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CORRECT VERSION OF FIGURE 1: The Ne/Nc ratio should be 0.1 as indicated in the text and figure legend.

What information is available on effective population size (Ne)?

- Genetic or demographic estimates of Ne for this species/population
- General information on Ne/Nc ratio in this taxonomic group
- No information

If genetic or demographic estimates are available:
- Use Ne > 500

If general information is available:
- Apply a taxon-specific Ne/Nc

If there is no information:
- Assume Ne/Nc = 0.1
- Use Nc > 5000
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We appreciate the encouraging response to our call for indicators for genetic diversity within the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD (Laikre et al. 2020; Hoban et al. 2020). In agreement with us, Frankham (2021) highlights the urgent necessity for the CBD to include an indicator that tracks the maintenance of genetic diversity within populations of all species—wild and domestic. Draft CBD Headline indicators (which all CBD Parties will need to report) do not include genetic diversity within populations of wild species (CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.1).

The genetically effective population size (Nₑ) is a metric that quantifies the rate of genetic change within a population. We welcome Frankham’s (2021) comments on the relevance of this important parameter, and the appropriate indicator threshold (Nₑ > 500 or Nᵥ > 5000; Nᵥ = adult census size, the
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number of sexually mature individuals). Frankham (2021) suggests rewording our proposed indicator 1, “The number of populations [or breeds] within species with an effective population size > 500 compared to the number < 500”, to “The number of populations [or breeds] with > 5000 mature individuals compared to the number < 5000.” The proposed rephrasing coincides with our suggestion that in the absence of empirical knowledge on \( N_e \), the relationship \( N_e/N_c \approx 0.1 \) can be assumed, substituting \( N_c \approx 5000 \) for \( N_e \approx 500 \) (Fig. 1).

We included published estimates of \( N_e \) from many populations (Hoban et al. 2020, 2021), recognizing they were not always directly comparable depending on methods used; we appreciate Frankham’s examination of subsets of estimates, which also supports a ratio of approximately 0.1 for many species.

Frankham (2021) proposes that his wording is simpler and more suitable for a policy audience. We agree that \( N_e \) may be conceptually challenging, but we remain convinced that, even if \( N_c > 5000 \) will often be used as a proxy, the term “genetically effective population size” has important meaning in policy (including the CBD, the EU Biodiversity Strategy, and others) for several reasons:

1. \( N_e \) stresses that within-population genetic diversity is the indicator’s focus. We consider it critical to signal to policy makers that census size \( N_c \) is not a sufficient metric to track how fast a population loses genetic diversity. The recent CBD document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3/Add.2 acknowledges this: “While population abundance is a key factor in the maintenance of genetic diversity, it is not a sufficient indicator since it does not account for within-population genetic diversity”.

2. Including \( N_e \) could spur CBD Parties to initiate more genetic monitoring efforts that will increase availability of robust estimates of \( N_e \) or taxon-specific \( N_e/N_c \) ratios. Also, \( N_e \) estimates should rapidly increase with the broadening availability of genomic and bioinformatics resources and large-scale databases (Santiago et al. 2020; Lawrence et al. 2019).

3. The CBD has used \( N_c \) concepts since it first included threatened animal breeds as an indicator. Livestock breeds have been considered as threatened or endangered based on \( N_e \) thresholds since at least 1992, when \( N_e < 200 \) was used to signal genetic erosion (Maijala 1992). \( N_e \) features prominently and is explained in detail in numerous Food and Agriculture Organization manuals, and the US endangered species recovery plan (Hössjer et al. 2016; Wang 2016; Ryman et al. 2019; Santiago et al. 2020). Our approach allows new information to be used to adjust \( N_e/N_c \). In addition, the relationship between ploidy level and loss of diversity is likely not as straightforward as suggested by Frankham. For example,
approximately 50% of all plant species are polyploids, and most, but not all, polyploids lose diversity at the same rate \((1/2N_e)\) as diploids (Soltis and Soltis 2000).

Conservation geneticists worldwide are working together to rapidly provide science-based guidelines for Goals, Targets, and Indicators for the post-2020 CBD framework. The Species Information Centre at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences has agreed to test indicators 1 and 2 (Hoban et al. 2020) on taxa from the Swedish Red List, and a G-BiKE (https://sites.google.com/lmach.it/g-bike-genetics-eu/home) working group is compiling data on indicator 3. We look forward to collaborating with Frankham and others to achieve improved CBD indicators for genetic diversity. Genetic diversity must be conserved as a foundation for all biodiversity, adaptive potential, resilience and nature’s contributions to society.
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