

# Scaling up - a literature review

Peter Ryan  
2004

**IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre**

IRC facilitates the creation, sharing, and use of knowledge so that sector staff and organisations can better support poor men, women and children in developing countries to obtain water and sanitation services they will use and can sustain. It does this by improving the information and knowledge base of the sector and by strengthening sector resource centres in the South.

As a gateway to quality information, the IRC maintains a Documentation Unit and a web site with a weekly news service, and produces publications in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese both in print and electronically. It also offers training and experience-based learning activities, advisory and evaluation services, applied research and learning projects in Asia, Africa and Latin America; and conducts advocacy activities for the sector as a whole. Topics include community management, gender and equity, institutional development, integrated water resources management, school sanitation, and hygiene promotion.

IRC staff work as facilitators in helping people make their own decisions; are equal partners with sector professionals from the South; stimulate dialogue among all parties to create trust and promote change; and create a learning environment to develop better alternatives.

IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre

PO Box 2869

2601 CW Delft

The Netherlands

Tel: +31 15 21 929 39

Fax: +31 15 21 909 55

Website: [www.irc.nl](http://www.irc.nl)

## Table of Contents

<b>Foreword</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
A backdrop to scaling up in the watsan sector .....	iv
<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>Part 1. Scaling up in the WATSAN sector</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1. An introduction to scaling up</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Scaling up in the watsan sector: what is it and why is it needed? .....	1
1.2 Objective of this Review.....	4
1.3 Method .....	5
<b>2. Water and sanitation</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Rural water supply .....	7
2.3 Sanitation projects.....	18
2.4 Institutional support mechanisms.....	21
2.5 Water resources.....	23
<b>Part 2. Scaling Up in other sectors</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>3. Economies of scale</b> .....	<b>25</b>
3.1 Origins .....	25
3.2 Introduction to scaling up in development.....	27
<b>4. Scaling up NGO activities</b> .....	<b>30</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	30
4.2 Categorising scaling up.....	30
4.3 Increasing the impact of NGO activities.....	32
4.4 Conclusions on scaling up development NGO impact.....	36
<b>5. Scaling up in HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation</b> .....	<b>37</b>
5.1 Why and what to scale up? .....	37
5.2 Scaling up as a process .....	38
5.3 Types of scaling up .....	39
5.4 Key considerations in scaling up.....	40
<b>6. Scaling up in agriculture</b> .....	<b>44</b>
6.1 Introduction.....	44
6.2 Scaling up LEISA .....	44
6.3 Scaling up watershed development .....	49
<b>7. Institutional issues in scaling up</b> .....	<b>52</b>
7.1 General.....	52
7.2 Institutionalising participation .....	52
7.3 NGOs working with government .....	55
<b>8. Conclusions</b> .....	<b>57</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>61</b>

## Foreword

### A backdrop to scaling up in the watsan sector

*Scaling up* is a term which is becoming familiar in the water and sanitation sectors but, despite or because of this increase in usage, it is apparent that the term means different things to different people.

A starting point might be that scaling up is a necessary response to a situation where an action which needs to be carried out should be undertaken at greater speed and/or to provide a greater volume of output than is the prevailing situation. Whatever it is, more of it is needed; and probably at lower unit input.

In the case of rural water supply in southern nations, the speed at which projects are undertaken is generally felt to be too slow to meet the needs of people in the millions of communities that require safe water in an acceptable timescale: so some form of acceleration is required. But just what sort of acceleration is needed and who by? Is it the case that projects should become bigger or is the project concept less relevant when considering scaling up? Should organisations expand their operations, or should they act as trainers for other organisations and lobbyists and advocates for greater action from others? In moving forward, can or how can capacity be transferred or built at the intermediate levels in support of communities, to avoid a repeat of supply driven shortcomings that occurred in the past?

The favoured method for water service development in rural parts of southern nations is community management. The widespread acceptance of this position has been hard won and may be fragile. So, perhaps most importantly, can the acceleration that is implied in scaling up occur through a community managed process or is it inevitable that a top-down approach will come to dominate again in a desire to improve coverage statistics? And if so, what would be the longer term impact upon sustainability? Should scaling up relate solely to increasing impact, or should – as many would argue - a more embracing definition be favoured, where it encompasses the durability of the impact as well as its geographical spread?

It is trusted that this Review will help those now starting to think about scaling up to consider what their objectives are in so doing. The outcome of scaling up in the rural water sector is sustained 100% coverage – an accepted human right. The activities which are necessary to attain that target constitute scaling up but this does not necessarily mean – in fact it almost certainly does not mean – that the agencies active in the sector need to expand their current programmes of work.

But if there is one lesson which must be quickly learned and disseminated from this Review it is this: there is a conflict between scalability and sustainability, between quickly expanding coverage and laying a firm foundation for longevity in terms of demand

responsiveness, participatory decision making and inclusion of all. It follows that rushing headlong to install water supply infrastructure could be doing a huge disservice to the communities they are supposed to serve – again.

## Abbreviations

Abbrev.	Description	Website
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome	See for example <a href="http://www.aids.org">www.aids.org</a>
AMSED	Association Marocaine de Solidarité Et Développement; a development NGO based in Rabat, Morocco	<a href="http://www.amsed.org.ma">www.amsed.org.ma</a>
ASEH	Advancing Sustainable Environmental Health – a sanitation project in Bangladesh led by WaterAid	<a href="http://www.wateraid.org.uk/wh_at_we_do/case_studies/858.asp">www.wateraid.org.uk/wh_at_we_do/case_studies/858.asp</a>
BIDS	An academic web search engine	<a href="http://www.bids.ac.uk">www.bids.ac.uk</a>
BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee. A development NGO working throughout Bangladesh	<a href="http://www.brac.net">www.brac.net</a>
CBO	Community Based Organisation	--
CINARA	Research and dissemination NGO based in Cali, Colombia	<a href="http://www.cinara.org.com">www.cinara.org.com</a>
CM	Community Management	See for example <a href="http://www.irc.nl">www.irc.nl</a>
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry – a government department in South Africa	<a href="http://www.dwaf.pwv.gov.za/wfw">www.dwaf.pwv.gov.za/wfw</a>
EHP	Environmental Health Programme a USAID sponsored NGO to develop, implement and promote environmental health interventions.	<a href="http://www.ehproject.org">www.ehproject.org</a>
GO	Government Organisation	--
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus	<a href="http://www.aids.org">www.aids.org</a>
IDS	Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, Brighton, England	<a href="http://www.ids.ac.uk">www.ids.ac.uk</a>
IDWSSD	The United Nations sponsored International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (or 'Water Decade' for short): the 1980s. Note the UN has now declared 2005-2015 as a water decade.	See for example <a href="http://www.irc.nl/content/view/full/7667">www.irc.nl/content/view/full/7667</a>
IGWDP	Indo-German Watershed Development Programme funded by the German government and implemented by village self-help groups organised and supported by NGOs to regenerate the watersheds they live in.	See for example: <a href="http://www.gtzindia.org">www.gtzindia.org</a> and <a href="http://www.ifpri.org">www.ifpri.org</a>
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development; a research and dissemination NGO based in London	<a href="http://www.iied.org">www.iied.org</a>
ILEIA	Information centre for Low External Input Agriculture. See below on LEISA (see below)	<a href="http://www.ileia.org">www.ileia.org</a>
INGOs	International NGOs	--
IPM	Integrated Pest Management; an agricultural technique	--
IRC	International Water and Sanitation Centre, a knowledge dissemination and capacity building NGO based in Delft, Netherlands	<a href="http://www.irc.nl">www.irc.nl</a>
ISM	Institutional Support Mechanism	--
LEISA	Low External Input and Sustainable Agriculture. See above on ILEIA.	<a href="http://www.ileia.org">www.ileia.org</a>
MDG	Millennium Development Goal	<a href="http://www.undp.org/mdg">www.undp.org/mdg</a>
NEWAH	Nepal Water for Health. NGO providing safe water, health, sanitation and livelihood opportunities based in Kathmandu, Nepal	<a href="http://www.newah.org.np">www.newah.org.np</a>
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation	--
NOVIB	Oxfam Netherlands – a relief and development agency	<a href="http://www.novib.nl">www.novib.nl</a>
NRM	Natural Resource Management	--

Abbrev.	Description	Website
O&M	Operation and Maintenance of an installed water supply and/or sanitation system	--
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal – a family of research and mobilisation techniques	See for example <a href="http://www.irc.nl">www.irc.nl</a> or <a href="http://www.geocities.com/prap/ages">www.geocities.com/prap/ages</a>
PRC	The People's Republic of China	--
RWS	Rural Water Supply	--
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, a government agency	<a href="http://www.sida.se">www.sida.se</a>
SoK	Streams of Knowledge – a network of water and sanitation resource centres aiming to build water sector capacity.	<a href="http://www.netwasgroup.com">www.netwasgroup.com</a> <a href="http://www.streamsofknowledge.net">www.streamsofknowledge.net</a>
USAID	United States Aid programme – a federal body which provides economic and humanitarian assistance	<a href="http://www.usaid.gov">www.usaid.gov</a>
UWASNET	Uganda Water and Sanitation Network: an NGO based in Kampala	Tel: +256 (0)41 222 922
VERC	Village Education and Research Centre – an NGO in Dhaka, Bangladesh	Contact details via: <a href="http://www.wisard.org">www.wisard.org</a>
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas – an NGO based in London which provides volunteer staff on placement in developing nations	<a href="http://www.vso.org.uk">www.vso.org.uk</a>
watsan	Water and sanitation	--
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development, held in Johannesburg South Africa in August 2002 (at which the MDGs were agreed)	<a href="http://www.johannesburgsummit.org">www.johannesburgsummit.org</a>



---

## Part 1.           Scaling up in the WATSAN sector

### 1.    An introduction to scaling up

#### 1.1   Scaling up in the watsan sector: what is it and why is it needed?

This Review has been written in an attempt to illuminate the background to the provision of improved water supply to the 1.1 billion people who do not have it – in particular, the pressing requirement to accelerate such provision while safeguarding the mechanisms put in place to achieve it: ‘scaling up’, while promoting ‘sustainability’.

In the 1980s, during the United Nations International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (IDWSSD or “the Water Decade”), a concerted attempt to confront the problem was made – the explicit goal was 100% coverage by the end of the decade. Many millions of people were provided with improved water supply, largely through the work of external agencies, but the goal was not met. The problems of the ‘supply-driven’ approach that was used at that time in working toward the goal have been well documented (see, for example, Carter *et al*, 1996) and can be summarised as being a lack of:

- Community involvement in the process.
- Consideration of appropriate technology, such that subsequent maintenance was problematic and hardware fell into disuse.
- Focus upon sustaining what was provided.
- Support mechanisms between communities and the various layers of government.
- Institutional capacity to undertake the tasks required.

Since the UNWD there has been a change in the focus of the approach, we now see an approach based largely upon Community Management (CM) of projects, in which projects and programmes more often:

- Contain greater community involvement or management.
- Include elements to enhance the capacity of the institutions involved to undertake the process.
- Contain greater emphasis on sustainability of both hardware and the institutional arrangements.

Despite these improvements the scale of the problem remains, the great number of people referred to above do not have access to a safe water supply. Further, a CM-based approach, while it has the undoubted benefits mentioned above, has been found to take a greater amount of time and other resources than the supply driven approach, and it is clear why this might be the case. So, here is the paradox at the heart of reaching the unreached millions – how to do so at greater pace, while maintaining the benefits of CM based approaches: is it possible to scale up and promote durability?

---

The unacceptable nature of the multiple sufferings of the 1.1 billion people has been highlighted vigorously by many organisations and individuals. Their attempts culminated in recognition of the urgency of the problem by the world governments at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) at Johannesburg in 2002. The water target in Millennium Development Goal 7 requires a 50% reduction in the proportion of those without access to safe water by 2015<sup>1</sup>.

It is a statistical possibility that the overall MDG7 goal in relation to water can be met if great strides are made in the People's Republic of China (PRC) – but major problems will still need to be confronted in sub-Saharan African, South Asia and Latin America. The following calculation shows how many people need to be newly served with safe water if the water target within MDG7 is to be met.

#### **Meeting the water target in Millennium Development Goal #7 (MDG7)**

- It is commonly asserted that 1.1 bn. people do not have safe water currently.
- As the world population is 6 bn, it follows that 4.9 bn are served and so the 1.1 bn without represent 18% of the total
- To halve the proportion by 2015 - the MDG - means to reduce this to 9% of the population at that time.
- If the world population in 2015 is 7 bn people and 91% of the population at that time is served, this equates to 6.3 bn. people served
- In the interim period, therefore, to meet the MDG, coverage needs to increase from 4.9 bn to 6.3 bn; being 1.4 bn in 13 years (2002-2015 inclusive).
- The simple sum 1.4 bn/13 results in an outcome that, on average, 108m people a year or 307,000 people a day need to be newly served.

*Some sources indicate that the currently unserved figure is greater than 1.1 bn: if for example there are 1.3 bn people currently unserved (22% of current world population), the requirement is 324,000 per day, if 1.5 bn (25%) are unserved, as some suggest it may be, the daily requirement rises to 342,000.*

---

1 It also requires a similar reduction in the larger number of people who do not have access to adequate sanitation facilities – in general terms this Review relates to water provision but there is considerable overlap

This is not to say that MDG7 is the driver of the process, merely that it is helpful in this instance in indicating the scale of the problem<sup>2</sup>.

Reaching over 300,000 people a day requires acting in both urban and rural areas, throughout southern nations. Some of the issues are common to both but many are not; for example:

- technology choice issues are different.
- the institutional set up and mechanics of provision are different.
- the issue of private sector provision may arise in the less economically impoverished urban areas.

Furthermore, the distribution of population is predominantly rural in most sub-Saharan African, South Asian (and South American) countries; what is more, adequate water supply is likely to have a degree of influence in reducing the flight to the cities in those countries. For these reasons, this Review concentrates upon reaching rural populations. Some of the main parameters that need to be dealt with and the consequent need to 'scale up' are shown in the following Text Box.

#### **An introduction to scaling up**

*The calculations shown above indicate that 300,000+ people need to gain access to adequate water supply every day for the water target in MDG7 to be met; does achieving this target require, and what is different about, scaling up?*

Taking Uganda as an example:

- Around 35% of the population is served by functioning equipment
- Coverage is increasing at 1-2% per year, a rate at which it would take around 50 years to achieve full coverage of the *current population*.
- Expenditure on water and sanitation is \$1 per head per year (\$20m); at this rate it would take 35 years to achieve full coverage of the *current population*.
- But the population growth rate is about 3.5% per year.
- And perhaps 30% of hardware provided in the country is not functional (so the real coverage rate might be as low as 25%).
- So, increased hardware provision alone can not keep pace with population growth, leave alone make a significant impact upon the achievement of MDG7.

*Source Ryan 2003*

<sup>2</sup> See for example, Hitting the Targets: Recommendations to the G8 for Delivery of the Millennium Development Goals on Water and Sanitation, by WaterAid and other NGOs, May 2003.

---

Without doubt, getting to 100% coverage has always been the aim of many of those involved, but scaling up is required in order to achieve it within a timescale that might be widely regarded as acceptable. On this basis, scaling up can be defined as *an accelerated process to achieve 100% coverage*.

Within the parameters that are shown as critical above is one that relates to the functionality of equipment. Such functionality and durability lies at the heart of the concept of *sustainability*. It is clear that the water target (of a 50% reduction in the proportion of people without safe water) within MDG7 can not be achieved, much less that of 100% coverage, in the absence of sustainability. It is argued<sup>3</sup> that scaling up has a geographical and temporal element: it encompasses both increased coverage and the notion of sustained coverage over time. This is an important differentiation, one upon which some degree of consensus would be useful. The attraction of an all-encompassing notion is strong but is it outweighed by the argument against it: that in doing so, scaling up might come to mean all things to all people and so effectively cease to have a meaningful definition?

In any event, it is obvious that there is therefore at the very least an overlap between the two issues but this Review has not sought to add, directly, to the knowledge base regarding sustainability.

Additionally, it is difficult to separate water from the issues of sanitation and hygiene in this context. There is a major overlap between these areas and clearly the topic of scaling up is common to sanitation and hygiene promotion work in rural communities in southern nations. So it is hoped that this Review will be of interest to those engaged in that work; it does include reference to documents which are specific to it.

## 1.2 Objective of this Review

The purpose of this Review is to document the literature coverage of scaling up, in the water and sanitation sector and in other sectors, such that lessons may be learned from other arenas where the debate may already have taken place.

There has been some consideration of scaling up in the watsan sector. This being the case, this element of the literature is reviewed in some detail in Part 1 of this Review. This includes addressing community management itself and contains some treatment of scaling up community participation within it.

Consideration of the subject in other areas follows in Part 2, the objective here being to address how its treatment in other sectors adds to that which has already occurred in the watsan arena. This second element has been structured to shed light on the subject moving from the general to the particular. So, the general concept of economies of scale is addressed first; this is followed by scaling up in the development context, looking at it

---

3 See for example coverage of these issues on the IRC website: [www.irc.nl/content/view/full/111](http://www.irc.nl/content/view/full/111)

---

generally within social development programmes, then scaling up the impact of NGOs, how it has been addressed within HIV/AIDS prevention, in agricultural development and in watershed development.

A full bibliography of references is provided at the end of the Review; for completeness, this includes some that have not been referred to in the main text of the Review but which may be of interest to the reader. If a document is known to be available on the Internet it is marked **www** at its main reference in the text; additionally, the bibliography contains, in addition to the full reference, a link to the *url*.

### 1.3 Method

The main references within the rural water supply field such as those arising from the conference work within IRC and the key paper produced by Jennifer Davis and Parameswaran Iyer for the World Bank were identified during the work on the author's MSc thesis (Davis & Iyer, 2002, **www**). An initial library search led to the identification of Michael Edwards and David Hulme's 1992 book on scaling up the activities of NGOs and Jocelyn Delong's 2003 book on scaling up HIV/AIDS prevention in developing nations as key references. The next step was to follow up references contained in each of these, thus making the process a rolling one. An electronic search of academic databases was undertaken in parallel. Three main references found through these methods were:

- a general reference on scaling up social programmes (Wazir and van Oudenhoven, 1998).
- On low external input and sustainable agriculture (LEISA)<sup>4</sup> in the form of an issue of the magazine of the institute devoted to this area devoted to the topic of scaling up (ILIEA, October 2001, **www**).
- on institutionalising scaled up participation within development (Blackburn and Holland, 1998).

It can not be declared with any certainty that the electronic search was comprehensive, even though dedicated search engines such as Science Direct and BIDS were used. This is simply because in an internet search it is impossible to be certain that all relevant 'hits' have been made. Searches were made using keywords, such as 'scaling up', 'scaled up', 'upscaling', 'expansion', 'spread' and others. The fact that these began to lead to repeated 'hits' on the same papers and to references that had already been found gives some comfort that coverage is good, but it is not certain that all major sources have been identified and it is inevitable that many 'minor' sources will have been missed.

