

Scaling-Up Dynamics in KOICA's Peace-Development Nexus Projects in the Mekong Region

Cases of Lao PDR and Cambodia

Bo Kyung Kim
Seoul National University

Taekyoon Kim
Seoul National University

December 2022

Prepared for the UNRISD project on:

DEEPEN: The Development-Environment-Peace Nexus in Borders and Borderlands

UNRISD working papers are posted online to stimulate discussion and to raise critical comments.



The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) is an autonomous research institute within the UN system that undertakes multidisciplinary research and policy analysis on the social dimensions of contemporary development issues. Through our work, we aim to ensure that social equity, inclusion and justice are central to development thinking, policy and practice.

UNRISD, Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
Tel: +41 (0)22 9173060
info.unrisd@un.org
www.unrisd.org

Copyright © United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)
This is not a formal UNRISD publication. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed studies rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the UNRISD website (www.unrisd.org) does not constitute an endorsement by UNRISD of the opinions expressed in them. No publication or distribution of these papers is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.



The project is funded by the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA).

About UNRISD's DEEPEN Working Paper Series

This paper is part of a series of outputs from the UNRISD research project on the Development-Environment-Peace Nexus (DEEPEN) in Borders and Borderlands.

The project has the following objectives:

- Facilitate the exchange and co-production of knowledge and experiences on development, environmental protection and peace-making in borders and borderlands
- Contribute to setting an agenda for an integrated and transformative approach to borders and borderlands
- Deepen understanding and enrich discussions around the dynamics and synergies between development, environment and peace in borders and borderlands
- Help policy decision makers and practitioners imagine and design development cooperation programmes and projects that respond to the specificities of borders and borderlands.

The working papers in this series present case studies selected to reflect diversity in terms of geography, culture, history and political systems. In addition to incorporating gender as a key lens of analysis, the series features case studies specifically dealing with women and girls in borders and borderlands.

Lessons drawn out from the case studies through comparative analysis highlighted the successes and difficulties of implementing integrated approaches and helped to identify opportunities and challenges for policies and practices that integrate the development, environment and peace dimensions in borderlands. Findings and lessons from the case studies were synthesized to produce the Guidelines on the Integrated Approach to Development Projects in Borderlands—the main publication output of the project.

Series Editor: Ilcheong Yi

Abstract

This study investigates the scaling-up dynamics as one form of integrated approach in peace-development nexus projects pursued by the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) in the Mekong region, with particular reference to Lao PDR and Cambodia. Integrated approaches can be witnessed in various projects using mixed methods that integrate objectives and processes for peace with other dimensions of development such as economic growth and environmental protection. KOICA's mine action and peace village projects in the Mekong region are compelling sites for examining factors shaping the nature and varying degree of scaling-up and integration at the project and programme levels.

The shift in approach from project-based to programme-based development in KOICA's operationalization of integrated approach in this region demonstrated diverse pathways for the integration of projects. Multiple and dynamic scaling-up processes enabled the integration in the context of borderlands where authority and ownership are delimited alongside the defensive lines. KOICA's Peace Village Development Projects (PVDP) in borderlands of Mekong region revealed how project or programme develops into more integrated form through horizontal scaling-up, which can be realised through expansion and replication, vertical scaling-up through strengthening capacity and institutions, and functional scaling-up integrating new elements or piggy-back on existing programmes.

In Lao PDR and Cambodia, KOICA's PVDPs integrated mine action with comprehensive rural community development through these scaling-up processes, particularly combining existing projects. PVDPs put together the removal of unexploded ordnances and landmines (peace), the protection of human rights of the disabled and mine victims (people) and inclusive rural development (prosperity) in consideration of crosscutting issues of gender and climate change. Needs and capacity assessment as a comprehensive situational analysis for each targeted province and the active involvement of diverse stakeholders such as government agencies and civil society organizations would be key enablers to make a successful design and implementation of the project or programme based on mixed scaling-up processes.

Contents

About UNRISD’s DEEPEN Working Paper Series	i
Abstract.....	ii
Contents.....	iii
Introduction	1
1. Conceptual Framework of Scaling-Up for Integrated Approach	2
1.1. Typology of Scaling-up of Projects or Programmes	2
1.2. Epistemological frameworks: Universalist, Contextualist, and Practical Middle-ground	3
2. KOICA’s Scale-ups in the Mekong Region: Lao PDR and Cambodia.....	4
2.1. Peace Village Development Programme (PVDP) in the Mekong Region	5
2.2. Conditions for scale-up and integration in Lao PDR and Cambodia.....	8
2.3. Lao PDR.....	10
2.3.1. the Phase I and II: Coordination challenge and horizontal scale-up	10
2.3.2. Phase III: Expectation for horizontal, vertical and organizational scaling-up.....	11
2.4. Cambodia	12
2.4.1. Clearing for Results (CfR) Phases I to IV with horizontal-vertical scaling-up.....	12
2.4.2. Towards integrated rural development with potentials for functional scaling-up	14
3. Conclusion	16
References	18
Appendix I. Interview Questions for Cambodia	22
Questions adapted to each institution CMAA / CMAA / KOICA / UNDP	22
I. Relative KOICA Projects for the Interview.....	22
II. Integrated Approach to Development (Core questions).....	22
III. Other Remarks	23
Appendix II. Interview Questions for Lao PDR	24
Questions adapted to each institution NRA / KOICA / UNDP	24
I. Relative KOICA Projects for the Interview.....	24
II. Integrated Approach to Development (Core questions).....	24
III. Other Remarks	25

Introduction

International interventions for peacebuilding in conflict-ridden countries have faced significant challenges. While ‘negative peace,’ which means the absence of violence, has been achieved temporarily, ‘positive peace,’ a state where violence and conflicts are replaced by social justice for all and mechanisms to avoid organized violence, has not been achieved yet in many conflict-stricken areas (Galtung 1969; Juncos and Joseph 2020). The absence of positive peace is particularly a stern concern in borderlands with a high risk of conflicts and violence. Achieving positive peace, however, requires more inclusive mechanisms to take an institutional innovation for scaling-up beyond a minimal peace guarantee designed for the absence of violence.

One of the approaches to address these concerns is an integrated approach to development which is imperative for sustainable peace and development. Although it is often described as “difficult and elusive” (United Nations 2015: 7), we can observe various forms of integrated approach in international development projects and programmes on the ground. Integrated approaches can be witnessed in various projects using mixed methods that integrate objectives and processes for peace with other dimensions of development such as economic growth and environmental protection. Various development projects, which the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) has implemented in the Mekong delta area, are a case in point.

KOICA which transformed project-based development into programme-based development in its operationalization of integrated approach in the Mekong region demonstrated diverse pathways of integration of projects. The integration has been realized through multiple and dynamic scaling-up processes in the context of borderlands where authority and ownership are delimited alongside the defensive lines (Goodhand 2008; Migdal 2004). The projects of KOICA in Mekong region offer good cases to examine the factors shaping the nature and degree of scaling-up and integration at the project and programme levels.

To explain how integrated approach has been implemented through scale-up process in these KOICA projects, this paper is structured as follows. Beginning with a short literature review on the discourses about scaling-up in international development discipline, the first section establishes a conceptual framework of scaling-up, which implement integrated approach. Then, it analyses the case of mine action and peace village projects conducted by KOICA in countries of the Mekong borderlands through the framework of scale-up, and identifies diverse patterns of integrated approach in these projects. Documented reports on KOICA’s Mekong Peace Village Development Programme (PVDP) are used as primary sources to identify scaling-up strategies of the projects, particularly those in Lao PDR and Cambodia. A more in-depth investigation was conducted by interviews with key personnel from national mine action centres, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and KOICA country offices. Based on the analysis, the study identifies crucial areas for scaling-up rural development. As a conclusion, it recommends and suggests a scaling-up strategy for integrating mine action projects with rural development projects with an emphasis on key integration enablers.

1. Conceptual Framework of Scaling-Up for Integrated Approach

The concept of scaling-up is not new. In a general sense, scaling-up refers to the process of expanding a project's or programme's scope, complexity, and influence. It also means bringing the beneficial impacts of innovations displayed in successful pilot projects to a broader range of beneficiaries or geographical regions while encouraging the continuous expansion of relevant policies and programmes beyond their initial pilot stage (Fox 2016; Simmons et al. 2007). A significant amount of research on scaling-up has also been undertaken in the context of international development for assessing development theories and practices. Scaling-up has often been used to explain components associated with organizational, management, financial, functional, and policy reform (Uvin and Miller 1996).

