



Centre d'expertise  
international de Montréal  
en intelligence artificielle



**GPAI** / THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP  
ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

## THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AS A PROVIDER OF DATA FOR AI

### ***Supporting governments in enabling AI innovation through responsible data stewardship***

Request for Proposal (March 20, 2023)

*This Request for Proposal (RFP) provides guidance on deliverables that the Global Partnership on AI's ("GPAI") Data Governance Working Group is expected to deliver by the end of December 2023. Formal requirements for tender responses are specified under Annex 1.*

#### **1. Context**

This project, from the GPAI Data Governance Working Group, will survey the different ways in which governments are, could, and should, use the data they steward to support development of AI. It will endeavour to understand the types of data held by governments – such as administrative data, statutory registers, or routine monitoring data – and their potential to support the development of AI systems.

The project as a whole is expected to last until the end of 2023, by which time it is expected to deliver a framework for understanding both the types, and management practices of, AI-relevant data in the hands of governments. Additionally, the project aims to collaborate with GPAI member countries and/or external organisations to gain additional insights into the project's research topics. The selected delivery partner will be expected to work with participating countries and/or external partners to incorporate their expertise and learnings into the research outputs.

#### **About GPAI**

The [Global Partnership on AI](#) ("GPAI") has been established with a mission to *"to bring countries and experts together to support and guide the responsible adoption of AI grounded in human rights, inclusion, diversity, gender equality, innovation, economic growth, and environmental and societal benefit, while seeking to contribute concretely to the 2030 Agenda and the UN Sustainable Development Goals"*.<sup>1</sup> Driven by a multistakeholder

---

<sup>1</sup> Global Partnership on AI [Terms of Reference](#)

approach, it is supported in its mission by four Working Groups made up of leading international experts, and 29 member governments and counting.

The Data Governance Working Group, co-chaired by Jeni Tennison and Maja Bogataj Jančič, supports GPAI's mission with its mandate to *“collate evidence, shape research, undertake applied AI projects and provide expertise on data governance, to promote data for AI<sup>2</sup> being collected, used, shared, archived and deleted in ways that are consistent with human rights, inclusion, diversity, innovation, economic growth, and societal benefit, while seeking to address the UN Sustainable Development Goals.”*

The Data Governance Working Group is supported by a Centre of Expertise (one of two supporting GPAI as a whole), [the CEIMIA](#). The Centre is led by an Executive Director, Sophie Fallaha.

### **About the project**

Governments are uniquely placed not only to create the policy environment in which others share data for the development of AI, but also to be a provider of data themselves. The data assets stewarded by governments – both at a national and multinational level – are unique and authoritative. Data assets in public hands include administrative data, health records in countries with national health systems, census information, statute and case law, statutory registers, and data collected by regulators. Because of the reach, power and scale of the state, they can be comprehensive (or close to it), accurate, timely, and sustainable due to their public funding.

Innovators may find such data useful when creating AI. However, governments are often concerned about the quality of publicly held datasets, particularly due to legacy systems and under-investment. Moreover, such data is frequently sensitive, particularly as it is often about citizens (including children, old people, and other vulnerable communities). Sharing it with innovators also raises concerns about potential harms for citizens and society as well as the transfer of public value into private hands. Sharing it internationally, for example to support broader multi-lateral collaboration or cross-border innovation prompts questions of sovereignty, national security, international trade and geopolitics.

## **2. Objectives**

This project aims to support governments to make decisions about whether and how to share data they steward with AI developers. The intended impact is to increase the availability of publicly held data for AI grounded in the principles of human rights, inclusion, diversity, innovation and economic growth by helping governments to prioritise their efforts and to reduce their concerns about the risks of sharing public data for AI by providing clear guidance, use cases and examples that demonstrate how it can be done safely and responsibly. This project aligns closely with the GPAI's mandate whilst focusing on applied AI issues and aiming at practical resorts and assessments. It also responds to GPAI's criteria to identify key projects: it's impactful, practical, and ambitious.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Mandate draws upon the definitions set out within the [OECD Recommendation on Artificial Intelligence](#) for this purpose

### 3. Outputs

This project will be broken into three phases, as outlined below:

Phase 1:

1. Conduct a survey of data sharing by governments for the development of AI around the world, to generate examples of existing approaches, including relevant legal controls. It will create three detailed illustrative case studies of current practice from these examples. It will also carry out future work to imagine potential positive and negative approaches to sharing government data for AI systems, specifically in healthcare, energy, and benefits data, both nationally and internationally.

