

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

#### **General:**

1. The legally binding document is the "Answers to clarifying questions" document written in [Hebrew](#). This document is a translation of the document written in Hebrew and is therefore a supporting document only. In any case where there is a conflict or a discrepancy between this version and the Hebrew version, the Hebrew version shall prevail.
  2. All answers in this document shall be considered an integral part of the Call for Proposals (CfP) and the technical annex.
  3. All terms used in this document shall have the meaning determined for them in the CfP documents and the technical annex, unless stated otherwise.
  4. In any case of contradiction between the provisions of this document and those of the CfP and the technical annex, that stated in this document shall prevail.
- 

**1. Question:** The wording of the section appearing under the heading "target audiences" on the CfP page raises a misunderstanding concerning the identity of the applicant. This should be clarified.

**Answer:** The applicant can be any corporation registered in Israel. The corporation submitting an application may be a supplier or partner licensed to operate regular public transportation service lines or a corporation with the ability to provide autonomous buses or technology systems, provided that they comply with the requirements of the CfP and the technical annex. It should be clarified that there is no limitation on the number of bodies providing services or products to the applicant corporation.

---

**2. Question:** An extension of 60 additional days is requested for submitting clarifying questions. There are many actions and adjustments involved, and further questions are certain to arise while preparing for submission of a proposal, especially concerning the requirements of the professional application form.

**Answer:** After examining the application, as well as other requests to extend the due date for submission of clarifying questions, we have decided that the period for submitting clarifying questions will be extended until June 30, 2022, and that the answers to the clarifying questions will be published on the CfP page on a current basis until July 10, 2022. Notification of the extension of this period will be published on the authority website on the CfP pages, in Hebrew and English.

---

**3. Question:** We wish to consider increasing the grant sum to 100% of the project's cost. From discussions with potential technological partners, it turns out that they do not wish to participate in financing the project. In light of the operating characteristics of the public transportation operators in Israel, the winning operator is not expected to benefit from the

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

plan's products. Since the state is the main benefactor of these products, alongside the technological partners, it is requested that the state bear the full cost of financing the plan. It may be appropriate to determine a ceiling amount for the project's cost, according to commonly accepted pricing, and enable the bidders to submit proposals at a certain discount off the ceiling amount, provided that the approved plan's cost is fully financed. It should be noted that as part of section 8 of Annex B of Benefit Track No. 2, the option exists for an increased grant of 75% of the project's cost. It therefore seems appropriate to raise the increased grant sum to 100%.

**Answer:** Subject to provisions and procedures of the CfP and Benefit Track No. 2 (Annex B), the research committee may approve a grant of up to 75% for R&D costs of the approved budget, for plans with potentially extraordinary impact on streamlining and improvement of transportation in Israel.

---

**4. Question:** Could several winners be chosen? If so, how would this affect the percentage of the grant sum?

**Answer:** Yes, several winners could be chosen. The number of winners itself will not affect the grant sum, which is determined at the discretion of the research committee. It should be made clear that the full financing sum will be distributed only among the applicant corporations whose proposals are found most suitable by the research committee.

---

**5. Question:** We wish to clarify that as part of the application form it will be possible to submit several alternative routes in several cities, and ultimately choose the most suitable in cooperation with the public transportation authority and the technological partner.

**Answer:** Clarification is hereby given that as part of the application form it will be possible to submit a number of alternatives in several cities, while the applicant may choose the most suitable route, in cooperation with the project team. It should be noted that the routes proposed by the applicant will constitute a consideration when evaluating the application, inter alia, in light of their impact on the quality of the pilot plan, degree of challenges involved in the plan, and more.

---

**6. Question:** We wish to clarify whether coordination with the local authority in which the pilot will be operating and its commitment to support the project, including aspects of information and erection of infrastructure, will be implemented only after winning, as this requires a great deal of coordination and regulation that will not be possible in the period of time prior to submitting the proposal.

**Answer:** According to the project stages described in the technical annex and in light of the fact that driving on public roads is expected to start in the third stage of the project, clarification is hereby given that coordination with the local authority in which the pilot is planned to operate and its commitment to support the project, including information and erection of infrastructure,

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### **Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines**

may be implemented in the stage after winning, provided that before the winning operator begins the third stage of the project and as a necessary condition for it, he presents the project team with a plan and references as proof of adequate coordination made by him with the local authority as stated. It should be clear that when submitting the application, the applicant should present the project team with an LOI (Letter of Intent) on behalf of the experiment area or operational area or the local authority in which the transportation will be carried out.

