CHAPTER 4

FOREST LAND

NOTE: subject to final copy-edit and layout prior to its final publication

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Authors[1]

Grant Domke (USA), Andrea Brandon (New Zealand), Rodel Diaz-Lasco (Philippines), Sandro Federici (San Marino), Emilio Garcia-Apaza (Bolivia), Giacomo Grassi (Italy), Thomas Gschwantner (Austria), Martin Herold (Netherlands), Yasumasa Hirata (Japan), Åsa Kasimir (Sweden), Mwangi J. Kinyanjui (Kenya), Haruni Krisnawati (Indonesia), Aleksi Lehtonen (Finland), Rogers E. Malimbwi (Tanzania), Sini Niinistö (Finland), Stephen M. Ogle (USA), Thomas Paul (New Zealand), Nijavalli H. Ravindranath (India), Joachim Rock (Germany), Carlos R. Sanquetta (Brazil), Maria J. Sanz-Sanchez (Spain), Marina Vitullo (Italy), Stephen J. Wakelin (New Zealand), Jianhua Zhu (China).

Contributing authors

Raul Abad-Vinas (Spain), Valerio Avitabile (Italy), Simone Rossi (Italy), Danaë M.A. Rozendaal (Netherlands), Louis Verchot (Colombia).

[1] **Biomass Carbon Sections** were prepared by lead authors, G. Domke, A. Brandon, R. Diaz-Lasco, S. Federici, E. Garcia-Apaza, G. Grassi, T. Gschwantner, M. Herold, Y. Hirata, M.J. Kinyanjui, H. Krisnawati, R.E. Malimbwi, S. Niinistö, S.M. Ogle, T. Paul, N.H. Ravindranath, J. Rock, C.R. Sanquetta, M.J. Sanz-Sanchez, Y. Son, M. Vitullo, S.J. Wakelin, and J. Zhu; and contributing authors, R. Abad-Vinas, V. Avitabile, S. Rossi, D.M.A. Rozendaal, and L. Verchot.

Soil Carbon Sections were prepared by lead authors, S. Niinistö, A. Lehtonen, Å. Kasimir, and S.M. Ogle.

Contents

Tables

Boxes

4 FOREST LAND

4.1 INTRODUCTION

No refinement

4.2 FOREST LAND REMAINING FOREST LAND

4.2.1 Biomass

No refinement

4.2.2 Dead organic matter

No refinement

4.2.3 Soil carbon

This section elaborates on estimation procedures and *good practices* for estimating change in forest soil C stocks. It does not include forest litter, which is a dead organic matter pool. Separate guidance is provided for two types of forest soils: 1) mineral forest soils, and 2) organic forest soils.

The organic C content of mineral forest soils (to 1 m depth) typically varies between 20 to over 300 tonnes C ha^{-1} depending on the forest type and climatic conditions (Jobbagy and Jackson, 2000). Globally, mineral forest soils contain approximately 700 Pg C (Dixon *et al.*, 1994), but soil organic C pools are not static due to differences between C inputs and outputs over time. Inputs are largely determined by the forest productivity, the decomposition of litter and its incorporation into the mineral soil and subsequent loss through mineralization/respiration (Pregitzer, 2003). Other losses of soil organic C occur through erosion or the dissolution of organic C that is leached to groundwater or loss through overland flow. A large proportion of input is from above-ground litter in forest soils so soil organic matter tends to concentrate in the upper soil horizons, with roughly half of the soil organic C in the upper 30 cm layer. In some forest ecosystems, rooting zones of trees extend considerable deeper than 30 cm, which can increase the share of soil organic carbon in deeper layers (Nepstad *et al*., 1994). Changes in soil carbon stocks in response to management actions such as thinning and clear-cutting have been detected below 20–30 cm, but not in all studies or all depths (Achat *et al*., 2015a; James and Harrison, 2016; Gross *et al*., 2018). Moreover, the scarcity of measurements increases uncertainty related to soil carbon stock changes deeper in soil. The C held in the upper profile is often the most chemically decomposable, and the most directly exposed to natural and anthropogenic disturbances. This section only deals with soil C and does not address decomposing litter (i.e., dead organic matter, see Section 4.2.2).

Human activities and other disturbances such as changes in forest type, productivity, decay rates and disturbances can alter the C dynamics of forest soils. Different forest management activities, such as rotation length; choice of tree species; drainage; harvest practices (whole tree or sawlog, regeneration, partial cut or thinning); site preparation activities (prescribed fires, soil scarification); and fertilization, affect soil organic C stocks (Harmon and Marks, 2002; Liski *et al*., 2001; Johnson and Curtis, 2001). Changes in disturbance regimes, notably in the occurrence of severe forest fires, pest outbreaks, and other stand-replacing disturbances are also expected to alter the forest soil C pool (Li and Apps, 2002; de Groot *et al.*, 2002). In addition, drainage of forest stands on organic soils reduces soil C stocks.

General information and guidelines on estimating changes soil C stocks are found in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3, and needs to be read before proceeding with the specific guidelines dealing with forest soil C stocks. Changes in soil C stocks associated with forests are computed using Equation 2.24 in Chapter 2, which combines the change in soil organic C stocks for mineral soils and organic soils; and stock change for soil inorganic C pools (Tier 3 only). This section elaborates on estimation procedures and *good practices* for estimating change in forest soil C organic stocks (Note: It does not include forest litter, i.e., dead organic matter). Separate guidance is provided for two types of forest soils: 1) mineral forest soils, and 2) organic forest soils. See Section 2.3.3.1 for general discussion on soil inorganic C (no additional information is provided in the Forest Land discussion below).

Subject to final copyedit and layout

To account for changes in soil C stocks associated with *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*, countries need to have, at a minimum, estimates of the total Forest Land area at the beginning and end of the inventory time period, stratified by climate region and soil type. If land-use and management activity data are limited, Approach 1 activity data (see Chapter 3) can be used as the basis for a Tier 1 approach, but higher Tiers are likely to need more detailed records or knowledge of country experts about the approximate distribution of forest management systems. Forest Land classes must be stratified according to climate regions and major soil types for Tier 1, which can be accomplished with overlays of suitable climate and soil maps. Further stratification may be useful for development of Tier 2 or 3 methodology for a country.

4.2.3.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

Inventories can be developed using Tier 1, 2 or 3 approaches, and countries may choose to use different tiers for mineral and organic soils. Decision trees are provided for mineral soils (Figure 2.4) and organic soils (Figure 2.5) in Chapter 2 to assist inventory compilers with selection of the appropriate tier for their soil C inventory.

Mineral soils

In spite of a growing body of literature on the effect of forest types, management practices and other disturbances on soil organic C, the available evidence remains largely site- and study-specific, but eventually may be generalized based on the influence of climatic conditions, soil properties, the time scale of interest, taking into consideration sampling intensity and effects across different soil depth increments (Johnson and Curtis, 2001; Hoover, 2003; Page-Dumroese *et al.*, 2003). However, the current knowledge remains inconclusive on both the magnitude and direction of C stock changes in mineral forest soils associated with forest type, management and other disturbances, and cannot support broad generalizations.

Tier 1

Current scientific basis is not sufficient to develop Tier 1 default emission factors for quantification of effects of forest management by IPCC climate zones. Thus, it is assumed in the Tier 1 method that forest soil C stocks do not change with management. Recent studies indicate, that effects of forest management actions on soil C stocks can be difficult to quantify and reported effects have been variable and even contradictory (see Box 4.3A). Furthermore, if using Approach 2 or 3 activity data (see Chapter 3), it is not necessary to compute C stock changes for mineral soils (i.e., change in SOC stocks is 0). If using activity data collected via Approach 1 (see Chapter 3), and it is not possible to identify the amount of land converted *from* and *to* Forest Land, then the inventory compiler should estimate soil C stocks for Forest Land using the areas at the beginning and the end of the inventory period in order to estimate the change in soil carbon stock. The changes in soil C stocks for Forest Land are summed with the changes in stocks for other land uses to estimate the influence of land-use change. If the compiler does not compute a stock for Forest Land, it is likely to create systematic errors in the inventory. For example, land converted from Forest Land to Cropland or Grassland will have a soil C stock estimated in the final year of the inventory, but will have no stock in the first year of the inventory (when it was forest). Consequently, conversion to Cropland or Grassland is estimated as a gain in soil C because the soil C stocks are assumed to be 0 in the Forest Land, but not in Cropland and Grassland. This would introduce a bias into the inventory estimates. SOC_0 and SOC_{0-T} are estimated for the top 30 cm of the soil profile using Equation 2.25 (Chapter 2). Note that areas of exposed bedrock in Forest Land are not included in the soil C stock calculation (assume a stock of 0). Further clarification on soil organic carbon estimation is presented in Section 2.3.3.1.

Tier 2

Using Equation 2.25 (Chapter 2) soil organic C stocks are computed based on reference soil C stocks and country-specific stock change factors for forest type (F_I), management (F_{MG}) and natural disturbance regime (F_{ND}). Note that the stock change factor for natural disturbance regime (F_{ND}) is substituted for the land-use factor (F_{LU}) in Equation 2.25. In addition, country-specific information can be incorporated to better specify reference C stocks, climate regions, soil types, and/or the land management classification system.

Tier 3

Tier 3 approaches will require considerable knowledge and data allowing for the development of an accurate and comprehensive domestic estimation methodology, including evaluation of model results and implementation of a domestic monitoring scheme and/or modelling tool. The basic elements of a country-specific approach are (adapted from Webbnet Land Resource Services Pty ltd, 1999):

- Stratification by climatic zones, major forest types and management regimes coherent with those used for other C pools in the inventory, especially biomass;
- Determination of dominant soil types in each stratum;

- Characterization of corresponding soil C pools, identification of determinant processes in SOC input and output rates and the conditions under which these processes occur; and
- Determination and implementation of suitable methods to estimate carbon stock changes from forest soils for each stratum on an operational basis, including model evaluation procedures; methodological considerations are expected to include the combination of monitoring activities – such as repeated forest soil inventories - and modelling studies, and the establishment of benchmark sites. Further guidance on good soil monitoring practices is available in the scientific literature (Kimble *et al.*, 2003, Lal *et al.*, 2001, McKenzie *et al.*, 2000). It is *good practice* for models developed or adapted for this purpose to be peer-reviewed, and validated with observations representative of the ecosystems under study and independent from the calibration data.

More guidance on Tier 3 methods is given in Chapter 2.3.3.1, such as examples of Tier 3 modelling methods in Box 2.2D. The examples provide information about types of data required, brief descriptions of models, methods that are used to apply the models, and how using a Tier 3 model has changed results. General guidance on measurement-based and model-based Tier 3 inventories for the AFOLU sector can be found in Section 2.5.

Organic soils

No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.

4.2.3.2 CHOICE OF STOCK CHANGE AND EMISSION FACTORS

Mineral soils

Tier 1

It is not necessary to compute the stock estimates for *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land* with Approach 2 or 3 activity data (see Chapter 3). If using Approach 1 activity data, stock change factors, including input, management and disturbance regime, are equal to 1 using the Tier 1 approach. Consequently, only reference C stocks are needed to apply the method, and those are provided in Table 2.3 of Chapter 2.

Tier 2

In a Tier 2 approach, stock change factors are derived based on a country-specific classification scheme for management, forest types, and natural disturbance regimes. A Tier 2 approach should include the derivation of country-specific reference C stocks, and a more detailed classification of climate and soils than the default categories provided with the Tier 1 method. The depth for evaluating soil C stock changes can differ from 30 cm with the Tier 2 method. However, this will require consistency with the depth of the reference C stocks (SOC_{REF}) and stock change factors (i.e., F_{LU}, F_I, and F_{MG}) to ensure consistent application of methods for determining the impact of land use change on soil C stocks. Box 4.3A provides information and references that can be used as a starting point for developing Tier 2 factors for forest management as well as observations on related challenges.

It is *good practice* to focus on the factors that have the largest overall effect, taking into account the impact on forest SOC and the extent of affected forests. Management practices can be coarsely labeled as intensive (e.g., plantation forestry) or extensive (e.g., natural forest); these categories can also be redefined according to national circumstances. The development of stock change factors is likely to be based on intensive studies at experimental sites and sampling plots involving replicated, paired site comparisons (Johnson *et al.*, 2002; Olsson *et al.*, 1996; see also the reviews by Johnson and Curtis, 2001; and Hoover, 2003). In practice, it may not be possible to separate the effects of different forest types, management practices and disturbance regimes, in which case stock change factors should be combined into a single modifier. If a country has well-documented data for different forest types under different management regimes, it might be possible to derive soil organic C estimates directly without using reference C stocks and adjustment factors. However, a relationship to the reference C stocks must be established so that the impact of land-use change can be computed without artificial increases or decreases in the C stocks due to a lack of consistency in the methods across the various land-use categories (i.e., Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Settlements, and Other Land).

Inventories can also be improved by deriving country-specific reference C stocks (SOC_{REF}), compiled from published studies or surveys. Such values are typically obtained through the development and/or compilation of large soil profile databases (Siltanen *et al.*, 1997; Scott *et al.*, 2002; Batjes 2011; De Vos *et al.*, 2015). Additional guidance for deriving stock change factors and reference C stocks is provided in Section 2.3.3.1 (Chapter 2).

Subject to final copyedit and layout

BOX 4.3A (NEW GUIDANCE)
DEVELOPING TIER 2 STOCK CHANGE FACTORS FOR FOREST LAND

Although the scientific basis is not sufficient for deriving default stock change factors for forest land, country specific Tier 2 factors can be developed if there is adequate data available to represent national circumstances. Several meta-analyses and reviews provide analyses and references to support incorporation of country-specific data into a Tier 2 method with estimation of management effects and corresponding stock change factors (F_{MG}) for Forest Land Remaining Forest Land. Quantification of management effects becomes increasingly important in cases in which forests represent a significant sink or source or in which changes in management intensity or practices result in gains or losses compared to earlier practices. Increased removal of harvest residues or stumps for bioenergy is one example of changes in management intensity and practices. Most analyses have focused on the effects following harvests of different intensities (e.g., Johnson and Curtis, 2001; Achat *et al*., 2015a; James and Harrison, 2016; Zhou *et al*., 2013). Response ratios or effect sizes based on measurements of soil carbon stocks reflect all changes associated with a management action; thus separate carbon stock factors for input of organic matter (F_I) cannot be derived from the existing data.

Most field experiments have been carried out in cool temperate regions, and meta-analyses or reviews on harvest effects can be found to support adaptation of Tier 2 methods for these regions (Nave *et al*., 2010; Thiffault *et al*., 2011; Clarke et al., 2015; Hume *et al*., 2017). When selecting harvesting experiments on which to base the calculation of stock change factors, several factors need to be considered: intensity of harvest, treatment of harvest residues and other site preparation practices, such as burning, time since the management action, and soil layers and sampling depths (Liao *et al*., 2010; Strömgren *et al*., 2013; Achat *et al*., 2015b; James and Harrison, 2016; Dean *et al*., 2017; Hume *et al*., 2017). Tree species composition, i.e., conifers versus broad-leaved or mixed species, could also influence the management effect although the influence can be confounded by other factors (e.g. Hume *et al.*, 2017). The question of control conditions for evaluating the management action is of great importance because the control is often not a native reference condition, but rather another managed forest (Dean *et al*., 2017). This should be taken into account when estimating a stock change factor based on several field studies as well as the relationship to country-specific reference soil C stock.

Conclusions on the harvesting effects differ between meta-analyses, which could be partly due to differences in field experiment set-ups and the different data selection and weighting procedures. As an example, whole-tree harvests resulted in average 7.5% smaller carbon stocks in mineral soil than the stocks measured 10–30 years after stem-only harvests (Achat *et al*., 2015a). However, no effect of whole-tree harvest was found in some other meta-analyses (Clarke *et al.*, 2015; Hume *et al*., 2017) or a positive effect was reported (James and Harrison, 2016). However, there was a tendency for smaller carbon stocks in forest floor after whole-tree harvesting compared to stem-only harvesting or pre-treatment conditions (Johnson and Curtis, 2001; Thiffault *et al*., 2011; Clarke *et al.,* 2015).

Considerable spatial variability increases the challenge to detect relatively small management effects in soil C stocks (Jandl *et al*., 2007). However, most studies include only the first one or two decades after the harvest, which may too short to reveal impact of forest management actions on soil carbon stock changes, especially in cool climate regions with long rotation periods (Clarke *et al*., 2015; Dean *et al*., 2017). Non-linearity in the responses has also been observed. For example, an increase in soil C stocks after an initial decrease has been observed for a group of studies on Spodosols from a cool and humid climate with longer monitoring periods, up to eight decades of typical rotation lengths (James and Harrison, 2016).

In addition to guidance in this Chapter 4.2.3.2 above, detailed guidance on estimation of country-specific stock change factors and reference C stocks in general is given in Chapter 2, in Section 2.3.3.1., including guidance on using models to derive carbon stock change factors.

Tier 3

Constant stock change rate factors *per se* are less likely to be estimated in favor of variable rates that more accurately capture land-use and management effects. See Section 2.3.3.1 (Chapter 2) for further discussion.

Organic soils

No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.

4.2.3.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Mineral soils

Tier 1
For the Tier 1 approach, it is assumed that forest soil C stocks do not change with management, and therefore it is not necessary to classify forest into various types, management classes or natural disturbance regimes. However, if using Approach 1 activity data (see Chapter 3), environmental data will be needed to classify the country into climate regions and soil types in order to apply the appropriate reference C stocks to Forest Land. A detailed description of the default climate classification scheme is given in Chapter 3, Annex 3A.5. If the information needed to classify climate types is not available from national databases, there are international sources of climate data such as United Nations Environmental Program. Data will also be needed to classify soils into the default categories provided in Chapter 3, and if national data are not available to map the soil types, international soils data provide a reasonable alternative, such as the FAO Soils Map of the World.

Tier 2
Activity data for the Tier 2 approach consist of the major forest types, management practices, disturbance regimes and the areas to which they apply. It is preferable for the data to be linked with the national forest inventory, where one exists, and/or with national soil and climate databases. Typical changes include conversion of unmanaged to managed forest; conversion of forest type (native forest into a new forest type, such as plantation of exotic species and vice versa); intensification of forest management activities, such as site preparation, tree planting, interval and intensity of thinning and rotation length changes; changes in harvesting practices (bole vs. whole-tree harvesting; amount of residues left on-site); and the frequency of disturbances (e.g., pest and disease outbreaks, flooding, fires, typhoon/cyclone/hurricane, snow damage). Data sources will vary according to a country's forest management system, but could include individual contractors or companies, statutory forest authorities, research institutions and agencies responsible for forest inventories. Data formats vary widely, and include, among others, activity reports, forest management inventories and remote sensing imagery.

In addition, Tier 2 methods should involve a finer stratification of environmental data than the Tier 1 approach, including climate regions and soil types, which would likely be based on national climate and soils data. If a finer classification scheme is utilized in a Tier 2 inventory, reference C stocks will also need to be derived for the more detailed set of climate regions and soil types, and the land management data will need to be stratified based on the country-specific classification.

Tier 3
For application of dynamic models and/or a direct measurement-based inventory in Tier 3, similar or more detailed data on the combinations of climate, soil, topographic and management data are needed, relative to the Tiers 1 and 2 methods, but the exact requirements will be dependent on the model or measurement design.

Organic soils
No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.

4.2.3.4 CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

No Refinement

4.2.3.5 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Three broad sources of uncertainty exists in soil C inventories: 1) uncertainties in land-use and management activity and environmental data; 2) uncertainties in reference soil C stocks if using Tier 1 or 2 approaches (mineral soils only); and 3) uncertainties in the stock change/emission factors for Tier 1 or 2 approaches, model structure/parameter error for Tier 3 model-based approaches, or measurement error/sampling variability associated with Tier 3 measurement-based inventories. In general, precision of an inventory is increased (i.e., smaller confidence ranges) with more sampling to estimate values for the three broad categories. In addition, reducing bias (i.e., improve accuracy) is more likely through the development of a higher Tier inventory that incorporates country-specific information.

Subject to final copyedit and layout

For Tier 1, uncertainties are provided with the reference C stocks in the first footnote of Table 2.3 (Chapter 2), and emission factor uncertainties for organic soils are provided in Table 4.6, Section 4.5. For organic soils, see guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.2. Uncertainties in land-use and management data will need to be addressed by the inventory compiler, and then combined with uncertainties for the default factors and reference C stocks (mineral soils only) using an appropriate method, such as simple error propagation equations. Refer to Section 4.2.1.5 for uncertainty estimate for land area estimates. However, it is *good practice* for the inventory compiler to derive uncertainties from country-specific activity data instead of using a default level.

Default reference C stocks for mineral soils and emission factors for organic soils can have inherently high uncertainties, particularly bias, when applied to specific countries. Defaults represent globally averaged values of land-use and management impacts or reference C stocks that may vary from region-specific values (Powers *et al.*, 2004; Ogle *et al.*, 2006). Bias can be reduced by deriving country-specific factors using Tier 2 method or by developing a Tier 3 country-specific estimation system. The underlying basis for higher Tier approaches will be research in the country or neighbouring regions that address the effect of land use and management on soil C. In addition, it is *good practice* to further minimize bias by accounting for significant within-country differences in land-use and management impacts, such as variation among climate regions and/or soil types, even at the expense of reduced precision in the factor estimates (Ogle *et al.*, 2006). Bias is considered more problematic for reporting stock changes because it is not necessarily captured in the uncertainty range (i.e., the true stock change may be outside of the reported uncertainty range if there is significant bias in the factors).

Uncertainties in land-use activity statistics may be improved through a better national system, such as developing or extending a ground-based survey with additional sample locations and/or incorporating remote sensing to provide additional coverage. It is *good practice* to design a classification that captures the majority of land-use and management activity with a sufficient sample size to minimize uncertainty at the national scale.

For Tier 2 methods, country-specific information is incorporated into the inventory analysis for purposes of reducing bias. For example, Ogle *et al.* (2003) utilized country-specific data to construct probability distribution functions for US specific factors, activity data and reference C stocks for agricultural soils. It is *good practice* to evaluate dependencies among the factors, reference C stocks or land-use and management activity data. In particular, strong dependencies are common in land-use and management activity data because management practices tend to be correlated in time and space. Combining uncertainties in stock change/emission factors, reference C stocks and activity data can be done using methods such as simple error propagation equations or Monte-Carlo procedures.

Tier 3 models are more complex and simple error propagation equations may not be effective at quantifying the associated uncertainty in resulting estimates. Monte Carlo analyses are possible (Smith and Heath, 2001), but can be difficult to implement if the model has many parameters (some models can have several hundred parameters) because joint probability distribution functions must be constructed quantifying the variance as well as covariance among the parameters (see e.g. Peltoniemi *et al.*, 2006; Metsaranta *et al*., 2017). However, if soil model parameters have been estimated with a Bayesian approach, the resultant joint probability distribution for the parameters can be sampled in a Monte Carlo Analysis to capture parameter uncertainty, along with sampling of probability distribution functions for model inputs and other associated data, see Lehtonen and Heikkinen (2016). Other methods are also available such as empirically-based approaches (Monte *et al.*, 1996), which use measurements from a monitoring network to statistically evaluate the relationship between measured and modelled results (Falloon and Smith, 2003; Ogle *et al.*, 2007). In contrast to modelling, uncertainties in measurement-based Tier 3 inventories can be determined from the sample variance, measurement error and other relevant sources of uncertainty.

4.2.4 Non-CO_2 greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning

No refinement

4.3 LAND CONVERTED TO FOREST LAND

4.3.1 Biomass

No refinement

4.3.2 Dead organic matter

No refinement

4.3.3 Soil carbon

Land conversions on mineral soils generally either maintain similar levels of C storage or create conditions that increase soil C stocks, particularly if the land was previously managed for annual crop production (Post and Kwon, 2000). However, under certain circumstances, Grassland conversion to Forest Land has been shown to cause small C losses in mineral soils for several decades following conversion (Davis and Condron, 2002; Paul et al., 2002). Emissions of C from organic soils will vary depending on the previous use and level of drainage. Specifically, conversion from Cropland will tend to decrease emissions; conversions from Grassland will likely maintain similar emission rates; while conversion from Wetlands often increases C emissions.

General information and guidelines on estimating changes soil C stocks are found in Section 2.3.3 in Chapter 2 (including equations) and need to be read before proceeding with guidelines dealing with forest soil C stocks. The total change in soil C stocks for *Land Converted to Forest Land* is computed using Equation 2.24 (Chapter 2), which combines the change in soil organic C stocks for mineral soils and organic soils; and carbon stock changes for inorganic soil C pools (Tier 3 only). This section provides specific guidance for estimating soil organic C stock changes; see Section 2.3.3.1 (Chapter 2) for general discussion on soil inorganic C (no additional information is provided in the Forest Land discussion below).