In practice, to maximize developmental outcomes and impacts, developmental partners, particularly donors, have made efforts to scale-up the project and programmes. Different approaches to scale-up have resulted in various types or pathways of scale-up. They include horizontal scale-up, vertical scale-up, functional scale-up, organizational scale-up, and evidence and learning scale-up (Carter et al. 2019). Modes of scaling-up found in the process of scaling are also diverse. They include: expansion, replication, intensification, innovation, modification, transfer of experience, or even formal and informal spontaneous diffusion (Howes and Sattar 1992; GTZ 2010; Hartmann and Linn 2008; UNDP 2008; Carter et al. 2019a).

These types and modes of scale-up are not mutually exclusive and many successful scaling-up processes include a strategic combination of multiple types and modes of scale-up that does not overcomplicate programme (WHO and ExpandNet 2010). These combinations have often been made based on multi-level and sector perspectives, in particular when scaling-up is undertaken for development project or programme (Diane and Maxwell 2005). Scaling-up, therefore, has been an integrated approach.

1.1. Typology of Scaling-up of Projects or Programmes

Focusing on the dynamics of project or programme, scaling-up types or pathways can be categorised as horizontal scale-up (through expansion and replication of projects or programmes), vertical scale-up (through the institutionalization of innovative elements as a policy or norm), organizational scale-up (through strengthening the capacity of an organization or establishing a new organization or partnership) and functional scale-up (through integrating new elements or 'piggybacking' on existing programs).

Horizontal scale-up mostly focuses on quantitative expansion or replication. Projects and programmes or their innovation are applied to a new context. Or their scope or targets are broadened to benefit a larger population. Intermediaries such as networks of organizations, educational institutions, multilateral agencies, or philanthropic actors for awareness-raising and training play a significant role in horizontal scaling-up (WHO & ExpandNet 2010).

Vertical scale-up refers to the process within which an innovation of a smaller scale project or programme may be institutionalized as a policy or a norm at the national or sub-national level which brings about changes in political, legal, administrative, or financial systems. Thus, it has a

significant effect on institutional framework such as policy, political, legal, regulatory, and budgetary changes.

Vertical scale-up often leads to organizational scale-up, aiming to boost organizational capacity or diversify organizational involvement and networks. Organizations may scale-up via direct or indirect techniques, where they accept full responsibility for executing change or adopt tested transformation (Harmann and Linn 2008; Cooley and Khol 2006).

Lastly, functional scale-up entails broadening the scope of concerns addressed by projects or programmes. It concerns the impacts closely related to each other, often those results across sectors. Functional scale-up is often implemented by integrating a new sector component into an existing program.

1.2. Epistemological frameworks: Universalist, Contextualist, and Practical Middle-ground

When determining how to scale-up their operations, development organizations or stakeholders make a decision based on their epistemological frameworks such as universalism or contextualism. Those with a universalist epistemological framework tend to use previous experience to derive a straightforward set of guidelines (Hancock 2003). This epistemological framework tend not to allow detecting and addressing any regional differences, thereby putting less burden on the designing project (van Oudenhovenco and Rekha 1998). A major flaw of the universalist epistemological framework from the perspective of scale-up is that it treats the scaling-up paths as binary (whether to adopt the sets of guidelines or not), failing to account for differences in the degree to which different adopters in diverse contexts embrace innovation.

In contrast, those with contextualist epistemological framework design and adapt projects to meet the needs of the target in consideration of the changing contexts. Although this framework is more likely to make a project responsive to specific context, the time-consuming process for designing and adapting a project suitable for specific context, often causes hesitation for implementers to fully reflect the specificities of the local context (Wazir and van Oudenhoven 1998).

Due to the problems of these dichotomized tendencies based on two contrasting epistemological frameworks, development organizations and stakeholders sometimes take a middle-ground for practical response. Those who take this attitude emphasize a 'generative reproduction' with iterative impacts (i.e. incorporating existing knowledge with new ideas to upgrade a project to higher level) which is very well aligned with vertical scale-up (Wigboldus 2013).

2.KOICA's Scale-ups in the Mekong Region: Lao PDR and Cambodia

For almost a decade, South Korea has been a core partner of the countries in the Mekong borderland countries and has achieved significant progress in recent years in all areas of political, economic, and socio-cultural cooperation in the region.¹ In October 2010, the “Joint Declaration on ASEAN-ROK Strategic Partnership for Peace and Prosperity” was adopted, which signalled South Korea’s engagement in the Mekong region. The “Han River Declaration” of establishing the “Mekong-ROK Comprehensive Partnership for Mutual Prosperity” was also signed in October 2011 during the Inaugural Mekong-ROK Foreign Minister’s Meeting. Foreign ministers from the Republic of Korea, Lao People’s Democratic Republic (PDR), Cambodia, Myanmar, the Kingdom of Thailand, and Vietnam were parties to the partnership agreement. Although the priority areas at the point of the agreement include infrastructure, ICT, sustainable development, human resource development, agriculture, and rural development (MOFA ROK 2012), the agreement provided a basis for designing an integrated peace village program as the “Mekong-Han River Declaration for Establishing Partnership for People, Prosperity and Peace” outcome document of the 1st Mekong-ROK Summit held in 2019, Section 2 (Future Direction of the Mekong-ROK Cooperation - Peace for Sustainable Development) stipulates:

“[the Mekong countries] welcome the ROK’s initiative to support the Mekong sub-region to be a place of peace and safety through the Korea-Mekong Future Peace Community Program, which is the comprehensive development cooperation program that encompasses the clearance of explosive remnants of war (ERW), support for victims, rural development and the protection of the environment” (Mekong-ROK 2019: 5, para 27).

Along the line of the outcome document of the 1st Mekong-ROK Summit, the “ASEAN-ROK Plan of Action (POA) 2021-2025” was finalized in September 2020 to strengthen and expand the strategic relationship, friendly ties, and meaningful ASEAN-ROK cooperation. In particular, mine action was noted as one of the two agendas under the ‘defence’ section, among seven large pillars (ASEAN-ROK 2019).² Over a decade of engagement in the region also made it possible to start Peace Village Development Programme (PVDP).

Using the framework of scaling-up for the integrated approach, the following section analyses two country cases: Cambodia and Lao PDR. These two countries have been selected since KOICA’s Mekong PVDP projects implemented in these countries demonstrate different patterns of scaling-up pathways over time.

In the next section on the application of case studies, the study examines scale-up process in different phases of the projects with a focus on how the projects are connected, whether there are learning effects, and how integrated approach is upheld as a key strategy. Research methods

¹ The Plan of Action (PoA) 2021-2025 under the Mekong-ROK Cooperation framework between the five Mekong countries (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam) and the ROK served as the guideline for the Mekong countries and the ROK (the Partner countries) by setting specific goals and measures for the next five years (2021-2025) to build a Partnership for People, Prosperity and Peace, as proclaimed in the Mekong-Han River Declaration adopted at the first Mekong-ROK Summit, on 27 November 2019 in Busan, ROK.

² Paragraph 1.4.2 (Defence) was specifically devoted to joint efforts to tackle mine-related issues: “Support ASEAN’s efforts to address humanitarian aspects of landmines and explosive remnants of war in the region through the work of the ASEAN Regional Mine Action Centre (ARMAC) and ADMM-Plus EWG on Humanitarian Mine Action in addressing this issue.” (ASEAN-ROK 2019: 2).

include qualitative content analysis on project documents released by UNDP, KOICA, and implementing agencies. In addition, online exploratory-early pilot interviews³ were conducted. Pilot interviews with the experts and personnel related to the respective stages of the feasibility study (preliminary surveyors) and evaluation (project managers) were used to design interview questions. The questions were used during the visit to the key project implementation and monitoring agents in Cambodia and Lao PDR.⁴ Supplementary information was collected through semi-structured interviews with experts and personnel related to project implementation and monitoring agents.⁵

2.1. Peace Village Development Programme (PVDP) in the Mekong Region⁶

In mine action, the international community's efforts revolve around five pillars of mine action: Mine clearance, Mine risk education, Victim assistance, Advocacy and Stockpile destruction (UNMAS 2018).⁷ When the mine action program includes an inclusive rural development component, it primarily focuses on simply removing UXO (Unexploded ordnance)/mines and conducting risk prevention education. Complex socio-economic needs at the community level are rarely addressed. Its shortcomings are the lack of an integrated response that considers mines, UXO, and sustainable development geared toward the needs of the rural communities. In this context, KOICA's PVDPs in the Mekong region are a unique case to overcome this limitation of the mine action of the international community.

