DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

Dear [redacted]

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated 11th of February 2022, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

Capitalised terms and expressions used in this letter have the same meanings as in the Contract Terms unless the context otherwise requires.

Order Number:	PS21154 – Transforming UK Food Systems SPF Programme
From:	UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) – Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC), Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, SN2 1FL ("Customer")
To:	ICF Consulting Services Ltd ("Supplier") [redacted]

Effective Date:	Wednesday, 2nd February 2022
Expiry Date:	Tuesday 31st March 2026 Notice period of Cancellation is 30 days

Services required:	Set out in Section 2, Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by: The Customer's Project Specification attached at Annex A and the Supplier's Proposal attached at Annex B;

Key Individuals:	[redacted]

	[redacted]

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	£609,945.00
Insurance Requirements	Additional public liability insurance to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim Additional employers' liability insurance with a minimum limit of £5 million indemnity Additional professional indemnity insurance adequate to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract with a minimum limit of indemnity of £2 million for each individual claim.
Liability Requirements	**Suppliers limitation of Liability** (Clause 18.2 of the Contract Terms);
Special Terms	There will be 3 break clauses in the contract at the end of phases 2,3 and 4 where UKRI will make a decision on the contract continuing. Bidders are required to cost each phase separately. There will be 3 break clauses in the contract as per the following dates: [redacted] If any of the break clauses are initiated, we would expect the contract to draw to a close on the dates outlined above (providing 30 days notices for termination has been served, as per the terms of the contract.
Customer billing address for invoicing:	All invoices should be sent to should be sent to: Queensway House,West Precinct, Billingham,TS23 2NF

GDPR	As per Contract Terms Schedule 7 (Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects)

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Customer to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Customer acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt

For and on behalf of the Supplier:

Name and Title:

[redacted]

Signature:

[redacted]

Date: 14th February 2022

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title:

[redacted]

Signature:

[redacted]

Date: 15 February 2022

ANNEX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Background

UKRI are committed to collecting evidence to understand how the Strategic Priorities Fund Transforming UK Food Systems Programme has delivered socio-economic impact, and therefore contributed towards the overarching ambitions of the Strategic Priorities Fund (SPF). Bids (including consortia bids) are invited for initial scoping and feasibility studies leading to an evaluation framework, the production of a baseline report, a process evaluation and an interim and final impact evaluation report.

The Transforming UK Food Systems Programme is one of the 34 programmes in the Strategic Priorities Fund (SPF) portfolio. The SPF builds on Sir Paul Nurse's vision of a 'common fund', as recommended in his independent review of the Research Councils, to ensure that strategically important research and innovation which is not aligned with other funding programmes can seek direct support.

The SPF is funded through the government's National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF). with a combined total investment across the portfolio of around £830million.
A competitive fund, the SPF has the following objectives:

- Drive an increase in high-quality interdisciplinary research and innovation;
- Ensure that UKRI's investment links up effectively with Government departments' research priorities and opportunities; and
- Ensure the system is able to respond to strategic priorities and opportunities.

This evaluation activity is focussed on the Transforming UK Food Systems programme, rather than the SPF as a whole, however the evaluation will feed into the evaluation of the SPF fund, the detailed background to which and its ambition can be found in Annex E.

1.1 Background to the Transforming UK Food Systems SPF programme

The subject of this evaluation activity is the Transforming UK Food Systems SPF Programme, a £47.5M interdisciplinary research programme that will help transform the UK food system within a global context by addressing two over-arching questions:

- If we put healthy people and a healthy natural environment at the heart of the food system, what would we eat, how would we encourage people to eat it, and where would that food come from? What would we grow and manufacture in the UK and what would we need to import?
- In delivering this transformed food system, what interventions would be needed across government, business and civil society?

This programme will consider the complex interactions between health, environment, economic and behavioural factors across the food system, while taking into account wider needs for different groups in society. The programme will foster a joined-up approach linking nutritionally healthy and accessible diets with sustainable food production and supply. It will deliver coherent evidence to enable concerted action from government, business and civil society to help achieve dietary health, obesity reduction and net zero emission goals.

Healthy people and a healthy environment are intrinsically linked through food, and it is only by taking a systemic, holistic, interdisciplinary approach, otherwise known as a 'food systems approach' that we can deliver the changes that are required. A system is a set of things working together as part of an interconnected whole. The food systems approach encapsulates the actors, behaviours and outcomes involved in land use, agriculture, aquaculture, storage, processing, manufacture, retail and consumption, alongside the interdependencies, pressures and drivers.

This programme is novel in bringing together researchers and stakeholders working in different parts of the food system to form interdisciplinary consortia, addressing health, environmental and social challenges simultaneously through systems-based approaches.

In this document we use the word 'stakeholders' to refer to representatives from business, civil society and government (local, national and devolved).

This programme aims to support pre-competitive research which brings together elements from both sustainable food production (incl. production, processing, manufacturing) and healthy diets and consumption; integrate across the natural and social sciences and collaborated with food system stakeholder organisations.

Businesses, civil society and government (local, devolved or national) are expected to collaborate and co-design research within this Programme. Whilst not eligible to lead on any project, or to receive direct funding from UKRI, it is a requirement that all funded research is in collaboration with at least one stakeholder organisation.

Taking a food systems approach, the programme will develop coherent knowledge and evidence to enable concerted action from policy, business and civil society in the UK, focusing on the following specific objectives:

- Transforming UK diets to be healthier, more sustainable and more accessible, determining how these diets could be met through UK food production and supply.
- Changing the behaviour of actors across the food system, from production to consumption.
- Modelling the interdependencies across the UK food system in order to join up healthy and accessible consumption with sustainable food production.
- Co-producing research between academia and stakeholders (UK government, business and civil society organisations) so that new knowledge helps to drive action across the food system.
- Developing a pipeline of skilled people able to apply critical interdisciplinary systems thinking to the food system, in order to strengthen UK capacity and capability.

