

TMO — Traffic Management Operation

Lebanon — Vehicle Registration & Driver Licensing RFP

OFFICIAL CLARIFICATIONS AND RESPONSES — Batch 9

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 — Data Centre, Servers & Network Infrastructure (10)

R2-01 — Data centre — power/cooling

Question:

On-site server room at HQ (not raised floor); cooling, UPS, and diesel-generator details (KVA rating, last test date)?

Authority's response:

The Authority provides the server room/facility. As a Greenfield build, the contractor designs and sizes its own cooling and UPS for the new platform's equipment and confirms the interface to the facility's standby generator, under the all-inclusive pricing.

R2-02 — Server inventory & specs

Question:

Full inventory of physical servers (make/model/role), CPU/RAM/storage of the primary application servers, SSD use, total raw capacity (TB), storage type (SAN/NAS/DAS)?

Authority's response:

This is a Greenfield build; the contractor proposes and supplies new servers sized to the RFP's performance and availability targets. The existing server inventory is not required for the new build and is not provided.

R2-03 — High availability & DR

Question:

How is HA implemented (clustering/failover/active-active)? Clarify the DR setup's device roles and full specifications (CPU/RAM/storage type/capacity/SSD).

Authority's response:

The contractor designs the high-availability and disaster-recovery architecture to meet the RFP's RPO/RTO and availability targets (on-premises primary plus a DR site). The existing DR equipment is not the design basis for this Greenfield build; its detail is reserved for the awarded contractor at the discovery phase.

R2-04 — Server management / remote access

Question:

Are server management interfaces such as iDRAC or iLO configured and used for remote management?



Authority's response:

Out-of-band management for the new servers is provisioned by the contractor. The existing servers' management configuration is not required for the Greenfield build and is not disclosed.

R2-05 — Network & security appliances

Question:

What firewall appliances (brand/model/throughput), hardware load balancer, core/distribution switches, and whether IDS/IPS, WAF, and HSM are deployed?

Authority's response:

As a Greenfield build, the contractor supplies the new platform's network and security appliances (including an HSM) as required per the RFP. The existing network-security appliances are security-sensitive and are not disclosed.

R2-06 — Internet connectivity & WAN

Question:

Primary/secondary internet (providers/technology/bandwidth), failover (BGP/ECMP or manual), WAN technology to branches, and average latency to the farthest branch?

Authority's response:

Connectivity provided by Ogero is at the Authority's cost. The contractor designs, configures, and maintains the networking infrastructure, including an independent redundant link path at its full cost for the whole contract term (Addendum No. 3, Article 2), under the all-inclusive scope.

R2-07 — Network architecture & segmentation

Question:

Is the network segmented (perimeter and internal segmentation), is traffic prioritization configured, what are the server-room switching speeds, and is the network documentation current?

Authority's response:

As a Greenfield build, the contractor designs the new platform's network architecture and segmentation. The existing topology, IP schema, and diagrams are security-sensitive and are not disclosed; they are not required to design the new network.

R2-08 — Network security & monitoring

Question:

Is network traffic continuously monitored (security-monitoring and logging tools), and are denial-of-service protection, DNS filtering, penetration-test history, and network access control in place?

Authority's response:

The new platform's security monitoring is designed and implemented by the contractor per the RFP's security requirements. The existing network's security-monitoring configuration is security-sensitive and is not disclosed.



R2-09 — External connectivity & integrations

Question:

What external government systems is HQ connected to, and how are integrations secured? Payment gateway, SMS/notification provider, and any public-cloud connectivity?

Authority's response:

The platform's integration partners are set out in the published Third-Party Integrations material (e.g., Lebanese Customs, Ministry of Finance, ISF, the postal service, insurance companies, notaries, driving schools, POS processors); the detailed integration specifications (protocols, endpoints, authentication) are reserved for the awarded contractor at the discovery phase. Production is on-premises with no public cloud. Any new integration required to deliver the services online is established by the contractor at no additional cost under the all-inclusive pricing.

R2-10 — Compliance & operations

Question:

Confirm zero reliance on public cloud for production; are software updates deliverable without external internet (local repository/mirror); is there a network configuration backup and change-management process?

Authority's response:

Confirmed — production is hosted on-premises in Lebanon, with no public cloud used for production data (RFP mandate). The citizen-facing services (mobile application and portal) are internet-facing but are served from the on-premises platform over the Authority's connectivity. The contractor provides the capability to apply software updates from a local repository when external internet is unavailable, and implements configuration backup and change management.

