



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

## Bringing together approaches to reporting on within species genetic diversity

**Citation for published version:**

O'Brien, DR, Laikre, L, Hoban, S, Bruford, MW, Ekblom, R, Fischer, MC, Hall, J, Hvilson, C, Hollingsworth, P, Kershaw, F, Mittan, CS, Mukassabi, TA, Ogden, R, Segelbacher, G, Shaw, RE, Vernesi, C & MacDonald, AJ 2022, 'Bringing together approaches to reporting on within species genetic diversity', *Journal of Applied Ecology*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 2227-2233. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14225>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1111/1365-2664.14225](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14225)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Journal of Applied Ecology

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# **Bringing together approaches to reporting on within species genetic diversity**

## **Author list/affiliations**

David O'Brien, Scottish Natural Heritage (NatureScot), Great Glen House, Leachkin Road, Inverness IV3 8NW, UK ORCID - 0000-0001-7901-295X

Linda Laikre, Division of Population Genetics, Department of Zoology, Stockholm University, SE 10691, Stockholm, Sweden ORCID - 0000-0001-9286-3361

Sean Hoban, Center for Tree Science, The Morton Arboretum, 4100 Illinois Rt 53, Lisle, 60532, USA ORCID - 0000-0002-0348-8449

Michael W. Bruford, School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cathays Park, Cardiff CF10 3AX, UK. ORCID - 0000-0001-6357-6080

Robert Ekblom, Wildlife Analysis Unit, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, SE-10648 Stockholm, Sweden, ORCID: 0000-0003-2222-1966

Martin C. Fischer, Institute of Integrative Biology (IBZ), ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland. ORCID - 0000-0002-1888-1809

Jeanette Hall, Scottish Natural Heritage (NatureScot), Great Glen House, Leachkin Road, Inverness IV3 8NW, UK ORCID - 0000-0002-2694-8209

Christina Hvilsom, Copenhagen Zoo, Roskildevej 38, 2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7870-6888>,

Peter M. Hollingsworth, Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH3 5LR, UK. ORCID - 0000-0003-0602-0654

Francine Kershaw, Natural Resources Defense Council, 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011, USA. ORCID: 0000-0003-2146-8094

Cinnamon S. Mittan, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Program, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA. ORCID - 0000-0002-5874-5588

Tarek A. Mukassabi, University of Benghazi, Department of Botany, Faculty of Sciences, Benghazi, Libya ORCID - 0000-0002-4108-7910

Rob Ogden, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies and the Roslin Institute, University of Edinburgh, EH25 9RG, United Kingdom. ORCID - 0000-0002-2831-0428

Gernot Segelbacher, Wildlife Ecology and Management, University Freiburg, Germany, ORCID: 0000-0002-8024-7008.

Robyn E. Shaw, Environmental and Conservation Sciences, Murdoch University, Perth, Australia ORCID - 0000-0002-7899-1743

Cristiano Vernesi, Forest Ecology Unit, Research and Innovation Centre - Fondazione Edmund Mach, via E. Mach 1, 38010 S. Michele all'Adige (TN), Italy ORCID 0000-0001-7534-5669

## Abstract

1. Genetic diversity is one of the three main levels of biodiversity recognised in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Fundamental for species adaptation to environmental change, genetic diversity is nonetheless under-reported within global and national indicators. When it is reported, the focus is often narrow and confined to domesticated or other commercial species.
2. Several approaches have recently been developed to address this shortfall in reporting on genetic diversity of wild species. Whilst multiplicity of approaches is helpful in any development process, it can also lead to confusion amongst policy makers and heighten a perception that conservation genetics is too abstract to be of use to organisations and governments.
3. As the developers of five of the different approaches, we have come together to explain how various approaches relate to each other and propose a scorecard, as a unifying reporting mechanism for genetic diversity.
4. *Policy implications:* We believe the proposed combined approach captures the strengths of its components and is practical for all nations and subnational governments. It is scalable and can be used to evaluate species conservation projects as well as genetic conservation projects.

