

ANNEX 8: TEMPLATE FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Nasira+ Onboarding Services

Reference 2025 - SA – Nasira+ OS – 005

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Reference Number: | Reference 2025 - SA – Nasira+ OS – 005 | |
| Publication dates | 16 January 2026 | |
| Subject | Question | Answer |
| Exclusion from TAF | If we bid for this tender, would this exclude us from bidding for the NASIRA+ Technical Assistance Facility? | Participation in this tender does not automatically preclude a Tenderer from taking part in the future NASIRA+ Technical Assistance (TA) Facility procurement. However, Tenderers should be aware that, in line with standard procurement principles, FMO will ensure that all future procedures are conducted in a manner that safeguards fairness, equal treatment, and competition. |
| Submission Deadline | We noticed that the submission deadline is indicated as '06/02/26 before 17:00 hours CEST' on the first page of the RFP, while page 4 refers to '06-02-2026 – 17:00 CET'. Could you please clarify which time zone applies to the submission deadline (CET or CEST)? | The correct deadline is 06-02-2026 – 17:00 CET. |
| Exclusivity Clause | Could you please clarify whether an expert may be proposed by more than one tenderer? In addition, if the exclusivity clause applies to experts, should the 'Statement of Exclusivity and Availability' be included in the Technical Proposal? | In the context of global price tenders, it is permitted for the same expert to be proposed by multiple tenderers, as exclusivity is not a requirement for these contracts. Consequently, the submission of a Statement of Exclusivity and Availability is not necessary for global price tenders. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Tenderer Selection | Does FMO plan to select one consultant for the full scope of the assignment or will several consultants be in charge of the beneficiaries' onboarding? | The tender will be awarded to one eligible tenderer defined in document 01. List of documents as 'an entrepreneur or entrepreneurs (natural or legal person or consortium) who have submitted a Tender or is/are planning to submit a Tender'. Please also refer to point 4 of document 2. Additional information about contract notice. As per this, all eligible natural and legal persons (as per item 4 above) or groupings of such persons (consortia) may participate or tender. |
| Tender structure | Page 11 of the RFP indicates the following: "FMO intends to contract one party per lot with the Most Economically Advantageous Offer. With equal scores, the score on Quality will be decisive". The RFP refers to "one party per lot." As the tender dossier does not appear to subdivide the scope into lots, can you please clarify whether the entire scope of Nasira+ Onboarding Services is one lot, and that one contractor would be awarded the full assignment? | Yes, the entire scope of Nasira+ Onboarding Services is one lot, and one tenderer will be awarded the full assignment. |
| Selection Criteria/ Relevant Experience | Regarding the "Relevant Experience" section, could you please clarify how many eligible reference projects need to be submitted in order to obtain the maximum score? | For the purposes of the technical assessment and scoring, there is no fixed minimum or maximum number of reference projects required to obtain the maximum score. Instead, the evaluation committee will assess the relevance, quality, and coverage of your submitted reference project(s) against the technical capacity requirements and award criteria. |
| Project references | RFP requires references to be completed projects. Please clarify under what circumstances an ongoing multi-year project may qualify if the completed components meet the financial and thematic thresholds and can be evidenced separately. | You are permitted to include ongoing multi-year projects as references, as long as you can provide clear documentation (e.g., client acceptance, payment records, completion certificates) and a detailed description of the significant milestones or deliverables that have been completed within the four-year reference period specified in the RFP. |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Project references | RFP section 3.4 lists four thematic type of references. Type #1 mentions MSME lending projects and type #3 mentions SME lending projects. Please confirm our understanding whether SME lending schemes (Type #3) inherently qualify as MSME lending schemes (Type #1) when SMEs represent a subset of MSMEs. | In the context of demonstrating technical capacity, for Type #1, the tenderer should demonstrate experience with working on projects with the target groups in the micro + SME lending space. So, inclusion of micro lending in addition to SME lending is important. For Type #3 the focus is on demonstrating experience with risk management projects which could be in the MSME or SME lending space. |
| Technical capacity | Please confirm whether FS&I-sector projects (commercial banks, insurers, non-bank financial institutions) that involve MSME lending, MIS improvements, and data governance are considered fully relevant references for this RFP's technical capacity criteria. | A project in the insurance sector will not be considered a relevant reference project. Financial institution sector (commercial banks, non-banking financial institutions and micro-finance institutions) is considered fully relevant. |
| Technical capacity | Would guarantee facility implementations with banks/insurers (risk-sharing, blended finance) be accepted as reference experience for the "risk sharing facilities/guarantee/blended finance products" criterion? | A project in the insurance sector will not be considered a relevant reference project. Financial institution sector (commercial banks, non-banking financial institutions and micro-finance institutions) is considered fully relevant. |
| Technical capacity | Where the RFP specifies "MSME lending schemes at commercial banks," does successful delivery for microfinance institutions (MFIs), non-banking FIs, or digital lenders qualify equivalently? | Yes. |
| Technical capacity | Can multi-year programs that started earlier than 4 years ago but delivered major milestones within the last 4 years be counted as compliant references? | Yes, you may include ongoing multi-year projects as references, provided you can document (e.g., client acceptance, payment records, completion certificates) and clearly describe the substantial milestones or deliverables completed within the 4-year reference period specified in the RFP. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Reference projects date of completion</p> | <p>Page 6 of the RFP, it is mentioned that "the reference projects must have been completed within the 4 years". We would like to know whether ongoing multi-year projects, for which substantial milestones have already been delivered, could be included as references.</p> | <p>You are permitted to include ongoing multi-year projects as references, as long as you can provide clear documentation (e.g., client acceptance, payment records, completion certificates) and a detailed description of the significant milestones or deliverables that have been completed within the four-year reference period specified in the RFP.</p> |
| <p>Project record evidence</p> | <p>The RFP (Section 3.4) states that: "... If a Tenderer has implemented the project in a consortium, the percentage that the Tenderer has successfully completed must be clear from the documentary evidence, together with a description of the nature of the services provided." Could FMO please clarify: (a) What form of documentary evidence is required to demonstrate the Tenderer's percentage contribution in the case of consortium-implemented projects? (b) Whether any documentary evidence is required for projects implemented solely by the Tenderer, or whether describing the project in the reference sheet is sufficient.</p> | <p>(a) Required Evidence for Consortium-Implemented Projects: When referencing consortium projects, tenderers must provide clear, official documentation showing their specific contribution and role. Acceptable evidence includes consortium agreements (detailing roles and percentage shares), financial records (such as bank transfers between consortium members), client certificates confirming the scope and value of delivered services, approved deliverables, or proof of payment. The evidence must explicitly state your percentage share and describe the nature of services provided. (b) Evidence for Solely Implemented Projects: For projects carried out solely by the tenderer, a detailed description on the reference sheet is generally sufficient. Additional evidence (e.g., completion certificates or client attestations) is only required if specifically requested by the FMO or if there is a need to clarify the information provided.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Relevant experience</p> | <p>For the \geq €250,000 per contract value note (Annex 1), can work packages or task orders under a larger framework agreement be presented as separate reference contracts if they meet the threshold?</p> | <p>Yes, you may present work packages or task orders under a larger framework agreement as separate reference contracts, provided each one is contractually distinct, meets the €250,000 threshold, and is supported by appropriate documentation. When presenting such references, please ensure that for each work package or task order you provide:</p> <p>The specific contract/order number or identifier,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The scope of work, -The value of the assignment (confirming it meets the €250,000 threshold), -The period of performance, -The client/contracting authority, and -Contact details for verification. <p>If multiple work packages or task orders are presented, each must be clearly distinguishable and supported by documentation demonstrating that it is a separate, completed assignment.</p> |
