



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

Gatineau

Quebec

K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT  
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise  
indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation  
remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire,  
les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Systems Software Procurement Division / Division des  
achats des logiciels d'exploitation  
Terrasses de la Chaudière  
4th Floor, 10 Wellington Street  
4th étage, 10, rue Wellington  
Gatineau  
Quebec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> RFI for AI Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 24062-190106/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 006
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 24062-190106	<b>Date</b> 2018-08-30
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$SEE-017-33657	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 017ee.24062-190106	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2018-10-29</b>	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Lessard, Peter	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 017ee
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 850-7602 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

This amendment 006 is raised for the following:

- 1) Publish the questions and answers from the July 20, 2018 Industry Engagement Day
  
- 2) Clarify the RFI and Solicitation closing dates

This RFI will be continually amended to advise industry, on an ongoing basis, of industry engagement activities and resulting feedback. To facilitate the above process, it is Canada's intention to keep the RFI phase of the solicitation open until such time as a Request for Supply Arrangement is released. Responses to the RFI process are requested by the date below.

RFI Requested Response Date: September 7, 2018

This Request for Information process includes the industry consultation detailed below:

Industry Day held: July 20, 2018

One-on-One Sessions held: September 4 to 11, 2018

Participation in this RFI or any industry engagement activities is encouraged, but is not mandatory. There will be no short-listing of potential suppliers for the purposes of undertaking any future work as a result of this RFI. Similarly, participation in this RFI is not a condition or prerequisite for the participation in any potential subsequent solicitation.

Respondents will not be reimbursed for any cost incurred by participating in this RFI.

The RFI closing date published herein is not the deadline for comments or input. Comments and input will be accepted any time up to the time when/if a follow-on solicitation is published.

# AI RFI Industry Day Questions and Responses for Products

Breakout room notes - First Session (Products):

Questions	Response
<p>What would be the best evaluation criteria to successfully pre-qualify companies for the future AI procurement vehicle, for example: company experience, # of projects completed, experience of personnel, breadth and depth of services, other?</p>	<p>You need to understand the use-cases – so using chatbots, supporting citizens, are really good ways of categorizing the AI streams. Identifying the business cases, then the success measurements. I would also add that not all AI companies have the same means – the GC should not rely solely on the industry to do the R &amp; D. it should not all be POC's.</p> <p>Products to do only AI may not be. It's more important to understand the goals of what GC needs, rather than understanding the actual products available on the market.</p> <p>As a small company – it terrifies me to hear about agile procurement (to me, it means short term, low value) – it does not stimulate my interest to invest in a partnership (to me, it is also about a commitment to relationship). It is more interesting to have a commitment to the big picture, and delivering lasting value. It could be a two year roadmap. I am fearing that PSPC might take the approach that we are going to go three months by three months, and not have an end vision to work towards. Because the cycles in government are so long, it means that we may not see the full picture, or be able to deliver something meaningful.</p> <p>Having milestones in a three year agreement could still be Agile. We can still meet our SLAs, but the investment in getting the contract is so onerous, that it may not be worth doing that.</p>
<p>Has there been some consideration given to material# hardware, etc. the open data conversation is also muddying the waters. Has the GC figured out how it would categorize those?</p>	<p>There are tons of use-cases. But we have not been doing that.</p>

Breakout room notes - Second Session (Products):

