



Scaling Up—From Vision to Large-Scale Change

A Management Framework for Practitioners

Second Edition, 2012

Scaling Up—From Vision to Large-Scale Change
A Management Framework for Practitioners

Second Edition, 2012



600 Water Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024, USA

Tel: +1.202.484.7170 | Fax: +1. 202.488.0754

www.msiworldwide.com

coffey  **international development**
SPECIALISTS IN DEVELOPING COMMUNITIES

Funded in part by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

Table of Contents

Forward	iii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Scaling Up Begins With a Plan	3
Step 1: Develop a Scaling Up Plan.....	4
Task 1: Create a Vision	5
Task 2: Assess Scalability	18
Task 3: Fill Information Gaps	23
Task 4: Prepare a Scaling Up Plan	25
Chapter 3: Establish Pre-Conditions and Implement a Scaling up Process.....	27
Step 2: Establish the Pre-Conditions for Scaling Up	29
Task 5: Legitimize Change.....	29
Task 6: Build a Constituency	31
Task 7: Realign and Mobilize Resources.....	33
Step 3: Implement the Scaling Up Process	36
Task 8: Modify and Strengthen Organizations	36
Task 9: Coordinate Action	39
Task 10: Track Performance and Maintain Momentum	41
Chapter 4: Lessons Learned.....	43
Chapter 5: Conclusion	45
Annex 1: Steps, Tasks, and Questions for Developing and Implementing a Detailed Scaling Up Plan	46
Annex 2: Useful Tools for Planning and Implementing a Scaling Up Strategy	49
Sources Cited	50



Tables

Table 1. Scaling Up Methods 10

Table 2. Choosing a Scaling up Method 12

Table 3. Scalability Assessment Tool (SAT) Checklist 21

Figures

Figure 1. Summary Overview of Issues for Analyzing Scaling Up 9

Figure 2. Organizational Roles in Scaling Up 14

Figure 3. An Overview of the Scaling Up Process..... 28

Figure 4. Advocacy Network Training Manual Table of Contents..... 35



Forward

This document is intended to be a companion document to the Scaling Up TOOLKIT. With support from the MacArthur Foundation and the Packard Foundation, both documents were developed, applied, and refined over a nine year period with twenty-two projects in India, Mexico, and Nigeria. An earlier version of this document was published in March of 2006.

Acknowledgements

This work has many forerunners, including MSI products such as the Institutional Development Framework, the Implementing Policy Change model, and the Logical Framework; and valuable products from other members of the scaling up community of practice including ExpandNet, the World Bank, WHO, IFAD, the Population Foundation of India, and the Brookings Institution. Support from the Packard Foundation enabled fieldwork case studies that yielded valuable lessons. Special thanks go to the MacArthur Foundation for its generous sponsorship of most of the fieldwork on which this product is based, and personal thanks go to Judith Helzner, Poonam Muttreja, and Dipa Nag Chowdhury, who believed in and supported this work for almost a decade.

The principal authors of this document are Larry Cooley and Rajani R. Ved.



Chapter 1: Introduction

The concept of “scaling up” has become increasingly popular as concerned donors note the relatively poor record of innovative pilot projects in extending their reach to large populations. The Scaling Up Management (SUM) FRAMEWORK and the guidelines presented in this document seek to improve this track record through practical advice on a three-step, ten task process for effective scaling up. These steps and tasks include:

This field-tested framework and set of guidelines offer practical advice on how to carry out each of the ten key tasks needed for effective scaling up.

Step 1: Develop a Scaling Up Plan

- ❖ Task 1: Create a Vision
 - 1A. The Model: What Is Being Scaled Up?
 - 1B. The Methods: How Will Scaling Up Be Accomplished?
 - 1C. Organizational Roles: Who Performs the Key Functions?
 - 1D. Dimensions of Scaling Up: Where and For Whom Does Scaling Up Occur?
- ❖ Task 2: Assess Scalability
 - 2A. Determining the Viability of the Model for Scaling Up
 - 2B. Analyzing the Organizational and Social Context
- ❖ Task 3: Fill Information Gaps
- ❖ Task 4: Prepare a Scaling Up Plan

Step 2: Establish the Pre-Conditions for Scaling Up

- ❖ Task 5: Legitimize Change
- ❖ Task 6: Build a Constituency
- ❖ Task 7: Realign and Mobilize Resources

Step 3: Implement the Scaling Up Process

- ❖ Task 8: Modify Organizational Structures
- ❖ Task 9: Coordinate Action
- ❖ Task 10: Track Performance and Maintain Momentum

The theory and practice underlying the FRAMEWORK come from the discipline of “strategic management.” More specifically, Step 1 brings to bear best practices related to strategic planning in complex settings; Step 2 focuses on change management functions associated with consensus building, policy change, and resource allocation; and Step 3 emphasizes the operational aspects of multi-actor program implementation.



In constructing this FRAMEWORK, the use of the word “task” is deliberate. Each element of the FRAMEWORK is conceived and presented as a task to be managed, not simply a category to be analyzed. To that end, the FRAMEWORK outlines the necessary actions to be taken for each task, while also presenting alternative methods. Annexes to the document present a sequenced list of questions to guide the scaling up process (Annex 1) and a list of tools that support each task. A companion document, the Scaling Up TOOLKIT², provides details on each of these tools along with examples and links to outside resources that can be of help in carrying out each of the FRAMEWORK’s ten tasks.

Fieldwork funded by the MacArthur and Packard Foundations focused particularly on the scaling up of interventions in maternal and child health, rural health, and family planning. Subsequently, the FRAMEWORK and TOOLKIT were adapted and applied to other sectors including early childhood education, community policing, human rights, welfare reform, and livelihoods. Likewise, while initial efforts focused on identifying successful models and taking them to scale, our later work also considered situations in which experimentation and scaling up were undertaken by governments as part of a deliberate strategy of reform. The current versions of the FRAMEWORK and TOOLKIT are designed to address both of these pathways.

² Management Systems International, *Scaling Up—From Vision to Large Scale Change: Tools and Techniques for Practitioners*, Washington, D.C., 2012. This publication is also known as the TOOLKIT, a companion document to the FRAMEWORK.



Chapter 2: Scaling Up Begins With a Plan

Service providers in wealthy and developing countries alike find themselves under pressure to reduce costs, improve social outcomes, and explain why it has proven so difficult to accelerate the spread of best practices. Recognizing this, the MacArthur Foundation awarded the first of what became a series of grants to Management Systems International (MSI) in October 2003 to study and field test methods to improve the scaling up process. The initial grant called for five activities:

- ❖ To develop a framework that synthesized current knowledge on scaling up;
- ❖ To conduct field trials, using the framework as a general guideline;
- ❖ To assess the experience of field trials;
- ❖ To revise the framework based on the experience of field trials; and
- ❖ To disseminate findings, particularly with population and reproductive health communities.

Under this grant, the FRAMEWORK built on eleven years of applied research carried out by MSI under the USAID-funded Implementing Policy Change Program.³ It also drew heavily from the existing literature on scaling up, strategic planning, and organizational development. This framework was field tested with twenty-two innovative programs in India, Nigeria, and Mexico and served as a basis for numerous exchanges with academics, policymakers, and practitioners. This current version of the FRAMEWORK has been revised to reflect lessons from that experience and feedback. It is deliberately operational and primarily directed to those involved in funding and implementing pilot projects, and those charged with bringing innovation to large-scale service delivery systems.

The remainder of this paper is organized around the three steps and ten tasks featured in the FRAMEWORK.

³ Management Systems International, “Implementing Policy Change,” www.msiworldwide.com/project/implementing-policy-change/



Step 1: Develop a Scaling Up Plan

Hope is not enough. Successful scaling up begins with good planning and ideally, that planning starts during the design phase of pilot projects. This section of the FRAMEWORK provides guidelines for **Step 1** of the scaling up process: **Develop a Scaling Up Plan** and includes four distinct tasks, namely:

Successful scaling up begins with good planning. Ideally, that planning starts during pilot project design.

- ❖ Task 1: Create a Vision
- ❖ Task 2: Assess Scalability
- ❖ Task 3: Fill Information Gaps
- ❖ Task 4: Prepare a Scaling Up Plan

The Normal Equation



“Successful” Pilot Project + HOPE = Large-Scale Change

Concrete results achieved during Step 1 include a realistic assessment of the prospects and parameters for scaling up and a road map for getting to scale. This step also includes a discussion on the development of documentation and the building of support that will be needed later in the scaling up process.

Step 1: Developing a Scaling Up Plan

Result: Realistic assessment of prospects, parameters, and strategy for scaling up

- ❖ Task 1: Creating a Vision
- ❖ Task 2: Assessing Scalability
- ❖ Task 3: Filling Information Gaps
- ❖ Task 4: Preparing a Scaling Up Plan



Task 1: Create a Vision

There is a lack of agreement on basic definitions and a shortage of well-documented case studies about scaling up.³

To organize these issues and differentiate among strategies, Task 1 of the FRAMEWORK focuses on creating a concrete vision of successful scaling up. This vision becomes the yardstick for judging scalability (Task 2) and for deciding what more needs to be done before embarking on the scaling up process. Task 1 includes the following four elements:

Task 1 focuses on creating a concrete vision of what scaling up would look like if it were successful.

³ Notable exceptions include:

- ExpandNet, *Scaling Up Health Interventions*, <http://www.expandnet.net/>.
- Ruth Simmons and Jeremy Shiffman, "Scaling-up Reproductive Health Service Innovations: A Conceptual Framework" (paper prepared for the Bellagio Conference: From Pilot Projects to Policies and Programs, March 21–April 5, 2003; and updated February 2, 2005).
- Jeremy Shiffman, "Generating Political Will For Safe Motherhood in Indonesia," *Social Science and Medicine* 56 (2003).
- Jeremy Shiffman, Cynthia Stanton, and Patricia Salazar, "The Emergence of Political Priority For Safe Motherhood in Honduras," *Health Policy and Planning* 19, no. 6 (2004).
- Peter Uvin, Pankaj S. Jain, and L. David Brown, "Think Large and Act Small: Towards a New Paradigm for NGO Scaling Up," *World Development* 28, no. 8 (2000).
- B. Goff, "Mastering the Craft of Scaling Up in Colombia," *Grassroots Development* 14, no. 1 (1990).
- John G. Haaga and Rushikesh Maru, "The Effects of Operations Research on Program Changes in Bangladesh," *Studies in Family Planning* 27, no. 2 (1996).
- Jocelyn DeJong, "NGO Experiences of Scaling Up HIV/AIDS Programs" (presentation at World Bank Workshop on Orphans and Vulnerable Children, May 2003).
- Ford Foundation, "Asset Building for Social Change: Pathways to Large Scale Impact," 2006. http://www.fordfound.org/publications/recent_articles/asset_pathways.cfm
- Ruth Levine, *Millions Saved: Proven Successes in Global Health*, Washington, D.C: Center for Global Development, November 2004.
- World Bank, "Scaling Up the Impact of Good Practices in Rural Development," Agriculture and Rural Development Department, Report 26031, June 2003.
- Johannes Linn, ed., "Scaling Up in Agriculture, Rural Development, and Nutrition," (policy briefs by the International Food Policy Research Institute, 2012).
- M.S. Swaminathan, *From Green to Evergreen Revolution: Indian Agriculture: Performance and Emerging Challenges*, Concord, MA: Paul & Company Publishers Consortium, 2010.
- Santiago Levy, *Progress Against Poverty: Sustaining Mexico's Progres-Opportunidades Program*, Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2006.
- Rajani R. Ved, "Scaling-up ICDS: Can Universalization Address Persistent Malnutrition?" in "Lifting the Curse: Overcoming Persistent Undernutrition in India," ed. L. Haddad and S. Zeitlyn, *Institute of Development Studies Bulletin* 40, no. 4 (2009): 53-60.
- Indira Kranthi Patham, *Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty*, <http://www.serp.ap.gov.in/SHG/aboutus.jsp>
- The MSI World (*Scaling Up Excerpt from COMET Video*, November 29, 2012) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UNJkKemni0>.



