GLOBAL ECONOMY & DEVELOPMENT
WORKING PAPER 101 | MARCH 2017

Global Economy and Development at BROOKINGS

SCALING UP THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS

LESSONS FROM A REVIEW OF UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMS

Miliça Begovic
Johannes F. Linn
Rastislav Vrbensky

B | Global Economy and Development
at BROOKINGS

Miliça Begovic is Knowledge and Innovation Team Leader at the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub for Europe and CIS

Johannes F. Linn is Non-Resident Senior Fellow at Brookings

Rastislav Vrbensky is the UNDP Deputy Regional Director for Europe and CIS

Authors' note:
This paper benefitted from inputs of the many country team members in the UNDP Cairo, Chisinau, Dushanbe and Sarajevo Country Offices. All their support is gratefully acknowledged. Larry Cooley and Ruth Simmons provided valuable peer review comments.

The views expressed in this paper are exclusively those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions they are affiliated with.

Abstract:

This paper reports on a review of whether and how the programs and projects supported by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in four countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Moldova, and Tajikistan) apply a systematic approach to scaling up in pursuit of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The paper applies an operational framework consisting of six basic questions: (i) Is there a pathway to scale? (ii) What is the problem to be solved, the vision and target of scale? (iii) What ideas, innovations or models are to be scaled up? (iv) How can the enabling conditions (drivers and spaces) be put in place? (v) How about the sequencing of key steps? (vi) Does monitoring and evaluation support learning for scaling up? The paper concludes that many of UNDP's programs and projects pursue pathways to scale, but that overall a more systematic operational approach along the lines suggested in this paper would be desirable.

SCALING UP THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS:

LESSONS FROM A REVIEW OF UNDP COUNTRY PROGRAMS

Miliça Begovic
Johannes F. Linn
Rastislav Vrbensky

INTRODUCTION

With the approval in 2015 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Addis Ababa Finance for Development agreement, and the Paris Climate Change Conference (COP21) agreements on climate change it is essential for development agencies to explore how best to support the achievement of the ambitious targets contained in these epochal international agreements. A key question that needs to be addressed is how current development projects and programs can best be structured so that they systematically help develop and implement pathways towards the global targets, appropriately adapted to particular country contexts. The answer to this question can be found in developing and implementing a systematic approach to scale up successful and impactful development interventions, projects and programs so that they effectively bridge the "missing middle" between individual projects and long-term goals. (Linn 2015a)

Fortunately, over the last decade the scaling up agenda has received increased attention in many development institutions, including in the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). However, much needs to be done to assure that scaling up in support of the SDGs and other global targets is effectively aided by the international development community at the global, national and local levels.

This paper summarizes the findings of a review of UNDP's experience with scaling up development impact in four of its country programs (Egypt, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova and Tajikistan). It concludes that while scaling up is now part of UNDP's corporate strategy, a more systematic operational approach to scaling up in its country programs will be important, if UNDP is to play the critical transformational role in helping to achieve the SDGs that it has assigned to itself.

This paper builds on earlier work on scaling up development impact carried out in Brookings over the last ten years, including a survey of the literature and practice of scaling up under the auspices of the Wolfensohn Center for Development at Brookings (Hartmann and Linn 2008) and a review of the UNDP country program in Tajikistan. (Linn 2012a).[1] The current paper draws on the results of a UNDP-sponsored study that provided and tested an analytical framework for assessing whether and how scaling up has been addressed in the

design and assessment of specific UNDP projects and programs and in the design and assessment of scaling up in UNDP's country programs as a whole. The study also provided detailed recommendations to UNDP country teams and management to help them reinforce their efforts in effectively supporting the scaling up of development impact.[2]

Following this introduction, the paper first reviews the corporate-level approach to scaling up in UNDP. It then briefly summarizes the analytical approach taken in the study to scaling up and the approach taken to assessing UNDP's scaling up experience. The next section then provides the core of the evidence on how effectively UNDP supported the development of pathways to scale in its projects and programs. This is followed by a brief review of the extent to which scaling up was reflected in the country program papers (i.e., country strategy statements) of UNDP in the four case study countries. The last section summarizes the findings of the study and the lessons learned for UNDP and for the development community more generally.

SCALING UP IN UNDP'S CORPORATE STRATEGY AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

At the corporate level, UNDP has focused on scaling up for some years. Most recently, UNDP's *Strategic Plan 2014-17: Changing with the World* (UNDP 2013a) has an explicit focus on scaling up. Under the heading of *"Our Approach to Institutional Change"* the strategy states that: *"Innovation, replication opportunities and lessons learned will be explicitly considered in programme development, management and review so that results achieved with assistance from UNDP can be sustained over the long term. Scaling-up strategies will be an essential aspect, to ensure better coverage and impact of development innovations. Together with the emphasis on sustainable results, this will not just mean designing successful projects to operate on a larger scale but also strengthening, in parallel, national, regional and subregional policies, skills base, financing strategies and institutional capacities."* (p. 53)

The *Strategic Plan 2014-17* further mentions scaling up in connection with specific areas of engagement, including *"to test and scale-up public-private initiatives that can increase employment and livelihoods opportunities using production technologies that are sustainable and markets that are inclusive*," (p. 24), "*to find and scale-up inclusive market-based solutions to achieving universal, affordable and clean energy access, especially to off-grid sources of renewable energy*," (p. 25) and to "*finance the scaling-up of promising ideas*." (p. 40)

The UNDP's *Alignment Handbook* (UNDP 2014), which provides guidance for the implementation of the Strategic Plan, frequently refers to scaling and sustainability as key elements of the Strategic Plan and devotes a page to the practical implementation of a scaling up approach.

UNDP's *Guidance Note* (UNDP 2013b) on scaling up, posted in January 2013, provides an excellent introduction and high-level guidance for how to apply a scaling up approach in UNDP programs. In connection with and based on the Guidance Note, UNDP also issued a two-page pamphlet for use by UNDP country teams entitled *Programme Design Questions for Scaling Up.* This pamphlet contains a definition of scaling up for UNDP, a set of useful guiding questions for program design, and a helpful list of references.[3] More recent internal operational guidance and project review documents for UNDP staff are less helpful when it comes to scaling up. They either make no reference to scaling up or mention scaling up only in passing, but offer no guidance on how to apply these ratings in practice. Moreover, operational staff in the UNDP country offices who were interviewed for this study generally were not aware of the Guidance Note or the Programme Design Question for Scaling Up document.

Finally, UNDP's *Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* (UNDP 2009), which represents a guide to UNDP's evaluation activity, included scaling up as one of the key criteria for evaluating development results, along with relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, etc. by highlighting the need to assess *"key drivers or factors enabling successful, sustained and scaled-up development initiatives, alternative options and comparative advantages of UNDP."* (p. 9) It also noted that "*evaluation of pilot initiatives is a must before such initiatives are replicated or scaled up. Lessons on what has and has not worked should inform the replication process. Again, good documentation of lessons and their internalization in the replication and upscaling processes will help UNDP and its partners ensure that mistakes are not repeated."*

(p. 183) A *Companion Guide to the Handbook* (UNDP 2011) adds specific questions regarding scaling up to the matrix of standard evaluation criteria and questions of the heading of "Sustainability": *"How has UNDP approached the scaling up of successful pilot initiatives and catalytic projects? Has the government taken on these initiatives? Have donors stepped in to scale up initiatives? What actions have been taken to scale up the project if it is a pilot initiative?"* (p. 34)

With these documents to guide UNDP staff in pursuing scaling up, the question is whether front-line teams have actually utilized the guidance and whether scaling up is systematically pursued in UNDP country programs.

THE APPROACH TO ASSESSING SCALING UP IN UNDP'S COUNTRY PROGRAMS

The assessment of the UNDP country programs in this paper draws on a methodology developed in the context of the Brookings work on scaling up.[4] It starts with the recognition that transformational change needed to achieve the SDGs requires an iterative process of innovation, learning and scaling up, where scaling up is defined as "expanding, adapting and sustaining impactful policies, programs or projects in different places and over time to reach a greater number of people." (adapted from Hartmann and Linn, 2008)

Starting with a development problem and vision of scale (e.g., a particular SDG in a particular country), alternative solutions need to be tested for impact and scalability. And then a scaling up pathway needs to be designed and implemented to ensure that benefits of the intervention achieve maximum reach. A key consideration in exploring scalability and designing a scaling up pathway is what enabling conditions—i.e., what forces that will drive the process forward, and what spaces that have to be created (or barriers to be removed) to allow an initiative to grow (see Box 1)—need to be put in place to assure that scaling up actually happens. Scaling up may be horizontal (i.e., extend by replication or diffusion to more people), vertical (i.e., lead to broader impact through institutional and policy reform), or functional (i.e., extend to more areas of engagement). In practice all three forms of scaling up need to be combined and properly sequenced. And throughout the pathway to scale it is essential to monitor and evaluate impact and progress with the scaling up process, and to ensure that learning is fed back to adapt the design of the intervention and of the scaling up pathway as appropriate.[5]

Based on this approach, the study developed a set of questions to assess how scaling up has been pursued by UNDP program teams. The study also tested the suitability of the approach as a potential operational tool for UNDP that can be used to design scaling up pathways and monitor their implementation. In essence, the approach consists of addressing six basic questions:

Box 1. Enabling conditions: "Drivers" and "spaces" for scaling up

Drivers

- ideas/solutions
- vision of scale
- leadership/champions
- market or community demand
- incentives and accountability
- external catalysts

Spaces

- fiscal/financial/costs
- political/ownership
- policies, laws and regulations
- organizational/institutional
- natural resources
- culture
- security (in fragile states)
- partnership
- learning

Source: Adapted from Hartmann and Linn (2008)

1. Is there a pathway to scale?
2. What is the problem to be solved, the vision and target of scale?
3. What ideas, innovations or models are to be scaled up?
4. How can the necessary enabling conditions (drivers and spaces) be put in place?
5. How about the sequencing of key steps?
6. Does M&E support learning for scaling up?

