

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

Introduction

“Design workshops” – a tool for developing systems based strategies

The Tällberg Forum 2006 marked the 26th year of consecutive global gatherings at Tällberg. Over the years, the Tällberg meetings have developed and evolved into a new form of global gathering, independent of established interests and institutions. The aim has been to create an arena for reflection and candid discussion, where people feel free to step outside of their professional identity, to share doubts and fragments of ideas, and search for ways forward outside of established frameworks. It has been characterised by humanism, systems thinking and informality, and there is always an effort to integrate both nature and the arts, in order to connect people to our essential human condition.

The increasing urgency of the global challenges we are facing, made more acute by the current climate crisis, has gradually shifted the focus of the Tällberg Forum. What started mainly as a forum for learning and mind-expanding activities, is moving towards becoming also an arena for forming systems based strategies that can make a real difference on the ground.

The Design Workshops were developed as a tool for doing precisely this. They were collaborative exercises and ran over three days. Each workshop engaged a diverse group of Forum participants and focused on the practical challenges at one of the following ten locations around the world: Lima, Peru; London, UK; The High North, Norway, Russia and Finland; Dalarna, Sweden; Sofia, Bulgaria; Kasese, Uganda; Bundhelkand, India; Dhaka, Bangladesh; Ton Lesap, Cambodia; Guangdong, China.

These locations presented a very diverse set of challenges, and illustrated different facets of the global problems the world is struggling with. The aim was to search for practical initiatives, frameworks and processes that could be implemented at these location and that were based on a systems understanding of the challenge.

In assessing the proposed strategies, one central test was used: any proposal must help reconcile the need for economic growth with waning energy resources and the fragile natural environment, while also strengthening governance, social justice, human rights and the rule of law.

The systems perspective was thus integral to the exercise, and one important aim was to bring out connections and similarities – be they between disciplines, institutions, profession or geographies - which our compartmentalised institutions and thought models often prevent us from seeing. Put along side each other, the ten Design Workshops thus provide an interesting window onto the world. They illustrate the interconnections and interdependencies between different practical challenges and between highly diverse locations, and help us trace and recognise the structural trends that contribute to the complex picture that emerges.

In coming to appreciate these connections, and adapting to their consequences, lies an important part of the answer to the basic question asked at Tällberg: How on earth can we live together?

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

Globalisation has left civic and political institution struggling to keep up

The backdrop to the Design Workshop, was the 26 year long conversation at Tällberg. A constant theme here has been the push towards increasingly globalised value-producing systems. The search for higher profits and new markets have led to more widely extended, but also more fluid, supply and distribution networks all across the world. Over the years it has become increasingly clear how these rapid developments have left other parts of society behind. This has in turn generated new conflicts and new challenges not only for political and civic institutions, but also for business itself.

Over the years in Tällberg, we have seen the evolution of business and organisational models developed in response to new market realities. With that has followed new methods for leadership and learning. The market institutions, freed from many of the regulatory obstacles which hampered them in the 1970s, have generally led the way. Financial markets and corporate structures are these days able to adjust investment decisions, distribution and supply channels at an instant, constantly looking to optimise return on invested capital. We do not today have the governance frameworks for handling this new reality. This is both a local and a global challenge.

The productivity gains from globalisation have been staggering. The effect of releasing market forces in countries such as India and China is currently responsible for the greatest instance of poverty alleviation in history. However, as made painfully clear by the case of Guangdong, the growth model that the global market forces have given rise to in China is neither compatible with local or global ecological balance nor human health. This is a crucial lesson when forming a development strategy for the area around Lake Tonle Sap, Cambodia – a region in Southeast Asia. It is of course a lesson of much wider relevance: the current economic model is not sustainable and cannot be exported globally.

The benefits of globalisation have also not been evenly distributed. Kasese in eastern Uganda has superficially many of the right conditions for success – yet the region is refusing to take off. Similarly, Bundhelkhand, in the heartland of India – a country showing annual national growth rates in the region of 6% to 7% - is seeing stagnant growth and even falling living standards. It has become increasingly clear that introducing market forces at the bottom of the income pyramid is far more beneficial in contexts where effective institutions and practices have already gained a foot hold. Making markets work, requires much more than deregulation and foreign investment.

