

# Journal of Applied Ecology

Volume 49 • Number 4 • August 2012

ISSN 0021-8901 (Print)

ISSN 1365-2664 (Online)



**Editors: E.J. Milner-Gulland, Phil Hulme, Marc Cadotte,  
Mark Whittingham, Jos Barlow**

- **Practitioner's Perspective: Collaborative research and conservation issues**
- Assessing anthropogenic impacts
- Management under climate change
- Agroecosystems
- Conservation, restoration and regeneration



British Ecological Society



# Managing the long-term persistence of a rare cockatoo under climate change

J. Berton C. Harris<sup>1\*</sup>, Damien A. Fordham<sup>1</sup>, Patricia A. Mooney<sup>2</sup>, Lynn P. Pedler<sup>2</sup>, Miguel B. Araújo<sup>3,4</sup>, David C. Paton<sup>1</sup>, Michael G. Stead<sup>1</sup>, Michael J. Watts<sup>1</sup>, H. Reşit Akçakaya<sup>5</sup> and Barry W. Brook<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia; <sup>2</sup>Glossy Black-Cockatoo Recovery Program, Department for Environment and Heritage, Kingscote, SA 5223, Australia; <sup>3</sup>Department of Biodiversity and Evolutionary Biology, National Museum of Natural Sciences, CSIC, C/José Gutierrez Abascal, 2, Madrid 28006, Spain; <sup>4</sup>Rui Nabeiro Biodiversity Chair, CIBIO, University of Évora, Largo dos Colegiais, 7000 Évora, Portugal; and <sup>5</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolution, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA

## Summary

1. Linked demographic-bioclimatic models are emerging tools for forecasting climate change impacts on well-studied species, but these methods have been used in few management applications, and species interactions have not been incorporated. We combined population and bioclimatic envelope models to estimate future risks to the viability of a cockatoo population posed by climate change, increased fire frequency, beak-and-feather disease and reduced management.

2. The South Australian glossy black-cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* is restricted to Kangaroo Island, Australia, where it numbers 350 birds and is managed intensively. The cockatoo may be at particular risk from climate change because of its insular geographic constraints and specialised diet on a single plant species, *Allocasuarina verticillata*. The cockatoo population model was parameterised with mark-resight-derived estimates of survival and fecundity from 13 years of demographic data. Species interactions were incorporated by using a climate-change-driven bioclimatic model of *Allocasuarina verticillata* as a dynamic driver of habitat suitability. A novel application of Latin Hypercube sampling was used to assess the model's sensitivity to input parameters.

3. Results suggest that unmitigated climate change is likely to be a substantial threat for the cockatoo: all high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration scenarios had expected minimum abundances of < 160 birds. Extinction was virtually certain if management of nest-predating brush-tail possums *Trichosurus vulpecula* was stopped, or adult survival reduced by as little as 5%. In contrast, the population is predicted to increase under low-emissions scenarios.

4. Disease outbreak, increased fire frequency and reductions in revegetation and management of competitive little corellas *Cacatua sanguinea*, were all predicted to exacerbate decline, but these effects were buffered by the cockatoo population's high fecundity.

5. Spatial correlates of extinction risk, such as range area and total habitat suitability, were nonlinearly related to projected population size in the high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration scenario.

6. *Synthesis and applications.* Mechanistic demographic-bioclimatic simulations that incorporate species interactions can provide more detailed viability analyses than traditional bioclimatic models and be used to rank the cost-effectiveness of management interventions. Our results highlight the importance of managing possum predation and maintaining high adult cockatoo survival. In contrast, corella and revegetation management could be experimentally reduced to save resources.

**Key-words:** beak-and-feather disease, bioclimatic envelope, *Calyptorhynchus lathami*, climate change, glossy black-cockatoo, management, population viability analysis, revegetation, wildfire

\*Correspondence author. E-mails: aramidopsis@gmail.com; bert.harris@adelaide.edu.au


## Introduction

Climate change may be one of the most potent extinction drivers in the future, especially because it can exacerbate existing threats, and there is an urgent need for conservation science to improve tools to predict species' vulnerability to climate change (Sekercioglu *et al.* 2008). One popular approach is the use of bioclimatic envelope models (BEMs), also known as species distribution models. These models use associations of present-day distributions with climate to forecast changes in species' bioclimatic envelopes (Pearson & Dawson 2003). BEMs have, in some cases, been used to assess extinction risk for thousands of species under climate change scenarios (e.g. Sekercioglu *et al.* 2008). However, predictions from these models are of constrained value because they (i) are correlative and yet typically require extrapolation to environmental space that is beyond the bounds of the statistical fitting (Thuiller *et al.* 2004); (ii) use range area type estimates to infer extinction risk rather than measuring threat to population persistence (Fordham *et al.* 2011); (iii) suffer from model selection uncertainty (Araújo & Rahbek 2006); and (iv) do not consider biotic interactions (e.g. Araújo & Luoto 2007).

Spatially explicit population-modelling techniques that link demographic models with BEMs are being used to add ecological realism to correlative BEM forecasts (Huntley *et al.* 2010). Combining quantitative population models and BEMs provides a more mechanistic and probabilistic approach compared to modelling distribution alone, because it links demographic parameters to climate and other explanatory

variables and explores a range of uncertain outcomes using stochastic simulation (Brook *et al.* 2009). Several studies have combined habitat and population models to assess population viability (e.g. Akçakaya *et al.* 2004), but few analyses have coupled population and bioclimatic models to estimate extinction risk in the context of climate change (Keith *et al.* 2008; Anderson *et al.* 2009; Fordham *et al.* in press), and this methodology has rarely been used in birds (but see Aiello-Lammens *et al.* 2011). Ideal case-study species for this approach are those with long-term estimates of vital rates (and their variance), representative occurrence data over their geographic range and detailed knowledge of the environmental drivers influencing range and abundance.

The South Australian glossy black-cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* Temminck (GBC) formerly inhabited mainland South Australia, but now survives only on Kangaroo Island (located off the southern coast of central Australia) and is considered 'endangered' by the Australian government (DEH 2000; Fig. 1). When the GBC recovery program began in 1995, the cockatoo population comprised c. 200 individuals. From 1998 to the present, the intensively managed population has increased gradually to the current estimate of c. 350 birds (Pedler & Sobey 2008). The GBC's specialised habitat requirements and slow life history make it inherently vulnerable to decline (Cameron 2006), and its small population size and insular geographic constraints (single location) put it at high risk from population-wide catastrophes such as fire and disease (Pepper 1997). High-quality *Allocasuarina verticillata* Lam. L.A.S. Johnson, drooping



**Fig. 1.** The South Australian glossy black-cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* is restricted to Kangaroo Island, South Australia. Maps showing (a) remnant native vegetation and protected areas and (b) elevation.

she-oak, woodlands provide food and cover that are critical to the survival of the GBC; indeed, *A. verticillata* seeds make up 98% of the GBC's diet (Chapman & Paton 2006). Hollow-bearing eucalypts (primarily *Eucalyptus cladocalyx* F. Muell and *E. leucoxylon* F. Muell), which take many decades to mature and may be vulnerable to fire, are required for nesting (Crowley *et al.* 1998).

The GBC faces an interacting set of current and future threats including nest competition and predation, wildfire, climate change and disease (Mooney & Pedler 2005). GBC recruitment can be severely impaired by nest predation from arboreal brush-tail possums *Trichosurus vulpecula* Kerr. Protecting nest trees from possum predation by fitting metal collars and pruning adjacent tree crowns increased nest success from 23 to 42% (Garnett, Pedler & Crowley 1999). Approximately, 45% of nests are now placed in artificial hollows fitted by managers. Little corellas *Cacatua sanguinea* Gould and honeybees *Apis mellifera* L. are nest competitors that are also managed (Mooney & Pedler 2005). Wildfires are another threat that can kill nestlings and destroy large areas of habitat (Sobey & Pedler 2008). Kangaroo Island is expected to warm by 0.3–1.5 °C and receive 0–20% less rainfall by 2050 compared to 1990 levels, under a mid-range greenhouse-gas emissions scenario (CSIRO 2007). Climate change is likely to threaten the GBC by causing *A. verticillata*'s climatic niche to shift and compress southwards towards the southern ocean boundary (Stead 2008), causing heat- and drought-induced mortality (Cameron 2008) and an increased frequency of extreme events, such as fire and drought (Dunlop & Brown 2008). In addition, *A. verticillata* cone production may decrease as conditions become warmer and drier (D. C. Paton personal observations), limiting the GBC's food supply. Lastly, psittacine beak-and-feather disease, although not yet reported in Kangaroo Island GBCs, could potentially cause substantial declines in the population if an outbreak occurred (DEH 2005; Appendix S5).

Here, we develop a detailed spatial population viability model for the GBC by building a demographic model, linking the demographic model to landscape and climate variables and testing scenarios in a population viability analysis. The analysis is based on a comprehensive location-specific data set and incorporates climate change and its interaction with fire, disease and management. Two earlier attempts at modelling the GBC used non-spatial simulations to investigate extinction risk (Pepper 1996; Southgate 2002), but both were limited in scope and made simplifying assumptions. For instance, in contrast to known population increases, Pepper (1996) predicted a rapid decline to extinction, and Southgate (2002) suggested the population would decline by 10% annually (Appendix S1). These studies were hampered by the limited data available when the analyses were performed and did not consider fire, disease, climate change or the positive influence of management. By contrast, we use a detailed data set collected by the GBC recovery program since 1995, consisting of 13 years of mark-resight and reproductive data and extensive documentation of catastrophes and

management intervention, to parameterise our models. Few parrots have such complete demographic data available (Snyder *et al.* 2004).

Our approach incorporates a critical biotic interaction between the GBC and its primary food source, *A. verticillata*, by incorporating projected changes in the plant's range in the spatially explicit cockatoo model to provide direct measures of extinction threat (e.g. expected minimum abundance) as well as implied measures calculated from changes in habitat suitability and range size (Fordham *et al.* 2011). Similar approximations of species interactions have been used with BEMs (e.g. Araújo & Luoto 2007; Barbet-Massin & Jiguet 2011), but never in combination with a demographic model. Specifically, we sought to (i) model the population trajectory and extinction risk of the GBC up to the year 2100; (ii) determine the possible future effects of current and emerging threats to the subspecies; (iii) assess the impact of choosing different management strategies on GBC population trends; and (iv) evaluate the relative importance of demography and anthropogenic extinction drivers on the GBC's population viability.

## Materials and methods

### POPULATION MODEL

For the demographic component of the model, we used 13 years of mark-resight surveys to estimate survival rates using program MARK v.5.1 (Cooch & White 2008). Birds are marked with numbered bands as nestlings at several sites across the island (some areas are better sampled than others), and telescopes are used to resight marked birds during the annual post-breeding census. The mark-resight analysis was used to test the importance of management and environmental variables on survival rates of juvenile (<1 year old) and sub-adult/adult GBCs (Table S1). Fecundity was calculated as the number of fledglings of each sex produced per female of breeding age from 1996 to 2008 (see Appendix S2 for details on the mark-resight analysis, fecundity calculations and standard deviations used in the population model). Survival and fecundity estimates were combined with other life-history information, such as age of first breeding, to build a stage- and sex-structured, stochastic population model of the GBC (Table 1). We used RAMAS GIS (Akçakaya & Root 2005) to create a spatially explicit metapopulation model that links the subspecies' demography to landscape data, comprising dynamic bioclimatic maps for *Allocasuarina verticillata* (the GBC's primary food source), and raster layers of native vegetation, substrate and slope (see below).

