



WILEY

## Climate change vulnerability assessment of species

Journal:	<i>WIREs Climate Change</i>
Manuscript ID	WCC-825.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Overview
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Jul-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Foden, Wendy; Stellenbosch University Faculty of Science, Botany &amp; Zoology          Young, Bruce; NatureServe          Akcakaya, Resit; Stony Brook University          Garcia, Raquel; Stellenbosch University Faculty of Science, Botany and Zoology          Hoffmann, Ary; University of Melbourne, School of Biosciences          Stein, Bruce; National Wildlife Federation          Thomas, Christopher ; University of York, Biology          Wheatley, Christopher ; University of York, Biology          Bickford, David; University of La Verne, Biology          Carr, Jamie; University of Leeds Faculty of Biological Sciences, Sustainability Research Institute          Hole, David; Conservation International, Moore Center for Science          Martin, Tara; University of British Columbia Department of Forest and Conservation Sciences, Forest and Conservation Sciences          Pacifici, Michela; Universita degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza Facolta di Scienze Matematiche Fisiche e Naturali, Biologia e Biotecnologie "Charles Darwin"          Pearce-Higgins, James; British Trust for Ornithology          Platts, Philip; University of York, Biology          Visconti, Piero; Institute of Zoology of the Zoological Society of London          Watson, James; University of Queensland, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences          Huntley, Brian; Durham University, Department of Biosciences</p>
Keywords:	climate change vulnerability, species conservation, conservation planning, IUCN Red List, vulnerability assessment
Choose 1-3 topics to categorize your article:	

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT OF SPECIES**

Article Type: Overview

**Authors:**

Wendy B. Foden\*, Bruce E. Young, H. Resit Akçakaya, Raquel A. Garcia, Ary Hoffman, Bruce A. Stein, Chris D. Thomas, Christopher J. Wheatley, David Bickford, Jamie A. Carr, David Hole, Tara Martin, Michela Pacifici, James W. Pearce-Higgins, Philip J. Platts, Piero Visconti, James Watson and Brian Huntley


\*Corresponding Author

**ABSTRACT**

Assessing species' vulnerability to climate change is a prerequisite for developing effective strategies to conserve them. The last three decades have seen exponential growth in the number of studies evaluating how, how much, why, when, and where species will be impacted by climate change. We provide an overview of the rapidly developing field of climate change vulnerability assessment (CCVA) and describe the key concepts, terms, important steps and considerations. We stress the importance of identifying the full range of pressures, impacts and their associated mechanisms that species face and using this as a basis for selecting the appropriate assessment approaches for quantifying vulnerability. We outline four CCVA assessment approaches, namely trait-based, correlative, mechanistic and combined approaches and discuss their use. Since any assessment can deliver unreliable or even misleading results when incorrect data and parameters are applied, we discuss finding, selecting, and applying input data and provide examples of open-access resources. Because rare, small-range, and declining-range species are often of particular concern and pose significant challenges for CCVA, we describe alternative ways to assess them. We also describe how CCVAs can be used to inform IUCN Red List assessments of extinction risk. Finally, we suggest future directions in this field and propose areas where research efforts may be particularly valuable.

## 30 GRAPHICAL/VISUAL ABSTRACT

### STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT OF SPECIES

32 **Caption:**

33 Assessing species' vulnerability to climate change is becoming a prerequisite for  
 34 conservation planning, but approaches for doing so are varied. Navigate a sound path  
 35 through do's and don'ts, and explore resources and future perspectives in this exciting field.

1  
2  
3 36  
4  
5 37  
6  
7 38  
8 39  
9 40  
10 41  
11 42  
12 43  
13 44  
14 45  
15 46  
16  
17  
18  
19 47  
20 48  
21 49  
22 50  
23 51  
24 52  
25 53  
26 54  
27 55  
28 56  
29 57  
30 58  
31 59  
32 60  
33 61  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 62  
39 63  
40 64  
41 65  
42 66  
43 67  
44 68  
45 69  
46 70  
47 71  
48 72  
49 73  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**INTRODUCTION**

In 2016, the Bramble Cay Melomys (*Melomys rubicola*) became the first documented case of climate-induced extinction among contemporary mammals (Gynther *et al.*, 2016; IUCN, 2017). This Australian rodent, endemic to the small, low-elevation island of Bramble Cay, near Papua New Guinea, was periodically recorded from 1978 to late 2009 (Limpus *et al.*, 1983; Latch, 2008; Gynther *et al.*, 2016). Over the last decade, waves overtopping at least parts of the island due to rising sea levels, along with increasingly frequent and severe storm surges, led to dramatic habitat loss and possibly direct mortality of individual animals. Intensive searches in 2011 and 2014 failed to detect any remaining individuals (Gynther *et al.*, 2016). The species is not represented in *ex situ* collections and is therefore considered extinct.

The Bramble Cay Melomys joins a rapidly growing number of species for which the impacts of anthropogenic climate change have been documented. These species span: different biological kingdoms, including plants and animals; most latitudes, including polar, temperate, subtropical and tropical; many ecosystems, including those of the marine, freshwater and terrestrial realms; all the principal terrestrial biomes, from tundra to equatorial rainforest; and most habitat types, including coral reefs, forests, deserts, grasslands and wetlands (e.g. Gardner *et al.*, 2015; Hughes *et al.*, 2003; Pounds *et al.*, 2006; Chen *et al.*, 2009; Doney *et al.*, 2011; Whinam *et al.*, 2014; Mason *et al.*, 2015a; Ramula *et al.*, 2015; Scheffers *et al.*, 2016). Within species, impacts have been shown at levels from genes and individuals to populations, and changes in composition of communities and in inter-specific interactions are also prevalent (e.g. Gardner *et al.*, 2015; Chen *et al.*, 2011; Ramula *et al.*, 2015; Scheffers *et al.*, 2016). These impacts have occurred at global mean temperature increases of less than 1°C, yet without major reductions in emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, a rise of 2°C or more is increasingly probable. As a result, many more impacts including species declines and extinctions are likely, with the potential to undermine ecosystem health and function (Martin & Watson, 2016; Pecl *et al.*, 2017).

How can further climate change-driven extinctions and negative impacts be minimised? The emerging field of ‘climate-smart’ nature conservation aims to update conservation principles and practice to lessen climate change’s impact on biodiversity (Stein *et al.*, 2014). Fundamental to choosing effective species’ conservation strategies is the need to address the questions: ‘What effects are climate changes already having?’ and ‘What is likely to happen in the future?’. In conservation terms, this requires robust assessments of species’ vulnerability to climate change. Questions often asked in the context of climate change impacts on species include ‘Which species?’, ‘How?’, ‘How much?’, ‘When?’, ‘Where?’ and ‘What remains unknown?’ Performing a climate change vulnerability assessment (CCVA) underpins subsequent identification, prioritisation and implementation of adaptation management options (Glick *et al.*, 2011; Foden & Young, 2016) (Figure 1). Answering these questions is of critical importance if we are to identify modifications needed for current conservation strategies and interventions.

Over the past decade interest in assessing the climate change vulnerability of biodiversity has increased explosively among managers, planners, policy makers, and researchers working at local, regional and global scales. Nonetheless, predicting climate change impacts on biodiversity remains a major challenge to science (Pereira *et al.*, 2010; Pacifici *et al.*, 2015), and studies comparing assessments with observed changes have met with limited success (Wheatley *et al.*, 2017). Further research is required. This review responds to the proliferation of literature on individual species assessments that predominate over assessments at other biological scales. Based on a collective effort to develop practical, user-friendly guidance for CCVA of species (Foden & Young, 2016), we share key concepts, and guide readers through commonly-used concepts and terms, steps for carrying out assessments, and selecting methods, as well as approaches for communicating and applying results. We outline resources available for users seeking more detailed or specific guidance. Finally, we discuss use of the results in Red List assessments of extinction risk, as well as promising new directions in this rapidly developing field. Since CCVA ultimately feeds into the wider context of identifying leverage points for minimising negative impacts of the climate change crisis on biodiversity (Figure 1), we consistently draw readers' attention back to this conservation context. Vulnerability assessment is primarily about identifying potential problems that must be planned for and addressed by appropriate environmental and conservation policies and actions.




Figure 1: Steps for developing climate change adaptation strategies (Adapted from Glick *et al.* (2011))

## THE EMERGENCE OF CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT

Although the influence of the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide on global climate had been identified already in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (Arrhenius, 1896), it was only during the late 1970s that concern about human impacts upon the climate system really began to grow. This concern grew rapidly such that by the mid-1980s there was a steady flow of scientific publications, including such

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

landmarks as the SCOPE 29 volume (Bolin *et al.*, 1986) that addressed the potential impacts upon ecosystems both of projected climate changes and of the direct effects of increasing carbon dioxide concentration. In 1987 the International Council of Scientific Unions established the International Geosphere–Biosphere Programme that stimulated international research organised around six core projects, including ‘Global Change and Terrestrial Ecosystems’, and that led to numerous influential publications (e.g. Walker & Steffen, 1996). The rapid growth in international concern also led to the establishment in 1988 of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that produced its first report in 1990 in which it discussed, albeit briefly, the potential impacts upon biodiversity and identified the potentially most vulnerable ecosystems (Street *et al.*, 1990). The implications for conventional approaches to biodiversity conservation began to be discussed around the same time (e.g. Hunter, Jacobson, & Webb, 1988; Huntley & Webb III, 1988) and the lessons that could be learned from studies of Quaternary palaeoecology also began to be discussed (e.g. Huntley & Webb III, 1988; Huntley, 1990, 1991). Subsequently the volume edited by Peters & Lovejoy (1992) represented a key milestone on the road towards formalised assessments of species’ vulnerabilities to climate changes.

Climate change vulnerability assessment as a field emerged in the 1990s, drawing on several disparate disciplinary traditions, including natural hazard and disaster planning, climate change effects research, and endangered species conservation. The concepts behind vulnerability were originally and most fully developed in relation to risks from natural hazards to people and communities. Indeed, the field of climate adaptation has been heavily influenced by the work of such natural hazards researchers as Gilbert F. White and colleagues, who emphasized the importance of social and technological ‘adjustments’ to these hazards (Burton *et al.*, 1993). Building on such disaster-related usage, early applications of vulnerability assessment in a climate change context primarily focused on susceptibility of people, infrastructure and economies to harm (Dow, 1992; IPCC, 1996). Adger (2006) offered perhaps the most influential distillation of climate change vulnerability in a socioecological context, noting that ‘the key parameters of vulnerability are the stress to which a system is exposed, its sensitivity, and its adaptive capacity.’

Biogeographers, ecologists and conservation biologists began to explore the potential impacts of climate change on species and ecosystems during the early and mid-1990s (e.g. Lindenmayer *et al.*, 1991; Huntley *et al.*, 1995; Sykes & Prentice, 1995; Sykes *et al.*, 1996). Around the same time observed effects of climate change on species’ distributions began to be documented (e.g. Grabherr *et al.*, 1994; Parmesan, 1996; Parmesan *et al.*, 1999) and the interacting effects upon species of climate change and habitat availability were discussed (e.g. Hill *et al.*, 1999). By the early 2000s, a range of effects of climate change on species was being widely documented (e.g. Hughes, 2000; Parmesan & Yohe, 2003), leading to more explicit interest in determining ‘which species, habitats and regions are most at risk from climate change’ (Pearson & Dawson, 2003), and the realisation that substantial numbers of species could be at risk of extinction (Thomas *et al.*, 2004). This in turn led to the application and modification of existing vulnerability frameworks (e.g. Schroter *et al.*, 2005; Adger, 2006) for assessing natural systems, including plant and animal species (Williams *et al.*, 2008; Pacifici *et al.*, 2018). Such applications were also informed by the rich tradition of assessing

species' extinction risk (e.g. the IUCN Red List (Mace & Lande, 1991)) and efforts to integrate knowledge about interacting threats to species persistence.

## **Vulnerability**

In the field of conservation biology, vulnerability is generally viewed as 'the degree to which a system is susceptible to, and unable to cope with, the adverse effects of climate change' (IPCC, 2007). As such, 'it is a function of the character, magnitude and rate of climate change to which the system is exposed, its sensitivity and its adaptive capacity' (IPCC, 2007). Although an alternative definition was presented in the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (IPCC, 2014), this has not been widely adopted within the conservation community; accordingly, here we use the former definition but discuss in Box 1 the differences with the more recent definition.



### **Box 1. Vulnerability: Old vs. New Definitions**

We note a shift in definitions between the IPCC's Fourth and Fifth Assessment Reports. In the former, the overall measure of concern (vulnerability), is defined as a function of intrinsic properties, namely sensitivity and adaptive capacity, and the magnitude and rate of climate change to which the system is exposed. In the latter, 'risk' is considered the overall measure of concern, with its contributing factors being intrinsic properties of vulnerability and exposure, and the extrinsic forcing agent defined as 'hazard'. The IPCC Fourth Assessment (2007) definition was widely adopted by the conservation community, with little attention paid to the revised Fifth Assessment (2014) definition in the conservation literature. We therefore use the Fourth Assessment definition in this review.

**IPCC Fourth Assessment terms (2007)**

**IPCC Fifth Assessment terms (2014)**



	
<p>Figure 2a. According to the IPCC Fourth Assessment (2007) and common usage in the field of CCVA of species, vulnerability to climate change results from the interaction of exposure and sensitivity with adaptive capacity (adapted from IPCC, 2007).</p>	<p>Figure 2b. According to the IPCC Fifth Assessment (2014), risk of climate-related impacts results from the interaction of climate-related hazards with the vulnerability and exposure of human and natural systems (adapted from IPCC (2014)).</p>
<p>Overarching measures of concern</p>	
<p><b>Vulnerability.</b> The extent to which biodiversity is susceptible to or unable to cope with the adverse effects of climate change. It is a function of the character, magnitude and rate of climate change to which the system is <b>exposed</b>, its <b>sensitivity</b> and its <b>adaptive capacity</b> (IPCC, 2007) (<i>Differs from IPCC, 2014a</i>).</p>	<p><b>Risk.</b> The probability of harmful consequences resulting from climate change. Risk results from the interaction of <b>vulnerability</b>, <b>exposure</b>, and <b>hazard</b>. Risk is often represented as <i>probability</i> of occurrence of hazardous events or trends multiplied by the <i>impacts</i> if these events or trends occur (IPCC, 2014) (<i>not defined in 2007</i>)</p> <p><b>Impact.</b> The effects, consequences or outcomes of climate change on natural and human systems. It is a function of the interactions between climate changes or <b>hazardous</b> climate events occurring within a specific time period and the <b>vulnerability</b> of an <b>exposed</b> society or system (IPCC, 2014) (<i>Differs from IPCC, 2007</i>)</p>
<p>Intrinsic Contributing Factors</p>	
<p><b>Sensitivity.</b> Sensitivity is the degree to which a system is affected, either adversely or beneficially, by <i>climate variability</i> or change (IPCC, 2007, 2014)</p> <p><b>Adaptive Capacity.</b> The potential, capability, or ability of a species, ecosystem or human system to adjust to</p>	<p><b>Vulnerability.</b> ‘The propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected. In this usage, vulnerability encompasses a variety of concepts, particularly <b>sensitivity</b> to harm and <b>lack of capacity to cope and adapt.</b>’ (IPCC, 2014) (<i>Differs from IPCC, 2007</i>).</p>



climate change, to moderate potential damage, to take advantage of opportunities, or to respond to the consequences (IPCC, 2007, 2014)	<b>Exposure.</b> The <i>presence</i> of people, livelihoods, species or ecosystems, environmental functions, services, and resources, infrastructure, or economic, social, or cultural assets in places and settings that could be adversely affected (IPCC, 2014) ( <i>Not defined in IPCC, 2007</i> )
<b>External Contributing Factors</b>	
<b>Exposure.</b> Exposure describes the nature, magnitude and rate of climatic and associated environmental changes experienced by a species (Dawson <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Foden <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Stein <i>et al.</i> , 2014) ( <i>Not defined in IPCC, 2007</i> )	<b>Hazard.</b> The potential occurrence of a natural or human-induced physical event or trend or physical impact that may cause loss of life, injury, or other health impacts, as well as damage and loss to property, infrastructure, livelihoods, service provision, ecosystems, and environmental resources. In [the IPCC Fifth Assessment] report, the term <i>hazard</i> usually refers to climate-related physical events or trends or their physical impacts (IPCC 2014) ) ( <i>Not defined in IPCC, 2007</i> ).

155

156 **Exposure**

157 Exposure refers to the nature, magnitude, and rate of extrinsic climatic and associated  
 158 environmental changes experienced by a species (Dawson *et al.*, 2011; Foden *et al.*, 2013; Stein *et al.*,  
 159 2014). Describing and quantifying exposure to climate change requires understanding its  
 160 components and unpacking an often-conflicting ‘entanglement’ of terminology and concepts  
 161 (Oesterwind *et al.*, 2016). While some studies describe climate change as a driver (e.g. Millenium  
 162 Ecosystem Assessment, 2005), others have defined it as a pressure (Omann *et al.*, 2009) or a threat  
 163 (e.g. Salafsky *et al.*, 2007). Given the conservation context in which CCVA of species is conducted, we  
 164 recommend an approach consistent with the Driver-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR)  
 165 framework (European Environment Agency, 1995; Holten-Andersen *et al.*, 1995) that is widely  
 166 applied in conservation and other disciplines for structuring and communicating policy-relevant  
 167 research (Kristensen, 2004; Svarstad *et al.*, 2008).

168


169 *Drivers* are the highest order phenomena governing change; they typically encompass societal  
 170 demands or needs (e.g. economic, social, and political) and natural factors that are independent of  
 171 anthropogenic causes (e.g. earthquakes, tectonic drift) (Maxim *et al.*, 2009; Oesterwind *et al.*, 2016).  
 172 A key characteristic of drivers is that they are beyond direct control or management (Oesterwind *et al.*,  
 173 2016). In the context of climate change and biodiversity, drivers are the factors leading to  
 174 greenhouse gas emissions, including society’s needs for energy, transport and food, as well as  
 175 contributing natural factors such as volcanic eruptions.

176

177 Climate change drivers result in *pressures* which may cause state changes or impacts on human and  
 178 natural systems. In the context of climate change and species, we propose a pressure classification

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

that includes three broad categories (Figure 3). *Abiotic pressures* include: climate changes driven by changes in atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (e.g. increased temperatures, altered drought frequency); resulting effects on the physical environment (e.g. sea level rise, melting ice, increased severity of storm surges); and, direct effects of the changes in greenhouse gas concentrations (e.g. ocean acidification as a result of the increased atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide). *Biotic pressures* result from changes in ecological processes (Ockendon *et al.*, 2014) and include those mediated through changes in habitat availability or community composition (e.g. increased competition from alien species), as well as direct effects of the changes in greenhouse gas concentrations (e.g. differential effects of elevated carbon dioxide levels on productivity of plants using alternative photosynthetic pathways). Finally, various societal actions resulting from climate change, including both from climate change mitigation (e.g. expansion of biofuel production, renewable energy technologies) and adaptation (e.g. changing land use, construction of dams and sea walls, water abstraction) may exert *human response pressures* on species that, although poorly recognised in vulnerability assessments, potentially have large impacts upon biodiversity (Turner *et al.*, 2010; Watson & Segan, 2013; Maxwell *et al.*, 2015). This category also includes climate change driven exacerbation of historical human pressures such as harvesting and persecution. We note that pressures and drivers may be variously interpreted in ecological contexts, and that several authors have classified pressures as ‘direct’ (i.e. abiotic) and ‘indirect’ (i.e. biotic, and in some cases including human-mediated responses)(e.g. Chapman *et al.*, 2014; Ockendon *et al.*, 2014; Segan *et al.*, 2015). However, strong interactions and feedbacks between almost all contributing pressures (Figure 3) suggest that it is more realistic to consider biological responses as emerging from a complex network of interacting physical, biological and human processes.



202

203 *Figure 3. Climate change related pressures on species, showing those originating from abiotic, biotic*  
204 *and human response causes.*

205

## 206 **Potential impacts and their mechanisms**

207 Pressures exert influence on the *state* of systems (Oesterwind *et al.*, 2016) and may thereby lead to  
208 *impacts* on them (Svarstad *et al.*, 2008). The extent of impacts on species resulting from climate  
209 change associated pressures depends upon the intrinsic and external factors contributing to the  
210 species' vulnerability and may be positive, negative or a combination of both. In the context of CCVA  
211 of species, the focus is species' vulnerability to climate change-driven extinction, and the impacts are  
212 factors that influence this. Key parameters used by the IUCN Red List (IUCN, 2017) to assess a  
213 species' extinction risk are characteristics of, and changes in, its population size and distribution  
214 extent. While these parameters are appropriate at the species level, we note that they result from  
215 impacts on individuals that differ from one another both genetically and phenotypically with respect  
216 to their morphological, physiological, behavioural and life-history attributes (Figure 4 and Table 1).  
217 Individual-level impacts influence subpopulation characteristics, including local abundance and  
218 metapopulation dynamics, that in turn determine species-level parameters, including extinction risk  
219 (Griffiths *et al.*, 2010). It is important to realise that climate change will often have contrasting  
220 impacts on different organisms and local- or subpopulations of a species in different parts of their  
221 overall distribution. Thus, impacts are likely to be positive towards the 'leading edge' of a species'  
222 distribution, but negative towards the 'trailing edge', where leading and trailing edge are defined by  
223 the geographical gradient and direction of change of a climatic variable. The net results of these  
224 individual subpopulation-level impacts are changes in the species' overall population and  
225 distribution.




Figure 4. Potential climate change impacts on species include the species-level population and range changes that underpin extinction risk. These changes are driven by changes at individual and subpopulation levels.

Table 1. Summary of types of climate change **impacts** on species, including those that are both positive and negative, with examples of where they have been documented. Further examples are documented in Bellard *et al.* (2012) and Scheffers *et al.* (2016). Here we define populations as the total number of individuals of the species and subpopulations as geographically or otherwise distinct groups within the population (IUCN SSC Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, 2017).

Impacts	Illustrative examples
<b>SPECIES LEVEL</b>	
<b>1. Population characteristics</b> 1.1. Changes in population size 1.2. Changes in proportion of mature individuals 1.3. Changes in sex ratio 1.4. Changes in magnitude and/or frequency of population fluctuations 1.5. Number of subpopulations	Gynther <i>et al.</i> , 2016
<b>2. Range characteristics</b> 2.1. Changes in range size	Hickling <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Tingley <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011;

2.2. Changes in range location 2.3. Level of fragmentation	Poloczanska <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Mason <i>et al.</i> , 2015
<b>3. Genetic characteristics</b> 3.1. Changes in genetic diversity (e.g. due to stochastic effects of changes in population size; inter-breeding with newly encountered species, especially congeners; loss of subpopulations; and restrictions on gene flow) 3.2. Changes in allele frequencies (e.g. due to adaptive selection and stochastic effects of changes in population size)	Bradshaw & Holzapfel, 2006; Forcada & Hoffman, 2014; Potts <i>et al.</i> , 2014
<b>SUBPOPULATION LEVEL</b>	
<b>4. Subpopulation characteristics</b> 4.1. Changes in sizes of subpopulations 4.2. Changes in the probability of local extinction and/or colonisation 4.3. Changes in subpopulation sex ratio 4.4. Changes in subpopulation age structure 4.5. Changes in magnitude and/or frequency of subpopulation fluctuations	Franco <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Martay <i>et al.</i> , 2017
<b>5. Range characteristics</b> 5.1. Changes in range sizes of subpopulations 5.2. Changes in range locations of subpopulations	Bennie <i>et al.</i> , 2013
<b>6. Genetic characteristics</b> 6.1. Changes in genetic diversity 6.2. Changes in allele frequencies 6.3. Changes in rates of gene flow between subpopulations	Kutschera <i>et al.</i> , 2016; Vincenzi <i>et al.</i> , 2017
<b>INDIVIDUAL LEVEL</b>	
<b>7. Life-history characteristics</b> 7.1. Changes in growth rates 7.2. Changes in duration of developmental stages 7.3. Changes in reproductive output and success 7.4. Changes in survival rates, and hence in longevity	Forchhammer <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Barbraud & Weimerskirch, 2001; Aars & Ims, 2002; Ludwig <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Foley <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Robinson <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Martin & Maron, 2012
<b>8. Morphological characteristics</b> 8.1. Changes in body size 8.2. Changes in body shape	Rode <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Cheung <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Baudron <i>et al.</i> , 2014; Caruso <i>et al.</i> , 2014
<b>9. Physiological characteristics</b> 9.1. Changes in phenotypic plasticity 9.2. Changes in metabolic rate 9.3. Changes in stress tolerance 9.4. Changes in disease susceptibility	Garamszegi, 2011; Crozier & Hutchings, 2014; Rangan <i>et al.</i> , 2015
<b>10. Phenological characteristics</b> 10.1. Changes in phenology (i.e. in seasonal timing of events, including migration, hibernation, flowering, bud burst, spawning, etc.) 10.2. Changes in direction and/or distance of seasonal migration 10.3. Changes in circadian (i.e. daily) pattern of activity	Both <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Thackeray <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Todd <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Møller <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Lane <i>et al.</i> , 2012; R. Kearney, 2013

(e.g. a shift from diurnal to crepuscular or nocturnal activity)	
<b>11. Genetic characteristics</b> 11.1. Changes in gene expression (e.g. due to epigenetic processes) 11.2. Heterozygosity	Bradshaw & Holzapfel, 2001; Hill & Henry, 2011; Geerts <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Pacifici <i>et al.</i> , 2015; de Pous <i>et al.</i> , 2016

Understanding the *mechanisms* of potential climate change impacts on species, that is, the chain of events between the exertion of the pressure and the potential impacts at species level, is particularly valuable. Firstly, the degree of confidence associated with a projected climate change impact is increased if there is evidence that the impact is underpinned by a known mechanism that also has been shown to be operating. Secondly, it can help identify appropriate targets for conservation interventions, thus allowing development of strategies to disrupt mechanisms underpinning negative impacts. Individual mechanisms may act alone, or in combinations that may be synergistic, antagonistic or neutral; mechanisms may also operate in different ways and to different extents at different times and/or locations. We propose here five general types of climate change impact mechanisms (Table 2). The relationship between impacts and the mechanisms driving climate change vulnerability of species, as shown in Figure 5, are mediated by species' unique sensitivities and adaptive capacities.

Table 2. Five potential mechanisms of climate change impacts that may operate on organisms, subpopulations and thereby species. These may have positive and/or negative impacts on species' vulnerability to climate change.

