Running-head: grassy biome restoration

Myth-busting tropical grassy biome restoration

Fernando A. O. Silveira^{1,*}, André J. Arruda^{1,2}, William Bond³, Giselda Durigan⁴,
Alessandra Fidelis⁵, Kevin Kirkman⁶, Rafael S. Oliveira⁷, Gerhard E. Overbeck⁸,
Jerônimo B.B Sansevero⁹, Frances Siebert¹⁰, Stefan J. Siebert¹⁰, Truman P. Young¹¹,
Elise Buisson^{11,12}

1 Departamento de Genética, Ecologia e Evolução, Instituto de Ciências Biológicas,
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Av. Antônio Carlos 6627, CEP 31270-901, Belo
Horizonte, MG, Brazil

2 University of Western Australia, School of Biological Sciences, WA, Australia

3 Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, South
Africa

4 Floresta Estadual de Assis, Instituto Florestal do Estado de São Paulo, P.O. Box 104,
19802-970, Assis, SP, Brazil

5 Lab of Vegetation Ecology, Instituto de Biociências, Universidade Estadual Paulista
(UNESP), Av. 24A, 1515, 13506-900, Rio Claro, SP, Brazil

6 Centre for Functional Biodiversity, School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-
Natal, South Africa

7 Department of Plant Biology, Institute of Biology, University of Campinas –
UNICAMP, Campinas, SP, Brazil

8 Departamento de Botânica, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Av. Bento Gonçalves 9500, CEP 91501-970, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

9 Departamento de Ciências Ambientais (DCA), Instituto de Florestas (IF), Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro – UFRRJ, BR 465, Km 07, CEP 23890-000, Seropédica, RJ, Brazil

10 Unit for Environmental Sciences and Management, North-West University, Potchefstroom 2520, South Africa

11 Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

12 Institut Méditerranéen de Biodiversité et d'Ecologie marine et continentale (IMBE), Avignon Université, UMR CNRS IRD Aix Marseille Université, IUT Site Agroparc, BP 61207, 84911 Avignon Cedex 09, France

Author contributions: FAOS conceived the research; all authors actively discussed ideas, contributed with writing topics, revised, and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conceptual implications

- The lack of knowledge on the ecology of tropical old-growth grassy biomes (TOGGB; grasslands, savannas and woodlands) has resulted in profound misunderstandings concerning their restoration.
- We must abandon the misperceptions that TOGGB are less valuable for biodiversity, ecosystem services and human livelihoods compared to forest ecosystems.

- Likewise, we must abandon TOGGB restoration myths that mainly stem from forest restoration, and shift theory and practice towards policy, standards, indicators, and techniques tailored for TOGGB.
- There is an urgent need for a positive agenda for global ecosystem restoration that integrates grassy biomes to benefit both people and nature.

Abstract

The historical focus in research and policy on forest restoration and temperate ecosystems has created misunderstandings for the restoration of tropical and subtropical old-growth grassy biomes (TOGGB). Such misconceptions have detrimental consequences for biodiversity, ecosystem services and human livelihoods in woodlands, savannas and grasslands worldwide. Here, we demystify TOGGB restoration myths to promote a positive agenda to increase the likelihood of success of ambitious landscape-scale restoration goals of non-forest ecosystems. The ten TOGGB restoration myths are: 1) Grasslands originate from degraded forests, 2) Tree cover is a reliable indicator of habitat quality, 3) Planting trees is always good for biodiversity and ecosystem services, 4) Grasslands are biodiversity-poor and provide few ecosystem services, 5) Enhancing plant nutrition is needed in restoration, 6) Disturbance is detrimental, 7) Techniques used to restore temperate grasslands also work for TOGGB, 8) Grasslands represent early stages of forest succession, 9) Grassland restoration is only about grasses, and 10) Grassland restoration is fast. By demystifying TOGGB restoration, we hope that policy-makers, scientists, and restorationists come to understand and embrace the value of these ecosystems and are motivated to establish policies, standards, indicators, and techniques that enhance the success of TOGGB restoration. We must abandon misperceptions and misunderstandings of TOGGB ecology that result in ill-conceived policies and build an informed and compelling global ecosystem restoration agenda that maintains and improves the well-being of all inhabitants of grassy biomes.

Key-words: afforestation, Bonn challenge, grassland, savanna, forest landscape restoration

Introduction

We are at the dawn of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, with the aim to restore 350 million hectares by 2030. Yet, restoration of tropical and subtropical old-growth grassy biomes (TOGGB) is overlooked because researchers and policymakers have largely focused on forest restoration. TOGGBs comprise the world's ancient open biomes: woodlands, savannas and grasslands (Fig. 1; Veldman et al. 2015a) that are dominated by herbaceous species and have typically low tree cover. Many biodiversity hotspots are covered extensively by significant areas of TOGGB (Myers et al. 2000). TOGGB have been historically misunderstood and undervalued, compromising biodiversity, ecosystem services and human livelihoods worldwide (Parr et al. 2014). Indeed, the Bonn Challenge website (<https://www.bonnchallenge.org/>), a highly visible initiative to advance ecological restoration, does not include a single reference to woodlands, savannas and grasslands, while providing a flawed, outdated opportunity-for-restoration map that considers extensive TOGGB areas as degraded forests and, consequently, targets for tree planting or afforestation (Veldman et al. 2015a).

