

Landscape scale biodiversity assessment: the problem of scaling

Report of an electronic conference, March 2005



E-Conference Organisation:

Juliette Young, Allan Watt, Malcolm Collie and Denise Wright

Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
Hill of Brathens, Glassel
Banchory AB31 4BW, UK



András Báldi

Animal Ecology Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
Hungarian Natural History Museum
Ludovika tér 2, Budapest, Hungary, H-1083



Ariel Bergamini and Christoph Scheidegger

Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research
Zürcherstrasse 111, CH-8903 Birmensdorf Switzerland



Lisandro Benedetti-Cecchi

University of Pisa
Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Uomo e dell'Ambiente
Via A. Volta 6, I-56126 Pisa, Italy



Keith Hiscock

Marine Biological Association of the UK
Citadel Hill, Plymouth PL1 2PB, UK



Sybille van den Hove and Thomas Koetz

Institute of Environmental Science and Technology
Autonomous University of Barcelona
Passeig Pintor Romero, 8, 08197 Valldoreix, Spain



Ekko van Ierland

Environmental Economics and Natural Resources
Social Sciences Group, Wageningen University
P.O. Box 8130, 6700 EW Wageningen, The Netherlands



András Lányi

Eötvös Loránd University, Institute of Sociology
Pázmány Péter sétány 1/A, H-1117 Budapest, Hungary



György Pataki

St. Istvan University
Pater K. u. 1., H-2103 Godollo, Hungary



BioPlatform (EVK2-CT-2001-20009):

Isabel Sousa Pinto (Project Coordinator)

University of Porto

CIIMAR, University of Porto

R. dos Bragas, 177

4150-123 Porto, Portugal



Martin Sharman and **Karin Zaunberger**

Biodiversity Sector, Natural Resources Management and Services,

European Commission Directorate General for Research

B-1049 Brussels, Belgium



This publication should be cited as follows:

Young, J., Báldi, A., Benedetti-Cecchi, L., Bergamini, A., Hiscock, K., van den Hove, S., Koetz, T., van Ierland, E., Lányi, A., Pataki, G., Scheidegger, C., Török, K. and Watt, A.D. (Editors). 2005. *Landscape scale biodiversity assessment: the problem of scaling. Report of an electronic conference*. Institute of Ecology and Botany of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Vacratot, Hungary.

Cover picture: Botanical Garden of the Institute of Ecology and Botany, Budapest.



Contents

Contents	1
Preface.....	2
Summary	3
List of contributions.....	10
Scaling problems in biodiversity assessment.....	15
Biological scales and conservation.....	77
Political and economic scales in relation to biodiversity	120
Integrating ecological and social scales	154
References	186

On the problematic 'political will' to conserve

Erling Berge, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

The discussion of conservation measures seems to revolve around protected areas and how many and big they have to be. Some have doubts that there ever will be many and large enough protected areas. They are right to worry. In democratic polities there are strict limits on the kinds of instruments politicians are allowed to use in exercising political will. Today it is not conceivable to declare an area for protected and then shut out or requiring non-development from the local people like it was done for example in the Serengeti National Park. Conservation of biodiversity will become increasingly difficult if protection is the only instrument known to deliver better conditions for ecosystems.

If biodiversity needs better conditions they have to be created around where humans live and work. To do this, politicians need to be able to judge the relative impact on biodiversity from several reasonable courses of action. Do we know enough to predict the true impact of a particular decision net of all confounding factors (that is all factors not part of the political decision)? If the decision to create a National Park in an area increases the number of tourists by 20% while the traditional use of the area by farmers dwindle to nothing, what is the effect on the ecosystem net of confounding factors? Will it be an improvement for our ecosystem if we were able to increase the proportion of cars running on electricity to 10%? What is better for biodiversity: building compact high-rise cities or land extensive suburban type cities? Both at small and large scales such questions require many and consistent decisions on many levels ranging from the person deciding to buy a car or landowner deciding to build to governments shaping taxes and regulations to encourage desired behaviour. To manage nature politicians need to know the net effects on ecosystems of their decisions. They have to be able to consistently choose the ecologically better of two options, not by guesswork but based on scientific knowledge. Today this knowledge does not exist.

Politics has traditionally been developed on a trial and error basis. Only during the last 50-100 years has policy development based on scientific knowledge been tried, and, admittedly, on balance, not with any remarkable success. But there is no turning back. Social and environmental change occurs at a high and maybe increasing frequency. The environmental problems have to find their solution more quickly than the ordinary trial and error approach can promise. But to my knowledge there is no large research program directed at the problem of determining the "subtle" effects of humans on ecosystem (Russell 1993).

In the world of social science a quantitative investigation of the impact of politically manipulated variables on ecosystems will be a mega project rivalling in cost anything known to this writer. But is it worth doing? Will it matter? Before going into this kind of mega project we should step back a bit and think hard on the question of whether a quantitative approach really will help us determine net causal connections. And if it cannot, can it still be worth doing? Causality is a difficult concept. In order to establish causal connections the basic requirement is that other things are equal, and that we are able to include all relevant variables. This amounts to a complete list of all initial and boundary conditions of the system we study. If this requirement is met, we are assured that our estimates, within the sampling error, are true estimates of the impact of causal forces. We are confident that the ecosystem will respond to equal quantities of impacts in the same way, most times. Hence, we are able to predict outcomes with a known uncertainty and able to advice on changes in policy.

However, there are reasonable arguments that the assumption of a complete listing of all initial and boundary conditions relevant for a study of system change is untenable not only for human societies, but also for biospheres. Kauffman (2000) argues this rather convincingly. He first conjectures that it probably is theoretically impossible to state the initial and boundary conditions for a biosphere. However, he argues, even if we grant that there perhaps is a theoretical possibility, it probably is practically impossible within the lifetime of the universe to enumerate all initial and boundary conditions relevant for the evolution of a biosphere. And moreover, the practical problems are of such a nature that it also is impossible to establish the distributions required for a statistical study of the possible outcomes.

