Earth's Future

COMMENTARY
10.1029/2020EF001696

Building a Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure to Address Global Grand Challenges for Macrosystem Ecology

Henry W. Loescher[1,2], Rodrigo Vargas[3], Michael Mirtl[4,5], Beryl Morris[6], Johan Pauw[7], Xiubo Yu[8], Werner Kutsch[9], Paula Mabee[1], Jianwu Tang[10], Benjamin L. Ruddell[11], Peter Pulsifer[12,13], Jaana Bäck[14], Steffen Zacharias[15], Mark Grant[6], Gregor Feig[7], Leiming Zheng[16], Christoph Waldmann[17], and Melissa A. Genazzio[1]

[1]Battelle, National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Boulder, CO, USA, [2]Institute of Alpine and Arctic Research, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA, [3]Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA, [4]Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research GmbH, Leipzig, Germany, [5]Umweltbundesamt GmbH, Environment Agency Austria, Vienna, Austria, [6]Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network (TERN) Australia, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QL, Australia, [7]South African Environmental Observation Network of the National Research Foundation (SAEON), Pretoria, South Africa, [8]Chinese Ecosystem Research Network, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CERN), Beijing, China, [9]Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS) ERIC Head Office, Helsinki, Finland, [10]The Ecosystems Center, Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA, USA, [11]School of Informatics, Computing, and Cyber Systems, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, USA, [12]Geography and Environmental Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, Canada, [13]National Snow and Ice Data Center, CIRES, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA, [14]Institute for Atmospheric and Earth System Research, Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland, [15]UFZ - Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research GmbH, Department Monitoring and Exploration Technologies, Leipzig, Germany, [16]Synthesis Center of Chinese Ecosystem Research Network, Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China, [17]Center for Marine Environmental Sciences (MARUM), University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

Abstract The development of several large-, "continental"-scale ecosystem research infrastructures over recent decades has provided a unique opportunity in the history of ecological science. The Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure (GERI) is an integrated network of analogous, but independent, site-based ecosystem research infrastructures (ERI) dedicated to better understand the function and change of indicator ecosystems across global biomes. Bringing together these ERIs, harmonizing their respective data and reducing uncertainties enables broader cross-continental ecological research. It will also enhance the research community capabilities to address current and anticipate future global scale ecological challenges. Moreover, increasing the international capabilities of these ERIs goes beyond their original design intent, and is an unexpected added value of these large national investments. Here, we identify specific global grand challenge areas and research trends to advance the ecological frontiers across continents that can be addressed through the federation of these cross-continental-scale ERIs.

Plain Language Summary The development of several large-, "continental"-scale ecosystem research infrastructures over recent decades has provided a unique opportunity in the history of ecological science. By bringing together these research infrastructures and harmonizing their respective data will more broadly enable cross-continental ecological research. It will also improve the capabilities of the research community to anticipate and address future global scale ecological challenges to the planet. Moreover, increasing the international capabilities of these research infrastructures goes beyond their original design intent, and is an unexpected added value of these large national investments. Here, we identify specific global grand challenge areas and research trends to advance the ecological frontiers across continents that can be addressed through the federation of these cross-continental-scale ecosystem research infrastructures.

Key Points:

- For the first time in history, we are able to bring together continental-scale Ecosystem Research Infrastructures globally
- This effort enables macrosystem ecologists to ask research questions from continent-to-continent in ways not available before
- This effort provides baseline data to tackle current and future unknown ecological challenges that society will face

Correspondence to:
H. W. Loescher,
hloescher@battelleecology.org

Citation:
Loescher, H. W., Vargas, R., Mirtl, M., Morris, B., Pauw, J., Yu, X., et al. (2022). Building a Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure to address global grand challenges for macrosystem ecology. *Earth's Future*, *10*, e2020EF001696. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001696

Received 12 JUL 2020
Accepted 8 APR 2022

Author Contributions:
Conceptualization: Henry W. Loescher, Rodrigo Vargas, Michael Mirtl, Beryl Morris, Johan Pauw, Xiubo Yu, Werner Kutsch, Jianwu Tang, Benjamin L. Ruddell, Peter Pulsifer, Jaana Bäck, Steffen Zacharias, Mark Grant, Gregor Feig, Leiming Zheng, Christoph Waldmann
Funding acquisition: Henry W. Loescher, Rodrigo Vargas, Michael Mirtl, Werner Kutsch, Jianwu Tang, Benjamin L. Ruddell, Melissa A. Genazzio
Methodology: Henry W. Loescher, Werner Kutsch

1. Introduction

Governments, decision-makers, researchers, and the public have all recognized that our global economies, quality of life, and the environment are intrinsically intertwined (USGCRP, 2018; USGEO, 2019). The ecosystem services that our environment provides include food, air and water quality, biogeochemical cycling, biodiversity, soil fertility, and energy, all of which are under threat from the growing needs of a global society (Díaz et al., 2018;

Project Administration: Henry W. Loescher, Beryl Morris, Werner Kutsch, Melissa A. Genazzio
Resources: Henry W. Loescher, Rodrigo Vargas, Michael Mirtl, Beryl Morris, Xiubo Yu, Werner Kutsch
Supervision: Henry W. Loescher, Werner Kutsch, Melissa A. Genazzio
Visualization: Henry W. Loescher, Werner Kutsch, Melissa A. Genazzio
Writing – original draft: Henry W. Loescher, Rodrigo Vargas, Michael Mirtl, Beryl Morris, Johan Pauw, Werner Kutsch, Paula Mabee, Jianwu Tang, Benjamin L. Ruddell, Peter Pulsifer, Jaana Bäck, Steffen Zacharias, Mark Grant, Gregor Feig, Christoph Waldmann
Writing – review & editing: Henry W. Loescher, Rodrigo Vargas, Michael Mirtl, Beryl Morris, Werner Kutsch, Gregor Feig

IPBES, 2019). These threats are the unintended result of increasing energy demand, water and food demand, land use change, species loss, invasive species, and other anthropogenic activities (Ehrlich, 1997; IPCC, 2021) and have the potential to change the fundamental trajectory of society (Newman, 2019; Turner, 2010; Waters et al., 2016). This creates unique conditions never before faced by society or science—how best to provide a sustainable economic future while understanding and managing the changing environment and human health upon which it relies?

