Public Works and Government Services Canada / Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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 etage, 10, rue Wellington
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet
AI - Regulatory Evaluation Platform

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation	**Amendment No. - N° modif.**
0X001-182587/A	006

Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client	**Date**
0X001-182587	2019-05-23

GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG
PW-$$EE-017-34665

File No. - N° de dossier	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
017ee.0X001-182587	

Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin
at - à 02:00 PM
on - le 2019-05-31

Time Zone / Fuseau horaire
Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT

F.O.B. - F.A.B.
Plant-Usine: ☐ **Destination:** ☐ **Other-Autre:** ☐

Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur**
Lessard, Peter	017ee

Telephone No. - N° de téléphone	**FAX No. - N° de FAX**
(613) 850-7602 ( )	( ) -

Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:
Destination - des biens, services et construction:

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	**Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée**

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Telephone No. - N° de téléphone
Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur

Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print)
Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)

Signature **Date**

Canada

This amendment 006 is raised to respond to questions from suppliers and update the solicitation.

A) Revise MT-1 of Attachment 4 - Evaluation Criteria and Basis of Selection

Delete MT-1 in its entirety and replace with the following:

Mandatory Technical Criteria (MT) Bidder's Experience			
No.	**Mandatory Technical Criterion**	**Bid Submission Requirement**	**Met/Not**
MT-1	The Bidder must demonstrate its experience, as a prime or sub-contractor, or through an Association of Entities or affiliate to the Bidder, in the application of artificial intelligence (AI) technology services: a. Insights and predictive modeling including natural language processing, text analytics and synthesis of structured and unstructured data, b. Big Data, Data Science and Artificial Intelligence, specifically, either (a) significantly improving and optimizing current legacy algorithms (by way or performance, scalability, cloud utilization, etc) OR, (b) the creation of a new custom state-of-the-art artificial intelligence algorithm, and c. State-of-the-art Big Data Visualization, specifically, custom big data visualization.	In order to demonstrate this experience, the Bidder must provide written summaries of two (2) similar projects (i.e., insights, predictive modelling, application of natural language processing, text analytics and syntheses of structured and unstructured data) they or their Association of Entities or affiliate have delivered within the past three (3) years (36 months) from date of bid solicitation that collectively include experience in: a. Insights and predictive modeling including natural language processing, text analytics and synthesis of structured and unstructured data, b. Big Data, Data Science and Artificial Intelligence, specifically, either (1) significantly improving and optimizing current legacy algorithms (by way or performance, scalability, cloud utilization, etc) OR, (2) the creation of a new custom state-of-the-art artificial intelligence algorithm, and c. state-of-the-art Big Data Visualization, specifically, custom big data visualization	

		Within each project summary, the Bidder MUST provide the following information: 1. Name of client and brief description of project; 2. Brief description of the type and scope of services provided, methodology used and results; 3. Name of the Respondent or Name of the member of the Association of Entities or Name of the affiliate that performed the work (if a member of the Association of Entities or an affiliate performed the work, the following certification should be provided) 4. Certification: By submitting a response, I (The Respondent) certify that (Respondent to insert Affiliate name) is an Affiliate as defined in this RFP or By submitting a response, I (The Respondent) certify that (Respondent to insert name of the member of the Association of Entities) is a member of the Association of Entities as defined in this RFP. 5. Brief description of the role the Bidder or their member of the Association of Entities or affiliate played in providing these services (was the Bidder, the member of the Association of Entities or affiliates, the Prime contractor or a sub-contractor on the project). 6. Duration of the project, including the start and end dates (month/year to month/year); 7. Extent to which these services were provided on-time, on-budget and in accordance with the established project objectives; and 8. Name, telephone number and/or email address of the client reference to whom the Bidder reported. The contact information may be used to validate the information provided.	

B) Revise Annex A – Definitions

Add the following definitions Annex A:

“**An Association of Entities**” means separate legal entities within a formally organized professional services network, where all members of the network operate using a common brand, with shared access to intellectual property and talent resources and integrated technology, methodology, strategies and policies across the network.

