



Advisory Board Meeting/ *Réunion du conseil consultatif* Agenda / *Ordre du jour*

June 2nd, 2011/ 2 juin 2011

Grand-Pré national historic site of Canada /
Lieu historique national du Canada de Grand-Pré

1 pm – 3 pm / 13 h à 15 h

Chair/ *Président de session*: Peter Herbin

1. Welcome / *Mots de bienvenue*
2. Approve agenda / *Approbation de l'ordre du jour*
3. Approve notes from previous meetings / *Approbation des notes de la réunion précédente*
4. For discussion and approval / *Pour discussion et approbation*:
 - a. Memo on ICOMOS evaluation mission / *Note sur la mission d'évaluation d'ICOMOS*
 - b. Memo concerning the request from the Grand Pré and Area Community Association to add members to the future Stewardship Board / *Note concernant la requête de l'Association communautaire de Grand-Pré et des environs d'ajouter des représentants sur le futur Comité d'intendance*
 - c. Memo on archaeological site protection – Mentink property / *Note sur la protection des sites archéologiques – propriété des Mentink*
 - d. Memo on initial findings regarding foundations / *Note sur les informations préliminaires concernant la mise en place d'une fondation*
 - e. Update on the legacy project / *Mise-à-jour concernant le projet communautaire*
 - f. Training on governance / *Formation en gouvernance*
 - g. Budget discussion and approval / *Budget discussion et approbation*
5. Roundtable update from partners / *Mise-à-jour de la part des partenaires*
6. For information / *Pour information*:
 - a. Financial and administrative report / *Rapport financier et administratif*
 - b. Project manager's and progress reports / *Rapports d'étape et du directeur de projet*
 - c. Communication and promotion report / *Rapport sur les activités de communication et de promotion*
7. Correspondence / *Correspondance*
 - a. Response to Mr. Pierce / *Réponse à M. Pierce*

8. Other business / *Autres affaires*
9. Open floor (time limited by chair)/ *Plénière (temps limité par le président de session)*
10. Next meeting / *Prochaine réunion*
11. Adjournment / *Levée de séance*



Advisory Board Meeting/ *Réunion du comité consultatif* NOTES

March 3rd, 2011/ 3 mars 2011
Grand-Pré national historic site of Canada /
Lieu historique national du Canada de Grand-Pré

1 pm – 3 pm / 13 h à 15 h

Chair/ *Président de session*: Peter Hebin

Present:

- Voting Member: Peter Herbin, Gerald Boudreau, Robert Palmetter (Marshbody), Beth Keech (Kings Hants Heritage Connection), Stan Surette (SPGP), Mike Ennis (Kings County Councillor), Jim Laceby (Kings RDA), Hanspeter Stutz (Community Rep), Susan Cargill (DSWN-Alternate)
- Ex- Officio: Paul Richards (ACOA), Robert Sheldon (Parks Canada), Neal Conrad (NSERDT)
- Project Manager: Christophe Rivet (Project manager)
- Secretary/Resource: Marianne Gates (Kings RDA)
- Alternates: Victor Tetrault

Absent:

Greg Young (EKCC), Barb Kaiser (Community Rep), Dawn Sutherland (Resource/Municipality of the County Kings Planning Department), Bill Greenlaw (NSCCH), Vaughn Madden (Acadian Affairs)

1. *Welcome / Mots de bienvenue*

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 by chair Peter

2. *Approve agenda / Approbation de l'ordre du jour*

Approved by consensus

3. *Approve minutes from previous meetings / Approbation des notes de la réunion précédente*

Notes were circulated. The following changes were suggested:

- Robert Sheldon Was not at the January meeting- Geraldine Arsenault represented PC
- 4 g-correction to archaeological review

Approved by consensus with corrections

July 8 notes- Barb Kaiser sent written request requested page 4f- change "not read" to "not read in full"

Approved by consensus with correction

Beth- same page –change "no minutes or notes" to "no minutes or attendance".

Approved by consensus with correction

4. *Nomination updates*

- *Christophe* received an email this morning from WHC. They confirmed unofficially that the nomination is complete. The review will proceed and we will hear about evaluation mission next (hopefully by the end of May).

