



CCAMLR

Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
Commission pour la conservation de la faune et la flore marines de l'Antarctique
Комиссия по сохранению морских живых ресурсов Антарктики
Comisión para la Conservación de los Recursos Vivos Marinos Antárticos

WG-EMM-17/24

26 June 2017

Original: English

WG-EMM

Domain 1 Marine Protected Area Preliminary Proposal – PART B: Conservation objectives

Delegations of Argentina and Chile



This paper is presented for consideration by CCAMLR and may contain unpublished data, analyses, and/or conclusions subject to change. Data in this paper shall not be cited or used for purposes other than the work of the CAMLR Commission, Scientific Committee or their subsidiary bodies without the permission of the originators and/or owners of the data.

Domain 1 Marine Protected Area Preliminary Proposal

PART B: Conservation objectives

On behalf of Argentina and Chile

Authors: Mercedes Santos¹ and Andrea Capurro¹

¹ Instituto Antártico Argentino/Dirección Nacional del Antártico

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the results of a series of international workshops specifically develop to assist in the Domain 1 MPA planning process, including the 2012 - First International Workshop held in Valparaiso, Chile, (WG-EMM 12/69); the 2013 – Binational Workshop (Chile-Argentina) held in La Serena, Chile (WG-EMM 14/40), the 2015 - Second International Workshop for identifying Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in Domain 1 of CCAMLR held in Buenos Aires, Argentina (WG-EMM 15/42); and the 2016 - Informal Workshop on Domain 1 MPA held in Bologna, Italy (WG-EMM 16/73).

This report has been compiled by the authors based on expert discussions held during the above workshops. The list of participants for these Workshops can be found in Annex 3.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this document is to briefly compile in one single document the rationale behind the MPA proposal, including relevant information on conservation objectives and spatial layers. Further details on the several decisions made along the years can be found in papers previously discussed - WG-EMM 12/69, WG-EMM 14/40, WG-EMM 15/42, WG-EMM 16/73 – and EMM report (WG-EMM-16, paragraph 3.19). Specific technical details on variables, analysis and metadata can be found in Data Forms for each Conservation Objective uploaded at the Domain 1 MPA e-group.

Conservation Objective 1: benthic important habitats

This conservation objective seeks to protect a representative fraction of all benthic habitats presented within Domain 1. From discussions arisen in the two previous workshops, this objective was separated in ecoregions and habitat types based on the importance to distinguish the different benthic communities found in the same habitat type across ecoregions.

Ecoregions correspond to a large geographical area distinguished by the uniqueness of its morphology, geology, climate, flora and fauna. We have distinguished the ecoregion of South Orkney Islands (48.2), the northwestern Antarctic Peninsula and the southwestern Antarctic Peninsula, to distinguish the different communities found in a same habitat type across ecoregions.

Habitat types were identified through the benthic bioregionalization work developed by Douglass et al. 2011 (WS-MPA-11/23) and Douglass et al. 2014, based on physical proxies such as depth, seabed slope, water column or seabed temperature and primary productivity.

Large and complex data layers, such as the benthic bioregionalization, in which each object is required to be protected, has been proved to have an effect in achieving consistent results (WG-EMM-16/73). Accordingly, the layer of benthic environment types was modified using only geomorph and depth features reducing the spatial objects to 67 categories, based on benthic ecoregions been included as separate objects and considering a dossier of data for Domain 1 (Douglass 2013).

Two layers based on domination of benthic organisms as a result of bottom fishing research from US cruises was agreed (WG-EMM 15/42). It was observed that benthic communities dominated by echinoderm are associated with warmer areas, whereas communities dominated by sponges are more common in colder regions. For this, the 0°C isotherm was considered a good proxy to identify these features, separating the Domain 1 in regions with temperatures above and below 0°C.

Ecoregions, habitat types and sea floor temperature correspond to a coarse approximation to the expected distribution of species, communities and ecosystems (Annex 1, Fig.1). Therefore, it is considered the degree of protection to be low (Annex 2, Table A). However, their inclusion is important in order to provide an adequate representativeness of benthic environmental variability within the Domain 1.

Conservation Objective 2: Representative examples of pelagic habitats

This conservation objective seeks to protect a representative fraction of all important pelagic habitats present within Domain 1.

It includes a single conservation object described by the pelagic bioregionalization used to classify the environments across a region into a number of discrete classes, thereby providing a spatial and environmental subdivision of the study area (Raymond 2011). To provide an adequate representativeness the Domain 1 was divided in Eastern and Western sections, and the pelagic ecoregions in north and south of the Antarctic Polar Front (APF), accounting for 16 pelagic bioregions (Annex 1, Fig.2).

Accordingly, target protection for this conservation objective was considered to be low and was divided proportionally within three subregions: north of APF (northwestern area of Domain 1), south of APF, and East and West of the 50°W meridian (Annex 2, Table A).

Conservation Objective 3: Important benthic ecosystem processes

This conservation objective seeks to protect specific benthic features that contribute to generate predictable ecologic processes within Domain 1.

Three benthic habitats were identified as generating predictable ecosystem processes, involving do types of canyons and ice shelves. These objects were chosen given that they are predictable high sources of productivity and are important for biodiversity (WG-EMM 12/69).

Canyons influence oceanographic processes, sediment transport, productivity and benthic biodiversity (Huang et al. 2014), but may perform different ecological functions based on their physical characteristics in relation to the shelf and slope. Shelf-incising canyons extend across the shelf and may therefore terminate closer to coastal areas, whereas blind canyons are confined to the continental slope and terminate blow the shelf-break (Huang et al. 2014). In 2015, a new geomorphic data describing submarine canyons based on updated bathymetry was included (Harris et al. 2014), and canyon layer was built to include two types, shelf-incising and blind (Annex 1, Fig. 3).

Benthic areas under ice-shelves: Persistent ice-shelves are a special habitat type with a unique ecosystem underneath. The potential collapse of ice-shelves with global warming will have profound effects on the ecosystem beneath, previously protected, with potential increase for primary and secondary productivity; it will also be an area prone to be colonized for new species; these are areas with significant scientific interest. Ice-shelves detected for Domain 1 were presented in WS-MAP-11/17.

Other predictable ecosystem processes are the up/down-welling and mixing areas as they are considered to be high sources of productivity and are important for biodiversity (WG-EMM 12/69). These processes were decided not to be included as separate data layers as they are already

considered in conservation objectives 1 and 2 as part of the benthic and pelagic models by Douglass (2014) and Raymond (2011), respectively.

Regarding target levels it was used a medium to high value for those conservation objectives that contributes to concentrate primary or secondary productivity(canyons), or that constitute a unique habitat with unique biodiversity (e.g., benthic ice-shelves) (Annex 2, Table A).

Conservation Objective 4: Large-scale pelagic ecosystem processes

This conservation objective seeks to protect large-scale, pelagic ecosystem processes, spatially predictable over the years.

Four large-scale pelagic processes predictable in space/time had been identified, which represent foreseen features for primary productivity or food concentration (Hofmann and Hüsrevoglu 2003, Atkinson et al. 2008, Siegel et al. 2013).

