We had originally planned to split coastal KBAs into their marine and terrestrial components for the SDG indicators of marine and terrestrial KBA overlap with protected areas. However, after investigating this there were a range of reasons why this would not be appropriate:

1. Many KBAs are miscoded as terrestrial and/or marine KBAs from the spatial overlap with coastline layers alone alone due to errors in the position and boundary of many coastal KBAs.
2. General BL practice for marine IBA boundary delineation (and KBA delineation has been informed by this) is to identify coastal parts of IBAs separately – i.e. one IBA for the breeding colony (terrestrial component) and one for the sea (marine component).

To investigate this, we compared the SDG system classification (from the spatial overlap) with the marine IBA classifications (maintained by the marine team at BirdLife). Of the 2,777 KBAs triggered by seabird species, 63% (1,742) should have been classified as marine or terrestrial only. For the remaining sites, it is unclear if they should be either one of the systems or both – so the number of sites that are both marine and terrestrial is much lower than this. Therefore the number of true coastal sites (both terrestrial and marine) is very small. Of the 1,742 KBAs that should be either marine or terrestrial, **only 58.2%** (1,013) **were correctly coded** based on the spatial overlap (highlighting the issues of the KBA boundaries not matching to the coastline and so the delineation and/or position not being accurate enough). This 41.8% of incorrectly assigned sites were either incorrectly classified (terrestrial when should be marine or vice versa), or coded as both marine and terrestrial when should be one or the other. The protected area spatial boundaries are also confounded by the same spatial and delineation issues, confounded by the accuracy of maps supplied and the coastline base map that they use.

Given all of this information, splitting coastal KBAs into marine and terrestrial components would lead to significant errors during the KBA-PA overlap analyses split by system, given the large error in KBA system classification and in their (and protected area) spatial boundaries. The fact that the proportion of true coastal sites (that are both terrestrial and marine) is very small also reduces the need to do this. It is therefore best to stick with the ≥5% overlap to classify sites as terrestrial/marine and allow sites to be listed as both where there is ≥5% overlap with both until the data are more reliable.

We are continuously reviewing and updating the KBA system classification by manually reviewing each site when made aware of any issues, and work is underway to review these seabird KBAs and update these. We are also doing this with the KBA spatial boundaries, so these should also become more accurate over time (increasing the accuracy of the spatial overlap system classification). Therefore, this issue will become less so over time as most sites will end up correctly classified as only terrestrial or marine, and the spatial overlap will better classify sites (and few sites will be both terrestrial and marine).