

# Internet Appendix for Contracts with (Social) Benefits: The Implementation of Impact Investing

Christopher Geczy, Jessica Jeffers, David K. Musto, Anne M. Tucker

Table IA1: Direct impact terms at the GP-LP level for funds under \$30 million

This table presents summary statistics for fund-level impact terms (as in Table 5), restricted to small funds below \$30 million in assets.

Panel A: Impact terms by fund type

	Score weight	Incidence (% funds)			Difference NMRS-MRS
		All	MRS	NMRS	
<u>Aspirational impact terms</u>					
Social impact addressed in agreement	1	97%	96%	100%	4.3%
Agreement generally prohibits negative impact	1	50%	48%	56%	7.7%
Fund commitment to social impact	} 1 if either	84%	91%	67%	-24.6%*
Fund commitment to environmental impact		69%	70%	67%	-2.9%
<u>Operational impact terms</u>					
Fund commitment to international ESG standards	0.5	25%	30%	11%	-19.3%
Fund GP/manager compensation tied to benefit/impact performance	1	13%	9%	22%	13.5%
Fund investment due diligence policy addresses impact generally	0.5	81%	83%	78%	-4.8%
Fund investment due diligence policy addresses portfolio company impact	1	63%	57%	78%	21.3%
Fund measures social impact	1	81%	87%	67%	-20.3%
Fund uses external, third-party monitor, or reporting system	0.5	34%	39%	22%	-16.9%
Fund has an impact committee	1	19%	22%	11%	-10.6%

Panel B: Total operational impact by fund type

	N	Mean	S.D.	Min	10 <sup>th</sup>	25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	Max	% > 0
<u>Operational impact</u>											
All	32	44.6	23.4	0.0	18.2	27.3	45.5	54.6	81.8	100	96.9
MRS	23	45.5	25.0	0.0	18.2	27.3	45.5	54.6	81.8	100	95.7
NMRS	9	42.4	19.8	18.2	18.2	27.3	45.5	45.5	81.8	81.8	100.0
<i>Difference NMRS-MRS</i>		-3.0									4.3

Table IA2: Direct impact terms at the GP-LP level for funds over \$100 million

This table presents summary statistics for fund-level impact terms (as in Table 5), restricted to large funds above \$100 million in assets.

Panel A: Impact terms

	Score weight	Incidence (% funds)
<u>Aspirational impact terms</u>		
Social impact addressed in agreement	1	93%
Agreement generally prohibits negative impact	1	86%
Fund commitment to social impact	} 1 if either	79%
Fund commitment to environmental impact		50%
<u>Operational impact terms</u>		
Fund commitment to international ESG standards	0.5	36%
Fund GP/Manager compensation tied to benefit/impact performance	1	7%
Fund investment due diligence policy addresses impact generally	0.5	79%
Fund investment due diligence policy addresses portfolio company impact	1	64%
Fund measures social impact	1	50%
Fund uses external, third party monitor or reporting system	0.5	14%
Fund has an impact committee	1	21%

Panel B: Total operational impact

	N	Mean	S.D.	Min	10 <sup>th</sup>	25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	Max	% > 0
Operational impact	14	37.7	21.9	0.0	9.1	27.3	27.3	54.6	72.7	72.7	92.9

Table IA3: Direct impact terms at the GP-PC level for funds under \$30 million

This table presents summary statistics for PC-level impact terms (as in Table 6), restricted to small funds below \$30 million in assets. “% funds with >0” refers to the fraction of funds in the group that have at least one PC contract with a positive impact score.

Panel B: Impact terms by fund type

	Score weight	Incidence (% funds)			Difference NMRS-MRS
		All	MRS	NMRS	
PC's mission locked in at the fund's exit	1	3%	5%	0%	-4.8%
Fund exit right if change in location or business model or benefit	0.5	2%	0%	6%	6.3%
Fund veto right on deviations from the business plan of the PC	1	45%	55%	19%	-36.0%**
PC has an impact committee	0.5	0%	0%	0%	0.0%
Fund participates in PC impact committee	0.5	0%	0%	0%	0.0%
Fund information rights include impact information	1	12%	14%	6%	-8.0%
PC environmental or social benefit is measured	1	21%	24%	13%	-11.3%
Internal impact measurement	0.5	3%	5%	0%	-4.8%
External impact measurement	0.5	7%	10%	0%	-9.5%
PC impact performance is reported	1	14%	17%	6%	-10.4%
Impact performance reporting done annually	0.25	9%	12%	0%	-11.9%
Compensation tied to benefit/impact performance	1	2%	2%	0%	-2.4%
Impact addressed generally	0.25	36%	38%	31%	-6.8%
Impact identified	0.25	17%	19%	13%	-6.5%
Additional social impact channels (e.g., ESG standards)	1	17%	21%	6%	-15.2%
Document specifies impact performance reporting	0.25	14%	17%	6%	-10.4%

