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Overview

On June 17, 2019 Sidewalk Labs submitted its Draft Master Innovation and Development Plan (MIDP) to Waterfront Toronto for review and evaluation. One week later, on June 24, 2019, Waterfront Toronto released the Draft MIDP to the public along with a commitment to hold two rounds of public consultation to seek feedback.

The first round of public consultation ran from June 24 through to July 31, 2019. The purpose was to orient the public to the MIDP from the perspective of Waterfront Toronto as a public steward working with the support of all three levels of government. Waterfront Toronto sought very early feedback on the MIDP, recognizing that it was a lengthy and complex proposal, and that Waterfront Toronto and the public would require much more time to become familiar with it.

Feedback from the first round of public consultations and from the Waterfront Toronto Board identified several issues that would need to be resolved between Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs before time and resources would be spent on evaluating the Draft MIDP including (but not limited to):

- Focusing on the 12-acre project boundary;
- Agreement to use existing democratically accountable legislative and regulatory bodies;
- Agreement to adhere to all current and future Canadian privacy and data protection laws, regulations, and Waterfront Toronto’s Digital Principles; and
- Agreement that Sidewalk Labs would pay fair market value for the lands.

On October 31, 2019, Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs aligned on these issues and agreed that project proceed to implementation:

- Waterfront Toronto will be responsible for leading all aspects of data governance and privacy for the project, including related discussions with the appropriate governmental authorities; as well as design, funding, and delivery of all public realm and public infrastructure.
- Sidewalk Labs will be responsible for design, funding, and delivery of advanced infrastructure systems and buildings (with competitively procured development partner(s)), and privately-owned public spaces (such as the internal pedestrian lanes).

After the October 31 realignment, Waterfront Toronto began a technical evaluation of Sidewalk Labs’ proposals, as amended. The results of that technical evaluation were the focus of Round Two of public consultation from February 18 to April 9, 2020.

Feedback from the public is critical to informing Waterfront Toronto’s thinking about Sidewalk Labs’ proposals for Quayside. It is Waterfront Toronto’s responsibility – informed by consultation with the public, technical experts, and all three orders of government – to determine if the ideas in the MIDP are in the public interest and respond to the objectives established for Quayside.

In June 2020, the Waterfront Toronto Board of Directors will decide whether to proceed with Sidewalk Labs on the development of Quayside.

If Waterfront Toronto decides not to move forward, efforts to build a next generation community at Quayside will continue. If the Board does approve moving forward with Sidewalk Labs, the proposals and implementation will be subject to review by relevant regulatory authorities at the
municipal, provincial, and federal levels. All existing legislation and regulations will apply. The City of Toronto will also conduct its own public consultation on the proposal.

About this report

The facilitation team from Swerhun Inc. wrote this Round Two Feedback Report. Waterfront Toronto retained Swerhun to support its public consultation process on this project. Swerhun works exclusively for governments, public agencies, and non-profits working to support public policy. The Swerhun team’s role is to support the delivery of transparent, constructive, and meaningful consultation processes. It does not to advocate for any particular project outcome.

This Round Two Feedback Report does not assess the merit or accuracy of any of the perspectives shared, nor does this documentation indicate an endorsement of any of these perspectives on the part of Waterfront Toronto.

The results of Waterfront Toronto’s technical evaluation

Waterfront Toronto’s technical evaluation of the MIDP identified a list of 160 distinct solutions, which underwent a methodical evaluation, and concluded that there is potential for an exciting project at Quayside. Going into the Round Two consultation, Waterfront Toronto shared six key questions and their emerging answers, which are summarized below:

**Do the solutions proposed raise the bar on meeting urban challenges?** Yes, they do. Of the 160 solutions proposed by Sidewalk Labs in the MIDP (as amended by the resolution of the threshold issues), 144 meet Waterfront Toronto’s objectives and merit being considered for inclusion in the Innovation Plan for Quayside.

