



THE ISLAMIC CORPORATION FOR
THE INSURANCE OF INVESTMENT
AND EXPORT CREDIT



The OIC Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC)

Assessment & Evaluation Report

*Prepared for Submission to the
42nd Ministerial Session of the COMCEC*

(30 October to 03 November 2026, Istanbul, Türkiye)

Assessment & Evaluation Report

Prepared for Submission to the

42nd Ministerial Session of the COMCEC

(30 October-03 November 2026, Istanbul, Türkiye)

Executive Summary

The OIC Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC) Assessment & Evaluation Report was prepared for presentation at the 42nd Ministerial Session of the COMCEC (October 30-November 3, 2026). This report evaluates the strategic importance of the OBIC initiative, implementation progress, performance, constraints, and future direction from its establishment in 2017 through May 2026. The COMCEC Follow-up Committee requested the evaluation at its 42nd meeting so that the ICIEC can assess the Program and recommend next steps. The evaluation confirms that OBIC remains necessary. No reliable way exists to determine a company's risk when making decisions about investing, borrowing, and managing money. This problem affects companies of all sizes in all OIC countries, especially small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and other companies that operate across borders. Digital trade is growing rapidly, and we are seeing many new types of data and AI-powered analytics.

As a result, we need to build a trustworthy information system. OBIC should work with existing national credit bureaus, registries, trade information systems, investment platforms, and OIC organizational resources. It should not try to replace them. Since 2017, the OBIC initiative has moved past the idea stage. Accomplishments include conducting feasibility and analytical studies; preparing an implementation plan; creating an Executive Committee and Technical Committee; creating pilot concepts; receiving ongoing support from COMCEC; and providing capacity-building programs for people from various OIC Member Countries.

However, although the initiative has accomplished important preliminary goals, it has not turned those accomplishments into functioning operations as initially envisioned.

For example, the main service platform, pilot hubs, and long-term cross-border intelligence services are not complete. Also, there is no evidence of user adoption or positive development outcomes. Implementation challenges, not concept development, are the initiative's biggest obstacle. Obstacles include unresolved issues related to sustainable financing; lack of firm commitments from Member States and data providers; varying data protection laws and regulations across borders; complexity of governance; possible overlap with other existing platforms; cybersecurity concerns; scope expansion; lack of evidence of user adoption; and inability to effectively measure results. According to the report, institutional approval does not automatically mean an organization is willing to commit to implementation. Future participation must be clearly stated in writing, outlining data delivery, funding, pilot implementation, and user responsibilities.

In conclusion, the evaluation confirms that OBIC is important strategically but needs a different implementation model. Instead of repeatedly extending the timeline, the next step should limit the number of services offered initially; increase accountability; secure funding and partner commitments; establish a proper legal/data governance framework; and create measurable performance/outcome indicators. The best way forward is a service-driven, federated model. This will allow integration of existing providers and centralize only those functions that truly need to be centralized. Three strategic options are presented in the report: (A) OBIC could be re-scoped to a two-year Credit Information Ecosystem Development Program (CIDP); (B) A phased Minimum Viable OBIC could be implemented using a subset of services available within a limited service portfolio and two or three interoperable pilots; or (C) The original goal of establishing a full-center model could be pursued, if confirmed funding and firm commitments from participating Member States/data providers are present. Regardless of which alternative is selected, the 2021 Implementation Plan will need to be revised. The Evaluation Report recommended that Option A – the two-year CIDP – be implemented immediately by ICIEC in collaboration with SESRIC, ICDT, ICCD and interested parties, and followed by

another evaluation to determine if implementation should continue to either Option B or C. Regarding additional support for the future of OBIC, the Evaluation Report recommended several additional steps, including creating an accountable Program Management Office; revising the 2026–2030 implementation plan; re-validating the financial model; securing commitments before selecting pilots; using modular/API-first technology; enhancing capacity-building initiatives; and conducting independent evaluations of implementation and outcomes.

