

THE MEGA MONGOLIA PROJECT

**Utilization Focused Evaluation for Development Research to
Empower All Mongolians through Information Communications
Technology**

UFE researcher: Bazar Chimed (Ph.D)

UFE Consultant: Sonal Zaveri, (Ph.D)

UFE Facilitator: Batpurev Batchuluun

Ulaanbaatar 2011

Table of contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Utilization Focused Evaluation	4
2. UFE STEPS: BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF STEPS FOLLOWED BY DREAMIT	7
3. FINDINGS	11
3.1 Planning	12
3.1.1 Analysis of Findings	12
3.1.2 Recommendations for the Board	15
3.2 Capacity Building:	17
3.2.1 Analysis of findings	18
3.2.2 Recommendations for the Board	20
3.3 Management	21
3.3.1 Analysis of findings	22
3.3.2 Recommendations for the Board	26
3.4 Project sustainability and policy influence	27
3.4.1 Analysis of findings	28
3.4.2 Recommendations for the Board	33
4. USES AND USERS OF THE UFE STUDY	34
5. CHECKLIST AND GUIDELINE FOR PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT	35
5.1 Proposal assessment for innovation projects in addition to traditional proposal appraisals	35
5.2 Guidelines for managing innovative projects additional to usual management principals	36
6. NOTES FROM DREAMIT BOARD DISCUSSION ON UFE STUDY	38
7. ATTACHMENTS	40
7.1. Attachment #1 – List of people interviewed.	40
7.2. Attachment #2 – Interview guide	41
7.3. Attachment #3 – List of trainings and participants	47

List of abbreviations

ICPTA	Information Communication Technology and Post Agency
ICT	Information Communication Technology
UFE/U-FE	Utilization Focused Evaluation
IDRC	International Development Research Center of Canada
DREAMIT	Development of Research Capacities of Mongolia through ICT project
OPSH	Online psychological service for health professionals project
BTEP	Blended Technology Education Project (BTEP): Using Technology to Level the Education Playing Field in Mongolia project
CDUC	Curriculum development of University Computing and ICT Education in Mongolia project
GESI	GES Information System to motivate reliable business relation for Gobi eco-system project
IREP	Improving the Responsiveness and Efficiency of Public Sector's Information Services Provision in Mongolia project
ECPP	Engaging citizen participation in the Parliamentary legislative process project
GES	Gobi Eco System
AoM	Academy of Management
UB	Ulaanbaatar city
NGO	Non Government Organization
MCA-M	Millennium Challenge Account Mongolia
EduTV	Education TV channel

1. Introduction

DREAM IT is a program of projects, which has been developed to address policy, infrastructure, development, innovation, capacity building and other challenges faced by the country's ICT sector as it deploys ICT-based activities and initiatives. DREAM IT (Development Research to Empower All Mongolians through Information Communication Technology) is a complex program, which has been developed to direct the operations of researchers to investigate the country's policy and innovation in the sector of ICT (Information and Communication Technology) and the socio-economic impact of it. This is a 3-year project, which is implemented with the support of Canadian International Development Research Centre and it is designed to develop the capacities of researchers and research managers to achieve their stated proposal objectives, as well as to strengthen strategic linkages and knowledge sharing opportunities among the sub-projects.

The main objective of DREAM IT project is to influence the development of ICT sector and further the progress of entire Mongolia through policy, consumption (utility) and socio-economic research projects.

The project has following outcomes:

- Policy and decision makers will have more knowledge about the specific issues of the sector and the result of researches.
- Will get up-level knowledge about the influence of technology in the field of development-problem solving.
- The abilities of research and service organizations will improve through using and piloting ICT.
- Will get a better knowledge about the advantages and weaknesses of the ICT use in Mongolia.

The "DREAM IT" project is managed by Project Board at the umbrella level, whose primary roles and responsibilities relate to management, coordination, cooperation, and oversight of the sub-projects, generating new ideas, research and studies, implementing capacity building of stakeholders involved in the project, and influencing policy-making process at sector and national levels.

The sub-projects included in "DREAM IT" Mega Mongolia project were proposed from non-governmental organizations (NGOs), government organizations, research and education institutions, and researchers (mainly research teams). These include ICT-related projects in education, health, environment, and governance projects as follows:

- Sub-project#1. "Online psychological service for health professionals",
- Sub-project #2. "Blended Technology Education Project (BTEP): Using Technology to Level the Education Playing Field in Mongolia",
- Sub-project #3. "Curriculum development of University Computing and ICT Education in Mongolia",

- Sub-project #4. “GES Information System to motivate reliable business relation for Gobi eco-system”
- Sub-project #5. “Improving the Responsiveness and Efficiency of Public Sector’s Information Services Provision in Mongolia”,
- Sub-project #6. “Engaging citizen participation in the Parliamentary legislative process”.

1.1 Utilization Focused Evaluation

1.1.1 Selection of Projects

Four sub-projects were involved in the “Utilization Focused Evaluation ” (UFE). The **purpose** for the UFE was to understand how DREAMIT could better manage its projects so that it could fulfill its management oversight role. Towards that end four projects were selected for the UFE – two of them had been able to complete its objectives on time and two had not. By comparing these two sets of projects, DREAMIT would learn how to develop guidelines for better results based management for new projects. This was the intended use of the UFE. The Board would be able to, based on the UFE findings, redesign its management to better support new projects.

At the time of this evaluation, DREAMIT had six (6) sub projects ongoing. Board has discussed and decided to choose 4 of them for UFE evaluation. Criterion for selection was 1) Equal representation of ‘delayed’ and ‘on track’ projects, 2) Willingness of the sub project to be evaluated and 3) Equal representation of Sector/theme of the sub project.

These selected four (4) sub-projects were:

Delayed Projects:

- a. Sub-project#1. “Online psychological service for health professionals”

The project was an innovative one as

- a) there was no online psychological counseling available for health professionals although there was evidence that there was high levels of job stress
- b) the web design was developed to provide easy access to information and also utilize various training materials using modern counseling techniques through music, picture and color therapy as well as games and activities.
- c) Along with this group counseling techniques were also used for some face to face meetings to cater to the larger number of professionals seeking help.

Up to the beginning of this project, psychological counseling was available only in a few specialized hospitals (such as cancer center).

The project was implemented by Health Science University of Mongolia in collaboration with an NGO Setgeliin Toli. The baseline study and overall management was by the University and the counseling was by the NGO.

One year into the project (the project was for 18 months), the project was delayed because the baseline study took a very long time as ethical permission had to be taken from the Ministry of Health and the study itself was very large and difficult to develop because no one had done it earlier.

Participation of the health professionals for the online counseling was very low. For these reasons, this project was selected as one of the delayed projects in terms of time and work plan for understanding how DREAMIT should manage such projects better.

- b. Sub-project #4. “GES Information System to motivate reliable business relation for Gobi eco-system

This project was very innovative. Although Mongolia has a number of eco-system related projects, this was innovative because it a) was implemented at the ‘soum’ level (second lowest administrative level) b) involved a tripartite cooperation model with herders, mining company and local government c) introduced herders to 21st century technologies such as the ICT d) contributed to the ‘soum’ access to internet providing various equipments and connectivity and e) involved the local school as a center for internet communication.

The project attempted several new strategies: 1) created a local NGO of herders, civil society organizations (the local school) and decision makers such as local ‘bagh’, ecology inspector and 2) developed a new ICT based communication model with traditional herders who had limited contact with local officials and mining companies.

Implementation was by this local newly created NGO and a private partnership with JEMR who facilitated the NGO, provided computer systems to the project and developed the software for the tripartite communication.

This project had many roadblocks. Along with the natural disaster of severe winter called ‘dzud’ when herders were not available, the project was delayed on many counts including the software and hardware setup for the tripartite communication and the remoteness of the project location.

On track Projects

- c. Sub-project #2. “Blended Technology Education Project (BTEP): Using Technology to Level the Education Playing Field in Mongolia”

Distance education through internet and mobile is not new to Mongolia but this project for the first time blended three technologies – internet, mobile and television to provide a more comprehensive learning experience. This project piggybacked on a new channel – Education TV that was national broadcast (only one of two channels to do so at that time). Hence an opportunity that was available was used. The teachers were exposed to this blended technology for the first time as well. The project evaluated how well children using this technology learned in rural versus urban schools.

In terms of software, the project built up on the findings from a previous IDRC project Pandora which evaluated learning management systems.

The project was implemented by Education TV and two schools, one in UB city and another in Tuv Aimag, Erdene Soum.

