The status and conservation of Cape Gannets *Morus capensis*

2

- 3 Richard B Sherley^{1,*}, Robert JM Crawford², Bruce M Dyer², Jessica Kemper³, Azwianewi B
- 4 Makhado^{2,4}, Makhudu Masotla², Lorien Pichegru^{4,5}, Pierre A Pistorius^{4,5}, Jean-Paul Roux⁶, Peter
- 5 G Ryan⁴, Desmond Tom⁶, Leshia Upfold² and Henning Winker^{2,7}

6

- 7 1. Environment and Sustainability Institute/Centre for Ecology & Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn
- 8 Campus, Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK
- 9 2. Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DEFF), PO Box 52126, Cape Town 8000, South
- 10 Africa
- 11 3. African Penguin Conservation Project, PO Box 583, Lüderitz, Namibia
- 12 4. DST-NRF Centre of Excellence at the FitzPatrick Institute of African Ornithology, Department of
- 13 Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
- 14 5. Department of Zoology, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa
- 15 6. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Lüderitz, Namibia
- 16 7. Centre for Statistics in Ecology, Environment and Conservation (SEEC), Department of Statistical
- 17 Sciences, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

18

19 * Corresponding author, email: <u>r.sherley@exeter.ac.uk</u>

20

21 ORCID: RB Sherley (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7367-9315)

22

23

Abstract

- 24 The Cape Gannet Morus capensis is one of several seabird species that are endemic to the
- 25 Benguela upwelling ecosystem (BUS), whose populations recently decreased leading to
- 26 unfavourable Red List classifications. Application of JARA, a Bayesian state-space tool for IUCN
- 27 Red List assessment, to updated information on areas occupied by and nest densities of breeding

Cape Gannets at their six colonies suggested the species should be classified as Vulnerable. However, the rate of decrease of Cape Gannets in their most recent generation exceeded that of the previous generation, primarily as a result of large decreases at Bird Island, Lambert's Bay, and Malgas Island off South Africa's west coast. Since the 1960s, there has been an ongoing redistribution of the species from northwest to southeast so that c. 70% of the species now occurs at Bird Island, Algoa Bay, on the eastern border of the BUS. Recruitment rather than adult survival may be limiting the present population, although information on demographic parameters and mortality in fisheries is lacking for colonies in the northern BUS. Major present threats to the species include a substantially decreased availability of their preferred prey in the west, heavy mortality of eggs, chicks and fledglings at and around colonies inflicted by Cape Fur Seals Arctocephalus pusillus and other seabirds, substantial disturbance at colonies caused by Cape Fur Seals attacking adults ashore, oiling and disease.

Keywords: Bayesian state-space model; Benguela ecosystem; Conservation status; IUCN Red List; Population decline; Seabird conservation.

Introduction

The Cape Gannet *Morus capensis* is one of seven seabirds endemic to the Benguela upwelling system off southwest Africa. It has historically bred at ten islands off the coasts of Namibia and South Africa but at only six islands by 1956: Mercury, Ichaboe and Possession in Namibia; Bird at Lambert's Bay (hereafter referred to as Lambert's Bay), Malgas and Bird at Algoa Bay (hereafter referred to as Bird Island, Algoa Bay) in South Africa (Figure 1, Crawford et al. 1983). Although many birds regularly disperse north along the west and east coasts of Africa after breeding (e.g. Broekhuysen et al. 1961, Cyrus and Robson 1980, Klages 1994), the species is not migratory and adults are often present at breeding localities throughout the non-breeding season (Nelson 2005, Pistorius et al. 2015). A number of historical and contemporary pressures

from human activities have caused the number of Cape Gannets to decline since the first efforts to estimate their abundance in 1956 (Crawford et al. 2007). For example, Cape Gannets construct their nests from quano, of which they produce substantial quantities at breeding localities (Jarvis 1970). Their guano and that of other seabirds was previously harvested at southern African islands and platforms, with much of it being shipped to Europe as a fertilizer (Crawford and Shelton 1978, van Sittert and Crawford 2003). Again, Cape Gannets prefer to feed on two energyrich forage fish species, sardine Sardinops sagax and anchovy Engraulis encrasicolus, though they may also utilise less nutritious fish species, such as saury Scomberesox saurus, and scavenge hake Merluccius spp. and other benthic species discarded by demersal trawlers (e.g. Berruti et al. 1993, Dundee 2006; Green et al. 2015, Grémillet et al. 2008, 2019). Sardine and anchovy are the mainstay of the region's industrial purse-seine fisheries (Hutchings et al. 2009) and play a major role in the transfer of energy from lower to higher trophic levels (e.g. Cury et al. 2000). However, access to forage fish for the regions' seabirds has changed markedly since the 1950s with the collapse of Namibia's sardine stock in the early 1970s (Crawford et al. 1983, Watermeyer et al. 2008, Roux et al. 2013) and a more recent decrease in the availability to seabirds of sardine and anchovy off South Africa's west coast after 2003 (Crawford et al. 2019).

In the 1950s and 1960s, most Cape Gannets bred in Namibia but by 1978, numbers were shared evenly between Namibia and South Africa (Crawford et al. 1983). Since 1997, > 80% of Cape Gannets bred in South Africa (Crawford et al. 2007). Under the criteria of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), in South Africa the Cape Gannet was of Least Concern in 1976 (Siegfried et al. 1976) and 1984 (Brooke 1984) but Vulnerable in 2000 (Barnes 2000) and 2015 (Hagen 2015). On account of its severe decrease in Namibia, it was there regarded as Critically Endangered in 2015 (Kemper 2015). The global status of the Cape Gannet was Least Concern in 1988, Near Threatened in 1994, Vulnerable in 2000 and Endangered in 2017 (BirdLife International 2019). Its 2017 assessment was based on Bayesian state-space modelling of

numbers breeding at the species' six extant colonies between 1956 and 2016, which indicated a decline of c. 52% over three generations of 20.2 years (Birdlife International 2019).

In this paper we update information on densities of nests, areas occupied by, and generation length of, Cape Gannets. We revisit the generation length calculation, reapply the model used in the 2017 assessment directly to estimates of the area occupied by breeding gannets, and propagate the uncertainty around nesting density in revised estimates of the species' abundance to ascertain whether the classification of Endangered remains applicable. We also review the threats faced by the species and identify interventions needed to secure the species' conservation.

Methods

The numbers of nests of Cape Gannets at colonies in breeding seasons were estimated from measurements of the area occupied by breeding birds (in hectares [ha]) from near-vertical aerial photographs, combined with ground-based measures of the densities of nests (Randall and Ross 1979, Klages et al. 1992). Aerial photographs were taken in November or December, when most birds were incubating or brooding (Shelton et al. 1982). Cape Gannets may commence breeding in mid-August, first clutches are usually complete by early November and most fledging is complete by the end of March (Staverees et al. 2008). The extent of the area occupied by breeding birds was measured using an Ibas interactive image-analysis system. The photographs were scaled from ground measurements of straight edges, e.g. walls or buildings, near the colonies (Crawford et al. 2007). In certain years (Table S1), when it was not possible to take photographs, the area of a gannet colony was estimated by an observer walking around the colony with a Global Positioning System (GPS) that had a horizontal error of ± 4 m (Crawford et al. 2007). Disturbance to birds was reduced by suspending the GPS from a pole that ensured a 2 m gap between the observer and the gannets. In total, between 1956/57 and 2018/19, estimates of the area occupied

by breeding birds were available for 27 seasons at Mercury Island, 25 at Ichaboe Island, 23 at Possession Island, 41 at Lambert's Bay, 38 at Malgas Island and 42 at Bird Island, Algoa Bay (Figure 3).