“**Affiliate(s)**”: means a person, including, but not limited to, organizations, bodies corporate, societies, companies, firms, partnerships, associations of persons, parent companies or subsidiaries, whether partly or wholly-owned, as well as individuals, directors, officers and key employees if: 1) one controls or has the power to control the other, or 2) a third party has the power to control both.

C) Add Appendix 2 to Attachment 2 – Reference Project Form

D) Revise Appendix 2 to Annex B - CATEGORIES OF WORK AND DESCRIPTIONS

Add Categories of Work

CATEGORY OF WORK	DESCRIPTION
Data Scientist	Responsibilities could include but are not limited to: • Create ETL and data transformation internal libraries; • Benchmark Machine Learning algorithms against the current state of the art; • Build a Machine Learning (ML) pipeline from data ingest through to solutions for specific use cases; • Use ETL and Big Data tools to develop an efficient and accurate data workflow; • Apply a wide variety of Machine Learning algorithms to real-world data sets; • Work closely with Researchers and AI Developers to ensure data and Machine Learning models are being used effectively; • Analyze and document ethical implications of applications of data science and ML pipelines.

Research Scientist	Responsibilities could include but are not limited to: • Conduct applied research to challenge the status quo in our industry; • Work hand-to-hand with Software Architects and Engineers using scientific programming to convert prototypes into tangible products • Collaborate with specialized Researchers to examine challenging problems; • To develop new models and optimize existing ones; • Propose innovative strategies related to consumer behaviors and requirements; • Publish original research papers, create patents and attend conferences.

Q61: *Could you please clarify a question re. Attachment 3 of RFP - 0X001-182587/A as follows:*

1. *Are bidders required to submit pricing for Stage III-A & B?   [ ]Yes   [   ]No*
2. *If "No", then:*

   a. *Do we leave Section 3 (Total Evaluated Price), items 2-8 blank as per pages 88-89?*
   b. *Is there any deduction / loss of evaluation points if Stage III pricing is not provided by bidders?*

Our Costing/Finance team is not certain as to the consequences of including/not including the Stage III – A & B pricing. Any help would be much appreciated.

R61: Bidders are required to provide pricing for Stage III A and B. Bidders are also required to provide pricing for items 1-8 of section 3 of the attachment 3. Pricing for item 1 of section 3 of attachment 3 must not exceed $150,000 (taxes extra) and pricing for items 2-4 of section 3 of attachment 3 must not exceed $170,000 (taxes extra).

Pricing for Stage III will be evaluated at bid submission. Bidders must provide pricing for Stage III to be considered for contract award.

Q62: *In Response R47 Canada states it requires bids from bidders who have gained experience delivering AI solutions and will use the same resources to do the work on this project. Organizations that have entered into a joint venture are no more or less likely to utilize resources with the appropriate experience than affiliated companies. Furthermore a joint venture could have been established by affiliated companies that planned to bid resources with experience gained through their parent, subsidiary or affiliate in order to respond to the ITQ had this requirement been made at that time.*

The Mandatory Requirement in Attachment 4 Section 1.1 does not address the Canadian School of Public Service's need for experienced resources to complete the work. We request that Canada modify the Bid Solicitation by eliminating the restriction against relying on customer references where the customer is the customer of an affiliate of the Bidder, and to replace this requirement with one that addresses the need for the resources being proposed to deliver the Canadian School of Public Service's project are the same resources that delivered on projects referenced in this RFP submission.

R62: The following response replace the response to Q47 of amendment 005.

MT-1 has been revised to reflect CSPS's Bidder Experience requirement. See Section A) of this amendment.

Q63: *Some of the requirements for the REP are ambiguous. Following an agile approach we expect that we would clarify these with the stakeholders whilst developing the Proof of Concept in Phase 2. This ambiguity though makes it very difficult to commit to a firm fixed price to finalize and support the solution in Phase 3. The RFP seems to require that we provide the price for Phase 3 as part of the response for Phase 2. Can the price for Phase 3 be revised later in the process based on what is discovered in Phase 2?*

R63: Bidders are required to provide pricing for Stage III A and B. Bidders are also required to provide pricing for items 1-8 of section 3 of the attachment 3. Pricing for item 1 of section 3 of attachment 3 must not exceed $150,000 (taxes extra) and pricing for items 2-4 of section 3 of attachment 3 must not exceed $170,000 (taxes extra).

