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## Appendix C: Robustness checks

Figure C1: Impacts of transformer injection on outages by time of day
A) Before construction
B) After construction



The figure shows mean minutes of power outages by hour of day separately for treatment and control sites. $95 \%$ confidence intervals around treatment means are clustered at the site level. Panel A shows means for the year prior to the start of the transformer construction period, and Panel B shows means for the year after the end of the construction period. ?? shows impacts on average voltage.

Table C1: Balance between panel and attrited respondents

|  | Matched N Mean Attrited N Difference p-value |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Respondent and Location |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age (years) | 1575 | 39.23 | 426 | 2.73 | 0.000 |
| Respondent is male | 1575 | 0.35 | 426 | 0.02 | 0.547 |
| Completed secondary education | 1575 | 0.50 | 426 | -0.05 | 0.050 |
| Owns premises | 1575 | 0.38 | 426 | 0.12 | 0.000 |
| Appliances |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any television (TV) at location | 1575 | 0.71 | 426 | -0.02 | 0.419 |
| Any fridge at location | 1575 | 0.62 | 426 | 0.01 | 0.835 |
| Count of mobile phones | 1575 | 2.17 | 426 | 0.05 | 0.605 |
| Any voltage protective devices | 1575 | 0.25 | 426 | 0.01 | 0.571 |
| Count of voltage defensive invest. | 1575 | 0.34 | 426 | 0.00 | 0.978 |
| Electricity and Energy |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pays someone else for electricity | 1575 | 0.09 | 426 | -0.08 | 0.000 |
| Count of meter users | 1566 | 1.82 | 424 | -0.38 | 0.001 |
| Monthly electricity spending | 1559 | 18.37 | 413 | 0.50 | 0.615 |
| Has generator | 1575 | 0.04 | 426 | 0.02 | 0.070 |
| Count of alternative fuels used in past 3 months | 1575 | 0.91 | 426 | -0.07 | 0.107 |
| Amount spent on all alt. fuels in past month | 1575 | 8.62 | 426 | 0.01 | 0.993 |
| Electricity Reliability and Quality |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average number of monthly outages - resp. | 1575 | 6.81 | 426 | 0.26 | 0.295 |
| Total outage duration in past 30 days (hrs) | 1575 | 42.05 | 426 | 5.19 | 0.059 |
| Average daily hrs with low voltage - resp. | 1566 | 1.58 | 422 | 0.14 | 0.408 |
| Has apps. burnt/broken due to voltage in past year | 1575 | 0.27 | 426 | 0.03 | 0.141 |
| Amt spent on burnt/broken apps in past year | 1562 | 10.25 | 426 | 4.52 | 0.002 |
| Household Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adult members | 746 | 2.39 | 251 | 0.28 | 0.001 |
| Child members (<18) | 746 | 1.21 | 251 | 0.24 | 0.014 |
| Total household monthly income | 714 | 729.62 | 234 | 252.66 | 0.444 |
| Share of HH adults (18+) with paid jobs in last 7 days | 746 | 0.66 | 251 | -0.04 | 0.123 |
| Business Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of workers | 829 | 1.97 | 175 | -0.11 | 0.579 |
| Total revenue in past month | 723 | 438.67 | 147 | -72.32 | 0.292 |
| Total measured business costs in past month | 1575 | 173.44 | 426 | 14.96 | 0.390 |
| Total profit in past month | 646 | 108.12 | 131 | -34.17 | 0.063 |
| Total hours typically open | 829 | 12.07 | 175 | 0.20 | 0.397 |
| Any non-electric business machines at location | 829 | 0.09 | 175 | 0.00 | 0.992 |
| Business engaged in retail activities | 829 | 0.44 | 175 | -0.07 | 0.085 |
| Business engaged in manufacturing activities | 829 | 0.20 | 175 | 0.11 | 0.000 |
| Business engaged in other service activities | 829 | 0.36 | 175 | -0.03 | 0.409 |
| Business activity likely using electricity | 829 | 0.22 | 175 | 0.09 | 0.004 |

Notes: This table shows means in the baseline period for survey respondents, pooling businesses and households, and tests for significance of the differences in means by whether the respondent was also surveyed at the endline. The p-value for the joint F-test for household baseline characteristics is 0.001 . The p-value for the joint F-test for business baseline characteristics is 0.028 . * $p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05$, ${ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C2: Correlation between attrited respondents' characteristics and treatment status