Measurements of the densities of nests at colonies were undertaken during breeding seasons by placing four poles, each 2 m long, on the surface of the ground, so as to form a square of 4 m². The numbers of whole nests and part nests that fell within a square were counted. The overall number of nests in a square was taken to be the number of whole nests plus half the number of part nests (Randall and Ross 1979, Crawford et al. 2007). The number of density measurements made in any season ranged from two at Possession Island in 2002/03 and 2005/06, when the colony was small and it was desired to minimize disturbance, to 30 at Algoa Bay in 2005/06 (Crawford et al 2007). Usually 10–25 density measurements were made at a colony in a given breeding season. Density measurements were made at Mercury, Ichaboe and Possession islands in three seasons, at Lambert's Bay in 19 seasons, at Malgas Island in 23 seasons and at Bird Island, Algoa Bay in 11 seasons (Figure 2). Additionally, three published estimates were available for Bird Island, Algoa Bay (Randall and Ross 1979, Batchelor 1982). As information on densities of nests was not available for many seasons, for each locality a mean and SD density were obtained, by giving equal weight to each season for which information existed.

In addition, in the 2010/11 and 2018/19 seasons, direct counts of the numbers of Cape Gannet nests at the three Namibian colonies were made from aerial photographs (Kemper 2015, MFMR and African Penguin Conservation Project unpubl. data). This method was also applied to the small colony at Possession Island in 2011/12 and 2014/15. We used these eight direct counts of nests to check our model estimates against these cases.

Generation length (G) for Cape Gannets was calculated as:

$$G = \frac{A+1}{(1-\phi_a)}$$

133 (1)

where A is age of first breeding and ϕ_a is adult survival (Birdlife International 2000). In keeping with the IUCN Red List guidelines, which state "where generation length varies under threat ... the more natural, i.e. pre-disturbance, generation length should be used" (IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee 2017), we used A = 4 years and $\phi_a = 0.93$ based on Crawford (1999) and the 1990 survival estimates from Distiller et al. (2012).

To determine the change occurring in the Cape Gannet population over the last 3G years, we used a Bayesian state-space tool for IUCN Red List assessment (Just Another Red List Assessment [JARA], https://github.com/henning-winker/JARA, Winker and Sherley 2019). JARA assumes that the underlying trend in the area occupied (I_t ; Figure S1) followed a conventional exponential growth model (e.g. Kéry and Schaub 2012):

$$I_{t+1} = I_t \lambda_t$$

where λ_t is the growth rate in year t. On the log scale, the state process model was:

148
$$\mu_{t+1,i} = \mu_{t,i} + r_{t,i}$$

where $\mu_{t,i} = \log{(I_{t,i})}$ and $r_{t,i} = \log{(\lambda_{t,i})}$, the year-to-year rate of change at breeding colony i that is assumed to vary around \bar{r}_i – the underlying mean rate of change for the colony – but with an estimable process variance σ_{η}^2 that is common to all colonies $r_{t,i} \sim Normal(\bar{r}_i, \sigma_{\eta}^2)$. The corresponding observation equation is:

$$\log (y_{t,i}) = \mu_{t,i} + \epsilon_{t,i}$$

where $y_{t,i}$ is the area occupied for year t and $\epsilon_{t,i}$ is the observation residual for year t at breeding colony i. The residual error is assumed to be normally distributed on the log-scale $\epsilon_{t,i} \sim Normal(0, \sigma_{\epsilon}^2)$ as a function of a common observation variance σ_{ϵ}^2 .

The estimated posterior of the population size (number of breeding pairs) at each colony became:

$$\hat{I}_{t,i} = \exp(\mu_{t,i}) \times \delta_i \times 10,000,$$

$$\delta_i = gamma(\alpha_i, \beta_i),$$

$$\alpha_i = \overline{D}_i^2 / \sigma_{D,i}^2,$$

$$\beta_i = \overline{D}_i / \sigma_{D,i}^2$$

165 (5)

where δ_i is a colony-specific informative gamma prior for the densities of nests, parameterised via shape (α_i) and rate (β_i) parameters using the observed mean (\overline{D}_i) and SD $(\sigma_{D,i})$ for nesting density (m²) at each colony. The global population $I_{p,t}$ for year t was computed from the sum of all individual colony trajectory posteriors:

$$I_{p,t} = \sum_{i} \hat{I}_{t,i}$$

171 (6)

The percentage change (C%) in numbers at each colony was calculated from the posteriors of the estimated population ($\hat{I}_{t,i}$) as the difference between a three-year average around the final observed data point T, and a three-year average around year T-(3G) (e.g. Figure S2). The year T+1 is always projected to obtain a three-year average around T (to reduce the influence of short-term fluctuations; Froese et al. 2017).

We implemented JARA in JAGS (v.4.3.0; Plummer 2003) via the "jagsUl" library (v.1.5.1; Kellner 2019) for R. The initial for the first modelled count $I_{t=1,i}$ was drawn in log-space from a 'flat' normal distribution with the mean equal to the log of the first observation $y_{t=1,i}$ and a standard deviation of 1000. We used vague normal priors of Normal(0,1000) for \bar{r}_i and inverse gamma priors for both the state and observation process variance of $\sigma^2 \sim 1/gamma(0.001,0.001)$, which is approximately uniform on the log scale (Winker et al. 2018). The model was fitted by running three Monte Carlo Markov chains (MCMC) for 50,000 iterations, with a burn-in of 25,000 and a thinning rate of 5. Convergence was diagnosed using the 'coda' package (Plummer et al. 2006), adopting minimal thresholds of p=0.05 for Geweke's (1992) diagnostics. Unless otherwise specified, we report medians and 95% Bayesian credible intervals (BCI).

188

189

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

Results

- 190 Generation length (G)
- Using values of A = 4 years and ϕ_a = 0.93 per annum, we obtained an estimate of G = 18.3 years
- 192 and 3G = c. 55 years.

193

- 194 Nesting densities
- 195 Mean (± SD) densities of nests·m⁻² at the six breeding localities of Cape Gannets were: Mercury
- Island 3.73 \pm 0.57; Ichaboe Island 3.56 \pm 0.67; Possession Island 4.39 \pm 1.12; Lambert's Bay
- 197 3.11 \pm 0.36; Malgas Island 2.90 \pm 0.17; Bird Island, Algoa Bay 3.00 \pm 0.276. There was no
- 198 evidence of a trend in nest densities at any of the three colonies at which densities were obtained
- in 10 or more seasons (Figure 2).

200

201

Population count estimates

The state-space model (SSM) estimate for the total number of breeding pairs of Cape Gannets at the six colonies declined from 264,558 (95% BCI: 193,839–365,146) in 1956/57 to 134,775 (110,013–166,901) in 2018/19 (Figure S2). In Namibia, estimated numbers declined from c. 210,000 pairs, c. 80% of the global population, in 1956/57 to c. 7,000 pairs, or c. 5% of the global population, in 2018/19. Estimated numbers at Mercury Island decreased from c. 9,000 pairs in 1956/57 to c. 3,500 pairs in 1969/70, recovered to c. 4,500 pairs in 1978/79 and after 1980 fluctuated around c. 2,000 pairs (Figure 3). Cape Gannets occupied much of Ichaboe Island in 1956/57 and 1967/68 (Rand 1963, Crawford 1991). In 1956/57, c. 180,000 pairs bred at the island. Estimated numbers declined to c. 50,000 pairs in 1981/82 and fluctuated around this level until the end of the 1980s, then decreased again to a present population of c. 5,000 pairs (Figure 3). The numbers at Possession Island decreased from c. 20,000 pairs in 1956/57 to c. 2,900 pairs from 1980–1992, and then to the present population of c. 130 pairs (Figure 3). Seven of the eight direct counts of nests fell within the 95% credible intervals of the state-space model estimate for the corresponding year and colony (Figure S3).