Section B — Equipment (4)

R2-11 — Card personalization equipment

Question:

What smart-card printers (brand/model/throughput/count), RFID encoders, lamination/hologram, laser-engraving, and RFID sticker printers/encoders are available (counts)?

Authority's response:

As a Greenfield build, the contractor supplies the new card-personalization equipment and proposes the quantities (no reuse of legacy hardware). The current card design is retained — the same specifications as the existing cards apply. Bidders should also refer to the issued Addenda Nos. 1 and 2 for the relevant volumes and equipment figures.

R2-12 — Biometric & capture devices

Question:

Specifications and model numbers of the installed biometric-fingerprint enrolment and digital-camera devices?



Authority's response:

As a Greenfield build, the contractor supplies the new biometric-capture and camera devices covering the RFP's enrolment requirements (per Addendum No. 2, live fingerprint scanners are provided at the enrolment workstations, ≥ 25 in total). The existing devices' models/specifications are not required for the new build and are not disclosed.

R2-13 — End-user devices & office equipment

Question:

Workstation specs (CPU/RAM/OS); HP printer models/specs/count; document-scanner count/specs (brand/DPI/duplex); POS/payment-terminal brand and count?

Authority's response:

The per-branch counts of workstations, counters, and scanners are published in the equipment information issued with Addendum No. 2; bidders size their supply to those counts. As a Greenfield build, the contractor supplies new end-user devices; the existing devices' exact specifications are not required to size the bid.

R2-14 — Monitoring (CCTV / queue)

Question:

How many CCTV cameras are installed, what areas do they cover, what is the retention period, and are queue-management display units present?

Authority's response:

The branch monitoring is a Greenfield requirement: the contractor proposes and supplies a complete transaction-linked CCTV and evidence-management solution — continuous recording at service counters and lane exits, tamper-evident storage linked to transactions — with a required retention of ninety (90) days and case-lock for flagged footage. The number, coverage and layout of existing cameras are security-sensitive and are not disclosed; they are not needed to prepare the bid, and any existing-infrastructure detail is reserved for the awarded contractor at the discovery phase. Queue-management display units, where required by the branch workflow, form part of the contractor-proposed branch solution under the all-inclusive pricing (PSF/CARC/CGAM).

Section C — System / Module Status (5)

R2-15 — Violations module (SY-11)

Question:

Does a violations module currently exist? If yes, its data volume and structure (migration vs greenfield)?

Authority's response:

As a Greenfield build, the contractor builds a new violations / enforcement module per the RFP. Any existing violations data is migrated as part of the data-migration work; the existing module's internal detail is reserved for the awarded contractor at the discovery phase.

R2-16 — RFID e-Sticker status (SY-13)

Question:



Are RFID stickers currently deployed? If yes, the number of active encoded stickers (migration / coexistence)?

Authority's response:

The RFID e-sticker (Vignette) is an optional, phased programme under the RFP: it is priced in the goods basket for comparison only and is not in general issuance — it remains disabled until the Authority issues a written Activation Notice (RFP §1.28.2), and the RFP may phase or defer it. Under the Greenfield model, when activated the new platform assumes the function with no parallel coexistence; scope and timing are the Authority's. Mechanical-inspection throughput is published with Addendum No. 2.

R2-17 — IAM — Active Directory / LDAP (SY-21)

Question:

Is an existing Active Directory or LDAP directory in place (integration/synchronization vs fresh provisioning)?

Authority's response:

As a Greenfield build, the contractor provisions the new platform's own identity and access management — its own user directory, roles, and authentication — created fresh on the new platform. The platform is self-contained and does not integrate with or depend on any existing/legacy directory. All of this is within the all-inclusive scope.

R2-18 — Full list of external integrations (SY-27)

Question:

Beyond AFIS and payment vendors, confirm all active and inactive integrations (e.g., National ID, Insurance, Customs, ISF, MoF) — each impacts integration scope and BoQ.

Authority's response:

The current integration partners are set out in the published Third-Party Integrations material (e.g., Lebanese Customs, Ministry of Finance, ISF, the postal service, insurance companies, notaries, driving schools...). For any additional or future integration, bidders refer to the RFP; any new integration required to deliver the services online is established by the contractor at no additional cost.

R2-19 — WAN-outage handling (SY-03)

Question:

What is the current operational impact when WAN connectivity is lost (to define offline-mode requirements and branch SLAs)?

Authority's response:

The RFP does not require branches to continue processing transactions offline if the WAN is lost. It requires offline credential verification (the mobile application and roadside checks verify the QR / signature offline and synchronise on reconnect) and resilience with user-facing fallbacks during outages, against the published availability targets (99.9% with 30% headroom). The contractor addresses these requirements in its design.