- ❖ Clarify the model, innovation, or project to be scaled up—**what** is being scaled up?
- ❖ Identify the methods of going to scale—the **how** of scaling up
- ❖ Determine the organizational roles involved in scaling up—the **who** of scaling up
- ❖ Establish the expected scope of the scaling up effort and the dimension(s) along which scaling up will occur—loosely speaking, the **where** of scaling up

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 1:

- ❖ What organizational, process, and technical factors were critical to success on a pilot-scale?
- ❖ Can the model be simplified without undermining its effectiveness? Is it absolutely necessary to replicate all elements of the model on a large scale?
- ❖ Does the organization that carried out the pilot project have the desire and organizational capacity to expand its operations and deliver services on a substantially larger scale?
- ❖ If not, which organization(s) are best suited and motivated to implement the model on a scaled up basis or to serve as partners in implementing the model?
- ❖ Should the scaling up effort include policy change by the government or rely exclusively on voluntary adoption by private and non-governmental organizations?
- ❖ Is there a need for one or more intermediary organizations to support the scaling up process? If so, what help is needed and which organizations are best suited to perform these roles?
- ❖ Along what dimension(s) should scaling up take place?
- ❖ What would scaling up look like if it were successful?

The following paragraphs explore these questions and more. They are organized around the elements of what, how, who, and where the scaling up effort will take place.



1a. The Model: What is Being Scaled Up?

Scaling up should begin by clarifying exactly what is to be scaled up. In the discussion that follows, we refer to this as the “model.”

This model is normally embedded, at least initially, in a project and can include

technical, process, and organizational components. We refer to un-scaled models or the individual components of models as “innovations.”⁴

Scaling up should begin by clarifying exactly what is to be scaled up.

An initial description of a model should focus on features that supporters of the model believe are essential to its effectiveness, including tacit elements of the model that are often invisible but central to the model’s effectiveness. Disaggregation also facilitates model simplification and finding the proper balance between fidelity to the original model and the streamlining that is usually essential for scaling up is fundamental to its success.

Pilot projects, upon which the FRAMEWORK focuses particular attention, have as their primary purpose the finding and testing of new solutions to particular problems. By definition, they include at least one technical, process, or organizational innovation. Examples of each would be: a new technology (technical innovation); a novel service delivery approach (process innovation); or creative use of a public/private/NGO partnership (organizational innovation). A pilot project can also take a model that has worked successfully in one context or for one problem and apply it to a new context or problem.⁵ Pilot projects assume that, if successful, these innovative and novel features can and will be adopted by others. Using terminology discussed later in this chapter, most pilot projects focus on “effectiveness” with the implicit assumption that “efficiency” and “expansion” will be addressed at some later date.

Demonstration projects take an existing model and raise awareness about its usefulness with the intention of making existing solutions better known and more widely accepted by decision makers and potential users.

Many projects funded by foundations and other donors describe themselves as pilot or demonstration projects, as do most examples cited in the scaling up literature. It is important to note, however, that relatively few of these projects contain an obvious innovation or research component, and most include many elements that need not—or cannot—be reproduced on a large scale. The majority of these projects are better seen as service delivery projects than as true pilot projects.

⁴ The nascent scaling up literature borrows heavily from social science literature on the diffusion and adoption of technological innovations. While we find the term “innovation” to be useful, many small-scale pilot projects discussed in the literature do not contain an obvious technical, process, or organizational innovation. We therefore prefer to use the term “model” rather than “innovation” to refer to what is being scaled up.

⁵ The case studies cited above include numerous examples of each of these types of innovations.



Any serious effort to scale up a model or pilot project should be preceded by testing, clarifying, refining, and simplifying the model to emphasize those elements essential to its success.⁶ This process can take many years. In reviewing a number of cases in the field of rural development, the World Bank observed that successful cases are “generally started with 10 to 15-year lead-up times, during which locally effective and appropriate technologies and processes were refined, often with subsidized donor support.”⁷ This same evidence suggests, however, that many social entrepreneurs are reluctant to consider simplifications of their initial models or prototypes, despite the fact that evidence from a variety of sources indicate that factors relevant to the success of scaling up efforts include determined efforts at simplification.⁸

While most models proposed for scaling up are described by proponents as “best practices,” few meet this standard. To this end, the World Bank publication cited above introduces a useful set of categories originally developed by the U.S. Center for Drug Abuse Prevention. These categories distinguish between “an *innovation* (minimal objective evidence), a *promising practice* (anecdotal reports and testimonials), a *model* (positive evidence in a few cases), a *good practice* (clear evidence from several settings/evaluations), *best practices* (evidence of impact from multiple settings, meta-analyses, expert reviews), and a *policy principle* (proven in multiple settings, considered widely applicable, and a “truism” essential for success).”⁹ This first element of Task 1 should result in clear specifications for the rationale and substance of what is to be scaled up.

Standards of Evidence

- ❖ What standard of evidence has been applied?
 - Innovation (minimal objective evidence)
 - Promising Practice (anecdotal reports)
 - Model (positive evidence in a few cases)
 - Good Practice (clear evidence from several cases)
 - Best Practice (evidence of impact from multiple settings and meta-analyses)
 - Policy Principle (proven; a “truism” essential for success)

1b. The Methods: How Will Scaling Up Be Accomplished?

The second element in Task 1 involves articulating a strategy for how the model can best be extended to large numbers of people. A good starting point is David Korten’s classic depiction of the scaling up process as three successive stages: effectiveness (developing a solution that

⁶ Simplification also implies an effort to identify objectively the elements of an intervention that are essential and cost-effective for producing the desired results. In this regard, the randomized trials pioneered by the Poverty Action Lab are instructive.

⁷ World Bank, *op. cit.*, p. 24


⁸ World Bank, *op. cit.*, p. xiv

⁹ World Bank, *op. cit.*, p.xi



works), efficiency (finding a way to deliver the solution at an affordable cost), and expansion (developing a way to provide the solution on a larger scale).¹⁰ Figure 1 illustrates this progression.¹¹

Figure 1. Summary Overview of Issues for Analyzing Scaling Up



Scaling up focuses principally on the third stage—expansion—and assumes that workable solutions have been found for issues implied by the first and second stages. However, literature and experience both suggest that it is useful to distinguish between several distinct approaches or methods of achieving scale (see Table 1).¹² Thus, the FRAMEWORK groups third stage “expansion” methods into three categories—**expansion, replication, and collaboration**—distinguished from one another by the degree to which the “originating organization” (i.e., the

¹⁰ F.F. Korten and R. Y. Siy, Jr., eds., “Sharing Experiences—Examples of Participatory Approaches in Philippines Communal Irrigation Projects,” in *Transforming Bureaucracy: the Experience of the Philippine National Irrigation Administration*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, 1988. (<http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0215.htm>)

¹¹ World Bank, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

¹² The following discussion parallels and integrates distinctions between “expansion of experience” and “transfer of experience,” either of which can be pursued through organizational growth (“horizontal”) or institutional and policy change (“vertical”) approaches, and each of which can engage the organization doing the scaling up on a “direct” or “indirect” basis (World Bank, *op. cit.*, p. x).



organization that managed the initial project) continues to control implementation as the model goes to scale.¹³

Expansion here refers to taking a model to scale by increasing the scope of operations of the organization that originally developed and piloted it.

The most common form of expansion is growth, which normally occurs by branching out into new locations or target groups. Sometimes this growth is accompanied by decentralization or restructuring, which we regard here as a distinct method of expansion because of the special demands it places on the originating organization. Two other methods of expansion are franchising of the model to organizations operating as agents or clones of the originating organization, and spinning off aspects or parts of the originating organization to operate independently.

Table 1. Scaling Up Methods

Approach	Method
Expansion	❖ Growth ❖ Restructuring or Decentralization ❖ Franchising ❖ Spin-Off
Replication	❖ Policy Adoption ❖ Grafting ❖ Diffusion and Spillover
Collaboration	❖ Formal Partnerships, Joint Ventures, and Strategic Alliances ❖ Networks and Coalitions

Replication involves the increased use of a particular process, technology, or model of service delivery by getting others, including the public sector, to take up and implement the model. In these cases, an arms-length relationship between the originating and “adopting” organizations (defined below) exists. Replication can occur between organizations of the same type (e.g., NGO to NGO) or between organizations of different types.

One of the most common types of replication is policy adoption, where a model is scaled up from a pilot run by an NGO, community group, or private company to a program or practice mandated and often run by the public sector. Another common form of replication is grafting, where a model—or one component of a model—is incorporated into another organization’s array of services or methods of service delivery. Policy adoption and grafting can occur together, as when a public sector agency incorporates a technique innovated by NGOs into its services such as a participatory approach to HIV education. Diffusion and spillover are other methods of replication and include both informal and more deliberate dissemination efforts. The use of social media, knowledge networks, and communities of practice are special cases of diffusion that bypass organizations altogether by marketing new ideas directly to individuals.

In addition to these more deliberate scaling up methods, replication sometimes occurs spontaneously. While this form of scaling up is common in the private sector where profit

¹³ Among other useful frameworks for distinguishing alternative methods of scaling up is the following taxonomy: developing public policies, fostering communities of practice, influencing market forces, changing power relationships, and promoting social learning. For a full discussion of this framework, see Ford Foundation. Asset Building for Social Change: Pathways to Large-Scale Impact, 2004.



provides the necessary incentive, cases of spontaneous replication of new models of service delivery are much less common in the non-profit and public sectors.

Collaboration, the third method for scaling up, falls somewhere between the expansion and replication approaches. Collaboration mechanisms run the gamut from formal partnerships to informal networks and include a number of innovative structures and governance arrangements. Formal partnerships and strategic alliances are increasingly common methods for organizing collaborative efforts, as are less formal networks and coalitions based on memoranda of understanding or merely a handshake. Typically, these arrangements include some division of responsibility among the collaborating organizations.

Some of these arrangements include the public sector as a key partner; many others are agreements among civil society groups and/or partnerships with private firms, such as an NGO involved in education and awareness that partners with media organizations to co-create new methods of delivering products and services to an expanded audience. The recognition by private firms of commercial opportunities among the poor,¹⁴ and a growing emphasis on corporate social responsibility has greatly expanded opportunities for these types of partnerships.

Balancing the Pros and Cons

Each of the ten methods listed in Table 1 has pros and cons, and choosing among alternative scaling up methods involves balancing a number of considerations. Take, for example, the case of replication through policy adoption such as the transfer of a model from an NGO to public sector institutions. The clear advantages of policy adoption are mandatory compliance and access to resources, as state and national governments have greater financial resources than most NGOs. Moreover, governments generally have greater public legitimacy, especially if they are democratic, and donors and foundations frequently view operating at scale on a sustainable basis as a more appropriate role for governments than for NGOs.

¹⁴ See for example: C. K. Prahalad, *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*, Philadelphia, PA: Wharton School of Publishing, 2004.



Policy adoption also has the advantage of occurring fairly rapidly in a system where decision-making is highly centralized and can cover a large area quickly. On the other hand, organizational congruence—the match between the skills, procedures, and values of the NGO and those of the government—can be a serious problem. For example, where the model being transferred involves a highly participatory approach, adoption by bureaucratic public agencies may be impractical. For this reason, policy adoption is typically more effective when the model involved is primarily technical than when process sensitivity and community participation are key factors to its success.¹⁵

The pros and cons of using expansion as a scaling up method largely mirror those associated with policy adoption. The major challenges of expansion are the ability of existing management to undertake and implement necessary internal changes, and the capacity to secure sufficient financial resources to support the scaling up exercise and to operate at scale. Expansion by NGOs across socially and political diverse regions and audiences is a particular challenge.