The conjecture sounds familiar for a sociologist. The debates about research methods and goals for research in social science revolve around the question of predictability. What we are most interested in, social change and innovation are inherently unpredictable. On the other hand, most of human activity is rather routine and repetitive. People do react in predictable ways to changes in their physical and social environment. Hence local and short term predictions are feasible. But will shaping of local and short term behaviour be sufficient for conservation purposes?

One reason for the practical impossibility of stating initial and boundary conditions completely is that for every stimuli and every level of stimuli there are vastly more possible responses than what in reality can happen (in any finite lifetime of the universe), and therefore be observed. With no practical way of listing the state space of our problem analytically, life will always have a potential for surprising us. Life is inherently unpredictable. Yet, it is not chaotic. In hindsight, we do see the paths taken and the causes forcing the development.

If we have to abandon the ambition to generalize, we will at least be able to establish empirical connections with some validity in the short run and for the areas studied. How good we are at selecting relevant variables will determine how good our predictions are, and for how long they will be valid. As long as the goal of protecting biodiversity is clear, this will be a vastly better guide to policy than ordinary trial and error. However, it also means that results are not guaranteed. We need to supplement any policy intervention with a learning program. Every change in policy should be viewed as an experiment from which we can learn. Today only occasionally there are linked relevant policy variables to observations of biodiversity. Data to start the slow process of accumulating knowledge about ecosystem responses to policy decisions do not accumulate.

It was noted above that the choice of policy instruments or policy variables are strictly circumscribed in democratic polities. The debate around differences between democratic polities and other kinds of governance systems may not be conclusive, but there are some strong indications that some kinds of policy instruments are impossible to use regularly in democratic societies. Among these are all policies that rely on physical coercion of large groups of people, or large-scale takings of established property. In general, it is conjectured that systematic violations of human rights will generate political and social backlashes that negate any possibly laudable goal one wants to further by such policies. This means we have to put aside all grand revolutionary solutions. In democracies choice of policy instruments need a foundation in the values and opinions of the public in order to have a beneficial impact. What politicians actually can use are the subtle tools of ordinary democratic political action, the piecemeal and small scale measures. They need advice on how to fashion taxes and subsidies, and on how to formulate the marginal changes in legislation that directs behaviour towards sustainable use. Politicians need evidence of how changes in priorities of land use planning can further sustainable resource usage. They need a map of which marginal shifts in values should be reinforced, and not least, they need knowledge about the internal consistency of various policy measures. Political rhetoric and public information campaigns have their place in biodiversity policy. But they work only if they are integrated with institutional changes and are fashioned to reinforce these.

The conclusion from this line of argument is that in order to further the goal of sustainable use of biodiversity we need to know the direction and size of the impact from a change in a policy variable and how the impact changes from context to context. Before we can know this, the systematic collection of data has to commence. From there on case studies will accumulate. Cumulative analysis of quantitative case studies may be the only feasible way of approaching the problem of democratic biodiversity policy. There is a long way to go, but ultimately political will comes as much from the ability to do something as from wanting the thing done. Until a better ability to give knowledge-based advice exists we cannot lament the lack of political will.



References

- Allen T.F.H. & Starr T.B. 1982. *Hierarchy: Perspectives for Ecological Complexity*. The University of Chicago Press, London.
- Allen T.F.H. & Hoekstra T.W. 1992. *Toward a unified ecology*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Altaba C. 1997. Documenting biodiversity: the need for species identifications. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 12 (9): 358-59.
- Anderson A. 1995. Measuring more of biodiversity: genus richness as a surrogate of species richness in Australian ant faunas. *Biological Conservation* 73: 39-43.
- Annan K.A. 2000. *We the peoples. The role of the United Nations in the 21st century*. UN, New York.
- Atauri J.A. & De Lucio J.V. 2001. The role of landscape structure in species richness distribution of birds, amphibians, reptiles and lepidopterans in Mediterranean landscapes. *Landscape Ecology* 16: 147-159.
- Báldi A. & Kisbenedek T. 1999. Species-specific distribution of reed-nesting passerine birds across reed-bed edges: effects of spatial scale and edge type. *Acta Zoologica Hungarica* 45: 97-114.
- Balmford A., Green M.J.B. & Murray M.G. 1996. Using higher-taxon richness as a surrogate for species richness: I. regional tests. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* 263: 1267-74
- Balmford A., Lyon A.J.E. & Lang R.M. 2000. Testing the higher-taxon approach to conservation planning in a megadiverse group: the macrofungi. *Biological Conservation* 93: 209-217.
- Balmford A., Moore J.L., Brooks T., Burgess N., Hansen L.A., Williams P. & Rahbek C. 2001. Conservation conflicts across Africa. *Science* 291: 2616-2619
- Barrow E. & Pathak N. 2005. Conserving "Unprotected" Protected Areas – Communities Can and Do Conserve Landscapes of All Sorts. In: Brown J., Mitchell N. & Beresford M. (Eds.), *The Protected Landscape Approach: Linking Nature, Culture and Community*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK (in proof).
- Bascompte J. & Solé R.V. 1995. Rethinking complexity: modelling spatiotemporal dynamics in ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 10: 361-366.
- Bascompte J. & Solé R.V. 1996. Habitat fragmentation and extinction thresholds in spatially explicit models. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 65: 465-473.
- Bauman Z. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

