Roundtable Discussion: Bridging Gaps, Impact Investing and Practitioners

Background

A roundtable on investments for social enterprises was conducted on April 7th 2014 as part of a broader research project conducted by the Policy Team at SELCO Foundation to understand:

- Expectation gaps from both sides, investors and practitioners, and its impact on organization sustainability
- Recommendations that could help guide the growing social investment community and practitioners on the development of sustainable social enterprises. For instance, what kinds of terms or investments instruments would best suit energy enterprises?

In that context, we brought together a few likeminded investors like OPES Fund, Lemelson Foundation, REEEP, DOEN Foundation among others to discuss:

- How investments can be better aligned to the missions of social enterprises and their related eco-systems?
- How to communicate to the larger social investment arena on the urgent need for and advantages of such an investment strategy through champions such as you?
- A few recommendations for the "content" of message to others on what these investments could look like and how these barriers are better overcome

Structure of Roundtable Discussions

Each participant was emailed a set of questions keeping in mind their backgrounds prior to the workshop to help bring a more in-depth discussion highlighting key points. The questions targeted 3 sets of stakeholders-impact investors, practitioners and intermediaries who form the missing middle role in bridging funding gaps to build the ecosystem. Hari Natarajan, Sr.Technical Expert, GIZ was the moderator for the discussion with 29 participants (refer Exhibit A).

General questions included expectation gaps that lead to unsustainable investments, suggestions to improve a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground, roles of intermediary agencies like GIZ or World Bank and so on.

Specific questions ranged from reflections on typical stumbling points for practitioners when engaging with investors with a focus on milestones, due diligence process, typical investment timelines, transaction costs, challenges in trying to get investors aligned with long term vision, etc., common understanding of social impacts and the effects on investment decisions. There were also questions around how investors factor in the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which the enterprise is operating in and how does this affect the investment decision/return expectation, typical timeline of an investment, in particular on due diligence process, approval criteria, paperwork process, etc. Challenges related to stage of the enterprises, funding cycles; how have investors tempered their return expectations to an extent based on observations from the field, what are the needs identified by missing middle funders that are essential to support the ecosystem. For further details please refer Exhibit B.

Key Remarks

Harish Hande, Founder SELCO, set the tone through the meeting with pertinent remarks. In his opening statement, Harish expressed concern over the future direction of sustainable social enterprises i.e the nature of investors, enterprises and the general scheme of things in the development sector over the last 5 years to a decade. Particularly, the kind of terms investors expect, the conditions under which entrepreneurs are accepting money and the subsequent failure of many of these enterprises to deliver on these terms- all of these eventually have an adverse effect on the lives of the Poor.

This concern propelled SELCO's policy team to look at an initiative that creates an opportunity to bring likeminded stakeholders together- entrepreneurs and investors- who often are only able to speak in fragmented voices. There is an attempt here to push back on the existing definition of how investments are done, especially what conditions enterprises can work under.

The goal is to have grounded, realistic discussions on experiences, the pitfalls with each set of stakeholders and what is necessary to change the course. By bringing both investors and relatively newer practitioners on one platform, this first meeting seeks to set the tone for future discussions with concrete action items.

In closing, Harish observed that the group articulated the kind of interventions/investments needed for different categories of entrepreneurs- very small enterprises, "the missing middle" and the SELCO type entrepreneurs. At a larger level, it is imperative to look at policies that govern the work of multinationals, bilaterals and government bodies in the development sector. Appropriate human resources can then be allocated to work on these interventions.

Based on the transparency in discussions, this event should take place annually to bring together this group of likeminded individuals from the space. An additional point for the next workshop would be for each entity in this group to influence and bring in one more practitioner/ investor. Often it is expressed that there are a number of practitioners and investors who are thinking about these issues- therefore need to expand this group and make this a platform to be able to address these issues.

Recommendations

1. <u>Annual meetings</u> that brings together these likeminded players to further this change in attitude towards sustainable long term investing as a continuation of this meeting. Each invitee will be expected to bring an additional participant to expand the community of likeminded investors and practitioners at different levels.