1. Background and Context

1.1 Rationale for Establishing OBIC

The initiative initially focused on credit reporting; however, the program's focus expanded to include business intelligence. This expansion is also strategically logical. Trade and investment decision-making requires more than just a company's credit history. It requires company information, its markets, the sector it operates in, the political and economic risks associated with that country, investment opportunities, trade flow patterns, and regulatory information. As the program scope expanded, defining what OBIC could offer versus what partners could offer became increasingly difficult.

1.2 Vision and Strategic Objectives

The documented objectives are to develop a digital platform (a cross-border credit registry) connected to all Bureau Services.

In addition, the objectives include developing OIC-wide capabilities in business intelligence ecosystem development, providing advisory/capacity-building services, creating an operational model and strategic partnerships, and developing a sustainable business model.

1.3 Strategic Alignment

This initiative is consistent with COMCEC's repeated emphasis upon intra-OIC trade, private sector development and institutional cooperation. This initiative will have the greatest impact when it complements, rather than duplicates, existing national credit bureaus, registries, chambers, trade information systems, investment promotion platforms, and OIC institutional datasets.

1.4 Implementation Progress and Key Milestones

The Initiative aligns with COMCEC's recurring theme of increasing intra-OIC trade, developing the private sector, and strengthening cooperation among OIC member countries. The Initiative will be most effective when it supplements – not duplicates – the current OIC institutional data set, national credit bureaus, registry offices, chamber of commerce databases, trade information systems and investment promotion platforms.

Period	Milestone
2017	First OBIC Concept Note endorsed at the 33 rd COMCEC Session.
2018	Interim report reviewed; Member Country feedback sought; and the 34 th Session requested operationalization.
2019	Benchmarking/SWOT/stakeholder analysis requested; SESRIC hosting/resources welcomed; technical preparation and Member Country survey requested.
2020	Technical preparation and survey completion reiterated; ICIEC and SESRIC formed Executive and Technical Committees to oversee implementation.
2021	Limited questionnaire response noted; capacity-building proposal welcomed; detailed Implementation Plan prepared in October 2021 and submitted.
2022	COMCEC again requested completion of technical preparations; capacity-building proposal reiterated.
2023	Capacity-building programmes held in Jeddah and Istanbul; regular progress reporting requested.
2024	Technical preparations and progress reporting continued; timetable was revised.
2025	Third capacity-building programme held in Jakarta; 41st Follow-up Committee again requested completion of preparations; 41st Session requested consideration of an update to the 2021 plan. A fourth capacity-building programme held in Morocco in November 2025.
2026	42 nd Follow-up Committee documentation included an OBIC Brief Note under intra-OIC trade documentation.

1.5 Capacity Building

The official reports submitted by ICIEC to COMCEC during the year 2025 have documented four programs: 1) Jeddah (March 2023) – 36 participants from 21 institutions/universities/organizations in 11 Member Countries; 2) Istanbul (September 2023) – 48 participants from 22 Member Countries; and 3) Jakarta (February 2025) – 38 participants from 11 Member Countries, and 4) Casablanca (November 2025) - 40 participants, from 16 OIC Member Countries. These programs matter because they build a potential user base and create an opportunity to test user requirements. Establishing a system of follow-up indicators to assess knowledge use, organizational change, data-sharing participation, and demand for specific OBIC services will increase these programs' benefits.

1.6 Governance and Management

ICIEC and SESRIC formed Executive and Technical Committees in 2020, and SESRIC allocated temporary space for the program. These are concrete institutional steps. However, the ongoing need to prepare legal documents governing relationships among the Center, information sources, and beneficiaries indicates that the durable operating and accountability framework has not yet been fully established.

1.7 Resource Mobilization

The Implementation Plan prepared in 2021 estimated first-phase investment capital of approximately US\$7.97 million, including US\$4.24 million for launch and US\$3.73 million in the first year of operations. Subsequent progress reports explicitly cited difficulty securing funding for the three pilot hubs as a reason to revisit the implementation timetable. This is one of the clearest constraints in the documentary record.

