



Toward a global strategy for seabird tracking

Alice Bernard, Ana S.L. Rodrigues, Victor Cazalis, David Grémillet

► To cite this version:

Alice Bernard, Ana S.L. Rodrigues, Victor Cazalis, David Grémillet. Toward a global strategy for seabird tracking. *Conservation Letters*, 2021, 14 (3), pp.e12804. 10.1111/conl.12804 . hal-03244859

HAL Id: hal-03244859

<https://hal.science/hal-03244859>

Submitted on 28 Oct 2021

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 I. Title page

2 Towards a global strategy for seabird tracking

3 Alice Bernard^{a,b,c}, Ana S.L. Rodrigues^a, Victor Cazalis^{a,e,f}, David Grémillet^{g,h,*}

4 a CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, Montpellier, France

5 b Sustainability Research Unit, Nelson Mandela University (NMU), George Campus, Madiba, drive,
6 6531 George, South Africa

7 c CNRS UMR 5558, LBBE, Université Lyon 1, Villeurbanne 69622 Cedex, France

8 d REHABS, CNRS-Université Lyon 1-NMU, International Research Laboratory, George Campus,
9 Madiba, drive, 6531 George, South Africa

10 e German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Puschstr. 4, D-
11 04103 Leipzig, Germany

12 f Leipzig University, Ritterstraße 26, 04109 Leipzig, Germany

13 g Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé (CEBC), UMR 7372 CNRS – La Rochelle Université, 405
14 route de Prissé la Charrière, 79360 Villiers-en-Bois, France.

15 h FitzPatrick Institute, DST/NRF Excellence Centre at the University of Cape Town, Rondebosch
16 7701, South Africa.

17 *Corresponding authors : David Grémillet david.gremillet@cebc.cnrs.fr; Alice Bernard:
18 alice.bernard@univ-lyon1.fr

19 1. Alice Bernard: alice.bernard@univ-lyon1.fr ORCID: [https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6056-](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6056-2599)
20 [2599](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6056-2599) ; +33625499517

21 2. Ana S.L. Rodrigues: ana.rodrigues@cefe.cnrs.fr ORCID : [http://orcid.org/0000-0003-](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4775-0127)
22 [4775-0127](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4775-0127)

23 3. Victor Cazalis: victor.cazalis@laposte.net. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0850-883X>

24 4. David Grémillet: david.gremillet@cebc.cnrs.fr ORCID: [https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7711-](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7711-9398)
25 [9398](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7711-9398)

26 **Short running title:** Global strategy for seabird tracking

27 **Key words:** biogeography, biologging, biotelemetry, marine conservation, oceanography, spatial
28 planning, threatened species, ecological monitoring.
29 **Statement of authorship:** DG, AR and AB designed the study. AB collected the data. AB and VC
30 analyzed the data. AB and DG wrote the first draft of the paper. All authors contributed to the final
31 version.
32 **Data accessibility:** All necessary information is included in the manuscript and its annexes.
33 **Type of article:** Review
34 **Number of words in the abstract:** 199 words
35 **Number of words in the main text:** 5 745 words
36 **Number of references:** 48
37 **This file includes:** 5 figures

38 II. Abstract page

39 ***Abstract***

40 Electronic tracking technologies revolutionized wildlife ecology, notably for studying the movements
41 of elusive species such as seabirds. Those advances are key to seabird conservation, for example
42 in guiding the design of marine protected areas for this highly threatened group. Tracking data are
43 also boosting scientific understanding of marine ecosystem dynamics in the context of global
44 change. To optimize future tracking efforts, we performed a global assessment of seabird tracking
45 data. We identified and mined 689 seabird tracking studies, reporting on >28,000 individuals of 216
46 species from 17 families over the last four decades. We found substantial knowledge gaps,
47 reflecting a historical neglect of tropical seabird ecology, with biases towards species that are
48 heavier, oceanic and from high-latitude regions. Conservation status had little influence on seabird
49 tracking propensity. We identified 54 threatened species for which we did not find published
50 tracking records, and 19 with very little data. Additionally, much of the existing tracking data are not
51 yet available to other researchers and decision-makers in online databases. We highlight priority
52 species and regions for future tracking efforts. More broadly, we provide guidance towards an
53 ethical, rational, and efficient global tracking program for seabirds, as a contribution to their
54 conservation.

55

56

III. Main Text

1) Introduction

Electronic tracking technologies are revolutionizing the study of animal movements (Sergio et al. 2014; Kays et al. 2015), bolstered by mass production industries, such as cellular phones (Burger & Shaffer 2008) and by powerful tools to store and analyze the huge amounts of data produced (López-López 2016). By fitting miniature trackers to elusive wild animals, researchers expanded the discipline of spatial ecology to scales ranging from seconds and centimeters, to entire animal lives and the planet (Nathan et al. 2008; Lohmann 2018). Scientific advances have been particularly spectacular in the marine environment, where animal tracking opened up new worlds of knowledge (Bonfil et al. 2005; Block et al. 2011). Many such technologies have been pioneered by seabird researchers (Jouventin & Weimerskirch 1990; Grémillet et al. 2000, 2004; Weimerskirch & Wilson 2000; Weimerskirch 2002), and across the last two decades over a thousand seabird tracking studies were published. Those yielded unprecedented knowledge of seabird habitat choice, foraging behavior and migration (Wakefield et al. 2013).

This novel information is playing an increasingly important role in the conservation of marine ecosystems, and of seabirds in particular. Indeed, seabird tracking is now key to the accurate definition of priority conservation areas, such as marine Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) (Lascelles et al. 2016), and to support the establishment and validation of area-based management tools, such as marine protected areas and fishery regulation zones (Pichegru et al. 2010; Kruger et al. 2017; Hindell et al. 2020), as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of these initiatives in supporting conservation outcomes. With seabirds being among the most threatened bird groups (BirdLife International 2018), including by interactions with fisheries and pollution (Burger & Shaffer 2008; Grémillet et al. 2018; Dias et al. 2019b), understanding of their spatial ecology is particularly crucial to the implementation of adequate conservation measures (Carneiro et al. 2020). Tracking studies also underpin the use of seabirds as ecological sentinels of marine ecosystems in the Anthropocene (Shaffer et al. 2006; Brisson-Curadeau et al. 2017). Indeed, detailed information on their movements at sea is shedding light on the structure and dynamics of marine systems in time and space (Grémillet et al. 2008; Péron et al. 2012). Finally, conveying maps and animations of seabirds movements to decision makers and the public is key to winning their commitment for marine conservation (Burger & Shaffer 2008; Lescroël et al. 2016).

Tracking however comes with substantial costs, not only economic (e.g., cost of equipment and field expeditions), but also environmental (e.g., energy of travels, and materials of equipment) and

ecological (e.g., on the fitness of the tagged animals), as well as ethical considerations of animal wellbeing (Burger & Shaffer 2008). Application of the Reduce-Refine-Replace framework (Richmond 2000) is thus essential to collectively optimize seabird tracking schemes, by strategically defining which species or populations yield highest priority for gathering new data, as well as through the sharing of the information already collected.

