

Universidade de São Paulo

Instituto de Biociências

Adrian David González Chaves

**COBERTURA FLORESTAL VS. ISOLAMENTO: EFEITO DA PAISAGEM SOBRE A
PROVISÃO DEMANDA E FLUXO DO SERVIÇO DE POLINIZAÇÃO**

**FOREST COVER vs. FOREST ISOLATION: THE LANDSCAPE EFFECT ON
POLLINATION SERVICE SUPPLY, DEMAND AND FLOW TO COFFEE CROP**

São Paulo

2016

Adrian David González Chaves

**COBERTURA FLORESTAL VS. ISOLAMENTO: EFEITO DA PAISAGEM SOBRE A
PROVISÃO DEMANDA E FLUXO DO SERVIÇO DE POLINIZAÇÃO**

**FOREST COVER vs. FOREST ISOLATION: THE LANDSCAPE EFFECT ON
POLLINATION SERVICE SUPPLY, DEMAND AND FLOW TO COFFEE CROP**

Dissertação apresentada ao Instituto de Biociências da Universidade de São Paulo, para a obtenção de Título de Mestre em Ciências, na Área de Ecologia de Ecossistemas Terrestres e Aquáticos.

Orientadora: Dra. Astrid de Matos Peixoto Kleinert

Coorientador: Dr. Rodolfo Jaffé Ribbi

São Paulo

2016

Ficha Catalográfica

González Chaves, Adrian David

Cobertura florestal vs. isolamento: efeito da paisagem
sobre a provisão demanda e fluxo do serviço de polinização

42 paginas

Dissertação (Mestrado) - Instituto de Biociências da
Universidade de São Paulo. Departamento de Ecologia.

1. Mata Atlantica 2. *Coffea arabica* 3. Local landscape.
Universidade de São Paulo. Instituto de Biociências.
Departamento de Ecologia.

Comissão Julgadora:

Prof(a). Dr(a).

Prof(a). Dr(a).

Prof(a). Dr.(a).

Epígrafe

*...It is when we act freely,
for the sake of the action itself
rather than for ulterior motives,
that we learn to become more
than what we were.*

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi

Agradecimentos

Primeiramente agradeço a natureza da qual fazemos parte e inspira quem quer aprender dela. Agradeço pontualmente às abelhas que foram o foco central do trabalho, sem elas a gente não conseguiria nem disfrutar de muitas frutas com as quais começamos nossos dias. Na sequência meus pais, quem tem me apoiado ao longo da vida com muito amor e sabedoria indistintamente dos diversos caminhos que já escolhi até agora. Meu irmão que na distância sempre tem sido uma fonte de motivação e a minha sobrinha que com cinco anos já me explicou o que era a polinização. A Sofia amiga e companheira quem deu a força e companhia para começar esta fase da vida no Brasil. Agradeço aos meus orientadores Astrid e Rodolfo e aos membros do comitê de acompanhamento, que foram pessoas-chaves no desenvolvimento do projeto. A Cris que com a grande paciência e sabedoria que a caracterizam soube me acalmar e esclarecer em momentos cruciais no começo do projeto. Ao Jean Paul, quem tem sido uma pessoa super-receptiva que sempre abriu um espaço para tirar dúvidas, dar conselhos e apontar na direção certa, ajudando assim a melhorar consideravelmente o trabalho e crescer como pessoa.

Devo agradecer também a todos os fazendeiros que abriram as portas para a gente fazer os trabalhos de campo. Sempre com uma ótima atitude, que caracteriza ao povo mineiro. Dentro deles um agradecimento super especial para a família Leite: Marcus, Betty, Pedro, Paulo Enrique, João Marcus e a magnífica Tia Leny. Não só por facilitar o trabalho em campo de maneira significativa, mas também porque sempre me fizeram sentir em casa e como parte da maravilhosa família que eles são. Eternamente agradecido e afortunado por ter-lhes conhecido.

Ao pessoal dos laboratórios nos quais o trabalho foi desenvolvido. Ao laboratório de abelhas, local especial onde cheguei pela primeira vez e tive a fortuna de compartilhar e conhecer pessoas como a Sheina, André, Liedson, William, Paula, Priscila e Guaraci. Pessoas maravilhosas com quem tive longas conversações, recebi um monte de dicas e conselhos fazendo assim do laboratório de uns dos melhores ambientes de trabalho no qual já estive. Reforço o agradecimento para Sheina, William e Liedson quem me ajudaram em campo colaborando muito com seus conhecimentos resultado dos anos de experiência que eles todos tem trabalhando com abelhas. Agradecimento especial para Paulo Cesar quem foi um grande parceiro e amigo. Ao LEPaC, laboratório que teve a estrutura que permitiu que todo o trabalho de campo fosse desenvolvido. A Fernanda já que ajudando no mestrado dela foi o que me levou a Poços de Caldas, foi ela quem fez os primeiros contatos em campo e das discussões dos resultados delas que surgiram as perguntas que estão sendo desenvolvidas neste trabalho. Ao Chico, Felipe, Juarez e especialmente a Larissa, Isabel e Karine, quem sempre com boa atitude e boa vontade forneceram um grande apoio em campo e no laboratório. À valentia da Natalia colega, amiga e coordenadora nata quem trabalhou em campo com muita garra, razão pela qual estarei infinitamente agradecido. Ao Leandro, quem com sua grande capacidade de ensinar, ajudou de transformar ideais em realidades por isso considero que sem ele o desenho amostral não fosse sido o que é.

Ao Instituto de Biociência e o Programa de Ecologia, quem tem pesquisadores incríveis que ajudaram enormemente na minha formação durante a minha passagem pela USP. Dentre deles quero agradecer a todos os participantes do curso de Campo com quem senti crescer como pessoa. Especial agradecimento à Gabi, Carol e Bruno (do grande Ergue!) quem com a boa atitude frente à

vide, risadas e carinho que os caracteriza fizeram do tempo em campo um mês especial. À USP, lugar maravilhoso que me permitiu fazer novas amizades, dentre delas devo destacar aos parceiros de bebida, escalada e aventuras: o Arthur e o Eric. Ao grupo de escalada do Geobulder com quem comparti muitos momentos bons conseguindo assim oxigenar o cérebro em momentos de estresse. Finalmente e não por isso menos importante agradeço e lhe dedico esta tese para minha avó, Tita. Mulher maravilhosa quem sempre tem me inspirado e motivado para continuar no mundo acadêmico, quem com sua postura ante a vida me ensino que nós somos nossos principais travas na vida.

Index

| | |
|---|----|
| Forest cover vs. Forest isolation: the landscape effect on pollination service provision coffee crop | 02 |
| Resumo | 08 |
| Abstract | 09 |
| Introduction | 10 |
| Materials and Methods | 13 |
| Study area | 13 |
| Coffee Bee Visitors | 15 |
| Coffee Pollination Service | 17 |
| Statistical analysis | 19 |
| Results | 20 |
| Discussion | 24 |
| References | 29 |
| Supporting Information | 34 |

COBERTURA FLORESTAL VS. ISOLAMENTO: EFEITO DA PAISAGEM SOBRE A PROVISÃO DO SERVIÇO DE POLINIZAÇÃO

Adrian González-Chaves ^{1*}, Rodolfo Jaffé ¹, Jean Paul Metzger ¹ and Astrid de M. P. Kleinert ¹

¹Departamento de Ecologia, Universidade de São Paulo, Rua do Matão 321, 05508-090 São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