**Does the development plan align with the East Bayfront and Keating Channel Precinct Plans?** Yes, the proposed development plan concept for the Quayside site meets the principles of the East Bayfront and Keating Channel Precinct Plans. If the project moves forward, it will be subject to the statutory development application process, and implementation details will be resolved through consultation with the City of Toronto.

**Are we taking a comprehensive approach to managing data collection and use?** Yes, all solutions will comply with existing and future legislation, regulation, and standards as well as Waterfront Toronto’s *Digital Principles* and emerging *Intelligent Community Guidelines*. In addition, Waterfront Toronto’s Digital Strategy Advisory Panel (DSAP) is actively advising Waterfront Toronto on these matters.

**Does Waterfront Toronto have sufficient controls in place to address the risks associated with the implementation of this project and partner, given the novelty of some of the proposed solutions?** The answer to this question is a work-in-progress and is subject to commercial negotiations with Sidewalk Labs. Waterfront Toronto will only undertake the project if confident that adequate controls are in place.

**Is Sidewalk Labs contributing enough to make the project work?** The answer is a work in progress. Discussions are now underway between Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs to determine if the project is financially viable on the 12 acres of Quayside. Agreement on the commercial terms between Sidewalk Labs/Alphabet and Waterfront Toronto will be critical to
answering this question. In addition, Waterfront Toronto is currently in discussions with Sidewalk Labs to determine its financial commitment to the project.

Is the proposed public investment in the solutions appropriate? Responsibility for funding the vast majority of solutions at Quayside lies with the private sector, including Sidewalk Labs (and possibly other partners), to invest in advanced infrastructure and innovations. Of the 144 solutions supported by Waterfront Toronto through the evaluation, 11 were identified as most appropriate for Waterfront Toronto to contribute to given the public benefit they could deliver. Should Sidewalk Labs not be able to fund all or some of the cost of these 11 solutions, Waterfront Toronto would consider dedicating a portion of the proceeds from the sale of Quayside lands to encourage their implementation.

Waterfront Toronto’s Round Two consultation focused on sharing and seeking feedback on these questions and the thinking informing the emerging answers.

Materials from Waterfront Toronto

To support its Round Two consultation process, Waterfront Toronto produced the following public materials:

- The Quayside Evaluation Committee Report, dated January 16, 2020, which summarized feedback and recommendations from Waterfront Toronto’s Evaluation Committee.
- A Discussion Guide summarizing Waterfront Toronto’s technical evaluation methodology, results, proposed controls to mitigate risks associated with digital solutions and partnership, information about Waterfront Toronto’s preliminary Human Rights Impact Assessment; and, solutions in the MIDP identified for Waterfront Toronto investment. The Discussion Guide included four Attachments, each of which provided detailed results of Waterfront Toronto’s technical evaluation in terms of Sustainability, Complete Communities, Economic Development, and New Mobility.
- Display boards that condensed the material from the Discussion Guide.
- Slide presentations shared at the public meetings.

All of these materials are available on Waterfront Toronto’s Quayside project website.
Round Two Public Consultation Activities

Waterfront Toronto’s Board of Directors, staff responsible for the Quayside project, and the Quayside Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) informed the design of the Round Two public consultation. Sidewalk Labs did not participate in the design or delivery of the consultation process. Representatives from Sidewalk Labs attended the public meetings as observers in order to hear public feedback first-hand.

There were three ways to participate in the Round Two public consultation, including:

- Two identical Public Meetings held on February 29, 2020, one in the morning and one in the afternoon;
- An Online Consultation that began on February 24 and closed April 9, 2020; and
- Written submissions provided to Waterfront Toronto between February 24 and April 9, 2020.

