

**The effects of model structure and complexity on the behaviour and
performance of marine ecosystem models.**

by

Elizabeth Ann Fulton, BSc Hons

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Tasmania (September, 2001)

Declarations

Originality

I declare that this thesis is my own work and contains no material that has been accepted in any form for another degree or diploma by the University of Tasmania or any other institution, except by way of background information that is duly acknowledged in this thesis. To the best of my knowledge and belief no material within this thesis has been published or written by another person except where due acknowledgment is made in the text of the thesis.

.....

(signature)

Elizabeth Ann Fulton

.....

(date)

Authority of Access

I declare that this thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the *Copyright Act 1968*.

.....

(signature)

Elizabeth Ann Fulton

.....

(date)

Abstract

Despite increasing use of ecosystem models, the effects of model structure and formulation detail on the performance of these models is largely unknown. Two biogeochemical marine ecosystem models were constructed as the foundation of a study considering many aspects of model simplification. The models use a trophic web that is resolved to the level of functional groups (feeding guilds), and includes the main pelagic and benthic guilds from primary producers to high-level predators. Both models are process based, but the Integrated Generic Bay Ecosystem Model (IGBEM) is highly physiologically detailed, while Bay Model 2 (BM2) uses simpler general assimilation equations. Both models compare well with real systems under a wide range of eutrophication and fishing schemes. They also conform to general ecological checkpoints and produce spatial zonation and temporal cycles characteristic of natural systems. The performance of IGBEM is not consistently better than that of BM2, indicating that high levels of physiological detail are not always required when modelling system dynamics. This was reinforced by a section of the study that fitted BM2, IGBEM and an existing ecosystem model (ECOSIM) to Port Phillip Bay. The predictions of all three models lead to the same general conclusions across a range of fishing management strategies and scenarios for environmental change.

Models that are less resolved or use simpler formulations have lower computational demands and can be easier to parameterise and interpret. However, simplification may produce models incapable of reproducing important system dynamics. To address these issues simplified versions of BM2 and IGBEM were compared to the full models to consider the effects of trophic complexity, spatial resolution, sampling frequency and the form of the grazing and mortality terms used in the models on the performance of BM2 and IGBEM. It was clear in each case that some degree of simplification is acceptable, but that using models with very little resolution

or very simplistic linear grazing and mortality terms is misleading, especially when ecosystem conditions change substantially. The research indicates that for many facets of model structure there is a non-linear (humped) relationship between model detail and performance, and that there are some guiding principles to consider during model development. Developmental recommendations include using a sampling frequency of 2 – 4 weeks; including enough spatial resolution to capture the major physical characteristics of the ecosystem being modelled; using quadratic mortality terms to close the top trophic levels explicitly represented in the modelled web; aggregating species to the level of functional groups when constructing the model's trophic web, but if further simplification of the web is necessary then omission of the least important groups is preferable to further aggregation of groups; giving careful consideration to the grazing terms used, as the more complex Holling type responses may be sufficient; and if an important process or linkage is not explicitly represented in the model, or is poorly known, then a robust empirical representation of it should be included.

The work presented here also has implications for wider ecological topics (e.g. the stability-diversity debate) and management issues. Consideration of the effects of trophic complexity on model performance under a range of environmental conditions supports the ecological “insurance hypothesis”, but not the existence of a simple relationship between diversity and stability. The biological interactions captured in the web are a crucial determinant of ecosystem and model behaviour, but simple aggregate measures such as diversity, interaction strength and connectance are not. Similarly, the work on the effects of spatial resolution on model performance indicates that spatial heterogeneity is a crucial system characteristic that contributes to many of the emergent properties of the system.

The comparison of the full models with each other, and with ECOSIM, leads to five general conclusions. First, shallow enclosed marine ecosystems react more strongly

to eutrophication than to fishing. Second, a selected set of indicator groups can signal and characterise the major ecosystem impacts of alternative management scenarios and large-scale changes in environmental conditions. Third, policies focusing on the protection of a small sub-set of groups (especially if they are concentrated at the higher trophic levels) can fail to achieve sensible ecosystem objectives and may push systems into states that are far from pristine. Fourth, multispecies and ecosystem models can identify potential impacts of anthropogenic activities and environmental change that a series of single species models cannot. Finally, and most importantly, the use of a single “ultimate” ecosystem model is ill advised, but the comparative and confirmatory use of multiple “minimum-realistic” models is very beneficial.

Acknowledgments

As with any body of work this large there are many, many, people who contributed in some way to its completion (or at least to the survival of the author). There are probably far too many to mention all of them by name, but there are some that deserve special attention.

Firstly, I'd like to thank Shell Australia and the CSIRO Division of Marine Research for providing my scholarships. I'd also like to thank the CSIRO Division of Marine Research and the School of Zoology, University of Tasmania for funding my research.

