Research & Studies Collection
From project

How to scale up community-based social innovations for better inclusive policies? Lao PDR as a case study

Innovation, Impact & Information Division
September 2020

Authors

Ana Maria Sanchez Rodriguez, CAROLINE – 'Collaborative Research Fellowships for a Responsive and Innovative Europe' Fellow, Maynooth University (Ireland) and Humanity & Inclusion

Contributors

Aude Brus, Research Specialist, Innovation, Impact & Information Division

Photo credits

Cover: © G. Giordanino / HI

Content

Acknowledgments

Abstract

This report is part of a larger research that analyses and promotes effective community level innovations that can be scaled up and inform the development or revision of government policy to enforce the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)[1] for persons with disabilities, with a particular focus on women and girls with disabilities. The study builds on the observation that good practices exist on inclusion of persons with disabilities in the SDG areas, but too often take the form of one-off pilot projects or confined social innovations. Therefore, it is important to explore how to scale up good practices understanding scaling up as influencing, repeating, adapting and ensuring social change for vulnerable populations, in particular for persons with disabilities.

This report addresses the research question: How is scaling up of Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs)' inclusive innovations happening and promoted? And it does this by exploring Lao PDR as a case study. The research defines inclusive innovations as: "the development and implementation of new ideas which aspire to create opportunities that enhance social and economic wellbeing for disenfranchised members of society" (George et al 2012, p.663) promoted through organizations whose primary purposes are social (Mulgan, 2006, p.146)

The study is a qualitative research conducted in 2018-2019 in Lao PDR.

The findings show that there are small inclusive innovations of OPDs that experience limited scaling up that need to be recognized as such. In the same way that scaling up strategies have to be promoted this research provides recommendations for the stakeholders to contribute to that.

The report targets Humanity & Inclusion staff, practitioners and other international organizations working with OPDs to strengthen and improve the scope of their actions.

---

[1] UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), The Sustainable Development Goals and Addressing Statelessness, March 2017 [accessed 5 June 2020].

Foreword

In 2016, Humanity & Inclusion (HI-Lyon) and Maynooth University (Ireland) decided to collaborate to better understand the process of scaling inclusive social innovations developed by civil society's organizations and explore the gap between these local initiatives and policies level. A post-doctoral fellowship was thus funded for 3 years by the EC CAROLINE research fund (2017-2020).

Presentation of the research project

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs-2030 Agenda) pledge is: "Leave no-one behind" and requires community and local government involvement. Yet local communities and marginalized groups are often left out of development planning; so, their needs are rarely included in the overall national sustainable development strategies (NSDS). While, there have been many examples of successful community-level initiatives relevant to achieving the SDGs, how best to scale such initiatives to national-level impact, remains highly problematic. Often such national scaling will involve systems and structural change, yet small-scale local initiatives thrive outside national systems, precisely because they eschew structural barriers.

This project aims to promote better scaling of good practices by connecting community-level innovations with national-level change – this project addresses the gap between the community and the State; a gap which is a fundamental challenge for achieving most of the SDGs.

Four research objectives were identified:
- Reviewing the literature of scaling up methodologies and their effectiveness using a realist approach: what works – how, where, for whom?
- Identifying and selecting a community innovation that is cross-sectoral and promotes persons with disabilities and, in particular, girls and women with disabilities
- Developing a framework to scale up social innovations at the community level
- Working with Government to adapt and apply an appropriate scaling-up methodology for Lao PDR in a cross-sector setting.

This report presents findings related to objectives 2 and 4 based on the case study lead in Lao PDR with the assistance of the Lao PDR HI Office. Other findings will be accessible in academic articles[2] and presented in other HI publications to come.

---

[2] Articles submitted. References will be shared as soon as possible.

Introduction

1. Context

Scaling up is an important ingredient for non-governmental organizations that want to increase social impact and their influence from the local level (Uvin, 1995). However, scaling up is challenging and complex and requires understanding the context in which the change should take place. There are different frameworks that describe the stages to scale up which vary in their approach to understanding how and when scale up happens (Edwards & Hulme, 1992, ExpandNet, 2010; Moore & Riddell, 2015; Gabriel, 2014; Hossain, 2016). However, the literature around understanding the process of scaling up inclusive innovations that incorporate the most marginalized groups is insubstantial; this is the case for the role of OPDs and their interventions.

This research focuses in Lao, a low-income country which is dependent on international aid (Gunn, 1990). Scaling up can be particularly challenging in a developing context as it aims to achieve sustainability in projects that are subsidized by foreign sources. This study contributes to a deepened understanding of scaling up to ultimately show how inclusive innovations carried out by OPDs can be used by governments policies in order to scale up their impact. Scaling up does not exist as a concept that can be literally translated into Lao. However, scaling up is interpreted in two Lao words: kan pap poung lae kan kha yai, which means improvement and expansion. A definition of scaling up was provided by the OPDs participating in the workshop as: improving, growing, continuing, planning, practicing, creating and expanding (Workshop, May 24, 2019) which is used in the research to explain their inclusive innovations or good practices.

2. Research objective

To understand how scaling up of OPDs' inclusive innovations takes place in the context of Lao PDR and to explore alternatives pathways to increase their impact.

3. Research questions

Three research questions were identified:
- What are the inclusive innovations of OPDs and within and between which SDGs are policy areas located?
- What are the obstacles and enablers of OPDs to scale up?
- What are the scaling up pathways of OPDs that can ultimately increase the impact of their inclusive innovations?

Methodology

1. Design of the study

The study entails qualitative multi-site ethnographic research conducted in Lao Popular Democratic Republic (PDR). Data was collected through in-depth interviews and participant observations.

2. Case study-Lao PDR

Lao PDR makes an interesting case study because of the recent developments towards the inclusion of marginalized population, particularly persons with disabilities. Firstly, Lao PDR' 8th Five-Year National Socio-Economic Development Plan (2016-2020) addresses the need to "respond to the transition from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to incorporating the global development framework provided by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)" (Lao PDR, 2016, p.83). Secondly, the National Disability Decree 137/PM was adopted on the 18th April 2014, and subsequently the National Committee for Disabled People and Elderly (NCDE) presented a Disability National Law that was enacted in 2019 by the General Assembly of Lao PDR. In 2009, Lao PDR signed and ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) submitting its initial report to the CRPD committee in 2017. The initial state report highlights the emergence of non-governmental organizations (NGOs)[3] as a strategy to advancing the rights of persons with disabilities that have been recognized by the state under the decree no. 115 (2009). Lao is divided into 18 provinces and Vientiane Capital and its population is 6.9 million; of those, 3.4 million are women (LSB, 2016). According to the 2015 Population and Housing Census (PHC), there are 160,881 people with disabilities; of this number, 80,766 were identified as males and 80,115 as females. The prevalence of disability is higher in rural areas, 3.3, and the in urban areas is 2.5 (PHC, 2015). The province with the highest prevalence is Luang Prabang with 4.2 and Savannakhet is the lowest at 1.9. The PHC addresses disabilities considers the following difficulties: seeing (78,175), hearing (71,667), walking (75,506), remembering (69,743), self-care (63,665) and communicating (54,964), and includes three level of difficulty: severe, moderate and mild.