The pros and cons of collaboration depend on the nature of the organizations, governance structures, and partnership models that are used. Collaboration has the greatest

Table 2: Choosing a Scaling up Method

Factors to Consider	Method Preferred
Type of Model	
Technology Intensive	Any
Process Intensive	Expansion or Collaboration
Comprehensiveness of Model	
Specific Practice	Any
Complete Model	Expansion
Capacity of Originating Organization	
Strong	Expansion or Collaboration
Weak	Replication
Source of Financing	
Internal	Any
External	Replication or Collaboration
Availability of Formal Evaluation and Documentation of the Model	
Yes	Any
No	Expansion
Observability of Results	
High	Any
Low	Expansion
Ease of Transfer to Other Organizations	
High	Replication or Collaboration
Low	Expansion
Quality of Governance	
High	Replication
Low	Expansion or Collaboration
Presence of NGO Networks	
Strong	Replication
Weak	Expansion or Collaboration
Social Homogeneity	
High	Any
Low	Replication

¹⁵ This corresponds to the distinction between the “hardware” (technical components) and “software” (participation, quality of service, and other less tangible components) aspects of change.



potential where various organizations have different and complementary skills or resources, shared or overlapping objectives, and a high level of mutual trust. For example, networks between similar institutions, such as among NGOs or public sector agencies, can be a powerful form of scaling up. However, because networks are voluntary and frequently lack external resources, the rate of adoption and coverage of the program may be slower and less widespread than with other strategies.

Table 2 displays the critical factors among alternative scaling up methods, along with the implications of each factor for the preferred method(s).

1c. Organizational Roles: Who Performs The Key Functions?

The third element of Task 1 is deciding who needs to do what in order for scaling up—and operating at scale—to be successful.

Drawing on a typology developed by Simmons and Shiffman (2003),¹⁶ at least two different organizational roles are involved in scaling up: the **originating organization** that develops and pilots the model, and the **adopting organization** that takes up the model. Adopting organizations may be newly created for the purpose of taking up the model, or be pre-existing. In the case of collaborative strategies, the role of the adopting organization is sometimes shared between the originating organization and one or more partners. In cases where scaling up takes place through the method of expansion, the originating and adopting organizations are one and the same. Nevertheless, the conceptual distinction is useful because significant expansion will almost certainly require the originating organization to undergo major change.

Simmons and Shiffman have noted the importance of the compatibility of a model with the values, norms, and systems of potential adopting organizations.¹⁷ When considering potential adopting organizations, it is important to look at how similar the organizational contexts, capacities, and values are; how much adaptation and capacity-building will be needed; and what resources will be required.

For example, community-based projects frequently owe their success to participation by program beneficiaries and stakeholders, including local ownership, volunteer labor, use of local resources, and priorities determined by community needs. Large public sector bureaucracies embody, almost by definition, exactly the opposite characteristics. Supply-driven and less responsive to local needs, they are unlikely to make extensive use of local resources or engender a strong sense of local ownership. While public bureaucracies have compensating virtues—legitimacy, resources, and infrastructure—differences in their processes and values may make transfer difficult, and ultimately jeopardize the viability of scaling up in cases where these components are fundamental to the success of the model.

¹⁶ Ruth Simmons and Jeremy Shiffman, *op. cit*


¹⁷ Ibid.



Considerations of compatibility apply equally to the social environments in which the originating and adopting organizations are embedded. If the vision of scaling up involves a new population or location, this requires, at the very least, a preliminary assessment of the context where scaling up will occur. The objective of this assessment is to ensure that the scaling up strategy takes into account opportunities and threats in the new environment and is able to adapt to the social conditions present in the new context. This should include an assessment of the supply and demand for the services that are to be provided and whether there are any “competitors” who may be threatened by the scaling up effort.

Most scaling up discussions assume that the originating organization is also the organization that does the work needed to transfer the model or to take the model to scale. Experience and theory both suggest, however, that many of the tasks involved in successfully transferring or expanding a model can be best done by or with the assistance of a neutral third-party or **intermediary organization** specifically charged with assisting in the scaling up process. The tasks these organizations perform can include conducting visioning and planning exercises, project evaluation and process documentation, political mapping and stakeholder assessments, coalition building, convening, design and conduct of advocacy campaigns, and fundraising. In the case of collaborative strategies for scaling up, intermediary organizations can also be essential in designing and forming innovative partnerships. In strategies that depend on expansion or replication, they often play necessary roles in assessing and strengthening the internal capacities required of originating and adopting organizations.¹⁸

Figure 2. Organizational Roles in Scaling Up



¹⁸ One of the major findings from MSI’s research and fieldwork is that there are few intermediary organizations in most developing countries with the range of skills needed to support scaling-up. Also noteworthy is the absence of funding to cover these services in most donor-assisted projects.



This third element of Task 1 involves identifying the organizations best suited to perform each of these functions and the major organizational changes that scaling up will require of them.

1d. Dimensions of Scaling Up: Where Does The Scaling Up Occur?

So far, we have reviewed three of the four key elements of scaling up: the model, types and methods of scaling up, and organizational roles. The fourth and final element needed to complete a vision of the scaling up process is **dimension**, or the scope and nature of the intended scaling up effort.

This third element of Task 1 involves identifying the organizations best suited to perform each of these functions and the major organizational changes that scaling up will require of them.

The extension of a pilot project's services or benefits can occur along any of the following five vectors:

- ❖ Geographic coverage (extending to new locations)
- ❖ Breadth of coverage (extending to more people in currently served categories and localities)
- ❖ Depth of services (extending additional services to current clients)
- ❖ Client type (extending to new categories of clients)
- ❖ Problem definition (extending current methods to new problems)

To clarify these distinctions, consider a project being piloted in a particular village with the intention to lower infant mortality by educating pregnant women about infant diseases and the need for ante and post-natal care. When scaling up is discussed, frequently only the geographic dimension is considered—such as the expansion of the project to reach more villages or a larger region, such as a district or the entire country. However, a number of other dimensions should also be considered and could include: extending services to more pregnant women within the original village (breadth of coverage); offering nutritional information and/or access to ante and post-natal care (depth of services); widening the target population to include all women of childbearing age (client type); or applying the approach to address other issues, such as maternal mortality (problem definition). Deciding on how many people will be served and along which of these directions the expansion will occur is the fourth and final element in developing a vision and broad strategy for scaling up.

Putting Task 1 into Action

The starting point for Task 1 depends on who initiates it and at what stage of the pilot effort.

Experience clearly demonstrates

that scaling up is highly unlikely without some level of active support from the originating

*The fourth and final element needed to complete a vision of the scaling up process is **dimension**—the size of the intended scaling up effort and the vector along which the model or project is to be extended.*



organization. However, the focus on scale often begins with donor or host-government interest in fashioning a solution that can be provided to large segments of the affected population. In cases where the NGO responsible for the pilot project does not share this emphasis on coverage, a mismatch of expectations is likely. The most typical result is vague language about scaling up in the funding documents for the pilot project and limited attention to scaling up during implementation. The best protection against this is clear and candid communication early on about each party's vision for the scale of effort, and their willingness to work toward that future.

A special case is when a government or donor agency has a deliberate strategy of using initial experimentation to test one or several approaches to addressing a need or solving a problem. Because an originating organization often believes itself to have the authority to scale up those interventions that prove themselves worthy, it often neglects to focus on Task 1 or on the other elements of Step 1 and Step 2. This is, almost without exception, a mistake. Experience shows that successfully scaled up innovations initiated by governments complete virtually the same tasks and trajectory as innovations that begin on a small scale outside of government.

Timing is also critically important. Often, discussion of scaling up begins only after a pilot project is well underway or completed. These projects are often assumed to be successful and ready for scaling up based on anecdotal evidence rather than a thorough, evidence-based evaluation of the extent and reasons for a model's success; an assessment of the model's strengths, weaknesses, and cost-effectiveness; and a comparison with alternative models or mechanisms for achieving the same goals. Taking the time to do an evaluation, assessment, and comparison with alternatives is important and, ideally, should be done by someone who is detached and independent. Third-party assessments often provide elements essential to the scaling up process, including documentation or credible verification of impact, which can be used to publicize and market the model.¹⁹

In other cases, multiple candidates may be appropriate for scaling up to fill a larger need and a selection must be made. In such instances, prioritization of projects for scaling up should be based on the scalability assessment criteria enumerated in Task 2 below.

In the best-case scenario, scaling up is anticipated during the initial design of a pilot project. In such cases, widely accepted best practices suggest that the following elements be incorporated into the original design and implementation of the pilot project: doing a baseline survey; documenting the model, especially processes such as working with local communities; building-in an ongoing method for monitoring, measuring, evaluating, and publicizing results; and incorporating mechanisms to gain buy-in from policymakers and other representatives of potential users or adopting organizations.

Regardless of entry point, scaling up depends on a shared vision that incorporates the elements described in Task 1 of the FRAMEWORK. Much of the work needed for ironing out these issues

¹⁹ Darcy Ashman, "Closing the Gap between Promise and Practice: A Framework for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating Social Development Networks" (unpublished, Mimeo).



can be done in a workshop setting with officials from the originating organization, potential donors, potential adopting organizations, and other selected stakeholders. Field tested models and materials have been developed to support this planning effort and are available upon request.²⁰

²⁰ For more information, please contact Larry Cooley at Management Systems International (lcooley@msi-inc.com).



Task 2: Assess Scalability

The second part of the planning process involves reaching pragmatic judgments about the **scalability** of the model or program in question. While some of the factors that affect scalability relate to the model itself, many relate to the larger context in which scaling up would take place. As a result, the task of assessing

While some of the factors that affect scalability relate to the model itself, many relate to the larger context in which scaling up would take place.

scalability should usually be undertaken at the same time as Task 1 to ensure that the vision and plan are fully informed by the realities of the situation.

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 2:

- ❖ Do relevant stakeholders, potential partners, and intended beneficiaries perceive a need for this kind of model?
- ❖ Has the model been documented, including the process component, and has its cost-effectiveness been objectively assessed? Does the evidence indicate that the model is more cost-effective than other approaches?
- ❖ Are there obvious economies or diseconomies of scale?
- ❖ How easily can institutional characteristics that were key to the outcomes achieved be replicated or enlarged?
- ❖ Is there anything special or unique about the social or political context, or general circumstances of the pilot project (e.g., cultural, ethnic, or religious values/characteristics; distribution of power; homogeneity; economic conditions) that would need to be present for the model to be replicated successfully?
- ❖ Does the adopting organization have the appropriate organizational and implementation capacity, or the means to develop that capacity?
- ❖ Does needed funding exist for replicating the model on a large scale?
- ❖ Are the central mission, organizational culture, and values of the proposed adopting organization sufficiently compatible with those necessary to adopt and implement the model successfully?

These issues are discussed in greater detail below.



2a. Determining the Viability of the Model for Scaling Up

In analyzing the comparative scalability of various pilot projects, Ruth Simmons enumerated seven useful criteria based on characteristics of successful technological or economic innovations. She summarizes them as follows:

To stand the best chance of being widely adopted, innovations [models] must be:

- (1) **Credible**, based on sound evidence or espoused by respected persons or institutions;
- (2) **Observable** to ensure that potential users can see the results in practice;
- (3) **Relevant** for addressing persistent or sharply felt problems;
- (4) Have a **relative advantage** over existing practices;
- (5) **Easy to transfer and adopt**;
- (6) **Compatible** with the existing users' established values, norms, and facilities; and
- (7) **Able to be tested or tried** without committing the potential user to complete adoption when results have not yet been seen.²¹

In addition, experience demonstrates that the easiest pilot efforts to scale up are those that involve a **clear and replicable technology** and **self-generate the financial resources** needed for expansion. This helps to explain why many of the most common examples of scaling up are commercial or fee-for-service products such as micro-credit, and why it has generally been easier to scale up innovations, such as new seeds or cell phones, than models where process, values, and organizational contexts are critical.²²

Experience demonstrates that the easiest pilot efforts to scale up are those that involve a clear and replicable technology and self-generates the financial resources needed for expansion.

