This is a repository copy of *Testing the benefits of conservation set-asides for improved habitat connectivity in tropical agricultural landscapes*.

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

Testing the benefits of conservation set-asides for improved habitat connectivity in tropical agricultural landscapes

Sarah A. Scriven[1]*, Kimberly M. Carlson[2], Jenny A. Hodgson[3], Colin J. McClean[4], Robert Heilmayr[5], Jennifer M. Lucey[6] and Jane K. Hill[1]

[1] Department of Biology, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK

[2] Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management, University of Hawai'i Mānoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

[3] Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7ZB, UK

[4] Department of Environment and Geography, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK

[5] Environmental Studies Program and Bren School of Environmental Science & Management, University of California Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

[6] Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3SZ, UK

*Corresponding author:

Email: sarah.scriven@york.ac.uk; sarah_scriven@hotmail.co.uk;
Phone: +44 (0)1904 328632

Key words: Agriculture, Borneo, climate change, fragmentation, High Conservation Value, Incidence Function Model, landscape colonisation, sustainable palm oil.

1

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

1   **Abstract**

2   **1.** Habitat connectivity is important for tropical biodiversity conservation. Expansion of

3   commodity crops, such as oil palm, fragments natural habitat areas, and strategies are needed

4   to improve habitat connectivity in agricultural landscapes. The Roundtable on Sustainable

5   Palm Oil (RSPO) voluntary certification system requires that growers identify and conserve

6   forest patches identified as High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) before oil palm

7   plantations can be certified as sustainable. We assessed the potential benefits of these

8   conservation set-asides for forest connectivity.

9   **2.** We mapped HCVAs and quantified their forest cover in 2015. To assess their contribution

10   to forest connectivity, we modelled range expansion of forest-dependent populations with

11   five dispersal abilities spanning those representative of poor dispersers (e.g., flightless

12   insects) to more mobile species (e.g., large birds or bats) across 70 plantation landscapes in

13   Borneo.

14   **3.** Because only 21% of HCVA area was forested in 2015, these conservation set-asides

15   currently provide few connectivity benefits. Compared to a scenario where HCVAs contain

16   no forest (i.e., a no-RSPO scenario), current HCVAs improved connectivity by ~3% across

17   all dispersal abilities. However, if HCVAs were fully reforested, then overall landscape

18   connectivity could improve by ~16%. Reforestation of HCVAs had the greatest benefit for

19   poor to intermediate dispersers (0.5-3 km per generation), generating landscapes that were up

20   to 2.7 times better connected than landscapes without HCVAs. By contrast, connectivity

21   benefits of HCVAs were low for highly mobile populations under current and reforestation

22   scenarios, because range expansion of these populations was generally successful regardless

23   of the amount of forest cover.

24   **4.** *Synthesis and applications*. The RSPO requires that HCVAs be set aside to conserve

25   biodiversity, but HCVAs currently provide few connectivity benefits because they contain

26   relatively little forest. However, reforested HCVAs have the potential to improve landscape

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

27   connectivity for some forest species (e.g., winged insects), and we recommend active

28   management by plantation companies to improve forest quality of degraded HCVAs (e.g., by

29   enrichment planting). Future revisions to the RSPO's Principles and Criteria (P&C) should

30   also ensure that large (i.e., with a core area >2 km^2) HCVAs are reconnected to continuous

31   tracts of forest to maximise their connectivity benefits.

32

1. Introduction

34   Agricultural expansion has reduced the extent of natural habitats globally, and more than

35   12% of the Earth's ice-free land surface is now under crop production (Ramankutty, Evan,

36   Monfreda, & Foley, 2008). With demand for cropland expected to increase (Laurance, Sayer,

37   & Cassman, 2014), decisions about how to conserve biodiversity within agricultural

38   landscapes are of critical importance. Conservation of biodiversity in fragmented landscapes

39   requires that habitat networks connect remaining areas of natural habitat to facilitate range

40   shifts under climate change (Saura, Bodin, & Fortin, 2014) and maintain meta-population

41   dynamics (Hanski, 1994). Thus, there is an urgent need to determine how existing habitat

42   networks facilitate movement of species across patchy landscapes (Hodgson et al., 2011).

43   Loss of habitat connectivity is of great concern in the tropics, where rapid expansion

44   of commodity agriculture has resulted in widespread loss and fragmentation of forest

45   (Hosonuma et al., 2012). In many areas, formerly extensive and contiguous forests now

46   persist as isolated remnants scattered across vast agricultural matrices (Hill et al., 2011), and

47   this conversion of forest to agriculture is accompanied by biodiversity losses (Laurance et al.,

48   2014). Agricultural lands may also impede the dispersal of forest-dependent species (Scriven,

49   Beale, Benedick, & Hill, 2017), and hence their ability to track climate change. Land-use and

50   land-cover changes are likely to interact with climate change to exacerbate the effects of

51   fragmentation in tropical ecosystems by reducing suitable habitat availability (e.g.,

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

52   Nowakowski et al., 2017; Senior, Hill, González del Pliego, Goode, & Edwards, 2017).

53   When current species distributions do not overlap with the locations of future suitable

54   habitats under climate change (e.g., see Colwell, Brehm, Cardelús, Gilman, & Longino,

55   2008), populations are likely to decline in landscapes with poor connectivity (Newmark,

56   Jenkins, Pimm, Mcneally, & Halley, 2017). Therefore, effective conservation measures that

57   preserve forest connectivity are needed to support species persistence.

58   In Southeast Asia, the oil palm, pulp and paper, rubber, and logging industries have

59   driven lowland rainforest clearance (Gaveau et al., 2016; Carlson et al., 2018). As a result,

60   few lowland forests outside of public protected areas remain (Curran et al., 2004). Given the

61   projected growth in palm oil demand (Carrasco, Larrosa, & Edwards, 2014) and

62   governments' interests in the palm oil industry as a vehicle for economic growth (Sayer,

63   Ghazoul, Nelson, & Boedhihartono, 2012), as well as the substantial negative effects of oil

64   palm agriculture on biodiversity (Meijaard et al., 2018), strategies are needed to reduce

65   biodiversity losses in oil palm landscapes (Lucey et al., 2017). Conservation set-asides are

66   one approach used to meet such conservation goals (Green, Cornell, Scharlemann, &

67   Balmford, 2005). To encourage such set-asides, voluntary sustainability certification

68   standards such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) require members to

69   identify and conserve areas within plantations that support High Conservation Values (HCVs;

70   Senior, Brown, Villalpando, & Hill, 2015). High Conservation Values are biological, social

71   or cultural values of critical importance that are split into six broad types. Types 1-4 are

72   important environmental values (e.g., for species diversity and ecosystem services), whilst

73   types 5-6 are important for the livelihoods of local communities (e.g., community needs and

74   cultural values) (see Senior et al., 2015, for a full description of HCV types). In the humid

75   tropics, HCV types 1-4 are areas most likely to be forested, and one HCV criterion is that

76   forest areas should be identified and protected if they are important for forest connectivity

77   and/or the preservation of forest corridors.

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

78   Previous studies have examined the potential for HCV forest patches to support

79   biodiversity (Lucey et al., 2017), but the contribution of current HCV forest patches to

80   landscape connectivity has not been examined. Here, we meet this research need by

81   evaluating the potential of forests in High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) to provide

82   forest connectivity benefits. Our main aims are to: (1) determine the area and distribution of

83   HCVAs in RSPO member-held plantations in Borneo; (2) quantify the amount of 2015 forest

84   cover within these HCVAs; and (3) examine the connectivity benefits of HCVAs for

85   populations with different dispersal abilities. We assess landscape connectivity by using the

86   Incidence Function Model (IFM; Hanski, 1994; Hodgson et al., 2011; Scriven, Hodgson,

87   McClean, & Hill, 2015) to model range expansion of forest-dependent populations across oil

88   palm plantation landscapes. Hence, we define connectivity in our study as landscape

89   colonisation (i.e., the ecological process of range expansion), and so landscapes that are

90   successfully colonised are deemed connected (e.g., see Scriven et al., 2015). We then

91   quantify the connectivity benefits of HCVAs by comparing range expansion rates when

92   HCVAs are simulated to be either present or absent. We test two hypotheses: (1) HCVAs

93   containing more forest that are located in landscapes where HCVAs provide stepping-stone

94   patches generate greater connectivity benefits, and (2) connectivity benefits of HCVAs

95   depend on population dispersal ability and forest cover within the wider landscape.

96

97   **2. Materials and methods**

98   **2.1 HCVA and forest land-cover data**

99   Starting on January 1st, 2010, the RSPO required that all members undertake the New

100   Planting Procedure (NPP; RSPO, 2015), comprising assessments to be conducted prior to

101   new oil palm developments, to prevent new plantings from negatively impacting areas of

102   primary forest, HCV and fragile/marginal soils. Following the NPP assessment, auditors

103   submit a report detailing where new plantings may take place to the RSPO for approval. We

104   obtained the location of HCVAs by digitising HCVA and plantation boundary maps from

105   such NPP audit reports for 70 RSPO member-held plantations in Borneo, including one in

106   Sarawak, Malaysia, and 69 across Kalimantan, Indonesia (Fig. 1; also see Appendix S1 for

107   digitisation details). Around 50% of all 200 NPP assessments published by August 2018

108   occurred in Borneo (K.M.C., unpublished data, August 2018). Land-cover data (30 m

109   resolution) for 2015 were downloaded from the Atlas of Deforestation and Industrial

110   Plantations in Borneo (https://www.cifor.org/map/atlas/; see Gaveau et al., 2016 for details).

111   We combined intact, logged, and regrowth forest land-cover classes into a single class that

112   we termed 'forest', and considered all other land-cover categories as 'non-forest'. We

113   aggregated these data to 90 m resolution by assigning each larger grid-cell a value

114   representing the number of the nine aggregated 30 m grid-cells that contained forest, so that

115   cell values ranged from zero (0% forest) to nine (100% forest). We chose 90 m resolution to

116   ensure computationally-feasible simulations while ensuring model sensitivity to the small

117   area of HCVAs.