Approximately 900 people participated across all Round Two consultation activities. The table below summarizes the dates, times, and locations of these activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date / Location / Time</th>
<th>Number of participants*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Two identical Public Meetings** | Sat., Feb. 29: Westin Harbour Castle Hotel, 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.  
Sat., Feb. 29: Westin Harbour Castle Hotel, 1:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. | 500                     |
| Online Consultation             | Feb. 24 – Apr. 9 available at www.QuaysideTO.ca | 379                     |
| Written submissions             | Delivered by April 9, 2019 to Waterfront Toronto (at quayside@waterfrontoronto.ca) or shared directly with the Swerhun Inc. facilitation team. | 14                      |
| Total                           |                                               | 892                     |

* The number of participants in the public meetings is necessarily an estimate, since it is based on the number of people who chose to sign-in. Nine individuals submitted written feedback, as did four organizations that represent a broader constituency or membership.

** Video recordings of the public meetings are available on the Waterfront Toronto YouTube channel and on the Quayside project website.
February 29 Public Meetings

Round Two Public Consultation Summary

Questions for you

1. Do you think the innovations raise the bar on meeting the urban challenges?
   - They really raise the bar
   - They somewhat raise the bar
   - They do not raise the bar
   - Unanswerable

Tell us why or why not the innovations raise the bar on meeting the urban challenges.

2. Do you think that Waterfront Toronto has identified sufficient controls to manage risks?
   - The controls are sufficient
   - The controls are somewhat sufficient
   - The controls are insufficient
   - Unanswerable

What other controls would you like to see considered?

3. Do you think that Waterfront Toronto has appropriately prioritized solutions for public investment?
   - Solutions are appropriately prioritized
   - Some solutions are appropriately prioritized
   - Solutions are not appropriately prioritized
   - Unanswerable

Tell us why or why not you think that Waterfront Toronto has appropriately prioritized solutions for public investment.

4. Are there some innovations you would like to see prioritized over others?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unsure

If you answered yes above, which innovations would you like to see prioritized and why?

5. What would you like to see in terms of commitments from Sidewalk Labs to this project?

6. Do you have any other thoughts you would like to share with the Waterfront Toronto team?

Online consultation

Written submissions
**Overall observations on the Round Two public consultation**

Broadly, the Round Two public consultation gave voice to the same three positions that emerged in Round One, including:

- **those that are supportive of the project**, usually based on the opportunity associated with the proposed innovations;
- **those that hold a cautious “maybe” position**, including those who see potential benefits of the proposed solutions, but only if there are strong(er) controls in place to mitigate risks with the partner and with digital proposals;
- **those that are against the project**, with major concerns with Sidewalk Labs (and Google and Alphabet), the potential harms caused by data / digital solutions, and concerns about Waterfront Toronto’s overall evaluation and decision-making process.

Relative to Round One, there was an overall increase in supportive voices at the public meetings. In Round Two, the most supportive feedback came from the 379 participants in the Online Consultation, and the most critical feedback came from the 13 written submissions (though a full range of perspectives were reflected in both). The approximately 500 people who attended the Public Meetings provided both supportive and critical feedback. The public meetings also attracted a significant number of new participants, with about two-thirds of meeting attendees self-identifying as attending their first public meeting related to Quayside.

Common themes in feedback from those **supporting the project** included:

- **Excitement about the innovations**, especially as they relate to sustainability, mobility, economic development.
- **Desire to see this project raise the bar in addressing urban challenges**, including the potential for this project to demonstrate Toronto and Canada are global leaders.
- **Support for the evaluation and public consultation process to date.**

Common themes in feedback from those **somewhat supportive, tentative, and/or unsure**:

- **Want to see more of an effort to raise the bar**, especially when it comes to affordable housing. Others wanted to see the project achieve more ambitious sustainability targets.
- **Need more information.** Across all feedback mechanisms, there were participants who said that Waterfront Toronto had provided both too much and/or not enough information for the public to participate effectively, and that the benefits of the project were unclear.

