

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The open tender procedure for the Procurement of a Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant for the DFCD Aya TA Facility

Reference Number:	DFCD-XX-1		
Publication dates	08.05.2026		
#	Subject	Question	Answer
1	Budget and payment — advance payments and cash flow	<p><u>Context:</u> The RFP states that the PDCC coordination envelope is capped at approximately 10% of the total framework value (~€600k), with the remaining 90% (~€5.4M) flowing through the PDCC to TA implementers via Task Orders. The framework contract template (Annex VII, Clause 7.4) provides for milestone-based payments in arrears following FMO approval of deliverables, with no provision for advance payments.</p> <p>Question: Given that the PDCC will be expected to procure and pay TA implementers on behalf of FMO, will any advance payment or pre-financing mechanism be available to the PDCC to cover pass-through costs prior to recovery from FMO? If not, is FMO open to including back-to-back payment provisions in individual Task Orders, whereby the PDCC's payment obligations to TA implementers are</p>	<p>FMO acknowledges that individual Task Orders may differ in scope, risk profile, and the nature of downstream TA implementation arrangements. Accordingly, the applicability of back-to-back payment provisions, including payment triggers linked to FMO disbursements, or pre-financing may be discussed and assessed on a case-by-case basis at Task Order level, subject to compliance with FMO's contractual and financial control requirements.</p> <p>Any such arrangements would need to be explicitly defined in the relevant Task Order and aligned with FMO's internal approval processes. The PDCC is encouraged to reflect any such considerations in its Task Order proposals, where relevant.</p>

		<p>explicitly linked to prior receipt of funds from FMO?</p>	
<p>2</p>	<p>Budget and payment — financial evaluation methodology</p>	<p><u>Context:</u> The financial offer template (Annex IV) states that the financial evaluation will be based on the average of all daily rates submitted across expert categories, for both the Programme Coordination and Ecosystem Development Strategy workstreams. Section 5.2 of the RFP states FMO will compare proposals based on requested daily rates and estimated person-days from the workplan.</p> <p>Question: Will FMO apply a single averaged daily rate across both workstreams (Programme Coordination and Ecosystem Development Strategy) for the purpose of the financial score, or will the two rate tables be evaluated separately? Additionally, can FMO confirm whether the person-day estimates from the tenderer's workplan are used as submitted, or whether FMO applies a standardised person-day</p>	<p>For the purpose of the financial evaluation, FMO will assess the financial offers based on the average of all daily rates submitted across the expert categories included in the Financial Offer Template (Annex IV), as described in Section 5 of the RFP. The daily rate tables for Programme Delivery Coordination and for the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy form part of a single financial offer and are not evaluated as stand-alone submissions.</p> <p>The estimated person-days from the tenderer's workplan are used as submitted to assess coherence between the proposed level of effort and pricing; no standardised person-day assumptions are applied by FMO at framework stage.</p>

		<p>assumption across all tenderers to ensure comparability?</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>Budget — indicative Task Order values and coordination fee calculation</p>	<p><u>Context:</u> The RFP states that PDCC coordination costs are capped at a maximum of 10% of the cumulative value of Task Orders contracted over 58 months, with an indicative cap of up to €600,000.</p> <p>Question: Can FMO provide indicative guidance on the expected total value of TA implementation Task Orders anticipated over the life of the facility, and the expected average value per Task Order? This would allow tenderers to model the likely coordination fee income more accurately and assess the commercial viability of their proposed approach.</p>	<p>The value and timing of individual Task Orders cannot be guaranteed and will depend on programme needs, pipeline maturity, and availability of funding. FMO therefore does not provide indicative average Task Order values beyond this information.</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>Contract — termination and mobilisation cost recovery</p>	<p><u>Context:</u> The framework contract template (Annex VII, Clause 17.2.1) provides FMO with the right to terminate the framework agreement at any time and for any reason on 30 days' written notice, with payment limited to valid undisputed invoices for work properly delivered to that point.</p> <p>Question: In the event of early termination by FMO, would the PDCC be entitled to recover any reasonable mobilisation or set-up costs incurred prior to the first Task Order being issued, for example costs related to establishing systems, procedures, and the Operational Manual under Task Order 1? If so, how would these be defined and claimed?</p>	<p>FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Contract — subcontracting consent and Task Order 2 consortium partner</p>	<p><u>Context:</u> The framework contract template (Annex VII, Clause 16.1) requires FMO's prior written consent for any subcontracting. The RFP simultaneously encourages tenderers to involve a specialised landscape/ecosystem strategy partner for Task Order 2, and states this expertise must be demonstrably available at the time of tender submission.</p> <p>Question: If a consortium or subcontracting arrangement for Task Order 2 is declared and approved at tender stage, will FMO's consent under Clause 16.1 be deemed granted for that specific partner and scope without</p>	<p>FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.</p>

		<p>requiring a separate approval process at contract execution? And can FMO confirm that declaring a subcontractor in the tender submission is sufficient to satisfy the prior written consent requirement for that subcontractor's involvement in Task Order 2?</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Contract — post-contract restriction on future work</p>	<p><u>Context:</u> The framework contract template (Annex VII, Clause 26.1) restricts the Consultant and its personnel from seeking or accepting work connected with projects or operations directly related to the agreement for one year after termination or expiry, without FMO's prior written consent. Question: Can FMO clarify the intended scope of the restriction in Clause 26.1? Specifically, would this clause restrict the PDCC from bidding on or accepting other FMO-tendered TA assignments or framework contracts that are thematically related to DFCD Aya but not directly derived from work performed under this agreement? And would the restriction apply to individual experts proposed in the bid who are not employees of the PDCC firm?</p>	<p>FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Eligibility Criteria</p>	<p>Is this tender open to individual consultants, or is it restricted to registered firms and consortia?</p>	<p>Participation in this tender is open to both legal persons (firms) and natural persons, provided they meet the eligibility, exclusion, and selection requirements set out in the Contract Notice, RFP, and annexes.</p>

<p>8</p>	<p>Eligibility criteria</p>	<p>Additional information about the contract notice: 4. Legal basis and eligibility. The legal basis of this procedure is Regulation (EU) N° 2021/947 establishing the NDICI. We are clear as to the eligibility of firms under this legal basis. However, the document then states: “Under FMO’s procurement rules, participation in this tender is open to economic operators established in countries not subject to European Union restrictive measures or FMO-applicable restrictive measures, including FMO high-risk country restrictions.” Does this then override the legal basis and firms from countries such as the UK, the US and Australia...etc. are eligible?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Consortium submissions</p>	<p>With respect to references, could you please confirm whether the selection criteria may be fulfilled collectively by the consortium members (e.g. through the combined experience of the lead partner and other members), or whether each consortium member is expected to individually meet the reference requirements?</p>	<p>Where a tender is submitted by a consortium, the selection criteria may be fulfilled collectively by the consortium members. Relevant experience and references may therefore be demonstrated through the combined experience of the consortium, provided it is clearly indicated which member is responsible for which role and scope under the framework.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Consortium submissions</p>	<p>Could you also clarify whether references may include ongoing projects, or if only completed assignments are eligible? In addition, is there a specific time period (e.g. past X years) within which references must fall?</p>	<p>Yes. Reference projects must fall within the last four (4) years prior to the submission deadline. Ongoing projects are acceptable provided they have been active for at least one (1) year at the time of submission and demonstrate relevant interim results or completed deliverables.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Consortium submissions</p>	<p>With respect to personnel requirements, could you please clarify whether the required expertise must be provided exclusively by internal staff of the</p>	<p>The required expertise does not need to be provided exclusively by internal staff of the consortium members. External experts, including freelance consultants, may be included in the proposed team, provided they are appropriately contracted or</p>

		consortium members, or whether external experts (e.g. freelance consultants) may also be included?	otherwise legally engaged, meet the eligibility requirements, and their roles and availability are clearly described in the tender submission.
12	Consortium submissions	In addition, for personnel requirements, could you confirm whether qualifications and experience may be aggregated across consortium members, or whether each consortium member is expected to meet these requirements individually?	See Question 9 - Personnel qualifications and experience may be aggregated across consortium members. The tender will be assessed based on whether the consortium as a whole demonstrates stable access to the required expertise for the relevant Task Orders, rather than requiring each consortium member to individually meet all personnel requirements.
13	Entitlement to Task Order budgets beyond PDCC fees	<p>The RFP indicates a total framework budget of EUR 6,000,000, of which up to 10% (approx. EUR 600,000) is allocated to Programme Delivery Coordination activities, and up to 90% (approx. EUR 5,400,000) to “frontline delivery of projects” through Task Orders.</p> <p>Could FMO please clarify whether the selected PDCC is expected to access the frontline delivery budget solely as a pass-through for third-party implementers, or whether the PDCC may also deliver TA assignments directly (in part or in full) using its own experts and daily rates under those Task Orders?</p>	<p>The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to implement TA assignments directly. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly in line with relevant procurement requirements.</p> <p>In such cases, the experts deployed and the applicable daily rates for that specific Task Order would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and aligned with FMO as part of the Task Order approval, rather than automatically applying the framework rates. The Consultant would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only.</p> <p>Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the budget structure, role separation, and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract. All Task Orders remain subject to FMO approval.</p>

<p>14</p>	<p>Scope of “procurement of implementing consultants”</p>	<p>Multiple sections of the RFP refer to the PDCC being responsible for the “procurement of TA implementers” and “procurement and supervision of implementing consultants”.</p> <p>Could FMO clarify whether this procurement is expected to take the form of:</p> <p>a) competitive selection of third-party firms or consultants under mini-tender procedures, or</p> <p>b) mobilisation and contracting of experts from within the PDCC contractor or its consortium (subject to approval and compliance checks)?</p> <p>In particular, would scenario (b) be permissible for subsequent Task Orders beyond Task Order 1 and 2?</p>	<p>The procurement of implementing consultants is expected primarily to take the form of competitive selection of third-party consultants or firms under Task Orders, in line with FMO’s Public Procurement Policy and applicable EC-compliant procedures.</p> <p>Mobilisation of experts from within the PDCC or its consortium may be permissible where justified, clearly defined, and approved within the relevant Task Order, provided there is no conflict of interest and all compliance requirements are met.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>Management and coordination fee on third-party TA budgets</p>	<p>Where TA assignments are implemented by third-party consultants procured under specific Task Orders, could FMO confirm whether the PDCC is entitled to include a management / coordination fee (or equivalent markup) within the Task Order budget to cover procurement, supervision, quality assurance, reporting, and payment management responsibilities?</p> <p>If so, is such a fee expected to fall within the 10% Programme Delivery Coordination cap, or may it be budgeted as part of individual Task Orders?</p>	<p>Programme delivery coordination, including procurement, supervision, quality assurance, reporting, and payment management, is remunerated through the Programme Delivery Coordination fees and is subject to the cumulative 10% cap at framework level. These costs are not intended to be charged as an additional mark-up or management fee within individual third-party TA Task Order budgets.</p>

<p>16</p>	<p>Project References</p>	<p>We would appreciate clarification regarding the eligibility requirement for project references under this tender. The RFP (Section 3.4.2) states the following requirement: “The Tenderer (or consortium partner) that is delivering the services related to the Programme Delivery and Coordination Consultant (PDCC) role must demonstrate, at minimum: a) One proven experience in the coordination and management of at least one multi-year EC-funded TA facilities programme, or comparable framework contract involving multiple assignments and external service providers with a climate adaptation and/or climate mitigation focus.” Could you please confirm whether multi-year, donor-funded projects financed by non-EC donors (for example, FCDO) may be considered “comparable framework contracts” for the purposes of this requirement, provided they fit all the requirements and their comparability is clearly demonstrated in the project reference description.</p>	<p>Yes. Multi-year, non-EC donor-funded projects (e.g. FCDO) may be accepted as comparable framework contracts, provided that they are clearly comparable in scope and complexity. This includes demonstrated experience in coordinating and managing multi-year TA programmes or facilities involving multiple assignments and external service providers, with a climate adaptation and/or mitigation focus. The comparability must be clearly substantiated in the project reference description.</p>
<p>17</p>	<p>Technical proposal submission</p>	<p>The RFP states that Parts A, B, C, D, and E should each contain a single file, in PDF format. Can parts A to E also be included in one combined PDF?</p>	<p>Yes. Please mark all the parts accordingly.</p>

<p>18</p>	<p>PDCC Delivered TA</p>	<p>Where suitably qualified, and where relevant FMO procurement regulations are respected, is there any barrier to consortium partners responsible for delivering the PDCC (i.e. Task Orders 1 and/or 2) also delivering subsequent Task Orders?</p>	<p>See Question 13 - The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to implement TA assignments directly. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly in line with relevant procurement requirements.</p> <p>In such cases, the experts deployed and the applicable daily rates for that specific Task Order would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and aligned with FMO as part of the Task Order approval, rather than automatically applying the framework rates. The Consultant would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only.</p> <p>Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the budget structure, role separation, and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract. All Task Orders remain subject to FMO approval.</p>
<p>19</p>	<p>Payments</p>	<p>Annex 7 (VII), Clause 7.4 of the RFP states: Subject to the Total Budget and each Task Order Budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.4.1 the Consultant may invoice the Client(s) for the Fees following completion of the milestones set out in the applicable Task Order to the satisfaction of the Client(s); and • 7.4.2 the Client(s) shall pay all valid, undisputed invoices of the Consultant for the performance of each Task Order as detailed in that Task Order. <p>Question: Where a Task Order includes multiple specific milestones, can the consultant invoice the Client for the corresponding Fees following the completion of each specific Milestone, or</p>	<p>Where a Task Order includes multiple specific milestones, the consultant is able to invoice the Client for the corresponding Fees following the completion of each specific Milestone</p>

