The environmental legacy of modern tropical deforestation

Isabel M.D. Rosa[1,4*], Matthew J. Smith[2], Oliver R. Wearn[1,3], Drew Purves[2,5], and Robert M. Ewers[1]

Affiliations:

[1] Imperial College of London, Silwood Park Campus, Buckhurst Road, Ascot SL5 7PY, United Kingdom, r.ewers@imperial.ac.uk

[2] Computational Science Laboratory, Microsoft Research, Cambridge, CB1 2FB, United Kingdom, matthew.smith@microsoft.com

[3] Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London, NW1 4RY, United Kingdom, oliver.wearn08@imperial.ac.uk

[4] German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Pl. 5E, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

[5] Google Deepmind, 5 New Street Square, London EC4A 3TW, UK, dwpurves@google.com

*Correspondence to: Dr. Isabel M.D. Rosa

Address: German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Pl. 5E, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

Telephone: 0049 176 2539 7888 // 00351 91 233 43 14

Twitter: @isamdr86

E-mail: isabel.rosa@idiv.de // isamdr@gmail.com

Keywords: tropical deforestation, carbon debt, species extinction debt, time lags

Summary

Tropical deforestation has caused a significant share of global carbon emissions and species losses, but the patterns of land cover over time have rarely been explicitly considered when estimating these impacts of deforestation [1]. A deforestation event today leads to a time-delayed release of carbon into the future, either from the eventual decay of forest products or from the decay of slash left at the site [2]. Similarly, deforestation often does not result in the immediate loss of species, and communities may exhibit a process of "relaxation" to their new equilibrium over time [3].

We used a spatially-explicit land cover change model [4] to reconstruct the annual rates and spatial patterns of tropical deforestation that occurred between 1950 and 2009 in the Amazon, in the Congo basin, and across Southeast Asia. Using these deforestation patterns, we estimated the resulting gross vegetation carbon emissions [2,5] and species losses over time [6]. Importantly, we accounted for the time lags inherent in both the release of carbon and the extinction of species.

We show that even if deforestation had completely halted in 2010, time lags ensured there would still be a carbon emissions debt of at least 8.6 Pg, equivalent to five to ten years of global deforestation, and a species extinction debt of more than 140 bird, mammal and amphibian forest-specific species, which if paid, would increase the number of 20th Century extinctions in these groups by 120%. Given the magnitude of these debts, high-profile commitments to reduce emissions and biodiversity loss are unlikely to be realised without specific actions, including habitat restoration and targeted interventions for threatened species, which directly address this damaging environmental legacy.

Results

Estimated tropical deforestation 1950-2009

The size of the environmental legacy is dependent on both the magnitude and timing of past land cover changes, rather than the snapshot of forest cover that is directly observable today. We used a validated regional data-constrained spatial model of tropical deforestation [4] to backcast deforestation from 2009 through 1950 in the three main tropical regions (Figure S1): the Amazon, the Congo Basin and Southeast (SE) Asia, which was further divided into 6 sub-regional models ([7], Tables S1-S8). Our model provided estimates of deforestation rates for the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s that fell within the ranges reported previously for all three tropical regions (Table S9).

Tropical deforestation resulted in the clearance of 2.27 M km^2 of forest by 2010.We estimate through our model that rates of tropical deforestation were very low in the 1950s, and then accelerated first in the Amazon in the 1970s, followed by SE Asia in the 1990s, and most recently in the Congo Basin (Figure 1). This pattern is in line with accepted histories for the regions [8,9], as is the slowdown in deforestation in the Amazon after 2004 that our model also captured [10].

Gross vegetation carbon emissions

Combining potential vegetation carbon maps with our simulated historical deforestation maps, we estimated that the modern era of tropical deforestation resulted in cumulative emissions of 49.93 Pg of vegetation carbon (± 1.99, 95% C.I.) between 1950 and 2009. Annual emissions from gross tropical deforestation rose sharply over the modern period to 2.30 Pg of vegetation carbon per year by 2009 (± 0.06, 95% C.I.) (Figure 2A).

