

Spring 2008

COMPASS Consulting

*The Federal Government's Participation in  
the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization  
Initiative: an Evaluation*

**WATERFRONT TORONTO**

*Where city, lake and river interact*



**COMPASS Consulting**  
*9 History Street*  
*Utility Bay, Canada, X1J 2K3*

The Honourable John Baird  
Minister of the Environment  
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière  
10 Wellington Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0H3

February 23, 2008

**RE: *EVALUATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION IN THE TWRI***

Dear Honourable John Baird,

Please find enclosed our submission of a proposal outlining an evaluation of the federal government's participation in the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Initiative for Environment Canada. We are very pleased to be given the opportunity to provide our suggestions for the evaluation of such an interesting and valuable initiative.

Evaluation results can be used to provide critical information regarding for priority setting, assessing targets for development, communication with stakeholders, future project planning, and budget justification. As such, our evaluation proposal will provide results that could be used for each of these objectives.

Our proposal incorporates what we feel are the main evaluation questions with detailed key indicators, further suggested methodology and our anticipated challenges in conducting the evaluation. In designing our proposal, we have combined evaluation rigor with a simplistic design in expectation that you require timely, valid, reliable, and meaningful information.

We hope our proposed recommendations assist Environment Canada with determining . Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to guide your implementation evaluation. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Compass Consulting

## 1.0 Introduction

In fall 2000, the City of Toronto in partnership with the Province of Ontario and the Government of Canada created the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Initiative (TWRI) as an effort to develop 1, 000 acres of underutilized prime real estate on Toronto's waterfront. The federal government has agreed to fund up to \$500 million dollars over seven years, which is to be matched in cumulatively by the province and city. The goal of the initiative is to create a clean, sustainable, accessible and attractive waterfront area to be used by city residents and visitors. The responsibility for the project has been transferred a number of times since 2004, but it has most recently been put under the responsibility of The Minister of the Environment. The main challenge of the TWRI is the upcoming closing stage of federal funding in March 2008, whilst city and provincial funding will continue to 2015.

This evaluation focuses on the TWRI's progress to date, the degree to which the immediate outcomes have been met, and the extent of initial planning for intermediate outcomes to take place in the future. The scope of this evaluation is on the participation of the federal government's contribution and participation to the TWRI. This proposal outlines; the key evaluation questions, the key indicators for each evaluation question, suggested methodology and the perceived challenges of the evaluation.

### 1.1 Overall Approach to Evaluation

Our evaluation will implement the following approach to ensure a utilization-focus and to manage the anticipated challenges which we highlight in a later section of this proposal

**1. Consistency with Treasury Board Secretariat Guidelines.** Since the TWRI represents a multi-million dollar government-funded program, our firm would be committed to aligning our approach with the evaluation and ethical standards of the Treasury Board Secretariat.

**2. Establishment of an Evaluation Advisory Committee.** Given the number of stakeholders from involved from multiple levels of government, and our firm's commitment to a **utilization-focused approach** we recommend the establishment of an **Evaluation Advisory Committee** (EAC). The role of the EAC would be to:

- Offer input and refinement to the evaluation issues proposed herein;
- Ensure relevance of proposed indicators to decision-making;
- Advise on the feasibility of the proposed data collection methods and the potential for respondent burden;
- Guide, from an end users perspective, the conduct and implementation of the evaluation;
- Liaise with the multiple levels of government and assist in relationship building between our consulting firm and key stakeholders and data sources (see Evaluation Matrix).

The EAC should consist of representatives from each of the key stakeholder groups, including the three levels of government, major community partners (listed at the end of the Annual Report) and community and commercial interests.

**3. Comparisons to existing evaluation data.** The background materials highlight a value-for-money audit and a corporate performance management system. Whenever possible, comparisons

should be made to the data that have already been collected and baseline approximations should be made to be able to see changes in indicators over time.

**4. Development of Common Indicators.** The indicators presented in Appendix One should be considered as a sample of those that we will collect during the evaluation. While the present evaluation is for the Federal government, it seems that efficiency of the evaluation could be enhanced by collaborating with the provincial and municipal governments to develop a minimum data set of common indicators to be collected for use by all partners. This would avoid duplication of effort, respondent burden, and also ensure comparability of data across jurisdictional levels.

## 2.0 Methodology

Our approach to the evaluation will employ a mix of multiple complementary methods. The methods are being proposed based on their relative benefits, appropriateness to the indicators, and ability to triangulate findings.