| Age (years) | Mean | LB Treat | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 37.11 | -1.20 | 426 |
|  | [12.40] | (1.09) |  |
| Respondent is male | 0.37 | -0.07 | 426 |
|  | [0.48] | (0.05) |  |
| Completed secondary education | 0.54 | 0.04 | 426 |
|  | $[0.50]$ 0.31 | $\stackrel{(0.05)}{-0.12^{* * *}}$ | 426 |
| Owns premises | [0.47] | (0.04) |  |
| Any television (TV) at location | 0.69 | $0.08 *$ | 426 |
|  | $[0.47]$ 0.60 | $(0.04)$ 0.02 | 426 |
| Any fridge at location | [0.49] | (0.05) |  |
| Count of mobile phones | 2.22 | -0.20 | 426 |
|  | [2.00] | (0.18) |  |
| Any voltage protective devices | 0.26 | -0.03 | 426 |
|  | ${ }_{0}^{[0.44]}$ | (0.04) | 426 |
| Count of voltage defensive invest. | [0.68] | (0.07) |  |
| Amt spent on burnt/broken apps in past year | 5.06 | 1.31 | 426 |
|  | [21.41] | (2.23) |  |
| Pays someone else for electricity | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ {[0.38]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | 426 |
| Count of meter users | 2.18 | 0.02 | 424 |
|  | [2.25] | (0.20) |  |
| Monthly electricity spending | 18.86 | -1.94 | 413 |
|  | [18.27] | (1.81) |  |
| Has generator | 0.02 $[0.14]$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | 26 |
| Count of alternative fuels used in past 3 months | $0.96$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | 426 |
| Amount spent on all alt. fuels in past month | 7.00 | (0.12) | 426 |
|  | [9.25] | (2.09) |  |
| Average number of monthly outages - resp. | 6.76 | -0.43 | 426 |
|  | [4.82] | (0.44) |  |
| Total outage duration in past 30 days (hrs) | 36.26 | 1.18 | 426 |
|  | [47.33] | (4.43) |  |
| Average daily hrs with low voltage - resp. | 1.42 | 0.03 | 422 |
|  | [3.41] | (0.31) |  |
| Has apps. burnt/broken due to voltage in past year | $\begin{aligned} & 0.24 \\ & {[0.43]} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.01 \\ (0.04) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 426 |

Notes: This table shows the correlation between the attrited respondents' characteristics and treatment status. The sample is restricted to respondents who do not participate in the endline survey. We regress each respondent characteristic at baseline on a dummy variable equals one if the respondent was in a treatment site at baseline. Each row represents an outcome. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C3: Impact of transformer injection intervention on hourly average voltage, robustness to implementation issues

|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ <br> Commissioned <br> sites | $(3)$ <br> New tx <br> confirmed <br> sites | $(4)$ <br> All sites, <br> IV new tx <br> with treat | All sites |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All sites | SMEC) | $(5)$ |  |  |
| During construction | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.65 | 0.42 | 0.79 |
|  | $(1.09)$ | $(1.09)$ | $(1.18)$ | $(1.22)$ | $(1.55)$ |
| Treat X During | 2.38 | 2.55 | $3.61^{* *}$ |  | 1.95 |
|  | $(1.60)$ | $(1.63)$ | $(1.70)$ |  | $(1.93)$ |
| New Trafo X During |  |  |  | 3.24 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $(2.05)$ |  |
| Post construction | $5.94^{* * *}$ | $5.95^{* * *}$ | $5.26^{* * *}$ | $5.26^{* * *}$ | $5.95^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(1.74)$ | $(1.75)$ | $(1.85)$ | $(1.95)$ | $(1.82)$ |
| Treat X Post | $5.48^{* *}$ | $6.07^{* *}$ | $8.413^{* * *}$ |  | $5.456^{* *}$ |
|  | $(2.48)$ | $(2.49)$ | $(2.48)$ |  | $(2.59)$ |
| New Trafo X Post |  |  |  | $7.13^{* *}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | $(3.13)$ |  |
| Observations | 9866078 | 9723260 | 8815828 | 9866078 | 9866078 |
| Pre-constr. ctl. mean | 219.2 | 219.2 | 220.2 | 219.2 | 218.0 |
| Hour of day FE | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Week of year FE | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Site FE | Y | Y | Y | Y |  |
| Revised constr. period | N | N | N | N | Y |

This table shows the difference-in-difference results for the impact of the transformer injection treatment on hourly average voltage levels measured by GridWatch devices in each site. Column 2 drops two sites where the construction manager SMEC indicated the new transformer was not commissioned successfully. Column 3 drops sites where our own construction monitoring activities indicated no new transformer was built in a treatment site or a new transformer was built in a control site. Column 4 instruments for observing a new transformer during the construction monitoring visits with site treatment assignment. Column 5 defines the construction period as July 1, 2020-December 31 , 2020 instead of October 1, 2020-March 31, 2021, based on reported dates of transformer construction activity from the construction manager, SMEC. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C4: Impact of transformer injection intervention on hourly outage minutes, robustness to implementation issues

|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ <br> Commissioned <br> sites | $(3)$ <br> New tx <br> confirmed <br> sites | $(4)$ <br> All sites, <br> IV new tx <br> with treat | All sites |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All sites | (SMEC) |  |  |  |

This table shows the difference-in-difference results for the impact of the transformer injection treatment on hourly power outage minutes measured by GridWatch devices in each site. Column 2 drops two sites where the construction manager SMEC indicated the new transformer was not commissioned successfully. Column 3 drops sites where our own construction monitoring activities indicated no new transformer was built in a treatment site or a new transformer was built in a control site. Column 4 instruments for observing a new transformer during the construction monitoring visits with site treatment assignment. Column 5 defines the construction period as July 1, 2020-December 31, 2020 instead of October 1, 2020-March 31, 2021, based on reported dates of transformer construction activity from the construction manager, SMEC. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C5: Impacts of transformer injection intervention on additional voltage quality measures, hourly data