5. For discussion and approval / *Pour discussion et approbation:*

a. Memo – scoping document on Board policies to be developed / *Note – Document d'analyse sur les politiques du comité*

- *Christophe* circulated report and members read the document
- Transition period- governance and stakeholder relations key aspects

Approved by consensus to review

b. Policy on record of Board meetings / *Politique sur la préparation des comptes rendu des réunions du comité*

- *Marianne* circulated Note Taking Policy and members were given opportunity to read

Approved by consensus to adopt

c. Memo – Review of Board Terms of Reference / *Note – Révision des termes de référence du comité*

- *Christophe* circulated report
- Recommendation to review and bring to next meeting

Approved by consensus to review

d. Memo – setup of interim technical advisory committees / *Note – mise en place de comités consultatifs techniques intérimaires*

- *Christophe* circulated report - MOU had two committees included- suggestion that these committees be set up in advance as interim committees to build capacity and partnerships
- *Gerald*- add SNA to both committees
- Interim chair be selected by committee at first meeting
- Note: Terms of Reference of stewardship board will be followed. These specifically indicate:
 - that expenses must be assumed by the represented organizations and;
 - the language will be English

Recommendation to approve formation of the two interim committees:

Approved by consensus with noted suggestions

e. Draft programme of April event / *Ébauche de programme de l'événement d'avril*

Christophe circulated report

- April 15 and 16
- Sub themes of water heritage

Recommendation to approve these sub themes and general direction

Approved by consensus

f. Review of Board agenda items / *Révision de la structure de l'ordre du jour du comité*

- Contact EKCC, Chief Shirley Clarke regarding attendance
- Board need to shift direct ion to maintenance and protection of the site

Examples:

- Marsh body- need help to access funds for maintenance- report at board and other could help
- SPGP- to make board aware of promotion work
- Topics need to pertain to the nominated site.
- Contact all board members to ask if they have agenda items; add interim committee reports to agenda and; add member's round table to the agenda.

6. For information / *Pour information* :

a. Financial and administrative report / *Rapport financier et administrative*

Marianne circulated report

New budget next meeting- no changes in amounts but adjustment to reflect priorities

b. Project manager's and progress reports / *Rapports d'étape et du directeur de projet*

-Report circulated

c. Project manager's work schedule / *Emploi du temps du directeur de projet*

- Report circulated

d. Land Project update-Robert Sheldon

- The Project to purchase the house received support from locals, Acadians, and international representatives. It is not done deal but coming along.
- Thanks to the local committee and many donors
- Details will be communicated to Nomination Grand Pre
- The legacy design is moving ahead and will be on PC land either way and still plans to be complete in 2011.

7. Correspondence / *Correspondance*

a. Response to Mrs. Blanchard / *Réponse à Mme Blanchard*

Response letter circulated

Gerald explained that in the January 29 email (4th paragraph) that he declined the request for quick word as the meeting was running late due to signing event. There was no time as it was already after 11:00 the time the meeting was scheduled to start.

Response approved by consensus

b. Maggie Keppie

Gerald's response was circulated.

There were no comments from the board members.

8. Other business / *Autres affaires*

Advisory Board members not attending will be contacted.

9. Open floor (time limited by chair)/ *Plénière (temps limité par le président de session)*

- Naomi Blanchard: regarding the decision to give board a copy, suggested the board explore paper version and also to sell the dossier- Joggins was available to public after designation (paper copy \$12.00) Also asked about the stewardship board composition. Christophe responded that the board composition does not change.

- Cora Mae Morse asked about board governance training for stewardship board. Christophe indicated that all MOU signees will be involved in any board training prior to designation.

10. Next meeting / *Prochaine réunion*

June 2 at 1:00

August 4 (full day) prepare for mission which will possibly be the last week August, 1st week of September

11. Adjournment / *Levée de séance*

2:50pm



TO: Nomination Grand Pré Advisory Board

From: Christophe Rivet, Project Manager

Date: June 2nd, 2011

RE: Project Manager's and Progress Report 20 (for discussion)

1. STATUS OF THE NOMINATION PROPOSAL

The nomination dossier is now available in French in print. The proposal is online in both languages along with key documents. ICOMOS contacted Canada on May 24th with instructions about the evaluation mission. A separate memo was prepared to propose a strategy for the mission.