The project was completed on time, evaluated the differences in learning between the schools and made recommendations to the Ministry of Education. It must be stated that although findings were available, the Ministry requires three years of piloting for a new method to be used widely (and this project had only 12 months work experience).

d. Sub-project #5. “Improving the Responsiveness and Efficiency of Public Sector’s Information Services Provision in Mongolia”

This project innovated the use of ICT for a) government to efficiently and effectively provide information to its citizens and b) citizens to give feedback directly and instantly to the government. This project not only enabled two way communications between government and citizens but also helped the government understand the citizens’ demand for different types of information.

The project was implemented by the Cabinet Secretariat of the Govt. of Mongolia in collaboration with the Academy of Management (also a government body).

In one year, the project completed its objectives and recommended that 1) all government ministries and UB city governor’s office should set up appropriate information databases (e.g. land rights) which is easily accessible by the citizens 2) develop brochures and handbooks including most asked queries from citizens for wide dissemination informing the citizens 3) establish citizen information center at government ministries

These two sets of projects formed the sample of the UFE to analyze differences in

- planning,
- capacity building,
- management practices and
- Sustainability and policy influence of the projects.

1.1.2 Methodology

The design was qualitative using an interview schedule. The sample consisted of the following:

1. Project leader
2. Board members of DREAM IT project
3. Sub-project leaders and project team members
4. Beneficiaries of the project (only one – Gobi ecosystem, a delayed project)

Total number of people interviewed were 25. (See list of persons interviewed in Attachment One and the Interview Guide in Attachment Two)

Analysis was qualitative and triangulation was used to confirm findings. The report provides suggestions or recommendations based on the findings, which needs to be considered in the future management of innovative projects.

2. UFE Steps: Brief description of steps followed by DREAMIT

1. Program/Organizational Readiness Assessment	
Primary Tasks	Evaluation Facilitation Challenges
<u>Premise</u> : Key people who want the evaluation conducted need to understand and be interested in a utilization-focused evaluation (U-FE).	<u>Premise</u> : U-FE requires active and skilled guidance from and facilitation by an evaluation facilitator.
<i>DREAMIT was committed and ready to spend time and resources after the PAN all Partner meeting in Penang.</i>	<i>Mrs. Sonal Zaveri was appointed as UFE consultant to DREAMIT by DECI project while DREAMIT chose Mr. B.Batpurev as he had some evaluation experience in Outcome mapping.</i>
2. Evaluator Readiness and Capability Assessment	
<u>Premise</u> : Facilitating and conducting a utilization-focused evaluation requires a particular philosophy and special skills.	<u>Premise</u> : Evaluation facilitators need to know their strengths and limitations and develop the skills needed to facilitate utilization-focused evaluations.
<i>DREAMIT had a workshop on UFE to build the necessary skill of the evaluator and the project stakeholders. (20, 21 April 2010)</i>	<i>Although B.Batpurev understood the UFE it was not possible for him to undertake the task alone since he was a board member and had other responsibilities. So another person had to be recruited because full time dedication was required for some period. There was no budget to hire this person and DREAMIT had to approach</i>

	<p><i>IDRC for budget allocation. So Ch. Bazar was contracted for 3 month period from 15, July 2010. She was appointed after the workshop so it took some time to orient herself in UFE and DREAMIT.</i></p>
<p>3. Identification of Primary Intended Users</p>	
<p><u>Premise:</u> Primary intended users are people who have a direct, identifiable stake in the evaluation and meet the criteria below to some extent. (Caveat: These judgments are necessarily subjective and negotiable.)</p>	<p><u>Premise:</u> The U-FE facilitator needs to both assess the characteristics of primary intended users and reinforce characteristics that will contribute to evaluation use.</p>
<p><i>We had to change the original topic of the UFE’s study (outcome assessment of sub project #1.) after the UFE workshop held in Mongolia because the project was delayed, had yet to start implementation and therefore had no outcome to assess. As a result the topic of UFE was changed to understand how DREAMIT could manage projects better so that they achieve results.</i></p>	<p><i>Primary intended users were easily identified as the Board of DREAMIT. DREAMIT Board members</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. D.Enkhbat, member of Parliamant, leader of Green party • Z.Batbold, DREAMIT Project Leader • B.Batpurev, CEO of ITCS Co.,Ltd and InfoCon LLC • L.Ariunaa, CEO of Intec Co.,Ltd • B.Burmaa, .MN domain director, Datacom Co.,Ltd • G.Enkhbold, CEO of Datacom Co.,Ltd • S.Enkhjargal, executive director of MIDAS NGO and CEO of ITEM Co.,ltd <p><i>B.Batpurev was also Board member and UFE facilitator it was easy to get approval from the Board. Batbold, the Project Manager (of all six projects) would be the ‘link’ to the Board and participate in all UFE meetings.</i></p>
<p>4. Situational Analysis</p>	
<p><u>Premises:</u> Evaluation use is people- and context-dependent. Use is likely to be</p>	<p><u>Premise:</u> The evaluator has responsibility to identify, assess, understand, and act on</p>

enhanced when the evaluation takes into account and is adapted to crucial situational factors such as those below.	situational factors that may affect use.
<i>It was not problem at all since the Board was willing to cooperate and use the outcomes for better management of DREAMIT projects.</i>	<i>UFE researcher (Mrs. Chimed Bazar) was assisted by the Board member so there was no problem.</i>
5. Identification of Primary Intended Uses	
<u>Premise:</u> Intended use by primary intended users is the U-FE goal of the evaluation.	<u>Premise:</u> The rich menu of evaluation options are reviewed, screened, and prioritized to focus the evaluation.
<i>Intended use was very clearly identified as it had emerged from analysis of why the 1st sub project originally selected for UFE could not be used (delayed project). Evaluation was meant to help the board with other projects that were also delayed as well as what were the factors that helped the project to be on time/track. The UFE help make better management.</i>	<i>Discussions were held with the board who decided that we should compare two delayed and two on time project and extended the scope of study to four projects.</i>
6. Focusing the Evaluation	
<u>Premise:</u> The focus derives from primary intended uses of the evaluation by primary intended users.	<u>Premise:</u> Primary intended users will often need considerable assistance identifying and agreeing on priority evaluation uses and the major focus for the evaluation.
<i>Number of Key Evaluation Questions were reviewed by the Board and finalized. (The key questions were developed using a framework by Jess Dart. For the DREAMIT Project, the KEQ appear in the findings analysis</i>	<i>UFE Researcher helped to finalised the questions and it was reviewed by the Board and Consultant and finalized. Several meetings with Project Leader and UFE Facilitator were held to achieve this.</i>
7. Evaluation Design	
<u>Premises:</u> The evaluation should be designed to lead to useful findings. Methods should be selected and the evaluation designed to support and achieve intended use by primary intended users.	<u>Premise:</u> Evaluators and users have varying responsibilities in the design decision-making process.
<i>The nature of the KEQ led to a qualitative study and understand the viewpoint of both the Board members and sub-project implementers. Triangulation of these findings with projects reports helped to verify the findings.</i>	<i>UFE Researcher and Facilitator jointly decided on methods for data collection and interviewing. UFE researcher did independent interviews and she was outsider to the project so people could openly talk to her. She also had focus</i>

	<i>group discussions and interview. All interviews were made face-to-face. UFE Researcher, Facilitator and designated Board member Mr. S.Enkhjargal visited and interviewed one of the project site in Nomgon soum, Umnugobi province.</i>
8. Simulation of Use	
<u>Premise:</u> Before data are collected, a simulation of potential use can be done with fabricated findings in a real-enough way to provide a meaningful learning experience for primary intended users.	<u>Premise:</u> It's important to move discussions of use from the abstract to the concrete, and a simulation of use based on fabricated data helps do that.
<i>Data was fabricated for findings indicating a worst case and best case scenario and necessary changes made to the KEQ .</i>	<i>UFE researcher, facilitator and Project Leader Mr. Z.Batbold had reviewed and discussed the scenario and added sections like Policy influence and sustainability because that would help in the use of the findings.</i>
9. Data Collection	
<u>Premise:</u> Data collected should be managed with use in mind.	<u>Premise:</u> It's important to keep primary intended users informed and involved throughout all stages of the process.
<i>UFE researcher continuously informed about the progress and certain key findings to the facilitator. In some of the interviews primary users were present which could help how the findings of the study could be used. This was intentional.</i>	<i>UFE researcher and facilitator was in continuous contact with Project leader and informed about the findings and noted of any changes.</i>
10. Data Analysis	
<u>Premise:</u> Analysis should be organized to facilitate use by primary intended users.	<u>Premise:</u> Facilitating data interpretation among primary intended users increases their understanding of the findings, their sense of ownership of the evaluation, and their commitment to use the results
<i>Organization of data was revised several times and came to tabular format so that busy Board members (who are business man and politician) could easily interpret the findings and take action.</i>	<i>All revisions were done with UFE facilitator and interpretation was discussed at every step. And raw data was referred for double checking.</i>
11. Facilitation of Use	
<u>Premise:</u> Use doesn't just happen	<u>Premise:</u> Facilitating use is a central part

naturally; it needs to be facilitated.	of the evaluator's job.
<i>We found out new uses from the data collected and this will be presented to the Board and decision will be made for actual use of the study. From managing projects we realized that innovative projects required different type of management. This was a very useful insight for the Board.</i>	<i>Planning to use the guidelines and checklist for new projects that are under consideration for approval and implementation.</i>
12. Metaevaluation	
<u>Premise:</u> Utilization-focused evaluations should be evaluated by whether primary intended users used the evaluation in intended ways.	<u>Premise:</u> A U-FE facilitator can learn something from each evaluation.
<i>Two new project proposals were scrutinized using the using the checklist and guidelines prior to actual implementation. And this was shared with IDRC and the Board, proposals were revised.</i>	<i>UFE facilitator understood that UFE can help improve management of projects and processes.</i>

