Biomass Breakout

9/26/2023

Strengths of CMS stakeholder engagement efforts

- How much are stakeholders currently using biomass map products? What works well?
  - Sasan: Community of users outside of those partnered with funded CMS projects
  - Andy: Forest Service uses inventory products from lidar, more basal area and volume vs. biomass (localized project level)
  - Localized projects use lidar, but regional planning based on filling in the gaps (based on remote sensing and models)
- Limitations of biomass maps
  - Marcela: One-time map of stocks not emissions, no attribution -> modeling used in reporting

What do stakeholders want?

- George: In Maryland, the need is more for planning purposes vs. just MRV (learned that remote sensing and modeling can do planning but also the monitoring)
- Mike: Also carbon “expertise” to help guide decisions on carbon markets
- Sasan: Stakeholders missing finer scale data in time and space (where decisions are made) - from remote sensing
- Kathy: unique cases for this in different states (in MRV and carbon markets), and things beyond aboveground biomass in forests… agriculture (big user of Planet data, e.g.), wetlands, coasts, urban areas
- Mallory: private sector engagement (carbon markets), they are interested in baselines
- In those cases where NASA does not provide highest resolution like Planet, we become their stakeholder
- Reaching the entities who will be guiding carbon mrv and markets into the future
- Private, for-profit entities

Challenges and barriers

- Building tools for stakeholders to use CMS data products
- Continuity (stakeholders don’t like when products are one-off and monitoring stops when the grant ends)
- NASA congressionally mandated to build a carbon monitoring “prototype”; operational program vs. funding research 3 or 5 year cycles
- Stakeholder focus of CMS from the beginning is why it is successful
- Do users know where to go (which DAAC?) to get CMS data
-