1	Cross-taxonomic surrogates for biodiversity conservation in human-modified
2	landscapes - a multi-taxa approach
3	Ding Li Yong ^{1,2*} , Philip S. Barton ¹ , Karen Ikin ¹ , Maldwyn John Evans ¹ , Mason Crane ¹ , Sachiko
4	Okada ¹ , Saul A. Cunningham ¹ & David B. Lindenmayer ¹
5	
6	¹ Fenner School of Environment and Society, The Australian National University
7	Linnaeus Way, Acton ACT 2601, Australia
8	
9	² BirdLife International
10	354 Tanglin Road, #01-16/17, Tanglin International Centre, Singapore, 247672
11	*corresponding author (email: dingli@anu.edu.au)
12	
13	Acknowledgments
14	We are grateful to the landowners who granted access to their private land during field work.
15	DLY is supported by the Lesslie Foundation and an Australian National University Postgraduate
16	Scholarship. DBL is supported by an Australian Research Council Laureate Fellowship. We are
17	grateful to Michael Batley and Michael Schwarz for their help with the identification of bee
18	specimens, as well as Mick Neave and John Ascher for advice in sampling bees. Lastly, we
19	thank two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback which substantially improved
20	the manuscript.

21 Abstract

22 Cross-taxonomic surrogates are often used in conservation planning because inventorying large 23 suites of taxa is either not feasible or too costly. However, cross-taxonomic surrogates are 24 seldom tested rigorously using both correlational and representation-based approaches at the spatial scales at which conservation management occurs. Here, we evaluated the effectiveness of 25 26 five ecologically contrasting taxa (birds, herpetofauna, wild bees, beetles, trees) as cross-27 taxonomic surrogates in native woodland patches within a heavily modified, farming and 28 plantation-dominated landscape. We first compared species richness and compositional 29 heterogeneity across taxa before testing for cross-taxonomic congruence using a correlative approach. We then quantified how well each taxon incidentally represented other taxa in their 30 best patch sets, and the costs of doing so using a complementarity-based approach. We found 31 32 significant pairwise associations between some taxa (birds, bees), but no single taxon was strongly correlated with all other taxa. Woodland patch sets prioritised for beetles represented 33 34 other taxa best, followed by birds, but were the costliest and required the largest amount of woodland. This contrasted with patch sets prioritised for wild bees or herpetofauna, which 35 achieved higher representation of other taxa at lower costs. Our study highlighted the influence 36 37 of taxon-specific patterns of diversity and heterogeneity on how remnant vegetation patches should be prioritised for conservation, a consideration not immediately obvious in correlative 38 39 analyses of surrogacy. Second, taxa that are not the most speciose (e.g. wild bees) can be efficient surrogates for other taxa, achieving higher incidental representation at lower costs. 40 Thus, while species-rich taxa are ideal as surrogates for prioritising conservation, conservation 41 planners should not overlook the potential of less speciose taxa such as bees, while considering 42 the cost-effectiveness of surveying multiple different taxa. 43

44 Keywords

45 Complementarity, compositional heterogeneity, farmland biodiversity, incidental representation,
46 indicators, systematic conservation planning

47

48 **1. Introduction**

Land use change driven by agricultural expansion and intensification is among the leading 49 drivers of biodiversity loss worldwide (Foley et al. 2011; Alexander et al. 2015). Presently, a 50 51 large proportion of the world's agricultural land is already used for grazing livestock, with permanent pastures covering nearly a quarter of the world's land surface (Wirsenius et al. 2010; 52 FAOSTAT 2014). Intensification of agricultural production in existing farming landscapes is 53 expected to exacerbate biodiversity declines (Benton et al. 2003; Donald et al. 2006; 54 Cunningham et al. 2013). Therefore, effective conservation of biodiversity will necessitate 55 56 conservation initiatives in agricultural systems that are underpinned by robust ecological research (Norris 2008; Ranganathan et al. 2008; Kay et al. 2016). 57

58

Knowledge of biodiversity patterns is essential for understanding the consequences of land use change and guiding subsequent conservation decisions (Margules & Pressey 2000; Ferrier 2002; Phalan et al. 201; Guisan et al. 2013). Given that it is neither cost-effective nor practical to inventory large groups of taxa, there is a need to adopt surrogate approaches drawing on more easily gathered data to guide biodiversity conservation (Rodrigues & Brooks 2007; Caro 2010; Lindenmayer et al. 2015). Surrogate approaches are usually grounded on the presumption that a measured subset of biodiversity components in the landscape can provide useful information on broader biodiversity patterns, therefore allowing variation in other aspects of biodiversity to be
predicted (Heino 2010; Larsen et al. 2012; Barton et al. 2015). Many surrogate approaches
adopted in conservation management and monitoring employ species data (e.g. cross-taxonomic
surrogates), often in combination with vegetation and environmental data (e.g. Grantham et al.
2010; Lindenmayer et al. 2014). Over time, the interest in using surrogates to guide conservation
management has fuelled a large amount of research to evaluate their utility.

72

Because cross-taxonomic surrogates offer expedient means to evaluate biodiversity for 73 conservation planning, easily surveyed taxa such as birds have been widely proposed as 74 surrogates (e.g. Eglington et al 2012; Carrascal et al. 2012; Di Minin & Moilanen 2014). 75 76 However, while some studies endorse the use of cross-taxonomic surrogates (e.g. Larsen et al. 2012), others have highlighted problems (e.g. Andelman & Fagan 2000; Paavola et al. 2006). 77 First, there is increasing evidence of how spatial scale, grain and resolution can shape the extent 78 of correlation between different taxa, thus compromising their effectiveness as surrogates for 79 other groups (e.g. Hess et al. 2006; Paavola et al. 2006; Westgate et al. 2014). Second, 80 differences in ecology and responses to environmental variables among taxa can be expected to 81 drive taxon-specific turnover patterns (e.g. Turtureanu et al. 2014), weakening the strong cross-82 taxonomic congruence expected of a good surrogate (Yong et al. 2016). Third, the diversity of 83 84 criteria, concepts and approaches used to evaluate the effectiveness of biodiversity surrogates across different studies has rendered it challenging to draw a consensus on what constitutes a 85 good surrogate (Favreau et al. 2006; Hunter et al. 2015). Put together, these problems highlight 86 87 the need to identify better biodiversity surrogates, and cross-validate their effectiveness through different analytical approaches (e.g. Favreau et al. 2006; Grantham et al. 2010). 88

90 In this study, we tested the effectiveness of a cross-taxonomic surrogate approach to guide 91 conserving planning for woodland biodiversity in a human-modified landscape. The conceptual 92 framework for our study was guided by three questions, and grounded systematically on field inventorying, initial identification of surrogate taxa, and cross-validation of these surrogate 93 94 groups in a systematic conservation planning approach. First, we asked: (1) Which pairs of taxa 95 show strong cross-taxonomic congruence? To do this, we inventoried two vertebrate groups 96 (birds, herpetofauna), two insect groups (wild bees, beetles) and one plant group (trees). We then 97 applied a correlative approach to assess the degree of pairwise cross-taxonomic association (i.e. cross-taxonomic congruence) in species richness and composition (Sauberer et al. 2004; Su et al. 98 99 2004; Rooney & Azeria 2015). As with many studies, we hypothesized that taxa showing high 100 cross-taxonomic congruency could perform better as species surrogates for other taxa.