Globalization creates an increasingly interconnected world with greater potential to change the flow and distribution of energy, materials, and species across the planet—humans are increasingly changing the biophysical, biogeochemical and biotic environment at the global scale. Globally distributed data that are long-term and interoperable are needed to understand and manage an intertwined world that is subject to rapid large-scale changes. Such data are necessary for forecasting and understanding the context of future ecological conditions (Dietze et al., 2018) and the societal challenges they may pose (Loescher et al., 2017). Some contemporary examples are the genesis and transmission vectors for new zoonotic diseases (HIV, Ebola, and SARS-CoV-2 viruses) and the transport of other insect and animal vector diseases (Hanta and West Nile viruses). Hence, we are entering an era of large-scale, interdisciplinary science fueled by global data sets that will be analyzed by current and future generations of scientists. Increasing streams of information from remote sensing platforms, process-based models, and research infrastructures have proven scientifically important (De Rosnay, 2014). Such importance has increased awareness of these data by ecologists, hydrologists, meteorologists, modelers and other scientific disciplines, but not yet established the case to advance the ecological frontiers that span both larger spatial areas (continents), and longer time periods (decades), and across multiple disciplines.

To collect such big data and to further advance our collective understanding of ecological processes at the levels of local-to-continental scales, several Ecosystem Research Infrastructures (ERIs) have emerged over the past decade that provide an historically unique opportunity. The coevolution of both continental-scale ERIs (approach) and ecological sciences (theory) has birthed a new science discipline: macrosystem ecology (Heffernan et al., 2014). Each ERI has its own historical foundation and has developed its own scientific strategies and conceptual approaches toward large-scale ecological observing (Loescher et al., 2017). This is the product of extensive bottom-up community input and top-down programmatic input that uniquely addresses their respective socio-scientific capabilities (AIBS and IBRCS, 2003; 2004a; 2004b; 2004c; 2004d; 2004e; 2004f; ESFRI, 2018; EC, 2006; NRC, 2001, 2003, 2004; Villarreal et al., 2018, 2019). As a result, a comparison of the continental-scale ERIs reveals some substantial differences, especially in design, which make it difficult to effectively link research objectives and data. The global context of changes in our environment and the growing demands on the provision and use of data across continental boundaries, however, require further development of ERIs, which in turn necessitates closer strategic coordination and stronger interoperability of data.

For the first time in history, scientists have at their disposal a collective ERI capability across most of Earth's continents to tackle new, societally, and scientifically relevant questions. Now it is time for these ERIs to federate their capabilities to tackle the programmatic work and meet these global questions at the global macro scale (Table 1, Figure 1). Here, we describe this foundational scientific rationale for a global ERI infrastructure: the Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure (GERI). Even though the GERI is currently terrestrial-based, broader inclusion is encouraged to bring together other ERIs and networks in support of this endeavor, and more broadly integrate atmospheric, terrestrial, coastal and ocean observations within its social-ecological context.

2. The Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure (GERI)

This GERI is an integrated network of six analogous, but independent, site-based research infrastructures (Table 1) dedicated to better understand the function and change of indicator ecosystems across global biomes. We envision that this GERI will deliver harmonized data, international partnerships and enable new understandings of global ecological processes—stretching across continents, decades, and ecological disciplines—in ways that were not previously possible.

At the first G7 Science Ministers' meeting in 2008, the Group of Senior Officials on global research infrastructures (GSO) was established (GSO, 2017). GSO's mandate includes identifying research infrastructures of global interest (GRIs), and new areas of possible cooperation. At the GSO 14th meeting in Shanghai (December 2019), GERI was endorsed as an official GSO case study (see 17 framework criteria in GSO, 2017). This decision

Table 1
Current Participating Environmental Research Infrastructure in This Global Ecological Research Infrastructure Project

Environmental Research Infrastructures	Webpage	Host country/continent
National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON)	neonscience.org	USA/North America
European Long Term Ecosystem, critical zone and socio-ecological systems Research Network (eLTER)	lter-europe.net	Germany/Europe
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	icos-ri.eu	Finland/Europe
Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network (TERN)	tern.org.au	Australia/Australia
Chinese Ecosystem Research Network (CERN)	cern.ac.cn	China/Asia
South Africa Ecological Observatory Network (SAEON)	saeon.ac.za	South Africa/Africa

Note. All GERI long term monitoring site data are registered in the Dynamic Ecological Information Management System - a Site and dataset registry (DEIMS, https://deims.org/). Open data from the respective ERIs can be found at the webpages above.

underpins the strong commitment to GERI of its six founding countries and organizations. As recommended, GERI follows the GSO Best practice Framework of GRIs, ensuring all GERI stakeholders benefit from the successful implementation of the globally accepted standards defined in its Framework.

All member GERI observatories are equally important in the ecosystem monitoring of our planet, and GERI's governance has been designed to reflect this notion. GERI's system of governance utilizes sociocracy principles (i.e., dynamic governance; Buck and Villines, 2017), which is built upon the trust and "group understanding" established over several years' of catalytic workshops, and which does not infringe upon the fiduciary relationship with members' respective sponsors and shareholders. This is a necessary requirement for international partnerships with different sponsors. Nor does any individual organization act as a lead. Instead, a Governance Board Chair rotates among the organizations and established working groups, which help advance and harmonize the common science questions, protocols, parameters, and data systems, are other ways in which GERI actively balances the needs among its members (e.g., Huber et al., 2021).

3. The Concept of Global Ecological Grand Challenges

Several community efforts have identified global ecological grand challenges (NRC, 2011) and questions (Musche et al., 2019; Sutherland et al., 2013), along with grand challenges for specific sub-disciplines such as functional plant ecology (Korner, 2011), sustainable development (Crow, 2010), soil science (Lavelle, 2000), and marine ecosystem ecology (Borja, 2014). From these syntheses, we recognize two key attributes to address "*grand challenges*".

