

Identifying the Species Threat Hotspots from Global Supply Chains

Daniel Moran¹, Keiichiro Kanemoto^{2,*}

Affiliations: ¹ Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; ² Shinshu University, Matsumoto, Japan

* Corresponding Author: keiichiro.kanemoto@gmail.com

Summary Sentence: Spatially explicit footprints make it possible to locate biodiversity hotspots linked to global supply chains.

Identifying species threat hotspots has been a successful approach for setting conservation priorities. One major challenge in conservation is that in many hotspots export industries continue to drive overexploitation. Conservation measures must consider not just the point of impact, but also the consumer demand that ultimately drives resource use. To understand which species threat hotspots are driven by which consumers, we have developed a new approach to link a set of biodiversity footprint accounts to the hotspots of threatened species on the IUCN Red List. The result is a map connecting global supply chains to impact locations. Connecting consumption to spatially explicit hotspots driven by production has not been done before on a global scale. Locating biodiversity threat hotspots driven by consumption of goods and services can help connect conservationists, consumers, companies, and governments in order to better target conservation actions.

Introduction

Human-induced biodiversity threats, such as from deforestation, overfishing, overhunting, and climate change, often arise from incursion into natural ecosystems in search of food, fibre, and resources. A major driver of this incursion is the production of goods for export. Lenzen and colleagues suggested that at least one third of biodiversity threats worldwide are linked to production for international trade^{1,2}. Understanding market forces and using effective spatial targeting are key to implementing protections efficiently^{3,4}. However, in order to realistically expedite remedial actions threat causes must be located more specifically. Previous work has linked consumption and supply chains to biodiversity impacts but only at the country level¹. Biodiversity threats are often highly localized. Knowing that a given consumption demand drives biodiversity threat somewhere within a country is not enough information to act. Here we present a new approach to making the inshore and terrestrial biodiversity footprint spatially explicit at a sub-national level.


Methods

Using a threat hotspot map built using composited extent-of-occurrence maps from IUCN⁵ and BirdLife International⁶ (also called distribution maps showing range

41 boundaries), we applied the biodiversity footprint method of Lenzen *et al*¹, attributing
42 each anthropogenic species threat to one or more culpable industries then traced the
43 implicated commodities from 15,000 production industries worldwide to final
44 consumers in 187 countries using a global trade model^{7,8}. The result is an account
45 linking production and consumption of economic sectors to spatially explicit species
46 threat hotspots. The account only considers threats which can be attributed to
47 industries and thus excludes threats such as change in population structure, disease,
48 natural catastrophes, etc. (discussed further below).

49 Figure 1 provides an illustration of the method. Species come under threat from a
50 variety of causes, many of which are anthropogenic and linked to industries
51 producing goods for consumption domestically and abroad. In Fig. 1 the extent of
52 occurrence (EOO) of *Ateles paniscus*, the Red-faced Spider Monkey in Brazil, is
53 shaded in a darker colour reflecting that a higher fraction (2.43%) of the total
54 anthropogenic threat to the species that can be attributed to consumption in the US
55 (via agriculture and logging activity in Brazil producing goods finally consumed in
56 the USA). The range of *Atelopus spumarius*, Pebas stubfooted toad, is shown in
57 lighter colour since a smaller fraction (2.02%) of the total threat to that species can
58 be attributed to final consumers in the US, due to the different mix of threat causes
59 to *Atelopus* and the different mix of implicated products consumed in the USA. These
60 impact maps are summed over all species so hotspots, so in the Fig. 1 example the
61 hotspot at the intersection of *Ateles* and *Atelopus* is shaded at the 2.43% + 2.02% =
62 4.45% level. The final biodiversity footprint map for a given country is thus a product
63 both of the actual distribution of biodiversity hotspots around the world and the
64 unique composition of how that country's consumption affects each individual species
65 in each partner country.

66



67

68 Fig. 1. Protocol illustration, for hotspot induced by consumption in the USA.

69

70 The biodiversity footprint of country s , $F_j^{(c)s}$ comprising the sum of the threat to
71 species suffered in country r exerted directly by industry i due to consumption in
72 country s of the good or service j , inclusive of the upstream and indirect impacts
73 involved in provisioning j can be expressed as

$$74 \quad F_j^{(c)s} = \sum_{i,r} q_i^r \sum_t L_{ij}^{rt} y_j^{ts} \quad (1)$$

75 where q is a threats coefficients, L is the Leontief inverse, and y is final demand
 76 ^{1,9}. This trade model follows flows through multiple trade and transformation steps,
 77 even via middleman countries, to attribute impacts from production in s to
 78 consumption in r via last supplying country t . In this study we used the
 79 implementation of the biodiversity footprint from Lenzen *et al.* directly, which in turn
 80 uses the Eora global MRIO¹⁰. The reader is referred to that paper and its
 81 supplementary information for a thorough discussion of the method, but we
 82 summarize it briefly here.

We extend the biodiversity footprint method previously produced by Lenzen and colleagues with spatial data. Following that method we considered only species which the IUCN and BirdLife International list as vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered, and we ignore threats which are not directly attributable to legal economic activities, including disease, invasive species, fires, and illegal harvesting (since illegal activities are not captured in the global trade model). The IUCN documents 197 different threats, 166 of which can be attributed to human activities. Threatened species hotspots were identified by overlaying species range maps from IUCN⁵ and BirdLife International⁶ for $N = 6,803$ *Animalia* species (the combined IUCN and BirdLife databases report on 20,856 species with known threat causes, of these 8,026 are threatened, and of these range maps are available for 6,803). Species threat records from the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, e.g. “The vulnerable (VU) *Atelopus spumarius* in Brazil is threatened by Logging and Wood Harvesting” are mapped to economic production sectors – in this case, attributed to the forestry sector in Brazil – and the resultant products are then traced through a multi-region input-output table which documents the trade and transformation steps in the economic network consisting of 14,839 sectors/consumption categories across 187 countries. When a species faces multiple threats all threats are given equal weight, as no relevant superior data is available. Every individual species is given equal weight, regardless of its ecological niche or threat level (vulnerable/endangered/critically endangered), and every threat cause is given equal weight.

The hotspot maps are potentially overestimates, for several reasons. Global MRIO databases do not currently trace flows at the sub-national level, i.e. which cities produce or consumer which goods. However the IUCN threat maps document the mix of species-threats occurring in each grid cell, and the trade model links the threats to implicated industries and traces the mix of goods and services embodied into supply chains bound for domestic or foreign final consumption. Multi-scale MRIOs combining inter-national and sub-national flows that would offer further improvements in resolution accuracy are under development^{11–14}. Another reason that the footprint maps are overestimates is that for species whose range spans multiple countries, there is no data on whether the threat(s) faced by that species occur differently in the various countries. Mathematically, our model treats country-species-threat tuples as the unique item, while in fact in the Red List it is only the

117 [country-species] and [species-threat] tuples that are unique. For example a species
118 spanning two countries could be threatened by logging, but it could be that logging
119 practices in one of the two countries do not actually threaten the species, or that one
120 of the countries does not even have any logging industry. However in the latter case,
121 that one country has no logging industry or exports to the focal country, the range of
122 the species in the innocent country will not be shaded since the shading is a function
123 of the unique mix of species and export of implicated goods.

124 While the hotspot areas identified in this study are potentially over-estimated, it is
125 important to note that the entire analysis is based on historical records of species
126 threats, not current or emerging threats. Threats such as invasive species, illegal
127 activities, or disease can arise very quickly and the Red List and Eora MRIO database
128 could be slow to identify these current issues. This delay is particularly relevant given
129 recent indications that humanity is surpassing “safe” limits for biodiversity loss.¹⁵

130 In this study only terrestrial and near-shore marine biodiversity are considered.
131 Open ocean fishing was deemed beyond the scope for this study because there are a
132 number of challenges related to getting reliable data on deep-sea fishing, both on
133 production (handling illegal and under-reported catch), and on correctly allocating
134 catch to the producing country (foreign-flagged vessels). Additionally, instead of the
135 IUCN EOO maps for marine species it could be preferable to use spatialized species
136 density models¹⁶ which could provide more accurate marine biodiversity hotspots. We
137 will note that marine biodiversity is higher in coasts than open oceans^{17,18}, and that
138 jurisprudence only holds within EEZs, these two facts partially justifying the
139 omission of extra-EEZ threats.

140 In this study, we link a hotspot EOO map R (which for display we have rasterized to
141 0.94', or ~3km² grid cells at the equator, though as discussed the actual accuracy of
142 the map is less) and biodiversity footprint for each threatened species h for each
143 country. Most threats (roughly 2/3rds) are exerted domestically so the country of
144 export and the country of the hotspots are the same¹. If a species is threatened by
145 climate change (CC), the driver (exporting) country, r , and the suffering country, u ,
146 are different. Therefore, we attribute the threat to all industries who emit carbon
147 dioxide emissions but keep the species range map in suffering countries. The unit of
148 the resulting maps is number of species, also called species-equivalents. This value
149 can be fractional, since one species can be threatened by many industries and
150 countries. The footprint maps are defined as

$$151 R^{(c)s} = \sum_{r,h} R_h^r \sum_i q_{hi}^{r(\text{nonCC})} \sum_{j,t} L_{ij}^{rt} y_j^{ts} + \sum_{u,h} R_h^u \sum_{i,r} q_{hi}^{r(\text{CC})} \sum_{j,t} L_{ij}^{rt} y_j^{ts} \quad (2)$$

152

153 Results


154 With the complete spatial footprint accounts in hand we may ask which countries,
155 and which consumption categories, threaten habitat at various hotspots. Fig. 2
156 presents the biodiversity threats map driven by US consumption.

157 For marine species Southeast Asia is the overwhelmingly dominant global hotspot
158 area, with the US and EU both exerting many threats there, primarily due to fishing,
159 pollution, and aquaculture. The US has additional marine hotspots off the Caribbean
160 coast of Costa Rica and Nicaragua at the mouth of the Orinoco around Trinidad and
161 Tobago (Fig. 3a). The EU drives threats hotspots outside Southeast Asia in the
162 islands around Madagascar: Réunion, Mauritius, Seychelles.

163 The US footprint on terrestrial species provides some notable findings. While the
164 hotspots in Southeast Asia and Madagascar are perhaps expected, we also observe
165 hotspots in southern Europe, the Sahel, the east and west coast of southern Mexico,
166 throughout Central America, and Central Asia and southern Canada. Despite much
167 attention on the Amazon rainforest, the US footprint in Brazil is actually greater in
168 southern Brazil, in the Brazilian Highlands where agriculture and grazing are
169 extensive, than inside the Amazon basin, although impacts along the Amazon river
170 itself are high. The high US biodiversity footprint in southern Spain and Portugal –
171 linked to impacts on a number of threatened fish and bird species – is also noteworthy
172 given that these countries are rarely perceived as threat hotspots.

173 We find that the biodiversity footprint is concentrated: for threats driven by US
174 consumption, the 5% most intensively affected land area covers 23.6% of its total
175 impact on species, and at sea the 5% most intensively impacted marine area affects
176 60.7% of threatened species habitats.

177



178
179 Fig. 2. Global species threat hotspots linked to consumption in the USA. Darker areas indicate areas of threat
180 hotspots driven by US consumption, based on the mix of threats exerted in each country and the mix of export
181 goods sent to US for final consumption. Units are species-equivalents and are fractional since one species threat
182 can be attributed to multiple consumer countries..


183

184 It is possible to view the threat hotspots for various major consumer countries and
185 zoom in on particular regions impacted by their consumption. The enlargements-in
186 subpanels in Fig. 3 focus on threat hotspots in South America driven by US
187 consumption (panel a), in Africa driven by EU consumption (panel b), and in
188 Southeast Asia driven by Japanese consumption (panel c). EU consumption drives
189 threat hotspots in Morocco, all along the coast of the Horn of Africa from Libya to
190 Cameroon, in Ethiopia, Madagascar, throughout Zimbabwe, and at Lake Malawi and
191 Lake Victoria. We also note the heavy EU footprint in Turkey and Central Asia;
192 regions perhaps not known for their charismatic species but nevertheless important
193 areas of EU-driven biodiversity impact.


194 The Japanese-driven biodiversity impacts in Southeast Asia are greatest in the
195 Bismarck and Solomon Sea off Papua New Guinea, and terrestrial hotspots can be
196 found at New Britain Island (where palm oil, cocoa, logging, and coconut plantations
197 are the dominant industries) and the eastern highlands of New Guinea; Bornean and
198 continental Malaysia, Brunei (where urban and industrial areas sprawl into high-
199 value habitat), the Chao Phraya drainage of Thailand, in northern Vietnam, and
200 around Colombo and southern Sri Lanka (where pressure is driven by tea, rubber,
201 and threats linked to manufactured goods sent to Japan).

202

203




c.



204 Fig. 3. Selected enlargements of threat hotspots in Latin America driven by US consumption (panel a), in Africa
205 driven by European (EU27) consumption (panel b), and in Asia driven by Japanese consumption (panel c). Note
206 some countries (incl. Solomon Islands, Guyana, French Guiana, Equatorial Guinea, Western Sahara) are not
207 covered in the economic database. Complete images are available in the Supplementary Information.

208 Biodiversity footprint hotspots are a function of both underlying species richness and
209 the level of threatening activity (i.e. number of species threats attributable to
210 implicated industries at a given location). Hotspot maps may be decomposed to view
211 the contributing factors. Fig. 4 provides a disaggregation of the USA footprint in Fig.
212 2 by threat cause. Hotspots are a function of underlying species density (composed
213 EOO maps).



214
215 Fig. 4. Decomposition of threat hotspots linked to consumption in the USA (see Fig. 2) by threat cause. Biodiversity
216 footprint hotspots for a given country are a function of both underlying species richness and the composition and
217 volume of threatening activity.

218

219 Discussion, Limitations, and Conclusions

220 Trade and responsibility attribution aside, identifying biodiversity hotspots is not
221 trivial, and is strongly limited by data resolution. The need for improved models and

maps locating species occurrence and biodiversity hotspots is documented^{19,20}. Since Myers and colleagues introduced the hotspot concept with 25 broad areas,²¹ much conservation research now relies on extent-of-occurrence (EOO²²) maps. Overlapping EOO maps²³ has limitations as a method for finding hotspots^{24–28}, and extent of occurrence is not the only way to identify hotspots: for birds, mapping species occupancy²⁹, endemism, or threat reveals different hotspots³⁰. Furthermore, both threat intensity and species density can vary considerably within the range³¹. Projects such as AquaMaps¹⁶, the Global Mammal Assessment¹⁸, and the Global Amphibian Assessment are working to generate more robust and high-resolution maps. When a superior, globally consistent, set of species occurrence maps becomes available it will be possible to replace the EOO maps with those. Grenyer and colleagues³² argued that priority areas for biodiversity conservation should be based on high-resolution range data from multiple taxa, not merely aggregated extent of occurrence maps since cross-taxon and rare species congruence are in fact low in such aggregate maps. Acknowledging this, the method we use here can be used to identify the spatial biodiversity footprints at the detail of individual species. It is also possible to use the spatial footprinting method with biodiversity threat hotspot maps generated using other approaches such as mechanistic modelling. Since EOO maps of range do not estimate actual occupancy or how threat varies across the range, more detailed local assessments at individual hotspots will be always be needed. Nevertheless these spatial footprint maps can be of use. For example, we can imagine that even if a company or buyer consults a spatial biodiversity footprint map that has overestimated the threat and identifies, say, three hotspots in a supplier country, even though over-estimated (i.e. the true hotspots will be in some sub-set of the identified area), this hotspot information is still more precise and actionable than simply a single total figure for impacts in that country, which has been the limit of knowledge so far.

The economic trade model is another source of uncertainty, although work continues to improve the convergence³³, reliability, spatial^{11,12}, and product-level detail³⁴ of multi-region input-output databases used for the trade accounting. While alternative methods exist to calculate land footprints³⁵ – which is the biggest driver of the biodiversity footprint³⁶ – for this study an existing biodiversity footprint account was used rather than building a new one. Improved spatial data of the trade model is especially important for spatially extensive countries such as USA, China, Russia, and India, where one industry may have different impacts across its domain. With much attention on global supply chains³⁷ and footprints³⁸ it may be expected that the trade accounting and embodied resource flow accounts will become more accurate in the future. However it must be noted that small-scale and illegal impacts are potentially important³⁹ and will possibly never be covered by global-scale trade databases.

It has been estimated that 90% of the \$6 billion of annual conservation funding originates in and is spent within economically rich countries⁴⁰, yet these countries are rarely where threat hotspots lie. Directing funding back up along their supply chains, toward the original points of impact, could help yield better conservation

266 outcomes.

267 As conservation efforts must both protect critical habitat^{41,42} and do so in an
268 economically efficient manner^{43–45} spatially explicit supply chain analysis can be a
269 helpful tool for finding the most efficient ways to protect absolutely important areas.
270 Given that the Aichi targets are inadequate –protecting 17% of global land area and
271 10% of marine can cover at most 53.1% of known threatened species EOO – and the
272 fact that biodiversity stocks are not evenly distributed amongst countries,
273 conservation hotspots must be prioritized (and of course, not be placed in
274 unproductive areas^{46–48}).

275 Shortly before this paper came to print we became aware of another spatially explicit
276 biodiversity footprint study by Kitzes and colleagues that used estimated species
277 richness based on potential net primary productivity to estimate which economic
278 activities impact the most potentially valuable bird habitats.⁴⁹

279 Using the biodiversity hotspots method it is possible to identify areas where the
280 biodiversity threat is predominantly driven by just a small number of countries. By
281 identifying regions where just two or three countries are implicated in driving the
282 pressure it could be easier to initiate direct collaborations between producers and
283 consumers, in parallel to existing international regimes, to mitigate biodiversity
284 impacts at those places.

285 Spatially explicit impact accounting can facilitate improvements in sustainable
286 production, international trade, and consumption. Responsibility for environmental
287 pressures should be shared along the supply chains, not pinned solely on primary
288 impacting industries nor exclusively on final consumers. Looking upstream, detailed
289 information on species hotspots can be useful for companies in reducing their
290 biodiversity impact. Downstream, accounts such as these can be of use to guide
291 sustainable purchasing and green labelling and certification initiatives. It is possible
292 to imagine companies comparing maps of biodiversity footprints with maps of where
293 their inputs are sourced. We could also foresee conservationists working to preserve
294 impacted areas using such models to help identify the intermediate and final
295 consumers whose purchases sustain threat-implicated industries, and looking down
296 the supply chain to help involve consumers in protection activities. Better targeting
297 spatial hotspots assist in setting effective conservation priorities⁵⁰.

298 Maps of species threat hotspots can help all actors, from producers and
299 conservationists to final consumers, to focus solutions on targeted biodiversity
300 hotspots.

301

302

303 **Acknowledgements:** This work was supported in part by the Japan Society for the
304 Promotion of Science through its Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (A) 15H05341,
305 the Norwegian Research Council grant #255483/E50, the PRINCE project of the

306 Swedish Environment Agency, and Belmont Forum's TSUNAGARI project. The
307 authors would also like to thank A. Hart for comments that have improved the work.
308

309 **Author contributions:**

310 Both authors contributed equally to this work.
311

312 **Data Availability:** The results maps presented and discussed in this paper are
313 available in the online Supplementary Information package. The results, calculated
314 as described in the Methods, are based on the data from the IUCN, BirdLife
315 International, and the Eora MRIO databases, all of which are publicly available.
316

317 The authors affirm they have no competing interests.
318

319 **References**
320

- 321 1. Lenzen, M. *et al.* International trade drives biodiversity threats in developing
322 nations. *Nature* **486**, 109–112 (2012).
- 323 2. Essl, F., Winter, M. & Pysek, P. Biodiversity: Trade threat could be even more
324 dire. *Nature* **487**, 39 (2012).
- 325 3. Chaplin-Kramer, R. *et al.* Spatial patterns of agricultural expansion determine
326 impacts on biodiversity and carbon storage. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 7402–
327 7407 (2015).
- 328 4. Bateman, I. J. *et al.* Conserving tropical biodiversity via market forces and
329 spatial targeting. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 7408–7413 (2015).
- 330 5. International Union for the Conservation of Nature. IUCN Red List v. 2015-3.
331 www.iucnredlist.org (2015).
- 332 6. BirdLife International and NatureServe. Bird species distribution maps of the
333 world. Version 5.0. Accessed August 2015 (2015).
- 334 7. Lenzen, M., Kanemoto, K., Moran, D. & Geschke, A. Mapping the structure of
335 the world economy. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **46**, 8374–8381 (2012).
- 336 8. Lenzen, M., Moran, D. D., Kanemoto, K. & Geschke, A. Building Eora: a Global
337 Multi-Region Input-Output Database at High Country and Sector Resolution.
338 *Econ. Syst. Res.* **25**, 20–49 (2013).
- 339 9. Kanemoto, K., Lenzen, M., Peters, G. P., Moran, D. D. & Geschke, A.
340 Frameworks for Comparing Emissions Associated with Production,
341 Consumption, And International Trade. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **46**, 172–179
342 (2012).

- 343 10. Lenzen, M., Kanemoto, K., Moran, D. & Geschke, A. Mapping the structure of
344 the world economy. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **46**, 8374–8381 (2012).
- 345 11. Godar, J., Persson, U. M., Tizado, E. J. & Meyfroidt, P. Towards more accurate
346 and policy relevant footprint analyses: Tracing fine-scale socio-environmental
347 impacts of production to consumption. *Ecol. Econ.* **112**, 25–35 (2015).
- 348 12. Lenzen, M. *et al.* Compiling and using input–output frameworks through
349 collaborative virtual laboratories. *Sci. Total Environ.* **485–486**, 241–251 (2014).
- 350 13. Bachmann, C., Roorda, M. J. & Kennedy, C. Developing a Multi-Scale Multi-
351 Region Input-Output Model. *Econ. Syst. Res.* **27**, 172–193 (2014).
- 352 14. Feng, K. *et al.* Outsourcing CO₂ within China. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **110**,
353 11654–11659 (2013).
- 354 15. Newbold, T. *et al.* Has land use pushed terrestrial biodiversity beyond the
355 planetary boundary? A global assessment. *Science (80-.).* **353**, 45–50 (2016).
- 356 16. Kesner-Reyes, K. *et al.* Aquamaps. *AquaMaps: algorithm and data sources for*
357 *aquatic organisms In: Froese, R. and D. Pauly. Editors. 2012. FishBase. World*
358 *Wide Web electronic publication. www.fishbase.org, Version (04/2012)* (2016).
- 359 17. Gray, J. S. Marine biodiversity: patterns, threats and conservation needs.
360 *Biodivers. Conserv.* **6**, 153–175
- 361 18. Schipper, J. *et al.* The status of the world's land and marine mammals:
362 diversity, threat, and knowledge. *Science* **322**, 225–30 (2008).
- 363 19. Meyer, C., Kreft, H., Guralnick, R. & Jetz, W. Global priorities for an effective
364 information basis of biodiversity distributions. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8221 (2015).
- 365 20. Hortal, J., Lobo, J. M. & Jiménez-Valverde, A. Limitations of biodiversity
366 databases: case study on seed-plant diversity in Tenerife, Canary Islands.
367 *Conserv. Biol.* **21**, 853–63 (2007).
- 368 21. Myers, N., Mittermeler, R. A., Mittermeler, C. G., Da Fonseca, G. A. B. & Kent,
369 J. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* **403**, 853–858 (2000).
- 370 22. Gaston, K. J. & Fuller, R. A. The sizes of species' geographic ranges. *J. Appl.*
371 *Ecol.* **46**, 1–9 (2009).
- 372 23. Dobson, A. P., Rodriguez, J. P., Roberts, W. M. & Wilcove, D. S. Geographic
373 distribution of endangered species in the United States. *Science (80-.).* **275**,
374 550–553 (1997).
- 375 24. Ficetola, G. F. *et al.* An evaluation of the robustness of global amphibian range
376 maps. *J. Biogeogr.* **41**, 211–221 (2014).
- 377 25. Jetz, W., Sekercioglu, C. H. & Watson, J. E. M. Ecological Correlates and
378 Conservation Implications of Overestimating Species Geographic
379 RangesCorrelaciones Ecológicas e Implicaciones para la Conservación de la
380 Sobrestimación de los Rangos Geográficos de Especies. *Conserv. Biol.* **22**, 110–

- 381 119 (2008).
- 382 26. Williams, R. *et al.* Prioritizing global marine mammal habitats using density
383 maps in place of range maps. *Ecography (Cop.)*. **37**, 212–220 (2014).
- 384 27. Hurlbert, A. H. & Jetz, W. Species richness, hotspots, and the scale dependence
385 of range maps in ecology and conservation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **104**, 13384–
386 13389 (2007).
- 387 28. Joppa, L. N. *et al.* Impact of alternative metrics on estimates of extent of
388 occurrence for extinction risk assessment. *Conserv. Biol.* n/a-n/a (2015).
389 doi:10.1111/cobi.12591
- 390 29. Jenkins, C. N., Pimm, S. L. & Joppa, L. N. Global patterns of terrestrial
391 vertebrate diversity and conservation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**,
392 E2602-10 (2013).
- 393 30. Orme, C. D. L. *et al.* Global hotspots of species richness are not congruent with
394 endemism or threat. *Nature* **436**, 1016–1019 (2005).
- 395 31. Kaschner, K., Tittensor, D. P., Ready, J., Gerrodette, T. & Worm, B. Current
396 and Future Patterns of Global Marine Mammal Biodiversity. *PLoS One* **6**,
397 e19653 (2011).
- 398 32. Grenyer, R. *et al.* Global distribution and conservation of rare and threatened
399 vertebrates. *Nature* **444**, 93–96 (2006).
- 400 33. Moran, D. & Wood, R. Convergence Between the Eora, WIOD, EXIOBASE, and
401 OpenEU’s Consumption-Based Carbon Accounts. *Econ. Syst. Res.* **26**, 245–261
402 (2014).
- 403 34. de Koning, A. *et al.* Effect of aggregation and disaggregation on embodied
404 material use of products in input–output analysis. *Ecol. Econ.* **116**, 289–299
405 (2015).
- 406 35. Bruckner, M., Fischer, G., Tramberend, S. & Giljum, S. Measuring
407 telecouplings in the global land system: A review and comparative evaluation
408 of land footprint accounting methods. *Ecol. Econ.* **114**, 11–21 (2015).
- 409 36. Pereira, H. M., Navarro, L. M. & Martins, I. S. Global Biodiversity Change: The
410 Bad, the Good, and the Unknown. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **37**, 25–50
411 (2012).
- 412 37. Wible, B., Mervis, J. & Wigginton, N. S. The global supply chain. Rethinking
413 the global supply chain. Introduction. *Science* **344**, 1100–3 (2014).
- 414 38. Hoekstra, A. Y. & Wiedmann, T. O. Humanity’s unsustainable environmental
415 footprint. *Science (80-.).* **344**, 1114–1117 (2014).
- 416 39. Fisher, M. C. & Garner, T. W. J. The relationship between the emergence of
417 Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis, the international trade in amphibians and
418 introduced amphibian species. *Fungal Biol. Rev.* **21**, 2–9 (2007).

- 419 40. James, A. N., Gaston, K. J. & Balmford, A. Balancing the Earth's accounts.
420 *Nature* **401**, 323–324 (1999).
- 421 41. Jenkins, C. N., Van Houtan, K. S., Pimm, S. L. & Sexton, J. O. US protected
422 lands mismatch biodiversity priorities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 5081–5086
423 (2015).
- 424 42. Rodrigues, A. S. L. *et al.* Effectiveness of the global protected area network in
425 representing species diversity. *Nature* **428**, 640–643 (2004).
- 426 43. Withey, J. C. *et al.* Maximising return on conservation investment in the
427 conterminous USA. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 1249–1256 (2012).
- 428 44. Brown, C. J. *et al.* Effective conservation requires clear objectives and
429 prioritizing actions, not places or species. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, E4342
430 (2015).
- 431 45. Li, C. *et al.* Impacts of conservation and human development policy across
432 stakeholders and scales. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 7396–7401 (2015).
- 433 46. Barnes, M. Aichi targets: Protect biodiversity, not just area. *Nature* **526**, 195–
434 195 (2015).
- 435 47. Venter, O. *et al.* Targeting global protected area expansion for imperiled
436 biodiversity. *PLoS Biol.* **12**, e1001891 (2014).
- 437 48. Fuller, R. A. *et al.* Replacing underperforming protected areas achieves better
438 conservation outcomes. *Nature* **466**, 365–7 (2010).
- 439 49. Kitzes, J. *et al.* Consumption-based conservation targeting: Linking
440 biodiversity loss to upstream demand through a global wildlife footprint
441 (Forthcoming). *Conserv. Lett.* (2016).
- 442 50. Game, E. T., Kareiva, P. & Possingham, H. P. Six common mistakes in
443 conservation priority setting. *Conserv. Biol.* **27**, 480–5 (2013).
- 444