In South Africa, fewer than 6,000 pairs bred at Lambert's Bay between 1956/57 and 1978/79. The colony grew to c. 11,000 pairs in 1987/88 and then varied around 10,000 pairs from 1988/89–2003/04. Between c. 5,500 and 7,700 pairs were estimated to have bred there in subsequent years (Figure 3). At Malgas Island, there were about 26,000 pairs between 1956/57 and 1983/84. The colony increased to a peak of c. 52,000 pairs in 1996/97. Since then it decreased in fluctuating fashion to c. 22,000 pairs in 2018/19 (Figure 3). The colony at Bird Island, Algoa Bay grew from c. 22,000 pairs in 1956/57 to c. 95,000 pairs in 2004/05 and subsequently varied around that value (Figure 3).

Percentage change (C%) and conservation status

The median *C*% in the global population over the last 3G was estimated as –44.7 (–63.8––18.9)% (Figure 4), or –1.0% per annum (Figure 5). The median rate of decrease was slower when only the last 2 generations were considered (–0.18% per annum), indicating a period of population stability (Figure 5 and S2). The annual rate of decline appears to have increased again during the most recent generation (–0.97% per annum), though the confidence in this latest estimate was lowest (greatest variance in Figure 5). Overall, the majority (>87%) of the plausible estimates (the posterior probability distribution) for *C*% exceed the decline thresholds for the IUCN threatened categories, with a 56.9% probability that the population meets the A2 criteria for a global classification of Vulnerable (VU; Figure 4) and 31.0% probability of meeting the same criteria for Endangered (EN; Figure 4). Only 0.12% of plausible rates of change were positive.

Discussion

Methodological/Previous estimates gave c. 254,000 and c. 249,000 pairs of Cape Gannets breeding in 1956/57 and 1968/69, respectively (Crawford et al. 2007). Applying the method of Crawford et al. (2007) to the most recent nesting area data suggests c. 135,000 pairs bred in 2018/19, a change of c. -46% in the 50 years since 1968/69. This accords well with our SSM estimates, which produced a median decline of -44.7% over the 3G (54.9 years) prior to 2018/2019, from c. 247,000 pairs around 1963/64 to c. 135,000 pairs around 2018/19 (Figure S2). In contrast, densities of nests varied between colonies from 2.9–4.4 m⁻², without clear trends at any of the three regularly monitored colonies (Figure 2). This suggests that the area used for nesting expands or contracts in response to increases or decreases in numbers breeding (while nesting density remains relatively constant). Nest sites may be chosen to minimise both aggressive interactions between neighbours (Jarvis 1971) and the loss of eggs and small chicks to predators (de Ponte Machado 2010) as breeding success is higher in the interior of colonies than at their periphery (Staverees et al. 2008, Mullers et al. 2009, Green and Pistorius 2013).

Seven of the eight direct counts of nests fell within the 95% credible intervals of the corresponding state-space model estimate (Figure S3). While this gives some credence to our approach for estimating abundance, the direct counts all come from the now relatively small Namibian colonies. Moreover, it is important to emphasize that our results represent modelled population estimates, not direct counts of the number of occupied nests as presented elsewhere (e.g. Kemper 2015).

It is possible to obtain direct nest counts from aerial photographs, even for the very large gannet colonies (Shelton et al. 1982). While these are likely to be more precise than our estimates, they are more time-consuming to undertake and to date no work has been done to assess the uncertainty associated with that approach. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs or drones) can now be used to census seabird colonies cheaply, accurately and precisely (Hodgson et al. 2018), with minimal disturbance if best-practise guidelines are followed carefully (Brisson-Curadeau et al. 2017). Future estimates to census Cape Gannet populations could benefit from using UAV technology to assess the intra-annual variability in colony attendance, to quantify the relative error in using direct counts versus estimates of the area occupied (as applied here), and to calibrate UAV images with aerial photographs from manned aircraft to reduce the cost and increase the frequency of population estimates in future.

Conservation status

The most recent IUCN Red List assessment for Cape Gannets reported a -51.5% change in the numbers breeding over 61 years (1956–2017), resulting in a global Red List status of Endangered (Birdlife International 2019). Our revised abundance estimates yielded a lesser decline -44.7%, with the balance of evidence suggesting a global classification of Vulnerable as the most appropriate status. Although the analysis we undertook for the Birdlife International (2019) assessment was also based on a Bayesian SSM model fit, it differed from the analysis reported on in this paper in two keys way. First, that SSM was applied to numbers of breeding pairs that

had been calculated without taking into account the uncertainty in the nesting density estimates. In contrast, here we considered both the uncertainty in the nesting density estimates and the estimates of the area occupied by breeding birds in modelling our revised abundance estimates. Greater uncertainty will increase the spread of the posterior probabilities for %C across the thresholds for the IUCN threatened categories. Second, we have suggested revising the generation length from 20.2 years (Birdlife International 2019) to 18.3 years based on the results of Crawford (1999) and Distiller et al. (2012). This is the main reason for our more conservative estimate in the median decline of -44.7% versus -51.5%, as the greatest rate of decrease in the Cape Gannet population occurred as a result of large losses of gannets in Namibia in the 1960s and early 1970s (Figure 3 and S2) following the loss of sardine stocks in the Northern Benguela (Roux et al. 2013). With a shorter generation time, these early declines contribute less to the 3G decline estimates in our results than in those used by Birdlife International (2019). Moreover, these losses were ameliorated to some extent by increases at South African colonies in the 1980s and 1990s (Figure 3), initially in the Western Cape as sardine and anchovy recovered in the Southern Benguela, then at Bird Island, Algoa Bay, as these fish shifted eastwards (Roy et al. 2007, Coetzee et al. 2008). However, while the current analysis suggests a global Red List status of Vulnerable would be appropriate, it is worth noting that substantial decreases at South Africa's two western colonies in the most recent 1G (since 2000) have again accelerated the rate of decrease (Figure 5).

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

296

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

Regional population change

The redistribution of Cape Gannets after 1967/68 in an anti-clockwise direction, from northwest to southeast around the southern African coast, is thought to have resulted from a similar relocation of its main prey species, sardine and anchovy (Crawford et al. 2007, 2015). Sardine off Namibia was depleted through overfishing in the 1960s and 1970s and has not recovered (e.g. Roux et al. 2013). In South Africa, there was a movement of mature sardine and anchovy from its

west to south coasts at the end of the 1990s and in the present century sardine has been heavily exploited west of Cape Agulhas (Roy et al. 2007, Coetzee et al. 2008). Additionally, there was a substantial decrease in the epipelagic availability of sardine and anchovy off South Africa's west coast after 2003 (Crawford et al. 2019).

Cape Gannets likely colonised Halifax and Possession islands in the mid-19th century, possibly due to displacement of birds from Ichaboe Island during intensive harvesting of guano there from 1843–1845 (Crawford et al. 1983). However, they did not establish a new colony off South Africa during their recent redistribution. Seal Island in False Bay, where they had previously bred (Crawford et al. 1983), was fully occupied by Cape Fur Seals *Arctocephalus pusillus* at this time (Shaughnessy 1984) and attempts to settle at Robben Island in c. 1968 and Dyer Island in 1984/85 (Berruti 1985, Crawford et al. 1986) may have been cut short by disturbance. The result is that >70% of all Cape Gannets now nest at Bird Island, Algoa Bay, at the eastern extremity of their breeding distribution, where the population seems to have reached an asymptote (Figure 3). Gannets at this colony are in poorer condition than those at the smaller South African colonies and have to work harder to find food, probably as a result of intra-specific competition (e.g. Moseley et al. 2012, Rijklief 2016). Outside their breeding season, adult Cape Gannets may disperse > 1,000 km from colonies and juvenile birds may move > 2,000 km (Broekhuysen et al. 1961, Klages 1994), but there are no suitable breeding localities for the species in southern Africa east of Bird Island, Algoa Bay.

