Papers

Spatio-Temporal Dynamics of Land Use in Mato Grosso do Sul from 1988 to 2018 and Payments for Ecosystem Services

Maycon Jorge Ulisses Saraiva Farinha¹ André Geraldo Berezuk² Luciana Virginia Mario Bernardo³ Adelsom Soares Filho⁴

Keywords

Policies

Services

Environmental Public

Payment for Ecosystem

Land Use Transformations

Abstract

Human actions in nature are ancient relationships that allow, among some characteristics, changes in land use. One possibility for studying these changes is the classification of their uses and their transformations over the years to make it possible to understand the relationship between people and nature in a given location. In this context, this research addressed the State of Mato Grosso do Sul, with the objective of investigating the dynamics and temporal space of land use in its mesoregions, and the implementation of public and private actions of environmental policies developed in the municipalities, aiming at the scope of ecosystem services. For this, the Shift-Share model was used to identify changes in land use from 1988 to 2018, and the data were extracted from MapBiomas. Furthermore, based on the recommendations of the Forest Code for the conservation of rural property areas and the creation of Conservation Units, the Value of Conservation via Public Policies per municipality in the state was estimated. During the analysis period, it can be seen that, between 1988 and 2018, changes in land use occurred in all mesoregions of the state. Each mesoregion has unique characteristics for replacing land use; however, in general, it can be seen that natural vegetation has lost area for other uses, with the main destination being agricultural use. It was also observed how public environmental policies have helped conserve areas in Mato Grosso do Sul.

 ¹ Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados - UFGD, Dourados, MS, Brazil. maycondds@hotmail.com
 ² Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados - UFGD, Dourados, MS, Brazil. andreberezuk@ufgd.edu.br
 ³ Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados - UFGD, Dourados, MS, Brazil. lucianavbernardo@ ufgd.edu.br

⁴Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados - UFGD, Dourados, MS, Brazil. adelsomfilho@ufgd.edu.br

INTRODUCTION

Human activities have transformed natural landscapes significantly (Dronava *et al.*, 2015; Yang *et al.*, 2013). Given this context, it can be observed that among the forms of environmental change that the planet Earth has suffered, the dynamics of land use is one of the most performed environmental studies (Hassan *et al.*, 2016). The attention of researchers to the topic can be understood if land use changes are considered one of the main factors that generate the degradation of natural resources (Wang *et al.*, 2015; Kindu *et al.*, 2018).

With technological advances, geotechnologies have contributed to land-use monitoring and are facilitators in identifying changes in localities (Gong, 2012). These geological resources enable the registration of a temporary series of information in the same area, often made available for free. Such geological features tend to contribute to the development of studies on environmental issues. Thus, this monitoring is essential for studies that address issues that are societal needs, such as environmental change, natural resource management, and urban planning, among other issues that may be related to global or local situations (Zell et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2015).

Demography is an important factor in landuse change. Population growth and migration tend to cause changes in these uses, especially in urban areas, due to population agglomerations that put pressure on the occupation of areas that are often not recommended for the desired use, such as civil construction. In rural areas, agricultural production must be increased. It is denoted that, in turn, the agricultural and livestock production and its increase, are carried out through the substitution of natural vegetation by food vegetation exotic to the natural biome. This planting is done because of the characteristics of the consumer market, which results in the prioritization of certain food crops over others, and in some situations, may be natural crops of the locality (Degife *et al.*, 2019).

When observing the use of soil for agricultural activities, regardless of climatic conditions, agricultural management practices should avoid soil impoverishment resulting from the removal of nutrients by crops, among other actions, such as compaction. Thus, planning activities related to land use should be selective concerning the characteristics of the region (Serra, 2005). This selectivity of use is also a prerogative for urban land use, where the determination of activities without concern for soil characteristics can lead to the compromise of other natural resources, such as groundwater (Embrapa, 2013).

Considering these characteristics, it can be observed that Brazil is a country in which its recent urbanization was carried out in an accelerated manner, arising from a process of rural exodus, and is still considered an agroexporting country (Marques, 2006; Chaveiro, Dos Anjos, 2007; Ugeda Junior, 2014). Urbanization and agricultural production are two land uses that alter natural vegetation. Urban space is considered a location with greater dynamism in relation to changes in land use due to population agglomeration and needs (Brenner et al., 2015). Agricultural production is considered the main cause of terrestrial biodiversity loss (Maxwell et al., 2016). It is denoted that the process of land use change has culminated in the loss of biodiversity (Kline et al., 2015, TEEB, 2015), and human needs can be considered a threat to the conservation of natural vegetation (Laurance et al., 2014). In this context, this study makes a cut, referring to the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, which aims to investigate the dynamics and temporal space of land use in the mesoregions of that state and identify the implementation of public and private actions of environmental policies developed in municipalities, aiming at the scope of ecosystem services.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Investigating the dynamics of the temporal space of a given location provides insight into the process that leads to the configuration of current land use. Furthermore, it helps to identify the reduction or conservation of areas of natural vegetation, that is, green areas consistent with the original biome of the location, which is the object of interest in this study, as a condition for analyzing public environmental policies. Therefore, to identify these characteristics, secondary data made available by MapBiomas (2020), collaborative network, formed by NGOs, universities and technology startups, the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística – IBGE (2017), which is the largest federal data and information provider in the country, the Ministério do Meio Ambiente (2020) and the Instituto de Meio Ambiente de Mato Grosso do Sul (2020), government agencies related to environmental issues. The data were used, referring to the municipalities of Mato Grosso do Sul, which are consistent with the period from 1988 to 2018.

Shift-Share Model

Shift-share is one of the oldest and most widely used techniques for analyzing the characteristics of regions (Rolim, 1999). This analysis is also known as variance component analysis, which decomposes the growth of a given variable into determinants at the regional level (Pospiesz *et al.*, 2011). In this case, land use change between 1988 and 2018 was investigated using this model. We used data from the MapBiomas (2020) platform grouped by the mesoregion of Mato Grosso do Sul (Figure 1).



Source: IBGE (2015). Elaborated by the authors (2020).

After the collection, using the shift-share model, considerations were made in relation to the Area Effect, and this effect was decomposed into Scale Effects (EE) and Substitution Effects (ES). In turn, the EE estimated the changes in size or scale per land-use class; thus, this effect shows whether there was an expansion or retraction in each land-use class. The second effect, ES, in turn, identified the areas that were replaced by the expansion of other land uses, which means that upon identification of change, which of the land use categories substituted the previous category (Fagundes; Borges, 2015; Garcia; Buainain, 2016; Carvalho et al., 2017). The Shift-Share model is registered using the following analytical expression:

$$Ai2 - Ai1 = (\alpha Ai1 - Ai1) + (Ai2 - \propto Ai1) \quad (1)$$

where Ai2 – Ai1 is the area variation for land use between the time periods T1 and T2; $(\alpha Ai1 - Ai1) = EE$; $(Ai2 - \alpha Ai1) = ES$.

The EE is the result of multiplying the coefficient of variation (α) by the land use area

of the initial analysis year (Ai1), subtracting the same initial area from this result. The ES is the result of subtracting the land use area of the final analysis year (Ai2) by multiplying the coefficient of variation by the land use area of the initial period. In both cases, the analyzed area was specific to each land use category. The coefficient of variation (α) is the result of the ratio between the total land use area of the final year and the initial year of the given timeframe (Fagundes; Borges, 2015; Carvalho *et al.*, 2017).

It is understood that positive and negative EE values indicate, in this order, tendencies of expansion or reduction of the land use analyzed. The EE values indicate the behavior of land use, if there was an increase or reduction in the area among the use categories (Santos *et al.*, 2008). In turn, ES, when positive, indicates the occupation of areas of other land uses by that use under analysis. A negative result indicates that the land use analyzed has had areas replaced by other uses. Furthermore, in ES, the result between the addition of the values of each land use category should be equal to zero, given that in this model, the replaced areas are

occupied proportionally by the land uses that have expanded (Lourenzani; Caldas, 2014).

Land Use and its relation to Public Environmental Policies

From the first analysis, it was possible to identify changes in land use in the municipalities of Mato Grosso do Sul from 1988 to 2018. Thus, it was proposed to relate land use with the current performance of public environmental policies in the country. For this, it was necessary to identify the areas that corresponded to conservation units in the Ministry of Environment (2020) and the Instituto de Meio Ambiente de Mato Grosso do Sul (2020). Conservation Units have been created over the years based on environmental legislation linked to the subject. with Legislation nº 9.985 of the 2000s being considered the mainstay at present. In addition, the size of rural properties was identified in the 2017 Agricultural Census (IBGE, 2017).