## مُلخَص:

1. التنوع الوراثي هو أحد مستويات التنوع البيولوجي الرئيسية الثلاث المُكونة لاتفاقية التنوع البيولوجي الدولية (سي بي دي). رغم أن التنوع الوراثي جانب مهم في تكيف الأنواع والتغير البيئي، إلا أنه عادةً لا يتم التركيز عليه في التقارير الإحيائية الوطنية والعالمية. وغالباً ما يقتصر التركيز على الأنواع الحية الداخلة أو التجارية.
2. تم مؤخراً تطوير عدة أساليب لمعالجة هذا النقص في التركيز على تضمين التنوع الوراثي للأنواع البرية في التقارير الوطنية. ورغم أن تعدد هذه الأساليب مفيد في أي عملية تطوير، إلا أنه يمكن أن يؤدي أيضاً إلى الارتباك بين صانعي السياسات ويُعطي الانطباع بأن علم الحفاظ الوراثي على الأنواع هو أمر غير أساسي بالتالي قد يتم إغفاله من قبل المنظمات والحكومات.
3. كمطورين لخمسة من الأساليب المختلفة لتحديد التنوع الوراثي، فإننا نشرح هنا كيفية ارتباط هذه الأساليب المختلفة ببعضها البعض ونقترح بطاقة قياس الأداء، كألية إبلاغ موحدة للتنوع الوراثي.

رؤية مستقبلية: نعتقد أن هذا الأسلوب المشترك المقترح يجسد نقاط القوة في مكوناته وهو عملي لجميع الدول والحكومات المحلية. حيث أنه قابل للتطوير ويمكن استخدامه لتقييم مشاريع الحفاظ على الأنواع الحية وكذلك مشاريع المحافظة على التنوع الوراثي.

#### Zusammenfassung (Deutsch)

1. Genetische Vielfalt ist eine der drei Säulen der Biodiversität, die im Übereinkommen zum Schutz biologischer Vielfalt definiert wurden. Obwohl die genetische Vielfalt für die Anpassungsfähigkeit von Arten von grundlegender Bedeutung ist, findet sie in nationalen und weltweiten Indikatoren zum Erfassen biologischer Vielfalt kaum Beachtung. Wird dennoch über genetische Vielfalt berichtet beschränkt sie sich häufig auf Arten, die wirtschaftlich bedeutend sind, oder auf die Tier- oder Pflanzenzucht.
2. Innerhalb der letzten Zeit wurden mehrere Ansätze entwickelt, wie diese Vernachlässigung der Berücksichtigung genetischer Vielfalt in den Zustandsberichten zur biologischen Vielfalt verbessert werden können. Verschiedene Ansätze können aber auch zu Verwirrung beitragen und insbesondere bei Entscheidungsträger dazu führen, dass Methoden der Naturschutzgenetik immer noch als zu abstrakt für eine Anwendung angesehen werden.
3. Hier stellen wir ein einheitliches Bewertungsschema zur Erfassung genetischer Vielfalt vor.
4. *Relevanz:* Die Kombination verschiedener Ansätze zur Erfassung genetischer Vielfalt innerhalb eines einheitlichen Bewertungsschemas ermöglicht die Anwendung in allen Ländern und Regionen weltweit. Es kann spezifisch angepasst werden und dient damit auch der Evaluation von Naturschutzprojekten

#### Riassunto (Italiano)

1. La diversità genetica è uno dei tre livelli principali della biodiversità come riconosciuto dalla Convenzione sulla Diversità Biologica (CBD). Essa è fondamentale affinché le specie possano adattarsi ai cambiamenti ambientali, nondimeno all'interno degli indicatori globali e nazionale è sotto rappresentata.
2. Recentemente sono stati sviluppati molti approcci per risolvere questa lacuna nel riportare i dati sulla diversità genetica delle specie selvatiche. Sebbene la molteplicità degli approcci sia utile in ogni processo di sviluppo, essa può altresì portare a qualche confusione fra i decisori politici ed accrescere la percezione che la genetica della conservazione sia troppo astratta per essere utilizzata dalle organizzazioni e dai governi.
3. In qualità di sviluppatori di 5 dei diversi approcci, ci siamo riuniti per spiegare come i vari approcci siano reciprocamente correlati e per proporre una 'carta a punti', quale meccanismo univoco per riportare i dati sulla diversità genetica.
4. *Implicazioni politiche:* Crediamo che la proposta di un approccio combinato catturi la forza di ciascuna delle sue componenti e sia applicabile da tutte le nazioni e dai governi sub-nazionali. Essa è modulabile e può esser impiegata per valutare i progetti di conservazione così come quelli di genetica della conservazione.