Notes: This table shows the difference-in-differences effects of the transformer injection intervention on measures of voltage quality using hourly data at the GridWatch device level. The minutes variables indicate the number of minutes in each hourly observation that the electricity had a certain status. 'Any voltage $>20 \%$ below nominal' is a dummy variable for whether voltage fell below this threshold at any point during an hourly observation. All regressions include hour of day, week of year, and site fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. * $p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C6: Impacts of transformer injection intervention on additional voltage quality measures, monthly data

|  | N | During |  |  | Treat $\times$ Treat $\times$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Control IV } \\ (\mathrm{SD}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (SE) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Post } \\ & \text { (SE) } \end{aligned}$ | (SE) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Post } \\ & \text { (SE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Hours with no power (outages) | 19079 | 11.15 | $2.78{ }^{* * *}$ | 1.12* | -0.04 | -1.34 |
|  |  | (10.96) | (0.59) | (0.65) | (0.92) | (1.09) |
| Number of spells with voltage | 19079 | 185.36 | -2.58 | -31.75* | -13.83 | -45.75** |
| <207 |  | (265.45) | (12.77) | (16.29) | (18.90) | (23.26) |
| Numb | 19079 | 156.14 | -4.24 | -29.05** | -10.34 | -33.66* |
| > Number of sp |  | (225.77) | (10.74) | (13.54) | (15.45) | (19.49) |
|  | 19079 | 22.15 | 0.20 | -2.30 | -1.74 | -8.59** |
| btwn 184-200 |  | (39.60) | (1.87) | (2.80) | (2.96) | (3.70) |
| Number of spells with min voltage <184 | 19079 | 7.07 | $1.46{ }^{* *}$ | -0.40 | -1.75 | -3.50*** |
|  |  | (12.78) | (0.71) | (0.83) | (1.35) | (1.27) |
| Total hours of spells with | 19079 | 91.87 | 7.27 | -22.57** | -21.63 | $-37.22^{* *}$ |
| voltage <207 |  | (157.81) | (8.77) | (11.11) | (13.52) | (15.40) |
| Total hours of spells with min | 19079 | 11.68 | 0.64 | -1.42 | -0.17 | $-2.72^{*}$ |
| voltage $>200$ |  | (16.83) | (0.85) | (1.05) | (1.18) | (1.47) |
| Total hours of spells with min | 19079 | 24.08 | 1.59 | -3.36 | -0.55 | $-5.88^{*}$ |
| voltage btwn 184-200 |  | (39.92) | (2.04) | (2.44) | (2.86) | (3.22) |
| Total hours of spells with min voltage <184 | 19079 | 56.12 | 5.05 | -17.79** | -20.92* | -28.62** |
|  |  | (131.51) | (7.42) | (8.70) | (11.45) | (12.26) |
| Share of low-voltage time in | 14776 | 0.37 | -0.02 | 0.03 | -0.11*** | 0.01 |
| spells with min voltage $<1$ <br> Mean spell length (hours) |  | (0.38) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
|  | 14776 | 0.75 | -0.10 | -0.31** | -0.04 | -0.08 |
|  |  | (2.14) | (0.12) | (0.14) | (0.16) | (0.19) |
| Median spell length (hours) | 14776 | 0.15 | -0.05 | $-0.07{ }^{* *}$ | 0.01 | 0.05 |
|  |  | (0.69) | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Maximum spell length (hours) | 14776 | 10.92 | -0.79 | $-2.95 * *$ | -2.86 | -4.46** |
|  |  | (20.49) | (1.27) | (1.48) | (1.75) | (2.15) |
| Mean of mean voltage during a spell | 14776 | 189.73 | 1.35 | -8.82*** | 1.18 | $-14.22^{* * *}$ |
|  |  | (35.25) | (2.28) | (2.34) | (2.84) | (3.85) |
| Median of mean voltage during a spell | 14776 | 191.86 | 1.65 | -8.39*** | 1.89 | $-14.22^{* * *}$ |
|  |  | (36.15) | (2.32) | (2.37) | (2.86) | (3.86) |
| Mean of minimum voltage during a spell | 14776 | 187.18 | 1.23 | -8.86*** | 2.22 | -13.70** |
|  |  | (36.73) | (2.31) | (2.46) | (2.97) | (4.05) |

Notes: This table shows the difference-in-differences effects of the transformer injection intervention on measures of voltage quality using monthly data at the GridWatch device level. Outcomes in the first 4 rows measure the total hours in each monthly observation that the electricity had a certain status. Outcomes in all other rows are measured based on identifying individual low-voltage 'spells' during which voltage fell below 207 V ( $10 \%$ below nominal) in any 2 -minute interval. Individual spells with different characteristics are then aggregated to the month-device level. Months where there were no low voltage spells for particular devices are assigned a 0 for outcomes that are not conditional on experiencing at least one such spell. Number of spells refers to the number of individual low voltage spells in a device-month. Total hours of spells take the sum of the duration of individual spells in a device-month. Mean, median, and maximum spell length are statistics calculated over all individual spells in a device-month. Mean and median of mean spell voltage are statistics calculated over the mean voltage level within a spell for all individual spells in a device-month. Mean minimum voltage is calculated similarly. These statistics are conditional on any low-voltage spell being observed in a device-month. All regressions include month and site fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C7: Impact of transformer injection intervention on primary outcomes for businesses

|  |  | Control Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Post |
| (SD) | (SE) | Treat |
| (SE) | Post x Treat |  |
| (SE) |  |  |

Notes: This table shows the difference-in-difference results from the ?? for businesses only. Each row represents an outcome. All variables measuring values are in USD; 1 USD $\approx 5.8$ GHS during the baseline survey and $\approx 8.5$ GHS during the endline survey. Results are qualitatively unchanged when using logged versions of the outcomes. In all the regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is part of the household or business sample, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$. Refer to Table D5 for impacts of transformer injection on additional business outcomes.