However, the uneven impact of globalisation has not only hurt certain regions. It has also hit already marginalised groups which have been losing out even further.

As market institutions in the last few decades have raced ahead, extending their newly-found influence across the globe, tremendous pressures has been put on labour market practices, trade patterns and more generally on the structure of the local and global economy.

Invariably, large groups of people have been left behind in this process, unable to sell their produce, to find dignified paid work or more generally to integrate socially in

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

society. This is not a problem reserved for the poorer parts of the world. Rather, such diverse groups as street children in Lima, illegal immigrants in London, or school drop-outs in Dalarna are today suffering from similar pressures unable to find their role in the global value producing systems.

In many places around the world some or all of these challenges, of course, exist at the same time. This is for example the case in the rapidly growing mega-cities, like Dhaka or London, where the problems of governance, employment, socio-cultural conflicts all come together. Added to this already complex picture is the ecological stress caused by such cities, making the trend, especially in the less developed part of the world, blatantly unsustainable.

The climate crises adds new pressure to every previous conflict and rupture

Globalisation has brought benefits, but it is also giving rise to a mounting set of challenges: social, cultural, political, economical and environmental. The global system reacts as any interdependent system. Rapid change in one part brings pressure in other parts. As the system evolves in search for a new equilibrium, regions or groups unable to keep up tend to get squeezed.

Civil society, governments and international institutions have indeed been under massive pressure to adapt to these developments. Often they have struggled to do so both at a national and an international level. Generally, these institutions answer to democratic processes which tends to impede rapid change. Alternatively, they often operate in environments where market pressures are largely absent, and where economic incentives are unavailable to provide the discipline. Partly, as a result of this, much of the political and civil space therefore suffer from greater inefficiencies and lower adaptability compared to the business sector.

The result is an imbalance between economic trends and political, social and environmental adjustments. Whereas financial incentives can be changed at an instant, thus redirecting the massive daily flows of global capital at the touch of a button, identities and established behaviours are much harder to change - ecological systems even more so.

This incongruence is a long running theme of the Tällberg conversations. With the current climate crisis, the need to redress it is so much more urgent. Business as usual, as James Hansen sombrely put it in his remarks to the Tällberg Forum, means that at the end of the century we will have what “for all practical purposes is a different planet”. The logic of our market practices, and the institutional and regulatory frameworks, have simply and embarrassingly left out that most crucial part of the equation: the vitality of our life supporting systems. Sir Nicholas Stern refers to it as “the gravest and widest market failure ever”.

Ahead of us, we have a massive reorientation in the way our societies are structured and the way we as consumers, leaders or more generally, human beings, act and think. Indeed, the situation is so grave that we can not assume that the transition will be either smooth or orderly. It may be forced upon us, by events – in the form of natural disasters,

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

such as mass flooding, hurricanes, altered rain patterns, or through floods of environmental refugees. Alternatively, the adaptation may come through the effective and pre-active use of severe regulation or indeed force. Once the awareness of the scale of the threat fully enters the political realm, we may see very far reaching interventions.

We therefore urgently need to act. We need to do this, not only to create the impetus for the transition required, but also to develop the support mechanisms and security frameworks to deal with the resulting friction, and the inevitable fall out. We also cannot assume an orderly proactive transition; we do however have an obligation to prevent the price of adaptation from falling on the already weak. There is an imminent risk that as the conflicts of interest are exacerbated, already marginalised groups will suffer even further.

In trying to navigate our way through the transition we have ahead of us, we therefore need to pay equal attention to our frameworks for fair governance, human rights and rule of law, as we do to the more tangible challenge of developing economic models that can balance growth with limited energy resources and the global ecological balance. This was the basic insight that led to the formulation of the Tällberg Grid that also served as input to the Design Workshops.

We need to speed up change and learn to scale our promising practices

Through the Design Workshops we find examples of promising practices and sources of hope. We find individuals who break out of established patterns of thought and practice - and quite often out of existing institutions - to establish new ways of working in line with the demands of a more equitable and sustainable future. We see them in NGOs, in foundations, in government, within corporations and among entrepreneurs and investors. In the Design Workshops we also found ideas for new legal frameworks, financial mechanisms and technologies that may aid us in navigating the transition ahead. We see corporations and business leaders take a lead and reinvent their markets, not content to sit back and wait for regulation to dictate new rules.