Previous studies have highlighted geographic biases in the tracking of seabirds, showing that some oceans have been under-studied (Mott & Clarke 2018). However, there has not yet been an analysis of how past tracking effort has been distributed across species, or across the ranges of each individual species. Identifying spatial and taxonomic gaps in tracking knowledge is key to the development of effective species management plans, especially for threatened species, and more broadly to support spatial conservation planning of marine ecosystems.

Here, we present the results of a global assessment of current seabird tracking knowledge in a conservation context, with the aim of identifying taxonomic as well as spatial gaps and thus priorities for future tracking. For this purpose, we reviewed and mined the scientific literature to determine which species had been studied with tracking technologies, using marine provinces as spatial units (Marine Regions 2019).

Based on these analyses, we formulate specific recommendations to guide forthcoming conservation-oriented seabird tracking.

2) Materials and Methods

Taxonomic and spatial entities

Species

We analyzed information for all 363 extant seabird species, belonging to 18 families, listed by *BirdLife International* (BirdLife International 2019a) (Table S1). Seabirds are defined as species for which a large proportion of the population rely on the marine environment for at least part of the year (Croxall et al. 2012). For each species, we obtained range maps from *BirdLife International* (BirdLife International & Handbook of the Birds of the World 2018), corresponding to coarse polygons encompassing the species' known distribution.

We classified species according to three characteristics that we anticipated to have a role in explaining variation in the attention received in previous tracking studies: conservation status, body mass and marine habitat. Each species was thus classified into a category of conservation status

(Critically Endangered, CR; Endangered, EN; Vulnerable, VU; Near Threatened, NT; Least Concern, LC; Data Deficient, DD) following the International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN Red List) (BirdLife International 2018; IUCN 2019). For analysis purposes, we converted this into a numeric discrete scale (LC=1; NT=2; VU=3; EN=4; CR=5; excluding the four data-deficient species from analyses) (Butchart et al. 2007). We obtained mean body mass of adults from Paleczny (2012) and prevailing marine habitat (coastal vs. oceanic) for each of 323 seabird species from Dias et al. (2019b), and gathered information from the scientific literature for the remaining species (Onley & Scofield 2007; IUCN 2019). Based on Dias et al. (2019b), species are characterized as coastal when they remain mainly within 8 km of the shoreline throughout their lifecycle, and as oceanic otherwise. "Coastal" and "oceanic" are thus pragmatic classes rather than ecological ones (e.g., depending on the width of the coastal shelf, a species classified as "coastal" in our analysis may be using variable fractions of the neritic province *sensu* Kingsford [2018]; whereas a species classified by us as "oceanic" may use not only the oceanic province *sensu* Kingsford [2018] but also part of the neritic province).

Longhurst provinces

To distinguish marine areas used by seabirds around the world, we used Longhurst biogeochemical provinces as spatial units (Fig. S1), mapped as 54 polygons (Marine Regions 2019) delimited according to physical discontinuities, climatic and oceanographic characteristics, fauna and flora (Longhurst 1995).

We classified provinces according to three characteristics that we anticipated to have a role in explaining geographic variation in tracking intensity: distance to equator (absolute value of the Y-coordinates of the centroid); adjacency to the coast (a binary variable defining whether or not adjacent to a continent); and average GDP per capita of the corresponding countries. The latter was obtained by averaging the Gross Domestic Product per capita (World Bank 2019) of countries whose Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) (Marine Regions 2019) intersect the corresponding Longhurst province. In calculating GDP per country, overseas territories were grouped according to sovereign countries (e.g. New Caledonia with France). Antarctica has no GDP, but for analytical purposes, we considered it to correspond to the average of the 29 countries that are "Consultative Parties" to the Antarctic Treaty (i.e. those that have research activities there).

Review of tracking data per species

Publications

For each of the 363 analyzed species, we reviewed systematically the extent to which its spatial distribution has been investigated through tracking studies. To obtain a list of candidate studies per species, we searched the Web of Science database (<http://apps.webofknowledge.com>) using as search terms: (“*Latin name*” or “*English name*”) AND (GLS or GPS or PTT or VHF or ARGOS or *biologging* or *track**) in the paper title, abstract, and keywords. Papers were selected through the Web of Science between early February and mid-May 2019. This initial list was in some cases augmented by few other relevant publications cited in the original studies.

Given our aim of evaluating the oceanic coverage of the tracking data, we retained only those studies in which tracking locations for a particular species were illustrated in figures (plotting of the tracks, minimum convex polygons or kernel distributions). Sometimes the same tracking data were presented in multiple studies; in these cases, and to avoid duplication, we focused on the study presenting the original dataset.

For each selected study, data were extracted and entered into a database. The unit of record was a unique combination of: species/study site/year/device/season/age of the birds equipped (multiple records were sometimes extracted from a single study). For each record, we extracted the following information:

1. Species: family, scientific name, English name (IUCN 2019).
2. Study site (where the birds were equipped with electronic devices): name, geographical coordinates.
3. Year in which the birds were equipped.
4. Number of individual birds tracked.
5. Type of tracking device: VHF (*Very High Frequency*); Argos tags, also called PTT (*Platform Terminal Transmitter*); GPS (*Global Positioning System*); and GLS (*Global Location Sensor*). Few articles report the use of electronic direction recorders (compass system) or the coupling of two types of electronic devices, GPS/VHF or GPS/PTT.
6. Season covered by the tracking data: breeding season; inter-breeding period; or both.
7. Age class of the equipped individuals: juveniles (first year from fledging); immatures (older than juveniles but not breeding); or adults (breeding).
8. Spatial distribution of tracking data, coded as presence/absence of the equipped individuals in each Longhurst province. This information was extracted visually from the figure displaying the data.

Seabird Tracking Database and Movebank

We listed all species for which there were tracking records in the *Seabird Tracking Database* (BirdLife International 2019b) and *Movebank* (Wikelski & Kays 2019), considering only those data that were visible online (by the end of February 2019). These databases may include invisible datasets, or available to others after a data request and the establishment of a collaboration. Nonetheless, we focused on the visible data as signaling a willingness by researchers to allow others to build from their data.

Data analyses

Data processing and analyses were performed in R version 3.4.4. Spatial analyses were performed using the "sf" package (Pebsma 2018) and spatial mapping were printed using the "sp" package (Bivand et al. 2013) and QGIS 2.12.3 (QGIS Development Team 2019).

Temporal patterns

In order to visualize biases in taxonomy, age class and seasons among the tracking studies, we plotted temporal trends in published studies according to family, type of tracking device, as well as the distribution of age classes of individuals tracked and the seasons monitored.

For each record, we calculated the delay between data collection and publication by subtracting the year of data collection from the year of publication. We then obtained the median delay across all records.

Characteristics of species explaining variation in tracking intensity

For each species, we calculated two indices of tracking intensity based on the information retrieved from the review of publications:

- Tracking effort, defined as the number of individuals tracked per species.
- Tracking coverage, corresponding to the proportion of marine provinces with tracking data within a species' range, calculated as the ratio between the areas of Longhurst provinces where the species has been tracked (based on the publication records) and the areas of provinces where the species is present (obtained by intersecting the species' distribution according to *BirdLife International* [BirdLife International & Handbook of the Birds of the World 2018] with the Longhurst provinces).

