

From Geodiversity to Geofunctionality: Quantifying Geodiversity-Based Ecosystem Services for Landscape Planning in French Guiana

Ottone Scammacca, François Bétard, David Montagne, Lucas Rivera, Célia Biancat, Geoffrey Aertgeerts, Arnauld Heuret

▶ To cite this version:

Ottone Scammacca, François Bétard, David Montagne, Lucas Rivera, Célia Biancat, et al.. From Geodiversity to Geofunctionality: Quantifying Geodiversity-Based Ecosystem Services for Landscape Planning in French Guiana. Geoheritage, 2024, 16, pp.3. 10.1007/s12371-023-00910-0. hal-04348387

HAL Id: hal-04348387 https://hal.science/hal-04348387v1

Submitted on 16 Dec 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

- 1 From geodiversity to geofunctionality: quantifying geodiversity-based
- 2 ecosystem services for landscape planning in French Guiana
- 3
- Ottone Scammacca^{a*}, François Bétard^b, David Montagne^c, Lucas Rivera^d, Célia Biancat^d,
 Geoffrey Aertgeerts^e, Arnauld Heuret^f
- 6 ^{*a*} UMR Prodig, CNRS, Université Paris 1: Panthéon-Sorbonne, IRD, AgroParisTech, 7 Aubervilliers, France
- 8 ^b Sorbonne Université, UR Médiations, Paris, France
- 9 ^c Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, UMR Ecosys, 91120 Palaiseau, France
- 10 ^d BRGM 93700 Cayenne, French Guiana
- 11 ^e BRGM 35700 Rennes, France
- ¹² ^f Geosciences Montpellier, CNRS, Université de Montpellier, Université de Guyane
- 13

- 16
- 17 Reference:
- 18 Scammacca, O., Bétard, F., Montagne, D., Rivéra, L., Bianca, C., Aertgeerts, G., Heuret, A.,
- 19 From Geodiversity to Geofunctionality: Quantifying Geodiversity-Based Ecosystem Services
- 20 for Landscape Planning in French Guiana. Geoheritage 16, 3 (2024).
- 21 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12371-023-00910-0</u>
- 22

^{14 *}Corresponding author: Ottone Scammacca (<u>ottone.scammacca@ird.fr</u>)

24 Abstract

Geodiversity assessment gained a prominent interest in the geoscientific community and beyond. However, it is not always sufficient for land planning or geoconservation. It is then pivotal to account for the contribution of functional geodiversity (i.e. geofunctionality), for instance declining the ecosystem services (ES) cascade model. However, by our knowledge geodiversity-based ES (GES) have been rarely quantified.

This paper aims at adapting existing ES-related approaches to quantify and map GES in French Guiana, a French Overseas territory located in the Amazon, where on-going land use changes might affect ES supply. Seven GES were spatially assessed through an indicator-based approach accounting for both offered and used GES and merged into multiservices maps. Multiservices maps were then combined with a hemeroby index to highlight geofunctionality hotspots. Difference maps were finally used to compare geodiversity and geofunctionality patterns.

36 The ES framework seems an effective way to quantitatively assess geofunctionality. 37 Geodiversity and geofunctionality do not follow the same spatial patterns: very geodiverse 38 areas can be poorly functional and vice-versa. Therefore, geodiversity and geofunctionality 39 need to be both considered when it comes to landscape planning. This might be enhanced 40 through hotspots mapping to highlight priority areas for planners. This study also focuses on 41 the role of human inputs in GES supply and raises questions about the selection of proper 42 indicators that should fit each step from the ES supply to management. High-quality datasets 43 must be available and their occasional absence is a central matter of land planning that must 44 be addressed before every decision-making process.

45 Keywords: Geodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Hotspots, Landscape, Human Inputs, French46 Guiana

47

1. Introduction

49

50

51 Despite their pivotal role in socio-ecological functioning, abiotic and interfacial (i.e. soils) 52 components of natural diversity still tend to do not find their due place within land planning, 53 environmental management and conservation strategies (Brilha et al. 2018; Boothroyd and 54 McHenry 2019), which often focus mostly on biodiversity (Chakraborty and Gray 2020).

Such considerations converged within the development of geoecological approaches (Tandaric 2015) and of the concept of "geodiversity", as a new prism to look at all non-living components of nature and as a new geological and geographical paradigm (Claudino-Sales 2021). Geodiversity, abiotic equivalent of biodiversity (Gray 2011), is generally defined as "the natural range (diversity) of geological (rocks, minerals, fossils), geomorphological (landforms, topography, physical processes), soil and hydrological features," including "their assemblages, structures, systems and contributions to landscapes" (Gray 2013).

62 Despite its scope encompasses a wider range of activities included in land-planning (Serrano 63 and Ruiz-Flaño 2007; Schrodt et al. 2019), geodiversity has been mainly related to 64 geoconservation. The possibility, conditions and usefulness of a broader operationalization of 65 this concept need to be tested and demonstrated. Moreover, the assessment of geodiversity in terms of site-specific richness and abundance (Zwolinski et al. 2018) appears insufficient to 66 67 support both land planning and geoconservation (Scammacca et al. 2022a). It is therefore 68 critical to apprehend the ensemble of contributions that geodiversity provides to socio-69 ecological functioning (i.e. geofunctionality) (Volchko et al. 2020; Scammacca et al. 2023a).

70 Over the last years, the scientific community suggested that declining the "ecosystem services" 71 (ES) concept to geodiversity might be an effective way to assess such contributions (Kløve et al. 72 2011; Gray et al. 2013; Van der Meulen et al. 2016; Reverte et al. 2020; Volchko et al., 2020; 73 Carrión-Mero et al. 2022) and the role of geodiversity in the delivery of many ES has been 74 widely recognized (Gray, 2011; Van Ree et al. 2017; Fox et al. 2020; Crisp et al. 2021). ES can 75 be defined as the contributions that ecosystems provide to human well-being (Muller and 76 Burkhard 2012; Haines-Young and Potschin 2018), sometimes through human inputs (Jones et 77 al. 2016; La Notte et al. 2017) and which do not exist in isolation from people's needs, demand, 78 access and priorities (Haines-Young and Potschin 2010; Heink et al. 2016).

The ES approach, particularly because of its suitability to assessment and mapping exercises
(Martinez-Harms and Balvanera 2012; Burkhard and Maes 2017), is widely recognized as a

potential tool to improve environmental monitoring and land planning through holistic thinking 81 82 about ecosystem processes and human well-being (Wei and Zhan 2023). This might be particularly useful in remarkable areas of natural richness and diversity such as the Amazon 83 84 basin, where rapid on-going land use changes affect ES supply (Richards and VanWey 2015; 85 Jakovac et al. 2016; Ferreira et al. 2021). Located in this region, the only continental French and 86 European Overseas territory of French Guiana has almost 96% of its surface covered by Amazon 87 rainforest. Although it is one of the least densely populated areas in the world, population 88 growth rate and the related needs in terms of infrastructures, agricultural supplies and 89 economic growth, are exacerbating, potentially affecting ES supply. Land use impacts on ES 90 supply are often analyzed through hotspots mapping, which also supports land planners in 91 geographic prioritization (Orsi et al. 2020). Analogously, hotspots can be used to identify highly 92 geodiverse and highly threatened areas (Bétard and Peulvast 2019).

Despite it might play a greater role than biotic components in the delivery of some services (Heink et al. 2016; Slabbert et al. 2022), geodiversity has been often neglected in practice in the developments of the ES concept. Although soil-related ES gained a growing interest over the last decades (Baveye et al. 2016; Fossey et al. 2020; Scammacca et al., 2023b), geodiversitybased ES (GES) are still considered as an "abiotic extension" (Gray, 2018) in current ES classification systems (Van der Meulen et al. 2016), creating a dichotomy between the role of biotic and abiotic contributions in ES supply (Fox et al. 2020).