2b. Analyzing the Organizational and Social Context

In many types of development projects, pilot-scale success or failure hinges on organizational factors. It is thus particularly important to identify the organizational features that need to be retained, recreated, or substituted for successful scaling up. In identifying the potentially unique or distinguishing features of the organization that implemented the pilot project—what

²¹ Simmons 2002, *op. cit.*, p. 63. Emphasis added.

²² The World Bank paper cited above (*op. cit.*, p. 9) uses the terms “universalist” and “contextualist” to distinguish these two broad approaches and provides the following definitions of each:

- *Universalist approach to scaling up.* In this approach, experience provides a set of universal generalizations that can be replicated, directly expanded, or adopted elsewhere with a simple set of rules. This does not require identifying and dealing with local variability. For that reason, it may take less time and effort than a contextualist approach to scaling up.
- *Contextualist approach to scaling up.* In this approach, practices to be scaled-up are tailor-made at the outset to address context-specific conditions.



we call elsewhere in this paper the “originating organization”—the categories and methodology used in the Institutional Development Framework²³ are a useful guide. These are:

- ❖ Organizational culture and values/principles
- ❖ Staffing skills and requirements
- ❖ Management and leadership style
- ❖ Financial system and resources
- ❖ External partnerships
- ❖ Monitoring and evaluation

The broader social and political context in which projects are located can also exercise substantial impact on the scaling up process. For this reason, it is important to assess the external environment in which the pilot project has been operating to identify contextual factors that may have been essential to the success of the model. Here again, the goal of the analysis is to identify features that need to be recreated or substituted for the model to be successfully scaled up. This analysis of the social context can be particularly important, as these factors are often invisible to those who—like fish unaware that they swim in the ocean—have no point of comparison.²⁴ Especially noteworthy among the key factors that should be considered in such an analysis are the quality of governance; respective roles and fiscal capacities of national, state, and local governments; extent and nature of NGOs and NGO networks; prevailing cultural and religious norms; and the extent of social homogeneity.

The Scalability Checklist shown in Table 3 below is a basic test of the scalability of pilot projects based on the factors noted above. Every check placed in Column A indicates a factor that simplifies scaling up, and every check in Column C represents a complicating factor.

The Scalability Checklist is intended to stimulate, not substitute for, serious dialogue and analysis. It is best used not as a scorecard to determine what can be scaled up and what cannot, but as an aid to prioritize alternatives and as a means for identifying actions that can be taken to simplify the scaling up process.

The Scalability Checklist is best used as an aid for prioritizing alternatives and as a means for identifying some of the actions that can be taken to simplify the scaling up process.

²³ See Mark Renzi, “An Integrated Toolkit for Institutional Development,” *Public Administration and Development* 16 (1996): 469-483. Also available at: <http://www.msiworldwide.com/approach/tools/institutional-development-framework/>

²⁴ For additional guidance on practical techniques for the analysis of social and political context, contact Larry Cooley (lcooley@msi-inc.com) or see Derick Brinkerhoff and Ben Crosby, *Managing Policy Reform*, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2002.



Table 3. Scalability Assessment Tool (SAT) Checklist

Model Categories		A 😊✓	←Scaling up is easier	B 😊✓	Scaling up is harder→	C ⊗
A. Is the model credible?	1		Based on sound evidence		Little or no solid evidence	
	2		Independent external evaluation		No independent external evaluation	
	3		There is evidence that the model works in diverse social contexts		There is no evidence that the model works in diverse social contexts	
	4		The model is supported by eminent individuals and institutions		The model is supported by few or no eminent individuals and institutions	
B. How observable are the model's results?	5		The impact is very visible to casual observation; tangible		The impact is not very visible; not easily communicated to public	
	6		Clearly associated with the intervention		Not clearly associated with the intervention	
	7		Evidence and documentation exists with clear emotional appeal		Currently little or no evidence with clear emotional appeal	
C. How relevant is the model?	8		Addresses an objectively significant, persistent problem		Addresses a problem which affects few people or has limited impact	
	9		Addresses an issue which is currently high on the policy agenda		Addresses an issue which is low or invisible on the policy agenda	
	10		Addresses a need which is sharply felt by potential beneficiaries		Addresses a need which is not sharply felt by potential beneficiaries	
D. Does the model have relative advantage over existing practices?	11		Current solutions for this issue are considered inadequate		Current solutions are considered adequate	
	12		Superior effectiveness to current solutions is clearly established		Little or no objective evidence of superiority to current solutions	
	13		Superior effectiveness to other innovative models established		Superior effectiveness to other innovative models not established	
E. How easy is the model to transfer and adopt?	14		Implementable within existing systems, infrastructure, and human resources		Requires new or additional systems, infrastructure, or human resources	
	15		Contains a few components easily added onto existing systems		Is a complete or comprehensive package of multiple components	
	16		Small departure from current practices and behaviors of <i>target population</i>		Large departure from current practices and behaviors <i>for target population</i>	
	17		Small departure from current practices and culture of <i>adopting organization(s)</i>		Large departure from current practices and culture of <i>adopting organization(s)</i>	



Model Categories		A ☺✓	←Scaling up is easier	B ☺✓	Scaling up is harder→	C ⊗
	18		Few decision makers are involved in agreeing to adoption of the model		Many decision makers are involved in agreeing to adoption	
	19		Demonstrated effectiveness in diverse organizational settings		Demonstrated effectiveness in only one /pilot organizational setting	
	20		The model is not particularly value or process intensive		Process and/or values are an important component of the model	
	21		Low technical sophistication of the components and activities of the model		High technical sophistication of the components and activities of the model	
	22		Key innovation is a clear and easily replicated <i>technology</i> , e.g., vaccine		Focus of the model is not a <i>technology</i> , or one which is not easily replicated	
	23		Low complexity; simple with few components and easily added on to existing systems		High complexity with many components; integrated package	
	24		Includes little supervision and monitoring		Includes substantial supervision and monitoring for implementation	
F. How testable is the model?	25		Able to be tested by users on a limited scale		Unable to be tested without complete adoption at a large-scale	
G. Is there a sustainable source of funding ?	26		Superior <i>cost-effectiveness</i> to existing or other solutions clearly established		Little evidence of superiority in terms of <i>cost-effectiveness</i>	
	27		Requires a large commitment of funds at scale		Requires a small absolute commitment of funds at scale	
	28		The model itself has its own internal funding (e.g., user fees) or endowment		No internal funding; the model is dependent on external funding source	
Total number of checks						



Putting Task 2 into Action

As noted, Task 2 is most effective when carried out in conjunction with Task 1. In its most basic form, Task 2 involves: (1) filling out the checklist, (2) brainstorming options to simplify the scaling up process, and (3) carrying out special analyses of the organizational, social, and political contexts for scaling up. This process often benefits from the involvement of neutral third-party facilitators or analysts, possibly drawn from the same intermediary organization that supports other aspects of the scaling up process.²⁵

Task 3: Fill Information Gaps

In principle, the next task after developing a vision and completing a scalability assessment is the development of a scaling up plan. As a practical matter, however, Tasks 1 and 2 almost always reveal a number of information or documentation gaps that need to be filled before the advancement of such a plan. Task 3 is dedicated to filling those gaps.

While rough approximations and anecdotal evidence will suffice in some cases, governments and donor organizations increasingly demand solid evidence prior to initiating a serious effort to scale up a model or intervention. The items most frequently found to be missing include:

- ❖ Documentation of the model, including goals and distinguishing technical, organizational, and/or process elements
- ❖ Analysis of need or demand for the service among the larger population
- ❖ Analysis of the changes needed to make the model applicable to other parts of the country or to other target groups
- ❖ (Comparative) analysis of the costs associated with the model
- ❖ Evaluation of the model's (comparative) impact and success
- ❖ Refinement and simplification of the model
- ❖ Analysis of the possibilities for achieving economies of scale
- ❖ Analysis of the institutional requirements for implementing the model

Task 3: Filling Information Gaps

- ❖ The most common gaps:
 - Documentation of the model
 - Independent, formal evaluations
 - Assessment of (comparative) cost effectiveness
 - Analysis of need or demand in the larger population
 - Demonstrating generalizability and robustness
 - Refinement and simplification of the model
 - Analysis of institutional and financial requirements for operating at scale

²⁵ For additional guidelines on this process and the role of neutral third parties, please contact Larry Cooley (lcooley@msi-inc.com).



- ❖ Identification of the main actions and resources needed to transfer the model

Experience in India, Mexico, and Nigeria suggests that six months to one year is a realistic allowance for the time needed to complete Task 3 for most pilot projects. That same experience suggests that this stage of the scaling up process is a particularly vulnerable one, because neither the pilot project nor the potential adopting organization has a budget or dedicated personnel to conduct the needed analyses.²⁶ It should thus be a particular priority for governments, foundations, and other interested groups to find practical ways to support and facilitate this task.

Task 3 typically begins with a review and mapping of decision makers' unmet information requirements, followed by the development of a schedule and budget for meeting these requirements. At the same time, a series of issues that can affect the credibility and persuasiveness of information and documentation must be considered. Among the considerations affecting the impact of information on decision makers, particular attention should be given to translate technical findings into terms that make sense to the intended audience and the need for credible interlocutors.²⁷

The following question should be addressed when beginning task 3:

- ❖ What additional information or documentation is needed as a basis for planning and to address stakeholder concerns?

²⁶ The typical small-scale project allocates less than 5 percent of its resources for monitoring and evaluation. When such a project is a serious candidate for scaling up, experience suggests that donors need to be prepared to allocate up to 20 percent of project costs for these purposes unless an alternative source of funding exists for Task 3 activities.

²⁷ A useful discussion of the factors that influence the impact of information on decisions about scaling up, policy adoption, and diffusion of innovation can be found in two unpublished memoranda developed by Liza Weinstein for the MacArthur Foundation: "Diffusion of Innovation" (October 29, 2004) and "Diffusion of Programmatic and Policy Innovation" (December 15, 2004).



Task 4: Prepare a Scaling Up Plan

Step 1 culminates in a practical and workable scaling up plan, and the consolidation of that plan is the work of Task 4. This relatively brief document (perhaps ten pages plus annexes) should summarize the thinking and analysis that took place throughout the previous three tasks of Step 1. In many cases, the intermediary organization that helped with the initial visioning (Task 1), scalability assessment (Task 2), and filling the information gaps (Task 3) can and should play a key role in pulling this material together during Task 4. Audiences for the plan are both internal (the originating organization and its Board of Directors) and external (networks, adopting organizations, government agencies, and potential project funders), and the document should be written with these audiences in mind.

While a scaling up plan can be organized and presented in several ways, the following outline is a useful guide:

Step 1 culminates in a practical and workable scaling up plan that summarizes the thinking and analysis that took place to produce it.

The document should be written with both internal and external audiences in mind.

PART I

- ❖ **Summary** of the need including, where possible, hard data on the size and distribution of the problem (one paragraph)
- ❖ **Vision**, including a one to two paragraph history and description of the pilot project; one paragraph each on the model (“what”), methods (“how”), organizations (“who”), and dimensions (“where”) of the proposed scaling up effort
- ❖ **Evidence** supporting the value and feasibility of scaling up the model, summarizing any data that exists on the (comparative) impact and cost-effectiveness of the model, and establishing the demand for and applicability of the model outside the pilot area

PART II

- ❖ **Proposed actions** grouped under the following headings: legitimizing, constituency building, realigning and mobilizing resources, modifying organizations, coordinating action, tracking performance, and maintaining momentum (see discussion below on each of these topics)
- ❖ **Timetable, roles and responsibilities**, including a Gantt chart and an organizational responsibility chart for major activities



- ❖ **Resources**, identifying the budget and other means needed to support the scaling up effort and for operating at scale

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 4:

- ❖ Does the plan summarize the need, vision, and evidence for scaling up the model?
- ❖ Does the plan include a clear description of proposed actions, timetables, roles, responsibilities, and resources?