A number of ecological concepts and processes (e.g. regeneration dynamics, succession trajectories, and landscape-level connectivity) are widely accepted as the foundation in tropical forest restoration (Norden et al. 2015; Poorter et al. 2016; Arroyo-Rodríguez et al. 2017). In contrast, TOGGB restoration is, so far, less supported by long-term ecological research. Broader application of techniques is still at an initial stage, in contrast to semi-natural temperate grasslands of cultural landscapes where concepts, principles and techniques of restoration are well developed (e.g. Walker et al. 2004; Kiehl et al. 2010). Here, we focus only on tropical and subtropical old-growth grassy biomes, while recognizing the value of protecting and restoring temperate old-growth grassy biomes.

Misconceptions on the basic ecology and biogeography of TOGGB, and indiscriminate application of principles of forest or temperate semi-natural grassland restoration to TOGGB can actually be detrimental to these biodiverse ecosystems. Here, we aim to correct ten common myths that impede successful restoration of TOGGB at a global scale. By myths, we mean ideas or techniques that were developed for other ecosystems, but which are a poor fit to TOGGB restoration.

Myth 1. Grasslands originate from degraded forests

The idea that TOGGB are the result of forest degradation, and therefore are in need of restoration, probably originated from an historical and widespread misunderstanding of savanna and grassland ecology (Noss et al. 2015). This perception is perpetuated by a highly biased economic valuation of forests and lumber combined with a highly visible and widespread transition of forests to grassland following deforestation, particularly in developed countries. Mounting evidence suggest that some TOGGB evolved in the Miocene and Pliocene (Bond 2016), pre-dating humans by millions of years. Many of them have long been maintained by fire and herbivores. A high proportion of grassland endemics also provide a key clue to the antiquity of TOGGB (Bond 2016). In contrast, derived secondary grasslands are recent, and can emerge from deforestation and anthropogenic fire (Sansevero et al. 2020). Because the latter have similar structure and spectral signatures with TOGGB, it is extremely difficult to use remote sensing to distinguish between both (Veldman & Putz 2011). Failure to distinguish between these two vegetation types results in misidentification of suitable areas for restoration (Bastin et al. 2019). TOGGB are by definition not the result of human-caused fires and deforestation, and therefore, we must abandon the idea that they are degraded ecosystems.

Myth 2. Tree cover is a reliable indicator of habitat quality

TOGGBs are open ecosystems dominated by an herbaceous component which makes up the bulk of plant diversity (Siebert & Dreber 2019). The Food and Agriculture Organization uses tree cover and height to classify forests worldwide (FAO 2000), but tree cover is not useful as an indicator of habitat quality in TOGGB. The application of the FAO definition misclassifies many tropical regions as forests that are in fact TOGGB (Griffith et al. 2017; Veldman et al. 2019; Kumar et al. 2020), and ignores the profound functional differences between open ecosystems with a highly flammable grassy understory and closed, fire-sensitive forests (Ratnam et al. 2011; Bond 2016). Low tree cover in TOGGB does not necessarily mean habitat degradation, and should not be used as a criterion to identify priority restoration targets.

Myth 3. Planting trees is always good for biodiversity and ecosystem services

Since TOGGB are open, biodiverse ecosystems, Carbon-focused tree planting over TOGGB, as suggested by the Bonn Challenge ‘Atlas of Forest and Landscape Restoration Opportunities’ (<https://www.wri.org/applications/maps/flr-atlas/>), makes little to no ecological sense and may actually degrade TOGGB. It has been independently shown that species diversity decreases with increasing tree cover in TOGGB (Veldman 2016; Abreu et al. 2017). Therefore, it is critical to distinguish reforestation from afforestation. Reforestation, i.e. planting trees after deforestation, is laudable, and needed to mitigate climate change, secure ecosystem services and protect biodiversity. In turn, afforestation, planting trees where they historically did not occur, has been repeatedly shown to be detrimental to both plant and animal life, ecosystem

services and to climate change mitigation (Jackson et al. 2005; Veldman et al. 2015b, 2019).

Myth 4. Grasslands are biodiversity-poor and provide few ecosystem services

Tropical forests are often seen as the world's most relevant biomes in terms of biodiversity and ecosystem services. However, many of the world's TOGGB as well as ancient semi-natural grasslands are also extremely rich in terms of taxonomic, phylogenetic and functional diversity (especially on small scales), as well as species endemism (Bond & Parr 2010; Wilson et al. 2012; Parr et al. 2014). They provide a number of essential ecosystem services, and are highly threatened (Overbeck et al. 2015). For example, Brazilian savannas harbor comparable plant species richness to the Brazilian Amazon, even though savannas occupy half of the area covered by the Amazon (Filardi et al. 2018).

TOGGB provide ecosystem services including provisioning of forage resources for livestock in natural grasslands habitat and for agriculturally-important pollinators (Öckinger & Smith 2007), and non-timber products for local populations, such as medicinal and ornamental plants (Dzerefos & Witkowski 2001; Resende et al. 2013). Some TOGGB also provide important attraction for tourism and regional economy systems, *via* support for many species of large mammalian herbivores (e.g. Kruger and Serengeti National Parks).