2. OBIC Assessment & Evaluation

2.1 Rationale for the Evaluation

As per the mandate of ICIEC to regularly report to different levels of COMCEC's meetings on the implementation of the initiative to establish the OIC Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC), a Progress Report was submitted to the 42nd Meeting of the Follow-up Committee of COMCEC held during the period 12-13 May 2026 in Ankara, Türkiye.

After deliberations on the Report, the Meeting issued the following Resolution:

*17. **Recalling** the relevant resolutions of the 41st COMCEC Session and taking note of the report of ICIEC on OIC Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC) Programme, the Committee **requested** ICIEC to prepare an evaluation report on the Programme and report therein to the upcoming COMCEC Ministerial Session.*

The supplied outline calls for an evaluation covering the period from the initial 2017 concept through the 42nd Meeting of the Follow-up Committee of COMCEC. This report follows that structure and evaluates both the strategic proposition and implementation record. The 42nd Follow-up Committee met in Ankara on 12–13 May 2026; COMCEC's official document portal lists a Brief Note on the OIC Business Intelligence Center among the IsDB-related documents for that meeting.

In response to the above-mentioned Resolution, the evaluation covered the period from the initial 2017 Concept Note through the 42nd Meeting of the Follow-up Committee of COMCEC, held in Ankara, Türkiye, on 12–13 May 2026. The evaluation also drew on the progress reports ICIEC prepared during this period for submission to the Sessional Committee, the Follow-up Committee, and COMCEC's Ministerial Session. These reports are available on COMCEC's official document portal (www.comcec.org) or on ICIEC's website (iciec.isdb.org).

2.2 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose is to determine whether OBIC continues to address material development and business needs; assess the quality and pace of implementation; identify constraints and risks; distinguish outputs from outcomes; and provide practical recommendations for a decision on the next implementation phase.

2.3 Scope

The scope covers strategic rationale, governance, implementation milestones, stakeholder engagement, capacity building, pilot concepts, technology and data considerations, funding, performance, risks, lessons and future options. It does not independently verify financial projections or quantify economy-wide causal impacts.

2.4 Evaluation Questions

- Is the OBIC problem statement still relevant to OIC Member States and intended users?
- To what extent have planned outputs and milestones been delivered?
- Has implementation converted institutional support into operational capability?
- Are governance, financing, technology and data arrangements sufficiently mature for scale-up?
- What intermediate results can be evidenced, and what claimed impacts remain prospective?
- What implementation model is most credible for the next phase?

2.5 Methodology

The review applies the methodology adopted by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to assess the dimensions of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, and is supplemented by results-based management, theory-of-change logic, milestone analysis, risk analysis, and institutional-capacity assessment. Evidence was triangulated across the supplied outline, prior OBIC evaluation materials, official COMCEC documentation, ICIEC's OBIC publications page, the 2021 implementation plan reproduced in official COMCEC papers, and later OBIC progress reports.

Criterion	Key Question	Core Evidence	Indicative Indicator
Relevance	Does OBIC address current user and Member State needs?	Official mandates, needs analyses, partner/user evidence	Demand, policy fit, problem persistence
Coherence	Does OBIC complement other systems and institutions?	Institutional mandates, platform/provider mapping	Additionality, interoperability, duplication avoided
Effectiveness	Are outputs and outcomes being achieved?	Milestones, pilots, training, technical deliverables	Milestone completion, live services, adoption
Efficiency	Are resources converted to results in a timely way?	Budgets, timelines, governance records	Cost/time variance, decision cycle, cost per output
Impact	What changes are plausibly attributable to OBIC?	Usage/outcome data, case studies, counterfactual evidence	Decision quality, finance/trade outcomes, risk reduction
Sustainability	Can benefits and services continue?	Funding, revenue, governance, data agreements	Recurring funding, retention, uptime, partner commitments

2.6 Limitations

Because there was no evidence from primary interviews; survey responses; financial ledgers; procurement records; signed data-sharing agreements; platform usage statistics; and/or beneficiary outcome data sets to support conclusions about stakeholder perceptions, cost effectiveness, realized impact and/or commercial sustainability, the evaluation's results on these topics should be considered more conservative than the results on the documented milestones.

