**Framing for multi-species trajectory paper:**

Ecological change is happening; that’s inevitable. Major changes are baked into the climate-environment system, regardless of what management actions we do or don’t take. However, it’s critically important for us to slow the rate of those changes so that both ecological and human social/cultural/economic systems can adapt. So, we need a way to identify where and when systems might be undergoing or will undergo major changes. In forest systems, much of this change is catalyzed by disturbance; however, we need to consider non-disturbance-related climate-driven change as well – both the fast and the slow.

We’re presenting a framework building on Seidl & Turner that takes **known or knowable** information (e.g., species-level abundance and basal area trends) and turns it into ecosystem-level trajectories. These can then be used to identify resilience hotspots, prioritize areas for intervention, and assess where change is happening too quickly and too broadly to fight.

Some additional considerations, miscellaneous thoughts:

* How do we deal with loss of function? In systems that have high functional redundancy, a 10% change in composition might not actually matter much.
  + Can we **weight species by functional uniqueness**? Build the framework so that it inherently prioritizes species that contribute unique function/structure?
* True resilience versus acceptable resilience 🡪 example of eastern chestnut… were eastern forests resilient to invasive chestnut blight? Well, there was massive compositional and structural change… but there’s still forest there that supports roughly the same species diversity, right?
* Harold brought up idea of adding a third, “function” dimension to framework… how would that play out?