100 By our knowledge, quantitative assessments of GES remain uncommon (Butorac and Buzjak 101 2020; Miklos et al. 2020; Reverte et al. 2020) and current studies provide often qualitative 102 assessments of GES and of their relationships with biodiversity and geodiversity (Alahuta et al., 103 2018). Recently, Balaguer et al. (2023) applied the matrix-based approach to assess how land 104 use changes might affect ecosystem services provided by geodiversity in Brazil. Nervertheless, 105 the scarcity of quantitative studies might limit the full implementation of the geodiversity 106 concept within the ES framework towards the accomplishment of Sustainable Development 107 Goals (Van Ree and Van Beukening 2016; Brilha et al. 2018; Bitoun et al. 2022). French Guiana 108 geodiversity, despite it is historically associated to gold mining, played an important role in the 109 past dynamics of the region and it has a wider potential of contributing to the supply of multiple 110 ES (Scammacca et al. 2022a). Because of its socio-geo-ecological features, this territory 111 represents a major challenge for sustainable land planning and conservation (Aubertin and 112 Pons 2017; Budoc 2017). Previous studies focused on the assessment of ES in the region (Sieber

- et al. 2021) mainly based on land-use proxies or specific biotic parameters (Trégarot et al.2021).
- 115 This study has therefore the purpose to: i) attempt at a first quantification of geofunctionality
- 116 in French Guiana, in terms of GES supply; ii) analyze the spatial patterns of geodiversity and
- 117 geofunctionality and; iii) explore approaches to account for geodiversity and geofunctionality
- 118 within sustainable land planning strategies in French Guiana discussing the challenges of data
- 119 unavailability and the pertinence of potential ES management indicators.
- 120

2. Applying the ecosystem service cascade model to geodiversity

123 The ES paradigm has been conceptualized through the "cascade model" which distinguishes 124 between ES components (e.g. ecosystem processes, functions, services, benefits) and linking 125 the two ends of ES supply chain (Haines-Young and Potschine 2010). This model has been often 126 revisited, particularly to fit land planning requirements (Villamagna et al. 2013; Von Haaren et 127 al. 2014; La Notte et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2022). Von Haaren et al. (2014) re-adapted the 128 cascade model proposing a practice-oriented ES evaluation model identifying: "offered" ES (or 129 ES capacity), as the totality of ecosystem contributions that could, at least potentially, be 130 utilized by humans, and "used" ES (or ES flow) which are those currently utilized by humans 131 (Von Haaren et al. 2014).

This distinction might also offer complementary perspectives elucidating the aspect of human inputs within planning objectives (Albert et al. 2016). Since landscapes are often modified by societies, human-derived capital – in terms for instance of knowledge, human interventions and environmental management (Fig.1) – is often necessary for the delivery of many ES (Jones et al. 2016). However, this dimension is rarely considered in ES assessments and it is currently unclear to what extent human influence is included in the ES concept (Heink et al. 2016).

138 In order to quantify GES, this study follows the Von Haaren et al. (2014) model. The link 139 between functions and services is reflected by the offered or used ES supply, depending on the 140 intensity of the human input involved (Fig. 1). On one hand, the assessment of offered ES 141 implies the acknowledgement (i.e. inventory, prospection, knowledge) of the capacity to 142 deliver the service according to user needs. On the other, the assessment of used ES might 143 imply human inputs involving planning and management practices (e.g. infrastructures 144 construction, exploitation, transformation, conservation) that allow for the offered service to 145 be concretely accessible and enjoyed by users according to their demands (Fig. 1).

3. Study area

149 The current approach is tested in French Guiana, a French region located in South America (Fig. 150 2). Its geology, locally documented (Choubert 1949; Magnien et al. 1990) and described by the 151 scientific literature (Choubert 1974; Milesi et al. 2003; Théveniaut et al. 2012) can be framed 152 within the formation of the Precambrian terrains of the Guiana Shield (Delor et al. 2003). French 153 Guiana can be divided into two main geomorphological domains: i) the coastal plains of the 154 lowlands (4% of the territory), underlined by ancient and recent Quaternary sediments (Fig. 155 2a); ii) the uplands of the inner regions (96% of the territory), with moderate relief energy (e.g. 156 hills of granitic inselbergs and volcano-sedimentary peaks reaching a maximum of 850 meters 157 a.s.l.), and composed of outcrops of the oldest crystalline Paleoproterozoic basement formed 158 during the crustal growth of the Transamazonian orogeny (2.25-1.9 Ga) (e.g. metamorphic, 159 magmatic, sedimentary and volcanic rocks). Of particular interest, two greenstone belts, mainly 160 composed of meta-volcanic lithology with greenschist to amphibolite facies metamorphism 161 and of poorly known meta-volcano-sedimentary rocks (Fig 2a), host most of gold primary and 162 placer deposits, targeted by legal and illegal mining (Scammacca et al. 2022b). Water resources 163 are distributed among groundwater bodies (84,000 km² in confined aquifers) and a dense and 164 tufted network of surface waters (20,000 km of length) spread across the territory (DEAL, 165 2013). Soils are well documented although data are scattered and often non-harmonized. They 166 are greatly heterogeneous as a function of petro-geochemistry diversity of parent materials, 167 geomorphological structures, tectonics, weathering through time and hydrological dynamics 168 (Boulet 1979; Palvadeau 1999; Ferry et al. 2003). Lowland soils, developed on coastal plains 169 include moderately developed soils, Histosols, Gleysols, Podzols, while highland soils include 170 Ferralsols, ferric Cambisols, Acrisols, Plinthosols and Podzols (Leprun et al. 2001).

Human settlements and activities are mostly located along the coastal areas and along the borders of Maroni and Oyapock rivers (Fig. 2b). Formal and informal human activities range from artisanal, industrial (e.g. fishing, hunting, mining, space sector, manufacturing, energy, agriculture, forestry) to commerce, construction, water management, tourism and transport.

French Guiana hosts more than 280,000 inhabitants in approximatively 84,000 km² but with the second highest population growth rate among French regions. With 96% of its surface covered by the Amazon rainforest and 90% under State ownership (ledom 2021), land tenure is a major issue, leading to challenges for future land management and conservation strategies.

4. Materials and methods

180 4.1 Considered GES and indicators selection

181

Seven GES were selected in order to include the main ES classes (e.g. provisioning, regulating, cultural services) and according to the significant planning and environmental challenges in French Guiana. (Table 1): four provisioning services such as mineral commodities supply (MM), non-metallic raw materials supply (MnM), surface water for drinking purposes (WS), groundwater for drinking purposes (WU), two regulating and maintenance services such as natural habitat regulation (HAB) and flood control (FC) and one cultural service, i.e. recreational activities (GC).

189 GES were assessed in their offered and used dimensions and mapped firstly on a single-service 190 basis and then combined to obtain multi-services maps (Fig. 3). GES were assessed and mapped 191 through spatially explicit indicators selected according to existing studies (Fig. 4) and listed with 192 the related input data in Table 2. Abiotic indicators were specifically chosen to underline the 193 role of geodiversity in ES supply, sometimes in combination with human or social data. Input 194 data were collected on GIS-based platforms such as GeoGuyane and Guyane SIG. More details 195 are available in the Supplementary materials. Although their non-renewable character, raw 196 materials supply services (MM and MnM) were addressed because it might be significant in 197 landscape-oriented ES frameworks for planning perspectives (Kandziora et al. 2013), especially 198 in such areas of interest. Their offered dimension was assessed respectively based on 199 prospected mineral occurrences and lithological favorability (Fig. 4a and b) while the used 200 dimension was based on the location of legal mines and quarries (Grêt-Regamey and Weibel 201 2020 (Fig. 4h and i). Water supply services (WS and WU) were quantified based on the actual 202 good status of surface waters (Fig.4c) and aquifers location (Fig.4d) for their offered dimension 203 (Albert et al. 2016; Reverte et al. 2020) and on drinking water points for the used dimension 204 (Fig.4j and k). Landscape capacity to support biodiversity habitats (HAB) was assessed through 205 biodiversity potential levels described by Guitet et al. (2015a), which identify forest habitats 206 mainly based on geomorphology (Guitet et al. 2013), one of the main drivers of biodiversity 207 changes in the Amazon basin (Guitet et al. 2015b) (Fig.4e). The surface of protected areas 208 indicated the used dimension of the service (Fig.4I). Flood control (FC) was assessed based on 209 the presence of natural barriers such as wetlands (Kandziora et al. 2013) while flood-prone 210 areas were identified by Guitet and Brunaux (2017) through the HAND topographic algorithm

(Rennó et al. 2008) (Fig. 4f). The assessment of the used service was based on the location of
wetlands in areas covered by flood-risk prevention plans (Albert et al. 2016) (Fig. 4m).

Recreational activities offer (GC) was assessed according to the number of currently inventoried geosites (Nontanovanh and Roig 2010; Roig and Moisan 2011; Bourbon and Roig 2013) and the presence of outcrops of granitic inselbergs (Fig. 4g), considered as one of the uncommon ways to observe French Guiana lithology (Ferry et al. 2003). The used dimension was characterized integrating a distance parameter (Albert et al. 2016) between geosites and the road network (Fig. 2n).

219

4.2 GES assessment and mapping221

After initial data were pre-processed (Fig. 4) (e.g. data merging, data extraction, geometry validation) using Qgis Desktop 3.28.5 and ArcMap 10.8.2 software, they were intersected, for each GES, with a 10x10 km grid-cell layer covering the whole continental part of the study area (922 cells).

226 Data were summarized according to each cell depending on the units of the initial data (Table 227 2). For instance, data expressed in units of surface (e.g. used MM, offered and used MnM, 228 offered WU, used HAB, offered and used FC), length (e.g. offered WS and usedGC) or volume 229 (e.g. MnM) were summed up for each cell while data expressed in terms of numbers of 230 punctual geometries were simply counted (e.g. offered MM andGC, used WS and WU). 231 Surfaces, lengths and point counting were calculated automatically using Qgis Desktop 3.28.5 232 functions. For the GC service, distances were calculated using the "Join attributes by nearest" 233 tool and then averaged for each cell.