Building on these six basic questions, a more detailed set of questions was developed (see Annex A) and tested in scaling up reviews of UNDP programs in four countries: Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH), Egypt, Moldova, and Tajikistan. One of the authors visited each country for three to five days[6] and met with the UNDP country management teams, with program and project team leaders, and with selected local stakeholders and partners. A total of 29 programs and projects were reviewed, 20 of these in some depth and nine more high-level.

The principal areas covered by these projects are:

- Local and community governance and local area development (11 programs/ projects in all four countries)
- Energy and environment, including bio-energy, energy efficiency, etc. (5 programs/projects in all four counties)
- Disaster risk management (2 programs/projects in Moldova and Tajikistan)
- Legal and judicial reform, including access to justice and civil registration (2 programs/projects in BiH and Tajikistan)
- HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria (2 programs in BiH and Tajikistan)
- Governance (1 program in Moldova)
- Other areas (6 programs/projects), including ICT in Egypt, FGM (female genital mutilation) in Egypt, innovation lab and career development (Syslab) in Moldova, confidence building for Transnistria in Moldova, and border management in Tajikistan/ Afghanistan

Selected project examples are referred to in the text of this article and in text boxes, where appropriate.

For each in-depth program or project review, the authors carried out semi-structured interviews with program teams, lasting 60-90 minutes, using the questionnaire contained in Annex A. Based on the interviews and on a review of available program and project documents, the authors prepared four detailed country case study reports for review and comment by the country program teams, to allow for correction of errors of fact or interpretation. The findings in this paper are based on these reports.[7]

FINDINGS OF THE SCALING UP REVIEW OF PATHWAYS IN UNDP'S PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

Based on the approach and the results of the country case studies described in the preceding section, the main elements of the scaling up pathways in UNDP's programs and projects in the four countries under review can be summarized as follows.

The overall scaling up pathway

UNDP programs and projects generally have performed well in terms of their pursuit of an overall scaling up pathway, since the great majority of them include a clear focus on scaling up with continuous and long-term engagement by UNDP in key operational areas. Although, as we shall see below, the approach to scaling up is not systematic and consistent in all relevant dimensions of our assessment framework, UNDP program and project management teams have a mindset where a focus on scaling up is a key ingredient of the development approach pursued.

Projects and programs typically combine aspects of a more deliberate longer-term planning approach with a more exploratory, continuously adjusting approach, akin to "crossing the river by feeling the stones." Some projects, including the Tajikistan Access to Justice and Rule of Law Program (A2J/RoL), Moldova Biomass Project and the HIV/AIDS programs in BiH and Tajikistan, followed a scaling up approach more along the lines of the former, deliberate planning approach (see Box 2 for brief program descriptions), while most of the other programs (including the area development programs in all four countries) unfolded more along the lines of the latter, more exploratory approach.

In many of its programs and projects, UNDP supported the development of strategies or action plans, or it built on strategies and action plans already in existence. For example, in BiH UNDP produced an excellent local development policy paper that serves as an informal guidepost for all external donors involved in supporting local development. In Moldova, UNDP supported the development and implementation of national strategies in three project areas. However, one of the features that has hampered the implementation of effective local government development programs, which form a core of UNDP's work in all four countries, has been the absence of an effective comprehensive national decentralization strategy that would guide the process of strengthening local government bodies on a nation-wide basis.

Box 2: Selected UNDP programs for legal reform, bioenergy and HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria in Tajikistan, Moldova and Bosnia and Herzegovina

Access to Justice and Rule of Law (A2J/RoL) – Tajikistan

The *Access to Justice* project (A2J) has four components: (i) capacity development, mostly focused on training civil registrars and notaries; (ii) policy dialogue; (iii) improving access to legal aid for vulnerable population groups; and (iv) public awareness raising. The *Strengthening Rule of Law and Human Rights to Empower People in Tajikistan* project (RoL) focuses on building the capacity of human rights and the justice system and actors to better implement laws, human rights recommendations, conduct oversight of government and

penitentiary services, and empower citizens and the most vulnerable and marginalized groups with access to justice and community legal empowerment. *The Civil Registry* project is based on the experience of the A2J and RoL projects and aims to provide universal access to modern civil registration. The program does very well in terms of scaling up, with clear scale goals, effective use of pilots and learning, strong domestic champions, and a deliberate effort to create the needed fiscal space for sustainability at scale.

Moldova Energy and Biomass Program (MEBP) – Moldova

UNDP's Moldova Energy and Biomass Program (MEBP) involves the processing and burning of biomass from agricultural residues for producing biogas to replace natural gas heating for use by households and small public facilities in rural areas. The program involved a comprehensive and highly complementary set of interventions on the demand and supply side of market development. On the supply side the program focused on supply chain development, involving farmers providing the biomass, biofuel pellet producing firms and firms that imported, assembled parts for, and ultimately locally produced the boilers that convert biomass into heat and/or energy. Technical innovation was encouraged through competitions. Alternative technical solutions were systematically studied and tested. On the demand side the program involved the identification of interested households and public agencies, outreach to communities, and educational and mass media campaigns and created demand with the provision of substantial subsidies for the purchase of boilers. The program also focused on the development of market supportive policies and institutions and capacity building for all key actors through training and knowledge sharing. Overall the program pursued an effective scaling up pathway, with effective piloting, appropriate sequencing of horizontal, vertical and functional scaling, and generally an effective approach to creating a favorable enabling environment. Policy, fiscal and partnership spaces deserve more attention in future.

HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria Program – Tajikistan

UNDP served as a Principal Recipient (PR) of the Global Fund for AIDS/HIV, TB and Malaria (GFATM) funds since 2003 through seven grant cycles in supporting the implementation of national programs on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. The goal of the three diseases programs is to reduce transmission and burden of communicable disease mortality and morbidity for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis (TB) and Malaria in Tajikistan, with the specific aim to halt the spread of HIV/AIDS and TB epidemics and eliminate Malaria by 2015. For all three diseases the program pursued capacity building, awareness raising and procurement of necessary medical inputs (drugs, equipment, etc.). The program followed the general approach pursued by the GFATM towards scaling up, which has been well developed and tested over the years of the Fund's existence, and has made the GFATM into a successful institution in the fight against a limited set of important global health threats.[8] Overall the experience in Tajikistan was also very successful in scaling up interventions in all three areas. However, the GFATM model in general, and also specifically in Tajikistan, faces two challenges: (a) how to embody the HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria interventions in a broader health system strategy, so as to ensure that resources—financial and institutional—are not inappropriately diverted to these three health challenges to the detriment of an overall strengthening of the country's health system, and (b) how to attain

sustainability of the scaled up interventions at the time of termination of GFATM support for the country. For example, while the goal of Malaria education was broadly achieved by the end of 2015, with the termination of GFATM and UNDP support, Tajikistan faced the serious risk of reemergence of Malaria in the absence of a sustained governmental effort.

HIV/AIDS and TB Program – BiH

The HIV/AIDS and TB program was funded by GFATM and implemented by UNDP as PR over successive phases for a total of about $60m, with great success. AIDS in BiH was contained to very low levels and TB treatment was substantially modernized. Now however the program faces a major challenge of sustainability: In 2015 GFATM announced phase-out of funding at the end of 2015. UNDP initiated a transition process to hand off responsibility to national authorities. However, government is not enthusiastic about picking up the pieces in terms of funding, and has limited capacity to do so effectively, e.g., in drug procurement. There is now a risk that, as in Romania when GFATM terminated its engagement, AIDS could see a major surge in incidence. TB treatment is perhaps less threatened, but here too there are risks of reversal. According to the program team, looking back it is not clear what UNDP could have done differently in preparing for the handoff. A key obstacle is that domestically there is little sense of urgency, given the great success and low incidence of disease.

Problem specification and range of interventions

Most UNDP programs reviewed for this study do well in terms of problem specification and range of interventions, i.e., they have good analytical foundations and prior program experience in defining what is the development problem that needs to be addressed and in implementing measures that are well designed and selective in addressing the development problem identified. However, for the area development programs and for other complex programs, e.g., the energy and environment and the governance programs, the range of interventions considered tends to be very large. The apparent lack of selectivity can lead to fragmentation of effort and hence difficulty with effective program design, implementation and follow up, particularly from a scaling up perspective.

