

APPENDIX B

LOCAL STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.1. Local stakeholder comment tracker

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
Prime Minister's office		General observations: - absence of acronyms and abbreviations - absence of bibliography	These are included in the final version of the report.
Prime Minister's office	xi	The program logic of the Di perimeter predicted that PAPs could increase cropping intensity and diversify crops, generate higher yields and increase net farm income through improved access to irrigated land, formalized land tenure and increased technical capacity gained following training. Since the project did not achieve all these objectives above can we say that the project was successful? Please revisit the elements of judging performance.	We have not made any changes, as the executive summary is a space to provide an overall appreciation of the project. Overall, the project succeeded in making all of the mentioned changes along the program logic. It is in that sense that the project was successful.
Prime Minister's office	Xii	Table ES 2nd, column, before last line: Please report percentages for the following: - The PAPs reported to be better off than prior to perimeter development, at least in terms of food security - Most PAPs consider that the security of their land tenure has increased on the perimeter, but there is confusion over land transfer rights.	In order not to overburden the Executive Summary, we do not include the percentages. Nearly all PAPs (95%) feel their food security has increased, and 90 percent feel secure about their land tenure.
Prime Minister's office	Xii	The context/background to the Di Lottery specifies: The PDA developed selection criteria for the lottery - for example by favoring candidates with experience in irrigated agriculture. This contrasts with what is said on page XIII table ES where it says this at the level of the results line 3, second column: - The lottery has selected a large number of rice plot beneficiaries of with no experience in rice cultivation. Please explain why the experience criteria was not respected. In the same column 4th line, you say: "The beneficiaries of the Di Lottery are significantly more likely to use improved farming techniques." Since you have pointed out above that there is a relatively small proportion who cultivate the parcels, is it not necessary to review this conclusion? Should this not be: the Di Lottery beneficiaries who cultivate their plot ...	The comment raises two separate issues. The first question asks the evaluator to address perceived inconsistencies between the baseline report summary and the interim report. We have not made any changes as these are not inconsistencies. The first statement was based on the baseline Di Lottery baseline information prior to us having access to the interim data. Overall, applications of persons with experience in irrigated agriculture were favored because they received higher points. However, applicants did not have to have experience in rice cultivation. In the interim report, we found that beneficiaries of rice plots performed worse which we hypothesize may be due to the selection process not selecting beneficiaries specifically for rice plots. As a result, there were beneficiaries who did not have experience in rice culture. Regarding the second statement, we clarify that these are Di Lottery beneficiaries who cultivate their plot.
Prime Minister's office	Xvii	Last line of table ES6: Drought is too strong of a word. The country did not experience a drought. I suggest replacing this by "the bad pluviometry suffered by [Burkina Faso during this interim evaluation]"	We now refer to below-average rainfall.

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
Prime Minister's office	xviii	Drought is too strong of a word. I suggest "The profits of both zones are lower, probably because of the bad pluviometry suffered by Burkina Faso during this interim evaluation"	We now refer to below-average rainfall.
Prime Minister's office	XIX	Second paragraph, last line: Review the word "drought". Replace by "bad pluviometry"	We now refer to below-average rainfall.
Prime Minister's office	2	Failure to take into account the rehabilitation of the Léry dam in the assessment was not explained	The evaluation of the Lery dam was not part of the scope of work for the evaluation.
Prime Minister's office	37, 50,51, 61,86	Please use FCFA as currency in the following Tables Table II.8. Profit and PAP income, by sex of PAP (in thousands of CFA) Table III.6. Impact on the agricultural results (in thousands of CFA) Chart III.2. Farm Sales Revenue for Winners and Control Group, by Season (in thousands of CFA) Table III.7. Impact on the main results by type of parcel received (in thousands of CFA)	This has been included in the revised report.
Prime Minister's office	37, 50,51, 61,86	Some amounts are USD and others in FCFA which does not facilitate understanding	We choose to provide some amounts in USD and others in FCFA because the evaluation report addresses multiple stakeholders and has different objectives. Yields, incomes, etc. are always in FCFA with a translation only for a key profit outcome. Amounts related to project funding are in USD as a key objective is to provide information on MCC investment which is naturally in USD.
Prime Minister's office	39	What has been done to resolve the land dispute between husbands and wives?	Respondents noted that there were meetings to resolve these disputes, with some resulting in restitution of land. This information was already contained in the report.
Prime Minister's office	62	A poorly worded phrase: "On the Dî and Niassan perimeters, recovery rates have fallen significantly during the rainy season and the 2016-17 dry season." Replace with during the rainy season and dry season of 2016/2017.	This has been changed in the report.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina		Generally : - point C is titled "discussion of results", but it is actually more of a simple presentation of these observed or collected results, not discussed (at this stage?) - regarding the results, it would be good to give an idea of the relative values (%) or absolute (number) that correspond with the estimation "some", "certain", "most", ...	We have renamed this section: summary [of evaluation findings]. We have keep numeric values for the main body of the text to not overburden the Executive Summary.

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	6	This should be 2,240 ha irrigated. It should be noted that the initial target was 2,033 ha. "The long-term outlook for returns is not optimistic." In addition to the factor of the low natural soil fertility and the current rate of contribution of organic fertilization (50%?), you need to include the factor of access to a remunerative market in the analysis. Decisions to invest in soil fertility maintenance will depend on the profitability of crops and the profits earned by producers. These questions of marketing and pricing of the products should be put at the heart of the analysis.	In the revised report, we note the increase from 2,033 to 2,240 hectares. Beyond respondents' perceptions of difficulties of selling their production, we plan to assess price changes as part of the final evaluation.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	6	"The authorities do not allow such sales." In order to assess the PAPs understanding of the various land rights they enjoy, it is important to specify here the types of properties on the lands in question. Indeed, the PAPs can only sell (in the strict sense of the term) the land received individually in compensation and land for which they have a Land Title (TF). Land allocated to PAP households and secured by an Emphyteutic Lease can not be sold. They can only be subleased. It would also be interesting to know the proportion or number of people surveyed who reported having faced a rejection from the administration in their land sales procedures. It is indeed interesting to know that PAPs understand that they can no longer sell their land according to the old practices before the intervention of the project.	We cannot answer this question with interim evaluation data. The interim evaluation asked respondents about land security on plots identified by the respondent. Since land for which PAPs received titles and land held as leases was usually contiguous, PAPs considered them to be a single plot, so land tenure questions were asked for the entire plot. We plan to ask about land tenure for titled and leased land separately in the final data collection.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	8	"..., notably the transfer of AMVS to the Ministry of Agriculture". It must be pointed out that the transfer was more exactly made from the AMVS to the Regional Directorate in charge of Agriculture in the Boucle du Mouhoun, which remains a different entity from the AMVS regardless of the institutional changes or reorganisations known up to this point.	This has been corrected in the report.

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	"... .. The logic of the program did not anticipate the creation of the CATG, because it supposed that the OUEA would be in full capacity before the end of the program". The creation of the CATG was conceived within the framework of the PDA as a support option (for professionalization) of the OUEA in the long term, not only as a measure of mitigation for the effects of project delays or to catch up on the services not provided during the Compact (see the baseline study on the organization of OM, deliverable 3.3 of the AD7 market). The CATG was designed by the MCC / MCA-BF to work with operational OUEAs, which are able to understand and manage contractual relationships. However, its implementation has experienced the same delays as the establishment of the OUEA, since it should be set up to support them. The issue of delays has been addressed through the Water Operator's contract (AECOM) extended until May 2015. However, the initial CATG team (based on the original design) was reinforced at the very end of Compact to integrate a dimension of close and permanent assistance in the field. This has raised the cost of CATG services costs from 13,000 FCFA / ha / year (deliverable 3.3) to 50,000 FCFA / ha / year.	In the revised version of the report, we drop the assertion that the CATG had not been anticipated in the program logic. We were unable to obtain the document referred to in the comment to provide support for a report revision.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	"The AMVS does not fulfill its responsibilities major repairs to irrigation infrastructure ". It should say upkeep and maintenance of structured infrastructure instead of major repairs of irrigation infrastructure.	We have revised our discussion of AMVS responsibilities in the report.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	"The WUA fees may not be set at a level that can be paid by the rice producers." Is it not possible for the evaluation to assess the reasonableness of the water fees charged by these OUEAs on the basis of actual costs of the l'OM at the level of these perimeters (the OUEAs with financial statements)? Also, MCC and MCA-BF conducted a study on the capacity to pay those exploiting the rice-growing and polyculture zones (deliverable 3.4 of the AD7 market). It determines OM load levels that be supported by producers in both cases. A comparison can also be done using the estimations of this study.	We were unable to obtain these documents, so we were unable to include this information.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	In addition to the analysis of farmers' ability to pay, other factors such as planting rates of these perimeters must be analyzed.	In Table II.7 we present the amount of land cultivated by PAPs. In the final report, we will present the cultivation rates for all beneficiary groups.