Each service map was joined by attributes to the original cell-grid layer. The values expressed for each service were re-classified in four classes using Jenks natural breaks, ranging from 1 (i.e., low supply) to 4 (i.e., very high supply).

The scores of offered and used single-service maps were summed to obtain multi-service maps representing, respectively, total offered and used geofunctionality (*Gf*). *Gf* maps were reclassified in four classes using Jenks natural breaks, ranging from 1 (i.e., low supply; sum equal

- to 7) to 4 (i.e., very high supply; sum superior to 18)
- All the final maps were interpolated through kriging on ArcMap 10.8.2 in order to limit border
- effects, often caused by the homogenization of partial data contained in bordering cells.

4.3 Updating the Geodiversity Index (Gt)

The Geodiversity Index (*Gt*) for the study area was originally assessed by Scammacca et al. (2022a), as the sum of four partial thematic sub-indices (e.g. lithological and unlithified diversity, mineral diversity, hydrodiversity, and geomorphodiversity). The index was here updated following two steps:

i) A pedodiversity sub-index, was integrated in the original assessment through a coarse
regional Soil Map of French Guiana (Blancaneaux 1979), recently available as a digital vector
layer with a spatial scale of 1:1,000,000.

ii) The hydrodiversity sub-index was recalculated using the same input data (e.g. surface
and underground waters) and counting the number of different entities in each cell. Surface
waters were categorized by their Strahler rank, as suggested by the 2019 Water Planning report
(OEG, 2020).

256

257 4. 4 GES and geodiversity relationships

258

The relationships between offered and used GES and between *Gf* and *Gt* levels were analyzed through difference mapping. Changes in spatial patterns and levels were obtained by adding a new field in the attribute table and calculating the relative difference (expressed in %) between

offered and used GES according to the following equation (Eq. 1):

263

262

$$RD_{Gf} = 100 \frac{Gf_o - Gf_u}{Gf_o}$$

264

265 Where RD_{Gf} is the relative difference between offered (Gf_o) and used (Gf_u) geofunctionality. 266 Changes between total offered and potential Gf and Gt indices were calculated according to 267 the equation (Eq. 2):

268

269

$$RD_{Gtf} = 100 \frac{Gt - Gf_{o,u}}{Gt}$$

270

Where RD_{Gtf} is the relative difference between the geodiversity index values Gt and offered (Gf_o) and used (Gf_u) geofunctionality. 273 Spatial differences were classified on a range of seven classes translating the direction and the 274 intensity of the change: for difference maps related to offered and used GES, areas with 275 negative values infer that used GES levels are superior to offered GES levels while areas with 276 positive values infer that offered GES levels are superior to used GES levels. When the value is 277 equal to zero, offered and used GES show the same levels. The same considerations can be 278 applied to the maps of relative difference between total *Gt* and offered or used *Gf* (Eq. 3).

279

280 4.5 Geodiversity and geofunctionality hotspots

281

According to the approach proposed by Bétard and Peulvast (2019), a Threat Index (TI) was combined to *Gt* in order to obtain a Sensitivity Index (SI) and highlight geodiversity hotspots. In this study TI was assessed based on the Hemeroby "*M*" index (Steinhardt et al. 1999), which is an integrative measure of human impacts on ecosystems (Lausch et al. 2015) and has the advantage to be both ecologically well-founded and easily applicable (Frank et al. 2012). This index is often used to evaluate the naturalness degree of an area (Walz 2008) and can be integrated within the assessment of ecological functioning (Frank et al. 2012).

289 The index was calculated based on the Regional Land Use Plan (RLUP) of French Guiana (CTG 290 2016), at the scale of 1:100,000 as spatial input data. The RLUP defines the general allocation 291 of areas to given land uses according to predefined planning objectives. It divides the territory 292 in eleven land use categories (Fig. 5a) translating current and future activities. A Hemeroby 293 degree (Fig. 5b) was assigned to each land use category as suggested by Walz and Stein (2014), 294 (Table 3). Since the study area is cartographically divided in 922 cells with equal size, a simple 295 area-weighted Hemeroby index was calculated using the following equation (Eq. 3) (Walz and 296 Stein, 2014):

297 $M_w = \sum_{h=1}^n f_n \times h$

Where M_w is the simple area-weighted Hemeroby index, n is the number of degrees of Hemeroby (here: n = 7), f_n is the proportion (%) of category n, h is the degree of Hemeroby. The calculation was performed intersecting the Hemeroby degree map (Fig.5b) with the original grid layer. After summarizing the intersected values to the grid cells, Eq. 4 was applied. The TI map was then interpolated through kriging showing low and high threat areas (Fig. 5d).

303	Finally, the SI was automatically obtained by the combination of the TI raster map with the Gt
304	raster map (Fig. 3) using ArcMap Raster Calculator tool and according to the equation (Eq. 4):
305	
306	$SI_{GI} = TI \times Gt$
307 308	The same equation was applied to offered and used $Gf(Gf_{o,u})$ raster maps as following (Eq. 5):
309	$SI_{GES} = TI \times Gf_{o,u}$
310	
311	The SI classes were normalized based on the overall minimum (i.e. 45.9) and maximum (i.e.
312	1,424.3) values of the three maps.
313	

314 5. Results

315 5.1 GES levels and maps

316

317 Figure 6 shows the single-service offered (Fig. 6a to g) and used (Fig.6i to o) GES maps while 318 overall averaged GES levels are synthetized in Figure 7. Globally speaking, the results highlight: 319 i) some services which are generally largely used – in terms of exploitation, management or 320 conservation strategies - compared to their offer (e.g. MM, HAB, GC); ii) some services which 321 are mainly underused – which does not imply a necessity of use – such as MnM, WS, WU, FC; 322 iii) general sustainable uses with potential overuses of the resources (e.g. MM, HAB, GC) but 323 which must be analyzed very carefully according to the methodological choices and the 324 selected indicators.

325 Raw material supply for mining (MM) shows high offered levels along the two greenstone belts 326 (Fig. 6a), although used levels are only higher in the northern belt because of formal 327 interdictions in the southern one, where the Amazonian Park is located (Fig. 6i) and where 328 illegal gold mining is very active (Jébrak et al. 2021). MnM offered levels are higher in all the 329 Quaternary sedimentary formations of the coastal plain (Fig. 6b) – where used MnM levels are 330 mainly located (Fig. 6j) – and in the TTG units (Fig. 2a), particularly in the western area of the 331 territory. Water supply (e.g. WS and WU) and natural habitat regulation (i.e. HAB) are offered 332 almost in the whole study-area (Fig. 6c, d and e). WS and WU are only locally used along the 333 coastal and riverine regions (Fig. 6k and I) while HAB shows moderate to high levels in almost 334 the totality of the territory (Fig. 6m). Despite FC shows moderate levels throughout French 335 Guiana (Fig. 6f), used levels are mainly located in coastal areas (Fig. 6n). GC is supplied in specific 336 spots spread across the whole region (Fig. 6g), mainly in the coastal, eastern and southern 337 regions. The southern areas are less accessible and, therefore, show lower used levels (Fig. 6o). 338 Unlike all offered GES, which show overall higher levels with the exception of MM and GC (Gf_o 339 = 1.3), used GES display globally low levels (Fig. 7). Only HAB differences map highlights multiple 340 areas where offered levels are inferior to the used ones (Fig. 6u). Nevertheless, when averaged 341 over the whole study area, levels are higher for the offered HAB service ($Gf_o = 3$) than for the 342 used one (Gf_o = 2.6) (respectively Fig. 6h, p and x).

343

344

345

349

348 5.2 Comparing Geodiversity (*Gt*) and geofunctionality (*Gf*) levels

Figure 8 compares the *Gt* (Fig. 8a) with offered and used *Gf* (Fig. 8b and c). Except for the northern and southern belts where *Gt* levels are at their peaks, *Gf* levels are higher than *Gt* levels (Figure 8d). Areas in the western part of French Guiana, characterized by TTG complexes (Fig. 6b) show higher offered *Gf* levels with relative differences compared to *Gt* that is locally higher than 100% (Fig. 8d). When averaged over the whole study area, offered *Gf* levels are approximatively 55% higher than *Gt* levels.