101

102 Second, we asked: (2) How effective are surrogate taxa in incidentally representing the occurrences of other taxa in sets of woodland patches prioritised for the surrogate? This question 103 is important because it allows initially identified surrogate taxa to be validated in realistic 104 conservation planning scenarios. Ideally, an effective surrogate taxon should be expected to 105 capture a high proportion of the representation targets for other taxa (Larsen et al. 2012; Di 106 107 Minin & Moilanen 2014), without being excessively costly itself – i.e. requiring the conservation of a large amount of woodland patches. To do this, we adopted a complementarity-based, site-108 selection approach (see Table 1 for definitions of terms) to identify near-optimal sets of remnant 109 110 woodland patches in our landscape using *a priori* representation targets set for each taxon. We then determined how well other taxa were incidentally represented in the patch sets selected for 111

the (surrogate) taxon (e.g. Sætersdal et al. 2004; Albuquerque & Beier 2016). Additionally, 112 determining the total area of woodland patches in patch sets selected for each taxon at a given 113 representation target provided a proxy of relative cost, and allowed us to compare the cost-114 effectiveness of multiple scenarios using different focal taxa as surrogates. 115 116 Finally, we asked: (3) How similar are these best sets of habitat patches selected for each taxa, 117 and at each defined representation target. We therefore compared the sets of woodland patches 118 selected for each taxon at each representation target by assessing the degree of overlap (as 119 measured with dissimilarity, distance metrics) in patch set solutions between taxa following Ikin 120 et al. (2016). Since many species in human-modified landscapes can be expected to be wide-121 ranging generalists rather than habitat specialists given the effects of biotic homogenisation (e.g. 122 Ekroos et al. 2010), we expected differences between sets of woodland patches selected for each 123 taxon to be low because many of these taxa are likely occur in a large proportion of woodland 124 patches. 125

126

127 **2.** Methods and materials

128

129 2.1. Study area and design

The highly modified Nanangroe landscape (34°58'S, 148°28'E) consists of approximately 30,000
hectares of agricultural (i.e. grazing) land and exotic Monterey pine *Pinus radiata* plantations
(Figure 1). Much of the original cover of box-gum grassy woodlands, an ecological community

now listed as critically endangered (Rawlings et al. 2010), has been extensively cleared in the 133 past two centuries for agriculture. This has left numerous scattered remnant patches across the 134 landscape (Lindenmayer et al. 2008). In 1998, the landscape matrix surrounding many of these 135 remnants was transformed by the establishment of extensive plantations of pine (Lindenmayer et 136 al. 2008). As a result, these remnant woodland patches became embedded within either a matrix 137 138 of grassy pasture actively grazed by livestock or pine plantations. Permanent transects were marked and established at all study patches prior to the commencement of the study. In 139 woodland patches exceeding one hectare, a 200-m long transect was established while 100-m 140 141 long transects were established for patches smaller than one hectare. For this study, a total of 42 remnant woodland patches in both kinds of matrix were identified to represent the full range of 142 patch area classes (See Supplementary Table 1 for full list of woodland patches and their 143 attributes) for biodiversity sampling. 144

145

146 2.2. Biodiversity sampling

We conducted field surveys of six animal taxa in our study landscape: birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, wild bees and ground-dwelling beetles. However, the mammal dataset was eventually excluded from our analyses due to its low diversity (< 10 species) at the landscape and patch level. The species composition of the dominant trees (i.e. tree assemblage) in each of our study woodland patches was identified and recorded as part of a detailed vegetation survey last carried out in spring 2015.

153

154 2.2.1. Bird sampling

We sampled bird occurrence and diversity at each woodland patch using three 5-min point counts along an established transect. Point counts were conducted between 0500–1000 hrs during the Austral spring (October–November 2014). At each point, observers recorded the numbers of individual bird species heard or seen within a 50 m radius. Birds observed in flight at the sampling point were excluded from the survey. Each point was re-sampled by a different observer on another day during the survey period to minimise detection biases resulting from weather and the variation in identification skills between different observers.

162

163 *2.2.2. Herpetofauna sampling*

164 As amphibians and reptiles were surveyed using the same method, we pooled them as one group, and defined them collectively as "herpetofauna". To sample amphibian and reptiles, we 165 conducted standardised, time-constrained searches (c. 20 mins) at two points along each transect 166 once in early spring (October-November 2014) and covering an area of approximately one 167 hectare (see Michael et al. 2012). During the establishment of the transects, artificial substrates 168 consisting of a corrugated iron sheet $(1.0 \text{ m} \times 1.0 \text{ m})$, wooden fence posts covered in mesh (4) 169 pieces; 1.0 m long, 0.2 m thick) and roof tiles (4 pieces; $32 \text{ cm} \times 42 \text{ cm}$) were placed at each 170 sampling point to simulate microhabitats for small ground herpetofauna such as skinks and 171 geckos. Active searches for amphibians and reptiles were conducted by scanning the site for 172 basking animals, and turning over logs, rocks and the artificial substrates placed at each point 173 along a transect during a survey (Michael et al. 2012). Each point was re-sampled by a different 174 observer on another day during the survey period to minimise detection biases. Species 175 176 identification and nomenclature is based on Cogger (2000).

177

178 2.2.3. Wild bee sampling

To survey wild bees, we used blue vane traps (e.g. Lentini et al. 2012; Joshi et al. 2015). We 179 sampled all 42 woodland patches at the midpoint of each line transect with two traps at each site. 180 Traps were set in trees and placed approximately 20 m apart from where they were suspended at 181 about 1.5–2.0 m above ground. Bee sampling was conducted for 14 days from November to 182 December 2014 and in tandem with beetle sampling. At the end of the sampling period, the traps 183 were retrieved and all bees were preserved in 70% ethanol before species-level sorting. Bees that 184 were difficult to identify were: (1) carefully separated from other insects, (2) washed in detergent 185 and, (3) blown-dry before being prepared in a reference collection for subsequent species-level 186 187 identification based on the methodology recommended in Droeges (2015). Most bees were identified to the species-level using the online database, Pest and Diseases Image Library (PaDIL 188 2016) and major bee identification keys (e.g. Walker 1995; Michener 2000). All bee 189 identifications were then rechecked by a bee taxonomist (Michael Batley, Australian Museum) 190 and the lead author to ensure accuracy. 191

192

193 *2.2.4. Ground-dwelling beetle sampling*

To survey ground-dwelling beetles, we used non-baited pitfall traps. Pitfall traps were placed in pairs along four rows at the centre of the transect within each woodland patch (i.e. four equally spaced pairs per site). Each pitfall trap consisted of a plastic container of 5.0 cm diameter and 7.5 cm depth. Traps were filled with 100 ml of ethylene glycol which functioned both as a killing agent and a temporary preservative. To increase the invertebrate catch rate, we mounted plastic

drift fences $(1.0 \text{ m} \times 0.2 \text{ m})$ along each pair of traps. Trapping was conducted from late 199 November to December 2014, with every trap opened for 14 days. Beetle specimens were 200 preserved in 70% ethanol before being sorted to family and morphospecies (hereafter referred to 201 as species) using a stereo microscope and relevant beetle identification keys (e.g. Matthews 202 1980; Hangay & Zborowski 2010). Vouchered specimens of each species were assembled into a 203 204 reference collection for identification. Highly similar species from species-rich families such as Staphylinidae and Carabidae were re-checked by two of the co-authors for the accuracy of 205 identifications, leading to a substantial reduction of duplicate species and a higher robustness of 206 207 the dataset. The beetle dataset was then partitioned into two for analysis: (1) the full dataset with all beetle species identified, and (2) a reduced dataset with rare species represented by singletons 208 excluded. 209

210

211 2.3. Statistical analysis

212 We explored the potential for each taxonomic group to be a surrogate for other groups by comparing their diversity patterns across the study landscape. First, we pooled data for sampling 213 points within each woodland patch to calculate species richness at the site level (α -diversity). We 214 then pooled species richness from all patches across the landscape to estimate γ -diversity. To 215 determine sampling completeness, we calculated and plotted smoothed accumulation curves 216 based on observed species richness for each taxon. Observed species richness was then 217 calculated as a proportion of the average of four non-parametric estimators of species richness 218 (see Table S2). To estimate compositional heterogeneity, we calculated mean site species 219 220 richness (α -diversity) as a proportion of landscape-level species richness (γ -diversity) for each 221 taxon.

223 2.3.1. Correlations of species richness and composition (Question 1)

To identify which pairs of taxa showed strong congruence patterns at the landscape level, we 224 used a combination of Spearman's rank correlations and partial Mantel tests. The correlation 225 strength in species richness between two taxa is frequently used as a metric of cross-taxonomic 226 227 congruence (e.g. Hess et al. 2006; Wolters et al. 2006; Duan et al. 2016). To assess the level of correlation between site-level species richness for each pairwise combination of taxa, we 228 calculated the Spearman's correlation coefficient (e.g. Similä et al. 2006). Spearman's 229 correlation was used instead of Pearson's correlation as the sample size for number of sites was 230 small (N = 42) and does not fulfil parametric assumptions based on the Shapiro-Wilk test 231 232 (Royston 1983).