To account for changes in soil C stocks associated with *Land Converted to Forest Land*, countries need to have, at a minimum, estimates of the areas of *Land Converted to Forest Land* during the inventory time period, stratified by climate region and soil type. If land-use and management data are limited, Approach 1 activity data can be used as a starting point, along with knowledge of country experts of the approximate distribution of land-use types being converted. If previous lands uses and conversions for *Land Converted to Forest Land* are unknown, SOC stocks changes can still be computed using the methods provided in *Forest Land Remaining Forest Land*, but the land base will likely be different for forests in the current year relative to the initial year in the inventory. It is critical, however, that the total land area across all land-use sectors be equal over the inventory time period (e.g., if 5 Million ha is converted from Cropland and Grassland to Forest Land during the inventory time period, then Forest Land will have an additional 5 Million ha in the last year of the inventory, while Cropland and Grassland will have a corresponding loss of 5 Million ha in the last year), and the total change will be estimated when summing SOC stocks across all land uses. *Land Converted to Forest Land* is stratified according to climate regions and major soil types, which could either be based on default or country-specific classifications. This can be accomplished with overlays of climate and soil maps, coupled with spatially-explicit data on the location of land conversions.

Inventories can be developed using Tier 1, 2 or 3 approaches, with each successive Tier requiring more detail and resources than the previous. It is possible that countries will use different tiers to prepare estimates for the separate components in this source category (i.e., soil organic C stocks changes in mineral soils and organic soils; and stock changes associated with soil inorganic C pools).

4.3.3.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

Inventories can be developed using Tier 1, 2 or 3 approaches and countries may choose different tiers for mineral and organic soils. Decision trees are provided for mineral (Figure 2.4) and organic soils (Figure 2.5) in Section 2.3.3.1 (Chapter 2) to assist inventory compilers with selection of the appropriate tier for their soil C inventory.

Mineral soils

Tier 1

Change in soil organic C stocks can be estimated for mineral soils with land-use conversion to Forest Land using Equation 2.25 (Chapter 2). For Tier 1, the initial (pre-conversion) soil organic C stock ($SOC_{(0-T)}$) and C stock in the last year of the inventory time period (SOC_0) are determined from the common set of reference soil organic C stocks (SOC_{REF}) and default stock change factors (F_{LU}, F_{MG}, F_I) as appropriate for describing land use and management both pre- and post-conversion. Note that area of exposed bedrock in Forest Land or the previous land use are not included in the soil C stock calculation (assume a stock of 0). Annual rates of stock changes are calculated as the difference in stocks (over time) divided by the time dependence (D) of the stock change factors (default is 20 years).

Tier 2

Subject to final copyedit and layout

The Tier 2 approach for mineral soils also uses Equation 2.25 (Chapter 2), but involves country or region-specific reference C stocks and/or stock change factors and possibly more disaggregated land-use activity and environmental data.

Tier 3

Tier 3 approaches will involve more detailed and country-specific models and/or measurement-based approaches along with highly disaggregated land-use and management data. It is *good practice* that Tier 3 approaches estimating soil C change from land-use conversions to Forest Land, employ models, monitoring networks and/or data sets that are capable of representing transitions over time from other land uses, including Grassland, Cropland, and possibly Settlements or other land uses. It is important that models be evaluated with independent observations from country or region-specific field locations that are representative of the interactions of climate, soil and forest type/management on post-conversion change in soil C stocks.

Organic soils

No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.

4.3.3.2 CHOICE OF STOCK CHANGE AND EMISSION FACTORS

Mineral soils

Tier 1

For native unmanaged land, as well as for managed Forest Land, Settlements and nominally managed Grassland with low disturbance regimes, soil C stocks are assumed equal to the reference values (i.e., land use, disturbance (forests only), management and input factors equal 1), but it will be necessary to apply the appropriate stock change factors to represent other systems which may be converted to Forest Land, such as improved and degraded Grassland, as well as all Cropland systems. See the appropriate land-use section for default stock change factors (Forest Land in 4.2.3.2, Cropland in Section 5.2.3.2, Grassland in 6.2.3.2, Settlements in 8.2.3.2, and Other Land in 9.3.3.2). Default reference C stocks are found in Table 2.3 (Chapter 2).

Tier 2

Estimation of country-specific stock change factors is probably the most important development associated with the Tier 2 approach. Differences in soil organic C stocks among land uses are computed relative to a reference condition. If default reference C stocks are used, the reference condition is native vegetation that is neither degraded nor improved through land-use and management practices. Stock change factors for land-use conversion to native forests will be equal to 1 if the forest represents the reference condition. However, stock change factors will need to be derived for *Land Converted to Forest Land* that do not represent the reference condition, accounting for the influence of disturbance (F_D), input (F_I) and management (F_{MG}), which are then used to further refine the C stocks of the new forest system. See the appropriate section for specific information regarding the derivation of stock change factors for other land-use sectors (Cropland in 5.2.3.2, Grassland in Section 6.2.3.2, Settlements in 8.2.3.2, and Other Land in 9.3.3.2).

Reference C stocks can also be derived from country-specific data in a Tier 2 approach. Reference values in Tier 1 correspond to non-degraded, unimproved lands under native vegetation, but other reference conditions can also be chosen for Tier 2. In general, reference C stocks should be consistent across the land uses (i.e., Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements, Other Land) (see section 2.3.3.1). Therefore, the same reference stock should be used for each climate zone and soil type, regardless of the land use. The reference stock is then multiplied by land use, input and management factors to estimate the stock for each land use based on the set of management systems that are present in a country. In addition, the depth for evaluating soil C stock changes can be different with the Tier 2 method. However, this will require consistency with the depth of the reference C stocks (SOC_{REF}) and stock change factors for all land uses (i.e., F_{LU}, F_I, and F_{MG}) to ensure consistency in the application of methods for estimating the impact of land use change on soil carbon stocks. Additional guidance is provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3.1.

The carbon stock estimates may be improved when deriving country-specific factors for F_{LU} and F_{MG}, by expressing carbon stocks on a soil-mass equivalent basis rather than a soil-volume equivalent (i.e., fixed depth) basis. This is because the soil mass in a certain soil depth changes with the various operations associated with land use that affect the density of the soil, such as uprooting, land levelling, tillage, and rain compaction due to the disappearance of the cover of tree canopy. However, it is important to realize that all data used to derive stock change factors across all land uses must be on an equivalent mass basis if this method is applied. This will be challenging to do comprehensively for all land uses. See Box 2.2C in Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3.1 for more information.

Tier 3
Constant stock change rate factors *per se* are less likely to be estimated in favor of variable rates that more accurately capture land-use and management effects. See Section 2.3.3.1 (Chapter 2) for further discussion.

Organic soils
No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.

4.3.3.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Mineral soils

Tier 1 and Tier 2
For purposes of estimating soil carbon stock change, area estimates of *Land Converted to Forest Land* should be stratified according to major climate regions and soil types. This can be based on overlays with suitable climate and soil maps and spatially-explicit data of the location of land conversions. Detailed descriptions of the default climate and soil classification schemes are provided in Chapter 3. Specific information is provided in the each of the land-use sections regarding treatment of land-use/management activity data (Forest Land in Section 4.2.3.3, Cropland in 5.2.3.3, Grassland in 6.2.3.3, Wetlands in 7.2.3.2, Settlements in 8.2.3.3, and Other Land in 9.3.3.3).

One critical issue in evaluating the impact of Land Converted to Forest Land on soil organic C stocks is the previous land-use and management activity. Activity data gathered using Approach 2 or 3 (see Chapter 3 for discussion about Approaches) provide the underlying basis for determining the previous land use and management for Land Converted to Forest Land. In contrast, aggregate data (Approach 1, Chapter 3) only provide the total amount of area in each land use and do not form a basis for determining specific transitions. Moreover, aggregate data only represent the net changes in land use and management rather than the gross changes, which could be considerably larger and may have an impact on the total soil C stock changes. Regardless, with aggregate data (Approach 1), changes in soil organic C stocks may be computed separately for each land-use category and then combined to obtain the total stock change even if the total changes do not capture the full dynamics occurring with land use change. Using this approach, it will be necessary for coordination among each land-use category to ensure the total land base is remaining constant over time, given that some land area will be lost and gained within individual land-use category during each inventory year due to land-use change. Further clarification on soil organic C estimation methods in case of land-use change is presented in Section 2.3.3.1.

Tier 3
For application of dynamic models and/or a direct measurement-based inventory in Tier 3, similar or more detailed data on the combinations of climate, soil, topographic and management data are needed, relative to Tier 1 or 2 method, but the exact requirements will be dependent on the model or measurement design.

Organic soils
No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.

4.3.3.4 CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

Mineral soils

The steps for estimating SOC_0 and $SOC_{(0-T)}$ and net soil C stock change per ha of *Land Converted to Forest Land* are as follows:

Step 1: Determine the land-use and management by mineral soil types and climate regions for land at the beginning of the inventory period, which can vary depending on the time step of the activity data (0-T; e.g., 5, 10 or 20 years ago).

Step 2: Select the native reference C stock value (SOC_{REF}), based on climate and soil type from Table 2.3, for each area of land being inventoried. The reference C stocks are the same for all land-use categories to ensure that erroneous changes in the C stocks are not computed due to differences in reference stock values among sectors.

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Step 3: Select the land-use factor (F_{LU}), management factor (F_{MG}) and C input levels (F_I) representing the land-use and management system present before conversion to forest. Values for F_{LU}, F_{MG} and F_I are given in the respective section for the land-use sector (Cropland in Chapter 5, and Grassland in Chapter 6).

Step 4: Multiply these values by the reference soil C stock to estimate of 'initial' soil organic C stock ($SOC_{(0-T)}$) for the inventory time period.

Step 5: Estimate SOC_0 by repeating step 1 to 4 using the same native reference C stock (SOC_{REF}), but with land-use, management and input factors that represent conditions in the last (year 0) inventory year. For Tier 1, all stock change factors are assumed equal to 1 for Forest Land (although for Tier 2, different values for these factors under newly converted Forest Land should be used, based on country-specific data).

Step 6: Estimate the average annual change in soil C stock for the area over the inventory time period, $\Delta C_{CC_{Mineral}}$, (see Equation 2.25 in Chapter 2).

Step 7: Repeat Steps 1 to 6 if there are additional inventory time periods (e.g., 1990 to 2000, 2001 to 2010, etc.).

A numerical example is given below for afforestation of cropland soil.

Example: An area of 100,000 ha of cropland was planted to forest. The soil type is an Ultisol in a tropical moist climate, which has a native reference stock, SOC_{Ref} (0-30 cm), of 47 tonnes C ha^{-1} (Table 2.3). The previous land use was annual row crops, with conventional tillage, no fertilization and where crop residues are removed, so that the soil carbon stock at the beginning of the inventory time period (in this example, 5 yrs earlier in 1995) was ($SOC_{Ref} \bullet F_{LU} \bullet F_{MG} \bullet F_I$) = 47 tonnes C $ha^{-1} \bullet 0.48 \bullet 1 \bullet 0.92$ = 20.8 tonnes C ha^{-1} (see Table 5.5, Chapter 5, for stock change factor for cropland). Under Tier 1, managed forest is assumed to have the same soil C stock as the reference condition (i.e. all stock change factors are equal to 1). Thus, the average annual change in soil C stock for the area over the inventory time period is estimated as (47 tonnes C ha^{-1} – 20.8 tonnes C ha^{-1}) / 20 yrs = 1.3 tonnes C ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. For the area reforested there is an increase of 131,000 tonnes C yr^{-1}. (Note: 20 years is the time dependence of the stock change factor, i.e., factor represents annual rate of change over 20 years)

Organic soils

No Refinement.

See guidance in 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.

4.3.3.5 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

No Refinement

4.4 COMPLETENESS, TIME SERIES, QA/QC, AND REPORTING AND DOCUMENTATION

4.4.1 Completeness

No refinement

4.4.2 Developing a consistent time series

Refinement

It is *good practice* to develop a consistent time series of inventories of anthropogenic emissions and removals of greenhouse gases for all AFOLU categories using the guidance in Volume 1, Chapter 5. Because forest-related activity data and emission factors may only be available every few years, achieving time series consistency may require interpolation or extrapolation from longer timeseries or trend.

In addition to the general guidance on gap filling (e.g. on linear interpolation or extrapolation) in Volume 1, Chapter 5, further guidance is provided here on how to ensure methodological consistency in the case of the Forest

Land category. When extrapolation may allow reflecting the evolution of the main drivers of emissions and removals during the period to be gap filled, including forest increment and harvest, with a greater level of accuracy than a linear interpolation or extrapolation.

Generally, these functional relationships are expressed in models which are applied to simulate the dynamics of carbon stocks in different pools, taking into account a number of interrelated variables.These variables include: forest characteristics (i.e. forest types, soil types, tree species composition, growing stock, age-class structure) and management practices (i.e. regeneration modality, rotation lengths, thinning frequency, etc.); the carbon pools and gases; the estimation parameters for HWP; the treatment of natural disturbances; the possible inclusion of impact of "indirect human-induced effects" (see Section 2.5), such as human-induced climate and environmental changes (e.g., temperature, precipitation, CO_2 and nitrogen deposition feedbacks) that affect growth, mortality, decomposition rates and natural disturbances regimes.

Among these, harvest volume is a key driver of emissions and removals. To this regard, if the actual harvest volume for the period to be extrapolated is known with confidence, then the model may directly apply this harvest volume, in combination with the other variables above. However, sometimes no reliable statistics on harvest volume (or other suitable proxies) are available for the period to be gap-filled. In this case, it is *good practice* to assume that the historical management practices continue during the period to be gap-filled. These practices should be those applied (and documented) in the existing time series, e.g. for the "calibration period" (see below). The functional relationships between available timber stocks, age structure dynamics, the increment and the harvest volume under the continuation of management practices (which is the basis of yield tables for forest management) can be used to calculate a consistent time series of annual C stock gains (forest net increment) and annual C stock losses (e.g. harvest, etc.). For example, if a given tree species is typically harvested at 80 years, the extrapolation based on functional relationships will apply this harvesting age (i.e. the historical forest management practice) also in the period to be gap-filled, taking into account the age structure dynamics (e.g. if the forest is getting older, more area reaching 80 years may be available); the carbon gains will be calculated using the forest net increment associated with the age structure and harvest volume simulated for the period to be gap-filled. An example of resolving data gaps in Forest Land through an extrapolation based on functional relationships is provided in Box 4.3B.

It is *good practice* that the model used for extrapolation utilizes information on the methodological elements above that is consistent with those used in the rest of the time series.

A change in any of the variables above used in the existing (non-extrapolated) time series (e.g., adding a new carbon pool) triggers a methodological inconsistency, to be addressed through a re-run, for the entire time series, of the model used for the extrapolation. Such re-run should ensure consistency in the variables described above.

As a general check for the consistency, it is *good practice* to demonstrate that the model used for the extrapolation reproduces the existing time series, for a selected "calibration period". The length of this calibration period may depend on various factors, but it is preferable to have at least 5 or 10 years of comparison between the model's results and the existing time series. If the model results for the calibration period fall within the estimated range of uncertainty of the existing time series (as documented in the GHG inventory), any remaining discontinuity between the existing time series and the portion extrapolated may be addressed through the application of the "overlap" technique (Volume 1, Chapter 5.3.3.1) to extrapolated data. This procedure will affect the level of modelled GHG estimates, but not their trend. If, for the calibration period, the model's results do not fall within the reported range of uncertainty of the existing time series, it is *not good practice* to use these results for extrapolating the time series. An example of resolving forest data gaps through extrapolation based on functional relationships is provided in Box 4.3B

BOX 4.3B (NEW GUIDANCE)

EXAMPLE OF RESOLVING FOREST DATA GAPS THROUGH EXTRAPOLATION BASED ON FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Consider a case in which the stock difference method (see Volume 4, Chapter 2.3) is applied to construct a consistent time series between 1990 and 2015. Suppose that the next complete forest inventory will be reported in 2025, and that no reliable harvest data after 2015 is available. Until this inventory becomes available, the GHG emissions after 2015 may need to be extrapolated.

One option is to apply a linear extrapolation to the historical time series. Another option, to be considered especially when age structure dynamics exert a relevant impact on the trend of forest CO2 fluxes, is to extrapolate the historical GHG emissions through functional relationships. To this aim, a model may be used to calculate, for the period to be gap-filled, the net increment and the harvest volumes associated with the continuation of historical management practices.

A theoretical example of the impact of different extrapolation approaches is provided in the following table, for selected years and for the living biomass of forests that are assumed to approach maturity.

For the purpose of extrapolating based on functional relationships, a model calculates the harvest volumes in the period to be gap-filled through the intersection between the continuation of historical forest management practices and the available timber stocks as affected by the age-related forest dynamics.

Historical period			**Linear extrapolation**	**Extrapolation based on functional relationships**
(ktC yr-1)	**2000**	**2015**	**2020**	**2020**
Net increment	20.0	26.0	28.0	26.0
Harvest	14.0	17.0	18.0	22.0
Net change	6.0	9.0	10.0	4.0

In this example, the net forest increment has increased in the historical period (2000-2015) more than the increase in harvest volumes. As a result, the sink (net change in C) has also increased. A linear extrapolation of this trend would lead to a further increase on the sink in 2020. However, in this example, the forests are aging, i.e. more forest area reaches maturity. As a consequence, assuming the continuation of the historical forest management practices, in 2020 the net increment is expected to saturate (i.e. in the table it remains at the 2015 levels) and the total harvest volume is expected to increase (because more area will reach maturity, and thus more biomass will be ready to be harvested). The resulting sink would also decline, in contrast with what obtained by the linear extrapolation. In this theoretical case, the extrapolation based on functional relationships may be considered to provide a more realistic estimate of GHG emissions in the period to be gap-filled.

Where countries use Tier 1 methods, estimates of DOM stock changes are only provided in the case of land-use change to or from Forest Land. It is *good practice* to recalculate the entire time series of data if either the default values for litter and dead wood carbon pools or the lengths of the transition periods are changed. It is also *good practice* to recalculate the entire time series of estimates if revisions to activity data, such as the rate of land-use change, have occurred. As more ground plot and other sample data on dead wood and litter carbon stocks become available in the future, countries are likely to improve the models used in higher Tier estimation procedures. It is *good practice* to use the same model parameter values (such as litterfall rates, decay rates, disturbance impacts) for the entire time series and to recalculate the entire time series if one or more of the model parameters have changed. Failure to do so may result in artificial sources or sinks, for example as a result of decay rate modifications.

4.4.3 Quantity Assurance and Quality Control

No refinement

4.4.4 Reporting and Documentation

No refinement

4.5 TABLES

Table 4.1

No refinement

Table 4.2

No refinement

Table 4.3

No refinement

Table 4.4

TABLE. 4.4. (UPDATED)
RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) [TONNE ROOT D.M. (TONNE SHOOT D.M.)$^{-1}$]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Origin (Natural/Plantation)	Above-ground biomass (tonnes ha^{-1})	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.)$^{-1}$]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
Tropical	Tropical Rainforest	Africa	Natural	≤ 125	0.825	±90%	default	1, 2
			Natural	> 125	0.532	±90%	default	2, 3
		North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	0.221	0.036	SD	4
			Planted	≤ 125	0.170	0.11	SD	5
			Natural	> 125	0.221	0.036	SD	4
			Planted	> 125	0.170	0.11	SD	5
		Asia	Natural	≤ 125	0.207	0.072	SD	6, 7, 8
			Planted	≤ 125	0.325	0.025	SD	8
			Natural	> 125	0.212	0.077	SD	7, 8, 9, 10, 11
	Tropical Moist	Africa	Natural	≤ 125	0.232	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.232	±90%	default	12
		North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	0.284	0.061	SD	12
			Natural	> 125	0.284	0.061	SD	12
		Asia	Natural	≤ 125	0.323	0.073	SD	1, 13, 14, 5
			Natural	> 125	0.246	0.036	SD	12, 16
	Tropical Dry	Africa	Natural	≤ 125	0.332	0.247	SD	1, 12, 17, 18, 19
			Natural	> 125	0.379	0.040	SD	12
		North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	0.334	0.040	SD	4, 12, 20
			Natural	> 125	0.379	0.040	SD	12

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE. 4.4. (UPDATED)
RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) [TONNE ROOT D.M. (TONNE SHOOT D.M.)$^{-1}$]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Origin (Natural/Plantation)	Above-ground biomass (tonnes ha^{-1})	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.)$^{-1}$]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
		Asia	Natural	≤ 125	0.440	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.379	0.040	SD	12
		North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	0.348	±90%	default	4
			Planted	≤ 125	2.158	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.283	0.16	SD	21
		Asia	Natural	≤ 125	0.322	0.084	SD	22, 23
			Natural	> 125	0.345	0.280	SD	22, 23
Sub-tropical	Subtropical Humid	Africa	Natural	≤ 125	0.232	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.232	±90%	default	12
		North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	0.175	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.284	±90%	default	12
		Asia	Natural	≤ 125	0.230	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.246	±90%	default	12
	Subtropical Dry	North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	0.336	±90%	default	12
			Natural	> 125	0.352	0.047	SD	12
		Asia	Natural	≤ 125	0.440	0.184	SD	12
			Natural	> 125	0.440	0.184	SD	12
	Subtropical Steppe	North and South America	Natural	≤ 125	1.338	±90%	default	12
		Asia	Natural	> 125	1.338	±90%	default	12
			Planted	≤ 125	2.158	±90%	default	12
Temperate	ceanic	Europe	Natural/Planted (Other Broadleaf)	all size classes	0.192	±90%	default	24
			Natural (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.359	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.172	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	>125	0.206	±90%	default	12, 25, 26, 27
			Planted (Conifer)	all size classes	0.359	0.145	SD	28
			Planted (Quercus)	≤ 125	1.400	±90%	default	29
		North and South America	Natural (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.337	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Conifer)	>125	0.338	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.466	±90%	default	12, 30
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.190	±90%	default	12, 31

TABLE. 4.4. (UPDATED)
RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) [TONNE ROOT D.M. (TONNE SHOOT D.M.)$^{-1}$]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Origin (Natural/Plantation)	Above-ground biomass (tonnes ha^{-1})	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.)$^{-1}$]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
			Planted (Conifer)	>125	0.203	±90%	default	12, 32
		Oceania	Natural (Eucalyptus)	≤ 125	0.464	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Eucalyptus)	>125	0.257	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.213	±90%	default	34-36
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.313	±90%	default	37, 38
			Planted (Conifer)	all size classes	0.190	±90%	default	39
			Planted (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.634	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	>125	0.294	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Eucalyptus)	≤ 125	0.391	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Eucalyptus)	>125	0.188	±90%	default	12, 40
	Continental	Europe	Natural (Quercus)	>125	0.477	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.340	±90%	default	12
		North and South America	Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.481	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.277	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.237	±90%	default	12
		Asia	Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.305	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Eucalyptus)	≤ 125	0.262	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Eucalyptus)	>125	0.356	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.303	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.221	±90%	default	12
	Mountain	Europe	Natural (Quercus)	≤ 125	1.155	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Quercus)	>125	0.394	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.370	±90%	default	12

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE. 4.4. (UPDATED)
RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) [TONNE ROOT D.M. (TONNE SHOOT D.M.)$^{-1}$]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Origin (Natural/Plantation)	Above-ground biomass (tonnes ha^{-1})	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.)$^{-1}$]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
		North and South America	Natural (Conifer)	>125	0.217	±90%	default	12, 41, 42
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.232	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.245	±90%	default	12, 43
			Planted (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.302	±90%	default	12
		Asia	Natural (Conifer)	>125	0.240	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Quercus)	>125	0.265	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.500	±90%	default	12
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.303	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	>125	0.220	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.231	±90%	default	12
		Oceania	Natural (Conifer)	>125	0.124	±90%	default	44
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.145	±90%	default	45
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.302	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.293	±90%	default	12
			Planted (Conifer)	>125	0.201	±90%	default	12
	Oceanic Continental Mountain	Asia	Natural (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.243	±90%	default	33
			Natural (Conifer)	>125	0.262	±90%	default	33
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.225	±90%	default	33
			Natural (Other Broadleaf)	>125	0.229	±90%	default	33
			Planted (Conifer)	≤ 125	0.224	±90%	default	33
			Planted (Conifer)	>125	0.232	±90%	default	33
			Planted (other Broadleaf)	≤ 125	0.307	±90%	default	33

TABLE. 4.4. (UPDATED)
RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) [TONNE ROOT D.M. (TONNE SHOOT D.M.)$^{-1}$]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Origin (Natural/Plantation)	Above-ground biomass (tonnes ha^{-1})	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.)$^{-1}$]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
			Planted (other Broadleaf)	>125	0.248	±90%	default	33
Boreal	Coniferous, tundra woodland, mountain systems	-	-	≤ 75	0.390	0.23 - 0.96	Range	12, 46
				>75	0.240	0.15 - 0.37	Range	12, 46

[1] Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

References:

1Masota, A.M., et al., 2016; 2Njana, M.A., et al., 2015; 3Masota, A.M., et al., 2015; 4FAO, 2015; 5Sanquetta, et al., 2011; 6Saner, P., et al., 2012; 7Murdiyarso, M., et al., 2015; 8Kotowska, M.M., et al., 2015; 9Lu, X.T., et al., 2010; 10Niiyama K, et al., 2010; 11Krisnawati, H., et al., 2014; 12Mokany, K., et al., 2006; 13Wang, X.P., et al., 2008; 14Li, X., et al., 2010; 15Monda, Y., et al., 2016; 16Gautum, T.P., Mandal, T.N., 2016; 17Mugasha, W.A., et al., 2013; 18Malimbwi, R.E., et al., 2016; 19Makero, et al., 2016; 20Sato, T., et al., 2015; 21Moser, G., 2011; 22Iqbal, K., et al., 2014; 23Sharma, D.P., 2009; 24Skovsgaard, J.P., Nord-Larsen, T., 2012; 25Green C., et al., 2007; 26Urban, J., et al., 2015; 27Xiao, C.W., et al., 2003; 28Levy, P.E., et al., 2004; 29Cotillas, M., et al., 2016; 30Gargaglione, et al., 2010; 31Frangi, J.L., et al., 2005; 32Miller, A.T., et al., 2006; 33Luo, Y., et al., 2014; 34Schwendenmann, L., Mitchell, N., 2014; 35Watson, A,. O'Loughlin, C., 1985; 36Watson, A., 1995; 37Beets, P.N., 1980; 38Miller, R. B. 1963; 39Beets PN, et al. 2007; 40Oliver GR, et al. 2009; 41Battles, J. J., et al. 2002; 42Laclau P. 2003; 43Grimm, U., Fassbender, H., 1981, 44Edwards, P., Grubb, P., 1977; 45Scott, N.A., et al., 2005; 46Li, et al., 2003.

