

A. Aims and objectives of the evaluation

The objective of the contract is to undertake a **process, outcome, impact, and value for money evaluation**, split into two faces: interim and final evaluation. This is a relatively new sector for BEIS's ICF, and therefore a key role for the Evaluation and Learning Partner will be to **maximise learning** from the evaluation to inform the delivery of MAGC, as well as to inform future strategic decisions.

The Evaluation and Learning Partner will also have the responsibility of **disseminating lessons learned** within BEIS, with other government departments, and more broadly with the climate finance and evaluation communities. Learning is likely to be produced, for instance, in the following areas: What works, why, and in what contexts, in interventions that aim to incentivise green buildings; additionality and effectiveness of blended finance in the green buildings sector; advantages and disadvantages of the delivery model; how to embed GESI in ICF programmes, and trade-offs of doing so; lessons to better monitor and evaluate transformational change.

B. Key aspects of our proposal and identified challenges

Key features: Our evaluation approach centres on building an in-depth understanding of the four MAGC pillars, the MAGC countries (financial markets, housing and energy efficiency/retrofit market, stakeholders), and how the MAGC operates in each country (through a **portfolio analysis** and **process mapping**). We will measure change over time through **longitudinal analysis** and using a **theory-based approach** to understanding the mechanisms - internal and external to the MAGC - which may bring about the change. The four-year duration offers the opportunity to deliver a highly robust evaluation through **iterative analysis and theory-testing**.

Our offering goes **beyond the requirements** of the bid to (a) cover T1, T2 and T3 levels in the mid-term and final evaluation, rather than only two levels; (b) conduct five, instead of the suggested four, case studies; (c) track financial transactions among FIs and developers using Pitchbook¹; and (d) analyse environmental and social impacts at the final evaluation by comparing results with business-as-usual scenario.

Principles: Our offer is underpinned by the following principles: (a) A theory-based **approach that is based on our previous experience** of evaluating ICF and home retrofitting programmes, (b) **Social value** embedded in our approach, using in-country experts and minimising international travel, (c) Holistic team with **experts** across all relevant fields (methodological and thematic) and knowledge of MAGC countries, (d) Selection of **methods that have already been tested** with hard-to-engage audiences (e.g., interviews with IFs rather than surveys, contact details from Pitchbook) and avoidance of methods that we know will not deliver **good value for money** (e.g. online surveys, given diversity of audiences and languages), and (e) Maximising the value from **existing evidence** (e.g., reports and monitoring information produced by the delivery partner, other ICF evaluations, financial data from Pitchbook).

Challenges: MAGC is a complex programme, with **four distinct components** and a delivery approach that is tailored to each country (i.e., some countries receive all four components, whereas others only a few). Therefore, we can expect different outcomes and impacts across the country portfolio and, to make conclusions at the programme level, **understanding the context-mechanism-outcome will be key**. Each pillar is also subject to its own challenges:

- a) The uptake of the **investment component** by FIs will largely depend on the financial market (e.g., in a context with a lot of liquidity, second-floor financing like MAGC provides becomes less attractive) and the results will depend, inter alia, on the depth of the market (e.g., whether there is a good investor base to be mobilised). Our methodology includes a financial market analysis of T2 countries.
- b) The **capacity building and research** components will improve the enabling environment and generate pipelines of green building projects. Anticipated outcomes relate to soft skills (improved understanding of the EDGE certificate) and policy changes that cannot be quantified and instead require a robust theory-based framework.

¹ Pitchbook is a database of private capital markets including venture capital, private equity and M&A transactions. It provides market analyses, detailed information on transactions, and contact details of staff involved in the transaction.

- c) The **EDGE certificate** is used beyond the MAGC, even by other ICF programmes (e.g., UKCI). A key aspect of the evaluation will be to assess its added value vs business-as-usual (BAU) and to understand its anticipated and unanticipated impacts.

Primary data collection may also offer some challenges in terms of identifying and recruiting stakeholders. Our method includes a **stakeholder mapping** to be undertaken at the beginning of the early outcome evaluation to help us identify who the main in-country stakeholders are (both participants and non-participants in MAGC) for all countries with substantial delivery (T2). This tool will inform our sampling methodology and will help us to identify stakeholders who did not participate in MAGC but who are part of the green buildings & green finance ecosystem and that we may want to interview at the final evaluation to inform the impact evaluation. Our in-country experts will conduct the stakeholder mapping for case study (T3) countries, under the guidance of the core evaluation team. We will rely on their knowledge of the market and networks to identify and engage stakeholders: Our EDGE experts are well connected in the green housing market and will be able to identify and engage project developers, constructors, etc.; and our Ipsos researchers will do the same with policymakers. For some stakeholder categories (UK Embassies, BEIS & ICF staff involved in delivery, and to a certain extent direct beneficiaries of MAGC), we will rely on contacts provided by BEIS and IFC. The ITT already hints that engaging **financial intermediaries (FIs)** may be particularly challenging. We will complement the contacts provided by IFC with data and contacts available in Pitchbook (this approach was very successful in the evaluation of the UK Climate Investments Pilot). Our method also includes **focus groups with residents of EDGE/MAGC buildings** in T3 countries, and our budget includes incentives to facilitate recruitment.

An evaluation of this scale is also subject to risks that need to be mitigated: (i) There could be **changes in priorities** or evaluation needs that require revisions of evaluation questions and methods. Our workplan is flexible and includes regular revisions of the evaluation plan. There are also likely to be changes in the choice of countries for case studies, and we would be able to source and mobilise in-country experts at speed (not least because of Ipsos global presence). (ii) The final evaluation will run when MAGC is in the closing stage of the **programme life cycle** (2026/27), but it is yet incomplete. It is likely that some impacts will not be observed at that stage, and the evaluation will need to look for signs of transformational change. (iii) The evaluation of **GESI** might be side-lined or overlooked. We will integrate GESI lines of enquiry, hypothesis and indicators in the evaluation framework and research tools to mitigate this risk. (iv) The evaluation of the **delivery model** may be sensitive and a relationship with the delivery partner needs to be cultivated, while maintaining the independence of the evaluation.

C. Our suggested evaluation approach

Our approach addresses the challenges and evaluation needs mentioned above and builds upon our extensive experience. Each strand of the evaluation will be undertaken as follows:

Process evaluation: We will undertake a **critical review of the Theory of Change (ToC)**, analysing its casual links, interdependencies, risks and assumptions (EQ2). For this, we will build upon the recommendations of a report that we produced for the NAMA Facility on lessons learned to design ToC for programmes that aim to achieve transformational change.² Other key methods of this strand are the **benchmarking** of other programmes, which will, inter alia, compare MAGC with other delivery approaches and assess its added value (EQ1), a **process map** of the decision-making processes whereby countries and projects are selected (EQ3), and the political economy analysis (**PEA**) at T1 level. The latter will have the double purpose of informing EQ3 and serving as a baseline to assess impact.

