



**Cyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru
Countryside Council for Wales**

The Countryside Council for Wales champions the environment and landscapes of Wales and its coastal waters as sources of natural and cultural riches, as a foundation for economic and social activity, and as a place for leisure and learning opportunities. We aim to make the environment a vital and valued part of everyone's life in Wales.

Contract Specification for providing a research report to the Land Use Policy Group on:

“Exploring the Concept of Sustainable Intensification”

**CCW Contract No:
324 EPG 11**

CCW Project Code: WDL009

**Version 1
Author Brian Pawson
Date 26th August 2011**



Summary

The Countryside Council for Wales (CCW), acting on behalf of the Land Use Policy Group (LUPG) of the UK environmental, conservation and countryside agencies, wishes to appoint consultants to explore the concept of sustainable intensification.

Against the backdrop of needing to provide more food in future, whilst at the same time safeguarding the ecosystem services underpinning agricultural production, the term “sustainable intensification” encapsulates the current debate.

The purpose of this project is to provide quantified evidence, using farm level case studies, of environmental and production gains occurring in situations where farm management is consistent with a “sustainable intensification approach”.

The work we are proposing is substantially based on survey (structured interviews and/ farmer focus groups) with the main output comprising a final report c.15 – 20,000 words. Once a final draft is available, LUPG will require the contractor to organise a workshop, involving the project steering group, the contractor, selected farmers and an invited audience as proposed by the contractor and agreed with LUPG. The workshop will be held London and its purpose will be to disseminate the key messages from the research work. In preparing the paper and organising the workshop, the chosen contractor will be expected to draw on a wide range of knowledge and expertise concerning the issues involved in practical farm management across a range of agricultural sectors within the UK.

1.Background

1.1. Food shortages currently affect growing numbers of people worldwide, with commodity prices peaking in 2008 before rising again in 2010-11. At the moment such food shortages arise primarily from inequalities in purchasing power and distribution systems, but the predicted rise in global population (from the current level of 6 billion to some 9 billion by 2050) points to the risk of absolute shortages of food at some point in the future. At the same time the nature of our demand for food is changing as the inhabitants of growing economies such as China and Brazil shift to a higher protein diet. These growing pressures on productive capacity are likely to be exacerbated by

a rise in global temperatures and a change in rainfall patterns. Increased competition over finite resources such as land, energy, water is also expected to place significant pressure on the global food system¹.

1.2. Against the backdrop of needing to provide more food at some point in future, whilst at the same time safeguarding the ecosystem services underpinning agricultural production, the term “sustainable intensification” encapsulates the current debate. As stated in the final report of the Foresight Project on the Future of Food and Farming²: *“It follows that if (i) there is relatively little new land for agriculture. (ii) more food needs to be produced and (iii) achieving sustainability is critical, then sustainable intensification is a priority. Sustainable intensification means simultaneously raising yields, increasing the efficiency with which inputs are used and reducing the negative environmental effects of food production. It requires economic and social changes to recognise the multiple outputs required of land managers, farmers and other producers and a redirection of research to address a more complex set of goals than just increasing yield”*.

1.3. Previous work commissioned by LUPG³ considered the sustainability challenge for agriculture and forestry in Europe. Four issues were considered in detail: the level of food production required in Europe; reducing the environmental footprint of agriculture; the contribution of technology; and emerging patterns in European land use. The analysis was illustrated through reference to a number of emerging techniques which, taken together, could be seen as forming part of an approach to sustainable intensification. This work provides a useful starting point for the current project, although it should not be viewed as being exhaustive since other techniques and practices such as agro-ecology may also be relevant.

2. Requirements

2.1. The principal tasks involved in the project are as follows:

- Identify the main characteristics of sustainable intensification in a UK context through reference to the various practices, technologies and systems which are consistent with

¹Foresight. *The Future of Food and Farming (2011) Final Project Report*. The Government Office for Science, London

²Foresight Report. *Executive Summary*, section 8, page 35.

³ *Scoping the development of the Environmentally Sustainable Production Agenda, IEEP report for LUPG. 2010. Report accessible at: <http://www.ieep.eu/topics/agriculture-and-land-management/>*

this approach;

- Identify a range of individual farmers(c.15-25) from across the UK whose farming practices either match the characteristics of sustainable intensification or who are perceived to be demonstrating aspects of sustainable intensification as part of managing a successful agricultural businesses;
- Use a combination of structured interviews and/or focus groups⁴ to gather evidence on:
 - (i). the nature of sustainable intensification in the context of the main agricultural sectors within the UK;
 - (ii). the range of farm level implications (production levels, environmental risks and/or known impacts, food quality, changing labour requirements etc) which arise as a consequence of adopting a sustainable intensification approach;
 - (iii). the nature of any barriers to the adoption of sustainable intensification approaches;
 - (iv). the expectations of those involved in sustainable intensification in terms of future drivers/ pressures on the business and farmers responses to these;
 - (v). the extent to which current RDPs/RDR measures have been used to support sustainable intensification at farm level or whether this taken place primarily as a result of private sector innovation and investment;
 - (vi). the extent to which sustainable intensification presents challenges for existing agri-environment schemes or can these can be used to promote a range of “win-win” solutions in terms of increased quantity/quality of production whilst at the same time enhancing the provision of a range of other ecosystem services?

