

# Using globally threatened pelagic birds to identify priority sites for marine conservation in the South Atlantic Ocean

Maria P. Dias<sup>1,\*</sup>, Steffen Opper<sup>2</sup>, Alexander L. Bond<sup>3</sup>, Ana P. B. Carneiro<sup>1</sup>, Richard J. Cuthbert<sup>3</sup>, Jacob Gonz ales-Sol s<sup>4</sup>, Ross M. Wanless<sup>5,8</sup>, Trevor Glass<sup>6</sup>, Ben Lascelles<sup>1</sup>, Cleo Small<sup>2</sup>, Richard A. Phillips<sup>7</sup> and Peter G. Ryan<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK

<sup>2</sup> RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, Cambridge, UK

<sup>3</sup> RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, Sandy, UK

<sup>4</sup> University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

<sup>5</sup> BirdLife South Africa, Cape Town, South Africa

<sup>6</sup> Tristan da Cunha Conservation Department, Edinburgh of the Seven Seas, Tristan da Cunha, South Atlantic

<sup>7</sup> British Antarctic Survey, Cambridge, UK

<sup>8</sup> Percy FitzPatrick Institute of African Ornithology, DST-NRF Centre of Excellence, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

\*Corresponding author: BirdLife International, David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge, CB3 3QZ, UK; phone number: +44 (0)1223 747540; [maria.dias@birdlife.org](mailto:maria.dias@birdlife.org),

## Abstract

The Convention on Biological Diversity aspires to designate 10% of the global oceans as Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), but so far few MPAs protect pelagic species in the high seas. Transparent scientific approaches are needed to ensure that these encompass areas with high biodiversity value. Here we used the distribution of all globally threatened seabirds breeding in a centrally located archipelago (Tristan da Cunha) to provide guidance on where MPAs could be established in the South Atlantic Ocean. We combined year-round tracking data from six species, and used the systematic conservation-planning tool Zonation to

delineate areas that would protect the largest proportion of each population. The areas used  
32 most intensively varied among species and seasons. Combining the sites used by all six  
species suggested that the most important areas of the South Atlantic are located south of  
34 South Africa, around the central South Atlantic between 30°S and 55°S, and near South  
America. There was no overlap between the identified areas and any of the existing MPAs in  
36 the South Atlantic. The conservation of these highly mobile pelagic species cannot be  
achieved by single countries, but requires a multi-national approach at an ocean-basin scale.

38

Keywords: Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas; Marine Protected Areas; Seabirds;  
40 Threatened species; Tristan da Cunha

## 42 **1. Introduction**

The designation of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) is an important mechanism to conserve  
44 marine areas of biological importance (Game et al. 2009). In 2016, MPAs covered 5.6% of  
the global ocean surface (Boonzaier and Pauly 2016; Juffe-Bignoli et al. 2014), which  
46 remains substantially less than the 10% envisioned by the Convention on Biological Diversity  
by 2020 (CBD 2010). Most existing MPAs are in near-shore waters, and there are very few  
48 MPAs to protect the diverse pelagic ecosystems of the world (Game et al. 2009). Many of the  
world's most charismatic animals such as marine mammals, seabirds, turtles, sharks, and tuna  
50 inhabit pelagic ecosystems. Because these species often face a diverse range of pressures due  
to their extensive movements (Croxall et al. 2012; Tuck et al. 2003; Žydelis et al. 2009),  
52 many pelagic species are now highly threatened, and there is a critical need to identify and  
designate an effective global network of pelagic MPAs to protect these species and the food  
54 webs on which they depend.

The processes by which MPAs are identified, designated, and enforced are complex  
56 (Game et al. 2010; Hobday et al. 2014; Kaplan et al. 2010). The approaches differ  
enormously depending on whether MPAs are designated opportunistically, if their location is  
58 based on strict scientific criteria that aim to maximise biodiversity benefits (BirdLife  
International 2010; Jessen et al. 2011; Smith et al. 2014), or whether the social and economic  
60 costs are considered in the site selection process (Ban 2009; Mazor et al. 2014). Due to the  
commitment of many national governments to protect a certain proportion of the marine area

62 within their jurisdiction, there is the risk that large MPAs are designated that fail to meet  
scientific principles of systematic conservation planning (Barr and Possingham 2013;  
64 Devillers et al. 2014). To avoid the protection of large marine areas that are of comparatively  
low biodiversity value and do not adequately represent the full range of marine ecosystems, it  
66 is fundamental that identification of MPAs is based on transparent scientific approaches  
(Fernandes et al. 2005; Gleason et al. 2010; Klein et al. 2009).

68 Many species depending on pelagic ecosystems can travel large distances (Block et al.  
2011). However, long-term studies have revealed considerable site fidelity or consistent use  
70 of well-defined habitats for many species or populations, despite their mobility (Arthur et al.  
2015; Dias et al. 2011; Wakefield et al. 2015). Sites and habitats used persistently by multiple  
72 species or populations would be suitable candidates for enhanced management or protection  
as an MPA (Lascelles et al. 2014). Understanding the spatial distribution of pelagic species is  
74 therefore crucial for the identification of sites with high biodiversity value; however, due to  
the logistical difficulties in sampling pelagic areas, our knowledge of site use by many  
76 marine animals is comparatively poor. The movements and distribution of large and  
charismatic mega-fauna, including marine mammals or seabirds, is much better understood  
78 than that of invertebrates and most fish (Chown et al. 1998; Mora et al. 2008; Tittensor et al.  
2010). Moreover, seabirds can act as umbrella species and represent the spatial distribution of  
80 diverse organisms at lower trophic levels (Aslan et al. 2015; Williams et al. 2014). By  
considering seabirds as a surrogate group representing wider marine biodiversity, robust  
82 analyses of their spatial distribution should therefore avoid the designation of MPAs in areas  
of low biodiversity value.

84 The South Atlantic Ocean is a globally important ecosystem with a high diversity of  
seabirds, fish, and marine mammals (Trebilco et al. 2011; Williams et al. 2014), but has a  
86 relatively poor coverage of MPAs, despite demonstrated high biodiversity especially around  
the Falkland Islands (Juffe-Bignoli et al. 2014), and off the coast of South America (Ramos et  
88 al. 2016; Tancell et al. 2016; Yorio 2009) and southern Africa (Ludynia et al. 2012). Given  
its global importance for pelagic biodiversity, delineating MPAs using objective criteria  
90 based on umbrella species would fill a critical gap in terms of conservation. Here we use a  
unique dataset covering the year-round distribution of all globally threatened seabirds  
92 breeding in a centrally located archipelago in the South Atlantic (Tristan da Cunha) to fill this  
critical data gap and provide guidance on where potential MPAs could be established in the  
94 region. The seabird community of Tristan da Cunha represents a variety of trophic levels and

foraging guilds, and the spatial distributions of several of the larger species have been studied  
96 using various tracking devices (Cuthbert et al. 2005; Reid et al. 2014; Reid et al. 2013). We  
combined the tracking data from this pelagic guild to determine which areas are likely to be  
98 the most important for these and other pelagic species in the central South Atlantic Ocean.

