regard to requests by data

subjects to exercise their rights under chapter III of the GDPR , noting different rights

may apply depending on the specific legal basis for the processing activity (and should be clarified by the Controller up-front);

● assist the Controller in ensuring compliance with the obligations to implementing a

level of security for the personal data appropriate to the risk, taking into account the

nature of processing and the information available to the Processor;

● assist the Controller in ensuring compliance with the obligations to carry out Data

Protection Impact Assessments, taking into account the nature of processing and the

information available to the Processor; and

● notify the Controller without undue delay after becoming aware of a personal data

breach.

## 11.2 Data archiving

The Agency is committed to openness and is engaged in work to make the results of the science it funds more accessible. All scientific evidence on which Agency policies are based is made publicly available via our open access repository, Foodbase and/ or another appropriate archive. Tenderers must comment on the suitability of archiving project data and indicate how it will be made suitable for Archiving. Tenderers must also provide a separate cost for archiving project data using the Agency’s open access repository Foodbase and/ or other such as the Essex Data Archive.

## 11.3 Data permissions and referencing

Contractors are responsible for ensuring that all necessary permissions are acquired for the use of data, visuals, or other materials throughout the life of the project that are subject to copyright law, and that the materials are used in accordance with the permissions that have been secured. Contractors are also responsible for ensuring suitable referencing of materials in **all** project outputs including project data.

## 11.4 Re-contacting participants

As the Agency is the data controller, it may wish to use the data for further research at a future date. Re-contact questions and supporting documentation must be phrased in such a way that participants are giving consent for the Agency or its selected agent to re-contact them. The contact data will only be used for research purposes and would only be handled by social research and IT Security staff.

**Dissemination and exploitation**

The FSA will disseminate findings internally and publish the report publicly with associated communication activities

**Quality**

It is desirable but not essential for tenderers to hold ISO 9000 - Quality management.[[3]](#footnote-3)

*Quality management considerations should be given as to whether any particular standards need to be met.*

*Please list all specific requirements and insert any specific links*

*Examples of standards can be found at:*

*If the project includes any mathematical modelling, the quality assurance considerations need to include how the work will meet the standards in the Aqua Book:*

[*https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-aqua-book-guidance-on-producing-quality-analysis-for-government*](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-aqua-book-guidance-on-producing-quality-analysis-for-government)

*Will the ‘*[*Joint Code of Practice for Research’*](http://fsahome/how/science/Pages/JCoPR.aspx) *apply to your project?*

*https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joint-code-of-practice-for-research-jcopr*

**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 (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** |
| TECHNICAL CRITERIA – **80% overall Value** | Made up of |
| 1. Tender summary and objectives
 | 10% |
| 1. The approach/scope of work, including innovation
 | 20% |
| 1. The plan and deliverables
 | 15% |
| 1. Organisational experience, expertise and staff effort
 | 15% |
| 1. Project management
 | 10% |
| 1. Risk management
 | 5% |
| 1. Quality management, ethics, data protection, dissemination and sustainability
 | 5% |
| FINANCIAL CRITERIA – **20% overall value** | 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:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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 rational 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 |

1. <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/ethics_guidance_tcm6-5782.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.iso.org/iso/home/standards/iso31000.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://www.iso.org/iso/home/standards/management-standards/iso_9000.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)