3. Findings

Findings from the interviews were analyzed according to a) planning b) capacity building c) Management and d) Sustainability and policy influence. For each of the sections data was analyzed in terms of 'delayed' and 'on track' projects, analyzing the view of both implementers and board members. All interviewees were asked 'How do we do better next time?' for each section. Details are given in the second table of each section indicating recommendations for use of the findings for both short and long term.

The key questions (sub-questions are available in the interview guide in Attachment Two). The findings from the interviews have been summarized in the tables below. On the left hand side, column one are the key questions, followed by a summary of findings from interviews with staff of the delayed projects and the Board members regarding the delayed projects. Columns four and five summarize the findings from interviews from staff of the on track projects (column 4) and from the Board members for the on track projects (column 5)

Each 'findings table' is followed by recommendations – short term and long term.

3.1 Planning

The key questions were:

- *Were the projects planned realistically in terms of activities, time, budget and staff?*
- *What was the role of the DREAMIT board members during the planning process of the sub-projects?*
- *To what extent were the roles, responsibilities and tasks clearly defined and followed of Subproject leader, Subproject team members, DREAMIT designated Board member for the subproject, DREAMIT project leader?*
- *What do we do better next time?*

All projects received support for planning from IDRC, DREAMIT board both informally and formally. This included several reviews of project proposals. Most projects had unrealistic time and work schedules – either too much work in too little time or too little work in too much time and through discussion with the sub project leaders, necessary modifications were made in planning the activities, budget and staff. Standard plan of action was developed for all projects.

The training on Project Management however took place after the projects had been approved or started and so the learning from this could not be applied to the development of the proposal.

3.1.1 Analysis of Findings

	Delayed projects	Board	On track projects	Board
<i>Realistic in terms of time, budget, staff</i>	<p>Unforeseen circumstances occurred in the GESI such as herders moved away due to extreme weather conditions, mining company did not start operations and lack of 24 hour electricity for the ICT.</p> <p>Unpredictable and busy</p>	<p>The reason for the lasting longer than planned of some projects is their internal organization and working responsibility.</p> <p>These projects had very new ideas and none of the staff had previous direct experience.</p>	<p>Less unforeseen or unpredictable situations because both projects built on previous work and expectations. For example, the govt. role is to provide information to citizens and the add-</p>	<p>The sub-project team consisted of good experts, who were specialized in their sector.</p>

<p><i>and DREAM IT project support</i></p>	<p>schedules of doctors were not considered in planning as well as their annual leave; hospital administration were unwilling to release the doctors for counseling; hospitals did not have enough computers with internet access or they were in the Director's office and so not usable.</p> <p>Number of staff was not planned realistically</p> <p>No logistical planning staff (making appointments, organizing counseling sessions)</p> <p>Planning of leader and staff's work (who is best suited for what and when) took more time than planned after the agreement.</p> <p>Part time workers delayed work</p> <p>More time spent on</p>		<p>on in this project was improving information dissemination method and content. In the other project, students were available and familiar with technology used and subject taught.</p> <p>Although there were part time workers who did not complete on time, project leader took responsibility to complete</p> <p>Number of staff and qualifications was according to project needs</p> <p>The projects had adequate experience with the project idea so were able to use their expertise quickly</p> <p>Preparatory work took more time than planned but the team had previous</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>preparation than it was planned, because it was a very new idea. No experience regarding how to attract and manage online counseling sessions</p> <p>IDRC technical support did not discuss possible challenges in implementing innovative projects and how to address it in planning</p>		<p>experience working together and could make up the delay</p>	
<p><i>Roles and Responsibilities clearly delineated</i></p>	<p>We needed support for recruiting staff and job descriptions but DREAMIT expertise was in ICT.</p> <p>Responsibilities of staff in contribution to overall umbrella DREAMIT project e.g. contributing to website were not clear.</p> <p>Unclear responsibility regarding documentation and reporting to the Board – was it staff or leader’s role in the initial phases but problem was resolved with Board member.</p>	<p>On paper terms of reference of project leader and the board was clear, however who takes decisions on what was not clear. Therefore, there were delays as small issues came to the board delaying project activities.</p> <p>Monitoring was difficult because of the remoteness of the GESI project so did not know about progress at project site; getting information from office site in UB was not enough</p>	<p>Staff responsibilities were clear but in case of non-performance, the project leader took full responsibility and resolved the issue internally.</p> <p>Inflexible budgets because Academy of Management was sub-recipients but could still manage the work because of leadership.</p>	<p>Some additional issues occurred during the implementation process, but designated board member managed to regulate them flexibly.</p> <p>Project leaders were influential in their own sectors and could fulfill their responsibilities.</p>

	<p>Greater flexibility regarding funding management within categories was possible</p> <p>Designated board member mostly met the leader of the subproject and not the whole team. This affected the quality of participation of the team members as well as receiving information directly from the board member</p>	<p>Designated Board member discussed within the sub-project team and the Board where necessary and found solutions</p> <p>Designated board member mostly met the leader of the subproject and not the whole team. This affected the quality of participation of the team members as well as receiving information directly from the board member</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

3.1.2 Recommendations for the Board

	Short term	Long term
1. Planning activities	<p>1.1 Assess the level of innovation of the project and plan the management of it accordingly.</p> <p>1.2 For highly innovative projects there should be adequate preparatory time and stock-taking at the end of this preparatory period</p> <p>1.3 To create and provide contract template for sub</p>	<p>1.1 develop a checklist for proposal assessment, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects for innovative projects.</p> <p>1.2 Both IDRC and Board should discuss possible challenges in implementing innovative projects and how to address it in planning</p>

3.2 Capacity Building:

The key questions were as follows:

1. Was the capacity building timely and useful (in terms of knowledge and skills gained)?
2. What technical support on ICT was provided by DREAMIT?
3. What were the gaps?
4. What do we do better next time?

As before, the analysis was done in two sets – one set representing the delayed projects and the other set representing the on-time projects.

All projects received six trainings (five by international experts and one from DREAMIT local partner) which are as follows:(For a description of the trainings, time schedule, number of participants, name of trainer please see Attachment Three)

- a) Project Management
- b) Research Methodology
- c) Web 2.0 Technology
- d) Writing Research Reports
- e) Policy Influence
- f) UFE

For each of the above trainings at least one to two persons from each project were invited to participate.

Translator/interpreter was hired and organized trainings, because there was English-barrier in the 30% of the project members.

The following findings were similar across both delayed and on track projects,

- a) Both delayed and on track projects stated that they were happy with the trainings provided by IDRC.
- b) Each designated Board member or Board member did try to solve any queries related to capacity needs of their sub-project –research design, hardware and soft skills needs.

- c) The Web 2.0 technology training was by DREAM IT. There is a goal set, to create an online researchers team through www.dreamit.mn site, but the implementation and participation was moderate. The reasons: There was no bonus-system, because the planning was not combined with the budget; DreamIT did not stimulate members regularly to contribute; the labor burden for the team members was too much; It was not clear which person of sub-project team was responsible; exchanging and writing information is generally less common.
- d) Some training timelines contradicted with the activities and causing negative consequences (time wasting, re-examining the finished works). For example, the research writing began after the trainings were conducted long ago. There could have been many questions, if the article writing training coincided with the research writing activities of all ongoing projects. Just attending the training is one thing, but there was a lack of methodology while applying the knowledge in the practice.
- e) Board felt that research project planning skills should be provided at the outset during proposal development workshops which should be formal and for a couple of days.