118   Oil palm plantations often comprise several estates. In our dataset, individual estates

119   within a single NPP assessment (subsequently termed a 'plantation') spanned distances of up

120   to ~27 km (Fig. S2). We assessed the area, core area, forest cover in 2015 and placement of

121   HCVAs within these 70 plantations using ArcGIS version 10.4.1. Core area of HCVA

122   patches (spatially discrete areas designated as HCV) was calculated by removing a buffer of

123   100 m from the edge of each patch (Lucey et al., 2017) (also see Appendix S1 for additional

124   details of geospatial statistics). In addition to HCVAs, many estates contained non-HCVA

125   forest cover within the plantation boundary. This forest could represent areas planned for

126   development, given that oil palm producers undergoing the NPP have lands planned for oil

127   palm plantings but have not yet commenced clearing. Moreover, in Indonesia, national law

128   requires that plantation companies convert all arable concession lands, including currently

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

129   forested areas, to agriculture (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). Hence, we removed all non-

130   HCVA forest found within the plantation boundaries for our connectivity analyses (823 km^2

131   across all plantations). This equated to ~8% (823/9884 km^2) of the total plantation area across

132   the 70 plantations. To delimit plantation landscapes for our connectivity analyses and include

133   all separate estates for any given NPP assessment plantation, we considered land-cover

134   within a 30 km radius (the plantation 'landscape') around the centre point (centroid) of each

135   of the 70 plantations (Fig. 2a, Fig. S2). With this size of study landscape, we were able to

136   assess the importance of HCVAs for connectivity in the context of the wider landscape,

137   including habitat beyond the plantation boundary, over distances relevant to the types of

138   species we were modelling.

139

140   **2.2 Modelling the contribution of HCVAs to forest connectivity using the Incidence**

141   **Function Model (IFM)**

142   We examined the potential connectivity benefits of HCVAs using a patch-based

143   metapopulation model (Incidence Function Model (IFM); Hanski, 1994). Our measure of

144   connectivity was based on successful range expansion of populations across our 70 plantation

145   landscapes, and we ran separate connectivity models for each plantation. We examined

146   whether forest-dependent populations with a range of dispersal abilities could successfully

147   colonise forest networks within these plantation landscapes over multiple generations (see

148   Hodgson et al., 2011; Scriven et al., 2015). The IFM examines habitat connectivity based on

149   colonisation and extinction dynamics, which are calculated by considering the size of forest

150   patches, the distance to all surrounding forest patches, and species-specific parameters such

151   as dispersal and fecundity (Hanski, 1994) (see Appendix S1 for IFM details).

152   For each of the 70 plantation landscapes, we simulated range expansion from 'source'

153   to 'target' grid-cells located on opposite sides of the landscape (Fig. 2b; 12 replicates per

154   landscape). All source grid-cells were seeded with full forest cover, regardless of the forest

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

155 fraction derived from the land-cover data, to prevent source populations from going

156 immediately extinct. Each simulation was terminated once an individual colonised a target

157 grid-cell (a 'successful' colonisation; see Fig. 2d), or after 100 generations if no individuals

158 reached the target grid-cell (an 'unsuccessful' colonisation; Fig. 2c). Individuals could move

159 across the plantation landscape in any direction but were constrained to reproduce only

160 within forest. We excluded source and target grid-cells over water for six plantations near the

161 coast.

162

163 *i) Testing connectivity benefits of HCVAs according to the amount of forest they contain*

164 To examine the benefits of HCVAs for forest connectivity, we ran IFMs under three different

165 scenarios, assuming HCVAs were (1) absent and contained no forest cover ('no forest'), (2)

166 present with current (2015) forest cover ('current forest'), or (3) present with full (100%)

167 forest cover ('full forest'). The no forest scenario provides a counterfactual that assumes that

168 without RSPO membership, companies would not conserve HCVAs, but plant these areas

169 with oil palm. The current forest cover scenario represents our best estimate of the current

170 contribution of HCVAs to connectivity. The full forest scenario assumes that all HCVAs are

171 reforested and represents the greatest potential contribution of HCVA designation to

172 connectivity. Since not all HCVAs contain forest or protect biodiversity (e.g., graveyards

173 may be designated because of their cultural value), the full forest cover scenario is likely an

174 overestimate of the benefits of the RSPO for connectivity (see Appendix S1 for further

175 details).

176

177 *ii). Modelling impacts of dispersal ability on HCVA connectivity*

178 We examined how different assumptions of population dispersal ability affected our

179 measures of forest connectivity, by varying α (alpha), the slope of a negative exponential

180 dispersal kernel within the IFM. This alpha value was inferred by assuming that 5% of

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

181   individuals within the population could go further than the stated maximum (see Hodgson et

182   al., 2011). We examined five dispersal values corresponding to maximum dispersal distances

183   of 0.5, 1, 3, 5 and 10 km per generation (see Appendix S1). Thus, our model examined

184   different types of populations, ranging from relatively sedentary species (e.g., flightless

185   insects), to relatively mobile vertebrates (e.g., birds or bats). We present results only for

186   population densities of 20 individuals per forested ha (representing winged insects; e.g., see

187   Benedick et al., 2006) because IFM outputs were generally similar when we ran models with

188   alternate population density values (Appendix S1; also see Scriven et al., 2015).

189

190   **2.3 Analyses of model outputs**

191   We ran connectivity models simulating range expansion across 70 plantations, from 12

192   different starting locations per planation (Fig. 2b) for three HCVA scenarios and five

193   dispersal abilities (i.e., 15 treatment combinations in a fully-factorial design). We used a

194   Generalised Additive Model (GAM: binomial logistic regression; R package *mgcv*: see

195   Wood, 2011 & Appendix S1 for more details) to examine forest connectivity according to the

196   probability of successful colonisations across 70 plantation landscapes. In this model, the

197   dependent variable was a two-column matrix that represented the number of successful and

198   unsuccessful colonisations across each plantation landscape, from the 12 replicates (Fig. 2b).

199   To prevent each replicate from being treated as independent, we weighted each row of data

200   by the reciprocal of the total number of replicate IFM runs for each plantation (e.g., 1/12).

201   We included dispersal ability and HCVA forest cover scenario as categorical predictor

202   variables. To examine the importance of forest (defined in section 2.1) within the wider

203   landscape on plantation connectivity, our model also included the area of forest cover within

204   each landscape (i.e., outside the focal plantation, but within a 30 km radius of each plantation

205   centre; see Fig. 2a). Finally, we included an interaction between the latitude and longitude of

206   each plantation centre (Wood, 2006). The interaction was fitted as a non-linear (smooth) term

9

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

207 selected at an optimal level of complexity by the fitted algorithm. By modelling spatial

208 dependence in the systematic part of the model we were able to account for spatial

209 autocorrelation in the model residuals, determined by inspecting correlograms (see Dormann

210 et al., 2007). We kept all variables in the GAM to examine their relative importance on forest

211 connectivity, and we ran the model using a logit link and binomial errors. To examine the

212 importance of HCVA forest cover scenario, irrespective of dispersal ability, we ran a second

213 GAM without dispersal ability included as a predictor variable, but kept all other model

214 parameters the same. Finally, to examine the robustness of our model outputs, we re-ran the

215 full analysis using a Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM; Appendix S1, Table S1, Fig.

216 S3), but our main conclusions were similar across these two models, and so we only present

217 findings from the GAM analysis in the main text. All statistical analyses were carried out in

218 R version 3.4.0.

219

220 ## 3. Results

221 **3.1 Size and amount of forest in HCVAs**

222 The 70 NPP plantations ranged in size from 10 to 547 km^2 (mean = 141, SD ± 81 km^2). In

223 these plantations, on average HCVAs comprised ~12% of the total plantation area (SD ±

224 10%; ranging from 0.6 to 53%, Fig. 3b). The mean area of individual HCVA patches (N =

225 1040), was 1.2 km^2 (SD ± 4.4) (Fig. 3c) and on average HCVAs were only about one fifth

226 forested (mean forest cover in HCVAs across the 70 plantations = 21%, SD ± 22%, Fig. 3e).

227 Across all HCVAs, HCV types important for biological diversity and ecosystem services

228 were the most extensive in terms of both area and forest cover, and were present in all

229 plantations (Table S2).