The key programme deliverables are as follows:

Call 1 (£24M)

- The aim of Call 1 was to fund 5-year, large multi-centre, interdisciplinary consortia bringing together the different parts of the food system. Aiming to build a critical mass

of researchers and stakeholders and enabling an integrated approach to addressing the objectives of the programme.
- Four £6M flagship consortia were funded in this call, with more than £2M of additional funds brought to the projects by the consortia partners. There are 19 different Universities involved in the consortia and more that 50 stakeholder organisations. The projects started in early 2021 and will run for 5 years.
- Download full summaries of the projects funded under Call 1 here.

Call 2 (£14M)
- The aim of Call 2 is to support 2 or 3-year research grants. These will be interdisciplinary and tackle specific issues that span sustainable production and healthy and accessible consumption. Each grant will include collaboration with at least one stakeholder partner. These smaller grants will lower the barrier to entry for researchers and ECRs without a track record in food systems, who could bring a different and valuable perspective to the challenges. They will also allow for collaboration with SMEs, who typically have limited resources to offer. A second call will enable portfolio balance, based on an analysis of grants supported in call 1.
- This funding call has not yet been awarded and applications are currently being assessed. We expect to fund between 10 and 20 projects and spend is expected to start after April 2022.

A Centre for Doctoral Training call (£5M)
- The aim of supporting a Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) is to ensure a pipeline of skilled people who are able to apply critical interdisciplinary systems thinking to health and sustainability challenges, across academia, business, government and civil society organisations. To facilitate this, it was specified that all each studentship will be in a specific area of the food system but at the interface of the natural and social sciences, and students will receive food systems training delivered centrally by the CDT institutions. Each studentship will include a mandatory minimum 3-month placement in a stakeholder organisation
- One CDT was awarded (£5M) to a consortium led by the University of Greenwich. The CDT will deliver three cohorts of students, supporting more than 60 students over the lifetime of the programme. It brings together 9 research organisations to ensure coverage of different parts of the food system and different disciplines. More information on the Centre for Doctoral Training can be found on the funded CDT's webpage: https://foodsystems-cdt.ac.uk/

The Programme Director (£1.8M)
- The Programme Director (£1.8M) will provide visibility and leadership over the lifetime of the programme; ensure coordination and collaboration across the projects supported in the two calls and the CDT; nurture the development of the interdisciplinary research community with regular meetings and events; ensure the projects maintain an interdisciplinary and food systems approach; synthesise and translate knowledge to drive impact from the projects, working with policymakers and businesses; ensure join-up and synergy with other investments in the area; monitor progress and feed into the final evaluation. The Programme Director will be supported

by a small coordination team comprising the SRO, senior manager and a knowledge exchange broker, and report to the Executive Chair of BBSRC.

Programme partners are Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) (lead), Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), Medical Research Council (MRC), Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), Innovate UK, Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (Defra), Department of Health & Social Care (DHSC), Public Health England (PHE) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA).

The issues being addressed and the context within which the programme is taking place:

Britain has the unhealthiest diet in Europe, significantly increasing the risk of obesity, heart attacks and strokes. Human biology is failing to keep pace with the increasingly obesogenic food environment, with ultra-processed foods high in fat, sugar, and salt making up just over half of all meals consumed in the average UK household. Our diets lack whole grains, fruit, vegetables and nuts and seeds and we consume over twice as much meat as we need for health. At the same time, food production systems that supply these diets are unsustainable, using 70% of all freshwater withdrawals, producing around a third of all GHG emissions, and contributing to biodiversity loss and soil degradation.

If diets continue along the current trajectory, then this will increase pressure on our healthcare systems and the environment until they reach breaking point. Diet-related chronic disease accounts for £6.1 billion of annual NHS spend (around 9%) and generates a wider economic loss of more than £54 billion per year (3% of UK GDP). Meanwhile, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) suggests a potential climate change catastrophe in the next two decades, which the food system contributes to. Climate change will affect our ability to produce food in the future and has been implicated in reducing the nutritional content of crops, making it more challenging to achieve healthy diets.

This interdisciplinary research programme will help transform the UK food system by placing healthy people at its centre and critically linking this with creating a healthy natural environment. It will address questions around what we should eat, produce and manufacture and what we should import, taking into account the complex interactions between health, environment and socioeconomic factors. This will enable a joined-up approach across healthy and accessible consumption and sustainable food production, delivering coherent evidence to enable concerted action from policy, business and civil society.

Many of these longer-term impacts will occur outside the lifetime of the programme therefore as part of the evaluation we are looking for a contribution analysis of the extent to which the programme is on the pathway towards improved health and environmental outcomes, alongside an indication of the potential economic value of the longer-term impacts.

The logic model for the programme is provided in Annex B.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The aim of this evaluation activity is in five parts:

1. Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework - *To be completed within three months of appointment.*
2. Conduct a Baseline study - *To be completed within six months of appointment.*
3. A process evaluation - *August 2022*
4. Prepare an Interim Evaluation Report - *January 2024*

5. Conduct a socio-economic impact evaluation of the programme - *January 2026*

We are looking to find out what difference the programme has made in the following areas:

- The effectiveness of taking a food systems approach and how well this has been normalised within academia and stakeholder organisations.
- The effectiveness of an interdisciplinary, cross-stakeholder approach to generate new knowledge relevant to multiple stakeholders.
- How effectively the knowledge generated has informed policy and practice to help improve health and sustainability outcomes.
- The extent to which the programme has contributed to wider socio and economic impact
- The extent to which the programme is on the pathway towards improved health and environmental outcomes, alongside an indication of the potential economic value of the longer-term impacts

A key measure of success is the extent to which we have achieved the outcomes and impacts from this programme, captured in the logic model at Annex B. Indicators will be used to measure progress towards these impacts, and these are captured at Annex C. We are in the process of developing a theory of change for the programme, which will help inform our indicators – both the theory of change and the indicators will be further refined with the contractors.

