

**The text that follows is a PREPRINT.  
O texto que segue é um PREPRINT.**

Please cite as:

Favor citar como:

**Nogueira, E.M.; Yanai, A.M.;  
Vasconcelos, S.S.; Graça,  
P.M.L.A.; Fearnside, P.M. 2018.  
Brazil's Amazonian protected  
areas as a bulwark against  
regional climate change. *Regional  
Environmental Change* 18(2): 573-  
579. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10113-017-1209-2>**

Free online reading link: <http://rdcu.be/wrf6>

[Published online in 2017]

ISSN: 1436-3798

Copyright: Springer

The original publication is available at:

O trabalho original está disponível em:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10113-017-1209-2>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10113-017-1209-2>

Free online reading link: <http://rdcu.be/wrf6>

1 **Authors:**

2 Euler Melo Nogueira<sup>a,b</sup> (euler.melo.nogueira@gmail.com),

3 Aurora Miho Yanai<sup>a</sup> (aurorayanai@gmail.com),

4 Sumaia Saldanha de Vasconcelos<sup>a</sup> (sumaia\_sv@hotmail.com)

5 Paulo Maurício Lima de Alencastro Graça<sup>a,c</sup> (pmlag@inpa.gov.br)

6 Philip Martin Fearnside<sup>a,c</sup> (pmfearn@inpa.gov.br)

7 <sup>a</sup> National Institute for Research in Amazonia (INPA), Av. André Araújo, 2936, CEP 69067-375, Manaus,  
8 Amazonas, Brazil.

9 <sup>b</sup> Guanambi Faculty, Av. Governador Nilo Coelho, 4911, São Sebastião, CEP 46430-000, Guanambi,  
10 Bahia, Brazil.

11 <sup>c</sup> Brazilian Research Network on Climate Change (RedeClima), Brazil

12 **Title:** Brazil's Amazonian protected areas as a bulwark against regional climate change

13 **Corresponding author:** Philip Martin Fearnside (pmfearn@inpa.gov.br); Tel.: +55 92 3643 1822; Fax: +  
14 55 92 3642 3028. National Institute for Research in Amazonia (INPA), Av. André Araújo, 2936, CEP  
15 69067-375, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil.

16 **Abstract**

17 Brazil's Amazonian protected areas play an important role in maintaining the environmental services of  
18 the region, including Amazonia's role in regional and global climate. These protected areas face threats  
19 both from deforestation and from degradation of standing forest. Preserving carbon stocks in protected  
20 areas is important both because of the climatic benefit of avoiding greenhouse gas emissions and because  
21 of the potential to provide a monetary value that contributes to supporting local human populations in  
22 ways that maintain rather than destroy the forest. REDD+ represents one potential mechanism for  
23 maintaining these areas. A variety of legal threats to protected areas in Brazilian Amazonia has arisen,  
24 leading to concern over the future of these areas and their role as a bulwark against regional climate  
25 change.  
26

27 **Keywords:** Conservation units; Indigenous reserves; Biomass; REDD; Amazon; Global warming

28 **Length of manuscript:** Abstract: 124 words; main text: 3126 words; one figure: 300 words;  
29 acknowledgments: 95 words; references: 1974 words. Subtotal without references: 3645 words; Grand  
30 total: 5619 words.

31

## 1. Brazil's Amazonian protected areas

Brazil's Amazon forest has an important role in avoiding regional as well as global climate change thanks to Amazonia's large stock of carbon that could be emitted as greenhouse gases (Nogueira et al. 2015; Fearnside 2016a) and thanks to the forest's role in recycling water that both maintains precipitation in the region and supplies water vapor that is critical to rainfall in other parts of Brazil and in neighboring countries (Arraut et al., 2012). Deforestation is advancing in Brazilian Amazonia, and the forces underlying this process threaten vast areas of the remaining forest (Fearnside 2017). Protected areas represent an important part of strategies to slow and contain deforestation (e.g., Ricketts et al. 2010). Over the past few decades Brazil has greatly expanded its Amazonian protected areas, which include federal, state and municipal (county) "conservation units," Indigenous lands and Maroon territories (*Quilombos*) (Figure 1). Brazil's Legal Amazonia region had 718 protected areas covering 2.2 million km<sup>2</sup> in 2014, representing 43% of the region's area and 57.0% its carbon stock in vegetation at that time considering losses to deforestation (Nogueira et al. 2017). Deforestation had reduced the "pre-modern" (pre-1970) carbon stock in these protected areas by 2.3% by 2014 (Nogueira et al. 2017). Some additional biomass carbon had been lost to forest degradation. A variety of threats face Brazil's Amazonian protected areas, thus threatening an important bulwark against regional climate change.

[Figure\_1\_here]

## 2. Degradation of standing forest

Forest degradation is a major source of uncertainty concerning current and past carbon emissions in Amazonia and throughout the tropics. In a review of perturbations in the carbon budget of the tropics, Grace et al. (2014) found that "insufficient information is available to estimate the tropical degradation flux and it may be the largest uncertainty in the tropical carbon budget." Berenguer et al. (2014) found that in 2010 carbon emissions from the various forms of degradation in Brazilian Amazonia were equivalent to up to 40% of the emissions from deforestation in the same year, which reached 0.08 Pg C. Data from the DEGRAD program (program for mapping forest degradation in Brazilian Amazonia), indicate that different forms of degradation affected 92,407.2 km<sup>2</sup> of native vegetation in Brazilian Amazonia between 2007 and 2013, after deleting the areas that were subsequently clear cut. The areas mapped as degraded, 27,872.4 km<sup>2</sup> were located within the protected areas (Nogueira et al. 2017). The original carbon stocks C (below- and above-ground) in these areas were estimated to be  $0.287 \pm 0.077$  Pg. However, estimating the carbon loss in these areas continues to be a challenge, since the remotely sensed features commonly used to map degradation do not allow identification of the kind of degradation affecting the mapped areas, which is essential for estimating carbon loss.

