# Tool 6: Scalability Assessment Checklist

## Scalability Assessment Checklist

| Assessment Categories | | ☺ A | ← Scaling up is easier | ☺ B | Scaling up is harder → | ☹ C |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. How convincing is the scaling strategy? | 1 | | Presence of a clear and compelling strategy for reaching scale | | No articulated scaling strategy | |
| | 2 | | Homogeneous problem, target group and setting—geography, language, economy, politics | | Multiple, diverse contexts | |
| B. Is the intervention credible? | 3 | | Robust evidence that the intervention works in diverse settings and for diverse target groups | | Little or no robust evidence that the intervention works in diverse settings and for diverse target groups | |
| | 4 | | Independent external evaluation | | No independent external evaluation | |
| C. How strong is the support for change? | 5 | | Supported by eminent individuals and institutions | | Supported by few or no eminent individuals or institutions | |
| | 6 | | Impact very visible to decision-makers and users, and easily associated with the intervention | | Impact relatively invisible to decision-makers and users and/or not easily attributable to the intervention | |
| | 7 | | Strong sense of urgency regarding the problem or need | | Relative complacency | |
| | 8 | | Strong and stable leadership coalition committed to change | | Weak, divided, unstable or deeply conservative leadership coalition | |
| | 9 | | Addresses an issue that is high on the national policy agenda | | Addresses an issue that is absent from or low on the national policy agenda | |
| | 10 | | Addresses a need that is sharply felt by the potential target group(s) | | Addresses a need that is not sharply felt by the potential target group(s) | |
| | 11 | | Faces limited opposition | | Faces strong opposition | |
| D. Does the intervention have relative advantage over existing practices? | 12 | | Current situation widely considered inadequate | | Current situation widely considered adequate | |
| | 13 | | Superior effectiveness to other alternatives clearly established | | Little or no objective evidence of superiority to other alternatives | |
| | 14 | | Substantially lower cost than existing or alternative solutions | | Higher cost than existing or alternative solutions | |
| E. How easy is the intervention to transfer and adopt? | 15 | | Implementable with existing systems, infrastructure and human resources | | Requires significant new or additional systems, infrastructure or human resources | |
| | 16 | | Small departure from current practices | | Large departure from current practices | |
| | 17 | | Fully consistent with government policy | | Requires substantial change in one or more government policies | |
| | 18 | | Few decision-makers involved in authorizing or approving adoption | | Many decision-makers involved in authorizing or approving adoption | |
| | 19 | | Proposed changes are highly structured or highly technological | | Heavily reliant on process, values and/or flexibility | |
| | 20 | | Low complexity or easily implemented component-by-component | | High complexity and need for implementation as an integrated "package" | |
| | 21 | | Compliance and quality of implementation easy to monitor | | Compliance and quality of implementation difficult to monitor | |
| | 22 | | Able to be tested on a limited scale | | Unable to test without adoption on a large scale | |

| Assessment Categories | | ☺ A | ← Scaling up is easier | ☺ B | Scaling up is harder → | ☹ C |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **F. How good is the fit between the intervention and the Adopting Organization?** | 23 | | Strong prior collaboration between Originating and Adopting Organizations | | No prior collaboration between Originating and Adopting Organizations | |
| | 24 | | Adopting Organization has operational capacity and financial resources to implement at scale | | Adopting Organization lacks systems, delivery agents and/or resources to implement at scale | |
| | 25 | | Adopting and Intermediary Organizations have experience scaling similar interventions | | Adopting and Intermediary Organizations lack experience scaling similar interventions | |
| | 26 | | Adopting Organization has physical presence and strong network and credibility in relevant contexts | | Adopting Organization lacks footprint and credibility in relevant contexts | |
| | 27 | | Intervention fully consistent with norms, incentives and leadership style of Adopting Organization | | Intervention conflicts with the norms, incentives and/or leadership style of Adopting Organization | |
| | 28 | | Demonstrable support for the intervention among staff of Adopting Organization | | Active resistance by staff of the Adopting Organization | |
| **G. Is there a sustainable source of financing?** | 29 | | Budget implications clear, predictable and justifiable to those expected to bear the costs | | Budget implications unclear, unpredictable and/or difficult to justify to those expected to bear the costs | |
| | 30 | | Requires small commitment of funds to begin transition to scale | | Requires large commitment of funds to begin transition to scale | |
| | 31 | | External sponsors with long-term commitment to supporting the intervention | | No external sponsors with long-term commitment to supporting the intervention | |
| | 32 | | Full cost of implementation at scale able to be absorbed within government budget or covered from other sustainable sources | | No realistic prospect for funding full cost of implementation at scale within government budget or from other sustainable sources | |