Our programme objectives lead to a number of longer-term impacts which will occur beyond the lifetime of the programme (these are detailed in the logic model). The likely timeframe for delivery of these longer-term impacts is 10+ years, which means it is not feasible to capture these within our planned evaluation. We can however measure progress along our logic model towards these longer-term impacts.

The route to achieving the longer-term aims is complex and many other factors will interplay with the work done in this programme to deliver changes in policy and practice. We are therefore interested in unpacking this and in understanding more about the contribution and additionality.

Our approach to the evaluation is therefore to focus on the short and medium-term outcomes and impacts, elements that can act as proxies for progress towards the longer-term impacts and understanding the contribution and additionality of the programme on the pathway towards the longer term goals of improved health and environmental outcomes, and economic value.

As part of the evaluation, we are asking the evaluators to carry out a process evaluation, the key process evaluation questions to consider are:

- To what extent was the programme effective in attracting researchers from across disciplines to work on food systems research?
- To what extent was the programme effective in attracting stakeholders (businesses/ NGOs/ Gov) to cocreate and collaborate on research proposals?

- To what extent did the use of expression of Interest stages and Feedback processes, lead to the submission of competitive high quality research proposals at the final proposal stage of competitions.
- To what extent did the strategic decision-making process (of funding decisions), including external interdisciplinary review and assessment panels, Programme Board and Executive Sponsor, deliver robust fair assessment of applications and funding decisions.
- To what extent have the programme coordination team facilitated knowledge exchange and synergy across funded portfolio.

The socio-economic impact evaluation questions to consider are:

Research

- How effectively has the programme developed new knowledge joining up healthy and accessible consumption with sustainable food production and supply?
- To what extent has the programme supported high quality research and knowledge generation, with the UK at the forefront of food systems research?
- How effectively has the programme developed new knowledge that has enabled the modelling of interdependencies across the UK food system in order to join up healthy and accessible consumption with sustainable food production and supply?
- To what extent has the research led to new modelling approaches and decision-making tools for stakeholders?
- How effectively has research within academia (across different disciplines) and between academia and stakeholders (UK government, business and civil society organisations) been co-designed so that new knowledge helps to drive action across the food system?
- To what extent has an interdisciplinary, cross-stakeholder approach generated new knowledge and evidence relevant to multiple stakeholders?

Translation

- How effectively has the programme translated new knowledge to help transform UK diets to be healthier, more sustainable and more accessible, linking back to UK food production and supply
- To what extent has new knowledge and trial interventions informed policy and practice?
- How effectively has the programme helped to change the behaviour of actors across the food system, from production to consumption?
- To what extent is a food systems approach being undertaken by stakeholders (academia, government, business and civil society organisations) operating in different parts of the food system?
- To what extent has the programme developed new and lasting partnerships?
- A quantified socio-economic impact evaluation (e.g GVA, ROI, NPV)

Training

- How effectively has the programme developed a pipeline of skilled people able to apply critical interdisciplinary systems thinking to the food system in a variety of different stakeholder organisations, in order to strengthen UK capacity and capability?

An indicative list of indicators and data sources for these evaluation questions are provided in Annex C. The successful bidder may regard these suggested metrics as indicative and non-exclusive: different metrics may be proposed during Phase 1 (see Section 4: Deliverables), that better measure the impact of the programme.

How do we envisage the findings of the evaluation activity will be used?

The evaluation at the programme level will be used by UK Research Innovation (UKRI) in informing future interdisciplinary research programmes, as well as allowing us to assess value for public money and the outcomes and impacts it has delivered. Aside from being used in the fund-level evaluation, the findings will feed directly into the Global Food Security (GFS) programme, which brings together the major public sector funders of food-related research to better coordinate and collaborate (collectively partners spend around £350M per year). The partners include all of the UKRI councils, government departments (Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy; Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs; Department for Health & Social Care; Food Standards Agency; Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office; Welsh Government; Scottish Government; Department for International Development), Met Office and the Wellcome Trust. The outcomes of this evaluation will inform this set of organisations when they are commissioning research themselves particularly in food systems or interdisciplinary areas. In terms of collaboration across partners, it will help GFS to better design future interdisciplinary research programmes and identify gaps and opportunities for further work. There will also be lessons learned from the trialled interventions and how to effectively translate research findings into policy and practice. Finally, the evaluation findings will feed into the National Food Strategy. We have inputted into the development of the strategy to ensure alignment with the evidence being generated by the programme, and any case studies or lessons learned will feed directly into the government response.

Who are its key audience?

The key audiences will be UKRI, the Food Systems SPF Programme Partners (BBSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, Innovate UK, Defra, DHSC, PHE & FSA- all of which have had the opportunity to see and comment on this tender), as well as the wider Global Food Security programme partners (UKRI councils, government depts and agencies) for the reasons described above; academia, business and civil society organisations in terms of case studies outlining major successes and best practice from the programme; and the public in terms of accountability for spending of public money.

How will the findings be shared and disseminated? Who else should be made aware of the findings?

The findings will be published and disseminated widely through the networks built during the lifetime of the SPF programme through projects and the coordination team, including international organisations such as the UN or EAT Foundation to showcase the UK approach as an exemplar for other countries to follow. We will also disseminate widely via GFS governance groups, mailing lists, networks and social media.

The timeline of evaluation set out in this document currently ends near the completion of the programme. However, some impacts of the programme are long term in nature. Therefore, the evaluation should highlight the evidence and outcomes and impacts realised to date, and crucially also, the prospect of future impact occurring, based on progress to date and relevant (evidenced) trajectories.

It should be noted that as the programme progresses, the evaluation questions or scope or nature of the programme may change. Evaluation should adapt to these changes as necessary to ensure it appropriately provides evaluation at the end of the programme.

3. Suggested Methodology

Bidders are invited to outline the methodologies they will use to meet the aims of the evaluation.

