

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Zeitschrift: | Archives des sciences [2004-ff.] |
| Herausgeber: | Société de Physique et d'histoire Naturelle de Genève |
| Band: | 59 (2006) |
| Heft: | 2-3 |
| Artikel: | Where hides the aquatic biodiversity of macroinvertebrates in the canton of Geneva (Switzerland)? |
| Autor: | Angélibert, Sandrine / Indermühle, Nicola / Luchier, Didier |
| DOI: | https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-738332 |

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 31.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Where hides the aquatic biodiversity of macroinvertebrates in the Canton of Geneva (Switzerland)?

**Sandrine ANGÉLIBERT¹,
Nicola INDERMUEHLE¹, Didier LUCHIER¹, Beat OERTLI¹, Jean PERFETTA²**

Ms. received 16th June 2006, accepted 17th July 2006

Abstract

The conservation of biodiversity constitutes an important stake in agreement with the Convention of Rio signed by Switzerland and the inventory of this biodiversity is necessary to monitor the quality of aquatic ecosystems. This study aims to draw up a state of knowledge of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Canton of Geneva and to highlight the respective biological potentialities of four waterbody types: rivers (Rhone and Arve), streams, ponds and the Lake (western part of Lake Geneva). We compiled more than 18 000 data, concerning 358 stations prospected through various investigations conducted between 1980 and 2006. Seven taxonomic groups were selected: Coleoptera, Odonata, Trichoptera, Plecoptera, Ephemeroptera, Gastropoda and Bivalvia. The results evidence that rivers and ponds have the greatest biodiversity (number of species) and also the highest number of unique species (i.e. species found in only one type of ecosystems). Ponds also present the highest number of Red List species. The watersheds of the Rhone and the Allondon are the richest areas according to their species number and Red List species. An assessment of sampling efficiencies showed that all types of waterbodies were relatively well sampled (more than 80% of species have been collected). Nevertheless gaps of knowledge remain highest for rivers and ponds. From the seven investigated taxonomic groups, the Trichoptera and Coleoptera were undersampled, and a quarter of the species still remains to be discovered.

Keywords: macroinvertebrates, Red List, odonata, ephemeroptera, mollusca, plecoptera, trichoptera, coleopteran.

Résumé

Où se cache la biodiversité en macroinvertébrés aquatiques du Canton de Genève (Suisse)? - Signée par la Suisse, la Convention de Rio sur la biodiversité formule, entre autres, les objectifs suivants: conservation de la biodiversité et exploitation durable de ses éléments. Appliqués au Canton de Genève, ces objectifs impliquent notamment de connaître la valeur biologique des différents types de milieux aquatiques afin de mettre en place des stratégies de conservation des milieux et des espèces. Cette étude a pour but de dresser un état des lieux de la biodiversité des macroinvertébrés aquatiques du Canton de Genève et de mettre en évidence les potentialités biologiques respectives de quatre types de milieux: les fleuves (dans le sens anglo-saxon du terme, i. e. Rhône et Arve), les rivières et les ruisseaux, les étangs ainsi que le lac (partie occidentale du Léman). Plus de 18 000 données provenant de diverses sources et concernant 358 stations, toutes prospectées entre 1980 et 2006, ont été compilées. Nous avons focalisé notre travail sur sept groupes taxonomiques: Coléoptères, Odonates, Trichoptères, Plécoptères, Ephéméroptères, Gastéropodes et Bivalves. Cette étude montre que les rivières et les étangs hébergent la plus grande biodiversité (nombre d'espèces) et le plus grand nombre d'espèces uniques, espèces que l'on ne rencontre que dans un seul des quatre types d'écosystèmes étudiés. Le bassin versant du Rhône et son sous-bassin de l'Allondon possèdent la plus grande biodiversité et le plus grand nombre d'espèces sur Liste Rouge. Une analyse des efforts de prospection montre que les écosystèmes étudiés ont été relativement bien échantillonnés puisque plus de 80% des espèces potentiellement présentes dans le Canton ont déjà été recensées. Néanmoins, des lacunes de prospection ont été mises en évidence au niveau des fleuves et des étangs, ainsi que pour les Trichoptères et les Coléoptères, chez lesquels un quart des espèces resteraient à découvrir.