In 2019, KOICA launched the "Peace Village Development Programme (PVDP) in the Mekong CLMV (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Vietnam) countries (2020-2030)" with its pick-and-mix approach combining peace-related development with agricultural development projects. PVDP's vision is to "free the UXO/Mine-affected rural communities from the threat of mine and UXO, with victim's rights protected, and transform (the Mekong CLMV countries) into the land of peace and prosperity." Improvements in community resilience to climate change and environmental protection, as well as women's empowerment and engagement in rural life, were regarded as overarching goals. Targeted areas of priority partner countries were chosen based on a set of criteria including high contamination level of UXO and mine; the number of accidents

³ The goal of an (unstructured) exploratory pilot interview is to come up with ideas and research hypotheses and to look into different ways to gather relevant data. Most of the time, the interview is based on a broad list of items to guide the scope of the interview. A pilot interview is not for data collecting but for research design. (Coffey 1967).

⁴ Interviewees include staff from UNDP, KOICA country office in Cambodia and Lao PDR, Cambodia Mine Action Authority (CMAA), Cambodia Mine Action Centers (CMAC), and the National Regulatory Authority for the UXO/Mine Action Sector in the Lao PDR (NRA).

⁵ Authors conducted multiple rounds of early-pilot interviews online. Based on the revised sets of interview questions using feedback from the pilot interviews, semi-structured interviews were conducted in person during their visit to Cambodia and Lao PDR in June 2022. Interview question samples are in Appendix I and II.

⁶ This subchapter was written based on official reports released by KOICA on the Mekong Peace Village Development Program (2019) and other official reports related to subsequent projects of PVDP.

⁷ <https://www.unmas.org/en/5-pillars-of-mine-action>

International community's movements for mine action include:

1) Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) which came into effect on 2007, signed by more than 120 countries; 2) Anti-person Mine Ban Treaty, Ottawa Process; 3) Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) that came into effect on 1983 and signed by 125 countries; 4) United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) established in 1997 as a specialized agency under the UN Department of Peace Operations, operating under the General Assembly and Security Council mandates; and 5) The International Campaign to Ban Landmines-Cluster Munition Coalition (ICBL-CMC) as the largest global network of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on landmines and cluster munition.

Among Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Vietnam, only Lao PDR is a state party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions; only Cambodia is a state party to the Mine Ban Treaty; all three ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

and numbers of UXO/mine victims; high poverty rate with potential for socio-economic development; high priority of national rural development strategies driven by the government; existing KOICA projects on mine removal and rural community development suitable for integration.

Mine action aligned with overarching development goals throughout the planning and implementation stages, and active participation were sought not only on the national government level, but also on provincial government levels where existing projects already took place. Thereby, the three key pillars of PVDP, mine action, victim support, and rural development initiatives, were integrated. The distinctive characteristic of PVDP comes from its holistic approach. Beyond the mere clearance of UXO/mine and piecemeal care for victims, aid came in the form of multi-national and multi-sectoral means to turn the damaged region into a peaceful, sustainable, and inclusive rural community. From the perspective of the UN's 5P concept, PVDP concentrated on combining the removal of UXO and landmines (Peace),⁸ protection of human rights of the disabled and mine victims (People),⁹ and inclusive rural development (Prosperity).¹⁰ PVDP also took into account crosscutting issues of gender, environment, and climate change in project design.¹¹

PVDP used various means, including public-private partnerships, training, voluntarism such as volunteers of World Friends Korea (WFK), etc. It developed projects taking into account regional specificities, called regional specialization, by conducting needs and capacity assessment as a comprehensive situational analysis for each targeted province. Through stakeholder mapping, activities to facilitate partner country agencies' capacity building and exchange of information were also undertaken, which enabled more inclusive cooperation at the national-regional-international levels. Another feature of the PVDP in the Mekong region (or Mekong Peace Village Programme) is that it built a knowledge base where data and information are constantly aggregated, used, and learned between and among stakeholder countries throughout the project operation. Likewise, South Korea and CLMV (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Vietnam) were able to form triangular cooperation to address the issue of UXO/mines jointly as a long-term vision.

In November 2019, KOICA publicized its contribution to the integrated, holistic approach and its interest in forming a jointly managed information system by hosting a CLMV transborder training workshop as a kick-off of PVDP: "Triangular Cooperation Workshop on the Integration of Mine Action and Victim Assistance to Peaceful and Inclusive Rural Community Development in the Mekong Region (TCWMR) (2019 / 19,300 USD)." The week-long training workshop invited 21 trainees (4-6 government officials from each CLMV country). It aimed to understand and share the best practices of neighbouring countries and enhance mutual learning on policies

⁸ The goal of this peace initiative is to create a rural area that is safe from the dangers of landmines and UXO. Triangular cooperation and the development of horizontal and vertical partnerships serve as promotion strategies for establishing an integrated action plan.

⁹ The people initiative aspires to provide conditions conducive to upholding the human rights of people with disabilities through community-based rehabilitation programs with inclusive development.

¹⁰ The prosperity initiative aims to improve the livelihoods of all via inclusive rural development and sharing the Korean experience, create an agricultural value change, and creating a demonstration village as a means of publicizing the program.

¹¹ The crosscutting issues deal with the preservation of rural production systems via adaptation to climate change and discard all forms of gender-based discrimination.

and activities related to UXO/mine action, victim assistance, and rural development. It aimed to enhance South-South and Triangular cooperation among participating countries and to lay the foundations for implementing the PVDP in the Mekong Region. The training was based on modules on humanitarian demining, victim assistance, integrated rural development, and ROK-Mekong peace village development.

However, a one-time workshop was not sufficient to form a system of long-term, periodic, fundamental information exchange and knowledge sharing among the participating countries which were essential to secure the sustainability of the integrated framework. This was also commented on by one of the key participants of the workshop:

“...Although the week-long training through TCWMR was helpful for light networking and knowledge exchange with neighbouring countries, it is difficult to say that it changed how we work in mine action. In fact, we attend various training sessions, workshops, and online webinars for capacity building on a regular basis, hosted by ARMAC (ASEAN Regional Mine Action Center) and GICHD (Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining). We are encouraged to attend a monthly international GICHD training platform to update on information management tools and capacity development. We already have small circles of networks communicating frequently and (data and information) sharing is a daily work...”

The comment also highlights the importance of further analysis on how integrated scaling-up can be realized, how to ensure that projects do not stay fragmented but get grouped under the program’s vision, and what the key enablers are. In this context, existing projects entering subsequent phases and new projects designed under the broad umbrella of peacebuilding through mine action were reframed by the PVDP.¹² Before this Programme’s launch, a series of projects that had not been considered a part of the PVDP when they were originally planned, were later grouped into PVDP. They played a significant role as catalysts designed to support the minesweeping and rural development in borderlands of the Mekong region (see table 1).

¹² There are nine projects grouped into the PVDP:

- 1) Project to Support the UXO Sector in Lao PDR (Phase 2) (2019-2022 / 550 mil USD)
- 2) Support for the Institutional Strengthening of the National Regulatory for UXO/Mine Action Sector in Lao PDR (2022-2025 / 1,100 mil USD)
- 3) Cambodia - Clearing for Results IV: Mine Action for Human Development (2021-2025 / 1,000 mil USD)
- 4) Cambodia Building Peace and Prosperity Village through Integrated Rural Community Development (2022-2026 / 1,000 mil USD)
- 5) Preventing and Reducing the Threats Posed by Landmines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) and System Approach to Victim Assistance in Myanmar (2022-2024 / KOICA 449 mil USD + UNICEF 123 mil USD)
- 6) Korea Vietnam Mine Action Project (2016-2021 / KOICA 19.8 mil USD + Gov. of Vietnam 9.7 mil USD)
- 7) Generation of Sustainable Income and Improvement of Rural Human Resource Quality for Peace Village in Quang Binh Province, Vietnam (2021-2025 / 1,000 mil USD)
- 8) Development of the Community Rehabilitation Center for People with Disability in Quang Tri Province, Vietnam (2022-2026 / 12 mil USD)
- 9) Korea-Vietnam Peace Village Project (KVPVP) (2022-2026 / 2,500 mil USD)

Table 1. A Series of KOICA Projects Prior to the PVDP

Country	Project Title
Lao PDR	The Project for Rural Development in Vientiane Province for Lao PDR – focusing on income generation (2009-2012)
	Project for the Establishment of Action Plan for Rural Income Generation in Northern and Central Region in Lao PDR (2021-2025)
	Integrated Rural Development Project in Three Provinces of Southern Lao PDR (2020-2025)
	Project to Support the UXO Sector in Lao PDR Phase 1 (2014-2018), Phase 2 (2019-2023), Phase 3 (2022-2026) on Sustainable UXO sector
Cambodia	The Self-Supporting Rural Development Project with SMU's Participatory Approach (2014-2020)
	Cambodia Clearing for Results, Phase 1 (2006-2010), Phase 2 (2011-2016), Phase 3 (2016-2019) with UNDP, and Phase 4 (2021-2025) with KOICA
	Cambodia building Peace and Prosperity Village through Integrated Rural Community Development (2022-2026)

Sources: Authors.

