Predicting species and community responses to global change in Australian mountain ecosystems using structured expert judgement

James S. Camac^{1,2,*}, Kate D.L. Umbers^{3,4}, John W. Morgan^{2,5}, Sonya R. Geange⁶, Anca Hanea¹, Rachel A. Slatyer⁶, Keith L. McDougall⁷, Susanna E. Venn⁸, Peter A. Vesk⁹, Ary A. Hoffmann¹⁰, Adrienne B. Nicotra⁶

¹Centre of Excellence for Biosecurity Risk Analysis, School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville 3010, Victoria, Australia

²Research Centre for Applied Alpine Ecology, La Trobe University, Bundoora 3086, Victoria, Australia

³School of Science, Western Sydney University, Penrith 2751, New South Wales, Australia

⁴Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, Western Sydney University, Penrith 2751, New South Wales, Australia

⁵Department of Ecology, Environment and Evolution, La Trobe University, Bundoora 3086, Victoria, Australia

⁶Research School of Biology, Australian National University, Acton, 2601 Australian Capital Territory, Australia

⁷NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, Queanbeyan 2620, New South Wales, Australia

⁸Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Burwood 3125, Victoria, Australia

⁹School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville 3010, Victoria, Australia

¹⁰School of BioSciences, Bio21 Institute, The University of Melbourne, Parkville 3010, Victoria, Australia

*correspondence: james.camac@gmail.com

Running head: Alpine species and community responses to global change

Article Impact Statement: Expert knowledge is used to quantify the adaptive capacity and thus, the risk posed by global change, to Australian mountain flora and fauna.

Keywords: adaptive capacity, alpine, biodiversity conservation, climate change, expert elicitation, exposure risk

Abstract

Conservation managers are under increasing pressure to make decisions about the allocation of finite resources to protect biodiversity under a changing climate. However, the impacts of climate and global change drivers on species are outpacing our capacity to collect the empirical data necessary to inform these decisions. This is particularly the case in the Australian Alps which has already undergone recent changes in climate and experienced more frequent large-scale bushfires. In lieu of empirical data, we used a structured expert elicitation method (the IDEA protocol) to estimate the abundance and distribution of nine vegetation groups and 89 Australian alpine and subalpine species by the year 2050. Experts predicted that most alpine vegetation communities would decline in extent by 2050; only woodlands and heathlands were predicted to increase in extent. Predicted species-level responses for alpine plants and animals were highly variable and uncertain. In general, alpine plants spanned the range of possible responses, with some expected to increase, decrease or not change in cover. By contrast, almost all animal species were predicted to decline or not change in abundance or elevation range; more species with water-centric life-cycles were expected to decline in abundance than other species. In the face of rapid change and a paucity of data, the method and outcomes outlined here provide a pragmatic and coherent basis upon which to start informing conservation policy and management, although this approach does not diminish the importance of collecting long-term ecological data.

Keywords: adaptive capacity, alpine, biodiversity conservation, climate change, expert elicitation, exposure risk

22 **Introduction**

23 Alpine, subalpine and montane species are predicted to be negatively impacted by climate change.
 24 For the most part, this is because the climate envelope for many mountain species is expected to
 25 shrink and, in some regions, disappear entirely as a consequence of increased global temperatures
 26 (Halloy & Mark 2003; La Sorte & Jetz 2010; Freeman et al. 2018). While range contractions have
 27 already been observed in some mountain plants (Grabherr et al. 1994; Lenoir et al. 2008; Steinbauer
 28 et al. 2020) and animals (Freeman et al. 2018, Wilson et al. 2005), not all species are responding to
 29 climate change in the same way (Lenoir et al. 2010; Tingley et al. 2012; Gibson-Reinemer & Rahel
 30 2015). What remains unclear is the capacity of mountain species to adapt (Hargreaves et al. 2014;
 31 Michalet et al. 2014; Normand et al. 2014; Louthan et al. 2015), and the characteristics that allow
 32 species to persist in the face of a changing climate (Fordham et al. 2012; Foden et al. 2018).

33

34 To understand the complexities and uncertainties of species responses to climate change, there have
 35 been several attempts to quantify adaptive capacity (Foden et al. 2013; Ofori et al. 2017; Gallagher
 36 et al. 2019). Adaptive capacity describes the ability of systems and organisms to persist and adjust to
 37 threats, to take advantage of opportunities, and/or to respond to change (Millenium Ecosystem
 38 Assessment 2005; IPCC 2014). Adaptive capacity confers resilience to perturbation, allowing
 39 ecological systems to reconfigure themselves with change (Holling 1973). In the context of alpine
 40 biota in Australia, adaptive capacity is the ability of species to maintain their often limited
 41 geographical distributions and population abundance when the climate and other factors are altered.
 42 While the underlying factors determining adaptive capacity encompass genetic and epigenetic
 43 variation, life history traits and phenotypic plasticity (Dawson et al. 2011; Ofori et al. 2017), little is
 44 known about which taxa have high adaptive capacity, how to quantify it, how it varies within and
 45 across related species, or how to manage populations in order to maximise it. As a consequence, data
 46 required to advise on the adaptive capacity of species are lacking.

47

48 Nonetheless, conservation practitioners and land managers are under increasing pressure to make
49 decisions about the allocation of finite resources used to conserve biodiversity under climate change.
50 Decisions are typically based on vulnerability assessments that incorporate exposure risk, species
51 sensitivity, and adaptive capacity (Foden et al. 2013; Ofori et al. 2017; Foden et al. 2018). Until now,
52 assessments of potential climate change impacts on species that cover multiple taxonomic groups
53 have been based primarily on species distribution models (e.g. Thomas et al. 2004; Lawler et al. 2009;
54 La Sorte & Jetz 2010). Incorporating species' physiological, ecological and evolutionary
55 characteristics, in conjunction with their predicted climate change exposure, will likely facilitate
56 accurate identification of the species most at risk from climate change (Briscoe et al. 2020). However,
57 these assessments focus on changes in species' distribution or extent, their 'climate space', and the
58 abiotic and biotic stresses that affect population ecology and physiology are not always fully
59 represented in them (Guisan & Thuiller 2005; Geyer et al. 2011; Fordham et al. 2012). Further, the
60 required data are rarely available for most species and the technical skill and time required to build
61 and fit relevant models restrict their use to specialists (Briscoe et al. 2020). Given that the rate of
62 climate change impacts has already outpaced our capacity to collect the required data to assess species
63 empirically, it is important to utilise alternative methods that make use of existing expertise across
64 taxa to estimate adaptive capacity and identify conservation priorities (Granger Morgan et al. 2001).

65

66 The need to predict how species will respond to climate change is particularly pertinent to the
67 Australian alpine ecosystem which has a high level of endemism and a restricted geographic range
68 (Venn et al. 2017). Since 1979, mean spring temperatures in the Australian Alps have risen by
69 approximately 0.4 °C and annual precipitation has fallen by 6% (Wahren et al. 2013), with a
70 consequent decline in snow pack depth (Sanchez-Bayo & Green 2013). Snow cover in Australia is
71 now at its lowest in the past 2000 years (McGowan et al. 2018). These climatic changes correlate
72 with changes in floristic structure, abundance and diversity (Wahren et al. 2013; Camac et al. 2015)

and increases in fire frequency and severity (Camac et al. 2017; Zylstra 2018). Changes are expected to threaten the many locally adapted and endemic species, with cascading effects on biodiversity and ecosystem services such as carbon storage and water yield.