Questions	Response
<p>How do we define a product?</p> <p>Is there a common definition in the industry? Can the industry coalesce around that term?</p>	<p>A product is something you can use right out of the box –may not be COTS and predefined, but something you can use (HW, SW, and algorithm).</p> <p>Not really – maybe more around software.</p>
<p>Would a product have intellectual property?</p> <p>Do we need to delineate?</p>	<p>The algorithm within the product may have IP.</p> <p>There are difference in trade agreements applications between goods and services.</p> <p>The discussion might be more around how you consume it – the question of ownership could be one of the differentiating criteria.</p> <p>We may need to keep some fluidity around the definitions.</p>
<p>In AI, there's tool benches, work benches that exist – chatbots learn. This is part of the AI capability that is extremely broad.</p>	<p>Maybe you want to have two streams for internal and external services and maybe focus more on the buyers need.</p> <p>One of the things (CSE) I would like to do is to bring a group of folks for a fixed price, to do a Proof of Concept to help me articulate better what I want, and iterate and increment. I have never seem specification, then solution work properly.</p>
<p>How would you propose that the GOC reflect, monitor and adjust for changes in AI algorithms, technology, and evolution of products over time in a contract with the GOC?</p>	<p>Most likely vendors would like to see the ability to change, advance, move forward with products, through time.</p> <p>Including new technology, new solutions, and we release, and add new software, etc., a vendor does not want to stop the sales process, to enhance the sales process is something vendors would like to do.</p> <p>Open it up, and ensure new vendors can come into the vehicle.</p>

Breakout room notes - Third Session (Products):

Questions	Response
<p>What would be the best evaluation criteria to successfully pre-qualify companies for the future AI procurement vehicle, for example: company experience, # of projects completed, experience of personnel, breadth and depth of services, other?</p>	<p>The less procurement, the better, so there is less effort in the procurement process.</p> <p>These are the usual criteria, the question is whether or not Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) can qualify to the experience factors, etc. (so maybe: niche players will not necessarily be able to compete).</p>
<p>How do you get to a proof of capability?</p>	<p>Maybe we can have a variety of stages for the streams.</p> <p>We need to ensure we don't isolate the different parts of the spectrum (innovation and experiment).</p> <p>Maybe we can do hackathons, Proofs of OCs, and share some of the risk with the vendors.</p>
<p>How do you define AI products: An app? An algorithm? A chatbot?</p>	<p>It's not about defining and buying AI, it's about solving a business problem.</p>

## Webex Questions and Responses for Products

Webex Questions	Response
<p>Does industry categorize themselves in one of the streams of AI? If so, where?</p>	<p>Offering available but the challenge is in configuration.</p> <p>AI means different things to different companies.</p> <p>Need to involve SSC (Department that supports Infrastructure) on architecture networking security, and do this early because departments are frustrated with how long it can take with discussions with SSC.</p> <p>Need to keep in mind cloud practices when determining modern infrastructures. Factors include delay in getting to cloud and being agile and nimble as well as security (Protected B).</p> <p>Important to make sure everything is good with the procurement vehicle but without infrastructure then there is a barrier to entry.</p>
<p>We would like to know what to consider in terms of selecting fair evaluation criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is right balance between never done it (theoretically) to 10 project (proven) so there are no barriers to entry for SMEs?</li> <li>- When designing the evaluation grid, where are sources for information?</li> </ul>	<p>A SME has a proof of concept for finding simple solutions to complex problems.</p> <p>The SME is not an AI dedicated company but has AI products.</p> <p>Another medium sized company is an open source software integrator but not an AI dedicated company.</p> <p>The SMEs wanted to be included in value chain in shaping the solutions and products.</p> <p>Need to have a greater understanding of the problem to determine good evaluation criteria (e.g. an individual might have a PhD in Machine Learning but not understand the problem).</p> <p>Request was made for one on one conversations.</p> <p>Industry was requested to respond to the RFI to provide us with information we need to consider, identify things to get through in expedited way, how the new industry will look in terms of infrastructures, services hardware and software and information on how to do a fair evaluation.</p> <p>Industry was informed that there will be one on ones open to all to ensure transparency.</p>
<p>Will the Treasury Board Secretariat whitepaper be shared?</p>	<p>This whitepaper has been shared to industry as part of the RFI.</p>