- On the contrary, considering the overall low used single-services levels (Fig. 7), Figure 8e highlights many areas where used *Gf* levels are estimated as lower than *Gt* levels. Nevertheless, when averaged over the whole study area, *Gt* levels are only 7% superior to used *Gf* levels (median equal to 0).
- 360
- 361

362 5.3 Geodiversity and geofunctionality hotspots

363

364 Most of the highest threat levels are located particularly along the coastal areas, where most 365 of the human settlements and activities are located (Fig. 9a), with the highest peak of threats 366 located particularly between the main cities of Cayenne and Kourou (Fig.5b). Moderate levels 367 are also shown along the riverine areas of Maripasoula, when going upstream the Maroni River. 368 When the TI map is combined with Gt (Fig. 9b) and offered (Fig. 9c) and used Gf (Fig. 9d), the 369 highest levels of sensitivity (i.e. hotspots) are highlighted particularly for Gt, mainly along the 370 coastal areas. Gf hotspots are less contrasted but still present particularly in the highest-threat 371 areas on the coastal areas and along the Maroni River (Fig. 9c). Used Gf hotspots seem to 372 follow similar patterns but, since used Gf levels are lower, the contrast is less enhanced (Fig. 373 9d).

6. Discussion

378 379

380

6.1 The added-value of geofunctionality assessment and hotspot analysis: from land planning to landscape planning

381 The assessment of geodiversity results often in the measurement of the heterogeneity of 382 landscapes abiotic features and it is generally influenced by their spatial geometry and 383 distribution within a given area. Switching to a functional dimension is uncontestably critical to 384 concretely enhance planning strategies because it allows to understand the complex 385 relationships between geodiversity-related entities and socio-ecological functioning, needs and 386 uses. As shown in Figures 8d and 8e, geodiversity and geofunctionality do not always follow the 387 same spatial patterns and thus, they must be both accounted when it comes to planning tasks. 388 Geofunctionality relates geodiversity to human activities, which can range from conservation 389 to exploitation or artificialization. Indeed, "land" planning might be defined as the systematic 390 and voluntary assessment of alternatives for land use and a territorial repartition of resources 391 reflecting socio-economic conditions, policy visions (e.g. economic development, landscape 392 protection, equal access to education and culture) and knowledge, in order to adopt the best 393 land use options (Metternicht 2017; Desjardins 2021). Since land uses and human inputs imply 394 a socio-economic and functional dimension of space and time, they dissolve within a "territorial 395 metabolism" (Desjardins, 2021) that goes beyond preservation and conservation purposes 396 alone, including also processes that might alter, exploit, artificialize, transform or even destroy 397 natural resources.

398 Therefore, "landscape" – rather than "land use" – planning implies a holistic and metabolic 399 vision of ecosystem diversity, in both its biotic and abiotic dimensions, and it allows the 400 understanding of the relationships between biodiversity, geodiversity and socio-ecological 401 functioning and needs.

402 Geodiversity and biodiversity should therefore be highlighted as equal and linked concepts (Ren 403 et al. 2021). Because geodiversity finds its synthesis in the landscape (Alexandrowicz and 404 Kozlowski 1999; Serrano and Ruiz-Flaño 2007), its operationalization should encompass the 405 landscape seen as a multifunctional complex unit (Nin et al. 2016; Englund et al. 2017; 406 Metternicht 2017; Miklós et al. 2020). Despite it raises many debates (Schröter et al. 2014), the 407 ES concept appears to be an interesting approach to analyze and assess geofunctionality. This 408 landscape-oriented analysis undoubtedly involves spatialized approaches to identify the distribution, across space, of landscape functional units. When it comes to such assessments, it is preferable to distinguish between GES or SI levels when averaged over the whole study area and their spatial distribution. Although considering the study area as a whole entity with averaged levels might be helpful to support strategies at the national or supranational scales, it would not allow to identify clusters or priority areas of intervention at the landscape functional unit scale.

415 For instance, despite averaged low levels, MM supply shows high offered levels mainly along 416 the two greenstone belts, which host most of the gold deposits (Fig. 4a). Offered WS and WU 417 are spread along the whole region (Fig. 4c and d) confirming the fact that, as its name suggests, 418 Guyana is the "land of many waters" (Clifford 2011). The Quaternary formations of the coastal 419 areas underlaying the Paleoproterozoic basement offer for instance overlapping aquifers, 420 increasing known offered WU levels in such regions (Fig. 7d). These portions of the territory 421 show also the most important potential in hosting natural flood-prone areas and wetlands (Fig. 422 4f), mainly because of their intertidal positions, the potential influence of sedimentary aquifers 423 and the presence of mangrove ecosystems developed on the coastal sediments.

424 When geofunctionality is combined with human-related threats according to the approach 425 proposed by Bétard and Peulvast, (2019), geofunctionality hotspots maps provide information 426 about the spatial patterns of endangered areas, thus supporting the spatial allocation of lands, 427 priorities of intervention, while integrating the socio-environmental impacts and conflicts with 428 other potential land uses (Nin et al. 2016). Important information could be also added through 429 statistical analysis or generalized additive models to analyze the relationships between land use 430 intensity, geodiversity and geofunctionality as performed by Tukianen et al. (2017). Focusing 431 only on geodiversity hotspots, would neglect potential areas of ordinary abiotic nature or lower 432 geodiversity that are not necessarily less important in terms of ES supply (Bétard and Peulvast 433 2019).

- 434
- 435

437 6.2 The dual role of human inputs in supplying services: towards ES management438 indicators?

439

Land use, as a human footprint on the environment, is often used to proxy threats to ecological integrity. Nevertheless, the conceptualization of land use only as a "threat" would be limiting in terms of landscape analysis since it is one of the main drivers of landscape structures and patterns (Pătru-Stupariu et al. 2017), driven by governance objectives and societal needs (Galler et al. 2016). As mentioned and conceptualized by the revised cascade model, human inputs are considered as a part of the ES production chain.

446 A service relates to a demand and it is indeed often combined with built, human or social capital 447 in terms of inventory and/or management activities (Jones et al. 2016). This can be particularly 448 observed in two complementary dimensions of GES supply. For instance, the supply of raw 449 materials for mining (MM) and quarrying (MnM) implies, on one hand, the construction of 450 exploitation infrastructures and human workforce that are able to provide the final service. On 451 the other hand, the location of the supply related to such activities is often regulated by 452 mandatory frameworks, such as the Quarrying Regional Plan (QRP) or the Departmental Mining 453 Plan (DMP) in French Guiana, which state where extraction can or cannot take place according 454 to different criteria (e.g. sensitive areas, minimum distance to populated areas). Also, MnM 455 levels are often concentrated especially along the coastal strips (Fig. 4j), since the sandy, 456 lateritic and hard-rock materials are more accessible and closer to human settlements where 457 on-going construction projects are located (Fig. 4j). Surface and groundwater supplies are often 458 located next to populated areas (Fig. 4k and I), since the used service would be non-existent 459 otherwise. Access to geoheritage areas is provided by a network of roads except for the 460 southern areas of French Guiana, where environmental protection measures limit some human 461 interventions (Fig. 4o). Globally, the highest levels of used geofunctionality seem to follow 462 human population distribution, suggesting that the concept of "used" service, depending on 463 the type of service, might be tightly related to human activities requiring interventions other 464 than conservation.

Thus, human inputs might act as ES co-producers and as ES managers. In the first case, they will
particularly influence the future levels of offered service supply, while in the second case they
might control ES spatial patterns, in both cases, to satisfy a demand.

In French Guiana, ES management seems to lead a clear distinction between two areas. The first one is composed of the littoral – and, in some case, riverine – areas, the most inhabited ones where most of needs and ES demands are located but also where geodiversity and biodiversity levels seem higher, hosting dynamic and fragile landscapes (e.g. mangroves, wetlands). The second area embraces most of the inner regions of the territory where human density is very low and where habitat protection strategies dominate, sometimes in contrast with dispersed legal or illegal gold mining activities.

475 Protected areas show in some cases even higher "used" levels than "offered" ones (Fig. 4m and 476 u). The overall higher values for this service and the spatial mismatches between its offered 477 and used levels, might imply that land planners give a priority to biodiversity conservation 478 objectives in inner French Guiana, compared to other land uses. In such protected areas, which 479 are also considered by the DMP, land uses such as mining are therefore forbidden because 480 conflictual with the objectives of local and national strategies. This might explain for instance 481 the difference between offered and used MM levels in the gold deposits of the southern 482 greenstone belt (Fig.6 q). It must not be forgotten indeed that the supply of multiple ES 483 depends on their management and it can result in synergies and trade-offs between single 484 services. For instance, management strategies targeting MM or MnM supply could lead to 485 decreasing surface or groundwater supply, because of the widely known impacts of extraction 486 activities on water quality (Castello and Macedo 2016) and quantity (Northey et al. 2019). 487 However, such considerations should highlight the existence of informal and illegal activities, 488 such as illegal gold mining, which participate to the production of "used" services – for instance 489 in the southern greenstone belt – but increasing negative impacts and trade-offs with other 490 services (e.g. water quality, natural habitat support). The inclusion of informal human inputs 491 and the related fuzzy-data should be considered in such approaches.

