Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence (GPAI)
AI and Pandemic Response Working Group
Project "AI-powered immediate response to pandemics"
Terms of Reference

1. Context

Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence (GPAI)

The Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence (GPAI) is an international and multistakeholder initiative to guide the responsible development and use of artificial intelligence consistent with human rights, fundamental freedoms, and shared democratic values, as reflected in the OECD Recommendation on AI.

Two Centres of Expertise have been established in Montreal and Paris to support the GPAI's different working groups. The International Centre of Expertise in Montreal on Artificial Intelligence ("CEIMIA" from its French acronym) assists the "Responsible AI" and "Data Governance" Working Groups. The Paris Centre supports the "Future of Work" and "Innovation and Commercialization" Working Groups.

AI and Pandemic Response

In light of the current international context, the Responsible AI Working Group formed an ad hoc AI and Pandemic Response Working Group (AIPR WG). The AIPR WG brings together AI practitioners, healthcare experts, members and international organizations to support the responsible development and use of AI-enabled solutions to COVID-19 and other future pandemics.

In 2020, The Future Society (TFS) prepared an exploratory report for the AI & Pandemic Response Sub Working Group containing a catalogue of AI initiatives developed and used in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. In light of the pandemic further developing and changing over the last year and beginning of 2021, these initiatives need to be re-evaluated (and the report updated and upgraded) including scalability and considerations of the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on developing countries as the developed world slowly reopens following lockdowns and vaccination campaigns.

2. Objective

The overarching goal of the AIPR WG's project "*AI-powered immediate response to pandemics*" is to directly support impactful and practical AI initiatives to help in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic.

A first output of the project will consist in updating and upgrading the 2020 TFS catalogue and transform it into a living repository of AI initiatives for pandemic response. A second output of the project will consist in evaluating 1-3 of the most promising (impactful, practical and scalable) initiatives which could be supported by GPAI. The insights from these activities will help establishing research/technology for fighting against future epidemics/pandemics.

3. Output

As the AIPR WG has committed to deliver **a living repository of AI initiatives to help in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic** for the 2021 GPAI Summit (November 11-12 2021), the outputs will include:

- A living repository of promising initiatives (an updated and upgraded version of the 2020 catalogue) which will be published as a GPAI-labelled document
- Impact evaluation leading to the selection of 1-3 initiatives which could be supported and funded by GPAI

4. Scope

The output should cover the following:

1. **A Living repository of promising initiatives (an updated and upgraded version of the 2020 catalogue) which will be published as a GPAI-labelled document.**

   The activities to update and upgrade the catalogue should include:
   - Reclassify and verify initiatives in the catalogue through in-depth surveys and desk research to collect additional and up-to-date information on these initiatives. New initiatives since last year's report should also be considered.
   - A clustering of initiatives by category and similarity of mission/description
   - An updated and upgraded shortlist of initiatives (about 30-40) with a two to three pages analysis of each initiative at a scientific level, including, but not limited to, the following items:
     - o clear summary of the initiative, impact on the current pandemic and potential for future pandemics, AI technology used, geographic scope and scalability, target audience, stage of development, budget (if applicable), date of entry into service, country / region of origin, key enabling factors, main hurdles, relevance, availability, adoption, diversity and inclusiveness, credibility, interoperability, potential for GPAI to make a significant difference to the initiative.

2. **Impact evaluation leading to the selection of 1-3 initiatives which could be supported and funded by GPAI**

   This evaluation should include:
   - Engagement with leaders of shortlisted initiatives
   - Evaluation of impact of shortlisted initiatives (assessment of funding vs. time vs. impact)
   - Given the updated and upgraded shortlist of initiatives including impact profiles, support the AIPR WG in the selection of 1-3 initiatives that should be engaged

5. Resource

The CEIMIA will provide programme funding of up to **CAD 60,000** (approximately **EUR 40,000**) to appoint expert consultancy support for the development and production of the outputs.

The AIPR WG will establish an **Evaluation Panel** for bids (excluding members with a potential conflict of interest at this stage), which will then become the **Project Steering Group** during the project engagement (bringing back in those who may have been excluded from the selection process). The steering group will also help brainstorm and prepare some of the key documents to be presented to the Working Group.

6. Governance

The **CEIMIA** will run the administrative process for the selection of consultancy, provide advice to the **Project Steering Group**, and day-to-day engagement with the **consultancy partner**.

The **Evaluation Panel** will lead on the scoring of bids.

The **Project Steering Group** will lead on project direction and review of outputs. The Project Steering Group will meet with the Consultancy Partner on a regular basis.

The **AIPR WG Immediate Response Committee** (see Annex 2) will review key milestones (e.g. drafts) and be invited to workshops organized and run by the **Consultancy Partner**, if any.

The **Consultancy Partner** will lead on the development and production of outputs specified under Section 4, and be responsible for the final product satisfying the standards and expectations of the **Project Steering Group**.

7. Methodology

The **CEIMIA** will lead on organizing and running the process to select a **consultancy partner** and will apply the evaluation criteria under Annex 1.

CEIMIA does not commit to accept the lowest or any of the proposals received and reserves the right to accept them in whole or in part. CEIMIA will own all intellectual property rights and copyrights on the work carried out by the contractor in the framework of this project.

The resources identified in the submission may not be changed after the deadline for receipt of submissions, unless authorized by CEIMIA and its designated representative.

8. Timeline

Bidding consultancy partners are required to set out a timescale for meeting the full scope of the project in their proposals (see Annex 1 under Project Management).