Here, we used a structured expert elicitation framework called the IDEA (“Investigate”, “Discuss”, “Estimate” and “Aggregate”) protocol (Hemming et al. 2018) to quantify changes in Australian alpine species’ future abundance in light of the many threats to their persistence. Structured expert elicitation provides a robust framework to estimate risk when data are either inadequate or lacking entirely (Hemming et al. 2018). While structured expert elicitation is increasingly being used in policy and management, few examples of its use exist in the ecological and conservation literature (Hemming et al. 2018). Expert elicitation quantitatively harnesses the local knowledge of biologists, conservation scientists, and natural resource managers to make predictions about critical but data-poor processes.

In this study, 37 experts (Table S1) estimated changes in the future abundance and/or distribution of nine Australian alpine plant communities, 60 alpine plant species and 29 mountain animal species. Expert knowledge provided insights into the species’ attributes and the biotic and abiotic factors that were expected to influence a species’ adaptive capacity. Using these expert elicited data, we:

1. quantified the direction and magnitude of change in cover/abundance/elevation range of Australian mountain plant communities as well as individual plant and animal species to climatic changes expected by 2050;
2. examined species attributes and biotic and abiotic factors that experts used when predicting changes in community and species abundances and how they compared to broad concepts about determinants of adaptive capacity, and;

3. examined how various measurable species attributes correlated with predicted changes in plant species abundance.

Methods

Study system

Australian high mountain ecosystems are restricted to south-eastern Australia, occupying an area ~ 11700 km², or 0.15% of the continent. They are comparatively low in elevation, barely exceeding 2000 m a.s.l, ancient and mostly covered in soils. There is no nival zone or areas of permanent snow and some alpine areas of Tasmania even remain snow-free during the winter (Venn et al. 2017).

Australian mainland alpine ecosystems encompass several plant communities characterised by different species and growth forms (Kirkpatrick & Bridle 1999; Williams et al. 2006; Venn et al. 2017). Heathland predominates on relatively steep sheltered slopes where alpine humus soils are shallow (<0.3 m deep). The shrubs are 1–2 m tall, with a canopy cover typically exceeding 70%. Grassland/herbfield complexes occupy the more level ground on slopes and hollows, some of which may be subject to severe winds and frost, and where the alpine humus soils are deepest (generally up to 1 m). Short herbfields (i.e. snowpatch vegetation) occur on steep, leeward, south- to east-facing slopes where snow persists well into the spring or summer (Venn et al. 2017). Feldmark are an extremely rare ecosystem, existing only on exposed rocky ridges consisting of prostrate, hardy shrubs of the family Ericaceae. Wetland complexes consist of heathlands, bogs and fens and occupy valley bottoms, drainage lines and some stream banks and are typically waterlogged for at least one month per year. Wet tussock grasslands are regularly inundated with water or snowmelt, also at lower parts

119 of the landscape. Woodlands are dominated by multi-stemmed, slow-growing trees (*Eucalyptus*
120 *pauciflora*) and are typically snow-covered for at least one month each year.

121

122 The abundance and activity of the animals are regulated by the seasons (Green & Osborne 1994;
123 Green & Stein 2015). The fauna consists of seasonal migrants and alpine specialists and is dominated
124 by insects and other invertebrates (Green & Osborne 1994, Green & Slatyer 2020). Many species
125 appear to be semelparous and require the snow pack to protect their overwintering eggs (e.g.
126 *Kosciuscola* grasshoppers). Others, such as the *Monistria* grasshoppers, can overwinter as adults in
127 the subnival space by supercooling and thus have overlapping generations. Many Australian alpine
128 insects exhibit iconic behaviour such as the long-distance migration of bogong moths (*Agrotis infusa*)
129 (Warrant et al. 2016) or the striking startle display of the mountain katydid (*Acripeza reticulata*)
130 (Umbers & Mappes 2015). The streams and wetlands support large alpine crayfish (*Euastacus spp.*),
131 endemic earthworms (e.g. *Notoscolex montiskosciuskoï*), galaxiid fish, and several terrestrial-
132 breeding frogs. The reptile diversity includes elapid snakes and many skink species. Most birds leave
133 the alps in winter, returning to forage each summer. The only alpine endemic marsupial, the mountain
134 pygmy possum (*Burramys parvus*), hibernates in boulder fields under the snow (Geiser & Broome
135 1991) while other mammals, such as wombats and echidnas, remain active throughout winter.

136

137 ***Applying the IDEA protocol for structured expert elicitation***

138 We utilised the IDEA protocol for structured elicitation of expert judgement (Hemming et al. 2018;
139 Fig S1). This protocol involved: 1) recruiting a diverse group of experts to answer questions with
140 probabilistic or quantitative responses; 2) discussing the questions (Table S2) and clarifying their
141 meaning, and then providing private, individual best estimates and associated credible intervals, often
142 using either a 3-point (i.e. best estimate, lower and upper limit; animal workshop) or 4-point (i.e. best

estimate, lower and upper limit and confidence that the true value falls within those limits; plant workshop) elicitation method (Spiers-Bridge et al. 2010); 3) providing feedback on the experts' estimates in relation to other experts; 4) discussing the results as a group, resolving different interpretations of the questions, sharing reasoning and evidence, and then providing a second and final private estimate, and; 5) aggregating experts' final estimates mathematically, including exploration of performance based weighting schemes of aggregation (see also Supplemental Material).

The plant and animal expert elicitation projects were undertaken in July 2017 and November 2018, respectively. Because there is no accepted method to quantify or compare adaptive capacity across plants and animals, we developed questions based on estimates of percent cover for plants or abundance/elevation range for animals for the present day and in 2050. Experts ($n = 22$ for plants, $n = 17$ for animals, $n = 2$ shared between workshops; Table S1) were selected to represent a breadth of expertise in alpine botany, zoology and ecology in Australia. In the plant workshop, experts estimated the current (2017) and the 2050 cover of 60 plant species (Table S4), with 10 to 15 representative species in each of five dominant alpine vegetation communities. Furthermore, experts estimated the future landscape cover of nine alpine/subalpine vegetation community complexes based on an agreed 2017 baseline cover: feldmark (0.1%), snowpatch (1%), grassland/herbfield (25%), woodland (24%), heathland (35%), bog (5%), fen (4%) and wet tussock grassland (6%). For the plant elicitation, we assumed increases in temperature, decreases in precipitation (and less of that falling as snow, and fewer days of snow cover), and increased chance of fire. For the animal elicitation, we provided a specific climate scenario for the year 2050 (Table S3).

Expert-derived data is often aggregated in one of two ways, weighted or equally weighted. Our analysis focused on using equally weighted *best* estimates from experts. While expert uncertainty defined by their bounds and estimated confidence was collected in both workshops, it was not used in this analysis due to considerable variability in how experts interpreted, and thus, estimated their

169 bounds (see Supplemental Material).

170

171 ***Data Analysis***

172 **Calculation of summary statistics**

173 We calculated the mean and 95% confidence intervals under both current and future scenarios for
 174 each species or plant community type. Various data transformations were required to estimate the
 175 mean and confidence limits because estimates were bounded (e.g. percent cover and abundance). For
 176 the plant percent cover data, individual expert best estimates were first logit transformed and then
 177 both mean and 95% confidence limits were estimated. Inverse logit transformations were then applied
 178 to each summary statistic to convert these estimates back to a proportional scale. As the animal
 179 abundance estimates were based on species-specific spatial scales, we first re-scaled expert estimates
 180 to a standard spatial scale (i.e. 100 m²). As some experts included zeros in their best estimates of
 181 abundance and elevation estimates, we applied a small constant (0.1) prior to log transforming the
 182 data. Means and 95% confidence limits were then calculated and back transformed to their original
 183 scale. Means and confidence limits for expert estimates of elevation range (maximum elevation minus
 184 minimum elevation) were calculated on the raw scale (i.e. not transformed prior to estimation).
 185 Comparison between ‘present’ and ‘future’ estimates was done using ‘inference by eye’ (Cumming
 186 & Finch 2005) by examining whether the 95% confidence intervals crossed the 1:1 line in plots of
 187 current vs future estimates. Finally, we used individual expert current and future best estimates to
 188 calculate the proportion of experts that indicated increase, decrease or no change.

189

190 To determine whether the change projected by the experts for alpine plants correlated with available
 191 data on species traits or environmental attributes, we calculated a proportional change in cover
 192 estimated by each expert (See Supplementary Material). Means and confidence intervals were then
 193 estimated and used to calculate the spearman rank correlations between this proxy of adaptive

capacity and 1) a set of environmental measures derived from records in the Australian Virtual Herbarium and 2) plant functional trait data obtained from the experts' published and unpublished data, as well as other published and online sources and, for a few species, field specimens were collected to supplement available data.

De-identified data and code used to produce figures 1-4 and Supplementary figures S2-S4 can be found at: https://github.com/jscamac/Alpine_Elicitation_Project.

Results

Predicted change in cover of Australian mountain vegetation types

Most of alpine vegetation communities were predicted by the majority of experts to decline in extent (i.e. total cover in the landscape) with global change by 2050 (i.e. snowpatch, bog, fen, wetland complex, grassland/herbfield). All experts predicted that snowpatch and bog communities will decrease by 2050, whereas most experts predicted heathlands and woodlands would increase in extent (Fig 1A). There was more uncertainty among experts about the future of wet tussock grasslands and feldmark communities (Fig 1A). Communities that are currently restricted in extent across the Australian alpine landscape (<5% extent) were predicted to be the ones most likely to decline (Fig 1B), but some of the more extensive communities (i.e. wetland complex, grassland/herbfield, which currently occupy ~25% of the landscape) were also predicted to decline in extent (Fig 1B).

Fig 1. Nine Australian alpine plant community landscape cover predictions for 2050. A) The proportion of experts' ($n = 22$) best estimates indicating a decline (orange), no change (pink) or increase (blue) in landscape cover between 2017 and 2050. B) Mean ($\pm$ 95% confidence intervals) of expert best estimates of community landscape cover for 2050. Records below the dashed 1:1 line signify a decrease in cover, while those above the line signify an increase in cover. Assumed current landscape covers were agreed upon by experts: Feldmark (0.1%), Snowpatch (1%), Grassland/Herbfield (25%), Woodland (24%), Heathland (35%), Bog (5%), Fen (4%), Wet tussock grassland (6%).

Direction and magnitude of change in cover for individual plant species

Within each plant community, experts predicted that the individual species' responses to global change would vary (Fig 2). Some species, such as the snowpatch forb *Montia australasica* (#50 in Fig 2) and the wetland moss *Sphagnum cristatum* (#38), were almost unanimously predicted to

decline in cover over time (Fig 2A). For other species, such as the subalpine heathland shrub *Hovea montana* (#22), experts predicted increases in cover (Fig 2A), although the magnitude of increase was small (Fig 2B). For most alpine plant species, there was much uncertainty about their future cover relative to current cover. The snowpatch graminoid *Rytidosperma nudiflorum* (#60), the wetland shrub *Baeckea gunniana* (#49), the grassland forb *Oreomyrrhis eriopoda* (#32), the heathland shrub *Acrothamnus montanus* (#17), the woodland forb *Stylidium montanum* (#1) and even the grassland structural dominant *Poa hiemata* (#27) were, according to experts, equally likely to show increases, decreases, or no change in cover (Fig 2B). This is reflected in the high uncertainty seen in future cover estimates (i.e. vertical error bars) for these species (Fig 2B).

Across all plant species, growth form was found to be relatively important in explaining expert judgements of species' adaptive capacity (Fig 2A). Woody plants (shrubs and one tree) were typically predicted to have higher adaptive capacity (i.e. show increases or no change in cover) relative to forbs and graminoids (Fig 2).

In general, plant species with current high cover in herbaceous communities (e.g. snow patches, grasslands and wetlands) were not predicted to become more dominant with climate change. Experts were uncertain about the future cover of many of these current high-cover herbaceous species (Fig 2). For example, the graminoids *Poa costiniana* (#31, grasslands), *Poa fawcettiae* (#57, snowpatches) and the forb *Celmisia costiniana* (#56, snowpatches) were predicted by experts to either increase or decrease in cover in roughly equal numbers (Fig 2A). By contrast, in communities dominated by woody plants (heathlands, woodland), species with current high cover were predicted to increase their cover into the future (Fig 2B, e.g. *Hovea montana* #22, *Oxylobium ellipticum* #8).

Fig 2. Sixty Australian alpine plants species cover predictions for 2017 and 2050. A) The proportion of experts' ($n = 22$) best estimates indicating a decline (orange), no change (pink) or increase (blue) in cover between 2017 and 2050. B) Mean ($\pm 95\%$ confidence intervals) of expert best estimates of species cover for 2017 and 2050. Records above the dashed 1:1 line signify a decrease in cover, while those above the line signify an increase in cover. Species have been grouped by the community type they most commonly occur in. Numbers signify species ID.

Direction and magnitude of change in abundance and elevation range for individual animal species

Animal expert predictions showed considerable variability in responses to global change (Fig 3). For nearly half the species ($n = 13$), the majority of experts predicted a decline in abundance (Fig 3A). The majority of experts suggested the Northern Corroboree Frog (*Pseudophryne pengellyi*, #18), the Baw Baw Frog (*Philoria frosti*, #20), the Kosciuszko Galaxias fish (*Galaxias supremus*, #19) and the Bogong Moth (*Agrotis infusa*, #1) would decline by 2050 (Fig 3A). For most of the remaining species,

263 the majority of experts predicted no change in abundance. For example, most experts suggested that
 264 the abundance of the Mountain Katydid (*Acripeza reticulata*, #16) and the Mountain Shrimp
 265 (*Anaspides tasmaniae*, #29) will not change by 2050 (Fig 3A). There was no species for which the
 266 majority of experts predicted an increase in abundance, but a notable proportion of experts predicted
 267 an increase in the abundance of the Thermocolour Grasshopper (*Kosciuscola tristis* #8). Experts were
 268 split equally between ‘increase’ and ‘no change’ for the Mountain Dragon (*Rankinia diemensis*, #17)
 269 and split equally between ‘decrease’ and ‘no change’ for the Alpine Darner (*Austroaeschna*
 270 *flavomaculata*, #28) (Fig 3A).

271

272 Examining the magnitude of change in abundance (Fig 3B), many species were predicted to decline
 273 by 2050, although in almost all cases these changes were small and uncertain (i.e. confidence limits
 274 cross the 1:1 line). The exceptions to this were the Mountain Dragon (*Rankinia diemensis*, #17) which
 275 is predicted to marginally increase — although this is uncertain — and both the Northern Corroboree
 276 Frog (*Psuedophryne pengellyi*, #18) and the Baw Baw Frog (*Philoria frosti*, #20), which are predicted
 277 to likely decrease in abundance. Examining species responses across water-centric and non-water-
 278 centric life histories revealed that, on average, non-water-centric species were expected not to change
 279 in abundance, while water-centric species were more likely to decline.

280

281

282 **Fig 3.** Twenty-nine Australian alpine animal species' abundance predictions for 2018 and 2050. A) The proportion of
 283 experts best estimate indicating a decline (orange), no change (pink) or increase (blue) in cover in 2018 and 2050. B)
 284 Mean ($\pm$ 95% confidence intervals) of expert best estimates of species abundance for 2018 and 2050. Records above the
 285 dashed 1:1 line signify a decrease in abundance, while those above the line signify an increase in abundance. Species are
 286 grouped by degree of dependency on water to complete their life-cycle as water-centric and non-water-centric. Numbers
 287 signify species ID. Numbers in parentheses in panel (A) represent the number of experts who provided estimates
 288 (Maximum = 17). Symbols represent higher taxon. Note: the bogong moth (*A. infusa*) has been omitted from panel B as
 289 its abundance estimates were multiple orders of magnitude higher than other species.

290

291 With uncertainty, the minimum elevation limits of fauna distributions were predicted to shift upslope
 292 for 24 of 29 species (Fig 4; right panels). The Mountain Pygmy Possum (*Burramys parvus*, #4) had

the largest predicted change in minimum elevation range-limit, expected to move up more than 150 m. The Alpine Cool Skink (*Niveoscincus microlepidotus* #3), Alpine Bog Skink (*Pseudemoia cryodroma*, #2) and Alpine Plaster Bee (*Leioproctus obscurus*, #6) also show substantial departures from no change. No change in minimum elevation was predicted for the two species whose distributions, while predominantly contained within mountain regions, extend to sea level – the Blue Planarian (*Caenoplana coerulea*, #26) and the Mountain Katydid (*Acripeza reticulata*, #16). The maximum elevation limits were predicted to increase for 16 species (range 8-80 m) and decrease for 11 species (range 1-80 m). Uncertainty encapsulated the 1:1 line for most species, but distinct increases in maximum elevation were predicted for the Mountain Dragon (*Rankinia diemensis*, #17). A conspicuous, but uncertain, reduction in maximum elevation was estimated for the alpine crayfish (*Euastacus reiki*, #25). For most species ($n = 23$), the total elevation range occupied was predicted to shrink as a result of upward shifts at low elevation limits. Increases in elevational range were predicted for four species and only one species - the Blue Planarian (*C. coerulea*, #26) - was predicted to show no change in elevational range by 2050. The largest declines in species elevational range were predicted for the Mountain Pygmy Possum (*Burramys parvus*, #4, ~250 m reduction), the Northern Corroboree Frog (*P. pengilleyi*, #18, ~110 m reduction) and the Alpine Crayfish (*Euastacus reiki*, #25, ~105 m reduction).

310

Fig 4. Australian alpine fauna species mean ($\pm$ 95% confidence intervals) elevation range (left panels); maximum elevation (center panels) and minimum elevation (right panels) predictions for 2018 and 2050. Records below the dashed 1:1 line signify a decrease, while those above the line signify an increase. Species are grouped by degree of dependency on water to complete their life-cycle, as water-centric and non-water-centric. Numbers signify species ID (see Fig 3A). Symbols represent taxon class.

Expert opinion on drivers of adaptive capacity

In the initial surveys, prior to the workshops, both plant and animal experts nominated genetic variability and phenotypic plasticity as key determinants of adaptive capacity, with fecundity, lifespan, and dispersal also considered important. However, notes and comments compiled during the

elicitation process suggested that experts referred more often to environmental and biotic attributes when considering drivers of change in cover/abundance for specific organisms. Climate niche-breadth, disturbance regimes (e.g. fire, frost events) and species interactions, including competitive ability in the face of native (e.g. shrubs and trees) or exotic species encroachment (e.g. Horses, deer, weeds), vulnerability to diseases (e.g. *Phytophthora cinnamoni*) and a dependence on other species (e.g. grazers, pollinators), dominated discussions about potential drivers of future change in alpine species abundance and/or distribution.

Correlations of plant species attributes with expert predictions

The projected magnitude of change in cover of plant species was correlated with environmental (Figure S2) and species range attributes (Figures S3 & S4). Adaptive capacity was most negatively correlated with species' minimum elevation ($r = -0.561$) and most positively correlated with mean annual temperature range ($r = 0.466$), elevation range ($r = 0.561$) and area of occupancy ($r = 0.43$), noting that these three variables are themselves highly correlated with each other. We found that our measure of adaptive capacity was not strongly correlated with the continuous species traits such as mean height ($r = 0.286$), leaf area ($r = -0.061$), specific leaf area ($r = -0.05$), diaspore mass ($r = 0.202$) or dispersal distance ($r = 0.342$).

Discussion

Conservation managers are increasingly required to make decisions about the allocation of finite resources to protect biodiversity under changing climate and disturbance regimes. Climate change impacts, however, are outpacing our capacity to collect data to assess individual risk empirically to inform resource allocation. A pragmatic alternative approach is to utilise expertise across taxa to produce timely estimates of conservation risk (Granger Morgan et al. 2001; Burgman et al. 2011a;

346 Martin et al. 2012). Experts' acquired experience allows them to provide valuable, nuanced insight
 347 into predictions about the future given a particular scenario. Our study has demonstrated the
 348 feasibility of a structured expert elicitation process for identifying the potential for adaptive capacity
 349 in Australian alpine plant communities, and individual animal and plant species. Adaptive capacity
 350 is the ability of systems and organisms to respond to consequences of change (IPCC 2014) and
 351 important for ecosystems undergoing rapid and substantial climate change such as alpine ecosystems
 352 (Steinbauer et al. 2018), tropical forests (Gallagher et al. 2019) and coral reefs (Silverstein et al.
 353 2012). We identified that some alpine species and communities are likely to be more vulnerable to
 354 global change by 2050 than others. Our exercise also identified species for which experts are
 355 equivocal and thus, targets for further investigation.

356

357 Expert judgement identified that the adaptive capacity of Australian alpine biota in the face of global
 358 change is, not surprisingly, likely to be species-specific. Here, the adaptive capacity estimates
 359 encompassed more than just species' responses to climate change; they also included structured
 360 consideration of all issues identified by experts such as a species' response to fire, invasive species,
 361 predation and interspecific competition. While this may seem self-evident, it is the first time that
 362 multiple species and communities in alpine Australia have been simultaneously assessed for their
 363 adaptive capacity and it provides a defensible basis for targeting monitoring of vulnerable species
 364 and communities, as well as the development of potential mitigation strategies for at-risk species.
 365 When given a plausible 2050 climate change scenario, incorporating the assumption that an extensive
 366 bushfire would occur during this period (which subsequently happened in early 2020; Nolan et al.
 367 2020), adaptive capacity was predicted to be lower in herbaceous plants relative to woody plants, and
 368 lower in water-centric animals relative to non-water-centric species. Adaptive capacity was not
 369 strongly correlated to quantitative plant traits such as specific leaf area or diaspore mass. This is
 370 perhaps unsurprising as such traits are thought to act on individual demographic rates (e.g. mortality,
 371 growth, fecundity), which themselves trade-off against one another. By contrast, adaptive capacity

(i.e. proportional cover change) is the outcome of the amalgamation of multiple such trade-offs – thus diminishing possible correlations with individual traits. Moreover, the amount of inter-specific variation explained by traits typically assumed to be strongly linked to demographic rates (e.g. wood density and tree mortality) have been shown to be small (e.g. Camac et al. 2018). Unlike correlative species distribution models which rely only on climate data and species occurrence data, experts undertaking structured judgements inherently consider physiological, ecological and evolutionary characteristics of species, as well as how those species might interact (or re-assemble) in novel assemblages, and how disturbance (from fire in our case) may affect their responses.

380

We found that experts came into the elicitation process with perceptions of key environmental and biotic drivers of species responses to global change but, after discussion with other experts, they refined these drivers. Prior to the elicitation process, experts emphasized characteristics of the focal species as being the most important predictors of their response to global change (e.g. genetic variability, phenotypic plasticity, fecundity, lifespan, dispersal). During discussion, experts shifted their thinking to include both biotic and environmental drivers as being of importance to predicting alpine biota response to global change (e.g. competitive ability, mutualisms, niche breadth). This shows the value of using a structured elicitation method relative to informal elicitation approaches (Krueger et al. 2012).

390

As might be expected, ‘rare’ species - defined by animal abundance (or elevational range) or plant cover - were typically predicted to become rarer with global change. Small population size and restricted habitat breadth are likely key reasons for such thinking amongst experts (Williams et al. 2015; Cotto et al. 2017; Kobiv 2017). Terrestrial ectotherms (insects, reptiles, frogs), for example, are likely to face increased periods of heat stress (Hoffmann et al. 2013), while drought and declining snow cover duration make many plants and water-centric animals vulnerable (Wipf et al. 2009; Griffin & Hoffmann 2012; Williams et al. 2015). For many animals, experts predicted that species

398 with the narrowest elevational range on mountains (such as the Mountain Pygmy Possum) are most
399 likely to further contract. Such processes are already occurring in mountain landscapes, with lower
400 limit upward shifts in species having already been reported (Pauli et al. 2007; Freeman et al. 2018;
401 Rumpf et al. 2019).

402

403 Unexpectedly, experts were uncertain about the future abundance/cover of some ‘common’ species.
404 While some structural dominants in plant communities are forecast to be either likely ‘winners’ (e.g.
405 shrubs such as *Hovea montana*, *Grevillea australis*, *Prostanthera cuneata*) or ‘losers’ under global
406 change (e.g. the moss *Sphagnum cristatum* in alpine wetland bogs), which is in broad agreement with
407 other studies (e.g. Williams et al. 2015; Camac et al. 2017), there was less agreement about others.
408 *Poa hiemata*, a dominant and potentially long-lived tussock grass of alpine grasslands and herbfields,
409 had uncertain adaptive capacity according to experts. We suspect that experts varied in the emphasis
410 they placed on a long adult lifespan in limiting the adaptive capacity of local populations, with
411 longevity buffering individual persistence in unsuitable sites at least in the short-term (Cotto et al.
412 2017) but slowing evolutionary rates. Alternatively, experts were potentially weighting disturbance
413 impacts, interspecific competition and climate sensitivity very differently (Granger Morgan et al.
414 2001). Given such species are functionally important, provide most of the community biomass (both
415 above- and below-ground), structure habitat for fauna, and provide ecosystem services such as
416 erosion control (i.e. they act as ‘foundation species’, Ellison & Deggrasi 2017), understanding the
417 autecology and dynamics of dominant species in response to global change drivers appears to be a
418 key research need. Indeed, the uncertainty around common species responses highlights that long-
419 term cover/abundance trends need to be quantified if future ecosystem stability is to be understood,
420 a call that has been made repeatedly in the literature (Smith & Knapp 2003; Gaston & Fuller 2007;
421 Gaston 2011; Smith et al. 2020). Monitoring species’ local abundance may therefore better inform
422 species’ extinction risks in alpine areas under global change than monitoring their range (Cotto et al.
423 2017).

424

425 Overall, the change in cover of plant species, or elevational range and abundance change for animals,
 426 were estimated to be modest despite some climatic effects already becoming evident in Australia's
 427 alpine biota (e.g. Camac et al. 2017; Hoffmann et al. 2019); estimates for cover change in plant
 428 communities were more pronounced. This may reflect that scientific experts are typically
 429 conservative when estimating the future (Oppenheimer et al. 2019). Experts also likely view biotic
 430 response to global change as a time-lagged process (i.e. 'disequilibrium dynamics', Svenning &
 431 Sandel 2013). Lags occur because of the limited ability of species to disperse to new areas (Morgan
 432 & Venn 2017; Alexander et al. 2018), establishment limitations following their arrival (Graae et al.
 433 2011; HilleRisLambers et al. 2013; Camac et al. 2017), and the extinction debt of resident species
 434 (Dullinger et al. 2012). By forecasting only to 2050, experts have indicated that many longer-lived
 435 species will potentially persist through the initial ongoing change, but their capacity to do so beyond
 436 this is not assured. Lastly, biologists may find it difficult to estimate the rate of change. Most models
 437 of global change impacts are based on short-term experiments and have typically focused on
 438 differences or ratios of state variables (e.g. control vs manipulated groups). While these models are
 439 useful for inferring the direction of impacts (which implicitly inform expert views), they often do not
 440 provide information on the rate of change, the fundamental process needed to accurately forecast the
 441 magnitude of change (Camac et al. 2015; Morgan et al. 2016).

442

443 *Applicability of IDEA methodology to ecological problems*

444 The IDEA protocol has been tested in a variety of application areas (Speirs-Bridge et al. 2010;
 445 Burgman et al. 2011a; McBride et al. 2012; Wintle et al. 2012, Hanea et al. 2016) and these tests
 446 consistently confirmed the value of using a diverse group of experts, of giving experts the opportunity
 447 to cross examine the estimates of their peers, and of reducing ambiguity through discussion. In our
 448 elicitations, we speculate that experts revised their initial estimates if they (i) had no direct knowledge
 449 of the species themselves but were guided by the discussion, (ii) aligned responses to those of a taxon

specialist, or (iii) adjusted their values based upon a particular line of reasoning they found convincing during the discussion. Most validation studies found that when experts revise their estimates, they do so in the direction of the “truth” (e.g. Burgman et al. 2011b; Hanea et al. 2018).

One difficulty in using this methodology was revealed at both workshops - the capacity of the participants to undertake this particular kind of statistical estimation. Gigerenzer & Edwards (2003) and many others (e.g. Low Choy et al. 2009) have previously documented the difficulties experts have when communicating knowledge in numbers and probabilities. We attempted a four point elicitation with the plant experts for each species (1. lowest plausible value, 2. highest plausible value, 3. best estimate and 4. confidence that the truth falls between their lower and upper limits), and revised this down to a three point elicitation for the animal experts (by omitting the confidence estimate, and fixing the upper and lower limits to correspond to a central 90% credible interval). While experts were comfortable in providing best estimates, there was inconsistency (indeed confusion) about interpreting and estimating bounds and confidence - even after conducting a brief workshop outlining how to do it. For these reasons, our analysis focused on using each expert’s best estimates and not their estimated uncertainty defined by bounds and estimated confidence. Potentially valuable information about the confidence in estimates was therefore lost during the elicitation process. However, the IDEA protocol strives to elicit improved best estimates by eliciting bounds first. Even if the bounds are not used as a measure of the expert’s uncertainty, the counterfactual thinking needed prior to eliciting the best estimates improves the latter. We feel that the ‘best estimate’ of cover or abundance is useful for forecasting the direction and magnitude of change expected by experts under a given global change scenario. Moreover, we believe that involving a mechanism for discussing and revising estimates (through the IDEA protocol) provides robust insights into these potential changes.

Management Implications

476 The adaptive capacity framework we used to elicit expert opinions about how alpine species and
 477 communities may respond to global change currently exists as a framework of “exposure risk” to
 478 change based on current state and predicted future state (i.e. our species prediction biplots). Our
 479 experts, through their judgment, implicitly accounted for multiple drivers of change in mountain
 480 ecosystems (e.g. rising temperatures, biotic interactions, feral animals, fire) but did so assuming no
 481 mitigation by management occurred. Using this approach, experts predicted that several plant (e.g.
 482 *Sphagnum cristatum*) and animal species (e.g. Baw Baw Frog *Philoria frosti*, Northern Corroboree
 483 Frog *Pseudophryne pengellyi*, and Mountain Pygmy Possum *Burramys parvus*) appear very
 484 vulnerable to the changes in alpine areas that are predicted to occur by 2050.

485

486 If the value of the framework is to identify the species that are most vulnerable to global change (i.e.
 487 the species with limited adaptive capacity), then it becomes important to consider our capacity to
 488 influence adaptive capacity into the future through management intervention. This will be of most
 489 relevance to land managers and conservation biologists who want to reduce the risk of species
 490 extinction. We believe this will be critical to operationalise the expert judgment outcomes reported
 491 here. Having identified in our biplots which species have lower adaptive capacity, managers may
 492 begin to ask: how might we buffer them against climate change? Or, how can we improve the
 493 resilience of alpine species? There are many management actions that can reduce threats and these
 494 are already part of a land manager’s current arsenal such as removing feral animals and weeds,
 495 protecting vulnerable communities from fire and assisted migration.

496

497 If management actions could improve the adaptive capacity of alpine species, and these actions could
 498 be ranked for their efficacy to achieve such aims, then the expert judgements we have elicited in this
 499 study can be used to inform prioritisation for conservation actions in regions such as the Australian
 500 Alps. Hence, not only can we use a species’ adaptive capacity as a means to rank species in need of
 501 mitigation action, but we could identify the species most likely to respond to management

interventions. Indeed, such an approach may even identify that, for some species, there is nothing that we can practically do to change their adaptive capacity. In such cases, it may be that options such as *ex situ* conservation strategies (such as seed banking, captive breeding) need to be implemented.

In an era of rapid change, conservation practitioners and land managers do not have the privilege of time to wait for additional data and knowledge to be accrued to inform their decisions. They must utilise information currently at hand to prioritise conservation efforts so that species losses may be mitigated. We believe the method and outcomes outlined here can provide a pragmatic and coherent basis for integrating available expert knowledge to quantify adaptive capacity and perhaps help mitigate the overwhelming risk posed by global change to the long-term persistence of Australian alpine species.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by funding from the National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility National Adaptation Network for Natural Ecosystems (vegetation) and the Centre for Biodiversity Analysis, ANU and the NSW Dept. of Industry Conference Support Program (animals). Sandra Lavorel, Mel Schroder and Libby Rumpff helped refine our study scope and questions. We thank all experts who participated in the structured elicitation workshops. We also thank Linda Broome, Nick Clemann, Elaine Thomas and Phil Zylstra, who provided participants with critical information that was used to inform their estimates. Lastly, we thank Nola Umbers for taking on caring responsibilities for KU. The flora elicitation workshop was approved by the Human Ethics Committee of La Trobe University (Project Number: S17-069). The fauna elicitation workshop was approved by the Human Ethics Committee of Western Sydney University (Project Number: H12680).

527 Literature Cited

- 528 Alexander JM, Chalmandrier L, Lenoir J, Burgess TI, Essl F, Haider S, Kueffer C, McDougall K, Milbau A,
529 Nuñez MA, Pauchard A, Rabitsch W, Rew LJ, Sanders NJ, Pellissier L. 2018. Lags in the response of mountain
530 plant communities to climate change. *Global Change Biology* **24**: 563–579.
- 531 Briscoe NJ, Elith J, Salguero-Gómez R, Lahoz-Monfort JJ, Camac JS, Giljohann KM, Holden MH, Hradsky
532 BA, Kearney MR, McMahon SM, Phillips BL, Regan TJ, Rhodes JR, Vesk PA, Wintle BA, Yen JD, Guillerá-
533 Arroita G. 2019. Forecasting species range dynamics with process-explicit models: matching methods to
534 applications. *Ecology Letters* **22**: 1940-1956.
- 535 Burgman M, Carr A, Godden L, Gregory R, McBride M, Flander L, Maguire L. 2011a. Redefining expertise
536 and improving ecological judgment. *Conservation Letters* **4**: 81–87.
- 537 Burgman MA, McBride M, Ashton R, Speirs-Bridge A, Flander L, Wintle B, Fidler F, Rumpff L, Twardy C.
538 2011b. Expert status and performance. *PLoSOne* **6**: 1-7.
- 539 Camac JS, Williams RJ, Wahren C-H, Jarrad F, Hoffmann AA, Vesk PA. 2015. Modeling rates of life form
540 cover change in burned and unburned alpine heathland subject to experimental warming. *Oecologia* **178**:
541 615-628.
- 542 Camac JS, Williams RJ, Wahren C-H, Hoffmann AA, Vesk PA. 2017. Climatic warming strengthens a
543 positive feedback between alpine shrubs and fire. *Global Change Biology* **23**: 3249-3258.
- 544 Camac JS, Condit R, FitzJohn RG, McCalman L, Steinberg D, Westoby M, Wright SJ, Falster DS. 2018.
545 Partitioning mortality into growth-dependent and growth-independent hazards across 203 tropical tree
546 species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**: 12459-12464.
- 547 Cotto O, Wessely J, Georges D, Klonner G, Schmid M, Dullinger S, Thuiller W, Guillaume F. 2017. A
548 dynamic eco-evolutionary model predicts slow response of alpine plants to climate warming. *Nature*
549 *Communications* **8**: 15399.

550 Cumming G, Finch S. 2005. Inference by eye: confidence intervals and how to read pictures of data.
551 American Psychologist **60**: 170-80.

552 Dawson TP, Jackson ST, House JI, Prentice IC, Mace GM. 2011. Beyond predictions: biodiversity
553 conservation in a changing climate. Science **332**: 53–58.

554 Dullinger S, Gatttringer A, Thuiller W, Moser D, Zimmermann NE, Guisan A, Willner W, Plutzer C, Leitner
555 M, Mang T, Caccianiga M, Dirnbock T, Ertl S, Fischer A, Lenoir J, Svenning J-C, Psomas A, Schmatz DR,
556 Silc U, Vittoz P, Hulber K. 2012. Extinction debt of high-mountain plants under twenty-first-century climate
557 change. Nature Climate Change **2**: 619-622.

558 Ellison AE, Deggrasi AL. 2017. All species are important, but some species are more important than others.
559 *Journal of Vegetation Science* **28**: 669-671.

560 Foden WB, Butchart SHM, Stuart SN, Vie' J-C, Akcakaya HR, et al. 2013. Identifying the world's most
561 climate change vulnerable species: a systematic trait-based assessment of all birds, amphibians and corals.
562 PLoS ONE **8**: e65427.

563

564 Foden WB, Young BE Akcakaya HR, Garcia RA, Hoffmann AA, et al. 2018. Climate change vulnerability
565 assessment of species. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Climate Change* **10**: e551

566

567 Fordham DA, Resit Akçakaya H, Araújo MB, Elith J, Keith DA, Pearson R, Auld TD, Mellin C, Morgan
568 JW, Regan TJ, Tozer M, Watts MJ, White M, Wintle BA, Yates C, Brook BW. 2012. Plant extinction risk
569 under climate change: are forecast range shifts alone a good indicator of species vulnerability to global
570 warming? Global Change Biology **18**: 1357-1371.

571

572 Freeman BG, Lee-Yaw JA, Sunday JM, Hargreaves AL (2018) Expanding, shifting and shrinking: the
573 impact of global warming on species' elevational distributions. Global Ecology and Biogeography **27**: 1268-
574 1276.

575

576 Gallagher RV, Allen S, Wright IJ. 2019. Safety margins and adaptive capacity of vegetation to climate
577 change. *Scientific Reports* **9**: 8241.
578

579 Gaston KJ. 2011. Common ecology. *BioScience* **61**: 354-362.
580

581 Gaston KJ, Fuller RA. 2007. Commonness, population depletion and conservation biology. *Trends in*
582 *Ecology and Evolution* **23**: 14-19.
583

584 Geiser F, Broome LS. 1991. Hibernation in the mountain pygmy possum *Burramys parvus* (Marsupialia).
585 *Journal of Zoology* **223**: 593-602.
586

587 Geyer J, Kiefer I, Kreft S, Chavez V, Salafsky N, et al. 2011. Classification of climate-change-induced
588 stresses on biological diversity. *Conservation Biology* **25**: 708-715.
589

590 Gibson-Reinemer DK, Rahel FJ. 2015. Inconsistent range shifts within species highlight idiosyncratic
591 responses to climate warming. *PLoS ONE* **10**: e0132103.
592

593 Gigerenzer G, Edwards A. 2003. Simple tools for understanding risks: from innumeracy to insight. *BMJ*:
594 *British Medical Journal* **327**: 741-744.
595

596 Graae BJ, Ejrnæs R, Lang SI, Meineri E, Ibarra PT, Bruun HH. 2011. Strong microsite control of seedling
597 recruitment in tundra. *Oecologia* **166**: 565-576.
598

599 Grabherr G, Gottfried M, Pauli H. 1994. Climate effects on mountain plants. *Nature* **369**: 448.
600

601 Granger Morgan M, Pitelka LF, Shevliakova E. 2001. Elicitation of expert judgments of climate change
602 impacts on forest ecosystems. *Climatic Change* **49**: 279-307.

603 Green K, Osborne W. 1994. *Wildlife of the Australian Snow-Country*. Reed Press, Sydney.

604

605 Green K, Slatyer R. 2020. Arthropod community composition along snowmelt gradients in snowbeds in the
606 Snowy Mountains of south-eastern Australia. *Austral Ecology* **45**: 144-157.

607

608 Green K, Stein JA. 2015. Modeling the thermal zones and biodiversity on the high mountains of Meganesia:
609 the importance of local differences. *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research* **47**: 671-680.

610

611 Griffin PC, Hoffmann AA. 2012. Mortality of Australian alpine grasses (*Poa* spp.) after drought: species
612 differences and ecological patterns. *Journal of Plant Ecology* **5**: 121-133.

613

614 Guisan A, Thuiller W. 2005. Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple habitat models.
615 *Ecology Letters* **8**: 993-1009.

616

617 Halloy SRP, Mark AF. 2003. Climate-change effects on alpine plant biodiversity: a New Zealand
618 perspective on quantifying the threat. *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research* **35**: 248-254.

619

620 Hanea A, McBride M, Burgman M, Wintle B, Fidler F, Flander L Twardy, CR, Manning B, Mascaro S.
621 2016. Investigate Discuss Estimate Aggregate for structured expert judgement. *International Journal of*
622 *Forecasting* **33**: 267–269.

623

624 Hanea AM, McBride MF, Burgman MA, Wintle BC. 2018. The value of performance weights and
625 discussion in aggregated expert judgments. *Risk Analysis* **38**: 1781-1794

626

626 Hargreaves AL, Samis KE, Eckert CG. 2014. Are species' range limits simply niche limits writ large? A
627 review of transplant experiments beyond the range. *The American Naturalist* **183**: 157-173.

628

628 Hemming V, Burgman MA, Hanea AM, McBride MF, Wintle BC. 2018. A practical guide to structured
629 expert elicitation using the IDEA protocol. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **9**: 169-181.

630 HilleRisLambers J, Harsch MA, Ettinger AK, Ford KR, Theobald EJ. 2013. How will biotic interactions
631 influence climate change–induced range shifts? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1297**: 112-
632 125.

633 Hoffmann AA, Chown SL, Clusella-Trullas S. 2013. Upper thermal limits in terrestrial ectotherms: how
634 constrained are they? *Functional Ecology* **27**: 934-949.

635 Hoffmann AA, Rymer PD, Byrne M, Ruthrof KX, Whinam J, McGeoc M, Bergstrom DM, Guerin GR,
636 Sparrow B, Joseph L, Hill SJ, Andrew NR, Camac J, Bell N, Riegler M, Gardner JL, Williams SE. 2019.
637 Impacts of recent climate change on terrestrial flora and fauna: Some emerging Australian examples. *Austral*
638 *Ecology* **44**: 3-27

639 Holling C. 1973. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*
640 **4**: 1-23.

641 IPCC 2014. Glossary. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

642 Kirkpatrick JB, Bridle KL. 1999. Environment and floristics of ten Australian alpine vegetation formations.
643 *Australian Journal of Botany* **47**: 1-21.

644 Kobiv Y. 2017. Response of rare alpine plant species to climate change in the Ukrainian Carpathians. *Folia*
645 *Geobotania* **52**: 217-226.

646 Krueger T, Page T, Hubacek K. Smith L, Hiscock K. 2012. The role of expert opinion in environmental
647 modelling. *Environmental Modelling & Software* **36**: 4-18.

648 La Sorte FA, Jetz W. 2010. Projected range contractions of montane biodiversity under global warming.
649 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **277**: 3401-3410.

650 Lawler JJ, Shafer S. L, White D, Kareiva P, Maurer EP, Blaustein AR, Bartlein PJ. 2009. Projected climate-
651 induced faunal change in the Western Hemisphere. *Ecology* **90**: 588-597.

652 Lenoir J, Gegout JC, Marquet PA, De Ruffray P, Brisse H. 2008. A significant upward shift in plant species
653 optimum elevation during the 20th century. *Science* **320**: 1768-1771.

654 Lenoir J, Gégout J.-C, Guisan A, Vittoz P, Wohlgemuth T, Zimmermann NE, et al. 2010. Going against the
655 flow: potential mechanisms for unexpected downslope range shifts in a warming climate. *Ecography* **33**:
656 295-303.

657 Louthan AM, Doak DF, Angert AL. 2015. Where and when do species interactions set range limits? Trends
658 in Ecology and Evolution **30**: 780-792.

659 Low Choy S, O'Leary R, Mengersen K. 2009. Elicitation by design in ecology: using expert opinion to
660 inform priors for Bayesian statistical models. *Ecology* **90**: 265-277.

661 Martin TG, Burgman MA, Fidler F, Kuhnert PM, Low-Choy S, McBride M, Mengersen K. 2012. Eliciting
662 expert knowledge in conservation science. *Conservation Biology* **26**: 29-38.

663 McGowan H, Callow JN, Soderholm J, McGrath G, Campbell M, Zhao J-X. 2018. Global warming in the
664 context of 2000 years of Australian alpine temperature and snow cover. *Scientific Reports* **8**: 4394.

665 Michalet R, Schöb C, Lortie CJ, Brooker RW, Callaway RM. 2014. Partitioning net interactions among
666 plants along altitudinal gradients to study community responses to climate change. *Functional Ecology* **28**:
667 75-86.

668 Millenium Ecosystem Assessment 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis*. Island Press,
669 Washington.

670 Morgan JW, Dwyer JM, Price JN, Prober SM, Power SA, Firn J, Moore JL, Wardle GM, Seabloom EW,
671 Borer ET, Camac JS. 2016. Species origin affects the rate of response to inter-annual growing season
672 precipitation and nutrient addition in four Australian native grasslands. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **27**:
673 1164-1176.

674 Morgan JW, Venn SE. 2017. Alpine plant species have limited capacity for long-distance seed dispersal,
675 *Plant Ecology* **218**: 813-819.

676 Nolan RH, Boer MM, Collins L, Resco de Dios V, Clarke H, Jenkins M, Kenny B, Bradstock RA. 2020.
677 Causes and consequences of eastern Australia's 2019–20 season of mega-fires. *Global Change Biology* **26**:
678 1039-1041.

679 Normand S, Zimmermann NE, Schurr FM, Lischke H. 2014. Demography as the basis for understanding and
680 predicting range dynamics. *Ecography* **37**: 1149-1154.

681 Ofori BY, Stow AJ, Baumgartner JB, Beaumont LJ. 2017. Influence of adaptive capacity on the outcome of
682 climate change vulnerability assessment. *Scientific Reports* **7**: 12979.

683

684 Oppenheimer M, Oreskes N, Jamieson D, Brysse K, O'Reilly J, Shindell M, Wazek M. 2019. Discerning
685 Experts: The Practices of Scientific Assessment for Environmental Policy. University of Chicago Press,
686 Chicago.

687

688 Pauli H, Gottfried M, Reiter K, Klettner C, Grabherr G. 2007. Signals of range expansions and contractions
689 of vascular plants in the high Alps: observations (1994–2004) at the GLORIA master site Schrankogel,
690 Tyrol, Austria. *Global Change Biology* **13**: 147-156.

691

692 Rumpf SB, Hülber K, Zimmermann NE, Dullinger S. 2019. Elevational rear edges shifted at least as much as
693 leading edges over the last century. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **28**: 533-543.

694

695 Sanchez-Bayo F, Green K. 2013. Australian snowpack disappearing under the influence of global warming
696 and solar activity. *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research* **45**: 107-118.

697

698 Silverstein RN, Correa AM, Baker AC. 2012. Specificity is rarely absolute in coral-algal symbiosis:
699 implications for coral response to climate change. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*. **279**: 2609-2618.

700

701 Smith MD, Knapp AK. 2003. Dominant species maintain ecosystem function with non-random species loss.
702 *Ecology Letters* **6**: 509-517.

703

704 Smith MD, Koerner SE, Knapp AK, Avolio ML, Chaves FA, Denton EM, Dietrich J, Gibson DJ, Gray J,
705 Hoffman AM, Hoover DL, Komatsu KJ, Silletti A, Wilcox KR, Yu Q, Blair JM (2020) Mass ratio effects
706 underlie ecosystem responses to environmental change. *Journal of Ecology* **108**: 855-864.

707

708 Speirs-Bridge A, Fidler F, McBride M, Flander L, Cumming G, Burgman M. 2010. Reducing
709 overconfidence in the interval judgments of experts. *Risk Analysis* **30**: 512-523.

710

711 Steinbauer MJ, et al. 2018. Accelerated increase in plant species richness on mountain summits is linked to
712 warming. *Nature* **556**: 231.

713

714 Steinbauer K, Lamprecht A, Semenchuk P, Winkler M, Pauli H. 2020. Dieback and expansions: species-
715 specific responses during 20 years of amplified warming in the high Alps. *Alpine Botany* **130**: 1-11.

716

717 Svenning J-C, Sandel B. 2013. Disequilibrium vegetation dynamics under future climate change. *American*
718 *Journal of Botany* **100**: 1266-1286.

719

720 Tingley MW, Koo MS, Moritz C, Rush AC, Beissinger SR. 2012. The push and pull of climate change
721 causes heterogeneous shifts in avian elevational ranges. *Global Change Biology* **18**: 3279-3290.

722

723 Umbers KDL, Mappes J. 2015. Postattack deimatic display in the mountain katydid, *Acripeza reticulata*,
724 *Animal Behaviour* **100**: 68-73.

725

726 Venn S, Kirkpatrick JB, McDougall K, Walsh N, Whinam J, Williams RJ. 2017. Alpine, sub-alpine and
727 sub-Antarctic vegetation of Australia. In: D.A. Keith (ed.), *Australian Vegetation*. pp. 461-490. Cambridge
728 University Press, Cambridge.

729

730 Warrant E, Frost B, Green K, Mouritsen H, Dreyer D, Adden A, Brauburger K, Heinze S. 2016. The
731 Australian Bogong Moth *Agrotis infusa*: a long-distance nocturnal navigator. *Frontiers in Behavioral*
732 *Neuroscience* 10: 77. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00077

733

734 Wahren C-H, Camac JS, Jarrad FC, Williams RJ, Papst WA, Hoffmann AA. 2013. Experimental warming
735 and long-term vegetation dynamics in an alpine heathland. *Australian Journal of Botany* **61**: 36-51.

- 736 Williams RJ, McDougall KL, Wahren C.-H, Rosengren NJ, Papst WA. 2006. Alpine landscapes. In:
737 Ecology: an Australian Perspective (eds. P. M. Attiwill & B. Wilson), pp. 557-72. Oxford University Press,
738 Oxford.
- 739 Williams RJ, Papst WA, McDougall KL, et al. 2014. Alpine ecosystems. In: Biodiversity and Environmental
740 Change: Monitoring, Challenges and Directions (eds. D. Lindenmayer, E. Burns, N. Thurgate & A. Lowe),
741 pp. 167-212. CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne.
- 742 Williams RJ, Wahren C.-H, Stott KAJ, Camac JS, White M, Burns E, Harris S, Nash M, Morgan JW, Venn
743 S, Papst WA, Hoffmann AA. 2015. An International Union for the Conservation of Nature Red List
744 ecosystems risk assessment for alpine snow patch herbfields, south-eastern Australia. *Austral Ecology* **40**:
745 433-443.
- 746 Wilson RJ, Gutiérrez D, Gutiérrez J, Martínez D, Agudo R, Monserrat VJ. 2005. Changes to the elevational
747 limits and extent of species ranges associated with climate change. *Ecology Letters* **8**: 1138-1146.
- 748 Wintle BC, Fidler F, Vesk PA, Moore JL. 2012. Improving visual estimation through active feedback.
749 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **4**: 53–62.
- 750 Wipf S, Stoeckli V, Bebi P. 2009. Winter climate change in alpine tundra: plant responses to changes in
751 snow depth and snowmelt timing. *Climatic Change* **94**: 105-121.
- 752 Zylstra PJ. 2018. Flammability dynamics in the Australian Alps. *Austral Ecology* **43**: 578-591.
- 753