PANGEA Draft White Paper

[**WRITING ASSIGNMENTS HERE**](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1USQ6QT2ePmF1G68PucHvCO_6cWeVqritkIX1cv3cOMU/edit?gid=21525332#gid=21525332)

[NASA Tropical Ecology Scoping Solicitation](https://nspires.nasaprs.com/external/viewrepositorydocument/cmdocumentid=860588/solicitationId=%7BEB63A640-7CE0-70F6-BE80-C12541C56B5F%7D/viewSolicitationDocument=1/A.4%20Terrestrial%20Ecology%20Amend%2036.pdf)

ABoVE White Paper: [ABoVE Final Scoping Report 2010.pdf](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1r9vFP5H4r7QVy379OSeGuPAWdINTQuRj/view?usp=sharing)

***From Solicitation:***

The main deliverable will be a scoping report that lays out the scientific issues at stake, the logistical framework, and one or more paths forward toward implementation. Scoping studies will be required to address the following elements:

1. The science questions and issues
2. The current state-of-the-science
3. The potential for a major, significant scientific advancement
4. The central, critical role of NASA remote sensing
5. The essential scientific components of the study and why coordinated teamwork is required in their implementation
6. An overall study design identifying the required observational (e.g., spaceborne, airborne, and/or supporting in situ observations) and analytical (e.g., models, data, and information system) infrastructure
7. The feasibility of the proposed project, both technical and logistical
8. The engagement of the broader research community to seek feedback on the ideas, to assess interest, and to foster diversity and inclusion
9. The disciplinary skills needed to conduct the study and engage potential partners in their planning activities
10. Potential use of results for applications and decision support.

Scoping studies must produce a written report that **provides the scientific rationale and an initial study design concept** for a new field campaign or related team project. While this report need not be lengthy, it **must include a thorough presentation of science questions, goals, and objectives; the underlying rationale in terms of state-of-the-art, relevance, and expected advances; implementation concepts**; and other information to enable NASA to fully evaluate the project.

**[LOGO]**

**The PAN tropical investigation of bioGeochemistry and Ecological Adaptation (PANGEA): A Concise Plan for a NASA-Sponsored Field Campaign**

**Draft Report**

**September 2024**

**Lead Authors:**

**Elsa M. Ordway (University of California, Los Angeles)**

**X (X)**

**X (X)**

**X (X)**

**Contributing Authors:**

**X (X)**

**X (X)**

**X (X)**

**Foreword**

NASA’s Research Opportunities in Space and Earth Sciences released in 2022 called for proposals to conduct scoping studies to identify the scientific questions and develop the initial study design and implementation concept for a new NASA Terrestrial Ecology field campaign. In the spring of 2023, NASA selected two projects for funding, including a project entitled: “*A Scoping Study for the NASA Tropical Terrestrial Ecology Campaign”* (NASA Grant 80NSSC23K1019 to the University of California, Los Angeles). This report contains the recommendations from this scoping study, which presents the **PAN tropical investigation of bioGeochemistry and Ecological Adaptation (PANGEA).** NASA outlined ten expectations to be identified for each scoping study:

1. The science questions and issues.
2. The current state-of-the-science.
3. The potential for a major, significant scientific advancement.
4. The central, critical role of NASA remote sensing.
5. The essential scientific components of the study and why coordinated teamwork is required in their implementation.
6. An overall study design identifying the required observational (e.g., spaceborne, airborne, and/or supporting in situ observations) and analytical (e.g., models, data, and information system) infrastructure.
7. The feasibility of the proposed project, both technical and logistical.
8. The engagement of the broader research community to seek feedback on the ideas, to assess interest, and to foster diversity and inclusion.
9. The disciplinary skills needed to conduct the study and engage potential partners in their planning activities.
10. Potential use of results for applications and decision support.

In this white paper, we XXX.

**Acknowledgments**

The scoping of PANGEA is very much an international community effort. It would not be possible without the contributions of an untold number of individuals. We are deeply grateful to all have contributed their ideas, time, energy, resources, and funding to scope this urgently needed campaign. More detailed acknowledgements will be included in the final draft of this PANGEA white paper.

**Table of Contents**

[**1. Introduction and Motivation 7**](#_k34ngprcwpga)

[1.1 Questions, Objectives, and Science Themes 10](#_f43eyfjc03r4)

[1.2 Role of Remote Sensing Observations 11](#_521zhe1ijge9)

[1.3 PANGEA Study Domain 13](#_szwuuhpl6jrs)

[1.4 The need for coordinated teamwork 13](#_fhtmlkbo44h7)

[1.5 The urgent need for PANGEA 14](#_w9c58goeuy6v)

[1.6 Earth Science to Action 15](#_y12nbecmffi8)

[**2. PANGEA Science Themes 15**](#_67ufwhve0n98)

[2.1 Biogeochemical Cycles 16](#_ykkfx91lnxr)

[2.2 Biodiversity 18](#_h53zsa9y2giw)

[2.3 Climate Interactions and Feedbacks 21](#_stmvw8hd42mo)

[2.4 Social-Ecological Systems 24](#_thgadem9pj58)

[2.5 Disturbance Dynamics 31](#_7i4li2ka6ozf)

[**3. Knowledge Gaps & Questions 34**](#_6b0x02s8q4vm)

[3.1 Pattern 34](#_9e0eno19l2od)

[3.2 Process 37](#_ci41fcynf7lz)

[3.3 Projections 40](#_j4eyjqb1ighr)

[**4. Scientific Advancement from PANGEA 41**](#_103rddclnjs1)

[**5. Critical Role of NASA Remote Sensing 43**](#_7t2ogl1w37ed)

[**6. Research Strategy and Study Design (scientific feasibility) 45**](#_krtr9hnd65qf)

[6.1 Overall Study Design 45](#_a7rsc2zcb4s)

[6.2 Essential Scientific Measurements 47](#_kw1o5d63g5dw)

[6.2.1 Satellite Remote Sensing Observations 51](#_8hvwu2pr0zwb)

[6.2.2 Airborne Remote Sensing Observations 52](#_tvm98o3pux72)

[6.2.3 Field Observations, Studies, Experiments 52](#_7locis78pd28)

[6.3 Candidate Landscapes 52](#_rt2hahfr5phm)

[6.4 Modeling, Data Synthesis, and Integrative Analyses 54](#_f11ajoxckysx)

[6.4.1 Modeling & Data Integration approach 54](#_6l7aghp2o9mp)

[6.4.2 Coordination with other modeling and data integration communities 58](#_yl0rsrank7iw)

[6.4.3 Scaling Strategy 58](#_7ipo55oabcn6)

[6.4.4 Modeling and data integration timeline 59](#_mxrm7legmwc3)

[**7. Technical and Logistical Feasibility 60**](#_p0uxu9uxhfos)

[7.1 Organization and Management 62](#_hqyhm81kx4qe)

[7.1.1 Program Management 63](#_hyedhoelr1xk)

[7.1.2 Project Office 63](#_x5mu1td5ughg)

[7.1.4 Project Implementation 64](#_lq3brrk2qvfv)

[7.1.5 Science Team and Science Leadership 64](#_7wuyqi8504jb)

[7.1.6 Disciplinary Skills Required 66](#_moant3j662pm)

[7.2 Project Organization 66](#_d22q1idfjrqr)

[7.3 International and Other Agreements 68](#_duixp9495bxf)

[7.3.1 Government agreements and MOUs 68](#_hkso13ohbc20)

[7.3.2 NASA airborne campaign Indigenous agreements, permissions, and treaties (KEEP this section) 68](#_44zh5ia5coj2)

[7.4 Community Engagement Strategy 69](#_w90m76cd6k00)

[7.5 PANGEA Partners 76](#_snp7kz6sl5x6)

[7.6 Cost Estimates 78](#_v6vwvy87f239)

[7.7 Co-funding 78](#_4bmujjquo8mq)

[7.8 Open Science - Data Management and Sharing 80](#_igdor1b4j3oc)

[7.9 Timetable 83](#_f0glc3cmn1d)

[7.10 Risk and Risk Mitigation / Risk Assessment 84](#_n6p8ovtnhgkd)

[**8. Enabling Earth Science to Action 85**](#_segnwgqaxwz7)

[8.1: Substantive applications of PANGEA research outputs 85](#_d0n9lllcjn02)

[8.1.1 Carbon 85](#_hm6wmphkkjb5)

[8.1.2 Biodiversity 85](#_e69rpn43gqyr)

[8.1.3 Agriculture and Livelihoods 86](#_7gf3ojfmbw3)

[8.1.4 Disturbance Dynamics 87](#_esmc1rvroflg)

[8.2: Process to enable Earth Science to Action 88](#_bpq2qriuj4gm)

[**9. Capacity Building, Training, and Education 90**](#_8t6ay0v9gizk)

[**10. References 97**](#_c36m01esiuds)

[**11. Figure and Photograph and Credits 97**](#_z4vei7kqp4a)

[**12. Glossary 97**](#_crm1yggb334o)

[**13. List of Acronyms 99**](#_pzrw4c5s7tpd)

[**14. Appendices 99**](#_rymy755ymrd5)

[A - Engagement during the Scoping Campaign 99](#_1737u9tquxno)

[B - Planned and Ongoing Research and Monitoring Activities 100](#_969urlcnvqlw)

[C - Summary of Level II and III Ecoregions in PANGEA Study Region 100](#_79hvy15uphw)

[D – Summary of Airborne and Spaceborne Remote Sensing Systems for PANGEA 100](#_6akhrmoqr5g7)

[E - Summary of PANGEA Participants 100](#_ud6tg3r5l8q3)

[F - Letters of Support 101](#_u0cqs6788e4p)

[**G - Stuff that’s beyond scope that could be developed in collaboration with PANGEA 103**](#_ffo9zvtu7fi)

## 

## 1. Introduction and Motivation

In response to a call from the NASA Terrestrial Ecology Program, we present the scope of a terrestrial ecology field campaign, *The PAN tropical investigation of bioGeochemistry and Ecological Adaptation* (PANGEA), that will focus on tropical forest biomes. PANGEA will answer globally relevant and urgent big science questions emphasizing comparison among the major tropical forest formations on our planet through effective interpretation and analysis of space-based measurements and through a combination of ground, airborne, and satellite-based science investigations. PANGEA will foster collaborations and build new relationships within the scientific community with an emphasis on interactions between US scientists and researchers from countries with tropical forests, as well as strengthening relationships with partners from international space agencies. PANGEA will also provide opportunities for training and educating the next generation of scientists and the broader workforce, including scientists and trainees from countries where field research will be based. PANGEA will leave a legacy of open data, open science, and strengthened partnerships between the US, tropical institutions, and international partners as the basis for future research and applications.

**The biogeochemical response of tropical forests to changing climate forcing and climate extremes varies strongly across the globe in ways that urgently require improved understanding.** Tropical forests regulate climate locally, regionally, and globally and retain the greatest share of biodiversity of any terrestrial biome. Tropical forests also store vast amounts of carbon; moist tropical forests in particular comprise about 40% of global biomass (Xu et al., 2021) and provide the critical global service of removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere rapidly. However, tropical forests are highly threatened by climate change and land-use change.Forests in the equatorial regions will soon experience the highest known temperatures since the Eocene which, combined with land-use change, will lead to increasing atmospheric dryness and water stress (Barkhordarian et al 2019). Tropical tree mortality rates are rising differentially across the tropics due to increases in drought duration and severity and storm intensity (Allen et al 2010, McDowell et al 2018, Choat et al 2012). Tropical forest canopy temperatures are more frequently dangerously close to the critical temperature (~47⁰ C), at which irreversible damage to the photosynthetic machinery occurs (Doughty et al. 2023). Unprecedented rates of anthropogenic land-use change in recent decades (DeFries et al 2004, Gibbs et al 2010a, Hosonuma et al 2012) have resulted in some tropical forests becoming net sources of carbon to the atmosphere (Gatti et al 2021). Prolonged hot and dry conditions increase forest vulnerability to fires and already burned forests in turn become hotter and drier leading to a positive feedback that has been called a “gathering firestorm” (Brando et al. 2020).

Even as regrowing, secondary tropical forests continue to sequester large amounts of carbon from the atmosphere, tropical deforestation and degradation accounted for 22% of annual anthropogenic carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, while intact tropical forest sinks weakened by an estimated 31% in the past two decades (1990-2019; [Pan et al., 2024](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-024-07602-x)). Tropical forests and floodplains, which are frequently interspersed with wetland and aquatic ecosystems, also play a critical role in the global methane (CH4) and CO2 budgets (Sjögersten et al., 2014; Peng et al., 2022). CH4 has experienced recent atmospheric growth rates inconsistent with our current understanding of global sources and sinks of this critical greenhouse gas (GHG) (Turner et al., 2019). CH4 contributes an estimated 30% of the increase in radiative forcing from anthropogenic emissions and is >25 times more potent as a GHG compared to CO2 (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2021). Tropical wetland and inland water systems contribute the vast majority of global aquatic CH4 emissions and make up roughly 20% of the total global CH4 budget of ~575 Tg CH4 yr-1 (Saunois et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2022). These tropical CH4 sources are the most uncertain component of the global carbon budget (Saunois et al., 2020, 2024).

Halting tropical deforestation and forest degradation and conserving regrowing tropical forests can be a cost-effective tool for mitigating climate change, with co-benefits that extend beyond carbon sequestration (e.g. [Heinrich et al., 2023](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-022-05679-w)). Tropical forests maintain high levels of evaporation and transpiration throughout the year, transferring energy and water to distant latitudes and maintaining high rates of regional precipitation through rainfall recycling (Salati et al. 1979; recent refs Amazon; Worden et al. 2021; Worden et al. 2024, van der Ent et al., 2010, Staal et al., 2018). Deforestation and forest degradation reduce evapotranspiration in the dry season (Sampaio et al. 2007; Longo et al. 2020; Zemp et al., 2017; recycling models refs) potentially leading to forest mortality and a positive feedback loop resulting in forest ecosystem collapse that has been called a “tipping point” (Xu et al., 2022,Lovejoy and Nobre 2018).

Current research has revealed our lack of understanding of how differences in the diversity of tropical forests’ species composition, structure, and functional traits across continents control responses to climate change and other anthropogenic changes. This knowledge gap is greater in the humid tropics than in other biomes (e.g., dryland, boreal or temperate forest ecosystems). Differences in the evolutionary history of tropical ecosystems across continents directly affects their vulnerability and resilience, i.e., the ability to withstand and recover from changes is directly linked to the conditions under which these systems evolved. From 1985-2015, the carbon sink of intact African lowland tropical forests measured in forest inventory plots was effectively constant while the carbon sink in Amazonian lowland tropical forests declined by one-third from 2005 through 2015 compared to the 1990s (Hubau et al. 2020; Brienen at al. 2015). Under El Niño conditions during 2015-2016, tropical America, Africa, and Asia, all temporarily became net sources of CO2 emissions to the atmosphere (Liu et al. 2017). However, these net carbon losses appear to be underpinned by distinct mechanisms that indicate differences in the stability of the carbon sink and will require regionally specific understanding and management to mitigate. The sources of CO2 concentrations, as measured by the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2), suggest that in the tropical Americas, reduced photosynthesis led to reduced carbon uptake reversing the balance to net emissions. In Africa, increased temperatures led to increased respiration, outweighing the sequestration benefits of Central African tropical forests (Liu et al. 2017). In Asia, a hotter and drier land surface resulted in more emissions from fires. However, **we cannot explain with confidence why different tropical forest biomes are responding differently to similar climate forcing with our current understanding of tropical forest ecology and biogeochemistry.**

**Future predictions of the role of the tropical carbon land flux in the Earth system remain highly uncertain** (Arora et al. 2020; Friedlingstein et al 2014; Friedlingstein et al 2006). The current uncertainty in terrestrial carbon flux predictions across Earth System Models (ESMs) is three times greater in the tropics than at any other latitude (Cavaleri et al 2015). [*more here - reference Friedlingstein et al 2023 - CMIP5 to CMIP6 updates, but remaining uncertainties regarding processes - are we getting the right answers for the right reasons - and need for improved RS data model integration, e.g., developing ESMs that link satellite measurements more directly to land processes, such as models that simulate SIF (Braghiere et al., 2021), have a more detailed radiative transfer model, spectrally resolved (Braghiere et al. 2023), directly linking traits to spectral/physiological forest properties, etc. As well as models that learn directly from data such as CARDAMOM (Bloom et al. 2016), AI (Massoud et al. 2023) and Pierre Gentine’s papers*]

Traditionally, ESMs represent forest canopies in simple and aggregated ways and thus fail to capture how disturbance history affects biomass accumulation and ecosystem stability (Levine et al. 2016; Yang et al. 2023). The need for representing ecological processes of diverse ecosystems is becoming increasingly recognized by the modeling community (Bonan et al. 2024). Newer generations of terrestrial biosphere models—vegetation demography models (Fisher et al. 2018)— namely XX represent structurally and functionally diverse forest canopies (Longo et al. 2019; Koven et al. 2020). Vegetation demography models represent forest dynamics processes more directly. However, the additional complexity creates two challenges for regional and global simulations. First, initial conditions require detailed forest structure and composition data that can be derived from forest plots only for small domains (Marvin et al. 2014). Second, existing model benchmarking systems, such as the International Land Model Benchmarking (ILAMB; Collier et al. 2018) are insufficient, because the newer generation of models may predict reasonable aggregated properties (e.g., total aboveground biomass) based on unreasonable distributions. Recent advances in remote sensing provide a unique opportunity to describe the structure, composition and diversity of ecosystems (Schimel et al. 2019).

Critically, **tropical forests are also the least investigated of all of the Earth’s major terrestrial biomes**. Few tropical forest countries maintain systematic repeated forest inventories because inventories are costly and require technical and management expertise. Networks of research plots provide valuable insights into forest dynamics, but their distribution is sparse and extrapolation from potentially biased plot locations may lead to significant uncertainties and biases (Saatchi et al., 2015). The latitudinal distribution of both forest inventory plots and eddy covariance flux towers is nearly inversely proportional to gross primary productivity, demonstrating the underrepresentation of sampling in these critical ecosystems (Baldocchi et al 2022, Schimel et al. 2015) (Figure X).

*[1-2 paragraphs on the critical timing of PANGEA that emphasize the points below - many efforts trying to ameliorate this with respect to XYZ, but still critical need to fill knowledge, data, and methods gaps - PANGEA will fill these gaps while coordinating with and reinforcing existing activities and preparing the next generation to continue leading this work into the future] A hallmark of PANGEA is its commitment to community-engaged research. By engaging communities traditionally left behind in major and international projects from the beginning, PANGEA is poised to …*

* *equitable science and not extractive science*
* ***Urgency/Timeliness*** *- need to do this now - why this should be the next campaign; why we can’t wait another 5-10 years* 
  + *tropical ecosystems, and in our data-rich era of new dimensionality effectively utilize current and forthcoming satellite missions to diagnose the current state of tropical forests*
* ***Societal need*** *- lots of people depend on those forests*
  + *local, regionally, or globally*
* *state that this is feasible and necessary* 
  + *the lack of cal-val data in the tropics, XXX*
  + *we HAVE to do this to understand XYZ*
  + *we need this global context that we can only get from remote sensing*
* *we learned from LBA that by adding new components and integrating / interdisciplinarity results in the pie growing for everybody*
* ***Embed within Earth Science to Action Strategy*** 
  + *PANGEA is an opportunity to integrate!!!*
  + *CC&E umbrella logical place to start*
  + *but emphasize integration beyond CC&E*
  + *integrate across R&A and Applied*

**PANGEA aims to determine whether tropical forests will share the same fate or vary in their responses to the effects of climate change, with a particular emphasis on the two largest tropical forests.**

### 1.1 Questions, Objectives, and Science Themes

Tropical forests have long been recognized as globally important carbon sinks, absorbing large amounts of CO₂ from the atmosphere. However, deforestation, increases in extreme weather events, frequent wildfires, and other disturbances are reversing this trend, with some regions now acting as net carbon sources. Moreover, forest regrowth following these disturbances does not fully restore the original carbon sink capacity. This reversal is not uniform: tropical forest landscapes differ in their recent carbon sink trends, sensitivity to extreme events, and interactions with climate and land-use change. Understanding controls on tropical forest carbon flux trends and the resilience of tropical forest carbon sinks to extreme events has global implications and requires an improved understanding of patterns and processes. Critically, continued monitoring of these dynamics at pan-tropical and global scales urgently requires filling data and methods gaps to effectively leverage the new era of satellite remote sensing capabilities available now and in the next 1-10 years. PANGEA will study the complex interactions of the carbon cycle and social-ecological systems in the tropics to answer: **How vulnerable or resilient are tropical forest landscapes and their feedbacks to the global carbon cycle and climate?**

Addressing this knowledge gap to inform climate mitigation and adaptation strategies and biodiversity conservation requires answering three critical questions:

1. What are the **patterns** of recent (5-30 years) and ongoing change in tropical forest landscape states, dynamics, and feedbacks, and how do they vary geographically?
2. What **processes** control heterogeneity in the vulnerability of tropical forest landscapes to structural and functional change in the Anthropocene?
3. How will ongoing and **projected** future changes in tropical forest landscapes alter feedbacks to local, regional, and global climates and social-ecological systems?

To address the above questions, **PANGEA’s objectives** are to:

1. **Characterize and quantify heterogeneous tropical forest responses** to anthropogenic changes;
2. **Constrain model uncertainty of future tropical carbon flux predictions** by improving process understanding and advancing remote sensing data-model integration;
3. **Address calibration and validation and algorithm development needs** to ensure measurements can be accurately retrieved from satellite remote sensing datasets over the tropics, ultimately supporting the global utility of satellite missions.

PANGEA research and activities will prioritize the investigation of variation between Earth’s two largest tropical forests in the **Amazon** and **Central Africa** while integrating datasets and research from existing and complementary activities across the tropics wherever possible. PANGEA’s research questions focus on resolving uncertainties related to **multidecadal trends** and **responses to extreme events** across five thematic areas:

* **Biogeochemical Cycles** …
* **Biodiversity** …
* **Climate Interactions and Feedbacks** …
* **Social-Ecological Systems** are the interactions and feedbacks between social and ecological systems, including the impacts of human activities on the Earth system and interactions from which co-benefits for nature and societies arise across scales, such as food, water, energy and livelihood security, biodiversity conservation, retention of organic matter and nutrients, and resilience of tropical systems.
* **Disturbance Dynamics** …

### 1.2 Role of Remote Sensing Observations

*[3-4 paragraphs about why this campaign is uniquely suited to satellite remote sensing → the central, critical role of NASA remote sensing] - Integrate material from ROSES solicitation, EVS-4 reviewer comments, and slide that emphasizes things from solicitation*

We are in an unprecedented data-rich, model-rich, and computationally-advanced moment. We now have remote sensing capabilities that allow for more direct measurement of structural, functional, and in some cases taxonomic diversity (REFS). Mention sensors like GEDI and EMIT and forthcoming missions like SBG and CHIME. Forthcoming missions like NISAR and BIOMASS XYZ. Also SIF (TROPOMI); ECOSTRESS; mention GeoNEX - fluxes from geostationary satellites, CO2 concentrations from OCO-2/3, methane emissions from EMIT., Important abiotic conditions like soil moisture from SMAP, ground water from GRACE, and surface water flows from SWOT. Disturbance dynamics including fire activity from VIIRS, and fine-scale disturbances from Harmonized Landsat-Sentinel-2 dataset and high-res commercial satellite providers through CSDA program like Planet.

LBA began before the use of EOS Terra and Aqua satellites. Landsat was already in use for estimates of deforestation (Skole and Tucker 1993) and through the first decade of LBA research it would be applied to estimate logging (Asner et al. 2005) and understory forest fires (Morton et al. 2011). Remote sensing in early ecological models that used satellite data such as CASA (Potter et al. YYYY), were originally designed to incorporate NDVI data from polar orbiting weather satellites (AVHRR) calibrated to net ecosystem exchange. Among the earliest major results of LBA, was the recognition that tower based estimates of NEE had very different seasonality than the predictions of models at the time (Saleska et al. 2003) , [1-3 sentences on where we were before, during, and immediately after LBA - with citations]. [1-2 sentences on moving beyond the era of grenness, into a new era of multi-dimensionality]

The knowledge gaps/questions that PANGEA will address cannot be answered without pan-tropical satellite observations, integrative analyses, and models. However, we are currently unable to fully leverage these satellite datasets without coordinated calibration and validation measurements. Major data gaps and process uncertainties in tropical forests currently limit algorithm and product development, preventing the global utility of these sensors from being fully realized. Scale mismatches exist for desired retrievals from nearly all of these satellites. For example, differences need reconciliing between the approximately 1 km footprint of tower-based eddy covariance fluxes and x-20 km satellite retrievals of gross primary productivity, methane fluxes, and ecosystem respiration. Similarly, leaf- and organismal-scale measures of diversity like functional traits and structural attributes scale non-linearly to pixels that incorporate multiple species or ecosystems at the 30-60 m scale (REFS). Reconciling these scale mismatches requires collocated ground, tower, drone, aircraft, and satellite measurements in combination with advances in understanding of processes that underpin scaling theory (REF).

[be honest about limitations of RS in the tropics as well and opportunities for improved coordination with ground-based research communities and institutions in the tropics - e.g., GEO-TREES effort, FLUXNET effort, etc. - There are some things we’ll never be able to measure using remote sensing like certain seasons, microbes, non-plant taxa, … - however there are major unrealized opportunities to improve scaling and advance data integration - and highlighting these gaps will be critical for 1) identifying the where, when and what of long-term ground-based monitoring in the tropics to complement RS data; and 2) …]

In addition to the suite of new satellite capabilities, the research and data user communities now have far greater access to cloud computing, advanced computational resources, and rapidly evolving machine learning and AI (REFS). Numerical models that represent processes that mediate forest diversity, xyz, the interactions of structurally heterogeneous forests with climate, land use and biogeochemical cycles (REFS).

### 1.3 PANGEA Study Domain

PANGEA will include a core and extended domain. The extended domain for pan-tropical satellite remote sensing and modeling analyses will encompass moist tropical forests, including wetlands, peatlands, and mangroves (Figure X). The initial focus of PANGEA will be on tropical biomes in Africa and the Americas. The PANGEA study region covers the major ecosystems and landscapes found in the tropics and the spatial scale required to address the primary questions in the X major science themes. The location of these Primary Research Areas will be based on opportunities to conduct integrated research across science themes as well as the existence of ongoing or planned research funded by NASA, as well as local and international partner agencies and organizations.

* Map of core and extended domains (Elsa will create based on ESA or FAO boundaries)
  + Modeling and satellite RS at pan-tropical scale
* Coordinated ground, tower, drone, and aircraft measurements will be collected in landscapes that capture variation in ….
  + See Section X for more detailed information
* Core PANGEA domain (tropical Americas & Africa) and extended PANGEA domain (pan-tropical - includes SE Asia and Australia enabling inclusion of existing datasets and opportunistic collection, but not focus of PANGEA data acquisition)

[1 brief paragraph on the variability analysis]

Include placeholder for variability analysis map here or in Overall Study Design section or in Candidate Study Sites / Regions section?

### 1.4 The need for coordinated teamwork

Individual investigator science excels in testing singular hypotheses. However, Earth system science is inherently multifaceted and complex. Recognizing this complexity, NASA scientific leadership embraced the multi-investigator team approach to Earth System Science decades ago (Asrar et al. BAMS v 82, pp.1309-1330, 2002, no DOI found). The Terrestrial Ecology Program has promoted the multi-investigator model for decades of field campaigns (FIFE, BOREAS, LBA, ABoVE refs). Multiple drivers and interacting processes that cannot be isolated in controlled experiments characterize Earth system investigations. Numerous variables require expert knowledge for acquisition and measurement whether if be through the operation of a high-performance spectrometer or botanical identification of a tree species. No single individual or small group of individuals possesses all the knowledge and tools demanded by an Earth system science investigation. Fulfilling the needs of integrative analyses of the tropical biomes for many variables and models that incorporate the complex interactions of those variables requires a large team of specialists working together. Equitable collaboration is required to assure that measurements are coordinated in time and space to maximize their value in interpretation and modeling. This can only be achieved by a cooperative, coordinated, interdisciplinary team.

### 1.5 The urgent need for PANGEA

* *the "context" section that will address all of the nascent and ongoing activities that will have strong synergy with PANGEA. We clearly state that our TE proposal will work as a stand-alone campaign but can benefit greatly from other activities (and not unimportantly will greatly support other activities).*
* *Clearly articulate*
* *Tropical forests have a major role in global climate and teleconnections with non-tropical climate*

PANGEA provides an urgently needed framework to advance the use of satellite remote sensing datasets in tropical forest landscapes, emphasizing coordination and equity.

PANGEA is designed to serve as a standalone NASA campaign. Still, it will benefit greatly from several current and forthcoming activities. For example, European Space Agency airborne airborne observations of XYZ in Brazil and X (Africa); FluxNet efforts including AmeriFlux coordination with AndesFlux in Peru and LBA in Brazil and ICOS coordination with CongoFlux in the DRC and other flux towers in Ghana; and AsiaFlux and TERN; Also GEO-TREES - cal-val of biomass maps; Methane and peatland work (Moore foundation; …); Congo Basin Science Initiative + Science Panel for the Congo in partnership with Science Panel for the Amazon.

Also wrapping up of NGEE-Tropics positions PANGEA to XYZ. Applications needs from CBD on global biodiversity maps; restoration needs; flux measurements; methane mapping; …

To complement these activities and address critical, remaining knowledge, data, and methodological gaps, PANGEA will establish a network of centrally coordinated field and airborne campaigns that are distributed across targeted tropical forest ecosystems to enable scaling between field and remotely sensed datasets, and regional scale modeling.

* Ground measurements on W
* Done and aircraft measurements on X
* Methodological advancements in Y
* RS data-model integration on Z

By filling these gaps, and coordinating with well-timed international efforts, PANGEA will **advance scientific understanding and remote sensing capabilities across thematic areas that directly address the goals of NASA’s Carbon Cycle and Ecosystems Focus Area, in alignment with the Water and Energy Cycle and Climate Variability and Change Focus Areas**.