Degradation can remove biomass over the full range from close to zero percent to essentially 100%. When degradation is so severe that an area appears as "non-forest" on LANDSAT-TM (30-m resolution) or equivalent satellite images, INPE classifies the areas as deforested in the PRODES dataset that serves as the basis of the forest-loss estimates in this paper. Not only is the existence of degradation more difficult to detect remotely than is deforestation, it is much more difficult to remotely estimate the amount of carbon lost. While deforestation is a simple "yes" or "no" classification, to estimate losses from degradation one must know both the initial and the present biomass.

Degradation often begins with logging, which not only removes biomass in the harvested trees but also results in killing many other trees that are damaged during the logging operations. Note that much of the logging in Brazilian Amazonia is illegal (Greenpeace 2016) and therefore does not have reduced impact measures that decrease damages in most (but not all) of the legal portion of this activity. Annual emissions from logging in Legal Amazonia have been estimated at  $62 \times 10^6$  Mg C (Fearnside 2000) and, for five of the region's nine states, at  $80 \times 10^6$  Mg C (Asner et al. 2005); the only official estimate is  $2.4 \times 10^6$  Mg C (Brazil, MCT 2004, p. 148), a value that is contested on methodological grounds (Fearnside 2007).

Another major cause of degradation is increased tree mortality during very severe droughts. Emissions have been estimated at 1.2 to 1.6 Pg C from forests throughout the Amazon basin during the drought of 2005 (Phillips et al. 2009) and 1.4 Pg C during the drought of 2010 (Lewis et al. 2011). The trees surviving the 2005 drought had widespread damage to their canopies that remained visible on satellite imagery until the 2010 drought, indicating slow recovery from severe drought stress and an additional risk of mortality under the increasingly closely spaced droughts of the present climate regime

89 (Saatchi et al. 2013). However, while the 2010 drought both increased mortality and slowed the growth of  
 90 trees in 97 plots monitored by the RAINFOR network in the area affected by this drought, its effect was  
 91 neither increased nor decreased by the prior occurrence of the 2005 drought at each plot location  
 92 (Feldpausch et al. 2016).

93 Fire is a major source of degradation and is favored by both logging and drought. During severe  
 94 droughts large areas of forest are affected by understory fires that kill and damage many trees, which can  
 95 sometimes take several years to die (*e.g.*, Barlow and Peres 2008). During the 1997-1998 El Niño drought  
 96  $11.4 - 13.9 \times 10^3 \text{ km}^2$  of forest burned in Brazil's state of Roraima (Barbosa and Fearnside 1999) and  
 97  $26.0 \times 10^3 \text{ km}^2$  in other parts of Legal Amazonia (Alencar et al. 2006). During the 2005 drought  $866 \text{ km}^2$   
 98 burned in Brazil's state of Amazonas (Vasconcelos et al. 2013) and  $2800 \text{ km}^2$  in the state of Acre, in  
 99 addition to  $1100 \text{ km}^2$  in neighboring areas of Bolivia and Peru (Shimabukuro et al. 2009). The 2010  
 100 drought caused a dramatic increase in forest flammability and fire penetration into forest in southeastern  
 101 Amazonia (Brando et al. 2014). As with logging, fire opens gaps in the canopy leading to dryer  
 102 microclimate in the forest and leaves dead biomass that serves as fuel for the next fire, thus setting in  
 103 motion a positive feedback leading to repeated fires and degradation (*e.g.*, Cochrane et al. 1999).  
 104 Repeated fires lead to successively lower biomass, essentially destroying the forest completely if burned  
 105 multiple times within a decade (Longo et al. 2016).  
 106

### 107 **3. Importance of protected areas in Brazilian Amazonia for carbon storage**

108 In addition to being essential for biodiversity conservation and for the survival of traditional  
 109 indigenous and non-indigenous populations, the vast area of the Amazon occupied by protected areas  
 110 contains an enormous carbon store that is under a variety of systems of protection. However, the  
 111 importance of these areas for maintaining carbon stocks has been underestimated (Walker et al. 2014).

112 The present study shows that the majority of the remaining forest in Legal Amazonia and in the  
 113 Amazonia biome is now officially under some form of protection, totaling about 33 Pg C of the remaining  
 114 carbon held in Brazil's Amazonian vegetation. Carbon in protected areas today represents more than the  
 115 total reported here because this study's estimates do not include carbon stored in recently created  
 116 protected areas or in areas for which files delimiting the spatial boundaries were not yet available (see  
 117 Brazil, MMA 2014). For example, on the occasion of Brazil's National Indian Day in April 2015, the  
 118 federal government announced demarcation of three new Indigenous lands in the states of Amazonas and  
 119 Pará, which together increased protected areas in Legal Amazonia by approximately 230 000 ha (Brazil  
 120 2015).