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	"CATG services are appreciated ... cost recovery". On OM cost recovery, the results of the diagnosis commissioned by Burkina Faso-APD, through the consultants in charge of Post-Compact Technical Assistance to OUEAs, CATG and AMVS, revealed a dissatisfaction of the OUEA with old perimeters and of rice-growing areas in the irrigated area of Di. This led all these OUEA to make prerequisites for the continuation of their collaboration with the CATG in year 3, despite a 70% subsidy rate provided by the APD-Burkina. The main condition was the improvement of recovery rates. Realistically, these problems of low recovery rates far exceeded the competences of the CATG, which led to the involvement, through a royalties recovery support committee, of the local authorities (administrative and traditional) in accordance with the organizational schema of OM defined by MCC and MCA-BF. The functioning and added value of this multi-stakeholder committee in improving royalty collection can be assessed among sustainability measures. In order to respond to the immediate concerns of the OUEAs and to avoid a dynamic of indebtedness (accumulation of two years of non-payment vis-à-vis the CATG), adjustments were found in order to reduce the contributions of the OUEAs through recruitment and direct management of key staff.	We did not revise the report as we were unable to obtain documents related to this issue from previous APD staff and this assessment did not come out of the responses to our qualitative interviews.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	In line with the research question posed on the OM, it may be interesting in the future to assess the value-added of CATG services (or its contribution) in the operation and maintenance of the facilities on the basis of functional OUEA criteria, beyond the perceptions of the members of the offices of the OUEA. These criteria are in the M & E Post-Compact Plan. There are also criteria for assessing the performance of the AMVS in the implementation of OM activities.	This is outside the scope of the evaluation.
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	9	"... the OUEA have increasingly faced the total cost of these services". In 2015, 2016 and 2017, the subsidy rates were 90%, 80% and 70% respectively. Obviously, we were still far from the total cost of CATG services. The problem is in the level of fee recoveries, because OUEAs with high recovery rates (4 in Di and 1 in Niassan) were up to date on their payments to CATG. Those that were unpaid, experienced real cash-flow stresses related to low recovery rates. Also, certainly because there was a subsidy, the CATG operator did not know or want to adjust its pricing as the MCA-BF approach intended. In fact, as the OUEAs became more capable and able to carry out certain tasks, the CATG should re-adjust its services offer in order to reduce its services costs for the OUEAs. In view of the study on the farmers' ability to pay, it was not feasible to increase CATG expenses from CFAF 13,000 to CFAF 50,000 / ha / year, should the subsidy come to an end. A survival plan for the CATG at the end of the subsidies could not be established by the operator.	We have received additional information on recovery rates from AMVS with which we have updated the report.

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
BATIONO Modeste/ Expert de l'Ex-APD Burkina	12, 13	<p>Integration of the project.</p> <p>It seems that the main purpose is to assess the extent to which the market construction and MIS development activities have achieved their objectives. It is a question of really assessing the overall coherence of the project, the analysis can be based on the description of the project and on the perception of this integration by the stakeholders in the design and the implementation. The endline report of the Compact gives some elements (see detailed description of this consistency sought in the report):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - securing access to water to ensure the development of intensive irrigated cultivation with water control: (i) support to Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), (ii) rehabilitation of the structure of Léry, (iii) development of a new perimeter in Di and finally, (iv) development and implementation of a strategy of Operation and Maintenance (O & M); - intensification of production, diversification, valorization; <p>Access to medium-term and long-term credit to encourage investment.</p>	To clarify the limited scope of the evaluation, we rename the chapter: "Rural markets, MIS and overlap of diversified agriculture activities"
AMVS		<p>General observations</p> <p>Reading this assessment, we are under the impression that AMVS has been circumvented by design. As proof, the conclusions on the AMVS are contrary to reality on the ground. We have the impression that it is a judgment of the AMVS, since no other stakeholder has failed, while we only had a supervisory role in this part of the project.</p>	<p>The evaluation was designed to provide perspectives from all stakeholders. Despite multiple cancelled interviews and unsuccessful visits, we were able to conduct two interviews with staff from AMV as a key stakeholder for the O&M evaluation.</p> <p>We incorporated information from the limited set of documents provided by AMVS in mid-January 2019.</p>
AMVS	58	<p>"These subsidies provided by the government were in large part eliminated in 2018". The subsidies come from reimbursement funds of granted loans in the frame of the Rural Finance Facility of the MCA-BF. The initial CATG contract expected a decrease in subsidies each year and by the fifth year, the OUEAs should take over all services from the CATG. The OUEAs were well informed from the beginning regarding the conditions of the contract [with CATG].</p> <p>"With the decrease of subsidies from the funds available under the MCA-BF Rural Finance Facility, all OUEAs stopped paying CATG benefits from 2017 on because they could not afford it." During the Compact, studies had already reviewed the capacity of OUEA [to pay for CATG services]. [The project] insistend on maintaining a structure (CATG) that does not serve much.</p>	<p>In the revised report we indicate the change in subsidy over time as well as to highlight the source of funding.</p> <p>We have not been able to obtain the studies mentioned in the comment.</p>

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
AMVS	62	<p>"AMVS has not assumed its main responsibilities for water management nor transferred its existing responsibilities for agricultural development to the Niassan perimeters"</p> <p>The evaluation was limited to interviews without worrying about what is done and visible on the perimeters and administrative data of the AMVS. Restoration work on the perimeters has been carried out and verifiable on the sites, work contracts and reception reports are available at AMVS.</p> <p>AMVS has transferred water management and maintenance of irrigation works and equipment to the WUAss through a transfer contract in accordance with the joint ministerial decree N ° 2012-090 / MAH / MATDS / MEF based on the set-up and functioning of the WUAs.</p> <p>For the perimeters not concerned with rehabilitation and already rehabilitated perimeters, the joint decree is clear: «the WUAs exploit the irrigation infrastructure and equipment located in their service areas to distribute the water to their members, collect the water royalties for the maintenance and repair of irrigation infrastructure, water management and renewal of equipment. The AMVS maintains structural works (dams, channel from the water supply to the pumping station, access lines to perimeters, guard ditches), advises and supervises the activities of the WUAs in the implementation of the O & M irrigation infrastructure and equipment transferred to them.</p> <p>Rehabilitation work on the former perimeters are underway since 2013 and more than 2000 ha have been rehabilitated and 1600 ha are currently underway. The AMVS has signed transfer contracts for the management of the installations with the WUAs of former perimeters. For the perimeter of 2240 ha, the contracts are not signed because the perimeter has not yet been transferred to the AMVS after its retrocession to the Ministry of Agriculture and Hydraulic Development in 2016 by the APD –Burkina.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>Send a field team to verify the work done by AMVS to benchmark what stakeholders said and what was done when the teams passed.</p> <p>-Consult the joint decree establishing and operating the EUOA and the contract for the transfer of irrigated areas by the AMVS to the OUEA attached to clearly understand the responsibilities of the UUEA and those of the AMVS in the maintenance of the perimeters and the Water Management.</p> <p>At the end of the audits we propose a reformulation that takes into account the results in the field in place of the impressions of actors</p>	<p>We draw on the documents provided to us by AMVS in January 2019 on AMVS's rehabilitation activities to complement stakeholder perceptions and to update the report. Additional field visits to verify AMVS activities are outside the scope of the evaluation.</p> <p>In the revised version of the report we highlight the difference between views of beneficiaries and AMVS .</p>

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
AMVS	64	<p>"Assistance to AMVS. Due to the low level of interest of AMVS officials and the Government of Burkina Faso and its limited funding, the AMVS has not implemented its action plan at the end of the Compact, thus failing in its task of creating a maintenance fund for the Sourou Valley. At the time of the interviews in April 2018, the action plan was still suspended. "</p> <p>The action plan of the AMVS was implemented and the funds intended for feeding the upkeep and maintenance account of the structured infrastructure of the Sourou Valley were transferred to the AMVS budget because the AMVS's status did not allow it to have a separate specific account. The investigators are really not interested in what is happening in the field because in April 2018 work was taking place on the perimeter of 2240 ha of Di and that of Guiedougou on behalf of CEMIS 2018 "Maintenance Account and Maintenance of Structured infrastructure) of the Sourou Valley. "</p> <p>Proposal: Verify the AMVS activities in the field, consult the AMVS administrative data, the joint decree N ° 2012-090 / MAH / MATDS / MEF on modality of setting up and functioning of the OUEAs and the contracts of transfer of irrigated perimeters to OUEA to understand the responsibilities of OUEA and those of the State (AMVS) in the management of the facilities.</p>	In the revised report we clarify what the action plan entailed and which components were achieved, based on the documents available to us and stakeholder interviews.
AMVS	64	<p>"In response to these cost pressures, OUEAs on the old perimeters have stopped paying for CATG services, while the OUEAs on the new perimeter of DI have directly hired staff to reduce costs."</p> <p>The OUEAs of Di have not hired staff to reduce the costs of CATG services. CATG's benefits are expensive compared to the services and staff it offers to OUEA. Since 2017 all OUEA (Di and Niassan) have stopped paying CATG services. They have signed certain contracts with the CATG but the services are fully covered by the APD-Burkina through the loan repayment funds granted under the MCA-BF Rural Finance Facility. Since 2017, CATG staff in the field is composed of a single accountant and an electromechanic (two to three weeks in the Valley per campaign).</p> <p>Consult the contracts of the WUAs with the CATG and the CATG contracts with the APD Burkina (2017) and those of 2018 with UCF or the Department of Agriculture, Water and Sanitation Prime Ministry (DAEA-PM).</p>	We have not made changes to the report, since your statement contradicts statements from OUEA board members who said that they contracted some services directly that had previously been provided by CATG.