---

**7. Question:** Is the winner obligated to make changes and improvements in the infrastructure? (Painting of routes, road signs, etc.).

**Answer:** No. This type of activity shall be conducted by the competent authorities, according to the progress of the project and the needs of the authorities. However, insofar as the winning corporation requirements for future changes in infrastructure, it should present them and price them as part of submitting the request.

---

**8. Question:** In the first bullet on p. 12 of the technical annex, it is written: "obligation of the applicant to fully operate the system if he wins, according to the operational and business plan presented in the application, and according to the approved schedule". When submitting the application, the scope of funding to be approved is still unknown; hence, no commitment can be made on the date of submission concerning the operation, even if the bidder is chosen as a winner. This obligation should be removed.

**Answer:** The intention of the above requirement is that the winner should undertake to operate the system according to the plans and schedules approved for him by the research committee, and not in a way that does not conform with the approved plans or deviates from them. Therefore, this section shall remain as is. It should be stressed that during the plan, reasoned requests for changes to the work plan may be submitted to the research committee. The committee has the authority to either approve or reject such requests.

---

**9. Question:** We wish to clarify whether presenting an insurance policy covering the activity of the service line included in the request will include coverage only of the existing activity. Implementation and signing of an insurance policy for operating an autonomous bus is a complex process that will not be possible within a short period of time and concerning this policy it seems appropriate to present it after winning.

**Answer:** It is hereby clarified that as part of the application, an insurance policy covering only the existing activity of the service line may be presented. The winning corporation should present an insurance policy for operating an autonomous bus within a reasonable period of time after winning, and before travel on the bus begins.

---

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**10. Question:** In the last bullet on p.12 of the technical annex it is written: "to the extent that after the pilot any obstacle arises to the continued operation of the line with autonomous buses, the operator must continue to operate the service line with non-autonomous vehicles unless approval is received from the Director of the National Public Transport Authority for termination of the service as part of that line". We wish to clarify whether the decision whether to continue operating the line after the end of the pilot and the method of operation (autonomous or driven by a person) will be in the hands of the operator.

**Answer:** The decision concerning the line's continued operation after the end of the pilot and the method of operation is at the discretion of the National Public Transport Authority.

---

**11. Question:** We request to reconsider the rationale for imposing compulsory payment of royalties on the winner. As is known, operation of public transportation in Israel is subsidized by the state. As with driver vehicles, the operation of AVs (autonomous vehicles) as part of the public transportation services is expected to be unprofitable. In addition, operation with AVs will be simultaneous with operation using driver vehicles and, of course, operation with drivers is not charged royalties. Therefore, there is no justification to charge the winning operator royalties, in the event of future operation of service lines with AVs.

**Answer:** The obligation to pay royalties is stipulated in the Encouragement of Research, Development and Technological Innovation in Industry Law 1984, in the provisions and in [Procedure 03-200](#): "Reporting and Payment of Royalties" (constituting an integral part of the provisions and procedures of Benefit Track No. 2). Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the procedure, as a rule no exemption can be given from the payment of royalties, when the obligating definition of royalties shall be as determined by the research committee. Based on this definition, the applicant will be charged with royalty payments.

Nevertheless, it should be made clear that pursuant to section 3.10.1 of procedure No. 03-200, a beneficiary may submit a request to halt the obligation to submit royalty report, if one of the following is fulfilled: the beneficiary is inactive; the R&D plan has failed; the beneficiary does not sell the product and no further income is expected for it.

---

**12. Question:** In section 7.1 b of the technical annex it is written: "the research and development subject of the plan including all its components shall be performed in Israel, by residents of Israel, unless the research committee is convinced, for reasons to be given, that in order to execute the plan it is vital that part of the plan be executed outside Israel or by non-residents or Israel." In section 8.2 a 2 of the technical annex it is written: "In its decision on the grant sum, the research committee shall give significant weight to the approval recipient's declaration concerning the portion of local manufacture in Israel". Does this mean that engagement with a technology company requires a company that meets the conditions of being Israeli? This kind of limits the market of possibilities.

