Indicator description	Development impact portfolio score for CDC					
Indicator	Output					
Type Rationale	Development Impact Grid incentivises CDC to make investments in harder geographies and in sectors which have the highest propensity to create jobs. It has been a useful tool to shift CDC's investment portfolio to more impactful investments.					
Technical definition	Individual investments have a Development Impact score ranging from 1 to 4 depending on where they fall on the Development Impact grid. The DI portfolio score is the weighted average (by investment £) of the Development Impact Grid score (between 1 and 4) across CDC's investments that have reached financial close since the start of the new CDC strategy (2012 onwards on a calendar year basis).					
	The DI Grid is a pre-investment screening tool that CDC has developed to assess the predicted development impact potential of CDC investments. It scores an investment based on two factors: the difficulty of the geography where the investment is made (x-axis) and the propensity of the business sector in which it is made to generate employment (y-axis).					
	• Geographies (x axis) is divided into four categories (A to D): Investment Difficulty of Country- assessed (except India) with regard to: (i) market size; (ii) income level; (iii) ability to access finance; and (iv) the ease of doing business (using WB Doing Business rankings). For investments in India, each state is assessed with regard to GDP per capita. For a list of countries within the four categories please see the <u>CDC methodology list</u> .					
	<ul> <li>Sectors (y-axis) is divided into three categories (low, medium and high). Propensity for Investment to Generate Employment- the propensity of each business sector to generate employment was assessed with regard to: (i) the potential to create employment directly, measured by the employment (both skilled and unskilled) to capital ratio; (ii) the potential to create employment through backward linkages in the supply chain, measured by the local procurement to capital ratio, and; (iii) the potential for investment into essential infrastructure to remove business constraints and build an environment for jobs. For a list of sectors by categories please see the <u>CDC methodology list</u>.</li> </ul>					

	Figure A: The Development Impact Grid							
	nerate	High						4
	y of sector to ge employment	Medium						3
	Propensity of sector to generate employment	Low						2
	Prop	Low						1
			D	C t <b>ment difficul</b> t	B	A		
			Invest		ty of country	or state		
Data calculations	Scoring - once an investment is located in the appropriate space on the grid, by reference to geography and sector, it receives a particular score. The scores range from 1 to 4. In the DI Grid in figure A the areas scoring different values are shown in contrasting colours.							
	In the case of investments that benefit multiple geographies and/or multiple sectors, a blended score is calculated using a weighted average based on the amount of the investment allocated to a certain geography and sector.							
Data sources	CDC investment portfolio database							
Reporting roles	CDC reports on the average scores and any breakdowns by individual investments if needed.							
Worked example								
Baseline data	Baseline year is calendar year 2014. The sectors and geographies categories are listed below.							
	Table 1 - business sector categories							
	Low			ledium		High		
	Business S Communica Financial S Mineral Ext Trade*	ation ervices*	A F M T T	gricultural crop orestry/Fisherie leat/Livestock rade* ransport ttilities & Power	es	Construction Food Proces Manufacturin Heavy) Microfinance Public Servic Education) Renewables	sing ng (Light & * xes (incl. H	
						Textiles Trade*		