First, ecological grand challenges are meant to be aspirational and identify salient gaps in our ecological understanding. They also articulate large scientific and societal needs identified from the culmination of planning efforts, and as such, each challenge is crafted at a specific point in time. But the complex issues that led to a grand challenge are relevant for an entire era, and therefore inform iterative efforts that have spanned decades, as in the case of advocating for, designing, and operating ERIs. We recognize, however, that an ERI should be periodically re-assessed and adapted to fit the changing rubric of the complex socio-ecological system in which it is embedded (Kulmala, 2018; Schimel and Keller, 2015).

Second, ecological grand challenges are meant to transcend geopolitical and continental barriers. The conceptualization of the Earth System as a complex and coupled natural-human system includes interconnected biotic and abiotic processes at the global scale (NASA, 1986). This Earth System concept underscores our current limited ability to understand local ecological processes that are dependent on other processes or drivers unfolding elsewhere. While this notion also harkens back to Odum (1953), only now are we beginning to realize the capability to systematically observe these patterns across continents and decades, including the human causes and effects of ecological change (Angelstam et al., 2019; Chapin et al., 2009; Smith et al., 2009). Despite the global ubiquity of a grand challenge, its intensiveness and emphasis vary with geography and with the capacity of various countries or regions to address them. For example, the impacts of sea-level rise are more immediate and visible for coastal communities and small island nations than for others. The contributing factors to sea-level rise, however, may impact those other communities through coupled atmospheric processes, as well as any services

that the coastal communities may provide to these inland communities (e.g., food, transportation). Hence, we need an integrated socio-ecological approach to understand the feedbacks among ecological, economic, cultural and social dimensions when tackling grand challenges.

4. Grand Challenge Questions for the ERIs

The science rationale to build GERI is to address global grand challenges that cannot be achieved by any single ERI. In all cases, the overarching scientific philosophy and mandate of each individual member ERI is the product of extensive community (bottom-up) and top-down input and reflects the respective geopolitical characteristics. Comprehensive datasets from each ERI are focused on ecosystem science, population and community ecology, and biodiversity. All ERIs are charged with enabling their research communities to broadly advance ecological understanding. Taken together, there are common inherent approaches that all ERIs embrace: (a) estimate and provide essential ecological observations; (b) adopt the cause-and-effect paradigm; (c) broaden our understanding in spatial and temporal variability in the ecological drivers and processes; (d) provide a scaling strategy; and (e) estimate observational uncertainty. A first step toward integrating (federating) the ability of these ERIs to address global grand challenges is to align individual scientific mandates among continents and RIs (Table 2). In this way, the value-added benefits of global activities can easily be justified within their own program and funding constraints, that is, no new mandates are required. The value-added activities gained by bringing together the capabilities from each ERI directly address the call for new approaches to tackle new grand challenges (Suresh, 2012; Uriarte et al., 2007). That is, in addition to applying the scientific mandate of each ERI globally (Table 2), new grand challenges can be specifically addressed as part of their global federation. We describe several of these in the sections that follow.

5. Ecological Teleconnections

There are new emergent ecological properties becoming apparent, particularly at continental and cross-continental scales that require a broader global ecological understanding (e.g., Higgins and Vellinga, 2004; Schmitz et al., 2018). Adopting the cause and effect paradigm, teleconnections are driven by climate in one area that affects ecological processes, that in turn affect ecological processes over long, cross-continental distances. In other words, ecological "information" or "services" being related to each other over large distances, are evident beyond regional climate and ecological processes, often considered in conjunction with global trade and use of natural resources (e.g., land use, deforestation, water use, nutrient transport, nitrogen deposition, and especially greenhouse gas emissions by human producers). A common example is how El Niño oscillations influence climate patterns across large regions of the earth, and in turn, affect ecological processes. Furthermore, exogenous drivers outside our regional-to-continental boundaries may also affect the ecological processes therein. Such patterns have shown a synchrony in the spatial and temporal connectivity of one ecological event that contributes to other ecological processes. For example, the genesis and magnitude of the South-Pacific climate dipole affects extra-tropical ecosystem productivity land use change, which in turn, affects the masting of North America Boreal Pines and the bird species that feed off them (Strong et al., 2015). Similarly, ecological connections between global and regional phenomenon may not always be apparent. For example, to mitigate global increases in atmospheric CO_2 concentrations, reforestation is strongly encouraged in some regions though in others, afforestation is an advocated approach (Bond et al., 2019). We argue that in an increasingly connected global world, the horizons of ecology need to look across and between traditional scientific disciplines to examine causal relationships, particularly considering changing synoptic climate, new migrations, and human mediated changes in mass and energy flows. Much ecological research has historically focused on the ecosystem and regional scale; only now, with enabling infrastructure and new macrosystem constructs are we able to more fully analyze and understand these complex ecological interactions across our planet.

6. Integration of Humans and Ecology in the Anthropocene

It is impossible to refute that humans are both part of-- and reliant on the natural world (Crutzen, 2006; Lewis and Maslin, 2015; Pickett et al., 2011). There is an increasing global importance and awareness of human behavior being a key driver of ecological change, which has led to recognition of the Anthropocene (Lewis and Maslin, 2015; Robin and Steffen, 2007). The recognition that humans influence the Earth has merged with core

Table 2
The Current Governing Science Principles or Grand Challenge Questions From Each of the Participating Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure Observatories

Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network (TERN Australia)
How are our ecosystems responding to environmental pressures, and how might positive trends be enhanced, and negative consequences managed?
How is our environment likely to alter in the future, for example, in relation to a changing climate?
How are significant environmental assets –soils, carbon stocks, water, vegetation and biodiversity – responding to such changes and to their management? And
How resilient are the ecosystem services upon which our society and many of our industries depend, such as soil health, nutrient cycling, fire mitigation, provision of clean water, crop pollination and carbon sequestration?
Chinese Ecosystem Research Network (CERN)
How to evaluate on the responses and adaption of the structure and functions of the main ecosystems to global change?
How to diagnose and assess the quality of different ecosystems under the influences of climatic change and human disturbance?
How to build the theory and provide practical approaches to restore the degraded ecosystems? and
How to provide the scientific & technical support for both the management of eco-environment and the high-efficient agricultural development to secure both ecological safety and food safety?
National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON)
How will ecosystems [among continents] and their components respond to changes in natural- and human-induced forcings such as climate, land use, and invasive species across a range of spatial and temporal scales? and, what is the pace and pattern of the responses? And
How do the internal responses and feedbacks of biogeochemistry, biodiversity, hydroecology and biotic structure and function interact with changes in climate, land use, and invasive species? and, how do these feedbacks vary with ecological context and spatial and temporal scales?
South Africa Ecological Observatory Network (SAEON)
To develop and sustain a dynamic South African observation and research network that provides the understanding needed to address environmental issues, to encompass: • ecosystem functioning that benefit society; including biodiversity, hydrology, biogeochemical cycling and production, soils and sediments and disturbance regimes, and • to distinguish natural variability of ecosystem functioning (including extreme events) from responses to anthropogenic impact that result from global change, such as: global change drivers that encompass; CO2 loading, climate change, changing marine geophysical patterns, sea-level rise, ocean acidification, land and sea use and management, harvesting, nutrient loading, acid deposition, hydrological functioning, sedimentation, alien organisms, diseases, pests, and pollution.
European Long Term Ecosystem, critical zone and socio-ecological systems Research Network (eLTER)
To track and understand the effects of global, regional and local changes on socio-ecological systems and their feedbacks to the environment
To identify drivers of ecosystem change across European environmental and economic gradients,
To explore the relationships among these drivers, responses and developmental challenges under the framework of a common research agenda,
To provide recommendations and support for solving current and future environmental problems and targeted at supporting knowledge-based decision-making concerning ecosystem services and biodiversity.
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)
To provide long-term, continuous observations of concentrations and fluxes of the greenhouse gases (GHGs) that include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and water vapor.
To facilitate research on biogenic and anthropogenic greenhouse gas fluxes, climate-carbon feedbacks, and adaptation to climate change impact.
To provide data that can permit evaluating GHGs emissions and their regional dynamics, and thus the efficiency of the mitigation activities against climate change.

ecological concepts to better understand complex climate-eco-sociological systems. For example, the concepts of resilience (capacity of a system to experience perturbations while retaining essentially the same function and structure, Holling, 1973), adaptability (capacity of the actors within a system to manage resilience, Berkes et al., 2003), and transformability (capacity to create fundamentally new system states when the existing system cannot maintain itself, Chapin et al., 2009) have advanced our thinking of how to integrate the social and ecological dimensions. Our current understanding, however, is often based on single use cases, specific disciplines, and/or constrained time/space domains, and is thus rarely applicable or scalable to other systems. Moreover, much of these activities is based on correlative statistics from populations and/or demographics, which do not provide a robust predictive capability (Bourgeron et al., 2018). Thus, here too, a broader theoretical and practical integration between the social and ecological dimensions are needed to reflect the human dimension of ecosystems and the socio-ecological feedbacks that will ultimately affect societal wellbeing and development (Fischer et al., 2015).

For example, how resilient, adaptable, and transformable are small coastal communities that are tied to tourist and local fisheries to saltwater intrusion that affects local ecosystem and estuarine processes? Integrating the social dimension with ecological studies and developing testable socio-ecological theory is a challenging and active area of research (Bettencourt and Kaur, 2011; Kates et al., 2001; Lang et al., 2012; Muelbert et al., 2019) that will be proactively enabled by the GERI.

7. Near-Term Ecological Forecasting

Currently 'ecological forecasting' is done at 25 to >100 years' time scales and provides the context for long term predictions of climate change for reports concerning ecological impacts and intergovernmental multi-decadal planning, for example, IPCC 2021. This approach, while useful, is also difficult to interpret for near-term time scales (e.g., days to the next 1–2 years) and arguably fosters a culture that does not embrace responsibilities for impacts that will not be apparent for much longer timespans. Moreover, >25-year forecasts do not provide a useful decision-space for natural resource managers who must make more immediate informed decisions. Therefore, a basic scientific question arises: how will climate and ecosystem processes interact in the next season, next year, and in the next 2 years? If we embrace such a question, we may also need to ask: if there are revolutionary advances in near-term climatic predictability, particularly at regional scales, what knowledge, infrastructure (both observational and computational), and local-to-global collaboration is needed to forecast the ecological consequences and optimize human decisions?

A goal for near-term ecological forecasting should be that it is used to provide "*actionable*" data (information that can be acted upon) for decision-making for the public, government, business, and science. For example, phenological forecasting for 1–10 years is strongly needed for natural resource managers to optimize their practices (e.g., in relation to the changing in timing of leaf out, leaf senescence, ecosystem water use, or onset of summer drought, in response to the changing climate). We do not advocate that near-term forecasting is a panacea that will provide known futures and we recognize that this area of research is at an early stage. Rather, "*actionable*" encompasses the cultural paradigm required of researchers to ensure terms (e.g., means, trends, decision-space) and associated uncertainties of forecasts are communicated in such a way that is understood and useable by managers. Only then will managers develop the means to translate "*actionable*" science into well-informed risk mitigation strategies, and decisional trade-space.

Although there have been strong efforts to work toward ecological forecasting (Dietze et al., 2018; Loescher et al., 2017), it is evident that there is still a missing consensus for an approach to near-term ecological prognosis. Moreover, signal-to-noise ratios of many ecological processes are typically large in both time and space, taking ≥10-year to determine a trend (Sierra et al., 2009). Such trends may wrongly assume that signal-to-noise ratios do not decrease further with future anthropogenic change (Keenan et al., 2011; Odum, 1953). This is an untested assumption in our ability to predict ecological processes at smaller time and space scales. For example, how can we downscale large spatial scale (global) processes to the near-term (<10-year) and to local and regional scales? Much of current ecological forecasting efforts rely on generalized linear models (e.g., generalized additive model, Paniw et al., 2019) and combinations of data assimilation approaches (e.g., Kalman filters, Luo et al., 2011) that need further development to achieve a clear understanding of the changes that underlie ecological processes to have accurate prognostic capabilities. Similarly, machine learning approaches and process-based models used for forecasting have difficulty estimating the effects of extreme events/values (Vargas et al., 2018). This is often due to their inability to represent values that are outside the variance structure (i.e., data space) to which they have been parameterized or trained. Therefore, if extreme events/values become a new normal (i.e., shift in parameter space), then current models cannot predict these future values or even expected simple, near-term (i.e., within the next 1–2 years) extreme events. In other words, we currently lack both the theoretic process understanding, the statistical data volumes, and process-based representation in models to currently achieve accurate near-term ecological forecasting, clearly making this a grand challenge that can be addressed by ERIs.