492 For better implementations within landscape planning, indicators selection should then fit the 493 cascade model and it might be necessary to clearly distinguish between offered services 494 indicators, used services indicators and management indicators. As example, Rendon et al. 495 (2022) propose a list of non-regulatory management indicators to analyze pressures on soil-496 related ES, mainly in terms of agricultural practices, although management indicators should 497 cover all the dimensions of human inputs. Table 4 attempts to satisfy such distinction for further 498 improvements of the current study proposing a list of management indicators and their 499 objectives for the services considered in this study. Management indicators could vary in terms

500 of management "intensity", which can range from preliminary screening, inventory and 501 baseline data acquisition, to advanced tasks of land allocation, zoning and planning. Such 502 indicators, sometimes unlike the ES they are related to, tend to be complementary rather than 503 discordant. For instance, management tools related to mining and water planning are often 504 compatible and harmonized. In French Guiana, the DMP and the SDAGE (Table 4) are explicitly 505 supportive and interrelated between each other. Management indicators, ideally, should be 506 the result of adequate strategies where planners accounted for ES synergies and trade-offs so 507 to find the optimal balance between economic development and ecological integrity.

Thus, a true implementation of the ES framework would require in practice "formal changes of
existing planning instruments" (Albert et al. 2016) and it would be therefore pivotal to address

510 in the future all the dimensions of human inputs in ES production chain to support prospective

511 studies for ES assessment, monitoring and landscape planning.

515

6.3 Unavailable data are a matter of landscape planning

516 Human inputs include the inventory of data that can be provided by all the stakeholders in a 517 territory (Jones et al. 2016), through various methods and tools, to supply the baseline of 518 knowledge used to quantify the capacity of an ecosystem to provide a service. Therefore, the 519 quality of such data and their scales of acquisition drive ES assessment and mapping tasks and 520 have a critical impact on the final results. Most of the services do not display the same spatial 521 coverage and are limited only to few portions of the study area. If this is related, on one hand, 522 to the bio-geo-physical heterogeneity of the landscape – meaning clearly that not all the ES are 523 or can be supplied by the same spatial units and might have different patterns - on the other 524 hand, it gives clues about data availability, accessibility and data acquisition methods (Le 525 Tourneau and Noucher 2023).

526 For instance, the assessment of quarrying and mining materials supply does not account for 527 data on ancient quarries which sometimes were located in the newly populated areas nor on 528 illegal gold mining production rates and risks. Raw materials offered supply is here based on 529 geological surveys and prospections carried by the French National Geological Survey over the 530 last decades (Magnien et al. 1990; Billa et al. 2013) that specifically targeted the gold-hosting 531 regions of the greenstone belts (Fig. 6a). Potential wetlands were identified at the scale of the 532 whole region (Guitet and Brunaux 2017). Biodiversity-related data (e.g. Fig. 4e) are mapped at 533 the regional scale also because most of the surveys over the years focused on biotic resource 534 inventory (Gautreau 2020). Spatial patterns of geoheritage points can be explained by their 535 identification through both remote-sensed regional data and local field surveys.

The areas with highest ES levels are located on the coastal and riverine areas of French Guiana, because they are the most explored, accessible and inhabited and data are needed for most of the past and current practical planning challenges. These areas are also the most threatened (Fig. 9a), since human occupation is mainly located here and, based on our assessment, that automatically leads to "very high" sensitivity levels (Fig. 9b, c, d).

This means also that applying land use-based metrics for threats identification – such as the Hemeroby index – could translate spatial bias and overlaps in the identification of geofunctionality hotspots since: i) land use is one of the drivers of used ES supply; ii) land use can proxy the accessibility and availability of data, which might be higher in anthropic areas.

The relationship between the spatial distribution of data availability and inhabited areas might lead to underestimate the levels of offered services in more remote areas. Such underestimations should be considered as a loss of opportunity to develop potential services which are still not known, and consequently unused, or, on the contrary, as the best way to preserve them (i.e. since they are not known they might be also not degraded by human interventions).

551 Unavailability of geoscientific data must be identified and assessed and such gaps represent an 552 undeniable challenge to address for landscape-planning. Through indirect or direct measures, 553 the landscape and its structures should be better acknowledged to identify and apply adequate 554 indicators for ES assessment and management. In lack of adequate indicators, the assessment 555 process risks to be performed with coarse available data since it is the only option, rather than 556 the best one. This is particularly true for regulating services, which provide direct impacts that 557 can be difficult to express through pertinent indicators (Villamagna et al. 20213), unlike 558 provisioning services which are usually more easily available. Therefore, the multi-service 559 combination of ES of different natures could lead to bias, since it combines services assessed 560 based on data that have different levels of availability.

561 A Regional Commission for Geoheritage of French Guiana has been only recently established 562 and geoinventories are still ongoing. Geodiversity features of French Guiana, such as the unique 563 komatiitic-related Dachine diamonds (Smith et al. 2016), a great variety of inselbergs spread 564 across the region (Aertgeerts 2020), such as the Mamilihpann inselberg and its still unknown 565 cave paintings (Fuentes 2022) or else the remarkable Grand Connétable island could be 566 integrated in the assessment of cultural GES. Wetland identification field surveys are still 567 unaccomplished because of the lack of harmonized soil and vegetation data (Blum 2013). Also, 568 water-related services could be proxied by the permeability of lithological formations (Perotti 569 et al., 2019) for instance through hydraulic conductivity or rock porosity (Freeze and Cherry, 570 1979).

571 The identification of management goals and land planning exercises require an important level 572 of detail, especially at regional and local scales (Gomez-Zotano et al. 2018). As highlighted by 573 Heink et al. (2016), indicator choice "should capture the meaning of the construct that is to be 574 measured" and "the variance between the indicator and the *indicandum* should be low", 575 meaning that the conceptual model used should be as clear as possible and that indicator 576 selection should stick to it.

578 579

6.4 Abiotic services or abiotic indicators?

580 In a theoretical way, the ES concept already includes abiotic and interfacial components in its 581 definition. However, the current position of geodiversity within the ES framework still remains 582 confused (Fox et al. 2020). This declination resulted sometimes in varying classification systems 583 and terminologies (e.g. "subsurface services": Van Ree and Van Beukening 2016; "abiotic ES": 584 Fox et al. 2020; "geosystem services": Gray 2011). For instance, some authors suggest that 585 geosystem services are all the services associated with geodiversity and that are "independent 586 of interactions with biotic nature" (Fox et al. 2020). Nevertheless, if we consider the landscape 587 as a unified, holistic and dynamic whole, most of the services are *per se* the result of both biotic 588 and abiotic components of natural diversity. One might argue that in any case, attention should 589 be given to identifying a given biotic or abiotic factor that plays a dominant role in the supply 590 of a specific service. Nevertheless, this dominance should be rather expressed in how that 591 specific service is assessed, and thus, in the choice of an adequate predictive – and dominant – 592 variable to assess it. For instance, although the "offered" services selected in this study are 593 classified as biotic (e.g. HAB, FC) and abiotic (MM, MnM, WS, WU, GC) (Table 1), their 594 assessment was performed only according to abiotic variables. Thus, it is pivotal to distinguish 595 between the services themselves (biotic and abiotic) and the underpinning variable(s) that can 596 be selected as assessment indicators. In other words, a unified definition of geodiversity-based 597 ES might be needed.

598

599

600 Conclusion

601

To fully support land use planning and conservation objectives, it is fundamental to account for the contribution of geodiversity to socio-ecological functioning (i.e. geofunctionality). This study proposes an approach to assess geofunctionality in terms of geodiversity-based ecosystem services (GES), through a conceptual model – based on the revised ES cascade model which distinguishes between offered and used services – and a methodological framework that aims at identifying and comparing geodiversity and geofunctionality hotspots. The application of these frameworks in French Guiana, an Overseas French territory presenting planning and conservation challenges, highlights the feasibility of such approaches and the heterogeneity of spatial patterns between geodiversity and geofunctionality which thus must be both included within landscape planning.

612 When assessing typological and functional variability, it is pivotal to distinguish between levels 613 and spatial patterns. The choice between the types of results to consider strictly depends on 614 the objectives of the assessment. Spatialized approaches seem more adequate for planning, 615 seen as the process of allocating lands and integrating impacts and conflicts with other 616 potential land uses. Nevertheless, when assessing geofunctionality hotspots - since used 617 services rely here on human inputs – threats and used geofunctionality levels might overlap 618 and lead to spatial bias. According to this study, French Guiana can be divided in two main 619 areas: the littoral areas, more populated, with higher levels of geodiversity and used 620 geofunctionnality but also higher threats, and the less inhabited and less known inner regions, 621 a widest area with important assessed levels of offered geofunctionality.

Despite the revised ES cascade model includes human interventions in the supply of ES, further
improvements should focus on a clear-cut distinction of human inputs as ES co-producers,
managers but also demanders.

Indicator selection is a crucial step in the assessment process and it should satisfy multiple criteria and fit precisely the conceptual model used. However, data unavailability is the main issue in the achievement of such requirements and it must therefore be considered as a matter of land planning that should be quantified. This is particularly true in French Guiana, where geoscientific data production must be enhanced.