233

234 We used partial Mantel tests to assess the strength of cross-taxonomic congruence in compositional dissimilarity between pairwise combinations of taxa (Landeiro et al. 2012). Partial 235 Mantel tests were used because they measure the correlation between two matrices (e.g. Su et al. 236 237 2004) after accounting for spatial variation associated with a third matrix of Euclidean distances, thus addressing the potential issue of spatial autocorrelation. We first quantified compositional 238 dissimilarity for each taxon across the landscape using the Jaccard similarity index which is 239 based on absence-presence data (Magurran 2004). We then performed the partial Mantel test for 240 all pairwise combinations of taxa. The significance of each Mantel test was assessed using 999 241 permutations. 242

244 2.3.2. Analysis of incidental representation of taxa across patches (Question 2)

245 We used a complementarity-based, site-selection approach to identify priority sets of woodland 246 patches that best represented the species richness and occurrence of each taxon. In such an 247 approach, woodland patches were iteratively added to a patch set in a step-wise manner based on the degree of complementarity in species composition until the representation target of any given 248 249 taxon is met. To quantify incidental representation of other taxa in the patch set selected for the 250 surrogate, we calculated the total occurrences of other (target) taxa represented in these patch 251 sets as a proportion of their total occurrences across the whole landscape (Question 2). In 252 addition, we calculated the total area of woodland needed to conserve each taxon in their best patch set as a proxy of cost for each representation target. 253

254

We defined the occurrence of each species in the study landscape as a 'conservation feature' 255 (Game & Grantham 2008; Ardron et al. 2010) (See Table 1 for definitions). A total of 399 256 conservation features were established from the five taxa. We then set representation targets for 257 all taxa ranging from 10% to 80% and at 10% intervals. We chose not to include representation 258 targets of 90% and 100% as it is not practical to retain the majority of woodland patches for 259 conservation in active, production landscapes such as ours (Ikin et al. 2016). For each taxon and 260 at each representation target, we ran 100 iterations using the simulated annealing algorithm 261 262 implemented in Marxan to identify the best patch set (Game & Grantham 2008; Ball et al. 2009). We did not set constraints on the number of patches (sites), therefore allowing as many patches 263 as required to be included in each Marxan solution to meet the representation target. The 'species 264 265 penalty factor', a Marxan parameter that measures the costs for failing to meet targets for each

conservation feature (Game & Grantham 2008) was kept constant for all conservation features,
thereby not giving higher weightage to any particular species.

268

To compare incidental representation of other taxa by the surrogate, we used the patch set from 269 the best of 100 solutions (hereafter as 'best patch set') identified by Marxan to meet 270 representation targets for the surrogate taxon. Using this solution, we calculated the total number 271 of conservation features for all other taxa represented therein, while recording if a priori 272 representation targets set for the surrogate had also been met for the target taxon. To quantify 273 representation of each taxon in the best patch set selected for the surrogate, we calculated species 274 occurrences captured in the patch set as a proportion of the total species occurrences. To 275 276 compare the relative cost needed to achieve each representation target, we calculated the sum of woodland area (in hectares) of the best patch sets for each taxon as a proxy measure of cost 277 (Ardron et al. 2010). 278

279

280 2.3.3. Similarity in best patch sets across taxa (Question 3)

To compare the level of similarity or spatial correspondence among the best patch sets selected for five taxa, we performed cluster analysis using an agglomerative hierarchical clustering approach (Question 3). First, we created a distance matrix based on the Jaccard similarity index for each taxon, and across four representation targets (20%, 40%, 60%, and 80%) using the function 'distance'. Jaccard similarity was calculated based on the presence or absence of a patch (site) in the best solution for each representation target. We then implemented the function 'hclust' using the complete-linkage clustering method. Pairs of clusters separated by the shortest

288	distances were thus combined in the cluster dendrogram, allowing the extent of similarity
289	between all patch sets for the five taxa to be visualised. Cluster analysis and partial Mantel
290	correlations were carried out using the 'ecodist' package (Goslee & Urban 2007), available on
291	the R platform (R Development Core Team 2013).
292	
293	3. Results
294	
295	3.1. Assemblage diversity for taxa sampled
296	We recorded a total of 77 bird, 21 herpetofauna, 31 bee, 258 beetle and nine tree species in
297	woodland patches in the Nanangroe landscape. Based on smoothed, species accumulation curves
298	(Figure 2a; Supplementary Table S2), our sampling effort was fairly complete for all taxa.
299	Average patch-level species richness (α -diversity) as a proportion of landscape-level species
300	richness (γ -diversity) was lowest for beetles at 9.98% (Figure 2b; Supplementary Table S2). For
301	beetles samples with singletons excluded, this rose to 13.43%. By comparison, each woodland
302	patch supported 16.98% of the total bird, 20.22% of the total bee, and 22.49% of the total tree
303	species pool (Supplementary Table S3).
304	
305	3.2. Correlations of species richness and composition (Question 1)
306	We found that only bird species richness was correlated with wild bee species richness at the
307	patch level (Spearman's $\rho = 0.309$, $P < 0.05$), but not with species richness of any other taxa.
308	Herpetofauna, beetle and tree species richness was not correlated with that of other taxa we

309	compared (Figure 3a). As with species richness correlations, we found that bird species
310	composition was correlated with bee species composition (partial Mantel R = 0.207 , $P < 0.01$)
311	but not with any other taxa (Figure 3b). Similarly, herpetofauna species composition was
312	correlated only with that of beetles (partial Mantel R = 0.137, $P < 0.05$) and no other taxon.
313	Exclusion of rare beetles represented by singletons weakened this correlation (partial Mantel R =
314	0.127, $P < 0.05$). Wild bee species composition was correlated with that of beetles (partial
315	Mantel R = 0.128, $P < 0.05$). This association was strengthened if rare beetles were excluded
316	(partial Mantel R = 0.140, $P < 0.05$). Compared with the four animal groups, tree species
317	composition at the patch level was not correlated with that of any taxa.
318	
319	3.3. Incidental representation of target taxa by the surrogate taxon (Question 2)
320	We found that the best patch sets identified to meet representation targets for both sets of the
321	beetle data generally represented other taxa better than patch sets at equivalent targets for other
322	taxa, across the range of targets from 10-80% (Figure 4; Supplementary Table S4). For example,
323	the best patch sets selected for the full beetle assemblage were able to represent over 70% (73.9-
324	91.2%) of all bird occurrences across the landscape for the range of targets (Figure 4a).
325	However, patch sets selected to meet representation targets of the full beetle assemblage were
326	also consistently more costly than other taxa (Figure 5a-5d, 5f). For example, achieving a 10%
327	representation of beetle occurrences required the conservation of 31 woodland patches covering
328	86.1% of the total woodland area. Beetles were also the least cost-effective surrogate taxon in
329	representing other taxa, requiring more than 80% of the total area of woodland across the range
330	of representation targets (Figure 5a-5d). The beetle assemblage that excluded rare species was
331	less costly in representing other taxa if representation targets were low (Figure 5a-5e), but

became increasingly costly at the highest representation targets. Not unexpectedly, this subset of
the beetle assemblage consistently represented the full beetle assemblage better than other taxa at
equivalent costs (Figure 5e).