Even if deforestation had stopped completely in 2010, the vegetation carbon emissions debt of modern tropical deforestation ensured that there was 8.6 Pg of carbon (± 2.24, 95% C.I.) of committed emissions still to be released, equivalent to roughly five to ten years of global deforestation [11]. The legacy is highest in the Amazon, where we estimated 3.72 Pg C (± 1.10, 95% C.I.) was still to be released. In SE Asia and the Congo basin, we estimated the legacies to be 3.54 Pg C (± 1.50,

95% C.I.) and 1.34 Pg C (± 0.34, 95% C.I.), respectively, with the SE Asian legacy [10] concentrated in the present-day deforestation hotspots of Sumatra and southern Borneo (Figure 3).

The Amazon is the largest remaining continuous tropical forest and accounts for 49% of total tropical forest carbon stock, with the remainder shared roughly evenly between SE Asia (26%) and the Congo basin (25%) [12]. Over time, 28-66% of the gross emissions came from the Amazon, an estimated 25-62% from SE Asia, and a much lower share of 9-14% from the Congo Basin ([7], Figure S2). In each of the three tropical regions, committed gross emissions by 2009 accounted for 60% of the carbon emissions in that year.

Species losses

We estimated that modern gross deforestation has led to an extinction debt of 144 forest-specific vertebrate species (± 14, 95% C.I) (Figure 2B), which is a number 20% larger than the total number of extinctions known to have occurred in vertebrate groups since 1900 (n = 124; [13]). While SE Asia was responsible for the majority of this debt until the 1980s (50-70%, Figure S3), from the 1990s onwards this legacy has been dominated by land cover changes that have occurred in the Amazon (> 50%). The Congo basin still represents a low share (~5%) due to the slower rates of deforestation in this region.

Of the 4,125 forest-specific tropical vertebrate species (mammals, birds and amphibians), 52% were found in the Amazon, 38% in SE Asia and 10% in the Congo Basin [7]. We estimated that a total of 41 vertebrate species (± 4, 95% C.I) have already been irreversibly driven extinct, with the Amazon being the region with the highest number of species lost by 2009: 28 (± 2, 95% C.I), compared to 15 (± 3, 95% C.I) in SE Asia, and only 1 (± 0, 95% C.I) in the Congo basin. Our model predicted that 1.1% of tropical vertebrate forest-specific species would have gone extinct by 2010, similar to the 1.2% forest-specific species that are classified as extinct by the IUCN, indicating our model is accurately recreating the pan-tropical patterns of extinction threat to vertebrate forest-specific species.

Spatial distribution of environmental legacy

We found that, within each tropical region, environmental legacies of past deforestation are not evenly distributed across space (Figure 3). In the Amazon, environmental legacies are broadly concentrated in the heavily deforested regions of the "Arc of Deforestation" along the south-eastern rim of the Amazon, whereas in the Congo Basin these are mainly concentrated in the south and eastern parts of the basin, where agricultural activity has been most intense. In SE Asia, there are large differences in the size of both environmental legacies among different island groups. For example, intensive deforestation in mainland Indochina and in the Philippines mostly occurred earlier than elsewhere, meaning that more of the debt has already been paid compared to other areas, such as the islands of Sumatra and Borneo, in which much of the deforestation has occurred more recently.

Furthermore, we found that carbon and extinction debts are poorly correlated in all regions (Figure 4), despite both being created by the same historical patterns of deforestation. This arises because the time-delays in carbon emissions are shorter than those involved in species extinction, meaning patterns of extinction debt reflect deforestation from earlier periods than the carbon emissions debt patterns. This same variation in time-delays ensures that the proportional magnitude of the deforestation legacy is higher for biodiversity than it is for carbon (Figure 2).

Discussion

Carbon dioxide emissions from tropical deforestation are already impacting the Earth's atmosphere and climate, and account for 10-20% of annual anthropogenic emissions [11]. Furthermore, widespread habitat loss has already caused significant species' losses globally [14], with important impacts on ecosystems [15]. Here we have shown that the carbon debt is equivalent to almost one-fifth of all historical gross emissions from tropical deforestation over the 60-year period we modelled, and to the emissions of five to ten years of global deforestation. The extinction debt of vertebrate species, on the other hand, if paid, will increase the number of known extinctions in these groups since 1900 [13] by 120%. In both cases these are substantial, and previously unquantified, debts that must be paid, unless specific actions, including habitat restoration and targeted

interventions for threatened species are put in practice. To generate these estimates we have utilised a model that has been validated on the basis of accurately simulating the time course of deforestation over time in tropical regions. Uncertainty was propagated throughout our study [7]: in the relationship between deforestation and its drivers (allowing parameter values to vary); when estimating carbon emissions (both in the biomass maps and in the carbon bookkeeping parameters; and in the extinction debt estimates (allowing both z- and k-values to vary). As a result of rigorously validating our model against multiple different datasets and accounting for multiple different sources of uncertainty we believe we have produced the best current estimates of the modern day environmental legacy from tropical deforestation.

Our results show that reaching national and global emissions targets may, in practice, be more difficult than expected. The carbon debt means that emissions in any one-year are a function of deforestation over previous years. For instance, the carbon debt in the Amazon in 2010 is equivalent to the total carbon emissions from 3.5 years of deforestation at the average rate observed in the 2000s. Thus, changes in annual deforestation rates will initially have a smaller than expected effect on annual emission rates. This time lag means, for example, that the 30% reduction in deforestation rates seen in the Brazilian Amazon between 2005 and 2010 has so far resulted in a reduction of just 10% of actual carbon emissions over the same time period.

At the Cancun Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in 2010, several tropical countries, where emissions from land use and land cover change often exceed those from the energy sector [16], voluntarily committed to reduce their carbon emissions: Brazil aims to reduce its total greenhouse gases emissions by 36-39% from its business as usual levels by 2020, and Indonesia aims to reduce its emissions by at least 41% between 2009 and 2020. Recently, at the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit 2015 in New York, President Dilma Rousseff committed to a further “intended reduction” of Brazil’s emissions of 43% by 2030. Reducing deforestation is the most immediate method available to meet these stringent targets, which is partially why, at the Conference of the Parties in Copenhagen, Brazil committed to reduce Amazon deforestation rates by 80% relative to the 1995-2005 baseline. However, our results demonstrate

clearly that reductions in actual emissions will lag many years behind any reductions in deforestation rate.

We necessarily assumed that the variables found to be driving deforestation in the 2000s also drove deforestation in previous decades (owing to the lack of data for previous decades), but this does not seem to have caused substantial bias in our results. This appears to be because deforestation resulting from different causes (e.g. conversion to agricultural land or fires following timber extraction) tends to generate similar spatial patterns of forest loss (e.g. occurring primarily along road networks). This consistency in the deforestation patterns arising from different root causes, and our explicit approach of modelling the spatial expansion of deforestation directly, means that our simulations about the spatial and temporal patterns of deforestation history are relatively robust to uncertainty about the underlying processes. Deforestation activities evolved over time from more artisanal slash-and-burn agriculture to large-scale industrial agriculture, which impacted the fractions of carbon immediately lost and left to decay over time. However, there are no spatial high-resolution datasets available with the full history of land use change in the tropics to take this into account.

Our gross vegetation carbon emission estimates are larger than those reported in other studies for all three tropical regions [7]. In part, this can be explained by the fact that we used a potential vegetation carbon map, which included belowground carbon stored in roots, not just stems and leaves aboveground, and ignores the fact that some of the forests covered in our study might have had stocks lower than the potential carbon (e.g. harvested or burned). However, an important reason for the differences between our estimates and other recent regional estimates is that we included the additional time-delayed emissions of carbon, which in recent decades represents a substantial proportion of annual emissions. Initially, in the early years of deforestation (e.g. 1950 to 1970), our estimates are similar to those in the literature [7]. However, as the size of the carbon debt gradually increases through time, an increasing amount of emissions in a given year are contributed by "legacy emissions" (Figure 2). Importantly, our estimates for 2009-2010 (0.51 ± 0.04 Pg C/yr) are comparable to independent measurements made in the Amazon (0.48 ± 0.18 Pg C/yr, for 2009-2011) by sampling

greenhouse gases in the lower troposphere [17], indicating our model provides an accurate representation of deforestation-related carbon emissions.

The most commonly employed action to prevent species extinctions is to protect habitat [18], but that approach alone will do little to avoid paying an extinction debt that has already accumulated from historical habitat loss. Under Aichi Target 12 [19] of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), 78 countries, of which nine lie within the geographic bounds of this study, have made voluntary agreements at the national level to prevent the extinction of known threatened species and improve their conservation status by 2020. Our results suggest, however, that tropical nations with large extinction debts will be unlikely to succeed in preventing the further loss of species without substantial investment in habitat restoration, as well as targeted conservation interventions for threatened species. Our estimates for species losses and extinction debt in the Amazon are slightly higher than those previously estimated [6], but this is because our analysis encompasses the whole Amazon basin, not just the Brazilian Amazon. We are not aware of any other previous studies that have estimated extinction debt across all tropical forests with which to compare our results. The total extinction debt, across all taxonomic groups present in these highly biodiverse tropical regions, is likely to be orders of magnitude larger than our estimate, which is based solely on three well-studied vertebrate groups. Nonetheless, species movements, adaptation, and mitigation strategies, which we did not consider in our study, would contribute to lower this debt.

Previous analyses have demonstrated a poor correlation between stocks of carbon and biodiversity, leading to calls for developing combined carbon-biodiversity conservation strategies, which better resolve trade-offs between the two conservation aims [20,21]. We have confirmed that not only is this true, but also that carbon and extinction debts are poorly correlated in space. Time-delays in carbon emissions and extinctions allow, however, a potential window for habitat restoration and conservation actions to alleviate the committed debts and avoid having to pay those [6]. Just as strategies to simultaneously preserve stocks of carbon and biodiversity can be optimised through careful planning [20,21], the ideal locations for habitat restoration actions to reverse the combined carbon-biodiversity debts will require detailed spatial planning to find cost-effective solutions.

Frameworks for making these decisions, including the incorporation of time lags, exist and have demonstrated the counter-intuitive result that it can be more cost-effective for conservation strategies to forego a sole focus on habitat protection in favour of restoring degraded areas [22]. These decision-making frameworks now need to be applied if we are to avoid paying the environmental legacy of tropical deforestation.

Experimental Procedures

We collected data from a variety of freely available sources [7], including annual global land cover maps from 2001 through 2010 derived from MODIS satellite imagery [23], and data on variables that could impact deforestation such as the location of roads and rivers, population density, the location of protected areas and climate data. Then, we used a data-constrained and validated spatial model of tropical deforestation [4] to backcast at 1 km^2 resolution, both the rates and spatial patterns of deforestation from 2009 back to 1950 in the three main tropical regions: the Amazon, the Congo Basin and Southeast (SE) Asia [7].

For each region modelled, we combined our deforestation estimates with spatially explicit maps of potential living vegetation carbon [5] (Figures S10-S13), and a modified carbon bookkeeping model [2], to calculate the carbon emissions debt ([7], Figures 2A, 3A, B and C and S2). We applied the exponential decay rates provided by Houghton et al. [2] at each annual time step and used bookkeeping to calculate the emissions released in a given year, as well as carried over into the subsequent year. Unlike previous studies, our bookkeeping model allowed for uncertainty in the parameter determining the proportion of emissions release immediately following a deforestation event [7].