3. Data collection

The data for this study was collected from: a) a review of documentary resources; and b) field work including two pilot studies conducted in 2018. In-depth interviews and participant observations were used.

---

[3] NGOs also called nonprofit associations (NPA).

3.1 Review documentary resources

The secondary sources collected are described in table 1.

Table 1. Document Review

Type of document	Sources	Year covered
Laws and policies in Lao PDR and statistical reports	Lao Government websites, Lao International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) network website and documents provided during my field work.	2009-present
Other Lao PDR government documents: evaluations, reports and approaches to disability-inclusive development and development, disability statistics.	Lao Government websites, Lao government reports submitted to the committee of the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), Lao INGO network website and documents provided during my field work, Lao Statistics Bureau to retrieve information on disability	2009-present
Lao PDR OPDs' reports and websites, public presentations	Not all the OPDs have information available in English	2011-present
Lao PDR document to the United National International Human Rights Committees and the Universal Periodic Review	Repository of the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights and the UN Universal Periodic Review.	The State's first initial report submitted to the UN treaties.
Donors including intergovernmental organizations and UN agencies' strategic plans and expert evaluations on disability inclusive development in Lao PDR	HI, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), UNICEF, UNESCO, Save the Children, World Vision, Catholic Service Relief, CBM	2009-present

3.2 Field work

Pilot studies

The first pilot study was conducted in March 2018 and the second one in November-December 2018. The objective of the two pilot studies was to identify and test the overall research assumptions before initiating the field work:

- **Assumption 1:** Some community innovations can contribute to policy change with the right leverage and government support to be scaled up.
- **Assumption 2:** National governments are often unaware of or unable to identify communities' needs and successful examples of inclusion. They have approached intermediary organizations to learn about their agenda, but they lack the resources, time and political will to implement the community level social innovations to scale up more broadly.
- **Assumption 3:** Successful examples of inclusion of the most marginalized groups exist, yet they are confined, limited in scope; and conditions of their replicability and scalability are not analyzed or documented. Therefore, their potential remains untapped.

As a result of the pilot studies the following new assumptions emerged:

- **New Assumption 1:** INGOs, OPDs and government understand scaling up differently.
- **New Assumption 2:** There are conflicting views on OPDs' capacity building- some OPDs are better managed than others and are perceived to be stronger.
- **New Assumption 3:** Different strategies are used to navigate state control over OPDs
- **New Assumption 4:** Inclusive innovations happens at various levels in service-delivery areas such as education and income generation activities.

Field work

Over the course of 5 months (April-September 2019) the researcher lived in Lao PDR to collect and test the initial assumptions as well as those found in the pilot studies. The field work was carried out in Vientiane capital, Savannakhet, Pakse and Xieng Khuang. The OPDs work in Vientiane capital with the exceptions of the Association for Autism (AFA), Quality of Life Association (QLA) and Lao Disabled People's Association (LDPA) which operate in other provinces (see table 1).

Sample

The research work was carried out with the support of the HI Rights and Inclusion Coordination team that helped the researcher to establish connections with government officials who work in disability either as a normative or an implementing government body. The OPDs interviewed were purposely selected and referred by HI as members of the OPDs' network. Participants were recruited with a letter of invitation that explained the purpose of

the study and requested an interview. The researcher conducted 87 in-depth interviews in total - this includes 9 OPDs and follow up interviews (see table 2). Data was also collected through 18 participant observations considered "as an overall strategy where the researcher is present in the setting experiencing and noticing events" (Rossman & Rallis, 2012, kindle location 3883) and included network meetings, workshops and public events such as the Third Disability Forum organized in December 2018 and the Sharing of Good Practices/Lessons Learned Workshop. Table 2 shows the OPDs, the date they were registered and/or founded and the number of beneficiaries / members they reported.

Table 2. OPDs interviewed[4]

Acronym	Name of Organization	Yr. founded and/or Registered	Members/ beneficia- ries	Female members/ beneficia- ries	Area of influence	Disability population they work with
AFA	Association for Autism	15/03/2012	88	18	Vientiane Capital and Pakse	Children with autism
AFD	Association for the Deaf	09/07/2013	2914	1160	Vientiane Capital	People with hearing impairments
LDPA	Lao Disabled People's Association	13/09/2011	13393	9116	Vientiane Capital and the 18 Lao' provinces[5]	All disabilities
LBA	Lao Blind Association	16/08/2012	75	38	Vientiane Capital	People with visual impairments
LDWDC	Lao Disabled Women's Development Centre	05/04/2001	945	930	Vientiane Capital	Women with disabilities, particularly physical disabilities
QLA	Quality of Life Association	ND	ND	ND	Xiang Hoang	All disabilities
SDDPA	Saysetha District for Disabled People Association	29/06/2014	687	126	Vientiane Capital	All disabilities

---

[4] Source: Adapted from DPOs PowerPoint presentation in the Third Disability Forum, March 2018.
[5] LDPA claims to have representation in almost all the Lao PDR provinces (Personal communication with former vice-president, March 2018).

| IDU | Intellectual Disability Unit[6] | 28/06/2008 - yr. founded | 135 | 54 | Vientiane Capital | Children with intellectual disabilities |
| VDBA | Vocational Development for Blind Association | ND | ND | ND | Vientiane Capital | People with visual impairments |

Table 3 shows the number of interviews, the time when they were conducted, and the sector identified. The number of interviews recorded was 52. The majority of government officials and INGO's staff interviews were not recorded because there was a sense of discomfort and fear of being exposed. Experts included external consultants who work in development.

Table 3. Number of interviews and focus groups conducted (2018-2019)

Sector	Number of interviews pilot studies (March, November and December 2018)	Number of Interviews (April-September 2019)	Total
OPDs	22	7	29
University	2		2
Government	6	10	16
INGOs	16	14	30
NPA	2	3	5
Experts	2	3	5
TOTAL	**50**	**37**	**87**
Participant observations	**9**	**9**	**18**
Focus Groups			**4**

The interviews that needed consecutive interpretation were 33 in total and the rest were conducted in English. The Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs)' interviews were conducted with their directors with the exception of the Association of Autism (AFA) that was later included as a single case study in which staff of their Vientiane Center and Pakse Center were interviewed[7].