It is anticipated a variety of methods will be used. Bidders are expected to identify and justify the most appropriate method(s) and propose approaches to evidencing attribution and Transforming UK Food Systems Programme contribution to the sectors. The methods are expected to also provide insights to the existing evidence and sector baselines, and a counterfactual baseline

Bidders are encouraged to think innovatively in terms of how they propose to address the evaluation aims, although innovation should not be to the detriment of robustness. The funding partners are keen to push boundaries in their evaluations, in order to improve the quality of their evidence base.

3.1 General considerations

The proposed approach should follow best practice guidance in designing evaluations drawing on a range of appropriate literature such as the HM Treasury's Magenta Book, and estimates of economic impact should use the HMT Green Book methodologies. This includes considering and outlining how the relevant analytical challenges would be addressed. For example, measuring deadweight, displacement, leakages and spillovers, defining/identifying a counterfactual, trade-offs between robustness and practicability, the reliability of quantified results, potentially small sample sizes, and intangible outcomes and impacts.

Proposals should give consideration to relevant external and policy factors, and activity being undertaken in complimentary programmes.

Bidders should outline how they will bring in policy/govt/industry expertise and sector knowledge relevant to this programme as part of the offering to the evaluation, and so consortia bids are welcome. This could include but is not limited to:

- What impacts are expected as a result of delivering the programme for these various food system stakeholders (academia/ business/ NGOs/ policy makers)
- What benchmarks and appropriate comparisons are available for different food systems stakeholders (academia/ business/ NGOs/ policy makers)involved and not involved in the programme, as a way to analyse the impacts as a result of the programme

3.2 Data collection

The Programme currently collects a number of different levels of data and the following sources will be provided to the successful bidder:

- Data collected through the grants system on applications (currently the Joint electronic Submission (Je-S) form.
- Programme- level data on project, event & publications
- Programme level monthly reporting data which captures progress against workstreams and milestones as well as updates on finance, people and benefits.
- Data on research and innovation outputs, outcomes and impacts outcomes collected through the researchfish
- Annual report data from the Centre for Doctoral Training, the 4 large consortia funded in Call 1 and the projects funded in Call 2.
- Reports from annual grantholder workshops & regular monitoring visits to investments

It is expected that the successful bidder will work with the Programme to refine the current monitoring streams to ensure the appropriate information is being captured from the Programme to allow benefits to be realised.

As well as this information provided by the Programme, it is expected that Bidders will set out the other sources of data they will collect and analysis methods they will use to carry out the different stages of the evaluation.

Bidders may wish to consider a combination of data collection and analysis methods.
It may be that not all methods are appropriate, but it is unlikely that any one alone will be sufficient. Proposals should set out how different data collection and analysis method will be deployed and will be combined to produce the final findings. Further, the proposal should set out how the particular data collection and analysis methods will address the evaluation questions and in a robust manner.

Bidders are expected to identify and justify their proposed approaches, paying particular attention to evidencing attribution. Where outcomes have not yet materialised, for example due to long lead times, the evaluation must consider whether there are interim outcomes that provide an indication of future impact. In all instances of data collection by the successful bidder, the burden on respondents must be minimised as far as possible.

Data collection must build on what is already collected from award holders and other data sources through existing processes, either of funding organisations or third parties – there is scope to negotiate changes in routine data collection by the core team, or to supplement fact-finding with, for example, extra sessions at meetings, webinars etc. Suggested methods of data collection that bidders could include but are not limited to are outlined in Annex D.

Bidders should consider how to survey or collect data and information from individuals that UKRI does not have funding or contractual relationships with. Hence, they will need to consider how data may be obtained efficiently and effectively from these individuals or broader pool of industry to be compliant with GDPR. Bidders should consider the most streamlined way to collect information from these individuals with an aim to maximise quality and rate of response.

For survey activity, proposals should indicate the type (face to face/phone/online) of survey to be implemented, an indication and comment on the required or expected sample size and any strategies to maximise the response rate.

If case studies are proposed, bidders should give an overview of the number of case studies to be conducted and what selection/ sampling methods (i.e. random selection, willingness to participate approach) and tools (i.e. face to face, phone interview) are going to be implemented, taking into consideration the time and costs of the different tools implemented. Proposals should also set out how case study findings will be analysed and presented.

Baseline data:

Phase 2 of this evaluation activity is to carry out a baseline study.

The Bidders should consider what the most appropriate ways of carrying out the baseline study and at what scale it should be carried out at, to understand the contribution and additionality of the intervention.

Factors the Bidders should consider:

- The programme has a number of different interventions (research funding calls and a Centre for Doctoral Training - CDT), should different baseline studies be carried out to allow the benefits of each intervention to be realised?
- How do we factor in the Covid pandemic into the baseline and evaluation of the intervention? The pandemic has had a major impact on the UK Food System, but how do we disentangle the impact of the pandemic from the impact of the programme? Do we conduct a pre and post pandemic baseline?
- What scale of baseline would be most useful to conduct? The route to the longer term aims (e.g improved human health) are complex and will be influenced by many other factors, therefore within the evaluation we are looking to understand the contribution of the programme towards the shorter-term impacts (see theory of change) such as changes in the behaviour of actors across the system, changes in policy and practise and changes in diets towards healthier and more environmentally sustainable food system.
- The evaluation should also baseline the research space, the level of interdisciplinary/ cross stakeholder working and the use of the 'food systems approach' before the intervention of the programme.

For baseline data collection, the data should represent project level information at the application stage/ point in time when projects are about to engage with the programme. Proposals should also consider how to capture and present this for projects that have already commenced under this programme, i.e. collect data retrospectively, especially for those who have not put in place the appropriate data collection protocols. It will not be possible to rely on programme administrative data to construct a baseline. Proposals should set out how they will be identifying and define the population for this aspect of the work.

It should be noted that the projects awarded under this programme have been awarded at different times and are of varying duration and funding. Bidders are therefore encouraged to consider whether a rolling data collection approaches or undertaking data collection at a set point in time relative to the start or end of each project is a feasible option or suggest alternative approaches for the timing of surveys.