### BIOCLIMATIC SUITABILITY MAPS FOR *ALLOCASUARINA VERTICILLATA*

Climate change was incorporated by modelling the potential distribution of *Allocasuarina verticillata*, as a function of three key climate variables that influence the species' distribution (annual rainfall, January temperature and July temperature; Stead 2008). We used meteorological data to estimate long-term average annual rainfall and mean monthly January and July temperature (1980–1999) for Australia (Fordham, Wigley & Brook 2012). We used thin-plate splines and a digital elevation model to interpolate between weather stations (Hutchinson 1995; Appendix S3). An annual time series of climate change layers was generated for each climate variable based

**Table 1.** Stage matrices used in the model with stable age distribution (SAD) of each age class

	Age 0	Age 1	Age 2 +	SAD(%)		
Female						
Age 0	0	0	0.2324 (0.0951)	7.3		
Age 1	0.612 (0.0951)	0	0	4.3		
Age 2 +	0	0.913 (0.0951)	0.913 (0.7148)	32.4		
	Age 0	Age 1	Age 2	Age 3	Age 4 +	SAD(%)
Male						
Age 0	0	0	0	0	0*	9.3
Age 1	0.612	0	0	0	0	5.5
Age 2	0	0.913	0	0	0	4.9
Age 3	0	0	0.913	0	0	4.3
Age 4 +	0	0	0	0.913	0.913	32.0

The top row in each matrix represents fecundities, and the subdiagonal and diagonal in the bottom right elements represent survival rates. The first stage (age 0) for both sexes is the sub-adult stage. The final stages (female, age 2+; male, age 4+) are the adult stages. The intermediate stages are pre-breeding sub-adult stages. The proportional sensitivities of the finite rate of increase to small changes in each of the non-zero elements of the female matrix (elasticities) are in parentheses.

\*In RAMAS, we specified fecundity values of 0.2324 and 0.296 for females and males, respectively (Appendix S2).

on two emission scenarios: a high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration stabilisation reference scenario, WRE750, and a strong greenhouse gas mitigation policy scenario, LEV1 (Wigley *et al.* 2009). WRE750 assumes that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> will stabilize at about 750 parts per million (ppm), whilst under the LEV1 intervention scenario CO<sub>2</sub> concentration stabilizes at about 450 ppm. Future climate layers were created by first generating climate anomalies from an ensemble of nine general circulation models and then downscaling the anomalies to an ecologically relevant scale (*c.* 1 km<sup>2</sup> grid cells) (Fordham, Wigley & Brook 2012; Fordham *et al.* 2012; Appendix S3). Averages from multiple climate models tend to agree better with observed climate compared to single climate models, at least at global scales (Fordham, Wigley & Brook 2012).

Occurrence records for *A. verticillata* ( $n = 572$ ) came from cleaned records from the South Australian biological survey. An equal number of pseudoabsences were generated randomly within the study region (Appendix S3). Although our focus was on Kangaroo Island, we modelled the distribution of the species across South Australia (325,608 grid cells) to better capture its regional niche (see Barbet-Massin, Thuiller & Jiguet 2010). We modelled the potential current and future climatic suitability of the landscape for *A. verticillata* with an ensemble of seven bioclimatic modelling techniques, including simple surface-range envelope models and more complex machine learning approaches, in BIOENSEMBLES software (Diniz-Filho *et al.* 2009; Appendix S3). Ensemble modelling generates consensus projections that circumvent some of the problems of relying on single-model projections of climate change impacts on species' potential distributions (Araújo & New 2007). We used BIOENSEMBLES models to forecast annually for 90 years (*i.e.* climate suitability maps for each year were created from 2010 to 2100). Nonetheless, our model assumed that the *A. verticillata*–GBC relationship would remain strong and we were unable to consider other species interactions.

#### INTEGRATING THE POPULATION MODEL AND SPATIAL INFORMATION

Binomial generalised linear models (GLMs) were used to relate GBC occurrence records to *A. verticillata* present-day climate suitability

(above) and three landscape variables that are known to influence the distributions of the GBC and *A. verticillata*: substrate (Raymond & Retter 2010), native vegetation cover (<http://www.environment.gov.au/erin/nvis/index.html>), and slope (<http://www.ga.gov.au/meta/ANZCW0703011541.html>; Appendix S4). Verified GBC occurrence records ( $n = 349$ ) consist of presences only. Pseudoabsences were generated by down-weighting cells close to a known sighting (Appendix S4). The analysis was performed with package MuMIn (Bartoń 2012) in R (v. 2.12.1; R Development Core Team, <http://www.R-project.org>). The best model (determined by AIC<sub>c</sub>) from this analysis was used to parameterise the habitat-suitability function in RAMAS (Appendix S4).

RAMAS uses the habitat-suitability function to assign a habitat-suitability value to each grid cell of the study area based on values of the input rasters (in this case *A. verticillata* climatic suitability, substrate, native vegetation and slope). Every grid cell above the habitat-suitability threshold is considered suitable, and suitable cells are aggregated based on neighbourhood distance (the spatial distance at which the species can be assumed to be panmictic; Akçakaya & Root 2005). The habitat-suitability threshold (0.83) and neighbourhood distance (four cells) values were derived iteratively to match the well-known current extent of suitable habitat for the GBC on the island (Mooney & Pedler 2005).

The initial population size in all scenarios was 350 birds, in accordance with recent estimates (Pedler & Sobey 2008). The island's current carrying capacity was estimated at 653 birds by combining feeding habitat requirements (Chapman & Paton 2002) with data on *A. verticillata* area (Appendix S4). Dispersal estimates came from data on movements of marked individuals (Fig. S1). A ceiling model of density dependence was used to approximate the GBC's intraspecific competition for nest hollows and feeding habitat (Mooney & Pedler 2005). Population dynamics were linked to habitat via the density dependence function: habitat determines carrying capacity that conditions demographic rates (survival and fecundity) in each year, as a function of population size and carrying capacity in that year (Akçakaya & Root 2005). Each simulation incorporated environmental and demographic stochasticity and was run 10 000 times (Akçakaya *et al.* 2004).



Our main measures of population viability were expected minimum abundance (EMA) and mean final population size of persisting runs. EMA, which is equivalent to the area under the quasi-extinction risk curve (McCarthy 1996), provides a better (continuous, unbounded) representation of extinction risk than probability of extinction or quasi-extinction (McCarthy & Thompson 2001). We calculated EMA by taking the smallest population size observed in each iteration and averaging these minima.

We also calculated three spatial measures that are commonly used to infer extinction likelihood: change in total habitat suitability (from RAMAS), occupied range area (area of cells greater than habitat-suitability threshold) and average cockatoo density (see Fordham *et al.* 2011 for details). Density was calculated by relating the population size at each time step to habitat-suitability values per grid cell in suitable patches.

#### MODEL SCENARIOS

We generated RAMAS models for three climate scenarios: WRE750, LEV1 and a control scenario with no climate change. For each climate scenario, we assessed GBC population viability given changes in fire frequency, disease outbreak and changes in management from funding constraints. We modelled severe fires as reducing GBC fecundity by 10% and adult and sub-adult survival by 3%, based on responses measured in 2007 (Sobey & Pedler 2008; P.A. Mooney personal communication). Wildfire frequency was modelled as increasing with building fuel loads. Baseline scenarios include an annual probability of severe fire of 6.8% (Appendix S5). We modelled 5%, 25% and 220% (i.e. 2.2-fold) increases in fire frequency under climate change (Lucas *et al.* 2007). It was not realistic to model any fire increases for the no climate change scenario or the 25% or 220% increase for the mitigation LEV1 scenario (Appendix S5). Psittacine beak-and-feather-disease outbreaks were modelled as reducing sub-adult survival by 50%, with an annual probability of an outbreak of 5% (DEH 2005; Appendix S5). We modelled ending brush-tail possum, little corella and revegetation management as causing 44%, 7% and 3% reductions in fecundity, respectively (Mooney & Pedler 2005).

#### SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

We used a Latin Hypercube sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of varying the values of six key input parameters (adult survival, varied by  $\pm 5\%$ ; sub-adult survival,  $\pm 10\%$ ; fecundity,  $\pm 10\%$ ; carrying capacity,  $\pm 20\%$ ; and proportion of population dispersing annually,  $\pm 20\%$ ) on GBC mean final population size (Iman, Helson & Campbell 1981). Latin Hypercube sampling, which simultaneously varies the values of the input parameters and then estimates sensitivity by fitting a spline regression model, is arguably preferable to other Monte Carlo techniques because it requires many fewer iterations to sample the parameter space whilst allowing for co-variation in parameter choices (McKay, Beckman & Conover 1979). We fit a Poisson GLM with all six predictors (a segmented linear model was used for adult survival; segmented package in R; Appendix S5) and calculated standardised regression coefficients (fitted slopes divided by their standard errors) to rank the importance of the input parameters (Conroy & Brook 2003). We also tested the model's sensitivity to parameterisation of disease outbreaks by doubling the frequency of simulated outbreaks, increasing the impact to a 75% reduction in survival and combining these parameterisations.

## Results

#### DEMOGRAPHY

The best-supported mark-resight survival model was stage-structured and time invariant (Table S2). There was also statistical support for the next eight models ( $\Delta \text{AIC}_c < 2$ ), yet the majority of model structural deviance was explained by the most parsimonious model (88% compared to 99%). The annual survival estimates so derived were  $0.612 \pm 0.0388$  SE for juveniles and  $0.913 \pm 0.0123$  SE for adults. All of the top-ranked 10 survival models incorporated stage structure with two age classes. There was little evidence for differences in survival between the sexes over the study period from the mark-resight data. Models including environmental covariates were suboptimal regardless of stage structure. All covariate models with no stage structure had  $w\text{AIC}_c < 0.01$ .

We used a mean annual fecundity estimate of  $0.232 \pm 0.0053$  SE female nestlings produced per female of breeding age, and  $0.296 \pm 0.0068$  SE male nestlings produced per female of breeding age, from 1996 to 2008, such that the finite rate of increase in the resultant matrix model was 1.0345, indicating a population increasing deterministically by 3.5% per year (Table 1; Appendix S2). The elasticities suggest that the rate of increase is most sensitive to adult survival.


#### SPATIAL RESULTS

There was considerable overlap between *Allocasuarina verticillata* patches and GBC presences. Approximately, 32% of GBC presences (feeding, nesting and band observations) were inside an *A. verticillata* patch, and 79% of presences were within 1 km of an *A. verticillata* patch (only 19% of the island is within 1 km of a patch).

The bioclimatic envelope modelling predicts that most of *A. verticillata*'s range (and consequently the GBC's habitat) will remain intact under the reduced emissions (LEV1) scenario, whilst the range is likely to contract substantially under the high- $\text{CO}_2$ -concentration scenario (WRE750) (Fig. 2). The majority of suitable habitat that is predicted to remain at the end of the century under the WRE750 emissions scenario is on the island's higher-elevation western plateau (Figs 1, 2). By 2100, total habitat suitability declined substantially (decreasing by 12%) in the WRE750 scenario, whereas suitability decreased by just 1% under LEV1 (Fig. 3). Range area was inversely related to average cockatoo density per cell (Fig. 3). This was especially evident for WRE750, where range area contracted by 77% and predicted density increased by 57% by 2100. Range area declined by only 6% in the LEV1 scenario (Fig. 3).

#### POPULATION VIABILITY

Habitat changes caused by unmitigated climate change had a strong effect on population viability, with simulated final population size and expected minimum abundance always  $< 160$  birds, which is roughly equivalent to a return to the population




**Fig. 2.** Climate-change-driven maps of habitat suitability for *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* according to a greenhouse gas mitigation policy scenario (LEV1) and a high- $\text{CO}_2$ -concentration stabilisation reference scenario (WRE 750). Recent cockatoo presences are shown on the 2010 maps. Habitat suitability is classified from a continuous variable into three categories to aid visual interpretation: high (above the habitat-suitability threshold), medium (below threshold) and low (unsuitable substrate for *A. verticillata*) suitability.

bottleneck of the 1980s (Fig. 4, Fig. S2). In contrast, all simulations in the no climate change (control) case had final population sizes  $> 635$ , and EMA  $> 350$ , unless brush-tail possum management ceased. The strong mitigation (LEV1) simulations had slightly lower final population sizes than the no climate change case, but still had all final population sizes  $> 595$  unless there was no possum management. The simulations predicted that stopping possum management would have a serious effect on the population with all EMAs below 90 birds. Scenarios that ceased possum management were the only cases when the population did not stay close to carrying capacity. Unlike all other scenarios, possum scenarios had considerable probabilities of quasi-extinction (falling below 50 individuals): 10% for no climate change, 11% for LEV1 and 36% for WRE750. Stopping all management actions caused severe declines, with EMAs  $< 26$  birds for each scenario. The other catastrophes and changes in management had much more minor effects compared to possum management, although they did impact the population in the hypothesised directions (e.g. increased fire management caused slightly higher population sizes in LEV1 and no climate change). In this group of scenarios, beak-and-feather-disease outbreak had the strongest effects, but still only resulted in final population size reductions of 13, 12 and 1, compared to the baseline for no climate change, LEV1 and WRE750, respectively.

#### SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

The Latin Hypercube sensitivity analysis indicated that model results were most heavily influenced by parameterisation of adult survival (top-ranked in each climate scenario) and carrying capacity (ranked second in each scenario; Fig. 5; Table S4). The standardised regression coefficients show that adult survival (low + high values from the segmented model) accounted for 35% (WRE750) to 52% (no climate change) of total sensitivity, whilst carrying capacity accounted for 21–32% of total sensitivity, respectively (Table S4). Decreased adult survival resulted in severe declines in GBC final population size, whilst increased adult survival had only slight or moderate effects because the modelled population, with the current survival estimate of 0.913, tracks carrying capacity with a positive population growth rate. Accordingly, varying carrying capacity also had substantial effects on final population size, especially for the WRE750 scenario where range area declines sharply. The other input parameters had small effects with sub-adult survival, fecundity and dispersal listed in order of decreasing importance. The additional disease outbreak sensitivity analysis indicated that increasing disease frequency or impact did not have substantially different effects on the population unless they were combined in the same scenario (Table S5).



**Fig. 3.** Percentage changes in total habitat suitability (output from RAMAS GIS), range size (area of suitable habitat), cockatoo density per cell and population size according to two climate change scenarios: (a) high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration stabilisation reference scenario (WRE750), (b) greenhouse gas mitigation policy scenario (LEV1).

## Discussion

The population viability analysis for the South Australian glossy black-cockatoo illustrates the type of applied management questions that can be addressed using coupled demographic-bioclimatic approaches, as well as a method for incorporating dynamic vegetation-driven habitat change into animal population forecasts. The modelling indicates that the outlook for this small population depends strongly on continuous funding for management and global efforts to mitigate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The simulations suggest that GBC population size will increase under a low emissions future even if disease outbreaks were to occur, most management actions were reduced, and fire frequency was to increase. The gradual increase in the population over the last 15 years, combined with the large stands of underused *Allocasuarina verticillata* on the island, shows the potential for continued population growth. In contrast, a failure to mitigate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could severely reduce GBC range area, critically threatening

long-term population viability. Regardless of emissions scenario, our predictions indicate that the GBC's insular geographic constraints and low population size, which is well below estimates of minimum viable estimates for most species (Traill *et al.* 2010), may leave the species vulnerable to decline.


Climate change under high CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (WRE750) caused a large reduction in range area, and contraction to the cooler and wetter western plateau, whilst habitat changes under low emissions (LEV1) were minimal, with range area decreasing modestly and habitat suitability remaining almost constant. Under high emissions, population size did not decrease as rapidly as range area because habitat suitability and cockatoo density initially increased in the remaining habitat (Fig. 3). These results indicate that range area is unlikely to be linearly related to GBC abundance. Habitat differences translated into much lower EMA for all high emissions scenarios compared to low emissions and no climate change. A population of 150 animals is inherently at risk of extinction from stochastic small-population processes (Traill *et al.* 2010). We did not run simulations beyond 2100 because of uncertainty in climate projections, but such small population sizes at the end of the century do not bode well for the GBC's persistence under a high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration scenario.

Simulating reduced brush-tail possum management had a profound impact on GBC EMA, whilst reduction in little corella management was almost negligible because of the resilient GBC population. The absence of a strong response to corella management indicates that culling could be experimentally stopped in some areas in an adaptive management framework to save resources. Simulated psittacine beak-and-feather-disease outbreaks also had only slight effects on the GBC population. If mortality rates become higher and outbreak frequency is increased, disease could become a potent threat (Table S5). We suggest that continued vigilance and communication with organisations involved with disease management in other threatened parrots (e.g. orange-bellied parrot *Neophema chrysogaster* Latham) is needed.


Our results indicate that revegetation is only having small effects on the population at present, but altered spatial patterns of *A. verticillata* abundance from climate change and the carrying capacity of 653 individuals will probably necessitate revegetation in the future. Our model assumed full dispersal and establishment of habitat trees (with implicit instantaneous seed production), which may overestimate *A. verticillata*'s ability to colonise new areas. Given the strong likelihood that emissions will exceed LEV1 levels (IPCC 2007) and that *A. verticillata* recruitment is limited by herbivores such as tamar wallaby *Macropus eugenii* Desmarest, managers will probably need to revegetate to maintain *A. verticillata* and GBC populations. Although revegetation effort could be reduced over the short term, key model assumptions (full dispersal and unlimited recruitment of *A. verticillata*) and model sensitivity to variation in carrying capacity (driven by climate related changes in *A. verticillata*) mean that managers should be ready for intensive revegetation in the future.

Management and monitoring should focus on maintaining adult survival and fecundity at their current levels. The acute





**Fig. 4.** Mean expected minimum abundance ( $\pm$ SD) of *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* under no climate change, a greenhouse gas mitigation policy scenario (LEV1) and a high- $\text{CO}_2$ -concentration stabilisation reference scenario (WRE750). The initial population size was 350 individuals (dashed line). Baseline = baseline scenario that includes observed fire frequency and ongoing use of current population management methods; disease = beak-and-feather-disease outbreak; -50% indicates 50% reduction in fire frequency from increased management; +5%, +25% and +220% (i.e. 2.2-fold increase) indicate increasing fire frequency from climate change. It was not realistic to model some fire increases for the no climate change or LEV1 scenarios. The last four groups of bars show the effects of ceasing management. 'Revegetation', 'corella' and 'possum' indicate stopping revegetation, little corella *Cacatua sanguinea* and brush-tail possum *Trichosurus vulpecula* management, respectively. 'All' indicates stopping all management actions.



**Fig. 5.** Relationship between uncertainty in adult survival and median final population size in a Latin Hypercube sensitivity analysis for the no climate change scenario. The breakpoint for the segmented generalised linear model was 0.89, and the slopes were 78.9 and 0.76 for the low and high parameters, respectively. The mean estimate for adult survival from the mark-resight analysis is 0.913 (95% confidence interval from 0.88 to 0.93).

sensitivity of the model to lower (but still plausible) values of adult survival in the range of 85–90% emphasises the importance of monitoring adult survival over time. Predation from raptors such as wedge-tailed eagles *Aquila audax* Latham, climate variation, fire frequency and food availability may be important drivers of adult survival (Mooney & Pedler 2005), but there was no evidence of changing survival during the study period, and these relationships are incompletely known. Threats to the GBC may change over time, and the effects of climate variation on survival can be difficult to detect without

monitoring data sets that span decades (Grosbois *et al.* 2008). Therefore, we suggest that mark-resight and reproductive data should continue to be collected to build this unique data set and allow ongoing analysis of the drivers of adult survival.

In addition to collecting data on the GBC, studies of *A. verticillata* are needed to improve forecasts of the GBC's extinction risk. In particular, studies on the effects of drought, warmer temperatures and fire on *A. verticillata* survival, recruitment and seed production are needed, especially given that climate change is likely to cause more extreme environmental events that would affect the life cycle of this food plant. New data could then be integrated with analyses that combine demographic models of both *A. verticillata* and the GBC.

Our approach minimised uncertainty by combining a comprehensive demographic data set with rigorous methods, including mark-resight estimation of survival and ensemble bioclimatic and global climate modelling, yet the model's assumptions should be considered when interpreting our results. The projected range contraction of *Allocasuarina verticillata* under the high emissions scenario assumes that the species' distribution–climate relationship remains the same as today and that climate is the main driver of range changes (species interactions are not considered for this plant). In addition, our model assumes that the relationship between *A. verticillata* and the GBC will remain strong in the future.

In conclusion, the results of our coupled demographic-BEM simulations suggest that the GBC is likely to continue its population increase over time until carrying capacity is reached, provided the climate remains similar to today and intensive possum control continues. However, should unmitigated climate change or reduced adult survival occur, severe declines are probable. We recommend continued intensive life-history

monitoring on the GBC, possum management and research on *A. verticillata*, to promote the persistence of the GBC. The methods illustrated here demonstrate how species interactions can be included in coupled demographic-bioclimatic modelling approaches to add realism to forecasts of population viability under climate change for well-studied species of conservation concern. Furthermore, our analysis shows how coupled models can provide practical management advice in the face of broader issues and uncertainties such as global emissions mitigation.

## Acknowledgements

Andrew Graham generously assisted with the GBC data base. Peter Lang verified *A. verticillata* soil preferences and validated the bioclimatic model. Eleanor Sobey summarised available data. Colin Wilson interpreted revegetation effort and Charlotte Morgan assisted with fire history. Mark Holdsworth gave beak-and-feather-disease expertise. We thank Steven Delean, Jane Elith, Lee Heard, Dan Wei, Peter Wilson and members of the Global Ecology Lab (Adelaide) for technical assistance. Fernando Colchero and an anonymous reviewer gave valuable comments on the manuscript. Peter Copley and Phil Pisanu provided logistical support. Funding was provided by SA DENR, University of Adelaide EIPRS and ARC grant LP0989420. HRA was supported by NASA grant NNX09AK19G, awarded through the NASA Biodiversity Program.