RESUMO

Na medida em que as demandas agrícolas continuam se expandindo, aumenta a necessidade de que a produção agrícola garanta a conservação da diversidade e a provisão de serviços ecossistêmicos. O intuito do trabalho é avaliar independentemente o efeito da distância aos fragmentos florestais e a cobertura florestal numa escala local. Quantificamos a diversidade de abelhas e a formação de frutos em 24 cultivos de café dentro de paisagens complexas de 2km de raio, compostas por mosaico de usos da terra, café, Mata Atlântica (20 – 27%) e outros usos. Adicionalmente estimamos a contribuição das espécies na formação de frutos depois de uma visita única, em cinco dos 24 pontos amostrais. No total foram identificadas 31 espécies de abelhas visitando o café, a maioria abelhas sem ferrão (Meliponini) e abelhas da família Halictidae. Não houve diferença na formação de frutos depois das visitas únicas pelas diversas espécies de abelhas, o que sugere que há uma complementaridade na provisão do serviço. No entanto, a maior produtividade esteve associada à abundância de abelhas nativas. Em geral, houve um incremento de 8% com a presença das abelhas, que diminuiu com o aumento da distância aos fragmentos de mata e com o aumento da quantidade de café em escala local (400 m de raio no entorno do ponto amostral). O efeito negativo da distância aos fragmentos reforça a importância da vegetação natural em prover diversidade de abelhas e portanto o serviço de polinização. O efeito negativo da cobertura de café sobre a frutificação sugere que há um excesso de demanda que excede a capacidade dos polinizadores de prover o serviço dentro de paisagens complexas. Nossos resultados mostram que a estrutura da paisagem afeta a densidade, a riqueza e a composição de espécies de polinizadores. Por tanto, recomendamos, como estratégia para incrementar a produção de café, sem necessidade de aumentar a cobertura florestal, o manejo das áreas agrícolas para aumentar a dispersão entre fragmentos florestais e plantios de café, com o intuito de criar paisagens mais fragmentadas que facilitem o fluxo de polinizadores ao café.

Palavras chaves: Agro ecossistema, mudanças nos usos da terra, e *Coffea arabica* L.

FOREST COVER vs. FOREST ISOLATION: THE LANDSCAPE EFFECT ON POLLINATION SERVICE SUPPLY TO COFFEE CROP

Adrian González-Chaves ^{1*}, Rodolfo Jaffé ¹, Jean Paul Metzger ¹ and Astrid de M. P. Kleinert ¹

¹Departamento de Ecologia, Universidade de São Paulo, Rua do Matão 321, 05508-090 São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

ABSTRACT

As the demands on agricultural lands continue to expand, effective strategies are urgently needed to manage agricultural production to guarantee biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service provision. Here we assessed independently the effect of forest isolation and local forest cover over bee diversity and on the provision of pollination service to coffee. We quantified bee diversity of flower visitors and fruit set in 24 coffee fields within three complex landscape of 2km radius surrounded by mosaic of coffee plantations, Atlantic forest fragments (20 – 27%), pastures and other lands uses. Additionally, we estimated species contribution to fruit set after single visit in five of the 24 coffee sites. In total we identified 31 bee species visiting coffee flowers, most being stingless bees (Meliponini tribe) and sweat bees (Halictidae). The absence of difference in fruit set after single visit by *Apis* and natives bee suggest that service complementation. Although, higher abundances of sweat bees and stingless bees were positively related to fruit set. Coffee fruit set was overall 8% higher in the presence of bees, and responded negatively to isolation from forest fragments and to high coffee cover at a local landscape scale (400 m radius landscape surrounding each sampled coffee bush). The negative association between isolation and fruit set reinforces the importance of natural vegetation to enhance bee diversity and therefore the provision of pollination service. The negative effect of coffee cover on fruit set suggests that the service demand can surpass pollinators' capacity to provide service within complex landscape. Our results provide clear evidences that landscape structure can affect the abundance, richness and composition of pollinators' species, and thus can indirectly regulate the provision of pollination service. Therefore we recommend, as a strategy to increase coffee yields without necessarily expanding forest cover, to manage agricultural landscapes in order to increase interspersion between forest fragments and coffee plantation thus a more patchy landscape mosaic that may facilitate pollinators flows to coffee crop.

KEY WORDS: Agro-ecosystems, land-use change and *Coffea arabica* L.

INTRODUCTION

Animal pollination is extremely important to ensure the reproduction of more than 90% of all flowering plant species (Ollerton, Winfree & Tarrant 2011), contributing hence to the maintenance of plant diversity in natural ecosystems (Buchmann & Nabhan 1996; Kearns, Inouye & Waser 1998). Pollination services also contribute to food production, as 70% of the commercial crops have an increase in harvest size and/or quality in the presence of pollinators (Heard 1999; Klein *et al.* 2007; Aizen *et al.* 2009). As demands on agricultural landscapes increase, improving crop yields through the enhancement of pollinators density and richness (ecological intensification) represents an alternative to meet such demands (Foley *et al.* 2011). It was recently reported that the enhancement of pollinators could help achieve higher yields for pollinated dependent crops worldwide (Garibaldi *et al.* 2016).

Most flowering plants are pollinated by multiple insect species, thus plants reproduction relies on the pollinators abundance (Waser *et al.* 1996; Vázquez, Morris & Jordano 2005; Garibaldi *et al.* 2014). Managed bee species like *Apis mellifera* have been used to increase pollination service but they may not be able to account for all pollination demands as pollinator-dependent crops are increasing faster than honeybee populations (Aizen & Harder 2009). Moreover, higher pollinator diversity may increase temporal and spatial stability in visitation rate (Klein 2009; Garibaldi *et al.* 2011a). Hence, attention on wild pollinators has increased as they naturally occur in agricultural landscapes, by relying on adjacent natural/semi-natural vegetation for nest and food resources (Losey & Vaughn 2006; Brosi *et al.* 2008; Tscharrntke *et al.* 2012). Wild bees have proven to be successful pollinators of exotic plants (Garibaldi *et al.* 2013) either directly or indirectly by enhancing managed pollinator efficiency (Garibaldi *et al.* 2014). Diverse bee assemblages are known to promote changes in foraging behaviour or spatially complement service provision over the crop plants (Brittain *et al.* 2013; Brittain, Kremen & Klein 2013). Despite their importance both wild and managed pollinators are threatened by agricultural intensification (Bommarco *et al.* 2010).

Changes in the land use and land cover composition, mainly due to urbanization and agricultural intensification, have transformed natural habitats causing pollinator declines (Brown & Paxton 2009; Potts *et al.* 2010), threatening the provision of pollination services (Biesmeijer *et al.* 2006; Bommarco *et al.* 2010; Vanbergen 2013). Today croplands and pastures occupy ~40% of the Earth ice-free land surface (Ramankutty *et al.* 2008; Foley *et al.* 2011). Given that forest fragments adjacent to the focal crop work as pollinators' reservoirs (Taki, Kevan & Ascher 2007; Brosi *et al.* 2008; Taki *et al.* 2011), the habitat amount in the landscape is an important indicator in predicting biodiversity (Fahrig 2013),

and consequently pollination service (Garibaldi *et al.* 2013). This has been supported by recent meta-analysis which found that the main factor enhancing bee diversity was the amount of high-quality habitat, whereas the spatial arrangements of the type of land use or configuration of the land cover habitats on bee diversity was not important (Kennedy *et al.* 2013). However, in the aforementioned study the configuration was assessed through natural patches only, disregarding the spatial arrangement of the focal crop. Moreover, it was reported that bee diversity reliance on the amount of natural vegetation surrounding crop fields increases as fields become more homogeneous (large monocultures) (Batáry *et al.* 2011; Kennedy *et al.* 2013). For this reason, management practices to enhance bee diversity, like flower strips and/or hedgerows, are recommended for landscapes that have been severely altered (less than 20% of natural vegetation) (Batáry *et al.* 2011; Carvalheiro *et al.* 2011).