Long-term scale target

One area of weakness in the design of scaling up pathways in UNDP country programs is that few of the programs reviewed for this study do well on identifying a long-term scale target beyond the duration of the program or project. Among the exceptions are the A2J/RoL program in Tajikistan, the biomass program in Moldova and the bioenergy program in Egypt (see Box 3). A lack of vision of scale means that the focus remains largely on delivery of program results in the short term, rather than on the building of a platform for the achievement of longer-term scale goals. Without a vision of scale of the intervention or project the scaling up pathway lacks clear definition beyond the immediate project. It also means that an important potential driver of scaling up is not activated.

Box 3. Bioenergy for sustainable rural development in Egypt

The program aims at developing biogas and bio slurry fertilizer production at individual farm level, based on processing of animal waste (which previously was burned, resulting in limited energy benefits and serious pollution). The project specifically focused on developing an appropriate business, financing and institutional model. The (Indian) technology chosen was identified based on efficiency of conversion, low investment cost, easy of construction, operation and maintenance, and demonstrated scalability in a context similar to Egypt. The program has a clear vision of scale and has effectively considered many of the enabling conditions necessary for scalability. Key concerns are how UNDP can best sustain its support and eventually hand of to national and local partners.

Enabling conditions: Drivers

Turning then to the enabling conditions, consider first the drivers that may push the scaling up process forward. A vision of scale as an important driver was already highlighted above. But there are other potential drivers, including the following.

External champions

UNDP and the donors supporting its programs play a dominant role as champions in all programs, with EU accession also a significant external driver in countries that have an EU accession prospect (i.e., BiH and —more distant—Moldova). From a scaling up perspective one would expect that over time the relative balance should shift from UNDP and donor championship to domestic champions and (where relevant) to EU accession as principal drivers of the programs along their scaling up pathways.

Domestic champions

UNDP has a varied experience across countries and programs in identifying and supporting domestic champions or, in other words, creating domestic ownership for its programs. In the case of countries with a top-down governance system, such as Tajikistan, domestic championship at or near the highest level of national leadership is essential. In the case of the A2J/RoL program in Tajikistan the minister of justice and the legal adviser to the president serve as key champions. For countries with weak or dysfunctional central authority, there is a need to build pressure on the higher levels of government from the bottom up in order to create the financial, legal and regulatory support at the national level needed to achieve successful scaling up of initiatives across the country. This is what UNDP has aimed to do very explicitly in BiH. In the case of the FGM project in Egypt (see Box 4 and Annex B) a broad coalition of domestic champions, including civil society organizations (CSOs) and women's advocacy groups, has been mobilized to support a patient, long-term and systematic approach to reduce and eventually eliminate a previously widely prevalent cultural practice very harmful to women. While individual cases show effective mobilization of domestic champions, UNDP needs to focus even more attention on ensuring that a strong coalition of stakeholders at all levels is built up over time, so that UNDP ultimately can safely withdraw without loss of momentum of the program.

Incentives

Few of the programs explicitly consider incentives as a key driver for scaling up. However, there are important incentive mechanisms that deserve more exploration in terms of their design and impacts:

Box 4. Abandon Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) in Egypt

FGM has been widely practiced in Egypt. The goal of the Abandon FGM program is to reduce and ultimately eliminate this practice as part of a broader shift in the way women are treated and empowered to participate actively in society. The program's approach involves a concerted effort at two levels: a national and a local level, involving public agencies, CSOs and communities. Horizontal and vertical scaling up (esp. with the passing of a national law banning FGM) went hand-in-hand. The focus on FGM was embedded in a wider approach to transform the role of women in society. The UNDP program has stayed engaged over more than a decade in what in essence amounts to a long-term campaign. Enabling conditions have been well addressed, with effective champions, media campaigns, political and policy engagement, cultural sensitivity and institution and partnership building. As with other UNDP programs a key hurdle in terms of sustainability and scalability will have to be passed as an when UNDP phases out its support and as local partners will have to take on full responsibility. (For more detail, see Annex B.)

- UNDP programs widely use *competitive mechanisms* for allocating grants as a way to get governmental and non-governmental entities to engage in the programs and to carry out investments or other activities at levels and in ways consistent with the programs' objectives. For example, in the case of the LOD project in BiH (see Box 5), UNDP allocates grants on a competitive basis to local governments, which in turn allocate grants on a competitive basis to CSOs for the provision of communal services. In principle, competitive grant mechanisms are an excellent tool to support scaling up, but there are many different ways to design them, some more effective than others;[9] moreover, they are subject to fiduciary risks and in need of financial/fiscal resources, which may not be forthcoming at the scale needed for scaled up programs unless carefully planned (see the discussion of *fiscal space* below).

Box 5. Reinforcing Local Democracy Project (LOD) in BiH

This program is designed to improve local democracy and delivery of public services to local communities by reinforcing the relationship between municipal governments and CSOs and by introducing an inclusive, transparent and competitive process for municipal grant allocation to CSOs. Currently about $50 million are allocated annually by municipalities to CSOs (and another $50 million by other government agencies). Overall the LOD has incorporated many important aspects of a systematic scaling up process. An overall pathway to scale has been pursued on a sustained basis countrywide and regionally for the Western Balkans, with many of the enabling conditions well taken care of and with effective vertical linkages. Selected scaling up aspects could have been perhaps more systematically pursued (definition of scaling up target, fiscal and partnership spaces, and M&E with a scaling up lens).

- For some UNDP projects the *market price of complementary or competitive products* are key incentive mechanisms that affect the uptake and commercial viability of programs. For example, in the case of the Moldova biogmass project, the price of natural gas is a determinant of commercial viability of the biogas

technology. This is particularly relevant for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. While the program team recognized the importance of the gas price, the gas price policy of the government was not explicitly considered as part of the project.

- In other cases, investment *subsidies for producers* (as in the case of the bioenergy project in Egypt and for the biomass program in Moldova) are important incentives for expanding the practice of renewable energy generation. Questions of effectiveness of such subsidies in generating investments, their necessary duration and their fiscal sustainability and scalability would need to be addressed, but are not commonly focused on in UNDP programs.

Community demand

For projects that involve the engagement or participation at community level, community demand can be mobilized to serve as a powerful driver for scaling up, if communities consider the UNDP supported interventions as providing them with significant benefits. This potential driver appears not to have been systematically pursued by UNDP in the four case study countries, or at least was not a factor highlighted in the interviews and the documents reviewed by the authors.

Enabling conditions: Spaces

Consider next the barriers that have to be removed, or spaces that have to be created, to facilitate the scaling up of programs. UNDP program and project documents do consider some of these factors in the context of their risk assessment sections, but they do so mostly in terms of how the risk factors might affect the implementation of a particular project during its duration, rather than considering how they might be relevant for the longer-term scaling up pathway of the program. Nonetheless, UNDP programs in the four case study countries to varying degrees reflected program teams' recognition of the importance to address key constraints and of the need to create space for programs to succeed and their impact to grow.

Political space

Virtually all UNDP programs in the four countries considered political space as a potential risk factor or constraint to project implementation. Consideration of political realities explicitly shaped the UNDP programs in BiH, where national governance is characterized by a fragmented top layer of national (State) and sub-national (Entity) level governmental structures that impedes comprehensive strategic policy making and legislation for the provision of socioeconomic development at the local level. Since local governments have a relatively high degree of autonomy and the authority to allocate their—albeit limited—own resources, UNDP's approach has been to work at the local level in developing capacity and solutions and create bottom up pressures for the removal of policy obstacles, legislative reform and financing mechanisms to allow local governments to function more effectively. In dealing with political aspects of program design and implementation, UNDP's reliance on its national staff with their good understanding of political realities on the ground is an important strength. Nonetheless, there is no explicit consideration of winners and losers of the programs and of how the differing interests of various stakeholders play out in regard to the sustainability and scalability of the programs UNDP supports.

Policy space

Policy constraints can be an important obstacle to scaling up the impact of individual project interventions and therefore should be addressed wherever possible as part of program design and implementation. Policy

dimensions are generally well addressed in the UNDP programs in the four case study countries through UNDP's support to national authorities in formulating strategic approaches, policies, legal frameworks, etc. For example, in Egypt UNDP supported the constitutional amendment in support of decentralization and a law that criminalized the practice of FGM; however, it might have focused more on policy issues related to fiscal decentralization. In Tajikistan UNDP generally addressed legal and policy issues; the exception was the border management program for Northern Afghanistan, where political and security issues limited UNDP's ability to develop a systematic policy agenda. In Moldova all three programs reviewed effectively addressed the policy aspects, except that the biomass energy project might have given greater attention to national gas pricing policy. In BiH, too, all projects adequately address policy issues at the national and Entity level, as far as possible and appropriate. Of course, implementation of strategies, policies, and legal requirements is always a challenge that takes long-term engagement in the implementation process and is not always successful. This is particularly the case in the area of decentralization of national authority and resources to lower levels of government, since most central governments, while ready to cede control on paper, are ultimately not ready to do so in practice. UNDP's strength as an external supporter is that it is involved not only at the policy level, but also in the implementation process at the subnational government levels. For the programs involving delivery of services at the local level in line with national policies, regional area offices maintained by UNDP in BiH and Tajikistan have demonstrated their effectiveness for delivery at scale.

