

SPECIFICATION

Specification Reference
FS430651
Specification Title
<i>Behaviours in Kitchens (Kitchen Life 2)</i>
Contract Duration
3 Years

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

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

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

SPECIFICATION

THE SPECIFICATION, INCLUDING PROJECT TIMETABLE AND EVALUATION OF TENDERS

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Food Standards Agency is an independent Government department working across England, Wales and Northern Ireland to protect public health and consumers wider interest in food. We make sure food is safe and what it says it is.

The FSA is responsible for protecting public health in relation to food in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The [latest estimates](#) indicate that the burden of foodborne disease in the UK is £9.1 billion. 2.4 million people suffer from a foodborne disease every year.

How food is handled is one of the key factors in the risk of foodborne disease. Our [research and evidence programme](#) includes the following questions:

- *What role does consumer and Food Business Operator behaviour and perception play in ensuring food safety and standards?*
 - *What tools, theories, models and evidence can be used to understand, identify and segment motivations of consumers, food businesses, regulatory bodies and others in the food system to frame approaches for effective interventions which embed good practices and support positive behaviour change?*
 - *How can the FSA make best use of cutting-edge social research methods to get broader and deeper insights into consumer and business behaviours, attitudes and trends?*
-
- 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). For science projects we will encourage contractors to publish their work in peer reviewed scientific publications wherever possible. Also, in line with the Government's Transparency Agenda which aims to encourage more open access to data held by government, the Agency is developing a policy on the release of underpinning data from all of its science- and evidence-gathering projects. Data should be made freely available in an accessible format, as fully and as promptly as possible. Consideration should be given to data management as new contracts are being negotiated. Resource implications for this should be taken into account. The mechanism for publishing underpinning data should allow the widest opportunity for to enable its re-use. Where possible, underpinning data should be included in the

SPECIFICATION

final project report. Where data are included in the final report in pdf format, they should also be published separately in a format that can be used for further analysis. Large data sets can be provided separately in an annex to the report, and published, where possible, alongside the final report online. Where it is more appropriate to publish underpinning data in an existing database, archive, repository or other community resource, or for data to be saved in a specialist proprietary format, information will be provided on how the data can be accessed. There will be some circumstances where release of data may need to be restricted or anonymised for reasons of commercial and/or personal sensitivities.

A. THE SPECIFICATION

Background

We are interested in commissioning a new study to understand food hygiene practices in domestic and catering kitchens in England, Northern Ireland, and Wales to better inform our risk assessment, management and communication and our broader policy.

In 2013 the FSA worked with the University of Hertfordshire on a study – Kitchen Life – which sought to investigate, document, analyse and interpret domestic kitchen practices. The study was intended to generate insights about what goes on and why in UK domestic kitchens to inform our thinking about how to reduce the burden of foodborne disease.

A key focus of FSA research has always been on reported behaviours, often through our flagship social research survey Food and You. This survey was recently given a wholesale review to include both attitudes and behaviours in its scope and to report more frequently from a larger sample, starting from January 2020 and is in field now.

However, the 2013 Kitchen Life study took a different and parallel approach, examining what people do, what they say about what they do and the role of the kitchen itself and its assorted things, technologies and resources (chopping boards, microwaves and cupboards, for example), taking a qualitative and ethnographic approach to investigate domestic kitchen practices. It highlighted the complex entanglement of food safety practices and other aspects of daily life, something scientists can often forget.

We are looking for a research partner to help us look at kitchen life in a food business setting as well as in the home. Rather than isolating particular aspects such as the people involved; their behaviour, attitudes or beliefs; or the kitchen technologies they have access to, a practices approach encompasses all of these

SPECIFICATION

elements and more and investigates how they are interconnected within everyday routines.

We are keen to build on our existing knowledge and then turn it into usable data for risk analysis and actionable insights for policy/regulatory interventions through the application of behavioural science. Digital technology now provides innovative techniques for collecting and observing data which were not available in 2013; we are also keen to explore these new possibilities.

The Specification

Tenderers are invited to carry out a new study to understand food hygiene practices in domestic and catering kitchens.

Aims

The aim of this study is to identify (i) the key behaviours relating to food safety that occur in domestic and catering conditions, (ii) where, when, how often and with whom they occur and (iii) influences on those behaviours that would need to change if the behaviours were to change (influences may be environmental, regulatory, social, motivational (e.g. beliefs, habits) or capability (e.g. knowledge and skills)).

Objectives

Our main objectives are as follows:

1. To provide data for risk assessment

Often we are reliant on studies conducted overseas or reported practices to inform our current risk assessment models. We are keen to have data on the likelihood of certain practices from observed study to fill evidence gaps and test the assumptions that we include in our risk assessment modelling for domestic and catering kitchen food handling and preparation. By understanding the prevalence of certain behaviours, we will be able to make an impact on the spread of foodborne disease.

We would like to be able to use the data to refine our understanding of our existing consumer segmentation, and FHRs ratings. For instance, identifying which risky behaviours are more common in catering kitchens with lower FHRs ratings, or which consumer segments are more likely to engage in risky practices.

