



Pathways to bridge the biophysical realism gap in ecosystem services mapping approaches

Sandra Lavorel, Anita Bayer, Alberte Bondeau, Sven Lautenbach, Ana Ruiz-Frau, Nynke Schulp, Ralf Seppelt, Peter Verburg, Astrid Van Teeffelen, Clémence Vannier, et al.

► To cite this version:

Sandra Lavorel, Anita Bayer, Alberte Bondeau, Sven Lautenbach, Ana Ruiz-Frau, et al.. Pathways to bridge the biophysical realism gap in ecosystem services mapping approaches. *Ecological Indicators*, 2017, 74, pp.241-260. 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.11.015 . hal-01681569

HAL Id: hal-01681569

<https://hal.science/hal-01681569v1>

Submitted on 19 Apr 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Title: Pathways to bridge the biophysical realism gap in ecosystem services mapping approaches

Sandra Lavorel^{a*}, Anita Bayer^b, Alberte Bondeau^c, Sven Lautenbach^d, Ana Ruiz-Frau^e, Nynke Schulp^f, Ralf Seppelt^g, Peter Verburg^f, Astrid van Teeffelen^f, Clémence Vannier^a, Almut Arneth^b, Wolfgang Cramer^c, Nuria Marba^e

^a Laboratoire d'Ecologie Alpine, CNRS – Université Grenoble Alpes UMR 5553, CS 40700, 38058 Grenoble Cedex 9, France.

^b Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Atmospheric Environmental Research, Kreuzeckbahn Str. 19, 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany.

^c Institut Méditerranéen de Biodiversité et d'Ecologie marine et continentale (IMBE), UMR CNRS 7263 / IRD 237, Bâtiment Villemin, Europole de l'Arbois - BP 80, 13545 Aix-en-Provence cedex 04, France.

^d University of Bonn, Faculty of Agriculture Institute of Geodesy and Geoinformation, Nußallee 1, 53115 Bonn, Germany

^e Department of Global Change Research, IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB), Institut Mediterrani d'Estudis Avançats, Miquel Marquès 21, 07190 Esporles (Illes Balears), Spain.

^f Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM), VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1087, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

^g UFZ – Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Department of Computational Landscape Ecology, Permoserstr. 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany.

* author for correspondence: sandra.lavorel@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Abstract

The mapping of ecosystem service supply has become quite common in ecosystem service assessment practice for terrestrial ecosystems, but land cover remains the most common indicator for ecosystems ability to deliver ecosystem services. For marine ecosystems, practice is even less advanced, with a clear deficit in spatially-explicit assessments of ecosystem service supply. This situation, which generates considerable uncertainty in the assessment of ecosystems' ability to support current and future human well-being, contrasts with increasing understanding of the role of terrestrial and marine biodiversity for ecosystem functioning and thereby for ecosystem services. This paper provides a synthesis of available approaches, models and tools, and data sources, that are able to better link ecosystem service mapping to current understanding of the role of ecosystem service providing organisms and land/seascape structure in ecosystem functioning. Based on a review of literature, models and associated geo-referenced metrics are classified according to the way in which land or marine use, ecological processes and especially biodiversity effects are represented. We distinguish five types of models: proxy-based, phenomenological, niche-based, trait-based and full-process. Examples from each model type are presented and data requirements considered. Our synthesis demonstrates that the current understanding of the role of biota in ecosystem services can effectively be incorporated into mapping approaches and opens avenues for further model development using hybrid approaches tailored to available resources. We end by discussing ways to resolve sources of uncertainty associated with model representation of biotic processes and with data availability.

Keywords: Ecosystem Service Provider; spatial modelling; biophysical assessment; species distribution; functional traits; large-scale ecosystem model

1. Introduction

Ecosystem services (ES) originate from spatially structured ecosystems and land/seascapes, and their dynamics over time. Quantifying ES provisioning therefore must account for spatio-temporal patterns and processes. Although this is evident, so far this challenge has been insufficiently resolved (Bennett et al., 2015). Spatially-explicit quantification of ES using geo-referenced metrics and GIS-based approaches has recently gained prominence through the needs from policy and decision-makers for global to local ES assessments (Maes et al., 2012; Martinez-Harms et al., 2015). Similar needs follow from emerging practices of land and marine planning (Outeiro et al., 2015; von Haaren and Albert, 2011) or land management decision (e.g. in agriculture or forestry; Doré et al., 2011; Grêt-Regamey et al., 2013; Soussana et al., 2012) that incorporate ecosystem services among use allocation and management criteria.

However the reliability of ES mapping varies as a function of the methods employed. For instance in a review of 107 studies, Lautenbach et al. (2015) found that, while half of ecosystem service studies were based on relatively simple look-up table approaches attributing fixed values for given land cover types, nearly a third of the studies of ecosystem services conducted between 1966 and 2013 mapped ecosystem services. This mapping is done in most cases based on land use composition ignoring land use configuration and land use intensity (Lautenbach et al., 2015 ; Mitchell et al., 2015; Verhagen et al., 2016). More specifically, regulating services have been the most commonly mapped, followed by provisioning services (Egoh et al., 2012; Lautenbach et al., 2015; Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012; Seppelt et al., 2011). For marine and coastal systems, among a total of 27 available studies from an exhaustive search of the Web of Science on ES mapping and ES modelling studies, almost half (52%) focused on Regulation & Maintenance services, of those 22% concentrated on coastal protection (wind & flood protection) and 33% on carbon sequestration and storage. A further third of the studies (33%) focused on provisioning services, particularly on food production (i.e. fish). The rest of the studies (19%) mapped cultural services.

Linked with this increased practice of mapping ES provisioning, several recent reviews have summarised available methods used to map ES. In the following we refer to 'models' as quantitative representations of ES variables depending on abiotic, biotic and social parameters. Overall, statistical models quantifying ES supply based on relationships with biophysical and social variables are prevalent, while process models based on causal relations are still rare (Crossman et al., 2013; Egoh et al., 2012; Lautenbach et al., 2015; Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012). For terrestrial ecosystems, static maps of land use and land cover are the most commonly used indicator for ES in Europe (Egoh et al., 2012) and the second most common globally (Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012). This widespread application of methods with weak links to ecosystem processes leads to severe uncertainty in the mapped ES supply from national (Eigenbrod et al., 2010) to landscape (Lavorel et al., 2011) scales. More advanced approaches incorporate estimates of above- and sometimes below-ground biomass, along with vegetation type, and soil parameters for the estimation of ecosystem functions from which services are derived. Species observation data, although potentially useful for the estimation of cultural services, is used only rarely.

Contrasting with these statistical models, process models, with explicit description of causal relationships between driver variables and ecosystem functions and properties underpinning ES provision, have primarily been used to map climate regulation and erosion control as well as the provisioning of food, fuel and fibre. Mapping and modelling assessments for marine and coastal ES are still in their infancy (Liquete et al 2013). Considering the 27 available studies from the Web of Science, 31% of the models were geostatistical while less than 20% were process-based.

Beyond the limitations of specific mapping methods, the large variety of primary indicators currently used to express one single ES is a large source of uncertainty for ES maps that limits their usefulness to managers and decision makers (Egoh et al., 2012). Level of process understanding, modelling methodology and data sources are three of the critical, yet poorly understood or documented sources of uncertainty for ES maps (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2014a; Hou et al., 2013; Kandziora et al., 2013). A systematic comparison of four sets of ecosystem service maps at the continental scale for five ecosystem services (climate regulation, flood regulation, erosion protection, pollination and recreation) showed considerable disagreement among spatial patterns across Europe (Schulp et al., 2014a), attributed to differences in the mapping aim, indicator definitions, input data and mapping approaches. The four original studies encompassed a land-cover look-up approach (Burkhard et al., 2012), environmental indicator modelling (Kienast et al., 2009) and two hybrid approaches combining environmental indicators, landscape effects and process modelling (Maes et al., 2012; Schulp et al., 2008; Stürck et al., 2014; Tucker et al., 2014; van Berkel and Verburg, 2011). In addition to highlighting the need for mapmakers to clearly justify the indicators used, the methods and related uncertainties, this study provided additional support for the urgent need for better process understanding and data acquisition for ES mapping, modelling and validation. Progress on these issues will be essential to support the uptake of ES spatial assessments for national ecosystem service assessments, national accounts, land planning and broader policy and natural resource management decisions (Crossman et al., 2013; Egoh et al., 2012).

Given this context, the common use of relatively simple statistical approaches contrasts with increasing evidence on the role of biodiversity for ecosystem functioning and ecosystem services (Cardinale et al., 2012), which has been referred to as a *lack of biophysical realism* (Seppelt et al., 2011). Ecosystem service supply is related to the presence, abundance, diversity and functional characteristics of service-providing organisms (also referred to as Ecosystem Service Providers, ESP henceforth; Luck et al., 2009). Positive relationships have been found between species richness and ecosystem services such as fodder and wood production, regulation of water quality through soil nutrient retention, carbon sequestration or regulation of pest and weed species (Cardinale et al., 2012). Similarly, the presence of key coastal and marine species has been found to enhance carbon sequestration, coastal protection, food provision or water quality through nutrient retention and particle trapping (Fourqurean et al., 2012; McLeod et al., 2011; Ondiviela et al., 2014; van Zanten et al., 2014). However such observed relationships between species richness and ES often reflect species functional traits and their diversity within communities, rather than species richness per se (Diaz et al., 2007). Lastly, land/sea-scape diversity and connectivity can strongly

influence the ES provided by mobile organisms and vegetation (Fahrig et al., 2011; Mellbrand et al., 2011; Mitchell et al., 2015). To provide more reliable estimates of service supply capacity by ecosystems, such fundamental ecological understanding needs to be better incorporated into ES models (Bennett et al., 2015).

This paper aims to address the biophysical realism gap in ecosystem service mapping by synthesising available approaches, models and tools, and data sources (with special reference to Europe) for mapping ecosystem services, and focusing on how the role of ecosystem service providing biota can be better incorporated. Based on a review of published mapping studies, modelling methods and associated geo-referenced metrics are classified into five categories according to the way in which the contribution of ecosystem service providing organisms is represented. This review highlights the diversity of individual methods, which increasingly combine different model categories. We end by discussing associated uncertainties and pathways towards resolving them. Our review focuses on assessment of ecosystem capacity to deliver services and does not address the social and economic aspects of ecosystem service demand.

2. Methods

We reviewed ES biophysical modelling approaches in the literature that incorporate descriptions of ecosystem service providers (ESP) and their contribution to ES supply. [Given our objective of analysing the merits and limitations of available models rather than producing a quantitative analysis of the state of the art](#), for terrestrial systems we did not attempt to reiterate the several systematic reviews that have already been published (Lautenbach et al., 2015; Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012; Seppelt et al., 2011), while for marine systems a systematic analysis of publications was conducted. [As we aimed to assess how biophysical realism was incorporated in different approaches, we chose to classify](#) models and associated geo-referenced metrics according to the way in which the relationships between ESP and biophysical processes are represented, [using the following terminology](#): spatial proxy models, phenomenological models, [niche-based models](#), trait-based models and full process-based models (Figure 1). Briefly, spatial proxy models refer to simple models based on expert knowledge or statistical associations relating abiotic and biotic indicators to ES provision. Phenomenological models add to these by explicitly incorporating effects of land/seascape configuration through spatial processes. [Niche-based](#) models deduce ES provision from the geographic distribution of ESP, while trait-based models depict statistical relationships between ecosystem processes and indicators of ESP community functional composition. Lastly, we refer to full process-based models as those incorporating explicit representations of geochemical, physical and biotic processes underpinning ecosystem functioning.

For each category of models we describe and exemplify based on published studies (supported by standard model descriptions presented in Appendix 1 **Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.**) the principles and mechanics of application of these models, with

specific reference to how ESP are represented. Main biodiversity components for ESP characterisation and the strengths and weaknesses of different model types for practice are summarised in Table 1. Table 2 summarises main data sources for each model type, with specific reference to Europe for terrestrial (Table 2a) and marine (Table 2b) systems respectively. Lastly, key data sources and strengths and weaknesses for practice are discussed.

3. Results

3.1. Proxy models

We define proxy models as models that relate ES indicators to land or marine cover, abiotic and possibly biotic variables by way of calibrated empirical relationships or expert knowledge. It is desirable, and in practice most common for such models to use selected proxy variables that are based on well-known causal relationships between environmental variables (Kienast et al., 2009; Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012). In proxy models habitat type (or biotope) or (more rarely) species composition are considered as the ESP. Most commonly land cover types, ranging from coarse vegetation types (e.g. evergreen vs. deciduous forest) to detailed habitat types such as those of the European Union's Habitats Directive, are associated with levels of ES supply, with the possible incorporation of additional environmental modifiers (e.g. altitude, soil type, climate...). Likewise, for marine ecosystems different habitat types depending on bathymetry or substrate may be used to model ES associated with the presence or activity of particular species.

One simple, and often used method consists in combining look-up tables allocating ES values per land cover with modifying categorical variables describing abiotic factors and ecological integrity (Burkhard et al., 2012). For example, in the Austrian Stubai valley, Schirpke et al. (2013) combined maps of vegetation types with measures of ES to map past, current or future fodder quantity and quality, carbon sequestration, soil stability, natural hazard regulation and aesthetic value. In traditional forest landscapes of Lapland, Vihervaara et al. (2010) illustrated how multiple biophysical and social data sources can be combined to quantify regulation service supply by different biotopes. In marine ecosystems, bathymetry, habitat distribution, sediment type, wave and currents regime, tidal range and water temperature are most frequently used proxies. Lique et al. (2013) developed a proxy-based model to assess coastal protection at European level based on 14 biophysical and socioeconomic variables describing coastal protection capacity, coastal exposure and demand for protection. Statistical models developed from observations or analysis of regional data sets may also be applied. Multiple regression models, Generalized Additive Models (Yee and Mitchell, 1991) or more sophisticated methods for capturing uncertainty in relationships, such as Bayesian modelling (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2013) may be used here. In general, the application of models developed at larger scale to smaller extents and greater resolution generates uncertainty as they do not capture context-dependent relationships

(Purtauf et al., 2005) and the effects of finer-grained relevant variables such as soils. Site-specific models may be developed based on field data collection (as encouraged by Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012 – see Lavorel et al., 2011) [and on remote sensing data \(Table 2, Figure 2\)](#). On the other hand, the validity of up-scaling from site-specific models to larger spatial scales depends on whether sites represent the average conditions at the larger scale. It has further been shown by Grêt-Regamey et al. (2014b) that spatially explicit information about non-clustered, isolated ES tends to be lost at coarse resolution, mainly in less rugged terrain, which calls for finer resolution assessments in such contexts.

In the marine case, proxy models have generally been used to map the distribution of coastal vegetation such as mangrove coverage, which then has been used to estimate carbon sequestration and storage. In contrast, proxy models have had a limited application for the assessment of “underwater” marine ES, and we contend that this mainly reflects the limitations of remote sensing for correctly determining underwater habitat coverage.

Strengths and weaknesses for practice

Sophisticated proxy models have been recommended for national assessment of ecosystem services (Maes et al., 2014). They help move from a pure ‘benefit transfer’ approach based on land cover (Eigenbrod et al., 2010; MAES Tier 1), to more precise assessments (MAES Tier 2) using classic GIS methods accessible to all (Kienast et al., 2009). Also, they can be easily combined with socio-economic variables in order to provide at least first level assessments of benefits (Burkhard et al., 2012; Grêt-Regamey et al., 2008; Vihervaara et al., 2010) and allow consistent mapping of different ecosystem services, which is essential for avoiding data artefacts when studying trade-offs. Model applications are however constrained by the availability of different data layers depending on scales and regions. For instance, while effects of soil parameters on regulation services (e.g. carbon sequestration, erosion control) are well understood by scientists and practitioners, soil maps are often not available at suitably fine resolution.

3.2. Phenomenological models

Phenomenological models are based on qualitative or semi-quantitative relationships between ESP and ES supply, based on an understanding of biological mechanisms underpinning ES supply. In difference to simple proxy models, at least part of the parameters and relationships are transferred from in-depth process-based studies or meta-analyses of observations. They assume, but do not represent explicitly, a mechanistic relationship between elements of the landscape, considered as ESP units, and the provisioning of ES. This often implies considering landscape configuration explicitly, contrary to simple land cover proxy models. This relationship might be represented by a functional relationship between landscape attributes and services, or might also incorporate spatial configuration. For example, the ES supply of a forest patch might depend on land cover, patch size and additional attributes such as soil quality or topography. However, quantitative biodiversity indicators are not commonly used in this type of models that are often dominated by the

influence of land cover/use, although biodiversity indicators might be used, e.g. by incorporating a statistical relationship between plant or bird species richness and recreational value of a location. Typically, these approaches are used at the regional to the global scale since the assumed relationships ignore most often smaller scale details and focus on patterns emerging at coarser scales.

Phenomenological approaches have been applied for ecosystem services provided by mobile organisms and ecosystem services relating to lateral flows [for which consideration of spatial configuration is essential \(Mitchell et al., 2015; Verhagen et al., 2016\)](#). As a simple example of mobile ESP, in the Swiss valley of Davos, the cultural service of habitat for the protected bird species Capercaillie was modelled by combining habitat suitability criteria relating to quality and spatial pattern with GIS-modelled vegetation distribution (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2008). Phenomenological approaches that incorporate landscape configuration are commonly used to model pollination through the interplay between habitats suitable for wild pollinators and demand from insect-pollinated crops (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2014a; Lautenbach et al., 2011; Maes et al., 2011; Schulp et al., 2014b). Based on a meta-analysis by Ricketts et al. (2008) these models represent realized pollination as a decay function based on the distance between pollinator habitat and fields with pollination-dependent crops. The InvEst pollination model (Lonsdorf et al., 2009) includes the location of crops to be pollinated and the habitat quality for different pollinator species or guilds, as well as the availability of floral resources. More sophisticated versions also limit the number of cells that can be pollinated by pollinator source (Lautenbach et al., 2011), and Grêt-Regamey et al. (2014a) used knock-off thresholds based on connectivity to modulate habitat quality.

The assessment of water quality regulation and recreation by Lautenbach et al. (2011), and the universal soil loss equation (USLE) and related approaches (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978) for the quantification of erosion control (Schirpke et al., 2013) represent examples of commonly used phenomenological approaches for ES depending on lateral flows.

In the marine environment phenomenological models have been rarely used, however Townsend et al. (2014) developed a method whereby services were defined from a series of principles based on ecosystem functioning and linked to marine biophysical parameters to develop ES maps for an area in New Zealand (Figure 3). Other studies have used phenomenological models to link the coverage of key habitats and their level of connectivity to fisheries production (Yee et al., 2014).

Strengths and weaknesses for practice

Phenomenological approaches depend on the validity of the qualitative or semi-quantitative relationships underlying the model. Typically, the required parameters are transferred from other study sites or obtained through meta-analysis. Results should therefore be interpreted as indicators of the direction or spatial variation of an effect or of the relative importance of an effect (e.g. by comparing different land use scenarios or historic land use data) rather than absolute values. The strength of the approach it incorporates land use configuration effects while requiring only limited data. It can therefore be used to get first estimates at scales where data availability is limited, such as the regional scale, or for the assessment of

past conditions for which required data for more sophisticated approaches will not become available.

3.3. Niche-based models

We define as **niche-based** models of ES models that assess ES supply based on the presence (or abundance) of ESP (often species) depending on their geographic distribution (Figure 4). ES can be modelled by aggregating distribution maps for different ESP if there are more than one contributing species, thus considering for instance the number of ESP species as a proxy for ES supply. A frequent limitation to such an approach is the lack of continuous distribution maps of ESP occurrence. To overcome this, Species Distribution Modelling (SDM) (Elith and Leathwick, 2009; Guisan and Thuiller, 2005) can be used to produce statistical relationships that predict the probability of occurrence of a given species (or group of species) over geographic areas depending on parameters such as climate, soil or land use, and generate continuous distribution maps of these taxa. There are also more sophisticated, mechanistic models, which (akin to full process models – see below) model species distributions based on physiological mechanisms (e.g. temperature tolerance thresholds, temperature responses), phenology (the timing of specific life cycle events such as bud burst or flowering in plants) or animal behaviour. The contribution of e.g. different species or functional groups to the ES of interest is assessed based on specific traits (e.g. trophic guilds) or expert knowledge.

Niche-based models may in particular apply to cultural services provided by well-identified species (e.g. protected species, species of particular aesthetic value) or to provisioning services by particular species such as in the case of wild foods (Schulp et al., 2014c). In Mediterranean regions provisioning services such as timber, fuelwood or cork production can be related to the presence of particular species (e.g. *Fagus sylvatica* or *Quercus ilex*, or *Quercus suber* respectively) and to forest species richness (Vilà et al., 2007; von Essen, 2015), while spiritual and aesthetic values are supported by *Quercus suber* and *Pinus halepensis*, and the regulation of fire hazards is promoted by *Quercus suber* but negatively affected by *Pinus halepensis* (Lloret et al., 2003). **Niche-based** modelling was applied to model biocontrol of vertebrate and invertebrate pests by terrestrial vertebrates (birds, mammals, reptiles) in Europe, considering predator species richness as a proxy for biocontrol potential (Civantos et al., 2012). As SDMs enable the projection of ESP distribution under changing environmental conditions, this approach showed that under future climate change scenarios pest control would be substantially reduced, especially in southern European countries, whereas in much of central and northern Europe climate change would likely to benefit pest-control providers. In coastal and marine environments **niche-based** models have been primarily used to model the distribution of mangroves and thus their carbon capture and storage capacity (Hutchison et al., 2014; Sunny and Juha, 2014) and fisheries production, based on species distribution models (Jordan et al., 2012).