This information was necessary to identify the size of the total area of rural properties conserved through the public environmental policy. Considering that the current environmental legislation refers to the 2012 The Código Florestal (Law nº. 12.651/2012), this legislation requires rural properties, through their owners, to maintain a percentage area with natural vegetation (determining the percentage of conserved area linked to the biome of the location), which is called a Reserva Legal (RL - area with native vegetation cover). The percentage of conservation via RL is 20% of the property area for the Pantanal, Atlantic Forest, and Cerrado biomes (Brasil, 2012).

Another mandatory way to conserve rural areas via the Código Florestal is through the Área de Preservação Permanente (APP - a protected area, covered or not by native vegetation, with the environmental function of preserving water resources, the landscape, geological stability and biodiversity, facilitating the gene flow of fauna and flora, protecting the soil and ensuring the well-being of human populations), which was not used in this study because of the impossibility of information for calculation at the time. In Mato Grosso do Sul, there are three biomes: Atlantic Forest, Pantanal, and Cerrado. Each predominates in the state region. The Database of environmental information made available by the IBGE (2020) was used to identify the predominant biome in each region. The predominant biome was identified for each municipality, as well as the total area of the RL related to rural properties and the area related to Conservation Units. From this information, the values of the ecosystem services of each biome were used to identify the economic value conserved from the environmental legislation in the two land uses that promoted some measure of conservation (Table 1).

