Summary of evidence:

1) **Quantitative analysis is inconclusive**: some metrics favorable in saturation villages (e.g. fewer overall complaints), others less favorable (e.g. larger % asked to pay a bribe)
2) FGDs suggests that conflict levels were low across both categories of villages (mainly rumors and awkwardness) and that when faced with the choice we have to make, people **prioritize the poorest**, who they feel are more deserving
3) Saturation generates some, but **not significant cost-savings** (~1.8% operating costs)[1]
4) Data collected to date does **not show an stat. sig. effect on gaming reduction**[2]
5) More inclusive criteria **targets less poor, but still very poor hh's** (<$1/day); we may be able to reach, on average, poorer recipient populations with better village selection

Recommendations:

Use thatch criteria for upcoming application, but pilot use of "exception" criteria for mbati hh's; options might include:

- Accept the very old, widowed, and visibly disabled living in iron-mud-mud
- Accept community based nominations for up to 10 "special cases"

1 Projection based on spending during 2M round

2 **4.3% vs. 3.6%** ineligibility rates in saturation vs. thatched-only for 2M round (p-value = 0.45)

Thatch-only villages vs. saturation villages				
Metric	Mean (thatch)	Mean (saturation)	Coeff. on saturation	P-value
Hear complaints in community	16.3%	11.2%	-0.05	0.06
Types of complaints (conditional on hearing complaints)				
Eligible hh's left out	15.7%	28.0%	0.12	0.07
Ineligible hh's left out	34.8%	32.2%	-0.03	0.77
Different criteria used across villages	30.3%	4.0%	-0.26	0.00
Jealousy	10.1%	6.0%	-0.04	0.37
GD asks questions without helping	23.6%	14.0%	-0.10	0.23
Village elder influenced process	2.2%	5.3%	0.03	0.22
People who are complaining (conditional on hearing complaints)				
Recipients	4.5%	5.3%	0.01	0.80
Eligible who did not receive	40.4%	52.2%	0.12	0.17
Ineligible hh's	61.8.%	45.7%	-0.16	0.09
Complaints against (conditional on hearing complaints)				
VE	9.0%	13.8%	0.05	0.25
Recipients	14.4%	7.3%	-0.07	0.22
GD	78.7%	88.2%	0.10	0.20
Other AE's				
Asked to pay a bribe	0.4%	0.7%	0.00	0.45
Shouting/arguments	2.2%	4.2%	0.02	0.10
Crime/violence in village	1.5%	0.9%	-0.01	0.41

Thatch hh's in thatch-only villages vs. thatch hh's in saturation villages				
Metric	Mean (thatch)	Mean (saturation)	Coeff. on saturation	P-value
Hear complaints in community	16.3%	11.8%	0.05	0.12
Types of complaints (conditional on hearing complaints)				
Eligible hh's left out	15.7%	21.1%	-0.05	0.42
Ineligible hh's left out	34.8%	36.6%	-0.02	0.85
Different criteria used across villages	30.3%	2.8%	0.27	0.00
Jealousy	10.1%	5.6%	0.04	0.37
GD asks questions without helping	23.6%	11.3%	0.12	0.19
Village elder influenced process	2.2%	4.2%	-0.02	0.57
People who are complaining (conditional on hearing complaints)				
Recipients	4.5%	7.0%	-0.03	0.53
Eligible who did not receive	40.4%	45.9%	-0.05	0.56
Ineligible hh's	61.8%	49.3.%	0.12	0.22
Complaints against (conditional on hearing complaints)				
VE	9.0%	13.7%	-0.05	0.43
Recipients	14.4%	11.1%	0.03	0.60
GD	78.7%	91.8%	-0.13	0.09
Other AE's				
Asked to pay a bribe	0.4%	1.3%	-0.01	0.14
Shouting/arguments	2.2%	4.3%	-0.02	0.13
Crime/violence in village	1.5%	0.7%	0.01	0.21

Summary of major opinions voiced during focus groups

Opinion	Strength	Rationale
Poorer [thatched] HH are more deserving of transfers than richer people		• 6/6 focus groups preferred to give to thatched HH in two villages, rather than to saturate one and leave the other • 6/6 groups proposed that thatched HH should receive more money or receive before other HH
Some (but not all) mabati or even permanent HH are as deserving as thatched HH		• 6/6 groups mentioned deserving special cases • 3/3 thatched groups said it was unfair that certain people were left out in their village
It would be good to give to (almost) everyone in the village		• 6/6 groups said giving to more people is better • Less bad feeling, and the wealthier still have good things to spend on (e.g., school fees) • Thatched people did not speak much on this topic
Conflict and unfairness is not severe in thatch villages		• 0/3 groups said they experienced conflict, with "bad feeling" taking the form of rumors or awkwardness • 2/3 said thatch was a good criteria
Similar issues occur in saturation villages as well		• 3/3 groups said they had "bad feeling" from neighboring villages or people in permanent houses • 3/3 reported permanent HH left out wrongfully • Skew in groups toward ineligible people

In the eyes of the poor, is saturation or thatch is better?

- When asked about their own village, all groups prefer saturation
- When asked about two hypothetical villages, all prefer thatch
- Exclusion, delay, or giving smaller amounts to richer HH is reasonable
- No-one thinks it would be "bad" to give to the wealthier

Giving to thatched houses is necessary. Including others is a nice-to-have.

"If there is a gift to be given out they should consider people who are really down or poor. But when there is enough for the whole village, that everyone should be given."

"I would recommend that people living in thatched houses in both villages should be given... As you continue this program never do things to please somebody, but do things that can change lives. "

"It can't be bad to give to someone in a mabati house who is eating well. It will just be a present to that person."

"It would be shameful that this person who is really poor did not get and this person who can fend for himself received."

"If you are capable, then everyone should be helped."

"It's better that the poor should received first, and it goes up to people who are living well, because God is doing that because he has seen the struggles and miseries of these people… [But] also God is a loving god to everyone."

*"[Some households should be given more than others because]…*this person living in thatched house is starting from zero."