Phase 2:

1. Examine how governments are making this data available to AI developers in well-governed ways – including how they are navigating issues around technology, culture, public attitudes, and fair financial models. This will:
  - a. create recommendations for governments who are trying to prioritise which data to make public;
  - b. inform the discussion of how to navigate data governance challenges; and
  - c. provide insight on the types of resources required to successfully govern the hosting of public data resources, particularly when these data are sensitive.

Phase 3:

1. Analyse what is the state of the art concerning data sharing technologies (e.g. granting access to data in secure environments) and data sharing facilitators (e.g. data trustees and other intermediary services), and who has access to them; and
2. Button-down how general guiding principles for the formulation of domestic rules on third-party data access should be designed as a basis for more transnational coherence.

These outputs will be presented in a written report and presentation to the **Project Advisory Group** and the **Data Governance Working Group**.

### 4. Resource

The Centre of Expertise will provide programme funding (of **up to 146950 Canadian dollars in total, including taxes**, for all outputs specified in this ToR to appoint expert consultancy / research partner support for the development and production of these outputs.

The project will be supported by a **Project Advisory Group**, led by Ching-Yi Liu (National Taiwan University) and Jhalak Kakkar (Centre for Communication Governance). It will seek to include representatives from GPAI's Working Groups including Data Governance, Responsible AI, Future of Work, and Innovation and Commercialization. It may also include representation from various member governments or external organisations who seek to collaborate with GPAI on this project.

From this group, the Centre will establish an **Evaluation Panel** for responses to this Request for Proposals (absolving those with a potential conflict of interest at this stage).

## 5. Governance

The **Consultancy / Research Partner** will be responsible for the development and production of outputs specified in the Sections above, and be responsible for the final product satisfying the standards and expectations of the Working Group.

In developing content for the report, the Partner is expected to work closely with the **Project Advisory Group** members, who will meet with the Partner on a regular basis. The Partner is also expected to map and, where appropriate, coordinate with relevant international initiatives. This is important both in the context of expected governmental or external organisational involvement in the project itself and other (non-GPAI) existing and planned initiatives in related areas.

The **Centre** (CEIMIA) will run the administrative process for the selection of the Partner, provide advice to the Project Advisory Group, and provide contractual and day-to-day engagement with the Partner for the duration of the project. It will be responsible for graphic design (in line with GPAI's visual identity) and translation of written outputs.

The **Evaluation Panel** (made up of members of the Project Advisory Group) will lead on the scoring of bids.

The **Data Governance Working Group** will review outputs at key milestones (e.g drafts) and be invited to workshops organised and run by the **Partner**. This review may be further supported by selected **external reviewers** who will provide additional peer review and quality assurance of the final output.

## 6. Methodology

The **Centre** (CEIMIA) will lead on organising and running the process to select a **consultancy / research partner** and will apply the evaluation criteria under Annex 1. A comprehensive, appropriate and robust approach to delivering the full scope of the work is one of the evaluation criteria for the Partner (see methodology under Annex 1).

## 7. Timeline

Key dates are set out in the table below.

*Note on evaluation: the Data Governance Working Group as a whole currently meets on a monthly basis (usually in the middle of the month) for up to two hours. The Working Group Co-Chairs will meet with Project Co-Leads on a fortnightly basis. The Project Advisory Group will be available to meet on a bi-weekly basis. As part of the proposed methodology, the Evaluation Panel will expect the proposal to account for review and feedback from both the Project Advisory Group and the Data Governance Working Group.*

Milestone	Date
Request for proposals published	20 March 2023
Deadline for proposal submissions	Midnight (Anywhere on Earth), <b>17 April 2023</b>
Evaluation and selection of proposal	<b>24 April 2023</b>
Notification of successful tenderer	<b>26 April 2023</b>
Contract signed and notification of remaining tenderers	<b>05 May 2023</b>
Start of partner engagement (including mobilisation)	<b>08 May 2023</b>
Phase 1 survey completed, with three detailed illustrative case studies of current practices generated	<i>To be proposed by successful bidder</i>
Phase 2 investigation completed on how governments make this data available to AI developers in well-governed ways	<i>To be proposed by successful bidder</i>
Phase 3 analysis completed on the landscape of data sharing with guiding principles on formulation of domestic rules	<i>To be proposed by successful bidder</i>
Submission of interim findings (with the intention to be publicly shared at the 2024 GPAI Summit)	18 August 2023
Submission of draft written report and presentation	17 November 2023
Submission of all final outputs	17 December 2023

