

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10175
Project Title	Building Resilience in the Wake of Climate Disasters in Southern Haiti
Date of Screening	November 27 2020
STAP member screener	Edward Carr
STAP secretariat screener	Guadalupe Duron
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes UN Environment’s project “Building Resilience in the Wake of Climate Disasters in Southern Haiti”. The project aims to strengthen the adaptive capacity and resilience of communities to climate change risks and natural disasters. Macaya National Park and Barraderes & Cayemites will be the target areas of the project.</p> <p>STAP commends the comprehensive descriptions on how lessons from several past and on-going initiatives will influence the design of this LDCF project. STAP encourages the project to apply the same rigor in the development of the causal pathways. This process entails backward mapping of, and supporting with evidence, the causal links between objectives, outcomes, outputs, and activities. In this regard, STAP looks forward to a refined theory of change in the final project document that demonstrates a backward mapping of causality, and builds in the assumptions, the barriers, and enablers, of change. STAP also recommends identifying barriers and opportunities to scaling up results in the theory of change. Currently, the proposal falls short of building scaling into causal pathways.</p> <p>Additionally, STAP recommends for the project developers to consider one, or two, additional simple pathways in the theory of change. Haiti faces significant climate risks and stressors, which are likely to require the</p>

	<p>project to consider a range options from adaptation to transformational change. Developing these simple scenarios will strengthen project planning so that resilience is built in the outcomes, and for the project’s impact to endure amidst long term changes, including climate, COVID-19, and shifting market demands.</p> <p>Below, STAP offers recommendations on how to improve the project design.</p>	
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, the objective is defined clearly.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	Yes, the activities support the project objective.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes, the outcomes focus on adaptation benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, potentially. The adaptation benefits are likely to be generated with a good theory of change, and careful monitoring of interventions.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes, the outputs are likely to contribute to the outcomes. However, it will be important to define a good theory of change, the assumptions that underlie the outcomes, and put in place a robust monitoring system.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project’s logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that	Is the problem statement well-defined?	The problem statement is well-articulated. STAP appreciates that the description of climate trends reflects a range of possible climate outcomes, but notes that different climate futures are not reflected in the project design. To ensure a project is robust across a range of plausible futures, STAP suggests

<p>need to be addressed (systems description)</p>		<p>the project consider two or more plausible futures (perhaps drawing on different RCPs) and use that information to assess the challenges the project might face in achieving durable outcomes. At this point, the range of plausible variability appears quite large. For example, sea level rise between 16 and 62 cm reflects very different impacts on the project area which would likely require different activities or produce different expectations of project outcomes.</p> <p>The PIF also notes that climate variability is a significant challenge in the project area. However, there is no discussion of trend with regard to variability. It would be useful to know if variability was increasing or steady over time to ensure project design is managing the risks that such variability might pose to project outcomes.</p>
	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>Yes, the barriers and threats are described.</p> <p>It will be important to build in the barriers and threats in a theory of change to ensure the interventions are feasible.</p>
	<p>For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?</p>	<p>Non-applicable.</p>
<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<p>Is the baseline identified clearly?</p>	<p>Yes, between the problem statement and the introduction to the proposed alternative scenario there is a clear <i>qualitative</i> baseline scenario.</p> <p>STAP notes that the PIF mentions co-financing from the World Bank “Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological Services” project that ends in 2020. As this project is still at the PIF stage, it seems that the World Bank project will be completed before the proposed project starts. STAP recommends</p>

		revising this in the PIF and considering the impact of this lost financing on project outcomes.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	<p>STAP notes that this baseline is not articulated in a manner that allows for measurement. For example, it does not lay out current trends in land degradation or invasive fish species impacts that would allow for the establishment of at least notional measurements of the baseline scenario. Such measurements would be useful for then identifying expected outcomes under the alternative scenario, and the indicators and measures needed to monitor progress towards those outcomes.</p> <p>STAP notes that such robust baselines appear to be planned for development as part of project activities under Components 1 and 2. STAP suggests the project ensure these baselines provide robust measures to inform both project design and project monitoring.</p>
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	The baseline is robust enough to support the incremental reasoning of the project with regard to existing projects and initiatives. In a qualitative sense, it also provides a robust justification for the need for this incremental cost. As noted above, it does not provide a robust basis for measuring the expected impact of the proposed project.
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	Non-applicable.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Partly. The PIF briefly mentions lessons from some of the initiatives listed under the baseline scenario. In the project document, suggest elaborating on the lessons, including lessons on scaling, and how they will contribute to this LDCF project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.