2.2. The research materials collected as part of this project should be presented in the form of a series of individual farm level case studies accompanied by an overarching final report. This should summarise the nature of the existing evidence for the applicability of the sustainable intensification approach; provide a critical overview of the concept (in terms of both opportunities and risks); evaluate the different tools which have been used to encourage its use and identify the nature of any knowledge gaps.

⁴ Note that all farmers within Wales must be offered the choice of being interviewed in either Welsh or English. Also any focus groups organised within Wales must include simultaneous translation facilities from Welsh into English to allow those who wish to do so to contribute in Welsh.

2.3. It should be noted that the sustainable intensification model may only be applicable to certain types of farms. In due course, it is likely that a further piece of work will be required in order to explore the nature of a sustainable economic growth model as applied to more extensive systems.

2.4. The project will be initiated following an inception meeting involving the contractor and the LUPG steering group. The most suitable venue for this meeting is likely to be in London. The aim of the inception meeting is to explore the issues that LUPG wishes to be developed in the research and to discuss the approach proposed by the selected contractor. The final version of the paper and executive bilingual summary (Welsh/English) must be submitted to CCW⁵, in both hard copy (which must be double sided and on paper containing at least 80% post consumer waste) and in digital version, by **6 August 2012** (see section 4 below).

2.5. Once a final draft is available, LUPG will require the contractor to organise a workshop, involving the project steering group, the contractor, selected farmers and an invited audience as proposed by the contractor and agreed with LUPG. The workshop will be held London and its purpose will be to disseminate the key messages from the research work. In preparing the paper and organising the workshop, the chosen contractor will be expected to draw on a wide range of knowledge and expertise concerning the issues involved in practical farm management across a range of agricultural sectors within the UK.

3.Procurement

3.1. CCW will accept consortium based tenders. Contractors will need to clearly detail who is in the consortium and what the arrangements for project management are and the credentials of the individual experts concerned.

3.2. The completion deadline is **6 August 2012**

⁵ Note that CCW will arrange for translation of the Executive summary into Welsh, but it is the responsibility of the contractor to insert the translation into the final text of the report.

4. Project Management

4.1. The project will be managed by the Countryside Council for Wales on behalf of LUPG. The project manager will be **Brian Pawson**, CCW Senior Agricultural Advisor (01792 326467). The contractor will be required to maintain close links with the project manager. CCW will chair a steering group representing the LUPG agencies overseeing the project. This group comprises:

- Brian Pawson - Countryside Council for Wales
- Graeme Kerr - Natural England
- James Petts – Natural England
- Maria de la Torre – Scottish Natural Heritage
- Margaret Griffiths – Scientific, Evidence & Assessment Branch, Welsh Government

4.2. Additional agency representatives with specialist knowledge of the subject area may also attend steering group meetings/be asked to provide comments on the draft paper as requested by the steering group.

4.3. The steering group will either use audio/video conferencing where available or meet in London (or somewhere similarly accessible). The cost of attendance by the contractor at steering group meetings should be included in the tender submission.

4.4. The contractor is responsible for ensuring that CCW receives all outputs in a timely manner. Reports should be submitted electronically in MS Word format. The contractor will ensure that CCW can retrieve all documents from the files including table, charts and any graphics. Large files (>5Mb) should be avoided. Please note that column layout is not acceptable, and formatting should be kept as simple as possible, in line with LUPG's style guidelines (See Annex 1). The front cover must be in the standard LUPG format and the inside front cover pages must include the LUPG agency descriptions and disclaimer. These documents will be provided by LUPG in electronic format.

4.5. Any variations from the above will need to be agreed in advance. Final editorial control will rest with the project steering group.