TOGGB play key roles in regulating water and carbon cycles. A considerably larger proportion of rainfall reaches the ground of TOGGB than in forests, where more rainfall is intercepted by the canopy and evaporates (Honda & Durigan 2016). Consequently, afforestation causes reduction of infiltration and streamflow threatening down-stream water supply in seasonal climates where water is scarce (Jackson et al.

2005). TOGGB also have a high potential for belowground carbon storage (Wiesmeier et al. 2015, Wigley et al. 2020), sometimes higher than forests (Dass et al. 2018), but this potential is usually underestimated because assessments of belowground carbon are more difficult and error-prone than of aboveground carbon (Sanderman et al. 2017). Belowground carbon storage is very stable in TOGGB, as relatively unaffected by fire or grazing, while forest carbon storage aboveground is more vulnerable to loss by fire (Veldman et al. 2019). Therefore, restoration of TOGGB results in benefits to people and nature, beyond climate change mitigation.

Myth 5. Enhancing plant nutrition is needed in restoration

Deforestation frequently leads to soil impoverishment, and reforestation often employs fertilizers and mycorrhizae inoculation to improve seedling establishment. Many TOGGB native species are adapted to nutrient-poor soils and are unresponsive to nutrient addition (Negreiros et al. 2009; Silva et al. 2015). In addition, species from extremely nutrient-impoverished grasslands have root specializations as an alternative to mycorrhizae, and lack the need for fungi inoculation (Abrahão et al. 2019). In nutrient-poor ecosystems, fertilization facilitates biological invasion (Zefferman et al. 2017), increases the risk of pathogen infection (Lambers et al. 2018), decrease fitness of target species (Williams et al. 2019), change the microbiota and favor rapidly growing taller species, decreasing taxonomic and functional diversity (Harpole et al. 2016). Therefore, care should be taken when designing site-preparation strategies for TOGGB restoration to maximize cost-benefit effectiveness. Restoration of TOGGB in soils that have been previously fertilized or limed for agriculture should involve strategies to restore the soil back to its original nutrient-poor state to maximize the recovery of slow growing species and biodiverse species assemblages (Sampaio et al. 2019).

Myth 6. Disturbance is detrimental

This myth poses that disturbances are anthropogenic (and therefore unnatural), and have negative impacts on vegetation. Indeed ‘degradation’ in the WRI Atlas is defined as any reduction in tree cover due to, for example, fire and herbivores. Consequently, major African protected areas, such as the Serengeti and Kruger National Park, are mapped as degraded. However, most TOGGB are not only resilient to, but often dependent on one or more types of endogenous disturbances such as fire, herbivory, and trampling (Buisson et al. 2019). Fire likely promoted the Miocene expansion of tropical grasslands and savannas and shaped open ecosystems. TOGGB, particularly under relatively high rainfall (Sankaran et al. 2005) are maintained in an open stable state by various disturbances (Staver et al. 2011). The continuous herbaceous layer of TOGGB form the main fuel for recurrent fire events and forage for herbivores. Both can create spatial and temporal heterogeneity, an important driver of grassland diversity (Ricketts & Sandercock 2016).

In contrast to grazing animals, fires are less selective, and their spread depends on plant traits, fuel loads, environmental conditions and topographic features. TOGGB species regenerate after disturbance by seeding or resprouting, and some show fire-related germination cues and fire-induced flowering (Buisson et al. 2019). Many other species resprout, mostly from bud banks, located in underground storage organs that store carbohydrates and water for resprouting after disturbance (Pausas et al. 2018).

Herbivores both create and are dependent on open ecosystems, and interact with fire and precipitation to maintain TOGGB. In African TOGGB, grazing and browsing often occur by both native and domestic animals (Du Toit 2003, Smith et al. 2016), and browsers such as elephants help prevent bush encroachment (Scogings & Gowda 2020).

In many TOGGB, domestic livestock replaced native herbivores (Overbeck et al. 2007). In such systems, grazing intensity remains important, although overgrazing has negative effects on biodiversity (Herrero-Juregui & Oesterheld 2018) and can lead to biological invasion (Andrade et al. 2015), including woody encroachment (Belayneh & Tessema 2017). Managing the intensity of grazing, fire, or a combination of both, should be incorporated in the maintenance and restoration of TOGGB. Without fire or sufficient browsing in some areas (Schmidt et al. 2019), woody encroachment and a biome shift from open to forested vegetation can lead to biodiversity losses, especially for endemic species (Abreu et al. 2017; Stevens et al. 2017).

Myth 7. Techniques used to restore temperate grasslands also work for TOGGB

Transferring seed-containing hay or soil are common and successfully applied techniques to overcome regeneration constraints for a high proportion of target plant species in restoration of semi-natural temperate grasslands (Kiehl et al. 2010; Blakesley & Buckley 2016; Török et al. 2018). In contrast to these examples, hay transfer in two TOGGB types in Brazil did not lead to the establishment of any native species (Le Stradic et al. 2014; Pilon et al. 2018). Seed quantity and quality are poor in some TOGGB (Dayrell et al. 2017), with very variable reproduction from seed, even for widespread keystone species (Snyman et al. 2013).