POTENTIAL MECHANISMS OF IMPACTS ON SPECIES	Documented examples (+ve) or (-ve)
1. Organisms' <b>physiological preferences</b> or limits become decreasingly or increasingly aligned with changing <b>environmental conditions</b> .	Kullman, 2007; Oswald <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Pérez-Ramos <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Sinervo <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Beever <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Cahill <i>et al.</i> , 2013
2. Organisms' <b>habitat and microhabitats</b> change in quality or availability leading to changes in the availability and quality of key resources. Examples of microhabitats include caves for roosting bats and boulders for desert reptiles.	Munday, 2004; Trape, 2009; Regehr <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Rode <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Bond & Midgley, 2012; Martin & Maron, 2012
3. Organisms experience changes in <b>interspecific interactions</b> . This includes with <b>beneficial species</b> (e.g. prey, mutualists, hosts, pollinators, dispersers), <b>detrimental species</b> (e.g. competitors, predators, parasites, pathogens) and those that are currently <b>neutral</b> but may become beneficial or	Biesmeijer <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Schweiger <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Durance & Ormerod, 2010; Pearce-Higgins <i>et al.</i> , 2010



detrimental in the future.	
4. Organisms experience change in <b>phenology</b> such that the timing of beneficial events or interactions are disrupted or enhanced.	Visser <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Fryxell & Sinclair, 1988; Ludwig <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Altwegg <i>et al.</i> , 2012
5. Organisms experience changes in interactions with <b>non-climate change-driven threats</b> such that they are exacerbated (e.g. overharvesting, invasive species, land use changes)	Frederiksen <i>et al.</i> , 2004; Walther <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Schweiger <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Van Zuiden & Sharma, 2016; Kovach <i>et al.</i> , 2017




Figure 5. Mechanisms describe the pathways through which climate change pressures may exert impacts on species. These impacts may have positive and/or negative impacts on the species and are mitigated or exacerbated by species' individual sensitivities and adaptive capacities.

### Sensitivity

Sensitivity refers to the degree to which a system [or species] is affected, either adversely or beneficially, by climate change (IPCC, 2007, 2014). While exposure, drivers, and pressures describe factors that are external to the species, sensitivity describes *intrinsic* attributes that are recognised to moderate and/or exacerbate the impact of those pressures on a species response (Jiguet *et al.*,



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2007; Dawson *et al.*, 2011; Nicotra *et al.*, 2015). The types of attributes that affect species’ sensitivity to climate change have been categorised in various ways (e.g. Keith *et al.*, 2008; Visser, 2008; Williams *et al.*, 2008), but typically include: A) specialized habitat and/or microhabitat; B) environmental tolerances or thresholds that are likely to be exceeded due to climate change; C) dependence on environmental triggers that are likely to be disrupted by climate change; D) dependence on interspecific interactions that are likely to be disrupted by climate change; E) rarity; F) sensitive life history; and F) high exposure to other pressures (Table 3). These categories of species attributes are not exhaustive nor mutually exclusive and are proposed simply to aide understanding and assessment of how species are sensitive to climate change. Evaluating sensitivity attributes requires detailed knowledge of focal species and the systems where they function. Where such knowledge is lacking, or the evidence linking an attribute to climate change sensitivity is weak, sensitivity assessments may have a high degree of uncertainty.

Table 3. Attributes associated with species’ sensitivity to climate change (adapted from Foden *et al.*, (2013)).

Sensitivity Attributes
A. <b>Specialised habitat and/or microhabitat requirements.</b> As climate change-driven environmental changes unfold, species that are less tightly coupled to specific conditions and requirements are likely to be more resilient because they will have a wider range of habitat and microhabitat options available to them. Sensitivity is further increased for species with several life stages, each requiring different habitats or microhabitats (e.g. water-dependent larval amphibians), and in seasonally migratory species that use different habitats or microhabitats during different parts of their annual cycle of migration. We note, however, that this does not hold in all cases, and extreme specialization may allow some species to escape the full impacts of climate change exposure (e.g. deep sea fishes).
B. <b>Environmental tolerances or thresholds (at any life stage) that are likely to be exceeded due to climate change.</b> Species where the majority of populations already occur in conditions that are close to their physiological thresholds (e.g. for temperature or precipitation regimes, water pH or oxygen levels) are likely to be at higher risk from climate change (e.g. mid-latitude ectotherms)(Hoffmann <i>et al.</i> , 2013). However, even species with broad environmental tolerances may already be close to thresholds beyond which physiological function quickly breaks down (e.g. drought-tolerant desert plants (Foden <i>et al.</i> , 2007), high temperature-tolerant birds (Cunningham <i>et al.</i> , 2013)).
C. <b>Dependence on environmental triggers that are likely to be disrupted by climate change.</b> Many species rely on environmental triggers or cues to initiate life stages (e.g. migration, breeding, egg laying, seed germination, hibernation and spring emergence). While cues such as day length and lunar cycles will be unaffected by climate change, those driven by climate and season may alter in both their timing and magnitude, leading to asynchrony and uncoupling with environmental factors (Thackeray <i>et al.</i> , 2016) (e.g. mismatches between advancing spring food availability peaks and hatching dates (Both <i>et al.</i> , 2006)). Climate change sensitivity is likely to be compounded when different sexes or life stages rely on different cues, as well as by local adaptation of species to gradients in environmental triggers (e.g. Bennie <i>et al.</i> , 2010).

- D. Dependence on interspecific interactions that are likely to be disrupted by climate change.** Climate change-driven alterations in species' ranges, phenologies and relative abundances may affect their beneficial inter-specific interactions (e.g. with prey, pollinators, hosts or symbionts) and/or those that have negative effects (e.g. with predators, competitors, pathogens or parasites). Species are likely to be particularly sensitive to climate change if, for example, they are highly dependent on beneficial interaction(s) with one or few particular species (e.g. Hutchings *et al.*, 2018) and are unlikely to be able to substitute alternatives for these species (Møller *et al.*, 2011).
- E. Rarity.** The inherent vulnerability of small populations to Allee effects and catastrophic events, as well as their generally reduced capacity to recover quickly following local extinction events, suggest that many rare species will be more sensitive to climate change than common species. Rare species include those with very small population sizes, as well as those that may be locally abundant but are geographically highly restricted. Such small population size and/or restricted distribution may be intrinsic or the result of past and/or ongoing pressures that exert negative effects upon the species.
- F. Sensitive life history.** Life history traits such as long generation length and slow growth rate have also been shown to be associated with heightened extinction risk under climate change (Pearson *et al.*, 2014). Species that experience marked population fluctuations, particularly those where populations periodically 'crash' or pass through 'bottlenecks', are particularly vulnerable to exacerbation of extreme events and/or climate variability at such times; on the other hand, species occurring in climates that have historically high vulnerability may possess life history characteristics that reduce vulnerability to further increases.. Species that become spatially concentrated at any stage of their life history (e.g. congregatory species, lekking species,) have low levels of adaptive variation and those that have temperature-dependent sex determination are also likely to be more sensitive.
- G. High exposure to other pressures.** Climate change is likely to interact with a range of existing pressures, exacerbating their effects (e.g. increasing susceptibility to disease (Munson *et al.*, 2008; Randall & van Woesik, 2015), increasing pressures from invasive species (Walther *et al.*, 2009; Elmhagen *et al.*, 2015), expansion of agriculture into some areas and abandonment in others (Hannah *et al.*, 2013)). Species that are already declining due to non-climate change related pressures are therefore likely to be more sensitive to climate change. They may also be restricted to climate change-vulnerable parts of their former distributions (e.g. all higher latitude populations have gone extinct for non-climatic reasons). Pearson *et al.* (2014) found that decreasing population size and/or occupied area, as well as increasing range fragmentation, were associated with higher extinction risk under climate change.

## Adaptive Capacity

Adaptive capacity has been defined as 'the potential, capability, or ability of a species, ecosystem or human system to adjust to climate change, including changes in climate variability and extremes, so as to moderate potential negative outcomes, to take advantage of opportunities, or to respond to the consequences' (based upon IPCC WGII definitions, IPCC, 2007, 2014). The concept of adaptive capacity was developed with respect to human systems, and with its origins in organizational theory and sociology, emphasized system attributes such as governance, economic resources, technology, and levels of education (Engle, 2011). The concept has been applied in an ecological context to reflect those capacities of a system (whether a species or ecosystem) that enable it to adjust to or cope with changing conditions. In practice, the application of adaptive capacity to species and other natural resources has been challenging. In particular, many of the attributes that confer such adaptability overlap with features also associated with 'sensitivity' (e.g. habitat specialization, physiological tolerances, interspecific dependencies). At its root, the term 'adaptive' suggests modification or adjustment, and thus the concept of adaptive capacity can perhaps best be thought

of as the ability of a species to accommodate a given stressor or change through some form of adjustment. The ability to adjust to changes is facilitated by high levels of phenotypic plasticity dispersal ability, or ‘evolvability’ (associated with its genetic diversity). These in turn can enable a species to adjust to new conditions by shifting locations, by modifying behaviours, physiology or life history factors, or by evolving new and more ‘adaptive’ traits (Table 4).

Adaptive capacity includes both intrinsic and extrinsic elements, and in that sense is context specific. Intrinsic factors include the dispersal, phenotypic and genetic attributes noted above. Extrinsic factors, however, may constrain or promote the expression of those adaptive capabilities. For example, even if a species has high dispersal capacity, if surrounding landscape conditions are inhospitable to the species or its propagules, there will be limited opportunities for dispersal-based coping. Indeed, the interplay between such intrinsic and extrinsic factors led Beever *et al.* (2016) to suggest an analogy for adaptive capacity based on classic ecological niche theory, as first proposed by Hutchinson (1957). In this conception, the *fundamental adaptive capacity* reflects a species’ intrinsic ability to accommodate climate change without significant genetic losses, large range contractions or extinction, or intensive management intervention. The *realized adaptive capacity*, in contrast, reflects how extrinsic factors constrain or limit expression of those intrinsic adaptive capacity factors. Under this framework, adaptation can be viewed as those actions or efforts capable of relaxing extrinsic constraints (particularly anthropocentric stressors) and shifting the realized adaptive capacity further towards the fundamental condition.

Table 4. Attributes associated with species’ ability to adapt to climate change (adapted from Foden *et al.* (2013) and Estrada *et al.* (2016)).

ADAPTIVE CAPACITY ATTRIBUTES	
<b>A. Phenotypic plasticity.</b> Changes in the phenotype expressed by an individual with a given genotype, perhaps as a result of epigenetic processes that alter gene expression, can enable adaptation to altered climate conditions. Such changes have been shown to play a key role in advances in the timing of avian breeding (Charmantier <i>et al.</i> , 2008) and are likely to remain important in the future for some common insectivorous passerines (Phillimore <i>et al.</i> , 2016), inferring high adaptive capacity for those species. Limited plasticity would require adaptive capacity to occur as a result of dispersal or evolution (below).	
<b>B. Dispersal ability.</b> Estrada <i>et al.</i> (2016) outline a framework highlighting four key factors that influence species’ range-shifts, namely:  (i) <b>Emigration.</b> Many mobile species (e.g. many seasonally migrant birds) exhibit strong site fidelity or natal philopatry, most individuals returning to breed at or close to their natal site. Other species may show negative density-dependence of dispersal, with a greater proportion of individuals dispersing when population densities are lower, leading to more rapid colonisation of new areas (Altwegg <i>et al.</i> , 2013).  (ii) <b>Dispersal</b> (movement ability):  <b>Intrinsic dispersal ability:</b> Species with low dispersal rates or low potential for long distance dispersal (e.g. land snails, ant and raindrop splash-dispersed plants) have low adaptive capacity since they are unlikely to be able to keep up with a shifting climate envelope. However, evidence of the rate and magnitude of past range shifts (e.g. Preece, 1997) showed that	

accidental dispersal by mechanisms to which the species shows no particular adaptations were more important than dispersal adaptations and typical dispersal distances in achieving rapid and large range shifts (e.g. Wilkinson, 1997; Wilkinson *et al.*, 2017).

**Extrinsic limitations:** Even where species are intrinsically capable of long distance or rapid dispersal, movement and/or successful colonisation may be reduced by low permeability or physical barriers along dispersal routes. Barriers to dispersal may be natural or anthropogenic and take various forms: oceans, large rivers or major highways can be barriers for terrestrial species; large waterfalls, dams or concentrations of pollutants can be barriers for freshwater species; tracts of unsuitable habitats or conditions can act as barriers for any species, for example, mountain ranges for lowland terrestrial species, arid areas for lacustrine and riverine freshwater species, cold ocean currents for marine species of warmer waters. Species for which little or no suitable habitat or 'climate space' is likely to remain (e.g. Arctic ice-dependent species) may also be considered to suffer from extrinsic dispersal limitations. Limited access to, or absence of, a key dispersal agent (e.g. by bird-dispersed plants) generally arises in relation to zoochory and results from the reduced range or population, or even the extinction, of key dispersal agents.

(iii) **Establishment.** A species' ability to establish at a new site depends on whether required resources available, making establishment by generalists more likely than by species with particular requirements for e.g. micro-habitats, food resources or mutualists. Some species exhibit allee effects, individual fitness being lower in small populations and hence limiting the species' ability to establish in new areas.

(iv) **Proliferation.** Species that are slow to reach reproductive maturity and/or that produce relatively small numbers of progeny/propagules have reduced dispersal ability simply because they produce fewer potentially dispersing entities. Sexually reproducing species that require a minimum of two individuals, one of each sex, to disperse to a given locality if a new population is to be established there have a lower dispersal ability than hermaphrodite species and/or species that reproduce asexually. Reproductive strategy, ecological generalisation and competitive ability play important roles in both successful establishment and proliferation.

**C. Evolvability.** Species' potential for rapid genetic change will determine whether evolutionary adaptation can result at a rate sufficient to keep up with climate change-driven changes to their environments. Species with low genetic diversity, often indicated by recent bottlenecks in population numbers, generally exhibit lower ranges of both phenotypic and genotypic variation. As a result, such species tend to have fewer novel characteristics that could facilitate adaptation to the new climate conditions.

Estimates of genetic diversity are becoming common and can now be readily obtained across the entire genome using SNP (single nucleotide polymorphism) markers which provide a picture not just of genetic diversity but also of historical processes acting on species and the likelihood of adaptive capacity across geographical gradients (Rellstab *et al.*, 2016). Evidence suggests that evolutionary adaptation is likely to be common across a few years in species with annual or shorter generation times (e.g. Lustenhouwer *et al.*, 2018). In animals and plants with longer generation times evolutionary adaptation may not keep up with climate change and populations may decline (Bay *et al.*, 2018) although where gene flow occurs across populations located along environmental gradients evolutionary adaptation may still occur.

STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT  
CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT OF SPECIES




Figure 6. The approaches used to carry out each of the three assessment types and the metrics or types of information of climate change vulnerability that they may produce.

Step 1: Define your goal and objectives

A well-defined *goal* explains why a CCVA is being undertaken, who the audience is and which decisions are intended to be influenced (Stein *et al.*, 2012; Foden & Young, 2016). CCVAs can be carried out, for example: to determine the degree of vulnerability to climate change of one or more species in a region or across their entire ranges; to provide input into a specific adaptation planning

process; to inform academic research (such as to generate input into a demographic model); or as an educational exercise to provide the basis for teaching about how climate change might influence species of interest. Identifying the audience, whether it be policymakers, land/resource managers, scientists or the public, will inform the level of complexity needed for the analyses and the strategy for communicating the results. If a CCVA aims to influence management practices, then understanding the planning and management context for the species to be assessed will allow the crafting of CCVA objectives and outputs to maximise their impact on those management processes, with correspondingly greater benefits for the conservation of the species.

*Objectives* describe the one or more specific action steps needed to achieve your CCVA goal. CCVA objectives can be grouped into five categories. Those are to identify, for specified taxonomic groups, regions and time frames: (A) **which** species are most vulnerable; (B) **how vulnerable** species are (i.e., the magnitude of vulnerability); (C) **why** species are vulnerable; (D) **where** species are vulnerable; and/or (E) **when** species become vulnerable. Further, some CCVAs include an objective to identify data gaps. Table 5 summarises a framework for describing the objectives of a CCVA in clear and certain terms, and Supplementary Table 1 provides examples of their use, including in the contexts of a focus on taxonomic groups, single sites and larger extents.

Table 5. Checklist to aid identification of clear, quantitative objectives.

Select an <b>objective</b> category:						
	Which?	How much?	Why?	Where?	When?	What's missing?
Select a <b>taxonomic</b> focus (for example):						
	Subpopulation		Species	Higher taxonomic group	Multiple higher taxonomic groups	
Select a <b>spatial</b> focus:						
	Single site	Network of sites	Range of a subpopulation	Entire range of taxon/taxonomic group	Politically-defined geographical area (e.g. national, continental, global etc.)	
Select a <b>time frame</b> (for example):						
	Present	5 years		20 years	50 years	100 years

The *taxonomic focus* of a CCVA is typically on species, sub-species, metapopulations or subpopulations, or on a group of species sympatric to an area of interest. An assessment's *spatial focus* may be a single site or a network of sites (e.g. protected or other discrete areas), a political or administrative unit, such as a province or a nation state, a larger spatial unit, such as a sub-continent or continent, or a taxon's overall range. *Time frames* of assessments are most effectively shaped by a combination of the needs of the intended audience (e.g. a planning horizon for site managers), focal species' generation lengths and the intervals for which climate projections are more readily available (e.g. 2016–2035, 2046–2065, 2081–2100 and 2181–2200 in the case of IPCC 2013 outputs).



**Step 2: Consider the climate change pressures and their mechanisms of impact to identify all likely climate change impacts**

This step involves systematically considering the ways in which climate change can affect a focal species and identifying those that could pose a threat to one or more populations. The desired outcome is: a list of the *pressures* to which the focal species is likely to be exposed (Figure 3); the *mechanisms* through which these may impact the species (Figure 5, Table 2); and the *likely impacts* at species level, as mediated through potential impacts at individual and subpopulation levels (Figure 4, Table 1). Recording these in a logic flow format may be helpful.

Consultation with experts and literature is particularly important for this step, and gaining background knowledge of focal species, habitat(s), region(s) and climate is strongly advised. Assessors should consider the full range of climate change pressures, including abiotic, biological and human response pressures, as well as the role of interactions between climate change and other pressures (e.g. habitat loss, fragmentation) (Mantyka-Pringle *et al.*, 2014). Where previous research has provided evidence that changes in particular climatic variables impact upon the focal species, or more generally upon members of the higher taxonomic group to which it belongs, this will help to inform the choice of climatic variables to use in the CCVA (see Step 3 and ‘Selecting and using CCVA input data’). Topics to explore for focal species are a) ecology, distribution (including climate determinates), life history and threat status; b) documented and/or likely pressures; c) documented and/or likely mechanisms of impacts; and d) climate change impacts that may already have been observed.

It is also valuable to explore whether CCVAs have already have been conducted for the species. Examples of possible sources of existing CCVAs are shown in Supplementary Table 2. Assessors may subsequently choose to carry out assessments themselves, or to use those of others. In either case, evaluating assessment quality, including input data, is essential before making use of the results. Foden *et al.* (2016) and sections below covering selecting CCVA approaches, methods and input data provide guidance for evaluating their reliability and suitability for meeting CCVA goals and objectives.

**Step 3: Quantify the impacts**

In this step, the likely climate change mechanisms and their impacts identified in Step 2 are quantified according to three stages of increasing complexity, data and resource requirements, and applicability of resulting vulnerability metrics (Figure 6); each may help to inform the choice of focal mechanisms and impacts for subsequent stages. Assessors’ choices of which stage(s) to complete typically include consideration of a) which deliver the vulnerability metrics needed to meet their CCVA objectives, and b) which they have sufficient resources (e.g. data, expertise, time) to apply. Where no alignment can be reached between these two considerations, assessors may consider revisiting objectives and/or mobilising additional resources. The three stages of complexity



correspond approximately with predominant CCVA approaches, namely *trait-based*, *correlative* and *mechanistic approaches*, while the *combined approach* is applicable to stages two and three. We outline each approach, discussing its strengths and limitations, methods of application, examples of use and the vulnerability metrics it delivers. More detailed discussions can be found in Pacifici *et al.* (2015).

In all cases, we recommend beginning with an expert-based assessment. This involves examining the range of likely impact mechanisms in relatively non-technical and non-statistically intensive ways, with the aim of categorising and potentially prioritising mechanisms according to their likely impacts on focal species. At the most basic level, this involves considering species' exposure to climate change pressures and, using available knowledge of the species' sensitivity and adaptive capacity to estimate the likely relative or absolute magnitude of the impacts on the species. Red List assessments may provide valuable information for such assessments because they help to identify species with demographic and/or behavioural characteristics that increase their sensitivity; they also identify other pressures faced by species that may be exacerbated by climate change. Notwithstanding their limitations, expert-based assessments provide a valuable foundation for identifying factors and mechanisms to focus on in subsequent stages.

#### *Trait-based approach*

This approach draws on the growing knowledge-base on associations between biological traits and climate change impacts (e.g. Cardillo *et al.*, 2008; Murray *et al.*, 2009; Thaxter *et al.*, 2010; Angert *et al.*, 2011; Chessman, 2013; Newbold *et al.*, 2013; Pearson *et al.*, 2014; Estrada *et al.*, 2015), and makes use of a range of biological and life history information to score or rank species' probable sensitivity and adaptive capacity to climate change. These are often combined with assessments of exposure (e.g. Williams *et al.*, 2008; Young *et al.*, 2012; Foden *et al.*, 2013b; Smith *et al.*, 2016). While in the strictest sense, 'traits' refer to the characteristics of an individual (Violle *et al.*, 2007), in the context of CCVA of species the term is generally used more loosely to refer to a broad range of species-level characteristics, examples of which are shown in Table 6. Data relating to these traits may be qualitative, categorical or quantitative; categories must be ranked according to risk, whilst where trait data are quantitative, thresholds must be defined to determine risk categories. Trait-level scores or ranks are then combined qualitatively or semi-quantitatively to assign species into categories of vulnerability. We categorise methods for applying the trait-based approach according to the ways in which their scores are developed (i.e. Qualitative vs. Semi-Qualitative) and describe available tools, data requirements and examples (Supplementary Table 3). Trait-based approaches may include the outputs of correlative and mechanistic approaches (e.g. Küster *et al.*, 2011; Young *et al.*, 2012; Pompe *et al.*, 2014) or be included in other approaches (e.g. Garcia *et al.*, 2014a); we discuss these further under the 'Combined approach'.

Because the trait-based approach requires ecological knowledge without strong modelling or statistical expertise, and because it facilitates assessment of large numbers of species relatively rapidly (Pacifici *et al.*, 2015; Foden & Young, 2016), it has been adopted by many conservation

1  
2  
3 447 organizations. Limitations of the approach include the high degree of uncertainty about the links  
4 448 between species’ traits and climate change impact, as well as gaps in the availability of species-level  
5 449 data for desired traits. Quantifying thresholds for high vs. low vulnerability for each trait is also  
6 450 challenging, resulting in thresholds that are often arbitrary and relative (Thomas *et al.*, 2011; Foden  
7 451 *et al.*, 2013; Pacifici *et al.*, 2015). Approaches for combining trait scores, discussed in detail in  
8 452 Huntley *et al.* (2016), also remain challenging and typically produce categorical outputs. A study  
9 453 comparing observed population trends in British birds and butterflies with CCVA results showed  
10 454 poor predictive ability by trait-based assessments (Wheatley *et al.*, 2017); further validation and  
11 455 method development are necessary. However, trait-based CCVAs remain valuable for exploring  
12 456 species’ sensitivity and adaptive capacity to climate change, as well as for understanding the relative  
13 457 roles that potential impact mechanisms may have on the extent and nature of species’ vulnerability  
14 458 to climate change.  
15  
16  
17 459

18  
19 460 *Table 6. Examples of traits considered in four CCVAs (adapted from Willis et al. (2015) and Huntley et*  
20 461 *al. (2016)).*

	Graham <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Gardali <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Garnett <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Foden <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Young <i>et al.</i> (2012)
Degree of exposure to climate change		X	X	X	X
Breadth of environmental / climate tolerance(s)		X	X	X	X
Phenological dependence upon seasonal climate trigger(s)				X	X
Degree of habitat specialisation	X	X	X	X	X
Degree of dietary (animals) and pollinator (plants) specialisation	X		X		X
Degree of specialisation of inter-specific interactions				X	X
Dispersal capacity		X		X	X
Migratory status		X			
Capacity for rapid genetic adaptation				X	X
Plant reproductive mode					X
Reproductive/recruitment capacity	X		X	X	
Rarity			X	X	
Degree of exposure to other pressures					
Body size	X				
Brain size			X		

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 462  
45 463  
46 464 *Correlative approach*

47  
48  
49 465 Perhaps better termed the ‘Climate-matching approach’, this includes ‘niche-based’, ‘climate  
50 466 envelope’ and ‘species distribution modelling’. Correlative assessment depends upon fitting models  
51 467 that describe the correlation between each focal species’ distribution, usually in the recent past (i.e.  
52 468 the late twentieth century), and the contemporary climate. The fitted model aims to reflect the

species' realised niche (Hutchinson, 1957) during the period to which the distribution and climate data relate and can be used to infer its climate requirements or ecological tolerances. Correlative assessments can be used to identify those geographical areas where climate is likely to be suitable for the species under any projection of potential future climate (Pearson & Dawson, 2003; Beale *et al.*, 2008), and hence to estimate its potential distribution under those climate conditions. A species' climate change vulnerability is inferred from differences between its recent distribution and its predicted potential future distribution in terms of extent, location and sometimes degree of fragmentation (e.g. Garcia *et al.*, 2014a), and also their degree of overlap (Huntley *et al.*, 2007). Correlative approaches have been used to predict species' potential distribution changes at various spatial scales (Pacifi *et al.*, 2015), and have been widely applied to assess climate change vulnerability of plants (Midgley *et al.*, 2002; Thuiller *et al.*, 2005; Fitzpatrick *et al.*, 2008), invertebrates (Harrison *et al.*, 2006; Settele *et al.*, 2008; Heikkinen *et al.*, 2010; Sánchez-Fernández *et al.*, 2011) and vertebrates, including birds (Gregory *et al.*, 2009; Hole *et al.*, 2011; Garcia *et al.*, 2012), mammals (Hughes *et al.*, 2012; Songer *et al.*, 2012; Visconti *et al.*, 2015), amphibians (Lawler *et al.*, 2009; Carvalho *et al.*, 2011) and fishes (Jeschke & Strayer, 2008; Yu *et al.*, 2013). We categorise methods for applying the correlative approach as climate envelope, regression-based, machine learning and Bayesian, and describe available tools, data requirements and examples of their application (Supplementary Table 4).

