Email to Andy Purvis

Dear Andy,

I wanted to bring something to your attention that I’ve been struggling with recently.

After chatting with Andrew Balmford and Rhys Green I have been working on a short paper with them. This paper contrasts the estimates of BII in Newbold et al (2016) with the results of recently published work on biomass intactness of terrestrial ecosystems as well as other proxies of human pressure. This paper is not yet complete, but thus far we have found that in most places vegetation biomass has been reduced by human activities more than biodiversity, according to the BII, has been. This result is on the face of it surprising. We are generally concerned that the values produced by the BII in the Newbold et al. (2016) paper do not reflect reality, although we are not clear why. Given these results, we are also aiming to encourage more debate and discussion about the use of BII as a metric to inform policy targets such as CBD.

I have been struggling with this because I have obviously been involved with some work your group has been doing. I want to assure you that our paper is a critique of one result that has come out of the PREDICTS project and not the project as a whole. I still think that the PREDICTS project is extremely valuable and would be happy to be involved with your group in the future.

This is also not a personal attack as everybody in your group, particularly you, has been very kind to me particularly when I was job-hunting.

If you have any concerns or queries about this piece of work, please get in touch.

Regards,

Phil Martin