Table C8: Impact of transformer injection intervention on primary outcomes

|  | N | Control Mean (SD) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { Post } \\ & \text { (SE) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline \text { FDR } \\ \text { q-value } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { Treat } \\ & \text { (SE) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FDR } \\ \text { q-value } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Post } \times \text { Treat } \\ & (\mathrm{SE}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FDR } \\ \text { q-value } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reported hours of bad voltage in past month | 3130 | $\begin{gathered} 43.05 \\ (87.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -42.36^{* * *} \\ (4.69) \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 | $\begin{gathered} 8.56 \\ (7.47) \end{gathered}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{aligned} & -9.12 \\ & (7.64) \end{aligned}$ | 0.444 |
| Reported total outage hours in past month | 3139 | $\begin{gathered} 38.61 \\ (47.88) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -35.70^{* * *} \\ (2.93) \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.48 \\ & (3.87) \end{aligned}$ | 0.881 | $\begin{gathered} -0.87 \\ (4.05) \end{gathered}$ | 0.933 |
| Max monthly WTP for perfect reliability | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 3.62 \\ (4.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.84^{* * *} \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.37 \\ & (0.27) \end{aligned}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} 0.47 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | 0.365 |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. outages | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 1.74 \\ (2.98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.59^{* * *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | 0.002 | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | 0.527 |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. volt. fluc. | 2000 | $\begin{gathered} 2.14 \\ (3.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.42 \\ & (0.30) \end{aligned}$ | 0.218 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.42 \\ & (0.36) \end{aligned}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} 0.57 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | 0.365 |
| Voltage damage and protection index | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (1.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | 0.040 | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} -0.10^{*} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | 0.365 |
| Any appliance damaged by voltage in past year | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.05^{*} \\ & (0.03) \end{aligned}$ | 0.123 | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.05 \\ & (0.04) \end{aligned}$ | 0.417 |
| Amt spent on burnt/broken apps in past year | 3080 | $\begin{gathered} 10.22 \\ (37.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -6.90^{* * *} \\ (1.47) \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (1.98) \end{gathered}$ | 0.917 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.15 \\ & (2.05) \end{aligned}$ | 0.755 |
| Any voltage protective device | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 0.025 | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | 0.831 | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 0.365 |
| Value of voltage protective devices | 2668 | $\begin{gathered} 6.05 \\ (25.51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.06^{* * *} \\ (1.00) \end{gathered}$ | 0.007 | $\begin{gathered} 0.52 \\ (1.57) \end{gathered}$ | 0.881 | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (1.70) \end{gathered}$ | 0.933 |
| Uses an alternative energy source | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 0.381 | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 0.881 | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | 0.933 |
| Total number of appliances | 3150 | $\begin{gathered} 8.59 \\ (5.98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | 0.691 | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | 0.881 | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | 0.755 |
| Monthly electricity spending | 3050 | $\begin{gathered} 19.51 \\ (18.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -6.41^{* * *} \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | 0.001 | $\begin{aligned} & -2.01^{*} \\ & (1.12) \end{aligned}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} 0.77 \\ (0.89) \end{gathered}$ | 0.601 |
| Total profit in past month | 1104 | $\begin{gathered} 108.61 \\ (158.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -21.45^{* *} \\ (10.80) \end{gathered}$ | 0.076 | $\begin{aligned} & -11.91 \\ & (12.02) \end{aligned}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} 5.21 \\ (14.07) \end{gathered}$ | 0.865 |
| Total revenue in past month | 1280 | $\begin{gathered} 436.45 \\ (689.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.37 \\ (43.52) \end{gathered}$ | 0.691 | $\begin{gathered} 5.87 \\ (55.89) \end{gathered}$ | 0.917 | $\begin{array}{r} -87.44 \\ (58.15) \end{array}$ | 0.365 |
| Total monthly reported business spending | 1206 | $\begin{gathered} 304.41 \\ (395.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34.28 \\ (35.48) \end{gathered}$ | 0.381 | $\begin{gathered} 38.12 \\ (38.04) \end{gathered}$ | 0.622 | $\begin{gathered} -97.95^{* *} \\ (49.39) \end{gathered}$ | 0.365 |
| Total household monthly income | 1358 | $\begin{gathered} 360.69 \\ (491.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -76.42^{* *} \\ (36.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.066 | $\begin{gathered} 12.66 \\ (43.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.881 | $\begin{aligned} & -72.63 \\ & (50.21) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.365 |

Notes: This table shows the difference-in-difference results from the ?? pooling businesses and households. Each row represents an outcome. All outcomes pre-specified in the pre-analysis plan (Berkouwer et al., 2019). All variables measuring values are in USD; $1 \mathrm{USD} \approx 5.8$ GHS during the baseline survey and $\approx 8.5$ GHS during the endline survey. Results are qualitatively unchanged when using logged versions of continuous outcomes. Sample sizes vary for some questions because of missing data, particularly when respondents were unable to estimate monetary values with a high degree of confidence, or because some questions were only asked to a subset of respondents. In all the regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is a household or a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05$, ${ }^{* * *}$ $p<0.01$. Sharpened FDR q-values following Anderson (2008) are also shown.