Mots clefs: macroinvertébrés, Liste Rouge, odonates, éphéméroptères, mollusques, plécoptères, trichoptères, coléoptères

¹ University of Applied Sciences of Western Switzerland (Lullier) Institute Earth-Nature-Landscape, Dpt. of Nature Management, 150 route de Presinge, CH-1254 Jussy, Switzerland

² Service de l'Ecologie de l'Eau, 23 av. Saint-Clotilde, CH-1205 Geneva, Switzerland
Corresponding author: sandrine.angelibert@hesge.ch


Introduction

The conservation of biodiversity, including the aquatic one, and the sustainable exploitation of its elements constitute an important stake, in agreement with the Convention of Rio signed by Switzerland. Applied to the Canton of Geneva, this implies an inventory of the biodiversity in order to assess the conservation value of the different aquatic ecosystems. Moreover, this inventory is necessary to monitor the quality of aquatic ecosystems. Macroinvertebrates are excellent overall indicators of both recent and long-term environmental conditions (Patrick and Palavage 1994). The immature stages of aquatic macroinvertebrates have relatively short life cycles and often several generations per year. Thus, when environmental changes occur, the species must endure the disturbance, adapt quickly, or die and be replaced by more adapted species. Macroinvertebrates are very useful to monitor aquatic ecosystems quality (see Rosenberg and Resh 1993) because of their fast response to environmental variations and their ability of informing about habitat intrinsic quality. Moreover,

they are a major link in the aquatic and terrestrial food chain. They are consequently essential to the development of other guilds such as amphibians, fish and birds for example.

This study was aimed to draw up a state of knowledge of the biodiversity of aquatic macroinvertebrates in the Canton of Geneva and to compare the four major types of aquatic ecosystems: rivers (Rhone and Arve), streams, ponds and the Lake (western part of Lake Geneva). To this end, we will first study the species richness and the conservation value (species listed on the Swiss Red Lists) of the aquatic macroinvertebrates in the Canton of Geneva. Secondly, we will compare the biodiversity of the different fresh-water ecosystems using species richness, number of unique species (i.e. species found in a single type of ecosystem) and number of endangered species. We will also highlight the taxonomic groups for which gaps of knowledge exist and emphasize the type of ecosystems for which the sampling effort remains insufficient. Finally, we will focus on lotic sites to compare the biodiversity between watersheds.

Fig. 1: Location of the 358 stations investigated: rivers, streams, ponds, lake. The black line represents the limit of the Canton of Geneva.



■ Study sites & methods

The Canton of Geneva extends on 282 km². It includes 16 watersheds (14 main streams and 2 rivers), one lake (western part of Lake Geneva) and more than 150 ponds. In this study, we selected 358 sites investigated between 1980 and 2006. Rivers (Rhone and Arve) and streams were represented by 189 sampling sites (Fig. 1), among which 80 belong to the monitoring net of the Cantonal Service of Water Ecology (SECOE). The lentic sites were represented by 169 stations: 103 ponds and 66 stations located on the Lake Geneva (Fig. 1). The macroinvertebrates, defined by Cummins (1975) as having a size ranging from 3 to 5 mm at the last stage of their development, were sampled in the frame of studies most conducted by the Department of the Territory (DT), the Federal Office for the Environment (OFEV) and the University of Geneva (Antoine 1996, Bänziger 1991, Bänziger 1998, Chanon Miguel 1992, Crozet 1982, Mulattieri 2006). Moreover, the data bank of the Swiss Centre for Fauna Cartography (CSCF) allowed us to complete this information for taxonomic groups concerned by the Swiss Red Lists (Odonata, Ephemeroptera, Coleoptera and Mollusca) and for Trichoptera and Plecoptera.

The compiled data bank contained 18244 data, with taxa identified at various taxonomic levels (species, genus, family). Only the 8271 data keyed to species level were used to conduct the present work. These data concerned seven taxonomic groups: Bivalvia, Gastropoda, Odonata, Coleoptera, Trichoptera, Ephemeroptera and Plecoptera.

The degree of threat of the species was assessed through the use of the Swiss Red Lists: Gonseth and Monnerat (2002) for Odonata, and Duelli (1994) for the others taxonomic groups.