Initial servicesTotal servicesCommon to BiomeseServiceUS\$.m-*.year-'Climate regulation0.0223Disturbance Regulation0.0025Water regulation0.0026ServiceUS\$.m-*.year'Enssion control0.0223Nutrient regulation0.0006Nutrient regulation0.0006Total servicesUS\$.m-*.year'Total0.0007Climate regulation0.0007Cultural0.0002Total Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$.m-*.year-'Total Services Common to BiomesServiceServiceUS\$.m-*.year-'Total Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$.m-*.year-'Total Services Common to BiomesServ			Losystem Service	es value by Blome	· D'
Service $USS.m^-$ year-1ReferenceService $USS.m^-$ year-1Climate regulation0.0223 Disturbance Regulation0.0006 Erosion control0.0215 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0010 Soil formation0.0021 RecreationNutrient recycling 0.0021 Recreation0.0022 Soil formation0.0011 Soil formation0.0012 RecreationNutrient recycling 0.00120.0922 Nutrient recycling 0.00120.0021 Recreation0.0012 Soil formation0.0012 Recreation0.0012 Soil formation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Soil formation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Soil formation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Soil formation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0021 Recreation0.0023 Recreation0.0023 Recreation0.0023 Recreation0.0023 Recreation0.0023 Recreation0.0023 RecreationReferenceServiceUS8.m-*, year-' Value/m/'yearPolination0.0023 Recreation0.0023 RecreationSoil formation Recreation0.0023 RecreationClimate regulation Recreation0.0023 RecreationClimate regulation Recreation0.0023 RecreationRe	Atlantic F	orest Biom	e	Total Services Com	non to Biomes
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Service	US\$.m	Reference	Service	US\$.m- ² .year- ¹
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		² .year- ¹			0.0000
Disturbance Regulation 0.0006 Water regulation 0.0006 Frosion control 0.0245 Soil formation 0.0010 Nutrient recycling 0.0922 Costanza et al. (1997) Nutrient recycling 0.0022 Tailings treatment 0.0087 Tailings treatment 0.0087 (1997) Recreation 0.0112 TOTAL 0.0021 Recreation 0.0112 TOTAL 0.1626 - value/m ⁴ /year Cultural 0.0002 Costanza et al. 0.1626 - value/m ⁴ /year Cultural 0.0002 Costanza et al. 0.0112 TOTAL 0.1626 - value/m ⁴ /year Cultural 0.0002 Costanza et al. 0.0112 Santos et al. 0.0006 Frosion control 0.0021 Santos et al. 0.0000 TOTAL 0.3248 value/m ⁴ /year Cultural 0.0002 Costanza et al. 0.0000 TOTAL 0.3248 value/m ⁴ /year Cultural 0.0002 Costanza et al. 0.000 Frosion control 0.0002 Costanza et al. 0.000 Climate regulation 0.0000 Water regulation 0.0000 Water regulation 0.0000 Costanza et al. 0.000 Soil formation 0.0000 Soil formation 0.0002 Costanza et al. Soil formation 0.0001 Soil formation 0.0002 Santos et al. 0.003 Recreation 0.0002 Santos et al. 0.003 Recreation 0.0002 Santos et al. 0.0023 Recreation 0.00023 Recreation 0.00023 Recreation 0.00023 Recreation 0.00023 Recreation 0.00025 Biological control 0.0023 Recreation 0.00025 Recreation 0.00023 Recreation 0.00237 Soil formation 0.00237 Soil formation 0.00237 Soil formation 0.00237 Soil formation 0.00756 Climate regulation 0.0037881 Soil formation 0.00237 Recreation 0.003781 Soil formation 0.001227 Recreation 0.003781 Soil formation 0.00237 Recreation 0.003784 Soil formation 0.003784 Soil formation 0.003785 Recreation 0.003785 Recreation 0.003785 Recreation 0.003784 Soil formation 0.001227 Recreation 0.003784 Recreation 0.013881 Soil formation 0.001227 Recreation 0.013787 Cultural 0.00555 Moraes (2000) RC	Climate regulation	0.0223		Climate regulation	0.0223
Water regulation0.0006 0.0245 Soil formationErosion control0.0245 0.0022 Soil formationLosion control0.0021 0.0022 Tailings treatmentNutrient recycling0.0922 (1997)Costanza et al. (1997)Tailings treatment0.0021 Biological control0.0021 0.0021 RecreationRacreation0.0112Costanza et al. (2000)0.0121 Biological control0.0121 0.1626 - value/m²/yearCultural0.0002 (2000)Santos et al. (2000)0.0003 (2000)Biological control0.0021 0.0003Santos et al. (2000)CortAL0.3248 shulem²/yearCerrado Biome - years'Total Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$.m- - years'Atmosphere regulation0.0007 0.0003Climate regulation0.0001 (1997)Vater regulation0.0002 (1997)Soil formation0.0001 (1997)Soil formation0.0002 (1995)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Biological control0.0023 (1995)Recreation0.0002 (1995)TOTAL0.0307 - value/m²/yearAtmosphere regulation0.0002 (1995)Nutrient recycling0.0130 (1995)Nutrient recycling0.0130 (1995)Nutrient recycling0.03781 (1995)Nutrient recycling0.03781 (1995)CortAL0.03775 value/m²/yearAtmosphere regulation0.00237 (0.03781)Soil formation0.00237 (0.037881)Soil	Disturbance Regulation	0.0005		Water regulation	0.0006
Forsion control 0.0010 Soil formation 0.0010 Nutrient recycling 0.0922 Costanza et al. Nutrient recycling 0.0087 Tailings treatment 0.0087 (1997) Biological control 0.0021 Recreation 0.0112 TOTAL 0.1626 - value/m³/year Cultural 0.0002 Santos et al. 0.1626 - value/m³/year Cultural 0.0002 Santos et al. 0.1626 - value/m³/year Cerrado Bione Total Services Common to Biomes Service US\$.m-*.year-1 Service US\$.m- Reference Service US\$.m-*.year-1 Atmosphere regulation 0.0001 (1997) Nutrient recycling 0.0130 Soil formation 0.0001 (1997) Nutrient recycling 0.0130 Soil formation 0.0002 Costanza et al., Soil formation 0.0001 Climate regulation 0.0002 Santos et al., Soil formation 0.0023 Recreation 0.0002 Santos et al., Soil formation 0.0023 Recreation	Water regulation	0.0006		Erosion control	0.0245
Soll formation0.0010 0.0022 (1997)Costanza et al. Tailings treatmentNutrient recycling 0.0021 Tailings treatment0.0027 0.0021 RecreationNutrient recycling 0.0021 Recreation0.0012 0.0021 0.1626 - value/m³/yearCultural0.0002 (2000)0.0002 (2000)TOTAL0.1626 - value/m³/yearCultural0.0002 (2000)Santos et al. (2000)0.0003 (2000)Biological control0.0021 0.0003Santos et al. (2000)Potrat0.2248 value/m³/yearCerrado BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$.m- *year-*Atmosphere regulation0.0007 0.0003Cilimate regulation0.0003 Erosion control0.0029 0.0029Biological control0.0029 0.003Soil formation0.0001 (1997)Nutrient recycling Nutrient recycling 0.0130Tailings treatment0.0087 (2000)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Nutrient recycling0.0130 (1997)Nutrient recycling0.0130 (2000)Mutient recycling0.023 (2000)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Recreation0.0002 (2000)Nutrient recycling0.0130 (1995)TOTAL0.0307 (2000)Value/m²/yearCostanze et al. (2000)Nutrient recycling0.0130 (1995)Nutrient recycling0.0023 (2000)	Erosion control	0.0245		Soil formation	0.0010
Nutrient recycling Tailings treatment0.0822 (1997)Tailings treatment0.0087 Biological controlToulogical control0.0021 RecreationRecreation0.0112TOTAL 0.1626 s. value/m²/yearCultural0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Biological control0.0021 (2000)Biological control0.0021 (2000)Biological control0.0021 (2000)Cerrado BiomeTotal Service Common to BiomesServiceUS8,m- *,year-1Atmosphere regulation0.0007 (1997)Climate regulation0.0003 Erosion controlSoil formation0.0001 (1997)Soil formation0.0002 (2000)Soil formation0.0023 (2000)Sintos et al. (2000)Soil formation0.0023 (2000)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Biological control0.0024 (2000)Biological control0.0025 (2000)ToTAL0.0307 (2000)Value/m²/yearModeiros et al. (2000)Biological control0.0027 (2000)TOTAL0.0307 value/m²/yearModeiros et al. (2000)Climate regulation0.00476 (2000)ToTAL0.03077 value/m²/yearAtmosphere regulation0.004785 (2000)TOTAL0.03077 value/m²/yearModeiros et al. (2000)Biological control0.0023 (2000)Biological control0.002476 (2000)Total Services Common to Biomes (2000)<	Soil formation	0.0010	Costanza <i>et al</i> .	Nutrient recycling	0.0922
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Nutrient recycling	0.0922	(1997)	Tailings treatment	0.0087
Recreation0.0112Kereation0.0112 0.0022TOTAL0.0002TOTAL0.1626 - value/m³/yearCultural0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Biological control0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Dytion value0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Existence value0.0003Carado BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesServiceUS8.m- *year-1Atmosphere regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.0001Water regulation0.0001Soil formation0.0001Soil formation0.0002Biological control0.0023Soil formation0.0001Soil formation0.0002Biological control0.0025Biological control0.0023Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Biological control0.0023Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Cossor20000Cossor0.0307 - value/m³/yearPatanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem Service ¹ / ₂ year-1Recreation0.006795Climate regulation0.077881Disturbance Regulation0.077881Soil formation0.00237Water supply0.197711Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.006341	Tailings treatment	0.0087		Biological control	0.0021
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Recreation	0.0112		Recreation	0.0112
Value/m²/yearValue/m²/yearCultural0.0002Oliveira. (2000)Biological control0.0021 0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Distonce value0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Total Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$.m-'.year-'ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-'.year-'Atmosphere regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.0003 0.0009Water regulation0.0001(1997)Nutrient recycling0.0130Tailings treatment0.0087 0.0002Tailings treatment0.0087 0.0023Biological control0.0023 0.0037 - (2000)Santos et al. (2000)TOTAL0.0027 0.0037 - value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130 0.0023Medeiros et al., (2000)TOTAL0.0275- value/m²/yearPollination0.0023 0.0037 - value/m²/yearTotal ServiceUS\$.m-'.year-' value/m²/yearPantana BiomeTotal ServiceUS\$.m-'.year-' value/m²/yearPantana BiomeTotal ServiceUS\$.m-'.year-' value/m²/yearEcosystem Service*.year-' *.year-'ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-'.year-' value/m²/yearAtmosphere regulation0.004176 0.004176Water regulation0.004376 0.003737Climate regulation0.0043781 0.003313Biological control0.006311 0.004314Tailings treatment0.005505 0.00337Soil formation0.00233781 value/m²/yearHati				TOTAL	0.1626 -
Cultural0.0002Oliveira. (2000)Biological control0.0021Santos et al. (2000)Dytion value0.0002(2000)Existence value0.0003ControlTOTAL0.3248 value/m ³ /yearTotal Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$.m- $xyear.^1$ ReferenceService $xyear.^1$ Climate regulation0.000Climate regulation0.0003Erosion control0.0029Erosion control0.0029Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0001Soil formation0.0002Santos et al., (2000)Soil formation0.0002Biological control0.0025Biological control0.0023Recreation0.0002Santos et al., (2000)TOTAL0.00276- value/m ² /yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.0276- value/m ² /yearFortal Biological control0.00279Climate regulation0.001476Value/m ² /yearNutrient recycling0.01307 - value/m ² /yearValue/m ² /yearAtmosphere regulation0.00476Climate regulation0.00476Climate regulation0.00237Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Disturbance Regulation0.00237Biological control0.006341Disturbance Regulation0.00237Biological control0.0015737Nutrient recycling0.01588Recreation0.001573		0.0000			value/m²/year
Water supply0.1610Onversa. (2000) Santos et al. (2000)Biological control0.0021 0.0003Santos et al. (2000)TOTAL0.3248 value/m²/yearTotal Services Common to BiomesCerrado BiomeTotal Service US\$.m-'.year.'Atmosphere regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.000Climate regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0001Soil formation0.0001(1997)Nutrient recycling0.0130Tailings treatment0.0087Tailings treatment0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al., (2000)Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al., (2000)TOTAL0.0275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.02775- value/m²/yearFeosystem ServiceUS\$.m-' *year.'ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-'.year.' value/m²/yearAtmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.00476Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.006341Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.006341Tailings treatment0.055055Moraes (2000)TOTALvalue/m²/yearPollination0.002237Biol	Cultural	0.0002	01: .		
(2000) Diological control Existence value 0.0002 0.0003 Santos et al. (2000) TOTAL 0.3248 value/m³/year Cerrado Biome Total Services Common to Biomes Service US\$.m- *.year-' Atmosphere regulation 0.0007 Climate regulation 0.0003 Water regulation 0.0001 (1997) Nutrient regulation 0.0002 Soil formation 0.0001 (1997) Nutrient recycling 0.0130 Tailings treatment 0.0087 Biological control 0.00023 Biological control 0.0023 Santos et al. (2000) TOTAL 0.0275- value/m²/year Nutrient recycling 0.0130 Medeiros et al., (2000) TOTAL 0.0275- value/m²/year Ecosystem Service US8.m- *.year-1 Reference Service US8.m²- value/m²/year Atmosphere regulation 0.006795 Climate regulation 0.004476 Uster regulation 0.004476 Water regulation 0.00437881 Soil formation 0.002237 Biological co	Water supply	0.1610	Oliveira.		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Dialagical control	0.0001	(2000)		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ontion value	0.0021	Santos <i>et al</i> .		