Common themes in feedback from **those against the project**:

- **Strong concerns about partnership with Sidewalk Labs (and its affiliation with Alphabet, and sister-company Google)**, including Sidewalk Labs’ lack of a track record in successfully building communities, and Alphabets/Google’s poor track record when it comes to human rights and surveillance.
- **Strong concerns about data and digital**, including the potential for the digital technologies to lead to surveillance, marginalization, and corporate ownership of public infrastructure.
- **Strong concerns about process**, including the lack of important information that should be available to support public discussion and Waterfront Toronto decision making (including the details of the evaluation process, the results of the preliminary Human Rights Impact Assessment, and the lack of an existing governance framework to address data and digital concerns, and the lack of time for public consultation).
Rich discussions, thoughtful questions and comments, and a wide range of perspectives and interests characterized both Public Meetings. Swerhun Inc. prepared an integrated summary of the Public Meetings, including four Attachments summarizing: 1) discussions in four breakout rooms; 2) closing plenary discussion; 3) feedback from participant worksheets; and, 4) results from clickers used to poll participants in the meeting (see Appendix 1). Drafts of the integrated summary and its attachments were shared with participants for review before they were finalized. The consistent themes highlighted below are based on the integrated Public Meetings summary.

Participants and format

The first meeting had approximately 300 participants and the second had approximately 200, with about 500 people participating across both meetings. In response to questions from the facilitation team, participants used anonymous, remote clickers to identify whether they had participated in a meeting before, what part of the city they had come from, how they heard about the meeting, and which of the four topics were of most interest to them:

- about two-thirds of participants (65%) were attending their first ever Quayside meeting, and about one-third (35%) had participated in a previous meeting;
- almost half of the participants (46%) said they live in Toronto / East York, just over 20% said they live on the waterfront, just under 20% said they live outside Toronto, and others indicated they were from North York (8%), Etobicoke (5%), and Scarborough (3%);
- about one-third of participants (35%) heard about the meeting from a friend or colleague, another one-third (34%) heard about it from Waterfront Toronto, and just over 20% heard about the meeting from another organization; and
- at the beginning of the meeting when asked which of the four topics offered were of most interest, about 35% of participants identified “Economic Development, Digital, and Partnership,” followed by “Sustainability” and “Complete communities” at 25% each, and New Mobility at 15%.

Facilitators in each breakout room asked participants to introduce themselves, revealing a wide range of backgrounds, interests, and experiences, including (but not limited to): local residents, community associations, members of unions in building trades, academics, tech start-ups, investors, global smart cities think tanks, Business Improvement Areas, students, and members of the #BlockSidewalk campaign. Elected officials (MPP Chris Glover, Councillor Paula Fletcher, Councillor Michael Thompson), Waterfront Toronto staff and Board members, City of Toronto staff, and Sidewalk Labs staff (who attended as observers) also attended.

The meetings were three hours in length. Each meeting began with a half hour open house session, where participants reviewed display panels and spoke with each other and Waterfront Toronto Quayside team members. Following the open house, participants met in a large plenary room to hear an overview presentation. Participants then rotated through up to two of four breakout room discussions, each focusing on the results of technical evaluation through the lens of Waterfront Toronto’s four key objectives for Quayside: Economic Development, Partnership, and Digital; Complete Communities; Sustainability, and; New Mobility. Each breakout room had between five and fifteen smaller table discussions. One representative from Waterfront Toronto and one Swerhun Inc. facilitator staffed most tables.
Consistent themes from the Public Meetings

The intent of the Public Meetings Summary was to capture the range of perspectives shared at the meetings. While there are references to “few,” “some,” and “many” participants expressing a certain point of view, not all participants were asked to confirm whether they did (or did not) agree with any particular point raised by the other participants. As a result, the summaries are qualitative in nature. The detailed Public Meetings Summary is included as Appendix 1.

1. Consistent with the July 2019 Round One public consultation, participants expressed three positions on the project overall:
   - Those that are supportive of the project, with a noticeable increase in the relative number of supportive participants (when compared to the July 2019 Round One public consultation or the November 2019 Public Briefing).
   - Those that hold a “cautious maybe” position because they see upsides and downsides that are difficult to reconcile related to economic development, data collection, and privacy, and because they’re unclear why Toronto needs Sidewalk Labs.
   - Those that are against the project because: distrust in Google, Alphabet, and by association Sidewalk Labs is too high to proceed; there is too much uncertainty; and, some suggesting revenues from Quayside would be better spent on other things (like affordable housing).