In addition to the data collected by in-depth interviews and focus groups, the researcher organized a workshop on May 24, 2019 with 13 OPDs.[8] The purpose of the workshop was to identify the OPDs good practices and to understand how scaling up happening in their work (see Appendix 6).

---

[6] In 2019 they became Intellectual Disability Association, getting their own registration.

[7] In this report the findings for the AFA case study are not included.

[8] The workshop was organized with the support of the Rights and Inclusion coordination of HI Laos.

4. Data analysis

The in-depth interviews were analyzed using a multiple cycling coding process in three cycles (Rossman & Rallis, 2012). In the first cycle, the researcher coded general themes related to scaling up such as definition of scaling up and directions, scaling up strategies, enablers and obstacles. The second cycle incorporated sub codes from the initial codes, for example, the code of scaling up definition included sub codes of improvement, expansion and replication. The third cycle constructed themes recognizing other themes from the sub codes, for example scaling up as improvement of OPDs as their role is recognized. The researcher had a field work diary that she updated and drew comparisons with the information from the interviews. At the same time, the OPD workshop produced data collectively that was then analyzed alongside the materials produced - flipcharts of the teamwork conclusions and evaluation forms. The data was analyzed using NVivo software.

5. Reflexivity

This study is qualitative, requiring the researcher to interact and be submerged in the field. The researcher was mindful of the position in the field as someone who was not a HI employee, but was getting the organization's support. The research was a continuous reflective and conscious process of learning in a different cultural setting. Lao PDR is a different context, and, like other places, the phenomena studied are part of a larger cultural system. The challenges included understanding and reconciling very different perspectives from those of the foreigners working in Lao PDR, the Lao staff working in international organizations and the Lao people working in Lao institutions. There are different organizational cultures that often collide and when they coincide it was because there was a lot of time and work invested by the different parties. The researcher was trusted with information from participants who knew each other, she was there to listen and reflect, and the OPDs perceived that she could help them to scale up. Whether she was HI staff or a scholar didn't make any difference to them as it was more about building trust through the conversations.

6. Trustworthiness

The concept of validity is understood differently in qualitative as compared to quantitative research. In qualitative research. The term "validity" is also known as credibility and trustworthiness and involves multiple standards of quality (Morrow, 2005). The study addressed trustworthiness or validity using a range of standards to avoid validity threats. These standards included triangulation of data collected from different sources and researcher triangulation such as member-checks (Nowell et al, 2017). The member checks contested the

researcher's assumptions, on reviewing the findings with the academic mentor as well as the home host advisor at Humanity & Inclusion. There were follow up interviews to check data accuracy with OPDs, and information was clarified with the HI Lao team regarding issues related to their work with OPDs. This triangulation of informant perspectives that included the perceptions and experiences of internal and external stakeholders and community leaders strengthen my study findings. A third strategy used was a long-term involvement with the cases. The study collected rich data from interviews and participants observations, and everything was transcribed and reviewed to be able to follow up if needed (Maxwell, 2013). Finally, the design of this ethnographic qualitative research study required an immersion in the organizational environments in order to understand the work and the impact of OPDs as well as with the context in which they work, understanding the cultural nuances and differences amongst them and their partners including HI (Ragin & Amoroso, 2011).

7. Study limitations

The language was one limitation, but it became an opportunity to pay attention to other forms of communication and to sharpen the attention to detail. The majority of the interviews with OPDs were conducted in Lao language and they needed an interpreter. This was a study limitation that was addressed by reviewing the materials with the interpreter beforehand and conducting member- checks with HI Lao staff colleagues. The researcher anticipated other limitations relating to access, particularly with the government, but HI-Lao were timely in sending the information required by the government to grant the interviews. The secondary sources such as laws were difficult to access due to language limitations, and in some cases the translations were soft copies and not certified.

8. Ethical considerations and related challenges

The overall study was approved by the Maynooth University Ethics Review Committee in December 2017 and the HI ethics guidelines were followed[9]. All the interviews were consented to by the participants. The consent form was translated into Lao and its contents were explained before conducting the interview and the focus groups. The interpreters signed a confidentiality and an ethics agreement (Appendix 4).

---

[9] HI (September 2015), Studies and research at Handicap International: Promoting ethical data management. Guidance Note. Humanity & Inclusion. Available for HI staff at HInside.

Findings and discussion

1. Finding 1 – OPDs' Innovations are simple, contributing to education and economic wellbeing

Community innovations are simple and concrete, and they target specific needs, such as income generating activities or the smartphone apps to improve communications accessibility.

HI has implemented several projects identifying good practices that were included in this research.

The project entitled: "The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) Advocacy for Government Action Program- Cambodia, Lao PDR and Thailand"[10] selected good practices using the Making it Work[11] methodology. The good practices selected in Lao PDR were:

- The Disability Rights and Equality Training (DRET) for Lao Disabled Peoples Association (LDPA);
- Basic Sign Language Training for Health professionals at Hospital (AFD);
- Hand me and Hand Talk: A smartphone application and online learning tool (AFD);
- Development Process of the Audio Program for Persons with Visual Impairment (LAB); and
- Dissemination Information on Public Services in rural Villages (Center for Medical Rehabilitation).

In the context of three other projects[12], three good practices were selected from LBA (Build the capacity of people who are blind to attend University), AFA (Lao Autism Talks) and QLA (Education support for persons with disabilities and UXO survivors). In each of these three cases there were recommendations to scale up- for example:

- in the case of LBA, assessing the accessibility of university,
- for QLA, strengthening the links between the Persons with Disabilities Committee (PIC) and representatives at a provincial level and,
- for AFA, planning for the next step for training on the use of the app.

---

[10] Available at https://issuu.com/apcdasia-pacific/docs/miw_readable_pdf. Last accessed September 2020.

[11] Available at: https://www.makingitwork-crpd.org/our-work/miw-methodology Last accessed September 2020.

[12] These projects are: the project on "Supporting the Lao Disabled People's Association to Build Capacity and Promote Greater Equity and Participation for Disabled People in Lao PDR - Phase II"; The co-funded project with MOFA Norway IV focus on UXO survivors as part of the broader disability inclusive development (as signed under the Memorandum of Understanding with the Lao Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare); The project "Strengthening the Capacities of Lao Disabled People's Organizations to Meaningfully Contribute to the Inclusive Development of Lao PDR", funded by the European Union with the reference DCI-NSAPVD/2014/352-244(2015-2018).

Other good practices that were shared at the Sharing of Good Practices/Lessons Learnt Workshop in December 2018, included:
- LDPA Taxi driver;
- AFA' Lao Autism Talks app;
- the LBA and VDBA's work to get blind students registered at the National Lao University
- and QLA's disability-inclusive committees.

OPDs differentiate between themselves by their target population, their scope and range of activities. There are some OPDs working at a national and some at a provincial level; some with a focus on income generation activities and inclusive education. OPDs that are parent-driven organizations such as AFA have stable goals compared to other OPDs, for example, improving the quality of inclusive education.