All the species richness taken into account in this study (for each kind of ecosystem and for each studied taxonomic group) were obtained through non exhaustive samplings. Therefore the real number of species that can be gathered in the Canton of Geneva through an exhaustive inventory would be much higher. To estimate this "real" regional species

richness ("regional" refers here to the Canton of Geneva), we used Chao1 estimator (Chao 1984). Such non-parametric estimator performs better than others to estimate species richness (Walther and Moore 2005). Chao1 was calculated using the software EstimateS (Colwell 2005).

■ Results

The aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Canton of Geneva

The synthesis of the aquatic macroinvertebrates data collected between 1980 and 2006 in the Canton of Geneva produces a list of 320 species for the seven selected groups. The richest taxonomic groups were the Coleoptera and the Trichoptera with respectively 88 and 86 species, whereas the poorest were the Plecoptera (20 species) and the Bivalvia (12 species) (Tab.1); the Odonata, Gastropoda, and Ephemeroptera are represented respectively by 43, 36 and 35 species.

In terms of conservation value, 52 species are classified as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered, on one of the five Swiss Red Lists (there is presently no Red List for Plecoptera and Trichoptera), i.e. 24.3% of the total number of species collected for the five taxonomic groups (see Table 2 for a list of the threatened species). Gastropoda and Coleoptera are particularly threatened (with respectively 20 and 18 Red List species) (Tab. 1). *Heptagenia longicauda* (Photo 1) is the only species being both classified in danger of extinction on the Red List and present in a single site in the Canton. *H. longicauda* had not been observed since 1983, but also the sampling has never focussed on this species. The last observation of seven of the threatened species is older than twenty years (*Bidessus delicatessus*, *Haliplus confinis*, *Peltodytes caesus*, and *Heptagenia longicauda* for example) (Tab. 2). Furthermore, six species (*Acilius canaliculatus*, *Graphoderus cinereus*, *Gyrinus paykulli*, *Hydroporus umbrosus*, *Ceriagrion tenellum* and *Ecdyonurus torrentis*) appeared in

| Taxa Group | Number of species | Number of families | Number of unique species | Number of Red List species |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Coleoptera | 88 | 12 | 33 | 18 |
| Trichoptera | 86 | 17 | 29 | ND |
| Odonata | 43 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
| Gastropoda | 36 | 8 | 6 | 20 |
| Ephemeroptera | 35 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| Plecoptera | 20 | 6 | 9 | ND |
| Bivalvia | 12 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 320 | 65 | 86 | 52 |

Table 1: Number of species, families, unique species (i.e. species found in a single type of ecosystem) and Red List species obtained through sampling for each taxonomic group. ND: No Data.




Fig. 2: Regional species richness of each taxonomic group estimated by Chao1 (N). The numbers in the pie charts indicate the number of known and unknown species. The size of the pie charts is proportional to the total number of species (N).

■ The real regional species richness

A total of 320 species have been sampled and identified. Using the Chao1 estimator (Magurran 2003), we can estimate the “real” regional species richness of each taxonomic group and deduce the proportion of potentially unknown species (Fig. 2). In the whole Canton, nearly a fifth of the species (19%) remains to be discovered. Coleoptera and Trichoptera are the less well known taxonomic group and about a quarter of species are potentially still to be discovered. On the contrary, Bivalvia and Ephemeroptera are very well known.

■ The invasive species

the Canton only after the year 2000; therefore the colonization of the Canton by these species is perhaps not perennial. Consequently, some of the endangered species listed are probably no longer present in the Canton of Geneva.

Photo 1: *Heptagenia longicauda* larvae (Ephemeroptera).
Photo: J. L. Gattolliat.




Two invasive species, *Dreissena polymorpha* (Pallas) (Zebra mussel, Bivalvia) and *Potamopyrgus jenkinsii* (Gray) (New Zealand mudsnail, Gastropoda) have durably colonized the Canton of Geneva. *Dreissena polymorpha* is known to be present in the Lake Geneva since 1962 (Boucard et al. 2004, Matthey 1966). Crozet et al. (1980) published the first record of *Potamopyrgus jenkinsii* within the French Switzerland and it appeared in the Lake Geneva in 1977. In the whole Canton, 83 sites were colonized by at least one of these two species which represented 23% of the studied stations. Among these 83 colonized sites, 92% were located on the Lake Geneva or the river Rhone.

Table 2: List of the most threatened species (listed on the Swiss Red Lists) in the Canton of Geneva, number of sites and type of habitat where the species are present and last year of recorded presence. L: Lake, P: Ponds, R: Rivers and S: Streams.