5.Outline of Proposed Timetable and Milestones

5.1. NB – exact dates will be established at the initial steering group meeting.

| Milestone | Week beginning |
|--|-----------------------|
| Contract awarded | 16 January 2012 |
| Inception meeting | 23 January 2012 |
| Preliminary report on main characteristics of sustainable intensification in a UK context together with suggested list of interviewees | 27 February 2012 |
| 2 nd Steering Group meeting | 5 March 2012 |
| Preliminary report on outcomes from interviews and focus groups | 7 May 2012 |
| 3 rd steering group meeting | 14 May 2012 |
| Draft final report submitted | 25 June 2012 |
| Seminar held by | 16 July 2012 |
| Final report submitted | 6 August 2012 |

6.Selection Criteria

6.1. The steering group will select the contractor on the basis of the following criteria. The tender bids will be assessed in 2 phases.

Phase 1

The first will be to establish which suppliers have the “must have” criteria, which are:

| | |
|---|--|
| Knowledge of agricultural systems, technology transfer and experience of working with individual farmers | |
| Conducted successful large scale workshops, please provide example of previous workshop with feedback comments | |
| Details of Relevant Experience of Personnel (CV's) that will be involved in this tender | |
| Capacity to complete project to deadline | |
| Professional Indemnity Insurance | |
| Employers Liability Insurance | |
| Public Liability Insurance | |
| 2 referenced | |
| *Financial Stability: Please indicate which of the following you would you be able to provide (tick a minimum of one) | |
| A copy of your audited accounts for the most recent two years (if this applies) | |
| A statement of your turnover, profit & loss account and cash flow for the most recent year of trading | |
| A statement of your cash flow forecast for the current year and a bank letter outlining the current | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| cash and credit position | |
| Alternative means of demonstrating financial status if trading for less than a year | |
| If requested, would you be able to provide a banker's reference? | Yes / No |

***To pass and be evaluated at 'Selection criteria' stage must be able to provide one of the options and if required provide a copy if successful.**

Please note if you do not have all of the above 'must have' criteria your bid will **not** progress to the next round and your bid will be rejected. Therefore please ensure before presenting your bid that you can demonstrate the above.

Phase 2

The selection criteria will be weighted as follows:

| Quality Weighting: | | 60% |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Proposed methodology and approach | 10% | |
| 2. Previous relevant experience of key staff and how they will be utilised on this contract. Please provide examples of relevant experiences. | 25% | |
| 3. Level of expertise. Balance of allocated team members (in terms of time and expertise and total time allocated to the project) | 25% | |
| 4. Project management | 25% | |
| 5. Details of how the seminar will be delivered and structured | 15% | |
| Total | 100% | |
| Price Weighting: | | 40% |
| TOTAL | | 100% |

The following standards will be applied when scoring tenders:

| Criteria | Standard | Score |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Proposed methodology and approach | <p>Detailed breakdown of methodology into stages.</p> <p>Clear understanding of the need to undertake the analysis, interpretation of key results and drafting of reports through an iterative and discursive process with steering group.</p> <p>Any additions or alternative suggestions to the specified requirements have an appropriate explanation as to why these are required, constitute an innovative approach and are deemed relevant and acceptable to LUPG.</p> | 5 |

| | | |
|---|--|----------|
| | <p>Proposal displays a very clear grasp of what is required, taking concepts referred to in the specification and showing how they can be developed in an innovative way. Approach to the work is very easy to understand, follows a logical progression and displays a realistic understanding of the time and resources required to complete the task as well as potential pitfalls. Very good use of English within a well written and easy to understand text.</p> | |
| | <p>Sufficiently detailed breakdown of methodology into stages.</p> <p>Understanding of the need to undertake the drafting of the analysis through an iterative and discursive process with the steering group, but limited recognition of the need to discuss the key findings for the summary analyses.</p> <p>Any additions or alternative suggestions to the specified requirements have only a limited explanation as to why these are required and / or these are deemed possibly relevant and possibly acceptable by LUPG and will require some discussions before implementation.</p> <p>Acceptable grasp of what is required with some discussion of the concepts involved, but lacking in innovation. Approach to work is rather pedestrian, but is clear and displays a realistic understanding of the time and resources required to complete the task. Limited reference to potential pitfalls. Satisfactory document with all necessary material provided in a clear order. Use of English is acceptable.</p> | 3 |
| | <p>Lack of clarity about how the methodology will be broken down into stages.</p> <p>No understanding of the need for an iterative and discursive process with policy staff.</p> <p>Any additions or alternative suggestions to the specified requirements have no explanation as to why these are required and / or these are deemed irrelevant and are not acceptable by CCW.</p> <p>Poorly drafted submission. Frequently repeats elements of specification verbatim without exploring concepts in a meaningful way. The approach to the work is difficult to follow. Limited understanding of the time and resources required to complete the task. No reference to potential pitfalls</p> | 1 |
| | Minimum Acceptable Score | 3 |
| Previous relevant experience of 'key staff' | <p>All of the leading staff possess very extensive experience (as described in CV's) in producing reports on agricultural and technology transfer issues for clients such as Government and the European Commission. Some of the relevant work referred to within CV's has been produced within last 18 months. Excellent, valid and clear explanation as to how experience will be utilised for this project.</p> | 5 |
| | <p>Some of the leading staff possess relevant experience in producing reports on agricultural and technology transfer issues for Government etc (as described in CV's). Whilst well related to the topic in hand, none of the work described in CV's was completed in the last 18 months. Valid and clear explanation as to how experience will be utilised for this project.</p> | 3 |