Correlative assessments are very widely used, probably because methods of application are relatively rapid and cost-effective, occurrence data required are easily available for a large number of taxa, and due to their applicability for spatial conservation planning (e.g. Hannah *et al.*, 2002; Araujo *et al.*, 2004; Phillips *et al.*, 2008; Araújo *et al.*, 2011). Choice of modelling technique is one of the major sources of uncertainty in correlative models (Diniz-Filho *et al.*, 2009; Garcia *et al.*, 2012) but valuable guidance on using and understanding correlative models is available, including from (Pearson, 2007; Franklin, 2009; Peterson *et al.*, 2011; Anderson, 2012, 2013). Shortcomings of correlative CCVAs have been widely discussed (e.g. Pearson & Dawson, (2003b), Hijmans & Graham (2006), Hannah *et al.*, (2007), Araújo & Peterson (2012) and Pacifi *et al.*, (2015)); their assumption that species' distributions are in equilibrium with the prevailing climate can prove problematic in cases where a species' contemporary distribution reflects the outcome of recent or historical pressures (e.g. habitat loss, persecution) or natural dispersal barriers that have excluded the species from areas of suitable climate (Guisan & Thuiller, 2005). Other challenges include poor performance for species with few records (see section below on 'Species that pose particular CCVA challenges'), failure to account for local adaptation, and difficulty in projecting suitability for novel climatic conditions (i.e. outside the climatic range of the training data).

When validated using species' observed responses to recent climate changes, however, correlative CCVAs have been shown to perform well in predicting species' population increases/decreases in many cases (Green *et al.*, 2008; Gregory *et al.*, 2009; Stephens *et al.*, 2016) and to have a fair ability to predict distribution changes (e.g. Chen *et al.*, 2011; Dobrowski *et al.*, 2011; Morelli *et al.*, 2012; Smith, 2013). The range of potential impact mechanisms may be increased, for example, by incorporating variables such as inter-species interactions (e.g. Schweiger *et al.*, 2008, 2012), the

1  
2  
3 511 availability of nesting sites (e.g. Heikkinen *et al.*, 2007) and habitat shifts (e.g. Thuiller *et al.*, 2006a)  
4 512 along with climate variables in models. Further advances are being made by combining correlative  
5 513 and trait-based approaches, including by incorporating estimates of dispersal ability (e.g. Warren *et*  
6 514 *al.*, 2013) and sensitivity and adaptive capacity (e.g. Garcia *et al.*, 2014a) into projections of species'  
7 515 range shifts (see 'Combined approach' and 'Improving CCVA methodology' below).  
8 516  
9  
10 517 *Inferring distribution changes from model projections*  
11 518  
12  
13 519 Most correlative models output continuous values of 'suitability' or probability of occurrence of a  
14 520 species for each grid cell, generally requiring assessors to select a threshold value separating species  
15 521 'presence' from 'absence' in order to estimate potential changes in the species' distribution.  
16 522 Threshold values are typically determined as those which optimise model goodness-of-fit. However,  
17 523 as Liu *et al.* (2005, 2013) showed, different measures of goodness-of-fit can give very different  
18 524 threshold values, with the True Skill Statistic (Allouche *et al.*, 2006) emerging as the most robust  
19 525 measure for this purpose. However, since different thresholds can yield dramatically different  
20 526 conclusions about whether a species' distribution will decrease or expand under climate change  
21 527 (Nenzén & Araújo, 2011), we recommend carefully experimenting with alternative threshold rules  
22 528 with consideration as to whether optimistic or pessimistic outcomes are more appropriate for the  
23 529 analysis. A complement or alternative to thresholding is to use the raw suitability values to assess  
24 530 whether environmental conditions improve or degrade for the species (e.g. Still *et al.*, 2015), i.e.  
25 531 how the 'quality' of the potential area of distribution changes.  
26 532  
27  
28 533 *Inferring population changes from distribution changes*  
29 534  
30  
31  
32  
33 535 Changes in distribution extent are unlikely to be linearly related to population changes because: (a)  
34 536 individuals are rarely evenly spread throughout a species' overall distribution; (b) suitable habitat  
35 537 patches in areas newly climatically suitable may not be large enough to support viable  
36 538 subpopulations; and (c) dispersal limitations may prevent the species from colonising areas that  
37 539 become newly climatically suitable. These factors are species-specific and must therefore be  
38 540 considered separately for each focal species' CCVA. In the context of IUCN Red Listing, in the  
39 541 absence of more specific information, it is allowable to infer a linear relationship between  
40 542 population and distribution changes (although this should be explicitly stated). Suitability values  
41 543 provide a basis for improving upon such an assumption; even without any change in distribution  
42 544 extent, a decrease in mean suitability indicates a likely population decline. Where abundance data  
43 545 (or a proxy for abundance, e.g. recording rate) are available, these may be used to model the  
44 546 relationship between abundance and bioclimatic variables, hence enabling projections of future  
45 547 abundance patterns which are then more closely linked to measures of future conservation status  
46 548 and extinction risk (e.g. Huntley *et al.*, 2012; Renwick *et al.*, 2012; Johnston *et al.*, 2013; Massimino  
47 549 *et al.*, 2017).  
48 550  
49 551  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 552 *Mechanistic approach*

553 Mechanistic assessments use process-based simulation models to quantify climate change impacts,  
 554 and explicitly incorporate focal mechanisms (Morin & Thuiller, 2009), thereby allowing projection  
 555 under novel climate conditions. One of two sub-types (Supplementary Table 5), *mechanistic niche*  
 556 models, project species' future ranges using estimates of species' physiological tolerances, typically  
 557 from field or laboratory observations (e.g. Jenouvrier *et al.*, 2009; Radchuk *et al.*, 2013; Overgaard *et al.*,  
 558 2014) or energy balance equations (e.g. Molnár *et al.*, 2010; Huey *et al.*, 2012; Kearney & Porter,  
 559 2009). Because they estimate species' fundamental niches they may perform poorly in predicting  
 560 realised niches when species interactions are important, especially when physiological tolerances  
 561 are measured in the laboratory. Secondly, *demographic* models project changes in abundance,  
 562 usually through simulating climate change impacts on individuals, subpopulations, or species (e.g.  
 563 Stanton, 2014; Aiello-Lammens *et al.*, 2015; Heinrichs *et al.*, 2016; Naveda-Rodríguez *et al.*, 2016);  
 564 they can therefore be used to assess extinction risk (e.g. Keith *et al.*, 2008; Brook *et al.*, 2009;  
 565 Pearson *et al.*, 2014). However, such models are very data intensive, requiring knowledge of the  
 566 relationships between a series of demographic parameters (e.g. adult survival, juvenile survival,  
 567 fecundity) and relevant climate variables. Supplementary Table 5 provides a further classification of  
 568 mechanistic models, as well as examples of their use.

570 Mechanistic CCVAs can include a broad range of climate change impact mechanisms, including  
 571 changes in resource availability (e.g. Mantyka-Pringle *et al.*, 2014; Martin *et al.*, 2015), habitat  
 572 suitability (e.g. Aiello-Lammens *et al.*, 2011; Forrest *et al.*, 2012), and inter-specific interactions (e.g.  
 573 Urban *et al.*, 2012; Fordham *et al.*, 2013). They can also accommodate interaction effects of climate  
 574 change and other pressures (e.g. land-use change; Mantyka-Pringle *et al.* (2014, 2016)), as well as  
 575 direct mortality in specific but different subpopulations and age classes. Morphological and  
 576 demographic factors, genetic adaptation and phenotypic plasticity may also be included (e.g. Chevin  
 577 *et al.*, 2010; Huey *et al.*, 2012). Use of such species trait data in the mechanistic approach is  
 578 distinguished from that of the Trait-based approach, since the latter relies on assessors' *a priori*  
 579 assumptions of the links between traits and species' vulnerability, while the Mechanistic approach  
 580 integrates traits into process-based empirical predictions. However, their often intensive  
 581 requirements for knowledge and data on species and their systems (Morin & Thuiller, 2009), and  
 582 hence their relative costliness (Kearney & Porter, 2009; Chevin *et al.*, 2010), have significantly  
 583 limited their application to date and are likely to do so for the foreseeable future.

## 584 585 *Combined approach*

586 Combining CCVA approaches such that they draw on the strengths of component approaches  
 587 provides a valuable opportunity to improve CCVA of species (Willis *et al.*, 2015). The trait-based  
 588 approach, for example, can draw on correlative assessments to estimate range shift predictions and  
 589 to understand the climatic variables associated with the species' historical ranges (i.e. a trait-  
 590 correlative approach)(e.g. Young *et al.*, 2012; Smith *et al.*, 2016). The Correlative approach can draw  
 591 on the trait-based approach by using dispersal distances (e.g. Schloss *et al.*, 2012; Warren *et al.*,  
 592 2013, 2018; Visconti *et al.*, 2015), and measures of species' sensitivity and adaptive capacity (e.g.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Garcia *et al.*, 2014a) to improve range shift predictions (i.e. a correlative-trait approach). Correlative and mechanistic approaches may be used in combination to enable inclusion of a range of potentially important variables for predicting the suitability of potential future range, including metapopulation dynamics and environmental processes such as sea level rise, fires and stochasticity (e.g. Keith *et al.*, 2008; Anderson *et al.*, 2009; Midgley *et al.*, 2010; Fordham *et al.*, 2012), as well as inter-species interactions (e.g. Harris *et al.*, 2012; Fordham *et al.*, 2013) (i.e. a correlative-mechanistic approach). Finally, all three approaches may be combined in Criteria-based assessments in which species are classified into categories of risk based on the information from correlative and/or mechanistic assessments, species trait data and observed species changes (e.g. Thomas *et al.*, 2011) (i.e. a correlative-mechanistic-trait Approach). We provide further details of combined approaches, including data requirements, available tools and examples of their application (Supplementary Table 6), and discuss their potential for advancing CCVA of species under ‘Future directions’.

**SELECTING AND USING CCVA INPUT DATA**

A growing body of data and resources for CCVA of species is now available online but selecting and using these appropriately can be challenging (Wade *et al.*, 2017). We discuss these below and provide summaries of CCVA resources in Supplementary Tables 7 and 8; a synthesis of the input data requirements for trait-based, correlative and mechanistic CCVA approaches is also provided (Supplementary Table 9). An important first consideration in setting the parameters of the assessment is defining the spatial extent and resolution of the CCVA. The *spatial extent* of a CCVA is the total area under consideration; this may be specified by the CCVA objective and/or encompass the distribution range of focal species. Two important considerations help to avoid over-estimating vulnerability when predicting areas of suitable climate in the future. Firstly, for species-focused CCVA objectives, including the full distribution range is important for estimating the species’ full niche breadths. Secondly, it is important to include sufficient area around the current range such that the spatial extent includes all areas that could feasibly become suitable for the species in the future time frames considered. Considering an excessively large area, however, will inflate model accuracy and pick up broad-scale rather than finer-scale differences in suitability (e.g. Anderson & Raza, 2010).

*Spatial resolution* or grain is relevant when CCVA is to be carried out using a modelling approach that requires gridded data and refers to the grid cells’ area or linear dimensions. Ideally, the spatial grid size should be ecologically relevant for the study species (i.e. reflecting relevant ecological processes) and capture the way individuals perceive the environment (Potter *et al.*, 2013). In practice the grid size used in most studies is orders of magnitude larger and is often determined by the resolution of data available, since the essential dataset with the coarsest resolution generally determines the limit to which grain size can be reduced. For example, whilst elevation data may be available on a 50m grid (i.e. 50m x 50m), if species’ distribution data are recorded for a 1km grid, the latter is the finest grain size possible for most analyses (Foden & Young, 2016). Finer resolutions may be necessary to represent areas of higher spatial heterogeneity (e.g. topographically complex or



with varying land-surface properties), but the associated increase in computational demands as grain size reduces typically poses a practical limit. At resolutions >20km, species' abundance and distributions can generally be explained by bioclimatic variables alone (Luoto *et al.*, 2007), but at finer scales variables related to habitat suitability, land use and management become important, and below 1 km microclimate becomes dominant. In the latter case, microclimate influences should be explored taking into account factors such as slope, aspect, vegetation and shading by adjacent areas at higher elevation (see e.g. Bennie *et al.*, 2008, 2013; Gillingham *et al.*, 2012; Hodgson *et al.*, 2015). At almost all grain sizes relevant to CCVAs important issues that arise with respect to downscaling climate model outputs should be considered (Baker *et al.*, 2017).

## **Species data**

### *Distributions*

For methods that rely on occurrence or locality records to characterise species' bioclimatic tolerances (i.e. correlative modelling approaches), using data of good quality is particularly important. Ideal sources include surveys or atlases, and well-validated specimen and citizen science records. Data from large distribution databases (Supplementary Table 7) provide a convenient source of data but must be carefully reviewed for accuracy. Where available, data on species' abundances (or based on abundance proxies such as reporting rate) are especially valuable. Expert-developed range polygons may be used when they are based on first-hand knowledge of current species occurrence or where gridded data or point records are unavailable, but they are likely to have a higher incidence of false presences (commission errors) especially if patchiness in the species' distribution within polygons is not accounted for.

False presences also arise from species misidentification or taxonomic uncertainty, incorrect locality recording or data entry error, and can lead to overestimation of species' environmental niches. The most common cause of uncertainty, however, is false absences (omission errors). These typically arise from spatial differences in sampling effort (e.g. low sampling effort away from roads, in inaccessible areas, or in countries with limited resources to survey biodiversity), differences in detectability (e.g. fewer records of cryptic species) or in level of interest/charisma (e.g. disproportionate number of records for charismatic species). Some datasets provide data from which detection probability can be estimated (e.g. Southern African Bird Atlas Project (Harrison *et al.*, 1997) Breeding Bird Surveys (Massimino *et al.*, 2017) or on areas where the species was sought and not found (e.g. European Bird Census Council Atlas (Hagemeijer & Blair, 1997). For correlative models, Guillerá-Arroita *et al.* (2015) provide guidance on how the type of distribution data (and associated sampling bias) determines the quantity that is estimated by the models. Various approaches have been proposed to address spatial biases in species' presence data. Phillips *et al.*, (2009) developed models that use all records of presence for members of a group of species to generate a background sample of pseudo-absences for the focal species that have the same spatial bias as the collective presence records. Other approaches include Bayesian approaches (Manceur & Kühn, 2014; Rocchini *et al.*, 2017), subsampling in geographic space (Aiello-Lammens *et al.*, 2015) or



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

674 in environmental space (Varela *et al.*, 2014), and weighting presences by the inverse of their density  
675 (Stolar & Nielsen, 2015).

676 *Trait and life history information*

677 Databases containing such information are increasingly available (Supplementary Table 7) but for  
678 the many taxa with few data available, data can be collected based on expert knowledge or inferred  
679 from similar species. There has also been some progress towards imputing unknown trait data based  
680 on probabilistic models (Penone *et al.*, 2014; Schrodt *et al.*, 2015). Recognition of the importance of  
681 understanding, recording and using trait variability, in addition to trait means, is also emerging  
682 (Cordlandwehr *et al.*, 2013). Since understanding of climate change impact mechanisms and the  
683 extent to which they are associated with particular traits will increase as impacts become  
684 increasingly apparent and more data become available, it is important to document both the  
685 rationales for trait choices, as well as desired traits or data that could be included at later stages.  
686 Similarly, since selection of thresholds of climate change vulnerability remains challenging and often  
687 subjective, recording thresholds used and the rationales for determining them is essential.

688  
689 **Climate data**

690 The decision about which climate projection(s) to use is one of the most important in CCVA (Snover  
691 *et al.*, 2013). It is influenced by three key questions: (i) Which bioclimatic variables should be used?  
692 (ii) Which General Circulation Models are appropriate? and (iii) Which Representative Concentration  
693 Pathways are relevant? We provide a summary of data resources for future and palaeoclimates  
694 (Supplementary Table 7) as well as for the climates of ‘present’ or recent past (Supplementary Table  
695 8). To ensure that CCVAs are transparent and reproducible, climate data used should be reported;  
696 Morueta-Holme *et al.* (2018) propose best-practices for this purpose.

697  
698 *Bioclimatic variables*  
699

700 Many CCVA studies have used simple climate variables that, whilst giving statistically significant  
701 models, very often have no understood mechanistic relationship with the focal species’ performance  
702 and/or survival. For correlative approaches, even where models have a high goodness-of-fit and/or  
703 statistical significance, they may only reflect correlations between mechanistically relevant variables  
704 and those used in the model. As a result, such correlations may not persist as one moves in space  
705 from one climate regime to another (see e.g. Huntley, 2012; Dormann *et al.*, 2013; Huntley *et al.*,  
706 2014) or across time as climate patterns change. For these reasons, it is extremely important to use,  
707 as far as possible, only variables for which a plausible mechanistic role can be identified. As a general  
708 rule, no more than one bioclimatic variable should be used for every five species occurrence records  
709 or ‘presence’ grid cells (IUCN SSC Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, 2017). This avoids the risk  
710 of model ‘over-fitting’ which occurs where highly complex models begin to describe or ‘fit’ random  
711 error or noise, instead of a meaningful relationship between variables. Transferability of over-fitted  
712 models in time or space becomes problematic.

Autecological studies identifying precise bioclimatic variables that affect a particular species' performance or survival, and their mechanisms of action, are rare (e.g. Pigott & Huntley, 1981). However, general biological knowledge accumulated for a variety of taxonomic groups and climate regions, assessments of bioclimatic variable performance (e.g. Barbet-Massin & Jetz, 2014) and previous published models provide a basis for an informed choice of bioclimatic variables for most species. Mean annual temperature or precipitation are unlikely ever to be mechanistically important (Bateman *et al.*, 2012; Huntley, 2012; Platts *et al.*, 2013) but coldest and/or warmest month means or annual extremes and annual thermal sums above or below relevant thresholds, for example, have well-understood mechanistic roles for a wide range of taxonomic groups. For higher plants, the balance between precipitation and evaporation is mechanistically relevant, while members of other taxonomic groups may be greatly influenced by the distribution of precipitation through the year. Other taxon-specific measures relating to particular periods of high sensitivity to weather conditions, such as the breeding season (Pearce-Higgins *et al.*, 2015a) may also be considered.

Regionally, for tropical species, relevant bioclimatic variables are likely to include a combination of coldest and warmest month mean temperatures, annual ratio of actual to potential evapotranspiration, the intensity of the dry/wet season, and measures of rainfall bimodality (i.e., two rainy seasons in a year). For temperate species, the best default bioclimatic variables are likely to include the coldest month mean temperature, annual thermal sum above 5°C, and the annual ratio of actual to potential evapotranspiration. For some cool temperate species that have a 'chilling' requirement, a measure of the length of the period with temperatures below a threshold (e.g. 0°C), or the (negative) annual thermal sum below 0°C can be an important additional variable, as well as snow water equivalent (SWE).

*General Circulation Models (GCMs).* GCMs are computationally intensive mathematical models of atmosphere and ocean processes that are used to generate weather forecasts and climate change projections. GCM outputs differ due to dissimilarities in the ways that models simplify and simulate extremely complex systems, as well as due to knowledge-gaps in climate science. No GCM perfectly reproduces all of the features of the global climate system, so use several models to understand the uncertainties in projections is essential. Fordham *et al.* (2011, 2012) offers some tools for model selection, ensemble building based on model skill, and downscaling. Model inclusion by the IPCC in a recent report (IPCC, 2013) conveys legitimacy, and those selected should reflect the range of uncertainty amongst models by including those that are relatively 'warm', 'cool', 'wet', and 'dry', as well as those whose mean temperature and precipitation projections are near the mean of all models. Models that perform 'best' in the geographical region of interest should be favoured (Baker *et al.*, 2015). Where possible, use of observed climate data to assess model performance under past conditions in CCVA focal areas is also valuable. The IPCC's Data Distribution Centre is a portal for a broad range of GCM outputs.

Projections from the individual models selected, collectively referred to as the model 'ensemble', may be averaged to produce a single projection, with the degree of agreement between projections represented by a measure of 'spread' such as the standard deviation or coefficient of variation (for details and caveats of model averaging, see Dormann *et al.* (2018)). While this is often carried out in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

other contexts, for CCVA this is inadvisable because it provides little insight into the uncertainty of CCVA outputs. Conducting individual assessments using projections from several (at least three) individual models is preferable to a single assessment applied to one model ensemble. Additionally, since different models may generate qualitatively different circulation patterns, averaging them could also result in an ensemble mean projection that is mechanistically unrealistic or physically impossible, or that disguises year-to-year variations that may be important drivers of vulnerability.

Where a CCVA's spatial extent is relatively limited, and particularly in areas of complex topography, projections using Regional Climate Models (RCMs (Morales *et al.*, 2007)) are generally more accurate than GCM projections downscaled using change factors or statistical downscaling, because RCMs operate mechanistically on horizontal resolutions of tens rather than hundreds of kilometres. The island of Madagascar, for example, is spanned by only approximately 15 grid cells at a typical GCM resolution, but by over 300 RCM cells (55 km in size). However, it is essential to ensure that the GCM-derived boundary conditions used by the RCM simulation are from an appropriate GCM simulation. The Coordinated Regional Climate Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX) provides a series of regional datasets derived from RCM simulations at continental scale, with a grain size of 0.11 to 0.44 decimal degrees (~12 to 49 km at the equator) depending on the model and continent, whilst the Hadley Centre PRECIS RCM can be run using either this grain size or a 25km grid (Jones *et al.*, 2004). Where possible, use of the most appropriate regional models that have been shown to provide good predictive performance for the area / variables of interest is advisable (Baker *et al.*, 2017). Even regional models, however, are unable to account for fine-scale climate variability across regions with high relief. A subsequent, non-mechanistic, downscaling step may therefore be desirable to recover finer-scale spatial variation at sub-RCM grid scales; the change factor method, for example, involves combining anomalies between modelled current and projected climate variables with those from observed climate datasets at finer scales (see Foden & Young, 2016).

*Greenhouse Gas Trajectories and Emissions Scenarios*

Greenhouse gas trajectories aim to capture the uncertainty in future climate due to different future anthropogenic emissions. The IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (IPCC, 2014) includes four Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) or trajectories: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6 and RCP 8.5 (the radiative forcing in  $W.m^{-2}$  determines the number succeeding RCP), which supersede the SRES scenarios used by the IPCC's third (2001) and fourth (2007) assessments. Selecting trajectories typically involves identifying a broad range of plausible possible futures and may include adoption of the precautionary principle. In support of the latter, evidence from the past 25 years is that emissions have continued more or less along the worst-case trajectory (i.e. 'business-as-usual') considered plausible by the IPCC in 1990 (Raupach *et al.*, 2007). In addition, improvements in climate models over the same period have not reduced the magnitude of disparities between changes projected by different models and under different emissions scenarios, nor have they resulted in any substantial change in the magnitude of projected potential climate changes. If the precautionary principle is adopted, then RCP8.5 is recommended.

To apply the 'plausible range of futures' approach, we suggest using either two or all four RCPs to represent the overall range of plausible uncertainty about future emissions. Selecting an odd number of RCPs is not recommended, because readers of the assessment may be inclined to interpret central values as most likely, and thus underestimate the uncertainties involved. Because achieving RCP2.6 is unlikely given our current trajectory, a common choice is to select RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 as the low and high emissions scenarios respectively, and indeed regional climate centres sometimes prioritise simulations with these forcings. However, RCP2.6 matches most closely to the ambition of 'Holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C' agreed by parties of the UNFCCC in Paris, 2015. Considering also the recent advances in carbon capture technologies (Keith *et al.*, 2018), the option of including RCP2.6 as an optimistic (low emissions) scenario should not be discounted (van Vuuren *et al.*, 2011). In contrast to working with climate models, it is inappropriate to calculate any kind of ensemble mean of the CCVA results for two or more RCPs. Instead, individual CCVAs should be made for each RCP in order to capture uncertainty in the CCVA due to the unknown future radiative forcing.

## Ecological data

Arguably the most important ecological pressure on many species from climate change, particularly over multi-decadal time scales, is through shifts, degradation, and changes in the extent of areas offering suitable habitat; unless these are considered in combination with climate suitability, CCVA may be inaccurate. Ecological changes have already been observed in response to climate and atmospheric carbon dioxide, for example as shrubs expand northward into the Arctic tundra boreal forest (Swann *et al.*, 2010; Blok *et al.*, 2011; Hill & Henry, 2011), and African savannah grasslands are transformed into woodlands (Bond & Midgley, 2012). When modelling species abundance, the inclusion of such habitat variables is particularly important (e.g. Renwick *et al.*, 2012). Although land-cover data for the 'present' (i.e., recent past) are widely available (Supplementary Table 7) and have been used for projecting species' future ranges (e.g. Renwick *et al.*, 2012; Pearce-Higgins & Green, 2014; Massimino *et al.*, 2017), use of projections of future land cover (i.e. considering climate change and other pressures) is, in principle, preferable. Some authors have begun to use Dynamic Global Vegetation Models (Cramer *et al.*, 2001; Scheiter & Higgins, 2009; Scheiter *et al.*, 2013) to estimate future vegetation changes (e.g. Thuiller *et al.*, 2006; Blanco *et al.*, 2014; Talluto *et al.*, 2016; Case & Lawler, 2017). Pompe *et al.* (2008) combined scenarios of climate and land use changes up to 2080 based on three 'storylines', in order to model the future ranges of German plant species, while Hannah *et al.* (2013) considered future agricultural land-use changes in response to climate change. However, such projections introduce a new level of uncertainty, being based upon a series of alternative socio-economic projections themselves.

## Data on human response pressures

Most current CCVA methods ignore the impacts of human responses to climate change on biodiversity, even though these could match or exceed impacts arising directly from abiotic or biotic

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

pressures (Turner *et al.*, 2010, but see Young *et al.*, 2012). Such responses include changing land use (e.g. due to expansion of biofuel plantations, land abandonment, new agricultural demands as people migrate), increased water abstraction and building hard infrastructure (e.g. sea walls, dams, wind and solar energy installations) (Watson, 2014; Segan *et al.*, 2015). The advent of Nature-based Solutions (Kabisch *et al.*, 2016; Nesshöver *et al.*, 2017), however, introduces the likelihood that some human responses will have positive impacts on species. Segan *et al.* (2015) found that the relative vulnerabilities of Southern African bird species changed markedly when potential impacts of climate change on human communities were considered (Supplementary Table 7 includes the resources they used). Although human response pressures are difficult to predict, their inclusion is a priority for future CCVA approaches (Maxwell *et al.*, 2015).