3. Evaluation and Assessment Results

3.1 Assessment of Performance

Criterion	Provisional Rating (1–5)	Evaluation Judgement
Relevance	4.5	Relevance is assessed as very strong. The core problem—uneven access to reliable, comparable, and actionable business and credit intelligence across OIC markets remains material. Digital trade, AI-enabled analytics, alternative data and cross-border business models have increased rather than reduced the strategic importance of trusted information. The key qualification is scope: relevance of the problem does not automatically validate every element of the original centralized solution design.
Coherence	4.0	OBIC is coherent with the mandates and capabilities of ICIEC, SESRIC, ICDT and ICCD and with COMCEC priorities. Coherence risk arises from overlapping with existing national bureaus, commercial data providers, trade-information portals and OIC institutional databases. A federated architecture with clearly allocated functions would improve additionality.
Effectiveness	3.0	Effectiveness is moderate. Preparatory effectiveness is substantial: concept development, feasibility work, implementation planning, governance committees, pilot concepts, capacity building and continuing COMCEC recognition have all been achieved. Operational effectiveness is lower because the core service platform, pilot hubs, and sustained cross-border intelligence delivery have not reached the scale envisaged in the original timetable.
Efficiency	2.5	Efficiency is below the level expected for a Programme entering its ninth year after concept endorsement. The use of existing OIC institutions and partner expertise has avoided creating a large standalone structure prematurely, which is positive. However, repeated extensions, unresolved financing and prolonged technical preparation indicate high transaction costs in coordination and decision-making. A smaller minimum viable Programme would likely improve time-to-value.
Impact	2.5	Impact is rated cautiously because the principal economic benefits remain prospective. Intermediate impact is visible in awareness, capacity building, institutional dialogue and the creation of a structured OIC conversation on credit and business intelligence. Claims regarding increases in lending, reductions in non-performing loans, FDI growth or intra-OIC trade should be treated as scenario-based potential benefits unless supported by post-implementation causal evidence.
Sustainability	2.5	Sustainability is not yet demonstrated. It depends on stable governance at home, diversified funding, predictable data supply, compliance with national data-protection and credit-reporting rules, cyber resilience, service model value for users, and a credible route from donor/member support to recurring revenue or budget financing. The need to revisit the financing model is therefore substantive, not administrative.
Overall Assessment		Overall, OBIC is a strategically sound initiative with a strong problem definition and meaningful preparatory achievements, but it has not yet converted that strategic relevance into commensurate operational results. The evaluation therefore supports continuation only with a redesigned implementation model, an updated evidence base, a narrower initial service scope, and stronger milestone accountability.

3.2 Assessment of Expected Outputs Vs Outcomes from the OBIC

Results Level	Illustrative Intended Result	Evaluation Observation
Inputs/activities	Studies, governance work, consultations, resource mobilization, capacity building	Substantial activity documented.
Outputs	Implementation plan, service bundle, pilot designs, committees, training programmes, legal/technical preparations	Many preparatory outputs achieved; platform/service deployment incomplete.
Intermediate outcomes	Greater awareness, stronger institutional coordination, improved user capability, pilot participation	Awareness/capacity evidence exists; systematic outcome measurement is limited.
Outcomes	Better credit/trade/investment decisions, more finance, stronger intra-OIC trade and investment	Plausible theory of change, but attribution cannot yet be demonstrated.
Impact	Reduced information asymmetry, stronger financial inclusion and economic cooperation	Long-term and currently prospective.

4. Assessment of Stakeholder Engagement

4.1 Quality of Engagement

Engagement is broad in scope; however, it is inconsistent. Repeated COMCEC Resolutions and Multi-Institutional Capacity-Building Events show a steady focus on building COMCEC's institutional capacity.

On the other hand, the initial questionnaire mailed to 26 Public and Private Entities in 19 Member Countries produced a very low response rate. Therefore, endorsement does not necessarily reflect the level of operational commitment. The next step will require Member Countries to provide a written commitment to specific data, funding, pilot, and user roles.

