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

Please cite as:
Favor citar como:

Fearnside, P.M. 2012. Environmental services of intact, degraded and secondary forests in Brazilian Amazonia. In: Peres, C.A., T.A. Gardner, J. Barlow & I. Vieira (eds.) *Biodiversity Conservation in Human-Dominated Landscapes*. Fundação o Boticário para a Natureza & Editora da Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, Paraná (no prelo).

(no prelo para dez. de 2012).

Copyright: Fundação o Boticário para a Natureza & Editora da Universidade Federal do Paraná

The original publication will be available from:
A publicação original está disponível de:
Fundação o Boticário para a Natureza & Editora da Universidade Federal do Paraná

Environmental Services of Intact, Degraded and Secondary Forests in Brazilian Amazonia

Philip M. Fearnside
Department of Ecology
National Institute for Research
in the Amazon (INPA)
C.P. 478
69.011-970 Manaus, Amazonas
BRAZIL
pmfearn@inpa.gov.br

26 May 2008

Contribution for:
*Biodiversity Conservation in Human-Dominated Landscape*s. C. Peres *et al*. (eds.)

ABSTRACT

Environmental services represent the product of Amazonian forests with the greatest value to human society, being much more valuable per hectare than the timber, beef and other commodities that can be obtained by destroying these ecosystems. Environmental services include maintenance of biodiversity, maintenance of the hydrological cycle, and avoidance of global warming. These services are supplied in very different amounts by intact forest, secondary forest, and degraded forests, as well as by other uses such as agriculture and cattle pasture. Transformations among these uses are occurring rapidly due to direct human actions, especially deforestation for ranching and agriculture and forest degradation through logging and fire. In addition, projected changes in climate can be expected to hasten forest degradation and loss through drought-induced tree mortality and through forest fires. The key to generating the political will for the Brazilian government to gain control over these destructive processes lies in the direct value of the forest's environmental services for Brazil's national interests, as well as in the value of financial flows from other countries that might be generated on the basis of the benefits that these services provide for the rest of the world.

KEYWORDS: Environmental services, Ecosystem services, Carbon, Hydrological cycle, Rainforest, Tropical forest, Protected areas

I.) BIODIVERSITY

Amazonia is commonly credited with having approximately 20% of the Earth's plant and animal species (*e.g.*, Magrin *et al*., 2007). Whether or not such gross estimates are correct, the fact that Amazonia's biodiversity is enormous is undeniable. Amazonia differs from many other regions of the world with high biodiversity such as Madagascar and Brazil's Atlantic forest, in that vast expanses of Amazon forest are still standing. Amazonia was not classified as a "hotspot" by Myers *et al.* (2000) and has been given lower priority for conservation than other areas, including the Brazilian *cerrado*, due to the perceived lack of threat (Dinerstein *et al*., 1995). Such "devaluation" of Amazonian forest in conservation priorities ignores high biogeographical variability within the region (Bates and Demos, 2001). Destruction is advancing quickly and the size of the remaining forest is deceptive as an assurance of maintaining biodiversity. In addition to loss of forest area through deforestation, biodiversity is threatened by the effects of fragmentation and by degradation from edge effects, forest fires, logging, hunting, introduction of exotic species and climate change (*e.g.*, Laurance and Peres, 2006).

Climate change represents a significant threat to Amazonian biodiversity. Under the most catastrophic scenarios (those of the UK Meteorological Office's Hadley Center, to be discussed later), 43% of a representative sample of 69 angiosperm plant species become unviable by 2095 due to shifts in the locations of climatic zones (Miles *et al.*, 2004).

The potential role of secondary forests in maintaining Amazonian diversity has provoked considerable controversy. Wright and Müller-Landau (2006) have suggested that increasing urbanization in the tropics, including Amazonia, will draw people from rural areas to the cities, allowing large areas of secondary forests to grow on abandoned farmland with a consequent maintenance of a substantial part of the biodiversity in tropical areas. This theory has been hotly contested, both in it's assumptions regarding abandonment of land to secondary forest and in its expectation of maintenance of high levels of biodiversity (Fearnside, 2008a; Laurance, 2006; Sloan, 2007).

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UN-FCCC) is far ahead of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in terms of having large volumes of money available. The CBD focuses on intellectual property rights to assure that the forest residents receive royalties from future discoveries of pharmaceutical products and other commercial uses of biodiversity. Developing drugs and licensing them for commercial use takes decades, such that substantial monetary flows from these sources cannot be relied upon to protect large areas of Amazonian forest (Fearnside, 1999a). The opinion frequently voiced in Europe that stopping tropical deforestation is a biodiversity issue rather than a climatic one, and should therefore be dealt with under the aegis of the CBD instead of the UN-FCCC, would represent nothing less than a death warrant for the forest if taken seriously.

II.) WATER CYCLING

Tropical forests in Amazonia recycle vast quantities of water. Evapotranspiration in the Amazon Basin is estimated to total 8.4×10^{12} m^3 of water annually, or almost half again as much as the 6.6×10^{12} m^3 annual flow of the Amazon River at its mouth, and more than double the 3.8×10^{12} m^3 annual flow at the "Meeting of the Waters" near Manaus (Salati, 2001). The percentage of the rainfall derived from the recycled water increases from the eastern to the western edge of the forest, and is highest in the dry season when forests are most susceptible to drought (Lean *et al.*, 1996, pp. 560-561). Simulations indicate that if the forest were cut entirely, there would be a substantial reduction of evapotranspiration, and dry-season rainfall would decrease over a large area, especially in the western part of the region (Foley *et al.*, 2007). If the area cleared and converted to pasture surpasses approximately 40% of the original forest area, the precipitation in the dry season undergoes a sharp decline (Sampaio *et al.*, 2007).

The water recycled through the forest not only contributes to maintaining the rainfall regime in Amazonia in a way that is necessary for the forest's continued survival, it also provides water vapor that is transported by winds to south-central Brazil and to neighboring countries such as Paraguay and Argentina (*e.g.*, Marengo *et al.*, 2002, 2004; Fearnside, 2004a). Uncertainty regarding the amount of water transport is high, but the volumes involved are so large that the effect would still be substantial even if the percentage transported to the south is at the lower end of the range of possibility. Correia (2005) produced a simulation of water transport that indicates that, of the annual total amount of water vapor entering a rectangle covering most of Brazilian Amazonia, half leaves the rectangle moving to the south. The predominant winds in Amazonia blow from east to west, bringing an estimated 10×10^{12} m^3 of water annually from over the Atlantic Ocean (Salati, 2001). Subtracting the 6.6×10^{12} m^3 that flows out the mouth of the Amazon leaves 3.4×10^{12} m^3 that must be transported to locations outside of the Amazon/Tocantins Basin. This is almost as much as the 3.8×10^{12} m^3/year flow one sees at the Meeting of the Waters.

Two types of wind move water vapor to south-central Brazil: wind fields derived from the northeast trade winds (Correia *et al.*, 2007) and intermittent low-level jets (Marengo, 2006; Marengo *et al.*, 2002, 2004). The amount transported varies seasonally, being most important in December and January – the height of the rainy season in south-central Brazil. This is the critical period for filling the hydroelectric reservoirs in both the Paraná/La Plata River Basin and in the São Francisco River Basin. These dams form the backbone of Brazil's electrical energy supply. If the reservoirs fail to fill during these few weeks, they will not fill during the rest of the year because the rate of water use invariably exceeds the rate of recharge. The widespread blackout, or "*apagão,*" in 2001 demonstrated that water supply is already at a critical level. If the rainy season were to be weakened by the loss of water vapor from Amazonia, the consequences for most of Brazil's population would be immediate (Fearnside, 2004a).

III.) CARBON STOCKS

A.) Deforestation Emissions from Primary Forests

The stock of carbon in primary forests in Brazilian Amazonia is enormous, and avoiding the release of this carbon to the atmosphere therefore represents an important environmental service by avoiding the corresponding impacts of global warming. The term "primary" is used here to refer to forests that are present since European contact. They are not "virgin" in the sense of being uninfluenced by the indigenous people who have inhabited them for millennia, nor are they necessarily free of impact from selective logging and ground fires from recent human influence.

Estimates vary widely as to the amount of biomass and carbon stocked in Amazonian primary forests. However, because of known errors in some of the estimates, the range of genuine uncertainty is much less than the range of numbers that have been published and quoted. Part of this stems from an extremely low value for forest biomass estimated by Brown and Lugo (1984), who calculated that Amazonian forests have an average live biomass of only 155.1 Mg (megagrams = tons) per hectare, including the roots. This is approximately half the magnitude of present-day estimates. This estimate and a subsequent revision (for above-ground biomass only) to 162 Mg/ha from the forest volume surveys by the Radar in Amazonia-Brazil Project (RADAMBRASIL) and 268 Mg/ha from forest volume surveys by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) (Brown and Lugo, 1992a), then revised to 227 and 289 Mg/ha, respectively (Brown and Lugo, 1992b), were the subject of a colorful dispute, during which this author was accused of being "clearly alarmist" (Lugo and Brown, 1986) for defending higher values for biomass (see Brown and Lugo, 1992c; Fearnside, 1985, 1986, 1992, 1993). While Brown and Lugo themselves no longer use their very low biomass estimates of that period, the ghost of these numbers is still with us to this very day, especially the notorious 155.1 Mg/ha estimate. This is because many discussions of Amazonian biomass confine themselves to reporting a range of published values, from "X" to "Y" (*e.g.,* Houghton, 2003a,b; Houghton *et al*., 2000, 2001). Readers unfamiliar with the details of the controversies usually assume that the "real" value lies in the middle of the range. This is the "Goldilocks fallacy," or assuming *a priori* that the middle value is "just right." Unfortunately, if the terms are defined in the same way there can only be one correct value for the average biomass of the Amazon forest. That value will depend on the quality and quantity of the underlying data and on the validity of the interpretation applied to these numbers. There is no substitute for understanding and evaluating the arguments involved.

The vast area of Amazonia, diverse types of forest in the region, and the high variability of biomass from one hectare to the next within any given forest type mean that a large number of sample plots is required to adequately represent the region's biomass. The principal sources of data are the RADAMBRASIL survey, with over 3000 one-hectare plots where trees were measured in the 1970s and early 1980s (Brazil, Projeto RADAMBRASIL, 1973-1983) and the 1356 ha of plots surveyed by the FAO (Heinsdijk, 1957, 1958; Glerum, 1960; Glerum and Smit, 1962). Estimates based on much smaller data bases will necessarily carry substantial uncertainty. Examples include the estimates by Saatchi *et al.* (2007), based on 280 plots in primary forests (approximately half of which were in Brazil), and the study of Malhi *et al.* (2006), which interpolated using Kriging (followed by adjustments for the effects of various environmental variables) based on 226 plots of which 81 were in Brazil, these being heavily clustered in the Manaus, Belém and Santarém areas. One estimate (Achard *et al.,* 2002) was based on a mean of two values, one of which Brown (1997, p. 24) was for a single plot located in the Tapajós National Forest in Pará (FAO, 1978) and made no claim to represent the whole of Amazonia (see Fearnside and Laurance, 2004). Houghton *et al*. (2000) derived an estimate interpolated from 56 plots, while Houghton *et al*. (2001) produced an estimate interpolated from 44 samples, of which only 25 were in Brazilian *terra firme* (upland) forests; these authors then averaged the resulting 192 MgC/ha value with six other regional estimates to produce the 177 MgC/ha average biomass carbon stock used by Ramankutty *et al*. (2007, p. 64) in calculating emissions. This also applies to studies that have based calculations on the Houghton *et al*. (2000) estimate, such as Soares-Filho *et al*. (2004, 2006) and DeFries *et al.* (2002). Interpolation from the small number of samples used in the estimates by Houghton and coworkers is made even more uncertain by the effect of a pronounced clustering of sample locations, which both exacerbates the lack of coverage for most of the region and reveals the large uncertainty of estimates based on small sample areas, which display high variability among nearby locations. The present study uses 2860 of the RADAMBRASIL plots and includes the information in the RADAMBRASIL vegetation maps.