We predicted that tracking intensity would be positively related with: body mass, given past technical limitations in the miniaturization of tracking devices; their tendency to use oceanic

ecosystems, given that for coastal species other methods of at-sea field study (e.g., coastal or boat surveys) are also available; and their risk of extinction, under the assumption that much tracking effort has a conservation focus. To test these predictions, we modelled the effect of species characteristics on tracking intensity using two independent models: one having tracking effort as the response variable, another for tracking coverage. In both models we included three species characteristics as explanatory variables: logarithm of the mean body mass; habitat (coastal *versus* oceanic); and conservation status (from 1 for LC to 5 for CR). Given that we found no tracking studies for 178 species, we used models that enabled us to disentangle the effect of these three covariates on: (1) the occurrence of tracking (i.e. whether the species was tracked at least once), using a binomial process; and (2) tracking intensity (effort or coverage) whenever the species was tracked at least once. For tracking effort (corresponding to count data), this was done with a Hurdle model from the "pscl" R package (Zeileis & Jackman 2008), in which we assumed that the non-zero data follow a negative binomial distribution (Zuur et al. 2009). For tracking coverage (corresponding to proportion data), we used a model that combines a binomial process to explain the occurrence of tracking with a beta distribution to explain tracking coverage in monitored species, using the *gamlss* function from the eponymous R package (Rigby & Stasinopoulos 2005). In this latter model, we assumed a beta-inflated distribution and modelled the *nu* (probability at 0) and *mu* (mean) parameters as functions of species characteristics while leaving the *sigma* (dispersion parameter) and *tau* (probability at 1) parameters as constants.

In addition, we visually analyzed the distribution of seabird species according to their body mass, contrasting tracked versus non-tracked species as well as species tracked according to different types of devices.

Characteristics of provinces explaining spatial variation in tracking intensity

For each Longhurst province, we characterized tracking intensity using two variables obtained from the review of published studies:

- Tracking effort, defined as the sum of the number of individuals tracked (across all species) per province.
- Percentage of species tracked, relative to the overall number of species present in the province (obtained from distribution maps).

We predicted that tracking intensity is positively related with: distance to the Equator, given past evidence of a focus of tracking on temperate and polar regions, and a concurrent neglect of tropical regions (Mott & Clack 2018); non-coastal province, because tracking methods were originally designed to study inaccessible areas; and higher economic capacity of the nearby countries, given

the high costs of tracking (Mott & Clack 2018). To test these predictions, we fitted generalized linear models with either tracking effort or percentage of species tracked per province as response variables, and adjacency to the coast, distance to the Equator, and GDP per capita as covariates. For the tracking effort per province (corresponding to count data), we built a generalized linear model assuming a negative binomial distribution using the “MASS” package (Venables & Ripley 2002). For the percentage of species tracked, we obtained a linear model assuming a Gaussian distribution.

We mapped tracking effort and the percentage of species tracked per province, considering all types of devices together, as well as separately for two main types of devices: GPS, GPS/VHF or GPS/PTT (with higher accuracy, mainly used for studying foraging movements around breeding sites); and GLS, VHF or PTT (with lower accuracy, mainly used for studying year-round movement).

Gaps in tracking data

We identified gap species as those for which no tracking data were found in the published literature, and among these specifically threatened gap species. For threatened species, we also highlighted near-gaps, i.e., species with very little data. For this purpose, we plotted species according to both indices of tracking intensity, and defined near-gaps with both low tracking coverage (i.e. <50% of their range tracked) and low tracking effort (<100 individuals tracked). We repeated these analyses by separating between high accuracy (GPS, GPS/VHF, GPS/PTT) and low accuracy devices (GLS, VHF or PTT).

In order to visualize spatial gaps in tracking coverage, we then mapped across Longhurst regions the richness in gap species, threatened gap species, and threatened near-gap species.

Species coverage in publications versus online databases

To analyze the accessibility of seabird tracking data in specialized online databases, we contrasted the percentage of species in each family covered by publications with that in the two most widely-used repositories of seabird tracking data: the *Seabird Tracking Database*, and *Movebank*.

3) Results

Sample sizes and temporal patterns

Out of 1057 scientific publications analyzed, we retained 689 which contained original seabird tracking data (see SI References). These were published between 1986-2019 and relate to over 28,000 individuals which were equipped with tracking devices between 1984-2018. The annual number of tracking studies increased strongly over time (Fig. 1): from two studies in 1984, to 201

in 2011. The subsequent (2012-2017) decline is likely an artefact due to the delay between data collection and publication, linked to quality control and data analysis. Indeed, among the records analyzed there was a median of 4 years delay between collection and publication (Fig. S2).

The number of published studies varied markedly across seabird families (Fig. 1, Table S2). Sulidae (gannets and boobies) and Diomedidae (albatrosses) were the dominant groups in the 1980s and 1990s, overtaken by Spheniscidae (penguins) and Laridae (gulls) in the 2000s. Together with Alcidae (auks and allies) and Procellariidae (petrels), these six families represent 86% of all tracking studies published across the study period, while the other eleven families account for the remaining 14% (Fig. 1).

Sixty-five percent of seabird tracking records concerned breeding individuals, with 29% focused on inter-breeding individuals (the remaining 7% concerned both seasons). The great majority of records concerned adult individuals (91%). GPS were the tracking devices most commonly deployed (40%), followed by PTT (29%), GLS (23%), VHF (6%) and others (GPS/PTT, GPS/VHF, compass and dead reckoning; 2%). Devices have been used heterogeneously across seabird families (Fig. S3, S4, S5).

Characteristics of species explaining variation in tracking intensity

We found that among the 363 species of seabirds analyzed, 185 had been tracked at least once. The probability that a species was tracked increased significantly with log-scaled body mass (Table S3, Fig. S6). GLS and VHF devices have been used to track smaller species than GPS and PTT (Fig. S7). The probability of being tracked was higher for oceanic than for coastal species, whereas conservation status had no significant effect (Table S3).

Among species that were tracked at least once, both tracking effort and tracking coverage increased with body mass. Tracking coverage was greater for oceanic than for coastal species, with a low effect of habitat on tracking effort. Conservation status did not have a significant effect on tracking coverage, but it was positively related with tracking effort (Table S3).

Characteristics of provinces explaining spatial variation in tracking intensity

Tracking effort varied substantially across marine provinces, being concentrated in European, Southern Ocean and Arctic waters, and away from the tropical Pacific and Indian Oceans (Fig. 2A). Overall, we found a statistically significant, positive effect of distance to the Equator (i.e., the intertropical zone had less effort than the Polar regions) and no significant effect of adjacency to the coast and of GDP per capita (Table S4).

Broadly similar results were obtained regarding spatial variation in the percentage of species tracked, with efforts concentrated in the Southern Ocean (> 60% of species tracked) and away from the tropical Pacific and Indian Ocean (< 20%; Fig. 2B). We found again a positive relationship between distance to the Equator and percentage of species tracked per province, as well as no significant effect of adjacency to the coast nor of GDP per capita (Table S4).

Different spatial patterns are obtained when contrasting high accuracy (GPS) versus low accuracy devices (GLS, VHF, PTT) in terms of both tracking effort (Fig. S8) and the percentage of species tracked (Fig. S9). Overall, high accuracy data are mainly concentrated around north-eastern Europe and the Southern Ocean, whereas low accuracy data are more widely distributed, even if focused mainly in polar oceans.