630 Landscape planning – rather than "land use planning" – implies a holistic and metabolic vision 631 of ecosystem diversity, in both its biotic and abiotic dimensions, and it allows the understanding 632 of the relationships between biodiversity, geodiversity and socio-ecological functioning and 633 needs. The ES concept, despite its anthropocentric nature, can be a useful tool to identify and 634 analyze human-nature relationships. However, many improvements must be achieved to clarify 635 the ES concept itself, the place of abiotic and interfacial components of natural diversity within 636 it, and how this concept can fully relate to human activities, uses, needs and priorities of action 637 to drive and support the implementation of policies in increasingly disturbed environments.

638

640 Acknowledgments

641 This study was carried within the post-doctoral grant of the CoSav « Géoressources et 642 durabilité » proposed by the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development

- 643 (Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, IRD). A particular thank is addressed to Dr. Robin
- 644 Cura (UMR Prodig Université de Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne) for the review of the maps used
- 645 in this study. The readers can freely access the data from this paper by contacting the first
- 646 author.
- 647

648 Compliance with Ethical Standards and ethical conduct

- 649 The authors declare that the presented research has been carried in compliance with the
- 650 Ethical Standards proposed by the journal Geoheritage and Springer and they declare to comply
- 651 with the ethical responsibilities of authors.
- 652

653 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

656

657 Funding

658 This study was possible thanks to the post-doctoral grant of the CoSav « Géoressources et

- 659 durabilité » proposed by the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development
- 660 (Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, IRD) and the funding of the UMR Prodig.
- 661

662 References

- Aertgeerts G., (2020), Les inselbergs: bibliographie générale, synthèse en Guyane française et focus sur l'inselberg Mamilihpan.
 Rapport final. BRGM/RP-69589-FR, 76 p., 51 fig., 1 tabl.
- Alahuhta, J., Ala-Hulkko, T., Tukiainen, H., Purola, L., Akujärvi, A., Lampinen, R., Hjort, J., 2018. The role of geodiversity in providing ecosystem services at broad scales. Ecological Indicators 91, 47–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.03.068
 - Albert, C., Galler, C., Hermes, J., Neuendorf, F., von Haaren, C., Lovett, A., 2016. Applying ecosystem services indicators in landscape planning and management: The ES-in-Planning framework. Ecological Indicators 61, 100–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.03.029
 - Aubertin, C., Pons, S., 2017. Politiques de développement durable en Guyane : souveraineté sur les ressources forestières. tem. https://doi.org/10.4000/tem.4440
 - Balaguer, L. P., Garcia, M. D. G. M., Reverte, F. C., & Ribeiro, L. M. D. A. L. (2023). To what extent are ecosystem services provided by geodiversity affected by anthropogenic impacts? A quantitative study in Caraguatatuba, Southeast coast of Brazil. Land Use Policy, 131, 106708.
- 676 Baveye, P.C., Baveye, J., Gowdy, J., 2016. Soil "Ecosystem" Services and Natural Capital: Critical Appraisal of Research on Uncertain Ground. Front. Environ. Sci. 4. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2016.00041
 - Bétard, F., Peulvast, J.-P., 2019. Geodiversity Hotspots: Concept, Method and Cartographic Application for Geoconservation Purposes at a Regional Scale. Environmental Management 63, 822–834. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-019-01168-5</u>
- Billa M., Chevillard M., Tourlière B., Marteau P., Cassard D., Théveniaut H. (2013), Guyane et gisements, hors Or : état des connaissances et réexamen du potentiel minier. Rapport final. BRGM/RP-62003-FR, 157 p., 64 fig., 16 tab.
- Bitoun, R. E., David, G., & Devillers, R. (2023). Strategic use of ecosystem services and co-benefits for Sustainable Development
 Goals. Sustainable Development, 31(3), 1296-1310.
- Blancaneaux P (2001) Carte Pedologique de Guyane, 1; 1,000,000, Planche 10. In: Barret J (ed) Atlas illustre de la Guyane.
 Publications guyanaises, IRD, Paris, pp 50–51
- Boothroyd, A., McHenry, M., 2019. Old Processes, New Movements: The Inclusion of Geodiversity in Biological and Ecological
 Discourse. Diversity 11, 216. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/d11110216</u>
- 688 Boulet (R.), Fritsch (E.), Humbel (F.-X.). Les sols des terres hautes et de la plaine côtière ancienne en
- 689 Guyane française septentrionale. Organisation en systèmes et dynamique actuelle de l'eau. Cayenne :
- 690 ORSTOM, 1979. 170 p. (Rapport n° P122).
- 691 Blum A. (2013), Délimitation des zones humides de Guyane en application de l'arrêté du 1er octobre 2009. Synthèse des données disponibles et recommandations. Rapport BRGM/RP-62333-FR. 18p.
- 693 Brilha, J., Gray, M., Pereira, D.I., Pereira, P., 2018. Geodiversity: An integrative review as a contribution to the sustainable 694 management of the whole of nature. Environmental Science & Policy 86. 19-28. 695 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.05.001
- 696Budoc, R.L., 2017. Quelle place pour la Forêt amazonienne dans le développement territorial guyanais ? tem.697https://doi.org/10.4000/tem.4295
- 698 Burkhard, B., & Maes, J. (2017). Mapping ecosystem services. Advanced books, 1, e12837.
- Butorac, V., Buzjak, N., 2020. Geodiversity and Landscape Services in the Region of Ogulinsko-Plašćanska Zavala, Croatia.
 Ekológia (Bratislava) 39, 130–144. <u>https://doi.org/10.2478/eko-2020-0010</u>
- Carrión-Mero, P., Dueñas-Tovar, J., Jaya-Montalvo, M., Berrezueta, E., Jiménez-Orellana, N., 2022. Geodiversity assessment to
 regional scale: Ecuador as a case study. Environmental Science & Policy 136, 167–186.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.06.009</u>
- Chakraborty, A., Gray, M., 2020. A call for mainstreaming geodiversity in nature conservation research and praxis. Journal for
 Nature Conservation 56, 125862. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2020.125862
- 706 Choubert, B. (1949). Géologie et pétrographie de la Guyane française. Office de la recherche scientifique outre-mer.
- 707 Choubert, B. (1974) Le Précambrien des Guyanes. Mém. BRGM, Orléans, 81, 213 p.
- Claudino-Sales, V., 2021. Geodiversity and geoheritage in the perspective of geography. Bulletin of Geography. Physical Geography Series 21, 45–52. <u>https://doi.org/10.2478/bgeo-2021-0008</u>
- Clifford MJ (2011) Pork knocking in the land of many waters: artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) in Guyana. Resour Policy 36:354–362. https:// doi. org/ 10. 1016/j. resou rpol. 2011. 09. 004
- Crisp, J.R., Ellison, J.C., Fischer, A., 2021. Current trends and future directions in quantitative geodiversity assessment. Progress
 in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment 45, 514–540. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309133320967219
- DEAL Guyane, service Milieux Naturels, Biodiversité, Sites et Paysages, Pole Eaux et Milieux Aquatiques (2013) Evaluation de
 l'état des masses d'eau, Mise a jour de l'état des lieux 2013.
- 716Delor, C., Lahondère, D., Egal, E., Lafon, J.-M., Cocherie, A., Guerrot, C., Rossi, P., Truffert, C., Théveniaut, H., Phillips, D., de717AVELAR, V.G., 2003. Transamazonian crustal growth and reworking as revealed.
- 718 Desjardins, X. (2021). L'aménagement du territoire-2e éd. Armand Colin.
- 719Englund, O., Berndes, G., Cederberg, C., 2017. How to analyse ecosystem services in landscapes—A systematic review.720Ecological Indicators 73, 492–504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.10.009
- Ferreira, S.J.F., Pinel, S., Ríos-Villamizar, E.A., Miranda, S.Á.F., Pascoaloto, D., Vital, A.R.T., Monteiro, M.T.F., da Silva, M. do S.R.,
 da Cunha, T.R.B., dos Santos, A.S., Bender, S., da Cunha, H.B., 2021. Impact of rapid urbanization on stream water quality
 in the Brazilian Amazon. Environ Earth Sci 80, 316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-021-09621-7