Predictable highly productive areas – surface: As a proxy measure for areas with predictable high primary productivity, the persistent summer Chl-a derived from multiyear satellite images was used. It was agreed considering for the analysis all areas with values equal or greater than 0.11mg/m³ (Annex 1, Fig. 4).

Frontal features: The sACCf was selected because it separates warmer ACC water to north, associated with the ecological division of the krill/copepods dominated ecosystems. The frontal zone area was estimated as the mean positions of sbACCf and nbACCf, plus 30km buffer on sbACCf. The frontal zone was further divided into 3 sectors, based on expert opinions about the different ecosystems east-west of the 50°W meridian and north-south the Anvers Island. For example, the southern section of the frontal zone is an area of high *E. superba* larvae production. Accordingly, each area will receive an equal % of protection (Annex 1, Fig. 4).

Marginal ice zone: The ice edge is considered to determine the distributional pattern of several zooplankton species, as well as marine mammals and birds. It is also a good proxy for the distribution of many species breeding in association with it (e.g. pack-ice seals). The climatologically position of the marginal ice zone (MIZ) during summer and winter period was characterized and included in the analysis: (i) February, when sea-ice extent is minimized and (ii) August, when sea-ice extent is maximized (Annex 1, Fig. 4).

Polynyas: These are persistent features that play a critical role during winter in the local flux of nutrients, attracting small and large animals. Polynyas were included each as a single, undivided object with no buffer around them (Annex 1, Fig. 4).

All the above conservation objects are representative of spatially predictable process contributing to the productivity in the Domain 1. Accordingly, the degree of protection was agreed to be

medium to high (Annex 2, Table A). For marginal ice zone the protection desired was medium-low (Annex 2, Table A) as it is only a proxy for the distribution of predators.

Conservation Objective 5: Important (spatially constrained/predictable) areas for mammals and birds life-history

This conservation objective seeks to protect the distribution of marine mammals and birds during critical stages of their life-history.

Seabirds and marine mammals are important predators of the Antarctic ecosystem. As they forage at sea, they are vulnerable to the potential impact of local activities, such as fisheries or regional effects like Climate Change. In the western Antarctic Peninsula an ongoing decline in the breeding populations of Adélie (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) and chinstrap (*P. antarctica*) penguins had been recorded while an increase in the population of gentoo penguins (*P. papua*) and the recovery of whales, the largest and most important krill consumers was observed in the same area (Carlini et al. 2007, 2009; Trivelpiece et al. 2011; Novacek et al. 2011; Lynch et al. 2012; among others).

Krill fishing is concentrated in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2 and it has been proved to have a high degree of spatial variability between and within years (Capurro et al. WG-EMM 17/##, Santa Cruz et al. WG-EMM-16/52). Moreover, in the last seasons it has been observed a spatial aggregation of the fishery in areas near the coast (Trathan and Hill, WG-EMM-16/17). Consequently, spatiotemporal overlap between top predators (pygoscelid penguins and fur seal) was observed throughout the Antarctic Peninsula and South Orkney Islands region, including breeding colonies and distant areas where recent fishing activity has concentrated (Hinke et al. 2017). Also, Weinstein et al. (2017) have identified whales foraging areas in the Gerlache Strait and the Bransfield Strait/Mar de la Flota; the latter one identified as the most used SSMU by the krill fishery (APBSW). They found a spatial overlap between whale presence and concentrated fishing activities. Bearing in mind the future projection of an increase in the krill fishery activities, the protection of krill fishing predators become one key element to be considered in the Domain 1 MPA preliminary proposal.

Many of these krill-dependent species are considered as bio-indicators of the state of the ecosystem by CCAMLR, existing data collected in a systematic way across year and localities, and/or there are future monitoring plans in cooperation within different members. Currently, work to develop a Feedback Management Strategy (FBM) for the krill fishery is under consideration, which could include changes to the spatial and temporal operations of the fishery in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2 in response to changes in predator-derived indexes. For this reason it will be necessary to harmonize the MPA proposal with the development of the FBM or any other strategy agreed by the Commission in a manner consistent with the objectives of the Convention.

This objective considers information for land based predators colonies; the foraging areas of penguins and Antarctic fur seals during breeding; the foraging areas of whales, seals, and penguins

during non-breeding period; and where information in some areas is scarce, the distribution of prey, as a good proxy for important feeding areas.

All this information led to the inclusion of spatial data layers for a) foraging distribution during breeding; b) prey distribution, and c) foraging distribution during non-breeding periods. All data was reviewed to ensure that shapefiles available for Marxan analysis include the best available information.

a) Foraging distributions of Central Place Foragers during breeding season:

This objective seeks to protect the main foraging grounds of known top predators during their reproductive season. The distribution of marine mammals and birds during their breeding when they behave as Central Place Foragers was considered a critical time during their life-history and important to protect. Data for penguins including pygoscelid species, emperor and macaroni penguins, as well as for Antarctic fur seal, was included in the analyses.

Colony locations and number of pygoscelids penguins breeding pairs were obtained from an extensive review of published and non-published material, largely compiled by the British Antarctic Survey, and complemented with information from other CCAMLR Member Countries, including USA, Argentina and Chile and lately compared with Mapping Application for Penguin Populations and Projected Dynamics (MAPPPD, Humphries et al. 2017) and the Important Birds Areas Report (Harris et al. 2014). Only pygoscelids colonies, for which at least 10 breeding pairs had been estimated in the last census data available, were considered. The locations of Emperor Penguin (*Aptenodytes forsteri*) colonies (Smyley Island and Snow Hill Island) were obtained from Fretwell et al. (2012) and Libertelli and Coria (2014). Emperor penguins have a variable diet across Antarctica (including fishes, crustaceans and squids) and in the Weddell sea, krill was found to be the main component of this species' diet representing up to 67% of stomach content (Ratcliffe and Trathan 2011). For macaroni penguins (*Eudyptes chrysolophus*) all known breeding sites in the Antarctic Peninsula Region were revised (Naveen and Lynch 2011).

Regarding colony buffer areas, associated with foraging range, they were represented by a half-circle rather than a full circle (WG EMM 15/42), based on observations that foraging distributions of central place foraging generally radiate from the colony in one direction over the shelf and towards the shelf break and are typically constrained by land masses in the opposite direction. Exceptions may occur on small islands (e.g. Powell Island) or on peninsulas and headlands of islands (Signy Island) where marine habitat is available throughout larger sectors; for these exceptions, full circles were agreed to be used (Annex 1, Fig. 5a).

Foraging range for the penguin species was defined as the inflection point in the cumulative frequency distribution of birds tagged with satellite transmitters during brood and crèche periods. Information for colonies at the South Shetland Islands and the Antarctic Peninsula was derived from birds tagged at Admiralty Bay (Copa) and Cape Shirreff colonies studied by the US-AMLR program and represented by the 75% cumulative distribution of the maximum foraging range of the birds tagged (Table 1, Fig. 5a).

Foraging range for penguins breeding at South Orkney were based from birds tagged at Signy Island by the BAS, when available. Data for chinstrap and Adélie penguin breeding was obtained from WG-EMM-02/33 (Table 1).