2. To develop hypotheses for behavioural interventions

The intention is that observing people in real life will allow us to develop hypotheses about what is driving practices. As well as observing them, we would like to develop recommendations based in evidence from behavioural science for interventions which might be tested in a subsequent phase of this project. We want to develop and test hypotheses on the following:

SPECIFICATION

- What influences good and poor food hygiene practices in domestic and catering kitchen contexts?
- What is the link between food safety knowledge and practice in domestic and catering kitchen contexts? Where are the gaps between knowledge and behaviour?
- Which practices have been improved in the past and what interventions were used to achieve this? How might we evaluate interventions that do this in domestic and catering kitchen contexts?

Research Questions

Within each aim, we have the following specific research questions.

- (i) What are the key behaviours that occur in domestic and catering conditions,**
 - a. What behaviours constitute everyday “kitchen life” in domestic and catering kitchens in England, Northern Ireland and Wales?
 - i. Behaviours of interest include, for domestic kitchens; washing fruit and vegetables (including use of chemicals), eating “inedible” parts of fruit and vegetables, use of chopping boards, washing up and use of tea towels, washing chicken, cooking and storage behaviours.
 - ii. For catering kitchens; handwashing, food preparation, toilet breaks, allergen labelling, allergen food preparation, training and communication to customers.
 - b. What are the relationships between these behaviours? Which behaviours are more commonly observed together?
 - c. How do these behaviours relate to food safety?
- (ii) Where, when, how often and with whom these behaviours occur in domestic and catering kitchens?**
 - a. What are the most common risky kitchen practices (i.e. behaviours which do not comply with the index of recommend practice), and by whom, when, and where do these occur, in both domestic and catering kitchens?
 - b. Do demographic factors (e.g. age, pregnancy, income, allergies) influence the following:
 - i. checking labels for allergen information, purchasing products and managing cross-contamination at home.
- (iii) What influences on those behaviours would need to change in order to change behaviours in domestic and catering kitchens? Influences**

SPECIFICATION

may be environmental, regulatory, social, motivational (e.g. beliefs, habits), or capability (e.g. knowledge and skills))?

- a. What are the main influences on kitchen behaviours in domestic and catering kitchens in England, Northern Ireland and Wales?
 - i. For instance, how important is cost as a factor in disregarding use-by-dates? How do people judge when food is safe to eat? What prompts people to clean their surfaces?
 - ii. What are the factors for risky (or “good”) behaviours in kitchens? Is cost-saving a factor, reputation, customer experience, or time restraints?
- b. What are the main barriers and levers to government recommended practice in domestic and catering kitchens?
- c. How might we overcome the barriers, or maximise the levers, to encourage greater uptake of recommended practice in domestic and catering kitchens?

Timings and Methodology

We understand that this is a complicated and ambitious ask, so would expect any proposal to employ a staged approach against the following outcomes:

January to March 2021

1. **a literature review** to ensure we are drawing on the latest thinking, and to identify key behaviours, actors, and potential barriers to be further explored in primary research (Aims i, ii, and iii)
2. **scoping work** to design and agree appropriate fieldwork techniques

2021-22

3. **primary research and data collection**, probably through a variety of methods but certainly incorporating direct observation of kitchen practice in both home and catering/restaurant settings, to address all three aims. It is hoped that COVID-19 restrictions will have enable catering kitchens to be in operation by this point, however, this is not guaranteed, and so contractors are invited to carefully consider the implications of COVID-19 on fieldwork over the coming years, including use of digital methodology and staggering fieldwork between domestic and catering kitchens if necessary.

2022-23

4. **development of evidenced hypotheses** around the drivers of good and poor food hygiene practices developed through the observation of social practices, to address our third aim.
5. **reporting including:**
 - a. **data** on the likelihood of practices and behaviour to balance or validate the assumptions we make in our risk assessment models.

SPECIFICATION

- b. **recommendations** for behavioural interventions to improve food hygiene practices and ways that we might pilot them

The FSA would like to see project proposals from expert teams who can demonstrate prior experience in projects of similar scope and scale; such a team might include expertise in behaviour science, psychology, sociology, social research, new technology and data collection methods, and in the spread of bacteria. Consortium bids are welcomed.