Outcomes evaluation: We will follow a **theory-based approach, most likely realist evaluation**. One of the challenges highlighted is the high likelihood that the results achieved will differ greatly across countries (as they receive different components of the intervention) and that results, in turn, will depend to a large extent on contextual aspects. A realist approach, using primarily the case

² Ipsos and SQ Consult (2021): Learning Report: Optimising theories of change for promoting and enabling transformational change, 2nd Independent Evaluation of the NAMA Facility, available at: https://nama-facility.org/wp-content/uploads/2021_Learning_Report_-_Theory_of_Change.pdf

studies, would allow us to investigate in depth these relationships. We are using this approach in the evaluation of the Climate Finance Accelerator (CFA), a technical assistance programme operating in a similar set of countries to MAGC, and it is proving to work well. An alternative approach that we are considering is contribution analysis (CA); however, our experience of evaluating the UK Climate Investments Pilot (UKCI) using CA indicates that, when the intervention differs greatly across cases/countries, as it is in MAGC, making assessments at the programme level becomes challenging. We will build a Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) framework that will be applied at T1, T2 and T3 levels (with difference in the depth of the analysis) and it will allow us to make conclusions at T0 level.

Example of a CMO configuration for the investment pillar

Context	Mechanism	Outcome
In countries where there is appetite to invest in new sectors such as green buildings, but FIs lack knowledge to assess the risk of the operations...	... providing advisory services to develop capacity, paired with blended finance...	... contributes to address barriers to investment and, over time, to reduce the perceived risk, hence increasing the offer of finance towards the sector.

Impact evaluation: We understand the transformational change MAGC aims to achieve is set out in its impact statement “Energy savings and reduced emissions achieved through the construction of new green buildings in selected countries”. First, we will develop **hypotheses for achieving transformational change**, building on the ToC and aligned with the KPI15 methodology. Then, we will develop **signs** that we would expect to see **at different points in time if the hypotheses were true** (e.g., mobilisation of capital, improved enabling environment for green buildings, demonstration of energy savings). These signs will be assessed using CA or process tracing (PT) (or a combination of both, where CA is used to develop the hypotheses and alternative theories, and PT to weight the strength of evidence). The table below provides an example of what the evaluation framework to assess impact might look like (note that it is for illustration purposes and it only includes a few examples of tests that would be used to assess a hypothesis).

Example of a CA and PT framework applied to an impact pathway

Hypothesis: In markets where MAGC had substantial delivery, the volume of finance granted to develop EDGE compliant buildings has increased (including by FIs who did not participate in MAGC), and MAGC has had a positive and significant contribution towards this change.				
Causal inference / Rival hypotheses	Test	Source	Triangulation method	Type of PT test ³
Causal inference	The volume of finance granted to develop EDGE compliant buildings in MAGC countries has steadily increased over the years.	Pitchbook	Authoritative source	Smoking-gun
Causal inference	FIs interviewed show willingness to continue investing in green buildings	Interviews	Volume of voice	Hoop
Causal inference	FIs who participated in MAGC have a positive opinion of the programme and consider its contribution was fundamental to accelerate the market	Interviews	Volume of voice	Doubly Decisive

³ For more information on the types of process tracing tests, see for instance: <https://www.betterevaluation.org/methods-approaches/methods/process-tracing>

Rival hypothesis	Intervention 'X' in countries a, b, c, which had a much larger outreach and budget than MAGC, has had a larger contribution in transforming the market.	Benchmarking, interviews	Convergent triangulated sources	Straw-in-the-Wind
------------------	---	--------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------

The key methods that we will use to test the hypotheses are: (a) Longitudinal PEA to assess changes in the enabling environment, (b) financial market analysis (including data from Pitchbook) to assess changes in the finance available to developers, (c) assessment of MAGC research outputs and comparative of energy use by EDGE buildings vs BAU to assess environmental impacts.

Value for Money (VfM): We propose taking a '**4e**' approach (economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity) to value for money with a focus on programme costs and outcomes. This will involve a light-touch and largely qualitative / process-focussed analysis of **economy** i.e. whether BEIS / IFC had adequate and effective procurement processes in place to ensure that ODA was being spent economically and whether decision-making on costs supported this. **Efficiency** will be assessed in terms of whether (a) the costs and benefits of the programme and projects were higher or lower than expected; (b) whether the programme and projects met targets within the time and cost budgeted; and (c) whether the gross costs of the programme outcomes (number of buildings developed, number of people trained) are equivalent to or cheaper than comparable programmes. We propose to compare efficiency with similar ICF programmes (for instance, UKCI, which also supported new EDGE buildings in Kenya) and similar non-ICF programmes (e.g. other WBG programmes promoting EDGE), though we assume that comparable cost level information from non-UK programmes will be hard to obtain. **Effectiveness** will consider cost-effectiveness and overall programme outcome effectiveness. To assess social **equity**, we will bring together findings from lines of inquiry related to GESI. At the scoping stage we will assess whether the data available allows us to conduct (ideally) a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) to assess VfM, or whether only a qualitative assessment is feasible.

GESI: It is an objective of the evaluation to identify learnings related to GESI, and we will seek to identify opportunities to strengthen GESI delivery in future ICF programming and to generate learnings for the international development community around consideration of GESI in green construction more generally.

In terms of the process evaluation, our approach will be to assess GESI through multiple dimensions, including programme delivery (i.e., identifying opportunities to include participation of women and marginalised groups in programme activities) and design (i.e., considering the extent to which marginalised groups and their needs were assessed and planned for in MAGC activities). We acknowledge that different GESI opportunities may arise across the types of support delivered by MAGC, and by country. For example, opportunities for GESI within MAGC's capacity building component could include providing training to women and marginalised groups, or to consider their needs in the training delivered to other stakeholders. These opportunities will be thoroughly scoped through consideration of the MAGC portfolio and a review of relevant literature.

GESI objectives are not embedded in the MAGC logframe, therefore we assume data will be limited. At the outset of the evaluation, we will investigate the programme logframe and data collection tools up front, so that we can identify any opportunities to enhance collection of GESI-related data going forward to support both process and outcome/impact evaluation objectives; for example, if we identify that applications/invites to participate in capacity building activities do not include any data on the gender, we may request that this data is collected to support analysis of GESI in our process evaluation. We will also draw on our experience in the CFA evaluation, where our process evaluation approach seeks to identify whether funded projects meet different GESI thresholds, ranging from 'minimum compliance' through to 'transformative change'. This approach acknowledges that GESI approaches are not a requirement of projects while allowing us to identify opportunities to move projects up the GESI ladder toward more transformative approaches and impacts.

Our approach will also seek to identify GESI outcomes/impacts and opportunities for enhancing these. Collection of GESI impact data is likely to be even more challenging, and will likely necessitate a qualitative approach and preclude quantifiable outcome/impact measures. To identify and assess unintended outcomes (positive or negative) and missed opportunities, we will use an **outcome mapping** approach. We used this method in the UKCI evaluation, where GESI was not part of the pilot's ToC, and it delivered very good results: We identified unintended outcomes, confirmed the pilot made no harm, and provided conclusions on trade-offs between GESI and environmental objectives. We will conduct a similar analysis, using desk research to identify potential unintended effects, and primary research with a broad range of stakeholders (direct beneficiaries, such as stakeholders trained, and wider beneficiaries, such as residents in EDGE buildings) to assess GESI outcomes. We will also benchmark MAGC to other programmes which considered GESI in their design and ToC to provide lessons on how GESI could be embedded in MAGC and what the trade-offs would be.

Our approach to GESI will be grounded in the country context. It will be important to undertake a GESI assessment at the country level to identify the relevant marginalised groups within each context.

D. Our approach to answering the evaluation questions

The high-level evaluation matrix below sets out for each evaluation theme, relevant EQs, analytical methods, indicators and data sources.