Table 2: Geographie	es categories (inc	luding Indian state	es)	
D	С	В	A	
Mauritius! Morocco South Africa Φ! Tunisia	Bangladesh* Botswana! Cape Verde Egypt † Ghana Maldives Namibia Nigeria* Sri Lanka †Ф!	Algeria† Angola* Bhutan Equatorial Guinea* Ethiopia* Gabon Kenya Nepal* Pakistan* Rwanda* Senegal Sudan* Swaziland Tanzania* Uganda* Zambia*	Burkina Faso*LBurundi*MCameroon*MCAR*MChad*MComoros*MDRC*MCote d'IvoireSDjibouti*SEritrea*FThe GambiaSGuinea*SGuinea-T	Liberia Libya† Madag Malaw Mali* Maurit Mozar Myanr Niger* Sierra Sierra Sierra Sierra Somal South Fogo* Zimba
Andaman & Nicobar Islands Φ Chandigarh Φ Delhi Φ Goa Φ Gujarat Φ Haryana Φ Maharashtra Φ Pudicherry Φ Punjab Φ Tamil Nadu Φ Uttarakhand Φ	Investment Policy 2		Assam Bihar Chhattisgarh Jammu &Kashmir Jharkhand Madhya Pradesh Manipur Nagaland Odisha Rajasthan Tripura Uttar Pradesh West Bengal auritius, Sri Lanka a	nd Sc
* Φ and †, see table 3 Table 3- Adjustmen	ts to classificatio		s sector categorizat	ions a
Sector/sub-sector/ deal type	Adjusted Classification		or circumstances	ا محاد
Sector/sub-sector/ deal type Financial Services (other than Microfinance)		All countries excep Indian states exce marked Φ)	or circumstances ot South Africa & Sri pt those in Category	
Sector/sub-sector/ deal type Financial Services (other than Microfinance) Microfinance	Classification High Low	All countries excep Indian states excep marked Φ) South Africa	ot South Africa & Sri pt those in Category	D (e)
Sector/sub-sector/ deal type Financial Services (other than Microfinance)	Classification High	All countries excep Indian states excep marked Φ) South Africa All Category A, B o	ot South Africa & Sri pt those in Category or C countries excepty a (exceptions mark	D (e>
Sector/sub-sector/ deal type Financial Services (other than Microfinance) Microfinance Power (other than Renewable Energy)	Classification High Low High	All countries excep Indian states excep marked Φ) South Africa All Category A, B o Lanka, Algeria, Lib	ot South Africa & Sri pt those in Category or C countries excep bya (exceptions mark itegory A, B or C	D (ex t Egyp
Sector/sub-sector/ deal type Financial Services (other than Microfinance) Microfinance Power (other than	Classification High Low	All countries excep Indian states excep marked Φ) South Africa All Category A, B o Lanka, Algeria, Lib Indian states in Ca	ot South Africa & Sri pt those in Category or C countries exceptoya (exceptions mark tegory A, B or C dian states	D (ex t Egyp

	Trade Passive replacement	High Medium Low Low	If >60% of procurement is local (from country or from other country of higher or equal ID score) If <60%, >20% of procurement is local If <20% of procurement is local Investments which result in no new capital to the		
	capital	LOW	company and where CDC has neither a board seat nor is party to a shareholders (or similar) agreement that permits CDC to better align the company with CDC's developmental mission.		
Return Format	A numerical score from 1 to 4. Weighted (by investment £) average of the Development Impact Grid score (between 1 and 4) across CDC's investments that have reached financial close since the start of the new strategy (2012 onwards on a calendar year basis).				
Data dis- aggregation	Not applicable				
Data availability	Quarterly and Annually (by 30 April each year)				
Time period/ lag	3 months				
Quality assurance measures	DI Grid scores are externally verified.				
Interpretation of results	The DI Grid is an ex-ante screening tool that CDC has developed to assess the predicted development impact potential of CDC investments. The methodology of the DI grid will be reviewed as part of the ongoing CDC strategy review. This will ensure that the grid draws on up to date economic data and reflects DFID's strategic priorities. Any updates on the methodology will be clearly noted.				
Data quality	See Interpretation of results on possible revisions to the sectors and/or geographies lists periodically.				
Data issues	The DI grid score predicts Development Impact potential at the time the investment decision is taken. No investment screening tool is perfect and CDC and DFID are also committed tracking actual results over time and using post- investment impact data to refine the DI grid.				
	to create jobs and measuring jobs are	are most to still developir the methodol	on which sectors have the highest propensity ransformative. In addition, improvements to ng, and hard geographies may shift over time. ogy will need to be reviewed and updated to inking.		
Additional comments	n/a				

Variations from standard methodology	See Data issues on possible updates to the sectors and/or geographies list.