OPDs' work focuses most frequently on the areas of inclusive education and income generation activities. Health is a big concern, but it has not been addressed comprehensively by OPDs, with the exception of Basic Needs, an organization focusing primarily on mental health. The projects with a health component have focused on rehabilitation (Community Based Rehabilitation and now renamed as Community Based Inclusive Development), for one OPD director this new approach meant moving a step forward to involve the community (OPD director, personal communication, December 2018). Other issues such accessibility to public areas, housing, and violence against persons with disabilities were not addressed in the interviews, further research on these areas of intervention is needed.

2. Finding 2 – Individual OPDs' approach to scaling up is reactive to their immediate needs, but as a network their approach is strategic

OPDs' scaling up is tied to their immediate needs, to the projects they carried out, and the learning outcomes are incorporated into improving what they know best. A director of one OPD explained that they have been working on other alternatives to respond to their current needs, for example providing audiobooks for people with sight impairments (personal communication, March 2018).

The OPDs constituted a network supported by HI; all the organizations take turns in performing the chair's role. The network plays an important role in improving OPDs' concerns and is playing a strategic role in planning ahead and underpinning an agenda to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities. An OPD director explains that the network is a space to promote their activities amongst other OPDs as well as to coordinate actions to raise awareness (OPD director personal communication, March 2018).

3. Finding 3 - OPDs scale up in different directions by replicating, expanding and improving their practices

OPDs are or have taken a path to scale up, for example by replicating their model, and AFA is one example. AFA Vientiane center for children with autism has expanded to Pakse, replicating their organizational model. In relation to AFA's expansion a former volunteer described that the association managed to achieve what it needed to found a new centre and she mentioned a key factor was to have in the case of AFA a group of parents that were willing to work and invest in it (AFA former volunteer, personal communication, March, 2018).

Other OPDs such as LBA and VDBA are supporting blind students and negotiating an inclusive model at the National University of Lao (NUOL), the achievement of including more than one faculty on board to provide accessible services and they continue planning the next steps. As LAB's director explains, they want to upgrade their programs to improve the technological platforms that they use, for example having the software used in smartphones (LAB' director, personal communication, March 2018). The LAB case is an example of changes at an institutional level in this case the NUL.

4. Finding 4 - OPDs have put in place a range of scaling up practices that are not planned as scaling up, and therefore not documented as such

There are scaling up' strategies but not methodologies (a step by step process), that would indicate how to scale up in the first place. OPDs are using different strategies to increase the impact of their actions. One strategy is to target the Lao PDR government (Ministry of Education and Sports) and require them to act upon specific actions. One way of doing this is to show them that it is feasible by inviting them to study tours. The director of an OPD mentioned that participating in study tours to Vietnam and Thailand, which are close to Lao PDR, is a way to bring awareness to government officials and to learn from them (personal communication, March 2018).

Other strategies include branding their products like LDWC, who is one of the only OPDs focusing on women and girls with disabilities. QLA for example, recognizes the need to get technical expertise. As the president commented "we don't know everything and we need trained people close to the work they do" (OPD' director, personal communication, March 2018). Other OPDs have stronger leadership that are supporting scaling up process such as AFA and the group of parents that they have contacted in Luang Phabang where they would like to start a center similar to AFA in Vientiane Capital (OPD's director, personal communication, November 2018). OPDs also report having benefited from the OPD network as a way of promoting their activities, working together in bringing awareness of disability rights and connecting with other regional disability networks. Table 4 shows the different strategies employed by OPDs.

Table 4. Strategies employed by OPDs

Strategy	OPDs
Branding their products	LDWC
Getting technical expertise and training locally	QLA, AFA
Having an appropriate and strong leadership	AFA
OPD network	LBA, LDPA, AFA, AFD, LDWC, QLA
Network with other actors particularly with other disability regional organizations or OPDs in Thailand and Vietnam	IDA, AFA, AFD
OPDs' healthy administration model and accountability	QLA, AFA
Partnering with government, particularly with provincial authorities	QLA, LDPA
Partnering with private sector	AFD, AFA
Raising awareness	AFD, LAB, QLA
Minimum planning to scale up	AFA, AFD, VDBA
Seeking community support	AFD, QLA

5. Finding 5 - Scaling up becomes crucial in order to deliver services for persons with disabilities, but OPDs do not have the capacity of the state or funding to fulfill the INGO's demands for larger projects

The National Committee for Disabled People and Elderly (NCDE) does not implement specific programs for persons with disabilities. The disability policy enacted in 2019 does not have regulations in place to mandate other governmental entities to mainstream disability. The government does not provide direct funding for the organizations - INGOs are the main funders for the OPDs. At the same time, most of the OPDs have no access to international funding and have to go through the INGOs to request funding. In Lao there is an INGOs' network that was established in January 2005 with 75 members representing roughly 40% of the INGOs working in Lao PDR (Civil Society Working Group (CSWG) Meeting, June 25, 2019). The INGO network's "primary focus is to facilitate liaison and information sharing among INGOs and other development partners as well as the Government of Laos"[13]. The INGOs' network contributes to closing the gap between the lack of communication and multiplicity of efforts tackling the same objectives amongst INGOs. However, in most cases there is multiplicity of actions with the same populations and the same OPDs funding similar projects. While there is this multiplicity of actions, there is a shift on the side of the donors towards funding larger projects such as the USAID Okard five-year project with three components: health, economic empowerment and stakeholder engagement[14]. The OPD

---

[13] Available at: https://www.directoryofngos.org/home. Last accessed June 2020
[14] Available at: https://www.usaid.gov/laos/fact-sheets/usaid-okard. Last accessed June 2020

network is targeted at implementing the stakeholder engagement component, expecting them to lead the process and work at a community level (INGO staff, personal communications, March, November 2018; May 2019). NPAs like ARMI is new to working on disability related issues; the organization will be working to implement CBID not having worked with this approach before.

6. Finding 6 - Scaling up enablers include the recognition of different organizational cultures and building a strong partnership amongst OPDs, INGOs and government

INGOs have their own organizational culture, meaning that they bring into their work values, norms and codes that are endemic to them. The INGOs face cultural adaptation to the way things are run in Lao and with the organizations they work with. At the same time, the partnerships built are disadvantageous for OPDs: INGOs are the main funders of OPDs and OPDs are highly dependent on these funds and therefore the INGOs have a huge influence on their work.