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
AMVS	64	<p>"AMVS operations. AMVS oversees OUEA and main canal maintenance in the new perimeter but does not seem to be taking on these responsibilities. In addition, the failure to create the Sourou Valley Maintenance Fund has limited AMVS 'ability to rehabilitate parts of the former non-functional perimeters. "</p> <p>All OUEA activities are supervised by AMVS. There is a confusion between supervising the work and the on-site control of the activity.</p> <p>AMVS has trained more than 1000 elected OUEA and their contractual staff in governance, financial and accounting management, perimeter maintenance and water management in 2017.</p> <p>The AMVS not only supervises the maintenance of the primary canal but also the programming, budgeting and implementation of O & M activities which concerns the entire irrigation network (primary, secondary, tertiary, works channels), the network drainage (primary, secondary and tertiary ditches), the network of tracks (primary, secondary and tertiary tracks), related works and equipment. Despite the presence of the CATG, we were often obliged to question the OUEA on the quality of the maintenance of the works under their jurisdiction.</p> <p>This is why the AMVS decided to maintain the primary channels of the Di perimeter, from the funds of the CEMIS (Maintenance Fund set up by the State). This Fund was also used for maintenance at the old perimeters.</p>	<p>We clarify in the report that there is confusion about the responsibilities for maintenance. We have revised the report to include AMVS' point of view on the responsibilities.</p>
AMVS	63 and 64	<p>"Cost recovery. OUEA royalty collection rates in four sectors are above 90%, but three sectors with rice plots have declining recovery rates "</p> <p>The rate of 90% is incorrect.</p> <p>The way in which the recovery rate was calculated does not make it possible to perceive the collection difficulties. Furthermore, the charts as designed do not allow a good interpretation of reality. The proof is that Di's OUEA do not have resources to cover all their expenses. In the operating principles of the OUEA, water charges are paid before the start of the campaign. It turns out that in the current calculation the rate is based on a recovery outside of the stated campaign, see two campaigns. The proof is that in our follow-up, no OUEA reached a recovery rate of 75% at the end of its fiscal year except that of the South 1).</p> <p>For a better interpretation of the recovery rate of WUA payments, the actual rate of recovery must be considered at the beginning of each campaign in accordance with the regulations in force.</p>	<p>In the revision of the report, we now make a distinction between on-time payment of WUA fees and the recovery rate after several seasons.</p>

Stakeholder	Page	Stakeholder comment translated to English	MPR Response
AMVS	16	<p>"AMVS remains responsible for agricultural development on all the perimeters of the Sourou with the exception of the perimeter of Di, but has trouble to assume all its responsibilities... Its agricultural development staff is too small to provide adequate advice and technical assistance to farmers of the old perimeters. "</p> <p>This conclusion is incorrect because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AMVS is responsible for agricultural development in all areas including Di, 2. The AMVS undertakes major repairs on the infrastructures: the rehabilitation of the channels, the pumping stations, the channels ..., 3. In terms of personnel, the AMVS has the highest rate of supervision in the country, with an agricultural advisor for every 300 ha, the rest, the State assigned to the AMVS in 2017 (agronomists) , Senior Technicians ...) 	<p>This statement touches upon three separate issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The first statement seems to directly contradict the statement in line 47 that the AMVS action plan was fully implemented. 2) In the revised report we provide information on AMVS's activities and contrast this with beneficiary perceptions. 3) We have been unable to obtain AMVS's annual reports from AMVS to document this high rate of supervision.

APPENDIX C

MCC AND REFEREE COMMENTS

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table C.1. MCC and referee comment tracker