Next steps: organize the evaluation mission.

2. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE NOMINATED PROPERTY

a. PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION

There were a number of actions undertaken regarding protection:

- an interim technical advisory meeting was held on June 1st. Its role is to exchange information between regulatory authorities and advise the Board on matters of protection, including developing policies.
- Archaeological research was undertaken to maintain the integrity of the nominated property. The work was accomplished according to the Management Plan and the Archaeological Heritage Strategy for the nominated property. A separate memo on this matter was prepared for the Board.
- Informal reports on activities were provided by key authorities.

Next steps: continue to monitor the condition of the nominated property. Follow up on the recommendations from the interim technical advisory committee.

b. COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTION

Communication and promotion efforts have been concentrated on specific actions:

- Completing the radio capsules in partnership with AVR: feedback has been overall positive. There are some comments indicating that there is still a misunderstanding about what the nomination is about. The next phase is underway

- Organisation of a public information meeting on April 14th at the national historic site: no concerns were raised.
- Organisation of the April 18th event: the event took place at Acadia University and at the national historic site. The quality of the speakers on Saturday was very high. Attendance was similar to last year's. Attendance was less on the Sunday event. Possible conflict with Palm Sunday and the bad weather may have contributed. ICOMOS Canada partnership did not occur. As next year's theme is a celebration of the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, a number of events will be organized nationwide to promote this. There are opportunities to partner for this promotion.
- Participate in tradeshow/ conferences: Nomination Grand Pré was present at Saltscapes as well as to the Senior's Federation Conference in Alma (Québec) in partnership with the Société Promotion Grand-Pré and the Regroupement des Aînés des la Nouvelle-Écosse.
- Participate in working groups on tourism: attended the Eastern Kings County Tourism working group meeting.

Next steps: complete work on the testimonials, including providing a translation of the main video. Hold first meeting of the Promotion and Marketing interim committee. Block the weekend of April 18th and organize event with other groups in the community that may be holding events simultaneously. Produce newsletter for the community.

3. STATUS OF PROJECT AND RELATED INITIATIVES

a. ADMINISTRATION

see administrative report.

Next steps: Implement decision on budget priorities.

b. PARTNERSHIPS

A draft MOU was prepared for discussion with Saint Mary's University professors on the matter of archaeological heritage research. A second draft is being prepared and will be circulated to the Archaeological Heritage Strategy task group for comments. An initial discussion is expected with the Dean in the near future.

Next steps: Complete second draft and make initial presentation to the Dean of Arts, Saint Mary's University.

Legacy project

A meeting with the working group on the legacy project occurred in May. A presentation of the archaeological information was given. Discussion ensued on the potential changes to the initial design based on that information and possible other locations. A revised proposal was forwarded by Sagedesign for review by Nomination Grand Pré.

Next steps: Consult on a revised design. Finalize discussions for implementation with Parks Canada.

Revenue	Budget	Received/ Incurred March 31/11	Remainder	Revised Budget Jun-11	Notes	Apr-11 Jul-12 Revenue
ACOA	273,519.50	206,198.91	67,320.59	273,519.50		67,320.59
Province of Nova Scotia	273,519.50	155,498.55	118,020.95	273,519.50		118,020.95
County of Kings	100,000.00	100,000.00	0.00	100,000.00		0.00
Kings RDA	12,829.51	12,829.51	0.00	12,829.51		0.00
Parks Canada	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
Societe Promotion Grand Pre	4,000.00	4,000.00	0.00	4,000.00		0.00
Private Donation	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00		0.00
World Acadian Congress	647.67	647.67	0.00	647.67		0.00
Acadian Organizations	13,000.00	12,706.22	293.78	13,000.00		293.78
Events & Promotional Items	2,497.33	156.00	2,341.33	2,497.33		2,341.33
Total	690,013.51	502,036.86	187,976.65	690,013.51	no change	187,976.65