Pricing for Stage III will be evaluated at bid submission. Bidders must provide pricing for Stage III to be considered for contract award.

Q64: *By ambiguity we mean that while the use cases/test cases for the Proof of Concept (PoC) are defined there is a lot that we will discover as we interact with users and build out the PoC that could impact the complexity of the system we would be supporting. Our goal would be to build something that regulators want to use and that means really understanding the problems they are trying to solve. We are confident we could build a solution that meets the requirements of the PoC but the final solution needs to be enterprise ready and there is often a significant effort to get* *from PoC to Production. Until we understand exactly what the minimum viable product is it is difficult to provide a fixed price.*

R64: There is time built into Stage II (prototype) and Stage III (production) to provide sufficient access and time with regulators to ensure the solution meets the needs of regulators. The prototype must meet all mandatory technical requirements (Stage II) and will be assessed against the point rated requirements as defined in the RFP. Pricing for item 1 of section 3 of attachment 3 must not exceed $150,000 (taxes extra) and pricing for items 2-4 of section 3 attachment 3 must not exceed $170,000 (taxes extra).

Q65: *At what level does a user need to tag the data? E.g. at another government agency we began with enabling users to tag at the regulation level but to work their use case required us to enable them to search for and tag at a paragraph level which required additional work parsing documents that were in different formats.*
Should users be able to view/modify comments added by other users or do they need to be able keep their comments confidential e.g. does the solution need to have any internal security/roles?
If a regulation is updated/deleted by the governing organization and a user has tagged it do we need to maintain that tag i.e. keep point in time references?

R65: Users require the ability to tag data at both the regulation level and at the regulatory text level.
Users should be able to view/modify comments added by other users if the user chooses to make their comments public and allow users to make comments private.
The solution should maintain tags and comments even when a regulation is updated/deleted by the governing organization.

Q66: *For the Canadian Regulations we are comfortable that we understand what is involved in ingesting them however we have not yet gone through the process for the provincial, US or European datasets.*
How users need to use these regulations will impact the complexity of the solution e.g. what data do we need to extract from European Regulations to make them practically useful to a Canadian regulator?

R66: The solution must allow a regulator to compare the characteristics and attributes of individual regulations and groups of regulations from Canada to other jurisdictions. Examining regulations from the perspective of comparison with key trading partners is crucial to support reducing regulatory burden on Canadian business while maintaining or improving the health, safety, security, social, and economic well-being of Canadians.

Regulations from other jurisdictions need to be ingested and analyzed in a similar capacity as Canadian regulations to allow users to assess opportunities for inter-jurisdictional alignment of regulations. Users must be able to do comparative analysis of this data to allow users to identify opportunities for regulatory alignment and coordination activities.

Q67: *These models operate with a degree of accuracy. Until we work more closely with users and build the other models it is difficult to assess the level of work required to make these truly useful to policy makers. E.g. If a regulation impacts 6 industries and our model identifies 4 of those is that accurate enough to make policy decisions?*

R67: It is understood that the accuracy of the model will be determined through consultation and engagement with users. The threshold for acceptable level of accuracy especially in the context of policy decisions will be determined during Stage II (prototype) in consultation with users.

Q68: *We could extract and map the burden counts completed manually by the departments to the various regulations. (E.g. SOR/2012-148 has a count of 89 Requirements.) This however may not be useful in that is cannot be leveraged to compare with other jurisdictions. We have thought through different ways of measuring/calculating burden but these would need to be tested with users.*

R68: Ingestion of secondary data sets (e.g. burden counts) offer a useful data point for regulators. Whether or not to include secondary data sources like burden counts will be determined as part of Stage II (prototype) in consultation with users. This includes any ideas the Bidder has about measuring/calculating burden within the context of the REP solution.

****

There are no other changes to this solicitation.