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
1	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	xi	AMVS appears as Authority for the Development of the Sourou Valley. "Sourou Valley Development Authority" would be simpler. However in numerous places in the document it appears as Sourou Valley Water Authority. The distinction is important. One of the aspirations of ADP was to transform AMVS from a development authority into a water authority.	We have corrected this to be Sourou Valley Development Authority, based on the French translation (and their own understanding of their work).
2	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	xv	Do large farmers who complain of insufficient compensation have any notion of the cost of the assets they received? Di perimeter cost almost \$40,000/ha	We did not collect information on whether they are aware of the value of the perimeter. In this report, we describe their self-reported assessment that compares their profits with and without the perimeter.
3	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	xvi	Outcomes/yields: for context it would be helpful to know the basis on which targets were established.	We are not sure how targets were determined for all crops. The post-compact M&E plan includes the following two statements regarding the rainy season rice yield and dry season corn yield target. 1) For rainy season rice productivity in the Di perimeter: "Di targets were set slightly lower than Sourou targets due to expected differences in experience of the new farmers on the Di perimeter." 2) "[The dry season corn] target [of compact year 5] of 5 based on what was produced during rainy season. This is first campaign for corn in dry season."
4	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	xvii	If this is first reference to APD, it would be helpful give its complete title.	We have corrected this.
5	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	xxi	Table ES.6 Implementation: "high teacher-to-trainee ratios . ." Don't you mean low teacher-to-trainee ratios or high trainee-to-teacher ratios?	We have corrected this.
6	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	xxi	AD10 is a contract number. I believe that AECOM was the contractor. (See also P. 66, 72)	We have corrected this.
7	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	15	What was tenure of land expropriated?	Land tenure pre-compact was based on customary land tenure systems. We include a description in the text.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
8	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	20	"Nearly all PAPs are farmers and most are men . ." This appears to be a reference to the heads of PAPs households, which include women and children.	We clarify this in the text. The sampled baseline respondents were PAP individuals, not PAP households, so this statistic reflects individual PAPs. In the terminology of the ADP, PAPs are only the persons who were registered as land rights holders, not their spouses or children. If spouses were not considered cultivators in their own right, they would not be considered PAPs.
8 follow-up	M&E		MCC Comment on Revised Report: Please clarify if anyone other than one land rights holder was placed on the title. MPR raises that women may have lost land rights as husbands took parcel that documented in the name of the household. When women and men both had parcels, were both names listed on the title? What about if just man listed? Did women hold rights prior? Trying to understand the nuance of potential land loss. Also, in relation to the descriptions about men having consolidated land parcels given to PAP women, did the documents to those parcels include women's names on them? If MPR doesn't know or if this wasn't examined, then MPR should add language or a footnote indicating they don't have answers to these questions	We collected information in the survey on the names that are listed on the land documentation but did not analyze this information. If MCC wants us to conduct this analysis, we propose to present this information in the final evaluation report.
9	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	21	Shouldn't PAPs have been compensated for lost profits (revenue minus expenses) not lost revenue? Distinction between revenue and profit is fuzzy throughout the document.	We clarify that compensation was for profits lost. We mention sales to provide some context because we do not have survey data on profits.
10	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	24	. . almost all PAPs confirmed receiving a starter kit . ." Don't you mean PAP households? It's important to distinguish between the universe of PAPs and PAP households.	We have corrected this.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
11	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	25	Table II.5 compensation amount: "type of irrigation used." Please explain. I thought PAPs were compensated for rights to unirrigated land that was expropriated to make way for the Di perimeter.	Some of the land (often near the Sourou river) was irrigated using motor pumps, which is also where the existing dry season vegetable production came from. Unfortunately, the baseline data does not include a variable that indicates whether land was irrigated or not. However, we know that 22.4% of PAPs lost land to farm rice which would have been irrigated, or at least flooded.
12	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	30	Table II.8 What is difference between agricultural profit and agricultural income?	We have now defined these terms in the text. Agricultural income includes income from employment on other person's fields, as well as transformation of production that was purchased. We define profits to only related to the own field.
13	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	33	Table II.10 "Profits net of agricultural costs" – aren't profits always net of costs?	Yes. We drop "net of agricultural costs"
14	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	43	Table III.6 What is difference between agricultural profits and agricultural income?	We have defined these terms in the table note.
15	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	48	2nd para under C.1 ". .MCC and MCA funded the creation of and capacity building for CATG to continue to provide TA to the WUAs post-compact." Please verify. My understanding is that compact funds may not be used to pay for work performed after the compact end date.	We rephrase this sentence.
16	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	57	There is no such thing as the IWRM support project. The IWRM effort was a sub-activity under the WMI Activity of ADP.	This has been corrected.
17	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	75	". . soy was no longer grown in the perimeter due to runoff." To what does runoff refer?	That was an incorrect translation. We have corrected this in the text.
18	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	76	Tables VI.6 and 7 Is this for irrigated land or non-irrigated land?	This is across both irrigated and non-irrigated plots since the farmer training program did not itself increase irrigated land.
19	TM, consultant (ex DCO/SO/AgLand	84	First full para, second sentence: Di market.	This has been corrected.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
20	Kari Nelson	Overall	For the Di Lottery- were non-winners at least not harmed in the longer term? Given the potential drop in prices for production, are non-winners worse off?	We are conducting an analysis of price changes in the Sourou Valley as part of the final report. That would allow us to determine if control group members (non-winners) who live close to the Di perimeter were negatively affected.
21	Kari Nelson	Overall	I would defer to MCC in terms of their preferred format. But personally, I would find it helpful if the report could provide a sense of the extent to which different views were expressed in the interviews and focus groups. Currently, the report uses language like, "many," "most," etc. But, "5 of 10 interviews" or similar would be helpful for gauging the extent to which perspectives are common or not among respondents.	For a limited number of qualitative findings, we've inserted statements that quantify the number of focus groups or interviews in which a key theme was mentioned--using the formulation "In X of Y focus groups...X theme was mentioned." Specifically, we indicate how many PAPs stated that the land received in compensation was insufficient, and the number of board members of Niassan WUAs who state that AMVS was not fulfilling its responsibilities.
22	Kari Nelson	Overall	Using the colloquial names for the ADP contractors is useful (AD10, etc.). However, it would be useful to include the actual names of the companies as well- this is done in some places, but not all.	We now use the contractor name in the main body of the text throughout the report.
23	Kari Nelson	Overall	Regarding implementation evaluation questions, does MPR have any feedback regarding the breadth of activities implemented under the project? In the past, it's been criticized for having been overly ambitious, including too many subactivities and not being focused enough. Anything to add to that debate?	Yes, this is a good line of questioning. But because this falls outside of the scope of this evaluation, we did not ask explicit questions about this topic of complexity/range of activities.
24	Kari Nelson	Overall	There is certainly a lot of ground to cover in this set of evaluations. So, understood that there is a tradeoff between depth and breadth. But, many of the findings are touched on but not discussed in depth/lack a lot of nuance. Additional examples and/or nuance could be helpful.	We have added additional nuance to the following topics: land tenure security and related investments and perceptions of AMVS fulfilling its responsibilities.
24 follow-up	M&E		MCC Response to Evaluator Response on Revised Report: Land tenure security nuances need clarity. It seems there is a lack of understanding of land efforts by MPR that could be aided by having a land expert added to the team for any future work.	We have added a land expert onto the evaluation team.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
25	Kari Nelson	Exec Summary	For the Di Lottery, it's noted that lottery winners have significantly higher incomes and sales than non-winners. But, even if that's true, was the same drop in the prices received for crops experienced by the PAPs also experienced by the lottery winners (and maybe even non-winners)?	We will conduct the analysis of price changes as part of the final evaluation.
26	Kari Nelson	xvii	Typo at end of the second paragraph about Implementation- "couldcouldcould"	This has been corrected.
27	Kari Nelson	xxii	The "Integration Evaluation" at least as described in the Exec Summary doesn't really seem to be about the integration of the project, but more so about the market-based activities. There is just one paragraph in the middle that says, "in addition to findings about the markets..." that talks about integration. In general, it seems odd to combine the market-specific components with a discussion of the integration of all activities together.	To address this issue, we rename the chapter: "Rural markets, MIS and integration of DA activities"
28	Kari Nelson	17	The "Di Perimeter Evaluation" really just focuses on the PAPs, not on the perimeter as a whole. Thus, the naming of this evaluation is a bit confusing.	In terms of perimeter <i>construction</i> , the evaluation does focus on the perimeter as a whole. In terms of agricultural outcomes, the chapter focusses on PAPs. We explain this in the intro paragraph to the Di perimeter chapter.
28 follow-up	M&E		MCC Response to Evaluator Response on Revised Report: Agree with initial comment by MCC that the naming is confusing throughout. It would be helpful to clarify in the title/naming of the evaluation covering PAPs that the focus is solely PAPs. For example "Di Perimeter PAP Evaluation". You would then have "Di Perimeter PAP Evaluation" and "Di Perimeter Lottery/RCT Evaluation". The Di Perimeter and Di Lottery Evaluations both cover land, ag and irrigation construction. MPR's response does not seem to realize this--namely that the evaluation does not cover the perimeter as a whole but rather a subset of irrigated land provided to PAPs.	We changed the name from Di PAP evaluation to Di perimeter evaluation since that chapter also includes overarching information on the construction of the perimeter. The name "Di Lottery evaluation" is the name of the evaluation as specified in the RFP.
29	Kari Nelson	23- Table II.4	Would be helpful if the table appeared all on one page.	This has been corrected.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
30	Kari Nelson	40- III.4	What do the numbers in this table represent? Percentages? Raw numbers? The male plus female columns don't equal the total column except in the very bottom row for the total.	This has been corrected. The All column is a weighted average of the other two columns with weights corresponding to number of female and male Di Lottery beneficiaries.
31	Kari Nelson	49	If WUAs are stopping their service agreements with the CATG, does the CATG have enough work to continue maintaining themselves as a service provider? Or have they lost so much business as to become financially unviable?	The respondents in our qualitative interviews did not provide information to determine whether CATG would be able to maintain themselves as service provider.
32	Kari Nelson	52	Regarding the difference between how the WUAs reported water payments vs plot owners self-reported payments, how were the WUA payment records verified (if at all)? Was it based on interviews? Copies of bank statements or payment registers?	The water payments were based on payment reports submitted by WUAs to AMVS. We did not verify payment records.
33	Kari Nelson	55	Regarding the comment that, "Recovery rates on the Di perimeter are generally sustainable," is this based just on the percentage of fees recovered? Or does it also take into account the amount of the fees collected as compared to the actual costs? If the latter, it would be interesting to hear more about this analysis. If not, even a high recovery rate might not be sustainable if the fees aren't high enough.	This finding is based on the percentage of fees recovered, based on information received from AMVS. We did not collect information on the actual costs expended by WUAs.
34	Kari Nelson	60- Table V.2	Is the title to this table correct? Farmer training?	This has been corrected.
35	Kari Nelson	65	In terms of the key findings, here in the report, they look largely positive regarding the IWM components. But the executive summary seemed more critical, focusing more on the challenges faced and the ability to really fulfill their intended function. Which is more accurate?	We have revised the report so that the ES and main body of the report are consistent. In particular we also now reference our finding that IWRM has had effects on strategic planning in the ES.
36	Kari Nelson	82- VII.3	Do you have data on the reach of any of the other project components? The items in the table mostly relate to farmer/animal husbandry training and Di. But what about the access to credit components? Animal health investments? Value chain investments, etc.? Also, this focuses on the overlap of farmer training with other components. But, what about the overlap/integration between other components (access to credit and the Di perimeter, for example).	We have renamed the chapter to more closely focus on the activities that are part of the evaluation scope.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
37	Kari Nelson	83	Regarding the finding that the markets are largely occupied, do you have any evidence for how/why this has improved over time? By about a year post-compact, there were notable sections of several of the markets that were not being used, in particular the round pavilions that were intended for women vendors. If this has changed, I'm curious what has led to this change.	Our design called for an assessment of occupancy at the time of the interim data collection. We did not ask how the occupancy changed over time in the post-Compact period.
38	Kari Nelson	85 (first full paragraph)	It would be helpful to know how many of the 37 originally served markets were originally in project areas. The two noted are no longer being covered. But, is that 2 of 37 in project areas? Or some other number?	We will conduct the analysis of price changes as part of the final evaluation.
39	Kari Nelson	85	Do you have any data on the number of MIS requests for price data EcoData receives? It's noted regarding the weather data, but not for price data.	We have included this information.
40	Kari Nelson	85	If people aren't really using the MIS for the price data, how is the private company continuing to pay to collect and provide the data?	This falls outside of the scope of the evaluation. We do know that EcoData uses the same platform to disseminate price and weather information so demand for weather data could drive continued service.
41	M&E	xvi	Quantify "substantially higher" and "do not meet project targets". For instance: Yields per hectare are XX % higher than at baseline but are XX% below project targets on average.	We now provide a quantitative comparison of yields and targets. However in the absence of a meaningful baseline, we cannot provide this type of comparison.
42	M&E	xviii	Perhaps mention that APD is no longer operational.	We now mention this in the ES.
43	M&E	xx	You need to explain what "AD10" is. Provide contractor name.	We now refer to the contractor name throughout.
44	M&E	Page 11	Provide specific months of data collection instead of saying data collection was conducted in fall 2017.	We have added this information.
45	M&E	Page 16	For all of the summary tables, does "activities and assistance" refer to what was planned or what was done?	This refers to assistance provided. We rename this row in the table to clarify this.
46	M&E	Page 21	Quote is attributed to ADP. It should be APD.	This has been corrected.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
47	M&E	Page 29	<i>Did the baseline survey have data on agricultural income? Why aren't there comparisons with pre- and post-project agricultural outcomes of PAPs?</i>	There is limited baseline data on agricultural income that is of poor quality, which we have opted not to use. Specifically, the baseline survey did ask one question on average agricultural sales revenue PAPs received in the last five years. However, this included years in which the household did not harvest as the perimeter was under construction, and is therefore a poor measure.
48	M&E	Page 52, Table IV.5.	Include unit for amount paid. Second row of table.	This has been corrected.
49	M&E	Page 63	"Fees are distributed according to a clearly defined formula." – Unclear sentence.	We have clarified that revenues from the Water User fees are divided up between recipients according to fixed shares
50	M&E	General comment	Need to edit document. Example page 89 "Water user fees being collected from large users, but due do lengthy legal enforcement, users—including mining companies—but enforcement is difficult so many companies pay fees voluntarily."	The final version has been re-edited.
51	M&E	General comment	You should spell out acronyms at first use and then use the acronym.	We spell out the acronym at first use in the ES, the main body of the report.
52	M&E	General comment	The length and structure of sentences make this report difficult to read.	We have reviewed sentence length and structure and made revisions.
53	M&E	General comment	Reduce wordiness. Example: Di Lottery beneficiaries are significantly more likely to use improved agricultural techniques. Farmers selected to receive plots through the lottery are significantly more likely to use improved agricultural techniques—including fertilizer, pest control, and improved seeds.	We have reviewed the report to minimize excess wordiness.
54	M&E	General comment	Re-consider use of quote text boxes. Many of the quotes are long and do not add to what is already included in the body of the report. Example: the first quote could easily be summarized in one or two sentences in the report.	We have shortened some of the quotes. We retain quotes to provide beneficiary/stakeholder perspectives in their own words.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
55	M&E	Page 71	What's the point of Figure VI.2.? Were 100% of farmers supposed to receive each topic?	This primarily highlights the focus of the training activities in the two areas. Since trainers had leeway in what they covered, we don't know what the expected number should have been. We clarify that in the text.
56	M&E	Page 72	Did the project meet its target with regards to gender distribution?	We include information on gender specific targets in the report.
57	M&E	Page 73	Before the project, were farmers using chemical fertilizers, organic fertilizers, Insecticides/pesticides, and improved seeds? This would influence what those farmers using today.	We reference baseline use of inputs in the text.
58	M&E	Page 74, Table VI.4.	Include unit.	This is included.
59	M&E	Page 75-76, Figure VI.4– VI.5	Consider revising presentation. The zeros are confusing.	This has been corrected.
60	EA	Di Lottery RCT	Can you give more technical detail describing how balanced the treatment and control groups were, and how this was ensured? Of how many variables tested were there imbalances, is there an F-test, etc.? What were the procedures followed to ensure the fairness of the lottery?	We have provided more information on the balance tests.
61	EA	Di Lottery RCT	Can you add units as relevant to Table III.5 and III.6?	We added units in Table III.5. The table title for III.6 clarifies that all indicators are in percent.
62	EA	Di Lottery RCT	Are there direct measures of input costs? If so, do these include the rental or other costs of obtaining land?	Yes, there are direct measures of input costs. Whenever land is rented, the measure of agricultural profits subtracts the rental cost of land. Agricultural income includes the income from renting out land.
63	EA	Di Lottery RCT	This compares people who received land to people who did not. It's somewhat unsurprising that people who received land had better outcomes than those who did not. I would think that the relevant comparison would be moving land from collective management to individual ownership. Is there a plan to measure cropping or yields using satellite data or something like that, perhaps as part of the Di Perimeter evaluation?	This falls outside the scope of this evaluation.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
64	EA	Di Lottery RCT	The rice plots are located differently from the polyculture plots – how sure are we that the differences in outcomes are due to the crop designation and not the distance to settlements or some other factor?	If we look at the location of plots of lottery beneficiaries, we observe that almost all rice and polyculture plots are located in the same sectors (See Figures A.1 and A.2 in the design report). We are confident that the small differences in distance to settlements do not drive the results.
65	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		Do the impacts of winning the Di Lottery vary by participant's gender? It would be useful to provide this evidence (and an accompanying discussion) -- as originally planned in the ADP Design Report and discussed in Section I.B.4 of the Interim Report.	We include the analysis separately by gender in the appendix.
66	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		The positive impacts of winning the Di Lottery on agricultural sales, profits, income, and household income are very encouraging. But these variables are notoriously noisy. It would thus be important to check whether the results are robust to different transformations of these variables to correct for outliers and the skewed nature of their distributions (e.g. winsorization, inverse hyperbolic sine transformation).	Our analysis is makes use of winsorized values for costs, revenues and profits. As a robustness check we now use the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation of winsorized values.
67	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		The discussion is silent about survey attrition. What was the fraction of respondents originally surveyed at baseline that were successfully tracked and interviewed during the interim survey? In the presence of attrition, does the attrition rate vary between treatment and control groups? Do the characteristics of those who attrit differ from those who don't attrit? These questions are important because differential treatment-control attrition patterns can undermine the internal validity of the results -- if not appropriately dealt with.	We provide information on overall attrition rates, and a disaggregation by treatment and control group. Overall, when we exclude multiple applicant households, we survey at least one household member in 94% of households. Attrition is different for households of control (7.5%) and treatment (1.9%) applicants.
68	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		The eligibility criteria for the Di Lottery focused on identifying farmers with high potential to put the land to good use (pg. 38). At baseline potential beneficiaries were ranked on a score proxying for that potential. It would be interesting to examine whether the Di Lottery impacts vary with respect to such score. That would help (ex-post) validate the eligibility criteria, as well as inform the design/targeting of future similar interventions.	In the appendix table B.X we provide estimates of interactions between the treatment variable and eligibility criteria.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
69	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		The estimated impacts on agricultural inputs are mostly focused on the extensive margins (e.g. whether any fertilizer or hired labor is used). It would be useful to also report impacts on the intensive margins (e.g. total amount of fertilizer and labor used).	We have updated the report to include information on amount spent on fertilizer, hired labor and other inputs.
70	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		Pg. 40 says that “nearly all Di Lottery winners received leases”. This statement seems to be at odds with Table III.3, which appears to indicate that that happened for only 60% of the cases. Maybe the statement is referring to both leases and land titles? Sorry if I’m missing something here.	We clarify this in the text. Di Lottery beneficiaries were not eligible to receive titles with full ownership over the land. However in the survey, a significant proportion of respondents state that they received a title. When beneficiaries state they received a title they mean a formal document that proves their land right. We separately present both variables as indication of confusion over land rights. Together, close to 90% reported they received formal documentation.
70 follow-up	M&E		MCC Response to Evaluator Response on Revised Report: Can you clarify what the 60% represents? All Di Lottery participants should have received leases. All PAPs should have received titles. It is common that people would refer to leases as titles in surveys. We suggest revising the report language to include clarifying language stating something such as “Survey respondents may have confused leases with titles, which contributes to the figures reported. Such confusion over the nuances of documentation is not uncommon in survey responses to this type of question”	Our footnote had provided the following information: “Di Lottery beneficiaries were not eligible to receive titles granting them full ownership of the land. When beneficiaries say they received a title, they mean a formal document that proves their land right. We separately present both variables to show beneficiaries’ confusion over land rights.” We slightly reformulate this in light of your suggestion to: The 28 percent of beneficiaries who say they received a title, likely mean a formal document that proves their land right. We separately present both variables to show beneficiaries’ confusion over their land rights documentation.”
71	World Bank Gender Innovation Lab		The report mentions that Di Lottery treatment impacts are measured using a regression framework (pg. 37), yet the report seems to only present t-tests from simple (unconditional) treatment-control differences. Appendix Table A.4 with robustness checks is missing!	All estimates rely on regression analysis, as outlined in the methodological section. We rename the table columns to clarify that this is an “estimated difference”, and add text to the notes to clarify this. We have updated the report to include Appendix Table A.4.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
72	ESP MCC	Overall	Rarely does this reviewer receive reports as well written as this one with proper spelling and grammar and clarity of expression. Thanks to the authors.	Thank you for this comment.
73	ESP MCC	Pg. xiv, Exec Sum	Pg. xv, Section C.1. The findings (or in some cases inability to have findings) regarding gender should be included here, because the methodology for census of PAPS initially was biased against women and subsequent adjustments were made, but this reviewer was never convinced they were adequate.	We now summarize the finding related to women's compensation in the ES as well.
74	ESP MCC	Pg. xvi, Table ES 2	Is the longer-term pessimistic outlook for sustainability of yields the same for PAPS as non PAPS?	Yes, this is a perimeter wide conclusion as WUAs regroup beneficiaries regardless of the channel through which they acquired land.
75	ESP MCC	Pg. xvi, Figure ES 2	The Di Lottery program logic shows <i>secure</i> land tenure as part of the program logic, but Figure ES 1 for Di Perimeter shows <i>Improved</i> land tenure. What is the difference between the two terms and if there is supposed to be one, please explain. One could note that Di PAPS received titles, but lottery winners received long-term leases.	We now change this so that both refer to "improved" land tenure.
76	ESP MCC	Pg. xvii, Table ES 3	Were outcomes similar regarding rice for the Di PAPS regarding rice or perhaps they did not cultivate rice only or if they did there are too few for statistical comparison. Please note such differences.	There are only 3 PAPS who received solely rice plots and 36 who received rice and polyculture plots. As such, the comparison with Di Lottery beneficiaries would be underpowered. PAPS with both types of plots are among the largest PAP landholders. As a result, a comparison with Di Lottery beneficiaries would also not be meaningful.
77	ESP MCC	Pg. xviii, Table ES 4	Is it possible to know how the PAPS are doing in terms of paying their WUA fees?	The O&M chapter provides this information and a comparison with Di Lottery beneficiaries.
78	ESP MCC	Pg. xxi, Table ES 6	Is it possible to know how women fared with respect to receiving training and the outcomes thereof?	We now mention whether the target of balanced male-female participation was met. In terms of benefits there are so few female headed households that we don't know.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
79	ESP MCC	Pg.xxii	Can the evaluators hypothesize as to why Soubakaniedougou market is only partially utilized? Was it rehabilitated less well than the others? Were there resettlement problems?	We add the reason for non-use into the ES.
80	ESP MCC	Overall Executive Summary	A conclusion this reviewer would draw from the Executive Summary is that a focus on “hardware” (the irrigation infrastructure) detracted from an appropriate focus on and delayed the implementation of the “software” (the services related to people using the infrastructure). This has occurred on other MCC irrigation projects, because the infrastructure works are typically delayed. Is this a legitimate conclusion to be drawn? If so, would the authors being willing to make this explicit?	It is safe to say that the delay in investments in infrastructure delayed the “software”. But we cannot conclude that this had any implications for the functioning of the perimeter, because APD coordinated the completion of many of the outstanding activities in the post-Compact period.
81	ESP MCC	Overall Executive Summary	There were many problems with contractors, especially resettlement, on the Di project, but the project has produced positive results, although perhaps not sustainable. Is it a leap of this reviewer’s imagination that initial problems were overcome by good oversight from MCA (and MCC)? For example, changes and rectifications were made, including paying for crops in years where farmers could not farm because of delays. This is not a good resettlement practice at all, but a remediation that is frowned upon because it can cause dependence; the results provided seem to indicate that this did not occur. Can the authors document that? Do the authors have any observations that would allow hypotheses on how/why things turned out better than expected?	The reviewer raises three distinct questions. 1) Respondents in our interviews did not highlight this particular phase in the RAP process or the course corrections that were done, so we are not able to include further analysis on this issue. 2) Respondents did not comment on the issue of dependence. 3) We already note in the ES that APD completed activities that were planned under the compact but were delayed.
82	ESP MCC	Overall – carry over from ES to Main Report	Please note that the above comments, as appropriate, could be applied to and addressed in the main report. For example, the distinction, if any, between improved land tenure and secure tenure.	We apply relevant corrections in the main body as well.
83	ESP MCC	II.B, pg. 17	Please make clear why the report does not address women’s gardens and the Di non-PAPS.	We include a footnote to illuminate the chapter’s focus on PAPS.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
84	ESP MCC	II.B, pg. 18	Last paragraph says BERD took plot censuses in 2010 and 2013. Specify that this was February 2013, because this was not done in the survey of October 2013. Clarify the household surveys in 2013. Figure II. 2 says the February 2013 was a “survey” but in October 2012 there was a retrospective baseline survey to a representative sample of PAPs. Does the text mean to reference the February survey or both? In any case, should the reader infer that the Feb 2013 survey was not representative or was it a full census? Was the October 2013 survey actually representative in Mathematica’s view? Did you detect biases?	In our baseline survey we describe the data and the poor quality in detail. The 2010 census data was copied from appendix tables to the BERD report by the then MCC program officer Kari Nelson, as BERD had never submitted the database. It only contained a handful of variables on land lost. This is in contrast to the 2013 census which collected substantially more information, but really is of limited use as it covers less than 10 percent of land lost. For the October 2013 survey, we do not know how representative the survey is as there is about a quarter of sample attrition but the initial sample stratification is not documented. The previous evaluator (who would have had access to more timely information) also could not replicate the sampling strategy. As such we have no idea of the extent of biases. (This is also discussed in more detail in our baseline report.)
85	ESP MCC	II.B, pg. 18	The fundamental question here concerns the adequacy of the data. At the time, there were many questions about the methodology and its application. Just one example of many: it was stated that the first resettlement specialist quit the team because inadequate funds had been provided to the team (although allocated in the contract budget that was paid for) to do the work and thus the census of plots was badly done.	
86	ESP MCC	II.B, pg. 19 Footnote 6	Which sample was not retained, February 2013 or October 2013? Explain more fully why the baseline respondents are not a representative sample of Di PAP households. This raises the question as to why the October baseline survey is called a representative sample. Was there ever a full baseline census and if so, why not, which is what PS 5 requires (the resettlement standard for MCC).	We have updated the report to clarify that it is the baseline survey of October 2013 that is not representative.
87	ESP MCC	II C. pg. 20	How adequate was the baseline survey of respondents to show that 22% is a representative number for females? This seems confusing in light of footnote 6 and especially in light of the many complaints and problems with identifying female farmers starting in 2010 that were never fully resolved.	This is representative of females identified as PAPs in the RAP as approximately one quarter of PAPs were female. We include this number in the text.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
88	ESP MCC	II D. 1. b, pg. 21	Which baseline survey is this? Which date and who did it? Any reason why records of MCA payouts of compensation and or MCC payments to MCA for compensation were not used?	We clarify the distinction between the baseline survey and the census. We make use of the payment information from the census database. We also refer the reader to the baseline report for more information.
89	ESP MCC	II. D. 1. b, pg. 22	The complaints about the complexity of the formula are well-justified in this reviewer's opinion, who has never seen such a complicated (and convoluted) formula. It is good that the results worked out well for most PAPs, but the lack of transparency and difficulties to understand the formula, including the double forms of land tenure documents, because some was deemed to be non-compensation land (the land based on ratio of adult household members exceeding a threshold). Typically good resettlement practice is to keep compensation simple and standardized.	There is a tradeoff between achieving a larger set of objectives with the RAP process and simplicity of the formula. Former MCA staff were still convinced of their use of this complex formula. Regarding the second comment: In this paragraph we reference stakeholder perceptions of accuracy of the databases.
90	ESP MCC	II. D. 1. b, pg. 22	The last paragraph on pg. 22 indicates the problems with the data and the quality of record keeping diplomatically, but perhaps the evaluation needs to be more frank about the situation. Does Mathematica believe that the data they had is trustworthy enough? This reassurance would be helpful.	We use the data in this section primarily to triangulate our qualitative analysis. We think this data is adequate for that purpose. Our baseline report provides an in-depth assessment of the quality of the baseline data sources.
91	ESP MCC	II. D. 1. b, pg. 22, Table II.3	Footnote a is not contained in the table. Provide the line item to which it is a reference. Source does not contain date reference to baseline 2013 survey – is this October? Note that the plot census of 2011 is not shown in Figure II.3. That should be added.	We have now clarified that the baseline survey is October 2013 and the census (without survey) February 2013.
92	ESP MCC	II. D. 1. b, pg. 23	The paragraph concerning the adverse effect on women is important. Hence the suggestion that this finding be part of the Executive Summary. Is it possible to add more data and any findings regarding the women's groups' agricultural activities? This seemed to be a productive and useful effort.	We have added some information on adverse effects on women in the ES.