In principle, any method of aggregation is possible, although so far species richness for ESP (i.e. added contributing species) has been considered as the proxy for ES without applying any weighting to different species. Though in their infancy, approaches considering relationships between taxonomic, phylogenetic and functional diversity and their links to ES

(Flynn et al., 2011) are good candidates to expand existing ones. These approaches build on the premise that since functional diversity, or functional composition tend to be better related to ES supply than species richness or diversity (Cardinale et al., 2012), then [niche-based](#) models of species distributions could be translated to functional diversity in order to generate projections of ES. The incorporation of phylogenetic diversity, which can be easily computed based on taxonomic data granted the availability of phylogenetic data (e.g. Thuiller et al., 2011), adds a further means to approach functional diversity and thereby to quantify ES (Cadotte et al., 2009).

Strengths and weaknesses for practice

Overall, [niche-based](#) modelling of species distributions is a well-developed approach with free accessible tools, suitable for future scenario projections (e.g. BIOMOD: Thuiller et al., 2009; Maxent: Elith et al., 2011). Species distribution data are often the critical bottleneck for [niche-based](#) approaches. Limitations of SDM and strengths and weaknesses of different distribution modelling methods have been discussed extensively (e.g. Bellard et al., 2012; Elith and Leathwick, 2009), and improvements proposed (Zurell et al., 2016). Apart from the intrinsic limitations of the approach, such as ignoring population dynamics, species interactions, or potential adaptive responses, the main avenue for improvement towards the application to ES modelling regards the understanding and quantitative specification of relationships between ESP and ES supply. This gap requires both greater ecological understanding (Cardinale et al., 2012; Nagendra et al., 2013), and research into the demand for ES in terms of the identities and relative weights of contributing species.

3.4. Trait-based models

There is increasing evidence for the relevance of traits of organisms as ES providers (De Bello et al., 2010; Lavorel, 2013; Luck et al., 2009). Trait-based models quantify ES supply based on statistical, quantitative relationships between an ecosystem property underpinning ES supply and trait-based metrics, as well as, if significant additional effects of abiotic parameters such as climate or soil variables (Gardarin et al., 2014; Lavorel et al., 2011). (Lavorel et al., 2011) demonstrated that trait-based models reduce uncertainty in ES prediction over space as compared to models based on land use alone, or even land use and soil variables (Eigenbrod et al., 2010; Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012). Such models are constructed based on empirical measures of ecosystem functioning, which are then related to explanatory variables including: land cover/use, trait-based metrics quantifying functional diversity of ESP (Mouchet et al., 2010), soil variables and, for regional to continental scale or topographically complex landscapes climate / microclimate variables. Models may combine metrics for several individual traits, e.g. plant height and leaf nitrogen concentration to model grassland productivity (Lavorel et al., 2011); or use multi-trait metrics such as a compound index of different traits, e.g. the leaf economics spectrum (Laliberté and Tylianakis, 2012; Lienin and Kleyer, 2012; Mokany et al., 2008) or multivariate trait diversity (e.g. Conti and Diaz, 2013; Mokany et al., 2008). A review of known relationships between

indicators of ecosystem biogeochemical functioning for plants, relevant to the modelling of ES such as for instance fodder or timber production, climate regulation through carbon sequestration or the maintenance of water quality, suggested that, for available studies so far, community mean values of single traits tended to capture most of the variance in these ecosystem properties (Lavorel, 2013). The recent extension to ES associated with other biota such as soil fauna and microorganisms (Mulder et al., 2013), insects (Ibanez, 2012; Moretti et al., 2013), terrestrial vertebrates (Luck et al., 2012), aquatic invertebrates (Engelhardt, 2006) or marine fish (Albouy et al., 2013) holds high promises. Multitrophic trait-based models quantify ecosystem services resulting from the interaction between several trophic levels such as pollination, biotic control of pests and weeds or maintenance of soil fertility (Grigulis et al., 2013; Lavorel et al., 2013a). These models capture not only the effects of environmental change on ES via their effects on e.g. plant traits, but by also integrating the traits that underpin biotic interactions between plants and other organisms such as pollinators (Pakeman and Stockan, 2013), herbivores (Ibanez et al., 2013), or soil microorganisms (de Vries et al., 2012; Legay et al., 2014), and their effects of ES supply (Grigulis et al., 2013; Moretti et al., 2013). In principle, and similar to [niche-based](#) models, a wide range of modelling methods are suitable, although selected methods must allow spatially-extensive extrapolation over space for which explanatory variables are available, and preferably across time under scenarios.

As an example, models of mountain grassland ES supply were developed based on plant traits (Lavorel et al., 2011), and further complemented by traits of soil microorganisms (Grigulis et al., 2013). In these models which focused principally on components of carbon and nutrient cycling, ecosystem properties were linked to plant height and easily measureable leaf traits such as dry matter content and nitrogen concentration, with additional effects of soil parameters. Both traits and soil parameters were related to grassland management to produce ES maps (Figure 5). These models were also applied to project effects of combined climate and socio-economic scenarios translated into grassland management projections and parameterised from observations and experiments (Lamarque et al., 2014).

The initial construction of trait-based ES models requires observational or experimental data sets measuring ecosystem properties underpinning ES supply along with community composition of ESP. ESP community composition can then be combined with original, site-level trait data, or data extracted from trait data bases, but considering uncertainties resulting from intraspecific trait variability (Kazakou et al., 2013; Violle et al., 2012). Scenario projections can be parameterised by combining projected values for land use and environmental parameters with new community-level trait values calculated based on species compositional turnover from e.g. state-and-transition models (Quétier et al., 2007) and on intraspecific variability measured along environmental gradients (Albert et al., 2010) or through experiments (Jung et al., 2014).

Increasing trait data availability through communal data bases and remote sensing offers high promises for the development of trait-based models of ES (Table 2a). There are definite geographic gaps, but overall European vegetation tends to be increasingly well covered, although more extreme environments such as Mediterranean or alpine, where intraspecific

variability hinders the use of data measured in more temperate regions, still require collection efforts.

Strengths and weaknesses for practice

Although trait-based models of ES supply are in their infancy they rely on rapidly increasing conceptual and empirical evidence. Such models also provide a mechanistic basis for the understanding of biophysical bundles and trade-offs in ES supply (Lavorel and Grigulis, 2012; Mouillot et al., 2011). The existence of so called ‘response – effects overlaps’ (Lavorel and Garnier, 2002; Suding et al., 2008) enables mechanistic ES projections under future scenarios using relatively simple models (Lamarque et al., 2014). As with any statistical model however, the greatest care should be taken when attempting to apply such models beyond the parameter space for which they were derived. So far trait-based ES models have rarely been validated across sites, although inter-site analyses have identified generic trait-based models of fodder production, fodder digestibility and litter decomposability (Fortunel et al., 2009; Gardarin et al., 2014; Lavorel et al., 2013b), and the model by Gardarin et al. (2014) was applied to map fodder quality at national scale (Violle et al., 2015). Lastly, trait-based models will become increasingly attractive as trait data bases become more generally available, although the lack of soil data layers in many regions will remain problematic.

3.5. Full process-based models

Full process-based models of (terrestrial) ecosystems rely on the explicit representation, using mathematical formulations, of ecological, physical, and biogeochemical processes that determine the functioning of ecosystems. The predictive algorithms simulate a large range of variables, which can then be post-processed to quantify ES. Process-based models have been most widely applied to quantify i) climate regulation (Bayer et al., 2015; Duarte et al., 2013; Metzger et al., 2008; Naidoo et al., 2008; Ooba et al., 2012; Watanabe and Ortega, 2014), ii) water supply, water quality, flood and erosion regulation (Gedney et al., 2006; Lautenbach et al., 2012a; Lautenbach et al., 2013; Logsdon and Chaubey, 2013), iii) food, fodder, and bioenergy provision (Bateman et al., 2013; Beringer et al., 2011; Lindeskog et al., 2013; Müller et al., 2014), iii) natural hazard regulation (Elkin et al., 2013), but also in the wider frame of habitat characterisation (Hickler et al., 2012; Huntingford et al., 2011). Here, we discriminate between large-scale and local to landscape scale process-based models.

Appendix 1 lists examples using Dynamic Vegetation Models (DVM) (LPJ-GUESS and LPJmL: Bondeau et al., 2007; Sibyll et al., 2013; Sitch et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2001), Earth System Models (ESM) (JULES and ORCHIDEE: Cox, 2001; Krinner et al., 2005; Zaehle and Friend, 2010), hydrological models (SWAT and others: Neitsch et al., 2005; Stürck et al., 2014), forest dynamic models (e.g. Elkin et al., 2013; Bugmann, 1996) and models for ecological restoration (e.g. Chen and Twilley, 1998; Duarte et al., 2013). Figure 6 represents the typical steps of ES assessments with process-based models and possible mapping outputs.

Large-scale process models

Several large-scale process models have been used for ES quantification. Dynamic Vegetation Models (DVMs) and Earth System Models (ESMs) are large-scale models that provide functional representations of plant and ecosystem processes that are universal rather than specific to one biome or region (Prentice and Cowling, 2013). Hydrological models represent water-related processes within river catchments (Gudmundsson et al., 2012). Global models typically apply a spatial resolution of $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$, but can be run at finer resolution, or even ecosystem scale if the required drivers are available. In that case, model adjustment might be necessary (e.g. re-calibration, re-formulation to better account for important processes of the region). Applications of these models that include a representation of regional specific features are often designed for local to regional scale application, like forest dynamic models and crop models.

This type of models uses a set of process formulations for representing key biogeochemical and physical processes as a function of prevailing atmospheric CO_2 concentration, climate, soil characteristics and eventually land use and management or nutrient deposition. Vegetation is represented as a mixture of plant functional types (PFTs) or species that are distinct in terms of bioclimatic limits and ecological parameters (see Lavorel et al., 2007; Woodward and Cramer, 1996), simulated or prescribed. Age or size classes may be distinguished, but more typically the modelled properties represent averages of the entire grid cell population of a given PFT (Prentice et al., 2007), possibly under a given management type. Soil profile is described using up to ten layers. Hydrological models consider also shallow and deep aquifer storages, and a river routing module simulates the discharge to the rivers network. "Fast" processes are modelled on a daily or sub-daily basis and include energy and gas exchange, photosynthesis, respiration and plant-soil water exchanges. Processes with seasonal dynamics such as plant phenology, growth and biomass allocation are implemented on a daily or monthly basis. Mortality, disturbance, management, are represented on an annual or sub-annual basis, eventually stochastically. By using a small number of PFTs which represent a low-dimensional continuum of plant trait combinations, process-based models generally underestimate the functional diversity of biota in favour of a manageable number of classes. Yet the rise of super computers allows to run DVMs with flexible individual traits (Sakschewski et al., 2015), making it possible to account for functional diversity.

Local to landscape scale process models

At local to landscape scales, forest dynamic models with similar philosophy and structure as DVMs have been used for the assessment of bundles of ecosystem services including timber production, natural hazard regulation (avalanches, rockfalls), carbon sequestration, conservation of forest diversity for greater drought resilience and habitat for protected bird species (Elkin et al., 2013; Grêt-Regamey et al., 2008; Temperli et al., 2012).

As another type of full-process models with strong potential for ES modelling, watershed models have been designed to simulate hydrological flows and often water quality at the

landscape to regional scale. Soil infiltration, surface and subsurface flows as well as evapotranspiration and snowmelt are the main hydrological processes. For modelling water quality the transport and turnover of nutrients and other chemicals need to be represented as well as soil erosion processes, along with agricultural practices. Given the importance of vegetation for the water cycle a vegetation growth model is part of all watershed models. Specifically differences between different plants (or plant functional types) are considered for water use, and in nutrient use for crops. As an example, Stürck et al. (2014) quantified the supply of flood control by running a hydrological model for a number of representative catchment types to quantify the regulating effect of different land use types in different positions in the catchments. Results were extrapolated on a European map accounting for catchment type, location in the catchment, land use and soil conditions. The soil water assessment tool (SWAT) (Neitsch et al., 2005) is an example of an advanced watershed model applied to agricultural landscapes map water purification services (Lautenbach et al., 2012a), to assess fresh water provisioning, fuel provisioning, erosion regulation and flood regulation (Logsdon and Chaubey, 2013) and to describe trade-offs between food and fodder provisioning, biofuel provisioning, water quality regulation and discharge regulation (Lautenbach et al., 2013) depending on crop rotations and crop management.

For marine ecosystems, the Ecopath with Ecosim (EwE) modelling approach supports predictions of changes in fish to evaluate ecosystem effects of fishing, explore management policy options, analyse impacts and placement of marine protected areas, predict movement and accumulation of contaminants and tracers and model the effects of environmental changes. At the core of EwE is Ecopath, a static, mass-balance snapshot of fisheries based on a set of linear equations combining net production that reflects the balance of catch, predation and other sources of mortality, migration, biomass accumulation, with respiration and unassimilated food. , The Ecosim and Ecospace modules then build on this basic mass-balance module to simulate respectively temporal dynamics using differential equations, and spatial dynamics using spatially explicit distribution of habitat types and fishing effort, along with lateral movement. Alcamo et al. (2005) applied EwE to model fish consumption and production for three important regional marine fisheries (North Benguela, Central North Pacific and Gulf of Thailand) under the four Millennium Ecosystem Assessment global scenarios, showing that for all scenarios fish catch (by weight) was maintained in North Benguela, not maintained in the Central North Pacific, whereas results were scenario-sensitive in the Gulf of Thailand. Another process-based model is available for the long-term carbon sequestration expected from seagrass restoration programmes (Duarte et al., 2013) by combining models of patch growth, patch survival in seagrass planting projects and estimates of seagrass CO₂ sequestration per unit area for the five seagrass species commonly used in restoration programmes. Results enable the estimation of an optimal planting density to maximise C sequestration.

Strengths and weaknesses for practice

There is a substantially overlapping set of physiological and ecological principles that is used across process-based models to represent ecosystem dynamics and matter flows, providing

robustness and scalability to these models for ES quantification. However, predictions of response variables, e.g. net primary productivity, vary considerably among individual large-scale models (e.g. Denman et al., 2007; Friedlingstein et al., 2006; Sitch et al., 2013). This is due to the lack of a universal set of benchmarks e.g. for terrestrial carbon cycle modelling, and the lack of consensus about several aspects of ecological processes (Prentice and Cowling, 2013). Conversely, local and landscape scale process models can be limited by detailed parameterization and calibration needs and by availability of case-specific validation data.

Most process models have not been designed to model ecosystem services but to model the underlying ecosystem functions from which an ecosystem service is derived directly or indirectly. The great strength of this approach is that it allows scenario analysis and if-then-else experiments if the model has been proven to capture the essential system behaviour. Because they model processes and their fundamental biological and physical interactions they also appear particularly promising for exploring mechanisms underpinning synergies and trade-offs between ES (Viglizzo et al., 2016).

4. Discussion

Mobilising scientific understanding to assess the spatial distribution of ecosystem services is a tremendous challenge to support environmental assessment, planning and sustainable futures (Bennett et al., 2015; Maes et al., 2016). Because ES lie at the interface between social and environmental systems, this endeavour requires an integrated assessment of the social and ecological factors determining the production of ecosystem services (Reyers et al., 2013; Villamagna et al., 2013). In this review, we have focused solely on how the biophysical condition of ecosystems, as influenced by biotic, abiotic and management factors, determines ES supply, thus not considering ES demand, and how it influences ES flows and feedbacks to biophysical condition. Mapping ES demand is an even more challenging objective (Wolff et al., 2015), and will ultimately need to be coupled in integrated spatial ES assessments (e.g. Schulp et al., 2014b; Schulp et al., 2014c; Stürck et al., 2014). In the following we discuss future avenues for further improvement of the mapping of ES supply by increasing biophysical realism, but this will need proceed along with parallel progress in accounting for ES demand.

4.1. Future avenues for increasing biophysical realism in ES mapping

Plant and Ryan (2013) identified the lack of an 'ES toolbox' as a barrier to the adoption of ES by natural resource managers. While this paper does not attempt to produce such a tool box, it provides a basis for guiding model choice by scientists and practitioners. Here, we identified two important dimensions which enable the incorporation of greater biophysical realism in models supporting ES mapping and can be developed into different model

categories regardless of their baseline complexity. First, while simple land cover information is most commonly used to map ES, effects of land use configuration and land use intensity that can be captured by phenomenological models are too often ignored (Verhagen et al., 2016). Recent practice also shows the benefits of incorporating explicit land use rather than simple land cover information for the simplest proxy-based models all the way to advanced full process-based models. Second, approaches incorporating explicitly the role of ES providing biota are emerging as powerful methods to reduce uncertainty in ES mapping. This includes models quantifying individual species effects, species diversity, functional traits, and ecosystem functions described in this review, and for which tools and data are becoming increasingly available. Our review also helps the selection of appropriate methods according to spatial scale, given that scale effects have so far been poorly considered in ES research (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2014b). Review of practice highlights (1) the predominant effect of scale on model selection for practical case studies, (2) the prospect within a single case study to combine different model types, of varying complexity and detail in the representation of biotic effects, depending on specific ES of interest, skills and data / resources availability.

The last point highlights that our categories of methods are not necessarily exclusive and there may be more of a continuum between approaches. Hybridization is a fruitful avenue for model improvement depending on context, scale, skills and data availability. This is illustrated by a number of published examples and ongoing developments that gradually help progressing from MAES Tier 2 to Tier 3, by gradually incorporating more mechanistic approaches (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2015), and especially a greater integration of explicit biodiversity effects into mapping of ES supply. For instance, Grêt-Regamey et al. (2008) demonstrated how statistical, phenomenological and process-based models of varying level of complexity can be coupled with a GIS platform in order to assess ecosystem services at landscape scale. Stürck et al. (2014) used a hybridization between a process-based hydrological model and a spatial proxy, look-up approach to map flood regulation across Europe by determining the regulating capacity of different land use-soil combinations within a catchment. Schirpke et al. (2013) coupled the USLE phenomenological model of soil erosion with a semi-mechanistic statistical model of plant root trait effects on soil retention to quantify effects of land use change on soil stability. Large scale full-process models are also evolving towards the integration of trait-based approaches rather than using a small number of fixed Plant Functional Types. First, global vegetation models can be reformulated to incorporate plant traits and their trade-offs as drivers of vegetation distribution (Reu et al., 2011). Second, recent models have started considering direct trait-based formulation (Scheiter and Higgins, 2009; Zaehle and Friend, 2010) and/or parameterisation (Verheijen et al., 2013; Wullschleger et al., 2014). Lastly, for landscape to regional scales so-called 'hybrid' DVMs pave the way to the integration of niche-based models with dispersal models (Midgley et al., 2010) and with trait-based process models (Boulangeat et al., 2012), thereby opening new perspectives for the refinement of the trait-based modelling of ES supply under scenarios of climate change (Boulangeat et al., 2014). Together, all these recent developments illustrate how increasing fundamental understanding on the role of different facets of biodiversity for ecosystem functioning and ecosystem services (Cardinale et al., 2012) can be incorporated into the spatially explicit modelling of ecosystem service supply.

Quantifying and mapping marine ecosystem services has lagged behind efforts for terrestrial ecosystems, but this is in the process of changing (Liquete et al., 2013; Maes et al., 2012). Data and methods to assess the provision of services from the marine environment are far behind to those available for terrestrial environments (Barbier, 2012; Costanza, 1999). The gap is greatest when it comes to the mapping of ES, the main reasons behind this is the lack of high-resolution spatial information for habitat and species distribution and the incomplete understanding of ecosystem processes and functions within a highly dynamic three-dimensional environment with fluid boundaries (Maes et al., 2012). However, efforts towards mapping marine habitats are increasing. In order to rapidly move towards biophysically realistic mapping, some large fundamental knowledge gaps regarding ecosystem processes need to be resolved. First, there is a lack of information at which scales ecosystem processes and functions occur and how these relate to the provisioning of services. Second, the relationships between biodiversity and ecosystem functions in marine ecosystems are still poorly known (Bergström et al., 2015; Moore et al., 2015). The literature search on marine models/mapping conducted as part of this review highlighted a considerable number of studies which stopped at the assessment or prediction of ESP distributions without taking the next step in analysing their implications for ES provision (e.g. Albouy et al., 2013; Bergström et al., 2015; Moore et al., 2015). Although this is not an easy problem, experience from terrestrial ecosystems in the integration of biotic processes and biodiversity effects into ES quantification and mapping may speed up progress for marine and coastal ecosystems.

4.2. Uncertainty and validation of spatially-explicit models of ES supply

While the importance of quantifying uncertainties and of model validation is accepted knowledge in the environmental and ecological modelling community (Bennett et al., 2012; Dormann et al., 2008; Jakeman et al., 2006; Laniak et al., 2013), these have been two enduring challenges for spatial explicit ES assessment (Crossman et al., 2013; Martinez-Harms and Balvanera, 2012; Seppelt et al., 2011).

Uncertainty can be conceptually separated into uncertainty about the model structure, uncertainty of model parameterization, uncertainty in the data and last but not least the conceptual uncertainty of the definition of an ecosystem service and underlying processes. In reality all these different components interact: data availability – especially at larger scales – drives in many situations the choice of proxys and the model structure for assessing an ES (Andrew et al., 2015). The use and parameterization of a model is limited by the availability of data – this can in turn lead to suboptimal decision about model structure which leads in turn to an increase in uncertainty. Choosing strongly simplified proxy-models to best match data availability may lead to ignoring the most important processes determining ecosystem service supply, and especially biotic processes. For ecosystem services that predominantly rely on mobile biota – such as pest control, or pollination - increased system understanding on how the different components of biodiversity affect ES provisioning of the services supports the development of more robust models suitable for spatial and temporal extrapolation (Kremen et al., 2007). At the same time, using the most advanced process

models in the absence of data to parameterise them at the desired scale does not necessarily lead to higher accuracy. Still, incorporating at least phenomenological understanding into ES models would likely increase reliability and robustness of ES assessments and maps. The use of remote sensing data to estimate ecosystem service proxies (Ayanu et al., 2012; de Araujo Barbosa et al., 2015) and to derive information on biodiversity (O'Connor et al., 2015; Schmidtlein et al., 2012) (Table 2) is promising to overcome some of the data limitations, although the derivation of information from remote sensing data requires the use of additional models that bring in their own sources of uncertainty (Foody and Atkinson, 2002).