Gaps in tracking data

We were unable to find published tracking studies for 178 gap species (49% of all species; Table S2), of which 54 are threatened (48% of all threatened species). Threatened gap species include two that are likely to be extinct (classified as Critically Endangered -Possibly Extinct; Butchart et al. 2006), 12 Critically Endangered, 13 Endangered and 27 Vulnerable (Fig 3B and Table S2).

Among the 59 threatened species for which we found published tracking records, there was wide variation in tracking intensity (Fig. 3A, Fig. S10). A weak correlation between tracking effort and coverage ($R^2 = 0.15$) means that some had a high number of individuals tracked but a lower proportion of their at-sea range tracked, whereas the reverse was true for others. We found 19 threatened near-gap species, i.e., combining low coverage (<50% of their range tracked) and low effort (<100 individuals tracked (Fig. 3A). Many more threatened species (50; 44%) have been tracked using low accuracy devices (GLS, VHF, PTT), covering higher numbers of individuals, than those tracked with high accuracy devices (GPS; 28 species, 25% of all threatened species; Fig. S11, S12, S13).

Gap (Fig. 4A), threatened gap species (Fig. 4B) and threatened near-gap species (Fig. 4C) are mainly present in the southern Pacific and Subantarctic Ocean and in coastal Southeast Asia and Oceania. They are almost absent from the Atlantic or Indian Oceans, or from the Antarctic coastline as well as from the Arctic Ocean for near-gap threatened species.

Species coverage in publications versus online databases

Across all data sources, coverage of species per family was highly variable, ranging from families with tracking data for all species in at least one source (e.g. Diomedidae, albatrosses, $n=22$) to

families with no data at all (Oceanitidae, Austral storm petrels, n=9 and Podicipedidae, grebes, n=4). There was also much variation across data sources (Fig. 5, Table S1 and S2). Some of the species covered were represented in published studies but not in one or both of the online databases (*Movebank* and *Seabird Tracking Database*), indicating that a part of existing data was not already shared through online databases. Indeed, there were 54 species that were present in published studies but not in either of the online databases. In addition, there were discrepancies between online databases, with 115 species in *Seabird Tracking Database*, whereas only 87 species were represented in *Movebank*. There were nonetheless a few families for which the total number of species covered was higher than what we found in publications, indicating that data in online databases was not a mere subset of those in published studies. For example, for Anatidae (ducks and geese) more species were covered by *Movebank* (n=12 species) than by published studies (n=9), whereas for Diomedidae (albatrosses), the *Seabird Tracking Database* covered all species (n=22), which was more than those we found in publications (n=20). This reflects the different geographic emphasis of the two online databases, with *Movebank* focusing for now on North American species, and the *Seabird Tracking Database* mainly focusing on the southern oceans. Taking into account the species for which tracking data exist in online databases (162 species) and in publications (185 species), 147 species seemed to have no existing tracking data.

4) Discussion

This world-wide assessment of seabird tracking studies demonstrates major taxonomic and geospatial biases in the global understanding of seabird spatial ecology as explored with electronic tracking tags. Given the delay between data collection and publication, as well as our own delay between reviewing the literature and publication of our results, additional data certainly exist. Nonetheless, our results underline the current absence of a coordinated framework for the tracking of the world's seabirds, and we therefore provide guidance towards a global strategy for seabird tracking.

As expected we found that heavier seabirds such as gannets and albatrosses were more likely to be tracked, with an over-emphasis on species with a body mass above 1000g and an underrepresentation of the smaller species that is most striking among those lighter than 320g (Fig. S6). This is due to persisting technical constraints on electronic tag miniaturization. Rapidly shrinking electronic components nonetheless reduced tag mass/size across the last two decades (Kays et al. 2015). Even though seabird researchers have taken advantage of these advances as soon as they became available (Fig. S14), they have been until recently a limitation to tracking efforts. Linked to this body mass effect, oceanic seabird species were more likely to be tracked

than coastal species. With GLS devices smaller than GPS and PTT (Fig. S14), the former have been used to track lighter species (Fig. S7).

Contrary to our expectations, we found no effect of conservation status on seabird tracking effort and a slight negative effect on tracking coverage. This could reflect the diversity of reasons underpinning the choice of species in tracking studies, with abundant species chosen to address ecology questions, whereas threatened species are tracked for conservation planning. It is also likely to reflect the fact that some threatened species are not easily accessible to researchers (e.g., because the location of their breeding sites is unknown, or their remaining populations are found in inaccessible areas) and some are so rare and vulnerable that it is too risky to handle them. In any case, we found no tracking data in the literature for about half of all species, including about half of all threatened species, with only one in four threatened species having been tracked using high accuracy devices. Furthermore, for some of the tracked species, the available data remain well below what is needed to understand their distribution and ecology, which requires both a sufficient number of tracked individuals and adequate representativeness of the tracked populations across the species' range size (Sequeira et al. 2019; Soanes et al 2013). Unfortunately, we found that among 113 threatened species only 10 had both high tracking effort (more than 100 individuals tracked) and good coverage (>50% of the range). Of these, only six had sufficient coverage through high accuracy devices (typically covering feeding movements in the breeding grounds), and only six through low accuracy devices (typically covering year-round movements), with only three having both (Fig. S13), highlighting that much research is still required.

Unexpectedly, we found no significant effect of country richness (GDP per capita of the adjacent coastal countries) on the geographical distribution of tracking studies. This appears to contrast with results by a previous study that found a positive relationship between the number of papers collecting at-sea seabird data (including tracking) published by each country (as established by first author's address) and its GDP (Mott & Clarke 2018). In practice, there is no contradiction given that our analysis looked at the spatial distribution of the tracked birds, which can extend very far from where they were equipped. Our results thus indicate that the knowledge benefits of research investment by richer nations extend much more broadly than the waters adjacent to these countries. As a different explanation, this can also reflect collaborations between researchers with access to better research funding and those in lower-income countries where the seabird breeding colonies are located. In both cases, these are welcomed news to the global conservation of seabirds.

Nonetheless, our results show that despite a high concentration of tracking effort in some regions (in particular northern European waters and the Subantarctic region; Fig. 2A), no single province

in the world has tracking records for all of the seabird species that occur there (the maximum being 70% of species; Fig. 2B), even less so when considering high accuracy (GPS) data (maximum 23% of species; Fig. S9A). This shows that knowledge on the movements of seabirds remains incomplete even in the best-sampled regions.

This said, some regions, mainly in tropical seas, do stand out as having particularly limited tracking data, both in terms of effort (number of individuals tracked) and in taxonomic coverage of their seabird species. This is in agreement with the results by Mott & Clarke (2018). The historical neglect of tropical seabirds may be indicative not only of limited local resources, but also reflect variation in seabird ecology. Indeed, tropical seabirds have notably lower seasonality, and thus lower breeding synchrony, than those at higher latitudes (Burr et al. 2016) and this in turn affects the success of seabird researchers in tag deployment and retrieval. A complementary perspective to spatial gaps in tracking comes from the distribution of species that have received no, or very little, tracking investment. We found that these species are mainly concentrated in the southern Pacific, Subantarctic Ocean and in coast Southeast Asia and Oceania (Fig. 4). These gaps in data are particularly worrying for threatened species, for which it is most urgent to identify at-sea habitats, in order to guide future management and conservation plans (e.g., definition of Marine Protected Areas or no-take areas).

