

Comparison of grassland plant-pollinator networks on dairy farms in three contrasting French landscapes

Alice Michelot-Antalik, Nadia Michel, Jérémie Goulnik, André Blanchetête, Emile Delacroix, Patricia Faivre-Rampant, Jean-Louis Fiorelli, Jean-Noël Galliot, David Genoud, Laurent Lanore, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Alice Michelot-Antalik, Nadia Michel, Jérémie Goulnik, André Blanchetête, Emile Delacroix, et al.. Comparison of grassland plant-pollinator networks on dairy farms in three contrasting French landscapes. Acta Oecologica, 2021, 112, pp.103763. 10.1016/j.actao.2021.103763. hal-03315908

HAL Id: hal-03315908 https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03315908

Submitted on 2 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

1 2	Comparison of grassland plant-pollinator networks on dairy farms in three contrasting French landscapes									
3 4	Alice Michelot-Antalik ¹ , Nadia Michel ¹ , Jérémie Goulnik ¹ , André Blanchetête ² , Emile									
5	Delacroix ¹ , Patricia Faivre-Rampant ³ , Jean-Louis Fiorelli ⁴ , Jean-Noël Galliot ⁵ , David									
6	Genoud ⁶ , Laurent Lanore ⁷ , Isabelle Le Clainche ³ , Marie Christine Le Paslier ³ , Sandra Novak ⁸ ,									
7	Jean-François Odoux ⁹ , Dominique Brunel ³ , Anne Farruggia ¹⁰									
8										
9	¹ Université de Lorraine, INRAE, LAE, F-54000 Nancy, France									
10	² Herbipôle, INRAE, F-63122, Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France									
11	³ Etude du Polymorphisme des Génomes Végétaux (EPGV), INRAE, Université Paris-Saclay,									
12	91000 Evry, France									
13	⁴ ASTER, INRAE, F-88500 Mirecourt, France									
14	⁵ UCA, INRAE, UMR 0874 UREP, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France									
15	⁶ DGE, F-11290 Arzens, France									
16	⁷ UCA, INRAE, VetAgro Sup, UMR Herbivores, F-63122 Saint-Genès-Champanelle, France									
17	⁸ FERLUS, INRAE, F-86600 Lusignan, France									
18	⁹ APIS, INRAE, Station du Magneraud, F-17700 Surgères, France									
19	¹⁰ DSLP, INRAE, F-17450 Saint Laurent de la Prée, France									
20										
21	*Corresponding author:									
22	E-mail: alice.michelot@univ-lorraine.fr									
23	Postal address:									
24	Université de Lorraine									
25	UMR 1121 UL-INRA Agronomie et Environnement Nancy-Colmar									
26	2, avenue de la Forêt de Haye									

27 54505 VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY Cedex

28 Abstract

29 Temperate grasslands provide both habitats and flower resources for pollinators in agricultural landscapes. Plant-pollinator networks change according to local and landscape variables, 30 which are important to identify to help conserve pollinators in grasslands. We analysed plant-31 pollinator networks in 18 grasslands on experimental dairy farms located in three French 32 regions contrasting by their climate, altitude, landscape or management. We combined visual 33 34 surveys and pollen DNA barcoding. Our objectives were to determine which environmental factors influence pollinator taxa abundance and diversity and differences among the visual 35 plant-pollinator networks in the three farming regions. Flower-visiting insects were trapped in 36 37 six grasslands per farm during three sessions from mid-April to mid-July along fixed 400 m² transects. Insects were identified individually to the lowest taxonomic rank possible. Pollen 38 carried by insects was identified using nuclear ribosomal ITS2 sequences belonging to the 39 40 NCBI nucleotide database. The size and diversity of plant-pollinator networks were much larger and higher in permanent grasslands at the two farms located in lowlands (Mirecourt) 41 42 and mountains (Marcenat) than those at the farm with temporary grasslands and a crop landscape (Lusignan), but the degree of specialisation (H2') was relatively similar and low 43 (mean of 0.46). Diptera, especially Empididae and Syrphidae, represented most plant-44 45 pollinator interactions in Mirecourt and Marcenat, while Hymenoptera were more abundant at Lusignan. The percentage of semi-natural habitats in 500 m buffers and vegetation height 46 explained 23% of the variance in pollinator abundance. Ranunculus sp., Knautia arvensis, 47 Centaurea jacea and Trifolium repens were key plant species in the networks. DNA 48 metabarcoding of pollen loads identified 114 genera in addition to those identified by visual 49 observations (+34-42 per site), reflecting insects' floral pathways and differences in the 50 immediate landscape among farms. This study highlighted the importance of Diptera in plant-51

52 pollinator networks and the need to conserve permanent grassland diversity to conserve53 pollinators.

54

Key words: pollination, agricultural practice, DNA bar-coding, Diptera, Hymenoptera,
metagenomics

57

58 Introduction

Permanent and temporary grasslands are major ecosystems that cover 33% and 6% of utilised 59 agricultural area in Europe, respectively (Huygues et al., 2014) and 9 and 3 million ha in 60 France (Agreste, 2019) in different livestock farming contexts. Permanent grasslands could 61 generally have a greater plant species diversity than temporary grasslands which are renewed 62 within five years and are usually part of arable rotations. Permanent grasslands are suitable 63 habitats for many flora and fauna species (Habel et al., 2013) and provide a wide range of 64 65 ecosystem services (e.g. Bengtsson et al., 2019). However, they have decreased by 10 million ha over the last 50 years in Europe (Huygues et al., 2014), mainly due to conversion to arable 66 land to produce animal feed or due to abandonment. Among grassland functions, 67 entomophilous pollination is crucial, but pollinators have been declining for the last two 68 decades (Potts et al., 2010), with an estimated decline of 77% in flying insect biomass from 69 70 1989-2016 in nature protection areas in Germany (Hallmann et al., 2017). In temperate ecosystems, most pollinators are insects (Hymenoptera, Diptera, Lepidoptera and Coleoptera), 71 and 78% of plants depend on animals to ensure their sexual reproduction (Ollerton et al., 72 73 2011). Grasslands provide both habitats and flower resources for pollinators in agricultural 74 landscapes. For instance, calcareous grasslands are major habitats for wild bees to support pollination in adjacent agricultural landscapes (Klaus et al., 2021; Steffan-Dewenter and 75 Tscharntke, 1999). An increase in grassland plant species richness can increase pollinator 76 diversity and the pollination of adjacent crop production (e.g. Orford et al., 2016, Woodcock 77

et al., 2013).. In return, pollinator diversity (Fontaine et al., 2005; Fründ et al., 2013) or
abundance (Lundgren et al., 2016) helps conserve the floral diversity of grasslands.

80

At the plot scale, local management practices (i.e. frequency of mowing or grazing, types and 81 amounts of synthetic fertilisers) can modify the diversity of plant-pollinator communities 82 greatly. Plant diversity decreases with early mowing (Gaujour et al., 2012) and as nitrogen 83 84 fertilisation increases (Jacquemyn et al., 2003). The diversity and abundance of pollinators decreases as mowing or mineral fertilisation (Hudewenz et al., 2012) or grazing intensity 85 86 increases (Lazaro et al., 2016; Sjödin, 2007) with changes in flower communities. Moreover, the composition (e.g. percentage of semi-natural habitats, SNH) and configuration of 87 landscapes can influence pollinator diversity in grasslands, but this effect varies among 88 studies and pollinator orders. For instance, the percentage of surrounding grasslands can 89 increase the species richness and abundance of bumblebees in grasslands (Diaz-Forero et al., 90 2013; Hatfield and LeBuhn, 2007), but some studies suggest that it has no effect on bees or 91 hoverflies (e.g. Holzschuh et al., 2016). Forest habitats near grasslands can decrease the 92 species richness of bumblebees (Diaz-Forero et al., 2013) and increase that of butterflies 93 (Villemey et al., 2015). Effects of both local and landscape factors on a variety of pollinator 94 orders have been studied less, but the results highlight differences of responses among taxa. 95 Butterflies and beetles seem to be influenced more by local factors (e.g. grassland height, 96 97 management) than landscape factors, unlike hoverflies. In comparison, bees were influenced by both local and landscape factors (Kormann et al., 2015; Sjödin et al., 2008). 98