FMO

Entrepreneurial
Development
Bank

		must the entire Task Order be completed before the Consultant invoices the Client for the Fees related to all Milestones within the Task Order.	
20	Non-Fee Costs	The Financial Pro-forma only provides for the fee rates of the different experts at their respective level. This proforma provides only for fee cards, so should fees be inclusive of any foreseen incidental/direct costs associated with TO 1 or 2, or would these be agreed and charged separately during the inception phase?	Where reimbursables such as travel is required, such costs may be reimbursed separately and at cost, provided they are explicitly foreseen, justified, and approved in the relevant Task Order, and incurred in line with applicable contractual and financial control requirements.
21	Monitoring responsibility	Section 2.2 of the RFP suggests that amongst the responsibilities of the Consultant will be: • Programme-wide monitoring, narrative and financial reporting, and assignment completion reporting Question: Does the FMO envisage any field-based primary research as part of the monitoring requirements or will the sole data-source be investee and stakeholder reports.	FMO acknowledges that individual Task Orders may differ in scope, risk profile, and the nature of downstream TA implementation arrangements. Accordingly, field based monitoring maybe required.
22	Timeframe for clarifications	Given the fundamental importance of some of these clarifications in shaping consortium, methodology and pricing strategies, can FMO commit to either: 1) Releasing answers to the queries faster than the stipulated timeframe; or 2)	No

		Pushing back the tender submission deadline to enable bidders to take account of the responses and clarifications issued.	
23	Timeframe for the Ecosystem Support Strategy (Task Order 2)	Noting the clear instruction that bidders ensure the availability of their team, we nonetheless have some concerns around the intention to conclude the Ecosystem Support Strategy to a high standard inside the stipulated two month' deadline. Questions: Is there scope to increase the deadline for this Task Order to three months upon signature.	Yes
24	Ecosystem development strategy	Reference: Section 2.2, pages 11–12 What is stated: Task Order 2 requires a “decision oriented” Ecosystem Development Support Strategy, including landscape prioritisation, mapping, and multi year workplans, to be delivered within two months. Question: Should the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy be based primarily on secondary research and stakeholder consultations, or is primary field level analysis or data collection expected within the two month timeframe?	The work will be based exclusively on secondary research, including interviews and consultations with key internal and external stakeholders.
25	Existing studies and learning documents	Reference: Section 2.2, Task Order 2 (page 12) What is stated: Strategy development includes mapping existing programmes, FMO investments, and external initiatives. Question: Will FMO provide access to existing internal analyses, pipelines,	FMO will make relevant existing internal analyses, landscape studies, and other background materials available to the extent feasible and subject to confidentiality and data-sharing restrictions. These materials are intended to support the mapping exercise and help avoid duplication of effort. However, bidders are expected to rely on secondary research and stakeholder consultations, and to independently assess and

		landscape studies, MEL studies to avoid duplication?	address any remaining information gaps as part of the assignment.
26	Task Order 2	Reference: Section 2.2, pages 11–12 What is stated: Task Order 2 delivers a strategy within a defined inception phase. Question: After delivery of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy, what role is envisaged for the Consultant or is Task Order 2 considered complete upon strategy handover?	Task Order 2 will be considered complete upon strategy handover.
27	Statement of agreement	Part 7.1 of the RFP: do we need to draft and submit a statement using the paragraph of part 7.1 or this is covered by part 4 of the Tender submission form (Annex I)?	No specific template is prescribed. Tenderers may use their own format, provided the Availability Statement clearly confirms the wording required in the RFP (i.e. availability for the relevant period and compatibility with the proposed level of effort).
28	Availability statements	Parts 4 and 7.1 of the RFP: a) is there a specific template to use for the Availability statement or we can use our own template using the wording from the RFP? b) do we understand correctly that all experts included in our tender must sign a statement to accompany their CVs?	a) No specific template is prescribed. Tenderers may use their own format, provided the Availability Statement clearly confirms the wording required in the RFP (i.e. availability for the relevant period and compatibility with the proposed level of effort). b) Yes. All experts included in the tender must provide an Availability Statement to accompany their CVs. Individual signatures are required only where applicable under the tenderer's standard CV and declaration practices; no separate standalone signed declaration template is required beyond what is specified in the RFP.
29	Submissions of declarations	According to part 7.6 of the RFP, we understand that the declarations must be submitted with the email Technical proposal. According to part 4 of the RFP "Parts A, B, C, D, and E should each contain a single file, in PDF format".	No specific requirement is prescribed for Annexes I and II to be submitted as separate single PDF files. The requirement for a single PDF per part applies only to Parts A–E of the technical proposal. Annexes I and II should be submitted with the Technical Proposal email, but tenderers may include them within one or more PDF files, provided all documents are complete,

		Should also the declarations (Annexes I and II) be attached in single pdf files?	clearly identifiable, and comply with the RFP submission instructions.
30	Signatures	We understand that the declaration on honour must be signed either with blue ink (handwritten) or QES. Is simple electronic signature acceptable for every other document that must be signed?	Yes
31	Evidence of meeting the Selection Criteria – Financial capacity	In part 6.5 of the RFP is mentioned that the supporting documents must be submitted together with the Tender Submission form. But proofs of professional capacity and technical capacity are part of the Technical proposal (Parts D and E) – part 4 of the RFP. Where should the remaining evidence which refer to the economic and financial capacity should be included? Can you please confirm if these must be attached to the Technical proposal email (financial accounts 3 last closed financial years), and be merged with the Tender Submission form?	Evidence of economic and financial capacity must be submitted together with the Tender Submission Form (Annex I) as part of the Technical Proposal submission. These documents do not need to be merged into a single file with the Submission Form and may be provided as separate, clearly identifiable attachments or as a consolidated file covering Selection Criteria evidence.
32	Supporting documentation to be submitted with the tender	In part 7.14 of the RFP it is mentioned that the Identification form, the duly authorised signature, and the documentary proof of statement of effective establishment or incorporation must be submitted upon request (award stage), but in the Tender submission form (Annex I), these documents are listed under part 4, as necessary to be	The documents listed (e.g. Identification Form, proof of establishment, authorised signature) are only required upon request at award stage, in line with Part 7.14. Their mention in Annex I reflects standard template wording and does not create a submission requirement at tender stage.

		<p>submitted together with the Tender Submission form "...following documents, which comprise our technical offer, and our financial offer". Can you please clarify?</p>	
<p>33</p>	<p>Number of files to be attached to the Technical proposal email</p>	<p>According to our interpretation of the RFP we understand that we must submit the below separate files (pdf) to the Technical proposal email (s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tender Submission form merged with the Tenderer's declaration (Annex I), Identification form and supporting documents, duly authorised signature document – Please confirm whether the Identification form and supporting documents, duly authorised signature document are needed now or at award stage, and the evidence of meeting the Selection Criteria: Annual accounts from the last 3. 2. Declaration on honour (Annex II) 3. Collaboration form (Annex VIII) – if applicable. 4. Part A: Understanding of the Assignment and Comments on the Scope of Work 5. Part B: Approach and Methodology 6. Part C: Workplan 7. Part D: Project Reference (Annex III) 8. Part E: Names and CVs of personnel to work on this project merged with the Availability statements. <p>Please confirm / clarify.</p>	<p>The understanding of the required Technical Proposal documents is largely correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Identification Form, proof of establishment, and authorised signature documents are only required upon request at award stage ✓ The Tender Submission Form (Annex I) should be submitted as a separate document (no need to merge with these documents) ✓ Evidence of Selection Criteria (e.g. financial statements) must be submitted at tender stage <p>The Technical Proposal should include:</p> <p>Annex I (Tender Submission Form) Annex II (Declaration on Honour) Annex VIII (if applicable) Parts A–E (as separate files or clearly structured documents, including CVs with Availability Statements)</p> <p>All documents should be included in the Technical Proposal email, except the Financial Proposal, which must be submitted separately.</p>

34	Capacity providing entities	Reference is made to CPEs only about relying on them for the economic and financial criteria. Can we rely on the CPEs for the technical or professional capacity criteria? If yes, what is the documentation expected to be signed by the CPEs and included in the tender? The RFP does not list any document. For example, letter of Undertaking referring to the capacities provided by the entity or declaration on honour.	<p>Yes. CPEs may be relied upon for technical and professional capacity, provided they will perform the relevant services, similar to consortium members or subcontractors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No specific template is prescribed ✓ A written commitment must be provided ✓ A Declaration on Honour (Annex II) should be submitted, where applicable <p>The documentation must confirm effective availability of the resources.</p>
35	Evidence on exclusion criteria	Can you please confirm that we are not expected to include the evidence on exclusion criteria at tender stage, but only upon request, during award stage?	The Declaration on Honour (Annex II) should be submitted at tender stage, and the evidence on exclusion criteria should be submitted upon request during the award stage.
36	References – part carried out by the entity	In Annex III there is a field “Proportion Carried out by Legal Entity (%)”. Does this mean that we need to include the implemented by the entity value in the last 4 years preceding the submission deadline?	Yes
37	Scope & Task Order Structure	Is it possible to bid only for one of the two tasks orders, either Task Order 1 – Programme Delivery Coordination (TA Facility Management or Task Order 2 – Ecosystem Development Support Strategy?	No
38	Extension of Deadline	Would it possible to request an extension to the submission deadline until Friday, 22 May at 23:59 (CEST)?	The submission deadline is as stated in the RFP and cannot be amended.

39	Eligibility	<p>The lead applicant has managed TAF funded by EIB and FMO - both institutions funded by EC funds. Furthermore, the lead applicant also had contracts funded by GCF, GEF and UN organisations. Would this be enough evidence to comply with the eligibility criteria of: “a) One proven experience in the coordination and management of at least one multi-year EC Funded TA facilities programme, or comparable framework contract involving multiple assignments and external service providers with a climate adaptation and/or climate mitigation focus”</p>	<p>FMO does not assess or confirm at Q&A stage whether a specific bidder meets the eligibility criteria. Experience with multi-year TA facilities funded by EIB, FMO, or other institutions managing EC funds, as well as programmes funded by GCF, GEF or UN organisations, may be considered comparable, provided they demonstrate similar scope and complexity. The final determination of compliance with the eligibility criteria will be made during the evaluation of the tender, based on the evidence submitted and the extent to which comparability is clearly substantiated.</p>
40	Procurement	<p>Can FMO share the updated daily rate thresholds applicable for this program?</p>	<p>The RFP does not define specific daily rate thresholds. Tenderers should propose rates in line with the requirements and budget framework of the assignment, ensuring consistency with public procurement principles and market standards.</p>
41	Content	<p>Are there specific geographic priorities for Aya, beyond ODA recipient countries?</p>	<p>Beyond the requirement that activities are implemented in ODA-eligible countries, DFCD Aya does not define fixed geographic priorities upfront. In practice, geographic focus will be informed by the investment pipeline, alignment with Team Europe Initiatives and Global Gateway priorities, and will be further refined through the ecosystem development strategy, which is expected to identify regions where targeted ecosystem-level support can most effectively strengthen climate adaptation project origination and scale impact.</p>
42	Content	<p>The RFP indicates 15-20 Task Orders over 58 months with 3 in Year 1. Should we expect relatively even distribution (3-4 per year), or is there likely to be significant clustering - e.g., front-loaded based on existing pipeline? This affects our resourcing model and budget assumptions.</p>	<p>The RFP outlines an indicative range of 15–20 Task Orders over the full 58-month period, with three anticipated in Year 1. While this suggests an average of approximately 3–4 Task Orders per year, the actual pacing may vary over time. In particular, some clustering—potentially earlier in the implementation period—may occur depending on the maturity of the investment pipeline, emerging priorities, and specific TA needs identified. Task</p>

			Orders will therefore be commissioned on a demand-driven basis rather than following a strictly even annual distribution.
43	Content	DFCD projects originate through SNV/WWF-NL consortium. Does PDCC coordinate directly with Origination Facility on pipeline visibility and TA scoping, or is FMO the sole interface? Will there be joint planning sessions?	DFCD Aya pipeline development is led by the Origination Facility implemented by the SNV/WWF-NL consortium. FMO serves as the primary interface between the PDCC and the Origination Facility, ensuring coordination, pipeline visibility, and alignment with DFCD Aya investment and TA priorities. While the PDCC is not expected to liaise directly with the Origination Facility on a day-to-day basis, coordination will be facilitated through FMO, including structured exchanges and, where relevant, joint alignment or planning sessions involving SNV/WWF-NL. The most effective and efficient modalities for coordination and information exchange will be further agreed during the project start-up phase.
44	Content	The RFP states FMO Programme Staff will share a 'relatively mature pipeline for Component 1.' At proposal stage, can you indicate whether there are already several identified investees with scoped TA needs, or should Year 1 workplan assume significant joint scoping/needs assessment effort?	FMO Programme staff will be able to share a relatively mature pipeline for Component 1, in the sense that several potential investees are already identified and at varying stages of development. However, while some preliminary understanding of TA needs exists, these are not expected to be fully scoped at proposal stage. As such, Year 1 should anticipate a combination of targeted TA delivery for more mature cases and a meaningful level of joint scoping and needs assessment, working closely with FMO and partners to refine TA scope and sequencing.
45	Content	What relationship does FMO foresee between the EFSD contract notice and the DFCD Aya PDCC?	It is not clear which specific EFSD contract notice is being referred to in this question.
46	Finance	How will invoicing/payment be structured under this program? (e.g. quarterly, annually)	See Question 1 - Invoicing and payment will be structured on a Task Order basis, in line with the specific scope, deliverables, and milestones defined in each Task Order. As such, payment schedules may vary and are expected to be deliverable- or milestone-based, rather than strictly quarterly or annual. The precise invoicing arrangement for each Task Order will be

			agreed at commissioning stage and set out in the relevant Task Order documentation.
47	Format of the submission	Page 16 of the RFP says that "Parts A, B, C, D, and E should each contain a single file, in PDF format." Do you mean that each part should be a standalone PDF document or can parts A, B, C, D and E be merged into one pdf document?	Parts A–E may be submitted either as separate PDF files or merged into one PDF, provided that each part is clearly labelled and identifiable.
48	Requirements concerning the Tenderer	<p>In 3.4.2. pg. 9, Technical capacity of the tenderer, are the experience examples for a) and b), included in the 'up to four references' mentioned in Part D, pg. 13, or are these references in addition to these? If in addition, can we include more than two references or what is the maximum number that can be accepted for 3.4.2?</p> <p>Likewise, for 3.4.3., pg.9, Professional capacity of tenderer, are the CVs for the profiles described in a), b) and c) for Task Order 1 and a) for Task Order 2, in addition to the CVs required in Part E, page 13?</p> <p>Lastly, are the requirements in Section 3.4. Selection Criteria, namely 3.4.1, 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 expected to be submitted in a separate pdf document to allow the pass/fail evaluation?</p>	<p>Selection and award criteria must be clearly distinguished in the submission:</p> <p>Selection Criteria (Section 3.4)</p> <p>Assessed on a pass/fail basis Should be clearly addressed and identifiable, preferably in a separate file or clearly labelled section, to facilitate the compliance check prior to evaluation</p> <p>Award Criteria (Parts A–E)</p> <p>Assessed on a scored basis Must be submitted as part of the Technical Proposal, structured in accordance with Parts A–E</p> <p>Where relevant, the same documents (e.g. references, CVs) may support both criteria, provided that compliance with Selection Criteria is clearly demonstrated and easy to verify.</p>