Expenses	Expenses March 2011				April 2011- Mar-12	April 2012- Jul-12	2011-2012 Expenses	
Communications & Public Relations								
Communications & PR Specialist	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Communications Strategy	27,370.48	27,370.48	0.00	27,370.48	0	0	0	
Website	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Web Administration	1,065.52	1,065.52	0.00	1,065.52	0	0	0	
Communication-Related Materials	12,180.00	15,576.91	-3,396.91	32,576.91	12000	5000	17000	
Translation	16,005.00	29,011.35	-13,006.35	29,011.35	0	0	0	
International Brochure	2,663.00	0.00	2,663.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Sub-Total	59,284.00	73,024.26	-13,740.26	90,024.26	net increase \$30,740.26	12000	5000	17000
Research & Expertise								
Heritage Planner	106,000.00	107,041.18	-1,041.18	107,041.18	0	0	0	
Archaeologists	35,145.00	27,297.57	7,847.43	35,145.00	7847.43		7847.43	
Cartography	5,378.25	0.00	5,378.25	0.00	0	0	0	
GIS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Historians	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Archaeological Surveys	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Archival Research	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Conservations Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Sub-Committee Meetings	26,387.11	18,806.50	7,580.61	18,806.50	0	0	0	
Air Photos	4,300.58	202.24	4,098.34	202.24	0	0	0	
LIDAR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Comparative Study	23,962.50	25,001.34	-1,038.84	25,001.34	0	0	0	
Background Research for Management Plan	15,423.66	5,458.98	9,964.68	5,458.98	0	0	0	
Sub-Total	216,597.10	183,807.81	32,789.29	191,655.24	net decrease \$24,941.86	7847.43	0	7847.43
Consultation & Stakeholder Relations								
Stakeholder Relations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Permanent Display	6,889.24	407.90	6,481.34	6,889.24	Legacy Interpretation	6481.34	0	6481.34
Meetings	7,303.07	7,510.73	-207.66	7,510.73	0	0	0	
Meeting Documents	4,292.55	4,292.55	0.00	4,292.55	0	0	0	
Translations Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Sub-Total	18,484.86	12,211.18	6,273.68	18,692.52	Net increase \$207.66	6481.34	0	6481.34
Nominations Proposal-Production & Follow-up								
Graphic Design	26,891.25	3,816.25	23,075.00	3,816.25	0	0	0	
Photography & Video	10,428.25	4,799.00	5,629.25	10,428.25	add video subtitles	5629.25	0	5629.25
Editing	21,373.00	7,148.22	14,224.78	7,148.22	0	0	0	
Translation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Printing	18,505.13	14,867.66	3,637.47	14,867.66	0	0	0	
Maps Production	5,378.25	0.00	5,378.25	0.00	0	0	0	
Interpretation & Presentation Supports	68,367.99	44,498.15	23,869.84	68,367.99	Legacy Project	23869.84	0	23869.84
Professional Services (including Paris delivery)	29,580.38	6,204.36	23,376.02	6,204.36	0	0	0	
Attendance at World Heritage Convention July '12	15,100.00	0.00	15,100.00	15,100.00	0	15100	15100	
Site Visit	10,428.25	0.00	10,428.25	10,428.25	10428.25	0	10428.25	
Sub-Total	206,052.50	81,333.64	124,718.86	136,360.98	Net decrease \$69691.52	39927.34	15100	55027.34
Project Administration								
Project Management	77,375.37	56,107.99	21,267.38	134,107.99	60000	18000	78000	
Research Assistant	20,000.00	23,000.00	-3,000.00	23,000.00				
Data File Management	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Office Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Office Space	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Board of Directors Operations	22,106.31	20,080.76	2,025.55	22,106.31	1200	825.55	2025.55	
Conferences & Events	10,681.37	9,858.44	822.93	14,634.21	Annual Heritage Event	\$2,412.00	2363.77	4775.77
Sub-Total	130,163.05	109,047.19	21,115.86	193,848.51	Net increase \$63685.46	63612	21189.32	84801.32
Total Expenses Pre-Contingency & Taxes	630,581.51	459,424.08	171,157.43	630,581.51	No Change in total	129,868.11	41,289.32	171,157.43
Contingency (6.5%)								
Contingency	59,432.00	0.00	59,432.00	59432				
TOTAL	690,013.51	459,424.08	230,589.43	690,013.51				