#### Key words:

Biodiversity; Convention on Biological Diversity; indicators; policy; monitoring; conservation, wild species; scorecard

## **Background**

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD 1992) recognises three main levels of biodiversity: “diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems”. Genetic diversity within species (heritable variation) underpins their ability to react, adapt and be resilient, which is particularly crucial at this time of climate change, and biodiversity loss. Reporting is a key aspect of the CBD - all Parties must report progress approximately every four years. Reporting on changes over time allows policy makers to assess progress, evaluate policy effectiveness and learn from the outcomes. However, despite its importance, genetic diversity did not achieve similar levels of recognition to the other two levels of biodiversity in the 2020 Aichi targets (e.g. Laikre et al. 2020; Hoban et al. 2020) and where reported upon, reports were largely limited to species of agricultural or forestry importance (Hoban et al. 2021), which are largely unrepresentative of global biodiversity.

Concerns about neglect of wild species’ genetic diversity over the past three decades have led to several potential monitoring and reporting approaches being proposed. Whilst we welcome this burgeoning interest, we are concerned that a choice of multiple reporting approaches may lead to confusion amongst policy makers, conservation practitioners and other stakeholders. Such confusion may lead to continued lack of reporting on genetic diversity of wild species, as the issue may be perceived to be too complex to resolve. Having different approaches also limits opportunities to make comparisons among countries, within countries and regions, and across time, and thus may mask genetic diversity loss. Given genetic diversity’s vital role, we believe that a consolidated approach to reporting is essential if all countries are to maximise opportunities to protect biodiversity. This paper presents a simple framework to bring together several proposed reporting methods, and shows how they are related.

In our proposals, genetic monitoring refers to “monitoring of genetic diversity within and between populations of species across contemporary time frames covering at least two different time points” (Hvilsom et al. in press). The examples below will show that such monitoring can make use of DNA data or proxies (Table 1), and results may be expressed as single indicators or grouped. Our focus is on monitoring genetic diversity within species, and does not include more general use of genetic data to study biodiversity (e.g. the use of molecular markers to track individual organisms, or the use of DNA barcoding to identify species). Indicators measure pressures on biodiversity, the state of biodiversity, conservation responses, and benefits from ecosystem services (Butchart et al. 2010).

## **Approaches in use or in development**

The Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON) Genetic Composition Working Group has used a collaborative international approach to develop genetic Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs; Hoban et al. 2022), designed for monitoring and understanding biodiversity change. These EBVs measure: (1) genetic diversity; (2) genetic differentiation; (3) inbreeding; and (4) effective population size ( $N_e$ ). The first two require genetic sampling, but can usually be calculated from a single time-point sample dataset. Furthermore, they can be calculated using different genetic markers (e.g. whole genome sequencing data, SNPs, DNA sequences, microsatellites), allowing cost to be reduced by using existing datasets (Kriesner et al. 2020), rather than requiring de novo sample analysis. Inbreeding and effective population size can be calculated using genetic data or inferred from proxies (Hoban et al. 2020, 2022). EBVs are summary measures of biodiversity rather than indicators.

Hoban et al. (2020) and Laikre et al. (2020) have also developed three complementary indicators for reporting on genetic diversity change, including “genetic erosion”.

- Indicator 1 describes the relative status of genetic diversity and inbreeding within populations by comparing the effective population size to the size needed for conserving genetic diversity, by calculating the proportion of populations with an effective size over 500. This indicator can usually be calculated from population census data using a well-accepted ratio of 1:10, effective to census size (Hoban et al. 2020, 2022).
- Indicator 2 calculates the proportion of distinct extant populations (e.g. Evolutionary Significant Units, Distinct Population Segment, or similar) relative to historic levels and hence the percentage of populations that have been lost, to reflect likely loss of local adaptations. Khoury et al. (2019) developed a similar indicator that measures the proportion of a species’ geographic range that (a) has been conserved *ex situ* or (b) is encompassed within protected areas.
- Indicator 3 measures DNA monitoring and research within a given country by reporting the number of populations and species studied.

As with all indicators, these are imperfect measures of genetic change and careful interpretation and application of indicators is needed, including thoughtfully considering historic and recent population fragmentation (see Hoban et al 2020, Hoban et al. 2022 for a more complete discussion). On average, though, they should provide relative assessment of genetic erosion, in an affordable manner, without requiring genetic data.

Several countries are developing national programmes for monitoring genetic diversity. The Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SwAM) has proposed three indicators to integrate genetic diversity into the national aquatic monitoring programme (Andersson et al., 2021). These focus on monitoring genetic diversity within and between populations, and on assessing the genetically effective population size; they are being applied to several marine and freshwater species using different types of DNA-data. Furthermore, the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) has recently prioritised species for monitoring genetic diversity, and initiated monitoring using different DNA-methods depending on target species and techniques available (Posledovich et al. 2021). SEPA is also using Swedish Red List data to apply the indicators proposed by Hoban et al. 2020, which use proxies for genetic diversity (Thurfjell et al. 2022).

Switzerland is also implementing a strategy for a national monitoring of genetic diversity and currently runs a pilot study (<https://gendiv.ethz.ch>) for a small number of high priority species based on an earlier feasibility study (Fischer et al. 2020) and stakeholder analysis (Pärli et al. 2021). This will monitor genetic diversity,  $N_e$ , population structure, gene flow, inbreeding, hybridisation, genetic load and, if possible, adaptive potential. Switzerland uses historical DNA (hDNA) from collections to directly explore the temporal dimension of genetic diversity and to infer baselines of past genetic diversity. It uses individual whole genome resequencing and *de novo* genome assemblies for all species, perhaps making it the most powerful of the methods considered, although at high cost and complexity. As technologies mature, cost typically declines, possibly making this approach more widely applicable.

Hollingsworth et al. (2020) developed a scorecard approach to assessing genetic diversity in wild species and published a report for Scotland. This was compiled using available data and expert knowledge across multiple disciplines including conservation, agriculture and forestry, and statistics. The method was designed to be practical in all countries regardless of economic development, focuses on threats to genetic diversity, and is not dependent on prior genetic knowledge. It assesses: (1) demographic declines likely to lead to genetic diversity loss (genetic erosion – including declines in population size, loss of functional diversity and loss of divergent lineages), (2) hybridisation likely to lead to undesirable replacement of genetic diversity (note that not all hybridisation is unwanted - in some cases

it is beneficial to adaptation or may be a natural process at contact zones - and genetic rescue can rely on crossing with allochthonous populations), (3) restrictions to regeneration/turnover likely to impede evolutionary change, and (4) representativeness of *ex situ* collections, where applicable. The overall risk and mitigation are summarised into 'green', 'amber', or 'red' status for each species. The Scottish scorecard covered 26 terrestrial species with plans to expand to marine species. A version is being developed in Libya to test its application in a country facing severe resource constraints. Additionally, standard bibliographic methods are being developed to facilitate a basic inventory of genetic studies of wild and domestic species within any given country, which can then be reported, although this does not refer only to genetic monitoring but also genetic surveys (single time point studies).

## Issues

Despite recognition of the importance of wild species' genetic diversity, reporting under CBD was very limited (Hoban et al. 2021). This may be partly because broad-scale monitoring of genetic diversity is seen as difficult. For example, whilst effective population size can be measured for populations (Hoban et al. 2022), getting meaningful data across a whole country for tens of species is resource intensive and thus challenging for developing nations. DNA sequence data collection for dozens of species may cost hundreds of thousands to several million euros per reporting period: e.g. Posledovich et al. 2021 and developing nations may need better access to training and equipment (Hvilsom et al. in press). In contrast, where detailed data are available, it makes sense to use them. Differential access to data may restrict comparisons among nations or regions if some use DNA data while others use proxies. Comparable data are important for nations to share good practice, or to enable interpretation across a species' international range. Reporting requirements must be flexible enough to allow nations to participate using the best level of technology available in each country for their own requirements.

Policy makers are a key audience who need access to clear, accurate information on the status of genetic diversity in order to make informed decisions affecting biodiversity (Vernesi et al. 2008; Hoban et al. 2013; Klütsch & Laikre, 2021). The multiplicity of methods may lead policy makers to conclude that reporting is too complex or impractical (Young et al. 2014). The healthy debate integral to scientific development may lead to mixed messages, even if most specialists agree on the key issues (Spierenburg 2012).

Furthermore, monitoring and reporting should be valuable to practitioners. The disconnect between conservation geneticists and conservation practitioners ("conservation genetics gap"; Hoban et al. 2013) remains a problem (Klütsch & Laikre, 2021). These issues must be resolved for genetic diversity to be properly considered nationally and internationally, and for global species conservation plans. Standardised tools will allow practitioners to integrate genetic diversity into conservation efforts across the *in situ* and *ex situ* continuum, ensuring that this essential facet of biodiversity receives adequate attention and reporting to CBD can be achieved.

## Opportunities

All the approaches to measure and report genetic change detailed above have strengths and are already being implemented, demonstrating that they are well aligned with policy-makers' needs. Hvilsom et al. (in press) have found that they have much in common, both in terms of policy goals and selection criteria (Figure 1).

As well as being essential for measuring change and informing policy, these approaches are relevant to species and habitat conservation. Existing and proposed genetic diversity conservation measures, such as Gene Conservation Units (GCU; Koskela et al. 2013; Minter



et al. 2021) rely on monitoring to assess their efficacy. GCUs are designed to protect genetic diversity and evolutionary processes *in situ*, aiding adaptation to environmental change, and complementing existing approaches to species and habitat conservation. Effective population size is frequently used as an assessment criterion for GCUs.

The various teams developed ideas separately but are now in frequent communication, particularly through the Coalition for Conservation Genetics (Kershaw et al. 2022), providing an opportunity to collaborate on international standards. We also recognise the benefits of engaging with initiatives such as the [Earth BioGenome Project](#), [Africa BioGenome Project](#), [International Barcode of Life](#) and others around the world. We should embrace pragmatism. In order to serve all nations, we believe that we should cooperate to develop a practical and flexible approach that can encompass genetic (including genomic) data as well as proxies or expert opinion.

## Proposal

Given common themes within the various approaches to genetic diversity reporting, we propose bringing them together, using the categories outlined in the Scottish scorecard (Hollingsworth et al. 2020) as headlines, and nesting all approaches within this framework (Table 1). This categorisation would allow users (e.g. Parties to the CBD and other agreements) to select and report on those metrics most suitable for their needs and resources (using as many as possible), considering expertise, time, and data availability. Equally importantly, it would provide an overview of potential steps for increasingly comprehensive reporting. The framework approach enables consideration of all main threats to genetic diversity: . It can also monitor interventions, *in situ* and *ex situ*, which may incentivise active conservation of genetic diversity.

To support genetic diversity reporting, we propose creation of a centrally held database to hold both monitoring and underlying data. This would allow transparency and encourage contributions from nations that may not have the resources to set up local mechanisms. The database could be established and maintained by an intergovernmental organisation such as GEO BON or IUCN, potentially linking into and informing the Red List process. Embedding genetic diversity metrics into the Red List would give appropriate weight to this crucial aspect of biodiversity (Willoughby et al. 2015; Garner et al. 2020). Experience with EUFORGEN, which has a much broader scope albeit over a smaller geographic area, suggests that a collaboratively funded coordination mechanism need not be expensive (EUFORGEN's annual budget  $\approx$  €350,000; member states contribute €2,500 - €35,000 each; EUFORGEN 2019). We suggest that funding is required for at least the whole CBD reporting cycle (i.e. to 2030) to ensure its benefits are realised. Our proposal would provide all nations, regardless of economic status, with the ability to report on the pressures, state, conservation interventions and ecosystem services provided by genetic diversity.

## Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the contribution of COST Action G-BiKE, CA 18134, supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology), [www.cost.eu](http://www.cost.eu), which formed the backbone of this work. We thank the following funding agencies for support to separate co-authors: the Swedish Research Council Formas (grant 2020/012990; LL), the Swedish Research Council (grant 2019-05503; LL).

## Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that we have no conflicts of interest.

## Authors' Contributions



David O'Brien conceived the paper, David O'Brien, Linda Laikre, Sean Hoban and Anna Macdonald managed the editing process and coordinated the paper's production. All authors contributed to the design of the component approaches, contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication. Robyn Shaw designed the graphical abstract

## References

Andersson, A., Karlsson, S., Ryman, N. and Laikre, L. 2021. Mapping and monitoring genetic diversity of an alpine freshwater top predator by applying newly proposed indicators. *Authorea*. December 08, 2021. DOI: 10.22541/au.163900315.52745564/v1

Butchart, S.H., Walpole, M., Collen, B., Van Strien, A., Scharlemann, J.P., Almond, R.E., Baillie, J.E., Bomhard, B., Brown, C., Bruno, J. and Carpenter, K.E., 2010. Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. *Science*, 328(5982), pp.1164-1168.

CBD 1992. *Convention on Biological Diversity*. UNEP.

EUFORGEN, 2019. *Strategic objectives and implementation plan for Phase VI (2020-2024)*. [http://www.euforgen.org/fileadmin/templates/euforgen.org/upload/Documents/EUFORGEN\\_PhaseVI\\_Objectives\\_and\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.euforgen.org/fileadmin/templates/euforgen.org/upload/Documents/EUFORGEN_PhaseVI_Objectives_and_Plan.pdf)

Fischer MC, Pärli R, Gugerli F, et al. (2020) *Machbarkeitsstudie zur Untersuchung des Zustands und der Veränderung der genetischen Vielfalt: Vernetzung, Inzucht und Anpassungsfähigkeit*. ETH Zurich, under mandate from the FOEN, Zürich.

Garner, B.A., Hoban, S. and Luikart, G., 2020. IUCN Red List and the value of integrating genetics. *Conservation Genetics*, 21(5), pp.795-801.

Hoban, S.M., Hauffe, H.C., Pérez-Espona, S., Arntzen, J.W., Bertorelle, G., Bryja, J., Frith, K., Gaggiotti, O.E., Galbusera, P., Godoy, J.A. and Hoelzel, A.R., 2013. Bringing genetic diversity to the forefront of conservation policy and management. *Conservation Genetics Resources*, 5(2), pp.593-598.

Hoban, S., Bruford, M., Jackson, J.D.U., Lopes-Fernandes, M., Heuertz, M., Hohenlohe, P.A., Paz-Vinas, I., Sjögren-Gulve, P., Segelbacher, G., Vernesi, C.Aitken, S. et al. 2020. Genetic diversity targets and indicators in the CBD post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework must be improved. *Biological Conservation*, 248, p.108654.

Hoban, S., Campbell, C.D., da Silva, J.M., Ekblom, R., Funk, W.C., Garner, B.A., Godoy, J.A., Kershaw, F., MacDonald, A.J., Mergeay, J. Minter, M., O'Brien, D. et al. 2021. Genetic diversity is considered important but interpreted narrowly in country reports to the Convention on Biological Diversity: Current actions and indicators are insufficient. *Biological Conservation*, 261, p.109233.

Hoban, S., Archer, F., Bertola, L., Bragg, J., Breed, M., Bruford, M., Coleman, M., Ekblom, R., Funk, W.C., Grueber, C., Hand, B., Jaffé, R., Jensen, E., Johnson, J., Kershaw, F., Liggins, L., MacDonald, A., Mergeay, J., Miller, J., Muller-Karger, F. et al. 2022. Global genetic diversity status and trends: towards a suite of Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs) for genetic composition.

Hollingsworth, P.M., O'Brien, D., Ennos, R.A., Yahr, R., Neaves, L., Ahrends, A., Ballingall, K.T., Brooker, R.W., Burke, T., Cavers, S., Dawson, I.K., Elston, D.A., Kerr, J., Marshall, D.F. et al. 2020. *Scotland's Biodiversity Progress to 2020 Aichi Targets: Conserving Genetic*

*Diversity – Development of a national approach for addressing Aichi Biodiversity Target 13 that includes wild species.* Scottish Natural Heritage.

Hvilsom, C., Segelbacher, G., Laikre, L., O'Brien, D., Fischer, M.C. and Leus, K. (in press). *Monitoring of genetic diversity: guidelines focusing on species and population selection.* IUCN Species Survival Commission.

Johannesson, K., & Laikre, L. (2020). Monitoring of genetic diversity in environmental monitoring (in Swedish). Report to the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (dnr. HaV 3642-2018, 3643-2018).

Kershaw, F., Bruford, M., Funk, C., Grueber, C., Hoban, S., Hunter, M., Laikre, L., MacDonald, A., Meek, M., Mittan, C., O'Brien, D., Ogden, R., Shaw, R., Vernesi, C. and Segelbacher, G. (2022) The Coalition for Conservation Genetics - Working across organizations to build capacity and achieve change in policy and practice. *Conservation Science and Practice.*

Khoury, C.K., Amariles, D., Soto, J.S., Diaz, M.V., Sotelo, S., Sosa, C.C., Ramírez-Villegas, J., Achicanoy, H.A., Velásquez-Tibatá, J., Guarino, L. and León, B., 2019. Comprehensiveness of conservation of useful wild plants: An operational indicator for biodiversity and sustainable development targets. *Ecological Indicators*, 98, pp.420-429.

Klütsch C.F.C., Laikre L. (2021) Closing the Conservation Genetics Gap: Integrating Genetic Knowledge in Conservation Management to Ensure Evolutionary Potential. In: Ferreira C.C., Klütsch C.F.C. (eds) Closing the Knowledge-Implementation Gap in Conservation Science. Wildlife Research Monographs, vol 4. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81085-6>

Koskela, J., Lefèvre, F., Schueler, S., Kraigher, H., Olrik, D.C., Hubert, J., Longauer, R., Bozzano, M., Yrjänä, L., Alizoti, P. and Rotach, P., 2013. Translating conservation genetics into management: Pan-European minimum requirements for dynamic conservation units of forest tree genetic diversity. *Biological Conservation*, 157, pp.39-49.

Kriesner, P., Weeks, A., Razeng, E. and Sunnucks, P., 2020. *Assessing genetic risks to Victorian flora and fauna.* Victorian Government Library Service.

Laikre, L., Hoban, S., Bruford, M.W., Segelbacher, G., Allendorf, F.W., Gajardo, G., Rodríguez, A.G., Hedrick, P.W., Heuertz, M., Hohenlohe, P.A., Jaffé, R., Johannesson, K., Liggins, L., MacDonald, A.J. et al. 2020. Post-2020 goals overlook genetic diversity. *Science* 367: 1083-1085.

Minter, M., O'Brien, D., Cottrell, J., Ennos, R., Hill, J.K. and Hall, J., 2021. Exploring the potential for 'Gene Conservation Units' to conserve genetic diversity in wild populations. *Ecological Solutions and Evidence*, 2(2), p.e12061.

Pärli R, Lieberherr E, Holderegger R, et al. 2021 Developing a monitoring program of genetic diversity: what do stakeholders say? *Conservation Genetics* 22, 673-684.

Posledovich, D., Ekblom, R. and Laikre, L., 2021. *Mapping and Monitoring of Genetic Diversity in Sweden: A Proposal for Program to Start 2020.* Swedish Environmental Protection Agency.

Spiereburg, M., 2012. Getting the message across biodiversity science and policy interfaces—a review. *GAIA-Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, 21(2), pp.125-134.

Thurfjell, H., Laikre, L., Ekblom, R., et al. 2022. Practical application of indicators for genetic diversity in CBD post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework implementation. bioRxiv 2022.02.18.481087; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.18.481087>

Vernesi, C., Bruford, M.W., Bertorelle, G., Pecchioli, E., Rizzoli, A. and Hauffe, H.C., 2008. Where's the conservation in conservation genetics? *Conservation Biology*, 22(3), pp.802-804.

Young, J.C., Waylen, K.A., Sarkki, S., Albon, S., Bainbridge, I., Balian, E., Davidson, J., Edwards, D., Fairley, R., Margerison, C. and McCracken, D., 2014. Improving the science-policy dialogue to meet the challenges of biodiversity conservation: having conversations rather than talking at one-another. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 23(2), pp.387-404.