In contrast to studies that evaluate the effects of landscape on bee diversity, studies that have quantified the loss of pollination service, have measure it in relationship to isolation from natural patches (Ricketts *et al.* 2008; Garibaldi *et al.* 2011b), but have not differentiated between landscape configuration (e.g. isolation) and the surrounding landscape composition. However it is important to consider configuration and composition separately because under intermediate values of natural habitat there is the greatest variation of landscape configuration (Villard & Metzger 2014) and there is also a steep loss of biodiversity (Banks-Leite *et al.* 2014). Thus the needs to disentangle which landscape attributes are causing biodiversity and pollination service loss. Even more importantly is to understand how already transformed landscapes can be managed to enhance pollination service provision (Vandermeer & Perfecto 2007). Each landscape attributes can be associated to the elements on which service provision depends: supply, flow and demand (Mitchell *et al.* 2015), which in the case of pollination service associated as follows. Service supply would be the pool of pollinators in the landscapes, which could be represented by the habitat amount; Service flow which could be attributed to pollinators foraging behaviour over the crop land, thus restriction in the flow due to forest isolation could be interpreted as restriction in pollinators flow to crop. Whereas, the amount of crop cover in the landscape would represent the amount of crop that needs to be pollinated (service demand) (Mitchell *et al.* 2015). Thus understanding the relative effect of landscape attribute on ecosystem service provision could be better target management strategies.

Coffee is the second most important commodity in legal international trade (O'Brien & Kinnaird 2003) and Brazil is the main coffee producer, responsible for more than 30% of the world exportation (International coffee organization – ICO 2015). Coffee production in Brazil replaced the Atlantic forest of which less than 16% remains today, most in small fragments found on private properties

(Ribeiro *et al.* 2009). Although *Coffea arabica* L. has self-fertile flowers (auto-pollinated) (Ngo, Mojica & Packer 2011), it exhibits increased levels of fruit set and yields in the presence of insect pollinators (Klein, Steffan-Dewenter & Tschardtke 2003a; De Marco & Coelho 2004; Ricketts 2004a; Klein 2009). Bees have been proposed as the main pollinators of coffee (Klein, Steffan-Dewenter & Tschardtke 2003a; Munyuli 2011). Although past studies have measured the effect of forest isolation and farm management on coffee pollination (Klein, Steffan-Dewenter & Tschardtke 2003a; De Marco & Coelho 2004; Ricketts 2004a; Krishnan *et al.* 2012), no study has ever combined crop isolation and local (surrounding) composition to test how the landscape enhance bee diversity and pollination service provision.

The main objective of this study is thus to understand how landscape structure, particularly forest cover, isolation and matrix composition, affect bee diversity and coffee production. We suppose that the presence of forest patches within agricultural landscapes, by supporting bee populations, will increase coffee yields through enhancement of pollination service. Within complex landscape, composed by a mosaic of different land use and land cover classes, with 20% to 50% of natural areas, overall isolation from natural habitat might be reduced (Saturni *et al.*, *in prep*). Thus we expect (1) that bee diversity will only be affected by isolation when there is low local forest cover surrounding crop sites. Coffee is expected to be pollinated by a variety of bee species; therefore we expect (2) that different species complement themselves in the service provision. Furthermore, bee movement between crop plants maximizes cross pollination, thus we expect higher chances of fructification after a single visit made by bees coming from a different bush than coming from the same bush (geitonogamy). If the former hypotheses are corroborated, we expect (3) coffee pollination to decay as bee diversity decreases. Furthermore, considering coffee cover in the local landscapes as a proxy of pollination demand, we expect shortages of pollinators supply and flow at sites with high coffee covers when isolated from forest fragments and/or with low local habitat amount.

By identifying key coffee pollinators, quantifying their relative contribution to pollination, and assessing how they are affected by landscape transformation, we hope to better understand how landscape contributes to stabilize and improve coffee production. By quantifying the independent effect of forest isolation and forest cover on mediating shifts in bee community composition and pollination service, we intend to fill knowledge gaps associated to relative effects of forest cover and configuration on pollination services (Fig. 1).




Fig. 1. Conceptual diagram presenting the main relationship (bullet points) explored in this study, the levels of analysis of the research (bullet points), each with the list of variables measured. We intended to evaluate the role of different species on coffee production using single visit experiments (1). In order to do so, landscape data of the focal crop was used to compare the relative effects of forest isolation and local forest cover on affects bee diversity (2). With the intention of testing how changes in bee assemblages affect coffee production (3).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area

The study region comprised the south east of Minas Gerais State, Brazil, one of the main coffee producing regions in the country. Sun coffee plantations are scattered between Atlantic Forest fragments along with pastures, sugar cane plantations and *Eucalyptus* forests. Our study areas comprised three circular landscapes of two-kilometre radius with coffee crops and similar forest cover, ranging from 20 to 27 % (Fig. 2), a cover range where typically spatial configuration should be more variable (Villard & Metzger 2014) . The amount of forest cover was determined based on high-resolution images (ArcGis 10.3 basemap imagery from DigitalGlobe satellites for 2009 to 2011, 0.5 m resolution) and a reference scale 1:5,000 (Fig. 3). In each landscape, we selected eight “local landscapes” (samples of landscape with 400 m radius) to evaluate the independent effects of local

Table 5. Model selection statistics for fruit set and fruit weight using as predictor variables both landscape and bee diversity.

| Response | Models | Random | AIC | Δ AIC | weight |
|--------------|---|---|--------|--------------|--------|
| Fruit Set | Treatment*Pan traps bee abundance, Treatment*Community variation | Landscape, site, bush and coffee variety | 7239.7 | 0.0 | 0.782 |
| Fruit weight | null | Landscape, site, bush | -741.9 | 0.00 | 0.981 |

Table 6. Summary statistics for the selected models (Δ AIC < 2) for fruit set.

| Response | Predictor | Estimate | SE | p-value |
|-----------|---|----------|-------|---------|
| Fruit Set | Treatment (open): Pan traps bee abundance | 0.149 | 0.035 | <0.001 |
| Fruit Set | Treatment (open): Community Variation | 0.218 | 0.051 | <0.001 |

DISCUSSION

Natural vegetation patches within complex landscapes are known to enhance biodiversity (Tscharntke *et al.* 2005; Batáry *et al.* 2011). However our results show that not all the crop land within such landscapes is equally visited by bees. Coffee sites far away from forest fragments and/or highly surrounded by coffee presented lower bee richness and abundance. The reduction of bee richness and abundances due to isolation and/or to high coffee cover resulted in lower coffee fruit set, as high bee abundances were associated to higher coffee yields. Moreover, no differences were found in coffee fruit set after single visits made by wild bees or by *Apis mellifera*. Together these results support that there is a complementation among species in the service provision. However, not all bee species equally contributed to coffee fruit set, as changes in the community composition negatively affect coffee fruit set, in particular high abundances of bees of the genus *Trigona*. Overall coffee sites nearby forest fragments and/or with low coffee cover had high bee richness and abundances and the highest fruit set. Thus local landscape is mediating the pollination services through changes in bee assemblages. Therefore we suggest that the spatial management of the focal crop could enhance bee diversity within cropland, if the interspersion of cropland within forest patches is maximized. This would maintain a high pollination flow over the cropland, by reducing overall the crop-forest isolation. The local reduction of large coffee extensions would help to guarantee that the pool of pollinators' accounts for the service demand (Fig.8).