Finally, the scope of study required in considering scaling up extends to issues such as institutional support, capacity building, civil society and governance issues. There is a wealth of literature on these but it has been neither possible nor profitable to attempt to provide a comprehensive list in these areas. It is noteworthy however that, in parallel with

---

4 There did not appear to be a major literature on the subject within agriculture outside LEISA

---

the production of this Review, a Thematic Overview Paper by Harold Lockwood and Ton Schouten to support the IRC-led and WSSCC sponsored Thematic Group on Scaling Up has been made available on the IRC website.

Additionally, a report by Harold Lockwood on institutional support mechanisms (ISMs) is especially useful and is covered at some length in this Review (see §2.4).

## 2. Water and sanitation

### 2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the main references in scaling up rural water projects, and some key relevant ones from the hygiene and sanitation arena, are addressed. The “major” ones are listed for easy-reference here (complete references in the standard format are, of course, in the Bibliography but where documents are accessible on the web, they are annotated as **www** here, and the relevant hyperlink is added to the listing in the Bibliography):

- *Taking Sustainable Rural Water Supply Services to Scale: a discussion paper* by Jennifer Davies and Parameswaran Iyer for the World Bank and others, March 2003. **www**
- *From System to Service – Scaling Up Community Management* – a report of a conference hosted by the IRC, Delft in Dec. 2001. **www**
- Report of an E-Conference “*Beyond the Community*” on scaling up community management of rural water supply, hosted by the IRC, Delft. **www**
- *WAMMA: empowerment in practice*, by Julie Jarman and Catherine Johnson, WaterAid, March 1997. **www**
- *Scaling up at WaterAid: a paper for discussion* - by Theresa Mahon and Peter Sinclair of WaterAid, May 2003. **www**
- *Scaling up Community-Managed Water Supply and Sanitation Projects in India: Part 1* – by Christine van Wijk-Sijbesma of the IRC, 2003.
- *The Soozhal Initiative: a model for achieving total sanitation in low-income rural areas*, by S Ramesh Sakthivel and Roger Fitzgerald of WaterAid, Sept. 2002. **www**
- *Subsidy or self-respect? Participatory Total Community Sanitation in Bangladesh* – by Kamal Kar of the Institute of Development Studies, the University of Sussex, (draft copy) dated April 2003. **www**
- Lockwood, Harold, 2002, *Institutional Support Mechanisms for Community Managed RWSS Systems in Latin America*, EHP/USAID, Washington DC **www**

### 2.2 Rural water supply

#### Davis & Iyer

The paper by Jenna Davis and Param Iyer provides extremely valuable inputs into the scaling up discussion and is a good first point of reference. The authors sought to ask some of the basic questions rather than attempting to answer them; their self-proclaimed “*modest goals*” were to present some overarching issues, to identify the common challenges and to suggest an agenda for future research.

They note a potential conflict between scaling up and sustainability (this is mentioned on a number of occasions elsewhere in this document), warning that a pressure to scale up through accelerating the implementation of new projects could lead to a return to supply-side RWS planning, thereby undermining the community ownership of the process that is

---

so important an element in sustainability. They also note a series of potential bottlenecks to scaling up as follows:

- Resource constraints: which are listed as inadequate funding, limitations in human capital or institutional capacity, inadequately defined or the absence of supply chains, or the myriad of potential other resource limitations and constraints “*that render a successful small-scale initiative infeasible on a larger scale*”.
- Lack of knowledge or shared understanding “*in which individuals responsible for planning or implementing an RWS initiative do not fully understand its principles and/or the roles they are expected to play in scaling up*”.
- Resistance to implementation by those with entrenched vested interests in which, for example, “*despite having full understanding of a successful, sustainable approach to RWS service delivery, key stakeholders are unwilling to scale up*”.

Examples cited included those where:

- staff or agencies do not share the objectives of the agencies seeking scaling up,
- the staff may already have too much to do and perhaps there is no motivation to take on the likely additional tasks that would be required in a scaling up process,
- a redistribution of responsibilities to facilitate scaling up may lead to officials or politicians being sidelined or bypassed. .
- Untested implementation conditions for extension or replication in new areas: “*When extended to new areas/communities. A successful initiative encounters difficulties because of its unique features (e.g. technical, social, policy, user demand) not confronted in the pilot communities*”.

There is a serious limitation exposed in the paper: the authors’ conception of scaling up is stated as being a position in which “*the vast majority of the target population is provided with sustainable, improved services within a reasonable timeframe*”. This definition, as it relates to the “vast majority” of the population, by implication indicates that it will not be possible to reach some parts of it, thereby (necessarily) omitting the poorest. If there is not to be 100% coverage, then who is to miss out and who decides, whereas, if 100% coverage is the goal – as it should be as water is a human right - the additional contentious question of poverty focus does not arise.

The following quotes illustrate the implications of this limited position “*effective RWS planning must grapple with the fact that some proportion of households, to whom we would like to extend improved services, will nevertheless be unwilling and/or unable to meet the participation requirements [described earlier in the paper as related to cost sharing]. Such households should not be considered as part of the target population*”. Alternative strategies will be needed for these people they comment, “*in order to attain the universal service goals so often articulated by government*”. It would follow that if the poor can not make a contribution to provision then scaling up will pass them by; this runs counter to the notion of water is a human right,

---

A second issue but less serious reservation is that the authors display a strong commitment to pilot projects; such commitment does not appear to manifest itself elsewhere in the literature on scaling up. Indeed, the report itself quotes a number of examples of 'gold-plating' and other practices which render pilots less than useful, one of which is apparent from the quote on untested implementation conditions above. In some instances they really meant 'staging' as against 'piloting' (the examples they use in Indonesia, India and Sri Lanka for example); the lesson here is that it will be helpful to distinguish between these two concepts.

#### *IRC conferences on scaling up*

##### **From system to service conference**

A conference entitled *From System to Service – Scaling Up Community Management* was hosted by IRC in December 2001. As its title implies, the organisers took as its basis that for scaling up to occur it must be rooted in community management (CM), so it followed that the requirement for scaling up in general is to find ways to scale-up community management itself.

The documentation of the conference is concise and comprises summary papers by presenters plus a conference statement arising as a result of the work carried out. The key issues in the statement are covered in the text which follows.

There was some initial debate about what constituted CM and therefore what is scaling up about? The organisers indicated that community management was a function of two main elements, being control by the community, and ownership by the community of the system. Two lesser elements were seen as involvement in the day to day operation and maintenance of the system and contribution to cost recovery.

After discussion, it was agreed that CM should be taken to equate to control at all stages; being "*the ability to make strategic decisions about the development process*" and "*not necessarily the actual day to day operation and maintenance of the system*". Importantly, a general consensus was also obtained on the issue of ownership: "*while important, legal ownership is not essential to CM*".

As important as control, there was agreement that "*financial viability is essential for sustainability*" and that, in this context "*some element of contribution to recurrent cost is important, particularly in assisting to create a sense of ownership*".

The second key topic covered in the conference was why should CM be favoured as a mechanism over any other option? The report indicates that a series of breakout groups looked at this topic and reported that CM "*is one of the few viable solutions in an economically marginal environment with low capacity government*". This and a further general view that CM "*can play an important role in situations where the public or private business can not be trusted and fails to provide services to (poor) people*" represent a

---

curiously negative motivation for CM, especially in a conference of this type and title, indeed the report highlights that consensus did not exist among conference delegates as to “*whether community management is sustainable in the long term*” although it was also stated that CM “*should not be promoted as a response to a perceived ‘failure of government’ but rather as a strong, viable and appropriate management model in its own right*”.

The detail of the reporting on the groups reveals more positive motivation; the reasons underlying this response are clear from the views that emerge in relation to scaling up CM.

The third and most important element of the report is that dedicated to the question on how to scale up CM. The list of main requirements is a valuable one and is summarised as follows:

1. An enabling environment that supports community management is required, in which:
  - a. policy is supportive of scaling up endeavours.
  - b. financial resources are available.
  - c. the critical requirement to build stakeholders’ capacity is recognised at all levels – noting that the ‘intermediate’ level of government is critical.
  - d. Development of a learning and questioning environment is necessary.
  - e. decentralisation is necessary to build intermediate level capacity which is crucial for the success of forming partnerships with communities.
2. It is necessary to target poverty, respond to real demand and take a more holistic approach:
  - a. while our agenda is drinking water, that of the community may be wider than that.
  - b. “From system to service” was the rallying call of this conference – “a system that works serves the demands of the customers”
3. Advocacy is crucial to the success of scaled up CM at all levels and to all stakeholders.

The conference went on to consider the main roles and responsibilities in scaling up generally and in providing an enabling environment in particular. Critically, it was agreed, CM requires a change in role of Government from being implementers to facilitators, from the strategic level (policy and legislation) to support for operation and maintenance by communities being the key example.

CM also requires support from the other players who are active in the area, who need especially to collaborate, and who must work to build more productive relationships to support CM efforts, even if this requires a change in their roles and responsibilities.

Initially, there was a degree of uncertainty about the degree to which CM is successful this uncertainty appeared to be replaced by a feeling confidence as the conference proceeded.

### Beyond the community e-conference

As a follow-up, an e-conference was hosted by IRC in July 2002 entitled “*Beyond the Community*” again, its consideration was scaling up CM of rural water supplies<sup>5</sup>. As with its precursor, it took as its starting point that “*CM is a viable option for the management of rural water supply*” and that it is CM that “*must be scaled up to reach its full potential and that the efforts of communities to manage their water supplies need to be supported*”. The proceedings of the conference, which was carried out over a six week period and included e-delegates from all over the world, are comprehensive and extremely usefully organised. A wide range of topics is covered but the quality in each does not suffer for this, as this is shown in the summaries of topics shown below which include a selection of key quotes.

Again the starting point was that CM must form the basis for attempts to scale up – indeed in the background paper the facilitators went to some lengths to reinforce this message, perhaps in view of the initial scepticism at the previous conference: “*Community management has become the leading approach for implementing rural water supply projects. Although a wide range of different methods and techniques to implement community managed water supply projects are used, they all aim at strengthening the capacities and willingness of community people to take on the ownership and responsibility of managing their water supply systems.*”

They note that community management is being used across a range of different project types, not just in water and sanitation and that the philosophy has developed over a lengthy period with widespread beneficial results. The authors’ simile is that communities can do 80% of what is required post implementation, but that “*there is a crucial 20% that must come from outside; troubleshooting, backstopping, facilitating, enabling. These are the issues that lie at the heart of scaling up community management. Only when systems can become sustainable beyond the lifetime of a project or a system [can] more people be served more quickly while maintaining sustainability*”.

To do this requires:

- A need to look beyond the community to the whole environment in which it exists and functions.
- A move away from projects which stand alone to a framework for scaling up system provision.
- A shift from output measurement to a qualitative focus.
- That each actor plays its role – from concrete pouring, to management, to backstopping, to retraining and financial accounting.
- Filling the “*glaring gap*” at the intermediate level capacity “*by capacity building, but also by changing attitudes and work practices, is the most pressing need in terms of scaling up community management*”.
- A move from single projects a different approach to implementation.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.irc.nl/content/view/full/691> (as at January 2004)

---

The themes for the e-conference were:

- Actions needed to scale up community management.
- Obstacles to scaling up.
- Experience (good and bad) with scaling up.

The conference considered at length the community and its dynamics, noting diversity within communities, the requirement to keep gender issues to the fore and to resist dominance by elite groups. Another key consideration related to the continuing need for a poverty focus: *“it was repeatedly commented and acknowledged that most projects, due to their focus on communities who demand, and can afford, water-lifting devices and O&M of a system, do not tend to focus on the ‘poor’”*. Some considered that scaling up should commence with poorer communities and scale up from there; readers may contrast this with a view expressed in the LEISA context (see ‘Scale One’ in Chapter 6) regarding the risks in working with those who can least afford to fail. Some felt that communities need to be properly prepared for system management, especially if donors impose systems on communities with insufficient involvement. Failure, it was pointed out, leads to a loss of confidence; effectively placing communities in a worse position than ‘square one’.

The issues of ownership, finance and technology were covered in some depth. That communities should own projects is common jargon; as with the previous conference it was agreed that legal ownership is preferable but establishing legal ownership is necessary and a *sense* of project ownership on the part of the community is vital. On funding, it was agreed that skills in accounting related practices required strengthening and cash (or equivalent “sweat”) access is a major stumbling block in community managed projects. A wide range of opinions were cited in respect of *“appropriate”* technological choice and O&M issues; the cost, ease of maintenance, access to spare parts and other related issues remain contentious areas in sustainability and scaling up.

There was then full consideration of the wider environment, and the need for support and capacity building. There was wide acceptance of the need to address shortcomings in capacity at local government level. This is perhaps best illustrated in a point made by participant NEWAH (a Nepalese NGO) being that there is a need to create *“coordination bodies at the district level to strengthen local government”*.

Support is needed from the centre as well, not only in the more obvious elements of creating the necessary policy and legislative environment but also in legitimising *“participatory approaches and... allowing [local government] to participate fully in the process”*. Appropriate decentralisation was seen as being of key importance to the process, with good leadership and minimal interference, for example *“no empty promises of free water”*.

Some suggested that governments do not see a need for community support once the hardware is in place, *“social mobilisation in communities is sufficient to manage systems*

*long term*”, they may think. Some areas where government should support were quoted as in spare part replacement and routine visits<sup>6</sup>.

The roles of the various players in the process were then considered. Government, it was indicated, should “*change its role to support an environment in which community management can be successful*” while local government, as frequently noted, needs major strengthening. Some participants questioned the motivation of international NGOs (INGOs) especially their perceived need for “*creating local success stories*”, some felt that they are not so much ‘bottom up’ but “*guided bottom up*”. The role of the private sector and that of donors received limited consideration and the familiar issue of the potential for a conflict between the requirements of sustainability and increasing coverage was also raised, a need for balancing funds to new and existing schemes being one suggested response. The facilitator asked “*shouldn’t we be much more systematic in calculating and documenting the costs and benefits of approaches in order to be able to answer this crucial question?*”

Numerous questions and ideas on how to scale up emerged. Successful interventions were quoted from Zimbabwe, where local politicians were very much involved, and from Ethiopia, where success was obtained in “*vast community managed schemes*” despite lack of legislation to allow schemes to have their own bank accounts. On the other hand, it was indicated that, “*despite 40 years of investment, 60% of the Kenyan population still has no access to a safe and reliable water supply*”. This delegate warned that “*a paradigm shift is needed to identify the key factors to stimulate rural communities to draw from their own resources, to stimulate governments to support these efforts and NGOs to facilitate shorter learning curves*”.

The efforts of the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF) in South Africa to develop model contracts with community based organisations (CBOs) and NGOs were quoted as examples of exactly such a shift in thinking. A further example was quoted as being the formation and operation of water supply associations of CBOs in Colombia. The organisation so formed – Aquacol – has better communication with government, exerts more influence and has access to more and better information than could be the case in its absence.

Obstacles to scaling up were considered also and categorised under issues including:

- Management: being intrinsically poor and lacking trust in communities.
- Governance: political interference and ‘short-termism’ (for example, in pricing issues generally, promising free water).
- Lack of capacity and awareness particularly at the government/community interface.
- Technological difficulties: spare part availability and geographical diversity /remoteness.

<sup>6</sup> See in particular commentary on the work of Harold Lockwood on ISMs at §2.4

- 
- Finance issues: lack of cost recovery, lack of government clarity, lack of money in communities and low salary/motivation of government employees.
  - Legal aspects: no legal status for community organisations and corruption issues “*by ignoring it [corruption] we risk creating structures that have no basis in reality*”.
  - Policy and planning aspects: lack of long term planning and recognition of the dynamic nature of all the inputs to the process; lack of support systems and of integration with other plans and programs and prevalence of self interest in many participant agencies, especially in donor interest areas.
  - Gender and poverty are not addressed implicitly or explicitly.

### *Scaling up at WaterAid*

Firstly, it is worth looking at a WaterAid project which was *designed at scale*: the WAMMA project in Dodoma, Tanzania. This long-term project offers a great deal of relevant experience for those looking to Scale-up in this sector as it was implemented through a combination of the resources and skills of NGOs working with three government departments in support of community managed projects. It has been well documented in “*WAMMA: empowerment in practice*” (Jarman and Johnson, 1997).

WAMMA drew its name from the four parties (of which three were government departments) which supported it and which were involved in it as contributing partners, being WaterAid, Maji (Water Department), Maedeleo ja Jamli (Community Development Department) and Afya (Health Department). Set up in 1991 in collaboration with the Tanzanian government, It initially helped around 86 communities in the Dodoma region of the country to provide themselves with improved water supply and sanitation systems.

The authors remark that the WAMMA project “*has become a model of an integrated participatory approach to community water supplies... crucially it has demonstrated the strong motivational effect which comes from empowerment*”. The community dictates the type and (crucially for scaling up programmes) the pace of project progress, while external bodies fill in the technical and financial gaps, also ensuring adherence to standards and norms. This took over a decade to achieve and incorporated flexibility to changing circumstances and learning of key lessons as the work progressed. In the five years covered by the WAMMA report (1991-6) over a quarter of a million people were served (for updated figures, see Mathew below).

The main issues regarding WAMMA in relation to its success as a project are summarised as follows:

- NGOs working with governments in a supportive policy environment “*deliver powerful support for community-based action*”.
- “*Empowerment of fieldworkers makes them dynamic agents for change*”: highly committed fieldworkers were vital and became the driving force of the project.
- The community management aspect of the project is a success: the communities manage their own projects well.

- Institutionalising participation – “*the WAMMA approach had to become an integral part of the government system*”; this enabled wider participation and allowed for scaling back of NGO involvement as time progressed
- The pace of change is governed by the speed at which community capacity is built: patience is required.
- The introduction of conflict coping and avoidance mechanisms helped to keep the project on the rails; conflict is inevitable and probably necessary, so to make progress, inclusivity and early consultation within project teams are vital; two conundrums arise:
  - If departmental management had been consulted too soon, then the project may have taken on a different tack, as managers were not open to consulting with others. They had, though, to be bought into the loop at an opportune time; the conundrum relates to the correct timing.
  - Village power structures had to be respected but external development agencies often wish to bypass such structures so as to ensure full participation.

In terms of scaling up, the authors note that the approach is not a blueprint but is replicable in certain conditions, which are:

- An enabling policy environment, the authors note that Tanzania’s national water policy allows a community based approach to water supply.
- Availability of fieldworkers for the PRA work, in the WAMMA case, government made these available.
- Official backing from relevant sources, in WAMMA, at least one senior government official gave the programme continuous support.
- Patience and flexibility; covered above, none of the participants pushed for quick results.
- High priority for *community* development; WaterAid gave community development a high profile and sufficient resources.
- Adequate donor resources: finance and commitment over a long period.