Our analysis underestimates existing knowledge. We found that for an additional 31 species there were tracking records in online databases that we could not find in publications (Fig. 5, Table S1 and S2). Nonetheless, our results are evidence that very important gaps and biases remain in the global knowledge of seabird movement, both taxonomically and geographically, nearly two decades after BirdLife International's initial efforts to synthesize seabird tracking knowledge (BirdLife International 2004). This reflects the fact that seabird tracking research has largely progressed without international coordination, mainly driven by the scientific questions of each team or the conservation concerns regarding certain species. Given the threats faced by seabirds (BirdLife International 2018) it is crucial that such coordination improves in the future, to ensure a strategic use of the limited resources available.

5) Conclusions and recommendations

We recommend a periodic update of this analysis as a means of monitoring progress and guiding strategic decisions regarding future investment in seabird tracking. Based on our results, we urge the seabird tracking community to embrace four main challenges.

First, to jointly work on a global seabird tracking scheme, to yield a complete picture of seabird spatial ecology, now technically possible for virtually all species given the small size of modern tracking devices (Fig. S14). This will require working collaboratively to fill the major taxonomic and geographical gaps we have identified. In particular, we recommend, a coordinated ramping up of effort towards the study of tropical seabird species (Mott & Clarke 2018), with an emphasis on the Pacific Ocean and Southern Oceans. These data will be key to inform national and international management and conservation efforts, including through the work of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO 2009) and of the Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR 1982). Indeed, at a time when there is wide recognition for the need to expand the coverage provided by Marine Protected Areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (e.g. Aichi target 11 to cover 10% of coastal and marine areas by 2020; SCBD 2010), tracking data will be crucial to ensure that such expansion is strategically done to protect the areas that are most important to biodiversity. We recommend that particular attention be given to threatened species that have received none or very little tracking effort so far, where possible (i.e. when their breeding colonies are known) and provided this does not add substantial stress to the populations (particularly for those with very small known breeding populations). Indeed, an understanding of their at-sea habitats is in many cases key to effective conservation planning, alongside measures for reducing land-based threats to their breeding colonies, such as the control of invasive predators (Dias et al. 2019a).

Second, the seabird tracking community, in partnership with the industry and supported by research funding agencies, should build an international fund aiming at designing the next generation of electronic tags. These will be sufficiently small to track even the smallest species (López-López 2016) through life history stages (Hazen et al. 2012), across a wide range of environmental conditions, and to overcome tag loss during molting (Kooyman et al. 2015). Notably, the time is now ripe for building a bird band which fully contains a tracking device, instead of attaching tags (such as GLS) onto metal or plastic bands. Also, it is urgent to work on alternative ways to provide energy to electronic tags while birds are at sea, for instance through chemical reactions with seawater (Kim et al. 2016). This is essential for studying juveniles and immatures, which are difficult to track once they leave their natal breeding site, often for several years. Those developments are particularly relevant for polar areas where solar-powered tags are useless in winter.

Third, we encourage researchers and their institutions to invest in solutions to enable the rapid and effective sharing and archiving of tracking data in online databases, while respecting the need for adequate recognition of data collectors (Rabesandratana 2018). Such solutions involve not only

technical support to the time consuming process of data treatment and archiving, but also fostering a scientific culture in which data collection and sharing are adequately valued and rewarded, both by the other researchers (through collaborative opportunities and resulting publications) and by institutions (taken into account in the evaluation of researchers and consequent career progression). More broadly, the value of tracking data should be measured not only through its translation into scientific publications but also when it serves as basis to conservation and management. Online databases allow researchers and decision-makers to easily find all available spatial information for a given species or focal region and use it as a base for identifying regions that are of high biodiversity value (Hindell et al. 2020), providing recommendations on policy and management (Lascelles et al. 2016), to predict and monitor ecological changes (Ropert-Coudert et al. 2020).

Fourth, seabird tracking data should be systematically used and, if needed, collected (among other data sources) to establish baseline environmental conditions and evaluate potential impacts, whenever a country or company sponsored by a nation wishes to exploit the sea in areas beyond national jurisdiction. Such use should be mandatory through international agreements such as the International Seabed Authority or Regional Fisheries Management Organizations. Thereby, an investment in higher resolution (GPS) tracking data is particularly crucial to the identification of the most important areas used by seabirds at a scale fine enough to allow an understanding of and their potential interactions with at-sea threats such as fisheries, offshore hydroelectric plants and oil spills.

Unbiased tracking of the world's seabirds is essential for understanding their ecology and of the impacts of environmental changes on their population trajectories. It is therefore key to seabird conservation in a changing world, as well as for understanding global marine ecosystem dynamics, for marine spatial planning and the design and efficiency of marine protected area networks (Lascelles et al. 2012; Young et al. 2015). This requires exploratory tracking of poorly known species, as well as repeated tracking within long-term observatories of seabirds as sentinels of the marine environment. Yet, potential impacts of tracking on seabird welfare always have to be carefully weighed against conservation benefits. In that respect, a research program only aiming at "tracking all seabirds" is simply not good enough. It has to be linked with major management efforts to push seabird conservation forward.

6) Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the financial support of the French Polar Institute IPEV through the project ADACLIM (PIs D. Grémillet and J. Fort), and of ANR through the projects ILETOP (PI P. Bustamante) and INTERARCTIC (PI E. Gauthier). We thank Grant Humphries and the seabird information network, and the BirdLife International Tracking Ocean Wanderers Program. We thank the editor, Jacob González-Solís and other anonymous reviewers for detailed and extremely pertinent input, which allowed us to significantly improve our work.

7) References

- BirdLife International. (2004). *Tracking ocean wanderers: the global distribution of albatrosses and petrels: results from the Global Procellariiform Tracking Workshop, 1-5 September, 2003, Gordon's Bay, South Africa*. BirdLife International, Cambridge.
- BirdLife International. (2018). *State of the world's birds: taking the pulse of the planet*.
- BirdLife International. (2019a). IUCN Red List for birds. Version 2019-3 downloaded from <<http://www.birdlife.org>>.
- BirdLife International. (2019b). Seabird Tracking Data. <http://seabirdtracking.org>.
- BirdLife International & Handbook of the Birds of the World. (2018). Bird species distribution maps of the world. Version 2018.1. Available at <http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/requestdis>.
- Bivand, R.S., Pebesma, E. & Gomez-Rubio, V. (2013). Applied spatial data analysis with R, Second edition. Springer, NY. <http://www.asdar-book.org/>.

525 Block, B.A., Jonsen, I.D., Jorgensen, S.J., Winship, A.J., Shaffer, S.A., Bograd, S.J.,
 526 Hazen, E.L., Foley, D.G., Breed, G.A., Harrison, A.-L., Ganong, J.E.,
 527 Swithenbank, A., Castleton, M., Dewar, H., Mate, B.R., Shillinger, G.L., Schaefer,
 528 K.M., Benson, S.R., Weise, M.J., Henry, R.W. & Costa, D.P. (2011). Tracking apex
 529 marine predator movements in a dynamic ocean. *Nature*, 475, 86–90.