Webex Questions	Response
<p>How would you propose that the GOC reflect, monitor and adjust for changes in AI algorithms, technology, and evolution of products over time in a contract with the GOC?</p>	<p>Reference website with tips provided below: <a href="http://www.sourcingspeak.com/2018/02/sourcing-ai-tips.html">www.sourcingspeak.com/2018/02/sourcing-ai-tips.html</a></p> <p>Suggestion of a quarterly refresh of the vehicle and consideration of cloud and AI procurement.</p> <p>Algorithms are proprietary (what to analyze and machine gets smarter as analyzed).</p> <p>There is a need to determine what is proprietary to government and industry in procurement (e.g. Intellectual Property).</p> <p>There is a need for methodology and data to be released in transparent way and the algorithm is not necessary part of that.</p> <p>Existing platform for AI in government. Considerations:</p> <p>How do you put governance around them? How does this dovetail with those. Some are out under existing vehicles which makes sense in many cases.</p> <p>Recommend obtaining a list of known vendors and existing contracts.</p> <p>Recommend identifying if working with government on AI in response to RFI</p>
<p>Any challenges in using the procurement vehicles or what works?</p>	<p>There are several RFI and RFP out there but for a specific requirement.</p> <p>May not need to reinvent the wheel.</p> <p>The regulatory review RFI is open until August 29th.</p>
<p>How does industry access the RFIs?</p>	<p>The RFIs are on the website <a href="http://buyandsell.gc.ca">buyandsell.gc.ca</a>. Type "Artificial Intelligence" into search engine.</p> <p>If there are any questions about the current RFI please sent them to the Contracting Authority, Peter Lessard.</p>
<p>Will the notes from today's sessions be shared with the group?</p>	<p>Yes, the notes will be sent to the industry via an amendment to the RFI.</p>

<b>Webex Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>How are we building accessibility in to the procurement?</p>	<p>Accessibility is important consideration.</p> <p>Minister Qualtrough now has accessibility as part of her portfolio.</p> <p>Concern expressed with accessibility and not getting the result we need (e.g. woman reading booking about depression but what came out in alternate text was woman in café talking with friends).</p> <p>Anywhere we need human interaction there needs to be a consideration for data and labelling.</p> <p>How accessibility policy needs to be updated (TBS separate policy discussion).</p>

## AI RFI Industry Day Questions and Responses for Services

Questions	Response
Slido Question: Is TBS opening the RFI outside to CDN suppliers?	Yes; included a whitepaper is included in the RFI; please add what your companies are offering
Slido Question: Will the procurement process focus on future RFP respondents meeting a set of industry/GoC standards or meeting business requirements? These are often at odd.	There are going to be standards; security categorization in the cloud; most flexibility to achieve their business requirements. While being flexible and nimble. Try to put out those timelines and being agile; ethical whitepaper; draft standards on algorithm index assessment; engage earlier; any procurement issues will be taking into considerations
Slido: Can we leverage this procurement process as an opportunity to ensure our workforce is developed in the field of AI, an outcome being developing our employees	Break-out session format explanation provided a response to answer the question
Are you able to describe the next steps of the procurement model?	The RFI is out on Buy and Sell to be consulted and engaged with industry. Additional consulting with industry on various elements depending on the streams. The RFI has some timelines however we want to keep it fluid; collaborate with TBS to simplify the procurement policies/process; and find the balance to have an agile procurement framework.
Will the procurement process focus on future RFP respondents?	Standards will need to be met, such as Security in cloud and ethical use of AI. Give users the most flexibility within constraints. A – plus timelines. Industry = standards. Make this the starting positions. M – Whitepaper (AiA). TBS - Draft standard on ADM first step in policy related to AI. Cornerstone Algorithmic Impact Assessment. If problem with process let us know – we need to take into consideration.
How will the balance be approached?	PSPC: scale up; come back with an agile procurement definition; Agile IT methodology approach ideas posted on GitHub; not just a contract splitting; smaller procurement vehicles; the Gov IT procurement approach needs to be agile; PSPC: The services of IT and Goods; new method of supply; timeframe is in the year ballpark; up to 2 years in the past; in this case, we are talking months; need to create this tool with the industry; goal is before Christmas; PSPC: Agile is about speed (perception); it is also about smaller increments; smaller scope
Complete service set? Back-office service; can't just have CIO's at the table. It comes from the business need; a complete package is required to articulate the right set.	TBS: Solutions sides; TBIPS, SBIPS; let's modernize this model PSPC: What is the min for pre-qualified; need a BN and security number; need a certain level of assurance; different approach and caps; different methods to draw on the supply; trade agreements; pre-established method of supply