## Annex 1: Tender response and evaluation criteria

By midnight (anywhere on Earth) on **17 April 2023**, interested parties should submit a costed proposal (in English) to [sophie.fallaha@ceimia.org](mailto:sophie.fallaha@ceimia.org) and [stephanie.king@ceimia.org](mailto:stephanie.king@ceimia.org), which includes:

- the project title “**The Role of Government as a Provider of Data for AI**” 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 [sophie.fallaha@ceimia.org](mailto:sophie.fallaha@ceimia.org) (Executive Director, CEIMIA) and [stephanie.king@ceimia.org](mailto:stephanie.king@ceimia.org) (Director of AI Initiatives, CEIMIA) no later than **07 April 2023**. CEIMIA reserves the right to make both anonymised questions and answers public or shared with other organisations having stated their interest (*please see Annex 2 - questions from interested parties*).

The proposal must come from a single organisation that will be contractually accountable and responsible for the project outputs. However, such an organisation may choose to include up one or more partners as part of the proposal. In such instances, the proposal will be evaluated on the combined credentials of the lead and partner organisations.

### *Evaluation criteria*

The evaluation panel will review proposals as below:

Criteria	Weight	Page limit	Guidance
Skills, expertise and experience	40%	5 pages (plus CVs in appendix)	<p>Please demonstrate the relevant skills and expertise of your organisation and staff to undertake this work.</p> <p>Please provide summary CV details (relevant experience and qualifications) for the people who will be responsible for delivering this work.</p> <p>Please include an organogram showing a summary of roles and responsibilities, and the amount of each person’s time to be dedicated to this project.</p> <p>Required:</p> <p>Documented examples of previous projects in commercial, public or social sectors that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• involved an understanding of data stewardship relevant to the objectives of this project (including the use of related technologies considered to be an asset)</li></ul>

Criteria	Weight	Page limit	Guidance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● involved one or more of healthcare, energy, and benefits data, at national and/or international levels</li> <li>● demonstrate a history of team members' ability to deliver on the scope of this request.</li> <li>● demonstrate a good global understanding of the AI &amp; data market and legal / compliance requirements for AI &amp; data technical projects, and understand both of these within both local and broader international context</li> </ul> <p>Describe the team's ability to work together to collectively produce meaningful and impactful outputs, particularly where team members will be spread across locations and/or organisations</p>
Diverse perspectives	10%	2 pages	<p>Please describe how the team will be able to bring in diverse perspectives, including those from the Global South.</p> <p>Please also outline how your team will bring in adequate understanding of the legal / compliance requirements and the data sharing ecosystem in different jurisdictions.</p>
Proposed methodology	10%	2 pages	<p>Please provide details of your Delivery Plan and methodology for the project, from contract commencement to contract completion.</p> <p>The Delivery Plan should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Include a proposed methodology for how you will carry out the work including key stages, tasks and activities</li> <li>● Demonstrate how you will work collaboratively and in the open both with GPAI's Data Governance Working Group of Experts and the wider external community</li> <li>● Demonstrate a clear and appropriate methodology for delivering the outputs and scope of the project, with clear rationale</li> <li>● Provide demonstrable evidence that your approach will deliver the required outputs at the promised project scope.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Weight	Page limit	Guidance
Project management, timeline and milestones	20%	2 pages	<p>Please provide details of your methodology for management of the project, from contract commencement to contract completion.</p> <p>Please provide project management proposals (including management structures to be established, delivery timetable &amp; identification and management of risks that may arise and strategy for how to overcome these).</p> <p>Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Plan setting out key milestones and dependencies;</li> <li>• How you will meet the timescales required, and ensure the timings and contract price are not exceeded; and</li> <li>• Key risks you feel may arise and how you will overcome these (tangible mitigation plans).</li> </ul> <p>Your response should provide confidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• your approach and ability to deliver the scope of the project is appropriate;</li> <li>• the project plan is comprehensive, realistic and achievable;</li> <li>• the programme will be managed effectively and with flexibility, and that the management structure is robust;</li> <li>• you will meet the timescales required, and ensure the timings and contract price are not exceeded;</li> <li>• any key risks are identified, considered and appropriate mitigation strategies are proposed;</li> <li>• that key roles/responsibilities have been identified and appropriate identified individuals are assigned; and</li> <li>• you have demonstrated sufficient capacity within the tenderers organisation to deliver the requirements.</li> </ul>
Pricing	20%	1 page	<p>Please include a costing breakdown of day rates and time allocated by project team members.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The calculation used is the following:</p>

