

## Partners Day Asia – Americas 2026 “The Future of Aid - Creating systemic impact beyond traditional funding”

### Key takeaways of the Deep Dive session “Selling Outcomes and Impact – examples from Asia” East and South East Asia section

- **Moving from impact measurement to impact markets**  
Development actors are well equipped to create and measure impact, but the emerging question is whether impact can be *sold* beyond public donors. This requires clarity on who buys impact, who benefits, and under what conditions impact can become a credible, tradable outcome – with the carbon market being an example.
  - **Broadening the buyer base beyond direct stakeholders (“participants”)**  
Impact often generates value along entire value chains. Outcomes such as better trained workers, improved resilience or service quality benefit not only direct employers or users, but also suppliers, buyers and downstream actors. Making these indirect benefits visible and investable is key to engaging the private sector.
- SDC as enabler and broker of co-financing**  
SDC’s role is evolving from sole funder to facilitator and broker – supporting design, sharing risks, enabling co-financing and mobilising networks. Combining direct funding with indirect catalytic support helps crowd in additional public and private capital.
- **Public donors as pioneers of new financing models**  
As with earlier innovations in microfinance and vocational skills development, public donors have a critical role in testing and legitimising new financing models such as outcome-based and impact-linked finance. Scaling requires clearer investment narratives and public-private roles as well as larger ticket sizes.
  - **Structural and contextual limits to scale**  
High operating costs and challenging, fragile contexts constrain scalability. These realities must be reflected in expectations around private sector participation, particularly in high-risk and unpredictable environments.
  - **Data and knowledge are essential but underfunded**  
Demonstrating impact depends on robust data, yet there is no sustainable market for data as a public good. While partners value and use data, they are rarely willing to pay for it, pointing to the need for explicit public financing (e.g. a small, dedicated share of programme budgets).
  - **Aligning incentives, definitions and risk appetite**  
Collaboration requires shared objectives, common impact definitions and transparency on risk appetite. Without this, there is a risk of fragmented approaches where actors speak about impact but mean different things.
  - **Recognising limits of market logic for public goods**  
Some services – such as early warning systems or meteorological data – should be publicly financed to ensure reliability and universal access – whenever possible. While niche markets exist, expectations about cost recovery and private financing must be carefully managed.
  - **Beyond competitive procurement towards partnership models**  
Competitive tendering can absorb significant resources for donors and implementors without necessarily improving impact. There is growing interest in more collaborative, partnership-based approaches among different stakeholders that prioritise long-term outcomes, learning and shared impact.