Step 1 culminates in a practical and workable scaling up plan that summarizes the thinking and analysis that took place to produce it.



Chapter 3: Establish Pre-Conditions and Implement a Scaling up Process

Steps 2 and 3 of the FRAMEWORK focus on translating aspirations into reality. This usually involves action by many people—legislators, national leaders, activists, service providers, and donors, to name but a few—and emphasizes the actions needed to reach agreement and to turn agreements them into tangible results.

Published case studies rarely describe in any detail the steps and considerations involved in implementing a scaling up plan; thus, there are few documented best practices on which to base step-by-step guidelines. The discussion in this section augments the published literature on scaling up with insights drawn from nine years of MSI fieldwork and lessons learned on two closely related topics, organizational development and managing policy change.²⁸

This two-part section presents, respectively, Steps 2 and 3 of the scaling up process. **Step 2, Establish the Pre-Conditions for Scaling Up**, includes three tasks: legitimizing change (Task 5), constituency building (Task 6), and realigning and mobilizing resources (Task 7). **Step 3, Implement the Scaling Up Process**, is comprised of three additional tasks: modifying organizational structures (Task 8), coordinating action (Task 9), and tracking performance and maintaining momentum (Task 10).


These six tasks and the links between them are displayed in Figure 3, illustrating that although the six tasks have a logical sequence, each task affects and is affected by each of the others.

Translating aspirations into reality involves action by many people, reaching agreements, and turning those agreements into tangible results.

²⁸ See D. Brinkerhoff and B. Crosby, *Managing Policy Reform: Concepts and Tools for Decision-Makers in Developing and Transitioning Countries*, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc., 2002. For additional technical and research notes and case studies, see Management Systems International's Implementing Policy Change Series available at <http://www.msiworldwide.com/approach/tools/institutional-development-framework/>



Figure 3. An Overview of the Scaling Up Process



Step 2: Establish the Pre-Conditions for Scaling Up

The intended result of Step 2 is that the decisions and resources needed for scaling up are approved and in place. This requires getting the issue onto the agenda of key decision makers, aligning constituencies to support needed changes, and securing required resources. The following sections explore each of these tasks.

Task 5: Legitimize Change

Given all the issues that compete for attention and resources, progress in scaling up a new model will hinge on decision makers who think that change from the status quo is imperative. For this to be the case, they must see the problem as critical and the affected constituency as a priority. They must believe that existing approaches are inadequate, and that better solutions are available.

Because change often represents a significant break from tradition and requires shifts in attitudes and actions, it is important that change is advocated by “legitimizers” or “champions” who enjoy widespread credibility. These individuals can come from public, non-profit, or private sectors. However, if government policy adoption is the chosen method of scaling up, it is essential to attract high-level government involvement and support at the earliest feasible date.

Building legitimacy is time consuming but essential.

Step 2: Establishing the Pre-Conditions for an Effective Scaling Up Process

Result: Decisions taken and resources allocated for going to scale

- ❖ Task 5: Legitimizing Change
- ❖ Task 6: Constituency Building
- ❖ Task 7: Realigning and Mobilizing Resources

Building legitimacy is time consuming but essential. It has been termed by some as a process of “going slow to go fast.” Experience suggests, and the literature on scaling up confirms, that there is a systematic tendency to underestimate the importance of this task. This is in part because donors and technocrats are impatient or uncomfortable with political or consciousness-raising activities and prefer to focus on capacity-building and service delivery. It also complicates matters that opportunities for legitimation are



unpredictable and frequently linked to a crisis or other attention-focusing events.²⁹ Numerous case examples indicate, however, that inattention to legitimacy results in failed efforts or a need to return to this task later in the process.

Legitimation is essential for getting policies approved, budgetary priorities adopted, and developing the broader and deeper base of support needed for implementation by bureaucratic institutions and others. More

generally, it is critical for attracting potential adopting organizations, persuading funders to provide support, and ensuring a warm reception of the model among new locations, client populations, and potentially competing organizations.

There is a greater need for sharing information and resources and for more concerted coordination, particularly during the transition period.

Establishing or increasing legitimacy can be accomplished through a variety of methods, including:

- ❖ Enlisting prominent spokespersons or celebrities as advocates
- ❖ Developing and popularizing images, slogans, and symbols
- ❖ Creating “blue-ribbon” commissions
- ❖ Establishing high-level advisory boards
- ❖ Mounting local, national, and international media campaigns
- ❖ Implementing public education programs
- ❖ Conducting policy debates

Information plays a critical role in legitimizing change, as it is vital to demonstrate that the proposed innovation or model is successful, cost-effective, and feasible. This is normally achieved through publicizing the model and its effectiveness, building on the documentation and evaluation materials assembled during Step 1, and packaging those materials for a wider audience.³⁰

²⁹ For a fuller discussion of the literature on agenda setting, see Jeremy Shiffman 2003, *op. cit.*, pp. 1197-1207.

³⁰ The concept of “ripeness,” as articulated by William Zartman also plays an important role in legitimation and conveys the importance of capitalizing on the timeliness of issues.



The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 5:

- ❖ What more needs to be done to persuade relevant decision makers, funders, and opinion leaders that new solutions are necessary and desirable?
- ❖ What more needs to be done to persuade relevant decision makers, funders, and opinion leaders that the proposed model is successful, cost-effective, and feasible?
- ❖ Which spokespersons, conveners, messages, and methods are most likely to have an impact on these audiences?

If existing legitimation is not deemed sufficient, Task 5 is essential to the formulation and implementation of a legitimation strategy. A variety of analytical tools (e.g., political mapping) and processes (e.g., deliberative dialogue) have been developed for this purpose.³¹ These actions can and should begin during Step 1 by involving key audiences in the planning process and anticipating their questions and information needs.

Task 6: Build a Constituency

Implementation requires active and ongoing support to overcome common tendencies toward inaction and backsliding. The most reliable constituencies are those who can hope to benefit directly

Implementation requires active and ongoing support to overcome common tendencies toward inaction and backsliding.

from implementation of the new model, but support can also come from organizations and individuals who support the change philosophically or politically. The task of constituency building complements and amplifies the legitimation process by going beyond a passive acceptance of the need for change to mobilizing action in favor of specific changes and models.

Beneficiaries of the current system and existing service delivery organizations are among those who are often reluctant to change. Because change normally affects budget allocations and funding priorities, strong opposition frequently comes from those whose budgets would need to be reduced in order to free up resources necessary for scaling up. If the originating organization is an NGO or sub-national government unit, other NGOs and government units may feel threatened both in terms of competition for funding or more generally in terms of recognition, reputation, and visibility. Bureaucratic interests that lose old functions or that may

³¹ Management Systems International, *Scaling Up—From Vision to Large-Scale Change: Tools and Techniques for Practitioners*, Washington, D.C., 2012.



be asked to take on new ones may feel similarly threatened by the proposed changes. Part of the task of constituency building is to understand and overcome these sources of resistance.

Particularly in countries with little or no history of participatory democracy, representative governance, or public accountability, advocacy efforts tend to rely on one-on-one lobbying with the person perceived to be “in charge.” Experience strongly suggests, however, that for change to be realized and sustained, it is important to mobilize a wider range of stakeholders.

Among the tools that can help to guide Task 6, the stakeholder analysis, network mapping, and Force Field Analysis are particularly useful.³² Together, these tools help to identify the different points through which a proposed change passes to become approved and implemented; the actor(s) in charge of each step; how one can gain access to these actors; who else

Among the tools that can help to guide Task 6, the stakeholder analysis, network mapping, and Force Field Analysis are particularly useful.

might be willing and able to support these efforts; what resources they are able to mobilize for the purpose; and what arguments are likely to be persuasive to each of these groups.

Potential tactics for building the needed constituencies include:

- ❖ Organizing multi-stakeholder coalitions
- ❖ Working through one or more political parties
- ❖ Conducting advocacy campaigns with legislators and legislative committees
- ❖ Direct outreach to business, religious, labor, or other civil society groups
- ❖ Mobilizing grassroots campaigns

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 6:

- ❖ Which organizations, organizational units, or individuals are responsible for key decisions regarding the funding and implementation of scaling up? Who has the authority to make decisions within these organizations?
- ❖ What arguments, appeals, or advocacy strategies are likely to have access and be persuasive to decision makers?
- ❖ What are the most effective networks and alliances for carrying out this advocacy, and how can they be most efficiently mobilized and organized?
- ❖ How can buy-in from the leadership and staff of potential implementing organizations best be achieved?

³² See TOOLKIT for additional information.



Task 6 normally includes a determined effort to mobilize new constituencies and implement a systematic advocacy strategy. It often includes efforts to secure formal adoption of new policies and funding by the government or by potential adopting organizations. Like legitimization, this task can begin in conjunction with the planning process detailed in Step 1.

Task 6 normally includes a determined effort to mobilize new constituencies and implement a systematic advocacy strategy.

Task 7: Realign and Mobilize Resources

For scaling up to be successful, resources need to be mobilized for the new model to **operate on an expanded scale**. Equally important, resources are also needed to **support the scaling up process**. Task 7 is concerned with securing the means necessary for these activities.

The resources for scaling up and for operating at scale are rarely in place at the outset, and old priorities do not disappear simply because new priorities arise. Funding for operating a new model at scale implies a redirection of current budget and operational priorities within a sector, or somehow securing additional resources for that sector. Almost always, this entails overcoming substantial inertia or active resistance, particularly when budgets are stretched, the new model is additional to or more costly than the current alternative, or when the new model does not self-generate the resources it requires.

The resources for scaling up and for operating at scale are rarely in place at the outset, and old priorities do not disappear simply because new priorities arise.

Funding the transition period (i.e., the scaling up process) is of particular concern given the absence of resources earmarked for such purposes, and the inability to redistribute human and financial resources to new priorities on short notice. In addition to complicating the scaling up process, this raises the potential for gaps or shutdowns once donor resources for the pilot project are exhausted.

Moreover, the resource problem is not simply financial. Often, no individual, team, or agency is charged with managing the scaling up process and coordinating the introduction of new programs, policies, or approaches necessary to implement the new model. Likewise, adopting organizations often lack the necessary organizational skills and systems. Like Tasks 5 and 6—legitimizing change and constituency building—those managing the task of realigning and mobilizing resources must often reach beyond the boundaries of individual organizations to find the needed capabilities. Donors can be particularly useful in supporting

Partnerships between institutions with complementary resources and strengths can be a synergistic way to provide the resources needed for the scaling up process.



internal advocates during this part of the change effort.

A particularly weak point for many scaling up projects is the additional burden on the staff of the originating organization, which is expected to provide training, mentoring, and other support for the adopting organization(s) while continuing to run their own programs.

The following are among the common approaches and mechanisms used during Task 7:

- ❖ Donor roundtables
- ❖ Budget hearings and budget transparency campaigns
- ❖ Fiscal decentralization
- ❖ Bridge financing
- ❖ Market mechanisms

Partnerships between institutions with complementary resources and strengths can provide the resources needed for the scaling up process. For example, the public sector frequently has political legitimacy, but lacks technical expertise or the ability to operate flexibly at the local level. The private for-profit sector often has the financial resources and technical expertise, but lacks political legitimacy. The non-profit sector has technical expertise and the capacity for flexible local implementation, but usually lacks political legitimacy and large-scale organizational capacity. Local communities and community-based organizations are often overlooked as potential sources for in-kind resources, and can also help create legitimacy. Partnerships that bring together the best assets of each partner can be a powerful and efficient way to mobilize the resources needed for the scaling up process and are increasingly fashionable in development circles. For all these reasons, the work of assembling and establishing guidelines for such partnerships often plays a central role during Task 7.