678

- Ferry, B., Freycon V., Paget D., 2003. Genèse et fonctionnement hydrique des sols sur socle cristallin en Guyane. Rev. For. Fr. 37. <u>https://doi.org/10.4267/2042/5786</u>
 - Forthofer R.N., Lee E.S., Hernandez M., Chapter 3 Descriptive Methods, in Forthofer R.N., Lee E.S., Hernandez M., Biostatistics (Second Edition), Academic Press, 2007, Pages 21-69, https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-369492-8.50008-X
 - Fossey, M., Angers, D., Bustany, C., Cudennec, C., Durand, P., Gascuel-Odoux, C., Jaffrezic, A., Pérès, G., Besse, C., Walter, C., 2020. A Framework to Consider Soil Ecosystem Services in Territorial Planning. Front. Environ. Sci. 8, 28. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2020.00028
 - Fox, N., Graham, L.J., Eigenbrod, F., Bullock, J.M., Parks, K.E., 2020. Incorporating geodiversity in ecosystem service decisions. Ecosystems and People 16, 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/26395916.2020.1758214
 - Frank, S., Fürst, C., Koschke, L., Makeschin, F., 2012. A contribution towards a transfer of the ecosystem service concept to landscape planning using landscape metrics. Ecological Indicators 21, 30–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.04.027
- Freeze, R. A. and Cherry, J. A. (1979). Groundwater. NewJersey: Prentice Hall.
- Fuentes O., « Maripasoula Peintures rupestres de la Mamilihpann » [notice archéologique], ADLFI. Archéologie de la France, Espace Caraïbes,2022: <u>http://journals.openedition.org/adlfi/114274</u>
- Galler, C., Albert, C., von Haaren, C., 2016. From regional environmental planning to implementation: Paths and challenges of integrating ecosystem services. Ecosystem Services 18, 118–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.02.031
- Gómez-Zotano, J., Riesco-Chueca, P., Frolova, M., Rodríguez-Rodríguez, J., 2018. The landscape taxonomic pyramid (LTP): a multi-scale classification adapted to spatial planning. Landscape Research 43, 984–999. https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2017.1404021
- Gray M (2013) Geodiversity: valuing and conserving abiotic nature (2nd edition), Wiley–Blackwell.
- Gray, M., 2018. The confused position of the geosciences within the "natural capital" and "ecosystem services" approaches. Ecosystem Services 34, 106–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.10.010
- Gray, M., 2011. Valuing Geodiversity in an 'Ecosystem Services' Context. Scottish Geographical Journal 128, 177–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/14702541.2012.725858
- Gray, M., Gordon, J.E., Brown, E.J., 2013. Geodiversity and the ecosystem approach: the contribution of geoscience in delivering integrated environmental management. Proceedings of the Geologists' Association 124, 659–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pgeola.2013.01.003
- Grêt-Regamey, A., Weibel, B., 2020. Global assessment of mountain ecosystem services using earth observation data. Ecosystem Services 46, 101213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2020.101213
- Guitet, S., Brunaux, O., 2017. Utilisation de l'indice HAND pour la cartographie prédictive des milieux humides en forêt guyanaise. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35364.30084
- Guitet, S., Cornu, J.-F., Brunaux, O., Betbeder, J., Carozza, J.-M., Richard-Hansen, C., 2013. Landform and landscape mapping, French Guiana (South America). Journal of Maps 9, 325–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/17445647.2013.785371
- Guitet, S., Pélissier, R., Brunaux, O., Jaouen, G., Sabatier, D., 2015b. Geomorphological landscape features explain floristic patterns in French Guiana rainforest. Biodivers Conserv 24, 1215–1237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-014-0854-8
- Haines-Young, R., Potschin, M., 2010. The links between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, in: Raffaelli,
 D.G., Frid, C.L.J. (Eds.), Ecosystem Ecology. Cambridge University Press, pp. 110–139.
 https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511750458.007
- Haines-Young, R., & Potschin-Young, M. (2018). Revision of the common international classification for ecosystem services (CICES V5. 1): a policy brief. One Ecosystem, 3, e27108.
- Heink, U., Hauck, J., Jax, K., Sukopp, U., 2016. Requirements for the selection of ecosystem service indicators The case of MAES indicators. Ecological Indicators 61, 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.09.031
- Institut d'Emissions des Départements d'Outre-Mer (ledom), Rapport Annuel Economique Guyane 2021.
- Jakovac, C.C., Peña-Claros, M., Mesquita, R.C.G., Bongers, F., Kuyper, T.W., 2016. Swiddens under transition: Consequences of agricultural intensification in the Amazon. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 218, 116–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.11.013
- Jébrak, M., Heuret, A., & Rostan, P. (2021). The gold, peoples and multiple frontiers of French Guiana. The Extractive Industries and Society, 8(1), 8-22.
- Jones, L., Norton, L., Austin, Z., Browne, A.L., Donovan, D., Emmett, B.A., Grabowski, Z.J., Howard, D.C., Jones, J.P.G., Kenter, J.O., Manley, W., Morris, C., D.A., Short, C., Siriwardena, G.M., Stevens, C.J., Storkey, J., Waters, R.D., Willis, G.F., 2016. Stocks and flows of natural and human-derived capital in ecosystem services. Land Use Policy 52, 151–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.12.014
- Kandziora, M., Burkhard, B., Müller, F., 2013. Interactions of ecosystem properties, ecosystem integrity and ecosystem service indicators—A theoretical matrix exercise. Ecological Indicators 28, 54–78. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.09.006</u>
- Kløve, B., Ala-aho, P., Bertrand, G., Boukalova, Z., Ertürk, A., Goldscheider, N., Ilmonen, J., Karakaya, N., Kupfersberger, H., Kværner, J., Lundberg, A., Mileusnić, M., Moszczynska, A., Muotka, T., Preda, E., Rossi, P., Siergieiev, D., Šimek, J., Wachniew, P., Angheluta, V., Widerlund, A., 2011. Groundwater dependent ecosystems. Part I: Hydroecological status and trends. Environmental Science & Policy 14, 770–781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2011.04.002
- La Notte, A., D'Amato, D., Mäkinen, H., Paracchini, M.L., Liquete, C., Egoh, B., Geneletti, D., Crossman, N.D., 2017. Ecosystem services classification: A systems ecology perspective of the cascade framework. Ecological Indicators 74, 392–402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.11.030

- 786 Lausch, A., Blaschke, T., Haase, D., Herzog, F., Syrbe, R.-U., Tischendorf, L., Walz, U., 2015. Understanding and quantifying 787 landscape structure - A review on relevant process characteristics, data models and landscape metrics. Ecological 788 Modelling 295, 31-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.08.018 789
 - Le Tourneau, F.-M., Noucher, M., 2023. La dialectique entre activités informelles et action de l'État dans la construction territoriale des grands espaces : le cas de l'orpaillage dans l'intérieur de la Guyane française. cybergeo. https://doi.org/10.4000/cybergeo.40484
 - Leprun, J. C., Misset, M., Viala, A. L., Le Matret, H., Wegnez, F., Cheaib, N., ... & Le Rouget, B. (2001, November). Cartographie agro-pédologique des sols guyanais à partir des documents existants et integration dans un SIG. In Convention EPAG/IRD (US 018 «Actualisation et valorisation des données pédologiques»), Rapport général de fin de convention, IRD (Vol. 30).
- 795 Magnien AP, Plat R, Coste B, Le Chapelain JR (1990) Inventaire minier du département de la Guyane. Avancement des travaux 796 au 3 août 1990. BRGM R 31286, 34 p., 16 fig., 2 tabl., 4 pl
 - Martínez-Harms, M.J., Balvanera, P., 2012. Methods for mapping ecosystem service supply: a review. International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management 8, 17–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/21513732.2012.663792
 - Metternicht, G. (2017). Land use planning. Global Land Outlook (Working Paper), 2(3), 25-31.