<p>49</p>	<p>Cash flow</p>	<p>Would the contracted consultant be expected to advance cash for the individual ToRs/call-downs? Or will FMO provide this directly?</p>	<p>See Question 1 - FMO acknowledges that individual Task Orders may differ in scope, risk profile, and the nature of downstream TA implementation arrangements. Accordingly, pre-financing may be discussed and assessed on a case-by-case basis at Task Order level, subject to compliance with FMO's contractual and financial control requirements. Any such arrangements would need to be explicitly defined in the relevant Task Order and aligned with FMO's internal approval processes. The PDCC is encouraged to reflect any such considerations in its Task Order proposals, where relevant. 1 - Invoicing and payment will be structured on a Task Order basis, in line with the specific scope, deliverables, and milestones defined in each Task Order.</p>
<p>50</p>	<p>Opportunity for technical involvement</p>	<p>Will there be the possibility for the management consultant to also be involved in/apply for the technical call downs (in addition to the ecosystem development strategy)?</p>	<p>See Question 13 - The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to implement TA assignments directly. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly in line with relevant procurement requirements. In such cases, the experts deployed and the applicable daily rates for that specific Task Order would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and aligned with FMO as part of the Task Order approval, rather than automatically applying the framework rates. The Consultant would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only. Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the budget structure, role separation, and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract. All Task Orders remain subject to FMO approval.</p>

<p>51</p>	<p>Team structure and possibility of expert pool</p>	<p>In Section 4 (Part E: Project Team), the RFP outlines an indicative core team structure and specifies that experts should be available for the duration of the Framework Contract (and for Task Order 2 as applicable). Given the breadth of anticipated Task Orders and the need for specialised, on-demand expertise (e.g. in areas such as climate finance, investment readiness, and pipeline development), could the Contracting Authority please clarify whether Tenderers are permitted to propose, in addition to the core team specified in Part E, pg. 14, a broader team of experts qualified to cater to the different topics, which can be mobilised on a call-down basis?</p>	<p>Yes. The RFP specifies an indicative core team structure under Part E (Section 4) and requires that the proposed Core PDCC Team be available for the duration of the Framework Contract, and that the Ecosystem Strategy Team be available for the duration of Task Order 2. At the same time, the RFP recognises that competencies required across different Task Orders may vary over time and by assignment. Tenderers may therefore propose, in addition to the core team, access to a broader pool of specialised experts that can be mobilised on a call-down / Task Order basis, provided that:</p> <p>the core team requirements set out in Part E are fully met; the tender clearly demonstrates how such additional expertise will be sourced, managed, and mobilised in compliance with the Framework Contract and Task Order modality; and any experts proposed for a specific Task Order will be subject to the applicable availability, eligibility, and contractual requirements at that stage.</p> <p>Only the experts proposed as part of the Core PDCC Team (and the Task Order 2 team, where applicable) must demonstrate availability at tender stage.</p>
<p>52</p>	<p>Availability Statement</p>	<p>Could FMO please kindly clarify if the "Availability Statement" to be included in each CV is included in the two-page limit? Is it possible to include the Availability Statement as an additional page?</p>	<p>The Availability Statement may be included within the CV or submitted as a separate page. In line with previous guidance, CVs and Availability Statements may be combined or provided as separate, clearly identifiable documents, provided that all requirements are clearly labelled and easy to verify.</p>
<p>53</p>	<p>References</p>	<p>For global entities, could FMO please kindly confirm if only references from entities in the EU should be used, or if it is possible to use references from entities outside of the EU?</p>	<p>References may be provided from both EU and non-EU entities. There is no restriction on geographical origin, provided that the references are relevant to the requirements and demonstrate the tenderer's capacity in line with the Selection Criteria.</p>

<p>54</p>	<p>Nationality of Contractors</p>	<p>The contract notice indicates under point 5, Legal basis: that “Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2024 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union” apply.</p> <p>Moreover, according to same article “This procurement procedure is conducted under indirect management, in accordance with FMO’s procurement rules and procedures, as FMO has been pillar-assessed for procurement by the European Commission, while ensuring compliance with applicable European Union restrictive measures and relevant donor requirements.”</p> <p>Under point 10 of the contract notice it is indicated that “Procurement Project fully financed with EU Funds.”</p> <p>In turn, the Request for Proposals indicates that the Invitation to tender is issued in accordance with FMO’s Public Procurement Policy. Under point 3.3 of the request for Proposals, there are listed the eligibility requirements, but the eligible nationality of contractors is not indicated.</p> <p>Can you please confirm what nationalities of contractors are eligible for this specific public procurement?</p>	<p>Eligibility is determined based on eligible countries rather than nationality alone.</p> <p>Participation is open to economic operators established in countries not subject to EU or FMO restrictive measures, in line with the RFP.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with PRAG principles under indirect management, ensuring broad access while respecting EU restrictive measures and donor requirements.</p>
<p>55</p>	<p>Conflict with other FMO opportunity</p>	<p>A couple of opportunities have been tendered by FMO in recent weeks, including the ESG Framework. Could the FMO please kindly confirm that suppliers, whether as leads or sub-contractors,</p>	<p>Participation by suppliers (whether as lead tenderers or subcontractors) in other separate and unrelated FMO procurement procedures, including the ESG FMO Framework, does not in itself exclude or restrict them from bidding for the DFCD Aya TA Facility.</p>

		bidding for the ESG FMO Framework will not be excluding for bidding for the DCFC Aya TA Facility?	
56	Task order delivery restrictions	Can FMO please confirm that companies delivering Task Order 1 and 2 as described in the RFP will be able to also deliver additional TA assignments under subsequent task orders?	<p>See Question 13 - The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to implement TA assignments directly. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly in line with relevant procurement requirements.</p> <p>In such cases, the experts deployed and the applicable daily rates for that specific Task Order would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and aligned with FMO as part of the Task Order approval, rather than automatically applying the framework rates. The Consultant would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only.</p> <p>Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the budget structure, role separation, and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract. All Task Orders remain subject to FMO approval.</p>
57	Programme delivery coordination activities value	How will the 10% cap on “Programme delivery coordination activities” be calculated over time? Is it by (i) total Task Order value awarded, (ii) total Task Order value actually spent/disbursed, (iii) both (with reconciliation), or (iv) 10% of the budget ceiling regardless of TO spend?	The 10% cap on Programme Delivery Coordination (PDC) activities is calculated on the basis of the total value of Task Orders actually awarded under the Framework Contract, and not on actual expenditure/disbursement or the overall budget ceiling. Accordingly, the cumulative value of Programme Delivery Coordination activities across Task Orders may not exceed 10% of the total Task Order value awarded over the lifetime of the Framework Contract. The cap does not operate as a separate ceiling detached from Task Order awards, nor is it recalculated ex-post based on actual spend.

<p>58</p>	<p>Task order sequencing</p>	<p>Can FMO indicate an indicative annual cadence/sequence for Task Orders (beyond “three in the first year” and 15–20 overall), e.g., expected distribution by year or by component?</p>	<p>See questions 3 and 42 - The RFP provides an indicative planning assumption of 15–20 Task Orders over the 58-month Framework Contract period, with approximately three Task Orders anticipated in Year 1. Beyond this, FMO does not define a fixed annual cadence, sequencing by component, or pre-determined distribution of Task Orders across years. Task Orders will be commissioned on a demand-driven basis, informed by the maturity of the investment pipeline, evolving programme priorities, and funding availability. As such, Task Orders may not be evenly distributed over time, and some degree of clustering may occur.</p>
<p>59</p>	<p>Pipeline development</p>	<p>What role will the PDCC have in active pipeline development? What is PDCC’s decision role vs facilitation role, given FMO retains pipeline generation and strategic oversight?</p>	<p>See Question 44 - FMO retains primary responsibility for pipeline generation, strategic oversight, and investment decision-making under DFCD Aya. The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant (PDCC) does not have a decision-making or approval role in relation to the investment pipeline.</p> <p>At the same time, the PDCC is expected to contribute in a supportive and collaborative capacity, including through structured brainstorming and technical input on pipeline development as requested by FMO. In practice, this includes a meaningful level of joint scoping and needs assessment, working closely with FMO and partners to refine TA scope and sequencing.</p> <p>The PDCC supports FMO by translating identified pipeline priorities into well-structured Technical Assistance interventions, including needs assessments, preparation of Terms of Reference, and coordination of TA delivery processes, based on direction and priorities set by FMO.</p>
<p>60</p>	<p>Procurement routes</p>	<p>What level of discretion does the PDCC have to recommend procurement routes (e.g., competitive vs using already engaged providers) and who will be responsible for the final determination (i.e. PDCC or FMO)?</p>	<p>The PDCC is expected to support FMO by assessing and recommending appropriate procurement approaches for each Task Order, based on the specific requirements of the assignment and FMO’s procurement guidance. However, the final determination of the procurement route remains with FMO, in line with its applicable procurement rules and approval processes.</p>

<p>61</p>	<p>Monitoring requirements</p>	<p>Will the PDCC be responsible for compiling programme-wide results tracking (outputs/outcomes), or only activity/assignment management reporting?</p>	<p>The PDCC is expected to support programme-wide results tracking primarily in a coordination and consolidation role, rather than acting as the owner of the overall results framework or outcomes monitoring.</p> <p>In practice, the PDCC will be responsible for activity- and assignment-level management reporting, including monitoring progress, deliverables, and outputs of individual Task Orders, and for aggregating and synthesising this information to support programme-level narrative and progress reporting to FMO. Responsibility for the overall results framework and outcome-level performance assessment remains with FMO. Where additional support is required—for example, to strengthen outcome-level analysis, harmonisation of indicators, or programme-wide learning—this may be discussed and, if appropriate, agreed under specific future Task Orders, based on FMO’s needs and priorities.</p>
<p>62</p>	<p>Landscape definition</p>	<p>Can FMO clarify expectations on “prioritised landscapes”: how many landscapes are envisaged, and what constitutes a “landscape” for this programme (jurisdictional boundary, ecosystem corridor, commodity geography, etc.)?</p>	<p>The RFP does not define a fixed number of prioritised landscapes, nor does it prescribe a single, rigid definition of what constitutes a “landscape. For the purpose of this programme, a landscape should therefore be understood as a functional geography, which may be framed using different lenses depending on the context and objectives of the intervention. This may include, for example, jurisdictional or sub-national areas, ecosystem corridors or river basins, or commodity-linked production geographies where coordinated ecosystem-level action can strengthen climate adaptation outcomes. The Ecosystem Development Support Strategy (Task Order 2) is explicitly intended to further define and operationalise how landscapes are constituted and prioritised for DFCD Aya, including how integrated landscape financing approaches can be applied in practice. This strategy will draw on secondary analysis, existing studies, and stakeholder inputs and will provide an analytical basis for subsequent ecosystem-level interventions under the programme.</p>

<p>63</p>	<p>TOR approval</p>	<p>Who has final sign off for ToRs, deliverables, and payments (FMO vs investees)? To what extent will investee cost-sharing be a consideration for TOs?</p>	<p>In practice, TA assignments are expected to be demand-driven, with investees closely involved in the scoping, implementation, and substantive validation of TA activities to ensure relevance and usefulness. Deliverables are typically reviewed with the relevant investee(s), and their feedback and confirmation of satisfactory completion will inform FMO's assessment. However, formal approval of ToRs and deliverables, as well as authorisation of payments, remains with FMO, in line with the Framework Contract and Task Order governance. With respect to investee cost-sharing, this is not a standard requirement across all Task Orders but will be considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature of the TA assignment, the beneficiary profile, and programme objectives. Any cost-sharing arrangements would need to be explicitly defined and agreed as part of the relevant Task Order.</p>
<p>64</p>	<p>Local funding platforms</p>	<p>Can FMO define the local funding platforms referenced in Figure 2 and Component 2C? There is limited description provided in the RFP of what these platforms are expected to look like, whether they will be existing or newly established entities, what their key purpose will be, etc.</p>	<p>The RFP intentionally does not provide a detailed or prescriptive definition of the local funding platforms referenced in Figure 2 and under Component 2C, nor does it pre-determine whether such platforms would be existing or newly established entities. Local funding platforms are envisaged as context-specific mechanisms that can help aggregate, structure, and channel financing to climate adaptation projects at landscape level, where individual projects or ticket sizes are not well suited to direct financing. Depending on the context, these platforms could take different forms, including adaptations of existing local or regional financing vehicles, partnerships with financial intermediaries, or newly designed structures where justified. A light-touch analysis and conceptual framing of potential local funding platforms is expected to be undertaken as part of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy (Task Order 2), including initial thinking on how such platforms could support integrated landscape-based climate adaptation objectives.</p>