| <p>Template for project references layout</p> | <p>Please clarify if FMO has any preferred template for presenting qualifying project references; or if any professional format is acceptable as long as all required fields are included.</p> | <p>FMO does not prescribe a specific layout or template for presenting the reference projects. However, all information required for reference projects, as outlined in Part 4 of the RFP—Format for Technical and Financial Offer—must be included in your submission.</p> |
| <p>Page limit for project references</p> | <p>RFP section 4 mentions a limit of 10 pages. We kindly request increasing the limit to 15 pages given the number of required reference criteria.</p> | <p>FMO has agreed to extend the page limit for RFP section 4 from 10 pages to 15 pages. This adjustment accommodates the extensive reference criteria required and ensures that applicants can provide more comprehensive documentation as part of their submission.</p> |
| <p>Microsoft PowerPoint</p> | <p>The RFP states that Parts A-C and Annexes 1 and 2 should be submitted in PowerPoint format (PDF). It does not specify slide limits except for Annex 1 (10 pages). Could you please confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Whether Parts A, B, and C are expected to follow a slide-based format with concise bullet points, or whether FMO expects more detailed narrative text even within a PowerPoint file? | <p>The RFP specifies that Parts A, B, and C, along with Annexes 1 and 2, must be submitted in PowerPoint format (saved as PDF). However, the choice of presentation style is left to the tenderer. You may structure your content as slide-based bullet points, detailed narrative text, or a combination of both, as long as your submission clearly and directly addresses the award criteria. Importantly, the only explicit page or slide limit is for Annex 1 (Reference Projects), which has been increased from 10 to 15 pages to accommodate more comprehensive documentation. Parts A, B, and C, as well as Annex 2, do not have specific page or slide limitations. Nevertheless,</p> |

| | | |
|--------------|--|--|
| | <p>· Are there any page or slide limitations for Parts A, B, and C, beyond the explicit 10-page limit for Annex 1 (reference projects)?</p> | <p>it is expected that all submissions remain clear, concise, and directly relevant to the requirements set out in Section 5 (Award Criteria).</p> |
| Evaluation | <p>Please confirm whether collateral documents (case studies, whitepapers) can be included as appendices to Parts A–C (single PDF per part), provided no pricing is shown.</p> | <p>Yes, supporting documents such as case studies and whitepapers may be included as appendices to your technical submission (Parts A–C), provided they are relevant to the evaluation criteria and do not contain any pricing or financial information. Please ensure that all appendices are clearly labeled and referenced in the main body of your submission, and that they directly support your responses to the evaluation criteria.</p> |
| CVs | <p>The RFP explicitly states: <i>“No specific format is required for the CVs.”</i> Could you please confirm whether there is no page limit for expert CVs in Annex 2?</p> | <p>FMO confirms that there is no page limit for expert CVs included in Annex 2. You are free to present each CV in the format and length that best demonstrates the qualifications and experience of the proposed experts. Please ensure all required information is clearly provided, as there are no restrictions on the number of pages for this section.</p> |
| Project Team | <p>Could you please clarify whether we are allowed—or expected—to submit more than one CV per expert role (except for the Team Leader)? If it is possible to submit multiple CVs per position, could you please indicate the maximum number of experts that need to be submitted in order to achieve the maximum score? regarding the Expert 3 – Banking Expert role, is it mandatory that all proposed candidates are Spanish-speaking? Under Section 8.1 “Staff,” the TOR indicates that the required languages are Spanish, French, and English. Could you please clarify which of the positions listed in the TOR require each of these languages? May we propose additional Expert roles, if deemed necessary, beyond those indicated in the TOR? In that case, will these be evaluated/scored?</p> | <p>The RFP does not limit the number of CVs that may be submitted per expert role. Tenderers may therefore propose more than one candidate for any role other than the Team Leader, who must be a single designated individual. The evaluation focuses on the quality and relevance of the proposed team rather than the number of experts submitted, and there is no maximum number of CVs required to achieve the highest score.</p> <p>For the Expert 3 – Banking Expert position, it is required that at least one Banking Expert speaks Spanish. As stated in Section 8.1 of the TOR, the language requirement applies at the team level: the team must include at least one Spanish-speaking consultant, at least one French-speaking consultant, and be able to operate in English, but the TOR does not assign specific languages to individual roles. Tenderers may propose additional expert roles if they consider them beneficial to the delivery of the assignment. While these additional roles will not receive separate scoring, they may contribute positively to the overall assessment of the team’s capability and suitability under the “Project Team” award criterion.</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Subcontracting | <p>'ANNEX 5: SERVICE TENDER SUBMISSION FORM AND DECLARATION'. As our firm consists of a member firm structure, do you expect us to subcontract all local firms covering the 120 countries at this stage or can we provide a subset of most relevant subcontractors and add subcontractors at later stage supporting beneficiaries in less likely countries.</p> | <p>At the submission stage, you are not required to nominate or subcontract all local firms covering every country in which services might eventually be delivered. You should provide a clear description of your consortium structure and, where possible, indicate the subset of most relevant or likely subcontractors that will play a key role in the assignment, especially for countries where beneficiary support is most probable. During contract implementation, the addition of new subcontractors is permitted, provided that any new subcontractors meet the eligibility and exclusion criteria, and that the contracting authority is informed and gives its approval as per the contract's general conditions. The lead tenderer remains fully responsible for the performance of the contract, including the work of any subcontractors, whether nominated at submission or added later.</p> |
| Operating Model | <p>Please confirm whether named personnel changes during the 60-month period are allowed with equivalent qualifications and FMO approval.</p> | <p>Yes, provided qualifications are equivalent and FMO approves.</p> |
| Team Composition Flexibility | <p>Could FMO clarify the extent of the Contractor's autonomy to adjust or refine the proposed team structure and team size? For example, may the bidder reorganize responsibilities between experts or modify the team setup as long as all required expertise remains covered? Could FMO clarify how the Evaluation Committee will assess the team? Specifically, will the evaluation emphasize: (a) the individual qualifications of each proposed expert, or (b) the overall team structure and complementarity, or (c) a combination of both?</p> | <p>Tenderers have flexibility to organize their proposed team as they see fit. FMO does not prescribe a fixed internal team structure beyond the requirement that all expertise and roles specified in the Terms of Reference are fully covered. This means that Tenderers may adjust, refine or redistribute responsibilities among the proposed experts, and may propose a larger or differently configured team, provided that the required competencies, seniority, and language capabilities remain available and clearly demonstrated. Regarding the evaluation approach, the Evaluation Committee will assess the team based on both the individual qualifications of the proposed experts and the overall coherence and complementarity of the team structure. In other words, the assessment considers: -the relevance and depth of experience of each expert, and -how effectively the team as a whole is designed to deliver the assignment. Both dimensions contribute to the scoring under the "Project Team" criterion, in line with Section 5 of the RFP.</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Availability Requirements</p> | <p>The ToR (Section 8.2) states that “CVs for experts should be submitted in the Tender, and the Tenderer will have to demonstrate in their offer that experts with the required profiles are available.” Could FMO clarify what form of evidence is expected to demonstrate expert availability? Specifically: Is a self-declaration signed by the expert as part of the CV sufficient?</p> | <p>Section 8.2 of the Terms of Reference requires Tenderers to demonstrate the availability of their proposed experts for the assignment. While FMO does not mandate a particular format for this demonstration, it is sufficient to include a signed declaration of availability within each expert’s CV when submitting your tender. This self-declaration, signed by the expert, fulfills the requirement at the tender stage. Please be aware that, consistent with standard procurement procedures, FMO may, at the contract award stage, request additional supporting evidence from the successful Tenderer to verify the experts’ availability if necessary. However, for the initial submission, only the signed self-declaration is required.</p> |