The placement of the RADAMBRASIL plots is highly non-random, with the samples heavily concentrated along rivers and roads. The concentration of samples near rivers means that riparian vegetation is proportionately more heavily sampled than the upland interfluves between the rivers. Simply converting the RADAMBRASIL volume estimates to biomass and interpolating between the locations will therefore over-emphasize the lower biomass riparian vegetation types and will tend to underestimate average biomass in the region (*i.e*., the "RADAMBRASIL" estimates in Houghton *et al*., 2001). The computational ease of using geographical information system (GIS) software to interpolate between the sample points using Kriging techniques produces visually attractive maps but throws out the tremendous amount of labor that the RADAMBRASIL teams invested in classifying and mapping the vegetation.

Another approach is to use remote-sensing information to estimate biomass by associating a variety of parameters detected from space with the biomass measured at a series of reference points on the ground. This has been done by Saatchi *et al*. (2007) using 1-km resolution satellite-borne radar data, from which a number of characters were extracted and associated with published or otherwise available data from plots surveyed since 1990. The older, but much larger, data sets from the RADAMBRASIL and FAO surveys were not used for calibrating the satellite-borne radar results, nor were the vegetation maps that the RADAMBRASIL project derived from high-resolution airborne radar coupled with extensive field observations.

Using the RADAMBRASIL dataset requires considerable effort due to confusion regarding the vegetation types in the map legends. Among the 23 volumes into which the coverage of Brazilian Amazonia is divided, the map codes corresponding to different vegetation types change from one volume to another. The level of detail in the codes is not consistent throughout the survey, some volumes using four-letter codes and others simplified to three. In Brazilian Amazonia there are 145 vegetation types in the RADAMBRASIL data set. These can be translated into the 19 forest types used in 1:5,000,000-scale maps by the Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA) and 1:2,500,000-scale maps by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), using equivalences that change depending on the RADAMBRASIL volume.

There are many inconsistencies in reporting the vegetation type associated with each plot. All volumes are composed of a green-covered main volume plus a packet of 1:1,000,000-scale maps. From Volume 8 onward there is also a white-covered volume with plot-level data on wood volume by species and size class. The chapters in the green volumes up to Volume 18 also contain many small 250,000-scale maps showing plot locations and vegetation types. Approximately half of the 3000 plots have some sort of inconsistency, where the green volume text lists a given plot for one vegetation type, the white volume lists another, and/or the 1:1,000,000-scale vegetation map or the 1:250,000-scale location map shows a different vegetation type. Fearnside (1997a, 2000b,c) used only the 1500 points with no inconsistency in reporting the vegetation type. An ongoing effort to clarify these inconsistencies has expanded the number of usable plots.

The tree-by-tree data from the plots are not reported in the published RADAMBRASIL volumes. These data have apparently been digitized twice: once by FUNCATE (Foundation for Space Research, Applications and Technology, a firm in São José dos Campos, São Paulo, that did contract work for INPE in preparing the data for the deforestation emission estimates included in Brazil's national communication to the UN-FCCC). As far as can be determined, this data set has been lost. Repeated efforts by this author and by Carlos Nobre have been unsuccessful in obtaining the original tree-by-tree data used in Brazil's national communication. The national communication estimate of deforestation emissions (Brazil, MCT, 2004, p. 148; FUNCATE, 2006, p. 23) is based on a "personal communication" from 2000 that has never been released. In addition to rendering impossible any checking of the calculations, this official estimate ignores all the work done in the five years from 2000 to December 2004.

The RADAMBRASIL data have subsequently been digitized by IBGE. A large number of apparent typographical errors, together with inclusion of treed savannas, make extensive filtering and culling necessary in order to use the data. Work on this is underway. It is probable that similar errors apply to the version of the dataset used in the national communication, but there is no way to verify this.

Recent advances have been made by Nogueira *et al*. (2007) in adjusting biomass estimates for the effect of variation in wood density between the arc of deforestation and the central Amazon area where almost all previous data had originated. Additional adjustments correct for differences in tree height between these parts of Amazonia (Nogueira *et al*., 2008). Trees of the same species in the arc of deforestation are shorter for any given diameter than they are in central Amazonia, and they have lighter density wood and higher water content. These corrections have the effect of lowering biomass as compared to previous estimates. The corrections do not resolve differences between these previous estimates, however, as all of them would decrease in parallel. For estimates based on tree-by-tree data (as opposed to estimates based on wood volume estimates by plot published by RADAMBRASIL), it is also necessary to make corrections for irregular and hollow trunks (Nogueira *et al*., 2006). In some cases, additional corrections are needed for wood density sample positioning within the trunk and/or for the way the wood samples are dried (Nogueira *et al.*, 2005).

B.) Carbon Uptake by Standing Forest

Is standing forest absorbing a large amount of carbon? This question has long been a source of controversy, but much progress has been made in resolving it. The still-popular misconception that Amazonia is the "lungs of the world," meaning that it is responsible for supplying the global atmosphere with oxygen, implies that a vast amount of carbon must be being stocked away in the region, presumably in increasing biomass of the forest. The impossibility of such a mechanism supplying a significant amount of oxygen has always been clear because to do so would imply such a rapid increase in biomass that it would be obvious to casual observers. The forest trees are not several fold larger today than they were a century ago. Although photosynthesis by the trees releases oxygen, approximately the same amount of oxygen is consumed by the forest through respiration of both plants and animals (which takes place 24 hours per day, unlike photosynthesis which is restricted to the daylight hours). In order to have a net release of oxygen, the carbon sequestered by photosynthesis must be stored away such that it cannot recombine with oxygen to produce carbon dioxide. This occurs, for example, with organic matter that falls to the bottom of the ocean and is buried in marine sediments.

Since carbon dioxide only makes up approximately 3% of the atmosphere, as compared to approximately 20% for oxygen, a much smaller emission or absorption would be necessary to have an appreciable effect on the concentration in the case of carbon dioxide. Imbalances in the uptake and release of carbon could affect atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations over a time scale of a few years, although over a scale of centuries the balance must be approximately zero. A series of estimates from eddy-correlation measurements of vertical movement of CO_2 past sensors mounted on towers above the forest canopy has produced widely differing values for net carbon flux, often simply reported as a range, such as an uptake of 1-6 MgC/ha/year. Expressing it this way implies that there is an enormous disagreement in the scientific community over the general nature of the result. While there is some disagreement, it is much less than such a range implies. In large part, the wide range of results represents a progression of revisions of the numbers due to problems with the initial measurement methodology. The revisions resulted in a steady decrease in the estimated uptake by the forest, and numbers at the upper end of the range have been disqualified because much of the carbon dioxide measured as entering the forest during the day was, in fact, leaking away by flowing downhill near the ground at night, only to be released past the boundary layer in the morning from some downhill location away from the tower (Araújo *et al.*, 2002; Kruijt *et al.*, 2004).

Corrected estimates extrapolated to all of Amazonia indicate substantial variation, with standing forests serving either as a source or a sink, the mean being a sink of 2.3 ± 3.8 MgC/ha/year (Ometto *et al.*, 2005). The nocturnal and early-morning fluxes are especially important for the huge uncertainty in the overall balance. During El Niño years the forest loses carbon, and at the Santarém site the forest was found to be a small source even in non-El Niño years (Saleska *et al.*, 2003), a result that is consistent with carbon stocks estimated from monitoring tree biomass and coarse woody debris in the same forest (Rice *et al.*, 2004). This effect is also expected from modeling results (Tian *et al.*, 1998, 2000). It was evident at the time of the early high estimates that something was wrong with the numbers because forest growth at the implied rate would be readily observable, and this contradicts tree measurement data from the large survey at the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project near Manaus (Fearnside, 2000a).

There is substantial variation with location in the amount of carbon uptake calculated. The maximum uptake rates were estimated from tree-growth measurements in Peru and Ecuador (Baker *et al*., 2004; Phillips *et al*., 1998, 2002, 2004); unfortunately, there are no towers at these sites for comparable eddy correlation measurements. A gradient in uptake rates declining from the Andes to the Atlantic has been attributed to a corresponding gradient in soil quality (Malhi *et al.*, 2006).

C.) Carbon Uptake by Secondary Forests

Shortly before the 1997 Kyoto Conference of the Parties, which produced the Kyoto Protocol, the Brazilian government announced that the country produces *zero* net emissions from Amazonian deforestation because "the carbon is re-absorbed" (*IstoÉ*, 1997). The claim that "the plantations [*i.e.*, secondary forests] that replace the forest re-absorb the carbon that was thrown into the atmosphere by the burning" ignores the approximately two-thirds of the deforestation emission that comes from decomposition rather than burning (Fearnside, 1997a). Even so, the notion that the landscape in the area that is deforested each year absorbs this much carbon is still a gross exaggeration. Only 7.3% of the 1990 CO_2 emission will eventually be re-absorbed by the replacement landscape (Fearnside, 2000b, p. 235). This is based on the equilibrium composition of the landscape implied by transition probabilities among land uses in the 1980s and early 1990s (Fearnside, 1996a; Fearnside and Guimarães, 1996).

Estimates of carbon uptake and stock in secondary forests vary tremendously, and several of the most frequently used numbers for these important parameters are not based on any data whatsoever. This is the case for the estimates by Houghton *et al.* (2000, p. 303) and Ramankutty *et al.* (2007, p. 65), which assume that secondary forests will grow linearly to attain 70% of the original primary forest biomass carbon stock in 25 years. For example, considering primary forest biomass carbon of 196 MgC/ha (above + below ground), which is the average of three estimates by Houghton *et al.* (2000), this secondary forest growth rate corresponds to 5.5 MgC/ha/year. The corresponding figure for Ramankutty *et al.* (2007) would be 5.0 MgC/ha/year, given their assumptions. These assumed growth rates are approximately double the growth rates that have been measured in secondary forests growing in abandoned pastures in Brazilian Amazonia. For abandoned pastures near Brasil Novo, Pará measured by Guimarães (1993) the mean annual accumulation to 20 years is 2.2 MgC/ha/year, while for abandoned pastures near Paragominas, Pará, with a history of "moderate" use studied by Uhl *et al.* (1988) the accumulation by year 20 would average 2.6 MgC/ha/year (see Fearnside and Guimarães, 1996, p. 41). These values assume a carbon content of 45% for secondary forest biomass.