## References

- Aiello-Lammens, M.E., Chu-Agor, M.L., Convertino, M., Fischer, R.A., Linkov, I. & Akçakaya, H.R. (2011) The impact of sea level rise on snowy plovers in Florida: integrating geomorphological, habitat, and metapopulation models. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 3644–3654.
- Akçakaya, H.R. & Root, W.T. (2005) *RAMAS GIS: Linking Landscape Data With Population Viability Analysis (version 5.0)*. Applied Biomathematics, Setauket, New York, USA.
- Akçakaya, H.R., Burgman, M.A., Kindvall, O., Wood, C.C., Sjogren-Gulve, P., Hatfield, J.S. & McCarthy, M.A. (2004) *Species Conservation and Management*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Anderson, B.J., Akçakaya, H.R., Araújo, M.B., Fordham, D.A., Martinez-Meyer, E., Thuiller, W. & Brook, B.W. (2009) Dynamics of range margins for metapopulations under climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **276**, 1415–1420.
- Araújo, M.B. & Luoto, M. (2007) The importance of biotic interactions for modelling species distributions under climate change. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **16**, 743–753.
- Araújo, M.B. & New, M. (2007) Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **22**, 42–47.
- Araújo, M.B. & Rahbek, C. (2006) How does climate change affect biodiversity? *Science*, **313**, 1396–1397.
- Barbet-Massin, M. & Jiguet, F. (2011) Back from a predicted climatic extinction of an island endemic: a future for the Corsican nuthatch. *PLoS ONE*, **6**, e18228.
- Barbet-Massin, M., Thuiller, W. & Jiguet, F. (2010) How much do we overestimate future local extinction rates when restricting the range of occurrence data in climate suitability models? *Ecography*, **33**, 878–886.
- Bartoň, K. (2012) Package MuMIn: Multi-model inference. Version 1.7.2.
- Brook, B.W., Akçakaya, H.R., Keith, D.A., Mace, G.M., Pearson, R.G. & Araújo, M.B. (2009) Integrating bioclimate with population models to improve forecasts of species extinctions under climate change. *Biology Letters*, **5**, 723–725.
- Cameron, M. (2006) Nesting habitat of the glossy black-cockatoo in central New South Wales. *Biological Conservation*, **127**, 402–410.
- Cameron, M. (2008) Global warming and glossy black-cockatoos. *Wingspan*, **18**, 16–19.
- Chapman, T.F. & Paton, D.C. (2002) Factors influencing the production of seeds by *Allocasuarina verticillata* and the foraging behaviour of glossy black-cockatoos on Kangaroo Island. Unpublished report to Wildlife Conservation Fund (project number 2506). Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.
- Chapman, T.F. & Paton, D.C. (2006) Aspects of drooping sheoaks (*Allocasuarina verticillata*) that influence glossy black-cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*) foraging on Kangaroo Island. *Emu*, **106**, 163–168.
- Conroy, S.D.S. & Brook, B.W. (2003) Demographic sensitivity and persistence of the threatened white- and orange-bellied frogs of Western Australia. *Population Ecology*, **45**, 105–114.
- Cooch, E.G. & White, G.C. (2008) Program MARK: a gentle introduction. 7th edn. Available at: <http://www.phidot.org/software/mark/docs/book/> (accessed 15 January 2009).
- Crowley, G.M., Garnett, S.T., Meakins, W. & Heinrich, A. (1998) Protection and re-establishment of glossy black-cockatoo habitat in South Australia: evaluation and recommendations. Report to the glossy black-cockatoo rescue fund, South Australian National Parks Foundation. Available at: <http://users.adam.com.au/kic01/glossy/reveg01.html> (accessed 12 September 2011).
- CSIRO (2007) *Climate Change in Australia*. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, Clayton South, Victoria, Australia. Available at: <http://www.climatechangeinaustralia.gov.au/resources.php> (accessed 12 September 2011).
- DEH (2000) *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999) list of threatened fauna*. Department of the environment, water, heritage, and the arts. Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. Available at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/publicthreatened-list.pl?wanted=faua> (accessed 12 September 2011).
- DEH (2005) *Threat Abatement Plan for Beak-and-Feather Disease Affecting Psittacine Species*. Department of Environment and Heritage, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. Available at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/tap/pubs/beak-feather-tap.pdf> (accessed 12 September 2011).
- Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Mauricio Bini, L., Fernando Rangel, T., Loyola, R.D., Hof, C., Nogués-Bravo, D. & Araújo, M.B. (2009) Partitioning and mapping uncertainties in ensembles of forecasts of species turnover under climate change. *Ecography*, **32**, 897–906.
- Dunlop, M. & Brown, P.R. (2008) Implications of climate change for Australia's National Reserve System: a preliminary assessment. Report to the Department of Climate Change, and the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage, and the Arts, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. Available at: <http://www.csiro.au/files/files/pjgl1.pdf> (accessed 12 September 2011).
- Fordham, D.A., Wigley, T.M.L. & Brook, B.W. (2012) Multi-model climate projections for biodiversity risk assessments. *Ecological Applications*, **32**, 3317–3331.
- Fordham, D.A., Wigley, T.M.L., Watts, M.J. & Brook, B.W. (2012) Strengthening forecasts of climate change impacts with multi-model ensemble averaged projections using MAGICC/SCENGEN 5.3. *Ecography*, **35**, 4–8.
- Fordham, D.A., Akçakaya, H., Araújo, M., Elith, J., Keith, D., Pearson, R., Auld, T., Mellin, C., Morgan, J., Regan, T., Tozer, M., Watts, M., White, M., Wintle, B., Yates, C. & Brook, B.W. (2011) Plant extinction risk under climate change: are forecast range shifts alone a good indicator of species vulnerability to global warming? *Global Change Biology*, **18**, 1357–1371.
- Fordham, D.A., Akçakaya, H.R., Araújo, M.B. & Brook, B.W. (in press) Modelling range shifts for invasive vertebrates in response to climate change. *Wildlife Conservation in a Changing Climate* (eds J. Brodie, E. Post & D. Doak) University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, USA.
- Garnett, S.T., Pedler, L.P. & Crowley, G.M. (1999) The breeding biology of the glossy black-cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami* on Kangaroo Island, South Australia. *Emu*, **99**, 262–279.
- Grosbois, V., Gimenez, O., Gaillard, J.M., Pradel, R., Barbraud, C., Clobert, J., Moller, A.P. & Weimerskirch, H. (2008) Assessing the impact of climate variation on survival in vertebrate populations. *Biological Reviews*, **83**, 357–399.
- Huntley, B., Barnard, P., Altwegg, R., Chambers, L., Coetsee, B.W.T., Gibson, L., Hockey, P.A.R., Hole, D.G., Midgley, G.F. & Underhill, L.G. (2010) Beyond bioclimatic envelopes: dynamic species' range and abundance modelling in the context of climatic change. *Ecography*, **33**, 621–626.
- Hutchinson, M.F. (1995) Interpolating mean rainfall using thin plate smoothing splines. *International Journal of GIS*, **9**, 305–403.
- Iman, R.L., Helson, J.C. & Campbell, J.E. (1981) An approach to sensitivity analysis of computer models: part I-introduction, input variable selection and preliminary variable assessment. *Journal of Quality Technology*, **13**, 174–183.
- IPCC (2007) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: fourth assessment report (AR4). Available at: <http://www.ipcc.ch> (accessed on 12 September 2011).
- Keith, D.A., Akçakaya, H.R., Thuiller, W., Midgley, G.F., Pearson, R.G., Phillips, S.J., Regan, H.M., Araújo, M.B. & Rebelo, T.G. (2008)



- Predicting extinction risks under climate change: coupling stochastic population models with dynamic bioclimatic habitat models. *Biology Letters*, **4**, 560–563.
- Lucas, C., Hennessy, K., Mills, G. & Bathols, J. (2007) *Bushfire weather in southeast Australia: recent trends and projected climate change impacts*. Consultancy report for the Climate Institute of Australia. Bushfire CRC and Australian Bureau of Meteorology, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
- McCarthy, M.A. (1996) Red kangaroo (*Macropus rufus*) dynamics: effects of rainfall, density dependence, harvesting and environmental stochasticity. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **33**, 45–53.
- McCarthy, M.A. & Thompson, C. (2001) Expected minimum population size as a measure of threat. *Animal Conservation*, **4**, 351–355.
- McKay, M.D., Beckman, R.J. & Conover, W.J. (1979) A comparison of three methods for selecting values of input variables in the analysis of output from a computer code. *Technometrics*, **21**, 239–245.
- Mooney, P.A. & Pedler, L.P. (2005) Recovery plan for the South Australian subspecies of the glossy black-cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*): 2005–2010. Unpublished report to the Department for Environment and Heritage, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.
- Pearson, R.G. & Dawson, T.P. (2003) Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **12**, 361–371.
- Pedler, L.P. & Sobey, E. (2008) *Annual Census Report, October 2008*. Glossy black-cockatoo recovery program. Department for Environment and Heritage, Kingscote, South Australia, Australia.
- Pepper, J.W. (1996) The behavioral ecology of the Glossy Black-Cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*. PhD thesis. The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.
- Pepper, J.W. (1997) A survey of the South Australian glossy black-cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*) and its habitat. *Wildlife Research*, **24**, 209–223.
- Raymond, O.L. & Retter, A.J. (2010) *Surface Geology of Australia 1:1,000,000 Scale, 2010 Edition*. Geoscience Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.
- Sekercioglu, C.H., Schneider, S.H., Fay, J.P. & Loarie, S.R. (2008) Climate change, elevational range shifts, and bird extinctions. *Conservation Biology*, **22**, 140–150.
- Snyder, N., McGowan, P., Gilardi, J. & Grajal, A. (2004) *Parrots: Status Survey and Conservation Action Plan 2000–2004*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland. Available at: <http://www.parrots.org/index.php/ourpublication/papfiles/> (accessed 15 January 2010).
- Sobey, E. & Pedler, L.P. (2008) *Impacts of the Kangaroo Island fires. Chewings, Glossy Black-Cockatoo Newsletter, Number 27*. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Kingscote, South Australia, Australia.
- Southgate, R. (2002) Population viability analysis for the South Australian glossy black-cockatoo. Unpublished report to the glossy black-cockatoo recovery team, Department for Environment and Heritage, South Australia, Australia.
- Stead, M.G. (2008) Niche area sensitivity of tree species in the Mount Lofty Ranges to climate change. Honours thesis, Flinders University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.
- Thuiller, W., Brotons, L., Araújo, M.B. & Lavorel, S. (2004) Effects of restricting environmental range of data to project current and future species distributions. *Ecography*, **27**, 165–172.
- Traill, L.W., Brook, B.W., Frankham, R.R. & Bradshaw, C.J.A. (2010) Pragmatic population viability targets in a rapidly changing world. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 28–34.
- Wigley, T.M.L., Clarke, L.E., Edmonds, J.A., Jacoby, H.D., Paltsev, S., Pitcher, H., Reilly, J.M., Richels, R., Sarofim, M.C. & Smith, S.J. (2009) Uncertainties in climate stabilization. *Climatic Change*, **97**, 85–121.

Received 13 November 2011; accepted 24 May 2012  
Handling Editor: Chris Elphick

## Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article.

**Fig. S1.** Annual dispersal-distance curve for the *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* population on Kangaroo Island.

**Fig. S2.** Mean final population size of persisting runs ( $\pm$ SD) of *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* under no climate change, a greenhouse gas mitigation policy scenario (LEV1) and a high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration stabilisation reference scenario (WRE750).

**Table S1.** Covariates and their data sources for the mark-recapture survival analysis of *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* on Kangaroo Island.

**Table S2.** Comparison of survival model results from Cormack-Jolly-Seber models in program MARK.

**Table S3.** Results of binomial GLMs relating spatial variables to *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* presences on Kangaroo Island.

**Table S4.** Latin Hypercube sensitivity analysis results.

**Table S5.** Sensitivity of results to parameterisation of disease outbreaks.

**Appendix S1.** Previous modelling studies on the Kangaroo Island GBC.

**Appendix S2.** Detailed population-modelling methods.

**Appendix S3.** Climate change forecasts and bioclimatic envelope modelling methods.

**Appendix S4.** Integrating population and distribution models (methods).

**Appendix S5.** RAMAS scenarios and sensitivity analysis methods.

As a service to our authors and readers, this journal provides supporting information supplied by the authors. Such materials may be re-organized for online delivery, but are not copy-edited or typeset. Technical support issues arising from supporting information (other than missing files) should be addressed to the authors.

## Supporting Information

### Appendix 1. Previous modelling studies on the Kangaroo Island GBC

Two previous studies used population models to estimate the viability of the GBC population, although neither considered climate change. Pepper (1996) used survival estimates from Carnaby's black-cockatoo (*C. latirostris*) and fecundity data from the little reproductive research that had been done on Kangaroo Island by that time. Using VORTEX software (Lacy 1993), Pepper (1996) calculated a mean time to extinction of 5.8 years. Pepper (1996) doubted the results and suggested that the assumptions of the model were incorrect. Southgate (2002) used mark-recapture data from 1996–2001 to estimate survival, without explicitly modelling recapture probability. He calculated survival to be 0.296 for egg to age 1, 0.77 for age 1 to 2, 0.83 for age 2 to 3, and c.0.85 for age 3+. Southgate (2002) used data on sex ratio, clutch size, and percent of females breeding to estimate fecundity to be equal to 0.4 for female nestlings. Southgate (2002) used the software ALEX (Possingham & Davies 1995) to estimate that the GBC population was declining by 10% a year. This finding conflicted with census data which showed the population was increasing by c. 4% annually. Southgate (2002) attributed the discrepancy to inaccurate survival data.

### Appendix 2. Detailed population modelling methods

#### *Demographic structure*

We used life history data and expert knowledge from the GBC recovery program to parameterise the model (Crowder *et al.* 1994; Table 1). Breeding age for females is three years and for males is five years (LPP, pers. obs.; Mooney & Pedler 2005), and the species



forms permanent or semi-permanent monogamous pairs (Garnett *et al.* 2000). Black-cockatoos probably show minimal reproductive senescence (Heinsohn *et al.* 2009). Thus, we developed a stage- and sex-structured model with composite age classes for breeding female (3+) and male age (5+) classes. Changes in mortality related to senescence are unknown in *Calyptorhynchus lathami* but we simulated the possible effects of senescence by adding a senescent stage (age 20+), whereby mortality in this oldest stage was doubled. We found that the growth rate ( $\lambda$ ) was reduced from 1.035 to 1.011.