In relation to scaling up, INGOs are enablers of scaling up when providing training, facilitating dialogue amongst other INGOs-donors, using participatory methods that include OPDs from the beginning of the project cycle and providing a space for reciprocal exchange, as an interviewee, former director of an INGO, explains: " somehow the scaling up was also due to an additional interest specially from INGO and the donors to support CSO (Civil Society Organizations) in Lao PDR they were organizations like [name of an INGO] with more disability specificity who supported and continue to support, the CSO the OPDs started to benefit from all of this proposed to support CSO in general and then they were more like embassies to fund and to support CSO mainstream organizations were willing to support local organizations and OPDs" (INGO staff, personal communication, May 2019).

OPDs consider that is important to be included by the government - for example, the registration process meant for them that they were recognized and publicly acknowledged. OPDs recognized that they had a strong relationship with the government and worked well with them. However, government's support varies between ministries and most of the time depends on the person in charge. Many of the OPDs have public servants as allies helping in the schools or in the health system that facilitate their insertion, to provide more support to their constituents. OPDs seek to include the government from the beginning and try to work with them as they need them to collaborate, especially at a provincial level as one Lao INGO staff member commented: "at the end of the day, we are the ones to stay (referring to Lao staff working in INGOs) and they (referring to international development and humanitarian workers) will leave" (INGO Lao staff member, personal communication, November 2018).

7. Finding 7 - Many scaling up obstacles were recognized, but two obstacles were salient: donor dependency and restrictive laws

Likewise, INGOs and Government are enablers of scaling up, but they are also inhibitors of scaling up processes when they impose their own agenda or delay the approval of the Memorandum of Understanding (an agreement to start the project). Lao Decree 238[15] on Associations released in 2017 imposed restrictions to international funding, for example, excessive supervision of the organization's decisions. A joint letter from INGOs was released to the government in December 2017 that highlighted their concern about the government's power to dissolve and restrict association activities.

Lao government's policy approach with INGOs is to keep control of their activities, for example: every internationally funded project has to be negotiated; it will be approved but only at the government's pace. A project approval could take months and even years. Institutional changes happen at a slow pace and advocacy is one strategy to scale up. OPDs in Lao PDR may not be doing advocacy loudly and openly, but they have learnt how to navigate government and INGO´s control. OPDs involve the government from the beginning, they need them to collaborate and this is also true for those organizations working in remote villages or whose work depends on the access they have to services such as schools. OPDs have realized that collaborating with the government, even if their role in the project implementation is minimal, will benefit the project in the long run. OPDs are not confrontative and they will not show their discontent or their disagreement openly. The Lao non-confrontational way seems to bring an impasse to situations, and this can be frustrating for INGOs and other development agencies that are expecting OPDs to be proactive (Cooper, 2008).

---

[15] Available at: https://www.laocivilsociety.org/resources/decree-association-2017-unofficial-english-translation/ Last accessed June 2020

Recommendations

The Lao case study allows the identification of practical recommendations to contribute to the promotion and replication of useful and fair inclusive innovations.

The Table 5 presents a set of recommendations following the research findings:

Table 5. Key recommendations

	Findings	Related recommendation
1	OPDs' Innovations are simple, contributing to education and economic wellbeing grounds	⇒ HI and other stakeholders do not need to start from scratch: e.g. they have a good database of good practices identified. ⇒ Targeting donors that are willing to scale up might be challenging but there are more international agencies interested in investing for inclusive innovations that have been previously tested. ⇒ HI, other INGOs and OPDs could improve their evaluations and feedback mechanisms finding the appropriate tools and time to follow up.
2	OPDs approach to scaling up is reacting to their immediate needs, but as a network their approach is strategic	⇒ The OPDs' Network could benefit by increasing communication with other NPAs as well as with INGOs and their own network. ⇒ Applying for funding through the network could potentially increase their success rate, as many donors like to see OPDs collaborating in order to have greater impact and reach out to persons with different disabilities.
3	OPDs scale up in different directions by replicating, expanding and improving their practices	⇒ INGOs that are funding OPDs can provide feedback on OPDs' scaling up plan and implementation. They could provide support to develop a guide to scale up and document the steps that OPDs have undertaken.
4	OPDs have put in place a range of scaling up practices that are not planned as scaling up and therefore not documented as such	⇒ HI funding could support OPDs to collect evidence to support the next scaling phase that include the strategies. ⇒ HI should continue to disseminate the results through various means such as public forums and meetings with OPDs to show the external evaluations results.
5	Scaling up becomes crucial to delivering services for persons	⇒ HI could assess the capacity of OPDs prior to partnering with them to implement large projects; issues concerning

		the OPD governance are important for the success of the project.
	with disabilities, but OPDs do not have the capacity of the state or funding to fulfill the INGO's demands for larger projects	⇒ HI could re-evaluate the possibility of partnering with the government to deliver at a larger scale-up, including a cost-benefit analysis. ⇒ INGOs might have to think of how to work with other NPAs that have more capacity to undertake larger projects but who do not have the expertise in disability. ⇒ INGOs should evaluate decentralized management, with OPDs and NPAs partly in charge of delivering results. This research report has not discussed issues of OPDs and INGOs governance, but this would be a general recommendation for INGOs and OPDs. ⇒ INGOs should honor OPDs' independence and foster a collaborative relationship. INGOs have power over local organizations, and the effect of power asymmetries should not be dismissed. OPDs' scaling up is, at present, tied to INGOs as well as their relationship with the government.
6	Scaling up enablers include the recognition of different organizational cultures and building strong partnership amongst OPDs, INGOs and government	⇒ Effective communication and setting realistic objectives and goals based on evidence can help to manage the expectations of multiple stakeholders. ⇒ INGOs can support OPDs in documenting a path to scaling up, as well as designing a scale up plan based on the intervention and its contribution to the bigger problem. ⇒ HI as well as other INGOs have developed participatory tools and guidelines to facilitate partnering with OPDs; these need to be reviewed considering the cultural context. ⇒ HI as well as other INGOs have very knowledgeable staff that have been working in the context of Lao PDR for many years; they work as cultural brokers and facilitate communication amongst partners. They should continue getting support and feedback from their local staff to move things forward with the government and OPDs.

7	Many scaling up obstacles were recognized but two that were salient are donor dependency and restrictive laws of the INGOs towards organizations	⇒ Strengthening the INGO network has proven to be an important tool to withstand government power at the same time that INGOs are trying to make a better effort to align their activities. Increasing these efforts has the potential to result in better resource allocation towards disability inclusion. Donor dependency is a huge problem and INGOs should focus on supporting OPDs' documentation of their own models to find the funding for those kinds of activities.

Conclusion

There is evidence of OPDs' good practices that have scaled up, but these remain as one-time successes, because in most cases there is no funding for expansion, replication or improvement phases. The report showed that OPDs scale in different directions. However, it will be useful to analyze whether the scaling happens on those highlighted inclusive innovations referenced in Finding 1, or there may be others that have not been identified. Furthermore, the role of INGOs as has been shown (Findings 5-7) is crucial for the advancement or regression of OPDs. INGOs need to be aware of the organization's learning processes and consider the context in which they operate, because attempting to make changes from the outside may bring resistance. In this sense INGOs, are also aware of the importance of working with OPDs that are accountable and transparent and they demand this prior to funding projects.