99 Plants and pollinators are organised into bipartite networks with mutualistic interactions. 100 These networks seem highly asymmetric (i.e. "specialists tend to interact with generalist 101 partners" (Alarcon, 2010) and nested (i.e. "specialists interact with subsets of the species with 102 which generalists interact" (Bascompte and Jordano, 2007). These characteristics could

stabilise networks in case of species extinctions, disturbance or habitat loss (Fortuna and 103 104 Bascompte, 2006; Jordano, 1987; Memmott et al., 2004) but this network asymmetry could be partly due to experimental artefacts (Blüthgen, 2010). Although some studies have shown 105 106 generalisation and redundancy in these networks, complementarity and specialisation between species could be important (Fründ et al., 2010). Pollinator diversity and network specialisation 107 can be influenced by the floristic richness and total blossom cover of grasslands. Indeed, an 108 109 increase in floral resource diversity can provide more ecological niches for pollinators and thus render plant-pollinator networks more specialised (Junker et al., 2015). Previous studies 110 showed that pollinator richness or visitation frequency can increase as plant species richness 111 112 increases (e.g. Fornoff et al., 2017; Fründ et al., 2010), but some studies showed that specialisation of plant-pollinator networks can remain high regardless of the plant diversity 113 (e.g. Weiner et al., 2011). Among pollinators on grasslands, bees could have the highest 114 115 specialisation and dipterans the lowest (Weiner et al., 2011). As bees are often considered to be the main pollinators in many habitats (e.g. Willmer et al., 2017), fewer studies have 116 considered Diptera. In grasslands, Diptera can represent a large percentage of plant foragers 117 (Rader et al., 2016; Weiner et al., 2011) and play a major role in pollination (Tiusanen et al., 118 2016). In particular, Diptera are more abundant when elevation increases (Kearns, 1992; 119 Lefebvre et al., 2014). 120

To understand grassland pollination and improve conservation of all pollinators on farms, it is thus important to determine which local and landscape variables influence the characteristics of plant-pollinator networks. Our study objective was to analyse plant-pollinator networks in 18 grasslands on experimental farms located in three French regions with contrasting landscape composition: crop-dominated landscapes surround plots the most at Lusignan (48-91% of surface area in a 1000 m buffer), whereas SNH surround plots the most at Mirecourt (47-67%) and especially at Marcenat (81-95%). The originality was to assess plant-pollinator interactions of permanent and temporary grasslands by combining two methods: visual identification of insects and plants and identification of the pollen transported by each pollinator using DNA metabarcoding. Our research questions were: (1) which environmental factors (i.e. local plant community, local management practices and percentage of SNH around grasslands) influence the abundance and diversity of pollinator taxa? (2) how do visual plant-pollinator networks differ among the three farming regions? and (3) which contribution of metagenomics to identify pollen and track pollinator visitations in grasslands ?

135

136 Material and methods

137 1. Study sites and sampled grasslands

This study was conducted on three experimental farms (hereafter, "site") of INRAE (French 138 National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and Environment) located at Lusignan in 139 140 western France (46°25' N, 0°07' E, 150 m a.s.l.), Mirecourt in eastern France (48°17' N, 6°07' E, 300 m a.s.l.) and Marcenat in the mountains of central France (45°18' N, 2°50' E, 141 142 1100 m a.s.l., Figure 1). Lusignan was the warmest site with the lowest rainfall (mean annual 143 temperature of 11.9°C and mean precipitation of 790 mm from 2001-2015), while Marcenat was the coldest and rainiest (7.5°C; 1154 mm) and Mirecourt was intermediate (10.3°C; 821 144 mm, INRAE CLIMATIK platform). Lusignan is a 91ha farm composed of 48ha of temporary 145 grasslands and 37ha of crops. Mirecourt, an organic farm since 2006, covers 238ha composed 146 of 133ha of permanent grasslands and 105ha of crops. Marcenat is a farm of 89.5ha composed 147 exclusively of permanent grasslands. We selected six grassland plots per farm (N=18 plots) 148 representative of local farm management for our study. Characteristics of each plot are 149 detailed in table 1. Plots were selected along a gradient of grassland plant species diversity 150 within each site. The temporary grasslands of Lusignan were sown 2 to 4 years before the 151 insect trapping and were included in an arable rotation. 152

153

154 2. Landscape characterisation around sampled plots

Landscape composition data were extracted using QGIS 3.4.3 Madeira (QGIS Development 155 156 Team, 2019). The landscape surrounding each studied plot was described in 500 and 1000 m buffers around the plot's centroid, using environmental and agricultural vector data for 157 France. The landscape was first described by agricultural land use using crop-group data from 158 the RPG ("Registre Parcellaire Graphique") database provided by IGN (French National 159 Geography Institute). Landscape composition was also described by SNH, which were 160 extracted from BD TOPO® (IGN). From this GIS database of the agricultural and semi-161 162 natural landscape, we then calculated %SNH as the sum of percentages of woods, heathland, hedgerows, mountain pasture (rangelands) and permanent grasslands. 163

164

165 **3. Pollinator and pollen trapping**

To trap pollinators, one transect 100 m long and 4 m wide was delineated in the centre of each 166 plot. Three sessions of pollinator trapping of generally 3 days each were performed on each 167 transect in the morning, early afternoon and late afternoon. Pollinators were sampled in 2015 168 at Marcenat and in 2016 at Lusignan and Mirecourt. The periods of catching were 12-13-14 169 April; 22-23-24 June; 7-8-9 July in Lusignan, 17-20-21 May; 6-9-10 June; 27-29-30 June in 170 Mirecourt, and 28-29-30-31 May and 2 June; 17-18-19-22 June; 7-8-9 July in Marcenat. 171 These periods are spaced out to record the phenology changes of plant-pollinator interactions. 172 Trapping periods ranged from 10:00-19:00. In total, 162 transect observations were performed 173 (3 transect observations \times 6 plots \times 3 sessions \times 3 sites). Trapping days were sunny, without 174 precipitation or wind. All flower-visiting insects that were actively collecting pollen and/or 175 nectar were trapped directly with FalconTM tubes (to avoid pollen contamination) by an 176 observer walking along the transect for 15 min (stopping the stopwatch to process each insect 177

trapped). Each flower species involved in the interaction was recorded to obtain the visual 178 plant-pollinator network. Each insect collected was killed by injecting 10 mL of 60% ethanol 179 into the FalconTM tube with a syringe. All tubes were stored at room temperature in the 180 laboratories. For pollen and insect preparation methods, see Galliot et al., (2017). Briefly, 181 pollen load was removed from the insect body by adding 30mL of 60% ethanol into the tube 182 and shaking it firmly for 6s. The insect was then collected and pinned for visual identification 183 to the lowest taxonomic rank possible. To identify pollen loads using DNA metabarcoding, 184 the ethanol solution containing the pollen extracted from the insect was filtered on a 5 µm-185 pore nylon filter (Nitex 03-5/1, SEFAR, Heiden, CH) and the filter was then placed in a 1.5 186 187 mL microcentrifuge tube.

188

189 **4. Vegetation measurements**

190 Plant species richness was determined by walking 1-2 diagonals in each plot in May-June 2016 at Lusignan and Mirecourt. At Marcenat, floristic composition had been assessed 4-5 191 years previously by estimating the percentage cover of all plant species in late July in 1 m² 192 quadrats distributed in each plot. The number of quadrats depended on plot size. At the three 193 sites, total flower cover percentage (i.e. blossom cover) and flowering species richness were 194 estimated visually in 30 m \times 30 m quadrats distributed along the 400 m² of each observation 195 transect according to the method of Farruggia et al. (2012). At the three sites, vegetation 196 height was measured along each observation transect as the mean height of 90% of the total 197 biomass. 198

199

200 5. DNA metabarcoding on pollen loads

We used the same metabarcoding protocol as Galliot et al. (2017) with the nuclear ribosomal universal specific primers ITS-S2F (5'-ATGCGATACTTGGTGTGAAT-3') and ITS-4R (5'-

TCCTCCGCTTATTGATATGC-3') (Chen et al., 2010). Sequencing was carried with the 203 MiSeq® V3 Reagent Kit 600 cycles (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA) but to increase the 204 number of samples per run, we performed two libraries: 384 ITS2-F and ITS-4R and 384 to 205 which 4 nucleotides (GATC) have been added at the 5' end. The reads of each sample were 206 distinguished by identifying (or not) the added GATC motif in the demultiplexed reads. ITS2 207 sequences stored in the NCBI nucleotide database in March 2017 were retrieved with the 208 criteria Gene name = ITS2, Organism = Plantae, and Sequence length = 100-3000 nt to 209 210 construct our reference database, called "BDD_ITS2_NCBI_Plants_100-3000" constituted of 182 708 sequences belonging to 9000 genera. Tag and GATC-sorted reads were trimmed 211 using the CLC Genomics Workbench 9.5.2 or 10.0 with the following parameters: (i) base 212 quality Phred >20 with no ambiguity, (ii) removing 20 nt in 5' and 3' and (iii) read length > 213 130 nt. All trimmed reads were mapped using the CLC mapping algorithm with Similarity = 214 215 95%, Length = 70% against the BDD_ITS2_NCBI_Plants_100-3000 database. R2 reads were excluded from the analysis (insufficient quality). The mean length of trimmed R1 reads for 216 217 the two sequencing runs were 151 nt (range: 73-212 nt) for the first run of sequencing and 176 218 nt (range: 87-252 nt) for the second one. Insect pollen loads were described to genus to avoid misclassification due to imprecision in the data base reference sequences. We assumed that a 219 genus was present in a mixed pollen load if its percentage of reads in a sample exceeded 10% 220 221 of all reads in the sample. This threshold was considered to be equivalent to the background noise. As suggested by Galliot et al., (2017) we retained only genera with more than three 222 reads per genus per sample. 223

224

225 **6. Data analysis**

226 **6.1. Spatial autocorrelation**

We used R software (R Core Team, 2019) for all data analyses. The mean distance (\pm SD) between two sampled plots was 929 \pm 611, 1242 \pm 541 and 638 \pm 314 m at Lusignan, Mirecourt and Marcenat, respectively. We tested the spatial autocorrelation of biodiversity data (i.e. mean blossom cover, mean flowering species richness, plant species richness and number of plant-pollinator interactions) among the six plots at each site using Mantel indices using the "ade4" package.

- 233
- 234 **6.2. Visual plant-pollinator networks**

Visual plant-pollinator networks were created for each site using the "bipartite" package by 235 236 combining the three trapping sessions to have a sufficient data number The matrices included foraged flowers (mostly to species) and foraging insects (to the lowest taxonomic rank). The 237 Shannon diversity index of plant-pollinator interactions, number of links per taxon, 238 239 connectance, degree of specialisation H2', network asymmetry, specialisation asymmetry and weighted nestedness were calculated using the function "networklevel" of the bipartite 240 241 package for each site. H2' describes the degree of "complementarity specialisation" or partitioning among two parties in the entire network (Blüthgen et al., 2006). H2' is affected 242 less by network size or sampling intensity than connectance. H2' was also calculated for only 243 the last two trapping sessions at each site. For each plant or pollinator taxon, we calculated 244 strength, taxa degree and taxa specialisation d' which describes "the degree of interaction 245 specialization" at the taxa level (Blüthgen et al., 2006). 246

247

248 **6.3. Statistical analysis**

After checking for data normality using Shapiro-Wilk tests, Spearman's correlations were calculated between each environmental variable and the pollinator abundance for each plot.

We performed Redundancy Analysis (RDA), using the "vegan" package according to Borcard 251 et al., (2011), to explain variation in a matrix of taxa (response variables) due to a matrix of 252 explanatory variables. In all analyses, we used an α threshold of 0.05 and we excluded plot 253 254 V12 (at Lusignan) due to under-sampling (one interaction for all sampling events performed). The response variables consisted of pollinator taxa abundance grouped by sampled plot 255 without considering sampling dates. We transformed the pollinator matrix using a Hellinger 256 transformation. Our explanatory variables were environmental variables known to influence 257 258 pollinator community composition: mean blossom cover (i.e. total flower cover percentage, %), mean vegetation height (cm), flowering species richness and %SNH in 500 buffers 259 around each sampled plot. We selected a %SNH in 500m buffers rather than 1000m because 260 i) %SNH 500m and 1000m were correlated, ii) 1000m buffers overlapped between close plots 261 in Lusignan and Marcenat, and iii) 500m buffers fitted better in our analysis. We also 262 263 included variables that indicated local land-use intensification: number of mowing events of the year, grass use (livestock units-day ha⁻¹) of the year and amount of nitrogen fertilisation of 264 265 the previous year (kg N ha⁻¹).

We checked for collinearity among environmental variables using a variance inflation factor (VIF) criterion. VIF<5 for all variables. We then selected a model using a step-wise procedure based on a permutation test with 10 000 iterations. For the most parsimonious model, only %SNH in a 500 m buffer and vegetation height were selected by the model. We calculated adjusted R² to assess the variance of the pollinator matrix explained by %SNH and vegetation height. We used a permutation test with 10 000 iterations to test the most parsimonious model and the significance of its canonical axes.

We then performed variance partitioning of the Hellinger-transformed pollinator community data using two environmental matrices: local variables (i.e. mean blossom cover, mean vegetation height, flowering species richness, number of mowing events, grass use and amount of nitrogen fertilisation) and a landscape variable (i.e. %SNH in a 500m buffer). We
applied the same step-wise procedure as before and we kept only mean vegetation height,
flowering species richness and nitrogen fertilisation for local variables. We tested the variance
explained by each set of variables using permutation tests.

Finally, we compared mean d' specialisation by pollinator group (i.e. Other Apidae, Syrphidae, Diptera, Lepidoptera and Coleoptera) using ANOVA followed by Tukey's test to compare pairs of means when data were normal (Shapiro test) and homoscedastic (Bartlett test) or Kruskal-Wallis tests when data were not normal or heteroscedastic followed by the Wilcoxon test to compare pairs of means.

285

286 **Results**

287 **1. Plant and pollinator diversities**

288 A total of 979 pollinator insects were trapped at the 3 sites during the 3 sessions on 53 plant species (Figure 2). The plant families of Asteraceae, Renonculaceae and Fabaceae (mainly 289 290 Trifolium repens) represented 35%, 20% and 16% of the total interactions with pollinators, respectively. Overall, 844 insects were identified to genus, of which 583 were identified to 291 species. The pollinator richness identified was 107 species, 78 genera and 50 families. Only 292 10 genera were common to the 3 sites. Most interactions were performed by Diptera (mainly 293 294 Empididae and Syrphidae) at Mirecourt and Marcenat (54% and 65% of site interactions, respectively) and by Hymenoptera at Lusignan (79% of site interactions). For all sites, the 295 interaction frequency of Diptera decreased from 242 in session 1 to 140 in session 2 and to 79 296 297 in session 3. However, that of Syrphidae increased from session 1 to 3 (18 to 61 individuals, respectively). The interaction frequency of Hymenoptera increased by a factor of 3 from 298 299 session 1 to 3, with an increase for bumblebees and honey bees and constant number for wild bees. 300

301

2. Effects of environmental variables on taxa pollinator abundance

Plots of Lusignan had a low %SNH, low flowering species richness and a high grass use. 303 Mirecourt showed mainly many mowing events, high vegetation height and high total 304 blossom cover. Marcenat had a high %SNH, high flowering species richness and a low grass 305 use. Hence, environmental variables clustered strongly by regional site (table 1). Mean 306 307 blossom cover, flowering species richness, plant species richness and the number of plantpollinator interactions were not spatially autocorrelated among the plots at each site (Mantel 308 test, p > 0.05). Pollinator abundance was positively correlated with the mean blossom cover 309 $(r_s = 0.48, p < 0.001)$, the mean plant species richness $(r_s = 0.57, p = 0.017)$ and the mean 310 flowering species richness ($r_s = 0.60$, p = 0.011) in each plot. 311

312 The most parsimonious model, with %SNH and vegetation height as explanatory variables, 313 showed a significant linear relationship between the pollinator taxa abundance matrix and these variables (F = 3.348, p < 0.001, Figure 3). The first two axes of the RDA were 314 315 significant (axis 1: F = 4.539, p < 0.001; axis 2: F = 2.158, p = 0.005). %SNH and vegetation 316 height explained 23% of the variance in the pollinator matrix (adjusted $R^2 = 0.23$). Pollinator community composition clustered strongly by regional site. Non-identified Diptera and 317 Melanogaster nuda were associated with a high %SNH, while Empis sp. were associated with 318 both a high %SNH and high vegetation height. Maniola jurtina, Episyrphus balteatus, 319 Lasioglossum pauxillum and Eristalis sp. were more abundant with high vegetation height, 320 unlike Sphaeroceridae. Bombus terrestris and Bombus lapidarius, which were more abundant 321 with low vegetation height. Apis mellifera were abundant with low %SNH and high 322 vegetation height and Andrena haemorrhoa with low %SNH. 323

The variance of pollinator taxa abundance by plot explained by both local (i.e. vegetation height, flowering plant richness and nitrogen fertilisation) and landscape (%SNH) variables differed significantly from zero (p < 0.05, data not shown). Local environmental variables, landscape variables and both types together explained 9% (p < 0.001), 9% (p < 0.001) and 8%, respectively, of the variance in the transformed pollinator matrix.

329

330 **3. Visual plant-pollinator networks**

The plant-pollinator networks differed among the three sites (Figure 4). The network of 331 Mirecourt and Marcenat had much higher insect taxa richness and Shannon diversity than that 332 of Lusignan (Table 2). The number of unique interactions was higher at Marcenat (158) and 333 Mirecourt (140) than that at Lusignan (60). For all three sites, connectance was relatively low 334 335 and weighted nestedness were similar. The network at Lusignan had the highest network asymmetry (0.67) and lowest specialisation asymmetry, while that at Marcenat had the lowest 336 network asymmetry (0.27) and highest specialisation asymmetry. When all three trapping 337 338 sessions at each site were considered, Lusignan had the most specialised network (H2' = 0.54). When considering only two trapping sessions (i.e. June-July), however, all three sites 339 340 had a similar degree of specialisation (mean H2' = 0.46).

At the taxon level (mainly species and genus, **Table 3**), pollinators with the highest strength 341 were observed at Marcenat (e.g. Diptera, Empis sp., Lasioglossum albipes, A. mellifera), 342 followed by Mirecourt (e.g. Empis sp., Pseudovadonia livida, Episyrphus balteatus) and 343 Lusignan (B. lapidarius, A. haemorrhoa, A. mellifera). The strongest plant taxa differed 344 greatly among sites: T. repens and Cirsium palustre attracted 72% of all pollinators at 345 Lusignan, Centaurea jacea (26%) and Ranunculus acris (21%) were the most foraged taxa at 346 Mirecourt and Ranunculus sp. (20%) and Knautia arvensis (12%) were the most foraged taxa 347 at Marcenat. 348

At Lusignan, other Diptera were more specialised than Apidae (ANOVA, F = 3.7, p = 0.038;

Tukey's test, p = 0.038, Table 4). At Mirecourt, other Diptera were more specialised than

Lepidoptera, (ANOVA, F = 4.29, p = 0.029; Tukey's test, p = 0.040) and Apidae had low values of d' (mean \pm SD: 0.25 \pm 0.25). At Marcenat, other Diptera and Syrphidae tended to have lower values of d' than Apidae, but the difference was not significant (Kruskal-Wallis test, p = 0.08).

355

4. Pollen analysis by metagenomics

The pollen DNA metabarcoding identified 84%, 81% and 75% of the genera of plants foraged in visual interactions at Lusignan, Mirecourt and Marcenat, respectively. A total of 107 plant genera were detected on pollen loads analysed from Diptera, Hymenoptera and Lepidoptera from the three sites. Most of these pollinators transported pollen from 1-3 genera (data not shown), with a maximum of 6 genera on one individual of *Pieris brassicae* (Lepidoptera).

Moreover, metabarcoding of pollen loads identified 34, 42 and 38 plant genera in addition to 362 363 those identified in the visual observations at Lusignan, Mirecourt and Marcenat, respectively (Table 5), which corresponded to 2-3 times the genera richness found with visual 364 365 observations alone. Among the plant genera found only with the metagenomics method at the 366 three sites, Dicotyledon and grass from grasslands were the main pollen carried. At Lusignan, 26% (mainly Apidae), 15% and 13% of pollinators sampled transported pollen of 367 trees/shrubs, Dicotyledon from grasslands, and crops, respectively. At Mirecourt, 20% and 368 369 14% of pollinators sampled (mainly Syrphidae and Nymphalidae) transported pollen of grass and Dicotyledon from grasslands, respectively. At Marcenat, 22% of pollinators sampled 370 (mainly Empididae and Syrphidae) transported pollen of Dicotyledon from grasslands. 371

372

373 Discussion

374

The three sites differed in plant-pollinator compositions, which firstly reflects different 376 regional species pools and/or a temporal effect due to different years of trapping. Pollinator 377 abundance of each taxa was related to both landscape (percentage of semi-natural habitats, % 378 SNH; in 500 m buffers) and local (vegetation height) variables. We determined that 379 communities with a high %SNH within landscape were characterised mainly by dominant 380 non-Syrphidae Diptera and Melanogaster nuda. Among the few studies of the influence of 381 landscape on non-Syrphidae Diptera, Burel et al., (2004) showed that Empididae had higher 382 species richness in landscapes with a large percentage of permanent grasslands, woods and 383 hedgerows than in landscapes dominated by crops. In contrast, plots with low %SNH were 384 385 dominated by polylectic bee species, which are known to be associated with farmlands due to the wide range of plant species they visit (e.g. A. haemorrhoa: Wood et al., 2016; B. 386 lapidarius: Roger et al., 2017; A. mellifera, which are associated only with beekeeping in 387 388 most of France: Requier et al., 2015). At Lusignan, Hymenoptera probably predominated because of higher temperatures (+ $0.7^{\circ}C$ and + $2^{\circ}C$ in mean temperature from April to July of 389 390 the pollinator trapping year compared to Mirecourt and Marcenat), the crop landscape and temporary grasslands. Temporary grasslands of Lusignan was composed of Trifolium repens 391 which was the most visited species, mainly by Apidae. T. repens has a large amount of nectar 392 with a high sugar concentration (ca. 804 kg of nectar productivity ha⁻¹ cover year⁻¹ in Baude et 393 al., 2016) and has a pollen rich in protein for bees (e.g. Ghosh et al., 2020; Hanley et al., 394 2008). Perennial plants, such as T. repens, have an higher melliferous potential than annual 395 plants so that temporary grasslands at Lusignan can offer continuous resources for pollinators 396 397 during the growing season in annual crop-dominated landscapes (Hicks et al., 2016; Ion et al., 2018). 398

399

Among local factors, the pollinator abundance of each grassland plot at the three sites was 400 401 positively correlated with mean blossom cover and flowering species richness. These results were previously obtained in other studies (e.g. Ebeling et al. 2008 ;Hudewenz et al. 2012 ; 402 403 Goulnik et al. 2020).and highlighted the importance of diversified permanent grasslands for pollinator conservation. Pollinators could benefit from more resources when the blossom 404 cover increases. An increase in flowering species richness could enhance the functional 405 406 diversity of floral traits and thus increase the niche partitioning for pollinators. This process could lead to an increase in pollinator abundance as recently observed by Goulnik et al. 407 (2020) in French permanent grasslands. Vegetation height influenced the composition of 408 409 pollinator community. Vegetation was on average shorter at Marcenat than in other sites. This difference may have been due to less favourable pedo-climatic conditions for grass growth 410 rather than more intensive management, because Marcenat had a low grass use and number of 411 412 mowing events. Grassland vegetation height has been shown to influence the species composition of Lepidoptera and Syrphidae (Sjödin et al., 2008) but also of other Diptera 413 414 (Milberg et al., 2016). Stratification of vegetation height has been shown to positively influence niche partitioning of pollinator species, along with flowering species richness and 415 time of day (Venjakob et al., 2016). Moreover, an increase in mean flower height of 416 communities could lead to higher pollinator species richness and visitations, as recently 417 highlighted by Fornoff et al. (2017) but not find in Goulnik et al., (2020).. In addition, higher 418 vegetation heights were associated with mown grasslands (i.e. 1-2 cuts per year), whose 419 pollinator composition can differ from that in grazed grasslands. 420

421

422 Visual plant-pollinator networks in the three farming regions

Plant-pollinator networks in the three studied sites had metrics similar to those in previousstudies from several continents (i.e. H2' of 0.41-0.54, positive network asymmetry and

negative specialisation asymmetry, e.g. Blüthgen et al., 2007; Fründ et al., 2010) but smaller 425 sizes. Size and diversity of plant-pollinator networks were much larger and higher at 426 Mirecourt and Marcenat than those at Lusignan, likely due to lower plant taxa richness, lower 427 %SNH and a higher grass use in Lusignan. Higher network asymmetry at Lusignan also 428 highlighted a large difference in species richness between plants and insects. Most grasslands 429 at Lusignan were temporary, which led to low spontaneous plant enrichment and reduced the 430 plant species richness. We observed a higher degree of network specialisation in Lusignan 431 when all three trapping periods were considered but H2' was relatively similar given the same 432 sampling periods (June-July) for the three sites. Two hypotheses could explain these findings. 433 434 First, the network of Lusignan appeared probably more specialised due to integration over a longer period (April-July) compared to the other sites (May-July), which increased the 435 number of missing links between plants and pollinator taxa due to differences in phenology 436 437 (Vázquez et al., 2009). Secondly, the lower flower diversity at Lusignan could force pollinators to forage fewer flower types. 438

439

440 Concerning pollinator taxa, at Lusignan and Mirecourt, Hymenoptera had the highest strength, but Diptera were the most specialised. In contrast, at Marcenat, Diptera had the 441 highest strength but were the least specialised, in agreement with results of Weiner et al. 442 (2014) for 50 German grassland plots. The degree of Syrphidae specialisation on our three 443 sites (0.40-0.63) was lower than that found by de Manincor et al. (2020) but in the same order 444 of magnitude as that found by Weiner et al. (2014) (0.24). The few interactions for other 445 Diptera at Lusignan (24) could partly explain the high degree of specialization d' for these 446 taxa (see Blüthgen et al., 2006). More generally, our results highlighted the key role of 447 Diptera in plant-pollinator networks in grasslands. Although they generally have a greater 448 handling time (reviewed in Inouye et al., 2015) and could transport less pollen than bees (e.g. 449

Goulnik et al., 2020 for facial measurements; Kearns and Inouye, 1994) because of lower 450 hairiness and smaller sizes for some taxa, , their number of interactions remained high and 451 structured the networks observed. They play an important role in pollen transfer of open 452 453 flowers such as Ranunculus sp. and Anthriscus sylvestris in our study, particularly because most flies have short mouthparts (Woodcock et al., 2014). Some plant species were important 454 to the network structure, particularly due to flower rewards (i.e. nectar and pollen). At both 455 Mirecourt and Marcenat, Ranunculus sp. and K. arvensis had high strength. Ranunculus sp. 456 contains a large amount of pollen and an average amount of nectar (http://www.floraweb.de). 457 They bloomed quite early in the season, which benefited foragers such as Empis sp. K. 458 459 arvensis is a well-known melliferous species that offers an average amount of nectar (Baude et al., 2016). At Mirecourt, C. jacea appeared as a key species that produced an average 460 amount of nectar and was associated with extensive management of grasslands (Jacot et al., 461 462 2007) and wild crop-pollinating bees (Sutter et al., 2017). At Lusignan, T. repens was visited frequently by Hymenoptera such as Bombus sp. and A. mellifera, which confirms previous 463 results (e.g. Goulson et al., 2005) and the important ability of *Trifolium* sp. to produce large 464 amounts of nectar and pollen for foragers. 465

466

467 Contributions and limits of pollen DNA barcoding

The pollinators sampled carried pollen from an average of 1-3 genera at the three sites, with no difference among insect orders (i.e. Diptera, Hymenopteran and Lepidoptera). DNA metaboarcoding data highlighted that more plant genera than visual assessed were probably visited by pollinators (+34-42), which was 2-3 times the genera richness found with visual observations only. Pornon et al., (2017) also found an increase in plant visitations with pollen DNA metabarcoding compared to visual networks (+26-68 plant species), unlike previous results (e.g. Popic et al., 2013). Metabarcoding allowed us to reveal the flowers foraged by the

insects at the plot scale. Moreover, our results suggest that pollen DNA barcoding can reflect 475 476 differences in the surrounding landscape among sites. At Lusignan DNA barcoding showed that they were mainly Apidae but also Halictidae and Andrenidae which transported pollens 477 of trees or shrubs, dicotyledons from grasslands and crops. Ligneous vegetation is known to 478 play a key role for wild bee community (Rollin et al., 2019) and honeybee colonies 479 development as well as large pollen supply for honeybees in spring in Europe (e.g. Requier, 480 2015) but also in America (Sponsler et al., 2020). On the other sites, DNA barcoding reflected 481 pollen transports of grassland's plants (i.e. grass and dicotyledons) by Syrphidae and 482 Nymphalidae (mainly Maniola jurtina) at Mirecourt and by Empididae and Syrphidae at 483 484 Marcenat. Diptera and Lepidoptera can need different habitats and host plants for their larvae and adult development. However, characterising the landscape and metabarcoding to genus 485 instead of species limited metagenomic analysis of the surrounding landscape. 486

487 We performed metabarcoding using ITS2 sequences from the NCBI nucleotide database to identify the mixed pollen loads. Using this database, we had to identify pollen to genus and 488 489 not to species to minimise the risk of misclassifying species due to imprecise reference sequences. Indeed, despite the advantages of the NCBI library, one drawback of its open-490 accessibility remains a lack of homogeneity of taxonomic assignations, incomplete data, 491 changes in taxonomic nomenclature, variability in the quality of the sequences provided and 492 the frequent shortage of data traceability (Collins and Cruickshank, 2013; Fišer Pečnikar and 493 Buzan, 2014; Galliot et al., 2017; Rimet et al., 2016). Consequently, as many studies, we 494 stress the urgent need for a curated barcode database that researchers can use without 495 uncertainty about taxonomic assignations. Moreover, 20% of pollen identified by visual 496 observation was not retrieved by metabarcoding which could have been due to failure of DNA 497 extraction from pollen loads, low quality of sequences (below the trimming threshold) or that 498 some insects did not carry pollen even though they visited a flower. The insects could also 499

have foraged quickly on the flower and not picked up pollen, or some plants could have hadsmall amounts of pollen.

502

503 Conclusion

Plant-pollinator networks of grasslands situated in three different French regions were 504 contrasted. The pollinator taxa abundance of each plot was influenced by vegetation height 505 and %SNH in 500 m buffers but was also related to plant species richness. Diptera were 506 507 abundant in permanent grasslands with landscapes with a high percentage of SNH, whereas Hymenoptera, particularly polylectic bees, dominated in temporary grasslands surrounded by 508 crops. Metabarcoding supplemented the plant genera identified by visual networks well and 509 allowed us to reflect insects' floral pathways as a function of the plot and landscape species 510 pools. Even though metabarcoding still has strong limitations, it offers new perspectives for 511 512 plant-pollinator network analysis. Pollination could thus be integrated more into multifunction assessment of agroecosystems. 513

514

515 Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the INRA metaprogramme on ecosystem services (EcoServ). The authors are grateful to Claude Gallois of LAE for his technical support and Emilie Gras for field experiments at Mirecourt. The climatic data were obtained from the INRAE CLIMATIK platform (https://intranet.inrae.fr/climatik/, in French) managed by the AgroClim laboratory of Avignon, France.

521

522 Author contributions

Alice Michelot-Antalik: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, software,
investigation, methodology, resources, supervision, validation, visualization, writing - original
draft, review & editing.

- 526 Nadia Michel: data curation, investigation, methodology, resources, writing review &
 527 editing
- 528 Jérémie Goulnik: formal analysis, software, writing review & editing
- 529 André Blanchetête: data curation, investigation
- 530 Emile Delacroix: data curation, investigation
- 531 Patricia Faivre-Rampant: data curation, investigation, resources, writing review & editing
- 532 Jean-Louis Fiorelli: data curation, investigation, resources
- 533 Jean-Noël Galliot: data curation, investigation, methodology, writing review & editing
- 534 David Genoud: data curation, investigation
- 535 Laurent Lanore: data curation, investigation
- 536 Isabelle Le Clainche: data curation, investigation
- 537 Marie Christine Le Paslier: data curation, investigation
- 538 Sandra Novak: data curation, investigation, resources, writing review & editing
- 539 Jean-François Odoux: data curation, investigation, writing review & editing
- 540 Dominique Brunel: data curation, investigation, methodology, resources
- 541 Anne Farruggia: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, software, funding
- 542 acquisition, investigation, methodology, supervision, validation, visualization, project
- administration, supervision, writing original draft, review & editing.

544

545 **Bibliography**

Agreste, 2019. Statistique agricole annuelle 2016-2017. Résultats définitifs. (No. 2019–1),
Agreste chiffres et données. Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation, Paris.

- Alarcon, R., 2010. Congruence between visitation and pollen-transport networks in a
 California plant–pollinator community. Oikos 119, 35–44.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17694.x
- Baude, M., Kunin, W.E., Boatman, N.D., Conyers, S., Davies, N., Gillespie, M.A.K., Morton, 551 R.D., Smart, S.M., Memmott, J., 2016. Historical nectar assessment reveals the fall 552 553 and rise of floral resources in Britain. Nature 530. 85-88. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16532 554
- Bengtsson, J., Bullock, J.M., Egoh, B., Everson, C., Everson, T., O'Connor, T., O'Farrell,
 P.J., Smith, H.G., Lindborg, R., 2019. Grasslands—more important for ecosystem
 services than you might think. Ecosphere 10, e02582.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2582
- Blüthgen, N., 2010. Why network analysis is often disconnected from community ecology: A
 critique and an ecologist's guide. Basic and Applied Ecology 11, 185–195.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2010.01.001
- Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F., Hovestadt, T., Fiala, B., Bluethgen, N., 2007. Specialization,
 constraints, and conflicting interests in mutualistic networks. Curr. Biol. 17, 341–346.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2006.12.039
- Blüthgen, Nico, Menzel, F., Blüthgen, Nils, 2006. Measuring specialization in species
 interaction networks. BMC Ecology 6, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6785-6-9
- Borcard, D., Gillet, F., Legendre, P., 2011. Numerical Ecology with R, Use R! Springer Verlag, New York.
- Burel, F., Butet, A., Delettre, Y.R., Millàn de la Peña, N., 2004. Differential response of
 selected taxa to landscape context and agricultural intensification. Landscape and
 Urban Planning, Development of European Landscapes 67, 195–204.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(03)00039-2
- 573 Chen, S., Yao, H., Han, J., Liu, C., Song, J., Shi, L., Zhu, Y., Ma, X., Gao, T., Pang, X., Luo,
 574 K., Li, Y., Li, X., Jia, X., Lin, Y., Leon, C., 2010. Validation of the ITS2 Region as a
 575 Novel DNA Barcode for Identifying Medicinal Plant Species. PLOS ONE 5, e8613.
 576 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008613
- Collins, R.A., Cruickshank, R.H., 2013. The seven deadly sins of DNA barcoding. Mol Ecol Resour 13, 969–975. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12046
- de Manincor, N., Hautekeete, N., Piquot, Y., Schatz, B., Vanappelghem, C., Massol, F., 2020.
 Does phenology explain plant-pollinator interactions at different latitudes? An
 assessment of its explanatory power in plant-hoverfly networks in French calcareous
 grasslands. Oikos 129, 753–765. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.07259
- Diaz-Forero, I., Kuusemets, V., Mänd, M., Liivamägi, A., Kaart, T., Luig, J., 2013. Influence
 of local and landscape factors on bumblebees in semi-natural meadows: a multiplescale study in a forested landscape. J Insect Conserv 17, 113–125.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-012-9490-3
- Farruggia, A., Dumont, B., Scohier, A., Leroy, T., Pradel, P., Garel, J.-P., 2012. An alternative rotational stocking management designed to favour butterflies in permanent grasslands. Grass and Forage Science 67, 136–149. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2494.2011.00829.x
- Fišer Pečnikar, Ž., Buzan, E.V., 2014. 20 years since the introduction of DNA barcoding:
 from theory to application. J. Appl. Genet. 55, 43–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13353013-0180-y
- Fontaine, C., Dajoz, I., Meriguet, J., Loreau, M., 2005. Functional Diversity of Plant–
 Pollinator Interaction Webs Enhances the Persistence of Plant Communities. PLoS
 Biology 4, e1. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0040001