PVDP is distinct from these pre-existing KOICA Rural Development Projects because it took a more holistic and integrated approach to project target regions, sectors, beneficiary groups, vision and objectives, implementation methods of scaling-up, collaboration levels on information management, triangular cooperation, etc. Projects under PVDP showed diverse scaling-up patterns linking peace, people, and prosperity, which also shows how different policy domains have been integrated into these scale-up processes. Among these projects, the following section delves into the cases of Cambodia (“Clearing for Results (CfR) Phases I to IV” and “Building Peace Villages through Integrated Rural Community Development”) and Lao PDR (“projects to support the UXO Sector, phases 1~3”) to analyse scale-up process and the degree and nature of integration.

2.2. Conditions for scale-up and integration in Lao PDR and Cambodia

The linkage between mine action and rural development appears to have stimulated the scaling-up of the development-peace nexus in Lao PDR and Cambodia. The projects in both countries show how the expansion of serial projects has evolved into programmes while showing pathways of both horizontal and vertical scale-ups. The cases of the two countries are particularly notable in terms of their continual mine action projects and their efforts to incorporate mine action into national development strategies. The current SDG institutional frameworks are adjusted to the national goals established to promote the participation of mine action stakeholders. Table 2 shows basic information and a comparison of Cambodia and Lao PDR's mine action status and key stakeholders.

Table 2. Comparison of Mine Action Status in Cambodia and Lao PDR

	Cambodia¹³	Lao PDR¹⁴
Mine Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenced in 1992 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commenced in 1994
Damage Report (as of December 2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster munition remnants contamination: 657.66km² • Landmine contamination: Approximately 801.64km² in 8,923 areas • Other ERW contamination: 566km² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster munition remnants contaminated area (confirmed as of 2020): 1,299.31km² in 1,601 villages • Other ERW contamination: unknown
National operators and Actors of mine action management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) • Cambodian Mine Action Centre (CMAC) (CMAA Took over the regulation, coordination, and monitoring of mine action from the existing CMAC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Regulatory Authority for the UXO/Mine Action Sector (NRA) under the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare • UXO Lao • Humanitarian teams of the Lao People's Army (Army 58)
UN Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Clearing for Results Phase 1 (2006–2010); Phase 2 (2011–2015); Phase 3 (2016–2019); Phase 4 (2020–2025) led with KOICA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP: Provides programmatic and technical support to the NRA and UXO Lao with Project to Support the UXO Sector Phase 1 (2014–2017); Phase 2 (2019–2022); Phase 3 (2022–2026)
Other actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HALO Trust • Mine Advisory Group (MAG) • The Royal Cambodian Armed Forces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HALO Trust • Humanity and Inclusion (HO) • Mines Advisory Group (MAG) • Tetra Tech
Mine action strategic and operational plans & Legislations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Mine Action Strategy (NMAS) 2018–2025, supported by a three-year implementation plan 2021–2023 for development • Gender Mainstreaming in Mine Action Plan 2018–2022 • 1999 Law to Prohibit the Use of Anti-Personnel Mines • 2005 Law on Weapons, Explosives and Ammunition Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Path Forward I, 2003–2010 • Safe Path Forward II, 2011–2020 • Safe Path Forward III, 2022–2026 (mine action strategic plan) • Multi-year Workplan for UXO 2016–2020 and Vision 2030 • Decree on the Organization and Operations of the National Regulatory Authority for UXO in Lao PDR (12 February 2018)
Mine action standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambodian Mine Action Standards (CMAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lao PDR National UXO/Mine Action Standards • National Standard on Mine Clearance Operations • Lao PDR UXO Survey Procedures (new from 2018)
Treaty Status on Mine Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine Ban Treaty (State Party) • Convention on Cluster Munitions (Non-signatory) • UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (State Party) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine Ban Treaty (Non-signatory) • Convention on Cluster Munitions (State party) • UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (Ratified)
Nationalized Development Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C-MDG Goal 9: De-Mining, ERW, and Victim Assistance • C-SDG Goal 18: End The Negative Impact of Mine/ERW and. Promote Victim Assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L-MDG Goal 9: Reduce the Impact of UXO • L-SDG Goal 18: Remove the UXO Obstacle to National Development

Sources: Adapted from ICBL-CMC Landmine & Cluster Munition Monitoring Website for Cambodia and Lao PDR & ICBL-CMC 2021 Report.

¹³ <http://www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/reports/2021/cambodia/impact.aspx>

¹⁴ <http://www.the-monitor.org/en-gb/reports/2021/lao-pdr/impact.aspx>

In the case of Lao PDR, the UXO seriously threatens the lives and safety of residents and is thus a severe obstacle to rural development. Its first mine action began in 1994, followed by the establishment of the National Regulatory Authority for the UXO/Mine Action Sector (NRA) under the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare in 2005. In 2010, the national MDG Goal 9, 'Reduce the impact of UXO,' was established, which later developed into Goal 18 of SDGs, "Remove the UXO obstacle to national development." Three rounds of UXO national strategy (Safe Path Forward) have been taken, and UNDP has provided programmatic and technical support to the NRA and the Lao National Unexploded Ordnance Programme (Lao UXO) through a three-phased project since 2014.

Cambodia has more potential for scaling-up in terms of its comparatively well-structured institutional system, governance structure, and implementation mechanisms than Lao PDR. In particular, the endogenously driven coordinating agency named Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) took over the regulation, coordination, and monitoring of mine action from the formerly existing CMAC (Cambodian Mine Action Centre). The nature of the projects was focused on capacity building and how to apply the project consultation and coordinating system to the CMAA-UNDP-KOICA-PMAC partnerships.¹⁵ Cambodia also developed its national development goals as MDG 9 and SDG 18. Even though both cases of Lao PDR and Cambodia have enabling conditions or factors to integration, the scale-up pathways and the level of integration found in these countries vary.

2.3. Lao PDR

2.3.1. the Phase I and II: Coordination challenge and horizontal scale-up

During the Indochina War, approximately two million tons of explosives were dropped on the Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR), making it one of the most extensively bombarded nations in the world (1964-1973). Whereas the number of cases may be as low as fifty explosions per year as of 2021, as many as 270 million submunitions remain unexploded according to estimates. For such reason, UXO contamination remains a concern for people's safety, particularly children, and a barrier to rural development in impoverished and isolated areas. Approximately 80% of Lao PDR's population lives in rural areas, where livelihood opportunities are limited. UXO contamination can result in a variety of socioeconomic issues such as limited access to land and agricultural income, food insecurity, a lack of basic infrastructure, disabilities, and so on. This affects more than 90% of Lao PDR's low-income districts. Despite decades of investigation, the extent and location of contamination in the country remain unclear.

Therefore, the first two phases of the "Project to Support the UXO Sector in Lao PDR Phase I (2014-2018) and Phase II (2019-2022)" were more focused on covering the entire territory for mine removal, which implied expanding mine removal operator groups. Horizontal scaling-up of extending the reach of provinces through replication of activities was prioritized over functional scale-ups across sectors such as rural community development. Unlike Cambodia's CMAA, the NRA in Lao PDR was not as potent as a central coordinating agency that orchestrated the discord among various stakeholders. The coordinating agency's (NRA) semi-autonomy and heavy reliance on development partners reduced scale-up potential of projects in Lao PDR. It led to

¹⁵ PMAC stands for the Provincial Mine Action Committee in Cambodia.

Lao PDR's scaling-up focusing on horizontal scaling-up pathway (to cover more provinces with mine clearance activities) although there were activities and a goal of moving toward vertical scale-up and organizational scale-up with institutional reform.

The UXO sector in Lao PDR is comprised of the NRA, the Lao National Unexploded Ordnance Programme (UXO Lao), humanitarian NGOs, several accredited commercial companies providing UXO services, and seven humanitarian clearance teams within the Lao People's Army (Unit 58). The UNDP has been the primary development partner assisting Lao PDR's UXO activities since the mid-1990s. The UXO Lao and NRA are two essential state organizations in the UXO sector that UNDP has aided their establishments.¹⁶ The Minister of Labor and Social Welfare chairs both the NRA Board and the UXO Sector Working Group. In addition to its other responsibilities, UNDP co-chairs the UXO Sector Working Group with the United States. The Sector Working Group's goal is to maximize the efficiency of UXO activity development by coordinating the efforts of all parties involved in the sector.