Institutional space

UNDP generally recognizes the importance of creating institutional space as a critical component for project success and sustainability, and ultimately for scaling up and all programs address this issue in a serious way, by strengthening institutional capacities at local as well as higher levels of government, of communities and CSOs. Of particular interest is the creation of and support for Local Development Funds—funding mechanisms that are set up to channel budgetary resources to local governments—which could be transformed into proper Municipal Development Funds, tasked not only with providing capital finance (grants and loans), but also with technical assistance and advocacy for strengthening local capacity.[10] For all programs there remain questions whether the institutions that UNDP helped to create and strengthen will withstand potentially corrosive political and financial pressures and will be able to support continued and sustained scaling up, esp. when UNDP and other supportive donors withdraw.

Fiscal and financial space

The creation of a supportive fiscal and financial space is critical for scaling up. Here UNDP programs (like so many other donor financed programs worldwide) generally pay insufficient attention, especially for maintenance and expansion of grant programs and for public investment financing of social infrastructure in the case of area development projects. The A2J/RoL project in Tajikistan stands out as an exception with its explicit consideration of long-term fiscal costs and the involvement of the ministry of finance in the design and implementation of the program as part of the supervisory board. Another exception is the project document for the Srebrenica Regional Recovery Program (SRRP) in BiH (see Box 6), which presents a detailed picture of the breakdown of donor, government and private financing and notes the importance of preparing for the phase-out of donor financing. More generally, however, with its heavy focus on strengthening local

governments, UNDP will have to address the lack of an effective fiscal decentralization in the countries in which it works, and in particular the question how to develop the local governments' authority and capacity to raise their own resources through local taxes and user charges. Without that, local governments will always remain under-resourced and unable effectively to deliver services to their citizens.

Box 6. Srebrenica Regional Recovery Program (SRRP) – BiH

In the 1990s, during the civil war in BiH, Srebrenica and its surroundings witnessed devastating and tragic human dislocation and suffering, as well as extensive destruction of the regional economy and infrastructure. The SRRP started in 2002 and in 2016 was in the last year of Phase IV (2014-16). SRRP's fundamental objective throughout has been promoting the socio-economic recovery of multiethnic communities with strengthened local government structures. It is based on an integrated, area-based development approach, supporting three adjacent municipalities, together making up the Srebrenica region. The SRRP is evidently a strongly performing program in supporting the recovery of the Srebrenica region. It does not have a focus on scaling up beyond the region, but some of its key aspects reflect strengths that would be very helpful for a systematic scaling up approach, including continuity of engagement, focus on capacity building, partnerships, sustainability and effective hand-off.

Partnership Space

Partnerships are critical for effective scaling up. In the programs reviewed for this study UNDP has teamed up with various national and international partners and often has done so effectively. Domestic actors mostly served as partners in program design and implementation, while foreign partners, especially selected bilateral donors, mostly served as sources of financing. Coordination with external donor partners is especially notable for the BiH Local Governance and Local Development Program (Box 7) with its track record of an effective donor coordination group. In domestic partnership, UNDP Egypt has been very successful in mobilizing large amounts of cofinancing from domestic authorities for its programs. The Tajikistan A2J/RoL program also focused explicitly on a systematic gradual transition from external to domestic financing, with the involvement of the Ministry of Finance as a key partner to help ensure a successful transition. From a scaling up perspective, this systematic focus on domestic cofinancing is important for the longer term and a key factor in developing an effective hand-off from UNDP/donor financed programs to programs ultimately funded by the authorities.[11] The lack of commitment by the domestic authorities to support an effective transition towards funding the UNDP-managed the malaria program in Tajikistan and the HIV/AIDS and TB program in BiH is shaping up as a major constraint in ensuring the continuity of these otherwise highly successful programs after termination of GFATM financing.

Social and cultural space

UNDP has generally worked effectively to increase social and cultural space for its programs to grow effectively, with its focus on the inclusion of disadvantaged population groups, and with sensitivity to local community conditions and to cultural and historical precedents. The fact that UNDP relies mostly on national staff is an important factor in assuring that its programs are attuned to local social and cultural conditions.

Box 7. Local Governance and Local Development Program (LGLDP) in BiH

The LGLDP is an umbrella program, comprising various individual projects in support of local economic development, local environmental management, local social development and local governance, planning and delivery. The program represents a strong and coherent strategic approach to integrated operational programming, and specifically also to scaling up, including an well-articulated approach to partnership development. Effective implementation of the approach will require continuous efforts and attention. In addition, some specific aspects deserve further strengthening from a scaling up perspective, including (a) scale targets are not identified; (b) greater selectivity across and within projects is desirable; (c) political, institutional and partnerships spaces are not systematically explored and addressed; and (d) the approach to pilots is not fully defined.

Program sequencing

Turning then to issues of program sequencing, the following key issues and findings emerge.

Continuity of project sequencing

The UNDP's programs reviewed for this study score remarkably well on continuity of project sequencing, with projects building systematically on prior engagement by UNDP and other actors, while successor projects generally built in a timely and effective manner on the preceding projects, avoiding disruptive breaks in UNDP's support and project teams' engagement.[12] However, UNDP faces one big challenge when it comes to project sequencing: How to phase out its support from programs without endangering the sustainability of the program and the scaling up process. The difficulties in BiH and Tajikistan with the phase out of UNDP support for the GFATM financed programs in Malaria and HIV/AIDS and TB were already noted above (see Box 2). Other programs that have come to an end, such as the Municipal Training Systems Program in BiH (which endeavored to build sustainable training capacity for local officials) also have faced considerable difficulties. The hand-off is particularly difficult in cases where UNDP has not moved from direct implementation (DIM) by UNDP to implementation by national authorities (NIM), esp. in BiH and Tajikistan. In these conditions, UNDP will need to plan for continued engagement over the longer term or will have to promote more forcefully a shift from DIM to NIM. More generally, UNDP has to plan much earlier and more effectively for hand-off of its program if it is to ensure the potential for sustainability and continued scaling up.

Sequencing horizontal, vertical, functional and regional scaling up

UNDP programs generally also perform well in the way they effectively combine and sequence horizontal scaling (i.e., extension of programs to more people and jurisdictions at the local level) with vertical scaling up (i.e., policy, legal and institutional reform and strengthening at the national level). Indeed, scaling up experience more generally shows that these two forms of scaling up are mutually reinforcing. (Agapitova and Linn 2016) In some cases UNDP programs also successfully pursue *functional scaling up,* i.e., branching out into additional areas of engagement. For example, the Srebrenica Regional Recovery Program in BiH started with infrastructure rehabilitation in its first phase, but added incrementally various other activities, including support for the development of various agricultural value chains. (see Box 6 above) In the

case of the BiH Reinforcement of Local Democracy (LOD) program, *regional scaling up* beyond BiH to the rest of the Western Balkans is being pursued (see Box 5 above).

Pilots

A few of the UNDP programs reviewed systematically pilot one or more types of interventions before scaling up (e.g., the Tajikistan A2J/RoL program, see Box 2 above)). Those who have done so (e.g., Moldova with its innovation efforts and MiLab, Egypt also with its innovation efforts and work on youth engagement and employment) benefited from generating more effective solutions, and achieving better profile with investors and clients. This review could not determine to what extent other pilots were effectively monitored and evaluated.[13] For the future, country managers should ensure that close attention is paid to M&E of all pilots. The Istanbul Hub's initiative to embed innovation in the way UNDP conducts its business offer several practical tools on how to design experiments (pilots) with accompanying monitoring and phasing out plans, in part building on the successes of Moldova and Egypt COs.

Scalability assessments

None of the programs systematically employed scalability assessments for interventions to be implemented and scaled. Perhaps the weakest element of scalability assessment relates to components that support specific investments at community level. Their sustainability and replicability are subject to serious doubt, but are apparently not systematically assessed. More generally, a more systematic assessment of scalability, focusing on whether the enabling condition can be put in place, would help UNDP pursue effective scaling up pathways.[14]

Monitoring and evaluation

The study also reviewed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to determine whether it supported a scaling up agenda, with the following conclusions:

- All UNDP programs appear to have involved some learning of lessons from one project to the next in the project sequence. However, independent evaluations were available only for some of the programs. These evaluations are carried out towards the end of projects and are intended to inform the design of follow-up interventions. With only very few exceptions none of these evaluations specifically focused on the scaling up aspects of the programs, despite the fact that this is required by standard UNDP evaluation guidelines, as noted above. The external evaluation of the second phase of the Srebrenica Regional Recovery Program in BiH is one of the few exceptions, since it referred to scaling up in a number of its recommendations. In Moldova UNDP has begun using randomized control trials as one mechanism assessment of effectiveness of various programmatic strategies and for future design of larger programs. Building on these efforts, emerging internal capacities for RCTs and growing demand from other UNDP country offices globally, UNDP can further develop and utilize this mechanism for identifying and pursuing scalability pathways.
- The M&E frameworks and the results management matrixes (which lay out key baseline and impact parameters) for UNDP programs and for their constituent projects are focused only on the implementation and the results of the specific project, not on how the projects contribute to any ultimate scale goals nor on metrics for progress in the creation of the relevant enabling conditions (drivers and spaces). Moreover, most results indicators are expressed only in absolute terms (e.g., x number of households or farmers serviced), rather than also in relation to the ultimate

scale goal (e.g., y percent of needy households or farmers serviced).