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**Answer:** The above sections relate only to the corporation submitting the application. There is no obstacle preventing the applicant corporation from engaging with foreign technology companies, in order to meet the requirements of the CfP and technical annex.

---

**13. Question:** May the committee approve a budget different from the project cost estimated by the applicant in the plan submitted by him?

**Answer:** The research committee may approve a budget different from that submitted to it, inter alia, according to a professional opinion.

---

**14. Question:** What are the criteria for determining the scope of the grant (20% to 50% of the approved project budget)?

**Answer:** The criteria are detailed in [benefit track No. 2](#) and in the project's CfP document.

---

**15. Question:** We wish to clarify whether none of the aspects of the operation agreement between the state and the operator in the cluster will be considered as double financing or double support concerning the benefit track.

**Answer:** It is hereby clarified that none of the aspects of the operation agreement between the state and the operator in the cluster will be considered as double financing or double support concerning the benefit track.

---

**16. Question:** In the webinar it was said that the financing applies only to the depreciation component. How will the cost of the vehicles be financed, and how will their value and use ultimately be determined? On the basis of what period are the vehicles developed?

**Answer:** The depreciation of a public transportation vehicle is accrued over 5 years up to 100%. The depreciation is according to the relative part of the period of use approved in the project. The vehicle continues to be property of the corporation even after the project has ended. Another option is to rent or lease a vehicle, and then submit the full cost of the rental or leasing.

---

**17. Question:** We wish to clarify the appointed times for receipt of financing in the event of winning. Is it given in one installment after winning? Or, on a periodic basis contingent upon achieving milestones? In any case, if payment is according to milestones, it seems appropriate that it should be on a monthly basis.

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**Answer:** As a rule, the winning corporation may receive an advance payment of up to 35% of the approved budget, according to the research committee's decision, while the rest of the payments will be made on a quarterly basis against expense reports, as detailed in the benefit track procedures.

---

**18. Question:** As part of section 5 of the CfP it is noted that "the plans should demonstrate pre-product capabilities on a high technological readiness level (TRL 7-8) without significant R&D content, except for adjustments to domestic market needs. We request further details of this requirement, and a way to examine the meaning of this section's requirement, with attention to the product's high degree of innovativeness.

**Answer:** The wording of this section in the CfP was changed as follows: "the plans should demonstrate pre-product capabilities at a high level of readiness without significant R&D content, except for adjustments to domestic market needs" (without noting the TRL level). Correspondingly, corporations submitting an application as part of the CfP should be ready for a demonstration, a test run, and operation of the bus or shuttle already on the occasion of submitting the application. It should be clear that the higher the level of technological readiness or proposed solution, the better the chances of getting a grant.

---

**19. Question:** To the best of our knowledge, there is no AV system currently in existence that even comes close to TRL 7-8, certainly not in public transportation. Therefore, we request to remove this threshold requirement which is not applicable, both with regard to the level of readiness and the R&D content. Consequently, it is suggested that the proposed product be examined by the committee, considering the fact that under the circumstances there will be significant R&D costs in order to adapt the product to the public transportation sector.

**Answer:** The wording of this section was changed as follows: "the plans should demonstrate pre-product capabilities at a high level of readiness without significant R&D content, except for adjustments to domestic market needs" (without noting the TRL level). Correspondingly, corporations submitting an application as part of the CfP should be ready for a demonstration, a test run, and operation of the bus or independent shuttle already on the occasion of submitting the application. It should be clear that the higher the level of technological readiness or proposed solution, the better the chances of getting a grant.

---

**20. Question:** On page 4 of the technical annex is a definition of human response team. We wish to clarify whether at the end of the definition this refers to certification "on behalf" of the operator.

**Answer:** It is hereby clarified that the position requires certification of the operator or certification on behalf of the operator.

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

---

**21. Question:** Concerning the rest of the functionalities defined in the definitions section of the technical annex (inspectors, shippers, etc) - are a certain number of functionalities or position percentages required?

**Answer:** There is no requirement for any specific number of functionalities or defined position percentage, provided that the winning corporation meets the requirements and provisions of the CfP and technical annex.

---

**22. Question:** In all stages of execution, can a proposal be submitted based on one minibus/bus only (for MVP purposes)?