| <p>Expert 2 requirements</p> | <p>For the position of Expert 2 - Data scientists, are multiple profiles expected?</p> | <p>FMO is open to consider different proposals for staffing models and the number of consultants/resources required, including for the role of Data scientists. While ensuring adequate delivery capacity is crucial, it is equally important that staff strength is proposed in a way that maintains consistency and continuity in the application of the agreed onboarding methodology and advisory across beneficiaries. If multiple resources or teams are proposed, it is the contractor’s responsibility to ensure sufficient knowledge retention and transfer, harmonization of processes, and accounting of lessons learned from one onboarding to another.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation</p> | <p>For data management expertise scoring, could FMO enumerate the specific competencies it values most (e.g., data modeling, lineage, governance, quality, analytics, privacy)?</p> | <p>Important required data skills are - Data modeling and management, data integration and ETL, data governance and data lineage. Depending on the Beneficiary, one or the other data management expertise might be more relevant.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Technical capacity</p> | <p>To accurately scope and propose the necessary professional capacity, we require further details regarding the specific skills and competencies FMO expects the selected vendor to provide. We kindly request that you specify the key skill sets and areas of expertise that should be covered within the proposed professional capacity for the Data Platform and Nasira+ program.</p> | <p>The key skills sets and areas of expertise are specified in section 8.2 Other experts, support staff & backstopping of Annex 2. Terms of reference</p> |
| <p>Nationality restrictions</p> | <p>The RFP specifies <i>eligibility of the tenderer</i> (countries excluded: Iran, Syria, North Korea; high-risk assessment for others) but does not mention nationality restrictions for individual experts. Please confirm whether there are any nationality restrictions on experts, or whether experts from any country (including the US) are eligible to participate in this assignment.</p> | <p>There are no nationality restrictions for individual experts proposed by eligible tenderers or subcontractors. Experts from any country—including the United States—are eligible to participate in this assignment, as long as they are not subject to EU restrictive measures (sanctions). FMO will verify compliance with these requirements prior to awarding the contract.</p> |
| <p>Submission Format and Structure for Annex 1</p> | <p>Could you please confirm that Annex 1 (Relevant Experience: Reference Project(s)) must also be submitted in PDF format? Additionally, could you clarify whether FMO has any preferred format or structure for presenting the reference projects, beyond the information requirements listed in the RfP?</p> | <p>Yes, Annex 1 – Relevant Experience must be submitted in PDF format. FMO does not prescribe a specific layout or template for presenting the reference projects. However, all information required for reference projects, as outlined in Part 4 of the RFP—Format for Technical and Financial Offer—must be included in your submission.</p> |
| <p>Confirmation of Required Documentation for Annex 2 (Personnel CVs) at Tender Stage</p> | <p>For Annex 2 (Names and CVs of personnel to work on this project, as referenced in Annex 2 – Terms of Reference, Section 8.2), could you please confirm that submitting the CVs alone is sufficient at the tender stage? Specifically, are any additional documents, such as reference letters, diplomas, or evidence of previous work accomplishments, required at this point?</p> | <p>Yes, FMO confirms that submitting the CVs alone is sufficient at the tender stage. No additional documents, such as reference letters, diplomas, or evidence of previous work accomplishments, are required at this point. However, please note that FMO reserves the right to request supporting documents for the proposed experts from the awarded tenderer if necessary.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Technical capacity | Can the proposed CVs for the expert skills required be anonymous one? | No, FMO does not accept CVs from anonymous experts. All submitted CVs must clearly identify the proposed individuals. |
| Eligibility Requirements | <p>Additional information about the Contract Notice indicates “For this contract award procedure, financed by NDICI-GE geographic programmes, participation is open to all natural persons who are nationals of and legal persons (participating either individually or in a grouping – consortium – of candidates/tenderers) which are effectively established in a Member State of the European Union or in an eligible country or territory as defined under Article 28 of Regulation (EU) N° 2021/947.”</p> <p>On the other hand, under section 3.2 Eligibility Requirements, the RFP indicates that “Countries which are considered an overall high risk will be subjected to an additional assessment for approval. See Annex 15 High Risk Countries.”</p> <p>Could you please kindly clarify the process for the additional assessment required for approval?</p> <p>Could you please indicate the countries in which companies must be registered to be considered eligible to participate in this tender?</p> | <p>Tenderers are eligible to participate in this procedure if they are legally and effectively established in any NDICI eligible country, including all EU Member States. Companies established in the three countries explicitly excluded for this tender—Iran, North Korea, and Syria—are not permitted to participate. Tenderers based in countries identified as high risk in Annex 15 are not automatically excluded; however, they must first undergo an additional approval assessment conducted by FMO, focusing on integrity, compliance, and associated risk considerations. This assessment applies solely to the Tenderer’s own place of establishment and has no bearing on the eligibility of Beneficiaries or the scope of work required from the Contractor. Only Tenderers that successfully pass this additional review will be admitted to the tender process.</p> |

Country Risk,
Sanctions & KYS

If a beneficiary operates in or expands into an Annex 15 high-risk country, how does that affect the contractor's onboarding remit, and are additional KYS/controls required?

If a Beneficiary operates in, or later expands its activities into, a country listed as high-risk in Annex 15 of the RFP, this does not change the scope of work or onboarding responsibilities assigned to the Contractor under the Terms of Reference. The Contractor is expected to carry out all onboarding, data assessment, and reporting tasks in line with the methodology and deliverables described in the RFP, regardless of the Beneficiary's operating geography. The designation of certain jurisdictions as "high-risk" triggers internal FMO due-diligence requirements, not additional obligations for the Contractor. Any enhanced integrity, sanctions, or compliance checks related to high-risk jurisdictions fall under FMO's internal processes, including FMO's Know Your Supplier (KYS) and integrity procedures. These procedures apply to the Tenderer during the procurement process, not to Beneficiaries and not to the services performed by the Contractor. Accordingly, no additional KYS or control activities are required from the Contractor if a Beneficiary is active in a high-risk country. The Contractor should continue delivering the onboarding services as specified in the TOR, while any needed enhanced checks are handled directly by FMO.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Professional capacity of the Tenderer</p> | <p>Regarding the section on the Professional Capacity of the Tenderer, we understand that we are expected to complete the table included in the RFP. Could you kindly clarify the following points: 1. Under the “Total” column, should we indicate only the number of permanent staff/associated consultants with relevant experience for this tender, or the total number of employees in the company? Under the “Role” heading, could you please advise what type of information you expect us to provide?</p> | <p>Under the “Total” column, please indicate only the number of permanent staff/associated consultants with relevant experience for this tender. Under the “Role” heading, please provide titles/roles/short descriptions indicating the expertise of the staff/consultant. These should be relevant to the tender and, if possible, correspond to the required expert roles identified in section 8.2 Other experts, support staff & backstopping of Annex 2. Terms of reference.</p> |
| <p>Relevant experience</p> | <p>Could you please clarify whether, in addition to the “eligible reference projects” to be presented under Annex 1, we are also expected to provide information on our ongoing relevant projects?</p> | <p>You are permitted to include ongoing multi-year projects as references, as long as you can provide clear documentation (e.g., client acceptance, payment records, completion certificates) and a detailed description of the significant milestones or deliverables that have been completed within the four-year reference period specified in the RFP. Please ensure that all referenced milestones are both substantial and well-documented to demonstrate your relevant experience during this timeframe.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation</p> | <p>If FMO requests clarifications on price components (e.g., milestones, regional multipliers), will this affect price scoring, or is clarification strictly nonevaluative?</p> | <p>Clarifications requested by FMO on elements of the Financial Offer—such as the composition of milestone pricing, regional multipliers, or other cost breakdowns—are strictly nonevaluative. Their purpose is solely to ensure that the submitted financial information is correctly understood and aligned with the tender requirements. Such clarifications do not influence or modify the price scoring, which is calculated exclusively on the basis of the total price submitted in accordance with Section 5.2 of the RFP. As long as no changes are made to the actual price offered, the score remains unaffected.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Beneficiaries | ToR estimates ~45 Beneficiaries to be onboarded globally. Please clarify whether Beneficiaries already onboarded under the previous NASIRA program (2019–2024) are expected to be further supported or re-onboarded under the new ramp-up phase, or whether the assignment concerns exclusively new Beneficiaries in the Nasira+. | Beneficiaries under the NASIRA program are not in scope. The assignment exclusively concerns new Beneficiaries in the Nasira+ program. |
