

TMO — Traffic Management Operation

Lebanon — Vehicle Registration & Driver Licensing RFP

OFFICIAL CLARIFICATIONS AND RESPONSES — Batch 7

The following clarifications are published in response to questions received from prospective bidders during the RFP clarification period, and are read together with the RFP and its issued Addenda Nos. 1, 2 and 3. These responses do not modify the RFP except where they reflect an issued Addendum; in case of discrepancy, the RFP and its issued Addenda prevail.

Section A — Business Rules, Workflow & Solution Governance

Q-001 — Business Rule Ownership and Workflow Configurability

Question: Please clarify whether the proposed platform is expected to provide configurable BPM/workflow and business-rule management capabilities enabling authorized TMO users to independently manage approval matrices, workflow routing, service conditions, exception handling, SLA escalation rules, and automation policies, without requiring vendor redevelopment; and whether workflow orchestration is expected to support future AI-assisted or rules-based STP.

Authority's response: Yes. The RFP (Annex 1) requires a configurable platform: authorized Authority users manage rules, tariffs, services and workflows from the Back-Office (RBAC, maker/checker, full audit), with new fees or services added by configuration rather than a major code rewrite. The platform must deliver end-to-end (straight-through) digital processing; the bidder details its BPM/rules-engine and any AI-assisted automation.

Q-002 — Legacy Business Rules Discovery and Process Rationalization

Question: Given the Greenfield approach and prohibition on extending the current system, please clarify whether the bidder must rediscover undocumented business rules from the legacy environment, whether complete As-Is documentation will be provided, and whether formal BPR and standardization across branches are part of scope.

Authority's response: The project is pure Greenfield — the contractor does not build on, extend, or take over the legacy system. It performs discovery only to establish the NEW platform: using the Authority's Handover Package and stakeholder sessions, it validates AS-IS and delivers the TO-BE BPMN/DMN design (process standardization) for all in-scope services (Annex 1). Detailed materials are shared with the awarded contractor at the discovery phase.

Q-003 — Real-Time Transaction Orchestration and Integration Automation

Question: Please clarify whether the Authority expects synchronous real-time orchestration across external entities, asynchronous/event-driven processing, automated retry/rollback/compensation, and centralized monitoring and audit traceability; and whether a centralized integration governance / API management platform is expected.

Authority's response: Yes. Annex 1 requires standards-based integration (REST/JSON APIs) with the external entities, end-to-end observability (logging, metrics, traces/APM, alerting, dashboards to the Authority), resilience (failover, circuit-breaker, rollback) and full audit



traceability. Synchronous and event-driven processing are both acceptable; the integration-governance / API-management architecture is the bidder's to propose.

Q-004 — Decentralized Operations and Offline Business Continuity

Question: Please clarify whether branch operations are required to support offline transaction processing during WAN outages, local continuity, delayed synchronization, and autonomous issuance during central disruption, and the expected operational/reconciliation model.

Authority's response: Continuity at branches is delivered by high availability, the contractor's independent redundant link path (Addendum No. 3, Art. 2), disaster recovery and backup systems — branches remain connected to the central database in real time, so the model is not offline branch issuance. The only offline capability required is in the mobile application: a citizen's or officer's digital licence/registration can be verified (via its QR code / digital signature) even without an internet connection, with synchronization on reconnection. The bidder details its resilience and graceful-degradation approach.

Q-005 — Operational Intelligence and Automated Service Governance

Question: Please clarify whether the platform must provide centralized operational intelligence and automation (real-time monitoring, queue orchestration, fraud/anomaly detection, SLA breach management, branch analytics, citizen-journey dashboards), and whether these are embedded or separate BI/observability tooling.

Authority's response: Yes. Annex 1 requires a modern, supported BI/Analytics platform (live dashboards, standard + ad-hoc reports), real-time service/queue monitoring with SLA timers, anomaly detection, safety analytics (incl. fraud flags), branch-performance and citizen-journey KPIs, and observability dashboards shared with the Authority. Legacy reporting tools are not accepted; the bidder proposes the integrated architecture.

Section B — Card, Personalization, Encoding & Security

Q-006 — Issuance Volume

Question: What is the estimated total number of driving and car licenses to be issued yearly and daily? Are there specific high-demand periods requiring a specific throughput?

Authority's response: Registry and full-year 2025 throughput — by category and by branch — are in the statistical & equipment publication issued with Addendum No. 2; bidders size to those figures (daily derived over working days). Physical card issuance is on-request, not mandatory mass printing; capacity must meet the RFP's performance requirements (Annex 1).

