STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10771	
Project Title	Strengthening the adaptive capacity of communities by up-scaling integrated landscape management and restoration in SW and SE region of Central African Republic	
Date of Screening	21 May 2021	
STAP member screener	Ed Carr	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	**Major issues to be considered during project design** STAP acknowledges this project and its efforts to address the challenges faced by both people and the environment in the southern parts of the Central African Republic. While these are very real challenges, the PIF does not connect these challenges to climate change, either in the present or by demonstrating intensifying or increasing climate-related challenges in the future. At most, climate change is a minor contributor to the challenges described in the PIF, and there is some evidence (in an article cited in the PIF) that climate change might even alleviate some pressures on tropical cereal yields. In short, it is not clear that the proposed project is appropriate for LDCF funding. To be appropriate for LDCF funding, the project will have to much more clearly document how current variability and future trends of climate change translate into agricultural, livelihoods, forest, and other environmental impacts that require attention. Right now, the connections between climate and impacts are asserted, sometimes by implication, but they are rarely substantiated and there appears to be evidence in the literature that some of the impacts claimed by this project are unlikely to materialize. Assuming the project can link climate change to climate impacts that require adaptation, STAP strongly suggests the project develop more than one future scenario of climate change. The climate is probabilistic, and while there is no doubt it is changing, the amount of change remains uncertain. STAP suggests the	

	project team develop two additional scenarios, grounded in the literature, one where change is plausibly greater than that described in the current document, and one where change is plausibly less. This will allow the project team to consider a range of plausible futures that their interventions need to address, allowing for the selection and implementation of interventions that are effective across this range of futures. STAP also suggests the project develop a much clearer, stronger baseline scenario. As noted below, the project often describes changes relative to present conditions without articulating the present conditions, thus making it difficult to understand the amount or importance of changes.	
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?	The project has clear objectives, but the relationship of those objectives to the problem diagnosis is not clear because the climate aspects of the problem are not clear.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	The activities are not well-connected to the climate objectives of the project because those objectives are not clear.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	This is difficult to assess, because it is unclear what the project is fostering adaptation to.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	It is not clear
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?	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe:	Is the problem statement well-defined?	It is not. The description nicely lays out the situation in CAR with regard to livelihoods,

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)		food security, and conflict/insecurity. It spends a lot of time describing the environment of the entire country, but the project is to be implemented only in the south/southwest, which are quite distinct from the northern half of the country. A great deal of the information provided in the first 16 points of the description is not relevant to the project. When the description turns to climate, it also exhibits problems. For example, the description emphasizes climate change as a driver of conflict, saying "the degradation of natural resources as a result of both overexploitation and climate change will contribute to increased conflicts over the distribution of natural resources." This statement is not universally true (there is a large literature around this) and therefore requires support in the CAR context. The description provides no support. The description states that there will be increases in temperature and climate variability but does not make it clear how those increases relate to present conditions. For example, it states "Total annual days of temperature above 35°C would rise by 60.6 days in 2050, while total annual days of temperatures above 40°C would be 14.5 days by 2050 and 50.7 by end of century." However, it never states how many days above 35°C we see now, or how many over 40ºC. As a result, we cannot assess the scale of the change by 2050. The description references 2100 conditions but does not note the substantial variance in projected conditions that far out. Even where there is a clear baseline against which to measure change, the significance of the change is not clear. For example, the description notes that "Mean

		annual rainfall in CAR has increased slightly since the end of the 1990s, as recorded by a 4-percent increase over the 1995-2017 average in Bangui." However, this is a place that receives around 1600 mm of rain per year, so what is the biophysical importance of a 4% change (60 mm of rain/year)? It seems unlikely that such a small shift matters for farming or any other issue raised in the description. It is clear that temperature is increasing, and temperature is what the RCPs are best at, but in the discussion of temperature it is not clear how temperature change will translate into impacts on the environment and people. Impacts are vaguely asserted, but without a clear pathway from temperature to environmental or human impact, it is not clear how a proposed intervention will address that impact. The claims about climate variability have a similar problem – in this case, the description does not do a good job of characterizing the increase in variability, but it also does not link that variability to environmental or human impacts in a manner that allows for the assessment of the efficacy of interventions. It is not until many points into the description that relevant information is provided that links climate trends to impacts. This is mostly in point 28, where a model is cited to warn of losses to maize and tropical cereal yields. Even here, the information provided is unclear – how much are maize yields projected to fall (the description only mentions affected area)? How much will other cereals decline? It appears the project team read the abstract of the Stuch et al (2020) article, which provides these figures, without actually reading the article itself –

		which suggests through figures that much of CAR would see a decline of 5-20% in maize yield and, for much of the country, no projected change in tropical cereal yield (though there is a pocket in the southwest modeled to have a 5-20% decline in yield). Reading the article carefully, it seems likely the projected maize yield decline is closer to 5% than 20%, and tropical cereals are likely to *increase* yields. This is critical information, as it suggests that farmers will, over time, adapt to this gradual shift in yields by shifting from one crop they already grow, maize, to other crops they already grow (tropical cereals), without requiring much intervention, and they might see an increase in productivity as they do so. While it is important and valid to note that CAR exhibits a great deal of climate change vulnerability, that vulnerability has three parts: exposure to changes and impacts, sensitivity to those changes/impacts, and adaptive capacity. When it comes to agriculture in CAR, there is clear exposure to trends and some sensitivity…but that sensitivity is not all negative. Further, it appears that farmers will have the adaptive capacity to shift from one familiar crop to another in a gradual manner. Thus, the staple production in the agricultural sector is not very vulnerable to climate change trends over the next several decades. Reading the description, it is clear that CAR's challenges are very real, but it appears that climate change has relatively little, if anything, to do with them. The same issue exists for discussions of the forests. The impacts that are described are a product of farming and other forest use, but

		these human activities are not clearly driven by any climate trend or event. There appears to be a subtle implication that climate change is and will stress agricultural production, thus leading to forest encroachment. However, the data in the articles cited by the project suggest that any encroachment will be driven not by climate impacts, but by a growing population in need of land and food. The project team should be advised that the term for the farming in this area is swidden farming. Slash and burn carries a pejorative sense that such practices inherently represent the mismanagement of environmental resources, when swidden farming can be a very sustainable practice. In fact, there are studies showing different results for biodiversity and carbon in the long term (see http://www.cifor.org/library/6318/). Likewise, Van Vliet et al., found that transition from swidden to permanent agriculture often contributes to "permanent deforestation, loss of biodiversity, increased weed pressure, declines in soil fertility, and accelerated soil erosion."
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Outside of climate change, the barriers and threats seem well-described, particularly issues of food security and conflict. With regard to the climate, the barriers and threats are poorly described and not effectively linked to either human or environmental vulnerability. The project appears to be identifying real human and environmental challenges worthy of attention, but with little to no connection to climate change.
	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?	n/a

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	It is not. Current conditions are not well-described for the project area, as the description tends to lay out conditions for the whole country. It also often refers to future conditions without explaining what the current conditions are so the reader can understand the change. There is no development of a scenario going forward that demonstrates the trajectory of human well-being and environmental conditions that justifies adaptation interventions or allows for the assessment of whether or not such interventions are robust across a range of plausible futures.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The project points to putting 125,000 hectares of land under climate-resilient, agro-ecological management and the reduced vulnerability of 60,000 beneficiaries as its goals, but the threats it identifies have to do with things like agricultural yields which are not easily linked to area and poorly linked to climate in this context.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	No. The baseline does not support the incremental reasoning for the project (see comments under description)
	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;	n/a
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	n/a
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	n/a
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The project should be commended for including a theory of change captured in Figure 15. The theory of change can be summarized as: 1) By strengthening at multiple scales integrated and inclusive land use planning

		and governance for enhanced resilience, the project will address a key barrier (lack of coordinated approach and government mechanisms to integrate climate change adaptation into development planning) to managing the direct and indirect drivers of vulnerability for local communities. 2) By scaling up sustainable NRM mechanisms and the restoration of degraded landscapes, the project will address key barriers (lack of coordinated approach and government mechanisms to integrate climate change adaptation into development planning; lack of capacity to implement sustainable and climate-smart interventions on the ground) to managing the direct and indirect drivers of vulnerability for local communities. 3) By promoting resilient, nature-based livelihoods interventions, the project will improve knowledge of and access to adaptation technologies and innovations, addressing a barrier to managing drivers of vulnerability 4) By strengthening the M&E system, the project will increase awareness of adaptation technologies/innovations and improve capacity to implement sustainable and climate-smart interventions, which are currently barriers to addressing drivers of vulnerability Doing all of this will result in increased productive lands under climate-resilient management, reduce the vulnerability of 60,000 beneficiaries, enhance biodiversity conservation in 50,000ha, and restore degraded

		lands, forests, and productive landscapes (no metrics provided) The ToC does not clearly address one of its barriers (regarding extension services and incentives for resilient nature-based solutions) and the entire TOC rests on claims about climate change impacts which are not substantiated.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See discussion of activities, outputs, and outcomes below.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Activity 1: promote an integrated landscape approach involving all the relevant sectors; strengthen the capacity of certain forest communes (mainly in the SW) to elaborate their Local Development Plans (LDP); integrate climate change adaptation concerns and measures (such as nature-based solutions and FLR) into the LDPs. Outcome 1.1. Efficient territorial planning for resilient and sustainable integrated landscape management, which will come from: • Capacity building programs implemented for national and decentralized entities or jurisdictions (prefectures and communes) to integrate climate change adaptation into development planning processes and through a landscape restoration approach • Community structures (Forest and Farm producer groups, Community Forest Associations, ...) strengthened/established to promote climate change adaptation thanks to access to tools/data that adopt nature-based solutions/integrated landscape management approach (including FLR)

		• Intersectoral and multi-stakeholder platforms set-up/strengthened at all levels (national, regional and local) to promote coordination amongst all stakeholders across the sectors for efficient effective climate change integration landscape planning and M&E of adaptation intervention Activity 2: Through the development and implementation of adaptive forest management plans, local communities will have identified in a participatory manner appropriate measures to counteract climate change hazards, for example restoration with resilient local tree species, putting in place re management and detection measures, training on pest and diseases identification/ measures building as well on local indigenous knowledge. Outcome 2.1. Forest ecosystems and productive landscapes are locally sustainably managed for enhanced resilience of local communities, which will come from: • Sustainable management plans developed and implemented for at least 6 Series of Agriculture and Human Settlements (SAOHs) in SW and in buffer zone of Bangassou Forest • Forests in at least 5 communes are sustainably managed and restored by local communities for enhanced ecological functionality and climate change resilience. Activity 3: The utilization of trees on farms, the usage of heat-tolerant crop varieties as well as improved soil conservation measures are

		some of the indicative adaptation measures that will be promoted by the project to counteract the anticipated climate impacts such as increase in temperature and rainfall variability. In combination with the promotion of Forest Farm Producer groups, Farmer Field Schools and Club Dimitra, local communities will have enhanced adaptive capacities to ensure sustainable livelihoods and income generation. The capacity of national research centers (ICRA and ISDR) will be strengthened to implement applied research programmes in both agroecology and Forest and Landscape Restoration, and the project will build on the experience/expertise gained to promote scaling-up. The project will also promote the development of viable business plans following the innovative incubator approach currently used under TRI (Bridge for Billions, The Restoration Factory) and will build on ongoing work with agri-business incubator and micro-credit facilities in Bangui under the WB project. Outcome 3.1. Diversified and resilient livelihood strategies promoted based on climate-smart nature-based approaches for increased community resilience • Forest and farm producers groups/cooperatives established and empowered to ensure efficient and inclusive management and governance in climate change adaptation • Sustainable NTFP/agriculture value chains identified and selected by forest and farm producer groups/cooperatives and bankable business plans developed for investments

		• Capacities of research institutions and extension services strengthened to provide up-to-date adaptive support to forest and farm producer groups/cooperatives • Climate-resilient agroforestry production systems identified by producer groups and developed with support of extension services to reduce climate change vulnerability Outcome 4.1. Lessons and knowledge from the project are captured through a robust M&E system • A sound results-based project M&E framework has been developed • Participatory monitoring approaches for adaptation interventions developed and implemented at decentralized level Outcome 4.2. Enhanced knowledge and learning dissemination of the project's outputs both at national and/ regional levels through a robust knowledge development and dissemination strategy • Exchange visits for key stakeholders (community groups, Forest Farm groups, cooperatives) organized to share best practices and increase knowledge on community-managed landscape planning and resilient nature-based value chain development

		• Knowledge generated by the project is shared and communicated with broader stakeholder group in-country and with existing regional platforms (COMIFAC, Congo Basin countries) and initiatives to promote efficient exchange of knowledge and information
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The mechanisms of change appear to be plausible. The gap in this project appears to lie between the assessment of climate change, climate impacts, and the drivers of vulnerability the project seeks to address. It is not clear the mechanisms of change have anything to do with climate change impacts.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Yes, the risks section covers needed adaptations.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	n/a
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	The project does not address the climate trends and impacts described in the description. It will likely provide livelihoods benefits, but it is not clear these will be adaptation benefits.
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?	It does not appear that this project is well-positioned to deliver adaptation benefits.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	The scale of benefits seems plausible, but they are not necessarily adaptation benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	They are explicitly defined, but they do not align with the climate data.