121 The amount of carbon in protected areas in Brazilian Amazonia is related to a combination of the  
 122 following factors: (i) protected areas occupying over two million  $\text{km}^2$  (as of 2014), which is mainly  
 123 covered by mature rainforest and partly distributed in mega-reserves (continuous Indigenous lands or  
 124 conservation units with more than 1 million hectares; Nogueira et al. 2017), (ii) little loss of native  
 125 vegetation ( $< 3\%$ ) in protected areas, and (iii) high per-hectare carbon density in remaining vegetation (  
 126 Nogueira et al. 2017). These three aspects show the importance of managing these areas to benefit  
 127 regional and global climate conditions because of the large amount of stored carbon that is not being  
 128 emitted into the atmosphere (Adeney et al. 2009; Dudley et al. 2010). Avoiding emissions requires  
 129 reducing both deforestation and forest degradation. Any plan to mitigate future emissions of greenhouse  
 130 gases in the Amazon should consider protected areas as an important part of the strategy, especially  
 131 protected areas located close to active deforestation frontiers (Nepstad et al. 2006; Clark et al. 2008;  
 132 Adeney et al. 2009; Soares-Filho et al. 2009).

133 Protected areas inhibit deforestation by a variety of means. Deforestation caused by large illegal  
 134 land grabbers ('*grileiros*') is substantially reduced where protected areas are created because these  
 135 invaders, who illegally occupy public lands in the expectation of obtaining land tenure in the future (albeit  
 136 illegally), have only a minimal likelihood of obtaining land title in a protected area (Fearnside 2008).  
 137 Deforestation in Amazonian protected areas is substantially lower than in the surrounding landscape, even  
 138 in locations under strong pressure from deforestation or where material and human resources are lacking  
 139 for management (Bruner et al. 2001; Ferreira et al. 2005; Soares-Filho et al. 2009; Leverington et al.  
 140 2010; Barber et al. 2014). In addition, protected areas can act as 'barriers' that prevent the advance of  
 141 deforestation to areas beyond the boundaries of the protected areas themselves (Fearnside 2008). For  
 142 example, in 2004 the Amazonas state government created a "mosaic" of protected areas along its border  
 143 with Mato Grosso to prevent deforestation activity in northern Mato Grosso from advancing into southern  
 144 Amazonas (*e.g.*, Greenpeace 2004). Such barriers can be defeated if roads are built that allow deforesters

145 to simply pass beyond the barrier. This is expected to be the case for another series of reserves intended  
 146 as a barrier: the “armored zone” (“*zona blindada*”) composed of reserves created between 2006 and 2009  
 147 along the route of the BR-319 Highway, an abandoned road that is proposed for reconstruction linking  
 148 Manaus to the ‘arc of deforestation’ in Rondônia. Planned side roads would perforate this “armor” and  
 149 allow access to large areas of unprotected forest in the western part of the state of Amazonas (Fearnside  
 150 and Graça 2006).

151 Questions remain concerning how much of the reduction of deforestation within protected areas  
 152 really reflects an absolute reduction of deforestation. One problem is that the deforestation avoided is not  
 153 directly measured, and the avoided emission must therefore be calculated from a counterfactual baseline  
 154 scenario. In some studies the baseline scenarios overestimate the effectiveness of protected areas in  
 155 reducing deforestation and the amount of deforestation avoided through future measures, mainly due to  
 156 absence of well-designed empirical analyses (see Andam et al. 2008; Yanai et al. 2012; Vitel et al. 2013).  
 157 Another problem in estimating how much deforestation has been prevented from occurring in a given  
 158 protected area is that clearing activity could be redistributed to areas outside (*e.g.*, Ewers and Rodrigues  
 159 2008; Terra et al. 2014). Carbon being emitted today through such “leakage” will be compensated for by  
 160 avoided emission at a future date when available forest is exhausted in the landscape surrounding the  
 161 reserve (Fearnside 2009, 2012a). The time elapsed between the clearing due to leakage and the future  
 162 benefit when the reserve effectively avoids deforestation, together with the value attributed to time, are  
 163 the critical factors in determining the impact of leakage from reserves (Fearnside 2009).

164

#### 165 **4. Monetary value of preserving carbon stocks in protected areas**

166

167 The reservoir of carbon in protected areas in Brazilian Amazonia is, at least formally, under  
 168 protection, with a variety of levels of restriction on human presence and sustainable use according the  
 169 criteria established in Brazilian environmental legislation (Brazil, SNUC 2000; Brazil, PNAP 2006;  
 170 Brazil, FUNAI 2015). Protection can be effective in some protected areas even if they have only minimal  
 171 management implemented. For example, ensuring the minimum management of a conservation unit  
 172 requires employees, basic equipment and a physical base, in addition to defined boundaries, a  
 173 management plan, an advisory organization and an established protection plan (Muanis et al. 2009). Even  
 174 in protected areas with only minimal management the carbon is less vulnerable than in surrounding  
 175 unprotected areas. For example, preliminary analyses indicate that strictly protected areas supported by  
 176 the ARPA (Amazon Region Protected Areas) program are more refractory to deforestation than those  
 177 without similar support (Soares-Filho et al. 2009). Highly refractory areas are those with low  
 178 deforestation inside the protected area despite high deforestation in the surrounding area. This suggests  
 179 that appropriate management of already-demarcated protected areas can ensure the maintenance of most  
 180 of the remaining stock of carbon in Brazil’s Amazonian forest (Nolte et al. 2013). It would be valuable if  
 181 at least the costs necessary to promote effective protection could be secured, regardless of whether funds  
 182 come from government or alternative sources or whether they are proportional to the amount of stored  
 183 carbon (Muanis et al. 2009; de Queiroz et al. 2010).