4.2 Stakeholder Ownership

Ownership will be most powerful for sponsoring institutions; however, it will be least effective when implementing a program requires country-specific commitment. The future governance model must therefore define who the sponsor(s), operator(s), data contributor(s), paying user(s), beneficiary of the "public-good," and regulatory body(ies) are, and what their respective rights and responsibilities are.

5. Challenges, Constraints and Risk Analysis

5.1 Core Constraint Diagnosis

The primary limitation of this project is not a lack of conceptual work; it has a well-developed set of analytical studies, proposed service offerings, governance frameworks, pilot country selections, and a financial model.

However, the bottleneck for the project is "conversion": transforming the inter-institutional planning into financially supported, legally authorized, and user-tested service offerings with defined owners and measurable demand.

Risk / Constraint	Likelihood	Impact	Priority Mitigation
Unresolved sustainable financing	High	High	Stage-gated budget; co-financing; distinguishing public-good and paid services.
Insufficient Member State/data-provider commitment	High	High	Signed pilot/data MOUs before technology build.
Data Protection and Cross-border Legal Differences	High	High	Federated data model; legal mapping; privacy-by-design; local processing where required.
Scope Expansion	High	High	Define minimum viable service catalog and explicit exclusions.
Technology Obsolescence	Medium	High	Modular architecture, open standards, API-first procurement, periodic technology review.
Cybersecurity/Trust Failure	Medium	Very High	Security-by-design, independent testing, access controls, incident response and audit.
Duplication of Existing Platforms	Medium	High	Partner inventory, build-vs-connect tests, additionality assessment.
Low User Adoption	Medium	High	User co-design, pilots, pricing tests, service-level KPIs.
Governance Complexity	High	High	Single accountable programme office and decision-rights matrix.
Weak Outcome Measurement	High	Medium	Baseline, usage analytics, outcome KPIs and annual independent review.

6. Conclusions

Based on the above findings, the evaluation concludes the following:

First, the rationale for OBIC remains valid. Reliable business and credit intelligence is infrastructure for trade, investment, financing, insurance and private-sector growth. The need is especially acute where SMEs and cross-border counterparties face information asymmetry.

Second, the initiative has achieved more than a concept but less than an operational centre. It has accumulated institutional legitimacy, analytical work, governance mechanisms, implementation design, pilot concepts and a growing capacity-building record. These assets should be preserved.

Third, implementation delay is material. The original plan envisaged an official launch after a three-phase programme, but later reporting revised the long-term phase and explicitly cited funding constraints. The appropriate response is not another timetable extension alone; it is a redesign of scope, sequencing, accountability and financing.

Fourth, the strongest future model is service-led and federated. OBIC should prove value through a limited portfolio, integrate with existing providers, and centralize only what must be centralized.

Finally, any next COMCEC or ICIEC decision should be supported by an updated implementation plan with verified baselines, signed partner commitments, costed work packages, a legal/data-governance framework, and measurable outcome indicators.

7. Future Strategic Options

This evaluation report endeavors to shed light on available strategic options for the future of the initiative. Each of the Options may be taken as a stand-alone solution, or they may be taken in sequence from A to C until the ultimate objective of achieving a full-fledged OBIC is reached. The Options proposed for consideration are as follows:

- **Option A – Re-scoping the OBIC) into a Credit Information Ecosystem Development Programme (CIDP) as a 2-year short-term phase**

This Option will build on the success of ICIEC and its Partners in organizing a series of capacity-building programs in Jeddah and Istanbul in 2023, and in Jakarta and Morocco in 2025, with plans to host another event in Cairo, Egypt, in November 2026. Participants from several OIC countries attended the events, which featured technical sessions on how credit information affects trade and investment decision-making.

It is also a lower-cost option and focuses on policy, institutional development, training, peer learning, and technical assistance. It would preserve useful public-good functions but would not fully address demand for cross-border decision intelligence.

For information, a full proposal for this Option was submitted to the 42nd Meeting of the Follow-up Committee, held in May 2026, and is also attached hereto as **ANNEX-1**.