| Beneficiaries | The ToR states 45 beneficiaries. Please confirm our understanding that this number is indicative only and there is no guaranteed minimum or maximum number of Beneficiaries to be onboarded under the assignment. How many Beneficiaries does FMO realistically expect to onboard in Year 1? Is there a tentative phasing plan (e.g., X PFIs in 2026–2027; Y PFIs in 2028), or will onboarding depend solely on Nasira+ deal pipeline? | Indeed, 45 is an estimated number of beneficiaries and the actual number of beneficiaries onboarded under the program may vary depending on the deal size and pipeline. Onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. |
| Terms of Reference | In the RFP document the contract period is mentioned as 60 months, can you provide the intermediate milestone dates for this duration of 60 months. | Please refer to RFP section 5. Scope of work and specifically section 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5. The 2 broad areas of deliverables are 1. Development of an overarching onboarding methodology for the Nasira+ program - draft to be ready and agreed with FMO before first onboarding which is expected around September 2026. 2. Execution of the onboarding methodology per beneficiary. This will be an ongoing activity for the remaining term of the assignment. The specific deliverables and reporting requirements for this are indicated in section 5 and section 9.1. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Beneficiaries | <p>Please clarify that reference to Spanish as mandatory for Banker Key Expert 3 is intentional and reflects FMO's expectation of a significant LatAm onboarding pipeline, and if so: What share of the ~45 Beneficiaries is expected from Latin America? Will LatAm be a priority geography during the ramp-up?</p> | <p>It is anticipated that around 15% of the deals will be allocated to the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region. We expect some of the early deals to take place in that region. The requirement for Spanish speaking expertise is therefore intentional. At least one Banking Expert should be able to speak Spanish.</p> |
| Beneficiaries | <p>To support resource planning, could FMO indicate an indicative split of expected Beneficiaries across regions: LatAm / Caribbean Sub-Saharan Africa Asia–Pacific MENA Eastern Neighborhood / Türkiye</p> | <p>The expected split across regions is expected to be as below. However, this is only an indicative and subject to variations related to the Nasira+ deal size and pipeline planning. LatAm / Caribbean - 15% Sub-Saharan Africa - 30% Asia–Pacific - 30% Eastern neighborhood/MENA - 10% Türkiye - 15%</p> |
| Countries and concentration of beneficiaries | <p>Document '04. Annex 4 List of Nasira+ Offered Countries - 2025 - SA - Nasira+ OS 005' contains a list of approximately 120 countries. Which sub regions and countries does FMO expect to have most beneficiaries?</p> | <p>The expected split across regions is expected to be as below. However, this is only indicative and subject to variations related to the Nasira+ deal size and pipeline planning. LatAm / Caribbean - 15% Sub-Saharan Africa - 30% Asia–Pacific - 30% Eastern neighborhood/MENA - 10% Türkiye - 15%</p> <p>While a transaction may be originated in any of the countries specified in Annex 4, the pipeline planning is currently focused on the countries specified in the attached list "Indicative countries for Nasira+ Pipeline".</p> |
| Beneficiaries – Multi-Country Banking Groups | <p>If a Beneficiary operates as part of a multi-country banking group, will onboarding occur at the subsidiary/entity level for each country, at group level, or based on an approach defined by FMO per case?</p> | <p>The onboarding will be per transaction at subsidiary/entity level, as FMO will enter into a separate guarantee transaction for individual entities within the group.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Milestone 1 - overarching onboarding methodology | For Milestone 1, which covers the definition and sign-off of the overarching onboarding methodology, could you please clarify whether a predefined framework from previous NASIRA deployments will be provided as an input to build upon, or whether the Contractor is expected to define the methodology independently? | No predefined framework will be provided; the Contractor is expected to define the methodology independently from the previous NASIRA program. |
| Beneficiaries – Legacy PFIs | For PFIs previously onboarded under the original NASIRA program, could FMO clarify whether a full Nasira+ onboarding cycle is required, or whether a streamlined/lighter onboarding is foreseen? | Beneficiaries under the NASIRA program are not in scope. The assignment exclusively concerns new Beneficiaries in the Nasira+ program. All Nasira+ beneficiaries should follow the same onboarding methodology. |
| Additional information on potential beneficiaries | Could FMO share the list of beneficiaries expected to be onboarded, or their potential types? | A list of potential beneficiaries cannot be provided. Typical beneficiaries are commercial banks and non-banking financial institutions, however may include other financial Institutions (including special purpose vehicles established by the same sponsor) and any other institution involved in providing financing to eligible End-borrowers (e.g. fintech, debt fund, NGO, operating lease company, agri-cooperative). |
| Independence and Conflict of Interest Management | The services offered by the contractor to the beneficiaries preclude the contractor from providing other services, especially regulated services such as statutory audits. When will FMO provide a list of potential beneficiaries, so that potential contractors can evaluate existing or future potential conflicts of interest and independence threats? | A list of potential beneficiaries cannot be provided. In case the Tenderer is conflicted due to other engagements, the Tenderer should find a solution in order to still meet the obligations of the contract with FMO. FMO should approve such a solution. |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| WP Bank | The ToR refers to 45 clients. Are there any assumptions regarding how many of these clients are expected to be onboarded in parallel at peak? For the purposes of this question, we define the onboarding period as the initial three months | 45 is an estimated number of beneficiaries and the actual number of beneficiaries onboarded under the program may vary depending on the deal size and pipeline. Onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. Hence, it is very likely that there will be overlaps in the onboarding of FIs at any given point of time. |
| Onboarding | When does FMO expect most onboarding taking place for the beneficiaries during the 5 year period? | Onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. Hence, it is very likely that there will be overlaps in the onboarding of FIs at any given point of time. |
| Volume and Workload | Is the beneficiary onboarding schedule expected to be linear across the 5-year ramp-up, or should tenderers propose phased cohorts (pilot, scale-up) with corresponding resource plans? | Onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. Hence, it is very likely that there will be overlap in the onboarding of FIs at any given point of time. While there may be similarities in activities undertaken in each onboarding, we expect each onboarding to have specificities related to the FI. |
| Onboarding Scheduling | Could FMO clarify whether onboarding will occur region-by-region, Beneficiary-by-Beneficiary , or whether multiple Beneficiaries may be onboarded in parallel across different regions depending on readiness and pipeline. | Onboarding will occur per beneficiary based on the program pipeline and status of each individual guarantee transaction. Hence, it is very likely that multiple beneficiaries may be in different phases of onboarding in parallel across different regions depending on readiness and pipeline. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Timelines, Beneficiary rollout and resource planning</p> | <p>Could FMO clarify the expected sequencing and high-level indicative timelines for the main milestones (general onboarding methodology; initial report; onboarding report; hand-over report), including whether Beneficiaries will typically be onboarded sequentially or in parallel, and what the expected peak concurrency might be? In connection with this, could FMO indicate whether there is an expected or recommended number of consultants/resources to ensure adequate delivery capacity throughout the program, or should the Contractor propose a staffing model accordingly?</p> | <p>Please refer to RFP section 5. Scope of work and specifically section 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5.. The 2 broad areas of deliverables are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of an overarching onboarding methodology for the Nasira+ program which is expected to be completed (and approved by FMO) by xx month 2026. 2. Execution of the onboarding methodology per beneficiary. This will be an ongoing activity for the remaining term of the assignment. The specific deliverables and reporting requirements for this are indicated in section 5 and section 9.1. The initial, onboarding and hand-over report are to be submitted per beneficiary onboarding. <p>In addition, FMO and the contractor will jointly agree on the format and periodicity for alignment and progress reporting on the program level.</p> <p>Onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. Hence, it is very likely that onboarding of beneficiaries may run in parallel.</p> <p>In terms of number of consultants/resources, FMO is open to consider different proposals for staffing models and the number of consultants/resources required. While ensuring adequate delivery capacity is crucial, it is equally important that the staff strength is proposed in a way that maintains consistency and continuity in the application of the agreed onboarding methodology and advisory across beneficiaries. If multiple resources or teams are proposed, it is the contractor's responsibility to ensure sufficient knowledge retention and transfer, harmonization of processes, and accounting of lessons learned from one onboarding to another.</p> |
