

A New River Innovation Challenge – Questions and Answers

Contents

Teams Composition & Eligibility:	1
Data:.....	1
Challenge Details & Honorarium:	3
Evaluation Process:	4
Intellectual Property	5

Teams Composition & Eligibility:

Q: Will participants be put into teams or able to choose their own teams?

Participants are expected to build their own teams.

Q: How big are the teams meant to be?

The Challenge does not include specific requirements around team size. We encourage participants to consider the needs of their proposed design when selecting team members.

Q: Do we need to register our teams?

The Challenge does not require registration before submitted a proposal. Please follow the submission instructions in the Challenge Brief on our website here: https://portlandsto.ca/wp-content/uploads/ANRIC_Brief_March2021_final-2.pdf

Q: Would a consultant be prohibited from entering the challenge if they have previously worked on various aspects related to environmental works for Waterfront Toronto, or as a subconsultant to a consultant who was awarded work by Waterfront Toronto?

Past or current consultants for Waterfront Toronto are permitted to enter the challenge; however, they will not be able claim any prize money. In any case, Waterfront Toronto retains the right to remove consultants as entrants at any time, if it is determined that a conflict of interest exists, or other unfair advantage, or they have, or had, access to information that creates a conflict of interest or unfair advantage.

Data:

Q: Can proposals use data outside of the TRCA data sets, including other data sources or new proposed data sources?

Proposals are welcome to use other existing sources of open data in addition to proposing new environmental data collection as part of the design. Please review the data privacy considerations outlined in the Competition Brief as part of the proposed design.

Q: Is there any information around future data TRCA will collect in the new river? What are they and where would they be located?

Post-construction monitoring will likely include: fish (electrofishing in river, potentially other methods in wetlands), water quality (both grab and continuous sampling), terrestrial and aquatic vegetation surveys, water level/stream flow, and geomorphic surveys. Other monitoring such as wildlife surveys (breeding bird, bats, amphibians, reptiles), acoustic telemetry surveys (fish, vegetation) may also be completed.

Q: Does TRCA measure E. coli levels within the Don River or Keating Channel? Are they planning to in the future?

TRCA currently collects *E. coli* samples once per month in the Don River at Pottery Road as part of the Provincial Water Quality Monitoring Network. This monitoring will continue after the new river mouth is opened. In the new river mouth, *E. coli* will be monitored as part of the post-construction monitoring on an infrequent basis.

Q: The Challenge Appendix A mentions that there are continuous datasets for water temperature and water quality - is there a website or URL that displays this information anywhere?

The continuous data is not currently available on the TRCA open data portal. It is currently stored in an internal database. TRCA is currently working on getting this data on to the open data website but at this time, we do not have a date for this work to be completed. Please reach out to innovationchallenge@waterfrontoronto.ca if you would like access to this data, otherwise you can use a placeholder for now.

Q: Our proposal would benefit from having the quantitative model outcome data for biophysical components, can these be made available to us?

Please use placeholder data instead of actual data as part of your proposal for now. We will look for any model data available.

Q: What water quality parameters were/are measured?

In surface water, we monitor traditional measures like turbidity and dissolved oxygen, as well as what contaminants are present (i.e. petroleum-based and metals). The general chemistry of the river is measured on a daily basis.

Q: Can you confirm if the Keating Channel will remain a hardened channel with no change – and no eco-education outlooks?

The Keating Channel will remain mostly as it is, some revetment will be added along the channel which will improve conditions for fish. In the Villiers Island Precinct Plan there is public realm planned on the south side of the Channel that could potentially include eco-education outlooks.

Q: Are the seasonal water level changes (1-2m) culturally significant [to Indigenous Peoples]?

Yes, in many ways, such as what indigenous plants and animals will thrive.

Q: Will there be any introductions of animals or are you expecting the animals to move in?

No introductions of animals are planned, they will recolonize the area on their own. We've already seen some animals on site.

Q: Are there countermeasures already planned for control of invasive species or is that something that will be addressed as needed in the future?

For the first few years, the contractor is responsible for controlling invasive species and helping native plants get established. After that period, and even now, the conservation authority will monitor. Hopefully well-established native plants help prevent invasive species. Countermeasures like carp-gates are already in place in some areas.

Q: Will the future coves/embayments on the new Don River also have those 2m wide carp gates?

Yes, we'll have four different wetland areas in the new river mouth and each will have a carp gate.

Challenge Details & Honorarium:

Q: Are you prioritizing scientific data collection proposals that can be collected through citizen science?

Proposals will not be prioritized. The proposals will be evaluated against the criteria included in the competition brief.

Q: Is it essential to engage with all 5 competition categories?

No, the 5 competition categories are merely suggested areas that WT is interested in. Proposals can respond to zero, one or multiple categories.

Q: Is the \$30,000 honorarium meant to be the project budget for the design?

The \$30,000 honorarium is meant to support the team in advancing their design (see [Addendum #1](#) for clarification on design development expectations). It is not meant to cover all the costs associated with bringing the proposed design to production.

Q: What does "advance the design" mean?

Please refer to [addendum #1](#).

Q: Any chance this deadline could become two phases (split in two) or delayed till the end of May?

The deadline has been extended. Please refer to [addendum #1](#).

Q: What exactly are the deliverables for this challenge? Do you want a proposal for the idea or something that can actually be used to collect and interpret the data?