Primary data collection must build on what is already collected through existing processes, either of funding organisations or third parties, with any new data collection designed to fill in the gaps. This is to minimise the burden on respondents. The evaluation may utilise data-linking from existing data sets, potentially including to proprietary third-party datasets. Access to these datasets should be considered and costed into proposals.

3.3 Data analysis

Proposals should clearly set out where reliable, quantified impact estimates are expected to be achieved, and where a more qualitative or descriptive approach might be expected. It should also include a long-term return on investment and value for money assessment for the programme where possible, and a socio-economic benefit analysis of the programme.

We anticipate this will be challenging due to an imperfect/incomplete evidence base and uncertain future impact, but the evaluator should use sensitivity and/or scenario analysis to produce a best possible estimate. In view of the estimated the return on investment, the evaluator should assess the value for money of the programme using appropriate benchmarks.

Analysis methods could include, but are not limited to econometric analysis including counterfactuals, analysis of primary or secondary data or theory-based techniques such as contribution analysis. Bidders should be prepared to justify their recommended methodological approach.

If an econometric analysis and survey is proposed as a method for evaluation, the bidders should provide the required sample size in the bid, power analysis where relevant (with an aim to achieve appropriate statistical significance) and how low power issues will be mitigated if the evaluation were to encounter them.

Control Group

The programme design does not allow for a control group to be readily identified given that other funding streams available for food-related research have different aims and would support very different projects (for example responsive mode, institute strategic programme grants, or specifically targeted initiatives). However, some potential comparison groups to compare the outcomes from this programme to could be; sample of food-related grants supported over the same period; projects submitted to the programme but unfunded or mono disciplinary funding streams in the food space; international approaches to food systems approaches or food systems funding.

If bidders propose the use of control groups as part of the evaluation design then proposals should outline which control group(s) and what characteristics will be used for the purposes of comparison, how data will be collected from the sample (both treatment and control groups), including how any issues around securing engagement and participation from treatment and control groups would be addressed.

Examples of how the bidder could compare outcomes from our programme with those from a sample of food-related grants supported over the same period. We could also explore the additionality of our intervention by following up unfunded applicants.

Outcomes

Our programme objectives lead to a number of longer-term impacts which will occur beyond the lifetime of the programme (these are detailed in the logic model Annex B). The likely timeframe for delivery of these longer-term impacts is 10+ years, which means it is not feasible to capture these within our planned evaluation. Our approach to the evaluation is therefore to focus on the short and medium-term outcomes and impacts, elements that can act as proxies for progress towards the longer term impacts, and understanding the contribution and additionality of the programme on the pathway towards the longer term goals of improved health and environmental outcomes, and economic value.

The programme outcomes, as detailed in our logic model Annex B:
To be refined as part of the first phase of the evaluation activity.
- Increased uptake of a food systems approach across stakeholders
- New policy frameworks that deliver an affordable, attractive, healthy and sustainable diet
- Social pressure for behaviour change in consumption patterns
- Improved international reputation of UK for research into transforming food systems and addressing environmental and diet/health challenges
- Synthesis of new knowledge on food system transformation into policy and practice advice
- Increased pressure from public on business/ gov for policy and practice change in the food system
- Increased coordination and collaboration on food systems research across academia, government, business and civil society organisations
- Decision-support tools enable evidence-based policymaking across health and the environment
- Increased capability and capacity for interdisciplinary research across the food system in the UK research base
- A trained cohort of researchers apply new knowledge and skills to challenges in academia, government, business and civil society organisations.

The evaluation would directly affect research funders, however there are benefits for wider stakeholders including government, academia, business and civil society organisations. The main outcomes would be:

- Lessons learned from delivering an interdisciplinary, cross-stakeholder research programme.
- Lessons learned from taking an interdisciplinary and food systems approach to the research.
- Lessons learned in the co-design of research across disciplines and stakeholders.
- Lessons learned from training people to take an interdisciplinary and food systems approach.
- Lessons learned from programme coordination.
- Case studies demonstrating the effectiveness of how interdisciplinary research and taking a food systems approach has informed policy and practice on the pathway towards improved health and environmental outcomes.
- Case studies demonstrating how effective the programme has been in changing the behaviour of actors across the food system, from production to consumption.
- Case studies demonstrating how effective the programme has been in generating new knowledge that has enabled the modelling of interdependencies across the UK food system.

- Lessons learnt from integrating production/consumption and natural/ social sciences into research.
- Evidence detailing the extent to which the food systems approach has been uptaken by stakeholders operating in different parts of the food system.
- Lessons learnt on how using new knowledge and trialling interventions informs policy and practice?
- Case studies demonstrating how effectively the programme has fostered the development of new and lasting partnerships across disciplines and stakeholders in the food system and lessons learnt from these partnerships.

Specific Challenges and limitations

The broad objectives and wide area of interest of this challenge, in comparison to other programmes, may impact on the ability of the evaluators to draw specific conclusions about the impact of the programme. The evaluation supplier should take the following challenges and limitations into consideration and develop an evaluation methodology and approach that mitigates against these limitations.

- Difficulty in measuring attribution due to complex nature of programme.
- Difficulty in attributing changes in policy and practice to the research supported in the programme.
- Difficulty in attributing aims such as reduction in GHG emissions and obesity to the programme as there are currently no recognised or consistent mechanisms to measure these at project level.
- Difficulty distinguishing impacts and benefits arising from this programme between those of other initiatives and challenges focussed on similar areas, e.g ISCF Transforming Food Production and other SPF Programmes. Difficulty tracking benefits- long timeframes, lag effects, uncertainty, and organisational changes making benefits difficult to track
- Spillover benefits to other firms and wider society are generally difficult to measure and predict.
- Current monitoring arrangements may be limited in the type of data that can be collected or may not cover or be able to collect certain data that the programme will want to collect.
- When surveying successful and unsuccessful applicants, there may be issues with the use of self-assessment data and unsuccessful applicants may not wish to participate.
- Access to privileged, confidential, commercial and personal data for evaluation purposes may be restricted through GDPR and data sharing agreements.
- The bidder should consider how to survey or collect data and information from individuals that UKRI does not have funding or contractual relationships with. Hence the bidder will need to consider how data may be obtained efficiently and effectively from these individuals or broader pool of industry to be compliant with GDPR. Bidders should consider the most streamlined way to collect information from these individuals with an aim to maximise quality and rate of response.