Cash Flow	
Revenue Received	502036.86
Expenses Incurred	459424
Cash Balance	42612.8
Cash Balace	42612.8
Outstanding Funding	187976.65
Outstanding expenses	-171157.43
Balance (contingency)	59432.02



To: Advisory Board

From: Steering Committee

Date: June 2, 2011

RE: Scoping exercise on seeking private funding to help sustain the potential WHS in Grand Pré

Context

The Strategic Plan for the future Stewardship Board outlines an annual budget with a request for funds to the three levels of government for the first ten years. In addition, it is committing to exploring the potential creation of an endowment fund for the long term sustainability of the nominated property.

At the last meeting of the Advisory Board, the Board directed the Steering Committee to meet with organisations and individuals that have experience with fundraising and report back on its findings.

Organisations individuals contacted

Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 – Marie Chapman, COO
Acadia University – Development Office
Red Letter Philanthropy Counsel – Harvey Gilmour, Partner
Pimachiowin Aki Inc. – Gord Jones, Project Manager

In addition, we met with Victor Tétreault from the Société Promotion Grand-Pré and Claude De Grâce to discuss the fundraising objectives of that organisation and potential opportunities for partnership.

Summary of information collected and highlights

There were four areas that were discussed: fundraising structures, challenges and opportunities with fundraising, costs, and first steps.

1. What fundraising models are there?

In essence there are two models:

- internal capacity where the beneficiary organisation is also fundraising.
- external structure where a separate organisation handles the fundraising tasks.

Each model can have various adaptations. Common components for each include an administrative structure, a communication capacity, and dedicated staff. In addition, both models can seek private donors from public campaigns, private foundations, or corporate citizens. Each model can use web based as well as more traditional media to attract funds.

The internal capacity comes with the benefit of streamlining the relationship between the receiver and the beneficiary as well as sharing resources between the operations of the site and the operations of fundraising. The challenge comes with the risk of confusion in role and mandate as well as a significant investment of shared resources into fundraising to the detriment of operating the site. In other words, fundraising is labour intensive and requires specific skills. Staff may end up spending more time on fundraising related activities instead of priorities tied to the protection and interpretation of the World Heritage site.

The external structure can be achieved through a partnership with an existing foundation and fundraising organisation, or with a new entity. An example of the first instance is the group leading the World Heritage nomination proposal for Pimachiowin Aki in Manitoba and Ontario has an agreement with the Winnipeg Foundation to manage the endowment fund and with the International Institute for Sustainable Development to carry out their fundraising efforts. This aimed initially to acquire expertise quickly and efficiently in those matters in response to the creation of a fund based on a financial commitment from the Government of Manitoba. The external structure can focus on the issue of collecting donations and manage the funds. Its administrative structure can sustain itself as a separate entity.

2. What are the challenges and opportunities with fundraising?

The main challenges that our scoping exercise identified are:

- Competition: there is an increasing demand for private donors.
- Clarity of message: what is this money for? What is the message that will resonate with the potential donor?
- Attracting volunteer leaders: individuals that are committed to attracting funds, raising awareness about the key messages, and sitting on a board.
- Attracting corporate citizen attention: identifying a 'lead' gift, identifying the donor that will be personally committed to the preservation of the World Heritage site.
- Demanding: it is labour intensive and it takes time.

The main opportunities are:

- Status: The World Heritage profile is an asset to a potential fundraising campaign and grabs attention;
- Story: The human story tied to both the agricultural and memorial landscape are attractive, irrespective of a World Heritage designation;
- Organisational track record: Nomination Grand Pré has demonstrated ability to manage stakeholder relations towards a common goal;
- 'Cause': There is a strong educational and scientific dimension to the proposal that is attractive;
- Leadership: There are already strong stakeholder relations with Grand Pré and potential leaders/donors can emerge from those communities.

