

The 25 Largest Unfragmented Areas in the Arctic



A report produced by UNEP-WCMC and UNEP/GRID-Arendal for
WWF Arctic Programme

Authors (maps, GIS production and descriptions):
Igor Lysenko
Christoph Zöckler

GIS and project management support:
Lorant Czarán
Julien Roud



A/N 22027

UNEP-WCMC Repats OL

The 25 Largest Un-fragmented Wilderness Areas in the Arctic

text by: Igor Lysenko (Lysenko@unep-wcmc.org) & Christoph Zöckler

(Christoph@unep-wcmc.org)

also contributed: Lorant Czaran (czaran@grida.no)

DECEMBER 2001

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND DISCLAIMER	5
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	6
Methodology	7
Results	9
Acknowledgements	12
No. 1. Northern Siberia	15
1.1. General description	15
1.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	15
1.3. Flora and Fauna	15
1.4. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	17
1.5. Threats and future developments	17
No. 2. Central Canadian Tundra and Taiga	21
2.1. General description	21
2.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	21
2.3. Flora and Fauna	21
2.4. Fish	22
2.5. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	22
2.6. Threats and future developments	22
No. 3. Greenland	26
3.1. General description	26
3.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	26
3.3. Flora and Fauna	26
3.4. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	27
3.5. Threats and future developments	27
No. 4. Canadian Arctic Archipelago	30
4.1. General description	30
4.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	30
4.3. 3. Flora and Fauna	30
4.4. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	31
4.5. Threats and future developments	31
No. 5. Eastern Canadian Shield (Canada)	34
5.1. General description	34
5.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	34
5.3. 3. Flora and Fauna	34
5.4. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	35
5.5. Threats and future developments	35
No. 6. Chukotka-Koryak (Russia)	37
6.1. General description	37
6.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	37
6.3. Flora and Fauna	37
6.4. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	39
6.5. Threats and future developments	39
No. 7. Alaska (USA)	43
7.1. General Description	43
7.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	43
7.3. Flora and Fauna	43
7.4. Nature Conservation and Protected areas	45
7.5. Threats and future developments	45
No. 8. Southern Hudson Bay (Canada)	48
8.1. General Description	48
8.2. Biomes and major vegetation zones	48

8.3.	Flora and Fauna	48
8.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	49
8.5.	Threats and future developments	49
No. 9.	North Yukon (Alaska/Canada)	51
9.1.	General Description	51
9.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	51
9.3.	Flora and Fauna	51
9.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	52
9.5.	Threats and future developments	52
No. 10.	Gydan (Russia)	55
10.1.	General description	55
10.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	55
10.3.	Flora and Fauna	55
10.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	56
10.5.	Threats and future developments	56
No. 11.	Yamal (Russia)	59
11.1.	General description	59
11.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	59
11.3.	Flora and Fauna	59
11.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	60
11.5.	Threats and future developments	60
No. 12.	Bolshezemelskaya Tundra (Russia)	64
12.1.	General description	64
12.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	64
12.3.	Flora and Fauna	64
12.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	65
12.5.	Threats and future developments	65
No. 13.	Muskwa/Slave Lake Forests (Canada)	68
13.1.	General Description	68
13.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	68
13.3.	Flora and Fauna	68
13.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	68
13.5.	Threats and future developments	68
No. 14.	Southern Labrador (Canada)	71
14.1.	General Description	71
14.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	71
14.3.	Flora and Fauna	71
14.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	71
14.5.	Threats and future developments	72
No. 15.	Novaya Zemlya (Russia)	74
15.1.	General description	74
15.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	74
15.3.	Flora and Fauna	74
15.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	75
15.5.	Threats and future developments	75
No. 16.	St. Elias (Alaska/Canada)	78
16.1.	General Description	78
16.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	78
16.3.	Flora and Fauna	78
16.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	79
16.5.	Threats and future developments	79
No. 17.	Svalbard (Norway)	82
17.1.	General description	82
17.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones	82
17.3.	Flora and Fauna	82
17.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas	83
17.5.	Threats and future developments	83