The growth rate assumed by Houghton *et al.* (2000), although not supported by any reference to data, has been used in such carbon-balance calculations and in global calculations by Achard *et al*. (2002, 2004), Houghton *et al*. (2003a) and Persson and Azar (2007). This is one of the reasons these studies underestimate greenhouse-gas emissions from Amazonian deforestation (Fearnside and Laurance, 2003, 2004; see also: Eva *et al*., 2003; Achard *et al*., 2004). Most important from a policy standpoint is the fact that this value for secondary forest growth is used in Brazil's national inventory of greenhouse-gas emissions (Brazil, MCT, 2004, pp. 148-149), leading this official estimate to included an absorption of 34.9 million MgC/year from secondary forests in Amazonia, supposedly absorbing 23% of the gross emission from deforestation calculated in the report. This author's estimate for absorption by the landscape in 1990 is only 7.9 million MgC/year (Fearnside, 2000b). The much higher value in the official estimate is only partially due to the high value used for per-hectare uptake in secondary forest; even more important is the misleading decision of counting all of the Amazonian landscape's uptake in an estimated 8.23 million hectares of secondary forest (an area 5.4 times the annual deforestation rate in the inventory period), but not counting any of the emission from each year's clearing of a portion of these secondary forests. In addition, if the inherited uptake from the more rapid clearing of the 1980s is to be claimed, then the inherited emissions from this period would also have to be counted to have a fair estimate of the impact of deforestation; these emissions are quite substantial for the years in question (Fearnside, 1996b, 2000b). Selective mixing of elements from net committed emissions and annual balance calculations does not produce a valid result (see Fearnside, 2000b, 2003a). "Net committed emissions" refers to the net result of the emissions and uptakes that occur in the area felled in a given year, such as the 13.8×10^3 km^2 of primary forest cleared in Brazilian Amazonia in 1990, extending from the moment of deforestation to the far-distant (theoretically infinite) future (Fearnside, 1997a); "annual balance," on the other hand, refers to the emissions and uptakes occurring in a single year (such as 1990) over the entire landscape (such as the 415×10^3 km^2 deforested by 1990) (Fearnside, 1996b). If trace gases are ignored, the two measures would be the same if (and only if) the deforestation rate were constant over an extended period of years preceding the year in question, which is not the case for the inventory period. As an indication of the magnitude of the omission of emissions from secondary forest clearing that would be need to be included in order for the inclusion of the full landscape's secondary forest uptake to be valid, release from these stocks in 1990 totaled an estimated 25.8 million Mg of CO_2-equivalent carbon (Fearnside, 2000b).

A key aspect of secondary forests in Brazilian Amazonia is that the vast majority of them are growing in abandoned cattle pasture – they are not shifting-cultivation fallows. Under cattle pasture, the soil becomes compacted and depleted in nutrients and soil biota, with the result that secondary forests in abandoned pastures grow much more slowly than do those in shifting cultivation (Fearnside, 1996a; Fearnside and Guimarães, 1996). Abandoned pastures also lack seed sources and other features that favor regeneration (Nepstad *et al.*, 1991). Most published data on tropical secondary forests are based on abandoned agricultural fields, including all of the studies included in the pan-tropical review of secondary forests by Brown and Lugo (1990).

The percentage of the deforested landscape that is under secondary forests in Brazilian Amazonia varies in response to the economic forces that motivate pasture maintenance. A widely used value is 30% of the deforested area under secondary forest (Houghton *et al.*, 2000), based on an analysis by David Skole of Michigan State University of 1:500,000-scale LANDSAT-MSS images for 1986. This is a reasonable estimate for 1986, a period following rapid growth of Amazonian pastures for "ulterior" motives such as maintaining land-tenure claims for speculative profits during a period of hyperinflation (Fearnside, 1987, 2005a). It also fits with the pattern of behavior indicated by interviews with ranchers (Uhl *et al.*, 1988; see calculations in Fearnside, 1996a) and is close to the percentage (37%) calculated for 1990 from transition probabilities in the 313×10^3 km^2 deforested at that time excluding 5×10^3 km^2 of hydroelectric dams and 98×10^3 km^2 of pre-1970 clearing.

In recent years, however, the ranching economy has become increasingly driven by the profit of raising beef for sale (*e.g.*, Margulis, 2003). This author traveled through ranching areas in northern Mato Grosso in 1986 and 2006; the contrast was evident – in 1986 large areas were in abandoned cattle pasture reverting to secondary forest, whereas the same areas were maintained as productive pasture stocked with cattle in 2006 (personal observation).

The intensity of use is a key factor in the rate of growth of secondary forest (*e.g.*, Uhl *et al.*, 1988). A special case is presented by the large areas of secondary forests in the Superintendency of the Manaus Free-Trade Zone (SUFRAMA) Agriculture and Ranching District, located approximately 80 km north of Manaus. This area of ranches was heavily subsidized in the 1970s and early 1980s, but when the subsidies effectively came to an end in 1984 much of the cleared area was abandoned to secondary forest (Fearnside, 2002a). One would expect the secondary forest to grow more vigorously under these circumstances than in typical abandoned pastures because the soil had not degraded to the point where pasture growth was reduced enough to force the rancher to suspend its use for grazing. In a part of the area, including one 1200 ha clearing, the land had not been used for pasture at all because the unusual rainfall during the burning season in 1983 prevented the ranch from burning the felled area (Fearnside *et al.*, 1993). Because of the large area of homogeneous secondary forest with known history on these ranches, there have been several studies of these secondary forests (*e.g.*, Foody *et al*., 2006; Lucas *et al*., 1993, 2002). However, the growth rates from this area cannot be extrapolated to the vast areas of abandoned pastures where the soil is more degraded under more-typical circumstances.

D.) Net Emissions from Amazonian Deforestation

Current values for emissions are summarized in Table 1. Even in years when the deforestation rate is lowest the emission from this source is several times the 69 million tC/year that Brazil was emitting from fossil-fuel combustion and cement manufacture when these emissions were inventoried for 1994 (Brazil, MCT, 2004, p. 87). The deforestation emissions in Table 1 are much higher than those reported in Brazil's national communication to the UN-FCCC (see Table 2). The discrepancy is primarily due to various omitted components in the official biomass estimates, including belowground biomass and dead biomass (necromass), plus the exaggerated secondary forest uptake mentioned earlier. The discrepancy totals 115% if comparable biomass values are used (Table 2). Approximately one-third of this discrepancy remains unexplained.

[Tables 1 & 2 here]

The emissions summarized in Tables 1 and 2 include the effect of two trace gases: methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O). Other trace gases such as carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx) and non-methane hydrocarbons (NMHC) are not included, in accord with current IPCC practices. Particularly in the case of CO, which is an important product of biomass burning, an eventual agreement on the magnitude of its indirect effect would increase the global-warming impact attributed to deforestation (see discussion in Fearnside, 2000a). CH_4 and N_2O emissions are converted to CO_2-equivalents using the 100-year global-warming potentials (GWPs) from the Fourth Assessment Report (AR-4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC): 25 for CH_4 and 298 for N_2O (Forster *et al.*, 2007, p. 212). The 100-year GWP represents the cumulative radiative forcing of one ton of gas relative to one ton of CO_2 over a 100-year period with no discounting or other adjustment for time preference within this time horizon. Quantities of CO_2 can be converted to carbon by multiplying by 12 (the atomic weight of carbon) and dividing by 44 (the molecular weight of CO_2). One ton of carbon in the form of CH_4 has the impact of 9.1 tons of carbon in the form of CO_2. The IPCC's values for 100-year GWPs have changed: the 1995 Second Assessment Report, which is still used for calculations under the Kyoto Protocol through 2012, adopted values of 21 for CH_4 and 310 for N_2O; the 2001 Third Assessment Report GWPs were 23 for CH_4 and 310 for N_2O. Deforestation emits more trace gases relative to CO_2 than does burning fossil fuels, and these effects must be included to have fair comparisons between these two major sources of emissions. Trace-gas emissions increase (Table 1) the impact of Amazonian deforestation by 6.6-9.5% relative to the release of CO_2 alone (updated from Fearnside, 2000b based on 100-year global warming potentials from the IPCC's AR-4 and emission factors from Andreae and Merlet, 2001). The range of percentage values reflects the range of estimates for emission factors for each trace gas associated with each emission process (flaming combustion, smoldering combustion, etc.).

In addition to carbon from primary and secondary forest biomass (the source of the emissions in Tables 1 and 2), deforestation produces emissions from release of soil carbon (Fearnside and Barbosa, 1998). Additional anthropogenic emissions occur from various other types of land use and land-use change in Amazonia, including hydroelectric dams (Fearnside, 2005b; Kemenes *et al*., 2007), savanna clearing (Fearnside, 2000b), periodic burning of savannas (Barbosa and Fearnside, 2005), logging in areas that will not be cleared within a short period (approximately three years) (Asner *et al*., 2005; Fearnside, 1995), forest fires in areas that will not later be cleared (Alencar *et al.*, 2006; Barbosa and Fearnside, 1999) and edge effects from the portion of the forest area near edges in the region that represents a net annual increase (Laurance *et al*., 1997, 2001; see discussion in Fearnside, 2000a). Implicitly included in the biomass estimates used for the deforestation emissions estimates are the losses to edge effects that are not net increases in the total edge area present, logging in areas that will later be cleared, and forest-fire effects in these same areas.

E.) Potential Carbon Release from Climate change

Global change is expected to result in substantial climate modification in Amazonia, although the various global climate models vary widely in the amount of change indicated for the region. Several models indicate that Amazonia will become significantly hotter and drier in the latter half of the present century. These include the Hadley Center model (HadCM3) from the United Kingdom, the Max Planck Institute model (ECHAM4) from Germany and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) model (CCSM3) from the United States, the GCM2 model from Canada and the CCSR/NIES2 model from Japan. Of the 21 models considered by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in its 2007 Fourth Assessment Report (AR-4), some, such as the CSIRO model from Australia, show no change and only one, the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory (GFDL) model from the United States, shows increased rainfall (Kundzewicz *et al*., 2007, p. 183).

The Hadley Center model is the most catastrophic in its predictions for Amazonia, including virtually all of the forest in Brazilian Amazonia being killed by 2080 (Cox *et al*., 2000, 2004; see also White *et al*., 2000). The changes, however, should not be as great as the Hadley model indicates because the model substantially underestimates the rainfall in the present climate (Cândido *et al*., 2007). But two facts suggest that it is likely that the general nature of the change indicated would hold, namely a climate that is sufficiently hotter and drier to result in massive tree mortality. First is the fact that the Hadley Center model was the best of 21 models tested in representing the connection between increased temperature of water at the surface of the equatorial Pacific Ocean and droughts in Amazonia (Cox *et al.*, 2004, p. 153). High sea-surface temperature in the Pacific is the criterion for what is known as "El Niño-like conditions." The IPCC's AR-4 concluded that there is now general agreement among the models that continued global warming will produce more "El Niño-like conditions" (Meehl *et al.*, 2007, p. 779). However, the report notes that there is not yet agreement among the models on the next step: the connection between El Niño-like conditions and the modeled occurrence of El Niño itself, meaning the characteristic pattern of droughts and floods at different locations around the world. But this second step does not depend on the results of climate models because this connection is based instead on direct observations: whenever the water in the Pacific warms, we have drought and forest fires in Amazonia, especially in the northern portion. The El Niño fires of 2003, 1997/98, and 1982 are remembered by many people in the region. The second fact that justifies concern is that the heat and drought indicated by the Hadley model so greatly exceed the levels of tolerance of Amazonian trees that large-scale mortality could be expected even if the changes were more modest than those indicated by the Hadley model. In fact, the majority of 15 models studied by Salazar *et al.* (2007) indicate that the eastern portion of Amazonia would have a climate appropriate for savanna by 2100. A similar result is shown by an analysis of 23 models (Malhi *et al.*, 2008). In other words, this is not a result that depends on the Hadley Center model proving to be correct.