In the previous sections we have illustrated how better biodiversity process understanding can be incorporated to reduce uncertainty in ES models. The uncertainty introduced by a selected model structure can be assessed by comparing models of different structure, as recently done for species-distribution models (Buisson et al., 2009; Morin and Thuiller, 2009). Such comparisons can be used to highlight areas or situations in which models strongly agree or disagree. Schulp et al. (2014a) followed this approach by comparing ES maps from five distinct studies at the European scale, and such practice is now gaining currency to assess the value of novel model developments. Another strategy is the use of model ensembles for forecasts and assessments. This strategy which is common practice for full-process models is now spreading for [niche-based](#) and trait-based based models (e.g. Araújo and New, 2007; Gritti et al., 2013; Thuiller et al., 2009).

As the availability on species, phylogenetic and functional biodiversity increases currently, along with remote sensing derived information, data availability is likely to become less limiting for using more advanced models (Table 2). But then uncertainty in biodiversity input data could propagate in ES models (Dong et al., 2015). Researchers will then need to estimate the effects of increasing model complexity both on feasibility of parameterisation and on sensitivity to uncertainty in the input data, and to carefully assess potential mismatches in temporal and spatial scale of the new data (Orth et al., 2015; Perrin et al., 2001). First, a specific source of uncertainty in ES assessment relates to the scale of the input data. Although the selection of the modelling scale should be driven by the requirements of the end user (the scale of the decision to be made) (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2014b), data availability seriously limits the degrees of freedom for the selection of input data. There should always be a match between the resolution for ESP biota and environmental data. This in particular applies to climate, where downscaled layers need to be available or calculated for adequate species distribution or process modelling. Conversely, care should also be taken in combining high resolution soil maps with biota data with a coarser resolution (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2014b). Second extrapolating models beyond the range of calibration data is a critical source of uncertainty. Black box statistical models, e.g. some phenomenological, [niche-based](#) or trait-based models that have been (over-)fitted to data without ensuring a robust model structure are especially prone to effects of extrapolation. In general, for an analysis of temporal changes or for assessing management options the projected effects should be compared to the sensitivity of the model outputs

against reasonable parameter changes: if the direction of the effect changes or if the magnitude of the response is weaker than the sensitivity of the model one should hesitate to draw strong conclusions from the model. Examples for this approach can be found in (Lautenbach et al. (2011) and (Schulp et al. (2014b). It is also possible to test the sensitivity towards the uncertainty in the input data, an approach followed in Lautenbach et al. (2012b).

Thus, ES map users should be aware of the different sources of uncertainty and map creators should at least list them with respect to their application. In addition to this qualitative step a quantitative assessment of the uncertainties of model output should be given. If observed data is used for model parameterisation and calibration, it should be always possible to quantify the uncertainty attached. If no observed data is available against which model output could be compared sensitivity analysis is an option to quantify uncertainties. Lastly, validation of ES models is complicated by the fact that many ES cannot be directly measured. Water purification for example has to rely on water quality data not on measured purification rates (Lautenbach et al., 2012a). Therefore, model validation is often pattern-oriented, considering proxy-data, and tries to at least capture the system behaviour instead of specific process variables.

Ultimately, comparing the gains from improved biophysical process understanding to the possible propagation of uncertainties in biodiversity and ecosystem process data will determine the net benefits from using models of increasing biophysical complexity.

5. Conclusion

In order to achieve the ambitious political agenda for biodiversity, and to support sustainable development that both preserves and benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services, considerable progress is still needed in the practice of quantifying ecosystem service supply. Today a rich array of methods are available, especially for terrestrial systems, that enable the incorporation of biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning into quantitative, spatially-explicit assessments of ecosystem service supply. We have summarised the main characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of different approaches for mapping ES supply, highlighting their complementarity depending on scale, assessment objectives and context, available skills and data. Review of practice illustrates the predominant effect of scale on model selection, and the ability within a single case study to combine different model types, of varying complexity and detail in the representation of biodiversity effects, depending on specific ES of interest, skills and data / resources availability. Besides, model categories are not necessarily exclusive and there may be more of a continuum between approaches. Recent model developments, with innovative hybridization across model types illustrate how increasing fundamental understanding on the role of different facets of biodiversity for ecosystem functioning and ecosystem services can be incorporated into the spatially explicit modelling of ecosystem service supply. As the availability of biodiversity data (species, phylogenetic and functional) increases and the potential for remote sensing of taxonomic and

functional diversity becomes realised, the application of more 'biodiversity realistic' models should be able to move to from research to practice. Considerable challenges remain for assessments to embrace good practice in model uncertainty quantification and validation, an upstream research need to still be addressed. Lastly, while the mapping of terrestrial ecosystem service supply is now reaching greater maturity, for marine ecosystems research is still in its infancy. Urgent research needs regard a better understanding of marine biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning, and at which scales this influences ecosystem service supply. The availability of high resolution data also proves to be an obstacle that needs to be cleared before sound practice can be achieved.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by project OPERAs FP7-ENV-2012-two-stage-308393. AB and WC acknowledge Labex OT-Med (ANR-11-LABX-0061) funded by the French Government Investissements d'Avenir program of the French National Research Agency (ANR) through the A*MIDEX project (ANR-11-IDEX-0001-02)

6. References

- Albert, C.H., Thuiller, W., Yoccoz, N.G., Soudant, A., Boucher, F., Saccone, P., Lavorel, S., 2010. Intraspecific functional variability: extent, structure and sources of variation within a French alpine catchment. *Journal of Ecology* 98, 604-613.
- Albouy, C., Velez, L., Coll, M., Colloca, F., Le Loc'h, F., Mouillot, D., Gravel, D., 2013. From projected species distribution to food-web structure under climate change. *Global Change Biology* 20, 730-741.
- Alcamo, J., van Vuuren, D., Ringler, C., Cramer, W., Masui, T., Alder, J., Schulze, K., 2005. Changes in nature's balance sheet: Model-based estimates of future worldwide ecosystem services. *Ecology and Society* 10, 19-19.
- Andrew, M.E., Wulder, M.A., Nelson, T.A., 2014. Potential contributions of remote sensing to ecosystem service assessments. *Progress in Physical Geography* 38, 328-353.
- Andrew, M.E., Wulder, M.A., Nelson, T.A., Coops, N.C., 2015. Spatial data, analysis approaches, and information needs for spatial ecosystem service assessments: a review. *GIScience & Remote Sensing* 52, 344-373.
- Araújo, M.B., New, M., 2007. Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 22, 42-47.
- Ayanu, Y.Z., Conrad, C., Nauss, T., Wegmann, M., Koellner, T., 2012. Quantifying and Mapping Ecosystem Services Supplies and Demands: A Review of Remote Sensing Applications. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46, 8529-8541.
- Barbier, E.B., 2012. Progress and Challenges in Valuing Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Services. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 6, 1-19.
- Bateman, I.J., Harwood, A.R., Mace, G.M., Watson, R.T., Abson, D.J., Andrews, B., Binner, A., Crowe, A., Day, B.H., Dugdale, S., Fezzi, C., Foden, J., Hadley, D., Haines-Young, R., Hulme, M., Kontoleon, A., Lovett, A.A., Munday, P., Pascual, U., Paterson, J., Perino, G., Sen, A., Siriwardena, G., van Soest, D., Termansen, M., 2013. Bringing Ecosystem Services into Economic Decision-Making: Land Use in the United Kingdom. *Science* 341, 45-50.
- Bayer, A.D., Pugh, T.A.M., Krause, A., Arneth, A., 2015. Historical and future quantification of terrestrial carbon sequestration from a Greenhouse-Gas-Value perspective. *Global Environmental Change* 32, 153-164.
- Bellard, C., Bertelsmeier, C., Leadley, P., Thuiller, W., Courchamp, F., 2012. Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity. *Ecology Letters* 15, 365-377.
- Bennett, E.M., Cramer, W., Begossi, A., Cundill, G., Diaz, S., Egoh, B., Geijzendorffer, I.R., Krug, C.B., Lavorel, S., Lazos, E., Lebel, L., Martín-Lopez, B., Meyfroidt, P., Mooney, H.A., Nel, J.L., Pascual, U., Payet, K., Harguindeguy, N.P., Peterson, G., Prieur-Richard, A.-H., Reyers, B., Roebeling, P., Seppelt, R., Solan, M., Tschakert, P., Tschardtke, T., Turner, B.L., Verburg, P.H., Viglizzo, E.F., White, P.C.L., Woodward, G., 2015. Linking biodiversity, ecosystem services and to human well-being: Three challenges for designing research for sustainability. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 14, 76-85.
- Bennett, N.D., Croke, B.F.W., Guariso, G., Guillaume, J.H.a., Hamilton, S.H., Jakeman, A.J., Marsili-Libelli, S., Newham, L.T.H., Norton, J.P., Perrin, C., Pierce, S.a., Robson, B., Seppelt,

832 R., Voinov, A.a., Fath, B.D., Andreassian, V., 2012. Characterising performance of
833 environmental models. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 40, 1-20.

834 Bergström, P., Lindegarth, S., Lindegarth, M., 2015. Modeling and predicting the growth of
835 the mussel, *Mytilus edulis*: implications for planning of aquaculture and eutrophication
836 mitigation. *Ecology and Evolution* 5, 5920-5933.

837 Beringer, T., Lucht, W., Schaphoff, S., 2011. Bioenergy production potential of global
838 biomass plantations under environmental and agricultural constraints. *GCB Bioenergy* 3,
839 299-312.

840 Bondeau, A., Smith, P.C., Zähle, S., Schaphoff, S., Lucht, W., Cramer, W., Gerten, D., Lotze-
841 Campen, H., Müller, C., Reichstein, M., Smith, B., 2007. Modelling the role of agriculture for
842 the 20th century global terrestrial carbon balance. *Global Change Biology* 13, 679-706.

843 Boulangeat, I., Georges, D., Thuiller, W., 2014. FATE-HD: A spatially and temporally explicit
844 integrated model for predicting vegetation structure and diversity at regional scale. *Global*
845 *Change Biology* 20, 2368-2378.

846 Boulangeat, I., Philippe, P., Abdulhak, S., Douzet, R., Garraud, L., Lavergne, S., Lavorel, S.,
847 Van Es, J., Vittoz, P., Thuiller, W., 2012. Optimizing plant functional groups for dynamic
848 models of biodiversity: at the crossroads between functional and community ecology. *Global*
849 *Change Biology* 18, 3464-3475.

850 Buisson, L., Thuiller, W., Casajus, N., Lek, S., Grenouillet, G., 2009. Uncertainty in ensemble
851 forecasting of species distribution. *Global Change Biology* 16, 1145-1157.

852 Burkhard, B., Kroll, F., Nedkov, S., Müller, F., 2012. Mapping ecosystem service supply,
853 demand and budgets. *Ecological Indicators* 21, 17-29.

854 Byczek, C., Longaretti, P.-Y., Lavorel, S., submitted. The benefits of recreational community-
855 based GPS information for modelling the recreation ecosystem service. *Landscape and*
856 *Urban Planning*.

857 Cadotte, M.W., Cavender-Bares, J., Tilman, D., Oakley, T.H., 2009. Using Phylogenetic,
858 Functional and Trait Diversity to Understand Patterns of Plant Community Productivity. *PLoS*
859 *One* 4, e5695.

860 Canu, D.M., Ghermandi, A., Nunes, P.A.L.D., Lazzari, P., Cossarini, G., Solidoro, C., 2015.
861 Estimating the value of carbon sequestration ecosystem services in the Mediterranean Sea:
862 An ecological economics approach. *Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy*
863 *Dimensions* 32, 87-95.

864 Cardinale, B.J., Duffy, J.E., Gonzalez, A., Hooper, D.U., Perrings, C., Venail, P., Narwani, A.,
865 Mace, G.M., Tilman, D., Wardle, D.A., Kinzig, A.P., Daily, G.C., Loreau, M., Grace, J.B.,
866 Larigauderie, A., Srivastava, D.S., Naeem, S., 2012. Biodiversity loss and its impact on
867 humanity. *Nature* 486, 59-67.

868 Casanoves, F., Pla, L., Di Rienzo, J.A., Díaz, S., 2011. FDiversity: a software package for
869 the integrated analysis of functional diversity. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 2, 233-237.

870 Chen, R., Twilley, R.R., 1998. A gap dynamic model of mangrove forest development along
871 gradients of soil salinity and nutrient resources. *Journal of Ecology* 86, 37-51.

872 Chytrý, M., Schaminée, J.H.J., Schwabe, A., 2011. Vegetation survey: a new focus for
873 *Applied Vegetation Science*. *Applied Vegetation Science* 14, 435-439.

874 Civantos, E., Thuiller, W., Maiorano, L., Guisan, A., Araújo, M.B., 2012. Potential Impacts of
875 Climate Change on Ecosystem Services in Europe: The Case of Pest Control by
876 Vertebrates. *BioScience* 62, 658-666.

877 Conti, G., Diaz, S., 2013. Plant functional diversity and carbon storage – an empirical test in
878 semiarid forest ecosystems. *Journal of Ecology* 101, 18-28.

879 Cornelissen, J.H.C., Lavorel, S., Garnier, E., Díaz, S., Buchmann, N., Gurvich, D.E., Reich,
880 P.B., ter Steege, H., Morgan, H.D., van der Heijden, M.G.A., Pausas, J.G., Poorter, H., 2003.
881 Handbook of protocols for standardised and easy measurement of plant functional traits
882 worldwide. *Australian Journal of Botany* 51, 335-380.

883 Costanza, R., 1999. The ecological, economic, and social importance of the oceans.
884 *Ecological Economics* 31, 199-213.

885 Cox, P., 2001. Description of the "TRIFFID" Dynamic Global Vegetation Model, Hadley
886 Centre technical note. MetOffice.

887 Crossman, N.D., Burkhard, B., Nedkov, S., Willemen, L., Petz, K., Palomo, I., Drakou, E.G.,
888 Martin-Lopez, B., McPhearson, T., Boyanova, K., Alkemade, R., Egoh, B., Dunbar, M.B.,
889 Maes, J., 2013. A blueprint for mapping and modelling ecosystem services. *Ecosystem*
890 *Services* 4, 4-14.

891 de Araujo Barbosa, C.C., Atkinson, P.M., Dearing, J.A., 2015. Remote sensing of ecosystem
892 services: A systematic review. *Ecological Indicators* 52, 430-443.

893 De Bello, F., Lavorel, S., Díaz, S., Harrington, R., Bardgett, R., Berg, M., Cipriotti, P.,
894 Cornelissen, H., Feld, C., Hering, D., Silva, P.M.d., Potts, S., Sandin, L., Sousa, J.P.,
895 Storkey, J., Wardle, D., 2010. Functional traits underlie the delivery of ecosystem services
896 across different trophic levels. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 143, 2873-2893.

897 de Vries, F.T., Manning, P., Tallowin, J.R.B., Mortimer, S.R., Pilgrim, E.S., Harrison, K.A.,
898 Hobbs, P.J., Quirk, H., Shipley, B., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Kattge, J., Bardgett, R.D., 2012.
899 Abiotic drivers and plant traits explain landscape-scale patterns in soil microbial
900 communities. *Ecology Letters*, n/a-n/a.

901 Dengler, J., Jansen, F., Glöckler, F., Peet, R.K., De Cáceres, M., Chytrý, M., Ewald, J.,
902 Oldeland, J., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Finckh, M., Mucina, L., Rodwell, J.S., Schaminée, J.H.J.,
903 Spencer, N., 2011. The Global Index of Vegetation-Plot Databases (GIVD): a new resource
904 for vegetation science. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 22, 582-597.

905 Denman, K.L., Brasseur, G., Chidthaisong, A., Ciais, P., Cox, P.M., Dickinson, R.E.,
906 Hauglustaine, D., Heinze, C., Holland, E., Jacob, D., Lohmann, U., Ramachandran, S., da
907 Silva Dias, P.L., Wofsy, S.C., Zhang, X., 2007. Climate 2007: The Physical Science Basis, in:
908 Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., M.Tignor, Miller, H.L.
909 (Eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

910 Diaz, S., Lavorel, S., De Bello, F., Quétier, F., Grigulis, K., Robson, T.M., 2007. Incorporating
911 plant functional diversity effects in ecosystem service assessments. *Proceedings of the*
912 *National Academy of Sciences* 104, 20684-20689.

913 Döll, P., Lehner, B., 2002. Validation of a new global 30-min drainage direction map. *Journal*
914 *of Hydrology* 258, 214–31. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1694(01)00565-0

915 Dong, M., Bryan, B.A., Connor, J.D., Nolan, M., Gao, L., 2015. Land use mapping error
 916 introduces strongly-localised, scale-dependent uncertainty into land use and ecosystem
 917 services modelling. *Ecosystem Services* 15, 63-74.

918 Doré, T., Makowski, D., Malézieux, E., Munier-Jolain, N., Tchamitchian, M., Tittone, P.,
 919 2011. Facing up to the paradigm of ecological intensification in agronomy: Revisiting
 920 methods, concepts and knowledge. *European Journal of Agronomy* 34, 197-210.

921 Dormann, C.F., Purschke, O., Marquez, J.R.G., Lautenbach, S., Schroder, B., García
 922 Márquez, J.R., Schröder, B., 2008. Components of uncertainty in species distribution
 923 analysis: a case study of the Great Grey Shrike. *Ecology* 89, 3371-3386.

924 Duarte, C.M., Sintes, T., Marba, N., 2013. Assessing the CO₂ capture potential of seagrass
 925 restoration projects. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50, 1341-1349.

926 European Environment Agency (EEA), 2012. CORINE Land Cover Data.

927 Egoh, B., Drakou, E.G., Dunbar, M.B., Maes, J., Willems, L., 2012. Indicators for mapping
 928 ecosystem services: a review, JRC Scientific and Policy Reports. European Commission,
 929 Ispra, Italy, p. 113.

930 Eigenbrod, F., Armsworth, P.R., Anderson, B.J., Heinemeyer, A., Gillings, S., Roy, D.B.,
 931 Thomas, C.D., Gaston, K.J., 2010. The impact of proxy-based methods on mapping the
 932 distribution of ecosystem services. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 47, 377-385.

933 Elith, J., Leathwick, J.R., 2009. Species Distribution Models: Ecological Explanation and
 934 Prediction Across Space and Time. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*
 935 40, 677-697.

936 Elith, J., Phillips, S.J., Hastie, T., Dudík, M., Chee, Y.E., Yates, C.J., 2011. A statistical
 937 explanation of MaxEnt for ecologists. *Diversity and Distributions* 17, 43-57.

938 Elkin, C., Gutiérrez, A.G., Leuzinger, S., Manusch, C., Temperli, C., Rasche, L., Bugmann,
 939 H., 2013. A 2 °C warmer world is not safe for ecosystem services in the European Alps.
 940 *Global Change Biology* 19, 1827-1840.

941 Engelhardt, K.A.M., 2006. Relating effect and response traits in submersed aquatic systems.
 942 *Ecological Applications* 16, 1808-1820.

943 Fader, M.M., Rost, S., Müller, C., Bondeau, A., Gerten, D., 2010. Virtual water content of
 944 temperate cereals and maize: Present and potential future patterns. *Journal of Hydrology*
 945 384, 218-231.

946 Fader, M., Von Bloh, W., Shi, S., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., 2015. Modelling Mediterranean
 947 agro-ecosystems by including agricultural trees in the LPJmL model. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 8,
 948 3545–3561. doi:10.5194/gmd-8-3545-2015

949 Fahrig, L., Baudry, J., Brotons, L., Burel, F.G., Crist, T.O., Fuller, R.J., Sirami, C.,
 950 Siriwardena, G.M., Martin, J.-L., 2011. Functional landscape heterogeneity and animal
 951 biodiversity in agricultural landscapes. *Ecology Letters* 14, 101-112.

952 FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2012. Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.2).

953 Feng, X., Fu, B., Yang, X., Lü, Y., 2010. Remote Sensing of Ecosystem Services: An
 954 Opportunity for Spatially Explicit Assessment. *ResearchGate* 20, 522-535.

955 Flynn, D.F.B., Mirotnick, N., Jain, M., Palmer, M.I., Naeem, S., 2011. Functional and
 956 phylogenetic diversity as predictors of biodiversity-ecosystem-function relationships. *Ecology*
 957 92, 1573-1581.

958 Foody, G.M., Atkinson, P.M., 2002. *Front Matter, Uncertainty in Remote Sensing and GIS*.
 959 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. i-xviii.

960 Fortunel, C., Garnier, E., Joffre, R., Kazakou, E., Quested, H., Grigulis, K., Lavorel, S.,
 961 Ansquer, P., Castro, H., Cruz, P., Dolezal, J., Eriksson, O., Freitas, H., Golodets, C., Jouany, C.,
 962 Kigel, J., Kleyer, M., Lehsten, V., Leps, J., Meier, T., Pakeman, R., Papadimitriou, M.,
 963 Papanastasis, V.P., Quétier, F., Robson, M., Sternberg, M., Theau, J.P., Thébault, A., Zarovali, M.
 964 2009. Plant functional traits capture the effects of land use change and climate on litter
 965 decomposability of herbaceous communities in Europe and Israel. *Ecology* 90, 598-611.