<p>65</p>	<p>Commercial scoring</p>	<p>The financial rate template (Annex IV) states that ‘the financial evaluation will be based on the average of all daily rates submitted across the expert categories listed below, as described in Section 5.3 of the RFP.’. There does not appear to be a section 5.3 of the RFP, but the information in section 5.2 of the RFP seems to differ from the commercial evaluation method provided on the rate card, stating that ‘FMO will compare financial proposals based on the level of effort estimated by a tenderer based on (1) the requested daily rate(s) and (2) the estimated number of person-days according to the workplan.’. Could FMO please clarify the intended method for commercial evaluation? And if the latter is correct, i.e. the scoring will be based on both daily rates in combination with workplan LOE, could FMO please confirm that the rate card is all that needs to be provided in the financial submission template Annex IV, as there is no area to include LOE.</p>	<p>See Question 2 - For the purpose of the commercial evaluation, FMO will assess financial offers based on the average of all daily rates submitted across the expert categories included in the Financial Offer Template (Annex IV). The reference to Section 5.3 in the Financial Offer Template should be read as referring to the financial assessment methodology described in Section 5.2 of the RFP. As set out in Section 5.2, FMO considers both daily rates and the estimated level of effort (person-days) to assess the overall coherence and credibility of the financial offer in relation to the proposed approach and workplan. The estimated person-days from the tenderer’s workplan are used as submitted for this coherence assessment; no standardised LOE assumptions are applied by FMO, and LOE is not scored as a separate financial criterion at framework stage. Accordingly, the completed Financial Offer Template (Annex IV) is the only financial input required for the commercial evaluation at tender stage. No additional LOE tables or person-day submissions are required in the financial proposal beyond what is presented in the technical proposal and workplan.</p>
<p>66</p>	<p>Conflict of Interest / PDCC Eligibility for Subsequent Task Orders</p>	<p>The PDCC will be responsible for procuring and supervising all TA implementers under the Framework Contract, including preparing ToRs, running competitive procedures, evaluating bids, and managing contracts. Given this oversight role, would the PDCC (or any entity in its consortium) be eligible to bid as an implementer on any of the subsequent Task Orders issued under the same framework — for</p>	<p>See Question 13 - The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to implement TA assignments directly. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly in line with relevant procurement requirements. In such cases, the experts deployed and the applicable daily rates for that specific Task Order would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and aligned with FMO as part of the Task Order approval, rather than automatically applying the</p>

		<p>instance under Component 1A+B or Component 2C — assuming a robust Chinese Wall arrangement is implemented? If so, what specific safeguards (e.g., disclosure requirements, recusal procedures, information barriers, separate personnel) would FMO require, and would FMO need to pre-approve such arrangements?</p>	<p>framework rates. The Consultant would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only. Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the budget structure, role separation, and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract. All Task Orders remain subject to FMO approval.</p>
<p>67</p>	<p>Scope & Task Order Structure</p>	<p>The RFP states that approximately 15–20 ToRs/Task Orders are expected over the 58-month lifetime of the facility. Can FMO provide a more detailed indicative pipeline of Task Orders — broken down by Component (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C) and by approximate timing and budget envelope — to allow tenderers to adequately dimension their proposed team?</p>	<p>See Question 3, 42 and 58 - The RFP provides an indicative planning assumption of approximately 15–20 Task Orders over the 58-month lifetime of the Framework Contract, with around three Task Orders anticipated in Year 1. Beyond this, FMO does not define a fixed or pre-determined pipeline of Task Orders broken down by component, timing, or budget envelope. Task Orders will be commissioned on a demand-driven basis, informed by the maturity of the investment pipeline, programme priorities, and availability of funding. As such, the number, sequencing, component allocation, and timing of Task Orders cannot be guaranteed in advance, nor are they expected to follow an even annual distribution. Some clustering may occur depending on programme needs. Accordingly, FMO does not provide a more detailed indicative pipeline by Component (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C) or by year at this stage. Tenderers are expected to propose a flexible resourcing approach capable of responding to varying Task Order volumes and scopes over time, within the indicative parameters set out in the RFP.</p>

<p>68</p>	<p>Scope & Task Order Structure</p>	<p>The Framework Contract is described as "non-exclusive" and "zero-value." Does this mean FMO retains the right to procure TA implementers outside of this framework for DFCD Aya TAF activities, bypassing the PDCC? Under what circumstances would FMO do so?</p>	<p>The Framework Contract is concluded on a non-exclusive and zero-value basis, which means that it does not create an obligation for FMO to channel all DFCD Aya Technical Assistance activities exclusively through this framework or through the PDCC. The signature of the Framework Contract does not constitute a commitment by FMO to award any minimum number, volume, or value of Task Orders. In principle, the PDCC is expected to act as the primary coordination and delivery management mechanism for TA activities commissioned under this Framework Contract. However, FMO retains the right to procure Technical Assistance outside of this framework where justified, for example in cases where specific needs cannot be efficiently or appropriately addressed through the framework, where timing or donor-specific requirements require an alternative approach, or where other FMO procurement mechanisms are more suitable. Any such decisions would be taken by FMO on a case-by-case basis, in line with applicable procurement rules, donor requirements, and internal approval processes. The non-exclusive nature of the Framework Contract is intended to preserve this flexibility rather than to signal a parallel or routine bypassing of the PDCC role.</p>
<p>69</p>	<p>Scope & Task Order Structure</p>	<p>Task Order 1 states the PDCC will assess "whether service providers already engaged by FMO through competitive procedures are well placed to support delivery" of TA assignments. Does this imply that some TA implementers could be directly awarded contracts (without competitive re-procurement) on the basis of existing FMO framework agreements? If so, what is the PDCC's role in those cases?</p>	<p>Task Order 1 foresees that the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant (PDCC) may assess whether service providers already engaged by FMO through prior competitive procedures are well placed to support delivery of specific TA assignments. This is intended to support efficiency where appropriate. This does not imply automatic direct award without competition. Any use of existing FMO-engaged providers would be subject to FMO's procurement rules and an explicit determination by FMO of the appropriate procurement route. In such cases, the PDCC's role is to support FMO in assessing suitability and to coordinate and manage delivery, while final decisions on procurement approach, contract award, and approval remain with FMO.</p>

Scope & Task Order Structure

The RFP describes subsequent Task Orders as covering "specific TA assignments linked to specific investees or ecosystem-level interventions" under Components 1 and 2. In our experience managing similar blended finance TA facilities, some of the most effective and cost-efficient activities for generating investee pipeline and building absorptive capacity are cohort-based or programme-wide interventions, rather than discrete one-to-one investee-level assignments — for example, cohort training programmes targeting multiple investees on shared capacity gaps, cross-portfolio peer-learning events, shared diagnostic tools applied across the investee portfolio, or multi-investee working groups on thematic priorities such as GESI or EU Sustainable Finance Standards.

We have three related questions on this:

Scope: Are cohort-based or programme-wide TA activities of this nature within scope as potential Task Orders under this framework? Does FMO already have an indicative pipeline of such activities in mind?

Cohort-based or programme-wide Technical Assistance activities—such as trainings, peer-learning, shared diagnostics, or thematic working groups—may fall within scope as potential Task Orders under the Framework Contract, provided they are clearly linked to DFCD Aya objectives and components. Task Orders are not limited to one-to-one investee-level assignments and may cover ecosystem-level or portfolio-wide interventions where these are considered effective and appropriate. At this stage, FMO does not provide a predefined or committed pipeline of such activities. Any cohort-based or programme-wide interventions would be identified and commissioned on a demand-driven basis, informed by programme needs, pipeline maturity, and priorities identified over time.

<p>71</p>	<p>Scope & Task Order Structure</p>	<p>PDCC eligibility and role: Where such activities are in scope, would the PDCC itself be eligible to design and deliver them — rather than procuring a third-party implementer — given that these activities are closely integrated with the PDCC's pipeline development and investee coordination work under Task Order 1? Or would the PDCC be expected to procure an external implementer in all cases, regardless of the nature of the activity?</p>	<p>See Question 13 - The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant (PDCC) is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to design or implement Technical Assistance assignments directly, including cohort-based or programme-wide activities. The default expectation is that the PDCC will procure and manage external implementers for such Task Orders. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the PDCC or an entity within its consortium may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly. In such cases, the PDCC would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only, and the experts deployed and applicable daily rates would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and agreed with FMO as part of that Task Order. Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the role-separation and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract.</p>
<p>72</p>	<p>Scope & Task Order Structure</p>	<p>Proposal expectations: Should tenderers' technical proposals reflect experience with cohort-level TA design and delivery, or should the methodology focus exclusively on procurement and management of individual assignments?</p>	<p>Tenderers' technical proposals should primarily focus on the procurement, coordination, and management of Technical Assistance assignments under the Framework Contract, as this is the core role of the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant (PDCC). At the same time, where relevant, tenderers may reflect experience with cohort-based or programme-wide TA design and delivery, to the extent that such experience demonstrates an ability to effectively scope, structure, and manage these types of interventions when commissioned as Task Orders. Tenderers are not expected to assume that cohort-level activities will be delivered directly by the PDCC as a default model. Accordingly, proposals should demonstrate flexibility and capability to manage a range of TA modalities, while maintaining a clear focus on the PDCC's primary coordination and procurement function.</p>

73	Budget & Financial Proposal	The PDCC fee is capped at 10% of cumulative Task Order value (indicative cap of EUR 600,000). Is this 10% calculated on the total value of Task Orders contracted (i.e., the amount awarded to TA implementers), on the total disbursed, or on the total framework budget ceiling of EUR 6,000,000? Could you clarify the exact calculation basis?	See Question 57 - The 10% cap on Programme Delivery Coordination (PDC) activities is calculated on the basis of the total value of Task Orders actually awarded under the Framework Contract, and not on actual expenditure/disbursement or the overall budget ceiling. Accordingly, the cumulative value of Programme Delivery Coordination activities across Task Orders may not exceed 10% of the total Task Order value awarded over the lifetime of the Framework Contract. The cap does not operate as a separate ceiling detached from Task Order awards, nor is it recalculated ex-post based on actual spend.
74	Budget & Financial Proposal	Are travel costs for PDCC staff included within the 10% cap / EUR 600,000 ceiling, or are these reimbursable separately and at cost?	The 10% cap / indicative EUR 600,000 ceiling applies to Programme Delivery Coordination fees only. Travel costs for PDCC staff are not included within this fee cap, unless explicitly bundled into daily rates by the tenderer. Where travel is required, such costs may be reimbursed separately and at cost, provided they are explicitly foreseen, justified, and approved in the relevant Task Order, and incurred in line with applicable contractual and financial control requirements.
75	Budget & Financial Proposal	The RFP provides daily fee rates as the basis for the financial proposal. Should tenderers price all key experts and non-key experts on an estimated-days basis for Task Order 1 and Task Order 2 specifically, or for the entire 58-month framework duration? How should contingency or unallocated days be handled in the financial offer?	The financial proposal is based on daily fee rates only, and tenderers are not expected to price the full framework duration. Estimated LoE (person-days) for Task Order 1 and 2 should be reflected in the workplan and is used to assess coherence with pricing, but is not submitted or scored separately. No contingency or unallocated days should be included; these are defined at Task Order level.

<p>76</p>	<p>Budget & Financial Proposal</p>	<p>The RFP indicates that PDCC programme delivery coordination activities are capped at 10% of the cumulative value of Task Orders contracted under the framework. However, a significant portion of the PDCC's workload under Task Order 1 — including pipeline scoping, needs assessments, drafting of Terms of Reference, preparation of procurement documentation, and facilitation of evaluation committees — will be expended on assignments that FMO ultimately decides not to proceed with, and for which no Task Order will therefore be contracted. In the absence of a contracted Task Order, there is no "value" against which the 10% can be calculated or drawn down.</p> <p>Could FMO clarify how the PDCC will be compensated for this pipeline development and abortive procurement work? Specifically: Is there a retainer, fixed fee, or minimum guaranteed amount under Task Order 1 that covers ongoing coordination and pipeline activities regardless of how many Task Orders are ultimately contracted?</p>	<p>Programme Delivery Coordination activities are remunerated through Task Orders, in line with the Framework Contract, which is concluded on a non-exclusive and zero-value basis. There is no separate retainer, fixed fee, or minimum guaranteed amount outside of agreed Task Orders.</p> <p>At the time of contracting Task Order 1, FMO will agree with the PDCC on a reasonable scope and budget for Programme Delivery Coordination activities anticipated for the first implementation period, based on the expected workplan. Subsequent Programme Delivery Coordination activities will be scoped and commissioned through future Task Orders, with budgets agreed based on the anticipated pipeline and workload for the relevant period (expected to be annually).</p>
<p>77</p>	<p>Budget & Financial Proposal</p>	<p>Will the PDCC's time spent on scoping and procurement exercises that do not result in a contracted Task Order be recoverable, and if so, against what budget line and at what rate?</p>	<p>See Question 76 - At the time of contracting Task Order 1, FMO and the PDCC will agree on a reasonable scope and budget covering Programme Delivery Coordination activities anticipated for the first year, including pipeline scoping, needs assessments, preparation of Terms of Reference, and procurement support.</p>

			Time spent on such activities during that period is recoverable against Task Order 1, in line with the agreed scope and rates.
78	Budget & Financial Proposal	How should tenderers account for this risk and uncertainty in their financial proposals?	Tenderers are expected to reflect the Task Order-based delivery model and associated uncertainty in their financial proposals, recognising that the Framework Contract is non-exclusive and zero-value and does not guarantee a minimum volume of work. Financial proposals should therefore be based on realistic daily rates and a flexible resourcing approach, aligned with the understanding that Programme Delivery Coordination activities will be scoped, agreed, and remunerated through individual Task Orders, based on anticipated workplans and pipeline needs at the time of commissioning.
79	Consortium & Subcontracting	The RFP encourages involvement of a "specialised strategy/management consulting consortium partner" for Task Order 2, but states this expertise is "not required for subsequent Task Orders." Can such a consortium partner be a subcontractor rather than a formal consortium member? What are FMO's requirements regarding minimum share/role of the lead tenderer versus consortium partners?	The specialised consultant for Task Order 2 may be engaged as a subcontractor rather than a formal consortium member, provided that the required expertise is demonstrably available and compliant with the RfP requirements. The RfP does not prescribe any minimum requirements regarding the role or share of the lead tenderer versus consortium partners. Tenderers may therefore organise their structure as they deem appropriate.
80	Consortium & Subcontracting	Can consortium partners or subcontractors be replaced or added after contract signature, for instance when a new Task Order is issued that requires specific expertise not originally represented? If so, what approval process would apply?	Changes to consortium partners or subcontractors after contract signature are in principle possible, provided that:✓ They are duly justified (e.g. need for additional expertise for a Task Order)✓ They comply with the same eligibility and selection requirements as initially assessed✓ They are subject to prior written approval by FMOIn line with public procurement principles, such changes must not alter the fundamental conditions of the contract or distort competition.Where relevant, updated documentation (e.g. commitments, declarations, eligibility confirmations) may be required to demonstrate continued compliance.