No. 18.	Sordoginskiy Mountains (Russia)	86
18.1.	General description.....	86
18.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	86
18.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	86
18.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	87
18.5.	Threats and future developments.....	87
No. 19.	Kola Peninsula (Russia)	89
19.1.	General description.....	89
19.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	89
19.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	89
19.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	90
19.5.	Threats and future developments.....	90
No. 20.	Yukon Alpine Tundra (Alaska/Canada)	92
20.1.	General Description.....	92
20.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	92
20.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	92
20.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	93
20.5.	Threats and future developments.....	93
No. 21.	Markha River Valley (Russia)	95
21.1.	General description.....	95
21.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	95
21.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	95
21.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	96
21.5.	Threats and future developments.....	96
No. 22.	James Bay Lowland (Canada)	98
22.1.	General Description.....	98
22.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	98
22.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	98
22.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	99
22.5.	Threats and future developments.....	99
No. 23.	New Siberian Islands (Russia)	101
23.1.	General description.....	101
23.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	101
23.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	101
23.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	102
23.5.	Threats and future developments.....	102
No. 24.	Severnaya Zemlya (Russia)	104
24.1.	General description.....	104
24.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	104
24.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	104
24.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	105
24.5.	Threats and future developments.....	105
No. 25.	Malazemelskaya Tundra (Russia)	107
25.1.	General description.....	107
25.2.	Biomes and major vegetation zones.....	107
25.3.	Flora and Fauna.....	107
25.4.	Nature Conservation and Protected areas.....	108
25.5.	Threats and future developments.....	108

INTRODUCTION AND DISCLAIMER

In 2000 the World Wildlife Fund's (WWF) Arctic Programme called upon GRID-Arendal and UNEP-WCMC to produce a new report on Arctic wilderness by analysing impact of man-made infrastructure on nature and define the 25 largest wilderness areas, following the work done in 1995 on the same subject.

The scarcity of publicly available, up to date digital geographic data on infrastructure features at medium resolution proved the work more difficult than anticipated. We found ourselves obliged to use the same old Digital Chart of the World (DCW) for most of the Arctic region, given the tight schedule imposed and limited funding available.

In parallel, search for better data started, and certain areas of the Arctic are now covered by such data in our database, but mostly could not be used because of the imminent quality differences in the result.

The DCW data (roads, rail, settlements) over some areas (such as Siberia and parts of Canada) have been further improved during this project, using local expertise and review. WWF Canada staff, in light of the many changes that occurred during last years, reviewed settlement names in Canada but certain mistakes might still prevail. Readers are encouraged to contact us for any updates or corrections.

However, the result of this project, this Arctic Wilderness report should not be seen as the exact reflection of present-day wilderness status in the Arctic. While efforts have been made to improve the base data used in the analysis, as stated, the overall DCW dataset is of course outdated, but was the only public global dataset that could be used for our purposes. The results therefore reflect more the situation 10-15 years ago.. However, some recent development in the American Arctic might not been captured this way.

Practical experience showed that in order to achieve full coverage of the Arctic with newer, better, larger scale digital geographic base infrastructure data that is also publicly available would require another year or even more from now. The resources needed for this are much larger as the frame of the present project would have allowed.

Furthermore, specific areas of intense development in the Arctic such as Prudhoe Bay in Alaska or some mining areas in Siberia could not possibly be fully represented by this analysis, given the lack of access to the necessary data on those changes.

However, GRID-Arendal and UNEP-WCMC in general are committed to improve their data holdings for generating better quality products, and look forward to sharing results of any future updates with WWF and other interested organizations. This project should be looked upon as an improvement towards the 1995 project but also as a long and ongoing process, rather than an isolated product.

The authors, December 2001

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The main purpose of this project was to explore where the last remote wilderness areas, resorts for nature, man and biodiversity can be found in the Arctic, as well as the pressures they are subjected to and their main threats. Since the Arctic Environment Protection Strategy (AEPS), the awareness of large undisturbed areas in the Arctic has grown, as well as the realisation of the threats and the speed of fragmentation.

There are two terms mentioned in the title, which require further explanation and definition.

What is **the Arctic region** and when is an area classified as a wilderness area?

The Arctic region has been defined several times and always differently, depending on the purpose and objectives. (see CAFF, AMAP and PAME). For this report we agreed with WWF on the most southern boundary of all definitions, including most of Alaska and many of the northern states in Canada, as defined by the WWF (see figure 1 and 2)..

The term **wilderness** has been interpreted differently and is not always understood in the same way by everybody. This has been discussed on various occasions and should be referred to (Fritz 1999, Nellemann et al. 2001, Kapos, Lysenko & Lesslie, 2000).

In summary, we have defined wilderness areas as areas un-fragmented by any permanent physical man-made structures, such as roads, railways, power transmission lines or pipelines or settlements. Roads and settlements in the wilderness area will not exclude the very area from being classified as a wilderness area, as long as these roads are not connected to the main road network. Of course, they have to be regarded as areas of disturbance to the wilderness, and a buffer around these structures inside the wilderness areas shows the level of impact, as demonstrated in figure 1..

The impact of air transport and via rivers on boat or with heavy vehicles along the frozen rivers in winter to many of these remote places is significant, but is not part of this assessment.

Another important distinction has to be made between **winter and summer roads**. In the past there has been a lot of confusion and misinterpretation about the terms.

Whereas formerly winter roads have been regarded as strong and physically

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_12325

