

Authors Esther Duflo Massachusetts Institute of Technology Michael Greenstone The University of Chicago Rema Hanna Harvard University UP IN SMOKE T early half of the world's population continues to try on sold fieth, including wood, dang, agricultu-waste, and coal, for its energy needs. The smoke release from using such fieth has been shown to lead to respirate diseases and long cancer. The World Health Organization (WHO) lialoor air pollution as the "leading environmental cause of death in the odd," stating that it contributes to two million deaths annually. Cooking with biomass fuels also contributes to climate change: Using biomass fuels releases carbon dioxide (COs) and black carbon into the ats also plays a role in deforestation. need cooking stores have been premoted as a simple solution to these problems. Based on their technical design, improved to share the potential to reduce remissions, fuel use, and the incidence of presuments and other lang diseases. The stores gained considerable international attention, and the Gebola Allianor for Gaus Cookstown has amounced a goal of having siliton beauer-beids adopt clean cooking technologies by 2000. A randomized evaluation in Gustreamfor found whether this is in smoke exposure indicators when few inspected cooking stores were distributed to 300 women and children. It as improvements in some dimensions of health (Smith-Stortison et al. 2003). However, these results derived from a disdiction which households of usage was closely mentioned and repairs were provided weekly and no cent. The evaluated was also too expensive fire households to purchase or for it to be practical for large-scale distribution. Evidence was still of from real-world conditions. How much would households use and maintain the stores? Given that level of use, what it would these stores have on boundedd health? ower these questions, J-PAL affiliated professors Rema Hunna (Harvard University), Eather Duffo (MIT), and Mich sotone (MIT), working in conjunction with a local NGO, Gram Vikas, evaluated the impact of inexpensive, impro-ing stoves on household well-being in Oriosa, India. ow usage limited the impact of the stoves on smoke exposure. In the first year of the program, when as at its highest, there was a 2,5 persons reduction in carbon monoide (CO) in the beath of the primary cooks in the households, but no meaningful change for other household members. By the second year, as use fell further a se stoom experienced normal wear and tear, there was no longer a significant effect.

Up in Smoke

Improved cookstoves in India did not reduce smoke exposure, improve health, or reduce fuel usage of recipients because they were not used regularly and recipients did not invest to maintain them properly.

Nearly half of the world's population continues to rely on solid fuels, including wood, dung, agricultural waste, and coal, for its energy needs. The smoke released from using such fuels has been shown to lead to respiratory diseases and lung cancer. The World Health Organization (WHO) lists indoor air pollution as the "leading environmental cause of death in the world," stating that it contributes to two million deaths annually. Cooking with biomass fuels also contributes to climate change: Using biomass fuels releases carbon dioxide (CO2)



and black carbon into the atmosphere and also plays a role in deforestation.

Improved cooking stoves have been promoted as a simple solution to these problems. Based on their technical design, improved stoves have the potential to reduce emissions, fuel use, and the incidence of pneumonia and other lung diseases. The stoves have gained considerable international attention, and the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves has announced a goal of having 100 million households adopt clean cooking technologies by 2020. A randomized evaluation in Guatemala found substantial reductions in smoke exposure indicators when free improved cooking stoves were distributed to 500 women and children, as well as improvements in some dimensions of health (Smith-Sivertsen et al. 2009). However, those results derived from a controlled setting in which households' usage was closely monitored and repairs were provided weekly at no cost. The evaluated stove was also too expensive for households to purchase or for it to be practical for large-scale distribution. Evidence was still needed from real-world conditions: How much would households use and maintain the stoves? Given that level of use, what impact would these stoves have on household health?

July 01, 2012