

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Rideau Canal

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Canada

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

1221

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Rideau Canal , Province of Ontario	44.994 / -75.765	21427.07	2334.78	23761.85	0
Fort Henry, Kingston , Province of Ontario	44.231 / -76.46	23.9	11.88	35.78	0
Fort Frederick, Kingston , Province of Ontario	44.228 / -76.47	3.1	3	6.1	0
Cathcart Tower, Cedar Island , Province of Ontario	44.225 / -76.454	0.25	9.15	9.4	0
Shoal Tower, Kingston , Province of Ontario	44.229 / -76.478	0.32	1.68	2	0
Murney Tower, Kingston , Province of Ontario	44.222 / -76.49	0.17	2.71	2.88	0
Total (ha)		21454.81	2363.2	23818.01	

Comment

Inscription year should read 2007 for all components.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map 1. Rideau Canal. Nominated property.	01/02/2006	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Rebecca Kennedy
International Programs, Parks Canada
Program Specialist

Comment

Please replace with: Vice President, Heritage Conservation and Commemoration Directorate Parks Canada Agency 25, rue Eddy, étage/floor 5 K1A 0M5 Gatineau Canada Telephone: +1(819) 994-1808 Fax: +1 (819) 934-1115

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Pamela Buell
Parks Canada
Manager of External Relations
Eastern Ontario Field Unit

Comment

Parks Canada Jewel Cunningham Director, Ontario Waterways Unit P.O. Box 567, 2155 Ashburnham Drive Peterborough, Ontario K9J 6Z6 Telephone: +1 (0) 705 750 4919 Fax: +1 (0) 705 750 4934 Email: jewel.cunningham@pc.gc.ca

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Website of the property](#)

Comment

Please REMOVE: #1. Our Place Please ADD: World Heritage in Canada (Eng) - <http://www.pc.gc.ca/eng/progs/spm-whs/index.aspx> World Heritage in Canada (Fre) - <http://www.pc.gc.ca/fra/progs/spm-whs/index.aspx>

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

Rideau Canal: National Historic Site of Canada (1926) Canadian Heritage River (2000) - Rideau River only Merrickville Blockhouse National Historic Site of Canada (1939) Note: part of Rideau Canal at Merrickville Lockstation Fort Henry National Historic Site of Canada (1923) Murney Tower National Historic Site of Canada (1930) Kingston Fortifications National Historic Site of Canada (1989) (designation includes Fort Henry, Murney Tower, Shoal Tower, Cathcart Tower, Fort Frederick)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The Rideau Canal is a large strategic canal constructed for military purposes which played a crucial contributory role in allowing British forces to defend the colony of Canada against the United States of America, leading to the development of two distinct political and cultural entities in the north of the American continent, which can be seen as a significant stage in human history.

Criterion (i): The Rideau Canal remains the best preserved example of a slackwater canal in North America demonstrating the use of European slackwater technology in North America on a large scale. It is the only canal dating from the great North American canal-building era of the early 19th century that remains operational along its original line with most of its original structures intact.

Criterion (iv): The Rideau Canal is an extensive, well preserved and significant example of a canal which was used for a military purpose linked to a significant stage in human history - that of the fight to control the north of the American continent.

The nominated property includes all the main elements of the original canal together with relevant later changes in the shape of watercourses, dams, bridges, fortifications, lock

stations and related archaeological resources. The original plan of the canal, as well as the form of the channels, has remained intact. The Rideau Canal has fulfilled its original dynamic function as an operating waterway without interruption since its construction. Most of its lock gates and sluice valves are still operated by hand-powered winches. All the elements of the nominated area (canal, associated buildings and forts) are protected as national historic sites under the Historic Sites and Monuments Act 1952-3. A buffer zone has been established. Repairs and conservation of the locks, dams, canal walls and banks are carried out directly under the control of Parks Canada. Each year one third of the canal's assets are thoroughly inspected by engineers. A complete inventory thus exists of the state of conservation of all parts of the property. A Management Plan exists for the canal (completed in 1996 and updated in 2005), and plans are nearing completion for Fort Henry and the Kingston fortifications. The Canal Plan is underpinned by the Historic Canals Regulations which provide an enforcement mechanism for any activities that might impact on the cultural values of the monument.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(i)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

The Rideau Canal is a masterpiece of human creative genius, in its concept, design and engineering. The slackwater system is shown by 74 dams, 47 locks at 24 lockstations, using dams and embankments to create lakes to serve as reservoirs. This outstanding example of a technology ensemble, illustrates a significant stage in human history, reflected in the strategic military route to connect Montreal to Lake Ontario, and the associated dams, bridges, fortifications, lockstations and archaeology.