With regard to help, advice and inspiration in all matters technical and model related I'd like to give special thanks to Jerry Blackford, Adam Davidson, Sandy Murray, Francis Pantus, Jason Waring and Stephen Walker. Thank you also to Robert Bell, Andy Edwards, Lars Håkanson, Xi He, Jaques Nihoul, Keith Sainsbury, Bill Silvert, Carl Walters and Andy Yool for their willingness to participate in discussions about modelling and model complexity. In particular, I'd like to thank Sandy Murray for facilitating the extension and modification of PPBIM, and John Parslow for his very thoughtful (and thought provoking) comments, insights and discussions during the entire course of this research – the models are all the better for them!

Moving into areas less technical, but nonetheless important, I'd like to thank the multitude of people who supported and tolerated me during this period. Thanks to my comrades in arms (Joe, Hugh, Piers, Jeff, Alice, Dirk, Phil and Reg) for the friendship and offers of beer over the last few years (it was all heartily appreciated even if I didn't drink the beer!). A very big thankyou to the Block 3 support crew (Nikki, Bronwyn, Wendy and Tilla) who have been there from the start (when even I wasn't sure what I was doing). An equally huge thank you to the Block 1 crew (David, Helen, Rich, Robin and Sally) who not only leant me their computers, but made sure there was always lots

of laughs to keep me going.

Lastly, to those people I couldn't have done without. Thanks to all my friends, near and far, who were interested enough to ask how it was going and polite enough to sit through my answer. Thanks must go to Craig Johnson for putting up with an esoteric student who still thinks isopods look like underwater cockroaches. A family sized thankyou goes to the Smiths for all their generosity, in particular to Tony who is worth immeasurably more than his weight in gold. A very big hug and thankyou to Jim whose daily e-mails were a pleasure to look forward to – on top of which he kept a better countdown than I ever could! And last, but never least, my family. I could not have done it without your love and support (Mum you can stop stressing now!). In particular, big, big hugs to the brave souls who travelled through this with me, Derek, Lachy, Janneke and Mei (?), I love you very, very much!!

Dedication

For my family.

Table of Contents

	Page Number
Declarations	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xx
General Introduction	1
Chapter 1 An Integrated Generic Model of Marine Bay Ecosystems	8
1.1 Introduction: marine ecosystem models	8
1.2 Building IGBEM	11
1.3 Model runs	21
1.4 Results and discussion	23
1.4.A IGBEM vs real bays	23
1.4.B Spatial and temporal form of meso- and eutrophic runs	40
1.4.C Weaknesses and alternative formulations	53
1.5 Conclusions	57
Chapter 2 The effect of physiological detail on ecosystem models I:	
The generic behaviour of a biogeochemical ecosystem model	61
2.1 Introduction: ecosystem models and physiological detail	61
2.2 Building BM2	64
2.3 Model runs	69
2.4 Results and discussion	72
2.4.A BM2 vs IGBEM and real bays	72
2.4.B Spatio-temporal structure and the effects of environmental Change	78
2.4.C Strengths and weaknesses	89

	Page Number
2.5 Conclusions	97
Chapter 3 The Effect of Physiological Detail on Ecosystem Models II:	
Models of Chesapeake Bay and Port Phillip Bay	99
3.1 Introduction	100
3.2 Methods	101
3.3 Results and discussion	103
3.3.A BM2 vs IGBEM and real bays	103
3.3.B Spatial structure	112
3.3.C Strengths and weaknesses	117
3.4 Conclusions	120
Chapter 4 The large and the small of it: The effect of spatial resolution and	
sampling frequency on the performance of ecosystem models	122
4.1 Introduction	123
4.2 Methods	125
4.2.A Spatial structure	128
4.2.B Sampling frequency	130
4.3 Results.	130
4.3.A Spatial structure	130
4.3.B Sampling frequency	142
4.4 Discussion	148
4.4.A Spatial structure	148
4.4.B Sampling frequency	153
4.5 Conclusions	156

Chapter 5	Lump or chop: The effect of aggregating or omitting trophic groups on the performance of ecosystem models .	157
5.1	Introduction	158
5.2	Methods	162
5.2.A	Aggregating functional groups.	166
5.2.B	Omitting functional groups	168
5.2.C	Altered ecosystem conditions	170
5.2.D	Analysis	171
5.3	Results.	173
5.4	Discussion	194
5.5	Conclusions	200
Chapter 6	Mortality and predation in ecosystem models: is it important how it is done?	203
6.1	Introduction	204
6.2	Methods	207
6.2.A	Grazing functions	210
6.2.B	Mortality schemes	211
6.2.C	Definition of the “standard” and alternative runs	211
6.2.D	Parameter tuning	214
6.2.E	Changing forcing conditions	214
6.2.F.	Comparing the runs	216
6.3	Results.	217
6.3.A	Sensitivity to Grazing Terms	217
6.3.B	Sensitivity to the form of mortality used in model closure	224
6.4	Discussion	234