| | | |
|---|---|----------|
| | Leading staff have very limited experience (as described in CV's) of producing reports on agricultural and technology transfer issues for Government etc. Those reports that have been produced are poorly related to the topic in hand and were completed more than 3 years ago. Limited explanation as to how experience will be utilised for this project. | 1 |
| | Minimum Acceptable Score | 3 |
| Level of expertise. Balance of team. | Key personnel (project manager and lead consultants) account for more than 70% of proposed staff time. Overall the ratio of staff time to costs is very high. | 5 |
| | Key personnel (project manager and lead consultants) account for more than 50% of proposed staff time, but on occasion those with most extensive experience have limited role in project. Overall the ratio of staff time to costs is moderate. | 3 |
| | Key personnel (project manager and lead consultants) account for less than 50% of proposed staff time and those with most extensive experience have limited role in project. Overall the ratio of staff time to costs is low. | 1 |
| | Minimum Acceptable Score | 3 |
| Project management | The identified project manager is highly experienced (as per CV) with a number of relevant major projects recently completed to deadline with explanation as to how this will be utilised for the project. Clear and realistic project plan supplied with bid in form of Gantt charts, timetables and well written explanation. Evidence supplied in bid re capacity to adjust the project plan if unexpected issues arise with an example of past project(s) where this has been done successfully. | 5 |
| | The identified project manager has some experience (as per CV) of successfully delivering moderately sized projects with explanation as to how this will be utilised for the project. Adequate project plan supplied with bid, with basic information such as timetables and charts. Some evidence supplied in bid re capacity to adjust the project plan if unexpected issues arise with an example of past project(s) where this has been done. | 3 |
| | The identified project manager (as per CV) has very limited experience of delivering projects. No example of previous focus group and seminar provided. | 1 |
| | Minimum Acceptable Score | 3 |
| Details of how the seminar will be delivered and structured | Proposals for farmer focus groups & final seminar are included within tender and display innovative thinking about how to ensure the event is successful in terms of providing evidence and advice to Government - such as listing suggested key participants as well as describing domestic arrangements, use of facilitators, Welsh language requirements etc . Example of previous focus group and seminar provided. | 5 |
| | Proposals for farmer focus groups & final seminar are included within | 3 |

| | | |
|--|---|----------|
| | tender, but these pay only limited attention to providing evidence and advice to Government and focus primarily on domestic arrangements, use of facilitators and Welsh language requirements etc . Example of previous focus group and seminar provided. | |
| | Proposals for farmer focus groups and final seminar are either not included or are minimal in terms of content. No example of previous focus group and seminar provided. | 1 |
| | Minimum Acceptable Score | 3 |

6.2. Please provide two relevant references. CCW may contact referees for the successful supplier.

7.Submission of tenders

7.1. Please refer to the 'invitation to tender' document regarding details required for the tender. Consultants will be expected to meet the costs of producing tender documents at their own expense.

Annex 1 – Formatting conventions for LUPG publications

To achieve a consistent style for publications commissioned by the LUPG, and to facilitate the process of publishing reports on the LUPG website, contractors are asked to follow the following formatting conventions:

Font

Arial, 10 or 11 pt for main text. Titles bold 18pt. Section 1 – 16pt, Section 2 – 14pt. All other section headings bold. Italic may be used.

Margins

All 2.54cm / 1”

Line spacing

Single line spacing throughout, with no extra spacing before or after paragraphs (you can insert a blank line or start a new page, but do not insert a space of e.g. 6pt before paragraphs).

Section numbering

No more than three levels of numbering. If further sub-division is needed, use Roman numerals. E.g. Section i. rather than Section 1.1.1.1

1

1.1

1.1.1

i.

If really necessary to split a section further; a, b, c is followed.

Numbering starts at the margin not indented.

Contractor logo

On one page only; not on every page.

Cover page

LUPG secretariat will insert a cover page containing the following information:

- Report title
- Additional information supplied by the contractor (e.g. reference number)
- Authors
- Contractor name(s)
- Contractor logo if required
- Date report accepted

LUPG
August 2011