3. What are 'typical' costs associated with fundraising?

Costs can be divided into three categories:

- Startup: the startup phase includes funds to acquire the expertise and develop a plan. Based on conversations, expertise in fundraising costs approximately 100K. In addition, depending on the strategy (corporate and institutional donors vs. Public fund-raising) the supporting budget ranges between another 50K (private donors) to 400K (public fundraising).
- Operations: there are costs associated with maintaining staff capacity to carry out the fundraising. Costs are difficult to assess because it depends on the model adopted (internal or external) and the type of staff. The more dedicated and specialized the staff, the more expensive, but also the greater the performance in attracting donations.
- Communication: there are costs associated with developing a communication strategy that is separate and complimentary to the one supporting the promotion of the site.

4. What would you recommend are next steps/ some lessons?

The main suggestions are the following:

- Get charitable status: it takes a year, doesn't cost much. Interviewees indicated that it doesn't matter how long the organization has been in the business of managing funds, what matters is who is on the board, whether it has a track record of managing stakeholders, and the 'cause'.
- Start early: interviewees recommended beginning exploring immediately in advance of a designation in order to be ready for when (if) the designation is awarded. This means having a plan, a lead donor, and capacity to handle the funds.
- Foundations vs endowment funds: interviewees suggest that many donors are not keen on endowment funds and wish to give directly to the 'cause' i.e. not to a third party foundation.

Recommendations

The Steering Committee recommends pursuing the matter further. It recommends three actions:

- Exploring setting up an external structure separate from the Stewardship Board: our initial findings suggest that it is the clearest and most efficient model to attract and manage funds.
- Establishing an exploratory committee: there are many aspects of fundraising that need to be explored further. The task of that committee would include developing a feasibility study and accompanying fundraising strategy.
- Inviting the Société Promotion Grand-Pré: the SPGP's objective is to explore fundraising to support its activities at the national historic site. Since the target audience would overlap and the investment objective would overlap with the SPGP's role of being stewards and promoters of Grand Pré, it is worthwhile to consider working together and explore the possibility of creating a single fundraising effort for both purposes.

Furthermore, the Steering Committee notes that there are no funds currently identified in the budget for this activity. It therefore recommends:

- Approaching the funding partners to identify means of supporting this initiative, including by identifying funds in the current budget and applying for new programs.
- Should the SPGP wish to partner with Nomination Grand Pré on the exploratory committee, invite the SPGP to contribute some amount to the joint effort.



To: Advisory Board

From: Christophe Rivet, Project Manager

Date: June 2, 2011

RE: Request from Grand Pré and Area Community Association for an additional board member

Context

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed on January 21st 2011, by the Grand Pré and Area Community Association, the Grand Pré Marsh Body, Kings Regional Development Agency, the Municipality of the County of Kings, Parks Canada, the Province of Nova Scotia, Société Promotion Grand-Pré (SPGP), and the Société Nationale de l'Acadie (SNA). Its purpose is to “set the means by which the Parties agree to collaborate through mutual understanding and assistance to manage the Nominated Property” (MOU, p. 4).

The MOU is associated with the Terms of Reference (TOR). The TOR sets out the structure of the Stewardship Board, which will manage the Landscape of Grand Pré if it is inscribed as a World Heritage Site. Until that time, the Nomination Grand Pré Advisory Board is fulfilling the role of the Stewardship Board.

The TOR defines the membership of the Stewardship Board. The Grand Pré and Area Community Association has one voting representative and one chairperson representing their organization.

Request

As a result of a meeting between Barbara Kaiser and the Grand Pré and Area Community Association, the Community Association requested that Nomination Grand Pré consider having “2 Members of the Marsh body and an additional community member besides the co-chair” on the Board.

The Advisory Board should note that the request comes from the Grand Pré and Area Community Association. The recommendation about the Grand Pré Marsh Body is an opinion. The Advisory Board should review such a request if it came from the Grand Pré Marsh Body.