[Specifically outline what PANGEA is and is not - section title TBE] - section that explicitly defines what NASA PANGEA covers

* What NASA funded elements of PANGEA covers
  + Science themes
    - Data collection
    - Data curation
    - Open science
  + Training activities directly related research
  + Community engagement, including engagement w partners who are:
    - Leading on the applications development and decisions support
    - Leading on the workforce development training
* What complementary funding towards PANGEA can cover
  + Specify where we have commitments and where we do not
* How PANGEA is coordinated with other activities (CBSI, GEO-TREES, …)
* Somewhere here or earlier, we should write about our positionality as authors trained in Western science. Do we have Indigenous coauthors? If not, we should mention, if yes, we should mention how this is incorporating or not Indigenous knowledge…

### 1.6 Earth Science to Action

The interconnected geophysical, biological, and social Earth System is experiencing a particularly unique moment in its history that demands decisive action from incredible advancements in modern tools and infrastructure. Accelerating rates of climate and land use change drives urgency to apply insights from the frontiers of NASA Earth Science to benefit the economy, health, quality of life, and environment around the planet. Since the turn of the century, NASA has led the frontier of Earth Science as *science for society* through leveraging unique capabilities to understand and protect our home planet. Since the inception of the Earth Science Enterprise Applications program in 2001 (ESE Strategic Plan) to the launch of the Earth Science to Action strategy in 2024 (ES2A Strategic Plan), NASA has innovated a systems approach to facilitate the collection of Earth Observations and predictions into decision and management support tools for diverse users and collaborators to use in their local initiatives that provide essential services to society. The time is *now* for strategic investment in pursuing increasingly ambitious collaborations and closing the gap between accelerating science and technology with the capacity of society to exploit those advances for a more resilient world.

Text Box A. NASA Earth Science to Action “Service” in the Tropics

-SERVIR’s first hub opened in Panama at the Water Center for the Humid Tropics of Latin America and the Caribbean, or CATHALAC. This hub, SERVIR Mesoamérica, serves Central America and the Dominican Republic. CATHALAC completed its NASA funding contract in 2011 and began **self-sustaining operations**. CATHALAC continues as a SERVIR network affiliate, using Earth observations and models in providing maps and information products to the region.

PANGEA is highly relevant to NASA’s strategic goal to advance and integrate Earth science knowledge to empower humanity to create a more resilient world. Specifically, PANGEA supports NASA’s Earth Science to Action strategy by:

* *investigating potential risks due to crossing thresholds for climate tipping points and the possibilities for cascading environmental and societal impacts.*
* *supporting efforts to Earth resilience, including the development of strategies for mitigation, adaptation, and the assessment of various risks and contingencies associated with global change and its impacts.*
* *building efficient and interactive end-to-end tools, models, and assessment systems with the needed latencies, at the appropriate temporal and spatial scales, and with the appropriate uncertainty quantification to serve people, communities, decision- and policy-makers, enabling them to take science-based actions.*

*Thriving on Our Changing Planet: A Decadal Strategy for Earth Observations from Space directs us to “Pursue increasingly ambitious objectives and innovative solutions that enhance and accelerate the science/applications value of space-based Earth observations and*

*analysis to the nation and to the world in a way that delivers great value ….”*

## 2. PANGEA Science Themes

Owing to the inherent complexity of tropical terrestrial ecosystems and their feedbacks with the Earth system, PANGEA takes an integrated, interdisciplinary approach. Understanding patterns and processes and constraining prediction uncertainty requires diverse expertise and coordinated collaboration. PANGEA bridges disciplines and ways of knowing to co-produce science that will address specific knowledge gaps and support urgently needed applications. In the following sections we parse the current state-of-the-science by thematic area. In Section 3, we present PANGEA’s integrated science questions in response to knowledge gaps related to pattern, process, and future projections. Section 4 describes how addressing these questions will yield major, scientific advancements.

### 2.1 Biogeochemical Cycles

***This PANGEA Science Theme will investigate patterns of spatial and temporal variability in carbon stocks and fluxes–including interactions with other biogeochemical cycles–as well as processes that control heterogeneous changes, and will improve future projections.***

The terrestrial biosphere is a large sink of atmospheric CO2 with a present-day global net ecosystem exchange estimated at 3.3 GtC yr-1, offsetting ~30% of the CO2 emitted by fossil fuels annually (Friedlingstein et al., 2023). From 1990 to 2019, the global forest carbon sink was equivalent to nearly half of fossil-fuel emissions (7.8±0.4 Pg C yr−1) (Pan et al. 2024). Furthermore, tropical landscapes are a controlling factor of atmospheric global CO2 interannual variability (Ahlström et al., 2015). Tropical terrestrial ecosystems are estimated to contribute up to 0.6±0.4 GtC yr-1 of this sink, with large interannual variability (Friedlingstein et al., 2023). However, over the past three decades an estimated two-thirds of the benefit from the global forest sink was negated by tropical deforestation (2.2±0.5 Pg C yr−1, 1990-2019) (Pan et al. 2024). In addition, according to the most recent Global Carbon Project CH4 budget synthesis (Saunois et al., 2024), the tropics contribute roughly 65% of total (anthropogenic + natural) global methane (CH4) emissions to the atmosphere (364 Tg CH4 yr-1). A significant portion of total CH4 emissions from the tropics are from wetland and inland water body sources (151 Tg CH4 yr-1) contributing ~20% of the total global CH4 budget.

Due to the improved observational coverage of column integrated CO2 (XCO2) and CH4 (XCH4) compared to ground-based and airborne in situ measurement networks, satellite remote-sensing retrievals have been used in inverse atmospheric models to estimate tropical GHG budgets. The tropical CO2 terrestrial budget has been constrained using satellite remote-sensing XCO2 data from GOSAT, OCO-2, and TanSat (e.g., Liu et al., 2016; Lunt et al., 2019; Crowell et al., 2019; Palmer et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2021).Tropical wetland emissions of CH4 have been estimated using satellite retrievals of XCH4 from GOSAT and TROPOMI (e.g., Parker et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2021; Feng et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2023).These studies have made critical findings about how climate, hydrology, and vegetation characteristics impact the tropical carbon budget across multiple temporal scales. These major findings are a result of satellite XCH4 observations filling a critical gap in ground-based measurements in the tropics and allowing for better constraint on regional emissions. Using spaceborne XCH4 retrievals it has been determined that our current estimates of tropical wetland and aquatic emissions are largely underestimated (Yu et al., 2023) and spatiotemporal variability in these natural CH4 sources are driven by environmental characteristic such as vegetation type/amount, temperature, and inundation extent (Parker et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2021). Furthermore, using satellite XCH4 data it was determined that tropical wetlands are a primary driver of global interannual variability in the global atmospheric CH4 growth rate (Feng et al., 2022).

* 1-2 paragraphs on the state-of-the-science of satellite remote-sensing GHG fluxes in the tropics

Tropical carbon stocks and fluxes vary enormously in space and time (REFS). [SPACE] Intact, disturbed, and regrowing forests differ dramatically in their ability to uptake carbon. From 1990-2019, regrowing tropical forests increased in area, resulting in a 29±8% increase in their ability to sequester carbon, while intact forest areas shrank, directly reducing their ability to store carbon by 31±7% (Pan et al. 2024). [TIME] As a result of climate and land-use change, the tropical carbon sink is becoming increasingly fragile. Critically, tropical forests appear to differ in their sensitivity to extreme events and future climate and land-use change feedbacks. However, most studies are based on ground-based data that represent a small fraction of tropical forest area, raising key questions regarding the generalizability of these findings, especially given that monitoring plots are a biased representation of tropical landscapes. [bring in Hubau, Liu, Bennett, others that demonstrate differences in responses to extreme events and future change]

Variation in geomorphology, climatic conditions, human activities, water and nutrient availability, and evolutionary histories drive wide variation in rates of photosynthesis, respiration, tree mortality, and woody productivity across the tropics. As a result, **tropical forests vary enormously within and among tropical continents, including over relatively small spatial scales**. This variation directly influences species composition and species interactions, land-atmosphere feedbacks, hydrological dynamics, forest productivity, and the carbon storage capacity of these landscapes. Climate plays a critical role in driving the tropical carbon cycle. For example, regions with high rainfall typically support more dense, evergreen forests with large carbon stocks, while areas with seasonal or lower rainfall may harbor deciduous forests with more seasonal variation in carbon fluxes and relatively lower carbon stocks (Malhi et al., 2002; Bonan et al., 2008; Muller-Landau et al. 2021). Precipitation also interacts with temperature non-uniformly; in cool forests high precipitation can decrease productivity, while in warmer forests precipitation typically increases productivity (Taylor et al., 2017). Productivity typically increases with temperature until water is limiting (Muller Landau et al., 2021). Elevation also drives variation in temperature, among other variables, with lower elevation associated with greater rates of productivity and biomass (Muller Landau et al., 2021). Tropical forests also exhibit enormous variation in geomorphology (Townsend et al. 2008), and often variables such as higher soil fertility and less favorable physical properties correlate, making it more difficult to tease apart their relationships with productivity and biomass. For example, across the Amazon Basin, lower soil fertility is often associated with deeper, more stable, well-aggregated, and well-drained soils (Quesada et al., 2010). Regardless, productivity typically increases with soil fertility, although there are no consistent relationships between soil fertility and biomass, likely because turnover increases and woody residence time decreases with soil fertility (Muller Landau et al., 2021).

Tropical forests are thought to be strongly influenced by nutrient availability because many tropical forests are situated on highly weathered soils depleted in rock-derived nutrients (REFS). Large variation in nutrient availability leads to large uncertainties around nutrient constraints on the CO2 fertilization effect (Fleischer and Terrer 2022). For example, phosphorus is expected to constrain forest growth responses to increased CO2 by about 50% (Fleischer et al., 2019; Braghiere et al. 2022). In addition, land-use change can displace large quantities of nutrients (Bauters et al. 2022;​​ 2018; 2021, Kauffman et al., 1995), leading to local nutrient losses and redistribution of some elements. While phosphorus is largely assumed to be the most limiting nutrient across the lowland tropics (e.g. Cunha et al., 2022), recent observations reveal the heterogeneity of nutrient limitation across tropical forests, including limitation and colimitation by nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and calcium (Davidson et al., 2004, Wright et al., 2011, Manu et al., 2022; 2024). The high biodiversity in tropical forests means that it is challenging to generalize results from manipulative experiments testing where and when nutrient limitation affects productivity. Remote sensing allows for the detection of foliar chemistry and canopy structure that can inform coordinated belowground soil processes across larger scales (Townsend et al., 2008, Chadwick and Asner 2016; 2018, Martins et al. 2018).

A large proportion of tropical forests are permanently or seasonally flooded wetlands (REFS), which include forested peatlands, swamps, and floodplains (Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989). For instance, Amazon River floodplain forests represent areas up to 250,000 km2 with most flooded six months of the year (Richey et al., 2002; Goulding et al., 2003). These tropical forest wetlands play a critical role in the global CH4 and CO2 budgets (Sjögersten et al., 2014; Peng et al., 2022). Tropical wetlands are a moderate source and sink of CO2 to the atmosphere depending on environmental characteristics (Sjögersten et al., 2014; Helfter et al., 2021); however, tropical wetland and inland water systems contribute the vast majority of global total wetland/aquatic CH4 emissions and make up ~20% of the overall global CH4 budget (Saunois et al., 2020, Peng et al., 2022). CH4 contributes ~30% of the increase in radiative forcing from anthropogenic emissions and is 25× or more effective as a GHG compared to CO2 (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2021). Methane has experienced recent atmospheric growth rates inconsistent with our current understanding of global sources and sinks of this critical greenhouse gas (GHG) (Turner et al., 2019). As CH4 concentrations soar past all-time record levels, climate scientists worry that climate change itself could be contributing to these elusive sources of CH4 (Tollefson, 2022). Tropical forest wetlands, floodplains, and inland waters like lakes, reservoirs, and rivers are significant sources of CH4 and are sensitive to changes in climate, yet remain the most uncertain contributors to the global CH4 budget (Saunois et al., 2020).

[briefly mention biodiversity as segue into Section 2.2] This environmental heterogeneity is conducive for a rich this biodiversity of tropical forests, which might introduce some variability in their response to disturbances, such as logging or fire (Phillips et al., 2004). Different species and forest communities may vary in their capacity to store carbon, recover from disturbances. The heterogeneity in climate, soils, and biotic factors lead to an non-uniform response of tropical forests to global change. Understanding and accounting for these heterogeneities is crucial for improving the accuracy of carbon monitoring efforts and for developing targeted strategies to mitigate the impacts of global change on tropical forests.

### 2.2 Biodiversity

***This PANGEA science theme will investigate how tropical biodiversity varies spatially with tropical forest structure and function, and the role of biodiversity in driving local, regional, and continental variation in tropical forest carbon stocks and fluxes.***

* Immense biodiversity and its importance to ecosystem structure and function
  + Importance of biodiversity to ecosystem structure & function
    - Plant diversity -
    - Cite Schmitz et al 2018
  + hypotheses that greater diversity should confer greater resilience (REFS)
  + Although complex - e.g., diversity & carbon stocks not necessarily linearly correlated (Sullivan et al 2017) in spite of
* Variation in tropical diversity including in functional composition
  + Description of patterns and changes
    - Plant diversity (Chave et al; Feldpausch et al; Banin et al; Declan et al )
    - **Animals** - Meg Crofoot; Martin Wikelski; Roland Kays; Tom smith; Berzaghi;
      * **Emphasize important plant-animal interactions (e.g. seed dispersal; redistribution of nutrients on the landscapes; etc.)**
    - Microbial?
    - *Genetic adaption - too slow; Migration - too slow; Acclimation - large knowledge gaps. Need PANGEA to fill these knowledge gaps at landscape scales that capture the heterogeneity of responses*
* Remotely sensed diversity
  + Trait-based functional composition, functional diversity and functional communities (Asner et al 2017; Chadwick & Asner; Ordway et al;
  + Spectral methods for estimating functional composition and beta diversity - Ferret & Asner 2014; Cavender-Bares et al 2022; Draper et al 2018; Draper et al 2020;
  + Structural diversity: Schneider et al; Stovall et al; Jucker;
* Quantifying diversity at large spatial scales is critical for many purposes, including ….
* New technologies and computing capabilities have resulted in large steps forward in
  + Conservation importance and mappability: Rose et al 2010; Skidmore et al 2021;

—----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Tropical biomes are the most biodiverse on Earth. Biodiversity is the variability among all living organisms including genetic, phylogenetic, taxonomic and functional diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems. Biodiversity arises from the richness of interactions between plants and animals, rooted in mutual dependence. It is widely believed that tropical forests host more than half of Earth’s biodiversity encompassing only about one-fifth of terrestrial area (Lewis et al. 2015, Barlow et al. 2018, Dinerstein et al. 2017, Pillay et al. 2022), even though many areas and species in tropical biomes remain unexplored and unidentified. Additionally, there is a large knowledge gap in characterization by functional traits (Jetz et al. 2016). Inter-species trait variation and the diversity of functions that each organism, species, ecosystem possesses is vital to access and create resources for life to persist. As the primary producers, plants provide food and habitat, while animals contribute to essential services such as pollination, seed dispersal and nutrient cycling. Biodiversity in tropical forest landscapes underpins the productivity, function, and resilience of tropical social-ecological systems. Variation in tropical diversity regulates the flow of critical biogeochemical and hydrological cycles including those of carbon, water and energy.

Tropical forests store the largest amounts of aboveground carbon globally, as tropical trees absorb carbon from the atmosphere to build large, long-lasting or slow-decaying structures such as tree bark or root systems. A forest's potential for carbon sequestration is highly linked to its biological and functional diversity. Experimental studies have found that more diverse assemblages of plants are more productive and hold higher carbon stocks, albeit there are few such studies in tropical forests. Many findings on relationships between biodiversity and ecosystem productivity and biomass so far stem from grassland biodiversity experiments that have been established since the 1990s and consistently show positive effects of plant species richness on ecosystem productivity and stability (e.g. Jochum et al. 2020; Tilman, Isbell, and Cowles 2014; Craven et al. 2018). Extending results beyond grasslands at local scale, Liang et al. (2016) report generally positive saturating relationships between species richness and forest productivity based on an analyses of spatial variation of a global collection of field sites, but with very limited coverage in tropical forests and limited understanding of mechanisms within and between sites. There are several possible mechanisms for this phenomenon that need to be tested outside of experimental set-ups. Species with diverse traits and resource requirements may exhibit niche complementarity, more completely utilizing available resources under a wider array of environmental conditions (Williams et al. 2017). In parallel, more diverse species assemblages are more likely to contain the most productive species, which can increase overall functioning through selection (Hooper et al. 2005) (sampling effect). Larger species pools are also more likely to include plastic and adaptive species increasing resilience, also known as ecological insurance effect (Silva Pedro, Rammer, and Seidl 2017).

In the tropics, relationships and feedbacks with climate might be even more complex, encompassing some of the most diverse and productive forests on Earth, varying regionally (Raven et al. 2020). Early research in the 1960s already pointed towards the importance of species interactions, resource use partitioning and the species energy theory (Rosenzweig 1968; MacARTHUR 1969) suggesting that higher productive environments (in terms of climate (Waide et al. 1999) or soil (Yang et al. 2016)) can support more species. Changing climate regimes could thus negatively impact levels of biodiversity that might feedback on climate through decreased carbon sequestration (Thomas et al. 2004; Cavanaugh et al. 2014). High biodiversity could help mitigate negative effects of climate change through increased ecosystem stability and resilience (Schmitt et al. 2020), but our knowledge of the distribution of functional, taxonomic and genetic diversity within the tropical biome is limited. Trisos, Merow, and Pigot (2020) project that many species in tropical forests will reach their realized niche limits by 2050 under continuing global change (RCP 8.5), which means it is critically important to understand the role of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning for climate change projections and mitigation strategies (Díaz, Hector, and Wardle 2009). Recent research also suggests that soil biodiversity plays an important role in the association between plant diversity and multiple ecosystem functions across biomes (Delgado-Baquerizo et al. 2020; van Ruijven et al. 2020), which might be critically impacted by climate change (Jansson and Hofmockel 2020).

However, despite this complexity, tropical forests are often represented as a single biome and a small number of plant functional types in global Earth system models, generally ignoring differences between tropical continents and differences in species and functional diversity within-continent due to the lack of underlying data and knowledge. Biodiversity varies significantly between tropical continents, not just due to climatic differences, but also due to their evolutionary past. Continents have shifted over deep time, and plant lineages have radiated and adapted leading to phylogenetic differences linked to the paleoclimatic and geologic history of our planet (Corlett & Primack 2006, Slik et al. 2018). This also leads to important differences in species diversity and composition (Raven et al. 2020). The Afrotropical region is comparatively species poor, especially when excluding Madagascar and Southern Africa, while the Latin American region holds most species, and Tropical Asia might have the highest species richness per area. For example, the Afrotropics host about 56,000 vascular plant species on an area similar to Latin America with over 118,000 species, while tropical Asia is home to around 50,000 plant species on an area four times smaller than the other tropical continents (Raven et al. 2020). We also expect the form of the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem structure, productivity and functionality to vary in strength and scale dependence, but our knowledge of these relationships and of any underlying mechanisms are highly uncertain.

Mapping, monitoring and understanding changes in biodiversity and it’s role in the Earth system under climate change are critically important. Remote sensing can play a crucial role in helping to fill important data and knowledge gaps by providing spatially explicit and continuous data at spatial scales otherwise unattainable including remote regions that are hard to reach on the ground. Importantly though, a thorough understanding and monitoring of biodiversity still requires on-the-ground collection, as remotely sensed biodiversity variables do not replace yet an understanding of functional and genetic composition, discovery of species and oftentimes require experiments to separate the phenotypic and genetic components of functional variability (Cavendar-Bares et al., 2022). The combined use of several remote sensing tools can provide fresh insights and perspectives into the structure, function and dynamics of forest ecosystems, and elucidate how the taxonomic, functional and phylogenetic components of biodiversity are linked to changes in the environment. This is important since, despite the contribution of biodiversity to efficient carbon sequestration, nature-based solution initiatives often focus on increasing or conserving the spatial extent of natural ecosystems, and not in their diversity and composition. This is likely due to the lack of data, but protecting areas with high biodiversity, carbon and productivity value would increase conservation efficiency and help countries address their policy targets, namely in areas under pressure of land cover land use change (e.g. agriculture expansion).

For example, imaging spectroscopy has enhanced enormously our ability to map taxonomic, functional and phylogenetic diversity in tropical forests (Feret and Asner, 2011; Asner et al., 2014 ; Asner et al., 2017), but we have a poor understanding of phenotypic variability across tropical tree species given their spatial distribution and enormous diversity - indeed a single hectare in a tropical forest can harbor as many native tree species as the entire Western Europe (Valencia et al., 1994). This enormous variation can lead to higher uncertainties in distinguishing tree species using purely remote sensing tools, and requires on-site data collection that calibrate local models for upscaling of physiological, morphological and reproductive characteristics of each species or group of species. Several studies have shown that the combination of extensive field sampling with airborne imaging spectroscopy and lidar can provide a powerful tool to estimate plant functional traits at individual-tree level to estimate the functional diversity and composition of tropical forest ecosystems (Asner, 2017, Chadwick & Asner 2020, Ordway et al. 2022). Additionally, spectral methods have been used to characterize differences in species communities in terms of species beta diversity, that is the spatial turnover in species composition (Feret & Asner 2014, Draper et al. 2018, Draper et al. 2020). Another example is regarding forest structural complexity, defined by the three-dimensional arrangement of branches, leaves and trunks, which has been frequently measured with LiDAR. Many studies show the potential to characterize forest structural diversity and 3D complexity using terrestrial and UAV-based (e.g. Decuyper et al. 2018, Terryn et al. 2022, Schneider et al. 2019), airborne (e.g. Ferraz et al. 2016, Jucker et al. 2018) and spaceborne LiDAR (e.g. Schneider et al. 2020, De Conto et al. 2024) at individual-tree to ecosystem scale. Structural complexity is strongly linked to ecosystem functioning, influencing light interception, productivity, faunal and flora diversity, microclimate regulation, as well as nutrient and water cycling (Coverdale and Davies, 2023). More complex forests often support higher plant species diversity due to architectural diversity among species (Kent et al., 2015; Milodowski et al., 2021). However, the links between structural complexity and functional diversity have been little explored, as the understanding of these links requires the combined use of multiple remote sensing techniques that offer complementary perspectives.

[1-2 paragraphs on differences in phenological strategies across the tropics, changing phenology in response to climate change stressors, and phenology mapping/scaling]

Leaf phenological strategy is an important aspect of plant functional trait variation in tropical forests, which plays a major role in stand-level productivity, responses to climate variation, and the seasonal availability of food resources for animals and microbes. Tropical trees and lianas display a large diversity of leaf phenological strategies. While many species are evergreen, many others are deciduous to some degree, with variation in the duration, timing, and completeness of deciduousness, and in whether deciduousness is obligate or facultative. Leaf lifespans and the seasonal timing of leaf production also vary widely, with implications for seasonal variation in leaf quality and photosynthetic capacity. The relative abundance of different leaf phenological strategies varies systematically among tropical forests in relation to climate, and in association with stand-level variation in leaf phenology. In everwet forests, evergreen species dominate and virtually all trees and lianas maintain leaves throughout the year. In contrast, the driest tropical forests are completely leafless in the dry season, reflecting the dominance of drought-deciduous species. Moist and dry tropical forests with one or two dry seasons of intermediate length and intensity typically contain a mix of evergreen species and species with varying degrees of deciduousness, and thus have patchily / partially leafless canopies in dry seasons.

Geographic and interannual variation in stand-level phenology can arise from both plastic responses of extant vegetation to climate variation and shifts in the relative abundance of phenological strategies. Drought-deciduous tropical plant species display considerable plasticity in the timing and duration of deciduousness, depending on the timing, duration, and intensity of the dryness they experience – which varies not only among sites and years, but depending on their canopy position and exposure. Importantly, leaf phenology depends not only on water availability, but also on light: many tropical trees, species, and stands “green up” at those times of year when they receive the most light, even if this higher light is accompanied by drier conditions. Geographic variation is likely due predominantly to compositional shifts, whereas interannual variation is due mostly to plastic responses. However, interannual variation can also arise from temporal shifts in species composition and abundance due to disturbances, succession, or other factors.

Tropical forest leaf phenology can be quantified with field observations of focal trees, litter traps, phenocams, drone-based or airborne imaging, and satellite remote sensing. Satellite remote sensing has greatly expanded the geographic area for which tropical forest phenology data are available, enabling mapping of stand-level phenology over large areas, and analyses of its relationship with climate. However, high cloud cover and sensor artifacts complicate satellite-based studies of tropical forest phenology, which also mainly provide information on overstory phenology. Further, information on the divergent leaf phenological responses of individual species and functional types can thus far be gleaned only from ground-based or near-surface observations, which alone can be linked to individual plants of known identity.

### 2.3 Climate Interactions and Feedbacks

***This PANGEA science theme will investigate complex feedbacks and interactions between tropical forests and climate systems, as well as changes to these feedbacks and interactions, which influence whether tropical forests will act as a future carbon sink or source.***

Changes to water, temperature, and energy cycling can induce large variability in tropical forest carbon cycling, with large heterogeneity in this response both within and between tropical rainforests (e.g., Liu et al., 2017, Staal et al., 2023). Tropical forests alter surface properties, including land surface albedo, latent and sensible heat fluxes, and roughness, which in turn exert biophysical climate feedbacks [(Bonan, 2008; Chen et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2011)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/J2Id+7TNp+vM0J). Additionally, belowground rooting systems and soil texture regulate soil moisture [(Fan et al., 2017)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/LDiS), exerting strong impact on surface energy and water balances [(Seneviratne et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2021)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/FPcy+yMq6). As a result of tightly coupled land-atmosphere interactions in tropical forests, anthropogenic and climate disturbances can alter key surface and atmospheric properties that determine local and regional climate conditions. For example, deforestation and degradation exert significant surface warming effects due to decreases in evaporative cooling [(Devaraju et al., 2018; Li et al., 2015)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/iirc+CruA), with the magnitude of this effect constrained by the forest cover fraction [(Alkama & Cescatti, 2016)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/MoNo), and may exert asymmetry in response to forest cover gain and loss [(Su et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/Chrq+nNbr). Higher temperatures can increase tree respiration, which may reduce net primary productivity (NPP) and change how tropical forests cycle carbon [(Choury et al., 2022; Das et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2017; Lloyd et al., 2023)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/FoUS+HHQU+ZxJz+MUqe). In addition, deforestation and degradation can increase streamflow and sediment fluxes ([Levy et al., 2018](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017GL076526)) due to reductions in evapotranspiration and infiltration ([Costa et al., 2003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(03)00267-1), [Souza-Filho et al., 2016](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479715303935?via%3Dihub#bib10)), leading to changes in the surface water balance.

Land-atmosphere interactions in tropical rainforest regions play key roles in modulating water, temperature, and energy conditions both locally and regionally. Tropical forest atmospheric emissions can alter the vertical profile of the atmosphere, and in turn, feedback to tropical convection and rainfall on diurnal to decadal time scales [(](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/1Ghm+fNLl+2TA9+7XOK)[Betts and Silva Dias 2010; Suni et al. 2015; Gentine et al. 2019; Weber et al. 2024](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/gTtBt+MPMLM+TnAjI+EwxMa), [Chakraborty et al., 2021](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-12855-2021)). Tropical forest moisture recycling influences the onset and timing of their own rainy seasons and provides large proportions of atmospheric moisture for rainfall locally and regions downwind ([Wright et al., 2017](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1621516114), [Sori et al., 2022](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119657002.ch11), [Worden et al., 2021](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JG006024), [van der Ent et al., 2010](https://doi.org/10.1029/2010WR009127), [Staal et al., 201](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0177-y)8, Dirmeyer et al., 2009, Zemp et al., 2017, Nyasulu et al., 2024). Additionally, emitted biogenic volatile organic compounds influence cloud formation and albedo, which influences the amount and quality of light available for vegetation ([Artaxo et al., 2022](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000054)).

Tropical rainfall magnitude and patterns are tightly linked to LCLUC activities ([Xu et al., 2022](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac4c1d/meta), [Bell et al., 2015](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2014JD022586), [Smith et al., 2023](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-022-05690-1)) that change land surface heterogeneity at various spatial scales [(](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/XlMK+2OlF+Ykxm)[Khanna et al., 2017](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/qpFq); [Lawrence & Vandecar, 2014; Leite-Filho et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2023)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/XlMK+2OlF+Ykxm). Along with atmospheric circulation, local and regional moisture and heat anomalies will be transferred to generate teleconnection on downstream circulation patterns [(Mahmood et al., 2014; Snyder, 2010)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/9zs5+pHwu) and cross-continental nutrient cycles [(Li et al., 2021,](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/YQKg) [Barkley et al., 2019](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906091116)[)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/YQKg). Additionally, extensive biomass burning releases large amounts of aerosols into the atmosphere. Subsequent aerosol-cloud and aerosol-radiation interactions can alter cloud formation and life time ([Liu et al., 2020](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13283-2020)), induce subsidence ([Zhang et al., 2008](https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009449)), and change temperature gradients controlling regional dynamic systems([Chaboureau et al., 2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-8639-2022)), ultimately limiting convection and rainfall ([Tosca et al., 2015](https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL065063)).

Climate systems, in turn, strongly influence vegetation structure and function. For example, mesoscale convective systems provide large proportions of rainfall within central Africa and the Amazon ([Andrews et al., 2024](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-023-06903-7), [Rehbein et al., 2017](https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/joc.5171)), while also influencing tree mortality via windthrow (e.g., [Negrón-Juárez et al., 2018](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aabe9f/meta), [Feng et al., 2023](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-35570-1)). Precipitation controls flooding cycles within the African and Amazon rainforests ([Alsdorf et al., 2016](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016RG000517), [Hawes and Peres 2016](https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12315)), which in turn, affects lowland floodplain forests as they adapt to long periods of submersion and water-logging that can affect oxygen availability, reduce photosynthesis, and decrease water conductance ([Parolin et al., 2004a,](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02803209) [Parolin et al., 2016](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27422-5_6), Hawes and Peres 2016). Indirectly, rainfall can also significantly influence local nutrient cycles via wet nutrient deposition onto forest canopies (Bauters et al., [2018](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1714597115), [2021](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25428-3)), altering the amount and quality of light available for photosynthesis via clouds and fog (Philippon et al., 2019, [Pohl](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112620) et al., 2021), and evapotranspiration and photosynthesis via dew deposition (e.g., [Gerlein-Safdi et al., 2018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.05.015), [Binks et al., 2019](https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14666)).