Sustainability

Finally, the program reviews also considered sustainability of the programs' outcomes as a critical component of successful and sustainable scaling up. Most UNDP program documents discuss sustainability, but with few exceptions they do so without a full accounting of all the factors that potentially determine sustainability (including, in particular, the enabling conditions—drivers and spaces—that also determining scalability). A special case in this regard is the Malaria component of the HIV/AIDS/TB program in Tajikistan: UNDP's engagement and the Global Fund's financing for this program finished at the end of 2015 and there is now as serious risk that there is insufficient political will and fiscal commitment by government to carry the program component forward. As a result, the UNDP program team is very concerned that the country may experience a resurgence in Malaria. As noted above, a similar problem faces the HIV/AIDS and TB program in BiH (see Box 2).

SCALING UP IN UNDP'S COUNTRY PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

The case studies also review the overall UNDP country program documents (CPDs) for each of the four countries from a scaling up perspective. CPDs typically present concise statements of UNDP's program plans five years into the future, briefly summarizing the country's development challenges, past lessons of experience, the UNDP's principal areas of prospective engagement, principal partnerships and how program implementation will be monitored and evaluated.

A principal conclusion of this review is that the CPDs generally do not consider scaling up or only do so in passing,[15] and that they do not effectively summarize the history of UNDP's scaling up efforts in the countries, do not effectively link past with future activities, and do not systematically address key aspects of the scaling up opportunities and challenges. This represents a missed opportunity, especially in view of the fact that many of the specific programs in all four countries actually pursue a scaling up pathway. A more systematic focus on scaling up in the CPDs would turn them into a more useful strategic documents for purposefully shaping UNDP's activities in the countries concerned, and would also present a stronger case for engagement with domestic and external partners and for resource mobilization. The strict limitations on the length of CPDs, which is imposed as a matter UNDP's corporate policy, limits the detail with which scaling up pathways can be represented in these documents; however, even with the size limitation are more explicit focus on scaling up is possible, as shown by the Tajikistan CPD. Moreover, a complementary management document, as in the case of the BiH local development policy document, could serve as a vehicle to reflect more effectively the scaling up dimensions of the UNDP country programs.

Another conclusion from the review of UNDP country programs is that they appear to involve a large number of relatively small projects. If one considers also that quite a few of the projects encompass many activities, one must conclude that the UNDP country programs tend to be overly ambitious in the number of initiatives they support relative to the resources and capacity UNDP generally has at its disposal.[16] This is relevant for the scaling up agenda, since a high degree of fragmentation makes it difficult to pursue effective scaling up pathways for the many areas of engagement (or business lines) that UNDP supports. The chances that interventions will be one-off, short-lived, not managed, financed and monitored/evaluated with a longer-term scaling up perspective in mind are significantly higher in such a context.

Finally, as noted earlier, UNDP has set up "regional area offices" in BiH and Tajikistan. These are UNDP offices in selected provincial capitals of the two countries that are provide support to UNDP projects in the regions in which they are located. They represent effective ways of implementing a scaling up approach of local and area development programs and represent a strong comparative advantage in terms of UNDP's capability of attracting donor funding and assisting national authorities in developing effective local and area development programs.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Table 1 provides an overview of the assessment of the twenty programs and projects reviewed in depth for this study. The table represents in an approximate and summary fashion the extent to which UNDP considered relevant scaling up dimensions by using color-coded cells: blue = excellent; turquoise = good; violet = partial; orange = not (or minimally) considered/no information.[17] If one attributes numerical values from 3 to 0 to these ratings[18] and weights each cell equally, one can calculate the average value for all cells combined. This shows that—with an average at 1.6—the programs on average fall about halfway between "good" and "partial" in terms of their consideration of the relevant scaling up dimensions and factors. From the country case studies, we find that the best programs from a scaling up perspective are Access to Justice and Rule of Law Program (A2J/RoL) in Tajikistan (with an average of 2.3, i.e., better than "good"), the Biomass Project in Moldova (with and average of 2.0) and the Local Democracy Program (LOD) in BiH (with an average 1.9). While the Egypt report did not report specific ratings for projects, the FMG and the biomass projects would also have received a high rating of at least "good".

The strengths of UNDP's approach lie in (a) its long-term engagement in particular lines of business, (b) its strong partnerships with local and external actors, (c) its focus on strengthening institutions and especially local government capacity (supported in some countries by UNDP's regional area offices), (d) its readiness to support appropriate policy and legislative changes, and (e) its emerging competence in identifying and pursuing innovative means of identifying non obvious insights, designing novel solutions and pursuing entirely new ways of conducting business. More attention needs to be paid especially to (a) a clear specification of long-term scale targets and scalability assessments for most of its programs, (b) rigorous testing of alternative interventions and of pilots, (c) effective fiscal and financial strategies for sustainability and scaling up, and (d) consideration of scaling up in its results metrics and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) approaches. UNDP also has encountered difficulties with project exit in ensuring sustainability and continued scaling up beyond the end of its program support. Country Program Documents (CPDs) generally do not lay out a clear scaling up strategy and country programs lacked a systematic approach to scaling up, even as specific programs represent excellent examples of scaling up efforts. Although corporate strategy and guidance documents for program management and evaluation provided some directives to UNDP staff at the country level, little if any of this guidance appeared to have been absorbed and reflected in program design, implementation and evaluation.

An important finding from the case studies is that the more comprehensive and multifaceted a program is in terms of the developmental problem that is being addressed and in terms of the range of interventions that are covered, the more difficult it is to systematically and effectively focus on scaling up. This is true in particular for the more comprehensive area development programs, which try to address a broad range of development issues with a large range of interventions in a particular geographical area (or areas) (e.g., the SRRP program in the Srebrenica region of BiH). On the other hand, projects with relatively narrowly defined problems and interventions tend to be easier to scale up effectively (such as the bio-energy projects on Egypt and Moldova, the FGM project in Egypt, the A2J/LP program in Tajikistan and the LOD project in BiH).

Finally, the main conclusion of this test of the proposed operational approach is that a systematic application of the set of questions used in this study can help ensure

Table 1. Summary assessment of selected UNDP programs and projects from a scaling up perspective

Overall Scaling Up Dimension	Specific Scaling Up Process Factor	Assessment of UNDP programs and projects
Overall scaling up pathway		
Problem specification		
Range of interventions		
Definition of scale targets		
Enabling conditions:		
Drivers	EU Accession	
	Domestic Champions	
	Incentives	
	Community demand	
	UNDP	
	Donors	
Spaces	Political	
	Policy	
	Institutional	
	Fiscal	
	Partnership	
	Social and cultural	
Program sequencing		
	Continuity	
	Vertical/ horizontal	
	Pilots	
	Scalability assessments	
M&E for scaling up		
Sustainability		

Legend: Excellent | Good | Partial | Minimally considered

Note: The color scheme indicates the extent to which UNDP has considered scaling up dimensions and factors in program design and implementation

that the scaling up process is effectively and comprehensively treated. By exploring the key dimensions, enabling conditions, sequencing and learning processes that make up a systematic approach to scaling up, one can plan, implement, monitor and evaluate scaling up pathways with some assurance that the most important aspects that make for a successful scaling up process are considered. At the same time, the approach is relatively simple and not very time and resource intensive. Therefore, it can readily be added to existing program and project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation tools already used by UNDP. For any program officer wishing to explore a more detailed and demanding approach to planning and managing scaling up pathways will find the framework presented by Cooley and Ved (2012) of particular relevance.

Beyond these specific findings for the four case studies there are also some more general lessons that can be drawn for UNDP and for development funding organizations more generally, at the corporate level, at the level of country management and at the level of individual program and project managers:

Corporate management:

- Corporate management should strongly champion the scaling up agenda, develop a systematic operational approach to scaling up and appropriate guidance, quality assurance and training for agency staff, consultants and national counterparts involved in country programs. The approach used in this study offers a simple and effective tool for this purpose.
- The corporate evaluation office should review its evaluation guidelines with a view to reinforcing the guidance they give for evaluating programs and projects in terms of the focus on and performance in regard to scaling up. It should also monitor systematically to what extent this guidance in followed in practice. The approach used in this study offers a simple and effective tool for this purpose.

Country program management:

- While specific development programs contain many valuable elements that support scaling up, the country programs overall and their many components would benefit from a more systematic consideration of scaling up aspects at program design, implementation, completion, and well as in monitoring and evaluation. The approach used in this study offers a simple and effective tool for this purpose.[19]
- Country strategy documents of development agencies should not only contain references to a scaling up objective, but also present key measures designed to deliver on this objective. They should be complemented by a management document that lays out in greater detail the scaling up objective(s) of the program, the principles and approaches by which these will be pursued, and for principal areas of engagement (or business lines) address key drivers and spaces that have to be put in place for the achievement of appropriate scale goals.
- Country programs should practice selectivity both across and within programs and projects. The key question that should drive a selectivity assessment is whether each program or project has an appropriate scaling up perspective, or whether it is likely—without significant redesign and increased resources —to remain a one-off intervention with very limited impact.
- Key stages for assuring individual programs and projects are effectively dealing with the scaling up agenda are project scoping, project design, project approval, the mid-term review of projects, and in the period approaching the end of the project. The six key questions presented above (and the more detailed questions in Annex A) provide guidance for the kind of issues that need to he addressed by project and program teams.

