Brazil's submission of a Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL) for reducing emissions from deforestation in the Amazonia biome for REDD+ results-based payments under the UNFCCC from 2016 to 2020

Brasília, DF
January, 2018

Coordination:

Ministry of the Environment (MMA)

Inputs:

Working Group of Technical Experts on REDD+ (Ministerial Ordinance No 41/2014)

Table of Contents

–

Figures

Tables

Boxes

Annexes[1]

[1] The additional information provided in the Annexes is meant to enhance clarity and transparency in the construction of the FREL. Brazil recalls paragraph 2 of Decision 13/CP.19 on guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of FREL submissions and paragraph 4 of the Annex of the same decision.

Introduction

Brazil welcomes the opportunity to submit a second forest reference emission level (FREL) for the Amazonia biome, for a technical assessment in the context of results-based payments for *reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries* (REDD+) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)[2].

In February 2014, the Ministry of the Environment of Brazil (MMA) created a Working Group of Technical Experts on REDD+ (GTT REDD+) through the Ministerial Ordinance No. 41. This Working Group, formed mainly by experts from renowned Brazilian federal academic and research institutions in the area of climate change and forests, provides guidance to the Brazilian government regarding the REDD+ submissions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Brazil underlines that the submission of FRELs and/or forest reference levels (FRLs) and subsequent Technical Annexes to the Biennial Update Report (BUR) with results are voluntary and **exclusively for the purpose of obtaining and receiving payments for REDD+ activities**, pursuant to decisions 13/CP.19, paragraph 2, and 14/CP.19, paragraphs 7 and 8.

This submission, therefore, does not modify, revise or adjust in any way the nationally appropriate mitigation actions currently being undertaken by Brazil pursuant to the Bali Action Plan (FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1), nor any nationally determined contribution made by Brazil in the context of the Paris Agreement.

Context of the second FREL submission for the Amazonia biome

This document presents the second submission of a FREL for reducing emissions from deforestation in the Amazonia biome, for results-based payments. In June 2014, Brazil submitted a dynamic FREL to be applied for emission reduction results achieved in the Amazonia biome in the period 2006-2010 (FREL A) and in the period 2011-2015 (FREL B). The dynamic FREL was technically assessed by LULUCF experts from the UNFCCC roster of experts in November of the same year.

In December 2014, Brazil submitted the first BUR to the UNFCCC that contained an Annex with REDD+ results for the period 2006-2010. The emission reduction achieved for each year of this period[3] was calculated using FREL A, estimated as the mean of the annual CO_2 emissions from gross deforestation in Amazonia from the period 1996-2005. The second BUR was submitted in February 2017 and included a Technical Annex with the emission reduction results achieved in the Amazonia biome in the period 2011-2015, based on FREL B, estimated as the mean of the annual CO_2 emissions from gross

[2] Decision 16/CP.1, paragraph 70.

[3] Emission reduction for year 2006, for instance, refers to emission reductions from 2005-2006. Hence, the emission reduction in each year of the period 2006-2010 (2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010), corresponds to emission reductions achieved in the annual periods 2005-2006; 2006-2007; 2007-2008; 2008-2009; and 2009-2010, respectively.

deforestation from the period 1996-2010. The Annex also included a proposed FREL C, for assessing emission reduction from deforestation for the period 2016-2020, for results-based payments. The FREL C proposed in the BUR was estimated as the mean of the annual CO_2 emissions from gross deforestation from 1996-2015, **maintaining the same emission estimates in the time-series as for FREL A and FREL B, and updating with adjusted emission estimates for the period 2011–2015**. The LULUCF experts responsible for the technical analysis of the Technical Annex of the BUR did not technically assess the FREL C since it was considered to be outside the scope of the guidelines for technical analysis of BURs. **For this submission of the FREL C, all emission estimates from deforestation in the period 1996-2015 have been re-estimated based on the updated adjusted increments from deforestation using deforestation data from the period 2011-2015**. This re-estimation resulted in an increase of 0.17% and 0.23% to the total area deforested and total emissions in the period 1996-2010, respectively (see http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub, directory "Technical Assessment FREL C", files "***WORKSHEET_FREL_C_2019***" and "***Simple_guide_to_WORKSHEET_FREL_C_2019"***).

The submission of **FREL C** maintains close resemblance with the construction of both FREL A and FREL B, and is considered to be an update of the first submission for the Amazonia biome, which is consistent with Decision 12/CP.17. Nonetheless, this submission considers or clarifies the status of suggested improvements from the technical assessment of the first FREL and includes new text to continuously improve the transparency and clarity of the submission.

Please note that since the same methodologies and data sources used in the construction of both FREL A and FREL B were applied in the construction of FREL C, most of the examples included in this submission are preserved from the first submission, since these were exhaustively analyzed by the team of LULUCF experts who carried out the technical assessment of FREL A and FREL B. Hence, most of the material available for the reconstruction of FREL C is simply an update of the material available for the construction of FREL A and FREL B, or those available for the technical assessment of the Technical Annex to the Second BUR, for results-based payments for the emission reductions from deforestation achieved in the period 2011-2015. As appropriate, the improvements suggested in the technical assessment report of FREL A and FREL B are addressed in this submission, as well as clarifications provided to the LULUCF experts during the technical assessment of FREL C.

Area and activity covered by the FREL C

Brazil recalls paragraphs 11 and 10 of Decision 12/CP.17 (FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.2) that respectively indicate that a subnational FREL may be developed as an interim measure, while transitioning to a national FREL; and that a step-wise approach to a national FREL

may be useful, enabling Parties to improve the FREL by incorporating better data, improved methodologies and, where appropriate, additional pools.

Brazil proposes here to update the subnational FREL for the Amazonia biome (refer to ***Figure 2*****),** which comprises approximately 4,197,000 km^2 and corresponds to 49.29% of the national territory[4] (refer to ***Figure 1***). The presentation of the FREL by biome allows the country to assess and evaluate the effect of policies and measures developed at the biome level (refer to ***Annex II*** for details of the Action Plan to Prevent and Control Deforestation in the Legal Amazonia).

Figure 1 **-** Distribution of the six biomes in the Brazilian territory. ***Source:*** IBGE, 2011.

[4] As presented in ***Figure 1***, in addition to the Amazonia biome, the national territory has five other biomes: Cerrado (2,036,448 km^2 – 23.92% of the national territory), Mata Atlântica (1,110,182 km^2 – 13.04% of the national territory), Caatinga (844,453 km^2 – 9.92% of the national territory), Pampa (176,496 km^2 – 2.07% of the national territory), and Pantanal (150,355 km^2 – 1.76% of the national territory) (BRASIL, 2010, Volume 1, ***Table 3.85***). The difference between the total area of the country in the III National Inventory (852,187,545.2 ha) and information in the site of IBGE (851,576,704.9 ha), equal to 610,840.3 ha or 0.07%, may occur due to the parameters used in the calculation, the projection used or the topological correction applied in the *shapefiles*. The FRELs for Amazonia maintain consistency with the data in the II National Inventory, which is the same as those in the IBGE site.



Figure 2 **-** State boundaries and boundaries of the Amazonia biome. ***Source:*** MMA (2014) based on IBGE (2010).

Despite the absolute and relative reductions in the contribution of Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) to the total national greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions over the last years, LULUCF still remains as a significant source of emissions, particularly CO_2. According with the III National GHG Inventory, part of the III National Communication of Brazil to the UNFCCC[5], LULUCF accounted for 42.01% of the total net emissions of Brazil in 2010 – refer to ***Figure 3***. Due to the importance of emissions from deforestation in the Amazonia biome, Brazil deemed appropriate to first focus its mitigation actions in the forest sector through "reducing emissions from deforestation" in the Amazonia and Cerrado biomes as an *interim* measure, while transitioning to a national level that will include all biomes, consistent with the policy efforts made by Brazil through the National REDD+ Strategy. It is relevant to note that the Amazonia and Cerrado biomes cover approximately 73% of the national territory, and individual FRELs for both biomes have already been submitted. This implies that the four remaining biomes will cover the remaining 27% of the territory.

[5] Refer to Volume 3 of the III National Communication (MCTI, 2014), ***Table 2.1***, page 45.



Figure 3 **-** Percent contribution of the different sectors to the total net CO_2 emissions in 2010 and the corresponding percent contribution of the Brazilian biomes to the total net emissions from LULUCF. Note: The Waste sector is not represented in the diagram because it corresponds to a mere 0.03% of the total national emissions in 2010. ***Source:*** III National Communication (MCTI, 2016).

Although this FREL submission for REDD+ results-based payments includes only **CO_2 emissions from gross deforestation** in the Amazonia biome, Brazil is implementing the National REDD+ Strategy and is carrying out concrete efforts to transition to a **national FREL (see details in Box 1)**. Preliminary information is provided in ***Annex III (Forest degradation in the Amazonia biome: preliminary thoughts)*** and ***Annex IV (From subnational to national approach (all biomes))*** for the ongoing process of a national monitoring system and the consideration of degradation in natural forested areas and vegetation regrowth (secondary vegetation).

Box 1. The approach to the National FREL and results thereafter

Since the first FREL submitted by Brazil to the UNFCCC, the approach to construct the national FREL for reducing emissions from deforestation was transparently informed. The approach consists of developing six individual FRELs, one for each of the six biomes in the Brazilian territory, and their subsequent sum, that defines the national FREL[6]. Advancing on this explanation, Brazil indicates here that this approach does not imply, however, that the same pools and/or gases will be included in each individual FREL, due to the very different characteristics and dynamics of REDD+ activities in each biome. Two important elements, in the view of Brazil, must be ensured: (i) to maintain the same reference period for all the biome FRELs, and (ii) the emission reduction results presented at biome level in the future is consistent with the corresponding biome FREL. A national

[6] Text in the first FREL submission by Brazil, on page 9: The national FREL to be submitted by Brazil in the future for each REDD+ activity selected will be calculated as the sum of the FRELs constructed for each of the six biomes in the national territory.

FREL and national emission reduction results can be presented as the sum of the FRELs and the sum of the emission reduction results for each biome.

Regarding the inclusion of other REDD+ activities, **Brazil clarifies that it will include reducing emissions from forest degradation in the biomes where this activity is a significant source of emissions. The same applies for pools and non-CO_2 gases. Until 2020, there is no intent of Brazil to include other REDD+ activities besides reducing emissions from deforestation and reducing emissions from forest degradation.**

Brazil followed the guidelines for submission of information on reference levels as contained in the Annex to Decision 12/CP.17 and structured this submission accordingly, i.e.:

a) Information that was used in constructing a FREL;

b) Complete, transparent, consistent, and accurate information, including methodological information used at the time of construction of FRELs;

c) Pools and gases, and activities which have been included in FREL; and

d) The definition of forest used in the construction of FREL.

Details are provided below.

a) Information that was used in constructing the FREL

The construction of the FREL for *reducing emissions from deforestation* in the Amazonia biome was based on the National Institute for Space Research's (INPE, for the Portuguese acronym) historical time series for gross deforestation in the **Legal Amazonia**[7] using Landsat-class satellite data on an annual, wall-to-wall basis since 1988. This time series is considered to be the most reliable source of the areas annually deforested, due to its consistency through time, transparency, verifiability, and low uncertainty. Due to the characteristics of the time series data (e.g., annual wall-to-wall assessments, adjustment for different dates between annual assessments), the use of this data (instead of the data from the National Inventories that do not present annual estimates but consider annual average estimates for periods of time[8]) is considered to be the most accurate for the purposes of the FREL construction for the Amazonia biome.

The **Legal Amazonia** encompasses three different biomes: the entire Amazonia biome; 37% of the Cerrado biome; and 40% of the Pantanal biome (***Figure 4***)**. For the construction of the FREL for the Amazonia biome, the areas from the Cerrado and Pantanal biomes contained in the Legal Amazonia were excluded. The boundaries of the Amazonia biome and the Legal Amazonia are available at**

[7] The Legal Amazonia is an area of approximately 5,217,423 km² (521,742,300 ha) that covers the totality of the following states: Acre, Amapá, Amazonas, Pará, Rondônia, Roraima and Tocantins; and part of the states of Mato Grosso and Maranhão.

[8] For instance, the period covered in the II National Inventory for LULUCF was 1994-2002 and for the III National Inventory, from 2002-2010, i.e., both span a period of 8 years.

http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub, directory "***Deforestation polygons/II Technical Annex and FREL C***", as "***limite_bioma_Amazonia.zip***" and "***limit_AMZ_Legal_MMA.rar***", respectively.



Figure 4 - Aggregated deforestation (in yellow) up to year 2012 in the Legal Amazonia, and in the Amazonia, Cerrado and Pantanal biomes. Forest in green; Non-forest in pink; water bodies in blue. ***Source:*** INPE (2014b).

The **area of interest (target area)** for the construction of the FRELs for the Amazonia biome is the area occupied by **natural forest cover in the** biome. In 2010, this area, according to the III National GHG Inventory[9] was equal to 309,966,626.7 ha, or approximately 73.95% of the Amazonia biome, 31.0% of which associated with **unmanaged natural forest** and 42.65% with **managed natural forest** (refer to ***Box 2***). The land cover of the remaining 26.10% consisted of pasture land (11.87%); cropland (0.81%); secondary forest (1.94%); reforestation (0.08%); selectively logged forests (0.28%); unmanaged grassland (1.04%); managed grassland (1.14%); secondary grassland (0.05%); settlement (0.09%); water (2.89%); reservoirs (0.15%); and other land (0.02%). The remaining 5.98% concerned cloud-covered areas in the Amazonia biome in the period 2005-2010 (not necessarily over natural forest land).

Box 2. The relation of managed and unmanaged land in the III National GHG

[9] **Table 3.85** (Areas of land use/cover transitions in the Amazonia biome in the period 2005-2010) in Total 2010.

Inventory and the FREL submission

All of the area in the Amazonia biome, with the exception of the **unmanaged natural forest**, unmanaged natural grassland, natural wetlands (rivers and lakes) and other land[10] is considered **managed land**. The **managed natural forest land** consists of areas of natural forest within lands with a legally defined use, such as Indigenous Lands, Conservation Units (see ***Figure 5*** for the boundaries of the Conservation Units and Indigenous Lands in Legal Amazonia in 2010) (FUNCATE, 2018). According with the III National Inventory, the managed natural forest land totaled 179,507,013 ha in 2010, or 42.65% of the biome[11]. All the **native forests** in **managed AND unmanaged areas** are included in the construction of the FREL. Once deforestation occurs on unmanaged land, the area deforested is automatically transferred to the managed land database. It is important to note that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) provides methodological approaches for national GHG inventories. REDD+ comprises **activities** in the forestry sector that do not necessarily match the sub-categories or definitions applied in the national inventories. For example, there is no definition of forest degradation provided by the IPCC for national inventories. Developing countries engaged in REDD+ can provide their own definition, once transparently and consistently applied through time (refer to ***Annex III – Forest degradation in the Amazonia biome: preliminary thoughts***). Another important point refers to the sources of data used in the construction of the FREL. In the case of Brazil, the most reliable, consistent, larger data set for deforestation in Amazonia is PRODES, which is nationally and internationally recognized. The data from PRODES, used in the construction of the FREL Amazonia, has a different scale and a different vegetation cover than those defined for the National Inventory and, hence, direct comparisons may lead to different estimates. Moreover, the data from the National Inventories are not annual, may be differently affected by cloud cover and may use satellite data from different dates than PRODES. So care needs to be taken when envisaging a direct comparison of these two distinct sources of data.



[10] According with the broad land-use categories in the GPG-LULUCF (IPCC, 2003).
[11] ***Table 3.85***, in Total 2010.

Figure 5 - **Distribution of the Indigenous Lands and Conservation Units in the Legal Amazonia area (red boundary) and in the Amazonia biome (black boundary) in 2010.** ***Source: FUNCATE, personal elaboration, 2018.***

.

In order to estimate the emissions associated with gross deforestation, two elements are necessary: (1) **activity data**; and (2) **emission factors**.

The **activity data** is defined here as the area of the deforestation polygons identified within the **target area**, discriminated by forest type (in km^2 or hectares). These data are necessary for the application of the first order approximation to estimate emissions[12] as suggested in the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry (GPG LULUCF) (IPCC, 2003). These areas have been obtained from INPE's Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project (PRODES) time series (modified to consider only deforestation in the **Amazonia biome**) as well as the vegetation map from the Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics (IBGE).

The ***emission factors*** consist of the carbon densities associated with the carbon pools of each forest type considered in this submission (refer to ***Table 4*** for the forest types and ***Tables 6*** and ***7*** for the associated carbon densities), consistent with the previous FRELs for the Amazonia biome. For the emission factors, data from the II National GHG Inventory (in tonnes of carbon per unit area, tC ha^{-1}) were used (refer to ***Tables 6*** and ***7***), to ensure consistency with the previous FRELs for the Amazonia biome. However, for transparency sake, an assessment of the effect of the use of the "carbon map" from the III National GHG Inventory on the CO_2 emissions from deforestation has been made and the results are presented in ***Table 8***.

This submission includes the following carbon pools: living biomass (above and below-ground biomass) and litter, consistent with the first submission for the Amazonia biome. ***Section c*** in this submission (*Pools, gases and activities included in the construction of the FREL*) provides more detailed information regarding pools and gases. The non-inclusion of the dead wood and the soil organic carbon pools (mineral and organic soils) in the FREL are dealt with in ***section c.2***.

***Annex III* (*Forest degradation in the Amazonia biome: preliminary thoughts*)** provides some preliminary information regarding forest degradation and introduces some ongoing initiatives to estimate the associated emissions, so as not to exclude emissions from significant REDD+ activities in future FRELs.

There is recognition of the need to continuously improve the GHG emission estimates associated with REDD+ activities, pools and gases and information in this respect is provided in the Annexes to this submission, which are not meant for results-based payments.

A more detailed description of the information used to estimate emissions in the

[12] "In most first order approximations, the "activity data" are in terms of area of land use or land-use change. The generic guidance is to multiply the activity data by a carbon stock coefficient or "emission factor" to provide the source/or sink estimates." (IPCC, 2003; section 3.1.4, page 3.15).

Amazonia biome for the FREL C is presented below.

a.1. Estimates for deforested areas (activity data) in the Amazonia biome

INPE, through the Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project (PRODES), annually estimates gross deforestation in natural forests in Legal Amazonia using satellite data, adopting a minimum mapping unit of 6.25 hectares (for details refer to ***Annex I.1 : Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project – PRODES***). PRODES includes all Evergreen Forest Formations in the Legal Amazonia as well as other formations such as Savanna and Steppe, which are generally classified as "Other Wooded Land" according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) classification system (see ***Section d*** of this submission for more information on the definition of forest adopted by Brazil). The presence of the "Other Wooded Land" formations in the Amazonia biome is not significant. For instance, in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015, the percent contribution of the areas deforested in these vegetation types, relative to the total annual area deforested were 0.26%; 0.48%; 0.27%; 0.22%; and 0.29%, respectively.

At the beginning of PRODES in 1988, a mask delimiting the boundaries of natural forest in Legal Amazonia was created based on the analysis of Landsat satellite imagery and attributes such as texture, color and other spectral characteristics, as well as other ancillary information, such as the vegetation maps by the IBGE. Since then, the boundaries of this mask have been preserved, so as to ensure the consistency of the deforestation time series through time. It is important to note, however, that at each annual assessment, the areas deforested are excluded from the mask, to ensure that the deforestation polygons identified at any subsequent year are unequivocally associated with **natural** forest areas only. In 1987, all previously deforested areas were aggregated into a single map (including deforestation in forest areas that, in 1987, were secondary forests) and classified as ***deforestation***. Thereafter, on a yearly basis, deforestation in the Amazonia biome has been assessed on an **annually updated natural forest area**.

The Brazilian deforestation time series from PRODES relate only to gross deforestation in natural forests, identified as patches (or polygons) with a **clear cut** pattern in the satellite imagery of Landsat class (approximately 30 meters resolution). This **clear cut** pattern is associated with the **elimination** of the natural forest.

Please note that the II (as well as the III) National GHG Inventory of Brazil includes emission estimates from the **conversion of forest land** (sub-categorized as natural, secondary, selectively logged, and planted) to other land-use categories, in different periods of time (I National Inventory, from 1990-1994; II National Inventory from 1994 to 2002; and III National Inventory from 2002 to 2010). Hence, due to the fact that the conversions occur at any point within the period considered in the inventory, it is assumed that the conversion occurs half way in the period, and the changes in carbon stock estimated following the Good Practice Guidance for Land use, Land-use Change and

Forestry (GPG LULUCF), (IPCC, 2003). However, for the construction of the FREL Amazonia, deforestation data from an annually updated database since 1988 is used, defined as those where natural forest areas have been suppressed. **No conversions are assessed in PRODES, as this is not the objective of the Deforestation Monitoring Program.**

The fact that satellite data from optical systems (e.g., Landsat) are the basic source of information to identify new deforestation events every year, and considering that the presence of clouds may impair the observation of deforestation events under clouds, requires the application of an approach to estimate the annual areas deforested in natural forest areas under clouds, so as not to underestimate nor overestimate the total deforestation at any year (refer to **Box *3*** for alternative approaches to estimate the area of gross deforestation in the Amazonia biome). This is in line with good practice as defined in GPG LULUCF (IPCC, 2003).

IMPORTANT REMARK: The emissions from deforestation in the FREL are associated with the elimination of natural forest. In few cases, deforestation occurs in areas of natural forest that have been subject to some type of degradation (e.g., by selective logging activities or fires). Part of the natural forest subject to degradation is deforested and part is left to regrow. The inclusion of emissions from forest degradation in a future FREL will have to take into account the stage of degradation and an adjustment of the carbon density of the affected forest physiognomy. Since the FREL includes only deforestation, the full carbon density is used to estimate the associated emissions, in the understanding that if deforestation occurred in degraded areas, the use of the full carbon density only disconsiders the timing of the emission (e.g., suppose that a selectively logged area in time *t-2* affects 10% of the carbon density per unit area; and that degradation continues at time *t-1*, resulting in an additional loss of carbon density of 30%; and that at time *t* deforestation occurs in this area). When degradation is included in the FREL, then degradation at these timings will be included. Presently, the emissions from degradation are included in the emissions from deforestation. There are only two options for degradation: (1) evolve to deforestation; or (2) evolve to secondary vegetation. Understanding these dynamics is the challenge to address degradation in a relatively accurate way. It is not expected that the inclusion of emissions from degradation in the FREL will significantly increase the present FRELs.

Box 3. Approaches to estimate the area of gross deforestation in the Amazonia biome

There are several approaches to estimate the area deforested and different results may be obtained depending on the approach used. For example, the annual deforested area can be estimated from the annual increments of deforestation; from the annual rate of deforestation; or from the adjusted deforestation increment. The explanations provided below are meant to clarify these different approaches and terminologies used throughout the Brazilian submissions.

(1) **Deforestation Polygons** (at year *t*): refer to new deforestation events identified from the analysis of remotely sensed data (satellite images) at year *t* as compared to the accumulated deforestation mapped up to year *t-1*. Each deforestation polygon is spatially identified (geocoded), has accurate shape and area representations, and has an associated date of detection (the date of the satellite image from which it was mapped). For each year, a map containing all deforestation polygons (deforestation map) is made available in shapefile format for PRODES (and hence, for the Amazonia biome, after exclusion of the areas associated with the Cerrado and Pantanal biomes) at (http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodesdigital/cadastro.php). This map does not include deforestation polygons under cloud covered areas. However, the deforestation map also renders spatially explicit distribution of the cloud covered areas.

(2) **Deforestation Increment** or **Increments of Deforestation** (at year *t*): refers to the sum of the areas of all observed deforestation polygons within a given geographical extent. This geographical extent may be defined as the boundaries of a satellite scene which has the same date as the deforestation polygons mapped on that scene; or the entire Amazonia biome, for which the deforestation increment is calculated as the sum of the individual deforestation increment calculated for each scene that covers the biome. The deforestation increment **may underestimate** the total area deforested (and associated emissions), since it does not account for the area of deforestation polygons under clouds.