A more personal view of WAMMA, its successes and lessons for the future, is to be found in a short paper written as an input to a PhD study programme by Brian Mathew entitled *Celebrating a decade of WAMMA*. He notes that the programme has continued to expand, the Department of Education has joined it and three new districts plus the peri-urban area of Dar-es-Salaam have been added to the programme. As a consequence, the number of beneficiaries has grown to 1.3 million people and the amount in “Waterfunds” has reached the equivalent of \$100,000. The junior programme staff have ‘risen through the ranks’ and now are programme managers while the programme itself remains a source of learning for a wide range of people.

Mathew remarks that WAMMA remains a success not least because of the motivation of staff to work with communities to help them achieve their goals and due to the support from WaterAid and the Government of Tanzania for continued support to the project over a

---

lengthy period. Not only has time moved on but so has the name 'WAMMA' – it now stands for WAwezesaji, Maji, Maendeleo and Afiya (facilitators, water, community development and health) – flexibility is the key!

Moving to other WaterAid experience in scaling up, Theresa Mahon and Peter Sinclair, in *Scaling Up at WaterAid, a paper for discussion*, most helpfully draw together some of its work in the area. There is a wealth of relevant experience documented in this summary paper; it covers WaterAid and its partners' work in four Asian and African countries succinctly and with clarity. Two of the projects relate to sanitation and so are covered in the next section; the remaining two are described here. Note that the full references for all four project documents are in the bibliography as well as the main reference (Mahon and Sinclair, 2003).

In Niassa Province, Moçambique, WaterAid aimed rapidly to increase rural water supply coverage ten-fold and then replicate this in larger scale programmes in the neighbouring Province of Zambezia. The attempt to scale up in Niassa was seen as crucial as government officials were sceptical about community managed projects, indeed they felt that this type of project management would lead to *fewer* projects being implemented (owing to the time consuming nature of community mobilisation) than was the case in the previous top-down environment.

The success of the scaling up effort is indicated by the fact that £180,000 of expenditure in 2000 bought 30 water points, while £360,000 in 2002 bought 156 points. Expenditure had doubled but outputs had increased by a factor of five. Increased efficiency made a contribution but reduced cost per water point was the key factor. Cost equates to labour inputs; a comparison of cost per point shows that in Niassa as being less than \$2,000, while that for another donor in an adjacent province is \$92,000.

WaterAid Moçambique believes that 100% coverage is possible in Niassa province in 5-7 years, if the *“lack of sector co-ordination [that] lies at the heart of financing problems rather than lack of funds”* can be addressed. *“It is essential also that donors work with the local government, private sector and local NGOs, rather than independently, to build capacity and thus ensure sustainability”*. The criticisms of INGOs mentioned in the IRC e-conference might well be addressed if this were done across the board and significant results achieved as a result.

Meanwhile, WaterAid in Singida, Tanzania was attempting to achieve 100% coverage in a district-based plan over a three year period – as against previous practice of incrementally increasing coverage with an open-ended time frame. The key in this instance was to work with a broader range and greater number of partners, across the spectrum and selected through open invitation, in order to maximise the use of local resources *“based upon the premise that local institutions have a better understanding of local conditions and are available to offer further services beyond the life of the project”*.

As noted elsewhere, the Tanzanian government has legislated in favour of community based projects and the Ministry of Water is changing to a role of facilitator rather than provider, private sector is granted a role but communities are responsible, with local government support. In a similar way to that described in Moçambique there is little donor co-ordination across projects and worse, little co-operation either. The scaling up method was as revealed above: a district wide approach with a limited timeframe (but with higher expenditure) as against a village based operation over an open ended period.

The results are clear to see in that 10,000 out of the target 57,000 received a new supply in Year 1, WaterAid was optimistic that 90% coverage would be achieved within three years. A key to the success, WaterAid Tanzania believes, is the use of local organisations which it feels are more able to respond effectively beyond the project lifetime, as against the prevailing national policy of using organisations irrespective of their location in the country. WaterAid hopes that this element of the Government's approach might be amended in the light of the Singida experience.

It is clear from Mahon and Sinclair's discussion of experience gained in these projects that scaling up has been achieved with a good deal of success in these cases: it is achievable in terms both of coverage and within the institutions which deliver it, given certain conditions and approaches:

- The policy, finance and legislative environment needs to be right (and be supported, see below) – in the absence of this, work needs to be undertaken to provide this necessary context;
- Mainstreaming and advocacy create the climate for scaling up through learning and applying lessons from successful projects;
- Barriers to the process need to be overcome or dismantled, WaterAid lists them as follows:
  - Lack of resources – financial, technical, human and institutional.
  - Badly targeted resources/inappropriate technology – the work in Moçambique contains examples of the choice of inappropriate pumps for the local conditions, on the basis that the pump chosen, although of an *“excellent standard... are too expensive to maintain and require spares that are not manufactured locally”*.
  - Donor/sector unco-ordination: donor policy and attitudes may need to be influenced, particularly to ensure co-ordination and co-operation, also to ensure that resources are not squandered.<sup>7</sup>
  - Weak policy environment – lack of policy ownership.
  - Pilot schemes and projects not designed to go to scale” (or may actually preclude it).
  - Trade-offs between sustainability<sup>8</sup> and scalability.

<sup>7</sup> As it might be felt that spending very large sums of money per water point is not only not yielding value for money, it is also reducing the opportunity for others to benefit from more efficient and effective programmes

<sup>8</sup> See Breslin 2003 for more details

---

### *Scaling up participation in community-managed projects*

Christine van Wijk-Sibesma indicates that *“ample evidence exists that better quality participatory planning and management lead to better performing community water supplies and better sanitation and hygiene”*. In her paper *“Scaling up community-managed water supply and sanitation projects in India”* she presents a number of examples which she indicates illustrate this; mainly from Indo-Dutch co-sponsored water projects.

However, reporting on projects which have attempted to go to scale in India, she indicates that insufficient analysis of results has been built into them to allow assessments of scaling up to be carried out. There is an in-depth analysis of the Swajal project in Uttar Pradesh, with consideration given to objectives and inputs and methodologies, with some quite hard-hitting criticism of the philosophy of what she considers to be a top down, inflexible project, which did not work to the benefit of the poor and did not confront the gender problems that prevailed. She also provides a critique of the ‘Clean Kerala project’, one which aimed to scale up sanitation provision in that state.

The author is clearly looking for real evidence that scaling up has been successful in these projects and does not find it: *“it can be concluded [from the Kerala project experience, she states] that for the scaling up of community-managed water supplies and sanitation much could be learned from the more in-depth analysis of experiences with these interesting programmes. Until now, such in-depth analysis has not taken place”* and, in her general commentary: *“the experiences with larger scale implementation which were gained over the last five years in various parts of the country [India] have not been systematically analysed... the analysis was not based on field study but on the author’s familiarity with these programmes and their reports”*.

The paper is less about scaling up and more about the research efforts which would assist efforts to scale up. So, at the conclusion of the paper, on the basis of these observations, the author lists questions that she feels need to be asked in order that the real success of these scaled up projects might be established:

- How effective have the support organisations been in helping communities to plan and implement the water and sanitation projects?
- What is the quality of facilities and the equality of the processes?
- What community and agency factors explain differences in performance?
- What is the cost of these schemes, who bears each element of it and how does this compare with externally generated projects?

### 2.3 Sanitation projects

Three projects are considered here, being two covered in the WaterAid review of its experience in scaling up and one from the Institute of Development Studies’ (IDS, University of Sussex) work in Bangladesh.

---

Theresa Mahon and Peter Sinclair, from WaterAid, first consider a Bangladeshi programme named Advancing Sustainable Environmental Health (ASEH), which featured an increase in programme size of a multiple of five, with an explicit aim of having “a significant and direct impact upon the level of watsan coverage in Bangladesh and to institutionalise the participatory demand approach implemented by WABs [WaterAid, Bangladesh’s] partners in the pilot areas”. It would be hoped that the scaling up impact would increase to other agencies in the country.

The project objective is to achieve a critical mass for total sanitation coverage through a process of osmosis (similar to the biological growth model described by Carl Taylor in agriculture and health projects, see Page 45), i.e. “indirectly creating further demand for sanitation in communities adjacent to project areas without the need for direct programme intervention”. The communities spread the message amongst themselves and the experience of WAB was that this osmosis effect can increase the impact of work by 3-5 times that of the direct work. This 100% sanitation approach is also considered below in the coverage of the paper by Kamal Kar of IDS. A key issue that arises is whether or not this approach is particular to sanitation or if it can be adopted and adapted for rural water projects.

Mahon and Sinclair then report on the WaterAid Soozhal Initiative project from Cuddalore District, Tamil Nadu<sup>9</sup> to move rapidly from low sanitation facility coverage (around 6%) to 25% coverage of its 1.4 million population in two years, moving to 100% in four. The method chosen was to train intermediaries such that an economy of scale was achieved in the community mobilisation process, as WaterAid staff became trainers rather than direct intervention staff. A mass communications campaign was undertaken in parallel (clearly something that can only be done when projects are at scale). Many households, when motivated, are willing to pay the cost of the latrines (see also Kamal below), but imaginative support financing mechanisms involving bridging loans from WaterAid were devised; default rates have been very low, the authors report, a fact which has encouraged financial institutions to start to offer low interest loans for sanitation facilities.

The 25% target has been achieved and it is felt that the 100% target will be met. Mahon and Sinclair report that one of the key lessons is to address both the supply and demand aspects: unlocking demand, they report, “needs to be backed up by realistic and timely delivery mechanisms”. Their conclusions include a number of valuable pointers for considering in scaling up sanitation facility coverage:

- Building community members’ capacity is effective in unlocking latent demand for sanitation.
- Working with CBOs and undertaking mass-communications provides a good combined approach.

---

<sup>9</sup> A fieldwork report is available directly from the WaterAid website: *The Soozhal Initiative: a model for achieving total sanitation in low income rural areas* by Sakthivel and Fitzgerald. [www.wateraid.org.uk/in\\_depth/in\\_depth\\_publications/1498.asp](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/in_depth/in_depth_publications/1498.asp)

- 
- Subsidy is needed as shown above for low interest loans and should be well targeted; pooling available finance across communities is possible and helpful.
  - Decentralisation of roles and delegation of responsibilities, to community members and bodies, especially on handling finance is essential.

Kamal Kari's report from Bangladesh goes a step further. He indicates that it is possible to go to 100% sanitation totally through community participatory methods with a zero subsidy. The approach developed by local NGO VERC<sup>10</sup> concentrated upon motivational aspects and the resultant totally "sanitised" villages bear witness to the success of this change in approach, in which *"the onus for progress is placed almost entirely on the community"*.

Community members become so motivated by the exercise that they construct the latrines for themselves or help others to do so, even going as far as helping to finance latrines for community members unable to do so themselves. It would appear that the peer group pressure is so strong that the community 'polices' facility usage (incidents of open defecation are followed up and eradicated), and people decide which latrine model to build for themselves according to their resources.

Kar reports on some of the methods that were adopted to achieve total sanitisation:

- One village adopted a slogan *"one fly is deadlier than 100 tigers"* to help understanding;
- Communities undertook collective action to stamp out indiscriminate defecation, for example, starting night patrols, carrying out early morning raids and, *"even children participated in the project by following offenders and then sticking little name tags on the 'offence' so that passers-by could identify the guilty party"*.
- When 100% sanitation is achieved and *"villages are freed from open defecation, the villagers erect signs saying 'No one in this village defecates in the open' "*.

The project report emphasises the time and effort taken in the early stages of the work to analyse the sanitation issues with the community and move slowly towards a shared understanding of ways forward. Kar makes a further interesting point that local governments will see the progress being made in this way and want to take credit for this and to replicate the method elsewhere – in a sense it becomes a self-generating model for scaling up.

Kar portrays this as a totally 'bottom-up' process. There is no discussion in the paper of whether or not for example any consideration of groundwater pollution was considered but it is possible that such technicalities can be built into projects even if they were not in this instance. A final observation on this seemingly wholly successful scaling up example is that there was a diversion of the financial resources (which came from WaterAid) as assistance with construction materials and subsidy was not required, more could be and was spent upon the extension and empowerment processes.

---

10 Village Education Resource Centre

While this review is only of two projects, it is immediately clear that a significant degree of success is being had in scaling up in sanitation which has, as yet, not been achieved in rural water supply. What is it that has led to such levels of success? Some comments on this are as follows:

- It is clear that a great deal of time was spent in community mobilisation and the preparation stage of the project, particularly in Kamal Kar's Bangladesh project; this must be a factor in achieving success.
- Again in the Bangladesh example, the project was very much community owned, with NGOs and government more peripheral.
- Perhaps sanitation projects are easier to scale up – each facility decision is household based and does not have the dynamics and processes of communities to take into account .
- The total “sanitised” coverage in Bangladesh was achieved and can be sustained largely by peer group pressure – it is not likely that this leverage is available in other project types where other peoples' behaviour is not as great an influence.

#### 2.4 Institutional support mechanisms

As community participation is institutionalised and as NGOs slowly relinquish control as they move from a delivery remit to one that facilitates the community, and as government takes on a policy and support mantle as civil society matures, how are communities to be supported in their efforts to lead their own development?

How are the twin issues of increasing coverage and ensuring sustainability to be confronted in a scaling up process? How can a desire to increase coverage not submerge the much highlighted problems with sustainability, where technical or logistic and management shortcomings, even failure is commonplace: “*Pumps litter the African landscape; skeletons of a dream deferred*”<sup>11</sup>, the words may be harsh, some may say that they may overstate the case but there is major concern on the issue of sustainability. There is a significant literature on the reasons for this and it is not proposed to go into detail here. It is necessary to ensure that sustainability is considered as well as supporting the coverage element of scaling up, when looking at how the community is to be supported in its efforts...

There are perhaps two issues that need to be differentiated when considering how to provide such support:

- The first can be summarised as mechanisms to support institutions involved currently in watsan provision – a key reference on this issue is covered immediately below.
- The second is the wider question of any necessary or helpful changes in Governmental structure and within Civil Society that would be of assistance to scaling up – the area of civil society and democracy is within neither the

---

11 Voiceover from training video

---

competence of this author to cover, nor the timescale for the production of this document<sup>12</sup>.

The key reference here is a booklet, written by Harold Lockwood, on the issue of institutional support mechanisms (ISMs), based upon his experience in Latin America. This document gives guidance to organisations and individuals who are attempting to provide support to rural communities in general and in their efforts in the water and sanitation sector in particular.

The work, for the EHP programme of USAID, concentrated upon post-implementation support to communities. It was published in 2002, and provides an excellent overview of the key issues in supporting communities post project implementation as well as providing a commentary on different types of mechanisms that might be appropriate.

Lockwood describes how support to communities can come via four main routes; three of which are where support is from government, the fourth is where it has been delegated to other parties. The government support mechanisms (1-3 below) are a function of the extent and type of decentralisation in the location being considered:

1. Centralised Model – where there is direct engagement by central government with communities with no intermediary and no devolution or power/responsibility transfer from the centre.
2. Deconcentrated Model – in which central government provides support through a 'local office' or equivalent.
3. Devolution Model – in which authority is transferred from central government to regional or municipal level.
4. Delegated Model – in which responsibility is contracted or delegated to a third party, being an NGO, private company or community user group.

The author provides extensive case study material of these different models of support, with a summary of the institutional and project set-up, the roles and tasks of actors, and details of co-ordination and financing in each case. On the basis of these, and noting that there is no single model which is appropriate (these are a function of local circumstances), he then identifies what the core elements of an ISM should be and how the "promoter"<sup>13</sup> might provide them:

- Technical assistance: including on repairs, tariff collection and hygiene promotion.
- Training: upgrade training and training for new staff.
- Monitoring and information collection; including on operation, usage, distribution, finance and administration.

---

12 But it is evident, however, from the work on the subject to date that the interface between government and community, and the role of other institutions is of major importance in scaling up in the watsan sector.

13 A person acting on behalf of the agency seeking to provide support to the community – is impartiality a consideration?

- Co-ordination and facilitation: general support and dynamism, plus encouragement and interest (which Lockwood notes as being known to be uplifting of itself).

The types of support that the promoter might provide are also categorised – usefully cutting the material a different way from the method of providing it as detailed above; Lockwood also details what is needed in order to provide for the requirements of the promoter itself. The author then details what major contextual issues need to be considered by those setting up and operating an ISM, being:

- the characteristics of the communities themselves.
- the institutional set up in the sector and country.
- the nature of water resources and topographical/technological matters.
- the capacity of communities to manage the RWS systems.
- the potential of the private sector to undertake a meaningful role.

He devotes special consideration to the issue of identifying reliable, long-term sources of financing the ISM itself, noting that “*financing of recurrent costs is one of the most problematic areas in the establishment of any effective ISM*”; to help with this there is a section devoted to headlining the cost areas, followed by other issues in implementing ISMs, including process charts to assist in the phasing of setting them up.

Clearly, setting up an ISM can be carried out in an environment where scaling up is not being carried out. However, it is apt to cover this topic here as, within a community led scaling up process, external support will become even more important. This booklet provides clear and useful pointers regarding how this might be achieved.

## 2.5 Water resources

It is the case, but it is nonetheless curious, that water itself receives scant attention in the watsan scaling up literature. Only one participant (from Morocco) in the IRC e-conference alluded to this issue.

However, under the heading “Misinterpreting the Global Water Crisis”, McGranahan *et al* writing in an IIED ‘Opinion’ paper seek comprehensively to scotch what they see as a “*mythical link*” between a global water crisis and lack of access for a quarter of its population. The message of the narrative they assert “*is that the world is running out of water, that the consequence are increasingly evident, and that only by giving water resource conservation and management higher emphasis can this emerging crisis be averted....* However, they assert, “*IWRM (Integrated Water Resource Management) will not ensure that poor people gain better access to water and sanitation, since the principal reasons they do not have adequate access lies in entitlement failure, not water resource scarcity*”.

---

They dispute the use of water stress indicators as “*they do not explain why so many people do not have access to water and sanitation, ... indeed, the statistics... seem to suggest that water coverage is actually higher in countries with less than 1,700 cubic metres of renewable freshwater resources per person (the ‘stress’ threshold)*”...

*“Ultimately, the challenge for international development agencies is not to decide how water and sanitation problems are to be solved and then to promote this approach internationally; it is to learn how to recognise locally driven initiatives that are likely to succeed and find the mean to support them”.*

The authors also dispute the contention that increased private sector participation will be of assistance in meeting the MDGs, as utilities are more interested in profiting from people in larger cities in middle income nations and, in any event, many of the obstacles hampering public utilities undermine private operators too.