	Page Number
6.5 Conclusions	241
Chapter 7 Lessons learnt from the comparison of three ecosystem models for Port Phillip Bay, Australia	243
7.1 Introduction	244
7.2 Methods	247
7.2.A Model Descriptions	247
7.2.B Comparison of the three models	261
7.3 Results.	267
7.3.A Comparison of the “Base case” results	267
7.3.B Fishing policy analysis	279
7.4 Discussion	302
7.5 Conclusions	310
Chapter 8 Effect of complexity on ecosystem models	312
8.1 Introduction	313
8.2 A general history of the study of model complexity in ecology	320
8.3 Model scope	328
8.4 Model Formulation	334
8.5 Model performance under changing conditions	343
8.6 Conclusions	345
References	348
Appendix A Biomass, production and consumption per set for real bays	392
Appendix B: Meaning of the acronyms, functional group codes and symbols used	406

	Page Number
Appendix C: Rate of change and process equations for Bay Model 2	408
C.1 Rate of change equations	408
C.2 Process equations	413
Appendix D: Equations for the dinoflagellates and mixotrophy in Bay	
Model 2	420
Appendix E: Equations for bacteria and the sediment chemistry in Bay	
Model 2	422
Appendix F: Equations for fish movement in Bay Model 2	427

List of Figures

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 1.1: Map of box geometry used for the standard runs of IGBEM	10
Figure 1.2: Biological and physical interactions between the components used in IGBEM	14
Figure 1.3: Map of the world showing the bays used to evaluate the performance of IGBEM	24
Figure 1.4: Ranges and average values for the main sets of the model (IGBEM) in comparison with field values worldwide	27
Figure 1.5: The relationship between the mean annual concentration of DIN and chl a for real and modelled microtidal marine systems	32
Figure 1.6: The relationship between the mean annual concentration of DIN and chl a for a selection of real and model microtidal marine systems	32
Figure 1.7: Relationship between the maximum depth and the average biomass of meiobenthos in the sediments of real and modelled coastal marine systems	33
Figure 1.8: Growth curves for fish groups as produced by the model and the species their parameterisations are based on	38
Figure 1.9: Maps of the location of the physical and biological areas identified in the output of the PM run	41
Figure 1.10: Maps of the location of the physical and biological areas identified in the output of the CM run	46
Figure 1.11: Relative biomass through time showing temporal patterns for representative groups in the PM run of IGBEM	48

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 2.1: Map of the geometry used for the standard runs of BM2	65
Figure 2.2: Biological and physical interactions between the components used in BM2	66
Figure 2.3: Map of the world showing the bays used to evaluate the performance of BM2	71
Figure 2.4: Range and average value for each of the main trophic sets of BM2 compared with values from empirical observations and from the output of IGBEM	73
Figure 2.5: Comparison of the mean annual DIN against mean annual chl a for real microtidal marine systems, BM2 and IGBEM	79
Figure 2.6: Plot of the average biomass of meiobenthos against maximum depth of the system for marine systems from around the globe, BM2 and IGBEM	79
Figure 2.7: Maps of the biological and physical areas identified by the MDS, cluster and correlation analysis of the runs using the loadings for Port Phillip Bay (the PM run) of BM2 and IGBEM	81
Figure 2.8: Maps of the biological and physical areas identified by the MDS, cluster and correlation analysis of the runs using the loadings for Chesapeake Bay (the CM run) of BM2 and IGBEM	82
Figure 2.9: Distribution of the main zones identified in the output of BM2 and IGBEM	83
Figure 2.10: The biomass through time for the aerobic bacteria in box 23 of BM2	86

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 2.11: Declines in biomass of the demersal and planktivorous fish with an increase in fishing for the standard run of BM2 and the run using Beverton-Holt recruitment	93
Figure 3.1: The specific bays chosen to set alternative nutrient load scenarios for BM2	102
Figure 3.2: Average value for the zooplankton in BM2, in comparison with values for those sets in the field and in the output of IGBEM	106
Figure 3.3: Spatial distribution of the main communities identified in the PM run of BM2 and IGBEM, as well as those recorded in PPB	113
Figure 3.4: Distribution of the main communities distinguished in the CM run of BM2 and IGBEM	115
Figure 4.1: Trophic webs of BM2 and IGBEM	127
Figure 4.2: Maps of the geometries used with the models	129
Figure 4.3: Variance of chlorophyll a in the “Yarra River” box over the final 4 years of the 20 year runs for different levels of spatial resolution in the BM2 and IGBEM models	131
Figure 4.4: Variance in the bay-wide average chlorophyll a over the final 4 years of the 20 year run for different levels of spatial resolution in the BM2 and IGBEM models	132
Figure 4.5: Effects of spatial resolution on self-simplification	135
Figure 4.6: Effects of spatial resolution on the spatial distribution of functional groups	138
Figure 4.7: Time-series of denitrification as defined by each of the sampling frequencies for BM2 and IGBEM	143