A timetable is set out as below (see next page):

Milestone	Date
Request for Proposals published	**May 31, 2021**
Deadline for Proposals	**Midnight AoE, June 18, 2021**
Selection of proposal	**June 28, 2021**
Notification of tenderers	**June 29, 2021**
Contract signed	**June 29-30, 2020**
Start of consultancy engagement	**July 1, 2021**
First draft of the report	**September 10, 2021**
Final report completed / end date	**September 30, 2021**

Annex 1: Tender response and evaluation criteria

By midnight AoE on **June 18, 2020**, interested parties should submit a costed proposal (in English) to dominique.croteau@ceimia.org which includes:
- the project title "GPAI Project - AI-powered immediate response to pandemics" in the email subject line
- a proposal that meets the requirements of the evaluation criteria specified below

If you have any questions about the tender, please contact dominique.croteau@ceimia.org (Head of Responsible AI Initiatives, CEIMIA) no later than **June 7, 2020**. CEIMIA reserves the right to make both anonymized questions and answers public or shared with other organizations having stated their interest.

The CEIMIA does not commit to accept the lowest or any of the proposals received and reserves the right to accept them in whole or in part.

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation panel will review proposals as below:

Criteria	Weighting	Page limit	Guidance
Skills, expertise and experience	20%	2 pages	Please demonstrate the relevant skills and expertise of your organization and staff, to undertake this work. To evidence this, please provide summary CV details (relevant experience, qualifications and professional accreditations) for the people who will be responsible for delivering this work. Please include an organigram showing a summary of roles and responsibilities, and the amount of each person's time to be dedicated to this project.
Proposed methodology (including delivery plan plus commitment to work collaboratively and in the open)	20%	3 pages	Please provide details of your Delivery Plan and methodology for the project, from contract commencement to contract completion. The Delivery Plan should: - Include a proposed methodology for how you will carry out the work including key stages, tasks and activities; - Demonstrate how you will work collaboratively and in the open both with GPAI's AI and Pandemic Response Working Group of Experts and the wider external community, including with diverse groups of the population; - Demonstrate a clear and appropriate methodology for delivering the outputs and scope of the project, with clear rationale; and - Provide confidence in your approach and ability to deliver the scope and outputs of the project, in an

			appropriate and timely manner.
Project management, timeline and milestones	20%	2 pages	Please provide details of your methodology for management of the project, from contract commencement to contract completion.
			Please provide project management proposals (including management structures to be established, delivery timetable & identification and management of risks that may arise and strategy for how to overcome these).
			Please provide:
			- Project Plan setting out key milestones and dependencies; - How you will meet the timescales required, and ensure the timings and contract price is not exceeded; and - Key risks you feel may arise and how you will overcome these.
			Your response should provide confidence that:
			● your approach and ability to deliver the scope of the project are appropriate; ● the project plan is comprehensive, realistic and achievable; ● the programme will be managed effectively and with flexibility, and that the management structure is robust; ● you will meet the timescales required, and ensure the timings and contract price are not exceeded; ● provide confidence that your approach offers the most efficient and effective use of resources; ● any key risks are identified, considered and appropriate mitigation strategies are proposed; ● that key roles/responsibilities have been identified and appropriate identified individuals are assigned; and ● you have demonstrated sufficient capacity within the tenderers organization to deliver the requirements.
Case study 1	10%	1 page	Please provide a case study demonstrating evidence of delivering a similar, successful project for a client - including the nature of the client, an outline of the objectives and how they were successfully met.
Case study 2 (written sample)	10%	As an attachment	Please include a writing sample of a similar research report. This sample will be evaluated for its clarity of writing, and well structured, robust analysis.

Pricing	20%	1 page	Please include a costing breakdown of day rates and time allocated by project team members.
			The maximum marks available for this part of the proposal will be 20% and will be awarded to the Tenderer submitting the lowest price. The remaining Tenderers will receive marks on a pro-rata basis from the lowest to the highest price.
			The calculation used is the following:
			$$Score = \frac{Lowest\ Tender\ Price}{Tender\ Price} \times 20\ (Maximum\ available\ marks)$$

Each part of the criteria will be evaluated and marked on a scale of 0-4 where:

0 – **Serious concerns:** e.g. does not meet requirements, and/or raises serious concerns
1 – **Minor concerns:** e.g. meets some requirements but with gaps and/or some minor concerns
2 – **Adequate confidence:** e.g. meets most/all requirements, but lacks sufficient detail or evidence in some areas
3 – **Good confidence:** e.g. meets all requirements and provides a detailed response but lacks evidence in minor areas
4 – **Excellent confidence:** e.g. meets all requirements, provides a detailed response and evidence which demonstrates a particularly strong understanding of the requirements

Your score will be determined by the marks awarded for each question (out of 4), in accordance with the applicable weighting.

For example, if the weighting for a question is 10%, a mark of 4 for that question would lead to a score of 10%. A mark of 3 would lead to a score of 7.5%, a mark of 2 would lead to a score of 5%, a mark of 1 would lead to a score of 2.5%, and mark of 0 would lead to a score of 0%.

Annex 2: AIPR WG Immediate Response Committee (as of 2021-05-27)

AIPR WG Members

Name	Organisation
Michael O'Sullivan (Co-Lead)	University of Auckland
Paul Suetens (Co-Lead)	KU Leuven
Alice Hae Yun Oh	Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST)
Howie Choset	Carnegie Mellon University
Enrico Coiera	Macquarie University
Margarita Sordo-Sanchez	Brigham and Women's Hospital at Harvard Medical School
Seán Ó hÉigeartaigh	Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge

AIPR WG Observers

Name	Organisation
Cyrus Hodes	AI Initiative
Alan Paic	OECD