Seasonal shifts in foraging distribution due to individual flexibility in a tropical pelagic forager, the Ascension frigatebird

Steffen Oppel1,*, Sam Weber2,3, Nicola Weber2,3, Derren Fox2, Eliza Leat2, Jolene Sim2, Julia Sommerfeld1,4, Mark Bolton1, Annette C. Broderick3, Brendan J. Godley3

1RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge CB2 3QZ, UK
2Ascension Island Government Conservation Department, Georgetown, Ascension Island ASCN 1ZZ, South Atlantic
3Centre for Ecology and Conservation, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Penryn TR10 9FE, UK
4Institut für Tierökologie und Spezielle Zoologie, Justus Liebig Universität Gießen, Heinrich-Buff-Ring 38, 35392 Gießen, Germany

ABSTRACT: Predators exploiting tropical pelagic waters characterised by low fluctuations in seasonal temperature and salinity may require different foraging strategies than predators that can rely on persistently productive marine features. Consistent individual differences in foraging strategies have been found in temperate seabirds, but it is unclear whether such foraging specialisation would be beneficial in unpredictable tropical pelagic waters. We examined whether foraging trip characteristics of a tropical seabird were consistent between seasons and within individuals and explored whether seasonal changes could be explained by environmental variables. Ascension frigatebird Fregata aquila trips lasted up to 18 d and covered a total travel distance of up to 7047 km, but adult frigatebirds stayed within a radius of 1150 km of Ascension Island. We found that the 50% utilisation distribution of the population expanded southwestward in the cool season due to individuals performing more and longer trips in a southerly and westerly direction during the cool compared to the hot season. Individual repeatability was low (R < 0.25) for all trip characteristics, and we were unable to explain seasonal changes in time spent at sea using oceanographic or atmospheric variables. Instead, frigatebird usage per area was almost exclusively determined by distance from the colony, and although individuals spent more time in distant portions of their foraging trips, the amount of time spent per unit area decreased exponentially with increasing distance from the colony. This study indicates that, in a relatively featureless environment, high individual consistency may not be a beneficial trait for pelagic predators.
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INTRODUCTION

Marine predators have to locate and exploit prey in an environment where the factors determining prey aggregation are frequently not detectable. In temperate and coastal waters, marine features such as oceanic fronts, upwellings, and seasonal temperature and salinity gradients can lead to conditions that render accessible prey aggregations temporally and spatially predictable (Wakefield et al. 2009). In warm pelagic waters of the tropics, with lower variation in seasonal temperature, there are often few persistent
marine features, and the occurrence of accessible prey aggregations becomes increasingly unpredictable (Weimerskirch 2007).

Terrestrial marine predators, such as seabirds, generally breed in large colonies on islands, from where individuals have to travel to surrounding waters to find prey. These predators are constrained to a central location during the breeding season when they need to return to their nest to feed offspring, which results in strong intraspecific competition that can lead to individually varying foraging strategies (Ashmole 1963, Wakefield et al. 2013, Wakefield et al. 2017). In temperate species, intraspecific competition can be reduced by individuals specialising on a narrow foraging strategy, either in terms of behaviour or in repeatedly exploiting a specific area (Votier et al. 2010, Cleasby et al. 2015, Wakefield et al. 2015). The consistent foraging behaviour by individuals can confer a fitness advantage (Woo et al. 2008, Patrick & Weimerskirch 2014, 2017, Patrick et al. 2014), but it is unclear whether such behaviour would be beneficial in a less predictable environment.

Tropical seabirds frequently exploit all marine areas within a species’ flight range, leading to a dispersed distribution around islands (Kappes et al. 2011, Hennicke & Weimerskirch 2014, Oppel et al. 2015). This dispersed distribution could occur by individuals consistently travelling to a certain location, with individuals exhibiting differences in their preferred foraging location, thus leading to a dispersed distribution at the population level. Alternatively, individuals may not benefit from consistently travelling to the same area, and may therefore show considerable within-individual variation in foraging trip directions and distances (Sommerfeld et al. 2013), but so far very little is known about the individual consistency of tropical seabirds. Equally little is known about how tropical seabirds allocate time along foraging trips (Weimerskirch 2007). Because seabirds that nest in large colonies may deplete marine prey resources close to their colony (Ashmole 1963, Gaston et al. 2007, Oppel et al. 2015), lower levels of prey availability near the colony may require birds to allocate more foraging time to distant portions of an individual’s foraging trip.

In addition to individual differences, seasonal changes in water temperature, chemistry, stratification, or other properties may lead to changes in prey accessibility in certain areas. Many tropical seabirds breed year-round, and conditions experienced by breeders during one part of the year may differ from conditions at other times of the year, despite similar day length and air temperatures. Although seasonal changes in the distribution of temperate seabirds is well understood and occurs as a consequence of predictable seasonal changes in temperature, day length, and prey availability (Shaffer et al. 2006, Guilford et al. 2009, Block et al. 2011), very little is known about seasonal variation in the distribution of tropical seabirds. Similar to the broad spatial distribution at the population level, seasonal variation in foraging distribution could occur either by specialised individuals breeding at the time of year when prey in their narrow preferred foraging area is most abundant, or by individuals adjusting their search and foraging behaviour in response to changing environmental conditions over time.

