Investor Contribution Claim Template

Investor Contribution 2.0 Project
Impact Frontiers & Predistribution Initiative
Please send feedback, comments, and questions to: info@investorcontribution.org
Revised June 2023

Table of Contents

Investor Contribution Claim Template (Asset Managers)

Instructions

Introduction: This template is designed to support investors in expressing and evaluating claims of investor contribution[1] through investment and/or non-financial engagement. A claim is an assertion that an approximate amount of investor contribution will occur or has occurred with an approximate likelihood. Both the amount and likelihood may vary. The template should be completed once for each claim of investor contribution.

Intended Users:

- Designed to assess asset managers' investor contribution. See page 16 for a guide to assessing investor contribution for asset owners and allocators
- Designed with private markets investors in mind, but it may be used in other asset classes as well
- The template may also be used by third-party service providers to assess claims of positive and negative investor contribution[2]

Potential Uses:

- Deal teams to present their case for investor contribution to investment committees, and investment committees to evaluate those claims
- Portfolio and/or firm managers to aggregate and synthesize claims of investor contribution across a portfolio
  - To evaluate past performance, inform future portfolio strategy, and set targets
  - To communicate investor contribution to external stakeholders
- To validate actual ex-post investor contribution against ex-ante expectations
- To monitor investor contribution over the course of an investment
- To facilitate third-party review of investor contribution

Two Format Options:

- Option 1 is a simple set of open-ended questions phrased for use in pre-investment due diligence
- Option 2 (pages 4 – 15) uses a tabular format to break out magnitude, likelihood, and evidence of investor contribution. It includes space for post-investment assessment as well as pre-investment due diligence. Three versions are provided: one with detailed instructions (page 4); one with a worked example (page 8); and one blank (page 12)

Information Sources: Users may populate the template with information obtained through the investment process as well as through market research, stakeholder engagement, and any other sources of relevant information about the contexts of the enterprise, its end-stakeholders, and the natural environment.

Burden of Proof: Users are recommended to seek 'a preponderance of evidence' that provides good reason to believe that a claim about the amount and likelihood of investor contribution is more likely true than not. Users are encouraged always to bear in mind the differences between the amount and likelihood of investor contribution claimed, and the strength of evidence presented to support that claim.[3]

---

[1] Investor contribution is defined as "a change in outcomes for end-stakeholders (people and/or the natural environment) caused by an investor's action(s) that wouldn't have likely occurred in the absence of the investor." The "change in outcomes" can be positive or negative (i.e., cause an improvement or a decline in stakeholder outcomes).

[2] The template is not intended to be a sufficient resource for identifying or evaluating harms to end-stakeholders and the natural environment, and should be used alongside other approaches specifically designed for those purposes.

[3] For instance, an investor might provide strong evidence that investor contribution is unlikely, and will be small in amount if it does occur. Conversely, an investor might provide weak evidence that investor contribution is likely and will be large in amount. Regardless of whether the amount and the likelihood of investor contribution are zero, small, or large, investors are encouraged to apply a consistent burden of proof: a preponderance of evidence leading the user to believe that a claim is more likely true than not.

Option 1: Open-Ended Due Diligence Questions

[Note: Retrospective evaluations can follow the same logic.]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to investor contribution with this investment?
    a. Spotting a combination of impact and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other investors.
    b. Accepting greater risk than other investors would for a given level of financial return.
    c. Accepting less financial return than other investors would for a given level of risk.
    d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the enterprise's impact performance.

2. In what way(s), if any, would our capital and/or non-financial engagement differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive[4]?
    a) What amount, terms, and conditions of capital, and/or what kind of non-financial engagement, would we provide to this enterprise?
    b) What amount, terms, and conditions would the enterprise most likely receive from other investors (if any)? What non-financial engagement would the enterprise most likely receive from other investors (if any)? What is the likelihood / what is our degree of confidence?

3. [*If we expect our capital or non-financial engagement to differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive:*]
   In what way(s), if any, would the enterprise act differently if we do invest and / or engage than if we don't?
    a) What do we expect the enterprise to do if we invest and/or engage? What is the likelihood / what is our degree of confidence?
    b) What do we expect the enterprise to do if we do <u>not</u> invest and/or engage, considering the likely alternatives available to the enterprise as described in question 2b. What is the likelihood / what is our degree of confidence?