- Bawa K.S., Rose J., Ganeshiah K. N., Barve N., Kiran M. C. & Umashaanker R. 2002. Assessing biodiversity from space: an example from the Western Ghats, India. *Conservation Ecology* 6(2): 7.
- Bawa K.S., Seidler R., & Raven H.P. 2004. Reconciling Conservation Paradigms. *Conservation Biology* 18 (4): 859-860.
- Bennett G. 2004. Integrating Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use: Lessons Learned from Ecological Networks. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Berkes F. 1999. Sacred Ecology: traditional ecological knowledge and resource management. Philadelphia, Taylor and Francis.
- Borgatti S. P. 2003. The Key Player Problem. In: Breiger R., Carley K. & Pattison P. (eds.), *Dynamic Social Network Modelling and Analysis: Workshop Summary and Papers*. Committee on Human Factors, National Research Council, pp. 241-252.
- Borrini-Feyerabend G., Kothari A. & Oviedo G. 2005. Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas: Towards Equity and Enhanced Conservation. Guidance on policy and practice for Co-managed Protected Areas and Community Conserved Areas. No. 11 in the IUCN/ WCPA Best Practice Series – (issue published in collaboration with IUCN/CEESP). Adrian Phillips, Series Editor. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Kothari A., & Oviedo G. 2004. Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas: Towards Equity and Enhanced Conservation. IUCN, Gland Switzerland and Cambridge UK xiii-111p.
- Bossert W. 1989. On the extension of preferences over a set to the power set. *Journal of Economic Theory* 49: 84-92.
- Bossert W. Pattanaik P. Xu Y. 1994. Ranking Opportunity Sets: An Axiomatic Approach. *Journal of Economic Theory* 63: 326-345.
- Boyd, R. N. 1988. How to be a moral realist. In: Sayre-McCord, G. (Ed.), *Essays on Moral Realism*. Cornell University Press. Ithaca, NY. Pp. 181-228.
- Brehm J. W. 1966. *A Theory of Psychological Reactance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brewer A. & Williamson M. 1994. A new relationship for rarefaction. *Biodiversity Conservation* 3: 373-379.
- Brooks T., Balmford A., Burgess N., Fjeldsa J., Hansen L. A., Moore J., Rahbek C. & Williams P. 2001. Toward a blueprint for conservation in Africa. *BioScience* 51: 613-624
- Brown J., Mitchell N. & Beresford M. (eds.). 2005. *The Protected Landscape Approach: Linking Nature, Culture and Community*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK (in proof).
- Butchart S.H.M., Stattersfield A.J., Bennun L.A., Shutes S.M., Akçakaya H.R., et al. 2004. Measuring global trends in the status of biodiversity: Red List Indices for birds. *PLoS Biology* 2(12): 383.
- Canterbury G.E., Martin T.E., Petit D.R. 2000. Bird community and habitat as ecological indicators of forest conditions in regional monitoring. *Conservation Biology* 14(2): 544-558.
- Cao T.Y. 2004. Ontology and scientific explanation. In: Cornwell J. (Ed.) *Explanations: styles of explanation in science*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Chao A. & Lee S.M. 1992. Estimating the number of classes via sample coverage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 87, 210-217.
- Chao A. & Shen T-S. 2003. Nonparametric estimation of Shannon's index of diversity when there are unseen species in sample. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics* 10:429-443
- Chao A. 1984. Nonparametric estimation of the number of classes in a population. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 11, 265-270.
- Chao A. 2004. Species Richness Estimation.
- Chapin III, F.S., Zavaleta E.S., Eviner V.T., Naylor R.L., Vitousek P.M., Reynolds H.L., Hooper D.U., Lavorel S., Sala O.E., Hobbie S.E., Mack M.C. & Díaz, S. 2000. Consequences of changing biodiversity. *Nature* 405, 234-242.

- Chettri N, Sharma E, Deb D.C. 2001. Bird community structure along a trekking corridor of Sikkim Himalaya: A conservation perspective. *Biological Conservation* 102(1): 1-16.
- Chettri N., Deb D.C., Sharma E. & Jackson R. (in press). On the relationship between bird communities and habitat: A study along a trekking corridor of the Sikkim Himalaya. Mountain Research and Development.
- Colwell R.K., & Coddington, J.A. 1994. Estimating terrestrial biodiversity through extrapolation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B* 345: 101–118.
- Colwell R.K., Mao C.X., & Chang J. 2004. Interpolating, extrapolating, and comparing incidence-based species accumulation curves. *Ecology* 85: 2717-2727.
- Cooperrider D.L., Pasmore, W.A. 1991. Global social change. A new agenda for social science? *Human Relations* 44(10): 1037-1055.
- Costanza R. 2003. A vision of the future of science: reintegrating the study of humans and the rest of nature. *Futures* 35: 651-671.
- Couteron P., & Pélissier R. 2004. Additive apportioning of species diversity: towards more sophisticated models and analysis. *Oikos* 107: 215-221.
- Cowling R.M., Rundel P.W., Lamont B.B., Arroyo M.K. & Arianoutso, M. 1996. Plant diversity in Mediterranean-climate regions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 11: 362-366.
- Crist T.O., Veech J.A., Summerville K.S. & Gering J.C. 2003. Partitioning species diversity across landscapes and regions: a hierarchical analysis of alpha, beta, and gamma diversity. *American Naturalist* 162: 734-743.
- Cristancho S. & Vining J. 2004. Culturally defined keystone species. *Human Ecology Review* 11(2): 153-164.
- Cronk Q. 1997. Islands: Stability, diversity, conservation. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 6(3): 477-93.
- Daily G. C. (Ed.). 1997. *Nature's Services*. Island Press, Washington D.C.
- DeVries P.J., Murray D., & Lande R. 1997. Species diversity in vertical, horizontal, and temporal dimensions of a fruit-feeding butterfly community in an Ecuadorian forest. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 62: 343-364.
- Diamond J.M. 1975. The island dilemma: lessons of modern biogeographic studies for the design of natural reserves. *Biological Conservation* 7: 129-146
- Díaz S. & Cabido M. 2001. Vive la différence: plant functional diversity matters to ecosystem processes. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 16(11): 646-655.
- Duelli P. & Obrist M.K. 2003. Biodiversity indicators: the choice of values and measures. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 98(1-3): 87-98.
- EEA. 2003a. *Europe's Environment: the third assessment*. EEA, Environmental assessment report No10, Copenhagen.
- Erasmus B.F.N., Freitag S., Gaston K.J., Erasmus B.H. & van Jaarsveld A.S. 1999. Scale and conservation planning in the real world. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* 266: 315-319
- Faith D P & Walker PA. 1996. How do indicator group provides information about the relative biodiversity of different sets of areas? On hotspots, complementarity and pattern based approaches. *Biodiversity Letters* 3:18-25.
- Faust K., Wassermann S. 1994. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Feagin J.R. 2001. Social justice and sociology. *Agendas for the twenty-first century*. *American Sociological Review* 66 (1): 1-20.
- Ferrier S. 2002. Mapping spatial pattern in biodiversity for regional conservation planning: Where to from here? *Systematic Biology* 51(2): 331-363.
- Fournier E., & Loreau M. 2001. Respective roles of hedges and forest patch remnants in the maintenance of ground-beetle (Coleoptera: Carabidae) diversity in an agricultural landscape. *Landscape Ecology* 16: 17-32.