2. There was a lot of support for the sustainability solutions and new mobility solutions proposed. Many agreed there are proposed solutions that can help address challenges facing cities identified by Waterfront Toronto, particularly related to climate change, active transportation, and mass transit.

3. On affordable housing, while some agreed that the proposed affordable housing solutions are “moving in the right direction,” many said that the proposal needs to do much more to address housing affordability. There was an interest in a higher percentage of affordable housing (including more “deeply” affordable housing), more units, and a more diverse range of ownership and unit types.

4. Regardless of their position on the project overall, participants had a lot of common ground on the following points:
   - There is need for rigorous controls on data collection and use, led by the public sector, that makes clear what data will be collected and why, by who, whether data will be monetized, how consent will work, how privacy will be protected, what the penalties would be, what digitally enabled solutions can achieve, and how to ensure Waterfront Toronto has sufficient capacity related to digital solutions and governance.
   - There is need for more information on the partnership, with a strong interest from participants in understanding the financial details of the deal, how much Sidewalk Labs would contribute, the potential implications on the public purse, how procurement would work, and how investment in and by local/Canadian interests would be supported. There were also varied perspectives on the ability of Waterfront Toronto and Sidewalk Labs to earn and maintain public trust.
   - There is a need to make public reflection and feedback on this project more manageable. Many participants focused on the fact that there was too little information shared to support participants’ efforts to provide meaningful feedback, and at the same time too much information to discern what was the most important to pay attention to. In addition to the volume of information, participants shared suggestions on how to better organize the information to support evaluation.
Feedback from the Online Consultation

As with all public consultation activities in Round Two, the Online Consultation was based on Waterfront Toronto’s Round Two Discussion Guide. The Online Consultation period was open from February 24, to April 9, 2020. It consisted of links to Waterfront Toronto’s Round Two Discussion Guide and associated Attachments, and a survey form that included both quantitative and qualitative questions for respondents to complete. The survey was designed to supplement in-person public consultation meeting feedback and help Waterfront Toronto understand public views on the results of Waterfront Toronto’s Technical Evaluation of the Draft MIDP; it was not designed or intended to be statistically significant.

Online Consultation statistics

The Online Consultation received 379 responses. The greatest number of responses to any question was 223 for question 5 (commitments respondents would like to see from Sidewalk Labs to the project). The number of responses for other questions ranged from 114 to 192 responses.

Squarespace, the platform on which the online consultation was hosted, collected Internet Protocol (IP) addresses to inform reporting on how many people visited the website, how many people submitted responses, and a general location of website visitors (at the level of country, region, or city). IP addresses were not connected to the survey responses. Between February 24 and April 9, 2020 the website logged 2,410 Unique Visitors and 2,505 Visits¹. The following list details the highlights of the geography of Visits by Internet Protocol (IP):

- 2,270 of 2,505 were from Canada (91%);
- 2,171 of 2,505 from Ontario (87%);
- 1,887 of 2,505 were from the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (75%);
- 1,647 of 2,505 were from Toronto (66%); and
- 118 of 2,505 were from USA (5%).

¹ Excerpt of definitions from Squarespace, the platform hosting the survey:

**Unique Visitors.** Unique Visitors is an estimate of the total number of actual visitors that reach your site in the selected time period. Unique Visitors is a good measure of your loyal audience and readership. Every time a visitor clears their cookies or opens your site from a different browser, Analytics counts their first new visit toward Unique Visitors.