Topsoil transfers are particularly important for post-mining rehabilitation and restoration. Although outcomes vary depending on seed bank quality (Le Stradic et al. 2018), soil depth (Le Stradic et al. 2016) and transfer dates (Pilon et al. 2018), topsoil transfers to restore TOGGB seem more successful than hay transfers (Ferreira et al. 2015). Because TOGGB are often fire-prone ecosystems, many species rely on underground storage organs for regeneration, more than in semi-natural temperate

grasslands (Veldman et al. 2015a), and soil seed banks with short-lived seed bank may explain failures of topsoil transfers.

Testing techniques developed for the restoration of semi-natural temperate grasslands in tropical and subtropical TOGGB is valuable, but careful analysis and appropriate adaptation that addresses the specific ecology of these TOGGB is advisable.

Myth 8. Grasslands represent early stages of forest succession

Ecological succession theories predict changes in plant-community structure and composition over time, eventually reaching a relatively stable condition – the “climax” (Wilson 2011), which is invariably expected to have a higher plant biomass. Even if the idea of a single deterministic climax has been largely abandoned, especially in non-forest ecosystems, the idea of fast-growing, r-strategist pioneers colonizing a disturbed site and eventually being replaced by the arrival and establishment of late-successional, shade-tolerant, k-strategists persists (Pickett et al. 2011). Herbaceous vegetation thus is often misperceived as an initial state of forest succession, and disturbances that interfere in this trajectory are seemingly negative. Evidence does not support this view in TOGGB, where disturbances are important drivers of ecosystem structure and diversity. For example, woody species remain absent from some TOGGB even after 25 years of fire exclusion (Le Stradic et al. 2018).

The secondary-succession theory has been successfully applied in tropical forest restoration (Lamb et al. 2005). It is, however, a poor fit to TOGGB restoration (Walker & Reddell 2007). Firstly, because continuous woody biomass increase is not a desirable outcome in disturbance-driven and light-demanding ecosystems. Secondly, because the functional traits defining pioneer, secondary or late-successional species in tropical forests (Swaine & Whitmore 1988) are far from adequate to categorize plant species

colonizing, covering the ground and persisting in grassland ecosystems (Dayrell et al. 2018). To be applied in grassland restoration, plant functional group classification should be clearly defined according to their precise role in grassland re-assembly instead of borrowing forest terms and definitions. Most importantly, TOGGB are often maintained by natural disturbance regimes, which can be mistaken for simply being early successional states of a woodier “climax” community.

Myth 9. Grassland restoration is only about grasses

Grassland restoration often involves the restoration of high-quality forage resources and dominant species through the reintroduction of palatable perennial, or tall grasses. Consequently, forbs have often been ignored in restoration, and may even be perceived as indicators of degradation (Siebert & Dreber 2019). The focus on dominant grasses (Kinyua et al. 2010) or forage grasses is subject to pitfalls. First, dominant grasses represent only a small proportion of species richness, and forb species richness can be six-fold higher than grasses (Siebert 2011). Forbs provide services, such as nitrogen-fixing, nutritious seasonal food source for browsers, mixed feeders and particularly for cattle (Odadi et al. 2007; O’Connor et al. 2010), invertebrates (Botha et al. 2017), and medicinal sources for human livelihoods (Dzerefos & Witkowski 2001).

Second, planting dominant grasses alone can hinder forb establishment (Werner et al. 2016). There is a general perception that forbs do well under conditions of high disturbance. However, only a small proportion of grassland forb species have evolved ruderality (Botha et al. 2017; Dayrell et al. 2018), and most have evolved with long histories of fire, herbivory and frost (Bond & Zaloumis 2016), which renders them particularly vulnerable to disturbances that remove their underground storage organs

(Fidelis et al. 2014). Restoring forbs with underground storage organs are therefore important for restoring grassland functionality (Morris & Scott-Shaw 2019).

Myth 10. Grassland restoration is fast

How long does an ecosystem take to be restored? The answer to this question has practical implications and interest to decision makers. However, the speed to return to the pre-disturbance state depends on disturbance frequency and intensity, as well as the ecosystem type (Jones et al. 2018). TOGGB are resilient to endogenous disturbance (Fynn et al. 2016), which appears to suggest that their restoration is fast. TOGGB subjected to exogenous disturbance, however, show impoverished communities with low similarity to reference TOGGB (Veldman 2016; Andrade et al. 2015). TOGGB were not able to recover composition and functional diversity even after 40 years after plantation forestry (Bond & Zaloumis 2016) or 60 years after mining or quarrying (Ilunga wa Ilunga et al. 2015). This pattern also proved true for TOGGB subjected to agriculture land use (Kirkman et al. 2004; Fensham et al. 2016). In contrast, secondary tropical forests take a median time of two decades to recover 80% the species richness (Rozendaal et al. 2019), and a median time of 66 years to recover up to 90% of the biomass of old-growth forests (Poorter et al. 2016). Relatively slow regeneration of tropical TOGGB compared to forests (Arroyo-Rodríguez et al. 2017) after exogenous disturbance is mostly related to slow plant growth rate, seed and dispersal limitation (Veldman et al. 2015a; Dayrell et al. 2017, 2018).