- Fuller R. & Brown N. 1996. A CORINE map of Great Britain by automated means. Techniques for automatic generalization of the Land Cover Map of Great Britain. *International Journal of Geographical Informations Systems* 10: 737-953.
- Garibaldi A. & Turner N. 2004. Cultural keystone species: implications for ecological conservation and restoration. *Ecology and Society* 9(3): 1 [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss3/art1>
- Georgescu-Roegen N. 1971. *The Entropy Law and the economic process*. Harvard University Press; Distributed by Oxford University Press, London.
- Gering J.C., & Crist T.O. 2002. The alpha-beta-regional relationship: providing new insights into local-regional patterns of species richness and scale dependence of diversity components. *Ecology Letters* 5: 433-444.
- Gering J.C., Crist T.O., & Veech J.A. 2003. Additive partitioning of species diversity across multiple spatial scales: implications for regional conservation of biodiversity. *Conservation Biology* 17: 488-499.
- Giampietro M. & Mayumi K. 2000a. Multiple-Scale Integrated Assessment of Societal Metabolism: Introducing the Approach. *Population and Environment* 22(2): 109-153.
- Giampietro M. & Mayumi K. 2000b. Multiple-Scale Integrated Assessments of Societal Metabolism: Integrating Biophysical and Economic Representations Across Scales. *Population and Environment* 22(2): 155-210.
- Giampietro M. & Mayumi K. 2001. Integrated assessment of sustainability trade-offs: Methodological challenges for Ecological Economics Paper for the EC High Level Scientific Conference: Frontiers 1: Fundamental Issues of Ecological Economics organized by the ESEE, Cambridge, UK 4-7 July, 2001.
- Giampietro M. 2004. *Multi-scale Integrated Assessment of Agroecosystems*. CRC Press, London
- Gonzales L. 2005. BIO 213: Diversity and Ecology. – URL: <http://www.sbs.utexas.edu/gonzalez/bio213.htm>
- Good I.J. 1953. The population of frequencies of species and the estimation of population parameters. *Biometrika* 40: 237-64.
- Gotelli N.J. & Colwell R.K. 2001. Quantifying biodiversity: procedures and pitfalls in the measurement and comparison of species richness. *Ecology Letters* 4: 379-391.
- Granovetter M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 3: 481-510.
- Grelle C.E.V. 2002. Is higher-taxon analysis a useful surrogate of species richness in studies of Neotropical mammal diversity? *Biological Conservation* 108(1): 101-106.
- Guisan A., Edwards Jr T.C. & Hastie T. 2002: Generalized linear and generalized additive models in studies of species distributions: setting the scene. *Ecological modelling* 157: 89-100.
- Guisan A., Theurillat J.P. 2000. Equilibrium modelling of alpine plant distribution: how far can we go? *Phytocoenologia* 30(3-4): 353-384.
- Guisan A., Zimmermann N.E. 2000. Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecological Modelling* 135(2-3): 147-186.
- Gunderson L.H. & Holling C.S. (Eds.). 2002. *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Island Press, London
- Gupta A. 1998. Rewarding Local Communities for Conserving Biodiversity: The Case of the Honey Bee. In: Guruswamy L.D. & McNeely J.A. (Eds.), *Protection of Global Biodiversity. Converging Strategies*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Hanski I., & Gilpin M. (Eds.). 1997. *Metapopulation Biology, Genetics, and Evolution*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Harary F. 1961. Who eats whom? *General Systems* 6: 41-44.
- Hassell M.P., Comins H.N. & May R.M. 1991. Spatial structure and chaos in insect population dynamics. *Nature* 353: 255-258.
- Hawking S.W. 1998. *A brief history of time*. Bantam, London.
- Heaney L.R. 1986. Biogeography of mammals in SE Asia: estimates of rates of colonisation, extinction and speciation. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 28: 127-165

