

Informing IPCC accounting of forest carbon using the global forest carbon database (ForC v4.0)

Madison Williams¹, Valentine Herrmann¹, Rebecca Banbury Morgan^{1,2}, Ben Bond-Lamberty³, Susan Cook-Patton⁴, Helene Muller-Landau⁵, Camille Piponiot⁶, Teagan Rogers¹, and Kristina J. Anderson-Teixeira^{1,5 *}

¹Center for Conservation Ecology, Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, Front Royal, VA, United States

²School of Geography, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

³Joint Global Change Research Institute, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, College Park, MD, United States

⁴The Nature Conservancy, Arlington VA 22203, USA

⁵Forest Global Earth Observatory, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Panama, Republic of Panama

⁶CIRAD, Montpellier, France

Correspondence: Kristina J. Anderson-Teixeira (teixeirak@si.edu)

Abstract. Forests are critical for climate change mitigation and constitute a substantial portion of planned emissions reductions under the 2015 Paris Agreement. Yet, the efficacy of greenhouse gas mitigation planning and reporting is dependent upon the quality of available emission factors data, including forest carbon (C) stocks and changes therein. Tens of thousands of relevant forest C estimates have been published, yet are not readily accessible to the practitioners compiling national greenhouse gas inventories. Many of these data have, however, been compiled in the Global Forest C database (ForC; <https://forc-db.github.io/>) and stand to be of value to greenhouse gas accounting if made available through the Emission Factor Database (EFDB) of the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Here, we develop and document a process for semi-automated transfer of data from ForC into the EFDB, assess the data available and transferred to date, and provide recommendations for improving forest data collection, analysis, and reporting to improve accounting of forest-sector greenhouse gas emissions and removals. We begin by reconciling terminology and mapping ForC fields into EFDB. This process required some updates to the ForC database structure, leading to the release of a new version of ForC (v4.0; described here). At the time of writing, ForC contained ## values that would qualify for inclusion in the EFDB, ## of which have been transferred to date. (Some analysis of representation/gaps.) In the future, forest C estimates in EFDB can be improved through targeted research to fill critical gaps, reporting of information required by IPCC, and continued submission of data from scientific publications to the EFDB.

1 Introduction

Forests are critical to management of atmospheric concentrations of the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide (CO₂), and thereby climate change. In recent decades, CO₂ uptake by forests, woodlands, and savannas has exceeded releases from deforestation and other severe disturbances, resulting in a net carbon CO₂ sink of ~0.88 Gt C yr⁻¹ (all biomes with trees, Xu et al., 2021) to ~1.6 Gt C yr⁻¹ (forests only, Harris et al., 2021). This has offset an estimated 10% to 18% of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions from fossil fuels and cement (Xu et al., 2021; Harris et al., 2021), dramatically slowing the pace of atmospheric CO₂ accumulation

and climate change. Going into the future, the fate of this important CO₂ sink is highly uncertain, depending both upon forest responses to climate change, which are likely to reduce the sink strength (McDowell et al., 2020; Hammond et al., 2022), and on human conservation, restoration, and management of forests (IPCC, 2019b, 2022).

Reflecting their strong influence on Earth's climate, forests play a central role in international plans for climate change mitigation under the Paris Agreement (UNFCCC, 2015). Forest conservation, reforestation, and improved sustainable management all have significant – and relatively cost-effective – potential as climate change mitigation options, with conservation and reforestation having the fourth and fifth largest net emission reduction potentials of all mitigation options (?). As of 2016, forest-based mitigation accounted for 26% of total planned greenhouse gas mitigation within Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement (Grassi et al., 2017). Yet, envisioned forest-based climate change mitigation initiatives do not always correspond to actual emission reductions through on-the-ground implementation (e.g., Badgley et al., 2022). One critical need for ensuring that forest-based climate change mitigation initiatives are effective is realistic planning and reporting, underlain by solid scientific data (Anderson-Teixeira and Belair, 2022; Deng et al., 2021).

The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) provides guidance for national greenhouse gas inventories for reporting to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, IPCC, 2006, 2019a). Under this guidance, greenhouse gas inventories include all managed land, including most of the world's forest land (Ogle, 2018). The IPCC inventory guidelines include specific instructions for accounting for greenhouse gas (mainly CO₂) exchanges between forest land and the atmosphere (IPCC, 2006, 2019a). This guidance has improved over the years as more of the relevant underlying data has become available (Requena Suarez et al., 2019; Rozendaal et al., 2022), but there remains room for continuous improvement as the science advances. For example, the year following the release of the latest IPCC guidelines, Cook-Patton et al. (2020) found that the latest default rates may underestimate rates of C accumulation in regrowth forests by 32% on average and fail to capture eight-fold variation within ecozones. In addition, Cuni-Sanchez et al. (2021) found that aboveground C stocks in mature African tropical montane forests were two-thirds higher than the IPCC default values for these forests. This rapid evolution of scientific information on the climate mitigation potential of forests is beneficial to climate mitigation efforts, but requires improved mechanisms for communicating the latest information from scientific researchers to the practitioners who need reliable estimates for greenhouse gas mitigation planning. Moreover, high variability of forest C cycling within ecozones (e.g., Cook-Patton et al., 2020; ?) implies that it is useful for practitioners to have access to locally-specific information, when available.

To improve the data accessible for C accounting, the IPCC created the Emission Factor Database (EFDB; <https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/EFDB/main.php>), which is intended as a recognized library of emission factors and other parameters that can be used for estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals. The EFDB can be used both for efforts to tally a nation's intended or accomplished greenhouse gas reductions, or as a basis of comparison for external parties to evaluate these inventories. The EFDB encourages researchers to submit estimates of emission factors or other related parameters from peer-reviewed journal papers or other accepted sources for inclusion in the database. In the case of forests, emission factors include carbon stocks, increments ("stock changes"), and fluxes ("gains" and "losses") for various pools (IPCC, 2006, 2019a).

55 The Global Forest Carbon Database, ForC (<https://forc-db.github.io/>), is the largest collection of published estimates of forest carbon stocks, increments, and annual fluxes (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2018, 2021). For C currently contains NA records from NA plots in NA distinct geographical areas, along with records of stand age and disturbance history. As such, ForC is positioned to improve forest C accounting through the transfer of data to EFDB. The purpose of this publication is to document that process and provide recommendations for future improvements.

60 Here, we (1) review IPCC methods and definitions for tallying forest C; (2) describe mapping of ForC to IPCC's EFDB; (3) describe updates to ForC (ForC v4.0), most of which were implemented to facilitate data transfer to EFDB; (4) summarize the data in ForC that's relevant to EFDB and records that have been transferred to date; and (5) provide recommendations for improving data collection, analysis, database, and accounting.

2 IPCC methods and definitions

65 The end goal of IPCC greenhouse gas inventories is to quantify greenhouse gas emissions to, or withdrawals from, the atmosphere on an annual basis, most commonly on a national level (IPCC, 2006, 2019a). For each stratum of subdivision within a land-use category, annual stock changes (ΔC ; t C yr^{-1}) are calculated as the sum of changes in various pools (section 2.1), plus any harvested wood products. For each pool, ΔC may be calculated using the "Gain-Loss Method", which takes the difference between gains and losses (influx and outflux variables in Fig. 1), or using the "Stock-Difference Method", which computes

70 ΔC based on C stocks at two points in time (IPCC, 2006). Thus, C cycle variables relevant to the IPCC methodology and to EFDB include C stocks, increments, and fluxes in the IPCC-defined pools.

2.1 Carbon pools

Forest ecosystem C pools may be parsed in various ways, and while certain definitions and thresholds are more common than others, there is no single standard for measuring or reporting that is adhered to by all – or even most – studies. IPCC parses

75 forest C pools into biomass (aboveground and belowground), dead organic matter (dead wood and litter), and soil organic matter (Table 1). While there is some flexibility around the components included in each pool, each national inventory must apply these in a consistent manner. In this section, we define and review the IPCC definitions in the context of typical forest C estimation methodologies.

2.1.1 Biomass

80 Biomass includes living vegetation, above- and below-ground, both woody and herbaceous, but with a focus on woody plants and trees given their much greater potential to sequester large amounts of C (IPCC, 2006).

Aboveground biomass, which is typically $<200 \text{ t C ha}^{-1}$ but can exceed 700 t C ha^{-1} (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021), is defined by the IPCC as "all biomass of living vegetation above the soil including stems, stumps, branches, bark, seeds, and foliage" (IPCC, 2006). IPCC's guidance is that the understory may be excluded the understory if it constitutes a "minor"

85 component, *where quantitative definitions of "understory" and "minor" are not provided*, but where a commonly applied

Table 1. IPCC-defined forest carbon pools with definitions and measurement methods. Definitions from IPCC Table 1.1. (See Table 1.1 in IPCC guidance).

pool	definition	important sources of estimate variation	IPCC guidance
aboveground biomass	all biomass of living vegetation	min dbh	may exclude understory if minor component
		include non-dicot trees?	?
		include dead standing?	no
		biomass allometry	?
belowground biomass	all biomass of live roots	all factors relevant to aboveground biomass	see above
		allometry or assumed ratio of below- to above-ground biomass (R)	can estimate based on R
		min root diameter	may exclude fine roots
		sampling depth	?
dead wood	all non-living woody biomass above a specified diameter, aboveground or belowground	min diameter	10 cm default, but may be chosen by country
		include belowground?	yes
litter	all non-living biomass with a size greater than the limit for soil organic matter and less than the minimum diameter chosen for dead wood, lying dead, in various states of decomposition above or within the mineral or organic soil	max diameter (= max diameter for deadwood)	10 cm default, but may be chosen by country
		layers included	includes entire O horizon
		include belowground?	yes
soil organic matter	organic carbon in mineral soils to a specified depth	sampling depth	30 cm default, but may be chosen by country

minimum size sampling threshold for mature forests would be 10 cm stem diameter at breast height (DBH). A recent study characterizing the contributions of trees in different DBH classes to ecosystem C stocks and fluxes found that trees 1 - 10 cm DBH contributed up to ~8% aboveground biomass, ~17% aboveground woody net primary productivity ($ANPP_{woody.stem}$), and ~20% woody mortality (M_{woody}) of mature closed-canopy forests worldwide (Piponiot et al., 2022). In regrowth forests, woodlands, or savannas, small trees and shrubs contribute a much larger proportion of C stocks and fluxes (Piponiot et al., 2022; ?), and, correspondingly, biomass estimates for these ecosystems tend include smaller size classes (e.g., ?). Beyond the minimum DBH sampled, forest censuses and biomass estimates also differ in their inclusion of life forms other than dicot trees – including lianas, ferns, palms, and bamboo – which in some places can reach large sizes and/or constitute a large fraction of forest C. *[explain IPCC guidance]* Further, it is important to note that this excludes standing dead wood, which is included in remote sensing biomass estimates (Duncanson et al., 2021).

A universal challenge in estimating biomass (living or dead) from forest census data is applying appropriate allometries to convert DBH measurements to biomass. Selection of allometries has an enormous influence on estimates of biomass stocks, increments, of fluxes (Clark and Clark, 2000; Clark et al., 2001). While trusted and standardized allometric equations are becoming increasingly available (Chave et al., 2014; Réjou-Méchain et al., 2017; Gonzalez-Akre et al., 2022), large uncertainties remain. *[explain IPCC guidance]*

Belowground biomass is defined as “all biomass of live roots” (IPCC, 2006), a definition including both coarse roots, whose biomass is typically estimated based on stem censuses and allometries or belowground to aboveground biomass ratios, and fine roots, whose biomass is typically estimated via extraction of roots from soil samples. The former, which is typically <40 t C ha⁻¹ (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021), is methodologically linked to aboveground biomass estimates, sharing the same methodological sources of variation, but tending to be far more uncertain. Fine root biomass generally constitutes a much smaller C pool (typically <5 t C ha⁻¹, Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021), and IPCC guidance is that it can be excluded when fine roots cannot be distinguished empirically from soil organic matter or litter (IPCC, 2006), which can be a painstaking process. Field methods for estimating root biomass are highly variable. IPCC’s default method for Tier 1 estimates is to apply a ratio of belowground to aboveground biomass, with default factors defined based on ecological zone, continent, and forest age (IPCC, 2006, 2019a).

2.1.2 Dead Organic Matter

Dead organic matter includes all non-living biomass that is not within the mineral soil layer and smaller than the litter size threshold. It’s inclusion in inventories is not required under Tier 1 methodology for Forest Land remaining Forest Land (see section 2.2), but is required for land that has transitioned to or from forest within the past 20 years (IPCC, 2006).

Dead wood, which is typically <50 t C ha⁻¹ but can exceed 150 t C ha⁻¹ (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021), is defined by IPCC as “all non-living woody biomass not contained in the litter, either standing, lying on the ground, or in the soil” (IPCC, 2006). This pool includes standing and fallen dead wood, stumps, and dead roots of diameter ≥10 cm (or a diameter specified by the country). While dead wood stocks and fluxes can be quite variable across forests (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021), and can at times be the dominant pool in a forest ecosystem [e.g., following a severe natural disturbance; Carmona et al.

120 (2002)], aboveground dead wood remains relatively poorly characterized at a global scale (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021), and belowground dead wood is rarely studied (Merganičová et al., 2012). In turn, they are poorly characterized in large-scale forest C budgets (Pan et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2021), and IPCC's latest Tier 1 default values are based on just 1-31 references per climate zone (Table 2.2 in IPCC, 2019a).

125 Litter is defined as including " all non-living biomass with a diameter less than a minimum diameter chosen by the country (for example 10 cm), lying dead, in various states of decomposition above the mineral or organic soil. This includes litter (OL), fumiic (OF), and humic (OH) layers. Live fine roots (of less than the suggested diameter limit for belowground biomass) are included in litter where they cannot be distinguished from it empirically." (2003 IPCC GPG for LULUCF (https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf_files/Glossary_Acronyms_BasicInfo/Glossary.pdf) IPCC's latest Tier 1 default values are based on just 1-7 references per climate zone (Table 2.2 in IPCC, 2019a).

130 **2.1.3 Soil Organic Matter**

Soil organic matter is defined as "Includes organic carbon in mineral and organic soils (including peat) to a specified depth chosen by the country and applied consistently through the time series. Live fine roots (of less than the suggested diameter limit for belowground biomass) are included with soil organic matter where they cannot be distinguished from it empirically."(2003 IPCC GPG for LULUCF (https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf_files/Glossary_Acronyms_BasicInfo/Glossary.pdf))

135 **2.2 Land use categories**

IPCC defines land-use categories to include six categories – Forest Land, Grassland, Wetlands, Cropland, Settlements, and Other Land (IPCC, 2006). Sub-divisions include land that has remained in a particular category for >20 years (e.g., Forest Land remaining Forest Land) and land that has been converted from one category to another in the past 20 years (e.g., Cropland converted to Forest Land). Definitions of forest are allowed to vary by country, but must be applied consistently.

140 Managed land...

3 Mapping ForC to EFDB

ForC data is incredibly valuable to EFDB and there is data which is included in the ForC database that does not meet EFDB standards. There were two main EFDB guidelines which limits the amount of data we could transfer. EFDB will not accept data which has been digitized(from graph) and ForC does.

145 **3.1 Carbon cycle variables**

Mapping of variables is shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1. Schematic illustrating the carbon pools quantified under IPCC accounting; ForC variables corresponding to the stock, increment, influx and outflux; and relationships among them. In many cases, the match of ForC variables to IPCC criteria depends upon measurement protocols (e.g., minimum DBH). Additional caveats are as follows: 1- assumes that change in foliage biomass is negligible (see note 7); 2- incomplete: excludes large branch fall; also, under IPCC definitions, outflux from aboveground biomass should include all sizes, influx to deadwood should include only above the minimum diameter chosen for dead wood; 3- incomplete: excludes belowground components; 4-incomplete: excludes breakage into pieces less than dead wood threshold size; 5-incomplete: excludes woody mortality of stems <10 cm DBH, decomposition of dead wood (aboveground and coarse roots) into sizes classified as litter, may exclude branch fall; 6- measurements often limited to decomposition of relatively fine litter and may exclude branches and stems below the dead wood size threshold and/or the more decomposed layers of the O horizon; 7 - foliage production is generally measured by collecting leaf-fall, a method that assumes that the influx = outflux (foliage biomass is roughly constant year-to-year); 8 - excludes branch fall, which is necessary for a full accounting of woody productivity but is typically assumed negligible for calculations of net biomass change.

3.2 Land use categories

Documented at https://github.com/forc-db/IPCC-EFDB-integration/blob/main/doc/ForC-EFDB_mapping/defining_land_subcategory.md,
https://github.com/forc-db/IPCC-EFDB-integration/blob/main/doc/ForC-EFDB_mapping/IPCC_LandUse_mapping.csv, and in
150 issue #8.

The UNFCCC requires greenhouse gas reporting for all managed lands in a country, where management is defined as “human interventions and practices have been applied to perform production, ecological or social functions” [*IPCC 2006 full report REF*]. This definition is applied differently across countries, and is not clearly defined by the majority of governments (Ogle, 2018). Given this, and because the IPCC definition of management does not necessarily match that which would be reported
155 in scientific publications and hence in ForC, we do not transfer any classification of land management status from ForC to the EFDB, but do provide auxiliary info that may be useful in making this determination (e.g., geographical location).

4 Updates to ForC (ForC v4.0)

To support export of data to EFDB, and to improve the overall quality of the ForC database, we defined ## new variables, implemented some modest restructuring, resolved duplicate records, and conducted quality control. This section describes
160 changes relative to ForC v2.0 (Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2018).

4.1 Defining new variables

We added eleven increment variables to the set of named and defined variables (or 22, counting _OM and _C versions), which previously included only one (aboveground biomass increment, *delta.agb*). (<https://github.com/forc-db/IPCC-EFDB-integration/issues/6>) These are directly related to C stocks as previously defined in ForC, with “delta.” added in front of the
165 variable name.

Although these variables currently lack records, the structure exists such that records can be populated over time.

To provide better definition of the previously existing variable *organic.layer*, which has a nebulous definition that reflects the varied definitions adopted by original studies, we added two clearly defined variables: *litter* (relatively undecomposed plant material/ OL horizon), and *O.horizon* (entire O-horizon, including *litter* (OL)).

170 4.2 Quality control measures

Prior to releasing ForC v4.0, we executed several quality control measures. First, we implemented a system of continuous integration using GitHub Actions (*sensu* Kim et al. in review) to run some automatic checks any time the master data files are updated. Second, to improve information on geographic coordinates, we flagged and reviewed records with suspected low precision (*Issue #29*)[<https://github.com/forc-db/ForC/issues/229>]. Third, to identify erroneous climate data... (*Issue*
175 *#212*)[<https://github.com/forc-db/ForC/issues/212>].




Figure 2. Map of sites in ForC shaded by number of records relevant to (circles) and transferred to (triangles) EFDB. Symbols are colored according to the number of records at each site. Underlying map shows FAO ecozones, which are coded as follows:

4.3 Resolving duplicates

Because ForC v4.0 contained known duplicate records, we used R scripts to remove likely duplicates, as detailed in Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2021). Henceforth, we refer to the records with duplicates removed as “independent records”.

4.4 Manual review of records to be sent to EFDB

180 EFDB data submissions require information that was not recorded in previous versions of ForC. It was therefore necessary to return to original publications to retrieve relevant information, including ...

5 Results

5.1 ForC v4.0 contents

As of April 14, 2022, ForC (v4.0) contained NA independent records (NA total), NA of which were for variables relevant to EFDB (Fig. 1). These records were distributed across all forested continents and ecozones, with particularly high concentrations in *[ecozone(s)]* and low concentrations in *[ecozone(s)]* (Fig. 2). The most widely represented forest type was *[type]*, followed by *[type]* and *[type]* (Fig. 3).




Figure 3. Histograms of number of records in ForC relevant to (grey) and transferred to (black) EFDB, organized by (a) dominant vegetation type, (b) FAO ecozone, (c) continent, and (d) stand age. Codes are as follows:

ForC contained data for ## of the ## variables relevant to EFDB (Table 2, Fig. 1).

5.2 Data transfers to EFDB

190 As of April 14, 2022, we had reviewed and sent NA, NA of which have been reviewed, accepted, and posted (Fig. 2-3, Table 2). [DETAILS]

6 Recommendations

(strongly flag both useful variables that the EFDB does not track and useful variables that papers fail to include that EFDB needs)

195 6.1 Data collection and analysis needs

(Paragraph highlighting important gaps in variables / regions)

Several variables of value to IPCC, including standing dead wood, woody mortality, delta.agb, are not calculated and presented as frequently as are AGB and ANPP_woody, even though they can readily be derived from the same census data. We recommend that researchers calculate and report these, following the reporting guidelines specified below. Furthermore, there is an opportunity to fill data gaps by calculating these from existing census data. For example, the core census protocol of the Forest Global Earth Observatory [ForestGEO; Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015), Davies et al. (2021)] collects the data required to calculate standing dead wood, woody mortality, and delta.agb, but these have not been calculated and reported for all sites for which the appropriate number of censuses are available (but see Pioniot et al., 2022, ?).

Given widespread trends of increasing tree mortality(?), including through severe natural disturbance (?), better characterization of dead wood will be critical.

6.2 Data reporting needs

We recommend that, unless they have some specific reason to do otherwise, researchers calculate and report the values according to IPCC standards:

- adopt common standards for variables like min diameter of deadwood, select soil sampling increments to include a cutoff at 30.
- report 95% CIs, SE, or STD and n
- report C variables in article text, table, or SI table. EFDB cannot accept data digitized from figures
- present calculations of all variables that would be useful to IPCC. EFDB requires that data in the database be presented in the original article, and as such cannot accept subsequent calculations. For example, if aboveground biomass and total biomass are presented, but root biomass is not presented, root biomass cannot be subsequently calculated and sent to

Table 2. Numbers of records of ForC variables relevant to, and sent to, EFDB. Relationships of variables to IPCC-defined forest C pools (Table 1) and to each other are illustrated in Figure 1.

variable	n in ForC	n independent records in ForC	n reviewed	n sent to EFDB	n posted to EFDB
STOCKS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_ag	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_ag_foliage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_ag_woody	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_root	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_root_fine	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_root_coarse	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
deadwood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
deadwood_standing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
deadwood_down	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
O.horizon	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SOM / SOC	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
INCREMENTS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.biomass	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.agb	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
biomass_ag_foliage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.biomass_root	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.deadwood	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.deadwood_standing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.deadwood_down	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.O.horizon	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
delta.SOM / delta.SOC	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
FLUXES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NPP_woody	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ANPP_woody_stem	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ANPP_foliage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
BNPP_root	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
BNPP_root_fine	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
BNPP_root_coarse	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
woody_mortality	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NPP_litterfall	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
R_het_litter	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
R_het_soil	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTAL	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

EFDB. Similarly, fine and coarse root biomass can't be summed; soil carbon can't be summed across depth increments, etc.

For data synthesis projects, compilation can only be useful to the EFDB if they include all the required, along with transparent description on the methodology applied to derive emission factors (or have a brief description and a reference to the original source) and the original emission factor values are present (not modified/rounded).

Contributing data to ForC and/or EFDB directly will ensure its broader impact. The latter is more efficient for getting data to EFDB, but does not get the data into ForC, where it can be more broadly useful—for example, being used for basic science (e.g., Banbury Morgan et al., 2021; Anderson-Teixeira et al., 2021) or model benchmarking (Fer et al., 2021).

6.3 Database needs

There are plenty of relevant, published data that are not included in ForC. Systematic review of the literature could vastly improve data coverage. *(There are some efforts underway, including a few that Susan can specify.)*

6.4 IPCC protocol considerations

An important challenge is that forests are changing rapidly, and data collected a decade ago may no longer be relevant, particularly in the cases of C increments and fluxes.

Remote sensing biomass estimates include standing dead wood (Duncanson et al., 2021).

7 Conclusions

8 Appendix A

Table 3: **Mapping of ForC fields to EFDB.** See footnotes at end of table (still need to be properly inserted).

ForC table	ForC field	EFDB field	Usage	Required
Measurements	measurement.ID	Other Properties	direct mapping	(no)
	dominant.life.form	1996 Source/Sink Categories, 2006 Source/Sink Categories	used to determine land subcategories (see defin- ing_land_subcategory.md)	yes
	stand.age	1996 Source/Sink Categories, 2006 Source/Sink Categories, Parameters/ Conditions	used to determine land subcategories (see defin- ing_land_subcategory.md), directly listed in Parameters/ Conditions	(yes)
	dominant.veg, veg.notes, min.dbh	Parameters/ Conditions	direct mapping/ linking to dominant.veg description	no
	variable.name	-	link to variable info in ForC_variables table	yes
	date / start.date, end.date	Other Properties	direct mapping	no
	mean	Value	direct mapping	yes
	mean.in.original.units	Value in Common Units	direct mapping	yes
	original.units	Common Unit	direct mapping	yes
	lower95%CI, upper 95%CI, se, sd and n	Lower Confidence Limit, Upper Confidence Limit	direct or calculated	(yes)
	depth, covariate_1, cov_1.value, covariate_2, cov_2.value	Other Properties	direct mapping	no

Table 3: **Mapping of ForC fields to EFDB.** See footnotes at end of table (still need to be properly inserted). (*continued*)

ForC table	ForC field	EFDB field	Usage	Required
	allometry_1, allometry_2	Comments from Data Provider	link to biomass allometry source, when provided	no
	data.location.within.souree		confirm that data weren't digitized, facilitate finding data in original publication	yes
	ForC.investigator	Data Provider, Data Provider Contact	link to Data Provider, Data Provider Contact info	yes
Sites	site.ID, sites.sitename	Other Properties	direct mapping	(no)
	lat, lon	Region/Regional conditions	direct mapping; used to extract continent, Koeppen, and FAO.ecozone	(no)
	country, state, city, masl, mat, map	Region/Regional conditions	direct mapping	no
	continent, Koeppen	Region/Regional conditions	direct mapping	auto
	soil.texture, sand, silt, clay, soil.classification	Parameters/ Conditions	direct mapping	no
	FAO.ecozone	Parameters/ Conditions	direct mapping	auto
History	date, hist.cat, hist.type	1996 Source/Sink Categories, 2006 Source/Sink Categories, Abatement/Control technologies	used to determine distmrs.type for Source/Sink Categories, generate list of events for Abatement/Control technologies	(yes)/no**
	plot.area	Other Properties	direct mapping	no
Plots	plot.ID, plot.name	Other Properties	direct mapping	(no)

Table 3: **Mapping of ForC fields to EFDB.** See footnotes at end of table (still need to be properly inserted). (*continued*)

ForC table	ForC field	EFDB field	Usage	Required
	distmrs.type	1996 Source/Sink Categories, 2006 Source/Sink Categories	used to determine land subcategories (see defin- ing_land_subcategory.md)	auto
	distmrs.type, distmrs.year, regrowth.type, regrowth.year	Other Properties	direct mapping	auto
PFT	description	Parameters/ Conditions	direct mapping	auto
variables	variable.type	Gases	For stocks in unit of organic matter, gases include CO2, CO, CH4, NO, NO2, N2O. For increments, fluxes, and stocks in units of C, gases includes only CO2.	auto
	variable.name	C pool, Equation	link to C pool, Equation	auto
	description	Description	direct mapping	auto
	extended.description	Other Properties	direct mapping	auto
	units	Unit (ID)	link to IPCC units	auto
Citations	citation.citation	Full Technical Reference	direct mapping	yes/auto
	citation.language	Reference Language	direct mapping	yes/auto
	citation.url	URL	direct mapping	no/auto
	citation.abstract	Abstract in English	direct mapping	no/auto
	source.type	Source of Data	direct mapping	yes

‘Required’ field indicates whether the field is required by EFDB: yes = value required; (yes) = input required, missing value acceptable if not reported; auto = present within ForC infrastructure, and therefore will always be exported to EFDB ; (no) =

235 not required for EFDB, but required for ForC and therefore will always be exported to EFDB; no = not required, but exported to EFDB when a value is present.

** '(yes)' for most recent severe disturbance; 'no' for other history events

9 Appendix B

Table 4: **Table of changes to ForC fields.**

Table	Column	Description	Changes	Motivation
Sites	coordinates.precision	Precision of geographic coordinates, as reported by source or estimated from maps.	field added	allow identification of records with poor coordinate precision
Measurements	data.location.within.source	location of data within the source listed in citation.ID.	field added	facilitate review, ensure traceability
	sd, se, lower95%CI, upper 95%CI	Standard deviation, standard error, and lower and upper 95 percent confidence intervals, respectively.	replaces ‘stat’ and ‘stat.name’	cleaner format; ability to handle assymetrical 95 percent confidence intervals
	mean.in.original.units, original.units	mean value and units presented in original publication	fields added	provide IPCC with original units, reduce errors/improve reproducibility
	C.conversion.factor	Assumed/ measured C content of organic matter used to convert organic matter to C.	field added	track units conversion, allow back-calculation of OM if conversion factor deemed inappropriate

Table 4: **Table of changes to ForC fields.** *(continued)*

Table	Column	Description	Changes	Motivation
PFT	description	Definition of the pftcode at the community level. Differs from individual level in that properly describes mixed plant functional types.	field added	
	description.individual	Definition of the pftcode at the individual plant level.	field name change (previously ‘description’)	
Citations	citation.citation	Full citation. Most of these records are automatically generated in R based upon DOI lookup.	field added	field required by IPCC
	citation.language	Language of original publication, automatically generated based on the title and abstract, with some manual entries and corrections.	field added	field required by IPCC
	citation.url	URL of original publication, generally retrieved automatically via URL lookup.	field added	field required by IPCC
	citation.abstract	Abstract, generally retrieved automatically via DOI lookup.	field added	field required by IPCC

Table 4: **Table of changes to ForC fields.** (*continued*)

Table	Column	Description	Changes	Motivation
	source.type	citation source type	field added	field required by IPCC
	pdf.in.repository	Indicates whether pdf of original study has been retrieved and saved in ForC's reference repository	field added	housekeeping
	EFDB.ready	Indicates whether data have been checked for export to EFDB.	field added	housekeeping

Code and data availability. use this to add a statement when having data sets and software code available

240 **Appendix A: Mapping ForC to EFDB**

CURRENT TABLE 3 GOES HERE

Appendix B: Updates to ForC

CURRENT TABLE 4 GOES HERE

Author contributions. (fill this in)

245 *Competing interests.* The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements. Thank you to all researchers who collected and published the data contained in ForC, and to all research assistants and collaborators who have helped to build the database. Funding for this study was provided by Bezos Earth Fund to The Nature Conservancy, the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, WLS(?)

References

- 250 Anderson-Teixeira, K. J. and Belair, E. P.: Effective Forest-Based Climate Change Mitigation Requires Our Best Science, *Global Change Biology*, 28, 1200–1203, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16008>, 2022.
- Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Davies, S. J., Bennett, A. C., Gonzalez-Akre, E. B., Muller-Landau, H. C., Joseph Wright, S., Abu Salim, K., Almeyda Zambrano, A. M., Alonso, A., Baltzer, J. L., Basset, Y., Bourg, N. A., Broadbent, E. N., Brockelman, W. Y., Bunyavejchewin, S., Burslem, D. F. R. P., Butt, N., Cao, M., Cardenas, D., Chuyong, G. B., Clay, K., Cordell, S., Dattaraja, H. S., Deng, X., Detto, M., Du,
255 X., Duque, A., Erikson, D. L., Ewango, C. E., Fischer, G. A., Fletcher, C., Foster, R. B., Giardina, C. P., Gilbert, G. S., Gunatilleke, N., Gunatilleke, S., Hao, Z., Hargrove, W. W., Hart, T. B., Hau, B. C., He, F., Hoffman, F. M., Howe, R. W., Hubbell, S. P., Inman-Narahari, F. M., Jansen, P. A., Jiang, M., Johnson, D. J., Kanzaki, M., Kassim, A. R., Kenfack, D., Kibet, S., Kinnaird, M. F., Korte, L., Kral, K., Kumar, J., Larson, A. J., Li, Y., Li, X., Liu, S., Lum, S. K., Lutz, J. A., Ma, K., Maddalena, D. M., Makana, J.-R., Malhi, Y., Marthews, T., Mat Serudin, R., McMahon, S. M., McShea, W. J., Memiaghe, H. R., Mi, X., Mizuno, T., Morecroft, M., Myers, J. A., Novotny, V.,
260 de Oliveira, A. A., Ong, P. S., Orwig, D. A., Ostertag, R., den Ouden, J., Parker, G. G., Phillips, R. P., Sack, L., Sainge, M. N., Sang, W., Sri-ngernyuang, K., Sukumar, R., Sun, I.-F., Sungpalee, W., Suresh, H. S., Tan, S., Thomas, S. C., Thomas, D. W., Thompson, J., Turner, B. L., Uriarte, M., Valencia, R., Vallejo, M. I., Vicentini, A., Vrška, T., Wang, X., Wang, X., Weiblen, G., Wolf, A., Xu, H., Yap, S., and Zimmerman, J.: CTFIS-ForestGEO : A Worldwide Network Monitoring Forests in an Era of Global Change, *Global Change Biology*, 21, 528–549, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12712>, 2015.
- 265 Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Wang, M. M. H., McGarvey, J. C., Herrmann, V., Tepley, A. J., Bond-Lamberty, B., and LeBauer, D. S.: ForC : A Global Database of Forest Carbon Stocks and Fluxes, *Ecology*, 99, 1507–1507, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2229>, 2018.
- Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Herrmann, V., Morgan, R. B., Bond-Lamberty, B., Cook-Patton, S. C., Ferson, A. E., Muller-Landau, H. C., and Wang, M. M. H.: Carbon Cycling in Mature and Regrowth Forests Globally, *Environmental Research Letters*, 16, 053009, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abed01>, 2021.
- 270 Badgley, G., Freeman, J., Hamman, J. J., Haya, B., Trugman, A. T., Anderegg, W. R., and Cullenward, D.: Systematic Over-Crediting in California’s Forest Carbon Offsets Program, *Global Change Biology*, 28, 1433–1445, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15943>, 2022.
- Banbury Morgan, R., Herrmann, V., Kunert, N., Bond-Lamberty, B., Muller-Landau, H. C., and Anderson-Teixeira, K. J.: Global Patterns of Forest Autotrophic Carbon Fluxes, *Global Change Biology*, 27, 2840–2855, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15574>, 2021.
- Carmona, M. R., Armesto, J. J., Aravena, J. C., and Pérez, C. A.: Coarse Woody Debris Biomass in Successional and Primary Temperate
275 Forests in Chiloé Island, Chile, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 164, 265–275, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127\(01\)00602-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(01)00602-8), 2002.
- Chave, J., Réjou-Méchain, M., Búrquez, A., Chidumayo, E., Colgan, M. S., Delitti, W. B., Duque, A., Eid, T., Fearnside, P. M., Goodman, R. C., Henry, M., Martínez-Yrizar, A., Mugasha, W. A., Muller-Landau, H. C., Mencuccini, M., Nelson, B. W., Ngomanda, A., Nogueira, E. M., Ortiz-Malavassi, E., Péliissier, R., Ploton, P., Ryan, C. M., Saldarriaga, J. G., and Vieilledent, G.: Improved Allometric Models to Estimate the Aboveground Biomass of Tropical Trees, *Global Change Biology*, 20, 3177–3190, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12629>, 2014.
- 280 Clark, D., Brown, S., Kicklighter, D., Chambers, J., Thomlinson, J., Ni, J., and Holland, E.: Net Primary Production in Tropical Forests: An Evaluation and Synthesis of Existing Field Data, *Ecological Applications*, 11, 371–384, 2001.
- Clark, D. B. and Clark, D. A.: Landscape-Scale Variation in Forest Structure and Biomass in a Tropical Rain Forest, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 137, 185–198, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127\(99\)00327-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1127(99)00327-8), 2000.
- Cook-Patton, S. C., Leavitt, S. M., Gibbs, D., Harris, N. L., Lister, K., Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Briggs, R. D., Chazdon, R. L., Crowther,
285 T. W., Ellis, P. W., Griscom, H. P., Herrmann, V., Holl, K. D., Houghton, R. A., Larrosa, C., Lomax, G., Lucas, R., Madsen, P., Malhi,

- Y., Paquette, A., Parker, J. D., Paul, K., Routh, D., Roxburgh, S., Saatchi, S., van den Hoogen, J., Walker, W. S., Wheeler, C. E., Wood, S. A., Xu, L., and Griscom, B. W.: Mapping Carbon Accumulation Potential from Global Natural Forest Regrowth, *Nature*, 585, 545–550, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2686-x>, 2020.
- Cuni-Sanchez, A., Sullivan, M. J. P., Platts, P. J., Lewis, S. L., Marchant, R., Imani, G., Hubau, W., Abiem, I., Adhikari, H., Albrecht, T.,
290 Altman, J., Amani, C., Aneseyee, A. B., Avitabile, V., Banin, L., Baturike, R., Bauters, M., Beeckman, H., Begne, S. K., Bennett, A. C.,
Bitariho, R., Boeckx, P., Bogaert, J., Bräuning, A., Bulonvu, F., Burgess, N. D., Calders, K., Chapman, C., Chapman, H., Comiskey, J.,
de Haulleville, T., Decuyper, M., DeVries, B., Dolezal, J., Droissart, V., Ewango, C., Feyera, S., Gebrekirstos, A., Gereau, R., Gilpin,
M., Hakizimana, D., Hall, J., Hamilton, A., Hardy, O., Hart, T., Heiskanen, J., Hemp, A., Herold, M., Hiltner, U., Horak, D., Kamdem,
M.-N., Kayijamahe, C., Kenfack, D., Kinyanjui, M. J., Klein, J., Lisingo, J., Lovett, J., Lung, M., Makana, J.-R., Malhi, Y., Marshall,
295 A., Martin, E. H., Mitchard, E. T. A., Morel, A., Mukendi, J. T., Muller, T., Nchu, F., Nyirambangutse, B., Okello, J., Peh, K. S.-H.,
Pellikka, P., Phillips, O. L., Plumptre, A., Qie, L., Rovero, F., Sainge, M. N., Schmitt, C. B., Sedlacek, O., Ngute, A. S. K., Sheil,
D., Sheleme, D., Simegn, T. Y., Simo-Droissart, M., Sonké, B., Soromessa, T., Sunderland, T., Svoboda, M., Taedoumg, H., Taplin, J.,
Taylor, D., Thomas, S. C., Timberlake, J., Tuagben, D., Umunay, P., Uzabaho, E., Verbeeck, H., Vleminckx, J., Wallin, G., Wheeler, C.,
Willcock, S., Woods, J. T., and Zibera, E.: High Aboveground Carbon Stock of African Tropical Montane Forests, *Nature*, 596, 536–542,
300 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03728-4>, 2021.
- Davies, S. J., Abiem, I., Abu Salim, K., Aguilar, S., Allen, D., Alonso, A., Anderson-Teixeira, K., Andrade, A., Arellano, G., Ashton, P. S.,
Baker, P. J., Baker, M. E., Baltzer, J. L., Basset, Y., Bissiengou, P., Bohlman, S., Bourg, N. A., Brockelman, W. Y., Bunyavejchewin, S.,
Burslem, D. F., Cao, M., Cárdenas, D., Chang, L.-W., Chang-Yang, C.-H., Chao, K.-J., Chao, W.-C., Chapman, H., Chen, Y.-Y., Chisholm,
R. A., Chu, C., Chuyong, G., Clay, K., Comita, L. S., Condit, R., Cordell, S., Dattaraja, H. S., de Oliveira, A. A., den Ouden, J., Detto, M.,
305 Dick, C., Du, X., Duque, Á., Ediriweera, S., Ellis, E. C., Obiang, N. L. E., Esufali, S., Ewango, C. E., Fernando, E. S., Filip, J., Fischer,
G. A., Foster, R., Giambelluca, T., Giardina, C., Gilbert, G. S., Gonzalez-Akre, E., Gunatilleke, I., Gunatilleke, C., Hao, Z., Hau, B. C.,
He, F., Ni, H., Howe, R. W., Hubbell, S. P., Huth, A., Inman-Narahari, F., Itoh, A., Janík, D., Jansen, P. A., Jiang, M., Johnson, D. J.,
Jones, F. A., Kanzaki, M., Kenfack, D., Kiratipayoon, S., Král, K., Krizel, L., Lao, S., Larson, A. J., Li, Y., Li, X., Litton, C. M., Liu,
Y., Liu, S., Lum, S. K., Luskin, M. S., Lutz, J. A., Luu, H. T., Ma, K., Makana, J.-R., Malhi, Y., Martin, A., McCarthy, C., McMahon,
310 S. M., McShea, W. J., Memiaghe, H., Mi, X., Mitre, D., Mohamad, M., Monks, L., Muller-Landau, H. C., Musili, P. M., Myers, J. A.,
Nathalang, A., Ngo, K. M., Norden, N., Novotny, V., O'Brien, M. J., Orwig, D., Ostertag, R., Papathanassiou, K., Parker, G. G., Pérez,
R., Perfecto, I., Phillips, R. P., Pongpattananurak, N., Pretzsch, H., Ren, H., Reynolds, G., Rodriguez, L. J., Russo, S. E., Sack, L., Sang,
W., Shue, J., Singh, A., Song, G.-Z. M., Sukumar, R., Sun, I.-F., Suresh, H. S., Swenson, N. G., Tan, S., Thomas, S. C., Thomas, D.,
Thompson, J., Turner, B. L., Uowolo, A., Uriarte, M., Valencia, R., Vandermeer, J., Vicentini, A., Visser, M., Vrska, T., Wang, X., Wang,
315 X., Weiblen, G. D., Whitfeld, T. J., Wolf, A., Wright, S. J., Xu, H., Yao, T. L., Yap, S. L., Ye, W., Yu, M., Zhang, M., Zhu, D., Zhu, L.,
Zimmerman, J. K., and Zuleta, D.: ForestGEO: Understanding Forest Diversity and Dynamics through a Global Observatory Network,
Biological Conservation, 253, 108 907, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108907>, 2021.
- Deng, Z., Ciais, P., Tzompa-Sosa, Z. A., Saunio, M., Qiu, C., Tan, C., Sun, T., Ke, P., Cui, Y., Tanaka, K., Lin, X., Thompson, R. L., Tian,
H., Yao, Y., Huang, Y., Lauerwald, R., Jain, A. K., Xu, X., Bastos, A., Sitch, S., Palmer, P. I., Lauvaux, T., d'Aspremont, A., Giron, C.,
320 Benoit, A., Poulter, B., Chang, J., Petrescu, A. M. R., Davis, S. J., Liu, Z., Grassi, G., Albergel, C., and Chevallier, F.: Comparing National
Greenhouse Gas Budgets Reported in UNFCCC Inventories against Atmospheric Inversions, *Earth System Science Data Discussions*, pp.
1–59, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2021-235>, 2021.

Duncanson, L., Armstron, J., Disney, M., Avitabile, V., Barbier, N., Calders, K., Carter, S., Chave, J., Herold, M., MacBean, N., McRoberts, R., Minor, D., Paul, K., Réjou-Méchain, M., Roxburgh, S., Williams, M., Albinet, C., Baker, T., Bartholomeus, H., Bastin, J. F., Coomes, D., Crowther, T., Davies, S., de Bruin, S., De Kauwe, M., Domke, G., Labriere, N., Lucas, R., Mitchard, E., Morsdorf, F., Næsset, E., Park, T., Phillips, O. L., Ploton, P., Puliti, S., Quegan, S., Saatchi, S., Schaaf, C., Schepaschenko, D., Scipal, K., Stovall, A., Thiel, C., Wulder, M., Camacho, F., Nickeson, J., Román, M., and Margolis, H.: Aboveground Woody Biomass Product Validation Good Practices Protocol, in: Good Practices for Satellite-Derived Land Product Validation, edited by Duncanson, L., Disney, M., Armston, J., Nickeson, J., Minor, D., and Camacho, F., p. 236, Land Product Validation Subgroup (Working Group on Calibration and Validation, Committee on Earth Observation Satellites), <https://doi.org/10.5067/doc/ceoswgcvlpv/agb.001>, 2021.

Fer, I., Gardella, A. K., Shiklomanov, A. N., Campbell, E. E., Cowdery, E. M., Kauwe, M. G. D., Desai, A., Duveneck, M. J., Fisher, J. B., Haynes, K. D., Hoffman, F. M., Johnston, M. R., Kooper, R., LeBauer, D. S., Mantooth, J., Parton, W. J., Poulter, B., Quaife, T., Raiho, A., Schaefer, K., Serbin, S. P., Simkins, J., Wilcox, K. R., Viskari, T., and Dietze, M. C.: Beyond Ecosystem Modeling: A Roadmap to Community Cyberinfrastructure for Ecological Data-Model Integration, *Global Change Biology*, 27, 13–26, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15409>, 2021.

Gonzalez-Akre, E., Piponiot, C., Lepore, M., Herrmann, V., Lutz, J. A., Baltzer, J. L., Dick, C. W., Gilbert, G. S., He, F., Heym, M., Huerta, A. I., Jansen, P. A., Johnson, D. J., Knapp, N., Král, K., Lin, D., Malhi, Y., McMahon, S. M., Myers, J. A., Orwig, D., Rodríguez-Hernández, D. I., Russo, S. E., Shue, J., Wang, X., Wolf, A., Yang, T., Davies, S. J., and Anderson-Teixeira, K. J.: Allodb: An R Package for Biomass Estimation at Globally Distributed Extratropical Forest Plots, *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 13, 330–338, <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13756>, 2022.

Grassi, G., House, J., Dentener, F., Federici, S., den Elzen, M., and Penman, J.: The Key Role of Forests in Meeting Climate Targets Requires Science for Credible Mitigation, *Nature Climate Change*, 7, 220–226, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3227>, 2017.

Hammond, W. M., Williams, A. P., Abatzoglou, J. T., Adams, H. D., Klein, T., López, R., Sáenz-Romero, C., Hartmann, H., Breshears, D. D., and Allen, C. D.: Global Field Observations of Tree Die-off Reveal Hotter-Drought Fingerprint for Earth’s Forests, *Nature Communications*, 13, 1761, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-29289-2>, 2022.

Harris, N. L., Gibbs, D. A., Baccini, A., Birdsey, R. A., de Bruin, S., Farina, M., Fatoyinbo, L., Hansen, M. C., Herold, M., Houghton, R. A., Potapov, P. V., Suarez, D. R., Roman-Cuesta, R. M., Saatchi, S. S., Slay, C. M., Turubanova, S. A., and Tyukavina, A.: Global Maps of Twenty-First Century Forest Carbon Fluxes, *Nature Climate Change*, pp. 1–7, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00976-6>, 2021.

IPCC: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (Eds.), IGES, Japan, 2006.

IPCC: Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, in: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, edited by Eggleston, S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., and Tanabe, K., Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Hayama, Japan, 2006.

IPCC: 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, IPCC, Switzerland, 2019a.

IPCC: Climate Change and Land: An IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems [P.R. Shukla, J. Skea, E. Calvo Buendia, V. Masson-Delmotte, H.- O. Pörtner, D. C. Roberts, P. Zhai, R. Slade, S. Connors, R. van Diemen, M. Ferrat, E. Haughey, S. Luz, S. Neogi, M. Pathak, J. Petzold, J. Portugal Pereira, P. Vyas, E. Huntley, K. Kissick, M. Belkacemi, J. Malley, (Eds.)], Tech. rep., 2019b.

IPCC: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [P.R. Shukla, J. Skea, R. Slade, A. Al Khourdajie, R. van Diemen, D. McCollum, M. Pathak,

- 360 S. Some, P. Vyas, R. Fradera, M. Belkacemi, A. Hasija, G. Lisboa, S. Luz, J. Malley, (Eds.)). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA., <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.001>, 2022.
- McDowell, N. G., Allen, C. D., Anderson-Teixeira, K., Aukema, B. H., Bond-Lamberty, B., Chini, L., Clark, J. S., Dietze, M., Grossiord, C., Hanbury-Brown, A., Hurr, G. C., Jackson, R. B., Johnson, D. J., Kueppers, L., Lichstein, J. W., Ogle, K., Poulter, B., Pugh, T. A. M., Seidl, R., Turner, M. G., Uriarte, M., Walker, A. P., and Xu, C.: Pervasive Shifts in Forest Dynamics in a Changing World, *Science*, 368, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz9463>, 2020.
- 365 Merganičová, K., Merganič, J., Svoboda, M., Bače, R., and Šebeň, V.: Dadwood in Forest Ecosystems, BoD – Books on Demand, 2012.
- Ogle, S. M.: Delineating Managed Land for Reporting National Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Removals to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, p. 13, 2018.
- Pan, Y., Birdsey, R., Fang, J., Houghton, R., Kauppi, P., Kurz, W., Phillips, O., Shvidenko, A., Lewis, S., Canadell, J., Ciais, P., Jackson, R., Pacala, S., McGuire, A., Piao, S., Rautiainen, A., Sitch, S., and Hayes, D.: A Large and Persistent Carbon Sink in the World's Forests, *Science*, 333, 988–993, 2011.
- 370 Piponiot, C., Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Davies, S. J., Allen, D., Bourg, N. A., Burslem, D. F. R. P., Cárdenas, D., Chang-Yang, C.-H., Chuyong, G., Cordell, S., Dattaraja, H. S., Duque, Á., Ediriweera, S., Ewango, C., Ezedin, Z., Filip, J., Giardina, C. P., Howe, R., Hsieh, C.-F., Hubbell, S. P., Inman-Narahari, F. M., Itoh, A., Janík, D., Kenfack, D., Král, K., Lutz, J. A., Makana, J.-R., McMahon, S. M., McShea, W., Mi, X., Bt. Mohamad, M., Novotný, V., O'Brien, M. J., Ostertag, R., Parker, G., Pérez, R., Ren, H., Reynolds, G., Md Sabri, M. D., Sack, L., Shringi, A., Su, S.-H., Sukumar, R., Sun, I.-F., Suresh, H. S., Thomas, D. W., Thompson, J., Uriarte, M., Vandermeer, J., Wang, Y., Ware, I. M., Weiblen, G. D., Whitfield, T. J. S., Wolf, A., Yao, T. L., Yu, M., Yuan, Z., Zimmerman, J. K., Zuleta, D., and Muller-Landau, H. C.: Distribution of Biomass Dynamics in Relation to Tree Size in Forests across the World, *New Phytologist*, n/a, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17995>, 2022.
- 375 Réjou-Méchain, M., Tanguy, A., Piponiot, C., Chave, J., and Hérault, B.: Biomass: An r Package for Estimating above-Ground Biomass and Its Uncertainty in Tropical Forests, *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8, 1163–1167, <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12753>, 2017.
- Requena Suarez, D., Rozendaal, D. M. A., Sy, V. D., Phillips, O. L., Alvarez-Dávila, E., Anderson-Teixeira, K., Araujo-Murakami, A., Arroyo, L., Baker, T. R., Bongers, F., Brien, R. J. W., Carter, S., Cook-Patton, S. C., Feldpausch, T. R., Griscom, B. W., Harris, N., Hérault, B., Coronado, E. N. H., Leavitt, S. M., Lewis, S. L., Marimon, B. S., Mendoza, A. M., N'dja, J. K., N'Guessan, A. E., Poorter, L., Qie, L., Rutishauser, E., Sist, P., Sonké, B., Sullivan, M. J. P., Vilanova, E., Wang, M. M. H., Martius, C., and Herold, M.: Estimating Aboveground Net Biomass Change for Tropical and Subtropical Forests: Refinement of IPCC Default Rates Using Forest Plot Data, *Global Change Biology*, 25, 3609–3624, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14767>, 2019.
- 385 Rozendaal, D. M. A., Suarez, D. R., Sy, V. D., Avitabile, V., Carter, S., Yao, C. Y. A., Alvarez-Davila, E., Anderson-Teixeira, K., Araujo-Murakami, A., Arroyo, L., Barca, B., Baker, T. R., Birigazzi, L., Bongers, F., Branthomme, A., Brien, R. J. W., Carreiras, J. M. B., Gatti, R. C., Cook-Patton, S. C., Decuyper, M., DeVries, B., Espejo, A. B., Feldpausch, T. R., Fox, J., Gamarra, J. G. P., Griscom, B. W., Harris, N., Hérault, B., Coronado, E. N. H., Jonckheere, I., Konan, E., Leavitt, S. M., Lewis, S. L., Lindsell, J. A., N'Dja, J. K., N'Guessan, A. E., Marimon, B., Mitchard, E. T. A., Monteagudo, A., Morel, A., Pekkarinen, A., Phillips, O. L., Poorter, L., Qie, L., Rutishauser, E., Ryan, C. M., Santoro, M., Silayo, D. S., Sist, P., Slik, J. W. F., Sonké, B., Sullivan, M. J. P., Laurin, G. V., Vilanova, E., Wang, M. M. H., Zahabu, E., and Herold, M.: Aboveground Forest Biomass Varies across Continents, Ecological Zones and Successional Stages: Refined IPCC Default Values for Tropical and Subtropical Forests, *Environmental Research Letters*, 17, 014047, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac45b3>, 2022.
- 395 UNFCCC: Adoption of the Paris Agreement, 2015.

Xu, L., Saatchi, S. S., Yang, Y., Yu, Y., Pongratz, J., Bloom, A. A., Bowman, K., Worden, J., Liu, J., Yin, Y., Domke, G., McRoberts, R. E., Woodall, C., Nabuurs, G.-J., de-Miguel, S., Keller, M., Harris, N., Maxwell, S., and Schimel, D.: Changes in Global Terrestrial Live
400 Biomass over the 21st Century, *Science Advances*, 7, eabe9829, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe9829>, 2021.