335

We found that some taxa (e.g. wild bees and herpetofauna) were able to achieve higher 336 incidental representation of other taxa at lower cost. Wild bees were relatively cost-effective 337 compared to other taxa, being able to achieve higher incidental representation of bird, beetle, 338 herpetofauna and tree targets at equivalent costs compared to other taxa across a range of its 339 representation targets (50-80%) (Figure 5a-5f). For example, the best patch set selected to meet a 340 representation target of 80.0% for wild bee occurrences could capture 81.7% of bird occurrences 341 342 in the landscape, while exceeding incidental representation of birds by other taxa at an equivalent cost (Figure 4a, 5a). Similarly, at a representation target of 80.0%, wild bees captured a higher 343 proportion of herpetofauna occurrences (84.9%) than other taxa at an equivalent cost (Figure 5b). 344

345

The herpetofauna assemblage was comparatively species-poor and achieved lower incidental 346 representation of other taxa across a range of targets (Figure 4). However, patch sets selected for 347 herpetofauna occurrences were usually the least costly, and able to achieve higher incidental 348 representation of some taxa (e.g. trees, wild bees, birds) at lower costs (Figure 5a, 5c-5f). For 349 example, a patch set to represent 10-20% of herpetofauna targets could capture 30.8% of bird 350 occurrences in < 25.0 ha (23.7% of the total) woodland (Figure 5a). However, as representation 351 targets for herpetofauna increased, it became increasingly similar to birds and wild bees in its 352 cost-effectiveness in representing other taxa. Compared to other taxa, trees were generally less 353

efficient than wild bees, herpetofauna or birds in representing other taxa across the range of
representation targets (Figures 4, 5, Supplementary Table S5).

356

357 3.4. Similarity in patch sets for each taxon (Question 3)

358 We found that the best patch sets selected for each taxon were very dissimilar at low 359 representation targets ranging from 20-40%, but became increasingly similar at higher 360 representation targets (Figure 6). For instance, the best patch sets selected to meet representation 361 targets for wild bees from 20-60% were more similar to each other than with that of any other 362 taxon. Likewise, patch sets selected to meet representation targets for the herpetofauna from 20-363 60% were more similar to each other than that for other taxa across different targets. At high 364 representation targets, the best patch sets for the five taxa become increasingly convergent. For instance, the best patch sets selected to meet a range of representation targets from 60%-80% for 365 beetles were most similar to patch sets selected to meet similar targets for bird and tree 366

368

367

369 4. Discussion

assemblages.

370

4.1. Species richness and composition

372 Our study revealed the high species richness of vertebrate and insect assemblages persisting in

373 remnants of box-gum grassy woodland embedded in a wider matrix of grazing land and

374 monoculture plantations. The low proportion of total beetle species richness at the patch-level

suggests high compositional heterogeneity of the overall beetle assemblage relative to other taxa 375 (e.g. Soininen et al. 2007; Barton et al. 2010). By contrast, woodland patches supported lower 376 compositional heterogeneity of birds and wild bees. Such patterns of diversity can be explained 377 by differences in body size and dispersal ability among the taxa, as well as the different 378 ecological traits and habitat requirements specific to each group (Cadotte & Fukami 2005; 379 380 Cadotte 2006; Soininen 2010; Janssen et al. 2016). Vagile taxa such as birds can be expected to show lower compositional heterogeneity at equivalent spatial scales compared to poor dispersers 381 like ground beetles (Baselga et al. 2012; Qian & Ricklefs 2012). Such differences in 382 383 compositional heterogeneity underscore the taxon-specific responses of different assemblages to habitat structure and other abiotic gradients at the landscape scale (e.g. Benton et al. 2003; Lovell 384 et al. 2007). 385

386

Framed in the context of cross-taxonomic surrogacy, a consequence of such differences in 387 compositional heterogeneity and other beta-diversity measures is that groups of taxa with very 388 different spatial patterns of diversity will require dissimilar levels of comprehensiveness in 389 habitat patch sets or reserve networks to meet representation targets for their conservation (e.g. 390 Ferrier 2002; Si et al. 2015). Taxa with high species richness and compositional heterogeneity in 391 a landscape will require more sites in the reserve network to represent them comprehensively 392 (Ryti 1992; Lund & Rahbek 2002; Ikin et al. 2016). However using species-rich taxa to plan and 393 prioritise agricultural landscapes for biodiversity conservation, while ideal, would translate into 394 increased sparing of land to achieve conservation outcomes (e.g. Fischer et al. 2008). Ultimately, 395 396 it is necessary for conservation planners to recognise how differences in diversity patterns specific to each taxon could compromise the effectiveness of some taxa as surrogates (e.g. Part 397

& Soderstrom 1999). Such a problem may arise because conservation planning for groups of
taxa with very dissimilar beta-diversity patterns could lead to moderate-good representation of
some taxa but poor representation of others in a reserve network.

401

402 4.2. Correlations of species richness and composition (Question 1)

403 Cross-taxonomic surrogates have an important role to play in guiding conservation planning 404 exercises, especially in identifying priority areas of high species diversity across spatial scales. 405 Species richness and composition correlations have been used widely as a first step to guide the 406 identification of cross-taxonomic surrogates (Sætersdal et al. 2004; Gardner et al. 2008; Landeiro 407 et al. 2012). Consistent with other studies using correlative approaches (e.g. Billeter et al. 2008), we found that no single taxon was a good surrogate for all other taxa. Of five taxa, only birds 408 showed consistently strong congruence in both species richness and composition with wild bees, 409 underscoring the potential of either taxon as a surrogate for the other (e.g. Sauberer et al. 2004). 410 Such observed cross-taxonomic congruence may arise as a result of the similar (high) dispersal 411 ability of both groups. Alternatively, wild bee and bird assemblages may be responding to 412 similar biotic gradients such as shared food resources (e.g. flowers) (e.g. Lovell et al. 2007). 413 Similarly, significant congruence between species composition of the predominantly terrestrial 414 herpetofauna and ground-dwelling beetles allude to similarities in the responses of both groups 415 416 to habitat structure at the ground level.

417

Generally, species-rich groups such as beetles and birds exhibited stronger cross-taxonomic
associations with other taxa, while pairs of species-poor groups tend to be weakly correlated. A

similar response in compositional turnover of taxa to habitat and environmental gradients (Lovell 420 et al. 2007; Duan et al. 2016) at the landscape scale offers one explanation to account for such 421 patterns. Additionally, despite differences in compositional heterogeneity across the groups, it is 422 recognised that species-rich groups can capture a greater range of environmental conditions and 423 habitat types (Larsen et al. 2009; Larsen et al. 2012; Ikin et al. 2016). Such a prediction was 424 425 broadly consistent with our complementarity-based, patch-selection analysis, which revealed that patch sets prioritised for groups like beetles were able to achieve high representation of other 426 taxa. Because woodland patches selected for species-rich surrogate groups in systematic 427 428 conservation planning scenarios can be expected to achieve a higher representation of other taxa (Larsen et al. 2009), a first step in the selection of surrogate taxa should be the species richness 429 within a taxonomic group of interest. 430

431

432 4.3. Representation of targets in patch sets selected for different taxa (Question 2)

We found that sets of woodland patches selected to meet representation targets for the species-433 rich beetle and bird assemblages were often able to capture a high proportion of most other taxa, 434 but came at a very high cost. By comparison, wild bee and herpetofauna assemblages achieved 435 higher representation of other taxa when costs were low and thus could be efficient surrogates to 436 prioritise landscapes for conserving other taxa in scenarios where little natural vegetation can be 437 438 spared (i.e. intensively farmed landscapes). Our findings reiterates the practical issues (e.g. Caro 2010) which are easily overlooked in the use of biodiversity surrogates when surrogate taxa are 439 determined alone from correlative analyses, and in relation to the costs of land allocation/sparing 440 441 to meet conservation targets. In practice, prioritising woodland patches in production landscapes to maximise the representation of beetles or other taxa showing high species richness and 442

compositional heterogeneity could become costly because more sites and effectively a larger area
of woodland has to be set aside to meet conservation targets. For instance, the costs to conserve
certain taxa in planning scenarios could be inflated due to the inclusion of a small number of
disproportionately large woodland patches which support a larger suite of taxa.