Draft evaluation matrix (EQ numbers as per ITT)

EQ (theme)	Lines of enquiry	Analytical methods	Data collection tools
Process evaluation			
1. Management approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role of IFC in the design and implementation of programme components Comparative with other delivery models Whether the Investment and Advisory administration agreements are achieving their purpose MAGC's management process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarking of other programmes Consultations with IFC and BEIS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research In-depth interviews with IFC and BEIS Visit to IFC HQ (flexible)
2. Accuracy of ToC results mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevance and effectiveness of MAGC four-pillar approach and interaction among components Analysis of interdependencies and assumptions Consideration of GESI in the Theory of Change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Critical review of the MAGC Theory of Change Benchmarking of other programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theory of Change workshop Desk research In-depth interviews with IFC and BEIS
3. Effectiveness of country/project choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added value of MAGC in the countries where it operates Barriers identified in countries for green construction and adequacy of MAGC to address them Assessment of country and project selection and prioritisation Breadth vs depth of the programme Trade-offs between transformational potential, additionality and commerciality Alignment of countries with HMG priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portfolio analysis PEA and financial market analysis Benchmarking of programmes at country level Review of IFC selection criteria and process mapping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research Document review for selection criteria analysis In-depth interviews with T2 country stakeholders
Outcome and impact evaluation			
4 and 6. Achievement of MAGC outcomes			
4a; 6a. Investment and Advisory services component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additionality of the funding provided and adequacy of the financial instruments used Appropriateness of level of concessional finance to maximise impact while minimising subsidy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal PEA Financial market analysis Case studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research Pitchbook analysis In-depth interviews with FIs and other in-country stakeholders (T2, T3)

EQ (theme)	Lines of enquiry	Analytical methods	Data collection tools
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume of finance mobilised and enablers/barriers to finance mobilisation Relevance and effectiveness of the Advisory service for financial institutions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-depth interviews with IFC and BEIS (T0) and IFC country offices (T3)
4b; 6b. Capacity building component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequacy of stakeholders targeted and reached Progress in the enabling environment to support the green building market Changes in green building stock New skills and capacities acquired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal PEA Stakeholder analysis Case studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research Pitchbook analysis In-depth interviews with green building sector, policymakers and wider stakeholders (T2, T3) In-depth interviews with IFC and BEIS (T0) and IFC country offices (T3)
4c; 6c. Green Building Certification component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether UK investment in green buildings is understood and valued in-country EDGE certification platform improvements and their contribution to construction standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case studies Longitudinal PEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research In-depth interviews with green building sector and EDGE experts (T2, T3)
6d. Research component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of improvements in better understanding of certified green construction by developers, FIs, MDBs, & DFIs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of outputs produced in research component Case studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research Interviews and focus groups with Research component stakeholders (T0, T3)
6e. Response to the Process evaluation findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme adaptation following the process evaluation findings, and if recommendations were not followed, why 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of response to process evaluation recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process mapping analysis In-depth interviews and workshop with IFC and BEIS
5 and 7. Impact/transformational change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early/intermediate/longer-term evidence of transformational change Growth in market share of green certified floor space Assessment of likely environmental and GESI impacts Transformation in the financial markets and the enabling environment for green buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal PEA Financial market review Case studies (including on-site visits and environmental assessment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research Pitchbook analysis In-depth interviews with in-country stakeholders (T2, T3) Focus groups with EDGE buildings residents In-country site visits
Value for Money Assessment			
8. Value for Money for HMG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of programme's management of resources, efficiency, effectiveness and equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4E approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Process mapping analysis In-depth interviews with IFC, BEIS, in-country stakeholders (T2, T3)
Gender Equality and Social Inclusion			
9. GESI opportunities and future programme design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GESI consideration opportunities in MAGC and lessons learned for future programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome mapping Benchmarking of other programmes Primary research with residents PEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk research Interviews with direct beneficiaries Focus groups with EDGE residents

E. Task-by-task methodology

This section explains our task-by-task methodology by evaluation phase (scoping, interim, and final phases). To facilitate and summarise our primary collection strategy, we have included the table below, which summarises our strategy across all three phases, by level of research (T0 to T3). The allocation of interviews will be further refined during the scoping phase and at later stages in the evaluation, and informed by the stakeholder mapping.

Summary of our data collection plan

Data collection method	Scoping		Interim process evaluation				Interim Early Outcome Evaluation & Vfm				Final Evaluation			
	T 0	T 1	T 0	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 0	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 0	T 1	T 2	T 3
Interviews with IFC and BEIS	10		10				10				10			
Workshops with BEIS and IFC	1		1				1				1			
Interviews with in-country stakeholders					15 (total)					15 per country			15 (total)	15 per country
Focus group /interviews with Research component stakeholders											1 FG			8 (total)
Focus groups with EDGE buildings residents										2 per country				2 per country
Site visit to selected projects														1 per country

Task 0: Evaluation scoping. Task 0 will begin with a **kick-off meeting** (Task 0.1), to be attended by all core members of the evaluation team (via videoconferencing, or in person by the Project Director and Manager). As part of the three-month scoping phase, we will conduct a **review of available programme documentation** (Task 0.2), including the business case, annual reviews, monitoring documents, and we will conduct an initial analysis of the MAGC portfolio, which will enable us to map the MAGC delivery to date in the 24 countries and its processes (Task 0.3). The **portfolio analysis** will include a matrix of activities conducted per country, while the **process map** will describe the programme activities from country identification, through decision of activities that will take place in each country, to delivery of activities. We will conduct up to **10 scoping interviews** (Task 0.4) with BEIS and IFC staff involved in the design and/or delivery of the programme, as well as the evaluation team at BEIS to understand evaluation needs. The scoping work will also involve an **initial review of the Theory of Change and logframe**, including KPI15 (Task 0.5) to build our understanding of the MAGC activities and pathways to change, as well as the data collected to measure outputs, outcomes and impact, and provide an initial assessment of the logframe. The **scoping report** (Task 0.6) will include an evaluation delivery plan and a comprehensive evaluation framework, which will be presented to the programme team and discussed during a **workshop** with BEIS and IFC at the end of the scoping phase (Task 0.7).

Task 1a: Process evaluation: The process evaluation will form the first phase of the interim evaluation, and it will be focused on the programme results, mechanisms, strategy (including the choice of countries), and governance. The main analytical outputs of this phase will be:

- A **revised Theory of Change** (Task 1.1): We will undertake a critical review of the MAGC ToC (more in-depth review than the initial assessment conducted at the scoping stage) to understand whether the pathways represented in the current ToC hold true, assess interdependencies, identify assumptions and risks to delivery, and develop a narrative ToC. It will be informed by a workshop with IFC and BEIS, as well as the documentation review.
- A **benchmarking of other programmes** (Task 1.2) both at the programme level (T0) as well as in T2 countries. The benchmarking will help us to identify the added value that MAGC provides in relation to other programmes, its space in the donor-funded programmes in T2 countries, and the added value of the delivery model selected vs other existing models. We will also use it to analyse how other similar programmes have embedded GESI in their design, if at all. We propose benchmarking MAGC against other programmes operating in the green buildings sector (most of these programmes will have a wider sectoral remit) with a financial/technical assistance component (for instance, REDACTED).

- A **light-touch PEA for T1 countries** (Task 1.3) to assess the criteria used by IFC to select countries and projects and the adequacy of the support provided (EQ 3). The PEA will be longitudinal and will set up the baseline to assess outcomes at later stages in the evaluation.