---

## Part 2.           Scaling Up in other sectors

### 3.     Economies of scale

#### 3.1   Origins

In this second section of the report, the objective is to identify attempts to scale up in other sectors and to seek to transfer lessons learned to the watsan sector. Before this is done, however, it is worth looking, even briefly, at the literal origin of the term 'scaling up'.

Clearly 'scaling up' has its basis in changing 'scale' and, implicitly as least, in the well known concept of an 'economy of scale'. It is sometimes worth going right back to definitions, if only to reassure oneself that nothing obvious has been missed. Consulting the Chambers English Dictionary reveals the origin of the concept of scale is a ladder or flight of steps, a graduated series or order, or a succession of musical tones performed in ascending or descending order. The definition of most relevance here is that scale is "*a system or scheme of relative values or correspondences: the ratio of representation to object: relative extent*"<sup>14</sup>.

The standard meaning of 'an economy of scale' is a reduction in cost per unit resulting from increased production, realised through operational efficiencies. Economies of scale can be accomplished because as production increases, the cost of producing each additional unit falls. Clearly, while the definition here relates to monetary cost, this can be applied more widely, to incorporate any resource allocation.

#### **The Model T Ford**

The classic economy of scale perhaps arises in mass production of industrial products, the best known example of this probably being Henry Ford's mass production of the Model T. The following is a brief summary of some of the key facets of that process, distilled from a paper by Niuewenhuis and Wells (2003)<sup>15</sup>; readers can draw their own conclusions in respect of its applicability (or otherwise!).

Henry Ford was a visionary who pursued a vision of bringing cars to the masses. His early efforts were "*impressive but hardly revolutionary*". He came to understand that the car and the manufacturing system "*ultimately had to be designed together*". At this time (in the very early years of the last century) cars were built singly in a dedicated assembly bay, using skilled labourers. Ford's vision for reaching the masses hinged on three issues:

1. A single standardised product.
2. Dedicated production equipment.
3. Unskilled labour performing repeated simple operations.

---

<sup>14</sup> Chambers English Dictionary, Chambers, Cambridge, page 1309.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.brass.cardiff.ac.uk/cafordPN0603.pdf>

---

He introduced the moving assembly line in 1913 – itself an adaptation of a process used in the meat processing factories in Chicago. The in-plant production time of the Model T fell from an average of 12.5 to 2.6 hours per unit. Ford felt uncomfortable about the profits that then rolled in so he lowered the price of the car to make it affordable and raised his workers' wages to an unheard of level of \$5 a day (twice the rate of his competitors). Demand outstripped production capacity.

He then attempted full vertical integration: his company would do all the work. The Ford company operated mines, forests, rubber plantation, even its own ships. An autocratic man, Ford declared that *"any customer can have a car painted any colour that he wants so long as it is black"*! Herein, say the authors, lies the root of why Ford *"failed in creating full mass manufacturing in the car industry"*.

Because he had vertically integrated, he had fields of cars drying outside the plant (it took up to 40 days to paint and dry a car body, and black paint was the quickest to dry, hence the lack of choice). Painting became the bottleneck of production. In the meantime, others rethought the technology of cars and replaced the timber frame with an all steel product, enhanced paint technology and nearly bought the Ford Motor Company to its knees.

Clearly Ford achieved dramatic a reduction in unit costs, enabling other activities to take place and benefits and indeed costs (a reduction in workers' job satisfaction being one) to occur. This was achieved through recognition of shortcomings in processes but it arose because an objective had been created for large scale production and it was recognised that existing production methods were not relevant.

In other spheres, the search for economies of scale take on different guises from the unit cost reduction sought by Henry Ford. Ford's; his was a direct approach which necessitated the major expansion of his enterprise with the attendant risks of increased expenditure plus potential obsolescence as others started to do it better – he couldn't change tack when he had invested so much in his Model T plant.

### **Where else is scaling up being considered?**

A search for 'scaling up' or 'scale up' in a search engine such as Ingenta yields thousands of hits, most of these would appear to relate to biological and chemical processes and many of them reveal, in their keyword descriptions, the word catalysis. This is defined<sup>16</sup> as *"the chemical influence of a substance not itself permanently changed"*, while a catalase is an enzyme that reduces hydrogen peroxide. Catalysis is commonly used to define a process in which an external agent sets in motion a process that could not be engendered from within, the implication of catalysis is that this is done through an intermediate process, being a chemical reaction, through heat, or through biological processes.

---

16 Chambers English Dictionary, page 224

Finally in this section, just to indicate that the watsan sector is not alone in looking at this, the following is a random selection of hits from the Ingenta database, obtained when searching for 'scaling up':

#### Indication of scaling up processes

- Transferring behavioral technology across applications.
- Gas antisolvent recrystallization of an organic compound.
- Tailoring product PSD and scaling up.
- Temporal complexity of repolarization and mortality in patients with implantable cardioverter defibrillators.
- A traditional healers' training model in rural Nepal: strengthening their roles in community health.
- Electrodialysis reversal of calcium sulphate and calcium carbonate supersaturated solution.
- Steam transformer as an inexpensive production system for desalinating water responsiveness of goal attainment scaling in a randomized controlled trial of comprehensive geriatric assessment.
- Metadata driven adaptation in the ADMITS project.
- Prediction of emulsion particle sizes using a computational fluid dynamics approach.
- A simple technique for scaling up pneumatic conveying systems.
- Scaling of ro membranes from silica supersaturated solutions.
- Kinetics and thermodynamics of calcium carbonate and calcium sulfate at salinities up to 1.5 m.
- Differences in recreationally targeted fishes between protected and fished areas of a coral reef marine park.
- The species–area relationship derived from species-specific incidence functions dynamic model of mesoscale eddies.
- Scaling up accurate phylogenetic reconstruction from gene-order data.
- Metallization and dissociation of fluid hydrogen and other diatomics at 100 gpa pressures.
- Scaling up community health insurance: Japan's experience with the 19th century Jyorei scheme.
- Ultra-low electrical percolation threshold in carbon-nanotube-epoxy composites the thermal relations of the freshwater triclad flatworm, *dugesia dorotocephala* (turbellaria: tricladida).

*Source: Ingenta database*

### 3.2 Introduction to scaling up in development

Only one reference identified was concerned solely with commenting generally on scaling up or the increasing coverage of social programmes in southern nations – as against looking at how to scale up in specific arenas. So, before going into the arena-specific detail of scaling up projects or programmes in different sectors, it is useful to consider

---

general issue as shown in this reference, being: Wazir and Oudenhoven's 1998 paper on increasing the coverage of social programmes.

Rekha Wazir and Nico van Oudenhoven's premise is that as there is sufficient knowledge to address most social problems, the fact that such problems remain must, at least in part, be due to inefficient ability or will to disseminate the information and knowledge we have. They believe that *"it is only when the processes of going to scale are appreciated in their full complexity that meaningful policy can be drawn up. The search for simplicity, and the general tendency to reduce the many dimensions of this issue into a set of how-to-guidelines, has been a main stumbling block in the formulation of this policy"*.

They indicate that the discussion on scaling up is taking place separately between two camps – that of the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors and that, because of the hostility between the two, important lessons are not being transferred between them. For these authors replication is synonymous with scaling up. The authors do not appear to be aware of how extremely limiting such a dictionary definition – making replicas – is, but despite this they do make a number of very valid points regarding scaling up. They define five methods of replication and characterise these as being either *universalist* or *contextualist*: *i.e.* the application of a tried and tested approach from elsewhere in a supply-driven model, or the development of a localised or demand-driven approach.

The authors clearly point toward the contextualist – demand-driven in the water sector – approach, as being the more valid one and they offer pointers to those seeking to replicate social programmes. These are returned to below, but it is also worth drawing attention to one of the elements of the universalist or supply driven types of replication which they do not "recommend" in their pointers, being that of a champion or programme entrepreneur. A business idea or a product innovation will often require an individual or agency which invests effort, time or money in its development and promotion. Such an individual or agency may be useful or even necessary in a 'contextualist' or demand driven arena, for example, to stimulate demand for clean water in a community, to champion getting resources for it, to set up an NGO or, to pioneer its change of direction as it seeks to scale up.

Returning to the pointers that Wazir and van Oudenhoven make, these can be summarised below and are discussed in the paragraphs which follow:

- There is greater communality of problems across the world and so lessons for replication are more widely available than might be thought.
- It is necessary to be careful in defining "good practice".<sup>17</sup>
- All knowledge has validity and outcome oriented networking is valuable.

There is they say, little evidence of the insulated groups responsible for these formulations learning from each other but that there are lessons which are useful across this border:

---

17 See also Christine van Wijk-Sibesma's comments on this issue in Chapter 2.

---

there are communalities of problems between countries across the globe, the causes can be compared and useful lessons drawn in some instances, also the clustering of problems and their impacts is a common issue across borders. So, there are valid lessons to be drawn from, for example, urban projects in northern nations, that can be applied in southern nations: *“It is a familiar sight in derelict or deprived areas to see first class community centres... that resemble facilities available in better off places. These exact replicas have often been established by benefactors who, in tandem with local leaders, want the ‘best of the best’ for youth. They are usually the show pieces reserved for visitors and the media but they may reach only a fraction of the youth living in the neighbourhood. It is also likely that the services offered are appropriated by the least disadvantaged youth. For financial and psychological reasons, the existence of such a service could foreclose any other form of assistance to deprived youth in the area.”*

In addition to a lack of a willingness to learn across divides and the error in some replication efforts implied in the above quote, the authors also point to a lack of analytical studies of good practice *“that reveal why programmes work under what conditions and why”*. Most reviews are descriptive and do not progress past evidence that a project has had a beneficial impact upon its target. This is not sufficient, they state: *“Understanding issues underlying wider principles is necessary to counter the mechanical application of outdated practice”*.

Validity needs to be given to all knowledge, irrespective of the source, recipients *“are not empty receptacles with no mechanism for creating their own knowledge”*, knowledge disseminated is not value-free and those disseminating it have their own agendas. The imposition of knowledge by those outside communities will not lead to an effective outcome, they argue, instead, knowledge should be transferred in both directions and *“should be owned, or internalised, by users”*. The implication is that, even in a programme which external promoters might be pleased to describe as demand driven is, in fact not quite as community led as it might be – as the information and knowledge being used emanates from the promoters and not the users.

And finally, knowledge should be shared so as to increase the effectiveness of its subsequent usage: *outcome-oriented networking of networks* is vital in disseminating good practice in the form of its distillation through multi-nodal and multi-modal networks of sharing of all knowledge types. NGO coalitions should take on these functions to provide for relative impartiality in effective, widespread and rapid sharing of such outcome-oriented knowledge.

---

## 4. Scaling up NGO activities

### 4.1 Introduction

As noted early in Part 1, NGOs have had, and will continue to have, a major role to play in the watsan sector and in other sectors of the development process. It follows that scaling up the activities of NGOs must have a potential role in the wider scaling up process.

In this chapter, the work of Peter Uvin is drawn upon, largely as it provides a useful categorisation of scaling up. This is followed by in-depth consideration of a work, which although over ten years old, still represents the most in-depth examination of scaling up in the development arena that has been identified to date. Edwards and Hulme's 1992 book covered a range of topics in scaling up NGO activities and how this relates to achieving greater impact generally.

In Chapter 5, similarly details attention is given to the 2003 work of Jocelyn Delong, looking at the scaling up of NGO impact in HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation.

### 4.2 Categorising scaling up

The work of Edwards and Hulme is probably more detailed and more useful in terms of its conclusions than that of Peter Uvin in respect of NGO activity in scaling up. However, while Uvin looks at scaling up in certain contexts (of NGO activity and in relation to fighting hunger); he does also relate his work to the broader question of scaling up. This is particularly helpful as his 1995 paper indicates that a basic question to ask is what, or perhaps who, is being scaled up. In that paper, (Uvin 1995) he proposes clear "*definitions and taxonomies*"<sup>18</sup> of scaling up.

His description of the *need* for scaling up is worth restating: "*It is often recognised that most of these grassroots initiatives are small, underfunded, poorly staffed, slow and localised in the face of poverty, hunger and degradation on a vast scale. They are thus considered to be only actions at the margins, capable of providing local relief and empowerment, but not of tackling the real issues of the eradication of hunger and poverty for hundreds of millions of people.*"

Uvin's interest in this particular article is scaling up NGO activities, indeed, the above passage continues: "*Hence, many people feel the need to develop a new breed of well managed and technically competent NGOs capable of mobilizing large numbers of people and channelling large sums of money to a variety of activities, and of interacting with the state and the international agencies. This has been called scaling up, i.e. increasing the impact of grassroots organisations and their programs.*"

---

18 A taxonomy is a classification

---

It is worth noting that there are two implicit but limited assumptions regarding what scaling up is; in Wazir and van Oudenhoven's work detailed in the previous chapter this was replication, and in that of Uvin (1995), it is increased impact through NGO activity. This is an early indication of a lack of focus on desired outcomes – objectives – as against processes, which litter the literature in this field.

Uvin's definitions of scaling up can be summarised as follows:

- Quantitative – a program or organisation expands its size.
- Functional – an organisation increases the number and/or type of activities in which it is engaged.
- Political – where organisations move from service delivery toward empowerment and change in structural causes.
- Organisational – where organisations improve effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of activities.

If scaling up is an objective as indicated above, then the outcome is to scale up an impact, not necessarily a process or the outputs of an organisation or sector. This could entail one or all of the above to take place. It might however require that some of these do not take place – there is no guarantee that what works at a small scale is necessarily of use at a greater one. Uvin considers impact in a later paper (Uvin *et al* 2000) in which the authors address NGO scaling up and rework his 1995 classification of NGO scaling up, so that it is:

- Expanding coverage and size – a direct impact, obtained through expansion through employing more staff, managing more funds, and covering more beneficiaries in more geographical areas.
- Increasing activities: (in Uvin 1995, "functional" scaling up) through horizontal or vertical integration.
- Broadening indirect impact and this, the authors note, is a rapidly expanding activity in the NGO arena, comprising advocacy, integration (NGO replacement by public sector bodies), joint-ventures between sectors and parties, training and knowledge creation and sharing, development of spin-offs, deputation and delegation. The aim in all cases is to change the behaviour of other actors to achieve the ends of the NGO.
- Enhancing organisational sustainability: where the NGO passes through stages from highly motivated individuals through teams to programme based institutions capable of withstanding change and developing into the foreseeable future.

Uvin *et al* point to a number of issues which the authors believe are important for the future. Firstly, there is great scope for synergies between direct and indirect activities and in some instances these need to be demonstrably retained. The need for organisations with a reputation built in project delivery when taking on an advocacy mantle to retain field credibility is one such issue. The authors note a possibility for a negative reaction from governments when, say, NGOs get more confrontational through advocacy etc, and also that there can be a certain amount of donor-anxiety in such cases.

---

They note that some see that decentralisation of the NGO itself is a necessity for scaling up NGO activity and impact to occur. This allows local communities better access to NGO services and facilitated the creation of local institutions. The process ensured devolution of quality and helped to ensure sustainability (durability). In concluding, Uvin *et al* point to two useful paradigms of scaling up:

1. An 'old paradigm' of scaling up through expansion (see, for example, Howes and Sattar's discussion re. BRAC in Edwards and Hulme, ed. 1992., see later in this chapter), or
2. The 'new paradigm' of multiplication, mainstreaming, spinning-off and advocacy.

Their concluding remarks point to the fundamental requirement to make sure Objectives are clear in scaling up; and although this had not been paramount in the text which preceded this observation, it is vital nonetheless: "*Impact, finally, is not only about the number of beneficiaries or even the specific local policy changes won, but [is] also about local capacity built, intersectoral contacts developed, norms of trust and co-operation strengthened and democratic space and social diversity reinforced*". So, scaling up is not solely about achieving numerical impact in alleviating hardship, they argue, it is about qualitative societal issues too.

#### 4.3 Increasing the impact of NGO activities

Edwards and Hulme's 1992 text formed the starting point for this literature search; it is comprehensive, provocative and still relevant twelve years on. Its central theme is an examination of the issues within scaling up NGO activities. But its consideration widens to the role of NGOs in scaling up generally, and particularly, a strongly expressed view that the role of NGOs, indeed NGOs themselves, need to change fundamentally as time passes and as scaling up occurs: *...despite the increasing scale of this [the development] sector, and the growing reputation that NGOs have won for themselves and their work over the last ten years, their contribution to development on a global level remains limited. Many small-scale successes have been secured, but the systems and structures which determine the distribution of power and resources within and between societies remain largely unchallenged. As a result, the impact of NGOs on the lives of poor people is highly localised, and often transitory. In contrast to NGO programmes, which tend to be good but limited in scope, governmental department efforts are often large in scale but limited in their impact. Effective development work on a sustainable and significant scale is a goal which has eluded both governments and NGOs.*

If NGOs provide "good" development but not at scale, does it follow that NGOs should have the same role in scaling up as they do now? The different contributors to the book appear unanimous in their response: NGOs can not, by their nature and in view of the values and strengths they have, and their disparity and size, secure the required lasting improvements on a vast number of people's lives; at least, not on their own.

This is a far cry from the implicit consideration in Uvin's 1995 work that scaling up NGO impact is synonymous with scaling up; the contributors and editors in Edwards and Hulme assert that scaling up can not be achieved within the context of current institutional structures.

As with Uvin's 1995 and 2000 works, Edwards and Hulme distinguish between three general "strategies"<sup>19</sup> for scaling up. These strategies are defined on the basis of the inputs of the contributing authors and are listed below:

1. Additive strategies: through increases in organisational and/or programme size.
2. Multiplicative strategies: where greater impact is sought through some combination of advocacy, training, networking etc.
3. Diffusive strategies: where greater impact is achieved through "informal and spontaneous" spread of ideas and information.

The editors indicate that within these strategies – and not necessarily limited to application within a single one them - are some common approaches; these are:

1. Working with government.
2. Increasing impact through organisational growth.
3. Advocacy in the North.
4. Linking the grassroots with lobbying and advocacy.

Before the contributing authors go into the details of these approaches, contributor Robert Chambers writes, in a general piece on NGO work, that for all or any of these strategies and approaches to have greater effect "*requires innovation as normal practice, critical self-awareness as personal attitude, and sharing as institutional culture*"<sup>20</sup>, so the work of NGOs should spread and improve naturally.