Panel B: Total PC impact by fund type

	N	Mean	S.D.	Min	10 <sup>th</sup>	25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	Max	% > 0	% funds with >0
All	58	11.6	13.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	12.8	31.9	53.2	69.0	100%
MRS	42	13.7	14.2	0.0	0.0	4.3	8.5	23.4	31.9	53.2	78.6	100%
NMRS	16	5.9	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	12.8	40.4	43.8	100%
<i>Diff. NMRS-MRS</i>		-7.88**									-34.82***	

Table IA4: Direct impact terms at the GP-PC level for funds over \$100 million

This table presents summary statistics for PC-level impact terms (as in Table 6), restricted to large funds above \$100 million in assets. “% funds with >0” refers to the fraction of funds in the group that have at least one PC contract with a positive impact score.

Panel A: Impact terms

	Score weight	Incidence (% funds)
PC's mission locked in at the fund's exit	1	3%
Fund exit right if change in location or business model or benefit	0.5	0%
Fund veto right on deviations from the business plan of the PC	1	39%
PC has an impact committee	0.5	0%
Fund participates in PC impact committee	0.5	0%
Fund information rights include impact information	1	3%
PC environmental or social benefit is measured	1	17%
Internal impact measurement	0.5	0%
External impact measurement	0.5	14%
PC impact performance is reported	1	11%
Impact performance reporting done annually	0.25	8%
Compensation tied to benefit/impact performance	1	0%
Impact addressed generally	0.25	42%
Impact identified	0.25	33%
Additional social impact channels (e.g., ESG standards)	1	3%
Document specifies impact performance reporting	0.25	11%

Panel A: Total PC impact

	N	Mean	S.D.	Min	10 <sup>th</sup>	25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup>	75 <sup>th</sup>	90 <sup>th</sup>	Max	% > 0	% funds with >0
All	36	9.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	12.8	31.9	40.4	55.6	80%

Table IA5: GP compensation for funds under \$30 million

This table presents statistics on compensation terms (as in Table 8), restricted to small funds below \$30 million in assets. We define the incidence rate as the percent of funds with a nonzero value for the term in question. We only report the mode and range for these nonzero values. For the management fee breakouts, funds with no management fees are counted in the “<2%” group.

		<u>Nonimpact</u>		<u>Impact</u>		<u>Difference</u>
	Reference	Nonimpact	All	MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			32	23	9	
<u>Waterfall</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	84%	83%	89%	6.3%
<u>Hurdle rate</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC)	45%	47%	48%	44%	-3.4%
	MY (PE)	92%				
Mode	MY (VC)	8%	6%	5%	10%	
	MY (PE)	8%				
Range	MY (VC+PE)	6%-10%	3%-10%	5%-8%	3%-10%	
<u>Carried interest</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	81%	83%	78%	-4.8%
Mode	MY (VC)	20%	20%	20%	20%	
	MY (PE)	20%				
	GL '99	20%				
Range	MY (VC)	17.5%-30%	10%-25%	10%-25%	10%-20%	
	MY (PE)	all at 20%				
	GL '99	0%-45%				
		(81% in 20-21%)				
<u>Catch-up target</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	99%	56%	61%	44%	-16.4%
Mode	MY (VC+PE)	20% <sup>1</sup>	10%	10%	10%	
Range	MY (VC+PE)	16.5-20%	1-25%	1-25%	10-20%	
<u>Management fee</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	75%	70%	89%	19.3%
Range			2%-3.6%	2%-3.5%	2.5%-3.6%	
% of funds:						
< 2%	MY (VC)	43%	25%	30%	11%	
	MY (PE)	8%				
2%	MY (VC)	47%	3%	4%	0%	
	MY (PE)	41%				
> 2%	MY (VC)	10%	72%	65%	89%	
	MY (PE)	51%				

<sup>1</sup> MY use 100% to represent that the GPs get 100% of their profit allocation under the contract before splitting the remaining profits between the manager and the investors, where that profit allocation is usually 20%. We express that number directly as a catch-up target of 20%.