- **Option B: Phased Minimum Viable OBIC**

This option starts with a small set of services: diagnostics for the OIC credit and business information ecosystem; common data and governance standards; a verified provider directory; selected country- and sector-specific intelligence products; capacity building; and two or three interoperable pilots. Technology investment expands only when user demand and data rights are proven. This is the most implementation-ready route.

- **Option C: Continue the Original Full-Centre Model**

This option preserves the original architecture and moves toward a complete hub-and-spoke center. It offers conceptual continuity but entails the highest funding, governance, legal, and execution burdens. It should not proceed without confirmed financing and binding participation by pilot jurisdictions.

The Evaluation Report also holds the view that the past milestones prepared for the implementation of the initiative were not met most of the time, and it deemed it necessary to extend the deadlines set for each milestone; as a result, the timelines set out in the Implementation Plan Report prepared in October 2021 need to be revised regardless of the Option to be agreed upon for the future of the OBIC.

The following timetable is also provided, as part of the Evaluation Report recommendations, to guide implementation of the initiative:

No.	Recommendation	Priority	Indicative Timing	Lead / Partners
1	Establish a small accountable Programme Management Office with a RACI/decision-rights matrix and quarterly milestone dashboard.	High	0–3 months	Lead institutions
2	Approve a refreshed 2026–2030 OBIC implementation plan replacing outdated milestones and assumptions.	Critical	0–6 months	ICIEC with SESRIC, ICDT, ICCD; COMCEC oversight
3	Revalidate the 2021 financial model, including technology costs, staffing, cybersecurity, data acquisition, pricing, and realistic revenue ramp-up.	High	0–6 months	Programme office / finance advisers
4	Select 2–3 pilots only after signed host-country, regulator, data-provider, and user commitments.	Critical	0–9 months	ICIEC / pilot countries
5	Convert capacity-building programmes into a structured academy with competency standards, pre/post assessment and institutional follow-up.	Medium	6–18 months	ICIEC / SESRIC / ICDT / ICCD
6	Implement API-first, modular technology procurement; avoid irreversible platform investment before data rights and use cases are validated.	High	6–18 months	Technical Committee
7	Commission an annual independent implementation review and a fuller outcome evaluation after 24–36 months of live service delivery.	Medium	Annual / 24–36 months	COMCEC / independent evaluator

8. Recommendations:

1. To approve implementing ICIEC’s Proposal to re-scope the OBIC into a Credit Information Ecosystem Development Programme (CIDP) as a 2-year short-term phase, after which another evaluation will be conducted to decide whether to proceed with either Option B or Option C.
2. To Mandate ICIEC to lead CIDP implementation, in collaboration with SESRIC, ICDT, ICCD, and any other OIC institutions, or any external partners that express interest in joining the Project.

ANNEX-1



A Proposal for:

**Re-scoping the OIC Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC) into
a Credit Information Ecosystem Development Programme
(CIDP)**

Enabling Smarter and Informed Credit and Investment Decisions

A Proposal for:

**Re-scoping the OIC Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC)
into a Credit Information Ecosystem Development
Programme (CIDP)**

Enabling Smarter and Informed Credit and Investment Decisions

1. Introduction & Strategic Context

The Member Countries of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) face a persistent structural constraint in achieving inclusive economic growth, expanding trade, and attracting investment namely, the limited availability and quality of credit information systems. Current data indicates that credit bureau coverage across OIC countries stands at approximately 15.5% of the adult population, compared to 66.8% in OECD economies, significantly constraining access to finance, particularly for SMEs, and limiting the effectiveness of risk assessment frameworks.

To address this challenge, and from within its mandates, ICIEC submitted a Concept Note to the Senior Officials and Ministers of Trade during the 33rd Session of COMCEC (19-24 November 2017, Istanbul, Türkiye, proposing the establishment of an OIC-wide Business Intelligence Centre (OBIC). The Concept Note was officially endorsed by the Meeting, in addition to the consequent resolutions adopted by the 34th COMCEC Ministerial Session (29 November 2018), where the OBIC was considered and conceived as a shared strategic vision to strengthen trade, investment, and financing across OIC Member Countries through enhanced credit intelligence and data-driven decision-making. To proceed further with the implementation of the initiative, ICIEC prepared an Implementation Plan Report in October 2021, and it was submitted to the 37th Session of the COMCEC (24-25 November 2021).

