	Corruption Outcomes			Mismanagement Outcomes		
	Indicator I	Indicator II	Indicator III	Indicator I	Indicator II	Indicator III
	(Binary)	(Share)	(Amount)	(Binary)	(Share)	(Amount)
Variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Purchases Estimates					
Proc. Category 1	0.117	0.037	234	0.049	-0.006	64
	(0.095)	(0.055)	(442)	(0.078)	(0.081)	(648)
	[n = 2098]	[n = 2087]	[n = 1934]	[n = 2129]	[n = 2097]	[n = 1924]
Proc. Category 2	-0.034	0.032	2,827	-0.100*	-0.055	-4,524
	(0.067)	(0.048)	(3,838)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(4,748)
	[n=2686]	[n=2106]	[n=2058]	[n=2553]	[n=2328]	[n = 2261]
	Works Estimates					
Proc. Category 1	-0.210	-0.039	61	-0.416**	-0.291*	-4,611*
	(0.143)	(0.078)	(1,482)	(0.190)	(0.178)	(2,802)
	[n = 330]	[n = 362]	[n = 314]	[n = 485]	[n = 485]	[n = 423]
Proc. Category 2	0.043	0.009	537	0.016	-0.006	-726
	(0.102)	(0.058)	(8,614)	(0.079)	(0.076)	(11,265)
	[n = 1185]	[n = 1014]	[n = 1050]	[n = 944]	[n = 858]	[n = 892]
Proc. Category 3	0.043	0.158	221478	0.171	-0.077	-88,510
3 ,	(0.307)	(0.183)	(281,249)	(0.212)	(0.251)	(340,566)
	[n = 313]	[n = 228]	[n = 205]	[n = 51]	[n = 157]	[n = 276]
	Pooled Estimates					
Proc. Category 1	-0.025	-0.054*	-425	0.098*	0.091*	-114
	(0.058)	(0.033)	(291)	(0.054)	(0.050)	(451)
	[n=2256]	[n=2263]	[n=1964]	[n=1977]	[n=2019]	[n=1905]
Proc. Category 2	-0.018	0.009	1,344	-0.064	-0.040	-572
	(0.043)	(0.030)	(3,078)	(0.044)	(0.041)	(3,486)
	[n=3767]	[n=2896]	[n=2846]	[n=2460]	[n=2436]	[n=4584]
Proc. Category 3	0.099	0.085	76,083	-0.006	-0.050	-1,869
	(0.128)	(0.069)	(59,995)	(0.081)	(0.079)	(79,197)
	[n=517]	[n = 568]	[n = 626]	[n=732]	[n=751]	[n = 423]
Note: This table reports the lower-bounded LATE of discretion on government performance in Brazilian municipalities. Each cell represents one non-parametric, local polynomial regression of order two between the discretion parameter (rows on first column) and performance outcome (columns 1-6). For each cell, we first report parameter estimates, then cluster-robust standard errors (at the municipal level), and lastly sample sizes around each cutoff for each regression. Corruption Indicator I (column 1) and Man-						
agement Indicator procurement call fraction; Corrupti report the share total number of i amount potentiall the share of corrupti regressions it effects. Robust stare reported in pa	I (columns has at least on and Miss of corruption fractions; y lost to end uption or many table dotandard errors.	4) are binar one corrupt management on and mism Indicators II ther problem issmanagement not include ors are clust	ry variables to ion or program Indicators I nanagement II (columns and issues over municipal cered at the	curning on vam manage: I (columns: infractions: 3 and 6) re ansfer amou er total infractions ovariates no municipal le	when the ment in- 2 and 5) over the port the nt times ractions. or fixed-	