| <p>Volume and Workload</p> | <p>Will beneficiary assignments be predefined by FMO or should tenderers plan for global coverage across the full Annex 4 list?</p> | <p>While a transaction may be originated in any of the countries specified in Annex 4, the pipeline planning is currently focused on the countries specified in the attached list "Indicative countries for Nasira+ Pipeline".</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Number of beneficiaries for the onboarding | How many beneficiaries can be expected to be onboarded simultaneously? This information will impact our proposed approach and the team size and structure. | Onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. Hence, it is very likely that there will be overlap in the onboarding of FIs at any given point of time. |
| Terms of Reference | Could FMO specify the expected minimum set of onboarding activities per beneficiary (e.g., data mapping, ETL setup, validation routines, governance workflows, training)? | Please refer to Section 5 Scope of work of Annex 2. Terms of reference. More specifically, an indicative list of activities (which should be further refined within methodology by the selected Contractor based on the nature of each client) is provided in section 5.4 Onboarding methodology. |
| Beneficiary delays & milestone dependencies | In the case of delays or lack of responsiveness from a Beneficiary, will milestone timelines be extended accordingly without penalisation to the Contractor? | Yes, milestone timelines may be extended subject to FMO approval. However, release of payments will be subject to completion of milestone. |
| Eligibility Criteria | Eligibility Criteria and Target Group definitions are set in Annex 1. Please confirm our understanding that the contractor will receive a full eligibility rulebook (loan-level, borrower-level), sample reporting templates upon start of services. | Full eligibility rulebook (loan-level, borrower-level), sample reporting templates will be available prior to the first onboarding, however will be subject to country or beneficiary specific changes or additions. Mature drafts will be provided prior to that to support development of the onboarding methodology. |
| Milestone 1 - overarching onboarding methodology | Will FMO provide the detailed eligibility rules for portfolio selection upfront, or is the Contractor expected to further develop/operationalize these rules within Milestone 1 based on the Nasira+ framework? | Full eligibility rulebook (loan-level, borrower-level) will be provided by FMO prior to the first onboarding, however, will be subject to country or beneficiary specific changes or additions. Working drafts will be provided prior to that to support development of the onboarding methodology. |
| Onboarding Start | Should onboarding activities begin immediately after contract signing , or only after issuance of Task Orders? Additionally, will the Consultant's diagnostic assessment influence FMO's decision to | These items will be addressed and agreed jointly by FMO and the contractor while finalizing the Onboarding methodology. Onboarding activities will begin after issuance of a task order, this may be before or after signing of the guarantee contract between FMO and the beneficiary. |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| | finalize a Guarantee Agreement with a Beneficiary? | |
| Onboarding Timing | ToR provides clear timing considerations for handover cycle, however does not detail on expected onboarding timeline. Does FMO expect a standard onboarding cycle length (X months), or should the Contractor propose ranges depending on maturity, geography, IT complexity, etc.? | Ranges depending on maturity, geography, IT complexity may be proposed. |
| Expected Outputs - Format | Methodology, approach, and data consultancy services are expected from the vendors by the FMO and it is mentioned that these services are expected during the Origination of the Nasira+ program. We would like to understand the duration for this Origination phase and will this happen for all the 45 clients in parallel? | Origination and onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4. Thereafter, we anticipate approximately 10 onboardings per year for the next 3 years and the remaining onboardings to be completed in the last year. Hence, it is very likely that there will be overlap in the onboarding of FIs at any given point of time. |
| Expected Outputs - Format | Does FMO expect the contractor to provide strategic advisory beyond onboarding (e.g., portfolio optimization, risk-sharing best practices)? | Please refer to Section 5.2 Description of Assignment in Annex 2. Terms of Reference. The Contractor is required to develop an overarching Onboarding methodology to facilitate the Onboarding of Beneficiaries onto the Data platform. This includes advising and supporting beneficiaries in understanding the requirements of the guarantee contract and accordingly advise on portfolio selection and data management in the context of the guarantee agreement. Broader advisory that is not related to the guarantee is out of scope. |
| Onboarding | No travel-related budget guidelines are stated. Please confirm our understanding of what is FMO preference: to have remote onboarding only or onsite missions (when justified) with travel included under the lump sum milestone? | Onboarding will be done in a combination of remote and onsite work. Our past experience shows that at least one on-site visit per Beneficiary is advisable. Any travel costs should be included in one or more of the milestones of the financial offer. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>MIS Implementation</p> | <p>ToR (Annex 2) highlights “data exchange including data quality validations” but excludes any MIS implementation at FI level. Please confirm that the Contractor is <i>not</i> expected to provide: (1) Core banking system modifications, (2) API development or coding, (3) System integration services. Any MIS changes (if recommended) would be borne by the Beneficiary, not by this contract.</p> | <p>Any actions and costs related to MIS changes will be taken by the beneficiary, however the consultant is expected to adequately advise the beneficiary on the development of IT scripts to facilitate the seamless transfer of data from the beneficiaries core banking system to designated data files and upload to FMO data portal, ensuring data integrity throughout the process. In addition, the consultant must follow up on recommendations and support additional advisory and troubleshooting for a 12-month period. The onboarding services provider is not expected to do system modifications, development or system integration under this contract.</p> |
| <p>Milestones 2, 3 and 4 - customization per Beneficiary</p> | <p>For Milestones 2, 3 and 4 (Initial Report, Onboarding Report and Hand-over Report per Beneficiary), will FMO provide guidance on the acceptable level of customization (to ensure a level playing field and comparability of outputs), or should the Contractor propose a modular approach with configurable components to adapt to different Beneficiary profiles (e.g. size, sector, data maturity, geography)?</p> | <p>While developing the onboarding methodology, the contractor will propose a general content and structure for these reports, in consultation with FMO and its requirements. A modular approach may be adopted for the capacity building phase to bring additional focus on beneficiary specific items related to gap identification and/or size, sector, data maturity, and geography to identify specific focus for this phase.</p> |
| <p>Scope of the onboarding</p> | <p>We would like to understand whether the onboarding scope is limited to data-related aspects or whether it should also include MSME lending practices, portfolio selection, guarantee understanding, and broader operational processes.</p> | <p>Please refer to Section 5.2 Description of Assignment in Annex 2. Terms of Reference. The Contractor is required to develop an overarching Onboarding methodology to facilitate the Onboarding of Beneficiaries onto the Data platform. This includes advising and supporting beneficiaries in understanding the requirements of the guarantee contract and accordingly advise on portfolio selection and data management in the context of the guarantee agreement. Broader advisory on general MSME lending practices or operational processes that are not related to the guarantee are out of scope.</p> |
| <p>Expected Outputs - Format</p> | <p>Could you please share the details of the Knowledge Transfer and Training sessions that FMO is arranging for the chosen vendor concerning both the Data Platform and the Nasira+ program.</p> | <p>These sessions will be agreed upon and scheduled in close consultation with the chosen vendor to ensure alignment with project objectives and timelines.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>FMO Data Platform</p> | <p>The ToR refers to “FMO’s Data Platform,” which is currently under development. In the previous NASIRA program, the reporting and onboarding platform was provided by Hypoport. Could FMO please confirm whether the Nasira+ Data Platform is built on the same Hypoport infrastructure as NASIRA, or if the Nasira+ platform uses a different provider/architecture? Additionally, please clarify to what extent the Contractor is expected to interact directly with the Data Platform provider (if any), or whether all system-level/vendor-level coordination will be handled exclusively by FMO?</p> | <p>Compared to NASIRA, Nasira+ has a different architecture. The 'data platform' is a combination of the new FMO company portal that interacts with an in-house custom-made Mendix application (called NCA) that manages the Nasira+ securitizations. System management is with FMO and not in scope of this assignment.</p> |