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

n/a

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

n/a

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.2	Commercial development							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.5	Underground transport infrastructure							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
3.3.4	Localised utilities							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.2	Ground water pollution							
3.4.3	Surface water pollution							
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.3	Temperature							
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
3.9	Other human activities							
3.9.1	Illegal activities							
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage							
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events							
3.10.1	Storms							
3.10.2	Flooding							
3.10.3	Drought							
3.10.6	Temperature change							
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts							
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.2	Earthquake							
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition							
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.3	Management activities							
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.1	Housing	localised	on-going	minor	high capacity	static

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	high capacity	increasing
3.2.5 Underground transport infrastructure	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.3 Services Infrastructures					
3.3.2 Renewable energy facilities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	increasing
3.3.4 Localised utilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
3.4 Pollution					
3.4.2 Ground water pollution	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.4.3 Surface water pollution	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	decreasing
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.3 Temperature	widespread	on-going	minor	high capacity	static
3.7.6 Water (rain/water table)	widespread	on-going	minor	high capacity	static
3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	widespread	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.9 Other human activities					
3.9.1 Illegal activities	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.10 Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1 Storms	widespread	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static
3.10.2 Flooding	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.3 Drought	widespread	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.6 Temperature change	widespread	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.7 Other climate change impacts	widespread	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition	extensive	on-going	minor	low capacity	static

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

The majority of current negative factors are localised, intermittent and have a minor impact on the heritage place. There has been sufficient capacity to respond to, manage, and minimize potential negative impacts. Many of the factors are derived from outside the site and relies on sound working relationships with adjacent landowners and municipal authorities to ensure the heritage site is protected.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities/landowners.**

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Some public awareness and understanding of the 30m buffer zone surrounding the site. Note: 30m buffer zone corresponds with the 30m development setback enforced by the municipalities bordering the waterway, which is well known/understood by local residents/communities/landowners.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional) (Advisory Body evaluation)

The structures of the nominated property, that is to say the canal structure and associated lockhouses and defensive structures, are all owned by the government of Canada. All the elements of the nominated area (canal, associated buildings and forts) are protected as national historic sites under the Historic Sites and Monuments Act 1952-3.

(Nomination File)

Historic Sites and Monuments Act, 1952-53:

The elements of the property have been commemorated as national historic sites of Canada under the authority of the Government of Canada's Historic Sites and Monuments Act (Appendix N), which empowers the Minister responsible for the Parks Canada Agency to commemorate, acquire and administer historic places pursuant to the act. Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada, 1926 Fort Henry National Historic Site of Canada, 1923 Kingston Fortifications National Historic Site of Canada, 1989. The designation includes Fort Henry, Murney Tower, Shoal Tower, Fort Frederick and Cathcart Tower.

Parks Canada Agency Act, 1998:

The Parks Canada Agency's responsibilities to commemorate, acquire and administer historic places are defined under the authority of the Parks Canada Agency Act.

Department of Transport Act, 1985:

Pursuant to the Department of Transport Act, the Historic Canals Regulations are a third legislation mechanism under which the property is protected. The Parks Canada Agency administers the Historic Canals Regulations, which apply to the management, maintenance, use and protection of historic canals.

Comment

Murney Tower is also designated as a national historic site in its own right, in 1930. Note: Merrickville Blockhouse is contained within the Rideau Canal property, at the Merrickville Lockstation, and is also a national historic site in its own right, designated in 1939.

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

Parks Canada's Law Enforcement Program was created in 2008 and implementation is ongoing. Three enforcement officers are shared between the Rideau Canal and the nearby Thousand Islands National Park, both managed by Parks Canada.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System


The Agency of Canada Parks is the authority which exerts the right of ownership, under the control of the Canadian Parliament and of a minister of supervision appointed by the Prime Minister of Canada, for the whole property, except for Fort Frederick which is under the supervision of the Ministry for Defence. The Historic Monuments Act requires each historic site to have in place a Management Plan. Currently a plan exist for the canal (completed in 1996 and updated in 2005), and plans are nearing completion for Fort Henry and the Kingston fortifications. The Canal Plan is underpinned by the Historic Canals Registrations which provide an enforcement mechanism for any activities that might impact on the cultural values of the monument. Being in one ownership and under one management greatly facilitates the management of the long canal and ensures a consistency of approach.

Management and control of the buffer zone and setting of the canal is provided by land-use planning in cities and townships rather than designation. Each province has slightly different regulatory mechanisms; in some cases this appears to be limited to protection of the natural environment. Overall the natural environment is well protected by a the Conservation Authorities Act which protects water resources, wetlands, woodlands and natural habitats in Ontario, and by the Cataraqui Regional Conservation authority and the Rideau Valley Conservation authority which together span the canal and protect natural habitats.