### *Survival estimates*

We estimated survival from 950 observations of 317 individuals marked between 1996–2008, using the Cormack-Jolly-Seber model for live recaptures in Program MARK (Cooch & White 2008). We used a two-stage modelling approach for mark-recapture data, whereby recaptures were initially modelled in combination with the most parameterised survival model, so as to retain as much power as possible for testing likely drivers of survival parameters (see Pardon *et al.* 2003 for justification). After the optimal recapture model was selected, a parsimonious survival model was sought.

Initially, we were interested in testing the effects of 13 covariates on annual cockatoo survival. We tested for correlations among covariates with a Spearman correlation matrix and excluded five correlated variables (all remaining variables had all Spearman coefficients  $<0.65$ ; most were  $<0.3$ ). The final analysis tested the effects of eight covariates on survival (Table S1). The covariates for extreme events (drought, river flow, and repeated fire) were best represented by thresholds in order to model GBC tolerance to low levels of these variables. Therefore we converted these covariates into a binary format—ones or zeros if the values were above or below the median, respectively. Models were tested from an *a priori* candidate set of 27 ecologically plausible models, which were developed based on our

experience with the species in the field. We used a hierarchical approach when testing for the optimal survival model (using likelihood) (Cooch & White 2008). We first tested for a cohort effect but found no evidence for this. Then we tested different stage structures (two, three, or four age classes) and found two stages was optimal. As the final step we compared models with no stage structure to those with two stages. Both classes of models included constant, time-variant, and environmental covariate models. The only difference was that models with no stage structure compared eight covariates (Table S1), while stage-structured models compared the three covariates (available protected hollows, number of hollows treated for bees, and number of little corellas *Cacatua sanguinea* culled) that were likely to have a stronger effect on sub-adults than adults (Mooney & Pedler 2005). Models with  $wAIC < 0.01$  are not included in Table S2.

We used parametric bootstrapping to estimate goodness-of-fit in the mark-recapture data (White 2002). We calculated  $\hat{c} = 1.08$  by dividing the observed deviance for the most parameterised model by the mean deviance from 1,000 bootstrap simulations. This low value suggests little overdispersion and requires no adjustment (White, Burnham & Anderson 2001).

For model comparisons, we report  $-2 \times \log(\text{likelihood})$  as the measure of deviance. We calculated an  $R^2$  statistic from an analysis of deviance based on the following formula from Le Bohec *et al.* (2008):  $R^2 = (\text{DEV}(\text{constant model}) - \text{DEV}(\text{covariate model})) / (\text{DEV}(\text{constant model}) - \text{DEV}(\text{time-dependent model}))$ , where DEV is deviance. The advantage of this method is that it assesses the relative effects of covariates on survival and recapture rates. We used MARK to calculate weighted averages of the parameter estimates from the Akaike weights (Burnham & Andersen 2002). Mark-resight data area continually collected by the recovery program. Researchers wishing to use GBC survival estimates should contact the recovery program for the latest figures.



73 Table S1. Covariates and their data sources for the mark-recapture survival analysis of  
 74 *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* on Kangaroo Island. **availprot** = available protected  
 75 hollows (artificial + natural); **bee** = number of hollows with honeybee *Apis mellifera*  
 76 deterrent inserted; **corella** = number of little corellas *Cacatua sanguinea* culled; **drought** =  
 77 drought index (total rainfall in previous five years); **heat** = number of summer days  $\geq 35^{\circ}\text{C}$ ;  
 78 **flow** = flow in Rocky River; **revegetation** = area revegetated with *A. verticillata* (with a six  
 79 year delay because *A. verticillata* cones require a minimum of six years to mature; PAM pers.  
 80 obs.); **fire** = repeated fire index (area burned in previous 5 years)

Covariate	Source	Possible effect on cockatoos
availprot	GBCRP data*	Nest predation by possums
bee	GBCRP data	Hollow competition
corella	GBCRP data	Hollow competition/nest predation
drought (threshold)	BOM, mean of 7 stations†	<i>A. verticillata</i> seed production and drinking water
heat	BOM, mean of 3 stations	Heat stress on adults‡
flow (threshold)	DWLBC¶	Proxy for available surface water for cockatoo drinking
revegetation	GBCRP data	<i>A. verticillata</i> seed production
fire (threshold)	GBCRP/DENR data	Reduction of nesting and feeding habitat

\*Glossy black-cockatoo recovery program. See Mooney & Pedler (2005) for details.

†Bureau of Meteorology. We used data from weather stations with the most complete collection histories: stations 22800, 22801/23, 22803, 22817, 22835, 22836, & 22839 for rain; stations 22801/23, 22803, & 22841 for temperature. <http://www.bom.gov.au>

‡Summer is defined as December of the previous year and January and February of the current year. See Cameron (2008), Saunders, Mawson & Dawson (2011) for information on heat stress in *Calyptorhynchus*.

¶Department of Water, Land, and Biodiversity Conservation. Flow of Rocky River at gorge falls, site A5130501. <http://e-nrims.dwlbc.sa.gov.au/swa/>.

Table S2. Comparison of survival model results from Cormack-Jolly-Seber models in program MARK. The optimal recapture model was stage-structured and time-dependent.

Model	$\Delta AIC_c$	$w_i$	$k$	LL	$R^2$
subad(.) ad(.)	0	0.20	15	2601.1	0.88
subad(corella) ad(.)	0.2	0.18	16	2599.2	0.90
subad(bee) ad(bee)	1.0	0.12	16	2600.0	0.89
subad(availprot) ad(.)	1.5	0.09	16	2600.5	0.88
subad(.) ad(.) + sex	1.6	0.09	16	2600.6	0.88
subad(availprot + corella) ad(.)	1.7	0.09	17	2598.6	0.90
subad(availprot) ad(availprot)	1.7	0.08	16	2600.7	0.88
subad(corella) ad(corella)	1.8	0.08	16	2600.8	0.88
subad(bee) ad(.)	2.0	0.07	16	2601.0	0.88
subad( $t$ ) ad( $t$ ) + sex	10.4	0	27	2586.6	1
constant	103.4	0	14	2706.5	0
$t$	104.4	0	25	2684.7	0.18
sex + $t$	105.5	0	26	2683.8	0.19

$t$  represents time. subad represents sub-adults, ad represents adults. Explanatory variables (Table S1) are availprot = available protected hollows, bee = hollows treated for bees, corella = number of corellas culled, repfire = repeated fires in the last five years.  $k$  indicates the number of parameters,  $AIC_c$  is Akaike's Information Criterion corrected for small samples sizes,  $\Delta AIC_c$  shows the difference between the model AIC and the minimum AIC in the set of models, AIC weights ( $w_i$ ) show the relative likelihood of model  $i$  and % DE is percent deviance explained by the model.

## *Fecundity*

We used the number of known fledglings in the population from 1996–2008 to measure reproductive output in the population. This number is calculated each year by summing the number of large nestlings seen at the nest up to a week before fledging, and additional fledglings noted during the census. Sex ratio of fledglings and adults is 1.3 and 1.5 males to females, respectively (GBC recovery program data, 1996–2008). Fecundity was calculated thus (Brook & Whitehead 2005):

$$\text{Number of nestlings of one sex produced per pair in year } i = x * \frac{\text{Number of known fledglings in year } i}{\text{population estimate in year } i * \text{proportion of females in breeding age class}}$$

The denominator represents the number of pairs alive in year  $i$  which is defined by the number of breeding females in the population because females are limiting; the proportion of females of breeding age (0.31) comes from the stable age distribution.  $x$ , the fledgling sex proportion, is equal to 0.4 and 0.6 to estimate the number of females and males produced per breeding female, respectively (LPP pers. obs.). We then multiplied the number of fledglings per female with adult survival to calculate fecundity based on a post-breeding census. This resulted in a  $\lambda < 1$ , whereas the observed population change indicated an annual rate of increase ( $R$ ) of 1.035. We thus adjusted the fecundities so that the eigenvalue of the stage matrix is 1.035.

## *Environmental stochasticity*

RAMAS GIS simulates environmental stochasticity by sampling distributions as specified by the mean and standard deviation of each stage matrix element (Akçakaya & Root 2005). To estimate standard deviation of fecundity we followed Akçakaya's (2002) approach



of subtracting the weighted average of demographic variance from the total variance. These methods are commonly used to separate demographic and environmental variability for population viability analyses (Lambert *et al.* 2006, Zeigler *et al.* 2010, Aiello-Lammens *et al.* 2011). For the standard deviation of survival estimates, we used the square root of the process error (sigma) reported by MARK (White, Burnham & Anderson 2001).

### **Appendix 3. Climate change forecasts and bioclimatic envelope modelling**

#### **Climate change forecasts**

Spatial layers describing present day climate (0.01° x 0.01° latitude/longitude ) were created by interpolating between weather station records sourced from the Queensland Government SILO patched point data base (Jeffrey *et al.* 2001), following the approach described in detail by Fordham *et al.* (in press-a).

We used MAGICC/SCENGEN v5.3 (<http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/cas/wigley/magicc>), a coupled gas cycle/aerosol/climate model used in the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007), to generate an annual time series of future climate anomalies for (2000–2100) for annual, austral winter and summer precipitation and temperature (0.5° x 0.5° latitude/longitude; annual rainfall, January temperature, and July temperature in this study). Projections were based on two emission scenarios: a high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration stabilisation reference scenario, WRE750, and a policy scenario that assumed substantive intervention in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, LEV1 (Wigley, Richels & Edmonds 1996; Wigley *et al.* 2009). Models were chosen using an assessment of model convergence and skill in predicting seasonal precipitation and temperature (see Fordham *et al.* in press-a for details). The nine skilful GCMs used to generate the multi- climate model ensemble average forecasts were GFDL-

CM2.1, MIROC3.2(hires), ECHAM5/MPI-OM, CCSM3, ECHO-G, MRI-CGCM2.3.2, UKMO-HadCM3, GFDL-CM2.1, MIROC3.2 (medres) (model terminology follows the CMIP3 model database; [http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/ipcc/about\\_ipcc.php](http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/ipcc/about_ipcc.php)). Although there is no standard procedure for assessing the skill of GCMs (Fordham, Wigley & Brook 2012), by using an ensemble model set of greater than five GCMs, the influence of model choice on model prediction skill is lessened (Murphy *et al.* 2004; Pierce *et al.* 2009).

We downscaled the climate anomalies to an ecologically relevant spatial scale (0.01 x 0.01° longitude/latitude), using the “change factor” method, whereby the low-resolution change from a GCM is added directly to a high-resolution baseline observed climatology (Hulme, Raper & Wigley 1995). One advantage of this method is that, by using only GCM change data, it avoids possible errors due to biases in the GCMs’ baseline (present-day) climate (Fordham, Wigley & Brook 2012; Fordham *et al.* 2012).

### **Bioclimatic envelope modelling**

#### *Allocasuarina verticillata* presence data

We modelled the bioclimatic envelope of *Allocasuarina verticillata* (drooping she-oak) because it provides the primary habitat and 98% of the diet of the GBC. *A. verticillata* presences came from Department of the Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) biological survey records across South Australia ([http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/Knowledge\\_Bank/Information\\_and\\_data/Biological\\_data\\_bases\\_of\\_South\\_Australia](http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/Knowledge_Bank/Information_and_data/Biological_data_bases_of_South_Australia)). The presences were carefully cleaned before inclusion; only records with an accuracy of 1 km or better were retained, duplicate and erroneous records were removed, and no opportunistic records were included, which left 572 presences for the analysis. Much of *A. verticillata*’s range has been cleared, which may influence our ability to model the species’s distribution. Using presences from across the species’s South Australian

range and requesting validation from local plant ecologists helped address this issue. An equal number of pseudoabsences were generated randomly within the study region; random pseudoabsences were appropriate in this case because of the difficulty of intensively sampling the study area (South Australia) (Wisz & Guisan 2009). Plant ecologists identified three climate variables as having the greatest general influence on *A. verticillata* survival and recruitment: mean annual rainfall, mean January temperature, and mean July temperature (Stead 2008).