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 4.8: Ratio of the estimated and true values of pelagic (water column) and benthic primary production for BM2 and IGBEM under various sampling frequencies	146
Figure 4.9: Ratio of the estimated and true values of production by benthic filter feeders BM2 and IGBEM under various sampling frequencies	146
Figure 4.10: Ratio of the estimated and true values of pelagic primary production for IGBEM under various sampling frequencies with baseline nutrient conditions and a fivefold increase in nutrient load	147
Figure 4.11: Ratio of the estimated and true values of pelagic secondary production for IGBEM under various sampling frequencies with baseline fishing conditions and a fivefold decrease in fishing pressure	149
Figure 5.1: Diagrams of the most common system configurations that are simplified by aggregating groups	160
Figure 5.2: Food web diagram for the ecosystem models BM2 and IGBEM	163
Figure 5.3: Plot of connectance (C) and the number of links in the simplified food webs produced by aggregating components, against the number of groups in the webs	174
Figure 5.4: Plot of connectance (C) and the number of links in the simplified food webs, produced by omitting components, against the number of functional groups in the webs	175

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 5.5: Plots of the absolute relative differences in the predicted values of indices between the simplified (with aggregated trophic groups) and full versions of the models in relation to the number of groups included in the models	177
Figure 5.6: Relative differences between the chlorophyll a concentrations provided by the simplified (with aggregated trophic groups) and full models	180
Figure 5.7: Comparison of the temporal dynamics of “large zooplankton” in LP2, the time series produced by adding the time series for “small zooplankton” and “large zooplankton” in LA6 and the time series produced by adding the time series for all the zooplankton groups in the standard (full) version of Bay Model 2 (BM2).	182
Figure 5.8: Comparison of the temporal dynamics of chl a in one cell of the standard model and versions of BM2 with aggregated groups	182
Figure 5.9: Plot of the absolute relative differences in the predicted values of indices between the simplified (with omitted trophic groups) and full versions of the models in relation to the number of groups included in the models	184
Figure 5.10: Absolute relative differences between estimates of primary production between models with omitted groups and the full model	186
Figure 5.11: Absolute relative differences between estimates of consumption between models with omitted groups and the full model	187

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 5.12: Comparison of the temporal dynamics of epifaunal predators in one cell of the full IGBEM model and versions with omitted groups	190
Figure 5.13: Comparison of the temporal dynamics of the biomass of diatoms in one cell of the full BM2 model and versions with omitted groups	190
Figure 5.14: Comparison of the temporal dynamics of the biomass of diatoms in one cell of the full BM2 model and versions with omitted groups when nutrient loads have been increased by fivefold	195
Figure 5.15: Plot of the ratio of interaction strength (strong:weak) for the BM2 runs simplified by omitting groups	201
Figure 6.1: Biological and physical interactions between the components used in BM2	209
Figure 6.2: Spatial structure implemented for BM2	210
Figure 6.3: Proportion of the total average biomass of heterotrophic flagellates in each box for each run with alternative grazing formulations	219
Figure 6.4: An example of only minor differences in time-series for alternative forms of model closure	231
Figure 6.5: An example of major differences in time-series for alternative forms of model closure	231
Figure 6.6: The “type I”, “type II” and “type III” functional responses for the large zooplankton	237

Figure Number	Page Number
Figure 7.1: Schematic diagram showing the groups in BM2 and IGBEM and their relative trophic positions	252
Figure 7.2: Depth map of Port Phillip Bay, Melbourne, Australia	253
Figure 7.3: Schematic diagram of the Port Phillip Bay ECOPATH model, showing the constituent groups and their relative trophic positions	259
Figure 7.4: Overlay of a section of the time series of the Benthic Deposit Feeder group in all three models	273
Figure 7.5: Overlay of a section of the time series of total phytoplankton for the three models	273
Figure 7.6: Overlay of a section of the time series of the planktivorous fish group (clupeoids) in all three models	274
Figure 7.7: Plot of ECOSIM biomass trajectories under the Fs that result from an economically oriented objective function	282
Figure 7.8: Plot of ECOSIM biomass trajectories under the Fs which result from an ecologically oriented objective function	283
Figure 7.9: Plot of ECOSIM biomass trajectories under the Fs which result from an objective function that is weighted for a compromise of the ecological and economic strategies	287
Figure 7.10: Plot of ECOSIM biomass trajectories under the split Fs which result from an economically oriented objective function applied when there is a drop in productivity	295
Figure 8.1: Plot of articulation against effectiveness for a number of existing aquatic models	324
Figure 8.2: Plot of predictive power / accumulated error against the number of x-variables for predictive lake models	326