230

231 **3.2 Connectivity benefits of HCVAs**

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

232   There were few connectivity benefits provided by HCVAs under 2015 forest cover (i.e.,

233   'current forest' scenario). Compared to landscapes with no HCVAs (i.e., 'no forest' scenario)

234   current HCVAs improved connectivity by only ~3% for all populations (i.e., across all

235   dispersal distances) (Fig. S4, Table S3). When dispersal ability was considered, HCVAs with

236   current forest cover had the greatest relative connectivity benefits for populations with poor

237   dispersal abilities (0.5 km). For these types of species, landscapes with current forest cover in

238   HCVAs were on average 1.2 times better connected than landscapes with no HCVAs, hence a

239   ~20% improvement to connectivity (Fig. 4, Table S4). Nevertheless, since poor dispersers

240   rarely colonised plantation landscapes successfully regardless of HCVA forest cover, the

241   absolute improvement to connectivity was small, increasing from a probability of

242   colonisation success of 0.0095 with no HCVA forest cover to 0.0114 with current forest

243   cover, an overall improvement of just 0.0019 (Fig 4).

244   Fully reforested HCVAs (i.e., 'full forest' scenario) provided greater connectivity

245   benefits than did HCVAs with current forest cover. Overall, irrespective of dispersal ability,

246   the relative improvement to connectivity provided by reforested HCVAs compared to

247   HCVAs with no forest cover was ~16% (Fig. S4, Table S3). When dispersal ability was

248   considered, the greatest percentage improvement to connectivity with HCVA reforestation

249   occurred for populations with poor to intermediate dispersal abilities (Fig. 4, Table S4).

250   Specifically, populations with 0.5, 1 and 3 km dispersal abilities were on average 2.7, 2.4 and

251   1.2 times more likely to successfully colonise plantation landscapes with full forest cover in

252   HCVAs, compared to landscapes with no HCVAs, respectively (Fig. 4). Despite HCVA

253   reforestation, absolute connectivity benefits were small for the poorest dispersers, as most

254   populations were still unable to successfully colonise plantation landscapes (Fig. 4). These

255   findings were relatively insensitive to variation in population density, although reforested

256   HCVAs may have greater absolute connectivity benefits for the very poorest dispersers if

257   their population densities are high (Appendix S1, Fig. S1). Absolute connectivity benefits

258   following HCVA reforestation were therefore greatest for populations with 1 and 3 km

259   dispersal abilities, for which the probability of successful colonisation increased by 0.13 and

260   0.16, respectively (Fig. 4). For populations with 5 and 10 km dispersal abilities, both relative

261   and absolute improvements to connectivity were low because the number of successful

262   colonisations was already high (Fig. 4).

263

264   **3.3 Surrounding forest cover and landscape connectivity**

265   Across all HCVA scenarios, the probability of successfully colonising plantation landscapes

266   increased with dispersal ability and was highest in landscapes with more surrounding forest

267   cover (Figs 4-5, Table S4). For populations with 0.5 km dispersal ability (i.e., representative

268   of very sedentary species) the probability of successful colonisation was relatively low

269   regardless of HCVA scenario, but increased with higher levels of surrounding forest cover

270   (Fig. 5a). Conversely, for populations with 5 to 10 km dispersal abilities (i.e., representative

271   of very mobile species), the probability of successfully colonising plantation landscapes was

272   always high, except for extremely isolated plantations with very low levels (i.e., <100 km^2)

273   of surrounding forest cover (Fig. 5d-e).

274

275   # 4. Discussion

276   **4.1 Characteristics of HCVAs**

277   High Conservation Value Areas in oil palm plantations comprised around 12% of the total

278   plantation area, and so have the potential to make an important contribution to remaining

279   forest cover in oil palm landscapes. Furthermore, almost half of all plantations contained at

280   least one HCVA patch that had a core area larger than 2 km^2 (200 ha), which may provide

281   substantial biodiversity benefits compared to oil palm (Lucey et al., 2017), and have the

282   potential to maintain populations of forest species. Conservation of large tracts of high-

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

283   quality forest habitat is important for population persistence in human-modified landscapes

284   (e.g., see Edwards, Fisher, & Wilcove, 2012; Lucey et al., 2017), and so small HCVAs may

285   be unable to support viable populations of forest-dependent species unless they are well-

286   connected to other forested areas. However, our results suggest that if well positioned

287   between large tracts of forest, smaller HCVAs may act as 'stepping stones' to facilitate

288   movement across fragmented landscapes (Hodgson, Wallis, Krishna, & Cornell, 2016).

289   HCVAs will provide the largest benefits for both biodiversity and connectivity if they

290   contain high-quality forest (Tawatao et al., 2014; Scriven et al., 2015), but HCVAs in our

291   study were only 21% forested, including intact, logged and regrowth forest. Our estimates of

292   forest cover are likely to be conservative, as they may not include all disturbed and severely

293   burned forest areas (Gaveau et al., 2016), but provide an indication of how much high-quality

294   forest is conserved within HCVAs as of 2015. High Conservation Value Areas identified in

295   plantations before any plantation development activities had commenced (i.e., completely

296   new developments after 2010) contained a higher percentage forest cover than HCVAs in

297   ongoing plantings (Appendix S1 & S3). Nevertheless, across all plantations, forest cover in

298   HCVAs was low, and so there is a pressing need to restore forest habitats within existing

299   HCVAs.

300

301   **4.2 Benefits of HCVAs for connectivity**

302   Our results suggest that HCVAs currently provide little benefit for connectivity, although

303   landscapes with HCVAs were still up to 1.2 times better connected than landscapes without

304   HCVAs for some populations. Connectivity improved (up to 2.7 times better) for all

305   populations when HCVAs were reforested compared to landscapes with no HCVAs.

306   However, for poor dispersers with very high population densities, connectivity benefits of

307   reforested HCVAs may be even higher (Appendix S1, Fig. S1). As HCV types 5 and 6 are

308   put in place to protect community needs and cultural values rather than biodiversity (see

309   https://www.hcvnetwork.org/), it is likely that these results are somewhat optimistic, as

310   reforestation may not be feasible or support the values that led to HCVA designation. Also,

311   our 'no forest' scenario is not a perfect counterfactual of the benefits of certification, as we

312   do not know how much forest remains in non-RSPO plantations.

313   We used the IFM (Hanski, 1994) to quantify connectivity because this measure

314   represents a key ecological process (range expansion), which incorporates ecological realism

315   (e.g., metapopulation dynamics) and so produces more ecologically-relevant outcomes

316   compared to simpler approaches. Our results are comparable to those of more standard

317   connectivity metrics (e.g., least-cost models; see Appendix S4), but our IFM approach

318   enables us to examine whether habitat networks of conservation set-asides will allow species

319   to colonise and persist over multiple generations (Hodgson et al., 2011). There is a need to

320   develop modelling approaches that assess the resilience of ecological networks and that go

321   beyond classic landscape connectivity estimates and incorporate ecological outcomes (Isaac

322   et al., 2018). Our approach is therefore an improvement on standard connectivity metrics, but

323   does not include parameters such as reproductive strategy or dispersal phase that are often

324   included in more complex Individual Based Models (IBMs; e.g., see Synes et al., 2015),

325   which are more flexible and predictive than IFMs, but also more computationally intensive.

326   More research is needed to better understand the resilience of habitat networks and identify

327   where connectivity losses are most critical.

328

329   **4.3. Role of dispersal on connectivity benefits**

330   In landscapes with both current and full forest cover in HCVAs, absolute connectivity

331   benefits were greatest for populations with intermediate dispersal abilities (1-3 km dispersal;

332   representative of fairly mobile species such as forest-dependent butterflies or small sub-

333   canopy birds). Despite high relative connectivity benefits (i.e., percentage improvement),

334   HCVAs provided few absolute connectivity benefits (i.e., change in probability) for

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

335   extremely sedentary populations, such as weak-flying, insects (e.g., see Malohlava & Bocak,

336   2010) that disperse less than 0.5 km per generation. These types of species are likely unable

337   to cross non-forest areas, and so may require continuous tracts of forest to move across

338   plantation landscapes. High Conservation Value Areas also provided little connectivity

339   benefit for extremely mobile species dispersing more than 5 km per generation because

340   landscapes are nearly always connected for these species (e.g., large birds or bats; see Corlett,

341   2009) (Fig. 4). In our connectivity models, we assumed that populations of forest species

342   could leave forested areas and disperse across plantation matrices. In reality, little research

343   has examined the permeability of oil palm plantations for forest-dependent species, which

344   may be confined to forest habitats if they are unable to cross forest-plantation edges (Scriven

345   et al., 2017).

346

347   **4.4. Influence of the wider landscape on connectivity benefits of HVCAs**

348   The availability of forest in the surrounding landscape varied considerably, and plantations

349   with more surrounding forest were better connected for all types of forest populations. Whilst

350   we did not explicitly explore the relationship between HCVA size and the connectivity

351   benefits of HCVAs, it is likely that even large HCVAs provide little connectivity benefit if

352   they are too isolated from other forested areas in the wider landscape (Fig. S5). Similarly,

353   HCVAs may also provide few additional connectivity benefits if located within reasonably

354   intact landscapes that are already well-connected. High Conservation Value Areas are

355   therefore likely to provide the most connectivity benefits in landscapes with a patchy mix of

356   forest and non-forest areas, dependent on the specific location of HCVAs in relation to

357   surrounding forest (i.e., the intermediate landscape-complexity hypothesis; see Tscharntke et

358   al., 2012) (Fig. S5).

359

360   **4.5. Conservation implications and recommendations**

15

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

361 Almost half of all plantations we studied contained at least one HCVA patch large enough to

362 support forest-dependent species (i.e., with a core area >2 km^2) (Lucey et al., 2017), but these

363 HCVAs may not contain good quality forest, which is needed for maintaining tropical

364 biodiversity (Tawatao et al., 2014). Many of the HCVAs we studied had low forest cover,

365 and we strongly recommend active management by plantation companies to improve forest

366 extent and quality, such as enrichment planting (Yeong, Reynolds, & Hill, 2016). Improving

367 the quality of HCVAs may not only benefit landscape connectivity but also provide important

368 ecosystem services such as pollination (Kormann et al., 2016) and prevention of soil erosion

369 (Dislich et al., 2017). To incentivise oil palm growers to enhance forest quality, we

370 recommend modification of HCV guidance documents and the RSPO's Principles and

371 Criteria (P&C) (see RSPO, 2018) to require restoration of degraded HCVAs. Current RSPO

372 guidelines are not prescriptive about strategies for maximising HCVA connectivity in relation

373 to the wider landscape (e.g., for P&C 7.12; RSPO, 2018). We therefore recommend that if

374 large (i.e., with a core area >2 km^2), isolated HCVAs are identified during HCV assessments,

375 then provision should be made to reconnect these areas via restoration of the intervening

376 plantation matrix. Hence, future revisions to the standard should explicitly ensure that large,

377 isolated HCVAs are reconnected to other tracts of forest such as public protected areas,

378 community-managed forests (Santika et al., 2017), and/or production forests, which can

379 maintain high levels of biodiversity (Edwards et al., 2011).

380   By May 2019, following 3-4 years of further NPP assessments since our cut-off in

381 2015, an additional 40 NPP plantations had been assessed in Borneo

382 (https://www.rspo.org/certification/new-planting-procedure/public-consultations). As NPP

383 regulations have remained the same since 2010 (RSPO, 2015) we would not expect any

384 HCVAs within these additional NPP plantations to be different from those in our analyses.

385 Nevertheless, the incorporation of the Assessor Licencing Scheme (ALS) into the NPP in

386 2015 (see https://hcvnetwork.org/als/) may have had positive impacts on forest connectivity if

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

387 more forest was designated as HCVA. Additionally, in November 2018, the RSPO revised its

388 P&C and incorporated a zero-deforestation policy (P&C 7.12; RSPO, 2018) via the inclusion

389 of the High Carbon Stock (HCS) approach. The requirement for connectivity is now more

390 implicit in the HCS Approach Toolkit (i.e., via the HCS Forest Patch Analysis Decision Tree)

391 (Rosoman, Sheun, Opal, Anderson, & Trapshah, 2017) and the HCV Common Guidance

392 document (e.g., in relation to HCV 2 for ensuring intact forest landscapes) (Brown, Dudley,

393 Lindhe, Muhtamen & Stewart, 2013). These changes are expected to increase the amount of

394 forest set-aside in new plantings (RSPO, 2018), improving biodiversity (Deere et al., 2018)

395 and connectivity in RSPO-dominated landscapes. We recommend that the RSPO publish

396 digitised maps of HCV/HCS areas, to provide opportunities for maintaining connectivity of

397 HCVAs at landscape scales and facilitate cooperation between neighbouring RSPO member

398 plantations. However, jurisdictional approaches including designation of HCVAs across

399 districts or states (Pacheco, Hospes, & Dermawan, 2017) may be needed to fully realise the

400 potential for linking HCVAs with forest outside the focal plantation. We conclude that

401 improvements to the RSPO standard will likely improve the connectivity benefits of HCVAs,

402 but more research is needed at landscape scales to test these benefits in the long term.

403

404 **Author's contributions**

405 The specific contributions are as follows: S.A.S., J.K.H., K.M.C. and J.M.L. conceived and

406 designed the research; J.A.H., S.A.S., C.J.M. and J.K.H. conceived and developed the

407 connectivity simulations, which were run by S.A.S. and C.J.M.; K.M.C., S.A.S. and R.H.

408 conceived and oversaw HCVA digitisation; S.A.S. analysed the data, with input from J.A.H.,

409 R.H. and C.J.M.; and S.A.S. drafted the manuscript. All authors provided manuscript

410 modifications and gave approval for publication.

411

412 **Acknowledgments**

424

Data availability

426   Data available via the Dryad Digital Repository: https://doi:10.5061/dryad.600vs50 (Scriven

427   et al., 2019).

428

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

Literature cited

430 Benedick, S., Hill, J. K., Mustaffa, N., Chey, V. K., Maryati, M., Searle, J. B., … Hamer, K. C.

431

432   (2006). Impacts of rain forest fragmentation on butterflies in northern Borneo: species richness,

433   turnover and the value of small fragments. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *43*(5), 967–977.

434   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01209.x

435 Brown, E., Dudley, N., Lindhe, A., Muhtamen, D. R., & Stewart, C. (Eds.) (2013). Common guidance

436   for the identification of High Conservation Values. HCV Resource Network. Available at:

437   https://hcvnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/HCVCommonGuide_English.pdf (accessed

438   8th May 2019).

439 Carlson, K. M., Heilmayr, R., Gibbs, H. K., Noojipady, P., Burns, D. N., Morton, D. C., … Kremen,

440   C. (2018). Effect of oil palm sustainability certification on deforestation and fire in Indonesia.

441   *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *115*(1), 121–

442   126. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1704728114

443 Carrasco, B. L. R., Larrosa, C., & Edwards, D. P. (2014). A double-edged sword for tropical forests.

444   *Science*, *346*(6205), 38–41. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1256685.

445 Colwell, R. K., Brehm, G., Cardelús, C. L., Gilman, A. C., & Longino, J. T. (2008). Global warming,

446   elevational range shifts, and lowland biotic attrition in the wet tropics. *Science*, *322*(5899), 258–

447   261. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1162547

448 Corlett, R. T. (2009). Seed dispersal distances and plant migration potential in tropical East Asia.

449   *Biotropica*, *41*(5), 592–598. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00503.x

450 Curran, L. M., Trigg, S. N., McDonald, A. K., Astiani, D., Hardiono, Y. M., Siregar, P., …

451   Kasischke, E. (2004). Lowland forest loss in protected areas of Indonesian Borneo. *Science*,

452   *303*(5660), 1000–1003. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091714

453 Deere, N. J., Guillera-Arroita, G., Baking, E. L., Bernard, H., Pfeifer, M., Reynolds, G., … Struebig,

454   M. J. (2018). High Carbon Stock forests provide co-benefits for tropical biodiversity. *Journal of*

455   *Applied Ecology*, 55(2), 997-1008. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13023

456 Dislich, C., Keyel, A. C., Salecker, J., Kisel, Y., Meyer, K. M., Auliya, M., … Wiegand, K. (2017). A

457   review of the ecosystem functions in oil palm plantations, using forests as a reference system.

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

458   *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, *92*(3), 1539-1569.

459   https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12295

460   Dormann, C. F., McPherson, J. M., Araújo, M. B, Bivand, R., Bolliger, J., Carl, G., … Wilson, R.

461   (2007). Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of species distributional

462   data: A review. *Ecography*, *30*(5), 609–628. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2007.0906-7590.05171.x

463   Edwards, D. P., Fisher, B., & Wilcove, D. S. (2012). High Conservation Value or high confusion

464   value? Sustainable agriculture and biodiversity conservation in the tropics. *Conservation Letters*,

465   *5*(1), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2011.00209.x

466   Edwards, D. P., Larsen, T. H., Docherty, T. D. S., Ansell, F. A., Hsu, W. W., Derhé, M. A., …

467   Wilcove, D. S. (2011). Degraded lands worth protecting: the biological importance of Southeast

468   Asia's repeatedly logged forests. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, *278*(1702), 82–90.

469   https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1062

470   Gaveau, D. L. A., Sheil, D., Husnayaen, Salim, M. A., Arjasakusuma, S., Ancrenaz, M., … Meijaard,

471   E. (2016). Rapid conversions and avoided deforestation: examining four decades of industrial

472   plantation expansion in Borneo. *Scientific Reports*, *6*, 32017. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32017

473   Green, R. E., Cornell, S. J., Scharlemann, J. P. W., & Balmford, A. (2005). Farming and the fate of

474   wild nature. *Science, 307*(5709), 550–555. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106049

475   Hanski, I. (1994). A practical model of metapopulation dynamics. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *63*(1),

476   151-162. https://doi.org/10.2307/5591

477   Hill, J. K., Gray, M. A, Khen, C. V., Benedick, S., Tawatao, N., & Hamer, K. C. (2011). Ecological

478   impacts of tropical forest fragmentation: how consistent are patterns in species richness and

479   nestedness? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological*

480   *Sciences*, *366*(1582), 3265–3276. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2011.0050

481   Hodgson, J. A., Thomas, C. D., Cinderby, S., Cambridge, H., Evans, P., & Hill, J. K. (2011). Habitat

482   re-creation strategies for promoting adaptation of species to climate change. *Conservation*

483   *Letters*, *4*(4), 289–297. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2011.00177.x

484   Hodgson, J. A., Wallis, D. W., Krishna, R., & Cornell, S. J. (2016). How to manipulate landscapes to

485   improve the potential for range expansion. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *7*(12), 1558-

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

486   1566. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12614

487   Hosonuma, N., Herold, M., De Sy, V., De Fries, R. S., Brockhaus, M., Verchot, L., … Romijn, E.

488   (2012). An assessment of deforestation and forest degradation drivers in developing countries.

489   *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(4), 044009. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044009

490   Isaac, N. J. B., Brotherton, P. N. M., Bullock, J. M., Gregory, R. D., Boehning-Gaese, K., Connor, B.,

491   … Hartikainen, M. (2018). Defining and delivering resilient ecological networks: nature

492   conservation in England. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 55(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-

493   2664.13196

494   Kormann, U., Scherber, C., Tscharntke, T., Klein, N., Larbig, M., Valente, J. J., … Betts, M. G.

495   (2016). Corridors restore animal-mediated pollination in fragmented tropical forest landscapes.

496   *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 283(1823), 20152347.

497   https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2347

498   Laurance, W. F., Sayer, J., & Cassman, K. G. (2014). Agricultural expansion and its impacts on

499   tropical nature. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 29*(2), 107-116.

500   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.12.001

501   Lucey, J. M., Palmer, G., Yeong, K. L., Edwards, D. P., Senior, M. J. M., Scriven, S. A., … Hill, J. K.

502   (2017). Reframing the evidence base for policy-relevance to increase impact: a case study on

503   forest fragmentation in the oil palm sector. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 54(3), 731–736.

504   https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12845

505   Malohlava, V., & Bocak, L. (2010). Evidence of extreme habitat stability in a Southeast Asian

506   biodiversity hotspot based on the evolutionary analysis of neotenic net-winged beetles.

507   *Molecular Ecology*, 19(21), 4800–4811. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04850.x

508   Meijaard, E., Garcia-Ulloa, J., Sheil, D., Wich, S. A., Carlson, K. M., Juffe-Bignoli, D., & Brooks, T.

509   (2018). Oil palm and biodiversity: a situation analysis by the IUCN Oil Palm Task Force.

510   Available at: https://www.cifor.org/library/6940/oil-palm-and-biodiversity-a-situation-analysis-

511   by-the-iucn-oil-palm-task-force/ (accessed 20th August 2018).

512   https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2018.11.en

513   Newmark, W. D., Jenkins, C. N., Pimm, S. L., Mcneally, P. B., & Halley, J. M. (2017). Targeted

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

514   habitat restoration can reduce extinction rates in fragmented forests. *Proceedings of the National*

515   *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *114*(36), 9635-9640.

516   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1705834114

517   Nowakowski, A. J., Watling, J. I., Whitfield, S. M., Todd, B. D., Kurz, D. J., & Donnelly, M. A.

518   (2017). Tropical amphibians in shifting thermal landscapes under land use and climate change.

519   *Conservation Biology*, *31*(1), 96-105. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12769

520   Pacheco, P., Hospes, O., & Dermawan, A. (2017). Zero deforestation and low emissions

521   development: Public and private institutional arrangements under jurisdictional approaches.

522   Available at: https://www.cifor.org/library/6777/zero-deforestation-and-low-emissions-

523   development-public-and-private-institutional-arrangements-under-jurisdictional-approaches/

524   (accessed 20th August 2018).

525   Ramankutty, N., Evan, A. T., Monfreda, C., & Foley, J. A. (2008). Farming the planet: 1. Geographic

526   distribution of global agricultural lands in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *22*(1),

527   1–19. https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB002952

528   Republic of Indonesia (2014). Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 39 Year 2014 about Plantations.

529   Available at: https://www.indolaw.org (accessed 16th October 2017).

530   Rosoman, G., Sheun, S. S., Opal, C., Anderson, P., & Trapshah, R. (Eds.) (2017). The HCS approach

531   toolkit. Singapore: HCS Steering Group. Avaiable at: http://highcarbonstock.org/wp-

532   content/uploads/2018/04/Def-HCSA-Module-5-16_04_2018_Web.pdf (accessed 2nd May

533   2019).

534   RSPO (2015). *RSPO New Planting Procedure.* Available at: https://rspo.org/certification/new-

535   planting-procedures (accessed 2nd February 2019).

536   RSPO (2018). *RSPO Principles and criteria for the production of sustainable palm oil.* Available at:

537   https://rspo.org/principles-and-criteria-review (accessed 02nd February 2019).

538   Santika, T., Meijaard, E., Budiharta, S., Law, E. A., Kusworo, A., Hutabarat, J. A., … Wilson, K. A.

539   (2017). Community forest management in Indonesia: Avoided deforestation in the context of

540   anthropogenic and climate complexities. *Global Environmental Change*, *46*, 60–71.

541   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.08.002

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

542   Saura, S., Bodin, Ö., & Fortin, M. J. (2014). Stepping stones are crucial for species' long-distance

543   dispersal and range expansion through habitat networks. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *51*(1),

544   171–182. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12179

545   Sayer, J., Ghazoul, J., Nelson, P., & Boedhihartono, A. K. (2012). Oil palm expansion transforms

546   tropical landscapes and livelihoods. *Global Food Security*, *1*(2), 114–119.

547   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2012.10.003

548   Scriven, S. A., Beale, C. M., Benedick, S., & Hill, J. K. (2017). Barriers to dispersal of rain forest

549   butterflies in tropical agricultural landscapes. *Biotropica*, *49*(2), 206–216.

550   https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12397

551   Scriven, S. A., Carlson, K. M., Hodgson, J. A., McClean, C. J., Heilmayr, R., Lucey, J. M., & Hill, J.

552   K. (2019). Data from: Testing the benefits of conservation set-asides for improved habitat

553   connectivity in tropical agricultural landscapes. *Dryad Digital Repository*,

554   https://doi:10.5061/dryad.600vs50

555   Scriven, S. A., Hodgson, J. A., McClean, C. J., & Hill, J. K. (2015). Protected areas in Borneo may

556   fail to conserve tropical forest biodiversity under climate change. *Biological Conservation*, *184*,

557   414–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.02.018

558   Senior, M. J. M., Brown, E., Villalpando, P., & Hill, J. K. (2015). Increasing the scientific evidence

559   base in the "High Conservation Value" (HCV) approach for biodiversity conservation in

560   managed tropical landscapes. *Conservation Letters*, *8*(5), 361–367.

561   https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12148

562   Senior, R. A., Hill, J. K., González del Pliego, P., Goode, L. K., & Edwards, D. P. (2017). A

563   pantropical analysis of the impacts of forest degradation and conversion on local temperature.

564   *Ecology and Evolution*, *7*(19), 7897–7908. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3262

565   Synes, N. W., Watts, K., Palmer, S. C., Bocedi, G., Bartoń, K.A., Osborne, P. E., & Travis, J. M.

566   (2015). A multi-species modelling approach to examine the impact of alternative climate change

567   adaptation strategies on range shifting ability in a fragmented landscape. *Ecological informatics*,

568   *30*, 222-229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2015.06.004

569   Tawatao, N., Lucey, J. M., Senior, M. J. M, Benedick, S., Vun Khen, C., Hill, J. K., & Hamer, K. C.

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

570   (2014). Biodiversity of leaf-litter ants in fragmented tropical rainforests of Borneo: the value of

571   publically and privately managed forest fragments. *Biodiversity and Conservation, 23*(12),

572   3113–3126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-014-0768-5

573   Tscharntke, T., Tylianakis, J. M., Rand, T. A, Didham, R. K., Fahrig, L., Batáry, P., … Westphal, C.

574   (2012). Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns and processes - eight hypotheses.

575   *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, *87*(3), 661–685. https://doi:

576   10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00216.x

577   Wood, S. N. (2006). *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*, (1st ed.) (pp. 384). Boca

578   Raton, FL, USA. Chapman & Hall/CRC.

579   Wood, S. N. (2011). Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of

580   semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B), 73*(1), 3-

581   36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.00749.x

582   Yeong, K. L., Reynolds, G., & Hill, J. K. (2016). Enrichment planting to improve habitat quality and

583   conservation value of tropical rainforest fragments. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, *25*(5), 957–

584   973. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-016-1100-3

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

Figure 1. Map of Borneo showing location of 70 New Planting Procedure (NPP) assessment plantations (light orange shading) belonging to 28 RSPO members. Distribution of forest cover (green shading) (30 m grid-cell resolution) represents 2015 intact, logged and regrowth forest according to Gaveau et al. (2016).

Figure 2. (a) Surrounding forest cover, High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) and estate area within a 30 km radius of an exemplar New Planting Procedure (NPP) assessment plantation in Kalimantan (Indonesian Borneo). The centre point (centroid) of the plantation is represented by a yellow circle. (b) An example plantation 'landscape' used to examine the connectivity benefits of HCVAs; numbers represent 12 different starting locations from which 'source' populations were seeded (i.e., forested 90 m grid-cells that were occupied at the start of each simulation). Each source population needed to colonise a forested 'target' grid-cell on the opposite side of the landscape. Hence, source population '2' needed to colonise its target at location '8' in less than 100 generations for the model simulation to be deemed successful. Thus, each number represents a single incidence function model (IFM) simulation, and separate model run for each plantation. (c) Example simulation output whereby populations with 0.5 km dispersal did not colonise the target location within 100 generations (i.e., an 'unsuccessful' colonisation). Colonised grid-cells after 100 generations are shown in grey. (d) Example simulation output whereby populations with 3 km dispersal per generation successfully colonised the target grid-cell within 100 generations (i.e., a 'successful' colonisation). Inset map shows location of property in Kalimantan, Borneo. In this example, the plantation comprised only one spatially discrete estate and no other plantations included in this study fell within 30 km of the focal plantation centroid.

25

Connectivity benefits of conservation set-asides

Figure 3. Histograms showing (a) total High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) area (km²)

per plantation, (b) percentage of each plantation deemed HCVA, (c) mean size (km²) of

HCVA patches per plantation, (d) number of HCVA patches with a core area greater than 2

km² per plantation, (e) percentage of 2015 forest cover within HCVAs per plantation, and (f)

percentage of each plantation covered by non-HCVA forest.

Figure 4. Probabilities of successful colonisation of oil palm landscapes across High

Conservation Value Area (HCVA) scenarios for populations with different dispersal abilities:

brown shading = no forest cover scenario, light green shading = current (2015) forest cover

scenario, and dark green shading = full forest cover scenario. Probabilities are predicted

values from the General Additive Model (GAM; binomial logistic regression) where all

covariates are held constant (i.e., at their mean values). Bars represent standard errors.

Figure 5. Relationship between the probability of successful colonisation of oil palm

landscapes and the area of forest cover surrounding each plantation for populations with (a)

0.5 km, (b) 1 km, (c) 3 km, (d) 5 km and (e) 10 km dispersal abilities. Points and lines are

colour coded to represent landscapes with different amounts of forest cover in High

Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs; i.e., HCVA scenarios): brown shading = no forest cover,

light green shading = current (2015) forest cover, and dark green shading = full forest cover.

Points represent predicted values from the General Additive Model (GAM; binomial logistic

regression) and lines represent model fit (i.e., when all other predictor variables are at their

mean values) for each HCVA scenario. Grey shading represents standard errors around

model fit lines.

Testing the benefits of conservation set-asides for improved habitat connectivity in tropical agricultural landscapes

Supporting information

Appendix S1. Additional methodological details

Digitisation of High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) in New Planting Procedure (NPP) assessment plantations

New Planting Procedure assessments were obtained online from the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) (https://www.rspo.org/) for oil palm growers in Borneo. Maps depicting oil palm plantation boundaries and HCVAs were extracted from these NPP assessments and were georeferenced and digitised in ArcMap version 10.4.1. While RSPO assessment reports for certification may include maps of HCVAs, the quality of these maps is generally insufficient for accurate digitisation. Hence, we focused our connectivity analyses solely on NPP assessments. New Planting Procedure assessment plantations (termed 'plantations') included both completely new developments and ongoing plantings. As the RSPO's NPP was initiated in 2010, completely new developments represent lands slated for land preparation and planting in 2010 or later (i.e., they had not yet been cleared and planted when the assessment was conducted), whilst ongoing plantings represent lands where planting was initiated before 2010. Thus, completely new developments were plantations that contained HCVAs and were identified as part of the NPP process (i.e., that underwent a HCV assessment before development commenced).

We digitised boundaries and HCVAs from 70 randomly-selected NPP assessment reports from 28 RSPO member companies (see Fig. 1 in main text). Where audit report quality was sufficient, we excluded water bodies (i.e., rivers that were classified as HCVAs) from our connectivity analyses. We did this because we were primarily interested in

examining the connectivity of terrestrial HCVAs and inclusion of water bodies would overestimate the connectivity benefits of HCVAs in the 'full forest' scenario. These separate features could only be identified when water bodies were large and image quality was high, which meant that the size of the water bodies excised from the HCVA dataset varied. Small streams could often not be distinguished from surrounding riparian HCVAs, and so were included as HCVAs in our analyses. Therefore, in the reforested scenario, such water bodies were converted to forest grid-cells at a 30 m resolution.

Where possible, HCVA polygons were classified by HCV type (e.g., 1 to 6; see https://www.hcvnetwork.org). We included all HCVA types and all HCV management areas in our analyses because HCVA classifications were not available for all plantations. Importantly, HCVAs – including types 5 and 6 – are not always designated for their forest cover. However, inclusion of these HCVA types is unlikely to severely influence our results. First, types 5 and 6 could often not be digitised because of their very small size, so they may be under-represented in our dataset. Second, there are also some instances where these HCVA types may be forested (i.e., for timber extraction, fuel resources, clean water protection and sacred forest sites).

Geospatial statistics:

For each NPP assessment plantation digitised ($N = 70$), we calculated the total area of all HCVAs, the percentage of the total plantation area designated as HCVA, and the percentage forest cover within HCVAs. We also examined the average size of all spatially discrete HCVA patches across plantations and calculated the 'core area' of each HCVA patch. Core area of HCVA patches was calculated by removing a buffer of 100 m, which we assume is the distance over which most edge effects cause detrimental impacts (Laurance et al., 2002), from the edge of each patch (see Lucey et al., 2017). In 44 plantations, information on HCVA

Scriven et al., 2019

type was available, and so we calculated the area and percentage forest cover across different

HCVA types for those plantations (Table S2).

The Incidence Function Model (IFM):

The IFM (see Hanski, 1994) is based on the assumptions that (1) extinction probability (i.e.,

the likelihood that a population goes extinct from any given habitat patch) is inversely related

to population size and habitat patch area (i.e., the number of 30 m forest grid-cells within an

aggregated 90 m grid-cell), and (2) the probability of patch colonisation is positively related

to patch connectivity, whereby the connectivity is a function of the distance to other occupied

forest cells and the amount of forest they contain (Hanski, 1994). The connectivity (S_i) of

each patch (a spatially discrete forested grid-cell(s)), (i), is defined as:

$$A_i \frac{R\alpha^2}{2\pi} \sum_{j \neq i} p_j A_j e^{-\alpha d_{ij}}$$

where A = area of habitat (km^2) in forested grid-cell i or j, R = population density (number

of emigrants (individuals) produced per generation per occupied 90 m grid-cell), α = slope

of a negative exponential dispersal kernel, p_j = occupancy of j (1 if grid-cell j is occupied, 0

if not) and d_{ij} is the Euclidean distance between the centre of grid-cells i and j. To estimate

the carrying capacity of each grid-cell, the amount of forest (i.e., the number of 30 m grid-

cells) within each 90 m grid-cell is multiplied by the population density. The extinction

probability is subsequently 1/carrying capacity of each 90 m grid-cell at each generation,

except within source cells where it was set to zero (see Hodgson et al., 2011, Scriven,

Hodgson, McClean, & Hill, 2015, for further details).

Scriven et al., 2019

Dispersal parameters:

We examined five dispersal values corresponding to maximum dispersal distances of 0.5, 1, 3, 5 and 10 km per generation. The lowest dispersal ability (0.5 km) was chosen to represent an extremely sedentary species such as a flightless, or poor-flying, insect that may require intact forest (e.g., see Malohlava & Bocak, 2010), whilst the intermediate dispersal abilities (1 and 3 km) were chosen to represent fairly mobile species, such as large rainforest butterflies (e.g., see Marchant et al., 2015) or small sub-canopy birds. We also included dispersal abilities that most represent highly mobile populations that can disperse more than 5 km per generation. These are most representative of species such as large birds or bats, which may be able to disperse across large gaps that separate remaining forest habitats (e.g., see Corlett, 2009). We ran our models for 100 generations, a value chosen to allow most populations with poor dispersal ability sufficient time to colonise each landscape assuming it was entirely forested. Hence, colonisation time is a function of the size of the landscape (e.g., 60 km diameter) and the population's dispersal ability (e.g., 0.5 km). Setting a fixed number of generations (rather than years) allowed us to infer the time it would take for different types of 'species' to colonise plantation landscapes. For example, a species with one generation per year would have up to 100 years to colonise the landscape.

Population density parameters:

Our IFM outputs presented in the main text are for populations with 20 individuals per forested ha. However, we ran additional IFMs with population density set much lower and higher than the value in the main text, to 2 and 200 individuals per forested ha. These represent plausible values for different types of species (i.e., mammals with very low population densities and invertebrates with much higher density values) and allowed us to examine the effect of changing this parameter on our findings. We re-ran the IFMs for

4

Scriven et al., 2019

populations with 0.5 and 3 km dispersal abilities for all our HCVA scenarios. These dispersal

distances were chosen specifically because reforestation of HCVAs had the greatest benefit

for poor to intermediate dispersers (0.5-3 km per generation), whilst range expansion of

highly mobile species was relatively unaffected by habitat loss (i.e., nearly all model

simulations were successful for populations with >5 km dispersal abilities; see main text and

Fig 4). Hence, we ran additional models for three HCVA scenarios, two population densities

and two dispersal treatments (i.e., 12 treatment combinations), for all 70 plantation

landscapes (Fig. S1).

For populations with 0.5 km dispersal ability and 2, 20 and 200 individuals per

forested ha, landscapes with reforested HCVAs were 1.09, 1.19 and 1.63 times better

connected than in landscapes with no HCVAs, respectively, and so reforested HCVAs may

have greater connectivity benefits for very poor dispersers with high population densities

(Fig. S1). For populations with 3 km dispersal ability and 2, 20 and 200 individuals per

forested ha, landscapes with reforested HCVAs were 1.33, 1.25 and 1.19 times better

connected than in landscapes with no HCVAs, respectively, and so HCVA benefits were

similar across our wide range of population density estimates (Fig. S1). Note that to enable

comparison, improvement values presented here were calculated from raw IFM output

probabilities and are not predicted probabilities from the GAM, where all covariates were

held constant (as presented in the main text). These additional analyses for low and high

population densities did not alter our main findings and conclusions, which are robust to

different population density parameter values.

