	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
	Ttl area cultivated (W/95)	Total labor on all household plots (Days/HA)	Attended extension training(=1)	Total spend organic fertilizer/ha (IHS)	Total spend inorganic fertilizer/ha (IHS)	Total spend seed fertilizer/ha (IHS)	Total wage pay to hired workers/ha (IHS)	Endline:Ttl area cultivated (W/95)	Total labor on all household plots (Days/HA)	Attended extension training(=1)	Total spend organic fertilizer/ha (IHS)	Total spend inorganic fertilizer/ha (IHS)	Total spend seed fertilizer/ha (IHS)	Total wage pay to hired workers/ha (IHS)
					Full Sample (CTs and NCTs) in Program Villages						RDD 18 (CTs and NCTs) in Program Villages			
CT in CT villages [A]	0.23	30.80	0.08	1.25***	0.57**	0.35	0.22	0.37	31.36	0.05	1.31**	0.52	0.39	0.06
	[0.36]	[18.77]	[0.08]	[0.45]	[0.25]	[0.24]	[0.25]	[0.37]	[28.86]	[0.09]	[0.55]	[0.34]	[0.32]	[0.20]
NCT in CT villages [B]	0.15	31.21*	0.11	1.31***	0.64**	0.37	0.28	0.22	27.33	0.10	1.41**	0.97**	0.55*	-0.03
	[0.36]	[17.14]	[0.08]	[0.47]	[0.30]	[0.25]	[0.27]	[0.36]	[21.96]	[0.10]	[0.58]	[0.41]	[0.32]	[0.25]
PET[C]	-0.46	-17.34	-0.10	-0.04	0.22	-0.57	0.11	-0.35	-9.42	-0.04	-0.31	-0.45	-0.71*	0.67
	[0.40]	[27.45]	[0.10]	[0.72]	[0.44]	[0.36]	[0.45]	[0.56]	[32.82]	[0.13]	[0.91]	[0.47]	[0.43]	[0.43]
PEV[D]	-0.47	7.55	-0.08	-0.59	-0.13	0.52	-0.21	0.66	-0.51	0.14	0.13	0.69	0.33	0.02
	[0.33]	[26.92]	[0.08]	[0.54]	[0.44]	[0.33]	[0.33]	[0.78]	[50.69]	[0.15]	[0.98]	[0.94]	[0.58]	[0.50]
#HH[E]	-0.07	-7.51	0.02	-0.38**	-0.25**	0.08	-0.03	0.05	-27.95*	0.07	-0.46*	-0.19	0.03	-0.28**
	[0.09]	[9.29]	[0.02]	[0.10]	[0.08]	[0.10]	[0.10]	[0.21]	[14.56]	[0.04]	[0.24]	[0.17]	[0.10]	[0.11]
Constant	1.21***	11.93	0.14**	0.14	-0.03	0.01	0.06	1.00***	21.26	0.13	0.02	-0.36	0.10	0.04
	[0.31]	[9.77]	[0.06]	[0.35]	[0.15]	[0.15]	[0.20]	[0.32]	[16.27]	[0.08]	[0.52]	[0.25]	[0.20]	[0.20]
Observations	1166	1166	1166	1166	1166	1166	1166	467	467	467	467	467	467	467
Adjusted R-squared	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.09	0.06	0.03	0.04
Meters	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
Outcome Mean Pure Control	1.22	24.30	0.17	0.41	0.09	0.14	0.22	1.22	24.30	0.17	0.41	0.09	0.14	0.22
CT recipients around (%)	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
Average EVs around (%)	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Households around(#)	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78

Notes: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
(1) Sample in Table F6 is a balanced panel that includes all ultra-poor households that were interviewed at baseline and endline.
(2) Table F6 includes anwers from primary male respondent in household.
(3)Regression utilizes ANCOVA estimation to control for the baseline of the outcome. However, the total number of inputs was measured differently at baseline. Therefore, in this instance, we control for the number of crops, which is the most standardized version across surveys.
(4) All regressions control for location i.e. local government area (LGA) fixed effects andconley standard errors that account for spatial correlation in the data are used (Conley 1999; 2008). The regression discontinuity (RD) estimation is presented in columns 8 to 14 that exploits the sharp discontinuity at the 18 EV cutoff that determined village-level program eligibility to receive cash transfers.We estimate the local average treatment effect (LATE) for the panel sample using only observations close to the cutoff.