Bee assemblage and pollination service

The exclusion experiments showed an overall increase of 8% in fruit set between coffee flowers left open in comparison to the flowers where pollinators were excluded. The increment in coffee fruit set increased up to 12% along with Halictidae bees' abundance (Fig. 7a, S2), although this result seems contradictory as sweat bees (Halictidae) were not found in abundance during the single visit experiment (Table S2). The Halictidae family has been reported to be the most abundant bee group in coffee systems and methodologies like the ones used in this study fail to truly record their abundances (Ngo *et al.* 2013). Moreover, highest coffee fruit set was found at small coffee patches adjacent to forest fragments, where the highest richness and abundance of sweet bees coincided with the highest stingless bees' richness and abundances. Thus these results suggest that both wild bee groups contribute to pollination service.

Even though there is no direct relationship between stingless bees and coffee fruit set, the higher yields found where stingless bee richness and abundance was highest reinforcing that wild bee contribute with pollination service to coffee (Veddeler *et al.* 2008). However not all stingless bees seem to contribute to fruit set, as increments of *Trigona* genus abundance resulted in reduced fruit set. This pattern could be attributed to the damage of flowers buds, that those species may cause, behaviour that has also been reported for other crops (*see* Saunders *et al.* 2015). *Apis mellifera* was the single most abundant specie found and even though their contribution to coffee yields is widely acknowledged (Roubik 2000, 2002; Ngo, Mojica & Packer 2011), *Apis mellifera* abundance did not explain coffee fruit set variations. This result reinforces that relying on a single species attempts against agroecosystem resilience (Peterson, Allen & Holling 1997; Kremen *et al.* 2007; Winfree *et al.* 2007; Garibaldi *et al.* 2013, 2015; Wilfert *et al.* 2016). Furthermore higher wild bees density and richness have been reported increase honey bee movements between crop plants (Brittain *et al.* 2013), thereby improving the chances of effective cross pollination (Ne'Eman *et al.* 2010; King, Ballantyne & Willmer 2013).

The single visit experiment suggests a complementation among the bees' species in the crop pollination service provision, as no difference was found in fruit set after a single visit made by a wild or a honey bee. Moreover, the lower coffee fruit set found after singles visit in comparison with the exclusion experiment could be attributed to the lack of effective visits, thus reinforcing the key role that bee abundance plays in increasing fruit set (Connelly, Poveda & Loeb 2015). Single visits experiments showed that coffee fruit set was lower when bees visited flowers from the same coffee bush, before visiting the sampled flower, reinforcing that cross pollination by bees causes a

significant increase in fruit set (Klein, Steffan-Dewenter & Tscharntke 2003b). We would therefore expect higher bee richness and abundance to result in higher cross pollination (Brittain *et al.* 2013; Garibaldi *et al.* 2016).

Forest cover vs. forest isolation

Stingless bees were more abundant near forest fragments, but contrary to our expectations bees were not affected by local forest cover. Thus suggesting that proximity to forest fragment, independently of the amount of forest at the local scale, equally contribute to support rich bee assemblages (Table S6) and to the provision of pollination service (Taki, Kevan & Ascher 2007; Taki *et al.* 2011), at least when the landscape forest cover is around 20 -27%. As at sites near forest fragments where fruit set was highest, stingless bees were more abundant and showed greater diversification in nesting sites (tree trunk cavities, exposed nest and ground nesters), size (1-2.8 mm) and foraging behaviour (Ramalho 2004; Brosi *et al.* 2008). It is noteworthy mentioning that lower bee abundances at far sites were associated to the absence of small bees and cavities nesting bees (See *Supporting Information*). Therefore our results reinforce that pollinators' flow is essentially restricted to crop land adjacent to forest fragments (Ricketts 2004b), especially to distances below 175 m in our complex landscapes.

The diverse nesting behaviour of stingless bees found visiting coffee seems to be associated with different response patterns to landscape transformations (Fig. 2). Out of the seven most abundant stingless bees, five were either exposed or ground nesters which have been seen to nest within the coffee crop (*personal observation*). The other two most abundant bees were tree cavity nesters (Fig. 5), which have been reported to benefit from anthropogenic landscapes (Batista, Ramalho & Soares 2003). The low abundance of restricted tree nesters (Fig. 5) might be due to a lack of nesting resources as a result of the landscapes being below the biodiversity loss threshold (Table 1) (Banks-Leite *et al.* 2014). After all the bee assemblages found are dominated by species more tolerant to landscape transformations (Batista, Ramalho & Soares 2003; Jaffé *et al.* 2015) which could alternative explanation why local forest cover did not affect bee diversity. Nonetheless, the non-restricted tree nesters response to isolation (*see Supporting Information*) reinforces that forest fragments provide resources for ground and exposed bee nesters as well (Brosi *et al.* 2008).

The community composition axis strongly associated to *Trigona* genus abundance (Fig. S5) which explained coffee fruit set (Fig 6b) did not respond to any of the landscape variables measured. This lack of association with forest isolation and/or local landscape composition could be attributed to *T. spinipes* exposed nesting behaviour, as they have been reported not to be fully reliant on forest (Jaffé

et al. 2015). Hence, *T. spinipes* could be the species involved in the different effects of native bee community on coffee fruit set at different landscape scales (Saturni *et al.*, *in prep.*). Thus more studies are needed to understand how the stingless bees' community interacts at a landscape level and their association to pollination service.

Coffee cover

The negative relationship between coffee cover and pollination service could be attributed to the dilution effect (Veddeler, Klein & Tschardt 2006; Jha & Vandermeer 2009), where the amount of bees cannot account for the amount of flowers to be visited (demand). Given that coffee cover, in our study, varies independently of forest cover and forest isolation, we therefore consider that an excess of service demand (crop extensification) is what is limiting service provision (Mitchell *et al.* 2015). This is consistent with a recent meta-analysis that found higher pollination benefits from increasing bee abundance at small crop fields (Garibaldi *et al.* 2016). The predominance of ground nesters in this complex landscapes also suggests that high local coffee cover is also negatively affecting the establishment of bees within cropland. After all landscape homogenization has been reported to negatively impact bee diversity and pollination service (Connelly, Poveda & Loeb 2015) due to the lack of resources in the surroundings (Benton, Vickery & Wilson 2003). Nonetheless, more studies are needed to understand how other types of cover affect bee diversity and pollination service to coffee.

Implications and final remarks

Our results for complex landscape suggest that: 1) Forest patch size did not affect the supply of bee diversity, within a regional context of intermediate forest cover (20-27%). 2) increasing crop proximity to forest fragments would increment the accessibility and facilitate flow of pollinators to crops. 3) large extension of focal crop results in excessive service demands. We thus provide supporting evidence that fragmentation, within complex landscapes can have positive benefits on pollination service (Mitchell *et al.* 2015), and, as a consequence, that the provision of pollination services is heterogeneously distributed in space (Fig. 8). Once landscape structure affects pollination service, we suggest that if coffee cropland is to be expanded, then it should be done maintaining close distances to forest patches and avoiding large extensions of coffee.




Fig. 8. Extrapolation of yield increments due to coffee bee pollination on the three 2-km landscapes using the best selected model considering distance to forest fragment and local coffee cover.

Our methodological approach using local landscape analysis can help to prioritize areas for management practices that enhance bee diversity, like flowers strip and hedgerows. After all, spatially managing cropland represents an alternative when is not possible (Perfecto & Vandermeer 2010) or unacceptable by farmers (Burton, Kuczera & Schwarz 2008) to increase forest cover. We therefore suggest efforts towards understanding how other land uses and landscape heterogeneity affect biodiversity and service provision, as heterogeneity could be achieved either by more diverse cover types or through a more complex spatial arrangement of cover types (Fahrig *et al.* 2011).

Finally our research have clear conservation implications, because most of the Atlantic forest remaining fragments are small and within private lands (Ribeiro *et al.* 2009), and we found strong evidence that reinforces the important role of any size forest fragments to supply wild pollinators. Therefore we support that landscape management to enhance pollination service could help to increase crop yields where pollination limitation occurs (Garibaldi *et al.* 2016).