### *Ensemble forecasting*

The potential distribution of *A. verticillata* was modelled with an ensemble forecasting approach (Araújo & New 2007) based on seven BEM techniques: BIOCLIM (Busby 1991), Euclidian and Mahalanobis distances (Farber & Kadmon 2003), generalised linear models (GLMs; McCullagh & Nelder 1989); Random Forest (Breiman 2001), Genetic Algorithm for Rule Set Production (Stockwell & Noble 1992), and Maximum Entropy (Phillips & Dudík 2008) in BIOENSEMBLES software (Diniz-Filho *et al.* 2009). Internal evaluation of the models was performed with a data split procedure, whereby 70% of the occurrence data were randomly split and used for calibration of the models, and the remaining 30% were used for cross-evaluation of the models. This procedure was repeated 10 times, thus generating a 10-fold cross-validation of model results. The observed prevalence of species was maintained in each partition, and for each partition we obtained alternative models by projecting ranges after performing a full factorial combination of the environmental variables used as predictors. The fitting and projection of alternative models using data partition and multiple combinations of variables was used to account for uncertainties arising from the initial conditions and model parameterization (*sensu* Araújo & New 2007). Model accuracy was measured using the average True Skill Statistic (Allouche, Tsoar & Kadmon 2006). This analysis was performed to check if a grossly implausible



projection was being made (i.e.  $TSS < 0.3$ ). However, because measures of accuracy on non-independent data do not provide a reliable benchmark for evaluation of projections of species distributional changes under climate change (Araújo *et al.* 2005), we instead used an unweighted consensus of the seven modelling techniques. The resulting map of the current distribution was validated by an expert botanist (P. Lang, DENR). We then ran the distribution models with the climate layers for 2011–2100 (described above) to create a combined time series of 91 climatic suitability maps for each year from 2010 to 2100.

The climate projected for 2100 on Kangaroo Island was within the range of variation in the training data for 2010. This was true for all three climate variables in both emissions scenarios. Therefore the bioclimatic model did not extrapolate to novel climates, which reduces uncertainty in projections (Pearson & Dawson 2003).

## **Appendix 4. Integrating population and distribution models**

### *Calculating the habitat suitability function*

The *A. verticillata* probability of occurrence maps for 2010–2100 (hereafter ‘AVS’) were added to edaphic spatial layers (substrate, slope, and native vegetation) to mask out unsuitable areas and delineate more suitable areas for *A. verticillata* and the GBC (Pearson, Dawson & Liu 2004). Substrate and slope are specific to *A. verticillata*, while native vegetation affects *A. verticillata* and the GBC.

Substrate, or geology, strongly influences soil type and is an important predictor of *A. verticillata* presence (Specht & Perry 1948; Green 1994). We collapsed category classes in the Surface Geology of Australia dataset (1:1 million scale; Raymond & Retter 2010) into 17 classes in South Australia. Expert knowledge was used to define which substrate classes are unsuitable for *A. verticillata* (mainly Holocene sands, and floodplain alluvium; P. Lang

unpubl. data). We treated areas with native vegetation (National Vegetation Information System; <http://www.environment.gov.au/erin/nvis/index.html>) as having twice the suitability of areas without native vegetation (Crowley, Garnett & Carruthers 1998). Because *A. verticillata* prefers to grow on steep, rocky slopes (Crowley, Garnett & Carruthers 1998; Crowley *et al.* 1998), we created a slope layer from a digital elevation model (DEM-9S, <http://www.ga.gov.au/meta/ANZCW0703011541.html>) in Arc GIS v9.3 (Arc GIS, Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, CA, USA).

We used binomial GLMs to relate the spatial layers to cockatoo presences and generate the habitat suitability function. Presence data for the GBC (349 points) came from active nest locations (n = 157; GBC recovery program data), band observations (n = 100; GBC recovery program data), known feeding sites (n = 18; GBC recovery program data), and the South Australian Biological Survey (n = 74). No reliable absence points were available for the GBC, so we were forced to generate pseudoabsences. Considering that the island has been well surveyed for GBCs, and that we wanted the model to focus on the factors determining its distribution within the landscapes in which one might reasonably expect to survey, we generated pseudoabsences using a positive distance weighting function that favours areas away from presences when creating pseudoabsences (Phillips *et al.* 2009; Wisz & Guisan 2009). We tested models from an *a priori* candidate model set generated using our knowledge of probable factors limiting the occurrence of GBCs. We primarily relied on Akaike's Information Criterion corrected for small sample sizes (AIC<sub>c</sub>) for model selection (Burnham & Andersen 2002), but we also calculated the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) because it is more conservative (tends to fit fewer tapering effects) and requires substantially better fit before selecting a more complex model (Bolker 2008).

#### Habitat suitability function

Our selected covariates adequately predict GBC occurrence, explaining 38.5% of the variance (Table S3). The best model (**habitat suitability ~ substrate\*slope + vegetation\*AVS**;  $wAIC$  of 0.954) became the habitat suitability function for the RAMAS model. Thus, habitat suitability is defined as:

$$\text{habitat suitability} = ((4.61 * [\text{substrate}] + 1.49 * (\text{thr}([\text{slope}], 0.01366)) - 2.11 * [\text{vegetation}] - 0.454 * (\text{thr}([\text{AVS}], 0.399)) - 0.8818 * [\text{substrate}] * (\text{thr}([\text{slope}], 0.01366)) + 3.784 * [\text{vegetation}] * (\text{thr}([\text{AVS}], 0.399))) * [\text{substrate}] / 5.34375$$

The coefficients were estimated from the binomial model. The entire equation is multiplied by substrate in order to mask out areas with unsuitable substrate, and then divided by 5.34375 to scale habitat suitability from 0 to 1 in each grid cell. We applied thresholds (thr) to slope and AVS such that this part of the equation was equal to zero unless the grid cell's value was greater than the lower fifth percentile of the variable where GBCs occur. Thresholds used in this manner better capture species' responses to continuous spatial variables in metapopulation models (DAF unpubl. data).

We used a threshold to determine a lower habitat suitability limit below which we would not expect an occurrence. Threshold selection affects range area predictions, and the choice of a threshold depends on the goals of the modelling exercise (Liu *et al.* 2005). The GBC population on Kangaroo Island has been carefully censused so we had high confidence that the distribution was well-represented by the point locality data. We aimed to characterise the current extent of medium to high quality habitat and predict the potential distribution of suitable habitat patches in the future which we did by selecting cells with a HS value higher than the value recorded for the lowest 5% of GBC presences. We used our knowledge of the species in the field to validate the resulting habitat suitability maps.



Table S3. Results of binomial GLMs relating spatial variables to *Calyptrorhynchus lathami* *halmaturinus* presences on Kangaroo Island. AVS stands for climatic suitability of *Allocasuarina verticillata* (the cockatoo's food plant). The global model had the strongest AIC<sub>c</sub> and BIC support, explaining 38.5% of model structural deviance. Of the single term models, slope had greatest support explaining 26.5% of model deviance. Models in bold had wAIC >0.01.

Model	% DE	wAIC <sub>c</sub>	Δ AIC <sub>c</sub>	wBIC	Δ BIC	k
<b>substrate*slope + vegetation*AVS</b>	38.5	0.954	0	0.497	0	7
<b>substrate*slope + vegetation + AVS</b>	35.9	0.022	7.5	0.065	4.1	6
<b>substrate + vegetation + slope + AVS</b>	35.1	0.015	8.4	0.245	1.4	5
substrate*slope + AVS	34.9	0.010	9.2	0.161	2.3	5
substrate*slope	31.4	0	20.0	0.004	9.5	4
substrate + slope	30.8	0	20.0	0.024	6.1	3
substrate + vegetation + slope	31.0	0	21.7	0.002	11.3	4
AVS*slope	30.8	0	22.1	0.001	11.6	4
slope	26.5	0	34.1	0	16.6	2
vegetation*slope	27.3	0	35.4	0	25.0	4
substrate + vegetation*AVS	20.0	0	64.6	0	57.6	5
substrate	10.8	0	92.6	0	75.1	2
vegetation*AVS	6.7	0	111.9	0	101.5	4
AVS	3.3	0	120.2	0	102.7	2
null	0	0	130.5	0	109.5	1
vegetation	0.04	0	132.4	0	114.9	2

## Carrying capacity

Estimates of carrying capacity were based on previous research on *A. verticillata* productivity and extent on Kangaroo Island, and known density of GBCs in *A. verticillata* stands. One hectare of moderate quality she-oak habitat (334,000 cones) supports approximately 7.5 birds (Crowley, Garnett & Pedler 1997; Chapman & Paton 2002). The current area of *A. verticillata* on Kangaroo Island is 4,900 ha (SA DENR data), so the approximate carrying capacity of the island is 653 birds. This is a maximum estimate of current carrying capacity given that GBCs only feed on c. 10% of available *A. verticillata* (Chapman & Paton 2005). In RAMAS we used a scaling constant (0.233) to relate the known carrying capacity to the number of suitable cells (noc). We applied a threshold to the equation to eliminate very small unviable patches with carrying capacity <10 birds:

$$K = \text{thr}(0.233 * \text{noc}, 10)$$

## Initial abundance

Initial abundance was calculated in a similar way. Annual censuses of the population estimated the current population size at c. 350 individuals, so we used a lower scaling constant to approximate this:

$$N_{\text{initial}} = \text{thr}(0.125 * \text{noc}, 10)$$

We ran trial scenarios with initial abundances of 100 and 200 birds and found that the population showed the same general responses as with 350 birds. These trials, combined with the carrying capacity of 653 under ceiling density dependence, suggest that the model was not very sensitive to initial population size.

284

285 Dispersal

286       Data on movements of marked birds were used to estimate annual dispersal. Available  
287 information suggests that approximately 73% of birds leave the general natal area annually  
288 and 23% of these leave the wider flock region, so c. 17% of birds disperse annually  
289 (Southgate 2002; Mooney & Pedler 2005). Dispersers moved an average of 44 km and up to  
290 78 km (Southgate 2002). This high rate of dispersal supports our use of mark-recapture-  
291 derived survival estimates even though only a portion of the island is covered by the mark-  
292 recapture surveys. Our dispersal function had 17% of birds dispersing  $\geq 28$  km annually and  
293 1% of the population (4 birds) dispersing 78 km annually (Fig. S1). We modelled dispersal as  
294 a function of the distance between the centres of suitable habitat patches.

295 **dispersal  $\sim a = 0.8, b = 16.5, c = 1$**






Figure S1. Annual dispersal-distance curve for the *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* population on Kangaroo Island.

#### Correlation among grid cells

Environmental variability was set to be correlated between populations depending on their spatial separation. Pairwise correlations were calculated using an exponential function,  $P = a \cdot \exp(D^{c/b})$ , where  $D$  is the distance between centroids of habitat patches and  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are

constants. Following Keith et al. (2008), we used regional variation in year-to-year annual rainfall across South Australia to approximate environmental variability ( $a = 0.79$ ,  $b = 1266$ ,  $c = 1$ ).

## Appendix 5. RAMAS scenarios and sensitivity analysis

### *Fire*

#### Baseline fire frequency

Four fires burned >10% of Kangaroo Island from 1950–2008, which yields an annual probability of severe fire of 6.8% (GBC recovery program data). Our vital rates estimates included the effects of past severe fires so we included observed fire frequency in the baseline scenarios. We modelled fire probability as being the lowest after a fire (0.1% probability) and then increasing with mounting fuel loads until the maximum probability (6.8%) is reached after seven years (Keith *et al.* 2008). To maintain structural simplicity of the model, it was assumed that fires burnt entire patches (i.e. no fire heterogeneity within patches)

#### Impacts of fire on the GBC

The best data on the effects of a severe fire on the GBC come from 2007 when fires burned 85,920 ha (19.5% of the island), destroying five known nest sites and 425 ha of *A. verticillata* feeding habitat (Sobey & Pedler 2008). Based on nesting data from 1997–2003, if five nests are lost, fecundity is reduced by 8–12%. Therefore we modelled the effects of a severe fire as having a 10% reduction in fecundity. Reduction in feeding habitat from severe fires is expected to have a minor, delayed impact on survival (DCP pers. obs.), so we modelled this effect by reducing sub-adult and adult survival by 3% after a severe fire.

