

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Harvested value per hectare that was					Harvested value per hectare that was				
	Sold (W/95)	Consumed(W/95)	Used as payment for labor (W/95)	Stored for next season(W/95)	Post-harvest lost per hectare (W/95)	Sold (W/95)	Consumed(W/95)	Used as payment for labor (W/95)	Stored for next season(W/95)	Post-harvest lost per hectare (W/95)
<i>SAMPLE</i>	<i>Full Sample (CTs and NCTs) in Program Villages</i>					<i>RDD 18 (CTs and NCTs) in Program Villages</i>				
CT in CT villages [A]	51031.92** [20345.23]	218272.92*** [77419.83]	4013.99 [4870.20]	17017.07** [8057.86]	1389.31 [1074.68]	70157.86** [27922.07]	235530.05*** [88526.68]	3613.09 [5411.13]	8522.55 [7531.48]	-645.51 [831.19]
NCT in CT villages [B]	57360.21*** [21600.61]	231338.74*** [79309.30]	3931.85 [4918.42]	19359.33** [8412.03]	1863.41* [1109.41]	76196.71** [31360.64]	271232.55*** [88490.74]	2855.41 [5452.33]	13454.35 [8279.48]	372.91 [990.51]
PET[C]	-41258.40 [32829.72]	-2.68e+05*** [96194.88]	588.38 [6180.95]	-23402.63** [9413.05]	-602.71 [1540.18]	-53494.84 [49593.08]	-2.63e+05* [136671.47]	898.40 [8579.37]	-13369.43 [12469.44]	1764.59 [1693.93]
PEV[D]	-25510.03 [26887.08]	-1.35e+05 [93218.11]	-9664.03** [4506.25]	-14803.83* [8101.04]	-2381.27** [1206.99]	-49932.12 [63277.82]	154709.10 [214877.57]	-4845.18 [8696.19]	13340.77 [21434.65]	-2248.24 [1724.28]
#HH[E]	-6237.65 [5509.32]	-18751.81 [24857.77]	-3233.06*** [967.28]	-3590.27 [2437.31]	-556.19* [296.17]	-9690.61 [9834.36]	8955.43 [38835.69]	-1863.37 [1533.15]	3215.66 [4345.20]	-712.84* [399.99]
Constant	52612.27*** [13823.57]	317259.84*** [63051.47]	10486.77*** [3678.44]	18622.28*** [6349.46]	1965.15*** [743.43]	78964.50*** [22165.52]	262300.08*** [67255.98]	8913.12** [3684.05]	11869.43* [6865.00]	2039.73** [977.52]
Observations	1166	1166	1166	1166	1166	467	467	467	467	467
Adjusted R-squared	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.06	0.01	0.02	0.01
Meters	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00
Outcome Mean Pure Control	29537.89	267758.25	6613.23	14394.96	1332.64	29537.89	267758.25	6613.23	14394.96	1332.64
Average CT recipients around (%)	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
Average EVs around (%)	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
Average HH around(#)	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78

Notes: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

(1) Sample in Table F8 is a balanced panel that includes all ultra-poor households that were interviewed at baseline and endline.

(2) Table F8 includes answers from primary male respondent in household.

(3) Used of harvest value was not measure at baseline. For this reason we control by total value harvested across all regressions include in this table.

(4) All regressions control for location i.e. local government area (LGA) fixed effects and conley 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.