- Hellmann J.J. & Fowler G.W. 1999. Bias, precision and accuracy of four measures of species richness. *Ecological Applications* 9(3): 824-834.
- Hill M.O. 1973. Diversity and evenness: a unifying notation and its consequences. *Ecology* 54: 427-31.
- Hopkins C.C.E. 2004. Biodiversity assessment and threats analysis for the WWF Global 200 Ecoregion "North-East Atlantic Shelf". WWF Germany. Bremen. 108 pp. http://www.ngo.grida.no/wwfneap/Projects/Reports/NEASE_BAR.pdf
- Hurlbert S.H. 1971. The nonconcept of species diversity: a critique and alternative parameters. *Ecology* 52: 577-586.
- ICES. 2004. ICES response to EC request for information and advice about appropriate ecoregions for the implementation of an ecosystem approach in European waters.
- IUCN, World Commission of Protected Areas. 1998. Economic Values of Protected Areas. Guidelines for Protected Areas Managers. A. Phillips (Ed.), Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK
- IUCN. 2003a. European challenges for Biodiversity. 56p., Gland.
- IUCN. 2003b. United Nations list of protected areas. (in cooperation with UNEP/WCMC), Gland, Switzerland.
- Jaireth H. & Smyth D. 2003. Innovative Governance: Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Protected Areas. Ane Books, New Delhi, India.
- James F.C. & Wamer N.O. 1982. Relationships among temperate forest bird communities and vegetation structure. *Ecology* 63: 159-171.
- Jetz W. & Rahbek C. 2002. Geographic range size and determinants of avian species richness. *Science* 297: 1548-1551.
- Jordán F. & Liu W.C. Topológiai kulcsfajok azonosítása táplálékhálózatokban – egy szociometriai módszer. *Magyar Tudomány*, in press.
- Jordán F. & Scheuring I. 2004. Network Ecology: topological constraints on ecosystems dynamics. *Physics of Life Reviews* 1: 139-172.
- Jordán F. 2001. Trophic fields. *Community Ecology* 2:181-185.
- Jordán F. Topological key players in communities: the network perspective. In: Tiezzi E., Brebbia C.A., Jörgensen S. & Almorza Gomar D. (Eds.), *Ecosystems and Sustainable Development V*, WIT Press, Southampton. In press.
- Jordán F., Scheuring I. & Vida G. 2002. Species positions and extinction dynamics in simple food webs. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 215:441-448.
- Kannai, Y., Peleg, B. 1984. A note on the extension of an order on a set to the power set. *Journal of Economic Theory* 32: 172-175.
- Kauffman, S. 2001. *Investigations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Kawachi, I. & Kennedy B.P. 2002. *The Health of Nations*. The New Press. New York.
- Kleijn D., Berendse F., Smit R. & Gilissen N. 2001. Agri-environment schemes do not effectively protect biodiversity in Dutch agricultural landscapes? *Nature* 413: 723-725.
- Krell F.T. 2004. Parataxonomy vs. taxonomy in biodiversity studies – pitfalls and applicability of 'morphospecies' sorting. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 13: 795-812.
- Kremen C. 1992. Assessing the indicator properties of the species assemblages for natural areas monitoring. *Ecological Applications* 2: 203-217.
- Krupnik I. & Jolly D. (Eds.). 2002. *The Earth is Faster Now: Indigenous Observations of Arctic Environmental Change*. Arctic Research Consortium of the United States, Fairbanks, Alaska, USA.
- Kunin W.E. 1997. Sample shapes, spatial scale and species counts: implications for reserve design. *Biological Conservation* 82: 369-377
- Lande R. 1987. Extinction thresholds in demographic models of territorial populations. *American Naturalist* 130: 624-635.
- Lande R. 1996. Statistics and partitioning of species diversity, and similarity among multiple communities. *Oikos* 76: 5-13.
- Larsen F.W. & Rahbek C. 2003. Influence of scale on conservation priority setting - a test on African mammals. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 12: 599-614

- Latour B. 1997. On actor - network theory. A few clarifications. Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Keele University.
- Lawton et al. 1998 Biodiversity inventories, indicator taxa and effects of habitat modification in tropical forest. *Nature* 391: 72-75.
- Lennon J.J., Gaston K.J, Koleff P. & Greenwood J.J.D. 2004. Contribution of rarity and commonness to patterns of species richness. *Ecology Letters* 7: 81-87.
- Lennon J.J., Koleff P., Greenwood J.J.D. & Gaston K.J. 2001. The geographical structure of British bird distributions: diversity, spatial turnover and scale. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 70: 966-979.
- Levin S. 2000. *Fragile Dominion: complexity and the commons*. Helix Books, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Lindenmayer D.B., Margules C.R., Botkin D.B. 2000. Indicators of biodiversity for ecological sustainable forest management. *Conservation Biology* 14(4): 941-950.
- Longino J.T., Coddington J., & Colwell R.K. 2002. The ant fauna of a tropical rainforest: estimating species richness three different ways. *Ecology* 83: 689-702.
- Loreau M. 2000. Are communities saturated? On the relationship between alpha, beta and gamma diversity. *Ecology Letters* 3:73-76.
- Luck G.W., Daily, G.C. & Ehrlich, P.R. 2003. Population diversity and ecosystem services *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 18(7): 331-336.
- Luczkovich J.J., Borgatti S.P., Johnson J.C., Everett M.G. 2003. Defining and measuring trophic role similarity in food webs using regular equivalence. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 220: 303-321.
- Mace G.A. 2005. An index of intactness. *Nature* 434: 32-33
- MacNally R. 2000. Regression and model-building in conservation biology, biogeography and ecology: The distinction between and reconciliation of 'predictive' and 'explanatory' models. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 9: 655-671.
- MacNeely, J.A., & Miller K.R. (Eds.). 1984. *National Park Conservation and Development: The Role of Protected Area in Sustaining Society*. Gland, Switzerland, IUCN, WRI, CI, WWF-US and The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Magurran A.E. 2004. *Measuring Biological Diversity*. Blackwell Publishing.
- May R.M. 1973. *Stability and Complexity in Model Ecosystems*. Princeton University Press.
- McCabe D.C. & Gotelli N.J. 2000. Effects of disturbance frequency, intensity, and area on stream macroinvertebrate communities. *Oecologia* 124: 270-279.
- McCann K., Hastings A. & Huxel G.R. 1998. Weak trophic interactions and the balance of nature. *Nature* 395: 794-798.
- McDonnell, M.J., & Pickett S.T.A. (Eds.). 1993. *Humans as Components of Ecosystems: The Ecology of Subtle Human Effects and Populated Areas*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- McMahon, S.M., Miller K.H., Drake J. 2001. Networking tips for social scientists and ecologists. *Science* 293: 1604-1605
- Melinte I., Manoleli D., Mladin E.C., Blujdea V., Kleps C., Babeanu N., Crutu Gh., Galdeanu N., Cogalniceanu D., Nistor M., Zisu D., Serban R., Vladescu G.. Reports on thematic evaluation for NCSA Project (ROM/03/G41).
- Mikkelsen, G.M. 2004. Biological diversity, ecological stability, and downward causation. In: Oksanen M. & Pietarinen J. (Eds.). 2004. *Philosophy and Biodiversity*, Cambridge University, Cambridge.
- Mill J.S. 1848. *Principles of Political Economy*. Longmans, Green and Co., London.
- Millennium ecosystem assessment. 2003. *Ecosystems and human well-being: a framework for assessment*. Report of the conceptual framework working group of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Island Press, Washington, 2003. 245 pp.
- Mueller-Dombois D. & Ellenberg H. 1974. *Aims and methods of vegetation ecology*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Mugabe J. et al. (Eds.). 1997. *Access to Genetic Resources. Strategies for Sharing Benefits*. ACTS Press, Nairobi.
- Myers N. & Kent J. (Eds.). 2001. *Perverse Subsidies*. Island Press, Washington DC.