8. Cross-ERI Interoperability of Observations

Each ERI is designed to address specific questions, and the experimental design, observational methods, and data infrastructure are mostly unique to these (Figure 2). Historically, ERIs were built without the requirement for their observations to be broadly interoperable (or even intercomparable) and without the advent of GERI,



Figure 1. Global distribution of Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure sites.

would no doubt continue to comprise a patchwork of research infrastructure and data collection that fare poorly when judged against the rubric of effectively leveraging and harmonizing investments to advance science and to serve society across disciplines or across scales. In parallel to the establishment of GERI, many global research planning efforts call for multiple integrated approaches to better understand our environment (e.g., DIICCSRTE, 2013; EC, 2012; Schimel et al., 2011), and they call for accessible long-term interoperable data sets to forecast global environmental change (Heinz Foundation, 2006; Kulmala, 2018; Suresh, 2012). According to one such planning effort, current (with the USA) environmental monitoring programs, are "distributed (across agencies) to an extent that reduces their potential effectiveness" (PCAST, 2011). We maintain that this pattern likely holds true globally, and is defined as an organizational barrier for interoperability that limits the efforts and knowledge generation (Chabbi and Loescher, 2017; Vargas et al., 2017) as well. As per above, this is likely because data from existing earth observation programs were specific for a diversity of questions and purposes. This challenge is critical and has yet to be solved (Holdren et al., 2014).

Many directives call for interoperable data (rf. Kulmala, 2018; USGEO, 2019) but fail to define what is meant by "interoperable" or define a unifying structure that can tackle these larger issues associated with generating new environmental knowledge. Incorporating information science or computer science to make ERIs interoperable is challenging (e.g., FAIR Principles, Garcia-Silva et al., 2018; Wilkinson et al., 2016), but making ontologies or metrology for true data interoperability is also not a simple activity. Some data scientists address 'scientific utility' through activities such as shared and reproducible notebooks (e.g., Jupyter), and/or through other structures such as machine-readable metadata (e.g., the International Standards Organization standard 19115). These practical cyberinfrastructures implement data interoperability, but also must be effective at global scales, across federated ERIs, and with the harmonized ontological and metrological structures (Horsburgh et al., 2011; Ruddell et al., 2014). Ideally, data interoperability should be designed-in a priori, but pragmatism requires it to be instead built organically and flexibly upon existing ERIs structures, and technologies that span both boundaries and eras.

Currently, there are serious efforts at community-based forums that bring together top-down and bottom-up approaches at the forefront of data science and management (e.g., the National Science Foundation's DataOne, EarthCube, European Open Science Cloud, and the Federation of Earth Science Information Partners, the



Figure 2. Research data are generated from different sources and types of organizations. Each type of organization is motivated by different research questions, has a different level of onsite experience strength, site-specific understanding, and infrastructure (*e.g.,* consistency and long-term operations). Large-scale ecosystem research infrastructures (ERIs) can take advantage of collaborative relationships and strong interoperability frameworks (depicted by the large interconnecting bars). Global Ecosystem Research Infrastructure connects these ERIs and can be leveraged to address global-scale grand challenges.

Research Data Alliance, the Open Geospatial Consortium). It is in these forums that another unifying strategic (process) framework has emerged to describe what information is needed by the research community to make the data more scientifically useful, and to foster scientific interoperability of environmental data for research, management, and policy purposes. As a grand challenge, the international collaborative engagement in GERI is an ideal forum to bring together "big data", AI and machine learning, scientific and societal imperatives, leadership, and a platform to implement (and learn from) *scientific* interoperability in partnership with these community-based forums. Finally, we recognize that 'full' interoperability would only be achieved by reducing conceptual, technical, organizational, and cultural barriers (Vargas et al., 2012). Therefore, GERI should aspire to be an organized collective effort to forest development of knowledge and implementation of "*actionable*" science.

9. Conclusion

We know that natural, managed, and socioeconomic systems are subject to complex interacting environmental stressors (e.g., some rapid and visible taking days to years, like extreme precipitation, droughts, heat waves, and wildfires, while others are subtle and develop over decades or longer, like changes in concentrations of atmospheric constituents that alter climate and ocean acidification). The resultant feedback of these stressors on ecosystem processes plays out over extended periods of time and space (NRC, 2007) which erode the world's environmental capital (PCAST, 2011; Rockström et al., 2009) and disrupt many ecosystem services, such as fisheries and agricultural production. We argue that the success for building global ecological understanding will be measured by the ability of scientists to address these outlined global environmental challenges by linking observations from a range of sources and spheres of influence (e.g., observatories, networks, integrated experiments, and investigator-driven, hypothesis-based research (Peters et al., 2008, 2014)). Such optimization of the

data will accelerate and deepen our scientific insights into complex socio-ecological and Earth systems, and better inform a societal understanding of natural and anthropogenic change in a time of need for adaptation and mitigation.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

Data Availability Statement

No data was used in this manuscript, open observatory data from each ERI is registered at the Dynamic Ecological Information Management System registry (https://deims.org/), and can be found at the respective data portals in Table 1.

Acknowledgments
This manuscript is in part the product of several workshops and ongoing GERI development. The first workshop was the Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network (TERN) sponsored and entitled: "Towards a Global Ecosystem Observatory", 5–7 March 2017, University of Queensland, Brisbane Australia. Another workshop was sponsored by Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) and entitled: "Global Integrated Research Infrastructure component in Next Generation ILTER", 17–20 April, 2018, South China Botanical Garden, Zhaoqing, Guangdong Province, China. The National Science Foundation (NSF) supported two workshops. The first was entitled: 'Building a Global Ecological Understanding' held at the University of Delaware, Newark Delaware, 3–6 June, 2016 (NSF 1347883) and the second entitled: "Global Environmental Research Infrastructure (GERI) Planning Workshop", held at NEON HQ, Boulder Colorado, 25–27 June 2019 (NSF 1917180). The authors wish to thank the workshop attendees for their thoughtful contributions. NEON is a project sponsored by the NSF and managed under cooperative support agreement (DBI-1029808) to Battelle. All authors intellectually contributed toward 'the main manuscript text' and have reviewed and approved the manuscript. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of our shareholders or sponsors. This research would not have taken place without decades of collegial interactions and community engagement with our peers and mentors.