We are looking for ideas/concepts:

“The submitted ideas should aim to collect, reveal and decode scientific data in compelling and appealing ways in order to educate citizens about nature and encourage stewardship and sustainable development. This can be done through innovations in environmental data collection platforms/methods/instruments as well as data interpretation and representation.” Please refer to the section “Challenge Submission Instructions” in the challenge brief for details on the submission content.

Q: After the winning team is announced, is the expectation that a workable prototype will be ready at six months?

No, we do not expect a final product after six months since the development time of the selected entry will depend entirely on the proposal. Please see [Addendum #1](#) for clarification on design development expectations.

Q: Is the intent to launch the communications platform during construction or post-construction?

Proposals with to be implemented post-construction are preferred. However, opportunities for implementation during construction could be considered for the successful proposal if selected for prototype development.

Q: Is the expectation that the digital and/or physical platforms will be permanent or temporary? If temporary, is there a set timeframe?

Proposals can be either permanent or temporary. There is no set timeframe for temporary proposals.

Q: Can you please provide additional detail on the timing of the design and implementation phase of the project?

The scope of the Challenge is to solicit ideas for potential digital and physical platforms that could be integrated into the Port Lands Flood Protection project post-construction in 2024. At this time, Waterfront Toronto has not secured funding to support the full design and build out of a winning design. Instead, the top team will be offered a \$30,000 honorarium to advance their design (please see Addendum #1 for clarification on design development expectations). Should Waterfront Toronto be interested in pursuing implementation at a later date, there is the possibility to secure funding for the project in the future.

Q: When will the public first have access to the site?

The Port Lands Flood Protection project is scheduled to finish construction in 2024.

Q: The brief has language that sounds like both an ideas competition and an RFP. Which is it?

This competition is structured as a general ‘contest’, or competition. It is not an RFP.

Evaluation Process:

Q: How will the jury evaluate team composition? How will you compare teams comprised mainly of student against those of professional consultants who may or may not be explicit about if and how exactly students are involved?

Please refer to [addendum #1](#) for clarification of the evaluation process. The General Scoring section, which all proposals will be evaluated against, allocates 5 points to team qualification. As per the competition brief “Waterfront Toronto is committed to representing the diversity of Toronto and encourages diverse and multidisciplinary teams.”

Diversity of experience is encouraged and evaluated positively. This includes diversity of occupation, including students.

Q: There is a huge emphasis put on the feasibility / costing. This seems a bit contrary to the ethos of an “innovation” or ideas competition. It also gives a sense of competing agendas in the brief. Feasibility and cost should certainly be considered, however the 20pt emphasis would require consultations with experts that are seemingly beyond the scope / scale of the brief. – What is this asking?

Please refer to [addendum #1](#) for clarification of the evaluation process.

Q: The evaluation criteria does not differentiate professional vs. student involvement. If there is no way to recognize any advantage, then what is the competition’s reason for suggesting student involvement?

Entrants and their teams will determine themselves who is/are the ‘inventor/s’ of their submission. Guidance on this type of information can also be obtained from the CIPO website.

We encourage the participation of students because we recognize the value that emerges out of a diversity of experience and believe that the academic environment is often one of heightened creativity. At the same time, we have restructured the evaluation criteria to address some of these concerns (please see [Addendum #1](#)).

Intellectual Property

Q: How will Waterfront Toronto protect the intellectual property and associated co-creations of the researchers, especially students and faculty without IP development experience?

Section 11 of the Brief states that Entrants “retain their intellectual property rights” of their Submission. By entering the Contest, the Entrants are granting Waterfront Toronto a “licence” (or permission) to use their Submission (their “Invention”) as set out in Section 11. Granting this ‘licence’ does not diminish the Entrants’ property rights, it merely gives Waterfront Toronto permission to use the invention in the ways noted in Section 11.

Please refer to [addendum #1](#) for further clarification.

It is the Entrants’ responsibility to further secure their intellectual property (such as a ‘patent’). They will need to ‘register’ their creations/inventions with the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (the “CIPO”) for further protection of their inventions. This information can be obtained on the CIPO website at <https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cipointernet-internetopic.nsf/eng/Home>

Q: How will intellectual property be defined for mixed teams of academics and consultants?

Entrants and their teams have to determine themselves whom is/are the 'inventor/s' of their Submission. Guidance on this type of information can also be obtained from the CIPO website.

Q: What will be the mechanism for IP protection for a winning team whose work may be used by a professional consultant in a subsequent implementation and development phase?

Section 11 of the Brief clearly states that Entrants' retain their IP rights, and they are granting Waterfront a licence, giving 'permission to use' the Submission—not transfer ownership of the Submission. In addition to Section 11, the winner will be required to sign a document (a licence) providing further detail on granting the license, and how Waterfront may 'use' the Submission in the future. The Entrant will NEVER lose their IP rights by entering or winning the Contest.

Please also refer to [addendum #1](#) for further clarification.

Q: Waterfront Toronto retains the right to “make derivative works from, and otherwise use your Submission (in whole or in part) without any fee or other form of compensation”. Can you clarify why this provision is included?

This 'use' of the work is a 'license' for Waterfront Toronto to 'use' the work only in the context of the Contest. It is the very purpose of the contest, and clearly set out in the Contest Rules.

As a condition of being named a 'winner' in the contest, the entrant(s) will sign a release form, detailing the terms of any further license. The 'inventor(s)' of the work will retain full ownership of the work.

Please refer to [Addendum #1](#) for clarification on rule 11.