Threats

Present threats to Cape Gannets include scarcity of nutritious prey, mortality in fisheries, predation at or around colonies, disturbance at (see above) or displacement from colonies, oiling, disease and extreme weather events. Each of these pressures is discussed briefly below.

Although Cape Gannets are able to switch their prey (e.g. Crawford et al. 2014, Grémillet et al. 2019), scarcity of good-quality prey is thought to be the main cause of their ongoing population decrease (e.g. Lewis et al. 2006, Pichegru et al. 2007, Cohen et al. 2014, Crawford et al. 2015). The numbers of Cape Gannets breeding in both Namibia and South Africa were significantly related to the biomass of sardine and anchovy (Crawford et al. 2007). In western South Africa, they were also related to the epipelagic availability of these prey species (Crawford et al. 2019). Scarcity of energy-rich prey may decrease the proportion of adult Cape Gannets that breed (Crawford and Dyer 1995) and may have influenced recent variability in numbers of nests at colonies (see Figure 3). It may also reduce breeding success (e.g. Crawford 1999, Grémillet et al. 2008, Cury et al. 2011), inhibit chick growth (Mullers et al. 2009) and nest attendance (Rishworth et al. 2014), increase foraging effort (Grémillet et al. 2016) and negatively impact adult body condition (Cohen et al. 2014). Parents in better body condition spent longer periods at their nests (Rishworth et al. 2014). Faced with scarcity of their natural prey, Cape Gannets exploited fishery waste from trawlers (Tew Kai et al. 2013) but this low-quality resource still results in low adult body condition and reproductive performance (Moseley et al. 2012).

Considerable numbers of Cape Gannets were killed off southern Africa in demersal-trawl and demersal- and pelagic-longline fisheries at the turn of the recent century (Watkins et al. 2008, Petersen et al. 2009a, 2009b) but numbers killed off South Africa have subsequently been much reduced via mitigation measures (Maree et al. 2014, Rollinson et al. 2017). Many juveniles were exhausted on arrival off Angola and easily killed by fishermen there (Broekhuysen et al. 1961). The extent to which such deliberate killing for food continues is unknown.

Cape Fur Seals killed an estimated 27,000 fledglings around Malgas Island over the course of three breeding seasons (Makhado et al. 2006) and > 900 gannets around Ichaboe Island in May 2000 (du Toit et al. 2004). Fur seals caused cessation of breeding at Hollam's Bird Island between

1938 and 1956 by entirely displacing gannets from that locality (Crawford et al. 1983) and, by attacking adults ashore, they also caused the abandonment of the colony at Lambert's Bay in 2005/06 (Wolfaardt and Williams 2006) and of c. 10% of the colony at Malgas Island in 2017/18 (Dyer et al. 2018). The removal of some damage-causing animals has prevented further losses. At Ichaboe and Bird, Algoa Bay islands, periods of non-attendance by parents caused by poor foraging conditions resulted in many eggs or small chicks being eaten by Kelp Gulls *Larus dominicanus* (Mullers and Tinbergen 2009, Rishworth and Pistorius 2015). At Lambert's Bay, between 2009 and 2013, Kelp Gulls ate an average of 13% of eggs laid by Cape Gannets (Saul and Fortuin 2015). At Malgas Island, Kelp Gulls took 10–70% of the colony's egg production between 2012 and 2018 (Pichegru 2017, SANParks unpublished data). In addition, Great White Pelicans *Pelecanus onocrotalus* have eaten gannet chicks at Malgas Island, especially smaller individuals (Pichegru et al. 2007, de Ponte Machado 2010), although active management put in place by South African National Parks since 2008 has drastically reduced their impact.

Oil-spills are a serious threat to Cape Gannets. In 1979, fish oil killed at least 709 gannets at Lambert's Bay but improvements in fish-offloading techniques lowered this risk (Crawford et al. 1983). However, fish oil from vessels processing fish or on-shore factories poses a chronic threat to gannets in Namibia (du Toit and Bartlett 2001, Kemper 2015). In 1983, oil spilt by the *Castillo de Bellver* affected > 5,000 Cape Gannets in the vicinity of Saldanha Bay; c. 1,500 were caught, of which 65% were de-oiled and successfully released (Wolfaardt et al. 2009). De-oiled birds had only slightly lower survival rates than un-oiled gannets (Altwegg et al. 2008). Recent harbour developments in Algoa Bay are likely to increase the risk of oil fouling seabirds in that region (Adeniji et al. 2017). This is of concern for Cape Gannets given that 70% of the global population now occurs at Bird Island, Algoa Bay.

Avian cholera *Pasteurella multocida* killed 172 Cape Gannets at Malgas Island in 1991 and almost 400 at Lambert's Bay in 2002 (Crawford et al. 1992, Ward and Williams 2004). In 2018, avian influenza (H5N8) was confirmed in Cape Gannets in South Africa and may have killed > 1,600 birds (Khomenko et al. 2018, Roberts 2018). At Lambert's Bay, four heat waves (35–40°C) killed 80 adult gannets attempting to shelter their nests in 1998 and 2000 (Ward and Williams 2004). Storms (heavy rain and strong winds) can also cause shorter nest attendance times and mortality of Cape Gannet chicks (Crawford et al. 1986, Rishworth and Pistorius 2015, Pistorius et al. 2015).

Conservation interventions

Assuming an age at first breeding of 4 years, and annual survival of birds aged ≥ 2 years and < 2 years of 0.91 and 0.71, respectively (Crawford 1999), an annual production of 0.32 fledglings per pair is required to maintain a (closed) Cape Gannet population in equilibrium (Makhado et al. 2006). Long-term averages in breeding success have generally exceeded 0.32 fledglings per pair (e.g. Adams et al. 1992, Staverees et al. 2008, Crawford et al. 2019). In contrast, annual survival of adult Cape Gannets averaged 0.83 at Lambert's Bay, 0.88 at Malgas Island and 0.90 at Bird Island, Algoa Bay from 1990–2009 (Distiller et al. 2012), and mortality immediately after fledging was deemed too high to sustain the population at Malgas Island (Makhado et al. 2006). Although better information on juvenile and immature survival and on demographic parameters at Namibian colonies is required, recruitment rather than adult survival may be limiting the Cape Gannet population (Distiller et al. 2012). In South Africa, adult Cape Gannets buffer their survival in periods of scarcity of sardine and anchovy by switching their diet to include saury or less nutritious hake offal discarded by bottom trawlers (Crawford et al. 2014, Grémillet et al. 2019), but this can have demographic implications through reduced breeding success and lower chick quality (e.g. Grémillet et al. 2008, but cf. Grémillet et al. 2019).

In order to improve the conservation status of Cape Gannets it will be necessary to maintain the present high rates of adult survival while at the same time increasing recruitment. The major threats to adult survival are mortality caused by fisheries, oiling and outbreaks of disease, which can be countered by requiring fisheries in the Benguela ecosystem to implement best practice by-catch mitigation, by marine spatial planning that minimises the risk of oil spills near colonies, where gannets have their highest densities, and by implementing standard protocols to reduce the possibility of pathogens spreading, e.g. rapid disposal of carcases (e.g. Khomenko et al. 2018). Recruitment seems to be mainly limited by insufficient high-quality prey off west southern Africa, and by disturbance and high post-fledging mortality inflicted by Cape Fur Seals around some colonies. Predation mortality at or near colonies can be reduced by removing damage-causing animals (e.g. Makhado et al. 2009).