966 Fourqurean, J.W., Duarte, C.M., Kennedy, H., Marba, N., Holmer, M., Mateo, M.A.,
 967 Apostolaki, E.T., Kendrick, G.A., Krause-Jensen, D., McGlathery, K.J., Serrano, O., 2012.
 968 Seagrass ecosystems as a globally significant carbon stock. *Nature Geosci* 5, 505-509.

969 Friedlingstein, P., Cox, P., Betts, R., Bopp, L., von Bloh, W., Brovkin, V., Cadule, P., Doney,
 970 S., Eby, M., Fung, I., Govindasamy, B., John, J., Jones, C., Joos, F., Kato, T., Kawamiya, M.,
 971 Knorr, W., Lindsay, K., Matthews, H.D., Raddatz, T., Rayner, P., Reick, C., Roeckner, E.,
 972 Schnitzler, K.G., Schnur, R., Strassmann, K., Weaver, A.J., Yoshikawa, C., Zeng, N., 2006.
 973 Climate-carbon cycle feedback analysis. Results from the C4MIP model intercomparison.
 974 *Journal of Climate* 19, 3337-3353.

975 Froese, R., Pauly, D., *FishBase: A Global Information System on Fishes*.

976 Fuchs, R., Herold, M., Verburg, P.H., Clevers, J.G.P.W., 2013. A high-resolution and
 977 harmonized model approach for reconstructing and analysing historic land changes in
 978 Europe. *Biogeosciences* 10, 1543–1559. doi:10.5194/bg-10-1543-2013

979 Gardarin, A., Garnier, E., Carrère, P., Cruz, P., Andueza, D., Bonis, A., Colace, M.P.,
 980 Dumont, B., Duru, M., Farrugia, A., Grigulis, K., Kernéis, E., Lavorel, S., Louault, F.,
 981 Loucougaray, G., Mesléard, F., Yaverkowsky, N., Kazakou, E., 2014. Plant trait-digestibility
 982 relationships across management and climate gradients in French permanent grasslands.
 983 *Journal of Applied Ecology* 51, 1207-1217.

984 Gasc, J.P., 2004. *Atlas of amphibians and reptiles in Europe*. Societas Europaea
 985 Herpetologica, Paris.

986 Gedney, N., Cox, P.M., Betts, R.A., Boucher, O., Huntingford, C., Stott, P.A., 2006. Detection
 987 of a direct carbon dioxide effect in continental river runoff records. *Nature* 439, 835-838.

988 Grêt-Regamey, A., Bebi, P., Bishop, I.D., Schmid, W.A., 2008. Linking GIS-based models to
 989 value ecosystem services in an Alpine region. *Journal of Environmental Management* 89,
 990 197-208.

991 Grêt-Regamey, A., Brunner, S.H., Altwegg, J., Bebi, P., 2013. Facing uncertainty in
 992 ecosystem services-based resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management*
 993 127, Supplement, S145-S154.

994 Grêt-Regamey, A., Rabe, S.-E., Crespo, R., Lautenbach, S., Ryffel, A., Schlup, B., 2014. On
 995 the importance of non-linear relationships between landscape patterns and the sustainable
 996 provision of ecosystem services. *Landscape Ecology* 29, 201-212.

997 Grêt-Regamey, A., Weibel, B., Bagstad, K.J., Ferrari, M., Geneletti, D., Klug, H., Schirpke,
 998 U., Tappeiner, U., 2014. On the Effects of Scale for Ecosystem Services Mapping. PLoS
 999 ONE 9, e112601.

1000 Grêt-Regamey, A., Weibel, B., Kienast, F., Rabe, S.-E., Zulian, G., 2015. A tiered approach
 1001 for mapping ecosystem services. *Ecosystem Services* 13, 16-27.

1002 Grigulis, K., Lavorel, S., Krainer, U., Legay, N., Baxendale, C., Dumont, M., Kastl, E., Arnoldi,
 1003 C., Bardgett, R., Poly, F., Pommier, T., Schloter, M., Tappeiner, U., Bahn, M., Clément, J.-C.,
 1004 2013. Combined influence of plant and microbial functional traits on ecosystem processes in
 1005 mountain grasslands *Journal of Ecology* 101, 47-57.

1006 Gritti, E.S., Duputié, A., Massol, F., Chuine, I., 2013. Estimating consensus and associated
 1007 uncertainty between inherently different species distribution models. *Methods in Ecology and*
 1008 *Evolution* 4, 442-452.

1009 Gudmundsson, L., Wagener, T., Tallaksen, L.M., Engeland, K., 2012. Evaluation of nine
 1010 large-scale hydrological models with respect to the seasonal runoff climatology in Europe.
 1011 *Water Resources Research* 48, W11504.

1012 Guerry, A.D., Ruckelshaus, M.H., Plummer, M.L., Holland, D., 2012. Modeling benefits from
 1013 nature: using ecosystem services to inform coastal and marine spatial planning. *International*
 1014 *Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 8, 14.

1015 Guisan, A., Thuiller, W., 2005. Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple
 1016 habitat models. *Ecology Letters* 8, 993-1009.

1017 Hagemeyer, W.J.M., Blair, M.J., Turnhout, C., van Bekhuis, J., Bijlsma, R., 1997. EBCC atlas
 1018 of European breeding birds : their distribution and abundance. Poyser, London.

1019 Hansen, M.C., Potapov, P.V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S.A., Tyukavina, A.,
 1020 Thau, D., Stehman, S.V., Goetz, S.J., Loveland, T.R., Kommareddy, A., Egorov, A., Chini, L.,
 1021 Justice, C.O., Townshend, J.R.G., 2013. High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century
 1022 Forest Cover Change. *Science* 342, 850-853.

1023 Harald, K.M.B., 1996. A Simplified Forest Model to Study Species Composition Along
 1024 Climate Gradients. *Ecology* 77, 2055-2074.

1025 Hickler, T., Vohland, K., Feehan, J., Miller, P.A., Smith, B., Costa, L., Giesecke, T., Fronzek,
 1026 S., Carter, T.R., Cramer, W., Kühn, I., Sykes, M.T., 2012. Projecting the future distribution of
 1027 European potential natural vegetation zones with a generalized, tree species-based dynamic
 1028 vegetation model. *Global Ecology and Biogeography, (Global Ecol. Biogeogr.)* (2012) 21,
 1029 50–63 21, 50-63.

1030 Homolová, L., Malenovský, Z., Clevers, J.G.P.W., García-Santos, G., Schaepman, M.E.,
 1031 2013. Review of optical-based remote sensing for plant trait mapping. *Ecological Complexity*
 1032 15, 1-16.

1033 Hou, Y., Burkhard, B., Müller, F., 2013. Uncertainties in landscape analysis and ecosystem
 1034 service assessment. *Journal of Environmental Management* 127, S117-S131.

1035 Huntingford, C., Cox, P.M., Mercado, L.M., Sitch, S., Bellouin, N., Boucher, O., Gedney, N.,
 1036 2011. Highly contrasting effects of different climate forcing agents on terrestrial ecosystem
 1037 services. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*. 369, 2026–2037.

1038 Hurtt, G.C., Chini, L.P., Frolking, S., Betts, R.A., Feddema, J., Fischer, G., Fisk, J.P.,
 1039 Hibbard, K., Houghton, R.A., Janetos, A., Jones, C.D., Kindermann, G., Kinoshita, T., Klein
 1040 Goldewijk, K., Riahi, K., Shevliakova, E., Smith, S., Stehfest, E., Thomson, A., Thornton, P.,
 1041 van Vuuren, D.P., Wang, Y.P., 2011. Harmonization of land-use scenarios for the period
 1042 1500–2100: 600 years of global gridded annual land-use transitions, wood harvest, and
 1043 resulting secondary lands. *Climatic Change* 109, 117-161.
 1044 Hutchison, J., Manica, A., Swetnam, R., Balmford, A., Spalding, M., 2014. Predicting Global
 1045 Patterns in Mangrove Forest Biomass. *Conservation Letters* 7, 233-240.
 1046 Ibanez, S., 2012. Optimizing size thresholds in a plant–pollinator interaction web: towards a
 1047 mechanistic understanding of ecological networks. *Oecologia* 170, 233-242.
 1048 Ibanez, S., Manneville, O., Miquel, C., Taberlet, P., Valentini, A., Aubert, S., Coissac, E.,
 1049 Colace, M.-P., Duparc, Q., Lavorel, S., Moretti, M., 2013. Plant functional traits reveal the
 1050 relative contribution of habitat and food preferences to the diet of four subalpine
 1051 grasshoppers. *Oecologia* 173, 1459-1470.
 1052 Jakeman, A., Letcher, R., Norton, J., 2006. Ten iterative steps in development and
 1053 evaluation of environmental models. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 21, 602-614.
 1054 Jardine, S.L., Siikamaeki, J.V., 2014. A global predictive model of carbon in mangrove soils.
 1055 *Environmental Research Letters* 9, 104013.
 1056 Jones, K.E., Bielby, J., Cardillo, M., Fritz, S.A., O'Dell, J., Orme, C.D.L., Safi, K., Sechrest,
 1057 W., Boakes, E.H., Carbone, C., Connolly, C., Cutts, M.J., Foster, J.K., Grenyer, R., Habib,
 1058 M., Plaster, C.A., Price, S.A., Rigby, E.A., Rist, J., Teacher, A., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P.,
 1059 Gittleman, J.L., Mace, G.M., Purvis, A., Michener, W.K., 2009. PanTHERIA: a species-level
 1060 database of life history, ecology, and geography of extant and recently extinct mammals.
 1061 *Ecology* 90, 2648-2648.
 1062 Jordan, S.J., O'Higgins, T., Dittmar, J.A., 2012. Ecosystem Services of Coastal Habitats and
 1063 Fisheries: Multiscale Ecological and Economic Models in Support of Ecosystem-Based
 1064 Management. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 4, 573-586.
 1065 Jung, V., Albert, C.H., Violle, C., Kunstler, G., Loucougaray, G., Spiegelberger, T., 2014.
 1066 Intraspecific trait variability mediates the response of subalpine grassland communities to
 1067 extreme drought events. *Journal of Ecology* 102, 45-53.
 1068 Kandziora, M., Burkhard, B., Müller, F., 2013. Mapping provisioning ecosystem services at
 1069 the local scale using data of varying spatial and temporal resolution. *Ecosystem Services* 4,
 1070 47-59.
 1071 Kaplan, J.O., Krumhardt, K.M., Zimmermann, N.E., 2012. The effects of land use and climate
 1072 change on the carbon cycle of Europe over the past 500 years. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 18, 902–
 1073 914. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02580.x
 1074 Kattge, J., Díaz, S., Lavorel, S., Prentice, I.C., Leadley, P., BÖNisch, G., Garnier, E.,
 1075 Westoby, M., Reich, P.B., Wright, I.J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Violle, C., Harrison, S.P., Van
 1076 Bodegom, P.M., Reichstein, M., Enquist, B.J., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Ackerly, D.D., Anand,
 1077 M., Atkin, O., Bahn, M., Baker, T.R., Baldocchi, D., Bekker, R., Blanco, C.C., Blonder, B.,
 1078 Bond, W.J., Bradstock, R., Bunker, D.E., Casanoves, F., Cavender-Bares, J., Chambers,
 1079 J.Q., Chapin Iii, F.S., Chave, J., Coomes, D., Cornwell, W.K., Craine, J.M., Dobrin, B.H.,
 1080 Duarte, L., Durka, W., Elser, J., Esser, G., Estiarte, M., Fagan, W.F., Fang, J., Fernández-

1081 MÉNdez, F., Fidelis, A., Finegan, B., Flores, O., Ford, H., Frank, D., Freschet, G.T., Fyllas,
 1082 N.M., Gallagher, R.V., Green, W.A., Gutierrez, A.G., Hickler, T., Higgins, S.I., Hodgson, J.G.,
 1083 Jalili, A., Jansen, S., Joly, C.A., Kerkhoff, A.J., Kirkup, D., Kitajima, K., Kleyer, M., Klotz, S.,
 1084 Knops, J.M.H., Kramer, K., KÜHn, I., Kurokawa, H., Laughlin, D., Lee, T.D., Leishman, M.,
 1085 Lens, F., Lenz, T., Lewis, S.L., Lloyd, J., Llusà, J., Louault, F., Ma, S., Mahecha, M.D.,
 1086 Manning, P., Massad, T., Medlyn, B.E., Messier, J., Moles, A.T., MÜLLer, S.C., Nadrowski,
 1087 K., Naeem, S., Niinemets, Ü., NÖLlert, S., NÜSke, A., Ogaya, R., Oleksyn, J., Onipchenko,
 1088 V.G., Onoda, Y., OrdoÑEz, J., Overbeck, G., Ozinga, W.A., PatiÑO, S., Paula, S., Pausas,
 1089 J.G., PeÑUelas, J., Phillips, O.L., Pillar, V., Poorter, H., Poorter, L., Poschlod, P., Prinzing,
 1090 A., Proulx, R., Rammig, A., Reinsch, S., Reu, B., Sack, L., Salgado-Negret, B., Sardans, J.,
 1091 Shiodera, S., Shipley, B., Siefert, A., Sosinski, E., Soussana, J.F., Swaine, E., Swenson, N.,
 1092 Thompson, K., Thornton, P., Waldram, M., Weiher, E., White, M., White, S., Wright, S.J.,
 1093 Yguel, B., Zaehle, S., Zanne, A.E., Wirth, C., 2011. TRY – a global database of plant traits.
 1094 *Global Change Biology* 17, 2905-2935.
 1095 Kazakou, E., Violle, C., Roumet, C., Navas, M.-L., Vile, D., Kattge, J., Garnier, E., 2013. Are
 1096 trait-based species rankings consistent across data sets and spatial scales? *Journal of*
 1097 *Vegetation Science* 25, 235-247.
 1098 Keeling, C., Piper, S.C., Bollenbacher, A.F., Walker, J.S., 2009. Atmospheric CO₂ records
 1099 from sites in the sio air sampling network. *In Trends: A Compendium of Data on Global*
 1100 *Change. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S.*
 1101 *Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., U.S.A. doi: 10.3334/CDIAC/atg.035* .
 1102 Kelley, D.I., Prentice, I.C., Harrison, S.P., Wang, H., Simard, M., Fisher, J.B., Willis, K.O.,
 1103 2013. A comprehensive benchmarking system for evaluating global vegetation models.
 1104 *Biogeosciences* 10, 3313-3340.
 1105 Kienast, F., Bolliger, J., Potschin, M., Groot, R.S.d., Verburg, P.H., Heller, I., Wascher, D.,
 1106 Haines-Young, R., 2009. Assessing Landscape Functions with Broad-Scale Environmental
 1107 Data: Insights Gained from a Prototype Development for Europe. *Environmental*
 1108 *Management* 44, 1099–1120.
 1109 Klein Goldewijk, 2005. Three centuries of global population growth: A spatial referenced
 1110 population density database for 1700 – 2000 *Population and Environment* 26, 343-367.
 1111 Klein Goldewijk, K., Beusen, A., Janssen, P., 2010. Long-term dynamic modeling of global
 1112 population and built-up area in a spatially explicit way: HYDE 3.1. *The Holocene* 20, 565–
 1113 573. doi:10.1177/0959683609356587
 1114 Klein Goldewijk, K., Beusen, A., Van Dreht, G., De Vos, M., 2011. The HYDE 3.1 spatially
 1115 explicit database of human-induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years.
 1116 *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* 20, 73–86. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00587.x
 1117 Kremen, C., Williams, N.E., Aizen, M.A., Gemmill-Herren, B., LeBuhn, G., Minckley, R.,
 1118 Packer, L., Potts, S.G., Roulston, T., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Vasquez, D.P., Winfree, R.,
 1119 Adams, L., Crone, E.E., Greenleaf, S.S., Keitt, T.H., Klein, A.-M., Regetz, J., Rickletts, T.H.,
 1120 2007. Pollination and other ecosystem services produced by mobile organisms: a conceptual
 1121 framework for the effects of land-use change. *Ecology Letters* 10, 299-314.
 1122 Krinner, G., Viovy, N., Noblet-Ducoudré, N.d., Ogée, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais,
 1123 P., Sitch, S., Prentice, I.C., 2005. A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the

1124 coupled atmosphere-biosphere system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 19, GB1015,
1125 doi:10.1029/2003GB002199.

1126 Krysanova V., Hattermann F., Wechsung F., 2005. Development of the ecohydrological
1127 model SWIM for regional impact studies and vulnerability assessment. *Hydrological*
1128 *Processes* 19, 763–783, doi: 10.1002/hyp.5619

1129 Kuenzer, C., Ottinger, M., Wegmann, M., Guo, H., Wang, C., Zhang, J., Dech, S., Wikelski,
1130 M., 2014. Earth observation satellite sensors for biodiversity monitoring: potentials and
1131 bottlenecks. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 35, 6599-6647.

1132 Laliberté, E., Shipley, B., 2011. Measuring functional diversity (FD) from multiple traits, and
1133 other tools for functional ecology, R package.

1134 Laliberté, E., Tylianakis, J.M., 2012. Cascading effects of long-term land-use changes on
1135 plant traits and ecosystem functioning. *Ecology* 93, 145-155.

1136 Lamarque, J.F., Bond, T.C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D., Liousse, C.,
1137 Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M.G., Shindell, D., Smith, S.J., Stehfest, E., Van Aardenne,
1138 J., Cooper, O.R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J.R., Naik, V., Riahi, K., Van
1139 Vuuren, D.P., 2010. Historical (1850-2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass burning
1140 emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: Methodology and application. *Atmos. Chem.*
1141 *Phys.* 10, 7017–7039. doi:10.5194/acp-10-7017-2010

1142 Lamarque, J.-F., Kyle, G.P., Meinshausen, M., Riahi, K., Smith, S.J., van Vuuren, D.P.,
1143 Conley, A.J., Vitt, F., 2011. Global and regional evolution of short-lived radiatively-active
1144 gases and aerosols in the Representative Concentration Pathways. *Clim. Change* 109, 191–
1145 212. doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0155-0

1146 Lamarque, P., Lavorel, S., Mouchet, M., Quétier, F., 2014. Plant trait-based models identify
1147 direct and indirect effects of climate change on bundles of grassland ecosystem services.
1148 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 23, 13751-13756.

1149 Laniak, G.F., Olchin, G., Goodall, J., Voinov, A., Hill, M., Glynn, P., Whelan, G., Geller, G.,
1150 Quinn, N., Blind, M., Peckham, S., Reaney, S., Gaber, N., Kennedy, R., Hughes, A., 2013.
1151 Integrated environmental modeling: A vision and roadmap for the future. *Environmental*
1152 *Modelling & Software* 39, 3-23.

1153 Lasseur, R., Vannier, C., Lefèbvre, J., Longaretti, P.-Y., Lavorel, S., submitted. Incorporating
1154 interannual variability in agricultural practices for modelling the crop production ecosystem
1155 service. *Ecological Indicators*.

1156 Lautenbach, S., Kugel, C., Lausch, A., Seppelt, R., 2011. Analysis of historic changes in
1157 regional ecosystem service provisioning using land use data. *Ecological Indicators* 11, 676-
1158 687.

1159 Lautenbach, S., Maes, J., Kattwinkel, M., Seppelt, R., Strauch, M., Scholz, M., Schulz-
1160 Zunkel, C., Volk, M., Weinert, J., Dormann, C.F., 2012. Mapping water quality-related
1161 ecosystem services: concepts and applications for nitrogen retention and pesticide risk
1162 reduction. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management*
1163 8, 35-49.

1164 Lautenbach, S., Mupepele, A.-C., Dormann, C.F., Lee, H., Schmidt, S., Scholte, S.S.K.,
 1165 Seppelt, R., Teeffelen, A.J.A.v., Verhagen, W., Volk, M., 2015. Blind spots in ecosystem
 1166 services research and implementation. *BioRxiv*.
 1167 Lautenbach, S., Seppelt, R., Liebscher, J., Dormann, C.F., 2012. Spatial and Temporal
 1168 Trends of Global Pollination Benefit. *PLoS ONE* 7, e35954.
 1169 Lautenbach, S., Volk, M., Strauch, M., Whittaker, G., Seppelt, R., 2013. Optimization-based
 1170 trade-off analysis of biodiesel crop production for managing an agricultural catchment.
 1171 *Environmental Modelling & Software* 48, 98-112.
 1172 Lavorel, S., 2013. Plant functional effects on ecosystem services. *Journal of Ecology* 101, 4-
 1173 8.
 1174 Lavorel, S., Diaz, S., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Garnier, E., Harrison, S.P., McIntyre, S., Pausas,
 1175 J., Pérez-Harguindeguy, N., Roumet, C., Urcelay, C., 2007. Plant functional types : are we
 1176 getting any closer to the Holy Grail ?, in: Canadell, J., Pitelka, L.F., Pataki, D. (Eds.),
 1177 *Terrestrial Ecosystems in a Changing World*. Springer-Verlag, pp. 171-186.
 1178 Lavorel, S., Garnier, E., 2002. Predicting the effects of environmental changes on plant
 1179 community composition and ecosystem functioning: revisiting the Holy Grail. *Functional*
 1180 *Ecology* 16, 545-556.
 1181 Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., 2012. How fundamental plant functional trait relationships scale-up
 1182 to trade-offs and synergies in ecosystem services. *Journal of Ecology* 100, 128-140.
 1183 Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., Lamarque, P., Colace, M.-P., Garden, D., Girel, J., Douzet, R.,
 1184 Pellet, G., 2011. Using plant functional traits to understand the landscape-scale distribution
 1185 of multiple ecosystem services. *Journal of Ecology* 99, 135-147.
 1186 Lavorel, S., Storkey, J., Bardgett, R.D., Bello, F.d., Berg, M.P., Roux, X.L., Moretti, M.,
 1187 Mulder, C., Díaz, S., Harrington, R., 2013. Linking functional traits of plants and other trophic
 1188 levels for the quantification of ecosystem services. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 24, 942-
 1189 948.
 1190 Lavorel, S., Zupan, L., Thuiller, W., 2013. CONNECT Deliverable 1.1 Meta-database with
 1191 documentation for the synthesis of relationships between taxonomic, phylogenetic and
 1192 functional diversity.
 1193 Legay, N., Baxendale, C., Krainer, U., Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., Dumont, M., Kastl, E., Arnoldi,
 1194 C., Bardgett, R., Poly, F., Pommier, T., Schloter, M., Tappeiner, U., Bahn, M., Clément, J.-C.,
 1195 2014. The relative importance of above-ground and below-ground plant traits as drivers of
 1196 microbial properties in grasslands. *Annals of Botany* 114, 1011-1021.
 1197 Lienin, P., Kleyer, M., 2012. Plant trait responses to the environment and effects on multiple
 1198 ecosystem properties. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 13, 301-311.
 1199 Lindeskog, M., Arneth, A., Bondeau, A., Waha, K., Seaquist, J., Olin, S., Smith, B., 2013.
 1200 Implications of accounting for land use in simulations of ecosystem carbon cycling in Africa.
 1201 *Earth System Dynamics* 4, 385-407.
 1202 Liqueste, C., Zulian, G., Delgado, I., Stips, A., Maes, J., 2013. Assessment of coastal
 1203 protection as an ecosystem service in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 30, 205-217.
 1204 Litchman, E., Klausmeier, C.A., 2008. Trait-based community ecology of phytoplankton.
 1205 *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 39, 615-639.