Analyses of model outputs:

The statistical relationship between the predictor variables and the probability of successful

colonisations across plantation landscapes was modelled using Generalised Additive Models

Scriven et al., 2019

(GAMs). Generalised Additive Models are a class of statistical regression that allow for non-linear relationships by extending Generalised Linear Models (GLMs) and incorporating a semiparametric 'smooth term'. The complexity of the non-linear relationship for each predictor variable is described by the effective degrees of freedom (edf) of the smooth term, and the form and complexity of the smooth term is a trade-off between the better fit of complex curves and the predictive ability of the model. Hence, the interaction between latitude and longitude (see main text) was selected at an optimal level of complexity, which is a trade-off between goodness of fit and the predictive accuracy of simpler functional relationships (see Wood, 2006; Scroggie & Clemann, 2009 for more details). To examine the robustness of our GAM outputs, we re-ran the same overall analysis using a Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM; binomial logistic regression; R package *lme4*: see Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015). In this model, the dependent variable was again a two-column matrix that represented the number of successful and unsuccessful colonisations across each plantation landscape, from the 12 replicates (see Fig. 2b in main text), and we included HCVA scenario as a categorical predictor. To ensure that the model converged, we included dispersal ability as a continuous predictor with an orthogonal polynomial transformation. The area of surrounding forest cover within a 30 km radius of the plantation centre was also included as a continuous predictor, but the geographic coordinates (i.e., latitude and longitude) of each plantation centre were not included in the GLMM. Instead, in order to account for spatial autocorrelation in the model residuals, plantations were assigned into 10 clusters (or groups) depending on the specific spatial location of their plantation centroid, and plantation cluster was included as a random factor in the model. Plantation identity (i.e., a unique number between 1-70 assigned to each plantation) was subsequently nested within cluster. We kept all variables in the GLMM, to examine their relative importance on connectivity, and we ran the model using a logit link and binomial errors.

Scriven et al., 2019

Model outputs were comparable with the results of the GAM analysis presented in the main text (see Table S1 for model coefficients and Fig. S3 for output probabilities of successful colonisations across HCVA scenarios and dispersal abilities).

Table S1. Outputs from the Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM; binomial logistic regression) determining the effects of dispersal ability ($N = 5$), High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) forest cover scenario ($N = 3$) and amount of surrounding forest cover (km^2) on the probability of successful colonisation for 70 plantation landscapes.

Random effects	Variance	SE		
Plantation ID: Plantation cluster	0.4057	1.401		
Plantation cluster	3.877	1.969		
Fixed effects	**Estimate**	**SE**	**z value**	**P**
Intercept	0.4057	0.6674	0.61	0.543
HCVA Scenario 2 (current forest)	0.1992	0.08564	2.33	0.020
HCVA Scenario 3 (full forest)	1.112	0.08832	12.59	<0.0001
poly (Dispersal, 2) 1	121.2	3.321	36.48	<0.0001
poly (Dispersal, 2) 2	-36.65	1.844	-19.87	<0.0001
Surrounding forest (km^2)	2.420	0.2284	10.60	<0.0001

Scriven et al., 2019

(a)

(b)

Scriven et al., 2019

Figure S1. Probabilities of successful colonisation of oil palm landscapes across High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) scenarios for populations with different population densities (representing the number of individuals per forested ha). Brown shading = no forest cover scenario, light green shading = current (2015) forest cover scenario, and dark green shading = full forest cover scenario, for (a) 0.5 km and (b) 3 km dispersal abilities. Probabilities are calculated from raw data and bars represent standard errors.

Scriven et al., 2019

Figure S2. Surrounding forest cover, High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) and estate area within 30 km of example New Planting Procedure (NPP) assessment plantations. The centre point (centroid) of the plantation is represented by a yellow circle. New Planting Procedure assessment plantation examples comprise: (a) one single estate, (b) and (c) multiple estates, and (d) one single estate that falls within 30 km of other NPP assessment plantation estates. These plantation 'landscapes' were used to examine the connectivity benefits of HCVAs (see Fig. 2 in main text for further details).

Scriven et al., 2019

Figure S3. Probabilities of successful colonisation of oil palm landscapes across High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) scenarios for populations with different dispersal abilities: brown shading = no forest cover scenario, light green shading = current (2015) forest cover scenario, and dark green shading = full forest cover scenario. Probabilities are predicted values from the Generalised Linear Mixed Model (GLMM; binomial logistic regression) where all covariates are held constant (i.e., at their mean values). Bars represent standard errors for fixed effect uncertainty.

Scriven et al., 2019

Appendix S2. Additional results

Table S2. Summary statistics and standard deviation (SD) calculated for different types of High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) across Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) New Planting Procedure (NPP) assessment plantations in Borneo.

HCVA type	Number of plantations with HCVAs present (%) ($N = 70$)	Average total HCVA area (km^2) across plantations ($N = 44$)[b]	Total HCVA area (km^2) across plantations ($N = 44$)[b]	Average forest cover (%) across plantations ($N = 44$)[bc]
1: Species diversity	100	12.6 (± 12.4)	553	26 (± 28)
2: Landscape-level ecosystems	49	3.6 (± 8.2)	159	27 (± 30)
3: Ecosystems and habitats	49	5.6 (± 15.5)	248	31 (± 35)
4: Critical ecosystem services	100	15.5 (± 19.3)	682	21 (± 23)
5: Community needs	47[a]	2.8 (± 6.3)	122	19 (± 23)
6: Cultural values	50[a]	1.5 (± 5.3)	67	15 (± 22)

[a] The number of plantations containing HCVA types 5 and 6 may be underestimated, as these areas could often not be digitised because of their small size. These areas can represent sacred trees, graveyards, wells or other small features that are important for local communities.

[b] These values have been calculated across the 44 plantations for which HCVAs could be classified by type. Note that many HCVAs are of more than one type and so occur across multiple categories; hence values are not additive.

[c] Forest cover derived from Gaveau et al. (2016).

Scriven et al., 2019

Table S3. Outputs from the General Additive Model (GAM; binomial logistic regression) determining the effects of High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) forest cover scenario ($N = 3$) and amount of surrounding forest cover (km^2) on the probability of successful colonisation for 70 plantation landscapes.

Parametric (linear) terms	Estimate	SE	z value	P
Intercept	-0.5230	0.1876	-2.787	0.0053
HCVA Scenario 2 (current forest)	0.0631	0.1659	0.381	0.7034
HCVA Scenario 3 (full forest)	0.357	0.1683	2.122	0.0339
Surrounding forest (km^2)	0.0013	0.0003	4.822	<0.0001
Smoothed (non-linear) terms	**edf**	**Ref.df**	**Chi.sq**	**P**
Latitude, Longitude (interaction)	15.69	19.98	61.72	<0.0001

Scriven et al., 2019

Table S4. Outputs from the General Additive Model (GAM; binomial logistic regression) determining the effects of dispersal ability ($N = 5$), High Conservation Value Areas (HCVA) forest cover scenario ($N = 3$) and amount of surrounding forest cover (km^2) on the probability of successful colonisation for 70 plantation landscapes.

| Parametric (linear) terms	Estimate	SE	z value	P
Intercept	-6.196	0.6004	-10.32	<0.0001
HCVA Scenario 2 (current forest)	0.1796	0.2799	0.642	0.5211
HCVA Scenario 3 (full forest)	1.007	0.2887	3.488	<0.0001
Dispersal (1 km)	2.353	0.3809	6.176	<0.0001
Dispersal (3 km)	5.522	0.475	11.62	<0.0001
Dispersal (5 km)	7.348	0.557	13.19	<0.0001
Dispersal (10 km)	10.45	0.910	11.48	<0.0001
Surrounding forest (km^2)	0.003	0.0006	4.989	<0.0001
Smoothed (non-linear) terms	**edf**	**Ref.df**	**Chi.sq**	**P**
Latitude, Longitude (interaction)	21.75	25.85	112.8	<0.0001

Scriven et al., 2019

Figure S4. Probabilities of successful colonisation of oil palm landscapes across High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) scenarios: brown shading = no forest cover scenario, light green shading = current (2015) forest cover scenario, and dark green shading = full forest cover scenario. Probabilities are predicted values from the Generalised Additive Model (GAM; binomial logistic regression) where all covariates are held constant (i.e., at their mean values) and where dispersal abilty was excluded from the model. Bars represent standard errors.

Scriven et al., 2019

(a)

No connectivity benefit of HCVAs
(0/12 replicates improved; 3 km dispersal)

(b)

No connectivity benefit of HCVAs
(0/12 replicates improved; 3 km dispersal)

(c)

Full connectivity benefit of HCVAs
(12/12 replicates improved; 3 km dispersal)

Figure S5. Example plantation landscapes used to test the connectivity benefits of High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs) using an incidence function model (IFM). Modelled landscapes are centred on New Planting Procedure (NPP) assessment plantations. Scenario (a) reflects an oil palm landscape where full forest cover in HCVAs (dark green shading) made little improvement to landscape connectivity, due to lack of forest cover surrounding the plantation (light green shading). Scenario (b) also reflects a landscape whereby full forest cover within HCVAs made little improvement to landscape connectivity, due to the large

Scriven et al., 2019

amount of surrounding forest cover and the relatively small HCVA area. Whilst scenario (c)

reflects a landscape whereby full forest cover in HCVAs had large connectivity benefits for

certain forest populations.

