

AHDB call for full proposals on Research and Knowledge Exchange

Potato Gap Analysis

Call for project proposals: Identification of crop protection gaps and benchmarking of current strategies for potato crops in field and store.

Purpose/Primary Objective

The aim of the project is to provide a comprehensive review and analysis to provide an informed position on crop protection use across the potato industry including crop protection problems and the potential and realised losses that result, the current crop protection programmes used in the sector and what other approvals are in place but are not being used along with information on why this is the case. The results from this work will then be used to prioritise crop protection research for the short and medium term and help in developing and building IPM adoption across the potato sector.

Scope

Crop protection solutions are of high priority for potato levy payers (see [AHDB strategy document](#)). Recent and ongoing legislative changes have and will continue to impact on the availability of products leaving existing programmes and practices vulnerable. New solutions such as the development of biopesticides are expected to positively impact commercial production in the future whilst changes such as the development of resistance as well as the threat of new pest/diseases are likely to lead to the breakdown of current crop protection strategies.

It is anticipated that this work will:

- Build on outcomes of previous gap analysis work where available including 2014 AHDB Potato funded – [Potential impact on GB potatoes of the Community Strategy for Endocrine Disruptors \(ED's\)](#), 2009 Potato Council funded – Pesticide availability for potatoes following revision of Directive 91/414/EEC: Impact assessments and identification of research priorities) and [Horticultural Gap analysis \(2015/16\)](#)
- Survey and document the range of crop protection strategies currently in use within the different potato sectors including seed, fresh and processing. These should include any cultural, varietal or other control methods as well as the use of conventional and biological products and should cover all existing targets (pests, diseases, weeds, sprout suppression and crop desiccation) in the growing crop and during storage. Targets that may pose a potential future risk (e.g. epitrix or zebra chip) should also be included.

- Regulatory implications (for example re-approval dates, MRL revision, and water framework directive) should be considered for all crop protection strategies including future potential issues.
- Assess the current state of resistance management in relation to the control of major pests and pathogens; assess the risk of the development of resistance and crop protection gaps in the light of such potential resistance.
- Create a ranked list of gaps for crop/target combinations where weaknesses are identified from the survey.

The successful proposal will provide a clear work plan designed to comprehensively document, analyse and evaluate control strategies currently in place covering the key cropping areas and types in the UK. Close liaison with levy payers and representative grower groups, in all major growing regions and sectors, will be required to ensure credibility.

The anticipated output will be a review including a prioritised list of crop protection gaps/risks of gaps developing and estimates of the cost of the problems to industry. The ranking should account for commercial impact and the feasibility of finding practical solutions

Contractors should note that this project will be used as a benchmark of current practice as well as a reference point for prioritising future programmes of work and will need to be designed to cover both of these activities. Crop protection programmes in other countries should be investigated to determine if any of the approaches could be used in UK potato production.

Knowledge Exchange and Knowledge Transfer will be a key part of the project including collating the information from relevant organisations and levy payers and then disseminating key messages to the industry. The work plan should detail the number and format of events.

The project aims to support the [industry priorities](#) and applicants should use the relevant priority documents when putting their application together.

AHDB carried out a gap analysis on a range of horticultural crops from 2015-2016 to determine what products are currently in use, what products are missing, constraints of use and where the gaps are. The Gap analysis included both conventional, biopesticides, biologicals and cultural control. It would be expected that the potato gap analysis is complimentary to the horticultural gap analysis to allow for comparisons between the data to be made. In addition to the Horticultural Gap analysis the Water Framework Directive (WFD) should be considered as well as inclusion of specific dates for active / product renewals.

Summary of results of the horticultural gap analysis can be found [here](#).

Outputs

A review report including a series of updatable tables similar to the horticultural gap analysis outlining prioritised crop protection gaps. (A template from the Horticultural gap analysis can be supplied upon request).

At least 2 presentations at relevant events on the outcomes of the project and the creation of materials suitable for dissemination to growers and available on the AHDB website.

Previously funded AHDB work on Crop Protection Gap analysis

This list is not exclusive or exhaustive and includes examples of previous and ongoing AHDB funded work.

Project Number	Title
CP 132	AHDB Horticulture's Gap Analysis
CP 17 & 17a	CP 17 & 17a – Pesticide gap analysis update for ornamental crops (2003 & 2006)
2009/2	Pesticide availability for potatoes following revision of Directive 91/414/EEC: Impact assessments and identification of research priorities

These reports and publications are available from the AHDB websites ahdb.org.uk. Applicants are expected to review the AHDB back catalogue.

Other relevant international and national research should be considered including;

Impact of changing pesticide availability on horticulture. Defra Report. Issued by ADAS UK Ltd. 31 March 2010

<http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=17126>

CRD website, endocrine disrupters and candidates for substitution

http://www.pesticides.gov.uk/guidance/industries/pesticides/News/Collected-Updates/Information-Updates-2014/January/Regulation+_EC_No_1107_2009-progress_on_endocrine_disrupters_and_candidates_for+substitution

Project duration

It is envisaged that a decision on the successful project will be communicated before 9th February and project outcomes should be presented to the Potato sector by the end of June 2018.