1206 Lloret, F., Pausas, J.G., Vilà, M., 2003. Mediterranean vegetation response to different fire
 1207 regimes in Garraf Natural Park (Catalonia, Spain): field observations and modelling
 1208 predictions. *Plant Ecology* 167, 223-236.
 1209 Logsdon, R.a., Chaubey, I., 2013. A quantitative approach to evaluating ecosystem services.
 1210 *Ecological Modelling* 257, 57-65.
 1211 Luck, G.W., Harrington, R., Harrison, P.A., Kremen, C., Berry, P.M., Bugter, R., Dawson,
 1212 T.P., de Bello, F., Díaz, S., Feld, C.K., Haslett, J., Hering, D., Kontogianni, A., Lavorel, S.,
 1213 Rounsevell, M., Samways, M.J., Sandin, L., Settele, J., Sykes, M.T., van den Hove, S.,
 1214 Vandewalle, M., Zobel, M., 2009. Quantifying the contribution of organisms to the provision
 1215 of ecosystem services. *Bioscience* 59, 223-236.
 1216 Luck, G.W., Lavorel, S., McIntyre, S., Lumb, K., 2012. Extending trait-based frameworks to
 1217 vertebrates and improving their application to the study of ecosystem services. *Journal of*
 1218 *Animal Ecology* 81, 1065-1076.
 1219 Maes, J., Egoh, B., Willemsen, L., Liqueste, C., Vihervaara, P., SchÅgner, J.P., Grizzetti, B.,
 1220 Drakou, E.G., Notte, A.L., Zulian, G., Bouraoui, F., Luisa Paracchini, M., Braat, L., Bidoglio,
 1221 G., 2012. Mapping ecosystem services for policy support and decision making in the
 1222 European Union. *Ecosystem Services* 1, 31-39.
 1223 Maes, J., Liqueste, C., Teller, A., Erhard, M., Paracchini, M.L., Barredo, J.I., Grizzetti, B.,
 1224 Cardoso, A., Somma, F., Petersen, J.-E., Meiner, A., Gelabert, E.R., Zal, N., Kristensen, P.,
 1225 Bastrup-Birk, A., Biala, K., Piroddi, C., Egoh, B., Degeorges, P., Fiorina, C., Santos-Martín,
 1226 F., Naruševičius, V., Verboven, J., Pereira, H.M., Bengtsson, J., Gocheva, K., Marta-
 1227 Pedroso, C., Snäll, T., Estreguil, C., San-Miguel-Ayanz, J., Pérez-Soba, M., Grêt-Regamey,
 1228 A., Lillebø, A.I., Malak, D.A., Condé, S., Moen, J., Czúcz, B., Drakou, E.G., Zulian, G.,
 1229 Laval, C., 2016. An indicator framework for assessing ecosystem services in support of the
 1230 EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. *Ecosystem Services* 17, 14-23.
 1231 Maes, J., Paracchini, M.L., Zulian, G., 2011. A European assessment of the provision of
 1232 ecosystem services. Towards an atlas of ecosystem services. JRC, Ispra, Italy, p. 88.
 1233 Maes, J., Teller, A., Erhard, M., al., e., 2014. Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and
 1234 their Services: Indicators for ecosystem assessments under Action 5 of the EU Biodiversity
 1235 Strategy to 2020, in: Environment, E.C.D. (Ed.).
 1236 Maiorano, L., Amori, G., Capula, M., Falcucci, A., Masi, M., Montemaggiori, A., Pottier, J.,
 1237 Psomas, A., Rondinini, C., Russo, D., 2013. Threats from Climate Change to Terrestrial
 1238 Vertebrate Hotspots in Europe. *PloS one* 8, e74989.
 1239 Martinez-Harms, M.J., Balvanera, P., 2012. Methods for mapping ecosystem service supply:
 1240 a review. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management*
 1241 8, 17-25.
 1242 Martinez-Harms, M.J., Bryan, B.A., Balvanera, P., Law, E.A., Rhodes, J.R., Possingham,
 1243 H.P., Wilson, K.A., 2015. Making decisions for managing ecosystem services. *Biological*
 1244 *Conservation* 184, 229-238.
 1245 McLeod, E., Chmura, G.L., Bouillon, S., Salm, R., Bjork, M., Duarte, C.M., Lovelock, C.E.,
 1246 Schlesinger, W.H., Silliman, B.R., 2011. A blueprint for blue carbon: toward an improved
 1247 understanding of the role of vegetated coastal habitats in sequestering CO₂. *Frontiers in*
 1248 *Ecology and the Environment* 9, 552-560.

1249 Mellbrand, K., Lavery, P.S., Hyndes, G., Hambäck, P.A., 2011. Linking Land and Sea:
1250 Different Pathways for Marine Subsidies. *Ecosystems* 14, 732-744.

1251 Metzger, M.J., Schroter, D., Leemans, R., Cramer, W., 2008. A spatially explicit and
1252 quantitative vulnerability assessment of ecosystem service change in Europe. *Regional*
1253 *Environmental Change* 8, 91-107.

1254 Midgley, G.F., Davies, I.D., Albert, C.H., Altwegg, R., Hannah, L., Hughes, G.O., O'Halloran,
1255 L.R., Seo, C., Thorne, J.H., Thuiller, W., 2010. BioMove - an integrated platform simulating
1256 the dynamic response of species to environmental change. *Ecography* 33, 1-5.

1257 Mitchell, M.G.E., Suarez-Castro, A.F., Martinez-Harms, M., Maron, M., McAlpine, C., Gaston,
1258 K.J., Johansen, K., Rhodes, J.R., 2015. Reframing landscape fragmentation's effects on
1259 ecosystem services. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30, 190-198.

1260 Mitchell, T.D., Jones, P.D., 2005. An improved method of constructing a database of monthly
1261 climate observations and associated high-resolution grids. *Int. J. Climatol.* 25, 693–712.
1262 doi:10.1002/joc.1181

1263 Mitchell-Jones, A.J., Amori, G., Bogdanowicz, W., Krystufek, B., Reijnders, P.J.H.,
1264 Spitzenberger, F., Stubbe, M., Thissen, J.B.M., Vohralik, V., Zima, J., 1999. The Atlas of
1265 European Mammals. 250p.

1266 Mokany, K., Ash, J., Roxburgh, S., 2008. Functional identity is more important than diversity
1267 in influencing ecosystem processes in a temperate native grassland. *Journal of Ecology* 96,
1268 884-893.

1269 Moore, G.E., Gilmer, B.F., Schill, S.R., 2015. Distribution of Mangrove Habitats of Grenada
1270 and the Grenadines. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 155-162.

1271 Moretti, M., Bello, F.d., Ibanez, S., Fontana, S., Pezzatti, G.B., Dziock, F., Rixen, C., Lavorel,
1272 S., 2013. Linking traits between plants and invertebrate herbivores to track functional effects
1273 of environmental changes. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 24, 949-962.

1274 Morin, X., Thuiller, W., 2009. Comparing niche- and process-based models to reduce
1275 prediction uncertainty in species range shifts under climate change. *Ecology* 90, 1301-1313.

1276 Mouchet, M.A., Villéger, S., Mason, N.W.H., Mouillot, D., 2010. Functional diversity
1277 measures: an overview of their redundancy and their ability to discriminate community
1278 assembly rules. *Functional Ecology* 24, 867-876.

1279 Mouillot, D., Villéger, S., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Mason, N.W.H., 2011. Functional Structure
1280 of Biological Communities Predicts Ecosystem Multifunctionality. *PLoS One* 6, e17476.

1281 Mulder, C., Ahrestani, F.S., Bahn, M., Bohan, D.A., Bonkowski, M., Griffithsk, B.S.,
1282 Guicharnaud, R.A., Kattge, J., Krogh, P.H., Lavorel, S., Lewis, O.T., Mancinelli, G., Naeem,
1283 S., Peñuelas, J., Poorter, H., Reich, P.B., Rossi, L., Rusch, G.M., Sardans, J., Wright, I.J.,
1284 2013. Connecting the Green and Brown Worlds: Allometric and Stoichiometric Predictability
1285 of Above- and Below-Ground Networks. *Advances in Ecological Research* 49, 69-175.

1286 Müller, C., Waha, K., Bondeau, A., Heinke, J., 2014. Hotspots of climate change impacts in
1287 sub-Saharan Africa and implications for adaptation and development. *Global Change Biology*
1288 20, 2505-2517.

1289 Nagendra, H., Reyers, B., Lavorel, S., 2013. Impacts of land change on biodiversity: making
 1290 the link to ecosystem services. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 5, 1-6.
 1291 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.1005.1010>.

1292 Naidoo, R., Balmford, A., Costanza, R., Fisher, B., Green, R.E., Lehner, B., Malcolm, T.R.,
 1293 Ricketts, T.H., 2008. Global mapping of ecosystem services and conservation priorities.
 1294 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 105,
 1295 9495-9500.

1296 Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2005. Soil and Water Assessment
 1297 Tool - Documentation, Version 2005.

1298 O'Connor, B., Secades, C., Penner, J., Sonnenschein, R., Skidmore, A., Burgess, N.D.,
 1299 Hutton, J.M., 2015. Earth observation as a tool for tracking progress towards the Aichi
 1300 Biodiversity Targets. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation* 1, 19-28.

1301 Ondiviela, B., Losada, I.J., Lara, J.L., Maza, M., Galván, C., Bouma, T.J., van Belzen, J.,
 1302 2014. The role of seagrasses in coastal protection in a changing climate. *Coastal*
 1303 *Engineering* 87, 158-168.

1304 Ooba, M., Fujita, T., Mizuochi, M., Murakami, S., Wang, Q., Kohata, K., 2012.
 1305 Biogeochemical model (BGC-ES) and its basin-level application for evaluating ecosystem
 1306 services under forest management practices. *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 13, 274-287.

1307 Orth, R., Staudinger, M., Seneviratne, S.I., Seibert, J., Zappa, M., 2015. Does model
 1308 performance improve with complexity? A case study with three hydrological models. *Journal*
 1309 *of Hydrology* 523, 147-159.

1310 Outeiro, L., Häussermann, V., Viddi, F., Huckle-Gaete, R., Försterra, G., Oyarzo, H., Kosiel,
 1311 K., Villasante, S., 2015. Using ecosystem services mapping for marine spatial planning in
 1312 southern Chile under scenario assessment. *Ecosystem Services* 16, 341-353.

1313 Pakeman, R.J., Stockan, J., 2013. Using plant functional traits as a link between land use
 1314 and bee foraging abundance. *Acta Oecologica* 50, 32-39.

1315 Pearman, P.B., Lavergne, S., Roquet, C., Wüest, R., Zimmermann, N.E., Thuiller, W., 2014.
 1316 Phylogenetic patterns of climatic, habitat and trophic niches in a European avian
 1317 assemblage. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 23, 414-424.

1318 Perrin, C., Michel, C., Andréassian, V., 2001. Does a large number of parameters enhance
 1319 model performance? Comparative assessment of common catchment model structures on
 1320 429 catchments. *Journal of Hydrology* 242, 275-301.

1321 Pettorelli, N., Laurance, W.F., O'Brien, T.G., Wegmann, M., Nagendra, H., Turner, W., 2014.
 1322 Satellite remote sensing for applied ecologists: opportunities and challenges. *Journal of*
 1323 *Applied Ecology* 51, 839-848.

1324 Plant, R., Ryan, P., 2013. Ecosystem services as a practicable concept for natural resource
 1325 management: some lessons from Australia. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science,*
 1326 *Ecosystem Services & Management* 9, 44-53.

1327 Potter, C.S., Randerson, J.T., Field, C.B., Matson, P.A., Vitousek, P.M., Mooney, H.A.,
 1328 Klooster, S.A., 1993. Terrestrial ecosystem production: A process model based on global
 1329 satellite and surface data. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 7, 811-841.

1330 Prentice, I., Cowling, S., 2013. Encyclopedia of Biodiversity, Volume 2, 2nd ed, in: Levin,
1331 S.A. (Ed.). Waltham, MA, Academic Press, pp. 670-689.

1332 Prentice, I.C., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., Harrison, S., Hickler, T., Lucht, W., Sitch, S., Smith,
1333 B., Sykes, M., 2007. Dynamic Global Vegetation Modeling: Quantifying Terrestrial
1334 Ecosystem Responses to Large-Scale Environmental Change, in: Canadell, J.G., Pataki,
1335 D.E., Pitelka, L.F. (Eds.). Springer Verlag, Berlin, pp. 175-192.

1336 Purtauf, T., Roschewitz, I., Dauber, J., Thies, C., Tschardtke, T., Wolters, V., 2005.
1337 Landscape context of organic and conventional farms: Influences on carabid beetle diversity.
1338 Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 108, 165-174.

1339 Quétier, F., Thébault, A., Lavorel, S., 2007. Linking vegetation and ecosystem response to
1340 complex past and present land use changes using plant traits and a multiple stable state
1341 framework. Ecological Monographs 77, 33-52.

1342 Ramankutty, N., Foley, J.A., 1999. Estimating historical changes in global land cover:
1343 Croplands from 1700 to 1992. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 13, 997-1027.

1344 Randerson, J.T., Hoffman, F.M., Thornton, P.E., Mahowald, N.M., Lindsay, K., Lee, Y.-H.,
1345 Nevison, C.D., Doney, S.C., Bonan, G., Stöckli, R., Covey, C., Running, S.W., Fung, I.Y.,
1346 2009. Systematic assessment of terrestrial biogeochemistry in coupled climate-carbon
1347 models. Global Change Biology 15, 2462-2484.

1348 Reu, B., Proulx, R., Bohn, K., Dyke, J.G., Kleidon, A., Pavlick, R., Schmittlein, S., 2011. The
1349 role of climate and plant functional trade-offs in shaping global biome and biodiversity
1350 patterns. Global Ecology and Biogeography 20, 570-581.

1351 Reyers, B., Biggs, R., Cumming, G.S., Elmqvist, T., Hejnowicz, A.P., Polasky, S., 2013.
1352 Getting the measure of ecosystem services: a social-ecological approach. Frontiers in
1353 Ecology and the Environment 11, 268-273.

1354 Ricketts, T.H., Regetz, J., Steffan, I., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen, C., Bogdanski, A.,
1355 Gemmill-Herren, B., Greenleaf, S.S., Klein, A.M., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L.A., Ochieng,
1356 A., Viana, B.F., 2008. Landscape effects on crop pollination services: are there general
1357 patterns? Ecology Letters 11, 499-515.

1358 Rudolf B, Becker A, Schneider U, Meyer-Christoffer A, Ziese M. 2010. The new "GPCC Full
1359 Data Reanalysis Version 5" providing high-quality gridded monthly precipitation data for the
1360 global land- surface is public available since December 2010. GPCC Status Report
1361 December 2010. Available at <http://gpcc.dwd.de>.

1362 Sakschewski, B., von Bloh, W., Boit, A., Rammig, A., Kattge, J., Poorter, L., Peñuelas, J.,
1363 Thonicke, K., 2015. Leaf and stem economics spectra drive diversity of functional plant traits
1364 in a dynamic global vegetation model. Global Change Biology 21, 2711-2725.

1365 Salmon-Monviola J., Durand P., Ferchaud F., Oehler F., Sorel L., 2012. Modelling spatial
1366 dynamics of cropping systems to assess agricultural practices at the catchment scale.
1367 Computers and Electronics in Agriculture 81, 1-13. doi:10.1016/j.compag.2011.10.020

1368 Salmon, S., Ponge, J.F., Gachet, S., Deharveng, L., Lefebvre, N., Delabrosse, F., 2014.
1369 Linking species, traits and habitat characteristics of Collembola at European scale. Soil
1370 Biology and Biochemistry 75, 73-85.

1371 Scheiter, S., Higgins, S.I., 2009. Impacts of climate change on the vegetation of Africa: an
 1372 adaptive dynamic vegetation modelling approach (aDGVM). *Global Change Biology* 15,
 1373 2224-2246.

1374 Schirpke, U., Leitinger, G., Tasser, E., Schermer, M., Steinbacher, M., Tappeiner, U., 2013.
 1375 Multiple ecosystem services of a changing Alpine landscape: past, present and future.
 1376 *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 9, 123-
 1377 135.

1378 Schmidtlein, S., Feilhauer, H., Bruehlheide, H., 2012. Mapping plant strategy types using
 1379 remote sensing. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 23, 395-405.

1380 Schulp, C.J.E., Burkhard, B., Maes, J., Van Vliet, J., Verburg, P.H., 2014. Uncertainties in
 1381 Ecosystem Service Maps: A Comparison on the European Scale. *PLoS ONE* 9, e109643.

1382 Schulp, C.J.E., Lautenbach, S., Verburg, P.H., 2014. Quantifying and mapping ecosystem
 1383 services: Demand and supply of pollination in the European Union. *Ecological Indicators* 36,
 1384 131-141.

1385 Schulp, C.J.E., Nabuurs, G.-J., Verburg, P.H., 2008. Future carbon sequestration in
 1386 Europe—Effects of land use change. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 127, 251-264.

1387 Schulp, C.J.E., Thuiller, W., Verburg, P.H., 2014. Wild food in Europe: a synthesis of
 1388 knowledge and data of terrestrial wild food as an ecosystem service. *Ecological Economics*
 1389 105, 292-305.

1390 Seppelt, R., Dormann, C.F., Eppink, F.V., Lautenbach, S., Schmidt, S., 2011. A quantitative
 1391 review of ecosystem service studies: approaches, shortcomings and the road ahead. *Journal*
 1392 *of Applied Ecology* 48, 630-636.

1393 Shapiro, A.C., Trettin, C.C., Kuechly, H., Alavinapanah, S., Bandeira, S., 2015. The
 1394 Mangroves of the Zambezi Delta: Increase in Extent Observed via Satellite from 1994 to
 1395 2013. *Remote Sensing* 7, 16504-16518.

1396 Sibyll, S., Ursula, H., Sebastian, O., Dieter, G., Jens, H., Wolfgang, L., 2013. Contribution of
 1397 permafrost soils to the global carbon budget. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 014026.

1398 Sitch, S., Friedlingstein, P., Gruber, N., Jones, S.D., Murray-Tortarolo, G., Ahlström, A.,
 1399 Doney, S.C., Graven, H., Heinze, C., Huntingford, C., Levis, S., Levy, P.E., Lomas, M.,
 1400 Poulter, B., Viovy, N., Zaehle, S., Zeng, N., Arneth, A., Bonan, G., Bopp, L., Canadell, J.G.,
 1401 Chevallier, F., Ciais, P., Ellis, R., Gloor, M., Peylin, P., Piao, S., Le Quéré, C., Smith, B., Zhu,
 1402 Z., Myneni, R., 2013. Trends and drivers of regional sources and sinks of carbon dioxide
 1403 over the past two decades. *Biogeosciences Discussions* 10, 20113-20177.

1404 Sitch, S., Smith, B., Prentice, I.C., Arneth, A., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., Kaplan, J.O., Levis,
 1405 S., Lucht, W., Sykes, M.T., Thonicke, K., Venevsky, S., 2003. Evaluation of ecosystem
 1406 dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global
 1407 vegetation model. *Global Change Biology* 9, 161-185.

1408 Smith, B., Prentice, I.C., Sykes, M.T., 2001. Representation of vegetation dynamics in the
 1409 modelling of terrestrial ecosystems: comparing two contrasting approaches within European
 1410 climate space. *Global Ecology & Biogeography* (2001) 10, 621– 637 10, 621-637.

1411 Soussana, J.-F., Fereres, E., Long, S.P., Mohren, F.G.M.J., Pandya-Lorch, R., Peltonen-
 1412 Sainio, P., Porter, J.R., Rosswall, T., von Braun, J., 2012. A European science plan to

1413 sustainably increase food security under climate change. *Global Change Biology* 18, 3269-
 1414 3271.

1415 Stürck, J., Poortinga, A., Verburg, P.H., 2014. Mapping ecosystem services: The supply and
 1416 demand of flood regulation services in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 38, 198-211.