**Answer:** As detailed in the technical annex, in stages A until D of the project, driving can be made with a single AV, while only from stages E to G the winning corporation is required to operate several vehicles (Stage E – at least 3 vehicles, and Stages F to G at least 5 vehicles). In this context, the CfP states as follows: "the number of autonomous buses operated by the corporation shall be 1-15, in a progressively increasing number, according to the schedule from the day the win is confirmed as detailed in the annex to the CfP".

---

**23. Question:** We request your approval that as part of the option applicants are given to propose another format of activity, the process be carried out in the MVP model, in order that the technological feasibility of one vehicle is proven at the outset.

**Answer:** As detailed in the technical annex, in stages A until D of the project, trips can be made with a single AV, while only from stages E to G the winning corporation is required to operate several vehicles (Stage E - 3 vehicles, and Stages F to G at least 5 vehicles). In this context, the CfP states as follows: "the number of autonomous buses operated by the corporation shall be 1-15, in a progressively increasing number, according to the schedule from the day the win is confirmed as detailed in the annex to the CfP".

---

**24. Question:** To the best of our knowledge, there is no system with a technological autonomy level 4 in existence; hence, we request to remove this requirement at the application stage.

**Answer:** According to the provisions of the technical annex, in stages A to F of the project, rides will be made with a safety driver in the vehicle, while only at stage G (the last) of the project will removal of the safety driver gradually begin. The aim of the project is to operate buses and shuttles at a technological autonomy level of 4 (SAE J3016).

---

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**25. Question:** Can the service line be operated within a delimited area, such as a government hospital campus?

**Answer:** The service line may be operated within such a delimited area, according to the objectives and conditions of the project stages, provided that all regulatory approvals have been given for it. The proposed service line will be examined by the research committee, inter alia, with consideration for the level of challenge offered by it, the risk it poses, the service lines proposed by other corporations submitting a response to the CfP, the potential demand for rides, and the prioritization model of the National Public Transport Authority.

---

**26. Question:** In the footnote on page 8 of the technical annex, for good measure, we shall ask you to provide all of the procedures the companies should become familiar with according to this note.

**Answer:** The relevant law on this matter the Law for the Amendment of Traffic Ordinance (No. 130) 2022, published in the records on March 15, 2022. The provision of the procedure derived from the law marked AV-02-2022 and whose heading is "Authorization to Operate Vehicle with Autonomous Driverless Driving System on a Public Road" will soon be published on the Ministry of Transportation website. With regard to application for a service line license, see addendum D to the technical annex. Applicants shall keep abreast of changes in the provisions of the law.

---

**27. Question:** In the footnote on page 8 of the technical annex it is noted that the companies should jumpstart the permit process for performing experiments as early as possible. It should be made clear whether this refers to the stage of responding to the CfP or after winning.

**Answer:** The corporations should obtain the regulatory approvals required for compliance with the project stages as early as possible; however, it should be made clear that these approvals are not a condition for winning but rather for the consequent project stages.

---

**28. Question:** We wish to call your attention to the fact that after the words "as part of the response to the CfP an integrated professional form shall be submitted including:..." on page 9, it seems that the continuation currently on page 11 should appear instead, whereas the diagram currently on page 10 should have appeared at the end of section 6. If such a correction is required, we would ask to make it in order to preclude any misunderstandings.

**Answer:** Indeed, the diagram on page 10 of the technical annex belongs to section 6 of the annex beginning on page 8. The illustration was placed there because it requires an entire page. Section 7 of the annex appears on pp. 8-9 and is continued on page 11 (after skipping over the illustration).



## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

---

**29. Question:** It is noted that "service line proposed as part of the application should comply with the prioritization model of the National Public Transport Authority". We request to receive the above prioritization model, or at least data on it.

**Answer:** For more information on this matter, send email to: [sternil@mot.gov.il](mailto:sternil@mot.gov.il).

---

**30. Question:** We wish to know at what stage is the operator required to produce a guarantee from the local authority in which the pilot is designated to operate for the existence of suitable infrastructures?

**Answer:** According to the project stages detailed in the technical annex, and particularly in light of the fact that driving on public roads is expected to take place from the third stage of the project, it is hereby clarified that coordination with the local authority in which the pilot will operate and its commitment to support the project, including aspects of explanation and establishment of infrastructure, may be performed at the stage following the win, provided that the winning operator has not yet begun the third stage of the project and, as a necessary condition for it, he must present the project team with a plan and references as proof of adequate coordination with the local authority as stated. It should be clear that when submitting the application, the applicant should present the project team with an LOI (Letter of Intent) on behalf of the experiment area or operational area or the local authority in which the transportation will be carried out.