Our main objectives were to quantify the use of distinct areas in the South Atlantic by  
100 six seabird species, and delineate areas that are used consistently by a large proportion of  
each population. We used international criteria and thresholds for Important Bird and  
102 Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) (BirdLife International 2010; Lascelles et al. 2016) to  
systematically identify areas of particular conservation relevance. Such areas could contribute  
104 to the establishment of a network of pelagic MPAs in the South Atlantic Ocean. This study is  
one of the few approaches to date to assess the combined use of pelagic areas by a suite of  
106 marine top predators (Delord et al. 2014; Le Corre et al. 2012; Tancell et al. 2016), and the  
first combining year-round data for all threatened seabirds breeding in a single island group.

108

## 2. Methods

110

### 2.1. Study area

112 The Tristan da Cunha archipelago consists of four major islands, separated by 20 - 400 km:  
Inaccessible (37°18'S, 12°39'W; 14 km<sup>2</sup>), Nightingale (37°25'S, 12°29'W; 4 km<sup>2</sup>), Gough  
114 (40°18'S, 9°57'W; 65 km<sup>2</sup>) and Tristan da Cunha (37°07'S, 12°16'W; 96 km<sup>2</sup>), the only  
island with a permanent human population. These four islands host colonies of 25 seabird  
116 species, of which six are globally threatened. Four of these species breed exclusively in the  
Tristan da Cunha archipelago (Tristan Albatross *Diomedea dabbenena*, Atlantic Yellow-  
118 nosed Albatross *Thalassarche chlororhynchos*, Spectacled Petrel *Procellaria conspicillata*,  
Atlantic Petrel *Pterodroma incerta*).

120 For the purpose of our spatial marine prioritization, we defined our study area in the South  
Atlantic Ocean from 12° S to 80° S, and from 65° W to 35° E.

122

124

## 2.2. Tracking data

126 We compiled the available tracking data for all six globally threatened seabird species  
(Critically Endangered - CR, Endangered – EN or Vulnerable - VU) that breed in the Tristan  
128 da Cunha archipelago: Tristan Albatross (CR), Sooty Albatross *Phoebetria fusca* (EN),  
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross (EN), Spectacled Petrel (VU), Atlantic Petrel (EN), and  
130 Northern Rockhopper Penguin *Eudyptes moseleyi* (EN). Most species were tracked during  
their breeding and non-breeding seasons from their major colonies between 2000 and 2013  
132 on Gough and Inaccessible islands; some of these data were used in previous studies focusing  
on individual species (Cuthbert et al. 2005; Reid et al. 2014; Reid et al. 2013). However,  
134 Northern Rockhopper Penguins were only tracked during the non-breeding season. All 380  
tracks of adult birds were obtained from colonies holding a significant proportion of the  
136 world population (> 5%; Table 1). Of these tracks, 231 were collected with satellite  
transmitters (Platform Terminal Transmitters, PTTs), and 149 with Global Location Sensor  
138 (GLS) devices, providing a total of 70,786 bird locations. Locations collected with PTTs  
were filtered using the R package “argosfilter” and then interpolated to obtain hourly  
140 positions. GLS data were processed following the procedures described in detail by Phillips  
et al. (2004).

142

## 2.3. Identification of marine Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) for each 144 species and season

An Important Bird and Biodiversity Area (IBA) is defined as a site known to regularly hold  
146 significant numbers of a globally threatened species, or a site that supports >1% of the global  
population of a congregatory seabird species (i.e., at least 20% of a colony with more than  
148 5% of the world population; Fishpool and Evants 2001; Lascelles et al. 2016). We analysed  
each dataset following the procedures developed by BirdLife International to identify marine  
150 IBAs using seabird tracking data (BirdLife International 2010; Lascelles et al. 2016). Many  
seabirds are known to use different areas at sea during different stages of their annual cycle,  
152 and the identification of IBAs generally benefits from analysing data separately for breeding  
and non-breeding seasons (Lascelles et al. 2016). However, because the six species in this  
154 study do not breed synchronously (Fig. A1), yet the management of MPAs requires the  
identification of areas that are important at certain times of the year, we split the data from  
156 each breeding population (species-island combination) into four seasons, defined by calendar

months rather than the breeding cycle. This approach allowed us to identify areas that are  
158 important for multiple species at the same time of year, and facilitates the integration of the  
results in dynamic management plans that consider seasonal use. We defined four seasons  
160 corresponding to four quarters of the year, and use the terms 'summer' (January - March),  
'autumn' (April - June), 'winter' (July - September), and 'spring' (October - December)  
162 throughout this paper.

For each population and season we calculated the 50% kernel utilisation distribution  
164 of all individual tracks (likely corresponding to their core foraging areas; e.g. Wood et al.  
2000), using the scale of interaction of the birds with the environment as estimated by first  
166 passage time analysis (Fauchald and Tveraa 2003) as a smoothing factor. We then quantified  
the number of overlapping core foraging ranges across all tracked individuals from each  
168 breeding population in each  $0.2 \times 0.2^\circ$  grid cell, and identified the sites used by  $\geq 20\%$  of the  
tracked birds (following a conservative approach due to the limited number of individuals of  
170 each species tracked in each year; see Lascelles et al. 2016). Core foraging ranges of birds  
tracked with GLS were estimated using a smoothing factor of 180 km due to the spatial error  
172 of the geolocation method (Phillips et al. 2004), and the resulting sites were cropped (90 km  
inner buffer), to avoid overestimation of areas due to the large kernel radius and the error of  
174 the geolocation method.

When tracking data from multiple years were available (Tristan Albatross and Sooty  
176 Albatross in all seasons, and Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross in winter and spring), we  
identified important areas for each year separately. Although this approach reduced the  
178 sample size for each annual site identification (Table 1), it allowed us to assess consistency  
among years, which is important for understanding the stability of sites over time (Meier et  
180 al. 2015; Robertson et al. 2014; Tancell et al. 2016). In these cases we only considered sites  
overlapping in more than one year, unless sample sizes were sufficiently large in any given  
182 year ( $>30$  individual core ranges overlapping). Finally, we calculated the percentage of  
overlap between the important areas identified for each species and the Exclusive Economic  
184 Zones (EEZ) of countries surrounding the South Atlantic Ocean.

#### 186 *2.4. Identification of candidate MPAs across all species and seasons*

To identify priority areas for conservation in the South Atlantic, the IBAs identified for each  
188 population and season need to be combined systematically to assess which areas were the

most important given their frequency of use by each of the target species. We used the sites  
190 identified for each population in each season (see above) in the spatial prioritization  
algorithm 'Zonation' (Moilanen 2007; Moilanen et al. 2005), which has been used  
192 successfully in large-scale marine applications to rank areas according to their priority for  
conservation (Leathwick et al. 2008; Opper et al. 2012; Winiarski et al. 2014). The spatial  
194 prioritization is achieved by sequentially removing grid cells from the study area that have  
low proportions of usage by a given species in a season, and therefore the lowest  
196 conservation value. The sequential removal also considers proximity of cells to areas of high  
conservation priority and therefore results in a spatially constrained set of priority areas  
198 (Moilanen 2007; Moilanen et al. 2005). The approach is designed for use with multiple  
species, which adds weight when justifying the designation of a marine reserve (Ainley et al.  
200 2009; Nur et al. 2011).

We used the IBAs identified for six species across four seasons, yielding a total of 22  
202 spatial data layers (no tracking data were available for Northern Rockhopper Penguin in  
spring and summer). We explored the use of different weights for each data layer based on  
204 the threat status of each species (CR, EN, or VU), the quality of the dataset (GLS or PTT),  
and whether the layer included breeding-season data. However, as the relative weight did not  
206 materially affect the location and extent of prioritized areas (Fig. A3), each layer was  
assigned the same weight in the prioritization to avoid arbitrary ranking. We used a simple  
208 core-area prioritization in Zonation 4.0 to guarantee the retention of intensively used areas  
that were either consistently important in all seasons or of outstanding importance in some  
210 seasons. We ran the algorithm without boundary quality penalties, but with a boundary length  
penalty of 0.01 to provide the most biologically-detailed map of priority areas for  
212 conservation. We present the most important 10% of grid cells identified in this spatial  
prioritization, thus corresponding to the CBD target of protecting 10% of the global marine  
214 habitat (CBD 2010).

All analyses were carried out in R 3.1.2 (R Core Team 2016) using the approach  
216 provided by Lascelles et al. (2016) to identify IBAs and the code provided by Opper et al.  
(2012) to implement the spatial prioritisation.

218

220

### 3. Results

222

#### *3.1. Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas by species and season*

224 The at-sea areas that were used most intensively by the threatened seabirds from Tristan da  
Cunha archipelago (representing candidate IBAs) varied among species and seasons (Fig. 1).  
226 The Tristan Albatross was the most widespread of the study species, using almost all South  
Atlantic waters located between 30°S and 45°S. In contrast, the Sooty Albatross had a more  
228 constrained distribution, foraging within 1200 km of the Tristan da Cunha archipelago  
throughout the year (Figs. 1 and S2). The Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross showed a  
230 consistent use of both the waters surrounding Tristan da Cunha, and the Benguela upwelling  
region, while Atlantic and Spectacled petrels mostly used South American coastal waters  
232 throughout the year. The non-breeding distribution of the Northern Rockhopper Penguin  
(Apr-Sep) was mostly confined to the waters south-east of the Tristan da Cunha EEZ.

234

#### *3.2. Consistency of IBAs across years*

236 Despite some annual variation, many of the core areas of the albatrosses were used  
consistently from year to year (Fig. A2). The exception was the Atlantic Yellow-nosed  
238 Albatross in winter, for which there was no overlap in the areas used in the two different  
years for which data were available (Fig. A2); however, given the large sample sizes in each  
240 year, both areas were retained for the prioritisation (Fig. 1 and Table 1).

#### *3.3. Overlap of IBAs with EEZs and current MPA network*

242 The overlap between core sites and national EEZs varied greatly among species (Table 2).  
For Tristan Albatross, Sooty Albatross and non-breeding Northern Rockhopper Penguin,  
244 almost all the sites identified (>80% of the total area - all seasons combined) were in pelagic  
waters beyond national jurisdiction. In contrast, almost 50% of the core areas of Atlantic  
246 Yellow-nosed Albatross were in the EEZs of Namibia, South Africa and Tristan da Cunha.  
The Brazilian EEZ was particularly important for Spectacled and Atlantic petrels (Table 2).  
248 Only a small proportion of the core areas that were identified overlapped with any of the  
existing pelagic MPAs in the South Atlantic (Fig. 1). Sooty Albatross and Atlantic Petrel  
250



winter core areas overlapped 5.1% and 1.0%, respectively, with the South Georgia and South  
252 Sandwich Islands MPA.

254

### 256 *3.4. Candidate MPAs important for multiple species across seasons*

We found little overlap between the most important areas used by different species (Fig. 2).  
258 The exceptions were those areas around the colonies, i.e., within the Tristan da Cunha EEZ  
(especially during the early breeding season of most species – spring and summer) and, to a  
260 lesser extent, the coastal waters of Brazil and Uruguay (October-March), Argentine Basin  
(July-September) and south of the Tristan da Cunha EEZ (April-June).

262 The areas identified using the Zonation algorithm as those of greatest importance for  
the conservation of all globally threatened seabirds of Tristan da Cunha reflect the wide range  
264 of sites used by this community (Fig. 3). The areas were located around the Tristan da Cunha  
archipelago, coastal South America (Uruguayan and Brazilian EEZ and Argentine Basin) and  
266 in the Benguela and Agulhas currents, off the South African coast.

## 268 **4. Discussion**

Our study demonstrates that the conservation of highly mobile pelagic species cannot be  
270 achieved effectively by single countries, but requires a multi-national approach at an ocean-  
basin scale. Due to the central location of the Tristan da Cunha islands, the pelagic seabird  
272 species that breed there can forage over a wide area, ranging from the highly productive  
waters in the Benguela Current along the African coast, to the coast of southern South  
274 America, both known to be important for pelagic seabirds (Abrams and Griffiths 1981;  
Bugoni et al. 2008; Guilford et al. 2009). By combining tracking data from multiple species  
276 and years, covering the complete annual cycle, we have shown that this seabird community  
takes advantage of the central location of this archipelago by using a few regions widely  
278 distributed across the width of the South Atlantic Ocean.

280 *4.1.Importance of areas for multiple species and priority areas for conservation*

282 The areas that we identified meet international criteria to qualify as IBAs. We further showed  
284 that for Tristan and Sooty albatrosses, the most important areas were used consistently in at  
286 least two different years by different individuals (Fig. A2), providing additional confidence  
288 that these are used regularly by a large number of birds (BirdLife International 2010; Meier et  
290 al. 2015). Seabird populations tend to be faithful to their foraging areas and migration  
corridors, both at small-medium spatio-temporal scales (e.g., during the breeding season;  
Meier et al. 2015), and also at very large (ocean-wide) scales when released from the  
constraints of a breeding site (Dias et al. 2013; Dias et al. 2011; Phillips et al. 2005). Because  
of this site fidelity at large spatial scales, it is possible to identify sites of major importance  
for seabird populations that are used consistently over time (Fig. 3), and are therefore good  
candidates for incorporation in a network of MPAs (Montevecchi et al. 2012).

292 In addition to the temporally consistent use, some areas were important for more than  
one species. The EEZ of Tristan da Cunha was important for all species during their  
294 respective breeding seasons, and there were additional areas in Brazilian and Uruguayan  
waters and in the Argentine Basin where core areas of two species overlapped (Fig. 2).  
296 However, elsewhere there was generally little overlap among species in core areas used  
within the same seasons (Fig. 2), revealing a high degree of spatial niche segregation at a  
298 broad (ocean basin) scale. This pattern of dispersion is likely facilitated both by the central  
location of the Tristan da Cunha group (Abrams and Miller 1986), and the highly mobile  
300 nature of the study species, which can travel thousands of kilometres even during the  
breeding season (Figs. 1 and S2). Spatial segregation among species breeding sympatrically  
302 on small oceanic islands has been shown in many pelagic seabird species, and is likely a  
mechanism to reduce inter-specific competition (Navarro et al. 2009; Quillfeldt et al. 2013;  
304 Ratcliffe et al. 2014). Although the spatial segregation of different species is of great  
biological interest, the comparatively low overlap of core areas has implications for the  
306 establishment of MPAs, because the candidate MPAs that we identified may omit critical  
areas for some species at certain times of the year. Therefore, the sites we identified should  
308 not be regarded as the definitive set of key areas for our target species; instead, they are the  
minimum that should be integrated in a broader MPA network for pelagic seabirds in the  
310 central South Atlantic Ocean, and should be supplemented by additional sites that are  
important at other times of the year and for other threatened species.

312 The most important areas identified in our study in the South Atlantic are also known  
foraging grounds of many other threatened or near-threatened seabirds, including the  
314 Wandering Albatross *Diomedea exulans* (VU), Northern Royal Albatross *D. sanfordi* (EN),  
Southern Royal Albatross *D. epomophora* (VU), Grey-headed Albatross *Thalassarche*  
316 *chrysostoma* (EN), Black-browed Albatross *T. melanophris* (NT), Light-mantled Albatross  
*Phoebastria palpebrata* (NT), White-chinned Petrel *Procellaria aequinoctialis* (VU), Desertas  
318 Petrel *Pterodroma deserta* (VU), Cape Verde Shearwater *Calonectris edwardsii* (NT), and  
Southern Rockhopper Penguin *Eudyptes chrysocome* (VU) (Ramírez et al. 2016; Ramos et al.  
320 2016; Tancell et al. 2016). In addition, some sites are also important non-breeding  
destinations for some long-distance migrants from the North Atlantic, such as Cory's  
322 *Calonectris borealis* and Manx *Puffinus puffinus* shearwaters and Bulwer's Petrel *Bulweria*  
*bulwerii* (Dias et al. 2011; Guilford et al. 2009; Ramos et al. 2015), as well as other species  
324 from the South Atlantic. Therefore, these sites are good candidates for MPAs in the South  
Atlantic, given their high biodiversity value and their potential to benefit a wide number of  
326 species from Tristan da Cunha and elsewhere, including many that are threatened.

#### 328 4.2. Is MPA designation an effective tool for threatened seabirds from Tristan da Cunha?

MPAs can be an effective tool in mitigating some of the major threats to seabirds,  
330 such as fisheries bycatch and some types of pollution (Hyrenbach et al. 2000), but the  
establishment of MPAs in the pelagic realm has been under intense debate due to the highly  
332 dynamic nature of this environment (Devillers et al. 2014; Game et al. 2009). We found no  
overlap of the most important areas and existing MPAs in the South Atlantic, mostly because  
334 the existing MPAs were designated to protect other biodiversity values. Because more than  
half of the most important areas that we identified were in pelagic waters beyond national  
336 jurisdiction, the effective establishment and enforcement of MPAs will be politically  
challenging.

338 Many of the threatened seabirds breeding at Tristan da Cunha are susceptible to  
bycatch in fishing gear; the bycatch is a particularly serious threat to the Critically  
340 Endangered Tristan Albatross, but other species, such as the Sooty and Atlantic Yellow-  
nosed albatrosses and the Spectacled Petrel, are also frequently by-caught (Bugoni et al.  
342 2008; Cuthbert et al. 2005; Wanless et al. 2009). All areas highlighted in Fig. 3 are important  
for at least one of these species, and some are known hotspots of seabird bycatch globally

344 (Lewison et al. 2014). The long-line fishing effort in the most important areas reported by the  
International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) ranged from 11.3  
346 to 18.1% of the fishing effort reported across the South Atlantic (south of 12° S). Because our  
most important areas cover 17% of the area from which ICCAT data were available, the  
348 recorded effort in the most important bird areas is equal to, or slightly less than, the effort  
expected by chance if fishing effort was distributed randomly (Table A1). Nevertheless, and  
350 in absolute values, 11 million hooks are set on average each year in these most important  
sites (Table A1). Given their importance for some of the threatened seabirds mentioned  
352 above, and also for species breeding at other colonies (Jiménez et al. 2014; Tuck et al. 2011),  
improvements in monitoring of bycatch rates and enforcement of compliance with bycatch  
354 mitigation requirements by fisheries in these areas would be highly beneficial. Therefore, our  
results reinforce the need for ICCAT to strengthen and enforce regulations to reduce bycatch  
356 and to develop appropriate levels of surveillance of fishery practices by independent  
observers in both national and international waters, in particular within the Brazilian,  
358 Namibian and South African EEZs (Melvin et al. 2014; Phillips 2013; Small et al. 2015).

Regardless of whether MPAs are established or whether seabird protection is  
360 achieved by enforcing bycatch reduction across a wider region, it will be important to specify  
explicit quantitative objectives that the protection measures need to deliver in order to assess  
362 whether the management of the priority areas actually results in tangible benefits to the  
seabird community (McGowan and Possingham 2016).

364

## 5. Conclusions

366 By using a unique dataset collected over a 13-year period for all the threatened seabird  
species breeding in a single archipelago, we show that it is possible to find areas used  
368 consistently by a suite of highly-mobile marine predators, and that conservation and  
management mechanisms are required at the level of the ocean basin. The sites we identified  
370 are highly relevant for the delineation of an effective network of pelagic MPAs in the South  
Atlantic and for identifying potential high-risk areas of seabird bycatch, therefore meriting  
372 particular attention for monitoring of bycatch rates and compliance with recommended  
mitigation methods from fisheries regulators.

374

## Acknowledgements

376 This analysis was facilitated by the Global Seabird Tracking database  
(www.seabirdtracking.org) hosted by BirdLife International. We appreciate the help of a  
378 large number of fieldworkers to collect tracking data, and the financial support of the UK  
Foreign and Commonwealth Office's Overseas Territories Environmental Programme, the  
380 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Birds Australia, the University of Cape Town, the  
Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), and the Government of  
382 Tristan da Cunha. We appreciate logistical support from the South African Department of  
Environmental Affairs and Tourism through the South African National Antarctic  
384 Programme, Ovenstone Agencies Pty., and the Government of Tristan da Cunha. Research  
was conducted with the approval of the Government of Tristan da Cunha.

386

## References

- 388 Abrams, R., Griffiths, A., 1981. Ecological structure of the pelagic seabird community in the  
Benguela Current region. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 5, 269-277.
- 390 Abrams, R.W., Miller, D.G.M., 1986. The distribution of pelagic seabirds in relation to the  
oceanic environment of Gough Island. *S. Afr. J. Mar. Sci.* 4, 125-137.
- 392 Ainley, D.G., Dugger, K.D., Ford, R.G., Pierce, S.D., Reese, D.C., Brodeur, R.D., Tynan,  
C.T., Barth, J.A., 2009. Association of predators and prey at frontal features in the  
394 California Current: competition, facilitation, and co-occurrence. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*  
389, 271-294.
- 396 Arthur, B., Hindell, M., Bester, M., Trathan, P., Jonsen, I., Staniland, I., Oosthuizen, W.C.,  
Wege, M., Lea, M.-A., 2015. Return customers: Foraging site fidelity and the effect  
398 of environmental variability in wide-ranging Antarctic fur seals. *PloS One* 10,  
e0120888.
- 400 Aslan, C., Holmes, N., Tershy, B., Spatz, D., Croll, D.A., 2015. Benefits to poorly studied  
taxa of conservation of bird and mammal diversity on islands. *Conserv. Biol.* 29, 133–  
402 142.
- Ban, N.C., 2009. Minimum data requirements for designing a set of marine protected areas,  
404 using commonly available abiotic and biotic datasets. *Biodiv. Conserv.* 18, 1829-  
1845.

- 406 Barr, L.M., Possingham, H.P., 2013. Are outcomes matching policy commitments in  
Australian marine conservation planning? *Mar. Pol.* 42, 39-48.
- 408 BirdLife International, 2010. Marine Important Bird Areas toolkit: standardised techniques  
for identifying priority sites for the conservation of seabirds at-sea.  
410 [http://www.birdlife.org/eu/pdfs/Marine\\_IBA\\_Toolkit\\_2010.pdf](http://www.birdlife.org/eu/pdfs/Marine_IBA_Toolkit_2010.pdf), accessed 4  
November 2010.
- 412 BirdLife International, 2016. IUCN Red List for birds. <http://www.birdlife.org>, accessed 2  
December 2016.
- 414 Block, B.A., Jonsen, I.D., Jorgensen, S.J., Winship, A.J., Shaffer, S.A., Bograd, S.J., Hazen,  
E.L., Foley, D.G., Breed, G.A., Harrison, A.L., Ganong, J.E., Swithenbank, A.,  
416 Castleton, M., Dewar, H., Mate, B.R., Shillinger, G.L., Schaefer, K.M., Benson, S.R.,  
Weise, M.J., Henry, R.W., Costa, D.P., 2011. Tracking apex marine predator  
418 movements in a dynamic ocean. *Nature* 475, 86-90.
- Boonzaier, L., Pauly, D., 2016. Marine protection targets: an updated assessment of global  
420 progress. *Oryx* 50, 27-35.
- Bugoni, L., Mancini, P.L., Monteiro, D.S., Nascimento, L., Neves, T.S., 2008. Seabird  
422 bycatch in the Brazilian pelagic longline fishery and a review of capture rates in the  
southwestern Atlantic Ocean. *Endang. Spec. Res.* 5, 137-147.
- 424 CBD, 2010. Aichi Biodiversity Targets. <https://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>, accessed 30 Aug  
2016.
- 426 Chown, S.L., Gaston, K.J., Williams, P.H., 1998. Global patterns in species richness of  
pelagic seabirds: the Procellariiformes. *Ecography* 21, 342-350.
- 428 Croxall, J.P., Butchart, S.H.M., Lascelles, B., Stattersfield, A.J., Sullivan, B., Symes, A.,  
Taylor, P., 2012. Seabird conservation status, threats and priority actions: a global  
430 assessment. *Bird Conserv. Int.* 22, 1-34.
- Cuthbert, R., Hilton, G., Ryan, P., Tuck, G.N., 2005. At-sea distribution of breeding Tristan  
432 albatrosses *Diomedea dabbenena* and potential interactions with pelagic longline  
fishing in the South Atlantic Ocean. *Biol. Conserv.* 121, 345-355.
- 434 Delord, K., Barbraud, C., Bost, C.-A., Deceuninck, B., Lefebvre, T., Lutz, R., Micol, T.,  
Phillips, R.A., Trathan, P.N., Weimerskirch, H., 2014. Areas of importance for  
436 seabirds tracked from French southern territories, and recommendations for  
conservation. *Mar. Pol.* 48, 1-13.

- 438 Devillers, R., Pressey, R.L., Grech, A., Kittinger, J.N., Edgar, G.J., Ward, T., Watson, R.,  
2014. Reinventing residual reserves in the sea: are we favouring ease of establishment  
440 over need for protection? *Aquat. Conserv.* 25, 480-504.
- Dias, M.P., Granadeiro, J.P., Catry, P., 2013. Individual variability in the migratory path and  
442 stopovers of a long-distance pelagic migrant. *Anim. Behav.* 86, 359-364.
- Dias, M.P., Granadeiro, J.P., Phillips, R.A., Alonso, H., Catry, P., 2011. Breaking the routine:  
444 individual Cory's shearwaters shift winter destinations between hemispheres and  
across ocean basins. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 278, 1786-1793.
- 446 Fauchald, P., Tveraa, T., 2003. Using first-passage time in the analysis of area-restricted  
search and habitat selection. *Ecology* 84, 282-288.
- 448 Fernandes, L., Day, J.O.N., Lewis, A., Slegers, S., Kerrigan, B., Breen, D.A.N., Cameron, D.,  
Jago, B., Hall, J., Lowe, D., Innes, J., Tanzer, J., Chadwick, V., Thompson, L.,  
450 Gorman, K., Simmons, M., Barnett, B., Sampson, K., De'Ath, G., Mapstone, B.,  
Marsh, H., Possingham, H., Ball, I.A.N., Ward, T., Dobbs, K., Aumend, J., Slater,  
452 D.E.B., Stapleton, K., 2005. Establishing representative no-take areas in the Great  
Barrier Reef: Large-scale implementation of theory on Marine Protected Areas.  
454 *Conserv. Biol.* 19, 1733-1744.
- Fishpool, L.D., Evants, M., 2001. Important bird areas in Africa and associated islands  
456 Priority sites for conservation. Pisces Publications and BirdLife International,  
Newbury and Cambridge, UK.
- 458 Game, E.T., Grantham, H.S., Hobday, A.J., Pressey, R.L., Lombard, A.T., Beckley, L.E.,  
Gjerde, K., Bustamante, R., Possingham, H.P., Richardson, A.J., 2009. Pelagic  
460 protected areas: the missing dimension in ocean conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24,  
360-369.
- 462 Game, E.T., Grantham, H.S., Hobday, A.J., Pressey, R.L., Lombard, A.T., Beckley, L.E.,  
Gjerde, K., Bustamante, R., Possingham, H.P., Richardson, A.J., 2010. Pelagic  
464 MPAs: The devil you know. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25, 63-64.
- Gleason, M., McCreary, S., Miller-Henson, M., Ugoretz, J., Fox, E., Merrifield, M.,  
466 McClintock, W., Serpa, P., Hoffman, K., 2010. Science-based and stakeholder-driven  
marine protected area network planning: A successful case study from north central  
468 California. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 53, 52-68.
- Guilford, T., Meade, J., Willis, J., Phillips, R.A., Boyle, D., Roberts, S., Collett, M., Freeman,  
470 R., Perrins, C.M., 2009. Migration and stopover in a small pelagic seabird, the Manx

shearwater *Puffinus puffinus*: insights from machine learning. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*  
472 276, 1215-1223.

Hobday, A.J., Maxwell, S.M., Forgie, J., McDonald, J., Darby, M., Seto, K., Bailey, H.,  
474 Bograd, S.J., Briscoe, D.K., Costa, D.P., Crowder, L.B., Dunn, D.C., Fossette, S.,  
Halpin, P.N., Hartog, J.R., Hazen, E.L., Lascelles, B.G., Lewison, R.L., Poulos, G.,  
476 Powers, A., 2014. Dynamic ocean management: Integrating scientific and  
technological capacity with law, policy and management. *Stan Env'tl L J* 33, 125-165.

478 Hyrenbach, K.D., Forney, K.A., Dayton, P.K., 2000. Marine protected areas and ocean basin  
management. *Aquat. Conserv.* 10, 437-458.

480 Jessen, S., Chan, K., Côté, I., Dearden, P., Santo, E.D., Fortin, M.J., Guichard, F., Haider,  
W., Jamieson, G., Kramer, D.L., McCrea-Strub, A., Mulrennan, M., Montevecchi,  
482 W.A., Roff, J., Salomon, A., Gardner, J., Honka, L., Menafrá, R., Woodley, A., 2011.  
Science-based Guidelines for MPAs and MPA Networks in Canada.  
484 <http://cpaws.org/publications/mpa-guidelines>, accessed 11 August 2014.

Jiménez, S., Phillips, R.A., Brazeiro, A., Defeo, O., Domingo, A., 2014. Bycatch of great  
486 albatrosses in pelagic longline fisheries in the southwest Atlantic: contributing factors  
and implications for management. *Biol. Conserv.* 171, 9-20.

488 Juffe-Bignoli, D., Burgess, N.D., Bingham, H., Belle, E.M.S., de Lima, M.G., Deguignet, M.,  
Bertzky, B., Milam, A.N., Martínez-Lopez, J., Lewis, E., Eassom, A., Wicander, S.,  
490 Geldmann, J., van Soesbergen, A., Arnell, A.P., O'Connor, B., Park, S., Shi, Y.N.,  
Danks, F.S., MacSharry, B., Kingston, N., 2014. Protected Planet Report 2014.  
492 UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, UK. .

Kaplan, D.M., Chassot, E., Gruss, A., Fonteneau, A., 2010. Pelagic MPAs: The devil is in the  
494 details. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25, 62-63.

Klein, C.J., Steinback, C., Watts, M., Scholz, A.J., Possingham, H.P., 2009. Spatial marine  
496 zoning for fisheries and conservation. *Front Ecol Environ* 8, 349-353.

Lascelles, B., Notarbartolo Di Sciara, G., Agardy, T., Cuttelod, A., Eckert, S., Glowka, L.,  
498 Hoyt, E., Llewellyn, F., Louzao, M., Ridoux, V., 2014. Migratory marine species:  
their status, threats and conservation management needs. *Aquat. Conserv.* 24, 111-  
500 127.

Lascelles, B.G., Taylor, P.R., Miller, M.G.R., Dias, M.P., Opper, S., Torres, L., Hedd, A., Le  
502 Corre, M., Phillips, R.A., Shaffer, S.A., Weimerskirch, H., Small, C., 2016. Applying  
global criteria to tracking data to define important areas for marine conservation. *Div.*  
504 *Distrib.* 22, 422-431.



- 506 Le Corre, M., Jaeger, A., Pinet, P., Kappes, M.A., Weimerskirch, H., Catry, T., Ramos, J.A.,  
Russell, J.C., Shah, N., Jaquemet, S., 2012. Tracking seabirds to identify potential  
Marine Protected Areas in the tropical western Indian Ocean. *Biol. Conserv.* 156, 83-  
508 93.
- 510 Leathwick, J., Moilanen, A., Francis, M., Elith, J., Taylor, P., Julian, K., Hastie, T., Duffy,  
C., 2008. Novel methods for the design and evaluation of marine protected areas in  
offshore waters. *Conserv. Lett.* 1, 91-102.
- 512 Lewison, R.L., Crowder, L.B., Wallace, B.P., Moore, J.E., Cox, T., Zydalis, R., McDonald,  
S., DiMatteo, A., Dunn, D.C., Kot, C.Y., 2014. Global patterns of marine mammal,  
514 seabird, and sea turtle bycatch reveal taxa-specific and cumulative megafauna  
hotspots. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 111, 5271-5276.
- 516 Ludynia, K., Kemper, J., Roux, J.-P., 2012. The Namibian Islands' Marine Protected Area:  
Using seabird tracking data to define boundaries and assess their adequacy. *Biol.*  
518 *Conserv.* 156, 136–145.
- Mazor, T., Giakoumi, S., Kark, S., Possingham, H.P., 2014. Large-scale conservation  
520 planning in a multinational marine environment: cost matters. *Ecol. Appl.* 24, 1115-  
1130.
- 522 McGowan, J., Possingham, H., 2016. Commentary: Linking movement ecology with wildlife  
management and conservation. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 4, 1-3.
- 524 Meier, R.E., Wynn, R.B., Votier, S.C., McMinn Grivé, M., Rodríguez, A., Maurice, L., van  
Loon, E.E., Jones, A.R., Suberg, L., Arcos, J.M., Morgan, G., Josey, S.A., Guilford,  
526 T., 2015. Consistent foraging areas and commuting corridors of the critically  
endangered Balearic shearwater *Puffinus mauretanicus* in the northwestern  
528 Mediterranean. *Biol. Conserv.* 190, 87-97.
- Melvin, E.F., Guy, T.J., Read, L.B., 2014. Best practice seabird bycatch mitigation for  
530 pelagic longline fisheries targeting tuna and related species. *Fish Res.* 149, 5-18.
- Moilanen, A., 2007. Landscape zonation, benefit functions and target-based planning:  
532 unifying reserve selection strategies. *Biol. Conserv.* 134, 571-579.
- Moilanen, A., Franco, A.M.A., Early, R.I., Fox, R., Wintle, B., Thomas, C.D., 2005.  
534 Prioritizing multiple-use landscapes for conservation: methods for large multi-species  
planning problems. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 272, 1885-1891.
- 536 Montevecchi, W., Hedd, A., Tranquilla, L.M., Fifield, D., Burke, C., Regular, P., Davoren,  
G., Garthe, S., Robertson, G., Phillips, R., 2012. Tracking seabirds to identify

538 ecologically important and high risk marine areas in the western North Atlantic. *Biol.*  
539 *Conserv.* 156, 62-71.

540 Mora, C., Tittensor, D.P., Myers, R.A., 2008. The completeness of taxonomic inventories for  
541 describing the global diversity and distribution of marine fishes. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.*  
542 *B* 275, 149-155.

543 Navarro, J., Forero, M.G., González-Solís, J., Igual, J.M., Bécarea, J., Hobson, K.A., 2009.  
544 Foraging segregation between two closely related shearwaters breeding in sympatry.  
545 *Biol Lett* 5, 545-548.

546 Nur, N., Jahncke, J., Herzog, M.P., Howar, J., Hyrenbach, K.D., Zamon, J.E., Ainley, D.G.,  
547 Wiens, J.A., Morgan, K., Ballance, L.T., Stralberg, D., 2011. Where the wild things  
548 are: predicting hotspots of seabird aggregations in the California Current System.  
549 *Ecol. Appl.* 21, 2241-2257.

550 Oppel, S., Meirinho, A., Ramírez, I., Gardner, B., O'Connell, A., Miller, P.I., Louzao, M.,  
551 2012. Comparison of five modelling techniques to predict the spatial distribution and  
552 abundance of seabirds. *Biol. Conserv.* 156, 94-104.

553 Phillips, R., 2013. Requisite improvements to the estimation of seabird by-catch in pelagic  
554 longline fisheries. *Anim Conserv* 16, 157-158.

555 Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Croxall, J.P., Afanasyev, V., Bennett, V.J., 2005. Summer  
556 distribution and migration of nonbreeding albatrosses: Individual consistencies and  
557 implications for conservation. *Ecology* 86, 2386-2396.

558 Phillips, R.A., Silk, J.R.D., Croxall, J.P., Afanasyev, V., Briggs, D.R., 2004. Accuracy of  
559 geolocation estimates for flying seabirds. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 266, 265-272.

560 Quillfeldt, P., Masello, J.F., Navarro, J., Phillips, R.A., 2013. Year-round distribution  
561 suggests spatial segregation of two small petrel species in the South Atlantic. *J.*  
562 *Biogeogr.* 40, 430-441.

563 R Core Team, 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation  
564 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

565 Ramírez, I., Paiva, V.H., Fagundes, I., Menezes, D., Silva, I., Ceia, F.R., Phillips, R.A.,  
566 Ramos, J.A., Garthe, S., 2016. Conservation implications of consistent foraging and  
567 trophic ecology in a rare petrel species. *Anim Conserv* 19, 139-152.

568 Ramos, R., Ramírez, I., Paiva, V.H., Militão, T., Biscoito, M., Menezes, D., Phillips, R.A.,  
569 Zino, F., González-Solís, J., 2016. Global spatial ecology of three closely-related  
570 gadfly petrels. *Scientific Reports* 6, 23447.

- Ramos, R., Sanz, V., Militao, T., Bried, J., Neves, V.C., Biscoito, M., Phillips, R.A., Zino, F.,  
572 González-Solís, J., 2015. Leapfrog migration and habitat preferences of a small  
oceanic seabird, Bulwer's petrel (*Bulweria bulwerii*). *J. Biogeogr.* 42, 1651-1664.
- 574 Ratcliffe, N., Crofts, S., Brown, R., Baylis, A.M.M., Adlard, S., Horswill, C., Venables, H.,  
Taylor, P., Trathan, P.N., Staniland, I.J., 2014. Love thy neighbour or opposites  
576 attract? Patterns of spatial segregation and association among crested penguin  
populations during winter. *J. Biogeogr.* 41, 1183-1192.
- 578 Reid, T.A., Ronconi, R.A., Cuthbert, R.J., Ryan, P.G., 2014. The summer foraging ranges of  
adult spectacled petrels *Procellaria conspicillata*. *Antarct. Sci.* 26, 23-32.
- 580 Reid, T.A., Wanless, R.M., Hilton, G.M., Phillips, R.A., Ryan, P.G., 2013. Foraging range  
and habitat associations of non-breeding Tristan albatrosses: overlap with fisheries  
582 and implications for conservation. *Endang. Spec. Res.* 22, 39-49.
- Robertson, G., Bolton, M., Grecian, W., Monaghan, P., 2014. Inter-and intra-year variation in  
584 foraging areas of breeding kittiwakes (*Rissa tridactyla*). *Mar. Biol.* 161, 1973-1986.
- Small, C., Wolfaardt, A., Tuck, G., Debski, I., Papworth, W., Kim, M.A., Favero, M., 2015.  
586 Preliminary identification of minimum elements to review the effectiveness of seabird  
by-catch mitigation regulations in tuna RFMOs. *Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT* 71,  
588 2933-2943.
- Smith, M.A., Walker, N.J., Free, C.M., Kirchhoff, M.J., Drew, G.S., Warnock, N., Stenhouse,  
590 I.J., 2014. Identifying marine Important Bird Areas using at-sea survey data. *Biol.  
Conserv.* 172, 180-189.
- 592 Tancell, C., Sutherland, W.J., Phillips, R.A., 2016. Marine spatial planning for the  
conservation of albatrosses and large petrels breeding at South Georgia. *Biol.  
594 Conserv.* 198, 165-176.
- Tittensor, D.P., Mora, C., Jetz, W., Lotze, H.K., Ricard, D., Berghe, E.V., Worm, B., 2010.  
596 Global patterns and predictors of marine biodiversity across taxa. *Nature* 466, 1098-  
1101.
- 598 Trebilco, R., Halpern, B.S., Flemming, J.M., Field, C., Blanchard, W., Worm, B., 2011.  
Mapping species richness and human impact drivers to inform global pelagic  
600 conservation prioritisation. *Biol. Conserv.* 144, 1758-1766.
- Tuck, G.N., Phillips, R.A., Small, C., Thomson, R.B., Klaer, N.L., Taylor, F., Wanless, R.M.,  
602 Arrizabalaga, H., 2011. An assessment of seabird-fishery interactions in the Atlantic  
Ocean. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 68, 1628-1637.

- 604 Tuck, G.N., Polacheck, T., Bulman, C.M., 2003. Spatio-temporal trends of longline fishing  
effort in the Southern Ocean and implications for seabird bycatch. *Biol. Conserv.* 114,  
606 1-27.
- Wakefield, E.D., Cleasby, I.R., Bearhop, S., Bodey, T.W., Davies, R.D., Miller, P.I., Newton,  
608 J., Votier, S.C., Hamer, K.C., 2015. Long-term individual foraging site fidelity—why  
some gannets don't change their spots. *Ecology* 96, 3058-3074.
- 610 Wanless, R.M., Ryan, P.G., Altwegg, R., Angel, A., Cooper, J., Cuthbert, R., Hilton, G.M.,  
2009. From both sides: Dire demographic consequences of carnivorous mice and  
612 longlining for the critically endangered Tristan albatrosses on Gough Island. *Biol.*  
*Conserv.* 142, 1710-1718.
- 614 Williams, R., Grand, J., Hooker, S.K., Buckland, S.T., Reeves, R.R., Rojas-Bracho, L.,  
Sandilands, D., Kaschner, K., 2014. Prioritizing global marine mammal habitats using  
616 density maps in place of range maps. *Ecography* 37, 212-220.
- Winiarski, K.J., Miller, D.L., Paton, P.W.C., McWilliams, S.R., 2014. A spatial conservation  
618 prioritization approach for protecting marine birds given proposed offshore wind  
energy development. *Biol. Conserv.* 169, 79-88.
- 620 Wood, A., Naef-Daenzer, B., Prince, P., Croxall, J., 2000. Quantifying habitat use in satellite-  
tracked pelagic seabirds: application of kernel estimation to albatross locations. *J.*  
622 *Avian Biol.* 31, 278-286.
- Yorio, P., 2009. Marine protected areas, spatial scales, and governance: implications for the  
624 conservation of breeding seabirds. *Conserv. Lett.* 2, 171-178.
- Žydelis, R., Wallace, B.P., Gilman, E.L., Werner, T.B., 2009. Conservation of marine  
626 megafauna through minimization of fisheries bycatch. *Conserv. Biol.* 23, 608-616.

628

630 Table 1: Summary of the tracking data used to identify important areas for conservation in the South Atlantic Ocean. N indicates the number of  
 individual tracks of adult birds. For Atlantic Petrels and Northern Rockhopper Penguins, data from multiple years were pooled due to small  
 632 sample sizes. Values in parentheses correspond to the percentage of the world population breeding on each island (following ACAP species  
 assessments [<http://acap.aq/en/acap-species>], and BirdLife International (2016) for Atlantic Petrel and Northern Rockhopper Penguin).

Species	Colony	Summer (Jan-Mar)			Autumn (Apr-Jun)			Winter (Jul-Sep)			Spring (Oct-Dec)		
		Year	Device	N	Year	Device	N	Year	Device	N	Year	Device	N
Tristan Albatross	Gough (~100%)	2001	PTT	31	2001	PTT	81	2001	PTT	24	2004	GLS	24
		2005	GLS	18	2005	GLS	13	2004	GLS	14	2005	GLS	7
		2006	GLS	12	2010	GLS	12	2005	GLS	12	2010	GLS	12
		2011	GLS	12	2011	GLS	11	2010	GLS	12	2011	GLS	10
		2012	GLS	10				2011	GLS	10			
Atlantic Yellow-nosed Albatross	Gough (~8%)	2005	GLS	40	2005	GLS	54	2004	GLS	30	2000	PTT	7
								2005	GLS	31	2004	GLS	90
Sooty Albatross	Gough (~30%)	2004	GLS	20	2004	GLS	12	2004	GLS	17	2003	GLS	22
		2005	GLS	7	2005	GLS	6	2005	GLS	6	2004	GLS	7
		2006	GLS	6							2005	GLS	6
		2007	PTT	5									
Spectacled Petrel	Inaccessible (100%)	2010	PTT	8	2010	PTT	5	-	-	-	2009	PTT	8
Atlantic Petrel	Gough (~100%)	2011-12	GLS	7	2010-12	GLS	7	2010-12	GLS	7	2009-11	GLS	7
Northern Rockhopper Penguin	Gough (24%)	-	-	-	2011-12	GLS	9	2011-12	GLS	9	-	-	-

634

636 Table 2: Percentage of overlap between the distribution of threatened seabirds breeding in Tristan da Cunha (areas used by >20% of the population of each species at Tristan da Cunha for which tracking data were available; see Table 1) and Exclusive Economic Zones and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ, % in relation to the total area used by each species).