Table IA6: GP compensation for funds over \$100 million

This table presents statistics on compensation terms (as in Table 8), restricted to large funds above \$100 million in assets. We define the incidence rate as the percent of funds with a nonzero value for the term in question. We only report the mode and range for these nonzero values. For the management fee breakouts, funds with no management fees are counted in the “<2%” group.

		<u>Nonimpact</u>	<u>Impact</u>
	Reference	Nonimpact	≥ \$100 M
N			14
<u>Waterfall</u>			
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	93%
<u>Hurdle rate</u>			
Incidence	MY (VC)	45%	79%
	MY (PE)	92%	
Mode	MY (VC)	8%	8%
	MY (PE)	8%	
Range	MY (VC+PE)	6%-10%	6%-10%
<u>Carried interest</u>			
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	93%
Mode	MY (VC)	20%	20%
	MY (PE)	20%	
	GL '99	20%	
Range	MY (VC)	17.5%-30%	20%-20%
	MY (PE)	all at 20%	
	GL '99	0%-45%	
		(81% in 20-21%)	
<u>Catch-up target</u>			
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	99%	79%
Mode	MY (VC+PE)	20% <sup>2</sup>	20%
Range	MY (VC+PE)	16.5%-20%	3%-25%
<u>Management fee</u>			
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	100%
Range			1.5-3%
% of funds:			
< 2%	MY (VC)	43%	21%
	MY (PE)	8%	
2%	MY (VC)	47%	0%
	MY (PE)	41%	
> 2%	MY (VC)	10%	79%
	MY (PE)	51%	

<sup>2</sup> MY use 100% to represent that the GPs get 100% of their profit allocation under the contract before splitting the remaining profits between the manager and the investors, where that profit allocation is usually 20%. We express that number directly as a catch-up target of 20%.

Table IA7: Covenants for funds under \$30 million

This table presents statistics on covenants (as in Table 9), restricted to small funds below \$30 million in assets.

## Panel A: Fund limits to manager discretion and manager restrictions at the GP-LP level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		<u>Difference</u>
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			32	23	9	
<u>Limits to manager discretion</u>						
Asset restrictions	n/a		88%	83%	100%	17.4%
Conflict of interest transactions	n/a		16%	22%	0%	-21.7%
Fund family coinvestment prohibition	n/a		3%	0%	11%	11.1%
Region investment cap	n/a		16%	13%	22%	9.2%
No outside region investment	n/a		13%	13%	11%	-1.9%
No outside sector investments	n/a		6%	4%	11%	6.8%
Industry restrictions y/n	n/a		13%	9%	22%	13.5%
Industry cap	n/a		0%	0%	0%	0.0%
<u>Manager restrictions</u>						
Reinvesting fund profits	GL '96	21%	59%	52%	78%	25.6%
Coinvesting with fund	GL '96	73%	53%	61%	33%	-27.5%
Outside fundraising	GL '96	58%	22%	26%	11%	-15.0%
Outside activities			28%	26%	33%	7.2%
<u>Combined</u>						
Average number of covenant classes	GL '96	5.6	3.2	3.1	3.3	0.25

## Panel B: Investment protection and exit at the GP-PC level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		<u>Difference</u>
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			58	42	16	
<u>Investment protection</u>						
Antidilution of fund investment	KS	95%	78%	88%	50%	-38.1%***
Full ratchet preemption	KS	22%	19%	19%	19%	-0.3%
Weighted average preemption	KS	78%	5%	5%	6%	1.5%
Founder/entrepreneur non-compete	KS	70%	43%	43%	44%	0.9%
Fund liquidation rights	KS	71%	41%	29%	75%	46.4%***
<u>Exit</u>						
Fund put/redemption right	KS	79%	55%	64%	31%	-33.0%**
	S	43%				
Registration rights	S	90%	53%	60%	38%	-22.0%

Table IA8: Covenants for funds over \$100 million

This table presents statistics on covenants (as in Table 9), restricted to large funds above \$100 million in assets.