These proposals should include:

- Plans for development and delivery:
 - in line with the latest and best thinking from various social science disciplines,
 - drawing where appropriate on innovative and digital tools
 - in line with our inclusion policy for analysis and our guidelines on the use of data
 - to a realistic timeframe and budget
 - to take into account the potential restrictions due to COVID-19 and where appropriate, suggest innovative fieldwork methods
- Plans for:
 - Fieldwork across the three nations in which we operate (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)
 - Regular reporting and discussion with the FSA science team, including programme managers and technical leads
 - A peer-reviewed final report of the project and its findings for publication by the FSA in line with HMG accessibility guidelines
 - Graphic and audio-visual content for dissemination on FSA internal and external communications channels about the project and its findings

Budget assumptions

The FSA estimates the cost of this study to be between £400-485k. This is expected to be split as follow:

20/21: 85k

21/22: 250k

22/23: 150k

The onus is on the applicant(s) to provide the costings they believe are reasonable to meet the evidence gap as outlined in this research specification and provide the justification of this within their research proposal. The applicant(s) should be aware

SPECIFICATION

that one of the key criteria that all research proposals are evaluated against is 'value for money' which is delivering the research asked for in the research requirement (including the anticipated outputs and benefits) at a competitive price'

Innovation

We are keen to explore new digital data collection options, which were not available in 2013, such as auto-ethnography. We are also keen to explore a range of non-digital techniques; therefore tenderers are invited to propose a range of innovative techniques to best address our research questions.

Risk

Tenderers are invited to complete a detailed risk register, including mitigations, for their proposal. Please consider any risks that the COVID-19 pandemic may have on the project, and proposed mitigations.

Ethics

Tenderers are invited to provide a detailed ethics section for their proposal. This should take into account any additional considerations for digital methodology, and for ethnographic research.

Tenderers are asked to consult the *Government Social Research Guide for Ethical Assurance for Social Research*¹.

Data protection

Ensure the roles and responsibilities of the Controller, usually FSA, and the Processor, usually supplier, are set out clearly in this specification.

If it is your expectation that there will be Personal Data in the delivery of the contract please include the following text in your specification:-

FSA will be the data controller, and the supplier will be the data processor.

'Please outline in your tender how you will comply with the GDPR, recognising the commissioning authority's role as the 'data controller' and the contractors role as the 'data processor', and responding to the sections below. If successful you may also be asked to carry out a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA), and a privacy notice may be required, which will be reviewed by the FSA data security team.

¹ http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/ethics_guidance_tcm6-5782.pdf

SPECIFICATION

Data security

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

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

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

Dissemination and exploitation

The final report will be published in line with GSR (government social research) guidelines on the FSA website, and we may also require a shorter report for publication in an academic journal.

The successful contractor will be invited to present the findings at an internal FSA talk to stakeholders and other interested parties.

The social science team will further disseminate the findings across our governmental networks, such as the cross-governmental behavioural insights network and the government social research network. We also expect to apply to present the findings at external conferences such as the annual centre for behaviour change conference.

Sustainability

The FSA is committed to reducing its carbon footprint as an organisation, including in its selection of contractors. Suppliers are therefore invited to provide a specific sustainability strategy for the project, including ways of reducing carbon footprint as

SPECIFICATION

well as minimising waste and protecting the natural environment during the course of fieldwork and dissemination.

Quality – See below for areas that you may wish to consider

Contractors should provide a detailed quality management plan in their response. It is desirable, but not essential, for suppliers to hold ISO 9000 – Quality Management.

Suppliers should consult the Joint Code of Practice for Research: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joint-code-of-practice-for-research-jcopr>

The stands in the Aqua Book should also be considered for the statistical elements of the research. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-aqua-book-guidance-on-producing-quality-analysis-for-government>

As required on a project by project base i.e. UKAS accreditation, ISO 9001 etc.

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:

<http://www.iso.org/iso/home/standards.htm>

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>

Will the '[Joint Code of Practice for Research](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joint-code-of-practice-for-research-jcopr)' apply to your project?

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

SPECIFICATION

B. PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE

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

TABLE 1. ESTIMATED PROJECT TIMETABLE	
EXPECTED DATE	INVITATION TO (ITT) TENDER
9 th November 2020	Invitation to Tender (ITT) issued by the Agency
9 th November	ITT Clarification period opens*
8 th December 2020	ITT Clarification period closes**
30 th December 2020	Closing date for submission of ITT responses***
6 th Jan 2021	Appraisal panel meeting
6 th Jan 2021	Tenderers notified of outcome
w/c 18 th January 2021	Contract awarded and signed
w/c 18 th January 2021	Project initiation meeting takes place and project commences

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

** Queries will not be answered after this date.

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

§ These stages are optional

Further Information

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

Phone: 0800 368 4850

Email: help@bravosolution.co.uk .

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

Closing Date 15th December 2021

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

SPECIFICATION

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

C. EVALUATION OF TENDERS

The Tenderers Application consists of the:

- Technical envelope (80% of overall value), in which applicants should detail the approach, the work plan and their ability to undertake the work, and
- Commercial 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 and the approach/scope of work, including innovation	30%
2. The plan and deliverables	10%
3. Organisational experience, expertise and staff effort	15%
4. Project management	10%
5. Risk management	5%
6. Quality management, ethics, data protection, dissemination and sustainability	10%
COMMERCIAL 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.

SPECIFICATION

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

All technical criteria will be evaluated as follows:

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

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

The Commercial Envelope

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

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

Requirement for the commercial envelope

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

Evaluation of the commercial envelope

Commercial criteria will be evaluated as follows:

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

SPECIFICATION

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