2. Forming an Alliance:
    a. Practitioners: Bringing together collective voices in the space will make it easier to engage and lobby with different actors particularly government and policy makers. It also brings in continuity that is not dependent on any one organization or entity but is representative of the larger industry or sector. In this regard, coordinated efforts have lead to the creation of CLEAN earlier this year which can be that collective voice[1].
    b. Investor Circles: Bringing together different types of investors- high risk funds, intermediaries and long term patient capital into an aligned thinking and also assist in advocating for changes in line with practitioner alliances. This group is also better placed to influence its own circles on a changing attitude towards modest returns and sustainable investing.
    c. Incubation Centers: as intermediary vehicles who can bring in newer players early into this mindset and also serve as advisors between investors and entrepreneurs. Ultimately they are the middle organizations connecting these two entities and therefore they too need to be clued into these conversations.

3. Exposure programs for Investors and practitioners:
    a. Exchange Program: Moving beyond traditional sense of engagement and exploring an exchange program that enables the investors to witness and engage directly with enterprises on the ground to have a deeper understanding of ground level realities.
    a. Practitioners joining advisory boards: Practitioners participating in advisory boards to assist in due diligence process to bring in a ground level perspective.

4. Pilot Model Investment Instruments: In order to invest more and invest early there is a need to look at a variety of ticket sizes in different forms. Currently there is a mismatch between big and small monies. For example soft funds are necessary in early stages especially for non tangible expenses (cost vs revenue) that can be used to raise equity funds targeted at organization growth. Therefore, In addition to outlining new sustainable blended investment instruments, it would add of value to demonstrate its viability in reality. This can also demonstrate a new model of partnership between investors and practitioners.

5. Shorten the due diligence process
    a. Standardizing investment documents: In order to ensure smoother negotiations, shorten due diligence periods and prepare practitioners. Perhaps a set of model documents can be developed by the broader impact investment community that can reduce time and resources-financial/human (refer model templates from National Venture Capital Association, http://tinyurl.com/ykdxq57)

[1] **'Clean Energy Access Network' (CLEAN) was created in 2014 in India as an** overarching alliance that capitalizes on the strengths and expertise of existing networks or interested organizations. The network will focus on areas around clean energy, energy access and decentralized energy while creating the capacity to deliver innovative solutions for other parts of the developing world.

b. Domestic Frontline Investor Organizations: Whose proximity will help gain a better understanding of the practitioner and also assist the "remote" decision making team and minimize waiting periods for the practitioner. Also staffed appropriately with folks mindful of ground level realities.

6. Develop an impact reporting framework: keeping the metrics simple but effective enough to communicate impactful processes and results of the organization will also help as an additional tool in the investment due diligence stage. This work is already initiated to undertake a larger robust study to develop a reporting framework with appropriate indicators [2].

7. Strengthen the Role of Incubator Vehicles: Incubation centres can serve an intermediary role between investors and practitioners. They can be an effective first level interaction that can translate expectations from both sides particularly for smaller entrepreneurs who can engage their counsel to facilitate negotiations.

8. Expand into other technology players in the energy access space that also shapes early on a holistic thinking around the need for a variety of instruments needed for multi-pronged solutions to solve the scale of the energy problem across the world.

Insights

1. Building the right investor team:
    a. Frontline Organizations: It is quite challenging to understand the realities on the ground particularly if the team is remotely located with limited bandwidth. It is observed that many who join investment circles have limited field experience and therefore understanding the language of the entrepreneur poses a steep learning curve. Typically, a frontline organization fills this gap however this requires careful selection as very often they are perceived to be far removed as well from the entrepreneurs vision and since this sets the tone of the discussion it can lead to widening gap of trust.
    b. Limited Bandwidth: Investor teams can be small, very often located out of the country and this limits capacity to travel and spend time with investees regularly. The counter measure is to engage local investor teams but as mentioned above there can still be a disconnect given the lack of field experience.

2. Ground level realism not acknowledged: Experience with ground level realities is not given much importance over qualifications. The latter will naturally help make more informed due diligence decisions however without the appropriate people in the team this realism is lost. For instance, would Facebook hire a well experienced entrepreneur to value whatsapp rather it would

[2] CII-Centre for Sustainable Development is working with SELCO Foundation as one of the partners to develop a reporting framework for social enterprises. The intent is to relook at existing indicators that capture impact within the organization (its practices) and results (its outputs) across sectors and differing approaches adopted by enterprises.

depend on experts who understand the industry well. Hence, why would the reverse be true- why should social enterprises be gauged by people who do not have experience and yet have a lot of discretion to determine direction of funds.