Alternative methods exist to estimate the size and location of the colony buffer zone including habitat modelling and cost-distance analysis. Although these analyses could provide greater resolution in potential foraging areas for each colony during the summer breeding season, preliminary results of habitat modeling for pygoscelis penguins in Subarea 48.1 do not differ significantly from estimations used here (Trathan et al. WG-EMM 17/XX) .

For emperor penguins, a 100 km buffer radius was considered based on the foraging areas of other colonies (Ratcliffe and Trathan 2011). In the case of the Snow Hill colony of emperor penguins, it was noted that although this colony is placed outside Domain 1, its 100km buffer enters this area. For macaroni penguins, buffer of 50 km was derived from averaging the foraging radius observed during chick rearing at South Georgia (Barlow and Croxall 2002; Trathan et al. 1998) (Annex 1, Fig. 5a).

Distribution of the breeding colonies of Antarctic fur seal was obtained from the last AMLR census (2007/08). Only the colonies with at least one pup in the last census were considered (Goebel et al. 2008). The foraging range for this species from pup birth to weaning was derived from the inflection point on the cumulative distribution of the maximum foraging range of breeding females tagged at Cape Shirreff by the US-AMLR program (Table 1, Fig. 5a).

Table 1: Species, colonies and buffers (km) used for estimating foraging habitat during breeding season.

| Species | Colony | Buffer radius (km) | According to |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Adélie penguin (South Orkney) | | 100 | WG-EM 12/69 and 14/40 |
| Adélie penguin (South Shetland and Antarctic Peninsula) | Admiralty Bay Hope Bay | 50 | WG-EM 12/69 and 14/40 |
| Chinstrap penguin (South Orkney) | | 45 | 2015 |
| Chinstrap penguins (South Shetland and Antarctic Peninsula) | Cape Shirreff Admiralty Bay | 25 | WG-EM 12/69 and 14/40 |
| Gentoo penguin (South Orkney) | | 45 | 2015 |
| Gentoo penguin (South Shetlands and Antarctic Peninsula) | Cape Shirreff Admiralty Bay | 25 | WG-EM 12/69 and 14/40 |
| Emperor penguin | | 100 (*) | 2015 |
| Macaroni penguin | | 50 | 2015 |
| Antarctic fur seal (South Shetlands) | Cape Shirreff | 75 | WG-EM 12/69 and 14/40 |

(*) Snow Hill colony of emperor penguins: this colony is placed outside Domain 1, but its 100km buffer enters this area.

Pack-ice seals were not considered as they do not forage during the lactation period. Southern elephant seals were assimilated within this category too. Data for other seabirds is scarce, particularly that referred to their breeding distribution and thus, were not considered.

Regarding conservation targets, due to feeding restrictions of central foragers, it was agreed to use medium-high protection levels for analyses (Annex 2, Table A).

b) Prey distributions

This object seeks to protect the distribution of key species for predators. Information of the distribution of marine mammals and birds when they are not restrained by breeding is less abundant. However, the data available suggests that they are highly mobile and able to track their prey over long distances. Even further, many species leave the Domain 1 area (and the Convention Area) during winter, e.g. Antarctic fur seals and whales. In this sense, the distribution of their main prey is a proxy for identifying their main foraging grounds.

Four prey taxa for which data is available were identified and rasters characterizing the spatial variation of their densities were used as data layers. Data for crystal krill (*Euphausia crystallorophias*), *Thysanoessa macrura*, and salps (*Salpa thompsoni*) were developed from zooplankton density data collected by U.S. AMLR Program during net tow surveys (1993-2011) and PAL LTER and German Zooplankton Cruise (2011). Adult krill (*Euphausia superba*) data was compiled from the KRILLBASE (Atkinson et al. 2017) using the standardized density (method described in Atkinson et al. 2008) for the period 1993-2011. Only adults organisms were considered as distribution of krill nurseries are considered in a separate objective (Objective 7). (Annex 1, Fig. 5b-d) Further details can be found in Data Form for objective 5b.

As the distribution of preys is only a proxy for identifying predators' main foraging grounds, it was decided to be protected using a medium target (Annex 2, Table A).

c) Foraging distribution during non-breeding season

This objective seeks to protect the main foraging grounds of known top predators during their non-reproductive season. Different studies suggest that winter survival rate, particularly of juveniles is a key factor explaining current declines observed in some penguin species (Hinke et al. 2007, Carlini et al. 2009, Trivelpiece et al. 2011). Likewise, breeding population size during spring is largely dependent on foraging success during the previous winter.

Most Antarctic pinnipeds (except for fur seals) have a capital reproduction. This means that during the gestation period they build up fat reserves that they use during the lactation period. In Antarctic pinnipeds the gestation period lasts from summer to summer (Forcada 2007). It is worth noting that a large influx of male Antarctic fur seals from South Georgias into Domain 1 occurs in late summer/early autumn. As a potentially large, transient population of krill-dependent predators, accounting for their main foraging areas was considered important for the MPA planning process. Current tracking data that include male fur seals from Cape Shirreff, Livingston Island, demonstrate that these animals use habitats throughout Domain 1, including marginal ice zones. Using a proxy habitat layer based on marginal ice zones for this transient population was considered.

In the case of whales, many species annually migrate to Antarctic waters to exploit the rich krill resources. Here, whales feed and build up fat deposits to survive their long migration to subtropical and tropical waters where they breed but hardly feed for the remainder of the year (Lockyer and Brown 1981).

In Antarctic waters, three different ecotypes of Killer whales (Type A, B1 and B2) has been described based on morphology and prey specialization. In the Antarctic peninsula, it appears to be two size variants of type B killer whales—a large form that wave-washes seals off ice floes (Visser et al. 2008) and takes an occasional Antarctic Minke whale, and a smaller form that forages in more open water. The smallest version has been observed in the Gerlache Strait feeding on penguins (Pitman & Durban 2010).

Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) have recovered to become the most numerous whale species in the region (Herr et al., 2016). Their distribution is related to the distribution and abundance of krill (Nowacek et al. 2011) since krill is their primary food source (Nicol et al. 2008).

For this objective tracking data for several penguins, pinnipeds and cetaceans were considered (Table 2). Tracking data for pygoscelids penguins (Adélie, gentoo and chinstrap), cetaceans (Humpback whales, Minke Whales, Type A, Type B1, and Type B2 killer whales), and 4pinniped species (Antarctic fur seal, Weddell seal, elephant seal and leopard seal) have been processed according to a method described by Hinke et al. (2012) which interpolates the time spent by an individual within an area and estimates alternatives paths for connecting positions derived from satellite links (Annex 1, Figs. 5f-g). The rationale for this relates to the need to standardize estimates of habitat utilization from different tagging locations so that the location of high-use winter distributions are not biased by data from tagging locations with larger sample sizes and longer deployment durations. Further analyses were performed in order to calculate the intensity of use of Domain 1 by each species, given that their distribution and use of space is not even across species (more details can be found in Data Form for Objective 5c).

Table 2: Species and tagging locations used for estimating non-breeding habitat use, based on tracking data.

| SPECIES | Colony (No. years) | Months (No. ind) | Data owner |
|--------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| Adélie penguin | Admiralty Bay (1) | April-August (1) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| | Northern Antarctic Peninsula Hope Bay/ Esperanza (2) | March-April (10) | ARG-IAA |
| | South Orkney Islands | April-August | UK-BAS |
| Chinstrap penguin | Cape Shirreff (4) | April-September (33) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| | Admiralty Bay (3) | April-July (13) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| | South Orkney Islands | April-August | UK-BAS |
| Gentoo penguin | Cape Shirreff (2) | April-September (25) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| | Admiralty Bay (1) | April-July (1) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| Antarctic fur seal | Cape Shirreff (5) | April-September (63) | US-AMLR ₁ |

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Weddell seal | Cape Shirreff (1) | April-September (6) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| Leopard seal | Cape Shirreff (3) | April-September (12) | US-AMLR ₁ |
| Crabeater seal | WAP (3) | April-November (44) | UCSC ³ |
| Southern Elephant seal | Cape Shirreff | February-October (54) | UCSC/US-AMLR ³ |
| | Potter Peninsula (4) | December-July (49) | AWI (GR)-IAA ⁴ |
| Humpback whales | WAP | January-Sept (22) | US-AMLR ² |
| Minke Whales | WAP | February-March (14) | US-AMLR ² |
| Killer Whales T A | WAP | Feb-April (9) | US-AMLR ² |
| Killer Whales T B1 | WAP | January-March (8) | US-AMLR ² |
| Killer Whales T B2 | WAP | January-March (23) | US-AMLR ² |

¹Hinke et al. 2012 and Hinke et al. 2017

² Data coordinated by Bob Pitman, U.S. AMLR Program

³University of California-Santa Cruz (Dan Costa)

⁴ Data owner-Horstmann (AWI). Data available in PANGAEA- Data published in De bruyn et al. 2014

Regarding conservation targets, similar to foraging distribution during breeding and directly related to it as breeding population size depends on foraging success during the past winter, it was agreed to use medium-high protection levels for analyses (Annex 2, Table A).

Conservation Objective 6: Important (spatially constrained/predictable) areas for fish life cycles

This objective seeks to protect the areas of occurrence of notothenioid fish populations in the southern Scotia Arc, which were overexploited by the commercial fishery in the South Shetland and South Orkney Islands and tip of the Antarctic Peninsula during the late 1970s and the 1980s (Tin et al. 2009). In general, these regions have similar ichthyofaunal communities and were affected by a similar history of resource depletion. As a consequence, finfish fisheries in Subareas 48.1 and 48.2 were banned in 1990 (CM 32-02), and stocks of several notothenioid species are still in the process of recovery (Barrera-Oro et al. 2000, Jones et al. 2000, Kock and Jones 2005, Jones and Kock 2009, Kock et al. 2012, Marschoff et al. 2012).

Object 6.a. Spawning/recruitment areas of commercially exploited notothenioid species

This objective seeks to protect nursery areas of notothenioids, particularly marbled notothenia (*Notothenia rossii*), green notothenia (*Gobionotothen gibberifrons*) and ice fish (*Chaenocephalus aceratus*) and as a co-effect, the main feeding areas of Antarctic shags, birds with a negative population trend at certain monitored colonies in the South Shetland Islands. At the same time, the coastal macroalgal communities in the neritic domain down to 50 m deep, which provide a valuable habitat and refuge for benthic and pelagic animals, would also be protected.

This object of conservation covers the breeding area of juvenile populations including early stages of commercially fished demersal notothenioid species, such as, *N. rossii*, *G. gibberifrons* and *C. aceratus* which occur in the inner/inshore neritic fraction of the shelf. In general, notothenioids have pelagic larval-postlarval stages and, although its targeted catch is prohibited in the Subareas

mentioned, there is a catch rate of these early stages in the krill fishery (WG-EMM-13/38, WG-EMM-14/31 Rev. 1). Juvenile stages of *N. rossii* and *G. gibberifrons* from 1-2 to 6-7 year old, and other notothenioids such as *C. aceratus* inhabit preferentially coves, bays and shore waters down to 150 m deep (Kock 1992, Marschoff et al. 2012). Rocky coastal areas are colonized by a dense cover of macroalgae species (Wiencke and Clayton 2002, Quartino and Boraso de Zaiuso 2008). The macroalgal assemblages are mainly distributed from 0 down to 30 m deep (Quartino et al. 2001, 2005), especially the dominant large brown *Desmarestiales* species are commonly used as habitat and refuge for pelagic larval and post-larval stages of the fish (Barrera Oro et al. 2012).

Object 6b. Occurrence areas of historically commercially exploited fish populations.

This object of conservation covers the area of geographic distribution of commercially exploited notothenioid fish in the offshore fraction of the shelf within Domain 1 region. The fish species to be protected are listed in the description of CM 32-02 for the areas surrounding the South Shetland Islands Archipelago, including the northernmost Elephant Island, Joinville Island in the tip of the Antarctic Peninsula and the South Orkney Islands. The issue of fish by-catch in the krill fishery has been largely discussed in the compass of CCAMLR since the mid-1980s; one of the most frequently species caught in offshore waters is *C. gunnari* (Kock and Jones 2014). However, although research on this matter is progressing, the actual effects of the early life stages of Antarctic fish by-catch on their populations are still unknown.

Four files were agreed to be included in the analysis: 0-150m North 64°S, 150-500m North 64°S, 0-150m South 64°S and 150-500m South 64°S (Annex 1, Fig. 6).

Layer strata 0-150m depth: Some species *N. rossii* and *G. gibberifrons* and of the icefish *C. aceratus* spend early stages of their life cycles in inshore waters. The first two ones were affected by the commercial finfish fisheries described in CCAMLR CM 32-02, and could potentially be affected by the current krill fishery;

Layer strata 150 to 500m deep: this layer was included in order to protect the whole populations of notothenioids, which are mainly distributed down to this depth, included the juvenile stages of *Dissostichus* pp. One of the main commercial exploited species, also included in CM 32-02, the mackerel icefish *C. gunnari*, occurs in this depth stratum during its whole life cycle. In this way, both layers were managed as two conservation objects (a and b) with distinct conservation targets.

A Southern limit for both 0 to 150m and 150-500m layer south of 64°S was established because this was the area of influence of the historical commercial fishery. It was decided to extend this limit to the southern part of Domain 1 along the western Antarctic Peninsula, in order to protect the entire distribution of important life cycle areas for these species, and in particular the juvenile stages of notothenioids which could have a potential threat from e.g. future activities of the krill fishery (Kasatkina 2006).

The target conservation levels were set according to the past and future threats related with industrial exploitation, acknowledging that levels in layers covering areas under the influence of historical (finfish) and current (krill) commercial fisheries (North of 64°S) are higher than those in not affected areas (South of 64°S). Thus, the conservation target proposed were high (80%) for layers 0-150m North 64°S, medium (50%) for 150-500m North 64°S, and low (20%) for both 0-150m and 150-500m South 64° (Annex2, Table A).

Conservation Objective 7: Important (spatially constrained/predictable) areas for zooplankton life cycles

This conservation objective seeks to protect the spawning/recruitment areas of key zooplankton species. The rationale for the inclusion of the krill nurseries is to protect the larvae, therefore a “source” of krill, in areas where it has been stated a reduction in krill abundance related to the effects of climate change (Atkinson et al. 2004), changes in fishery dynamics (Kawaguchi y Nicol 2006, Kasatkina et al. 2013, Silk et al. 2014) and where during the last years, recent catches by the krill fishery in Subareas 48.1 have reached limits set by CCAMLR resulting in the early closures in 2015/16, 2014/15, 2013/14 and 2009/10 (Krill Fishery report 2015).

Krill nursery areas, including data for the Gerlache Strait, West Scotia Sea, Weddell Sea and Bellingshausen Seawater characterized based on different publications (see table in Dataform Objective 7) . After hatching in deep water, the larvae develop while ascending. During their ascent, larvae are advected both onto the shelf and to the NE (along the Antarctic Circumpolar Current (ACC)). These two pathways are considered possible sources of krill larvae in the Gerlache Strait, but production within the Strait itself is also thought to occur. Huntley and Brinton (1991) concluded that the Gerlache Strait is a nursery area. Also, it is generally thought that many krill larvae found near the northeastern tip of the Antarctic Peninsula and in the Weddell-Scotia Confluence originate from the Weddell Sea (Capella et al. 1992). There have been very many observations of larvae in the eastern Bellingshausen Sea, including observations made during the 1993-2013 LTER surveys showing highest densities offshore and to SW (Frazer et al. 2002).

The importance of the areas where Circumpolar Deep Water (CDW) intrudes onto the continental shelf is described by Piñones et al. (2013): "The occurrence of juvenile and medium-size krill along the inner shelf may result from local inputs in areas of the shelf where the shelf is deep (Brinton 1991, Hofmann et al. 1992) and CDW is present, which allows completion of the descent ascent cycle (Hofmann and Hüsrevolu 2003). The clockwise surface circulation over the shelf and onshore flow at depth (Stein 1992, Smith et al. 1999, Dinniman and Klinck 2004) may facilitate transport of krill larvae to the inner shelf."

Krill nursery areas (areas with high densities of larvae up to Furcilia III) have been identified in association with waters from the ACC in the Bellingshausen Sea and South Shetland areas, close to the continental slope. Also, krill larvae in the South Orkneys and Weddell Sea area have also been reported as related with the Weddell Scotia Confluence, but recent cruises of the Puerto Deseado

(2011 to 2014) have shown a significant variability in the abundance of krill larvae in these areas in relation with historical values. On the other hand, the subgroup observed the high densities encountered in the Gerlache Strait as well as their constant presence in a definite location across the years (probably arising from the flux of ACC waters towards the shelf) and the role of the Bellingshausen gyre as originating krill populations along Domains 1 and 3. For these reasons, some nursery areas were further divided and eight files were decided to be included in the analysis: SW and NE Bellingshausen Sea, South Shetland and South Orkney for the Scotia Sea, Weddell Sea, Gerlache Strait, and CDW intrusions in west shelf and ACC (Annex 1, Fig. 7).

Related to the conservation targets (Annex 2, Table A), nursery areas in the west Scotia Sea, Weddell Sea and Bellingshausen Sea were allocated low target values. Given the importance of the krill nursery in the Gerlache Strait, conservation target was agreed to be high (WG-EMM 15/42).

Conservation Objective 8: Rare or unique habitats/features

This conservation objective seeks to protect rare or unique geomorphic habitats.

This objective corresponds to a unique geomorphological feature: seamounts, either isolated or forming seamount chains ('seamount ridges' in Douglas et al 2011.). Seamounts hold relevant marine biodiversity in that it is characterized by high species richness, and while endemism might be lower than previously assumed (Clark et al. 2010), isolated seamount systems may harbor many endemic species not found in the surrounding deep sea (EMM 14/40).

Seamounts were divided between two ecoregions (Antarctic Peninsula and South Orkney Islands). A seamounts layer was generated using geomorphic data based on bathymetry from the Global Seafloor Geomorphology dataset (publicly available from [www. bluehabitats.org](http://www.bluehabitats.org), and described in Harris et al. 2014). This layer includes all of the seamounts and seamount ridges. Seamounts were classified into three conservation objects, according to depth (bathome) and geographic location (ecoregion), using the Douglass et al. 2014 environment types: Seamounts and seamount ridges shallower than 2000m depth (occurring in all ecoregions), Seamounts and seamount ridges deeper than 2000m depth occurring in the South Orkney Islands ecoregion, and Seamounts and seamount ridges deeper than 2000m depth occurring in the Antarctic Peninsula ecoregion (Annex 1, Fig.8).

About conservation targets and taking into account that major threats to seamount's biota are fisheries concentrated in depths up to 2000m, it was proposed to use different levels of protection, establishing high conservation targets for shallower seamounts and lower values for deeper ones (Annex 2, Table A).

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In order to identify the most efficient Domain 1 MPA model, considerations were given to some areas that are already protected by the Antarctic Treaty System.

Southern Shelf South Orkney Islands Marine Protected Area (SS SOI MPA): It was included in the analyses to assist in the identification of Domain 1 priority areas for conservation taken into account the marine protection already given by the SS SOI MPA according to CCAMLR CM 91-03.

Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VME): They were also included in the analyses as they represent sites with highly diverse benthic communities that are already protected by CCAMLR CM 22-06 and CM 22-07.

Special areas following ice-shelf retreat or collapse in Statistical Subareas 48.1, 48.5 and 88.3: the generation of Domain 1 MPA model also considered the location of ice-shelf and the possible protection of the marine environments underneath them once ice-shelf retreat or collapse, according to the CCAMLR CM 24-04.

Antarctic Specially Protected (ASP) and Managed Areas (ASMA): Several protected areas with marine components already protected by ATMC Resolutions and by CCAMLR CM 91-02 were also included in the analyses (ASPAs 144, 145, 146, 149, 151, 152 and 153; ASMAs 1, 4 and 7). For more information on these areas please refer to ATS webpage (www.ats.aq).

Other aspects of the design of this Domain 1 MPA that were taking into account include the possible identification of Reference areas for scientific study and their contribution to strategies such as the Feedback Management Strategy (FBM). For instance, it is recognized the importance of reference or control areas to assess the potential impact of the krill fishery on krill-dependent species. In this sense, it could be proposed to classify existing ecosystem monitoring programs (CEMP and others) according to the existence of past and present fishing activities within the foraging range of the studied species (Adélie, gentoo, chinstrap and macaroni penguins and the Antarctic fur seal). Interestingly, the LTER study grid has never been subjected to fishery and it could be propose as a reference area for assessing changes in the ecosystem in the absence offishing. The identification of priority areas for conservation could also assist in the development of FBM or other strategies agreed by the Commission, for instance, by focusing resources to these areas.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson A, SiegelV, Pakhomov EA, RotheryP, LoebV, RossRM, QuetinLB, SchmidtK,FretwellP, MurphyEJ, TarlingGA, Fleming AH(2008). Oceanic circumpolar habitats ofAntarctickrill.*Marine Ecology Progress Series* 362:1-23.
- Barlow KE and CroxallJP (2002).Seasonal and interannual variation in foraging range and habitat of macaroni penguins at South Georgia.*MarineEcologyProgress Series* 232: 291-304.

- Barrera-Oro ER, Marschoff E, Casaux RJ (2000). Trends in relative abundance of fjord *Nototheniaronnissii*, *Gobionotothenigibberifrons* and *Nototheniacoriiceps* at Potter Cove, South Shetland Islands, after commercial fishing in the area. *CCAMLR Science* 7:43-52.
- Barrera-Oro ER, Eastman JT, Moreira E (2012). Phenotypic plasticity in the Antarctic nototheniid fish *Trematomus newnesi*: a guide to the identification of typical, large mouth and intermediate morphs. *Polar Biology* 35 (7): 1047-1056.
- Brinton E (1991). Distribution and population structures of immature and adult *Euphausia superba* in the western Bransfield Strait region during the 1986-87 summer. *Deep Sea Research Part A. Oceanographic Research Papers* 38(8): 1169-1193.
- Capella JE, Quetin LB, Hofmann EE, Ross RM (1992). Models of the early life history of *Euphausia superba*—Part II. Lagrangian calculations. *Deep Sea Research Part A. Oceanographic Research Papers* 39(7): 1201-1220.
- Carlini AR, Coria RN, Santos MM, Libertelli MM, Donini G (2007). Breeding success and population trends in Adélie penguins in areas with low and high levels of human disturbance. *Polar Biology* 30:917-924.
- Carlini AR, Coria NR, Santos MM, Negrete J, Juarez MA, Daneri GA (2009). Responses of *Pygoscelis adeliae* and *P. papua* populations to environmental changes at Isla 25 de Mayo (King George Island). *Polar Biology* 32: 142-1433.
- Clark MR, Rowden AA, Schlacher T, Williams A, Consalvey M, Stocks KI, Rogers AD, O'Hara TD, White M, Shank TM, Hall-Spencer JM (2010). The ecology of seamounts: structure, function, and human impacts. *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.* 2: 253-78.
- Dinniman MS and Klinck JM (2004). A model study of circulation and cross-shelf exchange on the west Antarctic Peninsula continental shelf. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 51(17): 2003-2022.
- Douglass LL, Turner J, Grantham HS, Kaiser S, Constable A, Nicoll R, Raymond B, Post A, Brandt A, Beaver D (2011). A hierarchical classification of benthic biodiversity and assessment of protected areas in the Southern Ocean. Submitted to the CCAMLR Marine Protected Area workshop held in Brest, France in 2011. WS-MPA-11/23.
- Douglass LL, Turner J, Grantham HS, Kaiser S, Constable A, et al. (2014) A Hierarchical Classification of Benthic Biodiversity and Assessment of Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean. *PLoS ONE* 9(7): e100551. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100551
- Frazer TK, Quetin LB, Ross RM (2002). Abundance, sizes and developmental stages of larval krill, *Euphausia superba*, during winter in ice-covered seas west of the Antarctic Peninsula. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 24(10): 1067-1077.
- Goebel ME, De Torres C, Miller A, Santora J, Costa D and P Diaz. 2008. Antarctic fur seal pup production and population trends in the south shetland islands with special reference to sources of error in pup production estimates. WG-EMM-PSW-08/14
- Harris PT, Macmillan-Lawler M, Rupp J, Baker EK (2014). Geomorphology of the Oceans. *Marine Geology* 352: 4-24.
- Harris, C.M., Carr, R., Lorenz, K. Jones, S. 2011. Important Bird Areas in Antarctica: Antarctic Peninsula, South Shetland Islands, South Orkney Islands – Final Report. Prepared


- forBirdLife International and the Polar Regions Unit of the UK Foreign & Commonwealth Office. Environmental Research & Assessment Ltd., Cambridge.
- Hinke J, Watters G, Trivelpiece W, Goebel M (2012). Synopsis of data from satellite telemetry of foraging trips and migration routes of penguins and pinnipeds from the South Shetland Islands, 1997/98 to present. WG-EMM 12/37.
- Hinke JT, Cossio AM, Goebel ME, Reiss CS, Trivelpiece WZ, Watters GM. 2017. Identifying Risk: Concurrent Overlap of the Antarctic Krill Fishery with Krill-Dependent Predators in the Scotia Sea. *PLoS ONE* 12(1): e0170132. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170132
- Hofmann EE and Hüsrevoglu YS (2003). A circumpolar modeling study of habitat control of Antarctic krill (*Euphausia superba*) reproductive success. *Deep-Sea Research II* 50:3121-3142.
- Huang Z, Nichol SL, Harris PT, Caley MJ (2014). Classification of submarine canyons of the Australian continental margin. *Marine Geology* 357: 362-383.
- Humphries G.R.W., Che-Castaldo C., Naveen R., Schwaller M., McDowall P., Schrimpf M., and Lynch H.J. 2017. Mapping Application for Penguin Populations and Projected Dynamics (MAPPPD): Data and tools for dynamic management and decision support. *Polar Records*
- Jones CD, K.-H. Kock and E. Balguerías. 2000. Changes in biomass of eight species of finfish around the South Orkney Islands (Subarea 48.2) from three bottom trawl surveys. *CCAMLR Science* 7: 53–74.
- Jones CD and K-H Kock (2009). Standing stock, spatial distribution, and biological features of demersal finfish from the 2009 US AMLR bottom trawl survey of the South Orkney Islands (Subarea 48.2). WG-FSA-09/19.
- Kasatkina SM (2006). On possible impact of new continuous krill fishing technology on juvenile fish and larvae. WG-FSA-06/23.
- Kasatkina SM, Shnar VN, Burikin SN (2013) The dynamic of krill fishery and the environment in the Antarctic Peninsula Subarea (48.1). WG-EMM 13/32.
- Krafft BA, Krag LA, Klevjer T, Skaret G, Pedersen R (2014). Report from the annual survey of Antarctic krill and apex predators distribution at South Orkney Islands in 2014, and assessing escape mortality of krill in trawls WG-EMM-14/16
- Kock K-H (1992). *Antarctic Fish and Fisheries*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, New York: 359 pp.
- Kock K-H and Jones CD (2005). Fish Stocks in the southern Scotia Arc region – a review and prospects for future research. *Rev. Fish. Sci.* 13: 75 -108.
- Kock K-H, Jones CD (2012). The composition, abundance and reproductive characteristics of the demersal fish fauna in the Elephant Island–South Shetland Islands region and at the tip of the Antarctic Peninsula (CCAMLR Subarea 48.1) in March–early April 2012. WG-FSA-12/10.
- Lynch HJ, Naveen R, Trathan PN, Fagan WF. (2012a). Spatially integrated assessment reveals widespread changes in penguin populations on the Antarctic Peninsula. *Ecology* 93(6): 1367-1377.
- Marschoff ER, Barrera-Oro ER, Alescio NS, Ainley DG (2012). Slow recovery of previously depleted demersal fish at the South Shetland Islands, 1983-2010. *Fisheries Research* 125-126: 206-213.

- Naveen R and Lynch H (2011). The average Antarctic Peninsula Compendium (3rd edition).
- Nowacek DP, Friedlaender AS, Halpin PN, Hazen EL, Johnston DW, et al (2011). Super-Aggregations of Krill and Humpback Whales in Wilhelmina Bay, Antarctic Peninsula. *PLoS ONE* 6(4): e19173.
- Orgeira JL, Alderete MC, Jiménez YG, González JC (2014). Long-term study of the at-sea distribution of seabirds and marine mammals in the Scotia Sea, Antarctica. WG-EMM-14/06 Rev. 1.
- Piñones A, Hofmann EE, Daly KL, Dinniman MS, Klinck JM (2013). Modeling the remote and local connectivity of Antarctic krill populations along the western Antarctic Peninsula. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 481, 69-92.
- Quartino ML, Klöser H, Schloss IR, Wiencke C (2001). Biomass and associations of benthic marine macroalgae from the inner Potter Cove (King George Island Antarctica) related to depth and substrate. *Polar Biology* 24:349-355.
- Quartino ML, Boraso de Zaiuso AL, Zaiuso H (2005). Biological and environmental characterization of marine macroalgae assemblages in Potter Cove, South Shetland Islands, Antarctica. *Bot Mar* 48:187-197.
- Quartino ML, Boraso de Zaiuso AL (2008). Summer macroalgal biomass in Potter Cove, South Shetland Islands, Antarctica: its production and flux to the ecosystem. *Polar Biology* 31: 281-294.
- Ratcliffe N and Trathan P (2011). A review of the diet and at-sea distribution of penguins breeding within the CCAMLR Convention Area. *CCAMLR Science*, Vol. 18: 75-114
- Raymond B. 2011. A circumpolar pelagic regionalisation of the Southern Ocean. WS-MPA-11/6.
- Siegel V, Reiss CS, Dietrich KS, Haraldsson M, Rohardt G (2013). Distribution and abundance of Antarctic krill (*Euphausia superba*) along the Antarctic Peninsula. *Deep-Sea Research I* 77:63-74
- Silk J, Hill SL, Trathan PN (2014). Exploring variability in the locations used by the krill fishery in Area 48 in relation to intra- and inter-annual variability in seasonal sea ice. WG-EMM-14/11
- Trathan PN, Murphy EJ, Croxall JP, Everson I (1998). Use of at-sea distribution data to derive potential foraging ranges of macaroni penguins during the breeding season. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 169, 263-275.
- Trivelpiece WZ, Hinke JT, Miller AK, Reiss CS, Trivelpiece SG & Watters GM. 2011. Variability in krill biomass links harvesting and climate warming to penguin population changes in Antarctica. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108: 7625-7628
- WG-EMM-12/69. 2012. Report of the First Workshop on the Identification of Priority Areas for MPA Designation within Domain No. 1 (CCAMLR). Valparaíso 2012.
- WG-EMM-13/38 (2013) A summary of scientific observer deployments and data collection in the krill fishery during the 2011, 2012 and 2013 seasons. CCAMLR, Hobart, Australia.
- WG-EMM-14/31 Rev. 1 (2014). Update on the analysis of fish by-catch in the krill fishery using data from the CCAMLR Scheme of Scientific Observation. CCAMLR, Hobart, Australia.

- Wiencke C and Clayton MN(2002).Antarctic Seaweeds. En: Wägelee, J. W. (ed.) Synopses of the Antarctic Benthos. Vol. 9, 159 pp, 40 pls.
- WG-EMM-16/17 (Trathan & Hill) - Spatial aggregation of harvesting in Subarea 48.1, in particular during the summer and close to the coast.
- WG-EMM-16/52 (Santa Cruz, Ernst & Arata) Spatio-temporal dynamics of Antarctic krill fishery: identification of fishing hotspots.
- Wiencke C and Clayton MN(2002).Antarctic Seaweeds. En: Wägelee, J. W. (ed.) Synopses of the Antarctic Benthos. Vol. 9, 159 pp, 40 pls.
- Weinstein BG, Double M, Gales N, Johnston DW, Friedlaender AS. 2017. Identifying overlap between humpback whale foraging grounds and the Antarctic krill fishery Biological Conservation 210: 184-191.

Annex 1: Spatial distribution of conservation objectives and objects considered for the Domain 1 MPA proposal. Further technical details on methods, variables and metadata can be found in Data Forms for each objective uploaded to the Domain 1 MPA e-group.

Conservation Objective 1: Benthic important habitats



Figure

1a: Benthic Ecoregions as defined in Douglass et al. 2011.




Figure 1b Representative examples of benthic habitats based on Douglass et al. 2011 and slightly modified according to MPA Dossier data for Domain 1 (Douglass 2013).




Figure 1c: Bottom sea temperatures above and below 0°C as a proxy to identify benthic invertebrate communities extracted from the World Ocean Atlas.

Conservation Objective 2: Representative examples of pelagic habitats




Figure 2: Pelagic habitats as defined in Raymond 2011, reduced to fit Domain 1.

Conservation Objective 3- Important benthic ecosystem processes




Figure 3: Distribution of shelf incising canyons, blind canyons (from Harris et al. 2014) and iceshelves.

Conservation Objective 4: Large-scale pelagic ecosystem processes




Figure 4: Distribution of pelagic process including polynyas, marginal ice zones (summer and winter), Antarctic Circumpolar Front (divided in three zones: east /west of the 50°W meridian and north/south the Anvers Island), and highly productive areas (surface).

Conservation Objective 5-Important areas for predators life-history.

5a) Foraging distributions of Central Place Foragers during breeding season




Figure 5a: Intensity of use for Domain 1 by Adélie penguins, chinstrap penguins, Gentoo penguin, emperor penguins and fur seals based on colonies locations and foraging distribution during breeding season.

Objective 5b: Prey distribution




Figure 5b: Density for Antarctic krill (*Euphausiasuperba*) estimated from standardized density data compiled from the KRILLBASE for the period 1993-2011 (Atkinson et al. 2017).




Figure 5c: Density for crystal krill (*E. crystallorophia*) estimated from zooplankton density data collected by U.S. AMLR Program during net tow surveys (1993-2011) and PAL LTER).




Figure
Figure5d: Density for *Thysanoessamacrura* estimated from zooplankton density data collected by U.S. AMLR Program during net tow surveys (1993-2011) and PAL LTER .




Figure 5e: Density for salps (*Salpathompsoni*) estimated from zooplankton density data collected by U.S. AMLR Program during net tow surveys (1993-2011) and PAL LTER Objective 5c: feeding distribution during non-breeding periods




Figure 5f: Intensity of use of Domain 1 by pygoscelid penguins and pinnipeds during non-breeding Season.




Figure 5g: Intensity of use of Domain 1 by cetaceans during non-breeding season.

Conservation Objective 6: Important (spatially constrained/predictable) areas for fish life cycles




Figure 6: Important areas for fish life cycles, including spawning/early stages habitat (0-150 m), and occurrence area (150-500 m) for exploited species.

Conservation Objective 7: Important (spatially constrained/predictable) areas for zooplankton-life cycles.




Figure 7: Location of krill nurseries in the Weddell Sea, Scotia Sea, Bellingshausen Sea, and Gerlache Strait, and location of the Circumpolar Deep Water Current.

Conservation Objective 8: Rare or unique habitats/features




Figure 8: Distribution of seamounts based on the Global Seafloor Geomorphology database.

Annex 2. **Table A.** Conservation objectives, objects and targets agreed for Domain 1 MPA planning process.

| CONSERVATION OBJECTIVE | | CONSERVATION OBJECT | CONSERVATION TARGET |
|--|--|--|---------------------|
| OBJECTIVE 1: Representative examples of benthic habitats | Benthic core regions | South Orkneys | 10 |
| | | Western Antarctic Peninsula | 10 |
| | | Pacific Basin | 10 |
| | Bottom temperature | Seafloor temp < 0°C | 10 |
| | | Seafloor temp > 0°C | 10 |
| | Benthic environment types | Benthic bioregionalization (66 features) | 10 |
| OBJECTIVE 2: Representative examples of pelagic habitats | Pelagic environment types | Pelagic bioregions (16 features) | 10 |
| OBJECTIVE 3: Important benthic processes | Benthic areas under ice shelves | Ice-shelves | 20 |
| | Canyons | Canyon shelf incising | 50 |
| | | Canyons blind | 50 |
| | Frontal features (Antarctic Circumpolar Current Front) | ACCf_Zone1 | 20 |
| | | ACCf_Zone2 | 20 |
| | | ACCf_Zone3 | 20 |
| OBJECTIVE 4: Large-scale pelagic ecosystem processes | Highly productive areas | High Chl a | 30 |
| | Marginal ice zone | SeaIce_Aug | 20 |
| | | SeaIce_Feb | 20 |
| | Polynyas | Polynyas | 50 |
| OBJECTIVE 5: Important areas for mammals and birds life-histories | 5a: Breeding/foraging distribution | Adelie penguin - SOr1 | 50 |
| | | Adelie penguin - SSr2 | 50 |
| | | Adelie penguin - SSr3 | 50 |
| | | Chinstrap penguin - SOr1 | 50 |
| | | Chinstrap penguin - SSr2 | 50 |
| | | Chinstrap penguin - SSr3 | 50 |
| | | Gentoo penguin - SOr1 | 50 |
| | | Gentoo penguin - SSr2 | 50 |
| | | Gentoo penguin - SSr3 | 50 |
| | | Emperor penguin - Weddell | 50 |
| | | Emperor penguin - WAP | 50 |
| | | Fur seals | 50 |
| | | Crystalline krill | 20 |
| | 5b: Prey distribution | E. superba | 20 |
| | | Salps | 20 |
| | | T. macrura | 50 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|-----|
| | 5c: Non-breeding foraging distribution | Adeliepenguin - SS | 50 |
| | | Adeliepenguin - SO | 50 |
| | | Gentoopenguin - SS | 50 |
| | | Chinstrapenguin | 50 |
| | | Chinstrapenguin - SO | 50 |
| | | Furseal | 50 |
| | | Leopardseal | 50 |
| | | Weddellseal | 50 |
| | | Elephant seal | 50 |
| | | Minkewhale | 50 |
| | | Humpbackwhale | 50 |
| | | Killerwhaletype A | 50 |
| | | Killerwhaletype B1 | 50 |
| | | Killerwhaletype B2 | 50 |
| OBJECTIVE 6: Important areas for fish life cycles | 6a: Spawning/early stages habitat | North of 64S:0m to 150m | 80 |
| | | South of 64S:0m to 150m | 20 |
| | 6b: Occurence areas for exploited species | North of 64S:150m to 500m | 30 |
| | | South of 64S:150m to 500m | 20 |
| OBJECTIVE 7: Important areas for zooplankton life cycles | Krillnursery | Bellinghausen_N_nursery | 20 |
| | | Bellinghausen_S_nursery | 20 |
| | | GerlacheStrait_nursery | 100 |
| | | WeddellSea_nursery | 20 |
| | | ScotiaSea_SS_nursery | 20 |
| | | ScotiaSea_SOI_nursery | 5 |
| | Circumpolar deepwater | CDW_shelf | 70 |
| | | CDW_BS | 70 |
| OBJECTIVE 8: Rare or unique habitats | Seamounts | Seamounts<2000m | 50 |
| | | Seamounts>2000m AP | 10 |
| | | Seamounts>2000m SOI | 10 |

| WS- DOMAIN 1 2012 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Name | Country | Institution |
| David Ramm | CCAMLR | CCAMLR |
| Javier Arata | Convener-Chile | Instituto Antártico Chileno |
| Enrique Marschoff | Convener-Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Esteban Barrera Oro | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Mercedes Santos | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Patricia Martinez | Argentina | INIDEP |
| Gustavo San Martín | Chile | Subsecretaría de Pesca |
| Carlos Gaymer | Chile | Universidad Católica del Norte |
| Francisco Squeo | Chile | Universidad de la Serena-CEAZA -IEB |
| Patricio Arana | Chile | Universidad Católica de Valparaíso |
| Taro Ichii | Japan | Research Institute of Far Seas Fisherie |
| Mari Mishima | Japan | Fisheries Agency of Japan |
| ErlendMoksness | Norway | Institute of Marine Research |
| SusieGrant | UnitedKingdom | British AntarcticSurvey |
| Phil Trathan | UnitedKingdom | British AntarcticSurvey |
| Chris Reiss | USA | Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service |
| Doug Nowacek | USA | NSF-OPP-LTER |
| Enrique Le Dantec | Industryobserver-Chile | Antarctic Sea Fisheries |
| Enrique Gutiérrez | Industryobserver-Chile | PescaChile |
| Beatriz Ramírez | Chile | MinisterioMedioAmbiente |
| VeronicaCirelli | Argentina | ASOC |
| Rodolfo Werner | Argentina | ASOC |
| LucindaDouglass | Australia | Centre for Conservation Geography / University of Queensland |
| MatthiasGorny | Chile | Oceana |
| LaylaOsman | Chile | TheNatureConservancy |

WS- DOMAIN 1 2015

| Name | Country | Institution |
|---------------------|----------------|--|
| Enrique Marschoff | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Esteban Barrera Oro | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Mercedes Santos | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Andrea Capurro | Argentina | Dirección Nacional del Antártico |
| Jose Luis Orgeira | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Viviana Alder | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Hernán Sala | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Liliana Quartino | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Silvia Romero | Argentina | Servicio de Oceanografía Naval |
| Facundo Alvarez | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Sandra Vivequin | Argentina | Instituto Antártico Argentino |
| Verónica Vlasich | Argentina | Dirección Nacional del Antártico |
| OdileHourcade | Argentina | Dirección Nacional del Antártico |
| Esteban Gaitan | Argentina | Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero |
| Javier Arata | Chile | Instituto Antártico Chileno |
| Patricia Brtnik | Germany | German OceanographicMuseum |
| Georg Skaret | Norway | Institute of Marine Research |
| Jefferson Hinke | UnitedStates | Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service |
| George Watters | UnitedStates | Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service |
| SusieGrant | UnitedKingdom | British AntarcticSurvey |
| Phil Trathan | UnitedKingdom | British AntarcticSurvey |
| Roberto Sarralde | EuropeanUnion | Instituto Español Oceanográfico |
| Rodolfo Werner | Argentina | ASOC |
| LucindaDouglass | Australia | Centre for Conservation Geography / University of Queensland |
| Esteban Frere | Argentina | BirdLifeIntl |
| Enrique Le Dantec | Chile | Antarctic Sea Fisheries |