Breakout room notes - First segment (SERVICES):

Questions	Response
<p>Key roles in digital identification and adoption, how can the GoC experiment and explore AI? How can the GoC apply AI to receive info? Call to the innovators at the table, some have started to engage with Innovation Canada. The GoC is continuing to explore and improve on mobile channels and chatbot services, internal IT help desk and external web facing sites. We curious to learn about the different service offerings.</p>	<p>To start small with very low cost. Prove that machine learning is viable and start small with the contracting vehicle before investing, learn at a small scale for quantified return.</p> <p>Working with the GoC on identifying the problem to break the bigger projects to scale an end to end solutions.</p>
<p>What can we do to standardize the SOW for a more agile procurement vehicle?</p>	<p>Expensive hence where can we add the most value for biggest pain points in the Statement of Work (SOW).</p>
<p>SOW can be very long and also short. Clients must have a shell of what is common, a 500 word text model works? Need more specificity? What should go in a SOW?</p> <p>How is the best way to describe the work; pages and pages; clearer or constraints are good?</p>	<p>Combine the SOW to include outcomes; multi-stages to demonstrate how they would solve the problems; pre-concept. The challenge is the ability to implement the solutions; change management is a big challenge; how to embed AI; how communities use AI; measurable outcomes.</p> <p>PSPC: There should be clarity for establishing AI; the method should be focused on co-creating solutions with a sand-box element to it, allowing it scale up to other commodities with competition among a narrow band of suppliers.</p> <p>Departments have a bunch of data but may not know what to do with it (i.e. big data) or to fix what problem; time box in 6-8 weeks to measure process improvement.</p> <p>The data layer needs to be well understood; what are the supplier community expectations regarding data lakes; what works in the context you are trying to solve; how clean does the data needs to be? Feasibility of AI solutions are dependent on it.</p> <p>Data quality and data sensitivity should be a separate and dependent stream for AI. Can data leave the premises? What is being done to the data? Processing will drive the capabilities of AI.</p> <p>PSPC: Open by default with lots of data to help the possible dimensions on what can be done with the data, structure can be more prescriptive.</p>

Questions	Response
<p>How can use cases be used to prove benefit and cost savings of AI and different models of costing and per diem rates?</p>	<p>It is a journey; bite-size chunks; even if you have a product; don't over prescribe the SOW; data: learning data and input data; ISED innovator comment earlier: companies are suppliers and consumers; innovation happening in smaller companies.</p> <p>It's important to talk about outcome and results based to improve service level and manage expectations not just statistics and statistical data.</p> <p>Ideation work; how services are accessed; how data is captured; journey on how to request services; 25% change or increase; experimenting and learning; speaking to users to understand what problems we are trying to solve; which results we aim to achieve; learn before we solidify our needs;</p>
<p>How should we pre-qualify firms and ensure they deliver on the outcomes? What criteria should be used?</p>	<p>Strong reporting; pre-qualification and qualitative criteria; forecast scale to measure even when nothing was done before.</p> <p>Worry about ethics, integrity; skills are going change in years to come; variety of buyers; meet the standards on which AI will perform</p> <p>Would small sole source contracts qualify?</p>

Breakout room notes - Second Session (SERVICES):

Questions	Response
<p>Teams working with AI and not really sure where to start. Do we start with an RFI or RFP and looking for a product or service?</p> <p>Would standardized SOW help fast track the process?</p>	<p>Different approaches or methodologies for different solutions. Setup the use cases and we will tell you how we will do it. Define the time and money; then how do you evaluate it; different AI firms will do things differently. Less prescriptive methods; pricing model constraints; small to medium enterprises.</p> <p>Move away from traditional procurement approach based on size but rather based on the best value. How many firms can be field to address use cases; keep it to the use cases to better define it and make it more manageable/scoped.</p>