- Country program evaluations should address the scaling up aspects of the programs.
- Country program staff should receive training in how to approach the scaling up agenda in the design and implementation of specific programs and projects.
- Country program managers of development agencies should explore whether there is interest in Government authorities and other donors to work with UNDP to systematically introduce a scaling up perspective in the government's own approach to development planning and implementation.
- Each country program team should prepare a cogent summary of the scaling up approach and experience in its most successful programs as a way to demonstrate the commitment to the scaling up agenda, and as a way to help attract government commitment and donor interest to partner with UNDP in seeking to achieve sustainable development impact at scale.

Finally, the UNDP experience allows us to draw some broader lessons for the international development community at large, for innovators, implementers and funders alike:[20]

- Scaling up generally needs to be done deliberately and systematically, but it is not rocket science. A change in mindset—thinking "beyond the project" and using the project as a platform to align missions and resources of various actors—is the most important step to take. Keeping the questions and answers simple is a good place to start.
- Scaling up needs to be considered from the beginning of planning and implementing an intervention. Asking "what next" at the end of a project is inevitably much too late.
- Successful scaling up generally takes time. This requires a "stick-with-it" attitude by those engaged in the scaling process, if not always at the individual level, then at the institutional and political levels. It further requires continually analyzing the leverage points across drivers and spaces and ensuring that programmatic interventions adapt to (or help create) the enabling conditions that are most critical for a successful scaling up effort.
- Horizontal replication of an intervention is generally not enough; successful scaling requires also a focus on policy and institutional change at the regional, national and even supra-national levels, if regional, national or global scale is to be reached.
- No one individual or institution can scale up in isolation. Building partnerships and coalitions is critical, but not always easy and certainly not costless. Using a mix of drives and spaces can help decouple a size of an intervention with the impact it potentially creates and thereby reducing the time scale of the scaling.
- Intermediary institutions can often be important facilitators of a successful scaling up process and development organizations like UNDP can play this role, but they need to work with local institutional partners and over time ensure that the local partners take on greater responsibility for the scaling up process and ultimately for sustainably operating at scale. Where it has been successful in scaling up, UNDP's has focused its role on identifying best locally sourced solutions and connecting those with resources (expert, human, financial) to help them grow. This indicates a broader shift away from bringing in externally designed solutions to investing in the portfolio of locally sourced ones.
- Measuring impact along the scaling up pathway is critical to assure the intervention has the desired impact, and it can serve as an important tool to generate demand and political support for the intervention; but monitoring and evaluation must also consider whether the enabling factors (drivers and spaces) are being created to assure sustainability and permit continued scaling. Development organizations like UNDP are well placed to integrate a host of innovative M&E mechanisms that leverage methods such as randomized control trials and behavioral insights to new technologies and data for an up-to-date and real time analysis of the progress.

ANNEX A. Guiding Questions for Assessing Specific UNDP Projects and Country Programs from a Scaling Up Perspective

Based on the analytical framework summarized above (for details see Cooley and Linn 2015, and Agapitova and Linn 2016), a simple set of guiding questions for UNDP country program managers and staff can help establish whether or not a scaling up process has been applied in a systematic and sensible manner, or guide the development and implementation of such a process. These questions are summarized in this annex, separately for assessing or designing specific UNDP sponsored projects and programs from a scaling up perspective and for the design and assessment of overall country programs.

These questions were tested in the four country case studies carried out for this project. Since, typically, current UNDP projects and country programs have not been explicitly and systematically designed for scaling up, and since the analytical framework proposed in this note has not been applied in designing projects and country programs, the questions are framed so as to elicit information which allows an assessment whether key components of a scaling up approach have been put in place or not. The same questions can also be used by UNDP in future to help design and monitor the implementation of projects and programs with a scaling up perspective from the outset of the project and program cycle.

1. **Questionnaire for specific projects and programs**

   ***The pathway to scale**:*

   - Does the project or program document define a pathway to scale from idea to target? Does the country have a (sub)sector strategy to which the project is effectively linked?

   The problem to be solved, the vision and the target of scale:

   - What is the development problem to be addressed and has it been effectively analyzed?
   - Given the statement of the development problem to be addressed, what is the appropriate ultimate scale target? I.e., how many people, households, districts, etc. could and should ultimately be reached, not merely by this particular intervention, but also by follow-on interventions which would build on the experience with this particular intervention.
   - Has the problem been identified and long term scale goals and targets been set in line with global and/or national goals (such as the SDGs) and in consultation with stakeholders, including the communities to be served or supported?

   The idea(s)/innovation(s)/model(s):

   - What is (are) the intervention(s) that is (are) to be scaled up, i.e., is it (are they) a new idea(s) or adopted and adapted from prior practice elsewhere.
   - Is it (are they) based on locally sourced innovations and ideas, or are the imported from outside? Have local ideas been given adequate consideration?
   - Has it (have they) been tested or evaluated for impact.
   - Has it (have they) been assessed for scalability?
   - Has appropriate selectivity been adopted in identifying the interventions to be scaled up, to ensure the program is impactful at scale, but also selective enough to allow scaling up to take place?

The enabling conditions:

- What or who are the drivers that are expected to push the scaling up process ahead? Including local leaders or champions, external catalysts and incentives, market or community demand? How does the intervention develop or support the relevant drivers?
- What barriers have to be removed or what spaces have to be created to allow the intervention to achieve the desired intermediate or final scale? How does the intervention aim to do this? Use Box 1 and/or Annex 2 for a comprehensive assessment of spaces to be created.
- Is there an intermediating institution that facilitates the scaling up implementation process and, if yes, how effectively can it carry out this function? If not, would an intermediating institution be useful?
- Does UNDP have the necessary capacity to support the design and implementation of an effective scaling up pathway?
- Does the risk analysis include an explicit assessment of the risk of some or all enabling conditions not materializing?

Sequencing of key steps:

- Is the project/program creating the conditions (or the platform) for subsequent projects/programs to be developed as part of a sustainable scaling up pathway?
- What is the sequencing of scaling up in the horizontal and vertical dimension?

The monitoring and evaluation process:

- Is there a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process in place that allows the tracking of impact and of the enabling conditions (drivers and barriers/spaces) in the context of a well-defined results management framework with intermediate targets linked to the longer-term scale goal?
- For any and all pilots undertaking as part of the program, are there effective M&E processes in place that allow an assessment of whether or not to scale up the pilot and what are the necessary enabling conditions to allow scalability.

Sustainability:

- Has the sustainability of the interventions at different scales been assessed?

2. Questionnaire for a UNDP country program:[21]

The scaling up perspective:

- Is scaling up among the considerations underpinning and reflected in the country program? (*)
  - Is there a longer-term perspective beyond the time horizon of the country program? Is it linked to global development goals (SDGs) and or national programs? Are there references to relevant (sub)sector strategies? (*)
  - Are individual projects/programs linked to the longer-term perspective, and if so how?
  - Do the individual components of the country program add up to a systematic focus on and approach to scaling up development impact linked to long term development goals? (*)
  - Is there an effective link between past and current engagement of UNDP and the future strategy? (*)

Lines of business:

- b. Are there clearly defined “lines of business” for UNDP’s engagement (past, present and future)? (*)
- c. To the extent there are discernible lines of business
  - Has selectivity been applied? (*)
  - Is past and ongoing engagement in particular business lined linked to future plans?

- If some lines of business are to be phased out, are clear exit strategies presented (hand-off to others, etc.)?
- Are new lines of business adequately justified in terms of why they are selected and how the engagement will be sequenced in future? (*)
- Are there (sub)sector strategies for each of lines of business, and if so, does the country program give a sense that they serve as effective scaling up instruments?
- Have clear scale goals and a scaling pathway been defined (including "drivers" and "spaces") for each line of business?
- Is the sustainability issue addressed? (*)

Partnerships for scaling up:

- How effectively does the Country Program address the partnership agenda in support of scaling up (including national and external funding sources other than UNDP) (*)
  - with the domestic public and private sectors,
  - with other aid donors?

Analytical work in support of scaling up:

- How supportive is UNDP's country analytical work of the scaling up agenda?
  - Is it linked to key operational business lines?
  - Is it supporting a scaling up agenda? (*)

Monitoring and evaluation:

- f. How is M&E treated?
  - Is there an assessment of the quality of M&E and a credible plan to improve it? (*)
  - Is M&E focused only on measuring impact or also on "drivers" and "spaces" for scaling up? (*)
  - Does the results matrix reflect any aspects of a longer-term scaling up perspective? (*)

Transferability to/from other countries (also: South-South Cooperation):

- Does the intervention draw on experience in other countries or is it expected to be transferred to other countries?