(3) **Adjusted Deforestation Increment** or **Adjusted Increments of Deforestation** (at year *t*): this adjustment is made to the deforestation increment at year *t*-1 (or years *t-1* and *t-2*, etc., as applicable) to account for deforestation polygons in areas affected by cloud cover and that are observable at time *t*. It is calculated according with ***Equation 1***:

$$Inc_{adj(t)} = Inc_{(t)} - \sum_{\Delta=1} A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)} + \sum_{\Delta=1} \frac{A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)}}{\Delta+1} + \sum_{\Omega-1} \frac{A_{CC(t+\Omega),(t)}}{\Omega+1}$$

Equation 1

where*:*

$Inc_{adj(t)}$ = adjusted deforestation increment at year *t*; km^2

$Inc_{(t)}$ = deforestation increment at year *t*; km^2

$A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)}$ = area of the deforestation polygons observed (cloud-free) at year *t* over cloud-covered areas at year *t*-Δ; km^2. Note that when $\Delta = 1$, $A_{CC(t-1),(t)}$ equals the area of the deforestation polygons observed at year *t* over cloud-covered areas at year *t*-1 (but which were under cloud-free at year *t*-2); for $\Delta = 2$, $A_{CC(t-2),(t)}$ equals the area of the deforestation polygons observed at year *t* over an area that was cloud-covered at both years *t*-1 **and** *t*-2.

$A_{CC(t+\Omega),(t)}$ = area of the deforestation polygons observed at year t+Ω over cloud-covered areas at year *t*; km^2. Note that when $\Omega = 1$, the term $A_{CC(t+1),(t)}$ provides the area of the deforestation polygons observed at

year t+1 over the area that was cloud-covered at year t; when $\Omega = 2$, the term $A_{CC(t+2),(t)}$ provides the area of the deforestation polygons observed at year t+2 over the area that was cloud-covered at years t **and** t+1.
Δ = number of years that a given area was persistently affected by cloud cover prior to year t but was observed at year t; Δ =1, 2, ...
Ω = number of years until a given area affected by cloud cover at year t is observed in subsequent years (i.e., is free of clouds); Ω = 1,2, …

As an example, suppose that the area of the deforestation increment observed at year t, $Inc_{(t)}$, is 200 km^2 and that 20 km^2 of this occurred over primary forest areas that were cloud covered at year t-1 (but are cloud-free at year t). Since these 20 km^2 may accumulate the area of the deforestation polygons under clouds at year t-1 and the area of the deforestation polygons that occurred at year t, the deforestation increment **may overestimate** the total area deforested area (and associated emissions) at year t.
The adjusted deforestation increment $Inc_{adj(t)}$ at year t evenly distributes the total area of the deforestation polygons observed at year t under the cloud-covered area at year t-1 (or before, if the same area was also cloud covered at year t-2, for instance) among years t-1 and t. Hence, the adjusted deforestation increment at year t is 190 km^2 (200 – 20/2) and not 200 km^2, assuming that there were no cloud-covered areas at year t (in which case the adjusted deforestation increment at year t would be adjusted by $\sum_{\Omega=1} \frac{A_{CC(t+\Omega)(t)}}{\Omega+1}$ where $A_{CC(t+\Omega),(t)}$ = area of the deforestation polygons observed at year t+ Ω over cloud-covered areas at year t; and Ω is the number of years that a given area affected by cloud cover at year t is observed (i.e., is free of clouds).
The rationale behind ***Equation 1*** is to remove from the deforestation increment the area to be distributed among the years ($-\sum_{\Delta=1} A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)}$) and then add back the portion allocated to year t $\left(\sum_{\Delta=1} \frac{A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)}}{\Delta+1}\right)$. The last term of the equation refers to the area distributed from subsequent years (or year) over cloud covered areas at year t.

(4) **Deforestation Rate** (at year t): was introduced in PRODES to sequentially address the effect of **cloud cover**; and, if necessary, the effect of **time lapse** between consecutive images. The deforestation rate aims at reducing the potential under or over-estimation of the deforested area at year t. The presence of cloud-covered areas in an image at year t impairs the observation of deforestation polygons under clouds, and may lead to an **underestimation** of the area deforested; while the presence of clouds in previous years (e.g., at year t-1) may lead to an **overestimation** of the area deforested if all deforestation under clouds at year t-1 is attributed to year t.
This **over** or **under-estimation** may also occur if the dates of the satellite images used in subsequent years are not adjusted. To normalize for a one year period (365 days) the time lapse between the images used at years t and t+1, the rate considers a reference date of August 1st and projects the cloud corrected increment to that date, based on a model that assumes that the deforestation pace

is constant during the dry season and zero during the wet season. Refer to ***Annex I.1 (Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project – PRODES)*** for more information on PRODES methodology for calculating the deforestation rate.

As an example of cloud correction, suppose that the primary forest area in an image is 20,000 km^2 and that 2,000 km^2 of this occurred over primary forest areas that were cloud covered. Suppose also that the observed **deforestation increment** is 180 km^2. As part of the calculation of the rate, it is assumed that the proportion of deforestation measured in the cloud-free forest area (18,000 km^2) is the same as that in the area of forest under cloud (2,000 km^2). Therefore the proportion 180/18,000 = 0.01 is applied to the 2,000 km^2, generating an extra 20 km^2 that is added to the observed deforestation increment. In this case, the **adjusted increment of deforestation** is 200 km^2.

IMPORTANT REMARKS:

1. Note that at any one year, an estimate based on the adjusted deforestation increment may be higher or lower than the rate of gross deforestation.
2. For the sake of verifiability, this submission introduces a slight change in the methodology used in PRODES to estimate the annual area deforested. PRODES methodology to annualize observed deforestation and to take into account unobserved areas due to cloud cover is not directly verifiable unless all the estimates are adjusted backwards.
3. The approach applied in this submission relies on a verifiable deforestation map and does not annualize the time lapse between consecutive scenes. It deals with the effect of cloud cover by equally distributing the area of the deforestation polygons observed at year *t* over cloud-covered areas at year *t*-1 (or to years where that area was persistently cloud covered) among years *t* and *t*-1.
4. The use of the adjusted deforestation increment to estimate the gross deforestation area and associated gross emissions is considered to be appropriate for the purposes of REDD+, since the areas covered by clouds in the Amazonia biome are still significant and non-consideration of deforestation under clouds could result in an underestimation of the annual emissions.
5. Note that the adjusted increments or the adjusted emissions calculated on the basis of the adjusted increments do not create additional deforested area nor additional emissions. The adjustment method only ensures that the annual estimates are more accurate, since it distributes the area (and emissions) observed at time *t* over cloud covered areas at time(s) t-x , x=1,2,3… , as necessary.

Annex II.1 (Example of the calculation of adjusted deforestation increment and associated CO_2 emissions for the year 2003) provides an example of the application of the ***adjusted deforestation increment*** approach to estimate the ***adjusted*** area deforested in year 2003.

a.2. Estimates for emission factors for the Amazonia biome

The carbon density per unit area was estimated using an allometric equation developed

by Higuchi *et al*., (1998) from the National Institute for Amazonia Research (INPA), to estimate the aboveground fresh mass[13] of trees from distinct forest types[14] in the Amazonia biome as well as data from the scientific literature, as necessary (refer to ***Box 4*** and ***section b.2***).

Box 4. Choice of the Allometric Equation to Estimate Aboveground Biomass

Four statistical models (linear, non-linear and two logarithmic) selected from thirty-four models in Santos (1996) were tested with data from 315 trees destructively sampled to estimate the aboveground fresh biomass of trees in areas near Manaus, Amazonas State, in the Amazonia biome (central Amazonia). This area is characterized by typical dense "terra firme" moist forest in plateaus dominated by yellow oxisols.

In addition to the weight of each tree, other measurements such as the diameter at breast height, the total height, the merchantable height, height and diameter of the canopy were also collected. The choice of the best statistical model was made on the basis of the largest coefficient of determination, smaller standard error of the estimate, and best distribution of residuals (Santos, 1996).

For any model, the difference between the observed and estimated biomass was consistently below 5%. In addition, the logarithm model using a single independent variable (diameter at breast height - DBH) produced results as consistent as and as precise as those with two variables (DBH and height) (Higuchi, 1998).

Silva (2007) also demonstrated that the total fresh weight (above and below-ground biomass) of primary forest can be estimated using simple entry (DBH) and double entry (DBH and height) models and stressed that the height added little to the accuracy of the estimate. The simple entry model presented percent coefficient of determination of 94% and standard error of 3.9%. For the double entry models, these values were 95% and 3.7%, respectively. It is recognized that the application of the allometric equation developed for a specific area of Amazonia may increase the uncertainties of the estimates when applied to other areas.

In this sense, the work by Nogueira *et al.* (2008) is relevant to be cited here. Nogueira *et al*. (2008) tested three allometric equations previously published and developed for dense forest in Central Amazonia (CA): Higuchi *et al*. (1998), Chambers *et al*. (2001) and Silva (2007). All three equations developed for CA tend to overestimate the biomass of the smaller trees in South Amazonia and underestimate the biomass of the larger trees. Despite this, the total biomass of the sampled trees estimated using the equations developed for CA was similar to those obtained in the field (-0,8%, -2,2% e 1,6% for the equations from Higuchi *et al*., 1998; Chambers *et al*., 2001 and Silva, 2007, respectively), due to the compensation of under and over-estimates for the small and larger trees. However, when the biomass per unit area is estimated using the equations developed for the CA, the estimates were 6.0% larger for the equations from Higuchi *et al*. (1998); 8.3% larger for Chambers *et al*. (2001); and 18.7% for Silva

[13] Hereinafter referred simply as aboveground fresh biomass.

[14] These forest types, or vegetation classes, totaled 22 and were derived from the Vegetation Map of Brazil (1:5,000,000), available at: ftp://ftp.ibge.gov.br/Cartas_e_Mapas/Mapas_Murais/, last accessed on May 5th, 2014.

(2007).

The input data for applying Higuchi *et al*. (1998) allometric equation have been collected during the RADAM (RADar in AMazonia) Project (later also referred to as RADAMBRASIL)[15]. RADAMBRASIL collected georeferenced data from 2,292 sample plots[16] in Amazonia (refer to ***Figure 15*** for the spatial distribution of the sample plots), including circumference at breast height (CBH) and height of all trees above 100 cm. More details regarding the allometric equation are presented in ***section b.2***.

The FREL proposed by Brazil in this submission uses the IPCC methodology as a basis for estimating changes in carbon stocks in forest land converted to other land-use categories as described in the GPG LULUCF (IPCC, 2003). For any land-use conversion occurring in a given year, GPG LULUCF considers both the carbon stocks in the biomass immediately before and immediately after the conversion.

Brazil assumes that the biomass immediately after the forest conversion is zero and does not consider any subsequent CO_2 removal after deforestation (immediately after the conversion or thereafter). This assumption is made since Brazil has a consistent, credible, accurate, transparent, and verifiable time-series for gross deforestation for the Legal Amazonia (and hence, for the Amazonia biome), but has limited information on subsequent land-use after deforestation and its dynamics.

The **emission factors** in this submission are defined as the carbon densities in living biomass (above and below-ground biomass) and litter, consistent with those adopted in the construction of both FREL A and FREL B (i.e., based on data from the II National GHG Inventory (refer to ***Table 8***, which provides estimates of CO_2 emissions from gross deforestation using data from the II and III National GHG Inventories).

Section a.2.1 presents a summary of the sequence of steps taken to construct FREL C.

a.2.1 The sequence of steps to construct FREL C

The basic data for estimating annual gross emissions from deforestation in the Amazonia biome derives from the analysis of remotely sensed data from sensors of adequate spatial resolution (mostly Landsat-5, of spatial resolution up to 30 meters). Images from the Landsat satellite acquired annually over the entire Amazonia biome (refer to ***Figure 6***), on dates as close as possible are selected, processed and visually interpreted to identify new deforestation polygons since the previous assessment (for details regarding the selection, processing and analysis phases, refer to ***Annex I***). This generates, for each

[15] The RADAMBRASIL project was conducted between 1970 and 1985 and covered the entire Brazilian territory (with special focus in Amazonia) using airborne radar sensors. The results from RADAMBRASIL Project include, among others, texts, thematic maps (geology, geomorphology, pedology, vegetation, potential land use, and assessment of natural renewable resources), which are still broadly used as a reference for the ecological zoning of the Brazilian Amazonia.

[16] Also referred in this submission as sample units, consisting of a varied number of trees.

image in the Amazonia biome a map with spatially explicit (georeferenced) deforestation polygons since the previous year.



Figure 6 - Landsat coverage of the Brazilian Legal Amazonia area. **Source:** PRODES, 2014.

The next step in the process of estimating emissions from deforestation in the Amazonia biome consists of overlaying this deforestation map with the "carbon map" that contains the carbon densities associated with distinct forest types in the Amazonia biome. Each deforestation polygon in a given image is associated with a RADAMBRASIL volume, a forest type and associated carbon density. Note that the same forest type may have a different carbon density depending on the RADAMBRASIL volume it falls in. This is due to variability in soil types, climatic conditions and flood regime for riparian vegetation in the Amazonia biome.

The carbon map used in this FREL C is the same as that used in the II National GHG Inventory to estimate the emissions from natural forest conversion to other land use categories (details of the carbon map are provided in ***Section b.2***) and used in the previous FRELs for the Amazon biome.

Figures 7 to ***10*** present the sequence followed to estimate the total emission from deforestation for any year in the period from 1996 to 2015, used in the construction of the FREL C.

Due to the fact the digital (georeferenced) information on the annual deforestation polygons only became annually available from 2001 onwards; that for the period 1998-2000 inclusive, only an aggregated digital map with the deforestation increments for years 1998, 1999 ad 2000 is available; and that no digital information is available individually for years 1996 and 1997, the steps and figures below seek to clarify how the estimate of the total CO_2 emission was generated for each year in the period 1996 to 2015.

In order to simplify the presentation, ***Steps 1*** to ***4*** assume that all the images used to identify the deforestation polygons were cloud free. Under this assumption, the ***adjusted***

deforestation increment is equal to the ***deforestation increment***, and both are equal to the sum of the areas of the deforestation polygons mapped. In the presence of cloud cover, then the deforested areas are calculated following the ***adjusted deforestation increment*** approach described in ***Box 3***.

Step 1: identification of the available maps with deforestation polygons, as follows: (i) map with the aggregated deforestation until 1997; aggregated deforestation polygons for 1998-2000; and individual maps with deforestation polygons for each year in the period 2001 to 2015 (inclusive) (refer to ***Figure 7***).



Figure 7 **- P**ictorial representation of ***Step 1.***

Step 2: integration of the map with the deforestation polygons (***Step 1***) with the carbon map in a Geographic Information System (GIS). For each year, a database containing each deforestation polygon and associated forest type (as well as RADAMBRASIL volume) is produced and is the basis for the estimation of the gross emissions from deforestation (in tonnes of carbon) that, multiplied by 44/12, provide the total emissions in tonnes of CO_2.

For the period 1998-2000, the total CO_2 emissions refer to those associated with the aggregated deforestation polygons for years 1998, 1999 and 2000 that, when divided by 3, provide the average annual CO_2 emission (refer to ***Figure 8***).



Figure 8 **- P**ictorial representation of ***Step 2.***

Step 3 indicates the estimated CO_2 emissions for each year from 1998 (inclusive) until 2015 (refer to ***Figure 9***); and ***Step 4*** indicates the CO_2 emissions for years 1996 and 1997 (refer to ***Figure 10***).



Figure 9 **- P**ictorial representation of ***Step 3.***



Figure 10 **- P**ictorial representation of ***Step 4.***

The next step is only applicable in case of the presence of cloud cover at year *t*.

Step 5: After the deforestation increment and associated emission have been estimated for year *t*, an analysis is made of the areas that were cloud covered in the previous year(s), for which information on deforestation is available at year *t*. The area of the observed deforestation polygons at year *t* that occur under the cloud covered area(s) at year *t*-1 is removed from the increment calculated for year *t* and evenly distributed (summed) to the increment calculated for year *t*-1 and year *t*.

As an example, suppose that the area of the deforestation polygons at year *t* that fall under a cloud-covered area at year *t*-1 is 100 km^2. For the calculation of the ***adjusted deforestation increment*** for years *t* and *t*-1, these 100 km^2 are subtracted from the increment calculated for year *t* and evenly distributed between years *t* and *t*-1 (i.e., 50 km^2 is added to the observed increment for year *t*-1, and 50 km^2 is added to the "reduced" increment for year *t*. In case the area observed at year *t* was cloud covered at years *t*-1 **and** *t*-2, then one third of the 100 km^2 is evenly distributed (summed) to the increment calculated for years *t*, *t*-1, and *t*-2. Hence, the deforestation increment at year *t* can be reduced due to the distribution of some area to previous years, but may also increase due to the distribution of areas at year *t*+1 over cloud covered areas at year *t*. The areas and associated emissions indicated in ***Table 3*** provide estimates of the areas presented as adjusted deforestation increment and their associated emissions.

a.2.2. Equations used in the construction of the FREL C

For each deforestation polygon *i*, the associated CO_2 emission is estimated as the product of its area and the associated carbon density in the living biomass[17] present in the forest

[17] Living biomass, here, means above and below-ground biomass, including palms and vines, and litter mass.

type affected by deforestation (refer to ***Equation 2***):

$$GE_{i,j} = A_{i,j} \times EF_j \times 44/12 \qquad \textbf{Equation 2}$$

where:

$GE_{i,j}$ = CO_2 emission associated with deforestation polygon *i* under forest type *j*; tCO_2

$A_{i,j}$ = area of deforestation polygon *i* under forest type *j*; ha

EF_j = carbon stock in the living biomass of forest type *j* in deforestation polygon *i* per unit area; tC ha^{-1}

44/12 is used to convert tonnes of carbon to tonnes of CO_2

For any year *t*, the total emission from gross deforestation, GE_t, is estimated using **Equation 3**:

$$GE_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{p} GE_{i,j} \qquad \textbf{Equation 3}$$

where:

GE_t = total emission from gross deforestation at year *t*; tCO_2

$GE_{i,j}$ = CO_2 emission associated with deforestation polygon *i* under forest type *j*; tCO_2

N = number of new deforestation polygons in year *t* (from year *t*-1 and *t*); adimensional

p = number of forest types, adimensional

For any period *P*, the mean annual emission from gross deforestation, MGE_p, is calculated as indicated in ***Equation 4***:

$$MGE_P = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} GE_t}{T} \qquad \textbf{Equation 4}$$

where:

MGE_p = mean annual emission from gross deforestation in period p; $tCO_2\ yr^{-1}$

GE_t = total emission from gross deforestation at year t; tCO_2

T = number of years in period p; adimensional.

a.2.3. Calculation of the FREL C

The FREL proposed by Brazil in this submission for results-based payments for emission reductions from deforestation in the period from 2016 to 2020 is the mean of the annual CO_2 emissions associated with the adjusted gross deforestation from 1996 to 2015 (refer to ***Figure 11*** and ***Table 3***).

As in the first submission (for FREL A and FREL B), Brazil's FREL C does not include assumptions on potential future changes to domestic policies.



Figure 11 - Pictorial representation of Brazil's FREL C (751,780,503.37 tCO_2).

Table 1 presents the ***increments of deforestation*** for each year of the period 1996-2015, considering the following: (A) ***adjusted increments of deforestation for years 1996-2010*** **without consideration of the information from years 2011-2015** (i.e., the same adjusted increments of deforestation used in the construction of both FREL A and FREL B), and ***increments of deforestation*** (not adjusted) for the period 2011-2015; (B) ***adjusted increments of deforestation*** for the period 1996-2015, using the information from the period 2011-2015 for all years; and (C) the difference between the increments. The grey lines in ***Table 1*** correspond to years for which data are only available in analogic format. For any year in the period from 1996 to 2015, gross CO_2 emissions from deforestation have been calculated following ***Steps 1-4*** in ***Figures 7 to 10***, and ***Step 5***.

Table 1 – *(A) Annual* adjusted deforestation increments for the period 1996-2010 (same as those used in

the construction of FREL A and FREL B, i.e., same as in the first FREL submission and annual unadjusted deforestation increments for years 2011 to 2015 (shaded in pink); (B) annual adjusted deforestation increments from 1996 to 2015, using data from 2011-2015[18]; (C) difference between the annual adjusted values in (B) and the values in (A) (in ha).

Year	(A) ANNUAL ADJUSTED[19] DEFORESTATION INCREMENT USING DATA FROM 1996-2010 (HA)	(B) ANNUAL DEFORESTATION INCREMENT ADJUSTED USING DATA FROM 2011-2015 (HA)	(C) DIFFERENCE
1996	1.874.013,00	1.874.013,33	0,33
1997	1.874.013,00	1.874.013,33	0,33
1998	1.874.013,00	1.874.013,33	0,33
1999	1.874.013,00	1.874.013,33	0,33
2000	1.874.013,00	1.874.013,62	0,62
2001	1.949.331,35	1.949.331,97	0,62
2002	2.466.603,88	2.466.605,01	1,12
2003	2.558.846,30	2.558.847,66	1,17
2004	2.479.429,81	2.479.431,66	1,85
2005	2.176.226,17	2.176.233,21	7,04
2006	1.033.634,15	1.033.687,21	53,06
2007	1.087.468,65	1.088.545,83	1.077,18
2008	1.233.037,68	1.237.179,07	4.141,39
2009	596.373,64	608.154,57	11.780,94
2010	583.147,53	610.642,15	27.494,62
2011	536.621,30	501.406,41	-35.214,89

[18] Note that some increments of deforestation in the period 1996-2010 could not be adjusted due to persistent cloud cover. Most of these areas could be seen in the images from 2011-2015 and hence, a total of 44,560.94 ha from deforested areas identified in the period 2011-2015 were distributed in the persistently cloud-covered areas from 1996-2010. This re-allocation of area represented only 0.17% of the total area deforested in the period 1996-2015. See http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub, directory "***Other relevant information and data***", ***WORKSHEET_FREL_C***", ***rows 4 to 18***, ***column C***, for the areas allocated to each year from 1996 to 2010 (sum = 44,560.94 ha), from deforested areas identified in the period 2011-2015 over previously cloud-covered areas; and ***rows 4 and 18, column D*** *(sum = 30,921,425.62)* for the emissions allocated to years 1996 – 2010 using data from 2011 -2015. (see also Table 2 and Table 3 in the file "***Simple_guide_file_WORKSHEET_FREL_C"***).

[19] The annual increments of deforestation (in ha) for years 2001 to 2015 (NOT ADJUSTED) are as follows : 1,800,242 ; 2,360,448 ; 2,781,345 ; 2,513,302 ; 2,184,556 ; 1,033,050 ; 1,088,709 ; 1,229,260 ; 596,260 ; 581,961 ; 536,621 ; 411,570 ; 508,451 ; 483,207; and 584,384, respectively

2012	411.569,64	425.499,51	13.929,86
2013	508.450,53	537.857,10	29.406,58
2014	483.206,86	490.851,45	7.644,59
2015	584.383,03	524.055,95	-60.327,08
TOTAL	28.058.395,53	28.058.395,53	
AVERAGE 1995-2015	**1,402,919.78**		

Table 2 provides the *annual adjusted* CO_2 *emissions from deforestation* for each year of the period 1996-2015, considering the following: **(A)** ***adjusted*** CO_2 ***emissions from deforestation*** *for years 1996-2010* without consideration of the data from years 2011-2015 (i.e., the same *adjusted* CO_2 *emissions from deforestation* used in the construction of both FREL A and FREL B), **and annual** CO_2 ***emissions from deforestation*** (not adjusted) for the period 2011-2015**; (B) annual *adjusted*** CO_2 ***emissions from deforestation*** for the period 1996-2015 for all years, using the information from the period 2011-2015**;** and (C) the difference between the CO_2 *emissions from deforestation* in columns (A) and (B). The grey lines in ***Table 2*** correspond to years for which data are only available in analogic format.

Table 2 - (A) Annual adjusted deforestation CO_2 emissions as for FREL A and FREL B, i.e., same as in the first FREL submission from 1996 to 2010; and unadjusted CO_2 emissions for years 2011-2015 (shaded in pink); (B) annual adjusted CO_2 emissions from 1996 to 2015, using data from 2011-2015; (C) difference between the adjusted values in (B) and the values in (A) (in t CO_2).