<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>What is the theory of change?</p>	<p>The PIF does not have a formally articulated theory of change. However, under its problem and solution statement (p. 13) it provides enough information to infer a theory of change. The theory of change is that, in the project area, there is a negative feedback loop created by vulnerability to severe climate events that threatens the population's food security, livelihoods, and well-being. This vulnerability leads the population to engage in maladaptive practices which degrade local ecosystems and render themselves more vulnerable to climate events. To break this negative feedback loop, the project will enhance environmental governance to address maladaptive practices, rehabilitate the environment so it might buffer the population from climate-related impacts like floods and droughts while improving food security, and provide alternative livelihoods opportunities through resilient value chains. The result is expected to be a virtuous cycle, where the sustainable use of natural resources increases resilience and adaptive capacity, which in turn will strengthen livelihoods and food security.</p>
	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>The project will strengthen institutional governance and capacity to reduce the vulnerability of livelihoods, natural systems, and physical assets in the project area by establishing a multistakeholder protected area governance mechanism on climate change risks, vulnerability, and adaptation. This is expected to support the development of participatory and community-based climate-resilient protected area management plans. These plans will support increased capacity for Ecosystem-based Adaptation and Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction planning. This increased capacity will then facilitate the promotion of Ecosystem-based Adaptation and Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction interventions at the local level, resulting in enhanced climate-resilient land management, environmental protection and</p>

		<p>rehabilitation practiced by local authorities and communities. Finally, with these initiatives demonstrating the value of Ecosystem-based Adaptation and Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction interventions, the project will be able to develop a Green Economy for ecosystem-based livelihood opportunities in the project areas, producing climate resilient value chains that contribute to increased sustainability and resilience of ecosystem-based livelihoods.</p>
	<p>What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</p>	<p>Component 1: A climate risk and vulnerability assessment will provide information, including indicators, about vulnerability to climate change in the project area. This effort will define management actions to address vulnerability. These actions will draw on Ecosystem-based Adaptation and Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction in their design. Alongside this effort, component 1 will work on establishing multistakeholder protected area governance mechanisms on climate change risks, vulnerability and adaptation. This will allow for coordination across the government and other agencies working on climate and the environment in Haiti, and the appropriate planning of interventions in this component.</p> <p>Component 2: Downscaled ecosystem-based adaptation and disaster risk reduction interventions will be implemented to address the needs of the population, which is expected to yield climate resilient land management, environmental protection, and environmental rehabilitation among local authorities and communities. The outcomes is expected to be more resilient livelihoods and improved environmental quality.</p> <p>Component 3: The project will build a green economy for the resilient livelihoods fostered in Components 1 and 2. This will require strengthening climate resilient value chains for</p>

		agriculture and greater sustainability and resilience overall for ecosystem-based livelihoods.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Partly. Some assumptions are described in the theory of change diagram, which STAP welcomes. During the project design, STAP recommends identifying in the diagram the remainder important assumptions for each outcome through an analysis of the barriers and enablers of change, as well as risks.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	<p>The project does not consider what sorts of adaptations might be required during project implementation in the narrative. However, the key risks section of the proposal lists several risks, including those from climate change, that might impact project implementation. These are well-articulated and can be monitored under project implementation.</p> <p>Additionally, STAP recommends for the project team to think about the drivers of change, including long-term changes (e.g. market changes, effects of climate change and natural disasters), and what responses measures may be needed for the project to stay on track to deliver its objective.</p> <p>This process entails having stakeholders think through one, or two simple scenarios for possible futures that focus on different change pathways based on shocks, stresses, and risks to the project. Refer to STAP's theory of change primer (table 2) and RAPTA for guidance on developing pathways, and more than one scenario:</p> <p>https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer</p> <p>https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines</p>
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Not applicable.

baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing		
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes, with a good theory of change, careful monitoring, and identification of several causal pathways that are necessary and sufficient to reach the project objective.
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	<p>The specific benefits of this project are clearly adaptation benefits.</p> <p>To strengthen the project’s ability to deliver adaptation benefits, STAP proposes the following:</p> <p>For component 1, consider using the World Bank’s climate and disaster risk screening tool during the project design. Refer to: https://climatescreeningtools.worldbank.org/start-screening</p> <p>As the project is developed, revisit whether all the key stakeholders needed to establish governance mechanisms for climate resilience have been identified and engaged in the project. Additionally, recommend paying attention to power dynamics, formal and informal decision making processes, cultural values, and other social determinants that may be essential for stakeholder engagement planning.</p> <p>STAP welcomes the use of EbA and Eco-DRR methods, and their integration within governance and institutional frameworks. As the project is developed, STAP recommends identifying the barriers on the training, and adoption, of EbA and Eco-DRR within and across ministries. These barriers should be described in the theory of change. For example, what barriers will stakeholders face in using the knowledge gained from disaster risk management training?</p>

		<p>In component 2, it will be valuable to consider the social structures (e.g. gender, culture, values, norms, among others) when designing the rehabilitation measures using EbA and Eco-DRR. Often, not accounting for social structures have constrained the impact of EbA and Eco-DRR approaches. Refer to the following paper to be aware of the EbA constraints outlined in the literature: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.08.014</p> <p>For component 3, STAP recommends developing a nested theory of change that links to the overall causal pathway. Mapping out carefully the causal pathways for component 3 will assist in analyzing closely the barriers, risks, and assumptions affiliated with reaching the two outcomes - which focus on novel activities in the target sites: i) strengthened climate-resilient agricultural value chains; and, ii) increased sustainability and climate-resilience of ecosystem-based livelihoods.</p> <p>Additionally, the project developers could consider the option of using charcoal for biochar production. Biochar is known to contribute to soil health, and use feedstock other than wood (e.g. animal manure). Refer to biochar production guidance developed by a UN Environment – GEF project: https://biochar.international/</p>
	<p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p>	<p>Possibly. The project aims to set up a monitoring and evaluation system for “...resilience and sustainability, including environmental restoration and protection, food production, livelihood improvement and inclusive socioeconomic development.” As the project is developed, and the theory of change is refined, consider what other indicators are needed to capture the diversity of adaptation outcomes resulting from EbA and Eco-DRR.</p>

	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	The adaptation benefits are explicitly defined.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	EbA and Eco-DRR approaches will be used. The methodologies and indicators will be further defined during the PPG phase.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project will identify potential adverse effects from climate change during the PPG phase. The project expects to factor resilience considerations into the restoration and agricultural interventions promoted by the project. The project also anticipates providing technical support to ensure that appropriate mitigation efforts are identified and implemented.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	The project is innovative in its effort to extend climate change adaptation and resilience beyond a localized focus on a specific climate change impact. Instead, it connects locally-specific responses to wider economic structures through a green economy approach (value chains), recognizing that vulnerability to climate impacts is produced by (and addressed by) more than the climate itself. The establishment of specific natural resource management practices will be new for the project areas, as will efforts to build protected area governance mechanisms. The project will pilot strategies (e.g. establishing woodlots) for charcoal harvesting. It also will also integrate EbA and Eco-DRR into institutions and governance settings.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The discussion of scaling up is vague, simply noting that there are several aspects of the project designed to be replicated and scaled up. <u>There is an assumption that piloting climate-resilient management and rehabilitation practices; implementing value chains; integrating climate resilience and disaster risk management across governing sectors; among other interventions, will lead to innovation and scaling.</u> STAP strongly suggests that the project articulate the mechanisms for scaling-up behind these opportunities at the

		<p>PPG stage to ensure that it engages productive practices that multiply the impacts of the project.</p> <p>Additionally, recommend defining assumptions (including behavior change assumptions) required to achieve outcomes 1, 2, and 3. Additionally, STAP recommends relying on the theory of change, and its monitoring, to identifying opportunities for scaling and transformative change. The theory of change also should be used to address barriers, and enablers, of scaling. Refer to STAP’s primer on theory of change: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer</p>
	<p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	<p>The project largely describes incremental adaptation, as it works within existing livelihoods and the existing economic structure. The interventions are designed to adjust those livelihoods, and leverage aspects of that economic structure, to bring about greater resilience and adaptative capacity.</p> <p>Suggest developing several pathways to deal with the expected incremental adaptation, and possible transformational change, required to reach the project goal by testing assumptions, and asking which pathway will be necessary and sufficient to address long-term changes resulting from climate stressors (floods, drought, hurricanes), COVID-19, market fluctuations, and other drivers. Refer to STAP’s primer theory of change, and RAPTA: https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer https://www.stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines</p>
<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		<p>The map adequately locates the project activities. STAP recommends following its guidance on maps in its Earth Observation document – see page A1-1. STAP guidance can be found at: https://www.stapgef.org/earth-observation-and-gef</p>