**Visits:** A visit is a single browsing session and can encompass multiple pageviews. [Squarespace tracks] visits with a browser cookie that expires after 30 minutes. Any hits from a single user within that 30-minute browsing session count as one visit. This means that one person can register multiple visits a day if they close their browser and return to your site at least 30 minutes later. Visits are a good measure of attention on your site because they correlate with a single browsing session and are frequently used in marketing applications.
Themes from the Round Two Online Consultation

1. Overall, the quantitative feedback on the Round Two Online Consultation reflected support for the emerging conclusions from Waterfront Toronto’s technical evaluation:
   - 85% of respondents thought the innovations really or somewhat raise the bar on meeting urban challenges;
   - 78% felt Waterfront Toronto had identified sufficient controls to manage risks; and,
   - 79% said Waterfront Toronto had appropriately prioritized the solutions (or some of the solutions) for investment.

2. Respondents who were supportive:
   - felt the proposals raised the bar on meeting urban challenges (in particular affordable housing, sustainability, and mobility challenges) and were appropriately prioritized;
   - said Waterfront Toronto had been thorough in identifying and implementing controls;
   - were excited about the proposals and supportive of the evaluation and consultation process;
   - wanted to see sustainability, affordable housing, and mobility solutions prioritized; and,
   - supported a partnership with Sidewalk Labs.

3. Respondents who were not supportive:
   - said the proposals were not ambitious or innovative enough to raise the bar;
   - were concerned about surveillance and partnership with Sidewalk Labs, citing a lack of trust for the company and its sister company Google and parent company Alphabet;
   - said Waterfront Toronto had not sufficiently identified controls to mitigate risks and had chosen a partner that has demonstrated it cannot be controlled; and,
   - said Waterfront Toronto should stop the process and not partner with Sidewalk Labs.

4. For each question, there were respondents who were unsure/unclear, saying:
   - Waterfront Toronto had provided both too much and not enough information;
   - it was unclear what the bar for measuring success is; and,
   - there was no evidence the proposed controls will actually work.

5. Some respondents identified commitments they would like to see from Sidewalk Labs, including (but not limited to) commitments to:
   - demonstrate if it can be a good project partner (by working with local governments and respecting local laws and by-laws);
   - address data and privacy concerns;
   - provide clarity about its investments and the timing of those investments;
   - hire locally and inclusively; and,
   - commit to expanding successful solutions.
Feedback from Written Submissions

Between February 24 and April 9, 2020 Waterfront Toronto invited written submissions about its Round Two Discussion Guide and Attachments. This section provides information about respondents and high-level themes from the submissions. Appendix 3 includes a detailed summary and all original written submissions as an Attachment.

Written submissions statistics

Four organizations and ten individuals shared written submissions, totalling 14 submissions. One individual submission included seven authors, and one individual shared a submission identical to one shared by an organization. These submissions ranged in length from half-page to twelve pages, totalling 50 pages. Written submissions came from academics, waterfront community members, advocacy organizations and groups, and members of the public.

The table below identifies organizations (listed alphabetically) that shared a written submission as well as the authors of six individual submissions that gave permission to be attributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Individuals that gave permission to be attributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• #BlockSidewalk</td>
<td>• Barbara Whitmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cement Association of Canada</td>
<td>• Blayne Hoggart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate Justice Toronto</td>
<td>• Bruna Nota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goods Jobs for All Coalition</td>
<td>• John Wilson, Suzanne Kavanagh, Cynthia Wilkey, James Cappelli, David Jackson, Sharon McMillan, Jane Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Julie Beddoes (identical submission as shared by #BlockSidewalk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natasha Tusikov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes from the Round Two Written Submissions

1. **Where organizations and individuals were supportive about the proposals.** Consistent with the Public Meetings and the Online Consultation, some individuals and organizations sharing written submissions were supportive of and expressed enthusiasm for solutions targeted at addressing sustainability challenges (especially reducing greenhouse gas emissions using new building materials), spurring economic development, improving the public realm, and striving to address mobility challenges. A few were supportive of a partnership with Sidewalk Labs and using new technologies and approaches to address urban challenges as long as concerns about privacy and data governance are addressed.