Year	(A) ANNUAL CO2 EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION (t CO_2)	(B) ANNUAL ADJUSTED CO2 EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION USING DATA FROM 2011-2015 (t CO_2)	(C) DIFFERENCE (t CO_2)
1996	979.523.413,88	979.523.618,48	204,60
1997	979.523.413,88	979.523.618,48	204,60
1998	979.523.413,88	979.523.618,48	204,60
1999	979.523.413,88	979.523.618,48	204,60
2000	979.523.413,88	979.523.849,37	435,49
2001	908.964.139,89	908.964.575,38	435,49
2002	1.334.457.456,93	1.334.458.298,72	841.79
2003	1.375.223.214,70	1.375.224.078,19	863,49
2004	1.380.140.945.68	1.380.142.199,34	1.253,66
2005	1.163.873.339,68	1.163.879.134,73	5.795.05
2006	576.097.126,38	576.136.731,11	39.604,72
2007	608.266.397,26	609.101.478,18	835.080,92
2008	666.005.315,39	669.215.058,08	3.209.742,68
2009	364.340.477,19	373.066.456,69	8.725.979,50
2010	344.406.512,43	362.507.086,87	18.100.574,44
2011	310.756.847,84	285.507.794,61	-25.249.053,23

2012	226.677.950,38	236.684.154,44	10.006.204,06
2013	282.107.628,10	301.847.850,91	19.740.222,81
2014	268.450.746,13	273.591.600,59	5.140.854,46
2015	328,224,900,10	287.665.246,39	-40.559.653,71
TOTAL	15.035.610.067,48	15.035.610.070,49	
AVERAGE 1995-2015	**751.780.503,37**	**751.780.503,37**	

Table 3 presents the data used in the construction of FREL C, reproduced from column B in ***Table 1*** and ***Table 2***.

Table 3 - Adjusted increments of deforestation (in ha) and corresponding adjusted CO_2 emissions (in t CO_2) for the period 1996-2015 used in the construction of FREL C (in t CO_2).

Year	(A) ANNUAL ADJUSTED INCREMENT FROM DEFORESTATION (HA)	(B) ANNUAL ADJUSTED CO2 EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION USING DATA FROM 2011-2015 (t CO_2)
1996	1.874.013,33	979.523.618,48
1997	1.874.013,33	979.523.618,48
1998	1.874.013,33	979.523.618,48
1999	1.874.013,33	979.523.618,48
2000	1.874.013,62	979.523.849,37
2001	1.949.331,97	908.964.575,38
2002	2.466.605,01	1.334.458.298,72
2003	2.558.847,66	1.375.224.078,19
2004	2.479.431,66	1.380.142.199,34
2005	2.176.233,21	1.163.879.134,73
2006	1.033.687,21	576.136.731,11
2007	1.088.545,83	609.101.478,18
2008	1.237.179,07	669.215.058,08
2009	608.154,57	373.066.456,69
2010	610.642,15	362.507.086,87
2011	501.406,41	285.507.794,61
2012	425.499,51	236.684.154,44
2013	537.857,10	301.847.850,91
2014	490.851,45	273.591.600,59
2015	524.055,95	287.665.246,39
TOTAL	28.058.395,53	15.035.610.070,49
AVERAGE 1996-2015	**1.402.919,78**	**751.780.503,37 (FREL C)**

The FREL C in this submission is equal to 751,780,503 t CO_2. See http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub, directory "***Other relevant information and data***", file "***WORKSHEET_FREL_C***", ***row 25***, ***column F,*** in Tab ***FINAL_TABLE_CLOUD_ADJUST.***

The REDD+ decisions under the UNFCCC value the continuous update and improvement of relevant data and information over time. Brazil values consistency and transparency of the data submitted as fundamental, and gives the highest priority to these. Nonetheless, it continues its efforts to continuously improve the accuracy of the estimates for all carbon pools included in the FREL. Brazil's data is presented in a transparent and verifiable manner, allowing the reconstruction of the FREL C.

b) Complete, transparent, consistent and accurate information used in the construction of the FREL

b.1. Complete Information

Complete information, for the purposes of REDD+, means the provision of information that allows for the reconstruction of the FREL.

The following information were used in the construction of the FREL and are available for download at ***http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub***:

(1) All the satellite images used to map the deforestation polygons in the Amazonia biome from 2001 to 2015.

(2) Accumulated deforestation polygons until 1997 (inclusive), presented in a map hereinafter referred to as the ***digital base map*** (see ***Annex I.1 (Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project – PRODES)*** for more details).

(3) Accumulated deforestation polygons for years 1998, 1999 and 2000 mapped on the ***digital base map.***

(4) Annual deforestation polygons for the period 2001-2015, inclusive (***annual maps of deforestation increments – see sample in Figure 12***).

Figure 12. Deforestation polygons in a subset of image 231/65, 31/08/2011.

IMPORTANT REMARK 1: All maps referred to in (2), (3) and (4) above are available in *shapefile* format ready to be imported into a Geographical Database for analysis. All satellite images referred to in (1) above are provided in full resolution in *geotiff* format. Any individual deforestation polygon can be verified against the corresponding satellite image.

IMPORTANT REMARK 2: The maps referred to in (2), (3) and (4) above are a **subset** of those produced by INPE for PRODES (for additional information see http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodes/index.php), since they refer only to the Amazonia biome, the biome of interest in this submission, and not to the Legal Amazonia region The information in (2) and (3) above is provided in a single file.

(5) The **deforestation polygons by forest type attributes and RADAMBRASIL volume**;

For each year in the period 2001-2015, the deforestation polygons are associated with the corresponding forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume.

It is worth noting that for all years since 2001, the stratification of the deforestation polygons by forest type attributes and RADAMBRASIL volume indicated that deforestation concentrates mostly in the so called "*Arc of Deforestation*" (a belt that crosses over RADAMBRASIL volumes 4, 5, 16, 20, 22 and 26 – refer to ***Figure 14***), and marginally affects forest types in RADAMBRASIL volumes associated with higher carbon densities.

(6) The **information that allows for the calculation of the adjusted deforestation increments for years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 at *data***" at http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub), directory "Other relevant information and data", file "***WORKSHEET_FREL_C***" and "***Simple guide_to_file_WORKSHEET_FREL_C***"). An example of the calculation of the adjusted increment of deforestation and associated CO_2 emissions is provided in ***Annex II.1 : Example of the calculation of adjusted deforestation increment and associated CO_2 emissions for the year 2003)*** (see file **"calculo_def_increment_emission_2003"** available in directory "***Other relevant information and data***" at http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub).

(7) A map with the carbon densities of different forest types in the Amazonia biome (**carbon map**), consistent with that used in the II National GHG Inventory and used in the construction of FREL A, FREL B and FREL C[20].

(8) Samples of the relevant[21] RADAMBRASIL data that have been used as input to the allometric equation by Higuchi *et al*. (1998). They are generated from the original RADAMBRASIL database, which is the basis for the construction of the carbon map. Consultation with the GTT REDD+ led to the understanding that there may be cases of apparent inconsistencies in carbon densities within a forest type due to specific circumstances of the sample unit. This is part of the natural heterogeneity of the biomass density distribution in tropical vegetation.

(9) Two excel files: (1) the first, ***VEG_RADAM_FINAL*** provides, for each RADAMBRASIL volume the area occupied by the vegetation types in the Vegetation Map from IBGE and the average carbon stock per volume; and (2) and the second, ***VEG_RADAM_FINAL1*** that provides, for each RADAMBRASIL volume the area occupied by the forest types in the Vegetation Map from IBGE and the average carbon stock per volume. The word file ***UNDERSTANDING FILE VEG*** provides guidance for the understanding of the data presented in both files.

b.2. Transparent Information

This section provides more detailed information regarding the items indicated in ***section b.1***. All the data and information used in the construction of the FREL are available for download at ***http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub***:

[20] A new carbon map was generated for the III National Inventory, that includes the living biomass and dead organic matter pools (including dead wood), following suggested improvements in the technical assessment report of the first FREL for Amazonia biome. Refer to ***Table 8*** for the differences in emissions from deforestation using the carbon map from the II and III National Inventories, maintaining the same pools and with the inclusion of the dead wood pool.

[21] The original RADAMBRASIL data for the volumes where deforestation occurs most frequently (CBH, forest type, RADAMBRASIL volume) can be made available upon specific request via email to reddbrasil@mma.gov.br.

Regarding (1): Satellite Imagery

As previously indicated (***section a***), remotely sensed data is the major source of information used to map deforestation polygons every year. The availability of all satellite images used since 1988 allows for the verification and reproducibility of annual deforestation polygons over natural forests in the Amazonia biome as well as the cloud-covered areas.

Given the large volume of data (approximately 200 Landsat images/year), the *info hub* provides a list with the dates of the Landsat images used to map the deforestation polygons (in the directory "***Deforestation polygons***", file "***Satellite dates***"). The actual images can be accessed at www.earthexplorer.usgs.gov.

Note that since the beginning of year 2003, INPE adopted an innovative policy to make satellite data publicly available online. The first step in this regard was to make available all the satellite images from the China-Brazil Earth Resources Satellite (CBERS 2 and CBERS 2B) through INPE's website (http://www.dgi.inpe.br/CDSR/). Subsequently, data from the North American Landsat satellite and the Indian satellite Resourcesat 1 were also made available. With this policy INPE became the major distributor of remotely sensed data in the world.

Regarding (2), (3) and (4): Deforestation polygons

All deforestation polygons[22] mapped for the Amazonia biome (i.e., aggregated until 1997 ***(***Map in the directory "*Deforestation polygons*", *shapefile* "*Digital base map_1997)*; aggregated for years 1998, 1999 and 2000 from the aggregated 1997 map ***(***Accumulated deforestation map in the directory "*Deforestation polygons*", *shapefile* "*Deforestation_1998-2000)*; and annual increments of deforestation from 2001 until 2015 (Deforestation increments maps in the directory "*Deforestation polygons*", individual *shapefiles* "*Deforestation Increments*)" for each year of the period.

In 2017, in order to provide information in a user-friendly manner, INPE launched the Terra Brasilis platform (http://terrabrasilis.info/composer/PRODES) (refer to ***Figure 13***). The platform allows to either download the data or to explore them online. Also, it is possible to visualize graphs with the deforestation rates and deforestation increments for each state of the Legal Amazonia and the entire Legal Amazonia area.

[22] The information for PRODES is also available for the Legal Amazonia are publicly available since 2003 at INPE´s website (www.obt.inpe.br/prodes).



Figure 13 - Terra Brasilis platform. ***Source:*** **http://terrabrasilis.info/composer/PRODES.**

Regarding (5): Deforestation polygons by forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume

In order to ensure transparency in the calculation of the annual adjusted deforestation increment and associated CO_2 emission provided in ***Table 3***, respectively, a file that associates each deforestation polygon with its forest type and corresponding RADAMBRASIL volume has been generated for each year since 2001, inclusive. The excel files are provided in the directory "*Deforestation polygons*", under files "*Deforestation_increments.xls)*, one for each year of the period. As one example, 402,175 deforestation polygons have been identified in year 2003[23], the year that has been used to exemplify the calculation of the adjusted deforestation increment (refer to ***Box 3*** and ***Annex II.1***).

The files for the aggregated deforestation 1997-2000 are extremely large and exceed the excel lines limit. They can be made available upon specific request via email to reddbrasil@mma.gov.br.

Regarding (6): Information for the calculation of the adjusted deforestation increment for years 2011 - 2015

The information to calculate the annual adjusted deforestation increment for the period 2011 – 2015 are available in the file ***WORKSHEET_FREL_C*** and ***Simple guide_to_file_WORKSHEET_FREL_C***.

It is important to note that the availability of data from similar spatial resolution sensors to Landsat is reducing the need for adjustments, as deforestation under cloud-covered areas is assessed using other available and compatible satellite data.

[23] For year 2003, a total of 402,175 deforestation polygons has been identified (see file ***calculo_def_increment_emission_2003***). For each deforestation polygon in the file, the following information is provided: the State of the Federation it belongs to (uf); the RADAMBRASIL volume (volradam); the associated forest type (c_pret) and the associated area (area_ha).

Regarding (7): Carbon map

The map with the biomass density of living biomass (including palms, vines and small trees) and litter mass used to estimate the CO_2 emissions from deforestation in ***Table 2*** is the same as that used in the II National GHG Inventory to estimate CO_2 emissions from conversion of forest land to other land-use categories. The map is available under directory "*Other relevant information and data*", file "*Mapa_Carbono_Amazonia.rar"*.

As already mentioned, the carbon map was constructed using an allometric equation by Higuchi *et al*. (1998) and data (diameter at breast height derived from the circumference at breast height) collected by RADAMBRASIL on trees in the sampled plots, as well as data from the literature, as necessary. The data collected by RADAMBRASIL were documented in 38 volumes distributed as shown in ***Figure 14*** over the RADAMBRASIL vegetation map (refer to ***footnote 14***). RADAMBRASIL data is provided for the relevant volumes at: http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub.



Figure 14 - RADAMBRASIL Vegetation map of the Amazonia biome with the distribution of its 38 volumes. ***Source:*** BRASIL, 2010.

Regarding (8): RADAMBRASIL data

RADAMBRASIL collected a significant amount of data for each one of the 2,292 sample units. ***Annex II.2 (Example of the calculation of the carbon density associated with a forest type***) provides one example of a carbon density reproduced from the RADAMBRASIL data (phytophisiognomy Ab in Volume 18). The original RADAMBRASIL data for this example is available in directory "*Other relevant information and data*", file "*equation_569_vol18_Ab.xlsx*".

The original RADAMBRASIL data for the volumes where deforestation occurs most

frequently (CBH, forest type, RADAMBRASIL volume) can be made available upon specific request via email to reddbrasil@mma.gov.br.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON RADAMBRASIL DATA AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE CARBON MAP

All the RADAMBRASIL sample plots with relevant data for this submission consisted of transects of 20 meters by 500 meters (hence, 1 hectare). ***Figure 15*** presents the distribution of the RADAMBRASIL sample plots in the biome Amazonia.

RADAMBRASIL collected data on trees with circumference at breast height above 100 cm in 2,292 sample plots. For the II National GHG Inventory, some of these sample plots were eliminated if:

- after the lognormal fit, the number of trees per sample unit contained less than 15 or more than 210 trees (less than 1% of the samples);
- the forests physiognomies were not found in the IBGE (Brazilian Institute for Geography and Statistics) charts;
- no geographical information regarding the location of the sample unit was available;
- no trees existed in the sample;
- duplicated data entry was identified;
- outlier values were identified; and
- sample fell over non-forested area.

The application of this set of rules led to the elimination of 582 sample plots from analysis (BRASIL, 2010)[24].

[24] Out of the 582 RADAMBRASIL samples excluded, 225 were duplicated data; 192 had no data; 59 had no biomass data; 35 with no trees in the sample; 30 without geographical coordinates; 26 were identified as outliers; 10 samples fell over non-forest area; and 5 were invalid data entry.



Figure 15 **-** Distribution of the RADAMBRASIL sample plots. ***Source:*** BRASIL, 2010.

The steps below are meant to facilitate the understanding regarding the construction of the carbon map:

1. Reclassification of the forest types defined for the Amazonia biome, consistent with those contained in the II National GHG Inventory.
2. Identification of RADAMBRASIL sample units in the RADAMBRASIL vegetation map.
3. Application of the allometric equation (Higuchi *et al*., 1998) to the data collected in the sample units for the specific forest type, to estimate the aboveground fresh mass from DBH (***Equation 5***).
4. Conversion of aboveground fresh mass to dry mass and then to carbon in dry mass (***Equation 6***).
    a) Inclusion of the carbon density of trees with CBH less than 100 cm (considering that RADAMBRASIL collected data only on trees with CBH larger than 100 cm) (***Equation 7***).
    b) Inclusion of carbon of palms and vines (***Equation 8***).
    c) Inclusion of carbon of belowground biomass and litter (***Equation 9***).
5. Application of extrapolation rules to estimate the carbon density associated with the forest types in each RADAMBRASIL volume, noting that the same forest type in different volumes may have different values.
6. Literature review to estimate the carbon density in forest types not sampled by RADAMBRASIL.

Each of the above steps is now detailed.

Step 1: Reclassification of the forest types defined for the Amazonia biome, consistent with those of the II National GHG Inventory.

The forest types in the Amazonia biome have been defined taking into account the availability of reliable data, either from RADAMBRASIL or from the literature to estimate their associated carbon densities. As such, twenty-two forest types[25] were considered, consistent with the forest types in the II National GHG Inventory (as well as in the III National GHG Inventory) submitted by Brazil to the UNFCCC. ***Table 4*** provides the list of forest types considered.

Table 4 - Forest types[26] considered in the Amazonia biome (see ***Table 7*** in section C).

Description (IBGE Vegetation Typologies)	
Aa	Alluvial Open Humid Forest
Ab	Lowland Open Humid Forest
As	Sub-montane Open Humid Forest
Cb	Lowland Deciduous Seasonal Forest
Cs	Sub-montane Deciduous Seasonal Forest
Da	Alluvial Dense Humid Forest
Db	Lowland Dense Humid Forest
Dm	Montane Dense Humid Forest
Ds	Sub-montane Dense Humid Forest
Fa	Alluvial Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest
Fb	Lowland Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest
Fm	Montane Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest
Fs	Sub-montane Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest
La	Wooded Campinarana
Ld	Forested Campinarana
Pa	Vegetation with Fluvial or Lacustrine influence
Pf	Forest Vegetation with Fluviomarine influenced
Pm	Forest Vegetarion Marine influenced
Sa	Wooded Savannah
Sd	Forested Savannah
Ta	Wooded Steppe Savannah
Td	Forested Steppe Savannah

[25] Also referred to in this document as forest types or forest physiognomies.

[26] PRODES forest mask includes some non-forest facies as forest, since they correspond to small patches within large extents of natural forests. These include Lb (Shrubby Campinarana); Lg (Woody Grass Campinarana); Rm (Montane Vegetacional Refuge); Sg (Woody Grass Savannah); Sp (Park Savannah), Tg (Woody Grass Steppe Savannah) and Tp (Park Steppe Savannah) normally classified as "Other Wooded Land" or "Other Land" in Brazil's report to FAO (2014). However, the extent of these non-forest facies included in the PRODES mask are extremely small and deforestation falling on any of these is insignificant. In 2003, for exemple, deforestation falling in these facies corresponded to 0.43 per cent of the total area deforested (see Annex II Part 1 of the FREL A/FREL B submission (2014)), whereas in 2005, it corresponded to 0.30 per cent (see file Ano2005_fisionomia_volume_2019).

Step 2: Identification of RADAMBRASIL samples units in the RADAMBRASIL vegetation map.

The information collected by RADAMBRASIL on the sample units (refer to ***Figure 15***) did not include the associated forest types. It did, however, include the coordinates of the sampled trees which, when plotted against the RADAMBRASIL vegetation map, led to the identification of the corresponding forest type (refer to ***Figure 14***). Data from RADAMBRASIL sample plots were not available for all 22 forest types, as indicated in ***Table 5***.

Table 5 - Identification of the forest types sampled by RADAMBRASIL.

Description (IBGE Vegetation Typologies)		**Source**
Aa	Aluvial Open Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
Ab	Lowland Open Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
As	Submontane Open Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
Cb	Lowland Deciduos Seasonal Forest	
Cs	Submontane Deciduous Seasonal Forest	
Da	Alluvial Dense Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
Db	Lowland Dense Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
Dm	Montane Dense Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
Ds	Submontane Dense Humid Forest	RADAMBRASIL
Fa	Alluvial Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest	
Fb	Lowland Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest	
Fm	Montane Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest	
Fs	Submontane Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest	
La	Wooded Campinarana	RADAMBRASIL
Ld	Forested Campinarana	RADAMBRASIL
Pa	Vegetation with Fluvial or Lacustrine influence	
Pf	Forest Vegetation with Fluviomarine influenced	
Pm	Forest Vegetarion Marine influenced	
Sa	Wooded Savannah	
Sd	Forested Savannah	
Ta	Wooded Steppe Savannah	
Td	Forested Steppe Savannah	

Step 3: Application of the allometric equation (Higuchi *et al*.,1998), to the data collected in the sample units for the specific forest type, to estimate the aboveground fresh mass from DBH.

The allometric equation used in the construction of the carbon map (Higuchi *et al*., 1998)[27] is applied according with the diameter at breast height (DBH)[28] of the sampled trees, as indicated in ***Equation 5***[29] below:

For DBH ≥ 20 cm

$$\ln P = -0.151 + 2.170 \times \ln DBH \qquad \textbf{\textit{Equation 5}}$$

where:

P = aboveground fresh biomass of a sampled tree; kg

DBH = diameter at breast height of the sampled tree; cm

Step 4: Conversion of aboveground fresh mass to dry mass and then to carbon in dry mass

For each sampled tree, the associated carbon density in the aboveground dry biomass was calculated from the aboveground fresh biomass of the tree from ***Step 3***, applying **Equation 6**:

$$C_{(CBH > 100\ cm)} = 0.2859 \times P \qquad \textbf{\textit{Equation 6}}$$

where*:*

P = aboveground fresh biomass of a sampled tree; kg

$C_{(CBH > 100\ cm)}$ = carbon in the aboveground dry biomass of a tree with CBH>100cm; kg

Important remark: the value 0.2859 is applied to convert the aboveground fresh biomass to aboveground dry biomass; and from aboveground dry biomass to carbon. Silva (2007) also derived values for the average water content in aboveground fresh biomass (0.416 ± 2.8%) and the average carbon fraction of dry matter (0.485±0.9%) which are very similar to those used by Higuchi *et al.* (1994) after Lima *et al*. (2007), equal to 0.40 for the average water content in aboveground fresh biomass and 0.47 for the average carbon fraction of dry matter. The IPCC default values are 0.5 tonne dry matter/tonne fresh biomass (IPCC 2003); and 0.47 tonne carbon/tonne dry matter (IPCC 2006, Table 4.3), respectively.

[27] Higuchi, N.; dos Santos, J.; Ribeiro, R.J.; Minette, L.; Biot, Y. (1998) Biomassa da Parte Aérea da Vegetação da Floresta Tropical Úmida de Terra-Firme da Amazônia Brasileira. Acta Amazonica 28(2):153-166.

[28] For the conversion of CBH to DBH, the CBH was divided by 3.1416.

[29] Higuchi (1998) provided two allometric equations: one for trees with DBH between 5cm and 20 cm; and another for trees with DBH larger than 20 cm. Since RADAMBRASIL only collected data on trees with DBH above 20 cm, only one of the equations is provided here (as ***Equation 5***).

The carbon densities of all trees in a sample unit (1 hectare) were summed up to provide an estimate of the total carbon stock in aboveground biomass for that sample, $AC_{(CBH>100cm)}$.

Step 4a: Inclusion of the carbon density of trees with CBH less than 100 cm (considering that RADAMBRASIL collected data only on trees with CBH larger than 100 cm).

Due to the fact that the RADAMBRASIL only sampled trees with circumference at breast height (CBH) above 100 cm (corresponding to diameter at breast height of 31.83 cm), an extrapolation factor was applied to the average carbon stock of each sampled unit to include the carbon density of trees with CBH smaller than 100 cm. This was based on the extrapolation of the histogram containing the range of CBH values observed in all sample units and the associated total number of trees (in intervals of 10 cm).

Figure 16 show the histograms used and the observed data (CBH and associated total number of trees), as well as the curves that best fit the observed data (shown in green). The extrapolation factor was applied to the total carbon stock in each sample unit, $AC_{(CBH > 100 cm)}$, as indicated in **Equation 7**.

$$C_{(total)} = 1.315698 \times AC_{(CBH > 100 cm)} \qquad \textit{Equation 7}$$

where*:*

$C_{(total)}$ = total carbon stock of all trees in a sample unit; tC ha^{-1}

$AC_{(CBH > 100 cm)}$ = total carbon stock in a sample unit from trees with CBH > 100 cm; tC ha^{-1}

Important remark: the adequacy of this extrapolation was verified comparing data (biomass of trees in experimental areas in Amazonia) in a study by Higuchi (2004). In this study, the relationship between the aboveground biomass of all trees with DBH < 20 cm and those with DBH > 20 cm varied between 3 and 23%, depending on the area. The average value was 10.1%. On the other hand, applying the methodology presented here (developed by Meira Filho (2001), available in BRASIL, 2010) for DBH=20 cm (instead of CBH equals to 100 cm), the value 9.4% is obtained, consistent with the value found by Higuchi (2004).



Figure 16 - Histogram and observed data (A) and histogram with carbon values in the aboveground biomass (B) per CBH in Amazonia biome. ***Source:*** BRASIL, 2010, from BRASIL 2004 (developed by Meira Filho and Higuchi) **Note:** The red line represents observed data and the green line represents the best fit curve.

Step 4b. Inclusion of carbon of palms and vines.

In addition to the biomass from trees in the sampled units (regardless of their DBH value), the biomass from palms and vines, normally found in the Amazonia biome, have also been included. This inclusion was a response to the public consultation conducted for the First National GHG Inventory, part of the Initial National Communication of Brazil to the UNFCCC.

Silva (2007) has estimated that the biomass of palms and vines represent 2.31 and 1.77% of the total aboveground biomass.