At the time of project planning of Phase I by KOICA, the project's overall duration was set from 2015 to 2017, but it was delayed by one year and completed in 2018. This delay was primarily due to issues with coordination among government agencies and implementing organizations, which failed to reach an agreement on the details of a victim support activity. Another reason would be a lack of risk management, particularly concerning coordination challenges driven by the absence of a strong central coordinating agency. Projects failed to complete on time and the original plan of victim assistance beneficiaries was reduced to one hundred, less than one-third of the original goal of three hundred. KOICA's final evaluation report recommends national institutions to strengthen their strategic planning, coordination, quality management, and information management. Lao PDR's core mine action agencies were not yet ready for vertical scaling-up due to internal factors such as lack of the autonomy of coordination agency and its heavy reliance on donor partners.

2.3.2. Phase III: Expectation for horizontal, vertical and organizational scaling-up

While Lao PDR's UXO and explosive pollution threat affect all 17 UN SDGs, the Government of Lao PDR addresses UXO concerns as part of its national SDG 18 "Lives Safe from UXO" which was established in 2016 with the stated goal of "eliminate the UXO hurdle to national development."¹⁷ It is in line with the UN Partnership Framework 2017-2021, which emphasizes UXO removal and victim assistance as critical components of achieving inclusive development, sustainable livelihoods, and resilience. Safe Path Forward (SPF) III, the new National Strategic Plan for the UXO Sector, aims to reduce the impact of UXO and guides the implementation of several important international conventions and declarations. This includes the CCM, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), the UNESCAP Declaration on the Decade of the Disabled, and 2011-2020 objectives and activities to reduce humanitarian and social needs caused by UXO contamination. UXO is a cross-sector concern in Lao PDR's 9th

¹⁶ UXO Lao is located within the Prime Minister's Office, Office of Rural Development and Poverty Eradication.

¹⁷ In 2016, Laos approved an 18th national-level SDG "Lives safe from UXO" as a crosscutting issue. This nationalization of global initiatives has its roots in the MDG period, when Lao PDR included the UXO sector in its national development strategy and, in 2010, established an extra MDG 9 concerning the issues associated with mines. National SDG 18 "Lives Safe from UXO" as an important element of the nationalized SDGs, was established in 2016 and its stated goal is to "eliminate the UXO hurdle to national development." This has created synergy effects with the UN Partnership Framework 2017-2021 that emphasizes UXO removal and victim assistance as key components in achieving inclusive development, sustainable livelihoods, and resilience.

National Socio-Economic Development Plan (9th NSEDP) for 2021-2025. By designating the UXO sector as its own output pillar,¹⁸ the UXO problem is elevated to a national level, raising awareness and emphasizing the importance of the national SDG 18. The 9th NSEDP and national gender equality objectives are being incorporated into SPF III (2021-2030) and the UXO Sector Multi-Year Work Plan (2021-2025).

UNDP Lao PDR plays a critical role as the SDG facilitator and enabler in supporting the UXO projects. The UN Mine Action Strategy 2019-2023 particularly highlights UNDP's role in linking mine action to development and the SDGs, as well as assisting UXO/mine-affected communities to achieve resilience and sustainable development. Using critical documents such as the NRA Capacity Needs Evaluation Report, SPF II outcomes, and UNDP's current UXO assessment, four areas where UNDP may add value to national SDG 18, SPF III, and CCM compliance have been identified.

Along with these national and UNDP's activities related to UXO sector, in the most recent phase (Phase III) of the KOICA's project "Support to the Establishment of a Sustainable UXO Sector in Lao PDR (2022-2026)," the focus of the project has been on strengthening the institutional capacity of UXO sector in Lao through stronger coordination mechanisms. The project aims to strengthen development-focused land release and other UXO activities such as victim assistance, explosive ordnance risk reduction, and advocacy. This is in support of achieving national SDG 18 "Lives free of UXO" and implementing the government's Safe Path Forward III 2021-2030 (SPF III), a decade-long UXO sector strategic plan. The project prioritizes the realization of communities' rights to live and develop in communities free of the threat of UXO injury. The aim is to accomplish such priorities by assisting the NRA to execute better coordinating, prioritizing, and monitoring UXO/mine activities. The project aims to help the agency to make UXO sector a more efficient and effective sector, thereby achieving SDG 18, SPF III, and compliance with the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM).¹⁹

With the start of the Phase III of the project this year, it is expected that the projects will have a good level of horizontal, vertical and organizational scaling-up, allowing the institutional and organizational reform.

2.4. Cambodia

2.4.1. Clearing for Results (CfR) Phases I to IV with horizontal-vertical scaling-up

The civil war, open and covert aggressive warfare, an extended cyclical chain of armed conflicts, and U.S. bombing for over 70 years left lots of landmines and Explosive Remnant of War (ERW) which take away human life and socioeconomic losses. Lack of a record on the exact locations of where landmines were buried was another factor to increase the human casualties (Royal Government of Cambodia 2017: vii).²⁰ The landmine and ERW issue in Cambodia, therefore, is

¹⁸ Output 6: UXO clearance progressively expedited, and more lives kept safe from UXO (in the 9th NSEDP authorized by the Government of Laos in March 2021).

¹⁹ Laos signed the CCM in 2008, which requires the state to destroy stockpiles (Art.3), clear munitions and conduct risk education (Art.4), assist victims (Art.5), cooperate with the international community (Art.6), report (Art.7), and implement national legal and administrative measures to implement the Convention (Art. 9). Laos must eliminate all cluster munition remains by 31 July 2025.

²⁰ More than 64,700 human casualties can be attributed to mines and ERW in Cambodia since 1979, including over 19,7600 deaths (McGinn 2019).

of essential importance since it is a direct outcome of the country's long history of internal wars, which began in the mid-1960s and lasted until late 1998. Towards the end of the conflict in 1991, the humanitarian mine action efforts began in earnest with the conclusion of the 'Comprehensive Cambodian Peace Agreement,' and with the establishment of the Cambodian Mine Action Centre (CMAC) in 1992 (UNDP & CMAA 2017). In 1997 ending the three-decade-long struggle, Cambodia signed the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) (or the Inhumane Weapons Convention) and its protocols, and the last of the Khmer Rouge soldiers surrendered to the Cambodian government, marking the end of conflict and the beginning of true peace in the nation. In 2000, Cambodia joined the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC), and the same year, the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) was established with Prime Minister Hun Sen, chaired as the agency's President, under Royal Decree No. 160.²¹ In 2012, Cambodia ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Three national mine action strategies were adopted. They are: the first National Mine Action Strategy (NMAS) 2003-2007, NMAS 2010-2019, and the most recent NMAS 2018-2025 which was adopted in 2017.

A series of mine action programmes were also carried forward by CMAA with support and oversight by UNDP under the names of Clearing for Results Phase I (CfR I) from 2006 to 2010, Clearing for Results Phase II (CfR II) from 2011 to 2016, and Clearing for Results Phase III: Mine Action for Human Development (CfR III) 2016-2019. Technical support has been provided by UNDP since 2006. With a tentative closure by 2025, funds were pooled by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) from 2013.

Focus during the earlier rounds of CfR I was on capacity building of the government to run mine action programs, and then expanded towards improving national institutions and methods for demining resource allocation during CfR II (UNDP & CMAA 2016: 4). Integration began to occur from Phase III, aside from the continual releasing of contaminated land for productive use, destroying the anti-personnel mines and anti-tank mines, or ERW, and mine risk education. During CfR III, the Performance Monitoring System (PMS) led to quality management, and frameworks of national, sub-national, and sectoral strategies were aligned with each other.

The final phase of the Clearing for Results: Mine Action for Human Development (CfR IV) began in 2021 and is expected to continue until 2025 with a new donor, KOICA. In Battambang, Banteay Meanchey, and Pailin Provinces, clearance, land release contracting activity, and mine action activities aligned to national and sub-national sectorial policies and planning strategies have been undertaken in this CfR IV (including support to victim assistance or support to mine-risk education activities). Almost forty percent of the total deaths after the mid-1990s accounted for the deaths in the aforementioned provinces. The goal of CfR IV is to facilitate the shift from a humanitarian-driven mine action sector towards another sector that makes use of the outcomes of mine action to promote poverty alleviation and human development in specific areas.

²¹ In 2000, the Cambodian government formed CMAA to coordinate and monitor all mine clearance activities and to aid those who have been injured by landmines. CMAC, the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, the Mines Advisory Group (MAG), and the Halo Trust were the four primary operators of demining initiatives. CMAC's function of regulation, coordination, and monitoring of mine action was transferred to CMAA in 2000.

