

South-south cooperation for strengthening and establishing climate finance units

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID	12284
Countries	Regional (Africa, Uganda)
Project Name	South-south cooperation for strengthening and establishing climate finance units
Agencies	UNEP
Date received by PM	2/18/2026
Review completed by PM	
Program Manager	Remy Ruat
Focal Area	Climate Change
Project Type	MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/26/2026):

cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

GEF Agency ID missing

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/26/2026):

1. Cleared

3. Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

1. Summary is missing one problem statement sentence, and one or two sentences on what the sharing of good practices of climate finance unit management can achieve for countries in Africa in terms of supporting country-drive investment frameworks and why this is important.

2. Please update results number as needed at the end of the review (64 beneficiaries seems small given dual scope of the project).

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

1. We have further elaborated the summary section to address the comment above. A problem statement has been included at the beginning, and the importance of sharing Uganda's good practices with other countries in the African region has been further emphasized.

2. The figure has been updated to 96 direct beneficiaries, out of which 48 male and 48 female. It is estimated that approximately 12 individuals from 8 different African countries (still to be determined) will benefit from the knowledge exchange activities under output 2.2.

Note to reviewer: all edits to the PIF have been highlighted in yellow, for ease of review.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

(3/13/2026)

For consideration by Agency during project preparation, you may draw on UNDP's guidance on gender-responsive climate finance

(<https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/UNDP%20Gender%20and%20Climate%20Finance%20Policy%20Brief%205-WEB.pdf>), as well as WEDO's resources on gender and climate finance (<https://wedo.org/resources/gender-climate-finance/>), for related considerations in output 1.2.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

We thank you for the suggestion. We will draw on UNDP and WEDO's resources on gender and climate finance during the PPG phase.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared

Co-financing to be further explored during PPG. Given the climate finance leverage focus this should be relatively straightforward.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/26/2026):

Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

current situation is well outlined in Uganda and Africa, the two scopes of this project. Current progress and capacity issues of climate finance units well described.

1. key issues/barriers/needs are clear for CFUs in Africa - but we miss the justification of component 1 - why Uganda's CFU needs strengthening

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

1. Uganda's current CFU faces the following 3 main gaps / barriers, which the GEF project will seek to overcome through technical assistance under component 1:

- ? - Institutional and coordination challenges (fragmentation),
- ? - Limited technical capacities to design bankable proposals,
- ? - Gaps in climate data, monitoring and reporting systems.

These has been further elaborated under Barrier 1, in the 'Key Barriers' section of the PIF. We have also added some text to further clarify this in the description of Component 1, in section 'B. Project Description'

Finally, please note that it is proposed to conduct a gap and needs assessment during the PPG phase of the project, to further refine the country's requirements for technical support under component 1.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/26/2026):

Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

1. under the baseline - climate finance in Africa, reference is made to the role of CFUs in preparation and appraisal of climate investment proposals, including GCF - but GEF is not mentioned. Also could you please refer to how this builds on the joint engagement efforts of climate funds with Uganda to date (including joint investment planning exercises of GEF and GCF with Uganda's CFU in 2023?)

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

1. The baseline section has been updated to refer to the role of CFUs in preparation and appraisal of climate investments proposals for the GEF (page 7 of the PDF version of the PIF uploaded in the Documents section of the GEF Portal).

A paragraph has been added in the 'Baseline' section to describe how the project will build on the joint engagement efforts of climate funds with Uganda, including joint investment planning exercises of GEF and GCF (pages 6-7 of the PDF version of the PIF).

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/23/2026)

Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

TOC is clear around the two main outcomes, strengthening Uganda's CFU to in turn share good practices with peers towards a country-driven collaborative and programmatic climate investment planning model.

1. Please see related comment in summary. The below statement misses an element about what the sharing of good practices of climate finance unit management can achieve for countries in Africa in terms of supporting country-drive investment frameworks and why this is important (as this is both a national and regional project)

By strengthening national ownership of climate action and fostering regional collaboration to share lessons and attract investment, this project can contribute to positioning Uganda as a regional front-runner on the topic of climate finance access, paving the way for other countries from the global South.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

1. We have further elaborated the statement to emphasize the importance of sharing good practices with other countries in the African region.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - global project with catalytic impact on long term climate finance programming

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared

For now Uganda CFU only executing entity - arrangements described.

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/26/2026):

Noted - during PPG stage please also account for beneficiaries from the national level work.

RR (3/13/2026)

64 seems very conservative in terms of project beneficiaries, for a project with dual national/regional scope. thank you for clarifying.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

The figure has been updated to 96 direct beneficiaries, out of which 48 male and 48 female. Indeed, at PIF stage it is conservatively estimated that approximately 12 individuals from 8 different African countries (still to be determined) will benefit from the knowledge exchange activities under output 2.2.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - to be further detailed during PPG.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared.