Hence, these values have been applied to $C_{(total)}$ in **Equation 7** to obtain the total aboveground carbon in the sample as shown in **Equation 8**:

$$C_{aboveground} = 1.3717 \times AC_{(CBH > 100\ cm)} \qquad \textit{Equation 8}$$

where:

$C_{aboveground}$ = the carbon stock in aboveground biomass in a sample unit (including carbon in all trees, palms and vines), tC ha^{-1}

$AC_{(CBH > 100\ cm)}$ = total carbon stock in a sample unit from trees with CBH > 100 cm; tC ha^{-1}

Step 4c: Inclusion of carbon in belowground biomass and litter.

Silva (2007) estimated that the contribution of thick roots and litter to the fresh weight of living vegetation was 27.1% (or 37.2 of the aboveground weight) and 3.0%, respectively.

The inclusion of carbon from these pools as indicated in **Equation 9** provides an estimate of the total carbon stock in the sample unit:

$$C_{total,\ SU} = 1.9384 \times AC_{(CBH > 100\ cm)} \qquad \textit{Equation 9}$$

where*:*

$C_{total,\ SU}$ = total carbon stock in living biomass (above and below-ground) for all trees, palms and vines in the sample unit; tC ha^{-1};

$AC_{(CBH > 100\ cm)}$ = total carbon stock in a sample unit from trees with CBH > 100 cm; tC ha^{-1}.

IMPORTANT REMARK: Equation 9 already includes ***step 4a*** and ***step 4b***. Hence, to generate the total carbon stock in living biomass and litter it is only necessary to apply Equations 5, 6 and 9. ***Annex II.2*** presents an example of the application of these equations to derive the carbon stock for one specific volume of RADAMBRASIL (volume 13) and a specific forest type (DS).

Step 5: Application of extrapolation rules to estimate the carbon density associated with the forest types in each RADAMBRASIL volume, noting that the same forest type in different volumes may have different values.

The application of ***Steps 3*** and ***4*** (or equivalently, the application of Equations 5, 6 and 9 which integrates Equations 7 and 8) produces estimates of carbon density in living biomass (including trees with CBH < 100cm, palms and vines) and litter mass for the data collected by RADAMBRASIL. These sample estimates, gathered from different forest types in different locations, did not necessarily cover every vegetation type in each RADAMBRASIL volume (see ***Figure 14***).

Hence, a set of rules was created to allow for the estimation of carbon densities for each vegetation type considered, as described below.

- **Rule 1.** For a given forest type in a specific RADAMBRASIL volume, if there were corresponding sample plots (where Steps 3, 4 and 7 are applied to each tree to estimate the associated carbon density), the carbon density for that forest type was calculated as the sum of the carbon density associated with each tree in the sample plot. For instance, suppose that volume v has 2 sample plots (sample plot 1, with 60 trees, and sample plot 2, with 100 trees) associated with forest type Aa. For sample plot 1, the sum of the carbon stock associated with each one of the 60 trees is calculated, say ASP1; for sample plot 2, the corresponding sum for the 100 trees was also calculated, say ASP2. The carbon density for forest type Aa in volume 1 was calculated as (ASP1+ ASP2)/2 (highlighted in green in ***Table 6***).
- **Rule 2.** For a given forest type in a specific RADAMBRASIL volume, if there

were no corresponding sample plots in that volume, then the carbon density for that forest type, for that volume, was calculated as the weighted average (by number of samples per sample plot) of the total carbon stock in each sample plot in the neighboring volume(s) (using a minimum of one and maximum of eight volumes).For instance, suppose that volume v has neighboring volumes v1, v2 and v3 with 2, 5 and 3 sample plots associated with forest type Aa. For each sample plot, the total carbon stock, say ASP1, ASP2 and ASP3, was calculated as in Rule 1 above. The carbon stock for forest type Aa in volume v, was then calculated as follows: (2* ASP1 + 5*ASP2 + 3* ASP3)/10 (highlighted in blue in ***Table 6***).

- **Rule 3.** For a given forest type in a specific RADAMBRASIL volume, if there were no corresponding sample plots in that volume nor in the neighboring volumes, but there are samples plots in the neighbors to the neighboring volumes (second order neighbors), then the total carbon stock for that forest type in the specific volume is the average of the total carbon stock calculated from the second order neighbors. For instance, assume that there are no sample plots associated with forest type Aa in volume v and its neighboring volumes v1, v2 and v3, and that volumes v4, v5, v6 , v7 and v8 (second order neighbors) have 2, 4, 6, 3 and 5 sample plots associated with forest type Aa. Then, the carbon stock for forest type Aa in volume v was calculated applying Rule 2 to the second order neighbors (highlighted in pink in ***Table 6***).

The example provided in ***Annex II.2*** (***Example of the calculation of the carbon density associated with a forest type***) applies rule 1 as described above.

Table 6 **-** Carbon densities (tC ha^{-1}) in living biomass (aboveground and belowground, including palms and vines; and litter mass) for the Amazonia biome, by forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume, following the set of rules in ***Step 5***. ***Note:*** Rule one: green, Rule 2: blue, Rule 3: pink. ***Source:*** BRASIL, 2010

RADAMBRASIL	Forest Fisionomy (tC/ ha)								
Volume	Aa	Ab	As	Da	Db	Dm	Ds	La	Ld
2	98.24	154.55	110.06	182.98	176.10	139.03	169.35	183.00	
3	98.24	154.55	129.28	137.85	161.01	139.03	275.37	183.00	
4	94.88	154.55	129.28	119.67	154.59	139.03	148.30	183.00	
5	108.33	154.55	146.82	213.85	185.15	109.69	230.13	183.00	
6	123.75	154.55	133.99	131.82	222.39	109.69	213.55	183.00	
7	159.51	160.29	180.66	142.58	153.42	139.03	175.71	262.99	
8	146.97	197.91	73.64	270.89	163.92	149.50	138.56	183.00	183.00
9	127.61	213.37	112.13	262.68	157.38	109.69	184.64	262.99	
10	141.81	169.49	146.45	174.03	149.54	147.77	171.21	262.99	262.99
11	154.71	197.91	158.20	166.72	168.13	83.74	144.81	114.31	114.31
12	144.32	150.69	116.14	164.35	157.42	139.03	161.84	183.00	
13	144.76	144.62	139.24	168.64	153.25	104.05	121.02	160.43	160.43
14	154.71	177.28	173.89	157.86	174.17	104.05	142.46	160.43	160.43
15	172.81	164.36	156.03	171.77	154.38	104.05	155.40	228.80	
16	165.70	136.14	156.76	175.73	188.14	139.03	175.02	183.00	
17	136.09	159.17	157.15	175.64	165.53	104.05	159.63	228.80	
18	162.92	213.37	150.61	174.79	158.01	139.03	140.48	262.99	262.99
19	150.22	147.92	135.72	170.56	159.40	139.03	154.78	183.00	
20	150.61	151.80	117.97	169.39	163.05	139.03	123.29	183.00	183.00
22	148.74	154.55	97.40	137.67	153.42	139.03	145.55	183.00	
25	155.84	154.55	113.12	172.77	162.51	139.03	127.87	183.00	
26	165.70	136.14	130.49	175.73	188.14	139.03	153.93	183.00	

Step 6: Literature review to estimate the carbon density in forest types not sampled by RADAMBRASIL

A literature review was conducted to fill in the gaps for which RADAMBRASIL had not estimated the associated carbon density. ***Table 7*** presents the carbon density estimated from the literature and makes reference to the literature used.

The weighted average carbon density for the Amazonia biome is 151.6 tC ha^{-1}. Eighty-four per cent of the carbon densities of the forest types defined for the Amazonia biome were estimated using sample data from RADAMBRASIL. The remaining 16% were derived from literature review.

Table 7 - Carbon density[30] for the vegetation typologies in the Amazonia biome estimated from the literature and references consulted[31]

Description (IBGE Vegetation Typologies)		**tC ha^{-1}**	**Reference***
Cb	Lowland Deciduos Seasonal Forest	116.27	1
Cs	Submontane Deciduous Seasonal Forest	116.27	1
Fa	Alluvial Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest	140.09	2
Fb	Lowland Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest	140.09	2
Fm	Montane Semi-deciduous Seasonal Forest	140.09	2
Fs	Submontane Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest	140.09	2
Pa	Vegetation with Fluvial or Lacustrine influence	105,64	2
Pf	Forest Vegetation with Fluviomarine influenced	98,16	2
Pm	Forest Vegetarion Marine influenced	94,48	2
Sa	Wooded Savannah	47,1	3
Sd	Forested Savannah	77,8	3
Ta	Wooded Steppe Savannah	14,41	4
Td	Forested Steppe Savannah	30,1	4

***Note*:**

1 Britez, R.M. *et al*., 2006

2 Barbosa, R.I. and Ferreira, C.A.C., 2004
Barbosa, R.I. and Fearnside, P.M., 1999

3 Abdala, G. C. *et al*., 1998
Andrade, L. A.; Felfili, J. M.; Violati, L., 2002
Araújo. L. S., 2010
Araújo, L. S. *et al*., 2001
Barbosa, R. I. & Fearnside, P. M., 2005
Batalha, M.A., Mantovani, W & Mesquita Junior, 2001
Bustamante, M. M. da C. & Oliveira, E. L. de, 2008
Castro, E. A., 1996
Castro, E. A., & Kauffman, J. B., 1998
Costa, A. A. & Araújo, G. M., 2001

[30] The vegetation types in ***Table 7*** represent only 16% of the total vegetation types for which thee were no RADAMBRASIL samples. The phytophysiognomies occur mainly in volumes 19,20,22, 25, 27 and 27, as can be observed in columns K and L, lines 3 to 25 of the file ***VEG_RADAM_FINAL1*** available at http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub (see also the file ***Understanding file VEG,*** available at http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub. The values include above and below-ground biomass but not litter. Hence, when used, they provide conservative estimates of emissions from deforestation.

[31] There was no single rule applied to estimate the carbon densities presented in ***Table 7*** (e.g., simple average of values in the literature). Some of these values refer to literature for the Cerrado biome but were deemed appropriate for the forest type considered.

Delitti, W. B. C. & MEGURO, M., 2001
Delitti, W. B. C.. Pausas, J. & Burger, D. M. 2001
Delitti, W. B. C., Meguro, M. & Pausas, J. G., 2006
Durigan, G., 2004
Fearnside, P. M. *et al*., 2009
Fernandes, A. H. B. M., 2008
Gomes, B. Z., Martines, F. R. & Tamashiro, J. Y., 2004
Grace, J. *et al*., 2006
Kauffman, J. B., Cummings & D. L. & Whard, D. E., 1994
Kunstchik, G., 2004
Meira Neto, J. A. A. & Saporeti-Junior, A. W., 2002
Martins, O. S., 2005
Ottmar, R. D. *et al.*, 2001
Paiva, A. O. & Faria, G. E., 2007
Pinheiro, E. da S., Durigan, G. & Adami, M., 2009
Resende, D., Merlin, S. & Santos, M. T., 2001
Ronquim, C. C., 2007
Salis, S. M., 2004
Santos, J. R., 1988
Santos, J. R. et al., 2002
Schaefer, C. E. G. *et al*., 2008
Silva, F. C., 1990
Silva, R. P., 2007
Vale, A. T. do & Felfili, J. M., 2005
Valeriano, D. M. & Biterncourt-Pereira, M. D., 1988
Fearnside, P.M. *et al*., 2009
Barbosa, R.I. and Fearnside, P.M., 2005
Graça, P.M.L.A., 1997 apud Fearnside, 2009

The information provided in this submission allows for the reconstruction of Brazil´s FREL. One should bear in mind that the exact value may not be necessarily reproduced due to rounding errors and the impressive amount of data being dealt with[32]. ***Annex II.1 (Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project – PRODES)*** presents the example of the independent reconstruction for year 2003. With this explanation, Brazil considers the submission to be complete and transparent.

b.3. Consistent Information

Paragraph 8 in Decision 12/CP.17 requires that FRELs shall be established maintaining consistency with anthropogenic forest related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks as contained in the country's National GHG Inventory. Moreover, paragraph 12 in the same decision agrees that a Party should update a FREL, **as appropriate.**

Brazil applied the IPCC definition of consistency (IPCC, 2006)[33]. Hence, the same

[32] An independent reconstruction of the data in ***Tables 1 and 2*** for years 2003, 2004 and 2005 led to the following results: for year 2003: difference in area (0.168%) and in CO_2 emission (2.52%); for year 2004: difference in area (0.93%) and in CO_2 emission (3.67%); and for year 2005, difference in area (0.00%) and in CO_2 emission (2.42%). The independent reproduction applied the values in ***Tables 6*** and ***7*** as they are presented, while the original data was generated with more decimal places.

[33] Consistency means that an inventory should be internally consistent in all its elements over a period of years. An inventory is consistent if the same methodologies are used for the base year and all subsequent years and if consistent data sets are used to estimate emissions or removals from sources or sinks. An

methodologies and consistent data sets as those used in the construction of the previous FREL for the Amazonia biome, are applied here to construct FREL C. These methodologies and data sets are also consistent with the II National GHG Inventory. Brazil recognizes that III National GHG Inventory has been submitted to the UNFCCC and provides an assessment of the effect of the use of data in that Inventory relative to the data of II National GHG Inventory (refer to ***Table 8***).

At the onset, Brazil clarifies that the estimation of emissions by sources and removals by sinks in the II National GHG Inventory followed the methodological guidance contained in the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry (IPCC, 2003).

Moreover, Brazil adopted approach 3 for land representation, meaning that all the land conversions and lands remaining in a same land-use category between inventories are spatially explicit. The basis for all activity data in the II National GHG Inventory as well as the assessment of deforestation for the purposes of this submission rely on the use of remotely sensed data of same spatial resolution (Landsat-class, up to 30 meters).

Also, the same national institutions and team engaged in the development of the LULUCF estimates for the II National GHG Inventory has been in charge of the annual estimation of the rate of gross deforestation for PRODES, ensuring an even greater consistency between the estimates for the II National GHG Inventory and those used for the generation of PRODES data, which are the ***basis*** for estimating the gross CO_2 emissions from deforestation for the Amazonia biome reported here. Furthermore, the experts from the institutions responsible for the development of the National GHG Inventory and the PRODES data are also part of the Working Group of Technical Experts on REDD+ that supported the development of this FREL submission and its quality control.

It is to be noted that the reporting of LULUCF under Brazil's II National GHG Inventory covered the period 1994 to 2002 and includes land-use transition areas and net CO_2 emissions for each individual biome for this. Hence, the figures provided in the II National GHG Inventory[34] for the area deforested in both managed and unmanaged forest land represent the area converted or maintained in the same land-use category for the 8-years interval between years 1994 and 2002.

In addition, the figures provided in the II National GHG Inventory took into account both the emissions from the conversion to a new land-use category as well as removals from this new category. The Amazonia biome data presented in this submission refers only to gross emissions. The emissions associated with forest land converted to other land-use categories in the II National GHG Inventory and those estimated for gross deforestation in this submission are based on the same carbon map introduced in ***section b.2*** (***Steps 1 to 6***).

inventory using different methodologies for different years can be considered to be consistent if it has been estimated in a transparent manner taking into account the guidance in Volume 1 on good practice in time series consistency (IPCC Glossary, 2006).

[34] ***Table 3.97*** (Land-use transition areas identified in the Amazon biome from 1994 to 2002); and ***Table 3.98*** (Net CO_2 emissions in the Amazon biome from 1994 to 2002).

Box 5. Emissions from gross deforestation as presented in the II National GHG Inventory and in the FREL C

Table 3.97 from the II National GHG Inventory provides the following information for the Amazonia biome:

For the area of primary forest converted to other land uses:

- Total managed and unmanaged primary forest land (FM and FNM, respectively) converted to other land uses from 1994 to 2002, inclusive = 164,997.14 km^2.
- The average annual primary forest land area converted to other land uses from 1994 to 2002, inclusive = 164,997.14/8 = 20,624.64 km^2.

The corresponding data in this submission is as follows:

- Total area of primary forest deforested (adjusted deforestation increment) for all years from 1996 to 2002, inclusive = 137,860.00 km^2.
- The average annual area deforested in this period is 137,860.00/7 = 19,694.29 km^2.

Note that in the calculation of the average annual area converted to other land uses in the II National GHG Inventory, the total area is divided by 8 (annual changes from 1994 to 2002: 1994-1995; 1995-1996; … 2001-2002); whereas for the calculation of the average in this submission, the total deforested area is divided by 7 (data for every year since 1996 until 2002).

IMPORTANT REMARK: the areas and associated emissions provided in the transition matrices in the II National GHG Inventory (***Table 3.97*** and ***Table 3.98***, respectively) have not been generated using the annual PRODES data. The analysis was carried out only for two years (1994) and (2002), and the area changes were not adjusted for the different dates and/or the presence of clouds (note that a reporting category has been introduced in the transition matrix, referred to as *areas not observed due to cloud cover*).

The difference between the average annual area deforested (adjusted deforestation increment) from the submission and the average annual area of forest land converted to other land-uses from the II National GHG Inventory is 930.36 km^2. This corresponds to a percent difference of 4.72% relative to the average annual area deforested in the period 1996 to 2002 presented in this submission.

Regarding the emissions: The table below provides the CO_2 emissions reported in the II National GHG Inventory for the period 1994 and 2002 inclusive (***Table 3.98***) from conversion of Forest Land (FNM and FM) to Grassland (Ap), Cropland (Ac), Settlements (S), Reservoirs (R) and Others (O) which total 8,175,002,260.0 tCO_2. Thus, the average annual emission is 1,021,875,828.5 $tCO_2\ yr^{-1}$. The table below also provides the CO_2 emissions for years 1996 to 2002 inclusive, estimated for this submission, which total 7,141,038,666.2 tCO_2, providing an annual average emission of 1,020,148,380.9 $tCO_2\ yr^{-1}$. The difference between the average annual emission from the National Communication and the submission is thus nearly zero.

*Forest land conversion to: **		Ap	Ac	S	Res	O	Total emissions from 1994 to 2002 (tCO2)	Average annual emissions from 1994 to 2002 (tCO2)
Second Inventory **	FNM	6,882,784,770.0	904,422,860.0	11,047,800.0	5,610,690.0	4,605,170.0	8,175,002,260.0	1,021,875,282.5
	FM	322,777,250.0	39,564,070.0	1,101,070.0	145,090.0	2,943,490.0		
FREL	1996	979,523,413.9					Total emissions from 1996 to 2002 - FREL (tCO2)	Average annual emissions from 1996 to 2002 - FREL (tCO2)
	1997	979,523,413.9						
	1998	979,523,413.9						
	1999	979,523,413.9					7,141,038,666.2	1,020,148,380.9
	2000	979,523,413.9						
	2001	908,964,139.9						
	2002	1,334,457,456.9						
Percent Difference								0.17%

* Grassland (Ap), Cropland (Ac), Settlements (S), Reservoirs (R) and Others (O).

** Note that the emissions in Table 3.98 in the Second National GHG Inventory are reported in Gg CO2, and have been converted to t CO2 in the present table.

Hence, Brazil considers that the percent difference is indicative of results that are very similar despite the minor (but consistent) change in the methodology used for the purposes of the II National GHG Inventory and the one applied to this submission. It is important to note that the **source** for the activity data and the emission factors are consistent, the first being based on the analysis of remotely sensed data and the second in the same carbon map used in the II National GHG Inventory.

NOTE: PRODES data, used to construct the FREL for Amazonia, is not generated from the National Inventories (neither the II nor the III). Important differences apply: (1) the work scale of PRODES is 1:75,000, allowing a more precise estimate than the III National GHG Inventory, for which the work scale is 1:125,000; (2) the forest cover in the National Inventory includes areas not considered by PRODES (refer to ***Figure 17***); (3) deforestation in PRODES is based on a forest mask created for the Legal Amazonia, which is not used to generate the estimates in the III National Inventory; (4) PRODES data are annually acquired, whereas annual estimates for the National GHG Inventory is the average of the emissions estimates for the period under study (for the III Inventory, the period from 2002 to 2010, that is, the average of 8 years). Consistency with the III National Inventory can be assessed in the following: use of the same emission factors (carbon map), definition of deforestation, use of satellite imagery of Landsat class to identify forest land conversions, similar forest cover. Consistency does not imply that the same pools and gases included in the National GHG Inventory are also included in the FREL construction, since the REDD+ provisions do not require that (only significant pools and activities cannot be excluded – refer to Decision 12/CP.17). Finally, the dataset used for the FREL is the longest consistent, verifiable, accurate, transparent deforestation data in the country and should not be replaced by the National GHG Inventory data. Hence, consistency needs to be understood in this context as well. As the own Reference Report for LULUCF for the III National GHG Inventory notes (page 248, section 4.8), main methodological differences do not allow direct comparison between the results from

these two projects (PRODES and National Inventory).



Figure 17. Areas of non-forest (in purple) and forest (in grey) considered in the III National Communication (TCN) and by PRODES. MCTIC, 2016.

b.4. Accurate Information

b.4.1. Activity Data

The definition of deforestation adopted for PRODES and maintained in the FREL C (i.e., clear cut), in conjunction with the annual wall-to-wall assessment of deforestation based on satellite imagery of high spatial resolution (up to 30 meters) allow deforestation polygons to be identified and mapped with very high accuracy. The fact that PRODES provides **annual wall-to-wall** assessments makes the classification of deforestation almost unequivocal, due to the very distinct spectral characteristics of areas with natural forests and those that are clear cut areas in the satellite imagery. Only new polygons of deforestation are mapped each year on the aggregated deforestation map containing deforestation up to the previous year.

In addition, with the advent of new processing tools and greater availability of satellite data, the gaps of observation in the Landsat imagery due to the presence of clouds are being filled with data from other satellites with sensors of similar spatial resolution to Landsat (e.g., ResourceSat, DMC, CBERS). This ensures that the **observation coverage** of the Amazonia biome is as comprehensive as possible every year.

The classification focus only in the identification of the clear cut patches from the previous year and is analyzed and mapped on the screen (visual interpretation). The annual mapping is conducted by INPE's support Foundation by a consistent team of techniciansand is subject to rigorous quality control and quality assurance by INPE´s researchers. All data are properly archived, with copies maintained at both INPE and its support Foundation.

A study conducted by Adami *et al.* (2017) analyzed the accuracy of PRODES data, taking the data for the year of 2014 for the state of Mato Grosso as an example. Independent random samples from the 2014 satellite images were classified by independent evaluators as forest or deforestation in 2014. Results show a global accuracy of 94.5% ± 2.05, consistent with the high level accuracy estimated by expert judgment in the previous

FREL.[35]

Most importantly, since all data (images and annual maps) are publicly available since 2003, it allows the reconstruction of the deforestation increments by any interested stakeholder (usually NGOs, State Environmental Secretaries) and hence may be verified by independent sources. Furthermore, PRODES data are used as reference for many initiatives of global forest monitoring such as those conducted by the NASA/University of Maryland and the European Commission.

b.4.2. Emission Factors

The emission factors used in the construction of the FREL are the carbon densities in the living biomass (including palms and vines) and litter mass, as contained in the carbon map used by Brazil on its II National GHG Inventory (refer to ***section b.1*** and the carbon map for the Amazonia biome).

Brazil is implementing its National Forest Inventory (NFI) (refer to ***Box 6***). Data collection for IFN is already in course in 14 Brazilian States, and approximately 5,500 conglomerates have already been measured. In the Amazonia, the work started in 2014 and data has already been collected in the states of Rondonia, west of Para and northeast of Mato Grosso, totaling 1,100 conglomerates. The analysis of the already collected data is in process and hence could not be used in this submission. However, it is expected that the NFI data will be instrumental for the construction of the national FREL.

Box 6. The National Forest Inventory of Brazil

The National Forest Inventory (NFI) is still in progress, having already inventoried an area of 228 million hectares. described as follow per state. The present situation of the NFI in the 27 Brazilian states is as follows. The field data collection has been completed in 13 states (Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catarina, Paraná, Rio de Janeiro, Espirito Santo, Sergipe, Alagoas, Pernambuco, Paraiba, Distrito Federal, Rio Grande do Norte, Ceará and Rondônia). For 11 states (Bahia, Piauí, Maranhão, Tocantins, Goiás, Mato Grosso, Mato Grosso do Sul, Acre, Amazonas, Pará and Roraíma) the field data collection is still in progress. In only 3 States of the Federation, field data collection has not yet started (São Paulo, Minas Gerais and Amapá).