93	ESP MCC	II D. 1. c pg. 24	<p>Please confirm that pesticides and herbicides were actually part of the starter kit and the generic or brand names of the products. To this reviewer's knowledge, no special assessment of the "cides" was prepared and that is not in accord with MCC Environmental Guidelines. Very few "cides" would pass the tests required by MCC Environmental Guidelines. Thus there is a potential compliance concern. Very few "cides" would pass the tests except those found acceptable by a USAID Pesticide Evaluation Report (PER) and Safe Use Action Plan (SUAP) for Burkina Faso, because the requirements are similar. MCC has a prohibition on funding if:</p> <p>(b) the project involves or will involve the production, procurement, or intentional release of any pesticide, industrial or consumer chemical or other product (including an emission or effluent)</p> <p>(i) that is listed for elimination or restriction under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants;</p> <p>(ii) that is banned or severely restricted under the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade;</p> <p>(iii) that is listed or nominated for inclusion under the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade;</p> <p>(iv) that includes an active ingredient that is classified as "extremely hazardous" (Class Ia) or "highly hazardous" (Class Ib) in "The WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard," as revised from time to time; or</p> <p>(v) that is a pesticide that includes an agent that the United States Environmental Protection Agency has classified in Toxicity Class I, has classified as a Restricted Use Pesticide, or has not registered for use in the United States; unless MCC has made a final determination, taking into consideration an appropriate environmental and social review in accordance with the criteria in the "Environmental and Social Review" section of these guidelines, that the project is not likely to cause a significant environmental, health, or safety hazard</p>	<p>We did not inquire about brand or generic names of any products included in the starter kits during the qualitative interviews. A verification of whether the products would have been allowable is outside the scope of our evaluation.</p>
----	---------	-------------------	---	---