- Myers N., Mittermeier R.A., Mittermeier C.G., da Fonseca G.A.B. & Kent J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403: 853-858
- Naess A. 1988. *Ecology, Community, and Lifestyle*. Cambridge University. New York.
- Nagendra H. & Gadgil M. 1998. Linking regional and landscape scales for assessing biodiversity: A case study from Western Ghats. *Current Science* 75(3): 264-271.
- Nagendra H. & Gadgil M. 1999a. Biodiversity assessment at multiple scales: Linking remotely sensed data with field information. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 96(16): 9154-9158.
- Nagendra H. & Gadgil M. 1999b. Satellite imagery as a tool for monitoring species diversity: an assessment. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 36(3): 388-397.
- Nagendra H. & Utkarsh G. 2003. Landscape ecological planning through a multi-scale characterization of pattern: studies in the Western Ghats, South India. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 87(3): 815-833.
- Nagendra H. 2001. Using remote sensing to assess biodiversity. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 22(12): 2377-2400.
- Nagendra H. 2002. Opposite response of the Shannon and Simpson indices of landscape diversity. *Applied Geography* 22(2): 175-186.
- Nagendra H., Karna B. & Karmacharya M. Cutting across space and time: Examining forest co-management in Nepal. *Ecology and Society*. In press.
- Nagendra H., Munroe D. & Southworth J. 2004. Introduction to the special issue. From pattern to process: Landscape fragmentation and the analysis of land use/land cover change. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 101 (2-3): 111-115.
- Nagendra H., Southworth J. & Tucker C.M. 2003. Accessibility as a determinant of landscape transformation in Western Honduras: Linking pattern and process. *Landscape Ecology* 18(2): 141-158.
- Nagendra H., Southworth J., Tucker C.M., Karmacharya M., Karna B. & Carlson L.A. Remote sensing for policy evaluation: Monitoring parks in Nepal and Honduras. *Environmental Management*. In press.
- Noss R.D. 1990. Indicators for monitoring biodiversity: A hierarchical approach. *Conservation Biology* 4(4): 355-364.
- Noss R.F. 1987. From plant communities to Landscapes in conservation inventories: a look at the nature conservancy (USA). *Biological Conservation* 41: 11-37.
- Noss R.F. 1999. Assessing and monitoring forest biodiversity: a suggested framework and indicators. *Forest Ecology and Management* 115: 135-146.
- O'Connell T.J., Jackson L.E., Brooks R.P. 2000. Bird guilds as indicators of ecological conditions in the central Appalachians. *Ecological Applications* 10(6): 1706-1721.
- O'Neill R.V., De Angelis D.L. & Allen T.F.H. 1991. *A Hierarchical Concept of Ecosystems*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- O'Connor S., Martin-Jones J. & Tamale E. 2000. Putting the ecosystem approach to practice - Lessons learned from WWF's initiatives. Position Paper in: Fifth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nairobi, Kenya, 15-26 May 2000. WWF: Gland, Switzerland. 9pp.
- Oksanen, J. 2004. 'vegan'. *Community Ecology Package*. Version 1.7-23. URL <http://cc.oulu.fi/~jarioksa/>
- Oliver I. & Beattie A.J. 1996. Invertebrate morphospecies as surrogates for species: a case study. *Conservation Biology* 10: 99-109.
- Olszewski T.D. 2004. A unified mathematical framework for the measurement of richness and evenness within and among multiple communities. *Oikos* 104: 377-387.
- Orlowski L. 1991. *Entropy and information*. SPB Academic Publishing.
- Ortega M., Elena-Rosselló R. & García del Barrio J.M. 2004. Estimation of plant diversity at landscape level: A methodological approach applied to three Spanish rural areas. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 95: 97-116.
- Oskamp S. 1995. Applying social psychology to avoid ecological disaster. *Journal of Social Issues* 51(4): 217-239.

- Patil, G.P. and C. Taillie. 1979. An overview of diversity. Pages 3-27 in Grassle, J.F., G.P. Patil, W. Smith and C. Taillie (eds.) *Ecological diversity in theory and practice*. Inter. Coop. Publish. House, Fairland, Maryland.
- Pattanaik P., Xu, Y. 1990. On Ranking Opportunity Sets in Terms of Freedom of Choice. *Recherches Economiques de Louvain* 56: 383-390.
- Pauly D., Christensen V., Froese R., Longhurst A., Platt T., Sathyendranath S., Sherman K. & Watson R. 2000. Mapping fisheries onto marine ecosystems: a proposal for a consensus approach for regional, oceanic and global integrations. ICES 2000 Annual Science Conference. Theme Session on Classification and Mapping of Marine Habitats CM 2000/T:14. 15 pp.
- Pausas J.G., Austin M.P. 2001. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 12: 153-166.
- Peterson D.L. & Parker T.V. (Eds.). 1998. *Ecological scale: theory and applications*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Phillips A. 2002. Management Guidelines for IUCN Category V Protected Areas – Protected Landscapes and Seascapes. No. 9 in the IUCN/ WCPA Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- Phillips A. 2005. Landscape As a Meeting Ground: Category V Protected Landscapes and Seascapes and World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. In: Brown J., Mitchell N. & Beresford M. (eds.). 2005. *The Protected Landscape Approach: Linking Nature, Culture and Community*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK (in proof).
- Pimm S.L. & Lawton J.H. 1977. Number of trophic levels in ecological communities. *Nature* 268: 329-331.
- Podani J. 1992. Space series analysis: processes reconsidered. *Abstracta Botanica* 16: 25-29.
- Prance G. 1994. A comparison of the efficacy of higher taxa and species numbers in the assessment of biodiversity in the neotropics. *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society London B* 345:89-99 .
- Prendergast J.R., Quinn R.M., Lawton J.H., Eversham B.C. & Gibbons D.W. 1993. Rare species, the coincidence of diversity hotspots and conservation strategies. *Nature* 365: 335-337.
- Pressey R.L. & Logan V.S. 1998. Size of selection units for future reserves and its influence on actual vs. targeted representation of features: a case study in western New South Wales. *Biological Conservation* 85: 305-319
- Pressey R.L., Humphries C.J., Margules C.R., Vane-Wright R.I. & Williams P.H. 1993. Beyond opportunism: Key principles for systematic reserve selection. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 8: 124-128
- Pressey R.L., Possingham H.P., Logan V.S., Day J.R. & Williams P.H. 1999. Effects of data characteristics on the results of reserve selection algorithms. *Journal of Biogeography* 26: 179-191
- Prigogine I. 1997. *The End of Certainty*. The Free Press, London.
- Prinzing A., Klotz S., Stadler J., Brandl R. 2003. Woody plants in Kenya: expanding the Higher-Taxon Approach. *Biological Conservation* 110:307-314.
- Rahbek C. & Graves G.R. 2000. Detection of macro-ecological patterns in South American hummingbirds is affected by spatial scale. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B, Biological Sciences* 267: 2259-2265
- Rahbek C. & Graves G.R. 2001. Multiscale assessment of patterns of avian species richness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 98: 4534-4539
- Rahbek C. 2005. The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness patterns. *Ecology Letters* 8: 224-239
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University. Cambridge, MA.
- Relph E. 1993. *Modernity and the Reclamation of Place*. In: Seamon D. (Ed.), *Dwelling, Seeing, Designing*, State University of New York Press.
- Rennolls K. & Laumonier Y. 2000. Species diversity structure analysis at two sites in the tropical rain forest of Sumatra. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 16:253-270
- Rennolls K. & Laumonier Y. 1999a. Analysis of species hyper-diversity in the tropical rain forests of indonesia: the problem of non-observance. In Sassa, K. (Ed.)