Brazil has been presenting the results of the NFI by means of technical reports by state, as soon as the corresponding full dataset becomes completed. This includes the tree species botanical identification by herbaria and soil sample analysis carried out by partner laboratories The time required to complete botanical identification is uncertain due to the number of tree species, reference sources at herbario and eventually the need

[35] Note that Adami et al., did not use the adjusted increments of deforestation, since the focus of their study was on the accuracy of the deforestation increment mapping using satellite imagery. Since the same class of satellite data as those used for the FREL construction are used, as well as the same deforestation definition and minimum mapping area, it is expected that the accuracy of the deforestation increment mapping is very close to that which resulted from Adami et al. study (94.5 ±2.05%)

for experts in botanical families. So far 50,883 botanical samples have been collected for tree species identification, resulting in more than 2,000 tree species identified. A total of 12,604 soil samples have been analysed. The delay in carrying out the NFI in some states are attributed mainly to administrative reasons and lack of financial resources, It is expected that at least part of the data from the NFI will be available for use in the construction of the national FREL.

RADAMBRASIL data used in the construction of the carbon map is the most comprehensive forest ground data available in Brazil up to now. It is difficult to assess the uncertainty of the data collected by many different teams. The carbon map has been constructed using the RADAMBRASIL data as input data to the allometric equation by Higuchi *et al*. (1998) to relate aboveground fresh biomass with carbon densities developed using ground data collected in Central Amazonia. As mentioned in ***Box 4***, the use of this allometric equation to estimate the aboveground fresh biomass in South Amazonia (SA) led to a difference of 6% when contrasted with the biomass estimated from ground data collected in SA.

Regarding uncertainties associated with other variables in Higuchi *et al* (1998) equation, the following uncertainties estimated by Silva (2007) for the water and carbon content in fresh and dry biomass provide a first approximation to the uncertainties of these values as used by Higuchi *et al* (1998).

(1) The average water content of 41.6 percent represents the weighted average of water in the following components from trees: (1) trunk (water content of 38.8% and contribution to total biomass of 58.02%); (2) thick branch (water content of 40.6% and contribution to total biomass of 12.48%); (3) thin branch (water content of 44.9% and contribution to total biomass of 12.78%); (4) leaves (water content of 59.7% and contribution to total biomass of 2.69%); (5) thick roots (water content of 48.9% and contribution to total biomass of 3.06%); (6) thin roots (water content of 44.5% and contribution to total biomass of 11.59%). The 95% confidence interval for the average percent water content is 41.6 ± 2.8%. The value used in ***Equation 6*** (40.0% is within this confidence interval).

(2) The average carbon content of 48.5% represents the weighted average of the following components from trees (dry mass): (1) trunk (carbon content of 48.5% and contribution to total dry biomass of 85.98%); (2) thick roots (carbon content of 47.0% and contribution to total biomass of 11.59%); (6) thin roots (carbon content of 45.7% and contribution to total biomass of 3.06%). The 95 % confidence interval for the average percent carbon content is 48.5 ± 0.9%.

(3) Regarding the uncertainties related to the biomass of palms and vines, Silva (2007) estimated that these are high (73.0 and 57.0%, respectively). However, their contribution to the average total aboveground biomass is only 4.0%, the largest contribution being from the trees themselves (94.0%). Hence, the contribution of the biomass of palms and vines to the biomass uncertainty is low.

Other uncertainties associated with the carbon map may arise from other sources, including the following:

(1) data collection, sampling design;

(2) aggregated forest type;

(3) rules used to estimate the carbon density of the forest types per RADAMBRASIL volume.

It is difficult to associate uncertainties to most of these elements. RADAMBRASIL data, for instance, was collected under strenuous circumstances in the 70s, by different teams. Also, by that time the technologies that exist today were not available or accessible (GPS, for example).

The aggregation of the diverse forest types in Amazonia in forest classes may also generate uncertainties, but these are difficult to access without a proper Forest National Inventory. This is one area where improvements may be expected in the medium term.

A recent paper by Ometto *et al*., (2014) (refer to Box 7) addresses *Amazon forest biomass density maps: tackling the uncertainty in carbon emission estimates* and provides comparison with other biomass maps for Amazonia from the literature. It concludes stating that the methodology used to construct the carbon map, based on the RADAM data (1:1,000,000) "*resulted in large differences in biomass with respect to the other maps, and large changes in biomass between adjacent surveyed areas and regions (corresponding to different RADAM volumes)* with the carbon map." And continues to say that "*the large apparent disparities in biomass calculated for the carbon map were not propagated into CO_2 emissions as the deforestation front in the analysis had not advanced to these areas."* Indeed, the analysis of the deforestation polygons (per volume and forest type) for years 2002 to 2005 have consistently shown that deforestation concentrates mainly in the so called "*Arc of Deforestation*", corresponding to RADAM volumes 4, 5, 16, 20, 22 and 26 (refer to ***Figure 14***). In addition, even within these volumes, the forest types affected by deforestation have been very consistent[36].

Box 7. Carbon map uncertainties – analyzing the literature

Estimating the uncertainty associated with the carbon map is extremely complex. There are several carbon maps for the Amazonia biome published in the literature. Most of them constructed using satellite data, including the airborne LIDAR data and plot information. Some incorporate only aboveground biomass, whereas others include living biomass and others pools.

The accuracy of the map can be assessed in case adequate and representative ground datasets for calibration are available. This may exist in some areas in Amazonia but do not exist for the entire Amazonia biome. The literature on uncertainties tend to indicate that the largest uncertainties for REDD+ activities relate to the spatial distribution of biomass and to the spatial pattern of forest cover change, rather than to total globally o nationally summed carbon density.

[36] In 2003, 2004, and 2005, the percentages of the deforestation increments falling in these volumes were 69%, 70%, and 76%, respectively. The forest types most affected by deforestation in RADAM volume 4, for instance, were As and Ds (99% in 2003; 98.8% in 2004 and 97% in 2005). In volume 16, 90.6% and 98% of the increments fell under forest types Ab and As; and 96.9% in Ab, As and Ds in 2003.

Edward TA Mitchard, Sassan S Saatchi, Alessandro Baccini, Gregory P Asner, Scott J Goetz, Nancy L Harris and Sandra Brown. Uncertainty in the spatial distribution of tropical forest biomass: a comparison of pan-tropical maps (2013).

A more recent paper (Ometto *et al*., 2014) examines the influence of the use of different biomass maps on uncertainty in carbon emission calculations due to land cover change in recent years and in future scenarios. Five maps are compared (Saatchi *et al*. (2007; 2011); Nogueira *et al*. (2008); MCT (2010); and Baccini *et al*. (2012). Some results indicate that the map used in the FREL (MCT (2010) and that from Nogueira *et al*. (2008) have similar spatial distribution of the biomass density classes.

The paper indicates that the methodology used in the II National GHG Inventory, based on the RADAM data resulted in large differences in biomass with respect to the other maps, and large changes in biomass between adjacent surveyed areas and regions (corresponding to different RADAM data sheets) within the map.

Ometto, J.P.; Aguiar, A.P.; Assis, T.; Soler, L.; Valle, P.; Tejada, G.; Lapola, D.M.; Meir, P. Amazon forest biomass density maps: tackling the uncertainty in carbon emission estimates. Climatic Change (2014) 124:545-560. DOI 10.1007/s10584-014-1058-7

Work is underway to assess and reduce uncertainties and this process will contribute to the improvement of the data in future submissions.

c) Pools, gases and activities included in the construction of the FREL

c.1. Activities included

FREL C includes only the activity "*Reducing Emissions from Deforestation*" in the Amazonia biome, using the PRODES data as a basis. In accordance with the technical assessment of the previous FREL for the Amazonia biome, Brazil understands the importance of better understanding forest degradation and its linkages with deforestation. Considerations regarding this topic and domestic efforts are provided in ***Annex III (Forest degradation in the Amazonia biome: preliminary thoughts)***.

c.2. Pools included

The pools considered in this FREL C are the same as those in the previous FREL for the Amazonia biome and included in the carbon map, i.e, living biomass (above and below-ground) and litter.

Considerations regarding the omitted carbon pools: soil organic carbon and dead wood

(1) The case of the soil organic carbon pool

Following the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF (IPCC, 2003, Section 3.2.1.3, p. 338) consideration here will be carried out for the two types of soil carbon pools including the following: (i) the organic fraction of mineral forest soils and (ii) organic soils.

In relation to the mineral forest soils, there are several publications in Brazil addressing changes in carbon stock in mineral soils from conversion of forest to pasture or agriculture in Amazonia. As already mentioned, Brazil does not have data on the dynamics of forest conversion for all years in the period considered in the construction of the FREL. However, there are two sources of information that were used as proxies to estimate the fate of the forest converted to other uses.

The first of these is the II National GHG Inventory that has a spatially explicit database for the conversions of forest (managed and unmanaged) to other land-use categories from 1994 to 2002, per biome. The land cover/use for these two years was mapped using Landsat as the main source of data. The data in ***Tables 3.97*** (Land-use transition areas identified in the Amazon biome from 1994 to 2002 (hectares)) can provide an estimate of the forestland converted to grassland and cropland, the two major forest land conversions in Amazonia. Considering the total area of Forest Land converted to Grassland - Ap; Cropland – Ac; Settements – S; Wetlands - Res; and Other Land in ***Table 3.97***, which totals 16,500,461 hectares, the area converted to Grassland and Cropland is 14,610,248 hectares and 1,846,220 hectares, corresponding to 88.5% and 11.2%, respectively.

The second source of information on transition of forest to other land use categories is ***TerraClass***[37], a project carried out by INPE in partnership with the Brazilian Enterprise for Agriculture (EMBRAPA), which has estimated forest transitions for years 2008 and 2010. For these two years, 80.3% and 80.0%, respectively, have been converted to grassland (exposed soil grassland; clean grassland; dirty grassland; regeneration with pasture). Hence, the two sources consistently indicate that the major Forest Land conversion is to Grassland, including cattle ranching, abandoned grassland etc.

With this assumption in mind, a literature review was carried out to assess the impact of the conversion of native forest to pasture on the soil organic carbon pool. It is important to bear in mind that the literature review cited here is limited, and may not be representative of all situations that may occur in Amazonia. Brazil will intensify efforts to improve the understanding of the changes in carbon stock in the soil organic carbon pool, including by expanding the literature review and by stimulating new research. One of the issues that make the assessment of changes in the soil organic carbon pool relates to the timing of the changes, which may not occur immediately after the conversion. Normally the process may take years before a change can be detected.

A large area of the Amazonia biome (approximately 75%) is covered by Latossolos (Oxisols) and Podzólicos (Ultisoils and Alfisols) (Cerri *et al*. (1999), following Jacomine and Camargo (1996)). The remainder falls into seven soil divisions (refer to ***Figure 18***).

[37] More information on TerraClass can be found in http://www.inpe.br/cra/projetos_pesquisas/terraclass2010.php



Figure 18 - Percent distribution of the main soil types in the Amazonia basin. ***Source:*** Cerri *et al.*, 1999.

Regarding the changes in the soil organic carbon pool from conversion of forest to grassland (pasture), part of the literature indicates that there is a loss of carbon in the first years of conversion, generally followed by full recovery of the carbon in organic soil as if under native forest. In some cases, an increase in soil carbon can occur, particularly in the superficial soil layer. A summary of some of the literature consulted in described below.

Fearnside and Barbosa (1998) showed that trends in soil carbon were strongly influenced by pasture management. Sites that were judged to have been under poor management generally lost soil carbon, whereas sites under ideal management gained carbon. Salimon *et al*. (2007) concluded that the soils under pasture present larger carbon stocks in the superficial soil layer where approximately 40 to 50% of the carbon originated from grasses at depth 0 to 5 cm. In deeper layers, the contribution of the remaining carbon from the primary forest is larger, notably in those soils with greater clay content.

Cerri *et al*. (2006) carried out a literature review on this issue and concluded that approximately two thirds of the pasture in Amazonia exhibited an increase in carbon stock in soil relative to the native vegetation. It estimated equilibrium organic matter levels by running the models for a period of 10,000 years. Then, the models were run for 100 years under pasture. Century and Roth predicted that forest clearance and conversion to well managed pasture would cause an initial decline in soil carbon stocks, followed by a slow rise to levels exceeding those under native forest. The only exception to this pattern was found for the chronosequence called Suia-Missu, where the pasture is degraded rather than well managed like the other chronosequences.

Costa *et al*., (2009) concluded that there was no significant difference in the soil carbon stocks under vegetation, degraded pasture and productive pasture, at different land use time and different depth. The authors also conclude that after 28 years of use with well managed pasture, approximately 62% of the carbon organic soil still derives from the original forest until 30 cm depth.

Fernandes *et al*. (2007) concluded that the incorporation of carbon by the pasture occurs gradually in increasing depth through time, and that the layer 0 – 10 cm apparently reached an equilibrium state after 10 years (around 9.8 tonnes per hectare). For the other layers, differences can still be observed in the stocks in areas of 10 and 20 years, this difference being largest at 40 cm depth. In the layer 0 – 20 cm the carbon stock in 10.8 tonnes per hectare in the soil with native vegetation; 15.1 and 17.3 tonnes per hectare for pastures of 10 and 20 years, respectively. These values represent an increase of 40 and 60% in relation to the soil under native vegetation, respectively.

Trumbore *et al*. (1995) reported soil carbon losses in overgrazed pasture but soil carbon gains from fertilized pasture in the Amazon region. Neil *et al*. (1997) suggested that degraded pastures with little grass cover are less likely to accumulate soil carbon because inputs to soil organic carbon from pasture roots will be diminished, but that might not be true in more vigorous re-growth of secondary forest. Greater grazing intensity and soil damage from poor management would, in all likelihood, cause soil carbon losses.

Finally, Neill *et al*. (1997) when examining carbon and nitrogen stocks in seven chronosequences, each consisting of an intact forest and pastures of different ages created directly from cleared forest (7 forests, 18 pastures), along a 700-km transect in the southwestern Amazon basis indicated that when site history was controlled by considering only pastures formed directly from cleared forest, carbon and nitrogen accumulation was the dominant trend in pasture soils.

In relation to organic soils, emissions from deforestation associated with organic soils (Organossolos) were not included in this submission since the presence of these types of soils in Brazil is not considered significant, as indicated in ***Figure 19***. Furthermore, these types of soil are not located in the areas most affected by deforestation (Arch of Deforestation).

Ordens	Área (km²)	%
Latossolos	2.691.563	31,61
Argissolos	2.281.135	26,79
Neossolos	1.130.776	13,28
Plintossolos	580.715	6,82
Cambissolos	462.358	5,43
Gleissolos	391.684	4,60
Luvissolos	239.268	2,81
Planossolos	235.011	2,76
Espodossolos	168.595	1,98
Nitossolos	102.179	1,20
Chernossolos	39.168	0,46
Vertissolos	17.881	0,21
Organossolos	2.544	0,03
Águas	156.674	1,84
Afloramento de Rocha	11.069	0,13
Dunas	4.257	0,05
TOTAIS	**8.514.877**	**100,00**

Figure 19 **-** Brazil´s soil classification system ***Source:*** EMBRAPA, 2006

Ideally, more studies are needed to determine with more certainty how significant the changes in the soil organic carbon pool are following conversion of Forest Land. Considering the above information, the soil organic carbon pool has not been included in the construction of the FREL proposed by Brazil in this submission.

Brazil considers that the dead wood pool is not a significant source of emissions and hence, does not include it in the FREL C. The exclusion of this pool also ensures consistency with both the FREL A and FREL B, and might be re-evaluated during the construction of national FREL.

(2) The case of the dead wood pool

The dead wood pool has not included in the FREL C. However, as already mentioned, emission factor used in the III National GHG Inventory, represented in the carbon map for the Amazonia biome were applied to the deforestation data from 2002 and 2015. The effect of the carbon map in the II and III National GHG Inventory is presented in ***Box 5***. Since the carbon map in the III National GHG Inventory includes living biomass, litter and dead wood, the effect was assessed as follows:

(i) Maintain the same carbon pools, i.e., excluding the dead wood pool from the carbon map in the III National GHG Inventory; and

(ii) Maintain the carbon map from the III Inventory, with the four carbon pools.

Box 8. The treatment of the dead wood in FREL C

Paragraph 28 of the technical evaluation of the FREL submitted by Brazil to the UNFCCC (FCCC/TAR/2014/BRA) indicated the treatment of the emissions from dead wood as an area for future improvement of the FREL. Although the results presented in this submission do not include emissions from this pool, in order to ensure consistency with the construction of both FREL A and FREL B, the III National GHG Inventory includes this pool in the carbon map for the Amazonia biome there proposed.

In the III National GHG Inventory, the percent contribution of the dead wood pool to the total biomass per hectare was discriminated for dense and non-dense forests. The mean ratios of the carbon in the dead wood pool to the carbon in dry biomass were estimated as 7.1% and 8.6% for dense and non-dense forests, respectively. Since the dead wood pool was included in the carbon map, together with living biomass and litter, a preliminary evaluation was made of the effect of the use of the carbon map in the II and III National Inventories with consideration of the same pools (living biomass and litter), as well as with the addition of the dead wood pool. The emission estimates have been generated from the deforestation increments and not from the adjusted deforestation increments. The results are presented in ***Table 8***, reproducing the data in http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub, directory "***Other relevant information and data***", file "***WORKSHEET_FREL_C***", ***rows 36 - 55***, ***columns B – L.***

Table 8 - Emission estimates from gross deforestation using the carbon maps in the II and III National GHG Inventories using the same carbon pools and their difference; and using the carbon pool of the III GHG National Inventory including the dead wood pool, and their difference.

	t CO_2 II Inventory (living biomass and litter)	t CO_2 III Inventory (living biomass and litter)	% difference (II – III)[38]	t CO_2 III Inventory (living biomass, litter and dead wood)	% difference (II – III) with dead wood included
2001	914,948,218	937,847,755	2.50	1,030,601,928	12.64
2002	1,206,821,066	1,219,576,620	1.06	1,340,194,088	11.05
2003	1,509,152,483	1,516,114,474	0,46	1,666,059,861	10.40
2004	1,339,437,300	1,330,016,121	-0.70	1,461,556,177	9.12
2005	1,145,213,623	1,140,289,111	-0.43	1,253,064,957	9.42
2006	563,497,470	571,609,609	1.44	628,142,427	11.47

[38] The absolute (only positive values) average percent difference of the emission estimates from 2001 to 2015 is 0.22% (same pools). The average percent difference of the emission estimates with the inclusion of the dead wood pool is 9.68%.

2007	588,196,437	597,720,394	1.62	656,835,597	11.67
2008	657,188,945	665,213,444	1.22	731,003,785	11.23
2009	354,487,621	347,810,179	-1.88	382,208,988	7.82
2010	341,843,471	340,429,142	-0.41	374,097,959	9.44
2011	310,756,848	303,414,099	-2.36	333,422,087	7.29
2012	226,677,963	224,889,100	-0.79	247,130,880	9.02
2013	282,107,626	278,471,430	-1.29	306,012,561	8.47
2014	268,450,749	266,352,017	-0.78	292,694,524	9.03
2015	328,223,858	319,749,663	-2.58	351,373,256	7.05
Mean	**669,133,578**	**670,633,544**	**-0.22**	**736,959,938**	**-9.68**

Brazil considers that the dead wood pool is not a significant source of emissions and hence, does not include it in the FREL C. The exclusion of this pool also ensures consistency with both the FREL A and FREL B, and might be re-evaluated during the construction of FREL C.

c.3. Gases included

This FREL includes only CO_2 emissions. However, the III National Inventory includes estimates of non-CO_2 emissions from biomass burning resulting from deforestation in the Amazonia biome. ***Box 9*** presents some considerations regarding the treatment of non-CO_2 gases.

Box 9. Consideration regarding non-CO2 gases

Paragraph 29 of the technical evaluation report of the FREL submitted by Brazil to the UNFCCC indicates the treatment of emissions of non-CO_2 gases as an area for future technical improvement of the FREL. An analysis of the impact of non-CO_2 emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O) and NOx for year 2010, included in the III National GHG Inventory indicates the following emissions: 8,400 Gg; 549 Gg; 16 Gg; and 129 Gg, respectively.

Non-CO_2 emissions from deforestation in the Amazonia biome are not available for other years and hence, recalculation of the emission estimates to include non-CO_2 emissions would not be possible, nor would it be consistent with **FREL A** and **FREL B**. Estimation of emissions from fire resulting from deforestation is expected to be improved in the next national inventories, and if possible, non-CO_2 emissions from fire will be included in the national FREL, if consistency of the time-series can be assured and if deemed relevant.

d) Forest definition

Brazil is a country of continental dimensions and with a large diversity of forest types. The forest definition broadly applicable in Brazil is that reported to the FAO for the Global Forest Resources Assessments (FRA), reproduced below:

> "*Forest is defined as land spanning more than 0.5 hectare with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than 10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. Land not classified as "Forest", spanning more than 0.5 hectare; with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of 5-10 percent, or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ; or with a combined cover of shrubs, bushes and trees above 10 percent are classified as "Other Wooded Land"*.

These two categories (*Forest* and *Other Wooded Land*) do not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use.

The classification of vegetation typologies into the categories of "Forest" and "Other Wooded Land" used by FAO was defined by Brazilian experts involved in the preparation of the FRA 2015.

It is to be noted that **the number of vegetation typologies under "Forest" for the purposes of FRA is much larger than the aggregated forest types defined for the purposes of this submission (*Table 9*)**, the reason being the need to have a basis for estimating the carbon density in the forest types defined.

Table 9 **-** FRA 2010 vegetation typologies included in this FREL (in grey).

Aa	Alluvial Open Humid Forest
Ab	Lowland Open Humid Forest
Am	Montane Open Humid Forest
As	Submontane Open Humid Forest
Ca	Alluvial Deciduous Seasonal Forest
Cb	Lowland Deciduous Seasonal Forest
Cm	Montane Deciduous Seasonal Forest
Cs	Submontane Deciduous Seasonal Forest
Da	Alluvial Dense Humid Forest
Db	Lowland Dense Humid Forest
Dl	High montane Dense Humid Forest
Dm	Montane Dense Humid Forest
Ds	Submontane Dense Humid Forest
Ea	Tree Steppe
EM	Transition Steppe / Mixed Humid Forest
EM	Transition Steppe / Seasonal Forest
Fa	Alluvial Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest
Fb	Lowland Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest
Fm	Montane Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest
Fs	Submontane Semi deciduous Seasonal Forest
La	Wooded Campinarana
Ld	Forested Campinarana
LO	Transition Campinarana / Humid Forest
M	Mixed Humid Forest:
Ma	Alluvial Mixed Humid Forest
Ml	Montane Mixed High Humid Forest
Mm	Montane Mixed Humid Forest
Ms	Submontane Mixed High Humid Forest
NM	Transition Seasonal Forest / Mixed Humid Forest
NP	Transition Seasonal Forest / Pioneer Formations
OM	Transition Humid Forest / Mixed Humid Forest
ON	Transition Humid Forest / Seasonal Humid Forest
Pa	Vegetation Fluvial and / or Lacustrine Influenced
Pfm	Forest Vegetation Fluviomarine influenced
Pma	Forest Vegetation Marine Influenced
Sa	Wooded Savannah
Sd	Forested Savannah
SM	Transition Savannah / Mixed Humid Forest
SN	Transition Savannah / Seasonal Forest
SO	Transition Savannah / Humid Forest
SP	Transition Savannah / Pioneer Formations (Restinga)
ST	Transition Savannah / Steppe Savannah
STN	Transition Savannah / Steppe Savannah / Seasonal Forest
Ta	Ta - Wooded Steppe Savannah
Td	Forested Steppe Savannah
TN	Transition Steppe Savannah / Seasonal Forest
	Forest Plantations
	Secondary Vegetation in Forestry areas

For the Amazonia biome, the historical time-series available for deforestation has been constructed assuming a clear cut pattern (elimination of vegetation) and does not follow strictly the definition used for the FRA. However, the boundaries of forest/non-forest were based on the definition applied in the FRA report.

Hence, deforestation for the Amazonia biome is not associated with thresholds, but simply with canopy cover equals to zero. Any situation in which forest falls below the thresholds of the FAO definition but still does not have canopy cover equal to zero is characterized as forest degradation and mapped by other Brazilian programs.

Since the basis for the estimation of the carbon densities in the different forest types was the RADAMBRASIL sample plots and vegetation map, it would not be logical to disaggregate the estimates to accommodate a larger set of forest types.

Box 10. Consideration regarding forest definition

PRODES was created in the late 80s to estimate deforestation in areas of natural tropical high forests in the Amazonia biome based on TM-satellite imagery of 30 meters spatial resolution. Hence, the boundaries of the PRODES forest mask were defined from visual interpretation focusing on dense, mostly continuous, natural tropical forest types. The forest definition adopted in the reporting of Brazil to FAO ("Land spanning more than 0.5 hectares with trees higher than 5 meters and a canopy cover of more than10 percent or trees able to reach these thresholds in situ. It does not include land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use") includes more land as the above mentioned forest types, given the too low thresholds of FAO definition. Hence, it also includes vegetation in "transition zones" such as transition between savannah and steppe savannah, transition steppe savannah and seasonal forests, most of which not considered forest for the purposes of PRODES. Note that the forest in PRODES forest land meets the FAO definition requirements (height, canopy cover) but does not include small forest patches (minimum mapping area of 6.25 ha, which corresponded to 1 mm2 in the working scale of 1:250,000. Note that the satellite imagery at the time PRODES was created were in hard prints (analogical), not digital.

The land use and land-use changes in the II and III National Inventories are assessed via interpretation of satellite imagery (TM-Landsat, 30 meters) through a contract between the Ministry of Science, Technology, Innovation and Communication and a Foundation. In the interpretation, part of the transition zones (not included in PRODES), is classified as forest land. This explains the 4.3 per cent difference between the forest area in PRODES and in the III Inventory (3,964,940 km2 x 3,800,956 km2). Whereas PRODES considers most of the transition zones as non-forest, these areas are classified as forests in the Inventory and in the report of Brazil to FAO.

Note that the forest area in PRODES is more stringent than that adopted for reporting to FAO and in the Inventory, since it focus on dense, mostly continuous, natural tropical forests, which are prevailing and also more susceptible to deforestation in the region (PRODES´ monitoring purpose).

References

ABDALA, G. C.; CALDAS, L. S.; HARIDASAN, M.; EITEN, G., 1998. Above and belowground organic matter and root:shoot ratio in Cerrado in Central Brazil. Brazilian Journal of Ecology, v.2, p.11-23.

ADAMI, M.; GOMES, A. R.; BELLUZZO, A. P.; COELHO, A. S.; VALERIANO, D. M.; RAMOS, F. S.; NARVAES, I. S.; BROWN, I. F.; OLIVEIRA, I. D.; SANTOS, L. B.; EDUARDO, L. A confiabilidade do PRODES: estimativa da acurácia do mapeamento do desmatamento no estado Mato Grosso. In: SIMPÓSIO BRASILEIRO DE SENSORIAMENTO REMOTO, 18. (SBSR), 2017, Santos. **Anais...** São José dos Campos: INPE, 2017. p. 4189-4196. Internet. ISBN 978-85-17-00088-1. IBI: <8JMKD3MGP6W34M/3PSM2LF>. Available at: <http://urlib.net/8JMKD3MGP6W34M/3PSM2LF>, last accessed on January 12th, 2018.

ANDRADE, L. A.; FELFILI, J. M.; VIOLATI, L., 2002. Fitossociologia de uma área de Cerrado denso na RECOR-IBGE, Brasília, DF. Acta Botanica Brasílica, V.16, n.2, p.255-240.

ARAÚJO, L.S., SANTOS, J.R., KEIL, M., LACRUZ, M.S.P., KRAMER, J.C.M., 2001. Razão entre bandas do SIR-C/ X SAR para estimativa de biomassa em áreas de contato floresta e cerrado. In: X Simpósio Brasileiro de Sensoriamento Remoto - 21-26 abril, 2001, Foz de Iguaçu, Paraná. X Simpósio Brasileiro de Sensoriamento Remoto, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE).

ASNER, G.P., KELLER, M., PEREIRA, R., ZWEEDE, J., SILVA, J.N.M., 2004. Canopy damage and recovery after selective logging in Amazonia: field and satellite studies. Ecological Applications 14, 280–298.

BARBOSA, R. I. & FERREIRA, C. A. C., 2004. Biomassa acima do solo de um ecossistema de “campina” em Roraima, norte da Amazônia Brasileira. Acta Amazonica, v. 34(4):577-586.

BARBOSA, R.I.; FEARNSIDE, P.M., 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 (4): 513-534.

BATALHA, M.A.; MANTOVANI, W; MESQUITA JÚNIOR, H.N. Vegetation structure in Cerrado physiognomies in South-Eastern Brazil. Brazilian Journal of Biology, v.61, n.3, p 475-483, 2001

BRASIL, 1975. Ministério das Minas e Energia. Departamento Nacional de Produção Mineral. Projeto RADAMBRASIL.

BRASIL, 2004. Comunicação Nacional Inicial do Brasil à Convenção-Quadro das Nações Unidas sobre Mudança do Clima – Brasília: Ministério da Ciência e Tecnologia, Coordenação Geral de Mudanças Globais de Clima, 2004. Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/brazilnc1e.pdf, last accessed on May 30th, 2014.

BRASIL, 2009. Lei Nº 12.187, de 29 de dezembro 2009. Institui a Política Nacional sobre Mudança do Clima - PNMC e dá outras providências. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2009/lei/l12187.htm, last accessed on March 24th, 2014.

BRASIL, 2010. Segunda Comunicação Nacional do Brasil À Convenção-Quadro das Nações Unidas sobre Mudança do Clima. – Brasília: Ministério da Ciência e Tecnologia, Coordenação Geral de Mudanças Globais de Clima, 2010. 2.v. CDU 551.583(81). Available at: http://www.mct.gov.br/upd_blob/0213/213909.pdf, last accessed on March 24th, 2018.

BRASIL, 2016. Terceira Comunicação Nacional do Brasil À Convenção-Quadro das Nações Unidas sobre Mudança do Clima. – Brasília: Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação. Coordenação Geral de Mudanças Globais de Clima, 2016. Available at: <sirene.mcti.gov.br/publicacoes>, last accessed on January 8th, 2018.

BRASIL, 2016. Terceira Comunicação Nacional do Brasil À Convenção-Quadro das Nações Unidas sobre Mudança do Clima. Relatório de Referência: Setor Uso da Terra, Mudança do Uso da Terra e Florestas – Brasília: Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação. Coordenação Geral de Mudanças Globais de Clima, 2016. Available at: <sirene.mcti.gov.br/publicacoes>, last accessed on May 24th, 2018.

BRITEZ, R. M.; BORGO, M.; TIEPOLO, G. FERRETI, A.; CALMON, M. HIGA, R., 2006. Estoque e incremento de carbono em florestas e povoamentos de espécies arbóreas com ênfase na Floresta Atlântica do Sul do Brasil. Dados eletrônicos. Colombo - PR: Embrapa Florestas (CD ROM).

BUSTAMANTE, M. M. da C. & OLIVEIRA, E. L. de, 2008. Impacto das Atividades Agrícolas, Florestais e Pecuárias nos Recursos Naturais. In: Savanas: desafios e estratégias para o equilíbrio entre sociedade, agronegócio e recursos naturais, Capítulo 18. Embrapa, Editores Técnicos, Planaltina, GO, p. 647-669.

BUSTAMANTE, M.M.C.; NOBRE, C.A.; SMERALDI, R.; AGUIAR, A.P.D.; BARIONI, L.G.; FERREIRA, L.G.; LONGO, K.; MAY, P.; PINTO, A.S.; OMETTO, J.P.H.B. (2012) Estimating greenhouse gas emissions from cattle raising in Brazil. Climatic Change 115:559-577. DOI 10.1007/s 10584-012-0443-3.

CARVALHO, J.L.N.; AVANZI, J.C.; SILVA, M.L.N.; DE MELLO, C.R.; CERRI, C.E.P. (2010) Potencial de sequestro de carbono em diferentes biomas do Brasil (in English, Potential of soil carbono sequestration in diferent biomes of Brazil). Literature Review. Ver. Bras. Ciênc. Solo, volume 34, número 2. Available from <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0100-06832010000200001&lng=en&nrm=iso>. ISSN 0100-0683. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0100-06832010000200001

CASTRO, E. A. & KAUFFMAN, J. B., 1998. Ecosystem structure in the Brazilian Cerrado: a vegetation gradiente of aboveground biomass, root mass and consumption by fire. Journal of Tropical Ecology, v.14, p.263-283.

CASTRO, E. A., 1996. Biomass, nutrient pool and response to fire in the Brazilian cerrado. Masters Dissertation , Oregon State University.

CERRI, C., BERNOUX, M., ARROWAYS, D., FEIGL, B. J., PICCOLO, M.C., 2000. Carbon stocks in soils of the Brazilian Amazon. In: LAL, R., KIMBLE, J.M.,

CERRI, C.E.P.; CERRI, C.C.; BERNOUX, M.; VOLKOFF, B. & RONDÓN, M.A. Potential of soil carbon sequestration in the Amazonian Tropical Rainforest. In: LAL,

CERRI, C.C.; BERNOUX, M.; ETCHEVERS, J. & CERRI, C.E.P. Carbon sequestration in soils of Latin America. New York, Haworth, 2006. p. 245-266.

CHAMBERS, J., ASNER, G., MORTON, D., ANDERSON, L., SAATCHI, S., ESPIRITO SANTO, F., PALACE, M., SOUZAJR, C. 2007. Regional ecosystem structure and function: ecological insights from remote sensing of tropical forests. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 22:8, 414-423 Online publication date: 1-Aug-2007.

CHAMBERS, J.Q., SANTOS, J., RIBEIRO, R.J., HIGUCHI, N., 2001. Tree damage, allometric relationship, and above-ground net primary production in central Amazon forest. Forest Ecology and Management 152, 73-84.

COSTA, A.A.; ARAUJO, G. M., 2001. Comparação da vegetação arbórea de Cerradão e de Cerrado na Reserva do Panga, Uberlândia, Minas Gerais. Acta Botânica Brasílica, v.15, n.1, p. 63-72.

COSTA, O.V.; CANTARUTTI, R.B.; FONTES, L.E.F.; DA COSTA, L.M.; NACIF, P.G.S.; FARIA, J.C. (2009) Estoque de Carbono do Solo sob Pastagem em Área de Tabuleiro Costeiro no Sul da Bahia. Part of a doctorate thesis by the first author in Soils and Plant Nutrition, Universidade Federal de Viçosa.(in English, Soil Carbon Stock under Pasture in Coastal Area at the South of Bahia).

DELITTI, W.B.C., PAUSAS, J. & BURGER, D.M. 2001. Belowground biomass seasonal variation in two Neotropical savannahs (Brazilian Cerrados) with different fire histories. Annals of Forest Science 7:713-722.

DELITTI, W.B.C.; MEGURO, M. & PAUSAS, J. G., 2006. Biomass and mineralmass estimates in a “cerrado” ecosystem. Revista Brasil. Bot., V.29, n.4, p.531-540, out.-dez. 2006.

DELITTI, W.B.C.; MEGURO, M., 1984. Biomassa e mineralomassa do campo cerrado de Mogi-Guaçu, SP. Ciência e Cultura 6:612.

DURIGAN, G., 2004. Estimativas de estoque de carbono na vegetação natural do Estado de São Paulo. Centro de Gestão e Estudos Estratégicos – CGEE, Prospecção Tecnológica, Mudança do Clima, Estudo 4- Oportunidades de Negócios em segmentos produtivos nacionais.

EMBRAPA, 2006. Sistema Brasileiro de Classificação dos Solos. 2a Ed. Brasilia, DF. 2006. Disponível em: http://www.agrolink.com.br/downloads/sistema-brasileiro-de-classificacao-dos-solos2006.pdf e http://clic.cses.vt.edu/IUSS1.4/Anjos_L_H-Evolution-Brazilian-Soil-Classification-System.pdf

FEARNSIDE, P. M. 2000 Global warming and tropical land-use change: greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning, decomposition and soils in forest conversion, shifting cultivation and secondary vegetation Clim. Change 46 115–58

FEARNSIDE, P.M. 2004. Biomassa das florestas amazônicas brasileiras. Anais do Seminário Emissão x Sequestro de CO_2: uma nova oportunidade de negócios para o Brasil. Companhia Vale do Rio Doce, Rio de Janeiro.

FEARNSIDE, P. M., RIGHI, C.A., GRAÇA, P. M. L. A., KEIZER, E. W. H., CERRI, C., Nogueira, E.M., BARBOSA, R. I., 2009. Biomass and Greenhouse-Gas Emissions from Land-Use Change in Brazil‟s Amazonian "Arc of Deforestation": The states of Mato Grosso and Rondônia. Forest Ecology and Management, v.258, p.1968 - 1978.

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.

FERNANDES, A. H. B. M.; SALIS, S. M. de; FERNANDES, F. A.; CRISPIM, S. M. A., 2008. Estoques de Carbono do Estrato Arbóreo de Cerrados no Pantanal de Nhecolândia. Comunicado Técnico 68, Embrapa Pantanal, Corumbá, MS. ISSN 1981-7231.

FERNANDES, F.A.; CERRI, C.C.; FERNANDES, A.H.B.M. (2007) 13C and the Soil Organic Carbon Dynamics in Cultivated Pasture in the Pantanal Sul-Mato-Grossense. Boletim de Pesquisa e Desenvolvimento 74. EMBRAPA. ISSN 1981-7215.

FRA 2010. Global Forest Resource Assessment 2010. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Available at: http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra/fra2010/en/ last accessed on May 23rd, 2014.

GOMES, B.Z.; MARTINES, F. R.; TAMASHIRO, J. Y., 2004. Estrutura do Cerradão e da transição entre Cerradão e floresta paludícola num fragmento da International Paper do Brasil Ltda., em Brotas, SP. Revista Brasileira de Botânica, v. 27, n. 2, p. 249-262.

GRACE, J.; SAN JOSÉ, J.; MEIR, P; MIRANDA, H. S.; MONTES, R. A., 2006. Productive and carbon fluxes of tropical savannas. Journal of Biogeography 33, 387-400.

HIGUCH, N.; SANTOS, J.M.; IMANAGA, M.; YOSHIDA, S. 1994. Aboveground Biomass Estimate for Amazonian Dense Tropical Moist Forests, Memoirs of the Faculty of Agriculture, Kagoshima, 30(39); 43-54.

HIGUCHI, N. DOS SANTOS, J., RIBEIRO, R.J., MINETTE, L., BIOT, Y. 1998. Aboveground biomass of the Brazilian Amazon rainforest. Acta Amazonica 28 (2), 153-166.

HIGUCHI, N., CHAMBERS, J. DOS SANTOS, J., RIBEIRO, R.J., PINTO, A.C.M., DA SILVA, R. P., 2004. Dinâmica e balanço do carbono da vegetação primária da Amazônia Central. Floresta 34 (3)

IBGE, 2011. Censo Demográfico 2010: Características gerais da população. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Available on:

http://www.ibge.gov.br/home/estatistica/populacao/censo2010/default_resultados_universo.shm, last accessed on March 24th, 2014.

IBGE, 2012. Manual técnico da vegetação brasileira. 2a edição revisada e ampliada. Rio de Janeiro, 2012. ISSN 0103-9598. Available at: ftp://geoftp.ibge.gov.br/documentos/recursos_naturais/manuais_tecnicos/manual_tecnico_vegetacao_brasileira.pdf, last accessed on April 4th, 2014.

INPE, 2013. Metodologia para o Cálculo da Taxa Anual de Desmatamento na Amazônia Legal. PRODES: Available at: http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodes/metodologia_TaxaProdes.pdf, last accessed on March 24th, 2014.

INPE, 2014b. PRODES: Monitoramento da Floresta Amazônica Brasileira por Satélite. Available at: http://www.obt.inpe.br/prodes/index.php,last accessed on March 24th, 2014.

IPCC, 2001. III Assessment Report: Climate Change 2001. Working Group I: The Scientific Basis. Available at: http://www.grida.no/publications/other/ipcc_tar/, last accessed on May 30th, 2014.

IPCC, 2003. Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry. Edited by Jim Penman, Michael Gytarsky, Taka Hiraishi, Thelma Krug, Dina Kruger, Riita Pipatti, Leandro Buendia, Kyoko Miwa, Todd Ngara, Kiyoto Tanabe and Fabian Wagner. Avaliable at: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpglulucf/gpglulucf_contents.html, last accessed on March 24th, 2014.

IPCC, 2006. Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories. Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (eds). Published: IGES, Japan. Avaliable at: http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/, last accessed on April 4th, 2014.

JACOMINE, P. K. T. and CAMARGO, M. N. 1996.Classificação pedológica nacional em vigor. P. 675 – 689. In. V. H. Alvarez, L. E. F. Fontes and M. P. F. Fontes (eds.), Solo nos Grandes Domínios Morfoclimáticos do Brasil e o Desenvolvimento Sustentado. SBCS-UFV, Viçosa, MG, Brazil.

KAUFFMAN, J. B.; CUMMINGS, D. L.& WHARD, D.E., 1994. Relationships of fire, biomass and nutrient dynamics along a vegetation gradient in the Brazilian Cerrado. Journal of Ecology, 82, 519-531.

KUNSTCHIK, G., 2004 Estimativa da biomassa vegetal lenhosa em Cerrado por meio de sensoriamento remoto óptico e de radar. Tese (doutorado) - Instituto de Biociências, USP.

LIMA, A.J.N.; TEIXEIRA, L.M.; CARNEIRO, V.M.C.; dos SANTOS, J.; HIGUCHI, N. Biomass stock and structural analysis of a secondary forest in Manaus (AM) region, ten years after clear cutting followed by fire. Acta Amaz. vol.37 no.1 Manaus 2007, ISSN 0044-5967.

MARTINS, O. S., 2005. Determinação do potencial de sequestro de carbono na

recuperação de matas ciliares na região de São Carlos – SP. Tese (Doutorado) - Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos : UFSCar, 136 p.

MATRICARDI, E.A.T.; SKOLE, D.L. PEDLOWSKI, M.A.; CHOMENTOWSKI, W.; FERNANDES. L.C 2010 Assessment of tropical Forest degradation by selective logging and fire using Landsat imagery. Remote Sensing of Environmet 114. 1117-1129.

MEIRA NETO, J. A. A.; SAPORETI-JÚNIOR, A. W. Parâmetros fitossociológicos de um Cerrado no Parque Nacional da Serra do Cipó, MG. Revista Árvore, v. 26, p. 645-648, 2002.

MIRANDA, S. C. 2012. Variação espacial e temporal da biomassa vegetal em áreas de Cerrado. Tese de Doutorado em Ecologia. Programa de Pós Graduação em Ecologia, Universidade de Brasília. 142p.

MITCHARD, TA E., SAATCHI, S., BACCINI, A., ASNER, G. P., GOETZ, S. J., HARRIS, N. L., and BROWN, S. 2013. Uncertainty in the spatial distribution of tropical forest biomass: a comparison of pan-tropical maps. Carbon Balance and Management, SpringerOpen Journal. Available at: http://www.cbmjournal.com/content/8/1/10, last accessed on October 29th, 2014.

MMA, 2016. Plano de Ação para Prevenção e Controle do Desmatamento na Amazônia Legal (PPCDAm): 4ª fase (2016-2020). Available at: http://combateaodesmatamento.mma.gov.br/, last accessed on December 14th, 2017.

MONTEIRO, A., LINGNAU, C., SOUZA, C.M., 2007. Object-based classification to detection of selective logging in the Brazilian Amazon. Revista Brasileira de Cartografia 225 -234.

NEILL, C., MELILLO, J. M., STEUDLER, P. A., CERRI, C. C., MORAES, J. F. L., PICCOLO, M. C., AND BRITO, M. 1997. Soil carbon and nitrogen stocks following forest clearing for pasture in the southwestern Brazilian Amazon. Ecological Applications 7:1216–1225.

NOGUEIRA. E.M., FEARNSIDE, P.M., NELSON, B.W., BARBOSA, R.I., KEIZER, E.W.H., 2008. Estimates of forest biomass in the Brazilian Amazon: New allometric equations and adjustments to biomass from wood-volume inventories. Forest Ecology and Management 256, 1853-1867.

OMETTO, J. P., AGUIAR, A. P., ASSIS, T., SOLER, L., TEJADA, G. LAPOLA, D., MEIR, P. 2014. Amazon forest biomass density maps: tackling the uncertainty in carbon emissions estimates. Climatic Change, Springer Science. DOI 10.1007/s10584-014-1058-7.

OTTMAR, R. D.; VIHNANEK, R. E.; MIRANDA, H. S.; SATO, M. N.; ANDRADE, S. M. A., 2001. Stereo photo series for quantifying Cerrado fuels in Central Brazil. Washington: USDA: USAID; Brasília, DF: UnB, 2001. V. 1. il.

PAIVA, A.O.; FARIA, G.E.. Estoques de carbono do solo sob cerrado sensu stricto no

Distrito Federal, Brasil. Revista Trópica-Ciências Agrárias e Biológicas, v.1, p. 60-65, 2007.

PINHEIRO, E. da S.; DURIGAN, G.; ADAMI, M., 2009. Imagens Landsat e QuickBird são capazes de gerar estimativas precisas de biomassa aérea de Cerrado? Marcos Adami Anais XIV Simpósio Brasileiro de Sensoriamento Remoto, Natal.

RESENDE, D.; MERLIN, S. & SANTOS, M.T., 2001. Sequestro de carbono: Uma experiência concreta. Instituto Ecológica. Palmas.

RONQUIM, C.C.. Dinâmica espaço temporal do carbono aprisionado na fitomassa dos agroecossistemas no nordeste do Estado de São Paulo. Campinas: Embrapa Monitoramento por Satélite, 2007. 52p. (Embrapa Monitoramento por Satélite. Documentos, 63).

SAATCHI, S. S. , HARRIS, N. L., BROWN, S., LEFSKY, M., MITCHARD, E. T. A., SALAS, W., ZUTTA, B. R., BUERMANN, W., LEWIS, S. L., HAGEN, S., PETROVA, S., WHITE, L., SILMAN, M., MOREL, A. 2011. Benchmark map of forest carbon stocks in tropical regions across three continents. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 108, 9899.

SAATCHI, S. S., HOUGHTON, R. A., DOS SANTOS ALVAL, R.C., SOARES, A. J. V., YU, Y. (2007) Distribution of aboveground live biomass in the Amazon basin. Glob Chang Biol 13(4):816–837.

SALIMON, C. I.; WADT, P.G.S.; DE MELO, W. F. Dinâmica do Carbono na Conversão de Floresta para Pastagens em Argissolos da Formação Geológica Solimões, no Sudoeste da Amazônia. Revista de Biologia e Ciências da Terra, ISSN 1519-5228, Volume 7, Número 1, 2007. (in English, Carbon Dynamics of the Pasture-Forest Conversion in Siltisoils from Solimões Geologic Formation in Southwestern Amazon)

SALIS, S.M. Distribuição das espécies arbóreas e estimativa da biomassa aérea em savanas florestadas, pantanal da Nhacolândia, Estado do Mato Grosso, do Sul. Tese (Doutorado) - Universidade Estadual Júlio de Mesquita Filho, Rio Claro, 2004

SANTOS, J. 1996. Análise de modelos de regressão para estimar a fitomassa da floresta tropical úmida de terra firme da Amazonia brasileira. Tese de Doutorado, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, 121 p.

SANTOS, J. R., 1988. Biomassa aérea da vegetação de cerrado, estimativa e correlação com dados do sensor Thematic Mapper do satélite Landsat. PhD Thesis, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil.

SANTOS, J.R., LACRUZ, M.S.P., ARAÚJO, L.S., KEIL, M., 2002. Savanna and tropical rainforest biomass estimation and spatialization using JERS-1 data. International Journal of Remote Sensing 23, 1217-1229.São José dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil.

SCHAEFER, C. E. G. R.; AMARAL, E. F.; MENDONÇA, B. A. F. de; OLIVEIRA, H.; LANI, J. L.; COSTA, L. M. FERNADES FILHO, E. I., 2008. Soil and vegetation carbon stocks in Brazilian Western Amazonia: relationships and ecological implications for natural landscapes. Environ Monit Assess (2008) 140:279-289.

SHIMABUKURO *et al*. 2004. Deforestation detection in Brazilian Amazon region in a near real time using Terra MODIS daily data. Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium, 2004. IGARSS '04. Proceedings. 2004 IEEE International (Volume:5) 20-24 Sept. 2004, 10.1109/IGARSS.2004.1370436.

SILVA, F.C. Compartilhamento de nutrientes em diferentes componentes da biomassa aérea em espécies arbóreas de um cerrado. 1990. 80 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ecologia) Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 1990.

SILVA, R. P. 2007. Alometria, estoque e dinâmica da biomassa de florestas primárias e secundárias na região de Manaus (AM). Tese de Doutorado. Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM), Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA), Manaus. 152 p. CDD 19. ed. 634.95.

SOUZA, C.M., ROBERTS, D. A., COCHRANE, M. A., 2005. Combining spectral and spatial information to map canopy damage from selective logging and forest fires. Remote Sensing of Environment 98, 329–343.

STEWART, B.A. (Eds.), Global Climate Change and Tropical Ecosystems. Crc Press Inc, Boca Raton, pp. 33-50.

TRUMBORE, S.E., DAVIDSON, E.A., DE CAMARGO, P.B., NEPSTAD, D.C. AND MARTINELLI, L.A. (1995). Belowground cycling of carbon in forests and pastures of Eastern Amazonia. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 9: doi: 10.1029/95GB02148. issn: 0886-6236.

UNFCCC, 2002. Decision 17/ CP. 8. Guidelines for the preparation of national communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention. FCCC/CP/2002/7/Add.2 ANNEX, p. 4-12. Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop8/07a02.pdf#page=2, last accessed on March 3rd, 2014.

UNFCCC, 2011. Annex. Guidelines for submissions of information on reference levels. In. Decision 12/ CP. 17. Guidance on systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected and modalities relating to forest reference emission levels and forest reference levels as referred to in decision 1/CP.16. FCCC/CP/2011/9/Add.2. p. 19. Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/cop17/eng/09a02.pdf#page=16, last accessed on January 5th, 2014.

UNFCCC, 2013. Decision 13/ CP.19. Guidelines and procedures for the technical assessment of submissions from Parties on proposed forest reference emission levels and/or forest reference levels. FCCC/CP/2013/10/Add.1. p. 34-38. Available at: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/cop19/eng/10a01.pdf, last accessed on December 23rd, 2017.

VALE, A. T. do & FELFILI, J. M., 2005. Dry biomass distribution in a cerrado sensu strict site in Central Brazil. R. Árvore, Viçosa-MG, v.29, n.5, p.661-669.

VALERIANO, D. M. & BITENCOURT-PEREIRA, M. D., 1988. Relationship between spectral reflectance and phytomass of the ground layer community of neotropical savanna (cerrado). Archives of the photogrammetric and remote sensing commission VII, 27 (B10), 649-657.

VERBRUGGEN, A., W. MOOMAW, J. NYBOER, 2011: Annex I: Glossary, Acronyms, Chemical Symbols and Prefixes. In IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation [O. EDENHOFER, R. PICHS-MADRUGA, Y. SOKONA, K. SEYBOTH, P. MATSCHOSS, S. KADNER, T. ZWICKEL, P. EICKEMEIER, G. HANSEN, S. SCHLOMER, C. VON STECHOW (eds)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. Available on http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/special-reports/srren/SRREN_Annex_Glossary.pdf, last accessed on March 24th, 2014.

Annexes

Annex I: Additional information

1. Amazonia Gross Deforestation Monitoring Project - PRODES

PRODES is part of a larger program (Amazonia Program) developed at INPE and provides annual wall-to-wall estimates of gross deforestation in the Legal Amazonia since 1988. It uses satellite imagery to identify annual deforestation polygons in areas of ***natural forest*** at each assessment (refer to ***Figure a.4***). Deforestation is associated with clear-cut activities associated with the elimination of natural forest land. Gross deforestation is assessed annually, on a wall-to-wall basis, encompassing the analysis of approximately 215 Landsat images, aided by additional Landsat class data (CBERS/CCD, REsourcSat/LISS3 and DMC) to reduce the incidence of cloud cover, with the minimum mapping area of 6.25 hectares.

BOX A.1: **PRODES minimum mapping area**

PRODES was set in 1988 to map deforestation over hardcopy prints of Landsat images at the 1:250,000 scale. Consistent data for gross deforestation are available on an annual basis since 1988. Minimum mapping unit was defined as 1 mm^2, which is equivalent to 6.25 ha in the surface. Since 2008, deforestation polygons with areas larger than 1 ha but smaller than 6.25 ha are retrieved in a separate dataset and registered as PRODES deforestation when they coalesce to a size larger than 6.25 ha. The consistency of the PRODES time series is ensured by using the same deforestation definition, same minimum mapping area, similar satellite spatial resolution[39], same Forest/Non-Forest vegetation boundaries, and same methodological approach to analyze the remotely sensed data at every new assessment.

At the beginning of PRODES in 1988, a map containing the boundary between Forest – Non-Forest was created based on existing vegetation maps and spectral characteristics of natural forest in Landsat satellite imagery. In 1987, all previously deforested areas were aggregated in a map (including deforestation in forest areas that in 1987 were secondary forests) and classified as ***deforestation***. Thereafter, on a yearly basis, deforestation in the Amazonia biome has been assessed on the remaining annually updated Forest.

Forest areas affected by forest degradation that do not have a clear-cut pattern in the satellite imagery are not included in PRODES. Two other projects are carried out by INPE to address forest degradation (refer to ***Annex III (Forest degradation in the Amazonia biome: preliminary thoughts)*** for more information). This ensures the consistency of the PRODES deforestation time series over time.

[39] Spatial resolution is the pixel size of an image associated with the size of the surface area being assessed on the ground. In the case of the Landsat satellite, the spatial resolution is 30 meters.

At the start of PRODES, deforestation polygons were identified by visual interpretation on false color composites of Landsat imagery at the scale of 1:250,000 and mapped on overlays that contained the aggregated deforestation up to the previous year. Subsequently these deforestation polygons were manually digitized in a Geographic Information System (GIS) developed at INPE. This analogical approach to assess deforestation (*Analog PRODES*) was employed from 1988 until 2002.

Due to the increased computing capability built at INPE, it was possible to transition from analogical to digital annual assessments of deforestation (*Digital PRODES*) after 2000, which was preceded by a 1997 ***digital base map***. *Digital PRODES* maintains full consistency with the *Analog PRODES* data. This includes consistency with the forest boundaries in *Analog PRODES* and the aggregated deforestation polygons. Despite the evolution to a digital assessment, the identification of the deforestation polygons continued to be carried out through visual interpretation in the screen and not through digital classification methods[40]. This ensured even greater consistency between the *Analog* and *Digital PRODES*.

Due to the large volume of analogic data when *Digital PRODES* started, INPE decided to map the deforestation polygons from years 1998 to 2000 on an aggregated deforestation map until 1997 (***digital base map***). Hence, the deforestation polygons for these years were lumped into a single digital database, with no discrimination of the specific year when deforestation occurred. From year 2000 onwards, the deforestation polygons have been annually assessed and included in the *Digital PRODES* database. The *Digital PRODES* allows for the visualization of the deforestation polygons every year, in a single file. Thus, the geographical expansion of deforestation, as well as its spatial pattern, can be assessed and monitored.

In summary, the **digital database** does not have individual deforestation information for years prior to 1997; it has information for years 1998 to 2000 in an aggregated format; and annual information (deforestation polygons) for all years since 2000.

Digital PRODES allowed INPE to make available through the web the deforestation maps in vector format, as well as all the satellite images used, thus ensuring full transparency to the public in general. Since 2003, INPE began to publish the annual deforestation rate in the web, together with all the satellite imagery used to generate the information, and the corresponding maps with the identification of deforestation polygons. Annually, INPE provides for the download of approximately 215 Landsat satellite images of Landsat5/7/8 (or similar data as CBERS/CCD, ResourceSat/LISS3 and DMC). Each image is accompanied by the associated map containing all past deforestation.

INPE continuously improves its tools to better manage large-scale projects such as PRODES. TerraAmazon is a system that manages the entire workflow of PRODES, annually storing approximately 600 images (e.g., Landsat, CBERS, DMC, ResourceSat). It performs geo-referencing, pre-processing and enhancement of images for subsequent

[40] INPE has developed alternative methodologies to identify deforestation increments in satellite imagery (e.g., linear mixture model, Shimabukuro *et al*., (2004)). However, the visual assessment demonstrated to be simpler and more efficient.

analysis in a multi-task, multi-processing environment. The database stores and manages approximately 4 million polygons.

There are some steps that are followed until the deforestation increments are identified in the satellite imagery. These are now detailed:



Figure a.1: Steps prior to identification of the deforested polygons.

Image selection

The first step consists of selecting the images to be used. For this, a query is conducted directly from INPE´s Image Generation Division (DGI) site (http://www.dgi.inpe.br/siteDgi_EN/index_EN.php) to identify (preferably) Landsat images (or similar) for the year of interest (usually corresponding to the months of July and August), with minimal cloud cover, better visibility and a suitable radiometric quality.

Satellite imagery available in the DGI are usually pre-processed for geometric correction and made available in UTM projection. ***Figure a.2*** shows an image from Landsat 5 selected in the DGI library.



Figure a.2: Landsat 5 (pathrow 227/65) of 01/07/2002 - Color composite Red, Green, Blue for bands 5,4,3, respectively,available on the DGI catalog .

Database and georeferencing

The next step consists of image geo-referencing (refer to ***Figure a.3***), which is carried out through visual collection of at least nine control points evenly distributed in coherent features (rivers, roads intersection) in the image to be geo-referenced. INPE uses as reference data the orthorectified Landsat mosaic for the year 2000, produced by Geocover NASA project (https:// zulu.ssc.nasa.gov / MrSID). The geo-referencing is carried out by linear matrix transformation of first or second order, depending on the image quality, with transformation parameters obtained by least-square method applied to the set of control points.



Figure a.3**:** An example of control points collection.

Contrast enhancement

Finally, the technique of contrast enhancement may be applied to improve the quality of the images under the subjective criteria of the human eye. The contrast between two objects may be defined as the ratio between their average gray levels.

The goal at this step is to increase the contrast to facilitate the visual discrimination of objects in the image.

Calculating deforestation rates based on deforestation increments

Deforestation rate calculations are elaborate, and have as a basis the information on deforestation increments (refer to ***Table a.1***). The simple sum of the mapped, observed deforestation polygons, is the deforestation increment.

Table a.1: Deforestation increments vs deforestation rates. ***Source:*** INPE, 2014.

Deforestation Increments	**Deforestation Rates**
Area measured directly from image interpretation Calculated for each pair of LANDSAT imagery Date of image acquisition maintained	Area estimated Interpolated to a reference date (August 1st) Estimates deforestation under cloud covered areas



Figure a.4: Deforestation polygon as shown by PRODES. Source: INPE, 2014.

It should be noted that up to 2000, the Landsat TM scenes 222/61 and 222/62 were never considered by PRODES since they were persistently covered by clouds. In 2001, it was possible to observe these scenes. It was then verified that a large area was cleared in these scenes, leading to a high deforestation increment at that year (2001). This implies that there will be a substantial difference between increments and rates in years before 2001.

In early 2000s, there was a preference for scenes without clouds, even when they were acquired many days before the date of reference (August 1st). In order to avoid discrepancies between the deforestation rates and the deforestation increments, a limit to

the number of days above or below the reference data was established. In 2004, INPE decided to select only the images with dates as close as possible to the reference date, so that after 2005/2006, the discrepancies between deforestation rates and deforestation increment became very small.

Comparing the emissions estimates: deforestation rates vs. adjusted increments

Deforestation rates were not the basis for the FREL calculations. The FREL was calculated on the basis of a different approach: the adjusted deforestation increments.

Until 2001, PRODES maps containing the deforestation polygons were analogic. This constrained the superposition of these maps with the carbon map adopted in this FREL. As an exercise, the annual CO_2 emissions per year were calculated taking as a basis the deforestation rates from PRODES and applying the average carbon stock per unit area (tC ha^{-1}). This was done to assess the average difference in CO_2 emissions using the annual rates of gross deforestation from PRODES and the emission estimates presented in this submission for years 1996 – 2015 based on the adjusted increments using data from 2011-2015 (third column in ***Table 2***). The formula used was:

Deforestation rate (ha)/year * 151.6 tC/ha * 44/12

Table A.2: Emission estimates from PRODES and FREL deforestation adjusted data (in ha) and related CO_2 adjusted emissions (tCO_2), using data from 2011-2015.

YEAR	DEFORESTATION PRODES (HA)	DEFORESTATION FREL INC (HA)	EMISSION PRODES (tCO2) AVERAGE CO2 151,6 tC/ha	EMISSION FREL (tCO2)
1996*	1816100	1874013	1009509453	979.523.618
1997*	1322700	1874013	735244840	979.523.618
1998*	1738300	1874013	966263026,7	979.523.618
1999*	1725900	1874013	959370280	979.523.618
2000*	1822600	1874014	1013122587	979.523.849
2001*	1816500	1949332	1009731800	908.964.575
2002*	2165100	2466605	1203506920	1.334.458.299
2003*	2539600	2558848	1411678987	1.375.224.078
2004*	2777200	2479432	1543752907	1.380.142.199
2005*	1901400	2176233	1056924880	1.163.879.135
2006*	1428600	1033687	794111120	576.136.731
2007*	1165100	1088546	647640253,3	609.101.478
2008*	1291100	1237179	717679453,3	669.215.058
2009*	746400	608155	414898880	373.066.457
2010*	700000	610642	389106666,7	362.507.087
2011	641800	501406	356755226,7	285.507.798
2012	457100	425499	254086653,3	236.684.154
2013	589100	537857	327461053,3	301.847.851
2014	501200	490851	278600373,3	273.591.601
2015	620700	524056	345026440	287.665.246

AVERAGE EMISSIONS 1996-2015	**772.734.590**	**751.780.504**
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AVERAGE PRODES AND FREL C		**20.954.086**
PERCENT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN VALUES 1996-2015		**2.71%**
AVERAGE ADJUSTED INCREMENTS 1996-2015	**1,388,325**	**1,402,920**
DIFFERENCE AVERAGE BETWEEN PRODES AND FREL C		**14,595**
PERCENT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MEAN VALUES 2001-2015		**1.05%**

The average emissions from 1996 through 2015, using PRODES rates were **772,734,590 tCO_2** and those by the FREL was **751,780,504 tCO_2**. Since the FREL C uses the average CO_2 emissions of 20 years, the annual differences balance out at the end, being only 2.71%. The difference between the average area in PRODES and FREL is 1.05% for the period 1996-2015. Details can be found in http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub, directory "***Other relevant information and data***", file "***WORKSHEET_FREL_C***", ***rows 60 - 86***, ***columns A – G.*** Note that PRODES data presented in Table a.2 refers to deforestation in the Legal Amazonia, and not in the Amazonia biome.

2. PPCDAm: Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Legal Amazonia

The increasing trend of deforestation in the Legal Amazonia since year 2000 led the Federal Government to establish, in 2003, a Permanent Interministerial Working Group (GPTI – Grupo Permanente de Trabalho Interministerial) through Decree s/n, July 3rd, to identify and promote coordinated actions aimed at reducing deforestation rates in Legal Amazonia. The GPTI was coordinated by the Chief of Staff of the Presidency until 2013 and is currently being coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment (MMA).

The GPTI was responsible for the development of the Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Legal Amazonia – PPCDAm, created in 2004, and which identified a number of measures, policies and actions to reverse the deforestation trend.

Since 2004, the Federal Government has been working in coordination with the various stakeholders, including state and municipal governments as well as the civil society, to promote a sustainable model of forest resource use and agricultural practices. PPCDAm is structured in three thematic axis that direct government actions towards reducing deforestation: i) Land Tenure and Territorial Planning; ii) Environmental Monitoring and Control, and iii) Fostering Sustainable Production Activities.

Throughout four phases of implementation (2004 to 2008; 2009 to 2011; 2012 to 2015; and 2016 to 2020), PPCDAm played a significant role in dramatically reducing deforestation in the Amazon and encouraged initiatives to fight deforestation in other sectors in the Brazilian society. Deforestation rate reached its lowest level in 2012, when 457,100 ha were registered. The four lowest deforestation rates in history were observed

during the 3rd PPCDAm phase (2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015), but they presented variations in the decrease trend.

The **4th PPCDAm phase (2016-2020)** seeks a more strategic action in the three axes and the creation of a fourth axis, with **normative and economic instruments**, intended to create mechanisms that foster the forest-based economy and that contribute to the development of a productive and economically competitive matrix, with the least possible impact on the forest.

Relevant Link: http://combateaodesmatamento.mma.gov.br/

Annex II: Examples to support this FREL submission

All excel files mentioned in this example are available in its complete form through the link: **http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub**.

1. Example of the calculation of adjusted deforestation increment and associated CO_2 emission for the year 2003

The file **"calculo_def_increment_emission_2003"** presents, for year 2003, the area of the deforestation polygons by forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume (***activity data***); and the carbon density associated with each polygon (***emission factor***) necessary for the calculation of the deforestation increment that precedes the calculation of the adjusted deforestation increment and the associated emissions. It results from data in ***tab "2003"*** in the file "**calculo_def_increment_emission_2003"** that presents individual information for each of the 402,175 deforestation polygons identified in Landsat satellite imagery at year 2003.

Lines 3 to 32 provide, for each forest type (line) and RADAMBRASIL volume (column) the total area of the deforestation polygons that fall under the corresponding line and column. For instance, the value 1,205.9 ha in row 5, column C, refers to the sum of the areas indicated in ***tab "2003"*** associated with forest type AA and RADAMBRASIL volume 3. The area deforested in each volume is presented in line 32 and columns B to X, respectively; and the total area (***deforestation increment***) presented in cell Y32 (***2,781,345 hectares*** or ***27,813 km^2***). Column Y, lines 5 to 30 provide the area deforested per forest types, and columns Z and AA provide the ratio and percent contribution of each forest type to the deforestation increment. In column AA, the cells shaded in yellow refer to the forest types in ***Table 6*** (75.6%); those in orange, to the forest types in ***Table 7*** (23.8%); and those in blue, to "new" forest types (refer to ***Box A.2 below***) (0.4%). From column AA it can be observed that approximately 84% of the deforestation polygons occurred in only four forest types (25% in forest type As; 15% in Db; 27% in Ds; and 17% in Fs).

BOX A.2 **: Additional "forest types"**

As a result of the technical assessment and disaggregation of the data by forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume, it was observed that few deforestation polygons fell over forest types that were not included in ***Tables 6*** and ***7***, as follows: Lb (campinarana = 21.63 tC ha^{-1}); Lg (campinarana gramíneo-lenhosa, depression = 25.31 tC ha^{-1}); Rm (refúgio montano = 6.55 tC ha^{-1}); Sg (savanna gramíneo-lenhosa, campo =16.30 tCha^{-1}) and Sp (cerrado parque; savanna parque = 24.10 tCha^{-1}).

The contribution of these forest types to the deforestation increment and associated emission is minor and highlighted in blue in column AA. For instance, for 2004 these forest types contributed 0.36% to the deforestation increment and to 0.015% of the total CO_2 emissions; in 2005, the contribution to the deforestation increment was 0.29%, and 0.011% to the total emissions.

Lines 34 to 61 provide the carbon densities per forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume used to estimate the emissions associated with the deforestation polygons (as per ***Table 6***, ***Table 7*** and ***BOX A.2*** above).

Lines 64 to 91 provide, for each volume and forest type, the area of the deforestation polygons (as per data in lines 5 to 31); associated carbon densities (as per lines 36 to 61); and associated emission (in tC) (resulting from the product of the areas and carbon densities). For example, for volume 2:

(i) column A, lines 65 to 91 (A65 – A 91) reproduces the area of the deforestation polygons provided in B5 – B30 (activity data);

(ii) B65 – B92 reproduces the carbon densities presented in B36 – B61 (emission factor);

(iii) C65-C91 provides the product between the activity data in column A and the emission factor in column B.

Line 92 provides, for each RADAMBRASIL volume, the area of the deforestation polygons (highlighted in green) and the associated emissions (highlighted in yellow). The deforestation increment observed in 2003 was ***2,781,345 ha*** (BS 92) or 27,813.45 km^2 (BS 93); and the total emission was ***411,592,418 tC*** (BS 95) or ***1,509,152,482 tCO_2*** (BS 96). Note that the deforestation increment is the same as that obtained from the sum of the individual areas of the 402,175 deforestation polygons in file **"calculo_def_increment_emission_2003"**

The complete excel file, available through the link (**http://redd.mma.gov.br/en/infohub**) also contains some interesting information.

Lines 94 to 118, column A, for instance, reproduce the areas presented in line 92 for all volumes (highlighted in green) and the deforestation increment in line 118 (2,781,345 ha); columns B and C for the corresponding lines present the ratio between the area deforested for each volume and the deforestation increment (total observed area deforested) and the corresponding percentage, respectively. It is to be noted that deforestation events do not occur evenly among the RADAMBRASIL volumes, but concentrate mainly (69.7%) in volumes 4, 5, 16, 20, 22 and 26. From the figure provided in lines 96-120, columns F to M (corresponding to ***Figure 14*** in the text of the submission) it can be seen that these volumes cover the area of the "Arc of Deforestation" in the Amazonia biome. The concentration of the deforestation polygons in these volumes is also observed for other years.

If the information on these volumes is individualized (see lines 120-149 for volume 4; lines 153-181 for volume 5; lines 184-212 for volume 16; lines 215-244 for volume 20; lines 247-276 for volume 22; and lines 279-308 for volume 26), then column F provides the forest types most affected by deforestation events in these relevant volumes. One notes that in all these volumes, the largest percentage of the deforestation polygons fell over at least 2 and at most 3 out of the 22 (+5) forest types. For ***volume 4***, 99.0% of the deforestation polygons fell over forest types AS and DS; for ***volume 5***, 91.87% over DB and DS; for ***volume 16***, 96.86% over forest types AS, DS and FS; for ***volume 22***, 96.32% over AS, FS and SD; and finally for ***volume 26***, 84.85% over forest types AS and FS. Hence, none of the deforestation polygons fell over "new" deforestation types (refer to ***Box A.2*** above) and most fell over forest types with data from RADAMBRASIL sample

units (***Table 6*** – forest types AB, AS, DS, DB) and few over forest types with data from the literature (***Table 7*** – FS and SD).

The bar diagrams in columns H to AB, lines 122 – 299 show the range of the carbon densities associated with the corresponding forest type and RADAMBRASIL volume, from the lowest to the highest value. The arrows indicate the value of the carbon density used.

Note that the figure provided in BS 93 for the deforestation increment (in km^2) is not the same as that presented in *Table 1* for year 2003. The difference is explained by the fact that in 2002 some satellite images were cloud covered and the adjusted deforestation increment approach was applied (refer to *Box 3* of the FREL´s main text).

The file **"verification_2003_area_emissao"** provides the data necessary to calculate the **adjusted deforestation increment** and associated CO_2 emissions. It includes information over cloud-covered area and the distribution of areas among years, so as not to under nor overestimate the total area deforested at any year (refer to ***Box 3*** of the FREL´s main text).

Lines 6 to 68, columns A to J, provide information on the following, per RADAMBRASIL volume: (i) satellite image (row labels) of interest (i.e., the Path/Row information on the Landsat images for which adjustment will be applied to the associated deforestation increment); (ii) the area of the deforestation polygons observed in 2003 over areas that were cloud covered in 2002 and corresponding emissions (Soma_de_area_hectares; Soma de emiss_am**)**; (iii) the forest types associated with the deforestation polygons observed in 2003 over areas cloud covered in 2002 (column A); (iv) the associated RADAMBRASIL volume (row 4).

For instance, the value ***28,068.05 ha*** in line 8 column I represents the sum of the areas of the deforestation polygons observed at year 2003 over areas that were cloud-covered in years 2002 and 2001 in ***Landsat Path/Row 225/59***. This area concentrated in ***volume 6*** of RADAMBRASIL and the deforestation polygons were associated with forest types AA, DA, DB, PA, PF, SA, SD, SG and SP, as indicated in lines 9 to 18. ***Tab "22559"*** in the file **"verification_2003_area_emissao"** gives the list of the deforestation polygons (a total of 3,441) stratified by forest type (c_pret in column A), and the associated areas (in column G, in hectares) and emissions (in column E, in tC) for this satellite scene. The emission associated with the deforestation polygons falling in forest type AA, for instance, is calculated using the carbon density for forest type AA in volume 6 in ***Table 6*** (123,75 tC), totaling 309.121,53 tC (refer to line 9, column F of tab ***verification_2003***). For the ***Landsat Path/Row 225/59***, a total of 3.295.357,34 tC of emissions resulted from the previously cloud covered areas (refer to line 8, column F in tab ***verification_2003)***. Due to the fact that these polygons fell over an area in the satellite imagery that was cloud-covered in 2002 and 2001, the area of 28,068.05 ha and corresponding emission of 3,295,357.34 tC was evenly distributed among the deforestation increment for 2002 and 2001. This implied the division of these values by 3, resulting in a shared area of 9,356.02 ha and shared emission of 1,098,452.45 tC. So, the original area of 28,068.05 ha is subtracted from the 2003 deforestation increment (2,781,345.04 ha) and replaced by 9,356.02 ha. This value is added to the deforestation increment of 2002 and 2001.

***BOX A.3*: Independent Verification**

For the sake of verifiability, the original data for Landsat scene 225/59 have been reproduced in tab "22559" in file **"verification_2003_area_emissao"** for all forest types. Refer to lines 2-262 columns I to P for forest type AA (carbon density = 123.75 tC, ***Table 6***); to lines 2-783 columns Q to X for forest type DA (carbon density = 131.82 tC, ***Table 6***); to lines 2-600 columns Z to AG for forest type DB (carbon density = 222.39 tC, ***Table 6***); to lines 2-405 columns AI to AP for forest type PA (carbon density = 105.64 tC, ***Table 7***); to lines 2-140 columns AR to AY for forest type PF (carbon density = 98.16 tC, ***Table 7***); to lines 2-14 columns BA to BH for forest type SA (carbon density = 47.10 tC, ***Table 7***); to lines 2-380 columns BJ - BQ for forest type SD (carbon density = 77.8 tC, ***Table 7***); to lines 2-28 columns BS to BZ for forest type SG (carbon density = 16.3 tC, ***Box A.2***, Additional Forest Types); and to lines 2-447 columns CB to CI for forest type SP (carbon density = 24.10 tC, Box A.2, Additional Forest Types). Note that the values highlighted in yellow (emissions) and green (area) in lines 263 (for AA); 784 (for DA); 601 (for DB); 406 (for PA); 141 (for PF); 15 (for SA); 381 (for SD); 29 (for SG); and 448 (for SP) correspond to the figures presented for Landsat scene 225/59 in columns F (for emissions) and G (for area) for forest types AA (line 9); DA (line 10); DB (line 11); PA (line 12); PF (line 13); SA (line 15); SD (line 16); SG (line 17); and SP (line 18) in tab ***verification_2003***. Note that the columns shaded in grey for each forest type (columns P, X, AG, AP, AY, BH, BQ, BZ, and CI for forest types AA, DA, DB, PA, PF, SA, SD, SG, and SP, respectively is the verification column for the emissions. It results from the multiplication of the area (in hectares) by the carbon densities corresponding to the forest type in ***Table 6***, ***Table 7*** or ***Box A.2*** above (Additional Forest Types). Note that the original emissions (highlighted in yellow) and those reproduced independently (highlighted in grey) most likely due to the number of decimal places used for the carbon densities. The original data (area and emissions) originate from the database and has its own internal functions (decimal places, order of applying operations, etc.). However, the numbers have been closely reproduced.

The same procedure applies for Landsat scenes 224/60; 225/63; 226/58; 226/59; 226/60; 226/61; 226/62; 226/63; and 227/58 which, together, present an area of ***368,979.57 ha*** of observed deforestation polygons at year 2003 that was cloud covered in the previous year or years, distributed as follows: scenes 224/60, ***35.67 ha***; 225/59, ***28,068.05 ha***; 225/63, ***24,355.22 ha***; 226/58, ***5,248.91 ha***; 226/59, ***85.74 ha***; 226/60, ***6,483.50 ha***; 226/61, ***4,457.58 ha***; 226/62, ***218,283.72 ha***; 226/63, ***81,960.44 ha***; and 227/58, ***0.72 ha***. These observed areas in 2003 were cloud-covered in ***2002*** or ***2002 and 2001***, as follows: scenes 224/60, cloud-covered in 2002; 225/59, cloud-covered in 2001 and 2002; 225/63, cloud-covered in 2002; 226/58, cloud-covered in 2002; 226/59, cloud-covered in 2002; 226/60, cloud-covered in 2001 and 2002; 226/61, cloud-covered in 2002; 226/62, cloud-covered in 2001 and 2002; 226/63, cloud-covered in 2002; and 227/58, cloud-covered in 2002. Note that part of the area ***368,979.57 ha*** is subtracted from the observed deforestation increment at year 2003 and is distributed among years 2001 and/or 2002, as applicable. Column J shows the portion of this area that is summed to the deforestation increment calculated for years 2001 and/or 2002 (corresponding to the area to be subtracted from the deforestation increment calculated for year 2003). Half of the area indicated in column J line 6 for scene 224/60 (***17.84 ha***) is added to the 2002 deforestation increment and half remains in the 2003 deforestation increment; one third of the area indicated in column J line 8 for scene 225/59 (***9,356.02 ha***) is added to the 2001 deforestation increment; one

third is added to the 2002 deforestation increment and one third remains in the 2003 deforestation increment.

Table A.3 shows the distribution of the area of the deforestation polygons observed in 2003 under cloud-cover areas in the satellite images in 2002 or 2001 and 2002.

Table a.3 - Distribution of the area of the deforestation polygons observed in 2003 under cloud-cover areas in the satellite images in 2002 or 2001 and 2002.

	2003	**2002**	**2001**	**Total area**
224/60	17.84	17.84		35,67
225/59	9,356.02	9,356.02	9,356.02	28.068,05
225/63	12,177.61	12,177.61		24.355,22
226/58	2,624.46	2,624.46		5.248,91
226/59	42.87	42.87		85,74
226/60	2,161.17	2,161.17	2,161.17	6.483,50
226/61	2,228.79	2,228.79		4.457,58
226/62	72,761.24	72,761.24	72,761.24	218.283,72
226/63	40,980.22	40,980.22		81.960,44
227/58	0.36	0.36		0,72
TOTAL	142,350.57	142,350.57	84,278.43	368,979.57

The figures in ***Table A.1*** above show that out of the area of ***368,979.57 ha*** associated to deforestation polygons observed in 2003 over areas that were cloud covered in years 2002 or 2001 and 2002, ***142,350.57 ha*** was attributed to year 2003; ***142,350.57 ha*** was attributed to year 2002; and ***84,278.43 ha*** was attributed to year 2001, thus implying the addition of these quantities to the deforestation increment calculated for these years.

Relating these values to ***Equation 1*** in the submission:

The value ***368,979.57 ha*** corresponds to term $\sum_{\Delta=1} A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)}$.

The value ***142,350.57 ha*** corresponds to term

$$\sum_{\Delta=1}^{Y} \frac{A_{CC(t-\Delta),(t)}}{\Delta+1} = \frac{A_{CC(t-1),(t)}}{2} + \frac{A_{CC(t-2),(t)}}{3} = \frac{116{,}144.29}{2} + \frac{252{,}835.28}{3}$$

$$= 58{,}072.14 + 84{,}278.43 = 142{,}350.57$$

The value 116,144.29 refers to term $A_{CC(t-1),(t)}$ and the value 252,835.28 to term $A_{CC(t-2),(t)}$ in ***Equation 1***.

The value ***116,144.29 ha*** corresponds to the sum of the areas associated with Landsat scene 224/60 (35.67 ha); 225/63 (24,355.22 ha); 226/58 (5,248.91 ha); 226/59 (85.74 ha);

226/61 (4,457.58 ha); 226/63 (81,960.44 ha). The area ***252,835.28 ha*** is associated to Landsat scenes 225/59 (28,068.05 ha); 226/60 (6,483.50 ha) and 226/62 (218,283.72 ha).

The term $\sum_{\Omega=1}^{Y} \frac{A_{CC(t+\Omega),(t)}}{\Omega+1} = 0$, since there were no cloud-covered areas in 2003 (thus, not requiring distribution of area from 2004 to 2003).

Turning now to the **distribution of the emissions** associated with the areas transferred to years 2002 or 2001 **and** 2002.

Lines 2 – 81, columns Q to W provide the verification of the emissions reported in the information from lines 3 to 68, columns A to I. The emissions are estimated using the carbon densities per unit area (tC ha^{-1}) provided in ***Tables 6*** and ***7*** and ***Box A.2*** in Annex II.1, and hence it is to be expected that the numbers do not completely match due to the number of decimal places used and order of the functions performed.

The emissions associated with each satellite image are summarized in lines 1 to 23, columns L to O (the totals presented originate from the calculations performed in columns Q to W – values highlighted in yellow -individually or totals). The emissions associated with the deforestation polygons in 2003 over areas that were cloud covered in year 2002 or 2001 and 2002 totaled ***74,179,069.36 tC***. Column X indicates how this area will be distributed among years 2002 and 2001 (divide by 2 in case the area was cloud-covered in 2002; divide by 3 if the area was cloud-covered in years 2001 and 2002, and was observed in 2003). Column Y provides the individual values to be reallocated.

Table A,4 shows the distribution of the emissions associated with the deforestation polygons observed in 2003 under cloud-cover areas in the satellite images in 2002 or 2001 and 2002.

Table a.4 - Distribution of the emissions associated with the deforestation polygons observed in 2003 under cloud-cover areas in the satellite images in 2002 or 2001 and 2002.

	2003	**2002**	**2001**	**Total emissions**
224/60	3,302.22	3,302.22		6,604,44
225/59	1,097,478.97	1,097,478.97	1,097,478.97	3,292,436.91
225/63	2,329,889.95	2,329,889.95		4,659,779.9
226/58	574,005.21	574,005.21		1,148,010.42
226/59	9,467.20	9,467.20		18,934.40
226/60	325,830.63	325,830.63	325,830.63	977,491.89
226/61	409,717.70	409,717.70		819,435.40
226/62	16,286,514.94	16,286,514.94	16,286,514.94	48,859,544.82
226/63	7,198,338.73	7,198,338.73		14,396,677.46
227/58	76.88	76.88		153.76
TOTAL	28,234,622.43	28,234,622.43	17,709,824.54	74,179,069.40

Columns AB and AC, rows 2 to 21 show a summary of the verification of the adjusted deforestation increment and corresponding emissions, where it can be observed that the differences were minor, given the different mode of calculation adopted in this example and that carried out for this submission.

2. Example of the calculation of the carbon density associated with a forest type

This example aims at facilitating the understanding of the application of ***Equations 5***, ***6*** and ***9*** in the main text of the submission. The original RADAMBRASIL data will be applied, *i.e.*, the values of the circumference at breast height (CBH) collected on the sample units to the allometric equation by Higuchi *et al*., 1998. The objective in this example is to reproduce the carbon density per unit area presented for forest type ***Ab*** in RADAMBRASIL ***volume 18*** (refer to ***Table 6*** of the submission).

File "equations_569_volume18_Ab"
contains the data necessary to reproduce the carbon density for forest type Ab in volume 18, equal to 213.37 tC **(*Table 6*).**

Column A – Circumference at Breast Height (CBH)
For sample unit 1 : lines 4 to 73
For sample unit 2 : lines 77 to 113
For sample unitt 3: lines 117 – 201
For sample unit 4 : lines 206 – 263

Column B – Conversion of CBH to Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) (by multiplying by 3,1416 (refer to footnote 27 in the submission) or multiplying by 113/355:

Columns C, D, E and **F** refer to the data necessary to apply the allometric equation (***Equation 5***) reproduced below.

$$\ln P = -0.151 + 2.170 \times \ln DBH \qquad \textit{Equation 5}$$

Column C – Natural logarithm of the DBH values (ln DBH)
Column D – Product of column C by 2.170
Column E – Value in column D - 0.151
Column F – Transforming natural logarithm of P (ln P) into P
Column G – Applying Equation 6, reproduced below, multiplying data in column F by 0,2859

$$C_{(CBH > 100\ cm)} = 0.2859 \times P \qquad \textit{Equation 6}$$

Column H – ***Transforming the data provided in kg of fresh biomass in column G to tonnes, by multiplying by 1,000*.**

Column H, line 74 – Total carbon stock in sample unit 1, necessary for application of

Equation 9, reproduced below. It is the sum of the carbon stock of all trees in the sampling plot**.**

$C_{total,\ SU} = 1.9384 \times AC_{(CBH > 100\ cm)}$ ***Equation 9***

where*:*
$C_{total,\ SU}$ = total carbon stock in living biomass (above and below-ground) for all trees, palms and vines in the sample unit; tC ha^{-1};

$AC_{(CBH > 100\ cm)}$ = total carbon stock in a sample unit from trees with CBH > 100 cm; tC ha^{-1}

Column H, line 75 – Product of the value in column H, line 76 by 1,9384 to obtain the total carbon stock in living biomass (above and below-ground) for all trees, lianas and palms in sample unit 1.

Repetition of the steps above for the three other sample units: the total carbon stock in living biomass (above and below-ground, including vines and palms) for all trees in sample units 2, 3 and 4 are provided in Column H, lines 115, 203 and 265, respectively.

Since there were four sample units in Volume 18 for forest type Ab, ***Rule 1*** in ***Step 5*** (***Step 5:*** *Application of extrapolation rules to estimate the carbon density associated with forest types in each volume of RADAMBRASIL*) can be used to generate the average carbon stock for forest type Ab in that volume.

Following ***Rule 1***, the simple average of the values in column I lines 75, 115, 203, and 265 is presented in **Column B, line 276.**

Annex III: Forest degradation in the Amazonia biome: preliminary thoughts

Paragraph 31 of the technical assessment report of the first submission of FREL Amazonia considered the information provided by Brazil regarding forest degradation (Annex III of that submission) as a good start to understand its dynamics. Brazil recognizes the importance of better understanding this process, to provide forest degradation emissions.

To further discuss these points, the GTT-REDD+ proposed a definition of forest degradation in the Amazonia biome for REDD+ purposes:

> *Process of changing forest structure and/or composition, resulting from anthropogenic action, which leads to the continuous reduction of its capacity to provide ecosystem goods and services."*

The Group agreed to this definition as a **starting point** to discuss aspects related to the monitoring of forest degradation and also agreed to revise it, if necessary and as appropriate, as the discussions evolve.

The GTT-REDD+ limited the concept of degradation to those resulting from direct anthropogenic actions. Therefore, according to the results of the discussions in the group, the reduction of the removal of carbon from the atmosphere caused by prolonged droughts, temperature increases, storms and blow-downs was not considered, even though anthropogenic actions might contribute to these processes. The experts agreed on two main vectors of forest degradation in the Amazonia: illegal logging and forest fires (refer to ***Figure a.5***). Also, when considering the process of forest degradation, a new component also stands out: natural regrowth. It is complex to identify these processes using remotely sensed tools. However, Brazil continues its efforts to progress discussions on the best tools to generate as accurate as possible estimates of forest degradation.

BOX A.4. Pragmatic approach to forest degradation

Presently, the GTT REDD+ is discussing a pragmatic approach to address forest degradation, based on data from the National Inventory. As mentioned in the main text of this submission, deforestation in Amazonia is associated with suppression of natural forest, which means canopy cover equal to zero over an area that previously met the forest criteria of minimum height equal to 5 meters, minimum area of 1 ha, and minimum canopy cover of 30%. One can then deduce that forest degradation would be any loss of carbon in natural forest that is not associated with elimination

of the forest. This approach is not consistent with the above definition suggested by GT REDD+, which refers to **continuous reduction** of the capacity of the forest to provide

ecosystem goods and services. The pragmatic approach will resemble more closely the carbon stock change approach in the IPCC GPG LULUCF (IPCC, 2003) of loss and gain.

Figure a.5. Pictorial representation of degradation process, elaborated by GTT-REDD + in 2015.

In most areas of Brazil, forest fires are frequent and almost entirely associated with human activities. In many cases, fire spreads over underground vegetation and depending on its intensity, results also in damage to the native vegetation. In addition to the negative short-term effects, there are also long-term harmful ones, such as soil carbon cycle damage, or regrowth of shrub and tree species, favoring the entry of invasive species.

Illegal logging can also result in forest degradation, but through a different dynamic. The withdrawal of trees in a natural ecosystem has long-term effects due to the dynamics of succession. Depending on the species that are removed, disturbance in the ecosystem can facilitate the entry of invasive grasses, which facilitate the spread of fires in the understory of forests and increase the vulnerability of these areas to recurrent fire events. It is important to emphasize that the understanding of the GTT-REDD+ is that authorized logging, guided by a management plan, should not be considered forest degradation.

INPE established in 2007 the Mapping System for Forest Degradation in the Brazilian Amazon (DEGRAD in the Portuguese acronym), designed to map the areas in the process of deforestation where the forest cover has not yet been completely removed. The mapping is based on indirect signs of selective logging (such as trails, roads, patios) or forest fires (vegetation burning scars). INPE produced data in this initiative from 2007 to 2013, based on the same set of images used for PRODES for these years. DEGRAD is

performed independently each year, without taking into account the record of degraded forests from previous years, identifying only the updates of the deforested areas recorded by PRODES.

Another monitoring system developed by INPE is the Real-Time Deforestation Detection System (DETER in the Portuguese acronym), initiated in 2004 to support law enforcement with daily information of potential deforestation fronts. With this system, it is possible to detect only changes in the forest cover with an area larger than 25 ha and, due to cloud cover, not all changes are identified. In 2016, to improve the spatial resolution of detection, the Deforestation and Forest Cover Change Detection System in Near Real Time (DETER-B in the Portuguese acronym) was launched. With the change in deforestation patterns, in which the smaller areas have become more frequent, the system identifies and maps, in real time, deforestation and other changes in forest cover with a minimum area of 1 ha. The identification of the forest cover change pattern is done by visual interpretation and maps deforestation, degradation and logging, then subdivided into second order classes. The system has attributes to provide useful data to the MRV of forest degradation. More recently, DETER-C is being used on a trial basis, mapping deforestation fronts with a minimum area of 30 cm.

Experts agree that Brazil has the potential to assess forest degradation activity. However, to produce emission estimates for forest degradation, a reflection on the temporal aspect of these emissions is necessary. After all, because it does not characterize land use conversion, it should be considered the carbon stocks of eventual vegetation regrowth, especially in areas not exposed to constant anthropogenic pressures such as recurrence of forest fires or illegal logging. Given the difficulty of objectively establishing levels of forest degradation intensity and also account the recovery of the vegetation in the same area during time, the GTT REDD + evaluated that the use of remote sensing tools for the mapping of forest degradation is a challenge at this point. On the other hand, progress in the elaboration of the National Forest Inventory of Brazil will bring important elements to this discussion by including degradation as a component of forest quality assessment.

On October 2017, a Technical-Scientific Seminar on Degradation and Forest Regrowth (Secondary Vegetation) in the Amazonia and Cerrado biomes was held and attended by representatives of Brazilian research institutions and universities, of federal environmental agencies and of some countries representatives from the Amazonia Basin. The objective was to better understand the forest dynamics in these biomes to provide inputs for future REDD+ submissions to the UNFCCC. In three days of work, the individual presentations from researchers as well as results from group discussions provided valuable inputs to create or improve Brazilian policies on climate change and forests. Experts agreed that, unlike the reality for deforestation, better understanding of forest degradation and forest regrowth may require the production of new data by research institutions, as well as the assessment of the latest remote sensing products.

The major challenge of monitoring and addressing forest degradation adequately (in particular in relation to the anthropogenic contribution to the associated emissions) lies in the ability to accurately assess the changes of carbon stock in the areas affected by

degradation, particularly aboveground biomass. Degradation may have different intensities, from very low (where few trees are removed) to very high (where, *most likely*, the land will be deforested at some point in time).

DEGRAD time series is not long enough to allow a good understanding of the degradation process and hence, for Brazil to include the REDD+ activity "Reducing Emissions from Forest Degradation" in this submission. It is expected that this understanding improves with time, as new data become available. Forest degradation has not been included in the construction of this FREL, to ensure a conservative approach for REDD+ results-based payments.

The data indicates that, on average, the emissions associated with forest degradation in the Amazonia biome, from 2007 to 2010 inclusive, are approximately 59.0% of those from deforestation. It is to be noted that the pattern of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation show some correspondence in the time series from 2007 to 2010 (a decrease in one is followed by a decrease in the other, and vice versa), as can be seen from ***Figure a.6***.

In the calculation of the percentage indicated above (see ***IMPORTANT REMARK*** below), it was assumed that the average loss of carbon in the areas affected by degradation was 33% (consistent with the value in the II National GHG Inventory). This percentage was assumed for the loss of carbon from selective logging and may not represent the average loss for forests impacted by degradation events in general.



Figure a.6. Emissions (in tCO_2) from deforestation and from forest degradation in the Amazonia biome for years 2007 to 2010, inclusive.

IMPORTANT REMARK 1: The emissions from forest degradation have been estimated using the area of forest degradation identified in DEGRAD; the mean carbon density in forest types in the Amazonia biome (151.6 tC ha^{-1}) is referred to ***section b.2*** in the main text of this submission); and an estimate of the average carbon loss from forest degradation, assumed as 33%, after Asner *et al*., 2005 and consistent with the II National GHG Inventory. An expert judgement from the Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) indicated a similar estimate for selectively logged areas. For information on this issue in the II National Inventory, refer to BRASIL (2010); Chapter 3, page 228.

Annex IV: From subnational to national approach (all biomes)

The Ministry of the Environment has established the Brazilian Biomes Environmental Monitoring Program for the monitoring of deforestation, land cover and land use, selective logging, forest fires and recovery of natural vegetation, through MMA Ordinance no. 365, of November 27, 2015.

Historically, with the development of geoprocessing and remote sensing technologies, Brazil has become a benchmark in the development and deployment of land cover/use monitoring systems. The resulting intelligence on the dynamics of land-use change has been a key element for curbing deforestation in the Amazon.

Since the 1970's, INPE, EMBRAPA and the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE, for the acronym in Portuguese) have established and strengthened strategic partnerships to develop technologies and methodologies to monitor the Brazilian territory through, for example, the monitoring of forests and wildfires. This enabled an ongoing flow of qualified data to inform firefighting activities, as well as the integrated management of species, territories, ecosystems and fire.

Mapping and monitoring initiatives have been undertaken to provide the government with official data on the remaining vegetation cover of Brazilian biomes. The MMA, through the Project for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Brazilian Biological Diversity (PROBIO), conducted significant mappings based on satellite imagery, which were later refined under the Project of Satellite Deforestation Monitoring of the Brazilian Biomes (PMDBBS). This project was developed through a cooperation agreement between the MMA, the IBAMA and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), which carried out a series of assessments between 2008 and 2011 on the Cerrado, the Caatinga, the Pampa, the Pantanal and the Atlantic Forest biomes, taking the PROBIO map as a basis.

Research and innovation in the field of remote sensing have helped in the mapping of land cover and land-use change dynamics at local, regional, and national levels. This has been essential for better understanding the spatial aspects related to the expansion, retraction, transition, intensification, conversion and diversification of Brazilian agricultural production. Being aware of the dynamics of the changes taking place on earth's surface is important not only for assessing the condition of different ecosystems, but also for estimating the impacts caused by different human activities on biodiversity and climate change.

Through these monitoring initiatives Brazil tracks its progress in achieving its targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 37% by 2025 and by 43% by 2030, having the emission level observed in 2005 as the benchmark, as stated on its NDC under the UNFCCC Paris Agreement. Furthermore, information on deforestation and forest degradation will be fundamental for the implementation of Brazil's National REDD+ Strategy.

The scope of these monitoring activities represents a major challenge. Brazil has an extensive territory of over 8.5 million square kilometers - with approximately 60-70% of the surface covered by natural vegetation. Brazil currently has five systems in place to monitor deforestation and forest degradation in the Amazon: PRODES, DETER, QUEIMADAS, DEGRAD/DETEX and TerraClass. TerraClass Cerrado, launched in 2013, is the first Land Use and Land Cover Mapping of the Cerrado biome.

For the Amazon and the Cerrado biomes, the Program provides for the assessment of deforestation in previous years, proving inputs for the construction of Forest Reference Emission Levels for REDD+.

The Program also envisages the gradual expansion of monitoring conversion of natural vegetation, land cover and land use to cover all of the Brazilian biomes. The monitoring of forest fires outbreaks throughout the national territory is being upgraded, in order to produce numeric data on the area affected by fire. Monitoring selective logging in the Amazon will be strengthened. Monitoring of native vegetation restoration will be devised and implemented for the Amazônia, Cerrado and the Atlantic Forest biomes.

This information will support decision-making regarding activities to foster the conservation of Brazilian biodiversity, along with informing a strategic vision for territorial management that reconciles diverse interests related to land use and enable Brazil to develop on a more sustainable basis.

The Program coordinates the efforts carried out by a diverse number of Federal institutions engaged on monitoring and mapping activities using satellite data (such as EMBRAPA, IBGE, IBAMA, INPE and research institutions), thus ensuring greater efficiency in the use of resources and better harmonization between the products. The complexity of the Program is reflected in the number of deliverables planned (***Figure a.7***). Considering that there are seven types of distinct mappings, six biomes and a long historical time series, prioritizing actions and organizing specific schedules is required. The schedule is frequently revised in order to better represents the resources available to implement the monitoring activities. Brazil intends, with the progress of the monitoring activities, submit a national FREL in the near future.



Figure a.7. Monitoring activity types and their frequency for the different Brazilian biomes.