Budget

The budget for this project is capped at £6,000K. Value for money to levy payers is a selection criteria. The intention is to fund a single project but joint proposals are acceptable as are bids with subcontractors awarded to key industry consultants. If deemed productive, applicants may be requested to form a consortium and work together.

Deadlines for the application procedure and project delivery

Full Proposal deadline	12:00 on 26/01/2018 There is no Concept or Expressions of Interest phase. Make an electronic submission in line with the instructions below. Receipt will be the time of receiving email.
Applications reviewed	Submissions will be evaluated internally by AHDB and with Industry Representatives By 31/01/2018
Applicants informed of outcome	By 09/02/2018
Project commences	On 01/03/2018
Project completion	By 30/06/2018

Application

- The following application form should be used: [Application Form](#) referring to our [guidance notes](#) to aid completion
- Electronic submission via button below (subject should include Potato Gap Analysis)
- To avoid bias in assessing the other evaluation criteria, the technical merit of applications will be judged before consulting the project costs.



Or e-mail to: research@ahdb.org.uk

Evaluation of submissions

A number of criteria will be used to judge the quality of the submissions (value in brackets indicates weight in assessment process)

Project Title:	
Applicant:	
SECTION 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW (Not assessed)	
SECTION 2: THE BUSINESS CASE (3x weighting, total 30 points; PASS THRESHOLD = 15)	
Evidence for the project demand including current cost of the problem to industry. Justification for levy funding. Quantification of proposed economic benefits and a realistic cost:benefit proposal. Details for supporting industry sustainability. Environmental benefits appropriately identified and any negative impacts detailed. Details of how the project will solve a supply chain problem and support good decision making. Relevance to AHDB priorities.	
Section Score:	Section Total:

SECTION 3: PROJECT OUTCOMES (2x weighting, total 20 points)

Beneficiaries appropriately identified. Approach to deliver industry KE and links to existing AHDB KE activities. Appropriateness and clarity of industry engagement. Timeframe qualified to deliver impact. Clarification over additional activities/resource required to deliver impact. Skills & training opportunities identified. Clear IP exploitation plan where relevant.

Section Score:	Section Total:
----------------	----------------

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL APPROACH AND WORK PLAN (3x weighting, total 30 points)

Evaluation of current knowledge (appropriate references used) and awareness of other work. Clarity of aims, objectives, work packages and milestone schedule. Originality & innovation. Effective collaboration with commercial companies. Is the approach statistically robust? Feasibility and risk management.

Section Score:	Section Total:
----------------	----------------

SECTION 5: RELEVANT EXPERTISE (total 10 points)

Knowledge and expertise. Quality of past contributions to, and impact on, the topic. Potential to bring added value through current and/or past contributions. Complementarities of expertise of the team.

Section Total:

SECTION 6: PROJECT COSTS (total 10 points)

Are costs reasonable and necessary? Will the total budget be adequate to carry out the proposed activities? For a cross-Sector proposal, is the shared budget appropriate & clearly defined? Added value of co-funding?

Section Total:

Total Points ____ out of 100	Recommend for Funding	Yes / No
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

Weightings are set to reflect the importance of specific criteria, any proposal failing to achieve a specified threshold may be rejected. They have been set to ensure appropriate standards are met.

AHDB Scoring Guidelines

9-10 Excellent	Exceptional quality; cutting-edge; highly likely to produce benefits/impact of great importance to the industry; highly innovative; impactful KE activities proposed; applicant is widely recognized in the field with an outstanding record of accomplishment; consortium is strong across all technical areas needed to accomplish the proposed outcomes. Strongly recommend support
7-8 Very good	High quality; potential to make an important contribution; innovative; likely to produce significant benefits/ impact for the industry; impactful KE activities proposed; applicant has a good reputation in the field; consortium appears to have more than adequate expertise across all technical areas required to deliver the proposed outcomes. Strongly recommend support
5-6 Good	Interesting; innovative; likely to produce good benefits/impact; good grasp of appropriate KE activities; applicant has a solid reputation in the field; consortium appears to have adequate expertise across all technical areas required to deliver the proposed outcomes. Should be supported
3-4 Fair	Interesting but little originality; likelihood of making significant impact is small; may require significant additional investment to deliver benefits; applicant/team lacks experience, has not established leadership in the field or demonstrated the potential to make impactful contributions. Support may be considered if strong in other areas
1-2 Poor	Poor quality; not well planned; lacking expertise; not feasible; unlikely to make an important contribution to fundamental or applied knowledge; unlikely to produce benefits/impact; lacking convincing evidence that the proposing team has sufficient and appropriate expertise to accomplish all of the tasks as outlined in the proposal. Should not be supported
0 Very poor	Very poor quality; duplicative of other work; fails to address the issues; no evidence for demand; cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information. Should not be supported

Questions

If you have a specific question related to this call please e-mail joe.martin@ahdb.org.uk

As part of the open tender process AHDB Horticulture cannot discuss *specific* project details prior to proposal submission. Answers to frequently asked generic questions will be posted [below](#) to assist applicants in the process of completing the application forms.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs):

There have been no questions to date.

Downloads:

- A copy of this tender specification: **Potato Gap Analysis**
- The application form for funding: **[AHDB Application Form for Funding](#)**
- Guidance notes for applicants seeking AHDB Horticulture funding: **[AHDB Guidance Notes for Funding Applications](#)**