

## About the data in this report – 2024 Update

This section of the report provides further insight by section into the data points used in the report and the limitations of the data for transparency.

### Overview

- The statistics on fiscal savings for homelessness property funds and social outcomes contracts are taken from:
  - A report by Alma Economics commissioned by Better Society Capital on Financial & social impact of Homelessness Property Funds. You can find further information about their specific methodology and approach [here](#)
  - A follow up report by ATQ commissioned by Better Society Capita to consider ‘non-attribution’ and identify the value of outcomes that would have been achieved without the interventions. You can find further information about their approach [here](#).

### BSC as a Market System Builder and Investor

- **Social Lending**
  - For our scale goal, we have reported an 8% increase from 2023 on the number of enterprises reached. For 2024, we are reporting >3,250 enterprises reached. In 2023, we reported in our impact report >2,500 however this figure has been retrospectively updated to >3000 due to a lag in reporting at the end of 2023.
  - For our quality goal, related to growth and resilience, we used our enterprise level impact framework data. We have further grown this data set in 2024 with >50% more enterprises included in the pilot sample than in 2023 therefore the percentages reported year on year are not directly comparable.
  - “For our diversity quality goal we are reporting the % of SPOs supported by BSC capital as of 2024, supporting underrepresented groups. Year on year changes are driven by new SPOs invested in, as well as by filling data gaps across existing SPOs in our data set.”

### BSC Impact on Enterprises and People

The visualisations in this section are driven by data that we collect on the organisations that are receiving investment through the funds that we invest in.

- **Dataset definitions and limitations:** We have set out the data points we collect and refer to within the report below. The table outlines data limitations that should be considered for each of the data points.

<b>Data categorisation</b>	<b>Alignment to UN Sustainable</b>	The coding of organisations to their alignment to the UN Sustainable Development Goals is done on a primary, secondary, and tertiary basis. This aims to provide us with a view of the top three SDGs each investment is supporting; however, many investments will be targeting
----------------------------	------------------------------------	--

	<b>Development Goals</b>	more than three SDGs and therefore will not always capture the full range. The visualisations shown in the report focus on the primary SDG alignment.
	<b>User group</b>	The “user group” describes the end-user or beneficiaries experiencing the impact. In the case of, for example, educational workshops at workplaces about promoting social inclusion of ethnic minorities, then the “user group” is the ethnic minorities, rather than the general population receiving the educational workshops. Some of the portfolio will be delivering across multiple user groups. Where organisations have multiple user groups, the primary target user group has been selected. A large proportion of the portfolio is delivering to the “general population”. This is where the predominant user group does not specifically fit within one of the vulnerable and/or underserved identified user groups. For the purposes of the visualisations and to communicate the range of specific user groups supported, “general population” is excluded from the % breakdown shown.
	<b>Primary outcome area</b>	A large proportion of the portfolio will be delivering across multiple outcome areas. For this report and insight purposes, we have focused only on the primary outcome area. Where organisations have multiple outcome areas, the most intentional one is coded as “Primary”.
	<b>Number of people reached</b>	We calculate the number of people reached across impact venture, social property, and social outcomes contracts. These numbers are approximate and shared through our fund managers and intermediaries reporting.
<b>Geographic relevance</b>	<b>Geographical focus of impact (region and postcode)</b>	It is not always possible to accurately depict the focus of impact and in cases where this occurs, we use the postcode of the organisation's headquarters. As a result, data may not always be representative of what is happening at a local level or where impact is spread across multiple areas of the UK.
	<b>IMD</b>	The Index of Multiple Deprivation have been provided at the Local Authority level as quintiles, where 1 = the most deprived 20% of local authorities by nation and 5 = the least deprived 20% of local authorities by nation. Deprivation at the Local Authority (LA) level is measured using the percentage of small areas (Local Super Output Areas - LSOAs) within a Local Authority which are in the top 20% most deprived small areas nationally. There are four measures of multiple deprivation for each UK country: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Each of these measures combines slightly different indicators and subsequently an Index of Multiple Deprivation. Differences include the year of reference, geographical units, indicators and indicator weights. It is not possible to directly compare deprivation indices across nations, and scores do not indicate the same absolute levels of deprivation. We also note that IMD is one relative measure of deprivation that should be considered with other metrics.