Q-007 — Card Body and Material Specifications

Question: Is the card body PVC, Composite, or 100% Polycarbonate? Required durability lifespan? Pre-printed "white" blanks or full-color/security printing on-site?

Authority's response: The current Authority-approved card design is retained — the same specifications as the existing cards apply: a polycarbonate ID-1 card with a minimum 10-year service life; blanks are pre-printed with the fixed design and personalized on-site. Exact



security specifications are withheld per the Annex 8/9 Confidentiality Notes and released to the awarded contractor post-award.

Q-008 — Personalization and Printing Technology

Question: Does the authority require Laser, DTC or Re-transfer? Tactile features? Clear or holographic top-coat (laminate)?

Authority's response: Personalization is by laser engraving on-site (the polycarbonate method); the card is a fused polycarbonate body with no separate applied laminate/overlay. Other tactile/security features are part of the retained design and are withheld per the Annex 8/9 Confidentiality Notes, released post-award. No redesign is invited.

Q-009 — Data Encoding and Smart Features

Question: Contact chip, contactless (RFID), or Dual Interface? Which profiles/protocols? 3-track Magnetic Stripe or 2D barcode (PDF417) on the reverse?

Authority's response: The card uses a contactless chip; it carries no magnetic stripe and no 2D barcode. (UHF RFID relates to the optional vehicle e-sticker, not the card; fingerprint matching is by the new in-platform matcher per Addendum No. 2.) The chip data model, profiles/protocols and cryptography remain withheld per the Annex 8/9 Confidentiality Notes, released post-award.

Q-010 — Security Features

Question: Provide a list of all required security features. Would the TMO explore more secure alternatives for the card printing technology and related features?

Authority's response: A framework-level list of the required security features is already set out in the RFP — Annex 8 (Electronic Vehicle Registration Cards) and Annex 9 (Electronic Driving Licences), with Annex 10 covering the electronic sticker — including the applicable ISO standards and the feature set (substrate/laser engraving, guilloché and microprint, UV/covert inks, OVD/OVI, and the secure contactless chip). The current Authority-approved design is retained; no redesign or alternative technology is invited at this stage, subject only to Authority-mandated security-feature refreshes. The exact specifications (ink spectra, placement maps, microtext strings, OVD effects, chip data model/cryptography) remain withheld per the Confidentiality Notes in those annexes and are provided to the awarded contractor post-award (RFP Annexes 8–10).

Q-011 — Support and Maintenance (secure consumables)

Question: Are there specific requirements for the storage, shipping, and disposal of secure ribbons and cleaning kits?

Authority's response: Secure-issuance materials are handled under the RFP's chain-of-custody, inventory and physical-security requirements (Annex 1); detailed storage, shipping and disposal of consumables are confirmed with the awarded contractor post-award.

Section C — Current-Operator Contracts, Connectivity & Scope

Q-012 — Current active HW maintenance contracts



Question: What are the current active HW maintenance contracts and what is the expiry date of each contract?

Authority's response: The new platform is delivered Greenfield (Addendum No. 1); the awarded contractor supplies, maintains and warrants all hardware for the new platform on an all-inclusive basis (one-year warranty from Go-Live + four years' support).

Q-013 — Current active SW solution licenses

Question: What are the current active SW solution licenses and what is the expiry date of each license?

Authority's response: Delivered Greenfield; the awarded contractor supplies all software and licences for the new platform, included within the all-inclusive transaction-based pricing (PSF/CGAM/CARC) and not separately billed.

Q-014 — Current SLA expiry

Question: What is the expiry date of the current SLA, should there be any?

Authority's response: There is no transfer of any existing service arrangement: under the Greenfield model the legacy system remains the Authority's responsibility until cut-over, so no "current SLA" passes to the contractor.

Q-015 — RFID — chip price alone or full turnkey solution

Question: Are you requesting the price for the RFID chip alone, or a full turnkey solution?

Authority's response: The bidder prices the RFID e-sticker (Vignette) per unit as one of the three priceable goods (with the DL and VR cards). The complete enabling system — stickers, encoders/printers, readers, the Issuance Orchestrator and central-database integration — is in-scope and included in the all-inclusive pricing (PSF/CGAM/CARC), not a separate line, and must be activation-ready (optional/phased) on the Authority's request. A complete, integration-ready solution is required — not the chip alone.

Q-016 — Redundant connectivity between Head office and branches

Question: Is it the bidder's responsibility to have a redundant connectivity between the TMO Head offices and the regional offices or branches?

Authority's response: Yes — it is the bidder's responsibility. Per Addendum No. 3 (Art. 2), the contractor must establish and maintain the linkage between all centres/sections and the Authority's database, and provide and maintain an independent redundant link path for the full contract term at its full infrastructure and monthly operating cost (all-inclusive).