The data collection methods will include 10 **interviews** with the MAGC programme team (IFC operational teams and BEIS) and up to **15 interviews** in total with stakeholders in T2 countries (Tasks 1.4-1.6), including UK Embassies, policymakers and green building experts (e.g. Green Building Associations) to assess the appetite for a programme like MAGC and its alignment with countries' priorities. We have budgeted to conduct a **site visit to IFC HQ** (Task 1.7). We would however like to maintain this as a flexible task to be undertaken depending on how the relationship with the DP shapes. We are conscious the process evaluation will cover sensitive topics, and a site visit would be helpful to establish a good working relationship with the DP. The trade-off, however, is the GHG emissions associated to it.

The emerging findings from the process evaluations will be presented to BEIS and IFC during a **learning workshop** (Task 1.10) to discuss findings, conclusions and recommendations, and to inform the following phases of delivery. A key objective of the workshop is to ensure buy-in of the recommendations from IFC. The work will culminate in a **process evaluation report**, which will include recommended improvements and GESI considerations (Task 1.9).

Task 1b: Early Outcome Evaluation and VfM: This evaluation strand will be focused on assessing early outcomes of the financial, capacity building, and green building certification components, as well as early impacts, GESI and VfM. A key component of this evaluation strand is the case studies.

Case study selection: We propose conducting, in addition to the four case studies for the selected deep dive countries (Colombia, India, South Africa, Vietnam), a fifth case study on **Kenya**. Kenya is among the ten countries with substantial MAGC delivery. It has received capacity building support but, so far, it has not benefited from the financial component. It provides a unique opportunity to compare MAGC's financial component with an alternative approach and delivery model: The approach used by UKCI. The UKCI pilot financed an investment fund which is funding green residential buildings in Nairobi. The financial structure used is private equity with an innovative approach in the fee structure. We conducted a case study of this investment as part of the UKCI evaluation, and we are therefore uniquely placed to undertake this analysis. REDACTED

At the programme level (T0) and for T1 countries, we will review any additional documentation on the programme since the scoping phase and update of the portfolio analysis, as well as analysing the Logframe monitoring indicators (Task 1.11). We will also conduct up to 10 interviews with the delivery partner IFC and with BEIS to explore early outcomes at programme level (Task 1.15).

We will produce a series of **analytical outputs for T2 and T3 countries** (analysis for T3 countries will be conducted more in-depth, with support from in-country EDGE experts and researchers):

- A **financial market analysis** (Task 1.12) to explore the context of the green finance market in countries that have received the MAGC investment component (main in-country financiers, depth of the market, volume of liquidity, maturity of the market, etc.). The analysis will be overseen by the climate finance expert panel and carried out through desk research. For this analysis, we will also use data from the financial database Pitchbook, that will allow us to map the relevant market actors in the sector and get insights of the investments in green buildings the country, with and without MAGC support.
- A **stakeholder mapping** (Task 1.13), to map all relevant stakeholders in the green buildings sector in the country, including relevant industry associations, public entities and

wider stakeholders involved, to assess the reach of the MAGC programme components on capacity building and EDGE.

- An **in-depth political economy analysis for T3 countries** (Task 1.14), including an overview of the housing market and energy efficiency sector in the country, the regulatory environment, existing energy efficiency standards, as well as review of GESI (including identifying relevant marginalised groups).

Primary data collection will take place at both T2 and T3 levels. In T2 countries that are not case studies, interviews will be conducted online by the core evaluation team. In T3 countries, the method will be a combination of online and in-person interviews, conducted by the core research team in the UK and the in-country researchers, respectively.

In deep dive (T3) countries, we will conduct a case study for each country to assess programme progress against the MAGC outcomes. For each case study country, the research will involve:

- **15 stakeholder interviews** (Tasks 1.16-1.20), conducted partly online by the UK evaluation team and partly face to face through country offices, with the following stakeholder categories to cover all the relevant programme pillars in the country:
 - for the **Investment and advisory services component**: financial intermediaries receiving finance and/or technical assistance
 - for the **Capacity building component**: policymakers/public sector entities, EDGE certification providers, developers, universities, professional organisations
 - for the **Green Building Certification component**: stakeholders involved in the EDGE platform maintenance and improvement, including EDGE auditors, developers, architects
 - **IFC in-country** offices and the **UK Embassy** in the country
- A **focus group** with residents of EDGE certified buildings (Task 1.21). This task will have two main objectives: assessing the energy efficiency benefits for residents of EDGE certified buildings, and assessing GESI implications for residents, including the affordability and suitability of buildings for marginalised groups. Focus groups may also involve residents who are expecting to move into MAGC supported buildings (if any identified at this stage), to be able to assess their needs (pre-intervention) and, at the final evaluation stage, the outcomes (post-intervention). The focus groups will be conducted face to face and led by the in-country research teams, and could be combined, where appropriate, with the use of online diaries through our in-house app Ipsos Applife, which allows participants to add written, audio, photographic and video contributions generating rich written and visual data (this has not been included in the current budget and workplan).

At T2 level, we will conduct **25 online stakeholder consultations** across T2 countries that are not part of the case studies (Tasks 1.16-1.19), selecting the interviewees in each country based on the most relevant MAGC pillar(s), to assess the achievement of relevant programme outputs and interim outcomes. These will include financial intermediaries, stakeholders involved in the capacity building component and in the green buildings' component, and IFC in-country offices.

The outcomes, GESI, and VfM analysis will be undertaken as per the methods highlighted above (realist evaluation, outcome mapping, and 4E approach, respectively). At the end of the data collection and analysis activities on early outcomes, we will hold an **emerging findings workshop** with BEIS and IFC to present and discuss early findings ahead of the Interim Early Outcome Evaluation Report and Interim VfM Report (Tasks 1.18 and 1.19).

Task 2: Final Outcome and Impact evaluation: The final evaluation will be preceded by a rescoping of the evaluation plan. This phase of the evaluation will focus on assessing all outcomes for T1, T2 and T3 countries, as well as impact and transformational change achieved. This phase will also include an updated process evaluation, GESI and VfM assessment. To facilitate the longitudinal, theory-based analysis of outcomes, all the analytical outputs produced at the interim stage will be updated. This comprises:

- Outputs **analysing the design and delivery of MAGC: A review of the Theory of Change** (Task 2.1), to improve the causal links identified based on the interim learning/findings and to identify opportunities for integrating GESI considerations into the ToC; an updated **portfolio analysis** and **process mapping** (Task 2.3), to assess changes in the programme processes following the process evaluation, an analysis of the **logframe** monitoring indicators (Task 2.2), and an update of the **stakeholder mapping** for T2 and T3 countries (Task 2.6)..
- Outputs analysing the **contexts in which MAGC operates**: During this phase of the evaluation, we will continue the longitudinal analysis started at interim stage to assess changes to the enabling environment, the availability of finance to developers, and other outcomes of interest. We will update: (a) the **PEA** (light-touch for T1, in-dept for T3 countries) (Tasks 2.4 and 2.7, respectively), to assess changes in the enabling environment compared to the baseline; (b) the **financial market analysis** (Task 2.5) for T2 countries, to assess outcomes on market transformation.

The approach to **primary data collection** for the final evaluation will follow a similar format to the early outcome evaluation (see Task 2.9-2.14 of the workplan for the T2 level data collection and T3 case study approach) and it will focus on assessing MAGC's outcomes and impact (including transformational change) and value for money. An important difference is that, at this stage, we will aim to interview stakeholders interviewed at the interim stage, to assess evolution of outcomes, as well as market players who did not participate in MAGC, to assess the extent to which the programme has produced changes in the market beyond participants.