3.2.1 Analysis of findings

	Delayed projects	Board	On track projects	Board
<i>Capacity building: timeliness and usefulness</i>	<p>Only one or two were allowed to attend trainings whereas all team members needed to attend.</p> <p>The team consists of representatives of two different sectors, researchers and experts in certain issues and may have a third sector of community. In this situation, where one</p>	<p>The two sub-project leaders had good English and the training was in English but yet there were delays. Most team members however had poor English understanding (but translation was available)</p>	<p>The projects did not mention problems on CB– some attended, some did not (because of lack of government permission).</p> <p>The projects were familiar with the research process, had fewer difficulties doing</p>	<p>English ability was generally poor but managed well with the translation.</p>

	<p>does research, while the other implements or provides a service, there were a lot of difficulties, because no trainings were organized before the implementation of the project, to work together as a team.</p> <p>The trainings were directed towards research methodology, but less on how to manage innovative projects with a multi-disciplinary and multi-stakeholder group. This affected the progress of the projects.</p>		<p>the research, because the training on research design and writing scientific article was very effective.</p>	
<p><i>The role of DREAMIT in supporting the ICT capacity of the subprojects.</i></p>	<p>Web 2.0 training given by DREAMIT was used by delayed projects to share information about their project with others.</p> <p>ICT knowledge of doctors and the herders in the GESI was weak and Board helped support ICT learning</p>	<p>Board did not have experience in psychological e-counseling but provided e solutions such as chatting, video conferencing, e-discussion, blogging, etc</p> <p>Helped in avoiding spamming and Google Analytic use to monitor website use</p>	<p>Did not need much ICT support as the level of complexity was simple</p>	<p>Board had experience in e learning and could give suggestions</p>

3.2.2 Recommendations for the Board

	Short term	Long term
1. Capacity building training	<p>1.1. To plan the training with the project activities</p> <p>1.2. For complex and innovative projects a) special module on how to handle innovation and its challenges b) how to collaborate and work in multi-disciplinary teams on planning, implementation and monitoring c) how to work with multi-stakeholders and improve team work.</p> <p>1.3. To repeat the social research training as it was very useful; To lengthen the duration of policy influence activity training</p> <p>1.4. To organize a proposal development workshop for potential grantees, to include among others, how to plan the output and outcome of the project.</p> <p>1.6. To evaluate training including learning outcomes of the participants, quality of translation, expertise of trainer.</p> <p>1.7 Extend the policy influence activity training duration, which lasts 2-3 days.</p>	<p>To train national teachers, who are able to organize trainings in the field of development research theory and methodology;</p> <p>To provide the sub-project team and implementing partner with wireless internet modem for online capacity building and collaboration.</p> <p>To plan the budget for DREAM IT to purchase research and other software and distribute to sub-project team members;</p>
2. Participation		
3. Interpretation	<p>2.1. To provide even opportunities (more participants) in the training for team members of the sub-project;</p>	

<p>4. Online continuous learning using web 2.0 technology</p>	<p>3.1. To realistic budget for quality translation and interpretation during the training.</p> <p>4.1 To continue through online collaboration with the training experts after the workshop during the implementation of the project</p> <p>4.2 To create video and online lesson on evaluation, implementation, planning and developing a project, using the advantages of information technology</p> <p>4.3 Make information sharing regular using web 2.0 and project portal site</p>	
---	---	--

3.3 Management

The key questions were as follows:

- a) How effectively did Dream IT manage and coordinate with the sub-project recipients?
- b) How effective was the Board in providing oversight?
- c) What worked and did not? What do we do better next time?

As before, the analysis was done in two sets – one set representing the delayed projects and the other set representing the on track projects.

Management

Overall, both sets of projects stated that certain management practices of DREAMIT **were useful**

- a) Established open communication atmosphere between DREAM IT project and Sub project by a) cooperative monitoring of activities against plans b) open discussion on how to do some project activities and c) joint planning of the National workshop (which involved policy and decision makers)
- b) Having a designated Board member was very useful for the sub-project
- c) DREAMIT was establishing operational procedures at the same time as contracting the sub-projects. Hence delay in contracts affected project implementation.
- d) Monitoring through quarterly reports was useful for all organizations
- e) DREAMIT main efforts were to help subproject implementers understand that the projects were development research in the use of ICT and not full blown implementation projects.

The following findings were similar across both delayed and on track projects,

1. Overall, both sets of projects stated that certain management practices of DREAMIT were not **used often**

Dotproject was a file sharing system introduced to share between projects but was not used – emails were used more.

2. Monitoring

- a) Quarterly report is advantageous as the progress report allowed systematic approach to project and business analysis according to plan. The Sub-project team members appreciated that the monitoring is not only reporting process to upper level management, it is useful to know where the project is and what should do in the future.
- b) DREAMIT quarterly reporting template was too exhaustive
- c) The DREAM IT board did not always provide immediate response on what measures need to be taken after receiving the reports from projects
- d) The report is written in two languages and so is time consuming
- e) The designated board member meets the sub-projects regularly every month.

3.3.1 Analysis of findings

	Delayed projects	Board	On track projects	Board

<p><i>DREAMIT management and coordination with the subproject recipients</i></p>	<p>The Board paid more attention to ICT related outcomes while the sub-project was interested in increasing number of people benefitting from the project.</p> <p>Project needed introductory letters to start the project. Even though the DREAM IT project sent official letters for cooperation on online counseling project to University and hospital administrations there was not sufficient feedback and communication from them. Because these administrative people had weak understanding of the project and were very bureaucratic to the project. That's why the Board DREAM IT project must clearly introduce the project's goal and result to managers and officials.</p> <p>For the GESI, the mining company has been appointed but not yet started operations and no letter has gone from DREAMIT about the NGO</p>	<p>Board felt that there was an appropriate management structure and planning of the sub-projects; training provided opportunities to meet; cooperation was possible at the national seminar, and official letters were submitted; willing to develop technology and use information from sub-project; regular exchange between board and sub-projects; sub-project leaders had good relationship with policy leaders</p> <p>But there some under performance of project which DREAM IT Board explains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inefficient utilization of an information base of IDRC to update knowledge on this new project idea 2. Not enough literature on internet to learn from for the project idea <p>Board members were</p>	<p>In one project, the grant holding agency was different from the one who implemented the research and this affected smooth operations because the implementer did not have authority to withhold or release funds according to researchers performance; unclear who owns which equipment. DREAMIT is still resolving the issue. But this did not affect performance. DREAM IT sent an official letters to administration of project grant recipient for the 'Citizen Information' project but no feedback from them (government).</p> <p>Project did not need introductory letters or support from the Board as the sub-</p>	<p>Previous co-operating working experience of some team members and so Board did not have to coordinate much</p> <p>The project idea had been piloted and had good knowledge base to build on</p>
--	--	---	---	--

	<p>to it.</p> <p>Letter of recommendation to the Ministry to use the GESI model called My Country Ecosystem as a model by the mining company has been sent but it is responsibility of the DREAMIT Board to follow it up</p>	<p>clear about their contribution to the sub-project but no clarity regarding role in umbrella project, which issues the DreamIT umbrella Project Leader or the Board has the right to make decision.</p>	<p>project leaders knew the stakeholders involved. Support from DREAMIT was needed only at the recommendation stage. For example, Education TV sent official letters of recommendation to the Ministry of Education but response was negative that the project had not completed three years and so findings could not be considered.</p>	
<p>How did DREAMIT support Project implementation</p>	<p>Project had limited funds to reach out often enough to herders and doctors and in addition IT knowledge of doctors and herders was not adequate The most effort was made on making ICT solutions. a) For example, It took a lot of time to research the ICT solution that would enable cooperation</p>	<p>There are two parts to implementing innovative projects: one is the ICT solution development and the other is getting participation to use this solution. ICT solutions did take time although DREAMIT did help out and a lot of time went in this development. In participation, although DREAMIT understood that</p>	<p>Project activities matched with the implementing organizations main activity so project implementation faced fewer issues. For example, Academy of Management main goal is to strengthen capacity of govt. bodies and to enable</p>	<p>DREAMIT Board only had to give additional ICT inputs as the basic framework was available. Also the internal management was in place and the Board did not have to get actively involved in understanding the project progress.</p>

	<p>of different sectors such as large industries of mining, environment, and local community such as herders and local government. Selected areas were far away and needed more effort to set up remote communication. The selected area got the electricity from December 2009 which was not even in 24 hours a day. To get opinions of herders depended on the weather. We faced difficulties when we were at those selected area to start the project, newly changed local governance did not have any understanding of the project.</p> <p>b) For example, Online counseling found it difficult to increase participation of initial</p>	<p>awareness raising would be important to get doctors and herders involved, the extent and time needed was underestimated. Although we knew who should participate (doctors and herders), they had inherent problems of movement and unpredictability which was not considered adequately.</p>	<p>citizen participation in govt responses and EduTV main goal was to educate Mongolians from a distance using TV and this project worked with blended technology</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