Questions	Response
<p>GoC: If we are not clear to the industry then GC needs to clarify; machine learning; opportunity for an information holding services for challenging data sets.</p> <p>GoC: What is the best for the GC to address the issue?</p> <p>GoC: For the transparency aspect of machine learning; how does the GC ensures the integrity if it is proprietary?</p>	<p>If the existing data is biased; then the learning will be impacted; learning from the data sets based on the history and past; make the distinction based on the knowledge and confirm if it is correct.</p> <p>Background IP has to be owned by the vendors; foreground IP can be owned by the GC; will take it back to their ethics officer; understand the needs and necessity.</p> <p>A lot of stuff is still black boxed; cannot give a consistent answer yet because of the Microsoft and Google.</p>
<p>Does the source code needs to be opened?</p>	<p>Can be a concerned; open to the GC only; not different than working with CSE; expires over time; predictive analytics runs out of value over time.</p> <p>Source code algorithm has a lot of different avenues in AI; compared to the product based market; huge point of contention.</p> <p>Transparency of contract; open to everybody; preference to own IP; depends on what is required in the contract.</p>

Breakout room notes - Third Session (SERVICES):

Questions	Response
<p>Experimental aspect; how do we balance?</p>	<p>Common theme is the ability to engage in a more material way; what is the business objective and how industry can present solutions to define a path forward, applies to services to deliver value.</p>
<p>Ethical considerations?</p>	<p>Needs to be considered by the Government; go fast or slow things down to avoid making the news; risk to Government and personal safety TBD by GC.</p> <p>Ethical guardrails cannot decouple IP; impact directly on citizens; underlying; public safety; IP needs to be well understood on all sides.</p> <p>Direct impact on citizen vs business/GC impacts; CRA experience; why did you select me for audit based on a machine decision</p>

Questions	Response
<p>How comfortable on Open Source? What is the view on that?</p>	<p>Open Source is different than open standards.</p> <p>Some companies may want to keep the source code proprietary; the engine can have some proprietary stuff; some mechanism when some business disappears; retain the knowledge based on public and private information classification.</p> <p>Smaller businesses may have an appetite to transfer some IP; needs to be recognition on IP ownership in accordance with industry; innovation type context; large and small industry; commercial implementation; different context/lens.</p>
<p>How does the industry deal with the liability aspect of AI?</p>	<p>It's a business justification to accept to liability clause which is onerous.</p> <p>It stands alone.</p> <p>Multi-billion company exposure to unlimited liability; industry would be more responsive based on a set liability scope.</p> <p>The company has to take it into consideration when signing up for a contract</p>

## Webex Questions and Responses for Services

Webex Questions - Services	Response
Industry was requested to provide feedback regarding the services questions on screen/PowerPoint slide.	<p>Industry commented regarding ownership of IP and that Canada would own the data.</p> <p>Industry commented regarding the importance of transparency in the procurement process.</p>
Industry was asked what would make standardized Statement of Work (SOW) better.	<p>Canada was asked what do you want to see in a SOW and how it makes the process quicker.</p> <p>Canada responded that a Standardized SOW allows for a clear requirement, terms and conditions, and efficiency in movement to contract in a way that is beneficial to both parties. It also allows for clear understanding of terms and conditions and understanding of the work in the contract management phase as the requirement is clear/standardized. An example of a standardized SOW would be found using the Standing Offer method of supply.</p> <p>There could be multiple standard SOWS which would contain more guardrails as opposed to being specific (e.g. training workforce on AI).</p> <p>Industry requested to provide anything missing in RFI questions as part of their response.</p>
Industry mentioned that there are a lot of components to bid on a requirement and that it needs to be in their best interest to bid. Would the vehicle be Enterprise wide (leveraged across departments)? Also, Industry is seeking clarification that Canada would use the vehicle that would be put in place instead of other vehicles?	Canada is seeking an Enterprise wide solution. Further, it is Canada's intent to use the Enterprise wide solution for resulting contracts based on the level of effort to put the supply method in place.
Could there be multiple subcategories within the same categories?	Canada responded that we could have subcategories within the same categories i.e.: planning, training.
Industry was wondering if the questions could be written clearly in one or two questions.	Industry was informed that they are not being evaluated at this time. Canada wants input so industry can respond to some or all of the questions presented on the slide.
Industry wanted to know if the Presentation (PowerPoint slides) would be shared.	Canada will issue an amendment to the RFI and attach the presentation deck to it.
Canada asked industry about what costing structures would look like for services? What would industry be willing to provide as part of this (e.g. training)?	Industry responded that it depends on products or services. There are various types of payment (Subscription or pay per use) and a need for understanding of the different types of software contracts – advanced payment for subscription. There is a need to look at budgeting for these cost structures.