The final evaluation will also include a round of **10 consultations** with the MAGC delivery team and BEIS (Task 2.9), a **focus group** with the stakeholders involved in the **Research** component (Task 2.13) at the international level, **8 interviews with Research stakeholders** in T3 countries (Task 2.13), and **site visits** to a sample of projects receiving investment (Task 2.15), which will allow part of the case study fieldwork to be conducted face to face and include consultations with residents of MAGC funded buildings (Task 2.14). The EDGE expert will also take part in these visits so as to contribute to the assessment of environmental impacts.

An important aspect of the analysis at this stage, which differs from the early outcomes evaluation, is the analysis of impact/transformational change. We will analyse how all MAGC components worked together to transform the market, using the findings from the outcome evaluation. This will also involve an analysis of the likely environmental impacts, which will be led by our green buildings' expert, and who will be supported by the in-country EDGE experts. The focus groups with residents, as well as the outputs produced by the research component, will be the primary sources of information for this assessment.

Before the final reporting phase, we will deliver a **workshop** with the programme team (BEIS and IFC) to present and discuss findings from the final outcome and impact evaluation.

F. Our approach to triangulation

At Ipsos, we put in place an **analytical framework and processes** for all projects, to facilitate interpretation and triangulation of large volumes of data, ultimately ensuring data translates to clear findings and recommendations. We will triangulate findings from across primary and secondary, and across qualitative and quantitative evidence to form interpretive explanations. This will involve triangulating and synthesising data collected at each level (T0 – T3) from multiple sources including stakeholder interviews, workshops, Pitchbook and financial market data, and programme documentation. Once the different data collection activities have been completed, all **evidence sources will be brought together and mapped against the evaluation framework**.

The triangulation of data from across different sources and methods provides greater confidence in accepting findings and allow the evaluation team to continually assess whether there is evidence to answer the evaluation questions or where are the gaps in evidence that need to be filled through further research. One challenge to the synthesis of data from multiple data collection tools and analytical strands is dealing with any contradiction in the findings produced. A '**weight of evidence**' based approach will be used to address this. Where the data sources highlight contrasting results (such as differences between views of stakeholders), these differences will be

reconciled by weighting the evidence collected by robustness, quality, consistency, and its broader context (such as the likely interests of different stakeholders) and where possible, using objective data gathered from management information and secondary sources. The weighting will vary depending on the type of data collection method, the level of stakeholder engagement, and the evaluation question being addressed (whether questions can be answered directly or indirectly through available evidence). At the impact level, the weighting will be conducted using process tracing.

G. Deliverables

Throughout the evaluation, we will produce the following outputs and deliverables:

Scoping phase

- A **scoping report**, which will include the evaluation framework, a detailed workplan, the KPI approach and methodology review, a detailed GESI approach.
- A **presentation** to BEIS and IFC.

Interim evaluation phase

- A Process Evaluation Report, including findings from the process evaluation and recommended improvements based on the findings. This will be accompanied by a Technical Annex.
- An Evaluation Report on Early Outcomes, outlining findings at programme and country level from the early outcome evaluation and recommendations to programme delivery, with a Technical Annex.
- Five Interim country specific reports, for each of the 'deep dive' T3 countries. Each report will include the country's political economy analysis, financial market analysis, stakeholder mapping and MAGC early outcome findings, and will be complemented by a Technical annex.
- A synthesis report, that will bring together findings on MAGC early outcomes across the programme level and country level evaluation activities, including the deep dives.
- A Value for Money interim programme report, presenting the interim findings of the Value for Money assessment.
- All raw data from this evaluation phase and materials used, such as research tools.
- A presentation of findings to BEIS and IFC.

Final evaluation phase:

- An updated scoping report, following the re-scoping phase and including any changes to the Theory of Change, approach and workplan for the final evaluation phase.
- An Outcome and Impact Evaluation report, presenting the full findings from the final outcome and impact evaluation at programme and country level, including recommendations to inform other ICF programmes. This will also be accompanied by a Technical Annex.
- Five country specific reports, one for each of the 'deep dive' countries, presenting the full findings from the case studies.
- A synthesis report, bringing together the results of the outcome and impact evaluation at programme level and at country level.
- A Value for Money report, outlining the final findings of the VfM assessment.
- All raw data from this evaluation phase and materials used, such as research tools.
- A final presentation of findings and lessons learned to BEIS and IFC

H. Learning and dissemination activities

We will deliver a range of learning and dissemination activities throughout the duration of the contract with the aim to **share lessons learned** during the delivery of the evaluation and ensure **buy-in from different stakeholders** in evaluation findings. At the scoping stage and in coordination with BEIS, we will discuss the potential opportunities for dissemination of lessons

throughout the contract. We will develop a detailed Knowledge Sharing plan which will be included in the Evaluation Delivery Plan and reviewed on an ongoing basis.

In addition to disseminating findings through formal publications to BEIS, we will deliver learning activities that are of interest of intra-programme stakeholders such as BEIS and the IFC, as well as wider stakeholders across the government and wider community. Examples of activities that we propose to deliver to share learnings include:

- **Emerging Findings workshops** to present and discuss early findings from the Interim Process Evaluation, Early Outcome Evaluation and Value for Money Assessment. These workshops will give the opportunity to implement lessons learned identified at Interim stage to the MAGC programme to enhance delivery. A final workshop will be also delivered to present the findings from the Final Outcome and Impact Evaluation.

These workshops will be delivered before reports are submitted to ensure buy-in from different stakeholder in evaluation findings. These events, which are expected to be attended by BEIS and IFC staff, can take place online or hybrid at the client's facilities or at Ipsos office in London.
- **Intra-programme learning workshops** to present findings that could be valuable for the delivery of similar programmes (e.g. on green construction, technical advisory, mixed blended finance) such as findings on management approaches that reflect best practice and GESI considerations in programme design and evaluation. These events, which will target BEIS, IFC and other government stakeholders working in similar programmes, can take place online, hybrid or in-person at the client's facilities or at Ipsos office in London.
- **Topical Knowledge Sharing presentations** covering specific topics that have been identified during the evaluation as crucial to shaping wider learning. Presentations could be based on topics such as what works and why in delivering advisory services and capacity building in developing countries and contextual factors that affect the delivery of MAGC-like programmes. These workshops will target both internal (e.g. MAGC delivery and governance teams) and external stakeholders (e.g. in-country MAGC stakeholders, government officials working on similar programmes) and will be delivered online.
- **External events** such as conferences focused on climate change mitigation, transformational change, and evaluation will also be considered. Ipsos UK hosts its own events, and we regularly collaborate with universities and think tanks. Evaluation societies host annual or biennial conferences, and Ipsos UK is a member of UKES and EES. The evaluation team members are experienced communicators, having presented at multiple conferences and seminars, and provided training to government audiences. Examples include REDACTED.

I. Quality Delivery: To ensure that we produce **high quality research and robust, timely deliverables that meet BEIS needs** we will follow these principles:

1. Our evaluation will be designed around a comprehensive evaluation framework – a single document (in matrix format) that will map evaluation questions, additional lines of inquiry, data sources and research methods. This will form the backbone of all data collection tools, analytical frameworks and reporting structures in the evaluation.
2. All research tools and analytical outputs will be authored by the most relevant senior team member and with quality-assurance by at least one other senior team member.
3. We will take a multi-stage, collaborative approach to analysis: mapping evidence then coming together in analytical workshops to collate this, interpret findings, and develop argumentation.
4. We will seek early agreement from BEIS on report structures and content and prior to drafting obtain an accurate understanding of the report's target audiences.