Panel A: Fund limits to manager discretion and manager restrictions at the GP-LP level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		<u>Impact</u>
	Reference	Incidence	≥ \$100 M
N			14
<u>Limits to Manager Discretion</u>			
Asset restrictions	n/a		100%
Conflict of interest transactions	n/a		0%
Fund family coinvestment prohibition	n/a		7%
Region investment cap	n/a		36%
No outside region investment	n/a		43%
No outside sector investments	n/a		7%
Industry restrictions y/n	n/a		29%
Industry cap	n/a		14%
<u>Manager Restrictions</u>			
Reinvesting fund profits	GL '96	21%	93%
Coinvesting with fund	GL '96	73%	43%
Outside fundraising	GL '96	58%	43%
Outside activities			57%
<u>Combined</u>			
Average number of covenant classes	GL '96	5.6	4.7

Panel B: Investment protection and exit at the GP-PC level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		<u>Impact</u>
	Reference	Incidence	≥ \$100 M
N			36
<u>Investment protection</u>			
Antidilution of fund investment	KS	95%	61%
Full ratchet preemption	KS	22%	19%
Weighted average preemption	KS	78%	25%
Founder/entrepreneur non-compete	KS	70%	58%
Fund liquidation rights	KS	71%	58%
<u>Exit</u>			
Fund put/redemption right	KS	79%	47%
	S	43%	
Registration rights	S	90%	31%



Table IA9: Participatory Governance for Funds under \$30 Million

This table presents statistics on participatory governance (as in Table 10), restricted to small funds below \$30 million in assets.

Panel A: Participatory governance at the GP-LP level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		Difference NMRS-MRS
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	
N			32	23	9	
Advisory committee incidence		n/a	94%	91%	100%	8.7%
Advisory committee role:						
Generally advise GP or BOD		n/a	69%	65%	78%	12.6%
Technical assistance to GP or BOD		n/a	9%	4%	22%	17.9%
Policy assistance to GP or BOD		n/a	9%	4%	22%	17.9%
Evaluate loans		n/a	3%	0%	11%	11.1%
Investment strategy		n/a	44%	48%	33%	-14.5%
Due diligence		n/a	38%	43%	22%	-21.3%
Approve investments		n/a	47%	61%	11%	-49.8%**
Investment financial performance review		n/a	3%	4%	0%	-4.3%
Investment impact review		n/a	6%	4%	11%	6.8%
Approve conflict of interests		n/a	38%	35%	44%	9.7%
Asset valuations		n/a	25%	22%	33%	11.6%
Approve exit scenarios		n/a	22%	22%	22%	0.5%
Approve reports and audits		n/a	9%	13%	0%	-13.0%
Approve budgets, reserves, draw downs, and/or fees		n/a	19%	17%	22%	4.8%
Fund compliance		n/a	22%	26%	11%	-15.0%
Fund life: terminate or extend the fund		n/a	6%	9%	0%	-8.7%
No description		n/a	3%	0%	11%	11.1%

Panel B: Governance at the GP-PC level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		Difference NMRS-MRS
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	
N			58	42	16	
Investor board seats guaranteed		n/a	86%	93%	69%	-24.1%**
Number of guaranteed seats?	GKM	2.80	1.4	1.3	1.5	0.12
PC board size	GKM	5-7 mem.	5.9	6.0	5.6	-0.40
	KS	6 mem.				
Investor majority control	KS	25.4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Investor min. voting %	KS	53.6%	19%	24%	6%	-17.8***

Table IA10: Participatory governance for funds over \$100 million

This table presents statistics on participatory governance (as in Table 10), restricted to large funds above \$30 million in assets.

Panel A: Participatory governance at the GP-LP level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		<u>Impact</u>
	Reference	Incidence	≥ \$100 M
N			14
Advisory committee incidence		n/a	100%
Advisory committee role:			
Generally advise GP or BOD		n/a	71%
Technical assistance to GP or BOD		n/a	0%
Policy assistance to GP or BOD		n/a	14%
Evaluate loans		n/a	0%
Investment strategy		n/a	43%
Due diligence		n/a	50%
Approve investments		n/a	29%
Investment financial performance review		n/a	21%
Investment impact review		n/a	0%
Approve conflict of interests		n/a	57%
Asset valuations		n/a	43%
Approve exit scenarios		n/a	14%
Approve reports and audits		n/a	7%
Approve budgets, reserves, draw downs, and/or fees		n/a	14%
Fund compliance		n/a	36%
Fund life: terminate or extend the fund		n/a	14%
No description		n/a	14%