4. [*If we expect our investment or non-financial engagement to differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive AND if we expect that difference to result in a change in enterprise actions:*]
   In light of our answers to 3a and b, in what way(s), if any, would end-stakeholders and/or the natural environment experience better outcomes if we invest and / or engage than if we don't? (Specify per relevant group of end-stakeholders)
    a) What level of outcome do we expect end-stakeholders to experience if we invest and / or engage, and why?
    b) What level of outcome do we expect end-stakeholders would likely experience if we do <u>not</u> invest and / or engage, in light of our answer to 3b?

---

[4] If your investment is a necessary condition for additional financing from other investors and/or if you facilitate a coordinated, collaborative engagement with other investors, describe the cumulative capital allocation and/or coordinated, collaborative engagement with other investors that would not occur in your absence.

Option 2: Tabular (with instructions)

[Note: depending on your strategy you may complete 2a (capital allocation), 2b (engagement), or both before proceeding to question 3.]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to investor contribution with this investment?

a. Spotting a combination of impact and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other investors.
b. Accepting greater risk than other investors would for a given level of financial return.
c. Accepting less financial return than other investors would for a given level of risk.
d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the enterprise's impact performance.

2a. Capital Allocation: In what way(s), if any, would our capital differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Investment	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** *Describe the amount, terms and conditions, and any other relevant characteristics of the capital you would provide.* *If your capital is a necessary condition for additional financing from other investors, describe the total capital that the enterprise would receive.* **Amount of Capital:** **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** **Evidence & Reasoning:** *If your capital is a necessary condition for additional financing from other investors, explain why; otherwise leave this part blank.*	**Description:** *Describe the amount, terms and conditions, and any other relevant characteristics of the capital that the enterprise would most likely receive from others if you <u>do not</u> invest.* *If you think the enterprise likely would not receive capital at all, simply put 'none.'* **Amount of Capital:** **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** **Evidence & Reasoning:** *Provide the evidence and reasoning that inform your estimate above.*	*Estimate the likelihood, or your degree of confidence, that your capital would differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive.* *You may express this in any way you like (e.g., percentages, ranges, high/medium/low, etc.)*
During Ownership	*If desired, note progress versus expectations, actions taken to increase investor contribution through capital allocation, and evidence that emerges about what the likely alternative scenario would have been.*		
Post-Exit	*Note here if the amount, terms, or conditions of the capital you provided were different than expected.*	*Note here if your estimate of the amount, terms, and conditions of the capital that the enterprise likely would have received has changed in light of additional information received during ownership.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of likelihood / degree of certainty, and evidence / rationale.*

2b. Engagement: In what way(s), if any, would our engagement differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Engagement	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** *Describe how you plan to engage with the enterprise to improve outcomes for end-stakeholders.*[5] **Evidence & Reasoning:** *If your participation is a necessary condition for a collaborative engagement with other investors to improve end-stakeholder outcomes, describe the collaborative engagement.*	**Description:** *Describe the engagement that the enterprise would most likely receive from others if you do not engage, along with evidence and reasoning.* **Evidence & Reasoning:** *If you think the enterprise likely would not receive impact-relevant engagement, simply put 'none.'*	*Estimate the likelihood, or your degree of confidence, that your engagement will differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive.* *You may express this in any way you like (e.g., percentages, ranges, high/medium/low, etc.)*
During Ownership	*If desired, note progress versus expectations, actions taken to increase investor contribution through engagement, and evidence that emerges about what the likely alternative scenario would have been.*		
Post-Exit	*Note here if your engagement with the company was different than expected.*	*Note here if your estimate of the engagement that the enterprise likely would have received has changed in light of additional information received during ownership.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of likelihood / degree of certainty, and evidence / rationale.*

[5] "End-stakeholders" can refer to people and/or the natural environment.

3. Enterprise Level: In what way(s), if any, would the enterprise act differently if we do invest and / or engage than if we don't?

	Enterprise Activities With Our Investment / Engagement	Enterprise Activities Without Our Investment / Engagement	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** *Describe the enterprise activities affecting end-stakeholder outcomes that you expect to occur if you invest and/or engage.* **Evidence & reasoning:**	**Description:** *Describe the enterprise activities affecting end-stakeholder outcomes that you expect to occur if you do not invest and/or engage.* **Evidence & reasoning:**	*Estimate the likelihood, or your degree of confidence, that the enterprise's impact-relevant activities would differ if you chose to invest than they would otherwise.* *You may express this in any way you like (e.g., percentages, ranges, high/medium/low, etc.)*[6]
During Ownership	*If desired, note enterprise actions taken versus expectations and evidence that emerges about what the likely alternative scenario would have been.*		
Post-Exit	*Describe actions the enterprise ended up taking, including differences from your expectations.*	*Note here if your estimate of what the enterprise likely would have received has changed in light of additional information received during ownership.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of likelihood / degree of certainty, and evidence / rationale.*

[6] This may reflect both the likelihood of the enterprise's actions if you do invest/engage, and the likelihood of the enterprise's actions if you do not.