Table C9: Impact of transformer injection intervention on primary outcomes, accounting for implementation issues and construction timing

|  | All sites | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline \text { Commissioned } \\ \text { sites } \\ \text { (SMEC) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | New tx confirmed sites | All sites, IV new tx with treat | All sites, except close sites |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reported hours of bad voltage in past month | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-9.12 \\ & (7.64) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-10.21 \\ & (7.75) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-12.72 \\ & (7.86) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-12.04 \\ (10.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-4.90 \\ & (8.36) \end{aligned}$ |
| Reported total outage hours in past month | $\begin{gathered} -0.87 \\ (4.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.98 \\ (4.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.33 \\ (4.41) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.16 \\ & (5.33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.09 \\ (5.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Max monthly WTP for perfect reliability | $\begin{gathered} 0.47 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.49 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.58^{*} \\ & (0.33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.62 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. outages | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.28 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. volt. fluc. | $\begin{gathered} 0.57 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.62 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.76^{*} \\ & (0.41) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.75 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| Voltage damage and protection index | $\begin{gathered} -0.10^{*} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.11^{*} \\ & (0.06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.13^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.14^{*} \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16^{* *} \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Any appliance damaged by voltage in past year | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.06 \\ & (0.04) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07^{*} \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.08^{*} \\ & (0.05) \end{aligned}$ |
| Amt spent on burnt/broken apps in past year | $\begin{gathered} 1.15 \\ (2.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.97 \\ (2.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (2.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.52 \\ (2.72) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.54 \\ (2.84) \end{gathered}$ |
| Any voltage protective device | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.02) \end{aligned}$ |
| Value of voltage protective devices | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (1.70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (1.73) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.03 \\ (1.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (2.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.11 \\ & (1.72) \end{aligned}$ |
| Uses an alternative energy source | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total number of appliances | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Monthly electricity spending | $\begin{gathered} 0.77 \\ (0.89) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.74 \\ (0.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.73 \\ (0.97) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.02 \\ (1.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.90 \\ (1.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total profit in past month | $\begin{gathered} 5.21 \\ (14.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.61 \\ (14.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.88 \\ (15.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.05 \\ (18.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.39 \\ (18.81) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total revenue in past month | $\begin{aligned} & -87.44 \\ & (58.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -87.03 \\ (59.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -18.32 \\ (58.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -120.09 \\ (83.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -104.18 \\ (71.27) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total monthly reported business spending | $\begin{gathered} -97.95^{* *} \\ (49.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -100.21^{* *} \\ (49.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -54.34 \\ (49.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -130.42^{*} \\ (68.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -143.81^{* *} \\ (59.91) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total household monthly income | $\begin{gathered} -72.63 \\ (50.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -79.87 \\ & (50.78) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -84.01 \\ (54.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -98.25 \\ & (67.42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -51.47 \\ (58.58) \end{gathered}$ |

This table shows the same difference-in-difference analyses presented in ??. Column 1 replicates the 'Post $\times$ Treat' column from ??. Column 2 drops two sites in Kaneshie where the construction manager SMEC indicated the new transformer was not commissioned successfully. Column 3 drops sites where our own construction monitoring activities indicated no new transformer was built in a treatment site or a new transformer was built in a control site. Column 4 instruments for observing a new transformer during the construction monitoring visits with site treatment assignment. Column 5 shows the difference-in-difference results from the main equation, by dropping geographically close control sites. We define distance by the shortest path to a treatment site, and we drop ant control site that is within 1.3 km from a treatment site, where 1.3 km is the median distance to a treatment site. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C10: Impact of transformer injection intervention on main business outcomes, dropping geographically close control sites