Despite the strong strategic rationale and development impact outlined in the Implementation Plan Report, the current financial realities present significant constraints that limit the feasibility of proceeding with the project at this stage, with its proposed scope and business model, as the Report clearly indicates that the establishment of the OBIC requires an estimated investment of approximately USD 7.79 million over an initial period of two years, including a substantial upfront costs for building a the technological infrastructure and sustaining early stage operations.

In the absence of secured and committed funding resources, whether from member countries, or other development partners, the financial risk associated with initiating the Centre remains high. Furthermore, the projected revenue generation is only expected to materialize in later years of operation, implying a prolonged period of financial exposure without guaranteed returns. Accordingly, this creates an additional pressure on ICIEC and its partners.

Moreover, the Implementation Plan Report itself emphasizes the critical importance of sustained funding across multiple phases, including the establishment of pilot hubs, technological deployment, and capacity-building programmes. In case no adequate financial backing was made available, there is a substantial risk of incomplete implementation, reduced impact, or reputational consequences for the institutions involved.

Accordingly, and while the strong belief that the OBIC initiative remains strategically valuable and aligned with long-term development objectives, it is both prudent and necessary

to revisit the initiative in terms of objectives and scope, taking into consideration the above-mentioned constraints and challenges, and come out with an alternative strategic solution.

2. The Proposed Approach: A Phased Pathway to Re-scope OBIC

This proposal introduces a Credit Information Ecosystem Development Programme (CIDP), an approach designed as a phased, enabling mechanism that re-scopes the OBIC, strengthens national credit ecosystems, builds institutional capacity, enhances data availability and quality, and integrates credit information into financing and risk mitigation frameworks.

CIDP is designed as a service-led, decentralized program that focuses on:

- Strengthening national credit information ecosystems (legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks).
- Providing targeted capacity-building for regulators, financial institutions, and SMEs.
- Delivering advisory services to support credit risk assessment and data-driven financing decisions.
- Linking credit information systems to risk mitigation instruments, including trade credit insurance and political risk insurance, in alignment with ICIEC's mandate.

Through this approach, CIDP is expected to deliver an early, measurable economic impact, including:

- Increased private sector lending and improved SME access to finance.
- Reduction in non-performing loan (NPL) ratios through better risk assessment.
- Enhanced investor confidence and increased Foreign Direct Investment (FDI).
- Strengthened intra-OIC trade through improved credit transparency and cross-border trust.

Importantly, CIDP offers a lower-cost, lower-risk implementation model compared to OBIC, with the ability to generate early-stage revenue streams through advisory and capacity-building services. It also allows for progressive scaling, beginning with pilot implementations in 4 Member Countries and expanding regionally to 8, based on demonstrated success.

The proposed phased approach ensures that Member Countries will achieve sufficient credit ecosystem maturity, regulatory alignment, and data readiness to support a sustainable and impactful regional solution.

3. Key Components of CIDP

CIDP will build on the success achieved by ICIEC and its Partners in organizing 4 successful capacity-building programmes in Jeddah and Istanbul in 2023, Jakarta and Morocco in 2025. The events were attended by participants from several OIC countries, with technical sessions covering areas relating to the impact of credit information on decision-making in trade and investment. Accordingly, CIDP will focus on the following four core areas:

3.1. Credit Ecosystem Development:

This is intended to support Member Countries in strengthening their legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks, in addition to enhancing credit reporting systems and data infrastructure.

3.2. Capacity-Building and Knowledge Transfer:

This will provide training for potential users, professional staff at regulating bodies, financial institutions, and private sector stakeholders, in addition to development of tools and guidelines for effective use of credit information.

Technical sessions will aim at providing the necessary awareness about the importance of credit information for decision-making, in addition to linking that to different operational areas of the institutions sending their Staff to attend the capacity-building programmes to be organized by CIDP.