Appendix S3. Examining the differences in total HCVA area and forest cover between completely new developments and ongoing plantings.

Methods:

To determine differences in total HCVA area (km^2) and forest cover between completely new developments and ongoing plantings, we compared the percentage of total plantation area that was designated as HCV across completely new developments (i.e., planted following the NPP assessment; $N = 23$) and ongoing plantings (developed before 2010; $N = 47$), and compared percentage forest cover of HCVAs across these plantation types. We also calculated the percentage of the total plantation area that comprised non-HCVA forest. As data did not follow a normal distribution, we compared differences in the total HCVA area (km^2) and the percentage forest cover within HCVAs in new developments and ongoing plantings using a Mann-Whitney U test. Additionally, we also used a Mann-Whitney U test to compare the percentage of total plantation area that contained non-HCVA forest between new developments and ongoing plantings.

Results:

The average percentage of total plantation area designated as HCVA was similar for completely new developments (12%; $N = 23$) and ongoing plantings (12%; $N = 47$) ($W = 530$; $P = 0.90$). However, HCVAs in new developments contained significantly more forest than those that were part of ongoing plantings (27% versus 18%, respectively) ($W = 702$; $P = 0.04$). New developments also contained a higher percentage of non-HCVA forest compared to ongoing plantings (14% versus 6%, respectively), but this difference was marginally insignificant ($W = 68.2.5$; $P = 0.08$).

Appendix S4. Examining the connectivity benefits of HCVAs using least-cost models.

Methods:

To determine whether the connectivity benefits of HCVAs were robust to our metric of connectivity, we calculated least-cost paths (e.g., see Adriaensen et al., 2003) across each of the 70 plantation landscapes and for the three different HCVA scenarios: assuming HCVAs were (1) absent and contained no forest cover ('no forest'), (2) present with current (2015) forest cover ('current forest'), or (3) present with full (100%) forest cover ('full forest'), using the standard GRASS GIS (version 7.4) *r.cost* function. The *r.cost* function is based on a least-cost path algorithm (see GRASS Development Team, 2019 for details) and calculates the cumulative cost of moving between geographic locations (e.g., source and target grid-cells) on an input raster whose grid-cell values represent cost. We created two different resistance surface scenarios (30 m resolution raster grids) in which: (1) forest grid-cells were given a resistance (cost) value of one and non-forest (matrix) grid-cells were given a resistance value of 100, and (2) forest grid-cells were given a value of zero and non-forest grid-cells were given a resistance value of one. Hence, in resistance scenario 1, the cost of traversing a non-forest grid-cell was 100 times greater than traversing a forest grid-cell. For each of the 70 plantation landscapes, we calculated least-cost paths for six directions across each landscape (i.e., directions 1-6 in Fig. 2b), and recorded the overall cost of each least-cost path (i.e., the sum of resistance values of the grid-cells along the path). Resistance scenario 1 was chosen as it would likely yield a high level of variation between our 70 plantations landscapes, whilst scenario 2 was chosen as the final cost value represented the number of 30 m matrix grid-cells that must be traversed across the least-cost path between the source and target grid-cells. We then compared the overall least-cost distance values across all plantation landscapes to determine whether HCVA scenario affected the overall cost.

Scriven et al., 2019

Results:

For resistance scenario 1 (where forest grid-cells were given a resistance value of one and non-forest (matrix) grid-cells were given a resistance value of 100), the cost of crossing plantation landscapes with no HCVAs (i.e., 'no forest' scenario) was 1.02 (92004/89861; ~2.4%) and 1.26 (92004/72856; ~26%) times more than landscapes with HCVAs that contained current forest cover ('current forest' scenario) and full forest cover ('full forest' scenario), respectively (Fig. S6a). Results were similar for resistance scenario 2 (where forest grid-cells were given a value of zero and non-forest grid-cells were given a resistance value of one) (Fig. S6b). Least-cost model results are comparable to the overall average results of the IFM (averaging over dispersal distances) whereby landscapes with current forest cover in HCVAs were 2.4% better connected than landscapes with no HCVAs, and landscapes with reforested HCVAs were 13.2% better connected. Note that to enable comparison, improvement values presented here were calculated from raw IFM output probabilities and are not predicted probabilities from the GAM, where all covariates were held constant (as presented in the main text). Overall, the relative improvement of reforesting HCVAs compared to landscapes with no HCVAs is slightly greater when least-cost values are the chosen metric of connectivity. Similarity of results is to be expected because both metrics are affected by the total amount of habitat in the landscape, and its spatial arrangement. For reference, across all landscapes the full forest scenario contained 3.3% (1233/37371 km^2; area of forest in HCVAs in the full forest scenario/total landscape forest area) more forest than the no forest scenario, and the current forest scenario contained 0.72% (268/37371 km^2; area of forest in HCVAs in the current forest scenario/total landscape forest area) more forest. The fact that relative improvements in connectivity are more substantial than relative improvements in forest cover underlines the importance of considering how landscapes function, even when limited information is available to parameterise models.

20

Scriven et al., 2019

(a)

(b)

Figure S6. Cost values produced by least-cost models run for different HCVA scenarios: brown shading = no forest cover scenario, light green shading = current (2015) forest cover scenario, and dark green shading = full forest cover scenario, and for two different resistance scenarios. In (a) (resistance scenario 1) forest grid-cells were given a resistance value of one and non-forest (matrix) grid-cells were given a resistance value of 100. In (b) (resistance scenario 2) forest grid-cells were given a value of zero and non-forest grid-cells were given a resistance value of one. Bars represent standard errors.

Scriven et al., 2019

Literature cited

Adriaensen, F., Chardon, J. P., De Blust, G., Swinnen, E., Villalba, S., Gulinck, H., & Matthysen, E. (2003). The application of 'least-cost' modelling as a functional landscape model. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *64*(4), 233–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(02)00242-6

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. M., & Walker, S.C. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

Corlett, R. T. (2009). Seed dispersal distances and plant migration potential in tropical East Asia. *Biotropica*, *41*(5), 592–598. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00503.x

Gaveau, D. L. A., Sheil, D., Husnayaen, Salim, M. A., Arjasakusuma, S., Ancrenaz, M., … Meijaard, E. (2016). Rapid conversions and avoided deforestation: examining four decades of industrial plantation expansion in Borneo. *Scientific Reports*, *6*, 32017. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32017

GRASS Development Team. 2019. Geographic Resources Analysis Support System (GRASS) Software, Version 7.4. Available at: http://grass.osgeo.org (accessed 20th Jan 2019).

Hanski, I. (1994). A practical model of metapopulation dynamics. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *63*(1), 151-162. https://doi.org/10.2307/5591

Hodgson, J.A., Thomas, C. D., Cinderby, S., Cambridge, H., Evans, P., & Hill, J. K. (2011). Habitat re-creation strategies for promoting adaptation of species to climate change. *Conservation Letters*, *4*(4), 289–297. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2011.00177.x

Laurance, W. F., Lovejoy, T. E., Vasconcelos, H. L., Bruna, E. M., Didham, R. K., Stouffer, P. C., … Sampaio, E. (2002). Ecosystem decay of Amazonian forest fragments: a 22-year investigation. *Conservation Biology*, *16*(3), 605–618. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.01025.x

Lucey, J. M., Palmer, G., Yeong, K. L., Edwards, D. P., Senior, M. J. M., Scriven, S. A., … Hill, J. K. (2017). Reframing the evidence base for policy-relevance to increase impact: a case study on forest fragmentation in the oil palm sector. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *54*(3), 731–736. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12845

Malohlava, V., & Bocak, L. (2010). Evidence of extreme habitat stability in a Southeast Asian biodiversity

Scriven et al., 2019

hotspot based on the evolutionary analysis of neotenic net-winged beetles. *Molecular Ecology*, *19*(21), 4800–4811. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04850.x

Marchant, N. C., Purwanto, A., Harsanto, F. A., Boyd, N. S., Harrison, M. E., & Houlihan, P. R. (2015). 'Random-flight' dispersal in tropical fruit-feeding butterflies? High mobility, long lifespans and no home ranges. *Ecological Entomology*, *40*(6), 696–706. https://doi.org/10.1111/een.12239

Scriven, S. A., Hodgson, J. A., McClean, C. J., & Hill, J. K. (2015). Protected areas in Borneo may fail to conserve tropical forest biodiversity under climate change. *Biological Conservation*, *184*, 414–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.02.018

Scroggie, M. P. & Clemann, N. (2009). Handling-related tail loss in an endangered skink: incidence, correlates and a possible solution. *Journal of Zoology*, *277*(3), 214-220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2008.00528.x

Wood, S. N. (2006). *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*, (1st ed.) (pp. 384). Boca Raton, FL, USA. Chapman & Hall/CRC.

356x200mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Caption for graphical abstract:

Forested High Conservation Value Area (HCVA) within a Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) certified oil palm plantation in Borneo. We found that HCVAs in Borneo currently provide few connectivity benefits because on average they contain only 21% forest cover. However, if these conservation set-asides are fully reforested, plantation landscapes could be up to 2.7 times better connected than landscapes with no HCVAs for some forest species. Photo credit: Robin Hayward.