---

**31. Question:** The company wishes, for good measure, to call the committee's attention to the fact that markings i and d mentioned in the footnote on page 13 do not appear in the table on this and on the following page. In addition, the explanation of marking d as it appears in the above footnote on page 1 does not accurately correspond to the explanation of this symbol's meaning in addendum A.

**Answer:** Markings i and d as appear in the document should be ignored. Attention should only be paid to the markings in addendum A to the annex, as defined in this addendum.

---

**32. Question:** We request clarification as to what procedure is referred to at the end of the first paragraph, by the words "in the procedure's provisions" on page 15 section 11 of the technical annex?

**Answer:** This refers to the provisions of the procedure to be determined by the Ministry of Transportation as detailed in the Law for the Amendment of Traffic Ordinance (No. 130) 2022.

## Answers to clarifying questions

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

---

**33. Question:** Correction is needed, that the requirement to provide the information detailed in section 12 on page 15 of the technical annex is from the winner(s) in the pilot/operation stage, and not the "applicants" as stated in the section.

**Answer:** It is hereby clarified that transfer of the information detailed in the above section to the project management center shall be made by the winning corporation, after the win is announced, according to the requirements and conditions of the project stages and not at the application stage.

---

**34. Question:** For the sake of coherence with the clarification given on the matter of ownership of knowledge as part of the threshold conditions, and with awareness of the importance of this matter, it seems that the statement in section 16 of the technical annex according to which the winners' ownership "refers" to knowledge, is insufficient; and it should be made clear later on in the above section that the winner's right to ownership of the knowledge associated with the autonomous driving system's technological capabilities (both existing and new knowledge) are and shall remain in the hands of the winner.

**Answer:** As stated in section 16 of the technical annex, clarification is hereby given that the winner's right to ownership of the knowledge associated with the autonomous driving system's technological capabilities (both existing and new knowledge) are and shall remain in the hands of the winner.

---

**35. Question:** For the sake of coherence with that stated in section 13 of the technical annex, after the wording "all knowledge associated with service and operational aspects, produced by the project", should be added the words "and pertaining to the system's integration as part of the operation of public transportation". Furthermore it is requested that at the end of section 13 emphasis C it should be noted that that stated in section 13 emphasis C is subject to that stated in section 16, and that stated in the threshold conditions in this context.

**Answer:** The requested words and clarifications have been added in such a way that the appended wording of emphasis C in section 13 of the annex is as follows: "**Emphasis C:** as stated in the following section 16, the Initiative management team have the right to make any use of the knowledge pertaining to operational and service aspects acquired during the project period".

---

**36. Question:** As a public transportation operator, section 17 with the heading "Royalties" is not clear to us. This is because to the best of our knowledge the term "royalties" in the public transportation world refers to the payment of royalties already paid by the public transportation operator in the cluster in which he won before commencement of the activity. Could a

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

numerical example be provided to illustrate the meaning of this section? The above question is also asked in connection with the term "royalties obligation" that appears as part of the threshold conditions.

**Answer:** the obligation to pay royalties is stipulated in the Encouragement of Research, Development and Technological Innovation in Industry Law 1984, in the provisions and in [Procedure 03-200](#): "Reporting and Payment of Royalties" (constituting an integral part of the provisions and procedures of Benefit Track No. 2). Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the procedure, as a rule no exemption can be given from the payment of royalties, when the obligating definition of royalties shall be as determined by the research committee. Based on this definition, the applicant will be charged with royalty payments.

Nevertheless, it should be made clear that pursuant to section 3.10.1 of procedure No. 03-200, a beneficiary may submit a request to halt the obligation to submit royalty report, if one of the following is fulfilled: the beneficiary is inactive; the R&D plan has failed; the beneficiary does not sell the product and no further income is expected for it.

---

**37. Question:** We would appreciate receiving a tracking table for the wholeness of the proposal, with separation between forms filled out in the computerized system and forms/approvals required in hard copy format.