3.3. Advisory Services for Trade and Investment:

This will be directed to support financial institutions and businesses in improving credit risk assessment skills, and to facilitating better access to finance, particularly for SMEs.

3.4. Integration with Risk Mitigation Tools:

CIDP will link credit information systems with providers of products and solutions in the areas of trade credit insurance, political risk insurance, and trade finance guarantees.

This integration directly supports ICIEC's mandate and enhances the effectiveness of financing and investment decisions.

4. Implementation Approach

CIDP will be implemented through a phased and scalable model, covering the following phases:

Phase One (2026-2028): Implementation

- Complete arrangements with current and potential partners to mobilize resources and design content of programmes.
- Start by organizing 4 events in Member Countries to be selected on regional distribution, and requests received to host the events.
- Deliver pilot and targeted advisory services, capacity-building programmes, and ecosystem strengthening.

Phase Two (2028-2030): Expansion

- Scale of Phase One to additional Member Countries.

5. Financial Considerations

The proposed approach adopts a low-risk, cost-efficient financial model, characterized by:

- Limited upfront investment requirements.
- Blended financing (institutional funding, donations, sponsorship of events and programmes, technical assistance grants, partnerships, and service-based revenues).
- Early generation of measurable impact and value.

This contrasts with a capital-intensive model and ensures:

- Greater financial sustainability.
- Reduced implementation risk.
- Flexibility to scale based on demand and readiness.

To enable ICIEC and its Partners to overcome the challenges related to financing the implementation of CIDP, the Proposal will target mobilizing resources from ICIEC and its Partners, in addition to utilizing any opportunities for technical assistance or grants from international institutions who are running similar projects, i.e. the World Bank Credit Reporting Initiative. This is in addition to utilizing the services of Professionals and Expert speakers from Partner institutions to deliver the technical sessions of the Programme.

6. Institutional Alignment

CIDP is designed to align and strengthen the mandates of existing institutions and potential partners:

- **ICIEC:** To lead the Programme, integrate risk mitigation tools, in accordance with Article 5 (1) of its Articles of Agreement which defines enlarging the scope of trade transactions of Member States and to encourage the flow of investments to Member States among the objectives for establishing the Corporation.
- **IsDB Group and its Affiliates:** The Programme will contribute to supporting their programmes related to trade and investment finance.
- **COMCEC/OIC:** Services relating to capacity-building, knowledge development, strategic oversight, and policy coordination are crucial for supporting the objectives of COMEC/OIC in increasing the volume of OIC intra-trade and investments.
- **OIC Member Countries:** enhancing credit information ecosystems and creating awareness about the importance of reliable credit information.
- **Other Potential Partners:** forging strategic partnerships and alliances, in addition to easy access to reliable and comprehensive credit information.

This alignment ensures:

- Clear roles and responsibilities.
- Strong ownership at both regional and national levels.
- Effective coordination across stakeholders.

7. Expected Impact

Since the CIDP is planned to be implemented in Short-Term, Medium and Long-Term, it is expected to deliver the following deliverables by the end of each Term:

Short-Term Impact:

- Improved access to finance for SMEs.
- Strengthened credit information systems.
- Increased use of risk mitigation tools.

Medium and Long-Term Impact:

- Increased private sector lending.
- Reduced non-performing loans (NPLs) ratios.
- Enhanced trade and investment flows.

8. Strategic Comparison: OBIC vs CIDP

The Table below provides a short comparison between the OBIC Model and the CIDP Model, covering several dimensions, and the comparison supports the importance of launching the CIDP, compared to that of OBIC.

Dimension	OBIC Model	CIDP Model
Investment	High upfront capital	Low, phased investment
Time to Impact	Long (5–6 years)	Short (1–2 years)
Complexity	High (cross-border)	Moderate (country-level)
Risk	High execution risk	Lower, scalable risk

9. Recommendations:

1. To approve the launch of CIDP as a re-scoping Programme for the OIC Business Intelligence Centre.
2. To Mandate ICIEC to lead CIDP implementation, in collaboration with SESRIC, ICDT, ICCD, and any other OIC institutions, or external partners that express interest in joining the Project.