**SPECIES THAT POSE PARTICULAR CCVA CHALLENGES**

Although CCVA has been widely applied across taxonomic groups (Pacifi *et al.*, 2015), many species are poorly assessed or frequently omitted due to insufficient occurrence, trait or physiological data. We focus here on species that are omitted from assessments, but note that others such as long-distance migrants may face concerning shortcomings in their assessments due to failure to explicitly incorporate migratory connectivity (Small-Lorenz *et al.*, 2013). With the exception of well-studied taxonomic groups, incomplete species coverage in CCVA applications is common. Species omission rates as high as 33% for African vertebrates (Garcia *et al.*, 2012), 42% of 5,200 species across 17 taxa in England, a relatively well-monitored and data-rich country (Pearce-Higgins *et al.*, 2017) and 92% for threatened sub-Saharan amphibians (Platts *et al.*, 2014) mean that general conclusions about species' vulnerability to climate change may be biased toward better-known species (Schwartz *et al.*, 2006; Platts *et al.*, 2014). Challenges in the application of conventional CCVA methods arise for three types of species in particular: those that are *poorly-known*, those with *naturally small ranges*, and those with *ranges that have become smaller due to other anthropogenic pressures*. For these species to be included in assessments, enhanced data to allow the use of conventional CCVA methods, modified CCVA methods or alternative approaches are needed.

Efforts to fill data gaps and use conventional CCVA methods can rely on inferences from data for related species (Foden *et al.*, 2013), expert opinion (Murray *et al.*, 2009; Martin *et al.*, 2015), data imputation techniques, or a combination of literature and targeted fieldwork (Williams *et al.*, 2009). Conventional CCVA methods can be modified to accommodate incomplete data. Correlative modelling of poorly-known and small-range species can rely on simplified correlative techniques (Hof *et al.*, 2011; Platts *et al.*, 2014), more complex techniques with adjusted parameters (Hof *et al.*, 2011), methods that account for potential biases in sampling effort (Beale *et al.*, 2014), or consensus building around several models based on a small number of predictors (Lomba *et al.*, 2010). For declined-range species, correlative models could overestimate climate change vulnerability if, for example, warmer parts of the range have been lost for non-climatic reasons (e.g. deforestation at low elevations); therefore, the extant range should be augmented with information on the historic range whenever possible. Another modification to conventional CCVA methods is to redefine taxonomic focus of the models, selecting either a resource used by the focal species that has

1  
2  
3 875 sufficient data (Delean *et al.*, 2013), or a species assemblage that includes the focal species.  
4 876 Assemblages can be defined with reference to community types (Ferrier & Guisan, 2006), biomes  
5 877 (Midgley *et al.*, 2003), or shared traits (Golicher *et al.*, 2008; Vale & Brito, 2015) that are thought to  
6 878 mediate species' responses to climate change. Caution is needed, however, in the use of such  
7 879 approaches given the evidence from the Quaternary record of the individualistic responses of  
8 880 species to past climate changes (e.g. Huntley, 1991; Graham *et al.*, 1996) and the resulting  
9 881 impermanence of species assemblages (e.g. Graham & Grimm, 1990; Huntley, 1996).  
10  
11  
12 882 Alternative approaches make use of available data to draw inferences about species' vulnerability to  
13 883 climate change (Table 7). When historical data on population and climate variability are available,  
14 884 temporal analysis can be used to identify long-term trends in potential climate drivers of population  
15 885 change and infer future population changes under projected climates (Pearce-Higgins *et al.*, 2017).  
16 886 When the information available is restricted to climate data, assessments can be based solely on the  
17 887 exposure of geographical areas to climate changes. Analysis of multiple dimensions of climate  
18 888 change, such as velocities of temperature change or the disappearance of specific climate  
19 889 conditions, and associated threats and opportunities for species (Garcia *et al.*, 2014b) can provide  
20 890 indications of the likely vulnerability of species present in such areas (Ohlemuller *et al.*, 2008; Garcia  
21 891 *et al.*, 2014a).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Table 7. Alternative approaches for carrying out CCVA in three challenging situations, namely for poorly-known species, those with naturally small ranges, and those with ranges that have become smaller due to anthropogenic threats (from Foden et al., 2016)

	Poorly-known species	Small-range species	Declined-range species (not climate related)
<b>Conventional approaches</b>			
<b>Correlative models</b>	Statistically problematic where occurrence records are insufficient	Statistically problematic due to insufficient occurrence records	Problematic since extant range cannot be used to infer environmental niche
<b>Mechanistic models</b>	Problematic where mechanistic information is insufficient	Applicable if mechanistic data available	Applicable if mechanistic data available
<b>Trait-based models</b>	Problematic where trait information is insufficient	Applicable if trait data available	Applicable if trait data available
<b>Alternative approaches</b>			
<b>i. Fill data gaps</b>	High priority; data addition or inference may render all conventional approaches applicable	Beneficial for correlative approaches if new data extend known distribution range New trait data may render conventional trait-based and mechanistic approaches applicable	Additional data on extinct localities or range are advisable to complement extant occurrence records for correlative modelling (thus increasing environmental niche coverage). Additional trait data likely to render conventional trait-based and mechanistic approaches applicable
<b>ii. Temporal analysis of population variability</b>	Potentially the best solution, but problematic where time-series information is insufficient. May not fully capture impact mechanisms associated with long-term climatic change.	Potentially applicable, if robust time-series of inter-annual population variability are available. Underlying demographic processes should be carefully considered. May not fully capture impact mechanisms associated with long-term climatic change.	Potentially applicable, if robust time-series of inter-annual population variability are available. Underlying demographic processes should be carefully considered. May not fully capture impact mechanisms associated with long-term climatic change.
<b>iii. Modified correlative</b>	Potentially applicable; advantageous when	Potentially applicable, and advantageous	Potentially applicable, but important to

<b>techniques</b>	species-level results are essential, although results will be less reliable	when species-level results are essential	ensure that predictors associated with decline are included in model or used to filter model projections
<b>iv. Alternative taxonomic focus</b>	Assessing assemblages of associated species is applicable when species-level results are not essential. This can be applied using conventional correlative and trait-based approaches	Apply correlative models to interacting species, particularly where closely coupled to the focal species (e.g., specialist resource species or close competitors). Assessing assemblages of associated species is applicable when species-level results are not essential; this can be applied using conventional correlative or trait-based approaches	As for 'small-range species'. Assessing assemblages is particularly relevant where they share a common reason for decline. Ensure that predictors associated with decline are included in model or used to filter model projections
<b>v. Exposure assessment of geographic area</b>	Potentially applicable if region of occurrence is known and when species-level results not essential	Applicable when species-level results not essential; potential to make results more species-specific by using traits to interpret likely threats and opportunities arising due to region's exposure to climate changes	Applicable when species-level results not essential; potential to make results more species-specific by using traits to interpret likely threats and opportunities arising due to region's exposure to climate changes and by considering impacts on drivers of species decline

RED LIST ASSESSMENTS AND CCVA

The three-step assessment protocol outlined above parallels that recommended for assessing species' extinction risks under climate change using the IUCN Red List criteria (IUCN SSC Standards and Petitions Subcommittee, 2017, section 12.1). Red List assessments use information on threats (including their spatial spread and projected severity), symptoms of endangerment (e.g. size and trends of population and range area, fragmentation and fluctuations), and life history traits (e.g. generation time, mating system, dispersal ability) to estimate or infer a number of variables such as reduction in geographic range and population size, and thereby to determine species' extinction risks. Identifying likely mechanisms of climate change impacts helps to define key variables needed in Red List assessments. Each of the three CCVA stages for quantifying impacts (Step 3) can produce results that are applicable to Red Listing. Table 8 links these stages to the Red List parameters they can inform and the subsequent Red List criteria to which these apply. Expert or trait-based assessment, for example, may reveal that a focal species has a very restricted distribution which is subject to an immediate threat, thereby triggering a Red Listing of Vulnerable under criterion D2. However, in order to project distribution and/or population declines and hence apply criteria A and C1, correlative, mechanistic and/or combined approaches are required.

Table 8. Relationships between CCVA Assessment Stages and approaches, Red List parameters and Red List Assessment criteria (in parentheses)

Assessment stage and approach	Relevant Red List parameters
Stage 1: Expert and trait-based assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Very restricted distribution and the plausibility and immediacy of threat (D2)</li><li>• Number of locations (B, D2)</li><li>• Severe fragmentation (B, C2)</li><li>• Extreme fluctuations (B, C2)</li><li>• Continuing decline (B, C2)</li><li>• <i>Suspected</i> population reduction (A)</li></ul>
Stage 2: Correlative assessment and correlative-trait combinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Estimated continuing decline (C1)</li><li>• <i>Inferred</i> or <i>projected</i> population reduction (A)</li></ul>
Stage 3: Mechanistic assessment and mechanistic-correlative-trait combinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Estimated continuing decline (C1)</li><li>• <i>Projected</i> population reduction (A)</li><li>• Probability of extinction (E)</li></ul>

## 915 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

### 916 CCVA validation

917 Validation of CCVAs is an important process that identifies how well the different methods are  
918 performing. This is crucial both for understanding uncertainty in current assessments and for guiding  
919 model choice and development for future assessments. Comparisons of the results of different  
920 CCVAs have highlighted variable results when considering the same species (Lankford *et al.*, 2014;  
921 Wheatley *et al.*, 2017), so identifying which approaches are most effective is essential to aid  
922 conservation practitioners and policy makers when making decisions based on the CCVA outputs.

923  
924 Most of the approaches applied to CCVA validation to date have been focussed on the performance  
925 of ecological niche models and similar correlative methods, testing model-based predictions across  
926 space and through time. The most commonly used approach involves repeatedly fitting models using  
927 randomly selected subsets of the available data from a single time period (e.g. 70% of the records),  
928 with performance of the model assessed on how well the remaining data are predicted by them  
929 (Araújo *et al.* 2005; Pearson *et al.*, 2007; Hole *et al.*, 2009; Araújo *et al.*, 2011; Garcia *et al.*, 2012).  
930 However, this can lead to an overestimation of predictive ability, because data in the test set are  
931 spatially autocorrelated with those used for calibration (Beale *et al.*, 2008). Where possible, it is  
932 preferable to predict a species' distribution in one geographic region based on a model fitted to  
933 records from a different region (Beerling *et al.*, 1995; Randin *et al.*, 2006), again comparing the  
934 predicted distribution with the actual distribution data for the non-modelled region to assess how  
935 well the model has performed. Alternatively, geographic partitioning of the study area can generate  
936 validation data that are more spatially independent than data resulting from random sub-setting  
937 (Morueta-Holme *et al.*, 2010; Wenger & Olden, 2012). In this case, the study area is divided into  
938 distinct geographic sections, such as spatially clustered tiles or longitudinal bands, and the model is  
939 fitted and evaluated with records from distinct sections.

940  
941 Both of these approaches (random subsets and 'out of area') only consider model performance  
942 during the same timeframe, which may be of limited applicability for a model that is designed to  
943 assess temporal changes in response to climate change. One way to improve this is to use the model  
944 to predict distribution in another time period (either forward or backwards in time; Hill *et al.*, 1999;  
945 Araújo *et al.*, 2005; Morelli *et al.*, 2012; Bled *et al.*, 2013; Watling *et al.*, 2013; Huntley *et al.*, 2014).  
946 The model predictions can then be tested against actual records in the non-modelled time period or,  
947 most rigorously of all, tested against changes to the distribution or abundance either forwards or  
948 backwards through time (Green *et al.*, 2008; Gregory *et al.*, 2009; Illan *et al.*, 2014; Stephens *et al.*  
949 2016). Such tests have demonstrated that correlative methods can have useful predictive power  
950 when modelling changes in distribution or abundance, and therefore may be informative when  
951 predicting species vulnerability under climate change.

952  
953 Combined CCVAs incorporate different (depending on the specific method) types of information  
954 about the attributes of species, environments they occupy, and their empirical population and  
955 distribution trends, as well as correlative model-based projections. There has been relatively little

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

validation of trait-based CCVAs, although it is possible to do so by comparing results of the assessment for a species against observed changes in that species' distribution or abundance under climate change (where available). One recent study (Wheatley *et al.*, 2017) using this approach found that trait-only CCVAs did not predict changes in status through time successfully whereas methods that included population and/or distribution trends (incorporating correlative projections) as well as some trait information (e.g. habitat and dispersal constraints) could predict changes in status. This validation was limited to one geographic region over a relatively short time period, so further work is required to broaden the scope of CCVA validation and establish which methods work best under different circumstances.

**Improving biodiversity data**

The absence of readily available, research-quality data on species' distributions, physiological tolerances, interspecific interactions and ecological traits limits the application of CCVA methods for many species, especially those in non-charismatic groups and/or poorly-studied regions (Foden *et al.*, 2013; Butt *et al.*, 2016; Supplementary Table 7). The poor coordination and disharmony of existing biodiversity observations are additional challenges (Scholes *et al.*, 2012; Joppa *et al.*, 2016). Increasing the quantity, quality and coordination of biodiversity data is therefore a priority to allow application of CCVA methods to more species, validate CCVA outputs, enable more widespread use of mechanistic models and perform the monitoring needed to integrate climate change adaptation into conservation plans and actions. Furthermore, recognition of the value of trait variability in addition to species means will improve predication accuracy (Cordlandwehr *et al.*, 2013). Encouraging signs are the increasing availability of digital locality data through portals such as the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, published trait databases (e.g. Oliveira *et al.*, 2017), and citizen science schemes for sharing observational data (e.g. eBird, iNaturalist (Pearce-Higgins *et al.*, 2018). Progress towards imputing unknown trait data also helps fill data gaps (Penone *et al.*, 2014; Schrodtt *et al.*, 2015).

**Advancing CCVA methodology**

CCVA methodological development remains a fertile area of research. Combined or 'hybrid' methods that draw on the strengths of the three approaches provide much promise. Inter-species interactions are seldom explicitly considered in CCVAs, yet they can be important drivers of climate change impacts on species (Ockendon *et al.*, 2014); Schweiger *et al.* (2008, 2012) and Singer *et al.*, (2018) provide notable exceptions and illustrate how such interactions may be included. Modelling the dynamics of predator-prey, host-parasite and competitor dynamics (including those involving invasive alien species) into the future represents a key gap and challenge. Better understanding of how climate and non-climate pressures interact, and how to account for this interaction in CCVA methods is another challenge (Segan *et al.*, 2015). Greater attention to baselines, and accounting for climate change that has already taken place (IPCC, 2013; van Wilgen *et al.*, 2015; Huntley *et al.* 2018) are needed to improve correlative approaches, especially for species with slow or lagged responses to ongoing climate change. Trait-based models can be improved through better empirical data on

995 thresholds associated with vulnerability for traits. As mentioned, incorporating the effects of human  
 996 responses to climate change into CCVAs is another area that requires additional development.

#### 997 *Better consideration of climate extremes and variability*

998 Future climates will have more variability and more frequent extreme events, although to date these  
 999 remain poorly projected by earth system models. Nonetheless, together these will likely have  
 1000 greater effects on ecological systems than shifts in means alone (Thompson *et al.*, 2013). Extreme  
 1001 events are challenging to evaluate due to their rarity. Ameca y Juárez *et al.* (2013) analysed impacts  
 1002 of cyclones and droughts on terrestrial mammals, and Thompson *et al.* (2013) proposed a method  
 1003 for using downscaled climate projections that incorporate changes in climate variability. Despite the  
 1004 important roles that variability and extremes play in determining patterns of biological diversity, the  
 1005 ecology and conservation communities are just beginning to address the impacts of catastrophic  
 1006 events (Butt *et al.*, 2016; Palmer *et al.* 2017).

#### 1007 **Incorporating molecular information**

1008 Molecular data can help in CCVA analyses by providing information on population processes such as  
 1009 modes of reproduction, past and current dispersal patterns, and changes in population size.

1010 Molecular analyses have traditionally involved microsatellite (=SSR) markers consisting of variation  
 1011 in the number of short tandem repeats ('microsatellites') at various locations in an organism's DNA,  
 1012 as well as sequence variation in mitochondrial (mt) and chloroplast (cp) DNA. However, in recent  
 1013 years there has been a rapid shift from scoring variation in a few (10-30) microsatellite markers to  
 1014 using thousands of SNP (single nucleotide polymorphism) markers across genomes, since new  
 1015 sequencing technologies mean that these can now be screened cheaply using non-invasive sampling  
 1016 (Allendorf, 2017). SNP markers provide a more detailed and accurate picture of population  
 1017 processes (Çilingir *et al.*, 2017; Younger *et al.*, 2017), including the way in which populations have  
 1018 expanded and shrunk historically, and their interactions with other populations. Molecular markers  
 1019 indicate whether ongoing exchange of genes across populations or species has occurred which may  
 1020 bolster the species' adaptive capacity (Garcia-Elfring *et al.*, 2017).

1021 As information on the genomics and transcriptomics of many groups of organisms increases,  
 1022 molecular SNP markers are increasingly being used to test for local adaptation across species ranges  
 1023 (Hoffmann *et al.*, 2015; Allendorf, 2017). Such tests have traditionally relied on controlled  
 1024 experiments in which populations from different environments are reared under common  
 1025 conditions and/or translocated between sites; these tests are difficult and time-consuming to  
 1026 undertake for long-lived species and may not deliver results in a sufficiently timely manner,  
 1027 particularly for already-threatened species. However, local adaptation to different climates can also  
 1028 be identified by testing whether genomic markers are correlated with environmental gradients (e.g.  
 1029 Steane *et al.*, 2014; Schweizer *et al.*, 2016; Harrisson *et al.*, 2017), which in turn can be used to  
 1030 predict whether gene pool mixing can bolster adaptive capacity (He *et al.*, 2016; Jordan *et al.*, 2017).  
 1031 Molecular data can also be combined with phenotypic information on species to determine whether  
 1032 translocations to boost natural populations are successful at increasing fitness (Christmas *et al.*,



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1033 2016) and to assess the effects of hybridization on species as climate shifts their distributions and  
1034 increases the likelihood of hybridisation (Janes & Hamilton, 2017).

1035 **Incorporating adaptive genetic change and phenotypic plasticity**

1036 At this stage it is still unclear how quickly species can adapt genetically or plastically to counter the  
1037 effects of climate change. While species can exhibit genetic adaptation over remarkably short time  
1038 scales, CCVA-relevant information on the potential of species to undergo evolutionary adaptation to  
1039 climate change is relatively scarce (Catullo *et al.*, 2015; Nicotra *et al.*, 2015; Beever *et al.*, 2016). In  
1040 models where evolutionary adaptation has been incorporated into CCVAs, the impact of  
1041 evolutionary adaptation can be substantial at least in species with relatively short generation times  
1042 (Bush *et al.*, 2016). However evolutionary adaptation depends on the availability of adequate  
1043 heritable variation on which selection can act, and relevant information on such heritable variation is  
1044 currently only available for a few species. Plasticity can have a large impact on the adaptive potential  
1045 of populations, particularly through phenological changes that adjust the timing of activity and  
1046 reproduction of organisms (Merilä & Hendry, 2014). However, while many plastic changes in  
1047 response to climate change are adaptive in populations, this is not always the case, particularly  
1048 when the entire range of a species is considered (Duputié *et al.*, 2015). Guidelines on the  
1049 development and maintenance of adaptive capacity are currently being developed for incorporation  
1050 into CCVAs (Beever *et al.*, 2016).

1051 **Approaches to uncertainty**

1052 Since each component of data used in CCVA is associated with a degree of uncertainty, the overall  
1053 CCVA has a level of uncertainty derived from all component datasets. Data omitted due, for  
1054 example, to unavailability contributes further (Patt *et al.*, 2005). High uncertainty over species-  
1055 specific assessments is therefore to be expected, even where there is high confidence in the general  
1056 direction of projected trends (Pearce-Higgins *et al.*, 2017; Wheatley *et al.*, 2017). Despite the large  
1057 literature on this topic (Patt *et al.*, 2005; Glick *et al.*, 2011), more transparent, precise and consistent  
1058 approaches are needed to estimate and/or communicate the nature of uncertainty. ‘Maps of  
1059 ignorance’ (Rocchini *et al.*, 2011) and ‘Value-suppressing uncertainty palettes’ (Correll *et al.*, 2018),  
1060 for example, are effective ways of conveying uncertainties associated with predictions of species’  
1061 future ranges. Effective and targeted communication of CCVA results, drawing from lessons learnt  
1062 from the public climate change debate (Moser, 2010; Pidgeon & Fischhoff, 2011), can increase the  
1063 likelihood that findings will be used, including to inform adaptation strategies for focal species.

1064

1065

1066

## CONCLUSION

Understanding species' vulnerability to climate change plays a vital role in developing effective biodiversity conservation plans. This has driven the emergence of an exciting new field and a rapidly growing literature. With a dizzying number of studies available and more published every day, practitioners can easily be overwhelmed. New and existing concepts and terms have been variously interpreted, creating challenges for those wishing to apply them. Nevertheless, the field is now mature enough to summarize best practices and recommend approaches to apply today. We borrow from the time-tested Driver-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR) framework (Kristensen, 2004; Svarstad *et al.*, 2008; Omann *et al.*, 2009), and stress the importance of identifying and quantifying particular mechanisms that underlie climate change impacts on species of interest, since these directly inform appropriate conservation responses.

Quantification of the vulnerability conferred to species through impact mechanisms is a central CCVA theme. We describe four commonly applied CCVA approaches, namely trait-based, correlative, mechanistic and combined approaches, highlight advantages and disadvantages of each, and providing examples of their use. Because mechanistic methods (and approaches that combine mechanistic with another method) can potentially quantify multiple mechanisms of climate impact as well as interactions between climate change and non-climate change related pressures, these approaches provide an obvious advantage. However, mechanistic methods are data and resource intensive. Practitioners typically face real-world limitation of resources (e.g. time, money, data, expertise), leaving as options only less intensive and less detailed approaches, which now nonetheless produce valuable outputs (Martin *et al.*, 2012, 2017). Because poorly-known, small- and declined-range species are often of high priority for conservation and pose particular challenges for CCVA, we highlight possible approaches for their assessment. We also discuss the use of CCVA to inform Red List assessments of extinction risk.

Any CCVA approach can deliver unreliable or misleading results when incorrect input data and parameters are applied. We therefore provide guidance on selecting and using CCVA input data for estimating species' sensitivity and adaptive capacity, as well as for measuring exposure to pressures driven by abiotic climate change-related pressures (i.e. climate change, elevated greenhouse gasses, physical environment changes), biotic pressures (e.g. biotic interactions, ecosystem changes), and human responses to climate change. A growing body of valuable open-access CCVA resources is available, and we provide links and references for locating a selection of these. We also outline ways to communicate CCVA results in a range of contexts to maximize influence on conservation planning and management decisions.

Finally, we look to the future of CCVA and highlight some of the directions that we see as important avenues for further development and research. Most importantly, as observable climate change impacts on species become widespread, they provide opportunities to improve understanding of impact mechanisms and to test and validate CCVA assessments. Stepping up such validation and using results to improve CCVA of species is critical. We recognise the need for improving quantity, quality, and availability of biodiversity data, and advancing CCVA methodology, particularly through consideration of climate extremes and variability and of the effects of human responses to climate

1

2

31107 change. Lastly, we discuss developments in molecular biology and their potential application for

41108 improving CCVA of species.

5

61109 As change to Earth’s climates accelerates, managers and policy makers must become increasingly

71110 informed by CCVAs. The current strategic goals for biodiversity set by the Convention on Biological

81111 Diversity expire in 2020 and largely ignore climate change. To be effective, the post 2020 biodiversity

91112 agenda will need to be more explicit on protecting biodiversity under climate change, thus elevating

101113 the role of CCVA and requiring even more rigor in its application.

11

12

131114

14

151115

16

171116

18

191117 **FURTHER READING**

20

211118 **Resources for climate change adaptation and vulnerability assessment**

221119

23

241120 • IUCN Species Survival Commission: Guidelines for Assessing Species’ Vulnerability to Climate

251121 Change (Foden & Young, 2016)

261122 • Responding to Climate Change: Guidance for Protected Area Managers and Planners. Developed

271123 by the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (Gross *et al.*, 2016).

281124 • Climate-Smart Conservation: Putting Adaptation Principles into Practice. Developed by the US

291125 National Wildlife Federation (Stein *et al.*, 2014).

30

311126 • Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment for Natural Resources Management: Toolbox of

321127 Methods with Case Studies. Developed by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Johnson, 2014).

331128 • The Adaptation for Conservation Targets (ACT) Framework: A Tool for Incorporating Climate

341129 Change into Natural Resource Management (Cross *et al.*, 2012, 2013).

35

361130 • Scanning the Conservation Horizon: A Guide to Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment.

371131 Developed by a workgroup of US government, non-profit, and academic institutions (Glick *et al.*,

381132 2011).

39

401133 • Climate Change and Conservation: A Primer for Assessing Impacts and Advancing Ecosystem-

411134 based Adaptation in The Nature Conservancy (Groves *et al.*, 2010).

42

431135 • Voluntary guidance for states to incorporate climate change into state wildlife action plans and

441136 other management plans. Developed by the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

451137 (Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, 2009).

461138 • Species’ Distribution Modeling for Conservation Educators and Practitioners (Pearson, 2007).

471139 • Habitat Suitability and Distribution Models (Guisan *et al.*, 2017).

481140 • Online Open Course in Species Distribution Modeling (Huijbers *et al.*, 2016).

491141 • Biodiversity and Climate Change Virtual Laboratory (Hallgren *et al.*, 2016).

501142

51

52

531143

## 1144 FIGURES AND TABLES

1145 [Figures 1-6 and Tables 1-8 are included in the body of the text as instructed]

1146

1147 **Sidebar title:**

1148 [Box 1 included in body of the text as instructed]

1149

## 1150 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1151 We thank David Wright for his assistance with figures. WF thanks Guy Midgley for invaluable  
1152 discussions and support during the preparation of this review. This project was supported by the  
1153 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust with contributions from Norwegian Polar Institute and the IUCN Species  
1154 Survival Commission. We offer thanks to Cheryl and Neville Williams, Kit Kovacs, Simon Stuart and  
1155 Jon Paul Rodrigues for their roles in providing this support. We acknowledge the following people  
1156 who contributed to the IUCN Species Survival Commission's Guidelines for Assessing Species'  
1157 Vulnerability to Climate Change, from which inspiration for this review drew: Stuart Butchart,  
1158 Richard Corlett, John Gross, Kit Kovacs, Robert Lacy, Guy Midgley, Paul Pearce-Kelly, Richard  
1159 Pearson, April Reside, Carlo Rondinini, Brett Scheffers, Adam Smith, Mark Stanley Price, Stephen  
1160 Williams and Stephen Willis.

1161

1162

REFERENCES

Aars J. & Ims R.A. (2002) Intrinsic and climatic determinants of population demography: the winter dynamics of tundra voles. *Ecology*, **83**, 3449–3456.

Adger W.N. (2006) Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, **16**, 268–281.

Aiello-Lammens M.E., Boria R.A., Radosavljevic A., Vilela B., & Anderson R.P. (2015) spThin: An R package for spatial thinning of species occurrence records for use in ecological niche models. *Ecography*, **38**, 541–545.

Aiello-Lammens M.E., Chu-Agor M.L., Convertino M., Fischer R.A., Linkov I., & Akçakaya R.H. (2011) The impact of sea-level rise on Snowy Plovers in Florida: integrating geomorphological, habitat, and metapopulation models. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 3644–3654.

Allendorf F.W. (2017) Genetics and the conservation of natural populations: allozymes to genomes. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 420–430.

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.

Altwegg R., Broms K., Erni B., Barnard P., Midgley G.F., & Underhill L.G. (2012) Novel methods reveal shifts in migration phenology of barn swallows in South Africa. *Proceedings. Biological sciences*, **279**, 1485–90.

Altwegg R., Collingham Y.C., Erni B., & Huntley B. (2013) Density-dependent dispersal and the speed of range expansions. *Diversity and Distributions*, **19**, 60–68.

Ameca y Juárez E.I., Mace G.M., Cowlshaw G., Cornforth W. a., & Pettorelli N. (2013) Assessing exposure to extreme climatic events for terrestrial mammals. *Conservation Letters*, **6**, 145–153.

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**, 1415–20.

Anderson R.P. (2012) Harnessing the world’s biodiversity data: promise and peril in ecological niche modeling of species distributions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1260**, 66–80.

Anderson R.P. (2013) A framework for using niche models to estimate impacts of climate change on species distributions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1297**, 8–28.

Anderson R.P. & Raza A. (2010) The effect of the extent of the study region on GIS models of species geographic distributions and estimates of niche evolution: preliminary tests with montane rodents (genus *Nephelomys*) in Venezuela. *Journal of Biogeography*, **37**, 1378–1393.

Angert A.L., Crozier L.G., Rissler L.J., Gilman S.E., Tewksbury J.J., & Chunco A.J. (2011) Do species’ traits predict recent shifts at expanding range edges? *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 677–689.

Araújo M.B., Alagador D., Cabeza M., Nogués-Bravo D., & Thuiller W. (2011) Climate change

- 1199 threatens European conservation areas. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 484–92.
- 1200 Araujo M.B., Cabeza M., Thuiller W., Hannah L., & Williams P.H. (2004) Would climate change drive  
1201 species out of reserves? An assessment of existing reserve-selection methods. *Global Change*  
1202 *Biology*, **10**, 1618–1626.
- 1203 Araújo M.B., Pearson R.G., Thuiller W., & Erhard M. (2005) Validation of species–climate impact  
1204 models under climate change. *Global Change Biology*, **11**, 1504–1513.
- 1205 Araújo M.B. & Peterson A.T. (2012) Uses and misuses of bioclimatic envelope modeling. *Ecology*, **93**,  
1206 1527–1539.
- 1207 Arrhenius S. (1896) The influence of the carbonic acid in the air upon the temperature of the ground.  
1208 *Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science Tolman Jr. Source: The Journal of Geology*, **41**,  
1209 237–276.
- 1210 Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (2009) *Voluntary Guidance for States to Incorporate*  
1211 *Climate Change into State Wildlife Action Plans & Other Management Plans*. Association of Fish  
1212 and Wildlife Agencies, Washington DC.
- 1213 Baker D.J., Hartley A.J., Burgess N.D., Butchart S.H.M., Carr J.A., Smith R.J., Belle E., & Willis S.G.  
1214 (2015) Assessing climate change impacts for vertebrate fauna across the West African  
1215 protected area network using regionally appropriate climate projections. *Diversity and*  
1216 *Distributions*, **21**, 991–1003.
- 1217 Baker D.J., Hartley A.J., Pearce-Higgins J.W., Jones R.G., & Willis S.G. (2017) Neglected issues in using  
1218 weather and climate information in ecology and biogeography. *Diversity and Distributions*, **23**,  
1219 329–340.
- 1220 Barbet-Massin M. & Jetz W. (2014) A 40-year, continent-wide, multispecies assessment of relevant  
1221 climate predictors for species distribution modelling. *Diversity and Distributions*, **20**, 1285–  
1222 1295.
- 1223 Barbraud C. & Weimerskirch H. (2001) Emperor penguins and climate change. *Nature*, **411**, 183–6.
- 1224 Bateman B.L., VanDerWal J., & Johnson C.N. (2012) Nice weather for bettongs: using weather  
1225 events, not climate means, in species distribution models. *Ecography*, **35**, 306–314.
- 1226 Baudron A.R., Needle C.L., Rijnsdorp A.D., & Tara Marshall C. (2014) Warming temperatures and  
1227 smaller body sizes: Synchronous changes in growth of North Sea fishes. *Global Change Biology*,  
1228 **20**, 1023–1031.
- 1229 Bay R.A., Harrigan R.J., Underwood V. Le, Gibbs H.L., Smith T.B., & Ruegg K. (2018) Genomic signals  
1230 of selection predict climate-driven population declines in a migratory bird. *Science (New York,*  
1231 *N.Y.)*, **359**, 83–86.
- 1232 Beale C.M., Brewer M.J., & Lennon J.J. (2014) A new statistical framework for the quantification of  
1233 covariate associations with species distributions. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 421–  
1234 432.
- 1235 Beale C.M., Lennon J.J., & Gimona A. (2008) Opening the climate envelope reveals no macroscale  
1236 associations with climate in European birds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*



1  
2  
3 1237 of the United States of America, **105**, 14908–12.  
4  
5 1238 Beerling D.J., Huntley B., & Bailey J.P. (1995) Climate and the distribution of *Fallopia japonica*.  
6 1239 *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **6**, 269–282.  
7  
8 1240 Beever E.A., O’Leary J., Mengelt C., West J.M., Julius S., Green N., Magness D., Petes L., Stein B.,  
9 1241 Nicotra A.B., Hellmann J.J., Robertson A.L., Staudinger M.D., Rosenberg A.A., Babij E., Brennan  
10 1242 J., Schuurman G.W., & Hofmann G.E. (2016) Improving Conservation Outcomes with a New  
11 1243 Paradigm for Understanding Species’ Fundamental and Realized Adaptive Capacity.  
12 1244 *Conservation Letters*, **9**, 131–137.  
13  
14 1245 Beever E.A., Ray C., Wilkening J.L., Brussard P.F., & Mote P.W. (2011) Contemporary climate change  
15 1246 alters the pace and drivers of extinction. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 2054–2070.  
16  
17 1247 Bellard C., Bertelsmeier C., Leadley P., Thuiller W., & Courchamp F. (2012) Impacts of climate change  
18 1248 on the future of biodiversity. *Ecology letters*, **15**, 365–377.  
19  
20 1249 Bennie J., Hodgson J.A., Lawson C.R., Holloway C.T.R., Roy D.B., Brereton T., Thoma C.D., & Wilson  
21 1250 R.J. (2013) Range expansion through fragmented landscapes under a variable climate. *Ecology*  
22 1251 *Letters*, **16**, 921–929.  
23  
24 1252 Bennie J., Huntley B., Wiltshire A., Hill M.O., & Baxter R. (2008) Slope, aspect and climate: spatially  
25 1253 explicit and implicit models of topographic microclimate in chalk grassland. *Ecological*  
26 1254 *Modelling*, **216**, 47–59.  
27  
28 1255 Bennie J., Kubin E., Wiltshire A., Huntley B., & Baxter R. (2010) Predicting spatial and temporal  
29 1256 patterns of bud-burst and spring frost risk in north-west Europe: the implications of local  
30 1257 adaptation to climate. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 1503–1514.  
31  
32 1258 Biesmeijer J.C., Roberts S.P.M., Reemer M., Ohlemüller R., Edwards M., Peeters T., Schaffers A.P.,  
33 1259 Potts S.G., Kleukers R., Thomas C.D., Settele J., & Kunin W.E. (2006) Parallel declines in  
34 1260 pollinators and insect-pollinated plants in Britain and the Netherlands. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*,  
35 1261 **313**, 351–4.  
36  
37 1262 Blanco C.C., Scheiter S., Sosinski E., Fidelis A., Anand M., & Pillar V.D. (2014) Feedbacks between  
38 1263 vegetation and disturbance processes promote long-term persistence of forest-grassland  
39 1264 mosaics in south Brazil. *Ecological Modelling*, **291**, 224–232.  
40  
41 1265 Bled F., Nichols J.D., & Altwegg R. (2013) Dynamic occupancy models for analyzing species’ range  
42 1266 dynamics across large geographic scales. *Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 4896–4909.  
43  
44 1267 Blok D., Schaepman-Strub G., Bartholomeus H., Heijmans M.M.P.D., Maximov T.C., & Berendse F.  
45 1268 (2011) The response of Arctic vegetation to the summer climate: relation between shrub cover,  
46 1269 NDVI, surface albedo and temperature. *Environmental Research Letters*, **6**, 035502.  
47  
48 1270 Bolin B.B., Döös B.R., Jäger J., & Warrick R.A. (1986) The greenhouse effect, climatic change, and  
49 1271 ecosystems. *Scope*, **29**, 541.  
50  
51 1272 Bond W.J. & Midgley G.F. (2012) Carbon dioxide and the uneasy interactions of trees and savannah  
52 1273 grasses. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **367**, 601–612.  
53  
54 1274 Both C., Bouwhuis S., Lessells C.M., & Visser M.E. (2006) Climate change and population declines in a

- 1275 long-distance migratory bird. *Nature*, **441**, 81–83.
- 1276 Both C., Van Turnhout C. a M., Bijlsma R.G., Siepel H., Van Strien A.J., & Foppen R.P.B. (2010) Avian  
1277 population consequences of climate change are most severe for long-distance migrants in  
1278 seasonal habitats. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, **277**, 1259–66.
- 1279 Bradshaw W.E. & Holzapfel C.M. (2001) Genetic shift in photoperiodic response correlated with  
1280 global warming. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **98**, 14509–14511.
- 1281 Bradshaw W.E. & Holzapfel C.M. (2006) Evolutionary response to rapid climate change. *Science*, **312**,  
1282 1477–8.
- 1283 Brook B.W., Akçakaya H.R., Keith D. a, Mace G.M., Pearson R.G., & Araújo M.B. (2009) Integrating  
1284 bioclimate with population models to improve forecasts of species extinctions under climate  
1285 change. *Biology letters*, **5**, 723–5.
- 1286 Burton I., Kates R.W., & White G.F. (1993) *The Environment as Hazard*. Guilford, New York.
- 1287 Bush A., Mokany K., Catullo R., Hoffmann A., Kellermann V., Sgrò C., McEvey S., & Ferrier S. (2016)  
1288 Incorporating evolutionary adaptation in species distribution modelling reduces projected  
1289 vulnerability to climate change. *Ecology Letters*, **19**, 1468–1478.
- 1290 Butt N., Possingham H.P., De Los Rios C., Maggini R., Fuller R.A., Maxwell S.L., & Watson J.E.M.  
1291 (2016) Challenges in assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change to inform  
1292 conservation actions. *Biological Conservation*, **199**, 10–15.
- 1293 Cahill A.E., Aiello-Lammens M.E., Fisher-Reid M.C., Hua X., Karanewsky C.J., Ryu H.Y., Sbeglia G.C.,  
1294 Spagnolo F., Waldron J.B., Warsi O., & Wiens J.J. (2013) How does climate change cause  
1295 extinction? *Proceedings. Biological sciences*, **280**, 20121890.
- 1296 Cardillo M., Mace G.M., Gittleman J.L., Jones K.E., Bielby J., & Purvis A. (2008) The predictability of  
1297 extinction: biological and external correlates of decline in mammals. *Proceedings. Biological  
1298 Sciences / The Royal Society*, **275**, 1441–8.
- 1299 Caruso N.M., Sears M.W., Adams D.C., & Lips K.R. (2014) Widespread rapid reductions in body size of  
1300 adult salamanders in response to climate change. *Global Change Biology*, **20**, 1751–1759.
- 1301 Carvalho S.B., Brito J.C., Crespo E.G., Watts M.E., & Possingham H.P. (2011) Conservation planning  
1302 under climate change: Toward accounting for uncertainty in predicted species distributions to  
1303 increase confidence in conservation investments in space and time. *Biological Conservation*,  
1304 **144**, 2020–2030.
- 1305 Case M.J. & Lawler J.J. (2017) Integrating mechanistic and empirical model projections to assess  
1306 climate impacts on tree species distributions in northwestern North America. *Global Change  
1307 Biology*, **23**, 2005–2015.
- 1308 Catullo R.A., Ferrier S., & Hoffmann A.A. (2015) Extending spatial modelling of climate change  
1309 responses beyond the realized niche: estimating, and accommodating, physiological limits and  
1310 adaptive evolution. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **24**, 1192–1202.
- 1311 Chapman S., Mustin K., Renwick A.R., Segan D.B., Hole D.G., Pearson R.G., & Watson J.E.M. (2014)  
1312 Publishing trends on climate change vulnerability in the conservation literature reveal a

1  
2  
3 1313 predominant focus on direct impacts and long time-scales. *Diversity and Distributions*, **20**,  
4 1314 1221–1228.  
5  
6 1315 Charmantier A., McCleery R.H., Cole L.R., Perrins C., Kruuk L.E.B., & Sheldon B.C. (2008) Adaptive  
7 1316 phenotypic plasticity in response to climate change in a wild bird population. *Science (New*  
8 1317 *York, N.Y.)*, **320**, 800–3.  
9  
10 1318 Chen I.-C., Hill J.K., Ohlemüller R., Roy D.B., & Thomas C.D. (2011) Rapid range shifts of species of  
11 1319 associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science*, **333**, 1024–1026.  
12  
13 1320 Chen I.-C., Shiu H.-J., Benedick S., Holloway J.D., Chey V.K., Barlow H.S., Hill J.K., & Thomas C.D.  
14 1321 (2009) Elevation increases in moth assemblages over 42 years on a tropical mountain.  
15 1322 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **106**, 1479–  
16 1323 83.  
17  
18 1324 Chessman B.C. (2013) Identifying species at risk from climate change: Traits predict the drought  
19 1325 vulnerability of freshwater fishes. *Biological Conservation*, **160**, 40–49.  
20  
21 1326 Cheung W.W.L., Sarmiento J.L., Dunne J., Frölicher T.L., Lam V.W.Y., Deng Palomares M.L., Watson  
22 1327 R., & Pauly D. (2012) Shrinking of fishes exacerbates impacts of global ocean changes on marine  
23 1328 ecosystems. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 254–258.  
24  
25 1329 Chevin L.-M., Lande R., & Mace G.M. (2010) Adaptation, plasticity, and extinction in a changing  
26 1330 environment: towards a predictive theory. *PLoS Biology*, **8**, e1000357.  
27  
28 1331 Christmas M.J., Breed M.F., & Lowe A.J. (2016) Constraints to and conservation implications for  
29 1332 climate change adaptation in plants. *Conservation Genetics*, **17**, 305–320.  
30  
31 1333 Cordlandwehr V., Meredith R.L., Ozinga W.A., Bekker R.M., van Groenendael J.M., & Bakker J.P.  
32 1334 (2013) Do plant traits retrieved from a database accurately predict on-site measurements?  
33 1335 *Journal of Ecology*, **101**, 662–670.  
34  
35 1336 Correll M., Moritz D., & Heer J. (2018) Value-Suppressing Uncertainty Palettes. 1–11.  
36  
37 1337 Cramer W., Bondeau A., Woodward F.I., Prentice I.C., Betts R.A., Brovkin V., Cox P.M., Fisher V.,  
38 1338 Foley J.A., Friend A.D., & Kucharik C. (2001) Global response of terrestrial ecosystem structure  
39 1339 and function to CO<sub>2</sub> and climate change: results from six dynamic global vegetation models.  
40 1340 *Global Change Biology*, **7**, 357–373.  
41  
42 1341 Cross M.S., McCarthy P.D., Garfin G., Gori D., & Enquist C.A.F. (2013) Accelerating Adaptation of  
43 1342 Natural Resource Management to Address Climate Change. *Conservation Biology*, **27**, 4–13.  
44  
45 1343 Cross M.S., Zavaleta E.S., Bachelet D., Brooks M.L., Enquist C.A.F., Fleishman E., Graumlich L.J.,  
46 1344 Groves C.R., Hannah L., Hansen L., Hayward G., Koopman M., Lawler J.J., Malcolm J., Nordgren  
47 1345 J., Petersen B., Rowland E.L., Scott D., Shafer S.L., Shaw M.R., & Tabor G.M. (2012) The  
48 1346 Adaptation for Conservation Targets ( ACT ) Framework: A Tool for Incorporating Climate  
49 1347 Change into Natural Resource Management. *Environmental Management*, **50**, 341–351.  
50  
51 1348 Crozier L.G. & Hutchings J.A. (2014) Plastic and evolutionary responses to climate change in fish.  
52 1349 *Evolutionary Applications*, **7**, 68–87.  
53  
54 1350 Cunningham S.J., Martin R.O., Hojem C.L., & Hockey P.A.R. (2013) Temperatures in Excess of Critical

- 1351 Thresholds Threaten Nestling Growth and Survival in A Rapidly-Warming Arid Savanna: A Study  
1352 of Common Fiscals. *PLoS ONE*, **8**, e74613.
- 1353 Dawson T.P., Jackson S.T., House J.I., Prentice I.C., & Mace G.M. (2011) Beyond predictions:  
1354 biodiversity conservation in a changing climate. *Science*, **332**, 53–58.
- 1355 Delean S., Bull C.M., Brook B.W., Heard L.M.B., & Fordham D.A. (2013) Using plant distributions to  
1356 predict the current and future range of a rare lizard. *Diversity and Distributions*, **19**, 1125–1137.
- 1357 Diniz-Filho J.A., Mauricio Bini L., Fernando Rangel T., Loyola R.D., Hof C., Nogués-Bravo D., & Araújo  
1358 M.B. (2009) Partitioning and mapping uncertainties in ensembles of forecasts of species  
1359 turnover under climate change. *Ecography*, **32**, 897–906.
- 1360 Dobrowski S.Z., Thorne J.H., & Greenberg J.A. (2011) Modeling plant ranges over 75 years of climate  
1361 change in California , USA: temporal transferability and species traits. *Ecological Monographs*,  
1362 **81**, 241–257.
- 1363 Doney S., Ruckelshaus M., Duffy J., Barry J., & Chan F. (2011) Climate change impacts on marine  
1364 ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, **4**, 4.1-4.27.
- 1365 Dormann C.F., Calabrese J.M., Guillera-Arroita G., Matechou E., Bahn V., Bartoń K., Beale C.M., Ciuti  
1366 S., Elith J., Gerstner K., Guelat J., Keil P., Lahoz-Monfort J.J., Pollock L.J., Reineking B., Roberts  
1367 D.R., Schröder B., Thuiller W., Warton D.I., Wintle B.A., Wood S.N., Wüest R.O., & Hartig F.  
1368 (2018) Model averaging in ecology: a review of Bayesian, information-theoretic, and tactical  
1369 approaches for predictive inference. *Ecological Monographs*, 1–63.
- 1370 Dormann C.F., Elith J., Bacher S., Buchmann C., Carl G., Carré G., Marquéz J.R.G., Gruber B.,  
1371 Lafourcade B., Leitão P.J., Münkemüller T., McClean C., Osborne P.E., Reineking B., Schröder B.,  
1372 Skidmore A.K., Zurell D., & Lautenbach S. (2013) Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with  
1373 it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*, **36**, 027–046.
- 1374 Dow K. (1992) Exploring differences in our common future(s): the meaning of vulnerability to global  
1375 environmental change. *Geoforum*, **23**, 417–436.
- 1376 Duputié A., Rutschmann A., Ronce O., & Chuine I. (2015) Phenological plasticity will not help all  
1377 species adapt to climate change. *Global Change Biology*, **21**, 3062–3073.
- 1378 Durance I. & Ormerod S.J. (2010) Evidence for the role of climate in the local extinction of a cool-  
1379 water triclad. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, **29**, 1367–1378.
- 1380 Elmhagen B., Kindberg J., Hellström P., & Angerbjörn A. (2015) A boreal invasion in response to  
1381 climate change? Range shifts and community effects in the borderland between forest and  
1382 tundra. *Ambio*, **44**, 39–50.
- 1383 Engle N.L. (2011) Adaptive capacity and its assessment. *Global Environmental Change*, **21**, 647–656.
- 1384 Estrada A., Meireles C., Morales-Castilla I., Poschlod P., Vieites D., Araújo M.B., & Early R. (2015)  
1385 Species' intrinsic traits inform their range limitations and vulnerability under environmental  
1386 change. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **24**, 849–858.
- 1387 Estrada A., Morales-castilla I., Caplat P., & Early R. (2016) Usefulness of Species Traits in Predicting  
1388 Range Shifts. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **20145**, 1–14.

- 1389 European Environment Agency (1995) *Europe's Environment: The Dobri's Assessment*. European  
 1390 Environment Agency Task Force (European Commission) in Cooperation with: United Nations  
 1391 Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP),  
 1392 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Copenhagen.
- 1393 Ferrier S. & Guisan A. (2006) Spatial modelling of biodiversity at the community level. *Journal of*  
 1394 *Applied Ecology*, **43**, 393–404.
- 1395 Fitzpatrick M.C., Gove A.D., Sanders N.J., & Dunn R.R. (2008) Climate change, plant migration, and  
 1396 range collapse in a global biodiversity hotspot: the Banksia (Proteaceae) of Western Australia.  
 1397 *Global Change Biology*, **14**, 1337–1352.
- 1398 Foden W., Midgley G.F., Hughes G., Bond W.J., Thuiller W., Hoffman M.T., Kaleme P., Underhill L.G.,  
 1399 Rebelo A., & Hannah L. (2007) A changing climate is eroding the geographical range of the  
 1400 Namib Desert tree *Aloe* through population declines and dispersal lags. *Diversity and*  
 1401 *Distributions*, **13**, 645–653.
- 1402 Foden W.B., Butchart S.H.M., Stuart S.N., Vié J.-C., Akçakaya H.R., Angulo A., DeVantier L.M., Gutsche  
 1403 A., Turak E., Cao L., Donner S.D., Katariya V., Bernard R., Holland R.A., Hughes A.F., O'Hanlon  
 1404 S.E., Garnett S.T., Şekercioğlu Ç.H., & Mace G.M. (2013) Identifying the World's Most Climate  
 1405 Change Vulnerable Species: A Systematic Trait-Based Assessment of all Birds, Amphibians and  
 1406 Corals. *PLoS ONE*, **8**, e65427.
- 1407 Foden W.B., Garcia R.A., Platts P.J., Carr J.A., Hoffmann A.A., & Visconti P. (2016) Selecting and  
 1408 evaluating CCVA approaches and methods. *IUCN SSC Guidelines for Assessing Species'*  
 1409 *Vulnerability to Climate Change* (ed. by W.B. Foden and B.E. Young), pp. 113. Commission,  
 1410 Occasional paper of the IUCN Species Survival, Gland, Switzerland.
- 1411 Foden W.B. & Young B.E. (2016) *IUCN SSC Guidelines for Assessing Species' Vulnerability to Climate*  
 1412 *Change. Version 1.0. Occasional Paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission No. 59*. IUCN  
 1413 Species Survival Commission, Cambridge, UK.
- 1414 Foley C., Pettorelli N., & Foley L. (2008) Severe drought and calf survival in elephants. *Biology letters*,  
 1415 **4**, 541–4.
- 1416 Forcada J. & Hoffman J.I. (2014) Climate change selects for heterozygosity in a declining fur seal  
 1417 population. *Nature*, **511**, 462–465.
- 1418 Forchhammer M.C., Stenseth N.C., Post E., & Langvatn R. (1998) Population dynamics of Norwegian  
 1419 red deer: density-dependence and climatic variation. *Proceedings. Biological sciences*, **265**,  
 1420 341–50.
- 1421 Fordham D.A., Akçakaya H.R., Brook B.W., Rodríguez A., Alves P.C., Civantos E., Triviño M., Watts  
 1422 M.J., & Araújo M.B. (2013) Adapted conservation measures are required to save the Iberian  
 1423 lynx in a changing climate. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 899–903.
- 1424 Fordham D.A., Wigley T.M.L., & Brook B.W. (2011) Multi-model climate projections for biodiversity  
 1425 risk assessments. *Ecological Applications*, **21**, 3317–3331.
- 1426 Fordham D.A., Wigley T.M.L., Watts M.J., & Brook B.W. (2012) Strengthening forecasts of climate  
 1427 change impacts with multi-model ensemble averaged projections using MAGICC/SCENGEN 5.3.  
 1428 *Ecography*, **35**, 4–8.



- 1429 Forrest J.L., Wikramanayake E., Shrestha R., Areendran G., Gyeltshen K., Maheshwari A., Mazumdar  
1430 S., Naidoo R., Thapa G.J., & Thapa K. (2012) Conservation and climate change: Assessing the  
1431 vulnerability of snow leopard habitat to treeline shift in the Himalaya. *Biological Conservation*,  
1432 **150**, 129–135.
- 1433 Franco A.M.A., Hill J.K., Kitschke C., Collingham Y.C., Roy D.B., Fox R., Huntley B., & Thomas C.D.  
1434 (2006) Impacts of climate warming and habitat loss on extinctions at species' low-latitude  
1435 range boundaries. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 1545–1553.
- 1436 Franklin J. (2009) *Mapping species distributions: spatial inference and prediction*. Cambridge  
1437 University Press, Cambridge.
- 1438 Frederiksen M., Wanless S., Harris M.P., Rothery P., & Wilson L.J. (2004) The role of industrial  
1439 fisheries and oceanographic change in the decline of North Sea black-legged kittiwakes. *Journal*  
1440 *of Applied Ecology*, **41**, 1129–1139.
- 1441 Fryxell J.M. & Sinclair A.R.E. (1988) Causes and consequences of migration by large herbivores.  
1442 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **3**, 237–241.
- 1443 Garamszegi L.Z. (2011) Climate change increases the risk of malaria in birds. *Global Change Biology*,  
1444 **17**, 1751–1759.
- 1445 Garcia-Elfring A., Barrett R.D.H., Combs M., Davies T.J., Munshi-South J., & Millien V. (2017)  
1446 Admixture on the northern front: Population genomics of range expansion in the white-footed  
1447 mouse (*Peromyscus leucopus*) and secondary contact with the deer mouse (*Peromyscus*  
1448 *maniculatus*). *Heredity*, **119**, 447–458.
- 1449 Garcia R.A., Araújo M.B., Burgess N.D., Foden W.B., Gutsche A., Rahbek C., & Cabeza M. (2014a)  
1450 Matching species traits to projected threats and opportunities from climate change. *Journal of*  
1451 *Biogeography*, **41**, 724–735.
- 1452 Garcia R.A., Burgess N.D., Cabeza M., Rahbek C., & Araújo M.B. (2012) Exploring consensus in 21st  
1453 century projections of climatically suitable areas for African vertebrates. *Global Change*  
1454 *Biology*, **18**, 1253–1269.
- 1455 Garcia R.A., Cabeza M., Rahbek C., & Araújo M.B. (2014b) Multiple dimensions of climate change and  
1456 their implications for biodiversity. *Science*, **344**, 1247579.
- 1457 Gardali T., Seavy N.E., DiGaudio R.T., & Comrack L.A. (2012) A climate change vulnerability  
1458 assessment of California's at-risk birds. *PloS one*, **7**, e29507.
- 1459 Gardner J., Amano T., Sutherland W., Ecology M.C., & 2016 undefined Individual and demographic  
1460 consequences of reduced body condition following repeated exposure to high temperatures.  
1461 *Wiley Online Library*, .
- 1462 Gardner J.L., Amano T., Sutherland W.J., Clayton M., & Peters A. (2015) Individual and demographic  
1463 consequences of reduced body condition following repeated exposure to high temperatures.  
1464 *Ecology*, **97**, 15–0642.1.
- 1465 Garnett S., Franklin D., Ehmke G., Vanderwal J., Hodgson L., Pavey C., Reside A., Welbergen J.,  
1466 Butchart S., Perkins G., & Williams S. (2013) *Climate change adaptation strategies for*  
1467 *Australian birds*. National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility, Gold Coast.



