

Criteria and Principles for new PAN for Palestine

PAN principles for Palestine

1. Represents all different vegetation types
2. In aggregate include >10% of plant species and 10% of animal species
3. Should limit environmental degradation and deal with threats
4. Assert local sovereignty
5. Address society needs and land use ownership protected (ecosystem services)
6. Consider ecosystems and corridors
7. Set stage for needed research
8. Consider buffer zones
9. Consider management effectiveness (at local and national level)
10. Maximize effectiveness by use of micro-reserves (like Jinsafut Uskar Pond)
11. Include other effective area conservation measures (OEACMs)
12. Be part of a master management plan for all protected areas (integration effectiveness)
13. When delineating borders, we considered human development areas (roads, agricultural lands, master plans) and if the border is in a natural area we considered topography and species/habitat needs (e.g. we did not put new borders in middle of valleys)

Criteria (Higher score 53 Lower score 15)

The Criteria and measures applied to each protected area:

1. The best representation of quality of vegetation type and coverage: [this is relative to similar vegetation zones/phytogeographical regions]
 - 3: good plant cover types represented (quality and coverage)
 - 2: average
 - 1: Low or Poor vegetation quality and coverage.
2. Biodiversity (given higher values because protected areas are focused on nature conservation) (see Humphries et al. 1995; Coetzee et al. 2014)
 - 2.1 Richness in biodiversity (expert evaluation based on existing data)
 - 3: Rich
 - 2: Average
 - 1: Below Average or Poor
 - 2.2 Flora Species of importance (endemic, rare or endangered species):
 - 5: >10 species
 - 4: 5-10 species
 - 3: 2-4 species
 - 2: 1 species
 - 1: None
 - 2.3 Vertebrate Fauna species of importance (endemic, rare or endangered species):
 - 5: >10 species
 - 4: 5-10 species
 - 3: 2-4 species
 - 2: 1 species

- 1: None

3. Wilderness/wildness values: does the area contain characteristics e.g., remoteness, few or no people, an absence of human-made objects, traces, sounds and smells, untravelled or infrequently visited terrain that are particularly unique or representative components of PA? This includes Perceived naturalness of land cover, Absence of modern human artifacts, Rugged and challenging nature of the terrain, and Remoteness (Cookson 2011)

- 3: High wilderness value
- 2: Medium /Average
- 1: Low wilderness value

4. Historic values: does the area contain features or objects that represent experiences, achievements, places or records that are important, significant or unusual in the course of human events and activity in PA?

- 3: Yes (e.g. near Dead Sea area)
- 2: Medium (e.g. W Zarqa Ulwi)
- 1: No (Wadi Quff)

5. Aesthetic values: does the area contain features or attributes e.g., beauty, inspirational qualities, scenic attraction and appeal that contribute to people's appreciation and sense or perception of an area? Intrinsic appeal/landscape value/s?

- 3 Yes (e.g. near dead sea area)
- 2 Medium (e.g. Wadi Quff)
- 1 No/minimal (e.g. Jabal Tamun)

6. Existing Designation Existing designations and international relevance: IBA, IPA, KBA, Ramsar?

- 3: yes two or more criteria
- 2: one criterion
- 1: None

7. Governance and Management authority to make management objectives and authority to implement management objectives.

- 3: Yes
- 2: Medium
- 1: No

8. Accessibility/logistics: Is the area sufficiently accessible for management operations? Might the logistics needed negatively impact on management objectives and are there alternative management options? Would inaccessibility help achieve management objectives by deterring potentially impacting activity?

- 3: Can protect fully or partially
- 2: protection marginally feasible
- 1: Protection extremely difficult (Area C behind wall, military zone)

9. Ecosystem services: Sites which could be developed for eco-tourism can raise income for their protection, provide jobs for local people and raise visitors' awareness of conservation. Is there an appropriate balance between the costs and benefits of protecting the area, and appropriate equity in the distribution of it and adjacent protected and unprotected areas? (see Puzyreva et al. 2022)

- 5: Very high potential (at least two different areas like ecotourism and agricultural tourism)
 - 4: High potential
 - 3: Possible development
 - 2: Limited information
 - 1: No potential
10. Free from Threats: To what extent has the area been free from threats (pollution, overexploitation etc)? [Does the area lack signs of human activities (e.g., tracks, litters)? The main 5 threats are climate change, habitat destruction, pollution, overexploitation, invasive species, and colonialism]
- 5: Four of the main threats or more
 - 4: Three threats
 - 3: Two threats
 - 2: One threat
 - 1: No or minimal impact threats
11. (Conservation) vulnerability: Is there minimal loss of native species or lack of invasive species? To what extent is it or can it be actually protected? How vulnerable to human activities?
- 3: Vulnerable
 - 2: Medium vulnerability
 - 1: Not vulnerable
12. Buffer Zones: What is the degree of protection and value of the adjacent landscape and is it possible to enhance protection via buffer zones?
- 3: High value buffer zones
 - 2: Medium value buffer zones
 - 1: Low or no value buffer zones
13. Land Ownership: Accommodating land ownership for sustainable management.
- 3 All govt land
 - 2 Mixed
 - 1 >90% Private land

Scoring sheets for the evaluated areas can be downloaded from here

<https://www.palestinenature.org/conservation/Protected-Area-Evaluation-Form--IUCN-.xlsx>