Conclusions

The UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration aims to massively scale up ecological restoration to mitigate climate change, support biodiversity and secure food, and

provide essential resources to human populations. Misperceptions and misunderstandings of TOGGB ecology and misapplication of principles used in other ecosystems will likely result in ill-conceived policies that preclude achieving these ambitious goals. By demystifying TOGGB restoration, we hope that policy-makers, scientists, and restorationists fully embrace the characteristics of these valuable ecosystems with the ultimate goal of generating policy, standards, indicators, and techniques that enhance TOGGB restoration. A positive agenda for global ecosystem restoration needs to integrate the ecology of TOGGB that will benefit both people and nature.

Acknowledgments

We thank Kelly Lyons, Kathrin Kiehl and an anonymous reviewer for comments that improved the manuscript. FAOS, GD, RSO, GEO and AF are supported by grants from CNPq, FAOS by FAPEMIG, TPY by NSF LTREB-12-56034 and 19-31224, EB by CNRS PICS-2018–2020, EB and TPY by France-Berkeley Fund (<https://fbf.berkeley.edu/>), GEO by Fundação O Boticário, AF by FAPESP (2015/06743-0), RSO by FAPESP-NERC (2019/07773-1).

References

Abrahão A, Costa PB, Lambers H, Andrade SAL, Sawaya ACHF, Ryan MH, Oliveira RS (2019) Soil types select for plants with matching nutrient-acquisition and -use traits in hyperdiverse and severely nutrient-impooverished campos rupestres and cerrado in Central Brazil. *Journal of Ecology* 107:1302–1316

- Abreu RCR, Hoffmann WA, Vasconcelos HL, Pilon NA, Rossatto DR, Durigan G (2017) The biodiversity cost of carbon sequestration in tropical savanna. *Science Advances* 3:1–8
- Andrade BO, Koch C, Boldrini I, Vélez-Martin E, Hasenack H, Maria-Hermann J, Kollmann J, Pillar VD, Overbeck GE (2015) Grassland degradation and restoration: A conceptual framework of stages and thresholds illustrated by southern Brazilian grasslands. *Natureza & Conservação* 13:95–104
- Arroyo-Rodríguez V, Melo FP, Martínez-Ramos M, Bongers F, Chazdon RL, Meave JA, Norden N, Santos BA, Leal IR, Tabarelli M (2017) Multiple successional pathways in human-modified tropical landscapes: new insights from forest succession, forest fragmentation and landscape ecology research. *Biological Reviews* 92:326–340
- Bastin J-F, Finegold Y, Garcia C, Mollicone D, Rezende M, Routh D, Zohner CM, Crowther TW (2019) The global tree restoration potential. *Science* 365:76–79
- Belayneh A, Tessema F (2017) Mechanisms of bush encroachment and its inter-connection with rangeland degradation in semi-arid African ecosystems: a review. *Journal of Arid Land* 9: 299–312
- Blakesley D, Buckley P (2016) *Grassland Restoration and Management*. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter, England
- Bond WJ (2016) Ancient grasslands at risk. *Science* 351:120–122
- Bond WJ, Parr CL (2010) Beyond the forest edge: Ecology, diversity and conservation of the grassy biomes. *Biological Conservation* 143:2395–2404
- Bond W, Zaloumis NP (2016) The deforestation story: testing for anthropogenic origins of Africa's flammable grassy biomes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371: 20150170

- Botha M, Siebert SJ, Van den Berg J, Ellis SM, Dreber N (2017) Plant functional types differ between the grassland and savanna biomes along an agro-ecosystem disturbance gradient in South Africa. *South African Journal of Botany* 113:308–317
- Buisson E, Stradic SL, Silveira FAO, Durigan G, Overbeck GE, Fidelis A, Fernandes GW, Bond WJ, Hermann JM, Mahy G, Alvarado ST, Zaloumis NP, Veldman JW (2019) Resilience and restoration of tropical and subtropical grasslands, savannas, and grassy woodlands. *Biological Reviews* 94:590–609
- Dass P, Houlton BZ, Wang Y, Warlind D (2018) Grasslands may be more reliable carbon sinks than forests in California. *Environmental Research Letters* 13: 074027
- Dayrell RLC, Arruda, AJ, Pierce S, Negreiros D, Meyer PB, Lambers H, Silveira FAO (2018) Ontogenetic shifts in plant ecological strategies. *Functional Ecology* 12:2730–2741
- Dayrell RLC, Garcia QS, Negreiros D, Baskin CC, Baskin JM, Silveira FAO (2017) Phylogeny strongly drives seed dormancy and quality in a climatically buffered hotspot for plant endemism. *Annals of Botany* 119:267–277
- Du Toit JT (2003) Large herbivores and savanna heterogeneity. Pages 292–309 In: DuToit JT, Rogers KH, Biggs HC (eds) *The Kruger Experience: ecology and management of savanna heterogeneity*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Dzerefos CM, Witkowski ETF (2001) Density and potential utilisation of medicinal grassland plants from Abe Bailey Nature Reserve, South Africa. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 10:1875–1896
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) (2000) FRA 2000: Comparison of forest area and forest area change estimates derived from FRA