447

Our analyses demonstrated that wild bee and herpetofauna assemblages on their own could act as 448 efficient cross-taxonomic surrogates in conservation planning scenarios if cost/land allocation for 449 conservation becomes a major limitation. Despite low bee or herpetofauna species richness and 450 limited congruence with other taxa (Figures 2, 3), woodland patches prioritised to represent bee 451 diversity achieved higher incidental representation of other taxa at lower costs. Given the 452 453 sensitivity of bee assemblages to landscape change and fine-scale habitat structure (Holzschuh et al. 2006; Carré et al. 2009) and their roles as providers of pollination services (Kremen et al 454 2004; Mallinger & Gratton 2015), bee assemblages not only have an overlooked potential as 455 broad indicators of landscape change, but also as cross-taxonomic surrogates to prioritise 456 remnant woodland/forest patches to optimise biodiversity conservation. Further studies are 457 needed to better understand the use of wild bee assemblages as surrogates to plan conservation 458 for other elements of biodiversity and across different types of farming landscapes. 459

460

461 4.4. Similarity in patch sets for different taxa (Question 3)

Although the best patch sets selected for each taxon were generally dissimilar to other taxa, they
became increasingly similar at high representation (> 40%) targets. Increasing similarity of patch
sets at high representation targets across taxa is expected to result because a larger proportion

(and number) of woodland patches with high species richness of each taxon increasingly overlap 465 in these patch sets. One clear conservation implication is that for cross-taxonomic surrogates of 466 biodiversity to be most effective, representation targets set for the surrogate taxon of interest in 467 conservation planning scenarios will need to be reasonably high. However, this correspondingly 468 raises the costs of using any one taxon as a surrogate to prioritise for other taxa, and may not be 469 470 feasible in intensive production landscapes. Additionally, the limited overlap in woodland patch sets prioritised for different taxa, particularly at low representation targets ($\leq 40\%$) showed that 471 cross-taxonomic congruence of species richness is overly simplistic an approach in identifying 472 473 what makes a good surrogate taxon. For instance, while correlations of species richness indicated congruence of bird and bee assemblages (and thus the potential of either as a good surrogate) 474 (Figure 3), they fail to account for compositional heterogeneity, the complexity of different 475 planning/prioritisation scenarios, as well as the poor overlap in woodland patches important to 476 either taxa. Thus, strong correlations of species diversity does not necessarily translate to better 477 478 representation of other taxa in woodland patches prioritised for the surrogate.

479

480 4.5. Costs of sampling different (surrogate) taxa

Conducting field surveys of multiple taxa adds the practical dimension of increased cost, on top of the costs of land sparing for biodiversity. This is because the effort needed to sample different taxa in biodiversity assessments can vary widely due to differences in monetary cost, time investment and the availability of specialist expertise for particular taxa (e.g. Gardner et al. 2008; Yu et al. 2012). Gardner et al. (2008) showed that standardised costs of biodiversity surveys could vary by nearly three orders of magnitude across different taxa. In the context of this study on cross-taxonomic surrogacy, birds are relatively cost-effective to survey as little specialised

equipment is needed, and expertise is more easily available (e.g. Bibby et al. 2000). Conversely, 488 using highly species-rich groups such as beetles as surrogates not only demand considerable land 489 allocations for conservation to capture the high diversity and compositional heterogeneity, but 490 also high investment in field and laboratory equipment and time, as well as technical expertise 491 (New 2007). Given scarce resources in many conservation projects, it is necessary and strategic 492 493 to consider the cost-effectiveness of different sampling efforts to assess biodiversity, even while recognising the fact (as demonstrated in our study) that specific, species-rich taxa may perform 494 495 better as surrogates.

496

497 4.6. Conclusions

The use of surrogate taxa to prioritise landscapes for biodiversity conservation is a well-498 established idea in conservation biology (Ryti 1992; Margules & Pressey 2000; Larsen et al. 499 2009). While many studies of cross-taxonomic surrogates have been completed at very large 500 501 spatial scales (e.g. Howard et al. 2006; Billeter et al. 2008; Westgate et al. 2014), our study provides one of few examples where cross-taxonomic surrogacy is down-scaled to a complex, 502 production landscape (c. 300 km²) and based on simultaneous sampling of five important and 503 ecologically distinct taxa. Our study offers three key insights on the use of surrogates for 504 biodiversity conservation in farming landscapes. 505

First, patterns in compositional heterogeneity tend to be taxon-specific, being highest for
species-rich taxa such as beetles. Less speciose groups that contain good dispersers such as bees
tend to show lower spatial turnover. Therefore, conservation planning in heterogeneous
agricultural landscapes based on a limited set of surrogate taxa will need to consider taxon-

specific turnover patterns (e.g. Ferrier 2002; Si et al. 2015). On the one hand, conservation
planning and prioritisation determined by assessments of species-poor and/or non-vagile groups
may result in a smaller number and total area of habitat patches conserved, to the detriment of
species-rich taxa. On the other, prioritising woodland conservation with taxa that are speciose
and show high compositional heterogeneity such as beetles could become exceedingly costly as
it necessitates the sparing of more land for conservation.

Second, sets of woodland remnant patches selected to prioritise conservation of different taxa
become increasingly similar at higher representation targets. This means that conservation
planning in landscapes based on low representation targets of one or few surrogate taxa would be
inefficient and uneven in representing broad suites of other biota. While it is ideal to spare as
much remnant natural woodland as possible for biodiversity conservation, trade-offs will need to
be better defined to meet biodiversity conservation targets (e.g. Cunningham et al. 2013) without
unrealistically compromising on agricultural production and vice versa.

523 Third, species-rich taxa like beetles and birds were able to achieve high incidental representation of other taxa in systematic conservation planning scenarios. While species-rich groups have been 524 recognised as being more effective surrogates (e.g. Larsen et al. 2012; Ikin et al. 2016) and 525 ideally should be the focus of how remnant woodland are prioritised for conservation, the issue 526 of cost cannot be overlooked. Costs may come from increased investment in land spared for 527 528 conservation, or the direct costs of implementing biodiversity surveys and laboratory sorting. In scenarios where limited land can be allocated for conservation, taxa with less species such as 529 bees may in fact be more efficient surrogates in representing the broader biota. Moreover, since 530 531 birds are already well known surrogates in agricultural landscapes (e.g. Part & Soderstrom 1999; Eglington et al. 2012; Ikin et al. 2016), biodiversity assessments based on bird data could be 532

complemented with that of wild bee assemblages to identify remnant habitat important to a broad
suite of taxonomic groups, especially where achieving high representation of every taxa is not
possible.

536

537 **References cited**

- 538
- Albuquerque, F. S., Beier, P., 2016. Downscaling patterns of complementarity to a finer
- resolution and its implications for conservation prioritization. Ecol. Evol. 6(12), 4032-4040.
- 541 Alexander, P., Rounsevell, M. D., Dislich, C., Dodson, J. R., Engström, K., Moran, D., 2015.
- 542 Drivers for global agricultural land use change: the nexus of diet, population, yield and
- 543 bioenergy. Glob. Environ. Chang. 35, 138-147.
- Andelman, S. J., Fagan, W. F., 2000. Umbrellas and flagships: efficient conservation surrogates
- 545 or expensive mistakes? Proc. Natl. Acad. Sc. U.S.A. 97(11), 5954-5959.
- Anderson, R. S., Ashe, J. S., 2000. Leaf litter inhabiting beetles as surrogates for establishing
- 547 priorities for conservation of selected tropical montane cloud forests in Honduras, Central
- 548 America (Coleoptera; Staphylinidae, Curculionidae). Biodivers. Conserv. 9(5), 617-653.
- 549 Ardron, J. A., Possingham, H. P., Klein, C. J., eds. 2010. Marxan Good Practices Handbook,
- 550 Version 2. Pacific Marine Analysis and Research Association, Victoria, British Columbia,

551 Canada.

- 552 Ball, I. R., Possingham, H. P., Watts. M., 2009. Marxan and relatives: Software for spatial
- 553 conservation prioritisation. In Moilanen, A., K. A. Wilson, H. P. Possingham. eds. Spatial