### **Additive strategies**

A natural inclination for those within organisations looking to achieve growth is to seek to do so in an additive fashion – through retaining what it does best and adding to it in some way. Howes and Sattar (in Edwards and Hulme 1992, as are all of the references quoted in the remainder of this Chapter) document four different additive approaches that they can discern from their work on the BRAC<sup>21</sup> programme over two decades to 1992. These are:

19 They recognise that these are not exclusive – there is inevitably a degree of overlap

20 Readers wanting to explore these issues in greater depth might wish to view the content and outcome of the Water Information Summit – the WIS-6 conference to be held in The Netherlands in September 2003; see [www.irc.nl](http://www.irc.nl); or the activities of "knowledge management" organisations such as CINARA, Streams of Knowledge and UWASNET (see Abbreviations Table in this Review)

21 Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee – one of the biggest Southern NGOs, employing some 4,500 people, with an annual budget of \$23m.

- 
- “Simple” replication – where a successful project is promoted elsewhere.
  - Vertical integration – adding a forward or backward linked activity, the example the authors give is that of adding a processing capacity to an agricultural production programme; DeLong (covered in the next Chapter) provides an example where an organisation providing micro-credit might diversify to develop programmes addressing high default rates.
  - Horizontal integration – the addition of further project components, where a programme that begins with one or two components has other components added to it – no example is given by the authors but DeLong cites the integration of HIV/AIDS work into income generating work which has occurred in Morocco, where the *Association Marocaine de Solidarité et Développement* (AMSED) has scaled up its work on HIV/AIDS by reaching out to the better developed micro-credit community in the country.
  - Substitution – of a small scale activity by something more complex, while no example is given by the authors, one might imagine a position where a small town might be provided with a piped water supply and put its wells out of commission.

They note that additive strategies are less problematic than multiplicative (see below) strategies but that the key to success in any approach lies in support issues: “*where attention is given to building organisational capacities to support programme expansion, there is no inherent contradiction between quality and scale. Bigger can also be better*”.

Internal difficulties within growing NGOs are cited as real stumbling blocks to scaling up their own activities. Both Billis & MacKeith and Hodson wrote of the logistical, staffing and motivational hurdles to organisational growth. The intimacy and shared goals within small organisations are easily lost as accretion occurs; perceiving oneself as just another ‘cog in the wheel’ is not easy for the typically vocationally motivated staff member in an NGO, especially when material rewards for their inputs are of necessity limited.

It might be argued that an additive approach does not, at least on its own, constitute scaling up since, as Howes and Sattar indicate, it implies “*a state of affairs where any new benefits arising will entail an approximately proportional addition in the resources provided by the promoting organisation*”.

### **Multiplicative and diffusive strategies**

In contrast, a multiplicative strategy is defined neatly also by Howes and Sattar as one “*where each additional input by the sponsor brings forth a more than proportional return*”. Attempting to achieve such economies of scale is at the centre of scaling up – in trying to get to far greater levels of sustainable coverage, how can this be done within likely resource limitations, so as to get more impact from each unit of resource?

The contributors to Edwards and Hulme attempt to identify evidence of a number of different approaches which might be categorised as being multiplicative or diffusive. Some of these approaches are considered next.

At the local level, Chambers and others refer to the issue of training trainers; so that the effectiveness of those engaged in participatory activities increases significantly. At a strategic level an approach is for NGOs as organisations to gain strength and therefore impact through co-operating with other NGOs. Karina Constantino-David cites Philippine experience in scaling up NGO impact across different sectors as being characterised by attempts to co-ordinate the work of NGOs across sectors to create units greater than the sum of their parts through:

- Differentiating between real development NGOs, which share a number of similar aspirations and who will gain from an economy of scale through cooperating and other NGO type organisations which do not share these aspirations<sup>22</sup>
- Setting up a collaborative framework or caucus (CODE: Caucus of Development NGOs) between them, where resources and ideas can be shared and lessons learned disseminated throughout the caucus
- Attempting to help focus upon confronting issues realistically, being self-reliant not dependent, being visionary not romantic and to confront issues of empowerment rather than power seizure.
- Adopting advocacy practices at home and internationally

Constantino-David argues that the process, although it was not without considerable difficulties, led towards far more effective work at a greater scale and impact than was previously achievable, that the influence of donors on the process was lessened and that strong local NGO-INGO linkages resulted. This was achieved, she argues, without centralising NGO power or undermining the strength of activity in relation to individual issues.

In the case of scaling up NGO activities in urban areas, Mitlin & Slatterthwaite show that scaling up will not be achieved solely through the multiplication of resources devoted to investments; it needs a change in approach. NGOs, they argue, need to be assisted to be more effective themselves through:

- *“Better use of existing, under-utilised resources”* through improving technical and organisational skills, implementing credit schemes and improving financial accounting and utilising latent productive capacity.
- *“Increased representation and accountability”* – community democratisation and organisation is vital because groups can achieve far greater power leverage than citizens.
- *“New partnerships in the development of [outputs]”* – the formation of external partnerships (including other NGOs as in the case of the Philippines above), for

---

<sup>22</sup> NGOs not sharing these aspirations and so not admitted to CODE were government run or inspired NGOs (GRINGOs), business organised NGOs (BONGOs) or fly-by-night NGOs (COME ‘N GOs)!

---

resource sharing; knowledge sharing; the provision of sufficient numbers of participants in activities such as training...

In the same vein, Roche writes that scaling up, using a combination of grassroots work with community groups and working with governments has been possible in Burkina Faso and southern Sudan. He indicates that it is critical to ensure that NGOs do not overstep the boundary of their accountability and that education of donors becomes an issue in advocacy growth; also that setting clear objectives and monitoring outcomes is vital in setting out toward, and then gauging success.

These issues are returned to by a range of contributors; see particularly Part V “*Advocacy in the North*”. Chris Dolan reports on the debate regarding Advocacy asking whether or not INGOs should continue to operate in the south or should their role be one of supporting Southern NGOs plus lobbying and advocacy in the north? Clearly major advocacy campaigns, aimed at changing the behaviour of, for example, donors have represented a major change in emphasis for some northern NGOs.

#### 4.4 Conclusions on scaling up development NGO impact

Edwards and Hulme stressed that “*Clearly scaling up NGO impact is not synonymous with expanding the staff and budgets of NGOs. The strategic choices facing NGOs are complex, since all options [i.e. those referred to in this chapter] seem certain to generate internal difficulties and all require careful analysis to gain an insight into ‘who gains and who loses’ when a particular option is chosen. Either by design or default all NGOs will have to make these strategic choices in the coming years. Whether or not they ‘make a difference’ will be determined by the quality of the choices they make.*”

So, while it is clear that NGOs can continue to make a contribution to a process of scaling up – it is equally clear that the contribution they can make is limited and that other avenues will need to be explored.

---

## 5. Scaling up in HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation

### 5.1 Why and what to scale up?

The literature on scaling up in health interventions is voluminous, especially in the area of HIV/AIDS prevention. The main reference was Jocelyn Delong's 2003 book *"Making an Impact in HIV and Aids; NGO experiences in scaling up"*. The author sets out her reasons for writing a book on this topic as being that while the scale of the consequences of HIV/AIDS are "catastrophic", *"the programmes, whether run by national governments, the private sector, non-government organisations or international agencies – currently addressing this rapid and devastating spread of the pandemic clearly are not operating at sufficient scale or with enough impact to stem its progress. Thus there is an urgent moral dimension to the need to enlarge the scale of HIV/AIDS activities"*.

The work deals largely with the work of NGOs in HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation. There are a number of parallels with that of NGOs in WASH work; especially that NGOs are in the forefront of HIV/AIDS programmes in developing nations. A key difference to be borne in mind, however, is that the ongoing institutional roles in this area are affected to a great extent by the stigma associated with HIV/AIDS. Despite this, there are major lessons to be learned from this book.

Firstly Delong asks why scaling up is important: *"there has been a chorus of voices for NGOs to increase the scale and impact of their activities and to build alliances such that the effects of any one organisation are multiplied and the pool of beneficiaries increases exponentially... there has also been recognition that expansion may bring with it trade-offs...between quality, quantity and costs"*

She indicates also that while some of the trade-offs that might be encountered can be identified, *"there is much less a shared understanding of the contexts most conducive to scaling up; the types of organisation or programme it is most appropriate to expand; the relative costs of different types of programme; the internal implications of scaling up; how to define objectives; how to measure the impact of scaling up; and how these processes depend on and interact with the wider political and social environment."*

There is a clarity regarding the differences between inputs and outputs when looking at scaling up, see Figure 3 of the book, reproduced here.

---

### Various definitions of scaling up used in development literature

'Input'	'Output'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanding organizational size</li> <li>• Increasing the scale of activity engaged in</li> <li>• Integrating other activities in order to reach more people:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 'Horizontal integration': addressing unrelated activities</li> <li>○ 'Vertical Integration': addressing different levels of related problems) in order to reach more people</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reaching more people</li> <li>• Expanding geographic area(s) reached</li> <li>• Reaching other 'target groups'</li> <li>• Increasing the volume of outputs (e.g. number of condoms distributed)</li> <li>• Increasing intensity of impact within given geographic area/ social group</li> </ul>

Source: Delong, p14

### 5.2 Scaling up as a process

She repeats the salutary warning in Edwards and Hulme (1992) that *"a programme that increases its scale may well lose in terms of its impact as the intensity of effort is reduced"*; she also, repeatedly, makes the important point relating to sustainability that is made in many other locations in this Review that the purpose is to scale up prevention of HIV/AIDS and to mitigate its effects but that this needs to be sustainable, which she describes as being *"not only in financial terms but according to whether it is technically sound and can be supported both politically and socially"*. Delong is at pains repeatedly to emphasise the social and political aspects.

There is a useful discussion about scaling up as a process that needs to be responsive to circumstances. Delong considers the two opposite extremes of universalist and contextualist interventions as discussed by Wazir and van Oudenhoven (discussed in §3). While showing distaste for the replication which is the hallmark of a universalist approach (she likens it to franchise imposition), she also shies away from going so far as to say that all contexts are unique. She notes that as scaling up is a process, its objectives may need to change over time. Her example is *"at low levels of epidemic, when infections may be more restricted to certain social groups, different strategies may be called for than when the epidemic is more generalised within the population at large"*. Other reasons for the process to adapt with time could stem, she says, from changes in the political or institutional context or from the internal needs of the organisation itself.

She also makes a valid point about finances: in scaling up, it is a requirement to move from projects to programmes. Programme cost and cost-effectiveness become major items on the agenda at this point, leading in turn to a need for much better monitoring and evaluation programmes.

Delong also differentiates between types of NGOs operational in the HIV/AIDS sector. Her definition is similar to the southern/northern typology common in the watsan sector but splits within these those that are;

- Indigenous and managed by outsiders;
- Indigenous and managed by community members (i.e. CBOs);
- Organisations of people living with HIV/AIDS;
- Foreign NGOs.

Her point in making these distinctions is to draw attention to the difference in impact each will have. She indicates that truly community based bodies can get things done at the local level, while larger professional groups are “*technically stronger, have more effective access to decision-makers and, despite higher cost, can often be very cost-efficient because of the scale of their operations... but very few of these groups can actually convince a young man to use condoms*”<sup>23</sup> with the implication that community bodies can do so.

She also is careful to cover a third element alongside coverage and sustainability, being quality. She quotes (see Page 35 *et seq*) examples where quality has reduced when scale has been sought. Particularly, she warns against loss of spontaneity and of community drive when the impetus comes from external sources, keen to replicate. In the watsan area, this can be taken as a warning not to sacrifice a demand driven community managed approach when seeking to achieve greater impact.

### 5.3 Types of scaling up

In looking to create alternative frameworks for scaling up, Delong agrees with the threefold strategies of additive, multiplicative and diffusive approaches devised by Edwards and Hulme in 1992 (covered extensively in the previous Chapter) but amends them as follows and places them in order of increasing abstraction (and therefore, she warns, increasing difficulty of impact measurement):

- Organisational expansion; the simplest form of scaling up, achieved through working within the organisation and expanding its functions and/or activities.
- Catalysing others: where deliberate efforts are made to work with other organisations in order to influence the nature or scope of their services. This could entail working with government on service provision, or supporting other service providing organisations with financial, technical or other support.
- Diffusion: which consists of spreading ideas or methodologies, through for example peer education and community counselling and can be planned or spontaneous. Approaches under this banner, Delong indicates, have been successful in countering top-down vertical programmes. Under this heading is the “concept transfer” approach: it is understood that communities “*contain some of the answers to the challenges posed by HIV but these have to be elicited*” In a highly participatory approach, community members are engaged in a discussion process and some supported to take the message to other communities to share

23 Delong, Page 33, quoting O'Malley et al, “Nongovernmental Organizations” in Mann, J and D Tarantola (Eds.) *AIDS in the World* Vol. II, 1996.

---

their experience (similar to the 'biological' process of Carl Taylor, see next Chapter).

- Influencing policy and legislation; on a larger scale, organisations may choose to shape policy or influence donors and can do this via a number of routes. Advocacy is one such strategy, one that, she says, has seen success in the HIV/AIDS arena in getting the World Trade Organisation to allow compulsory licensing to allow local manufacture of generic versions of patented anti-retroviral drugs.
- Mainstreaming scaling up in development. This is an effort to “*permeate all development sectors with concern for and attention to HIV/AIDS and its implications*”. This, DeLong says, encourages far greater understanding of the disease more rapidly than would otherwise be the case, while stimulating a greater understanding of the social, economic and gender climate that characterise the pandemic. Such mainstreaming occurs from local to international forums. Some have criticised this approach, maintaining that seeking to mainstream across ministries in developing nations may spread the resources too thin and so undermine effort.

She talks extensively about the need for partnership and alliances between NGOs and all other actors in scaling up, paying attention to the differences in stereotypical perceptions within each party – e.g. NGOs being considered to be rich by government officials; NGO staff considering government officials lazy; communities wanting HIV prevention; sufferers' priorities being medical care etc. On the subject of building NGO-government partnerships, she quotes among others references within Edwards and Hulme's 1992 book.

#### 5.4 Key considerations in scaling up

While her primary consideration is scaling up NGO operation in HIV/AIDS, she constructs a very relevant summary of factors to consider before scaling up generally; Figure 9 in the book is reproduced below.

### Strategic questions NGOs need to ask before scaling up

Feasibility as determined by:		
<i>Contextual parameters</i>	<i>Institution-specific considerations</i>	<i>Intervention-specific considerations</i>
Overall political context Government-NGO relations Government position on HIV/AIDS Stability versus conflict Level of epidemic Ease of reaching populations Economic context Available infrastructure	Time to plan scaling up Resources available to plan and implement Analysis of own comparative advantage in HIV/AIDS Internal implications (staffing, management etc) Capacity to implement and evaluate programme	Aim of scaling up Who (what groups) to focus on What level of coverage to be sought What (interventions) to focus on Evidence for effectiveness of interventions Evaluation mechanism (to measure quality and impact of intervention) Costs of intervention: - scaling up - strategy Sustainability of scaling up process

Source: Delong, Page 89.

A key question that Delong asks in relation to the extremely interesting and relevant considerations in this Table relates to who interventions should focus on, both in terms of beneficiaries “as well as whether the scaling up exercise would be confined to the original organisation or work with other institutions”:

- Should prevention activities concentrate on increasing numbers reached in absolute terms, or concentrate on those who might have a greater impact on the dynamics of the epidemic, or perhaps most likely to adopt behavioural changes?
- What criteria should be adopted to target or prioritise beneficiaries – those with greatest epidemiological need, those most vulnerable, those with lowest income, or special cases (e.g. truck drivers as being especially vulnerable to HIV/AIDS - the Healthy Highways Project in India), i.e. using risk based criteria?
- Are there vectors of social change (as against disease vectors) which should be targeted – for example disproportionate benefits might be achieved through working with blind people with HIV/AIDS?
- How should organisations work – many NGOs (she notes) are increasingly looking to provide organisational capacity development and technical support for local organisations, a position which may not require scaling up the NGO itself.

A second main question she poses is what to focus on in scaling up? If there is a number of alternative methods of scaling up then the criteria she suggests for resolving the choice are feasibility of the candidates, their effectiveness and the capacities of the organisations involved.

---

As noted above, when moving into alternative scaling up programmes it is inevitable and correct that greater scrutiny of costs, cost effectiveness and evaluation of outcomes (including versus cost) is to be expected. Delong does not go into detail but provides a beginners guide to economies of scale and highlights difficulties in measuring costs. In the watsan sector the issue of cost of scaling up, and the attribution of these to the various agencies involved in scaling up programmes, will both need to be confro

She talks about the risks and concerns in scaling up in general:

- NGOs taking on roles more appropriate for the state, thereby perpetuating undemocratic conditions.
- Bureaucratisation of NGOs or NGOs evolving toward donor principles.
- Cultural and political resistance to the objectives – particularly given the stigma attached to HIV/AIDS in some contexts.
- Difficulties in achieving full community participation when relationships within them are not equal (especially in respect of sex workers in the HIV/AIDS context).
- Difficulties in incorporating social diversity in scaled up programmes.
- Retaining a balance between generating momentum and keeping it under control, to ensure that objectives are being met.
- The risk of failure, especially after expectations have been raised.

She also alludes to the possibility of competition amongst NGOs in the search for donor funds both when these are scarce and when they are relatively freely available. The role of NGOs, she stresses, has been to pioneer appropriate humane responses and to provide a public arena for a discourse to confront the attendant discrimination and stigma against sufferers. No single intervention and no single player can hope to act alone she says: alliances are time consuming to construct but vital for success. Additionally, the role that NGOs play is also changing rapidly – their “honeymoon period”, she asserts is over; they must pay far more attention to the perhaps conflicting demands of their relationship with donors, their accountability to the communities they serve and to their advocacy role.

But, “*one of the first lessons that emerges from this collective experience [as set out in the book] is the importance of explicit discussion of the objectives and approach for the work being undertaken.*” Quoting the Executive Director of the International AIDS Alliance Jeff O’Malley, she asserts – and this has a critical resonance for the rural water supply sector: “*The (HIV/AIDS) Alliance was constructed within rhetoric of ‘scaling up community responses to AIDS’. What did that mean to various stakeholders? If more attention had been paid to the phrase, more contradictions in approach and within different sets of stakeholders would have been identified*”. She warns against the dangers inherent in a narrow understanding of impact, based upon reducing the number of new infections. Instead, she recommends that “*NGOs... need to articulate their own notions of the impact of their efforts and to communicate these to a broader audience*”. To be clear, Delong is saying that NGOs use rhetoric and do not articulate sufficiently clearly what they mean when talking about scaling up and so create confusion such that other stakeholders can not reach focus their own inputs well.

Delong points out that where success stories have been seen this is attributable at least in part to Governments taking responsibility and leadership to provide the necessary conducive moral and political environment to confront the problem. Her book is not littered with observations which point in this direction but it is none-the-less important. This may be a crucial point to note in scaling up in RWS. At the very least, it points to activities being carried out at a central level which is supportive of local activity. This is a clear demonstration of how scaling up is not synonymous with making local projects bigger.