	<p>users.</p> <p>It was time consuming to prepare on-line counseling methodology. No materials were available in Mongolian and had to rely on materials that were in another language.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

3.3.2 Recommendations for the Board

	Short term	Long term
<p>1. Professional consultant/expert</p> <p>2. Board</p>	<p>1.1. To appoint experts in their sector, to work part-time for the subproject as consultants.</p> <p>2.1. To have regular and frequent board meetings say, once a month.</p> <p>2.2 Because of the complexity and innovativeness of some projects, all Board members must participate in decision making along with designated Board member of that sub-project. This would mean that Board members will have to spend more time on some projects.</p> <p>2.3 Revisit job description of Board, Project Leader, Project Director of DREAM IT and administrator and clearly define tasks and accountability with reference</p>	<p>1.1. Select a strategic partner for the sub-projects who have continuous access/working relationship with the potential participants of the project and are likely to sustain or influence others for project uptake after the completion of the sub-project.</p> <p>2.1 To prepare an article on lessons learnt from managing innovative projects.</p>

3. Monitoring	<p>to each sub-project, umbrella and specifically their role in policy influence.</p> <p>2.4 To promptly provide feedback on review reports.</p> <p>2.5 Board should support and help in projects which have multi-stakeholders.</p> <p>3.1. Quarterly report making process takes much time, so IDRC model may be used once in a year and a simpler format for quarterly reports;</p> <p>3.2 Monitoring might be difficult for some projects because of remoteness so all have to contribute.</p>	
---------------	--	--

3.4 Project sustainability and policy influence

The key questions were as follows:

- a) Were project objectives achieved according to plan?
- b) How sustainable are the projects? Why? What measures should be taken?
- c) Were recommendations disseminated and used to influence policy?
- d) What do we do better next time?

As before, the analysis was done in two sets – one set representing the delayed projects and the other set representing the on track projects.

There were no similar findings to report across both delayed and on track projects,

3.4.1 Analysis of findings

	Delayed projects	Board	On track projects	Board
<i>Were project objectives achieved according to plan?</i>	<p>Project objectives were mostly achieved:</p> <p>a) ICT solutions were innovated and operationalized in spite of difficulties for both the GESI and the Health project.</p> <p>b) Participation remained low for various reasons: time limitation, IT access and knowledge gap of doctors and herders, lack of govt. or health sector support, unforeseen circumstances such as weather, delay in mining company becoming operational and inherent unpredictability of time availability of both herders and doctors.</p>	<p>1. The project result is important to establish open information and provide participation of local for protection of negative impact of mining. That's why need to submit the project result and advice to Ministry of Nature Environment and Tourism. The usage of "My country" system insufficient.</p>	<p>Project objectives were fully achieved;</p> <p>a) In the EduTV project, children' scores in English and Math improved. Also as the program was beamed nationwide, there is some evidence that adults also were able to improve their English because they could use interactive tools as a supplement to the TV education. The project was able to attract a new project from Millennium Challenge Account/ Mongolia for professional education schools for teaching English</p> <p>b) The Academy of Management provided recommendations to related government</p>	<p>1. DREAM IT project main goal is study and decide social problem through information technology. In this sphere co-operated with Sub-project and result was efficient.</p> <p>2. The policy recommendations of the sub-projects are given and delivered to the each sector representatives, who has participated the national seminar. Impact actions were held in the way of creating the participation of decision makers, providing the opportunity to share their ideas and reflect it in the recommendation. Some projects organized a scientific conference.</p>

			<p>organizations and posted on the web of Secretariat Office and dreamit.mn. These recommendations were to create database and print most needed information by citizens as identified by the project. The recommendations were routed through the Cabinet and decision to open a citizen information center by the UB city governor made.</p>	
<p><i>Project sustainability</i></p>	<p>Both projects have taken some steps for sustainability. For the GESI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A NGO was established with representation from three parties – herders; local bagh (smallest administrative unit) representatives and environmental inspector; and secondary school, 	<p>GESI has addressed environment issues and found a way to dialogue for eco-friendly inclusive development. Such projects need further nurturing and support from international and national partners. The mining companies should be made aware of and strong attempts need to be made to involve them.</p>	<p>The EduTV project of blended technology could not be sustained by the Ministry of Education as they need three years evidence. (please see policy influence section) However (see above), EduTV received funds for a new project through</p>	<p>There is a need to find the most effective way to activate the cooperation with the state organizations. IDRC changed its policy and IT supporting project will be completed next year. If these projects need more support, realignment of projects will be needed.</p>

	<p>However the sustainability will depend on tripartite initiative and usage of “Minii nutag” (“My country) system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations for the mining company regarding environment and community friendly operations were given to the local people and the Ministry of Nature, Environment. One of the recommendations was that the ‘my country’ eco-information system be used for environmental impact evaluation in Emgen Bulag Bagh, Nomgon soum. • ‘Jemr’ (implementer of this sub-project) while doing deep water research for Oyu Tolgoi recommended the use of “Minii nutag” (“My country”) information system in order to get the opinions of locals. 	<p>The NGO Setgeliin Toli who was team member of the project will continue on-line consultancy on psychology as a part of their own activity and provide its service online. The Ministry of Health and Ulaanbaatar city Health department has shown some interest in the project result but they are busy involved in real time health issues and thus not paying much attention to work stress of health professionals. Online counseling have not been tested before in Mongolia, so this project helped us to move one step forward to solving work stress problems through ICTs.</p>	<p>MCA-M. In the Academy of Management project, policy influence was conducted by the Govt. Cabinet Secretariat so it had direct influence on other govt. agencies to take steps such as the Citizen Information Center as a response to the recommendation.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

	<p><i>This NGO (as it is new) and 'my country' system would be difficult to sustain without financial and technical support. The capacity of local people in terms of law regulations and information technology etc. is very weak.</i></p> <p>For the Health Project</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NGO "Setgeliin Toli" will continue to use the web site and the method of online consultancy as part of their activity. 2. Materials such as handbook, online counseling methodology, website and such resources are available for further use. 3. The study has demonstrated the high levels of stress but hospitals need to provide internet 			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>facilities and rest areas and consider the mental health of its doctors to be important.</p> <p><i>It is therefore difficult to predict how sustainable the project can be since further support and strategy to increase reach is needed.</i></p>			
<p><i>Policy Influence</i></p>	<p>Although recommendations are given, don't know if they are used for policy making. We can only present findings at meetings but it is up to DREAM IT to influence decision makers. They need to do more.</p>	<p>Since the beginning of the DREAMIT project, the govt. organization called Information Communication Technology and Post Agency has been troubled by staff turnover and so have not been able to influence it.</p> <p>Policy influence activity is the responsibility of the DREAM IT project and in the framework of that responsibility the project organized the National Seminar which involved a decision makers, managers of state and industry level. In the line-meetings discussed</p>	<p>Projects are completed according to plan and DREAM IT has not provided funds for continuation. Yet the work on policy influence has not been finished. For example, Ministry of Education Culture and Science said "By rule and regulation at least 3 year testing should be done due to see end result". But the project implemented only one year. This has to be resolved</p> <p>2. The research</p>	<p>If the govt. requires 3 years of implementation, DREAMIT should look for additional funding for two years for the EduTV project. We need a budget to influence policy and request was given to IDRC. Right now, DREAMIT is doing through sub-projects but it is not effective. Whether our work has influenced policy may take years but we need to start the process to do so. According to our plan, the person, who will submit the policy advice document to government, is the project leader and</p>

		<p>about project result, proposal and policy recommendation and advices from research work.</p> <p>The DREAMIT has no budget except the Seminar for policy influence.</p>	<p>recommendations and advice to related ministries was submitted only at the National seminar.</p> <p>3. DREAMIT should actively recommend these results and recommendations to the working groups set up by govt. on various ICT issues.</p>	<p>the parliament member Dr.D.Enkhbat His influence should be the link. After each completion of the project the documents will be submitted to relevant organizations.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

3.4.2 Recommendations for the Board

	Short term	Long term
1. Co-operation with related ministries, agencies and organizations	<p>1.1 There is need for raising awareness, marketing and disseminating work of Sub-projects during implementation, otherwise policy influencing is difficult</p> <p>1.2 It is important to co-operate from very beginning by providing relevant information to related ministries, agencies and organizations in order to spread the project result.</p> <p>1.3 To co-operate with related government organization which is the Information Communication Technology and Post Agency</p>	<p>1.1 Develop a strategy and mechanism (conferences, membership in committees and working groups of govt.) to educate the government organizations by communicating, sharing ideas, exchange information about the project goal and results which will benefit the people.</p> <p>1.2 Publish a book which includes all advices and results of all projects and will be submitted to authorities like ministries and agencies. Also submit the documents to all other related organization after each</p>
2. Budget/finance		

3.Board involvement and representation	<p>from the beginning DREAM IT project</p> <p>2.1 To allocate enough funds from project budgets for</p> <p>a) Evaluation so that DREAM IT can advocate project results for continued funding and b) for policy influence activities.</p>	<p>completion of the project.</p> <p>3. Board should have more members of Parliament whose background is in ICT in order to strengthen policy influencing.</p>
--	--	--

4. Uses and users of the UFE study

The intended use of this UFE was to develop guidelines to manage new projects better so that results could be achieved according to plans.

In the process while analyzing the projects that have been ‘delayed’ and those ‘on track’ it was clear that delayed projects were far more innovative and complex than those on track projects. We realized that projects that are innovative (either in the technology/user group) and involve multi-stakeholders require different type of planning and management approach. The findings indicated that management support was directly proportional to complexity and innovativeness of the projects.

This **unexpected outcome** resulted in developing a checklist to assess proposals (in addition to usual proposal assessment tool) using a different lens that reviewed type of innovation in ICT, number and type of stake-holders involved and the complexity of the solution. In addition management guidelines were developed to respond to the degree of innovativeness and complexity of project. The assumption was that although all projects need to be better managed to achieve results, projects that are innovative require different management inputs. The guidelines also detail the role of management in policy influence, *no matter how innovative the project is.*

It may be said that the outcomes of this UFE went beyond what was envisaged as the original use which was managing projects better so that they achieve results.

The **users** are not only DREAMIT but can be extended to donors and implementers involved in the planning, implementation and management of innovative and complex projects.

The checklist and guidelines can assist both in proposal development and assessment as well as implementing and managing such projects.

5. Checklist and guideline for proposal assessment and management

5.1 Proposal assessment for innovation projects in addition to traditional proposal appraisals

(Innovation can be multi-disciplinary, multi-stakeholder and in terms of technology. If level of innovation is high (checklist # 1) then all other list item's importance will be higher)

Steps	Actions	Tools
1.	Assess the level of innovation of the project idea in terms of technology, participation needed to use this technology and skill sets of the potential participants.	Use grade (low, medium and high)
2.	Assess the level of expertise of the implementing organization in ICT as well as in the relevant sector of the project idea.	Use grade (low, medium and high)
3.	Assess the partners of the implementing organization (are they new partners?) 1. What previous experience they had in this area? 2. What is the work load of each partner and capacity to complete assigned tasks? 3. Assess the inherent strategic position to influence policy.	SWOT
4.	Assess the plan and check if enough time is allocated for devising ICT solutions involving multi-stakeholders. Unforeseen circumstances such as natural disaster, electricity and changing of staffs and bureaucracy.	Yes/No
5.	Assess challenges of participation in target groups in terms of skill sets and availability.	SWOT
6.	Assess how project results will be used to influence either sector, project and policy.	SWOT
7.	Assess the staffing in terms of numbers, qualifications, job description, part time/full time and related time allocation for the project.	Adequate/Not adequate
8.	Assess the leadership in terms of expertise, occupation/position, time commitment and teamwork skills.	Adequate/Not adequate

9.	Assess the budget allocated for evaluation (needed to provide evidence for Policy influence)	Adequate/Not adequate
10.	Assess the budget for policy influence activities	Adequate/Not adequate
11.	Assess the budget for consultant to provide sector based high level technical assistance.	Adequate/Not adequate
12.	Assess contingency budget.	Adequate/Not adequate
13.	Assess ability to use online collaboration tools using modern technologies.	Adequate/Not adequate

5.2 Guidelines for managing innovative projects additional to usual management principals

When	What	Who should do
Preparatory	Sensitize multiple stakeholders in the project	Board member and Project leader
	Initiate linkages with likely policy makers.	Board member and Project leader
	Discussion of potential ICT solution	Board
Implementation	Align capacity building with the activities	Board
	Introduce additional capacity building training on teamwork and managing challenges in innovative projects	Board
	Stock taking about 3-4 month into the project review the objectives.	Board
	Review meetings with whole team more frequently.	Designated Board member
	Troubleshooting should involve whole board more frequently.	Board
	Develop strategy to influence policy	Board
	Report feedback should be immediate	Designated Board member
	Sustain online collaboration of all sub project team members	Board and sub projects
	Document and develop video and online lessons from	Board and Trainers

	the capacity building trainings and make available online for further usage.	
	Use simple template for quarterly reporting	Board
	'Social research' and 'Science article writing' training should be more often organized.	Board
	National trainer should be included in the training to support the sub project after international trainers have left.	Board and sub project
On completion	Plan for dissemination and use (e.g. more frequent National seminar, use electronic media, representation in working committees etc.,)	Board and sub project.
	Include recommendations of the project in the policy and decision making of the parliament and government.	Project Director (Dr. D.Enkhbat)

6. Notes from DREAMIT Board discussion on UFE study

Meeting date: 2011/0414

Venue: Datacom office, San Business center, 1st floor, Ulaanbaatar

Invited people: All board members (7 people), UFE consultant Sonal Zaveri and UFE researcher Ch.Bazar

Participants: G. Enkhbold (grant recipient), Z.Batbold (Project leader), B.Burmaa (project administrator), B.Batpurev (board member and UFE facilitator), Sonal Zaveri and Ch. Bazar

Duration: 3 hours (3 p.m – 6p.m)

All participants was asked to comment, discuss and give feedback specially on

1. Short and long term UFE of findings by Board
2. Assessment Checklist for innovative and complex projects
3. Management Guidelines for innovative and complex projects

UFE researcher Ch. Bazar introduced about UFE and research methodology, participants. UFE facilitator B.Batpurev continued on presenting findings of UFE in detail. During presentation all Board members who attended the meeting was invited to comment/question and clarify any points during anytime of presentation.

Comments during the discussion:

B.Burmaa: DREAMIT provided even opportunity for team members to attend the training so I do not agree to the point about “DREAMIT not providing even opportunity”.

Z.Babold: Some team members were invited but did not come. In the future the Designated Board member and sub project leader will openly discuss with the whole team to select the training participant to make even opportunity for participation.

G.Enkhbold: This time we have only few projects coming so we can accommodate more (almost all team members) people in the trainings.

Z.Batbold: Agree to that “Develop video and online lessons of each trainings and make them available online” as it is very important. Actually all future trainings should be taped and uploaded to share with all teams. It is regretful we have not done so for previous trainings

Z. Batbold: We do not have budget to buy SPSS software. If we buy then we also will need to train the researchers to use it.

G.Enkhbold: Board has discussed quarterly reporting structure before and decided to use IDRC format. So current one is the final.

Z.Batbold: The quarterly report format can be made simpler. We need to discuss it again by the board meeting.

Z.Batbold: Sub projects should have at least 1 english speaking person to prepare the reports as we are accepting all quarterly reports in English. The sub project leader needs to manage that persons workload within the team.

B.Burmaa: Selecting strategic partner is very important and we should do so carfully.

G.Enkhbold: Sector specialist must be top level expert in that sector.

B.Burmaa: Whether providing contract template (for contracting with team members) to sub projects is not actually affecting its implementation. Because we have not done so for all four project but still 2 are delayed and 2 are not delayed.

Z.Batbold: Sub project leaders should prepare the TOR for its team members and can get reviewed/feedback from the Board. I think it is most suitable way.

All Board agreed on using these checklist and guidelines:

All new proposals are reviewed by DREAMIT and then sent to IDRC for comments, expert review and selection. Of the new proposals being considered, some have been reviewed by DREAMIT and submitted for approval to IDRC. One proposal however has yet to be reviewed by DREAMIT. To complete the UFE's 11th and 12th stages the Board has decided on either to take one of below two options.

1. Board needs to review the new proposal (not yet submitted to IDRC) by using the checklist suggested by UFE study and then call the submitters to discuss about it in more details
2. For submitted draft proposals to IDRC we could use this checklist to re-assess and the send the assessment output to IDRC as an additional information about the submitted proposal.

7. Attachments

7.1. Attachment #1 – List of people interviewed.

PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERVIEWS:

DREAM IT project team:

- Z Batbold, Project Leader
- I.Ariunaa, Board Member
- B.Batpurev, Board Member
- B.Burmaa, Board Member
- G.Enkhbold, Board Member
- S.Enkhjargal, Board Member

Sub-project “Blended Technology Education Project (BTEP): Using Technology to Level the Education Playing Field in Mongolia”,

- S.Natsagdorj, Team leader of the Sub-project
- D.Lodoidamba, Team member

Sub-project “Improving the Responsiveness and Efficiency of Public Sector’s Information Services Provision in Mongolia”

- J.Serjiamts, Team leader of the Sub-project
- Team members of the Sub-project :
 - B.Byambadorj
 - B.Narantulga
 - J.Tamir

Sub-project ““GES Information System to motivate reliable business relation for Gobi eco-system”

- R.Oyun, Team leader of the Sub-project
- Team members of the Sub-project:

- S.Ariunsuld
- B.Munkhtulga
- B.Mendbayar
- Nomgon soum’s secondary school director R.Battogtoh
- Nomgon town’s nature and environment inspector H.Munkhtuya
- local parliament leader Z.Amarsanaa
- Herdsmen B.Davaamaa

Sub-project “Online psychological service for health professionals”

- B.Ariunsanaa, Team leader of the Sub-project
- Team members of the Sub-project:
 - O.Saranchuluun
 - H.Handsuren
 - M.Sugarmaa
 - Ts.Enkhjargal

7.2. Attachment #2 – Interview guide

Project Partners		DREAMIT Project Leaders and Board	
1.	<i>Planning</i>	1.	<i>Planning</i>
1.1.	To what extent, was the initiation (planning) process by the DREAMIT network useful for sub-projects in defining and focusing on particular issues?	1.1.	To what extent, was the initiation (planning) process by the DREAMIT network useful for sub-projects in defining and focusing on Particular issues?
1.1.1.	To what extent DREAM IT supported the researchers in designing the research and developing research methodologies?	1.1.1.	To what extent DREAM IT supported the researchers in designing the research and developing research methodologies?
1.1.2.	Were the projects planned	1.1.2.	Were the projects planned

	realistically in terms of a) activities, b) time, c) budget and c) Staff?		realistically in terms of a) activities, b) time, c) budget and c) Staff?
1.1.3.	What was the role of the DREAM IT in enabling the planning of the subprojects?	1.1.3.	What was the role of the DREAM IT in enabling the planning of the subprojects?
1.1.3.1.	What would you recommend to do better next time?	1.1.3.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?
1.1.4.	To what extent were the roles, responsibilities and tasks clearly defined and followed of a) Subproject leader b) Subproject team members c) DREAMIT designated Board member for the subproject d) DREAMIT project leader e) Funder (Datacom)	1.1.4.	To what extent were the roles, responsibilities and tasks clearly defined and followed of a) Subproject leader b) Subproject team members c) DREAMIT designated Board member for the subproject d) DREAMIT project leader e) Funder (Datacom)
1.1.4.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?	1.1.4.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?
2.	<i>Capacity building</i>	2.	<i>Capacity building</i>
2.1.	To what extent were human resources—skills and knowledge—adequate in the subprojects?	2.1.	To what extent were human resources – skills and knowledge—adequate in the subprojects?
2.1.1.	Were human resources adequate in the subprojects? What difficulty did subprojects have in the capacity of its human resources?	2.1.1.	Were human resources adequate in the subprojects? What difficulty did subprojects have in the capacity of its human resources?
2.1.2.	To what extent did DREAM IT help build capacity of its partners in the a) Research design	2.1.2.	To what extent did DREAM IT help build capacity of its partners in the a) Research design b) planning and c) Implementation of the sub-

	<p>b) planning and</p> <p>c) Implementation of the sub-project?</p> <p>Explain</p>		<p>project?</p> <p>Explain</p>
2.1.3.	What was the role of DREAMIT in supporting the ICT capacity of the subprojects?	2.1.3.	What was the role of DREAMIT in supporting the ICT capacity of the subprojects?
2.1.3.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?	2.1.3.1.	What would you recommend to do better next time?
2.1.4.	How effective was the capacity building in terms of a) Timeliness? b) Usefulness?	2.1.4.	How effective was the capacity building in terms of a) Timeliness? b) Usefulness?
2.1.5		2.1.5.	1.1.1. What technical support was provided by DREAMIT members?
2.1.6.	What were the gaps?		What were the gaps?
2.1.6.	What would you recommend to do better next time?	2.1.6.	What would you recommend to do better next time?
3.	<i>2. Networking and management</i>	3.	<i>Networking</i>
3.1.	How did the network experience in DREAMIT impact the subproject?	3.1.	How did the network experience in DREAMIT impact the subproject?
3.1.1.	What are the strengths and weaknesses of the project approach adopted by DREAM IT?	3.1.1.	What are the strengths and weaknesses of the network approach adopted by DREAM IT?
3.1.1.1.	What would you recommend to do better next time?	3.1.1.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?
3.1.2.	How effectively did DREAMIT manage and coordinate with the subproject recipients? What worked and what did not?	3.1.2.	How effectively did DREAMIT manage and coordinate with the subproject recipients? What worked and what did not?
3.1.2.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?	3.1.2.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?
3.1.3.	How well did the network members functioning together?		

3.1.4.	How did being part of the DREAMIT project influence collaboration between the sub projects partner other work during the project or after the project?	3.1.3	How did being part of the DREAMIT network influence collaboration between the sub projects partner other work during the project or after the project?
4.	<i>Implementation</i>	4.	<i>Implementation</i>
4.1.1.	What are the challenges and possibilities in ICT application for development?	4.1.1	What are the challenges and possibilities in ICT application for development?
4.1.2.	How useful and timely was the quarterly technical reporting by sub-grant recipients?	4.1.2.	How useful and timely was the quarterly technical reporting by sub-grant recipients?
		4.1.3	What are the lessons learned in planning and implementing DREAM IT projects?
		4.1.4	What were the factors for success and challenges faced by these projects?
5.	<i>Communication</i>	5.	<i>Communication</i>
5.1.	How effectively did DREAMIT manage and coordinate with the sub-project recipients?	5.1.	How effectively did DREAMIT manage and coordinate with the sub-project recipients?
5.1.1.	To what extent were communication mechanisms that DREAMIT used with subproject leader and DREAMIT leader and designated board member appropriate and effective for smooth implementation?	5.1.1.	How project supported communication between different partners?
5.1.2	What factors enhanced network's ability of fostering effective communication between different partners?	5.1.2.	What factors enhanced network's ability of fostering effective communication between different partners?
5.1.3.	What factors hindered network's ability of effective communication between different partners? How did	5.1.3.	What factors hindered between different partners network's ability of effective communication? How did network respond to them?

	network respond to them?		
5.1.3.1.	What would you recommend to do better next time?	5.1.3.1	What would you recommend to do better next time?
5.1.4.	How has the project supported communication with people external to the network?	5.1.4.	How has the project supported communication with people external to the network?
5.1.5.	What other methods of communication would you suggest to enhance collaboration among DREAM IT members?	5.1.5.	What other methods of communication would you suggest to enhance collaboration among DREAM IT members?
6.	<i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i>	6.	<i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i>
5.1.	How effective was the Board in providing oversight to the projects?	5.1.	How effective was the Board in providing oversight to the projects?
5.1.1.	How did DREAM IT leaders and designated Board member quality control work to the subprojects?	5.1.1.	How did DREAM IT leaders and designated Board member quality control work to the subprojects?
5.1.2..	How effective was the monitoring of subproject implementation of DREAM IT leaders and board members?	5.1.2	How effective was the monitoring of subproject implementation of DREAM IT leaders and board members?
5.1.2.1	What is your opinion how to enhance it more next time?	5.1.2.1.	What is your opinion how to enhance it more next time?
5.1.3.	How did the ICT project activities and network experience in DREAMIT impact the sub-project organization's overall work and relationship with other development initiatives?	5.1.3.	How did the ICT project activities and network experience in DREAMIT impact the sub-project organization's overall work and relationship with other development initiatives?
5.1.4.	To what extent were DREAMIT document management systems, guidelines, manual used? To what extent were they useful for subprojects?		
5.1.5.	What training do you need next time?	5.1.5.	What training do you need next time?
6.	<i>Gender and Equity</i>	6.	<i>Gender and Equity</i>
6.1.	How does DREAM IT allow equal opportunity for members from both sexes to build capacity in research?	6.1.	Did DREAM IT allow equal opportunity for members from both sexes to build capacity in research?

6.2.	How effective is the network in facilitating participants of different sexes, experiences and perspectives to engage at all levels of the network?	6.2.	How effective is the network in facilitating participants of different sexes, experiences and perspectives to engage at all levels of the network?
7.	<i>USE</i>	7.	<i>USE</i>
7.1.	How did the ICT project activities and network experience in DREAMIT impact the subproject organization's overall work and relationship with other development initiatives?	7.1.	How did the ICT project activities and network experience in DREAMIT impact the subproject organization's overall work and relationship with other development initiatives?
7.1.1.		7.1.1.	To what extent were the subprojects able to use their findings for Policy recommendations or to influence other developmental programs? What are your recommendations for the DREAMIT management? Why
7.1.2.	What are your recommendations for the DREAMIT management? Why?	7.1.2.	Have Policy recommendation been recommended by partners? Are they in use?
8.	<i>Overall Management</i>	8.	<i>Overall Management</i>
8.1.	How sustainable are the projects?	8.1.	How sustainable are the projects?
8.1.1.	What are your recommendations for the DREAMIT management—what could we do better next time to manage the projects?	8.1.1.	What are your recommendations for the DREAMIT management—what could we do better next time to manage the projects?
8.1.2.	How sustainable are the projects? Why? What measures should be taken?	8.1.2.	How sustainable are the projects? Why? What measures should be taken?