At the heart of this is the drive of people who have come to look at themselves and their role in society differently. To encourage this change in mindset is also the aim of the Tällberg process.

The overall conclusion from the Design Workshops, however, is that we are not moving fast enough. Scattered promising practices are inspirational, but not transformational. We need ways to get good ideas and proven methods into the established systems, into corporations, governments and civil society on a large scale. We need to speed up change and learn to scale up the promising practices that exist. To do this, we need concerted action from corporations, governments, aid institutions and civil society. There is no time to sit and wait for others to take action.

Change must come both at a global and a local level. There are no obvious solutions, but rather a wide ranging process of adaptation and strategic and institutional innovation from all actors. What follows below is the weaving together of the Design Workshops around some of the themes that emerged.

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

The more specific challenges looked at in each Design Workshop are then followed up separately and in greater depth in the ensuing chapters. The aim of each of these chapters is to present a vision and a road forward for the particular location looked at, illustrated with a set of promising practices that either informed or emerged in the course of the discussions at Tällberg.

This grouping below is to some extent arbitrary. The same Design Workshop stories could have been told from a wide range of angles, with different aspects highlighted. Indeed, the whole point of focusing the Design Workshops on locations, rather than pre-defined themes, was to allow for an infinite number of perspectives to come into the discussion. In drawing connections between the locations, some themes or aspects of the local challenges do however need to be emphasised at the expense of others.

- (a) Preserving local solidarity and cohesion in a world of global economic pressures (Lima, Peru; London, UK; Dalarna, Sweden)
- (b) Handling security, energy and environmental challenges within a multilateral framework (The High North; Sofia, Bulgaria; Guangdong, China)
- (c) Making the global value producing system work sustainably to the benefits of the rural poor (Kasese, Uganda; Bundelkhand, India; Ton Lesap, Cambodia)
- (d) Meeting the challenges of governance, infrastructure and diversity in the megacities of tomorrow (Dhaka, Bangladesh)

There is nothing new with these challenges. Indeed, they have been long running themes at Tällberg over the years. There is, however, a much increased urgency brought to these challenges by climate change, and the massive pressure for institutional adjustment that this brings. In this very important sense, climate change is not an additional theme to be added to the long conversation that has been going on in Tällberg. Rather, it is a new structural trend underlying everything else.

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

A set of common themes from the Design Workshops

a) Preserving local solidarity and cohesion in a world of global economic pressures: the case of Lima, London, Dalarna

London provides a concentrated microcosm of the globalised world. Historically placed amidst the global flows of people, ideas and capital, London is in many ways a winner of globalisation. It is the home of some of the world's most advanced service jobs.

Alongside these, however, exists also the extreme opposite. High value added service jobs tend to bring demand for low-paid menial services: cleaners, waitresses, shop assistants, etc. Flexible labour practices in the UK have allowed both ends of the service industry to flourish. As with any dynamic economic centre, immigrants, legal and illegal, flock to where they perceive there to be opportunities. At the heart of London, you now therefore find some of the most diverse communities in the world and staggering income inequalities. Large groups are living in real poverty in the centre of the city. At the very bottom of society, a deep societal failure is visible in the form of up to 9,000 'slaves' – a more accurate name for the women stuck in the modern sex trade.

Mobility and open borders bring advantages, but also challenges. As brought out in the presentation by Chief Constable Babu in his address to the Tällberg Forum, this particular London challenge was encapsulated during an eventful week in the summer of 2005. On 7 July, London won the bid for the 2012 Olympics on the back of a campaign hailing diversity and openness as the prime virtues. On the very next day, British-born Muslim men set off 3 bombs in the centre of London. The socio-economic exclusion in London, and increasingly present all across Europe, suddenly seemed to coincide with the global conflicts over socio-religious identities.

Dalarna is in many ways London's opposite. There is still a relatively high percentage of employment in traditional industries and in the public sector. An emerging service economy is however becoming increasingly important. The region is well-integrated into the global economy through the export of ore, forestry products and heavy engineering equipment. Yet it finds itself largely ambivalent about its attitude towards globalisation and the onslaught of the global labour market pressures.