3. Finding aligned investors among investor circles: It has been difficult to find aligned investors looking at impact first, modest returns. In some cases, there are investors ready to invest in high risk, demonstrable models in order to bridge the gap for other investors, however latter stage investors who have a highly commercial vision can lead to divergent views on future of organization and hence drives a wedge in trying to combine scarce resources towards multiple needs of the organization that can lead to long term growth.

4. Advocating with the missing middle: Important to recognize that returns cannot be market rate there is an element of subsidy that needs to be injected into the system. This is the way all other industries have grown so unfair to say that this sector should focus on profits without an adequate amount of soft funding as well. There is large institutional funding that can be tapped into but requires loud, collective voice to release it to practitioners. The onus cannot only fall on practitioners but the investor community and other intermediary bodies need to lobby for this release.

5. Change the terms of engagement: The predominant language is in how profitable the business can be in the future and this is dictated by profit first investor community. Other stakeholder are lending themselves to this language and is probably one of the leading reasons why it is felt entrepreneurs are also largely speaking the same profit first language. This language of negotiation and reporting of impact needs to change otherwise it is a losing battle.

6. Accountability beyond just the entrepreneur:
    a. Impact of investors vs impact investors: Looking back at the MFI crisis very few questioned the model that was in place and the kind of lending practices. The original vision was to lend for livelihoods but once this was found not to be very promising, rather than digging deeper to understand why and correct these issues, they expanded their lending portfolio which ultimately led to an unsustainable model deepening poverty. There is a danger in repeating this general reluctance to reform the present model. Nobody wants to lose money and this risk averseness is not developing the appropriate instruments, risk appetite of entrepreneurs etc.

    b. Source of funding: There is sometimes a severe disconnect between the intent of the monies the investment vehicles have in their discretion and the conditions dictated to the potential investee companies. The practitioners feel that there lies a contradiction.

7. Partnerships vs hierarchical relationships:
    a. There is an engagement disconnect between investors and entrepreneurs to solve bottlenecks. This is further compounded by the due diligence process or interactions

with teams or amount of control sought and how it is exercised which can lead to a general climate of mistrust that is built between the entrepreneurs and their investors. Entrepreneurs need to engage with investors and spend time understanding their perspective also. Over time one can align with likeminded investors even if it calls for a few mistakes. There needs to be a balanced approach and one cannot be seen to take more risk that the other because that puts the partnership on a competitive footing.

   b. Ongoing dialogue: There is a need for ongoing dialogue between investors with entrepreneurs. Need for a mechanism like an alliance, circle of investors

8. <u>More hype, less depth</u>:
   a. <u>Beauty Contests</u>: Pitching on both sides is akin to beauty contests which brings a high degree of visibility but with fewer meaningful impacts to justify the enormous amount of publicity. This could in part be due to a gap in appropriate impact reporting frameworks but also due to the need to garner high visibility to attract big investments in today's hyper connected world. However, this is more apparent in urbanized entrepreneurs who have access to these social media tools, language, and events. This can be misleading to investors but also inculcates an unhealthy culture among entrepreneurs more concerned with visibility than field work.
   b. <u>Average case vs best case scenarios</u>: This overhype can lead to rosy, best case scenario projections that do not necessarily reflect the practical situation. If these rosy projections made during fundraising do not come to pass the entrepreneur is reluctant to reassess their strategy and recalibrate investor expectations.

9. <u>Imbalanced views on investment criteria</u>: For practitioners, the differing requirements from various investors, the kinds of documents required, the overemphasis on excel sheets vs field realities which contribute to longer approval periods can lead to frustration among practitioners. For smaller entrepreneurs (less than Rs.50lakhs) unable to articulate their plans through excel sheets there are few alternatives developed to suit their ability to communicate their vision.

   On the other hand, investors view excel sheets are the simplest tool out there as part of the due diligence process especially when dealing with unsophisticated entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs need to understand and trust that some conditions are put in there to give early investor some leverage with later investor, and are not going to be used against them.

   There is a need for a certain amount of accountability and one cannot forego that to ease access to funds. In addition even if investments are built on relationships in order to maintain continuity (lessen delays) there is a need for records and hence the importance of these documents in the event individuals moves from the original investment team.