<b>Webex Questions - Services</b>	<b>Response</b>
Industry was asked what would be good evaluation criteria.	Industry advised via Webex chat that one evaluation criteria would be the kind of services based on the many categories of AI with the link below: <a href="https://www.topbots.com/essential-landscape-overview-enterprise-artificial-intelligence/">https://www.topbots.com/essential-landscape-overview-enterprise-artificial-intelligence/</a>

# AI RFI Industry Day Questions and Responses for Solutions

Breakout room notes - First segment (Solutions):

Questions	Response
<p>How do we put out a buying vehicle to buy AI given the scope of AI and what we don't know about buying AI?</p>	<p>What is it the government is really looking for?</p> <p>What does the GOC mean by AI?</p> <p>Why is GOC casting such a wide net?</p> <p>Could AI be a building block to a greater solution?</p> <p><u>Vendor consensus from discussion</u>: Start with a clear business requirement, it should all flow from that requirement.</p> <p>Use good data that is reliable or the solution won't work well if at all.</p> <p>GOC may need to buy good data.</p> <p>Move to a Proof of Concept but vendors wanted to know how to go about costing for a proof of concept when the requirement might be developing as it goes along?</p>
<p><u>CIO</u>:</p> <p>We need to change / reform GOC procurement. Today we can't buy AI effectively, change is needed.</p> <p>Not buying a software but buying a solution to leverage Data / Results.</p>	<p>Industry must help GOC create a procurement model to work in an agile manor.</p> <p>Can't set a set price, will need to go with a flex solution with variable cost to fit agile methodology.</p> <p>May take multiple vendors to provide the solution.</p> <p>That's not a problem, we welcome vendor collaboration</p>
<p>How do we write a SOW that is useful to industry, we currently are not able to do that given the broad scope of AI?</p>	<p>AI should solve a problem, not be a solution. AI means different things to different people.</p> <p>Industry Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the big players in the AI industry cooperate and coordinate work with new and small upcoming companies.</li> <li>• Planning in the early stages is essential and the industry must be consulted and brought for analysis and recommendations.</li> <li>• Stop talking cost and talk value</li> <li>• RFP should move away from being technical oriented and rather focus on business requirements</li> <li>• The scope should not be limited and GOC must be flexible and adaptable to the fast changing environment of BI</li> <li>• Use case scenarios that the industry can share with GOC to help in the process.</li> </ul>

Breakout room notes - Second Session (Solutions):

Questions	Response
We are here to learn from industry so what's on your minds?	AI is very broad, will need a well-defined requirement or resulting solution will be junk.  Chance of one vendor solution are slim to none.
How do we work with an evolving solution / industry?	Algorithms in the near future will learn and evolve to stay current. In a few years the embedded Algorithms will update themselves to reflect changing issues and problems.  Industry Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete on going and incremental assessments with the industry throughout the planning phase</li> <li>• Business objects well defined and finding that balance to stay flexible</li> <li>• AI is a fast moving environment, GOC cant only focus on technology aspect as it is changing rapidly</li> <li>• Industry cannot take all the risks and GOC must find that balance</li> <li>• Industry has to be aware of the legacy systems to ensure the solution will integrate within the current environment</li> <li>• Have different vendors cooperate and work together thought the process to deliver solution in different phases</li> </ul>