Here we investigate the seasonal and individual consistency in the foraging distribution of a tropical pelagic predator, the Ascension frigatebird *Fregata aquila*. Frigatebirds have the lowest wing loading of any bird, and travel very efficiently by using thermals and wind patterns to gain elevation, soar, and glide, but they lack waterproof plumage and therefore cannot land on or dive into the sea to rest or to acquire prey (Weimerskirch et al. 2003, De Monte et al. 2012, Weimerskirch et al. 2016). Frigatebirds prey on flying fish and other marine species acquired at the surface (Stonehouse & Stonehouse 1963), and their prey is likely driven to the surface by subsurface predatory fish or mammals (Ashmole 1971, Diamond 1978, Au & Pitman 1986). The distribution of both prey species and subsurface predators may be influenced by oceanographic patterns, which may ultimately also affect the distribution of frigatebirds (Weimerskirch et al. 2004, 2010, Tew Kai et al. 2009).

We tracked frigatebirds with 2 different tag types to obtain tracking data for short periods with high spatiotemporal resolution and for longer periods with lower spatiotemporal resolution, which allowed us to study both seasonal and individual consistency. We first explored whether adult Ascension frigatebirds remain near their breeding colony year-round, or conduct regular migrations similar to other frigatebirds (Weimerskirch et al. 2017). We then investigated whether there were seasonal changes in foraging distribution and trip characteristics, and explored whether seasonal changes were due to highly consistent individuals foraging in different areas in each season or whether individuals exhibited flexible foraging strategies and adjusted their foraging patterns over time. We then explored whether seasonal shifts in foraging distribution were related to oceanographic conditions that may affect prey availability (Weimerskirch et al. 2004, 2010, Tew Kai et al. 2009), or whether these shifts could be explained by atmos-
phic conditions that may affect flight costs and thus facilitate efficient travelling (Weimerskirch et al. 2003, 2016, De Monte et al. 2012). Finally, we estimated the proportion of time that frigatebirds spent at various distances from the colony and derived predictions about the foraging effort per unit area that can be useful for assessing spatial distribution and interactions with fisheries.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area and study species

We studied Ascension frigatebirds on Boatswainbird Island (3 ha), a volcanic rock situated 260 m off the southeastern coast of Ascension Island (14° 18’ W, 7° 56’ S). Ascension is a volcanic island situated in deep oligotrophic waters without continental shelf, major seamounts, or current systems that could function as predictable foraging areas with permanently high productivity and prey availability for seabirds (Stonehouse 1962, Oppel et al. 2015). The arid tropical climate is characterised by a hot season (average air temperature 28°C) from January to the end of May, and a slightly cooler season (24°C) from June until December, with steady southeasterly trade winds throughout the year, and we used 1 June as the demarcation point between the hot and cool seasons.

The Ascension frigatebird population contains breeding birds at all times of the year, but there is a pronounced peak of egg laying from September to November during the cool season (Ratcliffe et al. 2008). While successful breeders may breed biennially (Nelson 1975, Ratcliffe et al. 2008), about 20–25% of failed breeders re-nest within 2–5 mo after failure (Stonehouse & Stonehouse 1963). The species forages at sea for multiple days and consumes mostly flying fish (Stonehouse & Stonehouse 1963), with a small proportion of the diet derived from kleptoparasitic activities, which may be a more frequent behaviour near the colony. Ascension frigatebirds are considered globally ‘Vulnerable’ to extinction due to their very limited breeding range, but the current status of the population appears to be stable (Ashmole et al. 1994, Ratcliffe et al. 2008). Following the successful removal of feral cats from Ascension Island in 2004 (Ratcliffe et al. 2010), birds started to re-colonise the main island and this new colony has expanded rapidly as a consequence of immigration from the nearby main colony on Boatswainbird Island (~400 pairs in 2017; Ascension Island Government unpubl. data).

Bird capture and tracking

We captured birds that were either incubating or attending small chicks by hand or with a noose-pole on their nest in February and March 2013 (GPS, n = 19; platform transmitter terminal, PTT, n = 3), September 2013 (GPS, n = 14), March 2014 (PTT, n = 16), and November 2014 (GPS, n = 3, Table S1 in the Supplement at www.int-res.com/articles/supp/m585p199_supp.pdf). GPS loggers (iGot-U GT-120, Mobile Action Technology, and Ecotone Uria-300, Ecotone) were scheduled to provide a location fix every 300 s and were sealed in heat-shrink tube for waterproofing prior to deployment. PTTs (PTT100, Microwave Telemetry, and Kiwisat® 202 K2G 172A, Sirtrack) were scheduled to provide locations every 90 s for 3 h followed by a 3 h gap to facilitate long-term tracking.

