**Article:**

Mazor, T, Beger, M, Mcgowan, J et al. (2016) The value of migration information for conservation prioritization of sea turtles in the Mediterranean. Global Ecology and Biogeography, 25 (5). pp. 540-552. ISSN: 1466-822X

https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12434

# The value of migration information for conservation prioritisation of sea turtles in the Mediterranean

Tessa Mazor[1], Maria Beger[1], Jennifer McGowan[1], Hugh P. Possingham[1,2], Salit Kark[1]

[1]ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia; tessa.mazor@csiro.au ; m.beger@uq.edu.au; j.mcgowan@uq.edu.au; h.possingham@uq.edu.au; s.kark@uq.edu.au

[2]Grand Challenges in Ecosystems and the Environment, Silwood Park, Imperial College, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom. Bowen

**Running head: Conservation planning of migratory species**

**Key words:** *Caretta caretta, connectivity, Marxan, Mediterranean Sea, migratory species, sea turtles, systematic conservation planning, value of information.*

**Number of words in abstract:** 299

**Number of words in main text:** 4,327

**Number of references:** ~50

**Corresponding author:**

Dr. Tessa Mazor

CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere Flagship

Ecosciences Precinct 41 Boggo Road, Dutton Park

QLD 4102, Australia

Phone: +61 7 3833 5626

E-mail: tessa.mazor@csiro.au

## ABSTRACT

**Aim**: Conservation plans often struggle to account for connectivity in spatial prioritisation approaches for protecting migratory species. Protection of such species is challenging because their movements may be: uncertain and variable, span vast distances, cross international borders, and traverse land and sea habitats. Often we are faced with small samples of information from various sources and collection of additional data can be costly and timely. Therefore, it is important to evaluate what degree of spatial information provides sufficient results for directing management actions. Here we develop and evaluate an approach that incorporates habitat and movement information to advance the conservation of migratory species. We test our approach using information on threatened loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta)* in the Mediterranean.

**Location**: The Mediterranean Sea

**Methods**: We use Marxan, a spatially explicit decision support tool for selecting priority conservation areas. Four approaches with increasing amounts of information about the loggerhead sea turtle are compared, ranging from: i) the broad distribution, ii) multiple habitat types that represent foraging, nesting and inter-nesting habitats, iii) mark-recapture movement information, to iv) telemetry-derived migration tracks.

**Results**: We find that spatial priorities for sea turtle conservation are sensitive to the information used in the prioritisation process. Setting conservation targets for migration tracks altered the location of conservation priorities, indicating that conservation plans designed without such data would miss important sea turtle habitat. We discover that even a small number of tracks makes a significant contribution to a spatial conservation plan if those tracks are substantially different.

**Main Conclusions**: This study presents a novel approach for improving spatial prioritisation for conserving migratory species. We propose that future telemetry studies tailor their efforts towards conservation prioritisation needs, obtaining spatially dispersed samples over quantity. This work highlights the valuable information that telemetry research contributes to the conservation of migratory species.

## INTRODUCTION

The increase in anthropogenic activities over the last two centuries has disrupted the movement of many organisms (Bolger *et al.*, 2008; Harris *et al.*, 2009). Migration and movement is essential for the persistence of many terrestrial and marine animals. Such species rely on movement between specific habitats or regions for reproduction, feeding, or thermal regulation (Alerstam *et al.*, 2003). The destruction of movement pathways, and threats to individuals that move (e.g. bycatch), affect the fitness and survival success of migratory species (Beger *et al.*, 2015). Protecting mobile species presents a great challenge due to the vast distances such animals often traverse, sometimes across international borders and in other cases between land and sea habitats (Martin *et al.*, 2007). Yet, most conservation plans fail to incorporate the spatial connectivity that is needed to adequately protect migratory species (Martin *et al.*, 2007; Runge *et al.*, 2014).

Sea turtles are an example of an ecologically, economically and culturally important globally threatened migratory species group (IUCN, 2013). The thousands of kilometres these species travel between nesting and feeding habitats makes them highly vulnerable to an array of anthropogenic threats (Shillinger *et al.*, 2010; Mazaris *et al.*, 2014). These threats include, disturbance to nesting beaches from coastal development and sea level rise (Fuentes *et al.*, 2011; Katselidis *et al.*, 2014), turtle egg harvesting (Koch *et al.*, 2006; Wallace *et al.*, 2011), incidental catch in fishing gear (Lewison *et al.*, 2004; Peckham *et al.*, 2007), collision with boats, and the digestion of plastic material (Casale & Margaritoulis, 2010). Contributing to the vulnerability of marine turtles is their long life spans, reproductive age (e.g. loggerheads ~ 40-50 years old; Casale, 2011; Scott *et al.*, 2012a; Avens & Snover, 2013) and different male versus female breeding patterns (Schofield *et al.*, 2013a). Given the need for sea turtle protection and conservation, large-scale conservation plans that explicitly incorporate their complete habitat needs and migratory behaviours are lacking.

Previous sea turtle conservation efforts have primarily focused on protecting nesting sites (Casale & Margaritoulis, 2010; Mazaris *et al.*, 2013). The central aim of these recovery efforts has been to protect female sea turtles and their nests, with little focus on males and the younger developmental stages (Schofield *et al.*, 2013b). However, while some sea turtle populations are recovering (Tapilatu *et al.*, 2013; Lamont *et al.*, 2014), some continue to decline (Stewart *et al.*, 2014; Weber *et al.*, 2014), suggesting that there are limitations to a conservation approach that focuses on only a sub-set of the life-history stages. Population models indicate that conserving sea turtle nesting habitats alone without considering other key habitats is insufficient for species recovery (Heppell *et al.*, 1996; Lazar *et al.*, 2004). Currently, there are limited management actions (e.g. turtle exclusion devices TEDs) to conserve sea turtles within marine waters and only recently have conservation efforts been directed towards protecting offshore sea turtle populations and their migration corridors (Pendoley *et al.*, 2014; Seminoff *et al.*, 2014; Baudouin *et al.*, 2015). Successful conservation planning for sea turtles must explicitly protect all the life-stages and link their terrestrial and marine habitat requirements (Beger *et al.*, 2015). One of the major impediments for minimising mortality in the sea is that information on the offshore distribution and movements of sea turtles is limited (Casale *et al.*, 2007a).

Various methods have been trialled to understand sea turtle movement in offshore habitats. Since the 1950s, the most common method has been mark-recapture approaches, where tags are affixed to sea turtles at nesting sites and their location of recapture is documented (Carr & Giovannoli, 1957; Hendrickson, 1958; Caldwell *et al.*, 1962). Mark-recapture methods have contributed to our knowledge of sea turtle migratory extent, links between release and capture sites (recaptures at sea; Casale *et al.*, 2007b), nesting populations and growth rates (recaptures at the same nesting beaches; Monk *et al.*, 2011). However this method is unable to provide information about entire migratory paths and remains labour-intensive (Stewart *et al.*, 2013), characterised by low recapture rates (Avens & Snover, 2013) and slow knowledge accumulation (Godley *et al.*, 2008). In recent decades, with the expansion of telemetry systems such as radio trackers, satellite transmitters and GPS loggers, tracking programs have proliferated (Godley *et al.*, 2008; Hussey *et al.*, 2015). These technologies actively improve our understanding of sea turtle migration pathways at sea (Pendoley *et al.*, 2014; Stokes *et al.*, 2015). While there is an increasing emphasis on telemetry to improve our understanding of sea turtles distribution, physiology and behaviour (e.g. Hochscheid *et al.*, 2007; McCarthy *et al.*, 2010), there is comparatively less attention paid to how this knowledge can improve management and identify conservation areas. Recent tracking studies link adult foraging grounds to existing MPAs and identifying new areas for protection (e.g. Scott *et al.*, 2012b; Schofield *et al.*, 2013a), however analyses that link habitat and movement information into spatial conservation prioritisations (Beger et al., 2015) remain scarce.

Sea turtle tagging and telemetry programs are rarely explicitly shaped by conservation planning objectives, and their execution is logistically difficult and expensive (satellite transmitters range from US$2000-5000 each; Godley *et al.*, 2008; seaturtle.org, 2013). Such information often remains in the sea turtle behaviour and ecology literature without any attempt to use it for conservation (Godley *et al.*, 2008). Recent studies that have used telemetry to inform and improve conservation have been restricted to examining species movements (Stokes *et al.*, 2015) and building distribution models (Schofield *et al.*, 2013a). Presently, attempts to use sea turtle migration information to enhance systematic conservation planning remain scarce (Beger *et al.*, 2015), and the sensitivity of conservation outcomes to the number and quality of tracks used has never been assessed. Furthermore, conservation plans are being made for mobile species such as sea turtles often without considering the potential input that migration information could contribute (Martin *et al.*, 2007; Runge *et al.*, 2014).

Here, we aim to develop and test approaches for incorporating information on habitat use and migration into conservation prioritisation for migratory species. The Mediterranean Sea and its endangered loggerhead sea turtle *Caretta caretta* (Linnaeus, 1758; IUCN, 2013) population provide an excellent case study for tackling this issue. We assess the potential impact of data limitations on conservation prioritisation outcomes by examining the value of different kinds of spatial information for identifying the location of areas that are a priority for sea turtle conservation.

## METHODS

### Study area and database

The study area was the entire Mediterranean Sea to a seafloor depth of 1,000 m[1]. We divided the resulting shallow Mediterranean Sea including coastal land areas with nesting beaches into planning units of 10 x 10 km, consistent with EU guidelines (Directive 2007/2/EC) and other large-scale regional planning studies (e.g. Mazor *et al.*, 2014).

We assembled available sea turtle data (for data sources see Appendix 1) to create maps of three sea turtle habitat types (Fig. 1a).

*Nesting habitat:* First, the locations of 131 loggerhead nesting beaches were collated from over thirty published resources (Table S1 in Supporting Information). We did not aim to predict potential additional (unreported) locations of beaches using species distribution modelling methods because female sea turtles display natal homing and factors that affect their site selection within this homing range are not well known (Garcon *et al.*, 2009). Planning units along the beach within a 10 km radius from each known nesting site were designating as nesting beach habitat. We note here that we did not aim to differentiate between major and minor nesting sites, but rather map the majority

[1] Areas below 1,000 m were excluded because: a) most important foraging habitats for sea turtles in the Mediterranean Sea are generally classified in shallow waters along the continental shelf, b) anthropogenic threats are mainly concentrated along the coast and c) the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) recommended the prohibition of towed dredges and trawl nets fisheries at depths beyond 1000 m (Recommendation GFCM/2005/1 on the ''management of certain fisheries exploiting demersal and deep-water species'') which has been adopted by the EU (Regulation 1967/2006).

of nesting sites (defined as sites averaging ≥ 20 nests per year to capture smaller nesting beaches) to represent the distribution of sea turtles.

*Inter-nesting habitat:* We created inter-nesting habitat data using a 10 km buffer from nesting beaches (Tucker *et al.*, 1995; Waayers *et al.*, 2011). These neritic areas are important habitat for female sea turtles during the time between laying clutches (Schofield *et al.*, 2010) and for juvenile turtles making their way to the ocean post-hatching (Bolten, 2003).

*Foraging habitat:* Given that sea turtle foraging habitat is not yet fully mapped in the Mediterranean, we modelled foraging habitats using MaxEnt (Version 3.3.3k; http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~schapire/maxent/ Phillips *et al.*, 2004, 2006; Appendix S1 in Supporting Information). This model is intended as a simplified baseline representation of foraging grounds in the Mediterranean Sea as it incorporates location data from both adult and juvenile sea turtles. The MaxEnt species distribution modelling software models occupancy across space using presence-only species data. We collated sea turtle sighting locations from EurOBIS (2014), several scientific papers and location and telemetry data contributed by seaturtle.org (2013; Table S2). Telemetry data points that were spatially aggregated exhibiting high sinuosity on the continental shelf (defined by the 200 m isobaths; Kallianiotis *et al.*, 2000; Sardà *et al.*, 2004) were included, because such patterns indicate foraging (McCarthy et al. 2010; Dodge et al. 2014). Thus, transiting movements (and those off the continental shelf) were excluded, resulting in a total of 9,058 data points (see Fig. S1). These point data were combined with 22 environmental variables (for a list of variables see Table S3). The resulting model was validated by a random sub-sampling method that was repeated 15 times and used 25% of the data (Phillips *et al.*, 2004, 2006). To create a distribution map of suitable foraging habitat we used the tenth percentile training presence logistic threshold (>0.36). By using this threshold, we defined suitable habitat to include 90% of the data we used to develop the model. Our resulting map of foraging habitat was consistent with findings by localised studies that identified foraging grounds in the region (Broderick *et al.*, 2007; Casale *et al.*, 2013; Stokes *et al.*, 2015).

*Migration information:* For our analyses of loggerhead turtle migration movements we compiled available satellite tracking data from EurOBIS (http://www.eurobis.org/ 2014) and seaturtle.org (http://seaturtle.org/; Table S4). A total of 34 individual tracks were collected from a variety of sources across the Mediterranean Sea and were used in this study (Fig. 1b – individual tracks cannot be shown due to data protection; Appendix S3). More tracking data should be obtained if this methods is to be used to robustly assign priority conservation areas for the regions sea turtle population.

**The value of sea turtle information for conservation**

We examined the value of sea turtle information for conservation using scenario exploration with Marxan, a commonly used decision-support tool, and its derivative algorithm, Marxan with Connectivity (Beger *et al.*, 2010a; 2010b). For each scenario (approach), we developed a set of spatial plans that met our conservation targets and connectivity objectives for the least possible cost (Ball *et al.*, 2009). Below, we describe each planning approach highlighting the incorporation of additional data layers. To focus on the effects that different kinds of information have on spatial priorities, we kept the number of iterations (1000 runs) and the associated cost (equal cost per planning unit) consistent in all planning approaches.

The changes in spatial priorities signify the potential knowledge gained from investing in additional and more complex information. For new information to be useful for planning, it must improve our ability to make a decision or modify a plan (Maxwell *et al.*, 2015). In the context of this analysis, we want to explore what information helps us better identify conservation priority sites that protect the entire turtle life cycle. First, we prioritise using the extant distribution range of sea turtles (Approach 1 - Range), then by multiple habitat types (nesting, inter-nesting and foraging,) (Approach 2 - Habitats), followed by movement information extracted from mark-recapture data (Approach 3 - Mark Recapture) and finally, the incorporation of satellite tracking data (Approach 4 - Tracks). Within Approach 4, we tested the influence of the number of tracks used on resulting conservation priorities. Our conservation objectives to protect a given percentage of sea turtle spatial distribution (targets) varied according to approach (Table 1; Appendix S2).

We parameterised Marxan both without representing any connections between planning units (Approach 1 - Range, and Approach 2 - Habitats; Ball *et al.*, 2009; Table 1) and by incorporating ecological connectivity into the objective function (Approach 3 - Mark-Recapture and Approach 4 - Tracks; Beger *et al.*, 2010a; 2010b; Table 1). When including connectivity, we calibrated the Connectivity Strength Modifier (CSM - for methods see Beger *et al.*, 2010b) to 50 (Fig. S2).

*Approach 1 - Range*

In this approach we represented the overall distribution of loggerhead sea turtles by a single broad distribution map in the Mediterranean Sea, combining nesting, inter-nesting and foraging habitat data into one single distribution range (target was 20% of the species distribution) This is a basic approach that is commonly used in conservation planning given the normal paucity of fine-scale spatial habitat data (e.g. IUCN distribution ranges).

*Approach 2 - Habitats*

For this approach we set specific conservation targets for nesting (target 60%), inter-nesting (target 40%) and foraging habitat (target 20%), simulating a situation where the three main habitats used by turtles are known. Dividing the broad distribution range into specific habitats with set targets ensures that priority conservation areas will be selected for each habitat type.

*Approach 3 - Mark-recapture*

Mark-recapture studies define at least two points on a turtle's travel, its start (tagging location) and end points (recapture location). To represent this type of information in conservation planning, we targeted the three habitats used by turtles while also ensuring connectivity between nesting and foraging sites. Here, we simulated mark-recapture data using tracking routes (34 tracks) to select planning units associated with nesting beaches and foraging habitat. For this purpose, we considered foraging and nesting habitat to be planning units where tracks demonstrated sinuosity (obvious foraging behaviour; McCarthy *et al.*, 2010) and overlapped with our modelled foraging grounds and our mapped nesting beaches (Fig. 1a). Tracks that did not move across more than 50 planning units were discarded from the analysis as based on typical distances that Mediterranean loggerhead sea turtles move between nesting and foraging grounds (Zbinden *et al.*, 2008; Schofield *et al.*, 2013a). This analysis enabled us to allocate connectivity links between the identified foraging and nesting planning units at either end of the track, assuming non-directional connectivity in Marxan and ignoring the remaining tracked pathways (Beger *et al.*, 2010b).

*Approach 4 - Tracks*

To capture information about the pathways turtles take to cross vast distances and incorporate links between habitats along the entire journey, we applied a method that incorporates telemetry-derived movement information into Marxan with Connectivity (Beger *et al.*, 2015). This approach allows for connectivity strength values to be assigned between and across sites by deriving a connectivity matrix that connects all planning units along each satellite track (Fig. 2). By symmetrically linking all planning units along an individual turtle's pathway, this method allows for spatial dependencies to exist between places that are not adjacent to each other (Beger *et al.*, 2010b). Planning units that are travelled through by more than one individual turtle are deemed increasingly important for migration and contribute more to the connectivity of the solutions. Applying this method, we targeted the three habitats (i.e. nesting, inter-nesting, foraging) used by turtles and the connectivity information provided from our 34 telemetry tracks (see *Migration information)*.

*Comparing planning approaches*

We compared the four approaches by calculating Spearman Rank Correlation between the selection frequency outputs from Marxan, and mapping the resulting spatial conservation priorities. Selection frequency is the number of times that a planning unit is selected as part of a near-optimal solution in Marxan. This frequency can be seen as a measure of relative importance, where units selected a high percentage of times could be considered more valuable than those appearing less frequently in solutions.

We then tested how the number of telemetry tracks altered the resulting conservation plan. To investigate the value of new spatial information for identifying conservation priorities, we randomly selected an increasing number of tracks from the pool of known tracks; 0 (no tracks), 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 34 (max). The Marxan analysis was repeated ten times for each group of tracks to account for variability in the selected tracks. From these solutions we calculated the Spearman rank correlation of the selection frequency outputs and compared it with that of a solution that includes all 34 tracks. To further examine the increased inclusion of telemetry tracks, we used a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix method as described in Linke *et al.*, (2012) and displayed our results in a dendrogram. This method compared the Marxan best solution outputs (solution with the lowest objective function score) when run with different numbers of tracks.

## RESULTS

Conservation priorities that were evident in Approach 4 (Tracks) were not well represented in the other three approaches. For example, Approach 3 (Mark-Recapture), which had the highest Spearman rank correlation coefficient of the three approaches when compared with a plan that incorporates tracking data (Approach 4 – Tracks), indicated that the spatial priority areas from the plans do not significantly overlap (rho = 0.08). Thus, results show that links between habitats are not protected by chance when protecting sea turtle habitat, but need to be separately represented.

We found that conservation priorities substantially changed as we added different aspects of turtle information (Fig. 3a; Fig. 4). Despite the weak correlations, approaches that incorporated more habitat and movement information (e.g. Approach 2 - Habitats rho = -0.12 and Approach 3 - Mark-Recapture rho = -0.23) than a broad species distribution range (Approach 1 - Range rho = -0.08), were more successful at capturing migration pathways (comparison with Approach 4 - Tracks) in the resulting spatial plans. Including movement data can also increase the cost of conservation plans as movement corridors may mean more area or costly planning units are needed to reach conservation targets (see Table S5).

We found that when sample sizes are low, which is often the case with tracking sea turtle and other large marine animals, even a small number of tracks (~5) can substantially increase the correlation (rho = 0.6) with plans that include all thirty-four tracks (Fig. 3b). We discovered that the largest Bray-Curtis dissimilarity was between conservation plans that did include sea turtle tracks and those that did not (see Group A vs. Group C in Fig. 5). The second largest dissimilarity was between plans that had a low number of tracks (Group B and Group D in Fig. 5) and a corresponding low spearman rank correlation (~ rho <0.7 Table S6) when compared with solutions that included ≥20 tracks and resulted in a higher spearman rank correlation (~ rho >0.7; Group C in Fig. 5). This dissimilarity was due to the low number of tracks (5-15 tracks) included in the plans and because the spatial variability captured was insufficient for the entire region. Given these results it seems that plans with >20 tracks were needed to capture the spatial heterogeneity of turtle movement across the Mediterranean Sea from our given sample size (34 tracks). Thus, plans with over twenty tracks did not vary considerably to those with 34 tracks.

## DISCUSSION

We demonstrated that migratory pathways provide critical information for identifying habitats for inclusion in spatial planning. We discovered that the inclusion of satellite tracking data makes a substantial difference to spatial priorities. Moreover, prioritisation without the use of such tracks is sub-optimal for wide ranging species that move between multiple habitats.

This study highlights the value of incorporating critical habitat and migration information for conservation planning of migratory species. Our example system of loggerhead sea turtles in the Mediterranean Sea showed significant changes in spatial priorities when increasing the amount of sea turtle information (see four approaches; Fig. 3; Fig. 4). Sea turtle migration was best captured by incorporating the entire movement track rather than critical habitat information (Approach 2 - Habitats), species range (Approach 1 – Range), or mark-recapture data (start and end points of movements; Approach 3 – Mark-Recapture; Fig. 3; Fig. 4). We managed to collate data from 34 sea turtle tracks in this study and discovered that even a small number of very different tracks (e.g. five) can substantially alter conservation priority sites and help capture the known spatial extent of the migratory life cycle of sea turtles (Fig. 3b; Fig. 5). As new methods emerge, we suggest that future conservation plans for sea turtles and other migratory species should attempt to incorporate available habitat and telemetry data where possible.

Our results suggest that in order to capture sea turtle habitat connectivity in conservation plans, a good quantity of heterogeneous tracks across the study area is needed (Fig. 5). Our case study example in the Mediterranean with a limited sample size (34 tracks; Fig. S3), found that >20 sea turtle tracks that were widely sampled across the study region were able to capture sea turtle movement. While we stress that more data is always better and higher sample sizes are preferable, such information is not always readily available and conservation decisions are often made with scarce data (Bottrill *et al.*, 2008). This study suggests that limited data that is well dispersed across the study region can actually contribute valuable information to begin conservation planning. Given our findings that more heterogeneously placed tracks provide the best value of information, future data collection efforts could be made more useful for conservation by taking a complimentary sampling approach, and targeting regions that currently have fewer or no tracking studies (e.g. the eastern Mediterranean; Fig. 1b; Stokes *et al.*, 2015).

Telemetry studies provide a wealth of connectivity information that is not often applied to conservation planning. We found that a limited but heterogeneous assemblage of tracks makes a substantial contribution to improve a spatial conservation plan towards better representing turtles' life cycles. This result could perhaps provide better direction for the timely and costly collection of telemetry data. We recommend that currently available telemetry data be extracted where possible, perhaps using monetary incentives or intellectual safeguards, and compiled into databases for the incorporation of species migration information into conservation plans. Established collaborative frameworks such as the EU, or the IUCN, could be potential starting points. Future work should aim to carry out value-of-information analyses (e.g. Maxwell *et al.*, 2015; Canessa *et al.*, 2015) in order to assess the trade-off between investing in the collection of more tracking data, or gaining new information for improved conservation outcomes. This type of analysis can help inform cost-effective conservation decisions.

Another challenge in addressing species movements is determining how much connectivity information is needed. Relying on too few tracks means there is also a risk of over-fitting to a limited number of data tracks. As an attempt to overcome these challenges, this study used a calibration method where planning units that contained a track were selected over 50% of the time

(Fig. S2). The method ensures that connectivity is represented, but it does not necessarily mean that 50% of all migration links are captured in the solution. Determining the level of connectivity that is needed will largely depend on the species of interest as well as the conservation budget and conservation objectives. For example, connectivity is especially important for sea turtles that exhibit high mortality rates within movement pathways (Lewison *et al.*, 2004; Casale, 2011). However, connectivity may not be particularly useful for species that are less threatened during the movement/migration phase or those that have large dispersal patterns without clear migration trajectories. Importantly, the area and cost of a conservation plan are likely to increase as the importance of connectivity is increased (Table S5). Hence, we suggest that the level of connectivity required could be pre-determined and a measure of minimum connectivity should be set per species.

This study demonstrates and tests a method for prioritising the conservation of migratory species. However, such an approach could be built upon to provide priority areas for sea turtle conservation in the region. A suitable conservation plan should aim to incorporate all available telemetry studies (e.g. the 195 tracks identified by Luschi & Casale (2014)), comparable and consistent data for sea turtle habitat across the Mediterranean region, robust species distribution modelling, as well as the associated cost of conservation actions (Carwardine *et al.*, 2008). This study has touched on several of these requirements however a comprehensive data pooling from organisations and scientific literature is required if priority for the region are to be robustly and transparently determined. Our method here explored connectivity between nesting and foraging grounds however other connectivity should be included such as links between breeding sites, wintering habitats and developmental grounds (Casale *et al.*, 2013; Schofield *et al.*, 2013a). Similarly, migration tracks should be evaluated by different age classes, sexes and weighted by direction of usage and the number of individuals that it represents as a proportion of the entire region.

In summary, this study highlights the value of habitat and movement information to advance the conservation of migratory species. Our findings on loggerhead sea turtles of the Mediterranean Sea are expected to provide one example of a broader application for the protection of migratory species. We recommend future research aims to incorporate and evaluate the value of telemetry information into conservation plans for migratory species (Runge *et al.*, 2014), especially those that are threatened, to ensure that mortality is reduced across their whole life cycle. Determining the value of investing in the collection of more spatial data for species or extracting information from existing resources can help inform spatial planning more immediately. When there is only a short widow of time to act for threatened species it is critical that decision makers invest and act in areas which will be most effective at ensuring species persistence (Bottrill *et al.*, 2008).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was conducted with the support of funding from the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions. T. M was funded by an Australian Postgraduate Award. SK is an ARC Future Fellow. We thank S. Hochscheid for providing data from the Satellite Tracking Project Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn (SZN) and RAC/SPA (seaturlte.org) as well as project partners. To C. Knot for data from SWOT (http://www.seaturtlestatus.org/) projects, and to To L. Boura from MEDASSET (http://www.medasset.org/en/) for providing data and UNEP/MAP information.

## REFERENCES


Alerstam, T., Hedenström, A. & Åkesson, S. (2003) Long-distance migration: evolution and determinants. *OIKOS*, **103**, 247-260.

Avens, L. & Snover, M.L. (2013) Chapter 5: Age and age estimation in sea turtles. In: Wyneken, J., Lohmann, K.J. & Musick, J.A. (eds.), The Biology of Sea Turtles Volume 3. CRS Press, Boca Raton, Florida. pp. 97-134.

Ball, I.R., Possingham, H.P. & Watts, M. (2009) Marxan and relatives: Software for spatial conservation prioritization. In: *Spatial conservation prioritization*: *Quantitative methods and computational tools*. Moilanen, A., Wilson, K.A. & Possingham, H.P. (eds). Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. pp. 185-195.

Beger, M., Grantham, H.S., Pressey, R.L., Wilson, K.A., Peterson, E.L., Dorfman, D., Mumby, P.J., Lourival, R., Brumbaugh, D.R. & Possingham, H.P. (2010a) Conservation planning for connectivity across marine, freshwater, and terrestrial realms. *Biological Conservation*. **143**, 565–575.

Beger, M., Linke, S., Watts, M., Game, E., Treml, E., Ball, I. & Possingham, H.P. (2010b) Incorporating asymmetric connectivity into spatial decision making for conservation. *Conservation Letters*, **3**, 359–368.

Beger, M., McGowan, J., Treml, E.A., Green, A.L., White, A.T., Wolff, N.H. et al. (2015) Integrating regional conservation priorities for multiple objectives into national policy. *Nature Communications*, **6**, 8208.

Bolger, D.T., Newmark, W.D., Morrison, T.A. & Doak, D.F. (2008) The need for integrative approaches to understand and conserve migratory ungulates. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 63–77.

Bolten, A.B. (2003) Variation in sea turtle life history patterns: neritic vs. oceanic developmental stages. In: Lutz, P.L., Musick, J. & Wyneken, J. (eds.), The Biology of Sea Turtles, volume II. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. pp. 243-257.

Bottrill, M.C., Joseph, L.N., Carwardine, J., Bode, M., Cook, C., Game, E.T., Grantham, H., Kark, S., Linke, S., McDonald-Madden, E., Pressey, R.L., Walker, S., Wilson, K.A. & Possingham, H.P. (2008) Is conservation triage just smart decision making? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **23**, 649-654.

Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Fuller, W.J., Glen, F. & Godley, B.J. (2007) Fidelity and over-wintering of sea turtles. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **274**, 1533-1539.

Caldwell, D.K. (1962) Comments on the nesting behavior of loggerhead sea turtles based primarily on tagging returns. *Quarterly Journal of the Florida Academy of Sciences*, **25**, 287- 302.

Canessa, S., Guillera-Arroita, G., Lahoz-Monfort, J. J., Southwell, D. M., Armstrong, D. P., Chadès, I., Lacy, R. C., Converse, S. J. (2015) When do we need more data? A primer on calculating the value of information for applied ecologists. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12423.

Carr, A. & Giovannoli, L. (1957) The ecology and migrations of sea turtles. 2. Results of field work in Costa Rica, 1955. *American Museum Novitates*, **1835**, 1- 32.

Carwardine, J., Wilson, K.A., Watts, M., Etter, A., Klein, C.J. & Possingham. H.P. (2008) Avoiding costly conservation mistakes: the importance of defining actions and costs in spatial priority setting. *PLoS ONE*, **3**, e2586.

Casale, P. (2011) Sea turtle by-catch in the Mediterranean. *Fish and Fisheries*, **12**, 299–316.

Casale, P., Freggi, D., Basso, R., Vallini, C. & Argano, R. (2007a) A model of area fidelity, nomadism, and distribution patterns of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea. *Marine Biology*, **152**, 1039-1049.

Casale, P., Freggi, D., Cina, A. & Rocco, M. (2013) Spatio-temporal distribution and migration of adult male loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea: further evidence of the importance of neritic habitats off North Africa. *Marine biology*, **160**, 703-718.

Casale, P., Mazaris, A.D., Freggi, D., Basso, R. & Argano, R. (2007b) Survival probabilities of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) estimated from capture-mark-recapture data in the Mediterranean Sea. *Scientia Marina*, **71**, 365-372.

Casale, P. & Margaritoulis, D. (eds.) (2010) Sea Turtles in the Mediterranean: Distribution, threats and conservation priorities. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Dodge, K.L., Galuardi, B., Miller, T.J. & Lutcavage, M.E. (2014) Leatherback turtle movements, dive behavior, and habitat characteristics in ecoregions of the northwest Atlantic Ocean. *PLoS ONE*, **9**, e91726.

EurOBIS, (2014) European node of the Ocean Biogeographic Information System (EurOBIS). Available: http://www.eurobis.org./ (accessed April 2014).

Fuentes, M.M.P.B., Limpus, C.J. & Hamann, M. (2011) Vulnerability of sea turtle nesting grounds to climate change. *Global Change Biology*. **17**, 140–153.

Garcon, J.S., Grech, A., Moloney, J. & Hamann, M. (2009) Relative exposure index: an important factor in sea turtle nesting distribution. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, **20**, 140–149.

Godley, B.J., Blumenthal, J.M., Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Godfrey, M.H., Hawkes, L. A. & Witt, M.J. (2008) Satellite tracking of sea turtles: Where have we been and where do we go next? *Endangered Species Research*, **10**, 3-22.

Harris, G., Thirgood, S., Hopcraft, J.G.C., Cromsigt, J.P.G.M. & Berger, J. (2009) Global decline in aggregated migrations of large terrestrial mammals. *Endangered Species Research*, **7**, 55–76.

Hendrickson, J.R. (1958) The green turtle *Chelonia mydas* in Malaya and Sarawak. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, **130**, 455–535.

Heppell, S.S., Limpus, C.J., Crouse, D.T., Frazer, N.B. & Crowder, L.B. (1996) Population model analysis for the loggerhead sea turtle, *Caretta caretta*, in Queensland. *Wildlife Research*, **23**, 143-161.

Hochscheid, S., Bentivegna, F., Bradhai, M.N., & Hays, G.C. (2007) Overwintering behaviour in sea turtles: dormancy is optional. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **340**, 287-298.

Hussey, N.E., Kessel, S.T., Aarestrup, K., Cooke, S.J., Cowley, P.D., Fisk, A.T., Harcourt, R.G. et al., (2015) Aquatic animal telemetry: A panoramic window into the underwater world. *Science*, **348**, 1255642.

IUCN, (2013) IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. Marine Turtle Specialist Group 1996. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Downloaded on 05 May 2014.

Kallianiotis, A., Sophronidis, K., Vidoris, P. & Tselepides, A. (2000) Demersal fish and megafaunal assemblages on the Cretan continental shelf and slope (NE Mediterranean): seasonal variation in species density, biomass and diversity. *Progress in Oceanography*, **46**, 429–455.

Katselidis, K.A., Schofield, G., Stamou, G., Dimopoulos, P. & Pantis, J.D. (2014). Employing sea-level rise scenarios to strategically select sea turtle nesting habitat important for long-term management at a temperate breeding area. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, **450**, 47-54.

Koch, V., Nichols, W.J., Peckham, H. & de la Toba, V. (2006) Estimates of sea turtle mortality from poaching and bycatch in Bahia Magdalena, Baja California Sur, Mexico. *Biological Conservation*, **128**, 327-334.

Lazar, B., Margaritoulis, D. & Tvrtkovic, N. (2004) Tag recoveries of the loggerhead sea turtle *Caretta caretta* in the eastern Adriatic Sea: implications for conservation. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, **84**, 475-480.

Lamont, M.M., Fujisaki I. & Carthy, R.R. (2014) Estimates of vital rates for a declining loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) subpopulation: implications for management. *Marine Biology*, **161**, 2659-2668.

Linke, S., Kennard, M.J., Hermoso, V., Olden, J.D., Stein, J. & Pusey, B.J. (2012) Merging connectivity rules and large-scale condition assessment improves conservation adequacy in river systems. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **49**, 1036–1045.

Lewison, R.L., Crowder, L.B., Read, A.J. & Freeman, S.A. (2004) Understanding impacts of fisheries bycatch on marine megafauna. *TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution*, **19**, 598-604.

Luschi, P. & Casale, P. (2014) Movement patterns of marine turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: a review. *Italian Journal of Zoology*, **81**, 478-495.

Martin, T.G., Chadès, I., Arcese, P., Marra, P.P. & Possingham, H.P. & Norris, D.R. (2007) Optimal Conservation of Migratory Species. *PLoS ONE*, **2**, e751.

Maxwell, S.L., Rhodes, J.R., Runge, M.C., Possingham, H.P., Ng, C.F. & McDonald-Madden, E. (2015) How much is new information worth? Evaluating the financial benefit of resolving management uncertainty. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **52**, 12–20.

Mazaris, A.D., Almpanidou, V., Wallace, B., Schofield, G. (2014) A global gap analysis of sea turtle protection coverage. *Biological Conservation*, **173**, 17–23.

Mazaris, A.D., Kallimanis, A.S., Pantis, J.D. & Hays, G.C. (2013) Phenological response of sea turtles to environmental variation across a species' northern range. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B. Biological Sciences*, **280**, 2012-2397.

Mazor, T., Giakoumi, S., Kark, S. & Possingham, H.P. (2014) Large-scale conservation planning in a multinational marine environment: cost matters. *Ecological Applications*, **24**, 1115–1130.

McCarthy, A.L., Heppell, S., Royer, F., Freitas, C. & Dellinger, T. (2010). Identification of likely foraging habitat of pelagic loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the North Atlantic through analysis of telemetry track sinuosity. *Progress in Oceanography*, **86**, 224-231.

Monk, M.H., Berkson, J., & Rivalan, P. (2011) Estimating demographic parameters for loggerhead sea turtles using mark–recapture data and a multistate model. *Population ecology*, **53**, 165-174.

Peckham, S.H., Diaz, D.M., Walli, A., Ruiz, G., Crowder, L.B., Nichols, W.J. (2007) Small-Scale Fisheries Bycatch Jeopardizes Endangered Pacific Loggerhead Turtles. *PLoS ONE*, **2**, e1041. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001041.

Pendoley, K.L., Schofield, G., Whittock, P.A., Ierodiaconou, D., Hays, G.C. (2014) Protected species use of a coastal marine turtle migratory corridor connecting Australian MPAs. *Marine Biology*, **161**, 1455-1466.

Phillips, S. J., Dudik, M. & Schapire, R.E. (2004) A maximum entropy approach to species distribution modeling. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Machine Learning. ACM Press, New York Pages, pp. 655-662.

Phillips, S.J., Anderson, R.P. & Schapire, R.E. (2006) Maximum entropy modeling of species geographic distributions. *Ecological Modelling*, **190**, 231-259.

Runge, C.A., Martin, T.G., Possingham, H.P., Willis, S.G. & Fuller, R.A. (2014) Conserving mobile species. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **12**, 395–402.

Sardà, F., Calafat, A., Flexas, M., Tselepides, A., Canals, M., Espino, M. & Tursi, A. (2004) An introduction to Mediterranean deep-sea biology. *Scientia Marina*, **68**, 7-38.

seaturtle.org, (2013) Sea Turtle Tagging. seaturtle.org Available: http://www.seaturtle.org/tagging/. (accessed June 2014).

Schofield, G., Dimadi, A., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Koutsoubas, D., Lilley, M.K.S., Luckman, A., Pantis, J.D., Karagouni, A.D. & Hays, G.C. (2013a) Satellite tracking large numbers of individuals to infer population level dispersal and core areas for the protection of an endangered species. *Diversity and Distributions*, **19**, 834–844.

Schofield, G., Hobson, V.J., Lilley, M.K.S., Katselidis, K.A., Bishop, C.M., Brown, P. & Hays. G.C. (2010) Inter-annual variability in the home range of breeding turtles: implications for current and future conservation management. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 722-730.

Schofield, G., Scott, R., Dimadi, A., Fossette, S., Katselidis, K.A., Koutsoubas, D., Lilley, M.K.S., Pantis, J.D., Karagouni, A.D. & Hays. G.C. (2013b) Evidence based marine protected area planning for a highly mobile endangered marine vertebrate. *Biological Conservation*, **161**, 101–109.

Scott, R., Hodgson, D.J., Witt, M.J., Coyne, M.S., Adnyana, W., Blumenthal, J.M., Broderick, A.C., Canbolat, A.F., Catry, P., Ciccione, S., Delcroix, E., Hitipeuw, C., Luschi, P., Pet-Soede, L., Pendoley, K., Richardson, P.B., Rees, A.F. & Godley, B.J. (2012b) Global analysis of satellite tracking data shows that adult green turtles are significantly aggregated in Marine Protected Areas. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **21**: 1053–1061.

Scott, R., Marsh, R. & Hays, G.C. (2012a) Life in the really slow lane: loggerhead sea turtles mature late relative to other reptiles. *Functional Ecology*, **26**, 227–235.

Shillinger, G., Swithenbank, A., Bograd, S., Bailey, H., Castelton, M.R., Wallace, B.P., Spotila, J.R., Paladino, F.V., Piedra, R. & Block, B.A. (2010) Identification of high-use internesting habitats for eastern Pacific leatherback turtles: role of the environment and implications for conservation. *Endangered Species Research*, **10**, 215–232.

Stewart, K.R., James, M.C., Roden, S. & Dutton, P.H. (2013) Assignment tests, telemetry and tag-recapture data converge to identify natal origins of leatherback turtles foraging in Atlantic Canadian waters. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **82**, 791–803.

Stewart, K.R., Martin, K.J., Johnson, C., Desjardin, N., Eckert, S.A., & Crowder, L.B. (2014) Increased nesting, good survival and variable site fidelity for leatherback turtles in Florida, USA. *Biological Conservation*, **176**, 117-125.

Stokes, K.L., Broderick, A.C., Canbolat, A.F., Candan, O., Fuller, W.J., Glen, F., Levy, Y., Rees, A.F., Rilov, G., Snape, R.T., Stotti, I., Tchernov, D. & Godley, B.J. (2015) Migratory corridors and foraging hotspots: critical habitats identified for Mediterranean green turtles. *Diversity and Distributions*. doi: 10.1111/ddi.12317.

Tapilatu, R.F., Dutton, P.H., Tiwari, M. et al. (2013) Long-term decline of the western Pacific leatherback, *Dermochelys coriacea*: a globally important sea turtle population. *Ecosphere* **4**, 25.

Tucker, A.D., Fitzsimmons, N.N. & Limpus, C.J. (1995) Conservation Implications of Internesting Habitat Use by Loggerhead Turtles *Caretta caretta* in Woongarra Marine Park, Queensland, Australia. *Pacific Conservation Biology*, **2**, 157-166.

Waayers, D.A., Smith, L.M. & Malseed, B.E. (2011) Inter-nesting distribution of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) and flatback turtles (*Natator depressus*) at the Lacepede Islands. *Western Australia Journal of the Royal Society of Western Australia*, **94**, 359–364.

Wallace, B.P., DiMatteo, A.D., Bolten, A.B., Chaloupka, M.Y., Hutchinson, B.J., Abreu-Grobois, F. A. et al. (2011) Global conservation priorities for marine turtles. *PLoS One*, **6**, e24510.

Weber, S.B., Weber, N., Ellick, J. et al. (2014) Recovery of the South Atlantic's largest green turtle nesting population. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **23**, 3005-3018.

Zbinden, J.A., Aebischer, A., Margaritoulis, D. & Arlettaz, R. (2008) Important areas at sea for adult loggerhead sea turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: satellite tracking corroborates findings from potentially biased sources. *Marine Biology*, **153**, 899–906.

References for 'Supporting Information' for Mazor et al. are found at the end of Appendix S3.

## BRIEF TITLES OF SUPPORTING INFORMATION

**Table S1.** Nesting habitat: A total of 131 loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) nesting beaches were recorded from the following literature.

**Table S2.** Foraging habitat: References for data extracted from EurOBIS (2014), scientific literature and seaturtle.org (2013) to collect point data (9058 point locations) on sea turtles when foraging.

**Table S3.** Environmental Variables (Variables included in final model marked with *)

**Table S4.** Migration information: A total of 34 sea turtle tracks were obtained via EurOBIS (2014) and seaturtle.org (2013). All data extracted from these sources is reference below.

**Table S5**. The opportunity cost of each scenario (cost is assumed equal for each planning unit). The Connectivity Strength Modifier (CSM; Beger *et al.*, 2010b) was calibrated to 50 (Fig. S1). All values in the table represent the average value when run in Marxan 1000 times. The "number of planning units" indicates the number of 10 x 10 km units needed for reservation to meet biodiversity targets.

**Table S6.** Spearman rank correlation coefficient when running conservation plans in Marxan with different numbers of sea turtle tracks (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 34). The selection frequency outputs from Marxan were compared against a solution with all 34 tracks included. These values indicate the similarity between spatial priorities in the solutions. We tested the number of tracks with 10 repetitions to test for variation between selected tracks in our random samples (indicated by a letter).

**Figure S1.** Map of 9058 data points (data supplied by reference Table S2) used to construct the foraging habitat model as described in full detail in Appendix S1.

**Figure S2.** Graphs showing the trade-off curve of the connectivity strength modifier (CSM) with the number of connected planning units (those containing a sea turtle track). By assessing a trade-off curve with the number of planning units that overlap with tracking data we could determine the appropriate Connectivity Strength Modifier (CSM - Beger *et al.*, 2010b). We aimed for planning units containing tracks to be selected >50% of the time when run 1000 times in Marxan. We used a CSM of 50 (equal cost per planning unit).

**Figure S3.** Graphs showing the length (km) of each of the 34 tracks used in this study. See Table S4 for the sources of the 34 tracks.

**Appendix S1.** Sea turtle foraging distribution model created using MaxEnt.

**Appendix S2.** Setting conservation targets

**Appendix S3.** Information for each sea turtle track. The start and end country that the tracks were found, starting positions were usually nesting sites. Further information is unable to be given due to data privacy.

## BIOSKETCH

Tessa Mazor is a research fellow at The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). This work was carried out during her PhD at the University of Queensland, and the Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions (CEED, http://ceed.edu.au/). Her research interests include conservation planning for threatened marine species, the application of systematic planning tools in the marine realm and the development of sustainable management practises for marine ecosystems.

Author contributions: All authors conceived the ideas and contributed to the writing; T.M. conducted the analysis and led the writing.

## APPENDIX 1 – DATA SOURCES


Aureggi, M. (2003) Conservation assessment of the sea turtle nesting beaches of Belek (Turkey). Report to the 23rd Meeting of the Standing Committee of the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention). pp. 1-15.

Aureggi, M., Rizk, C. & Venizelos, L. (2005) Survey on sea turtle nesting activity South Lebanon MEDASSET and MEDWESTCOAST. 35 pp.

Aymak, C., Ergene Gözükara, S. & Kaska, Y. (2005) Reproductive ecology of *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas* during 2002 and 2003 nesting seasons in Alata, Mersin, Turkey. The Second Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles, 4-7 May 2005, Kemer, Antalya, Book of Abstracts, 10 pp.

Basso, R. (1996) Primi documentati casi di schiusa sul litorale del mare Adriatico di tartaruga comune (*Caretta caretta*) con l'ausilio di unita' cinofile. *Ente Fauna Sicilana*, 153-157.

Bentivegna, F. & Paglialonga, A. (2000) Identification of the Gulf of Naples as a feeding ground and migratory path for *Caretta caretta* in the Mediterranean Sea. In: *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Sea Turtle Symposium.* Abreu-Grobois, F.A., Briseño-Dueñas, R., Márquez, R. & Sarti, L. (compilers). U. S. Dep. Commer. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC, **436**, 95-97.

Bentivegna, F. (2002) Intra-Mediterranean migrations of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) monitored by satellite telemetry. *Marine Biology*, **141**, 795–800.

Broderick, A.C. & Godley, B.J. (1996) Population and nesting ecology of the green turtle, *Chelonia mydas*, and the loggerhead turtle, *Caretta caretta*, in northern Cyprus. *Zoology in the Middle East*, **13**, 27–46.

Broderick, A.C., Coyne, M.S., Fuller, W.J., Glen, F. & Godley, B.J. (2007) Fidelity and over-wintering of sea turtles. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **274**, 1533- 1538.

Broderick, A.C., Glen, F., Godley, B.J. & Hays, G.C. (2002) Estimating the size of nesting populations of green and loggerhead turtles in the Mediterranean. *Oryx,* **36***,* 227–236.

Cambell, L.M. (2003) Contemporary culture, use, and conservation of sea turtles. In: *The Biology of Sea Turtles II.* Lutz, P.L., Musick J.A. & Wyneken J. (eds). CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 307-338.

Cañadas, A., Sagarminaga, R., de Stephanis, R., Urquiola E. & Hammond P.S. (2005) Habitat preference modelling as a conservation tool: Proposals for marine protected areas for cetaceans in southern Spanish waters. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, **15**, 495-521.

Canbolat A.F. (2004) A review of sea turtle nesting activity along the Mediterranean coast of Turkey. *Biological Conservation*, **116**, 81–91.

Casale, P. & Margaritoulis, D. (eds.) (2010) Sea Turtles in the Mediterranean: Distribution, threats and conservation priorities. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, 294 pp.

Casale, P., Broderick, A.C., Freggi, D., Mencacci, R., Fuller, W.J., Godey, B.J. & Luschi, P. (2012) Long-term residence of juvenile loggerhead turtles to foraging grounds: a potential conservation hotspot in the Mediterranean. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, **22**, 144-154.

Clarke, M., Campbell, A.C., Hameid, W.S. & Ghoneim, S. (2000) Preliminary report on the status of marine turtle nesting populations on the Mediterranean coast of Egypt. *Biological Conservation*, **94**, 363–371.

Coyne, M.S. & Godley, B.J. (2005) Satellite Tracking and Analysis Tool (STAT): an integrated system for archiving, analyzing and mapping animal tracking data. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **301**, 1-7.

Cross, H. & Bell, S. (2006) Sea turtle monitoring and public awareness in South Lebanon 2005. BCG Testudo **6**, 13-27. Available: http://www.medasset.org (accessed March 2014).

Demetropoulos, A. & Turkozan, O. (eds.) (2009) Proceedings of the Second Mediterranean Conference on Marine Turtles. Kemer, Turkey, 4-7 May 2005. Barcelona convention – Bern Convention – Bonn Convention (CMS), pp. 19-26.

Ergene, S., Aymak, C. & Ucar, A. (2006). Nesting activity of the marine turtles (*Chelonia mydas* and *Caretta caretta*) during 2005 in Alata, Mersin-Turkey. In: *Book of abstracts: Proceedings of the 26th annual symposium on sea turtle biology and conservation*. Frick, A., Panagolpolou, A., Rees. & K., Williams. (compilers). International Sea Turtle Society, Athens. 368 pp.

Genov, T. & Fujioka, E. (2008) Loggerhead turtles in Slovenian and adjacent waters in 2002-2008. Morigenos - marine mammal research and conservation society, Slovenia.

Godley, B.J. (2005) Satellite Tracking and Analysis Tool (STAT): an integrated system for archiving, analyzing and mapping animal tracking data. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **301**, 1-7.

Godley, B.J., Broderick, A.C., Glen, F. & Hays, G.C. (2003) Post-nesting movements and submergence patterns of loggerhead marine turtles in the Mediterranean assessed by satellite tracking. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, **287**, 119– 134.

Gómez de Segura, A. (2006) Abundancia y distribución de cetáceos y tortugas marinas en el mediterráneo español. Tesis Doctoral. Facultad de Biología de la Universidad de Valencia. 148 pp.

Gómez de Segura, A., Hammond, P.S. & Raga, J.A. (2008) Influence of environmental factors on small cetacean distribution in the Spanish Mediterranean and its conservational applications. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, **88**, 1185–1192.

Gómez de Segura, A., Hammond, P.S., Cañadas, A. & Raga, J.A. (2007) Comparing cetacean abundance estimates derived from spatial models and design based line transect methods. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, **329**, 289-299.

Hadjichristophorou, M., Demetropoulos, A. 1990-2007. Cyprus Turtle conservation project reports (internal reports). Department of Fisheries and Marine Research. Ministry of Agriculture Natural Resrouces and Environment. Cyprus.

Halpin, P.N., Read, A.J. Fujioka, E., Best, B.D., Donnelly, B., Hazen, L.J., Kot, C., Urian, K., LaBrecque, E., Dimatteo, A., Cleary, J., Good, C., Crowder, L.B. & Hyrenbach, K.D (2009) OBIS-SEAMAP: The world data center for marine mammal, sea bird, and sea turtle distributions. *Oceanography*, **22**, 104–115.

Hamza, A. & El Ghmati, H. (2006) Conservation of Marine Turtles nesting at three sites West of Sirte, Libya. Final report. The Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (UNEP-MAP-RAC/SPA), Tunis. 35 pp.

Hamza, A. (2010) Libya. In: *Sea turtles in the Mediterranean: Distribution, threats and conservation priorities.* Casale, P. & Margaritoulis, D. (eds.) Gland, Switzerland, IUCN Press, pp. 157-170.

Ilgaz, C. & Baran, I. (2001) Reproduction biology of the marine turtle population in Northern Karpaz (Cyprus) and Dalyan (Turkey). *Zoology in the Middle East*, **24**, 35-44.

Kaska, Y., Baran, I., Ilgaz, C., Türkozan, O., Oz, M. & Erdogan, A. (2005) An estimation of the total nesting activity of sea turtles in Turkey, In: *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual sea turtle biology and conservation*. Coyne, M.S. & Clark, R.D. (compliers). NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFCS-528., Miami pp. 204-205.

Laurent, L. & Lescure, J. (1994) L'hivernage des tortues caouannes *Caretta caretta* (L.) dans le Sud Tunisien. *Revue d' Ecologie (Terre et Vie)*, **49**, 63–86.

Laurent, L., Abd El-Mawla, E.M., Bradai, M.N., Demirayak, F. & Oruc, A. (1996) Reducing Sea Turtle Mortality Induced by Mediterranean Fisheries: Trawling Activity in Egypt, Tunisia and Turkey. WWF International Mediterranean Programme.

Lazar, B., Margaritoulis, D. & Tvrtkovic´, N. (2004) Tag recoveries of the loggerhead sea turtle, *Caretta caretta*, in the eastern Adriatic Sea and implications for conservation. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, **84**, 1–5.

Levy, Y. (2003) Status of Marine Turtles and Conservation efforts along the Israeli Coastline. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation*. Seminoff, J.A. (ed). NOAA Technical, Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-503, p.149.

Levy, Y. (2011) Summary of recovery activity of sea turtles in Israel 2011. Annual report (in Hebrew). Israel Nature and Parks Authority, Mikhmoret.

Luschi, P., Mencacci, R., Vallini, C., Ligas, A., Lambardi, P. & Benvenuti, S. (2013) Long-term tracking of adult loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Mediterranean Sea. *Journal of Herpetology*, **47**, 227-231.

Margaritoulis, D. & Rees, A.F. (2003) Loggerhead nesting effort and conservation initiatives at the monitored beaches of Greece during 2002. *Marine Turtle Newsletter*, **102**, 11–13.

Margaritoulis, D. (1988) Post-nesting movements of loggerhead sea turtles tagged in Greece. *Rapp P-V Reun Comm Int Explor Sci Mer Mediterr*, **31**, 284.

Margaritoulis, D. (2000) An estimation of the overall nesting activity of the loggerhead turtle in Greece. In: *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Sea Turtle Symposium*. Abreu-Grobois, F.A., Briseño-Dueñas, R., Márquez-Millán, R. & Sarti-Martinez, L. (compilers).

NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-436. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, USA. pp. 48-50.

Margaritoulis, D., Argano, R., Baran, I., Bentivegna, F., Bradai, M.N., Camifias, J.A., Casale, P., De Metrio, G., Demetropoulos, A., Gerosa, G., Godley, B., Haddoud, D.A., Houghton, J., Laurent, L. & Lazar, B. (2003) Loggerhead turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: present knowledge and conservation perspectives. In: Bolten, A.B. & Witherington, B. (eds). *Loggerhead Sea Turtles*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press. pp. 175-198.

Mencacci, R., Vallini, C., Rubini, S., Funes, L., Sarti, A., Benvenuti, S. & Luschi, P. (2006) Movements of a male loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) tracked by satellite in the Adriatic Sea. In: M. Zuffi (ed.), *Atti del V Congresso nazionale della Societas Herpetologica Italica*. Firenze University Press.

Mencacci, R., Vallini, C., Rubini, S., Funes, L., Sarti, A., Benvenuti, S. & Luschi, P. (2006) Movements of a male loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) tracked by satellite in the Adriatic Sea. In: Atti del V Congresso nazionale della Societas Herpetologica Italica. M. Zuffi (ed). Firenze University Press.

Mingozzi, T., Masciari, G., Paolillo, G., Pisani, B., Russo, M. & Massolo, A. (2007) Discovery of a regular nesting area of loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta* in southern Italy: a new perspective for national conservation. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **16**, 3519–3541.

Nada, M. & Casale, P. (2008) Marine Turtles in the Mediterranean, Egypt: Threats And Conservation Priorities. Rome: WWF Italy.

Network for the conservation of North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea Turtles. (2014) Fundación Biodiversidad (Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment) The OASIS Program funded by the Fish and Wild Life Service (US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) of the United States of America. Available: http://tortugasmarinas.info/proyecto-oasis.html. (Accessed March 2014).

Newbury, N., Khalil, M. & Venizelos, L. (2002) Population status and conservation of marine turtles at Al-Mansouri, Lebanon. *Zool. in the Middle East*, **27**, 47-60.

Oakley, D., White, M., Kararaj, E., Përkeq, D., Saçdanaku, E., Petri, L., Mitro, M., Boura, L., Grimanis K. & Venizelos, L. (2011) Satellite-telemetry reveals different behavioural patterns for three loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* tagged at a foraging ground in Albania. In: Proceedings of the 4th Mediterranean Conference of Marine Turtles. Bentivegna, F., Maffucci, F. &Mauriello, V. (compilers). November 7-10, 2011, Naples, Italy, 59 pp.

Oruç, A., Türkozan, O., Durmuş, S.H. (2003) Deniz Kaplumbağalarının izinde. Deniz kaplumbağası yuvalama kumsalları değerlendirme raporu, Doğal Hayatı Koruma Derneği, (On the trace of marine turtles: Marine turtles nesting beaches evaluation report.) WWF-Turkey, İstanbul, 96.

Rees, A.F, Saadi, S.A., Coyne, M.S. & Godley, B.J. (2008) Internesting habitat and nest frequency at a globally significant loggerhead nesting population described using Argos tracking. NOAA Tech Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-569, 55 pp.

Saad, A. (2012) Importance of Lattakia Beach (Syria) as nesting area for marine turtles: results of seven years of field survey. *Scholarly Journal of Agricultural Science*, **2**, 108-110.

Sagarminaga, R., Swimmer, Y., Parga, M., Tejedor, A. & Southwood, A. (2013) Is the SW Mediterranean Sea a trap for North Atlantic loggerhead turtles? In: *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. Baltimore 2-8 Feb 2013*. US Department of Commerce. NOAA, Miami, Florida.

seaturtle.org, (2013) Sea Turtle Tagging. seaturtle.org Available: http://www.seaturtle.org/tagging/. (accessed June 2014).

St John, F., Khalil, M. & Venizelos, L. (2004) Marine turtle Conservation in the Mediterranean. Marine turtle nesting in South Lebanon 2003. MEDASSET report, 18 pp.

Türkozan, O. & Baran, I. (1996) Research on the loggerhead turtle, *Caretta caretta*, of Fethiye beach. *Turkish Journal of Zoology*, **20**, 183–185.

Türkozan, O. & Yilmaz, C. (2008) Loggerhead Turtles, *Caretta caretta*, at Dalyan Beach, Turkey: Nesting Activity (2004–2005) and 19-year Abundance Trend (1987–2005). *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*, **7**, pp. 178-187.

Türkozan, O. (2000) Reproductive ecology of the loggerhead turtle, *Caretta caretta*, on Fethiye and Kizilot beaches, Turkey. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*, **3**, 4686–692.

Türkozan, O., Ilgaz, Ç. & Sak, S. (2001) Carapacial scute variation in loggerhead turtles, *Caretta caretta*. *Zoology in the Middle East*, **24**, 137-142.

Türkozan, O., Taşkavak, E. & Ilgaz, Ç. (2003) A Review on the Nesting Beaches of Loggerhead Turtle, *Caretta Caretta*, on the southwestern Mediterranean Coasts of Turkey. *British Herpetological Journal*, **13**, 27–33.

Yalçin-Özdilek, S. (2007) Status of sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas* and *Caretta caretta*) on Samandag beach, Turkey: a five year monitoring study. *Annales Zoologici Feennici*, **44**, pp. 333-347.

Yerli, S. & Demirayak, F. (1996) An assessment on sea turtle and nesting beaches in Turkey (Türkiye'de deniz kaplumbağaları ve üreme kumsalları üzerine bir değerlendirme) DHKD, İstanbul. 238 pp.

Yerli, S.V. & Canbolat, A.F. (1996) Marine turtles in turkey: a survey on nesting site status – DHKD & WWF, Istanbul. 134 pp.

Yerli, S.V. & Canbolat, A.F. (1998) Principles of the management plan for the protection of sea turltes in the east Mediterranean coasts of Turkey. Ministry of Environment, GEDP Publication, Ankara.

## TABLES

**Table 1.** Summary of the planning approaches, including increasing amounts of data and information on the distribution and movement of sea turtles. Each plan aims to derive conservation priorities for loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta)* in the Mediterranean Sea, and uses systematic conservation decision tool Marxan.

| Approach for sea turtles conservation planning | Targets | How connectivity was incorporated |
|---|---|---|
| **1.** Range | The distribution of sea turtles as a whole (not per habitat type) overall target = 20% | Not at all |
| **2.** Habitats | Nesting = 60%<br>Inter-nesting habitat = 40%<br>Foraging habitat = 20% | Targets for habitats used in different life-stages |
| **3.** Mark-Recapture | Nesting = 60%<br>Inter-nesting habitat = 40%<br>Foraging habitat = 20% | Connections between the priority habitats |
| **4.** Tracks | Nesting = 60%<br>Inter-nesting habitat = 40%<br>Foraging habitat = 20% | Connections between each track is prioritized |

## FIGURE LEGEND

**Figure 1**

a) Three types of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) habitat: nesting habitat, inter-nesting habitat and foraging habitat. b) Map of the Mediterranean Sea divided by geographical sub-areas as determined by the General Fisheries Commission of the Mediterranean Sea (GSCM). The total number of sea turtles tracks that cross each sub area were calculated and represented in this map. Individual tracks were unable to be displayed due to data confidentially reasons, see Appendix S2 for further information on data sources.

**Figure 2.** Assignment of connectivity values derived from sea turtle telemetry paths. The squares correspond to planning units of this study (10 x 10 km; consistent with EU guidelines (Directive 2007/2/EC) and other large-scale regional planning studies (Levin *et al.*, 2013; Mazor *et al.*, 2013; Mazor *et al.*, 2014) and result in a connectivity matrix.

**Figure 3.** a) Spearman rank correlation of selection frequency outputs, comparing four conservation plans with increasing data complexity on sea turtle movement and habitat: Approach 1 - single species distribution range, Approach 2 - habitat differentiation (nesting, inter-nesting, foraging), Approach 3 – three habitat types and movement information from mark-recapture data, and Approach 4 – three habitat types and movement information from 34 sea turtle tracks. b) Graph of the average Spearman rank correlation of selection frequency outputs, comparing scenarios with a subset of tracks vs. scenarios with all 34 tracks. The standard deviation is shown for each scenario (calculated from ten repeated Marxan runs). This analysis used an equal cost for each planning unit.

**Figure 4.** Maps of four conservation plans in the Mediterranean Sea with increasing data complexity for sea turtle movement: Approach 1 - Range, Approach 2 - Habitats (nesting, inter-nesting, foraging), Approach 3 – Mark-Recapture data, and Approach 4 – Tracks (34 telemetry tracks). Priority areas are those planning units that have a high percentage of selection (selection frequency).

**Figure 5.** Dendrogram comparing the dissimilarity of solutions (Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix method; Linke *et al.*, 2012) with increasing numbers of tracks. Each node on the dendrogram represents the number of tracks (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, and 34 tracks) used in the analysis and the repetition letter (each number of tracks was run 10 times each as represented by letters a – j). These

letters and numbers link to Supporting Information Table S6. Four groups were identified as denoted by cycles and letters A, B, C, D. The main split between solutions is between analyses without tracks and those that include tracks (Group A and B).

**FIGURES**


a)
Nesting Beaches
Internesting Habitat
Feeding Habitat
PlanningUnits (13953)
Slovenia
Croatia
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Turkey
France
Monaco
Italy
Macedonia
Albania
Syria
Andorra
Greece
Cyprus
Lebanon
Portugal
Spain
Jordan
Israel
Malta
Gibraltar
Tunisia
Egypt
Algeria
Libya
Morocco
b)
Number of tracks
0
1 - 2
3 - 4
5 - 6
7 - 8
9 - 10
11 - 12
13 - 14

Figure 1.




| to: / from: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | *1* | *0* | *0* | *1* | *1* | *1* |
| 2 | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| 3 | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| 4 | *1* | *0* | *0* | *1* | *1* | *1* |
| 5 | *1* | *0* | *0* | *1* | *1* | *1* |
| 6 | *1* | *0* | *0* | *1* | *1* | *1* |

**Figure 2.**

a)


1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
-0.2
-0.4
Spearman rank correlation
Approach 1
(Species distribution range)
Approach 2
(Habitat differentiation)
Approach 3
(Mark-recapture)
Approach 4
(Tracks)
Conservation planning approaches

b)


1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
-0.2
Spearman rank correlation
0
5
10
15
20
25
30
35
Number of Tracks

**Figure 3.**


Approach 1
Species distribution range
Approach 2
Habitat differentiation
Approach 3
Mark-recapture
Approach 4
Tracks
Selection Frequency
4% - 10%
11% - 20%
21% - 30%
31% - 40%
41% - 50%
51% - 60%
61% - 70%
71% - 80%
81% - 90%
91% - 100%
Planning Units (13953)

**Figure 4.**


Approach 1
Species distribution range
Approach 2
Habitat differentiation
Approach 3
Mark-recapture
Approach 4
Tracks
Selection Frequency
4% - 10%
11% - 20%
21% - 30%
31% - 40%
41% - 50%
51% - 60%
61% - 70%
71% - 80%
81% - 90%
91% - 100%

**Figure 4.**




**Figure 5.**