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 7:

- ❖ What additional human, institutional, and financial resources will be needed to support the process of “going to scale,” and what needs to be done to ensure that these resources are available?
- ❖ What human, institutional, and financial resources will be needed for “operating at scale,” and what needs to be done to ensure that these resources are available?
- ❖ What new partnerships will need to be established, if any?

Budget analysis and advocacy are among the most important skills required for realigning and mobilizing resources. When involved groups lack this expertise, donors, intermediary organizations, and government-sponsored innovation-support units can be of assistance in providing access to such expertise and/or relevant training. The table of contents shown in



Figure 5, drawn from an existing advocacy training manual, is typical of the skills taught in such programs.³³

The culmination of Tasks 5, 6, and 7—if successful—is a set of decisions by adopting organizations to scale up the model; the commitment to provide resources needed for the scaling up effort and for operating at scale; and a foundation of legitimacy and support that can help sustain the scaling up effort through the difficult implementation stage that lies ahead.

Figure 4. Advocacy Network Training Manual Table of Contents

Section 1: The Power of Numbers – Networking for Impact

- Unit 1: What are Advocacy Networks?**
- Unit 2: Effective Communication—Understanding One Another**
- Unit 3: Cooperation Not Competition—Building a Team**
- Unit 4: Decision Making—Reaching Group Consensus**
- Unit 5: Mission Statements—Creating a Common Purpose**
- Unit 6: Putting It All Together—Managing the Network**

Section 2: Actors, Issues, and Opportunities: Assessing the Policy Environment

- Unit 1: The Policy Process—Government in Action**
- Unit 2: Decision Making for Reproductive Health—Analyzing the Policy Climate**
- Unit 3: Prioritizing Policy Issues—Making the Best Matches**

Section 3: The Advocacy Strategy—Mobilizing for Action

- Unit 1: What Is Advocacy?**
- Unit 2: Issues, Goals, and Objectives: Building Opposition**
- Unit 3: Target Audiences—Identifying Support and Opposition**
- Unit 4: Messages—Informing, Persuading, and Moving to Action**
- Unit 5: Data Collection—Bridging the Gap**
- Unit 6: Fundraising—Mobilizing Resources**
- Unit 7: Implementation—Developing an Action Plan**
- Unit 8: Monitoring and Evaluation**

³³ Developed by the USAID-financed Policy Project managed by the Futures Group in Washington, D.C.



Step 3: Implement the Scaling Up Process

Tasks 8, 9, and 10 are devoted to implementing the scaling up effort. First and foremost, these tasks involve creating the necessary organizational capacity to transfer and apply the model at scale. Once this capacity is created (Task 8), Task 9 involves the actual transfer and adaptation of the model, including mechanisms for accountability and overall coordination. Task 10 covers monitoring and evaluating progress and performance, and the use of that information to inform public oversight and modification of the model.

Task 8: Modify and Strengthen Organizations

Implementing meaningful large-scale change almost always calls for the creation of new organizational structures or for major changes to existing ones. Even when this is not the case, there is a greater need for sharing information and resources and for more concerted coordination, particularly during the transition period.

There is a greater need for sharing information and resources and for more concerted coordination, particularly during the transition period.

The need for change is most apparent in the adopting organization(s) that are expected to implement the model on a scaled up basis. In this regard, it is especially important to identify what additional incentives, motivations, and capacities are needed to undertake large-scale implementation. The roles and motivations of personnel, particularly front-line implementers, are key issues that are often overlooked in the scaling up process. Many small scale interventions are successful because they offer competitive salaries; hire highly motivated, mission driven staff; or provide other non-financial means of reward or recognition. They also often use staff who are not burdened with other multiple tasks and competing demands on their time. For scaling up to be successful, these same conditions need to be replicated at scale, or other ways of dealing with issues of motivation and workload need to be addressed.

Step 3: Implementing the Scaling Up Process

Result: Sustainable provision of services at scale

- ❖ Task 8: Modifying and Strengthening Organizations
- ❖ Task 9: Coordinating Action
- ❖ Task 10: Tracking Performance and Maintaining Momentum

Changes are also needed in other organizations. This includes changes in the attitudes and behaviors of the organization that originated the model, and which now faces the prospect of either expanding itself or handing off its responsibilities to others. If this organization is



responsible for key aspects of the scaling up effort, it must determine what actions are required and how to integrate them into its ongoing programmatic responsibilities.

Transfer of knowledge and know-how³⁴ is one of the most neglected aspects of scaling up. In addition to procedures such as process engineering, developing manuals, and the training of trainers, this often requires a substantial simplification of the model when resources necessary for intensive mentoring and capacity-building are not available. Even when the originating and the adopting organization are one and the same, major organizational obstacles to change are likely, especially when expansion occurs through the creation of new branches.

In replication, transferring the model's technology, processes, and know-how can be particularly difficult if the originating and adopting organizations have differing organizational cultures, values, internal structures, and

*Transfer of knowledge and know-how is one of the
most neglected
aspects of scaling up.*

incentives. In cases where the values and norms of the adopting and originating organizations are dissimilar, part of the scaling up effort requires transforming the model or aligning the values of the organizations so that transfer can occur. This is especially the case when the originating organization is an NGO and the adopting organization is a government agency, given the natural differences between these types of organizations and the history of distrust between governments and NGOs in many countries.

Fortunately, the field of organizational development has a wealth of experience and a wide range of useful tools to aid in this process. W. Warner Burke provides a useful overview of organizational development options and issues,³⁵ and the Institutional Development Framework (referenced above)³⁶ offers a particularly useful toolkit with which to begin. In addition to changes in systems, structures, and procedures, leadership and management face special challenges during scaling up. Coaching and other leadership development programs can be especially helpful during this stressful period.³⁷

³⁴ Regarding technical transfer and change, "knowledge" is used to describe information, processes and procedures that are easily formalized and written down. "Know-how" describes the informal, tacit knowledge needed to make formal knowledge work in actual application.

³⁵ W. Warner Burke, *Organizational Change: Theory and Practice*, Chicago, IL: Sage Publications, 2002.

³⁶ Renzi, *op. cit.*

³⁷ A useful discussion of leadership and management development, and the relationship between leadership and organizational change can be found in: John P. Kotter, *Leading Change*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1996; John M. Bryson, *Strategic Planning Set*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2004; and Warren Bennis, *On Becoming a Leader*, New York: Perseus Press, 2009.



Some of the most effective mechanisms and approaches used for this task include:

- ❖ Apex organizations
- ❖ Future Search conferences and retreats
- ❖ Business process reengineering
- ❖ Leadership development and coaching
- ❖ Comprehensive staff re-training

Each of these processes benefit from the use of independent, third-party facilitators.

As noted earlier in this document, a key lesson in recent years is the critical need to create or strengthen intermediary organizations to facilitate the process of scaling up. The principal reason for this is that the tasks involved in **going to scale** (change management) are distinct from **operating a successful pilot** (innovation) and **operating at scale** (administrative efficiency).

Intermediary organizations are most effective when they can help the government, donor, or originating organization to identify key elements of the model, conduct an environmental scan of similar models, and undertake research and other documentation required for analysis and advocacy.

For Step 2, the most critical role of the intermediary organization is the design and implementation of legitimation and advocacy strategies. The skills required for this undertaking are the ability to identify and liaise with key stakeholders and decision makers, and a sound understanding of current policies, political concerns, and forces. To do so, the organization needs to have convening power and credibility, and be entrepreneurial in identifying organizations/departments that need to be reached in order to win necessary support for the scaling up of a pilot intervention.

Implementation at scale (Step 3) cannot be achieved by fiat. MSI's experience has demonstrated

Skills Needed for an Intermediary Organization

- ❖ Evaluation and Operations Research
- ❖ Documentation
- ❖ Strategic Planning
- ❖ Advocacy and Marketing
- ❖ Knowledge of Political and Institutional Landscape
- ❖ Convening Power
- ❖ Boundary Spanning and Policy Entrepreneurship
- ❖ Knowledge and Technology Transfer
- ❖ Capability Building and Systems Strengthening
- ❖ Process Consulting
- ❖ Organizational Change

the need for various kinds of support to adopting agencies as they transition to new tasks. Once again, an intermediary organization can be essential by focusing on change management, designing strategies for large-scale capacity-building, and monitoring and evaluating the scaling up process and scaled up intervention. The originating organization typically does not have the



skills or mandate to perform these functions, and the adopting organization often does not have the spare capacity or adequate knowledge of the original model.

Because funders and policy makers place such heavy emphasis on innovation, the “nuts and bolts” of scaling up are often overlooked or under-emphasized. Our research and experience suggest the need for a policy reversal whereby the principal focus is not on innovation *per se*, but on the operational dimensions of scaling up a successful innovation. This would lead almost certainly to an intensified focus on, and support for, intermediary organizations.

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 8:

- ❖ What needs to be done to encourage and assist the originating organization to relinquish control and make the changes necessary for the successful transfer and scaling up of the model?
- ❖ What changes need to be made in the adopting organization?
- ❖ Which organization(s) are responsible for the transfer process and what changes do they need in their own capacity—structure, staffing, or operations—to do this successfully?

Task 8 includes developing and executing institutional capacity-building and organizational development plans for all organizations with major roles to play in either the scaling up process or subsequent efforts to operate at scale.

Task 9: Coordinate Action

Task 9 focuses on establishing and applying multi-organizational management processes, coordination mechanisms, and accountability procedures to ensure that decisions are translated into concrete actions.

Because scaling up demands engagement from multiple agencies and institutions across sectors, processes need to go beyond top-down “command and control” management approaches. This requires coordination among organizations that are not in the habit of working with one another, and the development management literature provides some useful guidance on the subject of multi-party programming and interorganizational coordination. George Honadle and Lauren Cooper’s deconstruction of the term “coordination” is particularly relevant to the situation faced by many scaling up efforts. They distinguish between four aspects or approaches to coordination—sharing information, sharing resources, joint planning, and joint action—and argue that

Task 9 includes the instituting of action plans, coordinating mechanisms, and governance procedures for the scaling up activity and for operating at scale.



(1) coordination is by its nature very time consuming, and (2) each of the four approaches is successively more difficult.³⁸ The operational implications for those implementing scaling up programs are to limit, where possible, the extent of coordination that is necessary; favor less complex forms of coordination; and ensure that the responsibilities and resources for coordination are clearly established.

Since coordination and cooperation take time, cost money, and entail a loss of autonomy by participating organizations, these efforts only succeed when perceived benefits outweigh costs for the organizations involved. As a practical matter, this puts a premium on tangible incentives for working together and penalties for the failure to do so.

Particularly when a coalition, network, or working group forms to support or oversee the scaling up process, tools like Organizational Responsibility Charts are helpful for disentangling the respective roles of individuals and groups. Preparing the chart offers a systematic way of brokering agreements about the major activities to be done and clarifies for each activity: who must approve it; who is responsible for executing it; who should be providing tangible support; and who needs to be kept informed.³⁹ While the matrix can be completed by one or more analysts, it is most effective when used interactively by directly affected parties as a way to clarify and streamline their working relationships.

In scaling up pilot activities, Task 9 includes the implementation actions necessary to successfully transfer the model to others, as well as those needed for operating at scale.

The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 9:

- ❖ Are action plans and budgets in place for implementing the scaling up effort and, if not, what more needs to be done?
- ❖ Have responsibilities been clearly allocated and efficient mechanisms established for coordinating the scaling up effort?
- ❖ If more than one organization is involved, who will be responsible for monitoring these efforts and resolving any conflicts?