The CfR IV aims to secure and maximize the impacts of the successes of the prior three phases, which have concentrated primarily on freeing land to establish mine-free villages and improving the humanitarian situation in the nation after decades of violence. The CfR IV makes an effort to make enabling conditions to move beyond mine-free stages to rural development. They are: the provincial governments' prioritization of rural development; provincial mine action strategy aligned with national-level strategy; reinforced mine action sector and enhanced capability of the government, which will also help accomplish Cambodia's SDG 18 "End the Negative Impact of Mine/ERW and Promote Victim Assistance" since the targets are also integrated into Cambodia's Mine Action Strategic Plan.²²

2.4.2. Towards integrated rural development with potentials for functional scaling-up

Over the last decade, Cambodian government continuously made an effort to integrate socio-economic factors into its master plan for land release. Lack of information on landmines and ERW, however, limits the land release for socio-economic development. Now that the central government and CMAA have the capacity to oversee landmine and ERW-related project implementation with its national performance monitoring system (PMS), land release for socio-economic development becomes much easier than before.

Enhanced capacity of the central government and CMAA also makes their functions as a coordinator among donors, ministries, Provincial Mine Action Committee (PMAC), and Mine Action Planning Units (MAPUs) more effective and efficient. The CMAA, as the country's national mine action authority, has set up three strands of mine action coordinating mechanisms: the Technical Working Group on Mine Action (TWG-MA); Mine Action Coordination Committee (MACC); and Technical Reference Group (TRG). The TWG-MA, which has been a coordinating mechanism since 2004, is a consultative platform between the government, development partners, and NGOs to examine policy concerns to improve overall coordination, alignment, and harmonization of aid for mine action. The MACC is a forum where parties involved in mine action may communicate, learn about new development projects in the field, and provide feedback to the CMAA on how to coordinate their efforts better. TRGs are convened by the CMAA at the technical level to facilitate coordination and address technical issues (GICHD 2021).²³ Simultaneously, CMAA adapts its Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) and provides training for its employees in data collection and analysis, taking into account SDG-related goals (The Royal Government of Cambodia 2017: 24).²⁴

In this context, the CfR IV's goal of tying mine action and human development together is helping to expand the scope of community demands beyond those that can be met by land release. To further assist CMAA and MAPUs, more extensive capacity development is needed,

²² SDG 18 holds three targets:

18.1 To completely clear the identified mine and explosive remnants of war (ERW) areas by the year 2030.

18.2 To reduce the number of mine / ERW casualties to less than 10 persons / year by 2030.

18.3 To promote the rights and improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities due to landmines / ERW.

²³ "At the technical level, the CMAA organizes six Technical Reference Groups (TRG) to facilitate coordination, and address technical issues with all operators active in the sector. The six TRGs are Mine Clearance and Survey, Information Management (IM), Performance Monitoring System (PMS), Mine Risk Education (MRE), Victim Assistance (VA) and Gender" (The Royal Government of Cambodia 2017: 24).

²⁴ "CMAA selected 127 minefields in Banteay Meanchey province with MAPU for PMS Work Plan 2019. In 2019, PMS was implemented for data collection in the selected minefields/villages for this year. The collected data transferred to the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) of CMAA and was analyzed for the Performance Monitoring System (PMS) for Mine Action report in 2019" (UNDP 2019: 2).

particularly in terms of government resource mobilization, sector coordination, and monitoring of the environmental effect of land release.

To date, the CfR Project's human development part (as subtitled in Phases III and IV) has been included in the PMS for enhanced data management and land use knowledge. The Cambodian government's vision and strategy acknowledge the importance of data management. Pledges are made toward clearing the nation of mines and using the organization's expertise to promote mine action on a global scale. The project's objectives are consistent with those of the NMAS 2018-2025, which pursues to make Cambodia mine-free by 2025 and to promote local development in mine-affected areas. Furthermore, the programme bridges the gap between the mine action sector's historical concentration on humanitarian responses and its future focus on a more comprehensive rural development approach. Because the government has set a target of demining all damaged districts by 2025, this is an opportune reason for the initiative to scale-up its local development activities in priority communities while also ensuring that CMAA fulfils its purpose in a transparent and responsible way to address devastating humanitarian, social, and economic effects caused by the contamination.

Since mine action helps the farming sector, it also helps reduce poverty in rural Cambodia. Considering this, KOICA plans to support 10 million USD to create peace and prosperity communities in Northwest Cambodia as a build-up project of the CfR IV, under the project titled "Building Peace Villages through Integrated Rural Community Development (2022-2026)." People in rural areas, including those in vulnerable groups, smallholder farmers, farmer cooperatives, and government officials, will benefit from this project's efforts to improve living conditions. Strengthening rural development governance, increasing agricultural revenue sustainably, and improving living conditions in rural areas are the key focuses of the project. The project is implemented in the three identical provinces where CfR IV is implemented. Thus, it is expected to show the expansion (scaling-up) from the mine removal sector towards rural development that invites many of the local actors. In contrast with previous CfR projects that were conducted through a pooled fund of multiple donors, however, the Peace Village project is implemented bilaterally by KOICA.

Aligned with KOICA Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) with Cambodia which places a strong emphasis on rural development the project aims to establish a sustainable rural development system with locals' participation in areas where landmines have been removed through CfR (3 provinces, 5 districts, 10 communes).²⁵ This is pursued by fostering Village Development Committee (VDC) and Agricultural Cooperatives (AC) at the village level, Agricultural Cooperative Union (ACU) at the commune level, and Provincial Rural Development Committee (PRDC) at the district level as main actors of rural community development. The Provincial Department of Rural Development (PDRD), Ministry of Rural Development (MRD), and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries (MAFF) constitute the Project Implementation Unit (PIU). The main activities are to improve living conditions such as infrastructure, water, mine safety education, etc, income generation through AC and ACU, and capacity building by training workshops and building Cambodia-Korea Rural Development Centre (CKRDC).

²⁵ The original PCP submitted by Cambodia only included two provinces of Battambang and Banteay Meanchey. KOICA included Pailin Province to maximize the scaling up impacts.

The project also aligns with the Cambodia government's "Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency Phase IV 2021-2024," of which strategy 4 indicates the strategic goal of inclusive and sustainable development to create jobs and income in the agricultural sector (The Royal Government of Cambodia 2018). It also interlinks with the PVDP of KOICA that aims to eventually achieve a peaceful rural community that is free from UXO/mines, victims are protected with due human rights protection, and marginalized rural areas are transformed into prosperous lands.

3. Conclusion

In the previous section, we could identify horizontal scale-ups with various degrees after the initial phase of projects. In the cases of both Lao PDR and Cambodia, the projects were 'adapted' to neighbouring provinces as the phase one project moved to phase two. Later, different sectoral goals were integrated, and institutions sophisticated through vertical and organizational scale-ups.

The analysis above provides several findings related to scale-up and integration. First, different from the usual pattern of scale-up such as "horizontal scale-up first", the cases of both countries showed that it is possible to have vertical, organizational, or functional scale-up if there is a reliable facilitator with a middle-ground attitude. Institutions such as the CMAA and NRA play a key role as middle-ground facilitators in communicating between the national government, UNDP, and KOICA.

Second, the transfer of the experiences can be hampered if it stays within the boundary of simple replication. When learning process goes beyond the replication stage to the adaptation stage, where the generative reproduction of knowledge is made for a new context, vertical, organizational and functional scale-ups are possible. CfR IV which is currently being implemented is an example. KOICA as a new player taking over CfR was in perfect condition to incorporate existing knowledge with new ideas to upgrade a project through functional scale-up of adding rural development initiative to humanitarian-driven mine action.

Third, strong ownership and leaders with centralized power of the recipient country, and the strong will of donors to scale-up projects are indispensable elements for a successful scale-up as we can see in the development of CfR in Cambodia.

Lastly, when scaling-up, universalist lessons must be drawn. At least internally, the scaling-up process should be driven by simplifying rules and processes which can help to apply a project model to multiple contexts. But at the same time, successful scaling-up requires an awareness of institutional and environmental context. Scaling up may be constrained in scope and pace by variables that are beyond donors' control, such as unchangeable regulatory barriers or entrenched cultural norms (Gündel et al 2001). Thus, middle-ground attitudes or strategies are crucial. A position of middle-ground for practical response enables one to gain a wealth of information from experiences based on universalist and contextualist epistemological frameworks. The efforts to reinterpret the SDGs from the perspective of national contexts and align the SDGs with the project's multiple goals of mine clearance and rural development specific to the local contexts can

be considered a kind of middle-ground for practical responses to deal with national problems associated with landmines, UXO and ERW.