<p>81</p>	<p>Staffing & Key Experts</p>	<p>The RFP refers to key experts but the specific CVs/profiles required are not fully detailed in the tender document reviewed. Which positions are considered "Key Experts" for evaluation purposes, and what are the minimum qualification and experience thresholds for each? Are non-key experts evaluated, or only assessed at task order stage?</p>	<p>The RFP does not distinguish between “key” and “non-key” experts. All proposed experts submitted under Part E are evaluated in line with the award criteria, based on their relevance, experience, and suitability for the roles described. Minimum expectations (e.g. indicative years of experience and profiles) are defined in the RFP per role. Additional or specialised experts not included in the core proposal are not evaluated at tender stage, but may be proposed and assessed at Task Order level, depending on the specific requirements.</p>
<p>82</p>	<p>Staffing & Key Experts</p>	<p>Given the primarily remote delivery model, are there any requirements for the PDCC team (or key experts) to be based in or near specific geographies (Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, Asia-Pacific)? Will FMO consider the geographic spread of the team in the evaluation?</p>	<p>The RFP does not require the PDCC team or key experts to be based in, or near, specific geographies (such as Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, or Asia-Pacific). The assignment is expected to be delivered primarily through a remote delivery model, with travel undertaken where necessary and approved at Task Order level. Accordingly, geographic location of team members is not a formal requirement, nor is geographic spread assessed as a standalone evaluation criterion. Tenderers are expected to demonstrate that they have effective access to the required expertise and the ability to mobilise resources as needed to deliver Task Orders successfully, regardless of physical location. Where relevant, proximity to local contexts or networks may be considered an operational advantage for specific Task Orders, but this does not constitute a mandatory requirement at tender stage.</p>
<p>83</p>	<p>Staffing & Key Experts</p>	<p>Can key experts proposed in the tender be replaced during contract implementation, and if so, under what conditions and with what prior approval requirements from FMO?</p>	<p>The RFP does not distinguish “key experts” as a formal category. However, proposed experts forming part of the tender are expected to be available and committed as submitted. Replacements are in principle possible, provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ They are duly justified (e.g. unavailability or specific expertise required for a Task Order) ✓ The replacement expert has equivalent or higher qualifications and experience

			<p>✓ They comply with the same eligibility and selection requirements</p> <p>All replacements are subject to prior written approval by FMO. This approach ensures continuity of the evaluated team while allowing flexibility in line with the framework contract and Task Order structure.</p>
84	Evaluation & Procurement Process	Section 5.2 refers to an "Assessment method for Financial Assessment (price/daily fee rates)." Can FMO confirm the exact weighting between the Technical and Financial scores, and clarify which specific daily fee rates will be evaluated (e.g., per expert category)?	<p>The evaluation follows a best price–quality ratio, with the following weighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Technical Proposal: 70% ✓ Financial Proposal: 30% <p>The technical assessment is scored out of 100 points, and the financial assessment out of 20 points, with only tenders scoring at least 75 points in the technical evaluation proceeding to financial assessment.</p> <p>The financial evaluation is based on the daily fee rates submitted in Annex IV per expert category (e.g. junior, medior, senior, director/manager).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The calculation is based on the average of the daily rates across the proposed expert categories ✓ Financial scores are determined through a relative comparison to the lowest-priced offer <p>This approach ensures a balanced assessment of quality and price, fully aligned with the RFP evaluation methodology and supporting documents.</p>
85	Evaluation & Procurement Process	Will interviews (scheduled 16–21 June 2026) be mandatory for all tenderers who pass the technical threshold, or only for a shortlisted group? If shortlisted, what is the shortlisting criterion?	Tenderers that achieve at least 75 points in the technical evaluation will be invited to an interview.

<p>86</p>	<p>Compliance & EC Requirements</p>	<p>As the DFCD Aya TAF is financed under NDICI-EFSD+ and all activities must comply with EC PRAG-based procurement procedures: will the PDCC be required to use specific EC procurement templates (e.g., EC standard contracts, visibility requirements) for all Task Order procurements, or will FMO's own procurement templates take precedence? Is there a procurement manual or operational guide that will be shared with the selected PDCC?</p>	<p>The PDCC will implement procurement in line with FMO's procurement rules and templates, which are aligned with PRAG principles under the pillar-assessed framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ FMO templates and procedures take precedence ✓ Compliance with PRAG principles, EU requirements (including visibility where applicable), and donor obligations is mandatory <p>A TA Operational Manual (to be developed under the assignment) and further operational guidance will be used to ensure consistency and compliance during implementation.</p>
<p>87</p>	<p>Compliance & EC Requirements</p>	<p>What are FMO's audit and access-to-accounts requirements under the EC contribution agreement? Will the PDCC and its subcontractors be subject to EC audits, OLAF investigations, or European Court of Auditors reviews, and should this be factored into the proposed methodology and staffing?</p>	<p>As the programme is financed under NDICI-EFSD+, the contract will be subject to standard EU audit, control, and access-to-records requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The PDCC and its subcontractors must ensure full access to records, accounts, and supporting documentation for audit and verification purposes ✓ They may be subject to audits and controls by FMO and, where applicable, EU bodies (including the European Commission, OLAF, and the European Court of Auditors) ✓ Appropriate record-keeping, documentation, and compliance measures must be maintained throughout implementation <p>Tenderers should therefore ensure that their methodology, systems, and staffing arrangements allow for robust financial management, traceability, and audit readiness.</p>

<p>88</p>	<p>Interaction between the DFCD Aya PDCC RFP and the EFSD+/IYBA ESG TA Framework (EFSD-TA-XX-001)</p>	<p>The separate FMO tender for ESG Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building Services under EFSD+ and IYBA (Reference EFSD-TA-XX-001) indicates that DFCD-Aya falls within the scope of that framework. Could FMO clarify how the roles and boundaries of these two procurements are intended to interact in practice, specifically: Is the PDCC under this RFP expected to procure and manage TA implementers for DFCD Aya through the separate ESG TA framework where relevant, or will TA under DFCD Aya be procured independently under this facility? If both mechanisms may be used, how will responsibilities be delineated between the PDCC and the providers appointed under the ESG TA framework to avoid duplication or ambiguity in roles?</p>	<p>For DFCD Aya Technical Assistance activities, the PDCC under this RFP is the primary coordination and delivery management mechanism, responsible for scoping, procuring, supervising, and managing TA assignments commissioned under the DFCD Aya TA Facility. TA under DFCD Aya is therefore not automatically procured through the ESG TA framework, unless explicitly determined by FMO to be the most appropriate procurement route for a specific assignment. Where FMO decides that an existing procurement mechanism—such as the ESG TA framework—is suitable for a particular DFCD Aya TA assignment, the roles and responsibilities will be clearly delineated at Task Order level.</p>
<p>89</p>	<p>Interaction between the DFCD Aya PDCC RFP and the EFSD+/IYBA ESG TA Framework (EFSD-TA-XX-001)</p>	<p>To what extent should tenderers for this PDCC role assume coordination with, or reliance on, the ESG TA framework in designing their methodology and resource approach?</p>	<p>Tenderers for the PDCC role should not assume reliance on, or systematic coordination with, the ESG TA framework when designing their methodology or resource approach. The PDCC under this RFP is expected to operate as the primary coordination and delivery management mechanism for DFCD Aya Technical Assistance. While FMO may, in specific cases, determine that an existing procurement mechanism such as the ESG TA framework is an appropriate route for a particular DFCD Aya TA assignment, this would be decided by FMO on a case-by-case basis. Any such use would be clearly defined at Task Order level.</p>

<p>90</p>	<p>Interaction between the DFCD Aya PDCC RFP and the EFSD+/IYBA ESG TA Framework (EFSD-TA-XX-001)</p>	<p>In addition, could FMO clarify whether the coexistence of these two procurement mechanisms gives rise to any conflict-of-interest or eligibility considerations that tenderers should take into account, including where entities may participate in both under appropriate safeguards?</p>	<p>Participation in multiple procurement mechanisms does not in itself give rise to a conflict of interest or affect eligibility. However, any potential conflict of interest will be assessed by FMO on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature of the assignment and the role of the entity involved.</p>
<p>91</p>	<p>Place of performance of the PDCC</p>	<p>The RFP states <i>"Under this Task Order, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant (PDCC) works alongside FMO's internal DFCD Aya TA Programme Staff, providing..."</i>. We assume that the PDCC can be based anywhere (assuming can be available for calls with FMO during working hours) rather than having to be based at or near FMO's office in the Hague. i.e. it is not expected that the PDCC will need to be available to meet FMO staff in person on a daily basis, but rather regular remote calls (on a bi-weekly basis as per the TOR), and periodic meetings in person. Is bi-weekly assumed to be once every two weeks, or twice per week?</p>	<p>See Question 82. The RFP does not require the PDCC team or key experts to be based in, or near, specific geographies (such as Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, or Asia-Pacific). The assignment is expected to be delivered primarily through a remote delivery model, with travel undertaken where necessary and approved at Task Order level. Accordingly, geographic location of team members is not a formal requirement, nor is geographic spread assessed as a standalone evaluation criterion. Tenderers are expected to demonstrate that they have effective access to the required expertise and the ability to mobilise resources as needed to deliver Task Orders successfully, regardless of physical location. Where relevant, proximity to local contexts or networks may be considered an operational advantage for specific Task Orders, but this does not constitute a mandatory requirement at tender stage. Bi-weekly in this context refers to once every two weeks.</p>
<p>92</p>	<p>Core PDCC team and task order 2 team positions</p>	<p>Can we propose a different team set-up for both the core PDCC team and task order 2 team?</p>	<p>Yes. Tenderers may propose an alternative team set-up for both the Core PDCC Team and the Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Strategy) Team. As the RFP states, the core ask is that the proposal still meets the minimum requirements set out in the RFP (roles/competencies, availability).</p>

<p>93</p>	<p>Ecosystem Development Support Strategy / Landscape Prioritisation Methodology</p>	<p>Pg 6 states "A Landscape Prioritisation Methodology, incorporating systematic mapping of relevant ongoing programmes and initiatives, including FMO's own investments, to ensure coherence between DFCD Aya landscape funding under Component 2C, the identification of potential future DFCD Aya debt investment opportunities, and FMO's broader programmes and strategic priorities, thereby ensuring complementarity and avoiding duplication;" Regarding the identification of potential future DFCD Aya debt investment opportunities, do such opportunities need to have been identified in the strategy which seems unrealistic for a 2mth period, or is it that the strategy will define landscapes where there are likely to be potential debt investment opportunities.</p>	<p>The intention is not that specific future DFCD Aya debt investment opportunities are fully identified or developed within the two-month timeframe of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy. Rather, the strategy is expected to define and prioritise landscapes where there is a reasonable likelihood of future DFCD Aya debt investment opportunities, based on systematic mapping of existing programmes, initiatives, FMO investments, and broader strategic priorities. This landscape-level analysis is intended to identify where conditions are conducive to pipeline development and future investment, rather than to originate or pre-screen individual debt transactions. More detailed identification, scoping, and development of concrete investment opportunities—where relevant—would be expected to take place subsequently, through targeted follow-up work and dedicated Task Orders, rather than as part of the initial strategy exercise.</p>
<p>94</p>	<p>Eligibility</p>	<p>Could you please confirm that a UK register company can participate in this tender as partner?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>95</p>	<p>Project References</p>	<p>RFP indicates that we need to provide One proven experience in the coordination and management of at least one multi-year EC Funded TA facilities programme, or comparable framework contract... Would it be valid to provide a reference as a consortium partner of such a experience and not a leading company?</p>	<p>See Question 9. Where a tender is submitted by a consortium, the selection criteria may be fulfilled collectively by the consortium members. Relevant experience and references may therefore be demonstrated through the combined experience of the consortium, provided it is clearly indicated which member is responsible for which role and scope under the framework.</p>
<p>96</p>	<p>Templates</p>	<p>Could you please confirm if there is a required template for the CV's format?</p>	<p>As the RFP does not indicate any required template, there is no required template for the CV format, however there is a maximum limit of 2 pages per expert.</p>