We attached tags to the base of 3 or 4 central tail feathers using Tesa tape. Eggs or chicks were sheltered from the sun (while adults were handled) to avoid offspring loss due to sun exposure. The weight of GPS and PTT loggers with the waterproof sealing was 18–32 g (2.0–2.5% of body mass), below the threshold associated with adverse impacts (Phillips et al. 2003, Sergio et al. 2015), and similar to tags used in other frigatebird studies (Weimerskirch et al. 2006, 2010, Gilmour et al. 2012). All birds were handled for <20 min and returned to their nest on release. GPS loggers were deployed for 5–15 d to ensure that at least 1 foraging trip was recorded. We weighed birds equipped with a GPS tag on first capture (prior to being tagged) and at recapture (after foraging with an attached tag) to assess whether birds maintained or lost body mass. We concluded that GPS loggers did not adversely affect foraging of tracked birds if body mass after logger attachment did not significantly differ from body mass at first capture. Due to the difficulty in accessing Boatswainbird Island and the disturbance caused during every visit, PTT birds were not recaptured and neither their body mass nor their nesting success could be monitored after deployment of the tag. In addition, while the nesting stage at the time of tag deployment was known for birds equipped with PTT devices, a change in breeding status (chick hatched, fledged, failed) could not be objectively and independently determined, and the breeding stage for many foraging trips recorded by PTTs was therefore unknown. Permission to capture and tag birds was granted by the Conservation Department of the Ascension Island Government. The attachment of devices met the ethical guidelines of the Special Methods Panel of the British Trust for Ornithology.
Assessing variation in trip characteristics

We defined foraging trips as a series of >4 locations that extended for at least 3 h in duration and >22.5 km from the colony (Gilmour et al. 2012), and excluded locations in and in the immediate vicinity of the colony from further analyses. The choice of these thresholds was justified by GPS data that did not show short foraging trips, and reduced the influence of the different temporal resolution of PTT and GPS data on further analyses. For each foraging trip, we calculated the minimum total trip distance as the cumulative distance between all locations, assuming straight-line travel between all position fixes, the total duration as the time difference between the departure and return locations in the colony, and the maximum recorded distance from the colony. We refer to these 3 metrics (total distance, duration, and maximum distance from the colony) as trip characteristics. We also calculated the time spent at the colony prior to a trip and following a trip as the time difference between return from a trip and departure on the subsequent trip. To quantify the general direction into which foraging trips were oriented, we calculated the bearing from the colony to the most distant point along each foraging trip, but because frigatebirds frequently travel along looping trips (Weimerskirch 2007, 2010), these directions should only be interpreted at coarse resolution. We used a series of circular ANOVAs (R package ‘circular’, function ‘aov.circular’) to test whether mean foraging trip direction varied between sexes, breeding stages, or seasons with different subsets of data: trips for which the breeding stage was unknown were excluded from the analysis of breeding stage effects.

To explore whether variation in trip characteristics could be explained by seasonal differences, we used a subset of data for which the breeding stage was known, because breeding stage affects the foraging range in many seabird species (Sommerfeld & Hennicke 2010, Weimerskirch et al. 2010, Oppel et al. 2015). We used our sample of GPS tracks for which breeding status was known, and the foraging trips that occurred within 2 wk after deployment of a PTT device assuming that breeding status had not changed between deployment and the time of the foraging trip. We fitted 6 competing generalised linear mixed models (GLMMs) hypothesising that trip characteristics would vary by (1) sex, (2) breeding stage (incubation or chick rearing), (3) season, (4 and 5) season and breeding stage (additive and interactive effect), or (6 and 7) sex and breeding stage (additive and interactive effect) (Weimerskirch et al. 2004, 2010, Gilmour et al. 2012, Mott et al. 2017), and we included device type (GPS or PTT) as a controlling factor in each model to account for the coarser temporal resolution of PTT data. We fitted these models in R package ‘lmer’ using trip characteristics as normally distributed response variables and accounted for non-independence between multiple trips of the same individual by including individual identity as a random effect (Bolker et al. 2009). We compared models using the second-order Akaike’s information criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc) and inferred which variables best explained variation in trip characteristics based on the models with the greatest AICc weight (oAICc, Burnham & Anderson 2002).

Assessing seasonal distribution and individual consistency

To characterise the spatial distribution of the Ascension frigatebird population, we first interpolated all tracking data to regular 5 min intervals to avoid differential weighting of GPS and PTT data due to their different temporal resolution (Börger et al. 2006). We then estimated the core 50% kernel utilisation distribution (UD) of all locations associated with foraging trips for both the hot and the cool seasons using the ‘kernelUD’ function in R package ‘adehabitatHR’ (Calenge 2006) with a bandwidth h of 12 km determined from first passage time analysis (Pinaud & Weimerskirch 2005, Lascelles et al. 2016). We quantified the overlap between the 2 seasons using Bhattacharyya’s affinity index (Fieberg & Kochanny 2005), a statistical measure of affinity that ranges from 0 (no overlap) to 1 (identical distributions), using the ‘kerneloverlap’ function in R package ‘adehabitatHR’.

To explore whether seasonal shifts in distribution were a consequence of tracking different individuals in different seasons, we also calculated the kernel utilisation distribution and overlap for locations from those 14 individuals that were tracked in both the hot and cool seasons, which allowed us to quantify a seasonal distribution shift that was not confounded by individual differences.

For other trip characteristics, we calculated repeatabilities (R) to test whether the between-individual variance in foraging trip characteristics was equal to the within-individual variance, which would indicate that individuals use multiple trip strategies over time, rather than the population consisting of a range of specialised individuals (Patrick et al. 2014). We calculated repeatability only for birds tracked with PTT.
because deployment times for GPS tracked birds were too short to record >1 long foraging trip. We calculated repeatabilities and their associated standard errors using the R package ‘rptR’ (Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2010), using ‘season’ as a fixed effect and individual identity as grouping factor. For foraging trip directions, we used a circular ANOVA as described above and calculated the repeatability by using the mean squared error of this ANOVA (Les-sells & Boag 1987, Patrick et al. 2014).

Relating seasonal changes to environmental variables

To explore whether Ascension frigatebirds shifted their spatial distribution seasonally in response to environmental variation, we considered 2 distinct mechanisms, namely energy expenditure required for travel and energy acquisition resulting from foraging. We considered that changes in thermal updraft, wind, air temperature, cloud cover, and air pressure may have affected the energy landscape and therefore altered the relative suitability of certain areas (Shepard et al. 2011, 2013, Wilson et al. 2012, Dodge et al. 2014). Alternatively, the distribution of both prey species and other predators that facilitate prey availability for surface-feeding frigatebirds may be influenced by oceanographic patterns, such as water temperature, salinity, currents, or ocean stratification (Weimerskirch et al. 2004, 2010, Tew Kai et al. 2009).

To relate frigatebird usage of a certain area to both atmospheric and oceanographic variables, we first calculated the proportion of time that tracked frigatebirds spent in 1° × 1° grid cells encompassing the entire adult foraging range of the species in each of 9 monthly tracking periods (Table S1 & Fig. S1 in the Supplement). We calculated the time-in-area using the function ‘tripGrid’ in R package ‘trip’ (Sumner 2015), which adequately represents the foraging intensity in a given area for pelagic seabirds (Warwick-Evans et al. 2015). We then downloaded environmental variables corresponding both spatially and temporally to the tracking data from the Env-DATA system in Movebank (Dodge et al. 2013) and from the Copernicus Marine Environmental Monitoring Service (http://marine.copernicus.eu/services-portfolio/access-to-products/) (Table S2 in the Supplement).

For oceanographic data, we used vertically integrated measurements because frigatebirds can soar to over 4000 m above sea level and regularly reach altitudes of 2000 m above sea level (De Monte et al. 2012, Weimerskirch et al. 2016). We related the proportion of time used by frigatebirds in a grid cell to 21 environmental variables (Table S2) using a powerful random forest algorithm that can accurately identify the relative importance of variables under these conditions (Cutler et al. 2007, Hochachka et al. 2007, Strobl et al. 2008). A random forest is a machine learning algorithm based on ensembles of regression trees that can accommodate a large number of predictor variables while maintaining sufficient generality to yield highly accurate predictions (Breiman 2001, Cutler et al. 2007, Hochachka et al. 2007). Because a random forest does not assume that data are independent or follow a specified statistical distribution, the approach was useful to analyse repeated observations from the same grid cells, where pseudo-replication is avoided by specifying the re-sampling structure for internal cross-validation (Karpievitch et al. 2009, Buston & Elith 2011). We used a random forest model based on a conditional inference framework to account for correlated predictors and for missing data (Hothorn et al. 2006b, Strobl et al. 2008, Hapfelmeier et al. 2012).

We fitted this model in a regression framework with the R package ‘party’ (Hothorn et al. 2006a) and manually specified the internal cross-validation structure to ensure that observations from the same time period were not simultaneously used to fit and evaluate trees in the forest, which is equivalent to incorporating a temporal random effect in a linear modelling framework (Buston & Elith 2011). To evaluate the explanatory ability of the model, we performed a correlation test between the observed and predicted proportion of time in an area, with predictions being based on the internal cross-validation data that were not used for model fitting (Phillips & Elith 2010). To assess which variables had the greatest influence on our response variable, we used a permutation procedure that assesses the loss in predictive accuracy of the random forest model after randomly permuting a given variable (Strobl et al. 2007, Janitza et al. 2013, Hapfelmeier et al. 2014). We implemented this assessment using the R function ‘varimp’ with 100 permutations per variable and present results as relative variable importance, with the most important variable assigned a value of 100%.

Because a random forest is a non-parametric algorithm, the direction and size of effects by given variables cannot be expressed with numeric parameter
estimates. For the most important variables, we therefore produced partial dependence plots that show the direction and magnitude of the effect of an environmental variable on the spatiotemporal distribution of frigatebirds after accounting for the effects of all other variables in the model (Cutler et al. 2007, Strobl et al. 2008).