Tropical climate systems are changing in other important ways. Large-scale deforestation, anthropogenic aerosols, greenhouse gases, and changes in sea surface temperature (SST) patterns can alter cross-equatorial ([Cook and Vizy 2015](https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-14-00230.1)) and land-ocean energy transport and temperatures ([Zhou et al., 2019](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-019-0603-9)). In turn, this affects tropical precipitation and moisture patterns via changes to the intertropical convergence zone (ITCZ; [Schneider et al., 2014](https://www.nature.com/articles/nature13636), [Byrne et al., 2018](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40641-018-0110-5#ref-CR26)), monsoons ([Cook and Vizy 2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40641-019-00130-1), and regional-scale dynamic systems ([Cook and Vizy 2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-019-05033-3), [Creese et al., 2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-019-04728-x), [Montini et al., 2019](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD029634)). Climate phenomena such as ENSO, the Madden-Julian Oscillation, the Indian Ocean Dipole, and Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation can alter tropical convection and induce climate variability ([Raghavendra et al., 2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-020-05133-5), [Dias et al., 2017](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD026526), Gu and Adler, 2018) by modifying dynamic systems that control rainfall ([Jiang et al., 2021](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092370)), or inducing drying and droughts ([Ndehedehe et al., 2018](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969718336489?casa_token=oSJiFPgcdAYAAAAA:Js7DfKa7_T4JbahgzIGAPO0CZ2fPKZT1yC1hpZOG8glUpVcXpfS0ZzL4Y4_YYvqIDxrnqRdDjtk)). Due to these changes, tropical forests are experiencing significant changes in their water cycle, including increases in dry season lengths and intensity ([Jiang et al., 2019](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-019-0512-y), [Staal et al., 2020](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ab738e/meta)), variability in wet season onsets (Yin et al., 2014), decadal-scale declines in rainfall ([Zhou et al., 2014](https://www.nature.com/articles/nature13265)), and changes to the timing and intensity of mesoscale convective systems (Taylor et al., 2018, [Rehbein and Ambrizzi 2023](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-022-06657-8)). However, they are showing different responses to changes in water availability. Central African tropical forests appear less responsive to drought conditions compared to the Amazon rainforests ([Tao et al., 2022](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2116626119), [Asefi-Najafabady and Saatchi 2013](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0306), [Saatchi et al., 2012](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1204651110), [Bennett et al., 2021](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2003169118)), and in general, intact, wetter tropical forests seem better able to withstand these changing climatic conditions ([Bennett et al., 2023](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-023-01776-4)).

The tropical forest carbon balance is increasingly fragile due to a range of hydrological and thermal conditions. Critical thresholds are often linked to the point at which soil water availability drops below the needs for maintaining stomatal conductance, leading to reduced carbon assimilation ([Blinks et al., 2016](https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.13927)). The critical soil moisture threshold can vary between tropical regions. In the Amazon, deep-rooted trees can access water from deeper soil layers, which delays the onset of water stress compared to African or Southeast Asian forests where root systems are often shallower ([Fan et al., 2017](https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1712381114)). In addition, prolonged dry seasons [(Marengo et al., 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/mi2V) or increased frequency of droughts [(Jenkins, 2009)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/Z0Ps), can lead to water stress [(Rifai et al., 2019; Santos et al., 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/B1av+RyhY), reduced tree growth [(Ouédraogo et al., 2013; Sullivan et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/8ori+NFvI+kmVD), and increased mortality rates, particularly for drought-sensitive species [(Malhi et al., 2009; Phillips et al., 2009)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/FyA7D+QrVfD). Finally, tropical forests are near their thermal tolerance limit, with photosynthesis rates decreasing sharply at temperatures above 32-35°C ([Doughty & Goulden, 2008](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2007JG000632); [Doughty et al., 2023](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-023-06391-z)). Beyond this threshold, the efficiency of the photosynthetic machinery declines, and photoinhibition can occur, reducing carbon uptake. Prolonged exposure to elevated temperatures, especially when coupled with drought and reduced soil moisture, can lead to widespread tree mortality as forests are pushed beyond critical thresholds faster than either factor alone. This feedback loop can drive regions into a state of persistent stress, where recovery becomes increasingly difficult.

Projected increases in the intensity and frequency of extreme weather events can alter ecosystem structure and function in many ways, including higher tree mortality rates, loss of canopy cover, and subsequent changes in species composition and ecosystem processes [(Uriarte et al. 2019; Feng et al. 2023; Negron-Juarez et al. 2023)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/Kyl6g+xVK1H+gc1mx). Increases in precipitation can increase streamflow and induce heavy floods within primarily rainfed watersheds ([Marengo et al., 2012](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00704-011-0465-1)). With increasing temperatures and changing rainfall patterns, thresholds are being tested [(Esquivel-Muelbert et al., 2019)](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/gcb.14413). For instance, during the 2015 El Niño event, parts of the Amazon experienced temperatures that exceeded critical thresholds, leading to significant forest dieback (Liu et al., 2017, Jiménez-Muñoz et al., 2016). Variability in temperature sensitivity can be observed across tropical continents. African forests, particularly those in West Africa, are often exposed to higher temperatures and may be more adapted to heat stress compared to the relatively cooler, more humid regions of Southeast Asia ([Malhi et al., 2013](https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2012.0312)). However, this adaptation might come at the cost of reduced overall photosynthetic capacity under extreme conditions. Meanwhile, tropical forests, especially within the Congo Basin (Worden et al., 2024) are heavily reliant on moisture recycling to produce their own rainfall. Reductions in moisture recycling can exacerbate drying in both local and nonlocal regions (Zemp et al., 2017), and delay the rainy season onsets ([Leite-Filho et al., 2019](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD029537)), eventually leading to critical transition points and possibly even tipping points (Flores et al., 2024). Exceeding these climate thresholds could lead to subsequent shifts to alternative states, such as savannas, which are less capable of supporting globally important tropical forest ecosystem services [(Aguirre-Gutiérrez et al., 2020; Flores et al., 2024; Nobre et al., 2016; Scheffer et al., 2001)](https://paperpile.com/c/ovIUza/zrGk+iDoN+6fAo+yCO2).

### 2.4 Social-Ecological Systems

***This PANGEA Science Theme will investigate the interactions and feedbacks between social and ecological systems, including the feedbacks from which co-benefits for nature and societies arise, such as food, water, energy and livelihood security, biodiversity conservation, human health, and climate resilience and adaptation.***

The immense biodiversity of terrestrial tropical ecosystems supports globally important services like climate change mitigation, and provides livelihoods for millions of people (Pillay, et al). Tropical forests provide humans with a range of resources such as food, water, and timber, and other benefits like soil formation, nutrient cycling, and crop pollination. Tropical ecosystems are also vital for cultural identity and heritage preservation that sustain Indigenous Peoples and Local communities’ unique spiritual and religious sovereignty. For millennia, humans have modified tropical ecosystems to facilitate the provision of these benefits (Levis et al, 2024), and increase their resilience to disturbances like fire, droughts, and pests.

Traditional management practices have more recently been complemented or replaced by larger scale management practices, intensification of land-use, and informal and illegal activities that have led to large-scale deforestation, changes in biogeochemical cycles, water cycling and major and irreversible losses of biodiversity. Such unsustainable practices has led to the emergence of a web of private, public, and civil governance systems that regulate the access to and use of land and its natural resources (von Essen & Lambin, 2021, Lambin et al, 2018). The development of social-ecological systems in tropical ecosystems has been shaped by complex interactions that result from a diversity of actors, each differing in their values, capacities, and goals that influence their relationships with nature (Meyfroidt et al., 2018, 2022). Despite their critical role in climate regulation, biodiversity conservation, and provision of essential benefits to human well-being (Olesen et al. 2022), tropical ecosystems are increasingly threatened by environmental changes and overexploitation, leading to shifts in species composition, declines in ecosystem health, reduced resilience, and diminished productivity across key resources and benefits (Siyum, 2020). These shifts affect the functioning of the Earth system, inducing local and regional changes in social-ecological feedbacks and affecting benefits that humans derive from and contribute to (Houghton and Castanho, 2022, Mendoza-Ponce et al., 202).

Several conceptual frameworks have been developed to understand the relationships between and within social and ecological systems. Prominent approaches include the Club of Rome report (Donella et al, 1972), the sustainable livelihoods framework (Scoones, 1998), and various models of social-ecological systems (Anderies et al., 2004; Folke, 2006; Ostrom, 2009). Other frameworks focus on coupled human-nature systems (Liu et al., 2007), ecosystem services (Costanza et al., 2017; Daily, 1997), nature’s contributions to people (Díaz et al., 2018; Pascual et al., 2017), and social-ecological co-benefits (Levis et al, 2024). While these frameworks may differ in their definitions (Colding & Barthel, 2019), they converge on key principles and variables that describe the social-ecological system, facilitating comparability and systematic operationalization, often through the use of remote sensing, field-based surveys, and auxiliary data in both ecological and social realms. Adopting a systems perspective that integrates human and environmental processes, interactions, and feedbacks is critical for assessing the sustainability of natural systems (Ostrom, 2009), in particular for the highly dynamic ecosystems of the tropics.

Analyzing processes through the lens of complex social-ecological systems puts a focus on systemic aspects, including interactions, feedback mechanisms and dynamics exhibiting path dependency and non-linear change (Dearing et al. 2010, Mueller et al. 2024), and reveals new and complex patterns and processes not evident when studied by social or natural scientists separately (Liu et al. 2007). In tropical social-ecological systems, feedbacks play a critical role in maintaining resilience and guiding the trajectory of these systems (Dearing, et al. 2010). Feedbacks, both positive and negative, occur when changes in the environment or human behavior trigger responses that either amplify or mitigate those changes, including non-linear ones (Mueller et al. 2024). For instance, in tropical forests, deforestation from agriculture can degrade ecosystem services like water regulation, leading to soil erosion and reduced agricultural yields. This negative feedback can, in turn, drive further clearance as communities seek fertile land, creating and reinforcing degradation cycles.

Conversely, positive feedbacks can emerge from restoration efforts, such as diversified agricultural systems. These restoration practices can enhance biodiversity, improve ecosystem services, and provide economic benefits, fostering greater investment in conservation. Understanding and managing these feedbacks is essential for ensuring long-term sustainability, as they reveal points of leverage where interventions can stabilize or enhance system resilience in the face of disturbances. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41559-020-1230-6>

This dynamic is especially relevant in the emerging concept of socio-ecological hope spots (Levis, et al. 2024). Hope spots reimagine conservation as a process that integrates both ecological and cultural dimensions, recognizing that IPLCs have long influenced biodiversity through land management practices. The case of the Upper Xingu hope spot, located in the Brazilian Amazon’s arc of deforestation, demonstrates the power of such integration (REF). Indigenous groups like the Kuikuro have enriched biodiversity through millennia of landscape management, including the creation of anthropogenic soils, domestication of diverse crops, and formation of cultural forests. Rather than degrading ecosystems, these practices have created resilient systems that benefit both nature and people. By engaging Indigenous knowledge alongside remote sensing technologies, the Upper Xingu hope spot offers a model of how conservation can benefit from Two-Eyed Seeing or the integration of Indigenous knowledge and Western science.

* Example of 'phases' of social-ecological feedbacks over time (from the Chinese Loess Plateau) - https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abc0276
* Examples for tropical systems - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479718312143?casa_token=cxfFkv6F_igAAAAA:DLaHvuw4agyahJvei9iTwgW4FjqQTycbefcbpXVP8_a1om8VP5zBymunTFWOJx00o3dxMuYCUw>
* <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479721007374?casa_token=o8G0pMiVb_IAAAAA:TkA3MJhwzaGWDCKEVrjs5fESxFN6Y7HxyOx2q1AmVv8WquV9zoBsNXiLlwHYP-3wIbhR9BaK6g>

<https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/pan3.10167>

The tropical forests are regions of cultural and biological diversity, home to a vast array of ecosystems and communities that have coexisted for millennia (Nobre et al. 2021). However, this diversity is increasingly under threat due to a variety of human activities that disrupt the balance between social and ecological systems (Malhi et al. 2014). Small-scale and subsistence agriculture, which has traditionally been practiced sustainably by many indigenous, local communities and settlers, is now often driven to unsustainable levels due to population pressures and economic needs. Additionally, the expansion of commercial agriculture, driven by global demand for commodities like palm oil, soy, and coffee, has led to widespread deforestation and habitat fragmentation, severely impacting biodiversity and ecosystem functions (Curtis et al. 2018, Haddad et al. 2024).

Cattle Ranching is another significant driver of land-use change in the tropics, particularly in regions like the Amazon, where vast tracts of forest are cleared to make way for cattle pastures (Mapbiomas 2023). This not only contributes to loss of biodiversity but also alters carbon and water cycles, exacerbating climate change (Nobre et al. 2016). Illicit activities, such as unregulated mining, further degrade the environment by contaminating water sources, destroying habitats, and displacing local communities (REF). Timber harvesting, often carried out illegally or without regard for sustainable practices, leads to the depletion of forests that are critical for maintaining ecological balance and supporting the livelihoods of indigenous peoples (REF). (include land conflicts Moutinho et al…)

These human activities create complex interactions and feedbacks between social and ecological systems, resulting in a cascade of environmental and social impacts (REF). For instance, the degradation of ecosystems can reduce the availability of ecosystem services, such as clean water, fertile soil, and pollination, which are vital for the well-being of local communities (REF). In turn, the loss of these services can drive further unsustainable practices as communities struggle to meet their basic needs, perpetuating a cycle of environmental degradation and social hardship (Lambin & Meyfroidt, 2011). Understanding these interactions is critical for developing strategies that can protect the integrity of tropical ecosystems while also supporting the livelihoods and cultures of the people who depend on them.

Unfortunately, research on these feedbacks in the tropics is sparse, there are several studies that talk about the impacts of human activities, but few that closes the loop on how they create cascading impacts to people and environment. This represents significant gaps in our understanding of how complex interactions between human activities and ecological systems unfold over time. This scarcity of research hampers our ability to accurately predict the long-term impacts of human actions on tropical ecosystems, such as deforestation, agricultural expansion, and resource extraction, and their subsequent effects on local communities. Without a more comprehensive understanding, efforts to develop effective conservation strategies and sustainable management practices in these biodiverse and ecologically sensitive areas are severely constrained. Moreover, the lack of detailed, region-specific studies means that current models often fail to capture the full complexity of these interactions, potentially leading to misguided policies that do not adequately address the unique challenges faced by tropical regions.

Understanding these feedbacks is critical for predicting the future trajectories of tropical ecosystems because these interactions play a fundamental role in determining how these systems respond to both natural and human-induced changes. By comprehensively studying the dynamic relationships between social and ecological factors, researchers can gain insights into how tropical ecosystems might evolve under different scenarios, such as continued deforestation, climate change, or shifts in agricultural practices (Pörtner et al. 2021). This understanding is essential for forecasting potential outcomes, such as species loss, changes in ecosystem services, or the resilience of these ecosystems to external pressures (Leclère et al., 2020). Accurate predictions allow scientists to identify potential tipping points, where small changes could lead to irreversible damage, and to design interventions that might prevent or mitigate such outcomes (Staal et al., 2020, Liu et al., 2024, Flores et al. 2024).

Moreover, this knowledge is indispensable for empowering local communities and decision-makers with the information they need to govern these ecosystems effectively. Tropical regions are often home to indigenous and local populations whose livelihoods are intimately tied to the health of their surrounding environment. By understanding the feedbacks between human activities and ecosystem health, these communities can make more informed decisions about land use, resource management, and conservation efforts that align with both ecological sustainability and their socio-economic needs (Aguiar et al., 2020). Decision-makers at regional and national levels can also use this information to craft policies that balance development goals with the preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, ensuring that the benefits of these ecosystems are equitably shared and sustained for future generations (Pörtner et al., 2021). Ultimately, the ability to predict and manage the complex feedbacks in tropical ecosystems is key to fostering both environmental and social resilience in these critical regions.

In SES research, significant gaps remain, particularly in linking the drivers and effects of SES across regions with long histories of human management and stewardship. This is especially relevant in large systems like the Amazon, Congo, and Mekong river basins, where human interventions over millennia have altered both ecological and social outcomes (Wu, et al. 2024). Analyzing these regions through a multi–scalar lens can reveal critical insights into how these interactions have developed over time.

SES research remains too generalized, with a need for more fine-grained analyses that consider both direct and indirect drivers of ecosystems, such as climate change, land-use change, and socio-economic dynamics (Liu, et al. xx). This is particularly important in tracing how these drivers affect ecosystem services, biodiversity, and human well-being over time.

A research frontier lies in addressing emerging areas. The first is incorporating feedbacks into ecosystem models, where the dynamic interplay between ecological impacts and human well-being is quantified. This might mean, exploring how changes in biodiversity, ecosystem health, and ecosystem services directly affect livelihoods, health, and social stability. Moreover, new research might focus on disaggregating outcomes to address distributional equity, ensuring that SES research accounts for different social groups, stakeholders, and rights holders, and the inequities they face in managing resources. Finally, more research is needed seeking to analyze dynamic feedbacks between ecosystem services and social-economic systems, recognizing that the co-benefits of ecosystem services must be considered in terms of their contributions to both ecological integrity and economic stability (Chaplin-Kramer et al 2024).

—

**Note:** we don't need to have a research strategy for how to address our science questions; those will be addressed in section 5 Research Strategy and Study Design. Maybe we can include a short mention of research strategy and then refer to section 5, the quote from the ABoVE WP below can be used as inspiration for how to write about it.

Quote from ABoVE as inspiration for how to write about this section: *"Research to address these human dimensions questions will require an integrated approach using the results from studies being carried out for other science themes. Specifically, the questions on human impacts on fire and insect regimes will be coordinated with research for the disturbance science theme, with data on land management activities being integrated with other disturbance data sets to determine the role of human activities. The research on the impacts of human disturbances will be coordinated with those activities being carried out for the permafrost and surface hydrology science themes. In these cases, it will be necessary to obtain high-resolution airborne or satellite remote sensing imagery (e.g., IKONOS, QuickBird) or aerial photography to quantify the location and extent of the disturbances."*

**Text-snippets that we can consider integrating in the sections above:**

The resulting decline in species richness can have far-reaching implications, potentially undermining ecosystem services (e.g. pollination, pest control, seed dispersal), affecting food security by disrupting the food-networks, and modifying the functional diversity of the ecosystem, impeding the ability of local population to adapt to global environmental changes.

There have been many calls for ecosystem management and conservation to better consider social-ecological context (Fischer et al. 2017), to recognize that most landscapes are human dominated (Sanderson et al. 2002, Ellis et al. 2021), and to pay closer attention to human agency and context specificity of human activities (Ramankutty and Rhemtulla 2013, Pratzer et al. 2024).

Weak consideration of the complexity of social-ecological systems can not only conceal threats but also lead to missed opportunities in forest conservation. For instance, positive effects of Indigenous land-based stewardship on forest conservation and ecosystem service provisioning have recently been identified by several scientific studies (Vasco et al 2018, Baragwanath and Bayi 2020, Pratzer et al. 2023), in addition to Indigenous knowledge holders who have long provided contextual evidence of the various ecological values of their territories (Cajete 2000, Salmón 2000, Umeek 2011). Indeed, Indigenous land-based stewardship is often compatible with, and frequently actively supports, forest conservation and restoration (Newton et al. 2016, Fernández-Llamazares et al. 2024). This recognition has spawned innovative ways to design multi-functional reserves, policy instruments and management programmes (Garnett et al 2018).

SES APPROACH/METHODS

Remote sensing [Maria Santos]

* Detection of LULCC
* Identification of crop types; yield mapping (opportunities for RS-based precision ag in the tropics)
* Identification of agroforestry systems

Field data

* Using qualitative methods like interviews and focus groups to complement remote sensing data ,
* Governance [MVE]
* Economics
* Perceptions & culture [Ale Echeverri Ochoa?]

Methods: network analysis, social capital, modeling (biophysical models)

### 2.5 Disturbance Dynamics

***This PANGEA Science Theme will investigate how disturbance regimes are changing and altering carbon cycle feedbacks via climate, biodiversity, hydrologic cycling, and nutrient availability.***

Tropical forests are home for more than half of the world’s biodiversity and play a significant role in global carbon cycling. They are increasingly threatened by both natural disturbances (such as storms, fires, and pests) and human activities (such as logging, agriculture, and land-use change). Land-use change, particularly the conversion of forests to agricultural land, represents one of the most significant drivers of tropical deforestation. This not only results in the direct loss of biomass but also fragments the forest landscape, reducing connectivity and resilience (Hansen et al., 2013). The transformation of land often leads to soil degradation and the loss of critical ecosystem services, which can further impede forest recovery even if the land is later abandoned or restored. Fires, whether natural or anthropogenic, have increasingly become a concern due to their capacity to cause widespread damage. Fires can drastically reduce biomass, alter species composition, and create feedback loops that make forests more prone to future fires (Cochrane & Laurance, 2002). The frequency and intensity of fires are exacerbated by land-use changes that create drier, more fire-prone conditions. These lead to alterations in forest structure, affecting tree species composition and potentially leading to long-term consequences for forest resilience and global climate regulation.

However, tropical forests are increasingly threatened by confluence of environmental stressors such as climate change, extreme weather events, and changes in land cover and land use, triggering complex feedback mechanisms that extend far beyond the affected areas. These stressors not only disrupt the functionality of tropical forest ecosystems but also undermine their ability to provide essential services and maintain resilience in the face of ongoing environmental change. For example, changes in functional traits of plant species in human-modified ecosystems can lead to exacerbated negative effects of fire and climatic variation on tree growth and mortality, and making the resilience of forest ecosystems more difficult (Berenguer et al., 2021).

For instance, deforestation promotes changes in rainfall patterns, impacting regional water availability. The ability of tropical continents to absorb carbon from the atmosphere has been decreasing in recent decades, directly affecting the atmospheric CO2 concentration and climate. Climate change, characterized by increasing temperatures, shifting precipitation patterns, and increased atmospheric CO2 concentrations, affect tropical forest functioning. Land cover and land use changes, particularly deforestation and forest degradation, pose significant threats to tropical forest ecosystems [(Longo et al. 2020; Davidson et al. 2012)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/ydSLE+b3f4f). The conversion of forests to agricultural land, urban areas, or other land uses leads to habitat loss, fragmentation, and a reduction in forest cover, which in turn affects biodiversity and ecosystem functioning [(Gibson et al. 2011; Truong et al. 2022; Wei et al. 2014)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/SlHIN+cKbKV+eTw1y). Deforestation and wildfires also contribute to climate change by releasing stored carbon into the atmosphere, further exacerbating the impacts of global warming [(Houghton 2012; Gatti et al. 2021; Li et al. 2022; Harris et al. 2021; Bauters et al. 2018)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/NfoJ+QrN0+M0ek+WVni+y0P1). Forest degradation, often resulting from selective logging or fire, can diminish the resilience of tropical forests by altering species and functional composition, reducing biodiversity, and making forests more susceptible to invasive species and further disturbances [(Baker et al. 2007; Laurance et al. 2008; Bourgoin et al. 2024)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/m10J8+IwPWt+Rqs0e).

Resilience, the ability of an ecosystem to maintain its fundamental structure and function [(Holling 1973)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/agClR), is critical for the continued provision of ecosystem services . The resilience of tropical forests is increasingly challenged by the synergistic impacts of different disturbances including climate change, extreme weather events, and alterations in land use. Furthermore, the spatial variations of these thresholds across continents are still not well understood [(Bennett et al. 2021; Wigneron et al. 2020)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/gc2Z6+clnnk). Understanding the interactions between these stressors and their cumulative impacts on tropical forests is crucial for developing strategies to conserve these ecosystems and enhance their resilience in the face of ongoing environmental change.

Due to a similar mechanism, surface temperature warming from this biophysical effects of forest degradation is found to be comparable to its biogeochemical climate effects [(Zhu et al. 2023)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/L9zxN), highlighting the need of consider the biophysical climate feedback of tropical forests in climate policy [(Windisch et al. 2021)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/Oqo0O), and carbon accounting system [(Li et al. 2022)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/M0ek).

Despite the uncertainties in understanding the local and nonlocal rainfall feedback from tropical forests, it is crucial to move forward this process to better understand the impacts of these feedbacks on ecosystem carbon stocks [(Uribe et al. 2023)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/8aJWF), biodiversity [(Peters et al. 2019)](https://paperpile.com/c/gMdJbo/q4lha), and socioeconomics across continents in the tropics.

Reduced soil moisture can also lead to decreased evapotranspiration, further intensifying local temperature increases.Disturbances including forest fragmentation and logging can also exacerbate the negative drought impacts on forest structure and dynamics, but these links can be complex due to interacting environmental variables and also dependent on the disturbance frequency and intensity (Nunes et al., 2021).

During extreme events, the Amazon’s carbon cycle is highly sensitive to both droughts and floods, while the Congo is more vulnerable to droughts. These differences highlight the need for region-specific strategies to manage and protect these critical ecosystems in the face of climate change.

Climate and LCLUC changes have modified the pantropical water cycle, including changes in atmospheric moisture, surface water, ground storage, and precipitation distribution, intensity, and variability ([Gentine et al., 2019](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ab22d6/meta), [Allan et al., 2020](https://nyaspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/nyas.14337)). In addition, changes to the thermodynamic structure of the atmosphere, such as increases in convective available potential energy (CAPE; [Nicholson et al., 2022](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac61c4/meta)) and atmospheric instability ([Taylor et al., 2018](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2018GL080516)) can affect precipitation intensity and frequency (Taylor et al., 2018, [Yin et al., 2014](https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021349)).

Meanwhile, anthropogenic and climate disturbances alter tropical rainforest moisture recycling ([Wright et al., 2017](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1621516114), [Sori et al., 2022](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781119657002.ch11), [van der Ent et al., 2010)](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2010WR009127), leading to changes to monsoon systems ([Boers et al., 2017](https://nature.com/articles/srep41489#ref-CR15)), atmospheric drying ([Xu et al., 2022](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac4c1d/meta)), and decreases in precipitation ([Bell et al., 2015](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2014JD022586), [Smith et al., 2023](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-022-05690-1)). At the surface, these changes in climate and LCLUC have induced fluctuations in river discharge ([Nhedehede et al., 2022](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119657002.ch5), [Heerspink et al., 2020](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214581820302299)). Increases in precipitation can increase streamflow and induce heavy floods within primarily rain-fed watersheds ([Marengo et al., 2012](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00704-011-0465-1)), while deforestation increases streamflow and sediment fluxes ([Levy et al., 2018](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017GL076526)) due to reductions in evapotranspiration and infiltration ([Costa et al., 2003](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(03)00267-1), [Souza-Filho et al., 2016](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479715303935?via%3Dihub#bib10)).

For example, the 2015/2016 ENSO induced large meteorological and soil water droughts and increases in vapor pressure deficits that were exacerbated due to warming trends from climate change ([Rifai et al., 2019](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ab402f/meta)). These phenomena can also covary to further modulate tropical climate, such as modifying dynamic systems that control rainfall ([Jiang et al., 2021](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092370)), or inducing drying and droughts ([Ndehedehe et al., 2018](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969718336489?casa_token=oSJiFPgcdAYAAAAA:Js7DfKa7_T4JbahgzIGAPO0CZ2fPKZT1yC1hpZOG8glUpVcXpfS0ZzL4Y4_YYvqIDxrnqRdDjtk)).

However, the mechanisms controlling present and future changes to tropical rainforest water cycling are not yet fully understood, in part due to large uncertainties in model representation of these processes ([Tamoffo et al., 2019b](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-019-04751-y), [Baker et al., 2021](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/abfb2e/meta)), the anthropogenic impacts on these processes ([Dagan et al., 2023](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-023-01319-8)), and lack of data to constrain model estimates ([Washington et al., 2013](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0296)). For example, intense amounts of biomass burning within and nearby the tropical regions ([Chen et al., 2024](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-5227-2023)) alter atmospheric conditions both locally and in non-local regions down-wind, even extending to cross-continental transport ([Adebiyi and Zuidema 2016](https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2765), [Barkley et al., 2019](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906091116)). These impacts on tropical water cycling are highly uncertain in models ([Brown et al., 2021](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-20482-9), and in part contribute to large disagreements to projections of future climate conditions over tropical rainforests ([Dosio et al., 2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-019-04900-3)).

Ultimately, previous studies indicate variability in tropical rainforest carbon cycling in response to changes to its water cycle, although with spatial heterogeneity between continents and within the rainforests themselves. For example, in response to meteorological anomalies induced by the 2015/2016 El Nino, tropical rainforests temporarily became net carbon sources, but for different reasons depending on the continent ([Liu et al., 2017](https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.aam5690)). In addition, these rainforests exhibit different responses to drought, with the Congolese rainforests less responsive to such perturbations compared to the Amazon rainforests ([Tao et al., 2022](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2116626119), [Asefi-Najafabady and Saatchi 2013](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0306), [Saatchi et al., 2012](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1204651110), [Bennett et al., 2021](https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2003169118)). This extends to inter-basin variability with intact, wetter rainforest generally less vulnerable to these perturbations ([Bennett et al., 2023](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-023-01776-4)).

[placeholder: role of biodiversity in tropical forest response to and recovery from disturbance]

## 3. Knowledge Gaps & Questions

In spite of the global importance of tropical forests, there remains great uncertainty about basic patterns and processes, limiting our ability to effectively forecast their future role in the Earth system. PANGEA science questions are interdisciplinary and cut across multiple themes. For this reason, questions addressing key knowledge gaps that relate to the PANGEA Science Themes described in Section 2 are organized below according to **pattern**, **process**, and **projected future change**.

### 3.1 Pattern

Varying geographic patterns of tropical carbon stocks and fluxes, as well as their interannual and intrannual variability and responses to extreme events remain poorly understood. Satellite remote sensing now makes it possible to map annual forest-related emissions and removals from changes in biomass at a range of spatial resolutions (e.g., 4m - Xkm) (Harris et al 2021; Xu et al 2021; Csillik et al 2019). However, estimates of the biomass stocks, as well as the magnitude of fluxes, still require spatial maps of tropical forest biomass, which are generated from integrating ground inventory plots with airborne and satellite data using statistical relationships and increasingly AI. In reality, forest plots, which are based on allometry, can miss variation due to the lack of species-specific allometric equations, buttressed trees, and errors with missing woody biomass in branches. Terrestrial lidar offers opportunities for more accurate ground data, but is labor-intensive to process the data. Ground plots are also relatively sparse relative to the amount of carbon in biomass, and much more calibration/validation is needed to scale estimates of aboveground biomass. GEO-TREES, a PANGEA partner effort, is developing a biomass reference system across forests globally, with “strong priority placed on the tropics” to improve the calibration and validation of satellite-derived biomass mapping. This will include coordinated ground measurements (forest inventory plot censuses), terrestrial laser scanning, and drone and aircraft lidar data collection. However, despite the advances with satellite remote sensing, higher temporal resolution of carbon, energy, and water fluxes are still critical for understanding how fluxes respond to environmental drivers and extreme events. A critical gap, however, is fluxes from respiration, methane emissions, and lateral flows of carbon, which have been shown to be substantial in tropical forests (REFS).