	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators are provided for the project as a whole, but it is not clear these would be of use for measuring project progress, and they are not aligned with adaptation benefits.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	There is no discussion of what will be implemented to enhance project resilience to climate change, but this is not necessarily a problem as climate change is unlikely to pose a challenge for the project implementation.
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 innovation incubators are to be commended as an innovative means of mobilizing local knowledge and capacity to address livelihoods and environmental challenges. The rest of the interventions are well-established.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	There is an articulated vision involving demonstrations of successful efforts, using regional platforms to share knowledge with neighboring countries, and working with FAO through its Communities of Practice.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	While it is clear that some degree of climate change is coming to CAR, as noted in the description section above, these changes are incremental and likely easily managed by farmers through incremental, autonomous decisions. The challenges they face relate to population, economic opportunity, and political stability.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		There is no clear map of where implementation would occur below the prefecture level. There are many useful maps, but aside from a general sense of where, the maps do not help pinpoint project work. It would be good to have a more direct sense of where the work will take place, or the PIF should specify that specific locations are yet to be determined. Rather than have many maps from different sources and various resolutions, etc, it would be much more helpful to have one or two good

		maps which combine the relevant information and clearly lay out where the project intervention will take place.
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.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	The project has a good list of relevant stakeholders, but does not appear to see farmers or agrarian communities as a stakeholder for this project. These are not the same as forest-dependent communities and appear to be the largest group to be impacted by project efforts, so it seems odd to not name them.
	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?	Stakeholder roles vary widely. National government entities are the implementing organizations, support the development of activities, and ensure gender equality in the project. Civil society organizations will be engaged to provide data for the project, but also to develop gender action plans and ensure the participation of women. They will also work on upscaling successful interventions. Local governments will make sure adaptation interventions are integrated into local planning processes. Research institutions will promote adaptation measures, while local beneficiaries will help identify project sites and appropriate interventions. The private sector will also help identify project sites and information on micro-enterprise development

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. 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. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	The project is aware that women have differential access to communications and might be excluded from participation in various project stages without aggressive outreach. Much of that outreach is to be planned in the PPG stage. The PIF lays out important gendered issues with regard to property rights, labor patterns, and even domestic labor distributions. However, there is no clear discussion of gendered agricultural or forest management roles in the project, and thus no discussion of the different ways in which project activities might affect women or even bypass them entirely.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	The project notes that women have limited access to phones and computers, but plans to use engagement with women's associations to ensure women's participation.
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being	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? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	A separate climate risk assessment is helpfully provided as an Annex to the PIF and which provides much of the information on projected changes in temperature, etc. included in the PIF itself. However, it suffers from the limitations described above – that is that while

achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	• 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?	it is clear that temperature is increasing and precipitation changing, it is not clear how these changes will translate into impacts on the environment and people. In this screen, the Doukpolo article suggests reductions in cereal production directly contrary to the findings of the Stuch article cited in the PIF. The fact we have different studies directly contradicting one another with regard to the impacts of climate change suggests the need to carefully consider, in the project site, the potential pathways from climate change to climate impacts on people/activities to determine if adaptation interventions are truly needed. Both the PIF and the screen note that current models do not project major impacts from climate change on either people or the environment. Put another way, it is not clear how sensitive the people and environment of the proposed project areas are to projected climate change. The risks of climate change emerge from exposure to climate change (clearly present) and sensitivity to those changes (very unclear). STAP strongly recommends the project team establish the degree to which the people and environmental resources the project targets are sensitive to projected changes, and target their interventions at clear examples of sensitivity.
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, it appears so with the exception of the GEF Congo Basin Sustainable Landscape (CBSL) program (GEF 7 Impact Program under Sustainable Forests), which is mentioned in passing in terms of linking with the WB project in CAR and the forthcoming portal; however, many of the interventions are similar and this project could potentially benefit from plans underway in the CBSL to develop integrated land use management planning tools

		(iLUMPs) and to therefore avoid unnecessary duplication.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Throughout the PIF, there is recognition of prior and ongoing projects and their lessons.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No, the lessons tend to be described in very general terms, if at all.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	This is not clear.
	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?	This is not clear.
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?	The approach is to make KM integral to the project to promote learning and continuous improvement. This includes engaging beneficiaries for participatory M&E, which is potentially innovative and exciting.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	• engaging national and regional technical and educational institutions, • using South-South cooperation mechanisms. Using the Global and Regional Platforms under the GEF Impact Programmes (Congo Basin, FOLUR) as a vehicle to share knowledge generated by the project and capture lessons learned from other projects. • using the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration also as an opportunity to share project outputs and learn from other initiatives. • At the local level (LDCs and REDD+ Committees) will be capacitated to harvest knowledge and information and this will directly contribute to knowledge management at Prefectural level.

		• At the National level, the project is implemented within the REDD+ framework and the knowledge generated by the Project will be disseminated through the national coordination committee as well as the national climate committee through the MESD

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	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.
	* 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 ***"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."***
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.
	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.

3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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:
	(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.