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### WEBINAR OBJECTIVES

The goals of this webinar are:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Explain</strong> what Pay-for-Results is, and how it can be used to catalyze greater development impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Suggest a process for</strong> setting and pricing metrics to successfully plan, design, execute, and monitor Pay-for-Results initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PAY-FOR-RESULTS IS TRENDING… FOR GOOD REASON
WHAT IS PAY-FOR-RESULTS?

Initiatives where funders pay upon accomplishment of *results* rather than *efforts* to accomplish results.

**Benefits**
- Innovation
- New funding sources
- Alignment of interests
- Evidence-based

**Challenges**
- Metrics and pricing
- Upfront costs
- Unintended consequences
PAY-FOR-RESULTS APPROACHES

What examples have you seen?

- **Performance-based mechanisms**
- **Advanced Market Commitments (AMCs)**
- **Prizes**
- **Social Impact Bonds (SIBs)/Development Impact Bonds (DIBs)**
- **Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) /Social Payments**
- **Conditional Cash Transfers**
WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE TO USE PAY-FOR-RESULTS?

When is Pay-for-Results a good idea?

- Outputs and outcomes are well-defined, measurable, and plausible
- Service providers experience delivering desired outcomes
- Data sources and monitoring systems exist
- Funders comfortable giving service providers room to innovate
WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE TO USE PAY-FOR-RESULTS?

When is Pay-for-Results a good idea?

✔ Outputs and outcomes are well defined, measurable, and plausible
✔ Service providers experience delivering desired outcomes
✔ Data sources and monitoring systems exist
✔ Funders comfortable giving service providers room to innovate

What are some of the biggest challenges in Pay-for-Results?

❓ Agreeing on payment metrics
❓ Defining ambitious but achievable targets
❓ Pricing metrics
# HOW TO SET AND PRICE METRICS

The lifecycle of setting and pricing metrics follows the subsequent steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning on Shared Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Which Metrics to Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Baselines and Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting an Evaluation Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Pricing for Metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Performance and Paying for Success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our concept note “Setting, Pricing, and Administering Performance Metrics in Pay-for-Results Programming” covers this process for setting and pricing metrics.
STEP 1: ALIGNING ON SHARED GOALS AND DEFINING SUCCESS

Bring together stakeholders and answer:

1. What is the problem?
2. What are the short- and long-term priorities?
3. What is the desired end-state?
STEP 1: ALIGNING ON SHARED GOALS AND DEFINING SUCCESS

Align on a Theory of Change. What activities and mechanisms will allow you to reach the desired end-state?

Program

Current State

Inputs Activities Outputs

Medium-term Outcomes

Long-term Impact
Pay-for-Results Activity

We will think about how the steps we cover apply in designing a pay-for-results activity.

Pay-for-Results Water Program Example

- You are asked to develop a pay-for-results activity to increase community access to clean water
- To set and price metrics for the activity, follow each step
STEP 1: ALIGNING ON SHARED GOALS AND DEFINING SUCCESS

Water Example:

• Agree on shared goals and definition of success
• Below are example questions to answer:

• What is the clean water problem which needs to be addressed?
• What does success look like in the medium and long-term?
• What are the root causes of that problem?
• Which gaps could you directly affect in the near-term?
STEP 1: ALIGNING ON SHARED GOALS AND DEFINING SUCCESS

Water Example:

Stakeholders agree:

• Challenge is water-borne disease as a result of limited access to clean water,
• Success is a significant, measurable reduction in water-borne diseases
• Best solution is creating Clean Water Provision (CWP) sites (physical infrastructure that enables clean water access)
• Progress measured by:
  • Construction of and access to CWP sites
  • Reduction in water-borne diseases in impacted areas
  • Sustainability of the sites
STEP 2: DETERMINE WHICH METRICS TO USE

Metrics should include these characteristics:

- Direct
- Objective
- Useful for Management
- Practical
- Attributable
- Timely
- Adequate

Other characteristics to consider:

- Additionality
- Time to Impact
- Sustainable Impact
- Minimizing Distortion
- Value for Money
STEP 2: DETERMINE WHICH METRICS TO USE

Consider using a prioritization matrix to select metrics:

Determine the top 1-3 metrics for use as payment triggers.
STEP 2: DETERMINE WHICH METRICS TO USE

Water Example:

- Next, determine which indicators to use to track success
- Below are examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Cost and Management</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of households with access to a Clean Water Provision site</td>
<td>Cost per household of providing access</td>
<td>% of sites in which water fees cover O&amp;M costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% decrease in water-borne illnesses</td>
<td>Period of time required to provide access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 3: ESTABLISHING BASELINES AND TARGETS

• Next, create baselines and targets for each metric
• Baselines measure the current state, and targets specify the desired end-state

Impact: difference between baseline and target
STEP 3: ESTABLISHING BASELINES AND TARGETS

Counterfactuals:
“What would happen if my program did not exist?”