Although it would not reverse the changes in the distribution and availability of their main prey species, ecosystem-based management should implement forage thresholds (e.g. Cury et al. 2011, Crawford et al. 2019) and marine spatial planning (e.g. Distiller et al. 2012) to ensure sufficient food for Cape Gannets and other seabirds (e.g. Sherley et al. 2017, 2018). In South Africa, there is substantial overlap of areas where gannets feed when breeding and where purseseiners catch sardine and anchovy (Okes et al. 2009, Pichegru et al. 2009), whereas in Namibia, although some core gannet feeding areas fall within the Namibian Islands' Marine Protected Area (MPA) (Ludynia et al. 2012), an improvement in forage resources for gannets depends on the recovery of the Namibian sardine stock. The new Greater Addo MPA in Algoa Bay, and in particular the eastward extension of the MPA from Bird Island, may benefit Cape Gannets in future as breeding adults generally forage to east of the island, albeit often far outside the bay (Botha and Pistorius 2018). Given a lack of alternative breeding localities in the east, it is particularly important to stabilise the deceasing smaller colonies in the west, where the impact of top-down processes is expected to increase as colony size decreases (Crawford et al. 2018).

Acknowledgements

- We thank our institutions for supporting this research, as well as MA Meyer, PG Kotze, and all who assisted with aerial photography and collection of the data. We are grateful to CapeNature, Namibia's Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources and South Africa's National Parks and Defence Force for permission to visit colonies and logistical support. This paper is an output of
- the Benguela Current Commission's top-predator programme.

439

440

References

- Adams NJ, Seddon PJ, van Heezik YM. 1992. Monitoring of seabirds in the Benguela upwelling
- system: can seabirds be used as indicators and predictors of change in the marine
- environment? South African Journal of Marine Science 12: 959–974.
- Adeniji AO, Okoh OO, Okoh AI. 2017. Petroleum hydrocarbon profiles of water and sediment of
- 445 Algoa Bay, Eastern Cape, South Africa. International Journal of Environmental Research and
- 446 Public Health 14: 1263.
- 447 Altwegg R, Crawford RJM, Underhill LG, Williams AJ. 2008. Long-term survival of de-oiled Cape
- gannets after the Castillo de Bellver oil spill of 1983. Biological Conservation 141: 1924–1929.
- Barnes KN. 2000. The Eskom Red Data Book of birds of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland.
- 450 BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg.
- 451 Batchelor AL. 1982. The diet of the Cape gannet Sula capensis breeding on Bird Island, Algoa
- Bay. MSc thesis, University Port Elizabeth, Port Elizabeth.
- 453 Berruti A. 1985. Cape Gannets *Sula capensis* ashore at Dyer and Robben Islands, Southwestern
- 454 Cape, South Africa. Cormorant 13: 71–72.
- 455 Berruti A, Underhill LG, Shelton PA, Moloney C, Crawford RJM. 1993. Seasonal and interannual
- variation in the diet of two colonies of the Cape Gannet *Morus capensis* between 1977/1978
- 457 and 1989. Colonial Waterbirds 16: 158–175.

- 458 Birdlife International. 2000. *Threatened Birds of the World*. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.
- 459 BirdLife International. 2019. Species factsheet: Morus capensis. Downloaded from
- 460 http://www.birdlife.org on 23/04/2019.
- Brisson-Curadeau É, Bird D, Burke C, Fifield DA, Pace P, Sherley RB, Elliott KH. 2017. Seabird
- species vary in behavioural response to drone census. Scientific Reports 7: 17884.
- Botha JA, Pistorius PA. 2018. Variability in the Foraging Distribution and Diet of Cape Gannets
- between the Guard and Post-guard Phases of the Breeding Cycle. Frontiers in Marine Science
- 465 5:15.
- Broekhuysen GJ, Liversidge R, Rand RW. 1961. The South African Gannet Morus capensis. I.
- Distribution and movements. *Ostrich* 32: 1–19.
- 468 Brooke RK. 1984. South African Red Data Book Birds. South African National Scientific
- 469 Programmes Report 97: 213 pp.
- 470 Coetzee JC, van der Lingen CD, Hutchings L, Fairweather TP. 2008. Has the fishery contributed
- 471 to a major shift in the distribution of South African sardine? ICES Journal of Marine Science
- 472 65: 1676–1688.
- 473 Cohen LA, Pichegru L, Grémillet D, Coetzee J, Upfold L, Ryan PG. 2014. Changes in prey
- availability impact the foraging behaviour and fitness of Cape gannets over a decade. *Marine*
- 475 *Ecology Progress Series* 505: 281–293.
- 476 Crawford RJM. 1991. Factors influencing population trends of some abundant vertebrates in
- sardine-rich coastal ecosystems. South African Journal of Marine Science 10: 365–381.
- 478 Crawford RJM. 1999. Seabird responses to long-term changes of prey resources off southern
- 479 Africa. In: Adams NJ, Slotow RH (eds) Proceedings of 22nd International Ornithological
- 480 *Congress, Durban, 1998.* BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg: 688–705.
- 481 Crawford RJM, Shelton PA. 1978. Pelagic fish and seabird interrelationships off the coasts of
- 482 South West and South Africa. *Biological Conservation* 14: 85–109.

- Crawford RJM, Dyer BM. 1995. Responses by four seabird species to a fluctuating availability of
- Cape anchovy (*Engraulis capensis*) off South Africa. *Ibis* 127: 329–339.
- 485 Crawford RJM, Allwright DM, Heyl CW. 1992. High mortality of Cape Cormorants (*Phalacrocorax*
- 486 capensis) off western South Africa in 1991 caused by Pasteurella multocida. Colonial
- 487 Waterbirds 15: 236–238.
- 488 Crawford RJM, Shelton PA, Cooper J, Brooke RK. 1983. Distribution, population size and
- conservation of the Cape gannet *Morus capensis*. South African Journal of Marine Science 1:
- 490 153–174.
- 491 Crawford RJM, Williams AJ, Crawford PB. 1986. A note on mortality of seabirds off western
- southern Africa, October 1985–February 1986. South African Journal of Marine Science 4:
- 493 119–123.
- 494 Crawford RJM, Dundee BL, Dyer BM, Klages NTW, Meyer MA, Upfold L. 2007. Trends in
- numbers of Cape gannets (*Morus capensis*), 1956/1957–2005/2006, with a consideration of
- the influence of food and other factors. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 64: 169–177.
- 497 Crawford RJM, Makhado AB, Waller LJ, Whittington PA. 2014. Winners and losers responses
- 498 to recent environmental change by South African seabirds that compete with purse-seine
- 499 fisheries for food. *Ostrich* 85: 111–117.
- 500 Crawford RJM, Makhado AB, Whittington PA, Randall RM, Oosthuizen WH, Waller LJ. 2015. A
- 501 changing distribution of seabirds in South Africa the possible impact of climate and its
- consequences. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 3: 10, 1–10.
- 503 Crawford RJM, Makhado AB, Oosthuizen WH. 2018. Bottom-up and top-down control of the
- Benguela ecosystem's seabirds. *Journal of Marine Systems* 188: 133–141.
- 505 Crawford RJM, Sydeman WJ, Thompson SA, Sherley RB, Makhado AB. 2019. Food habits of an
- endangered seabird indicate recent poor forage fish availability off western South Africa. *ICES*
- Journal of Marine Science. DOI: 10.1093/icesjms/fsz081.