* The identification has to be confirmed

** Only an adult has been observed in Canton of Geneva. The breeding site is probably situated in neighbouring France.

| Red List category | Order | Species | Nb. of sites where the species is present | Type of habitats where the species is present | Last year of recorded presence |
|--------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| "Critically endangered" or "1" | Gastropoda | <i>Gyraulus laevis</i> (Alder) | 13 | L, P, R | 1994 |
| | | <i>Valvata macrostoma</i> Mörch | 2 * | R | 1993 |
| | Ephemeroptera | <i>Heptagenia longicauda</i> (Stephens) | 1 | R | 1983 |
| "Endangered" or "2" | Odonata | <i>Leucorrhinia albifrons</i> (Burmeister) | 2 ** | P, S | 2003 |
| | Gastropoda | <i>Ferissia wautieri</i> (Mirollii) | 15 | P | 2002 |
| | | <i>Physa fontinalis</i> (L.) | 7 | L, R, S | 1993 |
| | | <i>Segmentina nitida</i> (O.F. Muller) | 1 | P | 1987 |
| | | <i>Viviparus contectus</i> (Millet) | 1 | L | 1982 |
| | Coleoptera | <i>Bidessus delicatulus</i> (Schaum) | 1 | S | 1984 |
| | | <i>B. minutissimus</i> (Germar) | 3 | P, R | 2002 |
| | | <i>Graphoderus cinereus</i> (L.) | 1 | P | 2003 |
| | | <i>Gyrinus paykulli</i> Ochs | 1 | P | 2003 |
| | | <i>Hygrobria hermanni</i> (Fabricius) | 1 | S | 2004 |
| | | <i>Orechtochilus villosus</i> (O.F. Muller) | 6 | L | 1991 |
| | | <i>Stictotarsus duodecimpustulatus</i> (Fabricius) | 2 | L, S | 1994 |
| | Ephemeroptera | <i>Electrogena lateralis</i> (Curtis) | 12 | R, S | 2004 |
| | | <i>E. ujhelyii</i> (Sowa) | 2 | S | 1991 |
| | Odonata | <i>Ceriagrion tenellum</i> (de Villers) | 1 ** | P | 2002 |
| | | <i>Orthetrum albistylum</i> (Selys) | 5 | P, S | 2004 |
| "Vulnerable" or "3" | Gastropoda | <i>Acrolochus lacustris</i> (L.) | 7 | P | 2002 |
| | | <i>Anisus leucostoma</i> (Millet) | 6 | P, S | 2002 |
| | | <i>A. spirorbis</i> (L.) | 1 | P | 2003 |
| | | <i>A. vortex</i> (L.) | 8 | L, R, S | 2004 |
| | | <i>Aplexa hypnorum</i> (L.) | 2 | P | 1987 |
| | | <i>Bathyomphalus contortus</i> (L.) | 2 | L | 2004 |
| | | <i>Gyraulus crista</i> (L.) | 7 | P | 2003 |
| | | <i>Hippeutis complanatus</i> (L.) | 10 | L, P | 2003 |
| | | <i>Physella acuta</i> (Draparnaud) | 31 | L, P, R | 2005 |
| | | <i>Planorbarius corneus</i> (L.) | 13 | L, P | 2003 |
| | | <i>Planorbis carinatus</i> (O.F. Muller) | 22 | L, P, R | 2004 |
| | | <i>Stagnicola fuscus</i> (C. Pfeiffer) | 1 | P | 1991 |
| | | <i>Valvata cristata</i> (O.F. Muller) | 14 | L, P, R, S | 2003 |
| | | <i>Viviparus ater</i> (Cristofori et Jan) | 12 | L, S | 2004 |
| | Bivalvia | <i>Musculium lacustre</i> (O.F. Muller) | 7 | L, R | 1994 |
| | | <i>Pisidium amnicum</i> (O.F. Muller) | 5 | L, P, S | 1994 |
| | Coleoptera | <i>Acilius canaliculatus</i> (Nicolai) | 1 | P | 2002 |
| | | <i>Agabus biguttatus</i> (Olivier) | 2 | S | 2004 |
| | | <i>Haliplus confinis</i> Stephens | 1 | P | 1984 |
| | | <i>H. fulvicollis</i> Erichson | 1 | P | 1987 |
| | | <i>H. obliquus</i> (Fabricius) | 3 | P | 2005 |
| | | <i>Hydroporus angustatus</i> Sturm | 3 | P | 2005 |
| | | <i>H. ferrugineus</i> Stephens | 1 | S | 2001 |
| | | <i>H. umbrosus</i> (Gyllenhal) | 1 | P | 2002 |
| | | <i>Nebrioporus depressus</i> (Fabricius) | 5 | L, P | 1994 |
| | | <i>Peltodytes caesus</i> (Duftschmidt) | 1 | P | 1984 |
| | | <i>Yola bicarinata</i> (Latreille) | 4 | P | 2002 |
| | Ephemeroptera | <i>Ecdyonurus dispar</i> (Curtis) | 9 | S | 2000 |
| | | <i>E. torrentis</i> Kimmins | 1 | S | 2000 |
| | | <i>Potamanthus luteus</i> (L.) | 2 | R | 1996 |
| | | <i>Procloeon pennulatum</i> (Eaton) | 2 | S | 1983 |
| | | <i>Siphlonurus aestivialis</i> (Eaton) | 3 | S | 1982 |
| | Odonata | <i>Gomphus pulchellus</i> Selys | 16 | P | 2005 |