326

327 Climate change and increased fire management

328       Climate change is predicted to cause a substantial increase in the number of days with  
329 very high to extreme fire danger on the Fleurieu Peninsula (Lucas *et al.* 2007). These  
330 predictions suggest that severe fire danger will increase by 5% or 25% by 2050 for low and  
331 high emissions scenarios, respectively. We interpreted these changes as percent increases in  
332 base probability of fire on Kangaroo Island and used the 2050 estimates as guidelines.  
333 Making the conservative assumption that there is a linear correlation between fire frequency  
334 and fire days, increases of 5% and 25% would yield annual fire probabilities of 7.1% and  
335 8.5% on Kangaroo Island. We also considered a nonlinear example where a 2.2-fold increase  
336 in fire frequency yielded a 15% annual fire probability on Kangaroo Island (approximately  
337 doubling the current probability). We also investigated the impact of increasing fire  
338 management to reduce the annual probability of severe fire by half to 3.4%.

339

340 *Disease*

341       Psittacine beak-and-feather disease typically kills juvenile parrots only (DEH 2005).  
342 Virulence of the disease varies; major epidemics with high mortality can occur in isolated  
343 parrot populations with little immunity, while populations with previous exposure to the  
344 disease are more resilient (DEH 2005; Khalesi 2007). There have been no recorded cases of  
345 beak-and-feather disease on Kangaroo Island (LPP pers. obs.), so we assumed low immunity  
346 and high mortality. Little corellas regularly cross from the mainland to Kangaroo Island  
347 (Mooney & Pedler 2005) and could serve as vectors of the disease (DEH 2005). We modelled  
348 a possible outbreak by reducing survival of zero year olds and one year olds by 50%. We set

the annual probability of an outbreak at 5% and the probability of an infected dispersing bird transmitting the disease at 75%. While the values of these parameters are poorly known in the wild (Khalesi 2007) an expert on beak-and-feather disease confirmed that our parameterisation was realistic (M. Holdsworth, pers. comm.).

#### *Active management*

##### Brushtail possum management

The GBC recovery team manages nest-predating brush-tail possums *Trichosurus vulpecula* by placing metal collars around the trunks of GBC nest trees and pruning overlapping tree crowns to prevent access to nest trees (Mooney & Pedler 2005). Possum management can increase fecundity by 78% (the probability of an egg producing a fledgling increases from 23% to 41%; Garnett, Pedler & Crowley 1999). If possum management were stopped, fecundity would decrease by approximately 44%. We assumed a linear decrease in fecundity after stopping management in 2010. By 2025 (15 years after stopping management) all benefits from protected hollows are modelled as being lost (no new hollows protected, tree crowns overlap, and metal collars rust and fall off trees; LPP pers. obs.) and fecundity is 44% lower.

##### Correalla management

The little corella *Cacatua sanguinea* population on Kangaroo Island has increased substantially over time, probably as a result of land clearance and grain cropping (Garnett *et al.* 2000). Corellas compete with GBCs for nests and kill GBC nestlings. As a result, corellas found near GBC nests have been culled since 1998. If corella management were stopped, it

has been estimated that approximately two GBC nestlings would be lost per year (Garnett, Pedler & Crowley 1999; PAM pers. obs.), so we modelled stopping corella management as causing a 7% drop in fecundity. We simulated stopping management in 2010 and assumed a linear decrease in fecundity that took five years to reach the 7% reduction.

## Revegetation

Volunteers and the GBC recovery team have planted *A. verticillata* on Kangaroo Island since 1988 in an effort to augment GBC food sources. From 1996–2007, 39.3 ha were revegetated which amounts to 3.5 ha per year on average. Most revegetation is now done near traditional nesting areas where remnant *Allocasuarina verticillata* has been reduced considerably by clearing. Consequently, the current revegetation rate can be approximated as boosting fecundity by approximately 3% annually (PAM pers. obs.). We modelled stopping revegetation as causing a linear decline in fecundity that lead to a 3% drop in five years.

We also simulated the effects of stopping all management actions (possum, corella, and revegetation in 2010). This lead to a 24.7% decrease in fecundity in five years and a 54% drop in 15 years.

## **Sensitivity analysis**

For the Latin Hypercube sensitivity analysis we took samples from 200 equal-width strata (following the method described in Brook, Griffiths & Puckey 2002) along the following ranges of parameter values relative to the value used in the RAMAS models: adult survival ( $\pm 5\%$ ), sub-adult survival ( $\pm 10\%$ ), fecundity ( $\pm 10\%$ ), carrying capacity ( $\pm 20\%$ ), and annual dispersal ( $\pm 20\%$ ) (Brook, Griffiths & Puckey 2002). The range for fecundity is

equivalent to the standard error around the parameter estimate. The ranges for survival needed to be larger than the standard errors to evaluate the model's sensitivity over a plausible range. We used large ranges for carrying capacity and dispersal for the same reason.

Standardised regression coefficients, calculated by dividing the coefficient of each parameter by its standard error, and then weighting the resulting coefficients to sum to 1 (Conroy & Brook 2003), were used to assess the sensitivity of the model to the input parameters. The coefficients were estimated by fitting a quasiPoisson GLM (to correct for overdispersion) with all of the sensitivity analysis parameters (adult survival, sub-adult survival, fecundity, carrying capacity, and annual dispersal). The non-linear, near-threshold relationship between adult survival and final population size was broken into two parts and was best dealt with by fitting a segmented model (Fig. 5; Muggeo 2012). Therefore, the GLM included a segmented fit for adult survival which resulted in two parameters, one above and one below the breakpoint. The breakpoints were estimated at  $0.893 \pm 0.00081$  SE for no climate change (6 iterations to reach convergence),  $0.895 \pm 0.0011$  SE for LEV1 (8 iterations), and  $0.886 \pm 0.0010$  SE for WRE750 (4 iterations). Bootstrapping with 10,000 samples was used to estimate the 95% confidence intervals for the parameter estimates.



Table S4. Latin Hypercube sensitivity analysis results. Standardised regression coefficients were calculated from generalised linear models to rank six sensitivity parameters in order of their importance on *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus* mean final population size. “adult survival-low” is the parameter below the break point in the segmented model and “adult survival-high” is the above the break point.

	standardised coefficient	coefficient	lower CI	upper CI
<b>no climate change</b>				
adult survival-low	0.485	78.9	65.8	103.4
carrying capacity	0.211	0.0011	0.0009	0.0014
juvenile survival	0.110	1.26	0.76	1.86
fecundity, daughters	0.087	2.63	1.15	4.37
dispersal	0.041	-0.18	-0.39	0.01
fecundity, sons	0.033	0.79	-0.22	1.88
adult survival-high	0.033	0.76	0.27	1.78
<b>LEV1</b>				
adult survival-low	0.412	64.4	50.5	152.8
carrying capacity	0.246	0.96	0.75	1.14
sub-adult survival	0.154	1.98	1.24	2.77
fecundity, daughters	0.093	3.10	1.41	5.04
fecundity, sons	0.060	1.58	0.18	2.86
dispersal	0.022	0.11	-0.11	0.34
adult survival-high	0.013	0.35	-0.49	4.26
<b>WRE750</b>				
adult survival-low	0.327	67.7	45.2	131.4
carrying capacity	0.319	1.05	0.90	1.19
sub-adult survival	0.141	1.50	0.85	2.18
fecundity, sons	0.076	1.69	0.43	3.16
fecundity, daughters	0.071	1.99	0.51	3.59
dispersal	0.039	-0.16	-0.39	0.07
adult survival-high	0.026	0.49	-0.31	1.81

419 Table S5. Sensitivity of results to parameterisation of disease outbreaks.

Scenario	Mean final population size $\pm$ SD
baseline	649.66 $\pm$ 1.9
disease outbreak, 5% annual probability, sub-adult survival reduced by 50% <sup>1</sup>	636.79 $\pm$ 29.1
disease outbreak, 10% annual probability, sub-adult survival reduced by 50%	605.35 $\pm$ 65.3
disease outbreak, 5% annual probability, sub-adult survival reduced by 75%	607.02 $\pm$ 69.6
disease outbreak, 10% annual probability, sub-adult survival reduced by 75%	449.25 $\pm$ 164.6

420 <sup>1</sup>This is the parameterisation used in the present study (see Appendix 5).

421




Figure S2. Mean final population size of persisting runs ( $\pm$  SD) of *Calyptorhynchus lathami* *halmaturinus* under no climate change, a greenhouse gas mitigation policy scenario (LEV1), and a high-CO<sub>2</sub>-concentration stabilisation reference scenario (WRE750). The initial population size was 350 individuals (dashed line). Baseline = baseline scenario that includes observed fire frequency; disease = beak-and-feather disease outbreak; - 50% indicates 50% reduction in fire frequency from increased management; +5%, +25%, and +220% (i.e., 2.2-fold increase) indicate increasing fire frequency from climate change. The last four groups of bars show the effects of ceasing management. “Revegetation”, “corella”, and “possum” indicate stopping revegetation, little corella *Cacatua sanguinea*, and brush-tail possum *Trichosurus vulpecula* management, respectively. “All” indicates stopping all management actions.

## References

- Aiello-Lammens, M.E., Chu-Agor, M.L., Convertino, M., Fischer, R.A., Linkov, I. & Akçakaya, H.R. (2011) The impact of sea level rise on snowy plovers in Florida: integrating geomorphological, habitat, and metapopulation models. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 3644–3654.
- Akçakaya, H.R. (2002) Estimating the variance of survival rates and fecundities. *Animal Conservation*, **5**, 333–336.
- Akçakaya, H.R. & Root, W.T. (2005) *RAMAS GIS: Linking landscape data with population viability analysis (version 5.0)*. Applied Biomathematics, Setauket, New York, USA.
- Allouche, O., Tsoar, A. & Kadmon, R. (2006) Assessing the accuracy of species distribution models: prevalence, kappa and the true skill statistic (TSS). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **43**, 1223–1232.
- Araújo, M.B. & New, M. (2007) Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **22**, 42–47.
- Araújo, M.B., Pearson, R.G., Thuiller, W. & Erhard, M. (2005) Validation of species-climate impact models under climate change. *Global Change Biology*, **11**, 1504–1513.
- Bolker, B.M. (2008) *Ecological models and data in R*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA.
- Breiman, L. (2001) Random Forests. *Machine Learning*, **45**, 5–32.
- Brook, B.W., Griffiths, A.D. & Puckey, H.L. (2002) Modelling strategies for the management of the critically endangered Carpentarian rock-rat (*Zyzomys palatalis*) of northern Australia. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **65**, 355–368.

458 Brook, B.W. & Whitehead, P.J. (2005) Plausible bounds for maximum rate of increase in  
 459 magpie geese (*Anseranas semipalmata*): implications for harvest. *Wildlife Research*,  
 460 **32**, 465–471.

461 Burnham, K.P. & Andersen, D.R. (2002) *Model selection and multimodel inference, 2nd ed.*  
 462 Springer, New York.

463 Busby, J.R. (1991) BIOCLIM: a bioclimate analysis and prediction system. *Plant protection*  
 464 *quarterly*, **6**, 8–9.

465 Cameron, M. (2008) Global warming and glossy black-cockatoos. *Wingspan*, **18**, 16–19.

466 Chapman, T.F. & Paton, D.C. (2002) *Factors influencing the production of seeds by*  
 467 *Allocasuarina verticillata and the foraging behaviour of glossy black-cockatoos on*  
 468 *Kangaroo Island*. Unpublished report to Wildlife Conservation Fund (project number  
 469 2506), Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.

470 Chapman, T.F. & Paton, D.C. (2005) The glossy black-cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus lathami*  
 471 *halmaturinus*) spends little time and energy foraging on Kangaroo Island, South  
 472 Australia. *Australian Journal of Zoology*, **53**, 177–183.

473 Conroy, S.D.S. & Brook, B.W. (2003) Demographic sensitivity and persistence of the  
 474 threatened white- and orange-bellied frogs of Western Australia. *Population Ecology*,  
 475 **45**, 105–114.