Types of counterfactuals include:
• Baselines
• Controls

Targets:
Negotiated between funder and implementer

Types of targets include:
• Internal targets
• External targets
STEP 3: ESTABLISHING BASELINES AND TARGETS

For each indicator, determine what success looks like based on your baseline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of people reached</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Existing database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people with access to health intervention</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Survey by third-party monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in life expectancy</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>65 years</td>
<td>Government census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 3: ESTABLISHING BASELINES AND TARGETS

Water Example:

• Develop a set of baselines and targets for each metric
• Targets should be ambitious without deterring participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with CWP access</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households suffering from waterborne illness</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household cost to access CWP</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time to establish a CWP site</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (O&amp;M costs covered)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 4: SELECTING AN EVALUATION APPROACH
Select an evaluation approach to determine success:

**Non-Experimental**
Measure outcomes before and after program for participants only
*No comparison group*

**Quasi-Experimental**
Measure outcomes for program participants and similar non-participants
*Comparison group*

**Experimental/RCT**
Randomize participants to treatment or control group; measure outcomes for both groups
*Explicit comparison group*
### STEP 4: SELECTING AN EVALUATION APPROACH

Advantages and disadvantages of each evaluation approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Experimental</strong></td>
<td>• Lower evaluation costs&lt;br&gt;• Less resource intensive</td>
<td>• Less precise measurement of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quasi-Experimental</strong></td>
<td>• Isolates impact of program if other variables are controlled</td>
<td>• Less precise than RCT; random assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental / RCT</strong></td>
<td>• Isolates impact of program with high confidence</td>
<td>• Costly to design&lt;br&gt;• Randomization may not be feasible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 4: SELECTING AN EVALUATION APPROACH

Water Example:

Select evaluation approach based on:

- Examples of previous projects
- Ability to modify existing contracts
- Available evaluation resources

Which evaluation approach is most appropriate?

Non-Experimental
- Simplest approach, makes sense for limited evaluation resources

Quasi-Experimental
- Identification of control sites might be possible, but complex

Experimental/RCT
- Can’t create a true ‘control’ group through contract modification
STEP 5: SETTING PRICING FOR METRICS

There are several approaches for pricing outcomes:

**Cost-benefit**
- Calculate cost of not completing initiative
- Establish imputed economic benefits

**Comparable costs**
- Identify comparable projects prices
- Adjust for local context

**Competitive Procurements**
- Formal competition between implementers
- Helps determine the ‘market price’

**Cashable savings**
- Expected savings from the result
STEP 5: SETTING PRICING FOR METRICS

Structuring hybrid mechanisms can increase implementers’ comfort with Pay-for-Results:

Share risk by:

1. Structuring the mechanism to be partly Pay-for-Results and partly input-based
2. Phasing in performance-based payments
3. Determining short-term milestones to measure against

**Example:** 100% performance-based contract and hybrid time and materials contract
STEP 5: SETTING PRICING FOR METRICS

Water Example:

Which metric pricing approach makes the most sense and why?
STEP 5: SETTING PRICING FOR METRICS

Water Example:

Which metric pricing approach makes the most sense and why?

Imputing the cost from other projects:
- Given robust data on other water projects, it is simplest to price based on previous projects
- Prices should be based on local conditions
STEP 6: MONITORING PERFORMANCE AND PAYING FOR SUCCESS

Ensure the integrity of payment milestone monitoring:

- Third-party verifier
- Stringent data quality practices
- Regular progress reports
- Progress evaluation sessions with stakeholders
- Contract provisions to refine targets/outcomes

Example monitoring schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Program end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>Progress report</td>
<td>End-program strategy session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial strategy session</td>
<td>Mid-program strategy session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milestone 2 Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone 1 Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 6: MONITORING PERFORMANCE AND PAYING FOR SUCCESS

Put mechanisms in place to validate performance and pay success fees:

Example payment process:

- **Implementer reports success?**
  - Yes
    - **Does third party monitor verify success?**
      - Yes
        - Recommend payment
      - No
        - **Does implementer dispute verifier?**
          - Yes
            - **Begin dispute resolution process**
          - No
            - **Recommend against payment**
  - No
    - **Recommend against payment**
**STEP 6: MONITORING PERFORMANCE AND PAYING FOR SUCCESS**

**Water Example:**

In which of the below scenarios should an implementer be awarded a prize?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Implementer Reports Success</th>
<th>Verifier Reports Success</th>
<th>Pay Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with CWP access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWP site with ‘Good’ water quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in the area suffering from waterborne illness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOP TAKEAWAYS

1. Pay-for-Results is trending – for good reason
   • Innovation
   • Shares risk
   • Better outcomes
   • Value for Money

2. Different ways to use PforR in programming – most common is through performance-based awards

3. But not without challenges – principal among them setting and pricing metrics

4. Third Sector and USAID have written a guide – Performance Metrics in Pay-for-Results Programming

5. Of the six steps, the first (Aligning on Shared Goals and Defining Success) is arguably the most critical as sets the stage for all that follows.
Pay for Results in Development
A Primer for Practitioners

Pay for Results Primer Available in Web Links Box
MARKET-BASED SOLUTIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

Contact: info@Marketlinks.org

Previous webinars: youtube.com/user/microlinks

Tweet tips! twitter.com/Marketlinksorg

Post resources! facebook.com/marketlinksorg