Task 9 includes establishing action plans, coordinating mechanisms, and governance procedures for the scaling up activity and for operating at scale.

³⁸ George Honadle and Lauren Cooper, "Beyond Coordination and Control: An Interorganizational Approach to Structural Adjustment, Service Delivery and Natural Resource Management," *World Development* 10 (1989): 1531-1541.

³⁹ See TOOLKIT for links to additional information about Organizational Responsibility Charts.



Task 10: Track Performance and Maintain Momentum

Often, innovations lose their impact as they go to scale. This can result from diluting the fidelity of the original model or from unforeseen problems in applying it more broadly. For these reasons, it is important to track changes in outcomes associated with introducing the new model, and to make adjustments if the results differ from what was intended. Particularly important to assess are any effects associated with changes in the model itself, changes in the venue or social context in which it is applied, or changes in the people providing the services. Ideally, such monitoring and evaluation begins early in the process with baseline assessments of the effectiveness of the pilot project during Step 1. In some but not all cases, this assessment can be incorporated into the government's ongoing monitoring, oversight, and evaluation systems.

In addition, there is a need to monitor the implementation of the scaling up process. Besides the usual requirements for sound project management, such studies need to anticipate the questions and concerns of the broader audience involved in approving, funding, and implementing the scaling up process. This puts a particular premium on conducting monitoring and evaluation in a credible, public, and transparent manner, and there is considerable value in involving independent third parties in this effort. This monitoring is a catalyst for maintaining momentum and accountability, and for keeping the scaling up process on track following the adage, "what gets monitored gets done."

For this reason, Task 10 includes creating multiple avenues for feeding this information back to the public and to decision makers, and for ensuring that it is widely discussed. The press, academia, and non-partisan monitoring organizations can play important roles in this process.

It is important to track the effects of introducing the new model and to make adjustments if the results differ from what was intended.

Such monitoring begins by outlining a list of stages or milestone events in the scaling up process and a limited number of expected outcomes. This disaggregates the change process into "units" that are more easily understood and tracked, and helps managers to better analyze the monitoring and evaluation information that is collected.

Some of the approaches and techniques used for this task include:

- ❖ Citizen oversight panels
- ❖ Public hearings
- ❖ Blue-ribbon panels
- ❖ International monitoring groups
- ❖ Listservs and other web-based, open-access dissemination
- ❖ Third-party monitoring and evaluation contracts
- ❖ Comparative scorecards
- ❖ Sustained media coverage



The following questions should be addressed when beginning Task 10:

- ❖ Are there adequate procedures for documenting the progress, lessons learned, and impacts of the scaling up effort?
- ❖ What mechanisms will most effectively ensure that this information is fed back to key stakeholders and the broader public, and used to make necessary course corrections?



Chapter 4: Lessons Learned

A number of lessons learned have emerged in the course of applying the SUM FRAMEWORK and TOOLKIT for almost a decade. Many of these lessons are reflected in the latest versions of the framework and tools themselves. Among others, we would like to draw particular attention to the following:

Lesson 1: Simplify

The more one can simplify a model without losing the basis of its effectiveness, the more feasible it is to scale it up. This reverses the logic of most pilot projects, which **add** elements in an effort to maximize effectiveness. More generally, there is a strong reluctance on the part of most organizations to simplify, repackage, or relinquish control over their models for the purposes of scaling them up.

Lesson 2: Governance Matters

Transferring responsibility to and from government, or between levels of government, is dependent on the particularities of governance in specific localities, states, and countries. These dynamics are further complicated where there is a history of mistrust between the government, NGOs, and the private sector. Transferring responsibilities to and from government to an NGO is also heavily dependent on the details of governance in particular localities and made more difficult when there is a level of distrust between NGOs and government.

Lesson 3: Prioritize Intermediation

“Innovation” is currently over-funded relative to investments in scaling up successful innovations. In many cases, there is a conspicuous lack of **intermediary organizations** with the skills, mandate, and motivation to help organizations scale up successfully, and a shortage of donors willing to fund the scaling up process. Support for intermediary organizations should be a growing area of concern and emphasis.

Lesson 4: Avoid Common Pitfalls

Going to scale is particularly difficult when models:

- ❖ Lack credible documentation of impact
- ❖ Do not include a technological innovation
- ❖ Are value-laden or process intensive
- ❖ Are replacements or substitutes for government services rather than innovations in service delivery
- ❖ Are not easily grafted onto existing services
- ❖ Do not have a dedicated funding source or other means of generating revenue



Lesson 5: Plan Backwards

If planners and implementers are intent on reaching scale, they need to:

- ❖ Begin with an eye on scale and a strategy for achieving it
- ❖ Be strategic in the design/selection of the model and its testing
- ❖ Invest heavily in information
- ❖ Focus early on unit costs and implications for current service providers

Lesson 6: Tailor Evidence to the Audience

Data from pilot projects are rarely tailored to the decision criteria or decision-making styles of policymakers. Data on effectiveness is often necessary, but usually not sufficient. It is important that information be demand driven and those providing it be prepared to experiment with content, style, and format until they get it right.

Lesson 7: Begin Advocacy and Ownership Early

The chances for taking an innovation to scale are substantially increased by:

- ❖ Creating a multi-stakeholder team if possible
- ❖ Establishing an advisory board or some sort of mechanism to develop buy-in from key decision makers/adopters
- ❖ Setting up partnerships or collaborative mechanisms with potentially competing models

Lesson 8: Focus on Systems and Incentives

For sustainable change to occur, it is essential to understand and replicate the incentives that contributed to the success of the innovation or to make sure that an alternative incentive system is in place to reinforce needed actions. Changes in rules, regulations, and procedures are often necessary to achieve this.

Lesson 9: Educate Funders on Scaling Up Realities

Going to scale takes time, money, resources, and capacity/skills that are often greater than the pilot. The average time for scaling up a pilot to national application is **15 years**. Securing and maintaining the needed commitment and resources over this period calls for tangible milestones, strategic communications, and an explicit strategy for maintaining momentum.

Lesson 10: Provide for Multi-Stage Monitoring

It is essential to monitor and report on both the scaling up process and on implementation at scale. The monitoring and reporting process can and should be used as part of an ongoing strategy to maintain political and popular support and funding.



Chapter 5: Conclusion

Scaling up is drawing the attention of a widening circle of donors, philanthropists, governments, NGOs, activists, and researchers as growing concerns emerge regarding the challenge of reaching large numbers of those in need. Despite this growing interest and an expanding array of documented cases, relatively little evidence-based guidance exists about how to maximize prospects for new and innovative service delivery models to achieve scale.

Written primarily for officials charged with making funding decisions and implementing programs, this paper seeks to provide concrete advice derived from theory and practice. It is intended to inform decisions regarding:

- ❖ Selecting projects with the potential to go to scale
- ❖ Designing projects to maximize their scalability
- ❖ Managing the scaling up process

The SUM FRAMEWORK presented in this publication is organized as a series of steps and tasks based on the conviction that scaling up **can** be successfully managed. It is our hope that the development and humanitarian communities will in future years be filled with a growing number of entrepreneurial idealists who are able to bring ever-increasing professionalism to the scaling up process.



Annex 1: Steps, Tasks, and Questions for Developing and Implementing a Detailed Scaling Up Plan

Step 1: Develop a Scaling Up Plan

Task 1: Create a Vision

- ◆ What organizational, process, and technical factors were critical to success on a pilot-scale?
- ◆ Can the model be simplified without undermining its effectiveness? Is it absolutely necessary to replicate all elements of the model on a large scale?
- ◆ Does the organization that carried out the pilot project have the desire and organizational capacity to expand its operations and deliver services on a substantially larger scale?
- ◆ If not, which organization(s) are best suited and motivated to implement the model on a scaled up basis or to serve as partners in implementing the model?
- ◆ Should the scaling up effort include policy change by the government or rely exclusively on voluntary adoption by private and non-governmental organizations?
- ◆ Is there a need for one or more intermediary organizations to support the scaling up process? If so, what help is needed and which organizations are best suited to performing these roles?
- ◆ Along what dimension(s) should scaling up take place?
- ◆ What would scaling up look like if it were successful?

Task 2: Assess Scalability

- ◆ Do relevant stakeholders, potential partners, and intended beneficiaries perceive a need for this kind of model?
- ◆ Has the model been documented, including the process component, and has its cost-effectiveness been objectively assessed? Does the evidence indicate that the model is more cost-effective than other approaches?
- ◆ Are there obvious economies or diseconomies of scale?
- ◆ How easily can institutional characteristics that were key to the outcomes achieved be replicated or enlarged?
- ◆ Is there anything special or unique about the social or political context, or general circumstances of the pilot project (e.g., cultural, ethnic, or religious values/characteristics; distribution of power; homogeneity; economic conditions) that would need to be present for the model to be replicated successfully?



- ◆ Does the adopting organization have the appropriate organizational and implementation capacity, or the means to develop that capacity?
- ◆ Does needed funding exist to replicate the model on a large scale?
- ◆ Are the central mission, organizational culture, and values of the proposed adopting organization sufficiently compatible with those necessary to adopt and implement the model successfully?

Task 3: Fill Information Gaps

- ◆ What additional information or documentation is needed as a basis for planning and to address stakeholder concerns?

Task 4: Prepare a Scaling Up Plan

- ◆ Does the plan summarize the need, vision, and evidence for scaling up the model?
- ◆ Does the plan include a clear description of proposed actions, timetables, roles, responsibilities, and resources?

Step 2: Establish the Pre-Conditions for Scaling Up

Task 5: Legitimize Change

- ◆ What more needs to be done to persuade relevant decision makers, funders, and opinion leaders that new solutions are necessary and desirable?
- ◆ What more needs to be done to persuade relevant decision makers, funders, and opinion leaders that the proposed model is successful, cost-effective, and feasible?
- ◆ Which spokespersons, conveners, messages, and methods are most likely to have an impact on these audiences?

Task 6: Build a Constituency

- ◆ Which organizations, organizational units, or individuals are responsible for key decisions regarding the funding and implementation of scaling up? Who has the authority to make decisions within these organizations?
- ◆ What arguments, appeals, or advocacy strategies are likely to have access and be persuasive to these decision makers?
- ◆ What are the most effective networks and alliances for carrying out this advocacy, and how can they be most efficiently mobilized and organized?
- ◆ How can buy-in from the leadership and staff of potential implementing organizations best be achieved?

Task 7: Realign and Mobilize Resources

- ◆ What additional human, institutional, and financial resources will be needed to support the process of “going to scale,” and what needs to be done to ensure these resources are available?
- ◆ What human, institutional, and financial resources will be needed for “operating at scale,” and what needs to be done to ensure these resources are available?
- ◆ What new partnerships will need to be established, if any?



Step 3: Implementing the Scaling Up Process

Task 8: Modify Organizational Structures

- ◆ What needs to be done to encourage and assist the originating organization to relinquish control and make the changes necessary for the successful transfer and scaling up of the model?
- ◆ What changes need to be made in the adopting organization?
- ◆ Which organizations are responsible for the transfer process and what changes do they need in their own capacity—structure, staffing, or operations—to do this successfully?

Task 9: Coordinate Action

- ◆ Are action plans and budgets in place for implementing the scaling up effort and, if not, what more needs to be done?
- ◆ Have responsibilities been clearly allocated and efficient mechanisms established to coordinate the scaling up effort?
- ◆ If more than one organization is involved, who will be responsible for monitoring these efforts and resolving any conflicts?

Task 10: Track Performance and Maintain Momentum

- ◆ Are there adequate procedures for documenting the progress, lessons learned, and impact of the scaling up effort?
- ◆ What mechanisms will most effectively ensure that this information is fed back to key stakeholders and the broader public, and used to make necessary course corrections?