Spatial distribution of foraging effort

Tropical seabirds that nest on oceanic islands may deplete marine prey resources close to their colony, which may result in greater allocation of foraging time to distant portions of an individual’s foraging trip. To relate the relative foraging effort to distance from the colony, we used our high-resolution GPS data to first calculate the amount of time that individual frigatebirds spent within distance bands of 10 km width from the colony during each of their tracked foraging trips. We also calculated the total duration of the foraging trip to effectively convert the absolute amount of time spent in any distance band to the proportion of time for a given foraging trip. We then explored whether distance could adequately describe the time in each distance band by fitting 6 competing GLMMs hypothesising that temporal effort allocation (1) was constant, (2) varied by sex or (3) breeding stage, (4) was linearly related to distance from colony, (5) followed a quadratic function with distance from colony, or (6) was linearly related to distance from colony with differing gradients between breeding stages to reflect the fact that birds with small chicks generally have smaller foraging ranges (Weimerskirch et al. 2010, Mott et al. 2017).

We fitted these models using time as a response variable and total trip time as an offset, and included individual identity as a random effect. We compared models using AICc and present parameter estimates ($\beta$) of the most parsimonious model.

Because the area encompassed by concentric distance bands around the colony increases, we divided the predicted temporal effort distribution by the area encompassed in each distance band. We calculated the area of sea available in each 10 km distance band, and related the predicted proportion of time that frigatebirds spent during their foraging trips in each distance band by the available area in that distance band. This metric effectively reflects the temporal effort distribution of frigatebirds per unit area across the distance bands around the colony, and can indicate whether birds search areas that are farther away from the colony more intensively.

RESULTS

We recorded 804 foraging trips from 51 different individuals (11 incubating males, 8 chick-rearing males, 16 incubating females, 16 chick-rearing females), with 241 trips from 28 individuals recorded in the cool season between June and December, and 563 trips from 37 individuals recorded in the hot season between January and the end of May (Table 1). The PTT devices allowed us to track 14 individuals for up to 5 mo covering both the hot and cool seasons. Ascension frigatebirds foraged in all directions from the island, with trips lasting between 1 and 18 d and covering a total travel distance ranging from a minimum of 50 km to a maximum of >7000 km.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip characteristic</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip duration (h)</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>434.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>408.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>429.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>412.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum distance from colony (km)</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>245.8</td>
<td>173.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>988.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>329.4</td>
<td>180.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>685.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>187.0</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>896.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>233.4</td>
<td>210.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1153.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total trip distance (km)</td>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>736.1</td>
<td>674.3</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>3613.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1028.2</td>
<td>821.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>4122.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>560.5</td>
<td>552.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3574.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>686.9</td>
<td>880.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>7047.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 1, Fig. S1). We did not detect any migratory movements, and adult frigatebirds stayed within a radius of 1150 km of Ascension Island for at least 5 mo after PTT deployment when several of the tracked birds likely had completed their breeding season. Based on 138 trips for which breeding status was known, there was strong support for total travel distance (ω\text{AIC}_c = 0.98) and maximum distance from the colony (ω\text{AIC}_c = 1.0) to vary by season and breeding stage, while trip durations varied mostly by breeding stage and to a lesser extent by season (Table 2). Incubation trips extended on average up to 545 km (±203 km SD; n = 12) from the colony during the cool season, but only up to 301 km (±199 km; n = 35) during the hot season, while chick-rearing trips were similar between both seasons (cool: 199 ± 80 km, n = 14; hot: 218 ± 127 km, n = 77). Similarly, the total trip distance and duration during chick rearing was consistent between the 2 seasons (cool: 627 ± 321 km, 38 ± 23 h; hot: 589 ± 391 km, 41 ± 32 h), but on average 80% farther and 50% longer during incubation in the cool season (1894 ± 765 km, 120 ± 58 h) than in the hot season (1032 ± 820 km, 78 ± 70 h). Sex consistently explained the least amount of variation in all foraging trip characteristics (Tables 1 & 2).

Further support for equal time allocation to foraging trips between members of a pair can be inferred from the positive correlation between trip duration and both the preceding (Pearson correlation ρ = 0.27; 95% CI 0.21–0.34) and subsequent (ρ = 0.40; 0.34–0.46) intervals that a bird spent at the colony.

There were no differences in the mean foraging direction between breeding stages (F_{1,136} = 0.128, ρ = 0.72) or between sexes (F_{1,802} = 0.830, ρ = 0.36), but foraging trips during the cool season were on average in a more westerly direction (mean 294°) than during the hot season (149°; F_{1,802} = 90.68, ρ < 0.001). However, trips in all directions occurred in both the hot and the cool season.

### Seasonal shift in distribution and individual repeatability

The kernel UD of all foraging trip locations during the hot season from February to May indicated that the 95% UD was 529 622 km² and centred slightly to the northeast of the island (Fig. 1), while the 95% UD during the cool season between June and December was 798851 km² and centred on Ascension Island. The overall foraging range of Ascension frigatebirds was therefore 1.20 (hot season) to 1.81 (cool season) times larger than the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of Ascension (441 658 km²).

The core foraging areas characterised by the 50% UD comprised only 19.9% (hot season; 88 052 km²) and 35.5% (cool season; 156 933 km²) of Ascension’s EEZ, respectively (Fig. 1). Despite the slight seasonal shift in distribution, the Bhattacharyya’s affinity index indicated large overlap of the 2 seasonal distributions (BA = 0.771, Fig. 1).

The slight expansion in the core 50% UD between the hot and cool seasons persisted if we used only data from 14 birds tracked over 5 mo during both the hot season and subsequent cool season (BA = 0.775). These changes were therefore a consequence of individual changes in foraging trip characteristics, rather than a consequence of tracking different individuals. We found low repeatability for trip duration (R = 0.235, 95% CI: 0.10–0.37; n = 631 trips), maximum distance from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip characteristic</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>AIC_c</th>
<th>ΔAIC_c</th>
<th>ωAIC_c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip duration</td>
<td>Season + Stage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1436.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Season × Stage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1437.01</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1437.09</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage × Sex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1440.81</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Season</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1456.02</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1457.61</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1458.94</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum distance</td>
<td>Season + Stage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1773.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from colony</td>
<td>Season × Stage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1780.90</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1789.17</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage × Sex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1792.04</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Season</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1798.92</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1808.06</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1808.61</td>
<td>34.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total trip distance</td>
<td>Season + Stage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2127.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Season × Stage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2130.22</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2135.48</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage × Sex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2139.44</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Season</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2151.66</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2157.61</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2159.06</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. 1. Foraging distribution of 51 adult Ascension frigate-
Fregata aquila tracked with GPS and PTT from Ascen-
sion Island in 2013 and 2014. Polygons represent the 95, 75, and 50% kernel utilisation distributions, respectively, of all
locations from the hot season (February–May, red, top
panel) and the cool season (June–December, blue, bottom
panel); the black point indicates the location of Ascension Is-
land, and the dashed circle indicates the exclusive economic
zone of Ascension Island.

colony (R = 0.192, 0.07–0.32), total trip
length (R = 0.183, 0.07–0.30), and trip
direction (R = 0.22, 0.08–0.35), and indi-
vidual birds added more and much
longer trips in a westerly direction dur-
ing the cool season (Fig. 2).

Environmental correlates of seasonal
shift in distribution

Despite a noticeable expansion in the
general distribution and changes in the
length and average direction of forag-
ing trips between hot and cool seasons,
the amount of time that tracked frigate-
birds spent in a given grid cell could
not be explained by any oceanographic
or atmospheric variable in our random
forest model. The model was able to
predict the amount of time spent by
frigatebirds reasonably well in cross-val-
idaion (Spearman correlation coeffi-
cient $r_s = 0.547$). However, distance to
the island explained virtually all variation in frigate-
bird foraging intensity that was captured by the
model (Table 3) and suggested that the amount of
time spent per grid cell declined very sharply within
the first 150 km (Fig. 3). This result did not change
when we repeated the analysis at a higher (0.5° grid
cell size) or lower (2° grid cell size) spatial resolution.

Spatial distribution of individual time allocation

To explore whether distance to the colony was also
an important predictor in the relative proportion of
time that individuals allocated to portions of their for-
aging trips, we used 61 GPS tracks with known
breeding status from 29 individuals. Most trips were
of a looping nature, and frigatebirds spent more time
in the more distant parts of their trips. The most sup-
ported model indicated that the time spent in a given
10 km distance band from the island increased lin-
early with distance (Table 4), but that the increase
was much steeper during incubation trips ($\beta = 0.057 \pm
0.009$ SE) than during chick-rearing trips ($\beta = 0.015 \pm
0.006$, Fig. 4).

Because the area of the 10 km distance bands
increased by 628 km$^2$ for each successive band, the
increasing proportion of time spent by an individual
in more distant marine areas was more than offset by
Table 3. Relative importance (in %) of 21 environmental variables used to explain variation in the amount of time Ascension frigatebirds *Fregata aquila* spent in 1° × 1° grid cells around Ascension during 9 tracking periods in 2013 and 2014. Variable importance is assessed by the decrease in predictive accuracy of a conditional random forest model after random permutation of a variable—negative importance indicates that predictive performance increased when a variable was randomly permuted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental variable</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Relative importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to colony</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind speed (E–W)</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophyll <em>a</em> concentration</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current velocity (E–W) at surface</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean depth</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD of depth (ruggedness)</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea surface height</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current velocity (N–S) at surface</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net primary productivity</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-layer depth</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite size Lyapunov exponent</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal uplift velocity</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy kinetic energy</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind speed (N–S)</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air temperature</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pressure</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water temperature at surface</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cloud cover</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Lagrangian coherent structures</td>
<td>Oceanographic</td>
<td>−5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine duration</td>
<td>Atmospheric</td>
<td>−7.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing predicted proportion of time in area versus distance from Ascension Island](image)

Figure 3. Partial dependence plot of the predicted time that Ascension frigatebirds *Fregata aquila* tracked with GPS and PTT from Ascension Island in 2013 and 2014 spent in 1° × 1° grid cells with increasing distance from the island derived from a conditional random forest model. Dashed lines indicate 1 SD. Grey points indicate raw data.

The increasing area. Therefore, the amount of time spent by an individual frigatebird per unit area (*E*<sub>a</sub>) declined exponentially with increasing distance from the island (Fig. 4), following a similar shape as the decline in overall time spent by the population predicted from the random forest model including oceanographic and atmospheric covariates (Fig. 3). The shape of this function was best described by the following 2 equations:

\[
E_a = e^{(-3.62 - 0.13 \times \text{distance})} \tag{1}
\]

during chick rearing, and

\[
E_a = e^{(-3.50 - 0.15 \times \text{distance})} \tag{2}
\]

during incubation.

**DISCUSSION**

Ascension frigatebirds exhibit low individual consistency and roam widely in search of prey, and their distribution around the colony appears to be a random diffusion process that is poorly explained by easily measurable atmospheric or oceanographic variables. We found large variability in trip durations and directions both within and among individuals, with a pronounced distribution expansion from primarily northeast of the island during the hot season to more west and south of the island during the cool season (Fig. 1). This expansion was a consequence of individual birds undertaking more and longer trips in a southerly and westerly direction (Fig. 2), but we found no environmental correlates that could adequately explain this temporal shift in the frequency of use. Instead, distance to colony explained most of the variation in relative frigatebird use of an area, with much more time spent per unit area near the colony than in areas farther out at sea (Figs. 3 & 4).

We found a typical foraging strategy in Ascension frigatebirds as for many other seabirds, with foraging trips during incubation being often more than twice as long as during chick rearing when high energy demands of the growing chick require more frequent food deliveries by adults (Stonehouse & Stonehouse 1963, Sommerfeld & Hennicke 2010, Weimerskirch et al. 2010). As a consequence of this time limitation, Ascension frigatebirds were less able to devote substantial amounts of time to offshore foraging efforts.
during chick rearing. But even during long incubation trips, lasting up to 2 wk and covering several thousand kilometres, frigatebirds did not allocate similar amounts of time per unit area of sea to regions farther away from the colony (Fig. 4). Intense competition in waters close to the colony may lead to prey depletion and render foraging in near-colony waters less efficient (Ashmole 1963, Gaston et al. 2007, Oppel et al. 2015). We would therefore predict that birds allocate proportionately more time to those areas farther away from the colony with less-intense competition and prey depletion. Although we found such a pattern at the individual trip level, the level of intraspecific competition and prey depletion may decrease rapidly with increasing distance from the colony, such that even a smaller relative time per unit area could be energetically efficient. This pattern of exponentially declining bird use per area with distance from the colony is important for marine spatial planning, as the encounter probability of globally threatened seabirds such as the Ascension frigatebird with anthropogenic threats such as fishing vessels or industrial infrastructure would be predicted to decrease at a similar rate in farther offshore areas. Ascension frigatebirds offer a useful null distribution of pelagic seabird foraging effort that appears to be almost independent of easily measurable oceanographic or atmospheric patterns (Ashmole 1971, Weimerskirch 2007).

Table 4. Model selection table evaluating the effect of sex, breeding stage, and distance to colony on the proportion of time that adult Ascension frigatebirds *Fregata aquila* tracked with GPS in 2013 and 2014 spent in 10 km distance bands around the colony (n trips = 61). k: number of estimable parameters; AICc: second-order Akaike’s information criterion; ΔAICc: difference in AICc units to the most parsimonious model; ωAICc: relative weight of evidence for each model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>AICc</th>
<th>ΔAICc</th>
<th>ωAICc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance × Stage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6660.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance^2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6666.68</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6678.93</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6739.26</td>
<td>78.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6739.28</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6740.80</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Adult Ascension frigatebirds *Fregata aquila* tracked with GPS in 2013 and 2014 spent more time in more distant portions of their foraging trips (upper panels), but the amount of time spent per unit area decreased sharply due to the increasing amount of area available at larger distances (lower panels). Predicted proportion of time of an individual foraging trip (upper panels) and time allocated to a unit area of 1000 km² (lower panels) in 10 km distance bands from Ascension Island during either the incubation (left panels) or the chick-rearing stage (right panels) derived from a generalised linear mixed model with individual as a random effect; grey bands indicate 95% confidence intervals.
distant areas at sea than boobies, which range a maximum of 350 km from Ascension (Oppe et al. 2015). In the absence of distinct environmental gradients and substantial interspecific competition, it is plausible that frigatebirds forage very broadly, rendering their distribution very difficult to predict based on readily available environmental variables (Lavers et al. 2014). Alternatively, our tracking efforts, which mostly followed individuals outside the peak breeding phase, may not have occurred at the appropriate time to detect environmental relationships. Population-level demand for prey will be substantially higher during the peak breeding season (Ashmole 1963, Birt-Friesen et al. 1989), and it is possible that bird–habitat relationships may have been stronger during the peak breeding season. However, the breeding peak may only occur due to generally higher prey availability (Le Corre 2001, Wingfield 2008), which may actually reduce intraspecific competition and the strength of bird–habitat relationships, while the off-peak nesting may only occur due to nest site space constraints and may force individuals to raise chicks at times when prey availability is low (Ratcliffe et al. 2008). We therefore do not believe that the temporal distribution of our tracking efforts substantially affected our ability to detect bird–habitat relationships.

Further support for the fairly broad foraging strategy of Ascension frigatebirds comes from the low consistency of individuals. We found that the spatial distribution shift between hot and cool seasons was not a consequence of tracking different individuals in different seasons, but that individuals tracked across both seasons conducted more and longer foraging trips into a westerly and southerly direction during the cool season. As a consequence, we found low repeatabilities in all foraging trip characteristics, which were marginally higher than expected under a complete random distribution, but lower than for some temperate seabirds that specialise on discrete foraging areas (Patrick et al. 2014, 2015, Wakefield et al. 2015). This low individual consistency suggests that individuals explore vast areas in different foraging trips, potentially due to the low consistency of highly productive marine areas that are unlikely to persist at a location for long enough to warrant repeat visits during subsequent foraging trips (Weimerskirch et al. 2007, Hennicke & Weimerskirch 2014).

Because we marked birds during the breeding period but were not able to follow their nests after tag deployment, it is possible that some of the within-individual changes in foraging trip characteristics and directions were caused by changes in breeding status. Specifically, birds that were marked during incubation but successfully hatched a chick may have shortened their foraging trips, while birds that lost their egg or chick may have expanded their foraging trips after being relieved from parental duties. However, we found substantial variability in individual trip durations that did not allow an objective distinction between breeding stages from trip characteristics. In addition, it is highly unlikely that all birds tracked with PTT successfully fledged offspring given that Ascension frigatebirds have generally low breeding success of 19–34% (Stonehouse & Stonehouse 1963, Ratcliffe et al. 2008); thus, some of our tracked birds were almost certainly no longer breeding or raising fledglings during the cool season when more and longer trips occurred in westerly directions. One potential explanation for changing foraging directions and distances after breeding could be the freedom to perform exploratory movements or exploit areas with lower competition. During time of high-energy demand, birds are expected to forage in familiar areas with a reliable energy supply (Irons 1998, Piper 2011, Wakefield et al. 2015). Once relieved from energy-demanding parental duties, birds may have the liberty to explore different areas to build knowledge that can be beneficial in the future. Such exploratory movements have been proposed in other bird species (Bennett & Kitchens 2000, Oppel et al. 2009, Guilford et al. 2011), and may be the underlying motivation for long pre-breeding and intermittent non-breeding journeys of long-lived pelagic predators (Wakefield et al. 2015, Weimerskirch et al. 2015, 2017). Multi-annual tracking studies in combination with demographic studies that assess the consequences of persistent individual strategies are required to further investigate the causes and consequences of seasonal changes in the foraging patterns of Ascension frigatebirds.

Unlike other frigatebird species, Ascension frigatebirds are year-round central-place foragers that do not appear to embark on post-breeding migrations or roost on islands different from their breeding colony (Weimerskirch et al. 2006, 2017). Although juvenile birds may roam widely across the Atlantic (Williams et al. 2017), the adult birds that we tracked for up to 5 mo exhibited similar foraging trips during the breeding season and afterwards. The reason for this ‘residential’ behaviour is unknown; however, we speculate that due to the requirements of moult (Stonehouse & Stonehouse 1963, De Korte & De Vries 1978) and sleep (Rattenborg et al. 2016), frigatebirds may need to periodically return to land to rest (Weimerskirch et al. 2017). Because there is no
nearby land mass, Ascension frigatebirds may not be able to migrate to other roosting areas as has been speculated for frigatebirds in the equally isolated Galápagos archipelago (Weimerskirch et al. 2017), although the nearest island of Saint Helena is only marginally farther (1250 km) than the maximum distance from the colony recorded in our study. The somewhat limited dispersal outside the breeding season, which does not appear to overlap with the foraging area of any other frigatebird species, may have led to genetic isolation and contributed to the speciation of Ascension frigatebirds (Dearborn et al. 2003).

In summary, Ascension frigatebirds exploit large marine areas surrounding their only breeding colony on Ascension, with greater effort per unit area spent in marine areas closer to the colony. Although there appear to be discernible shifts in foraging behaviour between the hot and the cool seasons, large within- and between-individual variability in foraging trip directions and distances obscure any relationships that may exist with temporary oceanographic features. Marine spatial planning for the conservation of Ascension frigatebirds should therefore operate under the assumption that all areas within 1200 km of the island will be explored by the population, with exponentially decreasing density of birds at greater distances from the colony.
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