Estimation of Carbon Sequestration in a Forest: A case study of Bhawal National Park, Gazipur

Mohammad Elias Habib [a*#] and Mohammad Emadul Huda [a†]

[a] *Department of Environmental Science, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. First Author designed the study, collected primary and secondary data, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Second Author helps to determine the research methodology, presentation of result and discussion and supervise the study. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

Carbon sequestration is a global strategy of reducing atmospheric carbon to tackle global warming and climate change. Since the industrial revolution, the atmospheric carbon has been concentrating, therefore, global warming is speeding up and ecosystems are destroyed which increases the threat for global environmental sustainability. To limit global warming to 1.5^0C, COPs recommendation to be implemented particularly stop and restore forest loss, and line up the financial sector with net zero by 2050. Also, the Kyoto protocol explore the opportunity of carbon trading for developing countries like Bangladesh which is also reinforced by the net zero strategy of IPCC. To assess the forest carbon sequestration potentials, Bangladesh needs to accurately measure its storage carbon using statistical validated methods. Compared to ideal situations considering size and population, forest land is inadequate in Bangladesh as a result, to get global benefit, the country should manage the carbon pool by assessing periodically and managing accordingly. This study follows the randomized block design for sampling and data collection from 9 plots of 100 m2 each. Each individual tree of a sample plot measured and recorded and a total 240 trees measured to get its GBH and individual height. Study area covers the core area of Bhawal National Park which is a planted forest dominated by Sal tree (*shorea robusta*). From the study it

_____

[#] *Development Worker and Graduate Student;*
[†] *Professor;*
Corresponding author: E-mail: elias.undp@gmail.com;

has been observed that 3.345-million-ton Carbon sequestrate (equivalent to 12.276-million-ton CO_2) in the core area of Bhawal National Park which is 940 hectares. Very few older plants are found in the Bhawal national park, most of them were coppicing plants. This study report might be beneficial for the potential forest researchers to estimate sequestrate carbon and to achieve net zero of carbon emission also, helps to create a foundation of carbon trading, therefore, the country might be benefited.

1. INTRODUCTION

Carbon sequestration is a global emerging concern as strategy of reducing atmospheric carbon to tackle global warning and climate change. Since industrial revolution (1750) the increase in atmospheric CO_2 concentration by 31% from the combustion of fossil fuel and change in land use pattern as a result necessitates identification of strategies for mitigating the threat of global warming [1]. Likewise, there is a scientific consensus that global climate is changing in part as a result of anthropogenic activities [2,3,4] and those the social and economic costs of abating and of responding to its impacts will be big [5]. Forests plays an important role in the global climate system. In the meantime, deforestation contributes 18% all forms of CO_2 emissions worldwide [6]. Developing countries like Bangladesh are mostly affected by the consequences of Global Warming [7].

Bangladesh is a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by defined targets below a 1990 baseline level during the first commitment period of 2008 to 2012 [8-24]. Several provisions of the Kyoto agreement may affect how forestry is practiced in Bangladesh. Verifiable changes in carbon sequestration from afforestation, deforestation, and reforestation since 1990 could be counted as credits or debits if the result directly from anthropogenic activities [25-31]. Other articles establish mechanisms for trading carbon credits among parties to the protocol [32].

Houghton and Nassikas [33] emphasized on protecting deforestation and encouraging secondary forests to grow to reduce atmospheric carbon by about 120 PgC between 2016 and 2100. As forests, trees, or vegetation acts as the carbon storage, these could be used in devising mechanisms to cope with the unexpected impact of global climate change [34,35]. To achieve full carbon mitigation potential requires estimation of country-based carbon stocks through statistically valid methods [36]. As a cosigner of the Kyoto protocol, Bangladesh needs accurate estimations of carbon stocks throughout the country comprehensively to implement carbon trading CDM projects [37]. Accordingly, the Government of Bangladesh took initiative to develop carbon stock database of whole country and prepared the REDD+ Readiness Roadmap [38]. The reliable quantification of vegetative carbon sequestration will help the researcher, entrepreneur and policy makers of Bangladesh to sell certified emission reduction to developed countries [39,40] in global carbon markets under REDD+ and CDM [41,35] as they need to counterbalance their higher per capita carbon emission. Carbon stock estimation includes quantification of soil organic carbon, carbon in living trees, undergrowth vegetation, woody debris, and litters of forest floor in form of above-ground carbon and below-ground carbon [42,43]. In Bangladesh, researchers have estimated carbon stocks using different methods and have developed allometric models for few forest species [44-52]. However, most of the estimation is limited to few variables that miss the enormous pools of ecosystem carbon [53].