- conservation prioritisation: Quantitative methods and computational tools. Pp. 185-195 in
 Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 556 Barton, P. S., Manning, A. D., Gibb, H., Lindenmayer, D. B., Cunningham, S. A. 2010. Fine-
- scale heterogeneity in beetle assemblages under co-occurring *Eucalyptus* in the same subgenus.
- 558 J. Biogeog., 37, 1927-1937.
- Barton, P. S., Westgate, M. J., Lane, P. W., MacGregor, C., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2014.
- 560 Robustness of habitat-based surrogates of animal diversity: a multi-taxa comparison over time. J.
- 561 Appl. Ecol. 51(5), 1434-1443.
- 562 Barton, P. S., Pierson, J. C., Westgate, M. J., Lane, P. W., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2015. Learning
- from clinical medicine to improve the use of surrogates in ecology. Oikos 124(4), 391-398.
- Baselga, A., Lobo, J. M., Svenning, J. C., Aragón, P., Araújo, M. B., 2012. Dispersal ability
- 565 modulates the strength of the latitudinal richness gradient in European beetles. Glob. Ecol.
- 566 Biogeogr. 21(11), 1106-1113.
- Basset, Y., Kitching, R.L., 1991. Species number, species abundance and body length of arboreal
 arthropods associated with a rainforest tree. Ecol. Entomol. 16, 391–402.
- 569 Benton, T. G., Vickery, J. A., Wilson, J. D., 2003. Farmland biodiversity: is habitat
- 570 heterogeneity the key? Trends Ecol. Evol. 18(4), 182-188.
- 571 Bibby, C. J., Burgess, N. D., Hill, D. A., Mustoe, S. 2000. Bird census techniques. Second
- 572 edition. Academic Press, London, U.K.
- 573 Billeter, R., Liira, J., Bailey, D., Bugter, R., Arens, P., Augenstein, I., Aviron, S., Baudry, J.,
- 574 Bukacek, R., Burel, F., Cerny, M., De Blust, G., De Cock, R., Diekotter, T., Dietz, H., Dirksen,

- 575 J., Dormann, C., Durka, W., Frenzel, M., Hamersky, R., Hendrickx, F., Herzog, F., Klotz, D.,
- 576 Koolstra, B., Lausch, A., Le Couer, D., Maelfait, J. P., Opdam, P., Roubalova, M., Schermann,
- 577 A., Schermann, N., Schmidt, T., Schweiger, O., Smulders, M. J. M., Speelmans, M., Simova, P.,
- 578 Verboom, J., van Wingerden, W. K. R. E., Zobel, M., Edwards, P.J., 2008. Indicators for
- 579 biodiversity in agricultural landscapes: a pan-European study. J. Appl. Ecol. 45(1), 141-150.
- Cadotte, M. W., 2006. Dispersal and species diversity: a meta-analysis. Am. Nat. 167(6), 913924.
- 582 Cadotte, M. W., & Fukami, T., 2005. Dispersal, spatial scale, and species diversity in a
- hierarchically structured experimental landscape. Ecol. Lett, 8(5), 548-557.
- 584 Caro, T., 2010. Conservation by proxy: indicator, umbrella, keystone, flagship, and other
 585 surrogate species. Island Press, U.S.A.
- Carrascal, L. M., Cayuela, L., Palomino, D., Seoane, J., 2012. What species-specific traits make
 a bird a better surrogate of native species richness? A test with insular avifauna. Biol. Conserv.
 152, 204-211.
- 589 Cogger, H. G. 2000. Reptiles and amphibians of Australia. Reed New Holland, Sydney,590 Australia.
- 591 Cunningham, S. A., Attwood, S. J., Bawa, K. S., Benton, T. G., Broadhurst, L. M., Didham, R.
- 592 K., Didham, R. K., McIntyre, S., Perfecto, I., Samways, M. J., Tscharntke, T., Vandermeer, J.,
- 593 Villard, M., Young, A. G., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2013. To close the yield-gap while saving
- biodiversity will require multiple locally relevant strategies. Agri. Ecosys. Environ. 173, 20-27.

- Di Minin, E., Moilanen, A., 2014. Improving the surrogacy effectiveness of charismatic
 megafauna with well-surveyed taxonomic groups and habitat types. J. Appl. Ecol. 51(2), 281288.
- 598 Donald, P. F., Sanderson, F. J., Burfield, I. J., Van Bommel, F. P., 2006. Further evidence of
- 599 continent-wide impacts of agricultural intensification on European farmland birds, 1990–2000.
- 600 Agri. Ecosys. Environ. 116(3), 189-196.
- Duan, M., Liu, Y., Yu, Z., Baudry, J., Li, L., Wang, C., Axmacher, J. C., 2016. Disentangling
- 602 effects of abiotic factors and biotic interactions on cross-taxon congruence in species turnover
- patterns of plants, moths and beetles. Sci. Rep. 6, 23411.
- 604 Eglington, S. M., Noble, D. G., Fuller, R. J., 2012. A meta-analysis of spatial relationships in
- species richness across taxa: birds as indicators of wider biodiversity in temperate regions. J.
- 606 Nat. Conserv. 20(5), 301-309.
- 607 FAOSTAT. 2014. Food and agriculture data. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United
- 608 Nations. URL: <u>http://www.fao.org/faostat/</u>
- 609 Ekroos, J., Heliölä, J., Kuussaari, M., 2010. Homogenization of lepidopteran communities in
- 610 intensively cultivated agricultural landscapes. J. Appl. Ecol. 47(2), 459-467.
- 611 Favreau, J. M., Drew, C. A., Hess, G. R., Rubino, M. J., Koch, F. H., Eschelbach, K. A., 2006.
- 612 Recommendations for assessing the effectiveness of surrogate species approaches. Biodivers.
- 613 Conserv. 15(12), 3949-3969.
- 614 Ferrier, S., 2002. Mapping spatial pattern in biodiversity for regional conservation planning:
- 615 where to from here? Syst. Biol. 51(2), 331-363.

- 616 Fischer, J., Brosi, B., Daily, G. C., Ehrlich, P. R., Goldman, R., Goldstein, J., Lindenmayer, D.
- B., Manning, A. D., Mooney, H. A., Pejchar, L., Ranganathan, J., Tallis, H., 2008. Should
- agricultural policies encourage land sparing or wildlife-friendly farming? Front. Ecol. Environ.
 6(7), 380-385.
- 620 Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M.,
- 621 Mueller, N. D., O'Connell, C., Ray, D. K., West, P. C., Balzer, C., Bennett, E. M., Carpenter, S.
- 622 R., Hill, J., Monfreda, C., Polasky, S., Rockstrom, J., Sheehan, J., Siebert, S., Tilman, D., Zaks,
- 623 D. P. M., 2011. Solutions for a cultivated planet. Nature 478(7369), 337-342.
- Game, E. T., Grantham, H. S., 2008. Marxan user manual: for Marxan version 1.8.10. St. Lucia,
- 625 Queensland, Australia and Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: University of Queensland and
- 626 Pacific Marine Analysis and Research Association.
- 627 Gardner, T. A., Barlow, J., Araujo, I. S., Ávila-Pires, T. C., Bonaldo, A. B., Costa, J. E.,
- 628 Esposito, M. C., Ferreira, L. V., Hawes, J., Hernandez, M. I. M., Hoogmoed, M. S., Leite, R. N.,
- 629 Lo, N. F., Malcolm, J. R., Martins, M. B., Mestre, L. A. M., Miranda-Santos, R., Overal, W. L.,
- 630 Parry, L., Peters, S. L., Ribeiro, M. A., Da Silva, M. N. F., Motta, C. D., Peres, C. A., 2008. The
- 631 cost-effectiveness of biodiversity surveys in tropical forests. Ecol. Lett. 11(2), 139-150.
- Gaston, K. J., Blackburn, T. M., Goldewijk, K. K., 2003. Habitat conversion and global avian
- 633 biodiversity loss. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B: Biol. Sci. 270(1521), 1293-1300.
- 634 Goslee, S.C., Urban, D.L., 2007. The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based analysis of
- 635 ecological data. J. Stat. Soft. 22(7), 1-19.