Species diversity per freshwater ecosystem

Among the four types of freshwater ecosystems investigated in the Canton of Geneva, streams and ponds were the richest with respectively 63% and 53% of the regional species pool (Fig. 3) whereas the rivers and the Lake sheltered respectively only 27% and 22% of the regional species pool. Moreover, sampling effort remains insufficient on rivers, ponds and streams with respectively 35%, 27% and 18% of species which are still unknown. The Lake seems to be well prospected with only 8% of unknown species.

Among the 320 species listed, 168 (i.e. 52.5%) are unique to one type of ecosystem. Moreover, respectively 45 and 43% of these 168 species are unique to streams and ponds, against only 8% and 4% to rivers and the Lake (Fig. 4). Concerning taxonomic groups, the Coleoptera had the highest proportion of species found in only one type of ecosystem with 42% of unique species followed by the Trichoptera with 21% (Fig. 4).

Among the 52 Red List species, 31 were found in ponds against 19 in streams, 16 in the Lake and 12 in rivers (Fig. 5). The high conservation value of ponds is mainly due to the high number of Gastropoda, Coleoptera and Odonata threatened species; the lower conservation value of running waters (rivers and

Fig. 3: Species richness per ecosystem type and estimation of the "real" richness using Chao1 estimator (in grey). The regional species pool observed is 320 species (estimation of the real species pool: 393 species).

streams) is related to the absence of a Red List for Plecoptera and Trichoptera (groups well represented in running waters).

Among the 52 Red List species, 34 were found in only one type of ecosystem (Tab. 2). Ponds sheltered 56% of these unique and Red List species followed by streams (26%) and rivers and the Lake (9% each).

A focus on rivers and streams: analysis of the watersheds biodiversity

In this analysis, the Rhone basin corresponds to the main river catchment (i.e. not including its main tributaries (see Fig. 6 for catchments delineation). A classification of the 16 watersheds according to the magnitude of their species richness (taking into account only rivers and streams) indicated that the Rhone basin is the richest with 92 species, followed by the Allondon (86 species), the Versoix (68 species) and the Laire basin (66 species) (Fig. 6). For information, a classification (not presented here) taking into account the number of families gave approximately the same result: these 4 watersheds were also the richest but in a different order (Allondon, Laire, Versoix and Rhone). Although we




Fig. 4: Number of unique species to each type of ecosystems.




Fig. 5: Number of Red List species of each taxonomic group in the four types of freshwater ecosystems.

do not have the necessary data to correlate species richness and water quality, it should be noted that one of the poorest catchment (N: Nant des Crues, Fig. 6) is known to have a high chemical pollution index (DomEau 2004).

Moreover, the Rhone basin had the highest conservation value with 13 Red List species followed by the Allondon and the Laire with respectively 8 and 6 threatened species.