Table 4.5

No refinement

Table 4.6

No refinement

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Table 4.7

TABLE 4.7 (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS IN NATURAL FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA⁻¹]

Domain	Ecological zone [1]	Continent	Status/condition[2]	Aboveground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha-1]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
Tropical	Tropical rainforest	Africa	Primary	404.2	120.4	SD	1-12
			Secondary >20 years	212.9	143.1	SD	5-7, 11, 13-16
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	52.8	35.6	SD	9-11, 14, 15, 17
		North and South America	Primary	307.1	104.9	SD	3, 4, 9, 10, 18-21
			Secondary >20 years	206.4	80.4	SD	9, 10, 22-28
			Secondary ≤20 years	75.7	34.5	SD	9, 10, 14, 22, 23, 28-32
		Asia	Primary	413.1	128.5	SD	3, 4, 9, 10, 33-35
			Secondary >20 years	131.6	20.7	SD	9, 10, 36, 37
			Secondary ≤20 years	45.6	20.6	SD	9, 10, 37-39
	Tropical moist deciduous forest	Africa	Primary	236.6	104.7	SD	1, 2, 16
			Secondary >20 years Secondary ≤20 years	72.8	36.4	SD	9, 10, 16, 40-47
		North and South America	Primary	187.3	94.0	SD	3, 4, 9, 10, 18-21
			Secondary >20 years	131.0	54.2	SD	9, 10, 22-26
			Secondary ≤20 years	55.7	28.7	SD	9, 10, 22, 23, 25, 26
		Asia	Primary Secondary >20 years Secondary ≤20 years	67.7	93.4	SD	9, 10, 35, 48-50
	Tropical dry forest	Africa	Primary Secondary >20 years Secondary ≤20 years	69.6	47.5	SD	1, 2, 43, 44, 51-53
		North and South America	Primary	127.5	72.6	SD	18-21
			Secondary >20 years	118.9	81.3	SD	9, 10, 22, 23, 54
			Secondary ≤20 years	32.2	24.2	SD	9, 10, 22, 23, 54, 55
		Asia	Primary Secondary >20 years Secondary ≤20 years	184.6	144.5	SD	9, 10, 35, 48, 56
	Tropical shrublands	Africa	Primary Secondary >20 years Secondary ≤20 years	48.4	45.8	SD	44, 57, 58
			Primary	71.5	46.4	SD	59

TABLE 4.7 (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS IN NATURAL FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA-1]

Domain	Ecological zone [1]	Continent	Status/condition[2]	Aboveground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha-1]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
		North and South America	Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Asia	Primary	38.3	33.0	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
	Tropical mountain systems	Africa	Primary	190.0	131.2	SD	1-4, 9, 10, 42-44, 47, 53, 60-68
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		North and South America	Primary	195.0	95.6	SD	3, 4, 9, 10, 18-21
			Secondary >20 years	184.4	111.0	SD	9, 10, 22, 23, 26, 69
			Secondary ≤20 years	75.9	51.1	SD	9, 10, 22, 23, 26, 69, 70
		Asia	Primary	433.5	147.5	SD	3, 4, 9, 10, 34, 35
			Secondary >20 years	66.4	61.0	SD	9, 10, 50, 71-73
			Secondary ≤20 years				
Sub-tropical	Subtropical humid forests	Africa	Primary	54.1	20.6	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		North and South America	Primary	84.5	42.9	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Asia	Primary	323.0	157.7	SD	9, 10
			Secondary >20 years	258.4	128.1	SD	9, 10
			Secondary ≤20 years				
	Subtropical dry forests	Africa	Primary	65.2	27.1	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		North and South America	Primary	115.9	46.2	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Asia	Primary	70.9	26.2	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Africa	Primary	50.5	23.9	SD	59

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.7 (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS IN NATURAL FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA-1]

Domain	Ecological zone [1]	Continent	Status/condition[2]	Aboveground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha-1]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
	Subtropical steppe	North and South America	Primary	44.0	26.0	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Asia	Primary	41.6	24.7	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
	Subtropical mountain systems	Africa	Primary	35.1	22.2	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		North and South America	Primary	74.6	40.1	SD	59
			Secondary >20 years				
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Asia	Primary	250.2	59.4	SD	9, 10
			Secondary >20 years	155.2	41.7	SD	9, 10
			Secondary ≤20 years				
Temperate	Mountain	Asia	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	170.4	±57.85	95% CI	75
			Secondary ≤20 years	n.a	n.a	n.a	
		Europe	Primary	301.1	±90%	Default	76-79
			Secondary >20 years	214.7	±90%	Default	77
			Secondary ≤20 years	27.8	±90%	Default	77
		North and South America	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	185.9	153.8	SD	80
			Secondary ≤20 years	57.9	78.6	SD	80
	Continental	Asia	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	116.0	±18.37	95% CI	75
			Secondary ≤20 years	90.9	±40.43	95% CI	75
		Europe	Primary	332.4	±90%	Default	77-79
			Secondary >20 years	162.0	±90%	Default	77, 81-83
			Secondary ≤20 years	51.6	±90%	Default	77, 81-83
			Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	

TABLE 4.7 (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS IN NATURAL FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological zone [1]	Continent	Status/condition[2]	Aboveground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha-1]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
		North and South America	Secondary >20 years	128.9	240.3	SD	80
			Secondary ≤20 years	46.0	99.5	SD	80
	Oceanic	Asia	Primary	289.8	±90%	Default	84
			Secondary >20 years	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary ≤20 years				
		Europe	Primary	126.1	±90%	Default	77
			Secondary >20 years	153.9	±90%	Default	77,85-90
			Secondary ≤20 years	22.3	±90%	Default	77
		Oceana	Primary	352.7	±17	95%CI	91
			Secondary >20 years	120.5	±22.3	95%CI	91
			Secondary ≤20 years	57.5	±14.28	95%CI	92
		North and South America	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	354.1	455.7	SD	80
			Secondary ≤20 years	213.9	227.1	SD	80
	Desert	North and South America	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	44.0	39.7	SD	80
			Secondary ≤20 years	25.6	35.1	SD	80
	Steppe	North and South America	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	118.5	459.9	SD	80
			Secondary ≤20 years	42.9	76.5	SD	80
Boreal	Coniferous	North and South America	Primary	62.9	28.1	SD	93
			Secondary >20 years	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary ≤20 years	n.a	n.a	n.a	
	Tundra woodland	North and South America	Primary	63.7	30.1	SD	93
			Secondary >20 years	104.2	±90%	Default	94
			Secondary ≤20 years	n.a	n.a	n.a	
	Mountain	North and South America	Primary	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary >20 years	n.a	n.a	n.a	
			Secondary ≤20 years	1.9	±90%	Default	94

[1] Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.7 (UPDATED) ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS IN NATURAL FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1}]							
Domain	Ecological zone [1]	Continent	Status/condition[2]	Aboveground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha-1]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References

[2] Some categories include sub-strata for primary forests, which are defined as old-growth forests that are intact or with no active human intervention, and secondary forests which include all other forests. The table considers a forest definition of at least 10% tree canopy cover (74).

References

1Lewis, S. L. et al., 2013; 2Lewis, S. L. et al., 2013; 3Sullivan, M. J. P. et al., 2017; 4Sullivan, M. J. P. et al., 2016; 5Gatti, R. C. et al., 2015; 6Gatti, R. C., Laurin, G. V., Valentini, R., 2017; 7Vaglio Laurin, G. et al., 2013; 8Adou Yao, C. Y. et al., 2005; 9Anderson-Teixeira, K. J. et al., 2018; 10Anderson-Teixeira, K. J. et al., 2018; 11N'Guessan, A. E. et al., 2019; 12Xu, L. et al., 2017; 13Pirotti, F., et al., 2014; 14Palm, C. A. et al., 1999; 15Omeja, P. A., et al., 2011; 16Mitchard, E. T. A. et al., 2009; 17Thenkabail, P. S., et al., 2004; 18Brienen, R. J. W. et al., 2015; 19Brienen, R. J. W. et al., 2014; 20Mitchard, E. T. A. et al., 2014; 21Alvarez-Davila, E. et al., 2017; 22Poorter, L. et al., 2016; 23Poorter, L. et al., 2016; 24Rutishauser, E. et al., 2015; 25Martinez-Sanchez, J. L., et al, 2015; 26Pena, M. A., Duque, A., 2013; 27Robinson, S. J. B., et al., 2015; 28Salimon, C. I., Brown, I. F., 2000; 29Silva, C. et al., 2016; 30Vasconcelos, S. S. et al., 2008; 31Jacobi, J. et al., 2014; 32Schroth, G., et al., 2002; 33Qie, L. et al., 2017; 34Slik, J. W. F. et al., 2015; 35Slik, J. W. F. et al., 2013; 36Morel, A. C. et al., 2011; 37Mukul, S. A., Herbohn, J., Firn, J., 2016; 38Ewel, J., Chai, P., Lim, M., 1983; 39Hiratsuka, M., et al., 2006; 40Manlay, R. J. et al., 2002; 41Kalaba, F. K., et al., 2013; 42DVRF, 2016; 43MITADER, 2018; 44NAFORMA, 2015; 45FAO, SEP-REDD+, 2017; 46Carreiras, J. M. B., Vasconcelos, M. J., Lucas, R. M., 2012; 47Dees, M., 2018; 48WWF, Obf, 2013; 49Altrell, D., et al., 2005; 50FAO, 2005; 51Carreiras, J. M. B., Melo, J. B., Vasconcelos, M. J., 2013; 52Ryan, C. M. et al., 2012; 53Mukosha, J., Siampale, A., 2009; 54Atkinson, E. E., Marin-Spiotta, E., 2015; 55Salinas-Melgoza, M. A., et al., 2017; 56McNicol, I. M. et al., 2015; 57Raharimalala, O., et al., 2012; 58Johansson, S. G., Kaarakka, V. J., 1992; 59Santoro, M. et al., 2018; 60Mekuria, W., et al., 2011; 61Otuoma, J. et al., 2016; 62Giday, K., et al., 2013; 63DeVries, B., et al., 2012; 64Drichi, P., 2003; 65Avitabile, V., et al., 2012; 66Katumbi, N. M., et al., 2017; 67Kinyanjui, M. J. et al., 2014; 68Nyirambangutse, B. et al., 2017; 69Monreal, C. M. et al., 2005; 70Myster, R. W., 2017; 71Fujiki, S., et al., 2017; 72Chan, N., Takeda, S., 2016; 73Avitabile, V. et al., 2016; 74Hansen, M. C. et al., 2013; 75Luo, Y., et al., 2014; 76Trotsiuk, V., et al., 2016; 77Avitabile, V., Camia, A. 2018; 78Gazda, A., et al., 2015; 79Gazda, A., et al., 2015; 80June 18, 2018. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Available only on internet: https://apps.fs.usda.gov/fia/datamart/datamart.html]; 81Uri, V., et al. 2012; 82Lang, M., et al., 2016; 83Varnagiryte-Kabašinskiene, I., et al., 2014; 84Sato, T. J For Res 2010; 85Nunes L, et al., 2013; 86Granier, A., et al., 2000; 87Latifi, H., et al., 2015; 88Kattenborn, T., et al., 2015; 89Ningthoujam, R. K., et al., 2016; 90Husmann, K., et al., 2018; 91Holdaway, R.J., et al. 2017; 92Beets PN, et al., 2014; 93Keith, H., et al., 2009; 94September 25, 2017. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Available only on internet: http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html

Table 4.8

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED) ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})							
Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
Tropical	Tropical rain forest	Africa	Broadleaf	≤20	100	±90%	10
		Africa	Broadleaf	>20	300	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	60	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	200	±90%	10
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		200	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		150	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		300	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*	>20	240	±90%	13
		Asia	*Acacia auriculiformis*	≤20	99-119	±90%	20
		Asia	*Acacia mangium*	<20	93.6	64.20	28

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED) ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})							
Domain	**Ecological Zone**[1]	**Continent**	**Species**	**Age (yr)**	**AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})**	**SD**	**References**
		Asia	Broadleaf		220	±90%	10
		Asia	*Dipterocarp* sp.	>20	452.2	149.90	14
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	≤20	46-161	43.70	20
		Asia	*Gmelina arborea*	<20	97.6	23.60	14
		Asia	*Hevea brasiliensis*	<20	113-132	±90%	18
		Asia	*Mangifera indica*	<20	13.5	4.90	7
		Asia	*Rhizophora sp.*	>20	152.2	±90%	1
		Asia	Mixed	>20	69	±90%	3
		Asia	Oil Palm	<20	18.4-35.4	±90%	33
		Asia	Oil Palm	>20	48.5	9.20	33
		Asia	*Paraserianthes falcataria*	<20	64.4	38.80	14
		Asia	*Sweitenia macrophylla*	>20	512.8	170.40	14
	Tropical moist deciduous	Africa	Broadleaf	>20	150	±90%	10
		Africa	Broadleaf	≤20	80	±90%	10
		Africa	*Rhizophora sp.*		111-483	±90%	34
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	40-166	±90%	10,1
		Africa	*Tectona grandis*	<20	195.5	±90%	16
		Africa	*Tectona grandis*	>20	428.9	±90%	16
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	120-193.3	±90%	10,16
		Americas	*Anthocephalus chinensis*	<20	144	±90%	2
		Americas	*Coffea sp.*		46.9-57.5	±90%	15
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.	>20	90	±90%	31
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		100	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.	>20	270	±90%	10
		Americas	*Swietenia macrophylla*	<20	94	±90%	2
		Americas	*Swietenia macrophylla*	>20	121	±90%	2
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*	<20	84	±90%	24
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*	>20	284	±90%	24
		Asia	*Acacia auriculiformis*	>20	177	7.60	6
		Asia	*Acaica mangium*	>20	211	3.30	6
		Asia	Broadleaf	≤20	93.33-147.76	21.90	5
		Asia	Broadleaf	>20	107.05-224.48	55.60	5
		Asia	*Cassia montana*	<20	5.71	±90%	4

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA[-1])

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha[-1])	SD	References
		Asia	*Cedeus libani*	≤20	15.1	±90%	8
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	<20	41.78	±90%	4
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	>20	260	97.40	6
		Asia	Oil Palm	<20	124-202	±90%	29
		Asia	Other		100	±90%	10
		Asia	*Swietenia macrophylla*	>20	193	17.00	6
		Asia	*Tectona grandis*	<20	121.88	±90%	9
		Asia	*Tectona grandis*	>20	93.72	64.70	6
	Tropical dry forest	Africa	Broadleaf	≤20	30	±90%	10
		Africa	Broadleaf	>20	70	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	20-75.6	±90%	10,16
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	60-193.9	±90%	10,16
		Africa	*Tectona grandis*	<20	38.33	0.40	22
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		90	±90%	31
		Americas	Oil Palm	<20	40-62	±90%	26
		Americas	Oil Palm	>20	50-100	±90%	12
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		60	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		110	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		90	±90%	10
		Asia	*Acacia* sp.	<20	7.54-58.21	±90%	4
		Asia	*Adina cordifolia*		14.8	±90%	11
		Asia	*Adansonia digitata*		28.6	±90%	11
		Asia	*Albizia procera*	<20	4.9	±90%	11
		Asia	*Azadirachta indica*	<20	30.6-55.64	±90%	11,19
		Asia	*Bombax ceiba*		64.7	±90%	11
		Asia	Broadleaf		90	±90%	10
		Asia	*Courapita guianensis*		5.5	±90%	11
		Asia	*Dalbergia sissoo*	≤20	11.07	6.79	35
		Asia	*Dendrocalamus strictus*	<20	48.2	±90%	19
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	≤20	21.67	±90%	37
		Asia	*Ficus* sp.		25.4	±90%	11
		Asia	*Gmelina arborea*	≤20	6.65	1.37	35
		Asia	*Leucaena leucocephala*	<20	53.35	±90%	19
		Asia	*Madhuca indica*		35.2	±90%	11
		Asia	*Mangifera indica*		24.2	±90%	11

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
		Asia	*Rhizophora sp.*	<20	125.5	2.60	25
		Asia	*Manilkara elengi*	<20	7.4	±90%	11
		Asia	*Miliusa tomentosa*	<20	4.8	±90%	11
		Asia	*Mitragyna parviflora*		18.1	±90%	11
		Asia	Other		60	±90%	10
		Asia	*Pongamia pinnata*	≤20	8.57	2.00	35
		Asia	*Populus deltoides*	<20	37.5	34.40	21
		Asia	*Prosopis juliflora*	<20	3.56	±90%	4
		Asia	*Salvadora oleoides*		12.2	±90%	11
		Asia	*Samanea saman*		30.9	±90%	11
		Asia	*Sterculia urens*	<20	8.2	±90%	11
		Asia	*Swietenia mahogani*		28.7	±90%	11
		Asia	*Tamarindus indica*		88.8	±90%	11
		Asia	*Tectona grandis*	<20	21.8	±90%	19
		Asia	*Terminalia* sp.	>20	45.5-71.1	±90%	11
		Asia	*Terminalia* sp.	<20	8.2	±90%	11
		Asia	*Ziziphus mauritiana*	<20	8	±90%	11
	Tropical shrubland	Africa	Broadleaf		20	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus sp.*	≤20	15	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus sp.*	>20	20	±90%	10
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		60	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		30	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		60	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		50	±90%	10
		Asia	*Acacia* sp.	≤20	11.78-47.99	±90%	27,32
		Asia	*Azadirachta indica*	≤20	53.32	±90%	32
		Asia	Broadleaf		40	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf	>20	263.3	±90%	17
		Asia	*Casuarina equisetifolia*	≤20	9.12	±90%	32
		Asia	Other		30	±90%	10
		Asia	*Pongamia pinnata*	≤20	9.03	±90%	32
		Asia	*Tectona grandis*	≤20	31.66	±90%	32
	Tropical mountain systems	Africa	*Broadleaf*	≤20	40-100	±90%	10
		Africa	Broadleaf	>20	60-150	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	30-40	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	30-100	±90%	10

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		30-120	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		30-80	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		60-170	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		30-130	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf		40-150	±90%	10
		Asia	Other		25-80	±90%	10
Sub-tropical	Subtropical humid forest	Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		140	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		100	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		270	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		120	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf		180	±90%	10
		Asia	Other		100	±90%	10
		North America	*Populus sp.*	<20	23.07	20.40	36
		North America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	<20	2.45	2.99	36
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	<20	7.88	12.05	36
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	≥20	11.09	20.56	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	19.65	17.01	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	45.53	24.66	36
	Subtropical dry forest	Africa	Broadleaf	≤20	30	±90%	10
		Africa	Broadleaf	>20	70	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	20	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	60	±90%	10
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		110	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		60	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		110	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		90	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf	<20	69.45	48.89	39
		Asia	Broadleaf	>20	137.64	77.29	39
		Asia	Coniferous	<20	63.18	38.07	39
		Asia	Coniferous	>20	127.61	63.31	39
		Asia	*Cunninghamia* sp.	<20	62.96	37.38	39
		Asia	*Cunninghamia* sp.	>20	148.6	72.32	39
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	<20	68.72	55.05	39
		Asia	Other		60	±90%	39

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
		Asia	*Picea abies*	>20	138.23	47.42	39
		Asia	*Pinus massoniana*	<20	54.75	40.55	39
		Asia	*Pinus massoniana*	>20	163.45	66.07	39
	Subtropical steppe	Africa	Broadleaf		20	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	15	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	20	±90%	10
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		60	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		30	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		60	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		50	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf	≤20	10	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf	>20	80	±90%	10
		Asia	Coniferous	≤20	100-120	±90%	10
		Asia	Coniferous	>20	20	±90%	10
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	<20	3.59-8.75	±90%	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	22.8	19.91	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	46.69	16.55	36
	Subtropical mountain systems	Asia	*Acer velutinum*	<20	90.03	±90%	23
		Asia	*Alnus subcordata*	<20	103.53	±90%	23
		Asia	*Arizone cypress*	<20	25.72	0.11	30
		Asia	*Robinia pseudoacacia*	<20	8.85	0.54	30
		Asia	*Pinus brutia*	<20	50.62	0.52	30
		Asia	*Fraxinus excelsior*	<20	56.07	±90%	23
		Asia	*Morus sp.*	<20	9.87	0.33	30
		Asia	*Pinus nigra*	≤20	20.05-38.46	±90%	23,8
		Asia	*Prunus avium*	<20	37.92	±90%	23
		Asia	*Quercus castanifolia*	<20	72.82	±90%	23
		Asia	*Tilia begonifolia*	<20	71.88	±90%	23
		North America	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	<20	53.93	±90%	36
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	<20	3.68	4.53	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	14.51	14.54	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	24.87	25.85	36
		Africa	Broadleaf	≤20	40-100	±90%	10

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
		Africa	Broadleaf	>20	60-150	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	≤20	10-40	±90%	10
		Africa	*Pinus* sp.	>20	30-100	±90%	10
		Americas	*Eucalyptus* sp.		30-120	±90%	10
		Americas	Other Broadleaf		30-80	±90%	10
		Americas	*Pinus* sp.		60-170	±90%	10
		Americas	*Tectona grandis*		30-130	±90%	10
		Asia	Broadleaf		40-150	±90%	10
		Asia	Other		25-80	±90%	10
Temperate	Temperate oceanic forest	Asia, Europe	Broadleaf	≤20	30	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Broadleaf	>20	200	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Coniferous	≤20	40	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Coniferous	>20	150-250	±90%	10
		North America	*Populus sp.*	≥20	76.19	51.72	36
		North America	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	<20	15.35	18.86	36
		North America	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	≥20	95.8	73.39	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	3.87	±90%	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	131.27	143.75	36
		South America	Coniferous		90-120	±90%	10
	Temperate continental forest and mountain systems	Asia, Europe	Broadleaf	≤20	15	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Broadleaf	>20	200	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Coniferous	≤20	25-30	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Coniferous	>20	150-200	±90%	10
		North America	Coniferous		50-300	±90%	10
		North America	Coniferous		50-300	±90%	10
		South America	Coniferous		90-120	±90%	10
	Temperate continental forest	North America	*Populus sp.*	<20	88.35	±90%	36