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
94	ESP MCC	II D. 1. c , Table II.5 pg. 25	Row 2, column 2. Comment is made that the second round of compensation did not materialize. Please clarify if this was because the PAPs had an inaccurate perception of a second round but did not receive it because they were allowed to farm land that season or that they actually should have received it but did not. The first issue is one of lack of communication and transparency. The second is a lack of compliance with resettlement policy as applied to this project.	Our qualitative interviews do not allow us to distinguish between these two alternative explanations.
95	ESP MCC	II D 2, pg. 27	Table II. 6 reports that reported practice was 41% for appropriate use of pesticides/pest management. Who determined the criteria for appropriate use and who evaluated this? Were the MCC Environmental Guidelines followed? For example, if farmers used Restricted Use Pesticides per USEPA, they were not following appropriate use per MCC requirements. This is a very tricky subject, so unless specific information is available to evaluate appropriate use according to MCC requirements, it is better to footnote and say this was reported but this does NOT necessarily mean MCC requirements were followed (unless of course that can be documented). However, one cannot document this without knowing the specific generic or brand names and much more information on how label directions were or were not followed.	As mentioned above in our response to comment 93, we do not have this information.
96	ESP MCC	II D 4, pg. 31	Text says “most understand that renting out their plots is an option”. Use of the adjective “most” may be somewhat misleading as the statement about renting in the Executive Summary reports 55%, which just barely qualifies as “most”.	We clarify that beyond those who believe they have a legal right to lease out land, the majority of the remainder also think that <i>in practice</i> they can do so.
97	ESP MCC	III	This is a fascinating section and reinforces the importance of randomized control, which is hard to achieve in many resettlement situations.	Thank you for this comment.
98	ESP MCC	III D. 2 pg. 40	Please note if there were similar problems with PAPs – i.e., not cultivating land they were awarded.	We have included this information in Chapter 2.
99	ESP MCC	III D. 2, pg. 40	Please report on the names of phytosanitary products. See earlier comment about potential lack of compliance with MCC prohibitions on pesticides and herbicides.	As mentioned above in our response to comment 93, we do not have this information.
100	ESP MCC	III D. 2, pg. 40	Can the authors provide any hypotheses about the reasons that so few participated in training?	We propose asking this question in the final data collection since we currently do not have information on this issue.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
101	ESP MCC	IV overall	The analysis of O&M tends to reinforce the general conclusion that software such as TA suffers when infrastructure construction is delayed and training or other assistance is not available in a timely fashion. To the extent this conclusion can be reached by this evaluation, it will be helpful, because it appears to be a recurring one in MCC irrigation projects.	We know it was delayed, but we cannot state that the training implemented by the post-compact entity was worse than planned.
102	ESP MCC	IV overall	The reinforcement of the conclusion of the Di lottery analysis that rice only plots diminish recovery rates and could lead to a declining spiral with nonpayment of fees leading to reduced harvest and inability to pay WUA fees.	Yes. We also reference the lottery chapter in this context.
103	ESP MCC	V overall	Integrated Water Resource Management suffered delays in establishing CLEs and did not receive all the training planned. Can the authors hypothesize as to why? The report suggests that this may have been the result of insufficient stakeholder engagement. Can the lack of expertise and the disincentives to pay water user fees be overcome and how?	Our qualitative interviews do not provide information on the reasons for the delays and lack of training. We did not ask about whether the lack of expertise and the disincentives to pay water user fees can be overcome.
104			The document states that “Members of CLE Banfora conducted campaigns to convince the public to use approved pesticides.” Unless it can be documented that these were approved according to the requirements of MCC Environmental Guidelines (and the approved ones named), a caveat should be inserted to indicate that there is no information to indicate that these were approved under the strict MCC Environmental Guidelines for pesticides, no RUPs were used, etc., etc. See also pg. 64 which showed that there was pesticide contamination of water (which may have had nothing to do with the project, however).	Based on our understanding this targeted the reduction of the inappropriate use of non-approved pesticides. In untangling the double-negat. We have reformulated the section to clarify that it is not the case that the CLEs distributed any phytosanitary products with MCC funding.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
105	ESP MCC	VI overall	Please make clear how the training evaluated under the Farmer Training included the Di perimeter. This is not explicitly stated. It would be helpful to provide a list or map of the 30 villages involved. Figure VI.1 indicates that in 2011 TA was conducted for beneficiary farmers in ADP intervention zones, which suggests Di was included. Page 23 under Section II reports that PAP households reported receiving training from AD 10 or MCA. Was this the same type of training or different? Is it possible to know if results differed by the institution who delivered it?	The reviewer raised three questions. 1) Training for PAPs and Di perimeter farmers was conducted by the same contractor, but this chapter only deals with the non-Di perimeter farmer training activities. We update the report to include this information. 2) We provide information on the number of villages in each area, but do not provide a list. A list would reduce the effort needed for respondent identification. 3) The implementer for the training was AD10 funded through MCA. We have included a note to clarify that both names were used to designate the training.
106	ESP MCC	VI, Table VI.3, pg. 74 and text on pg. 73	This section that indicates over 50% of the households in the 2018 interim survey used insecticides and pesticides (not clear why this terminology is used, because earlier terminology was pesticides and herbicides). See earlier comments about this related to the Di perimeter. There, the percentages of those recollecting use of "cides" was much smaller. Can this be explained? Please be explicit about which "cides" are cited.	The question on use encompasses all phytosanitary products, so we do not know which ones were specifically used. Because we do not have this granular level of detail we cannot provide the comparison you suggested.
107	ESP MCC	VII overall	More information about the coordination (or lack thereof) among activities and the "silo" mentality of the multiple contractors would be useful to include.	Respondents blamed delays for the breakdown in coordination. Since a single contract covered the activities for which we are assessing overlap (AD10) a silo mentality between contractors could not be the explanation.
108	M&E	II overall	Is there information available for baseline production from monitoring data.	MCC has agreed to look for baseline monitoring data. If these baseline data are not available or usable, we will reference the information contained in the ITT and the ERR.
109	M&E	III overall	There is no information on land tenure outcomes for Di Lottery beneficiaries.	We updated the interim report to include information on land tenure outcomes for Di Lottery beneficiaries in the Appendix. These indicators we present are the same as for the Di PAP analysis (Table II.9).