List of Tables

Table Number	Page Number
Table 1.1: List of components in IGBEM compared to those in PPBIM and the biological modules of ERSEM II	13
Table 1.2: Level of detail used in the model formulation for each of the processes carried out in a standard run of IGBEM	15
Table 1.3: Diet matrix for the living components in a standard run of IGBEM	17
Table 1.4: Alternative regimes for fish recruitment implemented in IGBEM	22
Table 1.5: Comparison of the community composition for the benthic and fish communities determined from empirical estimates in PPB and the PM model run	29
Table 1.6: Summary of the Sheldon spectra for the pelagic classes in the run where nutrient loads were at the levels recorded in Port Phillip Bay (PM run) and Chesapeake Bay (CM run)	34
Table 1.7: Summary of the Sheldon spectra for the benthic classes in the baseline (PM) and nutrient load x10 (CM) runs of IGBEM	35
Table 1.8: Estimates of primary and secondary production and consumption for PPB and the PM run of IGBEM	36
Table 1.9: System level indices for a range of real coastal areas and three separate runs of IGBEM	39
Table 1.10: Definitions for the various communities found in the output of IGBEM runs	42
Table 1.11: Dominant communities and physical attributes characterising each biological area identified in the PM run	43

Table Number	Page Number
Table 1.12: Dominant communities and physical attributes characterising each biological area identified in the CM run	45
Table 2.1: Comparison of the underlying assumptions and formulations of the standard implementations of BM2 and IGBEM	63
Table 2.2: The recruitment relationships available in BM2	71
Table 2.3: A summary of the Sheldon spectra for the pelagic classes in the run of BM2 and IGBEM where the environmental conditions match those in Port Phillip Bay	77
Table 2.4: A summary of the pooled Sheldon spectra for the benthic classes in the run of BM2 and IGBEM where the environmental conditions match those in Port Phillip Bay	78
Table 2.5: Relative abundance of the large and small size fractions of the phytoplankton and zooplankton communities in the runs of BM2 and IGBEM using the nutrient loadings of Port Phillip Bay (PM run) and Chesapeake Bay (CM run)	88
Table 2.6: Steepness values for the Beverton Holt stock recruit curves implemented for the fish groups	92
Table 3.1: Average value for each set observed in PPB and Chesapeake Bay (CB) and predicted by the associated runs (PM and CM respectively) of BM2 and IGBEM	104
Table 3.2: Comparison of the community composition for the fish and benthic groups observed in PPB and predicted by BM2 and IGBEM in the runs with conditions matching those in PPB	108

Table Number	Page Number
Table 3.3: Comparison of the estimates of the ratios of production:biomass and consumption:biomass for PPB and the BM2 and IGBEM runs with conditions matching those in PPB	109
Table 3.4: List of indices and their associated values for PPB and the runs of the ecosystem models BM2 and IGBEM where the environmental conditions reflect those found in PPB (the PM run) or Chesapeake Bay (the CM run)	111
Table 3.5: Dominant groups distinguishing the “edge” and “central” communities	114
Table 3.6: Meaning of the codes used in Table 3.5	115
Table 4.1: Comparison of the underlying assumptions and formulations of the standard implementations of BM2 and IGBEM	126
Table 4.2: Persistence of the trophic groups in runs of BM2 and IGBEM using 8-box, 3-box and 1-box geometries	133
Table 4.3: Relative biomass, production and consumption for the runs of BM2 and IGBEM on the smaller geometries	137
Table 4.4: Spatial distribution of assemblages predicted using BM2 on 59-, 8- and 3-box geometries	139
Table 4.5: Groups demonstrating different responses to spatial structure under alternative amounts of fishing and nutrient loads in BM2	141
Table 4.6: Groups demonstrating different responses to spatial structure under alternative amounts of fishing and nutrient loads in IGBEM	142
Table 4.7: Summary of the impact of changes in nutrient loading or fishing pressure on the effects of sampling frequency	147
Table 4.8: Summary of the utility of a range of sampling frequencies	155

Table Number	Page Number
Table 5.1: List of the biological components in the full versions of BM2 and IGBEM	164
Table 5.2: Processes and structure of BM2 and IGBEM	165
Table 5.3: List of the trophic simplifications of the food web made by aggregating groups.	167
Table 5.4: List of the trophic simplifications of the food web made by omitting groups	169
Table 5.5: List of the trophic simplifications (models) considered under a fivefold increase in nutrient load or fishing pressure.	170
Table 5.6: Comparison of the magnitude of average relative deviation from the full models of the indices from runs produced by aggregation and omission of groups for BM2 and IGBEM	178
Table 5.7: Overall performance indicators (V) for the simplified versions of BM2 and IGBEM, when simplification was by aggregating trophic groups	179
Table 5.8: Categories of the effects of aggregating groups on the relative spatial distribution of the constituent components, and associated processes, in BM2 and IGBEM	180
Table 5.9: Overall performance indicators (V) for runs of BM2 and IGBEM, with groups omitted from the models	188
Table 5.10: Categories of the effects of omitting groups on the relative spatial distribution of the constituent components, and associated processes, in BM2 and IGBEM	188