**Document Review.** Document review is a frequently proposed method across the evaluation framework. Mainly, information concerning statistics relevant to the city is most efficiently obtained from the records of the TWRI, its collaborating organizations, and the city's departments (see Table 1). Document review is a cost- and time-effective means of examining necessary information that has already been collected. The documents will be analyzed annually, and on an ongoing basis. Data from 1999-2000 should be analyzed to provide a baseline for the TWRI. Access to these documents can be challenging due to privacy issues or organizational 'red-tape', thus access should be brokered through the evaluation advisory committee. Documents would be selected according to their relevance to the evaluation issue. Documents would be read by two independent reviewers and coded according to pre-specified indicators. Results of the two reviewers would be compared for inter-rater reliability. As necessary, document review would be complemented by follow-up directly to source organizations to gather any missing information.

**Focus groups.** Focus groups would be conducted using best practices (see Krueger and Casey, 2000<sup>1</sup>) for data collection, including audio-recording. We would recommend conducting multiple focus groups of 6-12 people each, sampled and recruited from the general community, or stakeholder groups according to the potential for groups to achieve greatest homogeneity. For example, separate focus groups would be conducted with community members with interest in affordable and free-market housing. Data will be analysed for themes and negative cases.

**Surveys.** Survey mode will be tailored to sample and implemented using best practices for survey research<sup>2</sup> Depending on the data source and indicator (identified in Table 1), we recommend different modes. Surveys will be a cost-effective way of gathering data from multiple people at a single point in time. All surveys will be analyzed according to type of data.

---

<sup>1</sup> Krueger, R.A. and Casey, M.A. (2000) Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.

<sup>2</sup> Dillman, D.A. (2000). Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Wiley Publications: New York, NY.

They will consist of a combination of fixed-response (descriptive and comparative analyses) and open-text questions (content analysis). (1) Telephone surveys, conducted using random digit dialing, will allow feedback from those who will be directly affected by the waterfront development – the city’s residents. This is also the population who will have constant access to the services provided by the Initiative, and who will play a significant role in its sustainability. The residents will provide key feedback concerning the awareness of the waterfront development, the need for it, as well as potential barriers to its implementation. A minimum sample of 1000 residents will be contacted to ensure reliable estimates. Stratification of the sample by neighbourhood socio-economic status or proximity to waterfront (according to 2006 Census data) may be considered to account for variability of responses by income and location. If this approach were taken, sample size would be increased. (2) Pen and Paper Surveys will be used to gather data from a convenience sample of attendees at public consultations. This will enable understanding of those who attend and their perceptions of the process. (3) Web-Based Survey will be conducted with managers of recreational facilities to determine the nature and extent of available services. The sample size will be guided by document review and will include all managers.

**Key Informant Interviews.** Semi-structured in-depth interviews will be used to gather rich, qualitative data from key informants. They will be conducted with: (1) a representative from Environment Canada to ensure that the TWRI is meeting environmental standards with all of its initiatives. Though document review from past projects is also suggested here, a hands-on assessment by an expert from this specific initiative would offer critical insight; (2) Senior TWRI representatives from each of the TWRI projects to analyze potential facilitators and barriers to the current and planned projects; and (3) Representative from other cities that have undergone comparable revitalization projects to obtain advice from those with experience in the field, as identified through the environmental scan. Data will be analyzed for themes.

**Field observation.** Field observation will be at public consultations as an unobtrusive method to assess the nature and extent of participation by attendees. Multiple observers will be used to ensure greatest observation and minimize bias.

**Environmental Scan.** An environmental scan will be conducted of cities that have undergone similar projects to ensure best practices for urban development and sustainability are employed. San Francisco, Barcelona, and Chicago have been preliminarily selected as possible sites through the Office of the Mayor (City of Toronto website).

### **3.0 Challenges**

Our proposal is limited by several unknown pieces of information, specifically: (1) the context for the repeated changing management responsibility, at the Federal level, for the TWRI, and (2) additional explanation of some of the cost variances in the Federal Government’s Plans, Spending and Results regarding planned vs. actual spending differentials (for example, 2005-06 unplanned expenditures on Human Resources and Skills Development and the results achieved by non-Federal partners). In addition, we are proposing this approach in the absence of knowledge of the budget for the evaluation. Accordingly, we will alter our approach in

partnership with Environment Canada, for evaluation without sacrificing thoroughness and rigor. Below are the anticipated challenges we perceive to evaluation.