10. Long approval periods: Cumbersome approval processes can entail a minimum of 6 months to 1 year or more just to clear approvals. This is then followed by release of funding which can take upto 6 months. This is untenable - needs to made much shorter and faster and less painful.

11. Careful use of commercial capital: Practitioners need to be mindful of not overpromising to investors but instead focus on core of work and organic growth. There is an emerging need to raise funds and grow as fast as possible without creating processes and strengthening the core values of the organization. This can also lead to false perceptions of growth and ability to scale.

12. Blended investments: Mismatch between big and small monies and there is a need to combine grant funds with matching investor funds at different stages. There is no standardized instruments that have demonstrated this appropriate mix of investments and there is a need for this. The time taken to approve investments is too long and this can stifle critical growth periods for entrepreneurs.

13. Overhyping, overselling Innovation: Replication needs to be given its due rather than the over emphasis on innovation. While innovation is an important facet of the organization it is increasingly being given an overriding importance over the ability of the organization to replicate sustainable processes.

14. Oversimplification of problems: Complexity of issues not acknowledged in that different regions call for different solutions. The expectation of return cannot be uniform and it’s a flawed approach to think that the same model or solution will work everywhere. There is an under appreciation of contexts.

15. Policy frameworks: Need to complement the industry and gain inputs from practitioners themselves. This need not always occur at the national level but can also lower decentralized levels as well. Policy frameworks need to be readjusted as well to stimulate the growing industry in order to mitigate risks for both parties fairly.

Exhibit A: Questions for Participants

Attendees

Sl. No	Organization	Designation	Name
1	S3IDF-US	Founder, President and Executive Director	Russell DeLucia
2	IIM Bangalore	Public Policy	M.S Sriram
3	TIDE, Sustaintech	Founder	Svati Bhogle
4	CIIE, IIM Ahmedabad	CEO	Kunal
5	Villgro	COO	P R Ganapathy
6	Rang De	Co-Founder, CEO	Ramakrishna NK
7	Rang De	Co-Founder	Smitha Ramakrishna
8	Lemelson Foundation	CFO	PhllipVarum
9	OPES Foundation	Executive President	Elena Casolari
10	DOEN Foundation	Program Manager, Climate&Energy	Jeff Prins
11	REEEP	Director General	Martin Hiller
12	United Nations Foundation	Deputy Director, Energy Access	Tripta Singh
13	Boond	CEO	Rustam Sengupta
14	GIZ	Team Leader, Renewable Energy Component (IGEN-RE)	Michael Blunck
15	GIZ	Sr. Technical Expert	Hari Natrajan
16	GIZ	Technical Expert	Nilanjan Ghose
17	Onergy	COO	Vinay Jaju
18	Energy Action Projects (ENACT)	Creative Director	Marilyn Smith
19	E-Hands Energy	Founder	Raghu
20	CTI-PFAN	Asia Regional Coordinator	Nagaraja Rao
21	S3IDF	CEO	Avinash
22	Villgro	Head, Entrepreneur Incubation	Thomas
23	SELCO Incubation	CEO, SELCO Incubation	Ashis
24	SELCO India	President, SELCO	Revathi
25	SELCO	Founder	Harish
26	SELCO Foundation	Policy	Surabhi
27	SELCO Foundation	Policy	Sarah
28	SELCO Incubation	Manager	Arun Patre
29	SELCO Incubation	Manager	Ravikanth

Exhibit B: Questions for Participants

Practitioners: Vinay/Rustam/Svati/Raghu (Onergy/Boond/SustainTech/E-Hands)

1. Can you reflect a little on your own investment journey for Sustaintech with a focus on milestones, due diligence process, typical investment timelines, transaction costs, challenges in trying to get investors aligned with long term vision, etc. Which are the typical stumbling points/ challenges with when engaging with investors?
2. How do you communicate the potential social impact and the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which you are operating in? How well do investors understand this how does this affect their investment decision/return expectation?
3. What in your opinion are some of the expectations among the larger social investment community that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
4. Can you list at least 2 changes you would like to see that could make the overall investment process smoother?
5. What would you do differently the next time you raise investments, based on your current experience? What can practitioners do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
6. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc. in this process?