1417 Suding, K.N., Lavorel, S., Chapin III, F.S., Diaz, S., Garnier, E., Goldberg, D., Hooper, D.U.,
 1418 Jackson, S.T., Navas, M.L., 2008. Scaling environmental change from traits to communities
 1419 to ecosystems: the challenge of intermediate-level complexity. *Global Change Biology* 14,
 1420 1125-1140.

1421 Sunny, L.J., Juha, V.S., 2014. A global predictive model of carbon in mangrove soils.
 1422 *Environmental Research Letters* 9, 104013.

1423 Nicole K. M. Vieira, N. LeRoy Poff, Daren M. Carlisle, Stephen R. Moulton II, Marci L. Koski,
 1424 and Boris C. Kondratief, 2006, A Database of Lotic Invertebrate Traits for North America.
 1425 U.S. Geological Survey Data Series 187.

1426 Taylor, KE, Stouffer, RJ, Meehl, GA., 2012. An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment
 1427 Design. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 93, 485–98. doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-
 1428 11-00094.1

1429 Temperli, C., Bugmann, H., Elkin, C., 2012. Adaptive management for competing forest
 1430 goods and services under climate change. *Ecological Applications* 22, 2065-2077.

1431 Thuiller, W., Lafourcade, B., Engler, R., Araújo, M.B., 2009. BIOMOD – a platform for
 1432 ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *Ecography* 32, 369-373.

1433 Thuiller, W., Lavergne, S., Roquet, C., Boulangeat, I., Lafourcade, B., Araujo, M.B., 2011.
 1434 Consequences of climate change on the tree of life in Europe. *Nature* 470, 531-534.

1435 Townsend, M., Thrush, S.F., Lohrer, A.M., Hewitt, J.E., Lundquist, C.J., Carbines, M.,
 1436 Felsing, M., 2014. Overcoming the challenges of data scarcity in mapping marine ecosystem
 1437 service potential. *Ecosystem Services* 8, 44-55.

1438 Tucker, G., Allen, B., Conway, M., Dickie, I., Hart, K., Rayment, M., Schulp, C.J.E., van
 1439 Teeffelen, A.J.A., 2014. Policy Options for an EU No Net Loss Initiative, Report to the
 1440 European Commission. Institute for European Environmental Policy, London, pp. 1-319.

1441 Turner, D.P., Ollinger, S.V., Kimball, J.S., 2004. Integrating Remote Sensing and Ecosystem
 1442 Process Models for Landscape- to Regional-Scale Analysis of the Carbon Cycle. *BioScience*
 1443 54, 573-584.

1444 van Berkel, D.B., Verburg, P.H., 2011. Sensitising rural policy: Assessing spatial variation in
 1445 rural development options for Europe. *Land Use Policy* 28, 447-459.

1446 van der Zanden, E.H., Verburg, P.H., Múcher, C.A., 2013. Modelling the spatial distribution of
 1447 linear landscape elements in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 27, 125-136.

1448 van Zanten, B.T., van Beukering, P.J.H., Wagtendonk, A.J., 2014. Coastal protection by
 1449 coral reefs: A framework for spatial assessment and economic valuation. *Ocean & Coastal*
 1450 *Management* 96, 94-103.

1451 Verhagen, W., Van Teeffelen, A.J.A., Baggio Compagnucci, A., Poggio, L., Gimona, A.,
 1452 Verburg, P.H., 2016. Effects of landscape configuration on mapping ecosystem service
 1453 capacity: a review of evidence and a case study in Scotland. *Landscape Ecology*, 1-23.

1454 Verheijen, L.M., Brovkin, V., Aerts, R., Bönisch, G., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Kattge, J., Reich,
 1455 P.B., Wright, I.J., van Bodegom, P.M., 2013. Impacts of trait variation through observed trait–
 1456 climate relationships on performance of an Earth system model: a conceptual analysis.
 1457 *Biogeosciences* 10, 5497-5515.

1458 Viglizzo, E.F., Jobbágy, E.G., Ricard, M.F., Paruelo, J.M., 2016. Partition of some key
 1459 regulating services in terrestrial ecosystems: Meta-analysis and review. *Science of The Total*
 1460 *Environment* 562, 47-60.

1461 Vihervaara, P., Kumpula, T., Tanskanen, A., Burkhard, B., 2010. Ecosystem services-A tool
 1462 for sustainable management of human-environment systems. Case study Finnish Forest
 1463 Lapland. *Ecological Complexity* 7, 410-420.

1464 Vilà, M., Vayreda, J., Comas, L., Ibáñez, J.J., Mata, T., Obón, B., 2007. Species richness
 1465 and wood production: a positive association in Mediterranean forests. *Ecology Letters* 10,
 1466 241-250.

1467 Villamagna, A.M., Angermeier, P.L., Bennett, E.M., 2013. Capacity, pressure, demand, and
 1468 flow: A conceptual framework for analyzing ecosystem service provision and delivery.
 1469 *Ecological Complexity* 15, 114-121.

1470 Violle, C., Choler, P., Borgy, B., Garnier, E., Amiaud, B., Debarros, G., Diquelou, S., Gachet,
 1471 S., Jolivet, C., Kattge, J., Lavorel, S., Lemauiel-Lavenant, S., Loranger, J., Mikolajczak, A.,
 1472 Munoz, F., Olivier, J., Viovy, N., 2015. Vegetation Ecology meets Ecosystem Science:
 1473 permanent grasslands as a functional biogeography case study. *Science of the Total*
 1474 *Environment* 534, 43-51.

1475 Violle, C., Enquist, B.J., McGill, B.J., Jiang, L., Albert, C.H., Hulshof, C., Jung, V., Messier, J.,
 1476 2012. The return of the variance: intraspecific variability in community ecology. *Trends in*
 1477 *Ecology & Evolution* 27, 244-252.

1478 von Essen, M., 2015. Cork before cattle: Quantifying Ecosystem Services in the Portuguese
 1479 Montado and Questioning Ecosystem Service Mapping. Lund University Centre for
 1480 Sustainability Studies.

1481 von Haaren, C., Albert, C., 2011. Integrating ecosystem services and environmental
 1482 planning: limitations and synergies. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem*
 1483 *Services & Management* 7, 150-167.

1484 Watanabe, M.D.B., Ortega, E., 2014. Dynamic emergy accounting of water and carbon
 1485 ecosystem services: A model to simulate the impacts of land-use change. *Ecological*
 1486 *Modelling* 271, 113-131.

1487 Weedon, G.P., Gomes, S., Viterbo, P., Shuttleworth, W.J., Blyth, E., Österle, H., Adam, J.C.,
 1488 Bellouin, N., Boucher, O., Best, M., 2011. Creation of the WATCH Forcing Data and Its Use
 1489 to Assess Global and Regional Reference Crop Evaporation over Land during the Twentieth
 1490 Century. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 12, 823-848.

1491 Wicaksono, P., Danoedoro, P., Hartono, Nehren, U., 2016. Mangrove biomass carbon stock
 1492 mapping of the Karimunjawa Islands using multispectral remote sensing. *International*
 1493 *Journal of Remote Sensing* 37, 26-52.

1494 Wischmeier, W.H., Smith, D.D., 1978. Predicting rainfall erosion losses – a guide to
 1495 conservation planning. US Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

1496 Wolff, S., Schulp, C.J.E., Verburg, P., 2015. Mapping ecosystem services demand: A review
1497 of current research and future perspectives. *Ecological Indicators* 55, 159-171.

1498 Woodward, F.I., Cramer, W., 1996. Plant functional types and climatic change: Introduction.
1499 *Journal of Vegetation Science* 7, 306-308.

1500 Wullschleger, S.D., Epstein, H.E., Box, E.O., Euskirchen, E.S., Goswami, S., Iversen, C.M.,
1501 Kattge, J., Norby, R.J., van Bodegom, P.M., Xu, X., 2014. Plant functional types in Earth
1502 system models: past experiences and future directions for application of dynamic vegetation
1503 models in high-latitude ecosystems. *Annals of Botany* 114, 1-16.

1504 Yee, S.H., Dittmar, J.A., Oliver, L.M., 2014. Comparison of methods for quantifying reef
1505 ecosystem services: A case study mapping services for St. Croix, USVI. *Ecosystem Services*
1506 8, 1-15.

1507 Yee, T.W., Mitchell, N.D., 1991. Generalized additive models in plant ecology. *Journal of*
1508 *Vegetation Science* 2, 587-602.

1509 Zaehle, S., Ciais, P., Friend, A.D., Prieur, V., 2011. Carbon benefits of anthropogenic
1510 reactive nitrogen offset by nitrous oxide emissions. *Nature Geoscience* 4, 601–605.
1511 doi:10.1038/ngeo1207

1512 Zaehle, S., Friend, A.D., 2010. Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land
1513 surface model: 1. Model description, site-scale evaluation, and sensitivity to parameter
1514 estimates. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 24, GB1005.

1515 Zupan, L., Cabeza, M., Maiorano, L., Roquet, C., Devictor, V., Lavergne, S., Mouillot, D.,
1516 Mouquet, N., Renaud, J., Thuiller, W., 2014. Spatial mismatch of phylogenetic diversity
1517 across three vertebrate groups and protected areas in Europe. *Diversity and Distributions* 20,
1518 674-685.

1519 Zurell, D., Thuiller, W., Pagel, J., Cabral, J.S., Münkemüller, T., Gravel, D., Dullinger, S.,
1520 Normand, S., Schiffrers, K.H., Moore, K.A., Zimmermann, N.E., 2016. Benchmarking novel
1521 approaches for modelling species range dynamics. *Global Change Biology* 22, 2651-2664.

1522

1523

Model type	MAES Tier	Ecosystem Service Provider representation	Scales	Skill needs	Data needs	Validation	Transferability in space and time
Proxy	1	Land cover / use or vegetation type	All	Low Tools: GIS application	Low-medium	Rare	Large uncertainty if local or past / future conditions exceed those of model development and validation
Phenomenological	2	Landscape pattern and processes	Mainly Local-regional	Low Tools: GIS application	Low-medium	Rare	Large uncertainty if local or past / future conditions exceed those of model development and validation
Niche-based	2-3	Species geographic distributions	Regional - continental	Medium Tools : Maxent (Elith et al., 2011), BIOMOD (Thuiller et al., 2009)	Medium Constrained by availability of modelled species distribution or of species distribution data.	Well developed	Designed for scenario projections Current limitations: lack species interactions, demographic and evolutionary processes
Trait-based	3	Trait effects on ecosystem functioning, and possibly spatial trait distributions	Local – regional Extension to continental scale through remote sensing	Medium-High Lack of readily available (or validated) models. Standardized packages for calculation of trait-based indices (Casanoves et al., 2011; Laliberté and Shipley, 2011).	Medium-High Constrained by availability of trait data and environmental layers (e.g. soils)	Easy but requires local data collection	Well-adapted for scenario projections. Risk of exceeding conditions / parameter space of model development and validation
Full process – large scale	3	Plant Functional Types Also possibly : individual species, traits	Regional - continental - global	High Tools : Complex computer models	High Long-term climate data, information on land use/cover change and N input	Well developed using spatial databases derived from remote sensing observations or from sampling	Designed for scenario projections Risk of exceeding conditions / parameter space of model development and validation

Full process – local- landscape scale	3	Plant Functional Types to individual species	Local - landscape – regional	High Tools : Complex computer models	High Long-term climate data, information on land use/cover change and N input	Well developed using spatial databases derived from remote sensing observations or from sampling	Depending on data availability
--	---	--	------------------------------------	--	---	---	-----------------------------------

Table 1 – Strengths and weaknesses of different model types for practice. Maes tiers refer to levels of model complexity (Grêt-Regamey et al., 2015). Criteria were rated according to expert opinion and synthesis of published studies.

Model type	Primary data sources for Europe	Remote sensing data
Proxy	Land cover maps Vegetation data bases (Chytrý et al., 2011). European Vegetation Archive (EVA) Global Index of Vegetation-Plot Databases (http://www.givd.info) (Dengler et al., 2011) Potential lack of data layers (e.g. soils)	Mapping thematic variables like Land Use/Land Cover, Vegetation, Forest, Wetland, Water, Burnt area, etc. Regional scale (for mapping landscape units), medium spatial resolution data like multitemporal MODIS, Spot Vegetation or MeteoSat data to follow vegetation dynamic. Local scale (for mapping precise thematic variables): high spatial resolution Landsat8 or Sentinel-2 (for passive RS data), RadarSat or TerraSar (for active RS data). (Ayanu et al., 2012 ; Burkhard et al., 2012; Kuenzer et al., 2014 ; Pettorelli et al., 2014)
Phenomenological	Maps or proxy of landscape elements (van der Zanden et al., 2013) Topographic information including Digital Elevation Models: road networks, river networks (Lehner et al., 2004), coastlines (USGS HYDRO1K, 2015) Biophysical data including soil data (European Soil database see Panagos et al., 2012)	As for proxy models
Niche-based	Occurrence data for all European terrestrial vertebrate species: 187 mammals (Mitchell-Jones et al., 1999), 445 breeding birds (Hagemeijer et al., 1997), and 149 amphibians and reptiles (Gasc, 2004). Refined data for 275 mammals, 429 birds and 102 amphibians across the Palearctic at 300 m resolution by incorporating 46 GlobCover land use/land cover classes (Maiorano et al., 2013). Clustering at 10' by (Zupan et al., 2014). Extensive distribution data available for 1280 higher plants; digitized Atlas Flora Europae. Trees: exhaustive data at 1 km² resolution (http://www.efi.int/portal/virtual_library/information_services/mapping_services/tree_species_maps_for_european_forests/). More comprehensive species distribution data available on a country per country basis, and for specific regions within a same country. Availability of phylogenies currently increasing, especially in Europe. Mega-phylogenies for higher plants, mammals and birds for Europe (Thuiller et al., 2011), with further complements for the Palearctic and amphibians by (Zupan	Texture variables like object size and shape, compactness, homogeneity/heterogeneity, neighborhood relationships, fragmentation, connectivity, relevant for plant type specification and habitats characterization. Global scale, Meteosat or SpotVegetation. Regional scale, medium spatial resolution data like multitemporal MODIS; can characterize vegetation dynamics. (Ayanu et al., 2012 ; Burkhard et al., 2012; Kuenzer et al., 2014 ; Pettorelli et al., 2014)

	et al., 2014).	
	Trait data for functional diversity: see trait-based models	
Trait-based	Community composition data – locally measured or from vegetation data bases as for proxy-based models. There are currently no public community composition data bases for animals Site-level measurements following standard methods (Cornelissen et al., 2003). Communal plant trait data bases, e.g. TRY (Kattge et al., 2011). More easily measurable traits such as plant size (e.g. vegetative height), leaf size, structural (e.g. Specific Leaf Area, Leaf Dry Matter Content) or chemical (e.g. C, N, P) concentrations, wood density or seed size available for many species globally. Traits requiring more time-consuming, expensive, or technically-demanding measurements, and especially root traits poorly available. Trait data bases for birds (Pearman et al., 2014), mammals (PanTHERIA (Jones et al., 2009)), amphibians (http://amphibiaweb.org/), fish (FishBase (Froese and Pauly)), phytoplankton (Litchman and Klausmeier, 2008), lotic invertebrates (Nicole et al., 2006), soil invertebrates (e.g. (Salmon et al., 2014) for Collembola).	Plant/Canopy height using laser scanning (LiDAR). Leaf phenology: satellite multi-temporal data or timelaps cameras (class by spatial resolution from coarse to fine) : AVHRR NDVI time series, MODIS, Sentinelle-2, RadarSat-2, Pleiades ; or aerial photos/hyperspectral data using airborne sensor. Using Radiative Transfer Models (RTM), leaf mass per area (for Specific Leaf Area SLA estimation), leaf water content using RTM and/or SWIR wavelengths of RS data (for leaf dry matter content), chlorophyll content (for leaf nitrogen concentration estimation). Methods operational at individual/population/community/ecosystem scales depending on RS data source. (Homolová et al., 2013; Kuenzer et al., 2014)
Full process – large-scale	Climate forcing from observations (e.g. Mitchell and Jones, 2005, Rudolf <i>et al.</i>, 2010, Weedon <i>et al.</i>, 2011) or from a suite of climate models (e.g. CMIP5, Taylor et al., 2012) Atmospheric CO₂ concentration from observations for the past and models for the future RCPs (e.g. Keeling et al., 2009). Land-use data historical reconstructions and future scenarios (e.g., Fader et al., 2010, 2015, Hurtt et al., 2011, Kaplan et al., 2012, Klein Goldewijk et al., 2011, 2010, Ramankutty and Foley 1999). Highly generalized classes of soil texture (e.g. by FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2012). Drainage direction map (e.g. Döll and Lehner, 2002) for models that apply a river routine scheme allowing for studying ecosystem services related to water flows Global N deposition (e.g. Lamarque et al., 2010; 2011) and N fertilization of croplands (e.g. by Zaehle et al., 2011) for models accounting for C-N	1) RS data provide model inputs, 2) RS data for calibrating model parameters, 3) RS data for evaluation of models output. Models that are run for scenario studies obviously must be prognostic models that are not fed by RS data. Frequent terrestrial indicators that are derived from RS data are e.g. Land use / Land cover, topography, phenology, gross primary production, evapotranspiration, but see the reviews in Turner et al. (2004), Andrew et al. (2014). At the global scale, the often used satellite instruments are Landsat, Meteosat, Spot-Vegetation, NOAA-AVHRR, ATSR, MISR, SeaWiFS (e.g. Ayanu et al. 2012, Kelley et al., 2013, Randerson et al., 2009). Remote Sensing derived land use data (e.g. Hansen et al., 2013 for forest extent, loss, and gain from 2000 to 2012) are typical model inputs. Seasonal fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (fPAR) can be used as input by process-models (Potter et al., 1993), but they are also useful tools for the validation of full process-models that simulate the fPAR based on the modelling of biophysical processes (Bondeau et al., 2007; Lindeskog et al., 2013).

	interactions	
	Population density maps (Klein Goldewijk, 2005; Klein Goldewijk et al. 2010) when this is required by fire disturbance modelling	
	Communal plant trait data bases for PFT parameterisation, e.g. TRY (Kattge et al., 2011).	
Full process – local-landscape-scale	Input data (historical and scenarios) as for large-scale process-based models with the additional possibility for local-landscape scale data Climate forcing from observations (e.g. UKCP09) Land-use / land management data: Fuchs et al. 2013, CORINE land cover (EEA, 2012), Salmon-Monviola et al., 2012 Detailed DEM and soil quality maps (Krysanova et al., 2005)	The same distinction as above between remote-sensing data for model input data or for model calibration/validation can be made. For vegetation mapping (like thematic variables) at the local or very local scale use of RS satellite data at 1 to 5 m spatial resolution (Worldview, Pleiades, Spot 6-7, Rapid-Eye, Quickbird, ...). For vegetation and soil characterization (plant diversity, heterogeneity, soil roughness, compaction, etc.), use of airborne RS data like NIR aerial photos, hyperspectral data or full-waveform LiDAR. (Feng et al., 2010)

Table 2 – Data sources for parameterisation of different types of ecosystem service mapping methods, with specific reference to Europe. (a) Terrestrial ecosystems

Model type	Primary data sources for Europe	Remote sensing data
Proxy	- Data on bathymetry, topography, slope, geomorphology, submarine habitats, emerged habitats, wave regime, tidal range, relative sea level, storm surge, population density, infrastructures, artificial surface, main cultural sites (Liquete et al., 2013) - Data on fishing fleet and fishing grounds distribution, value of landings, harvest rate information, price of harvested products (Guerry et al., 2012) - Data on stored C, rate of C accumulation in sediments, market and non-market valuation of C (Guerry et al., 2012)	LandSat images from US Geological Survey Landsat (Shapiro et al., 2015) EU Corinne Land Cover (Liquete et al., 2013) Modelled seabed habitat maps (Liquete et al., 2013) ALOS AVNIR-2 (Advanced Land Observation Satellite Advanced Visible and Near Infrared Radiometer type 2) (Wicaksono et al., 2016)
Phenomenological	- Sediment and bathymetry charts, point source contaminant data, tidal model outputs, seabed shear stress and expert information (Townsend et al., 2014)	
Niche-based	- WorldClim Bioclim data (Jardine and Siikamaeki, 2014) - Fisheries landings, effort data, habitat GIS coverages, survival rates for habitat types, salinity (Jordan et al., 2012)	
Trait-based	- Seagrass patch growth, patch survival in seagrass planting projects, estimates of seagrass CO₂ sequestration per unit area (Duarte et al., 2013)	
Full process – large-scale	- Submarine habitat cover (Yee et al., 2014)	
Full process – local-landscape-scale	- Use of biogeochemical model; Dissolved Organic Carbon; Particulated Organic Carbon; nutrients; carbonates; zooplankton; microzooplankton; phytoplankton (Canu et al., 2015)	

Table 2 – Data sources for parameterisation of different types of ecosystem service mapping methods, with specific reference to Europe. (b) Marine ecosystems

Figures

Figure 1 - Biodiversity components incorporated into different categories of models of ecosystem service supply




Figure 2 – Proxy-based spatial modelling of five-year average crop production (energy equivalent MG/ha) (2008-2012) for the Grenoble urban area (France). Schematic method identifying crop succession over 5 years at parcel scale using MODIS data for determining winter / spring crops based on phenology of photosynthetically active biomass. Adapted from Lasseur et al. in review.




Figure 3 - Phenomenological model development for mapping marine ecosystem services based marine ecological principles. Adapted from Townsend et al., 2014.




Figure 4 – Macro-ecological models of ecosystem service supply potential. ESP: ecosystem service provider; SDM: species distribution modelling. Here the final map uses richness of vertebrate predators of rodents as an indicator for potential capacity to control rodents in Europe (from Civantos et al. 2012).