| <p>FMO Data Platform</p> | <p>Tor states the Data Platform is “under development” and will provide automated validation feedback. Can bidders receive user access to current Data Platform and/or any documentation extracts to inform its rationale for designing the onboarding methodology?</p> | <p>User access will be given to future Nasira+ beneficiaries. They will log in to the portal through the FMO website and have access to upload functionality to submit their data files. Uploaded files will be subject to data validation rules as agreed with the beneficiary. Please refer to the data matrix. The successful tenderer will be provided with platform access to support the beneficiaries in the training and onboarding.</p> |
| <p>Data platform readiness</p> | <p>Will Beneficiaries require any technical onboarding or configuration to begin using the portal — and, if so, to what extent is the Contractor expected to support this activation process (e.g. account setup, first-data-upload guidance, troubleshooting during initial cycles)?</p> | <p>Account setup / user activation will be done by FMO and is not in scope of this assignment. Supporting beneficiaries in supplying the required data and making sure they meet the validation requirements, including resolving issues, is at the core of the assignment.</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Data platform readiness | Based on Annex 3, we understand that the Customer Portal & Loan Intake Repository enables monthly data uploads, executes hard/soft validation rules, retains validation history, supports re-submissions, and acts as a communication channel between Beneficiaries and FMO. Could FMO confirm whether the Data Platform will be fully operational and ready for production use at contract start, or if the Contractor is expected to support platform stabilization activities during the initial phase of Beneficiary onboarding? | The data platform, the FMO company portal and the Mendix application called NCA, are planned to be operational and in production by Q4 2026, ready for portfolio ramp-up. The onboarding services contractor is not expected to perform any tasks on stabilization of systems. |
| Customer Portal/ Data Platform | Could FMO provide more details about the technical architecture of the Data Platform, including available APIs and the “Customer Portal”, authentication mechanisms, and any existing documentation for third-party integration? This will help us design the data validation and submission process. | Beneficiaries are required to upload their data files in csv- format within the FMO Customer Portal; no separate API-service will be offered for uploading monthly data. |
| Data Platform & Technology | Could FMO provide technical details on the Data Platform (interfaces, transport protocols, authN/authZ, file formats, API specs, encryption, logging)? | No technical details on FMO’s customer portal are needed to fulfill this assignment. Nasira+ beneficiaries will log in to the portal through the FMO website. FMO will provide introduction hand-out with basic instructions on the basic functionality and data upload flow. |
| Customer Portal/ Data Platform | Could you please confirm our understanding that the “Customer Portal” and the “Data Platform” will be “given” and a modification or adaptation of those is out of scope of this assignment? Our interpretation is that this assignment is rather focusing on ensuring complete, accurate and to the extent possible automated data processing from each beneficiary’s core banking system to the “Customer Portal”. | That is correct. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Data Privacy and Security</p> | <p>What are FMO’s requirements for data privacy and security, particularly for handling borrower-level data? Are there specific certifications or protocols (e.g., GDPR, ISO 9001, 27001, and ISAE 3402) that the platform or processes must comply with.</p> | <p>Borrower-level data must be anonymized for GDPR-reasons. FMO operates on a need-to-know basis, meaning we only request the minimum borrower-level data necessary to validate eligibility. This data must not be traceable to any individual. Onboarding service party is responsible solely for ensuring that the data the client provides meets the requested validation criteria and is anonymized as required. All security and compliance obligations for the platform itself are managed by FMO.</p> |
| <p>Data Validation Errors/ Existing System</p> | <p>How does FMO currently handle data validation errors (e.g., missing fields, incorrect formats)? Is there an existing system for automated feedback to financial institutions, or is this something the successful bidder will need to develop?</p> | <p>For the Nasira+ program, FMO is developing a 'data platform' which is a combination of the new FMO company portal that interacts with a custom-made Mendix application (called NCA) that manages the Nasira+ securitizations. The data validations and (partially) automated feedback to financial institutions will be part of the platform and system management, which is with FMO and not in scope of this assignment.</p> |
| <p>Data quality rules</p> | <p>Annex 3 describes a comprehensive set of Data Quality validation rules, including hard criteria leading to full load rejection and soft criteria requiring manual review (pages 13–15).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Will FMO maintain and operate the validation rules centrally throughout the program, or is the Contractor expected to support the refinement/extension of DQ rules over time? · What level of technical support is expected from the Contractor when DQ flags arise — e.g. handson data correction support with the Beneficiary? · Is there an indicative threshold or KPI for acceptable soft-validation flag rates per upload to consider an onboarding “successful” during early stages? | <p>FMO will maintain and operate the validation rules centrally throughout the program. These rules will be open to refinement/extension during the lifetime of the program based on findings/issues identified during the course of onboardings/reporting, including those identified by the Contractor.</p> <p>During the testing (prior to start of reporting) the Contractor is expected to support the Beneficiary in resolving deficiencies and structurally reach successful data exchange. Further, during the 12-months handholding phase (after start of reporting), the contractor is expected to ensure the integrity of the data exchange and ensure the beneficiary can achieve independence in the data exchange. The contractor is expected to support the beneficiary in structurally correcting the data, however, is not expected to correct the data themselves on behalf of the beneficiary. For compliance and audit reasons, ownership of data and data submission remains with the beneficiary.</p> <p>There are no pre-defined KPI for acceptable soft-validation flag rates per upload to consider an onboarding “successful”. The contractor may propose such indicators while drafting the methodology in consultation with FMO.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Data Structure Continuity (NASIRA vs Nasira+) | Could FMO clarify whether the data structure, required data fields, and reporting logic used under the previous NASIRA program are similar or compatible with those under Nasira+, and whether prior onboarding work can be partially reused? | Several data fields are common, however the scope and requirements of the program differ, so prior onboarding work is not expected to be reused. |
| Data Platform & Technology | As per our understanding, this monthly upload of the .csv file will be a manual process, performed by the Local Finance Institution. Is this understanding correct? | That is correct. |
| Data Platform & Technology | Are there mandatory validation checks (e.g., referential integrity, uniqueness constraints, mandatory fields) that must be satisfied before submission is accepted? | Yes, please refer to Annex 3: Data Matrix Guidance for a working draft of the validation rules. |
| Validation error | What is the consequence of subsequent hard validation errors or soft validation error or hidden data flaws for the contractor? Is additional work expected with respect to data cleansing? And if so how is this being vectored in the pricing of the services? | During the testing (prior to start of reporting) the Contractor is expected to support the Beneficiary in resolving deficiencies and structurally reach successful data exchange. Further, during the 12 months handholding phase (after start of reporting), the contractor is expected to ensure the integrity of the data. The contractor is expected to support the beneficiary in structurally correcting the data, however is not expected to correct the data themselves on behalf of the beneficiary. For compliance and audit reasons, ownership of data accuracy and actual data submission remains with the beneficiary. |