- Fornoff, F., Klein, A.-M., Hartig, F., Benadi, G., Venjakob, C., Schaefer, H.M., Ebeling, A.,
 2017. Functional flower traits and their diversity drive pollinator visitation. Oikos.
- Fortuna, M.A., Bascompte, J., 2006. Habitat loss and the structure of plant-animal mutualistic
 networks. Ecol. Lett. 9, 278–283. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00868.x
- Fründ, J., Dormann, C.F., Holzschuh, A., Tscharntke, T., 2013. Bee diversity effects on
 pollination depend on functional complementarity and niche shifts. Ecology 94, 2042–
 2054. https://doi.org/10.1890/12-1620.1
- Fründ, J., Linsenmair, K.E., Blüthgen, N., 2010. Pollinator diversity and specialization in relation to flower diversity. Oikos 119, 1581–1590. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18450.x
- Galliot, J.-N., Brunel, D., Bérard, A., Chauveau, A., Blanchetête, A., Lanore, L., Farruggia,
 A., 2017. Investigating a flower-insect forager network in a mountain grassland
 community using pollen DNA barcoding. J Insect Conserv 21, 827–837.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-017-0022-z
- Gaujour, E., Amiaud, B., Mignolet, C., Plantureux, S., 2012. Factors and processes affecting
 plant biodiversity in permanent grasslands. A review. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 32, 133–
 160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0015-3
- Ghosh, S., Jeon, H., Jung, C., 2020. Foraging behaviour and preference of pollen sources by
 honey be (Apis mellifera) relative to protein contents. Journal of Ecology and
 Environment 44, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41610-020-0149-9
- Goulnik, J., Plantureux, S., Thery, M., Baude, M., Delattre, M., van Reeth, C., Villerd, J.,
 Michelot-Antalik, A., 2020a. Floral trait functional diversity is related to soil
 characteristics and positively influences pollination function in semi-natural
 grasslands. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 301, 107033.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2020.107033
- Goulnik, J., Plantureux, S., Van Reeth, C., Baude, M., Mesbahi, G., Michelot-Antalik, A.,
 2020b. Facial area and hairiness of pollinators visiting semi-natural grassland wild
 plants predict their facial pollen load. Ecol. Entomol.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/een.12913
- Goulson, D., Hanley, M.E., Darvill, B., Ellis, J.S., Knight, M.E., 2005. Causes of rarity in
 bumblebees. Biol. Conserv. 122, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2004.06.017
- Habel, J.C., Dengler, J., Janišová, M., Török, P., Wellstein, C., Wiezik, M., 2013. European
 grassland ecosystems: threatened hotspots of biodiversity. Biodiversity and
 Conservation 22, 2131–2138. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-013-0537-x
- Hallmann, C.A., Sorg, M., Jongejans, E., Siepel, H., Hofland, N., Schwan, H., Stenmans, W.,
 Müller, A., Sumser, H., Hörren, T., Goulson, D., Kroon, H. de, 2017. More than 75
 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas. PLOS
 ONE 12, e0185809. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185809
- Hanley, M.E., Franco, M., Pichon, S., Darvill, B., Goulson, D., 2008. Breeding System,
 Pollinator Choice and Variation in Pollen Quality in British Herbaceous Plants.
 Functional Ecology 22, 592–598.
- Hatfield, R.G., LeBuhn, G., 2007. Patch and landscape factors shape community assemblage
 of bumble bees, Bombus spp. (Hymenoptera: Apidae), in montane meadows.
 Biological Conservation 139, 150–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2007.06.019
- Hicks, D.M., Ouvrard, P., Baldock, K.C.R., Baude, M., Goddard, M.A., Kunin, W.E.,
 Mitschunas, N., Memmott, J., Morse, H., Nikolitsi, M., Osgathorpe, L.M., Potts, S.G.,
 Robertson, K.M., Scott, A.V., Sinclair, F., Westbury, D.B., Stone, G.N., 2016. Food
 for Pollinators: Quantifying the Nectar and Pollen Resources of Urban Flower
 Meadows. PLOS ONE 11, e0158117. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158117

- Holzschuh, A., Dainese, M., González-Varo, J.P., Mudri-Stojnić, S., Riedinger, V., Rundlöf,
 M., Scheper, J., Wickens, J.B., Wickens, V.J., Bommarco, R., Kleijn, D., Potts, S.G.,
 Roberts, S.P.M., Smith, H.G., Vilà, M., Vujić, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., 2016. Massflowering crops dilute pollinator abundance in agricultural landscapes across Europe.
 Ecology Letters 19, 1228–1236. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12657
- Hudewenz, A., Klein, A.-M., Scherber, C., Stanke, L., Tscharntke, T., Vogel, A., Weigelt, A.,
 Weisser, W.W., Ebeling, A., 2012. Herbivore and pollinator responses to grassland
 management intensity along experimental changes in plant species richness.
 Biological Conservation 150, 42–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2012.02.024
- Inouye, D.W., Larson, B.M.H., Ssymank, A., Kevan, P.G., 2015. Flies and Flowers III:
 Ecology of foraging and pollination. Journal of Pollination Ecology 16. https://doi.org/10.26786/1920-7603(2015)15
- Ion, N., Odoux, J.-F., Vaissière, B.E., 2018. Melliferous Potential of Weedy Herbaceous
 Plants in Crop Fields of Romania from 1949 to 2012. Journal of Apicultural Science
 660 62, 149–165. https://doi.org/10.2478/jas-2018-0017
- Jacot, K., Beerli, C., Eggenschwiler, L., 2007. Improved field margins and the effects on voles and moles. Agrarforschung 14, 214–219.
- Jacquemyn, H., Brys, R., Hermy, M., 2003. Short-term effects of different management
 regimes on the response of calcareous grassland vegetation to increased nitrogen.
 Biological Conservation 111, 137–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/S00063207(02)00256-2
- Jordano, P., 1987. Patterns of Mutualistic Interactions in Pollination and Seed Dispersal:
 Connectance, Dependence Asymmetries, and Coevolution. The American Naturalist
 129, 657–677.
- Junker, R.R., Blüthgen, N., Keller, A., 2015. Functional and phylogenetic diversity of plant
 communities differently affect the structure of flower-visitor interactions and reveal
 convergences in floral traits. Evol Ecol 29, 437–450. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682014-9747-2
- Kearns, C., Inouye, D., 1994. Fly Pollination of Linum-Lewisii (linaceae). Am. J. Bot. 81,
 1091–1095. https://doi.org/10.2307/2445470
- Kearns, C.A., 1992. Anthophilous Fly Distribution Across an Elevation Gradient. The
 American Midland Naturalist 127, 172–182. https://doi.org/10.2307/2426332
- Klaus, F., Tscharntke, T., Uhler, J., Grass, I., 2021. Calcareous grassland fragments as sources
 of bee pollinators for the surrounding agricultural landscape. Global Ecology and
 Conservation 26, e01474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01474
- Kormann, U., Rösch, V., Batáry, P., Tscharntke, T., Orci, K.M., Samu, F., Scherber, C., 2015.
 Local and landscape management drive trait-mediated biodiversity of nine taxa on
 small grassland fragments. Diversity and Distributions 21, 1204–1217.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12324
- Lazaro, A., Tscheulin, T., Devalez, J., Nakas, G., Petanidou, T., 2016. Effects of grazing
 intensity on pollinator abundance and diversity, and on pollination services. Ecol.
 Entomol. 41, 400–412. https://doi.org/10.1111/een.12310
- Lefebvre, V., Fontaine, C., Villemant, C., Daugeron, C., 2014. Are empidine dance flies
 major flower visitors in alpine environments? A case study in the Alps, France. Biol
 Lett 10. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2014.0742
- Lundgren, R., Totland, Ø., Lázaro, A., 2016. Experimental simulation of pollinator decline
 causes community-wide reductions in seedling diversity and abundance. Ecology 97,
 1420–1430.
- Memmott, J., Waser, N.M., Price, M.V., 2004. Tolerance of pollination networks to species
 extinctions. Proc Biol Sci 271, 2605–2611. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2004.2909