Sriram (Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore)

1. From an academic perspective, how do you see the evolution of the impact investment space?
2. Are there case studies/examples that look at the outcomes arising out of the mismatch in expectations between practitioners and investors?
3. How do investors look at/evaluate the potential social impact? How do they factor in the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which the enterprise is operating in and how does this affect the investment decision/return expectation?
4. Along the lines of pricing country risks through country risk premiums, can we actually start estimating a social investment premium attributable to an enterprise depending on the geography of operation (higher premium for an enterprise in Bihar as compared to Karnataka), sector of operation, tiered definition of energy access as per the SE4ALL framework (Slide 13 of the attached presentation), etc?
5. Although the impact investment space is very new, are there studies evaluating the performance of such investments on the basis of social impact?
6. What are the lessons from the microfinance experience in India for the energy access space?

Thomas (Villgro)

1. As someone working with small entrepreneurs at Villgro, can you speak a little about your experience in identifying potential entrepreneurs, the typical funding needs, etc? How do you see their role in the overall value chain of delivering energy services to the poor?
2. What are the additional challenges as compared to traditional social enterprises? It would be especially useful if you talk about the need for funding this missing middle and the challenges in raising funds for the same. Can you reflect on whether the S3IDF type model would work well in this regard?
3. Which are the typical stumbling points/ challenges with the small businesses that make raising investments for them more difficult/challenging/risky?
4. What in your opinion and experience are some expectations from the funders/investors that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
5. Can you list at least 2 aspects that you would like to see addressed that could make your overall operations (of identifying and working with small entrepreneurs) smoother?
6. Is there something we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground? Would you like to add something here from the perspective of small enterprises?
7. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process?

Jeff/Elena/Kunal (Doen Foundation/Opes Fund/CIIE)

1. What is the typical timeline of an investment in your experience? In particular can you comment on due diligence process, approval criteria, paperwork process, etc.? Which are the typical stumbling points/ challenges with practitioners that make the decision more difficult?
2. When considering an investment in a social enterprise, how do you evaluate the potential social impact? How do you factor in the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which the enterprise is operating in and how does this affect the investment decision/return expectation?
3. What in your opinion are some of the expectations among the larger social investment community that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
4. Has your investment approach/strategy changed over time and, if so, the reasons for the same?
5. Can you list at least 2 changes you would like to see that could make the overall investment process smoother?
6. Is there something we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
7. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process, especially with regards possible instruments that can increase the flow of funds in this space?

Ramakrishna (Rang De)

1. As someone who funds small businesses, what are the additional challenges as compared to traditional social investors?
2. What is a typical timeline of investment in your experience? In particular can you comment on due diligence process, approval criteria, paperwork process, etc.? Which are the typical stumbling points/ challenges with the small businesses that make the decision more difficult?
3. What in your opinion and experience are some expectations from the funders/investors that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
4. How has your investment approach/strategy changed over time?
5. Can you list at least 2 changes you would like to see that could make your overall operations smoother?
6. Is there something we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
7. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process, especially with regards possible instruments that can increase the flow of funds in this space?

Martin (REEEP)

1. At REEEP, you are currently in the process of moving from a grants based approach to that of a catalyst to help raise investments. Can you briefly touch upon the lessons from your earlier grant cycles that led to this change in approach?
2. As someone who will play the intermediary role between the social enterprise and the investor, what do you see as the typical reasons for the mismatch in expectations between the two?
3. Based on the experience in earlier grant cycles, have you developed a pitch for the investors that highlights the ground realities for social enterprises, and tempers their return expectations to an extent? Can you share some details in this regard?
4. What do you foresee as the typical timeline for a social enterprise to move through the phased financing approach of REEEP and finally raise investments? What do you foresee as the typical stumbling points/ challenges with practitioners or investors?
5. What do you think we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
6. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process?

Philip (Lemelson)

1. Based on what I understand as the objectives of the foundation, it would be especially useful to get your thoughts on the need for funding the missing middle that is required to build the ecosystem of sustainable investments.

2. What in your opinion and experience are some expectations from the investors that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
3. How has your approach/strategy changed over time within the foundation, especially with regards investments?
4. Can you list at least 2 changes you would like to see that could make the overall investment process smoother?