We obtained geographic range data [24,25] for forest-specific mammal, bird and amphibian species (Figure S14), and combined these with our spatially explicit trajectories of historical forest cover (Figure S1) to estimate species losses and extinction debt in each region ([7], Figures 2B, 3D, E and F and S3), following Wearn et al. [6]. The model uses the species-area relationship (SAR) to predict the equilibrial species richness expected under habitat loss, but extends the SAR to include a

time-delayed community 'relaxation' to equilibrium [6]. By explicitly incorporating time, this model allowed for estimation of species loss and extinction debt at any point between 1950 and 2009. Appropriate parameter values for the model were obtained using past studies [20], with uncertainty in these parameters accounted for using Monte Carlo simulations [7]. We applied this model at two scales: regional and local. For the coarser regional-scale analysis, we aggregated all our input data at the scale of 8 broad regions (Amazon, Congo basin and the six sub-regions of SE Asia), treating each region as a single cell. We then used the temporal trajectories of forest cover simulated by our deforestation model to determine losses and extinction debt of forest-specific species in each unit. The fine-scale analysis was done within 10 x 10 km cells. We used cell-specific trajectories of past forest loss (Figure S1) to estimate the impact of modern deforestation on the levels of local species loss and extinction debt in each cell (Figure 3D, E and F).

Author Contributions

I.M.D.R. assisted with formulation of the research question, generated code, conducted all the analyses and interpretation of results, wrote the manuscript; M.J.S. obtained the potential carbon maps, helped with outputs interpretation, and provided critical manuscript revisions; O.R.W. helped run the extinction debt model and interpret its results, and assisted with valuable reviews of the manuscript; D.P. helped developing the deforestation model and provided important feedback on the manuscript; R.M.E. assisted with formulation of the research question, assisted in results interpretation, and provided critical revision of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

This article is a contribution to Imperial College's Grand Challenges in Ecosystems and the Environment initiative. I.M.D.R. and R.M.E. were supported by the European Research Council, project number 281986. We thank the three anonymous reviewers that provided important feedback on our research and Dr. David Orme for helping producing the final figures.

References

1. Ramankutty, N. *et al.* (2007) Challenges to estimating carbon emissions from tropical deforestation. Glob. Change Biol. 13, 51-66, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01272.x.

2. Houghton, R.A. *et al.* (2000) Annual fluxes of carbon from deforestation and regrowth in the Brazilian Amazon. Nature 403, 301-304, doi:citeulike-article-id:725744.

3. Diamond, J.M. (1972) Biogeographic kinetics: estimation of relaxation times for avifaunas of southwest Pacific islands. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 69, 3199-3203.

4. Rosa, I.M.D., Purves, D., Souza Jr., C., and Ewers, R.M. (2013) Predictive Modelling of Contagious Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. Plos One 8, e77231, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0077231.

5. Smith, M.J., Vanderwel, M.C., Lyutsarev, V., Emmott, S., and Purves, D. (2012) The climate dependence of the terrestrial carbon cycle; including parameter and structural uncertainties. Biogeosciences 9, 13439-13496, doi:10.5194/bgd-9-13439-2012.

6. Wearn, O.R., Reuman, D.C., and Ewers, R.M. (2012) Extinction debt and windows of conservation opportunity in the Brazilian Amazon. Science 337, 228-232.

7. Detailed information on materials and methods used in this study are available in the Supplemental Information.

8. Rudel, T.K. (2007) Changing agents of deforestation: From state-initiated to enterprise driven processes, 1970–2000. Land Use Policy 24, 35-41, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2005.11.004.

9. Zhao, S. *et al.* (2006) Land use change in Asia and the ecological consequences. Ecol. Res. 21, 890-896, doi:10.1007/s11284-006-0048-2.

10. Nepstad, D. *et al.* (2009) The End of Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. Science 326, 1350-1351, doi: 10.1126/science.1182108.