4. Stakeholder Level: In what way(s), if any, would end-stakeholders and/or the natural environment experience better outcomes if we invest and / or engage than if we don't, considering our answers to Q2 and Q3? (Specify per relevant group of end-stakeholders)

	Stakeholder Outcomes With Our Investment / Engagement	Stakeholder Outcomes Without Our Investment / Engagement	Magnitude of Investor Contribution	Likelihood of Investor Contribution
Pre-Investment	**Description:** *Use stakeholder-level impact management tools and metrics (e.g., 5 Dimensions of Impact, GRI and IRIS+ metrics) to describe the outcomes you expect end-stakeholders to experience as a result of the enterprise's activities if you invest or engage.*[7] **Evidence & reasoning:**	**Description:** *Use stakeholder-level impact management tools and metrics (e.g., 5 Dimensions of Impact, GRI and IRIS+ metrics) to describe the outcomes you expect end-stakeholders to experience as a result of the enterprise's activities if you do not invest or engage.*[8] **Evidence & reasoning:**	*How great is the estimated difference between stakeholder outcomes with and without your investment / engagement?*	*Estimate the likelihood, or your degree of confidence, that the outcomes you expect with and without your investment / engagement will occur as you describe.* *You may express this in any way you like (e.g., percentages, ranges, high/medium/low, etc.)*
During Ownership	*If desired, note stakeholder outcomes versus expectations and evidence that emerges about what the likely alternative scenario would have been.*			
Post-Exit	*Describe the outcomes that end-stakeholders experienced, including differences from your expectations.*	*Note here if your estimate of what outcomes stakeholders would have experienced has changed in light of additional information received during ownership.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of magnitude above, and evidence / rationale.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of likelihood / degree of certainty, and evidence / rationale.*

[7] In particular, consider and include: relevant information about the end-stakeholders (Who), the kind(s) of outcome(s) you expect end-stakeholders to experience (What), the number of end-stakeholders you expect to experience each outcome (How Much – Scale), the level of outcome you expect them to experience (How Much – Depth), and the extent to which end-stakeholders would experience worse outcomes in the absence of the enterprise (Enterprise Contribution). 'Likelihood of Difference' captures some, but not all, of the considerations relevant to Impact Risk.

[8] See footnote 8.

Option 2: Tabular (with worked example)[9]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to investor contribution with this investment?
   a. Spotting a combination of impact and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other investors.
   b. Accepting greater risk than other investors would for a given level of financial return.
   c. Accepting less financial return than other investors would for a given level of risk.
   d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the enterprise's impact performance.

2a. Capital Allocation: In what way(s), if any, would our capital differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Investment	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Amount of Capital:** We provided a $750k loan as a bridge to a $6M equity fundraise. **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** Our unique risk-based screening and due diligence process, designed for flexibility and speed, enabled us to quickly disburse these funds in response to the enterprise's needs. **Evidence & Reasoning:**	**Amount of Capital:** If we chose not to invest, the most likely alternative scenario was that the enterprise would not have received investment from another investor. **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** Through conversations with the enterprise and our knowledge of the other players in their region, there were no others investors that were in a position to disburse the amount of capital that we did as quickly as we did. We stepped in only after it had become clear that the enterprise had been unable to secure a bridge loan from any other investor. **Evidence & Reasoning:**	High High **Evidence / Reasoning:** See "Most Likely Alternative Scenario" evidence & rationale
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

[9] This investor filled out the template for a recent investment, and has not yet completed the "Ex-Post Observation" rows.

2b. Engagement: In what way(s), if any, would our engagement differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Engagement	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment			
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

3. Enterprise Level: In what way(s), if any, would the enterprise act differently if we do invest and / or engage than if we don't?