References

American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS) and the Infrastructure for Biology at Regional to Continental Scales (IBRCS) Working Group. (2003). *IBRCS white paper: Rationale, blueprint, and expectations for the national ecological observatory network*. American Institute of Biological Sciences, 68. Retrieved from http://ibrcs.aibs.org/reports/pdf/IBRCSWhitePaper_NEON.pdf

AIBS, and the IBRCS Working Group. (2004a). *Biodiversity, species composition, and ecosystem functioning: Report from a NEON science workshop*. AIBS. ibrcs.aibs.org.

AIBS, and the IBRCS Working Group. (2004b). *Ecological aspects of biogeochemical cycles: Report from a NEON science workshop*. AIBS. ibrcs.aibs.org.

AIBS, and the IBRCS Working Group. (2004c). *Ecology and evolution of infectious diseases: Report from a NEON science workshop*. AIBS. ibrcs.aibs.org.

AIBS, and the IBRCS Working Group. (2004d). *Ecological impacts of climate change: Report from a NEON science workshop*. AIBS. ibrcs.aibs.org.

AIBS, and the IBRCS Working Group. (2004e). *Designing NEON initiatives for invasive species: Report from a NEON science workshop*. AIBS. ibrcs.aibs.org.

AIBS, and the IBRCS Working Group. (2004f). *Land use and habitat alteration: Report from a NEON science workshop*. AIBS. ibrcs.aibs.org.

Angelstam, P., Manton, M., Elbakidze, M., Sijtsma, F., Adamescu, M. C., Avni, N., et al. (2019). LTSER platforms as a place-based transdisciplinary research infrastructure: Learning landscape approach through evaluation. *Landscape Ecology*, *34*(7), 1461–1484. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-018-0737-6

Berkes, F., Colding, J., & Folke, C. (2003). *Navigating social-ecological systems: Building resilience for complexity and change*. Cambridge University Press.

Bettencourt, L. M. A., & Kaur, J. (2011). Evolution and structure of sustainability science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *10849*, 19540–19545. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1102712108

Bond, W. J., Stevens, N., Midgley, G. F., & Lehmann, C. E. R. (2019). The trouble with trees: Afforestation plans for Africa. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *34*(11), 963–965. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.08.003

Borja, A. (2014). Grand challenges in marine ecosystems ecology. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *1*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2014.00001

Bourgeron, P., Alessa, L., Kliskey, A., Loescher, H. W., Krauze, K., Virapongse, A., & Griffith, D. L. (2018). Complex human-environmental processes: A framework for social-ecological observatories. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *16*(S1), S52–S66. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1797

Buck, J. A., & Villines, S. (2017). *We the people: Consenting to a deeper democracy*. Sociocracy.info (ISBN: 9780979282737) OCLC 1017570726.

Chabbi, A., & Loescher, H. W. (2017). The lack of alignment among environmental research infrastructures may impede scientific opportunities. *Challenges*, *8*(2), 18. https://doi.org/10.3390/challe8020018

Chapin, F. S., III, Kofinas, G. P., Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Olsson, P., Abel, N., et al. (2009). Resilience-based stewardship: Strategies for navigating sustainable pathways in a changing world. In F. S., Chapin, III, G. P., Kofinas, & C., Folke (Eds.), *Principles of ecosystem stewardship: Resilience-based natural resource management in a changing world* (p. 401). Springer.

Crow, M. M. (2010). Organizing teaching and research to address the grand challenges of sustainable development. *BioScience*, *60*(7), 488–489. https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2010.60.7.2

Crutzen, P. J. (2006). The "Anthropocene", In *Earth system science in the Anthropocene* (pp. 13–18). Springer.

De Rosnay, J. (2014). *Le macroscope. Vers une vision globale*. 223. Le seuil.

Department of Industry, Innovation, Climate Change, Science, Research and Tertiary Education (DIICCSRTE). (2013). *National collaborative research infrastructure strategy. 2013-14 –2014-15*. Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/national_collaborative_research_infrastructure_strategy_guidelines.pdf

Díaz, S., Pascual, U., Stenseke, M., Martín-López, B., Watson, R. T., Molnár, Z., et al. (2018). Assessing nature's contributions to people. *Science*, *359*(6373), 270–272. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap8826

Dietze, M., Fox, A., Hooten, M., Jarnevich, C., Keitt, T., Kenney, M., et al. (2018). Iterative ecological forecasting: Needs, opportunities, and challenges. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1710231115

Ehrlich, P. (1997). A world of wounds: Ecologists and the human dimension. In O., Kinee (Ed.), *Excellence in ecology book 8. Ecology institute. Oldendorf/luhe*. Wiley-VCH Verlag, 210. https://doi.org/10.1002/iroh19970820414

European Commission, Commission to the Council and the European Parliament (EC). (2012). 1003/4/EC on Public Access to Environmental Information Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/

European Communities. (2006). European roadmap for research infrastructures, *The European strategy forum on research infrastructures* (ISBN: 92-79-02694-1). Report 2006 Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/pdf/esfri/esfri_roadmap/roadmap_2006/esfri_roadmap_2006_en.pdf

European Strategic Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI). (2018). *Strategy report on European research infrastructures. The European strategy forum on research infrastructures*. Retrieved from http://roadmap2018.esfri.eu/

Fischer, J., Gardner, T. A., Bennett, E. M., Balvanera, P., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S., et al. (2015). Advancing sustainability through mainstreaming a social–ecological systems perspective. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *14*, 144–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2015.06.002