|  |  | Control Mean | Post | Treat | Post x Treat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | (SD) | (SE) | (SE) | (SE) |
| Total profit in past month | 1006 | 100.92 | -27.10* | 3.90 | -7.22 |
|  |  | [151.98] | (16.37) | (15.24) | (22.87) |
| Total monthly reported business spending | 1065 | 278.23 | 64.83 | 80.61** | -130.21** |
|  |  | [362.22] | (48.82) | (39.01) | (58.39) |
| Total wages and benefits paid in | 1118 | 57.64 | 16.07 | 5.85 | -16.54 |
| past month |  | [142.30] | (15.10) | (13.32) | (17.16) |
| Total materials cost in past month | 1089 | 179.16 | 61.45 | 84.15*** | -116.12** |
|  |  | [283.70] | (37.79) | (29.81) | (46.38) |
| Monthly electricity spending | 1231 | 18.46 | -5.55*** | -1.10 | -0.34 |
|  |  | [19.40] | (1.03) | (1.62) | (1.21) |
| Amount spent on all alt. fuels in | 1256 | 4.12 | 0.45 | -0.01 | -0.86 |
| past month |  | [11.98] | (1.12) | (0.86) | (1.34) |
| Total revenue in past month | 1088 | 394.04 | 34.99 | 63.22 | -117.17* |
|  |  | [553.18] | (60.59) | (53.35) | (70.78) |
| Estimated change in revenue with | 985 | 384.54 | -128.46* | 67.62 | -191.37* |
| perfect electricity |  | [757.15] | (71.24) | (70.91) | (99.81) |
| Number of workers | 1256 | 1.92 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.12 |
|  |  | [1.40] | (0.09) | (0.15) | (0.11) |
| Share of men employees | 1252 | 0.31 | -0.00 | 0.01 | -0.01 |
|  |  | [0.42] | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Share of full-time employees | 1245 | 0.90 | -0.06*** | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  |  | [0.21] | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| Business open during any 'dark' | 1256 | 0.81 | -0.11*** | -0.05 | 0.00 |
| hours |  | [0.40] | (0.03) | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Total hours typically open | 1256 | 12.44 | -0.64*** | -0.38 | -0.10 |
|  |  | [2.60] | (0.16) | (0.23) | (0.24) |
| Applied for loans in past 12 | 1256 | 0.14 | 0.02 | $0.08^{* * *}$ | -0.04 |
| months |  | [0.35] | (0.04) | (0.03) | (0.05) |
| Total value of outstanding loans | 1233 | 319.92 | 96.74 | 143.51 | -279.61* |
|  |  | [1213.41] | (105.84) | (113.73) | (132.18) |
| Permanently change | 1252 | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.03* |
| industry/business (0-1) |  | [0.14] | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Permanently substitute to more | 1252 | 0.00 | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| labor (0-1) |  | [0.07] | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Permanently substitute to | 1252 | 0.02 | -0.01 | -0.02* | 0.01 |
| non-electric tools or machines (0-1) |  | [0.14] | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Business engaged in retail | 1256 | 0.43 | 0.02 | -0.00 | -0.02* |
| activities |  | [0.50] | (0.01) | (0.05) | (0.01) |
| Business engaged in manufacturing | 1256 | 0.21 | 0.01 | -0.01 | 0.00 |
| activities . |  | [0.41] | (0.01) | (0.03) | (0.01) |
| Business engaged in other service | 1256 | $0.36$ | $-0.02^{*}$ | $0.01$ | $0.02$ |
| activities |  | [0.48] | (0.01) | (0.05) | (0.01) |
| Business activity likely using | 1256 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.02 | -0.00 |
| electricity |  | [0.40] | (0.01) | (0.03) | (0.01) |

Notes: This table shows the difference-in-differences results from the main equation, by dropping the geographically close control sites. We define distance by the shortest path to a treatment site, and we drop any control site that is within 1.3 km from a treatment site, where 1.3 km is the median distance to a treatment site. Each row represents an outcome. In all regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is the business owner or a manager, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. * $p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table C11: Correlations between voltage quality and primary outcomes

|  | N | Control Mean (SD) | Avg voltage (SE) | Hours below nominal-10 (SE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reported hours of bad voltage in past month | 3130 | 43.05 | -0.010*** | 0.028*** |
|  |  | [87.25] | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| Reported total outage hours in past month | 3092 | 32.20 | -0.009*** | $0.024^{* *}$ |
|  |  | [31.09] | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| Max monthly WTP for perfect reliability | 3150 | 3.62 | $-0.006^{* * *}$ | 0.014*** |
|  |  | [4.85] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. outages | 3150 | 1.74 | -0.005*** | 0.011** |
|  |  | [2.98] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. volt. fluc. | 2000 | 2.14 | -0.003** | 0.008 |
|  |  | [3.68] | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| Voltage damage and protection index | 3150 | 0.00 | -0.003* | 0.010** |
|  |  | [1.00] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Any appliance damaged by voltage in past year | 3150 | 0.25 | -0.004** | 0.010** |
|  |  | [0.43] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Amt spent on burnt/broken apps in past year | 3080 | 10.22 | -0.003** | 0.007* |
|  |  | [37.23] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Any voltage protective devices | 3150 | 0.25 | -0.000 | 0.004 |
|  |  | [0.44] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Value of voltage protective devices | 2668 | 6.05 | -0.003 | 0.008* |
|  |  | [25.51] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Uses an alternative energy source | 3150 | 0.05 | 0.000 | -0.001 |
|  |  | [0.22] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Total number of appliances | 3150 | 8.59 | 0.001 | -0.004 |
|  |  | [5.98] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Monthly electricity spending | 3050 | 19.51 | -0.001 | 0.005 |
|  |  | [18.67] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Total profit in past month | 1104 | 108.61 | -0.000 | -0.000 |
|  |  | [158.44] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Total revenue in past month | 1280 | 436.45 | 0.001 | -0.006 |
|  |  | [689.48] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Total monthly reported business spending | 1206 | 304.41 | 0.001 | -0.006 |
|  |  | [395.39] | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Total household monthly income | 1358 | 360.69 | -0.002 | 0.010* |
|  |  | [491.13 | (0.00) | (0.01) |

Notes: This table shows the results from separate regressions of normalized outcomes on measures of voltage quality. Each row represents a different outcome pooling business and household respondents. The control mean is calculated for the original (non-normalized) outcome variable in column 2. Mean voltage in control sites is 219.5 V at baseline and 224.6 V at endline. Voltage is measured by assigning each respondent GridWatch data based on the nearest devices for either the last 30 days from the survey date or for the full baseline period (prior to November 1, 2020) and endline period (from April 1, 2021 - July 20, 2022). In all the regressions, we also control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1$, ** $p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