Existing forests of Bangladesh absorbs more carbon than the total carbon produced in the country [58-58]. As a cosigner of 'Kyoto Protocol' the country could be asked for compensation from the developed countries for their extra carbon absorbed by country's forest [59]. According to Forest Department (FD) and some other sources [60,61,62] the area of forest land is about 2.53 million ha which is approximately 17.5% of the country's total surface area however the Forest Resource Assessment 2005 reveals it is only about 0.871 million ha [63,64].

Sal forests covers vast area of central and eastern part of Bangladesh which constitute a unique biological diversity that constitute 70-75% "Sal" trees (*shorea robusta*) including several other valuable trees and herbaceous species [65 Agriculture is the main land-use in Bangladesh, comprising nearly 65% of the country's land area, followed by forests (17.5%), urban areas (7.9%), and water bodies (9.6%) (Dey et al. 2012). The 17.5% of forest area equivalent to about 2.53 million hectares (10.53% of the country's total land) in Bangladesh [61]. Among 2.53 million hectares, 1.53 million hectares are under the jurisdiction of the Bangladesh Forest Department (FD) [66] and rests are unclassed state forests (0.73 million hectares) under the control of district administration and homestead forests (0.27 million hectares) owned by smallholder landowners [61]. Most of the sal forests of Bangladesh are regenerated secondary forests (53%), followed by primary forests (30%) and planted (17%) forests [67]. The deciduous Sal forests are located on relatively plain lands in the central districts of Bangladesh and are dominated mainly by Sal (*Shorea robusta*). The sal forest covers 0.12 million ha which is 7. 9% of total country forest and 0.8% of total country land.

Accurate tree biomass estimation is critical and vital for calculating carbon stock as well as for studying climate change [68,69], monitoring of forest health, productivity, nutrient cycling and budget etc [70]. The IPCC default emission factors was applied, where it is assumed that soil and dead organic matter do not change with forest management practice, type of forest, or disturbance regime [71]. Sources and sinks of carbon associated with forests depend strongly on the management regime and spatial patterns in potential productivity [72].

The number of specific allometric equations for Bangladesh has increased, among them half of the models lack statistical validity, Mahmood et al. [36] concluded that only 5% tree species and shrubs in Bangladesh have allometric models to estimate the biomass [73]. Carbon sequestration rate under the same environment exclusively depends on the species [74] which prescribed the need to develop species-specific localized allometric equations [75,76]. Most of the studies, counted below-ground carbon stock as 15% of above-ground carbon stock [77,78], but in another study, it was found 14% in real field [79] which added further errors into the estimates.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Description of the Study Site

The study area "Bhawal National Park" was established in 1974 which officially declared as National Park in 1982 under the Wildlife Act of 1974. By origin, it is a planted forest and was the part of Madhupur forest under the rule of Bhawal Estate. It is located between 24°5′45″N 90°24′14″E in Gazipur, Dhaka Division of Bangladesh. The core area of the Bhawal national park covers 940 hectares but extends to 5,022 ha of surrounding forest. Most of this area was covered by forests fifty-five years ago and the dominant species was Sal (*Shorea robusta*). The purpose of this forest is to maintain important habitats as well as to provide opportunities for recreation. It has been kept under IUCN Management Category V, as a protected landscape.

Bhawal National Park

2.2 Biomass Sampling and Sampling Size Determination

The object of sampling is to secure a sample which will be represented the entire population and reproduce the important characteristics of the population as closely as possible. A sampling plots is determined by the size of sampling units, number of sampling units, the distribution of the sampling units over the entire area, the type and method of measurement in the selected units and the statistical procedures for analyzing the collected data.

Under this study, selected 3 spots within the core area of Bhawal National Park through transect walk at least 100 meter inside from road site. Then, demark serially 5 plots in a straight-line each plot size will be 10 mX10 m= 100 m2. Through lottery, select 3 plots among 5 plots for primary data collection. Likewise, collect data from 3 sites and 3 plots from each spot therefore, measure DBH and tree heights from total 9 plots of 100 m^2 size each.

In each plot, count the number of trees (sal) and other species. Also count DBH and height of each individual tree of the plot. Likewise, counted 3 random plots of each 3 sites.

2.3 Research Approach

This research is based on quantitative approach as we take sample plots and trees for further calculation, measurement of DBH, and height. It is the general approach to estimate above ground biomass before statistical analysis. There are several research works have already done by using that approach. This approach is used because this is more convenient and easier to handle into a forest cover area moreover identifying sample and trees are also easy to count.