TorXAL0.3248 value/m²/yearTotal Services Common to BiomesServiceUS\$,m- -*,year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$,m- -*,year-1Atmosphere regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.0003Climate regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0009Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0001Soil formation0.0002Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0002Biological control0.0023Costanza et al., (2000)Soil formation0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al., (2000)TOTAL0.0023Biological control0.0023Costanza et al., (2000)TOTAL0.0027Nutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.0027Pantanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$m- *,year-1ServiceUS\$m-²,year-1Atmosphere regulation0.00476Water regulation0.004476Water regulation0.00476Water regulation0.004476Water regulation0.00237Biological control0.006341Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi and Recreation0.015737Water regulation0.00427Biological control0.006341Water regulation0.001227Biological control0.00129Nutrient recycling0.018506<	Enjoton value	0.0002	(2000)		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		0.0003	alua/m²/waan		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		0.3240 v	alue/iii-/year	Total Services Com	non to Biomes
Service 2 year^{-1} ReferenceServiceUS\$.m- ² .year- ¹ Atmosphere regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.000Water regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0009Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0001Soil formation0.0001(1997)Nutrient recycling0.0130Tailings treatment0.0087Tailings treatment0.0087Pollination0.0023Santos et al. (2000)TOTAL0.00275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130(1995)TOTAL0.00275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.01300.0307 - value/m²/yearTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m *.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.004776Water regulation0.00476Climate regulation0.004775Climate regulation0.00476Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.177119Erosion control0.006341Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Seid andRecreationWater supply0.1129Seid andRecreation0.015737Total0.05505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.002237Seid andSeid and <td></td> <td>US\$ m</td> <td></td> <td>Total Services Collin</td> <td><u>non to biomes</u></td>		US\$ m		Total Services Collin	<u>non to biomes</u>
Atmosphere regulation0.0007Climate regulation0.000Climate regulation0.0003Water regulation0.0003Water regulation0.00029Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0029Soil formation0.0029Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0007Tailings treatment0.0087Tailings treatment0.0087Pollination0.0025Biological control0.0023Recreation0.0023Santos et al. (2000)Recreation0.0002Nutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)0.0307 - value/m²/year0.0307 - value/m²/yearPontanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m- 2.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.00231Disturbance Regulation0.037881Soil formation0.00231Water regulation0.037811Soil formation0.00231Water regulation0.06341Tailings treatment0.05605Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.006341Water regulation0.001227Biological control0.0015737Nutrient recycling0.01129Nutrient recycling0.015737Value/m²/yearSeidi andGontof0.015737Pollination0.00237Biological control0.0015737Pollination0.00237Seidi andTOTALPollination0.00237<	Service	² .year- ¹	Reference	Service	US\$.m- ² .year- ¹
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Atmosphere regulation	0.0007		Climate regulation	0.000
Water regulation0.0003Erosion control0.0029Erosion control0.0029Costanza et al., Soil formationSoil formation0.0001Soil formation0.0001(1997)Nutrient recycling0.0130Tailings treatment0.0087Biological control0.0023Pollination0.0002Santos et al. (2000)Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al., (1995)TOTAL0.0275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.0307Pantanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m- *.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.006341Disturbance Regulation0.0174719Erosion control0.006341Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.05055Soil formation0.001227Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Pollination0.001227Biological control0.001129Pollination0.005340Genetic Resource0.00823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.0576467 - value/m²/yearPollination0.015737Cultural0.0576467 - value/m²/year	Climate regulation	0.000		Water regulation	0.0003
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Water regulation	0.0003		Erosion control	0.0029
Soil formation0.0001(1997)Nutrient recycling0.0130Tailings treatment0.0087Tailings treatment0.0087Pollination0.0002Biological control0.0023Recreation0.0002Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al., (2000)TOTAL $0,0275$ - value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL 0.0307 - value/m²/yearPantanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m- ².year-1ServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.004476Water regulation0.0023781Disturbance Regulation0.07771Nutrient recycling0.01308Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.002237Biological control0.002371Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreationNutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreationPollination0.001227Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.015737Dislogical control0.015737Pollination0.001227Biological control0.008310Genetic Resource0.008330Genetic Resource0.008330Recreation0.0157370.576467 - value/m²/yearTOTAL0.36812 - value/m²/year	Erosion control	0.0029	Costanza <i>et al.</i> ,	Soil formation	0.0001
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Soil formation	0.0001	(1997)	Nutrient recycling	0.0130
Pollination0.0025Biological control0.0023Recreation0.0002Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al. (2000)TOTAL0,0275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.0307 - value/m²/yearPantanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m *.year.1"syear.1"ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-2.year.1Atmosphere regulation0.004476Water regulation0.002337Disturbance Regulation0.0137711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006795Climate regulation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.002337Biological control0.001227Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.005340Biological control0.005340Seidi andGenetic Resource0.005340Genetic Resource0.000823Recreation0.15737Cultural0.0157370.576467 - value/m²/yearValue/m²/year	Tailings treatment	0.0087		Tailings treatment	0.0087
Recreation0.0002Recreation0.0002Biological control0.0023Santos et al. (2000)TOTAL0,0275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.0307 - value/m²/yearTOTAL0.03070.0307 - value/m²/yearTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m *.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006476Water regulation0.004476Climate regulation0.004776Water regulation0.006341Disturbance Regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTALvalue/m²/yearPollination0.001129Habitat0.005340Genetic Resource0.008331Food production0.005340Genetic Resource0.008233Recreation0.15737Cultural0.0425130.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year	Pollination	0.0025		Biological control	0.0023
Biological control0.0023Santos et al. (2000)TOTAL0.0275- value/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)	Recreation	0.0002		Recreation	0.0002
Diblogical control0.0023(2000)101ALvalue/m²/yearNutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)0.0307 - value/m²/year0.0307 - value/m²/yearTOTAL0.0307US\$.m ².year-1Total Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m ².year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.004476Disturbance Regulation0.0147719Erosion control0.006341Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi and Moraes (2000)Recreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.005340Biological control0.001237Recreation0.015737Cultural0.010588500d production0.005340Genetic Resource0.000823Recreation0.576467 - value/m²/yearTotal0.576467value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year	Rielogical control	0.0099	Santos <i>et al</i> .	ΤΟΤΑΙ	0,0275-
Nutrient recycling0.0130Medeiros et al., (1995)TOTAL0.03070.0307 - value/m²/yearPantanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m- *.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m- *.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-².year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.004476Disturbance Regulation0.174719Erosion control0.006341Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTALvalue/m²/yearPollination0.001227Moraes (2000)TOTALvalue/m²/yearBiological control0.001528Food production0.005340cenetic Resource0.00823Recreation0.0157370.15737Cultural0.0425130.576467 - value/m²/yearTotal0.5764670.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year	Biological control	0.0023	(2000)	IOIAL	value/m²/year
TOTAL0.03070.0307 - value/m²/yearPantanal BiomeTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$,m- ²,year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$,m-²,year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.004476Climate regulation0.004476Water regulation0.0037881Disturbance Regulation0.0174719Erosion control0.006341Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.00823Recreation0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.005340Genetic Resource0.00823Recreation0.136812 - value/m²/yearHabitat0.010588Food production0.005340Genetic Resource0.00823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.425130.576467 - value/m²/year	Nutrient recycling	0.0130	Medeiros <i>et al.</i> ,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			(1995)		
Value m/yearTotal Services Common to BiomesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m *.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-2.year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.004476Olimate regulation0.004476Water regulation0.00437881Disturbance Regulation0.174719Erosion control0.006341Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.00823Recreation0.13737Genetic Resource0.000823Recreation0.015737cultural0.045713Total0.5764670.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year	TOTAL	0.0307	0.0307 -		
Total Services Collimit to FromesEcosystem ServiceUS\$.m 2.year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-2.year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.004476Climate regulation0.004476Water regulation0.037881Disturbance Regulation0.174719Erosion control0.006341Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Moraes (2000)TOTALvalue/m²/yearPollination0.005340Genetic Resource0.008823Recreation0.15737Cultural0.0425130.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year	Panta	al Biome	value/iii-/year	Total Services Com	non to Biomes
Ecosystem Service 2 .year-1ReferenceServiceUS\$.m-3.year-1Atmosphere regulation0.006795Climate regulation0.004476Climate regulation0.004476Water regulation0.037881Disturbance Regulation0.174719Erosion control0.006341Water regulation0.037881Soil formation0.002237Water supply0.197711Nutrient recycling0.018506Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 -Value/m²/yearPollination0.005340Value/m²/yearValue/m²/yearGenetic Resource0.00823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.0425130.576467 - value/m²/year0.576467 - value/m²/year		US\$ m		Total Services Com	non to biomes
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ecosystem Service	² .year- ¹	Reference	Service	US\$.m- ² .year- ¹
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Atmosphere regulation	0.006795		Climate regulation	0.004476
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Climate regulation	0.004476		Water regulation	0.037881
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Disturbance Regulation	0.174719		Erosion control	0.006341
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Water regulation	0.037881		Soil formation	0.002237
Erosion control0.006341Tailings treatment0.050505Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.001129Habitat0.010588Food production0.00823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.042513Total0.576467 - value/m²/year	Water supply	0.197711		Nutrient recycling	0.018506
Soil formation0.002237Biological control0.001129Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001129Habitat0.0010588Food production0.00823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.015737Total0.576467 - value/m²/year	Erosion control	0.006341		Tailings treatment	0.050505
Nutrient recycling0.018506Seidi andRecreation0.015737Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.001129Habitat0.010588Food production0.00823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.015737Total0.576467 - value/m²/year	Soil formation	0.002237		Biological control	0.001129
Tailings treatment0.050505Moraes (2000)TOTAL0.136812 - value/m²/yearPollination0.001227Biological control0.001129Habitat0.010588Food production0.005340Genetic Resource0.000823Recreation0.015737Cultural0.042513Total0.576467 - value/m²/year	Nutrient recycling	0.018506	Caidi and	Recreation	0.015737
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Tailings treatment	0.050505	Moraes (2000)	TOTAL	0.136812 -
Biological control 0.001129 Habitat 0.010588 Food production 0.005340 Genetic Resource 0.000823 Recreation 0.015737 Cultural 0.042513 Total 0.576467 - value/m²/year	Pollination	0 001997			value/iii-/year
Habitat 0.01120 Habitat 0.010588 Food production 0.005340 Genetic Resource 0.000823 Recreation 0.015737 Cultural 0.042513 Total 0.576467 - value/m²/year	Biological control	0.001120			
Food production 0.005340 Genetic Resource 0.000823 Recreation 0.015737 Cultural 0.042513 Total 0.576467 value/m²/year	Habitat	0.010588			
Genetic Resource 0.000823 Recreation 0.015737 Cultural 0.042513 Total 0.576467 value/m²/year	Food production	0.005340			
Recreation 0.015737 Cultural 0.042513 Total 0.576467 value/m²/year	Genetic Resource	0 000893			
Cultural 0.042513 Total 0.576467 value/m²/year	Recreation	0.000020			
Total 0.576467 0.576467 - value/m²/year	Cultural	0.042513			
Total 0.576467 value/m²/year		0.012010	0.576467 -		
	Total	0.576467	value/m²/year		

 Table 1 - Ecosystem Services Value by Biome

Source: IBAMA (2002); Seidi and Moraes (2000).

It was observed that the information on the estimation of the same ecosystem services was

different for each biome; however, we chose to represent the values in two situations: the first in relation to the same ecosystem services available per biome, namely, biological control, erosion control, soil formation, nutrient recycling, recreation, water regulation, climate regulation, and waste treatment. The second situation includes all services with available information. It should be noted that the reference values were used by Farinha *et al.* (2023).

To identify the conservation value of ecosystem services in a municipality for Conservation Units (VConUN), it is necessary to multiply the total amount of conserved area by the total value of services for each biome. It should be noted that the same measurement units were used.

$$VConUn = AT \ x \ VLSE \tag{2}$$

In the case of properties, it is necessary to use the following equality to perform estimation (3).

$$VConPRO = (\% RL \ x \ AT) \ x \ VLSE$$
(3)

VConPRO - Conservation Value of rural property by municipality, %RL - % of RL by Biome, AT - Total area of the municipality related to rural properties, and VLSE - Total Value of Ecosystem Services by biome. These two estimates are necessary to identify the total Conservation Value through Public Policies, which is the result of the sum of VConUN and VConPRO.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Regarding the dynamics of land use during the period of analysis, percentage variations in land use can be observed in all mesoregions and categories of analysis (Table 2). In the Pantanal mesoregion of Mato Grosso do Sul, the greatest variation in the dynamics of use over the last 30 years occurred in the agricultural category (106.6%), which is related to food production of vegetal and animal origin. In the centralnorthern Mato Grosso do Sul and eastern Mato Grosso do Sul, the greatest variation was in the water bodies category (70.6% and 132.1% respectively), linked to water resources such as rivers. In the mesoregion Southwest of Mato Grosso do Sul, the non-vegetated area showed the greatest variation, indicating the expansion of urban areas of the municipalities present in this mesoregion. This mesoregion covers the largest number of municipalities in the state, and since the 1970s, most of them have been increasing their population, which mostly resides in urban spaces (IBGE, 2020).

	Variation	Scale	Substitution Effect
Pantanal of Mato Grosso do Sul	(%)	Effect(ha)	(ha)
Forest	-14,9	0,8	-766.319,7
Non-forest Natural Formation	-8,8	0,7	-396.665,3
Agriculture and Livestock	106,6	0,2	1.243.647,5
Non Vegetated Area	21,1	0,0	985,3
Water Body	-33,5	0,0	-81.647,7
North-Central Mato Grosso do Sul	Variation (%)	Scale Effect (ha)	Substitution Effect (ha)
Forest	-38,3	-0,000000085	-1.209.910,8
Non-forest Natural Formation	-12,5	-0,0000000066	-30.567,0
Agriculture and Livestock	34,4	-0,000000095	1.223.985,7
Non Vegetated Area	43,5	-0,00000000071	11.418,1
Water Body	70,6	-0,00000000019	5.074,0
Eastern Mato Grosso do Sul	Variation	Scale Effect	Substitution Effect
	(%)	(ha)	(ha)
Forest	-32,1	0,000021	-1.117.551,5
Non-forest Natural Formation	-20,7	0,0000017	-59.522,1
Agriculture and Livestock	10 5		
	18,5	0,000033	1.018.696, 8
Non Vegetated Area	18,5 $78,5$	0,000033 0,00000078	1.018.696,8 10.345,6
Non Vegetated Area Water Body	18,5 78,5 132,1	0,000033 0,000000078 0,00000067	1.018.696,8 $10.345,6$ $148.031,2$
Non Vegetated Area Water Body Southwest Mato Grosso do Sul	18,5 78,5 132,1 Variation (%)	0,000033 0,00000078 0,00000067 Scale Effect (ha)	1.018.696,8 10.345,6 148.031,2 Substitution Effect (ha)
Non Vegetated Area Water Body Southwest Mato Grosso do Sul Forest	18,5 78,5 132,1 Variation (%) -26,5	0,000033 0,00000078 0,00000067 Scale Effect (ha) -1,2	1.018.696,8 10.345,6 148.031,2 Substitution Effect (ha) -547.113,4
Non Vegetated Area Water Body Southwest Mato Grosso do Sul Forest Non-forest Natural Formation	18,5 78,5 132,1 Variation (%) -26,5 -22,8	0,000033 0,00000078 0,00000067 Scale Effect (ha) -1,2 -0,2	1.018.696,8 10.345,6 148.031,2 Substitution Effect (ha) -547.113,4 -63.272,8
Non Vegetated Area Water Body Southwest Mato Grosso do Sul Forest Non-forest Natural Formation Agriculture and Livestock	18,5 78,5 132,1 Variation (%) -26,5 -22,8 10,3	0,000033 0,00000078 0,00000067 Scale Effect (ha) -1,2 -0,2 -3,5	1.018.696,8 10.345,6 148.031,2 Substitution Effect (ha) -547.113,4 -63.272,8 599.564,1
Non Vegetated Area Water Body Southwest Mato Grosso do Sul Forest Non-forest Natural Formation Agriculture and Livestock Non Vegetated Area	18,5 78,5 132,1 Variation (%) -26,5 -22,8 10,3 42,5	0,000033 0,00000078 0,00000067 Scale Effect (ha) -1,2 -0,2 -3,5 0,0	1.018.696,8 10.345,6 148.031,2 Substitution Effect (ha) -547.113,4 -63.272,8 599.564,1 8.732,2

Table 2 - Land use dynamics by Mato Grosso do Sul mesoregion - 1988/2018

Source: Mapbiomas (2020). Elaborated by the authors (2022).

However, a Scale Effect can be observed in relation to land use dynamics. This effect reveals the distribution of expanded or reduced areas among the land-use categories according to their shares in the initial period of the analysis. Therefore, one can observe that positive results indicate expansion, and negative results indicate a reduction in areas of land use. The Substitution Effect shows variation in the participation of land use in each mesoregion, indicating when land use was substituted or replaced by another use. In the Pantanal mesoregion of Mato Grosso do Sul, forest land uses (-766,319.7 ha), non-forest natural formation (-396,665.3 ha) and water bodies (-81,647.7) gave way to other uses, with predominant absorption by agriculture and cattle ranching (1,243,647.5). Because it is a region whose predominant biome is the Pantanal, the reduction in areas of the listed categories can be a matter of concern,

considering that one of the characteristics of this biome is that it consists of wet or flooded areas.

An indication of a possible reduction in water bodies is critical for biome maintenance (Mapbiomas, 2022). It is worth considering that Brazil (1988) guarantees the Pantanal biome as a national heritage. According to Mendes and Oliveira (2019), the biome stands out for its environmental connotation and development arising from the local culture and agricultural activity developed over more than 270 years in the region, with its own characteristics. However, it is worth highlighting that there are swampy regions, such as Nhecolândia, where environmental weaknesses can be identified and linked to climatic seasonality, periodic floods, poor soils, and high temperatures. Furthermore, there is little technical information about the possibility of sustainable use of forest species in the region (Soares et al., 2017; De Mattos et al., 2010), which is an obstacle or hindering factor in the development of sustainable activities.

The other mesoregions of the state of Mato Grosso do Sul exhibited similar behavior. The Substitution Effect was negative for the land use categories of forest and non-forested natural formations, indicating that they abandoned land for the other categories. Among the categories with positive results, those that received land for their respective uses, agriculture, and cattle ranching, in all mesoregions, had the highest values, indicating that the use of land for agriculture and cattle ranching has increased in the state. In fact, the contributions of agribusiness to the state economy from rural production are recognized (Domingues, 2011). However, it is also recognized that the lack of planning for the use and occupation of the state's lands and the lack of adequate vegetable management for animal and production have caused degradation in the soils of Mato Grosso do Sul (Chaves et al., 2012; Santos; Comastri-Filho, 2012).

The dynamics of land use in the mesoregions of Mato Grosso do Sul indicate that during the period investigated, there were changes that reduced natural vegetation, which was mainly replaced by agricultural use. In this context, it is noteworthy that man, by transforming his environment, enables the formation of a second nature based on artificial elements (Santos, 2006). The problem in this formation process is that individuals are increasingly closer to the artificial environment and farther from the natural environment, which results in imbalances (Santos, 1988). When woody cover is substituted by agricultural areas, there are negative effects on climate. These effects are related to carbon reserves in the soil, either in water resources or in biodiversity (Sibanda et al., 2016). Negative effects occur because this change in land use influences the organization of the existing habitat at the site and the

hydrological process, and also promotes the loss of biodiversity (Liu *et al.*, 2008).

The Substitution Effect on land use in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul was represented by changes in 12% of its land during the analysis period. At first, this percentage can be considered low, however, it should be considered that it can be explained by the existence of 63% of the state's municipalities today already in the 1970s(IBGE. 2020). The creation of municipalities is conditioned by changes in land use, which suggests that transformations in land use had already taken place before the analyzed period. Unfortunately, no data were identified before the analysis period.

In addition to the dynamics of land use, this study proposes to investigate issues related to public environmental policies, which makes the need for this investigation even more evident when identifying the reduction in areas of natural vegetation in mesoregions. Figure 2 overlaps the mesoregions and predominant biomes in each mesoregion according to the municipal information. Among those comprising the highest percentages is the Pantanais Sul-Matogrossense mesoregion, in which the predominant biome, as shown in this figure, is Pantanal biome. Similar to other the mesoregions, in relation to the replacements carried out, they are mainly related to the reducing of areas of natural vegetation due to agricultural use. The Central-North regions of Mato Grosso do Sul and East of Mato Grosso do Sul are the other mesoregions that present behavior close to the first mesoregion exposed, regarding changes in land use (both in terms of percentages of participation in the changes identified, as well as the replacement of natural vegetation for agricultural use).



Figure 2 - Overlap of the Mesoregions of Mato Grosso do Sul and biomes - East of Mato Grosso do Sul

Source: IBGE (2015). Elaborated by the authors (2022).

Figure 3 shows the number of areas designated as RL. These areas ensure sustainable economic use of the natural resources of rural property. These areas help, therefore. with the conservation and rehabilitation of ecological processes and promote the conservation of biodiversity, as well as the shelter and protection of wild fauna and native flora (Brasil, 2012), as the RL areas valued by the 2012 Código Florestal- Law No. 12.651/2012, but already exists legally in Law 4.771/1965. Another important piece of

information, referring to the environmental legal framework, is the quantity of areas destined for Conservation Units, created by public and private initiatives, from the use of Law N⁰. 9.985/2000. By definition, ิล Conservation Unit is a territorial space and its including environmental resources, jurisdictional waters, with relevant natural characteristics legally established by the Public Power, with conservation objectives and limits defined (Brasil, 2000).



Figure 3 - Amount of Municipal Areas set aside for RL and Conservation Units, according to legislation

Source: IBGE (2017), MMA (2020) and IMASUL (2020). Elaborated by the authors (2022).

In addition to representing the number of areas resulting from public policy measures, the values corresponding to the provision of ecosystem services from these areas were also estimated (Figure 4). In the figure, two situations are represented regarding the estimation of ecosystem services: the first represents the values referring to the same ecosystem services performed by the biome; the second image represents the values corresponding to all the ecosystem services estimated for each biome. It can be observed that the region with the predominance of the Pantanal biome is the one with the highest values of ecosystem services in both situations illustrated. This finding can be justified by the number of hectares protected, considering that the same ecosystem services for the Pantanal biome (0.136812 US\$. m².Year¹) had a lower value than the same services provided by the Atlantic Forest biome (0.1626 US\$. m² Year¹).

Figure 4 - Values corresponding to the provision of ecosystem services in RL and Conservation Units per municipality in Mato Grosso do Sul



Source: The authors (2022).

It should be considered that among the three biomes that make up the state, the Pantanal biome has the highest value referring to the junction of ecosystem services provided. Among the set of services offered by nature and made available to people, the water supply in the context of the Pantanal biome is the one with the highest value (Seidi; Moraes, 2000).

Furthermore, it can be observed that, to some extent, municipalities can offer ecosystem services to people, especially because they are identified as conservation areas. However, the economic valorization of the provision of ecosystem services in Brazil is still incipient, with some initiatives being carried out in different regions of the country based on specific local characteristics and aimed at distributing fiscal resources from state governments to municipal governments. For example, the ICMS-Ecológico is carried out in states such as Mato Grosso do Sul and Paraná, to which part of the tax collection on the Circulation of Goods and Services is allocated to municipalities. For the municipality to receive values related to the ICMS-Ecológico, it is necessary to comply with a set of specific characteristics for each state (De Castro *et al.*, 2019).

However, globally, it has been observed that the main purpose of payment for ecosystem services is to encourage landowners to practice more environmentally friendly production activities through economic incentives (Jiangyi *et al.*, 2020). Such measures aim to protect the environment and its biodiversity (Farley; Costanza, 2010; Dehua *et al.*, 2019). It is observed that the legal determination in Brazil of the existence of areas in rural properties destined for the RL partially covers this objective, leaving aside the economic incentives aimed at rural producers to maintain these areas.

Moreover, the initiative of payment for ecosystem services has been adopted worldwide since 1980, and since its inception, it has expanded to different locations (Jiangyi et al., 2020). Currently, there are more than 550 programs distributed around the world, with the objective of supporting actions that generate environmental conservation and can still reduce rural poverty (Moros et al., 2020). In total, these programs represent \$36 billion of annual transactions (Salzman et al., 2018). However, when privately funded, these programs are more efficient than government programs because they impose conditionalities and are designed based on local characteristics (Wunder *et al.*, 2008). The two identified characteristics that promote greater efficiency are measures that can be incorporated into the development or improvement of government programs, enabling them to improve their results. There are also considerations that highlight the importance of public-private partnerships for the development of these programs as a measure of their success (Huang et al., 2011).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The state of Mato Grosso do Sul is a biodiverse region composed of three Brazilian biomes. In contrast, it has developed throughout its history, activities considered traditional for food production, and that consequently generate changes in land use. During the analysis period, it can be seen that between 1988 and 2018, changes in land use occurred in all mesoregions of the state. Each mesoregion has unique characteristics for land use replacement, but in general, it can be seen that natural vegetation has lost area to other uses, with the main destination being agricultural use. This question is aggravated when the loss of natural vegetation is related to the biome that predominates in the area. The Pantanal biome is a natural heritage site that has been modified over the years and is vulnerable to traditional agricultural production processes. The Cerrado and Atlantic Forest biomes are biodiversity hotspots that, due to changes in land use verified in the mesoregions, already have a low percentage of existing natural vegetation in the country and, as such, should be priorities for preservation.

also It was observed how public policies environmental have helped the conservation of these areas in Mato Grosso do Sul. In general, RL are represented by larger hectares than conservation units. Furthermore, conservation units have legal obstacles that make it difficult even, in some situations, for the sustainable use of the area, and this may be a characteristic that facilitates the reduction in land use change. Moreover, by establishing a relationship between the areas created from environmental public policies and the provision of ecosystem services, the importance of these areas is reinforced. The use of payments for ecosystem services as a measure to encourage the conservation of areas, or even the use of sustainable management, is a Brazilian need that would facilitate people's understanding of the need to conserve the environment. Previous experiences, registered in research on the subject, consider that the elaboration of public actions must include their structure and characteristics, such as regional conditions. This issue is relevant to Brazil considering the biodiversity of its five biomes. Thus, there is a need to consider the issues peculiar to each locality or region when formulating an action. Another feature that can be included in this context is the establishment of conditionalities to be met by people who enjoy the economic benefits generated by the payment of ecosystem services. An example is the on-site maintenance of environmental conservation.

In this context, rural producers must be encouraged to conserve and continue to use sustainable food production management. In this sense, economically rewarding producers for conserving RL and APP as well as additional areas, may reduce the discussion about the need for the existence of these areas in rural properties, a discussion still to be better held in the country. Moreover, the inclusion of sustainable management as a measure for the existence of economic rewards for producers may enable practices identified as efficient and new knowledge to be created. It is possible that production and conservation are related in rural spaces. In relation to urban space, a measure that may be interesting to the country is the determination of specific characteristics for each region through legislation, which enables the existence of conservation actions in urban areas, making it mandatory, as it is in rural space, the maintenance of urban green areas, both for public and private agents.

REFERENCES

- ALARCON, G. G.; DE FREITAS, L. A. S.; DA FOUNTOURA, G. O.; DE MACEDO, C. X.; RIBEIRO, D. C. The challenges of implementing a legal framework for Payment for Ecosystem Services in Santa Catarina, Brazil. **Natureza & Conservação**, v. 14, p. 132–136, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ncon.2016.05.003
- BRASIL. Lei nº 12.651. **Dispõe sobre a proteção da vegetação nativa**. 2012. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2011 -2014/2012/Lei/L12651.htm. Accessed on: jan. 15, 2020.
- BRASIL. Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil. 1988. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituic ao/constituicaocompilado.htm. Accessed on: mar. 17, 2020.
- BRASIL. Lei nº 9.985. Regulamenta o art. 225, § 1º, incisos I, II, III e VII da Constituição Federal, institui o Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação da Natureza e dá outras providências. 2000. Available: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19985 .htm. Accessed on: mar. 08, 2000.
- BRENNER, N.; SCHMID, C. Towards a new epistemology of the urban? **City**, v. 19, p. 151-182, 2015.
- CARVALHO, F. S.; THOMPSON, K. N. N.; LIMA, W. A. S.; MELO, M. R. D.; DE SOUZA, V.Q.; BORGES, L. S.; GUERREIRO, A. M. Dinâmica de uso da terra, no setor agropecuário, em Paragominas – PA. Agroecossistemas, v. 9, n. 2, p. 148-163, 2017.

https://doi.org/10.18542/ragros.v9i2.5074

- CHAVEIRO, E.F.; DOS ANJOS, A.F. A periferia urbana em questão: um estudo socioespacial de sua formação. **Boletim Goiano de Geografia**, v. 27, n. 2, p. 181-197, 2007. https://doi.org/10.5216/bgg.v27i2.2663
- CHAVES, T. A.; DE ANDRADE, A. G.; LIMA, J. A. S.; PORTOCARRERO, H. Recuperação de áreas degradadas por erosão no meio rural. RJ: **Embrapa**, 2012. 21p.
- CHEN, J.; CHEN, J.; LIAO, A.; CAO, X.; CHEN, L.; CHEN, X. et al. Global land cover mapping at 30 m resolution: a POKbased operational approach. **ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing**, 103, 7-27, 2015.
- COSTANZA, R.; D'ARGE, R.; DE GROOT, R. The value of the world's ecosystem services

and natural capital. **Nature**, v.387, p.253–260, 1997.

- DA MOTTA, R. S.; ORTIZ, R. A. Costs and Perceptions Conditioning Willingness to Accept Payments for Ecosystem Services in a Brazilian Case. **Ecological Economics** v. 147, p. 333–342, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.01.032
- DE CASTRO, B. S.; DA COSTA, L. A. N.; COSTA, D. S. YOUNG, C. E. F. O ICMS Ecológico como uma política de incentivo dos gastos ambientais municipais. **Desenvolvimento em Debate**, v. 7, n. 1, 2019. https://doi.org/10.51861/ded.dmdn.1.013
- DEGIFE, A.; WORKU, H.; GIZAW, S.; LEGESSE, A. Land use land cover dynamics, its drivers and environmental implications in Lake Hawassa Watershed of Ethiopia.
 Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment, v. 14, p. 178-190, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsase.2019.03.005
- DEHUA, M.; XINGYUAN, H.; WANG, Z.; TIAN, Y.; XIANG, H.; YU, H.; MAN, W.; JIA, M.; REN, C.; ZHENG, H. Diverse policies leading to contrasting impacts on land cover and ecosystem services in Northeast China. Journal of Cleaner Production, v. 40, 2019.
- DE MATTOS, P. P.; SALIS, S.M.; BRAZ, E.M.; CRISPIM, S.M.A. Sustainable management of natural forests in Pantanal region, Brazil. **Ciência Florestal**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 321-333, 2010. https://doi.org/10.5902/198050981855
- DOMINGUES, A. T. O setor agroindustrial canavieiro no Mato Grosso do Sul: desdobramentos e perspectivas. **Revista Tamoios**, v. 7, n. 2, p. 21-36, 2011. https://doi.org/10.12957/tamoios.2011.2237
- DRONOVA, I.; GONG, P.; WANG, L.; ZHONG, L. Mapping dynamic cover types in a large seasonally flooded wetland using extended principal component analysis and object-based classification. **Remote Sensing of Environment**, v. 158, p. 193-206, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.10.027
- ECOSYSTEM PARTNERSHIP FUND. Perfil do Ecossistema Hotspot de Biodiversidade do Cerrado. 2017.
- EMPRESA BRASILEIRA DE PESQUISA AGROPECUÁRIA – EMBRAPA. Sistema brasileiro de classificação de solos. 3. ed. Brasília, DF: Embrapa, 2013. 353 p.
- FAGUNDES, F.N.; BORGES, A.C.G. Dinâmica territorial agropecuária e utilização das terras atuais no Escritório de Desenvolvimento Rural (EDR) de São João da Boa Vista. **Geosaberes**, v. 6, n. 2, p. 178-192, 2015.
- FARINHA, M. J. U. S.; BEREZUK, A. G.; BERNARDO, L.; SOARES FILHO, A.

Assessment of Ecosystem Services Provided by a Green Urban Infrastructure in Brazilian Atlantic Forest Biome Areas – Dourados, Mato Grosso Do Sul. Sociedade e Natureza, v. 35, n. 1, 2023. https://doi.org/10.14393/SN-v35-2023-68219

FARLEY, J., COSTANZA, R. Payments for ecosystem services: from local to global. Ecological Economics, v. 69, p. 2060-2068, 2010.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.06.010

GARCIA, J. R.; BUAINAIN, A. M. Dinâmica de Ocupação do Cerrado Nordestino pela Agricultura: 1990 e 2012. Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural, v. 54, n. 2, p. 319-338, 2016.https://doi.org/10.1590/1234.56781806-

947900540207

- GONG, P. Remote sensing of environmental change over China: a review. Science Bulletin, v. 57,2793-2801, 2012 n. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11434-012-5268-y
- GREIBER, T. Payments for Ecosystem Services Legal and Institutional Frameworks. IUCN, Gland. 2009.
- HASSAN, Z.; SHABBIR, R.; AHMAD, S.S.: MALIK. A.H.: AZIZ. N.: BUTT. A.; ERUM, S. Dynamics of land use and land cover change (LULCC) using geospatial techniques: a case study of Islamabad Pakistan SpringerPlus, v. 5, n. 1, 2016. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2414-z
- HUANG, SHU-LI, CHEN, YU-HWA, KUO, FEI-YU, WANG, SZU-HUA. Emergy-based evaluation of peri-urban ecosystem services. Ecological Complexity, v. 8, n. 1, p. 38-50, 2011.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2010.12.002

- IBAMA. Modelo de valoração econômica dos impactos ambientais em unidades de conservação – Empreendimentos de Comunicação, Rede Elétrica e Dutos -Estudo Preliminar. Rio de Janeiro: IBAMA/RJ, 2002.
- INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA IBGE. Censo 2017.Agropecuário. Disponível em: https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/economic as/agricultura-e-pecuaria/21814-2017-censoagropecuario.html. Acesso em: may, 12 2020.
- INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA – IBGE. Banco de Dados de Informações Ambientais - BDiA. 2020a. Available:

https://bdiaweb.ibge.gov.br/#/consulta/pesquis a. Accessed on: mar. 22, 2020.

INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA – IBGE. Malhas Digitais. 2015.

Available: https://mapas.ibge.gov.br/bases-ereferenciais/bases-cartograficas/malhasdigitais. Accessed on: mar. 03, 2020.

- INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA – IBGE. Séries temporais Censo Demográfico. 2020b. Available: https://sidra.ibge.gov.br/pesquisa/censodemografico/demografico-2010/inicial. Accessed on: may 05, 2020.
- INSTITUTO DE MEIO AMBIENTE DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL – IMASUL. Cadastro estadual de unidades de conservação -CEUC. 2020.Available: https://www.imasul.ms.gov.br/cadastroestadual-de-unidades-de-conservacao-ceuc/. Accessed on: mar. 25, 2020.
- JIANGYI, L.; SHIQUAN, D.; HMEIMAR, A.H. Cost-effectiveness analysis of different types of payments for ecosystem services: A case in the urban wetland ecosystem. Journal of Cleaner Production, v. 249, p. 1-13, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119325
- KINDU, M.; SCHNEIDER, T.; DÖLLERER, M.; TEKETAY, D.; KNOKE, T. Scenario modelling of land use/land cover changes in Munessa-Shashemene landscape of the Ethiopian highlands. Science of the Total Environment., v. 622, p. 534-546, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.338
- KLINE, K.; MARTINELLI, F.; OLIVEIRA, C.; VENIER, L.; SPAROVEK, G.; MAYER, A.; WALTER, A.; MEDEIROS, R. Bioenergy and biodiversity: key lessons from the Pan region. **Environmental** American Management, v. 56, n. 6, p. 1377-1396, 2015.
- LAURANCE, W.F.; SAYER, J.; CASSMAN, K.G. Agricultural expansion and its impacts on tropical nature. Trends in Ecology and Evolution, v. 29, n. 2, p. 107-116, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.12.001
- LIU, D.; SONG, K.; TOWNSHEND, J.; GONG, P. Using local transition probability models in Markov random fields for forest change Sensing detection. Remote of Environment, v. 112, p. 2222-2231, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2007.10.002
- LOURENZANI, W.L.; CALDAS. ΜM Mudancas no uso da terra decorrentes da expansão da cultura da cana-de-açúcar na região oeste do estado de São Paulo. Ciência Rural, v. 44, n. 11, p. 1980-1987, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-8478cr20140186
- MAPBIOMAS. Uso da terra de Mato Grosso do Sul 2020. Available: http://mapbiomas.org/. Accessed on: jan. 18, 2020.

2018.

MAPBIOMAS. Brasil ganha 1,7 milhão de hectares de água em 2022, mas continua secando. 2022. Available: https://brasil.mapbiomas.org/2023/02/15/brasi l-ganha-17-milhao-de-hectares-de-agua-em-2022-mas-continuasecando/#:~:text=A%20redu%C3%A7%C3%A3 o%20do%20Pantanel%20fag %C3%A1gue%20

o%20do%20Pantanal%20fez,%C3%A1gua%20 nas%20%C3%BAltimas%20tr%C3%AAs%20d %C3%A9cadas. Accessed on: ap. 08, 2024.

- MARQUES, M. I. M. Entre o campo e a cidade: formação e reprodução social da classe trabalhadora brasileira. **Agrária**, n. 5, p. 170-185, 2006. https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1808-1150.v0i5p170-185
- MAXWELL, S.L.; FULLER, R.A.; BROOKS, T.M.; WATSON, J.E. The ravages of guns, nets and bulldozers. **Nature**, v.536, n. 7615, p. 143-145, 2016.
- MEDEIROS, J.X. Aspectos econômicosecológicos da produção e utilização do carvão vegetal na siderurgia brasileira. In: May, Peter. H. (org.) Economia ecológica: aplicações no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro; Campus, p. 83-114, 1995.
- MENDES, P. P.; OLIVEIRA, M. A. C. Pantanal: bioma constitucional. **Revista Direito Ambiental e sociedade**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 171-195, 2019.

https://doi.org/10.18226/22370021.v9.n2.07

- MINISTÉRIO DO MEIO AMBIENTE MMA. Cadastro Nacional de Unidades de Conservação. 2020. Available: https://www.mma.gov.br/areasprotegidas/cadastro-nacional-de-ucs. Accessed
- on: mar. 19, 2020. MOROS, L.; CORBERA, E.; VÉLEZ, M.A.; FLECHAS, D. Pragmatic conservation: Discourses of payments for ecosystem services in Colombia. **Geoforum**, v. 108, p. 169–183, 2020.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.09.004

- OLIVEIRA, R. Quanto vale a floresta? **Revista Informativa do Instituto Terra Brasil**, Rio de Janeiro, n 9, 2000.
- POSPIESZ, R. C.; SOUZA, M. R. P.; OLIVEIRA, G. B. Análise shift-share: um estudo sobre os estados da Região Sul de 2005-2008. Caderno de Iniciação Científica, p. 327–338, 2011.
- ROLIM, C. F. C. **Restruturação produtiva, mundialização e novas territorialidades:** um novo programa para os cursos de economia regional e urbana. Curitiba, PR: PPGDE/UFPR, 1999.
- SALZMAN, J.; BENNETT, G.; CARROLL, N.; GOLDSTEIN, A.; JENKINS, M. The global status and trends of payments for ecosystem services. **Nature Sustainability**, v. 1, n. 3,

p.136–144,

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0033-0

SALVADOR, E. Fundo público e políticas sociais na crise do capitalismo. **Serviço Social & Sociedade**, v. 104, p. 605-631, 2010.

https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-

66282010000400002

- SANTOS, F. A. A.; FARIA, R. A.; TEIXEIRA, E. C. Mudança da composição agrícola em duas regiões de Minas Gerais. **Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural**, v. 46, n. 3, p. 579-595, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-20032008000300001
- SANTOS, M. **Metamorfoses do espaço habitado –** fundamentos teóricos e metodológicos da geografia. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1988.
- SANTOS, M. A natureza do espaço: técnica e tempo, razão e emoção. São Paulo: Editora da USP, 2006.
- SANTOS, S. A.; COMASTRI-FILHO, J. A. Práticas de limpeza de campo para o Pantanal. Corumbá, MS: **Embrapa**, 2012.
- SANTOS, V. D. A contribuição da Colônia Agrícola Nacional de Dourados – CAND no processo de ocupação e desenvolvimento do Mato Grosso do Sul meridional. 2000. **Especialização** em Geografia, UFMS, Dourados, 2000.
- SEIDI, A. F.; MORAES; A. S. Global valuation of ecosystem services: application to the Pantanal da Nhecolândia, Brazil. Ecological Economics, v. 33, n. 1, p. 1-6, 2000. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(99)00146-9
- SERRA, A. Β. Indicadores de sustentabilidade do solo em sistemas alternativos ao uso do fogo, baseados nos princípios agroecologia, da desenvolvidos por agricultores familiares na região da Rodovia Transamazônica. 2005. Dissertação (Mestrado em Agriculturas Familiares e Desenvolvimento Sustentável). Universidade Federal do Pará, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Agriculturas Amazônicas, Belém, 2005.
- SETO, K. C.; GÜNERALP, B.; HUTYRA, L. R. Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. **Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America**, v. 109, p. 16083-16088, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211658109
- SIBANDA, M.; DUBE, T.; MUBANGO, T.; SHOKO, C. The utility of earth observation technologies in understanding impacts of land reform in the eastern region of Zimbabwe. Journal Land Use Science, v. 11, p. 384-

400.

2016.

https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2015.113075 6

- SOARES, M. T. S.; GAIAD, S.; DE RESENDE, A. S.; DE MENEZES, G. I.; FERNANDES, F. A.; FERNANDES, A. H. B. M. Qualidade de mudas de espécies arbóreas procedentes do Bioma Pantanal e inoculadas com fungos micorrízicos. Brazilian Journal of Forestry Research, v. 37, n. 91, p. 311-322, 2017. https://doi.org/10.4336/2017.pfb.37.91.1424
- TEEB. **TEEB for Agriculture & Food: an Interim Report United Nations Environment Programme**, Geneva. 2015.
- UGEDA JUNIOR, J. C. Planejamento da paisagem e planejamento urbano: reflexões sobre a urbanização brasileira. **Revista Mato-Grossense de Geografia**, v. 17, n. 1, p. 101-116, 2014.
- WANG, Z.; WANG, Z.; ZHANG,
 B.; LU, C.; REN, C. Impact of land use/land cover changes on ecosystem services in the Nenjiang River Basin, Northeast China.
 Ecological Processes, v. 4, n. 1, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13717-015-0036-y
- WUNDER, S. Payments for environmental services: some nuts and bolts. CIFOR Occasional Paper v. 42, n. 32, 2005. https://doi.org/10.1080/03060497.2005.110838 47

- YANG, J.; GONG, P.; FU, R.; ZHANG, M.; CHEN, J.; LIANG, S.; XU, B.; SHI, J.; DICKINSON, R. The role of satellite remote sensing in climate change studies **Nature Climate Change**, v. 3, p. 875-883, 2013. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1908
- ZELL, E.; HUFF, A.K.; CARPENTER, A.T.; FRIEDL, L.A. A user-driven approach to determining critical earth observation priorities for societal benefit. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, v. 5, n. 6, p.1594-1602, 2012.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Maycon Jorge Ulisses Saraiva Farinha: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis and Writing – original draft.

André Geraldo Berezuk: Conceptualization, Project administration and Writing – original draft.

Luciana Virginia Mario Bernardo: Methodology, Formal analysis and Writing – review & editing.

Adelsom Soares Filho: Writing – review.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.