Table Number	Page Number
Table 5.11: The effects of model simplification by aggregation on the relative spatial distribution of the constituent components, and associated processes, in BM2 and IGBEM when the nutrient load or fishing pressure is increased to five times that of the “baseline” conditions	192
Table 5.12: The effects of omitting groups on the relative spatial distribution of the constituent components, and associated processes, in BM2 and IGBEM when the nutrient load or fishing pressure is increased to five times that of the “baseline” conditions	193
Table 5.13: Predicted change in biomass of macrophytes for standard (full) model and versions of BM2 with aggregated groups	193
Table 6.1: Biologically associated components present in BM2	208
Table 6.2: Alternative formulations of the grazing term per consumer considered	212
Table 6.3: List of the identifying names given to the runs and sets of forcing conditions discussed in this paper	215
Table 6.4: Proportional difference between the biomass predicted in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative grazing formulations	218
Table 6.5: Number of boxes for which the relative spatial distributions of the “standard” run differs from that predicted by the runs using an alternative grazing term	219

Table Number	Page Number
Table 6.6: Quality of the match between the predicted time-series for each component in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative grazing formulations	221
Table 6.7: Proportional difference in the size of the trends predicted in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative grazing formulations when the nutrient load is increased fivefold	222
Table 6.8: Proportional difference in the size of the trends predicted in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative grazing formulations when the fishing pressure is increased fivefold	223
Table 6.9: Number of boxes for which the relative spatial distributions of the “standard” run differs from that predicted by the runs using an alternative grazing term when forcing conditions are changing	225
Table 6.10: Quality of the match between the predicted time-series under changing forcing conditions for each component in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative grazing formulations	226
Table 6.11: Proportional difference between the biomass predicted in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative forms of model closure	227
Table 6.12: Number of boxes for which the relative spatial distribution of the “standard” run differs from that predicted by the runs using an alternative forms of model closure	228

Table Number	Page Number
Table 6.13: Quality of the match between the predicted time-series for each component in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative forms of model closure	230
Table 6.14: Proportional difference in the size of the trends predicted in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative forms of model closure when the fishing pressure is increased fivefold	232
Table 6.15: Proportional difference in the size of the trends predicted in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative forms of model closure when the nutrient load is increased fivefold	233
Table 6.16: Number of boxes for which the relative spatial distributions of the “standard” run differs from that predicted by the runs using an alternative forms of model closure when forcing conditions are changing	235
Table 6.17: Quality of the match between the predicted time-series under changing forcing conditions for each component in the “standard” run and those runs using alternative forms of model closure.	236
Table 7.1: Comparison of the underlying structure and assumptions of the three ecosystem models, ECOSIM, IGBEM and BM2	248
Table 7.2: Process detail involved in the phytoplankton production for each model	250
Table 7.3: The basic input parameters for the Port Phillip Bay ECOPATH model	255
Table 7.4: Landings, discard and total value information for the harvest methods included in the Port Phillip Bay ECOPATH model.	258

Table Number	Page Number
Table 7.5: Criteria used to define the objective functions used in the ECOSIM policy analysis routines	266
Table 7.6: Comparison of the group data for the three models	268
Table 7.7: A comparison of ten system level indices for the “base case” runs of the three models	271
Table 7.8: The relative change in biomasses for each of the three models under the test scenarios	276
Table 7.9: System level indices for all the simulations	278
Table 7.10: Results of the policy analyses under constant environmental conditions	280
Table 7.11: Comparison of the important “economic”, “ecological” and “intermediate” strategies	288
Table 7.12: The relative change in biomasses for each of the three models under the ecological and economically based strategies	289
Table 7.13: Results of the policy analyses under changing environmental conditions	293
Table 7.14: Changes in biomass that result from the implementation of the suggested optimal fisheries policies	299
Table 7.15: Summary of the major conclusions and supporting results from the three ecosystem models considered here	303
Table 8.1: Summary of the main strengths and weaknesses associated with the main types of multispecies and ecosystem models	315
Table A.1: DIN, chl a and primary production for real bays	392
Table A.2: Zooplankton biomass, production and consumption for real bays	394

Table Number	Page Number
Table A.3: Fish biomass, production and consumption for real bays .	395
Table A.4: Biomass of benthos and meiobenthos, maximum water depth, and total benthic production and consumption for real bays .	399
Table A.5: Macrophyte biomass and primary production for real bays .	403
Table A.6: Total detritus for real bays	404
Table A.7: Biomass and primary production of microphytobenthos for real bays	404
Table B.1: List of the acronyms commonly used in this thesis . .	406
Table B.2: List of components in BM2 and IGBEM, compared to those in PPBIM	406
Table B.3: List of main terms used in the equations in the appendices C to F	407

General Introduction

The question in context

Over the last few decades, and particularly within the last five years, there has been a shift in focus in managing natural resources. For aquatic systems, attention is increasingly moving from specific system components, such as water quality or status of fish stocks, to consideration of entire systems. Unfortunately, many of the tools to facilitate this new focus are still in the early stages of development and understanding. A prime example is ecosystem models. These “whole of system” models first began to appear during the International Biological Program (IBP) in the early 1970s. However, they soon developed a poor reputation (Jørgensen et al. 1992), as many were found not to be cost efficient (Watt 1975) and, more importantly, introducing detail to reflect a growing knowledge base did not necessarily produce good model performance (O’Neill 1975, Silvert 1981, DeCoursey 1992).