1  
2  
3 1468 Geerts a. N., Vanoverbeke J., Vanschoenwinkel B., Van Doorslaer W., Feuchtmayr H., Atkinson D.,  
4 1469 Moss B., Davidson T. a., Sayer C.D., & De Meester L. (2015) Rapid evolution of thermal  
5 1470 tolerance in the water flea *Daphnia*. *Nature Climate Change*, 1–5.  
6  
7 1471 Gillingham P.K., Huntley B., Kunin W.E., & Thomas C.D. (2012) The effect of spatial resolution on  
8 1472 projected responses to climate warming. *Diversity and Distributions*, **18**, 990–1000.  
9  
10 1473 Glick P., Stein B.A., & Edelson N.A. (2011) *Scanning the conservation horizon: a guide to climate*  
11 1474 *change vulnerability assessment*. National Wildlife Federation, Washington D.C.  
12  
13 1475 Golicher D.J., Cayuela L., Alkemade J.R.M., González-Espinosa M., & Ramírez-Marcial N. (2008)  
14 1476 Applying climatically associated species pools to the modelling of compositional change in  
15 1477 tropical montane forests. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **17**, 262–273.  
16  
17 1478 Grabherr G., Gottfried M., & Pauli H. (1994) Climate effects on mountain plants. *Nature*, **369**, 448–  
18 1479 448.  
19  
20 1480 Graham N.A.J., Chabanet P., Evans R.D., Jennings S., Letourneur Y., Aaron Macneil M., McClanahan  
21 1481 T.R., Ohman M.C., Polunin N.V.C., & Wilson S.K. (2011) Extinction vulnerability of coral reef  
22 1482 fishes. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 341–8.  
23  
24 1483 Graham R., Lundelius E., Graham M., Schroeder E., Toomey R., Anderson E., Barnosky A., Burns J.,  
25 1484 Churcher C., Grayson D., Guthrie R., Harington C., Jefferson G., Martin L., McDonald H., Morlan  
26 1485 R., Semken H., Webb S., Werdelin L., & Wilson M. (1996) Spatial response of mammals to late  
27 1486 Quaternary environmental fluctuations. *Science*, **272**, 1601–6.  
28  
29 1487 Graham R.W. & Grimm E.C. (1990) Effects of global climate change on the patterns of terrestrial  
30 1488 biological communities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **5**, 289–292.  
31  
32 1489 Green R.E., Collingham Y.C., Willis S.G., Gregory R.D., Smith K.W., & Huntley B. (2008) Performance  
33 1490 of climate envelope models in retrodicting recent changes in bird population size from  
34 1491 observed climatic change. *Biology letters*, **4**, 599–602.  
35  
36 1492 Gregory R.D., Willis S.G., Jiguet F., Voríšek P., Klvanová A., van Strien A., Huntley B., Collingham Y.C.,  
37 1493 Couvet D., & Green R.E. (2009) An indicator of the impact of climatic change on European bird  
38 1494 populations. *PloS one*, **4**, e4678.  
39  
40 1495 Griffiths R.A., Sewell D., & McCrea R.S. (2010) Dynamics of a declining amphibian metapopulation:  
41 1496 Survival, dispersal and the impact of climate. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 485–491.  
42  
43 1497 Gross J., Woodley S., Welling L., & Watson J. (2016) *Responding to Climate Change: Guidance for*  
44 1498 *Protected Area Managers and Planners*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.  
45  
46 1499 Groves C., Anderson M., Girvetz E., Sandwith T., Schwarz L., & Shaw R. (2010) *Climate Change and*  
47 1500 *Conservation: A Primer for Assessing Impacts and Advancing Ecosystem-based Adaptation in*  
48 1501 *The Nature Conservancy*. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia.  
49  
50 1502 Guillera-Aroita G., Lahoz-Monfort J.J., Elith J., Gordon A., Kujala H., Lentini P.E., Mccarthy M.A.,  
51 1503 Tingley R., & Wintle B.A. (2015) Is my species distribution model fit for purpose? Matching data  
52 1504 and models to applications. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **24**, 276–292.  
53  
54 1505 Guisan A. & Thuiller W. (2005) Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple habitat

- 1506 models. *Ecology Letters*, **8**, 993–1009.
- 1507 Guisan A., Thuiller W., & Zimmermann N.E. (2017) *Habitat Suitability and Distribution Models*.  
1508 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1509 Gynther I., Waller N., & Leung L.K. (2016) *Confirmation of the extinction of the Bramble Cay melomys*  
1510 *Melomys rubicola* on Bramble Cay, Torres Strait: results and conclusions from a comprehensive  
1511 survey in August–September 2014. Unpublished report to the Department of Environment and  
1512 Heritage Protection, Queensland Government, Brisbane.
- 1513 Hagemeijer E. & Blair M. (1997) *The EBCC Atlas of European Breeding Birds: Their distribution and*  
1514 *abundance*. T. & A.D. Poyser, London.
- 1515 Hallgren W., Beaumont L., Bowness A., Chambers L., Graham E., Holewa H., Laffan S., B M., H N., J P.,  
1516 & J. V. (2016) The Biodiversity and Climate Change Virtual Laboratory: Where ecology meets  
1517 big data. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, **76**, 182–186.
- 1518 Hannah L., Ikegami M., Hole D.G., Seo C., Butchart S.H.M., Townsend A., & Roehrdanz P.R. (2013)  
1519 Global Climate Change Adaptation Priorities for Biodiversity and Food Security. *PloS one*, **8**,  
1520 e72590.
- 1521 Hannah L., Midgley G., Anelman S., Araújo M., Hughes G., Martinez-Meyer E., Pearson R., &  
1522 Williams P. (2007) Protected area needs in a changing climate. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*  
1523 *Environment*, **5**, 131–138.
- 1524 Hannah L., Midgley G.F., Lovejoy T., Bond W.J., Bush M., Lovett J.C., Scott D., & Woodward F.I. (2002)  
1525 Conservation of Biodiversity in a Changing Climate. *Conservation Biology*, **16**, 264–268.
- 1526 Harris J.B.C., Fordham D.A., Mooney P.A., Pedler L.P., Araújo M.B., Paton D.C., Stead M.G., Watts  
1527 M.J., Akçakaya R.H., & Brook B.W. (2012) Managing the long-term persistence of a rare  
1528 cockatoo under climate change. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **49**, 785–794.
- 1529 Harrison J.A., Allan D.G., Underhill L.G., Herremans M., Tree A.J., Parker V., & Brown C.J. (1997) *The*  
1530 *Atlas of Southern African Birds*. BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg.
- 1531 Harrison P.A., Berry P.M., Butt N., & New M. (2006) Modelling climate change impacts on species'  
1532 distributions at the European scale: implications for conservation policy. *Environmental Science*  
1533 *& Policy*, **9**, 116–128.
- 1534 Harrison K.A., Amish S.J., Pavlova A., Narum S.R., Telonis-Scott M., Rourke M.L., Lyon J., Tonkin Z.,  
1535 Gilligan D.M., Ingram B.A., Lintermans M., Gan H.M., Austin C.M., Luikart G., & Sunnucks P.  
1536 (2017) Signatures of polygenic adaptation associated with climate across the range of a  
1537 threatened fish species with high genetic connectivity. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 6253–6269.
- 1538 He X., Johansson M.L., & Heath D.D. (2016) Role of genomics and transcriptomics in selection of  
1539 reintroduction source populations. *Conservation Biology*, **30**, 1010–1018.
- 1540 Heikkinen R.K., Luoto M., Leikola N., Po J., Settele J., Kudrna O., Marmion M., Fronzek S., & Thuiller  
1541 W. (2010) Assessing the vulnerability of European butterflies to climate change using multiple  
1542 criteria. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 695–723.
- 1543 Heikkinen R.K., Luoto M., Virkkala R., Pearson R.G., & Körber J.-H. (2007) Biotic interactions improve

1  
2  
3 1544 prediction of boreal bird distributions at macro-scales. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **16**,  
4 1545 754–763.

5  
6 1546 Heinrichs J.A., Lawler J.J., & Schumaker N.H. (2016) Intrinsic and extrinsic drivers of source-sink  
7 1547 dynamics. *Ecology and Evolution*, **6**, 892–904.

8  
9 1548 Hickling R., Roy D.B., Hill J.K., Fox R., & Thomas C.D. (2006) The distributions of a wide range of  
10 1549 taxonomic groups are expanding polewards. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 450–455.

11  
12 1550 Hijmans R.J. & Graham C.H. (2006) The ability of climate envelope models to predict the effect of  
13 1551 climate change on species distributions. *Global Change Biology*, **12**, 2272–2281.

14  
15 1552 Hill G.B. & Henry G.H.R. (2011) Responses of High Arctic wet sedge tundra to climate warming since  
16 1553 1980. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 276–287.

17  
18 1554 Hill J.K., Thomas C.D., Huntley B., Hill J.K., Thomas C.D., & Huntley B. (1999) Climate and habitat  
19 1555 availability determine 20th century changes in a butterfly's range margin. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.*,  
20 1556 **266**, 1197–1206.

21  
22 1557 Hodgson J.A., Bennie J.J., Dale G., Longley N., Wilson R.J., & Thomas C.D. (2015) Predicting  
23 1558 microscale shifts in the distribution of the butterfly *Plebejus argus* at the northern edge of its  
24 1559 range. *Ecography*, **38**, 998–1005.

25  
26 1560 Hof C., Araújo M.B., Jetz W., & Rahbek C. (2011) Additive threats from pathogens, climate and land-  
27 1561 use change for global amphibian diversity. *Nature*, **480**, 516–519.

28  
29 1562 Hoffmann A. a., Chown S.L., & Clusella-Trullas S. (2013) Upper thermal limits in terrestrial  
30 1563 ectotherms: How constrained are they? *Functional Ecology*, **27**, 934–949.

31  
32 1564 Hoffmann A., Griffin P., Dillon S., Catullo R., Rane R., Byrne M., Jordan R., Oakeshott J., Weeks A.,  
33 1565 Joseph L., Lockhart P., Borevitz J., & Sgrò C. (2015) A framework for incorporating evolutionary  
34 1566 genomics into biodiversity conservation and management. *Climate Change Responses*, **2**, 1–23.

35  
36 1567 Hole D.G., Huntley B., Arinaitwe J., Butchart S.H.M., Collingham Y.C., Fishpool L.D.C., Pain D.J., &  
37 1568 Willis S.G. (2011) Toward a management framework for networks of protected areas in the  
38 1569 face of climate change. *Conservation biology : the journal of the Society for Conservation*  
39 1570 *Biology*, **25**, 305–15.

40  
41 1571 Hole D.G., Willis S.G., Pain D.J., Fishpool L.D., Butchart S.H.M., Collingham Y.C., Rahbek C., & Huntley  
42 1572 B. (2009) Projected impacts of climate change on a continent-wide protected area network.  
43 1573 *Ecology letters*, **12**, 420–31.

44  
45 1574 Holten-Andersen J., Paaby H., Christensen N., Wier M., & Andersen F.M. (1995) *Recommendations*  
46 1575 *on Strategies for Integrated Assessment of Broad Environmental Problems: Report Submitted to*  
47 1576 *the European Environment Agency (EEA) by the National Environmental Research Institute*  
48 1577 *(NERI)*. European Environment Agency, Denmark.

49  
50 1578 Huey R.B., Kearney M.R., Krockenberger A., Holtum J.A.M., Jess M., & Williams S.E. (2012) Predicting  
51 1579 organismal vulnerability to climate warming: roles of behaviour, physiology and adaptation.  
52 1580 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, Biological Sciences*, **367**, 1665–79.

53  
54 1581 Hughes A.C., Satasook C., Bates P.J.J., Bumrungsri S., & Jones G. (2012) The projected effects of

- 1582 climatic and vegetation changes on the distribution and diversity of Southeast Asian bats.  
1583 *Global Change Biology*, **18**, 1854–1865.
- 1584 Hughes L. (2000) Biological consequences of global warming: is the signal already. *Trends in Ecology*  
1585 *& Evolution*, **15**, 56–61.
- 1586 Hughes T.P., Baird a H., Bellwood D.R., Card M., Connolly S.R., Folke C., Grosberg R., Hoegh-  
1587 Guldberg O., Jackson J.B.C., Kleypas J., Lough J.M., Marshall P., Nyström M., Palumbi S.R.,  
1588 Pandolfi J.M., Rosen B., & Roughgarden J. (2003) Climate change, human impacts, and the  
1589 resilience of coral reefs. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **301**, 929–33.
- 1590 Huijbers C., Richmond S., Low-Choy S., Laffan S., Hallgren W., & Holewa H. (2016) Available at:  
1591 <http://www.bccvl.org.au/training/>.
- 1592 Hunter M.L., Jacobson G.L., & Webb T. (1988) Paleoecology and the Coarse-Filter Approach to  
1593 Maintaining Biological Diversity. *Conservation Biology*, **2**, 375–385.
- 1594 Huntley B. (1990) Studying global change: the contribution of quaternary palynology. *Global and*  
1595 *Planetary Change*, **2**, 53–61.
- 1596 Huntley B. (1991) How Plants Respond to Climate Change: Migration Rates, Individualism and the  
1597 Consequences for Plant Communities. *Annals of Botany*, **67**, 15–22.
- 1598 Huntley B. (1996) Quaternary palaeoecology and ecology. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, **15**, 591–606.
- 1599 Huntley B. (2012) Reconstructing palaeoclimates from biological proxies: some often overlooked  
1600 sources of uncertainty. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, **31**, 1–16.
- 1601 Huntley B., Altwegg R., Barnard P., Collingham Y.C., & Hole D.G. (2012) Modelling relationships  
1602 between species spatial abundance patterns and climate. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*,  
1603 **21**, 668–681.
- 1604 Huntley B., Berry P.M., Cramer W., & McDonald A.P. (1995) Modelling Present and Potential Future  
1605 Ranges of Some European Higher Plants Using Climate Response Surfaces. *Journal of*  
1606 *Biogeography*, **22**, 967–1001.
- 1607 Huntley B., Foden W.B., Smith A., Platts P.J., Watson J.E.M., & Garcia R.A. (2016) Using climate  
1608 change vulnerability assessments and interpreting their results. *IUCN SSC Guidelines for*  
1609 *Assessing Species' Vulnerability to Climate Change* (ed. by W. Foden and B.E. Young), pp. 113.  
1610 Occasional Paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission, Gland, Switzerland.
- 1611 Huntley B., Green R., Collingham Y., & Willis S. (2007) *A climatic atlas of European breeding birds*.  
1612 Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.
- 1613 Huntley B., Midgley G.F., Barnard P., & Valdes P.J. (2014) Suborbital climatic variability and centres  
1614 of biological diversity in the Cape region of southern Africa. *Journal of Biogeography*, **41**, 1338–  
1615 1351.
- 1616 Huntley B. & Webb III T. (1988) Discussion. *Vegetation History* (ed. by B. Huntley and T. Webb III), pp.  
1617 779–785. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- 1618 Hutchings M.J., Robbirt K.M., Roberts D.L., & Davy A.J. (2018) Vulnerability of a specialized

1  
2  
3 1619 pollination mechanism to climate change revealed by a 356-year analysis. *Botanical Journal of*  
4 1620 *the Linnean Society*, **186**, 498–509.  
5  
6 1621 Hutchinson G.E. (1957) Concluding remark. *Cold Spring Harbour Symposium on Quantitative Biology*,  
7 1622 **22**, 415–457.  
8  
9 1623 Illan J.G., Thomas C.D., Jones J.A., Wong W.K., Shirley S.M., & Betts M.G. (2014) Precipitation and  
10 1624 winter temperature predict long-term range-scale abundance changes in Western North  
11 1625 American birds. *Global Change Biology*, **20**, 3351–3364.  
12  
13 1626 IPCC (1996) *Climate Change 1995: Impacts, Adaptations, and Mitigation*. Press Syndicate of the  
14 1627 University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.  
15  
16 1628 IPCC (2001) *Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, Contribution of Working*  
17 1629 *Group II to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.  
18 1630 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.  
19  
20 1631 IPCC (2007) *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working*  
21 1632 *Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,*  
22 1633 *2007*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.  
23  
24 1634 IPCC (2013) *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the*  
25 1635 *Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge  
26 1636 University Press, Cambridge and New York.  
27  
28 1637 IPCC (2014) *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability - Contributions of Working*  
29 1638 *Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York.  
30  
31 1639 IUCN (2017) Available at: [www.iucnredlist.org](http://www.iucnredlist.org).  
32  
33 1640 IUCN SSC Standards and Petitions Subcommittee (2017) *Guidelines for using the IUCN Red List*  
34 1641 *Categories and Criteria. Version 13. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Subcommittee of*  
35 1642 *the IUCN Species Survival Commission*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland,  
36  
37 1643 Janes J.K. & Hamilton J.A. (2017) Mixing it up: The role of hybridization in forest management and  
38 1644 conservation under climate change. *Forests*, **8**, 1–16.  
39  
40 1645 Jenouvrier S., Caswell H., Barbraud C., Holland M., Stroeve J., & Weimerskirch H. (2009)  
41 1646 Demographic models and IPCC climate projections predict the decline of an emperor penguin  
42 1647 population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**, 11425–11425.  
43  
44 1648 Jeschke J.M. & Strayer D.L. (2008) Usefulness of bioclimatic models for studying climate change and  
45 1649 invasive species. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1134**, 1–24.  
46  
47 1650 Jiguet F., Gadot A.-S., Julliard R., Newson S.E., & Couvet D. (2007) Climate envelope, life history traits  
48 1651 and the resilience of birds facing global change. *Global Change Biology*, **13**, 1672–1684.  
49  
50 1652 Johnson K.A. (2014) *Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment for Natural Resources Management:*  
51 1653 *Toolbox of Methods with Case Studies*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arlington, Virginia.  
52  
53 1654 Johnston A., Ausden M., Dodd A.M., Bradbury R.B., Chamberlain D.E., Jiguet F., Thomas C.D., Cook  
54 1655 A.S.C.P., Newson S.E., Ockendon N., Rehfisch M.M., Roos S., Thaxter C.B., Brown A., Crick



- 1656 H.Q.P., Douse A., McCall R.A., Pontier H., Stroud D.A., Cadiou B., Crowe O., Deceuninck B.,  
1657 Hornman M., & Pearce-Higgins. James (2013) Observed and predicted effects of climate change  
1658 on species abundance in protected areas. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 1055–1061.
- 1659 Jones R., Noguer M., Hassell D., Hudson D., Wilson S., Jenkins G., & Mitchell J. (2004) *Generating*  
1660 *high resolution climate change scenarios using PRECIS*. Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK.
- 1661 Joppa L.N., O'Connor B., Visconti P., Smith C., Geldmann J., Hoffmann M., Watson J.E.M., Butchart  
1662 S.H.M., Sawmy M.V., Halpern B.S., Ahmed S.E., Balmford A., Sutherland W.J., Harfoot M.,  
1663 Hilton-Taylor C., Foden W., Minin E. Di, Pagad S., & Burgess N.D. (2016) Filling in biodiversity  
1664 threat gaps. *Science*, **352**, 416–418.
- 1665 Jordan R., Hoffmann A.A., Dillon S.K., & Prober S.M. (2017) Evidence of genomic adaptation to  
1666 climate in *Eucalyptus microcarpa* : Implications for adaptive potential to projected climate  
1667 change. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 6002–6020.
- 1668 Kabisch N., Stadler J., Korn H., & Bonn A. (2016) Nature-based solutions to climate change mitigation  
1669 and adaptation in urban areas: perspectives on indicators, knowledge gaps, barriers, and  
1670 opportunities for action. *Ecology and Society*, **21**, .
- 1671 Kearney M. & Porter W. (2009) Mechanistic niche modelling: combining physiological and spatial  
1672 data to predict species' ranges. *Ecology letters*, **12**, 334–50.
- 1673 Keith D.A., Akçakaya H.R., Thuiller W., Midgley G.F., Pearson R.G., Phillips S.J., Regan H.M., Araújo  
1674 M.B., & Rebelo T.G. (2008) Predicting extinction risks under climate change: coupling stochastic  
1675 population models with dynamic bioclimatic habitat models. *Biology Letters*, **4**, 560–563.
- 1676 Keith D.W., Holmes G., St. Angelo D., & Heide K. (2018) A Process for Capturing CO<sub>2</sub> from the  
1677 Atmosphere. *Joule*, .
- 1678 Kovach R.P., Al-Chokhachy R., Whited D.C., Schmetterling D.A., Dux A.M., & Muhlfeld C.C. (2017)  
1679 Climate, invasive species and land use drive population dynamics of a cold-water specialist.  
1680 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **54**, 638–647.
- 1681 Kristensen P. (2004) The DPSIR framework. *A comprehensive / detailed assessment of the*  
1682 *vulnerability of water resources to environmental change in Africa using river basin approach.*,  
1683 1–10.
- 1684 Kullman L. (2007) Tree line population monitoring of *Pinus sylvestris* in the Swedish Scandes, 1973-  
1685 2005: implications for tree line theory and climate change ecology. *Journal of Ecology*, **95**, 41–  
1686 52.
- 1687 Küster E.C., Bierman S.M., Klotz S., & Kühn I. (2011) Modelling the impact of climate and land use  
1688 change on the geographical distribution of leaf anatomy in a temperate flora. *Ecography*, **34**,  
1689 507–518.
- 1690 Kutschera V.E., Frosch C., Janke A., Skírnisson K., Bidon T., Lecomte N., Fain S.R., Eiken H.G., Hagen  
1691 S.B., Arnason U., Laidre K.L., Nowak C., & Hailer F. (2016) High genetic variability of vagrant  
1692 polar bears illustrates importance of population connectivity in fragmented sea ice habitats.  
1693 *Animal Conservation*, **19**, 337–349.
- 1694 Lane J.E., Kruuk L.E.B., Charmantier A., Murie J.O., & Dobson F.S. (2012) Delayed phenology and



1  
2  
3 1695 reduced fitness associated with climate change in a wild hibernator. *Nature*, **489**, 554–557.  
4  
5 1696 Lankford A.J., Svancara L.K., Lawler J.J., & Vierling K. (2014) Comparison of climate change  
6 1697 vulnerability assessments for wildlife. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, **38**, 386–394.  
7  
8 1698 Latch P. (2008) *Recovery Plan for the Bramble Cay Melomys Melomys rubicola*. Environmental  
9 1699 Protection Agency, Brisbane.  
10  
11 1700 Lawler J.J., Shafer S.L., Bancroft B. a, & Blaustein A.R. (2009) Projected climate impacts for the  
12 1701 amphibians of the Western hemisphere. *Conservation biology : the journal of the Society for*  
13 1702 *Conservation Biology*, **24**, 38–50.  
14  
15 1703 Limpus C.J., Parmenter C.J., & Watts C.H.. (1983) *Melomys rubicola*, an endangered murid rodent  
16 1704 endemic to the Great Barrier Reef of Queensland. *Australian Mammalogy*, **6**, 77–79.  
17  
18 1705 Lindenmayer D.B., Nix H.A., McMahon J.P., Hutchinson M.F., & Tanton M.T. (1991) The Conservation  
19 1706 of Leadbeater’s Possum, *Gymnobelideus leadbeateri* (McCoy): A Case Study of the Use of  
20 1707 Bioclimatic Modelling. *Journal of Biogeography*, **18**, 371.  
21  
22 1708 Liu C., Berry P.M., Dawson T.P., & Pearson R.G. (2005) Selecting Thresholds of Occurrence in the  
23 1709 Prediction of Species Distributions. *Ecography*, **28**, 385–393.  
24  
25 1710 Liu C., White M., & Newel G. (2013) Selecting thresholds for the prediction of species occurrence  
26 1711 with presence-only data. *Journal of Biogeography*, **40**, 778–789.  
27  
28 1712 Lomba A., Pellissier L., Randin C., Vicente J., Moreira F., Honrado J., & Guisan A. (2010) Overcoming  
29 1713 the rare species modelling paradox: A novel hierarchical framework applied to an Iberian  
30 1714 endemic plant. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 2647–2657.  
31  
32 1715 Ludwig G.X., Alatalo R. V, Helle P., Lindén H., Lindström J., & Siitari H. (2006) Short- and long-term  
33 1716 population dynamical consequences of asymmetric climate change in black grouse.  
34 1717 *Proceedings. Biological sciences*, **273**, 2009–16.  
35  
36 1718 Luoto M., Virkkala R., & Heikkinen R.K. (2007) The role of land cover in bioclimatic models depends  
37 1719 on spatial resolution. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **16**, 34–42.  
38  
39 1720 Lustenhouwer N., Wilschut R.A., Williams J.L., van der Putten W.H., & Levine J.M. (2018) Rapid  
40 1721 evolution of phenology during range expansion with recent climate change. *Global Change*  
41 1722 *Biology*, **24**, e534–e544.  
42  
43 1723 Mace G.M. & Lande R. (1991) Assessing Extinction Threats: Toward a Reevaluation of IUCN  
44 1724 Threatened Species Categories. *Conservation Biology*, **5**, 148–157.  
45  
46 1725 Manceur A.M. & Kühn I. (2014) Inferring model-based probability of occurrence from preferentially  
47 1726 sampled data with uncertain absences using expert knowledge. *Methods in Ecology and*  
48 1727 *Evolution*, **5**, 739–750.  
49  
50 1728 Mantyka-Pringle C.S., Martin T.G., Moffatt D.B., Linke S., & Rhodes J.R. (2014) Understanding and  
51 1729 predicting the combined effects of climate change and land-use change on freshwater  
52 1730 macroinvertebrates and fish. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **51**, 572–581.  
53  
54 1731 Mantyka-Pringle C.S., Martin T.G., Moffatt D.B., Udy J., Olley J., Saxton N., Sheldon F., Bunn S.E., &