<b>Challenges</b>	<b>Suggestions</b>
Non representative sample of community members at community forums	Approaching community organizations in area to hold internal public forums
Working with partners in the sharing of internal documents/reports	Creation of evaluation advisory group (internal) with members of intergovernmental steering committees and all three levels of government
Time sensitivity (federal funding to be exhausted March 2008)	Extension of federal dialogue with provincial and city stakeholders, welcome designate to hold designation on board of directors
Linking this evaluation with existing evaluation activities (value for money audit and organizational review)	Evaluation advisory committee

#### **4.0 Conclusion:**

In closing, we have provided an evaluation of the TWRI with regards to the federal government's involvement in the project's progress. The TWRI has lots of potential, but in order for it to be sustainable and remain on target with its projected goals and timeline, periodic evaluation needs to be implemented. Environment Canada has taken the initiative to request an evaluation at this time, and while we feel that our suggestions are relevant to the project's present state, further evaluation is advised.

**Table 1. Evaluation Matrix**

Issues/Questions	Possible Indicators	Data Source	Method
<b>1. Relevance: To what extent is the TWRI relevant?</b>			
1.1 Is the TWRI aligned with the priorities of the federal government for the Toronto region?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases in economic growth and investment in Toronto over time</li> </ul>	Financial records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revenue Canada</li> <li>Statistics Canada</li> <li>Ontario Ministry of Finance</li> <li>Municipal finance Dept.</li> <li>Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review and trend analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased # of parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI</li> <li>City of Toronto Dept. of Planning</li> <li>City of Toronto Division of Parks, Forestry and Recreation</li> <li>Toronto and Region Conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased # of recreation opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI records</li> <li>City of Toronto Dept of Planning records</li> <li>City of Toronto Division of Parks, Forestry and Recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased # of public spaces</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI</li> <li>City of Toronto Dept of Planning</li> <li>City of Toronto Division of Parks, Forestry and Recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased # of LEED certified buildings</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI</li> <li>City of Toronto Division of Planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased #of active transport options on the waterfront (bike paths and walking trails)</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI</li> <li>City of Toronto Division of Planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased availability of public transportation</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TTC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>

Issues/Questions	Possible Indicators	Data Source	Method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil remediation measures in place</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Canada</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent to which the TWRI meets environmental standards</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One expert representative from Environment Canada</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key informant interview</li> </ul>
		Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records from previous environmental impact assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of Toronto by other jurisdictions for leadership in economic growth and environmental approaches</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Media and other municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
1.2 Does the TWRI address an actual need?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits to target audience(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community members from different economic groups</li> <li>• Public and private commercial representatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus groups – separate focus groups of 6-12 people for each of the identified data sources to achieve the greatest homogeneity</li> </ul>
		Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public consultation minutes and attendance records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived need for waterfront revitalization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents of the city of Toronto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion telephone survey (using random digit dial)</li> </ul>
<b>2. Impact: To what extent do the TWRI activities and partnerships contribute to the attainment of the TWRI outcomes?</b>			
2.1 Are the activities of the TWRI contributing to the achievement of immediate outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipated facilitators and barriers of current and planned projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior leadership from each of the TWRI projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-depth interviews (one with each leader)</li> </ul>
2.1.1 Project implementation / completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation status of projects</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TWRI annual reports</li> <li>• Expenditure reports for all investment years from the Federal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>

Issues/Questions	Possible Indicators	Data Source	Method
		government and other government partners	
2.1.2 Increased economic development / opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New employment opportunities (new businesses)</li> </ul>	Financial records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revenue Canada</li> <li>Statistics Canada (Labour Force Survey)</li> <li>Ontario Ministry of Finance</li> <li>Municipal finance Dept.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review and trend analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased private sector investment</li> </ul>	Financial records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revenue Canada</li> <li>Statistics Canada</li> <li>Ontario Ministry of Finance</li> <li>Municipal finance Dept.</li> <li>TEDCO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review and trend analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced marketability of land</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ontario Realty Corporation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased tourism</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourism Toronto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
2.1.3 Sound environmental processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land reclamation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>previous environmental impact assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soil and general environmental remediation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>previous environmental impact assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased or enhanced parkland or green space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>previous environmental impact assessments records</li> <li>Toronto and Region Conservation records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased use of sustainable energy (LEED Certified Building)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI records</li> <li>City of Toronto Division of Planning records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased or enhanced storm water management/flood protection</li> </ul>	Records from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Toronto and Region Conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
2.1.4 Greater community awareness / participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendance numbers and characteristics of those who</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees at meetings and public consultations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pen and paper survey</li> </ul>