REFERENCES

- Aizen, M.A., Garibaldi, L.A., Cunningham, S.A. & Klein, A.M. (2009) How much does agriculture depend on pollinators? Lessons from long-term trends in crop production. *Annals of Botany*, **103**, 1579–1588.
- Aizen, M.A. & Harder, L.D. (2009) The Global Stock of Domesticated Honey Bees Is Growing Slower Than Agricultural Demand for Pollination. *Current Biology*, **19**, 915–918.
- Araújo, E.D., Costa, M., Chaud-Netto, J. & Fowler, H.G. (2004) Body size and flight distance in stingless bees (Hymenoptera: Meliponini): inference of flight range and possible ecological implications. *Brazilian journal of biology = Revista brasleira de biologia*, **64**, 563–568.
- Banks-Leite, C., Pardini, R., Tambosi, L.R., Pearse, W.D., Bueno, A. a, Bruscagin, R.T., Condez, T.H., Dixo, M., Igari, A.T., Martensen, A.C. & Metzger, J.P. (2014) Using ecological thresholds to evaluate the costs and benefits of set-asides in a biodiversity hotspot. *Science*, **345**, 1041–1045.
- Barton, K. (2015) MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.9.13. *Version*, **1**, 18.
- Batáry, P., Báldi, A., Kleijn, D. & Tschardtke, T. (2011) Landscape-moderated biodiversity effects of agri-environmental management: a meta-analysis. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, **278**, 1894–902.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B.M. & Walker, S. (2014) lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and S4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **xx**, xx.
- Batista, M.A., Ramalho, M. & Soares, A.E.E. (2003) Nesting sites and abundance of Meliponini (Hymenoptera: Apidae) in heterogeneous habitats of the Atlantic Rain Forest, Bahia, Brazil. *Lundiana*, **4**, 19–23.
- Benton, T.G., Vickery, J.A. & Wilson, J.D. (2003) Farmland biodiversity: Is habitat heterogeneity the key? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **18**, 182–188.
- Biesmeijer, J.C., Roberts, S.P.M., Reemer, M., Ohlemüller, R., Edwards, M., Peeters, T., Schaffers, A.P., Potts, S.G., Kleukers, R., Thomas, C.D., Settele, J. & Kunin, W.E. (2006) Parallel declines in pollinators and insect-pollinated plants in Britain and the Netherlands. *Science*, **313**, 351–354.
- Bommarco, R., Biesmeijer, J.C., Meyer, B., Potts, S.G., Pöyry, J., Roberts, S.P.M., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Ockinger, E. (2010) Dispersal capacity and diet breadth modify the response of wild bees to habitat loss. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, **277**, 2075–2082.
- Brittain, C., Kremen, C. & Klein, A.M. (2013) Biodiversity buffers pollination from changes in environmental conditions. *Global Change Biology*, **19**, 540–547.
- Brittain, C., Williams, N., Kremen, C. & Klein, A. (2013) Synergistic effects of non-Apis bees and honey bees for pollination services. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, **280**, 20122767.
- Brosi, B.J., Daily, G.C., Shih, T.M., Oviedo, F. & Durán, G. (2008) The effects of forest fragmentation on bee communities in tropical countryside. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **45**, 773–783.
- Brown, M.J.F.F. & Paxton, R.J. (2009) The conservation of bees : a global perspective. *Apidologie*, **40**, 410–416.
- Buchmann, S.L. & Nabhan, G.P. (1996) The forgotten pollinators. *The forgotten pollinators*, **1**, 312.
- Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2002) *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*.
- Burton, R.J.F., Kuczera, C. & Schwarz, G. (2008) Exploring farmers' cultural resistance to voluntary agri-environmental schemes. *Sociologia Ruralis*, **48**, 16–37.
- Carvalho, L.G., Veldtman, R., Shenkute, A.G., Tesfay, G.B., Pirk, C.W.W., Donaldson, J.S. & Nicolson, S.W. (2011) Natural and within-farmland biodiversity enhances crop productivity. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 251–259.
- Connelly, H., Poveda, K. & Loeb, G. (2015) Landscape simplification decreases wild bee pollination services to strawberry. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **211**, 51–56.
- Fahrig, L. (2013) Rethinking patch size and isolation effects: The habitat amount hypothesis. *Journal of Biogeography*, **40**, 1649–1663.

- Fahrig, L., Baudry, J., Brotons, L., Burel, F.G., Crist, T.O., Fuller, R.J., Sirami, C., Siriwardena, G.M. & Martin, J.L. (2011) Functional landscape heterogeneity and animal biodiversity in agricultural landscapes. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 101–112.
- Foley, J. a., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. a., Cassidy, E.S., Gerber, J.S., Johnston, M., Mueller, N.D., Connell, C.O., Ray, D.K., West, P.C., Balzer, C., Bennett, E.M., Sheehan, J., Siebert, S., Carpenter, S.R., Hill, J., Monfreda, C., Polasky, S., Rockstro, J., Tilman, D. & Zaks, D.P.M. (2011) Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, **478**, 337–342.
- Garibaldi, L. a, Aizen, M. a, Klein, A.M., Cunningham, S. a & Harder, L.D. (2011a) Global growth and stability of agricultural yield decrease with pollinator dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **108**, 5909–14.
- Garibaldi, L.A., Bartomeus, I., Bommarco, R., Klein, A.M., Cunningham, S.A., Aizen, M.A., Boreux, V., Garratt, M.P.D., Carvalheiro, L.G., Kremen, C., Morales, C.L., Schüepp, C., Chacoff, N.P., Freitas, B.M., Gagic, V., Holzschuh, A., Klatt, B.K., Krewenka, K.M., Krishnan, S., Mayfield, M.M., Motzke, I., Otieno, M., Petersen, J., Potts, S.G., Ricketts, T.H., Rundlöf, M., Sciligo, A., Sinu, P.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Taki, H., Tscharntke, T., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F. & Woyciechowski, M. (2015) Trait matching of flower visitors and crops predicts fruit set better than trait diversity. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **52**, 1436–1444.
- Garibaldi, L.A., Carvalheiro, L.G., Leonhardt, S.D., Aizen, M.A., Blaauw, B.R., Isaacs, R., Kuhlmann, M., Kleijn, D., Klein, A.M., Kremen, C., Morandin, L., Scheper, J. & Winfree, R. (2014) From research to action: Enhancing crop yield through wild pollinators. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **12**, 439–447.
- Garibaldi, L.A., Carvalheiro, L.G., Vaissiere, B.E., Gemmill-Herren, B., Hipolito, J., Freitas, B.M., Ngo, H.T., Azzu, N., Saez, A., Astrom, J., An, J., Blochtein, B., Buchori, D., Garcia, F.J.C., Oliveira da Silva, F., Devkota, K., Ribeiro, M. d. F., Freitas, L., Gaglianone, M.C., Goss, M., Irshad, M., Kasina, M., Filho, A.J.S.P., Kiill, L.H.P., Kwapong, P., Parra, G.N., Pires, C., Pires, V., Rawal, R.S., Rizali, A., Saraiva, A.M., Veldtman, R., Viana, B.F., Witter, S. & Zhang, H. (2016) Mutually beneficial pollinator diversity and crop yield outcomes in small and large farms. *Science*, **351**, 388–391.
- Garibaldi, L.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Kremen, C., Morales, J.M., Bommarco, R., Cunningham, S.A., Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Greenleaf, S.S., Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R., Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L.A., Potts, S.G., Ricketts, T.H., Szentgyörgyi, H., Viana, B.F., Westphal, C., Winfree, R. & Klein, A.M. (2011b) Stability of pollination services decreases with isolation from natural areas despite honey bee visits. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 1062–1072.
- Garibaldi, L. a, Steffan-Dewenter, I., Winfree, R., Aizen, M. a, Bommarco, R., Cunningham, S. a, Kremen, C., Carvalheiro, L.G., Harder, L.D., Afik, O., Bartomeus, I., Benjamin, F., Boreux, V., Cariveau, D., Chacoff, N.P., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Freitas, B.M., Ghazoul, J., Greenleaf, S., Hipólito, J., Holzschuh, A., Howlett, B., Isaacs, R., Javorek, S.K., Kennedy, C.M., Krewenka, K.M., Krishnan, S., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Motzke, I., Munyuli, T., Nault, B. a, Otieno, M., Petersen, J., Pisanty, G., Potts, S.G., Rader, R., Ricketts, T.H., Rundlöf, M., Seymour, C.L., Schüepp, C., Szentgyörgyi, H., Taki, H., Tscharntke, T., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F., Wanger, T.C., Westphal, C., Williams, N. & Klein, A.M. (2013) Wild pollinators enhance fruit set of crops regardless of honey bee abundance. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **339**, 1608–11.
- Greenleaf, S.S., Williams, N.M., Winfree, R. & Kremen, C. (2007) Bee foraging ranges and their relationship to body size. *Oecologia*, **153**, 589–596.
- Heard, T.A. (1999) the Role of Stingless Bees in Crop Pollination. , 183–206.
- Jaffé, R., Castilla, A., Pope, N., Imperatriz-Fonseca, V.L., Metzger, J.P., Arias, M.C. & Jha, S. (2015) Landscape genetics of a tropical rescue pollinator. *Conservation Genetics*.
- Jha, S. & Vandermeer, J.H. (2009) Contrasting bee foraging in response to resource scale and local habitat management. *Oikos*, **118**, 1174–1180.
- Kearns, C.A., Inouye, D.W. & Waser, N.M. (1998) ENDANGERED MUTUALISMS: The Conservation of