- Grantham, H. S., Pressey, R. L., Wells, J. A., Beattie, A. J., 2010. Effectiveness of biodiversity
- 637 surrogates for conservation planning: different measures of effectiveness generate a kaleidoscope
- 638 of variation. PLoS One, 5(7), e11430.
- 639 Guisan, A., Tingley, R., Baumgartner, J. B., Naujokaitis-Lewis, I., Sutcliffe, P. R., Tulloch, A. I.,
- 640 Regan, T. J., Brotons, L., McDonald-Madden, E., Mantyka-Pringle, C., Martin, T. G., Rhodes, J.
- 641 R., Maggini, R., Setterfield, S. A., Elith, J. A., Schwartz, M. W., Wintle, B., Broennimann, O.,
- Austin, M., Ferrier, S., Kearney, M. R., Possingham, H. P., Buckley, Y. M., 2013. Predicting
- species distributions for conservation decisions. Ecol. Lett. 16(12), 1424-1435.
- Hangay, G., Zborowski, P., 2010. A guide to the beetles of Australia. CSIRO Publishing,Australia.
- 646 Heino, J., 2010. Are indicator groups and cross-taxon congruence useful for predicting
- biodiversity in aquatic ecosystems? Ecol. Indic. 10(2), 112-117.
- 648 Hess, G. R., Bartel, R. A., Leidner, A. K., Rosenfeld, K. M., Rubino, M. J., Snider, S. B., &
- 649 Ricketts, T. H., 2006. Effectiveness of biodiversity indicators varies with extent, grain, and
- 650 region. Biol. Conserv. 132(4), 448-457.
- Hunter, M., Westgate, M., Barton, P., Calhoun, A., Pierson, J., Tulloch, A., Beger, M.,
- Branquinho, C., Caro, T., Gross, J., Heino, J., Lane, P., Longo, C., McDowell, W. H., Mellin, C.,
- 653 Salo, H., Lindenmayer, D., 2016. Two roles for ecological surrogacy: Indicator surrogates and
- management surrogates. Ecol. Indic. 63, 121-125.
- Ikin, K., Yong, D. L., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2016. Effectiveness of woodland birds as taxonomic
- surrogates in conservation planning for biodiversity on farms. Biol. Conserv. 204, 411-416.

- Janssen, P., Cateau, E., Fuhr, M., Nusillard, B., Brustel, H., Bouget, C. 2016. Are biodiversity
- 658 patterns of saproxylic beetles shaped by habitat limitation or dispersal limitation? A case study in
- unfragmented montane forests. Biodivers. Conserv. 25(6), 1167-1185.
- Joshi, N. K., Leslie, T., Rajotte, E. G., Kammerer, M. A., Otieno, M., Biddinger, D. J., 2015.
- 661 Comparative trapping efficiency to characterize bee abundance, diversity, and community
- 662 composition in apple orchards. Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am. 108(5), 785-799.
- Justus, J., Sarkar, S. 2002. The principle of complementarity in the design of reserve networks to
- 664 conserve biodiversity: a preliminary history. J. Biosci. 27(4), 421-435.
- 665 Kay, G. M., Barton, P. S., Driscoll, D. A., Cunningham, S. A., Blanchard, W., McIntyre, S.,
- 666 Lindenmayer, D. B. 2016. Incorporating regional-scale ecological knowledge to improve the
- 667 effectiveness of large-scale conservation programmes. Anim. Conserv. 19(6), 515-525.
- Landeiro, V. L., Bini, L. M., Costa, F. R., Franklin, E., Nogueira, A., de Souza, J. L., Moraes, J.,
- Magnusson, W. E., 2012. How far can we go in simplifying biomonitoring assessments? An
- 670 integrated analysis of taxonomic surrogacy, taxonomic sufficiency and numerical resolution in a
- 671 megadiverse region. Ecol. Indic. 23, 366-373.
- 672 Larsen, F.W., Bladt, J. Rahbek, C., 2009. Indicator taxa revisited: useful for conservation
- 673 planning? Divers. Distrib. 15, 70–79.
- Larsen, F. W., Bladt, J., Balmford, A., Rahbek, C., 2012. Birds as biodiversity surrogates: will
- supplementing birds with other taxa improve effectiveness? J. Appl. Ecol. 49(2), 349-356.

- 676 Lentini, P. E., Martin, T. G., Gibbons, P., Fischer, J., Cunningham, S. A., 2012. Supporting wild
- 677 pollinators in a temperate agricultural landscape: maintaining mosaics of natural features and
- 678 production. Biol. Conserv. 149(1), 84-92.
- 679 Lindenmayer, D. B., Cunningham, R. B., MacGregor, C., Crane, M., Michael, D., Fischer, J.,
- 680 Montague-Drake, R., Felton, A., Manning, A., 2008. Temporal changes in vertebrates during
- landscape transformation: a large-scale "natural experiment". Ecol. Mono. 78(4), 567-590.
- Lindenmayer, D. B., Barton, P. S., Lane, P. W., Westgate, M. J., McBurney, L., Blair, D.,
- Gibbons, P., Likens, G. E., 2014. An empirical assessment and comparison of species-based and
- habitat-based surrogates: a case study of forest vertebrates and large old trees. PloS One, 9(2),
 e89807.
- Lindenmayer, D. B., Barton, P., Pierson, J., eds. 2015. Indicators and Surrogates of Biodiversity
 and Environmental Change. CSIRO Publishing, Australia.
- Lovell, S., Hamer, M., Slotow, R., Herbert, D., 2007. Assessment of congruency across
- 689 invertebrate taxa and taxonomic levels to identify potential surrogates. Biol. Conserv. 139(1),
- **690** 113-125.
- Lund, M. P., Rahbek, C., 2002. Cross-taxon congruence in complementarity and conservation of
 temperate biodiversity. Anim. Conserv. 5(2), 163-171.
- Magurran, A. E., 2004. Measuring Biological Diversity. Blackwell, Oxford, U.K.
- Margules C. R., Pressey, R. L., 2000. Systematic conservation planning. Nature 405, 243-253.
- 695 Michener, C.D., 2000. The Bees of the World. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore,
- 696 U.S.A. & London, U.K.

- Mallinger, R. E., Gratton, C., 2015. Species richness of wild bees, but not the use of managed
 honeybees, increases fruit set of a pollinator-dependent crop. Journal of Applied Ecology, 52(2),
 323-330.
- 700 Matthews, E.G., 1992. A guide to the beetles of South Australia. South Australian Museum,

701 Adelaide, Australia.

- Michael, D.R., Cunningham, R.B., Donnelly, C.F., Lindenmayer, D.B. 2012. Comparative use of
 active searches and artificial refuges to survey reptiles in temperate eucalypt woodlands. Wildlife
 Research 39(2), 149-162.
- New, T.R., eds. 2007. Beetle conservation. Springer, Dortrecht, the Netherlands.
- Norris, K. 2008. Agriculture and biodiversity conservation: opportunity knocks. Conserv. Lett.
 1(1), 2-11.
- Paavola, R., Muotka, T., Virtanen, R., Heino, J., Jackson, D., Mäki-Petäys, A., 2006. Spatial
- scale affects community concordance among fishes, benthic macroinvertebrates, and bryophytes
- 710 in streams. Ecol. Appl. 16(1), 368-379.
- 711 PADiL., 2016. Pest and disease image library. URL:
- 712 http://www.padil.gov.au/pollinators/search?queryType=all
- 713 Pärt, T., Söderström, B., 1999. Conservation value of semi-natural pastures in Sweden:
- contrasting botanical and avian measures. Conserv. Biol. 13(4), 755-765.
- Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A., Green, R. E., 2011. Reconciling food production and
- biodiversity conservation: land sharing and land sparing compared. Science 333(6047), 1289-
- 717 1291.