Criteria	Weight	Page limit	Guidance
			<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Score = <u>Lowest Tender Price</u> Tender Price x 20 (Maximum available marks)</i></p> <p>Please note that if a proposal is judged as having serious concerns in any of the three preceding categories, it will be excluded from the 'lowest tender price' consideration</p>

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: Questions from interested parties**

As noted under Annex 1, the CEIMIA reserves the right to make both anonymised questions and answers public. A log is kept as below:

1. Are there any restrictions on members of the GPAI MEG responding to the RFP as part of a broader team?

From the GPAI Terms of Reference<sup>3</sup>: "GPAI Experts, Observers, and external experts are required, in the context of agreeing to engage with GPAI, to declare the absence of any conflict of interest and commit to avoid any actual, apparent or potential conflicts of interest, commit to the shared values reflected in the OECD

<sup>3</sup> The complete GPAI Terms of Reference may be found [here](#); quote is from Article 24 (on page 6)

Recommendation on AI or the Principles set out in Annex A, as well as to any other conditions of their engagement." As such, a member of GPAI's MEG may not participate as part of the team responding to the RFP call, but are, in their own personal and/or professional capacity, permitted to advise and/or mentor the broader team submitting a response. If there exists an apparent conflict of interest, GPAI MEG members would be asked to declare and justify it.

2. What do you mean by 'benefits data in the RFP'?

Benefits data here refers to those data pertaining to the social benefits provided by governments to citizens, including (but not limited to) employment insurance, child benefits, assistance programs, pensions, benefits for housing, student aid, family, disabilities, and after a death, etc.

3. Does GPAI require an actual survey as part of the methodology (e.g., developing a questionnaire and soliciting survey responses from third parties)?

The GPAI would not require, nor would mandate, a conventional survey as described in the above question. Respondents are asked to propose the methodology or approach they would see as the best means of achieving the desired outcomes and objectives of the RFP, by which information on data sharing by governments for the development of AI applications can be properly collected and understood.

4. Clarity around the pricing chunk of the proposal criteria—is the emphasis on the lowest cost? Alternatively, if the entire amount is contemplated, a more robust proposal can be developed.

Respondents should consider what is achievable utilising the full amount listed, noting that the overall pricing of the response accounts for up to 20% of the ranking criteria as listed in Annex 1.

5. What are the terms of contracting for CEIMIA?

Contractual terms with the selected delivery partner would be negotiated with the successful Respondent upon award of the work.

Note: CEIMIA is the contracting entity and is a not-for-profit corporation incorporated under the Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act.

6. Are there any conflicts with a prospective CEIMIA independent board member responding to the RFP as part of a broader team?

As per CEIMIA's procurement policy:

No Person associated with the CEIMIA shall sell, directly or through intermediaries, their personal property to the CEIMIA or engage in transactions with the CEIMIA, including without limitation the acquisition, disposition or lease of property, or the provision of services, through which they would personally derive income as an agent, representative, corporation, partnership, principal shareholder or in any other

capacity, regardless of the source of funding for the transaction, ***unless a waiver is requested.***

Any request for a waiver of this rule must be submitted in writing to senior management by the person responsible for the file wishing to make the transaction.

The latter shall report every six months to the Treasurer on the waivers authorized.

“Associated Person” here refers to any member, director, officer or employee of the CEIMIA, or any person associated, affiliated or not dealing at arm’s length with them.

7. What are the rules around attribution and intellectual property? Will this follow the same format as the 2022 GPAI reports and can RFP respondents get recognition for their authorship in the report?

All intellectual property newly generated as part of this scope would be assigned to CEIMIA.

All contributors to the scope would be acknowledged in the final project reports, which recognizes individuals in their authorship. The format of the final report would be similar to that of the 2022 GPAI reports, for which the format of acknowledgments can be found on the second page (sample [linked here](#)).