- Milberg, P., Bergman, K.-O., Cronvall, E., Eriksson, Å.I., Glimskär, A., Islamovic, A., 696 Jonason, D., Löfqvist, Z., Westerberg, L., 2016. Flower abundance and vegetation 697 698 height as predictors for nectar-feeding insect occurrence in Swedish semi-natural & grasslands. Agriculture, Ecosystems Environment 230, 47-54. 699 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.05.029 700
- Ollerton, J., Winfree, R., Tarrant, S., 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? Oikos 120, 321–326. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18644.x
- Orford, K.A., Murray, P.J., Vaughan, I.P., Memmott, J., 2016. Modest enhancements to
 conventional grassland diversity improve the provision of pollination services. J Appl
 Ecol 53, 906–915. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12608
- Popic, T.J., Wardle, G.M., Davila, Y.C., 2013. Flower-visitor networks only partially predict
 the function of pollen transport by bees. Austral Ecology 38, 76–86.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2012.02377.x
- Pornon, A., Andalo, C., Burrus, M., Escaravage, N., 2017. DNA metabarcoding data unveils
 invisible pollination networks, in: Scientific Reports.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/srep27282
- 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 & Evolution
 25, 345–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.01.007
- 715 QGIS Development Team, 2019. QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source
 716 Geospatial Foundation Project.
- Rader, R., Bartomeus, I., Garibaldi, L.A., Garratt, M.P.D., Howlett, B.G., Winfree, R., 717 Cunningham, S.A., Mayfield, M.M., Arthur, A.D., Andersson, G.K.S., Bommarco, R., 718 Brittain, C., Carvalheiro, L.G., Chacoff, N.P., Entling, M.H., Foully, B., Freitas, B.M., 719 720 Gemmill-Herren, B., Ghazoul, J., Griffin, S.R., Gross, C.L., Herbertsson, L., Herzog, F., Hipólito, J., Jaggar, S., Jauker, F., Klein, A.-M., Kleijn, D., Krishnan, S., Lemos, 721 722 C.Q., Lindström, S.A.M., Mandelik, Y., Monteiro, V.M., Nelson, W., Nilsson, L., Pattemore, D.E., Pereira, N. de O., Pisanty, G., Potts, S.G., Reemer, M., Rundlöf, M., 723 724 Sheffield, C.S., Scheper, J., Schüepp, C., Smith, H.G., Stanley, D.A., Stout, J.C., Szentgyörgyi, H., Taki, H., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F., Woyciechowski, M., 2016. 725 Non-bee insects are important contributors to global crop pollination. PNAS 113, 146-726 151. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517092112 727
- Requier, F., Odoux, J.-F., Tamic, T., Moreau, N., Henry, M., Decourtye, A., Bretagnolle, V.,
 2015. Honey bee diet in intensive farmland habitats reveals an unexpectedly high
 flower richness and a major role of weeds. Ecological Applications 25, 881–890.
 https://doi.org/10.1890/14-1011.1
- Rimet, F., Chaumeil, P., Keck, F., Kermarrec, L., Vasselon, V., Kahlert, M., Franc, A.,
 Bouchez, A., 2016. R-Syst::diatom: an open-access and curated barcode database for
 diatoms and freshwater monitoring. Database (Oxford) 2016.
 https://doi.org/10.1093/database/baw016
- Roger, N., Moerman, R., Carvalheiro, L.G., Aguirre-Guitiérrez, J., Jacquemart, A.-L., Kleijn,
 D., Lognay, G., Moquet, L., Quinet, M., Rasmont, P., Richel, A., Vanderplanck, M.,
 Michez, D., 2017. Impact of pollen resources drift on common bumblebees in NW
 Europe. Global Change Biology 23, 68–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13373
- Rollin, O., Pérez-Méndez, N., Bretagnolle, V., Henry, M., 2019. Preserving habitat quality at
 local and landscape scales increases wild bee diversity in intensive farming systems.
 Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 275, 73–80.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.01.012
- Sjödin, N.E., 2007. Pollinator behavioural responses to grazing intensity. Biodiversity and
 Conservation 16, 2103–2121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-006-9103-0

- Sjödin, N.E., Bengtsson, J., Ekbom, B., 2008. The influence of grazing intensity and landscape composition on the diversity and abundance of flower-visiting insects.
 Journal of Applied Ecology 45, 763–772. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01443.x
- Sponsler, D.B., Grozinger, C.M., Richardson, R.T., Nurse, A., Brough, D., Patch, H.M.,
 Stoner, K.A., 2020. A screening-level assessment of the pollinator-attractiveness of
 ornamental nursery stock using a honey bee foraging assay. Scientific Reports 10, 831.
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-57858-2
- Steffan-Dewenter, I., Tscharntke, T., 1999. Effects of habitat isolation on pollinator
 communities and seed set. Oecologia 121, 432–440.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050949
- Sutter, L., Jeanneret, P., Bartual, A.M., Bocci, G., Albrecht, M., 2017. Enhancing plant diversity in agricultural landscapes promotes both rare bees and dominant crop-pollinating bees through complementary increase in key floral resources. Journal of Applied Ecology 54, 1856–1864. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12907
- Tiusanen, M., Hebert, P.D.N., Schmidt, N.M., Roslin, T., 2016. One fly to rule them allmuscid flies are the key pollinators in the Arctic. Proc. R. Soc. B-Biol. Sci. 283,
 20161271. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1271
- Venjakob, C., Klein, A.-M., Ebeling, A., Tscharntke, T., Scherber, C., 2016. Plant diversity
 increases spatio-temporal niche complementarity in plant-pollinator interactions.
 Ecology and Evolution 6, 2249–2261. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2026
- Villemey, A., van Halder, I., Ouin, A., Barbaro, L., Chenot, J., Tessier, P., Calatayud, F.,
 Martin, H., Roche, P., Archaux, F., 2015. Mosaic of grasslands and woodlands is more
 effective than habitat connectivity to conserve butterflies in French farmland. Biol.
 Conserv. 191, 206–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.06.030
- Weiner, C.N., Werner, M., Linsenmair, K.E., Blüthgen, N., 2014. Land-use impacts on plant–
 pollinator networks: interaction strength and specialization predict pollinator declines.
 Ecology 95, 466–474. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-0436.1
- Weiner, C.N., Werner, M., Linsenmair, K.E., Blüthgen, N., 2011. Land use intensity in grasslands: Changes in biodiversity, species composition and specialisation in flower visitor networks. Basic and Applied Ecology 12, 292–299. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2010.08.006
- Willmer, P.G., Cunnold, H., Ballantyne, G., 2017. Insights from measuring pollen deposition:
 quantifying the pre-eminence of bees as flower visitors and effective pollinators.
 Arthropod-Plant Interactions 11, 411–425. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11829-017-9528-2
- Wood, T.J., Holland, J.M., Goulson, D., 2016. Diet characterisation of solitary bees on farmland: dietary specialisation predicts rarity. Biodivers Conserv 25, 2655–2671. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-016-1191-x
- Woodcock, B.A., Edwards, M., Redhead, J., Meek, W.R., Nuttall, P., Falk, S., Nowakowski,
 M., Pywell, R.F., 2013. Crop flower visitation by honeybees, bumblebees and solitary
 bees: Behavioural differences and diversity responses to landscape. Agriculture,
 Ecosystems & Environment 171, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.03.005
- Woodcock, T.S., Larson, B.M.H., Kevan, P.G., Inouye, D.W., Lunau, K., 2014. Flies and
 flowers II: floral attractants and rewards. Journal of Pollination Ecology 12, 63–94.
- 790

Site	Plot	Grassland type	Plot size (ha)	Management	Grass use (LU day ha ⁻¹) ^b	Nitrogen fertilisation (kg ha ⁻¹)	Species richness	Total blossom cover (%)	Richness of flowering species	Vegetation height (cm)	%SNH
	G12	Temporary	3.1	MP	504	0/41	14	3.4	1.4	16.7	13.7
	G14	Temporary	0.8	MMM	552	0/0	10	9.6	2.3	40.0	15.2
Lucianon	G8	Permanent	0.6	М	0	0/0	33	6.7	2.1	51.7	15.4
Lusignan	M5	Temporary	3.3	Р	540	0/140	13	5.3	2.0	21.7	17.8
	M7	Temporary	1.6	Р	904	0/0	10	12.7	2.7	10.0	17.2
	V12	Temporary	2.9	MMM	457	0/38	11	<0.1	0.1	25.0	49.2
	Fr12	Permanent	2.3	MP	781	115/19	18	0.8	4.0	55.0	90.5
	HdV2	Permanent	1.8	MP	678	50/37	27	10.7	7.3	48.9	71.4
N. 4	Jo15	Permanent	1.9	MM	343	80/0	34	35.7	10.0	43.9	60.8
Mirecourt	Jo89	Permanent	1.6	MP^{a}	1117	0/0	26	7.5	5.2	37.2	61.7
	Ma11	Permanent	1.7	MP	899	0/100	38	15	12.7	43.9	74.5
	Mu42	Permanent	2.6	MP	937	0/11	25	9.6	5.7	42.8	56.8
	10Bis	Permanent	1.6	MP	153	70/70	47	3.2	10.1	20.0	99.1
	MFH	Permanent	8.6	Р	112	0/0	86	7.2	18.4	10.9	99.3
M (SF	Permanent	6.1	MP	153	57/31	34	0.1	3.6	18.9	94.6
Marcenat	Tri	Permanent	1.8	MMP	214	91/218	24	0.1	4.3	17.3	100.0
	V 1	Permanent	2.8	Р	368	0/67	17	2.1	2.4	22.2	78.8
	V8P	Permanent	1.4	Р	355	0/67	26	1.4	7.3	10.2	87.5

Table 1. Mean site and plot characteristics: plot name, grassland type, successive management events during the studied year (M: mowing; P:

pasture), grass use calculated in livestock units (LU) day ha⁻¹, sum of organic and mineral nitrogen fertilisation (for the year before pollinator

trapping/current year of trapping), herbaceous plant species richness, total blossom cover and mean richness of flowering species.

^aPlot management was only pasture for the 8 previous years.

⁷⁹⁵ ^bForage production from mowing was converted into LU day ha⁻¹ assuming ingestion of 15 kg dry matter day⁻¹ LU⁻¹ and summed with the

796 grazing use to estimate total grass use.