Finally, scaling up raises different expectations on the funders' and implementers' sides (INGOs and OPDs). OPDs tend to focus on what they lack to be able to implement their projects, and less on what they have accomplished in terms of scaling up. At the OPD workshop, the expectation was that the researcher could tell them how to scale up, but there is not one-size-fits-all strategy to scale (field notes, May 2019). Furthermore, OPDs are unaware whether they have gone through scaling up and, at the same time, INGOs expect OPDs to scale up by increasing their capacity and their ability to find their own funding. Regardless of INGOs' funding and support, OPDs have a vision of what and how to scale and implement different strategies. OPDs should focus their efforts on formal planning of and delivering their scaling up pathway as a means of increasing the impact of their inclusive innovations.

References

- Brus Aude (2015) Studies and research at Handicap International: Promoting ethical data management. Lyon: Handicap International.

- Cooper, R. (2011) Culture Shock! A Survival Guide to. Customs and Etiquette Laos. Marshall Cavendish Editions (2nd edition) Kindle Edition.

- Edwards, M., & Hulme, D. (1992). Scaling up NGO Impact on Development: Learning from Experience. Development in Practice, 2(2):77–91.

- ExpandNet, WHO -The World Health Organization (2010). Nine steps for developing a scaling up strategy.

- Gabriel, M. 2014. Making it Big: Strategies for scaling social innovations. National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA), (July), 1–61.

- George, G., Mcgahan, A. M., & Prabhu, J. (2012). Innovation for Inclusive Growth: Towards a Theoretical Framework and a Research Agenda. Journal of Management Studies, 49(4), 661–683.

- Gunn, G. C. (1990) Winds of Change. Asian Survey 31(1): 87–93. DOI: 10.2307/2645189.

- Hossain, M. (2016). Grassroots innovation: A systematic review of two decades of research. Journal of Cleaner Production, 137 (September 2015), 973–981.

- Lao People's Democratic Republic (2016) 8th Five Year National Socio-Economic Development Plan 2016-2020. Ministry of Planning and Investment Vientiane, Ministry of Planning.

- Lao Statistics Bureau. (2016). The 4th Population and Housing Census (PHC) 2015. Lao Statistics Bureau, 280pp.

- Maxwell, Joseph A. (2013). *Qualitative Research Design. An Interactive Approach.* USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Moore, M. Riddell, D. & Vocisano, D. (2015). Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep Strategies of Non-profits in Advancing Systemic Social Innovation. Journal of Corporate Citizenship. 58: 67-84.

- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. In Journal of Counseling Psychology.

- Mulgan, G. (2006). The Process of Social Innovation. Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization 1(2):145-162.

- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16(1), 1–13.

- Ragin, Charles, & Amoroso, Lisa (2011). *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. CA: Pine Forge: Thousand Oaks.

- Rossman, Gretchen B., & Rallis, Sharon F. (2012). Learning in the Field. An Introduction to Qualitative Research. Kindle Version.

- UN General Assembly (2015) [Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development](), 21 October 2015, A/RES/70/1.

- Uvin, P. (1995). Fighting hunger at the grassroots: Paths to scaling up. World Development, 23(6): 927-939.

Abbreviations

ACDA	Aid Children with Disability Association
AFA	Association for Autism
AFD	Association for the Deaf
APCD	Asian Pacific Center for Disability
CBID	Community based inclusive development
CBR	Community based rehabilitation
CDPED	Committee for Disabled People and the Elderly at district level
CDPEP	Committee for Disabled People and the Elderly at provincial level
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CF	Child Fund
CMR	Centre of Medical Rehabilitation
COPE	Cooperative Orthotic and Prosthetic Enterprise
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
CRS	Catholic Relief Service
DHC	Department of Health Care
DRET	Disability Rights and Equality Training
DSS	Department of Social Security
DSW	Department of Social Welfare
HEF	Health Equity Fund
HI	Humanity & Inclusion
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
IDU- IDA	Intellectual Disability Unit (there after Association)
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
LDPA	Lao Disabled People's Association
LBA	Lao Blind Association
LDWDC	Lao Disabled Women's Development Centre
LSB	Lao Statistics Bureau
LWU	Lao Women Union
LYU	Lao Youth Union
MoES	Ministry of Education and Sports
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare
MoNRE	Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment
MoPI	Ministry of Planning and Investment
MoPS	Ministry of Public Security
MoPWT	Ministry of Public Works and Transport

NCAW	National Commission for the Advancement of Women
NCDE	National Committee for Disabled People and the Elderly
NCMC	National Commission for Mothers and Children
NPA	Non-profit associations
NSEDP	National Socio-Economic Development Plan
NA	National Assembly
NUL	National University of Lao PDR
OPDs	Organizations of Persons with Disabilities
PBO	Provincial Branch Office of Lao Disabled People Association (LDPA)
PDR	People's Democratic Republic
QLA	Quality of Life Association
SCI	Save the Children International
SDGs	Sustainable Developments Goals
SL	Sign language
SDDPA	Saysetha District for Disabled People Association
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
UXO	Unexploded Ordinances
VDBA	Vocational Development for Blind Association
VCDPA	Vientiane Capital for Disabled People Association
WFD	World Federation of the Deaf
WHS	World Health Survey
WEL	World Education Lao PDR
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization
WV	World Vision

Appendices

1. Map of Lao PDR

2. Interview guides

Interview protocol for policy makers (Lao PDR)

Areas to cover:

- General information of the role of the public servant
- General information of the public body (mission, vision and policy areas covered)
- Relationship with Disability Peoples' Organizations (OPDs) and that includes any kind of support (financial, in-kind, training, technical)
- Relationship with different stakeholders (INGOs, UN) including HI
- Scaling up processes and experiences related within the public sector

Interview guide:

1. What is the name of the public entity you work for?
2. What is your role in the public entity you work for?
3. What is the main purpose of the public entity?
4. What are some of the relevant projects this public entity is working on persons with disabilities?
5. How is this public entity working to implement the National Strategy and Action Plan on Persons with Disabilities 2017-25?
6. How is this public entity working with other stakeholders (HI, other international organizations, United Nations agencies, community-based organizations, Disability People's Organizations)?
7. How is scaling up understood in the public entity?
8. Are there any experiences of scaling up projects that can be considered to be contributing to the rights of persons with disabilities, in particular women and girls with disabilities?
9. What is this public entity and the government of Laos doing to support scaling up processes of grassroots organizations and Disability People's Organizations (OPDs)?