3.4 Alignment to SPF Fund level objectives

The successful bidder will need to consider the alignment of this programme's evaluation questions and indicators to the SPF objectives below and outline these in the evaluation framework.

The SPF has the following objectives:
- Drive an increase in high-quality interdisciplinary research and innovation;
- Ensure that UKRI's investment links up effectively with Government departments' research priorities and opportunities; and
- Ensure the system is able to respond to strategic priorities and opportunities.

4. Deliverables

4.1 Deliverables

The evaluation is expected to take place over five phases.
1) Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework - *To be completed within three months of appointment.*
2) Conduct a Baseline study - *To be completed within six months of appointment.*
3) A light touch process evaluation - *August 2022*
4) Prepare an Interim Evaluation Report - *January 2024*
5) Conduct a socio-economic impact evaluation of the programme - *January 2026*

There will be 3 break clauses in the contract at the end of phase 2, 3 and 4, where UKRI will make a decision on the contract continuing. Bidders are required to cost each phase separately.

The deliverables from each Phase are outlined below. In addition to this regular progress update are required to the Programme Manager throughout the project. This may be in the form of fortnightly to monthly calls with a short status report. The updates would include progress updates on evaluation and a summary presentation of key findings and messages to date. It is anticipated that the successful bidder will also be asked to present at least twice a year to UKRI.

Any reports planned for publication will be peer reviewed by UKRI. The successful bidder will be expected to make amendments to deliverables in order to satisfactorily respond to comments before publication. Where appropriate peer review comments may be published alongside deliverables. The successful bidder is also expected to present the findings at the end of the project as outlined in Phase three.

The successful bidder is expected to produce and deliver reports that are:
- Clearly presented with the use of graphics, diagrams and visuals to highlight findings.
- Readable and easy to understand by the general public and non-experts
- Written succinctly with a focus on the findings through data collection and analysis

The successful bidder is also expected to:
- Apply intelligence to the data collected and analysis
- Ensure accuracy and clear assumptions of data used.
- Ensure recommendations are based on robust evidence and accompany statistics and data with discussions and explanation of the impact of these data.

Phase 1: Evaluation framework

This objective of this Phase is to set out the intended approach to evaluation in detail and is expected to be finished by first three months of the programme laying the groundwork for the evaluation. It is expected it would involve key stakeholder consultation via approaches such as interviews and workshops. The deliverable output of this Phase will be an approved Evaluation Framework Report.

As part of this Phase, the evaluator will be required to:

- Validate and refine as necessary the programme's logic model, and theory of change and key success criteria, building on the material already developed and as set out in this document. Verify with the relevant stakeholders the quality and robustness of the available material and suggest any improvements.
- Validate and refine the coverage of our proposed evaluation questions and indicators. (Propose any changes to the current set of questions and indicators that could be delivered within the time and resources allowed the evaluation.
- Based on this, fully develop the evaluation framework for the programme. This should include a complete set of input, activity, output, outcome, and impact indicators to be measured by the evaluation, and a description of how such measures link to the programme objectives. This set must be agreed with all stakeholders, and must align with the evaluation framework for the programme as a whole.
- Develop a detailed analysis approach and impact evaluation, e.g.establishing counterfactuals, baseline etc.
- Develop a detailed analysis plan, explaining the method of analysis of all qualitative and quantitative data, including statistical analysis plans and approaches to synthesis and triangulation, value of money assessment and challenges for evaluation and proposed mitigating strategies
- Define a complete set of data collection requirements (including who and how those data collection requirements will be carried out) to enable comprehensive monitoring and evaluation, identifying any gaps in existing data collection processes, taking into consideration the practical aspects of data collection. Building on the existing minimum data requirements and project level indicators that have already been developed, where applicable.
- Develop a detailed timeline including key activities and deliverables
- Outline a stakeholder map for the evaluation and the approach to communication with relevant groups and ways of working.
- Meeting to present and validate high level findings and report structure with key programme team & steering group.

The framework will include assessment of counterfactual options (more than one counterfactual should be outlined in order to observe the best way to capture programme impacts).

Timing: To be completed within the first three months of appointing an evaluator

Deliverables:

- Meeting with programme team and steering group to validate understanding of the programme and evaluation framework

- Evaluation Framework Report that covers the above requirements

Phase 2: Baseline study

As the activities for this programme started from Nov 2020, this second phase is expected to be rapid and complete by 6 months after the start of the evaluation, focusing on constructing the baseline(s) for measuring the impact of this programme.

Given the bespoke nature of the SPF Food systems Programme and the possible challenge of data paucity, the successful bidder should look to establish a credible baseline given the constraints and an indication of the extent to which it reflects the programme and industry in the absence of programme intervention. The Bidders should consider what the most appropriate ways of carrying out the baseline study(ies) and at what scale it should be carried out at, to understand the contribution and additionality of the intervention. Key questions the Bidders should think about are: if multiple baselines should be conduced for different interventions; how the Covid-19 pandemic is factored into the baseline, and what scale the baseline should be based at.