El Niños provoked by warming in the Pacific are only part of the threat to Amazonia. Warming of the Atlantic, also a result of global warming (Trenberth and Shea, 2006), is projected to have impacts at least as great. While El Niño has effects concentrated in the northern part of Amazonia (Malhi and Wright, 2004), warming in the northern part of the tropical Atlantic has its impact in the southern part of Brazilian Amazonia, as occurred in the drought of 2005 (Fearnside, 2006a, Marengo *et al.*, 2008). Greatly reduced rainfall over the headwaters of the tributaries on the southern side of the Amazon River produced a dramatic drop in water levels, impeding boat traffic and isolating many communities. Fires burned large areas of standing forest in Acre, a virtually unprecedented event (Brown *et al.*, 2006; Vasconcelos and Brown, 2007). Recent simulation results with the Hadley model (Cox *et al.*, 2008) indicate a tremendous rise in the probability of events like the 2005 drought over the coming decades. The key change is an increase in the temperature gradient between warm water in the northern part of the tropical Atlantic and colder water in the southern part. Global warming differentially warms the northern end of this gradient, and the effect is greatly augmented by continued decrease in aerosol pollution in the industrial countries of North America and Europe. The stronger north-south temperature gradient in Atlantic sea-surface temperatures draws the intertropical convergence zone further north, resulting in dry air from the Hadley circulation descending in areas further into the southern portion of Amazonia. The Hadley circulation is a flow of air that rises near the equator and then splits and moves toward the poles at an altitude of about 1800 m (an altitude at which the air holds very little water); the air then falls to the ground at a point between approximately 15 and 30 degrees latitude, depending on the time of year, after which it returns to the equator in winds blowing near ground level. The descending dry air desiccates the area where this air flow falls to the ground, as occurred in southern and western Amazonia in the drought of 2005. In 2005 the annual probability of an event of this type occurring in this part of Amazonia was approximately 5%, meaning that it had an expected recurrence interval of one year in 20. The Hadley Center model simulation with "business as usual" (IS92a) emissions indicates this frequency of recurrence increasing to one year in two by 2025, and to nine years in ten by 2060 (Cox *et al.*, 2008). The atmospheric concentrations of CO_2 causing this would be 450 ppmv in 2025 and 610 ppmv in 2060. Increasing atmospheric CO_2 levels even to the lower of these two concentrations would therefore represent a severe threat to Amazonian forest.

The mechanisms by which forest mortality could occur under the predicted climate conditions have been the subject of a number of studies. Current climatic variability already endangers large areas of Amazon forest (Huytra *et al.*, 2005; Nepstad *et al.*, 2004). The microclimate near the edge of forest that abuts cattle pasture is hotter and drier than that in the interior of the forest. Trees near the forest edge have much higher mortality rates than those in the forest interior, and the largest trees are the most likely to die. This is shown by the Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project (PDBFF) near Manaus, where over 65,000 trees have been monitored for over 25 years (Nascimento and Laurance, 2004). In a one-hectare plot near Santarém where plastic panels were installed to exclude 60% of the throughfall, the same result was found, with the large trees dying first (Nepstad *et al.*, 2007a).

Forest fires occur under the hot, dry conditions that characterize both El Niño and droughts like the one in 2005 (*e.g.*, Alencar *et al.*, 2006; Barbosa and Fearnside, 1999; Barlow *et al.*, 2003). These fires have a positive feedback relationship with tree mortality, killing trees by heating the bark at the base of the trunk, thereby leaving large quantities of dead wood in the forest that serves as fuel for the next fire (Alencar *et al.*, 2004; Cochrane, 2003; Cochrane *et al.*, 1999; Nepstad *et al.*, 1999, 2001). The effect of fire is not included in the Hadley Center model or in other global climate models, meaning that forest mortality could proceed more rapidly than they indicate. Direct loss of forest through deforestation is also not included in these models.

The possibility that Amazon forest could die back due to climate change should make mitigation measures to avoid this degree of climate change a top priority for the Brazilian government. Unfortunately, this appears not to be the case. When the summary for policy makers for the IPCC's report on climate change impacts was finalized in Brussels in 2007, the Brazilian delegation attempted to have mention of the risk of savannization removed from the summary (FSP, 2007a). The risk of savannization is mentioned in no less than four different chapters of the report, and the attempt to remove mention of this impact from the summary was unsuccessful. The final summary for policy makers includes the statement that "By mid-century, increases in temperature and associated decreases in soil water are projected to lead to gradual replacement of tropical forest by savanna in eastern Amazonia" (IPCC, 2007, p. 14). The attempt to exclude savannization is worrisome because when one denies the existence of a problem there is no need to do anything serious to solve it. The parallel with the traditional posture of US president George W. Bush in denying the very existence of global warming is obvious.

Brazil's diplomats have also so far refused to accept the European Union's proposed definition of "dangerous" climate change as 2ºC increase in mean global temperature over the average that prevailed prior to the industrial revolution (Angelo, 2007). The UN-FCCC, signed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) or ECO-92 "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, has as its declared objective the stabilization of atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at levels that avoid "dangerous interference with the global climate system"(UN-FCCC, 1992, Article 2). The definition of "dangerous," either in terms of a concentration of CO_2-equivalents or in terms of a mean temperature, is currently under negotiation. The decision that is made is the key element in determining the magnitude of future global-warming impacts and the effort that the countries of the world will devote to mitigation. The failure of Brazilian diplomats to take a position, and particularly the refusal to endorse 2ºC as the limit, appears to imply that they would rather have a higher limit so that Brazil can emit more greenhouse gases. Since 2ºC corresponds roughly to the limit of tolerance of Amazonian forest, this author has argued that Brazil's current diplomatic stance is not in the country's best interest (Fearnside, 2008b).

IV.) ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AS DEVELOPMENT

The environmental services of Amazonian forest need to be compensated in some way if the forest's role in providing these services is to be translated into changes in deforestation behavior. Keeping forest standing can be done in two main ways: inducing private landholders to leave stands intact on part of their land, and creating reserves on public land. Keeping forest on private land can be achieved either by motivating the government to rigorously enforce existing legislation requiring a "legal reserve" on each property, or by payments for environmental services (PES) to the landholder. Creating protected areas is usually only viable where the deforestation process is still incipient and large areas are still in the public domain. Because resources are limited, there is a tradeoff between effort put into creating reserves and effort put into trying to slow the deforestation rate in areas outside of reserves.

Protected areas represent one of the most important means of conserving biodiversity, but the funds needed to create and maintain reserves are chronically insufficient. At the same time the rapid advance of deforestation frontiers in Amazonia means that opportunities to create new reserves are rapidly being closed off. Protected areas have an important potential role in mitigating global warming (Fearnside, 2008c). This could lead to substantially greater volumes of money becoming available for reserves through carbon credits, particularly if they are valid for meeting international commitments for emissions reduction assumed under the Kyoto Protocol or successor agreements.

The climate-change mitigation value attributed to reserves depends heavily on how the accounting is done, and many of the decisions in this regard are still under negotiation. Only reserves near the deforestation frontier have appreciable value if accounting is based on "additionality," which means comparing emissions observed after implanting reserve or other mitigation measures with the emissions that would have occurred in a hypothetical baseline scenario without mitigation. The tradeoff between cost and carbon credit can mean that carbon and biodiversity priorities are not the same (Fearnside, 1995, 2003a; Fearnside and Ferraz, 1995). The value attributed to time in the calculations, as through a discount rate for carbon, heavily influences the amount of carbon credit that reserves can earn, low discount rates favoring reserves as compared with other mitigation options (Fearnside, 2002b,c, 2008d; Fearnside *et al*., 2000).

An alternative accounting paradigm, based on stocks rather than flows, gives much greater priority to reserves (Fearnside, 1997b). Under the December 1997 Kyoto Protocol, carbon has been calculated based on changes in flows, but the stocks-based approach has recently resurged in proposals for crediting in the "Amazonas Initiative" launched by the Amazonas state government (Viana and Campos, 2007). For areas that are far from the deforestation frontier, such as the large block of intact forest in the western part of the state of Amazonas, a stocks-based approach is essential to reward the climatic value of forests and to support the creation and maintenance of protected areas before the advancing frontier renders financially and politically much more difficult to create.

Reserves have a strong effect in inhibiting deforestation both in conservation units such as national parks and biological reserves and in indigenous areas (Ferreira *et al*., 2005; Nepstad *et al.,* 2006; Schwartzman *et al.*, 2000). A poorly quantified factor is the extent of "leakage," or the displacement of deforestation to locations beyond the boundaries of a mitigation project. Do people who would have deforested in an area of forest that is declared a reserve simply move somewhere else and continue to deforest just as much? Some, but not all, deforestation leaks in this way. Regardless of the amount of leakage that occurs, reserves will have a benefit in avoiding emissions years later when the landscape outside of reserves is either completely deforested or reaches the maximum amount of deforestation that is permitted in practice (which is not necessarily the same as what is theoretically permitted under the Forestry Code).

Threats to Amazonian forests are escalating and include a growing component that is grounded in marketed commodities, as opposed to land speculation and other unproductive "ulterior" motives, which also continue to exert pressure on the forest (Fearnside, 2008e). This means that greater resources are needed if deforestation is to be contained and the environmental services of large forest areas maintained. Still, the opportunity costs are relatively modest: Nepstad *et al*. (2007b) calculate that the economic benefits to Brazil of reducing deforestation would compensate for much of the opportunity cost of foregone deforestation, and that Brazil could avoid 6 billion tons of carbon emission over a 30-year period at a net cost of only US$8 billion, or US$1.33/ton.

Containing Amazonian deforestation will require financial outlays and government actions that are both rapid enough and of sufficient magnitude to achieve control. The climatic value of the forest, especially its role in averting global warming, offers the best prospect for obtaining monetary flows on the scale and within the timeframe needed. In order to do this, the full value of reducing deforestation must be captured and applied to containing deforestation and creating non-destructive means of supporting the region's rural population. Half measures that rule out credit for much of the reduced emission, or that reduce the potential monetary value of the emission reduction that is credited, will not be enough.

Capturing the full value of the forest's services will require Brazil to take on a commitment to a national limit on emissions, as by joining Annex I of the UN-FCCC and Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol. This allows credit for all reduction below the emission in the reference period from the national communication. For credit through 2012 the baseline is normally the year 1990, but in the case of Brazil the 1988-1994 average was chosen for the inventory in the national communication. The option is open to gain credit in this way without waiting for the beginning of the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period, or for a successor protocol, in 2013 (Fearnside, 1999b). During the 1988-1994 reference period the average deforestation rate was 15,228 km^2/year, or more than the 11,224 km^2/year rate in 2007 (Brazil, INPE, 2008). Note, however, that deforestation increased at the end of 2007, presumably due to rising prices of soy and beef (Fearnside, 2008e). Keeping deforestation below the baseline level is well within the country's capability if there is political will to do so (Fearnside, 2003b; Fearnside and Barbosa, 2003).

Other options have been proposed for national caps that could be accepted by some developing countries like Brazil. The compensated reductions proposal (Santilli *et al*., 2005) calls for a fixed baseline based on average historical emissions, for example for the decade of the 1990s. The fact that current deforestation rates in Amazonia are lower than they were during this period has raised fears of generating “tropical hot air” that would grant credit without a real climate benefit (Persson and Azar, 2007). One way of avoiding this is to have a target based on two limits, as proposed by Schlamadinger *et al.* (2005). In this proposal there would be an upper bound and a lower bound, between which a sliding scale of credit would apply ranging from a heavily discounted amount if the observed deforestation reduction only lowers the rate to the upper bound, increasing to the full amount if the lower bound is reached. The advantage of this is that there is at least some incentive to limit clearing at all plausible levels of success in reducing deforestation.

A proposal that has gained considerable support among tropical countries is that of the Coalition of Rainforest Nations (Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica, 2005; see also Laurance, 2007). This group of 41 countries, which Brazil has not joined, proposes credit for reduced deforestation based on mandatory targets. Brazil launched a competing proposal at the UN-FCCC conferences of the parties in Nairobi in 2006 and in Bali in 2007 (Brazil, 2006). The Brazilian proposal would have no mandatory targets and would instead encourage voluntary contributions to a fund to be used to help slow deforestation; the proposal received little support, but had the positive effect of beginning a dialog with Brazilian diplomats on a subject that had previously been taboo. Because the contributions to the proposed fund would not result in carbon credit that is valid against the emissions-reduction commitments of industrialized countries, the willingness to contribute would be much lower than it would if credit were allowed.