	Enterprise Activities With Our Investment / Engagement	Enterprise Activities Without Our Investment / Engagement	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** Our loan enabled the enterprise to continue their activities until they completed their equity fundraise. **Evidence & reasoning:** No observed changes in enterprise activities before their equity fundraise.	**Description:** The enterprise would have likely needed to layoff employees, slow new business initiatives, and contract their current operations if they failed to secure a bridge loan. **Evidence & reasoning:** The enterprise had <1 month cash on hand and negative EBITDA, and communicated to us their plan to undertake the above in the absence of a bridge loan.	High **Evidence / Reasoning:** See information in the left two cells in this row
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

4. Stakeholder Level: In what way(s), if any, would end-stakeholders and/or the natural environment experience better outcomes if we invest and / or engage than if we don't, considering our answers to Q2 and Q3? (Specify per relevant group of end-stakeholders)

	Stakeholder Outcomes With Our Investment / Engagement	Stakeholder Outcomes Without Our Investment / Engagement	Magnitude of Investor Contribution	Likelihood of Investor Contribution
Pre-Investment	**What**: income / wages **How Much (Scale)**: [redacted] **How Much (Depth)**: [redacted] **Who**: [redacted] No change in stakeholder outcomes. **Evidence / Reasoning:** [Stakeholder outcome metrics redacted]	**What**: income / wages **How Much (Scale)**: [redacted] **How Much (Depth)**: [redacted] **Who**: [redacted] [X] average decline in incomes for [Y] stakeholders as a result of layoffs **Evidence / Reasoning:** The employees that would have been laid off would have been unlikely to find alternative employment in short-to-medium term due to labor market conditions in *[region redacted]*	**What**: income / wages **How Much (Scale)**: [redacted] **How Much (Depth)**: [X – redacted] **Who**: [redacted]	High **Evidence / Reasoning:** See left two cells in this row
During Ownership				
Post-Exit				

Option 2: Tabular (blank)

[Note: depending on your strategy you may complete 2a (capital allocation), 2b (engagement), or both before proceeding to question 3.]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to investor contribution with this investment?

   a. Spotting a combination of impact and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other investors.
   b. Accepting greater risk than other investors would for a given level of financial return.
   c. Accepting less financial return than other investors would for a given level of risk.
   d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the enterprise's impact performance.

2a. Capital Allocation: In what way(s), if any, would our capital differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Investment	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Amount of Capital:** **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** **Evidence & Reasoning:**	**Amount of Capital:** **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** **Evidence & Reasoning:**	
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

2b. Engagement: In what way(s), if any, would our engagement differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Engagement	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** **Evidence & reasoning:**	**Description:** **Evidence & reasoning:**	
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

3. Enterprise Level: In what way(s), if any, would the enterprise act differently if we do invest and / or engage than if we don't?

	Enterprise Activities With Our Investment / Engagement	Enterprise Activities Without Our Investment / Engagement	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** **Evidence & reasoning:**	**Description:** **Evidence & reasoning:**	
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

4. Stakeholder Level: In what way(s), if any, would end-stakeholders and/or the natural environment experience better outcomes if we invest and / or engage than if we don't, considering our answers to Q2 and Q3? (Specify per relevant group of end-stakeholders)

	Stakeholder Outcomes With Our Investment / Engagement	Stakeholder Outcomes Without Our Investment / Engagement	Magnitude of Investor Contribution	Likelihood of Investor Contribution
Pre-Investment	**Description:** **Evidence / Reasoning:**	**Description:** **Evidence / Reasoning:**		
During Ownership				
Post-Exit				

Investor Contribution Claim Template (Asset Owners and Allocators)

Instructions

Introduction: This template is designed to support asset owners and allocators in expressing and evaluating claims of investor contribution as a product of their additionality[10] – providing an asset manager with capital and/or non-financial engagement that others would not have provided in their absence - and the asset manager's own investor contribution, expressed as changes in outcomes for end-stakeholders. It does not seek to trace asset owners' impacts through the asset manager, enterprise, and stakeholder levels. Asset owners are encouraged to provide asset managers with the template above to assess managers' investor contribution[11]; to use this template below to assess the additionality of asset owners' own capital and/or non-financial engagement; and to review both templates together as a proxy for asset owners' investor contribution.[12]

Intended Users:

- Designed to provide asset owners and allocators with a proxy for their investor contribution
- Designed with private markets investors in mind, but it may be used in other asset classes as well
- The template may also be used by third-party service providers to assess claims of positive and negative investor contribution[13]

Potential Uses:

- To synthesize assessments of investor contribution across a portfolio
  - To evaluate past performance, inform future portfolio strategy, and set targets
  - To communicate investor contribution to external stakeholders
- To assess actual ex-post investor contribution against ex-ante expectations
- To facilitate third-party review of investor contribution

Two Format Options:

- Option 1 (page 17) is a simple set of open-ended questions phrased for use in pre-investment due diligence
- Option 2 (pages 18 – 23) uses a tabular format to break out magnitude, likelihood, and evidence of investor contribution. It includes space for post-investment assessment as well as pre-investment due diligence. Two versions are provided: one with instructions (page 18) and one blank (page 21).