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
109 follow-up	M&E		MCC Response to Evaluator Response on Revised Report: It would be helpful to include this data not only as part of the appendix but also better analyzed within the report itself. See other comments.	This descriptive analysis was included in the main body of the report as Table III.8, but mistakenly noted in the response tracker that it is part of the appendix. We address the other comments below.
110	M&E	III overall	There is no analysis of the impact of the Di Lottery on land tenure outcomes for the Di Lottery evaluation.	Due to a programming error the questions on land tenure security and conflict were not collected for off-perimeter plots. This precludes an analysis of the lottery's impact on land tenure outcomes.
110 follow-up	M&E		MCC Response to Evaluator Responses on Revised Report: This was not a simple programming error. MPR did not realize the land data was not collected until MCC raised the issue upon review of MPR's draft interim report. In fact MPR first responded that they were not supposed to collect the land data and could not recall what data was/wasn't collected. MCC had to provide emails showing the agreement of data to be collected, which had followed multiple rounds of discussions during finalization of the questionnaire over the importance of collecting land tenure data in the interim. We suggest MPR explicitly state in the report their failure to obtain data as it was part of the evaluation's key research questions, approved evaluation design, and approved questionnaire, yet was not completed. The results/methodology no longer align with the evaluation design/logic and cannot be fixed at a later date by simply collecting endline data. Reason being, recall data on land tenure perceptions and tenure is not good so endline data will only provide longer-term results and perhaps recall data on land transfers. It would be helpful for MPR to onboard a land expert in the future as the current team does not seem to understand the land aspects.	We are fielding a survey to collect this information and will include this analysis in the final evaluation report. We include a footnote that the interim report did not include this information due to a programming error.
111	M&E	III overall	There is no analysis of the effect of land tenure on investment.	In the revised interim report we analyze the effect of winning the lottery on land investment. In the final evaluation, we will implement a mediation analysis to analyze which part of the effect of Di Lottery on land investment operates through the mechanism of an increase in land tenure security.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
111 follow-up	M&E		<p>MCC Responses to Evaluator Responses on Revised Report: The link of land tenure (long-term leases and titles and related perception changes) on investment was a key research question of this evaluation. It was a founding element of the project logic and evaluation design. Almost all lottery participants received leases for Di. Similarly all PAPs received titles. Having 14% of beneficiaries make investments could be considered relatively large considering the short exposure period once beneficiaries received leases. Similarly 8% of PAPs making investments after receiving titles could be significant depending on control group/pre project scenario--was this data compared with the resettlement data for PAPs on existing investments? Do we know the amounts of the investment and related change in investment which would provide an understanding of evaluation power? Per phone discussion between MPR and MCC following the draft interim report did MPR analyze this data? For Di lottery beneficiaries, this was provision of a brand new parcel so investment was 0 prior on that parcel (also have some Di lottery application data). For perception of land tenure, please clarify what questions were used for perception of tenure and investment and include correlation analysis in report-even if none, it is key to note since research question. Namely, even if can't show effects since did not collect required land data, per discussions, we would still like to understand if those who invested were those who had higher perceived tenure (keeping in mind timeline of receipt of land tenure documentation, parcel receipt, related trainings/planting seasons/starter kits, and transfers).</p>	<p>We agree that the effect of land tenure security on investments, loans and land transactions is an important mechanism through which benefits of the project may operate. However, the evaluation design report approved by the EMC did not include these research questions.</p> <p>The percentages actually refer to the percent households who report having made investments in the last three years, since the construction of the perimeter. We now include this time reference in the report.</p> <p>In terms of benchmarking, we do not have baseline information so we cannot provide information on changes in investments on the land that became the Di perimeter. In terms of other benchmarks, Bambio and Agha (2018) show that only 40 percent of plots in project regions have ever received any investments, but most of these investments are not applicable to land on an irrigated perimeter (well, dikes,...), so the comparison is not really meaningful. We also reviewed the M&E plan and ERR model and could not find anticipated levels of land investment nor the type of investment the program logic had hoped to facilitate. We also have information from the Di Lottery controls: Di Lottery beneficiary households are 6.9 percentage points more likely than Di Lottery control households to make any investment in their plots. We note the caveat that the type of land and the type of land tenure differ.</p>

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
112	M&E	Overall Di Lottery	MPR realized well after the interim results report was drafted (and only after raised by MCC) that they forgot to include the series of key land questions. If MPR had caught this mistake during analysis and data quality control/oversight, MPR might have been able to go back and collect the land interim data required. However, by the time of the interim results report review by MCC it was too late. Instead of noting this flaw in the evaluation, MPR states in the report that land benefit streams cannot be measured. As the design, logic and questionnaires planned to collect this data and could have measured this data, MCC suggests that the text better reflect the situation. For example, the report could note that MPR planned to collect and analyze interim effects on land tenure and related impacts on land based investment per the evaluation design and logic but failed to do so due to misprogramming and weaknesses in data quality control/oversight. As such, the evaluation will be limited in its ability to detail out the contributions of land tenure in the interim and will need to rely on the collection of longer-term exposure period data.	We include a note that we are collecting land tenure information from the control group on land conflicts and land tenure security that will be included in the final report. We have collected information on land investments and include the estimate of the effect of winning the lottery on land investment in the report.
113	M&E	Overall	During Interim Report Discussions when MPR realized and agreed that they did not collect the land data, the agreement was to review and incorporate the limited land data that was collected. Although basics were included, interactions with the rest of the data does not seem to be incorporated. Specifically, MPR was supposed to look at correlations with land tenure and agricultural investment and land use/transfers. If MPR did analyze this data, it is not documented in the revised report. MPR should review correlations with land tenure, agricultural investment and land use. This should be fixed prior to finalization of the Interim report.	We did include the correlation in the answer to MCC's question given MCC's specific stated request to know about the correlation. In terms of the larger interest in land tenure outcomes, we are collecting information on land tenure outcomes in the control group to assess the project effects on land tenure at interim. We will include this analysis into the final evaluation report.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
114	M&E	Di Lottery RCT	<p>It would be helpful for MPR to review interpretation of some land data points. Some of the interpretations do not seem well founded or informed by empirical evidence. For example, MPR notes low investment using land as collateral and use of land; however, there is no information on what are normal levels of land investment and use of land as collateral for Burkina. Some would think 14% investment on land obtained in less than a year (sometimes with training and incentive kits only delivered late or post compact) is considerable. If Burkina data is unavailable, one could look to comparison at least in other similar efforts in other countries/the region. As there is no control, MCC suggests that MPR either provide an understanding of general levels in Burkina or the region that support its analysis or simply provide the data without adding a negative interpretation. On a similar note, it is unclear why the report is comparing Di lottery beneficiaries to Di PAP beneficiaries. Di PAP beneficiaries received land and farmer training well before Di lottery beneficiaries. That along with PAPs receiving full title vs Di lottery beneficiaries receiving long term leases may be what is causing some of these differences; however, MPR does not delve into any of these nuances and instead seems to treat them like a comparison group, which is not an appropriate approach. It is important to note this if going to compare two groups of beneficiaries. Again, this is where having a land expert or land evaluation expert on board would be helpful.</p>	<p>This comment raises two issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How low are the investment in land relative to investment in Burkina Faso/the region? We are able to benchmark this by providing an estimate of the impact of the project on land invest by using interim outcomes in the control group. 2. The comparison of PAPs and Di Lottery beneficiaries. To clarify the limits of this comparison, we include a note similar to footnote 13 in chapter III. <p>We think its important to point out that both comparisons complement each other: The advantage of comparing PAPs to Di Lottery beneficiaries is that any confounding factors related to land are kept constant, although background characteristics vary, not all PAP land is leased and there are some differences in when the land was received. The advantage of the comparison of Di Lottery beneficiaries and controls is that their baseline characteristics are held constant, but the characteristics of the plot that affect investment (irrigated vs. non-irrigated land; distance from homestead to plot) differ.</p>