11. van der Werf, G.R. *et al.* (2009) CO_2 emissions from forest loss. Nat. Geosci. 2, 737-738.

12. Saatchi, S.S. *et al.* (2011) Benchmark map of forest carbon stocks in tropical regions across three continents. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 108, 24, 9899–9904, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1019576108.

13. Ceballos, G. *et al*. (2015) Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: entering the sixth mass extinction. Sci. Adv 1, e1400253.

14. Pereira, H.M., Navarro, L.M., and Martins, I.S. (2012) Global biodiversity change: the bad, the good, and the unknown. Ann. Rev. Env. Resour. 37**,** 25–50.

15. Hooper, D.U. *et al.* (2012) A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change. Nature 11118.

16. Minnen, J. *et al.* (2009) The importance of three centuries of land-use change for the global and regional terrestrial carbon cycle. Climatic Change 97, 123-144.

17. Gatti, L.V. *et al.* (2014) Drought sensitivity of Amazonian carbon balance revealed by atmospheric measurements. Nature 6; 506 (7486),76-80. doi: 10.1038/nature12957.

18. Becker, C.G., and Loyola, R.D. (2008) Extinction risk assessments at the population and species level: implications for amphibian conservation. Biod. Conserv. 17, 2297–2304.

19. The Convention on Biological Diversity. Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Targets. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. URL: www.cbd.int

20. Venter, O. *et al.* (2009) Harnessing carbon payments to protect biodiversity. Science 326, 1368.

21. Thomas, C.D. *et al.* (2013) Reconciling biodiversity and carbon conservation. Ecol. Lett. 16, 39-47.

22. Possingham, H.P., Bode, M., and Klein, C.J. (2015) Optimal Conservation Outcomes Require Both Restoration and Protection. Plos Bio. 13, e1002052.

23. Friedl, M. A. *et al.* (2002) Global land cover mapping from MODIS: algorithms and early results. P. Soc. Photo-Opt. Ins. 83, 287-302, doi:10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00078-0.

24. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (2014) The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2014.1. http://www.iucnredlist.org. Downloaded in October 2014.

25. Ridgely, R.S. *et al.* (2007) Digital Distribution Maps of the Birds of the Western Hemisphere, version 3.0 (NatureServe, Arlington, VA).

Figure Legends




Figure 1 – Modelled annual deforestation rates (km^2/yr) from 1950-2009 in 5-year intervals. Error bars represent the 95% confidence interval estimate from 100 model replicates.




Figure 2 – (A) Vegetation carbon emissions and (B) species losses from the deforestation of tropical forests from 1950-2009. Emissions are separated into those that occurred from deforestation that took place in that year (Immediate) and those that occurred as a result of time lags in the release of carbon from deforestation that occurred in previous years (Committed). Species losses are separated into those that have already occurred (Loss) and those that will occur as a result of time delays in the extinction of species (Debt). Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals from 100 model replicates. Figures for the Amazon, the Congo basin, and Southeast Asia are presented in the Supplemental Information (Figures S2 and S3).




Figure 3 – Magnitude of the (A, B, C) carbon emissions and (D, E, F) extinction debts in the world's tropical forests in 2009. The carbon maps display the (log-normal transformed) median amount of carbon left to decay after 2009 (C t/ha). The extinction maps show the (log-normal transformed) median number of forest-specific species that are committed to extinction in 2009 due to past tropical deforestation. Panels (A) and (D) show the results for the Amazon, (B) and (E) for the Congo basin, and (C) and (F) for Southeast Asia.




Figure 4 – Linear regression (in red, showing also the R^2) between carbon and extinction debts in the world's tropical forests in 2009. Each grey dot represents a 100 km^2 pixel. The carbon debt was aggregated from its initial 1 km^2 resolution, to match the resolution of the extinction debt. Figures for the Amazon, the Congo basin, and Southeast Asia are presented in the SI (Figure S15).