Project TOC is clear and the approach on catalyzing long term programmatic climate finance planning and management is innovative and has potential for transformational impact at national/regional level.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared. Aligns with all 4 objectives of the CCM FA (cross-cutting).

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared

reference to NDC is in the rationale - at CEO ER please re-include in that section as well the articulation with Uganda NDC targets, along with alignment with Africa regional strategies on climate if any (e.g. AU for example?)

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

Comment taken. We will ensure this section is included at CEO ER, as well as the articulation with Uganda NDC targets.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments N.A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - consultations to be held during PPG

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/23/2026):

Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

1. Are you sure Uganda CFU counterparts have not been consulted? the category for now lists that no stakeholder consultation took place at all

2. Agency should better describe the different stakeholder roles related to project objective and components, including Local communities, national and local CSOs and relevant women and youth groups. Agency should also provide a justification on why stakeholders were consulted during project design stage and provide additional details on plans and means to engage and consult these in project development.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

1. Preparation of the PIF has involved extensive consultation within the CFU. The Head of the CFU gave overall strategic direction on the components to be included and the appropriate combination of resources for South-South cooperation and Uganda-specific strengthening. The CFU's Social Safeguards and Gender Expert, who is also a member of the UNFCCC's Standing Committee on Finance, contributed significant expertise on Uganda's engagement with partner countries towards the development of Component 2. Senior Climate Finance Officer / Private Sector also contributed expertise engaging in international fora with other countries on challenges mobilising private sector finance. Finally, climate finance officers gave input on the key needs and gaps to be addressed as part of Component 1. This has now been mentioned in the Stakeholder Engagement section of the PIF.

2. During the PPG and implementation phases, the project will seek to involve a wide range of civil society stakeholders including local communities, CSOs, women's and youth groups. The experience of Uganda demonstrates that the participation of civil society groups

representing all these categories in NDA processes and more broadly in climate finance mobilization enhances the effectiveness of CFUs. Component 2 could also include a focus on CSO involvement in climate finance mobilization ? to be further explored at PPG stage. This has now been mentioned in the Stakeholder Engagement section of the PIF.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - Uganda STAR contribution

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - CCM global set aside

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - 50,000\$

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

1. Co-financing to be further explored during PPG. Given the climate finance leverage focus this should be relatively straightforward. It also seems reference is made to UNEP co-financed initiatives in the coordination section?

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

1. Additional co?finance opportunities will indeed be further explored during the PPG stage. The various UNEP initiatives referenced in the PIF are expected to provide valuable avenues for collaboration with this GEF project.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/26/2026):

Noted - from policy perspective, travel costs from participating countries are understood to be project-funded activities in the countries.

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared for Uganda

LoEs of the other participant countries (e.g. that will participate in study tours) will be required at CEO Approval stage.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

According to the GEF's [GUIDELINES ON THE PROJECT AND PROGRAM CYCLE POLICY \(2025 UPDATE\)](#)? (document [GEF_C.70_Inf.18_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_1_0.pdf](#)):

7. LoEs are not required in the following cases:

- (a) Global or regional projects with no GEF project-funded activities in the countries;*
- (b) Projects or Programs using Non-Grant Instruments in which there are public sector beneficiaries in more than one country;*
- (c) Projects or Programs using Non-Grant Instruments in which the beneficiaries are private sector actors exclusively;*
- (d) Global or Regional coordination child projects for Programs.*

In the context of this regional project, our understanding is therefore that LoEs are not required from the other participating countries, since no GEF project-funded activities will take place outside Uganda. Under the GEF financing, the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development would simply cover the travel costs for stakeholders from the participating countries to attend the knowledge-exchange events in Uganda. No GEF-funded activities, investments, or technical assistance will be implemented in those countries, which places the project under the exemption described in para. 7(a).

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

cleared

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

cleared

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared - to be complemented at CEO ER based on identified partner countries if known by then

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (4/26/2026):

final SRIF uploaded

RR (3/13/2026)

SRIF not complete

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/26/2026):

Cleared

RR (3/13/2026)

Please change CCM Rio Marker to 2 - this is the principal objective.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

Climate Change Mitigation Rio Marker has been changed to 2.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (3/13/2026)

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial

additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

RR (4/26/2026):

Project recommended for technical clearance

RR (3/13/2026)

Almost - minor clarifications to be provided before approval

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

All comments from the review sheet have now been addressed.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

to be further filled at the end of the review

- In the development of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan, please ensure that the activities developed are included in the project documents, and that the GAP aligns with the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (14/04/2026)

Thank you for your suggestions, to be taken into consideration during the PPG phase, as we prepare the CEO Endorsement Request. When developing the Gender Analysis and Action Plan (GAP) during the PPG phase, the activities identified will be integrated into the CEO ER and aligned with the project components. The Project Results Framework will also include

gender-specific indicators whenever relevant, to enable effective monitoring and reporting. In addition, we will ensure that references to gender-specific results are included in the PIRs, MTRs, and TE.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/13/2026	4/14/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/23/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		