Breakout room notes - Third Session (Solutions):

Questions	Response
How do we share the risk between vendor and GOC?	We need to develop a variable, flexible outcome moving towards a solution.
How do we make a SOW to achieve a solution that does not have a specific solution?	It's all experimental phase that must be built into the SOW / solution.
Thinking about the concept, what about the cost or value?	GOC must pay as an incentive for GOC to come to the table.  A small just started up business, feeling left out of this RFI AI process, can't afford to get involved in a long expensive process with no immediate return on investment.  Well established large business wants to collaborate with new small business to fill in some specific needs they have that a small company might be able to help them with.

## Webex Questions and Responses for Solutions

Webex Questions	Response
Industry was asked how do we know your company exists.	Industry recommended to reframe the question to a statement of the need for departments to have a clear vision statement of the challenge for the Canadian people they are looking to solve.
An example was provided to Industry of creating a chatbot for veterans with mental health; how do we know if we are reaching appropriate vendors to solve problem?	<p>Recommendation was for the government to act as facilitator to have veterans talk to industry and others.</p> <p>There could also be a mental health application for veterans but there is a lot of devil in details and way for deeper level of need be understood to get solution to need.</p>
The Request for Proposal (RFP) process is an arduous and difficult process which generally has a problem statement that is prescriptive. What do we do outside this?	<p>AI is very different than Custom Off The Shelf software (COTS); industry has different capabilities in different areas/departments (e.g. medical). The solution is not to develop an algorithm and use it forever.</p> <p>Suggest pushing for an RFP and let players present something. Combine multiple players and approaches.</p> <p>Directorate of companies with specific expertise.</p> <p>Selecting the right vendor is less linked with lowest price compliant and more on capability.</p> <p>No team can claim full AI without help of others.</p> <p>Suggest one on one consultations to get greater information than on the call.</p> <p>Need a process to understand who has what capabilities. (e.g. who handles platform data). Obtain proof of capabilities through this and procure solutions that solve business problems.</p> <p>Question:</p>
In terms of existing relationships is industry open to a vertical in the solution if the procurement is approached that way?	<p>Recommend having one on ones to obtain a response to this question.</p> <p>Opportunity for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) to do business with the Federal Government.</p>
Industry was asked for input regarding ethical considerations in AI.	<p>Initial feedback was that the Contractor would not be labelled with ethical considerations.</p> <p>Industry was informed that Algorithmic Impact Assessment (AIA), included in Request for Information (RFI), has an evaluation mechanism for risk category and subsequent activities which includes peer methodology and responsible outcomes.</p> <p>Industry responded that input on the topic could not be provided online (confer with legal).</p>

Webex Questions	Response
Did we missing anything in product or solution?	<p>Company not accountable for government data, methodology and inputs.</p> <p>Shared responsibility in development of the product or solution.</p>
Industry was asked are we missing anything.	<p>The importance of designing the solution properly from start establishes privacy as an enabler not a blocker.</p> <p>The government is custodian of information and companies need to identify the value derived from giving government personal information. Privacy and security discussion not on call with colleagues (need separate discussion with companies and their legal General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).</p> <p>There is a need to review Canada's privacy legislation (PIPEDA) knowing that European Union General Data Protection Regulation (EUGDPR) is where the bar is set.</p> <p>There is a need for one on one sessions and conversions related to privacy and retention of data that companies retain.</p>
<p>Do you define yourself in a stream of AI and if so what would that be?</p> <p>When responding in written form please include this response.</p>	<p>Keep open to multiple SOWs but need to know market segments to write appropriate ones. Multiple capabilities.</p> <p>Some Boutique SI's could also offer a stack approach just like the larger SIs but many do focus on a few areas (e.g. machine learning).</p> <p>Existing Standing Offers (SO's) updated with standard but AI is different. Concern expressed over the streams as product and services are part of solution.</p>