With the new focus on system management and substantial increases in computing power, ecosystem models have once again found favour. Unfortunately, the potential pitfalls encountered during the IBP remain. Greater computing power may lift computational constraints, but it cannot solve the issues of uncertainty about model specification and the effects of model structure and detail on model performance (Silvert 1981, Jørgensen 1994). There have been few attempts to systematically consider the effects of model structure on model behaviour and performance, particularly within the realm of marine models. The work presented here attempts to give some insight into the effect of the level of detail in an ecosystem model on the behaviour and performance of the model.

General methodology

Ecological data have a very low signal-to-noise ratio (Silvert 1981). This can make it difficult to evaluate the effect of model structure on performance if models with modified structure are compared using real data. However, knowledge of the effect of model detail on performance is fundamental to informed model development, interpretation and use. Before a robust understanding of the relationship between model complexity and performance is attained, both data-based and formulation-based issues must be addressed. In approaching these issues, it will be necessary to clearly separate their individual effects.

The research discussed here considers only the effect of model formulation on behaviour and does not attempt to consider effects of data uncertainty. A powerful approach to ascertain the effect of model structure on model behaviour is to use a “deep model-shallow model” comparison. In this approach a simulation model incorporating complex processes, thought to occur in nature, acts as an artificial world or “baseline” against which the performance of other (simpler) models are compared. The simulation model is referred to as a “deep model” and the simpler models that are compared with it are referred to as “shallow models”. One of the greatest advantages of this approach is that it allows the modeller to begin with a detailed, but validated, model and then systematically simplify it to determine the level of detail that is sufficient and parsimonious. In addition, it separates those parts of the optimal model complexity issue that are linked to model structure from those dependent only on data, as it deals with perfect knowledge.

The “deep model-shallow model” comparison approach was first used to good effect by Ludwig and Walters (1981, 1985) in fisheries science. The overall approach, of comparing simpler “assessment” models against more complex ones, has since become a useful means of evaluating fishery harvest strategies, including stock

assessment methods, for single species fisheries management. In this context the approach has been referred to as “operational management procedures” (Butterworth and Punt, 1999) or “management strategy evaluation” (Smith et al. 1999). More recently it has been extended to cover evaluations containing multi-species interactions (Sainsbury et al. 2000, Punt et al. in press).

Biogeochemical ecosystem models were chosen as the basis for this study because they capture processes known to be physically and biologically important determinants of ecosystem behaviour. They also represent some of the most complex ecosystem models available and so there is a lot of scope for simplification and consideration of the effects of many aspects of model structure on performance. Biogeochemical ecosystem models explicitly include complex trophic webs, nutrient dynamics and recycling, temporal variation and forcing. They can also be spatially resolved and include highly detailed process formulations. The degree of detail employed in the formulation of any one of these features may have an impact upon model behaviour and performance. Moreover, nutrient loading and fishing are two of the biggest anthropogenic forces on coastal marine systems, and as biogeochemical ecosystem models explicitly employ nutrients and a trophic structure spanning primary producers to fish, it was possible to consider the robustness of any results to the effects of changing anthropogenic forcing of the system. There are other successful types of ecosystem model that use alternative assumptions and formulations. For example, ECOSIM (Walters et al. 1997) is a dynamic simulation model that assumes mass balance and explicitly incorporates top-down vs. bottom-up control, but it does not include nutrient dynamics (using biomasses only), is not explicitly spatially structured (assumes homogeneous spatial behaviour) and does not usually incorporate temporal forcing. While knowledge of the sensitivity of ECOSIM to facets of its structure such as the trophic complexity is necessary (Walters pers. com.), in comparison with

biogeochemical models, ECOSIM and other types of ecosystem model do not readily allow consideration of the same range of complexity issues and forcing conditions. However, comparison of biogeochemical ecosystem models with these other types of ecosystem model is a good way of checking for the effects of underlying system and model assumptions on model behaviour.

This thesis

The first chapter introduces the “deep” ecosystem model, referred to as the Integrated Generic Bay Ecosystem Model (IGBEM). This model is the most detailed model used in the study and is one of two principle “deep” models in the “deep-shallow model” comparison. Its formulation and development is presented, as is an analysis of its performance assessed against real marine systems from around the world. This analysis indicates that the model reproduces realistic dynamics and levels of biomass and therefore provides a sound basis for the study of model complexity and structure.