Section D — Procedural

Q-017 — Outsourced key positions from the current operator

the bidder must include the (الفقرة 4، البند /ب), Question: Referring to the RFP, page 36 number of Lebanese employees and the number to be outsourced/contracted from the current operator via a notarized commitment. Can the TMO provide a list of the ?key positions recommended to be outsourced

Authority's response: The bidder proposes its own staffing. The Authority does not prescribe a list of key positions.

Q-018 — Request to extend the bid-submission date by 35 days

Question: We kindly ask the TMO to extend the bid submission date by an additional 35 days.

Authority's response: The submission deadline has already been extended to 15/7/2026 by Addendum No. 1; the deadline stands and no further extension is granted.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

TMO — Traffic Management Operation

Lebanon — Vehicle Registration & Driver Licensing RFP

OFFICIAL CLARIFICATIONS AND RESPONSES — Batch 8

The following clarifications are published in response to questions received from prospective bidders during the RFP clarification period, and are read together with the RFP and its issued Addenda Nos. 1, 2 and 3. These responses do not modify the RFP except where they reflect an issued Addendum; in case of discrepancy, the RFP and its issued Addenda prevail.

RM-01 — Similar-project experience

Question: ...we have participated as the implementation party in previous projects, while the operational activities were carried out by the respective government entities. Kindly confirm whether such experience would be considered compliant with the stated requirement.

Authority's response:

Form No. 2 of the RFP (Statement of Similar Projects Executed) defines a 'similar project' as the execution and operation of a system for issuing and managing secure smart cards/documents (e.g., driving licences, vehicle-registration cards or similar secure smart documents). Operation is therefore required for compliance, not execution alone — meaning operation and management of the system across the credential lifecycle (system-level operation: Levels 2–4 and maintenance). Whether the cited experience — implementing the system while a government entity operated it — meets this definition is assessed by the evaluation committee against Form No. 2.

RM-02 — Existing biometric system

Question: It is indicated that the existing biometric system must be utilized. Could you please provide the current brand, model, and version of the existing biometric system?

Authority's response:

Per the issued Addendum No. 2, the new platform supplies its own new fingerprint-matching system and does not integrate with or rely upon the existing one; the existing fingerprint database is fully migrated (including de-duplication). The data needed to size the migration is published in Addendum No. 2 — 978,447 person records, 13,205,948 fingerprints, and a 141 GB existing database.

RM-03 — Existing infrastructure details

Question: We kindly request detailed inventories of all existing infrastructure components to enable proper assessment and determination of their inclusion within our proposal.

Authority's response:

Per Addendum No. 1, this is a pure Greenfield build — no takeover or reuse of the existing/legacy infrastructure (the legacy system remains the Authority's responsibility through to a single cut-over); the contractor proposes and supplies the new platform's infrastructure, sized to the RFP's targets. A detailed inventory of the existing components is not required to prepare the proposal and is not issued; the information needed for data



migration (database schemas, data dictionary) is provided to the awarded contractor at the discovery phase.

RM-04 — PKI and Offline Root CA

Question: Please confirm whether there is an existing PKI setup that must be migrated to a new system. If so, kindly provide the brand, model, and version details of the current PKI.

Authority's response:

The contractor designs, procures, implements, and operates a new Authority-operated PKI (an offline Root CA with HSM-protected Issuing CAs); this is not a migration of an existing PKI.

RM-05 — Card personalization requirements

Question: ...could you please clarify if there is a preferred technology — such as laser engraving or color printing (e.g., DOD or other methods)?

Authority's response:

The cards are polycarbonate and are personalized by laser engraving inside the card body. The same specifications as the existing cards apply; the detailed specifications are withheld per the Annex 8/9 Confidentiality Notes and provided to the awarded contractor post-award.

RM-06 — Information from site visit

Question: Kindly confirm whether this information has already been shared. If so, we would appreciate it if you could provide us with the relevant documents.

Authority's response:

The relevant information has been made available to bidders through the RFP, the issued Addenda Nos. 1 and 2 (including the statistical and equipment publication), and the published clarification batches; further or security-sensitive detail is reserved for the awarded contractor at the discovery phase.

RM-07 — Request for extension of time

Question: ...we kindly request an extension of four (4) weeks beyond the submission deadline.

Authority's response:

The bid-submission deadline has been extended to Wednesday 15 July 2026 by Addendum No. 1; the requested additional time is thereby accommodated. All other procedural deadlines are extended in step with the new deadline.



Handwritten signature and initials in blue ink, appearing to read "C. 57 - U - N".