476 Cooch, E.G. & White, G.C. (2008) Program MARK: a gentle introduction. 7th ed. Available  
 477 at: <http://www.phidot.org/software/mark/docs/book/> (accessed 15 January 2009).

478 Crowder, L.B., Crouse, D.T., Heppell, S.S. & Martin, T. (1994) Predicting the impact of  
 479 turtle excluder devices on loggerhead sea turtle populations. *Ecological Applications*,  
 480 **43**, 437–445.

481 Crowley, G.M., Garnett, S.T. & Carruthers, S. (1998) Mapping and spatial analysis of  
 482 existing and potential Glossy black-cockatoo habitat on Kangaroo Island. Report to

the Glossy black-cockatoo Recovery Team. Department of Environment, Heritage,  
and Aboriginal Affairs. Kingscote, SA, Australia.

Crowley, G.M., Garnett, S.T., Meakins, W. & Heinrich, A. (1998) Protection and re-  
establishment of Glossy black-cockatoo habitat in South Australia: evaluation and  
recommendations. Report to the glossy black-cockatoo rescue fund, South Australian  
National Parks Foundation. Available at:  
<http://users.adam.com.au/kic01/glossy/reveg01.html> (accessed 12 September 2011).

Crowley, G.M., Garnett, S.T. & Pedler, L.P. (1997) Assessment of the role of captive  
breeding and translocation in the recovery of the South Australian subspecies of the  
glossy black-cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*. Birds Australia Report  
5. Birds Australia, Carlton, Victoria, Australia.

DEH (2005) Threat abatement plan for beak and feather disease affecting psittacine species.  
Department of Environment and Heritage, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia. Available  
at:  
[http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/tap/pubs/beak-  
feather-tap.pdf](http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/tap/pubs/beak-feather-tap.pdf) (accessed 12 September 2011).

Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Mauricio Bini, L., Fernando Rangel, T., Loyola, R.D., Hof, C., Nogués-  
Bravo, D. & Araújo, M.B. (2009) Partitioning and mapping uncertainties in  
ensembles of forecasts of species turnover under climate change. *Ecography*, **32**, 897–  
906.

Farber, O. & Kadmon, R. (2003) Assessment of alternative approaches for bioclimatic  
modeling with special emphasis on the Mahalanobis distance. *Ecological Modelling*,  
**160**, 115–130.

Fordham, D.A., Akçakaya, H.R., Araújo, M.B. & Brook, B.W. (in press-a) Modelling range  
shifts for invasive vertebrates in response to climate change. *Wildlife conservation in*



*a changing climate* (eds J. Brodie, E. Post & D. Doak). University of Chicago Press,  
Chicago, IL.

Fordham, D.A., Wigley, T.M.L. & Brook, B.W. (2012) Multi-model climate projections for  
biodiversity risk assessments. *Ecological Applications*, **32**, 3317–3331.

Fordham, D.A., Wigley, T.M.L., Watts, M.J. & Brook, B.W. (2012) Strengthening forecasts  
of climate change impacts with multi-model ensemble averaged projections using  
MAGICC/SCENGEN 5.3. *Ecography*, **35**, 4–8.

Garnett, S.T., Crowley, G.M., Pedler, L.P., Prime, W., Twyford, K.L. & Maguire, A. (2000)  
*Recovery plan for the South Australian subspecies of Glossy black-cockatoo*  
(*Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*): 1999–2003. Version 4.0. Report to the  
Threatened Species and Communities Section, Environment Australia. Available at:  
[http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/action/birds2000](http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/action/birds2000/pubs/g-b-cockatoo-ki.pdf)  
[/pubs/g-b-cockatoo-ki.pdf](http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/action/birds2000/pubs/g-b-cockatoo-ki.pdf) (accessed 12 September 2011).

Garnett, S.T., Pedler, L.P. & Crowley, G.M. (1999) The breeding biology of the glossy black-  
cockatoo *Calyptorhynchus lathami* on Kangaroo Island, South Australia. *Emu*, **99**,  
262–279.

Green, P.S. (1994) *Vegetation ecology of the central Mount Lofty Ranges*. Report to the  
Department of Botany, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia,  
Australia.

Heinsohn, R., Zeriga, T., Murphy, S., Igag, P., Legge, S. & Mack, A.L. (2009) Do palm  
cockatoos (*Probosciger aterrimus*) have long enough lifespans to support their low  
reproductive success? *Emu*, **109**, 183–191.

Hulme, M., Raper, S.C.B. & Wigley, T.M.L. (1995) An integrated framework to address  
climate change (ESCAPE) and further developments of the global and regional  
climate modules (MAGICC). *Energy Policy*, **23**, 347–355.

533 IPCC (2007) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: fourth assessment report (AR4).  
534 Available at: <http://www.ipcc.ch> (accessed on 12 September 2011).

535 Jeffrey, S.J., Carter, J.O., Moodie, K.B. & Beswick, A.R. (2001) Using spatial interpolation  
536 to construct a comprehensive archive of Australian climate data. *Environmental*  
537 *Modelling and Software*, **16**, 309–330.

538 Keith, D.A., Akçakaya, H.R., Thuiller, W., Midgley, G.F., Pearson, R.G., Phillips, S.J.,  
539 Regan, H.M., Araújo, M.B. & Rebelo, T.G. (2008) Predicting extinction risks under  
540 climate change: coupling stochastic population models with dynamic bioclimatic  
541 habitat models. *Biology Letters*, **4**, 560–563.

542 Khalesi, B. (2007) *Studies of beak and feather disease virus infection*. PhD thesis, Murdoch  
543 University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia.

544 Lacy, R.C. (1993) Vortex: A computer simulation model for population viability analysis.  
545 *Wildlife Research*, **20**, 45–65.

546 Lambert, C. M. S. Wielgus, R.B., Robinson, H.S., Katnik, D.D., Cruickshank, H.S., Clarke,  
547 R. & Almack, J. (2006) Cougar population dynamics and viability in the Pacific  
548 Northwest. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, **70**, 246–254.

549 Le Bohec, C., Durant, J.M., Gauthier-Clerc, M., Stenseth, N.C., Park, Y.-H., Pradel, R.,  
550 Grémillet, D., Gendner, J.-P. & Le Maho, Y. (2008) King penguin population  
551 threatened by Southern Ocean warming. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
552 *Sciences*, **105**, 2493–2497.

553 Liu, C.R., Berry, P.M., Dawson, T.P. & Pearson, R.G. (2005) Selecting thresholds of  
554 occurrence in the prediction of species distributions. *Ecography*, **28**, 385–393.

555 Lucas, C., Hennessy, K., Mills, G. & Bathols, J. (2007) *Bushfire weather in southeast*  
556 *Australia: recent trends and projected climate change impacts*. Consultancy report for  
557 the Climate Institute of Australia. Bushfire CRC and Australian Bureau of

558 Meteorology, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research, Melbourne, Victoria,  
 559 Australia.

560 McCullagh, P. & Nelder, J.A. (1989) *Generalized linear models. 2nd ed*, second edn.  
 561 Chapman and Hall/CRC, London.

562 Mooney, P.A. & Pedler, L.P. (2005) Recovery plan for the South Australian subspecies of the  
 563 glossy black-cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus lathami halmaturinus*): 2005–2010.  
 564 Unpublished report to the Department for Environment and Heritage, Adelaide, South  
 565 Australia, Australia.

566 Muggeo, V.M.R. (2012) Package segmented: Segmented relationships in  
 567 regression models. Version 0.2-8.4.

568 Murphy, J.M., Sexton, D.M.H., Barnett, D.N., Jones, G.S., Webb, M.J. & Collins, M. (2004)  
 569 Quantification of modelling uncertainties in a large ensemble of climate change  
 570 simulations. *Nature*, **430**, 768–772.

571 Pardon, L.G., Brook, B.W., Griffiths, A.D. & Braithwaite, R.W. (2003) Determinants of  
 572 survival for the northern brown bandicoot under a landscape-scale fire experiment.  
 573 *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **72**, 106–115.

574 Pearson, R.G., Dawson, T.P. & Liu, C. (2004) Modelling species distributions in Britain: a  
 575 hierarchical integration of climate and land-cover data. *Ecography*, **27**, 285–298.

576 Pepper, J.W. (1996) *The behavioral ecology of the glossy black-cockatoo* *Calyptorhynchus*  
 577 *lathami halmaturinus*. PhD thesis. The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

578 Phillips, S.J. & Dudík, M. (2008) Modeling of species distributions with Maxent: new  
 579 extensions and a comprehensive evaluation. *Ecography*, **31**, 161–175.

580 Phillips, S.J., Dudík, M., Elith, J., Graham, C.H., Lehman, A., Leathwick, J. & Ferrier, S.  
 581 (2009) Sample selection bias and presence-only distribution models: implications for  
 582 background and pseudo-absence data. *Ecological Applications*, **19**, 181–197.

583 Pierce, D.W., Barnett, T.P., Santer, B.D. & Gleckler, P.J. (2009) Selecting global climate  
584 models for regional climate change studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
585 *Sciences of the United States of America*, **106**, 8441–8446.

586 Possingham, H.P. & Davies, I. (1995) ALEX: A population viability analysis model for  
587 spatially structured populations. *Biological Conservation*, **73**, 143–150.

588 Raymond, O.L. & Retter, A.J. (2010) *Surface geology of Australia 1:1,000,000 scale, 2010*  
589 *edition*. Geoscience Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.

590 Saunders, D.A., Mawson, P. & Dawson, R. (2011) The impact of two extreme weather events  
591 and other causes of death on Carnaby’s Black Cockatoo: a promise of things to come  
592 for a threatened species? *Pacific Conservation Biology*, **17**, 141–148.

593 Sobey, E. & Pedler, L.P. (2008) Impacts of the Kangaroo Island fires. Chewings, glossy  
594 black-cockatoo newsletter, number 27. Department of Environment and Natural  
595 Resources, Kingscote, South Australia, Australia.

596 Southgate, R. (2002) *Population viability analysis for the South Australian glossy black-*  
597 *cockatoo*. Unpublished report to the Glossy black-cockatoo Recovery Team,  
598 Department for Environment and Heritage, South Australia, Australia.

599 Specht, R.L. & Perry, R.A. (1948) The plant ecology of part of the Mount Lofty Ranges 1.  
600 *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia*, **72**, 91–132.

601 Stead, M.G. (2008) *Niche area sensitivity of tree species in the Mount Lofty Ranges to*  
602 *climate change*. Flinders University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.

603 Stockwell, D.R.B. & Noble, I.R. (1992) Induction of sets of rules from animal distribution  
604 data: a robust and informative method of data analysis. *Mathematics and Computers*  
605 *in Simulation*, **33**, 385–390.

606 White, G.C. (2002) Discussion comments on: the use of auxiliary variables in capture-  
607 recapture modelling. An overview. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, **29**, 103–106.

608 White, G.C., Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2001) Advanced features of program  
609 MARK. *Integrating People and Wildlife for a Sustainable Future: Proceedings of the*  
610 *Second International Wildlife Management Congress* (ed. R. Fields). The Wildlife  
611 Society, Bethesda, MD, USA, Gödöllő, Hungary.

612 Wigley, T.M.L., Clarke, L.E., Edmonds, J.A., Jacoby, H.D., Paltsev, S., Pitcher, H., Reilly,  
613 J.M., Richels, R., Sarofim, M.C. & Smith, S.J. (2009) Uncertainties in climate  
614 stabilization. *Climatic Change*, **97**, 85–121.

615 Wigley, T.M.L., Richels, R. & Edmonds, J.A. (1996) Economic and environmental choices in  
616 the stabilization of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. *Nature*, **379**, 240–243.

617 Wisz, M.S. & Guisan, A. (2009) Do pseudo-absence selection strategies influence species  
618 distribution models and their predictions? An information-theoretic approach based  
619 on simulated data. *BMC Ecology*, **9**, 8.

620 Zeigler, S.L., DeFries, R. & Raboy, B.E. (2010) Identifying important forest patches for the  
621 long-term persistence of the endangered golden-headed lion tamarin (*Leontopithecus*  
622 *chrysomelas*). *Tropical Conservation Science*, **3**, 63–77.

623