5. We allow at least 4-6 weeks between the close of fieldwork and report submission to allow sufficient time for robust analysis and high-quality reporting.

A. Our team and how we will meet the objectives of the evaluation. Ipsos is excited to bid for this opportunity to evaluate the Market Accelerator for Green Construction (MAGC). We understand that the objectives of the assignment are to assess emerging benefits of the MAGC and maximise learning for BEIS on the transformational potential of their investment. The assignment would provide Ipsos with the chance to bring together its significant expertise in evaluating climate finance programmes of BEIS, other bilateral donors and the World Bank, and its expertise in evaluating BEIS' green construction programmes in the UK and in Kenya. This track record is showcased below. Team members have worked together on previous similar assignments and have established ways of working together and with BEIS that will support a smooth and effective delivery of the MAGC evaluation.

To enhance quality, value for money for BEIS, and to align with Ipsos and HMG's social value commitments, this assignment will be delivered by Ipsos' offices in the UK, Vietnam, India, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Colombia. To complement and support the delivery teams, we have invited green construction experts based in five deep-dive case study countries (South Africa, Vietnam, India, Colombia, Kenya) and private and public finance experts REDACTED, with whom we co-delivered the evaluation of BEIS' UK Climate Investments Pilot 2016-2022, and REDACTED. UK-based colleagues will have primary responsibility for evaluation design, overall analysis, and communications with BEIS and the IFC, and our MAGC country-based colleagues will be responsible for political-economy analysis, country insights, primary data collection and drafting case studies.

We have attached CVs for all named team members to this bid, excepting for Ipsos colleagues based in Vietnam, as the country is currently celebrating a public holiday 20-29 January. We were also not able to provide CVs for the EDGE experts in Vietnam and Colombia as, by the time this proposal was submitted, we were finalising commercial negotiations with a firm who would cover both countries. On request, we can provide evidence of their agreement to be included in this bid and can forward on their CV.

B. Core team skills and profile. Our team covers the skills required in the ITT:

Theory-based evaluation: All our core team are experienced in theory-based evaluation. REDACTED, the Quality Assurance Director, leads Ipsos's theory-based evaluation community of practice and has delivered internal and external training on methods such as process tracing and contribution analysis, and has applied most of the methods listed in the Magenta Book. REDACTED, Project Director, is highly trained in theory-based methods, having applied process tracing, contribution analysis, realist evaluation and outcomes mapping in other evaluations of climate finance programmes.

ODA evaluation: All our core team and some of our country researchers (REDACTED) are experienced in ODA evaluation, including in evaluations of ICF programmes. Examples of ODA and ICF evaluations conducted by our team are included in their CVs. All members of the UK-based Ipsos team have evaluated Climate Finance programmes specifically, and REDACTED, based in our Sub-Saharan Africa office, who will lead the Kenyan Case Study, has also 20+ years experience in research, including Climate Adaptation policy.

GESI: The GESI evaluation will be led by REDACTED, who is currently working on the GESI evaluation of the Climate Finance Accelerator. She has a particular interest in issues of inclusion, focusing on humanitarian issues, gender, refugees, disability, and other social inclusion issues in her research and evaluation work. She will be supported by Irene REDACTED, who works across energy, environment, and social policy evaluation, and is part of Ipsos's Gender Balance committee.

Private and public finance: REDACTED, is an economist specialised in the evaluation of international climate finance programmes. She has led many evaluations in this field for BEIS, the World Bank, DG CLIMA, and the GIZ. Prior to working in evaluation, REDACTED worked for the Spanish financial agency, which provides second-floor financing (similar to the MAGC) and is therefore very familiar with the financial instruments used by the MAGC and the contextual factors that affect their success. Our panel of four financial experts who

have in-depth expertise of the financial markets in developing countries in MAGC regions: Africa, Asia and Latin America will provide expert knowledge at key stages of the evaluation.

Green buildings: We have subcontracted in-country experts in EDGE and green standards, who will be conducting an analysis of the green housing market in their countries and contributing to the stakeholder analysis. In addition, REDACTED, is academically trained in buildings energy performance and the interactions between people and energy systems. He will be supported by junior evaluators REDACTED and REDACTED who have delivered evaluations of UK Energy Efficient & Low Carbon Building Retrofit programmes.

Diversity in the team: We understand the need to have diversity of demographic in our team in order to ensure a diversity of perspectives and insight and representation of the range of stakeholders we will be consulting for this assignment. We have proposed a team that comprises UK-based and beneficiary country-based expertise, a mix of junior and senior evaluators and researchers, and a balanced gender mix.

C. Operating structure and key skills and expertise

Figure 1. Composition of the team (organogram) REDACTED

- The Climate Finance Expert Panel (REDACTED) and the Quality Director (REDACTED) will advise REDACTED (project director, PD).
 - REDACTED (REDACTED), as PD, will have overall decision-making responsibility, as well as team oversight and final responsibility on evaluation design and deliverables.
 - REDACTED (Project Manager, REDACTED) will report to REDACTED.
 - REDACTED (REDACTED), REDACTED (REDACTED), and the Design and Analysis Team (REDACTED) will report to REDACTED
 - The Case Study and Country Research Team (REDACTED) will report to REDACTED. •
- All core team members will be supported by Ipsos researchers and evaluators, as needed, for the delivery of primary research and analysis (days as needed).
- REDACTED and REDACTED will manage all communications with and reporting into BEIS, as well as managing all communications and interactions with IFC.

We will manage knowledge-sharing, quality, timeliness of delivery, and two-way communications within the team through **internal team meetings** when the contract is active. All team members actively working on the project at that time will be required to attend the meeting. In addition, the PD and PM may ask team members to feed directly into written updates to the client and to periodically attend client project management meetings. REDACTED (case study lead) and any analytical strand leads will be responsible for briefing team members, including any ad-hoc or freelance interviewers, on the evaluation activity, any wider information they need to know about the evaluation, and research ethics.

D. Our relevant track record and experience, and lessons that we will apply.

Extensive track record in evaluating climate finance programmes for BEIS REDACTED.

For the World Bank we have REDACTED.

A strong understanding of green construction programmes. REDACTED

F. Ensuring continuity, knowledge retention and effective handover. REDACTED will act as deputy manager for the study and will assume the project management role in the event that REDACTED is absent. Should REDACTED be temporarily absent, REDACTED will stand in. Where absences become permanent we will replace with an equivalent-skilled team member. Ipsos offers access to more than 300 evaluators, economists and researchers. The table below sets out the five types of critical information that we will manage carefully within the evaluation to support knowledge retention and handover where team members in BEIS or Ipsos change.