Comment

Corrections: Parks Canada Agency Historic Sites and Monuments Act Historic Canals Regulations Each 'municipality' has slightly different regulatory mechanisms (ie planning policies) Multiple jurisdictions protect the natural environment including Parks Canada, two Conservation Authorities, Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Environment, Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Update: Management Plans completed in 2006 for Fort Henry, Kingston Fortifications & Merrickville Blockhouse

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Rideau Canal World Heritage Site Management Plan, 2005	In Force	Available	12/12/2005	

Comment

Also: Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan, 2005 Fort Henry National Historic Site Management Plan, 2006 Kingston Fortifications National Historic Site Management Plan, 2006 Merrickville Blockhouse National Historic Site Management Plan, 2006

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Not applicable

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is **little or no contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

As a result of legislative changes in 2012, management plan reviews are required every ten years (previously every five). Accordingly, planning and reporting processes and products

are currently being renewed in order to deliver and monitor results over a ten-year cycle. For 4.3.5, some actions contained in the NHS Management Plan (2005) have not been implemented or were implemented differently as program delivery directions have changed in the last eight years.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

n/a

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	93%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	4%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	3%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Comment

Not applicable

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding are **secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

no comment

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	60%
Part-time	40%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	60%
Seasonal	40%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

4.4.1 answers for Rideau Canal only. Commercial operator payments also includes landowner shoreline work permit fees and hydro generation revenue. 4.4.9-4.4.10: students account for 46% of part-time/seasonal Fort Henry NHS, operated by the St. Lawrence Parks Commission: 4.4.1 Governmental (Provincial): 35% In country donations: 6% Individual visitor charges: 49% Commercial operator payments: 4% Other grants: 6% 4.4.9 - 4.4.11 full-time paid: 4% seasonal paid: 11% volunteer:15% student paid: 70

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a small amount of research, but it is not planned

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are shared with local partners but there is no active outreach to national or international agencies

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

None.

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

No comment

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In many locations and easily visible to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Average

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only partly meets the needs and could be improved

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, but it could be improved

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted but improvements could be made

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Not needed
Other	Not needed

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

Promenade Agreement with National Capital Commission, City of Ottawa, and Department of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs for multimedia interpretation nodes at 7 locations along canal in Ottawa to be implemented in 2014. New municipal trails along the Rideau Canal planned in the Town of Smiths Falls and the City of Kingston. For 4.6.2, local authorities have a "good" awareness/understanding.

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Decreasing
Five years ago	N/A

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

The Management Plans for the Rideau Canal, Fort Henry and Kingston Fortifications include sections on strategic goals and key actions for interpretation, visitor services and facilities,

heritage tourism and recreation. Visitor Experience staff developed an internal Visitor Experience Plan for the direction and implementation of priority goals and actions. Will require revisions due to recent/ongoing organizational restructuring. Visitor Safety Plan under development.

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **excellent co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected, and makes **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

4.7.1 - For Rideau Canal National Historic Site (NHS) only - no visitor stats for 2008 due to problems with counters. 2009 saw a decrease from 2007 level, which was elevated due to 175th anniversary and WHS designation celebrations. 4.7.1 - Fort Henry NHS - decreasing each year 4.7.4 Staff receive Quality Visitor Experience training Recommendation - future visitor use will rely on working closely with partnering organizations, and a greater emphasis on self-guided tours/experiences.

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Non-existent
Local communities	Non-existent
Researchers	Non-existent
NGOs	Non-existent
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Non-existent

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is **underway**

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

Following WHC Decision 31COM 8B.35, forums & meetings held in 2008-09. The Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy resulted, led by a multi-jurisdictional steering committee and planners advisory group. From Oct 11-Dec 12 a landscape character assessment with planning & management recommendations was completed. Report released in April 2013. Implementation of report's recommendations commenced.