ANNEX B. Summary of the scaling up review of UNDP's program to support the Abandon Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Initiative in Egypt

This case study is based on a review of program documents and an interview with the UNDP's program team in Egypt during a visit by one of the authors to Egypt in November 2015.

What is the development problem and vision of scale?

- In the past, FGM has been widely practiced in Egypt. The goal of the Abandon FGM program is to reduce and ultimately eliminate this practice as part of a broader shift in the way women are treated and empowered to participate actively in society. The scale of the problem was that, in 2003, 97% of ever married women were subject to FGM; this had dropped to 90% by 2008. For girls aged 15-17, the share subject to FGM was 74% in 2008 and 61% in 2014. The goal of the National FGM Strategy is to reduce the prevalence of FGM among girls aged 15-17 to the range of 16-18%.
- The Abandon FGM program was seen as a long-term campaign from the outset, requiring ultimately a broader focus on the role of women in society. The program is now explicitly embedded in the larger UNDP and government program of Gender and Women Empowerment, which is financially supported by SIDA.

What have been key elements of the pathway to scale?

- The program's approach involves a concerted effort at two levels: a national and a local level.
- At the national level, the core instruments have been:
  - Preparation and passage of an anti-FGM Law, which criminalizes the practice and turns it from a revered tradition into a criminal act.
  - Validation of the law in specific court cases; a limited number of cases have now been successfully brought to closure.
  - Intensive media campaigns, engagement of and testimonials by prominent personalities, but also with voices from the villages, representing ordinary men, women and girls.
  - Outreach and training of legal and medical personnel, as part of mainstreaming the program in the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Health.
  - Pushing back systematically against any efforts by traditionalists in politics and practice to reverse progress towards the anti-FGM goal.
- At the local level, the approach is to engage with village level NGOs and communities to mobilize understanding of and support for the anti-FGM message, successfully mobilizing individuals (men, women, girls) from the communities to speak up in public and for the media (including on YouTube) against FGM.
- Thus the key elements of the pathway were:
  - A hybrid pathway, involving public agencies, CSOs and communities.
  - Horizontal and vertical scaling up went hand-in-hand.
  - The focus on FGM was embedded in a wider approach to transform the role of women in society.

How has the program been sequenced?

- The UNDP's engagement with the Abandon FGM (female genital mutilation) initiative started in 2003. UNDP has stayed with the program ever since, with the core project team remaining unchanged over successive phases (projects). It effectively combined horizontal and vertical scaling up.

- Phase 1 (2003-2008) involved the criminalization of FGM with passage of an anti-FGM law in 2008; creation of a network of concerned citizens; initiation of a national debate; work with villages to take a strong public stance anti FGM.
- Phase 2 (2009-15) involved training programs for district attorneys, doctors and nurses, mainstreamed by Ministry of Health; an outreach program and media campaign; validation of the anti-FGM Law in the courts; curriculum development for schools; village level engagement on anti-FGB, esp. in connection with education and youth services. Total estimated cost of Phase 2 was $6.8m; financing was provided by the EU, SIDA, Netherlands, GIZ, and UN agencies.
- In later 2015, Phase 2 was approaching the end. The challenge then was to ensure continuity of funding, and hence of the program, its staffing, etc.

How was the scalability of the intervention(s) assessed?

- UNDP did not use a systematic, explicit approach to assessing scalability, but the program team probably considered scalability implicitly at each step.

What have been the enablers/drivers?

- Champions:
  - The UNDP (and specifically its country office leadership and project team) played a key championship role from the beginning, with a deliberate strategy of proactive public outreach on the issue (at a time when other UN agencies took a more cautious approach).
  - Over time, national leadership, ministers, prominent public figures were mobilized as champions.
  - Critically, however, champions were found at all levels of society, including in families, communities, workplaces, etc., under the motto: "Everybody has to be a champion."
- The Anti-FGM Law: This is a critical driver of change, as it turns the traditional perspective on FGM on its head: from revered practice to criminal act.
- Media campaigns

What have been the constraints/spaces?

- *Fiscal/financial/costs*: The program requires ongoing financial support to maintain its various activities, which do not come cheap. Mainstreaming some of these into ministerial budgets (esp. Ministries of Justice, of Health, of Education and of Local Development) is one avenue and ultimately required for sustainability and full-scale effort; however, for the foreseeable future, support from donors will remain critical and will have to be mobilized on a continuing basis. This requires proactive and early donor outreach, esp. in ensuring continuity of programs beyond the termination date of the current project.
- *Institutional*: The UNDP's approach to form close partnerships with local stakeholder institutions (including community-level NGOs) and mainstreaming into ministries is a key institutional aspect of ensuring sustainability and scaling up. However, from the structure of the institutional anchor is not clear (ministry, public or private organization?). This could be important for long-term sustainability of the initiative.
- *Policy*: The programs focus on the anti-FGM Law and its implementation has been a critical policy parameter for sustained and scaled up impact. Reinforcing the anti-FGM message in connection with other gender, population, health and education-related laws and regulations will be important a potential opportunity/challenge in future.
- *Politics*: Political challenges occurred in the past (esp. during the immediate post-2011 revolution

period), as traditional forces tried to reverse the progress made with the Abandon FGM campaign in government and parliament. A concerted effort, including in the media, countering this political pressure was part of the program.

- *Culture*: The FGM practice is rooted in cultural tradition, less so in religious tradition. Focusing on the cultural aspects, on changing the popular understanding, on sharing information on the severe damage caused to women by FGM, on getting ordinary people as well as celebrities to speak up in public, on changing the rules of the game through the passage and enforcement of the anti-FGM laws—all these were focused on the cultural dimensions of the problem.
- *Partnerships*: Sustained, intensive partnerships with ministries, NGOs, media organizations, etc. have been a critical component of the success of the program. In addition, partnerships with key donors (esp. the EU, SIDA) and to some extent with other UN agencies were important for the financing of the program and for providing broad-gauged international validation for Egyptian anti-FGM stakeholders. Maintaining these partnership in future will be critical.

What instruments has UNDP used?

- UNDP's standard financing methods (grants) are being utilized.
- Intensive engagement by UNDP local staff and its project implementation unit throughout the program cycle has been a key element of success.
- Over time, mainstreaming (financially and administratively) into government ministries will have to be pursued.

What has been the approach to monitoring and evaluation?

- Measuring impact of the Abandon FGM program activities is difficult, but efforts are being made. The standard DHS surveys for all (married) women had to be complemented with survey questions specifically for girls aged 15-17. The resulting data show significant progress for this age cohort nationwide. Disentangling what of this is the result of broader demographic and socio-economic factors (rural-urban migration, improvements in women's general education, and the spread of non-traditional values more generally) and what specifically is the impact of project interventions is difficult, if not impossible. Perhaps more could be done to explore means for testing the impact of specific project components through targeted surveys in "treatment" and "non-treatment" communities.
- One of the interesting questions is where on the typical "innovation-diffusion" S-curve the program currently is; judging by the progress so far, it would appear that it now may be moving from the phase of "early adopters" to the "early majority" phase. This would imply that—barring unforeseen political reversals and discontinuities in the program, say due to funding gaps—the program impact could and should be expected to accelerate, before eventually slowing down, as one needs to deal with the difficult-to-reach communities and cultural holdouts.

REFERENCES

Agapitova, Natalia, and Johannes F. Linn (2016). "Scaling Up Social Enterprises Innovations." *Global Working Paper No. 95. Washington, DC: Brookings.* https://www.brookings.edu/research/scaling-up-social-enterprise-innovations-approaches-and-lessons/

Annez, Patricia Clarke, Gwenaelle Huet, and George E. Peterson (2008). *Lessons for the urban century: Decentralized infrastructure Finance in the World Bank.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Chandy, Laurence, Akio Hosono, Homi Kharas, and Johannes F. Linn, eds. (2013). *Getting to Scale: How to Bring Development Solutions to Millions of Poor People. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.*

Chandy, Laurence and Johannes F. Linn (2011). "Taking Development Activities to Scale in Fragile and Low Capacity Environments." Global Working Paper No. 41. Washington, DC: Brookings. http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2011/09/development-activities-chandy-linn

Cooley, Larry and Johannes F. Linn (2014). "Taking Innovations to Scale: Methods, Applications and Lessons." Washington, DC: MSI and R4D. http://r4d.org/about-us/press-room/taking-innovations-scale

Cooley, Larry and R. Ved (2012). "Scaling Up – From Vision to Large-Scale Change: A Management Framework for Practitioners". Washington, DC. Management Systems International.

ExpandNet/WHO (2010). "Nine Steps for Developing a Scaling-up Strategy." http://www.expandnet.net/PDFs/ExpandNet-WHO%20Nine%20Step%20Guide%20published.pdf

Hartmann, Arntraud and Johannes F. Linn (2008). "Scaling Up: A Framework and Lessons for Development Effectiveness from Literature and Practice." *Wolfensohn Center Working Paper No. 5. Washington, DC. Brookings.* http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2008/10/scaling-up-aid-linn

A. Hartmann et al. (2013) H. Kharas, R. Kohl, J. Linn, B. Massler, and C. Sourang. 2013. "Scaling Up Programs for the Rural Poor: IFAD's Experience, Lessons and Prospects (Phase II)." *Global Working Paper* 54. Brookings, p. 41 https://www.brookings.edu/research/scaling-up-programs-for-the-rural-poor-ifads-experience-lessons-and-prospects-phase-2/

Kharas, Homi and Johannes F. Linn (2013). "External Assistance for Urban Finance Development." In Roy W. Bahl, Johannes F. Linn and Deborah Wetzel, eds. *Metropolitan Government Finance in Developing Countries: Needs, Strategies, and Implementation.*" Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 2013.