- Plant-Pollinator Interactions. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 83–112.
- Kennedy, C.M., Lonsdorf, E., Neel, M.C., Williams, N.M., Ricketts, T.H., Winfree, R., Bommarco, R., Brittain, C., Burley, A.L., Cariveau, D., Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Cunningham, S. a., Danforth, B.N., Dudenhöffer, J.H., Elle, E., Gaines, H.R., Garibaldi, L. a., Gratton, C., Holzschuh, A., Isaacs, R., Javorek, S.K., Jha, S., Klein, A.M., Krewenka, K., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L., Neame, L. a., Otieno, M., Park, M., Potts, S.G., Rundlöf, M., Saez, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Taki, H., Viana, B.F., Westphal, C., Wilson, J.K., Greenleaf, S.S. & Kremen, C. (2013) A global quantitative synthesis of local and landscape effects on wild bee pollinators in agroecosystems. *Ecology Letters*, **16**, 584–599.
- King, C., Ballantyne, G. & Willmer, P.G. (2013) Why flower visitation is a poor proxy for pollination: Measuring single-visit pollen deposition, with implications for pollination networks and conservation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **4**, 811–818.
- Klein, A.M. (2009) Nearby rainforest promotes coffee pollination by increasing spatio-temporal stability in bee species richness. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **258**, 1838–1845.
- Klein, A.-M., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tscharntke, T. (2003a) Fruit set of highland coffee increases with the diversity of pollinating bees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **270**, 955–961.
- Klein, A.M., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tscharntke, T. (2003b) Bee pollination and fruit set of *Coffea arabica* and *C. canephora* (Rubiaceae). *American Journal of Botany*, **90**, 153–157.
- Klein, A.-M., Vaissiere, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen, C. & Tscharntke, T. (2007) Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **274**, 303–313.
- Kremen, C., Williams, N.M., Aizen, M.A., Gemmill-Herren, B., LeBuhn, G., Minckley, R., Packer, L., Potts, S.G., Roulston, T., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Vázquez, D.P., Winfree, R., Adams, L., Crone, E.E., Greenleaf, S.S., Keitt, T.H., Klein, A.M., Regetz, J. & Ricketts, T.H. (2007) Pollination and other ecosystem services produced by mobile organisms: A conceptual framework for the effects of land-use change. *Ecology Letters*, **10**, 299–314.
- Krishnan, S., Kushalappa, C.G., Shaanker, R.U. & Ghazoul, J. (2012) Status of pollinators and their efficiency in coffee fruit set in a fragmented landscape mosaic in South India. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, **13**, 277–285.
- Krug, C. & Alves-dos-Santos, I. (2008) O Uso de Diferentes Métodos para Amostragem da Fauna de Abelhas (Hymenoptera: Apoidea), um Estudo em Floresta Ombrófila Mista em Santa Catarina. *Neotropical Entomology*, **37**, 265–278.
- Losey, J.E. & Vaughn, M. (2006) The Economic Value of Ecological Services Provided by Insects. *BioScience*, **56**, 311.
- De Marco, P. & Coelho, F.M. (2004) Services performed by the ecosystem: Forest remnants influence agricultural cultures' pollination and production. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **13**, 1245–1255.
- Mitchell, M.G.E., Suarez-Castro, A.F., Martinez-Harms, M., Maron, M., McAlpine, C., Gaston, K.J., Johansen, K. & Rhodes, J.R. (2015) Reframing landscape fragmentation's effects on ecosystem services. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **30**, 190–198.
- Munyuli, T. (2011) Factors governing flower visitation patterns and quality of pollination services delivered by social and solitary bee species to coffee in central Uganda. *African Journal of Ecology*, **49**, 501–509.
- Ne'Eman, G., Jürgens, A., Newstrom-Lloyd, L., Potts, S.G. & Dafni, A. (2010) A framework for comparing pollinator performance: Effectiveness and efficiency. *Biological Reviews*, **85**, 435–451.
- Ngo, H.T., Gibbs, J., Griswold, T. & Packer, L. (2013) Evaluating bee (Hymenoptera: Apoidea) diversity using Malaise traps in coffee landscapes of Costa Rica. *Canadian Entomologist*, **145**, 435–453.
- Ngo, H.T., Mojica, A.C. & Packer, L. (2011) Coffee plant – pollinator interactions: a review. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **89**, 647–660.