Figure 5 – Trait-based modelling of ecosystem service supply potential for mountain grasslands. Schematic summary of modelling steps based on cascading effects from land use and environmental variables, to community mean plant traits and to ES, illustrated here in the case of fodder production by mountain grasslands (adapted from (Lavorel *et al.*, 2011) and (Lavorel & Grigulis, 2012)). N: nitrogen, P: phosphorus.





Figure 6 – Workflow typical for process-based models (a). Selected provisioning and regulating services are most often directly linked to simulated ecosystem state variables while cultural services may only be derived from suitable indicators. Example application of a process-based model for the quantification of an ES metric accounting for the full biogeochemical implications of carbon sequestration by estimating contribution of CO₂ to the Greenhouse Gas Value (GHGV) (b) (Figure after Bayer et al., 2015).



Appendix 1

Appendix 1 - Table 1a - Part 1 - Terrestrial Model Variables

Model name	Ecosystem service	Model type	Scale(s) of applicability	Land cover
	(CICES terminology)		local / regional / continental...	classification and data source
IVM-carbon (Schulp et al., 2008)	Global climate regulation	Phenomenological	continental (EU)	CLUE
IVM-pollination (Schulp et al., 2014)	Pollination	Phenomenological	applied at continental (EU) (NUTS2-regions). Model run on 250x250 LC data CORINE	CORINE and additional linear element dataset (van der Zanden et al., 2013)
IVM-tourism (van Berkel and Verburg, 2011)	Physical use of land-/seascapes	Phenomenological	continental (EU)	CORINE land cover
Biocontrol (Civantos et al., 2012)	Biocontrol	Niche-based	regional - continental (EU)	CORINE land cover 2000 - although any data base is suitable in principle
Trait-based models of grassland ES (Grigulis et al., 2013; Lavorel et al., 2011)	Grassland forage quantity, forage quality, soil organic matter, leached nitrates, soil fertility, soil stability	Trait-based	landscape	grassland management types

LPJ-GUESS (Sitch et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2001).	Global climate regulation, surface water supply (non-drinking), cultivated crops, fodder; tested: timber, energy crops, soil formation, etc.	Process-based	regional/global	Historical and land-use fractions according to (Hurt et al., 2011), crop species according to MIRCA2000 (Portmann et al., 2010). Usage of CLUMondo tested
LPJmL (Bondeau et al., 2007)	Provisioning (cultivated crops, fodder grass, fibres, timber, energy plants, non-drinking surface water), Regulation and maintenance (vegetation cover protecting, hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance, soil formation, global and regional climate regulation)	Process-based	regional / global	1) specifically adapted LPJmL historical land use data set (Fader et al. 2010), derived from the combination of MIRCA 2000 (Portmann et al., 2010), cropland and pasture fractions (Ramankutty et al., 2008), and historical land cover (Klein Goldewijk et al., 2007). Spatial resolution: 0.5° global, 0.25° regional, finer if needed. 2) for the future: published land use projections or simulated land use from the bio-economic MAGPIE model fed by LPJmL (Lotze-Campen et al., 2008; Lotze-Campen et al., 2010)
IVM-FloodRegulation (Stürck et al., 2014)	Flood protection	Process-based	continental (EU)	CORINE land cover 2000

SWAT (Lautenbach et al., 2012)	Cultivated crops, fibres and other materials from crops for direct use or processing (biofuel), Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance, Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates, Chemical condition of freshwaters, surface water for drinking, ground water for drinking, surface water for non-drinking purposes, ground water for non-drinking purposes	Process-based	regional	Any classification is suitable, it needs to be linked to the entries in the crop type database which contains generic land use classes and individual crops
HILLFLOW (Leitinger et al., 2015)	Soil moisture, deep water seepage	Process-based	landscape	grassland management types

Appendix 1 - Table 1a - Part 2 - Terrestrial Model Variables

Model name	Abiotic variables			
	<i>climate</i>	<i>soil</i>	<i>landscape pattern</i>	<i>others</i>
IVM-carbon (Schulp et al, 2008)		emission factors: Map with emission factor for each land use type as 1x1 km grids (see calculation rules) (Janssens et al., 2004) & Forest emission factors for soil and biomass from EFISCEN simulations		Map of forest biomass carbon content per EFISCEN region
IVM-pollination (Schulp et al, 2014)				
IVM-tourism (Van Berkel & Verburg, 2011)			Classification of the landscape relief within a 10km radius	tourist infrastructure; accesibility; policy instruments; tourist attractions; local cooperative networks; NGO operation and cooperation
Biocontrol (Civantos et al. 2012)	monthly precipitation, temperature (min, max, mean), ETP, aridity index. Data from alternative data bases or climate scenarios (variable spatial resolution)			

Trait-based models of grassland ES (Lavorel et al. 2011, Grigulis et al. 2013)		soil texture (calculation of water holding capacity), soil depth, soil C, soil N	DEM: altitude
LPJ-GUESS (Smith et al. 2001, Sitch et al. 2003).	Daily or monthly average air surface temperature, precipitation (daily precipitation or monthly precipitation and wet days), incoming shortwave radiation (or sunshine hours per day). Various sources depending on scale and considered time frame, e.g. 0.5° from CRU TS 3.1 (Mitchell and Jones 2005), usually in combination with CMIP5 scenario climate data (e.g. MPI-ES-LR after Giorgetta et al., 2013).	global soil map (FAO, 1991)	atmospheric CO2 concentration
LPJmL (Bondeau et al. 2007)	Daily or monthly average air surface temperature, daily precipitation (or monthly precipitation and wet days), cloudiness or shortwave and longwave radiation. Various sources depending on the scale, e.g. 0.5° from CRU TS 3.1 (Mitchell and Jones 2005) and GPCC (Rudolf et al 2010), 0.25° from WATCH Forcing Data (Weedon et al. 2011) and ERA-Interim (ECMWF).	Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.2) (2012) aggregated to 0.5° resolution and classified according to the USDA soil texture classification (http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/ss169).	atmospheric CO2 concentration

IWM-FloodRegulation (Stürck et al, 2014)	precipitation regime (Haylock et al., 2008)	soil water holding capacity classification (FAO, 2009)	DEM and forest and agricultural management variables
SWAT (Lautenbach et al. 2012)	precipitation, temperature (min and max), solar radiation, wind speed, humidity, potential evapotranspiration, daily resolution, spatial resolution: climate stations. Depending on the method used to calculate evapotranspiration. Values can also be estimated using a weather generator.	number and thickness of layers, hydrologic soil class, soil porosity, saturated hydraulic conductivity, porosity, field capacity, water content at wilting point, clay/silt/sand content, organic matter content, bulk density,... available resolution of soil together with land cover resolution defines the achievable resolution	terrain (slope)
HILLFLOW (Leitinger et al. 2015)	precipitation, temperature (min and max), solar radiation, wind speed, humidity, potential evapotranspiration, daily resolution, spatial resolution: climate stations.	soil texture, saturated water content, field capacity, residual soil water content, saturated hydraulic conductivity, soil depth, macropores	DEM: altitude, slope, aspect

Appendix 1 - Table 1a - Part 3 - Terrestrial Model Variables

Model name		Biotic variables				
	<i>individual species</i>	<i>species diversity indices</i>	<i>Plant Functional Types</i>	<i>Plant Funct. Traits</i>	<i>functional diversity indices</i>	<i>others</i>
IVM-carbon (Schulp et al, 2008)						forest age
IVM-pollination (Schulp et al, 2014)						pollination dependency index per crop; Habitat suitability for bees
IVM-tourism (Van Berkel & Verburg, 2011)						biophysical characteristics (e.g., presence of sea, beach); presence of N2000 areas, HNV farmland, and UNESCO natural monuments
Biocontrol (Civantos et al. 2012)	vertebrate species known as predators of vertebrate or invertebrate pests					
Trait-based models of grassland ES (Lavorel et al. 2011, Grigulis et al. 2013)		plant Shannon diversity			plant community mean vegetative height, leaf N concentration, leaf dry matter content, rooting architecture	microbial functional diversity parameters calculated from plant traits and soil N and WHC

LPJ-GUESS (Smith et al. 2001, Sitch et al. 2003).	11 PFTs e.g. according to (Ahlström et al., 2012); 11 CFTs (Lindeskog et al., 2013)
LPJmL (Bondeau et al. 2007)	9 PFTs (Sitch et al., 2003), 12/14 annual CFTs, 2 types of managed grass, 3 types of bioenergy plants. 7 perenial crops (Mediterranean version).
IVM-FloodRegulation (Stürck et al, 2014)	tree species, as part of the forest management variables at 1km scale (Brus et al., 2012)
SWAT (Lautenbach et al. 2012)	The crop.dat we use contains currently 17 generic land use types with vegetation cover (such as pasture, rangeland, deciduous forest), 81 agricultural crops. But this list has been extended e.g. for applications in the tropics.

HILLFLOW (Leitinger et al. 2015)	community mean root depth, evapo- transpiration, canopy interception
----------------------------------	---

Appendix 1 - Table 1b - Part 1 - Terrestrial Model Applications

Model name	Ecosystem service	Model type	Brief description of model logics
	(CICES terminology)		
IVM-carbon (Schulp et al, 2008)	Global climate regulation	Phenomenologica I	The carbon sequestration effect of land use change scenarios is tested at the EU scale. Each land cover category is assigned an annual average effect on carbon sequestration per country. For forest carbon sequestration is weighted by calculation of forest age, for agriculture a SOC map is used to weigh the effects of agriculture on carbon sequestration
IVM-pollination (Schulp et al, 2014)	Pollination	Phenomenologica I	potential supply of pollination is mapped based on habitat suitability of different land covers. Visitation probability is then calculated based on distance from landscape elements providing habitat using a distance decay function. Demand for pollination is mapped based on pollination dependency of crops. In the last step actual supply is then determined based on an overlay of pollination potential supply and pollination demand.
IVM-tourism (Van Berkel & Verburg, 2011)	Physical use of land- /seascapes	Phenomenologica I	expert based assessment of rural development options in Europe including rural tourism. Rural tourism is assessed based on suitability for summer tourism, winter tourism and nature tourism. These three factors are weighted by a factor for symbolic capital.
Biocontrol (Civantos et al. 2012)	Biocontrol	Niche-based	niche-based model of the distribution of vertebrates that exert predation on vertebrate or invertebrate pests

Trait-based models of grassland ES (Lavorel et al. 2011, Grigulis et al. 2013)	grassland forage quantity, forage quality, soil organic matter, leached nitrates, soil fertility, soil stability	Trait-based	statistical models of ecosystem properties depending on soil parameters, plant traits and their variations in response to soil and altitude
LPJ-GUESS (Smith et al. 2001, Sitch et al. 2003)	Global / regional climate regulation, surface water supply (non-drinking), cultivated crops; tested: timber, energy crops, soil formation, etc.	Process-based	LPJ-GUESS DGVM simulates development of land vegetation and biogeochemical cycles. Output variables are used to derive current state of selected Ecosystem Services and their historical and future transitions, e.g. carbon, nitrogen and water cycles, potential crop yields, that are translated into various Ecosystem Services
LPJmL (Bondeau et al. 2007)	Provisioning (cultivated crops, fodder grass, fibres, timber, energy plants, non-drinking surface water), Regulation and maintenance (vegetation cover protecting, hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance, soil formation, global and regional climate regulation)	Process-based	Process-based agro-ecosystem model: simulates the distribution of the potential natural vegetation, carbon stocks, carbon and water cycles, crop yields, harvested biomass. Climate- and management-driven outputs translate into a range of Ecosystem Services.
IVM-FloodRegulation (Stürck et al, 2014)	Flood protection	Process-based	The STREAM hydrological model is applied to several catchments across the EU. Precipitation data is linked to soil and land cover classes across the catchments resulting in a flood regulation supply index. The flood regulation supply is compared between current and potential vegetation (based on (Ramankutty and Foley, 1999)) to determine target areas where vegetation could

enhance flood regulation supply			
SWAT (Lautenbach et al. 2012)	Cultivated crops, fibres and other materials from crops for direct use or processing (biofuel), Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance, Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates, Chemical condition of freshwaters, surface water for drinking, ground water for drinking, surface water for non-drinking purposes, ground water for non-drinking purposes	Process-based	SWAT is a physically-based, conceptual, continuous-time river basin model with spatially semi-distributed parameters operating on a daily time step. It was designed to simulate broader scale patterns of discharge and water quality in the spatial and temporal domain (Neitsch et al., 2005). The model integrates all relevant processes for watershed modeling including water flow, nutrient transport and turnover, vegetation growth, land use, and water management at the sub-basin scale. It considers five different pools of nitrogen in the soils (Neitsch et al., 2005): two inorganic (ammonium and nitrate) and three organic (fresh organic nitrogen and active and stable organic nitrogen). Nitrogen is added to the soil by fertilizer, manure or residue application, fixation by bacteria, and atmospheric deposition. Nitrogen losses occur by plant uptake, leaching, volatilization, denitrification and erosion.
HILLFLOW (Leitinger et al. 2015)	Soil moisture, deep water seepage	Process-based	Mechanistic model of water evaporation, lateral flow and deep seepage depending on vegetation demand, soil properties and terrain

Appendix 1 - Table 1b - Part 2 - Terrestrial Model Applications

Model name	Main strengths	Limitations
IVM-carbon (Schulp et al, 2008)	able to detect changes in carbon sequestration following land use change at coarse levels; applicable across many EU countries;	use of country level averages per land cover class; focused on mapping changes and not necessarily state; only applicable at country or coarser level; only applicable in the EU four countries incorporated in study Janssens et al. (2005)
IVM-pollination (Schulp et al, 2014)	incorporation of both mapping demand and supply; applicable across many regions; level of detail can be enhanced by parameterizing the model for individual species	difficult to validate results, assumption of habitat uniformity, variation in timing of pollination demand and supply within a year not accounted for

IVM-tourism (Van Berkel & Verburg, 2011)	Applicable across the EU; using easy accessible datasets	Only applicable at this scale; expert based approach makes it inherently subjective; preferences and suitable indicators might change over time; does not generate reliable results in all regions
Biocontrol (Civantos et al. 2012)	Climate- and land use-based distributions of service providing species. Easy to project given scenarios. Contribution of individual species may be combined with different weights e.g. depending on diets (although currently even weights)	Usual limits of species distribution modelling
Trait-based models of grassland ES (Lavorel et al. 2011, Grigulis et al. 2013)	Mechanistic understanding of ES supply; functional understanding of ES trade-offs / bundles. Easy to project given scenarios.	Generic nature of models under checking (inter-site comparison). May need adaptation for different bioclimatic regions

LPJ-GUESS (Smith et al. 2001, Sitch et al. 2003)	Global quantification; historical and future transitions; high detail in representation of vegetation dynamics (age cohorts and gap dynamics), closed carbon and nitrogen cycles	Limitations in resolution (0.5°x0.5°), applicable up to country/regional level (i.e. Downscaling aspired in Scottish Exemplar)
LPJmL (Bondeau et al. 2007)	Closed carbon cycle, consistent representation of the biogeochemical processes between the different plant types.	Currently no nitrogen cycle
IVM-FloodRegulation (Stürck et al, 2014)	Combination of flood regulation demand and supply to identify priority areas where flood regulation can be enhanced using natural vegetation.	Extrapolation of estimates for relation between land cover, soils and flood regulation from single catchments to the entire EU. Method is difficult to apply at smaller scales

SWAT (Lautenbach et al., 2012)	Detailed representation of crop management; high number of management options implemented	Limited for the modelling of forests - focus is on the modelling of agricultural systems. Suitable for the regional scale (watersheds > ~ 50 sqkm), not suitable for small watersheds.
HILLFLOW (Leitinger et al. 2015)	Mechanistic understanding of ES supply depending on vegetation functioning	Not a detailed hydrological model; requires heavy site measurements for parameterisation

Appendix 1 - Table 2a - Part 1 - Marine Model Variables

Model name	Ecosystem service	Model type	scale(s) of applicability	Land cover
	(CICES terminology)		local / regional / continental...	classification and data source
Ecosim/EcoPath (Alcamo et al, 2005)	Provisioning, nutrition, biomass (fish production)	Niche-based	regional	NA
Mercury sequestration (Anastacio et al 2013)	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances	Process-based	regional	NA
Spatial model of coastal ecosystem services (Barbier 2012)	mediation of flows (storm protection) & fish density	NA	local	NA
Hydrodynamic model (Temmerman et al 2012)	Mediation of flows (flood protection)	Phenomenological	local	NA
Hydrodynamic model (Shepherd et al 2007)	Maintenance of physical, chemical and biological conditions (nutrient removal and carbon sequestration)	Phenomenological	local	NA
Mangrove's wind protection (Das et al, 2013)	Mediation of flows (wind protection)	Phenomenological	regional	NA
CO₂ capture potential of seagrass restoration (Duarte et al, 2013)	Maintenance of physical, chemical and biological conditions (carbon sequestration)	Trait-based	local	NA

Multiscale ecological and economic models salmon, shrimp & blue crab (Jordan et al 2012)	Provisioning, nutrition, biomass (food production)	Phenomenological	local & regional	NA
Coastal protection (Liquete et al 2013)	coastal protection	Spatial proxy-based	continental (EU)	Three data sources: EU Corine Land Cover (CLC) dataset v.15 from the year 2000 with a resolution of 100 m (EEA 2011); and modelled seabed habitat maps (MESH 2010; EUSeaMap JNCC 2010)
Role of eelgrass in ES, food web modeling (Plummer et al 2013)	multiple ES (provisioning, cultural, supporting)	Spatial proxy-based	local	NA
InVEST Marine carbon storage & sequestration (Guerry et al 2012)	Carbon storage & sequestration	Spatial proxy-based	local / regional / continental	NA
InVEST Food provision (Guerry et al 2012)	Food provision	Spatial proxy-based	local / regional / continental	NA
InVEST Marine renewable energy (Guerry et al 2012)	Energy	Spatial proxy-based	local / regional / continental	NA

InVEST Recreation (Guerry et al 2012)	Recreation	Spatial proxy-based	local / regional / continental
--	------------	---------------------	-----------------------------------

Appendix 1 - Table 2a - Part 2 - Marine Model Variables

Model name	Abiotic variables			
	<i>climate</i>	<i>soil</i>	<i>landscape pattern</i>	<i>others</i>
Ecosim/EcoPath (Alcamo et al, 2005)	x			Economic development, greenhouse emissions, air pollution emission, risk of acidification and excess nitrogen emissions, climate change, sea level rise, nitrogen loading to coastal marine systems
Mercury sequestration (Anastacio et al 2013)				Hg in biomass (several variables, Hg in belowground biomass, Hg exiting biomass, incorporation 365 days ago...), temperature, salinity, cloud cover
Spatial model of coastal ecosystem services (Barbier 2012)				Distance to the ecosystem, distance from seaward edge
Hydrodynamic model (Temmerman et al 2012)	x		x	
Hydrodynamic model (Shepherd et al 2007)		x	x	Elevation; management variables;
Mangrove's wind protection (Das et al, 2013)	x			% damaged houses, impact of the storm, wind velocity, velocity of the storm surge, surge height, distance from the coast
CO2 capture potential of seagrass restoration (Duarte et al, 2013)	x			

Multiscale ecological and economic models salmon, shrimp & blue crab (Jordan et al 2012)		Fishery landings, effort data, habitat GIS coverages, survival rates for habitat types, salinity, economic value salmon fisheries
Coastal protection (Liquete et al 2013)		Bathymetry, topography, slope, geomorphology, submarine habitats, emerged habitats, wave regime, tidal range, relative sea level, storm surge, population density, infrastructures, artificial surface, main cultural sites
Role of eelgrass in ES, food web modeling (Plummer et al 2013)		No abiotic variables stated
InVEST Marine carbon storage & sequestration (Guerry et al 2012)		Carbon stored, rate of C accumulation in sediments, economic information such as market/non-market value of stored/sequestered Carbon
InVEST Food provision (Guerry et al 2012)		Fishing fleet distribution, value of landings, fishing grounds distribution, price of harvested product, harvest rate information
InVEST Marine renewable energy (Guerry et al 2012)	wave condition data (height, peak period, technological capabilities (e.g. Performance tables, maximum capacity)	
InVEST Recreation (Guerry et al 2012)	visitation rates, recreational activities	

Appendix 1 - Table 2a - Part 3 - Marine Model Variables

Model name	Biotic variables						Ecosystem type
	<i>individual species</i>	<i>species diversity indices</i>	<i>Plant Functional Types</i>	<i>Plant Functional Traits</i>	<i>Functional diversity indices</i>	<i>others</i>	
Ecosim/EcoPath (Alcamo et al, 2005)	x					Trophic flows, biomass, production, mortality, exports, biomass accumulation, biomass of functional groups, consumption, catch data, trophic behaviours, landings, discards, fishing effort, human population development	marine
Mercury sequestration (Anastacio et al 2013)							tidal wetlands
Spatial model of coastal ecosystem services (Barbier 2012)						Thread of ecological collapse	mangrove habitat
Hydrodynamic model (Temmerman et al 2012)			tidal wetlands				tidal wetlands
Hydrodynamic model (Shepherd et al 2007)							tidal wetlands and mudflats

(estuary)

Mangrove's wind protection (Das et al, 2013)	x	mangrove forest	distance from mangrove forest, mangrove forest extent	mangrove forest
CO₂ capture potential of seagrass restoration (Duarte et al, 2013)	x	seagrass meadows	patch growth, parch survival in seagrass planting projects, estimates of seagrass CO2 sequestration per unit area for five seagrass species	seagrass meadows
Multiscale ecological and economic models salmon, shrimp & blue crab (Jordan et al 2012)	x		stock biomass, net recruitment per year, carrying capacity	marine
Coastal protection (Liquete et al 2013)				marine
Role of eelgrass in ES, food web modeling (Plummer et al 2013)			biomass, growth efficiency, consumption rates of prey, immigration rate, mortality, emigration rate, biological groups (primary producers, invertebrates, fishes, birds, marine mammals, detrital pools), commercial and recreational fisheries	marine

InVEST Marine carbon storage & sequestration (Guerry et al 2012)	vegetation distribution maps
InVEST Food provision (Guerry et al 2012)	fish distribution, fish survival, recruitment rate
InVEST Marine renewable energy (Guerry et al 2012)	None
InVEST Recreation (Guerry et al 2012)	habitat distribution

Appendix 1 – Table 2b - Part 1 – Marine Model Application

Model name	Model Category	Ecosystem service	Brief description of model logics
		(CICES terminology)	
Coastal protection (Liquete et al., 2013)	Spatial proxy-based	coastal protection	Provides a conceptual and methodological approach to assess coastal protection as an ecosystem service at different spatial-temporal scales, and applies it to the entire EU coastal zone. The assessment of coastal protection incorporates 14 biophysical and socio-economic variables from both terrestrial and marine datasets. Those variables define three indicators: coastal protection capacity, coastal exposure and human demand for protection. The three indicators are then framed into the ecosystem services cascade model to estimate how coastal ecosystems provide protection, in particular describing the service function, flow and benefit.
InVEST Marine carbon storage & sequestration (Guerry et al., 2012)	Spatial proxy-based	Carbon storage & sequestration	The marine carbon model estimates how much carbon is stored in coastal vegetation, how much carbon is sequestered in the sediments and the economic value of storage and sequestration.