Panel B: Governance at the GP-PC level

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		<u>Impact</u>
	Reference	Incidence	≥ \$100 M
N			36
Investor board seats guaranteed		n/a	69%
Number of guaranteed seats?	GKM	2.80	1.4
PC board size	GKM	5-7 mem.	6.2
	KS	6 mem.	
Investor majority control	KS	25.4%	0%
Investor min. voting %	KS	53.6%	24%

Table IA11: GP Compensation for 1993-2006

This table presents statistics on compensation terms (as in Table 8), limited to the period in the sample from Metrick and Yasuda (2010). We define the incidence rate as the percent of funds with a nonzero value for the term in question. We only report the mode and range for these nonzero values. For the management fee breakouts, funds with no management fees are counted in the "<2%" group.

		<u>Nonimpact</u>		<u>Impact</u>		<u>Difference</u>
	Reference	Nonimpact	All	MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			9	4	5	
<u>Waterfall</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	78%	75%	80%	5.0%
<u>Hurdle rate</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC)	45%	22%	25%	20%	-5.0%
	MY (PE)	92%				
Mode	MY (VC)	8%	7%	8%	6%	
	MY (PE)	8%				
Range	MY (VC+PE)	6%-10%	6%-8%	8%-8%	6%-6%	
<u>Carried interest</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	67%	75%	60%	-15.0%
Mode	MY (VC)	20%	20%	20%	20%	
	MY (PE)	20%				
	GL '99	20%				
Range	MY (VC)	17.5%-30%	20%-25%	20%-25%	20%-20%	
	MY (PE)	all at 20%				
	GL '99	0-45%				
		(81% in 20-21%)				
<u>Catch-up target</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	99%	22%	25%	20%	-5.0%
Mode	MY (VC+PE)	20% <sup>3</sup>	25%	25%	25%	
Range	MY (VC+PE)	16.5%-20%	25%-25%	25%-25%	25%-25%	
<u>Management fee</u>						
Incidence	MY (VC+PE)	100%	89%	100%	80%	-20.0%
Range			2.5%-3.5%	2.5%-3.5%	2.5%-3%	
% of funds:						
< 2%	MY (VC)	43%	11%	0%	20%	
	MY (PE)	8%				
=2%	MY (VC)	47%	0%	0%	0%	
	MY (PE)	41%				
> 2%	MY (VC)	10%	89%	100%	80%	
	MY (PE)	51%				

<sup>3</sup> MY use 100% to represent that the GPs get 100% of their profit allocation under the contract before splitting the remaining profits between the manager and the investors, where that profit allocation is usually 20%. We express that number directly as a catch-up target of 20%.

Table IA12: PC Registration Rights for 2000 - 2003

This table presents statistics on registration rights (as in Table 9, Panel B), limited to a period similar to the sample from Smith (2005), who uses data from 1997 - 2002. We do not have data for MRS funds during these five years, so we include 2003. We also do not have data from NMRS funds for 1997-1999, so our best comparison period is 2000-2003.

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		Difference
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			11	7	4	
Registration rights	S	90%	82%	75%	86%	10.7%

Table IA13: Board Seats and Size for 2011-2013

This table presents statistics guaranteed board seats and board size (as in Table 10, Panel B), limited to the period of the sample from Gompers et al. (2016).

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		Difference
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			18	14	4	
Number of guaranteed seats?	GKM	2.80	1.7	1.6	1.8	0.11
PC board size	GKM	5-7 mem.	6.3	6.4	5.7	-0.75
	KS	6 mem.				

Table IA14: PC Fees Paid to Funds

This table presents statistics on PC fees paid to funds. The reference sample comes from Phalippou et al. (2018) (PRU), who examine the fraction of leveraged buyout (LBO) transactions in their sample that have a fee going from the PC to the GP.

	<u>Nonimpact</u>		All	<u>Impact</u>		Difference
	Reference	Incidence		MRS	NMRS	NMRS-MRS
N			96	70	26	
Commission fee	PRU	84%	0.34	0.27	0.54	0.267**

## Scoring Notes

Fund operational impact — This score captures where fund documents incorporate impact goals into contract terms with fund investors.

Scoring notes: High importance terms have a weight of 1; medium importance terms a weight of 0.5; and low importance terms a weight of 0.25. Consideration is given to ‘incremental’ questions, e.g., around due diligence and measurement, such that if one question to that point is already given high importance, then the other is given medium importance.