The data points above cover organisations across all four market systems and the data aims to cover most of our portfolio. There are some exclusions as below:

- We do not hold complete data at an enterprise level for our equity investments in our bank lending portfolio, and therefore are unable to fully code by outcome area, user group and geographical reach. The charities and social purpose organisations are included in our aggregate figure of total enterprises reached (i.e. +3,750). We have reduced accordingly to count for unknown duplicates.

- For our investment into the Community Investment Enterprise Facility, we have not coded the SMEs that the four CDFIs invest into by outcome area, user group and business model. The enterprises are included in our aggregate figure of total enterprises reached.
  - For our Venture Portfolio, we have included only organisations that are based and delivering in the UK and meet our strong impact contribution criteria, i.e. contribute to solutions as per the IMP framework in our aggregate figure of total enterprises reached. Our full venture portfolio company, including those that don't meet our strong impact contribution are included in our analysis of outcome area, user group and geographical reach.
- **Data gaps:** To avoid misrepresentation, we have included below a breakdown of data gaps that we have included in the report. For each data point, the percentage of organisations that we don't have data for is included and the percentage of the £ invested that this represents. Nulls are excluded from the data.

		<b>% of investments coded by cumulative £ invested</b>	<b>% of investments coded by cumulative number of investments</b>
<b>Data categorisation: Who/what/how</b>	Alignment to UN Sustainable Development Goals	98%	89%
	User group	99%	93%
	Primary outcome area	97%	88%
	Business model	95%	71%
<b>Geographic relevance</b>	IMD	98%	90%
	Region	98%	90%

- **Spotlight on the Enterprise Level Impact Framework**
  - The data presented in the Enterprise-level Impact dashboard and section is collected through different means, including data scraped from Companies House and the Charity Commission website, data provided by fund managers and data obtained through self-reported surveys. Due to this, the sample sizes for each set of information are also different. The dashboard provides sample sizes for each element of the framework.
  - The Use of Proceeds and Purpose of Investment information in the dashboard is presented for **1,090** enterprises across **10** fund managers or intermediaries.

## **EDI Fund Manager Survey – Data collection and methodology**

- We ran our first survey of fund managers in 2020, and since then, we have iterated the survey to address privacy considerations, ease of completion to increase the response rate, and feedback from fund managers and experts in the sector such as TSIC.
- This year, we sought to implement the recommendations from the Diversity Forum Data Project and align the terminology used to mirror content from a sector level, learning from best practice that uses community or peer-agreed language such as the 360Giving DEI Data Standard, Diversity Data Alliance, and responding to specific feedback from the project. We also sought to align with how other peer organisations were asking for this data based on publicly available sources.
- Overall, we note that there are limitations to the data, for example where portfolio-level EDI data is not consistently collected and/or reported. Non-responses are likely due to a combination of factors, including:
  - The fund manager does not collect that data, in the case of certain groups and characteristics.
  - The data does not exist or was not declared due to General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), such as where a fund manager's team has fewer than five individuals.
  - The fund manager prefers not to disclose the data.
  - This year in responding to feedback to improve user experience and follow Diversity Forum best practice recommendations to not make all questions mandatory, there are some non-responses which have made data analysis more challenging to fully understand racialised representation across all groups.
- Due to the lack of sufficient responses under Race/Ethnicity, we have aggregated the data provided under racialised groups to have a sufficient sample size to report.
- Year-on-year percentage changes are calculated by rebasing the 2023 survey results to match the number of 2024 responses for comparison. The dashboards display the original, non-rebased responses.

### Selection of characteristics

- The survey collected information on certain protected characteristics, which refer to the characteristics protected by the Equality Act (2010). Below we outline the changes compared to last year's survey on the questions and content:
- Added text fill in option to allow for more personalised responses for self-identification option
- Added questions on sexual orientation and inclusion
- Updated terms used following review of current practice from the sources noted above



- Changed terminology of “portfolio companies” to “your investments” to cover range of investments in BSC portfolio
- Changed % under “Your investments” section to align with ONS benchmarks
- Added questions on General Partner ownership and carried interest for Venture survey only (will test responses with Venture survey this year and consider whether to include similar questions for non-Venture survey next year)

The tables below show a detailed summary of this review and resulting choice for this year’s survey on how certain characteristics were selected:

### 1. Characteristics

Characteristic	BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey	ONS Census 2021	BVCA	BPC Capital (Canadian LP)	360Giving DEI Data Standard	DiversityVC Data Alliance <sup>1</sup>	2024 Recommendation
Gender Identity <i>[updated from “Gender” in 2023 survey]</i>	Female Male Non-binary Prefer to self describe	Sex: male or female (mandatory)  Gender identity: voluntary question, asking if their gender identity was the same as their sex registered at	Female Male Prefer not to say	Female Male Nonbinary Not collected/ prefer not to provide	Women and girls <sup>3</sup>  <i>Under separate category LGBT+ People:</i> Transgender Non-binary people Other (including Intersex)	Cis man Trans man Cis woman Trans woman Nonbinary, genderqueer, gender non-conforming Prefer to self-describe [text fill-in option for self-describe] Prefer not to say	Use mix of DiversityVC, 360Giving, and Ford Foundation surveys:  Women Men Gender non-conforming Prefer to self-describe [text fill-in option for self-describe] Prefer not to say  <b>Rationale:</b> Female and male refers to biological sex, so have updated to women and men. Gender non-conforming is a broader term than non-binary and is used by Ford Foundation in

<sup>1</sup> Informed by side-by-side analysis of questionnaires of 7 organisations representing different communities and research and best practice recommendations for each organisation’s specific communities, noting that these are limited to the VC and startup world(s), where underrepresentation of certain populations is particularly stark and this structure may not be applicable to all industries because the decisions are guided by the gaps seen in the larger tech industry.

<sup>3</sup> Women and girls was chosen with a wide range of infrastructure organisations and charity groups through a consultation process led by The Social Investment Consultancy. “Non-binary” is captured in 360Giving’s LGBT+ people category, however DiversityVC removed Transgender and Intersex from the “Sexual Orientation” selection given these terms refer to one’s gender identity rather than their sexual orientation.

Characteristic	BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey	ONS Census 2021	BVCA	BPC Capital (Canadian LP)	360Giving DEI Data Standard	DiversityVC Data Alliance <sup>1</sup>	2024 Recommendation
		birth <sup>2</sup> [with option to write in]					their survey. We acknowledge that these three terms do not cover the range of gender identities. However, given that the responses under “non-binary” in last year’s survey were very limited, we decided to keep the response options limited in order to be able to use the data and avoid overwhelming respondents. We included a “prefer to self-describe” option and will evaluate adding more options to this question depending on the level of response.
Disability or long term health condition <i>[updated from “Disability”]</i>	Disabled Long-term health condition Other (impairment, medical)	Disabled; a lot <sup>5</sup> Disabled; a little Non-disabled; with non-	Asked if firm collects data on individuals who self identify as	# of persons with disabilities	Population group level: Disabled people  Category level:	Nested approach: I do not have a disability I have an invisible disability	Use mix of DiversityVC, 360Giving, and BPC Capital:  Have a disability or long-term health condition (please refer to

<sup>2</sup> Respondents could answer “Yes” or “No,” with those answering “No” given the option to write in their gender identity (self-declared responses included trans man, trans woman, non-binary, different gender identity)

<sup>5</sup> Initial Question: “Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last 12 months or more?”; Follow-Up Question: If they answered “Yes,” they were then asked, “Do any of your conditions or illnesses reduce your ability to carry out day-to-day activities?” The response options were: Yes, a lot; Yes, a little; Not at all

Characteristic	BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey	ONS Census 2021	BVCA	BPC Capital (Canadian LP)	360Giving DEI Data Standard	DiversityVC Data Alliance <sup>1</sup>	2024 Recommendation
<i>Status" in 2023 survey<sup>4</sup></i>	condition, or environmental disadvantage that is not listed above) Non-disabled	limiting condition Non-disabled; no condition	having a disability		Physical, mobility or sensory impairment Mental health Cognitive differences Health (chronic illness or long-term health condition) Other	I have a visible disability I have both a visible and invisible disability Prefer not to say  <i>Followed by:</i> How would you describe your disability? [multiple options to select]	360Giving DEI Standard Category level definitions <sup>6</sup> ) Do not have a disability Prefer to self-describe [text fill-in option for self-describe] Prefer not to say  <b>Rationale:</b> Options provided previously were not comprehensive but we were not able to include all categories, given that we reached the Microsoft Forms question limit and decided to prioritise characteristics that had more responses in last year's survey. We will explore alternative platforms for next year's survey.
Race / Ethnicity <i>[updated from "Best description of ethnic group or</i>	Asian/Asian British Black / African / Caribbean / Black British	Asian, Asian British, Asian Welsh Black, Black British, Black Welsh,	Asian Black / African / Caribbean	Visible Minorities (Racialised, Black or People of Color)	Population group level: Communities experiencing racial inequity	Multi-select options: American Indian, Alaska Native. Native	Mix of BSC Staff Survey, 360Giving, and DiversityVC categories:  Black / African / Caribbean East or South East Asian Latinx or Hispanic