**Answer:** No such tracking table exists. All documents must be submitted online while fulfilling the requirements detailed in the benefit track provisions, the CfP, and the technical annex. For any questions on how to submit the application, contact customer relations at the Innovation Authority email: [contactus@innovationisrael.org.il](mailto:contactus@innovationisrael.org.il) or telephone 03-7157900 Sun-Thurs from 09:00-17:00.

---

**38. Question:** The committee is requested to check and fix the numbering of subsections 21 and 22 of addendum A of the technical annex.

**Answer:** Read the numbering of the subsections of sections 21 and 22 according to the section numbering 21.1, 21.2... and 22.1, 22.2... respectively).

---

**39. Question:** In section 21 of addendum A to the annex, it would be appropriate to confirm that capability to travel in fog and at night is not required in the first stage of the experiment.

**Answer:** The more varied the scenarios in which the applicant corporation can show travel capability, the higher the ranking his proposal will receive. It should be made clear that the corporation will receive approval for travel according to vehicle capabilities.

---

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**40. Question:** It would be appropriate to clarify whether the IP used as part of the response to the CfP/ experiment/ project should be Israeli (in other words, kept in Israel).

**Answer:** As stated in section 16 of the technical annex, all knowledge connected with service and operational aspects produced by the project will be owned by the National Public Transport Authority and kept in Israel. There is no obstacle to prevent the knowledge pertaining to the autonomous driving system's technological capabilities (retained under ownership of the winning corporations) from being imported.

---

**41. Question:** It would be appropriate for the matter of accessibility to be handled in phase 2 (if our proposal for transition to MVP model is accepted).

**Answer:** As written in the CfP, one of the criteria for evaluating the application for financing is accessibility of the autonomous buses included in the proposal for people with a mobility impairment, in addition to the compulsory requirements pursuant to the regulations of equal rights for the disabled (arrangement of accessibility to public transportation services). Furthermore, according to section 4.11 of addendum A to the technical annex, the applicant is required to describe, as part of the request, inter alia, methods and procedures that apply to taking passengers with accessibility issues.

---

**42. Question:** What will the maximum speed permitted in the experiment stage be?

**Answer:** No maximum speed has been determined. The speed of travel will be determined according to road conditions and the authentication scenarios the winning corporation will have to perform. It should be made clear that the corporation's ability to travel within the speed limits could be an advantage in examining the application (i.e., a vehicle capable of traveling at a speed of 70 kph will be preferred over a vehicle limited to 25 kph). With regard to minimum speed, it should be emphasized that the traveling vehicle must not be an impediment to traffic.

---

**43. Question:** You are requested to confirm that parking may be performed manually, after the bus has arrived at its final stop.

**Answer:** There is no obstacle to prevent entry and exit from parking from being assisted by a human driver.

---

**44. Question:** Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm that AVs capable of transporting 10-15 passengers are acceptable?

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**Answer:** It is hereby clarified that vehicles capable of transporting 10-15 passengers may be proposed.

---

**45. Question:** Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm that AVs that operate at speeds of around 20 kmh are acceptable? Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm if there are minimum and maximum AV speed requirements?

**Answer:** No maximum speed has been determined. The speed of travel will be determined according to road conditions and the authentication scenarios the winning corporation will have to perform. It should be made clear that the corporation's ability to travel within the speed limits could be an advantage in examining the application (i.e., a vehicle capable of traveling at a speed of 70 kph will be preferred over a vehicle limited to 25 kph). With regard to minimum speed, it should be emphasized that the traveling vehicle must not be an impediment to traffic.

---

**46. Question:** Page 11 of the CfP Appendix states, "Accessibility for persons with disability characteristics..." Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm whether it is a requirement that some or all AVs are wheelchair accessible?

**Answer:** As written in the CfP, one of the criteria for evaluating the application for financing is accessibility of the autonomous buses included in the proposal for people with a mobility impairment, in addition to the compulsory requirements pursuant to the regulations of equal rights for the disabled (arrangement of accessibility to public transportation services). Furthermore, according to section 4.11 of addendum A to the technical annex, the applicant is required to describe, as part of the request, inter alia, methods and procedures that apply to taking passengers with accessibility issues.

---

**47. Question:** Since our solution can fully support both fixed route and on-demand public transportation services, can the Ministry of Transportation confirm if it seeks for the pilot to be on-demand (i.e., AVs are hailed on-demand and are dynamically routed) or be capable of doing so in the future?

