



HAL
open science

Sharing wintering grounds does not synchronize annual survival in a high Arctic seabird, the little auk

S Descamps, B Merkel, H Strøm, Rémi Choquet, H Steen, Jérôme Fort, M Gavriilo, David Grémillet, D Jakubas, K Jerstad, et al.

► To cite this version:

S Descamps, B Merkel, H Strøm, Rémi Choquet, H Steen, et al.. Sharing wintering grounds does not synchronize annual survival in a high Arctic seabird, the little auk. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 2021, SEA, 10.3354/meps13400 . hal-03017418

HAL Id: hal-03017418

<https://hal.science/hal-03017418v1>

Submitted on 20 Nov 2020

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

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

1 Sharing wintering grounds does not synchronize annual survival in a high

2 Arctic seabird, the little auk

3
4 Sébastien Descamps^{*},¹, Benjamin Merkel¹, Hallvard Strøm¹, Rémi Choquet², Harald Steen¹, Jérôme
5 Fort³, Maria Gavrilov⁴, David Grémillet², Dariusz Jakubas⁵, Kurt Jerstad⁶, Nina J. Karnovsky⁷, Yuri
6 V. Krasnov⁴, Børge Moe⁸, Jorg Welcker⁹ and Katarzyna Wojczulanis-Jakubas⁵

7
8 ¹ Norwegian Polar Institute, Fram Centre, 9296 Tromsø, Norway

9 ² Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, UMR 5175, CNRS - Université de Montpellier -
10 Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier - EPHE, 34293 Montpellier, France

11 ³ Littoral, Environnement et Sociétés (LIENSs), UMR 7266 CNRS – La Rochelle Université, 17000
12 La Rochelle, France

13 ⁴ Association Maritime Heritage, Saint Petersburg, Russia

14 ⁵ University of Gdańsk, Faculty of Biology, Department of Vertebrate Ecology and Zoology, 80-308
15 Gdańsk, Poland

16 ⁶ Aurebekksveien 61, 4515 Mandal, Norway

17 ⁷ Pomona College, Department of Biology, Claremont, California, 91711 USA

18 ⁸ Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, 7034 Trondheim, Norway

19 ⁹ BioConsult SH, 25813 Husum, Germany

20 Running page head: Little auk winter distribution and survival

21
22 * *Corresponding author*

23 ***Sébastien Descamps***

24 *sebastien.descamps@npolar.no*

26 **ABSTRACT**

27 Sharing the same wintering grounds by avian populations breeding in various areas may
28 synchronize fluctuations in vital rates, which could increase the risk of extinction. Here, by
29 combining multi-colony tracking with long-term capture-recapture data, we studied the winter
30 distribution and annual survival of the most numerous Arctic seabird, the little auk *Alle alle*. We
31 assessed whether or not little auks from different breeding populations in Svalbard and Franz Josef
32 Land use the same wintering grounds and if this leads to synchronized survival. Our results indicate
33 that birds from the Svalbard colonies shared similar wintering grounds, though differences existed
34 in the proportion of birds from each colony using the different areas. Little auks from Franz Josef
35 Land generally spent the winter in a separate area but some individuals wintered in the Iceland Sea
36 with Svalbard populations. Survival data from three Svalbard colonies collected in 2005-2018
37 indicated that sharing wintering grounds did not synchronize little auk annual survival rates.
38 However, it is clear that the Iceland Sea is an important wintering area for little auks and
39 environmental changes in this area could have widespread impacts on many populations.

40

41 Key-words: migration, synchrony, *Alle alle*, non-breeding distribution, geolocator, capture-mark-
42 recapture

43 **1. INTRODUCTION**

44 Knowledge about the migratory connectivity, i.e. the link between breeding and non-breeding areas,
45 (Taylor & Norris, 2010), is required to understand the degree of dependency among populations on
46 a specific environment or geographic area, and their sensitivity to environmental changes occurring
47 in this area. Sharing the same environment during winter may synchronize fluctuations of distant
48 populations through a so-called Moran effect. This effect corresponds to the synchronization in the
49 dynamics of populations by density-independent factors (like climate) that are correlated across
50 wide regions (Moran 1953, Bjørnstad et al. 1999). and which may increase the risk of extinction
51 (Heino et al. 1997, Palmqvist & Lundberg 1998, Engen et al. 2005). Moreover, knowledge of
52 migratory connectivity, and more specifically inter-population mixing in the wintering grounds, will
53 help to define appropriate conservation or management units (Webster et al. 2002, Runge et al.
54 2015). Protecting a specific wintering area will have different effects in the case of low or high
55 inter-population mixing, i.e. if it is used by individuals from only one or from several breeding
56 populations (Finch et al. 2017).

57 To assess such migratory connectivity and its potential importance for population or species
58 dynamics, it is necessary to (i) assess the winter distribution of several populations of the same
59 species, and (ii) determine whether or not sharing this wintering ground synchronizes the
60 populations' trajectories. Many migratory species are long-lived and their population dynamics and
61 viability are particularly sensitive to changes in adult survival (Saether & Bakke 2000) and to
62 changes that occur during the non-breeding season (e.g., Gaston 2003, Descamps et al. 2013,
63 Reiertsen et al. 2014). It is therefore especially important to understand the potential relationships
64 between conditions in the wintering grounds and adult survival. Mapping the winter distribution of
65 migratory species has, until recently, been extremely challenging, especially for small species that
66 cannot be equipped with large telemetry devices (Ropert-Coudert & Wilson 2005). However, the

67 development of new technologies in the last three decades and the miniaturization of data loggers
68 and transmitters has led to a large increase in our understanding of migratory species movements
69 (Ropert-Coudert & Wilson 2005). To link these movements and migratory behaviours to population
70 dynamics, long-term monitoring data of population size and/or vital rates are needed. These data are
71 particularly valuable for Arctic species experiencing rapid and large scale environmental changes
72 (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2013, AMAP 2017, Descamps et al. 2017), and for
73 whom long-term data are challenging to collect. (Mallory et al. 2018).

74 Here, we studied the annual survival of the most numerous Arctic seabird, the little auk *Alle*
75 *alle*, in relation to its winter distribution. More specifically, using individual tracking data, we
76 mapped the winter distribution of little auks breeding in five Arctic colonies to assess whether or
77 not individuals from different breeding populations use the same wintering grounds. Using long-
78 term (2005-2018) Capture-Mark-Resighting (CMR) data from three of these colonies, we tested the
79 hypothesis that sharing the same wintering ground leads to synchronized survival rates.

80

81 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

82 ***2.1. Study sites and little auk life history***

83 The little auk is a seabird with a single-egg clutch and strong mate and nest fidelity (Stempniewicz
84 2001). It adopts a life-history strategy typical of long-lived species with a population dynamic
85 highly sensitive to changes in adult survival. As with most seabirds, little auks have a delayed age
86 of first reproduction and do not start breeding before the age of three (unpubl. results). The little auk
87 is zooplanktivorous and during the summer, preferentially forages on high-lipid copepods
88 associated with Arctic waters. *Calanus glacialis* generally represents the main prey in Svalbard
89 (Węsławski et al. 1999, Harding et al. 2009, Kwasniewski et al. 2010, Jakubas et al. 2012, Hovinen
90 et al. 2014b) while both *C. hyperboreus* and *C. glacialis* are the main prey species in Franz Josef

91 Land (Wesławski et al. 1994, Gremillet et al. 2015). During the non-breeding season, the diet of the
92 little auk is less known but may be based on krill spp., *Themisto* spp. and capelin *Mallotus villosus*
93 at least in some parts of its wintering range (Rosing-Asvid et al. 2013a).

94 We collected tracking data (details below) from five colonies: Kongsfjorden (Svalbard,
95 78°00'N, 12°24'E), Isfjorden (Svalbard, 78°14'N, 15°19'E), Bjørnøya (Svalbard, 74°31'N, 19°01'E),
96 Hornsund (Svalbard, 77°00'N, 15°33'E) and Franz Josef Land (Russia, 80°20'N, 52°49'E ; Fig.1).
97 Kongsfjorden and Isfjorden are located in the middle of the west Spitsbergen coast, which is
98 influenced by the warm West Spitsbergen Current (WSC), while Bjørnøya is located in the Barents
99 Sea between the north Norwegian coast and Svalbard. Little auks from these three colonies thus
100 forage in an environment with low Arctic conditions. The Hornsund area is characterized by high
101 Arctic conditions and is typically surrounded by water masses colder than Isfjorden and
102 Kongsfjorden due to the influence of the coastal Sørkapp Current, carrying cold, less saline Arctic-
103 type water from the northeast Barents Sea (Swerpel 1985, Jakubas et al. 2013). Franz Josef Land is
104 also characterized by high Arctic environmental conditions (Wesławski et al. 1994).

105 We collected CMR data in three Svalbard colonies: Kongsfjorden, Isfjorden, and Bjørnøya
106 from 2005 (Isfjorden and Bjørnøya) or 2006 (Kongsfjorden) to 2018.

107

108 ***2.2. Identification of the wintering grounds***

109 We identified wintering grounds by deploying light-level geolocators on the little auks (Wilson et
110 al. 1992, Fort et al. 2013). Raw positions obtained by geolocation have a relative high average error,
111 which is usually ~200 km (Phillips et al. 2004, Lisovski et al. 2012). As such, they are appropriate
112 to answer research questions about large-scale movements and distribution (Lisovski et al., 2012,
113 2019). The geolocators were mounted on a plastic leg band on tarsus. During the period 2010 to
114 2017 we deployed more than 524 geolocators in the five study colonies, of which 242 geolocators

115 were retrieved between 2011 and 2018 (Table SM1). The available tracking data resulted in 248
116 annual tracks from 188 individuals (tracking data were not obtained in the same years for all
117 colonies; see details in Table SM1). We used several geolocator models (mk18l from British
118 Antarctic Survey, mk4093 from Biotrack, c65 from Migrate Technology, all from Cambridge, UK),
119 and different light thresholds were used in subsequent processing of the light data (1-16, in arbitrary
120 units or lux). After calibration, we assigned appropriate sun elevation angles (-2.5° - -4.5°) to the
121 different light thresholds and geolocator models. The tracking data for 2010/11 is part of the study
122 by Fort et al. (2013), and we applied the same calibration process as Fort et al. (2013) for the
123 geolocators retrieved in period 2010-2014. This method is based on plotting estimated latitudes
124 over time using a range of sun elevation angles and selecting the angle that minimized the variance
125 of latitudes around the equinox periods. Geolocators retrieved after 2014 were part of the
126 SEATRACK project (<http://www.seapop.no/en/seatrack/>) and were calibrated using a slightly
127 different approach (Strøm et al. 2019) that followed the same general principles as described above.
128 When using the approach by Fort et al. (2013) most geolocators were assigned with the same sun
129 elevation angle (representing the best average), while in the latter approach we allowed individual
130 angles for each geolocator/track. This inconsistency has only a limited potential effect on the
131 estimated latitudes and does not affect the conclusions of this study.

132 In order to reduce the influence of inaccurate positions, we used the double smoothing
133 procedure described by Hanssen et al. (2016). Latitudes obtained by geolocation are unreliable
134 around the equinoxes, when day length is constant at all latitudes. In this study, we used positions
135 from winter only, defined as December and January, which are not affected by equinox.

136

137 ***2.3. Statistical analyses***

138 *2.3.1. Little auk wintering areas*

139 We performed kernel analysis to determine high-density aggregations of little auks during winter,
140 defined as December and January, when birds are assumed to occupy their main wintering range
141 (Fort et al. 2012). To estimate colony-specific little auk distributions during the winter, we
142 calculated individual kernel utilization distributions (UD) for tracked birds on a 25x25 km grid in
143 an azimuthal equidistant projection centered on 66°N and 4°W. We used the package AdehabitatHR
144 (Calenge 2006) from R version 4.0.0 software (R Development Core Team 2016) and a constant
145 smoothing parameter of 50 km. For individuals with more than one year of tracking data, a random
146 year was selected for further analyses to avoid pseudo-replication. We extracted the 75% kernel
147 contour for each individual, rasterized them (with a value of 1) on the same 25x25 km grid and
148 combined all of these individual raster layers to establish colony-specific winter aggregations. To
149 estimate overall little auk wintering areas across colonies, we summed up all colony-specific raster
150 layers. As sample size differed between colonies (table SM1), we rescaled all rasterized winter
151 distributions to 1 before combining them. Finally, we defined the area of highest-density
152 aggregation of little auks from all investigated colonies as the area encompassed by the 90%
153 quantile. We calculated the proportional use of this area by each colony as the number of individual
154 75% kernel contours of tracked birds overlapping with this area compared to the total number of
155 tracked individuals, while taking into account the fraction of individuals without positional data due
156 to a lack of twilight events during polar night. We quantified inter-colony overlap in winter
157 distribution using Bhattacharyya's affinity (Fieberg & Kochanny 2005), which we estimated
158 between colony-specific kernel UDs of all tracked individuals (same parameters as above).

159

160 2.3.2. *Little auk survival modeling*

161 We captured, marked and re-sighted little auks in specific study plots in three colonies
162 (Kongsfjorden, Isfjorden and Bjørnøya), with slightly different methods. We ringed birds with both

163 steel and plastic color bands, which allowed identification at a distance. We only included in this
164 study those birds captured for the first time as adults (of unknown age). In all three colonies, we
165 carried out fieldwork from approximately mid-June (incubation) to late July (chick-rearing). In
166 Kongsfjorden and Isfjorden, we captured birds using nylon loops deployed on top of random rocks
167 within the study plots, while at Bjørnøya, we captured birds by various methods, including nets at
168 nest entrance and remote snare traps. In total, 781, 592 and 972 adult little auks were ringed in
169 Kongsfjorden, Isfjorden and Bjørnøya, respectively, in the period 2005-2018 (average of 71 new
170 rings/year, range [6, 336] in Kongsfjorden, of 46 new rings/year, range [8, 108] in Isfjorden, and of
171 75 new rings/year, range [28, 132] on Bjørnøya). We used the software E-Surge (Choquet et al.
172 2009) to model CMR data to estimate survival rates (Lebreton et al. 1992a), with data from the
173 three colonies combined and defined as three different groups. The method cannot separate
174 permanent emigration from mortality and only estimates apparent survival. However, little auks
175 show a very high colony and nest fidelity (Stempniewicz 2001) and the assumption that apparent
176 survival reflects true survival is robust. We considered both males and females together to estimate
177 little auk adult survival as preliminary analyses indicated no sex-difference in survival. Details
178 about the CMR modelling, model selection procedure and goodness-of-fit tests are given in
179 supplementary material Text SM1.

180 To assess the synchrony among colonies in little auk survival rate fluctuations, we used two
181 different approaches. First, we compared additive and interactive time-dependent models.
182 Synchronous variation in survival should lead to survival varying in parallel through time among
183 colonies, so that a model with an additive time effect (model $\phi(g+t)$ where ϕ represents the survival,
184 g the group or colony and t the time) should be preferred over a model where each colony shows
185 different interannual variation (model $\phi(g,t)$). Second, we considered the survival rates of each
186 colony (of the non-transient group, see details in Text SM1) estimated from time-dependent models

187 $\phi(g,t)$ and calculated the mean cross-correlation (which quantifies the synchrony) and associated
188 bootstrap confidence intervals using the mSynch function in the ncf package (Bjørnstad et al. 1999,
189 Bjørnstad 2009) in R software (R Development Core Team 2016).

190

191 **3. RESULTS**

192 ***3.1. Little auk wintering distribution***

193 During the winter months (December-January), little auks from Svalbard and Franz Josef Land
194 dispersed to the area between eastern Canada and the Barents Sea (Fig. 1). Birds from Kongsfjorden
195 and Isfjorden were mostly distributed in eastern Canada (Labrador Sea), south Greenland and in the
196 Iceland Sea (Fig1). Kongsfjorden birds, however, migrated to the mouth of Hudson Strait and fewer
197 Kongsfjorden birds than Isfjorden ones went to southeast Greenland (Fig. 1). Birds from Hornsund
198 and Bjørnøya were mostly present in the Iceland Sea and around the southern tip of Greenland (Fig.
199 1). Birds from Franz Josef Land stayed mainly in the Barents Sea and in the Iceland Sea (Fig. 1).
200 Despite some differences among colonies in their winter distribution, the area in the Iceland Sea
201 was used by birds from all study sites in December and January (Fig. 2a). Approximately half of the
202 tracked birds from Hornsund and Bjørnøya and 20-30% of those from Kongsfjorden and Isfjorden
203 spent the winter in this area (Fig. 2b). The proportion of Franz Josef Land birds wintering in the
204 Iceland Sea was lower (approximately 10%, Fig. 2b). Most of the Franz Josef Land population
205 wintered in the Barents Sea and/or at high latitudes above the Arctic circle. Indeed, the majority of
206 the light data from Franz Josef land little auks did not include any twilight events (Fig. 2c) which
207 implies that the birds were staying at high latitudes where night was permanent. The proportion of
208 birds using the Iceland Sea throughout the winter followed a similar trajectory for all colonies. The
209 number of birds there increased until late November, was the highest in December/January and then
210 decreased from late January onwards, when birds most likely started their spring migration (Fig. 2b
211 and Fig. SM2).

212 When considering the entire winter distribution for each colony (as colony-specific kernel UD
213 in December/January), we found that the overlap was high among all Svalbard colonies (i.e.
214 Bhattacharyya's affinity > 0.6) and not a function of the distance between these colonies (Table 1).
215 This overlap was smaller between Franz Josef Land and Svalbard colonies (Bhattacharyya's affinity
216 < 0.6 ; Table 1). Given that the majority of tracked individuals from Franz Josef Land spent the
217 winter where there is continuous polar night and thus where birds' positions cannot be estimated
218 (Fig. SM1), the overlap between Svalbard colonies and Franz Josef Land is likely overestimated.

219

220 **3.2. Synchrony in survival fluctuations**

221 The average survival of little auks was different among colonies (model ϕ_{g+t} was preferred over
222 model ϕ_t ; Table 2), being slightly higher in Isfjorden. (Isfjorden: 0.80, 95% CI: [0.77, 0.83];
223 Kongsfjorden: 0.85, 95% CI: [0.82, 0.88] and 0Bjørnøya: 0.81, 95% CI: [0.79, 0.83]). Little auk
224 survival showed significant inter-annual fluctuations (Fig. 1; Table SM2) and a model constraining
225 survival to vary in parallel among colonies was preferred (i.e. lower AIC for the additive model
226 ϕ_{g+t} than for model $\phi_{g,t}$; Table 2). However, this mostly reflects the rather large confidence
227 intervals around survival estimates, rather than the variation in their means (which are not parallel,
228 especially for Kongsfjorden). This result also seems mostly driven by Isfjorden and Bjørnøya,
229 which have more similar inter-annual variations as compared to Kongsfjorden (Fig. 2). This is
230 supported by the fact that a model constraining only Isfjorden and Bjørnøya survival to vary in
231 parallel (i.e. model $\phi_{g(1).t+g(2,3)+t}$) had a better fit than models constraining only Kongsfjorden and
232 Bjørnøya, or Kongsfjorden and Isfjorden to vary in parallel (Table 2).

233 The cross-correlation coefficient between the annual survival from these three colonies
234 (survival rates estimated from model $\phi_{g,t}$) indicates that the overall synchrony was weak and non-
235 significant (cross-correlation = 0.10, 95% CI: [-0.25, 0.30]). This coefficient is not taking the

236 uncertainty around the means (i.e. confidence intervals) into account and only reflects the lack of
237 synchrony in the variations of the mean annual survival rates (Fig.2).

238

239 **4. DISCUSSION**

240 By tracking little auks from five different colonies in the European Arctic, we found that birds
241 breeding in Svalbard had a similar winter distribution, though some differences exist (Fig. SM1).
242 Birds from Franz Josef Land differed more markedly and mostly stayed in the Barents Sea during
243 winter. The Barents Sea is rapidly changing and has become increasingly suitable habitat for
244 wintering little auks (Clairbaux et al. 2019). However the area used by Franz Josef Land little auks
245 has been mostly ice-free in winter, for at least the last 150 years (Shapiro et al. 2006). Therefore,
246 the current winter distribution of little auks in the Barents Sea may not represent contemporary
247 changes in the recent rapid loss of sea-ice (e.g. Parkinson et al. 1999, Li et al. 2017). Despite these
248 differences among colonies in their winter distribution, we identified a key wintering area in the
249 Iceland Sea, where some birds from all of Svalbard and Franz Josef Land colonies spent the winter
250 months. These results confirm that little auks from the European Arctic share, to varying degrees,
251 their wintering grounds. The proportion of tracked birds spending the winter north of Iceland varied
252 among colonies but was as high as 50-60% for birds breeding in Bjørnøya and Hornsund. Svalbard
253 and Franz Josef Land host more than 1.5 million breeding pairs of little auks (Keslinka et al. 2019),
254 indicating that a huge number of little auks likely spend the winter months in this area (though this
255 still represents a small proportion of the entire Atlantic population estimated at several 10s of
256 million pairs, del Hoyo et al. 1996). The importance of the Iceland Sea during winter for little auks
257 breeding in Svalbard and East Greenland had already been suggested (Fort et al. 2013). Our results
258 corroborate this finding by showing that even little auks from the Franz Josef Land population
259 utilize this area. The number of birds from Svalbard and Russia wintering there was highest in

260 December-January, and then gradually decreased from February onwards. Other Arctic seabirds
261 spend the winter in this region as well, such as Brünnich's guillemots *Uria lomvia* from Bjørnøya
262 (Frederiksen et al. 2016) and other alcid species breeding in Iceland (Linnebjerg et al. 2018). The
263 Iceland Sea can therefore be considered as a hotspot for wintering Arctic seabirds, with hotspot
264 defined as “an area where high abundances of species overlap in space and time” (Davoren 2007).

265 This hotspot is located between Jan Mayen and Iceland over the Jan Mayen ridge and is
266 characterized by complex oceanic currents (Astthorsson et al. 2007, Mork et al. 2014). This ridge
267 separates the warm Atlantic waters in the Norwegian Sea from the cold Arctic ones in the Iceland
268 Sea. As with most oceanic front systems, it is associated with high marine productivity and
269 densities of zooplankton (e.g. Wiborg 1955, Trudnowska et al. 2012) and thus potentially high prey
270 availability for little auks. The winter diet of little auks is poorly known but krill (*Euphausiacea*)
271 may represent an important prey in parts of the wintering range (Fort et al. 2010, Rosing-Asvid et
272 al. 2013b). Recent studies have also suggested that the winter distribution of little auks is linked to
273 the distribution of the copepod *Calanus finnmarchicus* (Fort et al. 2012, Amélineau et al. 2018).
274 These species are among the most abundant zooplankton in the Iceland Sea, though the overall
275 plankton abundance declines in winter (Gislason & Silva 2012). However, despite such a seasonal
276 decline, zooplankton biomass in the core wintering areas of little auks, remains relatively high, at
277 least in some years (Fig. SM3).

278 Capture-recapture data were available from three of the five study colonies to determine the
279 level of synchrony in their survival rates. The average survival in the three colonies was similar
280 (approx. 0.80), though slightly higher in Isfjorden. This is also comparable with the survival of
281 Greenlandic little auks (Amélineau et al. 2019) and with other alcids of similar size and life-history
282 (i.e. single-egg layers)(e.g., average adult survival of 0.83 for the Marbled murrelet *Brachyramphus*
283 *marmoratus*, Cam et al. 2003, of 0.80 for the Kittlitz's murrelet *Brachyramphus brevirostris*,

284 Kissling et al. 2015). The survival of Svalbard little auks showed high inter-annual fluctuations, as
285 observed in previous studies both in Svalbard and Greenland (Hovinen et al. 2014a, Amélineau et
286 al. 2019). The magnitude of these fluctuations is surprising (and thus far unexplained) for a species
287 in which adult survival has the largest influence on the population growth rate (Stearns & Kawecki
288 1994). However, such large inter-annual fluctuations in survival seem to be common in alcids and
289 have been observed in Ancient Murrelets *Synthliboramphus antiquus* (Gaston & Descamps 2011),
290 least auklets *Aethia pusilla* (Jones et al. 2002), Brünnich's guillemots *Uria lomvia* (Fluhr et al.
291 2017) and Atlantic puffins *Fratercula arctica* (Sandvik et al. 2005).

292 Two of the Svalbard little auk colonies (Kongsfjorden and Isfjorden) had a very similar
293 winter distribution. The third Svalbard colony (Bjørnøya) differed slightly with the majority of
294 birds staying north of Iceland or around the southern tip of Greenland and with very few birds
295 wintering along the Labrador coast. The synchrony in survival rates did not reflect these patterns in
296 wintering areas. Indeed, Bjørnøya and Isfjorden had more similar survival fluctuations throughout
297 the study period while survival fluctuations from Kongsfjorden differed markedly. Even if a model
298 with parallel survival for the three colonies was preferred, this was likely driven by the large
299 confidence intervals around the mean survival rates and overall, the synchrony in these mean
300 survival rates was very low. This shows that sharing part of the same wintering grounds was
301 insufficient to synchronize little auks' average annual survival rates. Several non-exclusive
302 explanations can be proposed. First, the survival of little auks may have been more affected by what
303 happened outside of the winter period (see for example Schaub et al. 2005 where survival of white
304 storks was mostly determined by conditions at one staging area used in the autumn). For instance,
305 little auks may be particularly vulnerable to environmental constraints during their flightless post-
306 breeding moulting period, for which contrasting distributions between Svalbard colonies were
307 suggested (Fort et al. 2013). It has also been shown, though based on a very short time-series, that

308 an increase in the summer sea surface temperature resulted in a decrease in survival rates of adult
309 little auks at some Svalbard colonies, probably through impaired nutritional status during the
310 breeding season (Hovinen et al. 2014a). A study performed in one Greenland colony during a
311 breeding season with relatively poor foraging conditions (reflected in elevated levels of
312 corticosterone) found that little auk parents ended the reproductive season with low body mass and
313 suffered increased post-breeding mortality (Harding et al. 2011). These results stress the importance
314 of conditions experienced during the summer (i.e. breeding) period in driving little auk survival.
315 Assessing the overlap in little auk distribution outside the winter period (i.e. during the breeding
316 season, molting period and migration) would be needed but presents important challenges. In
317 particular, constant darkness and/or daylight for part of the year at high latitudes combined with the
318 difficulty of estimating bird positions around the equinoxes prevent the use of light data to map
319 little auk distribution during a large part of their annual cycle. Using different tracking devices
320 and/or supplementing the light data with other sources of information (see details in Merkel et al.
321 2016 for example) would be necessary. Second, even if little auks shared the same space on a large
322 scale during winter, birds from different breeding grounds may segregate at a finer scale (temporal
323 or spatial) and use different environments and potentially food sources. To test this hypothesis, fine-
324 scale tracking data, potentially combined with diet information from wintering little auks, would be
325 necessary.

326 *Conclusion*

327 Our study identified a common wintering ground used by little auks from both Svalbard and Franz
328 Josef Land (Russian Arctic). This result has important management and conservation implications.
329 Even though sharing part of the wintering grounds did not lead to synchronized annual survival
330 during our study, what happens at these wintering grounds, and in particular in this common area
331 north of Iceland, may still have an effect on their population dynamics. Indeed, by using the same

332 wintering grounds, populations of little auks are likely to experience similar environmental
333 conditions during this season and are thus, to some extent, subject to the same environmental
334 drivers of population change. Any change in this region, like an increase in shipping or drilling
335 activities, modifications to resource availability or climate conditions, could thus have a widespread
336 effect on little auks breeding throughout the European Arctic.

337

338 **Acknowledgements**

339 This research was funded by the programs SEATRACK (<http://www.seapop.no/en/seatrack/>),
340 SEAPOPOP (<http://www.seapop.no/en/>) and MOSJ (<http://www.mosj.no/en/>). We thank all the field
341 workers that helped in collecting the data and in particular Delphin Ruché, Saga Svavarsdóttir,
342 Iñigo López Sarasa, Antonio Vilches, Charlotte Lassen, Bart Peeters, Ireen Vieweg, Coline
343 Marciaiu, and Benjamin Metzger for Kongsfjorden and Isfjorden fieldwork and Madeleine Stigner
344 for Hornsund fieldwork.

345

346 **Literature cited**

- 347 AMAP (2017) Snow, Water, Ice and Permafrost in the Arctic (SWIPA). In, Oslo, Norway
348 Amélineau F, Fort J, Mathewson P, Speirs D, Courbin N, Perret S, Porter W, Wilson R, Grémillet
349 D (2018) Energyscapes and prey fields shape a North Atlantic seabird wintering hotspot
350 under climate change. *Royal Society open science* 5:171883
351 Amélineau F, Grémillet D, Harding AM, Walkusz W, Choquet R, Fort J (2019) Arctic climate
352 change and pollution impact little auk foraging and fitness across a decade. *Scientific*
353 *reports* 9:1014
354 Astthorsson OS, Gislason A, Jonsson S (2007) Climate variability and the Icelandic marine
355 ecosystem. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* 54:2456-2477
356 Bjørnstad ON (2009) ncf: spatial nonparametric covariance functions. R package version 1.1-3.
357 <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ncf>.
358 Bjørnstad ON, Ims RA, Lambin X (1999) Spatial population dynamics: analyzing patterns and
359 processes of population synchrony. *Trends Ecol Evol* 14:427-432
360 Calenge C (2006) The package “adehabitat” for the R software: a tool for the analysis of space and
361 habitat use by animals. *Ecol Modell* 197:516-519
362 Cam E, Loughheed L, Bradley R, Cooke F (2003) Demographic assessment of a marbled murrelet
363 population from capture-recapture data. *Conservation Biology* 17:1118-1126
364 Choquet R, Rouan L, Pradel R (2009) Program E-SURGE: a software application for fitting
365 Multievent models. In: Thomson DL, Cooch EG, Conroy MJ (eds) *Environmental and*
366 *Ecological Statistics*, Book 3
367 Clairbaux M, Fort J, Mathewson P, Porter W, Strøm H, Grémillet D (2019) Climate change could
368 overturn bird migration: Transarctic flights and high-latitude residency in a sea ice free
369 Arctic. *Scientific Reports* 9:1-13
370 Davoren GK (2007) Effects of gill-net fishing on marine birds in a biological hotspot in the
371 Northwest Atlantic. *Conservation Biology* 21:1032-1045
372 del Hoyo J, Elliott A, Sargatal J (1996) *Handbook of the Birds of the World*, vol. 3: Hoatzin to
373 Auks. , Vol. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain
374 Descamps S, Aars J, Fuglei E, Kovacs KM, Lydersen C, Pavlova O, Pedersen AO, Ravolainen V,

- 375 Strøm H (2017) Climate change impacts on wildlife in a High Arctic archipelago - Svalbard,
 376 Norway. *Glob Change Biol* 23:490-502
- 377 Descamps S, Strøm H, Steen H (2013) Decline of an arctic top predator: synchrony in colony size
 378 fluctuations, risk of extinction and the subpolar gyre. *Oecologia* 173:1271-1282
- 379 Engen S, Lande R, Saether BE, Bregnballe T (2005) Estimating the pattern of synchrony in
 380 fluctuating populations. *J Anim Ecol* 74:601-611
- 381 Fieberg J, Kochanny CO (2005) Quantifying home-range overlap: the importance of the utilization
 382 distribution. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 69:1346-1359
- 383 Finch T, Butler SJ, Franco AM, Cresswell W (2017) Low migratory connectivity is common in
 384 long-distance migrant birds. *J Anim Ecol* 86:662-673
- 385 Fluhr J, Strøm H, Pradel R, Duriez O, Beaugrand G, Descamps S (2017) Weakening of the subpolar
 386 gyre as a key driver of North Atlantic seabird demography: a case study with Brünnich's
 387 guillemots in Svalbard. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 563:1-11
- 388 Fort J, Beaugrand G, Grémillet D, Phillips RA (2012) Biologging, remotely-sensed oceanography
 389 and the continuous plankton recorder reveal the environmental determinants of a seabird
 390 wintering hotspot. *PloS one* 7:e41194
- 391 Fort J, Cherel Y, Harding AM, Egevang C, Steen H, Kuntz G, Porter WP, Grémillet D (2010) The
 392 feeding ecology of little auks raises questions about winter zooplankton stocks in North
 393 Atlantic surface waters. *Biol Lett* 6:682-684
- 394 Fort J, Moe B, Strom H, Gremillet D, Welcker J, Schultner J, Jerstad K, Johansen KL, Phillips RA,
 395 Mosbech A (2013) Multicolony tracking reveals potential threats to little auks wintering in
 396 the North Atlantic from marine pollution and shrinking sea ice cover. *Divers Distrib*
 397 19:1322-1332
- 398 Frederiksen M, Descamps S, Erikstad KE, Gaston AJ, Gilchrist HG, Grémillet D, Johansen KL,
 399 Kolbeinsson Y, Linnebjerg JF, Mallory ML (2016) Migration and wintering of a declining
 400 seabird, the thick-billed murre *Uria lomvia*, on an ocean basin scale: Conservation
 401 implications. *Biol Conserv* 200:26-35
- 402 Gaston A, Descamps S (2011) Population change in a marine bird colony is driven by changes in
 403 recruitment. *Avian Conservation and Ecology* 6
- 404 Gaston AJ (2003) Synchronous fluctuations of thick-billed murre (*Uria lomvia*) colonies in the
 405 eastern Canadian arctic suggest population regulation in winter. *The Auk* 120:362-370
- 406 Gislason A, Silva T (2012) Abundance, composition, and development of zooplankton in the
 407 Subarctic Iceland Sea in 2006, 2007, and 2008. *ICES J Mar Sci* 69:1263-1276
- 408 Grémillet D, Fort J, Amelineau F, Zakharova E, Le Bot T, Sala E, Gavrilov M (2015) Arctic
 409 warming: nonlinear impacts of sea-ice and glacier melt on seabird foraging. *Glob Change*
 410 *Biol* 21:1116-1123
- 411 Hanssen SA, Gabrielsen GW, Bustnes JO, Bråthen VS, Skottene E, Fenstad AA, Strøm H, Bakken
 412 V, Phillips RA, Moe B (2016) Migration strategies of common eiders from Svalbard:
 413 implications for bilateral conservation management. *Polar Biol* 39:2179-2188
- 414 Harding AMA, Egevang C, Walkusz W, Merkel F, Blanc S, Grémillet D (2009) Estimating prey
 415 capture rates of a planktivorous seabird, the little auk (*Alle alle*), using diet, diving
 416 behaviour, and energy consumption. *Polar Biol* 32:785-796
- 417 Heino M, Kaitala V, Ranta E, Lindstrom J (1997) Synchronous dynamics and rates of extinction in
 418 spatially structured populations. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 264:481-486
- 419 Hovinen JEH, Welcker J, Descamps S, Strøm H, Jerstad K, Berge J, Steen H (2014a) Climate
 420 warming decreases the survival of the little auk (*Alle alle*), a high Arctic avian predator.
 421 *Ecol and Evol* 4:3127-3138
- 422 Hovinen JEH, Wojczulanis-Jakubas K, Jakubas D, Hop H, Berge J, Kidawa D, Karnovsky NJ,

423 Steen H (2014b) Fledging success of little auks in the high Arctic: do provisioning rates and
424 the quality of foraging grounds matter? *Polar Biol* 37:665-674

425 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2013) *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science*
426 *Basis. Working Group II Contribution to the IPCC 5th Assessment Report, Vol.*
427 <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2/>

428 Jakubas D, Iliszko L, Wojczulanis-Jakubas K, Stempniewicz L (2012) Foraging by little auks in the
429 distant marginal sea ice zone during the chick-rearing period. *Polar Biol* 35:73-81

430 Jakubas D, Trudnowska E, Wojczulanis-Jakubas K, Iliszko L, Kidawa D, Darecki M, Błachowiak-
431 Samołyk K, Stempniewicz L (2013) Foraging closer to the colony leads to faster growth in
432 little auks. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 489:263-278

433 Jones IL, Hunter FM, Robertson GJ (2002) Annual adult survival of Least Auklets (Aves, Alcidae)
434 varies with large-scale climatic conditions of the North Pacific Ocean. *Oecologia* 133:38-44

435 Keslinka LK, Wojczulanis-Jakubas K, Jakubas D, Neubauer G (2019) Determinants of the little auk
436 (Alle alle) breeding colony location and size in W and NW coast of Spitsbergen. *PloS One*
437 14:e0212668

438 Kissling ML, Lukacs PM, Gende SM, Lewis SB (2015) Multi-state mark–recapture model to
439 estimate survival of a dispersed-nesting seabird, the Kittlitz's Murrelet. *The Journal of*
440 *Wildlife Management* 79:20-30

441 Konyukhov N (2002) Possible ways of spreading and evolution of Alcids. *Biology Bulletin of the*
442 *Russian Academy of Sciences* 29:447-454

443 Kwasniewski S, Gluchowska M, Jakubas D, Wojczulanis-Jakubas K, Walkusz W, Karnovsky N,
444 Błachowiak-Samołyk K, Cisek M, Stempniewicz L (2010) The impact of different
445 hydrographic conditions and zooplankton communities on provisioning Little Auks along
446 the West coast of Spitsbergen. *Prog Oceanogr* 87:72-82

447 Lebreton J-D, Burnham KP, Clobert J, Anderson DR (1992a) Modeling survival and testing
448 biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecol*
449 *Monogr* 62:67-118

450 Lebreton JD, Burnham KP, Clobert J, Anderson DR (1992b) Modeling survival and testing
451 biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecol*
452 *Monogr* 62:67-118

453 Li D, Zhang R, Knutson TR (2017) On the discrepancy between observed and CMIP5 multi-model
454 simulated Barents Sea winter sea ice decline. *Nature Communications* 8:1-7

455 Linnebjerg JF, Frederiksen M, Kolbeinsson Y, Snaethórsson AÖ, Thórisson B, Thórarinnsson TL
456 (2018) Non-breeding areas of three sympatric auk species breeding in three Icelandic
457 colonies. *Polar Biol* 41:1951-1961

458 Lisovski S, Hewson CM, Klaassen RH, Korner-Nievergelt F, Kristensen MW, Hahn S (2012)
459 Geolocation by light: accuracy and precision affected by environmental factors. *Meth Ecol*
460 *Evol* 3:603-612

461 Mallory ML, Gilchrist HG, Janssen M, Major HL, Merkel F, Provencher JF, Strøm H (2018)
462 Financial costs of conducting science in the Arctic: examples from seabird research. *Arctic*
463 *Science* 4:624-633

464 Merkel B, Phillips RA, Descamps S, Yoccoz NG, Moe B, Strøm H (2016) A probabilistic algorithm
465 to process geolocation data. *Movement Ecology* 4:26

466 Moran PAP (1953) The statistical analysis of the Canadian lynx cycle. II. Synchronization and
467 meteorology. *Aust J Zool* 1:291-298

468 Mork KA, Drinkwater KF, Jónsson S, Valdimarsson H, Ostrowski M (2014) Water mass exchanges
469 between the Norwegian and Iceland seas over the Jan Mayen Ridge using in-situ current
470 measurements. *Journal of Marine Systems* 139:227-240

471 Palmqvist E, Lundberg P (1998) Population extinctions in correlated environments. *Oikos* 83:359-
472 367

473 Parkinson CL, Cavalieri DJ, Gloersen P, Zwally HJ, Comiso JC (1999) Arctic sea ice extents, areas,
474 and trends, 1978–1996. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* 104:20837-20856

475 Pereira SL, Baker AJ (2008) DNA evidence for a Paleocene origin of the Alcidae (Aves:
476 Charadriiformes) in the Pacific and multiple dispersals across northern oceans. *Molecular*
477 *phylogenetics and evolution* 46:430-445

478 Phillips RA, Silk JRD, Croxall JP, Afanasyev V, Briggs DR (2004) Accuracy of geolocation
479 estimates for flying seabirds. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 266:265-272

480 R Development Core Team (2016) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. In: R
481 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org/>.

482 Reiertsen TK, Erikstad KE, Anker-Nilssen T, Barrett RT, Boulinier T, Frederiksen M, Gonzalez-
483 Solis J, Gremillet D, Johns D, Moe B, Ponchon A, Skern-Mauritzen M, Sandvik H, Yoccoz
484 NG (2014) Prey density in non-breeding areas affects adult survival of black-legged
485 kittiwakes *Rissa tridactyla*. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 509:289-+

486 Ropert-Coudert Y, Wilson RP (2005) Trends and perspectives in animal-attached remote sensing.
487 *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 3:437-444

488 Rosing-Asvid A, Hedeholm R, Arendt K, Fort J, Robertson G (2013a) Winter diet of the little auk
489 (*Alle alle*) in the Northwest Atlantic. *Polar Biology* 36:1601-1608

490 Rosing-Asvid A, Hedeholm R, Arendt K, Fort J, Robertson G (2013b) Winter diet of the little auk
491 (*Alle alle*) in the Northwest Atlantic. *Polar Biol* 36:1601-1608

492 Runge CA, Watson JE, Butchart SH, Hanson JO, Possingham HP, Fuller RA (2015) Protected areas
493 and global conservation of migratory birds. *Science* 350:1255-1258

494 Saether BE, Bakke O (2000) Avian life history variation and contribution of demographic traits to
495 the population growth rate. *Ecology* 81:642-653

496 Sandvik H, Erikstad KE, Barrett RT, Yoccoz NG (2005) The effect of climate on adult survival in
497 five species of North Atlantic seabirds. *J Anim Ecol* 74:817-831

498 Schaub M, Kania W, Köppen U (2005) Variation of primary production during winter induces
499 synchrony in survival rates in migratory white storks *Ciconia ciconia*. *J Anim Ecol* 74:656-
500 666

501 Shapiro I, Colony R, Vinje T (2006) April sea ice extent in the Barents Sea, 1850–2001. *Polar Res*
502 22:5-10

503 Stearns SC, Kawecki TJ (1994) Fitness sensitivity and the canalization of life-history traits.
504 *Evolution* 48:1438-1450

505 Stempniewicz L (2001) *Alle alle* little auk. In: BWP Update The Journal of the Birds of the Western
506 Palearctic Book 3. Oxford University Press., Oxford

507 Strøm H, Helgason HH, Bråthen VS, Descamps S, Ekker M, Fauchald P, Merkel B, Moe B,
508 Tarroux A (2019) Large-scale tracking of seabirds in the Northeast-Atlantic 2014-2018 -
509 Final report from SEATRACK phase I. . In: Norsk Polarinstitut (ed) Rapportserie
510 (Forthcoming)

511 Swerpel S (1985) The Hornsund fjord: water masses. *Polish Polar research* 475:96

512 Trudnowska E, Szczucka J, Hoppe L, Boehnke R, Hop H, Blachowiak-Samolyk K (2012)
513 Multidimensional zooplankton observations on the northern West Spitsbergen Shelf. *Journal*
514 *of Marine Systems* 98:18-25

515 Webster MS, Marra PP, Haig SM, Bensch S, Holmes RT (2002) Links between worlds: unraveling
516 migratory connectivity. *Trends Ecol Evol* 17:76-83

517 Wesławski J, Stempniewicz L, Galaktionov K (1994) The food and feeding of little auk from Franz
518 Josef Land. *Polar Res* 13:173-181

- 519 Węśławski J, Stempniewicz L, Mehlum F, Kwaśniewski S (1999) Summer feeding strategy of the
520 little auk (*Alle alle*) from Bjørnøya, Barents Sea. *Polar Biol* 21:129-134
- 521 Wiborg KF (1955) Zooplankton in relation to hydrography in the Norwegian Sea. In: Report on
522 Norwegian Fishery and Marine Investigations, Book XI
- 523 Wilson RP, Ducamp J, Rees WG, Culik BM, Niekamp K (1992) Estimation of location: global
524 coverage using light intensity. In: Priede IM, Swift SM (eds) *Wildlife telemetry: remote*
525 *monitoring and tracking of animals*. Ellis Horward, Chichester
- 526
- 527

528

529 **Table 1.** *Overlap in the winter distribution of Svalbard and Franz Josef Land little auks. The distribution for*
530 *each colony is based on the months of December and January and was assessed as kernel UD. The overlap*
531 *was calculated using the Bhattacharyya's affinity index (from 0 = no overlap to 1 = identical distribution;*
532 *see Methods for details). Distances between colonies (in km) are indicated in the lower part of the table*
533 *(gray area).*

534

Colony	Franz Josef Land	Kongsfjorden	Isfjorden	Hornsund	Bjørnøya
Franz Josef Land	-	0.32	0.35	0.51	0.48
Kongsfjorden	795	-	0.72	0.66	0.65
Isfjorden	769	103	-	0.80	0.73
Hornsund	851	227	140	-	0.90
Bjørnøya	993	523	430	296	-

535

536

537 **Table 2.** Synchrony in the survival of little auks breeding at Isfjorden, Kongsfjorden and Bjørnøya. Subscript
538 “g” represents the colony (i.e. g(1) represents Kongsfjorden, g(2) Isfjorden and g(3) Bjørnøya) and “t” the
539 time dependence. The QAIC values have been calculated using an overdispersion parameter $\hat{c} = 1.84$.
540 $\Delta QAIC$ corresponds to the difference between the QAIC of a given model and the lowest QAIC among the
541 different models considered. N_p represents the number of identifiable parameters and Dev the deviance. The
542 survival ϕ represents the survival of the non-transient birds (age-class 2). Survival of age class 1 has been
543 modeled as time-dependent with a multiplicative colony/group effect (see Table SMI). Recapture rates have
544 been modelled as colony- and time-dependent with an additive trap-dependence (see table SMI and
545 methods).

546

<i>Model</i>	<i>N_p</i>	<i>Dev</i>	<i>QAIC</i>	<i>ΔQAIC</i>
$\phi_{g,t}$	110	13231.72	7411.15	17.73
ϕ_{g+t}	92	13265.336	7393.42	0.00
ϕ_t	90	13281.75	7398.34	4.92
ϕ_g	81	13335.76	7409.70	16.28
ϕ_i	79	13347.02	7411.82	18.40
$\phi_{g(1).t+[g(2,3)+t]}$	101	13243.11	7399.34	5.92
$\phi_{g(2).t+[g(1,3)+t]}$	102	13252.83	7406.63	13.21
$\phi_{g(3).t+[g(1,2)+t]}$	101	13247.98	7403.99	10.57

547






Figure 1. Winter distribution (Dec-Jan) of little auks breeding in Svalbard (Kongsfjorden, Isfjorden, Hornsund, Bjørnøya) and Franz Josef Land. Colonies are represented by a circle. Distributions are based on light logger data and the color represents the overall area usage (details in Methods). Grey area denotes persistent seasonal sea ice cover (as 75% sea ice concentration across the study period). The dashed line represents the limit of the marginal sea ice zone (as 15% sea ice concentration across the study period). Sea-ice data are from NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSL (<https://psl.noaa.gov/>). The black line north of Iceland represents the area of highest usage during winter when all colonies are combined (see Figure 2).

548
549



551

552 **Figure 2.** Winter distribution of little auks breeding in Svalbard (Kongsfjorden, blue circle; Isfjorden, purple circle; Hornsund, orange circle; Bjørnøya, green circle)
 553 and Franz Josef Land (yellow circle). Distribution is based on 188 little auks tracked throughout the year with light loggers (details in Methods). Panel (a) represents the
 554 winter distribution of little auks in Dec-Jan. The colour represents the overall area usage (details in Methods). Grey area denotes persistent seasonal sea ice cover (as
 555 75% sea ice concentration across the study period). The dashed line represents the limit of the marginal sea ice zone (as 15% sea ice concentration across the study
 556 period). Sea-ice data are from NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSL (<https://psl.noaa.gov/>). Panel (b) shows the proportion of individuals from each colony present in the area of
 557 highest usage north of Iceland during winter (area delineated with a black line in panel (a)); grey areas in the graph represent equinox periods. Panel (c) shows the
 558 proportion of individuals from each colony that experienced conditions without twilight events (i.e., polar night and midnight sun) throughout the year. Dotted lines in (b)
 559 and (c) indicate the winter period used for analyses (Dec-Jan; area delineated with a black line in panel (a)).



560
561
562
563
564
565
566

Figure 3. Annual survival ($\pm 95\%$ confidence intervals) of little auks breeding in Svalbard. Only the non-transient groups have been considered (see details in Methods) and each survival estimate represents the survival between two consecutive breeding seasons. Survival in the last year (2017-2018) cannot be estimated separately from the recapture rate (Lebreton et al. 1992b).