On this subject, Charlotte Watts and Lilani Kumaranayake point to Uganda and Senegal as providing the way forward, "*showing the importance of a national and co-ordinated response*" although again they acknowledge that more needs to be done to establish scaling up costs. They believe that, at least in the case of HIV/AIDS, for the benefits of the (national) prevention through education programmes to be sustainable, they need to be linked with "*complementary actions to invest in broader development and economic programmes...*"

---

## 6. Scaling up in agriculture

### 6.1 Introduction

The search conducted to assemble this review resulted in two relevant sources being found which relate to scaling up in agriculture, being external support for mainly low income farmers in developing countries and that relating to watershed development, mainly in India. These are covered in turn in this section.

### 6.2 Scaling up LEISA

Firstly, what is LEISA? It is *“about low external input and sustainable agriculture [and] the technical and social options open to farmers who seek to improve productivity and income in an ecologically sound way”*<sup>24</sup>. LEISA as a concept is supported by ILEIA; the centre for information on LEISA, its programme is funded by Sida and NOVIB. By far the most in-depth piece of literature on scaling up that was found in the search for this Review is the October 2001 edition of the ILEIA magazine simply called LEISA, which was devoted to the issue<sup>25</sup>.

While its support roots lie in northern Europe, its actions are fundamentally community based. The LEISA magazine notes that it does not seek to ‘help’ or to ‘promote’, it is about optimal use of resources, and of external inputs where necessary; it seeks to empower male and female farmers and communities who *“seek to build their future on the basis of their own knowledge, skills, values, culture and institutions”*. It is about participation to strengthen capacity and it seeks to combine local and imported knowledge – it is *“a concept, an approach and a political message”*.

The issue of scaling up arises in food production because: *“In a bid to guarantee food security for all, policy makers argue for a doubling of food production in the next two decades together with poverty eradication... to be brought about with no added pressure on natural resources”* (LEISA 2001, p. 4). The ILEIA movement convened four workshops between 1999 and 2001 in Nairobi, Washington and Whitstable<sup>26</sup> to address the scaling up issues and *“use cases and participants’ own experience to derive common principles”*. It was quickly agreed in the workshops that *“scaling up leads to more quality benefits to more people over a wider geographic area more quickly, more equitably and more lastingly”*.

The October 2001 edition of the magazine comprises 17 articles on scaling up; mostly concerning agriculture but also including some to draw in ideas from other arenas. The issues covered include scaling up in natural resource management, integrated pest

---

24 Introductory Note to LEISA Magazine, October 2001, the source of the content of this section.

25 At [www.ileia.org/2/nl17-3.html](http://www.ileia.org/2/nl17-3.html)

26 Whitstable is a small town near London.

control, zero tillage agriculture, participatory development, agroforestry, fallow management and others. The key issues are summarised as follows.

As with Edwards and Hulme and with Delong, there is an attempt to classify scaling up into different types in a piece by Julian Gonsalves. He makes the distinction between now familiar classification of horizontal and vertical scaling up, and that promoted by Uvin (see Chapter 4), which differentiates between the quantitative (or additive), functional (expanding number of activities), political (moving from service delivery to advocacy) and organisational (supporting other organisations). Gonsalves also draws attention to a slightly different way of understanding scale, proposed by Larry Harrington and colleagues (2001), being scale of:

- Analysis (from plant to plot, to farm, to watershed, to region).
- Intervention point (from high level policy to low level scheme specific).
- Investment (amount of time, money, effort expended).
- Community empowerment (the number of communities empowered to carry out their own research and adaptation).
- Geographical coverage (of the practice from farm, to village, to watershed, to nation).
- Impact (extent to which the desired outcomes are achieved).

Perhaps the most powerful typology and exploration of scaling up in the bulletin is that provided by Carl Taylor. Of all the contributions that emerged in the process of compiling this Review, this one appealed most, mainly because it:

1. went a good deal further than the categorisation of types,
2. dealt with more than scaling up activities of NGOs and
3. identified real processes of scaling up which, although being from a very different environment (where the author was using his experience in the health sector in the context of agriculture), appear very relevant to the watsan sector.

This being the case, the work is summarised in some detail. Drawing on his experience in the health field, Taylor starts by categorising and rating scaling up as follows:

- Blueprint – outsider driven, top-down; results in a loss of sustainability.
- Explosion – focussed interventions selected at high levels; effective for in-filling but local priorities are over-ridden.
- Additive – community developed and paced, NGO supported handover to local control, too slow so needs top-down enabling environment.
- Biological – existing good projects are nurtured as biological growth nodes for other communities; scaling up is then natural and exponential and leads to integrated inter-sectoral development.

He makes a strong plea to move away from pro or anti top-down or bottom-up “rhetoric”, stressing that both are needed in balance according to circumstances. Solutions are not universal, he asserts, but processes are. He also stresses that scaling up is a process that

---

evolves and that processes will change as this occurs; so, he goes on to provide three principles for 'valid' processes of scaling up, as follows:

- Three way partnerships involving the community, government, NGOs and experts, are essential to preserve the top-down and bottom-up balance with the following pointers:
  - The community must be treasured and always be in eventual control.
  - Governments and NGOs must learn to support community development – this requires, he acknowledges, a tremendous shift in attitudes and values away from the likely prevalence of a felt need to control projects.
  - Experts must guide the process by learning to synthesise scientific innovation with traditional knowledge and wisdom. The role of experts is to bring the outside in – this requires as great a shift in attitude and values on their part as that required of government he says.
- Action must be based on locally specific data – the practice of “community manipulation” which Taylor says is the reality of current community participation, which he characterises as being “rhetoric”, must be comprehensively replaced by community immersion in data collection and decision making: *“when people know how the data is gathered they trust the findings, feel ownership and are motivated to act”*.
- Changes in community behaviour produce sustainable social change. With the community in charge of their own development, a ‘biological’ process will happen which will be led by them and not fuelled by experts who are not immersed in the social culture. Through this biological process there will be a natural diffusion of ideas and practices, so scaling up will occur through communities: *“Most convincing are messages that are transmitted by people like themselves. Biological models of scaling up work mainly because they systematise the process of learning, community by community, in exponential expansion as people teach each other”*.

How would this work? Taylor goes on to describe three dimensions of going to scale, which he indicates are based upon fieldwork in many parts of the world. These are:

1. *Scale One: Successful Change as Learning Experience* – try ideas and take forward the good ones; a process initiated by local people. This is where learning takes place with some external facilitation, indeed the process can be externally generated but the mechanism is *“a community-based laboratory and a school without walls”*. In an ongoing successful biological process, the external initiator is someone from another community like the one now being worked with. It is also worth noting that Taylor indicates that the community being worked with should not be the one that can least afford to fail.
2. *Scale Squared: Self-help Centres for Action Learning and Experimentation*: using community engendered experience and outsider expertise to provide the educational catalyst and experimentation “centre” in a process where community based action becomes a demonstration for other communities. The “source of power” here is a cluster of Scale One communities grouped together, but again

---

outside influences are appropriate and useful “*to bring the outside in*”. Trip making of community members to previously successful Scale One projects is one of the learning methods suggested as being appropriate here. Experimentation is also felt to be viable here, but these communities should not become showcases; this can lead to them being incapable of (and perhaps inappropriate for) replication.

3. *Scale Cubed: Systems for Collaboration, Adaptive Learning and Extension.* Provision of a network of centres, encouraging communities to learn from each other in a more formal way, thereby creating an enabling environment for very large scale change. The systems needed in this instance can create change at a regional scale and include a system for sustainable collaboration and partnership, for adaptive learning and for extension of innovations. The people in communities will do this when aided by small incentives to change and supported by appropriate financing mechanisms, relationships with service agencies and institutions and appropriate policies and legislation.

He then provides six criteria for measuring progress in social development, which are appropriate when evaluating progress in scaling up:

1. Collaboration around a shared vision: communities acting together and going in an agreed direction.
2. Equity: communities reaching out to those in greatest need.
3. Sustainability: does development exhausting water, forest and energy sources or is it increasing pollution?
4. Interdependence not dependency is essential for a just and sustainable process.
5. Holistic action at the community level is automatically inter-sectoral: with communities addressing their own needs they become aware of causes of the problems that exist.
6. Iterative attempts and evaluations reduce the steepness of the learning curve and allow incremental improvements.

His paper seems to be an extremely valuable one: the biological model for community management of development is that which is most favoured in the watsan sector currently and his ideas on scale one, squared and cubed are simple and appealing.

The contributors to the LEISA bulletin are convinced that there is no place in scaling up for what Taylor dismisses as blueprints or Gonsalves calls “cookie-cutters”; what is required is not standardisation but systematisation. Replication, Uphoff warns, is not scaling up; the process needs to be adaptive and multiplicative. So, pilot or model projects are increasingly seen as limited. Gonsalves reports that strengthening organisational and learning capacities was probably the single most mentioned concept in the workshops recounted in the document and that strengthening capacities within communities to innovate may be more important than technologies.

---

As with literature in other areas, the need for institutional collaboration and partnerships and for widening the representation of stakeholders is repeatedly stressed. The need to try to avoid hostility between parties, especially where intellectual ownership may be an issue, is also stressed (Gündel *et al*). The process is more important than any inputs to it. Round-table processes involving a broad constituency of bodies have been helpful (Juan Sanchez reports on *mesas de concertacion*, roundtable discussions involving community members, their local government and those engaged in R&D) in the growth of social capital and co-operation is a key issue in scaling up.

Some contributors were of the view that there might be a temptation or pressure to sacrifice participation during efforts to scale up. Uphoff *et al*, cited in Gonsalves's contribution, indicate that there are "*inevitably risks of dilution and diminution of effort [in participatory processes] and that patterns of organisation and operation were compromised in scaling up*". Despite this, the contributors agreed that such dilution needs to be resisted vigorously and an NGO-GO link can help to mainstream participatory processes in scaling up.

The need to consider scaling up at the design stage rather than post implementation was mentioned above and was reiterated at one of the forums of ILIEA. An implication of this is a need to put more effort in at the early stages to defining objectives, problem identification, defining target groups and ensuring that a pro-poor dialogue is concluded.

A further issue is the problem of donors being wedded to a project approach despite evidence that a shift away from this is needed for best outcomes and best use of resources. They should, Uphoff *et al* indicate, "*fund programmes on a wholesale basis rather than a retail basis... successful rural development programmes depend more on ideas, leadership and appropriate strategies than money!*"

Russ Dolts, in his piece on Integrated Pest Management (IPM) also provides a checklist of the keys to successful 'upscaling'. Many of those present are covered above but, in addition, he effectively calls for revisiting the notion of subsidiarity, "*make efforts to push down roles which reside "at the top" as in the case of strategic planning which is now done at the community level by farmers*". As with other contributors in LEISA, he proffers benefits of the concept of holistic community development as pursued in 'sustainable livelihoods' type approaches.

The LEISA scaling up synthesis is characterised by repeated affirmations of the power of communities to decide their own destinies and to undergo the scaling up process with some outside help. Von der Weid quotes examples of farmers in Brazil being extremely successful in doing so at a far lower cost per capita than is achieved in centrally led programmes; Holt-Gimenez quotes successes in Guatemala and Nicaragua of the *Campesino a Campesino* (farmer to farmer) movement – not an externally led technology transfer process but, similar to that espoused by Taylor, "*that walks' on the legs of innovation and solidarity and 'works' through production and protection*". It 'sees' shared

visions for farmer-led sustainable agriculture; at its 'heart' its members are motivated by shared beliefs. Powerful in the process have been 'encuentros' (farmer symposiums) and roving farmer promoter teams (membership of which is revolving).

Many of the other contributors confirm the message of Taylor and others; namely that scaling up can be achieved but in a community inspired process, a biological one. For example:

- Delia Catacutan *et al* reinforce this message from Mindanao, Philippines, where farmer led NRM (Natural Resource Management) movements and techniques spread through their organisation called 'Landcare'. It is, they say, "*a melting pot... [to] discuss issues, share lessons, invest talents, skills and resources...*"
- Freddie Kwesiga *et al*, working in agroforestry in eastern Zambia, indicate that scaling up "*from thousands to millions*" requires smart partnership and exciting results amongst other things. It is, they say "*only a synergistic partnership among all parties that can produce greater impact or scaling up as demonstrated... in Zambia*"
- Chesha Wettasinha provides similar evidence from his work in agricultural settlements in Sri Lanka that scaling up is best achieved in a participatory process fuelled from within and supported from without.

If the experiences reported in LEISA could be summed up in brief, it is that scaling up is possible led by the community and supported from the outside. There are good examples given in this literature of how such scaling up may occur; what is striking is the overwhelmingly positive tone of the writers who contributed.

### 6.3 Scaling up watershed development

Watershed management became a major focal point in rain-fed agricultural areas especially in India in the late 1990s. It watershed development concept aims to "*establish an enabling environment for the integrated use, regulation and treatment of water and land resources of a watershed based ecosystem to accomplish resource conservation and biomass production objectives*" (Jensen *et al* 1996, quoted in Turton *et al* 1998). Often, although not in every instance, such an approach aims to bring back into usage land in need of rehabilitation.

Cathryn Turton, Michael Warner and Ben Groom (Turton *et al* 1998) undertake the task of producing a review of the literature on this subject. Their reason for looking at scaling up watershed development is that there has been, they say, a number of success stories which are characterised by improved watershed management and so they are seeking to learn the lessons from these. They suggest that the successes in watershed development (particularly micro-watersheds, being those of less than 1000 ha) "*share one or more of the following characteristics*":

- They often occur under specific preconditions which are not easily replicable; the authors argue that there may be some biophysical conditions which lend

---

themselves to successful watershed management – more research is needed, they say, to develop understanding of the successes to find out whether or not his is applicable.

- Approaches to development are resource intensive and cannot easily be scaled up to new areas; here the authors present the dilemma that is present in the watsan sector, that the NGO led nature of watershed development activities is time and resource consuming such that identifying how to scale up sustainable benefits to each larger numbers of the poor is the “*unique challenge*”.
- There is uncertainty over the long term institutional and ecological sustainability of rehabilitated watersheds. Turton *et al* argue that benefits in watershed development come from new institutional opportunities (increased community capacity to organise themselves) and ecological ones (increases in resource productivity); “*the ultimate indicators of [scaled up] success are the ability to take advantage of new opportunities and to what extent these benefits are sustained in the post project phase*”.

Turton and her colleagues believe that that scaling up can occur in watershed development with scaling up of participatory approaches, “*necessitating a move away from resource intensive approaches to the formation of new partnerships*”. They see a need to move from what they see as NGO dominated projects to community led ones, but recognise the highly resource consuming nature of participation. So, “*a key concern for micro-watershed developers is to identify approaches which ensure that the interface between communities NGOs and the State is managed in a way which is most likely to enhance efficiency, effectiveness and accountability*” (they say, quoting Carney and Farrington, 1997).

In order to scale up they say, there is a need to recognise the strengths and weaknesses across the board of assets and duties within each layer of society and to be prepared to see responsibilities change, perhaps significantly. They see a need for demonstration projects, giving momentum into other communities for the scaling up process.

One particular watershed development project (known as the Indo-German Watershed Development Program or IGWDP) was designed specifically with replicability in mind. Turton *et al* indicate that having a macro-management perspective (able to stretch across a number of projects as replication occurred) was a big consideration in its design. Turton criticises a donor-led potential for projects not take external governmental context into consideration to the extent that they become incapable of replication (a point also made by Davis and Iyer, see §2). Finally, they indicate that the presence or otherwise of implementation capacity is a critical factor in scaling up – but they do not define what this is.

More recently, in 2002, Shashi Kolavalli and John Kerr reported on the participatory element of scaling up watershed development in India. They indicated that participatory approaches have become the standard under NGO implemented projects but when scaling

---

up, NGOs do not have the resources to spread themselves over bigger projects and programmes. Thus, they indicated, the onus is upon Governments to do this and so a realistic scaling up strategy must “*seek to improve the capabilities and incentives of government agencies*” – i.e. government staff need to be trained to carry out participatory development projects and given the incentives to engage in meaningful participation. This is similar to so many of the contributions that have been found and, like them, advice on just how ‘scaleable’ this is, is lacking.

---

## 7. Institutional issues in scaling up

### 7.1 General

Many of the references quoted to date alluded to the need for greater resources to be allocated into participation activities; many called for redirection of effort from NGOs to government and others have indicated that communities need to be supported in some way; all so as to support processes of sustainability and scaling up.

Very few of these have attempted to shed light on how this might be achieved. In this chapter attention is drawn to some references where such attempts have been made to clarify different aspects of this:

- firstly in trying to ensure that participation becomes a central element of the development process and is resourced as such;
- secondly to extend the impact of NGO/government partnerships, and
- thirdly, in creating institutional support mechanisms for communities.

### 7.2 Institutionalising participation

A key question: *Why Hasn't Participation Occurred at a Large Scale* has been posed by Deepa Narayan (Narayan, 1995). He attempts to answer his own question by saying that there has been "*reluctance to frame the issue in institutional rather than technological term... such a narrow conception of participation as a microlevel activity with no linkages to policy and institutional reform hampers large-scale beneficiary participation*".

He then indicates that a series of myths has been perpetuated about the sector that damage the ability to institutionalise participation. Unfortunately, many of those that he quotes are simply not relevant to the topic he is writing about, he is merely attempting to shed light on a list of issues that are standard in Washington circles. For example, the text on the willingness of the poor to pay for water, while a usual bone of contention at the World Bank and elsewhere, has no reference to participation, implicit or explicit.

Some are better however; for example, he cites a need to target women in participation to ensure women's empowerment and he says that participation can be carried out rapidly (thus ensuring more of it can be undertaken) if the community expresses need, also that charismatic leaders are helpful to the process but are not a pre-requisite.

Some of the above issues are covered in greater depth in "*Who Changes? Institutionalizing Participation in Development*" a 1998 text edited by James Blackburn and Jeremy Holland who start their volume by asking two questions:

1. What is scaling up?
2. Is organisational change the "nitty-gritty" of the institutionalisation of participation?

Blackburn and Holland themselves appear to view scaling up as being the same as the spread of the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) process. There is a crusading tone among many PRA protagonists, and it is evident here, which sometimes undermines the

---

strength of their argument; in this instance, this is a shame, because many of the contributions to the book are well balanced, ask a lot of searching questions about the process and its effectiveness in theory and practice. In particular, in respect of organisational change, there is a recurring view that if PRA is truly to take root organisational change is required; certainly in attitude and behaviour but also in structure (see commentary on Part 2 of the book, overleaf).

The book is divided into three sections, relating firstly to the opportunities and dangers of scaling up participatory approaches, secondly to organisational change as the key to institutionalising participation and finally to where do we go from here?