97	Procurement process	Could you please confirm if the procurement process is based on the PRAG 2025 rules?	The procurement is not conducted directly under PRAG 2025 procedures. As FMO is pillar-assessed by the European Commission, the procedure is carried out using FMO's own procurement rules and templates, which are aligned with the key principles of PRAG (e.g. transparency, equal treatment, sound financial management). This reflects the indirect management framework, under which FMO applies its own systems while ensuring compliance with EU requirements and donor obligations.
98	Audits	Is there a verification of the expenditures by a third party foreseen?	Activities under the programme are subject to applicable European Commission requirements, including audit and reporting obligations. This may include verification of expenditures by relevant audit bodies in line with these requirements.
99	Reimbursable Expenses	We understand that reimbursable expenses are not part of the financial evaluation. However, are reimbursable costs, to be included to the maximum framework budget value?	See Question 74. The 10% cap / indicative EUR 600,000 ceiling applies to Programme Delivery Coordination fees only. Other reimbursable costs such as travel costs for PDCC staff are not included within this fee cap, unless explicitly bundled into daily rates by the tenderer. Where reimbursables such as travel is required, such costs may be reimbursed separately and at cost, provided they are explicitly foreseen, justified, and approved in the relevant Task Order, and incurred in line with applicable contractual and financial control requirements.
100	Reimbursable Expenses	Please specify your understanding of eligible costs under a Task Order	Only costs that are directly linked to the delivery of the Task Order scope and incurred within the agreed timeframe are eligible. Costs not explicitly included or approved in the Task Order are not eligible. The eligibility of specific cost categories is therefore determined at Task Order level, rather than generically at framework level.
101	Scope of Task Order 2	The Programme Targets mentioned in figure 2 under Component 2 A+B include coordination meetings. Is our understanding correct that the budget for such events should not be included in	The Programme Targets shown in Figure 2 under Component 2A+B, such as coordination meetings and convening activities, relate to subsequent programme implementation and are not expected to be budgeted under Task Order 2. Costs associated with such coordination meetings

		the allocated budget up to 250.000 EUR for the Task Order 2?	or events would be scoped, approved, and budgeted under separate, subsequent Task Orders, where relevant.
102	Task order 2 Ecosystem budget envelope	Could you please clarify whether the EUR 250,000 envelope is intended only for the initial two-month deployment phase, or whether it also covers continued expert involvement beyond this period (e.g. convening events, online meetings, and other activities under components 2a, 2b, and 2c)?	The allocated budget of up to EUR 250,000 for Task Order 2 is intended to cover the development of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy itself, including analytical work, mapping, consultations, and preparation of strategy outputs., Future outputs such as coordination meetings and convening activities, relate to subsequent programme implementation and are not expected to be budgeted under Task Order 2. Costs associated with such coordination meetings or events would be scoped, approved, and budgeted under separate, subsequent Task Orders, where relevant.
103	Task order 2 Engagement of experts	<p>The RfS indicates that Task Order 2 does not require continuous engagement of the expertise for the full duration of the framework contract.</p> <p>Could you please clarify whether the experts proposed for the initial ecosystem support (e.g. during the first two months) are expected to conclude their involvement after this period, and whether they would subsequently be considered in a situation of conflict of interest for participation in future Task Orders?</p> <p>Alternatively, would it be possible to foresee their continued or renewed engagement under subsequent assignments, if their expertise remains relevant?</p>	<p>Task Order 2 does not require continuous engagement of the ecosystem development expertise for the full duration of the Framework Contract. The experts proposed for the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy are expected to be engaged for the duration and scope of Task Order 2 only, which is focused on the development of the strategy.</p> <p>Following completion of Task Order 2, the involvement of these experts may conclude. Their prior participation in Task Order 2 does not automatically place them in a situation of conflict of interest with respect to future Task Orders. Any potential conflict of interest would be assessed on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature of the subsequent assignment and the role envisaged.</p> <p>Where relevant and subject to FMO approval, it would be possible to foresee continued or renewed engagement of the same experts under subsequent Task Orders, if their expertise remains appropriate and provided that all conflict-of-interest, role-separation, and procurement requirements are fully respected.</p>
104	Technical proposal format	Are there any preferred layout requirements (e.g. font type/size, margins, formatting), beyond the indicated 16-page limit?	No. There are no mandatory layout requirements beyond the 16-page limit for the technical proposal. However, proposals are preferably submitted in PowerPoint using Arial font, size 10.

105	Backstopping team	Could you confirm whether CVs of the backstopping team are expected to be submitted at this stage?	No. CVs of the backstopping team are not required to be submitted at this stage. The RFP requires CVs to be provided for the key experts proposed for the Project Team. Backstopping or supporting experts may be described at a role or profile level in the technical proposal, but their individual CVs are not mandatory at tender stage.
106	Availability Statement	Could you please confirm whether the availability statement should be included within the CVs (and therefore count toward the 2-page limit), or submitted as a separate standalone document not counted within this limit?	The Availability Statement may be included within the CV or submitted as a separate page. In line with previous guidance, CVs and Availability Statements may be combined or provided as separate, clearly identifiable documents, provided that all requirements are clearly labelled and easy to verify.
107	Experts profiles for subsequent Task Orders	Could you please clarify whether it will be possible to introduce additional expert CVs for subsequent Task Orders, or whether all experts potentially involved across the framework contract should already be presented at this stage? In particular, should we include a broader pool of profiles now, even if their involvement may only be required for later assignments?	See Question 105. The RFP requires CVs to be provided for the key experts proposed for the Project Team. Backstopping or supporting experts may be described at a role or profile level in the technical proposal, but their individual CVs are not mandatory at tender stage.
108	Team composition and allocation of expertise	Could you please clarify whether the expertise required under the coordination team and the ecosystem team can be distributed across several individuals, or whether it is expected that each role be covered by a single expert?	Tenderers may organise their teams as they deem appropriate. The required expertise for the Programme Delivery Coordination function and the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy may be distributed across several individuals, provided that the minimum role, competency, and availability requirements set out in the RFP are met.

109	Addition of partners for future task order	Could you please clarify whether the tenderer is allowed to introduce additional partners for future task order under the framework, or whether the consortium composition must remain unchanged as submitted at the tender stage?	The consortium composition as submitted forms the basis of the evaluated tender and is expected to remain largely stable during implementation. However, the introduction of additional partners or subcontractors for specific Task Orders may be considered, provided that: ✓ It is duly justified (e.g. need for specialised expertise) ✓ The new entities comply with the same eligibility and selection requirements ✓ The change does not alter the fundamental conditions of the contract or distort competition All such additions are subject to prior written approval by FMO.
110	Eligibility of service providers	Is a consortium of two legal entities/organizations, who has been selected and awarded the Framework Contract thus intending to carry out the assignments under Task Order 1 (PDCC) and Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy), eligible to also partake in the individual tenders for the expected subsequent 15-20 Task Orders that are expected during the lifetime of the facility?	See Question 14. The procurement of implementing consultants is expected primarily to take the form of competitive selection of third-party consultants or firms under Task Orders, in line with FMO's Public Procurement Policy and applicable EC-compliant procedures. Mobilisation of experts from within the PDCC or its consortium may be permissible where justified, clearly defined, and approved within the relevant Task Order, provided there is no conflict of interest and all compliance requirements are met.
111	Tendering procedures under the lifetime of the facility	During the lifetime of the facility, shall the subsequent 15-20 Task Orders follow established FMO procurement rules, or will the awarded PDCC's procurement rules apply?	FMO's procurement principles will be applied.
112	Contracting authority	With reference to the document 3. RFP_DFCD-XX-1, section 1.1. Contracting Authority, details the FMO being the contracting authority. However, the footnote in the same section (footnote 1: "FMO is EC pillar assessed for procurement. FMO main activity is	Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor ontwikkelingslanden N.V. (FMO is a trade name) is Contracting Authority for this tender.

		<p>Financial Services. FMO does not qualify as Contracting Authority. Official name: Nederlandse Financierings-Maatschappij voor ontwikkelingslanden N.V. (FMO is a trade name”). Can you please confirm which entity will be the contracting authority for this Framework Contract?</p>	
<p>113</p>	<p>Professional capacity of tenderer</p>	<p>With reference to the document 3. RFP_DFCD-XX-1, and in the context of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy under Task Order 2, please clarify whether alignment with EU initiatives should be interpreted narrowly—i.e. focused on Global Gateway and Team Europe Initiatives (TEIs)—or more broadly to include the wider landscape of EU-funded programmes and cooperation frameworks at country and regional level?</p>	<p>In the context of Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy), alignment with EU initiatives should be interpreted broadly, and not limited exclusively to Global Gateway and Team Europe Initiatives (TEIs).</p>
<p>114</p>	<p>Professional capacity of tenderer</p>	<p>With reference to the document 3. RFP_DFCD-XX-1, section 4. Format for Technical and Financial Offer, Part E (Names and CVs of personnel) for Task Order 2, please clarify how experience will be assessed for the (1) (Senior) Ecosystem Strategy Lead and (3) EU Policy / Donor Coordination Expert roles? Specifically, would relevant experience include broader coordination with European donors and development finance actors (e.g. DFIs, or multi-donor platforms), even where this is not directly linked to Global Gateway or Team Europe Initiatives, provided that the proposed expert demonstrates familiarity</p>	<p>The RFP requires experience with EU-funded programmes or donor coordination frameworks, with demonstrated familiarity with Global Gateway priorities and Team Europe Initiatives (TEIs), and experience engaging with EU Delegations or comparable public-sector stakeholders. Relevant experience is therefore not limited exclusively to Global Gateway or TEIs, provided the expert demonstrates alignment with EU priorities and coordination contexts.</p>

		with EU priorities and stakeholder engagement?	
115	Competition	How many parties do you expect to receive a bid from?	N/A
116	Geographical Scope	Which countries within the following regions do you expect the DFCD Aya investments to be located in Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia-Pacific?	See Question 41. Beyond the requirement that activities are implemented in ODA-eligible countries, DFCD Aya does not define fixed geographic priorities upfront. In practice, geographic focus will be informed by the investment pipeline, alignment with Team Europe Initiatives and Global Gateway priorities, and will be further refined through the ecosystem development strategy, which is expected to identify regions where targeted ecosystem-level support can most effectively strengthen climate adaptation project origination and scale impact.
117	Contracting	Can you confirm that FMO Netherlands will be the contracting party for all Task Orders in the framework contract (and not a party registered in another country than The Netherlands)?	For certain Task Orders, investees or other partners may also act as co-contracting parties together with FMO.
118	Contracting	We note that the draft Framework Consultancy Agreement is currently based on English law and London arbitration. Given that the final contracting parties are expected to be Dutch entities, could you please confirm whether it would be acceptable to apply Dutch law and submit disputes to the competent courts in the Netherlands instead?	FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.

119	Contracting	Can you confirm that awarding the framework contract to a consulting firm means awarding the contract for Task Order 1 AND the contract for Task Order 2 AND the possibility to be awarded additional contracts for other Task Orders as the need arises?	Yes. Award of the Framework Contract entails the award of Task Order 1 (Programme Delivery Coordination) and Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy) to the selected consulting firm. In addition, the Framework Contract establishes the possibility (but not a guarantee) for the same firm to be awarded additional Task Orders over the duration of the framework, as needs arise and subject to FMO approval, in line with the non-exclusive, zero-value nature of the contract.
120	Contracting	How will the contracts for other Task Orders apart from Task Order 1 and Task Order 2 be awarded to the consulting firm that has won the framework contract: via direct allocation or via competition for each additional Task Order?	See question 13, 14 and 18. Award of the Framework Contract includes the award of Task Order 1 and Task Order 2. Any subsequent Task Orders are commissioned as needs arise and are subject to explicit scoping and approval by FMO. While the selected PDCC is the primary coordination and delivery-management consultant, implementation of subsequent Task Orders is expected, as a default, to be carried out by competitively procured third-party TA providers procured under Task Orders, with direct implementation by the PDCC or its consortium only permitted in exceptional, duly justified cases and subject to FMO approval.
121	Contracting	In the context of the requested availability statements for proposed key experts, we note that the Framework Contract has a duration of 58 months. Given the length of the framework, could FMO please confirm whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • substitutions of proposed experts would be permitted for valid and objective reasons (e.g. resignation, long term illness, maternity leave or other force majeure related circumstances), subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o justification, and o prior approval by FMO, and o replacement with experts of equal or higher qualifications? 	Yes

<p>122</p>	<p>Selection Criteria</p>	<p>Section 3.4.2 states of the tender document: The Tenderer (or consortium partner) that is delivering the services related to the Programme Delivery and Coordination Consultant (PDCC) role must demonstrate, at minimum:</p> <p>a) One proven experience in the coordination and management of at least one multi-year EC Funded TA facilities programme, or comparable framework contract involving multiple assignments and external service providers with a climate adaptation and/or climate mitigation focus.</p> <p>Could you please confirm that this is one of the 4 project references requested in section 4 of the tender document as part of the Technical Offer and not a reference in addition to the maximum of 4 requested as part of the Technical Offer?</p>	<p>Yes. The experience requirement set out in Section 3.4.2 is intended to be demonstrated through the project references submitted in Part D of the Technical Offer. The required experience may therefore be included as one of the maximum four (4) project references requested under Section 4 of the tender document, and does not need to be provided as an additional reference beyond this limit.</p>
<p>123</p>	<p>Selection Criteria</p>	<p>Section 3.4.2 states of the tender document: The Tenderer (or consortium partner) tasked with the delivery of Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy) must demonstrate:</p> <p>a) One proven experience in developing a concrete and decision-oriented multi country scoping report in the sustainable land-use sector that informs strategic investment priorities, TA pipelines, and/or ecosystem level interventions.</p> <p>Could you please confirm that this is one of the 4 project references requested in section 4 of the tender document as part of the Technical Offer and not a</p>	<p>See Question 122. Yes. The experience requirement set out in Section 3.4.2 is intended to be demonstrated through the project references submitted in Part D of the Technical Offer. The required experience may therefore be included as one of the maximum four (4) project references requested under Section 4 of the tender document, and does not need to be provided as an additional reference beyond this limit.</p>

		reference in addition to the maximum of 4 requested as part of the Technical Offer?	
124	Task Order 1	Is Task Order 1 (Programme Delivery Coordination) expected to be issued annually , and if so, will its scope and level of effort be materially revised each year, or is a largely stable annual scope anticipated?	Task Order 1 (Programme Delivery Coordination) is expected to be commissioned on a recurring basis, typically reflecting an annual implementation cycle. However, its scope and level of effort are not fixed and may be reviewed and adjusted each year, depending on programme needs, pipeline maturity, and the expected volume and complexity of Task Orders for the relevant period.
125	Task Order 1	Can FMO clarify the boundary between the responsibilities of FMO DFCD Aya Programme Staff and the PDCC, particularly with respect to TA pipeline prioritisation and strategic decision-making, to avoid role overlap during programme implementation?	See Question 59 and Question 44 - FMO retains primary responsibility for pipeline generation, strategic oversight, and investment decision-making under DFCD Aya. The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant (PDCC) does not have a decision-making or approval role in relation to the investment pipeline. At the same time, the PDCC is expected to contribute in a supportive and collaborative capacity, including through structured brainstorming and technical input on pipeline development as requested by FMO. In practice, this includes a meaningful level of joint scoping and needs assessment, working closely with FMO and partners to refine TA scope and sequencing. The PDCC supports FMO by translating identified pipeline priorities into well-structured Technical Assistance interventions, including needs assessments, preparation of Terms of Reference, and coordination of TA delivery processes, based on direction and priorities set by FMO.