## Appendix D: Pre-specified analyses of socioeconomic outcomes

Table D1: Impact of transformer injection intervention on willingness to pay outcomes

|  | N | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Control Mean } \\ (\mathrm{SD}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Post } \\ & \text { (SE) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treat } \\ & \text { (SE) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Post x Treat } \\ & \text { (SE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max monthly WTP for perfect | 3150 | 3.62 | -1.84*** | -0.37 | 0.47 |
| reliability |  | [4.85] | (0.22) | (0.27) | (0.30) |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. | 3150 | 1.74 | -0.59*** | -0.18 | 0.22 |
| outages |  | [2.98] | (0.17) | (0.19) | (0.22) |
| Max monthly WTP for 1 unnan. 8hr | 906 | 1.11 | -0.55*** | -0.18 | 0.13 |
| outage |  | [1.78] | (0.16) | (0.17) | (0.21) |
| Max monthly WTP for 1 announ. 8hr | 924 | 1.45 | -0.95*** | -0.05 | 0.27 |
| outage |  | [2.22] | (0.20) | (0.24) | (0.27) |
| Max monthly WTP for 4 unnan. 2hr | 884 | 1.19 | -0.71*** | 0.29 | -0.19 |
| outages |  | [2.10] | (0.15) | (0.22) | (0.23) |
| Max monthly WTP for half of curr. | 2000 | 2.14 | -0.42 | -0.42 | 0.57 |
| volt. fluc. |  | [3.68] | (0.30) | (0.36) | (0.39) |
| Max WTP for generator | 2887 | 356.03 | -61.97** | 29.91 | -37.43 |
|  |  | [452.35] | (24.41) | (25.69) | (32.41) |

Additional results from ??. All variables measuring values are in USD. Results are qualitatively unchanged when using logs. Sample sizes are lower for reliability scenarios that were only presented to a random subset of respondents. In all the regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is part of the household or business sample, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table D2: Impact of transformer injection intervention on alternative energy and defensive investment outcomes

|  | Control Mean <br> $(\mathrm{SD})$ | Post <br> $(\mathrm{SE})$ | Treat <br> $(\mathrm{SE})$ | Post x Treat <br> $(\mathrm{SE})$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uses an alter. energy source |  | 0.05 | -0.01 | 0.00 | -0.00 |
|  |  | $[0.22]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Value of alter. energy sources | 3084 | 223.44 | $-62.94^{*}$ | 558.72 | -615.79 |
|  |  | $[3711.51]$ | $(35.06)$ | $(691.33)$ | $(641.94)$ |
| Count of voltage defensive invest. 3150 | 0.35 | $-0.06^{* * *}$ | -0.01 | 0.01 |  |
|  |  | $[0.70]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.04)$ | $(0.02)$ |
| Value of voltage protective | 2843 | 8.10 | -0.45 | -0.31 | -0.47 |
| devices |  | $[34.09]$ | $(3.50)$ | $(1.85)$ | $(3.76)$ |
| Has multi-phase system | 2810 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 |
|  |  | $[0.20]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Frequency of switching phases | 3150 | 0.02 | -0.03 | 0.11 | -0.08 |
| (z-score) |  | $[1.18]$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.07)$ |
| Cost of installing phase system | 2732 | 10.15 | -4.14 | 3.60 | -6.59 |
|  |  | $[110.88]$ | $(4.47)$ | $(6.65)$ | $(6.19)$ |

Notes: This table shows the difference-in-difference results from the main equation. Each row represents an outcome. All variables measuring values are in USD; 1 USD $\approx 5.8$ GHS during the baseline survey and $\approx 8.5$ GHS during the endline survey. Results are qualitatively unchanged when using logged versions of continuous outcomes. In all the regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is part of the household or business sample, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table D3: Impact of transformer injection intervention on energy/electricity spending and burnt appliance outcomes

|  | Control Mean <br> $(\mathrm{SD})$ | Post <br> $(\mathrm{SE})$ | Treat <br> (SE) | Post X Treat <br> $(\mathrm{SE})$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monthly electricity spending |  | 19.37 | $-6.26^{* * *}$ | $-2.05^{*}$ | 0.75 |
|  |  | $[18.58]$ | $(0.67)$ | $(1.10)$ | $(0.87)$ |
| Has generator | 3150 | 0.04 | -0.01 | -0.00 | 0.01 |
|  |  | $[0.20]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Generator fuel and maintenance | 3150 | 5.15 | $-3.89^{* * *}$ | -2.37 | 1.60 |
| costs in past 3 months |  | $[48.99]$ | $(1.41)$ | $(1.94)$ | $(1.66)$ |
| Has solar panels | 3150 | 0.01 | -0.00 | 0.00 | -0.00 |
|  |  | $[0.08]$ | $(0.00)$ | $(0.00)$ | $(0.00)$ |
| Amount spent on solar panel | 3145 | 0.52 | -0.52 | -0.53 | 0.52 |
| repairs in past 3 months |  | $[14.41]$ | $(0.52)$ | $(0.52)$ | $(0.52)$ |
| Count of alternative fuels used in | 3150 | 0.92 | $0.05^{*}$ | -0.01 | 0.01 |
| past 3 months |  | $[0.85]$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.04)$ |
| Amount spent on all alt. fuels in | 3150 | 8.73 | -0.93 | -1.53 | 0.89 |
| past month |  | $[31.42]$ | $(1.08)$ | $(1.23)$ | $(1.20)$ |
| Amount spent on charcoal as alt. | 2993 | 12.21 | $13.37^{* * *}$ | -0.18 | -3.25 |
| fuel in past month |  | $[26.11]$ | $(2.94)$ | $(1.48)$ | $(3.66)$ |
| Amount spent on gas as alt. fuel | 2996 | 27.56 | $14.58^{* * *}$ | -0.73 | -0.40 |
| in past month |  | $[38.74]$ | $(2.03)$ | $(1.94)$ | $(4.12)$ |
| Amount spent on wood as alt. fuel | 3140 | 5.40 | -4.28 | -5.52 | 5.64 |
| in past month |  | $[144.29]$ | $(4.42)$ | $(5.36)$ | $(4.51)$ |
| Total hrs per day lightbulbs are | 3150 | 9.17 | $-0.96^{* * *}$ | 0.25 | -0.58 |
| on |  | $[5.68]$ | $(0.34)$ | $(0.38)$ | $(0.46)$ |
| Any appliance damaged by voltage | 3141 | 0.25 | $-0.05^{*}$ | 0.04 | -0.05 |
| in past year |  | $[0.43]$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.04)$ |
| Has burnt/broken apps. that were | 3141 | 0.08 | $-0.02^{*}$ | 0.02 | -0.01 |
| not replaced in past year |  | $[0.28]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.02)$ | $(0.02)$ |
| Amt spent on burnt/broken apps in | 3114 | 10.11 | $-6.82^{* * *}$ | 0.33 | 1.17 |
| past year |  | $[36.99]$ | $(1.46)$ | $(1.94)$ | $(2.03)$ |