Koh, Harvey, Nidhi Hegde, and Ashish Karamchandani (2014). "Beyond the Pioneer: Getting Inclusive Industries to Scale." Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Private Ltd (DTTIPL) http://www.beyondthepioneer.org/wp-content/themes/monitor/Beyond-the-Pioneer-Report.pdf

Linn, Johannes F. (2011)."Scaling Up with Aid: The Institutional Dimension." in H. Kharas, K. Makino and W. Jung, eds., *Catalyzing Development: A New Vision for Aid. Washington: Brookings Institution Press* http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2011/catalyzingdevelopment

Linn, Johannes F. (2012a). "Scaling Up Development Interventions: A Review of UNDP's Country Program in Tajikistan." Global Working Paper No. 46. Brookings. http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/development-interventions-linn

Linn, Johannes F. (2015). "Scaling Up in the Country Program Strategies of International Aid Agencies: An Assessment of the African Development Bank's Country Strategy Papers." *Journal of Emerging Markets Economies.* vol. 7 no. 3 236-256. http://eme.sagepub.com/content/7/3/236.abstract

Linn, Johannes F. (2015a). "Implementing the SDGs, the Addis Agenda, and Paris COP21 needs a theory of change to address the "missing middle". Scaling up is the answer." *Future Development Blog. Brookings.* https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2015/12/01/implementing-the-sdgs-the-addis-agenda-and-paris-cop21-needs-a-theory-of-change-to-address-the-missing-middle-scaling-up-is-the-answer/

Linn, Johannes F., Arntraud Hartmann, Homi Kharas, Richard Kohl, and Barbara Massler (2010). "Scaling Up the Fight Against Rural Poverty: An Institutional Review of IFAD's Approach." *Global Working Paper No. 39. Washington, DC: Brookings.* http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2010/10/ifad-linn-kharas .

Moreno-Dodson, Blanca, ed. (2005). *Reducing Poverty on a Global Scale: Learning and Innovating for Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

MSI (2016). "Scaling Up—From Vision to Large-Scale Change A Management Framework for Practitioners." Third Edition. http://www.msiworldwide.com/wp-content/uploads/ScalingUp_3rdEdition.pdf

Nesta (2014). "Making in Big: Strategies for scaling social innovations." http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications/making-it-big-strategies-scaling-social-innovations

Jenny Perlman Robinson and Rebecca Winthrop, with Eileen McGivney (2016). "Millions Learning: Scaling up quality education in developing countries." Brookings. Washington, DC. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/FINAL-Millions-Learning-Report-1.pdf

UNDP (2004). "Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results, Turkey." New York, NY. http://www.tr.undp.org/content/turkey/en/home/library/corporatereports/asessmentofdevelopmentresults.html

UNDP (2009). "Handbook for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results." New York, NY. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#handbook

UNDP (2011). "Outcome-Level Evaluation: A Companion Guide to the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results for Programme Units and Evaluators." New York, NY. http://www.seachangecop.org/sites/default/files/documents/2011%2012%20UNDP%20-%20Outcome-Level%20%20Evaluation.pdf

UNDP (2012). "Programme Design Questions for Scaling up Development Innovations for Transformational Change." New York. http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/poverty-reduction/participatory_localdevelopment/programme-design-questions-for-scaling-up-development-innovation.html

UNDP (2013a). “Strategic Plan 2014-17: Changing with the World.” New York, NY. http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/corporate/Changing_with_the_World_UNDP_Strategic_Plan_2014_17.html

UNDP (2013b). “Guidance Note: Scaling Up Development Programs.” New York, NY. http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/poverty-reduction/participatory_localdevelopment/guidance-note--scaling-up-development-programmes.html

UNDP (2014), “Alignment Handbook: A Guide to Key Concepts and their Application.” Final Draft. New York, NY.

Zinnes, Clifford (2009). *Tournament Approaches to Policy Reform*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

ENDNOTES

1. Other studies carried out by Brookings include assessments of scaling up in programs supported by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (Linn et al. 2010; Hartmann et al. 2013); a review of scaling up experience in fragile states (Chandy and Linn 2011); a book on scaling up in development (Chandy et al. 2013); an analysis of scaling up for social enterprises (Agapitova and Linn 2016); and a review of experience with scaling up education programs (Perlman et a. 2016). This work is part of a wider effort in the international development community to develop systematic approaches to scaling up, including ExpandNet/WHO (2010), Koh et al. (2014), Moreno-Dodson, Blanca, ed. (2005), MSI (2016) and Nesta (2014).
2. The study was initiated as part of a major initiative by the UNDP Istanbul Hub office, in cooperation with Nesta, to develop a comprehensive operational approach to embed innovation in the way UNDP conducts its work, known as the "UNDP Project Cycle Hacker's Kit." The approach to scaling up has been integrated into the overall innovation tool kit, which can be accessed at http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/rbec/en/home/library/innovation/hackers-toolkit.html.
3. Both, the *Guidance Note* and the *Programme Design Questions* draw on and refer to the prior work by Brookings on scaling up.
4. See references cited in the introduction and footnote 1; also Cooley and Linn (2014).
5. This approach is explained in detail in Cooley and Linn (2014) and Agapitova and Linn (2016).
6. The country visits were timed as follows: Egypt in September 2015, Moldova in October 2015, Tajikistan and BiH in February 2016.
7. Annex B to this paper contains, by way of example, a summary write-up up of the program to combat female genital mutilation in Egypt.
8. See http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/strategy/ for resources that describe the GFAT approach at the global and country level.
9. For a thorough discussion of alternative competitive mechanisms and their pros and cons in scaling up, see Clifford Zinnes, *Tournament Approaches to Policy Reform. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2009*.
10. For a more detailed analysis of the international experience with Municipal Development Funds see Annez et al. (2008) and Kharas and Linn (2013). Aside from providing financing, these organizations can serve as "intermediating institutions" in supporting the process of scaling up, as defined by Cooley and Ved (2012).
11. To the extent EU funds will be available to the authorities of some of the countries (BiH and Moldova) in the course of the EU accession process and beyond, these funds can also serve as a financial resource base for sustaining and scaling up UNDP-supported programs.
12. This continuity could also be the result of UNDP's unwillingness to exit from areas of engagement in a timely manner. While this is an issue that bears watching, for the programs reviewed in depth from a scaling up perspective, the continuous and longer-term engagement of UNDP and its "stick-with-it" must definitely be judged to be a plus.
13. An evaluation of the UNDP country program for Turkey carried out in 2004 showed that many of the projects supported by UNDP at that time involved "pilots to nowhere", i.e., small, short-lived interventions, which were not pursue further after completion and with no effective learning of lessons for subsequent programs. (UNDP 2004) This problem was not pervasive in the four country programs that we reviewed.
14. In addition to using the drivers-spaces framework as a way to assess scalabililty, specific scalability assessment tools have also been developed by

Management Systems International and ExpandNet (see Cooley and Linn 2014)

15. The Tajikistan CPD is an exception. It considers scaling up explicitly and a scaling up mindset also appears to have become an integral part of the country team's approach to programming its operational work in Tajikistan. However, the Tajikistan CPD also does not effectively summarize the history of UNDP's scaling up efforts, does not effectively link past with future activities, and does not systematically address key aspects of the scaling up opportunities and challenges. See UNDP, "Draft country programme document for Tajikistan (2016-2020)", in Executive Board of UNDP, "Second regular session 2015 - Advance documentation", http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/executive_board/documents_for_sessions/adv2015-second.html
16. An internal review of CPDs for UNDP's Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific in 2012, carried out by one of the authors of this study, revealed a similar lack of selectivity, although the degree of program fragmentation had declined in prior years.
17. A similar table was prepared for each of case study reports (except Egypt), showing the scaling up assessment for each project reviewed in depth.
18. For example: 3 = excellent; 2 = good; 1 = partial; "0 = minimal". Each of the 20 programs were rated separately, except in the case of Egypt, where no ratings were attempted. The summary ratings in Table 1 are an indicative reflection of individual project ratings.
19. This conclusion is also confirmed by analysis of country programs and country program strategies supported by the African Development Bank (Linn 2015) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (Linn et al. 2010).
20. These conclusions are consistent with those in Cooley and Linn (2014).
21. UNDP County Program Documents (CPDs) are very limited in length by corporate rule. This may mean that the standard CPD cannot be expected to address all the questions. Those that are essential to address are marked with a (*). The other questions, while not perhaps covered in the CPD, should be considered explicitly and systematically in some form by the UNDP country team, perhaps in a freestanding informal note.

BROOKINGS
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-797-6000
www.brookings.edu/global