Information Sources: In addition to the information provided by asset managers via the asset manager investor contribution template, users may populate the template below with information obtained through the investment process as well as through market research and any other sources of relevant information about the investee.

Burden of Proof: Users are recommended to seek 'a preponderance of evidence' that provides good reason to believe an asset manager's claim of investor contribution, as well as their own claim of additionality. Users are encouraged always to bear in mind the differences between the amount and likelihood of investor contribution/additionality claimed, and the strength of evidence presented to support those claims.[14]

[10] Additionality refers here solely to the investor-level counterfactual (i.e., an investor action that wouldn't have likely occurred otherwise), in contrast to investor contribution (i.e., an investor action that causes a change in stakeholder outcomes that wouldn't likely have occurred otherwise).

[11] Users are encouraged to consider a representative sample of investments if it is not possible to consider all investments.

[12] For example, a highly additional investment in an asset manager that itself has no investor contribution would be considered as having no investor contribution.

[13] The template is not intended to be a sufficient resource for identifying or evaluating harms to end-stakeholders and the natural environment, and should be used alongside other approaches specifically designed for those purposes. The template will be most useful in tracing the chain of causality of impacts.

[14] For instance, an investor might provide strong evidence that investor contribution is unlikely, and will be small in amount if it does occur. Conversely, an investor might provide weak evidence that investor contribution is likely and will be large in amount. Regardless of whether the amount and the likelihood of investor contribution are zero, small, or large, investors are encouraged to apply a consistent burden of proof: a preponderance of evidence leading the user to believe that a claim is more likely true than not.

Option 1: Open-Ended Due Diligence Questions

[Note: Retrospective evaluations can follow the same logic.]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to investor contribution with this allocation of capital?
    a. Spotting a combination of impact and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other asset owners and allocators.
    b. Accepting greater risk than other asset owners and allocators would for a given level of financial return.
    c. Accepting less financial return than other asset owners and allocators would for a given level of risk.
    d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the investee's impact performance.

2. In what way(s), if any, would your capital and/or non-financial engagement differ from what the asset manager would likely otherwise receive[15]?
    a. What amount, terms, and conditions of capital, and/or what kind of non-financial engagement, would we provide to this investee?
    b. What amount, terms, and conditions would the investee most likely receive from other asset owners and allocators (if any)? What non-financial engagement would the investee most likely receive from other asset owners and allocators (if any)? What is the likelihood / what is our degree of confidence?

3. [*If we expect our capital or non-financial engagement to differ from what the investee would likely otherwise receive:*]
In light of the evidence provided by the asset manager, what is the overall likelihood and magnitude of the asset managers' own investor contribution to impact?

[15] If your investment is a necessary condition for additional financing from other investors and/or if you facilitate a coordinated, collaborative engagement with other investors, describe the cumulative capital allocation and/or coordinated, collaborative engagement with other investors that would not occur in your absence.

Option 2: Tabular (with instructions)

[Note: depending on your strategy you may complete 2a (capital allocation), 2b (engagement), or both.]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to additionality with this investment?

a. Spotting a combination of investor contribution and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other asset owners/allocators.
b. Accepting greater risk than others would for a given level of financial return.
c. Accepting less financial return than others would for a given level of risk.
d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the asset manager's impact performance.