184 Carbon stocks in Amazonian protected areas provide an important justification both for creating  
 185 more protected areas and for investing in the staffing and other requirements for maintaining the protected  
 186 areas that have already been created. Estimating the value of carbon stocks held in protected areas  
 187 requires estimating the resources needed to ensure effective defense of the protected areas that have  
 188 already been demarcated, even if they receive minimal management. In Brazil, studies of the financial  
 189 demands of effective protection are scarce, although it is known that the resources required would be  
 190 substantial because of the need for staffing and for payment of expropriations (Araújo and Barreto 2015)  
 191 and other basic management investments. It is estimated that about US\$ 1.1 million (assuming an  
 192 exchange rate of R\$3.00/US\$) would be required to ensure the consolidation of a conservation unit,  
 193 considering mean total investments since creation (Muanis et al. 2009). This value was estimated from a  
 194 dataset on total costs obtained for the 2005-2008 period for 51 conservation units supported by ARPA.  
 195 Since most protected areas in Amazonia are still in the initial implantation stage, funds are needed for  
 196 adequate management of the protected areas that have already been delimited (Muanis et al. 2009; Araújo  
 197 and Barreto 2015) in order to conserve nearly 60% of the carbon stocks in Brazilian Amazonia (57.0% in  
 198 Legal Amazonia and 58.5% in the Amazonia Biome). Only 4% of the conservation units in the Amazonia  
 199 biome have a high level of implementation, while 56% have an intermediate level and 40% have a low

200 level (Brazil, TCU 2014). This reflects, in part, the generally low priority for the environment in the  
 201 Brazilian government's allocation both of funding and of staffing. It also reflects the fact that in Brazilian  
 202 Amazonia at present, unlike the parts of Brazil that are already largely deforested, the scarce resources  
 203 available for conservation have their greatest environmental benefit if used for creating new protected  
 204 areas, even if they are only "paper parks," rather than in completing implementation of already existing  
 205 protected areas (Fearnside 2003).

206

## 207 **5. Relevance of protected areas for REDD+**

208

209 The potential role of protected areas in REDD+ projects needs to be carefully considered. The  
 210 best estimates of carbon stocks at the time a REDD+ project begins should be used in calculating carbon  
 211 benefits, and will require correction of the pre-modern biomass to reflect degradation. Under REDD+,  
 212 carbon benefits are calculated at the end of the project period by comparing the emissions estimated to  
 213 have occurred during the period with the emissions that were predicted to occur under a hypothetical  
 214 scenario without the REDD+ project. Both the emissions estimated to have actually occurred and those  
 215 that are calculated to be the most likely outcome under the no-project "baseline" scenario depend on a  
 216 realistic estimate of biomass.

217 The baseline scenario is a key issue in controversies surrounding REDD+ as a means of  
 218 mitigating global warming (Fearnside 2012b). These scenarios can easily be misleading in exaggerating  
 219 the deforestation that would occur without the project and thereby overstating the project's climatic  
 220 benefits (Yanai et al. 2012). However, baseline scenarios can be developed without such exaggerations  
 221 (Vitel et al. 2013). REDD+ and other ways of generating monetary flows to reward avoided carbon  
 222 emissions from deforestation face significant political challenges, but it also represents a major  
 223 opportunity both for maintaining Amazonian forests (and their environmental services) and for providing  
 224 a substantial and timely contribution to efforts to contain global warming (Fearnside 2013).

225

## 226 **6. Legal threats to protected areas in Brazilian Amazonia**

227

228 Threats to protected areas in the Amazon are not restricted to deforestation and illegal logging.  
 229 Some threats can be more severe than the lack of effective protection for areas that have already been  
 230 legally established. The Brazilian National Congress is considering legislation to allow mining in  
 231 integral-protection conservation units and in Indigenous lands. Hundreds of requests for permission to  
 232 prospect have already been filed by mining companies, which may compromise 20% of these areas  
 233 (Araújo and Barreto 2010; Brazil, MME 2010; Brazil 2011, 2012; Ferreira et al. 2014).

234 In addition, sectors opposed to current policies on protected areas in the Amazon have  
 235 undertaken legislative efforts to change the way that protected areas are created and demarcated,  
 236 proposing transfer of executive power to the legislature for establishment of new areas and for making  
 237 alterations in areas that have already been demarcated (Brazil 2000). In several of the states in Legal  
 238 Amazonia, judicial measures have been used to change the limits and the degree of protection of  
 239 protected areas, usually in favor of infrastructure projects such as dams and roads (Araújo and Barreto  
 240 2010; Bernard et al. 2014).

241 These legal and legislative changes may provide mechanisms for more widespread retraction of  
 242 protected areas throughout the Brazilian Amazon, posing a greater threat than deforestation and  
 243 degradation (which are usually restricted to agricultural frontier zones). Various business interests and  
 244 politicians argue that productive activities and economic development are being compromised by the  
 245 large number and the vast extent of protected areas (Fearnside 2016b). To counteract these threats it is  
 246 necessary to quantify and assess all environmental, social and economic benefits of protected areas. One  
 247 of the many benefits of these areas is their value as carbon reserves, and it is essential that the climate  
 248 benefits of this role be recognized and rewarded.