The requirements of baseline report are:

- A clear definition (where applicable, quantitative definition) of the food system and/or research areas.
- Relevant statistics capturing the state of the research areas of focus prior to commencement of the programme activities, including where appropriate, trends over the preceding few years
- Relevant statistics capturing the usage of the ‘food systems approach’ in research, government and across UK food systems stakeholders prior to the commencement of the programme.
- Relevant statistics capturing the degree of interdisciplinarity in research, government and across UK food systems stakeholders prior to the commencement of the programme.
- The state of key metrics/indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts in the absence of the programme. Following discussion with the programme team, construct a baseline for the programme, using new (primary) and existing (secondary) data (both qualitative and quantitative). To manage expectations the bidder will be expected to source the majority of data for the baseline from multiple sources and not rely solely on programme administrative data to construct a baseline
- Where applicable, a proposed set of targets for each baseline metric/indicator that is reasonable and practical for the programme to aspire to meet by the end of the programme term. Where appropriate interim targets should be proposed if thought to be beneficial. Consideration should be made to the different levels of impacts, short and longer term, and how baselines will be able to capture the contribution of the programme along the pathway to the longer term impacts.
- Descriptions of caveats and assumptions surrounding the evidence that forms the baseline report (incl. definitions, sample size, response rate, collection method, caveats of data), which highlights any data gaps preventing setting a baseline metric in any specific area and make recommendations as to how the programme could fund or commission work to fill these gaps.

- Proposals for a method/process by which the required data should be collected during and after the programme in order to evaluate changes compared against the baseline and achievement of targets. Outline time and resource requirements for data collection.

Proposals should also consider how to capture and present this for projects that have already commenced under this programme, i.e. collect data retrospectively, especially for those who have not put in place the appropriate data collection protocols.
It will not be possible to rely on programme administrative data to construct a baseline. Proposals should set out how they will be identifying and define the population for this aspect of the work.

Timing: To be completed within six months of appointment.

Deliverables:

- Meeting with programme team and steering group to validate understanding of the programme and evaluation framework
- Baseline Report with the baseline measures in relation to all relevant research questions, as outlined in the Evaluation Framework Report, along with anychallenges encountered in relation to capturing these baseline measures.
- There will be a break clause in the contract at the end of Phase 2 for the contracting authority to review the deliverables for UKRI to make a decision on the continuation of contract. The Evaluation Framework Report and Baseline Study will be put out to external peer review as part of this process.

Phase 3: Process Evaluation

Phase 3 will only commence upon the satisfactory completion of phase 2, and so this represents a break clause in the contract. Bidders are therefore expected to cost each stage separately.

A process evaluation will be conducted to look at how effectively the SPF Food Systems team have delivered the programme.

Answering the following Questions:

- To what extent was the programme effective in attracting researchers from across disciplines without a track-record in food systems research?
- To what extent was the programme effective in attracting stakeholders (businesses/ NGOs/ Gov) to cocreate and collaborate on research proposals?
- To what extent did the use of expression of Interest stages and Feedback processes, lead to the submission of competitive high quality research proposals at the final proposal stage of competitions.
- To what extent did the strategic decision-making process (of funding decisions), including external interdisciplinary review and assessment panels, Programme Board and Executive Sponsor, deliver robust fair assessment of applications and funding decisions.

- To what extent have the programme coordination team facilitated knowledge exchange and synergy across funded portfolio.
- To what extent did the programme utilise governance groups and external experts in the strategic decision making process.

To note: the programme is not novel or contentious, it involves interdisciplinary research with researchers working in different but linked areas across the food system. This sort of research has been supported before (for example the Rural Economy and Land Use Programme, and the GFS Resilience Programme) so it is not novel. The programme is also not addressing any contentious issues around food, instead focusing on developing new knowledge joining up healthy and accessible consumption with sustainable food production and supply. However analysis of the programme delivery will help to inform the delivery of future funding programmes by UKRI and other partners.

Deliverable: Report which will include an analysis of the findings.

There will be a break clause in the contract at the end of Phase 3 for the contracting authority to review the deliverables for UKRI to make a decision on the continuation of contract.

Timing of report: August 2022

Phase 4: Interim evaluation report

Phase 4 includes data collection, the analysis and reporting to provide interim updates. In Phase 4 the successful bidder will review the evaluation framework developed in phase 1 and make any adjustments required in order to conduct the impact evaluation in Phase 5. These include any ongoing survey data collection and analysis to enable a robust assessment of the additional impact of the programme on inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. It will be conducted in accordance with the timetable outline in the Evaluation Framework Report.

Phase 4 involves the delivery of one report: Interim evaluation progress report

Phase 4 will only commence upon the satisfactory completion of phase 3, and so this represents a break clause in the contract. Bidders are therefore expected to cost each stage separately.

The purpose of interim evaluation progress report is to:

- Indicate if the programme is on track to deliver the expected impacts
- Review and adjust the evaluation approach to date as necessary in order to deliver impact evaluation report

The interim evaluation progress report should:

- Evidence of outcomes and impacts programmes have delivered to date by the programme, by analysing internal monitoring data collected and primary and secondary research conducted by the appointed evaluator
- Assumptions for the analysis and data collection

- Review evidence collected through internal monitoring processes (largely for benefit realisation use, such as the progress against benefits KPIs) to assess if the challenge is on track for delivering the expected impacts.
- Review and adjust evaluation approach/framework as necessary if required (e.g. if some baseline indicators have become less relevant due to programme changes, the approach to evaluation and data to be collected will require adjustment such as additional data collection on different indicators)
- Identify foreseeable issues to evaluation and mitigation strategy
- Workshop to present and validate high level findings and report structure with key programme stakeholders

Deliverables:

- Workshop(s) with key programme stakeholders to present and validate high level findings and report structure and to present and validate interim reports
- Reports which will include both an executive summary as well as detailed analysis of the findings.

Timing of report: January 2024

Workshop for report to present and validate high level findings and report structure with key programme stakeholders by March 2024

There will be a break clause in the contract at the end of Phase 4 for the contracting authority to review the deliverables for UKRI to make a decision on the continuation of contract. The Interim evaluation report will be put out to external peer review as part of this process.

Phase 5 – Impact evaluation

Phase 5 is the main period of data collection and analysis for reporting of impact evaluation. In Phase 5 the successful bidder will implement the evaluation framework developed in phase 1, including any ongoing survey data collection and analysis to enable a robust assessment of the additional impact of the programme on inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. It will be conducted in accordance with the timetable outline in the Evaluation framework Report.

Phase 5 involves the delivery of the impact evaluation report that marks the impacts to date and indicative future impacts of the challenge.