<sup>4</sup> To align with DiversityVC, FCA, ONS

<sup>6</sup> Includes pan impairment; physical, mobility, or sensory impairment; mental health; cognitive differences; health (chronic illness or long-term health conditions); other impairment, medical condition or environmental disadvantage that is not listed



Characteristic	BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey	ONS Census 2021	BVCA	BPC Capital (Canadian LP)	360Giving DEI Data Standard	DiversityVC Data Alliance <sup>1</sup>	2024 Recommendation
<i>background" in 2023 survey]</i> <sup>7</sup>	White / White British Mixed / Multiple ethnic groups Other Ethnic Group Prefer not to say	Caribbean or African Mixed or multiple ethnic groups White Other ethnic group	Mixed / Multi-ethnic Other	Indigenous Peoples Not collected/prefer not to provide	Category level: Black / African / Caribbean / Black British Mixed Asian / Asian British Other group experiencing ethnic or racial inequity	American or Indigenous East Asian Southeast Asian South Asian Central Asian Black or African American Hispanic or Latino/Latinx Middle Eastern or North African Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander White Prefer to self-describe [text fill-in option	Middle Eastern or North African South Asian (Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi) White Mixed Prefer to self-describe [text fill-in option for self-describe] <sup>8</sup> Prefer not to say  <b>Rationale:</b> Align to peer-agreed language and move away from ONS categories which do not capture range of racialised identities in the UK. For venture survey only, added breakdown of racialised categories to test new type of question and obtain more granularity to measure progress against Market System EDI goals.

<sup>7</sup> Aligned with DiversityVC

<sup>8</sup> While people may identify with one or more of these groups, Microsoft Forms does not allow for multi-select options in the Likert scale option, but prefer to self describe with text fill in option aims to capture this; we will explore alternatives for next year's survey. When present results in dashboards, use "racialised communities" instead of ethnic minority (or the term that is agreed as part of the inclusive language guide development).

Characteristic	BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey	ONS Census 2021	BVCA	BPC Capital (Canadian LP)	360Giving DEI Data Standard	DiversityVC Data Alliance <sup>1</sup>	2024 Recommendation
						for self-describe] Prefer not to say	
Age	18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+	5-year increments	Do not collect (collect tenure and seniority)	Do not collect	Older people (typically those aged 60 and over) Children and young people	Date of birth	Change ranges to 15-year ranges of working age population to capture generations (e.g. Gen x, Millennial, etc):  Born before 1964 Born between 1965-80 Born between 1981-96 Born between 1997-2006  <b>Rationale:</b> Previous age ranges do not allow for many insights; this allows for more analysis based on generational trends. No prefer to self-describe option since it is determined by years of birth.
Socioeconomic background	Social Mobility Commission questions	Economic Activity status Employment Industry and Occupation	Do not collect	Do not collect	People who are educationally or economically disadvantaged	Do not collect	No changes – keep questions from Social Mobility Commission since these are best practice Added prefer to self-describe for questions 1 and 2