G7 Group of Senior Officials (GSO) on Global Research Infrastructures. (2017). Progress report 2017. *Dipartimento di Fisica – università degli studi di Milano ec*. Retrieved from http://europa.eu/research/infrastructures/index_en.cfm?pg=gso

Garcia-Silva, A., Gomez-Perez, J. M., Palma, R., Krystek, M., Mantovani, S., Foglini, F., et al. (2018). *Enabling FAIR research in earth science through research objects. Special issue: Science gateways workshops 2017 Future generation computer systems*. Retrieved from http://arxiv.org/abs/1809.10617

Heffernan, J. B., Soranno, P. A., Angilletta, M. J., Buckley, L. B., Gruner, D. S., Keitt, T. H., et al. (2014). Macrosystems ecology: Understanding ecological patterns and processes at continental scales. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *12*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1890/130017

Heinz Foundation. (2006). *Filling the gaps: Priority data needs and key management challenges for national reporting on ecosystem condition*. Heinz Foundation. Retrieved from www.heinzctr.org/ecosystem

Higgins, P. A. T., & Vellinga, M. (2004). Ecosystem responses to abrupt climate change: Teleconnections, scale and the hydrological cycle. *Climatic Change*, *64*(1/2), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:clim.0000024672.41571.ba

Holdren, J., Dickenson, T., & Paulson, G. (2014). *National plan for earth observations*. National Science and Technology Council, Executive Office of the President. 71. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/NSTC/2014_national_plan_for_civil_earth_observations.pdf

Holling, C. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, *4*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

Horsburgh, J. S., Tarboton, D. G., Maidment, D. R., & Zaslavsky, I. (2011). Components of an environmental observatory information system. *Computers & Geosciences*, *37*(2), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2010.07.003

Huber, R., D'Onofrio, C., Devaraju, A., Klump, J., Loescher, H. W., Kiddermann, S., et al., 2021. Integrating Data and Analysis Technologies within leading environmental research infrastructures Challenges and Approaches. *Ecological Informatics*, *61*, 101245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2021.101245

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2021). In V., Masson-Delmotte, P., Zhai, A., Pirani, S. L., Connors, C., Péan, S., Berger, et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the sixth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (p. 3949). Cambridge University Press.

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). (2019). In S., Díaz, J., Settele, E. S., Brondízio, H. T., Ngo, M., Guèze, J., Agard, et al. (Eds.), *Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. IPBES secretariat.56.

Kates, R. W., Clark, W. C., Corell, R., Hall, J. M., Jaeger, C. C., Lowe, I., et al. (2001). Sustainability science. *Science*, *292*(5517), 641–642. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1059386

Keenan, T. F., Carbone, M. S., Reichstein, M., & Richardson, A. D. (2011). The model-data fusion pitfall: Assuming certainty in an uncertain world. *Oecologia*, *167*(3), 587–597. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-011-2106-x

Korner, C. (2011). The grand challenges in functional plant ecology. *Frontiers of Plant Science*, *2*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2011.00001

Kulmala, M. T. (2018). Build a global Earth observatory. *Nature*, *553*(7686), 21–23. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-017-08967-y

Lang, D. J., Wiek, A., Bergmann, M., Stauffacher, M., Martens, P., Moll, P., et al. (2012). Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: Practice, principles, and challenges. *Sustainability Science*, *71*(S1), 25–43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-011-0149-x

Lavelle, P. (2000). Ecological challenges for soil science. *Soil Science*, *165*(1), 73–86. https://doi.org/10.1097/00010694-200001000-00009

Lewis, S L., & Maslin, M. A. (2015). Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature*, *5197542*(7542), 171–180. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14258

Loescher, H. W., Kelly, K., & Lea, R. (2017). National ecological observatory network: Beginnings, programmatic and scientific challenges, and ecological forecasting. In A., Chabbi, & H. W., Loescher (Eds.), *Terrestrial ecosystem research infrastructures: Challenges, new developments and perspectives* (pp. 27–48). CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group (ISBN: 9781498751315).

Luo, Y., Ogle, K., Tucker, C., Fei, S., Gao, C., LaDeau, S., et al. (2011). Ecological forecasting and data assimilation in a data-rich era. *Ecological Applications*, *21*(5), 1429–1442. https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1275.1

Muelbert, J. H., Nidzieko, N. J., Acosta, A. T. R., Beaulieu, S. E., Bernardino, A. F., Boikova, E., et al. (2019). Ilter – the international long-term ecological research network as a platform for global coastal and ocean observation. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *6*, 527. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00527

Musche, M., Adamescu, M., Angelstam, P., Bacher, S., Bäck, J., Buss, H. L., et al. (2019). Research questions to facilitate the future development of European longterm ecosystem research infrastructures: A horizon scanning exercise. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *250*, 109479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109479

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) (1986). *Earth system science, overview, a program for global change, report of the earth system science committee*. Francis Bretherton, Chair), NASA Advisory Council.

National Research Council (NRC) (2001). *Grand challenges in environmental sciences*. The National Academies Press.106.

NRC. (2003). *NEON: Addressing the nation's environmental challenges*. National Academies Press, 115.

NRC. (2004). *Setting priorities for large research facility projects supported by the national science FoundationCommittee on setting priorities for NSF-sponsored large research facility projects*. National Research Council (ISBN: 0-309-09084-9), 236.

NRC. (2007). *Understanding multiple environmental stresses: Report of a workshop*. The National Academies Press, 154.

NRC. (2011). *Adapting to the impacts of climate change; America's Climate Choices: Panel on adapting to the impacts of climate change*. The National Academies Press, 272.

Newman, E. A. (2019). Disturbance ecology in the Anthropocene. *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, *7*, 147. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00147

Odum, E. P. (1953). *Fundamentals of ecology*. W.P. Saunders Publications. 546.

Paniw, M., Maag, N., Cozzi, G., Clutton-Brock, T., & Ozgul, A. (2019). Life history responses of meerkats to seasonal changes in extreme environments. *Science*, *363*(6427), 631–635. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau5905

Peters, D. P. C., Groffman, P. M., Nadelhoffer, K. J., Grimm, N. B., Collins, S. L., Michener, W. K., & Huston, M. A. (2008). Living in an increasingly connected world: A framework for continental-scale environmental science. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, *6*(5), 229–237. https://doi.org/10.1890/070098

Peters, D. P. C., Loescher, H. W., SanClements, M. D., & Havstad, K. M. (2014). Taking the pulse of a continent: Expanding site-based research infrastructure for regional- to continental-scale ecology. *Ecosphere*, *5*(3), 29. https://doi.org/10.1890/es13-00295.1

Pickett, S. T. A., Cadenasso, M. L., Grove, J. M., Boone, C. G., Groffman, P. M., Irwin, E., et al. (2011). Urban ecological systems: Scientific foundations and a decade of progress. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *92*(3), 331–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.08.022

President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCSAT) (2011). Sustaining environmental capital: Protecting society and the economy. Report to the President Retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/pcast

Robin, L., & Steffen, W. (2007). History for the Anthropocene. *History Compass*, *5*, 1694–1719. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2007.00459.x

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, A., Chapin, F. S. III, Lambin, E. F., et al. (2009). Planetary boundaries: Exploring the safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, *461*(7263), 472–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a

Ruddell, B. L., Zaslavsky, I., Valentine, D., Beran, B., Piasecki, M., Fu, Q., & Kumar, P. (2014). Sustainable long-term scientific data publication: Lessons learned from a prototype observatory information system for the Illinois river basin. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, *54*, 73–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.12.015

Schimel, D., & Keller, M. (2015). Big questions, big science: Meeting the challenges of global ecology. *Oecologia*, *177*(4), 925–934. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-015-3236-3

Schimel, D., Keller, M., Berukoff, S., Kao, R., Loescher, H. W., Powell, H., et al. (2011). *NEON Science Strategy; Enabling continental-scale ecological forecasting* (p. 55). Publication NEON Incorporation.

Schmitz, O. J., Wilmers, C. C., Leroux, S. J., Doughty, C. E., Atwood, T. B., Galetti, M., et al. (2018). Animals and the zoogeochemistry of the carbon cycle. *Science*, *362*, 6419. eaar3213.

Sierra, C. A., Loescher, H. W., Harmon, M. E., Richardson, A. D., Hollinger, D. T., & Perakis, S. S. (2009). Interannual variation of carbon fluxes from a tropical, a temperate, and a boreal evergreen forest: The role of forest dynamics and climate. *Ecology*, *90*(10), 2711–2723. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-0073.1

Smith, M. D., Knapp, A. K., & Collins, S. L. (2009). A framework for assessing ecosystem dynamics in response to chronic resource alterations induced by global change. *Ecology*, *30*(12), 3279–3289. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1815.1

Strong, C., Zuckerberg, B., Betancourt, J. L., & Koenig, W. D. (2015). Climatic dipoles drive two principal modes of North American boreal bird irruption. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *112*(21), E2795–E2802. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1418414112

Suresh, S. (2012). Global Challenges need global solutions. *Nature*, *490*(7420), 337–338. https://doi.org/10.1038/490337a

Sutherland, W. J., Freckleton, R. P., Godfray, H. C. J., Beissinger, S. R., Benton, T., Cameron, D. D., et al. (2013). Identification of 100 fundamental ecological questions. *Journal of Ecology*, *101*(1), 58–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12025

Turner, M. G. (2010). Disturbance and landscape dynamics in a changing world. *Ecology*, *91*(10), 2833–2849. https://doi.org/10.1890/10-0097.1

Uriarte, M., Ewing, H. A., Eviner, V. T., & Weathers, K. C. (2007). Constructing a broader and more inclusive value system in science. *BioScience*, *57*(1), 71–78. https://doi.org/10.1641/b570111

U.S. Global Climate Change Research Program (USGCRP). (2018). In D. R., Reidmiller, C.W., Avery, D. R., Easterling, K. E., Kunkel, K. L. M., Lewis, T. K., Maycock, & B. C., Stewart (Eds.), *Impacts, risks, and adaptation in the United States: Fourth national climate assessment, volume II*. U.S. Global Change Research Program. pp. 1515. https://doi.org/10.7930/NCA4.2018

U.S. Group on Earth Observations (USGEO), Subcommittee on the Environment. (2019). *National plan for civil earth observations office of science, technology, and policy*. National Science and Technology Council Executive Office of the President. pp. 24. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Natl-Plan-for-Civil-Earth-Obs.pdf

Vargas, R., Alcaraz-Segura, D., Birdsey, R., Brunsell, N. A., Cruz-Gaistardo, C. O., de Jong, B., et al. (2017). Enhancing interoperability to facilitate implementation of REDD+: Case study of Mexico. *Carbon Management*, *8*(1), 57–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/17583004.2017.1285177

Vargas, R., Loescher, H. W., Arredondo, T., Huber-Sannwald, E., Lara-Lara, R., & Yépez, E. A. (2012). Opportunities for advancing carbon cycle science in Mexico: Towards a continental scale understanding. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *12*, 84–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2012.04.033

Vargas, R., Sánchez-Cañete, P. E., Serrano-Ortiz, P., Curiel Yuste, J., Domingo, F., López-Ballesteros, A., & Oyonarte, C. (2018). Hot-moments of soil CO_2 efflux in a water-limited grassland. *Soil Systems*, *2*(3), 47. https://doi.org/10.3390/soilsystems2030047

Villarreal, S., Guevara, M., Alcaraz-Segura, D., Brunsell, N. A., Hayes, D., Loescher, H. W., & Vargas, R. (2018). Ecosystem functional diversity and the representativeness of environmental networks across the conterminous United States. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, *262*, 423–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2018.07.016

Villarreal, S., Guevara, M., Alcaraz-Segura, D., & Vargas, R. (2019). Optimizing an environmental observatory network design using publicly available data. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, *124*(7), 1812–1826. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018jg004714

Waters, C. N., Zalasiewicz, J., Summerhayes, C., Barnosky, A. D., Poirier, C., Gałuszka, A., et al. (2016). The Anthropocene is functionally and stratigraphically distinct from the Holocene. *Science*, *351*(6269), aad2622. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad2622

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., et al. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, *3*(1), 160018. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18