- Environmental Forest Science. Forestry Sciences Series 54. Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht.
- Rennolls K. and Laumonier Y. 1999b. Species-area and species-diameter curves for three forest sites in Sumatra. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science* 11(4):784-800.
- Renyi A. 1961. On measures of entropy and information. In Neyman, J. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Ricotta C., Corona P., Marchetti M., Chirici G., Innamorati S. 2003. LADY: software for assessing local landscape diversity profiles of raster land cover maps using geographic windows. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 18: 373-378.
- Rodrigues A.S.L. & Gaston K.J. 2002. Rarity and Conservation Planning across Geopolitical Units. *Conservation Biology* 16: 674-682
- Roemer J.E. 1998. *Equality of Opportunity*. Cambridge, MA.
- Rosenzweig M.L. 1995 *Species diversity in Space and Time*. CUP
- Rosenzweig M.L. 2003. Reconciliation ecology and the future of species diversity. *Oryx* 37: 194-205.
- Ross N.A. 2004. *What Have We Learned Studying Income Inequality and Population Health?* Canadian Institute for Health Information. Ottawa, ON.
- Roth R. 2004. Spatial Organization of Environmental Knowledge: Conservation Conflicts in the Inhabited Forest of Northern Thailand. *Ecology and Society* 9(3): 5. <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vo9/iss3/art5>.
- Russell E. 1993. Discovery of the Subtle. In McDonnell M.J & Pickett S.T.A. (Eds.), *Humans as Components of Ecosystems. The Ecology of Subtle Human Effects and Populated Areas*. Springer, New York.
- Sanders H.L. 1968. Benthic marine diversity: a comparative study. *American Naturalist* 102: 660-668.
- Santini F. & Angulo A. 2001. Assessing conservation biology priorities through the development of biodiversity indicators. *Biology Forum* 94: 259-276.
- Schweik C., Nagendra H. & Sinha D.R. 2003. Using satellites to search for forest management innovations in Nepal. *Ambio* 32(4): 312-319.
- Secretariat of the CBD. 2004. *Biodiversity Issues for Consideration in Planning, Establishment and Management of Protected Area Sites and Networks*. Montreal, SCBD. CBD Technical Series No 15. 164pp.
- Sen A. 1988. Freedom of Choice. Concept and Content. *European Economic Review* 32: 269-294.
- Sen A. 1991. Welfare, Preference and Freedom. *Journal of Econometrics* 50: 15-29.
- Sen A. 1993. The economics of life and death. *Scientific American*: 40-47.
- Shankar Raman T.R. 2001. Effect of slash-and-burn shifting cultivation on rainforest birds in Mizoram, North-east India. *Conservation Biology* 15(3): 685-698.
- Shankar Raman T.R., Rawat G.S., Johnsingh A.J.T. 1998. Recovery of Tropical rainforest avifauna in relation to vegetation succession following shifting cultivation in Mizoram, north-east India. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 35: 214-231.
- Sharma E. & Chettri N. 2003a. Corridor Development for Biodiversity Landscape Conservation. In *Facilitating Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, Protected Areas and Technology Transfer and Cooperation*, CBD Technical Series 9. Montreal (Canada): Secretariat of the CBD.
- Sharma E. & Chettri N. 2003b. Sustainable Biodiversity Management Practices in the Hindu-Kush Himalayas. *Proceedings of Norway/UN Conference on Technology Transfer and Capacity Building*. Trondheim.
- Simberloff D. 1988. The contribution of population and community biology to conservation science. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 19: 473-511
- Simpson E.H. 1949. Measurement of diversity. *Nature* 163: 688.
- Simpson G.G. 1961. *Principles of animal taxonomy*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Sousa T. & Domingos T. 2004. Phase Transitions in Macroscopic Thermodynamics and Neoclassical Microeconomics. Paper presented at the 8th Biennial Conference of the