To what extent experience and lessons on scale-up and integration drawn from a single project can be applied to other contexts within a country, let alone across borders, remains a question. It is clear, however, that continuous learning and sharing lessons drawn from various projects increase the chances of being successful in scale-up and integration. This study on the cases of Lao PDR and Cambodia provides materials for the continuous learning and sharing to be successful in scale-up and integration.

References

- Andrews, Matt, Lant Pritchett, and Michael Woolcock. 2013. "Escaping Capability Traps Through Problem Driven Iterative Adaptation (PDIA)." *World Development* 51: 234–244.
- ASEAN-ROK. 2020. *ASEAN-ROK Plan of Action (POA) 2021-2025*.
<https://asean.org/asean2020/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/16.-ASEAN-ROK-POA-2021-2025-Final.pdf>
- Berry, Frances S. and William D. Berry. 2018. "Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research." In *Theories of the Policy Process* (4th ed.), Christopher M. Wieble and Paul A. Sabatier (eds). New York: Westview Press.
- Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA). *Brief of CMAA (Legal Framework and Mandate)*. <https://cmaa.gov.kh/background>.
<https://cmaa.gov.kh/document/a.legalframeworkandmandate>
- Carter, Becky, Marina Apgar, and Shandana Khan Mohamand. 2019. *Brief 2. Scaling up Social Norm Change: Types of Scale Up*. K4D Emerging Issues Report. Brinton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.
- Carter, Becky, Marina Apgar, and Shandana Khan Mohamand. 2019. "Guidance Note on Scaling up Social Norm Change: Types of Scale Up (Brief 02) 1 April 2019" Department for International Development.
- Coffey, Amanda. 1967. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Cooley, Larry, and Richard Kohl. 2006. *Scaling up – From Vision to Large-Scale Change: A Management Framework for Practitioners* (3rd ed). Washington, DC: Management Systems International.
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and W. W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutionalism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48(2): 147-160.
- Fox, Jonathan. 2016. *Scaling Accountability through Vertically Integrated Civil Society Policy Monitoring and Advocacy*. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.
- Galtung, Johan. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 167-191.
- Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). 2021. *The Sustainable Development Outcomes of Mine Action in Cambodia*. Geneva, Switzerland: GICHD.
- GTZ. 2011. *Scaling Up in Development Cooperation: Practical Guidelines*. Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ).
- Goodhand, Jonathan. 2008. "War, Peace and the Places in Between: Why Borderlands are Central." In *Whose Peace? Critical Perspectives on the Political Economy of Peacebuilding*. Michael Pugh, Neil Cooper, and Mandy Turner (eds). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1983. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." *Sociological Theory* 1: 201-233.

- Gündel, Sabine, Jim Hancock, Simon Anderson. 2001. *Scaling-Up Strategies for Research in Natural Resources Management: A Comparative Review*. Chatham, UK: Natural Resources Institute. U.K. Department for International Development-Funded Natural Resources Systems Programme (NRSP) Research Project R7865.
- Hancock, J. 2003. *Scaling Up the Impact of Good Practices in Rural Development: A Working Paper to Support Implementation of the World Bank's Rural Development Strategy*. Report No. 26031. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Hartmann, Arntraud, and Johannes F. Linn. 2008. "Scaling Up: A Framework and Lessons for Development Effectiveness from Literature and Practice." *Wolfensohn Center for Development Working Paper* No. 5 (October 2008). Washington, DC: Wolfensohn Center for Development at Brookings.
- Hays, Scott P. 1996. "Patterns of Reinvention: The Nature of Evolution During Policy Diffusion." *Policy Studies Journal* 24(4): 551-566.
- Howes, Mick, and M.G. Sattar. 1992. "Bigger and better? Scaling-up strategies pursued by BRAC 1972-1991." In *Making a Difference: NGOs and Development in a Changing World*. Michael Edwards and David Hulme (eds). London: Earthscan.
- International Campaign to Ban Landmines–Cluster Munition Coalition (ICBL-CMC). 2021. *Cluster Munition Monitor 2021*.
http://www.the-monitor.org/media/3299952/Cluster-Munition-Monitor-2021_web_Sept2021.pdf
- Juncos, Ana E. and Jonathan Joseph. 2020. "Resilient Peace: Exploring the Theory and Practice of Resilience in Peacebuilding Interventions." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 14(3): 289-302.
- Karch, Andrew, and Matthew Carvens. 2014. "Rapid Diffusion and Policy Reform: The Adoption and Modification of Three Strikes Laws." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 14(4): 461-491.
- KOICA Project Reports. "Project to Support the UXO Sector in Lao PDR (Phase 2) (2019-2022)"
- KOICA Project Reports. "Support for the Institutional Strengthening of the National Regulatory for UXO/Mine Action Sector in Lao PDR (2022-2025)"
- KOICA Project Reports. "Cambodia - Clearing for Results IV: Mine Action for Human Development (2021-2025)"
- KOICA Project Reports. "Cambodia Building Peace and Prosperity Village through Integrated Rural Community Development (2022-2026)"
- McGinn, Colleen. 2019. *Final Evaluation Report for UNDP, Clearing for Results – Phase 3*. Institute for Social and Environmental Transition (ISET).
<https://www.aramis.admin.ch/Default?DocumentID=67182&Load=true>
- Mesequer, Covadonga, and Fabrizio Gilardi. 2009. "What is New in the Study of Policy Diffusion?" *Review of International Political Economy* 16(3): 527-543.
- Migdal, Joel. 2004. *Boundaries and Belonging. States and Societies in the Struggle to Shape Identities and Local Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- MOFA ROK. 2012. “ 「Han-River Declaration」 of Establishing the Mekong-ROK Comprehensive Partnership for Mutual Prosperity.”
https://www.mofa.go.kr/eng/brd/m_5467/view.do?seq=341589&srchFr=&srchTo=&srchWord=&srchTp=&multi_itm_seq=0&itm_seq_1=0&itm_seq_2=0&company_cd=&company_nm=
- Robinson, Jenny P., Rebecca Winthrop, R., and Eileen McGivney. 2016. *Millions learning: Scaling up Quality Education in Developing Countries*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Rogers, Everett M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Simmons, Ruth, Peters Fajans, and Laura Ghiron. 2007. *Scaling Up Health Service Delivery: From Pilot Innovations to Policies and Programmes*. Geneva: World Health Organization and ExpandNet.
- Stone, Diane, and Simon Maxwell. 2005. *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development: Bridges Across Boundaries*. New York: Routledge.
- The Royal Government of Cambodia. 2018. *Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity, and Efficiency: Building the Foundation toward realizing the Cambodia Vision 2050 Phase IV*. Penh, Cambodia: the Royal Government of Cambodia.
- The Royal Government of Cambodia. 2017. *National Mine Action Strategy 2018-2025*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA).
- United Nations. 2015. *Report of the Capacity Building Workshop and Expert Group Meeting on Integrated Approaches to Sustainable Development Planning and Implementation* (27-29 May 2015).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2008. *Poverty Reduction that Works: Experience of Scaling Up Development Success*. (Paul Steele, Neil Fernando and Maneka Weddikara (eds). London: Earthscan.
- UNDP & CMAA. 2016. *Clearing for Results Phase II (CFRII) Final Project Report*. CMAA and UNDP. <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/cambodia-clearing-for-results-phase-II-final-project-report-undp.pdf>
- UNDP & CMAA. 2016. *Clearing for Results Phase II (CFRII) Final Project Report*. CMAA and UNDP. <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/cambodia-clearing-for-results-phase-II-final-project-report-undp.pdf>
- UNDP & CMAA. 2019. *Clearing for Results Phase III Mine Action for Human Development (CFRIII) 2019 Annual Report*. CMAA and UNDP.
<https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/KHM/Annual%20Report%202019-Final.docx>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2017. *Institutional and Coordination Mechanisms: Guidance Note on Facilitating Integration and Coherence for SDG Implementation*. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=2478&menu=1515>
- United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS). *5 Pillars of Mine Action*.
<https://www.unmas.org/en/5-pillars-of-mine-action>
- United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS). 2018. *The United Nations Mine Action Strategy 2019-2023*. https://www.unmas.org/sites/default/files/un_mine_action_strategy_2019-2023_lr.pdf