In the first section, four case studies of the opportunities and dangers in scaling up participation countrywide in each instance are presented from Ethiopia, Vietnam, Indonesia and Bolivia. From Ethiopia, Dereje Wordofa concludes that high-quality training is an essential feature of scaling up and needs to be sustained over the long term by the introduction of PRA into the formal educational sphere but warns of villagers getting 'PRA-fatigue' and of the approach being hijacked and so discredited as a consequence of the high demand for it reducing standards in its application. However, if managers are infused in the process then scale can be achieved: *"There is no question that the speed of PRA can be increased if there is material and moral support from people at a higher level within an organisation, but such people need training themselves in order fully to understand what it is that they are supporting and helping to promulgate"*

Bardolf Paul considers the lessons of forestry programmes in Vietnam and concludes that the institutional structures and people within them need to be changed and prepared for that change for scaling up to work; interestingly, his work reveals that he is far from convinced that scaling up PRA is possible.

When considering an attempt to do undertake nationwide village level planning in Indonesia Mukerjee suggests that this attempt to go to national scale was too fast and not well enough resourced with trainers particularly; it was, he says, *"an exercise in compromise"*, particularly as, in effect, it became a top-down planning exercise. So, scaling up participation had undermined its very ethos; he too warns of the need for institutional change.

Blackburn and de Toma conclude the first section of the book indicating that successful spread of PRA has been bought in Bolivia about through central government willingness to decentralise some key relevant functions through its Law of Popular Participation. Indeed *Scaling down as the key to scaling up* is the title of the chapter. There is the likelihood, the authors suggest, of major consequences arising from the combination of decentralisation and participation that was occurring.

There are also case studies of sector-specific scaling up projects from Estonia, India and Zimbabwe. John Thompson illustrates the success in the Baltic state in using participatory social assessments to help the new administration understand problems and issues in the

---

rural parts of the country and to initiate a process of farmer education; and the development of a “cadre” of trainers to take the process forward, while Haggmann, Chuma and Murwira, drawing on their work in participatory agricultural extension work in Zimbabwe, identify great PRA successes but warn that the process of adaptation of staff within institutions and the institutions themselves will take a long time. From a slum programme in ‘Calcutta’, Kar and Phillips provide the view that piloting is necessary before across the board action: you need to scale-down before scaling up is their observation – not referring to the decentralisation of authority implicit in the phrase in the Bolivian case mentioned above but through using community projects as learning laboratories for subsequent scaling up.

In Part 2 of the book, the contributors cover the issue of whether or not organisational change holds the key to institutionalising participation. Firstly, James Mascarenas illustrates how institutional changes, with NGOs becoming catalysts and government providing support mechanisms, have helped in micro-watershed development in Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, south India. The areas where NGO ground preparation is especially needed, he reports of the watershed development programmes in which he was involved, is in the creation of self help groups; they also need to be involved in the very extensive planning elements of the work on the ground.

The capacity of parties to engage in participatory approaches involves much more than one-off training, reports Mallika Samaranayake from Sri Lanka; training is needed intensively and as part of an ongoing process, but PRA is itself one element, albeit a recurrent one, of the project cycle, she indicates. While she says that donor organisations need to be prepared for long term involvement in such the process, she does not elaborate on the clear issues of resourcing that are implied by her observations.

John Thompson lists a number of key training issues for governments to consider as they look to include PRA in their own armoury and suggests some other major considerations for them as they seek a more “strategic” approach:

1. a policy framework supportive of a clear role for local people in research and development.
2. strong leadership committed to learning.
3. a long term flexible financial commitment.
4. better monitoring and evaluation systems for ensuring accountability.
5. attention to detail in formulating plans.
6. creative management to facilitate scaling up.
7. an environment to support creativity.
8. creation of dedicated catalysing staff units.
9. documentation of practice for learning purposes.
10. flexible, integrated training programmes.

Finally, other contributors in the Blackburn and Holland book look at the negative consequences of pressure caused by some donors, for example, where an input based measurement (pumps, plants etc) is mistaken for output; at how transformation of

institutions into learning based agencies can have profound effects; and how decentralisation to achieve 'technical' gains can also help to more fundamental democratisation of regions.

The view that institutionalising participation will naturally lead to scaling up, with some institutional change where necessary, pervades this section of the literature but a quote from Richard Feacham relating to community participation from over 20 years ago might make us feel that we may not have come that far in the intervening period: *"it is concluded that these concepts are often applied in an over-simplified manner and that they divert attention away from political and administrative realities that primarily determine the success or failure of rural water and sanitation programmes"* (Feacham, 1980).

### 7.3 NGOs working with government

It is accepted that NGOs can not on their own provide for and manage a scaling up process, what is their role when working alongside Government? If this is the case, then what is the role of NGOs in the process, especially one that is seeking to scale up?

Edwards and Hulme (1997) indicate that NGOs are *"losing their roots as they increasingly serve the interests of donors and to a lesser degree governments, rather than the poor and disempowered whom they set out to help"*.

Returning to Edwards and Hulme (1992), contributors Bebbington and Farrington, drawing on their work in agricultural technology development, indicate that NGOs should build upon the key areas in which they offer benefits and where, at least by implication, they differ from Governments. *"Their [NGOs] success is rooted in locally-adapted participatory and empowering approaches, in a strong problem-orientation, and in a capacity to think beyond the bounds of the particular technical issues confronted at each location."* They go on to indicate that threats to NGOs, and where their weaknesses lie, are in being donor-led to the extent of being dictated to by donors' requirements and attitudes; and in the lack of collaboration between NGOs in the areas in which they work <sup>27</sup>.

Using an NGO project as a pilot for replication is considered by Klinmahorn and Ireland. After a pilot stage, they argue, two stages of small-scale integration and assimilation should occur, with reducing amounts of NGO inputs accompanied by increasing amounts from Government at each stage. They consider a project in Bangkok to provide support, development and educational opportunities for children with psychiatric illnesses. They conclude that even the pilot stage needs to be operated within the Government sector – NGO-led projects are demonstrations, not pilots – the difference being that demonstration projects show others how to do something, pilot projects are to find out if they can be done. They also raise the familiar concern that replicability does not indicate sustainability, indeed the fact that scaling up requires change in all elements of project conduct may actually lead to a reduction in sustainability unless it is specifically addressed. The main

---

<sup>27</sup> See also Mahon and Sinclair, in Chapter 2

---

conclusion however is that the key to good NGO/Government inter-working lies in the development of a high quality of relationships between the personnel involved but *“in the final analysis”*, they conclude, *“scaling up can only occur when the appropriate people within government support it. International NGOs should see their role as supporting their partners within government to create the necessary conditions for this to happen but they cannot create these conditions from outside”*.

Mackie considers the ability to scale up, using his experience within VSO projects across developing nations in Africa and Asia. Again stressing a possible threat to sustainability through scaling up, he suggests that planned multiplication of micro-level inputs is an obvious way to proceed, through for example seconding external staff in government agencies in greater numbers for periods and implementing teaching programmes for Government staff. He concludes that managing the process of scaling up is an onerous one: *“there is the obvious need to be able to provide the increased level of inputs required over a longer period of time. But there is also the less immediately obvious need to be able to manage work on a larger scale. VSO’s experience show s that large projects require radically different management structures and systems...”*.

A further area where NGOs can provide support, Parry-Jones argues, is in assisting the legal reform process thereby increasing the impact of their work. His case is built upon assisting the legislature in the drafting and adoption of laws to protect of children’s rights in Uganda and the consequent impact that this will have in particular in accelerating their protection from poverty through child labour practices. Clearly to engage in this work of work requires the NGO to be a trusted partner of government; indeed, the author acknowledges difficulties relating to the potential for negative impact on other players’ activities and the possibility of NGOs having undemocratic influence on the development process. There are those who are indicating that the position of NGOs currently is moving towards the untenable and that the requirement for them to move is inexorable; those that won’t will wither and die: *“The fundamental question facing all NGOs is how to move from their current position – as unhappy agents of a foreign aid system in decline – to where they want to be – as vehicles for international co-operation in the emerging global arena... In a global future NGOs have the world at their feet”* (Edwards, Hulme and Wallace, 1999).

Their argument is on the basis that *“global trends are creating unprecedented opportunities for civic action at local, national and international level”*: the authors see a clear link between globalisation and the insecurity it breeds, the complexity in humanitarian action especially in response to ethnic conflict and violence, and the necessity to reform the international response to these. They believe that the co-operation that is mushrooming in civil society movements across the globe will put NGOs at the forefront of this movement, so long as they evolve and adapt away from being doers to facilitators: from ‘agents of development-as-delivery’ to ‘agents of development-as-leverage’.

---

## 8. Conclusions

An objective of this Review has been to provide as wide ranging as possible an appraisal of literature that has been produced in recent years on the subject of scaling up. The output is a document which should be useful as learning material. During the production of the Review, The United Nations has seen fit to declare a second water decade: so scaling up is on the agenda, even if the term is not widely used yet.

In this Review, scaling up has been taken to mean the accelerated implementation of safe sustainable water supplies in a timescale that might be judged acceptable (with the clear implication that this is not happening now). Perhaps the key finding that jumps from the pages of the literature is that there is agreement that it probably can not be achieved in most locations under prevailing institutional conditions. Some things need to change, some of them quite a lot. As noted in the Foreword, a reorientation of philosophy and activity by many of the key players is necessary for scaling up to occur.

One reason why it is difficult to provide meaningful conclusions is that so much of what is said and written in this sector appears to be anecdotal. Christine van Wijk-Sibesma, quoted in this Review, points to a lack of meaningful explanatory writing, maybe this is one area that needs to be confronted to assist in the scaling up process. She (and others) are perhaps telling us to be careful what we view as good practice when we are preparing projects and to be careful in what we subsequently call good practice when we report back.

But there is a feeling that quite a lot has been said about scaling up in various guises in various arenas. In the watsan field there is a sense of impatience with talking and a need for action. It is almost as if there is a need for a leap of faith and once this is started then it will become the norm for others. If it is taken that there is a need to translate words into actions, then perhaps the words set out in this Review can help in some way to guide those actions.

And there are some clear lessons that can be drawn; some of the key ones are considered under the major headings, for the sake of ease of consideration.

### **Scaling Up**

There is a need to be clear about objectives, and to be clear that these are really the communities' objectives. It is easy to write evaluation papers if objectives can be retro-fitted or if none existed – for example that the standard project cycle diagram used in this country does not mention objectives but it is not possible or acceptable to commence anything meaningful without agreeing them and stating them loud and clear.

There is also a need to agree what the ultimate measure of success is: I believe that scaling up is about achieving 100% sustainable coverage of safe water – it is not about

---

water for the vast proportion, nor necessarily is it about adhering to MDGs or any other targets imposed from above.

We need to consider our actions – to what extent will the project or programme have a multiplicative effect or sow the seeds for a process that has such an effect? Additive programmes are fine – but is there some element of them that can be turned into a multiplicative one later?

The types of multiplicative actions are detailed in this document – which ones are appropriate is a choice specific to each location – and of course there are many which are as yet unearthed.

### **Community Management**

In some quarters there is doubt about CM as a mechanism for progress. The literature is clear that CM is the way forward if communities receive the support that they need; this does not negate CM as a process. But perhaps the name ‘community management’ causes difficulty if it is implied that this means the community can achieve success on its own, so that if it needs support then it does not work.

Carl Taylor rejected the bottom up versus top down rhetoric. The community is in control but the proper and significant involvement of others is vital, there is no contradiction here.

### **Role Change**

It is accepted that NGOs have done much good work but can't themselves lead the accelerated scaling up process that is now needed. Many authors appeared not to stand back far enough to address what the future role of NGOs might be: they have done good work so they always will, might be the implication, but this does not appear to be sufficient. It is, on the other hand, easy to write that NGOs, therefore, must get more involved in advocacy and should train the new trainers. This is not because these are not appropriate actions, more that there appears to be consensus about this, so action to do this is required, as is widespread dissemination of results.

The literature is full of examples of NGOs carrying out work that needs to be taken over by Government, particularly local government where NGOs often act as surrogate. However, where large – scaled up - projects have occurred then governments have taken on their proper role and responsibility, and have supported communities, while NGOs have taken on key supporting roles. The WAMMA project in Tanzania appears to offer a significant lesson in this regard – especially in respect of the length of support given by all parties.

If NGOs are to provide a support role, then there is a clear need for coordination between them; the example quoted from Mozambique of a huge disparity in unit cost of water points between adjacent projects is symptomatic of a serious coordination and communication

problem; the resultant waste of resources and money is effectively depriving some people of their chance to partake in projects for their own benefit.

There appeared in the literature to be near unanimity on general roles in scaling up:

- Community – in control, managing a process but not the sole actors – it needs support.
- Central government: policy, financial and legal environment, setting up institutional support mechanisms.
- INGOs – advocacy, honest broker, support.
- Local government: project and programme planning, support to communities.
- NGOs – facilitation, support and training.
- Private sector – development of the sector to provide the supply chain.
- The donor and international community – more hands off and less controlling, commitment over long periods.

Perhaps the gist of the issue is, that scaling up requires trust in communities, decentralised planning, long term support, widespread capacity building and empowerment: in short, democracy.

### **Issues and Questions**

A summary of some of the key issues that need to be considered is as follows, based upon that proposed by DeLong (see Chapter 5) and expanded using contributions from other authors covered in this Review:

#### *Context for scaling up*

- Overall political context:
  - Policy environment.
  - Official backing from key sources.
  - Patience and flexibility.
  - Priority for *community* development.
  - Legal clarity
- Government-NGO relations.
- Stability versus conflict.
- Level of need – confidence in data.
- Level of expressed demand.
- Ease of reaching populations.
- Economic context.
- Available infrastructure.
- Need for further research.

#### *Institutional considerations*

- Time to plan scaling up.
- Resources available to plan and implement.
- Adequate donor resources: finance and commitment for lengthy periods.

- 
- Ability and willingness of players to coordinate actions.
  - Internal implications (staffing, management etc).
  - Capacity to implement and evaluate programme amongst all key players.

#### *Objectives and Actions*

- Clarity between inputs, outputs and outcomes or objectives.
- Objectives defined and agreed.
- Who (what groups) to focus on.
- What level of coverage is sought.
- What (interventions) to focus on.
- What role and responsibility for each key player.
- Availability of trained fieldworkers.
- Evidence for effectiveness of interventions.
- Evaluation mechanisms (to measure quality and impact of interventions).
- Knowledge of potential risk of failure and its impact.
- Costs of interventions and scaled up programmes – risk associated with costing.
- Sustainability of scaling up process itself.

#### *Bottlenecks or hurdles*

- Lack of shared understanding of objectives and principles.
- Resource constraints:
  - Funds (lack of and no clarity about...).
  - Human resources.
  - Institutional capacity.
  - Supply chain absence or weakness.
  - Technological difficulties (parts, remoteness).
- Political interference.
- Unresolved fears of loss of sustainability when scaling up occurs.
- Corruption.
- Lack of support systems.
- Inadequate reference to gender and poverty aspects.
  - Pilot schemes not designed to go to scale or which inhibit it.
  - Resistance to implementation.
  - Badly targeted resources or programmes.
  - Untested implementation conditions.

And finally, some additional general questions might include:

- Will donors and governments sign up to real programmes of scaling up as against generalised policy commitments to targets?
- Can there be some co-ordination of distillation of information relating to scaling up lessons so that these are not lost in the plethora of competing dissemination organisations?

---

## Bibliography

Anyonge T M *et al*, 2001, Scaling Up Participatory Agroforestry Extension in Kenya: from pilot projects to extension policy; *Development in Practice* 11 (4) 449-59

Available from [www.developmentinpractice.org](http://www.developmentinpractice.org)

Bebbington, Anthony J and John Farrington, 1992, *Non-Governmental Interaction in Agricultural Technology Development*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Billis, David, 1984, *Welfare Bureaucracies: Their Design and Change in Response to Social Problems*, Heinemann, London

Billis, David and Joy MacKeith, 1992, *Growth and Change in NGOs: concepts and comparative experience*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Binswanger, Hans P, 2000, Scaling Up HIV/AIDS Programs to National Coverage, *Science* Vol 288, 2173-6

Available from [www.sciencemag.org](http://www.sciencemag.org)

Binswanger, Hans P and Swaminathan S Aiyar, 2003, Scaling Up Community-Driven Development - Theoretical Underpinnings and Program Design Implications, *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3039*

[www.econ.worldbank.org/files/26012\\_wps3039.pdf](http://www.econ.worldbank.org/files/26012_wps3039.pdf)

Blackburn James and Jeremy Holland, Eds., 1998, *Who Changes? Institutionalizing participation in development*, ITDG Publishing; London

Blackburn James and Costanza de Toma, 1998, *Scaling down as the key to scaling-up? The role of participatory municipal planning in Bolivia's Law of Popular Participation*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*

Boydell, R, 1996, *Scaling Up Rural Water and Sanitation Projects: Reaching the Unreached: Challenges for the 21st Century*, WEDC, Loughborough, 22nd WEDC Conference, New Delhi

[www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/cv/wedc/papers/22/plenary/boydell.pdf](http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/cv/wedc/papers/22/plenary/boydell.pdf)

Breslin, Edward D, 2003, *Demand Responsive Approach in Practice: why sustainability remains elusive*, WaterAid, Mozambique

[www.wateraid.org.uk/in\\_depth/in\\_depth\\_publications/1504.asp](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/in_depth/in_depth_publications/1504.asp)

Brown, David *et al*, 2002, *From Supervising 'Subjects' to Supporting 'Citizens': Recent developments in community forestry in Asia and Africa*, ODI, London, Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Natural Resource Perspectives, No 75

---

[www.odi.org.uk/nrp/75.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/75.pdf)

Brugha, R *et al*, 2002, GAVI, The First Steps: Lessons for the Global Fund, *The Lancet* 359 (9304) 435-438

Access free at: [www.thelancet.com/journal/vol359/iss9304](http://www.thelancet.com/journal/vol359/iss9304)

Carter, Richard *et al*, 1993, Lessons Learned from the UN Water Decade, *Journal of the Institute of Water Engineering and Management* 10 (April)

Carter, Richard *et al*, 2001, *The Report of the 2001 Evaluation of the Kigezi Diocese Water and Sanitation Programme*, Unpublished Project Report for KDWSP, Uganda

Carter, Richard *et al*, 1997, *Kigeze Diocese Water Department: External Evaluation*, Unpublished Project Report for Kigezi Diocese Water Department, Uganda

Carter, Richard *et al*, 2003, *Development of a Strategy for Support to Private Sector Organisations Participating in Rural Water and Sanitation Programmes in Uganda*, Unpublished Interim Project Report for DfID, London

Catacutan, Delia C *et al*, 2001, Scaling Up the Landcare and NRM Planning Process in Mindanao, Philippines, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*

[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12523](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12523)

Chambers Robert, 1992, *Spreading and Self-Improving: a strategy for scaling up*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Constantino-David, Karina, 1992, *The Philippine Experience in Scaling-up*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Cooper, PJM and G Denning, 2001, Ten Fundamentals for Scaling Up Agroforestry Innovations in Developing Countries, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*

[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12516](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12516)

Dasgupta, Monica *et al*, 2003, *Fostering Community-driven Development: What role for the state?* Development Research Group, World Bank, World Bank Policy Research Paper 2969

[www.econ.worldbank.org/files/24036\\_wps2969.pdf](http://www.econ.worldbank.org/files/24036_wps2969.pdf)

Davis, Jennifer and Parameswaran Iyer, 2002, *Taking Sustainable Rural Water Services to Scale: A discussion paper*, BNWP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Programme, Washington DC

[www.wsp.org/pdfs/scaling\\_up\\_press\\_20\\_03\\_03.pdf](http://www.wsp.org/pdfs/scaling_up_press_20_03_03.pdf)

Delong, Jocelyn, 2003, *Making an Impact in HIV and AIDS*, ITDG Publishing; London

---

Dichter, T W, 1989, *NGOs and the Replication Trap*, Technoserve, Connecticut, Findings '89

Dilts, Russ, 2001, Scaling Up the IPM Movement, *ILEIA 17 (3) op cit*  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12518](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12518)

Directorate of Water Development, Government of Uganda, 2002a, Strategic Investment Programme for 2015, ('SIP15'), Government of Uganda

Directorate of Water Development, Government of Uganda, 2002b, *Rural Water and Sanitation Operational Plan: 2002-2007*, ('OP5'), Government of Uganda

Ebdon, Rosamund, 1995, NGO Expansion and the Fight to Reach the Poor: Gender Implications of Scaling Up in Bangladesh, Institute of Development Studies; Brighton, *IDS Bulletin 26 (3) 49-55*

[www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/bulletin/bull263abs.htm#ngo](http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/bulletin/bull263abs.htm#ngo) (abstract)

Edstrom, J, 2002, *Indonesia's Kecamatan Development Project: Is it Replicable? Design considerations in a community driven development*, World Bank Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network, Social Development Paper No. 39 (quoted in reference but not located in searches of the World Bank website and stated to be not located in WB Image Bank)

[http://inweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/60ByDocName/SocialDevelopmentListofPublications/\\$FILE/SDV+Catalog+March+2004+for+Web.doc](http://inweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/60ByDocName/SocialDevelopmentListofPublications/$FILE/SDV+Catalog+March+2004+for+Web.doc).