Discussion

Based on our study, the Canton of Geneva has nearly 400 species of macroinvertebrates for the seven investigated taxonomic groups. This quantity represents only a part of the global macroinvertebrate diversity, as other groups, not investigated here, bring usually a big contribution to the macroinvertebrate diversity of freshwaters. Indeed, we did not study the number of Diptera species which is potentially the most diverse order of insects in aquatic habitats. Studies about Diptera are very scarce as their identification to species level is often very difficult. These insects are generally polluo-tolerant and used to estimate the water and sediment quality (Wiederholm 1978; Saether 1979; Ruse 2002). However, concerning Tipulidae (Diptera) there is some existing data as well as a Red List (Dufour 1994).

Among the observed species of macroinvertebrates, 52 are listed on one of the five Swiss Red Lists available (Coleoptera, Odonata, Ephemeroptera, Gastropoda and Bivalvia). A Red List of aquatic organisms for Switzerland is about to be drawn up by the CSCF (CSCF 2006), including the Plecoptera and Trichoptera. This new Red List will therefore enlarge

the number of endangered aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Canton of Geneva.

Heptagenia longicauda, the only species being both classified in danger of extinction on the Red List and found in a single station in the Canton of Geneva, deserves some attention. Its current distribution in Switzerland is restricted to one station in the North of the country (Canton of Zurich) and one station on the Genevan part of the Rhone. Little studied, this species is mainly found in large rivers (Sowa 1975) and seems to be, among *Heptagenia* genus, the least sensitive to organic water pollution (Bauernfeind et al. 1995). As this species has not been seen since 1983, it deserves a more intensive sampling effort to clarify its status in Switzerland in order to implement appropriate conservation measure if necessary. In the UK, this species is classified as endangered and benefits from an Action Plan in order to maintain any discovered populations (UK Biodiversity Group 1999).

Our study also shows that Coleoptera and Trichoptera are the most diverse taxonomic groups. Nevertheless they have to be better studied; we evidence here that a quarter of species remains to be discovered in the Canton.

Concerning the different aquatic habitats, streams and ponds were the richest ecosystems. With the exception of the Lake, all the aquatic habitats should be more intensively sampled as they potentially shelter more species than recorded in the current study. This will allow i) the identification of rare species and ii) the implementation of conservation strategies focussed on species rich habitats and/or rare species.

In the Canton of Geneva, the value of ponds for the conservation of aquatic biodiversity, in terms of species number, is as high as the streams one, and much higher than the Lake or the rivers. The recognition of the high patrimonial value of ponds is a recent phenomenon. In France for example, ponds shelter nearly a third of the patrimonial species. The loss of only one pond can remove the only station of a

species on a territory as large as a region (Sajaloli and Limoges 2005). A study conducted in the UK (Williams et al. 2003) demonstrated that, at a regional level, ponds contributed most to biodiversity, supporting considerably more species, more unique species and more scarce species than other waterbody types such as rivers, streams and ditches. Recent studies conducted at a catchment scale in various parts of Europe (Biggs et al. 2006) have shown that, although lakes and rivers have high site (alpha) diversity, ponds consistently support a high proportion of aquatic plant and macroinvertebrates species found at a regional level (gamma diversity), typically in excess of 50% of the total number of species.


Furthermore, it is important to notice that the present study did not take into account types of waterbodies that were missed from most previous studies: small drainage ditches, wet depressions, temporary ecosystems and springs. These ecosystems are often strongly impacted by anthropic actions and were forsaken a long time. However, they potentially shelter interesting species. For example, in the UK, ditches (most of them seasonal) were the least species-rich habitat, but supported uncommon

species, including temporary water invertebrates not recorded in other waterbody types (Williams et al 2003). In a same way, in Northern Europe, the value and the ecology of temporary ponds have been less studied (Nicolet et al. 2004) although they have recently been recognized as a wetland type of international importance by the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Resolution VIII.33). Moreover, it is recommended to gather information on the whole "Geneva basin" (which includes areas of both France and Switzerland) in order to have an overview of aquatic macroinvertebrates biodiversity based on natural rather than political boundaries.

Conclusion

The biodiversity of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Canton of Geneva is relatively well known as 82% of the species living in ponds, streams, rivers and the Lake are supposed to be known. However, in order to ensure an efficient regional policy for the conservation of the biodiversity, it is of prime importance to discover the species still unknown in the Canton, including the rarest species with a potentially important patrimonial value (Red Lists species). Rivers

Fig. 6: Species richness by watersheds. Only lotic stations were taken into account. In brackets, the number of species present in each watershed.