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
		North America	*Populus sp.*	≥20	55.71	14.47	36
		North America	*Pseudotsuga menziesii*	≥20	42.62-96.65	±90%	36
		North America	*Abies sp.*	<20	5.62	6.63	36
		North America	*Abies sp.*	≥20	21.49	10.62	36
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	<20	6.7	12.63	36
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	≥20	23.72	46.23	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	31.45	28.87	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	80.94	68.21	36
		North America	*Picea sp.*	<20	9.89	8.14	36
		North America	*Picea sp.*	≥20	77.34	131.88	36
		Asia	*Larix* sp.	<20	57.49	32.16	39
		Asia	*Larix* sp.	>20	112.88	56.21	39
		Asia	*Pinus koraiensis*	<20	58.23	18.89	39
		Asia	*Pinus koraiensis*	>20	132.13	72.18	39
		Asia	*Pinus sylvestris*	<20	18	8.95	39
		Asia	*Pinus sylvestris*	>20	58.6	18.57	39
		Asia	*Pinus tabuliformis*	<20	34.02	14.15	39
		Asia	*Pinus tabuliformis*	>20	59.39	35.26	39
		Asia	*Poplar* sp.	<20	66.74	45.30	39
		Asia	*Robinia pseudoacacia*	<20	29.44	13.20	39
		Asia	*Robinia pseudoacacia*	>20	54.46	16.99	39
	Temperate mountain system	North America	*Populus sp.*	<20	55.98	±90%	36
		North America	Douglas fir	<20	13.56	18.81	36
		North America	Douglas fir	≥20	89.22	71.32	36
		North America	*Abies sp.*	<20	3.02	3.11	36
		North America	*Abies sp.*	≥20	40.48	71.99	36
		North America	Oaks and other hardwoods	<20	3.77	5.76	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	6.93	14.26	36

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.8 (UPDATED)
ABOVEGROUND BIOMASS (AGB) IN FOREST PLANTATIONS (TONNES D.M. HA^{-1})

Domain	Ecological Zone[1]	Continent	Species	Age (yr)	AGB (Tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})	SD	References
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	29.07	35.39	36
		North America	*Picea sp.*	<20	5.92	11.25	36
		North America	*Picea sp.*	≥20	50.27	38.11	36
		Asia	*Acacia crassicarpa*	<20	31.5	±90%	38
		Asia	*Castanopsis hystrix*	<20	16.6	±90%	38
		Asia	*Eucalyptus sp.*	<20	34.6	±90%	38
		Asia	Mixed Plantation	<20	19.2	±90%	38
	Temperate steppe	North America	*Populus sp.*	≥20	51.8-60.05	±90%	36
		North America	*Quercus* and other hardwoods	≥20	41.06	29.99	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	48.57	65.55	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	<20	4.75	6.72	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	84.88	24.75	36
		North America	*Pinus* sp.	≥20	3.6	4.70	36
Boreal	Boreal coniferous forest and mountain systems	Asia, Europe	Coniferous	≤20	5	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Coniferous	>20	40	±90%	10
		North America	Coniferous		40-50	±90%	10
	Boreal tundra woodland	Asia, Europe	Coniferous	≤20	5	±90%	10
		Asia, Europe	Coniferous	>20	25	±90%	10

[1] Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). *Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.*

References

1Arief, W. et al., 2013; 2Lugo, A. E., et al. 2012; 3 Arora P., Chaudhry S., 2017; 4Arul, P.L, Karthick, A., 2013; 5Banerjee, S. K., Prakasam, U. K., 2013; 6De Costa, W. A. J. M., Suranga, H.R., 2012; 7Guiabao, E. G., 2016; 8Fataei, E, Varamesh, S., 2016; 9Giri, C., et al., 2014; 10 IPCC, 2003; 11Ishan, Y.P., et al., 2013; 12Klaarenbeek, F.W.,, 2009; 13Kraenzel, M.B., et al. 2003; 14Lasco, R.D., Pulhin, F.B., 2003; 15Soto-Pinto, L., , Aguirre-Dávila, C., 2015; 16Masota, A.M., et al., 2016; 17Mohit, K., 2017; 18Muhdi, et al., 2016; 19Nadagouda, V.R., et al., 1997; 20Nambiar, E.K.S., Harwood, C.E., 2014; 21Negi, M.S., Tandon, V. N., 1997; 22Odiwe, A.I., et al., 2012; 23Ostadhashemi, R., et al., 2014; 24Pérez Cordero, L.D., Kanninen, M., 2003; 25Sahu, S.C., et al., 2016; 26Sanquetta, C.R., et al., 2015; 27Singh, K.C., 2005; 28Siregar, S.T.H., et al., 2008; 29Sitompol, S.M., Hairiah, K., 2000; 30Sohrabi, H., et al., 2016; 31Stape, J.L, et al., 2004; 32Swamy, K.R., et al., 2015; 33Syahrinudin, 2005; 34Trettin, C.C, et al., 2016; 35Umrao, R., et al., 2010; 36September 25, 2017. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Available only on internet: http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html]; 37Yadava, A. K., 2010; 38Yuanqi, C., et al., 2015; 39Yunjian, L., et al., 2014.

Table 4.9

TABLE 4.9. (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN NATURAL FORESTS[212,3] [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological Zone[4]	Continent	Status/ Condition	Aboveground biomass growth [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
Tropical	Tropical rainforest	Africa	Primary	1.3	3.5	SD	1, 2
			Secondary>20 years	3.5	3.3	SD	3-8
			Secondary≤20 years	7.6	5.9	SD	3-7, 9
		North and South America	Primary	1.0	2.0	SD	2, 10, 11
			Secondary>20 years	2.3	1.1	SD	3, 4, 12-15
			Secondary≤20 years	5.9	2.5	SD	3, 4, 6, 12-14
		Asia	Primary	0.7	2.2	SD	2, 16
			Secondary>20 years	2.7	3.1	SD	3, 4, 17
			Secondary≤20 years	3.4	3.9	SD	3, 4, 17-19
	Tropical moist deciduous forest	Africa	Primary[6]	0.4	±90%	Default	
			Secondary>20 years	0.9	0.7	SD	20, 21
			Secondary≤20 years	2.9	1.0	SD	20, 21
		North and South America	Primary	0.4	2.1	SD	2, 10, 11
			Secondary>20 years	2.7	1.7	SD	3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 22
			Secondary≤20 years	5.2	2.3	SD	3, 4, 12, 13, 22
		Asia	Primary	0.4	±90%	Default	7
			Secondary>20 years	0.9	±90%	Default	8
			Secondary≤20 years	2.4	0.3	SD	3, 4
	Tropical dry forest	Africa	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	1.6	±90%	Default	9
			Secondary≤20 years	3.9	±90%	Default	10
		North and South America	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	1.6	1.1	SD	12, 13
			Secondary≤20 years	3.9	2.4	SD	12, 13, 23
		Asia	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	1.6	±90%	Default	11
			Secondary≤20 years	3.9	±90%	Default	12
	Tropical shrublands	Africa	Primary	0.9 (0.2-1.6)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	0.9 (0.2-1.6)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	0.2-0.7	±90%	Default	24
		North and South America	Primary	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	4.0	±90%	Default	24
			Primary	1.3 (1.0-2.2)*	±90%	Default	24

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.9. (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN NATURAL FORESTS[212,3] [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological Zone[4]	Continent	Status/ Condition	Aboveground biomass growth [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
		Asia (continental)	Secondary>20 years	1.3 (1.0-2.2)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	5.0	±90%	Default	24
		Asia (insular)	Primary	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	2.0	±90%	Default	24
	Tropical mountain system	Africa	Primary	0.5	±90%	Default	13
			Secondary>20 years	1.8	±90%	Default	14
			Secondary≤20 years	5.5	6.8	SD	25-27
		North and South America	Primary	0.5	1.9	SD	2, 10, 11
			Secondary>20 years	1.8	0.8	SD	3, 4, 12, 13
			Secondary≤20 years	4.4	1.6	SD	3, 4, 12, 13, 22
		Asia	Primary	-0.7	3.1	SD	2, 16
			Secondary>20 years	1.1	0.4	SD	3, 4, 28, 29
			Secondary≤20 years	2.9	0.1	SD	3, 4, 28-30
Subtropical	Subtropical humid forest	Africa	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	1.0	±90%	Default	15
			Secondary≤20 years	2.5	±90%	Default	16
		North and South America	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	1.0	±90%	Default	17
			Secondary≤20 years	2.5	±90%	Default	18
		Asia	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	1.0	0.9	SD	3, 4, 31
			Secondary≤20 years	2.5	0.8	SD	3, 4, 31
	Subtropical dry forest	Africa	Primary	1.8 (0.6-3.0)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.8 (0.6-3.0)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	2.4 (2.3-2.5)	±90%	Default	24
		North and South America	Primary	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	4.0	±90%	Default	24
		Asia (continental)	Primary	1.5*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.5*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	6.0	±90%	Default	24
		Asia (insular)	Primary	2.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	2.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	7.0	±90%	Default	24

TABLE 4.9. (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN NATURAL FORESTS[212,3] [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological Zone[4]	Continent	Status/ Condition	Aboveground biomass growth [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
	Subtropical steppe	Africa	Primary	0.9 (0.2-1.6)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	0.9 (0.2-1.6)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	1.2 (0.8-1.5)	±90%	Default	24
		North and South America	Primary	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	4.0	±90%	Default	24
		Asia (continental)	Primary	1.3 (1.0-2.2)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.3 (1.0-2.2)*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	5.0	±90%	Default	24
		Asia (insular)	Primary	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary>20 years	1.0*	±90%	Default	24
			Secondary≤20 years	2.0	±90%	Default	24
	Subtropical mountain system	Africa	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	0.5	±90%	Default	19
			Secondary≤20 years	2.5	±90%	Default	20
		North and South America	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	0.5	±90%	Default	21
			Secondary≤20 years	2.5	±90%	Default	22
		Asia	Primary	-	-	-	
			Secondary>20 years	0.5	0.3	SD	3, 4, 32
			Secondary≤20 years	2.5	0.03	SD	3, 4, 32
Temperate	Oceanic	New Zealand	Primary	0.37	±0.85	95%CI	33
			Secondary>20 years	2.12	±0.82	95%CI	33
			Secondary≤20 years	3.12	0.83	SE	34
		Europe	All	2.3	-	-	35
		North and South America	Secondary>20 years	9.1	20.2	SD	36
			Secondary≤20 years	6.3	7.4	SD	36
	Continental	North and South America	Secondary>20 years	3.6	15.0	SD	36
			Secondary≤20 years	3.3	5.2	SD	36
	Mountain	North and South America	Secondary>20 years	4.4	100.7	SD	36
			Secondary≤20 years	3.1	3.6	SD	36
	Desert	North and South America	Secondary>20 years	0.6	0.9	SD	36

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.9. (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN NATURAL FORESTS[212,3] [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological Zone[4]	Continent	Status/ Condition	Aboveground biomass growth [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]	Uncertainty	Uncertainty type	References
			Secondary≤20 years	0.5	1.2	SD	36
	Steppe	North and South America	Secondary>20 years	3.5	13.3	SD	36
			Secondary≤20 years	2.3	3.2	SD	36
Boreal	Coniferous	Asia, Europe, North America	All	0.1-2.1	-	-	35
	Tundra woodland	Asia, Europe, North America	All	0.4	(0.2-0.5)	Range	24
	Mountain	Asia, Europe, North America	Primary or secondary>20 years	1.1-1.5	-	-	24
			Secondary≤20 years	1.0-1.1	-	-	24

[1] Aboveground net biomass growth is defined as net change in total aboveground biomass over time. In this respect, both forest productivity and mortality are accounted for.

[2] Some categories include sub-strata for primary forests defined as old growth forests that are intact or with no active human intervention, and secondary forests which include all other forests. The table considers a forest definition of at least 10% tree canopy cover.

[3] For above-ground biomass growth rates with no standard deviation, IPCC Tier 1 default uncertainties apply.

[4] Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). *Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.*

Observations on ecological zone and continent columns
Above-ground biomass growth rate was taken from: Tropical moist deciduous forest - North and South America (Primary); Tropical moist deciduous forest - North and South America (Primary); Tropical moist deciduous forest - Africa (Secondary>20 years); Tropical dry forest – North and South America (Secondary>20 years); Tropical dry forest – North and South America (Secondary≤20 years); Tropical dry forest – North and South America (Secondary>20 years); Tropical dry forest – North and South America (Secondary≤20 years); Tropical mountain system – North and South America (Primary); Tropical mountain system – North and South America (Secondary>20 years); Subtropical humid forest – Asia (Secondary>20 years); Subtropical humid forest – Asia (Secondary≤20 years) Subtropical humid forest – Asia (Secondary>20 years); Subtropical humid forest – Asia (Secondary≤20 years); Subtropical mountain system – Asia (Secondary>20 years); Subtropical mountain system – Asia (Secondary≤20 years); Subtropical mountain system – Asia (Secondary>20 years); Subtropical mountain system – Asia (Secondary≤20 years).

Note: SD = standard deviation, CI = confidence interval, SE = standard error.
***Recommendation based on IPCC 2006 estimates for Forests > 20 years.

References
1Lewis, S. L., et al., 2009; 2Lopez-Gonzalez, G. et al., 2011; 3Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., et al., 2018a; 4Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., et al., 2018b; 5Omeja, P. A. et al., 2011; 6Palm, C.A., et al., 1999; 7N'Guessan, A. E., et al., 2019; 8Gourlet-Fleury, S., et al., 2013; 9Thenkabail, P. S., et al., 2004; 10Brienen, R. J. W., et al., 2014: 11Brienen, R. J. W., et al., 2015; 12Poorter, L. et al., 2016a; 13L. Poorter et al., 2016b; 14Salimon, C. I., Brown, I. F., 2000; 15Rutishauser, E., et al., 2015; 16Qie, L., et al., 2017; 17Mukul, S. A., Herbohn, J., Firn, F., 2016; 18Hiratsuka, M., et al., 2006; 19Ewel, J. J., Chai, P., Tsai, L. M., 1983; 20Kalaba, F. K., et al., 2013; 21Manlay, R., et al., 2002; 22Peña, M. A., Duque, A., 2013; 23Salinas-Mendoza, M. A. et al., 2017; 24IPCC, 2003; 25Otuoma, J., et al., 2016; 26Giday, K., et al., 2013; 27Mekurja, W., Veldkamp, E., Corre, M. D., 2010; 28Tang, J. W., et al., 1998; 29Fujiki, S., 2017; 30Chan, N., Takeda, S., 2016; 31Schomakers, J., et al., 2017; 32Dang, C. L., Wu, Z. L., 1991; 33Holdaway, R.J., et al. 2017; 34Beets P.N., et al. 2014; 35IPCC 2006; 36June 18, 2018. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. (Available only on internet: https://apps.fs.usda.gov/fia/datamart/datamart.html).

Table 4.10

TABLE 4.10. (UPDATED) ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN TROPICAL AND SUB-TROPICAL PLANTATION FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]						
Domain	**Ecological zone**[1]	**Continent**	**Species**	**Above-ground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]**	**Range [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]**[2]	**References**
Tropical	Tropical rainforest	Africa	*Pinus* sp. ≤ 20 y	20		1
			other ≤ 20 y	6	5-8	1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	20	6-40	1
			Pinus sp.	20		1
			Tectona grandis	15		1
			other broadleaf	20	5-35	1
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	5	4-8	1
			other	5	2-8	1
	Tropical moist deciduous forest	Africa	*Eucalyptus* sp. >20 y	25		1
			Eucalyptus sp. ≤20 y	20		1
			other ≤ 20 y	9	3-15	1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	16		2
			Tectona grandis	8	4-12	1
			other broadleaf	6-20	6-20	3
		Asia		8		1
	Tropical dry forest	Africa	*Eucalyptus* sp. ≤20 y	13		1
			Pinus sp. > 20 y	9	7-10	4
			Pinus sp. ≤ 20 y	6	5-8	4
			other ≤ 20 y	10	4-20	1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	20	6-30	1
			Pinus sp.	7	4-10	1
			Tectona grandis	8	4-12	1
			other broadleaf	10	3-12	1
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	15	5-25	1
			other	7	2-13	1
	Tropical shrubland	Africa	*Eucalyptus* sp. >20 y	8	5-14	1
			Eucalyptus sp. ≤20 y	5	3-7	1
			Pinus sp. > 20 y	2.5		1
			Pinus sp. ≤ 20 y	3	0.5-6	1
			other > 20 y	10		1
			other ≤ 20 y	15		1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	20		1
			Pinus sp.	5		1
		Asia		6	1-12	1
	Tropical mountain systems	Africa		10		1

TABLE 4.10. (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN TROPICAL AND SUB-TROPICAL PLANTATION FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Species	Above-ground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]	Range [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}][2]	References
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	10	8-18	1
			Pinus sp.	10		1
		Asia	*Tectona grandis*	2		1
			other broadleaf	4		1
			Eucalyptus sp.	3		1
			other	5	1-10	1
Subtropical	Subtropical humid forest	North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	20	6-32	1
			Pinus sp.	7	4-10	1
			Tectona grandis	8	4-12	1
			other broadleaf	10	3-12	1
		Asia		8		1
	Subtropical dry forest	Africa	*Eucalyptus* sp. ≤20 y	13		1
			Pinus sp. > 20 y	10		1
			Pinus sp. ≤ 20 y	8		1
			other ≤ 20 y	10	4-20	1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	20	6-30	1
			Pinus sp.	7	4-10	1
			Tectona grandis	8	4-12	1
			other broadleaf	10	3-12	1
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	15	5-25	1
			other	7	2-13	1
	Subtropical steppe	Africa	*Eucalyptus* sp. >20 y	8	5-14	1
			Eucalyptus sp. ≤20 y	5	3-7	1
			Pinus sp. > 20 y	2.5		1
			Pinus sp. ≤ 20 y	3	0.5-6	1
			other > 20 y	10		1
			other ≤ 20 y	15		1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	20		1
			Pinus sp.	5		1
		Asia		6	1-12	1
	Subtropical mountain systems	Africa		10		1
		North and South America	*Eucalyptus* sp.	10	8-18	1
			Pinus sp.	10		1
			Tectona grandis	2		1
			other broadleaf	4		1
		Asia	*Eucalyptus* sp.	3		1
			other	5	1-10	1
Temperate	Continental	North and South America	Secondary >20 years	4	5	5
			Secondary ≤20 years	5	4	5

TABLE 4.10. (UPDATED)
ABOVE-GROUND NET BIOMASS GROWTH IN TROPICAL AND SUB-TROPICAL PLANTATION FORESTS [TONNES D.M. HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Species	Above-ground biomass [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}]	Range [tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1}][2]	References
	Mountain	North and South America	Secondary >20 years	9	7	5
			Secondary ≤20 years	10	86	5
	Oceanic	North and South America	Secondary >20 years	10	8	5
			Secondary ≤20 years	6	4	5
	Steppe	North and South America	Secondary >20 years	11	56	5
			Secondary ≤20 years	4	3	5
Boreal	Coniferous	Asia, Europe, North America	Secondary >20 years	1.0		1
			Secondary ≤20 years	1.0		1
	Tundra woodland	Asia, Europe, North America	Secondary >20 years	0.4		1
			Secondary ≤20 years	0.4		1
	Mountain	Asia, Europe, North America	Secondary >20 years	1.0		1
			Secondary ≤20 years	1.0		1

[1] Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). *Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179*.

[2] If a single estimate is included in this column it refers to the standard deviation of the mean estimate.

References
1IPCC 2003; 2Stape et al., 2004; 3Lugo et al., 1990; 4Masota et al 2016; 5June 18, 2018. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station (Available only on internet: http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html).

Table 4.11

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.11. (UPDATED)
REPORTED MEAN ANNUAL INCREMENT (GROWTH RATE OF MERCHANTABLE VOLUME) VALUES FOR SOME PLANTATION FOREST SPECIES M^3 HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Continent	Region/Country	Tree species	Plantation Purpose	MAI min	MAI max	S.D.[2]	Reference
World	General	*Acacia auriculiformis*	Productive	6	20	3.5	5, 8
		Acacia mearnsii	Productive	14	25	2.8	5, 8
		Araucaria angustifolia	Productive	8	24	4.0	5, 8
		Araucaria cunninghamii	Productive	10	18	2.0	5, 8
		Casuarina equisetifolia	Productive	6	20	3.5	5, 8
		Casuarina junghuhniana	Productive	7	11	1.0	5, 8
		Cordia alliodora	Productive	10	20	2.5	5, 8
		Cupressus lusitanica	Productive	8	40	8.0	5, 8
		Dalbergia sissoo	Productive	5	8	0.8	5, 8
		Eucalyptus camaldulensis	Productive	15	30	3.8	5, 8
		Eucalyptus deglupta	Productive	14	50	9.0	5, 8
		Eucalyptus globulus	Productive	10	40	7.5	5, 8
		Eucalyptus grandis	Productive	15	50	8.8	5, 8
		Eucalyptus robusta	Productive	10	40	7.5	5, 8
		Eucalyptus saligna	Productive	10	55	11.3	5, 8
		Eucalyptus urophylla	Productive	20	60	10.0	5, 8
		Gmelina arborea	Productive	12	50	9.5	5, 8
		Leucaena leucocephala	Productive	30	55	6.3	5, 8
		Pinus caribaea var. *caribaea*	Productive	10	28	4.5	5, 8
		Pinus caribaea var. *hondurensis*	Productive	20	50	7.5	5, 8
		Pinus oocarpa	Productive	10	40	7.5	5, 8
		Pinus patula	Productive	8	40	8.0	5, 8
		Pinus radiata	Productive	10	50	10.0	5, 8
		Swietenia macrophylla	Productive	7	30	5.8	5, 8
		Tectona grandis	Productive	6	18	3.0	5, 8
		Terminalia ivorensis	Productive	8	17	2.3	5, 8
		Terminalia superba	Productive	10	14	1.0	5, 8
Africa	General	*Acacia mellifera*	Productive	2.2	4.0	0.5	6, 8
		Acacia nilotica	Productive	15.0	20.0	1.3	6, 8
		Acacia senegal	Productive	1.4	2.6	0.3	6, 8
		Acacia seyal	Productive	2.0	6.0	1.0	6, 8
		Ailanthus excelsa	Productive	6.6	9.4	0.7	6, 8
		Bamboos	Productive	5.0	7.5	0.6	6, 8
		Cupressus spp.	Productive	15.0	24.0	2.3	6, 8
		Eucalyptus spp.	Productive	12.0	14.0	0.5	6, 8
		Khaya spp.	Productive	8.5	12.0	0.9	6, 8
		Tectona grandis	Productive	2.5	3.5	0.3	6, 8
		Acacia albida	Productive semi-natural	4.0	6.1	0.5	6, 8

TABLE 4.11. (UPDATED)
REPORTED MEAN ANNUAL INCREMENT (GROWTH RATE OF MERCHANTABLE VOLUME) VALUES FOR SOME PLANTATION FOREST SPECIES M^3 HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Continent	Region/Country	Tree species	Plantation Purpose	MAI min	MAI max	S.D.[2]	Reference
		Acacia mellifera	Productive semi-natural	1.9	3.5	0.4	6, 8
		Acacia nilotica	Productive semi-natural	12.5	20.0	1.9	6, 8
		Acacia senegal	Productive semi-natural	1.1	2.4	0.3	6, 8
		Acacia seyal	Productive semi-natural	1.8	3.2	0.4	6, 8
		Acacia tortilis	Productive semi-natural	1.2	3.7	0.6	6, 8
		Acacia tortilis var. *siprocarpa*	Productive semi-natural	1.5	2.4	0.2	6, 8
		Balanites aegyptiaca	Productive semi-natural	1.2	1.5	0.1	6, 8
		Sclerocarya birrea	Productive semi-natural	1.5	1.7	0.1	6, 8
		Ziziphus mauritiana	Productive semi-natural	0.9	1.0	0.0	6, 8
		Acacia mellifera	Protective	2.0	6.0	1.0	6, 8
		Acacia nilotica	Protective	13.0	21.0	2.0	6, 8
		Acacia senegal	Protective	1.4	2.8	0.4	6, 8
		Acacia seyal	Protective	1.9	4.3	0.6	6, 8
		Ailanthus spp.	Protective	6.0	12.0	1.5	6, 8
		Bamboos	Protective	4.0	8.0	1.0	6, 8
		Cupressus spp.	Protective	14.0	20.0	1.5	6, 8
		Eucalyptus spp.	Protective	10.0	14.0	1.0	6, 8
		Khaya spp.	Protective	7.0	16.0	2.3	6, 8
		Tectona grandis	Protective	5.0	8.0	0.8	6, 8
	E and S	*Acacia mearnsii / melanoxylon*	Productive	10	12	0.5	6, 8
	N	*Acacia nilotica*	Productive	15	20	1.3	6, 8
	N	*Acacia nilotica*	Productive semi-natural	12.5	20	1.9	6, 8
	N	*Acacia senegal*	Productive	1.4	2.6	0.3	6, 8
	N	*Acacia senegal*	Productive semi-natural	1.1	2.4	0.3	6, 8
	N	*Acacia seyal*	Productive	2	6	1.0	6, 8
	N	*Acacia seyal*	Productive semi-natural	1.8	3.2	0.4	6, 8
	E and S	*Eucalyptus grandis*	Productive	18	24	1.5	6, 8
	E and S	*Eucalyptus nitens*	Productive	22	28	1.5	6, 8
	N	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	12	14	0.5	6, 8
	E and S	*Pinus elliottii*	Productive	12	18	1.5	6, 8
	N and C	*Pinus elliottii*	Productive	7	8	0.3	6, 8
	N	*Pinus halapensis*	Productive semi-natural	1	2	0.3	6, 8

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.11. (UPDATED)
REPORTED MEAN ANNUAL INCREMENT (GROWTH RATE OF MERCHANTABLE VOLUME) VALUES FOR SOME PLANTATION FOREST SPECIES M^3 HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Continent	Region/Country	Tree species	Plantation Purpose	MAI min	MAI max	S.D.[2]	Reference
	Africa	*Pinus patula*	Productive	12	18	1.5	6, 8
	Africa	*Pinus pinaster*	Productive semi-natural	1	2	0.3	6, 8
	Africa	*Pinus radiata*	Productive	12	16	1.0	6, 8
	Congo	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Experimental	13.8	25	2.8	10
Asia	Asia	*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*	Productive	21.0	43.0	5.5	6, 8
	Asia	*Pinus* spp.	Productive	4.0	15.0	2.8	6, 8
	S and SE	*Acacia mangium*	Productive	19	40	5.3	6, 8
	E and S	*Castanea molissima*	Productive	1	6	1.3	6, 8
	E and S	*Cunninghamia lanceolata*	Productive	2.5	13.5	2.8	6, 8
	E and S	*Cunninghamia lanceolata*	Productive semi-natural	2.5	13.5	2.8	6, 8
	E	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	1.6	8.7	1.8	6, 8
	S and SE	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	7	12	1.3	6, 8
	S and SE	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive semi-natural	8	12	1.0	6, 8
	W and C	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	4	10	1.5	6, 8
	Asia	*Pinus massoniana*	Productive semi-natural	2.8	16.3	3.4	6, 8
	Asia	*Populus* spp. and cultivars	Productive	3.7	18.5	3.7	6, 8
	Asia	*Populus* spp. and cultivars	Productive semi-natural	3.7	17.7	3.5	6, 8
	Asia	*Populus* spp. and cultivars	Productive	5	12	1.8	6, 8
	Asia	*Tectona grandis*	Productive	4	17.3	3.3	6, 8
	Asia	*Tectona grandis*	Productive semi-natural	4	6	0.5	6, 8
	China	*Dalbergia sissoo*	Productive	4	6	0.5	1
	China	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	8	12	1.0	1
	China	*Gmelina arborea*	Productive	10	15	1.3	1
	China	*Acacia nilotica*	Productive	3	4	0.3	1
	China	*Populus* spp.	Productive	20	25	1.3	1
	China	*Tectona grandis*	Productive	0.6	7	1.6	1
	Vietnam	*Acacia* hybrid	Experimental	24.4	39.4	3.8	3
	Turkey	*Pinus pinaster*	Productive	9.8	22.4	3.2	4
	Turkey	*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*	Productive	18.3	24.1	1.5	4
	Turkey	*Populus* spp. and cultivars	Productive	23.5	55.1	7.9	4
	Turkey	*Pinus brutia*	Productive	1	15.4	3.6	4
	Vietnam	*Acacia mangium*	Productive	11	23	3.0	9
	Vietnam	*Melia azedarach*	Productive	15	17	0.5	9
Europe	Europe	*Fagus sylvatica*	Productive	4	14	2.5	6, 8
	Europe	*Fagus sylvatica*	Productive semi-natural	2	14	3.0	6, 8

TABLE 4.11. (UPDATED)
REPORTED MEAN ANNUAL INCREMENT (GROWTH RATE OF MERCHANTABLE VOLUME) VALUES FOR SOME PLANTATION FOREST SPECIES M^3 HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Continent	Region/Country	Tree species	Plantation Purpose	MAI min	MAI max	S.D.[2]	Reference
	Europe	*Larix decidua*	Productive	7	13	1.5	6, 8
	Europe	*Larix decidua*	Productive semi-natural	2	11	2.3	6, 8
	Europe	*Picea abies*	Productive	3.5	6	0.6	6, 8
	Europe	*Picea abies*	Productive semi-natural	1.5	15	3.4	6, 8
	Europe	*Pinus pinaster*	Productive	4.7	13.8	2.3	6, 8
	Europe	*Pinus sylvestris*	Productive	2.5	14	2.9	6, 8
	Europe	*Pinus sylvestris*	Productive semi-natural	1	10	2.3	6, 8
	Europe	*Quercus robur*	Productive	3	9	1.5	6, 8
	Europe	*Quercus robur*	Productive semi-natural	1.5	10	2.1	6, 8
	Sweden	*Pinus sylvestris*	Productive semi-natural	3.3	5.3	0.5	7
	Sweden	*Picea abies*	Productive semi-natural	3.4	10	1.7	7
	Sweden	*Larix sibirica*	Productive semi-natural	4	5.9	0.5	7
	Sweden	*Pinus contorta*	Productive semi-natural	4.6	6.9	0.6	7
	Sweden	*Betula pendula*	Productive semi-natural	3	8	1.3	7
	Sweden	*Populus* spp. and cultivars	Productive semi-natural	12	16	1.0	7
	Sweden	*Quercus robur*	Productive semi-natural	3.9	5.2	0.3	7
	Finland	*Pinus sylvestris*	Productive semi-natural	2	5	0.8	7
	Finland	*Picea abies*	Productive semi-natural	3	7	1.0	7
	Finland	*Betula pendula*	Productive semi-natural	3	7	1.0	7
	Norway	*Pinus sylvestris*	Productive semi-natural	1.5	3.5	0.5	7
	Norway	*Picea abies*	Productive semi-natural	4	8.5	1.1	7
	Norway	*Picea sitchensis*	Productive semi-natural	12	18	1.5	7
North and Central America	North and Central America	*Pinus taeda*	Productive	9	10	0.3	6, 8
Oceania	Oceania	*Eucalyptus globulus*	Productive	15.6	25	2.4	6, 8
	Oceania	*Pinus radiata*	Productive	15.7	21	1.3	6, 8
South America	South America	*Tectona grandis*	Productive	7.3	17.3	2.5	6, 8
	South America	*Xylia xylocarpa*	Productive	3.0	8.8	1.5	6, 8
	South America	*Acacia* spp.	Productive	15.0	30.0	3.8	6, 8

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.11. (UPDATED)
REPORTED MEAN ANNUAL INCREMENT (GROWTH RATE OF MERCHANTABLE VOLUME) VALUES FOR SOME PLANTATION FOREST SPECIES M^3 HA^{-1} YR^{-1}]

Continent	Region/Country	Tree species	Plantation Purpose	MAI min	MAI max	S.D.[2]	Reference
	South America	*Araucaria angustifolia*	Productive	15.0	30.0	3.8	6, 8
	South America	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	20.0	70.0	12.5	6, 8
	South America	*Hevea brasiliensis*	Productive	10.0	20.0	2.5	6, 8
	South America	*Mimosa scabrella*	Productive	10.0	25.0	3.8	6, 8
	South America	*Pinus* spp.	Productive	25.0	40.0	3.8	6, 8
	South America	*Populus* spp.	Productive	10.0	30.0	5.0	6, 8
	South America	*Tectona grandis*	Productive	15.0	35.0	5.0	6, 8
	South America	*Eucalyptus* spp.	Productive	15	70	13.8	6, 8
	South America	*Pinus radiata*	Productive	14	34	5.0	6, 8
	Brazil	*Khaya ivorensis*	Productive	18	25	1.8	11
	Brazil	*Schizolobium amazonicum*	Productive	10	33	5.8	2

[1] Updated and replaced former Table 4.11A and 4.11B from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines

[2] Standard deviation estimated from the min and max estimates.

Note: E: East, S: South, N: North, SE: Southeast, W: West, C: Central

References
1Chuande, X., 2001; 2Cordeiro, et al., 2015; 3Dell, B., Daping X., Thu, P.Q.; 4Erkan, N., 2003; 5FAO, 2001; 6FAO, 2006; 7Haapanen, M., et al., 2015; 8IPCC, 2006; 9Kien, N.D., 2014; 10Nzila, J.D., et al., 2004; 11Silva, L.F., et al., 2016.

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Table 4.12

TABLE 4.12. (UPDATED) BIOMASS VALUES FROM TABLES 4.7–4.10							
Domain	**Ecological zone[1]**	**Continent**	**Status/condition**	**Above-ground biomass in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[2]**	**Above-ground biomass in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[3]**	**Above-ground net biomass growth in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[4]**	**Above-ground net biomass growth in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[5]**
Tropical	Tropical rainforest	Africa	Primary	404.2	n.a.	1.3	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	212.9	200-300	3.5	n.a.
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	52.8	60-100	7.6	5-8
		North and South America	Primary	307.1	n.a.	1.0	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	206.4	150-300	2.3	5-40
			Secondary ≤20 years	75.7	150-300	5.9	5-40
		Asia	Primary	413.1	n.a.	0.7	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	131.6	48.5-512.8	2.7	2-8
			Secondary ≤20 years	45.6	13.5-161	3.4	2-8
	Tropical moist deciduous forest	Africa	Primary	236.6	n.a.	0.4	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	72.8	120-483	0.9	n.a.
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	72.8	40-195	2.9	3-15
		North and South America	Primary	187.3	n.a.	0.4	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	131.0	46.9-284	2.7	4-20
			Secondary ≤20 years	55.7	46.9-195	5.2	4-20
		Asia	Primary	67.7	n.a.	0.4	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	67.7	93.7-260	0.9	8
			Secondary ≤20 years	67.7	5.7-202	2.4	8
	Tropical dry forest	Africa	Primary	69.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	69.6	60-193.9	1.6	6-13
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	69.6	20-75.6	3.9	4-20
		North and South America	Primary	127.5	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	118.9	50-110	1.6	4-30
			Secondary ≤20 years	32.2	40-62	3.9	4-30
		Asia	Primary	184.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	184.6	45.5-88.8	1.6	2-25
			Secondary ≤20 years	184.6	3.56-125.5	3.9	2-25
	Tropical shrublands	Africa	Primary	48.4	n.a.	0.9	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	48.4	20	0.9	2.5-14
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	48.4	15-20	0.2-0.7	3-7

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.12. (UPDATED)
BIOMASS VALUES FROM TABLES 4.7–4.10

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Status/condition	Above-ground biomass in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[2]	Above-ground biomass in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[3]	Above-ground net biomass growth in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[4]	Above-ground net biomass growth in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[5]
		North and South America	Primary	71.5	n.a.	1.0	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	71.5	30-60	1.0	5-20
			Secondary ≤20 years	71.5	30-60	4.0	5-20
		Asia	Primary	38.3	n.a.	1.0-1.3	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	38.3	30-263.3	1.0-1.3	1-12
			Secondary ≤20 years	38.3	9.0-53.3	2.0-5.0	1-12
	Tropical mountain systems	Africa	Primary	190.0	n.a.	0.5	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	190.0	30-150	1.8	10
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	190.0	30-100	5.5	10
		North and South America	Primary	195.0	n.a.	0.5	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	184.4	30-170	1.8	8-18
			Secondary ≤20 years	75.9	30-170	4.4	8-18
		Asia	Primary	433.5	n.a.	-0.7	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	66.4	25-150	1.1	1-10
			Secondary ≤20 years	66.4	25-150	2.9	1-10
Subtropical	Subtropical humid forests	Africa	Primary	54.1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	54.1	n.a.	1.0	n.a.
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	54.1	n.a.	2.5	n.a.
		North and South America	Primary	84.5	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	84.5	11.1-270	1.0	3-32
			Secondary ≤20 years	84.5	2.45-270	2.5	3-32
		Asia	Primary	323.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	258.4	100-180	1.0	8
			Secondary ≤20 years	258.4	100-180	2.5	8
	Subtropical dry forests	Africa	Primary	65.2	n.a.	1.8	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	65.2	60-70	1.8	8
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	65.2	20-30	2.4	4-20
		North and South America	Primary	115.9	n.a.	1.0	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	115.9	60-110	1.0	3-30
			Secondary ≤20 years	115.9	60-110	4.0	3-30
		Asia	Primary	70.9	n.a.	1.5-2.0	n.a.

TABLE 4.12. (UPDATED)
BIOMASS VALUES FROM TABLES 4.7–4.10

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Status/condition	Above-ground biomass in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[2]	Above-ground biomass in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[3]	Above-ground net biomass growth in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[4]	Above-ground net biomass growth in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[5]
			Secondary >20 years	70.9	60-163.5	1.5-2.0	2-25
			Secondary ≤20 years	70.9	54.8-69.5	6.0-7.0	2-25
	Subtropical steppe	Africa	Primary	50.5	n.a.	0.9	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	50.5	15-20	0.9	2.5-14
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	50.5	15-20	1.2	0.5-15
		North and South America	Primary	44.0	n.a.	1.0	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	44.0	30-60	1.0	5-20
			Secondary ≤20 years	44.0	3.6-60	4.0	5-20
		Asia	Primary	41.6	n.a.	1.0-1.3	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	41.6	20-80	1.0-1.3	1-12
			Secondary ≤20 years	41.6	10-120	2.0-5.0	1-12
	Subtropical mountain systems	Africa	Primary	35.1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	35.1	30-150	0.5	10
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	35.1	10-100	2.5	10
		North and South America	Primary	74.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	74.6	24.9-170	0.5	2-18
			Secondary ≤20 years	74.6	3.7-170	2.5	2-18
		Asia	Primary	250.2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	155.2	n.a.	0.5	1-12
			Secondary ≤20 years	155.2	8.9-103.5	2.5	1-12
Temperate	Mountain	Asia	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	170.4	n.a.	n.a.	3.0
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	n.a.	16.6-34.6	n.a.	3.0
		Europe	Primary	301.1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	214.7	n.a.	n.a.	3.0
			Secondary ≤20 years	27.8	n.a.	n.a.	3.0
		North and South America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	185.9	29.1-89.2	4.4	9
			Secondary ≤20 years	57.9	3.0-56.0	3.1	10
	Continential	Asia	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	116	54.5-132.1	n.a.	4.0

Subject to final copyedit and layout

TABLE 4.12. (UPDATED)
BIOMASS VALUES FROM TABLES 4.7–4.10

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Status/condition	Above-ground biomass in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[2]	Above-ground biomass in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[3]	Above-ground net biomass growth in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[4]	Above-ground net biomass growth in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[5]
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	90.9	18-66.7	n.a.	4.0
		Europe	Primary	332.4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	162	n.a.	n.a.	4.0
			Secondary ≤20 years	51.6	n.a.	n.a.	4.0
		North and South America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	128.9	21.5-96.7	3.6	4
			Secondary ≤20 years	46	5.688.35	3.3	5
	Oceanic	Asia	Primary	289.8	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	n.a.	150-200	n.a.	4.4
			Secondary ≤ 20 years	n.a.	30-40	n.a.	4.4
		Europe	Primary	126.1	n.a.	2.3	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	153.9	150-200	2.3	4.4
			Secondary ≤20 years	22.3	30-40	2.3	4.4
		Oceania	Primary	352.7	n.a.	0.37	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	120.5	n.a.	2.12	4.4
			Secondary ≤20 years	57.5	n.a.	3.12	4.4
		North and South America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	354.1	76.2-131.3	9.1	10
			Secondary ≤20 years	213.9	3.9-120	6.3	6
	Desert	Asia Europe North and South America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	44	n.a.	0.6	n.a.
			Secondary ≤20 years	25.6	n.a.	0.5	n.a.
	Steppe	Asia Europe North and South America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	118.5	3.6-84.9	3.5	11
			Secondary ≤20 years	42.9	4.8-48.8	2.3	4
Boreal	Coniferous	Asia Europe North America	Primary	62.9	n.a.	0.1-2.1	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	n.a.	40-50	0.1-2.2	1.0
			Secondary ≤20 years	n.a.	5.0-50	0.1-2.3	1.0
	Tundra woodland	Asia Europe North America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	0.4	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	63.7	25	0.4	0.4
			Secondary ≤20 years	104.2	5	0.4	0.4

TABLE 4.12. (UPDATED)
BIOMASS VALUES FROM TABLES 4.7–4.10

Domain	Ecological zone[1]	Continent	Status/condition	Above-ground biomass in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[2]	Above-ground biomass in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1})[3]	Above-ground net biomass growth in natural forests (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[4]	Above-ground net biomass growth in forest plantations (tonnes d.m. ha^{-1} yr^{-1})[5]
	Mountain	Asia Europe North America	Primary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
			Secondary >20 years	n.a.	40-50	1.1-1.5	1.0
			Secondary ≤20 years	1.9	5.0-50	1.0-1.1	1.0

[1] Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). Global Ecological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

[2] For information related to uncertainties and references refer to table 4.7

[3] For information related to uncertainties and references refer to table 4.8

[4] For information related to uncertainties and references refer to table 4.9

[5] For information related to uncertainties and references refer to table 4.10

Annex 4A-1 Glossary for Forest Land

No refinement

Subject to final copyedit and layout

References newly cited in the 2019 Refinement

Soil C References

Achat, D.L., Fortin, M., Landmann, G., Ringeval, B. and Augusto, L. (2015a). Forest soil carbon is threatened by intensive biomass harvesting. *Scientific Reports* **5**, 15991; doi: 10.1038/srep15991.

Achat, D. L., Deleuze, C., Landmann, G., Pousse, N., Ranger, J., and Augusto, L. (2015b). Quantifying consequences of removing harvesting residues on forest soils and tree growth–A meta-analysis. *Forest Ecology and Management* **348**: 124–141.

Clarke, N., Gundersen, P., Jönsson-Belyazid, U., Kjønaas, O. J., Persson, T., Sigurdsson, B. D., ... and Vesterdal, L. (2015). Influence of different tree-harvesting intensities on forest soil carbon stocks in boreal and northern temperate forest ecosystems. *Forest Ecology and Management* **351**: 9–19.

Dean, C., Kirkpatrick, J. B. and Friedland, A. J. (2017). Conventional intensive logging promotes loss of organic carbon from the mineral soil. *Global Change Biology* **23**: 1–11. doi:10.1111/gcb.13387

De Vos, B., Cools, N., Ilvesniemi, H., Vesterdal, L., Vanguelova, E. and Carnicelli. S. (2015). Benchmark values for forest soil carbon stocks in Europe: Results from a large scale forest soil survey. *Geoderma* **251**: 33–46.

Falloon, P. and Smith, P. (2003). Accounting for changes in soil carbon under the Kyoto Protocol: need for improved long‐term data sets to reduce uncertainty in model projections. *Soil Use and Management* **19**: 265–269.

Gross, C. D., James, J.N.,Turnblom, E. C. and Harrison, R.B. (2018). Thinning treatments reduce deep soil carbon and nitrogen stocks in a Coastal Pacific Northwest forest. *Forests* **9**(5): 238. doi:10.3390/f9050238

Hume, A. M., Chen, H.Y.H. and Taylor, A.R. (2017). Intensive forest harvesting increases susceptibility of northern forest soils to carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus loss. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.12942

James, J. and Harrison, R. (2016). The effect of harvest on forest soil carbon: A meta-analysis. *Forests* **7**(12): 308. doi:10.3390/f7120308

Jandl, R., Lindner, M., Vesterdal, L., Bauwens, B., Baritz, R., Hagedorn, F., Johnson, D.W., Minkkinen, K. and Byrne, K. A. (2007). How strongly can forest management influence soil carbon sequestration? *Geoderma* **137**(3): 253–268.

Johnson, D.W. and Curtis, P.S. (2001). Effects of forest management on soil C and N storage: meta analysis. *Forest Ecology and Management* **140**: 227–238.

Lehtonen, A., Heikkinen, J., (2015). Uncertainty of upland soil carbon sink estimate for Finland. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **46**: 310–322.

Liao, C., Luo, Y., Fang, C., and Li, B. (2010). Ecosystem carbon stock influenced by plantation practice: implications for planting forests as a measure of climate change mitigation. *PloS one 5*(5): e10867.

Metsaranta, J.M., Shaw, C., Kurz, W.A., Boisvenue, C. and Morken, S., 2017. Uncertainty of inventory-based estimates of the carbon dynamics of Canada's managed forest (1990–2014). *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **47**: 1082–1094.

Monte, L., Håkanson, L., Bergström, U., Brittain, J. and Heling, R. (1996). Uncertainty analysis and validation of environmental models: the empirically based uncertainty analysis. *Ecological Modelling* **91**: 139–152.

Nave, L. E., Vance, E. D., Swanston, C. W., and Curtis, P. S. (2010). Harvest impacts on soil carbon storage in temperate forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 259(5): 857–866. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2009.12.009

Nepstad, D.C., de Carvalho, C.R., Davidson, E.A., Jipp, P.H., Lefebvre, P.A., Negelros, G.H., da Silva, E.D., Stone, T.A., Trumbore, S.E. and Vieira, S. (1994). The role of deep roots in the hydrological and carbon cycles of Amazonian forests and pastures. *Nature* **372**: 666–669.

Ogle, S.M., Breidt, F.J., Easter, M., Williams, S. and Paustian, K. (2007). An empirically based approach for estimating uncertainty associated with modelling carbon sequestration in soils. *Ecological Modelling* **205**: 453–463.

Peltoniemi, M., Palosuo, T., Monni, S. and Mäkipää, R. (2006). Factors affecting the uncertainty of sinks and stocks of carbon in Finnish forests soils and vegetation. *Forest Ecology and Management* **232**: 75–85.

Smith, J.E. and Heath, L.S. (2001). Identifying influences on model uncertainty: an application using a forest carbon budget model. *Environmental Management* **27**: 253–267.

Stewart, C., Paustian, K., Conant, R., Plante, A. and Six, J. (2007). Soil carbon saturation: concept, evidence and evaluation. *Biogeochemistry* **86**(1): 19–31.

Strömgren, M., Egnell, G., and Olsson, B. A. (2013). Carbon stocks in four forest stands in Sweden 25 years after harvesting of slash and stumps. *Forest Ecology and Management* **290**: 59–66. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2012.06.052

Thiffault, E., Hannam, K. D., Paré, D., Titus, B. D., Hazlett, P. W., Maynard, D. G., and Brais, S. (2011). Effects of forest biomass harvesting on soil productivity in boreal and temperate forests—a review. *Environmental Reviews* **19**(NA): 278–309.

Villarino, S.H., Studdert, G.A., Laterra, P. and Cendoya, M.G. (2014). Agricultural impact on soil organic carbon content: Testing the IPCC carbon accounting method for evaluations at county scale. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment* **185**: 118–132.

Zhou, D., Zhao, S. Q., Liu, S., and Oeding, J. (2013). A meta-analysis on the impacts of partial cutting on forest structure and carbon storage, *Biogeosciences* **10**: 3691–3703.

Updated table 4.4.

Battles, J. J., Armesto, J. J., Vann, D. R., Zarin, D. J., Aravena, J. C., Pérez, C., Johnson, A. H. (2002). Vegetation composition, structure, and biomass of two unpolluted watersheds in the Cordillera de Piuchué, Chiloé Island, Chile. *Plant Ecology*, **158**(1): 5-19. doi:10.1023/A:1014741821292

Beets, P. N. (1980). Amount and distribution of dry matter in a mature beech/podocarp community. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science*, **10**(2): 395-418.

Beets, P. N., Pearce, S. H., Oliver, G. R., Clinton, P. W. (2007). Root/shoot ratios for deriving below-ground biomass of Pinus radiata stands. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science*, **37**(2): 267-288.

Cotillas, M., Espelta, J. M., Sánchez-Costa, E., Sabaté, S. (2016). Aboveground and belowground biomass allocation patterns in two Mediterranean oaks with contrasting leaf habit: an insight into carbon stock in young oak coppices. *European Journal of Forest Research*, **135**(2): 243-252. doi:10.1007/s10342-015-0932-9

Edwards, P. J., Grubb, P. J. (1977). Studies of Mineral Cycling in a Montane Rain Forest in New Guinea: I. The Distribution of Organic Matter in the Vegetation and Soil. *The Journal of Ecology*, **65**(3): 943-969. doi:10.2307/2259387

Food and Agriculture Organization (FA0) (Ed.) (2015). The Global Forest Resources Assessment. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Office of the United Nations.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). *Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.*

Frangi, J. L., Barrera, M. D., Puigdefábregas, J., Yapura, P. F., Arambarri, A. M., Richter, L. (2004). Ecología de los bosques de Tierra del Fuego. Ecología y Manejo de los Bosques de Argentina. La Plata, Argentina. Editorial de la Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

Gargaglione, V., Peri, P. L., Rubio, G. (2010). Allometric relations for biomass partitioning of Nothofagus antarctica trees of different crown classes over a site quality gradient. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **259**(6): 1118-1126. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2009.12.025

Gautam, T. P., Mandal, T. N. (2016). Effect of disturbance on biomass, production and carbon dynamics in moist tropical forest of eastern Nepal. *Forest Ecosystems*, **3**(1): 11. doi:10.1186/s40663-016-0070-y

Green, C., Tobin, B., O'Shea, M., Farrell, E. P., Byrne, K. A. (2007). Above- and belowground biomass measurements in an unthinned stand of Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis* (Bong) Carr.). *European Journal of Forest Research*, **126**(2): 179-188. doi:10.1007/s10342-005-0093-3

Grimm, U., Fassbender, H. W. (1981). Ciclos biogeoquimicos en un ecosistema forestal de los Andes Occidentales de Venezuela. III. Ciclo hidrologico y translocacion de elementos quimicos con el agua. *Turrialba*, **31**: 89-99.

Iqbal, K., Bhat, J. A., Pala, N. A., Hussain, A., Negi, A. K. (2014). Carbon and Biomass Density of Trees in Duggada Area of Garhwal Himalaya, India. *Indian Forester*, **140**(1): 18-22.

Kotowska, M. M., Leuschner, C., Triadiati, T., Meriem, S., Hertel, D. (2015). Quantifying above- and belowground biomass carbon loss with forest conversion in tropical lowlands of Sumatra (Indonesia). *Glob Chang Biol*, **21**(10): 3620-3634. doi:10.1111/gcb.12979

Krisnawati, H., Adinugroho, W. C., Imanuddin, R., Hutabarat, S. (2014). Estimation of Forest Biomass for Quantifying CO2 Emissions in Central Kalimantan. Indonesia: Forestry Research and Development Agency.

Laclau, P. (2003). Biomass and carbon sequestration of ponderosa pine plantations and native cypress forests in northwest Patagonia. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **180**(1): 317-333. doi:10.1016/S0378-1127(02)00580-7

Levy, P. E., Hale, S. E., Nicoll, B. C. (2004). Biomass expansion factors and root : shoot ratios for coniferous tree species in Great Britain. *Forestry*, **77**(5): 421-430. doi:10.1093/forestry/77.5.421

Li, X., Yi, M. J., Son, Y., Park, P. S., Lee, K. H., Son, Y. M., . . . Jeong, M. J. (2010). Biomass Expansion Factors of Natural Japanese Red Pine (*Pinus densiflora*) Forests in Korea. *Journal of Plant Biology*, 53(6), 381-386. doi:10.1007/s12374-010-9134-7.

Li, Z., Kurz, W. A., Apps, M. J., Beukema, S. J. (2003). Belowground biomass dynamics in the Carbon Budget Model of the Canadian Forest Sector: recent improvements and implications for the estimation of NPP and NEP. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **33**(1): 126-136. doi:10.1139/x02-165.

Lü, X.-T., Yin, J.-X., Jepsen, M. R., Tang, J. W. (2010). Ecosystem carbon storage and partitioning in a tropical seasonal forest in Southwestern China. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **260**(10): 1798-1803. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2010.08.024

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Luo, Y., Zhang, X., Wang, X. P., Lu, F. (2014). Biomass and its allocation of Chinese forest ecosystems. *Ecology*, **95**(7): 2026-2026. doi:10.1890/13-2089.1

Makero, J. S., Malimbwi, R. E., Eid, T., Zahabu, E. (2016). Allometric biomass and volume models for Itigi thicket. In R. E. Malimbwi, T. Eid, & S. A. O. Chamshama (Eds.), Allometric tree biomass and volume models in Tanzania. Tanzania: Department of Forest Mensuration and Management Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture.

Malimbwi, R. E., Eid, T., Chamshama, S. A. O. (2016). Allometric tree biomass and volume models in Tanzania. Tanzania: Department of Forest Mensuration and Management, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture.

Masota, A. M., Bollandsås, O. M., Zahabu, E., Eid, T. (2015). Allometric biomass and volume models for lowland and humid montane forests. In R. E. Malimbwi, Eid, T. Chamshama, S.A.O. (Ed.), Allometric tree biomass and volume models in Tanzania (pp. 19-34). Tanzania: Department of Forest Mensuration and Management Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture.

Masota, A. M., Chamshama, S. A. O., Malimbwi, R. E., Eid, T. (2016). Stocking estimates of biomass and volume using developed models. In R. E. Malimbwi, Eid, T. Chamshama, S.A.O. (Ed.), Allometric tree biomass and volume models in Tanzania (pp. 19-34). Tanzania: Department of Forest Mensuration and Management Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture.

Miller, A. T., Allen, H. L., Maier, C. A. (2006). Quantifying the coarse-root biomass of intensively managed loblolly pine plantations. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **36**(1): 12-22. doi:10.1139/x05-229

Miller, R. B. (1963). Plant nutrients in hard beech. III. The cycle of nutrients. *New Zealand journal of science*, **6:** 388-413.

Mokany, K., Raison, R. J., Prokushkin, A. S. (2006). Critical analysis of root: shoot ratios in terrestrial biomes. *Global Change Biology*, **12**: 84-96. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.001043.x

Monda, Y., Ito, E., Kiyono, Y., Sato, T., Toriyama, J., Sokh, H., . . . Bounthabandid, S. (2016). Allometric Equations for Tropical Seasonal Deciduous Forests in Cambodia: A Method of Estimating Belowground Tree Biomass with Reduced Sampling Loss of Roots. *Japan Agricultural Research Quarterly: JARQ*, **50**(4): 369-377. doi:10.6090/jarq.50.369

Moser, G., Leuschner, C., Hertel, D., Graefe, S., Soethe, N., Iost, S. (2011). Elevation effects on the carbon budget of tropical mountain forests (S Ecuador): the role of the belowground compartment. *Global Change Biology*, **17**(6): 2211-2226. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02367.x

Mugasha, W. A., Eid, T., Bollandsås, O. M., Malimbwi, R. E., Chamshama, S. A. O., Zahabu, E., Katani, J. Z. (2013). Allometric models for prediction of above- and belowground biomass of trees in the miombo woodlands of Tanzania. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **310**: 87-101. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2013.08.003

Murdiyarso, D., Purbopuspito, J., Kauffman, J. B., Warren, M. W., Sasmito, S. D., Donato, D. C., . . . Kurnianto, S. (2015). The potential of Indonesian mangrove forests for global climate change mitigation. *Nature Climate Change*, **5**: 1089. doi:10.1038/nclimate2734

Niiyama, K., Kajimoto, T., Matsuura, Y., Yamashita, T., Matsuo, N., Yashiro, Y., . . . Noor, N. S. (2010). Estimation of root biomass based on excavation of individual root systems in a primary dipterocarp forest in Pasoh Forest Reserve, Peninsular Malaysia. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **26**(3): 271-284. doi:10.1017/S0266467410000040

Njana, M. A., Eid, T. Z., E., Malimbwi, R. (2015). Procedures for quantification of belowground biomass of three mangrove tree species. *Wetlands Ecology and Management*, **23**(4): 749-764. doi:10.1007/s11273-015-9417-3

Oliver, G. R., Pearce, S. H., Graham, J. D., Beets, P. N. (2009). Above- and below-ground carbon in *Eucalyptus fastigata* in the central North Island of New Zealand (2011/44). Retrieved from Wellington, New Zealand.

Saner, P., Loh, Y. Y., Ong, R. C., Hector, A. (2012). Carbon stocks and fluxes in tropical lowland dipterocarp rainforests in Sabah, Malaysian Borneo. *PLOS ONE*, **7**(1): 29642. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029642

Sanquetta, C. R., Corte, A. P., da Silva, F. (2011). Biomass expansion factor and root-to-shoot ratio for Pinus in Brazil. *Carbon Balance Manag*, **6**(6): 6. doi:10.1186/1750-0680-6-6

Sato, T., Saito, M., RamÍRez, D., PÉRez De Molas, L. F., Toriyama, J., Monda, Y., . . . Vera De Ortiz, M. (2015). Development of Allometric Equations for Tree Biomass in Forest Ecosystems in Paraguay. *Japan Agricultural Research Quarterly: JARQ*, **49**(3): 281-291. doi:10.6090/jarq.49.281

Schwendenmann, L., Mitchell, N. D. (2014). Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology*, **38**(2): 213-220.

Scott, N. A., White, J. D., Townsend, J. A., Whitehead, D., Leathwick, J. R., Hall, G. M. J., . . . Whaley, P. T. (2000). Carbon and nitrogen distribution and accumulation in a New Zealand scrubland ecosystem. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, **30**(8): 1246-1255. doi:10.1139/x00-048

Sharma, D. P. (2009). Biomass distribution in sub-tropical forests of Solan Forest Division (HP). *Indian Journal of Ecology*, **36**(1): 1-5.

Skovsgaard, J. P., Nord-Larsen, T. (2012). Biomass, basic density and biomass expansion factor functions for European beech (Fagus sylvatica L.) in Denmark. *European Journal of Forest Research*, **131**(4): 1035-1053. doi:10.1007/s10342-011-0575-4

Urban, J., Čermák, J., Ceulemans, R. (2015). Above- and below-ground biomass, surface and volume, and stored water in a mature Scots pine stand. *European Journal of Forest Research*, **134**(1): 61-74. doi:10.1007/s10342-014-0833-3

Wang, X. P., Fang, J. Y., Zhu, B. (2008). Forest biomass and root–shoot allocation in northeast China. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **255**(12): 4007-4020. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2008.03.055

Watson, A., O'Loughlin, C. (1985). Morphology, strength, and biomass of manuka roots and their influence on slope stability. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science*, **15**(3): 337-348.

Watson, A. J., Marden, M., Rowan, D. (1994). Tree species performance and slope stability. Paper presented at the Vegetation and slopes: stabilisation, protection and ecology, University Museum, Oxford.

Xiao, C. W., Yuste, J. C., Janssens, I. A., Roskams, P., Nachtergale, L., Carrara, A., . . . Ceulemans, R. (2003). Above- and belowground biomass and net primary production in a 73-year-old Scots pine forest. *Tree Physiol*, **23**(8): 505-516. doi:10.1093/treephys/23.8.505

Updated table 4.7.

Adou Yao, C. Y., Blom, E.C., Dengueadhé, K. T. S., Van Rompaey, R. S.A. R., N'Guessan, E. K., Wittebolle, G., Bongers F., (2005). Diversité floristique et végétation dans le Parc National de Taï, Côte d'Ivoire. Tropenbos-Côte d'Ivoire Série 5. Wageningen, the Netherlands. 92 pp.

Altrell, D., Saket, M., Lyckebäck, L., Piazza, M. (2005). National Forest and Tree Resources Assessment 2005-2007. Bangladesh. Ministry of Environment; Forest (MoEF). http://www.fao.org/forestry/15466-0af9a225183f27cf84c440a6a1bf90d6e.pdf.

Alvarez-Davila, E, Cayuela. L., González-Caro, S., Aldana, A.M., Stevenson, P.R., Phillips, O., ...Rey-Benayas, J.M. (2017). Forest biomass density across large climate gradients in northern South America is related to water availability but not with temperature. *Plos One*, **12**: e0171072. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171072

Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Wang, M.M.H., McGarvey, J.C., Herrmann, V., Tepley, A.J., Bond-Lamberty, B., LeBauer, D.S. (2018a). ForC: a global database of forest carbon stocks and fluxes. *Ecology*, **99**:1507. DOI:10.1002/ecy.2229

Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Wang, M.M.H., McGarvey, J.C., Herrmann, V., Tepley, A.J., Bond-Lamberty, B., LeBauer, D.S. (2018b). Forest Carbon database (ForC-db) v. 2.0-alpha. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1135089.

Atkinson, E. E., Marin-Spiotta, E. (2015). Land use legacy effects on structure and composition of subtropical dry forests in St. Croix, US Virgin Islands. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **335**: 270-280.

Avitabile, V., Schultz, M., Herold, N., de Bruin, S.,, Pratihast, A.K.,, Manh, C.P., Quang, H.V., Herold, M. (2016). Carbon emissions from land cover change in Central Vietnam. *Carbon Management*, **7**: 333-346.

Avitabile, V., Camia, A. (2018). An assessment of forest biomass maps in Europe using harmonized national statistics and inventory plots. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **409**: 489–498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.11.047.

Avitabile, V., Baccini, A., Friedl, M. A., Schmullius, C. (2012). Capabilities and limitations of Landsat and land cover data for aboveground woody biomass estimation of Uganda. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, **117**: 366-380.

Beets, P.N., Kimberley, M.O., Paul, T.S.H., Oliver, G.R., Pearce, S.H., Buswell, J.M. (2014). The Inventory of Carbon Stocks in New Zealand's Post-1989 Natural Forest for Reporting under the Kyoto Protocol. *Forests*, **5**(9): 2230–2252.

Brienen, R. J. W., Philips, O.L., Feldpaussch, T.R., ... Zagt, R.J. (2014). Plot Data from: Long-term decline of the Amazon carbon sink. ForestPlots.NET doi: 10.5521/ForestPlots.net/2014_4.

Brienen, R. J. W., Philips, O.L., Feldpaussch, T.R., ... Zagt, R.J. (2015). Long-term decline of the Amazon carbon sink. *Nature*, **519**: 344-348. doi.org/ 10.1038/nature14283

Carreiras, J. M. B., Melo, J. B., Vasconcelos, M. J., (2013). Estimating the above-ground biomass in miombo savanna woodlands (Mozambique, East Africa) using L-band Synthetic Aperture Radar data. *Remote Sensing*, **5**: 1524-1548.

Carreiras, J. M. B., Vasconcelos, M. J., Lucas, R. M. (2012). Understanding the relationship between aboveground biomass and ALOS PALSAR data in the forests of Guinea-Bissau (West Africa). *Remote Sensing of Environment*, **121**: 426-442.

Chan, N., Takeda, S. (2016). The transition away from swidden agriculture and trends in biomass accumulation in fallow forests. *Mountain Research and Development*, **36**: 320-331.

Dees, M. (2018). IPCC Data contribution Cameroon from NFI 2003-2004. *Report for Cameroon REDD+ TS, USFS/Silvacarbon & IUCN.*

Subject to final copyedit and layout

DeVries, B., Avitabile, V., Kooistra, L., Herold, M. (2012). Monitoring the impact of REDD+ implementation in the Unesco Kafa biosphere reserve, Ethiopia. *Proceedings of the "Sensing a Changing World" Workshop (2012).*

Drichi, P. (2003). National Biomass Study, Technical Report. Forestry Department, Ministry of Water, Lands & Environment. Kampala, Uganda.

DVRF (2016). Rapport de mission d'inventaire forestier et d'évaluation de l'intégrité écologique – Ecorégion des forêts humides de l'est de Madagascar.

Ewel, J., Chai, P., Tsai, L.M. (1983). Biomass and floristics of three young second-growth forests in Sarawak. *The Malaysian Forester,* **46**: 347-364.

FAO, SEP-REDD+ (2017). Données forestières de base pour la REDD+ en Côte d'Ivoire: Inventaire de la biomasse forestière pour l'estimation des facteurs d'émission. Abidjan, Ivory Coast.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2005). National forest and Tree Resources Assessment 2003-05. Working Paper 96. The Philippines. http://www.fao.org/forestry/15603-0b641a2f5813896ac8a5220e5e8bc4106.pdf.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

Fujiki, S., Nishio, S., Okada, K., Nais, J., Kitayama, K. (2017). Plant communities and ecosystem processes in a succession-altitude matrix after shifting cultivation in the tropical montane forest zone of northern Borneo. *Journal of Tropical Ecology,* **33**: 33-49.

Gatti, R. C., Castaldi, S., Lindsell, J.A., Coomes, D.A., Marchetti, Maesano, M., Di Paola, A., Paparella, F., Valentini, R. (2015). The impact of selective logging and clearcutting on forest structure, tree diversity and above-ground biomass of African tropical forests. *Ecological Research,* **30**: 119-132.

Gatti, R. C., Laurin, G. V., Valentini, R. (2017). Tree species diversity of three Ghanaian reserves. *Iforest-Biogeosciences and Forestry*, **10**: 362-368.

Gazda, A., Miścicki, S., Chwistek, K. (2015). Tree species diversity and above-ground biomass of natural temperate forest: montane versus lowland forest. *Dendrobiology*, **73**: 3–10. https://doi.org/10.12657/denbio.073.001.

Giday, K., Eshete, G., Barklund, R., Aertsen, W., Muys, B. (2013). Wood biomass functions for Acacia abyssinica trees and shrubs and implications for provision of ecosystem services in a community managed exclosure in Tigray, Ethiopia. *Journal of Arid Environments,* **94**: 80-86.

Granier, A., Ceschia, E., Damesin, C., Dufrêne, E., Epron, D., Gross, P., … Saugier, B. (2000). The carbon balance of a young Beech forest. *Functional Ecology,* **14**(3): 312–325. doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2435.2000.00434.x.

Hansen, M. C., Ptapov, P.V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., … Townshend, J. R. G. et al.(2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. *Science,* **342**: 850-853.

Hiratsuka, M., Toma, T., Diana, R., Hadriyanto, D., Morikawa, Y., (2006). Biomass recovery of naturally regenerated vegetation after the 1998 forest fire in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Jarq-Japan Agricultural Research Quarterly*, **40**: 277-282.

Holdaway, R.J., Easdale, T.A., Carswell, F.E., Richardson, S.J., Peltzer, D.A., Mason, N.W.H., Brandon, A.M., Coomes, D.A., et al. (2017). Nationally Representative Plot Network Reveals Contrasting Drivers of Net Biomass Change in Secondary and Old-Growth Forests. *Ecosystems,* **20**: 944. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-016-0084-x.

Husmann, K., Rumpf, S., Nagel, J. (2018). Biomass functions and nutrient contents of European beech, oak, sycamore maple and ash and their meaning for the biomass supply chain. *Journal of Cleaner Production,* **172**: 4044–4056. doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.03.019.

Jacobi, J., Andres, C., Schnedider, M., Pillco, M., Calizaya, P., Rist, S. (201). Carbon stocks, tree diversity, and the role of organic certification in different cocoa production systems in Alto Beni, Bolivia. *Agroforestry Systems* **88**, 1117-1132.

Johansson, S. G., Kaarakka, V. J. (1992). Regeneration of cleared Acacia-Zanzibarica Bushland in Kenya. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **3**: 401-406.

Kalaba, F. K., Quinn, C. H., Dougill, A. J., Vinya, R. (2013). Floristic composition, species diversity and carbon storage in charcoal and agriculture fallows and management implications in Miombo woodlands of Zambia. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **304**: 99-109.

Kattenborn, T., Maack, J., Faßnacht, F., Enßle, F., Ermert, J., Koch, B. (2015). Mapping forest biomass from space – Fusion of hyperspectral EO1-hyperion data and Tandem-X and WorldView-2 canopy height models. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, **35**(PB): 359–367. doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2014.10.008.

Katumbi, N. M., Mwangi, J. K., Kimondo, J. M., Mware, M. J. (2017). Biomass energy resource of the highland bamboo (*Yushania alpina*) and its potential for sustainable exploitation in southern Aberdares forest. *Journal of Sustainable Bioenergy Systems,* **7**: 85-97.

Keith, H., Mackey, B.G. and Lindenmayer, D.B. (2009). Re-evaluation of forest biomass carbon stocks and lessons from the world's most carbon-dense forests. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **106**(28): 11635-11640.

Kinyanjui, M.J., Latva-Käyrä, P., Bhuwneshwar, P.S., Kariuki, P., Alfred Gichu, Wamichwe, K. (2014). An inventory of the above ground biomass in the Mau forest ecosystem, Kenya. *Open Journal of Ecology*, **4**: 619-627.

Lang, M., Lilleleht, A., Neumann, M., Bronisz, K., Rolim, S. G., Seedre, M., … Kiviste, A. (2016). Estimation of above-ground biomass in forest stands from regression on their basal area and height. *Forestry Studies*, **64**(1). doi.org/10.1515/fsmu-2016-0005

Latifi, H., Fassnacht, F. E., Hartig, F., Berger, C., Hernández, J., Corvalán, P., Koch, B. (2015). Stratified aboveground forest biomass estimation by remote sensing data. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, **38**: 229–241. doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.01.016

Lewis, S. L., Sonke, B., Sunderland, T., Begne, S. K., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., ... Zemagho, L. (2013). Above-ground biomass and structure of 260 African tropical forests. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **368**. doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0295

Lewis, S. L., Sonke, B., Sunderland, T., Begne, S. K., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., ... Zemagho, L. (2013). Plot data from "Above-ground biomass and structure of 260 African tropical forests". ForestPlots.NET doi: 10.5521/FORESTPLOTS.NET/2013_1.

Luo, Y., Zhang, X., Wang, X., Lu, F. (2014). Biomass and its allocation of Chinese forest ecosystems. *Ecology*, **95**(7): 2026–2026. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-2089.1

Manlay, R. J. *et al.*, (2002). Carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus allocation in agro-ecosystems of a West African savanna I. The plant component under semi-permanent cultivation. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **88**, 215-232.

Martinez-Sanchez, J. L., Tigar, B. J., Camara, L., Castillo, O. (2015). Relationship between structural diversity and carbon stocks in humid and sub-humid tropical forest of Mexico. *Ecoscience*, **22**: 125-131.

McNicol, I. M., Berry, N. J., BechBruun, T., Hergoualc'h, K., Mertz, O., Neergaard, A., Ryan C. M., (2015). Development of allometric models for above and belowground biomass in swidden cultivation fallows of Northern Laos. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **357**: 104-116.

Mekuria, W., Veldkamp, E., Corre, M. D., Haile, M., (2011). Restoration of ecosystem carbon stocks following exclosure establishment in communal grazing lands in Tigray, Ethiopia. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, **75**: 246-256.

MITADER (2018). National Forest Inventory Report. Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development. Maputo, Mozambique.

Mitchard, E. T. A., Saatchi, S. S.; Woodhouse, I. H.; Nangendo, G.; Ribeiro, N. S.; Williams, M.; Ryan, C. M.; Lewis, S. L.; Feldpausch, T. R.; Meir, P. (2009). Using satellite radar backscatter to predict above-ground woody biomass: A consistent relationship across four different African landscapes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **36**(23): L23401.

Mitchard, E. T. A., Feldpausch, T. R., Brienen, R. J. W., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Monteagudo, A., Baker, T. R., Lewis, S. L.,.... Phillips, O. L. (2014). Markedly divergent estimates of Amazon forest carbon density from ground plots and satellites. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **23**: 935-946.

Monreal, C.M., Etchevers, J. D., Acosta, M., Hidalgo, C., Padilla, J., López, R. M., Jiménez, L., Velázquez, A. (2005). A method for measuring above- and below-ground C stocks in hillside landscapes. *Canadian Journal of Soil Science*, **85**: 523-530.

Morel, A.C., Saatchi, S.S., Malhi, Y., Berry, N. J., Banin, L., Burslem, D., Nilus, R., Ong, R. C. (2011). Estimating aboveground biomass in forest and oil palm plantation in Sabah, Malaysian Borneo using ALOS PALSAR data. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **262**: 1786-1798.

Mukosha, J., Siampale, A. (2009). "Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA) 2005-2008. Republic of Zambia," (FAO & Zambia Forestry Department).

Mukul, S. A., Herbohn, J., Firn, J. (2016). Tropical secondary forests regenerating after shifting cultivation in the Philippines uplands are important carbon sinks. *Scientific Reports*, **6**: 22483 .

Myster, R. W. (2017). Gradient (elevation) vs. disturbance (agriculture) effects on primary cloud forest in Ecuador: floristics and physical structure. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science*, **47**: 3. doi.org/10.1186/s40490-016-0085-8.

NAFORMA (2015). National Forest Resources Monitoring and Assessment of Tanzania Mainland (NAFORMA): Main Results. MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES & TOURISM.

N'Guessan, A. E., Kassi, N´D. J., Yao, O.N., ... Herault, B. (2018). Drivers of biomass recovery in a secondary forested landscape of West Africa. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **433**: 325-331. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2018.11.021.

Ningthoujam, R. K., Balzter, H., Tansey, K., Morrison, K., Johnson, S. C. M., Gerard, F., … Bermejo, J. P. (2016). Airborne S-band SAR for forest biophysical retrieval in temperate mixed forests of the UK. *Remote Sensing*, **8**(7). doi.org/10.3390/rs8070609

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Nunes, L., Lopes, D., Castro Rego, F., Gower, S.T. (2013). Aboveground biomass and net primary production of pine, oak and mixed pine–oak forests on the Vila Real district, Portugal. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **305**: 38-47.

Nyirambangutse, B., Zibera, E., Uwizeye, F. K.,Nsabimana, D., Bizuru, E., Pleijel, H., Uddling, J., Wallin, G. (2017). Carbon stocks and dynamics at different successional stages in an Afromontane tropical forest. *Biogeosciences*, **14**: 1285-1303.

Omeja, P. A., Lwanga, J. S., Obua, J., Chapman, C. A. (2011). Fire control as a simple means of promoting tropical forest restoration. *Tropical Conservation Science.* **4**: 287-299.

Otuoma, J., Anyango, B., Ouma, G., ...Oindo, O. (2016). Determinants of aboveground carbon offset additionality in plantation forests in a moist tropical forest in western Kenya. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **365**: 61-68.

Palm, C. A., Woomer, P.L., Alegre, J., Arevalo, L., Cstilla, C.,......va Noordwijk. (1999). Carbon sequestration and trace gas emissions in slash-and-burn and alternative land-uses in the humid tropics. Alternatives to Slash and Burn Program Climate Change Working Group Final Report Phase II. ASB Coordination Office, ICRAF. Nairobi, Kenya.

Pena, M. A., Duque, A. (2013). Patterns of stocks of aboveground tree biomass, dynamics, and their determinants in secondary Andean forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **302**: 54-61.

Pirotti, F., Laurin, G. V., Vettore, A., Masiero, A., Valentini, R. (2014). Small footprint full-waveform metrics contribution to the prediction of biomass in tropical forests. *Remote Sensing*, **6**: 9576-9599.

Poorter, L., Bongers, F., Aide, T.M., Almeida-Zambarno, A.M.,... Rozendaal, D.M.A. (2016). Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. *Nature*, **530**: 211-214.

Poorter, L., Bongers, F., Aide, T.M., Almeida-Zambarno, A.M.,... Rozendaal, D.M.A. (2016). Data from: Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. Dryad Digital Repository. https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.82vr4.

Qie, L., Lewis, S.L., Sullivan, M.J.P., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., ... Phillips, O.L. (2017). Long-term carbon sink in Borneo's forests halted by drought and vulnerable to edge effects. *Nature Communications*, **8**: 1966.

Raharimalala, O., Buttler, A., Schlaepfer, R., Gobat, J. M. (2012). Quantifying biomass of secondary forest after slash-and-burn cultivation in central Menabe, Madagascar. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science*, **24**: 474-489.

Robinson, S. J. B., van den Berg, E., Meirelles, G. S., Ostle, N. (2015). Factors influencing early secondary succession and ecosystem carbon stocks in Brazilian Atlantic Forest. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **24**: 2273-2291.

Rutishauser, E., Herault, B., Baraloto, C., Blanc, L., ...Sist, P.(2015). Rapid tree carbon stock recovery in managed Amazonian forests. *Current Biology*, **25**:787-788.

Ryan, C. M., Hill, T. C., Woollen, E., Ghee, C., Mitchard, E., Cassells, G., Grace, J.; Woodhouse, I. H., Williams, M. (2012). Quantifying small-scale deforestation and forest degradation in African woodlands using radar imagery. *Global Change Biology*, **18**: 243-257.

Salimon, C. I., Brown, I. F. (2000). Secondary forests in western Amazonia: Significant sinks for carbon released from deforestation? *Interciencia*, **25**: 198-202.

Salinas-Melgoza, M. A., Skutsch, M., Lovett, J. C., Borrego, A. (2017). Carbon emissions from dryland shifting cultivation: a case study of Mexican tropical dry forest. *Silva Fennica*, **51**(1B): 1553.

Santoro, M., Cartus, O., Mermoz, S., Bouvet, A., …..Seifert, F. M. (2018). GlobBiomass - global datasets of forest biomass. *PANGAEA*, doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.894711.

Sato, T. (2010). Stocks of coarse woody debris in old-growth lucidophyllous forests in southwestern Japan. *J For Res*, **15**: 404. doi.org/10.1007/s10310-010-0198-5

Schroth, G., D'Angelo, S. A., Teixeira, W. G., Haag, D., Lieberei, R. (2002). Conversion of secondary forest into agroforestry and monoculture plantations in Amazonia: consequences for biomass, litter and soil carbon stocks after 7 years. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **163**: 131-150.

Silva, C. V. D., dos Santos, J. R., Galvao, L. S., da Silva, R. D., Moura, Y. M. (2016). Floristic and structure of an Amazonian primary forest and a chronosequence of secondary succession. *Acta Amazonica*, **46**: 133-150.

Slik, J. W. F., Paoli, G.D., Mcguire, K.L., Amaral, L., Barroso, J., ...Zweifel, N. (2013). Large trees drive forest aboveground biomass variation in moist lowland forests across the tropics. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **22**: 1261-1271.

Slik, J. W. F., Arroyo-Rodriguez, V., Aiba, S., Alvarez-Loayza, O., ...Venticinque, E.M. (2015). An estimate of the number of tropical tree species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **112**: 4628-4629.

Sullivan, M. J. P., Talnot, J., Lewis, S.L., Phillips, I.L., ...Zemagho, L. (2016). Data from "Diversity and carbon storage across the tropical forest biome". ForestPlots.NET doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5521/FORESTPLOTS.NET/2016_3.

Sullivan, M. J. P., Talnot, J., Lewis, S.L., Phillips, I.L., ...Zemagho, L. (2017). Diversity and carbon storage across the tropical forest biome. *Scientific Reports*, **7: 39102**.

Thenkabail, P. S., Enclona, E. A., Ashton, M. S., Legg, C., De Dieu, M. J. (2004). Hyperion, IKONOS, ALI, and ETM plus sensors in the study of African rainforests. *Remote Sensing of Environment,* **90**: 23-43.

Trotsiuk, V., Svoboda, M., Weber, P., Pederson, N., Klesse, S., Janda, P., … Frank, D. (2016). The legacy of disturbance on individual tree and stand-level aboveground biomass accumulation and stocks in primary mountain Picea abies forests. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **373**: 108–115. doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.04.038

Uri, V., Varik, M., Aosaar, J., Kanal, A., Kukumägi, M., Lõhmus, K. (2012). Biomass production and carbon sequestration in a fertile silver birch (Betula pendula Roth) forest chronosequence. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **267:** 117–126. doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2011.11.033

USDA. June 18, 2018. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. [Available only on internet: http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html]

USDA. September 25, 2017. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. [Available only on internet: http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html]

Vaglio Laurin, G. Chen, Q., Lindsell, J.A., Coomes, D., ... Valentini, R. (2013). Above ground biomass estimation from lidar and hyperspectral airbone data in West African moist forests. *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts,* **15**: 6227.

Varnagiryte-Kabašinskiene, I., Armolaitis, K., Stupak, I., Kukkola, M., Wójcik, J., Mikšys, V. (2014). Some metals in aboveground biomass of Scots pine in Lithuania. *Biomass and Bioenergy,* **66**: 434–441. doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2014.03.047.

Vasconcelos, S. S., Zarin, D. J., Machado Araújo, M., Gabrig, L., Rangel-Vasconcelos, T., Reis de Carvalho, C. J., Staudhammer, C. L., de Assis Oliveira, F. (2008). Effects of seasonality, litter removal and dry-season irrigation on litterfall quantity and quality in eastern Amazonian forest regrowth, Brazil. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **24**: 27-38.

WWF, Obf, (2013). Xe Pian REDD+ project document. Gland, Switzerland.

Updated table 4.8.

Arief, W., Sigit-Deni, S., Joko, P., Daniel, M. (2013). Calibration of Global Above Ground Biomass Estimate Using Multi-Source Remote Sensing Data, Living Planet Symposium, Edinburgh.

Arora P., Chaudhry S., (2017). Vegetation and Soil Carbon Pools of Mixed Plantation of Acacia nilotica and Dalbergia sissoo under Social Forestry Scheme in Kurukshetra, India. *J. Mater. Environ. Sci.,* **8**(12): 4565-4572. doi.org/10.26872/jmes.2017.8.12.482.

Arul, P.L., Karthick, A. (2013). Carbon Stock Sequestered by tree plantations in University campus at Coimbatore, India. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences*, **3**(5): 1700-1710.

Banerjee, S. K and Prakasam, U. K. (2013). Biomass carbon pool and soil organic carbon sequestration in Tectona grandis plantations. *Ind. For.*, ***139***: 797-802.

Chen, Y., Liu, Z., Rao, X., Wang, X., Liang, C., Lin, Y., Zhou, L., Cai, X., Fu, S. (2015). Carbon Storage and Allocation Pattern in Plant Biomass among Different Forest Plantation Stands in Guangdong, China. *Forests,* **6**: 794-808.Yunjian, L., Xiaoquan, Z., Xiaoke, W., Fei, L., (2014) Biomass and its allocation in Chinese forest ecosystems. *Ecology,* **95**: 20-26.

De Costa, W.A.J.M., Suranga, H.R. (2012). Estimation of carbon stocks in the forest plantations of Sri Lanka. *J. Natn. Sci.Foundation Sri Lanka*, **40**(1): 9-41.

Fataei, E., Varamesh, S. (2016). Carbon stocks in a 20-year-old coniferous plantation – A Case Study in Fandoghloo Region Northwestern Iran. *Applied Ecology and Environmental Research,* **14**(3): 325-337.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

Giri, C., Long, J.B., Abbas, S., Thau, D. (2014). Distribution and dynamics of mangrove forests of South Asia. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **148**:101-11. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.01.020.

Guiabao, E. G. 2016. Above-Ground Carbon Stock Assessment of Mango-Based Agroforestry in Bulbul, Rizal, Kalinga, Philip *Pinus* sp.. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovations*, 4(2): 19-25.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2003). Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.

Ishan, Y.P., Harshad, S., Omprakash, C., Nilesh, V. (2013). Quantitative analysis on carbon storage of 25 valuable tree species of Gujarat, Incredible India. *Indian J.Sci.Res.,* **4**(1): 137-141.

Klaarenbeek Singel, F.W. (2009). Greenhouse gas emissions from palm oil production: Literature review and proposals from the RSPO Working Group on Greenhouse Gases. (https://www.rspo.org/files/project/GreenHouse.Gas.Working.Group/Report-GHG-October2009.pdf)

Kraenzel, M.B., Moore, T., Castillo, A., Potvin, C. (2003). Carbon storage of harvest-age teak (Tectona grandis) plantations. Panama. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **173**(1–3): 213–225.

Lasco, R.D., Pulhin, F.B. (2003). Philippine forest ecosystems and climate change: Carbon stocks, rate of sequestration and the Kyoto Protocol. *Annals of Tropical Research,* **25**(2): 37-51.

Lugo, A.E., Abelleira Martínez, O., Fonseca da Silva, J. (2012). Aboveground biomass, wood volume, nutrient stocks and leaf litter in novel forests compared to native forests and tree plantations in Puerto Rico. *Boiset Forêts Des Tropiques*, **314**(4): 7-16.

Masota, A. M., Chamshama, S. A. O., Malimbwi, R. E., Eid, T. (2016). Stocking estimates of biomass and volume using developed models. Ed.; Malimbwi, R.E; Eid, T and Chamshama, S.A.O; (2016). Allometric tree biomass and volume models in Tanzania. Department of Forest Mensuration and Management Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture. Pp.19-34.

Mohit, K. (2017). Carbon Sequestration in a Agroforestry system at Kurukshetra in Northern India. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Science*, **9**(1): 43-46.

Muhdi, Haryati, Hanafiah, D. S., Saragih, E. S., Sipayung, F. R., Situmorang, F. M. S. (2016). The potency of biomass and carbon stocks in smallholder rubber trees (Hevea Brasiliensis Muell. Arg), Serdang bedagai, Indonesia. *Journal of Biodiversity and Environmental Sciences (JBES)*, 9(1): 474-477.

Nadagouda, V.R., Patil, C.V., Desai, B.K., Manjappa, K. (1997). Growth and yield of seven tree species under high density planting and irrigation. *Indian Forester*, 123(1): 61-65.

Nambiar, E.K.S., Harwood, C. E. (2014). Productivity of Acacia and *Eucalyptus* Plantations in Southeast Asia. 1. Bio-Physical Determinants of Production: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Forestry Review*, **16**(2): 249-260.

Negi, M.S., Tandon, V. N. (1997). Biomass and nutrient distribution in an age sequence of *Populus deltoides* ecosystem in Haryana. *Indian Forester,* **123**: 111–117.

Odiwe, A.I., Adewumi, R. A., Alimi, A. A., Ogunsanwo, O. (2012). Carbon stock in topsoil, standing floor litter and above ground biomass in *Tectona grandis* plantation 10-years after establishment in Ile-Ife, Southwestern Nigeria. *Int. J. Biol. Chem. Sci.*, **6**(6): 3006-3016

Ostadhashemi, R., Rostami Shahraji, T., Roehle, H., Mohammadi-Limaei, S. (2014). Estimation of biomass and carbon storage of tree plantations in northern Iran. *J. For. Sci.*, **60**(9): 363–371.

Pérez Cordero, L. D., Kanninen, M. (2003). Above-Ground Biomass of *Tectona grandis* Plantations in Costa Rica. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science*, **15**: 199-213.

Sahu, S. C., Manish, K., Ravindranath, N. H. (2016) Carbon stocks in natural and planted mangrove forests of Mahanadi Mangrove Wetland, East Coast of India. *Current Science*, **110**(12): 2253-2260.

Sanquetta, C. R., Péllico-Netto, S., Corte, A. P. D., Rodrigues, A. L., Behling, A., Sanquetta, M. N. I. (2015). Quantifying biomass and carbon stocks in oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis* Jacq.) in Northeastern Brazil. *Afr. J. Agric. Res*., **10**(43): 4067-4075.

Singh, K. C. (2005). Relative Growth and Biomass Production of some MPTS under Silvi-pastoral system on a stony Rangeland of Arid-Zone. *Indian Forester*, **131**(5): 719-723.

Siregar, S. T. H., Nurwahyudi, and Mulawarman, K. (2008) Effects of inter-rotation management on site productivity of Acacia mangium in Riau Province, Sumatra, Indonesia. In: Nambiar, E.K.S. (ed.) Site management and productivity in tropical plantation forests. Proceedings of Workshop in Brazil, November 2004, and Indonesia, November 2006. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.

Sitompol, S. M., Hairiah, K. (2000). Biomass measurement of home garden. Proceedings of Workshop on LUCC and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Biophysical Data, IPB, Bogor.

Sohrabi, H., Bakhtiari, S. B., Ahamad, K. (2016). Above- and below-ground biomass and carbon stocks of different tree plantations in Central Iran. *J. Arid Land*, **8**(1): 138–145, doi: 10.1007/s40333-015-0087-z

Soto-Pinto, L., Aguirre-Dávila, C., (2015). Carbon Stocks in Organic Coffee Systems in Chiapas, Mexico, *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 7(1): ISSN 1916-9752 E-ISSN 1916-9760.

Stape, J. L., Binkleyb, D., Ryanc, G. M. (2004). *Eucalyptus* production and the supply, use and efficiency of use of water, light and nitrogen across a geographic gradient in Brazil. *Forest ecology and management*, **193**(1/2): 17-31.

Swamy, K. R., Shivaprasad, D., Bammanahalli, S., Lamani, T. N., Shivanna, H. (2015). Assessment of carbon sequestration of different tree species planted under shelterbelt of Northern Transitional Zone of Karnataka. *Res. Environ. Life Sci*., **8**(4): 657-658.

Syahrinudin (2005). The potential of palm oil and forest plantations for carbon sequestration on degraded land in Indonesia. In: Vlek PLG, Denich M, Martiuns C, Rodgers C, van de Giesen N, editors. Ecol. Dev. Series No. 27. Cuvillier Verlag, Inhaberin Annette Jentzsch-Cuvillier, Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen, Germany.

Trettin, C. C., Stringer, C. E., Zarnoch, S. J. (2016). Composition, biomass and structure of mangroves within the Zambezi River Delta. *Wetlands Ecology and Management*, **24**(2): 173-186.

Umrao, R., Bijalwan, A., Naugraiya, M. N. (2010). Productivity status of ten-year old silvipasture system in Lateritic soil of Chhattisgarh Plains. *Indian Forester*, **136**(1): 107-116.

USDA, (2017). September 25, 2017. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Available only on internet: http://apps.fs.fed.us/fiadb-downloads/datamart.html]

Yadava, A. K. (2010). Biomass Production and Carbon Sequestration in Different Agroforestry Systems in Tarai Region of Central Himalaya. I*ndian Forester*, **136**(2): 234-244.

Updated table 4.9.

Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Wang, M. M. H., McGarvey, J. C., Herrmann, V., Tepley, A. J., Bond-Lamberty, B., LeBauer, D. S. (2018a). ForC: a global database of forest carbon stocks and fluxes. *Ecology*, 99:1507. DOI: 10.1002/ecy.2229.

Anderson-Teixeira, K. J., Wang, M. M. H., McGarvey, J. C., Herrmann, V., Tepley, A. J., Bond-Lamberty, B., LeBauer, D. S. (2018b). Forest Carbon database (ForC-db) v. 2.0-alpha. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1135089.

Beets, P. N., Kimberley, M. O., Paul, T. S. H., Oliver, G. R., Pearce, S. H., Buswell, J. M. (2014). The Inventory of Carbon Stocks in New Zealand's Post-1989 Natural Forest for Reporting under the Kyoto Protocol. *Forests*, **5**(9): 2230–2252.

Brienen, R. J. W., Philips, O. L., Feldpaussch, T. R., ... Zagt, R. J. (2014). Plot Data from: Long-term decline of the Amazon carbon sink. ForestPlots.NET doi: 10.5521/ForestPlots.net/2014_4.

Brienen, R. J. W., Philips, O. L., Feldpaussch, T. R., ... Zagt, R. J. (2015). Long-term decline of the Amazon carbon sink. *Nature,* **519**: 344-348. doi.org/ 10.1038/nature14283

Chan, N., Takeda, S. (2016). The Transition Away From Swidden Agriculture and Trends in Biomass Accumulation in Fallow Forests: Case Studies in the Southern Chin Hills of Myanmar. *Mountain Research and Development*, **36**: 320-331.

Dang, C.L., Wu, Z.L. (1991) Studies on the biomass of Pinus yunnanensis forest. *Acta Bot. Yunnanica* **13**, 59-64.

Ewel, J. J., Chai, P., Tsai, L. M. (1983) Biomass and floristics of three young second-growth forests in Sarawak. *The Malaysian Forester*, **46**: 347-364.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

Fujiki, S., Nishio, S., Okada, K., Nais, J., Kitayama, K. (2017). Plant communities and ecosystem processes in a succession-altitude matrix after shifting cultivation in the tropical montane forest zone of northern Borneo. *Journal of Tropical Ecology,* **33**: 33-49.

Giday, K., Eshete, G., Barklund, P., Aertsen, W., Muys, B. (2013). Wood biomass functions for *Acacia abyssinica* trees and shrubs and implications for provision of ecosystem services in a community managed exclosure in Tigray, Ethiopia. *Journal of Arid Environments* **94**, 80-86.

Gourlet-Fleury, S., Mortier, F., Fayolle, A., Baya, F., Ouédraogo, D., Bénédet, F., Picard, N. (2013). Tropical forest recovery from logging: a 24 year silvicultural experiment from Central Africa. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 368: 1625.

Hiratsuka, M., Toma, T., Diana, R., Hadriyanto, D.,Morikawa, Y. (2006). Biomass Recovery of Naturally Regenerated Vegetation after the 1988 Forest Fire in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *JARQ*, **40**: 277-282.

Holdaway, R.J., Easdale, T.A., Carswell, F.E. et al. (2017). Ecosystems, **20**: 944. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-016-0084-x

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2003). Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2006). IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Volume 4: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2011.03.002.

Kalaba, F.K., Quinn, C.H., Dougill, A.J., Vinya, R. (2013). Floristic composition, species diversity and carbon storage in charcoal and agriculture fallows and management implications in Miombo woodlands of Zambia. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **304**: 99-109.

Lewis, S.L. Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Sonké, B., Affum-Baffoe, K., Baler, T.R., ….. Wöll, H. (2009) Increasing carbon storage in intact African tropical forests. *Nature,* **457**: 1003-1006.

Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Lewis, S.L., Burkitt, M., Phillips, O. L. (2011) ForestPlots.net: a web application and research tool to manage and analyse tropical forest plot data. *Journal of Vegetation Science,* **22**: 610-613.

Manlay, R. J., Kairé, M., Masse, D., Chotte, J. L., Ciornei, G., Floret, C. (2002). Carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus allocation in agro-ecosystems of a West African savanna I. The plant component under semi-permanent cultivation. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 88: 215-232.

Mekurja,W., Veldkamp, E., Corre, M. D. (2010) Restoration of Ecosystem Carbon Stocks Following Exclosure Establishment in Communal Grazing Lands in Tigray, Ethiopia. *SSSAJ,* **75**: 246-256.

Mukul, S.A., Herbohn, J., Firn, F. (2016). Tropical secondary forests regenerating after shifting cultivation in the Philippines uplands are important carbon sinks. *Scientific Reports,* **6**: 22483-22483.

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Nygård, R., Sawadogo, L., Elfving, B. (2004). Wood-fuel yields in short-rotation coppice growth in the north Sudan savanna in Burkina Faso. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **189**: 77-85.

N'Guessan, A. E., Kassi, N´D. J., Yao, O.N., ... Herault, B. (2018). Drivers of biomass recovery in a secondary forested landscape of West Africa. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **433**: 325-331. DOI: 10.1016/j.foreco.2018.11.021.

Omeja, P. A., Lwanga, J. S., Obua, J., Chapman, C. (2011). Fire control as a simple means of promoting tropical forest restoration. *Tropical Conservation Science,* **4**: 287-299.

Otuoma, J., Anyango, B., Ouma, G., Okeyo, D.,, ...Oindo, B. O. (2016). Determinants of aboveground carbon offset additionality in plantation forests in a moist tropical forest in western Kenya. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **365**: 61-68.

Palm, C. A., Woomer, P. L., Alegre, J., Arevalo, L., Cstilla, C.,......va Noordwijk. (1999). Carbon sequestration and trace gas emissions in slash-and-burn and alternative land-uses in the humid tropics. *Alternatives to Slash and Burn Program Climate Change Working Group Final Report Phase II. ASB Coordination Office, ICRAF. Nairobi, Kenya.*

Peña, M. A., Duque, A. (2013) Patterns of stocks of aboveground tree biomass, dynamics, and their determinants in secondary Andean forests. *Forest Ecology and Management,* **302**: 54-61.

Poorter, L., Bongers, F., Aide, T. M., Almeida-Zambarno, A. M.,... Rozendaal, D. M. A. (2016). Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. *Nature,* **530**: 211-214.

Poorter, L., Bongers, F., Aide, T. M., Almeida-Zambarno, A. M.,... Rozendaal, D. M. A. (2016). Data from: Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. Dryad Digital Repository. https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.82vr4.

Qie, L., Lewis, S. L., Sullivan, M. J. P., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., ... Phillips, O.L. (2017). Long-term carbon sink in Borneo's forests halted by drought and vulnerable to edge effects. *Nature Communications,* **8**: 1966.

Rutishauser, E., Herault, B., Baraloto, C., Blanc, L., ...Sist, P., (2015). Rapid tree carbon stock recovery in managed Amazonian forests. *Current Biology,* **25**:787-788.

Salimon, C. I., Brown, I. F. (2000) Secondary forests in Western Amazonia: Significant sinks for carbon released from deforestation? *Interciencia,* **25**: 198-202.

Salinas-Mendoza, M.A., Skutsch, M., Lovett,J.C., Borrego, A., (2017). Carbon emissions from dryland shifting cultivation: a case study of Mexican tropical dry forest. *Silva Fennica,* **51**: 1553-1553.

Schomakers, J., Jien, S. H., Lee, T. Y., ... Zehetner, F. (2017). Soil and biomass carbon re-accumulation after landslide disturbances. *Geomorphology,* **288**: 164-174.

Tang, J. W., Zhang, J. H., Song, Q. S., Cao, M., Feng, Z. L. (1998). A preliminary study on the biomass of secondary tropical forest in Xishuangbann. *J. Plant Ecol.,* **22**: 489–498.

Thenkabail, P. S., Enclona, E. A., Ashton, M. S., Legg, C., De Dieu, M. J. (2004). Hyperion, IKONOS, ALI, and ETM+ sensors in the study of African rainforests. *Remote Sensing of Environment,* **90**: 23-43.

USDA, June 18, (2018). June 2018. Forest Inventory and Analysis Database, St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. Available only on internet: https://apps.fs.usda.gov/fia/datamart/datamart.html]

Updated table 4.10.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2003). Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.

Lugo, A. E., Wang, D., Bormann, F. H. (1990). A comparative analysis of biomass production in five tropical tree species. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **31**(3):153-166.

Masota, A. M., Chamshama, S. A. O., Malimbwi, R. E., Eid, T. (2016). Stocking estimates of biomass and volume using developed models. Ed.; Malimbwi, R. E; Eid, T and Chamshama, S. A. O; (2016). Allometric tree biomass and volume models in Tanzania. Department of Forest Mensuration and Management Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation, Sokoine University of Agriculture. Pp.19-34.

Stape, J. L., Binkley, D., Ryan, M. G. (2004). *Eucalyptus* production and the supply, use and efficiency of use of water, light and nitrogen across a geographic gradient in Brazil. *Forest Ecology and Management*, **193**(1-2):17-31.

Updated table 4.11.

Chuande, X., (2001). Timber Plantation in China. FAO Forestry - Proceedings of the International Conference on Timber Plantation Development. Manila, The Phillipines.

Cordeiro, I. M. C. C., Contente de Barros, P.L., Lameira, O. A., Filho, A. B. G. (2015). Assessment of parica (*Schizolobium parahyba* var. *amazonicum* (Huber ex Ducke) Barneby) plantations at different ages and cultivation systems in Aurora do Para (Para State-Brazil). *Ciencia Florestal*, **25**(3):679-687.

Dell, B., Daping, X., Thu, P.Q. (2012). Managing threats to the health of tree plantations in Asia. New Perspectives in Plant Protection. Intechopen. Edited by A. R. Bandani. 63-92p.

Erkan, N. (2003). Fast growing species and economic analyses for plantations in Turkey. XII World Forestry Congress, 2003, Québec City, Canada.

Food and Agriculture Organization (2001). Forest Plantations Thematic Papers: mean annual volume increment of selected industrial forest plantation species, by L. Ugalde & O. Pérez. Forest Plantation Thematic Papers, Working Paper 1. Forest Resources Development Service, Forest Resources Division. FAO, Rome (unpublished). 27 pp.

Food and Agriculture Organization (2006). Global planted forests thematic study: results and analysis, by A. Del Lungo, J. Ball and J. Carle. Planted Forests and Trees Working Paper 38. Rome (also available at www.fao.org/forestry/site/10368/en).

Haapanen, M., Jansson, G., Nielsen, U. B., Steffenrem, A., Stener, L. G. (2015). The status of tree breeding and its potential for improving biomass production – A review of breeding activities and genetic gains in Scandinavia and Finland. Skogforsk. Uppsala. Edited by L. G. Stener. 55pp.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2006). IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Volume 4. Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use.

Kien, N. D. (2014). Timber supply and demand and growth potential of fast growing tree species in the northwest region of Vietnam. AFLI Technical Report No. 6. World Agroforestry Centre, Nairobi, Kenya.

Nzila, J. D., Deleporte, P., Bouillet, J. P., ... Ramger, J. (2004). Effects of Slash Management on Tree Growth and Nutrient Cycling in Second-rotation Eucalyptus Replanted Sites in the Congo. In: Site Management and Productivity in Tropical Plantation Forests: Proceedings of Workshops in Congo July 2001 and China February 2003. Edited by E. K. S. Nambiar, J. Ranger, A. Tiarks and T. Toma. CIFOR 2004: 15-30.

Silva, L. F., Ferreira, G. L., Alburquerque dos Santos, A. C., Leite, H. G., Lopes da Silva, M. (2016). Tree height, volume and growth equations for *Khaya ivorensis*, planted in Pirapora. *Floresta e Ambiente*, **23**(3): 362-368. dx.doi.org/10.1590/2179-8087.130715

Updated table 4.12.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

References copied from the 2006 Guidelines

Soil C References

Australian Greenhouse Gas Office (AGO) (2002). Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Land Use Change in Australia: An Integrated Application of the National Carbon Accounting System (2002).

Andreae, M.O. and Merlet, P. (2001). Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 15: 955-966.

Armentano, T.V. and Menges, E.S. (1986). Patterns of change in the carbon balance of organic soil-wetlands of the temperate zone. Journal of Ecology 74: 755-774.

Baker, T.R., Phillips, O.L., Malhi, Y., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., Di Fiore, A., Erwin, T., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T.J.Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Lewis, S.L., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D.A., Vargas, P.N., Pitman, N.C.A.,Silva, J.N.M. and Martínez, R.V. (2004a). Increasing biomass in Amazonian forest plots. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B 359: 353-365.

Baker, T.R., Phillips, O.L., Malhi, Y., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., Di Fiore, A., Erwin, T., Killeen, T.J., Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Lewis, S.L., Lloyd, J., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D.A., Patiño, S., Pitman, N.C.A., Silva, J.N.M. and Martínez, R.V. (2004b). Variation in wood density determines spatial patterns in Amazonian forest biomass. Global Change Biology 10: 545-562.

Barbosa, R.I. and Fearnside, P.M. (2004). Wood density of trees in open savannas of the Brazilian Amazon. Forest Ecology and Management 199: 115-123.

Battles, J.J., Armesto, J.J., Vann, D.R., Zarin, D.J., Aravena, J.C., Pérez, C. and Johnson, A.H. (2002). Vegetation composition, structure, and biomass of two unpolluted watersheds in the Cordillera de Piuchué, Chiloé Island, Chile. Plant Ecology 158: 5-19.

Subject to final copyedit and layout

Beets, P.N., Gilchrist, K. and Jeffreys, M.P. (2001). Wood density of radiata pine: Effect of nitrogen supply. Forest Ecology and Management 145: 173-180.

Bhatti, J.S., Apps, M.J., and Jiang, H. (2001). Examining the carbon stocks of boreal forest ecosystems at stand and regional scales. In: Lal R. et al. (eds.) Assessment Methods for Soil Carbon, Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton FL, pp. 513-532.

Cairns, M.A., Brown, S., Helmer, E.H. and Baumgardner, G.A. (1997). Root biomass allocation in the world's upland forests. Oecologia 111: 1-11.

Cannell, M.G.R. (1982). World forest biomass and primary production data. Academic Press, New York, NY.

Centre Technique Forestier Tropical (CTFT) (1989). Memento du Forestier, 3e Édition. Ministère Français de la Coopération et du Développement, Paris, France.

Chambers, J.Q., Tribuzy, E.S., Toledo, L.C., Crispim, B.F., Higuchi, N., dos Santos, J., Araújo, A.C., Kruijt, B., Nobre, A.D. and Trumbore, S.E. (2004). Respiration from a tropical forest ecosystem: Partitioning of sources and low carbon use efficiency. Ecological Applications 14: S72-S88.

Chambers, J.Q., dos Santos, J., Ribeiro, R.J., and Higuchi, N. (2001a). Tree damage, allometric relationships, and above-ground net primary production in a tropical forest. Forest Ecology and Management 152: 73-84.

Chambers, J.Q., Schimel, J.P. and Nobre, A.D. (2001b). Respiration from coarse wood litter in Central Amazon Forests. Biogeochemistry 52: 115-131.

Clark, D.A., Piper, S.C., Keeling, C.D. and Clark, D.B. (2003). Tropical rain forest tree growth and atmospheric carbon dynamics linked to interannual temperature variation during 1984-2000. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA 100: 5852-5857.

de Groot, W.J., Bothwell, P.M., Carlsson, D.H. and Logan, K.A. (2003). Simulating the effects of future fire regimes on western Canadian boreal forests. Journal of Vegetation Science 14: 355-364

DeWalt, S.J. and Chave, J. (2004). Structure and biomass of four lowland Neotropical forests. Biotropica 36: 7-19.

Dietz, P. (1975). Dichte und Rindengehalt von Industrieholz. Holz Roh- Werkstoff 33: 135-141.

Dixon, R.K., Brown, S., Houghton, R.A., Solomon, A.M., Trexler, M.C. and Wisniewski, J. (1994). Carbon pools and flux of global forest ecosystems. Science 263(1544): 185-190.

Dong, J., Kaufmann, R.K., Myneni, R.B., Tucker, C.J., Kauppi, P.E., Liski, J., Buermann, W., Alexeyev, V. and Hughes, M.K. (2003). Remote sensing estimates of boreal and temperate forest woody biomass: Carbon pools, sources, and sinks. Remote Sensing of Environment 84: 393-410.

Dubé, S., Plamondon, A.P. and Rothwell, R.L. (1995). Watering up after clear-cutting on forested wetlands of the St. Lawrence lowland. Water Resources Research 31:1741-1750.

Echeverria, C. and Lara, A. (2004). Growth patterns of secondary Nothofagus obliqua-N. alpina forests in southern Chile. Forest Ecology and Management 195: 29-43.

Ellert, B.H., Janzen, H.H. and McConkey, B.G. (2001). Measuring and comparing soil carbon storage. In: R. Lal, J.M. Kimble, R.F. Follett and B.A. Stewart (eds.). Soil Management for Enhancing Carbon Sequestration. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL., pp. 593-610.

Falloon, P. and Smith, P. (2003). Accounting for changes in soil carbon under the Kyoto Protocol: need for improved long-term data sets to reduce uncertainty in model projections. Soil Use and Management, 19, 265-269.

Fearnside, P.M. (1997). Wood density for estimating forest biomass in Brazilian Amazonia. Forest Ecology and Management 90: 59-87.

Feldpausch, T.R., Rondon, M.A., Fernandes, E.C.M. and Riha, S.J. (2004). Carbon and nutrient accumulation in secondary forests regenerating on pastures in central Amazonia. Ecological Applications 14: S164-S176.

Filipchuk, A.N., Strakhov, V.V., Borisov, B.A. et al. (2000). A Brief National Overview on Forestry Sector and Wood Products: Russian Federation. UN ECE, FAO. New York, Geneva. ECE/TIM/SP/18, p. 94 (In Russian).

Fittkau, E.J. and Klinge, N.H. (1973). On biomass and trophic structure of the central Amazonian rainforest ecosystem. Biotropica 5: 2-14.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 2001. Global forest resources assessment 2000. FAO, Rome, Italy.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 2006. Global forest resources assessment 2005. FAO, Rome, Italy.

Forest Resources Assessment (FRA). (2015). Global Eological Zones for FAO Forest Reporting 2010 Update. Forest Resources Assessment Working Paper 179.

Gayoso, J. and Schlegel, B. (2003). Estudio de línea de base de carbono: Carbono en bosques nativos, matorrales y praderas de la Décima Región de Chile. Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.

Gayoso, J., Guerra, J. and Alarcón, D. (2002). Contenido de carbono y funciones de biomasa en especies natives y exóticas. Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.

Gower, S.T., Krankina, O., Olson, R.J., Apps, M., Linder, S. and Wang, C. (2001). Net primary production and carbon allocation patterns of boreal forest ecosystems. Ecological Applications 11: 1395-1411.

Hall, G.M.J. (2001). Mitigating an organization's future net carbon emissions by native forest restoration. Ecological Applications 11: 1622-1633.

Hall, G.M.J. and Hollinger, D. Y. (1997). Do the indigenous forests affect the net CO2 emission policy of New Zealand? New Zealand Forestry 41: 24-31.

Hall, G.M.J., Wiser, S.K., Allen, R.B., Beets, P.N. and Goulding, C.J. (2001). Strategies to estimate national forest carbon stocks from inventory data: The 1990 New Zealand baseline. Global Change Biology 7:389-403.

Harmand, J.M., Njiti, C.F., Bernhard-Reversat, F. and Puig, H. (2004). Aboveground and belowground biomass, productivity and nutrient accumulation in tree improved fallows in the dry tropics of Cameroon. Forest Ecology and Management 188: 249-265.

Harmon, M.E. and Marks, B. (2002). Effects of silvicultural practices on carbon stores in Douglas-fir-western hemlock forests in the Pacific Northwest, USA: results from a simulation model. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 32 (5): 863-877.

Harmon, M.E., Franklin, J.F., Swanson, F.J., Sollins, P., Gregory, S.V., Lattin, J.D., Anderson, N.H., Cline, S.P., Aumen, N.G., Sedell, J.R., Lienkaemper, G.W., Cromack, J.R. and Cummins, K.W. (1986). Ecology of coarse woody debris in temperate ecosystems. Advances in Ecological Research 15: 133–302.

Hessl, A.E., Milesi, C., White, M.A., Peterson, D.L. and Keane, R. (2004). Ecophysiological parameters for Pacific Northwest trees. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, OR.

Hinds, H.V. and Reid, J.S. (1957). Forest trees and timbers of New Zealand. New Zealand Forest Service Bulletin 12: 1-221.

Hughes, R.F., Kauffman, J.B. and Jaramillo, V.J. (1999). Biomass, carbon, and nutrient dynamics of secondary forests in a humid tropical region of México. Ecology 80: 1892-1907.

Hughes, R.F., Kauffman, J.B. and Jaramillo-Luque, V.J. (2000). Ecosystem-scale impacts of deforestation and land use in a humid tropical region of México. Ecological Applications 10: 515-527.

IPCC (1997). Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Inventories. Houghton J.T., Meira Filho

L.G., Lim B., Tréanton K., Mamaty I., Bonduki Y., Griggs D.J. Callander B.A. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/OECD/IEA, Paris, France.

IPCC (2003). Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry. Penman J., Gytarsky M., Hiraishi T., Krug, T., Kruger D., Pipatti R., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T., Tanabe K., Wagner F. (Eds).Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/IGES, Hayama, Japan.

Jenkins, J.C., Chojnacky, D.C., Heath, L.S. and Birdsey, R.A. (2004). Comprehensive database of diameterbased biomass regressions for North American tree species. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Newtown Square, PA.

Jobbagy, E.G. and Jackson, R.B. (2000). The vertical distribution of soil organic carbon and its relation to climate and vegetation. Ecological Applications 19(2):423-436.

Johnson, D.W., and Curtis, P.S. (2001). Effects of forest management on soil C and N storage: meta analysis. Forest Ecology and Management 140: 227-238.

Johnson, D.W., Knoepp, J.D. and Swank, W.T. (2002). Effects of forest management on soil carbon: results of some long-term resampling studies. Environment Pollution 116: 201-208.

Knigge, W. and Schulz, H. (1966). Grundriss der Forstbenutzung. Verlag Paul Parey, Hamburg, Berlin.

Köppen, W. (1931). Grundriss der Klimakunde. Walter deGruyter Co., Berlin, Germany.

Kraenzel, M., Castillo, A., Moore, T. and Potvin, C. (2003). Carbon storage of harvest-age teak (Tectona grandis) plantations, Panama. Forest Ecology and Management 173: 213-225.

Kurz, W.A., Apps, M.J., Banfield, E. and Stinson, G. (2002). Forest carbon accounting at the operational scale. The Forestry Chronicle 78: 672-679.

Kurz, W.A. and Apps, M.J. (2006). Developing Canada's national forest carbon monitoring, accounting and reporting system to meet the reporting requirements of the Kyoto Protocol. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 11(1): 33-43.

Kurz, W.A., Apps, M.J., Webb, T.M. and McNamee, P.J. (1992). The carbon budget of the Canadian forest sector: phase I. Forestry Canada, Northwest Region. Information Report NOF-X-326, 93 pp.

Kurz, W.A., Beukema, S.J. and Apps, M.J. (1998). Carbon budget implications of the transition from natural to managed disturbance regimes in forest landscapes. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 2:405-421.

Kurz, W.A., Beukema, S.J. and Apps, M.J. (1996). Estimation of root biomass and dynamics for the carbon budget model of the Canadian forest sector. Can. J. For. Res. 26:1973-1979.

Lamlom, S.H. and Savidge, R.A. (2003). A reassessment of carbon content in wood: variation within and between 41 North American species. Biomass and Bioenergy 25: 381-388.

Lasco, R.D. and Pulhin, F.B. (2003). Philippine forest ecosystems and climate change: Carbon stocks, rate of sequestration and the Kyoto Protocol. Annals of Tropical Research 25: 37-51.

Levy, P.E., Hale, S.E. and Nicoll, B.C. (2004). Biomass expansion factors and root:shoot ratios for coniferous tree species in Great Britain. Forestry 77: 421-430.

Li, C. and Apps, M.J. (2002). Fire Regimes and the Carbon Dynamics of Boreal Forest Ecosystems. In Shaw C. and Apps MJ (Eds). The role of Boreal Forests and Forestry in the Global Carbon Budget, Northern Forestry Centre Report Fo42-334/2000E, 107-118.

Li, C., Kurz, W.A., Apps, M.J. and Beukema, S.J. (2003). Belowground biomass dynamics in the Carbon Budget Model of the Canadian Forest Sector: recent improvements and implications for the estimation of NPP and NEP. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 33: 126-136.

Liski, J., Pussinen, A., Pingoud, K., Makipaa, R. and Karjalainen, T. (2001). Which rotation length is favourable to carbon sequestration? Canadian Journal of Forest Research 31: 2004-2013.

Loveland, T.R, Reed, B.C., Brown, J.F., Ohlen, D.O., Zhu, Z., Yang, L. and Merchant, J.W. (2000). Development of a global land cover characteristics database and IGBP DISCover from 1-km AVHRR data. International Journal of Remote Sensing 21: 1303-1330.

Lugo, A.E., Wang, D. and Bormann, F.H. (1990). A comparative analysis of biomass production in five tropical tree species. Forest Ecology and Management 31: 153-166.

Malhi, Y., Baker, T.R., Phillips, O.L., Almeida, S., Alvarez, E., Arroyo, L., Chave, J., Czimczik, C.I., Di Fiore, A., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T.J., Laurance, S.G., Laurance, W.F., Lewis, S.L., Montoya, L.M.M.,

Monteagudo, A., Neill, D.A., Vargas, P.N., Patiño, S., Pitman, N.C.A., Quesada, C.A., Salomãos, R., Silva, J.N.M., Lezama, A.T., Martínez, R.V., Terborgh, J., Vinceti, B. and Lloyd, J. (2004). The aboveground coarse wood productivity of 104 Neotropical forest plots. Global Change Biology 10: 563-591.

Matthews, G.A.R. (1993). The carbon content of trees. UK Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, UK.

McGroddy, M.E., Daufresne, T. and Hedin, L.O. (2004). Scaling of C:N:P stoichiometry in forests worldwide: Implications of terrestrial Redfield-type ratios. Ecology 85: 2390-2401.

McKenzie, N.J., Cresswell, H.P., Ryan, P.J. and Grundy, M. (2000). Opportunities for the 21st century: Expanding the horizons for soil, plant, and water analysis. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 31: 1553-1569.

Mokany, K., Raison, J.R. and Prokushkin, A.S. (2006). Critical analysis of root:shoot ratios in terrestrial biomes. Global Change Biology 12: 84-96.

Monte, L, Hakanson, L., Bergstrom, U., Brittain, J. and Heling, R. (1996). Uncertainty analysis and validation of environmental models: the empirically based uncertainty analysis. Ecological Modelling 91:139-152.

Montès, N., Bertaudière-Montes, V., Badri, W., Zaoui, E.H. and Gauquelin, T. (2002). Biomass and nutrient content of a semi-arid mountain ecosystem: the Juniperus thurifera L. woodland of Azzaden Valley (Morocco). Forest Ecology and Management 166: 35-43.

Nygård, R., Sawadogo, L. and Elfving, B. (2004). Wood-fuel yields in short-rotation coppice growth in the north Sudan savanna in Burkina Faso. Forest Ecology and Management 189: 77-85.

Ogle, S.M., Breidt, F.J., Eve, M.D. and Paustian, K. (2003). Uncertainty in estimating land use and management impacts on soil organic carbon storage for U.S. agricultural lands between 1982 and 1997. Global Change Biology 9:1521-1542.

Ogle, S.M., Breidt, F.J. and Paustian, K. (2006). Bias and variance in model results associated with spatial scaling of measurements for parameterization in regional assessments. Global Change Biology 12:516-523.

Post, W.M. and Kwon, K.C. (2000). Soil carbon sequestration and land-use change: processes and potential. Global Change Biology 6:317-327.

Poupon, H. (1980). Structure et dynamique de la strate ligneuse d'une steppe Sahélienne au nord du Sénégal. Office de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique Outre-Mer, Paris, France.

Powers, J.S., Read, J.M., Denslow, J.S. and Guzman, S.M. (2004). Estimating soil carbon fluxes following landcover change: a test of some critical assumptions for a region in Costa Rica. Global Change Biology 10:170-181.

Pregitzer, K.S. (2003). Woody plants, carbon allocation and fine roots. New Phytologist 158 (3): 421-424. Reyes, G., Brown, S., Chapman, J. and Lugo, A.E. (1992). Wood densities of tropical tree species. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, New Orleans, LA.

Rijsdijk, J.F. and Laming, P.B. (1994). Physical and related properties of 145 timbers. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Saldarriaga, J.G., West, D.C., Tharp, M.L. and Uhl, C. (1988). Long term chronosequence of forest succession in the upper Rio Negro of Colombia and Venezuela. Journal of Ecology 76: 938-958.

Scott, N.A., Tate, K.R., Giltrap, D.J., et al. (2002). Monitoring land-use change effects on soil carbon in New Zealand: quantifying baseline soil carbon stocks. Environmental Pollution 116: 167-186.

Sebei, H., Albouchi, A., Rapp, M. and El Aouni, M.H. (2001). Évaluation de la biomasse arborée et arbustive dans une séquence de dégradation de la suberaie à Cytise de Kroumirie (Tunisie). Annals of Forest Science 58: 175-191.

Siltanen, et al. (1997). A soil profile and organic carbon data base for Canadian forest and tundra mineral soils. Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Forest Service, Northern Forestry Centre, Edmonton, Alberta.

Singh, K. and Misra, R. (1979). Structure and Functioning of Natural, Modified and Silvicultural Ecosystems in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Banras Hindu University, Varanasi, India.

Singh, S.S., Adhikari, B.S. and Zobel, D.B. (1994). Biomass, productivity, leaf longevity, and forest structure in the central Himalaya. Ecological Monographs 64: 401-421.

Smith, J.E. and Heath, L.S. (2001). Identifying influences on model uncertainty: an application using a forest carbon budget model. Environmental Management 27:253-267.

Smithwick, E.A.H., Harmon, M.E., Remillard, S.M., Acker, S.A. and Franklin, J.F. (2002). Potential upper bounds of carbon stores in forests of the Pacific Northwest. Ecological Applications 12: 1303-1317.

Somogyi, Z., Cienciala, E., Mäkipää, R., Muukkonen, P., Lehtonen, A. and Weiss, P. (2006). Indirect methods of large-scale forest biomass estimation. European Journal of Forest Research. DOI: 10.1007/s10342006-0125-7.

Stape, J.L., Binkley, D. and Ryan, M.G. (2004). Eucalyptus production and the supply, use and efficiency of use of water, light and nitrogen across a geographic gradient in Brazil. Forest Ecology and Management 193:17-31.

Stephens, P., Trotter, C., Barton, J., Beets, P., Goulding, C., Moore, J., Lane, P. and Payton, I. (2005). Key elements in the development of New Zealand's carbon monitoring, accounting and reporting system to meet Kyoto Protocol LULUCF good practice guidance, Poster paper presented at IUFRO World Congress, Brisbane Australia, August 2005.

Stocks, B.J., Mason, J.A., Todd, J.B., Bosch, E.M., Wotton, B.M., Amiro, B.D., Flannigan, M.D., Hirsch, K.G.,

Logan, K.A., Martell, D.L., and Skinner, W.R. (2002). "Large forest fires in Canada, 1959 – 1997", Journal of Geophysical Research, 107, 8149 printed 108(D1), 2003].

Trotter, C., Barton, J., Beets, P., Goulding, C., Lane, P., Moore, J., Payton, I., Rys, G., Stephens, P., Tate, K. and

Wakelin, S. (2005). New Zealand's approach to forest inventory under the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol. Proceedings of the International Workshop of Forest Inventory for the Kyoto Protocol (Eds Matsumoto,M. and Kanomata, H.), pp. 33–43, published by: Division of Policy and Economics, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, 1 Matsunosato, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8687, Japan.

Trotter, C.M. (1991). Remotely sensed data as an information source for Geographical Information Systems in natural resource management. International Journal of Geographical Information Systems 5, No. 2, 225-240.

Ugalde, L. and Perez, O. (2001). Mean annual volume increment of selected industrial forest planatation species. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy.

VandenBygaart, A.J., Gregorich, E.G., Angers, D.A., et al. (2004). Uncertainty analysis of soil organic carbon stock change in Canadian cropland from 1991 to 2001. Global Change Biology 10:983-994.

Wulder, M., Kurz, W.A. and Gillis, M. (2004). National level forest monitoring and modeling in Canada, Progress in Planning, Volume 61:365-381.

Zianis, D., Muukkonen, P., Mäkipää, R. and Mencuccini, M. (2005). Biomass and stem volume equations for tree species in Europe. Silva Fennica, Monographs 4. 63. p.