Issues/Questions	Possible Indicators	Data Source	Method
in waterfront planning	attend public consultations		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extent and nature of participation at public consultations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public consultations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field observation at meetings</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitators and barriers to engagement in waterfront planning process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents of the city of Toronto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion telephone survey (using random digit dial)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived awareness of waterfront planning process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents of the city of Toronto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion telephone survey (using random digit dial)</li> </ul>
2.2 What is the evidence of progress toward achievement of intermediate outcomes?			
2.2.1 Increased accessibility and usage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased use of public transit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TTC records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased # of public transit routes to Toronto waterfront</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TTC records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased # of active transport links to public transit at the Toronto waterfront</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TTC records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of public transit schedule relative to multiple intended uses of waterfront (ie. commuter-appropriate times, times aligned with scheduled entertainment or tourist events)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TTC scheduling records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased availability of affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toronto Community Housing Corporation records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of Toronto residents living in affordable housing relative to amount of affordable housing available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toronto Community Housing Corporation records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased use of new or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Toronto Division of Parks,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>

Issues/Questions	Possible Indicators	Data Source	Method
	existing recreation facilities	Forestry and Recreation records	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased availability of recreational opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managers of recreation facilities</li> <li>• Managers of recreation facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web-based survey</li> <li>• Web-based survey</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitators and barriers to accessibility and usage of all waterfront projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents of the city of Toronto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion telephone survey (using random digit dial)</li> </ul>
2.2.2 Revitalized urban infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of new or improved recreation facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Toronto Division of Parks, Forestry and Recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retail occupancy rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TEDCO records</li> </ul>	
2.2.3 Improved environmental management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• land reclamations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toronto Port Authority</li> <li>• Toronto Regional Conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In-depth interview (one from each)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• completed soil and environmental remediation projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Canada</li> <li>• Ministry of Public Infrastructure renewal</li> <li>• Waterfront Secretariat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• completed environmental assessments (under Canadian Environmental Assessment Act)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Canada</li> <li>• Ministry of Public Infrastructure renewal</li> <li>• Waterfront Secretariat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of environmental assessment results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Canada</li> <li>• Ministry of Public Infrastructure renewal</li> <li>• Waterfront Secretariat</li> </ul>	In depth interviews (one from each organization)
2.3 What is the evidence of progress toward achievement of final outcomes?			
2.3.1 Sustainable urban development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential and retail occupancy rates over time</li> <li>• Plans for accessible public transportation and usable roadways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TEDCO records</li> <li>• TTC and TWRI annual reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend analysis</li> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
2.3.2 Infrastructure renewal in the Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local amenities (e.g., grocery stores, laundry)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BIA reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>

Issues/Questions	Possible Indicators	Data Source	Method
waterfront area			
2.4 How is the tri-governmental partnership contributing to the attainment of the TWRI outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial contribution of each government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual planning and spending reports (budgets)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IGSC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-depth interviews with members of IGSC to assess project quality control</li> </ul>
<b>3. Implementation: Is the TWRI designed and delivered effectively?</b>			
3.1 Is the TWRI designed based on best practices for urban development and sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparable methods to previous successful urban revitalization projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities who have designed urban revitalization and sustainability projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental scan</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expert opinion of adequacy of TWRI design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representatives from other cities who have designed urban revitalization and sustainability projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-depth interviews (one per selected city)</li> </ul>
3.2 Does the TWRI delivery conform to its design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Match between planned and actual activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI annual reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
3.3 What are the reasons TWRI activities not being delivered as planned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barriers to implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior leadership from each of the TWRI projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-depth interviews (one with each leader)</li> </ul>
<b>4. Cost Effectiveness/Alternatives: Are there any more effective and efficient methods for achieving the objectives of the TWRI?</b>			
4.1 Is the TWRI being implemented and executed in a cost-effective manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting budget</li> <li>Costs relative to benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TWRI planned and actual spending results report</li> <li>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document review</li> </ul>
4.2 Do any of the TWRI activities <i>not</i> contribute to the attainment of the objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>#/type of activities that do not contribute to attainment of TWRI objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IGSC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-depth interviews (one with each level of government)</li> </ul>
4.3 Are there different activities that could be implemented to achieve the same objectives at a lower cost?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of available alternatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities who have designed urban, revitalization and sustainability projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental scan</li> </ul>