	Tristan Albatross	Atlantic-Yellow- nosed Albatross	Sooty Albatross	Spectacled Petrel <sup>1</sup>	Atlantic Petrel	Northern Rockhopper Penguin <sup>2</sup>
Tristan da Cunha	<b>19.3</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>26.9</b>	3.3	0.2
Brazil				<b>10.8</b>	<b>10.4</b>	
Uruguay				7.2	3.9	
Argentina				8.1	5.2	
Falkland Islands					5.6	
South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands			1.8		0.4	
Angola		2.3				
Namibia		<b>19.1</b>				
South Africa	0.1	<b>10.1</b>				
ABNJ	80.6	52.1	84.3	47.0	71.2	99.8
Total area (× 1000 km <sup>2</sup> )	3256	2800	2153	1115	2885	761

638 1 – Excluding winter (see Methods and Table 1)

2 – Only non-breeding period (autumn and winter) considered (see Methods and Table 1)

640

Figure captions:

642

644 Figure 1: Important areas used by >20% of the tracked population of six globally threatened  
646 seabirds from the Tristan da Cunha archipelago based on tracking data collected between  
2001 and 2013. Important areas were identified for each season, which are indicated by  
different colours. Currently existing marine protected areas are shaded grey. Light grey lines  
indicate the Exclusive Economic Zones of all adjacent countries and territories.

648

650 Figure 2: Season-specific Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas for globally threatened  
652 pelagic seabirds breeding in the Tristan da Cunha archipelago, based on tracking data  
collected between 2001 and 2013 (Fig. 1). Dark red borders indicate sites used by more than  
one species, the red shading gradient indicates the number of species for which an area was  
considered important. Light grey lines indicate the Exclusive Economic Zones of all adjacent  
654 countries and territories.

656 Figure 3. Marine areas in the South Atlantic Ocean with the highest value for the  
conservation of six globally threatened seabird species breeding in the Tristan da Cunha  
658 archipelago. Areas were identified using the systematic conservation-planning algorithm  
'Zonation' (see text for details); the shading reflects the priority for conservation. Only the  
660 10% most important areas (i.e., those scoring  $\geq 0.9$  on a scale from 0 to 1) are shown. Light  
grey lines indicate the Exclusive Economic Zones of all adjacent countries and territories.

## Supporting Information

### Using globally threatened pelagic birds to identify priority sites for marine conservation in the South Atlantic Ocean

Maria P. Dias<sup>1,\*</sup>, Steffen Oppel<sup>2</sup>, Alexander L. Bond<sup>2</sup>, Ana P. B. Carneiro<sup>1</sup>, Richard J. Cuthbert<sup>2</sup>, Jacob Gonzáles-Solís<sup>3</sup>, Ross Wanless<sup>4</sup>, Trevor Glass<sup>5</sup>, Ben Lascelles<sup>1</sup>, Cleo Small<sup>2</sup>, Richard A. Phillips<sup>6</sup> and Peter G. Ryan<sup>7</sup>













Figure A1: Breeding cycle of the six threatened seabirds at the Tristan da Cunha archipelago, and overlap with each season. Tristan Albatrosses are biennial breeders, so the plot reflects the alternation between breeding and sabbatical years. Based on ACAP species assessments (available at <http://acap.aq/en/acap-species>), Cuthbert (2004) for Atlantic Petrel and Cuthbert (2013) for Northern Rockhopper Penguin.

Cuthbert, R., 2004. Breeding biology of the Atlantic Petrel, *Pterodroma incerta*, and a population estimate of this and other burrowing petrels on Gough Island, South Atlantic Ocean. *Emu* 104, 221-228.

Cuthbert, R. J. 2013. Northern Rockhopper Penguin. Pages 131-143 in *Penguins: natural history and conservation* (P. G. Borboroglu, and P. D. Boersma, Eds.). University of Washington Press, Seattle.








22

Figure A2: Spatial overlap of important areas identified for three globally threatened seabird  
 24 species tracked from the Tristan da Cunha archipelago in more than one year. Each year is  
 shown in a different colour, see Table 1 for details of sample sizes and tracking devices. Grey  
 26 areas correspond to the IBA for each species (corresponding to the overlap of 2 or more years  
 of data, when available).

28




32 Figure A3: Marine areas in the South Atlantic Ocean with the highest value for the  
conservation of six globally threatened seabird species breeding in the Tristan da Cunha  
34 archipelago, derived from various iterations of the spatial prioritisation algorithm using  
arbitrary weights for device type ('dev', giving higher weight to PTT than GLS), global threat  
36 status ('IUCN', ranking CR > EN > VU), and breeding season ('breed', giving higher weight  
to the breeding season than the non-breeding season). Colour scheme is analogous to Figure 3  
38 in the main text; only the 10% most important areas (i.e., those scoring  $\geq 0.9$  on a scale from  
0 to 1) are shown.

40

42 Table S1: Fishing effort (millions of hooks deployed during the years 2000-2014) reported by  
the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT; obtained at  
44 <https://www.iccat.int/en/accesingdb.htm> on 15 Nov 2016) within the entire South Atlantic  
study area, and within the priority sites identified based on the IBAs for threatened seabirds  
46 breeding in Tristan da Cunha. Because the ICCAT data do not cover our entire study area, we  
estimated a “random fishing index” to take into account the difference in the areas being  
48 compared. The random fishing index was calculated as (total number of hooks in South  
Atlantic Study Area/ number of hooks within the priority area)/proportion of ICCAT fishing  
50 effort data covered by the priority area (fixed value=0.17). The random effort index indicates  
whether fishing effort within the priority area is greater (>1) or smaller (<1) than expected by  
52 chance if fishing effort was distributed randomly.


<b>Year</b>	<b>Estimated number of hooks within South Atlantic study area [millions]</b>	<b>Estimated number of hooks within the 10% priority area [millions]</b>	<b>Random fishing index</b>
2000	90.53	14.06	0.90
2001	110.53	19.96	1.05
2002	98.16	14.95	0.89
2003	78.65	11.37	0.85
2004	82.97	11.92	0.84
2005	72.99	9.66	0.78
2006	83.65	9.47	0.67
2007	74.42	9.69	0.75
2008	68.14	9.19	0.79
2009	69.96	8.26	0.69
2010	70.41	8.45	0.69
2011	81.75	9.31	0.67
2012	66.43	9.9	0.96
2013	66.02	9.86	0.88
2014	50.67	6.6	0.76

Figure 1




2

4 Figure 2



6

Figure 3



8