In chapter 2 I introduce the second total ecosystem model developed in the study, Bay Model 2 (BM2). This model has a two-fold purpose. First, because it is simpler in formulation than IGBEM, it provides a form of “shallow” model. Second, it is sufficiently detailed to also act as a “deep model” when considering the effects of model structure on behaviour by reducing detail or scope. The development and validation of the model as a generic system is presented, and the effect of reducing physiological detail on model behaviour relative to IGBEM is examined. The question of whether BM2 performs as well as IGBEM is crucial because although physiologically intensive ecosystem models are used (Baretta et al. 1995, Baretta-Bekker and Baretta 1997) they are controversial because they have large data and maintenance requirements (Murray and Parslow 1999b). If simpler formulations perform as well as physiologically intensive ones then this will temper some of the

controversy surrounding complex ecosystem models.

While chapter 2 considers performance of BM2 in the context of temperate marine bays in general, in chapter 3 I extend the analysis presented in chapter 2 to consider two specific bays (Port Phillip Bay in Australia and Chesapeake Bay in the USA). This analysis of the effect of process detail on model behaviour considers the models' abilities in specific circumstances. Generic models are good for developing theory and general understanding, but models are usually applied to specific locations and there can be system specific concerns about model behaviour. Thus, consideration of the effects of model complexity on performance in specific systems is necessary.

The fourth chapter is concerned with specific aspects of the implementation of IGBEM and BM2, and treats both models as “deep models”. I address the effect of spatial resolution and sampling frequency (the temporal spacing of output) on model behaviour and how accurately it is interpreted. These are important issues that have been central concerns in ecology and ecological modelling for over 40 years (Huffaker 1958, MacArthur and Wilson 1967, Levins 1970, Levin 1992, Keitt 1997, Rantajärvi et al. 1998). The sampling scale (spatial and temporal) used in field studies and in models has logistical implications (the more intensive the sampling the more it costs to collect, store and analyse). It can also potentially affect the processes observed in the field and how they are interpreted (Roughgarden et al. 1988, Rantajärvi et al. 1998), and in models it can impact on both model predictions (Murray 2001) and the stability of the modelled system (Gurney and Nisbet 1978, Hassell et al. 1994, Sharov 1996, Keitt 1997).

The fifth chapter examines the effect of trophic complexity on the performance of IGBEM and BM2. It addresses how much of the web is needed to capture the important dynamics, and the sensitivity of model performance to the way in which the web is constructed. This is another issue that has occupied ecology and ecological

modelling for decades. In ecology, the debate over the relationship between stability and diversity in foodwebs has focused on trying to determine which webs are stable and why (Odum 1953, MacArthur 1955, May 1973, Pimm and Lawton 1978, Yodzis 1981, Harding 1999, Yachi and Loreau, 1999, McCann 2000). However, as construction of simpler models is often a goal (Iwasa et al. 1987, Sugihara et al. 1984, Lee and Fishwick 1998), simplifying trophic complexity in models has received some attention (Zeigler 1976, O'Neill and Rust 1979, Cale et al. 1983, Iwasa et al. 1987, Yodzis 2000). There are two main ways in which trophic webs can be simplified, either by omitting trophic groups or by aggregating several similar groups into a single component. Both of these methods are commonly used in developing ecosystem models, but in the past the effects of these decisions on model performance have not received equal attention as researchers have largely concentrated on the effects of aggregating groups. Therefore, here I consider their relative affects on model performance.

Chapter six considers two other specific aspects of model structure and its impact on the dynamics of the BM2 model. I evaluate the form of the grazing term (or functional response) used in the model and the way in which the model is 'closed' (the form of the mortality terms imposed on the highest groups in the modelled web). Both aspects are recognised as potentially having considerable effects on the dynamics of multispecies models (May 1976, Hassell and Commins 1978, Begon and Mortimer 1986, Steele and Henderson 1992, Edwards and Brindley 1999, Murray and Parslow 1999a, Tett and Wilson 2000, Gao et al. 2000), but their effect on ecosystem models has received little attention.

In chapter 7 I compare biogeochemical models, IGBEM and BM2, with another ecosystem model, ECOPATH with ECOSIM. In this case all the models are calibrated to Port Phillip Bay. The objectives of this part of the study are to compare the predictions of the models under changing conditions (nutrient loads and fishing rates) or

alternative management policies, and to ascertain whether there are commonalities and general conclusions that are robust to model structure and formulation. This comparison also served to examine the effect of structure on model behaviour, as the three models are dissimilar in their data requirements, underlying assumptions, trophic complexity and process detail. A comparative and confirmatory approach to the consideration of the potential effects of management policies and changes in ecosystem conditions, such as the one in this chapter, is one of the most effective ways of using ecosystem models (Reichert and Omlin 1997, Steele 1998, Duplisea 2000, Yodzis 2001a and b).

The final chapter reviews the topic of model structure and performance by synthesising the findings of the present study in the context of published work on the topic. While some clear guidelines emerge, it is clear that the field is still in an early stage of development and much remains to be done.