- 1732 Rhodes J.R. (2016) Prioritizing management actions for the conservation of freshwater  
1733 biodiversity under changing climate and land-cover. *Biological Conservation*, **197**, 80–89.
- 1734 Martay B., Brewer M.J., Elston D.A., Bell J.R., Harrington R., Brereton T.M., Barlow K.E., Botham M.S.,  
1735 & Pearce-Higgins J.W. (2017) Impacts of climate change on national biodiversity population  
1736 trends. *Ecography*, **40**, 1139–1151.
- 1737 Martin T.E. & Maron J.L. (2012) Climate impacts on bird and plant communities from altered animal–  
1738 plant interactions. *Nature Climate Change*, **2**, 195–200.
- 1739 Martin T.G., Camaclang A.E., Possingham H.P., Maguire L.A., & Chadès I. (2017) Timing of Protection  
1740 of Critical Habitat Matters. *Conservation Letters*, **10**, 308–316.
- 1741 Martin T.G., Murphy H., Liedloff A., Thomas C., Chadès I., Cook G., Fensham R., McIvor J., & van  
1742 Klinken R.D. (2015) Buffel grass and climate change: a framework for projecting invasive  
1743 species distributions when data are scarce. *Biological Invasions*, **17**, 3197–3210.
- 1744 Martin T.G., Nally S., Burbidge A.A., Arnall S., Garnett S.T., Hayward M.W., Lumsden L.F., Menkhorst  
1745 P., McDonald-Madden E., & Possingham H.P. (2012) Acting fast helps avoid extinction.  
1746 *Conservation Letters*, **5**, 274–280.
- 1747 Martin T.G. & Watson J.E.M. (2016) Intact ecosystems provide best defence against climate change.  
1748 *Nature Climate Change*, **6**, 122–124.
- 1749 Mason S.C., Palmer G., Fox R., Gillings S., Hill J.K., Thomas C.D., & Oliver T.H. (2015) Geographical  
1750 range margins of many taxonomic groups continue to shift polewards. *Biological Journal of the  
1751 Linnean Society*, **115**, 586–597.
- 1752 Massimino D., Johnston A., Gillings S., Jiguet F., & Pearce-Higgins J.W. (2017) Projected reductions in  
1753 climatic suitability for vulnerable British birds. *Climatic Change*, **145**, 117–130.
- 1754 Maxim L., Spangenberg J.H., & O'Connor M. (2009) An analysis of risks for biodiversity under the  
1755 DPSIR framework. *Ecological Economics*, **69**, 12–23.
- 1756 Maxwell S.L., Venter O., Jones K.R., & Watson J.E.M. (2015) Integrating human responses to climate  
1757 change into conservation vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning. *Annals of the  
1758 New York Academy of Sciences*, **1355**, 98–116.
- 1759 ME Assessment (2005) *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and Human Well-Being:  
1760 Biodiversity Synthesis*. World Resources Institute, Washington D.C.
- 1761 Merilä J. & Hendry A.P. (2014) Climate change, adaptation, and phenotypic plasticity: the problem  
1762 and the evidence. *Evolutionary Applications*, **7**, 1–14.
- 1763 Midgley G., Hannah L., Millar D., Thuiller W., & Booth A. (2003) Developing regional and species-level  
1764 assessments of climate change impacts on biodiversity in the Cape Floristic Region. *Biological  
1765 Conservation*, **112**, 87–97.
- 1766 Midgley G.F., Davies I.D., Albert C.H., Altwegg R., Hannah L., Hughes G.O., O'Halloran L.R., Seo C.,  
1767 Thorne J.H., & Thuiller W. (2010) BioMove - an integrated platform simulating the dynamic  
1768 response of species to environmental change. *Ecography*, **33**, 612–616.

1  
2  
3 1769 Midgley G.F., Hannah L., Millar D., Rutherford M.C., & Powrie L.W. (2002) Assessing the vulnerability  
4 1770 of species richness to anthropogenic climate change in a biodiversity hotspot. *Global Ecology*  
5 1771 *and Biogeography*, **11**, 445–451.

6  
7 1772 Møller A.P., Saino N., Adamík P., Ambrosini R., Antonov A., Campobello D., Stokke B.G., Fossøy F.,  
8 1773 Lehikoinen E., Martin-Vivaldi M., Moksnes A., Moskat C., Røskoft E., Rubolini D., Schulze-Hagen  
9 1774 K., Soler M., & Shykoff J.A. (2011) Rapid change in host use of the common cuckoo *Cuculus*  
10 1775 *canorus* linked to climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological*  
11 1776 *Sciences*, **278**, 733–8.

12  
13 1777 Molnár P.K., Derocher A.E., Thiemann G.W., & Lewis M.A. (2010) Predicting survival, reproduction  
14 1778 and abundance of polar bears under climate change. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 1612–1622.

15  
16 1779 Morales P., Hickler T., Rowell D., Smith B., & Sykes M.T. (2007) Changes in European ecosystem  
17 1780 productivity and carbon balance driven by regional climate model output. *Global Change*  
18 1781 *Biology*, **13**, 108–122.

19  
20 1782 Morelli T.L., Smith A.B., Kastely C.R., Mastroserio I., Moritz C., & Beissinger S.R. (2012)  
21 1783 Anthropogenic refugia ameliorate the severe climate-related decline of a montane mammal  
22 1784 along its trailing edge. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **279**, 4279–86.

23  
24 1785 Morin X. & Thuiller W. (2009) Comparing niche- and process-based models to reduce prediction  
25 1786 uncertainty in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology*, **90**, 1301–13.

26  
27 1787 Morueta-Holme N., Fløjgaard C., & Svenning J.-C. (2010) Climate Change Risks and Conservation  
28 1788 Implications for a Threatened Small-Range Mammal Species. *PLoS ONE*, **5**, e10360.

29  
30 1789 Morueta-Holme N., Oldfather M.F., Olliff-Yang R.L., Weitz A.P., Levine C.R., Kling M.M., Riordan E.C.,  
31 1790 Merow C., Sheth S.N., Thornhill A.H., & Ackerly D.D. (2018) Best practices for reporting climate  
32 1791 data in ecology. *Nature Climate Change*, **8**, 92–94.

33  
34 1792 Moser S.C. (2010) Communicating climate change: history, challenges, process and future directions.  
35 1793 *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, **1**, 31–53.

36  
37 1794 Munday P.L. (2004) Habitat loss, resource specialization, and extinction on coral reefs. *Global*  
38 1795 *Change Biology*, **10**, 1642–1647.

39  
40 1796 Munson L., Terio K.A., Kock R., Mlengeya T., Roelke M.E., Dubovi E., Summers B., Sinclair A.R.E., &  
41 1797 Packer C. (2008) Climate extremes promote fatal co-infections during canine distemper  
42 1798 epidemics in African lions. *PLoS One*, **3**, e2545.

43  
44 1799 Murray J. V., Goldizen A.W., O’Leary R.A., McAlpine C.A., Possingham H.P., & Choy S.L. (2009) How  
45 1800 useful is expert opinion for predicting the distribution of a species within and beyond the  
46 1801 region of expertise? A case study using brush-tailed rock-wallabies *Petrogale penicillata*.  
47 1802 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **46**, 842–851.

48  
49 1803 Naveda-Rodríguez A., Vargas F.H., Kohn S., & Zapata-Ríos G. (2016) Andean Condor (*Vultur gryphus*)  
50 1804 in Ecuador: Geographic Distribution, Population Size and Extinction Risk. *PLoS one*, **11**,  
51 1805 e0151827.

52  
53 1806 Nenzén H.K. & Araújo M.B. (2011) Choice of threshold alters projections of species range shifts  
54 1807 under climate change. *Ecological Modelling*, **222**, 3346–3354.

- 1808 Nesshöver C., Assmuth T., Irvine K.N., Rusch G.M., Waylen K.A., Delbaere B., Haase D., Jones-Walters  
1809 L., Keune H., Kovacs E., Krauze K., Külvik M., Rey F., van Dijk J., Vistad O.I., Wilkinson M.E., &  
1810 Wittmer H. (2017) The science, policy and practice of nature-based solutions: An  
1811 interdisciplinary perspective. *Science of the Total Environment*, **579**, 1215–1227.
- 1812 Newbold T., Scharlemann J.P.W., Butchart S.H.M., Sekercioglu Ç.H., Alkemade R., Booth H., & Purves  
1813 D.W. (2013) Ecological traits affect the response of tropical forest bird species to land-use  
1814 intensity Ecological traits affect the response of tropical forest bird species to land-use intensity  
1815 Author for correspondence : *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*,  
1816 **280**, 2012–2131.
- 1817 Nicotra A., Beever E.A., Robertson A.L., Hofmann G.E., & O’Leary J. (2015) Assessing the components  
1818 of adaptive capacity to improve conservation and management efforts under global change.  
1819 *Conservation biology: the journal of the Society for Conservation Biology*, **29**, 1268–1278.
- 1820 Ockendon N., Baker D.J., Carr J.A., White E.C., Almond R.E.A., Amano T., Bertram E., Bradbury R.B.,  
1821 Bradley C., Butchart S.H.M., Doswald N., Foden W., Gill D.J.C., Green R.E., Sutherland W.J.,  
1822 Tanner E.V.J., & Pearce-Higgins J.W. (2014) Mechanisms underpinning climatic impacts on  
1823 natural populations: Altered species interactions are more important than direct effects. *Global  
1824 Change Biology*, **20**, 2221–2229.
- 1825 Oesterwind D., Rau A., & Zaiko A. (2016) Drivers and pressures - Untangling the terms commonly  
1826 used in marine science and policy. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **181**, 8–15.
- 1827 Ohlemuller R., Anderson B.J., Butchart S.H.M., Arau M.B., Kudrna O., Ridgely R.S., & Thomas C.D.  
1828 (2008) The coincidence of climatic and species rarity : high risk to small-range species from  
1829 climate change. *Biology letters*, **4**, 568–572.
- 1830 Oliveira B.F., São-Pedro V.A., Santos-Barrera G., Penone C., & Costa G.C. (2017) AmphiBIO, a global  
1831 database for amphibian ecological traits. *Scientific Data*, **4**, 170123.
- 1832 Omann I., Stocker A., & Jäger J. (2009) Climate change as a threat to biodiversity: An application of  
1833 the DPSIR approach. *Ecological Economics*, **69**, 24–31.
- 1834 Oswald S.A., Bearhop S., Furness R.W., Huntley B., & Hamer K.C. (2008) Heat stress in a high-latitude  
1835 seabird: effects of temperature and food supply on bathing and nest attendance of great skuas  
1836 *Catharacta skua*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, **39**, 163–169.
- 1837 Overgaard J., Kearney M.R., & Hoffmann A.A. (2014) Sensitivity to thermal extremes in Australian  
1838 *Drosophila* implies similar impacts of climate change on the distribution of widespread and  
1839 tropical species. *Global change biology*, **20**, 1738–50.
- 1840 Pacifici M., Foden W.B., Visconti P., Watson J.E.M., Butchart S.H.M., Kovacs K.M., Scheffers B.R., Hole  
1841 D.G., Martin T.G., Akçakaya H.R., Corlett R.T., Huntley B., Bickford D., Carr J.A., Hoffmann A.A.,  
1842 Midgley G.F., P. P.-K., Pearson R.G., Williams S.E., Willis S.G., Young B., & Rondinini C. (2015)  
1843 Assessing species vulnerability to climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **5**, 215–225.
- 1844 Pacifici M., Visconti P., & Rondinini C. (2018) A framework for the identification of hotspots of  
1845 climate change risk for mammals. *Global Change Biology*, **24**, 1626–1636.
- 1846 Parmesan C. (1996) Climate and species’ range. *Nature*, **382**, 765–766.

1  
2  
3 1847 Parmesan C., Ryrholm N., Stefanescu C., Hill J.K., Thomas C.D., Descimon H., Huntley B., Kaila L.,  
4 1848 Kullberg J., Tammaru T., Tennent W.J., Thomas J.A., & Warren M. (1999) Poleward shifts in  
5 1849 geographical ranges of butterfly species associated with regional warming. *Nature*, **399**, 579–  
6 1850 583.  
7  
8 1851 Parmesan C. & Yohe G. (2003) A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across  
9 1852 natural systems. *Nature*, **421**, 37–42.  
10  
11 1853 Patt A., Klein R.J.T., & de la Vega-Leinert A. (2005) Taking the uncertainty in climate-change  
12 1854 vulnerability assessment seriously. *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*, **337**, 411–424.  
13  
14 1855 Pearce-Higgins J.W., Ausden M.A., Beale C.M., Oliver T.H., & Crick H.Q.P. (2015a) *Research on the*  
15 1856 *assessment of risks & opportunities for species in England as a result of climate change*. Natural  
16 1857 England,  
17  
18 1858 Pearce-Higgins J.W., Baillie S.R., Boughey K., Bourn N.A.D., Foppen R.P.B., Gillings S., Gregory R.D.,  
19 1859 Hunt T., Jiguet F., Lehikoinen A., Musgrove A.J., Robinson R.A., Roy D.B., Siriwardena G.M.,  
20 1860 Walker K.J., & Wilson J.D. (2018) Overcoming the challenges of public data archiving for citizen  
21 1861 science biodiversity recording and monitoring schemes. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, .  
22  
23 1862 Pearce-Higgins J.W., Beale C.M., Oliver T.H., August T.A., Carroll M., Massimino D., Ockendon N.,  
24 1863 Savage J., Wheatley C.J., Ausden M.A., Bradbury R.B., Duffield S.J., Macgregor N.A., McClean  
25 1864 C.J., Morecroft M.D., Thomas C.D., Watts O., Beckmann B.C., Fox R., Roy H.E., Sutton P.G.,  
26 1865 Walker K.J., & Crick H.Q.P. (2017) A national-scale assessment of climate change impacts on  
27 1866 species: Assessing the balance of risks and opportunities for multiple taxa. *Biological*  
28 1867 *Conservation*, **213**, 124–134.  
29  
30 1868 Pearce-Higgins J.W., Dennis P., Whittingham M.J., & Yalden D.W. (2010) Impacts of climate on prey  
31 1869 abundance account for fluctuations in a population of a northern wader at the southern edge  
32 1870 of its range. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 12–23.  
33  
34 1871 Pearce-Higgins J.W., Eglinton M.B., & Chamberlain D. (2015b) Drivers of climate change impacts on  
35 1872 bird communities. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, **84**, 943–54.  
36  
37 1873 Pearce-Higgins J.W. & Green R.E. (2014) *Birds and climate change: impacts and conservation*  
38 1874 *responses*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.  
39  
40 1875 Pearson R.G. (2007) Species’ distribution modeling for conservation educators and practitioners.  
41 1876 *Lessons in conservation*, **3**, 1–50.  
42  
43 1877 Pearson R.G. & Dawson T.P. (2003) Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of  
44 1878 species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **12**, 361–  
45 1879 371.  
46  
47 1880 Pearson R.G., Raxworthy C.J., Nakamura M., & Townsend Peterson A. (2007) Predicting species  
48 1881 distributions from small numbers of occurrence records: a test case using cryptic geckos in  
49 1882 Madagascar. *Journal of Biogeography*, **34**, 102–117.  
50  
51 1883 Pearson R.G., Stanton J.C., Shoemaker K.T., Aiello-lammens M.E., Ersts P.J., Horning N., Fordham  
52 1884 D.A., Raxworthy C.J., Ryu H.Y., Mcnees J., & Akçakaya H.R. (2014) Life history and spatial traits  
53 1885 predict extinction risk due to climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **4**, 217–221.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1886 Pecl G.T., Araújo M.B., Bell J.D., Blanchard J., Bonebrake T.C., Chen I.-C., Clark T.D., Colwell R.K.,  
 1887 Danielsen F., Evengård B., Falconi L., Ferrier S., Frusher S., Garcia R.A., Griffis R.B., Hobday A.J.,  
 1888 Janion-Scheepers C., Jarzyna M.A., Jennings S., Lenoir J., Linnetved H.I., Martin V.Y.,  
 1889 McCormack P.C., McDonald J., Mitchell N.J., Mustonen T., Pandolfi J.M., Pettoirelli N., Popova  
 1890 E., Robinson S.A., Scheffers B.R., Shaw J.D., Sorte C.J.B., Strugnell J.M., Sunday J.M., Tuanmu  
 1891 M.-N., Vergés A., Villanueva C., Wernberg T., Wapstra E., & Williams S.E. (2017) Biodiversity  
 1892 redistribution under climate change: Impacts on ecosystems and human well-being. *Science*  
 1893 (*New York, N.Y.*), **355**, eaai9214.
- 1894 Penone C., Davidson A.D., Shoemaker K.T., Di Marco M., Rondinini C., Brooks T.M., Young B.E.,  
 1895 Graham C.H., & Costa G.C. (2014) Imputation of missing data in life-history trait datasets: which  
 1896 approach performs the best? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 961–970.
- 1897 Pereira H.M., Belnap J., Brummitt N., Collen B., Ding H., Gonzalez-Espinosa M., Gregory R.D.,  
 1898 Honrado J., Jongman R.H., Julliard R., McRae L., Proença V., Rodrigues P., Opige M., Rodriguez  
 1899 J.P., Schmeller D.S., van Swaay C., & Vieira C. (2010) Global biodiversity monitoring. *Frontiers in*  
 1900 *Ecology and the Environment*, **8**, 459–460.
- 1901 Pérez-Ramos I.M., Ourcival J.M., Limousin J.M., & Rambal S. (2010) Mast seeding under increasing  
 1902 drought: results from a long-term data set and from a rainfall exclusion experiment. *Ecology*,  
 1903 **91**, 3057–3068.
- 1904 Peters R.L. & Lovejoy T.E. (1992) *Global Warming and Biological Diversity*.
- 1905 Peterson A.T., Soberón J., Pearson R.G., Anderson R.P., Martínez-Meyer E., Nakamura M., & Araújo  
 1906 M.B. (2011) *Ecological niches and geographic distributions (MPB-49)*. Princeton University  
 1907 Press,
- 1908 Phillimore A.B., Leech D.I., Pearce-Higgins J.W., & Hadfield J.D. (2016) Passerines may be sufficiently  
 1909 plastic to track temperature-mediated shifts in optimum lay date. *Global Change Biology*, **22**,  
 1910 3259–3272.
- 1911 Phillips S.J., Dudík M., Elith J., Graham C.H., Lehmann A., Leathwick J., & Ferrier S. (2009) Sample  
 1912 selection bias and presence-only distribution models: Implications for background and pseudo-  
 1913 absence data. *Ecological Applications*, **19**, 181–197.
- 1914 Phillips S.J., Williams P., Midgley G., & Archer A. (2008) Optimizing dispersal corridors for the Cape  
 1915 Proteaceae using network flow. *Ecological applications*, **18**, 1200–11.
- 1916 Pidgeon N. & Fischhoff B. (2011) The role of social and decision sciences in communicating uncertain  
 1917 climate risks. *Nature Climate Change*, **1**, 35–41.
- 1918 Pigott C.D. & Huntley J.P. (1981) Factors controlling the distribution of *Tilia cordata* at the northern  
 1919 limits of its geographical range III. Nature and causes of seed sterility. *New phytologist*, **87**,  
 1920 817–839.
- 1921 Platts P.J., Garcia R.A., Hof C., Foden W., Hansen L.A., Rahbek C., & Burgess N.D. (2014) Conservation  
 1922 implications of omitting narrow-ranging taxa from species distribution models, now and in the  
 1923 future. *Diversity and Distributions*, **20**, 1307–1320.
- 1924 Platts P.J., Gereau R.E., Burgess N.D., Marchant R., Group C.S., Garden M.B., & Mountains E.A. (2013)  
 1925 Spatial heterogeneity of climate change in an Afrotropical centre of endemism. 1–35.



1  
2  
3 1926 Poloczanska E.S., Brown C.J., Sydeman W.J., Kiessling W., Schoeman D.S., Moore P.J., Brander K.,  
4 1927 Bruno J.F., Buckley L.B., Burrows M.T., Duarte C.M., Halpern B.S., Holding J., Kappel C. V.,  
5 1928 O’Connor M.I., Pandolfi J.M., Parmesan C., Schwing F., Thompson S.A., & Richardson A.J. (2013)  
6 1929 Global imprint of climate change on marine life. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 919–925.  
7  
8 1930 Pompe S., Hanspach J., Badeck F., Klotz S., Thuiller W., & Kühn I. (2008) Climate and land use change  
9 1931 impacts on plant distributions in Germany. *Biology letters*, **4**, 564–7.  
10  
11 1932 Pompe S., Hanspach J., & Badeck F.W. (2014) Using ecological and life-history characteristics for  
12 1933 projecting species’ responses to climate change. *Frontiers of Biogeography*, **6**, 119–133.  
13  
14 1934 Potter K.A., Arthur Woods H., & Pincebourde S. (2013) Microclimatic challenges in global change  
15 1935 biology. *Global Change Biology*, **19**, 2932–2939.  
16  
17 1936 Potts W.M., Henriques R., Santos C. V, Munnik K., Ansorge I., Dufois F., Booth A.J., Kirchner C., Sauer  
18 1937 W.H.H., & Shaw P.W. (2014) Ocean warming, a rapid distributional shift, and the hybridization  
19 1938 of a coastal fish species. *Global Change Biology*, **20**, 2765–2777.  
20  
21 1939 Pounds J.A., Bustamante M.R., Coloma L. a, Consuegra J. a, Fogden M.P.L., Foster P.N., La Marca E.,  
22 1940 Masters K.L., Merino-Viteri A., Puschendorf R., Ron S.R., Sánchez-Azofeifa G.A., Still C.J., &  
23 1941 Young B.E. (2006) Widespread amphibian extinctions from epidemic disease driven by global  
24 1942 warming. *Nature*, **439**, 161–7.  
25  
26 1943 de Pous P., Montori A., Amat F., & Sanuy D. (2016) Range contraction and loss of genetic variation of  
27 1944 the Pyrenean endemic newt *Calotriton asper* due to climate change. *Regional Environmental*  
28 1945 *Change*, **16**, 995–1009.  
29  
30 1946 Preece R.C. (1997) The spatial response of non-marine Mollusca to past climate changes. *Past and*  
31 1947 *Future Rapid Environmental Changes* pp. 163–177. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin,  
32 1948 Heidelberg.  
33  
34 1949 R. Kearney M. (2013) Activity restriction and the mechanistic basis for extinctions under climate  
35 1950 warming. *Ecology Letters*, **16**, 1470–1479.  
36  
37 1951 Radchuk V., Turlure C., & Schtickzelle N. (2013) Each life stage matters: the importance of assessing  
38 1952 the response to climate change over the complete life cycle in butterflies. *The Journal of*  
39 1953 *Animal Ecology*, **82**, 275–85.  
40  
41 1954 Ramula S., Johansson J., Lindén A., & Jonzén N. (2015) Linking phenological shifts to demographic  
42 1955 change. *Climate Research*, **63**, 135–144.  
43  
44 1956 Randall C.J. & van Woesik R. (2015) Contemporary white-band disease in Caribbean corals driven by  
45 1957 climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, **5**, 359–379.  
46  
47 1958 Randin C.F., Dirnböck T., Dullinger S., Zimmermann N.E., Zappa M., & Guisan A. (2006) Are niche-  
48 1959 based species distribution models transferable in space? *Journal of Biogeography*, **33**, 1689–  
49 1960 1703.  
50  
51 1961 Rangan H., Bell K.L., Baum D. a., Fowler R., McConvell P., Saunders T., Spronck S., Kull C. a., &  
52 1962 Murphy D.J. (2015) New Genetic and Linguistic Analyses Show Ancient Human Influence on  
53 1963 Baobab Evolution and Distribution in Australia. *Plos One*, **10**, e0119758.

- 1964 Raupach M.R., Marland G., Ciais P., Le Quéré C., Canadell J.G., Klepper G., & Field C.B. (2007) Global  
1965 and regional drivers of accelerating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
1966 *Sciences*, **104**, 10288–10293.
- 1967 Regehr E. V, Hunter C.M., Caswell H., Amstrup S.C., & Stirling I. (2010) Survival and breeding of polar  
1968 bears in the southern Beaufort Sea in relation to sea ice. *The Journal of animal ecology*, **79**,  
1969 117–27.
- 1970 Rellstab C., Zoller S., Walthert L., Lesur I., Pluess A.R., Graf R., Bodénès C., Sperisen C., Kremer A., &  
1971 Gugerli F. (2016) Signatures of local adaptation in candidate genes of oaks ( *Quercus* spp.) with  
1972 respect to present and future climatic conditions. *Molecular Ecology*, **25**, 5907–5924.
- 1973 Renwick A.R., Massimino D., Newson S.E., Chamberlain D.E., Pearce-Higgins J.W., & Johnston A.  
1974 (2012) Modelling changes in species' abundance in response to projected climate change.  
1975 *Diversity and Distributions*, **18**, 121–132.
- 1976 Robinson R., Crick H., Learmonth J., Maclean I., Thomas C., Bairlein F., Forchhammer M., Francis C.,  
1977 Gill J., Godley B., Harwood J., Hays G., Huntley B., Hutson A., Pierce G., Rehfish M., Sims D.,  
1978 Santos B., Sparks T., Stroud D., & Visser M. (2009) Travelling through a warming world: climate  
1979 change and migratory species. *Endangered Species Research*, **7**, 87–99.
- 1980 Rocchini D., Garzon-Lopez C.X., Marcantonio M., Amici V., Bacaro G., Bastin L., Brummitt N.,  
1981 Chiarucci A., Foody G.M., Hauffe H.C., He K.S., Ricotta C., Rizzoli A., & Rosà R. (2017)  
1982 Anticipating species distributions: Handling sampling effort bias under a Bayesian framework.  
1983 *Science of The Total Environment*, **584–585**, 282–290.
- 1984 Rocchini D., Hortal J., Lengyel S., Lobo J.M., Jiménez-Valverde A., Ricotta C., Bacaro G., & Chiarucci A.  
1985 (2011) Accounting for uncertainty when mapping species distributions: The need for maps of  
1986 ignorance. *Progress in Physical Geography*, **35**, 211–226.
- 1987 Rode K.D., Amstrup S.C., & Regehr E. V. (2010) Reduced body size and cub recruitment in polar bears  
1988 associated with sea ice decline. *Ecological Applications*, **20**, 768–782.
- 1989 Salafsky N., Salzer D., Stattersfield A.J., Hilton-Taylor C., Neugarten R., Butchart S.H.M., Collen B., Cox  
1990 N., Master L.L., O'Connor S., & Wilkie D. (2007) A Standard Lexicon for Biodiversity  
1991 Conservation: Unified Classifications of Threats and Actions. *Conservation Biology*, **22**, 12897–  
1992 911.
- 1993 Sánchez-Fernández D., Lobo J.M., & Hernández-Manrique O.L. (2011) Species distribution models  
1994 that do not incorporate global data misrepresent potential distributions: a case study using  
1995 Iberian diving beetles. *Diversity and Distributions*, **17**, 163–171.
- 1996 Scheffers B.R., De Meester L., Bridge T.C.L., Hoffmann A.A., Pandolfi J.M., Corlett R.T., Butchart  
1997 S.H.M., Pearce-Kelly P., Kovacs K.M., Dudgeon D., Pacifici M., Rondinini C., Foden W.B., Martin  
1998 T.G., Mora C., Bickford D., & Watson J.E.M. (2016) The broad footprint of climate change from  
1999 genes to biomes to people. *Science*, **354**, .
- 2000 Scheiter S. & Higgins S.I. (2009) Impacts of climate change on the vegetation of Africa: an adaptive  
2001 dynamic vegetation modelling approach. *Global Change Biology*, **15**, 2224–2246.
- 2002 Scheiter S., Langan L., & Higgins S.I. (2013) Next-generation dynamic global vegetation models:  
2003 learning from community ecology. *New Phytologist*, **198**, 957–969.

