

Evaluating Ecotourism Sustainability Indicators for Protected Areas in Tehran, Iran

Parvaneh Sobhani ¹, Hassan Esmaeilzadeh ^{1,*}, Seyed Mohammad Moein Sadeghi ^{2,*}, Marina Viorela Marcu ², and Isabelle D. Wolf ^{3,4}

¹ Environmental Sciences Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Evin, Tehran 1983969411, Iran; p_sobhanipajoh@sbu.ac.ir (P.S.)

² Department of Forest Engineering, Forest Management Planning and Terrestrial Measurements, Faculty of Silviculture and Forest Engineering, Transilvania University of Brasov, Șirul Beethoven 1, 500123 Brasov, Romania; viorela.marcu@unitbv.ro (M.V.M.)

³ School of Geography and Sustainable Communities, University of Wollongong, Northfields Avenue, Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia; iwolf@uow.edu.au (I.D.W.)

⁴ Centre for Ecosystem Science, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

* Correspondence: H_esmaeilzadeh@sbu.ac.ir (H.E.) or seyed.sadeghi@unitbv.ro (S.M.M.S.)

Table S1. List of factors affecting decrease of sustainability in these areas (results of round 1 of Delphi method).

Dimension	Factors	Lar	Jajrud	Tangeh Vashi	Kavdeh
		Mean of Factors			
Environmental-physical	-High level of topographic factors (height and slope)	3.20	2.40	3.18	3.16
	-Livestock overgrazing	4.18	3.65	3.92	3.84
	-High level of environmental pollutions	2.84	3.45	3.80	3.12
	-High number of tourists and visitors	3.85	4.00	4.28	2.96
	-High number of tourism attractions in the area	3.46	3.52	3.85	2.80
	-High number of restaurants and food stores in the area	1.08	1.85	1.28	1.17
	-Existence of abundant water resource	2.84	2.78	3.75	2.77
	-High potential of area for development of ecotourism activities	3.77	4.35	3.84	3.90
	-High richness of plant and animal species	3.91	3.38	3.30	3.25
	-High percentage of pristine habitat and natural conditions of the area	3.88	3.00	3.40	3.92
	-High level of human activities and LULC changes	2.56	4.18	3.98	3.86
	-High level of habitat fragmentation	3.85	3.32	3.21	3.00
	-High level of access to ways and roads	3.20	4.52	3.55	3.18
	-Low number of guard stations and environmental guardians	3.00	3.14	2.87	4.17
	-Low level of infrastructure and tourism services	2.33	3.52	3.22	2.40
	-Long period of ecotourism activities and visits to the area	3.23	3.85	3.64	3.73
	-High tourism restrictions due to high percentage of pristine zones	3.96	3.02	3.88	4.00
-Existence of natural attractions	2.88	2.43	2.74	2.65	
-Low level of safety	2.72	3.00	3.86	3.77	
	Mean	3.20	3.35	3.45	3.25
Demographic-social	- Low level of security	3.86	3.53	3.48	3.56
	- Low level of people culture	3.15	3.42	3.37	3.22
	- High distance from human habitats	3.54	3.27	3.40	3.50
	- High density of tourists	3.08	3.45	4.00	3.00
	- High density of local residents	3.00	3.24	2.58	2.93
	- Low level of environmental sensitivities among local communities	2.92	3.62	3.58	3.05
	- Low level of partnership	2.68	3.40	3.36	3.30
- Low level of social networks	3.60	3.00	3.35	3.57	
	Mean	3.23	3.37	3.39	3.27
Economic-institutional	- Weakness management in the area	2.65	3.72	3.87	3.52
	- Lack of rules and regulations	2.23	3.33	3.45	2.90
	- Low level of monitoring on ecotourism activities	4.17	3.68	3.76	3.95
	-High legal restrictions on tourism activities and visitors entry	4.10	2.37	2.88	3.72
	- High level of control on number of visitors	3.88	3.00	3.12	3.67
	- Low number of NGOs in the area	3.76	2.90	3.14	3.06
	- Low level of people awareness	2.80	3.12	3.35	2.85
	- High level of economic activities	3.22	3.82	3.45	3.28
	- Low level of cooperation between relevant organizations	3.28	3.78	3.64	3.55
	- High number of interferer organizations in decision making	3.00	3.70	4.00	2.86
- Low level of quality of managers functions	2.67	3.00	2.94	2.75	
	Mean	3.25	3.31	3.42	3.28
	Total Mean	3.22	3.35	3.43	3.26

Table S2. List of factors affecting decrease of sustainability in these areas (results of round 2 of Delphi method).

Dimension	Factors	Lar	Jajrud	Tangeh Vashi	Kavdeh
		<i>Mean of Factors</i>			
Environmental-physical	-High level of topographic factors (height and slope)	3.18	2.25	3.15	3.17
	-Livestock overgrazing	4.17	3.32	3.90	3.52
	-High level of environmental pollutions	2.86	3.25	3.63	3.12
	-High number of tourists and visitors	3.00	3.23	4.25	2.87
	-High number of tourism attractions in the area	3.36	3.42	3.77	3.00
	-High potential of area for development of ecotourism activities	3.00	4.20	3.68	3.11
	-High richness of plant and animal species	3.86	3.26	3.32	3.25
	-High percentage of pristine habitat and natural conditions of the area	3.64	3.00	3.36	3.72
	-High level of human activities and LULC changes	2.36	4.15	4.08	3.34
	-High level of habitat fragmentation	3.00	3.30	3.26	3.21
	-High level of access to ways and roads	3.20	4.50	3.98	3.18
	-Low number of guard stations and environmental guardians	3.08	3.14	2.94	4.19
	-Low level of infrastructure and tourism services	2.28	3.52	3.42	2.44
	-Long period of ecotourism activities and visits to the area	3.15	3.85	3.66	3.73
	-High tourism restrictions due to high percentage of pristine zones	3.78	3.17	3.58	4.00
	-Existence of natural attractions	3.11	2.32	2.87	2.50
-Low level of safety	2.98	3.00	3.40	3.11	
	Mean	3.18	3.35	3.54	3.26
Demographic-social	- Low level of security	3.60	3.53	3.47	3.56
	- Low level of people culture	3.11	3.42	3.36	3.28
	- High distance from human habitats	3.52	3.27	3.40	3.47
	- High density of tourists	3.34	3.45	4.18	3.22
	- High density of local residents	3.00	3.24	2.56	2.93
	- Low level of environmental sensitivities among local communities	2.92	3.45	3.38	3.26
	- Low level of partnership	3.05	3.64	3.57	3.30
	- Low level of social networks	3.33	3.02	3.20	3.28
	Mean	3.23	3.38	3.39	3.29
Economic-institutional	- Weakness management in the area	3.25	3.45	3.87	3.38
	- Lack of rules and regulations	2.23	3.00	3.45	2.90
	- Low level of monitoring on ecotourism activities	4.12	3.52	3.76	3.86
	-High legal restrictions on tourism activities and visitors entry	4.00	2.36	2.88	3.72
	- High level of control on number of visitors	3.57	2.95	3.12	3.35
	- Low number of NGOs in the area	3.48	2.85	3.14	3.06
	- Low level of people awareness	3.40	3.62	3.75	3.48
	- High level of economic activities	3.20	3.58	3.32	3.28
	- Low level of cooperation between relevant organizations	2.95	3.64	3.22	3.10
	- High number of interferer organizations in decision making	3.18	3.80	3.92	2.86
- Low level of quality of managers functions	2.68	3.92	3.24	3.35	
	Mean	3.28	3.34	3.43	3.30
	Total Mean	3.22	3.35	3.48	3.28