7.3. Attachment #3 – List of trainings and participants

Training # 1

Title: Pre-training for the Project Management and Financial Administration training workshop

When: 22 Apr, 2009 - 23 Apr, 2009

Where: Datacom Co., LTD -

Category: Upcoming Events

Description

Datacom in cooperation with the Mega Mongolia, DREAM IT project Board, successfully conducted pre-training for the Project Management and Financial Administration training workshop at 15:00, 17 April 2009 at Datacom office.

The aim of a brief training was to present about the Mega Mongolia DREAM IT project for the participants, who're not already familiar with Mega Mongolia DREAM IT project, prior to the IDRC's Project management and Financial Administration trainings.

Trainer was Mr. S. Enkhjargal, Executive Director, ITEM Co.Ltd (Aptech, Arena training centers) and Executive Director, MIDAS NGO, UB, Mongolia. More than 15 attendees from more than 10 organisations attended.

The meeting began with an introduction International Development Research Center (IDRC), Pan Asia Networking (PAN), pre-project planning activities and the Mega Mongolia, DREAM IT projects and benefits.

Datacom in cooperation with the Mega Mongolia, DREAM IT project Board, successfully conducted pre-training for the Project Management and Financial Administration training workshop at 15:00, 17 April 2009 at Datacom office.

The aim of a brief training was to present about the Mega Mongolia DREAM IT project for the participants, who're not already familiar with Mega Mongolia DREAM IT project, prior to the IDRC's Project management and Financial Administration trainings.

Trainer was Mr. S. Enkhjargal, Executive Director, ITEM Co.Ltd (Aptech, Arena training centers) and Executive Director, MIDAS NGO, UB, Mongolia. More than 15 attendees from more than 10 organisations attended.

The meeting began with an introduction International Development Research Center (IDRC), Pan Asia Networking (PAN), pre-project planning activities and the Mega Mongolia, DREAM IT projects and benefits.

The participants learned why proposals were red and amber in accordance to the below reasons:

1. Research question
2. Development issue

3. Research project vs. Development project
4. No Action Plan
5. No survey/study
6. Research methodology
7. Unclear output
8. Less ICT role for development
9. Hardware oriented

During the training there were open discussion about the Mega Mongolia project and IDRC and Mr. S. Enkhjargal provided a valuable comment on submission of the successful proposal to IDRC.

Venue Datacom Co., LTD

Training # 2

Title:

Training on social science research on ICTD

When:

26 May, 2009 - 30 May, 2009

Where:

Chinggis Khaan hotel -

Category:

Upcoming Events

Trainer: Czarina Saloma-Akpedonu, Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
School of Social Sciences, Loyola Schools, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines

Training # 3

Title: Training on Online collaboration tool (DotProject) and Web 2.0 technologies

When: 05 Jun, 2009 - 05 Jun, 2009

Where: CSMS -

Category: Previous events

Description

School of Computer Science and Management, University of Science and Technology,
Suite 202

Trainers:

Mr. D. Enkhbaatar – Director, DotMN Co. Ltd.

Training # 4

Title: Training workshop on Research writing and publication

When: 22 Sep, 2009 - 24 Sep, 2009

Where: Ulaanbaatar hotel - Ulaanbaatar

Category: Upcoming Events

Description

Trainer: Dr. Krishnamurthy Sriramesh, Professor, Department of Communication, Journalism, and Marketing, School of Business, Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand.

Description, plan and objectives

Research writing and publication is both an art and a science. Being a good researcher is only one half of the equation. The other half consists of being able to disseminate that information to a wider audience through different modes such as conference presentations, articles in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in edited volumes, and books. Research writing is a genre that needs to be mastered as it has its own characteristics. This workshop seeks to educate participants about the process of writing research papers for conferences, refereed journals, and book chapters. In the process, they will be taught such things as the structure of research papers, conducting a review of relevant literature and writing it, referencing and use of style manuals, as outlined below.

The primary objective of this workshop is:

1. To enable participants to grasp the basics of research writing with the aim that they are in a position to generate research articles from their projects; and
2. To help participants understand the process of publishing those written pieces in various avenues such as conferences, peer-reviewed journals, and books.

Ms. Ch.Munkhzul – Manager, Infocon Co. Ltd

Training # 5

Title: Training workshop on Communications for influence on policy and practice

When: 16 Oct, 2009 - 17 Oct, 2009

Where: Corporate Hotel -

Category: Upcoming Events

Description

Instructors: Dr Rohan Samarajiva, Chair and CEO, LIRNEasia & Ms Helani Galpaya, COO, LIRNEasia.

Description, plan and objectives

The very name, “Development Research to Empower All Mongolians through Information Communications Technology,” indicates an intention to take research in understandable form to all Mongolians in general, and all stakeholders of the constituent projects, in particular. The overall program addresses the following questions:

- 1) What are the strategies and processes needed to allow research findings from this project to influence the policy-making process?
- 2) What is the role of ICTs in achieving socio-economic outcomes that are sought by the development sectors (e.g., health, education, governance)?
- 3) In the Mongolian context, what specific technologies and systems would be appropriate to achieve developmental effects in the sectors of health, education, governance, environment, etc.?
- 4) (a) How is the success of an ICT4D project defined? (b) And how do we ensure that learning about success and failure is transferred and integrated for future ICT programming in the country?

In addition, each constituent project has specific policy objectives, an example being “What appropriate policies may be recommended to the Ministry of Nature and the Environment, arising from the research evidence of this project to increase dialogue between government, grassroots communities and the mining private sector?” The present workshop seeks to advance the ability of researchers to answer question 1 (and possibly question b) in general, and the corresponding questions related the individual projects, specifically.

At the conclusion of this workshop, the participants should be able to design and implement communication strategies for their own research projects and have gained a better understanding of the communication strategies of the other projects within DREAM IT. Hopefully the training and the interactions among the participants will create the conditions for mutual learning in the future because the communication strategies will have to be modified several times depending on circumstances and it will be helpful to have a support network to draw upon as the modifications are made.

Training # 6

Workshop on Utilization Focused Evaluation on 20, 21 April 2010

When: 20 Apr, 2010 - 21 Apr, 2010

Where: Open Society Forum –

Category: Upcoming Events

Description

Day 1 Date: 20 April, 2010, Tuesday

Time: 9:00-17:30

Venue: Open Society Forum (Soros foundation), near Silk Road Building, Jamiyan Gun Street - 5/1, Sukhbaatar district, Ulaanbaatar-48, Mongolia

Day 2 Date: 21 April, 2010, Wednesday

Time: 9:00-17:00

Venue: Datacom Meeting room, National Information Technology Park bldg, Suite 110, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia 210646, Tel: +(976)-11-329688

Trainer: Dr. Sonal Zaveri, DECI consultant, IDRC

Description, plan and objectives

The workshop plans to provide an overview to participants about Utilization Focused Evaluation. This approach pioneered by Michael Patton seeks to ensure that evaluations are put to good use – in other words, serve a purpose or create an impact or contribute to further programming and policy. UFE is important to understand as many evaluations are carried out merely as a routine completion of projects. In this way, we lose a valuable opportunity to learn from what we do. Michael Patton has outlined various steps in the UFE that enable program managers, evaluators, administrators, donors and other interested parties to design and use evaluations that make a difference in what we do.

By the end of the workshop, participants will:

- a. Understand UFE Steps
- b. Analyze how UFE is different from conventional evaluations
- c. Be able to identify who the user is and why use is important
- d. Learn about the roles of the evaluator and users
- e. Understand the different steps of the UFE and how they influence the evaluation design
- f. Learn how to plan for the UFE
- g. Understand criteria of assessing an UFE evaluation

Day 2 Date: 21 April, 2010, Wednesday

One day intensive workshop with subproject entitled **Online psychological service for health professionals**, selected for UFE evaluation, April 21st, 2010. Key users will be involved in this workshop.

Objectives of the workshop on 21 April 2010

By the end of the one day workshop:

- Key users understand their role and contribution
- Key uses are identified
- Key questions are identified
- Evaluation focus is determined
- Evaluation design and data collection methods are identified
- Time and work plan prepared with tentative budget