- Uvin, Peter. 1995. "Fighting Hunger at the Grassroots: Paths to Scaling Up." *World Development* 23(6): 927–939.
- Uvin, Peter. 1996. "Scaling Up the Grassroots and Scaling Down the Summit: The United Nations and Local NGOs." *Third World Quarterly* 16(3): 495-512.
- Uvin, Peter, and David Miller. 1996. "Paths to Scaling Up: Alternative Strategies for Local Nongovernmental Organizations." *Human Organization* 55(3): 344-354.
- van Oudenhooven, Nico, and Wazir, Rekha. 1998. "Increasing the Coverage of Social Programmes." *International Social Science Journal* 50(155): 145-154.
- Wazir, Rekha, and Nico van Oudenhooven. 1998. "Replicating Social programmes: Approaches, Strategies and Conceptual Issues." *Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Discussion Paper No. 18*. Paris: UNESCO.
- WHO and ExpandNet. 2010. *Nine Steps for Developing a Scaling-up Strategy*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- WHO and ExpandNet. 2011. *Beginning with the End in Mind: Planning Pilot Projects and Other Programmatic Research for Successful Scaling Up*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Wigboldus, Seerp, and Cees Leeuwis. 2013. *Towards Responsible Scaling Up and Out in Agricultural development: An exploration of Concepts and Principles*. Discussion Paper CDI-13-023. Wageningen, Netherlands: Centre for Development Innovation.
- World Bank. 2003. *Scaling-Up the Impact of Good Practices in Rural Development: A Working Paper to Support Implementation of the World Bank's Rural Development Strategy*. Report No. 26031, June 2003. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Appendix I. Interview Questions for Cambodia

Questions adapted to each institution CMAA / CMAA / KOICA / UNDP

I. Relative KOICA Projects for the Interview

KOICA Project 1: Triangular Cooperation Workshop on the Integration of Mine Action and Victim Assistance to Peaceful and Inclusive Rural Community Development in the Mekong Region (2019)

KOICA Project 2: CfRIV, Clearing for Results, Phase 4: Mine Action for Human Development in Cambodia (2021-2025)

KOICA Project 3: Project of Building Peace Villages through Integrated Rural Community Development (2022-2026)

[Reference Projects with UNDP: Clearing for Results, Phase 1 (2006-2010), Phase 2 (2011-2016), Phase 3 (2016-2019)]

Basic questions on the projects - Whether the project(s) has/had:

1. a clear common vision or goal?
2. conflicting priorities?
3. unrealistic expectations?
4. enough resources (time, money, equipment, knowledge, or expertise)?
5. a mechanism for good communication amongst project team members?
6. members with a clear understanding of what needs to be done?
7. a buy-in and support from key stakeholders (both national and local)?
8. good leadership?

II. Integrated Approach to Development (Core questions)

A. Questions on 'Vision and Innovation'

(Related Keywords: Dedicated management with vision for scale, continuous innovation and improvement, vision of social responsibility, investments in future generations, continuity etc.)

1. Whether projects have visions and goals with a prominent causal sequence? Are they sufficiently internalized?
2. Whether (and how) the triangular cooperation workshop has helped in terms of setting the vision and goals of other mine action-related projects? Were there changes between Clearing for Result Phase 3 (before the 2019 workshop) and Phase 4 that began after the training? How do you think it influences the current run project (KOICA Project 3)?

B. Questions on 'Coordination & Enabling Policy Environment'

(Related Keywords: Coordinated approach, enabling policy environment, institutional space, alignment with national development priorities, multi-sector coordinated policy support national-local levels, strong leadership, etc.)

3. Does the project have policy instruments that correspond to multiple ministries or local and/or national government departments? Were roles clearly defined among stakeholders? (If not, did the 2019 workshop help improve such policy instruments?)

4. Has the project assessed multiple areas of development (ex. mine action, rural development, capacity-building, victim assistance, etc.) compared to projects with a single dimension (mine removal)? Which is more effective, and how?

C. Questions on 'Financing and M&E'

(Related Keywords: Effective M&E, responsive to market demands and needs, shared financing, economic incentives, and fiscal space, responsible governance)

5. Whether the project has a monitoring and evaluation system to measure both innovativeness of the project process and organizational capacities in addition to the effectiveness of the project in terms of achievement of the project objectives?

D. Questions on 'Partnerships'

(Related Keywords: Public-private partnerships, innovations on incentives and win-win partnerships, holistic vision and partnerships, smart and effective partnerships, etc.)

6. Whether the project has a space where members undertaking separate unit operations can discuss and share the information and experience (UNDP, KOICA, CMAA, CMAC, NGOs, Local actors, other donors, etc.)?
7. Whether the project has a systemic and regular mechanism to learn and share the knowledge and skills of the locals who live and work in the project area? Are there team members recruited from communities of the project area?
8. How well did the 2019 workshop affect projects in terms of scaling-up (both within Cambodia/Lao PDR and across neighboring countries) and knowledge sharing, such as the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database?

E. Questions on 'Thematic focus and SDGs'

(Related Keywords: environmental conservation and expansion, empowerment of women, peace, etc.)

9. Does the project have multiple SDGs and their targets, and how does it reflect the national goals (including the localized goal of SDG 18 Cambodia mine/ERW free, etc.)?
10. Whether the project has multiple groups of beneficiaries categorized along the line of gender, race, age, and geographical location?

III. Other Remarks

If you have any other opinions regarding *scaling-up dynamics* among development projects, views regarding the effectiveness of taking an *integrated/individual approach to development*, or any other remarks on any of the above projects listed in section I, please feel free to share.

Appendix II. Interview Questions for Lao PDR

Questions adapted to each institution NRA / KOICA / UNDP

I. Relative KOICA Projects for the Interview

Project 1: Triangular Cooperation Workshop on the Integration of Mine Action and Victim Assistance to Peaceful and Inclusive Rural Community Development in the Mekong Region (2019)

Project 2: Project to Support the UXO Sector in Lao PDR (2014-2017)

Project 3: Project to Support for UXO Sector in the Lao PDR (Phase 2) (2019-2022)

Project 4: Support to the Establishment of a Sustainable UXO Sector in Lao PDR (2022-2026)

Basic questions on the projects - Whether the project(s) has/had:

1. a clear common vision or goal?
2. conflicting priorities?
3. unrealistic expectations?
4. enough resources (time, money, equipment, knowledge, or expertise)?
5. a mechanism for good communication amongst project team members?
6. members with a clear understanding of what needs to be done?
7. a buy-in and support from key stakeholders (both national and local)?
8. good leadership?

II. Integrated Approach to Development (Core questions)

A. Questions on 'Vision and Innovation'

(Related Keywords: Dedicated management with vision for scale, continuous innovation and improvement, vision of social responsibility, investments in future generations, continuity etc.)

1. Whether projects have visions and goals with a prominent causal sequence? Are they sufficiently internalized?
2. Whether (and how) the triangular cooperation workshop has helped in terms of setting the vision and goals of other mine action-related projects? Were there changes between Phase 1 (before the 2019 workshop) and Phase 2 that began after the training?

B. Questions on 'Coordination & Enabling Policy Environment'

(Related Keywords: Coordinated approach, enabling policy environment, institutional space, alignment with national development priorities, multi-sector coordinated policy support national-local levels, strong leadership, etc.)

3. Does the project have policy instruments that correspond to multiple ministries or local and/or national government departments? Were roles clearly defined among stakeholders? (If not, did the 2019 workshop help improve such policy instruments?)
4. Has the project assessed multiple areas of development (ex. mine action, rural development, capacity-building, victim assistance, etc.) compared to projects with a single dimension (mine removal)? Which is more effective, and how?

C. Questions on 'Financing and M&E'

(Related Keywords: Effective M&E, responsive to market demands and needs, shared financing, economic incentives, and fiscal space, responsible governance)

5. Whether the project has a monitoring and evaluation system to measure both innovativeness of the project process and organizational capacities in addition to the effectiveness of the project in terms of achievement of the project objectives?

D. Questions on 'Partnerships'

(Related Keywords: Public-private partnerships, innovations on incentives and win-win partnerships, holistic vision and partnerships, smart and effective partnerships, etc.)

6. Whether the project has a space where members undertaking separate unit operations can discuss and share the information and experience (UNDP, KOICA, NRA, NGOs, Local actors, etc.)?
7. Whether the project has a systemic and regular mechanism to learn and share the knowledge and skills of the locals who live and work in the project area? Are there team members recruited from communities of the project area?
8. How well did the 2019 workshop affect projects in terms of scaling-up (both within Laos and across neighbouring countries) and knowledge sharing, such as the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database?

E. Questions on 'Thematic focus and SDGs'

(Related Keywords: environmental conservation and expansion, empowerment of women, peace, etc.)

9. Does the project have multiple SDGs and their targets, and how does it reflect the national goals (including Laos SDG 18 Lives safe from UXO, etc.)?
10. Whether the project has multiple groups of beneficiaries categorized along the line of gender, race, age, and geographical location?

III. Other Remarks

If you have any other opinions regarding scaling-up dynamics among development projects, views regarding the effectiveness of taking an integrated/individual approach to development, or any other remarks on any of the above projects listed in section I, please feel free to share.