

## Notes on What works for MCC event: Mali case

1. Evaluation design challenge: Evaluate overall package and/or program components
  - a. Complex multi-objective programs may have large impact on beneficiaries because many constraints to development are relaxed simultaneously.
  - b. What we gain in a more sophisticated program may mean that it is difficult to evaluate components.
  - c. Decisions on what to evaluate overall program or components should be coordinated across projects and depend on what we know a lot about and what we know little about
  - d. In the Mali case, program design affects evaluation (PAPs vs New Settlers)
    - i. Program design tradeoffs should be assessed against 'costs' in rigor to the evaluation and how much we know about a program intervention and it's effectiveness
    - ii. PAPs using matching with two control groups in case of PAPs due to resettlement protocol
      1. Rainfed cultivators who were most like PAPs at baseline to measure project impact (the counterfactual to the PAPs)
      2. Proximate irrigation cultivators who were most like who we thought the PAPs would likely become after treatment (understand adaptation to irrigation)
    - iii. New Settlers with RCT
2. Post compact data collection and estimation of benefits for long-term investments
  - a. Long term benefits of investments need to be weighed against the costs
  - b. Measuring a year or two after program implementation may underestimate benefits of programs if we expect farmers to learn/adapt overtime and become more productive or seasonality affects gains
  - c. We understand much more about the mechanisms through which programs have impact if we evaluate over a longer period of time (adaptation to irrigation, potential hh composition changes, nonfarm enterprises, etc.)
  - d. Critical to ERR calculations which justify projects