- 718 Qian, H., & Ricklefs, R. E., 2012. Disentangling the effects of geographic distance and
- environmental dissimilarity on global patterns of species turnover. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 21(3),
 341-351.
- 721 R Development Core Team., 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
- 722 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL
- 723 http://www.R-project.org/.
- Ranganathan, J., Daniels, R. R., Chandran, M. S., Ehrlich, P. R., & Daily, G. C. 2008. Sustaining
- biodiversity in ancient tropical countryside. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 105, 17852-17854.
- Rawlings, K., Freudenberger, D., Carr, D. 2010. A guide to managing box-gum grassy
- woodlands. Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, Canberra, A.C.T.
- 728 Rodrigues, A. S., Brooks, T. M., 2007. Shortcuts for biodiversity conservation planning: the
- reflectiveness of surrogates. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst., 38, 713-737.
- 730 Rooney, R. C., Azeria, E. T., 2015. The strength of cross-taxon congruence in species
- composition varies with the size of regional species pools and the intensity of human
- 732 disturbance. J Biogeog. 42(3), 439-451.
- Royston, J. P., 1983. Some techniques for assessing multivariate normality based on the ShapiroWilk W. Appl. Stat. 32, 121-133.
- Ryti, R. T., 1992. Effect of the focal taxon on the selection of nature reserves. Ecol. Appl. 2(4),
 404-410.
- 737 Sætersdal, M., Gjerde, I., Blom, H. H., Ihlen, P. G., Myrseth, E. W., Pommeresche, R., John
- 738 Skartveit, J., Solhøy, T., Aas, O., 2004. Vascular plants as a surrogate species group in

- complementary site selection for bryophytes, macrolichens, spiders, carabids, staphylinids,
- snails, and wood living polypore fungi in a northern forest. Biol. Conserv. 115(1), 21-31.
- 741 Sauberer, N., Zulka, K. P., Abensperg-Traun, M., Berg, H. M., Bieringer, G., Milasowszky, N.,
- Moser, D., Plutzar, C., Pollheimer, M., Tröstl, R., Zechmeister, H., Grabherr, G., 2004. Surrogate
- taxa for biodiversity in agricultural landscapes of eastern Austria. Biol. Conserv. 117(2), 181-
- 744 190.
- Si, X., Baselga, A., Ding, P., 2015. Revealing beta-diversity patterns of breeding bird and lizard
- communities on inundated land-bridge islands by separating the turnover and nestedness
- 747 components. PloS One, 10(5), e0127692.
- Similä, M., Kouki, J., Mönkkönen, M., Sippola, A. L., Huhta, E., 2006. Co-variation and
- indicators of species diversity: Can richness of forest-dwelling species be predicted in northern
- 750 boreal forests? Ecol. Indic. 6(4), 686-700.
- Soininen, J., 2010. Species turnover along abiotic and biotic gradients: patterns in space equal
 patterns in time? BioScience 60(6), 433-439.
- Soininen, J., Lennon, J. J., Hillebrand, H., 2007. A multivariate analysis of beta diversity across
 organisms and environments. Ecology 88(11), 2830-2838.
- Su, J. C., Debinski, D. M., Jakubauskas, M. E., Kindscher, K., 2004. Beyond species richness:
- 756 Community similarity as a measure of cross-taxon congruence for coarse-filter conservation.
- 757 Conserv. Biol. 18(1), 167-173.

- 758 Tscharntke, T., Klein, A. M., Kruess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Thies, C., 2005. Landscape
- perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity–ecosystem service management.
 Ecol. Lett. 8(8), 857-874.
- Tulloch, A. I., Chadès, I., Dujardin, Y., Westgate, M. J., Lane, P. W., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2016.
- 762 Dynamic species co-occurrence networks require dynamic biodiversity surrogates. Ecography
 763 39, 1185-1196.
- 764 Turtureanu, P. D., Palpurina, S., Becker, T., Dolnik, C., Ruprecht, E., Sutcliffe, L. M., Szabo, A.,
- 765 Dengler, J., 2014. Scale-and taxon-dependent biodiversity patterns of dry grassland vegetation in
- 766 Transylvania. Agri. Ecosys. Environ. 182, 15-24.
- Walker, K.L., 1995. Revision of the Australian native bee subgenus Lasioglossum (Chilalictus)
 (Hymenoptera: Halictidae). Mem. Mus. Vict. 55(1): 1-423
- 769 Westgate, M. J., Barton, P. S., Lane, P. W., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2014. Global meta-analysis
- reveals low consistency of biodiversity congruence relationships. Nat. Comm. 5, 3899.
- 771 Wirsenius, S., Azar, C., Berndes, G., 2010. How much land is needed for global food production
- under scenarios of dietary changes and livestock productivity increases in 2030? Agri. Sys.
- 773 103(9), 621-63.
- Wolters, V., Bengtsson, J., Zaitsev, A. S., 2006. Relationship among the species richness of
- 775 different taxa. Ecology, 87(8), 1886-1895.
- Vane-Wright, R. I., Humphries, C. J., Williams, P. H. 1991. What to protect?—Systematics and
- the agony of choice. Biol. Conserv. 55(3), 235-254.

778	Yong, D. L., Barton, P. S., Okada, S., Crane, M., Lindenmayer, D. B., 2016. Birds as surrogates
779	for mammals and reptiles: Are patterns of cross-taxonomic associations stable over time in a
780	human-modified landscape? Ecol. Indic. 69, 152-164.
781	Yu, D. W., Ji, Y., Emerson, B. C., Wang, X., Ye, C., Yang, C., & Ding, Z. 2012. Biodiversity
782	soup: metabarcoding of arthropods for rapid biodiversity assessment and biomonitoring.
783	Methods Ecol. Evol., 3(4), 613-623.
784	
785	
786	
787	
788	
789	
790	
791	

Figure 1. Map of the Nanangroe study landscape showing the location and distribution of our 42
study sites in relation to the Murrumbidgee River. Grey-shaded areas are monoculture

plantations of *Pinus radiata* while unshaded areas are open grazing land.



Figure 2 (a). Smoothed species accumulation curves for each taxon in the Nanangroe landscape
showing observed species richness and sampling effort for each taxon relative to other taxa. (b).
Bar plots (with error bars representing standard deviation) showing mean species richness at the
patch-level as a percentage of the total species pool in the landscape (gamma-diversity).



Figure 3 (a). Network diagram showing pairwise cross-taxonomic congruency in species
richness between five taxa based on the Spearman's rho. Significant correlations are presented as
black arrows while non-significant correlations are presented as grey arrows. (b). Network
diagram showing pairwise cross-taxonomic congruency in species composition between five taxa
conditioned on geographic space, based on the partial Mantel *R*. Significant correlations are
represented as black arrows while non-significant correlations are presented as grey arrows.
Correlations using the beetle dataset excluded singletons is presented in parenthesis.



Figure 4. Accumulation plots showing incidental representation of each taxon (indicated by taxon name on the vertical axis: (a) bird, (b) herpetofauna, (c) bee, (d) tree, (e) all beetle, (f) beetle excluding species represented by singletons) in the best patch sets prioritised for the surrogate taxa (see inset legend). Enlarged points in grey indicate that that representational target for that taxon has been met. See also Supplementary Table S4 for details.



Figure 5. Accumulation plots showing incidental representation of each taxon (indicated by
taxon name in the vertical axis): (a) bird, (b) herpetofauna, (c) bee, (d) tree, (e) all beetle, (f)
beetle excluding species represented by singletons, in relation to the cost of the best patch sets
selected for the surrogate taxa (see inset legend). See also Supplementary Table S5 for details.



Figure 6. Dendrogram of clusters for best patch sets selected for every taxa at four target threshold

841 (20%, 40%, 60%, 80%) based on the complete linkage method. The taxon and its corresponding

842 representation target is shown at each node of the dendrogram.

Jaccard similarity



843

844

845

Term	Definition
Biodiversity surrogate	A defined taxonomic group (e.g. birds) or group of species
	whose occurrence or diversity predicts that of another,
	usually less well-known group of species.
Cross-taxonomic congruence	Degree of association or co-variation in the diversity pattern
	of a defined group of species with respect to another group.
	Common metrics include measures of correlation strength
	such as Spearman's ρ and Pearson's <i>r</i> .
Compositional turnover	Variation in the composition of species across space; an
	approach to quantify beta diversity in a landscape.
Conservation feature	A unit to be represented in a solution of reserve sites in
	systematic conservation planning scenarios. Usually
	quantified as the absence of a species in a defined site.
Incidental representation	Representation of a species in a set of identified
	sites/reserves that was not targeted a priori, usually in a
	systematic conservation planning scenario.
Representation target	Defined numerical thresholds in the representation of
	selected conservation features (e.g. occurrence and
	distribution of a surrogate) in a systematic conservation
	planning context.
Complementarity	A principle in designing networks of reserve sites in
	conservation whereby the selection of sites iteratively adds
	sites that complement those already selected (Vane-Wright et
	al. 1991; Justus & Sarkar 2002).
Simulated annealing	An algorithm implemented in Marxan to identify near-
	optimal solutions in selecting networks of reserve sites in
	conservation (Game & Grantham 2008).

Table 1. Glossary of key terms (in text) and definitions