**Answer:** the current CfP is intended for travel under service lines. On-demand services will be considered as a future option. It should be made clear that a corporation presenting capabilities to provide on-demand services, may receive higher ranking for his proposal.

---

**48. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation seek to enable riders to book rides on the vehicles, on-demand or pre-scheduled?

**Answer:** Services of this kind will be considered as a future option.

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

---

**49. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation seek to enable riders to confirm that they have boarded the vehicle without Safety Driver intervention?

**Answer:** Yes.

---

**50. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation seek to enable riders to provide feedback and respond to surveys?

**Answer:** Yes.

---

**51. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation seek to enable riders to communicate with customer support or Safety Drivers?

**Answer:** Yes.

---

**52. Question:** Since our solution can fully support all vehicle types, does the Ministry of Transportation seek to Integrate both AVs and conventional vehicles within the same service?

**Answer:** It should be made clear that this is not a compulsory requirement; however, it can be an advantage when evaluating the application.

---

**53. Question:** Since our solution can fully support all vehicle types, does the Ministry of Transportation seek to Integrate multiple AV providers within the same service?

**Answer:** It should be made clear that this is not a compulsory requirement; however, it can be an advantage when evaluating the application.

---

**54. Question:** Commingle services - e.g., microtransit, fixed route bus, paratransit?

**Answer:** The current CfP is intended for travel under service lines. Services of this kind will be considered as a future option.

---

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**55. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation seek to enable intermodal transportation (e.g., enable riders to view and book connecting public transportation options in the same booking medium used for the pilot)?

**Answer:** It should be made clear that this is not a compulsory requirement.

---

**56. Question:** The CfP website states, "The corporations that are found to be suitable will be awarded government funding ranging between 20% - 50% of the cost of operating the pilot according to the provisions in the Innovation Law, Benefit No. 2 Program and the Program Procedures." Does the Ministry of Transportation have any guidelines or limitations for how the remaining pilot costs can be covered, such as through fare box revenue and advertising revenue?

**Answer:** Subject to provisions and procedures of the CfP and Benefit Track No. 2 (Annex B), the research committee may approve a grant of up to 75% for R&D costs of the approved budget, for plans with potentially extraordinary impact on streamlining and improvement of transportation in Israel. It should be emphasized that financing from the research committee can be received for any activity, provided that it advances the pilot, all subject to the benefit track procedures.

---

**57. Question:** Page 3 of the CfP Appendix states, "The initiative will enable to support and examine the companies' business organization with the intent that at the end of 12 to 24 months of receiving participation approval, the option of the companies operating commercially will be examined - in the framework of operating a licensed public transport Service Line, using autonomous public buses in Israel." Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm the contract term for the pilot?

**Answer:** The length of the pilot period is up to 24 months. The greater the readiness of the corporation's solution for transporting passengers and operation by the public transportation operator, the possibility of shortening the pilot will be considered. After completing the pilot, and if the solution is ready as stated, the National Public Transport Authority intends to continue expansion of the solution's assimilation in Israel's public transportation.

---

**58. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation seek to prioritize any particular populations (e.g., historically underprivileged) and/or points of interest (e.g., places of education, employment)?

**Answer:** The service line proposed as part of the application must comply with the prioritization model of the National Public Transport Authority. Answer: for more information on this matter, send email to: [sternil@mot.gov.il](mailto:sternil@mot.gov.il). Furthermore, it should be made clear that

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

the more the characteristics of the proposed service are accessible to the disabled and underprivileged (as mentioned in the question), this can be an advantage when evaluating the application.

---

**59. Question:** Does the Ministry of Transportation have requirements or guidelines for the service zones and routes selected for Operation Space?

**Answer:** There are no requirements or instructions unique to the various operation sites or various routes. Several route alternatives may be submitted, while the applicant may choose the most suitable route, in cooperation with the project team. It should be made clear that the routes proposed by the applicant service line will be a consideration when evaluating the application, inter alia, with consideration for the level of challenge offered by it, the risk it poses, the service lines proposed by other corporations submitting a response to the CfP, the potential demand for rides, and the prioritization model of the National Public Transport Authority.