Analysis

The Stewardship Board has the following voting members,

- 1 County of Kings member (the councillor);
- 1 Kings RDA member;
- 1 Marsh Body member;
- 1 SNA member (as co-chair);
- 1 SPGP member;
- 1 member from Glooscap First Nation;
- 1 member from Destination Southwest Nova;
- 1 from the Grand Pré and Area Community Association (as co-chair); and,

- 1 from Parks Canada.

Currently, of the nine voting members, there are three that represent the interests of the local community: the member of the Grand Pré and Area Community Association, the Grand Pré Marsh Body member, and the councillor. In addition, both the Kings RDA and Destination Southwest Nova have a regional mandate. Finally, decisions are expected to be carried out by consensus.

An informal conversation with the Chair of the Community Association indicated that the community wants to ensure it has a strong voice at the table. The current makeup of the Board was chosen to facilitate efficient decision-making and consensus-building. Each board member has an alternate, from the same organization, to ensure that there is a consistent presence from each organization.

There are provisions for the Stewardship Board to increase its membership, once it begins meeting, if members feel the number of board members need to be increased.

The Stewardship Board will not be making regulatory decisions regarding the property; that will be left to the individual legislative authorities. Its role is to advise the regulatory authorities on matters that affect the authenticity and integrity of the World Heritage Site.

Options

There are two proposed options:

1. Keep the current Board structure as is, and suggest to the Community Association to wait until the Board is set up to assess the need for additional representation.
2. Add one member per organization that co-chairs the Stewardship Board to ensure the interests of that organization are fully represented.

The Steering Committee recommends option 1.



To: Advisory Board

From: Christophe Rivet, Project Manager

Date: June 2, 2011

RE: Protection of archaeological heritage in Grand Pré: property potentially containing burials

Context

The *Management Plan for the Landscape of Grand Pré* aims to guide the management of activities and plans affecting the nominated property, both for the proposed site's governance structure and the responsible authorities. The Management Plan provides an overarching management framework to guide the protection, conservation and presentation of the nominated property.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed in January 2011, by all levels of government and stakeholder organizations. Signing the MOU committed levels of government to partnering to protect the nominated property.

The *Strategy for the Management and Conservation of Archaeological Heritage in the Landscape of Grand Pré* (Archaeological Heritage Strategy) is a management document applying to the nominated property. It ensures a holistic approach to managing the property's archaeological heritage, with a focus on the outstanding universal value. It has been endorsed by both the federal and provincial authorities.

Currently, under provincial legislation, the developer is responsible for the costs incurred during the discovery of burials or archaeological resources. The nomination proposal identifies funds in the budget for the Stewardship Board as articulated in the Strategic Plan to cost-share with landowners the implementation of legal requirements. Moreover, the nomination proposal is in the process of negotiating with Saint Mary's University a long term commitment to support the Stewardship Board in the management of archaeological heritage.

Sequence of Events

Provincial authorities were advised, in April 2011, of potential development taking place on a property that could contain the burial place of the Noble brothers.

The Noble brothers were British officers stationed at Grand Pré. On 11 February 1747, a French, Maliseet, and Mi'kmaq force attacked Grand Pré. Caught by surprise as many as 80 New England men were killed, including their commander, Colonel Noble. The soldiers were buried in a mass grave while the Colonel and his brother were buried separately. This event has national significance, as it influenced the decision to deport the Acadians in 1755. While there was previously a sign indicating the location of the Noble brothers' burial location, the exact location of the burials is unknown to this day.

The Provincial authorities contacted Nomination Grand Pré to talk about the means of implementing the Archaeological Heritage Strategy and the Provincial legal requirements. Nomination Grand Pré was notified

separately that the issue would likely be raised at a public meeting on April 14th; additionally a reporter had been contacted about the development and its potential impact on these burials. The landowners were unaware of the potential for remains on their property, and their legal obligation to protect them. Construction was scheduled to begin in one week's time.

Nomination Grand Pré implemented the Archaeological Heritage Strategy by working with the landowners, working with the province, and with Saint Mary's University. It met with the landowners Herman and Ann Marie Mentink to explain the legal obligations tied to the potential presence of burials and archaeological resources. Nomination Grand Pré offered assistance to the Mentinks to fulfill the provincial legal requirements. As a result of this discussion Nomination Grand Pré and the Mentinks agreed to cost share the implementation of the legal obligations: Nomination Grand Pré would cover the cost of the archaeological work, while the Mentinks would cover the cost of the mechanical excavation.