(Rhone and Arve) and ponds must be prospected more intensively. Coleoptera and Trichoptera are the taxonomic groups which have the best potential to reveal new species. The biodiversity of aquatic macroinvertebrates is distributed unequally between the four types of habitats (rivers, streams, the Lake and ponds). The greatest biodiversity is observed in streams and ponds. However, even though there are differences in species richness, each ecosystem type supports an interesting fauna with species being unique to each one. This demonstrates that the network of both streams and ponds is particularly important as a refuge for the aquatic diversity of macroinvertebrates in the Canton of Geneva. We can also note that small aquatic habitats (such as wet depressions, springs and temporary ditches) have been too little studied for the last 25 years. These ecosystems have not been taken into account in our study and it is now important to improve our knowledge of these small wetlands.

The community of aquatic macroinvertebrates in the Canton of Geneva has a lot of patrimonial species. In order to ensure good management practices of these species, it is important to continue the monitoring of aquatic habitats, and to concentrate on target groups (i.e. groups having a national Red List). Moreover, macroinvertebrates are likely to be highly responsive to perturbations and can be used to assess the effects of climate changes or rivers flow modifications for example. Monitoring programs are already well developed for running waters in the Canton and aim to control water quality. Present investigation underlines that this monitoring also has to focus on biodiversity (with identification of macroinvertebrates to the species level). Furthermore, it is essential to enlarge these monitoring programs to the lentic water-bodies.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the Swiss Centre of Fauna Cartography and all the people who collected the data:

Aellen V., Antoine C., Aubert J., Auderset Joye D., Badstuber A., Bänziger R., Barbalat S., Besuchet C., Beuchat S., Cailliez J., Cambin D., Carron G., Castella E., Chanon V., Cordonier A., De vevey E., Delarue E., Dethier M., Dulka N., Ferdinand J., Geroudet P., Humbert Droz H., Juillerat L., Keist B., Knispel S., Landolt P., Lavigne S., Lenz P., Lods Crozet B., Lüthi A., Maibach A., Maier E., Maier H., Menetrey Perrottet N., Monnerat C., P. Mulattieri, Mulhauser G., Muller J., Muller P., Perrenoud A., Pilotto JD., Pongratz E., Poth U., Pulfer C., Räz K., Ribi G., Rohmig T., Ruetschi J., Sartori M., Schär O., Scherler P., Schonbachler C., Schricker JP., Siegenthaler C., Sinniger V., Stucki P., Tohme H., Toumayeff G., Turner H., Wermeille E., Wiprächtiger P.

Thanks to Jane O'Rourke for linguistic corrections on a previous draft of the manuscript.