Characteristic	BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey	ONS Census 2021	BVCA	BPC Capital (Canadian LP)	360Giving DEI Data Standard	DiversityVC Data Alliance <sup>1</sup>	2024 Recommendation
							<b>Rationale:</b> Linked to BSC target outcome of reducing poverty and to increase data availability of this question over time
Sexual orientation	Not included	Straight or heterosexual Gay or lesbian Bisexual Other sexual orientation [with option to write in]	Asked if firm collects LGBTQ+ data on employees	Number of LGBTQ2+ professionals (no breakdown)	Population group level: LGBT+ People  Category level: LGBT+ People Bisexual people Gay men Lesbian/gay women Transgender (trans man, trans woman) Non-binary people Other (including queer and intersex people)	Aspec (Aromantic or asexual) Bisexual Gay Lesbian Straight (Heterosexual) Queer Prefer to self-describe [text fill-in option for self-describe] Prefer not to say	Use 360Giving recommendation to collect at population level <sup>9</sup> : LGBQ+ People <sup>10</sup> Straight or heterosexual Prefer to self-describe [with text fill-in option] Prefer not to say  <b>Rationale:</b> Recommendation from Diversity Forum Data Project and to increase data availability of representation of this characteristic over time. While it is an additional question in the survey, we have removed other questions to have a neutral impact on user experience.

<sup>9</sup> 360Giving Guidance recommends collecting data at population level if know will get few responses in order to be able to use it. Given that it is our first time asking about this characteristic, we will collect at this level this year and assess next year whether to include category level breakdown based on level of responses.

<sup>10</sup> People with relationship diversity including but not limited to Aspec (Aromantic or asexual), Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, or Queer

## 2. Teams, leadership or decision-making bodies

<b>BSC 2023 Fund Manager Survey</b>	<b>ONS Census 2021</b>	<b>BVCA</b>	<b>BPC Capital (Canadian LP)</b>	<b>Ford Foundation</b>	<b>360Giving DEI Data Standard</b>	<b>DiversityVC Data Alliance<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>2024 Rec.</b>
Board (excluding Executive Team); Executive Team / Managing Partners; Investment Team or All Staff; Fund Investment Committee	N/A	Senior Mid Junior <sup>12</sup>	Ownership of GP; Investment Committee  <b>Investment Professionals:</b> Firm and Investment Leadership (Partners and C-Level Executives);	Ownership; Senior management (fund leadership and investment committee); Investment team	By leadership of the organisation we mean that the majority of the key decision-makers have a shared identity.  As an indication,	N/A	Remove “excluding Executive Team” from Board <sup>13</sup>  Change Executive team to Senior Leadership <sup>14</sup> to clarify definition  Change Investment Team or All Staff to two categories: All staff with option to provide Investment team data in text field below given that All Staff had most responses last year

<sup>11</sup> Informed by side-by-side analysis of questionnaires of 7 organisations representing different communities and research and best practice recommendations for each organisation’s specific communities, noting that these are limited to the VC and startup world(s), where underrepresentation of certain populations is particularly stark and this structure may not be applicable to all industries because the decisions are guided by the gaps seen in the larger tech industry.

<sup>12</sup> No definitions provided, using Level20 guidelines to determine seniority and tenure

<sup>13</sup> Aligned to FCA consultation paper which acknowledges there may be overlap between categories

<sup>14</sup> Defined as key decision-makers (typically C-level executives and/or Managing Partners) at the highest level of organizational management who have the day-to-day responsibilities of managing an organisation.

<p>(voting members only, aggregate number of IC members for funds that receive BSC investment)</p> <p>Extent to which organisation is diverse-led (defined as Board, IC, and Executive Team)</p>			<p>Senior Investment Professionals; Other Investment Professionals; <b>Non-Investment Professionals:</b> Operations and Administration Leadership Other Operations and Administrative Professionals</p>		<p>this might be 75% or more of the Board of Trustees/ Management Committee AND 50% or more of senior staff identify as from a community or Characteristic.</p>		<p>Changed “extent to which organisation is diverse-led” since had poor response rate last year for non-Venture to a yes, no, and other/fill in option answer on whether the fund manager is diverse-led<sup>15</sup> and moved to top of survey.</p> <p><i>For Venture survey only</i> Keep same categories as last year and add: GP Ownership GP Carried Interest</p>
--	--	--	---	--	---	--	---

## Data Privacy

Better Society Capital’s data privacy policy can be accessed in full [here](#)

---

<sup>15</sup> Diverse-led is defined as whether any underrepresented or marginalised groups have at least 50% representation on the decision-making bodies (Board or IC AND Senior Leadership) that pertain to BSC’s investment. Venture survey does not include breakdown of Board, IC and Senior Management team given that teams are small so would be identifiable.