Eddy covariance flux measurements are one of the few ways to measure the ecosystem-scale exchange of carbon, water, and energy across time (hours to decades) and space (leaves to communities) (Baldocchi 2020). Long-term eddy covariance flux measurements, inclusive of CO2 and CH4 fluxes, including ecosystem respiration, also enable direct monitoring of changing forcings, including warming temperatures, shifting rainfall regimes and soil moisture, rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations, changing phenology, compositional shifts resulting in changing structural and functional plant traits, and land-use change (Keenan et al., 2013; Keenan et al., 2014; Stocker et al., 2018; Fernández‐Martínez et al., 2014; Magnani et al., 2007; Balzarolo et al., 2016; Keenan et al., 2014; Chen, Dirmeyer, Guo, & Schultz, 2018; Luyssaert et al., 2007; Thornton et al., 2002). The long-term data and ability to capture extreme events has facilitated critical findings; under LBA, eddy covariance captured the previously unknown late dry-season increases in GPP (Doughty and Goulden 2008, Saleska et al. 2003). In addition, the ability to capture diurnal cycles aid in modeling efforts … (REF). By capturing areas ranging from tens to hundreds of meters, eddy covariance towers also play a critical role in ground-truthing remote sensing measurements. Despite the advances and growing number of planned eddy covariance flux towers in the tropics, they are still underrepresented globally (Schimel et al., 2015), due to the high cost of installation and maintenance. For example, only a single, recent flux tower has been built in Central Africa (Sibret et al. 2022). While there have been about 21 towers across the Amazon, most flux tower data ended around 2014, and they are geographically biased towards the lower precipitation and lower soil fertility gradient in the central Amazon (REFS). This leads to discrepancies in both our understanding of environmental drivers of variation, but also our ability to predict how fluxes will respond to large perturbations. For example, models project that about half the precipitation within the Amazon Basin comes from evapotranspiration carried via trade winds to the Andes, but we lack towers in the western Amazon to ground-truth these estimates, making it difficult to model future precipitation (REF).

[argument about integrating tools/what PANGEA can do. Despite the advantages that eddy covariance towers provide, we still need to integrate across multiple tools sets. First, eddy covariance still doesn’t allow us to partition beyond net fluxes, so we will need ways to capture NPP, mortality, and soil respiration to actually understand processes. Second, there is still a scale mismatch between flux towers and spaceborne that airborne could fill a role in for. Third, PANGEA can help provide the opportunity to standardize among networks such as AsiaFLUX, FluxNET, etc.]

Current literature stresses that the observational coverage of CH4 fluxes from wetlands and aquatic systems in the tropics is extremely limited compared to temperate and boreal regions (Johnson et al., 2022; Melack et al., 2022; Stanley et al., 2023). The lack of flux observations for use in mechanistic model development and statistical upscaling has led to poorly quantified tropical wetland (Ganesan et al., 2019) and inland water system (Rosentreter et al., 2021) CH4 emissions. Existing mechanistic wetland models have large differences in tropical CH4 emissions (Melton et al., 2013; Bloom et al., 2017) and do not capture observed seasonality of CH4 in tropical regions dominated by forested wetlands (Melack et al., 2022). Much of this difference is driven by the lack of fine-scale measurements detailing the drivers of wetland and aquatic emissions (Melack et al., 2022) and the threefold difference in wetland/inundation extents applied in individual models (Peng et al., 2022). Tropical forested wetlands are an uncertain component of the global CH4 budget due to the: a) complexity of the meteorology, hydrology, ecology, land-use practices, and CH4 emission drivers in these regions; and b) extreme data limitations amplified by cloud cover prevalence that inhibits satellite retrievals (Ganesan et al., 2019; Melack et al., 2022). Given these complexities in the main flux drivers (e.g., meteorology, hydrology, biomass, vegetation type, soil moisture, edaphic factors, aquatic constituents/quality, etc.) and the persistent cloud coverage in the tropics inhibiting our understanding of tropical forest GHG fluxes, PANGEA will acquire vital suborbital remote-sensing and in situ data coincident with ground-based observations to improve regional CH4 model capabilities and emission budget estimates.

More recently, polar-orbiting satellite sensors like the Orbiting Carbon Observatory (OCO-2, OCO-3), TROPOMI, and geostrationary satellites like GOES-R are being used to estimate CO2 emissions, terrestrial GPP, and ecosystem respiration (OCO & TROPOMI REFS needed; Khan et al. 2021; Ranjbar et al. 2023). Sensors like SWOT, measuring surface water flows, enable direct measurements of lateral carbon fluxes from tropical systems. **Effectively and accurately using these satellite measurements to map and monitor spatial and temporal variation in carbon stocks and fluxes over the tropics, however, requires filling major data and methodological gaps.** To address knowledge gaps directly related to variation in carbon stocks and fluxes, PANGEA will answer the following questions:

* *How does spatial variation in tropical forest* ***carbon stocks and fluxes*** *relate to spatial variation in climate, hydrological cycling, soils, geomorphology, and anthropogenic influences / land-use and land cover change?*
* *How does* ***temporal variation*** *in tropical landscape carbon fluxes relate to temporal variation in climate change trends and extreme events?*
* *How do tropical forests vary in their* ***disturbance regimes****?*
* *How does geographic and temporal variation in* ***tropical forest phenology*** *covary with carbon stocks and fluxes, and how is this changing in relation to systematic shifts in forcing processes, including climate, land-use, and disturbance regimes?*

[2-4 sentences about how PANGEA will do this - leave main methods for Section 6]

* *Will address sparse and poorly distributed ground data issue - improving scaling by coordinating aircraft data with ground and tower measurements to improve use of satellite data*
  + *Aboveground woody carbon stocks and fluxes: Plots*
  + *Net ecosystem flux: Eddy flux*
  + *Methane: eddy flux + chambers - link to Rob Jackson and Alison Hoyt’s work*
  + *Soils, hydrology - in situ measurements*
  + *Link to shifting climate and disturbance regimes*
* *For carbon stocks, we focus on aboveground woody biomass, a large pool in tropical forests and one amenable to remote sensing. For C fluxes, we include woody productivity, woody biomass losses, net change in woody biomass, NPP, GPP, net CO2, as well as CH4 fluxes (uptake, emissions, net flux).*

Given the enormous biodiversity in the tropics, understanding the interactions between geographic differences in biodiversity within and among tropical contints and carbon cycle dynamics is critical. [more specific motivation / knowledge gaps]

Recent advances in XYZ. As a result, PANGEA is well positioned to address knowledge gaps related to patterns of biodiversity by answering the following questions:

* *How does tropical* ***biodiversity*** *vary spatially with forest structure and function?*
* *What are the plant* ***functional trait distributions of tropical forests*** *on different continents, and how do these differences affect forest carbon cycle responses to extreme events and across disturbance and climatic gradients?*
* *To what degree are changing tropical carbon cycle dynamics caused by shifts in* ***plant functional composition****?*

Data-driven framework that integrates several data sources – including spectroscopy, DNA sequences, image recognition, morphological data, animal movement, bioacoustics data, and camera trap data.

…airborne and satellite campaigns with field campaigns to understand variation in detection of canopy foliar nutrients. Regarding how foliar nutrients vary from canopy to the forest floor and with soils, sampling in the tropics (and in general) is relatively scarce (Lira-Martins et al., 2019, Heineman et al., 2016); most vegetation models use standardized extinction coefficients based on optimality; a scoping mission can test these assumptions. Furthermore, do airborne lidar (i.e. leaf biomass distribution, LAI analogs, etc.) and hyperspectral trait retrievals (from NASA products) help to scale from local measurements?

*link to trait-tradeoffs - leaf economic spectrum, hydraulic tradeoffs, …*

* *There's a lot packed into this. How would PANGEA actually collect data on / measure the responses part? Map/evaluate tradeoffs across gradients?*
* *Refer to elements of previous questions in the written text:*
  + *How do tropical forest functional traits relate to interspecific variation in responses to spatial and temporal environmental variation, and how do these traits contribute to forest function?*
  + *How does variation in plant functional composition relate to woody productivity (GPP, CUE, and allocation to wood production) and woody residence time, and thus to spatial variation in tropical forest biomass?*
  + *How does functional composition influence ecosystem processes and tropical forest vulnerability and resilience to environmental change?*

The mechanisms controlling tropical rainforest land-atmosphere interactions represent one of the most uncertain aspects of the terrestrial climate system, in part due to the complex pathways through which they can take place and large variations in the spatial scales at which they occur (Lintner and Neelin, 2009, Betts and Silva Dias, 2010, Gentine et al., 2019). Additionally, investigating these interactions requires extensive use of models and reanalysis products that can vary significantly within the tropics due to factors such as heavy parameterization, lack of ground-based data to constrain estimates, and different representations of key processes (e.g., [Fisher et al., 2009](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01813.x), [Sibret et al., 2022](https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoil.2022.883236),[Lopez-Ballesteros et al., 2018](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aad66c/meta), [Seinfeld et al., 2016](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514043113)). For example, large variations exist in current carbon, water, and energy fluxes that cannot be measured directly over large scales, such as evapotranspiration and gross primary productivity (e.g., [Baker et al., 2021](https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-2279-2021), [Weerasinghe et al., 2020](https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-1565-2020), [Zhang and Ye 2021](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969721020350)). Meanwhile, studies investigating how land-atmosphere interactions influence large-scale atmospheric thermodynamic and dynamic conditions, as well as water and energy cycling, must heavily rely on climate models and reanalysis products (e.g., Staal et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2022, [Brown et al., 2021](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-20482-9), Te Wierik et al.,2022, Sori et al., 2022, [Seinfeld et al., 2016](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514043113), Liu et al., 2020).

Therefore, the impacts of changes in environmental conditions on these interactions are highly uncertain. For example, the central African rainforests appear to rely more heavily on moisture recycling to provide atmospheric moisture for rainfall than the Amazon (Worden et al., 2021, Baker and Spracklen 2022). Compared to the Amazon, central African studies investigating transport pathways for recycled atmospheric moisture, consequences of deforestation on moisture recycling, and potential thresholds for transition are either at non-regional scales or do not exist (Staal et al., 2023, Zemp et al., 2017, Xu et al., 2022, Flores et al., 2024, Theeuwen et al., 2023, Baker and Spracklen 2022, Te Wierik et al., 2022, Nyasulu et al., 2024, van der Ent et al., 2010). In addition, aerosol emissions, clouds, and their interactions can modulate available energy for carbon fluxes such as photosynthesis and respiration. Variability in regional and cross-continental climate conditions and cloudiness (e.g., Phillipon et al., 2018, Pohl et al., 2022, Martins et al., 2018, Chakraborty et al., 2019, Jonard et al., 2022), as well as magnitude, type, and location of anthropogenic disturbances (for example, large-scale deforestation *within* the south-eastern Amazon versus massive biomass burning *nearby* the central African forests) necessitates regionally-specific investigations of how changing environmental conditions affect carbon fluxes via climate feedbacks (Braghiere et al., 2020, Durand et al., 2021, Adebiyi and Zuidema 2016).

Hydroclimatic conditions in tropical rainforests additionally vary significantly along disturbance gradients, from intact forests to heavily fragmented landscapes (Gutierrez-Cori et al., 2021) and are unique across tropical regions as they are heavily shaped by local climate and disturbance histories. For example, deforestation and degradation have been directly linked to reductions in rainfall and increase dry season lengths and intensities (Staal et al., 2020, [Fu et al., 2013](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1302584110), [Spracklen and Garcia-Carreras 2015](https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066063)), while additionally inducing edge effects that alter local and nearby climate conditions such as increases in surface temperatures (Silva Junior et al., 2020, [Zhao et al., 2021](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-021-00763-8), Smith et al., 2018, Butt et al., 2023). The effects of these disturbances can happen at small spatial scales or be hard to measure, such as changes in local winds (Staal et al., 2020). Additionally, they can depend on the geographical distribution and spatial extent of deforestation (Butt et al., 2023), on background climate conditions, or interact with other factors such as climate change or natural fluctuations (Staal et al., 2020). Therefore, the role of these disturbances pushing tropical regions past water and temperature thresholds is thus highly uncertain.

PANGEA is well poised to address many of these uncertainties by answering the following questions:

* *How do changes in* ***land-atmosphere interactions****, including moisture recycling and carbon fluxes, vary with climate feedbacks, carbon storage capacity, and resilience of tropical forests under changing environmental conditions?*
* *Do* ***hydroclimatic thresholds****, such as critical soil moisture levels or thermal boundaries, vary within and between tropical continents, and how do hydroclimatic conditions vary along disturbance gradients?*

### 3.2 Process

Key processes remain highly uncertain, preventing modeling efforts and limiting XYZ.

The questions below address specific knowledge gaps associated with the processes that control heterogeneity in the vulnerability and resilience of tropical forest socio-ecological systems to carbon cycle perturbations.

Our ability to understand and predict how environmental variables drive carbon fluxes and stocks remains hindered by the discrepancy between the scales and quality of data collected for environmental variables and forest responses. Much of our understanding relies on information collected from individual sites, while studies across space have relied on syntheses of forest plot networks. These studies have demonstrated strong spatial variation in tropical forest aboveground biomass carbon (e.g. Sullivan et al., 2020, other REFS), but rely on coarse environmental data. Variation in biomass carbon has been attributed to maximum temperature and rainfall, with little variation explained by cloud cover, wind speed, and edaphic properties, despite their importance at local scales (Sullivan et al., 2020). The lack of variation explained by some of these predictors likely reflects the lack of strong environmental data, rather than lack of relationships. For example, these environmental variables have been obtained from large gridded datasets such as WorldClim and SoilGrids (~a minimum of 250 to 1 km resolution), which rely on extrapolated ground data. However, remote sensing offers a huge opportunity to improve upon environmental data and forest carbon sto

Current literature stresses that the observational coverage of CH4 fluxes from wetlands and aquatic systems in the tropics is extremely limited compared to temperate and boreal regions (Johnson et al., 2022; Melack et al., 2022; Stanley et al., 2023). The lack of flux observations for use in mechanistic model development and statistical upscaling has led to poorly quantified tropical wetland (Ganesan et al., 2019) and inland water system (Rosentreter et al., 2021) CH4 emissions. Existing mechanistic wetland models have large differences in tropical CH4 emissions (Melton et al., 2013; Bloom et al., 2017) and do not capture observed seasonality of CH4 in tropical regions dominated by forested wetlands (Melack et al., 2022). Much of this difference is driven by the lack of fine-scale measurements detailing the drivers of wetland and aquatic emissions (Melack et al., 2022) and the threefold difference in wetland/inundation extents applied in individual models (Peng et al., 2022). Tropical forested wetlands are an uncertain component of the global CH4 budget due to the: a) complexity of the meteorology, hydrology, ecology, land-use practices, and CH4 emission drivers in these regions; and b) extreme data limitations amplified by cloud cover prevalence that inhibits satellite retrievals (Ganesan et al., 2019; Melack et al., 2022). Given these complexities in the main flux drivers (e.g., meteorology, hydrology, biomass, vegetation type, soil moisture, edaphic factors, aquatic constituents/quality, etc.) and the persistent cloud coverage in the tropics inhibiting our understanding of tropical forest GHG fluxes, PANGEA will acquire vital suborbital remote-sensing and in situ data coincident with ground-based observations to improve regional CH4 model capabilities and emission budget estimates.

[a few sentences motivating the following questions]

*Models do not always account for the effects of biodiversity. For example, Earth System Models (ESMs) typically model terrestrial ecosystems using a small number of plant functional types and do not include biodiversity-carbon sequestration or biodiversity-productivity mechanisms (ref).*

* What is the role of **biodiversity** in driving the variation in tropical forest carbon stocks and fluxes at local, regional, and continental scales?
  1. How do **plant-animal interactions** mediate the vulnerability or resilience of tropical forest carbon stocks and fluxes?
  2. How vulnerable or resilient are the **species interactions** underpinning tropical forest function to climate and land-use change?
  3. What **plant functional traits and structural attributes** confer carbon cycle resilience, and how do they vary across forest types, environmental gradients, and vertically within forests?

[a few sentences motivating the following questions]

* *Describe changing disturbance regimes* - drought, fire, storms, land-use change
* *Emphasize that land surface biophysical properties includes evapotranspiration, albedo, roughness, land surface temperature, and humidity*
* *Emphasize human interactions via varying land-use practices as drivers, but also climate feedbacks on land-use practices (farmer adaptation, urbanization, NTFP collection, etc.)*
* How are climate and land-use changes altering **land surface biophysical properties** that influence the strength of land-atmosphere feedbacks and teleconnections?
* What are the direct and indirect **hydroclimate controls** on tropical forests and how does this influence the resilience or vulnerability of their carbon balance with shifting disturbance regimes, land cover and land-use change, and increasing atmospheric CO2?
* How do **deforestation**, **degradation**, and **forest regrowth** alter regional **hydrological cycles** in tropical regions, including precipitation regimes, freshwater resources, and water quality, and river connectivity?
* *Mention hydroperiods, convective development, and the atmospheric boundary layer in the related text - these are included in precipitation regimes/dynamics*
* *Bring details from previous questions below into the main text - link to the need to understand impacts of deforestation and degradation on hydrological cycles to inform how forest restoration can influence hydrological cycles*
  + *What are the feedback processes between LCLUC and physical climate systems during specific climate variability events (e.g., ENSO, AMOC, MJO, IOD)?*
  + *How do LCLUC, forest regrowth, and degradation alter recycling, patterns, frequency, and intensity of precipitation and what are the associated feedbacks?*
  + *How do tropical forest disturbances (e.g., wildfire and their aerosols) interact with clouds and influence continental precipitation?*
* How are changing disturbance regimes impacting the **carbon use efficiency (CUE)** and **water use efficiency (WUE)** of different tropical forests?
* How do **tree mortality** rates and patterns vary within and across tropical forests in response to systematic shifts in forcing processes, including climate, land-use change, and disturbance regimes, and how well do these differences explain variation in tropical carbon stocks and fluxes?
* *Bring into text:* 
  + *How does temporal variation in tree mortality rates, especially of large trees, relate to temporal variation in climate, land-use, and disturbance regimes?*
  + *How do these relationships differ among tropical forests, and how do these temporal responses vary spatially in relation to environmental variables?*
* How do disturbance type and intensity - including different patterns of land use - influence **post-disturbance recovery time scales** of forest structure, composition, and function?
* *Make sure elements of the question below are captured in the main text:*
  + *How does forest resistance or resilience to disturbances vary across climate and disturbance history gradients within and across continents?*
  + *How do different land uses and patterns of deforestation and degradation interact with climate to impact fire regimes and ecosystem recovery?*
  + *What are the typical time scales in which the energy, water and carbon fluxes of degraded forests become indistinguishable from non-degraded forests? How does the time scale vary as a function of degradation type (e.g., fires, logging, fragmentation) and climate?*

[a few sentences motivating the following questions]

* What **human activities and management practices** support the resilience of the tropical carbon sink, including protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) such as Indigenous and territorial community practices, agroforestry practices, and selective logging practices?

### 3.3 Projections

PANGEA will address specific knowledge gaps related to how tropical forest changes will influence positive and negative feedbacks to local, regional, and global social-ecological systems. …. future change and evaluation of impacts on co-benefits emphasized here…

Since many tropical forests are situated on nutrient-poor soils in topographically varying landscapes that are actively undergoing land-use changes, improved understanding of the role of nutrient limitations, water cycling, and land-use activities is needed to reduce large uncertainties around interactions with carbon-climate feedbacks like increased respiration, carbon losses from tree mortality, changes in CH4 fluxes, and constraints on a CO2 fertilization effect (REFS; Townsend et al 2008).

[a few sentences motivating the following question]

* How will increasing temperatures, atmospheric CO2, and extreme events impact **nutrient availability** and **soil-vegetation interactions**?
* *(e.g., drought, fires, flooding)*

[a few sentences motivating the following question]

* Which **functionally distinct forest types** are most vulnerable to becoming net sources of carbon to the atmosphere in a changing climate, which are resistant, and why?
* *Link to how climate warming and increasing extreme events will shift tropical forest structure and function via influences on plant ecophysiology and shifts in functional composition*

[a few sentences motivating the following questions]

* Include human dimensions in motivation and knowledge gaps
* *Mention drought, heat, and flooding explicitly*
* How will climate warming and shifting extreme events interact withland cover and land-use change to influence **shifting fire regimes** and their feedbacks with forest function and the climate?
* How will changes in precipitation patterns (e.g., ITCZ displacement), increasing temperatures, and shifting disturbance dynamics in tropical forests alter the **terrestrial water balance** via changes in seasonal rainfall timing and duration, evapotranspiration, and soil water?
* *Mention that stream, groundwater, runoff are included in the terrestrial water balance.*
* How will **future changes in vegetation**, including deforestation, degradation, and regrowth, impact local, regional, and cross-continental climate and hydrology?
* *Include in related text that htis includes precipitation patterns and timing, land surface temperatures, evapotranspiration, soil and groundwater, stream and river flows, and runoff*
* How will these future changes in climate and extreme events impact carbon cycling within tropical rainforests, and at what point will this lead to a **large-scale transition** in functional composition and/or the regions becoming a net carbon source?
* How will climate and land-use change interact with the changing vulnerability of tropical forests to influence the provisioning of and access to **social-ecological co-benefits,** including water availability, agricultural production, human health, disaster risk reduction, and cultural practices?
* *Mention bioeconomies, incliuding forest-friendly economic activities*
* *Explicitly mention that this includes Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities"*

## 4. Scientific Advancement from PANGEA

* Expand ability to interpret
* Remote sensing
  + Has great potential, especially instruments coming on line in coming years
  + But lack of ground data hinders accurate and precise interpretation
  + Scales mismatch

RS related methods advances enabled by PANGEA

* Cal/Val and algorithm development
  + SBG, CHIME, ECOSTRESS, NISAR, BIOMASS, OCO-2/3, SMAP, GRACE, TROPOMI, GEDI, Landsat, VIIRS,
  + Commercial Satellite providers through CSDA program
* Model-[RS] data integration
  + Processes we need to get right in models
    - Dynamic vegetation (incl post-disturbance recovery and structural and functional diversity)
    - Plant water use efficiency
    - Drought stress response (incl. natural vs. managed lands)
    - Partitioning of ET
    - Hydraulic redistribution
    - Root-groundwater interactions
    - Surface water quality
    - Planetary boundary layer diurnal evolution, advection, and entrainment
    - Drivers of land-use change?
    - Feedbacks of climate change in tropics on people (e.g., ag production, water quantity and quality, fire & air quality)
* RS indicators of:
  + Vulnerability to tree mortality
  + Biodiversity – in most biodiverse region (what taxonomic/functional scales of diversity matter for carbon cycle dynamics?)
  + Productivity
* Improved climate model predictions for the tropics (has global climate prediction implications)
  + ERA5 and CHIRPS discrepancies / lack of weather stations
  + Land-atmosphere interactions

Attempts to assess the stability of forests to changes have garnered inconsistent results. Field studies suggest Central African forests may be more resistant or resilient to changing climatic conditions and may offer a longer-term carbon sink compared to other tropical forests [6], [10]. However, satellite remote sensing studies indicate that Central African forests are just as sensitive to climate anomalies as the Amazon and other tropical forest regions [7], [11]. ***Inconsistencies between field measurements and satellite observations must be reconciled to predict the impact of climate change on the role of these forests in global carbon and water cycles.*** Hypotheses that may explain these inconsistencies include: 1) changing rates of tree mortality, 2) varying sensitivity of photosynthesis, respiration rates, and other ecosystem processes that alter net carbon and water fluxes, to natural and anthropogenic disturbances, 3) differing intensities and patterns of deforestation and degradation on ecosystem structure and function, and 4) different evolutionary trajectories that have resulted in unique biodiversity and species interactions that directly influence ecosystem resilience (e.g., varying megafauna abundances across tropical forests).

PANGEA leverages NASA’s history of successful field and airborne campaigns in the tropics to measure ecosystem dynamics and status at the end of the dry season, when tropical forest systems are most stressed and differences in function are most apparent [19]. Ecosystem structure and function is characterized across multi-dimensional gradients of intact to degraded and low- to high-diversity tropical forest ecosystems. PANGEA measures floristic and phylogenetic diversity as well as demographic rates, using existing ground data from permanent inventory plots, and functional and structural diversity using airborne lidar. Coincident airborne VSWIR data and in situ leaf trait measurements are used to map canopy traits and distinct functional communities, in addition to evaluating scalable models leveraging satellite measurements. Using this output, we characterize differences across abiotic, land-use, and animal abundance gradients. Airborne measurements are then used to model ecosystem fluxes under climate change and evaluate differences in ecosystem responses. In doing so, PANGEA addresses how varying tropical forest structure and function influences tropical forest stability in the face of climate change impacts.

Climate Feedbacks & Interactions: PANGEA will provide data and knowledge to advance our understanding of climate interaction, including studies to determine (1) how increased CO₂ levels and rising temperatures specifically affect carbon sequestration rates in tropical forests, (2) the impacts of extreme weather events, such as severe droughts, on forest health and carbon emission, (3) the consequences of land use changes—like deforestation for agriculture—on forest fragmentation and its effects on biodiversity and ecosystem services is crucial, (4) how altered forest cover influences both biophysical factors (e.g., albedo changes) and biochemical processes (e.g., nutrient cycling) will help clarify their role in climate feedbacks, (5) the effectiveness of various forest restoration strategies in improving resilience and mitigating climate impacts is essential for developing practical solutions.

Spaceborne remote-sensing and top-down emission estimates in the tropics are known to be challenging (Tunnicliffe et al., 2020, Wilson et al., 2021); thus, PANGEA’s sustained aircraft and ground-based observations are essential. Given the complications due to cloud coverage, large regional emission variability, and inability to separate different wetland/aquatic sources and processes, satellite data alone cannot provide a mechanistic understanding. Airborne and finer scales of observations are vital to connect airborne and space-based remote-sensing observations of XCH4 to specific emission source types and drivers. By leveraging increased spatial, temporal, and spectral data from airborne observations, we can delineate between wetland/aquatic ecosystem types in order to assign the appropriate magnitude of flux contributions to different source types, which is currently a large source of uncertainty in quantifying the tropical CH4 budget.

Attempts have been made to estimate tropical wetland CH4 fluxes using aircraft in situ measurements in the Amazon (Miller et al., 2007, Beck et al., 2012, Wilson et al., 2016, Basso et al., 2021) and Africa (Shaw et al., 2022); however, these observations only help identify the spatiotemporal differences in emissions. In contrast, PANGEA will take advantage of multiple scales of observations: a) regional-scale – 1 km2 to 1000 km2 (crewed aircraft); b) ecosystem-scale – 1 m2 to 100 km2 (sUAS and tall towers); c) near-surface (sUAS platforms); and d) fine-scale – <1 m2 to 1 km2 (ground-based systems) to connect spatiotemporal flux variability to: 1) specific wetland/aquatic sources (i.e., wetlands, floodplains, lakes, reservoirs, rivers); 2) intra-system emission characteristics (e.g., open-water versus vegetation-mediated fluxes; ebullition versus diffusion); and 3) primary biological and physiochemical flux drivers.

## 5. Critical Role of NASA Remote Sensing

* *What are the challenges with using satellites in the tropics?*
  + *Newer satellite remote-sensing GHG observing sensors (e.g., TROPOMI, OCO-2, CO2M, MethaneSat) have the spatial resolution and precision (<1.0%) needed to estimate tropical CO2 and CH4 fluxes. Improved precision and spatial resolution in future spaceborne GHG sensors will aid in the capability to constrain diffuse fluxes of CO2 and CH4 in the tropics.*
* *How can PANGEA improve our understanding of remote-sensing capabilities in the tropics?*

PANGEA aims to determine whether different tropical forests will share the same fate or vary in their responses to the effects of climate and land-use change, with a particular focus on Earth’s two largest tropical forests. Identifying processes that result in tropical forest stability is paramount for constraining uncertainty in predictions of future terrestrial carbon flux dynamics. To reconcile differences between ground and satellite measurements and improve scaling strategies to advance future monitoring, coordinated airborne measurements are necessary to characterize how and why Central African and American tropical forests differ in their ability to remain stable in the face of rapid climate change. Sufficiently high spatial resolution (~2-4 m) is needed to adequately scale organismal level leaf and tree dynamics to landscapes, serving as an intermediary between field and satellite observations (Fig. 1). PANGEA builds directly upon the scaling developments and successes from the NASA Arctic Boreal Vulnerability Experiment (ABoVE) in North America (e.g., Virkkala et al 2021; Peltola et al. 2019), which shed new light on previously understudied Arctic systems.

PANGEA leverages NASA’s Airborne Science Program to obtain high-resolution VSWIR imaging spectroscopy, small footprint lidar, [etc] data over tropical forests in Central Africa and the Americas to facilitate a PANGEA science team that will address PANGEA’s science objectives. Obtaining high spatial and spectral resolution data in these regions supports unprecedented evaluation of forest dynamics, including fluxes, growth, mortality, and functional strategies (e.g., nutrient- and water-use efficiency) at the resolution of individual trees across large landscapes that vary in their species composition, soil characteristics, topography, disturbance regimes, and human interactions.

Persistent cloud coverage is a significant issue when using space-based XCO2 and XCH4 to constrain tropical greenhoues gas fluxes (e.g., Rayner et al., 2002; Qu et al., 2021). Even at the higher spatial resolution of the current low earth orbiting satellite sensors retrieving XCH4 (e.g., TROPOMI [3.5 km x 7.0 km]) and XCO2 (e.g., OCO-2 [1.3 km x 2.2 km]) >95% of retrieved information is filtered due to clouds in the tropics (Qu et al., 2021). Higher spatial resolution XCO2 and XCH4 satellite sensors such as the recently launched MethaneSat (100 m x 400 m) will greatly improve the ability to retrieve tropical flux measurements through cloud gaps. Other point-source mapping satellite sensors (e.g., EMIT, GHGSat, Carbon Mapper, PRISMA) have been launched with very high spatial resolution (<100 m x 100 m). However, these target mode observations will not provide the global coverage needed to constrain tropical greenhouse gas budgets.

PANGEA will obtain a large variety of airborne and ground-based observations coincident with overpasses of existing NASA (e.g., OCO-2, OCO-3, Landsat, MODIS, VIIRS, SMAP, GRACE, SWOT, AMSR-E, AMSR2, ICESat-II, EMIT, PACE), international (e.g., TROPOMI, GOSAT, GOSAT-2, CO2M, RADARSAT, Envisat, PRISMA, DESIS), and commercial (e.g., GHGSat, MethaneSat, WorldView, Quickbird/GeoEye, Planet) satellite products. These observations will aid in validation of these satellite’s retrievals of terrestrial vegetation, inundation, precipitation, disturbance dynamics, and atmospheric composition. They will also assist in assessing the capability of future planned satellite sensors (e.g., SBG, GLIMR, Carbon Mapper) and observation strategies. PANGEA will allow for investigating the required instrument characteristics (e.g., precision, accuracy, spatial/spectral resolution) and observational strategies (e.g., low Earth orbit versus geostationary) for monitoring greenhouse emissions, hte many variables driving tropical source-sink dynamics.

## 6. Research Strategy and Study Design (scientific feasibility)

### 6.1 Overall Study Design

The PANGEA research strategy will enable NASA funded investigators to answer big scientific questions by comparison among major tropical forest formations. Research will integrate ground, airborne, and satellite-based science investigations so that the study design will enable effective interpretation of present and future satellite-based science investigations. The PANGEA strategy will facilitate collaborations and build new relationships within the scientific community with a special emphasis on interactions among US scientists and scientists from tropical forest countries. PANGEA research and future NASA studies will benefit from opportunities for training and educating the next generation of scientists including scientists from tropical countries where field research will be based. The strategy will leave a legacy of open data, open science, and strengthened partnerships between the US and tropical institutions providing a basis for future research.

To initiate PANGEA, we will define our scientific study design during a preliminary phase that will last, ideally, about one year. During this phase, a science definition team will refine the general strategy presented below by selecting specific landscapes for studies and refining the ground, airborne, and satellite measurements and analyses to be used to answer the campaign scientific questions. During this science definition phase resources will be broadly matched to activities. The refined strategy developed in the science definition phase will inform NASA managers enabling the development of a NASA announcement of opportunity to recruit and select the PANGEA campaign Phase 1 science team. Based on previous field campaigns, NASA nominally will solicit proposals for science team participation every three years.

The PANGEA campaign will be executed over 6 to 9 years. The first year of the campaign will focus on development of the research capacity through establishment and augmentation of field sites including installation of new instrumentation. Satellite based analyses can begin immediately in the first year along with development of models and execution of model studies and analysis of existing data to reveal greatest sensitivities that will guide the details and emphases of measurement campaigns. Peak data acquisition would occur in years 2 to 4 of a six-year campaign or between years 2-7 of a nine-year campaign. A longer campaign will permit more intermediate analysis. While there is often pressure to acquire as much data as possible as soon as possible, the TE program is sufficiently mature to understand the value that intermediate analysis of early data can have on the overall success and cost-effectiveness of a campaign.

Analysis and synthesis of data will not be restricted to later phases of the campaign but will be carried out from the initial phases starting with model studies that facilitate and inform effective measurement design. All science team members will either conduct integrative analysis (including modeling) or participate in integrative analyses. Building the team from the earliest stages and involving all the minds and experience on the team will result in deeper insights. Collected data will be made available to the full team as soon as possible, always following NASA requirements as a minimum. Open science practices will make integrative analyses and model studies as transparent as possible to the full team. The PANGEA campaign will benefit from years of field-campaign experience in the Terrestrial Ecology program including ABoVE, LBA, and earlier campaigns. Moreover, the team will learn from experience outside of NASA through collaboration with partner projects and use of existing protocols for data collection. Examples abound from NASA projects and facilities (e.g. AVIRIS, EMIT, SBG) as well as outside organization (e.g. CEOS, NEON, ICOS, Ameriflux, Fluxnet, Forestplots.net, GEO-TREES, etc.). [MAY BE USEFUL TO ADD REFERENCES HERE]

[include brief mention of scaling strategy concept/framework here]

* Link science themes and questions to variables, measurements, and geographies
* 'scoping' traceability matrix
* *Start with a statement showing that we are following on well learned precedents*
  + *ABLE 2a and 2b*
  + *SAFARI*
  + *LBA*
  + *AfriSAR 1 a 2*
  + *BioSCape*
  + *Multiple airborne campaigns in Central and South America using AVIRIS on a variety of platforms*
* *Will will go through NASA OIIR*
  + *We will build relationships with in-country partners and establish contacts to develop signed agreements*
* *not requiring NASA assets (NASA aircraft) to be deployed in Brazil or DRC*
* *NASA or other (ARES, commercial) can be used*
* *Interest from / alignment with partner agencies ESA, ISRO, Canadian Space Agency*
* *Emphasize that PANGEA will take advantage of what's happening locally*
* *Notes based on recent conversations with Ryan about scope*
  + *need to turn grand ambition into modular / scalable campaign*
    - *a few million / 10 million/ 30 million / 50 million -*
  + *depends on second PM though (an offer was made, date TBD, will likely start this summer)*
  + *could be bolstered by contributions from Biodiversity and/or Hydrology (also LCLUC, X, and X?)*
  + *possibly also Earth Action (Tom, Nancy, Keith)*
* *Provide threshold and baseline(s)*
  + *5 years - $30 million* 
    - *emphasize that we've already put in a PANGEA EVS*
* *6 years - $50 million*
* *8 years - $100 million*
* *10 years - $150 million*
* need proof that we've had discussions with partners who can allocate additional resources - actual funding or in-kind through existing activities (e.g., USAID, European Space Agency, NERC, donor community) - letters!
* **Synergies**
  + ride AfriSAR-2 - on budget, on schedule, for the most part no major glitches (describe successes and lessons learned)
    - Emphasize that relationship strengthening and building is key and will be prioritized by PANGEA
  + LVIS flight(s) in SE Asia - talk to GEDI team
  + Amazon 2026 - Jack committed to trying to make NASA aspect equal to or exceed ESA component - talk to Clement Albergel & Dirk
  + talk to Barry Lefer about possibly sharing costs with Africa air quality campaign (not guaranteed, just being explored)
    - Building on Asia-AQ - Phillipines, Malaysia, Thailand, South Korea
  + possibility for synergies with Laura Lorenzoni's interest in lateral fluxes in rivers - especially in Amazon
  + India - AVIRIS-3 - in 2025 - other plans?

Functional requirements:

| **Table 2.** | |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Investigation Functional Requirements** |
| T | **Airborne Campaign:**   * **Brief description**   **Ground Campaign:**   * Brief descriptions   Field Infrastructure   * **Brief description**   **Satellite Observations** |
| B | **Airborne Campaign:**   * **Brief description**   **Ground Campaign:**   * Brief descriptions   Field Infrastructure   * **Brief description**   **Satellite Observations** |

### 

### 6.2 Essential Scientific Measurements

**PANGEA's overarching science goal is to understand the role of biodiversity in tropical forest ecosystem stability and reduce uncertainties in projected tropical forest responses to climate and land-use change.** Addressing this gap requires a coordinated ground and airborne campaign design that spans multiple continents. [include statement about two continents - why tropical Americas (Amazon especially) and Africa (Congo Basin especially) are an important comparison]

PANGEA leverages NASA’s history of successful field and airborne campaigns in the tropics (**Fig. 2**) to measure ecosystem dynamics and status at the onset and end of the dry season, when tropical forest systems are least and most stressed and differences in function are most apparent (Yang et al. 2021). Recent acheivements that demonstrate feasibility include the highly successful AfriSAR-2 campaign that collected airborne L- and P-band UAVSAR data over Ghana, Cameroon, Sao Tome, Gabon, the Republic of Congo, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). There is a need for sustained measurements across the highly variable tropical landscapes to capture variation in ecosystem structure and function within and across continents. Achieving PANGAEA’s objectives requires flight campaigns that meet the measurement requirements in **Table A1**, based out of multiple countries in Central Africa and the neotropical Americas to span the range of environments present in these systems. These observations provide an essential scaling bridge linking sustained high resolution, process measurements (forest plots and flux towers) with spatially extensive measurements (satellite) which are becoming increasingly spectrally resolved with new sensors. These combined measurements will provide a baseline snapshot through which we can understand sustained field and spaceborne measurements, as well as hindcast and contextualize previous studies.

PANGEA Science Objectives to 1) understand differences in ecosystem structural and functional diversity within and among tropical forests, 2) resolve scaling issues between field and satellite data by advancing process understanding and scaling methods, and 3) forecast varying tropical forest ecosystem responses to climate and land-use change allow us to derive the **baseline and threshold Essential Scientific Measurements**. Ecosystem structure, function, fluxes, and biodiversity are characterized across multi-dimensional gradients of intact to degraded and low- to high-diversity tropical forest systems.

PANGEA implements a sample-to-scale approach, with a nested ground and airborne measurement sampling design including ground mesaurements spanning gradients within a landscape and landscapes spanning climatic and diversity gradients within a continent (**Figure X**). Two focused airborne campaigns with wall-to-wall mosaics and transects at multiple landscapes, as opposed to higher repeat frequency airborne measurements at one landscape, is necessary to capture shoulder-season variation across landscapes that span important within and among continental heterogeneity in a standardized way. These airborne campaigns will be conducted at landscapes that encompass intact, disturbed, and degraded forests, peatland, and wetland ecosystems (and mangroves where nearby coastal data acquisition allows), as well as adjacent agro-ecosystems. Coordinated, coincident ground data collection on XYZ will occur.

PANGEA landscapes will prioritize locations where:

* Existing eddy covariance flux tower data are, or will soon, be collected, or where chamber measurements can be extended.
* Long-term forest inventory plots are established, enabling re-censusing to support new measurements that build on rich forest demographic rates information (e.g., mortality, growth and recruitment rates).
* Phenology datasets
* Already have or can establish camera traps, bioacoustic sensors, weather station data, collect eDNA
* Partnerships with Indigenous and/or Local Communities

The proposed airborne data (e.g., VSWIR, XYZ) has only been collected in a few locations across the tropics to date, at different points in time and by different organizations with different methods. PANGEA allows for direct comparisons and evaluations of the role of tropical forest heterogeneity in ecosystem dynamics. Despite multiple existing spaceborne lidar sensors (e.g., GEDI, ICESat-2) and forthcoming radar sensors (NISAR and BIOMASS), small footprint airborne lidar and radar data are also essential to achieving PANGEA’s objectives. As with VSWIR data, retrieval of tree- and crown-level structural attributes from lidar is necessary to link organismal processes and dynamics to ecosystem responses observed at landscape scales. In addition, vertical variation in forest structure has been shown to vary with ecosystem function even when vertically integrated metrics like leaf area index (LAI) does not (Ordway et al. 2022). [1 sentence from Marc or Naiara on why airborne radar is critical for scaling in tropics] Spaceborne lidar and radar yield ecosystem-scale observations that, although incredibly valuable, remain insufficient to pair with tree level *in situ* measurements. Because these data are sampled across forests (Dubayah et al. 2020), they do not support retrieval of crown and tree-level metrics, or fine-scale ecosystem metrics like canopy gap detection.

PANGEA measures floristic and phylogenetic diversity as well as demographic rates, using existing ground data from permanent inventory plots, and functional and structural diversity using airborne lidar. Coincident airborne VSWIR data and *in situ* leaf trait measurements are used to map canopy traits and distinct functional communities, in addition to evaluating scalable models leveraging satellite measurements. Using this output, we characterize differences across abiotic, land-use, and animal abundance gradients. Airborne measurements are then used to model ecosystem fluxes under climate change and evaluate differences in ecosystem responses. In doing so, PANGAEA addresses how varying tropical forest structure and function influences tropical forest stability in the face of climate change impacts.

These include collecting VSWIR reflectance and small footprint lidar to measure canopy leaf traits and vegetation structure, thus allowing us to model functionally distinct forest types, advance data-model integration to generalize mapping capabilities across the tropics, and model carbon, water, and energy fluxes to examine the stability of tropical forests under future climate projections (*see Sections 1.4.1 and 1.4.2*). Our baseline and threshold Science Objectives are allocated to measurements and modeling across landscapes in both Africa and the neotropics (Baseline) or just in Central Africa (Threshold). Investigation Functional Requirements include airborne VSWIR data collection coincident with field leaf sample collection, as well as lidar acquisitions that can be paired with VSWIR flights for cost saving or collected using a second aircraft, as described in our Science Observational Profile (*see Table 2 and Section 1.4*).

**Table X** details PANGEA Baseline and Threshold requirements.

* **Introduce threshold (core science questions - 2 landscapes in Africa, 2 landscapes in Americas)**
* **baseline 1 (core science questions - additional landscapes in each Africa and Americas)**
* **baseline 2 (extension to include additional science questions)**
* **threshold = repeat coverage twice at fewer sites -** Emphasize 2 seasons - dry and wet season / shoulder seasons - define endmembers for fluxes; stocks; traits; hydrodynamics…
  + The time elapsed between the two sites doesn’t matter - could be 1 year; 2 years apartno repeat coverage
  + Target more sites with more existing infrastructure and long-term data collection
  + Emphasize 2 seasons
  + need to think about the sites and which sites
    - which are the first order and which are the second order
    - don't worry about instruments detail
* **baseline - more extensive spatial coverage at more sites** (more coverage / longer transects at coarser resolution - e.g., for imaging); more training with more partners repeat aircraft coverage at X sites
  + repeat (shift like coverage over sites in Americas?) - to look at dynamics
  + single flights in Africa to fill data gaps
* **need to think about the sites and which sites**
  + which are the first order and which are the second order
  + need to have a process for selecting and approving ground sites
  + locations for ground campaigns will be the hard part
    - Engage with existing efforts
    - Opportunities for training to expand existing data collection to fill in gaps
      * Drones
      * lab facilities

The **Baseline Investigation** fulfills all Science Objectives (Sections 1.1 and 3) at American and African tropical forest landscapes. To meet these Baseline Investigation Objectives, we establish the following requirements:

1. For Objective 1, PANGEA will:
   1. Measure VSWIR reflectance via wall-to-wall flightline mosaics and sampling transects over priority landscapes (Table 3), once at each landscape during the dry season.
   2. Measure canopy leaf traits from in situ samples coincident with VSWIR data.
   3. Measure vegetation structure and ground elevation from small footprint lidar, acquiring contiguous lidar flightlines for wall-to-wall mosaicing as well as sampling transects over all priority landscapes described in Table 3, once at each landscape, within the same year as the imaging spectroscopy acquisitions.
   4. Model foliar functional traits, canopy water content, and structural attributes.
   5. Model functionally distinct forest types, using trait maps and structural attributes.
   6. Model tree mortality rates from static and dynamic canopy gap detection using single and repeat lidar data.
   7. Model forest degradation using small footprint lidar data.
2. For Objective 2, PANGEA will:
   1. Develops data-model integration algorithms and evaluates trait model generalizability.
3. For Objective 3, PANGEA will:
   1. Model carbon and water fluxes, using terrestrial biosphere models parameterized and benchmarked with airborne data, at regional scales under future climate scenarios.
   2. Model tropical forest stability within and among all investigation landscapes and regionally based on terrestrial biosphere model results.
   3. Model the relative role of climate, soils, and divergent evolutionary histories in determining variation in tropical forests’ stability in the face of climate change impacts.

Our **Threshold Investigation** fulfills Objective X / Science Questions XYZ at two landscapes in Africa and two landscapes in the Americas only. Our investigation requirements drive our Measurement, Model, and Functional Requirements (see Tables A1 & A2).

Final Paragraph that clearly summarizes what can be done within the NASA scope - what's the safe science we can commit to delivering just from NASA. State that we can expand on threshold (Baseline 2 and 3) with contributions from other agencies (ESA, USAID, NSF), initiatives (OFV), and donor community.

*PANGEA provides a framework for airborne observations and solicits team members experienced with in-situ field observations, eddy-covariance flux tower measurements, airborne and satellite remote sensing, and terrestrial biosphere modeling to* ***advance scientific understanding and remote sensing capabilities across thematic areas that directly address the goals of NASA’s Carbon Cycle and Ecosystems Focus Area, in alignment with the Water and Energy Cycle and Climate Variability and Change Focus Areas****. PANGAEA establishes a network of centrally coordinated field and airborne campaigns that are distributed across targeted tropical forest ecosystems to enable scaling between field and remotely sensed datasets, and regional scale modeling*

* Need to demonstrate the feasibility

Strawman Baseline/Threshold Mission Concept:

* **Baseline A:** extend to Amazon & Africa
  + - comparative - to include Africa - repeat AfriSAR with other sensors
* Brazil (and DRC / other risky countries)
  + Plan A - ARES first
  + Plan B - commercial aircraft and commercial sensor
* talk to Marc to see how he did it for Delta-X
* Emphasize gradients!
  + Climatic gradients
  + Disturbance gradients
  + Elevation gradients
    - Peru, Rwanda,
* overall table here that can trace back to the Scoping Tracability Matrix, since many questions may require similar measurements.
* Elsa building out large table which will be inserted here



| **Table A1. Science Measurement Requirement Matrix.** B=Baseline; P=Priority; Qs=Questions; T=Threshold; TA=Threshold: Africa; BA&N=Baseline: Africa & Neotropics | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scientific Measurement Requirement** | | | | | **Science Q Addressed** | **T/B** |
| **Physical Parameters** | **P\*** | **Observables** | **Measurement Platform** | **Required Value** |
| * Canopy foliar traits⁑ | 1 | VSWIR wall-to-wall mosaics and transects | NASA King Air B-200 is preferred | * 380-2500 nm range * ≤ 10 nm spectral sampling * 2-5m ground sampling distance (GSD) where ground is top of canopy * Composite maps 100 – 5,000 km2 * Transects > 100 km * 598 cross-track elements, translates to ~1196 m swath width @ 2 m GSD, ~2990 m @ 5 m GSD. | **Q1-HQ1-1; Q1-HQ1-4; Q2**; **Q3** | TA, BA&N |
| * Canopy water content | 1 | **Q1-HQ1-3** |
| * Canopy Height | 1 | Lidar transects and wall-to-wall mosaics with full vertical height profile | NASA King Air B-200 is preferred | * Minimum Point Density of 5 points/m2 * 2-5m ground sampling distance (GSD) where ground is top of canopy * Composite maps 100 – 5,000 km2 * Transects > 100 km * ≥ 300 m swath width; variable with aircraft altitude | **Q1-HQ1-2; Q2; Q3** |
| * Vertical heterogeneity | 1 | **Q1-HQ1-2; Q1-HQ1-4; Q2**; **Q3** |
| * Vertical LAI distribution | 2 | **Q1-HQ1-2; Q1-HQ1-4; Q2**;**Q3** |
| * Canopy gap size and frequency | 1 | **Q1-HQ1-2; Q1-HQ1-4** |
| * Tree mortality | 2 | **Q1**; **Q2**; **Q3** |
| * Forest degradation | 2 | **Q1**; **Q2**; **Q3** |
| *\* 1 = required, 2 = desired, 3 = useful*  ⁑ *Calcium, carbon, carotenoids, cellulose, chlorophyll-a, copper, fiber, flavonoids, leaf mass per area, lignin, magnesium, non-structural carbohydrates, nitrogen, phenolics, phosphorus, potassium, starch, sugars, sulfur, leaf water content, δ13C, δ15N* | | | | | | |

#### 6.2.1 Satellite Remote Sensing Observations

* get specific about satellites and how they'd be used - **not just a list of sensors**
* Paragraph on synergies with partner agencies
  + ESA, JAXA, ISRO
  + Use of sensors from partner agencies:
  + BIOMASS

| Satellite Observations | Cal/Val & Algorithm Advances | Science Advances |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *NISAR*, BIOMASS, Sentinel-1 |  |  |
| EMIT, *CHIME, SBG* |  |  |
| *Carbon-i* |  |  |
| GEDI, ICESat-2, *EDGE* |  |  |
| SMAP | SMAP exhibits a notable bias in tropical forests (Cho et al. 2023).However, significant advancements have been achieved by employing the Maximum Entropy Algorithm on SMAP (Wang et al. 2023).The scarcity of ground-based soil moisture observations remains a critical barrier to further enhancements | PANGEA will expand the involvement of tropical countries, including those in Africa and Asia, in soil moisture measurement efforts. These data will enhance SMAP's current algorithms (but also NISAR), leveraging remote sensing data to improve global soil moisture monitoring capabilities |
| OCO, TROPOMI, FLEX |  |  |
| SWOT |  |  |
| GRACE |  |  |
| Geostationary: GOES-R (americas) & X (Africa) |  |  |
| ECOSTRESS |  |  |
| Landsat, Sentinel-2 |  |  |

#### 6.2.2 Airborne Remote Sensing Observations

* need to define what other aircraft assets could be deployed
  + commercial aircraft
  + why don't we just hire companies to hire data there
  + then don't have to worry about flight permissions for NASA aircraft
  + what about sensors
  + AVIRIS has flown a lot on a Dynamic Aviation aircraft
  + use ARES (Switzerland) - other assets?
* INDIA: shipping AVIRIS-3 over and installing on an Indian plane
  + is there a short write-up about Indian deployments
* **Will co-design the flight plans - recommendation from AfriSAR-2**
* **demonstrate precedent wherever possible**
* AfriSAR-2
* AVIRIS in India (ISRO putting up money on that)
* lidar in Brazil and DRC
* ARES?
* ESA?
* mention tech advancing so rapidly
  + describe current drone capabilities
  + are currently these instruments at this level of readiness
  + will have protocols in place to leverage rapidly evolving technologies

[1-3 paragraphs on AfriSAR-2 campaign here - successes and lessons learned; plan to refly these transects and include Yangambi area in DRC - will require flight to Rwanda]

#### 

#### 6.2.3 Field Observations, Studies, Experiments


On the ground field observations are necessary for 1) validation of spaceborne measures of ecological processes and fluxes, 2) uncovering mechanistic drivers of observed fluxes and processes which can then inform model development/improvement and understanding spaceborne observations and 3) evaluating the scale dependencies of ecological processes. Despite the importance of tropical ecosystems, they are dramatically underrepresented with respect to field observations. This underscores the importance of field-based studies as part of PANGEA. Field observations will broadly fall into the following categories:

* **Ecological/Biological Sampling**: This includes all data that must be directly measured by individuals with boots on the ground at sites and cannot be easily automated. Some examples of this data include leaf pigments,
* **Ecological/Biological Observations:** This includes all data that supports our understanding of ecologic processes but does not require frequent revisits and is easily automated. Some examples of this include stem radius measurements, sap flux measurements, …
* **Flux and Meteorological data:** This includes all data taken at a flux-tower site…
* **Proximal Remote Sensing:** This includes all data that are taken at the site/stand level but that can be observed from air or spaceborne platforms. Specifically visible-to-shortwave infrared hyperspectral reflectance, solar-induced fluorescence, thermal infrared radiation, microwave backscatter, and LiDAR.

At present, field observations in the tropics are limited by the following:

* **Accessibility**: Dense, difficult-to-navigate terrain and remote areas with limited infrastructure limit the ability to deploy and maintain field equipment in the tropics.
* **High Biodiversity**: Tropical ecosystems are highly biodiverse, limiting the generalizability of field studies from one location to another and requiring more detailed knowledge about a broad variety of species in a particular location.
* **Seasonality and Climate**: Extreme weather such as heavy rainfall during monsoon season and extreme heat and humidity, create harsh working environments which can limit the duration and extent of fieldwork.
* **Funding and Resources**: Funding and resources for science often come from the global north. Therefore, fieldwork in the tropics is generally more expensive due to the logistical challenges of bringing resources and funding to tropical regions.
* **Political and Social Instability**: Many tropical regions are in countries that experience political instability, conflict, or land-use disputes, which can pose risks to researchers and make it unsafe or difficult to conduct long-term studies.

PANGEA will address these limitations by building lasting, mutually beneficial, collaborative partnerships with local tropical organizations and existing infrastructure. Partners have been engaged in the scoping process and will be involved in the development of the PANGEA Concise Experimental Plan. The following partnerships will be essential to the success of PANGEA.

* **ATFS** and sub-organizations AfriTRON, ForestGEO, GEM, RAINFOR and XYZ**:**
* **AndesFlux:**
* **Congo Basin Institute:**
* **Congo Basin Science Initiative:**
* **FLUXNET** and sub-organizations **AmeriFlux** and **ICOS**: FLUXNET is an international “network of networks,” tying together regional networks of primarily field-based earth system scientists and research sites. FLUXNET scientists use the eddy-covariance technique which uses primarily scaffolding towers above the forest canopy and measures high-frequency wind and scalar (gas concentration, energy, momentum) data to estimate ecosystem water and carbon fluxes. The eddy-covariance technique is the presently accepted ‘gold standard’ for site level fluxes. While FLUXNET has produced consolidated data across sites processed following a standardized pipeline, more current data is available through sites registered with local networks including AmeriFlux (covering North and South America) and ICOS (covering Europe and Africa - including CongoFlux). Flux sites typically have sufficient infrastructure and power supply to host additional support measurements such as proximal remote sensing instruments, dendrometer/stem radius measurements, sap flux measurements, biodiversity and plant trait information and pigment samples. Because of this PANGEA will prioritize field observations that are partnered with FLUXNET registered sites to make use of existing infrastructure and build collaborations with existing sites.
* **LBA:**
* **NGEE-Tropics**: Funded by the DOE, very synergistic, more of a field focus
* 

### 6.3 Candidate Landscapes

PANGEA will collaborate closely with in-country partner institutions to ensure the smooth execution of field activities across selected Landscapes. Table X summarizes candidate landscapes based on

we will plan for field measurements during the project.

|  | **Landscape** | **Country** | **Ground** | **Tower** | **Socioeconomic** | **Drone** | **Aircraft** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Potential Central African Tropical Forest Landscapes*** | | | | | | | |
|  | Dja | Cameroon |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Mbalmayo |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Korup |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Campo Ma’an |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
|  | Democratic Republic of Congo |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yangambi |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ghana |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
|  |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
|  |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
|  |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Lopé | Gabon |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Mondah |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Mabounié |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Rabi |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Bokatola | Republic of Congo |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kolongomba |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lac Tele |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Potential Neotropical Forest Landscapes*** | | | | | | | |
|  | Amazónica | Bolivia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vida Silvestre |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amacayacu | Colombia |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Amazonas |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| La Planada |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Tiputini | Ecuador |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Yasuní |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Paracou | French Guiana |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Agua Salud | Panama |  |  |  |  |  |
| BCI |  |  |  |  |  |
| Darien |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iquitos | Peru |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Madre de Dios |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| Ucayali |  |  |  |  | X (NASA) |
| *\* Alternate deployment locations are included to allow for flexibility in logistics while still meeting the science objectives.*  *P Planned for 2023.* | | | | | | | |

### 6.4 Modeling, Data Synthesis, and Integrative Analyses

#### 6.4.1 Modeling & Data Integration approach

**Notes from writing workshop:**

* Data synthesis: how can we scale the field observations to upscale to other domain using the satellite with machine learning, create wall to wall maps
* Model data integration: how to use remote sensing data and incorporate into mechanistic models, machine learning into process based models
* Mechanistic model, statistic model, hybrid models (leverage AI with satellite, field feed into mechanistic models) to make predictions
* Use models to select sites
* Space for time time series to constrain modeling
* Emphasize data fusion
  + Carlos Silva (and Laura Duncanson?) [has CMS funded project](https://carlos-alberto-silva.github.io/silvalab/cms4d/cms4d_workshop.html) that emphasizes data fusion
    - Include as case study of data-model fusion and stakeholder engagement
    - iterative process
    - Carlos in Brazil - August and September, but otherwise can help with figures and text

**Notes for the Modeling folks from SES**

* One potential angle to explore could be: "Integrated assessment models that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services could be an important tool for improving our understanding of interconnected social-economic-ecological systems", <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378024000955>
* Examples for agent-based models that include social and ecological components in the tropics:
  + von Essen and Lambin, 2023, Agent-Based Simulation of Land Use Governance (ABSOLUG) in Tropical Commodity Frontiers
  + Iwamura et al, 2014 - Agent-based modeling of hunting and subsistence agriculture on indigenous lands: Understanding interactions between social and ecological systems
  + Iwamura et al, 2016 - Socio-environmental sustainability of indigenous lands: Simulating coupled human-natural systems in the Amazon
  + ANDERSEN, L. E., Groom, B., Killick, E., Ledezma, J. C., Palmer, C., & Weinhold, D. (2017). Modelling land use, deforestation, and policy: A hybrid optimisation-Heterogeneous agent model with application to the Bolivian Amazon. *Ecological Economics*, *135*, 76–90. [[doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.12.033]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.12.033)

Modeling and data syntheses will be fundamental components of the PANGEA throughout the entire duration of the experiment. Models will be used to (1) identify key processes that are poorly represented and regions within the PANGEA domain that drive uncertainty of key variables and processes in existing models, (2) develop Observing System Simulation Experiments (OSSEs) that will help inform the optimal location and gradients needed to capture to maximize the representativeness of the intensive sites within the PANGEA domain, (3) synthesize and scale measurements from intensive sites to the core PANGEA domain, and (4) implement new processes and techniques, as well as improve existing ones in models and apply them to answer PANGEA’s scientific questions.

Projecting the future trajectory of tropical ecosystems presents a significant challenge to Earth system models (ESMs), as these models must accurately represent complex physical, biogeochemical, and ecosystem dynamics. Model intercomparison projects such as CMIPs (Taylor et al. 2012; Eyring et al. 2016) and TRENDY (Friedlingstein et al. 2023; Sitch et al. 2024) are crucial for tracking the development of process-based models and identifying areas that need to be improved (Arora et al., 2020). While the benchmarking and validation of ESMs have become more common in recent years (Fisher et al. 2018), it is still rare to systematically evaluate the performance of carbon cycle models after they have been updated (Fer et al. 2021). However, such comparisons with observational datasets are essential for testing hypotheses and evaluating predictive accuracy (Fisher et al. 2018). The International Land Model Benchmarking (ILAMB) project (Hoffman et al. 2017; Collier et al. 2018) provides tools to track and compare model performance using a comprehensive skill score method and incorporates multiple observational datasets to account for model uncertainty (Braghiere et al., 2023). Improved agreement between historical simulations and observations may indicate that model components can be refined to better represent processes, thereby increasing confidence in future projections. Nonetheless, as models evolve, addressing future challenges such as acclimation, nutrient limitation, shifts in species composition and carbon allocation partitioning between above and belowground biomass will be increasingly important for maintaining model accuracy. Data collected through PANGEA will be used to expand benchmarking tools, improve model comparison exercises, and identify modeling areas that need to be improved or are not yet represented.

Over the past decades, terrestrial biosphere models have expanded scope and incorporated many new processes that could not be addressed during LBA (Fig. XX). For example, processed-based models now resolve structural and functional diversity, a broad variety of natural and anthropogenic disturbance dynamics, and strong coupling with biogeochemical cycles (Fisher et al. 2018; Fisher and Koven 2020), and we are now in a time in which ecological processes in diverse ecosystems driving energy, water, carbon and nutrient cycling on Earth must be accounted for (Bonan et al. 2024). Likewise, several classes of models have been increasingly leveraging the broad range of remote sensing observations, and throughout PANGEA we will have participation of a broad range of models that can use remote sensing for initialization, uncertainty quantification and data assimilation. Examples of such models include, but are not limited to, (1) process-based vegetation demography models such as ED2 (Antonarakis et al. 2014; Longo et al. 2020; Schneider et al. 2023), ED (Hurtt et al. 2004; Ma et al. 2023) and FATES (Negrón-Juárez et al. 2020), (2) data-driven hybrid models that solve processes with a strong data assimilation approach such as CARDAMOM (Bloom et al. 2016, 2020) and CliMA (Braghiere et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023), (3) top-down inverse modeling approaches that link column measurements with fluxes through atmospheric transport models such as CarbonTracker (Peters et al. 2007) and CMS-Flux (Liu et al. 2020), and (4) models that are based on Artificial Intelligence and machine learning (REF). We already identified several opportunities for which models can be used to investigate processes relevant to PANGEA to help answer the key research questions (Table XX). The data collected by PANGEA will allow further advancing both the representation of processes relevant to tropical forests under a changing Earth (Fig. XX) and methods to integrate between remote sensing and models in the upcoming years.

| **Table A2. Modeling Traceability Matrix.** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| **Process** | **Model** | | | **Data–Model integration opportunities** | | **Science Questions Addressed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Class\*** | **Examples**  **(not exhaustive)** | **Variables of interest** | **Remote sensing** | **Other data** |
| Change in forest structure over time | PB | ED2, FATES | Vertical LAI profile | Lidar | Forest inventory | **Q1-HQ1-2; Q1-HQ1-4; Q2**;**Q3** |
| PB | CLM, FATES | Total LAI |
| Change in carbon fluxes | PB | ED2,FATES,  CLM,ELM, etc | GPP, NPP | SIF, fAPAR | Flux tower |  |
| HM | CARDAMOM, CliMA | GPP, NPP | SIF, XCO2 | Flux tower |  |
| TBC … |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \* PB: Process-based terrestrial biosphere models; HM: Data-driven hybrid models; TD: top-down models; AI: Models based on Artificial Intelligence Machine Learning | | | | | | |

* Highlight that the model activities will be closely coordinated with the science themes throughout the duration of PANGEA. Highlight examples from direct potential applications of models to address the scientific questions in the PANGEA Science Themes (e.g., pick one direct case for each of the themes). Also highlight how models will help integrate questions across the science themes. Bonan et al. (2024) figure 7 may be a good conceptual figure, though it somewhat overlaps with the PANGEA figure. [Marcos; Félicien, Renato, Yanlei, César]
* Another paragraph that highlights how data synthesis activities will be coordinated with science themes.[Cesar, Yanlei]

In PANGEA, data synthesis activities are integral to our scientific approach, facilitating the upscale of intensive site measurements to regional and pan-tropical scales. By measuring key variables at intensive sites and coupling these with high-quality ancillary data on environmental predictors (e.g. soil moisture, nutrient availability, plant functional traits), we can establish robust empirical relationships. These relationships can enable us to use statistical models to interpolate wall-to-wall variations in critical variables. For example, field-based measurements on biomass carbon losses due to droughts across multiple sites, can be used to develop statistical models that predict biomass changes in response to varying soil moisture, VPD, drought frequency, plant functional groups, etc. This model can then be used to map pan-tropical impacts on forest biomass following specific drought scenarios, enhancing our understanding of ecosystem responses to environmental stressors across diverse tropical landscapes.

PANGEA will leverage multiple data synthesis approaches to enhance our understanding of tropical forest dynamics. For example, we recognize the potential of AI/ML models for data synthesis due to their robustness in handling non-linearities and interactions among predictors, which are particularly critical in the complex ecosystems of tropical forests dominated by multi-factorial processes. To improve the interpretability of these AI/ML models and to 'open the black box,' we advocate for several techniques such as Feature Importance Analysis, which quantifies and highlights the most influential factors driving the model's predictions. Partial Dependence Plots can be employed to visualize how changes in specific variables impact predicted outcomes, providing insights into the underlying ecological processes. Additionally, incorporating non-AI techniques like Causal Inference can help us understand cause-and-effect relationships within PANGEA data, offering a complementary perspective that enhances our mechanistic understanding. These strategies will not only improve our grasp of tropical forest dynamics but also provide valuable insights that can be integrated into process-based models for more accurate predictions.

Another powerful data synthesis technique is the space-for-time substitution approach, which, despite its limitations, can be particularly useful for understanding long-term dynamics in the absence of extensive temporal data series, whether remote-sensing or field-based. One significant challenge in understanding tropical forest dynamics is the limitation of current satellite biomass products. For example, while recent products like GEDI offer high spatial resolution, they only cover the past few years, restricting our ability to monitor long-term biomass changes. To overcome this challenge and obtain long-term, high-resolution forest biomass regrowth data, previous work used a space-for-time substitution approach, which calculates biomass carbon recovery from a single snapshot of current biomass data in areas that experience disturbance in different years (Heinrich et al. 2021, Rappaport et al. 2018). This approach, coupled with AI/ML models and traditional data synthesis techniques, ensures that PANGEA can robustly assess and predict tropical forest dynamics across various scales and timeframes.

In the first year of the campaign, existing research on 5 science themes at pan-tropical level will be synthesized, integrating with ongoing synthesis efforts (add citations) to inform decisions on key variable measurements with the fewest data points but the greatest potential research impacts. Beginning at the end of peak data acquisition and continuing into the final Phase, PANGEA will integrate individual site-level measurements with regional-scale airborne and spaceborne remote sensing imagery to upscale to a pan-tropical level. Projects and datasets collected within the peak data acquisition period, primarily located in Amazonia and tropical Africa will be reviewed and synthesized. This process will enable the upscaling of findings from local and regional to the global scale. In addition, the synthesis can determine what further modifications need to be made to the modeling effort. Based upon these syntheses and assessments, further adjustment to the models will be made during the final Phase to account for the global scale process.

#### 6.4.2 Coordination with other modeling and data integration communities

* List potential partners.
  + ILAMB. data collected through PANGEA could become new benchmarking data sets in ILAMB, which can be used directly by many global modeling efforts, potentially the land component of CMIP [Renato]
  + NGEE-Tropics (caveat that NGEE-Tropics will be sunsetting by the time PANGEA enters the most active phase) [Marcos]
  + [GMAO](https://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov/seasonal/)? [Elsa]
  + TRENDY
  + CMIP

#### 6.4.3 Scaling Strategy

The NASA Terrestrial Ecology (NASA TE) Program has been instrumental in the development of scaling strategies for Earth system science research. The first NASA TE field campaign, the First International Satellite Land Surface Climatology Project (ISLSCP) Field Experiment (FIFE) explicitly aimed to upscale soil-plant-atmosphere models designed for the cell and leaf level and apply them at the larger scales (kilometers) appropriate to atmospheric models and satellite remote sensing (Sellers et al. 1992). Likewise, scaling approaches were central to following field campaigns such as BOREAS, LBA, and ABoVE. The development and diversification of sensors over the past decades allow us to characterize relevant properties from leaf organs (LiCOR) and individuals (Terrestrial Laser Scanners) to forest stands (UAV-borne sensors), regions (airborne scanners) and continents (satellite sensors) (Bustamante et al. 2016). Likewise, several terrestrial biosphere models now include processes with time scales of minutes (photosynthesis, energy cycles) to days (phenology), months (growth, mortality) and years (disturbances) that also span across spatial scales from plant tissues to continents (Fisher et al. 2018; Longo et al. 2019; Koven et al. 2020). In such models, the large-scale ecosystem scale state and fluxes emerge directly from competition between individuals happening at fine spatial scale. Consequently, a campaign designed across multiple scales provides opportunities for assimilating data and benchmarking various processes in next-generation ecosystem models, which can significantly advance the ability of applying these models for process understanding and long-term prediction.

To ensure processes are captured across a broad diversity of environmental conditions, the field and airborne campaigns in PANGEA will include sampling across gradients in nutrient availability, ecosystem structure, climate, and disturbance regimes. Incorporating this variability will be critical for informing models and ensuring that they can be assessed and benchmarked under different limitations, and thus reducing the risk of equifinality (right answers due to compensating wrong reasons). Likewise, the choice of priority gradients will consider the current uncertainties in models, and novel processes that have not hitherto been assessed with remote sensing data at scale (e.g., X, Y, Z).

* Emphasize sampling to scale - see mention of this in Section 6.2 - Essential Scientific Measurements
* Ground, tower, drone, aircraft,
* Integrate into existing coordination efforts and gap-fill
* Drone lidar standards - KC Cushman
  + would build something similar out for other sensors
* Great collaborative example: https://arcticdrones.org/ - Welcome to the High-Latitude Drone Ecology Network (HiLDEN)
* Collaborative example of **mycorrhizal fungi** field sampling in historically poorly sampled areas: SPUN (<https://www.spun.earth/>)

#### 6.4.4 Modeling and data integration timeline

* Phase 1 (Y1-Y2). Establish MDSWG whose tasks will be to identify key areas and processes that drive uncertainty in models of energy, water, carbon, nutrients, and biodiversity in tropical moist forests through a combination of synthesis studies and model assessment / model intercomparison using established benchmarking (e.g., TRENDY, CMIP, ILAMB). This effort will be used to inform the campaigns’ design and feasibility WGs on what are the key regions and processes that are the most uncertain and thus that could benefit the most from PANGEA measurements. MDSWG will also identify the key datasets and data synthesis products derived from a fusion of field, airborne remote sensing and spaceborne remote sensing data that are needed for model initialization, assessment and benchmarking.
  + Maybe a ROSES or a directed funds to carry out OSSE-type of modeling efforts to identify priority areas and priority variables/processes for the field campaign. Representativeness studies (Marcos’s thesis figure or something better, like uncertainty maps)
* Phase 2 (Y3-Y6). Model development to leverage the observations that will be measured during PANGEA, as well as from the new generation of satellites that will be launched during PANGEA and add key processes, variables and dimensions relevant to answer PANGEA’s key questions. The goal of this phase is not the creation of a single, unified model, as this would limit the ability to perform multi ensemble modeling exercises. Rather, in this phase, we aim for a process of data synthesis using one category of model that allows for scaling of space-time limited measurements to the entire pantropical region together with uncertainty quantification, e.g, AI/machine learning methods such as random forest,
* Phase 3 (Y7-Y9). Synthesis studies that use the data collected during PANGEA’s intensive campaigns to answer the key questions across the science themes.
* Emphasize model intercomparison efforts (CMIP) and ensemble modeling approaches
* NASA [Global Modeling and Assimilation Office](https://gmao.gsfc.nasa.gov/)
* Also DOE models (ELM, E3SM), and NSF models (CLM, CESM)
* ILAMB, TRENDY, Rubisco
* Integration of observations and models
  + Emphasize on RS data - model integration (CARDAMOM, CliMA)
  + Process-based models: opportunities for improved initial conditions of diverse ecosystems (lidar, imaging spectroscopy), uncertainty quantification and reduction (PEcAn, ILAMB)
  + Inverse modeling (top-down approaches) [Junjie]
* Advancing process-based understanding - specify a couple of key processes that PANGEA can advance
  + Focus on things that are now being modeled that did not exist or was in very early stages back in the LBA time (demography, eco-hydrology, nutrient cycling coupled with vegetation dynamics, spectroscopy/hyperspectral)
* Need to work on constraining uncertainty and getting the right answers for the right reason(s)
* It needs to show strong connections with the other working groups (so models are fully integrated with PANGEA)

## 7. Technical and Logistical Feasibility

PANGEA will leverage NASA’s history of successful international field and airborne campaigns, including recent campaigns in the Americas, Africa, and Asia. The research being proposed as part of PANGEA will not involve the deployment of new remote sensing technologies or development of new sensors. Rather, PANGEA research will utilize existing airborne and spaceborne remote sensing systems and datasets.

While much of the research for PANGEA will be conducted in locations with existing field based studies, some of the research will be conducted in remote regions that will require more complex logistical arrangements. In addition, because PANGEA is an international deployment taking place in several countries, there are a number of challenges that need to be considered.


Anticipated challenges include deploying and maintaining in situ instrumentation, obtaining international flight permission for airborne data acquisition, visas and research permits for US and international investigators, access to field sites, human-animal interactions/conflict, political or other unrest, health and safety of scientists and participants.

There will be challenges in obtaining flight clearances for the X countries and field sites that are part of the PANGEA domain. To obtain flight clearances, we will work with NASA OIIR to develop the diplomatic clearance packages needed for international airborne deployments. Prior to requesting flight clearances, PANGEA will build relationships with in-country partners such as government agencies, US Embassies and NGOs to develop agreements that will ensure proper flight clearances and field permits. PANGEA will ensure that we follow the rules and customs of each country where we are deployed, through co-design of flight plans and site selection.

In cases where NASA aircraft cannot obtain overflight permission or acquire data using its own instrumentation, PANGEA will deploy commercial or other assets, such as commercial ALS, commercial drone based instrumentation or local instruments and aircraft to acquire the required airborne datasets. This is particularly important in Brazil, where historically we have encountered challenges for ground observations using non-Brazilian instruments and aircraft . Here we will leverage the existing practice employed by NASA and the USG of using commercial airborne data providers to collect the required datasets.

### 7.1 Organization and Management

The organization and coordination of PANGEA will be determined by NASA Program Management. We present a concept for organization and management that reflects a successful model used in the ABoVE and LBA-ECO campaigns. This structure will enable the organization and management of a long-term project with significant investment from interdisciplinary partnerships and collaborations at the national and international scale.



#### 7.1.1 Program Management

The NASA Terrestrial Ecology Program uses surface, airborne, and space-based

observations to understand how Earth’s carbon cycle and terrestrial ecosystems

respond to environmental change and human interventions. Improved

understanding is gained by combining observations with advanced data analysis

techniques and ecosystem process modeling. Terrestrial Ecology *Program Management* will organize and oversee PANGEA with the support of the PANGEA *Project Office*. They will work within the NASA Earth Science Division to select and fund research projects conducted by the PANGEA *Science Team* for participation in PANGEA and to allocate resources to the PANGEA *Project Office* including the PANGEA *Project Scientist and Deputy Project Scientist*. Program management will be responsible for representing PANGEA activities within NASA including to other NASA Programs that may support PANGEA activities. Program management will coordinate PANGEA activities with other research partners from domestic and foreign agencies.

#### 7.1.2 Project Office

Implementation of PANGEA will be supported by a *Project Office*. Field and airborne activities conducted within PANGEA will be organized, coordinated, and supported through the Project Office. Important aspects include coordination and support for field operations and logistics, safety and risk management, and interactions with local and regional stakeholders. The Project Office can provide cyberinfrastructure for data analysis and management. Along with cyberinfrastructure, past campaign experience suggests that a human touch from the Project Office to encourage participation and compliance with data and open science policies will enhance team science. The Project Office will assist Science Team members with permit applications to appropriate authorities. Depending on the needs of the Science Team, the Project Office may also arrange for the collection of core variable data and installation of infrastructure at field sites. The Project Office will be responsible for managing the airborne science campaigns. Science Team Members will work closely with the Project Office and rely upon guidance from its staff for field activities, communications with local and regional stakeholders and authorities, and utilization of PANGEA cyberinfrastructure. The Project Office will be led by a *Project Manager* appointed by Program Management*.* The leaders of the PANGEA *Science Team*, the *Project Scientist* and *Deputy Project Scientist* will be ex officio members of the Project Office and will participate in Project Office activities and coordinate closely with the Project Office to enhance communication with and support of the Science Team.

7.1.3 Science Definition

Prior to initiation of the PANGEA science investigations, a group of scientists and scientific leadership selected by the Program Office will work with the Project Office to design the PANGEA research in a *Concise Science Pla*n. This plan will present a refinement of the ideas presented in this scoping document. The desired content of the Concise Science Plan will be determined by the Program Office. The purpose of the refined plan is to match scientific scope with available resources. Specific recommendations regarding research sites, field scientific infrastructure needs (including instrumentation), and requirements for airborne remote sensing will be defined in the concise plane. The Concise Science Plan will serve Program Management’s needs to solicit science investigations and will serve the selected Science Team as a guide for their integrated investigations to answer PANGEA science questions.

#### 7.1.4 Project Implementation

The PANGEA project will be implemented by the selected PANGEA Science Team supported by the Project Office over a nominal period of six to nine years as called for in the NASA announcement A.4 of 2022. A Project *Implementation Plan* will be elaborated based on the Concise Science Plan. The Project Office shall be responsible for the Implementation Plan including regular updates the frequency of which will be determined in consultation with the Science Team and Program Management. The implementation plan shall detail the research activities to be conducted and specify roles and responsibilities for investigators involved in those activities during the execution of PANGEA. A notional timetable for project implementation is presented in section 7.10. At the outset of the project, roughly one year will be spent preparing for field and airborne data collection activities. The main period of data collection will extend from three to six years depending upon the overall project duration and scope. Analysis of the data collected will be continuous throughout the project. But, we expect data collection to draw gradually to a close one to three years prior to the conclusion of the project to allow time for data analysis, integration, and synthesis. PANGEA will leave a legacy of data and open science that will support future scientific investigations that will respond to the PANGEA science questions and to new science themes.

#### 7.1.5 Science Team and Science Leadership

NASA Program Management working within the NASA Earth Science Division will select and fund research projects conducted by the PANGEA *Science Team* for participation in the PANGEA Project. The *Science Team* will be composed of PIs and CO-Is of selected investigations as well as scientists recruited by those PIs and Co-Is including post-doctoral scientists and students. NASA Program Management will select a PANGEA Project Scientist and a Deputy Project Scientist who will be responsible for providing scientific coordination, leadership and direction for PANGEA, providing scientific inputs regarding PANGEA priorities and activities to Program Management, and communicating about PANGEA to a wide variety of scientific, governmental, and public audiences. In close coordination with the PANGEA Science Team, the Project Office, and Program Management the Project Scientist and Deputy will call and organize the program for regular PANGEA Science Team meetings. The Project Scientist and Deputy will meet with Program Management and the Project Office management, at a minimum, quarterly ,to review progress, resolve problems, and discuss next steps for implementation.

Communication is a critical role of the PANGEA scientific leadership. Experience with past campaigns informs us that timely communication is important to manage the expectations of the PANGEA Science Team and researchers from partner projects and organizations. The PANGEA Project Scientist and a Deputy Project Scientist (hereafter Science Leads = SL) will communicate the research objectives and outputs of the NASA-funded science team to diverse audiences. The SL will work with local partners to set expectations of PANGEA. The SL will accurately and promptly communicate project updates to local research partners. Presentations, webinars, and town halls will employ interpretation services and project materials will be made available in the languages of participating countries. Throughout the lifecycle of PANGEA, conversations with partners should be recorded and expectations clearly tracked as guidance for actions. After PANGEA data has been collected and as science data products become available, the SL will be responsible for ensuring that local partners continue to receive regular updates. The SL will set the tone of PANGEA, and will be mindful about setting an example to the rest of the Science Team about inclusive and respectful collaboration and the value of co-producing research. The SL and all members of the PANGEA Science Team will adhere to the PANGEA Community Guidelines[[1]](#footnote-0).

PANGEA science investigations will be executed by the Science Team. As noted, membership in the Science Team will include investigators selected by NASA and investigators who are recruited by Science Team PIs and Co-Is. PANGEA investigations will concern a number of countries throughout the humid tropics. Based on NASA experience in the Large Scale Biosphere-Atmosphere Experiment in Amazonia, we recommend that *all* investigations have counter-part investigators humid tropical forest countries and endeavor to train early career scientists and technicians from countries where PANGEA research is active and other countries of the humid tropics. This should apply even to investigations that have no field component. During LBA, NASA learned that this approach had many benefits. Practically, it made the NASA presence in host countries more acceptable because of the capacity being built by the researchers. Researchers found that host countries often provided significant leverage for their research projects through in-kind and funded contributions, especially student fellowships. Decades after the NASA presence in South America for LBA concluded, NASA still has a large network of friendly collaborators in the South American scientific community. The impact of those investigators on science in their home countries has been vast.

**PANGEA will emphasize and prioritize diversity, equity, and inclusion in all aspects of the campaign**, including diverse representation in its leadership. As such, PANGEA’s Science Team will prioritize diverse representation in terms of scientific expertise, technical specialties, national origin, race, gender, native language, different career stages, and more. Early career researchers will be included from the beginning, as will representatives from participating countries where field research will take place. Team members must commit to cultural sensitivity, with respect for local collaborators and extra care taken to uphold NASA’s reputation internationally. **Leadership and engagement in the PANGEA scoping process demonstrates diverse support for the campaign and diversity of candidates who have the capacity to and interest in contributing to PANGEA.** The scoping effort also exemplified PANGEA’s ability to implement scientific diplomacyinternationally. The Science Team will meet regularly, and for virtual meetings will endeavour to arrange meetings considerate to the time zones of persons represented.

#### 7.1.6 Disciplinary Skills Required

PANGEA is conceived as an interdisciplinary campaign. Scientists involved in PANGEA research may identify themselves with one discipline or with several. We expect participation from scientists connected with physical, biological, and social sciences. The skills and knowledge associated with an array of disciplines will be represented in the PANGEA Science Team. As part of the Terrestrial Ecology program we expect that ecology at various levels of organization (ecosystem, community, population) will be strongly represented. Biogeochemistry and atmospheric chemistry have long been associated with NASA TE campaigns as are plant physiology and ecophysiology. The science team will include the skills and knowledge of other related disciplines including land systems, meteorology, hydrology, and social sciences. Remote sensing specialists will certainly be well represented in the science team.

### 7.2 Project Organization

Activities for PANGEA will be coordinated and directed by a *Project Office* designated and supported by the Terrestrial Ecology Program Management. The Project Office will be directed by a *Project Manager* who similarly will be appointed by NASA Program Management. A project staff will support the Project Manager. The PANGEA Project Scientist and Deputy Project Scientist will serve as *ex-officio* members of the Project Office. The Project Office will (a) oversee and manage PANGEA field and airborne research activities and projects sponsored by NASA’s Terrestrial Ecology Program and other NASA program offices; (b) coordinate and provide logistical support for NASA-sponsored field research and airborne remote sensing campaigns; (c) provide logistical support to the PANGEA working and coordinating groups, including support of meetings and workshops; and (d) develop and maintain the PANGEA Information System.

We anticipate close coordination between the PANGEA Science Team and Earth Science to Action activities. The Project Manager will designate a point of contact (POC) in the Project Office for science applications of PANGEA. This POC will monitor expectations that applications partners have of the PANGEA science team. Regular and transparent communication with potential application partners will continue at all stages of PANGEA, and updates on decisions to pursue or not pursue potential applications will be communicated promptly. NASA’s international reputation depends on carefully matching end user needs with NASA investment and capabilities as well as managing expectations of all partners.

The organization of the PANGEA Science Team will grow out of the Concise Science Plan and the selected team. We expect that the main themes represented in this scoping document will be the basis of scientific working groups but it is too early to define a detailed structure for those groups. Other working groups may coalesce around specific sites or campaigns. Guided by the Scientific Leadership, the Science Team will coordinate their activity so that results can be synthesized and knowledge gaps can be identified. We anticipate that PANGEA will hold annual team in-person meetings supplemented by more frequent virtual meetings for the full team and sub-teams. The venue and timing of the annual meeting will be the responsibility of the Project Office taking into account team needs, logistics, costs, and other important constraints such as visas for participants regardless of where the meeting is held. The Project Office will also provide support for virtual meetings.

### 7.3 International and Other Agreements

As soon as PANGEA is selected, the team will begin to officially engage institutional partners and develop formal MOU’s, with the help of NASA’s OIIR office, ESPO, and the US State Department. International airborne campaigns have been repeatedly plagued by slow landing clearances and associated bureaucracy, and much of this can be avoided by beginning the formal MOU process early.

* *As soon as selected - [re-]initiate partnership conversations at the outset*
  + *call a PANGEA meeting with all PMs - but also have Earth Action there from the beginning*
  + *Engage international partners at the outset*
  + *PANGEA leadership team start relationship building with partner govts on Day 1 (or 2) to start developing MOUs for PANGEA campaign*
    - *Point to lessons learned from LBA and AfriSAR-2*

#### 7.3.1 Government agreements and MOUs

[1-3 paragraphs on successes and lessons learned from AfriSAR-2 campaign]

#### 7.3.2 NASA airborne campaign Indigenous agreements, permissions, and treaties (KEEP this section)

* Indigenous land and sovereign territories.
* [Draft being co-written (in multiple languages) can be found here](https://drive.google.com/drive/u/1/folders/1Gw5jlwLzT7Z_KHRGMwto6nnl4nSpxRIX)
* State that IPs have different international human rights than other communities

### 7.4 Community Engagement Strategy

This section provides an overview of PANGEA’s strategy for engaging with diverse local communities to address PANGEA’s science questions, find synergies with local research priorities, and implement PANGEA in a manner that is broadly beneficial in the landscapes and countries targeted for research. The strategy draws upon the knowledge, expertise and experiences shared throughout PANGEA’s scoping campaign, which engaged with over 500 individuals and 150 organizations from 42 countries across five continents through (a) consultative workshops, (b) outreach events, (c) working group discussions, (d) bilateral meetings, and (e) web surveys. A more detailed description of engagement methods used during the scoping campaign is provided in Appendix A. Here, we present a list of the communities prioritized for engagement in PANGEA, the principles that underpin PANGEA’s engagement efforts, and PANGEA’s strategy for engaging local communities and cultivating a long-term, positive legacy throughout the tropics.


#### 7.4.1. Communities

PANGEA defines local communities broadly to encompass (1) civil society organizations (CSOs), including those led by and comprised of Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women and youth; local and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and international NGOs; (2) national, regional and global networks of CSOs; (3) scientific institutions; (4) government agencies, (5) intergovernmental agencies, (6) the private sector and investors, and (7) the donor community. Table X provides an overview of these categories of communities and why PANGEA’s engagement with each will be instrumental to the long-term success of the program.

Table X PANGEA Target Groups for Community Engagement

#### 7.4.2. Principles

Table X. PANGEA Principles of Engagement based on CARE (Jennings et al. 2023 & Carroll et al. 2020)

****

****

#### 7.4.3 Engagement Strategy

Addressing these questions

1. How can scientists, local institutions, and communities work together throughout the PANGEA program to develop engagement methods for effective collaboration in diverse geographic and cultural contexts?
2. How can we develop and sustain long-term a network of networks\* that enhances the accessibility, usability, transferability and benefits of the data, methods, models and knowledge about tropical ecosystems during and after PANGEA?

**Knowledge Exchange Opportunities:**

* How can the knowledge/training on remote sensing and its capabilities enable (indigenous/traditional) communities to protect forests? What are the educational needs to support PANGEA? How can ILPC need and knowledge guide PANGEA funded research? (Community Engagement. Will address here.)
* How can PANGEA support or begin to establish a science-based economy and long-term research collaborations with IPLC across the tropics? (Community Engagement. Will address here.)
* How can Indigenous Peoples & Local Communities be empowered to use remote-sensing data to conserve and restore their landscapes? (Split between Section 7.4 Community Engagement and Section 9 Capacity building, training and education. Will partially address here.)

#### 

t

Indigenous Peoples and local, forest-dependent communities

* [Draft being co-written (in multiple languages) can be found here](https://drive.google.com/drive/u/1/folders/1Gw5jlwLzT7Z_KHRGMwto6nnl4nSpxRIX)

Women

* Address gender balance overall. Highlight specific efforts PANGEA could take to address this and key performance indicators we’ll track over time.
* Gender-responsive vs gender transformative (is 9 years enough to transform a system?) acknowledge that we may not transform the system in 6-9 years, but describe the type of impact PANGEA would like to achieve

Scientific Institutions

For the purpose of this White Paper, we use the term scientific institutions primarily for universities, colleges, national laboratories, national professional institutions, and research institutes that through their leaders, faculty, researchers, and students are fundamental partners of PANGEA. PANGEA seeks to partner with scientific institutions located or with research expertise related to any part of the pan tropical forest region to collaborate and carry out its proposed research programs. This partnership will establish a world leading network of research experts and scientific institutions collaborating in response to the grand environmental challenges in the Pan Tropical Forest region due to global atmospheric warming and changes in land use. A particular interest of this partnership is to facilitate the co-development of knowledge and whenever necessary to do technology transfer to generate capacity and capability building in local and regional institutions. One overarching goal of the partnership is to train the next generation of technical personnel and scientists. This partnership seeks to focus on:

* Co-development of the research, analysis, and potential applications of the proposed programs by PANGEA.
* Identification of field sites, research infrastructure, and capabilities that are critical to achieve PANGEA proposed research goals.
* Co-production, sharing, and management of data, development of data infrastructure, equipment, and management expertise at local and regional institutions; creation of regional or national data banks to curate field and remote sensing data, and numerical model outputs so that the emerging knowledge can be integrated with and applied to regional and national demands for the socioeconomic development and policy development.
* The strengthening and broadening of the state-of-the-art research infrastructure and instrumentation for the local and regional scientific institutions to be able to develop and carry out long-term critical research plans
* The design and implementation of strategies to do capacity building for faculty and early career researchers at local and regional universities and research institutes to train and guide the new and diverse generation of scientists at local and regional institutions (for instance, co-lead technical workshops to train junior research faculty and students, and create visiting scholars programs at participating US-based scientific institutions).

Based on ongoing efforts, engage national governments and relevant government agency leaders to showcase benefits and expected impacts to generate financial and policy support for PANGEA related programs in their jurisdictions.

Government agencies

* Policymakers
* Administrators and program directors of government funding agencies
* At national and sub-national levels

Non-governmental organizations

* International
* Local

Intergovernmental organizations

Private sector

Foundations (e.g., the Ford Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, etc.),

We use the term Private Sector to refer to for-profit entities of all sizes that are privately owned and managed. Private sector entities relevant to PANGEA include, but are not limited to; legally-registered (a) agribusiness which cultivate and/or will harvest agricultural, timber and forest non-timber products; (b) extractive industries which alter land cover and/or below-ground ecosystems in search and extraction of oil, minerals, metals and other products from the ground; (c) energy companies that alter ecosystems by installing equipment on or below the surface of the ground; (d) big data companies that develop software or hardware that facilitates the collection and/or analysis of ecosystem data (e.g. forest carbon, biodiversity, etc.); (e) conglomerates and financing institutions that invest in, buy, and/or sell any of the aforementioned types of companies; and (f) companies involved in ecotourism. Although the scope of companies deemed relevant may be vast, the profile of companies present in each landscape where PANGEA is implemented will vary ranging from corporates to SMEs, coops and associations. This section describes a basic engagement strategy that can be adapted in each context.

Private value chain actors are under increasing legal pressure to comply with social, economic, and environmental standards and regulations. On the other end of the corporate responsibility spectrum, a growing number of companies strive to surpass minimum standards, potentially to improve competitiveness and sustainability in production areas, to report positive socio-economic changes to customers and clients, plan more efficient allocation of resources for future projects and improve accountability. This has fueled an increasing demand amongst private sector entities for Earth observation and ground-based data related to ecosystem extent, structure, function, and condition, as well as the social, economic, tenure, and governance systems that may impact ecosystems and communities. More specifically, many private sector entities seek data addressing (1) soil health and fertility, (2) land use (including forest) and land use change, (3) fire risk and occurrence, (4) ecosystem carbon stocks and greenhouse gas emissions, (5) fresh water availability and consumption, and (6) biodiversity conservation and enrichment.

Governance and market mechanisms that drive this demand include national and regional legislation (e.g. US Lacey Act, FLEGT, EU DR), international agreements (e.g. UNFCCC Kyoto Protocol, Paris Agreement, New York Declaration on Forests, UN CBD Aichi Targets, Bonn Challenge, etc.), carbon markets (e.g. voluntary, Clean Development Mechanism), certification schemes (e.g. FSC, Fair Trade), and industry-led associations (e.g. Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil / Biofuels / Cocoa, etc.). Evidence-based data, applied scientific research, capacity building and technical assistance is needed for private sector to move beyond commitments to action PANGEA’s engagement with the private sector has five objectives:

* Strengthen the use of Earth observation data to understand the impacts of companies on ecosystems and monitoring their degradation, mitigation and/or ecosystem enhancement efforts
* Develop standardized methodology/protocols for land use change, forest cover, fire alerts)
* Engage the private sector in a collaborative network, based on best practices and lessons learned and geared toward improving the collection, analysis, and sharing of ground-based data related to ecosystem extent, structure, function, and condition, as well as the social, economic, land tenure, and governance systems that may impact ecosystems and livelihoods.
* Capacity building and technology sharing/development
* Targeted dissemination of research outcomes via business briefs…

Corporates and value chain actors can be major contributors to GHG emissions and biodiversity loss. However, without those actors it will be all but impossible to put the agriculture sector on track towards net zero and sustainability. Engaging the private sector in information and data sharing, fostering a business-friendly collaborative learning environment and providing ad-hoc (practical, operational?) capacity building and technical assistance could enhance the long-term impact of PANGEA (beyond the duration of the program’s funding) on people and nature in areas of operation.

Donor community ← Funding agencies or foundations?

* Public (USAID, Sida, NORAD, etc.)
* Private (e.g. Bezos)

### 7.5 PANGEA Partners

PANGEA research on tropical forest will complement and expand existing research efforts that mainly are limited to small geographical extents ….

* *Coordinating with existing external efforts - mechanisms and responsibility - link to existing mechanisms for coordination including CBSI, LBA, etc.*
  + *FluxNet (especially ICOS & AmeriFlux)*
  + *GEO-TREES*
  + *One Forest Vision*
  + [*GEO*](https://earthobservations.org/)
  + [*USGCRP LACI*](https://www.globalchange.gov/our-work/laci)
  + *Indigenous and Local Community Partners: GATC, RRI, SILK*
* *Categorize potential PANGEA partners according to specific user groups*
* *Map geographically and thematically potential partners*

1. AndesFlux (research initiative conducted by institutions in the US, Canada, Germany, and Peru)
2. ASCEND
3. Australia
4. BELOW
5. Congo Basin Initiative
6. CBSI
7. CIAT - Alliance Bioversity International (International Center for Tropical Agriculture + Bioversity)
8. European Space Agency (ESA)
9. ESDT
10. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
11. FLUXNET
12. Global Alliance of Territorial Communities (GATC)
13. GeoTrees
14. IITA
15. IREES
16. MapBiomas
17. NASA ARID
18. NASA Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation (BDEC)
19. NASA Earth Science to Action (ES2A)
20. NASA Harvest
21. NASA Hydrology
22. NASA Jet Propulsion Lab / AfriSAR
23. NASA Land Cover Land Use Change (LCLUC)
24. NASA Large-scale Biosphere-Atmosphere Experiment in Amazonia (LBA)
25. NASA SERVIR
26. NASA Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP)
27. Observatoire National sur les Changements Climatiques (ONACC)
28. Penn State University
29. Poverty Action Lab at MIT
30. SilvaLab
31. Smithsonian
32. Sylvera
33. US Agency for International Development (USAID)
34. US Department of Energy (US DOE)
35. University of California Santa Cruz
36. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
37. Woodwell
38. World Resources Institute

PANGEA will include several levels of organization (Figure X). At the highest level, there will be a “Government Coordinating Working Group” (GCWG), which is needed because of the involvement of research sponsored by international partners if the required agreements are negotiated, with representatives from partner agencies from countries including but not limited to: Brazil, Peru, Panama, Cameroon, DRC. Additionally, there is potential to form collaborative relationships with a number of domestic U.S. agencies (Appendix X with list of partner agencies) involved in research, monitoring, and assessment activities. The GCWG membership will include program managers who are directing and managing scientific research, monitoring, and assessment projects that involve climate and land use change in tropical latitudes. The GCWG would also provide coordination between PANGEA and frontier research programs that are coordinated at the national and international scale such as the U.S. Climate Change Research program, Convention on Biological Diversity, and others. For example, the Science Panel for the Amazon and the Science Panel for the Congo Basin were created to coordinate a continental-scale approach to help inform and accelerate local and regional solutions to strengthen nature conservation and advance sustainable development. Including a member from the Science Panel for the Amazon and Science Panel for the Congo Basin would provide the basis for coordination of these activities with those being sponsored by PANGEA at a regional scale. The GCWG will need to negotiate with other international space agencies (ESA, ISRO) to establish secure access to satellite remote sensing data that will be used during above. The GCWG will establish data-sharing agreements at the national and international agency level that outline data ownership, usage rights, and storage plan to address data sovereignty.

An International Science Steering Group (SSG) will provide additional oversight and guidance for PANGEA. The SSG will include scientists with expertise in each of the different PANGEA science themes. Depending on the level of sponsorship provided to support PANGEA activities (either directly or indirectly through active collaborations), this group will be led by a co-chair from each representative country whose agencies support the research that is part of PANGEA (e.g., Cameroon, Brazil, and the U.S., see section X). The SSG will provide guidance to the GCWG and Project Office for transference to the various coordinating and working groups that will be part of PANGEA. The SSG will provide oversight for developing the detailed PANGEA Concise Experimental Plan based on the feasibility constraints defined by the GCWG.

* *Establish data-sharing agreements at nation-/agency-level that outline data ownership, usage rights, storage, etc. issues. This will help with the data sovereignty issue.*


### 7.6 Cost Estimates

* **Cost** - Leveraging additional funding sources
  + Related relevant NASA funding opportunities
    - Topical Workshops, Symposiums, and Conferences (TWSC) in Space and Earth Sciences and Technology
    - ARSET, ….
  + Existing opportunities to solicit complementary funding
    - NSF RCN, AccelNet
    - NSF RISE
    - NSF EArly-concept Grants for Exploratory Research ([EAGER](https://new.nsf.gov/policies/pappg/24-1/ch-2-proposal-preparation#ch2F3)) Proposal
    - NSF DEB & BIO calls (alignment with NEON)
    - USAID CARPE
    - USAID SPARK (in prep)
    - USAID - other…
    - Belmont Forum
    - DOE calls?
    - UNESCO
    - JRS Biodiversity
  + In-kind support
    - AmeriFlux, ICOS
  + Seeking additional funding from new sources
    - Donor community

(move Required resources here)

### 7.7 Co-funding

PANGEA recognizes that NASA-TE is limited in the amount and type of funding that it can provide. PANGEA has been designed to leverage a Terrestrial Ecology investment in its core purpose to attract funding from other donors that can support complimentary work that will expand the impact of PANGEA. The project has already made significant strides towards securing diverse sources of funding to leverage TE’s potential investment. Resources from other U.S. government science funders, U.S. government development and conservation funders, private foundations, international governments, and philanthropists will support complementary activities that are outside of NASA’s scope.



This will be critical to provide support to collaborators from tropical countries, and to support research application work. During the scoping phase, the PANGEA team met with XX potential funders, many of whom have expressed interest in providing complementary funding to support activities outlined in this white paper (see Letters of Support).

[PANGEA White Paper Figures & Tables](https://docs.google.com/presentation/u/0/d/1I1VCZSjVCHu4JMfPi1QtXO5UI4u8tuRA-mqUeMGHtvM/edit)[See Table 5 for table of potential co-funders/supporting projects]

The PANGEA team will work with other supporters to detail their contributions while drafting the concise experimental plan. This process will include defining activities and funders to ensure support is complementary and not duplicative, streamlining management and oversight between donors, and addressing any data security concerns. PANGEA hopes to be a leader in operationalizing blended financial support to Terrestrial Ecology projects and to provide learnings to advance such partnerships in the future. To do that, PANGEA will seek to answer the following question:

* How can diverse funding institutions work synergistically to support the advancement of remote sensing and terrestrial ecological research
  + How can complementary funding enhance NASA’s work?
  + What data sharing and security approaches work when there are multiple funders?
  + How can reporting and communications be streamlined?

### 7.8 Open Science - Data Management and Sharing

The PANGEA data management and sharing strategy aims to facilitate open source science, promote collaboration, and maximize the value of PANGEA data more broadly and longer into the future. This strategy will follow NASA Scientific Information Policy requirements and guidelines, adhere to community principles and practices, and keep ethical guidelines and cultural sensitivity in mind. In doing so, PANGEA will also coordinate closely with Indigenous partners to ensure data sovereignty, specifically including Indigenous data sovereignty (IDS). PANGEA will build on top of the success from past field campaigns and leverage new advances in open science and data management concepts and technologies.

PANGEA will integrate data streams from multiple measurement systems, partners, and countries. The PANGEA data management will adhere to the FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) guiding principles to improve data discoverability and accessibility, promote data interoperability and integration, and enhance data reusability and reproducibility. The PANGEA data collection, management, and use will align with the CARE (Collective Benefit, Authority to Control, Responsibility, and Ethics) principles, which emphasize the importance of considering the rights and interests of Indigenous peoples when managing data related to their communities, lands, and resources. The CARE principles complement the FAIR principles by focusing on the ethical, cultural, and social dimensions of data management.

PANGEA data collection, management, and use also acknowledges the importance of data sovereignty, which requires active partnerships with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs). Data sovereignty is the management of information in a way that is consistent with the laws, practices, and customs of the nation-state in which it is located. Indigenous data sovereignty is the “right of Indigenous Peoples and Nations to govern the collection, ownership, and application of their own data, deriving from the inherent right of Indigenous Nations to govern their peoples, lands, and resources,” and is positioned as a collective right within international Indigenous rights frameworks (Cannon et al 2024). Indigenous knowledge-holders retain culturally sensitive information and data. To ensure that PANGEA’s data collection and management efforts are ethical and respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, PANGEA will work with partners, including Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities to:

* *Engage with partners, including IPLCs, during the development of the Concise Experimental Plan, well before data collection is conducted;*
* *Determine who is responsible for granting permission for external parties to access data and/or Indigenous territories for research;*
* *Create steps or policies for researchers and/or IPLCs for data sharing and/or requesting permission to access data or IPLC territories;*
* *Establish a plan for data collection and/or monitoring;*
* *Build capacity and work with partners, including IPLCs to secure funding for storing and managing Indigenous data;*
* *Provide training to create tools that would support data collection, management, and dissemination.*

Open Science Coordinating Group

* Involves members from both US and international teams
* Establish data workflows
* Establish consistent formats and practices for data and metadata and optimization for cloud-based access and analysis, especially for emerging types of data, like drone-based.
* Provide guidance on capturing data quality information in a consistent manner
* Coordinate and provide guidance on open science and data management activities

Coordinated through the Government Coordinating Working Group (GCWG), data and information sharing agreements at the national and international agency level will be established to outline data ownership, usage rights, and storage plan. Such agreements are an important first step to align expectations around issues associated with data and information management involving multiple countries and agencies, including data sovereignty. PANGEA will follow guidelines from the NASA Earth Science Data Preservation Content Specification ( <https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/esdis/esco/standards-and-practices/preservation-content-spec>) to prepare and preserve data as well as associated information beyond the lives of a project. This will enable a new user in the future to understand how the data were used for deriving information, knowledge, and policy recommendations and to “repeat the experiment” to ascertain the validity and possible limitations of conclusions reached in the past, and to provide confidence in long-term trends that depended on data from multiple projects. The Preservation Content Implementation Guidance document (<https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/s3fs-public/2022-07/ESDS-RFC-042VERSION1.pdf>) provides guidelines and checklists to address the PCS needs for different types of Earth science research projects, including airborne and field investigations.

PANGEA will develop an Information Portal to point to datasets from partners (e.g., GEO-TREES, AmeriFlux, ICOS, XYZ). This Information Portal will be publicly accessible and will outline PANGEA’s data management and sharing strategy, provide direct links to data, as well as information on the planned and ongoing activities of PANGEA investigators and collaborators, including inventories of the location, timing, and types of data collected.

The **PANGEA Information Portal (PIP)** will provide easy discovery and access to data collected by PANGEA and also existing data useful for PANGEA research. PIP will compile inventories of the location and types of data collected by other researchers that are being used by PANGEA investigators and collaborators. The PANGEA Open Science Coordinating Group will work closely with coordinate closely with data owners when collating and linking to existing data sources to ensure data sharing is collaborative and ethical, respecting the rights and ownership of data already collected. As such, PIP will serve as a critical interface both campaign coordination with aligned activities. PIP will include a web-based GIS that allows for review of the data within the tool, including information on previous and ongoing investigations. PIP will be designed to be user friendly and support both researchers and the public community at large. Visualization and GIS support will be critical to maximize the value of PANGEA data to a broader audience.

Data provenance and reproducibility are important aspects of open-source science. Algorithms, codes, and workflows associated with data creation (such as models), processing, and validation for PANGEA will be made openly available to the extent possible. Active code development will ideally be through open collaborative platforms, like GitHub, when appropriate.

PANGEA will leverage and integrate with existing and emerging capabilities and systems offered by NASA Earth Science Data Systems as much as possible. These include the Distributed Active Archive Centers (DAACs) for airborne data, DAAC tools and services to make airborne and orbital data easier to use for terrestrial ecology research, NASA’s Visualization, Exploration, and Data Analysis (VEDA) platform (<https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/esds/veda>), and ongoing efforts to coordinate data standardization and protocols. PANGEA is an opportunity to harmonize protocols across research communities to support scaling. One example is the coordinated VSWIR data cleaning by (SBG/EMIT/AVIRIS/NEON coordinated team).

Similarly, PANGEA will work closely with partners at the outset (i.e., conversations to ensure alignment have already begun and coordination will commence upon selection) to ensure ground data, flux tower data, drone data, camera trap data, bioacoustics data, Indigenous and Traditional Ecological Knowledge, and more are collected, stored, and shared appropriately and according to the best available practices.

For example, PANGEA will work closely with important FLUXNET partners AmeriFlux and ICOS to XYZ. - also mention [KADI](https://kadi-project.eu/)

For example, IPBES xyz.

For example, LBA

For example, ATFS

PANGEA will develop a **cloud-based data analysis platform** for PANGEA investigators to support open and collaborative research. PANGEA’s data analysis platform will be based on successful science clouds implemented by ABoVE, SHIFT, BioSCape, and NASA’s Multi-Mission Algorithm and Analysis Platform (MAAP, <https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/esds/maap>). These efforts demonstrate successful international data collaboration, including between NASA and ESA (MAAP), Amazon Web Services’ Social Responsibility Program (BioSCape), and between X and Y (ABoVE). PANGEA’s cloud-based computing platform will lower barriers to entry, especially for international partners who are likely to be limited in bandwidth, data storage capacity, and computing power. The cloud computing platform will also allow PANGEA science team members to easily share early versions of data products (before they are ready for archiving) and troubleshoot data analysis problems communally (e.g. via slack). Additionally, capacity building materials, especially coding notebooks, can be developed specifically for the cloud computing environment, allowing anyone anywhere in the world to run them and apply similar approaches. The importance of a cloud computing environment were demonstrated during BioSCape, whose South African science team members would otherwise have been severely limited in their ability to access, analyze, and apply the campaign’s data. Based on BioSCape’s success, PANGEA will deploy a cloud computing platform that will allow users to access and analyze the data without them needing high performance computing resources and eliminating the issue of tranferring large data files over long distances on unreliable internet connections.

* Emphasize low barrier for entry, especially for international partners

PANGEA will improve on open-source science and data management practices throughout the campaign, including through trainings and workshops on data management in collaboration with the DAACs, FLUXNET, IPLC partner organizations like the Global Alliance of Territorial Communities, ATFS, and more. Many of these partners have existing training programs that will be leveraged. This will include developing campaign specific versions of NASA’s Open Science 101 curriculum: <https://nasa.github.io/Transform-to-Open-Science/os101-modules/> PANGEA will prioritize trainings and workshops with partners to support independent and coordinated data management efforts, which: 1) enhances the capacity of tropical institutions and 2) ensures international alignment that will serve as a foundation for datasets and collaboration to continue beyond the PANGEA campaign. Example partners include LBA, XYZ.


* Explain how data management considerations will be addressed during the campaign.
  + NASA Terrestrial Ecology field campaigns must be committed to NASA’s Earth Data and Information Policy, NASA Open Science Philosophy, and NASA’s Open Data, Services, and Software Policy.
  + See ABoVE data management strategy - CCE
  + work with CCE and DAACS to ensure meet XYZ policies
    - NASA Earth Science Data Preservation Content Specification: https://www.earthdata.nasa.gov/esdis/esco/standards-and-practices/preservation-content-spec
  + Community input on data management plan
* Different data support for different data products linked to via central PANGEA Data Portal
  + AmeriFlux & ICOS for flux tower data
* Data accessibility, usability, and visualization
  + Need user-friendly data platform!!!!
    - Appears.earthdata - mentioned as useful by graduate student researchers from the tropics at various workshops
  + How to make data more accessible to non scientists? - think about applications side of things - partner with existing efforts like Global Forest Watch, Land and Caron Lab, GIS efforts via Rights & Resources Initiative

[ Include text regarding models ]

### 7.9 Timetable

(number of years?)

* We need to develop tables like Table 2 & 3 in the AboVE white paper (copied below for reference)



### 7.10 Risk and Risk Mitigation / Risk Assessment

* *Proactively discuss limitations in our engagement methods.*
* *Identify the gaps and explain why certain groups were under-represented groups in our consultative process (e.g. private sector, government esp in Africa, IPLC logistical challenge + ethical concerns). Explain how the funded PANGEA program could address these gaps.*
* Inclusiveness. PANGEA will interact with people with different backgrounds and levels of instructions. Simple language is needed,
* Interaction with Stakeholders. Point out current gaps, allude to desire to improve this with ES2A and speak to PANGEA’s ability to advance this while being honest about real challenges with both national and international stakeholders
* Inter-agency effort: both a risk and a benefit - lots to coordinate but highly valuable - greater than the sum of its parts - PANGEA is conducting research in a region highly sensitive to climate change, making this work particularly valuable to several U.S. research institutions
* Proprietary data from collaborators? how will we deal with this limitation? - see careful langeuage in Open Science section
* Universality: PANGEA documents will be translated into, english, spanish, portuguese, and french.
* Formation: PANGEA will strive to integrate the next generation of scientists, though this effort may be constrained by budget limitations. - will actively seek additional funding to support this
* Lack of alignment between NASA priorities (e.g. answering novel science questions) and end-user priorities (e.g. consistent monitoring of landscapes)
* MvE: Co-developing projects and working equitably with IP&LC can take a long time and ideally builds on long-standing relationships; it should also involve a plan for how to continue supporting communities beyond the duration of the project. It might be worth considering this as a 'risk' considering the potentially 'short' duration of Pangea field work.

## 8. Enabling Earth Science to Action

There are two main requirements for effective application of NASA research: (1) substantive overlap between NASA science and user needs; and (2) a process that brings potential users and scientists together. This section presents the ways PANGEA will enable Earth Science to Action (ES2A) in critical fields like climae change and carbon, biodiversity, and agriculture and livelihoods. It also details the current and future processes that the project employs to ensure uptake of research outputs by users. PANGEA’s early, intensive, and diverse engagement of stakeholders during the scoping phase for co-design is foundational to ensure end use of data products. Based on feedback from the scoping phase, PANGEA data products will be highly accessible and user friendly, and will include information on scaling approaches, offer educational materials, and continue a bidirectional dialog that raises awareness about PANGEA and its products while collecting feedback on end user needs. PANGEA plans to advance methodologies for the weaving of local, traditional, and ecological knowledge with remote sensing data, which offers both opportunities for improved scientific understanding, and unearths novel routes to put PANGEA products in the hands of decision makers and action takers.

* Emphasize that community engagement is central to PANGEA’s Earth Science to Action strategy - stated in the process section below, but good to tease here
* Work with partners to make these data products as accessible as buying something on Amazon - e.g., Global Forest Watch
  + Include info on how scaling was done so users understand
  + Educational materials - summer schools, MOOCs,
  + Raise awareness across communities - about PANGEA, about needs, also about existing datasets
* Integration of RS data with LEK, IEK, and TEK - put there here or integrate into biodiversity 8.1.2
* use ES2A language
* Provide specific examples in applications examples below

### 8.1: Applications of PANGEA research outputs

#### 8.1.1 Climate Change and Carbon

| Science question or methodological improvement | Research application | Partners/channels for implementation |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1, 4 | Improving carbon accounting for credits and mitigation |  |
| 2, 4, 6, 7 | Improving carbon flux predictions for global climate predictions (IPCC) |  |
| 1, 7 | Improving precision around impacts of forest loss and gain on carbon sequestration |  |
|  |  |  |

* Carbon mapping
  + Carbon credit Standards, uncertainties, harmonization
  + Do trade agreements and market policies (ex. EU Deforestation Regulation, African Continental Free Trade Area Agreement) between Global North/South countries affect SES?
  + Refining predictions, specifically IPCC, to make them more accurate
    - Expected changes to carbon stocks under climate change
* Mapping of risks to carbon stocks in the tropics - important for carbon markets

#### 8.1.2 Biodiversity

The Earth Science to Action strategy urges that now is the time for the Earth information of global biodiversity collected and archived by NASA to be applied towards the existing gap between technological advancements and the needs of society to adapt resilient strategies. Concern for the rate of global biodiversity loss is intensified by a poor understanding of the emergent contributions of biological assembly to the structure and function of ecosystems. Throughout the evolutionary history of life on Earth, the tropical biosphere has served as an “engine” for generating biodiversity (Antonelli et al., 2015) and remains identified as the contemporary biodiversity hotspot. Applied Biodiversity science in the tropics may elucidate the reciprocal socio-ecological mechanisms persevering resilient global biodiversity hotspots, and inform strategies for local-scale adaptation and resilience to climate and land use change.

* **biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity**
* Speak to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework - PANGEA can directly support mapping biodiversity in the tropics which is currently insufficient, but necessary to support Target 1 of the KM GBF - [**TARGET 1**](https://www.cbd.int/gbf/targets/1)**: Plan and Manage all Areas To Reduce Biodiversity Loss** 
  + **Could also support** [**TARGET 2**](https://www.cbd.int/gbf/targets/2/)**: Restore 30% of all Degraded Ecosystems**
* Material here pulled from [IPBES Scoping report for a methodological assessment of integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity:](https://files.ipbes.net/ipbes-web-prod-public-files/2024-06/decision_10_1_annex-ii.pdf) 18. Chapter 2: Implementing target 1 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework on biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning (indicative length: 25,000 words). Chapter 2 will focus on target 1 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. It will highlight the importance of including biodiversity in all spatial planning (including urban planning) for conserving and enhancing nature and nature’s contributions to people, including outside protected and restored areas, and the role of connectivity in enhancing the resilience of such areas in order to meet goal A of the framework. Chapter 2 will also focus on the role that spatial planning can play in relation to the elements of target 1 that refer to “effective management processes addressing land and sea use change” and in relation to bringing the loss of areas of high biodiversity importance, including ecosystems of high ecological integrity, close to zero by 2030, while respecting the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. It will explain the need to meet target 1 in order to meet other targets of the framework, including targets 2, 3, 8, 10 and 12, and will explain the interlinkages. The chapter will show how target 1 provides a spatial context for those other targets, and it will explore the importance of spatial planning for reducing trade-offs and increasing synergies between different uses of land (including inland waters) and sea in the context of the nexus among biodiversity, food, water, health and climate change, taking into account different economic activities and the wide range of sustainable practices available at the regional and national levels to scale up positive impacts. 19. The chapter will take a landscape/seascape approach to exploring the various demands and interests involved as well as the interactions between them. It will assess how biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning influences biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people. It will assess applications in different contexts, such as urban planning, protected area and ecological network planning, restoration planning, regional land use planning, marine and coastal planning, and other types of integrated spatial planning, including customary practices of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The chapter will assess available methods and indicators for measuring progress in biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and will, as necessary, provide options for other indicators to complement those of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
* The Global Biodiversity Framework reported four long-term goals for 2050 and 23 targets to be achieved by 2030 (CBD, 2022) of which two are directly related to the Pangea. Goal A focuses on expanding the area of healthy ecosystems by maintaining, enhancing, or restoring the ecosystems, through the prevention of species extinction, and preservation of genetic diversity. Goal B emphasizes the sustainable utilization and management of biodiversity and recognizes nature's contributions to people. The 23 global targets aim to reduce threats to biodiversity, meet people's needs through sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing, and develop tools for conservation implementation.
* IPBES and Convention on Biological Diversity
* [Global Biodiversity Framework 23 targets for 2030](https://www.cbd.int/gbf/targets)
  + Reduce biodiversity loss
  + Restore 30% degraded ecosystems

#### 8.1.3 Agriculture and Livelihoods

* **Connect to partners:** NASA Harvest, CGIAR, Alliance Bioversity & CIAT, IITA
* **Sustainable agriculture and deforestation-free supply chains (ultimately supporting intensification efforts in the tropics to reduce defor pressures from extensification - requires improving yields and providing alternative livelihoods)** 
  + Yield and crop type mapping
  + Water use and supply
  + Precision ag
  + Focus on applications that support Early Warning, Early Action, Early Finance - related to drought, flooding, pest impacts on ag in the tropics
* Supply chain traceability and management / Supply chains / Value chains - EUDR
* Bioeconomy
  + Non-timber forest products
* Ecosystem service mapping
  + What ecosystem services are readily mappable via remote sensing and/or integration with ancillary data and information (LEK, TEK, IEK)?
  + What ecosystem service mapping capabilities could be advanced by PANGEA?

#### 8.1.4 Disturbance Dynamics

* Deforestation and degradation alerts - associated with drivers?
  + Mining, roads, urbanization, etc. to be used by local and Indigenous communities and/or jurisdictional governments
* Restoration
* Disaster Alerts & Response
  + Fires
  + Flooding
* Weather prediction
* Empowering and elevating Indigenous, local, and traditional communities
* Use the information we gathered during the DC workshop session on flows of information → specifically call out we worked to engage potential end users from the beginning. This should make the applications suggestions more realistic
* Draw upon lessons learned from ABOVE (Debjani Singh, Libby Larson, Kimberly Minor). Divide all the user cases into different stakeholder group. These groups will have different needs and how we will address these needs. Maybe have 4-5.
* Sort potential partners into groups
* Visualization of partners and different types of uses
* what's the outcome we want at the end of all of this and how are going to measure it at the end?
* Be realistic about data expectations from airborne campaigns
  + not data that's going to be around beyond the campaign (for the most part)
  + more episodic than is necessarily needed
  + how do we feather into other ongoing services / satellite missions
    - E.g. SAR training / readiness for SERVIR
      * Engage in something simliar for hyperspectral w relevant mission leads
  + can use the airborne campaign as candy - training before, after, alongside
  + Focus on operational data - already in the DAAC, as opposed to simulated data
    - Not so much early adopters workshops (e.g., for NISAR)
    - Nancy tries to keep ARSET out of 'simulated data' space

### 8.2: Process to enable Earth Science to Action

Substantive interest alone is insufficient to guarantee that NASA products will be used. Research application requires that end user communities must be identified and engaged early, and must be partners in research design and tool development. This requires advanced planning, intent, and resources. That is why PANGEA has invested since the inception of the scoping phase in laying the groundwork for research translation. Specifically, PANGEA addresses the following Guiding Principles from NASA’s ES2A Strategy (2024-2034):

* Amplify impact through partnerships: PANGEA’s investment in community engagement has attracted a diverse array of partners, including international governments, donors, and local communities (see for details about community engagement). These partners include potential end users, data contributors, and potential funders for applications—the last of which will help make PANGEA’s work cost effective by supplementing NASA’s Earth Science resources with funds to support capacity building, community engagement, and research translation (see [Section 7.5](#_w90m76cd6k00): Co-funding for additional information). PANGEA also brings extensive international partnerships, ranging from national space agencies that could provide complementary data to tropical communities who will participate in data collection and potentially in end use. PANGEA has engaged these partners early in the process to increase their investment and their input in co-development of potential end products.
* Engage a diverse workforce and broader Earth Science community: PANGEA transdisciplinary goals are supported by a diverse team that ranges from data scientists to economists and hail from NASA, academia, non-profit organizations, other federal agencies, and governments from around the world. PANGEA’s extensive international engagement also offers opportunities to work with and recruit the best minds globally to NASA’s Earth Science efforts, while the capacity building and training efforts (see [Section 9](#_8t6ay0v9gizk)) help form the next generation of scientists.
* Use a balanced approach: PANGEA builds on prior decadal campaigns both for science questions and data (e.g. LBA) and for process improvement (e.g. LBA, ABOVE). By asking bold and critical science questions that were formulated based on prior campaigns, while focusing geographic scope, PANGEA maximizes value.

During the Scoping Phase, PANGEA led extensive outreach to potential end users (see [Section 7.5](#_w90m76cd6k00)), and engaged with potential end users about what questions and data are most valuable to them. As a result, PANGEA has worked since its inception to bridge the sometimes difficult gap between what science questions are being asked and what end users need for decision making. This process is especially important for a decadal campaign that will not offer end users long term data sets. PANGEA has also prioritized seeking a diverse range of funding partners, recognizing that NASA is well-suited to support data collection and analysis and tool/platform development, while other sponsors are better positioned to support conservation projects that apply data and some forms of training and capacity building. The Scoping Phase also included a visioning exercise, where diverse teams collaborated to draw translational pathways that included data acquisition, potential end uses, co-development of products, and listing of stakeholders

Community engagement is central to PANGEA’s Earth Science to Action strategy (see section XX for details on how PANGEA will engage the community). PANGEA is aware that with community engagement comes with the risk of creating expectations that cannot be met by the project - largely because the airborne data being collected is spatiotemporally limited in scope and will be more episodic than is necessarily needed to meet many end user decision making needs. PANGEA will make every effort to repeatedly and clearly convey the impact limitations of the airborne data. PANGEA will also endeavour to leverage the momentum created by an airborne campaign to create, grow, and strengthen a new end user community for NASA Earth data beyond the airborne campaign. Specifically, PANGEA will ensure that all community engagement activities emphasise the links between PANGEA’s field and arborne data and NASA’s Earth Observatory satellite sensors (both current and planned). In doing so, PANGEA will build an SBG early adopter community in the tropics.

During the decadal campaign, PANGEA will use the following activities to facilitate translation of research to action:

* + Include conversations with end users (user needs assessment) as part of the Concise Science Plan
  + Environment scan to find existing tools that could integrate data

Decision Support Systems / Impact & Vulnerability Assessments

NASA, along with other domestic and international agencies, are increasingly leading an important role in the development and implementation of decision support systems. These systems are designed to incorporate the results from research activities within a modeling framework in order to provide information to land managers, regional governments, among others who require information in a specific context.

* The PANGEA Information System (PIS) will provide a platform to conduct further research on the use of satellite information products to support decision making
* The PIS will also be a critical platform for PANGEA researchers to interact at multiple levels with scientists and managers at agencies who are responsible for assessing the impacts of climate change in tropical regions, as well as the media and general public
* The Integrated Modeling Framework will provide the basis to create unique information products based upon integrated assessments.

There is increasing recognition by NASA and other U.S. and international agencies on the need to co-develop decision support systems to exchange information and analysis with land managers, regional governments, and other policy and decision makers.

* Development of programs within national and international land management agencies whose mandate is to provide data required for climate and land cover change monitoring.
* Aligned with program mission to refine and develop the same process-driven models that will be the focus of research in PANGEA
* Two-way benefits: Similarity of interests aligns opportunity to coordinate modeling activities and associated research

## 9. Capacity Building, Training, and Education

* Be realistic about data expectations from airborne campaigns
  + not data that's going to be around beyond the campaign (for the most part)
  + more episodic than is necessarily needed
  + how do we feather into other ongoing services / satellite missions
    - E.g. SAR training / readiness for SERVIR
      * Engage in something simliar for hyperspectral w relevant mission leads
  + can use the airborne campaign as candy - training before, after, alongside
  + Focus on operational data - already in the DAAC, as opposed to simulated data
    - Not so much early adopters workshops (e.g., for NISAR)
    - Nancy tries to keep ARSET out of 'simulated data' space

PANGEA represents an important opportunity to increase understanding around the utility of Earth observations and expand the use of NASA Earth data around the world. As PANGEA advances knowledge of tropical forests and their vulnerability and resilience to climate change, PANGEA will develop innovative methods, compile valuable datasets and produce critical findings that can help communities understand their environmental impacts and take urgent actions to mitigate and adapt to climate change. PANGEA shares NASA Earth Science’s strategic goal of advancing and integrating Earth science knowledge to empower humanity to create a more resilient world over the next decade (NASA Earth Science to Action Strategy 2024-2034). Strengthening capacity and investing in education is central to this endeavor of leveraging the PANGEA terrestrial ecology program to benefit local and national communities in the tropics. PANGEA intends to partner with existing NASA programs, as well as with local collaborating organizations, to plan and execute training activities that are appropriate for a range of potential trainees, including: students, early career scientists, the broader workforce, and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities …..

During the Large Scale Biosphere Experiment in Amazonia (LBA), capacity building was mutually beneficial to the NASA LBA-ECO efforts and to our South American hosts. Brazil demanded that every LBA project include a training and education component. These were tailored to the size of each project and often linked to academic programs within Brazil. The largest group of students trained within LBA were Brazilians engaged in scientific initiation programs. These are positions for undergraduates who earned minimum wage to work 20 hours per week for a science project. Often these students did technical work but many reached the level of co-authorship on paper and some were even primary authors. About 500 students participated in LBA in this way in the first decade of the program. Often they went on to do masters and doctoral degrees. Another 500 students earned MS and Ph.D. degrees associated with LBA projects. Only a small portion of the funds to pay students came from NASA research projects (mainly for students who did their degrees in the US). The bulk of the funds came through traditional Brazilian mechanisms through their national education and science ministries and through State level research foundations. While the total investment in dollar terms was probably less than 5% of the NASA investment in LBA-ECO and other foreign research activities, the immediate payoff was huge because of the low cost of student stipends. In Brazil, many LBA graduates went on to do important work in the environmental field in universities, in municipal, state, and national government agencies, and in non-governmental organizations exceeding Brazilian expectations for the impact of the LBA training and education program.

The scope of each PANGEA capacity building, training, or education activity will depend on which individuals from which institutions are being targeted for training. Intermittently throughout PANGEA, a brief needs assessment will be carried out to assess what the community requires and desires in terms of capacity building, training, and education activities. The intention of this assessment will be to identify who needs what kind of development activities and what resources are availble and what resources are needed to support any planned activities (e.g. host institution can provide venue and catering, instructors and teaching materials are needed). PANGEA is not funded to deliver capacity building, training, and education activities and therefore complementary funding will be sought to support these activities (tablexx??). Evaluating the needs assessment will help PANGEA identify which complementary funding opportunities are most appropriate to pursue.

The primary goal of PANGEA’s capacity building strategy is to strengthen and grow the NASA Earth data user community in the tropics. PANGEA’s airborne activities will generate a lot of excitement around the potential of remote sensing for ecological applications. While capacity building activities focused on teaching users how to access and analyze PANGEA’s airborne data products will be essential to ensure these data produts are applied to their full potential, it is PANGEA’s intention to leverage the momentum created by the airborne campaign to promote broader application of NASA orbital data sets, particularly those that are well suited for examination alongside the airborne data products, e.g. EMIT, PACE, ECOSTRESS, GEDI, and in the future NISAR and SBG. As such, all of PANGEA’s capacity building activities will use field, airborne, and orbital NASA Earth data, and instructors will constantly remind users that the potential of these multi-scalar datasets is far greater than if only one or two types of data are examined alone. An added benefit of this approach is that users will know, from the beginning, that while PANGEA airborne data is limited in spatiotemporal scope, NASA’s satellite datasets can help fulfil their data needs. PANGEA’s approach to capacity building intends to build NASA Early Adopter user groups in the tropics - particularly for SBG and NISAR, but also for ESA missions like BIOMASS and CHIME.

PANGEA will draw upon NASA Earth Science’s strategy to “build capacity through an extensive and diverse set of partnerships, both traditional and new… [including with] national and international governmental agencies, academia, non-governmental and international organizations, the private sector, and philanthropies.” Here, we outline the “Enhanced Partnerships” PANGEA has already cultivated during the scoping campaign with other institutions involved in education and capacity building at local, regional, national, and global scales – with an emphasis on activities in the tropics.

| Partner | Country | Regions active | Forms of capacity building | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Formal education (3 months or more) | In-person workshops & short courses | Online workshops & courses | Technical consul- tations with experts | Network- ing & learning events | Scholar- ships |
| NASA ARSET | USA | Global & Online |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| NASA ORNL DAAC | USA | Global & Online |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| NASA GLOBE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NASA SERVIR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NASA Indigenous People’s Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NSF RISE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NSF GOLD-EN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USAID SPARK | USA | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESA | EU | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One Forest Vision | France | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CEOS |  | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UN FAO | Italy | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNFCCC | Germany | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Cameroon Yaoundé | Cameroon | Central Africa |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WRI | USA | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUCP | Peru | Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University of Oklahoma | USA | Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Penn State University | USA | Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SilvaCarbon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SMACON | Nigeria | West Africa |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Geospatial Girls & Kids | Cameroon | Central Africa |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CIAT-Bioversity | USA | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CI | USA | Global |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. NASA’s Applied Remote Sensing Training program (ARSET): ARSET offers training pitched at various levels of applied Earth observation users and with experience training both US and international participants. PANGEA would work with ARSET and the PANGEA science team to deliver a multi-part training webinar series. Additionally, PANGEA would hope to replicate the in-person training model trialed during BioSCape, that saw ARSET and the ORNL DAAC work together for the first time to deliver a 5-day in-person training in South Africa to conservation decision makers, university lecturers, and diverse researchers.
2. NASA’s Distributed Active Archiving Centers (DAACs): PANGEA hopes to emulate the success of EMIT working with the LP DAAC and BioSCape working with ORNL DAAC to produce capacity building materials, particularly training notebooks, and conduct training workshops at conferences. The materials produced for these workshops will be tailored to the needs of the PANGEA science team, and therefore especially useful to them, but will be appropriate and engaging for a broad audience. Delivering these materials at conference workshops, such as AGU, ESA, and ATBC, will help to engage diverse researchers at a variety of career stages and with various levels of prior engagement with NASA Earth data.
3. NASA’s DEVELOP program: DEVELOP partners with decision makers who are interested in using NASA Earth data to support their work. Each partner will have a DEVELOP team of 4-5 people work with them over 10 weeks to assess how NASA Earth data can help address their needs. The 10 week period can be renewed for up to 3 terms. DEVELOP proposals submitted by non-US PANGEA partner organizations can help develop capacity within partner organizations and may lead to the generation of applied data products. For example, during BioSCape, the South African National Botanical Insitute partnered with DEVELOP to help develop data products to map ecologically important riparian vegetation.
4. NASA Global Learning and Observations to benefit the Environment Program (GLOBE): GLOBE delivers educational activities to K-12 students, teachers, and citizens. During BioSCape, GLOBE traveled to South Africa to deliver an educational program to 170 high-school students from 10 under-resourced schools and delivered a “train the trainer” program to high school teachers. The South African iteration of this program was a success, due largely to the tailoring of the program to the South African context, and with the train-the-trainer program likely leading to larger impact in the future. PANGEA intends to emulate this success, capitalizing on the excitement surrounding an airborne campaign to engage the next generation of scientists in STEM.
5. NASA/USAID SERVIR: SERVIR works through hubs across the tropics to support sustainable development through capacity building and incorporating perspectives from women, Indigenous Peoples and their communities. PANGEA would work with SERVIR to develop custom services/data pipelines to serve the specific decision making needs of local partner organizations. SERVIR has an excellent Planning Toolkit that provides instruction on how to assess and deliver impactful interventions, and we hope to work with SERVIR and the PANGEA science team to execute this.
6. Indigenous Peoples Initiative:
7. NSF Research, Innovation, Synergies, and Education (RISE): The NSF’s new RISE program aims to foster transdisciplinary collaborations that engage the broader geosciences community to drive transformative discoveries, innovations in workforce development, and use-inspired solutions for urgent Earth system challenges. The program will specifically focus on supporting work that will build a resilient planet, and therefore there may be opportunities for PANGEA to engage with NSF around certain capacity building and training activities. The details of RISE are not yet available.
8. USAID’s Strategic Partnerships For Advancing Research And Knowledge (SPARK) program: SPARK awards are a new USAID mechanism to support research generation in collaboration with USAID partner countries. SPARK has a focus on collaborative work towards addressing international development challenges and values co-creation of knowledge as well as Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting practices. As such, PANGEA’s activities would be synergistic with this program, and we hope to encourage PANGEA partners and members of the science team to apply for this funding.
9. NSF Geoscience Opportunities for Leadership in Diversity (GOLD-EN): GOLD-EN is an NSF funding call that explicitly supports activities to increase and sustain including people from diverse backgrounds in the geoscience education and research community. PANGEA’s ethos is synergistic with that of this NSF program, and we hope that members of the science team and broader PANGEA community will apply for this funding.
10. ESA?
11. One Forest Vision?
12. Committee on Earth Observation Satellites WGCapD?

As an international project, PANGEA’s biggest opportunity for capacity development and training is within the science team. PANGEA’s ROSES funding call would explicitly indicate that proposals co-developed with local researchers are more likely to be funded. This was done in the BioSCape funding call and was a significant contributor to ~50% of their science team being local. This co-development of research will enable skills and knowledge transfer within each project team, and create opportunities for the science team to learn from each other more braodly. Additionally, the PANGEA ROSES funding call would encourage proposers to commit time to co-mentor and co-supervise students and postdocs, further helping to build capacity. Once formed, PANGEA’s science team will abide by a Code of Conduct that has both advice for ethical and equitable collaboration as well as clear authorship guidelines that everyone must abide by. These guidelines will be based on the Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT, credit.niso.org), which values the diversity of roles that make a research product possible.

Capacity building notes from Elsa

* + Need to define capacity building around what exactly
    - Who - which kinds of individuals and which institutions
      * students and mid-career
      * centers of excellence - define what that means and point to CBSI, for example
    - what kind of capacity building
      * Carry out brief capacity building needs assessment
      * who is doing what, where?
      * create document of WHO we need to contact
      * create form to send to them with questions - ask Bonaventure for input
      * follow up short interviews
      * Marius, Adia, Robinson, Jose, someone from SE Asia
  + NASA Capacity Building efforts
    - Indigenous Peoples Initiative
    - SERVIR - food security, water security, ecosystem and carbon
    - ARSET - Applied Remote Sensing Training - international!
    - DEVELOP
  + ATBC!!
  + PANGEA excellence centers
    - point to existing excellence centers - CBI, CongoFlux, + most promising from CBSI; Latin America community (Brazil, Peru/Univ of Oklahoma, PUCP, Colombia, Ecuador?); Asia community (SEARPP)
    - e.g., universities with minimum requirements, and conditions that need to be satisfied - MOU
      * see example from Peru/University of Oklahoma or CBI
      * get buy-in from university at the highest-level possible (where possible - although be aware that will be challenging in Africa - watch out for "big fish"
  + BI-DIRECTION FLOW/Exchange
    - early career scientists but also mid-career (train the trainers)
    - also citizen science & K-12 - see [NASA GLOBE](https://www.nasa.gov/get-involved/globe/)
    - also with local communities - need to specify how!!
    - brain-drain - emphasize paying researchers from the region equitably
      * foreign researchers often get paid more for same work
  + Infrastructure for capacity building - can be in partnership with Europe (ESA, One Forest Vision, country-level govt efforts - e.g., Germany, France, Belgium, Norway)
  + regional variation, not just in science, but also in ways to engage users, carrying out capacity-building
  + PANGEA recommends that… Propose requirements that need to be met for competed projects that would be a part of PANGEA (e.g., \*any PANGEA funded project or project associated with PANGEA - associated projects must adhere to basic principles and push info back for reporting) - Every project must require:
    - a Co-I from the project country
      * include language that collaboration needs to be equitable time investment from the global north and global South collaborators / co-Is, including co-mentoring of students and postdocs
    - a minimum of one early-career researcher from the project region (would need to define)
    - every paper resulting from the project needs to have a policy brief that is translated into the local languages (e.g. English, French and Baka)
    - Any project that involves social dimensions requires co-production with local communities
* Address capacity building
* Training that goes beyond data collection - learn to collaborate, plan, write papers, write grants, do analysis
* Coordinating with existing NASA efforts
* a more resilient world
* Committee on Earth Observation Satellites WGCapD
  + Working group on Capacity Building and Data Democracy with outreach to over 164 countries
* ARSET Earth Observations - ARSET offers online and in-person trainings for beginners and advanced practitioners alike - **targeting decisions and actions,** not science
  + can't use NASA money to fund international science, but if it's a training, can use ARSET money
  + Not for training scientists - for training decision-makers how to use RS data / data products, not scientific workforce - training for next gen grad students different than a working professional
    - Emphasize ARSET for training working professions in PANGEA
  + Takes at least a year to spin something up
* NASA-USAID Joint Global SERVIR Initiative - Sustainable development through capacity building and incorporating perspectives from women, Indigenous Peoples and their communities
  + it's USAID $ that allows for SERVIR activities to be conducted internationally
  + New USAID SPARK solicitation - mention this!
  + include letters that speak to alignment with / support from USAID - country missions, SERVIR hubs, etc., CARPE in Central Africa
* NASA DEVELOP
  + DEVELOP - 10 week programs; can last up to 3 week terms
  + fellows pitch those
  + tool out there in the toolbox
  + DEVELOP has done projects with airborne data/campaigns
    - usually focused on integrating airborne & satellite data
  + **one of the most flexible mechanisms** 
    - can turn around a DEVELOP project/initiative fairly quickly - 6 months
    - Only a 1/4 or less of budget from DEVELOP for international, but little bites can be really helpful
* Indigenous Peoples Initiative - Est. 2017 for engagement with Indigenous geospatial community in US and globally
* Workforce development, particularly, in the areas of emerging technologies such as machine learning and artificial intelligence (in addition to RS)
  + Emphasize that PANGEA will count on the participation of researchers from EPSCoR states as a part of NSF’s Broadening Participation portfolio.
  + Work with NASA ARSET and [NSF RISE](https://www.nsf.gov/div/index.jsp?div=RISE) programs
* GLOBE: <https://www.globe.gov/>
  + Support schools and teachers in landscapes to participate in GLOBE
  + Engage and connect elementary school students across the globe
* NSF Geoscience Opportunities for Leadership in Diversity ([GOLD-EN](https://new.nsf.gov/funding/opportunities/geoscience-opportunities-leadership-diversity-gold)) - Supports creating a network of professionals to implement evidence-based best practices and resources that improve diversity, equity and inclusion within the geosciences

## 10. References

## 11. Figure and Photograph and Credits

## 12. Glossary

***Anthropocene -*** A proposed new geological epoch resulting from significant human-driven changes to the structure and functioning of the Earth system, including the climate system. Originally proposed in the Earth system science community in 2000, the proposed new epoch is undergoing a formalisation process within the geological community based on the stratigraphic evidence that human activities have changed the Earth system to the extent of forming geological deposits with a signature that is distinct from those of the Holocene, and which will remain in the geological record. Both the stratigraphic and Earth system approaches to defining the Anthropocene consider the mid-20th century to be the most appropriate starting date (Steffen et al., 2016), although others have been proposed and continue to be discussed. The Anthropocene concept has already been informally adopted by diverse disciplines and the public to denote the substantive influence of humans on the Earth system. ([IPCC AR6 WGI & WGII](https://apps.ipcc.ch/glossary/))

***Biodiversity***- tree functional composition, tree functional diversity, liana abundance, liana functional composition, microbial composition, megafaunal abundance, abundance of seed-dispersing animals, abundance and composition of flora and fauna more generally / Functional, phylogenetic, and taxonomic (think trait and spectral diversity and phylogenetic diversity likely at the genus and family levels), faunal and floral diversity

* More generally: Functional, phylogenetic, and taxonomic (think trait and spectral diversity and phylogenetic diversity likely at the genus and family levels), faunal and floral diversity

***Carbon stocks and fluxes*** *-* Carbon stocks in soils, vegetation, ….. Includes carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and lateral flows of carbon.

***Co-benefits*** - Joint positive contributions of biodiversity and cultural diversity for humans and other species. These contributions are associated with the concepts of nature’s contributions to people and people’s contributions to nature. → From: Levis et al, 2024, “Contributions of human cultures to biodiversity and ecosystem conservation”, Nature Ecology & Evolution, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-024-02356-1>

***Degradation*** - selective logging, mining, defaunation, human-ignited fire

***Ecosystem*** - PANGEA uses the IPCC working definition of ecosystion, which includes people as key organisms, thus including agroeocsystems and more broadly social-ecological systems. A functional unit consisting of living organisms, their non-living environment and the interactions within and between them. The components included in a given ecosystem and its spatial boundaries depend on the purpose for which the ecosystem is defined: in some cases they are relatively sharp, while in others they are diffuse. Ecosystem boundaries can change over time. Ecosystems are nested within other ecosystems, and their scale can range from very small to the entire biosphere. In the current era, most ecosystems either contain people as key organisms or are influenced by the effects of human activities in their environment. → directly from [IPCC AR6 WGI, WGII, WGII](https://apps.ipcc.ch/glossary/))

***Ecosystem Services*** - All the contributions, both positive and negative, of living nature (i.e. all organisms, ecosystems, and their associated ecological and evolutionary processes) to people’s quality of life.

***Environmental variables***- Current and past climate (amount and seasonality of rainfall, temperature, solar radiation, and more), geology, soils, topography (including elevation), current and past disturbance regimes (storms, flooding, drought, fire, etc.), current and past land use, and their interactions.

***Forest carbon stocks and fluxes*** - biomass stocks, woody productivity and woody mortality

***Forest-friendly activities*** - Economic activities that utilize forest resources in a way that preserves the forest's ecological integrity and supports the sustainable livelihoods of local communities → From: IUCN. (2021). *"Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use"*

***Forest function*** - GPP, NPP, woody productivity, ecosystem respiration, tree mortality, woody residence time, evapotranspiration, sensible heat flux, net radiation, water-use efficiency, carbon-use efficiency, nutrient-use efficiency, and nutrient cycling

***Forest structure***- Biomass, canopy height, stem density, vertical height heterogeneity, and vertical plant area density distributions

***Human activities -*** Formal, informal, legal, illegal and traditional economic, subsistence, cultural, and development practices and behaviors by humans that lead to the exploitation, alteration, and degradation of forest ecosystems, including logging, infrastructure development, agriculture, livestock rearing, fire, mining, hunting and wildlife exploitation, and charcoal production.

***Landscapes -***

***Land-use change*** - deforestation, degradation, fragmentation, restoration, and regeneration

***Resilience -*** The capacity of interconnected social, economic and ecological systems to cope with a hazardous event, trend or disturbance, responding or reorganising in ways that maintain their essential function, identity and structure. Resilience is a positive attribute when it maintains capacity for adaptation, learning and/or transformation (Arctic Council, 2016). → directly from [IPCC AR6 WGI, WGII, WGII](https://apps.ipcc.ch/glossary/))

***[forest?] Resistance*** - Forest resistance to a certain disturbance type = the relationship between forest stand mortality rates and disturbance intensity - define more clearly

***Vulnerable communities*** - Communities that are most likely to experience the adverse effects of climate change and environmental degradation, including Indigenous peoples, low-income communities, and those reliant on natural resources for their livelihoods. → From: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). (2020). *"Vulnerable communities"*.

***Vulnerability*** - The propensity of social and ecological systems and their practices to be adversely affected by changes, encompassing their sensitivity to such changes and their ability to adapt. → Adapted From: FAO. (2013). *"Community-Based Forest Management and Vulnerability to Climate Change"*

## 13. List of Acronyms

**CH4** - Methane

**CO2** - Carbon dioxide

**ENSO** - El Niño Southern Oscillation

**GHG** - Greenhouse gases

**IPLCs** - Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

**ITCZ** - Intertropical convergence zone

**LCLUC** - Land cover and land-use change

**SST** - Sea surface temperature

## 14. Appendices

### A - Engagement during the Scoping Campaign

The Community Engagement and Research Applications Working Group engaged with over 500 individuals from X number of countries across five continents during the PANGEA Scoping Campaign through (A) an international working group, (B) short information sharing events, (C) multi-day consultative workshops, and (D) bilateral meetings with potential partners.

(A) The Community Engagement and Research Applications (CERA) working group (1) was comprised primarily of students, researchers and professors from academic institutions, practitioners from non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations, and some private sector representatives. Similar to the other PANGEA working groups, CERA membership was open and advertised online, at PANGEA events, and within “word of mouth.” In total, approximately 100 individuals signed up to the CERA working group and participated in one or more of the 12 CERA meetings conducted online and/or contributed to the team’s collaborative documents. Many members also participated in CERA-relevant sessions at the PANGEA multi-day workshops in Cameroon, US, Brazil and Peru.

(B) The PANGEA Leadership Team engaged with X NUMBER OF PEOPLE through twelve information sharing events conducted on five continents. These events include 1-2 hour presentation and discussion sessions at international academic conferences (e.g. American Geophysical Union Town Hall, USA, December 2023; Ecological Society of America webinar, March 2024; European Geosciences Union presentation, Austria, April 2024), regional events (e.g. Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Barro Colorado Island 100th Anniversary Symposium presentation, Panama, June 2024; Congo Basin Forest Partnership 20th Meeting of the Parties presentation, June, 2024), and special meetings organized by the PANGEA community (e.g. Africa women’s session, April 2024; Meeting with Indigenous Communities in Panama, April 2024).

(C) The PANGEA Leadership Team organized four, multi-day regional scoping workshops that included sessions focused on community engagement best practices and regional demand and preferences for research applications. PANGEA Scoping workshops include a 3-day event in Yaoundé, Cameroon in February 2024; a 3-day event in Washington, DC in April 2024; a 3-day workshop in Manaus, Brazil in May 2024; and a 2-day workshop in Lima, Peru. All events were organized in close collaboration with local PANGEA partners representing the academic community, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations.

(D) The PANGEA Leadership Team and CERA working group members conducted bilateral meetings with 33 potential PANGEA partners, including. Many (ADD EXACT NUMBER HERE) have shared letters of support to confirm their interest in collaborating on the PANGEA program (if funded).

### B - Planned and Ongoing Research and Monitoring Activities

### C - Summary of Level II and III Ecoregions in PANGEA Study Region

### D – Summary of Airborne and Spaceborne Remote Sensing Systems for PANGEA

### E - Summary of PANGEA Participants

Detailed overview of PANGEA Community Engagement Activities

1. Community Engagement and Research Applications working group meetings online
   * February 13th
   * March 14th
   * March 21st
   * March 28th
   * April 3rd
   * May 15th
   * June 7th
   * June 27th
   * July 11th
   * July 25th
   * August 8th
   * August 22nd
2. Short (1-2 hour) information sharing meetings
   * Kick-off webinar, November 2023
   * American Geophysical Union (AGU) Town Hall, San Francisco, California, December 2023
   * Ecological Society of America (ESA) webinar, March, 2024
   * Information sharing (hybrid) meeting with Indigenous Communities in Panama, April 2024
   * Africa regional women’s session, online, April 2024
   * European Geosciences Union (EGU) presentation, Vienna, Austria, April 2024
   * Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Barro Colorado Island 100th Anniversary Symposium presentation, Panama, June 2024
   * Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP) 20th Meeting of the Parties presentation, June, 2024
   * Congo Basin Institute, presentation, July, 2024
   * Ecological Society of America (ESA) update webinar, August, 2024
   * NASA Biological Diversity and Ecological Conservation meeting in Maryland, May, 2024
   * Association for Tropical Biology and Conservation (ATBC), Kigali, Rwanda, July 2024
3. Multi-day workshops
   * Africa Regional Consultation 3-day workshop, Yaoundé, Cameroon, February 2024
   * PANGEA Scoping 3-day workshop, Washington, DC, April 2024
   * Amazon Climate 4-day workshop, Manaus, Brazil, May 2024
   * PANGEA/Governors' Climate & Forests Task Force (GCFTF) Americans regional 2-day workshop in Lima, Peru, June 2024
   * Asia Regional Consultation X # of days? workshop, LOCATION?, July, 2024
4. Bilateral meetings with potential partners

### F - Letters of Support

1. Alliance Bioversity & CIAT  
   <https://alliancebioversityciat.org/>
2. National University of Piura, PERU  
   Agronomy Department  
   <https://www.gob.pe/unp>
3. PennState University, USA  
   Department of Meteorology and Atmospheric Science  
   <https://www.met.psu.edu/>
4. Society for the Protection of Underground Networks  
   <https://www.spun.earth/>
5. Université Catholique de Louvain  
   Earth and Life Institute  
   <https://uclouvain.be/en/research-institutes/eli>

Critical letters:

* ESA - one or multiple? - Elsa will work on this
* Ares - Elsa email Michael Schaepman & Andy Huni
* Other space agencies - connect with Pamela Collins about this ([pamela.collins@nasa.gov](mailto:pamela.collins@nasa.gov))
* State Department - Frances Seymour - if not letter, mention somewhere in white paper - Elsa will work on this
* USAID -
* USFS-IP - Michael work on this
* DOE - Michael work on this - in coordination with separate letter from NGEE tropics NGEE-Tropics - Michael work on this - with Robinson & Marcos - get from Jeff or Charlie
* GEO-TREES - Elsa will work on this -
* CongoFlux -
* NASA Harvest -
* NEON - Dana work on this
  + Work w AVIRIS and EMIT teams to standardize and harmonize datasets and advance algorithm development
* Users
  + [Alliance Bioversity & CIAT](https://alliancebioversityciat.org/) - received
  + Conservation International
  + WCS - Kemen
  + FAO regional offices - biodiversity, agriculture, climate resilience
  + Govt agencies:
    - ONACC - Elsa can work on this
    - Other ‘end-users’
* Roger Wakimoto - Elsa will work on this

Maybe important?

* Johnson Center & Langley? - pilots and other ppl who can speak to feasibility

### G - Stuff that’s beyond scope that could be developed in collaboration with PANGEA

* Ideas from PANGEA scopes that have been deemed beyond scope buy relevant
* List of complementary funding

—------------------------------------

PANGEA Organizational Suggestions from 7.2 (much too much detail for now)

*PANGEA Participation Structure (LESS is MORE at this point)*

* + *Annual PANGEA Team Meeting*
  + *Working Group Membership*
    - *Co-chairs*
      * *Global N*
      * *Global S*
      * *Early Career*
    - *Members*
      * *NASA-sponsored PIs and researchers*
      * *Scientists funded by other organizations who have agreed to participate in PANGEA*
    - *Responsibilities*
      * *Synthesizing results of PANGEA research*
      * *Conveying results and addressing knowledge gaps to Modeling WG*
      * *WG Meetings as needed*
  + *Multidisciplinary “Coordinating Groups”*
    - *Remote Sensing*
    - *Field Studies*
    - *Modeling and Data Synthesis*
      * *Formed in Phase 1 of PANGEA*
      * *Basis for integration and synthesis across themes*
      * *MDS WG members are expected to participate in other WGs*
        + *Coordinate activities/meetings between WGs and MDS*
        + *Start with PIs and Co-Is, collaborating researchers/managers, new members added as funding allows*
        + *Objective:*

*A. Coordinating with participating land*

*management agencies who are conducting impact assessments*

*(b) coordinating PANGEA modeling activities with those being carried out for other programs, such as X*

*(c) creating an Integrated Modeling Framework (IMF) that utilizes remotely-sensed observations of key surface characteristics to allow for assessments of the impacts of climate and land use change in tropical latitudes*

* + - *Working Group Members nominate participants to Coordinating Groups*

From a planning and logistics perspective, it will be necessary to coordinate a number of activities associated with the Intensive Study Period of Phase II and the synthesis and assessment of Phase III activities. These include the collection, documentation, analysis, and processing of remote sensing and field data, the retrieval of information needed to carry out research for PANGEA, and archiving data products within a PANGEA information system. Each of these activities will be carried out by a separate coordinating group, as discussed below.

* *Remote Sensing Coordinating Group*
* *Field Studies Coordinating Group*
* *PANGEA Information System Coordinating Group*

1. The PANGEA Community Guidelines is a living document found at <https://tropicalforestscoping.com/community-guidelines/>. The guidelines derived from existing institutional guides can be vetted by NASA and modified according to the needs of program management. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)