2a. Capital Allocation: In what way(s), if any, would our capital differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Investment	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	*Describe the amount, terms and conditions, and any other relevant characteristics of the capital you would provide.* *If your capital is a necessary condition for additional financing from others, describe the total capital that the asset manager would receive.* **Amount of Capital:** **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** **Evidence & Reasoning:** *If your capital is a necessary condition for additional financing from others, explain why; otherwise leave this part blank.*	*Describe the amount, terms and conditions, and any other relevant characteristics of the capital that the asset manager would most likely receive from others if you <u>do not</u> invest.* *If you think the asset manager likely would not receive capital at all, simply put 'none.'* **Amount of Capital:** **Terms & Conditions of Capital:** **Other:** **Evidence & Reasoning:** *Provide the evidence and reasoning that inform your estimate above.*	*Estimate the likelihood, or your degree of confidence, that your capital would differ from what the asset manager would likely otherwise receive.* *You may express this in any way you like (e.g., percentages, ranges, high/medium/low, etc.)*
During Ownership	*If desired, note progress versus expectations, actions taken to increase additionality through capital allocation, and evidence that emerges about what the likely alternative scenario would have been.*		
Post-Exit	*Note here if the amount, terms, or conditions of the capital you provided were different than expected.*	*Note here if your estimate of the amount, terms, and conditions of the capital that the asset manager likely would have received has changed in light of additional information received during ownership.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of likelihood / degree of certainty, and evidence / rationale.*

2b. Engagement: In what way(s), if any, would our engagement differ from what the investee would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Engagement	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	*Describe how you plan to engage with the asset manager to improve their investor contribution, and explain why you expect it will improve their investor contribution.*[16] *If your participation is a necessary condition for a collaborative engagement with other investors to improve end-stakeholder outcomes, describe the collaborative engagement.*	*Describe the engagement that the asset manager would most likely receive from others if you do not engage, along with evidence and reasoning.* *If you think the asset manager likely would not receive impact-relevant engagement, simply put 'none.'*	*Estimate the likelihood, or your degree of confidence, that your engagement will differ from what the asset manager would likely otherwise receive.* *You may express this in any way you like (e.g., percentages, ranges, high/medium/low, etc.)*
During Ownership	*If desired, note progress versus expectations, actions taken to increase investor contribution through engagement, and evidence that emerges about what the likely alternative scenario would have been.*		
Post-Exit	*Note here if your engagement with the asset manager was different than expected.*	*Note here if your estimate of the engagement that the asset manager likely would have received has changed in light of additional information received during investment.*	*Indicate any changes to your estimate of likelihood / degree of certainty, and evidence / rationale.*

[16] "End-stakeholders" can refer to people and/or the natural environment.

3. Asset Manager's Investor Contribution: In light of the evidence provided by the asset manager, what is the overall likelihood and magnitude of the asset managers' own investor contribution to impact?

	Magnitude	Likelihood	Strength of Evidence
Investment #1	*Q4 – Magnitude, Asset Manager template*	*Q4 – Likelihood, Asset Manager template*	*Input your assessment of whether or not the asset manager has provided a preponderance of evidence to support their claim*
Investment #2			
Investment #3			
Investment #4			
Investment #5			
Overall	*Input your assessment of the magnitude of the asset manager's investor contribution*	*Input your assessment of the likelihood of the asset manager's investor contribution*	*Input your assessment of whether or not the asset manager has provided a preponderance of evidence to support the overall assessment of magnitude and likelihood*

Option 2: Tabular (blank)

[Note: depending on your strategy you may complete 2a (capital allocation), 2b (engagement), or both.]

1. Which of the following best describes your approach to investor contribution with this investment?

a. Spotting a combination of impact and competitive risk-adjusted financial return overlooked by other investors.
b. Accepting greater risk than other investors would for a given level of financial return.
c. Accepting less financial return than other investors would for a given level of risk.
d. Pursuing non-financial engagements to improve the enterprise's impact performance.

2a. Capital Allocation: In what way(s), if any, would our capital differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Our Investment</th><th>Most Likely Alternative Scenario</th><th>Likelihood of Difference</th></tr>
<tr><td>Pre-Investment</td><td>Amount of Capital:
Terms & Conditions of Capital:
Other:
Evidence & Reasoning:</td><td>Amount of Capital:
Terms & Conditions of Capital:
Other:
Evidence & Reasoning:</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>During Ownership</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>Post-Exit</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

2b. Engagement: In what way(s), if any, would our engagement differ from what the enterprise would likely otherwise receive?

	Our Engagement	Most Likely Alternative Scenario	Likelihood of Difference
Pre-Investment	**Description:** **Evidence / Reasoning:**	**Description:** **Evidence / Reasoning:**	
During Ownership			
Post-Exit			

3. Asset Manager's Investor Contribution: In light of the evidence provided by the asset manager, what is the overall likelihood and magnitude of the asset managers' own investor contribution to impact?

	Magnitude	Likelihood	Strength of Evidence
Investment #1			
Investment #2			
Investment #3			
Investment #4			
Investment #5			
Overall			