Info type	Purpose of the info	How we will manage it
Key project information – e.g. contract, milestones, contact details, team members, folder structure	Where key team members are absent, such a document would provide critical briefing information enabling a new PM or other core member to take over.	Ipsos will develop a comprehensive briefing sheet in the Scoping Phase and update this at six monthly intervals / as needed. We will set up and structure the evaluation folder on our server according to Ipsos' Business Excellence Service (BES)'s checklist, which provides guidance on how contract and research files should be named, stored and handled.
Delivery timelines – for tasks, including contingency or slack, milestones, critical periods and delivery crunches	Delivery timelines change, particularly in multi-year projects. Where there are multiple deliverables and policy information needs, it is critical to have foresight of upcoming tasks and critical time-paths.	The Gantt in this proposal will be further elaborated and updated as soon as task-level information about sub-tasks, dependencies, alignment with policy delivery, emerges. Then, the PM will review the Gantt each week, before the client PMO meeting, checking (a) what the primary deliverables are for that 1-2 weeks ahead, and (b) whether there are any upcoming milestones which appear at risk. These will then be systematically reported on in the weekly update to the client, with risk mitigation plans.
Evaluation delivery progress	Updates on evaluation strand progress will ensure that Ipsos and the client share an up-to-date understanding of the evaluation's status, so that any delivery risk can be quickly identified.	At the beginning of the evaluation, we will agree with BEIS the breakdown of the evaluation project into discrete tasks. In our weekly updates we will assign a status – 'live', 'dormant', with % progressed for live delivery strands. Each week the consortium PM will ask strand leads to provide the status, plus a brief update on any activity conducted during the week, plus risks. This will be incorporated into the weekly PM memo that will go to the client in advance of the PMO meeting.
Evaluation delivery decisions	Ipsos will need to track all delivery decisions to ensure transparency and clarity with BEIS and to maintain an 'audit trail' that can be referred to in making future project decisions.	All client meetings will be attended by the project's executive (REDACTED) who will take notes against a structure agreed with the client. We expect this to include a section at the bottom for 'actions', with an associated deadline. We will save all weekly minutes in Word with a standard filename that includes the date, and use a standard document structure making all decisions and actions logged are easily searchable.
Primary and secondary data	Extensive primary and secondary data will be collected for the evaluation, requiring robust & effective filing.	We will assign a dedicated data manager to the project who will be responsible for naming conventions for all data files, for maintaining oversight of all secondary data shared within the evaluation, where all primary data is being stored and how it is being collected and managed.

Annex A CVs of named team **REDACTED**

A. Resource Plan: The project will be **managed centrally** by the Project Director (REDACTED) and Project Manager (REDACTED). They will be the primary contact points for BEIS, the IFC, the internal team and our partners (including Ipsos offices in MAGC countries). To further enhance the efficiency of delivery, we have proposed sub-teams for cross-cutting and country specific analysis, as outlined in our response to Q2 (Team structure, experience, and technical expertise).

B. Time plan: We have annexed a **Project Work Plan** in Excel to this submission. We consider that the Plan is self-explanatory so have not included any further narrative. As a general rule, we will work closely with BEIS (see below) to review the Gantt each week, before the client PMO meeting, checking (a) what the primary deliverables are for it 1-2 weeks ahead, and (b) whether there are any upcoming milestones which appear at risk. These will then be systematically reported on in the weekly update to the client, with risk mitigation plans. We will discuss with BEIS during the Scoping Phase which of the timelines are fixed and/or linked to key policy and programme milestones (which therefore have little slack or room for change) and those which might be flexed if needed.

C. Working with BEIS and the IFC: We agree with all of the proposed coordination points set out in the Terms of Reference. We propose to hold **weekly Project Management Office (PMO) meetings** with BEIS during the Scoping Phase of the evaluation with frequency will be reviewed for the evaluation phase. The meetings, attended by the Project Manager and Project Director, will be structured around a **working-level reporting dashboard** updated weekly and sent in advance of the meeting to BEIS.

We will hold **Quarterly Evaluation Steering Group meetings** during periods when evaluation work is happening to provide updates on the progress and management of the evaluation, receive feedback on evaluation deliverables and emerging findings.

We propose also to hold **monthly meetings with the Delivery Partner** (which can be held more frequently as needed e.g. in the first 1-2 months). These meetings will support effective engagement and cooperation between the evaluation and the IFC; productive ways of working, including data sharing agreements and protocols for the exchange of monitoring / evaluation data and findings; and alignment of respective work planning to ensure that e.g. any interactions with programme beneficiaries is timed so as to mitigate the consultation fatigue risk to participants. We will also hold a **workshop with BEIS and the IFC** following the drafting of the project workplan to ensure its feasibility and to agree and gain buy-in.

B. Risk and mitigations strategies: We have set out what we currently consider to be the key delivery risks in the table below / overleaf.

Risk and Mitigation strategy

Risk: Delays in project kick-off mean that overall evaluation timeline is reduced. **Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones:** Low impact. **Mitigation:** Our workplan is flexible, and especially at the scoping phase some tasks can be combined during the scoping and process evaluation. **Management where risk still occurs:** Regular catch-ups between Ipsos and BEIS will ensure that any bottlenecks can be quickly identified and resolved.

Risk: Low engagement of IFC in the evaluation and lack of buy-in of recommendations. **Risk rating:** High impact. **Mitigation:** We will keep open channels of communication with IFC and explain the benefits of the evaluation and the robustness of our methods. IFC will be consulted at all stages in the evaluation (through interviews and workshops) and we will discuss emerging findings with them before drafting the report. **Management where risk still occurs:** More frequent catch-ups, ad-hoc meetings to discuss concerns, and a visit to IFC HQ to ease relationships if needed.

Risk: Ipsos unable to obtain programme documentation with sufficient time to conduct the rapid evidence review and portfolio analysis. **Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones:** Low impact. **Mitigation:** Ipsos, the DP and BEIS will be in close communication to ensure that all the required documentation are received promptly. Any non-disclosure agreements will be prepared and agreed at speed. **Management where risk still occurs:** The timeline for the desk research tasks will be swapped with the interviews at the scoping phase.

<p>Risk: There may be sensitivities around the evaluation of GESI. Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones: Medium risk. Mitigation: We will explain the purpose of evaluating GESI to IFC and build their buy-in for this component of the evaluation; there may otherwise be resistance due to a perception of being evaluated on something that was not part of their mandate. We will sensitise IFC on the role of GESI in the evaluation; this includes not only explaining HMG's requirements around GESI, our approach, and that the aim of this is to address learning purposes, but demonstrating the value of this from other evaluations—here, we will be able to share learnings from other Ipsos evaluations such as our ongoing evaluation of the CFA and the evaluation of UKCI, which included a GESI assessment of a green construction housing development project in Kenya. Management where risk still occurs: Communication will be open and clear to maintain IFC informed and address any concerns.</p>
<p>Risk: Covid affects our capacity to conduct in-face fieldwork or international travel. Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones: Low impact. Mitigation: We have minimised international travel, most of the in-face fieldwork will be conducted by in-country experts, and we are ready to move to online methods when and as needed. Management where risk still occurs: Online methods will be used instead. Focus groups with residents will be substituted with online diaries using Ipsos' Applife.</p>
<p>Risk: Unable to recruit sufficient participants due to e.g., lack of interest or unavailability over summer. Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones: Medium impact. Mitigation: We are highly experienced in recruiting participants for qualitative research. We schedule fieldwork flexibly to accommodate participant needs/preferences. We will send reminders to boost participation. All participants will be provided with information sheets detailing what the research involves and provide a contact email to which participants can direct any concerns or questions. Incentives have been budgeted for harder to engage audiences. Management where risk still occurs: We will update BEIS regularly on fieldwork progress, workplan can be reviewed to be adapted to stakeholders' preferred consultation methods.</p>
<p>Risk: The scope of the evaluation increases beyond the resources planned / available to the evaluation team. Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones: Low impact. Mitigation: Throughout the evaluation, we will monitor this resource efficiency challenge and flag with BEIS any time we think it may arise, the resultant impact on resources, and implications for delivery. Management where risk still occurs: We will work with BEIS to prioritise tasks and review the workplan.</p>
<p>Risk: Dynamic nature of the programme – changing context for example changing case study countries. Risk rating to achievement of evaluation objectives & milestones: High impact. Mitigation: Close communication with BEIS will be crucial in getting early sight of any changes and ensuring that the implications of these changes to the evaluation are discussed in full. We have planned light-touch longitudinal research for all countries, therefore impact on our ability to assess outcomes through our theory-based approach will be minimal. Management where risk still occurs: Quick mobilisation of staff in new countries through Ipsos offices, revision of workplan and budget if needed.</p>