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
115	M&E	Di Lottery RCT	There seem to be some interesting findings for women, where women actually took out more loans/invest than the men. Why were these findings not highlighted? It is quite an odd finding for land projects and key. Considering the other notes re women/land, this appears to be an area that could be better highlighted.	This is a question of sample size. Out of the 29 PAP households, 3 female headed households took out loans and of these 1 used land as collateral. So there is little we can say with such a small sample. For Di Lottery beneficiaries, about 4% of male Lottery beneficiaries have used land as collateral versus 1% for female beneficiaries. While the rate for men is a factor of 4 higher than for women, it is really the absolute numbers that stand out and that document that this is not a major mechanism for project effectiveness. The differences in land investments at 16 and 12 percent for female and male Di Lottery beneficiaries are also really small.
116	M&E	Literature Review and Di Irrigated Perimeter PAP Evaluation- pg 32	MPR's framing of the PAP and Di land/ag activities and related links would benefit from revision. PAP is not a land only investment (deals with those who were resettled) and Di lottery not only irrigation. Both evaluations are unable to separate out the effects of the three joint activities of land, ag/farmer training and irrigation/infrastructure. For example in the literature review, MPR notes that irrigation and land by gender can be analyzed via RCT but land titling cannot since no control group. This is incorrect. The distinction is we can measure effects of irrigation plus farmer training plus land certification via Di lottery RCT but not for the PAPs (same set of investments-land title, irrigation and farmer training/incentive kits). Namely, it is not effect of land titling performance vs. irrigation RCT but rather MPR can only tell the combined effects of ag/infra/land in RCT/Di lottery but not for PAPs. On pg 32, MPR notes, "...land tenure security was not enough on its own to allow investment." However, PAPs received irrigation and farmer training--not just land tenure.	We drop the qualifier "on its own" from the statement and add "even in combination with the other compact benefits...". We also make corrections to the literature review section.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
117	M&E + DCO/AgLand/Land	Literature Review	The land part of the literature review could benefit from clarification. The Burkina example MPR gives to illustrate the lack of effects of land titling is incorrectly used. MPR states, "Early interim results from the compact's Rural Land Governance Project (RLGP) suggest a positive impact of the RLGP on perceptions of land tenure security, though not [[YET]] on conflicts or agricultural outcomes (MCC 2016)." However, in RLG Burkina, there were no titles even issued at time of interim data collection (villages had only just recently been demarcated) and hence no effects on longer-term goals like agricultural outcomes were even expected at this milestone.	Regarding your comment on our citation of the interim results of the RLGP, we drop the mention that there was no effect yet on conflicts or agricultural outcomes, as the project logic did not expect them to occur by the time of the interim period.
118	DCO/AgLand/Land	xvii	"Although about one-fifth of the PAPs were women, some women who previously cultivated land were not compensated. The project considered all individuals within the households who cultivated land as PAPs. As a result, women were also registered, and they comprised 24 percent of the PAPs. Some women, however, were reportedly not registered. In addition, because all land allocated in compensation was combined into a single plot, some female PAPs reported that their husbands kept control of the entire plot." Based on the description MPR gives, it may not mean that these women were not compensated by the MCC project. The language used suggests a failure without providing detail on the basis. We suggest MPR re-state in the interim report to language such as: "Some women did not REPORT being compensated. MPR does not have further information on how this survey finding aligns with the design or actual roll-out of the land dimensions of the actual compensation process" . MPR could also use the more precise wording that the report itself uses (later in the doc): "Some women, however, reported that they were never given plots on the perimeter, even though they gave up parcels of land during the perimeter construction."	The language in the summary is actually more accurate as this conclusion relies on information from focus groups, interviews with KIIs and project documentation, but not survey information. We reword the language in the report. Based on our review of project documentation we know that MCC's project design did not exclude female PAPs, so we can reject the notion that this was by project design. The language we use is pretty clear on this: "The project considered all individuals within the households who cultivated land as PAPs. As a result, women were also registered, and they comprised 24 percent of the PAPs."

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
119	DCO/AgLand/Land	24	"Some PAPs received their land titles in 2015; others received them in 2016." We suggest MPR note here additionally that "this was after compact closure, thus this work was completed by the GOBF with its own resources"	We add that the titles were received after compact closure. We don't think its accurate to state that the work was completed with GOBF funding since the post-compact entity received financing from the repayment of loans to the rural finance activity which gave out loans with MCC funding.
120	DCO/AgLand/Land	26	"Land received in compensation was given to households in one contiguous plot, and this made it easy for some household heads to claim the entire land for themselves. Some women reported that their parcels were given to their husbands and then it was up to the husbands on whether or not they gave the land back to their wives." We suggest MPR clarify if this in fact was an issue that the project did not address, or whether the project did address this in some form, but the intervention (documentation, agreements, awareness, etc) did not "stick". Those are two different issues. We recommend if MPR does not know which it was, MPR consider adding language indicating something such as "we don't know whether X or Y was the cause"	We include a note that we do not know if this was part of program communication or not. We do add information that the project did try to remedy this (similar to language we use subsequently).
121	DCO/AgLand/Land	26	"To make matters worse, in cases in which women's land was added to parcels given to their husbands, women were told they could not register for women's groups (to gain access to perimeter land) because they had already received land compensation" We suggest MPR consider stating this more clearly, such as "women INTERVIEWED REPORTED THAT THEY were told... MPR does not know whether this was a result of the project design, implementation, communications/awareness raising, or another factor; this was outside the scope of what MPR examined"	As our land tenure analysis relies on interviews with PAPs, interviews with KIIs and project documentation, this revision would not be accurate as this information is triangulated from all three sources. For example, project documentation notes that the small vegetable plots were only for women and youth who were not themselves PAPs. We do include a footnote that the exclusion of female PAPs whose land was taken by their husbands is consistent with eligibility criteria for vegetable plots that excluded PAPs from receiving any land as part of women's or youth groups.

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
122	DCO/AgLand/Land	32	"Low levels of collateralized credit and equally low investments in land suggest that any effect of land tenure security on these outcomes would be small. Only 20 percent of the 30 percent of male PAPs who applied for a loan have used their land as collateral for a loan, while female PAP households do not appear to use land for this purpose. The increased land security has had minimal effects on land investments, with only 8 percent of households reporting any investments, primarily in planting trees." Was the time of the survey consistent with the timing the investment effect was expected to have been seen? We recommend MPR to say more about this because planting trees shows tenure/long-term investment and 8% after less than a year of having a title, is not necessarily bad at all depending on what was the base/control (per earlier comment). Investment effects related to land tenure take time. We suggest MPR add a short additional statement clarifying how this 8% fits into the project's or the sector's expected timing for investment effect following receipt of land and land documents.	As we note above we now clarify that this is 8% for the three year period since completion of the perimeter, and we discuss the contextualization. In terms of project expectations, the ADP program logic in the M&E plan itself unfortunately does not specify a target level of investment (this is also absent from the ERR). The rural land governance project does specify an exposure period whereby longer-term outcomes could be expected by 2017, or 3-5 years after the project was completed. However, there was a delay in provision of titles and leases with the last groups of PAPs receiving titles in 2016 so that it is possible that these effects will only materialize by the time of the final data collection. We include a footnote that discusses the issue of exposure periods.
123	DCO/AgLand/Land	33	"According to some female focus group participants, the land allocation process generated some land disputes between husbands and wives. When the perimeter was finished, some of the land that legally had been given to female PAPs was in most cases adjacent to the land given to their husbands." In relation to prior statements related to this issue, above, HERE the language seems to suggest that the land was "legally given" to female PAPs (ie names on documents), compared to above which says that land was "given to husbands".	We add a subclause to this paragraph: "Land received in compensation was given to households in one contiguous plot, and this made it easy for some household heads to claim the entire land for themselves, even if it was legally allocated to the woman. Some women reported that their parcels were given to their husbands and then it was up to the husbands on whether or not they gave the land back to their wives. "

Number	Reviewer name, division, and/or institution	Page Number	Comment	Evaluator Responses
124	DCO/AgLand/Land	33	"Most of these cases were resolved in community meetings organized by the project." This also says that MOST of these situations were resolved within the project, whereas above, the text seems to say that this was a generalized problem that remained unaddressed at the time of the survey. Dispute resolution is a standard and critical portion of any project of this type. We suggest MPR correct or clarify the language in the report to more clearly and consistently explain when respondents indicated that disputes were resolved during the project (as intended) vs. when respondents reported that they felt disputes remained or emerged after the close of the project.	This is an issue of timeframe. The first set of statements addresses the allocation of land as part of compact implementation. The second set drew on questions related to the current status of land conflicts, where respondents just noted few remaining issues. We agree however that it makes sense to reference the dispute resolution in the section on implementation and include this information.
125	DCO/AgLand/Land	35	"Although around one-fifth of PAPs were women, some women who previously cultivated land were not compensated." This language repeats same language used earlier in the report and commented above. See comments above (ie suggestion to MPR to clarify whether a failure of design, implementation, awareness, etc) - and then ensure that any textual changes made in one portion of the report flow through to other portions of the report where the same topic is also discussed.	As we note in our response to comment 118, the information came from a variety of sources, individual interviews, reports and FGDs. We write: "Although around one-fifth of PAPs were women, some women who previously cultivated land were reportedly not compensated."