Section D — Laserfiche DMS (9)

R2-20 — Scope — legacy digitization

Question:

Confirm that the current project scope does NOT include the digitization or conversion of legacy (paper-based) documents.

Authority's response:

Confirmed — the digitization of legacy paper-based documents is a separate effort (the Laserfiche-based DMS under deployment); it is not within the scope of this RFP. The new platform integrates with that DMS for the documents it generates.

R2-21 — Reuse of existing DMS

Question:

Confirm the awarded bidder may use the existing Laserfiche DMS to store all future documents generated by TMO operations, without restrictions.

Authority's response:

Yes — the new platform integrates with the Authority's existing Laserfiche DMS to store the documents it generates; such integration is required. Laserfiche provides an open architecture with API/SDK, through which the contractor builds the integration under the all-inclusive scope; use follows the Authority's DMS governance and security model, and is not unrestricted.

R2-22 — DMS storage limits

Question:

Confirm there are no limitations on the number or types of documents that can be stored in the Laserfiche DMS.

Authority's response:

The DMS is sized to cover the expected document growth, and managing the DMS's capacity is the Authority's responsibility. Bidders size their integration accordingly; the Authority does not set per-bidder document limits.

R2-23 — Laserfiche SDK / API support

Question:

Confirm the DMS vendor (Laserfiche) will provide the necessary SDK and support required for API integration.

Authority's response:

Confirmed — the Authority's deployed Laserfiche DMS (on-premises) provides an open architecture with the SDK/API required for integration. The contractor performs the API-based integration under the all-inclusive scope; the DMS's own support and maintenance remain the Authority's responsibility. Detailed integration specifications are provided to the awarded contractor at the discovery phase.

R2-24 — Laserfiche support contract (5 yrs)

Question:



Confirm the Laserfiche platform is covered by a valid support and maintenance contract for five (5) years.

Authority's response:

The Laserfiche DMS is the Authority's system; its support and maintenance are the Authority's responsibility, not the contractor's. The contractor is not required to support or maintain the DMS — it integrates with it as provided (via its API/SDK) and prices only that integration under the all-inclusive scope. The DMS's own support-contract term is an internal Authority matter and is not part of this RFP.

R2-25 — Underlying infra support (5 yrs)

Question:

Confirm the underlying infrastructure (operating system and database) is covered under a five (5) year support agreement.

Authority's response:

As with the DMS platform, the DMS's underlying operating system and database are part of the existing DMS deployment and are the Authority's responsibility; their support term is an internal Authority matter and is not part of this RFP.

R2-26 — DMS backup/recovery scope

Question:

Confirm backup and recovery of the DMS are outside the scope of this project, and that the existing setup handles data growth (5-year warranty).

Authority's response:

Confirmed — the DMS's own backup, recovery, and data-growth/capacity are part of the existing DMS deployment and are the Authority's responsibility, outside this RFP's scope. The contractor is responsible only for the new platform's own data — its backup, recovery, and disaster recovery to the RFP's targets (on-prem warm standby, RPO $\leq$ 15 min / RTO $\leq$ 4 h, encrypted backups with periodic restore tests) — up to the point its integration hands documents to the DMS. DMS capacity and support are managed by the Authority under that separate deployment.

R2-27 — Backup server in place

Question:

Confirm a backup server or appliance is already in place and adequately sized to support the anticipated data growth.

Authority's response:

The DMS's backup server and its sizing form part of the existing DMS deployment and are the Authority's responsibility, outside this RFP's scope.

R2-28 — Infra sizing (legacy + new)

Question:

Confirm the current server and storage infrastructure are sized for both the digitized legacy data and the future data from the new system(s).



Authority's response:

These are two separate scopes. The infrastructure for the digitized legacy documents is part of the existing DMS deployment (the Authority's, designed to scale for that growth) and is outside this RFP's scope. The new platform's infrastructure — sized for both the migrated data and future data — is independently sized and supplied by the contractor as a Greenfield build to the RFP's performance, availability, and DR targets.

Section E — Administrative (1)

R2-29 — طلب تمديد مهلة تقديم العروض

السؤال:

نتقدم بطلب الموافقة على تمديد مهلة تقديم العروض لمدة ثلاثة (3) أسابيع إضافية .

رد الإدارة:

تم تمديد مهلة تقديم العروض إلى يوم الأربعاء 2026/7/15 بموجب الملحق التوضيحي رقم 1، وبذلك تكون المهلة الإضافية المطلوبة قد لحظت. وتُمدد سائر المهل الإجرائية تبعاً للمهلة الجديدة.



٣ - ٧ - ٢٦ <