<p>126</p>	<p>PDCC responsibilities</p>	<p>To what extent are reporting formats, indicators, and other documentation for DFCD Aya TA activities already defined under the EC Contribution Agreement, versus being developed by the PDCC during implementation?</p>	<p>FMO uses its own standard reporting and documentation formats for managing Technical Assistance assignments (e.g., Task Order workplans and assignment / project closure documentation). In parallel, the EC Contribution Agreement already defines the programme-level reporting requirements and indicator framework that DFCD Aya must report against. The PDCC is therefore expected to align Task Order-level reporting and results tracking with these existing requirements, and to use FMO’s formats as the baseline. Where FMO identifies a need for additional or adapted reporting formats, indicators, tools, or documentation (e.g., to strengthen consolidation across Task Orders, harmonise templates, or enhance MEL and learning), this would be discussed and—if required—scoped and commissioned as part of a specific Task Order during implementation, with an agreed budget and deliverables.</p>
<p>127</p>	<p>PDCC responsibilities</p>	<p>Can FMO clarify whether the (Senior) Procurement and Contracting Specialist is expected to play a hands-on operational role in the procurement and contracting of TA implementers (including drafting procurement dossiers, managing tender processes, and contract administration), or whether the role is intended primarily to provide procedural set-up, guidance, and quality assurance, with FMO retaining day-to-day procurement execution?</p>	<p>The PDCC core team is expected to play a hands-on operational role in the procurement and contracting of TA implementers under the Framework Contract. The (Senior) Procurement and Contracting Specialist is expected to support the PDCC core team by providing procedural set-up, guidance, and quality assurance for the procurement and contracting of TA implementers. This includes advising on procurement approaches, ensuring compliance with FMO procurement rules and donor requirements, and supporting the preparation and review of procurement documentation. While FMO retains overall oversight, approval authority, and final decision-making, day-to-day operational procurement activities for Task Orders are expected to be carried out by the PDCC, with the Procurement and Contracting Specialist ensuring procedural compliance, quality assurance, and effective execution.</p>

<p>128</p>	<p>PDCC responsibilities</p>	<p>Can FMO clarify whether the PDCC is expected to procure TA implementers predominantly through open competitive tenders, or whether existing FMO framework suppliers are expected to be used wherever possible, and under what conditions?</p>	<p>See Question 14 and Question 48. The procurement of implementing consultants is expected primarily to take the form of competitive selection of third-party consultants or firms under Task Orders, in line with FMO’s Public Procurement Policy and applicable EC-compliant procedures. For DFCD Aya Technical Assistance activities, the PDCC under this RFP is the primary coordination and delivery management mechanism, responsible for scoping, procuring, supervising, and managing TA assignments commissioned under the DFCD Aya TA Facility. TA under DFCD Aya is therefore not automatically procured through FMO’s existing frameworks, such as the ESG TA framework, unless explicitly determined by FMO to be the most appropriate procurement route for a specific assignment. Where FMO decides that an existing procurement mechanism—such as the ESG TA framework—is suitable for a particular DFCD Aya TA assignment, the roles and responsibilities will be clearly delineated at Task Order level.</p>
<p>129</p>	<p>Task Order 2</p>	<p>Can FMO indicate whether alignment with Global Gateway priorities and Team Europe Initiatives is expected to be primarily analytical/strategic, or whether the PDCC is also expected to support ongoing coordination and engagement activities with EU Delegations beyond Task Order 2?</p>	<p>Alignment with Global Gateway priorities and Team Europe Initiatives (TEIs) is expected to be primarily analytical and strategic under Task Order 2, where the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy defines priority landscapes, coordination approaches, and alignment opportunities. Ongoing coordination and engagement with EU Delegations beyond Task Order 2, where required, would be scoped and commissioned under subsequent Task Orders, rather than being assumed as a standing responsibility under Task Order 2.</p>
<p>130</p>	<p>The foundation, governance and accountability</p>	<p>Is the programme Board already in place and functional for steering the mandates of the programme? If in place, how are the programme Board’s accountabilities structures and cascaded across all regions/countries as expected for this programme</p>	<p>There is no single, standalone Programme Board established for DFCD Aya. Programme oversight and steering are provided through a combination of governance and coordination structures, including programme-level coordination arrangements led by FMO, as well as other relevant internal and partner fora. The PDCC is expected to develop a clear understanding of these governance and coordination structures during programme start-up and to position itself appropriately, working through the relevant mechanisms to support effective</p>

			<p>coordination, information flow, and alignment across regions and programme components, under FMO's overall accountability.</p>
<p>131</p>	<p>Risk Management; Identify & assess</p>	<p>Is there an existing unified global governance, compliance and/or risk charter (framework) that consultant can make reference upon delivery of the this activity; or will the consultant be expected to create or tailor the existing one to the programme?</p>	<p>FMO has existing governance, compliance, and risk management frameworks in place at institutional and programme level that are applicable to DFCD Aya. These provide the overarching principles and requirements within which the programme operates.</p> <p>The consultant is not expected to create a new standalone global governance or risk charter, but rather to understand, reference, and where relevant tailor or operationalise existing frameworks to the specific context of the DFCD Aya programme and the scope of the assignment, in close coordination with FMO.</p>
<p>132</p>	<p>PDCC Scope</p>	<p>We understand that FMO expects niche technical expertise and/or geography-specific experience to be required for a lot of the frontline TA. As such, the RFP indicates that the PDCC will subcontract most of the frontline TA. Can FMO please clarify whether the PDCC may be directly contracted to deliver some of the EUR 5.4m in frontline TA work funded under Task Orders, where (1) they have the requisite capacity and experience and (2) direct contracting would deliver the most value for money?</p>	<p>See Question 13 - The Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant is not expected, as a standard delivery model, to implement TA assignments directly. However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, and subject to explicit approval by FMO at Task Order level, the Programme Delivery Coordination Consultant may also deliver a specific TA assignment directly. In such cases, the experts deployed and the applicable daily rates for that specific Task Order would need to be explicitly proposed, negotiated, and aligned with FMO as part of the Task Order approval, rather than automatically applying the framework rates. The Consultant would be acting as a TA implementer for that Task Order only.</p> <p>Any such arrangement must be clearly reflected in the relevant Task Order and remain fully compliant with the budget structure, role separation, and conflict-of-interest provisions set out in the RFP and the Framework Contract. All Task Orders remain subject to FMO approval.</p>

<p>133</p>	<p>Task Order 2 Implementer</p>	<p>The RFP indicates in multiple places that a specialized management consulting firm is expected to be involved in the implementation of Task Order 2. Given that the work to be conducted under Task Order 2 is not limited to the landscape finance piece of Component 2C, would it be acceptable for the prime contractor to lead this work if its proposed personnel possess the integrated landscape approach expertise required? Is there a specific reason FMO would like to have a separate firm involved in the delivery of Task Order 2?</p>	<p>The RFP requires that specialised ecosystem and integrated landscape expertise be available for Task Order 2, but does not mandate the involvement of a separate firm. Task Order 2 may be led by the prime contractor, provided the proposed personnel demonstrably meet the required expertise and availability requirements.</p>
<p>134</p>	<p>Part C Work Plan</p>	<p>To support development of a realistic Part C: Work Plan, can FMO please provide any additional information concerning the types, timelines, and sequencing of the ToRs/Task Orders expected over the lifetime of the facility, beyond the high-level 15–20 estimate?</p>	<p>See Question 3, 42 , 58 and 67 - The RFP provides an indicative planning assumption of approximately 15–20 Task Orders over the 58-month lifetime of the Framework Contract, with around three Task Orders anticipated in Year 1. Beyond this, FMO does not define a fixed or pre-determined pipeline of Task Orders broken down by component, timing, or budget envelope. Task Orders will be commissioned on a demand-driven basis, informed by the maturity of the investment pipeline, programme priorities, and availability of funding. As such, the number, sequencing, component allocation, and timing of Task Orders cannot be guaranteed in advance, nor are they expected to follow an even annual distribution. Some clustering may occur depending on programme needs. Accordingly, FMO does not provide a more detailed indicative pipeline by Component (1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C) or by year at this stage. Tenderers are expected to propose a flexible resourcing approach capable of responding to varying Task Order volumes and scopes over time, within the indicative parameters set out in the RFP.</p>

<p>135</p>	<p>TA Pipeline</p>	<p>Are there indicative target sectors or thematic allocations for TA under this facility (e.g. % allocation across agriculture, forestry, financial intermediaries, etc.)?</p>	<p>The Technical Assistance budget is allocated by programme component and by region, rather than by sector or thematic area (e.g. agriculture, forestry, financial intermediaries). Beyond the overall scope and objectives described for the programme components, the RFP envisages that Technical Assistance activities will be demand-driven and responsive to programme needs, rather than guided by pre-defined sectoral or thematic budget allocations.</p>
<p>136</p>	<p>Client financial contributions</p>	<p>Where DFCD investees or prospective customers make a financial contribution to a TA assignment, will this contribution be handled exclusively between FMO and the customer, or can it be transferred directly to the Contractor as part of the Task Order budget?</p>	<p>Where DFCD investees or prospective customers make a financial contribution to a Technical Assistance assignment, this contribution is handled directly between the customer and the TA implementer (i.e. the subcontracted consultant), in accordance with the arrangements defined for the relevant Task Order. The PDCC is responsible for ensuring that any customer cost-share is appropriately structured, documented, and reflected in the Task Order scope and budget, and for overseeing compliance with the agreed arrangements, while financial transactions themselves do not flow through the PDCC or FMO.</p>
<p>137</p>	<p>Task Order 1 and 2</p>	<p>If a combination of different, specialized suppliers would offer the best solution for FMO, would FMO consider opting for different suppliers for Task Order 1 (Programme Delivery Coordination) and Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy)? Would FMO appreciate Tenders to only propose for either Task Order 1 or Task Order 2 or will FMO only accept full scope offers?</p>	<p>FMO will only accept full-scope tenders covering both Task Order 1 (Programme Delivery Coordination) and Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy), to ensure overall coherence and accountability under a single Framework Contract. At the same time, the RFP recognises that specialised expertise may be required specifically for Task Order 2. Such expertise may be provided through the prime contractor's own team or through a consortium partner or subcontractor engaged for Task Order 2 only, and does not need to be maintained as a party to the Framework Contract for its full duration, provided the required competencies are demonstrably available at tender stage.</p>

<p>138</p>	<p>Budget</p>	<p>As per RFP paragraph 2.5, the maximum budget ceiling allocated under this framework is EUR 6,000,000. This amount covers the costs of: a) Programme delivery coordination activities, capped at a maximum of 10% of the cumulative value of Task Orders contracted under the framework over the entire implementation period of 58 months (with an indicative cap of up to EUR 600,000); and b) Frontline delivery of projects. Do we understand correctly there is no upfront budget allocation available for the activities under Task Order 1 and Task Order 2? If so, can FMO provide an indication of the distribution per Task Order?</p>	<p>The RFP indicates an indicative budget of up to EUR 250,000 for Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy), reflecting its defined and time-bound scope. Aside from this indication for Task Order 2, the Framework Contract is concluded on a non-exclusive and zero-value basis, and there is no upfront budget allocation attached to Task Order 1 or to the framework as a whole at award stage. At the time of contracting Task Order 1, the scope and budget for Programme Delivery Coordination activities for the first year of programming will be agreed between FMO and the selected consultant, based on anticipated programme needs and workload. Budgets for subsequent Task Orders will be defined, scoped, and approved at Task Order level.</p>
<p>139</p>	<p>Direct contracting</p>	<p>Does the Framework allow DFCD customers to procure additional or follow-on services directly from the selected Contractor outside the Task Order structure, or must all such services be contracted through FMO-issued Task Orders?</p>	<p>Where FMO provides funding or cost-share for a Technical Assistance assignment, such services must be contracted through FMO-issued Task Orders under the Framework Contract, in line with applicable procurement and financial control requirements. Where no FMO funding is involved, DFCD customers may independently procure additional or follow-on services outside the Task Order structure, at their own discretion. Such arrangements fall outside the scope of the Framework Contract and are not governed by FMO procurement processes.</p>
<p>140</p>	<p>Liability cap</p>	<p>Can FMO confirm whether liability arising from indemnities under the Framework Contract is intended to fall within the overall limitation of liability applicable to the Contractor, or whether it sits outside the agreed liability cap?</p>	<p>FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.</p>

141 Liability cap

We appreciate your willingness to limit liability. The graduated scale used contains a higher liability than we are used to agreeing with our clients. In view of the above, we request you to replace the text of Article 15.1 with the text proposal below. Can you agree to this? If the Client demonstrates that it has suffered damage as a result of faults on the part of the Contractor that can be attributed to it, any liability of the Contractor for damage, whether on the basis of breach of contract or unlawful act, or on the basis of the law or otherwise, is limited to a maximum of three times the amount of the fee for the assignment in question, invoiced to the Client. In the case of an assignment with a duration of more than twelve months, the liability referred to here is limited to a maximum of three times the fee that was invoiced to the client in the context of the assignment in question in the last twelve months prior to the errors. The foregoing limitation does not apply to damage caused by intent or gross negligence on the part of the Contractor or by such a restriction prohibited by law or regulations. The Contractor consists of a network of affiliated member firms, each of which is a separate legal entity and belongs to the same global network. The Contractor enters into agreements independently. Pursuant to the law, the Contractor is liable for the auxiliary persons engaged by it (including

FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.