2.4 Data Collection

To complete this project, we required two types of data, one is primary data and another is secondary data. Data and its collection methods are discussed below:

2.4.1 Primary data

Data, those are collected from direct field level and those were not used before is called primary data. To complete study, tree diameter, tree height, GPS reading is needed that's why we collect those data from this site by manually. By

using diameter tape, we measure diameter at breast height (1.32 m above from the ground) of trees in cm, height is measured by Michael Kuhn's Stick method in meter, measurement tape is used to measure the plot size and an Android GPS is also used to get geographic location like altitude, latitude, elevation etc.

2.4.2 Secondary data

The secondary data like total area of plantation, tree species, history of management by which we can get to determine the age of tree and by this way we can easily know about growth and height relationship, height and biomass relationship and the growth and development of those site. I have collected official data from the forest office of Dhaka division, online resources through internet browsing, collect opinion of local denizens and forest villagers, etc.

2.5 Biomass Calculation

2.5.1 Biomass and carbon calculation

Indeed, tree biomass includes above ground biomass including shoots, branch, twigs etc. and the below ground biomass includes roots biomass.

Calculation of Estimation of carbon of above ground biomass: The above ground tree biomass (AGTB) was estimated for carbon estimation by multiplying the bio-volume with the green wood density of particular tree species. Tree bio-volume (TBV) value was calculated by multiplying of DBH and height of tree species to factor 0.4 [80]. Wood density (WD) was found from the Global wood density database [81]. The height of trees was measured by Michael Kuhn's Stick method, while the DBH was determined by measuring tree girth at breast height (GBH), approximately 1.32m from the ground. The GBHs of trees was measured directly from tree using measuring tape. The DBH of the tree was measured by dividing GBH by π (3.14) value i.e., GBH/3.14.

Bio-volume (TBV) = 0.4 × (DBH)2 × H
AGTB = TBV × WD

Calculation of Estimation of below ground biomass: The below ground tree biomass (BGTB) was calculated by multiplying the above ground biomass (AGTB) by root-to-shoot ratio of 0.26 (because the bhawal national park forest is a sub-tropical moist forest), [82].

BGTB = AGTB × 0.26

Calculation of Estimation of total biomass: The total tree biomass was then calculated as [83]:

Total tree biomass (TTB) = AGTB + BGTB

Calculation of Estimation of carbon storage: Generally, for any plant species 50% of its biomass is considered as carbon (Pearson et al., 2005). Therefore, the total biomass carbon was calculated as:

Carbon storage = Biomass × 50% or Biomass/2

Calculation of estimation of CO_2 equivalent: The CO_2 equivalent was calculated as following equation [84]:

1 ton of carbon = 3.67 tons of CO_2 equivalent.

The estimated data was then complied and tabulated and analyzed by statistically validated methods. The Microsoft Office Excel 2010 and SPSS software was used to analyze the data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are two methods of carbon estimation in tree species, destructive method and non-destructive method approved by many researchers. The project employed the non-destructive method for carbon estimation, in this method the study doesn't need to harvest the entire bio-volume and sacrifice the tree.

A total 240 trees were recorded from 9 sampling plots of 100 m2 (10m x 10m) each of Bhawal national park. The study conducted in the core area of Bhawal National Park where 3 plots were located in the Plot 1 (P1)- Coordinate-24°05'26.3"N 90°24'04.1"E, Plot 2 (P2)- Coordinate- 24°05'31.9"N 90°24'11.2"E, and Plot 3 (P3)- Coordinate- 24°05'01.7"N 90°23'45.9"E.

3.1 Results on Biomass Estimation

The study collected data to calculate above ground biomass and below ground biomass to find total biomass. Both biomasses could contain carbon which the study estimated.

3.1.1 Estimation of above ground tree biomass (AGTB)

The graph shows the comparison of tree bio volume found in different sample plots. It represents a strong relationship between tree diameter, height and above ground biomass. Highest biomass found in the P1R1 (2278.35 kg/plant) and lowest in the P2R1 (1969.88 kg/plant). The diameter of individual plants was found higher in plot 1 than plot2 with tree height because plot 1 was located inside the park and plot 2 was near the road side.

3.1.2 Estimation of below ground tree biomass (BGTB)

The graph shows that the below ground biomass is higher in the P1R1 (592.37 kg/individual) and lowest in the P2R1 (512.17 kg/individual). The cause behind the variation may be for the tree diameter and height, if any plant has higher girth and height that means the plant has more root biomass. Moreover, the below ground biomass calculated from the above ground biomass, therefore which plot has more AGTB, certainly that will have more BGTB.

3.1.3 Estimation of total tree biomass (TTB)

The graph shows the total tree biomass found in the P1R1 (2,870.72 kg/individual) and lowest in the P2R1 (2,482.05 kg/individual). The reason may be the same that the growth of plot 1 trees is higher than plot 2 therefore, total biomass found higher in the plot 1.