---

**60. Question:** Page 7 of the CfP Appendix states that Stage G "...gradually removing the Safety Driver..." Does this need to occur on all the roads/routes in the Operation Space from previous stages, or can the removal of the Safety Driver occur just for a specific subset of roads/routes (e.g., specifically well-suited for a safe and successful Safety Driver removal).

**Answer:** The aim of the project is to operate autonomous driverless service lines, for those service lines that travelled with a safety driver prior to stage G of the project. There is no intention of operating a service line with a safety driver at the end of the pilot. A corporation may ask to operate more than one service line without a driver; however, it will have to accumulate the travel experience required with a safety driver on each line separately, according to the requirements and terms of the project stages.

---

**61. Question:** Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm whether there are any quality of service parameters for the pilot (e.g., maximum rider wait time)?

**Answer:** Parameters relating to quality of service will be determined in the line license and operation agreement of the public transportation operator in the cluster the line will be operating in.

---



## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**62. Question:** Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm which entity is responsible for setting the fare price and whether there are any restrictions?

**Answer:** Bus fares are determined according to price controls on goods and services order (prices of tickets on the service lines of buses and local trains) 2003, and pursuant to the Public Transport Tariffs Law 2016. Subsidy payment to public transportation operators is determined according to the agreements between the state and the operators. Therefore, the final transport tariff shall be determined in the operation agreement of the public transportation operator in the cluster in which he operates the service line.

---

**63. Question:** Page 12 of the CfP Appendix references the “rider experience poll.” Can the Ministry of Transportation confirm whether there are any other rider education features (e.g., in-ride screens with live trip information, real-time customer support) desired?

**Answer:** Presentation of abilities as detailed in the question can be an advantage in evaluating the proposal.

---

**64. Question:** As part of the annex to the CfP, particularly addendum A to it, on the date of submission the applicant is required to provide a response and hand over documents referring to about 90 different sections, most of them pertaining to the way of operation of the buses in the project's operation space, after completion of activity in the experiment area which is expected to go on for a year. Attached herein is a list of the sections as mapped by us. Therefore, we request to diminish the requirement for producing information and documents at the proposal submission stage, and have it related only to the stages executed in the experiment area such as test run plan, integrity of the solution, suitability for use as part of the public transportation lines, etc. and not the stages executed in the operation space (including operation methods and procedures, manpower training processes, etc.).

**Answer:** The necessary documents and forms that must be attached to the application appear on the [support of pilots in the field of transportation page](#). In addition, the documents specified in the technical appendix must be attached to the application as appendices. The more detailed and complete the application submitted, the higher the chances of winning. It is clarified that the submitting corporations that do not attach to their application documents listed in the Technical Appendix, will be forced to complete them during the review period, in accordance with the requirements of the evaluators.

---

## **Answers to clarifying questions**

### Call for Proposals for examining the integration of autonomous buses in service lines

**65. Question:** In the CfP documents, there is reference to the declaration of the experiments company we will work with. Can these experiments be performed based on internal resources and departments in the company that deal in it as part of their regular work, without an external body?

**Answer:** Experiments may be performed based on internal resources; however, signed approval must be obtained from a certified auto lab and presented to the Ministry of Transportation to prove execution of the experiments. Details of the certified auto labs can be found in the [following link](#).

---

**66. Question:** Can a proposal be submitted as a partnership in which one of the members is a company with a license to run buses, alongside technology suppliers and other companies, a kind of consortium?

**Answer:** The applicant can be any corporation registered in Israel. The corporation submitting an application may be a supplier or partner licensed to operate regular public transportation service lines or a corporation with the ability to provide autonomous buses or technology systems, provided that they comply with the requirements of the CfP and the technical annex. It should be clarified that there is no limitation on the number of bodies providing services or products to the applicant corporation.

---

**67. Question:** Can we simultaneously submit a proposal to the CfP for operation of pilots in the transportation area, including tasks that are complementary to the autonomous shuttle autonomy project?

**Answer:** Yes. Applications complementary to the CfP may be submitted simultaneously to the ["support track for pilots in the transportation field"](#) and the project's CfP.

---

**68. Question:** Can the shuttle be operated on a route that is not an existing bus line? Must the bus company operate the route within its area of franchise or can it do so in other areas too?

**Answer:** the project will enable operation of autonomous buses under service lines, new or existing, to be approved in the line license. The routes will be operated within the franchise areas approved in the line license.

---