Annex 2: Useful Tools for Planning and Implementing a Scaling Up Strategy

Tools and Guides

SCALING UP STEPS	SUB-TASKS	ASSOCIATED TOOLS AND GUIDES
Step 1: Develop a Scaling Up Plan	❖ Create a Vision ❖ Assess Scalability ❖ Fill Information Gaps ❖ Prepare Scaling Up Plan	❖ Model Mapping ❖ Tool 1: Reverse LogFrame ❖ Tool 2: Visual Mapping ❖ Tool 3: Model Profile ❖ Tool 4: Evidence Standards ❖ Assessing Feasibility ❖ Tool 5: Methods Screen ❖ Tool 6: Scalability Assessment
Step 2: Establish Pre-Conditions for Scaling Up	❖ Legitimize Change ❖ Build a Constituency ❖ Mobilize Resources	❖ Mobilizing Support ❖ Tool 7: Stakeholder Analysis ❖ Tool 8: Network Mapping ❖ Tool 9: Force Field Analysis ❖ Tool 10: Advocacy Strategy Profile: Part I ❖ Tool 11: Advocacy Strategy Profile: Part II ❖ Mobilizing Resources ❖ Tool 12: Cost Analysis Manual
Step 3: Manage the Scaling Up Process	❖ Modify and Strengthen Organization(s) ❖ Coordinate Action ❖ Track Performance and Maintain Momentum	❖ Strengthen Organizations ❖ Tool 13: Institutional Development Framework ❖ Coordinate Key Actors ❖ Tool 14: Organizational Responsibility Chart ❖ Information Procedures and Protocols ❖ Tool 15: Monitoring & Evaluation Guidelines



Sources

Ashman, Darcy. "Closing the Gap between Promise and Practice: A Framework for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating Social Development Networks." Unpublished, Mimeo.

Bennis, Warren. *On Becoming a Leader*. New York: Perseus Press, 2003.

Blackburn, James, Robert Chambers, and John Gaventa. "Mainstreaming Participation in Development." Operations Evaluation Department (OED) Working Paper Services No. 10, World Bank, 2000. <http://wordbank.org/html/oed>

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. "Policy Characteristics Analysis." Implementing Policy Change Technical Note 6, Management Systems International, 1994.
www.msiworldwide.com/project/implementing-policy-change/

Brinkerhoff, D. and B. Crosby. *Managing Policy Reform: Concepts and Tools for Decision-Makers in Developing and Transitioning Countries*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc., 2002.

Bryson, John M. *Strategic Planning Set*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Burke, W. Warner. *Organizational Change: Theory and Practice*. Chicago, IL: Sage Publications, 2002.

Care-India. *Integrated Nutrition and Health Project II INHP-II Replication Strategy Guide*, 2001.

Chandy, L. and J. Linn. "Taking Development Activities to Scale in Fragile and Low Capacity Environments," Brookings Global Working Papers No. 41, Brookings Institution, 2011.

Cooley, Larry. "Uses and Limitations of Projects as Instruments of Change." Unpublished, Management Systems International, 1992.

Cooley, Larry. "The Logical Framework: Program Design for Program Results." *The Entrepreneurial Economy* July/August (1989): 8–15.

Crosby, Benjamin L. "Management and the Environment for Implementation of Policy Change: Part Two." Implementing Policy Change Technical Note 5, Management Systems International, 1992.

Crosby, Benjamin L. "Stakeholder Analysis: A Vital Tool for Strategic Managers." Implementing Policy Change Technical Note 2, Management Systems International and USAID, 1991. www.msiworldwide.com/project/implementing-policy-change/



DeJong, Jocelyn. "NGO Experiences of Scaling Up HIV/AIDS Programs." Presentation at World Bank Workshop on Orphans and Vulnerable Children, May 2003.

ExpandNet, *Scaling Up Health Interventions*, <http://www.expandnet.net/>

Ford Foundation. "Asset Building for Social Change: Pathways to Large-Scale Impact," 2006.
http://www.fordfound.org/publications/recent_articles/asset_pathways.cfm

Fujimoto, G., and Y. Villanueva. "Going to Scale: The Peruvian Experience." Unpublished paper prepared for the Second Interagency Meeting on Community-Based Child Development, 1984.

Goff, B. "Mastering the Craft of Scaling Up in Colombia." *Grassroots Development* 14, no. 1(1990): 12–22.

Haaga, John G. and Rushikesh M. Maaru. "The Effects of Operations Research on Program Changes in Bangladesh." *Studies in Family Planning* 27, no. 2 (March–April 1996): 76–87.

Hartmann, A. and J. Linn. "Scaling Up: A Framework and Lessons for Development Effectiveness From Literature and Practice." Wolfensohn Center for Development Working Papers no. 5, Brookings Institution, 2008.

Hall, C. S. and G. Lindzey. *Theories of Personality*, 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Honadle, George and Lauren Cooper. "Beyond Coordination and Control: An Interorganizational Approach to Structural Adjustment, Service Delivery and Natural Resource Management." *World Development* 10 (1989):1531–1541.

Kohl, Richard and Iwere Ngozi. "Scaling Up the Community Life Project: Applying the MSI Scaling Up Framework to a Community-based Approach to Health Education in Nigeria." Paper presented at the American Public Health Association, Philadelphia, PA, December 10-14, 2005.

Korten, F. F. and R. Y. Siy, Jr., eds. "Sharing Experiences—Examples of Participatory Approaches in Philippines Communal Irrigation Projects" in *Transforming Bureaucracy: the Experience of the Philippine National Irrigation Administration*. West Hartford, CT: Kumerian Press, 1988.
<http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0215.htm>

Kotter, John P. *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1996.

Levine, Ruth. *Millions Saved: Proven Successes in Global Health*. Washington, D.C: Center for Global Development, 2004.



- Levy, Santiago. *Progress Against Poverty: Sustaining Mexico's Progresa-Opportunidades Program*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2006.
- Linn, Johannes, ed., "Scaling Up in Agriculture, Rural Development, and Nutrition." Policy briefs, International Food Policy Research Institute, 2012.
- Linn, Johannes. "Scaling Up With Aid: The Institutional Dimension" in H. Kharas, K. Makino, and W. Jung, eds. *Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution.
- Management Systems International. *Scaling Up--From Vision to Large-Scale Change: Tools and Techniques for Practitioners*. Washington, D.C., 2012.
- Management Systems International. "Implementing Policy Change Series." www.msiworldwide.com/project/implementing-policy-change/
- Management Systems International. "Organizational Responsibility Charts." MSI technical note, unpublished, 1990.
- Management Systems International. "Scaling Up Case Studies." Unpublished, 2007.
- Community-Based Approach to Health Education (Community Life Project), Nigeria, 2007.
 - Public-Private Partnership for National Scaling Up of Improved Sexual Education Curriculum, Mexico, 2007.
 - Multi-Party Alliance to Improve Sexual Education for Indian Populations through Teacher Training, 2007.
 - Training village health workers to provide home-base neonatal care (SEARCH), India, 2007.
 - Training of primary health care physician in Emergency Obstetric and Gynecological Care (FOGSI), 2007.
 - Reproductive Health of Married Adolescent Girls (IHMP), 2007.
- McCoy, Martha L. and Patrick L. Sully. "Deliberative Dialogue to Expand Civic Engagement." *Civic Review* 91, no. 2 (2002).
- Patham, Indira Kranthi, *Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty*, <http://www.serp.ap.gov.in/SHG/aboutus.jsp>
- Prahalad, C. K. *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*. Philadelphia, PA: Wharton School of Publishing, 2004.
- Renzi, Mark. "An Integrated Toolkit for Institutional Development." *Public Administration and Development*. Vol. 16 (1996): 469–483.
- Samoff, Joel, Molapi Sebatane, and Martial Dembele. "Going to Scale by Scaling to Go: Nurturing the Local Roots of Education Innovation in Africa." Paper presented



at the African Studies Association Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., November 17-20, 2005.

Shiffman, Jeremy. "Generating Political Will for Safe Motherhood in Indonesia." *Social Science and Medicine* 56 (2003): 1197–1207.

Shiffman, Jeremy, Cynthia Stanton, and Patricia Salazar. "The Emergence of Political Priority for Safe Motherhood in Honduras." *Health Policy and Planning* 19, no.6 (2004).

Simmons, Ruth, Joseph Brown, and Margarita Diaz. "Facilitating Large-Scale Transitions to Quality of Care: An Idea Whose Time Has Come." *Studies in Family Planning* 33, no. 1 (2002): 61–75.

Simmons, Ruth and Jeremy Shiffman. *Scaling Up Health Service Innovations: A Framework for Action*. Unpublished, 2005.

Simmons, Ruth and Jeremy Shiffman, "Scaling-up Reproductive Health Service Innovations: A Conceptual Framework." Paper prepared for the Bellagio Conference: From Pilot Projects to Policies and Programs, March 21 – April 5, 2003.

Swaminathan, M.S. *From Green to Evergreen Revolution: Indian Agriculture: Performance and Emerging Challenges*. Concord, MA: Paul & Company Publishers Consortium, 2010.

TheMSIWorld (2012, November 29). Scaling Up Excerpt from COMET Video, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UNJkKemni0>.

Uvin, Peter, Pankaj S. Jain, and David L. Brown. "Scaling Up NGO Programs in India: Strategies and Debates" in "IDR Reports: A Continuing Series of Occasional Papers." *Institute for Development Research* 16, no. 6 (2000).

Uvin, Peter, Pankaj S. Jain, and David L. Brown. "Think Large and Act Small: Towards a New Paradigm for NGO Scaling Up." *World Development* 28, no. 8 (2000).

USAID Office of Innovation and Development Alliances. "Tools for Alliance Builders." Available at: <http://idea.usaid.gov/gp/tools-alliance-builders>

Ved, Rajani R., "Scaling-up ICDS: Can Universalization Address Persistent Malnutrition?" in "Lifting the Curse: Overcoming Persistent Undernutrition in India," ed. L. Haddad and S. Zeitlyn, *Institute of Development Studies Bulletin* 40, no. 4 (2009): 53–60.

Vondal, Patricia, et. al. "How Can Research Influence Policy Change? Evidence from Africa." *Implementing Policy Change Series*, November 1998.



- Weinstein, Liza. "Diffusion of Innovation." Unpublished memo, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, October 29, 2004.
- Weinstein, Liza. "Diffusion of Programmatic and Policy Innovation." Unpublished memo, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, December 15, 2004.
- Weisbord, Marvin R. and Sandra Janoff. *Future Search: An Action Guide to Finding Common Ground in Organizations and Communities*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 1995.
- World Bank. "Scaling Up the Impact of Good Practices in Rural Development: A Working Paper to Support Implementation of the World Bank's Rural Development Strategy." Agriculture and Rural Development Department, Report Number 26301, June 2003.
[http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/ardext.nsf/11ByDocName/ScalingUptheImpactofGoodPracticesinRuralDevelopment/\\$FILE/Scale-up-final_formatted.pdf](http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/ardext.nsf/11ByDocName/ScalingUptheImpactofGoodPracticesinRuralDevelopment/$FILE/Scale-up-final_formatted.pdf).
- William Zartman. "The Timing of Peace Initiatives: Hurting Stalemates and Ripe Moments." In *Contemporary Peacemaking: Conflict, Violence and Peace Processes*, edited by John Darby and Roger MacGinty. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.



Founded in 1981, MSI is an 800-person international development consulting firm located in Washington, D.C., serving clients worldwide. MSI provides management consulting services to governments, local organizations, foundations, corporations, and international donor agencies in more than fifty countries. In 2008, MSI was acquired by Coffey International and now forms part of the Coffey family with offices in fourteen countries around the world.