| Data repository and validation rules | Document '03. Annex 3 Data Matrix Guidance - 2025 - SA - Nasira+ OS 005' refers to the Nasira+ Data platform. Can the contractor make use of this tooling environment or receive validation rules in order to perform training and support to the beneficiaries or is the contractor expect to build its own training and support environment? | Yes, a mature draft of the validation rules will be provided and the contractor can use the FMO platform for the purpose of training the FIs. The contractor is expected to support the beneficiary in structurally correcting the data, however is not expected to themselves correct the data on behalf of the beneficiary. For compliance and audit reasons, ownership of data accuracy and actual data submission remains with the beneficiary. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Data Platform & Technology</p> | <p>Will the contractor be responsible for beneficiary-side tooling (e.g., ETL pipelines, transformation scripts, data profiling), or is the expectation limited to methodology, guidance, and oversight?</p> | <p>Any actions and costs related to MIS changes will be taken by the beneficiary, however the consultant is expected to adequately advise the beneficiary on the development of IT scripts to facilitate the seamless transfer of data from the beneficiaries core banking system to designated data files and upload to FMO data portal, ensuring data integrity throughout the process. In addition, the consultant must follow up on recommendations and support additional advisory and troubleshooting for a 12-month period.</p> |
| <p>Scope boundaries on IT systems integration</p> | <p>Could FMO clarify whether the Contractor’s responsibility regarding data preparation is limited to advisory/guidance (mapping to Data Matrix, DQ expectations, data submission support), or if hands-on technical integration within Beneficiary systems (e.g. ETL development, automation, legacy system data extraction) may also be expected?</p> | <p>Any actions and costs related to MIS changes will be taken by the beneficiary, however the consultant is expected to adequately advise the beneficiary on the development of IT scripts to facilitate the seamless transfer of data from the beneficiaries core banking system to designated data files and upload to FMO data portal, ensuring data integrity throughout the process. In addition, the consultant must follow up on recommendations and support additional advisory and troubleshooting for a 12-month period. This may include advising on ETL development, automation, legacy system data extraction. However, hand-on technical integration is not in scope.</p> |
| <p>Data Quality – Consultant Responsibilities</p> | <p>The ToR states that the Consultant will conduct “data quality analysis and support the monthly reporting process.” Could FMO clarify whether this implies that the accuracy of the submitted data is the Consultant’s responsibility? Specifically, is the Consultant responsible only for helping Beneficiaries resolve system-generated validation errors and structural/format issues. Please confirm that the accuracy and truthfulness of data content remain the Beneficiary’s responsibility, with the Consultant providing technical assistance rather than data assurance.</p> | <p>For compliance and audit reasons, ownership of data accuracy and actual data submission remains with the beneficiary. Neither the contractor nor FMO are responsible for the accuracy of the data. However, the contractor is responsible to guide and support the beneficiary in understanding the requirements of the guarantee contract and meeting reporting requirements. Further, the consultant is required to follow up on recommendations and support additional advisory and troubleshooting for a 12-month period in which the beneficiary delivered 6 successful reporting periods after the start of reporting on the transaction. If this requirement is not met, the 12-month period will be extended until the minimum of successful report is achieved.</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Data matrix | Annex 3 Data Matrix Guidance contains the expected fields. Is Annex 3 the final version for the tender, or whether additional fields (e.g., environmental/green eligibility fields, if applicable) are expected to be added. | Annex 3 is a mature version of the Data matrix. Some additions/changes are anticipated. The general data matrix is expected to be finalized prior to the first onboarding. However, minor adjustments for country and/or beneficiary specific requirements may be added subsequently. |
| Data Matrix Guidance | Please confirm whether the Data Matrix Guidance is the definitive schema and validation rule set for data exchange, and whether any country-specific or beneficiary-specific extensions will be provided by FMO. | Annex 3 is a mature version of the Data matrix. Some additions/changes are anticipated. The general data matrix is expected to be finalized prior to the first onboarding. However, some country and/or beneficiary specific requirements may be added subsequently. |
| Compliance | Will FMO provide a standard governance playbook for portfolio selection and reporting (e.g., eligibility rules, exception handling, audit trail requirements)? | Full eligibility rulebook (loan-level, borrower-level) will be provided by FMO prior to the first onboarding, however will be subject to minor country or beneficiary specific changes or additions. Mature versions of these will be provided prior to that to support development of the onboarding methodology. |
| Compliance | Please clarify how portfolio eligibility violations or late/incomplete reporting impact the guarantee coverage and the contractor's deliverables/acceptance. | Inclusion of ineligible loans or late/incomplete reports are events of default under the guarantee agreement. |
| Compliance | Are there penalties or liquidated damages related to delays in onboarding or data quality issues attributable to the contractor's methodology? | Please refer to the draft agreement in Annex X. |
| Task Orders | The RFP states that each Beneficiary will have a separate Task Order covering each milestone (Initial, Onboarding, Hand-over Report). Will FMO issue Task Orders sequentially (per Beneficiary, per milestone) or can multiple Task Orders run in parallel for several beneficiaries? | Task orders will be issued per beneficiary per milestone. Multiple Task Orders may run in parallel for several beneficiaries. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Handover Reports | According to the Terms of reference, it is foreseen an extension of the period of advisory beyond 12 months to reach at least 6 successful reports, will this extension be applied even if it is a proven failure of the Local Financial Institution to comply with the rules? | Yes. The contractor is expected to pre-empt and mitigate the risk of such extensions through thorough analysis and gap identification during the onboarding, testing and eventually handholding phases. In case failure to report or comply by the beneficiary is due to extraordinary/unforeseeable circumstances, these will be assessed on case by case basis by FMO. |
| Reporting Cycles – Hand-over Conditions | The ToR requires Beneficiaries to complete six consecutive successful reporting cycles before Hand-over. Could FMO clarify whether Hand-over is contingent solely on these successful submissions, or whether the Beneficiary must also demonstrate a defined level of reporting maturity before Hand-over approval? | If a beneficiary makes six consecutive successful reporting cycles, it is assumed this implies a required level of reporting maturity. |
| Milestone 4 - hand-over | <i>In relation with milestone 4, could you please clarify which performance criteria will confirm that a Beneficiary is considered fully autonomous for hand-over (e.g. X successful submissions, no critical DQ flags, etc)?</i> | Acceptance criteria and KPIs will be jointly agreed by FMO and the contractor in the Onboarding methodology. |
| Fee allocation | <i>“The Tenderer needs to ensure that the total price of the hand-over reports, assuming 45; Beneficiaries, amounts to at least 40% of the total Financial Offer.”</i> Are contractors allowed to allocate the fees based on the contractors expected level of effort per the different phases of the TORs? | Yes, besides this specific requirement that onboarding methodology amounts to at least 5% and hand-over reports amount to at least 40% of the total Financial Offer, contractors are allowed to allocate the fees based on the contractors expected level of effort per the different phases of the TORs. |
| Reporting Method – Manual vs Automated | Does FMO require Beneficiaries to move toward semi-automated or automated reporting processes , or is manual reporting acceptable as long as six successful uploads are achieved? Should the Consultant systematically recommend upgrades where Beneficiaries rely heavily on manual data extraction? | To ensure data integrity and eliminate risk of manual interventions, it is important that the beneficiary is able to set up a automated reporting process for extracting the data from its core banking and other inhouse systems. This is also considered a more efficient approach for the beneficiary, considering that the beneficiary will deliver these reports on a monthly basis for a minimum period of 4-5 years during the lifetime of the guarantee contract. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Recommendations & Hand-over Preconditions</p> | <p>If the Consultant identifies gaps in Beneficiary reporting infrastructure or capacity and recommends improvements, must Beneficiaries implement these recommendations prior to Hand-over, or is implementation optional and not required for milestone completion?</p> | <p>Any implementation that is critical for the timely and accurate delivery of data reports must be completed prior to handover and ideally before the first reporting by the beneficiary. The ultimate decision on criticality of the recommendations will be with FMO.</p> |