By contrast, if there is no national cap on emissions, the options are for project-level measures (as under the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism, or CDM) from 2013 onwards (a 2001 decision ruled out credit for avoided deforestation under the CDM before 2013). Project-level measures have much less scope for gaining credit because only deforestation reduction that can be attributed to the effect of a given project is eligible, and this causality is difficult to establish in many cases. The effect of leakage is inherently much greater at the project level than at the national level. The national baseline proposed by Santilli *et al.* (2005) is designed to minimize this effect, although there are still ways that some leakage can occur through displacement of commodity demand (see review by Sathaye and Andrasko, 2007).

Compensation for reducing emissions outside of the Kyoto Protocol is already available through “voluntary” markets, such as those on the commodity exchanges in Chicago and London. This carbon is not valid against international commitments, but can be used, for example, by companies that want to advertize that their products are “carbon neutral.” The markets for this carbon are largely unregulated, so there is great variety in the types of projects that are accepted, the way the carbon is calculated and monitored, and the reality of the climate benefits represented by each ton of carbon that is sold. Progress is being made on standardizing these features. The price of each ton of carbon is inevitably much lower in these voluntary markets than it is for carbon that is valid against mandatory national commitments.

Advances on the inclusion of carbon credit from reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD) in the international negotiations are important because both the scale and the price per ton of carbon are potentially very much greater than for voluntary markets. Price depends on the balance between supply and demand, as is the case for any commodity. In international negotiations an argument frequently used against full inclusion of tropical forest carbon is that it would “flood” the market with cheap carbon, lowering the price to the point where industrialized countries would cease to invest in energy efficiency and clean energy technologies to reduce their fossil-fuel emissions. However, this argument assumes that the demand for emissions reductions is fixed, whereas in fact the national commitments that correspond to demand for emissions reductions are currently under negotiation simultaneously with setting the rules of the game on such issues as credit for tropical forests. The demand would be sufficient to maintain attractive carbon prices if the countries of the world were to commit to sufficient reductions to bring global warming under control. For example, at the Bali conference of the parties of the UN-FCCC, over 200 scientists signed a statement calling for mandatory caps of at least 50% below 1990 levels by 2050 (Kintisch, 2007). Such massive cuts require tapping all options for mitigation to the fullest extent possible, including both reduction of fossil-fuel and deforestation emissions.

The amount of tropical forest carbon that is marketed can be limited by defining percentages of each country's mitigation commitment that can be satisfied in this way, or by other mechanisms to maintain the price of carbon. Several proposals include limitations of this kind on the amount of carbon that can be marketed (*e.g.*, Hare and Macey, 2008; Moutinho *et al*., 2005). While these proposed limitations help assuage fears that industrial countries will escape from the need to reform their energy technologies and consumption patterns, this author has argued that the emphasis should instead be on maximizing the overall commitment to reducing emissions. No one wants rich countries, and rich segments of the population within the poorer countries, to continue driving sports-utility vehicles (SUVs) and consuming fossil fuels in other ways that waste the Earth's limited capacity to absorb greenhouse gases. Both deforestation and fossil-fuel combustion must be drastically reduced, and this will only come about through international commitments to much more ambitious targets than those contemplated in the past. The battle for these targets is just beginning, and limiting the credit for forest carbon would be a strategic error. It is essentially accepting defeat before the battle has even begun.

The question of a national target for greenhouse-gas emissions from Brazil is at the heart of both the effort to confront global warming and the transformation of the rural economy in Amazonia into one based on environmental services rather than on forest destruction. Unfortunately, Brazilian diplomacy has made its top priority the delaying of such a commitment for as long as possible (*e.g.*, FSP, 2007b; OESP, 2007). The reporting of emissions with a view to avoiding international pressure for such a commitment has even been publically confessed (see Fearnside, 2004b). However, sooner or later Brazil must make a commitment, and this author holds that the risk that further delay poses to the Amazon forest makes it very much in Brazil's national interest that this be sooner rather than later.

Using environmental services as an alternative foundation for "sustainable development" in Amazonia requires a wide variety of advances in altering the economic system to reward these services, creating institutions for this purpose and for assuring that the resulting monetary flows have their desired effects both in maintaining the forest with its services and in maintaining the human population in the forest areas (Fearnside, 1997b). There has been considerable progress over the course of the more than two decades that this author has been arguing for this transformation, particularly in the area of rewarding the forest's role in averting global warming (Fearnside, 2006b, 2008f). The term "environmental services" is now practically a household word. However, the threats to the forest have grown faster than has the effort to defend it, and the need for a radical change in how the forest's services are valued and rewarded is more urgent than ever.

V.) CONCLUSIONS

Primary forests provide essential environmental services to Brazil and to other countries in maintaining the water cycle, avoiding global warming and maintaining biodiversity. Water cycling is important for maintaining dry-season rainfall in Amazonia at levels that allow continuation of tropical forest. It is also important for hydroelectric power and other uses of water in Brazil's center-south region and in neighboring countries. The role of Amazonian forest in avoiding global warming is primarily in preventing the release of carbon stocks through deforestation, as opposed to absorption of carbon by standing forest. Assessing the net impact of deforestation depends on the biomass stock in the forest, on the dynamics of the landscape that replaces the forest, and on the rate of growth of secondary forests in the landscape. A number of estimates of this impact have understated the importance of Amazon deforestation in contributing to global warming either by underestimating the biomass of the original forest, overestimating the proportion of the replacement landscape that is occupied by secondary forest (or the area to be counted in indices of net emissions) , or overestimating the growth rate of secondary forest. The value of averting deforestation also applies to averting levels of climate change that could threaten the forest by increased drought and temperature and through a positive feedback with forest fires. Avoiding these damages should be the number one priority of Brazilian diplomacy in international negotiations concerning climate change, but the country's recent negotiating positions indicate that this is not yet the case.

VI.) ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq: Proc. 306031/2004-3, 557152/2005-4, 420199/2005-5, 474548/2006-6; 305880/2007-1), Rede GEOMA and Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA: PRJ02.12) contributed financial support. I thank R.I. Barbosa and P.M.L.A. Graça for helpful comments.

VII.) LITERATURE CITED

Achard, F., H.D. Eva, P. Mayaux, H.-J. Stibig and A. Belward. 2004. Improved estimates of net carbon emissions from land cover change in the tropics for the 1990's. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 18, GB2008. doi:10.1029/2003GB002142.

Achard, F., H.D. Eva, H.J. Stibig, P. Mayaux, J. Gallego, T. Richards and J-P. Malingreau. 2002. Determination of deforestation rates of the world's humid tropical forests. *Science* 297: 999-1002.

Alencar, A.C., D.C. Nepstad and C. del C.V. Diaz. 2006. Forest understory fire in the Brazilian Amazon in ENSO and Non-ENSO Years: Area burned and committed carbon emissions. *Earth Interactions* 10: Paper No. 6, pp. 1-17.

Alencar, A.C., L.A, Solórzano and D.C. Nepstad. 2004. Modeling forest understory fires in an eastern Amazonian landscape. *Ecological Applications* 14(4): S139-S149.

Andreae, M.O. and P. Merlet. 2001. Emissions of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 15(4): 955-966.

Angelo, C. 2007. “Brasil terá compromissos ambiciosos sobre o clima.” *Folha de São Paulo,* 8 July 2007, p. A-16.

Araújo A.C., A.D. Nobre, B. Kruijt, A.D. Culf, P. Stefani, J. Elbers, R. Dallarosa, C. Randow, A.O. Manzi., R. Valentini, J.H.C. Gash and P. Kabat. 2002. Dual tower longterm study of carbon dioxide fluxes for a central Amazônian rain forest: The Manaus LBA site. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 107(D20)**:** 8090.

Asner, G.P., D.E. Knapp, E.N. Broadbent, P.J.C. Oliveira, M. Keller and J.N. Silva. 2005. Selective logging in the Brazilian Amazon. *Science* 310: 480-482.

Baker, T.R., O.L. Phillips, Y. Malhi, S. Almeida, L. Arroyo, A. Di Fiore, T.J. Killeen, S.G. Laurance, W.F. Laurance, S.L. Lewis, J. Lloyd, A. Monteagudo, D.A. Neill, S. Patiño, N.C.A. Pitman, N. Silva and R.V. Martínez. 2004. Variation in wood density determines spatial patterns in Amazonian forest biomass. *Global Change Biology* 10: 545-562.

Barbosa, R.I. and P.M. Fearnside. 1999. Incêndios na Amazônia brasileira: Estimativa da emissão de gases do efeito estufa pela queima de diferentes ecossistemas de Roraima na passagem do evento "El Niño" (1997/98). *Acta Amazonica* 29: 513-534.

Barbosa, R.I. and P.M. Fearnside. 2005. Above-ground biomass and the fate of carbon after burning in the savannas of Roraima, Brazilian Amazonia. *Forest Ecology and Management* 216(1-3): 295-316.

Barlow, J., C. Peres, R.O. Lagan and T. Haugaasen. 2003. Large tree mortality and the decline of forest biomass following Amazonian wildfires. *Ecology Letters* 6**:** 6-8.

Bates, J.M. and D.C. Demos. 2001. Do we need to devalue Amazonia and other large tropical forests? *Diversity and Distributions* 7(5): 249-255.

Brazil. 2006. The 12th Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC, Nairobi, Kenya. Positive incentives for voluntary action in developing countries to address climate change: Brazilian perspective on reducing emissions from deforestation. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Bonn, Germany. 4 pp. (http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/dialogue/application/pdf/wp_21_braz.pdf).

Brazil, INPE (Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais). 2008. Projeto PRODES: Monitoramento da Floresta Amazônica Brasileira por Satélite. INPE, São José dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil. (Available at: http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodes/).

Brazil, MCT (Ministério de Ciência e Tecnologia). 2004. *Brazil’s Initial National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. Ministry of Science and Technology (MCT), Brasília, DF, Brazil. 271 pp.

Brazil, RADAMBRASIL. 1973-1983. *Levantamento de Recursos Naturais, Vols. 1-23*. Ministério das Minas e Energia, Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral (DNPM), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Brown, I.F., W. Schroeder, A. Setzer, M.J.R. Maldonado, N. Pantoja, A.F. Duarte and J. Marengo. 2006. Monitoring fires in Southwestern Amazonia rain forest. *EOS, Transaction American Geophysical Union* 87(26): 253-264.

Brown, S. 1997. *Estimating Biomass And Biomass Change Of Tropical Forests: A Primer*. FAO Forestry Paper 134. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy. 55 pp.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1984. Biomass of tropical forests: A new estimate based on forest volumes. *Science* 223: 1290-1293.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1990. Tropical secondary forests. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 6: 1-32.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1992a. Aboveground biomass estimates for tropical moist forests of the Brazilian Amazon. pp. 46-52. In: *Forest '90: Anais do Primeiro Simpósio Internacional de Estudos Ambientais em Forestas Tropicais Úmidas*. Sociedade Brasileira para a Valorização do Meio Ambiente (Biosfera), Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil. 508 pp.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1992b. Aboveground biomass estimates for tropical moist forests of the Brazilian Amazon. *Interciencia* 17(1): 8-18.

Brown, S. and A.E. Lugo. 1992c. Biomass of Brazilian Amazonian forests: The need for good science. *Interciencia* 17(4): 201-203.

Cândido, L.A., A.O. Manzi, J. Tota, P.R.T. da Silva, F.S.M. da Silva, R.N.N. dos Santos and F.W.S. Correia. 2007. O clima atual e futuro da Amazônia nos cenários do IPCC: A questão da savanização. *Ciência e Cultura* 59(3): 44-47.

Chave, J., C. Andalo, S. Brown, M.A. Cairns, J.Q. Chambers, D. Eamus, H. Fölster, F. Fromard, N. Higuchi, T. Kira, J.-P. Lescure, B.W. Nelson, H. Ogawa, H. Puig, B. Riéra and T. Yamakura. 2005. Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon stocks and balance in tropical forests. *Oecologia* 145: 87-99.

Clark, D.A. 2002. Are tropical forests an important carbon sink? Reanalysis of the long-term plot data. *Ecological Applications* 12: 3–7.

Clark, D.A., S.C. Piper, C.D. Keeling and D.B. Clark. 2003. Tropical rain forest tree growth and atmospheric carbon dynamics linked to interannual temperature variation during 1984-2000. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100: 5852-5857.

Cochrane, M.A. 2003. Fire science for rainforests. *Nature* 421: 913-919.

Cochrane, M.A., A. Alencar, M.D. Schulze, C.M. Souza Jr., D.C. Nepstad, P. Lefebvre and E.A. Davidson. 1999. Positive feedbacks in the fire dynamic of closed canopy tropical forests. *Science* 284: 1832-1835.

Correia, F.W.S. 2005. *Modelagem do Impacto de Modificaçoes da Cobertura Vegetal Amazonica no Clima Regional*. Doctoral thesis in meteorology, Instituto Nacional de

Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil. 392 pp + appendices.

Correia, F.W.S., R.C.S. Alvalá and A.O. Manzi**.** 2006. Impacto das modificações da cobertura vegetal no balanço de água na Amazônia: um estudo com modelo de circulação geral da atmosfera (MCGA). *Revista Brasileira de Meteorologia* 21(3a): 153-167.

Cox, P.M., R.A Betts, M. Collins, P.P. Harris, C. Huntingford and C.D. Jones. 2004. Amazonian forest dieback under climate-carbon cycle projections for the 21st century. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* 78: 137-156, doi:10.1007/s00704-004-0049-4.

Cox, P.M., R.A. Betts, C.D. Jones, S.A. Spall and I.J. Totterdell. 2000. Acceleration of global warming due to carbon-cycle feedbacks in a coupled climate model. *Nature* 408: 184-187.

Cox, P.M., P.P. Harris, C. Huntingford, R.A. Betts, M. Collins, C.D. Jones, T.E. Jupp, J.A. Marengo and C.A. Nobre. 2008. Increasing risk of Amazonian drought due to decreasing aerosol pollution**.** *Nature* 453: 212-215.

DeFries R.S., R.A. Houghton, M.C. Hansen, C.B. Field, D. Skole and J. Townsend. 2002. Carbon emissions from tropical deforestation and regrowth based on satellite observations for the 1980s and 1990s. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99(22): 14,256–14,261.

Dinerstein, E., D.M. Olson, D.M. Graham, D.J. Webster, A.L. Primm, S.A. Bookbinder and G. Ledec. 1995. *A Conservation Assessment of the Terrestrial Ecoregions of Latin America and the Caribbean*. The World Bank, Washington, DC., U.S.A. 129 pp.

Eva, H.D., F. Achard, H-J. Stibig and P. Mayaux. 2003. Response to comment on “Determination of deforestation rates of the World’s humid tropical forests.” *Science* 299: 1015b.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 1978. *Metodologia e Procedimentos Operacionais para o Inventário de Pré-investimento na Floresta Nacional do Tapajós*. Projeto de Desenvolvimento e Pesquisa Florestal. PNUP/FAO/IBDF/BRA/76/027. Ministério da Agricultura, Brasília, DF. Brazil.

Fearnside, P.M. 1985. Brazil's Amazon forest and the global carbon problem. *Interciencia* 10(4): 179-186.

Fearnside, P.M. 1986. Brazil's Amazon forest and the global carbon problem: Reply to Lugo and Brown. *Interciencia* 11(2): 58-64.

Fearnside, P.M. 1987. Causes of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. pp. 37-61 In: R.F. Dickinson (ed.) *The Geophysiology of Amazonia: Vegetation and Climate Interactions*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, U.S.A. 526 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1992. Forest biomass in Brazilian Amazonia: Comments on the estimate by Brown and Lugo. *Interciencia* 17: 19-27.

Fearnside, P.M. 1993. Biomass of Brazil's Amazonian forests: Reply to Brown and Lugo revisited. *Interciencia* 18(1): 5-7.

Fearnside, P.M. 1995. Global warming response options in Brazil's forest sector: Comparison of project-level costs and benefits. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 8(5): 309-322.

Fearnside, P.M. 1996a. Amazonian deforestation and global warming: Carbon stocks in vegetation replacing Brazil's Amazon forest. *Forest Ecology and Management* 80(1-3): 21-34.

Fearnside, P.M. 1996b. Amazonia and global warming: Annual balance of greenhouse gas emissions from land-use change in Brazil's Amazon region. pp. 606-617 In: J. Levine (ed.) *Biomass Burning and Global Change. Volume 2: Biomass Burning in South America, Southeast Asia and Temperate and Boreal Ecosystems and the Oil Fires of Kuwait*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 902 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 1997a. Greenhouse gases from deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia: Net committed emissions. *Climatic Change* 35(3): 321-360.

Fearnside, P.M. 1997b. Environmental services as a strategy for sustainable development in rural Amazonia. *Ecological Economics* 20(1): 53-70.

Fearnside, P.M. 1999a. Biodiversity as an environmental service in Brazil's Amazonian forests: Risks, value and conservation. *Environmental Conservation* 26(4): 305-321.

Fearnside, P.M. 1999b. Como o efeito estufa pode render dinheiro para o Brasil. *Ciência Hoje* 26(155): 41-43.

Fearnside, P.M. 2000a. Global warming and tropical land-use change: Greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning, decomposition and soils in forest conversion, shifting cultivation and secondary vegetation. *Climatic Change* 46(1-2): 115-158.

Fearnside, P.M. 2000b. Greenhouse gas emissions from land-use change in Brazil's Amazon region. pp. 231-249 In: R. Lal, J.M. Kimble and B.A. Stewart (eds.) *Global Climate Change and Tropical Ecosystems*. Advances in Soil Science. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, U.S.A. 438 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 2002a. Can pasture intensification discourage deforestation in the Amazon and Pantanal regions of Brazil? pp. 283-364 In: C.H. Wood and R. Porro (eds.) *Deforestation and Land Use in the Amazon*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A. 386 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 2002b. Time preference in global warming calculations: A proposal for a unified index. *Ecological Economics* 41(1): 21-31.

Fearnside, P.M. 2002c. Why a 100-year time horizon should be used for global warming mitigation calculations. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 7(1): 19-30.

Fearnside, P.M. 2003a. Emissões de gases de efeito estufa oriundas da mudança do uso da terra na Amazônia brasileira. pp. 45-68 In: *A Floresta Amazônica nas Mudanças Globais*. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia-INPA, Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 134 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 2003b. Deforestation control in Mato Grosso: A new model for slowing the loss of Brazil's Amazon forest. *Ambio* 32(5): 343-345.

Fearnside, P.M. 2004a. A água de São Paulo e a floresta amazônica. *Ciência Hoje* 34(203): 63-65.

Fearnside, P.M. 2004b. Greenhouse gas emissions from hydroelectric dams: Controversies provide a springboard for rethinking a supposedly "clean" energy source. *Climatic Change* 66(1-2): 1-8.

Fearnside, P.M. 2005a. Deforestation in Brazilian Amazonia: History, rates and consequences. *Conservation Biology* 19(3): 680-688.

Fearnside, P.M. 2005b. Do hydroelectric dams mitigate global warming? The case of Brazil's Curuá-Una Dam. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 10(4): 675-691.

Fearnside, P.M. 2006a. A vazante na Amazônia e o aquecimento global. *Ciência Hoje* 38(231): 76-78.

Fearnside, P.M. 2006b. Mitigation of climatic change in the Amazon. pp. 353-375 In: W.F. Laurance and C.A. Peres (eds.) *Emerging Threats to Tropical Forests.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A. 563 pp.

Fearnside, P.M. 2008a. Will urbanization cause deforested areas to be abandoned in Brazilian Amazonia? *Environmental Conservation* (in press).

Fearnside, P.M. 2008b. Climate change as a threat to the tropical forests of Amazonia. Chapter 9 In: S.H. Schneider, A. Rosencranz and M. Mastrandrea (eds.) *Climate Change Science and Policy*. Island Press, Washington, DC, U.S.A. (in press).

Fearnside, P.M. 2008c. O valor de áreas protegidas em evitar mudança climática na Amazônia. In: A.K. Albernaz (ed.) *Atualização das Áreas Prioritárias para a Conservação, Uso Sustentável e Repartição dos Benefícios da Biodiversidade – Bioma Amazônia*, Ministério do Meio Ambiente, Brasília, DF, Brazil (in press).

Fearnside, P.M. 2008d. On the value of temporary carbon: A comment on Kirschbaum. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 13(3): 207-210.

Fearnside, P.M. 2008e. The roles and movements of actors in the deforestation of Brazilian Amazonia. *Ecology and Society* 13(1): 23. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol13/iss1/art23/

Fearnside, P.M. 2008f. Amazon forest maintenance as a source of environmental services. *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências* 80(1): 101-114.

Fearnside, P.M. and R.I. Barbosa. 1998. Soil carbon changes from conversion of forest to pasture in Brazilian Amazonia. *Forest Ecology and Management* 108(1-2): 147-166.

Fearnside, P.M. and R.I. Barbosa. 2003. Avoided deforestation in Amazonia as a global warming mitigation measure: The case of Mato Grosso. *World Resource Review* 15(3): 352-361.

Fearnside, P.M. and J. Ferraz. 1995. A conservation gap analysis of Brazil's Amazonian vegetation. *Conservation Biology* 9(5): 1134-1147.

Fearnside, P.M. and W.M. Guimarães. 1996. Carbon uptake by secondary forests in Brazilian Amazonia. *Forest Ecology and Management* 80(1-3): 35-46.

Fearnside, P.M., D.A. Lashof and P. Moura-Costa. 2000. Accounting for time in mitigating global warming through land-use change and forestry. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 5(3): 239-270.

Fearnside, P.M. and W.F. Laurance. 2003. Comment on “Determination of deforestation rates of the world’s humid tropical forests”. *Science* 299: 1015*a*.

Fearnside, P.M. and W.F. Laurance. 2004. Tropical deforestation and greenhouse gas emissions. *Ecological Applications* 14(4): 982-986.

Fearnside, P.M., N. Leal Filho and F.M. Fernandes. 1993. Rainforest burning and the global carbon budget: Biomass, combustion efficiency and charcoal formation in the Brazilian Amazon. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Atmospheres)* 98(D9): 16,733-16,743.

Ferreira, L.V., E. Venticinque and S.S. de Almeida. 2005. O Desmatamento na Amazônia e a importância das áreas protegidas. *Estudos Avançados* 19(53): 1-10.

Foley, J.A. G.P. Asner, M.H. Costa, M.T. Coe, R. DeFries, H.K. Gibbs, E.A. Howard, S. Olson, J. Patz, N. Ramankutty and P. Snyder. 2007. Amazonia revealed: Forest degradation and loss of ecosystem goods and services in the Amazon Basin. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 5(1): 25-32.

Foody G.M., G. Palubinskas, R.M. Lucas, P.J. Curran and M. Honzak. 1996. Identifying terrestrial carbon sinks: Classification of successional stages in regenerating tropical forest from Landsat TM data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 55(3): 205-216.

Forster, P and 50 others. 2007 Changes in atmospheric constituents and radiative forcing. pp. 129-234. In: S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.) *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis.*

Contribution of Working Group to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. 996 pp.

FSP (*Folha de São Paulo).* 2007a. “Conclusão de texto involve debate intenso.” *Folha de São Paulo*, 6 April 2007, p. A-14.

FSP (*Folha de São Paulo).* 2007b. “Brasil se manterá contra metas para CO_2.” *Folha de São Paulo,* 29 November 2007, p. A-34.

FUNCATE (Foundation for Space Research, Applications and Technology). 2006. *Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Removals from Forest Conversion and Abandonment of Managed Lands*. First Brazilian Inventory of Anthropogenic Greenhouse Gas Emissions Background Reports. Ministério de Ciência e Tecnologia, Brasília, DF, Brazil. 92 pp. http://www.mct.gov.br/upd_blob/0022/22472.pdf

Glerum, B.B., 1960. *Report to the Government of Brazil on a forest inventory in the Amazon Valley. Part 5: Region between Rio Caete and Rio Maracassume*. Expanded Technical Assistance Program, FAO Report no. 1250. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. 67 pp.

Glerum, B.B. and G. Smit.1962. *Report to the Government of Brazil on a combined forestry-soil survey along the road BR-14 from São Miguel do Guama to Imperatriz.* Expanded Program of Technical. Assistance Report no. 1483. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. 137 pp.

Guimarães, W.M. 1993. *Liberação de carbono e mudanças nos estoques dos nutrientes contidos na biomassa aérea e no solo resultante de queimadas de florestas secundárias em áreas de pastagens abandonadas, em Altamira, Pará*. Masters thesis in ecology, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia/Fundação Universidade do Amazônia (INPA/FUA), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 69 pp.

Hare, B. and K. Macey. 2008. Tropical deforestation emission reduction mechanism (TDERM): A discussion paper. Greenpeace, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. 52 pp.

Hecht, S.B., R.B. Norgaard and C. Possio. 1988. The economics of cattle ranching in eastern Amazonia. *Interciencia* 13: 233–240.

Heinsdijk, D. 1957. *Report to the Government of Brazil on a forest inventory in the Amazon Valley (Region between Rio Tapajós and Rio Xingu)*. Expanded Technical Assistance Program FAO Report no. 601600. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. 135 pp.

Heinsdijk, D. 1958. *Report to the Government of Brazil on a forest inventory in the Amazon Valley. Part 3: Region between Rio Tapajós and Rio Madeira. FAO Report nº 969 & Part 4: Region between Rio Tocantins and Rios Guama and Capin,* FAO Report nº 992. Expanded Technical Assistance Program (FAO/58/10/8131), Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy. 83 pp.

Houghton, R.A. 2003a. Revised estimates of the annual net flux of carbon to the atmosphere from changes in land use and land management 1850-2000. *Tellus Series B Chemical and Physical Meteorology* 55(2): 378-390.

Houghton, R.A. 2003b. Why are estimates of the terrestrial carbon balance so different? *Global Change Biology* 9: 500-509.

Houghton, R.A., K.T. Lawrence, J.L. Hackler and S. Brown. 2001. The spatial distribution of forest biomass in the Brazilian Amazon: A comparison of estimates. *Global Change Biology* 7: 731-746.

Houghton, R.A., D.L. Skole, C.A. Nobre, J.L. Hackler, K.T. Lawrence and W.H. Chomentowski. 2000. Annual fluxes of carbon from deforestation and regrowth in the Brazilian Amazon. *Nature* 403: 301-304.

Huytra, L.R., J.W. Munger, C.A. Nobre, S.R. Saleska, S.A. Vieira and S.C. Wofsy. 2005. Climatic variability and vegetation vulnerability in Amazonia. *Geophysical Research Letters* 32: L24712, doi: 10.1029/2005GL024981.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. Summary for policymakers. pp. 7-22. *In*: M.L Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson (eds.) *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. 976 pp.

IstoÉ. 1997. A Versão do Brasil. *IstoÉ* [São Paulo] 15 October 1997, p. 98.

Kemenes, A., B.R. Forsberg and J.M. Melack. 2007. Methane release below a tropical hydroelectric dam. *Geophysical Research Letters* 34: L12809, doi:10.1029/2007GL029479. 55.

Kintisch, E. 2007. Researchers: Folly in Bali. *Science* 318: 1855.

Kruijt, B., J. A. Elbers, C. von Randow, A. C. Araujo, P. J. Oliveira, A. Culf, A. O. Manzi, A. D. Nobre, P. Kabat, and E. J. Moors. 2004. The robustness of eddy correlation fluxes for Amazon rain forest conditions. *Ecological Applications* 14: S101-S113.

Kundzewicz, Z.W., L.J. Mata, N.W. Arnell, P. Döll, P. Kabat, B. Jiménez, K.A. Miller, T. Oki, Z. Sen and I.A. Shiklomanov. 2007. Freshwater resources and their management. *pp.* 173-210. *In*: M.L Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson (eds.) *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. 976 pp.

Laurance,W.F. 2006. Have we overstated the tropical biodiversity crisis? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 22: 65-70.

Laurance,W.F. 2007. A new initiative to use carbon trading for tropical forest conservation. *Biotropica* 39(1): 20–24.

Laurance,W.F., S.G. Laurance, L.V. Ferreira, J.M. Rankin-de-Merona, C. Gascon and T.E. Lovejoy. 1997. Biomass collapse in Amazonian forest fragments. *Science* 278: 1117-1118.

Laurance, W.F. and C.A. Peres (eds.). 2006. *Emerging Threats to Tropical Forests.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A. 563 pp.

Laurance, W.F., G.B. Williamson, P. Delamonica, A. Olivera, C. Gascon, T.E. Lovejoy and L. Pohl. 2001. Effects of a strong drought on Amazonian forest fragments and edges. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 17: 771-785.

Lean, J., C.B. Bunton, C.A. Nobre and P.R. Rowntree. 1996. The simulated impact of Amazonian deforestation on climate using measured ABRACOS vegetation characteristics. pp. 549-576. In: J.H.C. Gash, C.A. Nobre, J.M. Roberts and R.L Victoria (eds.), *Amazonian Deforestation and Climate*. Wiley, Chichester, U.K. 611 pp.

Lucas R.M., M. Honzák, I. Do Amaral, P.J. Curran and G.M. Foody. 2002. Forest regeneration on abandoned clearances in central Amazonia. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 23(5): 965-988.

Lucas, R.M., M. Honzak, G.M. Foody, P.J. Curran and C. Corves. 1993. Characterizing tropical secondary forests using multi-temporal Landsat sensor imagery *International Journal of Remote Sensing* 14(16): 3061–3067. DOI: 10.1080/01431169308904419

Lugo, A.E. and S. Brown. 1986. Brazil's Amazon forest and the global carbon problem. *Interciencia* 11(2): 57-58.

Magrin, G., C. Gay García, D. Cruz Choque, J.C. Giménez, A.R. Moreno, G.J. Nagy, C. Nobre and A. Villamizar. 2007. Latin America. pp. 581-615. In: M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson (eds.) *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. 976 pp.

Malhi, Y. T.R. Baker, O.L Phillips, S. Almeida, N. Higuchi, W.F. Laurance, S.L. Lewis, P.V. Nuñez, J.N.M. Silva and B. Vinceti. 2004. The above-ground coarse wood productivity of 104 neotropical forest plots. *Global Change Biology* 10: 563-591.

Malhi,Y., J.T. Roberts, R.A Betts, T.J. Killeen, W. Li and C.A. Nobre. 2008. Climate change, deforestation, and the fate of the Amazon. *Science* 319: 169-172.

Malhi, Y., D. Wood, T.R. Baker, J. Wright, O.L. Phillips, T. Cochrane, P. Meir, J. Chave, S. Almeida, L. Arroyo, N. Higuchi, T. Killeen, S.G. Laurance, W.F. Laurance, S.L. Lewis, A. Monteagudo, D.A. Neill, P.N. Vargas, N.C.A. Pitman, C.A. Quesada, R., Salomão, J.N.M. Silva, A.T. Lezama, J. Terborgh, R.V. Martínez and B. Vinceti.

2006. The regional variation of aboveground live biomass in old-growth Amazonian forests. *Global Change Biology* 12: 1107-1138.

Malhi Y. and J. Wright. 2004. Spatial patterns and recent trends in the climate of tropical forest regions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2003.1433.

Marengo, J.A. 2006. On the hydrological cycle of the Amazon Basin: A historical review and current state-of-the-art. *Revista Brasileira de Meteorologia* 21(3a): 1-19.

Marengo, J.A., M.W. Douglas and. P.L.S. Dias. 2002. The South American Low-level jet east of the Andes during the LBA-TRMM and LBA-WET AMC campaign. J*ournal of Geophysical Research (Atmospheres)* 107(20D): 47.1-47.11.

Marengo, J.A., C.A. Nobre, J. Tomasella, M.D. Oyama, G. Sampaio de Oliveira, R. de Oliveira, H. Camargo, L.M. Alves and I.F. Brown. 2008. The drought of Amazonia in 2005. *Journal of Climate* 21**:** 495–516.

Marengo, J.A., W.R. Soares, C. Saulo and M. Nicolini. 2004. Climatology of the low-level jet east of the Andes as derived from the NCEP-NCAR reanalyses: Characteristics and temporal variability. *Journal of Climate* 17(12): 2261-2280.

Margulis, S. 2003. *Causas do Desmatamento na Amazônia Brasileira*. The World Bank, Brasília, DF, Brazil. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/BRAZILINPOREXTN/Resources/3817166-1185895645304/4044168-1185895685298/010CausasDesmatamentoAmazoniaBrasileira.pdf

Meehl, G.A., T.F. Stocker, W.D. Collins, P. Friedlingstein, A.T. Gaye, J.M. Gregory, A. Kitoh, R. Knutti, J.M. Murphy, A. Noda, S.C.B. Raper, G. Watterson, .J. Weaver and Z -C. Zhao. 2007: Global climate projections. pp. 747-845 In: S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.) *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis.* Contribution of Working Group to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. 996 pp.

Miles, L., A. Grainger and O. Phillips. 2004. The impact of global climate change on tropical biodiversity in Amazonia. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 13(6): 553-565.

Moutinho, P., S. Schwartzman and M. Santilli. 2005. Introduction. pp. 7-9 In: P. Moutinho & S. Schwartzman (eds). *Tropical Deforestation and Climate Change.* Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM), Belém, Pará, Brazil & Environmental Defense (EDF), Washington, DC, USA. 131 pp.

Myers, N., C.G. Mittermeier, R.A. Mittermeier, G.A.B. da Fonseca and J. Kent. 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403: 853-858.

Nascimento, H.E.M. and W.F. Laurance. 2004. Biomass dynamics in Amazonian forest fragments. *Ecological Applications* 14(4) Supplement: S127-S138.

Nepstad, D.C., A. Alencar, C. Nobre, E. Lima, P. Lefebvre, P. Schlesinger, C. Potter, P. Moutinho, E. Mendoza, M. Cochrane and V. Brooks. 1999. Large-scale impoverishment of Amazonian forests by logging and fire. *Nature* 398: 505-508.

Nepstad, D., G. Carvalho, A.C. Barros, A. Alencar, J. P. Capobianco, J. Bishop, P. Moutinho, P. Lefebvre, U.L. Silva, Jr. and E. Prins. 2001. Road paving, fire regime feedbacks, and the future of Amazon forests. *Forest Ecology and Management* 154: 395-407.

Nepstad, D.C., P Lefebvre, U.L Silva Jr., J. Tomasella, P. Schlesinger, L. Solorzano, P. Moutinho, D. Ray and J.G. Benito. 2004. Amazon drought and its implications for forest flammability and tree growth: A basin-wide analysis. *Global Change Biology* 10(5): 704-712.

Nepstad, D.C., S. Schwartzman, B. Bamberger, M. Santilli, D. Ray, P. Schlesinger, P. Lefebvre, A. Alencar, E. Prinz, G. Fiske and A. Rolla. 2006. Inhibition of Amazon deforestation and fire by parks and indigenous lands. *Conservation Biology* 20(1): 65-73.

Nepstad D.C., B. Soares-Filho, F. Merry, P.Moutinho, H.O. Rodrigues, M. Bowman, S. Schwartzman, O. Almeida and S. Rivero. 2007b. *The Costs and Benefits of Reducing Carbon Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in the Brazilian Amazon*. Woods Hole Research Center (WHRC), Falmouth, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 26 pp.

Nepstad, D.C., I.M. Tohver, D. Ray, P. Moutinho and G. Cardinot. 2007a. Mortality of large trees and lianas following experimental drought in an Amazon forest. *Ecology* 88(9): 2259-2269.

Nepstad, D.C., C. Uhl and E.A.S. Serrão. 1991. Recuperation of a degraded Amazon landscape: Forest recovery and agricultural restoration. *Ambio* 20: 248-255.

Nogueira, E.M., P.M. Fearnside, B.W. Nelson and M.B. França. 2007. Wood density in forests of Brazil's 'arc of deforestation': Implications for biomass and flux of carbon from land-use change in Amazonia. *Forest Ecology and Management* 248(3): 119-135.

Nogueira, E.M., B.W. Nelson and P.M. Fearnside. 2005. Wood density in dense forest in central Amazonia, Brazil. *Forest Ecology and Management* 208(1-3): 261-286.

Nogueira, E.M., B.W. Nelson and P.M. Fearnside. 2006. Volume and biomass of trees in central Amazonia: Influence of irregularly shaped and hollow trunks. *Forest Ecology and Management* 227(1-2): 14-21.

Nogueira, E,M., B.W. Nelson, P.M. Fearnside, M.B. França and Á.C.A. de Oliveira. 2008. Tree height in Brazil's "arc of deforestation": Shorter trees in south and southwest Amazonia imply lower biomass. *Forest Ecology and Management* 255: 2963-2972.

OESP (*O Estado de São Paulo).* 2007. "Brasil diz que combate efeito estufa, mas não aceita metas**".** *O Estado de São Paulo*. 27 August 2007 (http://www.estadao.com.br/vidae/not_vid41671,0.htm).

Ometto, J.P., A.D. Nobre, H. Rocha, P. Artaxo and L. Martinelli. 2005. Amazônia and the modern carbon cycle: Lessons learned. *Oecologia* 143(4): 483-500.

Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica. 2005. *Submission by the Governments of Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation in Developing Countries: Approaches to Stimulate Action*. Eleventh Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC, Agenda Item No. 6. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Bonn, Germany. 23 pp. (http://www.rainforestcoalition.org/documents/COP-11AgendaItem6-Misc.Doc.FINAL.pdf)

Persson,U.M. and C. Azar. 2007. Tropical deforestation in a future international climate policy regime—lessons from the Brazilian Amazon. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 12(7): 1277-1304.

Phillips, O.L., Y. Malhi, N. Higuchi, W.F. Laurance, P.V. Núñez, R.M. Vásquez, S.G. Laurance, L.V. Ferreira, M. Stern, S. Brown and J. Grace. 1998. Changes in the carbon balance of tropical forests: Evidence from long-term plots. *Science* 282: 439-442.

Phillips, O.L., Y. Malhi, B. Vinceti, T. Baker, S.L.Lewis, N. Higuchi, W.F. Laurance, P. Núñez Vargas, R. Vásquez Martinez, S. Laurance, L.V Ferreira,. M. Stern, S. Brown, J. Grace. 2002. Changes in growth of tropical forests: Evaluating potential biases. *Ecological Applications* 12: 576–587.

Phillips, O.L., T.R. Baker, L. Arroyo, N. Higuchi, T.J. Killeen, W.F. Laurance, S.L. Lewis, J. Lloyd, Y. Malhi, A. Monteagudo, D.A. Neill, P.N. Vargas, J.N.M. Silva, J. Terborgh, R.V. Martínez, M. Alexiades, S. Almeida, S. Almeida, S. Brown, J. Chave, J.A. Comiskey, C.I. Czimczik, A., Di Fiore, T. Erwin, C. Kuebler, S.G. Laurance, H.E.M Nascimento, J. Olivier, W. Palacios, S. Patiño, N.C.A. Pitman, C.A. Quesada, M. Saldias, A.T. Lezama and B. Vinceti. 2004. Pattern and process in Amazon tree turnover, 1976-2001. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* B 359: 381-407.

Ramankutty, N., H.K. Gibbs, F. Achard, R. De Fries, J.A. Foley and R.A. Houghton. 2007. Challenges to estimating carbon emissions from tropical deforestation. *Global Change Biology* 13(1): 51–66. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01272.x

Rice, A.H., E.H. Pyle, S.R. Saleska, L. Hutyra, M. Palace, M. Keller, P.B. de Camargo, K. Portilho, D.F. Marques and S.C. Wofsy. 2004. Carbon balance and vegetation dynamics in an old-growth Amazonian forest. *Ecological Applications* 14(4) Supplement: S55-S71.

Saatchi, S.S., R.A. Houghton, R.C. Dos Santos Alvala, J.V. Soares and Y. Yu. 2007. Distribution of aboveground live biomass in the Amazon Basin. *Global Change Biology* 13: 816-837.

Salati, E. 2001. Mudanças climáticas e o ciclo hidrológico na Amazônia. pp. 153-172. In: Fleischresser, V. (ed.), *Causas e Dinâmica do Desmatamento na Amazônia*. Ministério do Meio Ambiente, Brasília, DF, Brazil. 435 pp.

Salazar, L.F., C.A. Nobre and M.D. Oyama. 2007. Climate change consequences on the biome distribution in tropical South America. *Geophysical Research Letters* 34: L09708, doi:10.1029/2007GL029695.

Saleska. S.R., S.D Miller, D.M. Matross, M.L Goulden, S.C. Wofsy, H.R da Rocha, P.B. de Camargo, P. Crill, B.C. Daube, H.C. de Freitas, L. Hutyra, M. Keller, V. Kirchoff, M. Menton, J.W. Munger, E.H. Pyle, A.H. Rice and H. Silva. 2003. Carbon in Amazon forests: Unexpected seasonal fluxes and disturbance-induced losses. *Science* 302: 1554-1557

Sampaio, G., C.A. Nobre, M.H. Costa, P. Satyamurty, B.S. Soares-Filho, M. Cardoso. 2007. Regional climate change over eastern Amazonia caused by pasture and soybean cropland expansion. *Geophysical Research Letters* 34: L17709, doi:10.029/2007GL030612.

Santilli, M., P. Moutinho, S. Schwartzman, D. Nepstad, L. Curran and C. Nobre. 2005. Tropical deforestation and the Kyoto Protocol. *Climatic Change* 71: 267-276.

Sathaye, J.A. and K. Andrasko. 2007. Land use change and forestry climate project regional baselines: A review. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 12(6): 971-1000.

Schlamadinger, B., L. Ciccarese, M. Dutschke, P.M. Fearnside, S. Brown and D. Mudiyarso. 2005. Should we include avoidance of deforestation in the international response to climate change? pp. 675-691. In: P. Moutinho and S. Schwartzman (eds.). *Tropical Deforestation and Climate Change.* Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM), Belém, Pará, Brazil & Environmental Defense (EDF), Washington, DC, U.S.A. 131 pp.

Schwartzman, S., A. Moreira and D. Nepstad. 2000. Arguing tropical forest conservation: People versus parks. *Conservation Biology* 14: 1370-l374.

Sloan, S. 2007. Fewer people may not mean more forest for Latin American forest frontiers. *Biotropica* 39: 443-446.

Soares-Filho, B.S., A.A. Alencar, D.C. Nepstad, G.C. Cerqueira, M. del C.V. Diaz, S. Rivero, L Solórzano and E. Voll. 2004. Simulating the response of land-cover changes to road paving and governance along a major Amazon highway: The Santarém-Cuiabá corridor. *Global Change Biology* 10(5): 745-764.

Soares-Filho, B.S., D.C. Nepstad, L.M. Curran, G.C. Cerqueira, R.A Garcia,. C.A. Ramos, E., Voll, A. McDonald, P. Lefebvre and P. Schlesinger. 2006. Modelling conservation in the Amazon Basin. *Nature* 440: 520-523.

Tian, H., J.M. Mellilo, D.W. Kicklighter, A.D. McGuire, J.V.K. Helfrich III, B. Moore III and C. Vörömarty. 1998. Effect of interannual climate variability on carbon storage in Amazonian ecosystems. *Nature* 396: 664-667.

Tian H., J.M. Melillo, D.W Kicklighter, A.D. McGuire, J. Helfrich III, B. Moore III and C.J. Vorosmarty. 2000. Climatic and biotic controls on annual carbon storage in Amazonian ecosystems. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 9: 315–335.

Trenberth, K.E. and D.J. Shea. 2006. Atlantic hurricanes and natural variability in 2005. *Geophysical Research Letters* 33, L12704, doi:10.1029/2006GL026894.

Uhl, C., R. Buschbacher and E.A.S. Serrão. 1988. Abandoned pastures in Eastern Amazonia. I. Patterns of plant succession. *Journal of Ecology* 76: 663-681.

UN-FCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change). 1992. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (available in English at http://www.unfccc.de and in Portuguese at http://www.mct.gov.br).

Vasconcelos, S.S. and I.F. Brown. 2007. The use of hot pixels as an indicator of fires in the MAP region: tendencies in recent years in Acre, Brazil. pp. 4549-4556. In: *Anais XIII Simpósio Brasileiro de Sensoriamento Remoto, Florianópolis, Brasil 21-26 abril 2007*. Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil.

Viana, V. and M.T. Campos. 2007. *Bolsa Floresta: Recompensa para Quem Conserva a Floresta em Pé*. Secretaria do Estado do Meio Ambiente e Desenvolvimento Sustentável (SDS), Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. 13 pp.

White, A., M.G.R. Cannell and A.D. Friend. 2000. CO_2 stabilization, climate change and the terrestrial carbon sink. *Global Change Biology* 6: 817-833.

Wright, S.J. and H.C. Muller-Landau. 2006. The future of tropical species. *Biotropica* 38: 287-301.

Table 1

Net committed emissions from Amazonian deforestation over the 1988-1994 Brazilian inventory period[(a)]

	Emissions (million Mg gas/year)			
	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total
Forest biomass gross emission	819.40	1.56 - 2.23	0.04 - 0.05	
Committed uptake	-71.61			
Forest biomass net committed emission	747.80	1.56 - 2.23	0.04 - 0.05	
CO_2 carbon equivalent (Million Mg C)	203.94	10.61 - 15.19	2.90 - 4.25	217.46 - 223.39

(a) Average deforestation rate 15,228 km^2/year. Low and high values reflect range of emission factors, not uncertainty in biomass.

(b) Converted using 100-year global warming potentials from the IPCC AR4: per Mg of gas CO_2=1, CH_4=25, N_2O=298.

Table 2
Comparison of deforestation emissions results with the official Brazilian estimate

Year	Deforestation rate (10^3 km^2/year)	Net emission (million tons CO_2-equivalent C/year)			
		Fearnside (*e.g.*, Table 1 midpoint)	Brazilian national inventory[(a)]	Discrepancy (%)	
				Raw values	With comparable biomass[(b)]
1990	13.8	200.0			
1988-1994	15.2	220.4	116.9	90	115
2000	18.2	263.8			
2004	27.4	396.3			
2007	11.2	162.5			

(a) Brazil, MCT (2004, p. 149).
(b) Calculated using Fearnside value without the adjustments to biomass for new estimates of wood density and tree height that are included in the values in Table 1.