2. **Where organizations and individuals were not supportive about the proposals.** Some were not supportive of the proposals, saying they do not really raise the bar or meet Waterfront Toronto’s objectives. Specific areas include:
   - **Affordable housing.** The proposal should go beyond Waterfront Toronto’s 20% requirement and affordable housing should be more affordable.
   - **Sustainability.** The proposal should strive to be net positive in terms of energy use.
   - **Economic development.** Concern that there is insufficient information about the type of jobs that will be available and that the employment initiative offers too few jobs. Desire
for more funding for the Venture Fund, Urban Innovation Cluster, and more procurement of tech and services from Toronto and Canadian businesses.

- **Construction methods and building materials.** The proposal and evaluation focus too much on timber and modular construction techniques, ignoring the other materials like low-carbon approaches to cement.

3. **Concerns about data and digital.** Written feedback highlighted concerns with the data and digital elements of the proposal, including:
   - **Insufficient plans for data governance, oversight, and enforcement,** connected to issues like: potential corporate accumulation of personal data; potential for surveillance of marginalized communities, and; equity problems associated with requiring use of technology to visit or live/work in the neighbourhood.
   - **Lack of Waterfront Toronto mandate or capacity to address digital and data issues.** Waterfront Toronto’s own Digital Strategy Advisory Panel has said it has not had enough time to understand and comment on the proposals.
   - **Concerns about digital solutions,** including Super PON (which could reduce vendor competition), distributed credential infrastructure (which could have privacy implications), responsible data use, AI, and digital accessibility principles (it’s unclear how public accountability will be ensured), and; potential for electro-magnetic frequency exposure.

4. **Concerns about the partner.** Written feedback highlighted concerns about the proposed partnership with Sidewalk Labs, citing its lack of a track record in successfully building the solutions it proposes, and the poor track record of its parent (Alphabet) and sister (Google) companies when it comes to human rights, privacy, and surveillance.

5. **Concerns and suggestions about the process,** including:
   - **The evaluation process.** The evaluation process and its findings are out-of-date given the COVID-19 pandemic and shifting government priorities. Waterfront Toronto should have received and shared a revised MIDP from Sidewalk Labs (rather than pick and choose solutions from the original proposal). The evaluation does not reflect careful, holistic consideration of consequences or “separate fact from fiction” of some proposals (such as sustainability impacts of tall timber vs. other materials).
   - **Both too much and not enough information.** The amount of information is overwhelming, making it difficult to share feedback. There is too little information about the details of the proposals, including specifics about what is achievable at Quayside alone and how Waterfront Toronto’s proposed controls will actually work. Key information is missing that should inform decision-making, including conclusions from the preliminary Human Rights Impact Assessment and the final Intelligent Community Guidelines.
   - **Conflicts of interest,** including Waterfront Toronto conflict of interest in evaluating a proposal it co-created and has funded with money from Sidewalk Labs, and; conflict of interest in the preliminary Human Rights Impact Assessment being conducted by a for-profit company that is potential competitor or supplier to Sidewalk Labs.
   - **Public consultation.** A single-day of back-to-back Public Meetings is insufficient consultation project, there has not been informed consent and engagement of Indigenous peoples, the engagement process has not achieved demographically representative participation, and COVID-19 may have limited participation.
   - **Other process suggestions** including: revisit Waterfront Toronto’s mandate to pursue innovation since that pursuit is leading it to explore potentially harmful solutions; and, Waterfront Toronto should invoke its ability to allow other governments to make their own decisions about whether or not to proceed with this project.
Next Steps

All feedback received during Round Two of the public consultations, including this report and all of its appendices, is a critical input to Waterfront Toronto’s decision making.

On March 26, 2020, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, Waterfront Toronto has shifted the date for its Board decision to June 25, 2020.

For the latest information about Waterfront Toronto’s work at Quayside, see www.QuaysideTO.ca.