Notes: This table shows the difference-in-difference results from the main equation. Each row represents an outcome. All variables measuring values are in USD; $1 \mathrm{USD} \approx 5.8$ GHS during the baseline survey and $\approx 8.5 \mathrm{GHS}$ during the endline survey. Unless shown, results are qualitatively unchanged when using logged versions of continuous outcomes. In all the regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is part of the household or business sample, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table D4: Impact of transformer injection intervention on electricity-related indices

|  | N | Control Mean <br> (SD) | Post <br> (SE) | Treat <br> (SE) | Post x Treat <br> (SE) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outage backup power index | 3150 | 0.00 | $-0.06^{*}$ | 0.01 | -0.01 |
|  |  | $[1.00]$ | $(0.04)$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.04)$ |
| Freq. of wetcell batt./generator | 3150 | 0.06 | -0.06 | -0.01 | 0.02 |
| use during outage (normalized) |  | $[1.26]$ | $(0.04)$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.05)$ |
| Share of apps. using | 3131 | 0.10 | -0.10 | 0.03 | -0.04 |
| solar/generator during outage (normalized) |  | $[1.41]$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.08)$ |
| Alternative energy/fuel sources | 3150 | -0.00 | -0.04 | 0.03 | -0.03 |
| index |  | $[1.00]$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.07)$ |
| Uses an alter. energy source | 3150 | 0.05 | -0.01 | 0.00 | -0.00 |
|  |  | $[0.22]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Count of alt. light sources | 3150 | 0.10 | $-0.11^{*}$ | 0.05 | -0.05 |
| (normalized) |  | $[1.10]$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.08)$ | $(0.09)$ |
| Count of alt. fuel sources | 3150 | -0.08 | $0.06^{*}$ | -0.01 | 0.01 |
| (normalized) |  | $[0.96]$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.05)$ |
| Appliance protection index | 3150 | -0.00 | $-0.20^{* * *}$ | -0.04 | $0.07^{*}$ |
|  |  | $[1.00]$ | $(0.03)$ | $(0.05)$ | $(0.04)$ |
| Count of voltage defensive apps. | 3150 | 0.08 | $-0.10^{* * *}$ | -0.02 | 0.02 |
| (normalized) |  | $[1.11]$ | $(0.02)$ | $(0.06)$ | $(0.03)$ |
| Has multi-phase system | 2810 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 |
|  |  | $[0.20]$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Share of TVs plugged to TV guard | 877 | 2.44 | $-2.42^{* * *}$ | -0.19 | 0.26 |
| (normalized) |  | $[0.81]$ | $(0.14)$ | $(0.23)$ | $(0.24)$ |
| Share of fridges plugged to fridge | 805 | 1.27 | $-1.36^{* * *}$ | -0.03 | 0.09 |
| guard (normalized) |  | $[0.51]$ | $(0.10)$ | $(0.09)$ | $(0.14)$ |

Additional results from ??. The main outcomes are indices; we also show results for the index components for completeness. Indices are constructed as the sum of normalized components, and are then normalized to have mean 0 and SD 1 for control respondents in the baseline. In all the regressions, we control for respondent age, gender, education, whether the meter is paid directly by the user, number of meter users, whether the respondent is part of the household or business sample, whether the location includes both a household and a business, and district fixed effects. The control mean is the mean for control sites in the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. * $p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$

Table D5: Impact of transformer injection intervention on business outcomes


Additional results from ??. All variables measuring values are in USD. Results are qualitatively unchanged when using logs. All regressions control for baseline socioeconomic characteristics. The control mean is for the baseline period. SEs clustered by site. ${ }^{*} p<0.1,{ }^{* *} p<0.05,{ }^{* * *} p<0.01$


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania and NBER. ${ }^{2}$ Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California, Berkeley. ${ }^{3}$ Department of Economics, Texas A\&M University. ${ }^{4}$ Department of Economics, Texas A\&M University and NBER. ${ }^{5}$ The Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and NBER.