791

792

Table 2. Main characteristics of plant-pollinator networks for each site: insect taxa richness, plant taxa richness, number of unique interactions, Shannon diversity index of plant-pollinator interactions, mean number of links per taxon, connectance, degree of specialisation H2' for all three trapping sessions, degree of specialisation H2' of two last trapping sessions, network asymmetry, specialisation asymmetry and weighted nestedness.

802

Characteristic	Lusignan	Mirecourt	Marcenat
Insect taxa richness	45	74	73
Plant taxa richness	9	20	42
Number of unique interactions	61	140	158
Shannon diversity	2.97	4.28	4.69
Links per taxon	1.13	1.49	1.37
Connectance	0.15	0.09	0.05
H2' of all three trapping sessions	0.54	0.44	0.41
H2' of last two trapping sessions	0.46	0.48	0.44
Network asymmetry	0.67	0.57	0.27
Specialisation asymmetry	-0.23	-0.17	-0.05
Weighted nestedness	0.56	0.53	0.51

803

Table 3. Taxa-level descriptors for the 10 pollinator and 5 plant taxa with the highest strength

805 (S) for each site. D: taxa degree, d': taxa specialisation. n.i. not identified to lower taxon.

Lusignan			Mirecourt			Marcenat					
	S	D	d'		S	D	d'		S	D	d'
Pollinator											
Bombus lapidarius	2.66	6	0.36	Empis sp.	2.66	6	0.42	Diptera n.i	7.76	18	0.43
Andrena haemorrhoa	1.22	2	0.63	Pseudovadonia livida	2.00	2	1.00	Empis sp.	6.69	14	0.42
Apis mellifera	0.73	3	0.19	Episyrphus balteatus	1.63	8	0.15	Lasioglossum albipes	3.03	9	0.35
Andrena flavipes	0.52	2	0.46	Sphaerophoria scripta	1.48	6	0.28	Apis mellifera	2.24	3	0.84
Sicus ferrugineus	0.50	1	0.85	Maniola jurtina	1.39	4	0.35	Bombus sylvarum	1.57	3	0.69
Syrphidae n.i	0.44	3	0.33	Scathophaga stercoraria	1.13	4	0.38	Sphaeroceridae n.i	1.36	6	0.46
Diptera n.i	0.37	2	0.50	Lasioglossum lativentre	1.05	3	0.40	Phyllopertha horticola	1.29	4	0.42
Scathophaga stercoraria	0.37	1	0.68	Cratosilis sp.	1.00	1	1.00	Sphaerophoria scripta	1.27	3	0.47
Andrena ranunculi	0.33	1	0.77	Eucera nigrescens	1.00	1	1.00	Bombus lapidarius	1.21	3	0.56
Bombus terrestris	0.26	3	0.13	Diptera n.i	0.69	4	0.39	Cryptocephalus sericeus	1.06	5	0.53
Plant											
Cirsium palustre	16.74	20	0.57	Centaurea jacea	18.98	27	0.53	Knautia arvensis	10.99	14	0.71
Trifolium repens	10.39	12	0.42	Ranunculus acris	14.11	25	0.34	Ranunculus sp.	9.82	16	0.44
Taraxacum sp.	7.56	10	0.79	Knautia arvensis	8.77	17	0.25	Anthriscus sylvestris	6.86	11	0.43

Cichorium intybus	6.02	8	0.67	Crepis biennis	6.44	14	0.28	Conopodium majus	5.69	12	0.34
Ranunculus sp.	1.83	3	0.85	Heracleum spondylium	5.44	8	0.74	Rhinanthus minor	4.53	6	0.86

⁸⁰⁶

Table 4. Mean (±SD) specialisation (d') of six pollinator groups at each site.

Group	Lusignan	Mirecourt	Marcenat
Apis mellifera	0.19	0.18	0.84
Other Apidae	0.31 ± 0.21	0.25 ± 0.25	0.49 ± 0.25
Syrphidae	0.28 ± 0.21	0.23 ± 0.12	0.31 ± 0.28
Diptera	0.61 ± 0.20	0.44 ± 0.20	0.32 ± 0.23
Lepidoptera	0.06 ± 0.09	0.21 ± 0.16	0.44 ± 0.20
Coleoptera	0.27 ± 0.15	0.33 ± 0.30	0.35 ± 0.18

808

Table 5. Number of plant genera found with the metagenomics method on pollen loads of Diptera, Hymenoptera and Lepidoptera and percentage of sampled pollinators that transported pollen of each vegetation type for the three sites. Percentages higher than 10% are indicated in bold. The insect families that transported the more pollen of each type (> 20% of insects that transported genera found only with metagenomics) were indicated in brackets for each site.

814

	Lusignan	Mirecourt	Marcenat
Total number of genera	34	42	38
Dicotyledon from	16/ 15.3 %	17/ 13.9%	23/ 21.9 %
grassland	(Apidae,	(Syrphidae,	(Empididae,
	Halictidae)	Nymphalidae)	Syrphidae)
Grass	5/5.1%	12/ 19.9 %	4/1.2%
		(Syrphidae,	
		Nymphalidae)	
Crop	3/12.8%	2/0.9%	0
	(Apidae,		
	Andrenidae)		
Tree/shrub	5/ 26.0 %	5/2.9%	8/4.7%
	(Apidae)		
Crop weed	2/5.1%	1/1.2%	1/0.3%
Vegetable	2/2.0%	1/0.3%	0
Ornamental	1/4.1%	4/1.2%	2/0.9%

815

816

817 Figure captions

818

Figure 1. Map of site locations. The 18 sampled plots are indicated in red.

820

Figure 2. Interaction frequency of plant pollinators by insect taxon at the three study sites.

822

Figure 3. Distance triplot of the two significant axes of the redundancy analysis. Black arrow:
explanatory variables. %SNH: percentage of semi-natural habitats in a 500 m buffer around each plot;
Veg.height: mean vegetation height (cm). Ellipses represent normal 95% confidence intervals for plots
at each site. Grey circles indicate insect taxa. Only most abundant insect taxa have their name
displayed.

828

Figure 4. Plant-pollinator networks obtained from visual surveys in (a) Lusignan, (b) Mirecourt and (c) Marcenat for the three trapping sessions. Rectangles represent insect taxa (above) and plant taxa (below), in which rectangle widths are proportional to the sum of the interactions that involve them.

833









Hylaeus sp. Ichneumonidea n.i Lasioglossum calceatum Lasioglossum laticeps Lasioglossum leucozonium Lasioglossum malachurum

Stenopterus rufus Apora crataegi Inachis io Lycaena phlaeas Melanargia galathea Pyropteron chrysidiformis



Lasioglossum malachurum

Oedemera flavipes Oedemera Groupe flavipes Oedemera nobilis Oedemera podagrariae Oxythyrea funesta Pseudovadonia livida Coenonympha pamphilus

Miridae n.i

Achillea millefolium Ajuga reptans Alchemilla sp.

Anthriscus sylvestris

Arctium lappa Barbarea intermedia

Bellis perennis

Capsella bursa-pastoris Cerastium sp. Chamaespartium sagittale

Conopodium majus

Crepis sp.

Crepis/Hieracium/Hypochaeris Cruciata laevipes Galium verum Gentiana lutea Helianthemum nummularium Hieracium pilosella Hypochaeris radicata

Knautia arvensis

Lamium album Leucanthemum ircutianum Lotus corniculatus Meum athamanticum Ranunculus acris



Agrypnus murinus Cryptocephalus sericeus Oedemera lurida Phyllopertha horticola Anthomyiidae n.i Calliphoridae n.i Chaetorellia jaceae Cheilosia albitarsis Cheilosia sp. Chloromyia formosa Cynomya mortuorum Dilophus femoratus Dilophus sp.

Diptera n.i

Dolichopodidae n.i Drymeia sp.

Empis sp.

Empis tessellata Eristalis arbustorum Eristalis jugorum Eristalis tenax Melanogaster hirtella

Melanogaster nuda

Merodon equestris Muscidae n.i Paragus sp. Pipizella viduata Platycheirus manicatus Scathophaga sp. Scathophaga stercoraria Sericomyia silentis

Sphaeroceridae n.i

Sphaerophoria scripta Sphaerophoria sp. Tachinia sp. Tachinidae n.i Volucella bombylans Zophomyia temula Andrena hattorfiana Andrena humilis Andrena labialis Andrena nigroaenea Andrena semilaevis Andrena wilkella



Apis mellifera

Bombus cryptarum Bombus humilis Bombus lapidarius Bombus pascuorum Bombus ruderarius Bombus sylvarum Bombus wurflenii Cephus sp. Formica sp. Halictus tumulorum Ichneumonidae n.i

Lasioglossum albipes

Lasioglossum calceatum Lasioglossum leucozonium Lasioglossum villosulum Lasioglossum xanthopus Panurgus banksianus Tenthredo sp. Tenthredopsis sp.

Adscita sp.

Colias croceus Erebia meolans Geometridae n.i

Odezia atrata

Pieris brassicae Thymelicus lineolus Vanessa cardui Zygaena purpuralis