530 Bonfil, R., Michael Meyer, Michael C. Scholl, Ryan Johnson, Shannon O'Brien, Herman
 531 Oosthuizen, Stephan Swanson, Deon Kotze, et Michael Paterson. « Transoceanic
 532 Migration, Spatial Dynamics, and Population Linkages of White Sharks ». *Science*
 533 310 (7 octobre 2005): 100-103. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1114898>.

534 Brisson-Curadeau, E., Patterson, A., Whelan, S., Lazarus, T. & Elliott, K.H. (2017).
 535 Tracking Cairns: Biologging Improves the Use of Seabirds as Sentinels of the Sea.
 536 *Front. Mar. Sci.*, 4.

537 Burger, A.E. & Shaffer, S.A. (2008). Application of tracking and data-logging technology
 538 in research and conservation of seabirds. *Auk*, 125, 253–264.

539 Burr, Z.M., Varpe, Ø., Anker-Nilssen, T., Erikstad, K.E., Descamps, S., Barrett, R.T.,
 540 Bech, C., Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., Lorentsen, S., Moe, B., Reiertsen, T.K. &
 541 Strøm, H. (2016). Later at higher latitudes: large-scale variability in seabird
 542 breeding timing and synchronicity. *Ecosphere*, 7.

543 Butchart, S.H.M., Resit Akçakaya, H., Chanson, J., Baillie, J.E.M., Collen, B., Quader, S.,
 544 Turner, W.R., Amin, R., Stuart, S.N. & Hilton-Taylor, C. (2007). Improvements to
 545 the Red List Index. *PLoS ONE*, 2, e140.

546 Butchart, S.H.M., Stattersfield, A.J. & Brooks, T.M. (2006). Going or gone: defining
547 'Possibly Extinct' species to give a truer picture of recent extinctions. *Bull. Br.*
548 *Ornithol. Club*, 126A, 7–24.

549 Carneiro, A.P.B., Pearmain, E.J., Oppel, S., Clay, T.A., Phillips, R.A., Bonnet-Lebrun, A.-
550 S., Wanless, R.M., Abraham, E., Richard, Y., Rice, J., Handley, J., Davies, T.E.,
551 Dilley, B.J., Ryan, P.G., Small, C., Arata, J., Arnould, J.P.Y., Bell, E., Bugoni, L.,
552 Campioni, L., Catry, P., Cleeland, J., Deppe, L., Elliott, G., Freeman, A., González-
553 Solís, J., Granadeiro, J.P., Grémillet, D., Landers, T.J., Makhado, A., Nel, D.,
554 Nicholls, D.G., Rexer-Huber, K., Robertson, C.J.R., Sagar, P.M., Scofield, P.,
555 Stahl, J.-C., Stanworth, A., Stevens, K.L., Trathan, P.N., Thompson, D.R., Torres,
556 L., Walker, K., Waugh, S.M., Weimerskirch, H. & Dias, M.P. (2020). A framework
557 for mapping the distribution of seabirds by integrating tracking, demography and
558 phenology. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 57, 514–525.

559 CCAMLR. (1982). Convention on Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources.
560 <https://www.ccamlr.org/en/organisation/convention>.

561 Croxall, J.P., Butchart, S.H.M., Lascelles, B., Stattersfield, A.J., Sullivan, B., Symes, A. &
562 Taylor, P. (2012). Seabird conservation status, threats and priority actions: a global
563 assessment. *Bird Conserv. Int.*, 22, 1–34.

564 Dias, M.P., Martin, R., Pearmain, E.J., Burfield, I.J., Small, C., Phillips, R.A., Yates, O.,
565 Lascelles, B., Borboroglu, P.G. & Croxall, J.P. (2019a). Threats to seabirds: A
566 global assessment. *Biol. Conserv.*, 237, 525–537.

567 Dias, M.P., Warwick-Evans, V., Carneiro, A.P.B., Harris, C., Lascelles, B.G., Clewlow,
 568 H.L., Manco, F., Ratcliffe, N. & Trathan, P.N. (2019b). Using habitat models to
 569 identify marine important bird and biodiversity areas for Chinstrap Penguins
 570 *Pygoscelis antarcticus* in the South Orkney Islands. *Polar Biol.*, 42, 17–25.

571 Grémillet, D., Wilson, R.P., Wanless, S. & Chater, T. (2000). Black-browed albatrosses,
 572 international fisheries and the Patagonian Shelf. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 195, 269–
 573 280.

574 Grémillet, D., Dell’Omo, G., Ryan, P.G., Peters, G., Ropert-Coudert, Y. & Weeks, S.J.
 575 (2004). Offshore diplomacy, or how seabirds mitigate intra-specific competition: a
 576 case study based on GPS tracking of Cape gannets from neighbouring colonies.
 577 *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 268, 265–279.

578 Grémillet, D., Lewis, S., Drapeau, L., van Der Lingen, C.D., Huggett, J.A., Coetzee, J.C.,
 579 Verheye, H.M., Daunt, F., Wanless, S. & Ryan, P.G. (2008). Spatial match-
 580 mismatch in the Benguela upwelling zone: should we expect chlorophyll and sea-
 581 surface temperature to predict marine predator distributions? *J. Appl. Ecol.*, 45,
 582 610–621.

583 Grémillet, D., Ponchon, A., Paleczny, M., Palomares, M.-L.D., Karpouzi, V. & Pauly, D.
 584 (2018). Persisting Worldwide Seabird-Fishery Competition Despite Seabird
 585 Community Decline. *Curr. Biol.*, 28, 4009-4013.e2.

586 Hazen, E., Maxwell, S., Bailey, H., Bograd, S., Hamann, M., Gaspar, P., Godley, B. &
 587 Shillinger, G. (2012). Ontogeny in marine tagging and tracking science:
 588 technologies and data gaps. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 457, 221–240.

589 Hindell, M.A., Reisinger, R.R., Ropert-Coudert, Y., Hüeckstädt, L.A., Trathan, P.N.,
 590 Bornemann, H., Charrassin, J.-B., Chown, S.L., Costa, D.P., Danis, B., Lea, M.-A.,
 591 Thompson, D., Torres, L.G., Van de Putte, A.P., Alderman, R., Andrews-Goff, V.,
 592 Arthur, B., Ballard, G., Bengtson, J., Bester, M.N., Blix, A.S., Boehme, L., Bost,
 593 C.-A., Boveng, P., Cleeland, J., Constantine, R., Corney, S., Crawford, R.J.M.,
 594 Dalla Rosa, L., de Bruyn, P.J.N., Delord, K., Descamps, S., Double, M., Emmerson,
 595 L., Fedak, M., Friedlaender, A., Gales, N., Goebel, M.E., Goetz, K.T., Guinet, C.,
 596 Goldsworthy, S.D., Harcourt, R., Hinke, J.T., Jerosch, K., Kato, A., Kerry, K.R.,
 597 Kirkwood, R., Kooyman, G.L., Kovacs, K.M., Lawton, K., Lowther, A.D.,
 598 Lydersen, C., Lyver, P.O., Makhado, A.B., Márquez, M.E.I., McDonald, B.I.,
 599 McMahon, C.R., Muelbert, M., Nachtsheim, D., Nicholls, K.W., Nordøy, E.S.,
 600 Olmastroni, S., Phillips, R.A., Pistorius, P., Plötz, J., Pütz, K., Ratcliffe, N., Ryan,
 601 P.G., Santos, M., Southwell, C., Staniland, I., Takahashi, A., Tarroux, A.,
 602 Trivelpiece, W., Wakefield, E., Weimerskirch, H., Wienecke, B., Xavier, J.C.,
 603 Wotherspoon, S., Jonsen, I.D. & Raymond, B. (2020). Tracking of marine predators
 604 to protect Southern Ocean ecosystems. *Nature*, 580, 87–92.