- 1990 and FRA 2000. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 59 FAO, Rome, Italy
- Fensham RJ, Butler DW, Fairfax RJ, Quintin AR, Dwyer JM (2016) Passive restoration of subtropical grassland after abandonment of cultivation. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 53:274–283
- Ferreira MC, Walter BMT, Vieira DLM (2015) Topsoil translocation for Brazilian savanna restoration: propagation of herbs, shrubs, and trees. *Restoration Ecology* 23:723–728
- Fidelis A, Appezzato-da-Glória B, Pillar VD, Pfadenhauer J (2014) Does disturbance affect bud bank size and belowground structures diversity in Brazilian subtropical grasslands? *Flora* 209: 110– 116
- Filardi FLR, Barros F, Baumgratz JFA, Bicudo CEM, Cavalcanti TB, Coelho MAN, et al. (2018) Brazilian Flora 2020: innovation and collaboration to meet Target 1 of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC). *Rodriguesia* 69:1513–1527
- Fynn RWS, Augustine DJ, Peel MJS, Garine-Wichatitsky M (2016) Strategic management of livestock to improve biodiversity conservation in African savannahs: A conceptual basis for wildlife-livestock coexistence. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 53:388–397
- Griffith DM, Lehmann CER, Strömberg CAE, Parr, CL, Pennington RT, Sankaran M, et al. (2017) Comment on “The extent of forest in dryland biomes”. *Science* 358, eaao1309
- Harpole WS, Sullivan LL, Lind EM, Firn J, Adler PB, Borer ET, et al. (2016) Addition of multiple limiting resources reduces grassland diversity. *Nature* 537:93–96
- Herrero-Juregui C, Oesterheld M (2018) Effects of grazing intensity on plant richness and diversity: a meta-analysis. *Oikos* 127:757–766

- Honda EA, Durigan G (2016) Woody encroachment and its consequences on hydrological processes in the savannah. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 371:20150313
- Ilunga wa Ilunga E, Mahy G, Piqueray J, Séleck M, Shutcha MN, Meerts P, Faucon MP (2015) Plant functional traits as a promising tool for the ecological restoration of degraded tropical metal-rich habitats and revegetation of metal-rich bare soils: A case study in copper vegetation of Katanga, DRC. *Ecological Engineering* 82:214–221
- Jackson RB, Jobbágy EG, Avissar R, Roy SD, Barrett D, Cook CW, Farley KA, le Maitre DC, McCarl BA, Murray BC (2005) Trading water for carbon with biological carbon sequestration. *Science* 310:1944–1947
- Jones HP, Jones PC, Barbier EB, Blackburn RC, Rey Benayas JM, Holl KD, McCrankin M, Meli P, Montoya D, Mateos DM (2018) Restoration and repair of Earth's damaged ecosystems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 285: 20172577.
- Kiehl K, Kirmer A, Donath TW, Rasran L, Hölzel N (2010) Species introduction in restoration projects – Evaluation of different techniques for the establishment of semi-natural grasslands in Central and Northwestern Europe. *Basic and Applied Ecology* 11:285–299
- Kinyua DM, McGeoch LE, Georgiadis N, Young TP (2010) Short-term and long-term effects of tilling, fertilization, and seeding on the restoration of a tropical rangeland. *Restoration Ecology* 18S1:226–233
- Kirkman LK, Coffey KL, Mitchell RJ, Moser EB (2004) Ground cover recovery patterns and life-history traits: Implications for restoration obstacles and opportunities in a species-rich savanna. *Journal of Ecology* 92:409–421

- Kumar D, Pfeiffer M, Gaillard C, Langan L, Martens C, Scheiter S (2020) Misinterpretation of Asian savannas as degraded forest can mislead management and conservation policy under climate change. *Biological Conservation* 241, doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108293
- Lamb D, Erskine PD, Parrotta JA (2005) Restoration of degraded tropical forest landscapes. *Science* 310:1628–32
- Lambers H, Alborno F, Kotula L, Laliberté E, Ranathunge K, Teste FP, Zemunik G (2018) How belowground interactions contribute to the coexistence of mycorrhizal and non-mycorrhizal species in severely phosphorus-impooverished hyperdiverse ecosystems. *Plant and Soil* 424:11–33
- Le Stradic S, Buisson E, Fernandes GW (2014) Restoration of Neotropical grasslands degraded by quarrying using hay transfer. *Applied Vegetation Science* 17:482–492
- Le Stradic S, Fernandes GW, Buisson E (2018) No recovery of campo rupestre grasslands after gravel extraction: implications for conservation and restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 26:S151–S159
- Le Stradic S, Séleck M, Lebrun J, Boisson S, Handjila G, Faucon M-P, Enk T, Mahy G (2016) Comparison of translocation methods to conserve metallophyte communities in the Southeastern D.R. Congo. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 23:13681–13692
- Morris CD, Scott-Shaw R (2019) Potential grazing indicator forbs for two mesic grasslands in South Africa. *Ecological Indicators* 107:105611
- Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, Fonseca GAB, Kent J (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403:853–858