InVEST Coastal protection (Guerry et al., 2012)	Spatial proxy-based	coastal protection	The InVEST Coastal Protection model quantifies the protective services provided by natural habitats of nearshore environments in terms of avoided erosion and flood mitigation. The model's profile generator prepares a 1D bathymetry transect of a shoreline, providing information about its backshore and the location of natural habitats. The transect is used to estimate the total water level and shoreline erosion in the presence and absence of nearshore marine habitats
InVEST Food provision (Guerry et al 2012)	Spatial proxy-based	Food provision	InVEST model estimates the quantity and monetary value of fish harvested by commercial fisheries. Appropriate to use for single species or groups of species with similar life stories. It estimates annual production of fish. Another section of the model can be used to analyse the production and monetary value of farmed fish and shellfish and quantify by-products of farming.
InVEST Marine renewable energy (Guerry et al 2012)	Spatial proxy-based	Energy	Models energy production from waves and models off-shore wind energy production. The model assesses potential wave power and

			energy based on wave conditions and technology-specific capabilities.
InVEST Recreation (Guerry et al 2012)	Spatial proxy-based	Recreation	The InVEST recreation model predicts the spread of person-days of recreation, based on the locations of natural habitats and other features that factor into people's decisions about where to recreate
Hydrodynamic model (Temmerman et al., 2012)	Phenomenological	Mediation of flows (flood protection)	Hydrodynamic model simulations of flood attenuation by a tidal marsh, with particular focus on the effects of spatial patterns of vegetation dieoff. Tidal marsh die-off, which may increase with ongoing global change (e.g. because sea level rise), is expected to have non-linear effects on reduced coastal protection against flood waves.
Hydrodynamic model (Shepherd et al., 2007)	Phenomenological	Maintenance of physical, chemical and biological conditions (nutrient removal and carbon sequestration)	Hydrodynamic model to estimate nutrient removal and carbon sequestration in a UK estuary covered with tidal wetlands and mudflats, based on sediment dynamics and composition. The model also estimates the associated value of habitat created under a scenario of extensive managed realignment. A cost

			benefit analysis of the managed realignment is conducted too.
Mangrove's wind protection (Das and Crépin, 2013)	Phenomenological	Mediation of flows (wind protection)	Modeling of wind attenuation and protection offered by mangroves in the event of wind-related damage during storms, specially in areas affected by tangential wind
Ecosim/EcoPath (Alcamo et al., 2005)	Niche-based	Provisioning, nutrition, biomass (fish production)	Fish production (landings) is estimated for three regional fisheries (Gulf of Thailand, Central North Pacific North Benguela) for 4 different scenarios. The model computes dynamic changes in selected marine ecosystems as a function of fishing efforts (Pauly et al. 2000). For its fish production estimates, the EcoSim/EcoPath model takes into account not only the future source of feed for aquaculture, but also future subsidies for the fishing industry, the management objectives of fishing (either to optimize employment or profits), and the impact of climate change on shifts in species distribution and abundance (Pauly et al. 2003). For all scenarios, fish catch (by weight) is maintained in the North Benguela fishery, not maintained in the Central North Pacific, and has

			mixed results in the Gulf of Thailand. The overall message of these results is that it is uncertain whether future demands for fish can be sustainably provided by either aquaculture or marine fisheries.
Multiscale ecological and economic models salmon, shrimp & blue crab (Jordan et al., 2012)	Niche-based	Provisioning, nutrition, biomass (food production)	Model of the link between the production functions of critical habitats to commercial and recreational fishery values through the combination of specific research data with spatial analysis and population models
CO₂ capture potential of seagrass restoration (Duarte et al., 2013)	Trait-based	Maintenance of physical, chemical and biological conditions (carbon sequestration)	Model of the long term carbon sequestration expected for seagrass restoration programmes
Role of eelgrass in ES, food web modeling (Plummer et al., 2013)	Trait-based	multiple ES (provisioning, cultural, supporting)	Use of dynamic simulations in a food web model of central Puget Sound, Washington, USA developed in the Ecopath with Ecosim software, to examine how the marine community may respond to changes in coverage of native eelgrass (<i>Zostera marina</i>), and how these modeled responses can be assessed using an ecosystem services framework, expressing these services with economic currencies in some cases

			and biological proxies in others.
Mercury sequestration (Anastácio et al., 2013)	Process-based	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances	Modelling of growth and mercury (HG) sequestration by <i>Bolboschoenus maritimus</i> on the most contaminated area of a temperate shallow coastal lagoon historically subjected to heavy Hg load, under gradients of climate driven variables. Simulation of <i>B. maritimus</i> mercury sequestration under different environmental scenarios involving increases and decreases in temperature, salinity and cloud cover. The largest effects were related to high salinity scenarios but all variables presented an inverse relation with Hg-sequestration
Spatial model of coastal ecosystem services (Barbier, 2012)	NA	mediation of flows (storm protection) & fish density	Modelling of ecological production functions that decline across a coastal landscape

Appendix 1 - Table 2b – Part 2 – Marine Model Application

Model name	Main strengths	Limitations
Coastal protection (Liquete et al 2013)	The assessment shown in the paper could help assist the comparison between European regions and to further national or regional scale studies of ecosystem services. In Europe it can have a direct application on the EU Biodiversity Strategy, the EU Floods Directive. On an international scale, this approach could be taken by CBD (Convention on biological diversity) countries.	The continental scale of the model may oversimplify the local coastal processes, since they cannot be taken into account a the continental scale and resolution. Coastal studies generally lack the step of aggregation of data and knowledge transfer from local case studies to regional ones. Due to the lack of large scale datasets or methodologies some important factors could not be included in the model (e.g. local sediment Budget, subsidence, main direction of morphologic features with respect to wave action, coastal development and management, low vs. high coasts, health of the ecosystems, the specific non-linear response of habitats for protection among others). Further information on limitations or aspects that could improve the model are discussed in the paper.
InVEST Marine carbon storage & sequestration (Guerry et al 2012)	Not stated in the paper	Not stated in the paper
InVEST Coastal protection (Guerry et al 2012)	Not stated in the paper	A primary limitation is that the Erosion Protection model assumes that all erosion leads to a loss of land. Further, the model estimates coastal protection services provided by habitats in terms of the reduction in damages due to erosion from storm waves, not surge. Some coastal habitats

		have the ability to attenuate surge in addition to waves (e.g., marshes, coastal forests), while other nearshore subtidal habitats do not (e.g., eelgrass). the model has technical limitations. The first is the lack of high quality GIS data that are readily available. The theoretical limitations of the Nearshore Waves and Erosion model are more substantial. As mentioned earlier, wave evolution is modeled with a 1D model. This assumes that the bathymetry is longshore-uniform (i.e. the profile in front of the site is similar along the entirety of the stretch of shoreline). Because this is unlikely true, the model ignores any complex wave transformations that occur offshore of the site of interest
InVEST Food provision (Guerry et al 2012)	Production of maps that identify the most important marine and coastal areas across a variety of fishing fleets	It does not model behavior , for that reason it is not well suited to the evaluation of how human uses may change in response to changes in the marine environment.
InVEST Marine renewable energy (Guerry et al 2012)	Not stated in the paper	Not stated in the paper
InVEST Recreation (Guerry et al 2012)	Not stated in the paper	The model does not presuppose that any predictor variable has an effect on visitation. Instead, the tool estimates the magnitude of each predictor's effect based on its spatial correspondence with current visitation in the area of interest. It requires the assumption that people's responses to attributes that serve as predictors in the model will not change over time.

		In other words, in the future, people will continue to be drawn to or repelled by the attributes as they are currently.
Hydrodynamic model (Temmerman et al 2012)	Not stated in the paper	Not stated in the paper
Hydrodynamic model (Shepherd et al 2007)	Cost benefit analysis (CBA) demonstrates that managed realignment provides positive economic advantages. In a wider sense the case study demonstrates how CBA of managed realignment schemes should be undertaken so that the potential social cost of realignment can be better understood	The model and CBA is based in many assumptions (e.g. sedimentation rate 1.5 or 6mm per year) and uncertainties (e.g. habitat values or nitrogen removal), however the assumptions are conservative, if anything it will have underestimated the value of the service
Mangrove's wind protection (Das et al, 2013)	The study found that not accounting for the role of mangroves significantly overestimates actual wind damage. Wind barriers like mangroves reduces tangential wind and contributes substantially to reduce wind-caused damage to structures	While the simplicity of the model makes it very tractable for use in empirical studies in poor regions, further model development and better data would shed more light on the particular mechanisms underlying mangrove protection from storms
Ecosim/EcoPath (Alcamo 2005)	Global application	Not stated in the paper
Multiscale ecological and economic models salmon, shrimp & blue crab (Jordan et al 2012)	Ecological production functions generally are observed at fine spatial scales for brief spans of time, whereas the resulting ecosystem services and their economic values may be delivered over broad geographic and temporal scales. This paper demonstrates methods of modeling and estimation that link fishery production and its associated economic indicators to the distributions and attributes of coastal habitats across scales ranging from habitat patches to large ocean basins.	Not stated in the paper

CO₂ capture potential of seagrass restoration (Duarte et al, 2013)	The model indicates that the cumulative C sequestered increases rapidly over time and with planting density. The value corresponding to this C sequestration suggests that the costs of seagrass restoration projects may be fully recovered by the total CO ₂ captured in societies with a carbon tax in place	The model presented delivers rough, but conservative, estimates of the average CO ₂ capture capacity associated with seagrass restoration projects. These estimates are conservative because they focus on the mean, whereas planting of seagrass patches for CO ₂ capture can be managed to achieve maximum capture, which could double the estimates provided above. In addition, the model considers clonal spread alone, whereas the restored meadows would produce seeds as they develop, contributing to accelerate colonization beyond the limits imposed by clonal growth, accelerating space occupation and therefore carbon capture.
Role of eelgrass in ES, food web modeling (Plummer et al 2013)	Increased eelgrass coverage was most associated with increases in commercial and recreational fishing with some small decreases in one non-market activity, bird watching. When ES categories were considered (aggregations of individual groups of species) there was little evidence of strong tradeoffs among marine resources; that is, increasing eelgrass coverage was essentially either positive or neutral for all services examined	Not stated in the paper
Mercury sequestration (Anastacio et al 2013)	tool to analyze system behavior and to make projections regarding mercury sequestration. This is particularly relevant in the case of human interventions (i.e. engineering) for the optimization of this ecosystem service	the value calculated does not include sequestration by other plants sharing the habitat with <i>B. maritimus</i> . For this reason we should expect that the total value for mercury sequestration by wetland plants will be higher since other plant species are present in the

		studied area
Spatial model of coastal ecosystem services (Barbier 2012)	The basic model demonstrates how spatial production of ecosystem services affects the location and extent of landscape conversion. An extension allows for the risk of ecological collapse, when the critical size of the remaining landscape that precipitates the collapse is not known. Both models are simulated using the example of spatial variation in ecosystem services across a mangrove habitat that might be converted to shrimp aquaculture.	Not stated in the paper

References

- Ahlström, A., Schurgers, G., Arneth, A., Smith, B., 2012. Robustness and uncertainty in terrestrial ecosystem carbon response to CMIP5 climate change projections. *Environmental Research Letters* 7, 044008.
- Alcamo, J., van Vuuren, D., Ringler, C., Cramer, W., Masui, T., Alder, J., Schulze, K., 2005. Changes in nature's balance sheet: Model-based estimates of future worldwide ecosystem services. *Ecology and Society* 10, 19-19.
- Anastácio, P.M., Marques, B., Lillebø, A.I., 2013. Modeling the effect of temperature, solar radiation and salinity on *Bolboschoenus maritimus* sequestration of mercury. *Ecological Modelling* 256, 31-42.
- Barbier, E.B., 2012. Progress and Challenges in Valuing Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Services. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 6, 1-+.
- Bondeau, A., Smith, P.C., Zaehle, S., Schaphoff, S., Lucht, W., Cramer, W., Gerten, D., Lotze-Campen, H., Müller, C., Reichstein, M., Smith, B., 2007. Modelling the role of agriculture for the 20th century global terrestrial carbon balance. *Global Change Biology* 13, 679-706.
- Brus, D.J., Hengeveld, G.M., Walvoort, D.J.J., Goedhart, P.W., Heidema, A.H., Nabuurs, G.J., Gunia, K., 2012. Statistical mapping of tree species over Europe. *European Journal of Forest Research* 131, 145-157.
- Civantos, E., Thuiller, W., Maiorano, L., Guisan, A., Araújo, M.B., 2012. Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Ecosystem Services in Europe: The Case of Pest Control by Vertebrates. *BioScience* 62, 658-666.
- Das, S., Crépin, A.-S., 2013. Mangroves can provide protection against wind damage during storms. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 134, 98-107.
- Duarte, C.M., Sintes, T., Marba, N., 2013. Assessing the CO₂ capture potential of seagrass restoration projects. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50, 1341-1349.
- Grigulis, K., Lavorel, S., Krainer, U., Legay, N., Baxendale, C., Dumont, M., Kastl, E., Arnoldi, C., Bardgett, R., Poly, F., Pommier, T., Schloter, M., Tappeiner, U., Bahn, M., Clément, J.-C., 2013. Combined influence of plant and microbial functional traits on ecosystem processes in mountain grasslands *Journal of Ecology* 101, 47-57.
- Guerry, A.D., Ruckelshaus, M.H., Arkema, K.K., Bernhardt, J.R., Guannel, G., Kim, C.-K., Marsik, M., Papenfus, M., Toft, J.E., Verutes, G., Wood, S.A., Beck, M., Chan, F., Chan, K.M.A., Gelfenbaum, G., Gold, B.D., Halpern, B.S., Labiosa, W.B., Lester, S.E., Levin, P.S., McField, M., Pinsky, M.L., Plummer, M., Polasky, S., Ruggiero, P., Sutherland, D.A., Tallis, H., Day, A., Spencer, J., 2012. Modeling benefits from nature: using ecosystem services to inform coastal and marine spatial planning. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 8, 107-121.
- Hurt, G.C., Chini, L.P., Frolking, S., Betts, R.A., Feddes, J., Fischer, G., Fisk, J.P., Hibbard, K., Houghton, R.A., Janetos, A., Jones, C.D., Kindermann, G., Kinoshita, T., Klein Goldewijk, K., Riahi, K., Shevliakova, E., Smith, S., Stehfest, E., Thomson, A., Thornton, P., van Vuuren, D.P., Wang, Y.P., 2011. Harmonization of land-use scenarios for the period 1500–2100: 600 years of global gridded annual land-use transitions, wood harvest, and resulting secondary lands. *Climatic Change* 109, 117-161.

Janssens, I.A., Freibauer, A., Schlamadinger, B., Ceulemans, R., Ciais, P., Dolman, A.J., Heimann, M., Nabuurs, G.-J., Smith, P., Valentini, R., 2004. The carbon budget of terrestrial ecosystems at country-scale—a European case study. *Biogeosciences Discussions* 1, 167-193.

Jordan, S.J., O'Higgins, T., Dittmar, J.A., 2012. Ecosystem Services of Coastal Habitats and Fisheries: Multiscale Ecological and Economic Models in Support of Ecosystem-Based Management. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* 4, 573-586.

Klein Goldewijk, K., Van Dreht, G., Bouwman, A.F., 2007. Mapping contemporary global cropland and grassland distributions on a 5 × 5 minute resolution. *Journal of Land Use Science* 2, 167-190.

Lautenbach, S., Maes, J., Kattwinkel, M., Seppelt, R., Strauch, M., Scholz, M., Schulz-Zunkel, C., Volk, M., Weinert, J., Dormann, C.F., 2012. Mapping water quality-related ecosystem services: concepts and applications for nitrogen retention and pesticide risk reduction. *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management* 8, 35-49.

Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., Lamarque, P., Colace, M.-P., Garden, D., Girel, J., Douzet, R., Pellet, G., 2011. Using plant functional traits to understand the landscape-scale distribution of multiple ecosystem services. *Journal of Ecology* 99, 135-147.

Leitinger, G., Ruggenthaler, R., Hammerle, A., Lavorel, S., Lamarque, P., Schirpke, U., Clément, J.C., Obojes, N., Tappeiner, U., 2015. Drought impact on water provision of managed alpine grasslands in two climatically different regions of the Alps. *Ecohydrology* in press.

Lindeskog, M., Arneeth, A., Bondeau, A., Waha, K., Seaquist, J., Olin, S., Smith, B., 2013. Implications of accounting for land use in simulations of ecosystem services and carbon cycling in Africa. *Earth System Dynamics Discussion* 4, 235-278.

Liquete, C., Zulian, G., Delgado, I., Stips, A., Maes, J., 2013. Assessment of coastal protection as an ecosystem service in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 30, 205-217.

Lotze-Campen, H., Müller, C., Bondeau, A., Rost, S., Popp, A., Lucht, W., 2008. Global food demand, productivity growth, and the scarcity of land and water resources: a spatially explicit mathematical programming approach. *Agricultural Economics* 39, 325-338.

Lotze-Campen, H., Popp, A., Beringer, T., Müller, C., Bondeau, A., Rost, S., Lucht, W., 2010. Scenarios of global bioenergy production: The trade-offs between agricultural expansion, intensification and trade. *Ecological Modelling* 221, 2188-2196.

Neitsch, S.L., Arnold, J.G., Kiniry, J.R., Williams, J.R., 2005. Soil and Water Assessment Tool - Documentation, Version 2005.

Plummer, M.L., Harvey, C.J., Anderson, L.E., Guerry, A.D., Ruckelshaus, M.H., 2013. The Role of Eelgrass in Marine Community Interactions and Ecosystem Services: Results from Ecosystem-Scale Food Web Models. *Ecosystems* 16, 237-251.

Portmann, F.T., Siebert, S., Döll, P., 2010. MIRCA 2000 - Global monthly irrigated and rainfed crop areas around the year 2000: A new high-resolution data set for agricultural and hydrological modelling. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 24, GB1011.

Ramankutty, N., Evan, A.T., Monfreda, C., Foley, J.A., 2008. Farming the planet: 1. Geographic distribution of global agricultural lands in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 22, 1-19.

Ramankutty, N., Foley, J.A., 1999. Estimating historical changes in global land cover: Croplands from 1700 to 1992. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 13, 997-1027.

Schulp, C.J.E., Lautenbach, S., Verburg, P.H., 2014. Quantifying and mapping ecosystem services: Demand and supply of pollination in the European Union. *Ecological Indicators* 36, 131-141.

Schulp, C.J.E., Nabuurs, G.-J., Verburg, P.H., 2008. Future carbon sequestration in Europe - Effects of land use change. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 127, 251-264.

- Shepherd, D., Burgess, D., Jickells, T., Andrews, J., Cave, R., Turner, R.K., Aldridge, J., Parker, E.R., Young, E., 2007. Modelling the effects and economics of managed realignment on the cycling and storage of nutrients, carbon and sediments in the Blackwater estuary UK. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 73, 355-367.
- Sitch, S., Smith, B., Prentice, I.C., Arneth, A., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W., Kaplan, J.O., Levis, S., Lucht, W., Sykes, M.T., Thonicke, K., Venevsky, S., 2003. Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model. *Global Change Biology* 9, 161-185.
- Smith, B., Prentice, I.C., Sykes, M.T., 2001. Representation of vegetation dynamics in the modelling of terrestrial ecosystems: comparing two contrasting approaches within European climate space. *Global Ecology & Biogeography* (2001) 10, 621– 637 10, 621-637.
- Stürck, J., Poortinga, A., Verburg, P.H., 2014. Mapping ecosystem services: The supply and demand of flood regulation services in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 38, 198-211.
- Temmerman, S., De Vries, M.B., Bouma, T.J., 2012. Coastal marsh die-off and reduced attenuation of coastal floods: A model analysis. *Global and Planetary Change* 92-93, 267-274.
- van Berkel, D.B., Verburg, P.H., 2011. Sensitising rural policy: Assessing spatial variation in rural development options for Europe. *Land Use Policy* 28, 447-459.
- van der Zanden, E.H., Verburg, P.H., Mûcher, C.A., 2013. Modelling the spatial distribution of linear landscape elements in Europe. *Ecological Indicators* 27, 125-136.