| <p>Per-beneficiary work caps</p> | <p>Given the lump-sum, milestone-based structure, the TOR is silent on time limits per Beneficiary. At the same time work will be procured in task orders. Please detail on task orders logic. Will FMO impose: A maximum time effort per Beneficiary, or A fixed maximum fee per Beneficiary (beyond milestone pricing), where the Contractor bears the risk of varying workload depending on Beneficiary data readiness? or Allow flexible approach for custom pricing per beneficiary. This is crucial consideration for risk pricing given the heterogeneity of PFIs (CBS maturity, staff capacity, data readiness).</p> | <p>Milestone 1 is defined on program level, whereas the remaining milestones (initial, onboarding, handover report) are per beneficiary. Considering this, it is preferred that the contractor proposes a flexible approach for milestones 2,3 and 4 such that the pricing is defined per type of onboarding rather than per FI. For e.g. contractors may propose onboarding types based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - level of complexity - time of onboarding, on the assumption that as the contractor gains more experience, future onboardings may require less effort (i.e. different price for the contract duration by year, i.e. year 1, year 2 and so on) - any other form of classification the contractor deems suitable. |
| <p>Payment mechanism</p> | <p>Could FMO clarify the payment mechanism? Specifically, will payments be released upon acceptance of each individual deliverable, or only after completion of all deliverables within a milestone?</p> | <p>Payment will be released per milestone after completion of all deliverables within the milestone.</p> |
| <p>Experts</p> | <p>ToR refers to data scientists, but the scope of advanced analytics is unclear. What does FMO expect the Contractor's data scientists to deliver?</p> | <p>There is limited requirement for advanced data analytics. Focus is on Data modeling and management, data integration and ETL, data governance and data lineage.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Current operational status of Nasira+</p> | <p>According to Annex 2 (ToR), the NASIRA programme’s ramp-up closed in August 2024 and is now in run-off, while Nasira+ is described as the “new program” building on its predecessor. Could you please clarify the current operational status of Nasira+?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Has the Nasira+ programme already started originating transactions, or is the onboarding assignment expected to begin before any new Beneficiaries sign guarantee agreements? · Are any Beneficiaries already identified or contracted under Nasira+? | <p>The Nasira+ program is currently in 'set-up' phase. No beneficiaries have been contracted as yet. Origination and onboarding will depend on the deal pipeline, however as an indication, it is expected that onboarding for approximately 2 FIs will begin in 2026 Q4.</p> |
| <p>Expert 2: Data scientists</p> | <p>The ToR refers to “Expert 2: Data scientists” in the plural, without specifying the required number. Could you please clarify how many CVs FMO expects to be proposed for the Expert 2 category?</p> | <p>FMO is open to consider different proposals for staffing models and the number of consultants/resources required including for the role of Data scientists. While ensuring adequate delivery capacity is crucial, it is equally important that the staff strength is proposed in a way that maintains consistency and continuity in the application of the agreed onboarding methodology and advisory across beneficiaries. If multiple resources or teams are proposed, it is the contractor’s responsibility to ensure sufficient knowledge retention and transfer, harmonization of processes, and accounting of lessons learned from one onboarding to another.</p> |
| <p>Physical presence of the experts</p> | <p>The ToR states that “<i>Physical presence at our company’s location is not required</i>”, and beneficiaries are located globally. Could you please clarify whether FMO prefers experts based in The Hague, or whether a remote setup with appropriate proximity and availability is acceptable?</p> | <p>Presence in The Hague is not necessary. A remote setup with appropriate proximity and availability is acceptable.</p> |
| <p>Training/ Training Materials</p> | <p>Does FMO prefer a format of training materials (e.g., video tutorials, live webinars, in-person workshops)? Are there specific regions or institutions where onsite training is expected or encouraged?</p> | <p>Onboarding will be done in a combination of remote and on-site work. As such, a combination of digital and in person trainings are considered suitable. Establishing a training approach is the Tenderer's responsibility as part of setting up the onboarding methodology.</p> |

FMO

Entrepreneurial
Development
Bank

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Language requirements for onboarding materials | Is there any language requirement for material developed for beneficiaries, such as training content and onboarding guidelines? | All materials must at the minimum be available in English. Availability of Spanish is a big plus, and French is nice to have. Tenderers are requested to elaborate in their offers to what extent they are able to offer key work products in Spanish and/or French language. |
| Operating Model | Are work products (reports, training materials) required solely in English, or should we plan for localized versions for certain beneficiaries? | All materials must at the minimum be available in English. Availability of Spanish is a big plus, and French is nice to have. Tenderers are requested to elaborate in their offers to what extent they are able to offer key work products in Spanish and/or French language. |
| Level of Technical Proficiency | Could FMO clarify the technical proficiency of the end-users (e.g., staff at financial institutions) who will be trained? This will help us tailor the complexity and delivery method of the training. | In our experience, staff at financial institutions are generally at proficient, advanced or expert level in their respective areas. However, often various departments at the beneficiary may be engaged in the delivery of the data and hence risks arising from limited ownership on the ultimate delivery and alignment between various stakeholders at the Beneficiary could undermine the quality and timeliness of the delivery process. |
| After award | What level of access will the successful bidder have to FMO's internal teams (e.g., IT, data analysts) for troubleshooting, feedback, or co-development of tools? | FMO's internal teams will work in close collaboration with the contractor throughout these activities, providing input, feedback, and support to ensure alignment with our standards and objectives. This includes joint sessions for methodology refinement and coordinated efforts during the onboarding process. However, the ultimate responsibility for delivering the agreed methodology and achieving onboarding milestones rests with the contractor. The contractor is accountable for meeting all deliverables within the agreed timelines and quality parameters. |
| Expected Outputs - Format | For the Initial, Onboarding, and Hand-over Reports, can you share minimum content templates or acceptance criteria (e.g., KPIs, data quality scores, error thresholds, sign-off steps)? | Acceptance criteria and KPIs will be jointly agreed by FMO and the contractor in the Onboarding methodology. |
| Expected Outputs - Format | It is mentioned that Physical presence at our Nasira+ team location is not required, please confirm if there will be a need to travel to the physical location of the Beneficiary. | Onboarding will be done in a combination of remote and onsite work. Our past experience shows that at least one on-site visit per beneficiary is advisable. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Delivery modality & on-site requirements | Does FMO expect consultants to travel and work on-site with Beneficiaries? or will onboarding activities be managed centrally by the Contractor? | Onboarding will be done in a combination of remote and onsite work. Our past experience shows that at least one on-site visit per beneficiary is advisable. |
| KPIs | Could FMO provide a list of key performance indicators (KPIs) that will be used to evaluate the success of the onboarding process and data quality? How often will progress reports be required, and in what format? | KPIs will be jointly agreed by FMO and the contractor in the Onboarding methodology. Progress reports are to be provided per beneficiary as required in section 9.1 Reporting requirements of Annex 2. Terms of reference. In addition, FMO and the contractor will jointly agree on the format and periodicity for alignment and progress reporting on the program level. |
| Beneficiary Maturity Levels | For beneficiaries that may require extensive capacity building for readiness to be onboarded; will FMO make a provision for additional fees (overruns)? | All fees are expected to be included in the financial proposal which should fit the indicated budget ceiling. There will be no additional budget for cost overruns. |
| Budget | Are there specific budget guidelines or constraints for activities such as platform development, training, or onsite visits? For example, is there a per-institution budget for onboarding support? | Specific budget requirements, constraints and milestones are indicated in section 2.6 Budget. The milestones include allocations to all required onboarding activities including training, onsite visits and onboarding support activities. Platform development is not in scope. |
| Key Lessons/ Challenges | Could FMO share any key lessons or challenges from the 2019 NASIRA tender (e.g., 'Configuration Services and Technical and Functional Support') that could inform the current project? For example, were there specific technical or operational hurdles that arose during implementation? | The scope of the 2019 NASIRA tender differs significantly from the current tender, hence the lessons or challenges from the previous tender are not considered relevant for the current tender. |

List of Indicative countries for Nasira+ Pipeline

Uzbekistan
Kyrgyzstan
India
Pakistan
Bangladesh
Vietnam
The Philippines
Cambodia
Indonesia
Sri Lanka
Mongolia
Argentina
Ecuador
Bolivia
Paraguay
Costa Rica
Guatemala
El Salvador
Dominican Republic
Peru
Türkiye
Armenia
Georgia
Moldova
Tunisia
Egypt
Morocco
Uganda
Kenya
Tanzania
Rwanda
Ethiopia
Madagascar
Mauritius
Nigeria
Ghana
South Africa
Zambia
Ivory Coast
Mozambique