<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes. This appears to be a comprehensive consideration of who needs to be involved leveraging previous experiences in the country and study area.</p>
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>Government partners are expected to provide institutional support and will receive capacity building training to support implementation and lessons learned from the project.</p> <p>Local stakeholders, including women and other vulnerable groups, will contribute to project implementation.</p> <p>Civil society and NGO partners are expected to play a role in disseminating lessons learned and helping communities pilot their own interventions.</p> <p>STAP suggests describing stakeholders' roles, particularly at the outcome level. Additionally, amend stakeholder plans as needed after ensuring during the project design that the relevant stakeholders have been identified. We recommend using STAP's guidance on Multi-stakeholder engagement for transformational change, focused on establishing stakeholder engagement processes</p>

		to achieve long-term drivers thru scaling and transformative change. Refer to: https://www.stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/tbd.</p> <p>If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>The gender discussion in the PIF usefully notes that gender issues are closely tied to socioeconomic class in Haiti, thus avoiding the trap of treating all men and women as homogenous groups. The PIF also notes the activities that women conduct and how this relates to their (lack of) resilience to climate change impacts. The project plans to address this issue by focusing on value chains that benefit women’s activities while ensuring women receive training. STAP suggests that the project look beyond economic and environmental vulnerabilities to consider the ways in which women’s activities are currently managed in the study areas and identify means of mitigating the risks associated with those social structures. Often there are social barriers to the participation of women in projects or value chains. Projects that fail to take this into account will find women’s participation to be disappointing and could even produce negative effects, like increases in domestic violence, if they encourage women to take up activities that threaten men or other authorities. and recommends describing how EbA and Eco-DRR approaches, as well as other approaches used in the project, will embed gender. The project team may wish to draw from this study on gender and Eco-DRR, which is based on a UN Environment Project in Haiti: https://postconflict.unep.ch/DRR/Rokicki_Thesis_GenderInclusion.pdf</p>
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Gender considerations could hinder full participation, but the project is designed to avoid that outcome. This is particularly true of its</p>

		targeting of value chains that would benefit women's production.
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	<p>The risks listed are valid and comprehensive, covering issues outside of project control. There are social and environmental risks that could affect the project, but these are well-articulated in the PIF.</p> <p>There is no discussion of how climate risk might affect the project's outcomes over the 2020-2050 period. STAP strongly suggests the project consider how such risks will impact the project outcomes. STAP further suggests the project consider more than one plausible future climate scenario when assessing this risk to ensure a range of plausible impacts on the project are considered and addressed.</p>
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes, the project will build on the knowledge of other LDCF and non-LDCF projects.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, there is recognition of how learning from previous projects will feed into this initiative.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Most of the lessons from ongoing initiatives will be assessed, or elaborated further during the PPG phase.
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes. The project will establish a regional monitoring system for the project, which are expected to feed into knowledge systems in the region. Additionally, the Global Adaptation Network (GAN) will coordinate knowledge from

		other initiatives to support this LDCF project, and vice-versa. Project findings from this LDCF project will be disseminated through the REGATTA platform.
8. Knowledge management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project, and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	<p>The PIF notes the uncoordinated character of projects in Haiti and the need for knowledge management to address this issue. Overall, the approach seems to be to build the capacity of the government, particularly the Ministry of Environment and Agriculture, to manage and feed back information to the Table Verte, a venue for donor coordination. There is also mention of strengthening the science-policy interface, for example through better data on the cost-effectiveness of ecosystem-based adaptation.</p> <p>The PIF also notes that efforts will be made at the PPG phase to develop South-South learning mechanisms.</p> <p>As the project stakeholders develop this sub-activity, consider indicators for knowledge management.</p> <p>Additionally, suggest linking monitoring and evaluation, and knowledge management activities to the theory of change as they will all be needed to manage knowledge and learning.</p>
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	As noted above, there is no specific scaling-up plan for these project activities and outputs. STAP strongly suggests that the project articulate the mechanisms for scaling-up behind these opportunities at the PPG stage to ensure that it engages productive practices that multiply the impacts of the project.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.</p>
	<p>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p>
	<p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>