- O'Brien, T.G. & Kinnaird M.F. (2003) CONSERVATION: Caffeine and Conservation. *Science*, **300**, 587–587.
- Ollerton, J., Winfree, R. & Tarrant, S. (2011) How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? *Oikos*, **120**, 321–326.
- Perfecto, I. & Vandermeer, J. (2010) The agroecological matrix as alternative to the land-sparing/agriculture intensification model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **107**, 5786–5791.
- Peterson, G., Allen, C.R. & Holling, C.S. (1997) Ecological Resilience, Biodiversity, and Scale. *Ecosystems*, **1**, 6–18.
- Potts, S.G., Biesmeijer, J.C., Kremen, C., Neumann, P., Schweiger, O. & Kunin, W.E. (2010) Global pollinator declines: Trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **25**, 345–353.
- Quinn, G.P. & Keough, M.J. (2002) *Experimental Design and Data Analysis for Biologists*.
- Ramalho, M. (2004) Stingless bees and mass flowering trees in the canopy of Atlantic Forest: a tight relationship. *Acta Botanica Brasilica*, **18**, 37–47.
- 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.
- Ribeiro, M.C., Metzger, J.P., Martensen, A.C., Ponzoni, F.J. & Hirota, M.M. (2009) The Brazilian Atlantic Forest: How much is left, and how is the remaining forest distributed? Implications for conservation. *Biological Conservation*, **142**, 1141–1153.
- Ricketts, T.H. (2004a) Tropical Forest Fragments Enhance Pollinator Activity in Nearby Coffee Crops. *Fragmentos de Bosque Tropical Incrementan la Actividad de Polinizadores en Cultivos de Café Cercanos*. *Conservation Biology*, **18**, 1262–1271.
- Ricketts, T.H. (2004b) Tropical Forest Fragments Enhance Pollinator Activity in Nearby Coffee Crops. *Fragmentos de Bosque Tropical Incrementan la Actividad de Polinizadores en Cultivos de Café Cercanos*. *Conservation Biology*, **18**, 1262–1271.
- Ricketts, T., Daily, G., Ehrlich, P. & Michener, C. (2004) Economic value of tropical forest to coffee production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **101**, 12579–12661.
- Ricketts, T.H., Regetz, J., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen, C., Bogdanski, A., Gemmill-Herren, B., Greenleaf, S.S., Klein, A.M., Mayfield, M.M., Morandin, L.A., Ochieng', A. & Viana, B.F. (2008) Landscape effects on crop pollination services: Are there general patterns? *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 499–515.
- Roubik, D.W. (2000) Pollination system stability in tropical America. *Conservation Biology*, **14**, 1235–1236.
- Roubik, D.W. (2002) Feral African bees augment neotropical coffee yield. *Pollinating bees: the conservation link between agriculture and nature* (eds P.G. Kevan), & V.L. Imperatriz-Fonseca), pp. 255 – 266. Ministry of Environment, Brasília.
- Saunders, M.E., Peisley, R.K., Rader, R. & Luck, G.W. (2015) Pollinators, pests, and predators: Recognizing ecological trade-offs in agroecosystems. *Ambio*, **45**, 4–14.
- Taki, H., Kevan, P.G. & Ascher, J.S. (2007) Landscape effects of forest loss in a pollination system. *Landscape Ecology*, **22**, 1575–1587.
- Taki, H., Yamaura, Y., Okabe, K. & Maeto, K. (2011) Plantation vs. natural forest: Matrix quality determines pollinator abundance in crop fields. *Scientific Reports*, **1**, 1–4.
- Tscharntke, T., Klein, A.M., Kruess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Thies, C. (2005) Landscape perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity - Ecosystem service management. *Ecology Letters*, **8**, 857–874.
- Tscharntke, T., Tylianakis, J.M., Rand, T.A., Didham, R.K., Fahrig, L., Batáry, P., Bengtsson, J., Clough, Y., Crist, T.O., Dormann, C.F., Ewers, R.M., Fründ, J., Holt, R.D., Holzschuh, A., Klein, A.M., Kleijn, D., Kremen, C., Landis, D.A., Laurance, W., Lindenmayer, D., Scherber, C., Sodhi, N., Steffan-

- Dewenter, I., Thies, C., van der Putten, W.H. & Westphal, C. (2012) Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns and processes - eight hypotheses. *Biological Reviews*, **87**, 661–685.
- Vanbergen, A.J. (2013) Threats to an ecosystem service: Pressures on pollinators. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **11**, 251–259.
- Vandermeer, J. & Perfecto, I. (2007) The Agricultural Matrix and a Future Paradigm for Conservation. *Conservation Biology*, **21**, 274–277.
- Vázquez, D.P., Morris, W.F. & Jordano, P. (2005) Interaction frequency as a surrogate for the total effect of animal mutualists on plants. *Ecology Letters*, **8**, 1088–1094.
- Veddeler, D., Klein, A.M. & Tschardt, T. (2006) Contrasting responses of bee communities to coffee flowering at different spatial scales. *Oikos*, **112**, 594–601.
- Veddeler, D., Olschewski, R., Tschardt, T. & Klein, A.M. (2008) The contribution of non-managed social bees to coffee production: New economic insights based on farm-scale yield data. *Agroforestry Systems*, **73**, 109–114.
- Villard, M.A. & Metzger, J.P. (2014) Beyond the fragmentation debate: A conceptual model to predict when habitat configuration really matters. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **51**, 309–318.
- Waser, N.M., Chittka, L., Price, M. V., Williams, N.M. & Ollerton, J. (1996) Generalization in pollination systems, and why it matters. *Ecology*, **77**, 1043–1060.
- Wilfert, L., Long, G., Leggett, H.C., Schmid-Hempel, P., Butlin, R., Martin, S.J.M. & Boots, M. (2016) Deformed wing virus is a recent global epidemic in honeybees driven by Varroa mites. *Science*, **351**, 594–597.
- Winfree, R., Williams, N.M., Dushoff, J. & Kremen, C. (2007) Native bees provide insurance against ongoing honey bee losses. *Ecology Letters*, **10**, 1105–1113.

Supporting Information

Bee trait classification

The net sampled bees were classified according to their size using the intertegular distance (ITD) as a proxy for bee size (Cane 1986). Since the size of the intertegular distance of the sampled bees ranged between 1mm to 3.6mm, and only five (5) of the 20 identified morphospecies exhibited an ITD above 2 mm, we grouped bees as small (ITD < 1.64 mm) and medium (ITD > 1.64 mm). Based on the revision on the neotropical bees (Camargo *et al.* 2007), the species were also classified according the most common nesting type cited. Two categories were considered in the analysis: cavities nesting bees vs. non-cavities nesting bees.

This data was not included in the general analysis as there was a zero inflated problem for small and cavity and ground nesting bees, due to their absence in the far experimental sites. Nonetheless for the other classifications analysis were possible: Meliponini tribe, exposed nesting bees (*Trigona spinipes*, *Trigona hyalinata* and *Apis mellifera*), and medium sized bees.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES




Fig. S1. Effect of distance over two functional categories: nesting behaviour (a) and bee size (b).




Fig. S2. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) using the percentage of landscape covers of each land use type (matrix composition) on the 24 local landscapes. The first axis explains 36% of the variance.




Fig. S3. Community variation analyses with Non-metric Dimensional Scaling (NMDS) using the abundance/presence of visiting species sampled with entomological nets in each of the 24 coffee sites. In red, species names and in black the experimental sites.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table S1. Response and predictor variables considered for the analyses.

| RESPONSE VARIABLES | PREDICTOR VARIABLES |
|--|---|
| a) Effect of local landscape variables over bee diversity | |
| Bee abundance (nets and pan traps) Bee richness (nets, pan traps and total) Shannon Index (nets) Community variation (NMDS) | Distance to forest fragments Percentage of forest cover (400m radius) Percentage of coffee cover (400m radius) Percentage of pasture cover (400m radius) Matrix composition: from more pasture to more coffee (PCA first axis). |
| b) Effect of bee diversity over coffee production | |
| Fruit set Fruit weight | Bee abundance (nets and pan traps) Bee richness (nets, pan traps and total) Shannon Index (nets) Community variation (NMDS) |
| c) Single visit over coffee production | |
| Fruit set | Bee Precedence (geitonogamy vs. cross pollination) Native vs. <i>Apis mellifera</i> Small vs. medium |

Table S2. Number of single visits of a virgin coffee flower, performed by bee species observed in the study sites. Fruit set is the percentage of single visited flowers that ripped. (FC = Forest Cover).

| Species | Visits | Same Bush* | Other Bush* | Fruits | Fruit Set (%) | Near & High FC | Far & Low FC |
|-----------------------------------|--------|------------|-------------|--------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| <i>Apis mellifera</i> | 73 | 41 | 32 | 32 | 44 | 37 | 36 |
| <i>Plebeia sp.</i> | 31 | 4 | 27 | 10 | 32 | 31 | 0 |
| <i>Schwarziana quadripunctata</i> | 9 | - | - | 2 | 22 | 9 | 0 |
| <i>Scaptotrigona</i> | 8 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 38 | 8 | 0 |
| <i>Meliponini sp.</i> | 5 | - | - | 3 | 60 | 5 | 0 |
| <i>Plebeia remota</i> | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 100 | 4 | 0 |
| <i>Trigona sp</i> | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| <i>Melipona quadrifasciata</i> | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 3 | 0 |
| <i>Jataí</i> | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| <i>Paratrigona subnuda</i> | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 0 |
| <i>Halictidae sp.</i> | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 0 |