- Negreiros D, Fernandes GW, Silveira FAO, Chalub C (2009) Seedling growth and biomass allocation of endemic and threatened shrubs of rupestrian fields. *Acta Oecologica* 35:301–310
- Norden N, Angarita HA, Bongers F, Martínez-Ramos M, Granzow-de la Cerda I, van Breugel M, Lebrija-Trejos E, Meave JA, Vandermeer J, Williamson GB, Finegan B, Mesquita R, Chazdon RL (2015) Successional dynamics in Neotropical forests are as uncertain as they are predictable. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences* 112:8013–8018
- Noss RF, Platt WJ, Sorrie BA, Weakley AS, Means DB, Costanza J, Peet RK (2015) How global biodiversity hotspots may go unrecognized: lessons from the North American Coastal Plain. *Diversity and Distributions* 21:236–244
- Öckinger E, Smith HG (2007) Semi-natural grasslands as population sources for pollinating insects in agricultural landscapes. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 44:50–59
- O'Connor TG, Kuyler P, Kirkman KP, Corcoran B (2010) Which grazing management practices are most appropriate for maintaining biodiversity in South African grassland? *African Journal of Range & Forage Science* 27:67–76
- Odadi WO, Young TP, Okeyo-Owuor JB (2007) Effects of wildlife on cattle diets in Laikipia rangeland, Kenya. *Rangeland Ecology & Management* 60:179–185.
- Overbeck GE, Müller SC, Fidelis A, Pfadenhauer J, Pillar VD, Blanco CC, Boldrini I, Both R, Forneck ED (2007) Brazil's neglected biome: the south Brazilian campos. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 9:101–116
- Overbeck GE, Vélez-Martin E, Scarano FR, Lewinsohn TM, Fonseca CR, Meyer ST, et al. (2015) Conservation in Brazil needs to include non-forest ecosystems. *Diversity and Distributions* 21:1455–1460

- Parr CL, Lehmann CER, Bond WJ, Hoffmann WA, Andersen AN (2014) Tropical grassy biomes: misunderstood, neglected, and under threat. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 29:205–213
- Pausas JG, Lamont BB, Paula S, Appezzato-da-Glória B, Fidelis A (2018) Unearthing belowground bud banks in fire-prone ecosystems. *New Phytologist* 217:1435–1448
- Pickett STA, Meiners SJ, Cadenasso ML (2011) Domain and propositions of succession theory. Pages 185–216 In: Scheiner SM, Willig MR (eds.) *The Theory of Ecology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Pilon NAL, Buisson E, Durigan G (2018) Restoring Brazilian savanna ground layer vegetation by topsoil and hay transfer. *Restoration Ecology* 26:73–81
- Poorter L, Bongers F, Aide TM, Zambrano AMA, Balvanera P, Becknell JM, et al. (2016) Biomass resilience in secondary Neotropical forests. *Nature* 530:211–214
- Ratnam J, Bond WJ, Fensham RJ, Hoffmann WA, Archibadl S, Lehmann CER, Anderson MT, Higgins ST, Sankaran M (2011) When is a ‘forest’ a savanna, and why does it matter? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 20:653–660
- Resende FM, Fernandes GW, Coelho MS (2013) Economic valuation of plant diversity storage service provided by Brazilian rupestrian grassland ecosystems. *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 73:709–716
- Ricketts AM, Sandercock BK (2016) Patch-burn grazing increases habitat heterogeneity and biodiversity of small mammals in managed rangelands. *Ecosphere* 7:e01431
- Rozendaal DMA, Bongers F, Aide TM, Alvarez-Dávila R, Ascanrrunz N, Balvanera P, et al. (2019) Biodiversity recovery of Neotropical secondary forests. *Science Advances* 5:eaau3114

- Sampaio AB, Vieira DLM, Holl KD, Pellizzaro KF, Alves M, Coutinho AG, Cordeiro A, Ribeiro JF, Schmidt IB (2019) Lessons on direct seeding to restore Neotropical savanna. *Ecological Engineering* 138:148-154
- Sanderman J, Hengl T, Fiske GJ (2017) Soil carbon debt of 12,000 years of human land use. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114:9575–9580
- Sankaran M, Hanan NP, Scholes RJ, Ratnan J, Augustine DJ, Cade BS, et al. (2005) Determinants of woody cover in African savannas. *Nature* 438:846-849
- Sansevero JBB, Garbin ML, Sánchez-Tapia A, Valladares F, Scarano FR (2020) Fire drives abandoned pastures to a savanna-like state in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. *Perspectives in Ecology and Conservation* 18:31-36
- Schmidt IB, Ferreira MC, Sampaio AB, Walter BMT, Vieira DLM, Holl KD (2019) Tailoring restoration interventions to the grassland-savanna-forest complex in central Brazil. *Restoration Ecology* 27: 942-948
- Scogings PF, Gowda JH (2020) Browsing herbivore–woody plant interactions in savannas. Pages 489–507 In: Scogings PE, Sankaran M (eds.) *Savanna woody plants and large herbivores*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey
- Siebert F, Dreber N (2019) Forb ecology research in dry African savannas: Knowledge, gaps, and future perspectives. *Ecology and Evolution* 9:7875–7891
- Siebert SJ (2011) Patterns of plant species richness of temperate and tropical grassland in South Africa. *Plant Ecology and Evolution* 144:249–254
- Silva RRP, Oliveira DR, da Rocha GPE, Vieira DLM (2015) Direct seeding of Brazilian savanna trees: effects of plant cover and fertilization on seedling establishment and growth. *Restoration Ecology* 23:393–401