Références

- **ANTOINE C.** 1996. Répartition des invertébrés benthiques (annélides Oligochaeta et mollusques Sphaeriidae) et caractéristiques sédimentologiques de la zone littorale lacustre (Léman). Diploma, University of Geneva.
- **BÄNZIGER R.** 1991. Etude de la macrofaune benthique de huit interfaces eau-terre du Petit-Lac (Léman). Diploma, University of Geneva.
- **BÄNZIGER R.** 1998. Répartition spatio-temporelle des invertébrés aquatiques en relation avec la dynamique des herbiers littoraux (lac Léman). PhD Thesis, University of Geneva.
- **BAUERNFEIND E, WEICHSELBAUMER P, MOOG O.** 1995. Ephemeroptera. In: Moog O. (ed.), Fauna aquatica austriaca. Bundesministerium Für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Wasserkataster, Wien, pp 1-17.
- **BIGGS J, WILLIAMS P, WHITFIELD M.** 2006. Catchment scale patterns in aquatic biodiversity: the contribution made by ponds. Abstract book of the 2nd European Pond Conservation Network Workshop: Conservation of pond biodiversity in a changing European landscape, p. 15.
- **BOUCARD E, LODS-CROZET B, PERRIN JF, PERFETTA J, PATTAY D.** 2004. Les espèces envahissantes du Léman. La lettre du Léman: Bulletin d'information de la Commission Internationale pour la Protection des Eaux du Léman, 28: 2-5.
- **CHANON MIGUEL V.** 1992. Influence d'un abri sur la microdistribution du zoobenthos des cailloux du Léman. Diploma, University of Geneva.
- **CHAO A.** 1984. Nonparametric estimation of the number of classes in a population. Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 11: 265-270.
- **COLWELL RK.** 2005. EstimateS: Statistical estimation of species richness and shared species from samples. Version 7.5. User's Guide and application published at: <http://purl.oclc.org/estimates>.
- **CROZET B, PEDROLI JC, VAUCHER C.** 1980. Premières observations de *Potamopyrgus jenkinsi* (Smith) (Mollusca, Hydrobiidae) en Suisse romande. Revue Suisse de Zoologie, 87: 807-811.
- **CROZET B.** 1982. Contribution à l'étude des communautés littorales de macroinvertébrés benthiques du Léman en relation avec leur environnement. PhD Thesis, University of Geneva.
- **Cscf.** 2006. Stratégie nationale de révision du statut liste rouge des espèces, Organismes aquatiques – Mollusques, éphémères, plécoptères, trichoptères. Bulletin d'information du Centre Suisse de Cartographie de la Faune, 31: 8-9.
- **CUMMINS KW.** 1975. Macroinvertebrates. In: Whitton BA (ed.), River ecology. Blackwell, Oxford, pp 170-198.
- **DOMEAU.** 2004. Qualité des cours d'eau du Genevois exprimée par l'indice de pollution chimique (IPC): Etat 1998-2004. <http://etat.geneve.ch/dt/site/eau/master-home.jsp>
- **DUELLI P.** 1994. Listes rouges des espèces animales menacées de Suisse. Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage (OFEFP), Bern.
- **DUFOUR C.** 1994. Liste rouge des tipules menacées de Suisse. In: Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage (ed.), Listes rouges des espèces animales menacées de Suisse. OCFIM, Bern, pp 52-54.
- **GONSETH Y, MONNERAT C.** 2002. Liste rouge des Libellules menacées de Suisse. Office fédéral de l'environnement, des forêts et du paysage (OFEFP), Bern.
- **MAGURRAN AE.** 2003. Measuring Biological Diversity. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- **MATTHEY G.** 1966. Deux espèces nouvelles de la faune du Léman: *Dreissena polymorpha* Pallas (Mollusca, Dreissenidae), *Acerina cernua* (L.) (Pisces, Percidae). Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise de Sciences Naturelles, 69: 229-232.
- **MULATTIERI P.** 2006. Etude de l'impact des aménagements riverains sur les macroinvertébrés benthiques des rives genevoises du Léman. Master report, University of Geneva.
- **NICOLET P, BIGGS J, FOX G, HODSON MJ, REYNOLDS C, WHITFIELD M, WILLIAMS P.** 2004. The wetland plant and macroinvertebrate assemblages of temporary ponds in England and Wales. Biological Conservation 120 (2): 261-278.
- **PATRICK R, PALAVAGE DM.** 1994. The value of species as indicators of water quality. Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, 145: 55-92.
- **ROSENBERG DM, RESH VH.** 1993. Freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates. Chapman & Hall, New York.
- **RUSE L.** 2002. Chironomid pupal exuviae as indicators of lake status. Archiv Fur Hydrobiologie, 153: 367-390.
- **SAETHER OA.** 1979. Chironomid communities as water quality indicators. Holarctic Ecology, 2: 65-74.
- **SAJALOLI B, LIMOGES O.** 2005. Plaidoyer pour les mares. Mares: le journal d'information du Pôle-Relais Mares & Mouillères de France, 1: 2-4.
- **SOWA R.** 1975. Ecology and biogeography of mayflies (Ephemeroptera) of running waters in the Polish part of the Carpathians. 1. Distribution and quantitative analysis. Acta Hydrobiologica, 17: 223-247.
- **UK BIODIVERSITY GROUP.** 1999. Tranche 2 Action Plans – Volume VI: Terrestrial and freshwater species and habitats. United Kingdom Biodiversity Group, London.
- **WALTHER BA, MOORE JL.** 2005. The concepts of bias, precision and accuracy, and their use in testing the performance of species richness estimators, with a literature review of estimator performance. Ecography, 28: 815-829.
- **WIEDERHOLM T.** 1978. Chironomids as indicators of water quality in swedish lakes. Acta Universitatis Carolinae-Biologica, 12: 275-283.
- **WILLIAMS P, WHITFIELD M, BIGGS J, BRAY S, FOX G, NICOLET P, SEAR D.** 2003. Comparative biodiversity of rivers, streams, ditches and ponds in an agricultural landscape in Southern England. Biological Conservation, 115: 329-341.