Fig. 1. Graphical presentation of average above ground tree biomass (AGTB) in different sample plots

**Fig. 2. Average below ground tree biomass in different sample plots**

Fig. 3. Total Tree Biomass (TTB) found in different sample plots

3.2 Results on Storage Carbon Estimation in different Plots

The study calculated total storage carbon in the total biomass found in the 240 trees of Bhawal National Park. Among the 240 trees other tree species number was minor and statistically insignificant. It has found Sal (*shorea robusta*) - 237, Arjun (Terminalia arjuna)- 1, Bohera (Terminalia belirica)-1, Acacia (Acacia auriculiformis)-1, among the 9 sample plots. Also, the Arjun, Bohera and Acacia DBH were 49, 51 and 71 cm; and tree height were 22.6, 20.3 and 19.8 meter whereas average (of 240 trees) DBH was 57.33 and average tree height was 21.75. Based on the primary data, the study estimated storage carbon per hectare.

3.2.1 Carbon storage estimation of above ground tree biomass (AGTB)

The graph shows that the storage carbon found highest in the P1R1 (1139.175 kg/plant) and second highest in the P3R3 (1104.87kg/plant) and lowest in the P2R1 (984.94 kg/plant). The storage carbon depends on the tree bio-volume and wood density therefore found more in the plot where biomass is also higher compared to other plots.

3.2.2 Carbon storage estimation of below ground tree biomass (BGTB)

The graph shows that the storage carbon in the below ground biomass is highest in the P1R1 (296.185 kg/tree), second highest the P3R3 (287.265 kg/tree) and lowest in the P2R1 (256.085 kg/tree). It may be for the storage carbon calculated from the tree bio volume, where girth and height are major factors that are found highest in the plot 1, then plot 3 and then plot 2.

3.2.3 Carbon storage estimation of total tree biomass (TTB)

The graph shows that the total storage carbon is higher in the P1R1 (1435.36 kg/tree) and second highest in the P3R3 (1392.135 kg/tree) and lowest in the P2R1 (1241.025 kg/tree). The wood density (0.73) is higher in the Sal (*shorea robusta)* compared to other forest trees as a result, storage carbon found higher in the plot 1.

3.3 Estimation of CO_2 Equivalent

The study calculated total storage carbon first, then convert into equivalent CO_2.

3.3.1 Estimation of CO_2 equivalent of above ground tree biomass (AGTB)

The graph shows CO_2 sequestrate highest in P1R1 (3839.02 kg/tree) and lowest in P2R1 (3319.248 kg/tree) in the above ground biomass of a tree. Those trees biomass is higher, they could sequestrate more carbon.

**Fig. 4. Storage carbon found in the above ground biomass in different sample plots**

**Fig. 5. Storage carbon in the below ground biomass in different sample plots**

Fig. 6. Total carbon storage in the sample plots

3.3.2 Estimation of CO_2 equivalent of below ground tree biomass (BGTB)

The graph shows that, CO_2 sequestration found highest in the P1R1 (1086.999 kg/tree) and lowest in the P2R1 (939.832 kg/tree) in the below ground biomass. CO_2 sequestration calculate from the below ground biomass, result which tree has higher biomass in the below ground they can sequestrate more carbon.

3.3.3 Estimation of CO_2 equivalent in the total tree biomass (TTB)

The graph shows that, total CO_2 sequestrate in the P1R1 (5267.771 kg/tree) and lowest in the P2R1 (5044.635 kg/tree). However, which trees

biomass is higher, they could sequestrate more carbon.

3.4 Carbon Stock Calculation per hectare Area of Bhawal National Park

A total 240 trees were recorded from 9 sampling plots of 100 m2 each in the Bhawal National Park Forest range. And the result and discussion chapter analyze the biomass and storage carbon for individual plants. Based on the individual tree data, the estimation of carbon storage are as follows.

The project studied 3 plots in the different locations of Bhawal National Forest and recorded

data from 9 plots of 100m2 each. Therefore, 240 trees were found in the 900 m2 and we know, 1 ha= 10000 m2. So, the average total number of trees in one-hectare is 2666. Average total tree biomass found per sal (*shorea robusta*) tree was 2669.56 kg, so total biomass found per hectare was 7117046.96 kg or 7117.04 ton/ha.

Average storage carbon in individual Sal tree in the recorded plots (900m2) is 1334.782 kg/tree and the total number of trees in one-hectare is 2666, so total storage carbon found in the Bhawal National Forest is 3558528.812 kg or 3558.53 ton/ha.

And we know One ton of carbon = 3.67 tons of CO_2 equivalent, therefore equivalent CO_2 is 13059.80 ton/ha.

The core area of Bhawal National Park is 940 ha, therefore total storage carbon estimated as 3.345 million ton and 12.276-million-ton CO_2.

3.5 Correlation Analysis of Tree Biomass, Tree Height and Diameter

The correlation between tree biomass, tree height and diameter at breast height analyzed using SPSS to find the correlation among parameters. The auto generated table showed the significant correlation (>0.5) between tree biomass, DBH (0.886) and height (0.711) which means there is a strong correlation between biomass, tree height and diameter.


**Fig. 7. CO_2 sequestration in the different sample plots**

**Fig. 8. Graphical presentation of CO_2 sequestrates in the different sample plots in the below ground biomass**

Fig. 9. Total Carbon sequestrate in different sample plots

Correlations		Biomass	DBH	Height
Biomass	Pearson Correlation	1	.886**	.711*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.003	.048
	N	8	8	8
DBH	Pearson Correlation	.886**	1	.350
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003		.395
	N	8	8	8
Height	Pearson Correlation	.711*	.350	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	.395	
	N	8	8	8
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				

Fig. 10. Table of correlation analysis

4. CONCLUSION

The estimation of sequestrate carbon in each natural, planted or homestead forest of a country is becoming more important considering the global action of tackling global warming and climate change. If the global effort wants to limit global temperature increment by 1.5^{o} C, it needs to control emission of greenhouse gasses including carbon by any means. There are two ways to offset atmospheric carbon, one is reduced carbon emission from anthropogenic action at source and another is sequestration (creating a large reservoir of storage carbon) to balance emission. The sequestration strategies may be natural or mechanical, where Carbon sequestration in living forest may be a good strategy as natural. There are different types of natural or planted forest available in the earth, however, the study recommended increasing forest area with native species only and improving the management practice also to get large reservoirs of carbon. Bhawal national park is a regenerated secondary forest, therefore, afforestation and reforestation projects with tree species which sequesters more carbon should be implemented in the deforested area keeping all environmental parameters in mind. The study encourages researchers to develop allometric equations for its native species. It has concluded that 12.276-million-ton CO_2 offset in the 940-ha core area of Bhawal National Park and it can potentially increase its storage capacity by improving forest management practice. Comparing population and size Bangladesh has inadequate forest land, therefore need to manage existing forest intensively and underutilized areas need to be brought under the carbon sequestration pool. Bangladesh forest absorbed more carbon than total emission in the country therefore, the country has good potential to earn foreign currency from carbon trading. Finally, the study is suggesting to perform further study incorporating herb, shrub and soil carbon in order to gain a complete estimation of carbon storage in Bhawal national park.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1.   Lal R. Soil carbon sequestration to mitigate climate change. Geoderma. 2004:1–22.
2.   IPCC. Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, contribution of Working Group II to the third assessment report of the IPCC, Cambridge University Press, New York. 2001:188.
3.   Ravindranath NH, Somashekhar BS, Gadgil M.Carbon flows in Indian forests. Climate Change. 1997;35: 297–320.

4. Negi JDS, Manhas RK, Chuhan PS.. Carbon sequestration through community-based forest management-A case study from Sambalpur Forest Division, Orissa. Indian Forester. 2002;129(6):735-738.

5. OECD. Long-term Strategies for Cooperation with Developing Countries, Working Paper No. 37, OECD, Paris; 2000.

6. Stern N. Report of the Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change. HM Treasury: London; 2006.

7. Anon. Environmental Matters. World Bank. 2000:65.

8. Ramachandran A, SJ. Carbon sequestration: estimation of carbon stock in natural forests using geospatial technology in the Eastern Ghats of Tamil Nadu, India . Current Science. 2007;92(3).

9. Anna Dey MI. Above Ground Carbon Stock Through Palm Tree in the Homegarden of Sylhet City in Bangladesh. Journal of Forest and Environmental Science. 2014;30(3):293-300.

10. Bass S, Dubois O, Moura CP, Pinard M, Tipper R, Wilson C. Rural livelihood and carbon management. *IIED Natural Resources Issues* Paper No.1. London, IIED. 2000;120.

11. Borunda A. This young whale died with 88 pounds of plastic in its stomach, National Geographic; 2019.

12. Bosetti V, Lubowski R, Golub A, Markandya A. Linking Reduced Deforestation and a Global Carbon Market: Impacts and Costs, Financial Flows, and Technological Innovations. Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy; 2009.

13. Bosquet P, Peylin P, Ciais P, Quere CL, Friedlingstein P, Tans PP. Regional changes in carbon dioxide fluxes of land and oceans since 1980. Science. 2000;290:1342–1346.

14. Follett RF, Kimble JM, Lal R.. The potential of US grazing lands to sequester soil carbon in R. F. Follett, J. M. Kimble, and R. Lal. Eds, The potential of U S grazing lands to sequester carbon and mitigate the greenhouse effect. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, Florida. 2001:401–430.

15. Grace J, Lloyd J, McIntyre J, Miranda AC, Meir P, Miranda HS, Nobre C, Moncrieff J, Massheder J, Malhi Y, Wright I, Gash J. Carbon dioxide uptake by an undisturbed tropical rainforest in southwest Amazonia, 1992 to 1993. Science. 1995;270:778–780.

16. Hinsley N. The History of Polyethylene. Global Plastic Sheeting; 2015.

17. How to Estimate Carbon Sequestration on Small Forest Tracts. Journal of Forestry, carbon Forestry; 2000.

18. Hunt E, Raymond Jr., Kelly, Robert D, Smith, William K, Fahnestock, Jace T, Welker, Jeffrey M, Reiners, William A. Estimation of Carbon Sequestration by Combining Remote Sensing and Net Ecosystem Exchange Data for Northern Mixed-Grass Prairie and Sagebrush–Steppe Ecosystems. Publications from USDA-ARS / UNL Faculty. 2004:306. Available:https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdaarsfacpub/306

19. Hunt ER, Kelly RD, Smith WK, Fahnestock JT, Welker JM, Reiners WA. Estimation of carbon sequestration by combining remote sensing and net ecosystem exchange data for northern mixed-grass prairie and sagebrush–steppe ecosystems. Environmental Management. 2004;33(1): S432-41. Available:https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usdaarsfapub.

20. IPCC, Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Agriculture, Forestry and other Land Use. 2006;4:1-66.

21. Islam MS. Estimation of biomass carbon stock at three plantation sites in Sher-E-Bangla agricultural university campus (Master's thesis). Sher-E-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, Bangladesh; 2013.

22. Jha MN, Gupta MK, Sexena A, Rajesh K. Soil organic carbon store in different forest of India. Indian Forester. 2003;129 (6):714-721.

23. Jaman MS, Hossain MF, Islam MS, Helal MGJ, Jamil M. Quantification of carbon stock and tree diversity of homegardens in Rangpur District, Bangladesh. International Journal of Agriculture and Forestry. 2016;6:169–180.

24. Kuhns; 2001. Available:https://forestry.usu.edu/kids-and-teachers/tree-height

25. Schoene D. Assessing and reporting forest carbon stock changes: a concerted effort. Unasylva. 2002;210 (53):76-81.

26. Singh ML. Carbon Sequestration Potential of Indian Forests. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. 2000;60:315–327.

27. Smith P, Powlson DS, Glendining MJ, Smith JU. Preliminary estimates of the

potential for carbon mitigation in European soils through no-till farming. Global Change Biology. 1998;4(6):679-685.
Available: https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2486.1998.00185.x

28. USDA Forest Service.. RPA Assessment of forest and range lands. Report No. FS-687. USDA Forest Service, Washington, D/C. 2001:78.

29. UN FCCC. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; 1992.
Available:www.unfccc.de/resource/conv/index.html.

30. World Bank. World Development Indicators: Bangladesh; 2014.
Available:http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=2&country=BGD&series=&period= (Date of access: May, 2014).

31. WRI (World Resources Institute). Global Forest Watch: Bangladesh Climate Data; 2014. Available online at: http://climate.globalforestwatch.org/countries/BGD (Date of access: May, 2014).

32. Coeli M, Hoover RA. (How to Estimate Carbon Sequestration on Small Forest Tracts. *Journal of Forestry*, Carbon Forestry; 2000.

33. Houghton RA, Nassikas AA. Negative emissions from stopping deforestation and forest degradation, globally. Global Change Biology. 2018;24:350–359.

34. Rahman M, Sarker MH, Hossen T. Effects of human induced activities on carbon emission in Chittagong District, Bangladesh. International Journal of Agriculture and Forestry. 2013;3:71–76.

35. Shin MY, Miah MD, Lee KH. Mitigation options for the Bangladesh forestry sector: Implications of the CDM. Climate Policy. 2008;8:243–260.

36. Mahmood H, Siddique MRH, Akhter M. A critical review and database of biomass and volume allometric equation for trees and shrubs of Bangladesh. IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science. 2016;39:012057.

37. Saatchi SS, Harris NL, Brown S, Lefsky M, Mitchard ETA, Salas W, Morel A. (). Benchmark map of forest carbon stocks in tropical regions across three continents. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2011;108:9899–9904.

38. BFD. Official website of Bangladesh Forest Department; 2018.

39. Ahammad R, Hossain MK, Husnain P. Governance of forest conservation and co-benefits for Bangladesh under changing climate. Journal of Forestry Research. 2014;25:29–36.

40. Ahmed N, Glaser M. Coastal aquaculture, mangrove deforestation and blue carbon emissions: Is REDD+ a solution? Marine Policy. 2016;66:58–66.

41. Al-Amin M. Forest carbon stock measurement to management: Perspective REDD+ in Bangladesh. Indian Forester. 2016;142:86–92.

42. Gibbs HK, Brown S, Niles JO, Foley JA. Monitoring and estimating tropical forest carbon stocks: Making REDD a reality. Environmental Research Letters. 2007;2:045023.

43. Patra PK, Canadell JG, Houghton RA, Piao SL, Oh NH, Ciais P, Bhattacharya T. The carbon budget of South Asia. Biogeosciences. 2013;10:513.

44. Lal M, Nozawa T, Emori S, Harasawa H, Takahashi K, Kimoto M, Abe-ouchi A, Nakajima T, Takemura T, Numaguti A. Future climate change: Implications for Indian summer monsoon and its variability. Current Science. 2001;81:1196–1207.

45. LeBlanc R. The Decomposition of Waste in Landfills. A Story of Time and Materials; 2021.

46. Liu WS. Review on carbon storage estimation of forest ecosystem and applications in China. Forest Ecosystems. 2020:7:4.
Available: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40663-019-0210-2.

47. Ullah MR, MAA. Above- and below-ground carbon stock estimation. Journal of Forest Science. 2012;(8):372–379.

48. McNulty SG. Hurricane impacts on US forest carbon sequestration. Environmental Pollution. 2002;116:s17-s24.

49. Md. Shawkat Islam Sohel MP. The Carbon Sequestration Potential of Forestry Sector: Bangladesh Context. Journal of Forest Science. 2009;25(3):157~165.

50. Miriam Münnich Vass KE. Is forest carbon sequestration at the expense of bioenergy and forest products cost-efficient in EU climate policy to 2050? Journal of Forest Economics; 2016.
Available:http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jfe.

51. Murray B, Lubowski R, Sohngen B. Including International Forest Carbon Incentives in Climate Policy:

Understanding the Economics. Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions. Duke University; 2009.

52. Murray, Brian C, McCarl, Bruce A, Lee, Heng-Chi. Estimating leakage from forest carbon sequestration programs, Research Report, No. 2004-3, The University of Western Ontario, Department of Economics, London (Ontario); 2003.

53. Donato DC, Kauffman JB, Murdiyarso D, Kurnianto S, Stidham M, Kanninen M. Mangroves among the most carbon-rich forests in the tropics. Nature Geoscience. 2011;4:293.

54. Ramachandran Nair PK, BM. Agroforestry as a strategy for carbon sequestration. J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. 2009;172:10–23.

55. Paustian K, Cole CV, D. Sauerbeck, and N. Sampson. CO_2 mitigation by agriculture: an overview. Climatic Change. 1998;40:135–162.

56. Pearson TRH, Brown S, Ravindranath NH. Integrating carbon benefits estimates into GEF Projects, UNDP, GEF. 2005: 1-56.

57. Phillips OL, Malhi Y, Higuchi N, Laurance WF, Núñez PV, Vásquez RM, Laurance SG, Ferreira LV, Stern M, Brown S, Grace J. Changes in the carbon balance of tropical forests: evidence from long-term plots. Science. 1998;282:439–442.

58. Richard Birdsey K. Forest Carbon Management in the United States:. *J. Environ. Qual.* 2006;35:1600–2100.

59. Mukul SA.. Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development in Bangladesh: An overview of the present status, management problems and future prospects. 2007:28.
Available:http://www.mtnforum.org/rs/ol/browse.cfm?tp=vd&docid=1159. Last accessed, 18 march 2009.

60. Hossain MK. Conversion of dipterocarps-dominant natural forests to short rotation plantations- an unrecoverable threat to the native dipterocarps in Bangladesh; 2005.
Available:http://www. apafri.org/8thdip/Session%204/S4_Hossain.doc; last accessed Jan. 3, 2009

61. Khan MASA, Uddin MB, Uddin MS, Chowdhury MSH, Mukul SA. Distribution and status of forests in the tropic: Bangladesh perspective. Proc. Pakistan Acad. Sci. 2007;44:145-153.

62. Mukul SA, Uddin MB, Uddin MS, Khan MASA. Protected areas of Bangladesh:

current status and efficacy for biodiversity conservation. Proc. Pakistan Acad. Sci. 2008;45(2):133-140.

63. FAO. Global Forest Resource Assessment 2005: Progress towards sustainable forest management. FAO Forestry Paper 147, FAO, Rome, Italy, 2006:170.

64. FAO. State of the world's forest 2007. FAO, Rome, Italy, 2007:144.

65. Ahmed DK. Wildlife Biodiversity in Bhawal National Park: Management . Our Nature. 2005;3:83-90.

66. Alamgir M, Turton SM. Climate change and organic carbon storage in Bangladesh forests. In: Tuteja N, Gill SS. (eds.). Climate change and plant abiotic stress tolerance. Wiley-VCH Verlag; 2014.

67. Mongabay. Bangladesh: Environmental Profile; 2014.
Available:http://rainforests.mongabay.com/deforestation/archive/Bangladesh.htm (Date of access: May, 2014).

68. Robin L, Chazdon 1E. Carbon sequestration potential of second-growth forest regeneration in the Latin American tropics. Science Advance. 2016;2.

69. Ruben N, Lubowski AJ. Land-Use Change and Carbon Sinks: Econometric Estimation of the Carbon Sequestration Supply Function. Resources for the Future, Discussion. 2005:05-04.

70. Mohammad Raqibul Hasan Siddique, Mahmood Hossain, Md. Bakhtiar Nur Siddiqui SM, Rubaiot Abdullah, Mariam Akhter, Gael Sola, Md. Zaheer Iqbal, Matieu Henry, Conventional and additive models for estimating the biomass, carbon and nutrient stock in individual *Shorea robusta* Gaertn. f. tree of the Sal forests of Bangladesh, Environmental Challenges; 2021.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2021.100178

71. Sun Jeoung Lee JS. Estimation of Forest Carbon Stocks for National Greenhouse Gas Inventory Reporting in South Korea; 2018.
Available:http://www.mdpi.com/journal/forests, 9, 625; doi:10.3390/f9100625.

72. David P, Turner MA. Monitoring Forest Carbon Sequestration with Remote Sensing and Carbon Cycle Modeling. Environmental Management. 2004;33(4):457–466.

73. Chanda A, Mukhopadhyay A, Ghosh T, Akhand A, Mondal P, Ghosh S, Hazra S. Blue carbon stock of the Bangladesh

Sundarban mangroves: What could be the scenario after a century? Wetlands. 2016;36:1033–1045.

74. Nahiyan MT, Baidya D, Dip AD, Sultan MZB, Ahmed JU. (2017). CO_2 sequestration by tree plantation in Bangladesh: Opportunities and challenges. International conference on mechanical engineering and renewable energy 2017 (ICMERE2017), Chittagong, Bangladesh; 2017.

75. Aysha A, Hena MKA, Mishra M, Nesarul MH, Padhi BK, Mishra SK, Masum MB. Sediment and carbon accumulation in sub-tropical salt marsh and mangrove habitats of north-eastern coast of Bay of Bengal, Indian Ocean. Inter Journal Fisheries Aquat Sciences. 2015;2:184–189.

76. Mukul SA, Biswas SR, Rashid AZM, Miah MD, Kabir ME, Uddin MB, Chowdhury MSH. A new estimate of carbon for Bangladesh forest ecosystems with their spatial distribution and REDD+ implications. International Journal of Research on LandUse Sustainability. 2014;1:33–41.

77. Miah D, Uddin MF, Bhuiyan MK, Koike M, Shin MY. Carbon sequestration by the indigenous tree species in the reforestation program in Bangladesh Aphanamixis polystachya wall. and Parker. Forest Science and Technology. 2009;5:62–65.

78. Ullah MR, Al-Amin M. Above-and belowground carbon stock estimation in a natural forest of Bangladesh. Journal of Forest Science. 2012;58:372–379.

79. Rahman MM. Carbon and nitrogen dynamics and carbon sequestration in soils under different residue management. The Agriculturists. 2015;12:48–55.

80. Pandya IY, Salvi H, Chahar O, Vaghela N. Quantitative analysis on carbon storage of 25 valuable tree species of Gujarat, Incredible India. Indian J. Sci. Res. 2013;4(1):137-141.

81. Zanne AE, Lopez-Gonzalez G, Coomes DA, Ilic J, Jansen S, Lewis SL, Miller RB, Swenson NG, Wiemann MC, Chave J. Global wood density database. Dryad; 2009.

82. Hangarge LM, Kulkarni DK, Gaikwad VB, Mahajan DM, Chaudhari N.. Carbon sequestration potential of tree species in Somjaichi Rai (Sacred grove) at Nandghur village, in Bhor region of Pune District, Maharashtra State, India. Ann. Biol. Res. 2012;3(7):3426-3429.

83. Sheikh MA, Kumar M, Bussman RW, Todaria NP. Forest carbon stocks and fluxes in physiographic zones of India. Carbon Balanc. Manage. 2011;6:15.

84. Johnson I, Coburn R. Trees for carbon sequestration; 2010. Retrieved 19 August, 2012.
Available:http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/317559/Trees-forcarbon-sequestration.pdf

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/88412