	Panel A: Midline					
	Full Sample (CTs and NCTs) in Program			*RDD 18 (CTs and NCTs) in Program Villages*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		Expenditures (IHS)			Expenditures (IHS)	
	Assets Index	Health	Education	Assets Index	Health	Education
CT in CT villages [A]	0.54***	1.46	0.39	0.47**	2.38**	1.05
	[0.19]	[1.05]	[0.88]	[0.24]	[1.12]	[1.05]
NCT in CT villages [B]	0.39**	1.42	0.01	0.41*	2.31**	0.94
	[0.19]	[1.08]	[0.91]	[0.25]	[1.16]	[1.08]
PET[C]	-0.15	-0.98	0.31	-0.25	-2.19	-1.16
	[0.26]	[1.06]	[0.95]	[0.38]	[1.52]	[1.20]
PEV[D]	-0.41**	-1.44	0.40	0.06	-1.99	2.47
	[0.19]	[0.93]	[0.76]	[0.42]	[2.15]	[1.60]
#HH[E]	-0.05	-0.19	0.06	-0.06	-0.92**	-0.31
	[0.04]	[0.23]	[0.22]	[0.10]	[0.45]	[0.39]
Constant	-0.14	5.49***	2.11***	-0.30*	6.13***	1.65*
	[0.15]	[0.95]	[0.76]	[0.18]	[1.00]	[0.87]
Observations	1166	1166	1166	467	467	467
Adjusted R-squared	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.04
Meters	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00	400.00
Outcome Mean Pure Control	-0.13	5.23	2.53	-0.13	5.23	2.53
CT recepients around (%)	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.40
EVs around (%)	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.30	0.30	0.30
HH around(#)	1.19	1.19	1.19	0.78	0.78	0.78
	Panel B					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		Expenditures (IHS)			Expenditures (IHS)	
	Assets Index	Health	Education	Assets Index	Health	Education
CT in CT villages [A]	0.21*	1.52**	0.73	0.10	2.07**	1.38*
	[0.12]	[0.74]	[0.72]	[0.14]	[0.84]	[0.77]
NCT in CT villages [B]	0.06	1.47**	1.10	-0.02	2.12**	2.05**
	[0.13]	[0.74]	[0.75]	[0.15]	[0.83]	[0.81]
PET[C]	0.01	-0.85	0.73	0.13	-1.99	-0.98
	[0.14]	[0.89]	[0.87]	[0.18]	[1.28]	[1.06]
PEV[D]	0.06	-0.63	0.59	0.24	-1.82	-0.46
	[0.12]	[0.84]	[0.81]	[0.26]	[1.30]	[1.40]
#HH[E]	0.01	-0.17	0.16	0.03	-0.37	0.16
	[0.03]	[0.19]	[0.17]	[0.07]	[0.35]	[0.32]
Constant	0.25**	6.94***	1.87***	0.21*	7.72***	2.25***
	[0.11]	[0.62]	[0.60]	[0.12]	[0.65]	[0.73]
Observations	1166	1166	1166	467	467	467
Adjusted R-squared	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.03
Meters	400	400	400	400	400	400
Outcome Mean Pure Control	0.34	6.68	1.95	0.34	6.68	1.95
CT recepients around (%)	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.40
EVs around (%)	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.30	0.30	0.30
HH around(#)	1.19	1.19	1.19	0.78	0.78	0.78

(1) Outcome variables are as follows: (1) "Assets Index" is a standardized weighted index, following Anderson (2008) that aggregates across different types of asset investments: animals and livestock, farming assets and household assets owned by the household expressed using the inverse hyperbolic sine (IHS) transformation. (2)"Expenditures on Health" is the IHS transformed amount spent by the household on health expenditures over a six month recall period. (3) "Expenditures on Education" is the IHS transformed amount spent by the household on school fees over a six month recall period. The point estimates presented in this table require an adjustment to be interpreted as a percentage change following Bellemare and Wichman (2020).

2) Asset values were measured differently at baseline to the follow-up surveys so in Table 5 the regression uses OLS estimation and presents results as a cross-section with midline in Panel A and endline in Panel B not controlling by value at baseline. All regressions control for location i.e. local government area (LGA) fixed effects. In columns 1 to 6 standard errors are clustered at the village level; and in columns 7 to 12 Conley standard errors that account for spatial correlation in the data are used (Conley 1999; 2008).

3) CT in CT villages =1 if household was randomly assigned to receive cash transfers in a cash transfer program village; NCT in CT villages = 1 if household was randomly assigned to receive no cash transfers in program villages; and Pure Control = 1 if household did not receive cash transfers in a non-program village.

(4) In Table 5 columns 7 to 12 we include a set of variables to control for local neighborhood effects that includes the size of the local market (#HH), the density of cash transfers (PET) and the relative level of poverty (PEV) in a 400 meter radius. #HH is the total number of households in the local area rescaled by a factor of 100. PET is a vector for the proportion of cash transfer households in the local area equivalent to the total number of cash transfer households over the number of eligible households around household i in a 400m radius. PEV is the proportion of extremely vulnerable households out of the total number of households in the neighborhood.

(5) Sample in Table 5 is a cross-section of all ultra-poor households that were interviewed at both midline and endline.

(6) The regression discontinuity (RD) estimation is presented in Table 5 columns 10 to 12 that exploits the sharp discontinuity at the 18 EV cutoff that determined villagelevel program eligibility to receive cash transfers.We estimate the local average treatment effect (LATE) using only observations close to the cutoff +/- 18 EVs.