Table S3. Results of GGLM model selection for the effect of local landscape variables over bee richness, the likelihood ratio test and LRT *p*-value for the variables of the best model selected using Akaike Corrected criterion.

| Response | Models | Random effect | LRT | <i>p</i> -value |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|
| Richness (nets) | Distance (m) | Landscape | | |
| | Distance | | 7.29 | 0.007** |
| | Distance (categorical) | Landscape | | |
| | Distance | | 6.53 | 0.011* |
| | Coffee_400, Distance | Landscape | | |
| | Coffee_400 | | 0.01 | 0.93 |
| | Distance | | 6.87 | 0.009** |
| | Pastures_400, Distance | Landscape | | |
| | Pastures_400 | | 0.01 | 0.94 |
| Distance | | 7.29 | 0.007** | |
| Richness (Pantraps) | PCA1 - Matrix variation | Landscape | | |
| | Matrix variation | | 16.77 | > 0.001*** |
| | Coffee cover (400-m radius) | Landscape | | |
| | Coffee cover | | 16.59 | > 0.001*** |

Table S4. Results of GGLM model selection for the effect of local landscape variables over bee abundance, the likelihood ratio test and LRT *p*-value for the variables of the best model selected using Akaike Corrected criterion.

| Response | Models | Random effect | LRT | <i>p</i> -value |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------------|
| Abundance (nets) | Coffee_400, Distance (m) | Landscape | | |
| | Coffee_400 | | 5.87 | 0.015* |
| | Distance (m) | | 8.96 | 0.003** |
| Abundance (pantraps) | Coffee cover (400-m radius) | Landscape | | |
| | Coffee cover | | 49.07 | > 0.001*** |
| | Coffee_400, Distance | Landscape | | |
| | Coffee cover | | 46.697 | > 0.001*** |
| | Distance | | 0.27 | 0.602 |
| Abundance (Meliponini) | Coffee_400, Distance (m) | None | | |
| | Coffee cover | | 4.86 | 0.023* |
| | Distance | | 6.64 | 0.010* |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|------|------|---------|
| Distance (m) | None | | |
| Distance | | 7.97 | 0.005** |
| F2 - Matrix variation | None | | |
| Matrix variation | | 6.77 | 0.009** |

Table S5. Correlation values, *p-values* and graphs of the species abundances, of the bees correlated, with the first axis of the Non-Dimensional Multi Scale (NMDS). The nesting site and nectar robber behaviour is also presented for each species. *Trigona spinipes*, *Trigona hyalinata*, *Paratrigona subnuda*, *Nannotrigona testicornis*, *Tetragonisca angustula*.




| Bee species abundance | Community Composition (First axis) | R ² | <i>p-values</i> | Nesting site | Nectar robbers |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| <i>T. spinipes</i> |  | 0.81 | <0.001 | Exposed | Yes |
| <i>T. hyalinata</i> |  | 0.5 | 0.014 | Exposed | Yes |
| <i>P. subnuda</i> |  | 0.46 | 0.004 | Ground | No |
| <i>N. testaceicornis</i> |  | 0.45 | 0.029 | Cavities | No |
| <i>T. angustula</i> |  | 0.46 | 0.025 | Cavities | No |

Table S6. Main sampling characteristics and species composition results of studies that have measured bee diversity during the coffee blooming period, within a variety of shade management (From shaded polyculture to sun coffee production).

| Country | Sampling methodology | Sampling effort | Bee richness -> N° Bees | References |
|------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Brazil | Entomological nets 2 min sweep-netting - twice | 1h 36 min 24 sites | 20 species -> 169 bees Figure S6 | Our Study |
| Brazil | Flower observations 9 sessions of 10 min observations per plant | 6 hours 4 coffee bush/plants | 5 species <i>A. mellifera</i> (89%) | Malerbo-Souza <i>et al.</i> 2003 |
| Brazil - viciosa | Observations? | NA | 8 species <i>A. mellifera</i> , <i>Dialictus</i> *, <i>M. quadrisfaciata</i> *, <i>T. angustula</i> *, <i>T. spinipes</i> * & <i>Xylocopa</i> | De Marco and Coelho 2004 |
| Ecuador | Flower observations 4 sessions of 15 min | 21 hours 21 agroforest | 29 morphosps. -> 2733 bees <i>Apis mellifera</i> (42%) | Veddeler <i>et al.</i> 2006 |
| Colombia | Flower observations 10 min session (shurb) | 18h 40 min 12 farms -> 112 plants | <i>A. Mellifera</i> (59%); Stingless bees (40%) | Bravo-Monroy <i>et al.</i> 2015 |
| Panamá | Flowers observations Max 3 min per day - 4 days | 1h 28min 11 transects. | 22 species -> 1926 bees <i>Apis mellifera</i> (73%) | Roubik 2002 |
| Costa Rica | Flowers observations Two sessions of 10 min | 9h 20min 12 sites(2001)- 16 sites(2002) | 40 morphosp. -> 1041 bees | Ricketts 2004 |
| Costa Rica | Malasia Trap 20 coffee flushes (blooms) 3 days/flush | 1,440 hours 9 sites in 3X(shade/sun/follow) | 113 morphosp.-. -> 1012 bees (34 genera) <i>Dialictus</i> (49%), <i>Trigona</i> (11.5%) | Ngo <i>et al.</i> 2013 |
| Mexico | Pan traps 6 sessions of 8 hours once every two weeks (6 before and after the coffee bloom). | 10,080 (bowls hours) 30 bowls (of 6 oz = 177 ml) TOTAL: 336 hours (per site) | 46 species -> 648 bees 72.2% Halictidae and Apidae 27.8% | Jha & Vandemeer 2010 |
| Brazil | Pan Traps 3 bowls (110 ml) per site. During 48 h | 3,456 (bowl hours) (1728h of day) 24 sites | 16 species -> 67 bees Figure S6 | Our Study |
| México | Flower observation 4 sessions (shrub) of 25 min | 26h 40 min 4 farms -> 4 sites per farm | 7 species → 550 bees <i>A. mellifera</i> (87%); <i>Scaptotrigona</i> (7%) | Vergara <i>et al.</i> 2008 |
| México | Flowers observtions 10 minutes sessions per plant | 5 hours 30 plants | 5 species -> 55 bees <i>Trigona</i> (47%); <i>A. mellifera</i> (12.7%) | Philpott <i>et al.</i> 2006 |
| Mexico | Flower observations 15 min sessions | 31 hours 124 sessions | 17 species -> 499 bees | Jha & Vandemeer 2009 |
| India | Flower observation 15 min sessions -> looking at 5 branches | 176 h 15 min 149 sites -> 5 bushes/site TOTAL: 10575 min | 15 species -> 5658 bees <i>A. mellifera</i> (81.4%); <i>Tetragonula</i> (18%) | Krishnan <i>et al.</i> 2012 |
| Indonesia | Flower observations 15 min sessions on 7 coffee bush per system | 7 h 30 min 10 coffee systems TOTAL: 450 min | 22 sps -> 510 bees 7 sp socias -> 312 ind 15 sp solitary -> 198 ind | Klein 2002 |
| Indonesia | Flower observations 3 sessions (days) of 25 min | 15 sites(18h 45 min) 24 sites (30 hours) | 33 sp -> 2269 bees (<i>C.canephora</i>) 29 sp. -> 2038 bees (<i>C.arabica</i>) | Klein <i>et al.</i> 2003 |