

Box 0.23 Response-options framework – example				
<i>Response option</i>	<i>Feasibility</i>	<i>Advantages</i>	<i>Disadvantages</i>	<i>Timing</i>
1. Distribution of spare (confiscated) supplies from Forest Dept.	Low	Would have immediate economic and environmental impacts. Would utilize existing/ useless stocks; in the short term, would slow deforestation; simple distribution programme.	Requires warehouses, distribution staff. Limits integration with market in town and camp. Wood may be sold on, as people are now coping by scavenging. Legal obstacles in transporting wood through district borders? Need to determine market rate for purchase and quantity.	2–3 weeks
2. Distribution involving camp-based retailers and vouchers	Medium	Inject cash into camp economy, thus creating many secondary beneficiaries; would create more local vendors.	Very few camp retailers with any capacity; no storage or infrastructure inside camps; open to fraud. Start-up slow – with procurement and beneficiary identification process.	2 months to implement
3. Promotion of fuel-saving (efficiency) techniques	High	Transferrable skills, creating savings for women at household level. Addresses child protection. Good for environment. Clear exit strategy. Easily integrated with other programmes e.g. pressure cookers	Requires intense inputs from community development/mobilizers. Requires lots of training and materials. Time of women. Risky because it requires behaviour change over a long time. Hard to monitor impact.	Behavioural change, the longer the better
4. Refilling of gas canisters; conditional on school attendance	High	Less firewood usage, time-saving. Incentives for sending children to school. Reduces protection issues. Clear exit strategy: reduces distributions.	Gas is twice the price of firewood; risky using inside tents; IDPs cannot afford refilling on own. May increase dependency on aid; makes school attendance linked to reward, instead of intrinsic worth; not sustainable.	Can be started soon
5. Cash distribution	Low	Injects money into the camp economy. Positive effect on household economies but no effect on firewood market; gives households choices.	Potential for inflation; corruption; no exit strategy; no way to ensure that cash is used for firewood; people might continue to send children for firewood collection instead of buying it.	Quick response