- 508 Cury P, Bakun A, Crawford RJM, Jarre A, Quiñones RA, Shannon LJ, Verheye HM. 2000. Small
- 509 pelagics in upwelling systems: patterns of interaction and structural changes in "wasp-waist"
- ecosystems. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* Symposium Edition 57: 603–618.
- 511 Cury PM, Boyd IL, Bonhommeau S, Anker-Nilssen T, Crawford RJM, Furness RW, Mills JA,
- Murphy EJ, Österblom H, Paleczny M, Piatt JF, Roux J-P, Shannon L[J], Sydeman WJ. 2011.
- Global seabird response to forage fish depletion one-third for the birds. Science 334: 1703–
- 514 **1706**.
- 515 Cyrus D, Robson N. 1980. Bird Atlas of Natal. University of Natal Press, Pietermaritzburg.
- de Ponte Machado M. 2010. Population dynamics of Great White Pelicans in southern Africa.
- 517 PhD thesis, University of Cape Town.
- 518 Distiller G, Altwegg R, Crawford RJM, Klages NTW, Barham B. 2012. Factors affecting adult
- survival and inter-colony movement at the three South African colonies of Cape gannet. *Marine*
- 520 Ecology Progress Series 461: 245–255.
- du Toit M, Bartlett PA. 2001. 'Soaked' Cape Gannets at Ichaboe Island, Namibia. Bird Numbers
- 522 10: 8–9.
- 523 du Toit M, Bartlett PA, Bester MN, Roux J-P. 2004. Seal-seabird predation at Ichaboe Island,
- 524 Namibia: prey selection by individual seals. South African Journal of Wildlife Research 34: 45–
- 525 54.
- 526 Dyer BM, Crawford RJM, Makhado AB. 2018. Impact of Cape fur seals on Cape gannets at
- 527 Malgas Island. Report for Top Predator Scientific Working Group, Department of
- 528 Environmental Affairs, 1 p.
- Froese R, Demirel N, Coro G, Kleisner KM, Winker H. 2017. Estimating fisheries reference points
- from catch and resilience. *Fish and Fisheries* 18: 506–526.
- 531 Geweke J. 1992. Evaluating the accuracy of sampling-based approaches to the calculation of
- posterior moments. In: Berger JO, Bernardo JM, Dawid AP, Smith AFM (eds) Bayesian

- Statistics 4: Proceedings of the Fourth Valencia International Meeting. Clarendon Press,
- 534 Oxford, pp 169–193.
- Green D, Pistorius P. 2013. Living on the bare edge: fitness consequences for Cape gannets
- Morus capensis at Bird Island, Algoa Bay. Ostrich 84: 123–127.
- 537 Green DB, Klages NTW, Crawford RJM, Coetzee JC, Dyer BM, Rishworth GM, Pistorius PA.
- 538 2015. Dietary change in Cape gannets reflects distributional and demographic shifts in two
- South African commercial fish stocks. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 72: 771–781.
- 540 Grémillet D, Pichegru L, Kuntz G, Woakes AG, Wilkinson S, Crawford RJM, Ryan PG. 2008. A
- junk-food hypothesis for gannets feeding on fishery waste. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
- of London B: Biological Sciences 275: 1149–1156.
- 543 Grémillet D, Péron C, Kato A, Amélineau F, Ropert-Coudert Y, Ryan PG, Pichegru L. 2016.
- Starving seabirds: unprofitable foraging and its fitness consequences in Cape gannets
- competing with fisheries in the Benguela upwelling ecosystem. *Marine Biology* 163: 1–11.
- Grémillet D, Collet J, Weimerskirch H, Courbin N, Ryan PG, Pichegru L. 2019. Radar detectors
- carried by Cape gannets reveal surprisingly few fishing vessel encounters. *PLoS ONE* 14:
- 548 e0210328.
- Hagen C. 2015. Cape Gannet *Morus capensis*. In: Taylor MR, Wanless RM, Peacock F (eds) *The*
- 550 Eskom Red Data Book of Birds of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. BirdLife South Africa,
- Johannesburg, pp 218–219.
- Hodgson JC, Mott R, Baylis SM, Pham TT, Wotherspoon S, Kilpatrick AD, Raja Segaran, Reid I,
- Terauds A, Koh LP. 2018. Drones count wildlife more accurately and precisely than humans.
- Methods in Ecology and Evolution 9: 1160–1167.
- Hutchings L, van der Lingen C, Shannon LJ, Crawford RJM, Verheye HMS, Bartholomae CH, van
- der Plas AK, Louw D, Kreiner A, Ostrowski M, Fidel Q, Barlow RG, Lamont T, Coetzee J,
- 557 Shillington F, Veitch J, Currie JC, Monteiro PMS. 2009. The Benguela Current: an ecosystem
- of four components. *Progress in Oceanography* 83: 15–32.

- 559 IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee. 2017. Guidelines for using the IUCN Red List
- 560 Categories and Criteria. Version 13. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.
- http://www.iucnredlist.org/documents/RedListGuidelines.pdf.
- Jarvis MJF. 1970. Interactions between man and the South African Gannet. *Ostrich* Supplement
- 563 8: 497–513.
- Jarvis MJF. 1971. Ethology and ecology of the South African Gannet, Sula capensis. PhD thesis,
- University of Cape Town, Cape Town.
- Kellner K. 2019. jagsUI: A Wrapper Around 'rjags' to Streamline "JAGS" Analyses. R Package.
- 1.5.1. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=jagsUI.
- Kemper J. 2015. Cape Gannet. In: Simmons RE, Brown CJ, Kemper J (eds) Birds to watch in
- Namibia. Red, rare and endemic species. Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Namibia
- Nature Foundation, Windhoek, pp 149–151.
- 571 Kéry M, Schaub M. 2012. Bayesian population analysis using WinBUGS: A hierarchical
- 572 *perspective*. Academic Press, Oxford.
- 573 Khomenko S, Abolnik C, Roberts L, Waller L, Shaw K, Monne I, Taylor J, Dhingra M, Pittiglio C,
- Mugyeom M, Roche X, Fredrick K, Kamata A, Okuthe S, Kone P, Wiersma L, Von Dobschuetz
- 575 S, Soumare B, Makonnen Y, Morzaria S, Lubroth J. 2018. 2016–2018 spread of H5N8 highly
- 576 pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) in sub-Saharan Africa: epidemiological and ecological
- observations. FOCUS ON, No. 12, Aug 2018. Rome.
- 578 Klages NTW. 1994. Dispersal and site fidelity of Cape Gannets Morus capensis. Ostrich 65: 218–
- 579 224.
- Klages NTW, Willis AB, Ross GJB. 1992. Variability in the diet of the Cape gannet at Bird Island,
- Algoa Bay, South Africa. South African Journal of Marine Science 12: 761–771.
- Lewis S, Grémilet D, Daunt F, Ryan PG, Crawford RJM, Wanless S. 2006. Using behavioural and
- state variables to identify proximate causes of population change in a seabird. *Oecologia* 147:
- 584 606–614.

- Ludynia K, Kemper J, Roux J-P. 2012. The Namibian Islands' Marine Protected Area: using
- seabird tracking data to define boundaries and assess their adequacy. *Biological Conservation*
- 587 156: 136–145.
- 588 Makhado AB, Crawford RJM, Underhill LG. 2006. Impact of predation by Cape fur seals
- 589 Arctocephalus pusillus on Cape gannets Morus capensis at Malgas Island, Western
- Cape, South Africa. *African Journal of Marine Science* 28: 681–687.
- 591 Makhado AB, Meÿer MA, Crawford RJM, Underhill LG, Wilkie C. 2009. The efficacy of culling
- seals seen preying on seabirds as a means of reducing seabird mortality. African Journal of
- 593 *Ecology* 47: 335–340.
- Maree BA, Wanless RM, Fairweather TP, Sullivan BJ, Yates O. 2014. Significant reductions in
- 595 mortality of threatened seabirds in a South African trawl fishery. Animal Conservation 17: 520-
- 596 529.
- 597 Moseley C, Grémillet D, Connan M, Ryan PG, Mullers RHE, van der Lingen CD, Miller TW,
- Coetzee JC, Crawford RJM, Sabarros P, McQuaid CD, Pichegru L. 2012. Foraging ecology
- and ecophysiology of Cape gannets from colonies in contrasting feeding environments.
- Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 422: 29–38.
- 601 Mullers RHE, Tinbergen JM. 2009. Parental provisioning behaviour predicts survival of Cape
- Gannet chicks under poor conditions. *Ardea* 97: 89–96.
- Mullers RHE, Navarro RA, Crawford RJM, Underhill LG. 2009. The importance of lipid-rich fish
- prey for Cape gannet chick growth: Are fishery discards an alternative? ICES Journal of Marine
- 605 Science 66: 2244-2252.
- 606 Nelson JB. 2005. Pelicans, cormorants and their relatives. Pelecanidae, Sulidae,
- 607 Phalacrocoracidae, Anhingidae, Fregatidae, Phaethontidae. Oxford University Press, Oxford,
- 608 U.K.

- Okes NC, Hockey PA, Pichegru L, van der Lingen CD, Crawford RJM, Grémillet D. 2009.
- 610 Competition for shifting resources in the southern Benguela upwelling: seabirds versus purse-
- seine fisheries. *Biological Conservation* 142: 2361–2368.
- Petersen SL, Honig MB, Ryan PG, Underhill LG. 2009a. Seabird bycatch in the pelagic longline
- fishery off southern Africa. African Journal of Marine Science 31: 191–204.
- 614 Petersen SL, Honig MB, Ryan PG, Underhill LG. Goren M. 2009b. Seabird bycatch in the
- demersal longline fishery off southern Africa. African Journal of Marine Science 31: 205–214.
- 616 Pichegru L, Ryan PG, van der Lingen CD, Coetzee J, Ropert-Coudert Y, Grémillet D. 2007.
- Foraging behaviour and energetics of Cape gannets *Morus capensis* feeding on live prey and
- fishery discards in the Benguela upwelling system. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 350: 127–
- 619 136.
- Pichegru L, Ryan PG, le Bohec C, van der Lingen CD, Navarro R, Petersen S, Lewis S, van der
- Westhuizen J, Grémillet D. 2009. Overlap between vulnerable top predators and fisheries in
- the Benguela upwelling system: implications for marine protected areas. *Marine Ecology*
- 623 Progress Series 391: 199–208.
- 624 Pichegru L. 2017. Crude estimation of Kelp Gull predation on Cape Gannets breeding on Malgas
- Island. Report for Seabird Scientific Working Group, Department of Environmental Affairs, 8
- 626 pp.
- Pistorius PA, Hindell MA, Tremblay Y, Rishworth GM. 2015. Weathering a dynamic seascape:
- influences of wind and rain on a seabird's year-round activity budgets. *PLoS One* 10:
- 629 e0142623.
- 630 Plummer M. 2003. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs
- sampling. In: Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Distributed Statistical
- 632 Computing (DSC 2003). Vienna, Austria.
- Plummer M, Best N, Cowles K, Vines K. 2006. CODA: Convergence Diagnosis and Output
- Analysis for MCMC. R News 6: 7–11.

- Rand RW. 1963. The biology of guano-producing seabirds. 5. Composition of colonies on the
- 636 South West African Islands. Investigational Report Sea Fisheries Research Institute South
- 637 *Africa* 46: 1–26.
- Randall R, Ross GJB. 1979. Increasing population of Cape Gannets on Bird Island, Algoa Bay,
- and observations on breeding success. *Ostrich* 50: 168–175.
- Rijklief R. 2016. Gannets in contrasting environments: behaviour, demographics and indicators
- of environmental change. PhD thesis, Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth.
- Rishworth GM, Pistorius PA. 2015. Protection and provisioning: the role of parental behaviour in
- terms of chick growth and survival in a pelagic seabird. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 530:
- 644 153–162.
- Rishworth GM, Tremblay Y, Connan M, Green DB, Pistorius PA. 2014. Drivers of time-activity
- budget variability during breeding in a pelagic seabird. *PLoS One* 9 e116544.
- Roberts L. 2018. Highly pathogenic avian influenza (H5N8 subtype) in coastal birds in South
- Africa. Status update: 18 May 2018. Report of Veterinary Services, Western Cape
- Government, 11 pp.
- Rollinson DP, Wanless RM, Ryan PG. 2017. Patterns and trends in seabird bycatch in the pelagic
- longline fishery off South Africa. African Journal of Marine Science 39: 9–25.
- Roux J-P, van der Lingen CD, Gibbons MJ, Moroff NE, Shannon LJ, Smith ADM, Cury PM. 2013.
- Jellyfication of marine ecosystems as a likely consequence of overfishing small pelagic fishes:
- lessons from the Benguela. Bulletin of Marine Science 89: 249–284.
- Roy C, van der Lingen CD, Coetzee JC, Lutjeharms JRE. 2007. Abrupt environmental shift
- associated with changes in the distribution of Cape anchovy *Engraulis encrasicolus* spawners
- in the southern Benguela. *African Journal of Marine Science* 29: 309–319.
- 658 Saul L, Fortuin A. 2015. Penguin (Bird) Island Nature Reserve Protected Area Management Plan.
- Version 2.0. CapeNature, Cape Town.

- Shaughnessy PD. 1984. Historical population levels of seals and seabirds on islands off southern
- Africa, with special reference to Seal Island, False Bay. *Investigational Report Sea Fisheries*
- Research Institute South Africa. 127: 1–61.
- Shelton PA, Crawford RJM, Kriel F, Cooper J. 1982. Methods used to census three species of
- southern African seabirds, 1978–1981. Fisheries Bulletin South Africa 16: 115–120.
- Sherley RB, Barham, BJ, Barham PJ, Campbell, Crawford RJM, Grigg J, Horswill C, McInnes A,
- Morris TL, Pichegru L, Steinfurth A, Weller F, Winker H, Votier SC. 2018. Bayesian inference
- reveals positive but subtle effects of experimental fishery closures on marine predator
- demographics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 285: 20172443.
- Sherley RB, Botha P, Underhill LG, Ryan PG, van Zyl D, Cockcroft AC, Crawford RJM, Dyer BM,
- 670 Cook TR. 2017. Defining ecologically-relevant scales for spatial protection using long-term
- data on an endangered seabird and local prey availability. Conservation Biology 31: 1312-
- 672 1321.
- 673 Siegfried WR, Frost PGH, Cooper J, Kemp AC. 1976. South African Red Data Book Aves. South
- African National Scientific Programmes Report 7: 108 pp.
- Staverees L, Crawford RJM, Underhill LG. 2008. Factors influencing the breeding success of
- 676 Cape Gannets *Morus capensis* at Malgas Island, 2002/03. *Ostrich* 79: 67–72.
- 677 Tew Kai E, Benhamou S, Lingen CD, Coetzee JC, Pichegru L, Ryan PG, Grémillet D. 2013. Are
- Cape gannets dependent upon fishery waste? A multi-scale analysis using seabird GPS-
- tracking, hydro-acoustic surveys of pelagic fish and vessel monitoring systems. Journal of
- 680 Applied Ecology 50: 659–670.
- van Sittert L, Crawford RJM. 2003. A historical reconstruction of guano production on the
- Namibian islands, 1844–1895. South African Journal of Science 99: 13–16.
- Ward VL, Williams AJ. 2004. Coastal killers: causes of seabird mortality. Bird Numbers 13: 14-
- 684 19.

- Watermeyer KE, Shannon LJ, Roux J-P, Griffiths CL. 2008. Changes in the trophic structure of
- the northern Benguela before and after the onset of industrial fishing. *African Journal of Marine*
- 687 *Science* 30: 383–403.
- Watkins BP, Petersen SL, Ryan PG. 2008. Interaction between seabirds and deep-water hake
- trawl gear: an assessment of impacts in South African waters. Animal Conservation 11: 247-
- 690 254.
- 691 Winker H, Sherley RB. 2019. JARA: Just Another Red-List Assessment. bioRxiv
- 692 https://doi.org/10.1101/672899.
- 693 Winker H, Carvalho F, Kapur M. 2018. JABBA: Just Another Bayesian Biomass Assessment.
- 694 Fisheries Research 204: 275–288.
- Wolfaardt AC, Williams AJ. 2006. Sealed off: predation threatens seabirds and tourism. Africa
- 696 Birds & Birding 11: 61–67.
- 697 Wolfaardt AC, Williams AJ, Underhill LG, Crawford RJM, Whittington PA. 2009. Review of the
- rescue, rehabilitation and restoration of oiled seabirds in South Africa, especially African
- 699 penguins Spheniscus demersus and Cape gannets Morus capensis, 1983–2005. African
- Journal of Marine Science 31: 31–54.

701 Figures




Figure 1: Locations of extant (black squares) and extinct (white stars) colonies of Cape Gannets *Morus capensis* and other southern African localities mentioned in the text.




Figure 2: The densities of Cape Gannet *Morus capensis* nests at the three extant South African colonies, 1974–2018.




Figure 3: Bayesian state-space model estimates (coloured lines) and 95% credible intervals (grey polygons) of the number of Cape Gannet *Morus capensis* breeding pairs at the six extant colonies, 1956/57–2018/19. Coloured points show the raw estimated number transformed from the area occupied by breeding gannets in each year and the mean nesting density (see methods for details).




Figure 4: Posterior probability density of the percentage change (C%) of the overall population of Cape Gannets *Morus capensis* over three generation lengths (3G). Note that all probabilities are negative and the median rate of change -44.7%.




Figure 5: Posterior probability densities for the annual rate of change of the overall population of Cape Gannets *Morus capensis* over the last three generations (3G), the two most recent generations (2G), the years corresponding to the most recent generation (1G) and for all available years (All.yrs). The generation length was G=18.3 years.

Supporting Information

Table S1. Bayesian State-space model estimates of the numbers of Cape Gannets (thousand pairs) that bred at the species' six extant colonies, 1956–2018 based on estimates of areas occupied by breeding Cape Gannets (Figure S1) obtained from aerial photographs or GPS measurements^a and mean densities of nest at each colony. See main text for methods.

Year	Mercury Is.	Ichaboe Is.	Possession Is.	Lambert's Bay	Malgas Is.	Bird Is., Algoa Bay
1956	8.93	180.77	19.98	5.40	25.93	21.93
1957	8.42	178.04	19.35	5.20	26.33	23.22
1958	7.90	174.92	18.78	5.01	26.72	24.55
1959	7.46	171.75	18.25	4.85	27.06	26.05
1960	7.04	169.05	17.73	4.66	27.38	26.76
1961	6.62	166.04	17.13	4.49	27.79	27.36
1962	6.23	163.61	16.69	4.33	28.13	28.09
1963	5.87	160.82	16.25	4.18	28.54	28.82
1964	5.52	159.16	15.73	4.03	28.96	29.49
1965	5.20	156.65	15.33	3.88	29.26	30.26
1966	4.91	153.95	14.84	3.75	29.68	30.90
1967	4.63	151.97	14.43	3.60	30.09	31.61
1968	4.01	140.75	12.89	3.49	29.37	32.49
1969	3.47	130.73	11.56	3.37	28.69	33.32
1970	3.56	121.57	10.36	3.57	28.68	33.45
1971	3.67	112.67	9.30	3.79	28.77	33.68
1972	3.76	104.23	8.30	4.01	28.83	35.63
1973	3.87	96.71	7.46	4.24	28.83	37.69
1974	3.97	89.93	6.67	4.47	28.82	39.83
1975	4.08	83.31	5.99	4.73	28.84	41.32
1976	4.20	77.41	5.38	5.00	28.88	42.92
1977	4.32	71.99	4.81	5.27	29.02	44.64
1978	4.45	67.01	4.33	5.58	29.06	46.42
1979	3.75	60.73	3.93	6.07	29.49	45.26
1980	3.19	55.23	3.57	6.64	29.87	48.84
1981	2.70	51.48	3.57	6.90	30.18	51.15
1982	2.89	50.05	3.21	6.86	30.43	52.47
1983	2.72	48.64	3.16	7.05	28.51	51.98
1984	2.90	49.59	2.85	8.47	29.50	51.39
1985	2.57	45.64	3.06	9.06	31.34	52.43
1986	2.55	47.06	2.94	10.30	36.49	55.04
1987	2.58	48.55	2.83	11.41	39.71	56.86
1988	2.86	50.48	2.86	10.82	41.71	58.86
1989	2.83	49.03	2.77	10.41	43.64	58.36
1990	2.74	41.84	2.53	10.04	38.02	59.89

1991	2.65	35.65	2.33	10.47	41.13	62.26
1992	2.57	30.41	2.14	10.18	41.37	64.21
1993	2.36	30.38	1.44	9.95	40.05	68.57
1994	1.94	29.94	1.03	9.66	45.89	70.20
1995	1.88	29.44	0.81	9.65	49.57	70.60
1996	1.73	27.98	0.68	10.05	52.48	69.96
1997	1.54	23.66	0.54	10.20	51.51	69.41
1998	1.47	20.29	0.43	9.92	50.66	68.38
1999	1.51	17.84	0.42	10.01	49.25	74.19
2000	1.56	15.75	0.41	10.09	47.79	80.54
2001	1.61	13.87	0.41	9.32	45.54	87.43
2002	1.59	12.73	0.41	8.76	40.37	87.08
2003	1.58	11.75	0.42	8.10	35.83	89.55
2004	1.65	10.87	0.41	6.17	35.33	94.43
2005	1.53	10.11	0.37	5.86	34.80	97.64
2006	1.52	10.81	0.34	5.53	32.51	92.12
2007	1.61	10.63	0.32	6.87	32.84	90.73
2008	1.71	10.47	0.29	7.18	34.28	^a 96.69
2009	1.81	10.34	0.27	^a 7.03	33.02	^a 94.81
2010	1.92	10.24	0.25	7.68	31.96	94.24
2011	2.04	10.10	0.23	7.66	30.88	93.61
2012	2.04	9.65	0.21	7.21	30.15	^a 95.31
2013	2.05	9.24	0.19	^a 5.83	28.57	^a 90.79
2014	2.07	8.83	0.18	6.72	27.50	^a 88.88
2015	2.08	7.66	0.16	7.34	28.08	^a 91.46
2016	2.09	6.65	0.15	^a 7.64	27.55	^a 95.51
2017	2.10	5.80	0.14	7.38	^a 24.55	96.93
2018	2.12	5.04	0.13	7.09	22.43	^a 97.52




Figure S1: Time series of estimates of the area occupied by breeding Cape Gannets *Morus capensis* at the species' six extant colonies, 1956–2018.




Figure S2: Estimated trajectory (black line) of the total number of breeding pairs of Cape Gannets *Morus capensis* at the species' six extant colonies combined, 1956–2018, from the Bayesian state-space model and 95% Bayesian credible intervals (grey polygon). Vertical dashed lines show the time span from the final observation (2018/19) of 1 generation lengths (–1G; 18.3 years; blue line), 2 generation lengths (–2G; 36.6 years; green line) and (–3G; 54.9 years; red line).




Figure S3: Bayesian state-space model fits (coloured lines) and 95% credible intervals (grey polygons) for the estimated number of Cape Gannet *Morus capensis* breeding pairs at its three Namibian colonies, 2010/11–2018/19, compared against direct counts of the numbers of Cape Gannet nests at these colonies made from aerial photographs (coloured points).

Year