- Smith MD, Knapp AK, Collins SL, Burkepile DE, Kirkman KP, Koerner SE, et al. (2016) Shared drivers but divergent ecological responses: insights from long-term experiments in mesic savanna grasslands. *BioScience* 66:666–682
- Snyman HA, Ingram LJ, Kirkman KP (2013) *Themeda triandra*: a keystone grass species. *African Journal of Range & Forage Science* 30:99–125
- Staver AC, Archibald S, Levin SA (2011) The global extent and determinants of savanna and forest as alternative biome states. *Science* 334:230–232
- Stevens N, Lehmann CER, Murphy BP, Durigan G (2017) Savanna woody encroachment is widespread across three continents. *Global Change Biology* 23:235–244
- Swaine MD, Whitmore TC (1988) On the definition of ecological species groups in tropical rain forests. *Vegetatio* 75:81–86
- Török P, Helm A, Kiehl K, Buisson E, Valkó O (2018) Beyond the species pool: modification of species dispersal, establishment, and assembly by habitat restoration. *Restoration Ecology* 26:S65–S72
- Veldman JW (2016) Clarifying the confusion: old-growth savannahs and tropical ecosystem degradation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 371:20150306
- Veldman JW, Buisson E, Durigan G, Fernandes GW, Le Stradic S, Mahy G, Negreiros D, Overbeck GE, Veldman RG, Zaloumis NP, Putz FE, Bond WJ (2015a) Toward an old-growth concept for grasslands, savannas, and woodlands. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 13:154–162
- Veldman JW, Overbeck GE, Negreiros D, Mahy G, Le Stradic S, Fernandes GW, Durigan G, Buisson E, Putz FE, Bond WJ (2015b) Where tree planting and forest expansion are bad for biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Bioscience* 65:1011–1018

- Veldman JW, Aleman JC, Alvarado ST, Anderson TM, Archibald S, Bond WJ, et al. (2019) Comment on “The global tree restoration potential. *Science* 366, 6463, DOI 10.1126/science.aay7976
- Veldman JW, Putz FE (2011) Grass-dominated vegetation, not species-diverse natural savanna, replaces degraded tropical forests on the southern edge of the Amazon Basin. *Biological Conservation* 144:1419–1429
- Walker J, Reddell P (2007) Retrogressive succession and restoration on old landscapes. Pages 69–89 In: Walker LR, Walker J, Hobbs RJ (Eds.) *Linking restoration and ecological succession*. Springer, New York
- Walker KJ, Stevens PA, Stevens DP, Mountford JO, Manchester SJ, Pywell RF (2004) The restoration and re-creation of species-rich lowland grassland on land formerly managed for intensive agriculture in the UK. *Biological Conservation* 119:1–18
- Werner CM, Vaughn KJ, Stuble KL, Wolf KM, Young TP (2016) Persistent asymmetrical priority effects in a California grassland restoration experiment. *Ecological Applications* 26:1624–1632
- Wiesmeier M, Munro S, Barthold F, Steffens M, Schad P, Kögel-Knabner I (2015) Carbon storage capacity of semi-arid grassland soils and sequestration potentials in northern China. *Global Change Biology* 21:3836–384
- Williams A, George S, Birt HWG, Daws MI, Tibbett M (2019) Sensitivity of seedling growth to phosphorus supply in six tree species of the Australian Great Western Woodlands. *Australian Journal of Botany* 67:390–396
- Wigley BJ, Augustine DJ, Coetsee C, Ratnam J, Sankaran M (2020) Grasses continue to trump trees at soil carbon sequestration following herbivore exclusion in a semi-arid African savanna. *Ecology* (in press)

- Wilson JB (2011) The twelve theories of co-existence in plant communities: the doubtful, the important and the unexplored. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 22:184–195
- Wilson B, Peet RK, Dengler J, Pärtel M (2012) Plant species richness: the world records. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 23:796–802
- Zefferman EM, Stevens J, Charles G, Dunbar MD, Emam T, Fick S, Morales LV, Wolf K, Young DN, Young TP (2015). Plant communities in harsh sites are less invaded: a summary of observations and proposed explanations. *AoB PLANTS* 7:plv056

Figure 1. Examples of tropical and subtropical old-growth grassy biome (TOGGB) restoration myths. Forest degradation (A) often results in derived-savannas (B), that should be targeted for landscape forest restoration. Pristine grasslands (campo rupestre in Brazil; C) and subtropical mesic in South Africa; D) are mostly treeless ecosystems threatened by mining (E). TOGGB are fire-prone ecosystems (post-fire flowering in *Calliandra linearis*; F) that provide key ecosystem services, such as water recharge (G), but their restoration is challenging. Invasive and ruderal species (H), but not forbs, the bulk of diversity in TOGGB (I) often colonize degraded areas, decreasing biodiversity. Vegetation survey in 40 cm × 40 cm quadrats showed no germination of native species after hay transfer in a subtropical OGGB (J) and attempts to plant trees often result in catastrophic losses of TOGGB species (K).