Nagaraja (CTI-PFAN)

1. At our last conversation, you had spoken about your partnership with REEEP, where you were proposing to play the role of a catalyst to help raise investments. Can you briefly touch upon the progress in that regard?
2. As someone who will play the intermediary role between the social enterprise and the investor, what do you see as the typical reasons for the mismatch in expectations between the two?
3. As a part of the work with REEEP, have you developed a pitch for the investors that highlights the ground realities for social enterprises, and tempers their return expectations to an extent? Can you share some details in this regard?
4. What do you foresee as the typical timeline for a social enterprise to move through the phased financing approach of REEEP and finally raise investments? What do you foresee as the typical stumbling points/ challenges with practitioners or investors?
5. What do you think we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
6. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process?

Russell/Avinash (S3IDF)

1. As someone who funds small businesses, what are the additional challenges as compared to traditional social investors? It would be especially useful if you talk about the need for funding the missing middle that is required to build the ecosystem of sustainable investments, the challenges in communicating this need and associated challenges in raising funds for the same.
2. Which are the typical stumbling points/ challenges with the small businesses that make the investment decision more difficult/challenging/risky?
3. What in your opinion and experience are some expectations from the funders/investors that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
4. How has your investment approach/strategy changed over time?
5. Can you list at least 2 changes you would like to see that could make your overall operations smoother?
6. Is there something we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?

7. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process, especially with regards possible instruments that can increase the flow of funds in this space?

Michael/Nilanjan (GIZ)

1. What are GIZ's plans to support social entrepreneurs? May be good to briefly touch upon the support to the Selco Incubation, follow up support for the incubatees, the proposed catalytic facility to provide working capital for social enterprises and finally the next phase, where the focus is even stronger on social enterprises.
2. How do you see the role of agencies like GIZ in supporting social enterprises raise investments? May be good here to speak about the potential support to the Energy Access Alliance, donor coordination, communicating through our networks, etc.
3. How do you see the role of entities like GIZ in communicating to investors on the potential social impact and the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which the social enterprises are operating in? How can GIZ help investors understand the challenges better, which will hopefully influence their investment decision/return expectation?
4. Do you see the tiered framework of measuring energy access as introduced within the SE4ALL as a way forward to better understand/evaluate social impact? (presentation attached for your ready reference)

Ganapathy (Villgro)

1. As someone who understands both sides of the coin, given that you provide incubation support as well as seed funding, what are the typical reasons for the mismatch in expectations between the social enterprise and the investor?
2. What is a typical timeline of investment in your experience? In particular can you comment on due diligence process, approval criteria, paperwork process, etc.? Which are the typical stumbling points/ challenges with practitioners that make the decision more difficult?
3. What in your opinion are some expectations from the investor side that can be stumbling roadblocks or lead to unsustainable investments?
4. How has your investment approach/strategy changed over time based on the lessons from your early investments?
5. Can you list at least 2 changes (on either side) you would like to see that could make the overall investment process smoother?
6. Is there something we can do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
7. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc in this process, especially with regards possible instruments that can increase the flow of funds in this space?

Ashis (SELCO Incubation)

1. From your experience with entrepreneurs under the incubation process, what are the typical misconceptions among practitioners about investors? How are they misguided in their search for appropriate investors and what are the typical mistakes they tend to make?
2. What are the consequences of such mistakes and how has the incubation centre attempted to address this?
3. What efforts has the incubation centre taken/will take up to communicate to investors on the potential social impact and the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which the social enterprises are operating in? How well do investors understand this according to you and how does this affect their investment decision/return expectation?
4. Can you list at least 2 things that the incubation centre can do to make the overall investment process smoother?
5. What can the incubation centre do to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
6. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc. in this process?

Tripta (United Nations Foundation)

1. From your experience with the practitioners' network, what are the typical misconceptions among practitioners about investors and vice versa?
2. What steps/efforts has the practitioners' network taken in order to address the mismatch in expectations/communication gap between practitioners and investors?
3. How do you see the role of the practitioners' network in communicating to investors on the potential social impact and the challenges arising out of the ecosystem in which the social enterprises are operating in? How can the practitioners' network help investors understand the challenges better, which will hopefully influence their investment decision/return expectation?
4. What kind of communication approaches can we adopt to bring about a change in investment community attitudes towards a sustainable investment climate, where the investments (and associated return expectations) are more aligned with realities on the ground?
5. Do you see the tiered framework of measuring energy access as introduced within the SE4ALL as a way forward to better understand/evaluate social impact?
6. Do you see any role here for intermediary /development agencies like World Bank, GIZ, etc. in this process?