Edwards, Michael and David Hulme, 1992, *Scaling-up the Developmental Impact of NGOs: concepts and experiences*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Edwards, Michael and David Hulme, (Eds.) 1992, *Making a Difference: NGOs and development in a changing world*, Earthscan, London

Edwards, Michael, David Hulme and Tina Wallace, 2000, *NGOs in a Global Future: Marrying local delivery to worldwide leverage*

European Union, 2003, *Sectoral Policy on Water Resources*, European Union, Policy Paper, EU, Brussels

[www.europa.eu.int/comm/development/sector/water\\_en.htm](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/development/sector/water_en.htm)

Farrington, John and Crispino Lobo, 1997, Scaling Up Participatory Watershed Development in India, ODI, London, *Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Natural Resource Perspectives, No 17*

[www.odi.org.uk/nrp/17.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/17.html)

Farrington, John *et al*, 2002, *Do Area Development Projects Have a Future?* ODI, London,

---

Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Natural Resource Perspectives, No 82

[www.odi.org.uk/nrp/82.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/82.pdf)

Feacham, Richard (1980), Community Participation in appropriate water supply and sanitation technologies; the mythology for the Decade; *Proc. R. Soc. London B209*, 15-29

Franzel, S *et al*, 2001, Scaling Up the Benefits of Agroforestry Research: lessons learned and research challenges, *Development in Practice* 11 (4) 524-34

Available from [www.developmentinpractice.org/](http://www.developmentinpractice.org/)

Gonsalves, Julian F, 2001, Going to Scale, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*

[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id=12514](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id=12514)

Gundel, Sabine *et al*, 2001, A Project Design Framework for Scaling Up NRM Research, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*

[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id=12515](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id=12515)

Hagmann, Jurgen, Edward Chuma and Kudakwashe Murwira, 1998, *Scaling-up of participatory approaches through institutionalization in Government Services: the case of agricultural extension in Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*

Hartmann, Peter, 2001, *Rural Water Supply in Benin*, IRC; Delft, in IRC 2001 *op cit*

[www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/ruralbeninocs.html](http://www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/ruralbeninocs.html)

Henderson, Keith M, 2001, Urban Service Delivery in Developing Countries - Escaping Western Bureaucratic Solutions, *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 14 (4), page 327-340

Abstract: [titania.emeraldinsight.com/vl=4561016/cl=30/nw=1/rpsv/cw/www/mcb/09513558/contp1-1.htm](http://titania.emeraldinsight.com/vl=4561016/cl=30/nw=1/rpsv/cw/www/mcb/09513558/contp1-1.htm)

Hodson, Roland, 1992, *Small, Medium or Large? The rocky road to NGO growth*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Holt-Gimenez, Eric, 2001, Scaling Up Sustainable Agriculture, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*

Horizons, 2000, *Case Studies in Scaling Up*, Horizons, Washington, DC

[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id=12521](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id=12521)

Howes, Mick and M G Satter, 1992, *Bigger and Better? Scaling up strategies pursued by BRAC 1972-1991*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

---

Institute of Low External Input Agriculture (ILEIA), 2001, *Lessons in Scaling Up, Low External Input and Sustainable Agriculture (LEISA) Quarterly News*, 17 (3) –  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=magazine-details.tpl&p\[readOnly\]=1&p\[\\_id\]=12510](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=magazine-details.tpl&p[readOnly]=1&p[_id]=12510)

IRC - International Water and Sanitation Centre, 2002, *Beyond the Community - An e-conference on scaling up community management of rural water supply*, IRC; Delft  
[www.irc.nl/content/view/full/7653](http://www.irc.nl/content/view/full/7653)

IRC - International Water and Sanitation Centre, 2001, *From System to Service - Scaling up community management*, IRC; Delft  
<http://www.irc.nl/page/10398>

Iyer, Parameswaran, 1997, *The Swajal Project: a new approach*, WEDC, Loughborough, 22nd WEDC Conference Report, New Delhi, 1996  
[www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/cv/wedc/papers/22/grouph/iyer.pdf](http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/cv/wedc/papers/22/grouph/iyer.pdf)

Jareg, P and D C O Kaseje , 1998, Growth of Civil Society in Developing Countries: Implications for Health, *Lancet Vol 351, (9105) 819 – 822*  
Available free at: [www.thelancet.com/journal/vol351/iss9105](http://www.thelancet.com/journal/vol351/iss9105)

Jarman, Julie and Catherine Johnson, 1997, *WAMMA: Empowerment on Practice*, WaterAid, London  
Access at [www.wateraid.org.uk/in\\_depth/old/in\\_depth\\_publications\\_old/default.asp](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/in_depth/old/in_depth_publications_old/default.asp)

Jenkins, Paul *et al*, 2002, Luanda, *Cities 19 (2) 139-50*  
Available from [www.elsevier.com/locate/cities](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/cities)

Kar, Kamal, 2003, Subsidy or Self-Respect? Participatory total community sanitation in Bangladesh, Institute of Development Studies; Brighton, *IDS Working Paper 184*, University of Sussex  
[www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/wp184.pdf](http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/wp184.pdf)

Kar, Kamal and Sue Phillips, 1998, *Scaling Up or Scaling Down? The experience of institutionalizing PRA in slum improvement projects in India*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*

Keivani, Ramin and Edmundo Werna, 2001, Modes of Housing Provision in Developing Countries, *Progress in Planning 55 (2) 65-118*  
Available from [www.elsevier.com/locate/pplann](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/pplann)

Klinmahorn, Somthavil and Kevin Ireland, 1992, *NGO-Government Collaboration in Bangkok*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

---

Kolavalli, Shashi and John Kerr, 2002, *Scaling Up Participatory Watershed Development in India*, *Development and Change* 33 (2) 213  
Available from [www.blackwellpublishing.com/](http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/)

Korten, D, 1990, *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda*, Kumarian Press, West Hartford

Kumaranayake, Lilani, 2000, *The Economics of Scaling Up*, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Paper to WHO Commission on Macro-Economics of Health; Planning Meeting of Working Group 05.00

Kwesiga, Freddie *et al*, 2001, *Scaling Up Management Innovations*, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit* [www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12524](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12524)

Leemans, Annelies, 2001, *Water Supply in Urban Egypt*, IRC; Delft, In IRC 2001 *op cit* [www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/urbanegyptcs.html](http://www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/urbanegyptcs.html)

Lister, Sarah, 2001, *Scaling-Up in Emergencies: British NGOs After Hurricane Mitch*, *Journal of Disaster Studies and Management* 25 (1) 36-47  
Available from [www.blackwellpublishing.com/](http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/)

Lockwood, Harold, 2002, *Institutional Support Mechanisms for Community Managed RWSS Systems in Latin America*, EHP/USAID, Washington DC - [www.ehproject.org/PDF/Strategic\\_papers/SR-6.pdf](http://www.ehproject.org/PDF/Strategic_papers/SR-6.pdf)

Lockwood, Harold and Ton Schouten, 2004, *Scaling Up Community Management of Rural Water Supply, a Thematic Overview Paper*, IRC Delft – [www.irc.nl/content/view/full/8857](http://www.irc.nl/content/view/full/8857)

Lovell, C, 1991, *Scaling-up Health: two decades of learning in BRAC*, BRAC, Dhaka

McGranahan, Gordon, David Satterthwaite and John Thompson, 2003, *Improving Access to Water and Sanitation: rethinking the way forward in light of the Millennium Development Goals*; IIED Sustainable Development 'Opinion' Paper

Mackie, James, 1992, *Multiplying Micro-Level Inputs to Government Structures*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

Mahajan, Sharad *et al*, 2001, *How Successful is the Wadi Model?* *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit* [www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12529](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12529)

Mahon, Therese and Peter Sinclair, 2003, *Scaling Up at WaterAid - A paper for discussion*, WaterAid, London  
[www.wateraid.org.uk/documents/scaling%20up%20at%20wateraid.pdf](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/documents/scaling%20up%20at%20wateraid.pdf)

- 
- Marchione T J (Ed), 1999, *Scaling Up, Scaling Down: Overcoming Malnutrition in Developing Countries*, Gordon Breach Publishers, Amsterdam
- Mascarenas, James, 1998, *Participatory watershed development implementation process: some practical tips from OUTREACH in South India*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*
- Mathew, Brian, 2003, *Celebrating a Decade of WAMMA*, Unpublished personal paper
- Mitlin, Diana and David Satterthwaite, 1992, *Scaling-up in Urban Areas*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*
- Mukasa, Sarah, 2000, Are Expatriate Staff Necessary in International Development NGOs? LSE Centre for Civil Society; London, *International Working Paper 4*  
[www.wateraid.org.uk/documents/scaling%20up%20at%20wateraid.pdf](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/documents/scaling%20up%20at%20wateraid.pdf)
- Mukerjee, Nilanjana, 1998, *The rush to scale: lessons being learned in Indonesia*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*
- Myers, R, 1992, *Going to Scale*, Routledge, London, in Cooperson W (Ed.) *The Twelve Who Survive*, 369-96
- Narayan, Deepa, 1995, *The Contribution of People's Participation: Evidence from 121 Rural Water Supply Projects*. Environmentally Sustainable Development Occasional Paper Series No. 1. The World Bank, Washington D.C  
[www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1995/07/01/000009265\\_3961219095253/Rendered/PDF/multi\\_page.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1995/07/01/000009265_3961219095253/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf)
- Negussie, Amsalu, 2001, *Institutionalising Community Management in Uganda*, IRC; Delft, in IRC 2001 *op cit*  
[www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/ugandacs.html](http://www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/ugandacs.html)
- Nieuwenhuis, Peter and Peter Wells, 2003, *Did Ford Really Invent Mass Production?* The Centre for Business Relationships Accountability, Sustainability and Society (BRASS), University of Cardiff; accessed at [www.brass.cf.ac.uk](http://www.brass.cf.ac.uk), January 2004.
- Noordin Q *et al*, 2001, *Scaling Up Adoption and Impact of Agroforestry Techniques: experiences from Western Kenya*, *Development in Practice* 11 (4) 509-23  
Available from [www.developmentinpractice.org/](http://www.developmentinpractice.org/)
- Parry Williams, John, 1992, *Scaling Up via Legal Reform in Uganda*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*

- 
- Patjoshi, Pradeep, 2001, *Scaling Up Community Management in Ganjam, Orissa - India*, IRC; Delft, in IRC 2001 *op cit*  
[www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/ganjam.html](http://www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/ganjam.html)
- Paul, Bardolf, 1998, *Scaling up PRA: lessons from Vietnam*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*
- Riddell, A, 1999, Evaluations of Educational Reform Programmes in Developing Countries: Whose Life is it Anyway? *International Journal of Educational Development* 19 383-394  
Available from [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)
- Robinson, Mark, 1992, *NGOs and Rural Poverty Alleviation*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*
- Roche, Chris, 1992, *It's Not Size that Matters*, in Edwards and Hulme (Eds.) 1992 *op cit*
- Ruben, Ruerd, 2001, A New Role for the Market and the State, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12530](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12530)
- Sakthivel, S Ramesh and Roger Fitzgerald, 2002, *The Soozhal Initiative: a model for achieving total sanitation in low-income rural areas*, WaterAid, India  
Access at: [www.wateraid.org.uk/in\\_depth/in\\_depth\\_publications/1498.asp](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/in_depth/in_depth_publications/1498.asp)
- Ryan, Peter, 2003, *Scaling Up Rural Water Supply*. Unpublished MSc thesis, Cranfield University at Silsoe.  
Available on request from [peter\\_ryan@btopenworld.com](mailto:peter_ryan@btopenworld.com)
- Samaranayake, Mallika, 1998, *Introducing participatory learning approaches in the Self-Help Support Programme, Sri Lanka*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*
- Schouten, Ton and Patrick Moriarty, 2001, *From System to Service - Scaling up community management - conference background paper*, IRC; Delft, in IRC 2001 *op cit*  
<http://www.irc.nl/page/10398>
- Sherwood, Stephen and Sergio Larrea, 2001, Farmer Recommendations After 15 Years of Innovation, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12522](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12522)
- Taylor, Carl E, 2001, Scaling Up Social Development, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12517](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12517)
- Thompson, John, 1998, *Participatory approaches in government bureaucracies: facilitating institutional change*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*

---

Turton C *et al*, 1998, Scaling Up Participatory Watershed Development in India: a review of the literature, ODI, London, *ODI Agricultural Research & Extension Network Paper 86*  
[www.odi.org.uk/agren/papers/agrenpaper\\_86.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/agren/papers/agrenpaper_86.pdf)

United Nations, 2000, *United Nations Millennium Declaration, 6-8 September 2000*, UN, Washington, DC, Accessed via UN website, [www.un.org/millennium/](http://www.un.org/millennium/) August 2003

Uphoff, N, M Esman and A Krishna, 1998, *Reasons for Success: learning from instructive experience in rural development*, Kumarian Press, New Delhi

Uvin, Peter, 1995, Fighting Hunger at the Grassroots: Paths to Scaling Up, *World Development* 23 (6) 927-39  
Available from [www.elsevier.com](http://www.elsevier.com)

Uvin, Peter, 1995, Scaling Up the Grass Roots and Scaling Down the Summit: the Relations Between Third World Nongovernmental Organisations and the United Nations, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 16 (3) 495-512  
Available from [www.tandf.co.uk/journals](http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals)

Uvin, Peter and David Miller, 1996, Scaling-Up: Alternative Strategies for Nongovernmental Organisations, *Human Organizations* Vol 55 (3) 344-53

Uvin, Peter, Pankaj S Jain and David Brown, 2000, Think Large and Act Small: Toward a New Paradigm for NGO Scaling Up, *World Development* 28 (8) 1409-19  
Available from [www.elsevier.com](http://www.elsevier.com)

van Wijk-Sijbesma, Christine, 2003, *Scaling Up Community-managed Water Supply and Sanitation Projects in India: Part 1*, IRC; Delft

Vaneph, Sandrine and Jose Benites, 2001, An Unexpected Success: From zero tillage to conservation agriculture, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12519](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12519)

Vargas, Mariela Garcia, 2001, *Association of Community Based Organisations - Colombia*, IRC; Delft, in IRC 2001 *op cit*  
[www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/colombiacs.html](http://www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/colombiacs.html)

Vermeulen, Abri, 2001, *Institutional Frameworks to Support Community Management in South Africa*, IRC; Delft, in IRC 2001 *op cit*  
[www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/southafricancs.html](http://www2.irc.nl/manage/manuals/cases/southafricancs.html)

von der Veld, Jean Marc, 2001, Scaling Up, and Further Scaling Up Participatory Development, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*  
[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj\\_id\]=12520](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&pj_id]=12520)

---

Wambugu, C *et al*, 2001, Scaling Up the Use of Fodder Shrubs in Central Kenya, *Development in Practice* 11 (4) 487-94

Available from [www.developmentinpractice.org/](http://www.developmentinpractice.org/)

WaterAid *et al*, 2003, *Hitting the Targets: Recommendations to the G8 for delivery of the Millennium Development Goals on water and sanitation*, WaterAid, London

Access via [www.wateraid.org.uk/in\\_depth/campaigns/838.asp](http://www.wateraid.org.uk/in_depth/campaigns/838.asp)

WaterAid, Tanzania (date?), *Singida Project Operation Manual*, WaterAid, Tanzania

Watts, Charlotte and Lilani Kumaranayake, 1999, Thinking Big: Scaling Up HIV-1 Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa, *The Lancet* 354 (9189) 1492-

Available free at [www.thelancet.com/journal/vol354/iss9189](http://www.thelancet.com/journal/vol354/iss9189)

Wazir Rekha and Nico van Ouderhoven, 1998, Increasing the Coverage of Social Programmes, *International Social Science Journal* Vol 55 (1) 145-54

Available from [www.blackwellpublishing.co.uk](http://www.blackwellpublishing.co.uk)

Weber, Ron, 1990, Scaling Up Jacob's Ladder: Community Development in Trinidad and Tobago, *Grassroots Development* 14 (1) 23-34

Wettasinha, Chesha, 2001, Scaling Up Participatory Development in Agricultural Settlements, *ILEIA* 17 (3) *op cit*

[www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&p\[\\_id\]=12525](http://www.leisa.info/index.php?url=article-details.tpl&p[_id]=12525)

Wordofa, Dereje, 1998, *Internalizing and diffusing the PRA approach: the case of Ethiopia*, in Blackburn and Holland (Eds.) *op cit*.