791

792

793

794

797

798

799

805

807

808

809

810

811

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

829

830

831

832

- 800 Miklós, L., Špinerová, A., Belčáková, I., Offertálerová, M., Miklósová, V., 2020. Ecosystem Services: The Landscape-Ecological 801 Base and Examples. Sustainability 12, 10167. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122310167 802
- Milesi, J.-P., Lerouge, C., Delor, C., Ledru, P., Lahondère, D., Lasserre, J.-L., Marot, A., Martel-Jantin, B., Rossi, P., Tegyey, M., 803 Théveniaut, H., Thiéblemont, D., Vanderhaeghe, O., 2003. Gold deposits (gold-bearing tourmalinites, gold-bearing. 804
 - Müller, F., Burkhard, B., 2012. The indicator side of ecosystem services. Ecosystem Services 1, 26–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.06.001
- 806 Nin, M., Soutullo, A., Rodríguez-Gallego, L., Di Minin, E., 2016. Ecosystem services-based land planning for environmental impact avoidance. Ecosystem Services 17, 172–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.12.009
 - Northey, S.A., Mudd, G.M., Saarivuori, E., Wessman-Jääskeläinen, H., Haque, N., 2016. Water footprinting and mining: Where the limitations and opportunities? Journal of Cleaner Production 135 1098-1116 are https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.07.024
- Orsi, F., Ciolli, M., Primmer, E., Varumo, L., Geneletti, D., 2020. Mapping hotspots and bundles of forest ecosystem services 812 across the European Union. Land Use Policy 99, 104840. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104840
- 813 Palvadeau, É. (1998). Géodynamique quaternaire de la Guyane française (Doctoral dissertation, Brest). 814
 - Pătru-Stupariu, I., Stupariu, M.-S., Stoicescu, I., Peringer, A., Buttler, A., Fürst, C., 2017. Integrating geo-biodiversity features in the analysis of landscape patterns. Ecological Indicators 80, 363–375. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.05.010
 - Perotti, Carraro, Giardino, De Luca, et Lasagna. « Geodiversity Evaluation and Water Resources in the Sesia Val Grande UNESCO Geopark (Italy) ». Water 11, no 10 (9 octobre 2019): 2102. https://doi.org/10.3390/w11102102.
 - Gautreau P., 2020, "Les régimes spatio-temporels de la prospection naturaliste", in : Noucher M., Polidori L. (eds), 2020, Atlas critique de la Guyane, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 136-137.
 - Ren, Y., Lü, Y., Hu, J., Yin, L., 2021. Geodiversity underpins biodiversity but the relations can be complex: Implications from two biodiversity proxies. Global Ecology and Conservation 31, e01830. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01830
- 822 Rendon, P., Steinhoff-Knopp, B., Burkhard, B., 2022. Linking ecosystem condition and ecosystem services: A methodological 823 approach applied European agroecosystems. Ecosystem Services 101387 to 53. 824 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2021.101387
- 825 Rennó, C.D., Nobre, A.D., Cuartas, L.A., Soares, J.V., Hodnett, M.G., Tomasella, J., Waterloo, M.J., 2008. HAND, a new terrain 826 descriptor using SRTM-DEM: Mapping terra-firme rainforest environments in Amazonia. Remote Sensing of Environment 827 112, 3469-3481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2008.03.018 828
 - Reverte, F.C., Garcia, M. da G.M., Brilha, J., Pellejero, A.U., 2020. Assessment of impacts on ecosystem services provided by geodiversity in highly urbanised areas: A case study of the Taubaté Basin, Brazil. Environmental Science & Policy 112, 91– 106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.05.015
 - Richards, P., VanWey, L., 2015. Where Deforestation Leads to Urbanization: How Resource Extraction Is Leading to Urban Growth in the Brazilian Amazon. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 105, 806-823. https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2015.1052337
- 834 Scammacca, O., Bétard, F., Aertgeerts, G., Heuret, A., Fermet-Quinet, N., Montagne, D., 2022a. Geodiversity Assessment of 835 French Guiana: Challenges and Implications for Sustainable Land Planning. Geoheritage 14. 83 836 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12371-022-00716-6
- 837 Scammacca, O., Fermet-Quinet, N., Bétard, F., Aertgeerts, G., Montagne, D., Heuret, A., 2023a. The functional dimension of 838 geodiversity: geo-ecosystem services assessment for sustainable land-planning in French Guiana (other). display. 839 https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu23-2337
- 840 Scammacca, O., Mehdizadeh, R., Gunzburger, Y., 2022b. Territorial Mining Scenarios for Sustainable Land-Planning: A Risk-841 Based Comparison on the Example of Gold Mining in French Guiana. Sustainability 14, 10476. 842 https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710476
- 843 Scammacca, O., Sauzet, O., Michelin, J., Choquet, P., Garnier, P., Gabrielle, B., Baveye, P.C., Montagne, D., 2023b. Effect of 844 spatial scale of soil data on estimates of soil ecosystem services: Case study in 100 km 2 area in France. European J Soil 845 Science 74, e13359. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejss.13359
- 846 Schrodt, F., Bailey, J.J., Kissling, W.D., Rijsdijk, K.F., Seijmonsbergen, A.C., van Ree, D., Hjort, J., Lawley, R.S., Williams, C.N., 847 Anderson, M.G., Beier, P., van Beukering, P., Boyd, D.S., Brilha, J., Carcavilla, L., Dahlin, K.M., Gill, J.C., Gordon, J.E., Gray, 848 M., Grundy, M., Hunter, M.L., Lawler, J.J., Monge-Ganuzas, M., Royse, K.R., Stewart, I., Record, S., Turner, W., Zarnetske,

- P.L., Field, R., 2019. To advance sustainable stewardship, we must document not only biodiversity but geodiversity. Proc.
 Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 116, 16155–16158. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1911799116
 Schröter, M., van der Zanden, E.H., van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., Remme, R.P., Serna-Chavez, H.M., de Groot, R.S., Opdam, P., 2014.
- Schröter, M., van der Zanden, E.H., van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., Remme, R.P., Serna-Chavez, H.M., de Groot, R.S., Opdam, P., 2014.
 Ecosystem Services as a Contested Concept: a Synthesis of Critique and Counter-Arguments: Ecosystem services as a contested concept. Conservation Letters 7, 514–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12091
 - Serrano, E., Ruiz-Flaño, P., 2007. Geodiversity: a theoretical and applied concept. Geogr. Helv. 62, 140–147. https://doi.org/10.5194/gh-62-140-2007
 - Sieber, I.M., Campagne, C.S., Villien, C., Burkhard, B., 2021. Mapping and assessing ecosystems and their services: a comparative approach to ecosystem service supply in Suriname and French Guiana. Ecosystems and People 17, 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/26395916.2021.1896580
 - Slabbert, E.L., Knight, T.M., Wubet, T., Kautzner, A., Baessler, C., Auge, H., Roscher, C., Schweiger, O., 2022. Abiotic factors are more important than land management and biotic interactions in shaping vascular plant and soil fungal communities. Global Ecology and Conservation 33, e01960. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01960
 - Smith, C.B., Walter, M.J., Bulanova, G.P., Mikhail, S., Burnham, A.D., Gobbo, L., Kohn, S.C., 2016. Diamonds from Dachine, French Guiana: A unique record of early Proterozoic subduction. Lithos 265, 82–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lithos.2016.09.026
 - Tandarić, N., 2015. Towards a general theory of landscape systems: the integration of the geoecological and bioecological approaches. Miscellanea Geographica 19, 29–34. https://doi.org/10.2478/mgrsd-2014-0028
 - Théveniaut, H., Billa, M., Cassard, D., Delor, C., Maldan, F., n.d. Le plateau des Guyanes et son potentiel minier.
 - Trégarot, E., Caillaud, A., Cornet, C.C., Taureau, F., Catry, T., Cragg, S.M., Failler, P., 2021. Mangrove ecological services at the forefront of coastal change in the French overseas territories. Science of The Total Environment 763, 143004. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.scitotenv.2020.143004
 - Tukiainen, H., Alahuhta, J., Field, R., Ala-Hulkko, T., Lampinen, R., & Hjort, J. (2017). Spatial relationship between biodiversity and geodiversity across a gradient of land-use intensity in high-latitude landscapes. Landscape Ecology, 32, 1049-1063.
 - van der Meulen, E.S., Braat, L.C., Brils, J.M., 2016. Abiotic flows should be inherent part of ecosystem services classification.
 Ecosystem Services 19, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.03.007
 - Van Ree, C.C.D.F., van Beukering, P.J.H., 2016. Geosystem services: A concept in support of sustainable development of the subsurface. Ecosystem Services 20, 30–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.06.004
 - van Ree, C.C.D.F., van Beukering, P.J.H., Boekestijn, J., 2017. Geosystem services: A hidden link in ecosystem management. Ecosystem Services 26, 58–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.05.013
 - Villamagna, A.M., Angermeier, P.L., Bennett, E.M., 2013. Capacity, pressure, demand, and flow: A conceptual framework for analyzing ecosystem service provision and delivery. Ecological Complexity 15, 114–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2013.07.004
- Volchko, Y., Norrman, J., Ericsson, L.O., Nilsson, K.L., Markstedt, A., Öberg, M., Mossmark, F., Bobylev, N., Tengborg, P., 2020.
 Subsurface planning: Towards a common understanding of the subsurface as a multifunctional resource. Land Use Policy 90, 104316. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104316</u>
- von Haaren, C., Albert, C., Barkmann, J., de Groot, R.S., Spangenberg, J.H., Schröter-Schlaack, C., Hansjürgens, B., 2014. From
 explanation to application: introducing a practice-oriented ecosystem services evaluation (PRESET) model adapted to the
 context of landscape planning and management. Landscape Ecol 29, 1335–1346. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-0140084-1
- Walz, U., Stein, C., 2014. Indicators of hemeroby for the monitoring of landscapes in Germany. Journal for Nature Conservation 22, 279–289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2014.01.007
- Wei, F., Zhan, X., 2023. A review of ES knowledge use in spatial planning. Environmental Science & Policy 139, 209–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.11.003
- Zhang, C., Li, J., Zhou, Z., 2022. Ecosystem service cascade: Concept, review, application and prospect. Ecological Indicators
 137, 108766. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2022.108766
- 895 Zwoliński, Z., Najwer, A., Giardino, M., 2018. Methods for Assessing Geodiversity, in: Geoheritage. Elsevier, pp. 27–52.
 896 https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809531-7.00002-2