- International Society for Ecological Economics: "Challenging Boundaries: Economics, Ecology and Governance" Montréal, Québec, Canada 11-14 July 2004.
- Southwood, T.R.E. & Henderson, P. A. 2000. *Ecological Methods*. 3rd ed. Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- Star, S.L. & Griesemer, J.R. 1988. Institutional Ecology, Translations and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science* 19(4): 387-420.
- Stohlgren T.J., Falkner M.B. & Schell L.D. 1995. A modified-Whittaker nested vegetation sampling method. *Vegetatio* 117: 113-121.
- Stoll-Kleemann S. & O'Riordan T. 2002. From participation to partnership in biodiversity protection: experience from Germany and South Africa. *Society and Natural Resources* 15: 157-173.
- Stoll-Kleemann S. 2001a. Reconciling Opposition to Protected Areas Management in Europe. *Environment* 43: 32-44.
- Stoll-Kleemann S. 2001b. Barriers to Nature Conservation in Germany: A model explaining opposition to protected areas. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 21: 369-385.
- Stoll-Kleemann S. 2004. The rationale of socio-economic research for the successful protection and use of wetlands: the example of participatory management approaches. *Hydrobiologia* 527: 15-17.
- Szathmáry E., Jordán F. & Pál C. 2001. Can genes explain biological complexity? *Science (Perspective)* 292:1315-1316.
- Tacconi L. 2000. *Biodiversity and ecological economics. Participation, values, and resource management*. Earthscan, London.
- Tilman D. 2001. Functional diversity In: Levin, S.A. (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of biodiversity* (Vol. 3), Academic Press, pp 109-120.
- Tilman D., & Kareiva P. (Eds). 1997. *Spatial Ecology. The Role of Space in Population Dynamics and Interspecific Interactions*. Princeton University Press.
- Tóthmérész B. 1995. Comparison of different methods for diversity ordering. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 6: 283-290.
- Tóthmérész B. 1998. On the characterization of scale -dependent diversity. *Abstracta Botanica* 22, 149-156.
- Tóthmérész B. 2005. Diversity characterizations in R. DIAS Report 15, 333-344.
- Tóthmérész B. & Magura T. 2005. Diversity and scalable diversity characterizations. DIAS Report 15, 353-368.
- Turner M.G. & Gardner R.H. (Eds.). 1991. *Quantitative Methods in Landscape Ecology. The Analysis and Interpretation of Landscape Heterogeneity*. Springer-Verlag. New York.
- Turner R.K., Paavola J., Cooper P., Farber S., Jessamya V. & Georgiou S. 2003. Valuing nature: lessons learned and future research directions. *Ecological Economics* 46: 493-510
- Vanclay J.K., Bruner A.G., Gullison R.E., Rice R.E., da Fonseca G.A.B. 2001. The Effectiveness of Parks. *Science* 293: 1007-1008
- Veech J.A., Summerville K.S., Crist T.O., & Gering J.C. 2002. The additive partitioning of diversity: recent revival of an old idea. *Oikos* 99: 3-9.
- Velazquez A., Bocco G., Romero F.J., Vega A.P. 2003. A Landscape Perspective on Biodiversity Conservation: The Case of Central Mexico. *Mountain Research and Development* 23(3): 240-246
- Vellend M. 2001. Do commonly used indices of beta-diversity measure species turnover? *Journal of Vegetation Science* 12: 545-552.
- Vellend M. 2004. Parallel effects of land-use history on species diversity and genetic diversity on forest herbs. *Ecology* 85: 3043-3055.
- Villasenor J.L., Ibarra-Manriquez G., Meave J.A., Ortiz E. 2005. Higher taxa as surrogates of plant biodiversity in a megadiverse country *Conservation Biology* 19(1): 232-238.
- Vitousek P.M., Mooney H.A., Lubchenco J. & Melillo J.M. 1997. Human domination of the Earth's ecosystems. *Science* 277: 494-499.

- Vogel J.H. 1994. *Genes for Sale. Privatization as a Conservation Policy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Wagner H.H., & Edwards P.J. 2001. Quantifying habitat specificity to assess the contribution of a patch to species richness at a landscape scale. *Landscape Ecology* 16: 121-131.
- Wagner H.H., Wildi O. & Ewald K.C. 2000. Additive partitioning of plant species diversity in an agricultural mosaic landscape. *Landscape Ecology* 15:219-227.
- Wallace A.R. 1876. *The Geographical Distribution of Animals*. Harper and Brothers, New York.
- Warman L.D., Sinclair A.R.E., Scudder G.G.E., Klinkenberg B. & Pressey R.L. 2004. Sensitivity of systematic reserve selection to decisions about scale, biological data, and targets: Case study from Southern British Columbia. *Conservation Biology* 18: 655-666
- Weitzman, M.L. 1992. On Diversity. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107: 363-405.
- Wells M. 1992. Biodiversity Conservation. Affluence and Poverty: Mismatched Costs and Benefits and effort to remedy them. *Ambio* 21(3): 237-243.
- Williams P. & Gaston K. 1994. Measuring more of biodiversity- can higher-taxon richness predict wholesale species richness? *Biological Conservation* 67:211-17.
- Williams P.H., Burgess N.D. & Rahbek C. 2000. Flagship species, ecological complementarity and conserving the diversity of mammals and birds in sub-Saharan Africa. *Animal Conservation* 3: 249-260
- Williams P.H., Gaston K.J. & Humphries C.J. 1997. Mapping biodiversity value worldwide: combining higher-taxon richness from different groups. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Biological Sciences* 264: 141-148.
- Williams R.J., Berlow E.L., Dunne J.A., Barabási A.L., Martinez N.D. 2002. Two degrees of separation in complex food webs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99: 12913-12916.
- Williams, P.H. 1996. Measuring biodiversity value. *World Conservation* 1: 12-14.
- Willis K.J. & Whittaker R.J. 2002. Species Diversity: Scale Matters. *Science* 295: 1245-1248.
- Wu J. 2004. Effects of changing scale on landscape pattern analysis: scaling relations. *Landscape Ecology* 19: 125-138.
- WWF & IUCN. 1994–1997. *Centres of plant diversity: a guide and strategy for their conservation*, Oxford, UK. WWF and IUCN.
- WWF International. *Global 200 Ecoregions - a blueprint for a living planet*. http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/ecoregions/index.cfm