Dalarna is yet to face the full integration into the global flows of people, money and goods. The challenge is on what terms this integration takes place. As Ingrid Dahlberg, the Governor of the Region said: "Dalarna may seem like a haven of stability, prosperity and environmental health. Still, Dalarna, is part of a world that changes fast and where adaptability is crucial for success". The challenge for Dalarna, Ingrid continued, "is to meet the increasing demands for flexibility without sacrificing the stability and traditions that are part of its identity". Even here, we begin to see elements of the common post-industrial maladies in the form of increasing school dropout rates and growing labour market exclusion, especially among young men,. In the recent Swedish elections, a worrisome rise in the vote for the far-right was noticeable, even in Dalarna.

Dalarna and London thus provide interesting contrasts with regards to the way they have embraced globalisation. But both do it from relatively advantageous positions. Lima, Peru faces a more difficult challenge: integrating into the global system from a position of weakness, both as regards their standing in the international systems, their

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

economic strength, and the maturity of their domestic institutions. This is the plight of much of the recently industrialised world. Without the strong legal frameworks and social institutions, marginal groups face a more difficult challenge.

In the Tällberg Design Workshop the focus fell on street kids, whose plight, just like the sex workers in London, is an indication of a very serious failure of governance and indeed of our economic system. As with many large cities in Latin America, and in the developing world, hundreds of kids roam the streets of Lima, driven away from home due to domestic abuse or poverty.

The lack of social institutions to take these kids into protection leaves them to navigate society on their own terms. But, with few basic skills economic opportunities are limited. This situation in turn is aggravated by an accelerating stigmatisation whereby “street-kids” has become a term of abuse. The term itself gives tacit legitimacy to verbal and physical abuse, including from the police. Society seems to abdicate even from its formal responsibility to protect the weak, as neither the police nor the legal system extends their protection to these groups.

The three locations - Dalarna, Lima and London – thus illustrate in different ways the challenges of global interdependence. They illustrate how societies struggling to integrate into the global flows of people, money and goods, face mounting pressure that tend to pull the societies apart. In this process already marginalised groups are left even more exposed.

However, where national policies have proved insufficient, new mechanisms and practices are constantly being tried and tested at a local level. Some of these show very promising results. Here there is room for both vertical and horizontal learning. Can mechanisms for handling diversity in London, provide inspiration for the work with street kids in Lima, or with excluded groups in Dalarna? Can mechanisms for local governance and coalitions across sectors in Dalarna, in turn, provide inspiration to London? Also, are there things we can learn at a global level, from successful practices attempted in local contexts?

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

b) Handling security, energy and environmental challenges within a multilateral framework: the case of The High North, Sofia and Guangdong

As rising global temperatures cause the ice cover to retreat in the High North, new commercial opportunities open up. To the indigenous people, as well as to local flora and fauna, the threat from changing climate conditions is thus aggravated by the inevitable commercial explorations of the region. Primarily it is the unexploited gas fields that attract attention, but also the fishing and shipping opportunities. The nanook, slowly dying as its habitat is gradually destroyed became the symbol at Tallberg of man's selfish expropriation of natural resources.

But the developments in the High North also have security implications. The potentially massive findings of fossil fuels in such a politically relatively stable region could alter the global political balance. This turns the future of the region into a great power issue – with competing interests from the EU, USA and Russia. Norway, with its own territorial claims in the area, and with the technology and know-how to explore the gas fields, needs to turn this into a European issue in order not to get swept aside. As the conflicts over energy and natural resources continue to harden, it is not only the interest of the nanook that are in danger of being ignored.

Previously in the High North, the ice-cover protected the natural environment and the global commons. Without the ice – no other protective framework is in place to balance more narrowly defined national economic or security interests. The most obvious losers are the indigenous population, the flora and the fauna.

A bakery in Sofia provides a more promising view of how a very different, yet related challenge can be handled. Here, in the bakery of Mr and Mrs Dobrev, energy efficiency has been turned into a commercially successful strategy. This positive change on the ground was made possible through the successful intervention of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). EBRD provided credit guarantees via local banks, structured so as to provide incentives for energy efficiency, and thereby allowed rapid energy savings to go hand in hand with a successful commercial strategy.

In the case of Sofia, successful local action was thus made possible only through the effective mediation of multilateral institutions. This provided the lever that could align local economic incentives with the globally recognised concerns of energy efficiency. It is the indication of the positive potential of globalisation, provided the right “glocal” frameworks are put in place.

In the case of Mr and Mrs Dobrev's bakery, and Sofia more generally, the EBRD is of course only one example of the long and successful process towards greater European integration. Their case serves to put this development in an interesting light.

A web of multilateral institutions and practices have slowly evolved in Europe over half a century, which now anchor and aid development in neighbouring states. This happens directly through financial and trade arrangements, like in the case of the Dobrevs, and also more generally through the success of the European Union. The prospect of European Union membership, conditioned on certain domestic reforms, has proved successful in asserting the necessary pressure on domestic political agendas in order to

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

generate results. As such, the European Union is a promising example of the use of “soft power” with potential applicability much beyond Europe.

There are of course limits of this model of soft governance. Bulgaria is a small player at the direct border of Europe, and with obvious self-interest in adopting European standards – not least the carrot of a future European Union membership. This is not a relationship among equals. There are also long historical ties and cultural affinities.

China presents a different picture. It is far too large and powerful to be easily drawn into any existing international framework except on its own terms. Yet, given its size and influence, no global issues can today be meaningfully dealt with without the cooperation of China. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the case of global warming. The predicted massive surge in Chinese energy demand, and the likely use of basic coal technology to meet the need, means that any meaningful strategy to tackle the climate issue must centrally involve China.

The climate crisis thus requires very rapid progress in integrating China into our multilateral institutional practices. This challenge became the focus in the Design Workshop on Guangdong. Here the example used to illustrate the issue was the EU-China agreement on building a joint experimental carbon neutral coal plant.

However, even where there are clear opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation, there is a shortage of well-established and tested practices to turn potentials into reality. Even established structures, like the G8, are less influential than they could be. Decisions made, or agreements reached, at an international level do not penetrate into domestic structures quickly. To align local developments with global imperatives, there is a need for “glocal” frameworks that work. In a country as large as China, it is hard enough for national policies to penetrate throughout the country, which makes implementation of global agreements even more challenging. There is an urgent need to speed up the search for mechanisms and techniques that can take matters forward.

Sofia, the High North and Guangdong thus, in the light of the global energy and climate crises, in different ways illustrate the growing need for “glocal” frameworks of governance, but also the challenges of establishing these. Each Design Workshop, however, also held out promising practices, in terms of embryos of legal frameworks, financial mechanisms and methods for “soft governance”, that serve as sources of inspiration and hope.

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

c) Making the global value producing systems work sustainably to the benefits of the poorest: the case of Kasese, Bundelkhand, Ton Lesap

The intricate and complex ecosystem around Lake Tonle Sap is a good metaphor for both the interdependence and fragility of the global social, economic and political systems. As the water of the Mekong river flows and recedes in rhythm with the seasons, a wide range of species have developed their own niches. Small scale farming and fishery, and houses on stilts, have allowed the region to be populated by humans. People in the region, however, live in conditions of poverty, malnutrition and severe gender inequities.

Status quo in Ton Lesap is therefore not desirable. The question, as in many of the other Design Workshops, is on whose terms change takes place. The various actors around the lake, eg. national governments, ADB, NGOs, local communities, as well as the neighbouring states, Laos, China, Vietnam, are currently pulling in different directions. As so often, they are pursuing largely incompatible development visions. It is not easy to combine the promotion of sustainable livelihoods that can exist in harmony with the intricate existing ecosystem with large scale dam-building needed for irrigation and electricity generation. This underlines the political dimension of the development challenge. Developing strategies going forward is not merely a technical issue, of how best to reconcile the needs for energy, economic growth with the fragilities of the local and global environment. It is also crucially a democratic question: whose interests are served in the name of “development” or “progress”?

Bundhelkand, one of the poorest regions in India, raises many of the same questions. The Central Indian government spends significant portions of its budget on projects designed to attract FDI. Airport upgrades get prioritised over poverty schemes, in what sometimes appears an Indian obsession with the much quoted comparisons with China. The Central government must also ask itself which vision of development it is promoting, and thereby whose interests it is serving.

After almost two decades of impressive national growth figures there are still very significant pockets of real poverty in India. One such example is Bundhelkand. The structure of the economic growth currently benefiting India seems to be getting only a weak hold here. As such it is a good example of how global market forces require a certain form of pre-existing institutions or practices to be effective.

The problem with Bundhelkand is not only the lack of economic growth. Already the pressures on land and water tables are unsustainable. The likely effects of climate change, on melt water from the Himalayas and on rain and temperature patterns in the region, could have disastrous effects. The increased stress on the natural environment of large scale industrialisation would simply be unacceptable. The conclusion must therefore be not only that the currently promoted economic model is not working in the region; in the long-run it could not work there. The question, however, is what the alternative looks like, and how it gets off the ground.

Focus in the Design Workshop fell on local promising practices. Working with a systems approach, these seek to create the support frameworks which under market conditions can stimulate the growth of sustainable livelihoods from below. To become effective, these local initiatives require a new set of organisational practices, financial mechanisms and technologies to be in place. There are many local success stories, but we are still

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

lacking a model for making a large scale impact. There is a need here for new thinking both in terms of how to attract commercial and non-commercial capital, and in terms of which institutional structures to build.

An important player in this game is of course the aid institutions. In the Design Workshop on Kasese, that Tällberg Foundation cooperated with SNV, the Dutch development agency, whose challenge is to determine the most effective use of aid spending.

The case of Kasese illustrate yet again the complexity of promoting economic and social development. Superficially, many of the right conditions are in place in the region. Still, it is struggling to take off. A complex web of factors – relating to geographical isolation, poor infrastructure, poor health records and a history of political instability and ethnic conflict – all combine to hamper progress. With climate change, the intricate water situation in the region is likely to grow worse. The cost of airtravel is also almost certain to rise and make the reliance on air transport an even greater obstacle going forward.

Kasese has a long history as an aid recipient, with a significant portion of the regional budget derived from aid spending. This has probably helped to foster a focus on aid money and thus diverting attention from developing coherent strategies to attract private capital. One issue focused on in the discussions in Tällberg was the need to foster better links between aid institutions, government, civil society and private interests. Tällberg process, prior to, during and after the Tällberg Forum, has become an important step in this direction.

Ton Lesap, Bundhelkand and Kasese all highlight how the current trend of economic globalisation is leaving certain regions behind. There are local promising practices that indicate an alternative way forward. Currently, we lack the mechanisms and the capital to scale these. Here there is a need to identify and spread best practice, and to develop models that can provide the necessary local support frameworks on a large scale. In this search, new interfaces are required between the relevant players: local governments, aid institutions, civil society and corporations.

d) Meeting the challenges of governance, infrastructure and diversity in the mega-cities of tomorrow (Dhaka, Bangladesh)

“Most people will say: Don’t look at Dhaka – there are limits to optimism”. This was Muzammel Huq’s opening line when presenting the Design Workshop on Dhaka – a city covering the space equal to the municipality of Leksand but with a population of 18m, massive poverty, rampant corruption and under severe threat of being inundated as climate change raises the sea level. The need for massive action is greater than in most places in the world, but the conditions for taking concrete actions worse.

The multitude of challenges also underline the need of a systems approach – with the inevitable difficulty of deciding where to start. The idea that emerged in the course of the Design Workshop was to construct practical and very tangible mechanisms at the bottom of the system, so as to ensure that the basic incentive structures for transparency and effective governance were put in place. At its most basic form the idea involved

TÄLLBERG FOUNDATION

developing ways to measure and communicate the effectiveness of public service delivery. In this way, the blatant failure of public service delivery can be substantiated. By starting the exercise from below, at a ward level (the lowest administrative unit in Dhaka), the responsibility can also be directly attributed to a easily identifiable person, and concrete pressure can be brought to bear.

Attempting to provide the impetus for systems change from below in a city the size of Dhaka obviously raises a number of practical challenges. Most obviously, there is a need to harness the support of a large number of independent organisations, that can be united under the same vision, to join forces. Only a thin umbrella organisation would then be needed to orchestrate a systems wide effort. In this sense, the Dhaka challenge reminds us of the organisational challenges in Bundhelkand and Ton Lesap: how can we move from small promising initiatives to a systems wide effort?