Interview protocol for Disability People's Organizations (OPDs) in Lao PDR

Areas to cover:

- General information of the interviewee (years working in the organization and role)
- General information about the organization (Year founded, mission, vision)
- Relations and networking (relationship with other organizations, communities, government, funders, others)
- Areas of expertise (Main projects and those related to women and girls with disabilities, geographical areas covered)
- Practice presented and selected by HI-MIW (description and success)
- Identifying good practices that are particularly related to working with women and girls with disabilities (criteria to select good practices)
- Follow up to scale up (draw from the data analysis of the interviews of the organizations in the first call the questions will address issues concerning useful resources and challenges to scale up)

Interview guide:

- Demographics
  1. How long have you been working in the organization?
  2. What are your main responsibilities?
- Organization' background
  3. When and why was the organization founded?
  4. What's the mission of the organization?
  5. What are their main projects?
  6. How is the organization's engagement in policy making processes? What are the contacts with policy making processes? How do you contribute?
  7. What's the relationship with other stakeholders? Other organizations?
  8. What's the relationship with the government?
- Good practice
  9. How do you describe the organization's good practice?
  10. What make your practice a good one?
- Scale up
  11. How are you planning to scale up your practice? Or what are the steps that you have followed to scale up your practice?
  12. What do you think it will need to happen for the scale up to be successful?
  13. What would you see using of what you learnt in this workshop to scale up?

Interview protocol for HI Lao Team

Areas to cover:

- General information of the interviewee (years working in the organization and role)
- General information about HI Lao PDR (starting year of operation, mission, vision related to the overall work done by HI)
- Relationship with Lao PDR government
- Main projects carried out by HI La PDR alone or with other stakeholders
- Relationship with OPDs
- Main policy concerns of Lao PDR
- Potential good practices that have been identified over the past five years that have or could have been scale up: What worked and what didn't? And why is that?
- Current potential good practices that can be scale up
- Relevance of scaling up good practices to the work of HI Lao PDR

Interview guide:

1. How long have you been working for HI?
2. What is your position and main responsibilities?
3. What are the main projects of HI in Lao PDR?
4. How is the relationship of HI Lao PDR team with other stakeholders? Government, UN agencies, other international organizations?
5. How is the relationship with OPDs? In what ways has HI being working with OPDs?
6. What are the main policy concerns for HI in Lao PDR?
7. What is your understanding of scaling up good practices?
8. Have you identified good practices of OPDs, grassroots organizations u others than can be scale up?
9. In what ways has HI Lao PDR be involved in scaling up good practices for persons with disabilities, particularly focusing on women and girls with disabilities?

3. List of Institutions- Interviews and informal conversations

Institution	Acronym
Association for Autism	AFA
Asia Regional Hub CBM International	CBM
Aid Children With Disability Association	ACDA
ASEAN DISABILITY FORUM	
Association for Development of Women and Legal Education	
Association for Rural Mobilisation and Improvement	ARMI
Association for the Deaf	AFD
Basic Needs	
Caritas International	
Catholic Relief Services	CRS
ChildFund	
CORD-LAO	CORD
Department of health care and rehabilitation	
Disability Service Center	DSC
European Union Delegation Lao PDR	EU
French Embassy in Lao	
Hat Hae Primary School-PAKSE	
Humanity & Inclusion	HI
Intellectual Disability Unit	IDU
KinderGarden-PAKSE	
Lao Association of the Blind	LAB
Lao Disabled People Association	LDPA
Lao Disabled Women's Development Centre	LDWDC
Lao Statistics Bureau	LSB
Lao Women Union	LWU
Laos - Australia Development Learning Facility	LADLF
Ministry of Education and Sports	MoES
Ministry of Home Affairs	MoHA
National Commission for the Advancement of Women, Mothers and Children Secretariat	NCAWMC
National Committee for Disabled People and the Elderly	NCDE
National University of Lao	NUL
Oxfam Lao	
Plan International	PI
Primary School-VTE	
Quality of Life Association	QLA
Save the Children	
Saysetha District for Disabled People Association	SDDPA
Secondary SchooL-VTE	
Service Fraternel d'Entraide	SFA

UN Women Lao PDR	UN Women
Unicef	
Vocational Development for Blind Association	VDBA
World Education	WE
World Health Organization-Lao PDR	WHO
World Vision	WV

4. Interpreter code of conduct[16]

Confidentiality: Interpreters must treat all information learned during the interpretation as confidential.

Accuracy: Conveying the content an spirit of what is said: Interpreters must transmit the message in a thorough and faithful manner, giving consideration to linguistic variation in both languages and conveying the tone and spirit of the original message. A word-for-word interpretation may not convey the intended idea. The interpreter must determine the relevant concept and say it in language that is readily understandable and culturally appropriate to the listener. In addition, the interpreter will make every effort to assure that the client has understood questions, instructions and other information transmitted by the service provider.

Completeness: Conveying everything that is said: Interpreters must interpret everything that is said by all people in the interaction, without omitting, adding, condensing or changing anything. If the content to be interpreted might be perceived as offensive, insensitive or otherwise harmful to the dignity and well-being of the client, the interpreter should advise the researcher of this before interpreting. If interpreter is taking notes to aid in ensuring the complete message is relayed, notes will be destroyed immediately following the session.

Conveying cultural frameworks: Interpreters shall explain cultural differences or practices to the researcher, when appropriate.

Non-judgmental attitude about the content to be interpreted: An interpreter's function is to facilitate communication. Interpreters are not responsible for what is said by anyone for whom they are interpreting. Even if the interpreter disagrees with what is said, thinks it is wrong, an untruth, or even immoral, the interpreter must suspend judgment, make no comment, and interpret everything accurately.

Client self-determination: The interpreter may be asked by the client for his or her opinion. When this happens, the interpreter may provide or restate information that will assist the client in making his or her own decision. The interpreter will not influence the opinion of clients by telling them what action to take.

Attitude toward clients: The interpreter should strive to develop a relationship of trust and respect at all times with the client by adopting a caring, attentive, yet discreet and impartial attitude toward the client, toward his or her questions, concerns and needs.

---

[16] Adapted from and retrieved from Kansas State Department of Education:
http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/Title/ESOL/Interpreter-CodeofEthicsSample.pdf

The interpreter shall treat each client equally with dignity and respect regardless of race, color, gender, religion, nationality, political persuasion or life-style choice.

Acceptance of Assignments: If level of competency or personal sentiments make it difficult to abide by any of the above conditions, the interpreter shall decline or withdraw from the assignment.

Interpreters should disclose any real or perceived conflict of interest that could affect their objectivity. For example, interpreters should refrain from providing services to family members or close personal friends except in emergencies. In personal relationships, it is difficult to remain unbiased or non-judgmental.