FMO

Entrepreneurial
Development
Bank

subcontractors). In the interest of the Contractor, but also in that of the Client in view of possible inadmissibility and to protect the Contractor's auxiliary persons, we request that the following be added to article 15: "The Client will only make any complaints, claims and rights of recourse known and/or exercise them vis-à-vis the Contractor, namely the contracting party to the Agreement."

142 Indemnification

FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published., Article 15.3 states that the Contractor must indemnify the Client against damage as a result of claims from third parties. This means that the Contractor's liability extends beyond the liability that we as a Contractor are willing to accept. We only accept liability towards our client, because that is what we do the work for. It is up to the client to assess the risks and to limit its own liability towards its counterparties.

Can you therefore agree to the disapplication of Article 15.3?

If you do not honour this request, can you confirm that the liability arising from the indemnification (1) falls under the agreed limitation of liability (as requested by us) and that (2) the indemnification only relates to the claims of third parties that are the result of an attributable shortcoming on the part of the Contractor?"

FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.

<p>143</p>	<p>Third-party claims</p>	<p>Is FMO willing to confirm that any indemnification obligations of the Contractor are limited to third-party claims resulting from an attributable shortcoming of the Contractor, excluding claims caused by FMO, DFCD customers, or third parties not engaged by the Contractor? We would like to request that you add the following provision to article 15.3. Do you agree with this?</p> <p>"The Client indemnifies the Contractor against claims from third parties for damage caused by the Client or third parties not engaged by the Contractor having provided incorrect or incomplete documents or information to the Contractor, unless the Client can demonstrate that the damage is not related to culpable acts or omissions on its part or is caused by intent or gross negligence on the part of the Contractor."</p>	<p>FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.</p>
<p>144</p>	<p>Intellectual property</p>	<p>Under our professional rules, we are not allowed to transfer IP rights to our clients. After all, this could result in our clients being allowed to adjust the statements and/or reports issued by us. Can FMO clarify whether it is acceptable for Contractors to retain IP in pre-existing methodologies, tools, and know-how, while granting FMO a license to use deliverables produced under Task Orders for DFCD-related purposes?</p>	<p>FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.</p>

145 Confidentiality & Data

The Contractor consists of a network of affiliated member firms, each of which is a separate legal entity and belongs to the same global network. In view of the way in which the Contractor is organised, it is important for the Contractor that the Contractor can share information with other member firms. For this reason, the Contractor proposes to add the following to article 12:

"The Contractor is permitted to share confidential information with the Contractor's member companies if this is necessary in the context of the performance of the work. The Contractor guarantees that these member firms comply with the confidentiality obligations."

FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.

146

**GDPR –
processing
personal data**

Annex 7, article 29 - The mutual agreements with regard to the processing of personal data (including a possible processing agreement) are further regulated in the agreement. As a business service provider, we will usually act as a data controller because of our independent, objective and expert position. In addition, it is possible that the Contractor, but also other (foreign) member firms - which belong to the same global network to which the Contractor belongs - and external service providers as referred to under the heading confidentiality, may come into contact with information about the Client, including personal data, in the context of the work for the Client. Of course, the sharing of the relevant information will only take place if this is necessary for the purpose of the service, all this according to the applicable legislation. For this reason, we propose to include the following provision as Article 29"Information about the Client, including personal data, may be processed by the Contractor, other member firms belonging to the same global network to which the Contractor belongs and external service providers in the various countries in which they operate. The processing of information that the Contractor has received from the Client takes place in accordance with the applicable laws and professional regulations. The transfer of personal data

FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.

		<p>within the network of member firms to which the Contractor belongs is subject to the Contractor's Binding Corporate Rules policies. The Client guarantees that it is authorised to provide Personal Data to the Contractor in connection with the performance of the services, and that any Personal Data provided to the Contractor have been processed in accordance with the applicable legislation."</p>	
<p>147</p>	<p>Client readiness</p>	<p>Does FMO use, or plan to use, a standard onboarding or intake checklist for DFCD customers that defines minimum requirements, applicable standards, and common capability gaps, and will such tools be available to the Contractor to support Task Order design?</p>	<p>FMO uses onboarding, appraisal, and due-diligence processes primarily at the investment stage to assess DFCD customers against minimum requirements, applicable standards, and key capability gaps. These processes are not designed as a standalone or standardised intake checklist for Technical Assistance design outside the investment context. For Technical Assistance assignments, the Contractor is expected to work with FMO on a case-by-case basis to identify relevant gaps and requirements for Task Order design, drawing</p>

FMO

Entrepreneurial
Development
Bank

			on available investment-stage insights where applicable, rather than relying on a predefined TA-specific onboarding tool.
148	Inspection of Insurance	<p>On the basis of agreements with our insurer, we are not permitted to give third parties (including clients) access to the insurance policy or individual policy conditions. However, as an alternative, we can provide proof of insurance, being a statement from the insurer stating that we are adequately insured.</p> <p>Is it sufficient for us to submit this statement?</p>	FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.
149	Additional Provision	<p>As an organization, we must adhere to the (professional) regulations that apply to us. To this end, we would like to include the following provision:</p> <p>"1. The Contractor shall carry out the assignment in accordance with the applicable (professional) regulations and what is required of him by or pursuant to the law. The Client will always fully respect the obligations arising from this for the Contractor. Professional regulations are understood to mean the relevant rules of conduct and professional conduct of the (directors of) members/partners, directors, employees and/or third parties involved in the implementation, such as the rules of, for</p>	FMO does not agree to amendments nor provides clarifications regarding the Framework Agreement or Task Order templates at the tender stage. The contractual terms in Annex 7 apply as published.

		<p>example, NBA, NOREA, NOB and FB.</p> <p>2. In this context, the Contractor shall maintain a work file containing copies of relevant documents, which file shall be the property of the Contractor."</p>	
<p>150</p>	<p>Participation in multiple consortiums / subcontractor involvement</p>	<p>The tender documentation specifies that no more than one tender can be submitted by a natural or legal person, regardless of the form of participation. In this context, can FMO clarify whether this restriction is intended to also apply strictly to all subcontractors and non-lead consortium members, including those providing highly specialized or locally embedded expertise?</p> <p>In particular, is there any flexibility envisaged in cases where such actors may contribute to multiple bids in a limited or clearly delineated capacity, without affecting competition between lead bidders?</p>	<p>The restriction that no more than one tender may be submitted by a natural or legal person applies to tenderers, including lead tenderers and consortium partners. An entity acting as a tenderer (whether as lead or consortium member) may therefore only participate in one bid under this procurement.</p> <p>This restriction does not apply in the same way to subcontractors that are not part of the tendering entity. Subcontractors providing highly specialised or locally embedded expertise may support more than one tender, provided their role is clearly delineated, non-exclusive, and does not undermine fair competition or create conflicts of interest. Tenderers remain responsible for ensuring compliance with the applicable procurement and competition requirements.</p>
<p>151</p>	<p>Participation across Task Orders / conflict of interest</p>	<p>Can FMO clarify whether consultants involved in delivering Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy) would be eligible to participate in subsequent Task Orders issued under the framework (e.g., as implementers or subcontractors), and whether any</p>	<p>Consultants involved in delivering Task Order 2 (Ecosystem Development Support Strategy) are not automatically excluded from participating in subsequent Task Orders under the Framework Contract, whether as implementers or subcontractors. However, any such participation would be subject to a case-by-case conflict-of-interest assessment by FMO.</p>

		conflict-of-interest considerations would apply in such cases?	
152	Sourcing approach for subsequent Task Orders	Can FMO elaborate on the expected approach to sourcing implementers for subsequent Task Orders? Specifically, to what extent does FMO anticipate drawing on the PDCC consortium versus conducting open or competitive procurement processes for individual TA assignments? Is there any indicative expectation regarding the balance between consortium-delivered and externally procured TA assignments over the lifetime of the facility?	See Question 14 - Subsequent Task Orders are expected, as a default, to be implemented through the competitive procurement of third-party TA providers, in line with FMO's procurement rules and the Framework Contract. Mobilisation of expertise from within the PDCC consortium may be permitted where justified, clearly defined, and approved by FMO, but there is no predefined expectation or fixed balance between consortium-delivered and externally procured TA assignments over the lifetime of the facility.
153	Use of pre-qualified implementer pools	In the interest of ensuring timely and efficient execution of TA assignments, does FMO foresee the possibility of establishing a pool or roster of pre-qualified implementers (potentially including members of the PDCC consortium and/or other providers), from which consultants may be selected for subsequent Task Orders? If so, how would such a mechanism be structured within the procurement framework?	FMO does not foresee the establishment of a standing pool or roster of pre-qualified implementers at framework level. Implementers for subsequent Task Orders will be identified and procured on a case-by-case basis, in line with FMO's procurement rules and the specific requirements of each assignment.
154	Delivery model – global vs local capacity	How does FMO envision the balance between global expertise and locally embedded delivery capacity across both (i) the composition of the PDCC consortium and (ii) the sourcing of implementers for subsequent Task Orders?	The RFP does not require the PDCC team or key experts to be based in, or near, specific geographies. The assignment is expected to be delivered primarily through a remote delivery model, with travel undertaken where necessary and approved at Task Order level. For the implementation of specific Task Orders, geographic proximity and local or regional knowledge of customers and

		<p>In particular, are there any expectations or preferences regarding the role of locally based or regionally embedded firms in either the coordination function or the execution of TA assignments?</p>	<p>operating contexts may be considered an operational advantage, where relevant, to support effective and context-appropriate implementation, but this does not constitute a mandatory requirement.</p>
<p>155</p>	<p>Existing pipelines and strategic inputs (Origination Facility & Land Use Facility)</p>	<p>Can FMO provide further clarity on the extent to which investment strategies, priority landscape analyses, and/or pipelines have already been developed under the Origination Facility (managed by SNV/WWF) and the DFCD Land Use Facility (managed by FMO)? In particular, how mature are these pipelines and strategic frameworks at the time of PDCC engagement, and to what extent are they expected to inform the development of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy under Task Order 2?</p>	<p>Existing pipelines, analyses, and strategic inputs under DFCD Aya are at varying levels of maturity at the time of PDCC engagement and are expected to inform and provide key inputs to the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy under Task Order 2. However, these inputs should not be considered a complete or finalised strategic framework. Task Order 2 is explicitly intended to review and synthesise existing pipelines and analyses, assess pipeline depth at landscape level to inform prioritisation, and refine priority landscapes, coordination approaches, and sequencing of ecosystem-level interventions, rather than to originate, develop, or screen individual investment pipelines or opportunities.</p>
<p>156</p>	<p>Roles, responsibilities, and handoffs across DFCD facilities</p>	<p>How does FMO envision the respective roles of the Origination Facility, the DFCD Land Use Facility, and the PDCC in pipeline development, prioritisation, and translation into TA activities—particularly in relation to the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy under Task Order 2? In particular, where does FMO see the primary “handoff” between pipeline development (including origination and investment screening) and TA design and strategy development sitting?</p>	<p>See Question 93 - Task Order 2 is a strategic and analytical exercise: it is intended to review and synthesise existing pipelines and analyses, assess pipeline depth at landscape level to inform prioritisation, and refine coordination approaches and sequencing of ecosystem-level interventions. Task Order 2 does not involve the development or origination of new investment pipelines, which remain the responsibility of the Origination Facility and FMO at this stage. The intention is not that specific future DFCD Aya debt investment opportunities are fully identified or developed within the two-month timeframe of the Ecosystem Development Support Strategy. Rather, the strategy is expected to define and prioritise landscapes where there is a reasonable likelihood of future DFCD Aya debt investment opportunities, based on systematic mapping of existing programmes, initiatives, FMO investments,</p>

			<p>and broader strategic priorities. This landscape-level analysis is intended to identify where conditions are conducive to pipeline development and future investment, rather than to originate or pre-screen individual debt transactions.</p> <p>More detailed identification, scoping, and development of concrete investment opportunities—where relevant—would be expected to take place subsequently, through targeted follow-up work and dedicated Task Orders, rather than as part of the initial strategy exercise.</p>
<p>157</p>	<p>Subsequent task orders</p>	<p>Is there any additional information that FMO can share around size, high-level geographic distribution (e.g. Africa, LatAm, Asia), sector, etc. for the subsequent TA task orders expected?</p>	<p>See Question 41. Beyond the requirement that activities are implemented in ODA-eligible countries, DFCD Aya does not define fixed geographic priorities upfront. In practice, geographic focus will be informed by the investment pipeline, alignment with Team Europe Initiatives and Global Gateway priorities, and will be further refined through the ecosystem development strategy, which is expected to identify regions where targeted ecosystem-level support can most effectively strengthen climate adaptation project origination and scale impact.</p>