605 IUCN. (2019). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2019-3.
 606 <http://www.iucnredlist.org>. Downloaded on 10 December 2019.

607 Jouventin, P. & Weimerskirch, H. (1990). Satellite tracking of Wandering albatrosses.
 608 *Nature*, 343, 746–748.

609 Kays, R., Crofoot, M.C., Jetz, W. & Wikelski, M. (2015). Terrestrial animal tracking as an
 610 eye on life and planet. *Science*, 348, aaa2478–aaa2478.

611 Kim, Y., Kim, H., Park, S., Seo, I. & Kim, Y. (2016). Na ion- Conducting Ceramic as Solid
612 Electrolyte for Rechargeable Seawater Batteries. *Electrochimica Acta*, 191, 1–7.

613 Kingsford, M.J. (2018). Marine ecosystem. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*.
614 <https://www.britannica.com/science/marine-ecosystem> Access Date December 02,
615 2020.

616 Kooyman, G.L., McDonald, B.I. & Goetz, K.T. (2015). Why do satellite transmitters on
617 emperor penguins stop transmitting? *Anim. Biotelemetry*, 3, 54.

618 Kruger, L., Ramos, J.A., Xavier, J.C., Gremillet, D., Gonzalez-Solis, J., Kolbeinsson, Y.,
619 Militao, T., Navarro, J., Petry, M.V., Phillips, R.A., Ramirez, I., Reyes-Gonzalez,
620 J.M., Ryan, P.G., Sigurdsson, I.A., Van Sebille, E., Wanless, R.M. & Paiva, V.H.
621 (2017). Identification of candidate pelagic marine protected areas through a seabird
622 seasonal-, multispecific- and extinction risk-based approach. *Anim. Conserv.*, 20,
623 409–424.

624 Lascelles, B.G., Langham, G.M., Ronconi, R.A. & Reid, J.B. (2012). From hotspots to site
625 protection: Identifying Marine Protected Areas for seabirds around the globe. *Biol.*
626 *Conserv.*, 156, 5–14.

627 Lascelles, B.G., Taylor, P.R., Miller, M.G.R., Dias, M.P., Oppel, S., Torres, L., Hedd, A.,
628 Corre, M.L., Phillips, R.A., Shaffer, S.A., Weimerskirch, H. & Small, C. (2016).
629 Applying global criteria to tracking data to define important areas for marine
630 conservation. *Divers. Distrib.*, 22, 422–431.

631 Lescroël, A., Mathevet, R., Péron, C., Authier, M., Provost, P., Takahashi, A. & Grémillet,
 632 D. (2016). Seeing the ocean through the eyes of seabirds: A new path for marine
 633 conservation? *Mar. Policy*, 68, 212–220.

634 Lohmann, K.J. (2018). Animal migration research takes wing. *Curr. Biol.*, 28, R952–R955.

635 Longhurst, A. (1995). Seasonal cycles of pelagic production and consumption. *Prog.*
 636 *Oceanogr.*, 36, 77–167.

637 López-López, P. (2016). Individual-Based Tracking Systems in Ornithology: Welcome to
 638 the Era of Big Data. *Ardeola*, 63, 103–136.

639 Marine Regions. (2019). *Marine Regions shapefile*.
 640 <http://www.marineregions.org/downloads.php#longhurst>.

641 Mott, R. & Clarke, R.H. (2018). Systematic review of geographic biases in the collection
 642 of at-sea distribution data for seabirds. *Emu - Austral Ornithol.*, 118, 235–246.

643 Nathan, R., Getz, W.M., Revilla, E., Holyoak, M., Kadmon, R., Saltz, D. & Smouse, P.E.
 644 (2008). A movement ecology paradigm for unifying organismal movement
 645 research. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 105, 19052–19059.

646 Onley, D. & Scofield, P. (2007). *Albatrosses, Petrels and Shearwaters of the World*. Helm,
 647 London.

648 Paleczny, M. (2012). *An analyse of temporal and spatial patterns in global seabird*
 649 *abundance during the morderne industrial era, 1950-2010, and the relationship*
 650 *between global seabird decline and marine fisheries catch*. MSc thesis, Department
 651 of Zoology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver (MSc thesis, Department of
 652 Zoology).

653 Pebsma, E. (2018). Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data.
654 The R Journal 10 (1), 439-446, <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-009>.

655 Péron, C., Weimerskirch, H. & Bost, C.-A. (2012). Projected poleward shift of king
656 penguins' (*Aptenodytes patagonicus*) foraging range at the Crozet Islands, southern
657 Indian Ocean. *Proc. R. Soc. B-Biol. Sci.*, 279, 2515–2523.

658 Pichegru, L., Grémillet, D., Crawford, R.J.M. & Ryan, P.G. (2010). Marine no-take zone
659 rapidly benefits endangered penguin. *Biol. Lett.*, 6, 498–501.

660 QGIS Development Team. (2019). QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source
661 Geospatial Foundation Project. <http://qgis.osgeo.org>.

662 Rabesandratana, T. (2018). European funders detail their open-access plan. *Science*, 362,
663 983–983.

664 Richmond, J. (2000). The 3Rs – Past, Present and Future. *Scand. J. Lab. Anim. Sci.*, 27, 9.

665 Rigby, R. & Stasinopoulos, D. (2005). Generalized additive models for location, scale and
666 shape,(with discussion). *Appl. Stat.*, 507–554.

667 Ropert-Coudert, Y., Van de Putte, A.P., Reisinger, R.R., Bornemann, H., Charrassin, J.-
668 B., Costa, D.P., Danis, B., Hückstädt, L.A., Jonsen, I.D., Lea, M.-A., Thompson,
669 D., Torres, L.G., Trathan, P.N., Wotherspoon, S., Ainley, D.G., Alderman, R.,
670 Andrews-Goff, V., Arthur, B., Ballard, G., Bengtson, J., Bester, M.N., Blix, A.S.,
671 Boehme, L., Bost, C.-A., Boveng, P., Cleeland, J., Constantine, R., Crawford,
672 R.J.M., Dalla Rosa, L., Nico de Bruyn, P.J., Delord, K., Descamps, S., Double, M.,
673 Emmerson, L., Fedak, M., Friedlaender, A., Gales, N., Goebel, M., Goetz, K.T.,
674 Guinet, C., Goldsworthy, S.D., Harcourt, R., Hinke, J.T., Jerosch, K., Kato, A.,

675 Kerry, K.R., Kirkwood, R., Kooyman, G.L., Kovacs, K.M., Lawton, K., Lowther,
 676 A.D., Lydersen, C., Lyver, P.O., Makhado, A.B., Márquez, M.E.I., McDonald, B.I.,
 677 McMahon, C.R., Muelbert, M., Nachtsheim, D., Nicholls, K.W., Nordøy, E.S.,
 678 Olmastroni, S., Phillips, R.A., Pistorius, P., Plötz, J., Pütz, K., Ratcliffe, N., Ryan,
 679 P.G., Santos, M., Southwell, C., Staniland, I., Takahashi, A., Tarroux, A.,
 680 Trivelpiece, W., Wakefield, E., Weimerskirch, H., Wienecke, B., Xavier, J.C.,
 681 Raymond, B. & Hindell, M.A. (2020). The retrospective analysis of Antarctic
 682 tracking data project. *Sci. Data*, 7.

683 SCBD. (2010). Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In: *COP 10 Decis. X2 Strateg. Plan Biodivers.*
 684 *2011-2020*. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Nagoya, Japan.

685 Sequeira, A.M.M., Heupel, M.R., Lea, M. -A., Eguíluz, V.M., Duarte, C.M., Meekan,
 686 M.G., Thums, M., Calich, H.J., Carmichael, R.H., Costa, D.P., Ferreira, L.C.,
 687 Fernández-Gracia, J., Harcourt, R., Harrison, A. -L., Jonsen, I., McMahon, C.R.,
 688 Sims, D.W., Wilson, R.P. & Hays, G.C. (2019). The importance of sample size in
 689 marine megafauna tagging studies. *Ecol. Appl.*, 29.

690 Sergio, F., Tanferna, A., De Stephanis, R., Jiménez, L.L., Blas, J., Tavecchia, G., Preatoni,
 691 D. & Hiraldo, F. (2014). Individual improvements and selective mortality shape
 692 lifelong migratory performance. *Nature*, 515, 410–413.

693 Shaffer, S.A., Tremblay, Y., Weimerskirch, H., Scott, D., Thompson, D.R., Sagar, P.M.,
 694 Moller, H., Taylor, G.A., Foley, D.G., Block, B.A. & Costa, D.P. (2006). Migratory
 695 shearwaters integrate oceanic resources across the Pacific Ocean in an endless
 696 summer. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 103, 12799–12802.

697 SPRFMO. (2009). South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation.
698 <https://www.sprfmo.int/>.

699 Venables, W.N. & Ripley, B.D. (2002). Modern Applied Statistics with S. Fourth Edition.
700 Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0.

701 Wakefield, E.D., Bodey, T.W., Bearhop, S., Blackburn, J., Colhoun, K., Davies, R., Dwyer,
702 R.G., Green, J.A., Gremillet, D., Jackson, A.L., Jessopp, M.J., Kane, A., Langston,
703 R.H.W., Lescroel, A., Murray, S., Le Nuz, M., Patrick, S.C., Peron, C., Soanes,
704 L.M., Wanless, S., Votier, S.C. & Hamer, K.C. (2013). Space Partitioning Without
705 Territoriality in Gannets. *Science*, 341, 68–70.

706 Weimerskirch, H. & Wilson, R.P. (2000). Oceanic respite for wandering albatrosses.
707 *Nature*, 406, 955–956.

708 Weimerskirch, H., Bonadonna, F., Bailleul, F., Mabile, G., Dell’Omo, G. & Lipp, H.-P.
709 (2002). GPS Tracking of Foraging Albatrosses. *Science*, 295, 1259–1259.

710 Wikelski, M. & Kays, R. (2019). Movebank: archive, analysis and sharing of animal
711 movement data. Hosted by the Max Planck Institute for Animal Behavior.
712 www.movebank.org.

713 World Bank. (2019). *World Bank Open Data*. <https://data.worldbank.org/>.

714 Young, H.S., Maxwell, S.M., Conners, M.G. & Shaffer, S.A. (2015). Pelagic marine
715 protected areas protect foraging habitat for multiple breeding seabirds in the central
716 Pacific. *Biol. Conserv.*, 181, 226–235.

717 Zeileis, A. & Jackman, S. (2008). Regression Models for Count Data in R. *Journal of*
718 *Statistical Software* 27(8). URL <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v27/i08/>.

719 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A. & Smith, G.M. (2009). Zero-Truncated
720 and Zero-Inflated Models for Count Data. In: *Mix. Eff. Models Ext. Ecol. R.*
721 Springer New York, New York, NY, pp. 261–293.
722
723

Figures




Figure 1. Total annual number of seabird tracking studies across 1984-2018. Seabird families are color-coded. Tracking studies with datasets covering multiple years are represented in all corresponding columns. Studies covering multiple families appear more than once in any given year (these are rare, 0.6%).





Figure 2. Spatial variation in tracking intensity across Longhurst provinces. A) Tracking effort (number of individuals tracked); B) Percentage of species in the province that were tracked.




Figure 3: Tracking intensity of threatened species: A) Relationship between tracking effort (number of individuals tracked per species) and tracking coverage (percentage of the species' at-sea range covered by tracking data), for threatened seabird species for which tracking data were found in the literature (n=59). B) List of threatened species for which no tracking data were found in the literature (n=54). For species not in bold (n=9) we found tracking data in online databases (*Seabird Tracking Database* or *Movebank*). The genera abbreviations for Alcidae are: Bra. *Brachyramphus*; Fra. *Fratercula*; Syn. *Synthliboramphus*. For Anatidae: Cla. *Clangula*; Mel. *Melanitta*, Pol. *Polysticta*,

744 Tac. *Tachyeres*. For Diomedeidae: Dio. *Diomedeida*, Pho. *Phoebetria*, Tha. *Thalassarche*. For
 745 Fregatidae: Fre. *Fregata*. For Hydrobatidae: Hyd. *Hydrobates*. For Laridae: Chl. *Chlidonias*, Lar.
 746 *Larus*, Ony. *Onychoprion*, Ris. *Rissa*, Sau. *Saundersilarus*, Ste. *Sternula*, Tha. *Thalasseus*. For
 747 Phalacrocoracidae: Leu. *Leucocarbo*, Nan. *Nannopterum*, Pha. *Phalacrocorax*. For Podicipedidae:
 748 Pod. *Podiceps*. For Procellariidae: Ard. *Ardenna*, Pac. *Pachyptila*, Pel. *Pelecanoides*, Pro.
 749 *Procellaria*, Pse. *Pseudobulweria*. Pte. *Pterodroma*, Puf. *Puffinus*. For Spheniscidae: Eud.
 750 *Eudyptes*, Med. *Megadyptes*, Sph. *Spheniscus*. For Sulidae: Mor. *Morus*, Pap. *Papasula*.

751




Figure 4. Spatial gaps in tracking data, mapped across Longhurst provinces. A) Number of gap species, i.e. those for which no tracking data were found in the reviewed literature (n=178). B) Number of threatened gap species (n=54). C) Number of threatened near-gap species, i.e., with both little tracking effort (< 100 individuals) and little tracking coverage (<50% of range covered) (n=19)




Figure 5. Percentage of seabird species tracked by family and by data source: publications (up to mid-May 2019), the *Seabird Tracking Database*, and *Movebank* (in February 2020).

762

763 **Supplementary materials for this manuscript include the following:**

764 Figures S1 to S14

765 Tables S1 to S4

766 SI References

767

768