1  
2  
3 2004 Schloss C.A., Nuñez T.A., & Lawler J.J. (2012) Dispersal will limit ability of mammals to track climate  
4 2005 change in the Western Hemisphere. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **109**,  
5 2006 8606–8611.

6  
7 2007 Scholes R.J., Walters M., Turak E., Saarenmaa H., Faith D.P., Mooney H.A., Heip C.H.R., Ferrier S.,  
8 2008 Jongman R.H.G., Harrison I.J., Yahara T., Pereira H.M., Larigauderie A., & Geller G. (2012)  
9 2009 Building a global observing system for biodiversity. *Current Opinion in Environmental*  
10 2010 *Sustainability*, **4**, 139–146.

11  
12 2011 Schrodtt F., Kattge J., Shan H., Fazayeli F., Joswig J., Banerjee A., Reichstein M., Bönisch G., Díaz S.,  
13 2012 Dickie J., Gillison A., Karpatne A., Lavorel S., Leadley P., Wirth C.B., Wright I.J., Wright S.J., &  
14 2013 Reich P.B. (2015) BHPMF - a hierarchical Bayesian approach to gap-filling and trait prediction  
15 2014 for macroecology and functional biogeography. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **24**, 1510–  
16 2015 1521.

17  
18 2016 Schroter D., Polsky C., & Patt A.G. (2005) Assessing vulnerabilities to the effects of global change: An  
19 2017 eight step approach. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, **10**, 573–596.

20  
21 2018 Schwartz M.W., Iverson L.R., Prasad A.M., Matthews S.N., O'Connor R.J., & O'Connor R. J. (2006)  
22 2019 Predicting extinctions as a result of climate change. *Ecology*, **87**, 1611–5.

23  
24 2020 Schweiger O., Biesmeijer J.C., Bommarco R., Hickler T., Hulme P.E., Klotz S., Kühn I., Moora M.,  
25 2021 Nielsen A., Ohlemüller R., Petanidou T., Potts S.G., Pyšek P., Stout J.C., Sykes M.T., Tscheulin T.,  
26 2022 Vilà M., Walther G.-R., Westphal C., Winter M., Zobel M., & Settele J. (2010) Multiple stressors  
27 2023 on biotic interactions: how climate change and alien species interact to affect pollination.  
28 2024 *Biological Reviews*, **85**, 777–795.

29  
30 2025 Schweiger O., Heikkinen R.K., Harpke A., Hickler T., Klotz S., Kudrna O., Kühn I., Pöyry J., & Settele J.  
31 2026 (2012) Increasing range mismatching of interacting species under global change is related to  
32 2027 their ecological characteristics. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **21**, 88–99.

33  
34 2028 Schweiger O., Settele J., Kudrna O., Klotz S., & Kühn I. (2008) Climate change can cause spatial  
35 2029 mismatch of trophically interacting species. *Ecology*, **89**, 3472–3479.

36  
37 2030 Schweizer R.M., Robinson J., Harrigan R., Silva P., Galverni M., Musiani M., Green R.E., Novembre J.,  
38 2031 & Wayne R.K. (2016) Targeted capture and resequencing of 1040 genes reveal environmentally  
39 2032 driven functional variation in grey wolves. *Molecular Ecology*, **25**, 357–379.

40  
41 2033 Segan D.B., Hole D.G., Donatti C.I., Zganjar C., Martin S., & Watson J. (2015) Considering the impact  
42 2034 of climate change on human communities significantly alters the outcome of species and site-  
43 2035 based vulnerability assessments. *Diversity & Distributions*, **21**, 1101–1111.

44  
45 2036 Settele J., Kudrna O., Harpke A., Kühn I., Van Swaay C., Verovnik R., Warren M.S., Wiemers M.,  
46 2037 Hanspach J., Hickler T., & Kühn E. (2008) *Climatic risk atlas of European butterflies*. Pensoft,  
47 2038 Sofia-Moscow.

48  
49 2039 Sinervo B., Méndez-de-la-Cruz F., Miles D.B., Heulin B., Bastiaans E., Villagrán-Santa Cruz M., Lara-  
50 2040 Resendiz R., Martínez-Méndez N., Calderón-Espinosa M.L., Meza-Lázaro R.N., Gadsden H., Avila  
51 2041 L.J., Morando M., De la Riva I.J., Victoriano Sepulveda P., Rocha C.F.D., Ibargüengoytía N.,  
52 2042 Aguilar Puntriano C., Massot M., Lepetz V., Oksanen T.A., Chapple D.G., Bauer A.M., Branch  
53 2043 W.R., Clobert J., & Sites J.W. (2010) Erosion of lizard diversity by climate change and altered

- 2044 thermal niches. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **328**, 894–9.
- 2045 Singer A., Schweiger O., Kühn I., & Johst K. (2018) Constructing a hybrid species distribution model  
2046 from standard large-scale distribution data. *Ecological Modelling*, **373**, 39–52.
- 2047 Small-Lorenz S.L., Culp L.A., Ryder T.B., Will T.C., & Marra P.P. (2013) A blind spot in climate change  
2048 vulnerability assessments. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 91–93.
- 2049 Smith A.B. (2013) On evaluating species distribution models with random background sites in place  
2050 of absences when test presences disproportionately sample suitable habitat. *Diversity and*  
2051 *Distributions*, **19**, 867–872.
- 2052 Smith A.B., Long Q.G., & Albrecht M.A. (2016) Shifting targets: spatial priorities for ex situ plant  
2053 conservation depend on interactions between current threats, climate change, and  
2054 uncertainty. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **25**, 905–922.
- 2055 Snover A.K., Mantua N.J., Littell J.S., Alexander M.A., McClure M.M., & Nye J. (2013) Choosing and  
2056 Using Climate-Change Scenarios for Ecological-Impact Assessments and Conservation  
2057 Decisions. *Conservation Biology*, **27**, 1147–1157.
- 2058 Songer M., Delion M., Biggs A., & Huang Q. (2012) Modeling Impacts of Climate Change on Giant  
2059 Panda Habitat. *International Journal of Ecology*, **2012**, 1–12.
- 2060 Stanton J.C. (2014) Present-day risk assessment would have predicted the extinction of the  
2061 passenger pigeon (*Ectopistes migratorius*). *Biological Conservation*, **180**, 11–20.
- 2062 Steane D.A., Potts B.M., McLean E., Prober S.M., Stock W.D., Vaillancourt R.E., & Byrne M. (2014)  
2063 Genome-wide scans detect adaptation to aridity in a widespread forest tree species. *Molecular*  
2064 *Ecology*, **23**, 2500–2513.
- 2065 Stein B.A., Glick P., Edelson N., & Staudt A. (2014) *Climate-Smart Conservation: Putting Adaptation*  
2066 *Principles into Practice*. National Wildlife Federation, Washington D.C.
- 2067 Stein B.A., Staudt A., Cross M.S., DuBois N., Enquist C., Griffis R., Hansen L., Hellman J., Lawler J.,  
2068 Nelson E., Pairis A., Beard D., Bierbaum R., Girvetz E., Gonzalez P., Ruffo S., & Smith J. (2012)  
2069 Adaptation to impacts of climate change on biodiversity, ecosystems, and ecosystem services.  
2070 *Impacts of climate change on biodiversity, ecosystems, and ecosystem services: technical input*  
2071 *to the 2013 National Climate Assessment* (ed. by M.D. Staudinger, N.B. Grimm, A. Staudt, S.L.  
2072 Carter, F.S. Chapin III, P. Kareiva, M. Ruckelshaus, and B.A.). Stein), Washington DC.
- 2073 Stephens P.A., Mason L.R., Green R.E., Gregory R.D., Sauer J.R., Alison J., Aunins A., Brotons L.,  
2074 Butchart S.H.M., Campedelli T., Chodkiewicz T., Chylarecki P., Crowe O., Elts J., Escandell V.,  
2075 Foppen R.P.B., Heldbjerg H., Herrando S., Husby M., Jiguet F., Lehtikainen A., Lindström Å.,  
2076 Noble D.G., Paquet J.-Y., Reif J., Sattler T., Szép T., Teufelbauer N., Trautmann S., van Strien A.J.,  
2077 van Turnhout C.A.M., Vorisek P., & Willis S.G. (2016) Consistent response of bird populations to  
2078 climate change on two continents. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **352**, 84–7.
- 2079 Still S.M., Frances A.L., Treher A.C., Oliver L., & Still S.M. (2015) Using Two Climate Change  
2080 Vulnerability Assessment Methods to Prioritize and Manage Rare Plants : A Case Study. *Natural*  
2081 *Areas Journal*, **35**, 106–121.
- 2082 Stolar J. & Nielsen S.E. (2015) Accounting for spatially biased sampling effort in presence-only

1  
2  
3 2083 species distribution modelling. *Diversity and Distributions*, **21**, 595–608.

4  
5 2084 Street R.B., Semenov S.M., Westman W., Peters R., Janetos A., Boyd H., Pagnan J., Wein R., &  
6 2085 Lopoukhine N. (1990) *Natural terrestrial ecosystems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

7  
8 2086 Svarstad H., Petersen L.K., Rothman D., Siepel H., & Wätzold F. (2008) Discursive biases of the  
9 2087 environmental research framework DPSIR. *Land Use Policy*, **25**, 116–125.

10  
11 2088 Swann A.L., Fung I.Y., Levis S., Bonan G.B., & Doney S.C. (2010) Changes in Arctic vegetation amplify  
12 2089 high-latitude warming through the greenhouse effect. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
13 2090 *Sciences of the United States of America*, **107**, 1295–300.

14  
15 2091 Sykes M.T. & Prentice I.C. (1995) Boreal Forest Futures: Modelling the Controls on Tree Species  
16 2092 Range Limits and Transient Responses to Climate Change. *Boreal Forests and Global Change* pp.  
17 2093 415–428. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.

18  
19 2094 Sykes M.T., Prentice I.C., & Cramer W. (1996) A Bioclimatic Model for the Potential Distributions of  
20 2095 North European Tree Species Under Present and Future Climates. *Journal of Biogeography*, **23**,  
21 2096 203–233.

22  
23 2097 Talluto M. V., Boulangeat I., Ameztegui A., Aubin I., Berteaux D., Butler A., Doyon F., Drever C.R.,  
24 2098 Fortin M.J., Franceschini T., Liénard J., Mckenney D., Solarik K.A., Strigul N., Thuiller W., &  
25 2099 Gravel D. (2016) Cross-scale integration of knowledge for predicting species ranges: A  
26 2100 metamodeling framework. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **25**, 238–249.

27  
28 2101 Thackeray S.J., Henrys P.A., Hemming D., Bell J.R., Botham M.S., Burthe S., Helaouet P., Johns D.G.,  
29 2102 Jones I.D., Leech D.I., Mackay E.B., Massimino D., Atkinson S., Bacon P.J., Brereton T.M.,  
30 2103 Carvalho L., Clutton-Brock T.H., Duck C., Edwards M., Elliott J.M., Hall S.J.G., Harrington R.,  
31 2104 Pearce-Higgins J.W., Høye T.T., Kruuk L.E.B., Pemberton J.M., Sparks T.H., Thompson P.M.,  
32 2105 White I., Winfield I.J., & Wanless S. (2016) Phenological sensitivity to climate across taxa and  
33 2106 trophic levels. *Nature*, **535**, 241–245.

34  
35 2107 Thackeray S.J., Sparks T.H., Frederiksen M., Burthe S., Bacon P.J., Bell J.R., Botham M.S., Brereton  
36 2108 T.M., Bright P.W., Carvalho L., Clutton-Brock T., Dawson A., Edwards M., Elliott J.M., Harrington  
37 2109 R., Johns D., Jones I.D., Jones J.T., Leech D.I., Roy D.B., Scott W.A., Smith M., Smithers R.J.,  
38 2110 Winfield I.J., & Wanless S. (2010) Trophic level asynchrony in rates of phenological change for  
39 2111 marine, freshwater and terrestrial environments. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 3304–3313.

40  
41 2112 Thaxter C.B., Joys A.C., Gregory R.D., Baillie S.R., & Noble D.G. (2010) Hypotheses to explain patterns  
42 2113 of population change among breeding bird species in England. *Biological Conservation*, **143**,  
43 2114 2006–2019.

44  
45 2115 Thomas C.D., Cameron A., Green R.E., Bakkenes M., Beaumont L.J., Collingham Y.C., Erasmus B.F.N.,  
46 2116 De Siqueira M.F., Grainger A., Hannah L., Hughes L., Huntley B., Van Jaarsveld A.S., Midgley  
47 2117 G.F., Miles L., Ortega-Huerta M.A., Peterson A.T., Phillips O.L., & Williams S.E. (2004) Extinction  
48 2118 risk from climate change. *Nature*, **427**, 145–148.

49  
50 2119 Thomas C.D., Hill J.K., Anderson B.J., Bailey S., Beale C.M., Bradbury R.B., Bulman C.R., Crick H.Q.P.,  
51 2120 Eigenbrod F., Griffiths H.M., Kunin W.E., Oliver T.H., Walmsley C.A., Watts K., Worsfold N.T., &  
52 2121 Yardley T. (2011) A framework for assessing threats and benefits to species responding to  
53 2122 climate change. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **2**, 125–142.




- 2123 Thompson R.M., Beardall J., Beringer J., Grace M., & Sardina P. (2013) Means and extremes: Building  
2124 variability into community-level climate change experiments. *Ecology Letters*, **16**, 799–806.
- 2125 Thuiller W., Lavorel S., Araújo M.B., Sykes M.T., & Prentice I.C. (2005) Climate change threats to  
2126 plant diversity in Europe. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **102**, 8245–50.
- 2127 Thuiller W., Midgley G.F., Hughes G.O., Bomhard B., Drew G., Rutherford M.C., & Woodward F.I.  
2128 (2006a) Endemic species and ecosystem sensitivity to climate change in Namibia. *Global  
2129 Change Biology*, **12**, 759–776.
- 2130 Thuiller W., Midgley G.F.G.F., Hughes G.O.G.O., Bomhard B., Drew G., Rutherford M.C., & Woodward  
2131 F.I.I. (2006b) Endemic species and ecosystem sensitivity to climate change in Namibia. *Global  
2132 Change Biology*, **12**, 759–776.
- 2133 Tingley M.W., Monahan W.B., Beissinger S.R., & Moritz C. (2009) Birds track their Grinnellian niche  
2134 through a century of climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**,  
2135 19637–19643.
- 2136 Todd B.D., Scott D.E., Pechmann J.H.K., & Gibbons J.W. (2010) Climate change correlates with rapid  
2137 delays and advancements in reproductive timing in an amphibian community. *Proceedings of  
2138 the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **278**, 2191–2197.
- 2139 Trape S. (2009) Impact of Climate Change on the Relict Tropical Fish Fauna of Central Sahara: Threat  
2140 for the Survival of Adrar Mountains Fishes, Mauritania. *PLoS ONE*, **4**, e4400.
- 2141 Turner W.R., Bradley B.A., Estes L.D., Hole D.G., Oppenheimer M., & Wilcove D.S. (2010) Climate  
2142 change: helping nature survive the human response. *Conservation Letters*, **3**, 304–312.
- 2143 Urban M.C., Tewksbury J.J., & Sheldon K.S. (2012) On a collision course: competition and dispersal  
2144 differences create no-analogue communities and cause extinctions during climate change.  
2145 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **279**, 2072–80.
- 2146 Vale C.G. & Brito J.C. (2015) Desert-adapted species are vulnerable to climate change: Insights from  
2147 the warmest region on Earth. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, **4**, 369–379.
- 2148 Varela S., Anderson R.P., & Fernández-González F. (2014) Environmental filters reduce the effects of  
2149 sampling bias and improve predictions of ecological niche models. *Ecography*, **37**, 1084–1091.
- 2150 Vincenzi S., Mangel M., Jesensek D., Garza J.C., & Crivelli A.J. (2017) Genetic and life-history  
2151 consequences of extreme climate events. *Proceedings. Biological sciences*, **284**, 20162118.
- 2152 Violle C., Navas M.-L., Vile D., Kazakou E., Fortunel C., Hummel I., & Garnier E. (2007) Let the concept  
2153 of trait be functional! *Oikos*, **116**, 882–892.
- 2154 Visconti P., Bakkenes M., Baisero D., Brooks T., Butchart S.H.M., Joppa L., Alkemade R., Di Marco M.,  
2155 Santini L., Hoffmann M., Maiorano L., Pressey R.L., Arponen A., Boitani L., Reside A.E., van  
2156 Vuuren D.P., & Rondinini C. (2015) Projecting Global Biodiversity Indicators under Future  
2157 Development Scenarios. *Conservation Letters*, **9**, 5–13.
- 2158 Visser M.E. (2008) Keeping up with a warming world; assessing the rate of adaptation to climate  
2159 change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **275**, 649–59.



- 2160 Visser M.E., Holleman L.J.M., & Gienapp P. (2006) Shifts in caterpillar biomass phenology due to  
2161 climate change and its impact on the breeding biology of an insectivorous bird. *Oecologia*, **147**,  
2162 164–172.
- 2163 van Vuuren D.P., Stehfest E., den Elzen M.G.J., Kram T., van Vliet J., Deetman S., Isaac M., Klein  
2164 Goldewijk K., Hof A., Mendoza Beltran A., Oostenrijk R., & van Ruijven B. (2011) RCP2.6:  
2165 exploring the possibility to keep global mean temperature increase below 2°C. *Climatic Change*,  
2166 **109**, 95–116.
- 2167 Wade A.A., Hand B.K., Kovach R.P., Luikart G., Whited D.C., & Muhlfeld C.C. (2017) Accounting for  
2168 adaptive capacity and uncertainty in assessments of species' climate-change vulnerability.  
2169 *Conservation Biology*, **31**, 136–149.
- 2170 Walker B. & Steffen W. (1996) *Global change and terrestrial ecosystems Vol 2*. Global change and  
2171 terrestrial ecosystems,
- 2172 Walther G.-R., Roques A., Hulme P.E., Sykes M.T., Pyšek P., Kühn I., Zobel M., Bacher S., Botta-Dukát  
2173 Z., Bugmann H., Czúcz B., Dauber J., Hickler T., Jarošík V., Kenis M., Klotz S., Minchin D., Moora  
2174 M., Nentwig W., Ott J., Panov V.E., Reineking B., Robinet C., Semenchenko V., Solarz W.,  
2175 Thuiller W., Vilà M., Vohland K., & Settele J. (2009) Alien species in a warmer world: risks and  
2176 opportunities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **24**, 686–693.
- 2177 Warren R., Price J., Graham E., Forstenhaeusler N., & VanDerWal J. (2018) The projected effect on  
2178 insects, vertebrates, and plants of limiting global warming to 1.5°C rather than 2°C. *Science*,  
2179 **360**, 791–795.
- 2180 Warren R., VanDerWal J., Price J., Welbergen J.A., Atkinson I., Ramirez-Villegas J., Osborn T.J., Jarvis  
2181 A., Shoo L.P., Williams S.E., & Lowe J. (2013) Quantifying the benefit of early climate change  
2182 mitigation in avoiding biodiversity loss. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 678–682.
- 2183 Watling J.I., Bucklin D.N., Speroterra C., Brandt L.A., Mazzotti F.J., & Romañach S.S. (2013) Validating  
2184 predictions from climate envelope models. *PloS ONE*, **8**, e63600.
- 2185 Watson J.E.M. (2014) Human responses to climate change will seriously impact biodiversity  
2186 conservation: It's time we start planning for them. *Conservation Letters*, **7**, 1–2.
- 2187 Watson J.E.M. & Segan D.B. (2013) Accommodating the human response for realistic adaptation  
2188 planning: response to Gillson *et al.* *Trends in ecology & evolution*, **28**, 573–574.
- 2189 Wenger S.J. & Olden J.D. (2012) Assessing transferability of ecological models: an underappreciated  
2190 aspect of statistical validation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 260–267.
- 2191 Wheatley C.J., Beale C.M., Bradbury R.B., Pearce-Higgins J.W., Critchlow R., & Thomas C.D. (2017)  
2192 Climate change vulnerability for species—Assessing the assessments. *Global Change Biology*,  
2193 **23**, 3704–3715.
- 2194 Whinam J., Abdul-Rahman J.A., Visoiu M., di Folco M.B.F., & Kirkpatrick J.B. (2014) Spatial and  
2195 temporal variation in damage and dieback in a threatened subantarctic cushion species.  
2196 *Australian Journal of Botany*, **62**, 10–21.
- 2197 van Wilgen N.J., Goodall V., Holness S., Chown L., & Mcgeoch M.A. (2015) Rising temperatures and  
2198 changing rainfall patterns in South Africa's national parks. *International Journal of Climatology*,

- 2199           **721**, doi: 10.1002/joc.4377.
- 2200   Wilkinson D.M. (1997) Plant colonization: are wind dispersed seeds really dispersed by birds at larger  
2201   spatial and temporal scales? *Journal of Biogeography*, **24**, 61–65.
- 2202   Wilkinson D.M., Lovas-Kiss A., Callaghan D.A., & Green A.J. (2017) Endozoochory of Large Bryophyte  
2203   Fragments by Waterbirds. *Cryptogamie, Bryologie*, **38**, 223–228.
- 2204   Williams J.N., Seo C.W., Thorne J., Nelson J.K., Erwin S., O'Brien J.M., & Schwartz M.W. (2009) Using  
2205   species distribution models to predict new occurrences for rare plants. *Diversity and*  
2206   *Distributions*, **15**, 565–576.
- 2207   Williams S.E., Shoo L.P., Isaac J.L., Hoffmann A.A., & Langham G. (2008) Towards an Integrated  
2208   Framework for Assessing the Vulnerability of Species to Climate Change. *PLoS Biology*, **6**, e325.
- 2209   Willis S.G., Foden W., Baker D.J., Belle E., Burgess N.D., Carr J., Doswald N., Garcia R.A., Hartley A.,  
2210   Hof C., Newbold T., Rahbek C., Smith R.J., Visconti P., Young B.E., & Butchart S.H.M. (2015)  
2211   Integrating climate change vulnerability assessments from species distribution models and  
2212   trait-based approaches. *Biological Conservation*, **190**, 167–178.
- 2213   Young B.E., Hall K.R., Byers E., Gravuer K., Hammerson G., Redder A., & Szabo K. (2012) Rapid  
2214   assessment of plant and animal vulnerability to climate change. *Conserving Wildlife Populations*  
2215   *in a Changing Climate* (ed. by J. Brodie, E. Post, and D. Doak), pp. 129–150. University of  
2216   Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- 2217   Younger J.L., Clucas G. V., Kao D., Rogers A.D., Gharbi K., Hart T., & Miller K.J. (2017) The challenges  
2218   of detecting subtle population structure and its importance for the conservation of emperor  
2219   penguins. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 3883–3897.
- 2220   Yu D., Chen M., Zhou Z., Eric R., Tang Q., & Liu H. (2013) Global climate change will severely decrease  
2221   potential distribution of the East Asian coldwater fish *Rhynchocypris oxycephalus*  
2222   (Actinopterygii, Cyprinidae). *Hydrobiologia*, **700**, 23–32.
- 2223   Van Zuiden T.M. & Sharma S. (2016) Examining the effects of climate change and species invasions  
2224   on Ontario walleye populations: can walleye beat the heat? *Diversity and Distributions*, **22**,  
2225   1069–1079.
- 2226   (2004) *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*.
- 2227

STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT  
CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT OF SPECIES



190x338mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 1: Steps for developing climate change adaptation strategies (Adapted from Glick et al. (2011))

174x162mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2a. According to the IPCC Fourth Assessment (2007) and common usage in the field of CCVA of species, vulnerability to climate change results from the interaction of exposure and sensitivity with adaptive capacity (adapted from IPCC, 2007).

Figure 2b. According to the IPCC Fifth Assessment (2014), risk of climate-related impacts results from the interaction of climate-related hazards with the vulnerability and exposure of human and natural systems (adapted from IPCC (2014)).

338x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3. Climate change related pressures on species, showing those originating from abiotic, biotic and human response causes.

92x68mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Figure 4. Potential climate change impacts on species include the species-level population and range changes that underpin extinction risk. These changes are driven by changes at individual and subpopulation levels.

338x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 5. Mechanisms describe the pathways through which climate change pressures may exert impacts on species. These impacts may have positive and/or negative impacts on the species and are mitigated or exacerbated by species' individual sensitivities and adaptive capacities.

338x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)

STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT  
CLIMATE CHANGE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT OF SPECIES




Figure 6. The approaches used to carry out each of the three assessment types and the metrics or types of information of climate change vulnerability that they may produce.

190x338mm (300 x 300 DPI)