In emergency situations, interpreters may be asked to do interpretations for which they are not qualified. The interpreter may consent only as long as all parties understand the limitations and no other, better qualified, interpreter is available.

Compensation: The fee agreed upon by the researcher, and the interpreter is the only compensation that the interpreter may accept. Interpreters will not accept additional money.

Self-evaluation: Interpreters shall represent their certification(s), training and experience accurately and completely.

Ethical violations: Interpreters shall withdraw immediately from encounters that they perceive to be in violation of the Code of Ethics.

Professionalism: Interpreters shall be punctual, prepared and dressed in an appropriate manner. The trained interpreter is a professional who maintains professional behavior at all times while assisting clients and who seeks to further his or her knowledge and skills through continuing studies and training.

By signing this document, I am verifying that I have read, understand and agree to all the provisions listed in the above Code of Ethics.

Name (printed):

Interpreter agency or company:

Language(s) used:

E-mail address:

Date:

Phone:

_____

Signature

5. Consent form template in English

You are being asked to share your views about good practices in relation to community social innovations projects that have improved the lives of persons with disabilities in particular women and girls with disabilities. You have the right to ask questions about this research before you begin the interview as well as any time during the study. The researcher is Ana María Sánchez Rodríguez and she will be happy to answer your questions. She can be reached at the following email address: anamaria.sanchezrodriguez@mu.ie

The principal purpose of the research is to understand how community social innovations can be scaled up on behalf of persons with disabilities. The interview is expected to last approximately one hour. If you agree to being interviewed please remember that you may terminate the interview at any time by informing the interviewer.

You have the following options to protect the confidentiality of your interview data and you can change your options at any time.

Please check the option you prefer:

- ❑ Option A: Limited confidentiality. This option means that you won't be identified as the source of the excerpt. The information gathered for this project will not be published or presented in a way that would allow anyone to identify you.
- ❑ Option B: Attributed source. This option means that you would like to include your name when we refer to excerpts from your interview responses are used (e.g., in a direct quote).

This study involves the recording of your interview with the researcher. The recordings will be transcribed and erased once the transcriptions are checked for accuracy. Transcripts of your interview may be reproduced in whole or in part for use in presentations or written products that result from this study. Immediately following the interview, you will be given the opportunity to have the recording erased if you wish to withdraw your consent to recording.

Please check the following boxes to consent to participate:

❑ By ticking this box I consent to having your interview taped and transcribed;

By ticking this box I consent to use the written transcript in presentations and written products

Finally, If during your participation in this study you feel the information and guidelines that you were given have been neglected or disregarded in any way, or if you are unhappy about the process, please contact the Secretary of the Maynooth University Ethics Committee at research.ethics@mu.ie or +353 (0)1 708 6019. Please be assured that your concerns will be dealt with in a sensitive manner.

Signatures

I have read the consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I consent to participate in this study. I also certify that I am 18 years of age or older.

_____   _____   _____

Signature of Participant   Date   Signature of Researcher

_____   _____

Printed Name of Participant   Typed/Printed Name of Researcher

6. Workshop planning

First Workshop on Scaling

Day: 24th May, 2019

Participants: Disability People´s Organizations

Duration: 2pm to 5 pm.

Place: LDPA

Office Supplies:
- Flipcharts
- Pens
- Projector
- Scotch
- Coffee Break for 20 people

Interpreters:
- Interpreter Lao-English
- Interpreter sign language

Objectives for the DPOs:

DPOs good practices:
1. Recall their good practices and recognize what made them successful
2. Identify strategies employed that were useful to the success of the practice
3. Identify the changes produced- anecdotally or story telling

DPOs scaling their good practice
1. Understanding what scaling is and how it is referred in their context
2. Identify the scaling dimensions and how are these happening in their organization
3. Identify actions that have unintentionally led to scaling their good practice

Agenda

Time	Activity	Purpose	Description
2.00 pm	Introductions - explaining purpose of the workshop and providing a quick summary of the status of my research project	Making sure that everyone knows who is in the room and that we learnt from everyone's expectations	Go around the room and answer: Hobby Why are we here What we expect from this workshop
2.15 pm	Part 1. Revisiting the good practice- work in teams and chose one to present (2 to 3 groups)	Recalling your good practice. Each organization will describe their practice to the other team members 1. Briefly describe your practice, recall the objective 2. In what terms you practise was targeting inclusion for persons with disabilities 3. What make your practice a good one? 4. Have you developed or improved your practise? How? 5. Tell a story for your practice success	Work individually to recall your practice and answer the questions. Share your answers with the members. Chose the story to role play it- how could the story be portrayed instead of portrayed limited time.

3. 15 pm	BREAK		Coffee break, instant coffee, fruit and cookies
3.30 pm	Part 2. Understanding scaling and the scaling process	Discussing about the scaling dimensions, recognising the types of scaling that my organizations is going through. In what ways my organization is scaling and, if not, my practice?	Presenting scaling dimensions and stages- translate
4.00 pm	Part 3. Explaining briefly components of a scaling plan	How are you planning to scale up your practice? Or what are the steps that you have followed to scale up your practice? What do you think it will need to happen for the scale up to be successful?	Distribute plan template to fill in- start filling and I will follow up
4.30 pm	Wrapping up- conclusions	1. How did you find the workshop useful for the work of your organization? 2. What could be improved? 3. Are you interested in a second workshop to	Distribute evaluation forms

| | | follow up the work that we did here?

4. What will be important for you to learn specifically on scaling?

Mac

1. How did you find the workshop useful for the work of your organization?
2. What could be improved?
3. Are you interested in a second workshop to follow up the work that we did here?
4. What will be important for you to learn specifically on scaling? | |
| 5.00 pm | END OF WORKSHOP | | |

**How to scale up community-based social innovations
for better inclusive policies? Lao PDR as a case study**

This report is part of a larger research that analyses and promotes effective community level innovations that can be scaled up and inform the development or revision of government policy to enforce the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for persons with disabilities, with a particular focus on women and girls with disabilities. The study builds on the observation that good practices exist on inclusion of persons with disabilities in the SDG areas, but too often take the form of one-off pilot projects or confined social innovations. Therefore, it is important to explore how to scale up good practices understanding scaling up as influencing, repeating, adapting and ensuring social change for vulnerable populations, in particular for persons with disabilities.

This report addresses the research question: How is scaling up of Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs)' inclusive innovations happening and promoted? And it does this by exploring Lao PDR as a case study (qualitative research conducted in 2018-2019).

The findings show that there are small inclusive innovations of OPDs that experience limited scaling up that need to be recognized as such. In the same way that scaling up strategies have to be promoted this research provides recommendations for the stakeholders to contribute to that.

This report targets Humanity & Inclusion staff, practitioners and other international organizations working with OPDs to strengthen and improve the scope of their actions.