249

## 250 7. Conclusions

251 The role of Brazil's Amazonian protected areas in regional and global climate is threatened by  
 252 deforestation and degradation. These protected areas offer an important climatic benefit by avoiding both  
 253 greenhouse gas emissions and the loss of water cycling. Mechanisms to harness the value of the forest's  
 254 environmental services, including possible application of REDD+, are important parts of strategies to  
 255 maintain protected areas and their environmental services. Legal threats in Brazil place these areas and  
 256 their climatic role at risk.  
 257

## 258 Acknowledgments

259

260 We thank the National Institute for Research in Amazonia (INPA: PRJ15.125), the National Institute of  
 261 Science and Technology for the Environmental Services of Amazonia (INCT-SERVAMB), the National  
 262 Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq/PCI Program Proc. 304130/2013-3 and  
 263 301183/2015-5; CNPq: Proc. 304020/2010-9; 573810/2008-7), the Foundation for Support of Research in  
 264 Amazonas State (FAPEAM: Proc. 708565) and the National Postdoctoral Program (PNPD/CAPES: Proc.  
 265 n° 028176/2009-41) for financial and logistical support. This article is a contribution of the Brazilian  
 266 Research Network on Global Climate Change, FINEP/ Rede CLIMA Grant Number 01.13.0353-00.  
 267 Three reviewers contributed valuable comments.  
 268

## 269 8. References

- 270 Adeney JM, Christensen Jr. NL, Pimm SL (2009) Reserves protect against deforestation fires in the  
 271 Amazon. PLoS ONE 4(4), e5014. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0005014
- 272 Alencar AA, Nepstad DC, Diaz MCV (2006) Forest understory fire in the Brazilian Amazon in ENSO  
 273 and non-ENSO years: Area burned and committed carbon emissions. *Earth Interactions* 10(6):1-17.  
 274 doi:10.1175/EI150.1
- 275 Andam KS, Ferraro PJ, Pfaff A, Sanchez-Azofeifa GA, Robalino JA (2008) Measuring the effectiveness  
 276 of protected area networks in reducing deforestation. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 105:16089–16094.  
 277 doi:10.1073/pnas.0800437105
- 278 Araújo T, Barreto P (2010) Formal threats to protected areas in the Amazon. *Imazon, State of the*  
 279 *Amazon*, 16 (July):1–6. [http://imazon.org.br/publicacoes/formal-threats-to-protected-areas-in-the-](http://imazon.org.br/publicacoes/formal-threats-to-protected-areas-in-the-amazon/?lang=en#updateOnce)  
 280 *amazon/?lang=en#updateOnce*. Accessed 15 June 2016
- 281 Araújo T, Barreto P (2015) Estratégias e fontes de recursos para proteger as unidades de conservação da  
 282 Amazônia. IMAZON, Belém, Pará, Brazil
- 283 Arraut JM, Nobre CA, Barbosa HM, Obregon G, Marengo JA (2012) Aerial rivers and lakes: Looking at  
 284 large-scale moisture transport and its relation to Amazonia and to subtropical rainfall in South  
 285 America. *J Climate* 25(2):543-556. doi:10.1175/2011JCLI418
- 286 Asner GP, Knapp DE, Broadbent EN, Oliveira PJC, Keller M, Silva JNM (2005) Selective logging in the  
 287 Brazilian Amazon. *Science* 310:480-482. doi:10.1126/science.1118051
- 288 Barber CP, Cochrane MA, Souza Jr. CM, Laurance WF (2014) Roads, deforestation, and the mitigating  
 289 effect of protected areas. *Biol Conserv* 177:203–209. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2014.07.004
- 290 Barbosa RI, Fearnside PM (1999) Incêndios na Amazônia brasileira: Estimativa da emissão de gases do  
 291 efeito estufa pela queima de diferentes ecossistemas de Roraima na passagem do evento "El Niño"  
 292 (1997/98). *Acta Amazonica* 29(4):513-534. doi:10.1590/1809-43921984143528
- 293 Barlow J, Peres CA (2008) Fire-mediated dieback and compositional cascade in an Amazonian forest.  
 294 *Phil Trans Royal Soc B* 363:1787–1794. doi:10.1098/rstb.2007.0013
- 295 Berenguer E, Ferreira J, Gardner TA, Aragão LEOC, de Camargo PB, Cerri CE, Durigan M, Oliveira  
 296 RCD, Vieira ICG, Barlow J (2014) A large-scale field assessment of carbon stocks in human-  
 297 modified tropical forests. *Global Change Biol* 20(12):3713–3726. doi:10.1111/gcb.12627
- 298 Bernard E, Penna LAO, Araújo E (2014) Downgrading, downsizing, degazettement, and reclassification  
 299 of protected areas in Brazil. *Conserv Biol* 28(4):939–950. doi:10.1111/cobi.12298
- 300 Brando PM et al (2014) Abrupt increases in Amazonian tree mortality due to drought-fire interactions.  
 301 *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 111:6347–6352. doi:10.1073/pnas.1305499111
- 302 Brazil (2000) Projeto de Emenda à Constituição n° 215 de 2000. Acrescenta o inciso XVIII ao art. 49;  
 303 modifica o § 4° e acrescenta o § 8° ambos no Art. 231 da Constituição Federal. *Diário da Câmara dos*  
 304 *Deputados*, Ano LV, n° 71 abril 2000, Brasília, DF, Brazil.

- 305 [http://www.camara.gov.br/proposicoesWeb/prop\\_mostrarintegra?codteor=889041](http://www.camara.gov.br/proposicoesWeb/prop_mostrarintegra?codteor=889041). Accessed 20 May  
306 2015
- 307 Brazil (2011) Projeto de Lei Complementar nº 37 de 2011. Dispõe sobre o regime de aproveitamento das  
308 substâncias minerais, com exceção dos minérios nucleares, petróleo, gás natural e outros  
309 hidrocarbonetos fluidos e das substâncias minerais submetidas ao regime de licenciamento de que  
310 trata o inciso III do art. 2º do Decreto-lei nº 227, de 28 de fevereiro de 1967.  
311 <http://www.camara.gov.br/proposicoesWeb/fichadetramitacao?idProposicao=490935>. Accessed 20  
312 May 2015
- 313 Brazil (2012) Projeto de Lei nº 3682 de 2012. Dispõe sobre mineração em unidades de conservação.  
314 <http://www.camara.gov.br/proposicoesWeb/fichadetramitacao?idProposicao=541161>. Accessed 20  
315 May 2015
- 316 Brazil (2015) Decreto Federal nº 8.433 de 16 e 17/04/2015. Homologa a demarcação administrativa da  
317 Terra Indígena Mapari, localizada nos municípios de Japurá, Fonte Boa e Tonantins, estado do  
318 Amazonas; da Terra Indígena Setemã, localizada nos municípios de Borba e Novo Aripuanã, estado  
319 do Amazonas e da Terra Indígena Arara da Volta Grande do Xingu, localizada no Município de  
320 Senador José Porfírio, estado do Pará. Diário Oficial da União nº 74, Seção 1, 20 de abril de 2015.
- 321 Brazil, FUNAI (Fundação Nacional do Índio) (2015) Modalidades de Terras Indígenas. FUNAI, Brasília,  
322 DF, Brazil. <http://www.funai.gov.br/index.php/indios-no-brasil/terras-indigenas>. Accessed 12 May  
323 2015
- 324 Brazil, MCT (Ministério de Ciência e Tecnologia) (2004) Brazil's initial national communication to the  
325 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. MCT, Brasília, DF, Brazil, 271 pp.  
326 [http://www.mct.gov.br/upd\\_blob/0005/5142.pdf](http://www.mct.gov.br/upd_blob/0005/5142.pdf) Accessed 12 Mar 2017
- 327 Brazil, MMA (Ministério do Meio Ambiente) (2014) Cadastro Nacional de Unidades de Conservação  
328 (CNUC), Tabela consolidada das Unidades de Conservação. Atualizada em 27 October 2014. MMA,  
329 Brasília, DF, Brazil. [http://www.mma.gov.br/images/arquivo/80112/CNUC\\_Categorias\\_Out14.pdf](http://www.mma.gov.br/images/arquivo/80112/CNUC_Categorias_Out14.pdf).  
330 Accessed 31 January 2015
- 331 Brazil, MME (Ministério de Minas e Energia) (2010) Plano Nacional de Mineração 2030: Geologia,  
332 Mineração e Transformação Mineral, Secretaria de Geologia, Mineração e Transformação Mineral,  
333 MME, Brasília, DF, Brazil. [http://www.mme.gov.br/web/guest/secretarias/geologia-mineracao-e-  
334 transformacao-mineral/plano-nacional-de-mineracao-2030/pnm-2030](http://www.mme.gov.br/web/guest/secretarias/geologia-mineracao-e-transformacao-mineral/plano-nacional-de-mineracao-2030/pnm-2030). Accessed 20 May 2015
- 335 Brazil, PNAP (Plano Nacional Estratégico para Áreas Protegidas) (2006) Plano Nacional Estratégico para  
336 Áreas Protegidas (PNAP), Decreto nº 5758 de 13 de abril de 2006, Ministério do Meio Ambiente  
337 (MMA), Brasília, DF, Brazil.  
338 [http://www.mma.gov.br/estruturas/205/\\_arquivos/planonacionaareasprotegidas\\_205.pdf](http://www.mma.gov.br/estruturas/205/_arquivos/planonacionaareasprotegidas_205.pdf). Accessed 16  
339 June 2016
- 340 Brazil, SNUC (Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação) (2000) Sistema Nacional de Unidades de  
341 Conservação (SNUC), Lei no. 9985 de 18 de julho de 2000. Serviço Brasileiro Florestal (SBF),  
342 Ministério do Meio Ambiente (MMA), Brasília, DF, Brazil.  
343 [http://www.mma.gov.br/images/arquivos/areas\\_protegidas/snuc/Livro%20SNUC%20PNAP.pdf](http://www.mma.gov.br/images/arquivos/areas_protegidas/snuc/Livro%20SNUC%20PNAP.pdf).  
344 Accessed 16 June 2016
- 345 Brazil, TCU (Tribunal de Contas da União) (2014) Amazônia: unidades de conservação – auditoria  
346 coordenada. TCU, Brasília, DF, Brazil.
- 347 Bruner AG, Gullison RE, Rice RE, da Fonseca GAB (2001) Effectiveness of parks in protecting tropical  
348 biodiversity. *Science* 291:125–128. doi:10.1126/science.291.5501.125
- 349 Clark S, Bolt K, Campbell A (2008) Protected areas: an effective tool to reduce emissions from  
350 deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries? Working Paper, UNEP World  
351 Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK
- 352 Cochrane MA, Alencar AA, Schulze MD, Souza CM, Nepstad DC, Lefebvre P, Davidson EA (1999)  
353 Positive feedbacks in the fire dynamic of closed canopy tropical forests. *Science* 284:1832-1835.  
354 doi:10.1126/science.284.5421.1832
- 355 de Queiroz JM, Young CEF, Medeiros R (2010) Expansão e financiamento de unidades de conservação  
356 na Amazonia brasileira a partir do potencial de redução das emissões de carbono por desmatamento.  
357 *Desenvolvimento em Debate* 1(1):71–89. [http://desenvolvimentoemdebate.ie.ufrj.br/pdf/dd\\_1\\_2.pdf](http://desenvolvimentoemdebate.ie.ufrj.br/pdf/dd_1_2.pdf).
- 358 Dudley N, Stolton S, Belokurov A, Krueger L, Lopoukhine N, MacKinnon K, Sandwith T, Sekhran N  
359 (2010) Natural Solutions: Protected areas helping people cope with climate change. A report funded  
360 and commissioned by IUCN-WCPA, TNC, UNDP, WCS, The World Bank and WWF, Gland,  
361 Switzerland, Washington, DC & New York, USA.
- 362 Ewers RM, Rodrigues ASL (2008) Estimates of reserve effectiveness are confounded by leakage. *Trends*  
363 *in Ecol and Evol* 23(3):113–116. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.11.008

- 364 Fearnside PM (2000) Greenhouse gas emissions from land-use change in Brazil's Amazon region. In: Lal  
 365 R, Kimble JM, Stewart BA (eds.) *Global Climate Change and Tropical Ecosystems. Advances in Soil*  
 366 *Science*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, U.S.A. pp 231-249
- 367 Fearnside PM (2003) Conservation policy in Brazilian Amazonia: Understanding the dilemmas. *World*  
 368 *Devel* 31(5):757-779. doi:10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00011-1
- 369 Fearnside PM (2007) Uso da terra na Amazônia e as mudanças climáticas globais. *Brazilian Journal of*  
 370 *Ecology* 10(2):83-100. <http://repositorio.inpa.gov.br/handle/123/5892>
- 371 Fearnside PM (2008) Amazon forest maintenance as a source of environmental services. *Annals of the*  
 372 *Brazilian Acad of Sci* 80(1):101–114. doi:10.1590/S0001-37652008000100006
- 373 Fearnside PM (2009) Carbon benefits from Amazonian forest reserves: Leakage accounting and the value  
 374 of time. *Mitigat Adaptat Strat Global Change* 14(6):557–567. doi:10.1007/s11027-009-9174-9
- 375 Fearnside PM (2012a) The theoretical battlefield: Accounting for the carbon benefits of maintaining  
 376 Brazil's Amazon forest. *Carbon Manage* 3(2):145–158. doi:10.4155/cmt.12.9
- 377 Fearnside PM (2012b) Brazil's Amazon forest in mitigating global warming: Unresolved controversies.  
 378 *Climate Policy* 12(1):70-81. doi:10.1080/14693062.2011.581571
- 379 Fearnside PM (2013) What is at stake for Brazilian Amazonia in the climate negotiations. *Climatic*  
 380 *Change* 118(3):509-519. doi:10.1007/s10584-012-0660-9
- 381 Fearnside PM (2016a) Brazil's Amazonian forest carbon: The key to Southern Amazonia's significance  
 382 for global climate. *Regional Environ Change*. doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1007-2
- 383 Fearnside PM (2016b) Brazilian politics threaten environmental policies. *Science* 353:746-748.  
 384 doi:10.1126/science.aag0254
- 385 Fearnside PM (2017) Deforestation of the Brazilian Amazon. In Schugart H (ed) *Oxford Research*  
 386 *Encyclopedia of Environmental Science*. Oxford University Press, New York, USA. (In press)
- 387 Fearnside PM, Graça PMLA (2006) BR-319: Brazil's Manaus-Porto Velho Highway and the potential  
 388 impact of linking the arc of deforestation to central Amazonia. *Environ Manage* 38(5):705–716.  
 389 doi:10.1007/s00267-005-0295-y
- 390 Feldpausch TR et al (2016) Amazon forest response to repeated droughts. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 30.  
 391 doi:10.1002/2015GB005133
- 392 Ferreira J, Aragão LEOC, Barlow J, Barreto P, Berenguer E, Bustamante M, Gardner TA, Lees AC, Lima  
 393 A, Louzada J, Pardini R, Parry L, Peres CA, Pompeu PS, Tabarelli M, Zuanon J (2014) Brazil's  
 394 environmental leadership at risk: Mining and dams threaten protected areas. *Science* 346:706–707.  
 395 doi:10.1126/science.1260194
- 396 Ferreira LV, Venticinquê E, Almeida S (2005) O desmatamento na Amazônia e a importância das áreas  
 397 protegidas. *Estudos Avançados* 19(53):157–166. doi:10.1590/S0103-40142005000100010
- 398 Grace J, Mitchard E, Gloor E (2014) Perturbations in the carbon budget of the tropics. *Global Change*  
 399 *Biol* 20:3238-3255. doi:10.1111/gcb.12600
- 400 Greenpeace (2004) Sul do Amazonas ganha mosaico de áreas protegidas.  
 401 <http://www.greenpeace.org/brasil/pt/Noticias/sul-do-amazonas-ganha-mosaico/>. Accessed 15 June  
 402 2016
- 403 Greenpeace (2016) PF realiza ação de combate à madeira ilegal no Maranhão. Greenpeace Brasil, 14 July  
 404 2016. [http://www.greenpeace.org/brasil/pt/Noticias/PF-realiza-acao-de-combate-a-madeira-ilegal-no-](http://www.greenpeace.org/brasil/pt/Noticias/PF-realiza-acao-de-combate-a-madeira-ilegal-no-Maranhao/)  
 405 [Maranhao/](http://www.greenpeace.org/brasil/pt/Noticias/PF-realiza-acao-de-combate-a-madeira-ilegal-no-Maranhao/) Accessed 11 March 2017
- 406 Leverington F, Costa KL, Pavese H, Lisle A, Hockings M (2010) A global analysis of protected area  
 407 management effectiveness. *Environ Manage* 46:685–698. doi:10.1007/s00267-010-9564-5
- 408 Lewis SL, Brando PM, Phillips OL, van der Heijden GM, Nepstad D (2011) The 2010 Amazon drought.  
 409 *Science* 331:554. doi:10.1126/science.1200807
- 410 Longo M, Keller MM, dos-Santos MN, Leitold V, Pinagé ER, Baccini A, Saatchi S, Nogueira EM,  
 411 Batistella M, Morton DC (2016) Aboveground biomass variability across intact and degraded forests  
 412 in the Brazilian Amazon. *Global Biogeochem Cycles* 30:1639–1660. doi:10.1002/2016GB005465
- 413 Muanis MM, Serrão M, Geluda L (2009) Quanto custa uma Unidade de Conservação Federal? Uma visão  
 414 estratégica para o financiamento do Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação (SNUC). *Funbio*,  
 415 1ª Edição, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil
- 416 Nepstad D, Schwartzman S, Bamberger B, Santilli M, Ray D, Schlesinger P, Lefebvre P, Alencar A,  
 417 Prinz E, Fiske G, Rolla A (2006) Inhibition of Amazon deforestation and fire by parks and indigenous  
 418 lands. *Conserv Biol* 20(1):65–73. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00351.x
- 419 Nogueira EM, Yanai AM, Fonseca FOR, Fearnside PM (2015) Carbon stock loss from deforestation  
 420 through 2013 in Brazilian Amazonia. *Global Change Biol* 21(3):1271–1292. doi:10.1111/gcb.12798
- 421 Nogueira EM, Yanai AM, Vasconcelos SS, Graça PMLA, Fearnside PM (2017) Carbon stocks and losses  
 422 to deforestation in protected areas in Brazilian Amazonia. *Reg Environ Change* doi:  
 423 10.1007/s10113-017-1198-1

- 424 Nolte C, Agrawal A, Silvius KM, Soares-Filho BS (2013) Governance regime and location influence  
 425 avoided deforestation success of protected areas in the Brazilian Amazon. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA*  
 426 110(13):4956–4961. doi:10.1073/pnas.1214786110
- 427 Phillips OL et al (2009) Drought sensitivity of the Amazon rainforest. *Science* 323:1344–1347.  
 428 doi:10.1126/science.1164033
- 429 Ricketts TH, Soares-Filho B, da Fonseca GAB, Nepstad D, Pfaff A, Peterson A, Anderson A, Boucher D,  
 430 Cattaneo A, Conte M, Creighton K, Linden L, Maretti C, Moutinho P, Ullman R, Victurine R (2010)  
 431 Indigenous lands, protected areas, and slowing climate change. *PloS Biology* 8(3):e1000331.  
 432 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000331
- 433 Saatchi SS, Najafabady SN, Malhi Y, Aragão LEOC, Anderson LO, Myneni RB, Nemani R (2013)  
 434 Persistent effects of a severe drought on Amazonian forest canopy. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA*  
 435 110(2):565–570. doi:10.1073/pnas.1204651110
- 436 Shimabukuro YE, Duarte V, Arai E, Freitas RM, Lima A, Valeriano DM, Brown IF, Maldonado MLR  
 437 (2009) Fraction images derived from Terra Modis data for mapping burnt areas in Brazilian  
 438 Amazonia. *Int. J. Remote Sensing* 30(6):1537–1546. doi:10.1080/01431160802509058
- 439 Soares-Filho BS, Dietzsch L, Moutinho P, Faliéri A, Rodrigues H, Pinto E, Maretti CC, Scaramuzza  
 440 CAM, Anderson A, Suassuna K, Lanna M, de Araújo FV (2009) Reduction of carbon emissions  
 441 associated with deforestation in Brazil: The role of the Amazon Region Protected Areas Program  
 442 (ARPA). *Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF), Brasília, DF, Brazil*
- 443 Terra TN, dos Santos RF, Costa DC (2014) Land use changes in protected areas and their future: The  
 444 legal effectiveness of landscape protection. *Land Use Policy* 38:378–387.  
 445 doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2013.12.003
- 446 Vasconcelos SS, Fearnside PM, Graça PMLA, Nogueira EM, de Oliveira LC, Figueiredo EO (2013)  
 447 Forest fires in southwestern Brazilian Amazonia: Estimates of area and potential carbon emissions.  
 448 *Forest Ecol Manage* 291:199–208. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2012.11.044
- 449 Vitel CSMN, Carrero GC, Cenamo MC, Leroy M, Graça PMLA, Fearnside PM (2013) Land-use change  
 450 modeling in a Brazilian indigenous reserve: construction of a reference scenario for the Suruí REDD  
 451 project. *Human Ecol* 41:807–826. doi:10.1007/s10745-013-9613-9
- 452 Walker W, Baccini A, Schwartzman S, Ríos S, Oliveira-Miranda MA, Augusto C, Ruiz MR, Arrasco CS,  
 453 Ricardo B, Smith R, Meyer C, Jintiaich JC, Campos EV (2014) Forest carbon in Amazonia: the  
 454 unrecognized contribution of indigenous territories and protected natural areas. *Carbon Manage*  
 455 5:479–485. doi:10.1080/17583004.2014.990680
- 456 Yanai AM, Fearnside PM, Graça PMLA, Nogueira EM (2012) Avoided deforestation in Brazilian  
 457 Amazonia: Simulating the effect of the Juma Sustainable Development Reserve. *Forest Ecol Manage*  
 458 282:78–91. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2012.06.029

#### 459 460 **FIGURE CAPTION**

461 **Fig. 1** Protected areas (Indigenous lands, Conservation units and Maroon territories) in Brazil's Legal  
 462 Amazonia and Amazonia biome regions. Only protected areas that have over 50% of their area inside the  
 463 boundaries of Legal Amazonia are included.