C. Research ethics: Ipsos' dedicated **Ethics Group** will support the project. As with all new Ipsos projects, we will complete an **Ethics Review Form** and develop a full chapter on ethics to be included in the **Scoping Report**. As the assignment will be funded through ODA we anticipate that we may need to go through a Due Diligence process, and that we will need to demonstrate evidence and be able to describe all processes enabling Ipsos to abide by BEIS' **Supply Partner Code of Conduct**. We have gone through the assessment successfully when we were awarded the contract for the evaluation of the ICF Climate Finance Accelerator. In the Scoping Phase of the evaluation we will work with our Ethics Group to develop our approaches to: (i) sampling (to ensure diversity of voice represented), (ii) ethical research methods and reducing bias through research design, (iii) information that should be shared with research participants to meet ethical standards and best practice recruitment materials and content for interviewer briefings, (iv) safeguarding risks during the project and disclosure / whistleblowing and reporting processes, (v) researcher safety, (v) other ethical risks (particularly of methods involving video diaries, social listening, covert observation during face-to-face fieldwork). We will hold a **full team briefing** on research ethics (where we will cover other aspects of our research plan, time plan and social value). Any newly-

joining team members will also be asked to review the research plan and be briefed on ethics. We will track research ethics through a tab in the monthly reporting dashboard. Within the delivery team, REDACTED will act as **independent reviewer and advisor** on ethical standards. At this bidding stage we consider that the highest ethical risks to this assignment will be balancing the involvement of the IFC as evaluand and evaluation audience – we will need to ensure that we cover a diversity of perspectives on MAGC delivery, but that we also remain sensitive to their relationship with BEIS and MAGC stakeholders. There may be specific ethic risks during face-to-face data collection and site visits (in the final evaluation), and to our proposed use of video diaries.

D. Fraud and corruption: When an employee suspects fraud or corruption, and reports it to their line manager, the latter must ensure that, within 24 hours, the fraud is reported to the Ipsos Group's Director of Internal Audit and the Group's CFO. Ipsos Group also has an externally-managed whistleblowing system. We also maintain separate anti-Fraud, Anti-Bribery, and Supplier Anti-Corruption Policy Policies. REDACTED and REDACTED will brief all team members on the evaluation-specific ethics context, including HMG's zero tolerance approach and any BEIS-specific policies.

We would request that during the scoping stage BEIS share any programme specific Safeguarding Procedures and associated reporting procedures. We suggest including a Due Diligence register in the monthly reporting dashboard, which will be regularly updated.

E. Safeguarding: The Ipsos Business Excellence and Compliance Team ensures adherence to all **data safeguarding** legal requirements. We have been awarded ISO 27001, with regular external/internal audits maintaining standards, and are fully committed to complying with all relevant legislation and standards. Ipsos also maintains a Data Protection Policy and Information Security Policy, provided to all staff members to ensure the protection of personal data obtained through research. In terms of external reporting, external stakeholders e.g., interviewees can report safeguarding concerns via the PD, with the contact details made available to the participant through an information sheet supplied as part of interviews. Regarding **research participant safeguarding**, Ipsos will prepare information sheets which include specific reference to means of reporting safeguarding concerns to Ipsos centrally via either the PD or the Chair of the Disclosure Board, whilst also giving the alternative options to raise concerns around data handling or general complaints. The option could also be given to report to BEIS directly. To **safeguard our researchers** we will provide all researchers assigned to fieldwork with lone worker and fieldwork safety, as well as – where necessary – additional travel security training. This will be discussed in advance with BEIS so they can quality-check the appropriateness of this training.

F. Data handling and security: As one of the UK's largest research organisations, the secure and ethical handling of data is a key priority for Ipsos and is central to the research we undertake. Ipsos are compliant with the highest regulatory standards for the legal and safe processing of personal and/or sensitive data, including the European General Data Protection Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR), the UK Data Protection Act 2018, Market Research Society Code of Conduct and the international standards for information security (ISO 27001), market research (ISO 20252) and company quality (ISO 9001). We are also registered with the ICO. As part of our 'Business Excellence System (BES)', Ipsos has an Information Security Policy that stipulates how data is to be managed and applies to all employees, freelancers, interviewers and contractors engaged by Ipsos, as well as anyone visiting our offices. The Policy ensures that information is collected and processed in compliance with our legal, contractual and industry code of practice obligations. There are three primary aspects of data handling and processing that concern the MAGC evaluation: (1) how data are shared; (2) how data are stored; and (3) security measures in place to protect data. During the scoping stage project specific procedures for these three elements of data management will be developed in collaboration with BEIS.

G. Financial management: At Quarterly Evaluation Steering Group meetings, we will provide **quarterly financial and risk reporting** including breakdown of spend by workstream to accompany invoicing, projected spend for the next quarter and a copy of the evaluation risk register. This will also enable BEIS to track the evaluation's profit margin during delivery and direct cost expenditure. This will be checked against the evaluation's forecast and any unexpected discrepancies reviewed and followed up. We will invoice BEIS in accordance to a schedule agreed at Scoping Phase and tied to deliverable milestones.

Annex A: Workplan REDACTED

A. Overview: our approach to social value for this assignment

We understand that, if successful in this bid, Ipsos and its subcontractors will be expected to contribute through this contract to:

1. BEIS' policy outcome of effective stewardship of the environment and to the Model Award Criteria of delivering additional environmental benefits, including working towards net zero greenhouse gas emissions.
2. BEIS' policy outcome of increasing supply chain resilience and capacity and to the Model Award Criteria of creating a diverse supply chain to deliver the contract, supporting the development of scalable and future-proofed new methods to modernise delivery and increase productivity, and demonstrating collaboration throughout the supply chain, including a fair and responsible approach to working with supply chain partners.

We have identified likely timings for all of the Social Value activities we describe in this section and have marked these activities in the Work Plan (Gantt) attached to our response to Q3 (Programme Management). In the remainder of this response we set out how we intend to bring social value to BEIS and its stakeholders against the two above-described policy outcomes. In line with the Terms of Reference we have provided information on our commitments / activities, when they will be carried out, and how they will be monitored, measured. We will track social value as part of our regular PMO meetings with BEIS and report on progress in our social value commitments at quarterly meetings of the evaluation steering group. If successful in our bid, we will discuss the Plan with BEIS during the Scoping Phase of the assignment, where there will also be opportunity for BEIS to feed back on the Plan and for Ipsos to adapt it subsequently.

Our social value commitments have been developed by Ipsos in collaboration with its partner offices for the evaluation (in India, Sub-Saharan Africa/Kenya, South Africa, Vietnam, Colombia). We have tried to design activities that will maximise this international, global connection to address global issues and concerns with our actions.

As BEIS has made clear, social value activities for this assignment should have an impact beyond the direct audiences of the research, influencing staff, suppliers, customers and communities to support delivery of your commitments. We propose to do this by:

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED