Estimation Above Ground Biomass (AGB) and Carbon Stocks of Tectona grandis and Gmelina arborea

by Y. Ruslim

Estimation Above Ground Biomass (AGB) and Carbon Stocks of *Tectona grandis* and *Gmelina arborea* in Gorontalo Province, Indonesia

Abstract. Plantation forest exploitation has an important role in meeting timber needs and also as carbon sequestration for the environment. The purpose of this study was to calculate the stand potential, to calculate the standing biomass and carbon stock of teak and gmelina in the Gorontalo area. The research object was 4 plots each with an area of 1 hectare. The sampling method used was a systematic random sampling by measuring the diameter and height of a stand, while the data analysis used the potential stand and increment formula of MAI and CAI. Meanwhile, the estimation of biomass and carbon by calculating the aboveground carbon stock (AGB) is then analyzed using simple linear regression to determine the closeness relationship between variables. The results showed that the maximum growth of teak plots I and II reached a maximum point at the age of 32 and 25 years and the total volume was 307.50 and 254.81 m^3ha^{-1}. While the maximum growth of gmelina plots I and II reaches a maximum point at the age of 15 years and the total volume is 190.54 and 251.80 m^3ha^{-1}. The biomass content in teak plots I and II and gmelina plots I and II were respectively 267.83; 221.94; 104.03 and 137.48 tonsha^{-1}. Meanwhile, the carbon content in teak plots I and II and gmelina plots I and II were respectively 125.88; 104.31; 48.90; and 64.62 tons ha^{-1}. The results of simple regression analysis, the relationship between the two variables shows a very close relationship. This indicated that *Tectona grandis* more potentialy than *Gmelina arborea* plantations in carbon sequestration and biomass production although both of thrm have an important role in mitigating and climate change.

Key words: Biomass, Carbon, *Gmelina arborea,* Growth, *Tectona grandis*

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has renewable natural resources such as plantation forests. These forest resources have the potential as a source of biomass by promoting the planting of fast growing plants. However, until now the existence of fast growing plantations requires sustainability (Siregar et al. 2017). Over time, forests do not only function as wood producers, but as environmental service producers, where forests have the opportunity to reduce carbon dioxide in the atmosphere through photosynthesis (Lukito and Rohmatiah 2013). This is in line with research conducted by Birdsey and Pan (2015) that there has been a change in forest function in the last few decades and explains its impact on global carbon stocks. Tropical forest in Indonesia has a fast growing nature. Tesfaye et al. (2016) explained that tropical forests have an important role in global carbon sequestration. However, increasing rates of deforestation and impacts of land use change need to be considered before preventing the loss of the function of tropical forests. One example is the process of forest degradation caused by non-selective logging, forest fires, and neglected forest development dynamics occurring in large areas in tropical forests (Pinheiro et al. 2016). Therefore, one of the ways that can be used to prevent and reduce illegal logging activities according to Ruslim et al. (2016) is to develop more effective ways to protect tropical forest diversity and pay more attention to land use (Domec et al. 2015). Because this affects the depreciation of the day elements. Where the depreciation of these nutrients depends on the characteristics of the species, growth rate, tissue nutrient content, harvest rotation period, use of harvest methods and nutrient reserves in the soil (Arias et al. 2011).

Biomass and carbon stocks (C) in forest ecosystems have an important role in climate change and mitigation (Calfapietra et al, 2015; Zeng et al, 2018; Pandey et al, 2019). This biomass estimation is very important and aims to calculate the amount and variation of C (Ekholm 2016; Gren and Zeleke 2016; Ruitta et al. 2018; Nonini and Fiala 2019). Biomass is important in determining forest production and sustainable forest management (Rinnamang et al. 2020). Furthermore, according to Gonzalez-Benecke et al. 2015; Sharma et al. 2016; Panwar et al. 2017, states that an increase in rotation length will also result in an increase in biomass and carbon stocks. Where biomass production is influenced by organic matter in the soil. Biomass functions as organic material to maintain soil fertility and soil biotic stability (Lee et.al 2014). Balancing economic productivity with other ecosystem services such as carbon sequestration requires sustainable fertility of soil and water resources. This is done because of the assessment of all potential biomass carbon stocks, and other potential in order to change management activities (Birdsey and Pan 2015; Law and Waring 2015; Noormets et al. 2015). The ability of fast-growing stand types to absorb carbon faster than slow-growing stands is one of the strong reasons why it is necessary to plant and cultivate fast-growing stands in plantation forests (Chauhan et al. 2016a). In addition to producing biomass, most plantations produce wood and provide environmental services in the form of water management and carbon sinks (Kanninen 2010; Chauhan et al. 2016b). One type of fast growing stands is teak and gmelina. This is because besides being fast growing, Teak (*Tectona grandis* Linn.f.) is an important commercial stand type and has a high selling value (Warner et al. 2017) and is a type of light wood with a round crown, large leaves, and the stem can be transparent and resistant to fire (Meunpong 2012). Meanwhile, *Gmelina arborea* Roxb. is one type of plant that is widely developed for industrial plantations in tropical regions such as Indonesia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and some countries in Southeast Asia. Gmelina is a type of fast growing stand, can live well in the lowlands to an altitude of 1200 m above sea level with an average rainfall of 750-5000 mm year^{-1} (Adinugraha and Setiadi 2018).

Research on forest potential is very important. This is in line with the statement from Nonini and Fiala (2019) that estimating carbon storage in forests is very important to support climate change and mitigation and promote the transition to a low-carbon emission economy.This research includes the potential for the stands, the potential for biomass and carbon. One of the factors that determine the analysis of forest potential is the allometric method, which is measuring the potential of biomass and carbon with standard standards. Based on this background, the following problems can be formulated: how much is the amount of carbon content with the approach of calculating the amount of biomass. This is because carbohydrates are obtained from photosynthesis stored in living plant organs. Karyati et al (2019) stated that the allometric equation for estimating aboveground biomass on this land is still limited. So it is necessary to do this research to analyze the allometric relationship between diameter at breast height, tree height, leaves, branches, stems, and total aboveground biomass (TAGB) in an abandoned land. This is in line with Edson and Wing 2011; Durkaya et al. 2013 where allometric equations and tree dimensions such as diameter and total height can be used to calculate forest stand biomass. Allometric equations have a very important role in reducing the uncertainty of biomass estimation. This is expected to provide great benefits in implementing climate change mitigation programs, especially in the forestry sector (Anitha et al. 2015). There are two methods commonly used to estimate the carbon content of forest stands, namely by: (1). indirect measurement by changing the biomass using a specific carbon content figure. This method is most widely used by using a constant carbon content of 50% of the biomass weight (Brown 1997) and 47% of the biomass weight (Kristiningrum et al. 2019). Carbon stocks in arable land contain higher carbon storage and vegetation biomass (Hairiah et al.2011). Therefore, this study aims to calculate the stand potential, stand biomass and carbon stocks of teak and gmelina in the Gorontalo region. The aim of this research is to develop an allometric equation for estimating AGB with a coefficient of determination that can predict biomass and carbon stock in the land after being abandoned.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

The experiment was conducted from September 2020 to December 2020 in Gorontalo Province. The field experiments were conducted in four plots of *Tectona grandis* were two plots and *Gmelina arborea* were two plots. The area was located on the coordinate 0º 32 '28 "North Latitude and 123º 03 '36 "East Longitude.



Figure 1. Location studies (in which**: A** = *G. Arborea* plot II, **B** = *T.grandis* plot I**, C** = *G. Arborea* plot I , **D** = *T.grandis* plot II)

Research object

The objects to be studied were 2 types of teak and gmelina stands, each with a plot area of 1 hectare each, so that the number of research plots was 4 plots, with different spacing. Where the *Tectona grandis* plant spacing is 3m x 3m and the

Gmelina arborea spacing is 3.5m x 4m. Determination of the sample and the location of the study by purposive sampling, with the sampling method using systematic random sampling. Then the data obtained is analyzed mathematically using simple linear regression. To find the closeness of the relationship between age and increment, the polynomial method was used to determine the regression coefficient.

Data analysis

Estimating MAI and CAI

Data collection includes diameter, plant species as high as 1.3 m from the soil surface (cm). Carbon (C) storage (kg per year) can be estimated by multiplying the tree biomass (Y: kg) with the general vegetation carbon content, namely (0.46) (Hairiah and Rahayu 2007). Carbon stock calculations were also carried out on cultivated plants *Tectona grandis* (teak) and *Gmelina arborea* (white teak) planted on land by the community.

Maximum production was calculated by analyzing the growth increment of *T. grandis* and *G. arborea* tree in a particular measurement time span (cycle), which included mean annual increment (MAI) and current annual increment (CAI). Van Gardingen et al. (2003) state that the increment is defined as an increase in the dimensional growth (height, diameter, base plane, volume) or an increase in the standing stock of a tree, in relation to the tree age or a particular period

$$V = \frac{1}{4}\pi d^2 hf$$

in which: V = standing volume, d = diameter at breast height (Dbh), h = branch-free height, f = form factor

According to Van Gardingen et al. (2003), to estimate the mean annual increment (MAI) and the current annual increment, the following mathematic formulas were used:

$$MAI = \frac{V_t}{t}$$

in which: MAI = Mean annual increment, V_t = Total volume in ages t_0 - t (m^3); t = Ages (years)

$$CAI = \frac{V_t - V_{t-1}}{T}$$

In which: CAI = Current annual increment, V_t = Total volume in ages t_0 - t (m^3), V_{t-1} = Previous total volume (m^3), T = Second age t_0 - t, minus the first age (in year)

The estimation of tree biomass and carbon

The method proposed for estimating biomass and carbon stock is to estimate biomass based on a combination tree height, trunk diameter and wood density are used (Chave et al., 2014).According to the Indonesian National Standard [SNI] number 7724 (2011) Determination of Biomass/Mass and stored carbon and Irundu et al (2020) using the following formula:

$$M = BJ \times V_t \times BEF$$

In which : BJ = Specific Gravity, V_t = Total Volume, BEF = Biomass Exfaction Factor (1.3)

$$Cb = B \times \%\ C\ Organic$$

In which: Cb = Carbon content of biomass (kg), B = Total biomass (kg), % C Organic = Percentage value of carbon content, amounting to 0.47 (Hairiah et al. 2011).

The determination of the biomass potential is calculated by multiplying the biomass obtained per plot with the conversion unit to ton ha^{-1}. According to Adhitya et al. (2013) Calculation of the Biomass content per hectares for aboveground biomass with the following formula:

Biomass (kg ha^{-1}) = Biomass (kg m^{-2}) x 10,000 m^2

Biomass and stored carbon have a causal relationship with tree volume values.

Determination of the value of biomass and stored carbon can be determined through a volume value approach. According to Ruslianto et al. (2019), determining the causal relationship to the tree dimensions using the general regression formula as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = a + bX$$

In which: $\hat{Y}$ = Estimated value of biomass, X = Volume (m^3), a, b = regression constant

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Estimation of standing volume standing done by using measurement data inventory result tree parameters. From the results of this inventory, data obtained the measurement results of the Dbh parameter, tree height, and tree number data on each plot in the classroom age. The data is further processed to find out the average Dbh, high average, volume each tree,

tree density per hectare, and the volume of trees per hectare. Based on the results of data processing, known Dbh and average tree height, so that the average tree volume standing can be known.

Growth of *Tectona grandis*

Growth of Tectona grandis Plot I

T. *grandis* which was cultivated in plot I at the beginning was planted using a spacing of 3m x 3m, so the initial number of trees was 1,111 trees. However, at a later age, the teak stands experienced a reduction in the number of trees due to natural mortality or due to thinning activities. Based on the teak growth table, the number of trees, diameter, height, total volume and increment of teak can be seen as follows:

Table 1. The volume of *T. grandis* in plot I

Age	n	d	h	f	TV	MAI	CAI	B.A	Biomass	Carbon
2	910	3.1	2	0.8	1.10	0.55		0.69	0.96	0.45
4	880	5.9	3.5	0.8	6.73	1.68	2.82	2.40	5.86	2.76
7	750	8.8	5.3	0.8	9.33	2.76	4.20	4.56	16.84	7.91
9	700	10.9	6.3	0.8	2.90	3.66	6.79	6.53	28.66	13.47
10	610	12.4	6.9	0.8	40.88	4.09	7.97	7.36	35.60	16.73
15	600	20.0	7.5	0.7	98.91	6.59	11.61	18.84	86.15	40.49
20	570	26.0	7.8	0.7	165.79	8.29	13.38	30.25	144.40	67.87
25	560	31.0	7.8	0.7	230.66	9.23	12.97	42.25	200.91	94.43
30	550	37.5	7.9	0.6	287.79	9.59	11.43	60.71	250.66	117.81
32	**500**	**40.4**	**8.0**	**0.6**	**307.50**	**9.61**	**9.86**	**64.06**	**267.83**	**125.88**
34	460	42.0	8.5	0.6	324.86	9.55	8.68	63.70	282.95	132.99
35	400	45.0	8.7	0.6	331.91	9.48	7.05	63.59	289.10	135.88

Notes: N = Population of *T.grandis* (tree ha^{-1}), d = Tree Diameter (cm), h = clear bole height (m), F = form factor, TV = Total Volume (m^3 ha^{-1}), MAI = Mean Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), CAI = Current Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), B.A = Bassal area (m^2ha)

Based on the table above, it can be explained that at the plot I in 1 hectare at the age of 2 years there are 910 teak trees with a diameter at 2 years to 35 years of 3.1 to 45 cm. While the height is 2 to 8.7 meters. The total volume from 2 years to 35 years is 1.10 to 331.91 m^3ha^{-1}. Meanwhile, the growth increment ranged from 0.55 to 9.61 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$. The maximum total volume of teak reached at the age of 32 years is 307.50 m^3 ha^{-1} and an increment of 9.61 and 9.86 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$ with the number of trees per hectare as many as 500 trees.

The graphical relationship between MAI and CAI teak in plot I can be seen in the image below



Figure 2. The corellation of MAI and CAI *T. grandis* in Plot I

The graphs according to Kristiningrum et al. (2019), Winarni et al. (2017), Muliadi et al. (2017), and Dinga (2014) in Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5 exhibits certain characteristics, as follow: CAI curve rapidly reached the peak and from there declined immediately, whereas the MAI curve climbed and declined slowly. Based on the picture above, it can be explained that the MAI and CAI increments of teak initially increased and met at one point, namely the age of 32 years. This means that the maximum increment of teak is reached at the age of 32 years. After experiencing a maximum increment at the age of 32 years, the teak after the age of 32 years will experience a decline. This is supported by a simple linear regression test with a polynomial type on MAI which has an R^2 value of 99%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the MAI increment of 99% and 1% influenced by other factors. Meanwhile, CAI has an R^2 value of 97%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the CAI increment of 97% and 3% is influenced by other factors.

Growth of Tectona grandis Plot II

T.grandis which was cultivated in plot II at the beginning was planted using a spacing of 3m x 3m, so the initial number of trees was 1,111 trees. However, at a later age, the teak stands experienced a reduction in the number of trees due to natural mortality or due to thinning activities. Based on the teak growth table, the number of trees, diameter, height, total volume and increment of teak can be seen as follows:

Table 2. The volume of *T. grandis* in plot II

Age	n	d	h	f	TV	MAI	CAI	B.A	Biomass	Carbon
2	800	3.0	2.0	0.80	0.90	0.45		0.57	0.79	0.37
4	700	6.0	3.7	0.77	5.64	1.41	2.37	1.98	4.91	2.31
7	650	9.0	4.7	0.75	14.57	2.08	2.98	4.13	12.69	5.96
8	630	10.0	5.3	0.74	19.40	2.42	4.83	4.95	16.89	7.94
9	604	12.0	5.8	0.73	28.91	3.21	9.51	6.83	25.18	11.83
10	580	14.0	6.1	0.72	38.87	3.89	9.96	8.92	33.86	15.91
15	560	21.5	7.7	0.72	112.66	7.51	14.76	20.32	98.12	46.12
20	550	26.5	8.5	0.70	180.40	9.02	13.55	30.32	157.13	73.85
25	**500**	**31.6**	**9.0**	**0.65**	**229.28**	**9.17**	**9.78**	**39.19**	**199.70**	**93.86**
30	400	38.0	9.3	0.60	253.82	8.46	4.91	45.34	221.08	103.91

Notes: N = Population of *T.grandis* (tree ha^{-1}), d = Tree Diameter (cm), h = clear bole height (m), F = form factor, TV = Total Volume (m^3 ha^{-1}), MAI = Mean Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), CAI = Current Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), B.A = Bassal area (m^2ha)

Based on the table above, it can be explained that at plot II in 1 hectare at the age of 2 years there are 800 teak trees with a diameter at 2 years to 30 years of 3.0 to 38 cm. While the height is 2 to 9.3 meters. The total volume from 2 years to 30 years is 0.90 to 229.28 m^3 ha^{-1}. Meanwhile, the growth increment ranged from 0.45 to 9.17 m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$. The maximum total volume of teak reached at the age of 25 years is 229.28 m^3 ha^{-1} and an increment of 9.17 and 9.78 m^3 $ha^{-1}year^{-1}$ with the number of trees per hectare as many as 500 trees.

The graphical relationship between MAI and CAI teak in plot II can be seen in the image below



Figure 3. The corellation of MAI and CAI *T. grandis* in Plot II

Based on the picture above, it can be explained that the MAI and CAI increments initially increased and met at one point, namely the age of 32 years. This means that the maximum increment of teak is reached at the age of 25 years. After experiencing a maximum increment at the age of 25 years, the teak after the age of 25 years will experience a decline. This is supported by a simple linear regression test with a polynomial type on MAI which has an R^2 value of 95%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and MAI increment of 95% and 5% influenced by other factors. Meanwhile, CAI has an R^2 value of 88%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the CAI increment of 86% and 14% is influenced by other factors. This causes teak growth at a young age to be more developed. Meanwhile, according to Murtinah et al. (2015), stated that the growth of teak stands in East Kalimantan generally shows a decline in growth along with the increasing age of the stands. The growth of a tree stand both in height and diameter is influenced by climate and soil fertility. In addition, it is also influenced by the space and surface of the canopy, relative humidity and the root system (Juwari et al. 2020a).

The highest growth in diameter and height of stands occurred in the early stages of growth, namely in the range of 1-5 years of age, then there was a gradual decline in growth and was seen to decrease after 12 years of age stands; Until the stand was 12 years old, generally teak growth in East Kalimantan showed a higher growth (increment) in diameter and height compared to several teak plant locations in Java. Meanwhile, according to Alam et al. (2017) and Setiawan et al. (2011) who conducted research in Samboja District, East Kalimantan Province, stated that the potential (total volume and increment) respectively, for maximum teak at the age of 25, namely for super teak of 154.32 m^3 and 6.17 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$ and Solomon teak 150.94 m^3 and 6.04 m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$.

Information in KPH Nganjuk states that the diameter increment of teak from root graft reaches 25-28 cm at the age of 20 years, while the diameter increment of the original plant is only 1-2 cm $year^{-1}$. In optimal site conditions, teak volume increment can reach 7.9 - 10 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$ (Susila 2012). According to Yunianti et al. (2011) stated that in terms of silviculture, plants with long rotation accelerated growth were pursued to meet market demand. The wide spacing produces trees with large appearance in terms of quantity is very profitable, while in terms of wood quality, the accelerated plant species reduce some wood properties, especially strength. The effort taken should be to choose a place to grow that is very suitable for the plant so that even though its growth is accelerated, the quality of the wood remains stable.

Growth of *Gmelina arborea*

Growth of G. arborea Plot I

G. arborea which was cultivated in plot I at the beginning was planted using a spacing of 3.5m x 4m, so the initial number of trees was 714 trees. However, at a later age, the *G. arborea* stands experienced a reduction in the number of trees due to natural mortality or due to thinning activities. Based on the *G. arborea* growth table, the number of trees, diameter, height, total volume and increment of *G. arborea* can be seen as follows:

Table 3. The volume of *G.arborea* in plot I

Age	n	d	h	f	TV	MAI	CAI	B.A	Biomass	Carbon
2	660	6	4	0.90	6.71	3.36		1.87	3.67	1.72
4	570	13	5	0.87	32.89	8.22	13.09	7.56	17.96	8.44
6	550	17	5.5	0.88	60.39	10.07	13.75	12.48	32.97	15.50
8	530	21	6	0.82	90.27	11.28	14.94	18.35	49.29	23.17
10	500	23.6	7	0.79	120.89	12.09	15.31	21.86	66.01	31.02
12	470	24.6	9	0.75	150.71	12.56	14.91	22.33	82.29	38.68
15	**430**	**28**	**10**	**0.72**	**190.54**	**12.70**	**13.28**	**26.46**	**104.03**	**48.90**
20	360	32	12	0.71	248.29	12.41	11.55	28.94	135.57	63.72
25	350	34	14	0.64	284.58	11.38	7.26	31.76	155.38	73.03

Notes: N = Population of *G. arborea* (tree ha^{-1}), d = Tree Diameter (cm), h = clear bole height (m), F = form factor, TV = Total Volume (m^3 ha^{-1}), MAI = Mean Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), CAI = Current Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), B.A = Bassal area (m^2ha)

Based on the table above, it can be explained that *G. arborea* at plot I in one hectare at the age of two years there are 660 teak trees with a diameter at 2 years to 25 years of 6 to 34 cm. While the height is 4 to 14 meters. The total volume from 2 years to 25 years is 6.71 to 284.58 m^3ha^{-1}. Meanwhile, the growth increment ranged from 3.36 to 12.70 m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$. The maximum total volume of *G. arborea* reached at the age of 15 years is 190.54 m^3 ha^{-1} and an increment of 12.70 and 13.28 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$ with the number of trees per hectare as many as 430 trees. The graphical relationship between MAI and CAI *G. arborea* in plot I can be seen in the image below.



Figure 4. The corellation of MAI and CAI *G. arborea* in Plot I

Based on the picture above, it can be explained that the MAI and CAI increments initially increased and met at one point, namely the age of 15 years. This means that the maximum increment of *G. arborea* is reached at the age of 15 years. After experiencing a maximum increment at the age of 15 years, the *G. arborea* after the age of 15 years will experience a decline. This is supported by a simple linear regression test with a polynomial type on MAI which has an R^2 value of 90%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the MAI increment of 91% and 9% influenced by other factors. Meanwhile, CAI has an R^2 value of 98%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the CAI increment of 98% and 2% is influenced by other factors.

Growth of G. arborea Plot II

Based on the *G. arborea* growth table, the number of trees, diameter, height, total volume and increment of *G. arborea* in Plot II can be seen as follows:

Table 4. The volume of *G.arborea* in plot II

Age	**n**	**d**	**h**	**f**	**TV**	**MAI**	**CAI**	**B.A**	**Biomass**	**Carbon**
2	660	5	3	0.90	3.50	1.75		1.30	1.91	0.90
4	600	13.8	5.3	0.87	41.36	10.34	18.93	8.97	22.58	10.61
6	570	18.5	6.2	0.86	81.65	13.61	20.15	15.31	44.58	20.95
8	540	21.3	8	0.80	123.08	15.39	20.72	19.23	67.20	31.59
10	510	23.5	9.5	0.78	163.83	16.38	20.37	22.11	89.45	42.04
12	470	27	10	0.75	201.72	16.81	18.95	26.90	110.14	51.77
15	**450**	**30**	**11**	**0.72**	251.80	16.79	16.69	31.79	137.48	64.62
20	380	34	13	0.70	313.80	15.69	12.40	34.48	171.33	80.53
25	370	35.5	15	0.64	351.40	14.06	7.52	36.60	191.86	90.18

Notes: N = Population of *G. arborea* (tree ha^{-1}), d = Tree Diameter (cm), h = clear bole height (m), F = form factor, TV = Total Volume (m^3 ha^{-1}), MAI = Mean Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), CAI = Current Annual Increment (m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$), B.A = Bassal area (m^2ha)

Based on the table above, it can be explained that *G. arborea* at plot II in one hectare at the age of 2 years there are 660 *G. arborea* trees with a diameter at 2 years to 25 years of 5 to 35.5 cm. While the height is 3 to 15 meters. The total volume from 2 years to 25 years is 3.50 to 351.40 m^3ha^{-1}. Meanwhile, the growth increment ranged from 1.75 to 16.69 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$. The maximum total volume of *G. arborea* reached at the age of 15 years is 251.80 m^3 ha^{-1} and an increment of 16.79 and 16.69 $m^3ha^{-1}year^{-1}$ with the number of trees per hectare as many as 450 trees.

The potential growth of teak stands was better than that of gmelina stands. This is due to differences in spacing and density of different trees per hectare. One of the factors that can affect the size of the stand diameter is the density and intensity of sunlight entering the stand. According to Sedjarawan et al. (2014), stand density will affect the light entering the vegetation. Stands that receive little sunlight will experience slow growth so that they have a small stem diameter. In addition, the light intensity will also have an influence on cell enlargement and differentiation such as height growth, leaf size and the structure of the leaves and stems. The results showed that the increasing age of both teak and gmelina stands, the more the amount of standing carbon stock would also increase. According to Lubis et al. (2013), standing carbon stock increases with the increase in stem diameter and a decrease in carbon stock occurs when the number of stands or density found in that diameter class is only small.

The graphical relationship between MAI and CAI *G. arborea* in plot II can be seen in the image below



Figure 5. The corellation of MAI and CAI *G. arborea* in Plot II

Based on the picture above, it can be explained that the MAI and CAI increments initially increased and met at one point, namely the age of 15 years. This means that the maximum increment of *G. arborea* is reached at the age of 15 years. After experiencing a maximum increment at the age of 15 years, the *G. arborea* after the age of 15 years will experience a decline. This is supported by a simple linear regression test with a polynomial type on MAI which has an R^2 value of 86%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the MAI increment of 86% and 14% influenced by other factors. Meanwhile, CAI has an R^2 value of 98%. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and the CAI of 98% and 2% is influenced by other factors.

At the age of 10, according to Sandalayuk et al. (2018), the increase in diameter reaches 2.4 cm $year^{-1}$ and resembles an increase in diameter of Jabon of 2.1 cm $year^{-1}$. Meanwhile, according to the data above, the increase in gmelina diameter at the age of 10 was 2.36 cm $year^{-1}$. The maximum total volume of *G. arborea* achieved at the age of 15 years of biological rotation is 190.54 m^3 ha^{-1} and increments of 12.70 and 13.28 m^3 ha^{-1} $year^{-1}$ and the number of trees is 430. Meanwhile, according to Siarudin and Indrayana (2015) that if *Gmelina arborea* is harvested at the age of 14 years, it has a total volume of 122 $m^3 ha^{-1}$ and a diameter of 15 cm, whereas if harvested at the age of 20 years, the diameter is 20 cm and the total volume is 146 m^3 ha^{-1}. This means that the age of a stand also influences the biomass and the amount of carbon stored in a stand (Lukito and Rohmatiah 2013).



Figure 6. A. *Tectona grandis* stands at the age of 15 years with spacing of 3 m x 3 m at Plot I and B.*Tectona grandis* stands at the age of 15 years with spacing of 3 m x 3 m at Plot II

Figure 7. A. *Gmelina arborea* stands at the age of 15 years with spacing of 3.5 m x 4 m at Plot I and B. *Gmelina arborea* stands at the age of 15 years with spacing of 3.5 m x 4 m at Plot II

Carbon and biomass production

The increase in CO_2 gas emissions in the air causes an increase in global temperatures on earth. Function forests as carbon sinks in the very atmosphere needed to maintain the earth's temperature apart from forests as biodiversity conservation. Information regarding the amount of carbon absorbed in the plant biomass (carbon stock) in an area becomes very important to know (Trimanto 2014). Carbon dioxide (CO2) is an important component in the photosynthesis process. The carbon dioxide absorbed by the stands will compose carbohydrates as a result of photosynthesis and stored in the form of biomass. Therefore, the amount of standing biomass can be used as a basis for determining the amount of carbon stock or the amount of CO2 absorbed and stored by the stands (Uthbah et al. 2017). According to Sardjono et al. (2017), biomass has a very close relationship with the photosynthesis process. Biomass increases because plants absorb CO2 from the air and convert it into organic compounds through the process of photosynthesis. In addition, stands will easily absorb carbon if the soil pH is neutral (Setiawan 2013). Therefore, neutral soil pH also affects the presence of carbon absorption. According to Putri and Wulandari (2015) stated that the biomass of a stand can be estimated using an allometric equation whose parameter is the diameter of the stand. The large diameter of the stands causes the greater the biomass and carbon stored, and vice versa, the smaller the stand diameter, the smaller the biomass and carbon stored in it.

The tree allometric equation is one way of measuring forest resources. This can yield some estimates standing volume, biomass and carbon stock. The equation obtained is a statistical model used to explain the relationship between the various components of a tree stand. It gives permission to foresters to take simple measurements of tree stands, such as measuring diameter, height, biomass and carbon (Kasim et al. 2014). Therefore, the analysis of simple linear regression was needed. To measure the precision of the regression line which was used to identify the variability of data explained by the regression model, the coefficient of determination was required, which was symbolized as R^2. The maximum value of R^2 as 100%, and the minimum value was 0%, with the following criteria: if the value of R^2 was high, then there was a strong correlation between X and Y or if $R^2 = 0$, then there was no any correlation between X and Y. If the value of R^2 was low, then the correlation between X and Y was weak (Handayani 2010: Kristiningrum et al. 2019 and Muliadi et al. 2017). In addition, if the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) showed a precise and strong correlation between the independent and dependent variables, then, according to this criterion, it could give greater confidence on the acceptance of the model. The high value of R^2 means that there was a strong correlation between the variables (Grafen and Hails 2002; Arezoo et al. 2014).

Mansur and Tuheteru (2011) explain that age was very influential in the production of carbon. If the trees were getting older, their ability to absorb carbon was also high. Measurement of deep forest biomass this research was conducted on the whole tree consists of aboveground biomass (aboveground biomass) includes stems, branches, and leaves. In addition, it turns out that the number of trees per hectare and the density of the stands greatly affect the presence of biomass and carbon. This means that the denser and healthier the stand, the greater the amount of biomass and carbon. (Juwari et al. 2020b). Based on this statement, a relationship between age and carbon is made as shown below. The stand age, in relation to its influence on carbon sequestration, had a very strong and high correlation (R^2), the average regression coefficient is 97%. Where the regression coefficient of the relationship between age and carbon in teak plot I is 98%, teak plot II is 96%, gmelina plot I is 99% and gmelina plot II is 97%. According to Sugiyono (2012), the coefficient value determination in the range of 80% - [illegible]0% means that there is a very strong relationship the dependent variable and the independent variable. This indicated that there was a strong correlation between age and carbon because th[illegible] value of its coefficient of determination was higher than 90% and the graph of each correlation formed a linear shape. This is in line with research conducted by Sar[illegible]no et al (2017) that there is a close relationship between age and carbon in *A.cadamba*. While according to Polosakan et al. (2014) and Uthbah et al. (2017) stated that the difference in the amount of biomass above the soil surface was influenced by the age of the stands. Stand age has an effect on biomass because stand age affects the volume of stems and density of stand wood. The older the stand, the higher the volume and density of wood stands.



Figure 8. The correlation between the stand age and production carbon of *T. grandis* and *G. arborea*

Meanwhile, the relationship between carbon and basal area in each type of stand can be seen in the figure below



Figure 9. The correlation between the production carbon and basal area of *T. grandis* and *G. arborea*

Based on the picture above, it can be explained that the production of carbon in relation to its influence on basal area, had a very strong and high correlation (R^2), the average regression coefficient is 97%. Where the regression coefficient of the relationship between carbon and basal area in teak plot I and II is 99%, gmelina plot I is 92% and gmelina plot II is 99%. This indicated that there was a strong correlation between carbon and basal area because the value of its coefficient of determination was higher than 90% and the graph of each correlation formed a linear shape. This means that the regression coefficient of both the relationship between age and carbon and carbon with the basal area has a regression coefficient value above 97%. And the graph of each correlation formed a linear shape. This value means that there is a close relationship between age and carbon of 97% and 3% is influenced by other factors. So is the same relationship between carbon and basal area of about 97% and 3% is influenced by other factors. And the graph of each correlation formed a linear shape. This is in line with the research conducted by Kumi et al. (2019) where in their research, they chose teak species and gave results that the teak biomass estimation was very accurate and ignored differences in areas, tree characteristics and diameters that had high, constant ratios, stems and sharp crowns with determination coefficient (R^2 = 0.99) and significant (Bredu and Birigazzi 2014).

Meanwhile, the relationship between each stand at its maximum age is related to the total volume, basal area, biomass and carbon can be seen in the table below.

Table 5. The volume, basal area, biomass and carbon each stand

No	Type	Age (yr)	TV (m^3ha^{-1})	BA (m^2ha^{-1})	Biomass (ton ha^{-1})	Carbon (ton ha^{-1})
1	*T. grandis* Plot I	32	307.50	64.06	267.83	125.88
2	*T. grandis* Plot II	25	254.81	43.56	221.94	104.31
3	*G.arborea* Plot I	15	190.54	26.46	104.03	48.90
4	*G.arborea* Plot II	15	251.80	31.79	137.48	64.62

Notes: TV = Total volume (m^3 ha^{-1}), BA= Basal area (m^2 ha^{-1})

Based on the table above, it can be explained that the teak plot I at the age of 32 years has the largest total volume, basal area, biomass and carbon among other stands of 307.5 m^3 ha^{-1}; 64.06 m^2 ha^{-1}; 257.83 ton ha^{-1} and 125.88 ton ha^{-1}. then followed by teak plot II, gmelina plot II and finally gmelina plot I. This is due to the different fertility rates in each type of stand. The teak plot 2 at the age of 25 years has total volume 254.81 m^3 ha^{-1}, basal area 43.56 m^2 ha^{-1}; biomass 221.94 ton ha^{-1} and carbon 104.31 ton ha^{-1}. *G. arborea* plot II at the age of 15 years has total volume 251.80 m^3 ha^{-1}, basal area 31.79 m^2 ha^{-1}; biomass 137.48 ton ha^{-1} and carbon 64.62 ton ha^{-1}, while *G. arborea* plot 1 at the age of 15 years has total volume 190.54 m^3 ha^{-1}, basal area 26.46 m^2 ha^{-1}; biomass 104.03 ton ha^{-1} and carbon 48.90 ton ha^{-1}. The amount of carbon in gmelina plot one is almost the same as the amount of *gmelina arborea* in East Kutai District, East Kalimantan, Indonesia as research conducted by Amirta et al (2016). According to Trimanto (2014) states that production of *G. arborea* tends to store carbon in large quantities smaller 19.96 ton C ha^{-1} or 2.49 ton C $ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$ compared to production of *Tectona grandis* which can store as much carbon 114.88 ton C ha^{-1} or 9.57 ton C ha^{-1} yr^{-1}. Our results show that both younger stands of teak and gmelina produce higher tree densities when compared with old stands. However, basalt the area of older stands is larger than that of younger stands. This is in line with research conducted by Rinnangmang et al (2020). In addition, the management of stands has a significant effect on the characteristics of the stands and the soil content as a place to grow stands. Therefore, good forest managers must apply intensive forest management practices optimize the benefits of plantations (Kumi et al. 2020).

The graphical relationship between total volume, basal area, biomass and carbon each stand can be seen in the image below



Figure 8. The correlation between total volume, basal area, biomass and carbon each stand

Research result shows that *T. grandis* stands have the highest total stored carbon when compared to *G. arborea*. Fast growth and the ability of *T. grandis* trees to absorb carbon dioxide (CO_2) makes this plant the most stored carbon among tree species other. According to Lubis et al. (2013), the increase in biomass and carbon stored by trees goes hand in hand the increase in the dimensions of the stem includes the diameter and height. This indicates that at diameter and height have a linear relationship. This can be seen from the total volume of each stand. Where *T. grandis* plot I has the largest total volume among the three types of stands. Forest plantations play a critical role in mitigating the various effects of environmental degradation and increasing absorption of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and also its consequences on climate change. Tree promotes sequestration of carbon into soil and plant biomass. The outcome of this study revealed that *Tectona grandis* and *Gmelina arborea* has a great potential in promoting carbon sequestration especially when they are allowed to grow older. Favorable growth conditions have high potential of increasing the biomass accumulation of this species. Hence, it is recommended that sustainable management of this plantation should be paramount in securing a cleaner environment and mitigating the effect of climate change in Indonesia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our gratitude to Umbar Sujoko for his help in creating the map of the study site. The authors would like to acknowledge the anonymous reviewers for providing constructive comments to improve the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Adhitya PW, Hardiansyah G, Yani A. 2013. Estimation of surface carbon content on a tree in the Ketapang Regency City Forest Area. J Sustain Forests, 2 (1), 23-32.

Adinugraha HA, Setiadi D. 2018. Selection of Seed Trees of Gmelina arborea Roxb. at Smallholder Forest In Bondowoso, East Java. Tropical Forest J 16(1): 6-12.

Alam AS, Rafiuddin, Setiawan, B. 2017. Financial analysis systems teak and elephant grass agroforestry in Samboja District Kutai Kartanegara Regency, East Kalimantan. Proceedings National Biodiversity Conservation: 136-142.

Amirta R, Yuliansyah, Angi EM, Ananto BR, Setyono B, Haqiqi MT, Septiana HA, Lodong M, Oktavianto RN. 2016. Plant diversity and energy potency of community forest in East Kalimantan, Indonesia: Searching for fast growing wood species for energy production. Nusantara Bioscience 8: 22-30. [Indonesian].

Anitha K, Verchot LV, Joseph S, Herold M, Manuri S, Avitabile V. 2015. A review of forest and tree plantation biomass equations in Indonesia. Annals of Forest Science, 72: 981-997.

Arezoo S, Sankhayan PL, Hofstad O. 2014. A dynamic bio-economic model for community management of goat and oak forests in Zagros, Iran.J Ecol Econ 106: 174-185.

Arias D, Alvarado J, Richter DJ, Dohrenbusch A. 2011. Productivity, aboveground biomass, nutrient uptake and carbon content in fast growing tree plantations of native and introduced species in the Southern Region of Costa Rica. Biomass Bioenerg 35: 1779-1788.

Birdsey R, Pan Y. 2015. Trends in management of the world's forests and impacts on carbon stocks. For Ecol Manag 355: 83-90.

Bredu AS, Birigazzi L. 2014. Proceedings of the regional technical workshop on tree volume and biomass allometric equations in west africa. UN–-REDD Programme MRV Report 21, Kumasi, Ghana, Forestry Research Institute of Ghana. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

Brown S. 1997. Estimating biomass and biomass change of tropical forests: A primer, FAO Forestry Paper 134, Rome: Food Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.

Calfapietra C, Barbati A, Perugini L, Ferrari B, Guidolotti G, Quatrini A, Corona P, 2015. Carbon mitigation potential of difffferent forest ecosystems under climate change and various in Italy. Ecosyst. Heal Sustain 1 (8): 1–9.

Chanan M. 2012. Estimation of carbon stock (c) stored above ground in teak plantations (Tectona grandis Linn, F) (at RPH Seng guruh BKPH Sengguruh KPH Malang Perum Perhutani II East Java). Gamma Journal 7 (2): 61-73 [Indonesian].

Chauhan SK, Sharma R, Panwar P, Chander J. 2016a. Short rotation forestry: a path for economic and environmental prosperity. In: Parthiban KT, Seenivasan R (eds.). Forestry Technologies - A Complete Value Chain Approach. Vol.1 Scientific Publishers, Jodhpur.

Chauhan SK, Ritu, Chauhan R. 2016b. Carbon sequestration in plantations. Agroforestry for increased production and livelihood security (Eds. Gupta, S.K., Panwar, P. and Kaushal, R.). New Indian Publishing Agency, New Delhi.

Chave J, Réjou MM, Búrquez A, ChidumayoE, Colgan MS, Delitti WBC, Duque A, Eid T, Fearnside PM, Goodman RC, Henry M, Martínez YrízarA, Mugasha WA, Muller Landau HC, Mencuccini M, Nelson BW, Ngomanda A, Nogueira EM, Ortiz ME, Pélissier R, Ploton P, Ryan CM, SaldarRJG, Vieilleden G. 2014. Improved allometric models to estimate the aboveground biomass of tropical trees. Glob. Change Biol 20: 3177–3190.

Dinga E. 2014. On a possible predictor of the cyclical position of the economy. Procedia Econ Finance 8:254-261.

Domec JC, Ward EJ, Oishi AC, Palmroth S, Radecki A, Bell DM, Miao G, Gavazzi M, Johnson DM, King JS, McNulty, SG, Oren R, Sun G, Noormets A. 2015. Conversion of natural forests to managed forest plantations decreases tree resistance to prolonged droughts. For Ecol Manag 355: 58-71.

Durkaya B, Durkaya A, Makineci E, Karaburk T. 2013. Estimating above ground biomass and carbon stock of individual trees in uneven-aged Uludag Fir stands. Fresenius Environ Bull 22 (2): 428-434.

Edson C, Wing MG. 2011. Airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) for individual tree stem location, height, and biomass measurements. Remote Sens 3 (11): 2494-2528.

Ekholm T. 2016. Optimal forest rotation age under eficient climate change mitigation. For. Policy Econ. 62: 62–68.

Gonzalez-Benecke CA, Samuelson LJ, Martin TA, Cropper Jr WP, Johnsen KH, Stokes TA, Butnor JR, Anderson PH. 2015. Modeling the effects of forest management on in situ and ex situ longleaf pine forest carbon stocks. For Ecol Manag 355: 24-36.

Gren IM, Zeleke AA. 2016. Policy design for forest carbon sequestration: a review of the literature. For Policy Econ. 70: 128–136.

Handayani. 2010. Regression models. STIE Atma Bhakti, Surakarta. [Indonesian].

Hairiah K, Andree A, Rika RS, Subekti R. 2011. Measurement of carbon stock from land level to landscape 2nd edition. Bogor: Agroforestry Center.

Irundu D, Beddu MA, Najmawati. 2020. Potential of biomass and carbon stored stands in green open space Polewali City, West Sulawesi. J Forests Communities 12 (1): 49-57.

Juwari, Ruhiyat D, Aipassa MI, Ruslim Y. 2020a. Carbon stocks of Rhizhopora apiculata and Sonneratia alba of mangrove forest in Ngurah Rai Forest Park, Bali Province, Indonesia. J Biodiversity Enviro Sci, 16 (3): 93-105.

Juwari, Ruhiyat D, Aipasaa MI. 2020. Growth analysis of *Rhizophora Mucronata m*angrove in Ngurah Rai Forest Park (Sanur) Bali Province, Indonesia. Energy Enviro Res. 10 (1): 30-35.

Karyati, Widiati KY, Karmini, Mulyadi R. 2019. Development of allometric relationships for estimate above ground biomass of trees in the tropical abandoned land. Biodiversitas 20 (12): 3508-3516.[Indonesian]

Kasim AR, Henry M. Danial M, Faiz M, Birigazi L. 2014. Inventory of tree biomass and volume allometric equations in Southeast Asia. FRIM, Kepong, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy

Kristiningrum R, Lahjie A, Masjaya, Yusuf S, Ruslim Y. 2019. Species diversity, stand productivity, aboveground biomass and economic value of mangrove ecosystem in Mentawir Village, East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Biodiversitas 20 (10): 2848-2857.[Indonesian]

Kumi JA, Kyereh B, Ansong M, Ansate W. 2020. Inflfluence of management practices on stand biomass, carbon stocks and soil nutrient variability of teak plantations in a dry semi-deciduous forest in Ghana. Elsevier.Trees, Forest and People 3.

Lee SY, Primavera JH, Dahdouh-Guebas F, McKee K, Bosire JO, Cannicci S, Diele K, Fromard F, Koedam N, Marchand C, Mendelssohn I, Mukherjee N, Record S. 2014. Ecological role and services of tropical mangrove ecosystems: a reassessment. Global Ecoly and Biography, 23:726-743

Lubis SH, Arifin SH, Samsoedin I. 2013. Analysis of tree carbon stocks in forest landscapes city in DKI Jakarta. J of Fores Sos and Econ Research, 10 (1):1-20.

Lukito M, Rohmatiah A. 2013. Estimated biomass and carbon of teak 5 year (Case of Nusantara Superior Teak Plantation Forest (JUN) Krowe Village, Lembeyan District, Magetan Regency). Agritek Journal 14(1): 1-23

Law BE., Waring, RH. 2015. Carbon implications of current and future effects of drought, fire and management on Pacific Northwest forests. For Ecol Manag 355: 4-14.

Mansur I, Tuheteru FD. 2011. Jabon Tree. Book. Penebar Swadaya. Jakarta..[Indonesian].

Meunpong P. 2012. Nutrient and Carbon Storage in Forest Plantation, Prachuap Khiri Khan province, Thailand. [Dissertation]. Kasetsart University, Bangkok. [Thailand]

Muliadi M, Lahjie AM, Simarangkir BDAS, Ruslim Y. 2017. Bioeconomic and environmental valuation of dipterocarp estate forest based on local wisdom in Kutai Kartanegara, Indonesia. Biodiversitas18(1): 401-408.[Indonesian].

Murtinah V, Ruchaemi A, Ruhiyat D. 2015. Forest growth teak plant (Tectona grandis Linn.f.) in East Kalimantan. J Agrifor 14 (2).

Nonini L, Fiala M. 2019. Estimation of carbon storage of forest biomass for voluntary carbon markets: preliminary results. J. For. Res 32(1):329–338

Noormets A, Epron D, Domec JC, McNulty SG, Fox TD, Chen J, Sun G, King JS. 2015. Effects of forest management on productivity and carbon sequestration: a review and hypothesis. For Ecol Manag 355: 124-140.

Panwar P, Chauhan S, Kaushal R, Das DK, Ajit, Arora G, Chaturvedi OP, Jain AK, Chaturvedi S, Tewari S. 2017. Carbon sequestration potential of poplar-based agroforestry using the CO_2 FIX model in the Indo Gangetic Region of India. Trop Ecol 58 (2): 1-9.

Pinheiro TF, Escada MIS, Valeriano DN, Hostert P, Gollnow F, Müller H. 2016. Forest degradation associated with logging frontier expansion in the Amazon: The BR-163 Region in Southwestern Pará, Brazil. Earth Interactions 20 (17): 1-26.

Rinnamang S, Sirirueang K, Supavetch S, Meunpong P. 2020. Estimation of aboveground biomass using aerial photogrammetry from unmanned aerial vehicles in teak (Tectona grandis) plantation in Thailand. Biodiversitas 21: 2369-2376.[Indonesian].

Riutta T, Malhi Y, Kho LK, Marthews TR, Huasco WH, Khoo M. 2018. Logging disturbance shift net primary productivity and its allocation in Bornean tropical forest. J. Glob Change Biol 24 (7):2913–2928.

Ruslianto M, Alviani, Maisuri, Irundu. 2019. Biomass allometric model of *Rhizophora Apiculata* at Polewali Mandar Regency, West Sulawesi Province. Eboni Buleti Journal 1 (1): 11-19.[Indonesian].

Ruslim Y, Sihombing R, Liah Y. 2016. Stand damage due to mono-cable winch and bulldozer yarding in a selectively logged tropical forest. Biodiversitas 17 (1): 222-228. [Indonesian].

Pandey S, Shukla R, Saket R, Verma D. 2019. Enhancing carbon stocks accumulation through forest protection and regeneration. A review. Int. J. Environ. 8 (1): 16–21

Putri AHM, Wulandari C. 2015. Potential carbon absorption in *Shorea javanica* in Pekon Gunung Kemala Krui, West Lampung. Sylva Lestari 3 (2): 13-20. [Indonesian].

Polosakan R, Alhamd L, Joeni SR. 2014. Estimated biomass and carbon stored in Pinus merkusii Jungh. & de Vriese In the Pine Forest Mt. Bunder, TN. GN Halimun Salak. Biology News. 13 (2): 15-120. [Indonesian].

Sandalayuk D, Lahjie AM, Simarangkir BDAS, Ruslim Y. 2020. Carbon absorbtion of *Anthocephalus macrophyllus* and *Swietenia macrophylla*. King in Gorontalo, Indonesia. Jof Biodiversity and Enviro Scie16 (5): 24-30.

Sandalayuk. D, Soedirman S, Pambudhi F. 2018. Reserves estimating carbon in forest city district village Bongohulawa Gorontalo. **Ijrtem. 2(8), 60-63.**

Sandalayuk D, Lahjie AM, Simarangkir BDAS, Ruslim Y. 2018. Analysis of gmelina and mahogany growth in Gorontalo. J Forest Research. 1 (1): 1-8.

Sardjono A, Lahjie AM, Simarangkir BDAS, Kristiningrum R, Ruslim Y. 2017. Carbon sequestration and growth of *Anthocephalus cadamba* plantation in North Kalimantan, Indonesia. Biodiversitas18(4): 1385-1393.[Indonesian].

Sharma R, Chauhan SK, Tripathi AM. 2016. Carbon sequestration potential in agroforestry system in India: an analysis for carbon project. Agrofor Syst 90 (4):631-644.

Setiawan, B., Lahjie A.M., 2011. Financial analysis of agroforestry systems teak, sungkai, and elephant grass in Samboja Kutai District Kartanegara. . Humida Tropical Forestry Vol. 4 (1).

Setiawan H. 2013. Ecological status of mangrove forest at various thickness level.Wallace's Journal of Forestry Research 2, 104-120. [Indonesian].

Setiawan, B., Lahjie A.M, Yusuf, S, Ruslim. 2019. Model of community forest land management production and financial simulation of super teak, solomon teak and sungkai treesin Samboja Kutai Kartanegara East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Energy and Environment Research 9(20): 48-60.

Siaruddin, M and Indrayana, Y. 2015. Dynamics of carbon stock systems gmelina agroforestry in community forests in Tasikmalaya and Banjar, West Java. Wasian 4 (1): 37-46.

SNI. 2011. Indonesian National Standard Number 7724. Measurement and calculation of carbon stocks - field measurement for forest carbon stock assessment. tandardization Agency. Jakarta. [Indonesian].

Siregar UJ, Narendra BH, Suryana J, Siregar CA, Weston C. 2017. Evaluation on community tree plantations as sustainable source for rural bioenergy in Indonesia. International Conference on Biomass: Technology, Application, and Sustainable Development IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 65: 1-9.

Sugiyono. 2012. Qualitative and uantitative research methods and R&D. Alfabeta. Bandung. [Indonesian].

Susila, IWW. 2012. Estimation model of teak stand volume and increment in Nusa Penida, Klungkung Bali. J of Plant Forest Research 9 (3): 165-178.

Tesfaye MA, Bravo F, Ruiz-Peinado R, Pando V, Bravo-Oviedo A. 2016. Impact of changes in land use, species and elevation on soil organic carbon and total nitrogen in Ethiopian Central Highlands. Geoderma 261: 70-79.

Tong S, Berry HL, Ebi K, Bambrick H, Hu W, Green D, Hanna E, Wang Z, Butler CD. 2016. Climate change, food, water and population health in China. Bull World Health Organ 94:759-765.

Trimanto. 2014. Vegetation analysis and tree biomass estimation of carbon stocks in Seven Montane Forests of Bawean Island Nature Reserve, East Java. Biology News 13(1): 321-332.

Uthbah Z, Sudiana E, Yani E. 2017. Biomass analysis and carbon stock at various ages of resin stands (Agathis dammara (Lamb.) Rich.) In KPH Banyumas Timur. Scripta Biologica 4(2): 119-124.

Van Gardingen PR, McLeish MJ, Philips PD, Fadilah D, Tyrie G, Yasman I. 2003. Financial and ecological analysis of management options for logged-over dipterocarp forest in Indonesia Borneo. For Ecol Manag 183: 1-29.

Warner AJ, Jamroenprucksa M, Puangchit L. 2017. Buttressing impact on diameter estimation in plantation teak (*Tectona grandis* L.f.) sample trees in northern Thailand. Agric Nat Resour 51 (6): 520-525.

Winarni B, Lahjie AM,Simarangkir BDAS, Yusuf S, Ruslim Y. 2017. Tengkawang cultivation model in community forest using agroforestry system in West Kalimantan, Indonesia.Biodiversitas18(2):765-772.[Indonesian].

Yunianti AD, Wahyudi, Siregar, Pari. 2011. Quality of teak clones with different planting distances. J of Wood Sci and Tech Tropical 9 (1): 93-100.

Zeng W, Fu L, Xu M, Wang X, Chen Z, Yao S. 2018. Developing individual tree-based models estimating aboveground biomass of fifive key coniferous species in China. J For Res (5): 1251–1261.

Estimation Above Ground Biomass (AGB) and Carbon Stocks of Tectona grandis and Gmelina arborea

ORIGINALITY REPORT

5%	%	5%	%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	A. Noormets, Y. Nouvellon. "Introduction for special issue: Carbon, water and nutrient cycling in managed forests", Forest Ecology and Management, 2015 Publication	1%
2	Adnan Ahmad, Muhammad Amir, Abdul Mannan, Sajjad Saeed, Sher Sha, Sami Ullah, Rahman Uddin, Qijing Liu. "The Carbon Sinks and Mitigation Potential of Deodar (<i>Cedrus deodara</i>) Forest Ecosystem at Different Altitude in Kumrat Valley, Pakistan", Open Journal of Forestry, 2018 Publication	<1%
3	Makinen, H.. "Intensive management of Scots pine stands in southern Finland: First empirical results and simulated further development", Forest Ecology and Management, 20050825 Publication	<1%

4	Patricia Oliva, Leonardo Duran, Alejandro Venegas, Paulina Vidal, Claudia Montoya. "Spatially Refined Biomass and Combustion Efficiency Estimations in Support of Forest Fires Emissions Quantification", IGARSS 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, 2019 Publication	<1%
5	Muhdi, A Sahar, D S Hanafiah, A Zaitunah, F W B Nababan. "Analysis of biomass and carbon potential on eucalyptus stand in industrial plantation forest, North Sumatra, Indonesia", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2019 Publication	<1%
6	Juang Rata Matangaran, Erianto Indra Putra, Iis Diatin, Muhammad Mujahid, Qi Adlan. "Residual stand damage from selective logging of tropical forests: A comparative case study in central Kalimantan and West Sumatra, Indonesia", Global Ecology and Conservation, 2019 Publication	<1%
7	L. Rytter. "Productivity and thinning effects in hybrid aspen (Populus tremula L. x P. tremuloides Michx.) stands in southern Sweden", Forestry, 07/01/2005 Publication	<1%

8 Peter Tarp. "Economics of converting an even-aged Fagus sylvatica stand to an uneven-aged stand using target diameter harvesting", Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research, 2/1/2005 <1 %
Publication

9 V Apriyani, T Soedjiarti, M P Patria. "Carbon uptake and stock potency in Tunda Island mangrove ecosystem, Serang, Banten, Indonesia", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2020 <1 %
Publication

10 Safril Kasim, Aminuddin Mane Kandari, Asramid Yasin, La Ode Agus Salim Mando. "A Model to Estimate Stored Carbon in the Upland Forests of the Wanggu Watershed", Journal of Sustainable Development, 2020 <1 %
Publication

11 "Tropical Forestry Handbook", Springer Nature, 2016 <1 %
Publication

12 N M Ashuri, M P Patria. "Vegetation and carbon stock analysis of mangrove ecosystem in Pancer Cengkrong, Trenggalek, East Java, Indonesia", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2020 <1 %
Publication

13	Yosio Edemir Shimabukuro, Egidio Arai, Valdete Duarte, Anderson Jorge et al. "Monitoring deforestation and forest degradation using multi-temporal fraction images derived from Landsat sensor data in the Brazilian Amazon", International Journal of Remote Sensing, 2019 Publication	<1 %
14	M VERDINELLI. "Development and feeding efficiency of Malacosoma neustrium larvae reared with Quercus spp. leaves", Annals of Applied Biology, 10/2003 Publication	<1 %
15	Tron Eid, Erik Tuhus. "Models for individual tree mortality in Norway", Forest Ecology and Management, 2001 Publication	<1 %

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	< 10 words
Exclude bibliography	On		