After seeking their approval to carry out archaeological research in the area that would be disturbed, Nomination Grand Pré contacted Prof. Jonathan Fowler and the Special Places Programme to discuss the means to set up a team of archaeologists, acquire a permit, and define the research objective. A permit was obtained within 48 hours, and work began immediately after. Jonathan Fowler worked with the contractors to mitigate impact to potential remains, and survey the property. He was assisted by three additional archaeologists. No archaeological or human remains were found. Work was completed in the span of a week, under legal and permit requirements. The landowners were able to proceed with their building. The archaeological inventory of the nominated property was enhanced and new information was generated for future research opportunities. The integrity of the nominated property was maintained.

Challenges

There were three main challenges:

- Communication needs to be improved between the municipality, the province and Nomination Grand Pré to be able to respond proactively to such situations. Advance notice to all parties would have reduced stress on the landowners, stress on Nomination Grand Pré's budget, and risk of not maintaining the integrity of the nominated property;
- The landowners were unaware of their legal obligations and the potential for remains on their property.
- Nomination Grand Pré has limited funds dedicated to archaeological investigation. Should there be another situation in the coming months, it may be difficult for Nomination Grand Pré to invest the resources to protect the nominated property, which may jeopardize the argument for integrity during the evaluation by UNESCO.

Successes

There were significant successes:

- Once the matter came to light, the communication between the partners was flawless as a result of the strong relationship between Nomination Grand Pré, the municipality and the province.
- The relationship between Nomination Grand Pré and stakeholders, including the landowners, was successful which allowed everyone to proceed and have each other's support.
- The Management Plan and the Archaeological Heritage Strategy worked as they were intended. We will confidently be able to show UNESCO that we have an effective management system.
- The benefits of a long-term relationship between Nomination Grand Pré and SMU were demonstrated.

Conclusions

This series of events demonstrated that the Management Plan works. It gives Nomination Grand Pré an example to prove to UNESCO that we are able to manage the property. It also demonstrates that the funds requested for

the Stewardship Board in its Strategic Plan and presented to the potential funders are needed and essential to the protection of the nominated property.

Communication

There was no public communication of the work undertaken during the process out of respect for the Mentink's privacy and because of the sensitivity of the matter. The Mentinks are willing to work with Nomination Grand Pré to communicate their perspective on what was accomplished.

Recommendations

The Steering Committee recommends that a letter of thanks be mailed to the Mentinks and congratulate them on supporting the preservation of the nominated property.

The Steering Committee recommends that broad public awareness and education is needed on this matter. This event can be used as a case study. Communication in the media and in the newsletter should be done in the near future.

The Steering Committee recommends that the following points be communicated:

- The building of a house on the location of potential burials and archaeological resources triggered the need to protect them according to provincial legislation;
- The legislation applies everywhere in Nova Scotia and is not specific to Grand Pré;
- The responsibility to protect those resources is the developer's according to provincial legislation;
- The management plan for the Landscape of Grand Pré and the agreement signed on January 21st 2011 says that the protection and preservation of the Landscape of Grand Pré is a shared responsibility;
- Nomination Grand Pré was able to offer assistance to the landowners in the form of expertise to meet those legal obligations;
- The expertise came as a result of a long-standing relationship between Nomination Grand Pré and Prof. Jonathan Fowler from Saint Mary's University.
- The relationship is based on a long-term research objective of better understanding the Landscape of Grand Pré and better helping landowners deal with the presence of potential archaeological resources.
- The owner's consent was necessary before work could be done.
- The owner incurred, in this instance, the cost of an excavator.
- If the nominated property is inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Stewardship Board would operate the same way and cost-share the cost of preserving the nominated property.

The Steering Committee recommends that the interim technical advisory committee should be directed to do a post-mortem on this event and come back with recommendations to the Advisory Board on how to improve the response in the future.