Question	Weight	Mean
Is fund committed to international ESG standards?	0.5	30.2%
Is the fund GP/manager's compensation tied to benefit/impact performance?	1	9.4%
Does the fund's investment due diligence policy address impact generally?	0.5	77.4%
Does the fund's investment due diligence policy address portfolio company impact?	1	62.3%
Does the fund measure social impact?	1	71.7%
If yes, does the fund use external, third party monitor or reporting system?	0.5	28.3%
Does the fund have an impact committee?	1	17.0%

PC impact — This score captures where fund investments in portfolio companies incorporate impact goals into contract terms.

Scoring notes: High importance terms have a weight of 1; medium importance terms a weight of 0.5; and low importance terms a weight of 0.25. Most breakout responses receive a weight of 0.25, capped at a maximum of 1 for the total question. Funds receive a maximum of 0.5 for an indication of *either* social or environmental impact. Funds receive a maximum of 0.5 for identifying *either* social or environmental impact. Breakout responses for impact measurements are capped at 0.5 for either internal or external measurement processing, which requires rolling up several different external measurement responses into a single score. Finally, we combine impact-reporting breakouts into three categories: to whom the report is delivered, what report is delivered, and when is the report delivered. Responses in all three categories are scored at a maximum of 0.25.

Question	Weight	
Will the PC's mission be locked in at the fund's exit?	1	3.1%
Contingent fund exit scenarios include: change in location or business model or benefit	0.5	1.0%

Veto rights: does the fund approve/veto deviations from the business plan of the PC?	1	42.7%
Does the portfolio company (PC) have an impact committee?	0.5	0.0%
If yes, will the fund participate in the impact committee?	0.5	0.0%
Information rights include: Impact information	1	9.4%
Is PC environmental or social benefit measured?	1	19.8%
Internal impact measurement	0.5	9.4%
Is the PC impact performance reported?	1	12.5%
Impact performance reporting done annually	0.25	8.3%
Is compensation tied to benefit/impact performance?	1	2.1%
<i>Address impact</i>	<i>MAX of the following</i>	
Is social impact addressed in agreement?	0.25	36.5%
Is environmental impact addressed in agreement?	0.25	5.2%
<i>Identify impact</i>	<i>MAX of the following</i>	
Does the portfolio company (PC) have an identifiable social impact?	0.25	24.0%
If yes, does the PC have an identifiable environmental impact?	0.25	0.0%
<i>Breakouts for social impact addressed through</i>	<i>SUM, CAP at 1</i>	
Governance standards	0.25	4.2%
International ESG standards	0.25	3.1%
Compliance with laws	0.25	8.3%
Employee safety	0.25	1.0%
Employee nondiscrimination	0.25	1.0%
Employee wages	0.25	4.2%
<i>Breakouts for prohibited activities</i>	<i>SUM, CAP at 1</i>	
Prohibited activities (generally)	0.25	9.4%
Child labor	0.25	1.0%
Violation of international convention	0.25	2.1%
Tobacco	0.25	1.0%
Weapons	0.25	2.1%
Natural resource development (i.e., oil, mining)	0.25	0.0%
Gambling	0.25	1.0%
Wildlife products	0.25	1.0%
Radioactive materials	0.25	2.1%
Commercial logging	0.25	1.0%
Pesticide	0.25	1.0%

Asbestos	0.25	1.0%
Ozone depletion	0.25	1.0%
Drift net fishing	0.25	1.0%
Pornography	0.25	1.0%
Inactive businesses	0.25	0.0%
Indigenous people land infringement	0.25	1.0%
Forced resettlement	0.25	1.0%
Transboundary waste product	0.25	2.1%
Business with antimoney laundering or terrorism groups	0.25	2.1%
<i>Breakouts for external benefit measurement</i>	<i>MAX of the following</i>	
External count	0.5	2.1%
External GIIRS	0.5	1.0%
External: software	0.5	0.0%
External other	0.5	1.0%
<i>Breakouts for impact performance reporting: Who</i>	<i>MAX of the following</i>	
To: Fund generally	0.25	11.5%
To: Fund BOD	0.25	1.0%
To: MBB	0.25	2.1%
<i>Breakouts for impact performance reporting: What</i>	<i>MAX of the following</i>	
What: questionnaire	0.25	1.0%
What: general report	0.25	2.1%
What: impact numbers	0.25	5.2%
What: CEO narrative	0.25	1.0%