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

No comment

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.3	Temperature	Temperature changes between summer and winter and freeze/thaw effects impact engineering works including locks and dams, as well as lockstation buildings. It also impacts the ability to maintain through navigation.	Increase in capacity in water management; Dedicated Water Engineer; Updates to water monitoring technology.	Ongoing water monitoring through water gauge network. Asset management plan guides monitoring, maintenance, prioritization of capital expenditures	Ongoing	Parks Canada	Regular/expected temperature fluctuations between summer and winter, however with increasing irregularities, such as greater humidity in summer, early/fast thaws in spring.
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	Engineering components such as masonry walls of slackwater canal system (locks, canal walls, dams), as well as stone Martello towers, blockhouses and stone structures at Fort Henry	Asset management plan guides monitoring, maintenance, prioritization of capital expenditures	Ongoing via periodic monitoring, formally a minimum every three years; ongoing informal monitoring by lock staff and associated third-party operators (eg Kingston Historical Society at Murney Tower)	Ongoing	Parks Canada Others: PWGSC; consultants and contractors hired under contract; third party operators at Fort Henry, Fort Frederick, Murney Tower and Merrickville Blockhouse	Monitoring, maintenance, periodic significant capital expenditures for conservation and repair
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	Boat traffic impacts safety, causes shoreline erosion. Positive impact from new Visitors Centre which was built on Fort Henry NHS; site offers a wide range of visitor programming.	Watch Your Wake program (public outreach education) to manage visitor use, safety, erosion. Shoreline renaturalization at lockstations to address erosion. Partnerships and licenses with interpretive operators, such as houseboat, canoeing providers	Shoreline erosion monitoring at lockstations Monitoring at lockstations and narrow sections of the canal Lock staff employ Prevention Record and Report Program, and monitor visitor activity. PRR Program to be reviewed, improved	Ongoing	Parks Canada	Third party boat operators and community-organized canal festivals provide WHS interpretation. Tourism/ visitor use and recreation has a positive impact on the property, improving relevance, understanding, appreciation and visitor experience.
3.9	Other human activities						
3.9.1	Illegal activities	Encroachment close to canal's demarcated navigation channel. Illegal construction of in-water infrastructure within the 30 buffer zone.	Enforcement activities include restore orders and permitting. Increasing public awareness, information sharing via Shoreline Property Owners webpage, and the Policies for In-Water and Shoreline Works and Related Activities	Use aerial imagery and GIS data Navigation Aids crew and lock staff monitor activity on the waterway and at lockstations and employ the Prevention Record and Report Program 3 Enforcement Officers monitor the canal Security systems in some buildings	Ongoing	Parks Canada	Limited capacity to monitor and enforce.
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.6	Temperature change	Temperature changes as it relates to flooding and drought, impact the engineering works of the slackwater canal system, including the locks and dams. It also impacts the ability to maintain through navigation.	Increase in capacity in water management Dedicated Water Engineer Updates to water monitoring technology	Ongoing water monitoring through water gauge network. Asset management plan guides monitoring, maintenance, prioritization of capital expenditures	Ongoing	Parks Canada	Climate change can lead to an increase in significant weather events

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts	Similar to above, freeze/thaw action, flooding and drought impact the engineering works of the slackwater canal system, including the locks and dams. It also impacts the ability to maintain through navigation.	Increase in capacity in water management Dedicated Water Engineer Updates to water monitoring technology	Ongoing water monitoring through water gauge network. Asset management plan guides monitoring, maintenance, prioritization of capital expenditures	Ongoing	Parks Canada	Climate change can lead to an increase in significant weather events

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones							
			Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
4.1.5	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities/landowners		Via the Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy - landscape character assessment, updated website, ext communications, more contact with community groups & municipality New Shoreline Property Owners website re shoreline development and govt coordination	Ongoing. Significant improvement via the landscape character assessment and the associated external relations	Parks Canada Also: National Capital Commission, the 13 municipalities along the canal, 3 counties, and the 2 conservation authorities	The 30m buffer zone corresponds with the 30m development setback enforced by all municipalities along the canal. This setback is well-known by residents/communities/landowners. WHS info being incorporated into municipal Official Plans - ongoing	
4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management		Minimal relevancy to the management of the property. External Relations monitors industrial activities via media scans, consultation, partner/stakeholder relationships. Contact generally via group meetings re municipal planning policies, bylaws	Ongoing. Contacted if required.	Parks Canada	Some contact with ministries, for example Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines via municipal-led planning meetings eg Official Plan reviews.	
4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects							
4.5.2	Research in the property is not planned		Research conducted as required, generally associated with asset management, resource conservation initiatives. Extensive body of research, knowledge already known about the property.	Conducted as required	Parks Canada Others: Public Works and Government Services Canada (Heritage Conservation Directorate) and consultants, contractors hired on contract	Research often tied to targeted funding, such as federal funding programs: Action on the Ground for natural resource conservation and Economic Action Plan for asset management.	
4.5.3	No active outreach of research results to national or international agencies		Some sharing of data with relevant partners and stakeholders, general public	Ongoing, as requested or relevant.	Parks Canada	Increased flow of information under new Waterways Directorate, which is the amalgamation of Parks Canada's historic waterways in Quebec and Ontario, for enhanced and dedicated program delivery.	

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

No comment

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	No impact
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Not applicable
Institutional coordination	Not applicable
Security	Not applicable
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

Include Save tab at end of each question. There is also a significant jump in rating scales for some of the questions, making it difficult to select the correct answer. An option for "good" between "average" and "excellent" would be beneficial. Also, some questions have answers which contain two components. One may be accurate, the other not.

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very poor

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

All required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

• **Geographic Information Table**

Reason for update: Inscription year should read 2007 for all components.

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise