Conservation Biology

Conservation Focus Review

Connecting science, policy, and implementation for landscape-scale habitat connectivity

Jedediah F. Brodie,*¶ Midori Paxton,† Kangayatkarasu Nagulendran,‡ G. Balamurugan,§ Gopalasamy Reuben Clements,**††‡‡ Glen Reynolds,§§ Anuj Jain,*** and Jason Hon†††

*Departments of Zoology and Botany, 3529–6270 University Blvd., University of British Columbia, Vancouver V6T 1Z4, British Columbia, Canada

†United Nations Development Programme, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, Bangkok Regional Hub, Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, 10200 Bangkok, Thailand

‡Faculty of Science, University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus, 43500 Broga, Malaysia

§ERE Consulting Group, 47630 Subang Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia

**Rimba, 4 Jalan 1/9d, 43650 Bandar Baru Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

††Centre for Tropical Environmental and Sustainability Science and School of Marine and Tropical Biology, James Cook University, Cairns, Queensland, Australia

‡‡Kenyir Research Institute, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, 21030 Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia

§§South East Asia Rainforest Research Partnership, Danum Valley Field Centre, Po Box 60282, 91112 Lahad Datu, Sabah, Malaysia

***Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, 117543 Singapore

†††World Wildlife Fund Malaysia, 7th Floor, Lot 138, Section 54, Jalan Padungan, Sarawak, 93100 Kuching, Malaysia

Abstract: *We examined the links between the science and policy of habitat corridors to better understand how corridors can be implemented effectively. As a case study, we focused on a suite of landscape-scale connectivity plans in tropical and subtropical Asia (Malaysia, Singapore, and Bhutan). The process of corridor designation may be more efficient if the scientific determination of optimal corridor locations and arrangement is synchronized in time with political buy-in and establishment of policies to create corridors. Land tenure and the intactness of existing habitat in the region are also important to consider because optimal connectivity strategies may be very different if there are few, versus many, political jurisdictions (including commercial and traditional land tenures) and intact versus degraded habitat between patches. Novel financing mechanisms for corridors include bed taxes, payments for ecosystem services, and strategic forest certifications. Gaps in knowledge of effective corridor design include an understanding of how corridors, particularly those managed by local communities, can be protected from degradation and unsustainable hunting. There is a critical need for quantitative, data-driven models that can be used to prioritize potential corridors or multicorridor networks based on their relative contributions to long-term metacommunity persistence.*

Keywords: deforestation, extinction, habitat loss, Malaysia, metacommunity, metapopulation, persistence, Southeast Asia, tropical forest, wildlife corridor

Conexión entre la Ciencia, la Política y la Implementación para la Conectividad de Hábitats a Escala de Paisaje

Resumen: *Examinamos las conexiones entre la ciencia y la política de los corredores de hábitat para entender mejor cómo pueden implementarse efectivamente. Como un estudio de caso, nos enfocamos en un conjunto de planes de conectividad a escala de paisaje en la parte tropical y subtropical de Asia (Malaysia, Singapore, y Bhutan) El proceso de designación de corredores puede ser más eficiente si la determinación científica de la ubicación y el arreglo óptimo del corredor está sincronizada en tiempo con la aceptación política y el establecimiento de las políticas para crear los corredores. La tenencia y lo intacto de un hábitat existente en la región también son importantes de*

¶*Current address: Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812, U.S.A. email brodie@biodiversity.ubc.ca*
Paper submitted April 20, 2015; revised manuscript accepted December 6, 2015.

DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12667

considerar porque las estrategias óptimas de conectividad pueden ser muy diferentes si hay pocas, contra muchas, jurisdicciones políticas (incluyendo las tenencias tradicionales y comerciales) y pocos hábitats intactos contra degradados entre los fragmentos. Los mecanismos novedosos de financiamiento para los corredores incluyen los impuestos turísticos, los pagos por servicios ambientales y las certificaciones estratégicas de bosques. Los vacíos en el conocimiento del diseño efectivo de los corredores incluyen el entendimiento de cómo los corredores, en particular aquellos manejados por las comunidades locales, pueden ser protegidos de la degradación y la caza insustentable. Existe una necesidad crítica de modelos cuantitativos llevados por datos que puedan usarse para priorizar a los corredores potenciales o a las redes de multicorredores con base en sus contribuciones relativas a la persistencia a largo plazo de la metacomunidad.

Palabras Clave: bosque tropical, corredor de vida silvestre, deforestación, extinción, Malasia, metacomunidad, metapoblación, pérdida de hábitat, persistencia, sureste de Asia

Introduction

Natural habitats in many parts of the world are increasingly fragmented. Maintaining or recreating connections between fragments is critical to maintaining movement of organisms and genes between them (Prugh et al. 2008) and to support the long-term persistence of metapopulations (Nicholson et al. 2006). A fundamental conservation strategy is the establishment of large-scale (i.e., landscape- or continental-scale) habitat networks consisting of core habitat patches linked by habitat corridors (Soule & Terborgh 1999).

Landscape-scale habitat connectivity plans have been, or are being, developed in many parts of the world (Beier et al. 2008; Beier et al. 2011). The quantitative science of corridor design and assessment is also progressing rapidly (Beier et al. 2011). Here, we use the term *corridor* to mean a strip of habitat that links 2 habitat patches; corridors can be retained when surrounding lands are cleared or restored through habitat rehabilitation. In some cases, it may be possible to create corridors by increasing the structural complexity of the agricultural matrix and thus its permeability to dispersing wildlife (Yue et al. 2015). The proximate goal of a corridor is to promote "functional connectivity" (Fagan & Calabrese 2006), or the movement of organisms, across it to maintain gene flow between the patches and increase resilience to a range of pressures (e.g., climate change, extreme weather events, and hunting). The ultimate goal of the corridor is, or should be, to support the long-term persistence of metapopulations of native species. Although there are few examples to date of connectivity plans enhancing metapopulation persistence, corridors have effectively increased movement and gene flow across the landscape (e.g., Sawaya et al. 2014) and enhanced ecological processes such as seed dispersal (e.g., Levey et al. 2005).

As with many conservation arenas, however, in landscape connectivity, it remains unclear what the relative influences of science and policy are and how best to link them (Berger & Cain 2014). We assessed the linkages between science and policy in the design and implementation of habitat corridors by examining case studies in tropical and subtropical Asia, a region containing several biodiversity hotspots (Myers et al. 2000) with some of the highest rates of habitat loss (Hansen et al. 2013) in the world. We assessed the scientific analysis, policy framework, and implementation details of 6 connectivity projects in Asia that spanned a range of spatial scales and biological and sociopolitical settings (Table 1). Several of our conclusions have not been well highlighted in the literature to date. We also identified areas where overcoming knowledge gaps could greatly improve the efficacy of corridor strategies.

Corridor Science

Once the goals of a given connectivity project have been established, for example to connect 2 or more protected areas, focal taxa, the most important corridors, and corridor locations must be identified to help guide the strategy and its implementation.

Identification of Focal Taxa

We have no data on the ecological requirements of most taxa in most communities, particular in hyperdiverse regions such as tropical Asia. Moreover, species differ immensely in their responses to anthropogenic disturbances and, thus, their need for corridors in the first place. Therefore, habitat-corridor strategies often focus on a few priority taxa. The identity of these taxa is often determined subjectively, for example by focusing on large-bodied, charismatic, flagship species. For example, the Central Forest Spine (CFS) Masterplan (FDTCP 2010*a*) in Peninsular Malaysia focused on tigers (*Panthera tigris*), tapirs (*Tapirus indicus*), and elephants (*Elephas maximus*) because these were endangered and expected to garner public support for the connectivity strategy. In Central Sabah, considerable weight was given to the habitat requirements of orangutan (*Pongo pygmaus*) and elephants, despite there being little evidence that these species use the area. Either implicitly or explicitly, focusing on priority taxa assumes that such

Table 1. Summary of characteristics of 6 habitat-connectivity plans from Southeast Asia.

Connectivity plan	*Country*	*Year of establishment*	*Priority taxa (if any)*	*Data and analyses on which the plan was based*	*Legal designations and governance*	*Land tenure and land use*
Biological corridors	Bhutan	1999	5 threatened carnivore species, 6 threatened ungulate species	satellite imagery and land-use maps used to sketch 14 potential corridors to link 10 existing protected areas; assessment of potential corridors based on wildlife abundance, topography, fire frequency, forest condition, and human disturbance	1995 Forest and Nature Conservation Act; Rules on Biological Corridors 2007 provides framework for corridor governance and management	predominantly national forest areas with a limited number of villages and settlements
Central Forest Spine Masterplan	Malaysia	2010	elephant (*Elephas maximus*), tapir (*Tapirus indicus*), tiger (*Panthera tigris*), gaur (*Bos gaurus*)	data on existing and planned land use, known wildlife habitats, legal status of the land, size of forest fragments, and areas with human–wildlife conflicts	state governments not legally bound to implement because it is a federal government plan; funding provided by federal government	most of the land between forest patches are forest reserves that have been selectively logged, although some have been legally clearcut for plantations
Sabah EcoLinc	Malaysia	2014	none	1 year of field data collection on wildlife, flora, human communities, infrastructure, and human–wildlife conflicts	multiple	multiple

Continued

Table 1. Continued.

Connectivity plan	*Country*	*Year of establishment*	*Priority taxa (if any)*	*Data and analyses on which the plan was based*	*Legal designations and governance*	*Land tenure and land use*
Central Sabah Corridor	Malaysia	2012	elephants, other large mammals (also to improve ecological resilience into climate warming)	elephant and other large mammal surveys; long-term research on wildlife habitat selection in the Danum Valley Conservation Area	protected forest reserves buffered by commercial forest reserves	part of Sabah's permanent forest reserve; area under total forest cover
Sarawak Landscape Connections	Malaysia	pending	6 threatened carnivore species	habitat-selection data from widespread camera trapping used in circuit-theoretical animal dispersal models; model results used to parameterize metacommunity persistence models	to be determined; initial proposals to call for land reclassification (to increased protection status) by the state	most of the land between protected areas is state owned (with numerous unresolved native land claims) and leased as timber concessions (mostly already selectively logged) or for other extractive uses
NatureWays and Eco-Link	Singapore	2013	birds, butterflies, and small mammals	habitat-selection data from camera trapping and visual surveys; corridor locations designated by expert estimation	no legal protection; current government expressed commitment to conserve for as long as possible	roadside plantings; wildlife overpass

taxa will be umbrella species, in that promoting habitat connectivity for them will also ensure connectivity for other sympatric species. If priority taxa are chosen explicitly to be umbrella species, they should be wide-ranging organisms with low population density that specialize on intact habitat, such as many large-bodied carnivore species (Beier et al. 2008). Connectivity strategies in Asia often focus on tigers (Wikramanayake et al. 2011) or, in places where they do not occur, such as Sarawak, Sunda clouded leopard (*Neofelis diardi*) and sun bear (*Helarctos malayanus*). Research suggests that protecting these species will effectively protect other species that are intolerant of intense habitat disturbance (Brodie et al. 2015*a*).

Priority taxa can also be those that are critical to ecosystem function. Loss of important seed dispersing animals, for example, could inhibit forest regeneration, so large-bodied frugivores could serve as priority taxa for conservation in order to maintain the ecological process of seed dispersal (McConkey et al. 2012). Connectivity strategies could also focus on smaller insects and birds that provide important pollination services. In Singapore, for example, an abandoned rail corridor is used by the globally vulnerable straw-headed bulbul (*Pycnonotus zeylanicus*) and the common birdwing butterfly (*Troides helena cerberus*) (listed by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species) (Ho et al. 2011), thereby potentially increasing the exchange of both animals and animal-pollinated plants between the connected habitat patches.

Identification of Priority Corridors

The fragmented nature of many landscapes means that numerous habitat patches exist, and the number of possible habitat corridors between patches becomes vast as the number of patches increases. The 43 protected-area complexes in Sarawak, for example, have 903 possible corridors between them. Connecting each of n patches to every other patch in a network requires $[n^*(n\text{-}1)]/2$ links. Given so many options for corridors and limited funding and political capital available to provide them all with legal protection and on-site management, one needs to prioritize which potential corridors are most important.

In some cases, the patches that need to be connected are determined politically. In Sabah, for example, forested habitat between the 2 large parks in the west, Mt. Kinabalu (754 km^2) and the Crocker Range (1399 km^2), was lost decades ago, leaving them effectively isolated. The Sabah Parks department instigated the EcoLinc project (Table 1) to reestablish connectivity. Likewise, the Sabah Forest Department wanted to maintain connections between the 3 flagship conservation areas of central Sabah (Imbak Canyon, Maliau Basin, and Danum Valley). Although not specifically stated as the driver for this decision, scientists involved with Danum Valley Conservation Area emphasized the ecological importance of the elevational gradient represented by the Silam-Danum-Maliau-Imbak forest complex (0–1600 m in elevation) to support possible range shifts in response to climatic changes. In Singapore, the hourglass-shaped Eco-Link wildlife bridge was constructed across a major expressway to reconnect 2 nature reserves that were fragmented in 1985 (Chong et al. 2010).

In other cases, determining which habitat patches warrant connection by protected forests is not as easy. Planning for the CFS Masterplan revealed 6119 forest fragments in Peninsular Malaysia. Prioritization of linkages between these patches was done with expert opinion, based on fragment size, elevation, and known wildlife habitats. In Sarawak, there is less direction as to how to prioritize linkages. Many protected areas still have forest habitat between them (Gaveau et al. 2014), and it is not clear which linkages are most important to metacommunity persistence.

The problem of corridor prioritization has received substantial attention, usually in terms of each corridor's contribution to overall connectivity of the landscape—the proximate goal of the connectivity strategy. Prioritizations often employ graph theory, a branch of mathematics based on the analysis of information flow across networks of nodes (ecologically analogous to patches) and links between the nodes (i.e., corridors; Urban et al. 2009; Rayfield et al. 2011). Using graph theory, corridors can be ranked in terms of the contribution of each to overall connectivity (Urban et al. 2009; Rayfield et al. 2011) or gene flow (Rozenfeld et al. 2008). However, several problems with these approaches limit their utility. For example, rankings based on the contribution of each patch or corridor to landscape connectivity are very sensitive to the connectivity metric used (Laita et al. 2011; Ziolkowska et al. 2014), and many of the connectivity measures have divergent and counterintuitive model behaviors (Laita et al. 2011). Overall, connectivity measures derived from graph theory tend to focus on the dynamics of immigration and local extinction and not on regional population size or persistence (Moilanen 2011).

Corridors could also be prioritized based on their relative contributions to the long-term persistence of metapopulations of the focal species (Nicholson et al. 2006; Webb & Padgham 2013), thereby addressing the ultimate goal of the connectivity strategy. This can be problematic, however, due to inconsistencies and difficulties in estimating metapopulation persistence. Spatially explicit population models are data and computation intensive, making the optimization across multiple species difficult (Burgman et al. 2001). Instead, many studies use surrogates of metapopulation persistence rather than direct estimations of persistence itself (Webb & Padgham 2013). Such surrogates include species occurrence probabilities (Williams & Araujo 2000) or the proportion of habitat occupied (Urban & Keitt 2001). Rankings based on the contribution of each link to overall connectivity in a metapopulation context are also highly sensitive to the extinction and colonization parameters (Gilarranz & Bascompte 2012), so their utility may be limited for focal species whose demography is poorly known.

Identification of Corridor Locations

Once it is determined which habitat patches are to be connected, the exact location of the corridors is identified. The science behind this task is well advanced, and powerful modeling tools are available for determining optimal corridor locations. For example, some models estimate the least-cost path between 2 patches, which is a measure of potential connectivity (Beier et al. 2008). Other models use electrical circuit algorithms to determine the paths of maximum dispersal from one patch to another (McRae et al. 2008). These simulate random-walk dispersal by numerous individuals of the focal species and determine how many dispersers pass through each landscape pixel, thereby providing information on functional connectivity. These models are often data intensive, and the necessary habitat-selection information may or may not be available at the outset of a corridor designation process. The ongoing connectivity planning in Sarawak is based on camera-trap assessments of habitat quality for the various focal species (Brodie et al. 2015*a*; Brodie et al. 2015*b*). The CFS Masterplan did not have explicit maps of habitat quality; rather, a number of different proxy data sets were compiled (e.g., known wildlife habitats, human–wildlife conflicts, and fragment size). Then, the final designation of corridor locations was determined via a multicriteria prioritization process and fine-tuned by expert opinion (FDTCP 2010*a*). In this case, a major focus was to reconnect large, fragmented forest blocks; hence, rough locations for the linkages were largely clear.

Expert estimation may be used where direct habitat selection information is unavailable. In Singapore, least-cost path analysis has been carried out based on vegetation structural analysis and expert estimation of habitat requirements of moderately specialized small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and butterflies. The proposed maps have been validated for the presence or absence of species at selected patches (Hamid 2015). However, specialist and generalist species require different solutions for connectivity: short-range corridors to habitat for specialists and resource stepping stones for generalists (Dennis et al. 2013).

Corridor Policy

Maintaining effective landscape connectivity will often require consideration of the availability and spatial arrangement of habitat patches across state or national boundaries. This requires innovative mechanisms for cross-boundary spatial planning because land is owned by the states. Peninsular Malaysia, comprising 11 of the country's 13 states, has federally mandated national physical plans (NPPs) that provide top-down justification for spatial planning, mobilized through the National Physical Planning Council chaired by the prime minister (Taib & Siong 2008). The East Malaysian states of Sabah and Sarawak are not currently subject to the federal NPPs. Cross-border connectivity planning in those states, however, is guided by the vision for the Heart of Borneo Initiative, a tri-country program seeking to protect and link the forests of the island of Borneo through sustainable land uses (WWF 2007). At small scales involving multiple stakeholders, innovative measures of land use need to be developed. The National Parks Board of Singapore has been proactive in connecting its fragmented habitats by constructing corridors along city's streetscape with bird and butterfly friendly plantings (Jain et al. 2014). Several policy issues must be considered for connectivity strategies either within or between states.

Legal Mechanisms for Corridor Designation

The protection of habitat corridors may occur via numerous mechanisms. The simplest is when the corridor locations are managed by a single private group or government agency amenable to connectivity planning. In North America, for example, The Nature Conservancy often purchases land outright to serve as habitat corridors or works with landowners to implement conservation easements on corridors (Kiesecker et al. 2007). The CFS connectivity establishment in Peninsular Malaysia also requires a significant amount of land acquisition or gazettement of protected areas, given that most of the corridors are landscapes with multiple types of land tenure including forest reserves, state-owned forests, plantation areas, and villages. The central Sabah corridor is a land effectively controlled by the state via the Sabah Foundation and required a redesignation of permitted land-use activities rather than additional land purchases or multistakeholder management plans. For important corridors, management prescriptions can be recommended to ensure the long-term protection of these linkages. In contrast, the Sabah EcoLinc corridor is community owned and so required extensive consultations with the local communities to determine the degree and extent of habitat protection (Vaz & Agama 2013). Bhutan's biological corridor network is unique in that the initial designation in 1999 was by Her Majesty the Queen Mother Ashi Dorji Wangmo Wangchuck as a "Gift to the Earth from the People of Bhutan" under the 1995 Forest and Nature Conservation Act of Bhutan (WCD 2010). The conservation status of biological corridors in Bhutan is higher than that of forest reserves but lower than that of protected areas (WCD 2010).

Long-Term Maintenance of Political Buy-In and Leadership

Achieving political buy-in for landscape-scale connectivity and conservation plans will often be difficult and time-consuming (Schwabe et al. 2015). It also cannot be a one-time activity—political buy-in must be maintained continuously. Habitat corridors that required extensive political capital to designate could easily become paper corridors, heavily affected by illegal deforestation and hunting, without continued political support leading to effective enforcement (Jain et al. 2014). Moreover, without continued political support, often both at the federal level for leadership and the state level for implementation, future reevaluations of spatial plans could reverse current gains. Under strong political pressure for economic development, parks and corridors could be degazetted (Bernard et al. 2014) or simply ignored and cleared for agriculture or industry (Heng 2012; Hedges et al. 2013).

Probably the most effective way to achieve long-term political buy-in is for conservation scientists to work with government agency staff to coproduce connectivity plans (Beier 2008; Beier et al. 2015). The persistence of corridor networks in Singapore since 1991 (Tan 2006) and their recent unprecedented increase in the form of "nature ways" only seems possible through continued political support and funding to build and maintain such corridors. Such political will is necessary for the long-term success of any corridor network. In Singapore, communities are engaged in many ways through the cultivation of bird- and butterfly-friendly plants. Public participation has reinforced political support of such corridors.

Commitment to Implementation and Enforcement

The designation of corridors, even if habitat protection is ensured into perpetuity, is not sufficient to ensure the corridor will provide functional connectivity for focal taxa (Jain et al. 2014). It is essential to ensure robust management structure and enforcement mechanisms on the ground for the corridors to fulfill their intended functions. Corridors can be degraded via encroachment from unplanned or poorly planned development (Jain et al. 2014). Unsustainable hunting, for local subsistence or markets, is also a major threat to vertebrates in most tropical areas (Milner-Gulland et al. 2003) and could be particularly severe in narrow corridors that provide easy access to hunters (Brodie et al. 2015*b*). Several corridors in the CFS receive or have received strong poaching pressure, reducing their effectiveness at supporting wildlife movement (Clements et al. 2010). It is even possible that overhunted corridors could become attractive sinks or ecological traps that reduce population viability. According to recent surveys, the most important hurdles to effective enforcement of conservation regulations (such as hunting prohibitions) in Malaysia are, in order of decreasing importance, insufficient resources and capacity for enforcement, little determent due to weak sentences upon conviction of offenders even though the prevailing laws have high penalties, and jurisdictional boundaries and lack of coordination among agencies at both federal and state levels (Nagulendran et al. 2014). Although weak sentences may be insufficient to deter illegal hunting, very harsh sentences may be unlikely to be enforced by authorities—it may be that moderate sentences with an emphasis on restoring the ecological damage are optimal (WCD 2010).

Similarly, implementation of corridors has been difficult in Bhutan. Boundaries are not demarcated on the ground and most corridors do not have a management plan, although these are required under the 2007 Rules on Biological Corridors. In the absence of corridor management plans, many forest management units and community forests were established and infrastructures such as roads and transmission lines have been placed in corridor areas (WCD 2010). Some urgent tasks include the establishment of decentralized governance and management systems for individual corridors, integration of corridors into local land-use plans and practices, hiring and training of staff, and securing financial resources. Capacity and resources for corridor management on the part of the governments and communities need urgent improvement. With Bhutan's high poverty rate (12%), the government is striving to improve living standards. Given limited financial and human resources in the government, there is a need for achieving an integrated approach to advancing national and local development along with landscape connectivity for biodiversity conservation.

Awareness of the Importance of Connectivity

Awareness on the part of the public and government officials about the need for landscape-scale habitat connectivity is required for legislators to commit political and financial capital to designating corridors. Awareness among local communities, key government agencies with jurisdictions relevant to corridor areas (e.g., ministries of agriculture, forestry, and land planning), and industry stakeholders is particularly critical. In Peninsular Malaysia, the first "national physical plan" required significant awareness-raising and outreach (FDTCP 2010*b*). There is also a greater need to create cross-sectoral awareness, for example to ensure the objectives of the National Tiger Conservation and Action Plan in Peninsular Malaysia do not conflict with those of the National Highway Network Development Plan.

Educating the public and policy makers about the need for landscape-scale connectivity is also important to help overcome potential antagonism toward corridors.

Antagonism can stem from different sources. In some cases, local communities feel disaffected and disenfranchised by past conservation actions (e.g., the designation of national parks or forest reserves on lands to which they had claimed traditional title). In the Sabah EcoLinc, for example, communities resented the nearby Kinabalu National Park, and so the corridor plan involved no new designation of forest reserves but instead relied on community-managed forest. Long-term monitoring is needed to ensure the efficacy of such management. Antagonism can also arise at the other end of the economic spectrum, from developers who point to the often massive opportunity costs of corridor designation in the form of lost opportunities for industrial agriculture (Nantha & Tisdell 2009).

Recent surveys suggest that the biggest hurdles to conservation awareness in Malaysia are apathy and lack of passion among the Malaysian public on biodiversity and environmental issues; lack of champions or personalities to promote and garner support for conservation; and lack of training and capacity of officers in charge of public awareness programs to effectively execute their duties (Nagulendran et al. 2014). A conservation group called Borneo Futures has addressed the second point by pairing researchers with a popular Sabahan musician as the public spokesperson for the conservation goals. As with political buy-in, awareness can also be greatly improved and maintained by coproduction of connectivity plans by conservation scientists and government agency staff (Beier 2008; Beier et al. 2015).

Financing Connectivity Plans

In addition to political capital, providing legal protection for corridors requires financial capital to effectively manage the corridors, purchase the land outright, or defray the opportunity costs incurred by preventing land conversion. Financing plans are too often lacking in corridor schemes. This is particularly true in Malaysia, where state governments have the rights over lands and natural resources including timber, minerals and water and depend on them for revenue (Clements et al. 2010).

The bulk of the funding for corridor management often comes directly from governments. The CFS initiative implementation is envisaged to run into the end of the 12th Malaysian Plan (2025) and is expected to cost over US$1 billion (MNRE and UNDP 2014). Long-term funding requires the establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms. Some examples of such national-level financing mechanisms exist. Belize and Palau have added conservation fees and green fees, respectively, to departure taxes payable by visitors upon leaving the country. The fund generated is allocated for conservation (UNDP 2012). Certain areas where development is limited for other reasons, such as in the UNESCO World Heritage city of Melaka (Malaysia), have bed taxes (i.e., governmental fees for hotel accommodations). This model could be applied for conservation, whereby a small addition to the existing accommodation tax can be pulled together to create a fund to support protected-area and corridor management. Wildlife bonds, analogous to development impact bonds and social impact bonds (Warner 2013), could be sold to raise money for corridors, as could conservation-fee vehicle license plates, which generate substantial funding for wildlife conservation in the United States (MDJ 2015). None of these, which could systematically and sustainably generate millions of dollars of new funding per year, to our knowledge, have yet been tried for habitat connectivity fund raising in tropical Asia.

In some cases, it may also be possible to use payments for ecosystem services to offset the costs of corridor management. Protecting tropical forests for the carbon they store, embodied by the Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation Plus (REDD+) program, could also be used to help fund habitat connectivity. At a national and regional scale, the location of REDD+ projects is essentially haphazard from the point of view of spatial habitat planning. But there is no reason that REDD+ projects could not be specifically situated to serve as habitat corridors (Brodie et al. 2012). For example, the Central Sabah corridor may be effectively doubled in width and overall extent by the protection of the 1140 km^2 Kuamut Forest Reserve funded by carbon trading. Moreover, based on its ongoing project to calculate the nation's forest carbon stocks (Ngo et al. 2013), the Singapore government could earmark a significant part of the income from emission reduction for protected-area and corridor management costs to maintain the ecosystem services (i.e., carbon sequestration) that generate credits for the country.

Refinement of certain certification policies could create mechanisms to generate new habitat corridors without the need for additional funding. Both the Forest Stewardship Council and the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil require the assessment and designation of high-conservation-value (HCV) patches in order to certify timber or palm oil, respectively. But HCV assessments do not operate at a landscape level—the unit of assessment is the estate, forest concession, or plantation. If certification rules were revised to require consideration of landscape-scale processes, HCVs could be situated so as to act as stepping-stone corridors that provide broad-scale habitat linkage. A proposed initiative to approach Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil certification at a jurisdictional level, using Sabah (Malaysia) as a pilot case, would allow HCV assessments at the level of the state (D. Webber, personal communication). This would allow decisions to be made about connectivity at the landscape scale and, through associated compensatory mechanisms, would fund forest protection and restoration including the reconnection of key protected areas through the establishment of new corridors.

Lessons Learned

Importance of Synchronizing the Timing of Corridor Science and Policy

Science is performed and policy is generated by different groups at different paces. This means that if a time comes when there is sufficient political capital to launch a habitat-connectivity plan but there are not enough ecological data to inform the decision making, the process could be delayed or rely on expert opinion rather than objective analysis. In the CFS and the Sabah EcoLinc projects, for example, the political decisions to designate corridors were made before relevant data were available on where the corridors would best be located. Thus, these projects had to devote time and resources to consolidating available data (CFS) or collecting field data de novo (EcoLinc). In Sarawak, the reverse occurred—objective analyses of focal species habitat selection for use in corridor planning had been underway for several years during which the state government had little to no interest in conservation (Brodie et al. 2015*a*; Brodie et al. 2015*b*). In 2014, under a new government, conservation planning (including large-scale habitat connectivity strategies) commenced via a collaboration between nongovernmental organizations, government agencies, and academic institutions. In general, communication and collaboration via long-term relationships among scientists, policy makers, and land managers would reduce delays in enacting corridor plans and their implementation.

Land Tenure as a Crucial Input Variable in Corridor Analysis

Assessments of landscape-scale connectivity and plans for habitat corridors almost always include land-use maps (e.g., delineating forest vs agriculture) as inputs to the decision-making process. Land tenure maps, however, may be equally important. The differences between the Sabah EcoLinc and the central Sabah corridor project are illustrative. The EcoLinc, while connecting 2 government-owned parks, had to pass through areas controlled by local communities who were reluctant to give up their agricultural areas so the corridor had to pass through a narrow bottleneck of remnant intact forest. In central Sabah, the corridor lands were all owned by a single government agency (the Forest Department). When that agency decided to set aside corridors, it could do so by executive fiat. Such land-tenure information, when publically available (which is by no means always the case in Asia), could be easily incorporated into circuit-theoretical or other connectivity models and provide target areas for corridors that are much more feasible to enact politically.

Intactness and Optimal Corridor Design, Location, and Management

Land use strongly influences animal dispersal paths (McRae et al. 2008), so optimal corridor locations will differ depending on whether the landscape is already degraded (and needs restoration) or still intact but facing imminent degradation. The CFS Masterplan included construction of wildlife underpasses because many of the necessary connections were already severed by roads (FDTCP 2010*a*). Most of Sarawak has been selectively logged but not yet converted into agriculture (Gaveau et al. 2014), so old-growth forest corridors are generally unavailable but logged forest corridor options are plentiful.

Type of Corridor and Physical and Socioeconomic Management

Different corridor-management approaches need to be considered depending on the land tenure, land use, and socioeconomic situation. In most cases, a mix of physical and socioeconomic measures is necessary to create functional corridors because most corridors are inhabited multiple-use areas. Physical measures include creation of new protected areas, as was done in Sabah; creation of riparian reserves to secure wildlife corridors and protect water resources; building of wildlife-crossing overpasses and viaducts in critical ecological corridors where there are infrastructural barriers to movement, as was done in some of the CFS corridors; and rehabilitation of degraded forest. Most importantly, these physical measures require long-term management plans if the corridor is to be effective. Socioeconomic approaches are critical in developing countries in particular and include ecotourism development and promotion to realize local-community economic benefits from conservation-oriented land uses; enhancement of sustainability of community nontimber forest product harvests; and improvement of plantation estate design and operation to maintain wildlife movement and ecosystem services. In some places, socioeconomic measures may need to include actions to abate human–wildlife conflicts. This can include compensation schemes, improvement of farming and land-use practices to mitigate human–wildlife conflict, awareness programs, community involvement, and community empowerment.

Evaluating Outcomes

The connectivity plans we evaluated did not include specific desired outputs, making it difficult to monitor their success at achieving their outcomes. Ideally, connectivity plans include outputs related to species-specific processes of dispersal and population dynamics, incorporate environmental change and stochasticity (Nicholson et al.

2006), and evaluate with a single measure that is transparent, understandable to scientists and managers alike, and that addresses the ultimate goal of the connectivity strategy. Perhaps the best such currencies are the long-term probability of metapopulation persistence (Bakker & Doak 2009) or the minimization of long-term extinctions in metacommunities (Nicholson et al. 2006). It may, however, take a long time for extinctions to occur, so landscape-level gene flow could serve as a useful medium-term metric of connectivity (Gregory & Beier 2014).

Knowledge Gaps

Ranking, Prioritizing, and Optimizing Corridors

Currently, there are few standardized, quantitative ways to prioritize the contribution of individual corridors to metacommunity persistence (Nicholson et al. 2006) or to compare the importance of corridors versus other conservation actions, for example setting aside new protected areas. Strategic conservation planning (e.g., Fajardo et al. 2014) can be used to rank protected areas (or potential new protected areas) in terms of their contribution to species representation but cannot be used to assess the probabilities that those species will persist over the long term. For example, even large, high-quality habitat patches (which have high conservation value on their own) will contribute little to metapopulation persistence if they are too isolated; thus, they are of low value for connectivity. If the ultimate goal of a landscape connectivity plan is to ensure long-term metapopulation or metacommunity persistence, individual corridors must be prioritized using metapopulation or metacommunity models.

There are multiple methods (discussed above) for determining locations for corridors to ensure optimal connectivity. But many of these provide only the optimal corridor route—corridors, for example, may be situated to follow least-cost paths. These are one-dimensional lines and it is unclear how far on either side of the line the actual corridor should extend (Beier et al. 2008; Brodie et al. 2015*a*). Corridors that are too narrow will be highly accessible to hunters as well as vulnerable to edge effects such as fire, wind, and increased mortality of canopy tree species. But wide corridors may be expensive to procure or manage. Moreover, limited political and financial capital may entail trade-offs between the number of corridors that can be established and the dimensions of each one. Objective tools to determine the optimal widths of a series of corridors in a network are greatly needed.

Optimal Land-Use Patterns and Corridor Efficacy and Socioeconomic Benefits

Many corridors are in multiple-use areas with mixtures of production and conservation land uses. In developing nations, governments' top priorities are often poverty reduction, so for corridors to be functional stakeholders at national and local levels need to be convinced of their benefits. Given this, a range of socioeconomic research would be useful, including economic assessments of different land-use patterns in corridor areas and comparisons of scenarios of long-term economic values derived from the area that accounts for biodiversity and ecosystem-service values. The Sabah Forest Department is developing an economic model to establish the optimal land-use patterns of a multiple-use forest landscape to optimize economic and biodiversity conservation benefits of a landscape.

Optimal Mix of Top-Down and Bottom-Up Influence

Some corridors are enacted by simple governmental decree (top-down designation), such as the corridors in Bhutan and central Sabah. Others, such as the CFS, are federal administrative approaches that have to be followed through by the states to actually designate corridors. Other plans may be driven by local communities (bottom-up approach). In the Sabah EcoLinc, the planning process was started and driven by a state government agency (Sabah Parks), but most of the land involved belonged to local communities who demanded that no new forest reserves be designated and the management of the corridor be left to the communities (Vaz & Agama 2013). Most connectivity strategies will have at least some mixture of top-down and bottom-up influence. A critical question is how different mixtures of top-down and bottom-up enactment strategies affect the long-term effectiveness of the corridor. Future monitoring of the corridors we considered here would allow assessment of the long-term success of top-down versus bottom-up corridors.

There is some evidence that involving nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in corridor science, policy, and implementation can yield positive results. Corridor initiatives led by NGOs may also provide a mix of top-down and bottom-up approaches. For example, Panthera is developing a comprehensive strategy to link core jaguar populations from Northern Argentina to Mexico under the Jaguar Corridor Initiative through multilateral partnerships, government support, and local buy-in (Panthera 2015).

Optimal Mix of Expert Opinion versus Objective Data

The vast majority of habitat connectivity plans rely on expert opinion at some stage of the process, and it is often embedded into otherwise objective quantitative analyses (Beier et al. 2008). The human brain is very good at synthesizing disparate types of data, and it may or may not be that subjective determinations of corridor priorities and optimal corridor locations are as effective as completely objective data. Monitoring and comparing the long-term effectiveness of corridors designed with a range of subjective versus objective approaches would provide important insights into optimal corridor-design strategies.

Literature Cited

Bakker VJ, Doak DF. 2009. Population viability management: ecological standards to guide adaptive management for rare species. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment **7:**158–165.

Beier P. 2008. Thinking like a mountain. Wildlife Society Bulletin **Winter**:26–29.

Beier P, et al. 2015. Guiding principles and recommended practices for co-producing actionable science. Report to the Secretary of the Interior from the Advisory Committee on Climate Change and Natural Resource Science. U.S. Department of Interior, Washington, District of Columbia. Available from www.cspo.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Actionable-Science-How-to-Guide.pdf (accessed July 2015).

Beier P, Majka DR, Spencer WD. 2008. Forks in the road: choices in procedures for designing wildland linkages. Conservation Biology **22:**836–851.

Beier P, Spencer W, Baldwin RF, McRae BH. 2011. Toward best practices for developing regional connectivity maps. Conservation Biology **25:**879–892.

Berger J, Cain SL. 2014. Moving beyond science to protect a mammalian migration corridor. Conservation Biology **28:**1142–1150.

Bernard E, Penna LAO, Araujo E. 2014. Downgrading, downsizing, degazettement, and reclassification of protected areas in Brazil. Conservation Biology **28:**939–950.

Brodie J, Post E, Laurance WF. 2012. Climate change and tropical biodiversity: a new focus. Trends in Ecology & Evolution **27:**145–150.

Brodie JF, Giordano AJ, Dickson BG, Hebblewhite M, Bernard H, Mohd-Azlan J, Anderson J, Ambu L. 2015*a*. Evaluating multispecies landscape connectivity in a threatened tropical mammal community. Conservation Biology **29:**122–132.

Brodie JF, Giordano AJ, Zipkin EF, Bernard H, Mohd-Azlan J, Ambu L. 2015*b*. Correlation and persistence of hunting and logging impacts on tropical rainforest mammals. Conservation Biology **29:**110–121.

Burgman MA, Possingham HP, Lynch AJJ, Keith DA, McCarthy MA, Hopper SD, Drury WL, Passioura JA, Devries RJ. 2001. A method for setting the size of plant conservation target areas. Conservation Biology **15:**603–616.

Chong KY, Yee ATK, Yeo CK. 2010. Biodiversity: linking Singapore's fragmented habitats. Nature **465:**289–289.

Clements R, Rayan DM, Zafir AWA, Venkataraman A, Alfred R, Payne J, Ambu L, Sharma DSK. 2010. Trio under threat: Can we secure the future of rhinos, elephants and tigers in Malaysia? Biodiversity and Conservation **19:**1115–1136.

Dennis RLH, Dapporto L, Dover JW, Shreeve TG. 2013. Corridors and barriers in biodiversity conservation: a novel resource-based habitat perspective for butterflies. Biodiversity and Conservation **22:**2709–2734.

Fagan WF, Calabrese JM. 2006. Quantifying connectivity: balancing metric performance with data requirements. 297–317 in Crooks K, Sanjayan M, editors. Connectivity conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Fajardo J, Lessmann J, Bonaccorso E, Devenish C, Munoz J. 2014. Combined use of systematic conservation planning, species distribution modelling, and connectivity analysis reveals severe conservation gaps in a megadiverse country (Peru). PLoS ONE **9**(12):e114367. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0114367

FDTCP (Federal Department of Town and Country Planning). 2010*a*. Final report central forest spine I: masterplan for ecological linkages. FDTCP, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

FDTCP (Federal Department of Town and Country Planning). 2010*b*. National physical plan 2. FDTCP, Ministry of Housing and Local Government, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Gaveau DLA, et al. 2014. Four decades of forest persistence, clearance and logging on Borneo. PLOS ONE **9**(7):e101654. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0101654.

Gilarranz LJ, Bascompte J. 2012. Spatial network structure and metapopulation persistence. Journal of Theoretical Biology **297:**11–16.

Gregory AJ, Beier P. 2014. Response variables for evaluation of the effectiveness of conservation corridors. Conservation Biology **28:**689–695.

Hamid A. 2015. Ecological networks: their application for biodiversity conservation in an urbanized environment. PhD Dissertation. National University Singapore, Department of Architecture.

Hansen MC, et al. 2013. High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. Science **342:**850–853.

Hedges L, Clements GR, Aziz SA, Yap W, Laurance S, Goosem M, Laurance WF. 2013. Small carnivore records from a threatened habitat linkage in Terengganu, Peninsular Malaysia. Small Carnivore Conservation **49:**9–14.

Heng N. 2012. Shrinking refuge. The Star 10 July. Available from http://www.thestar.com.my/Story/?file=%2F2012%2F7%2F10%2Flifefocus%2F11335679. (accessed May 2015)

Ho HC, Baker N, Jain A, O'Connell N. 2011. Ecology of the green railway corridor. Nature Society, Singapore.

Jain A, Chong KY, Chua MAH, Clements GR. 2014. Moving away from paper corridors in Southeast Asia. Conservation Biology **28:**889–891.

Kiesecker JM, et al. 2007. Conservation easements in context: a quantitative analysis of their use by the nature conservancy. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment **5:**125–130.

Laita A, Kotiaho JS, Monkkonen M. 2011. Graph-theoretic connectivity measures: What do they tell us about connectivity? Landscape Ecology **26:**951–967.

Levey DJ, Bolker BM, Tewksbury JJ, Sargent S, Haddad NM. 2005. Effects of landscape corridors on seed dispersal by birds. Science **309:**146–148.

McConkey KR, Prasad S, Corlett RT, Campos-Arceiz A, Brodie JF, Rogers H, Santamaria L. 2012. Seed dispersal in changing landscapes. Biological Conservation **146:**1–13.

McRae BH, Dickson BG, Keitt TH, Shah VB. 2008. Using circuit theory to model connectivity in ecology, evolution, and conservation. Ecology **89:**2712–2724.

MDJ (Montana Department of Justice). 2015. License plate designs and fees, parks and environment. Available from https://dojmt.Gov/driving/plate-designs-and-fees/parks-environment/ (accessed April 2015).

Milner-Gulland EJ, Bennett EL. 2003. Wild meat: the bigger picture. Trends in Ecology & Evolution **18:**351–357.

MNRE and UNDP (Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment United Nations Development Programme). 2014. Improving connectivity in the central forest spine (CFS) landscape—project documentation. MNRE, and UNDP Global Environment Fund Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Available from http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=4732 (accessed March 2015).

Moilanen A. 2011. On the limitations of graph-theoretic connectivity in spatial ecology and conservation. Journal of Applied Ecology **48:**1543–1547.

Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, Fonseca G, Kent J. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature **403:**853–858.

Nagulendran K, Padfield R, Campos-Arceiz A. 2014. Biodiversity governance: priority issues in protected area and wildlife management in Peninsular Malaysia. Conference on Protected Areas Malaysia. Taman Negara, Malaysia.

Nantha HS, Tisdell C. 2009. The orangutan-oil palm conflict: economic constraints and opportunities for conservation. Biodiversity and Conservation **18:**487–502.

Ngo KM, Turner BL, Muller-Landau HC, Davies SJ, Larjavaara M, Hassan NFB, Lum S. 2013. Carbon stocks in primary and secondary tropical forests in Singapore. Forest Ecology and Management **296:**81–89.

Nicholson E, Westphal MI, Frank K, Rochester WA, Pressey RL, Lindenmayer DB, Possingham HP. 2006. A new method for conservation planning for the persistence of multiple species. Ecology Letters **9:**1049–1060.

Panthera. 2015. The jaguar corridor initiative. Panthera, New York. Available from http://www.panthera.org/programs/jaguar/jaguar-corridor-initiative (accessed March 2015).

Prugh LR, Hodges KE, Sinclair ARE, Brashares JS. 2008. Effect of habitat area and isolation on fragmented animal populations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **105:**20770–20775.

Rayfield B, Fortin MJ, Fall A. 2011. Connectivity for conservation: a framework to classify network measures. Ecology **92:**847–858.

Rozenfeld AF, Arnaud-Haond S, Hernandez-Garcia E, Eguiluz VM, Serrao EA, Duarte CM. 2008. Network analysis identifies weak and strong links in a metapopulation system. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **105:**18824–18829.

Sawaya MA, Kalinowski ST, Clevenger AP. 2014. Genetic connectivity for two bear species at wildlife crossing structures in Banff National Park. Proc. R. Soc. B **281:** 20131705.

Schwabe KA, Carson RT, DeShazo JR, Potts MD, Reese AN, Vincent JR. 2015. Creation of Malaysia's Royal Belum State Park: a case study of conservation in a developing country. Journal of Environment & Development **24:**54–81.

Soule ME, Terborgh J. 1999. Continental conservation. Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Taib MS, Siong HC. 2008. Planning system in Malaysia. Conference on sustainable development and governance. Toyohashi University of Technology, Japan.

Tan KW. 2006. A greenway network for Singapore. Landscape and Urban Planning **76:**45–66.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2012. International guidebook of environmental finance tools. UNDP, New York.

Urban D, Keitt T. 2001. Landscape connectivity: a graph-theoretic perspective. Ecology **82:**1205–1218.

Urban DL, Minor ES, Treml EA, Schick RS. 2009. Graph models of habitat mosaics. Ecology Letters **12:**260–273.

Vaz J, Agama AL. 2013. Seeking synergy between community and state-based governance for biodiversity conservation: the role of indigenous and community-conserved areas in Sabah, Malaysian Borneo. Asia Pacific Viewpoint **54:**141–157.

Warner ME. 2013. Private finance for public goods: social impact bonds. Journal of Economic Policy Reform **16:**303–319.

WCD. 2010. Regulatory framework for biological corridors in Bhutan part I: policy recommendations and framework for development corridor management plans. Wildlife Conservation Division, Department of Forest and Park Services, Royal Government of Bhutan, Thimphu, Bhutan.

Webb JA, Padgham M. 2013. How does network structure and complexity in river systems affect population abundance and persistence? Limnologica **43:**399–403.

Wikramanayake E, et al. 2011. A landscape-based conservation strategy to double the wild tiger population. Conservation Letters **4:**219–227.

Williams PH, Araujo MB. 2000. Using probability of persistence to identify important areas for biodiversity conservation. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences **267:**1959–1966.

WWF (World Wildlife Fund). 2007. The heart of Borneo declaration. WWF, Washington, D.C. Available from http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/where_we_work/borneo_forests/about_borneo_forests/declaration.cfm (accessed March 2015).

Yue S, Brodie JB, Zipkin EF, Bernard H. 2015. Oil palm fails to conserve mammal biodiversity. Ecological Applications **25:**2285–2292.

Ziolkowska E, Ostapowicz K, Radeloff VC, Kuemmerle T. 2014. Effects of different matrix representations and connectivity measures on habitat network assessments. Landscape Ecology **29:**1551–1570.