Phase 5 will only commence upon the satisfactory completion of phase 4. Bidders are therefore expected to cost each stage separately.

The purpose of the impact evaluation progress report is to provide an assessment of the outcomes and impacts of the programme to date, providing comprehensive answers to each of the pre-agreed evaluation questions in turn.

To meet the project's objectives, the evaluation will need to provide a quantitative economic impact assessment if possible. By focusing on benefits to the public sector and UK businesses, it should be possible to quantify the economic impact in monetary terms (e.g. increased value added/saved costs). To quantify the benefits some primary research is likely to be needed, in addition to substantial secondary research. Primary research could include, for example, contacting users to ask them for estimates and data about the benefits that the programme has generated, as well as searching and analysing data. Secondary research will include identifying academic literature / government reports and summarising the information contained (e.g. cost – benefit analyses and identifying documents that summarise scientific information to support specific policies).

Unless technically impossible or largely impractical, the methodology to generate the estimates of benefit will be based on guidance and methodologies in HM Treasury's Green Book and in related guidance (including the Magenta Book) these methodologies should be described in the report. Where the supplier intends to use non-Green Book methodologies, the approach will need to be discussed and approved explicitly by BBSRC and the Steering Group.

The impact evaluation report should include:

- Evidence of outcomes and impacts programmes have delivered by the completion of programme (with thematic findings that address all evaluation questions and grouping by UKRI impact categories, i.e. impacts on knowledge, economic, society and environmental, the successful bidder will have a copy of UKRI and SPF evaluation framework
- Dataset of results and data in a format that can interrogated in the future
- Estimate on longer term return on investment and value for money assessment where possible, e.g NPV calculation
- Assumptions for the analysis and data collection
- Assessment of the likelihood of achieving the expected impacts in the future beyond the life of programme
- Lessons learnt/ recommendations for future improvements
- Workshop to present and validate high level findings and report structure with key programme stakeholders
- Presentation of and quality assured key findings and predictions and recommendations.

Proposed approach for how the evaluation will be completed beyond the life of the programme by considering future data linking, merging and application of similar analysis methods, timing of future evaluation. This approach should allow continuation by any potential deliverer of evaluation beyond the life of the programme.

Deliverables:

- Workshop(s) with key programme stakeholders to present and validate high level findings and report structure and to present and validate evaluation report
- Report which include both an executive summary as well as detailed analysis of the findings (which will be put out to external peer review)

Timing of report: January 2026

Workshop for report to present and validate high level findings and report structure with key programme stakeholders by March 2026

All outputs from Phase 1-5 will be subject to internal and external, independent peer review.

At the end of EACH Phase of the evaluation, all datasets provided, compiled, or used, along with a detailed description of analysis methods must be provided to UKRI with unique business identifier in a convenient format, such that it will be possible to hand over, in full, either to UKRI or another contractor, as appropriate. Proposals must state how this will be achieved, including how any data protection issues will be resolved.

It should be noted that as the programme is being delivered, changes to the programme may affect the design and delivery of evaluation. Hence bidders should note to allow for flexibility in the design and delivery of evaluation to ensure evaluation remains appropriate for the programme.

To allow for evaluation beyond the life of the programme, the successful bidder's evaluation deliverables must allow for future continuation of their work. This includes the provision of the methodology used, all data and contact lists to any potential future evaluators.

All data collected during the course of evaluation must be made available, on request, to contracting organisations or third parties under contract to them, for the purposes of additional research and evaluation. Data from programme participants must be collected in such a way to enable this to happen. Proposals must clearly state how this will be achieved and any limitations to data sharing which may exist.

Activities and Outputs

UKRI will have a SPF Food Systems Programme Manager who will act as day-to-day contact for the successful bidder. The suggested outputs and meetings are shown below, however bidders should remain flexible to meet emerging requirements. The timelines have been suggested; however if the bidder considers these timescales conflict with the methodology suggested the bidder is invited to suggest alternative timescales with supporting rationale. In addition to the formal meetings listed below it is expected that the contractor will engage in regular catch up meetings (weekly/fornightly/monthly as appropriate) with the programme team to discuss progress and on-going issues.

Phase	Output	Meetings
Phase 1: Evaluation Framework	Draft Evaluation Framework Report for review Final Evaluation Framework Report for acceptance	Kick off meeting Workshops with key stakeholders, sector experts and evaluation working group to identify and validate key metrics and logic model Meeting to present the draft Evaluation Framework Report Meeting/ Workshop to present the final Evaluation Framework Report
Phase 2 will only commence upon the satisfactory completion of Phase 1 and so this represents a break clause in the contract. Bidders are therefore expected to cost each stage separately.		
Phase 2: Baseline Report	Draft Baseline Report for review	Workshops with stakeholders to facilitate

	Final Baseline Report for acceptance	data collection and data validation Meeting to present draft Baseline Report Meeting/ Workshop to present final Baseline Report
Phase 3: Light touch Process evaluation	Draft Process evaluation report Final Process evaluation report	
Phase 4 will only commence on the satisfactory completion of phase 2 and so this represents a break clause in the contract. Bidders are expected to cost each phase separately.		
Phase 4: Interim Evaluation Report	Draft Interim Evaluaton Report for review Final Interim Evaluation Report for acceptance	Workshops/meetings with stakeholders as required to facilitate data collection Meeting to present draft Interim Evaluation Report Meeting/ workshop to present the final Interim Evaluation Report
Phase 5 will only commence on the satisfactory completion of phase 3 and so this represents a break clause in the contract. Bidders are expected to cost each phase separately.		
Phase 5: Final Full Evaluation Report	Draft Final Full Evaluation Report for review. Final Final Full Evaluation Report for acceptance. Presentation of findings.	Meeting to present the draft Final Evaluation Report. Meeting/ Workship to present the final Final Evaluation Report. Dissemination event (meeting date, time and audience to be identified)

ANNEX B

Supplier Proposal

[Redacted]

Part 2: Contract Terms

Contract Terms v6.0