

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 (1), 10.1007/s12371-023-00910-0. hal-04348387

HAL Id: hal-04348387

https://hal.science/hal-04348387

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.

From geodiversity to geofunctionality: quantifying geodiversity-based 1 ecosystem services for landscape planning in French Guiana 2 3 Ottone Scammacca^{a*}, François Bétard^b, David Montagne^c, Lucas Rivera^d, Célia Biancat^d, 4 Geoffrey Aertgeerts^e, Arnauld Heuret^f 5 ^a UMR Prodig, CNRS, Université Paris 1: Panthéon-Sorbonne, IRD, AgroParisTech, 6 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 ^e BRGM 35700 Rennes, France 11 f Geosciences Montpellier, CNRS, Université de Montpellier, Université de Guyane 12 13 14 *Corresponding author: Ottone Scammacca (ottone.scammacca@ird.fr) 15 16 17 Reference: Scammacca, O., Bétard, F., Montagne, D., Rivéra, L., Bianca, C., Aertgeerts, G., Heuret, A., 18 19 From Geodiversity to Geofunctionality: Quantifying Geodiversity-Based Ecosystem Services

20

21 22 for

Landscape

Planning

https://doi.org/10.1007/s12371-023-00910-0

in

French

Guiana.

16,

3

(2024).

Geoheritage

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.

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

Keywords: Geodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Hotspots, Landscape, Human Inputs, French Guiana

1. Introduction

79

80

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). 55 Such considerations converged within the development of geoecological approaches (Tandaric 56 2015) and of the concept of "geodiversity", as a new prism to look at all non-living components 57 of nature and as a new geological and geographical paradigm (Claudino-Sales 2021). 58 Geodiversity, abiotic equivalent of biodiversity (Gray 2011), is generally defined as "the natural 59 range (diversity) of geological (rocks, minerals, fossils), geomorphological (landforms, topography, physical processes), soil and hydrological features," including "their assemblages, 60 61 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 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 basin, where rapid on-going land use changes affect ES supply (Richards and VanWey 2015; Jakovac et al. 2016; Ferreira et al. 2021). Located in this region, the only continental French and European Overseas territory of French Guiana has almost 96% of its surface covered by Amazon rainforest. Although it is one of the least densely populated areas in the world, population growth rate and the related needs in terms of infrastructures, agricultural supplies and economic growth, are exacerbating, potentially affecting ES supply. Land use impacts on ES supply are often analyzed through hotspots mapping, which also supports land planners in geographic prioritization (Orsi et al. 2020). Analogously, hotspots can be used to identify highly 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). By our knowledge, quantitative assessments of GES remain uncommon (Butorac and Buzjak 2020; Miklos et al. 2020; Reverte et al. 2020) and current studies provide often qualitative assessments of GES and of their relationships with biodiversity and geodiversity (Alahuta et al., 2018). Recently, Balaguer et al. (2023) applied the matrix-based approach to assess how land use changes might affect ecosystem services provided by geodiversity in Brazil. Nervertheless, the scarcity of quantitative studies might limit the full implementation of the geodiversity concept within the ES framework towards the accomplishment of Sustainable Development Goals (Van Ree and Van Beukening 2016; Brilha et al. 2018; Bitoun et al. 2022). French Guiana geodiversity, despite it is historically associated to gold mining, played an important role in the past dynamics of the region and it has a wider potential of contributing to the supply of multiple ES (Scammacca et al. 2022a). Because of its socio-geo-ecological features, this territory represents a major challenge for sustainable land planning and conservation (Aubertin and Pons 2017; Budoc 2017). Previous studies focused on the assessment of ES in the region (Sieber

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

et al. 2021) mainly based on land-use proxies or specific biotic parameters (Trégarot et al. 2021).

This study has therefore the purpose to: i) attempt at a first quantification of geofunctionality in French Guiana, in terms of GES supply; ii) analyze the spatial patterns of geodiversity and geofunctionality and; iii) explore approaches to account for geodiversity and geofunctionality within sustainable land planning strategies in French Guiana discussing the challenges of data unavailability and the pertinence of potential ES management indicators.

2. Applying the ecosystem service cascade model to geodiversity

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

The ES paradigm has been conceptualized through the "cascade model" which distinguishes between ES components (e.g. ecosystem processes, functions, services, benefits) and linking the two ends of ES supply chain (Haines-Young and Potschine 2010). This model has been often revisited, particularly to fit land planning requirements (Villamagna et al. 2013; Von Haaren et al. 2014; La Notte et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2022). Von Haaren et al. (2014) re-adapted the cascade model proposing a practice-oriented ES evaluation model identifying: "offered" ES (or ES capacity), as the totality of ecosystem contributions that could, at least potentially, be utilized by humans, and "used" ES (or ES flow) which are those currently utilized by humans (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). In order to quantify GES, this study follows the Von Haaren et al. (2014) model. The link between functions and services is reflected by the offered or used ES supply, depending on the intensity of the human input involved (Fig. 1). On one hand, the assessment of offered ES implies the acknowledgement (i.e. inventory, prospection, knowledge) of the capacity to deliver the service according to user needs. On the other, the assessment of used ES might imply human inputs involving planning and management practices (e.g. infrastructures construction, exploitation, transformation, conservation) that allow for the offered service to be concretely accessible and enjoyed by users according to their demands (Fig. 1).

3. Study area

147148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

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

4.1 Considered GES and indicators selection

180 181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

179

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

218

213

214

215

216

217

4.2 GES assessment and mapping

220221222

223

224

225

232

- 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).
- Data were summarized according to each cell depending on the units of the initial data (Table 2). For instance, data expressed in units of surface (e.g. used MM, offered and used MnM, offered WU, used HAB, offered and used FC), length (e.g. offered WS and usedGC) or volume (e.g. MnM) were summed up for each cell while data expressed in terms of numbers of punctual geometries were simply counted (e.g. offered MM andGC, used WS and WU). Surfaces, lengths and point counting were calculated automatically using Qgis Desktop 3.28.5
- 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).

functions. For the GC service, distances were calculated using the "Join attributes by nearest"

- 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)

243244

- 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
- 247 diversity, mineral diversity, hydrodiversity, and geomorphodiversity). The index was here
- 248 updated following two steps:
- 249 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.
- 252 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
- 255 (OEG, 2020).

256

4. 4 GES and geodiversity relationships

257258

- 259 The relationships between offered and used GES and between *Gf* and *Gt* levels were analyzed
- 260 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):

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

264

- 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
- the equation (Eq. 2):

268

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

- Where RD_{Gtf} is the relative difference between the geodiversity index values Gt and offered
- 272 (Gf_o) and used (Gf_u) geofunctionality.

Spatial differences were classified on a range of seven classes translating the direction and the intensity of the change: for difference maps related to offered and used GES, areas with negative values infer that used GES levels are superior to offered GES levels while areas with positive values infer that offered GES levels are superior to used GES levels. When the value is equal to zero, offered and used GES show the same levels. The same considerations can be applied to the maps of relative difference between total *Gt* and offered or used *Gf* (Eq. 3).

4.5 Geodiversity and geofunctionality hotspots

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).

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

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

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).

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

5. Results

5.1 GES levels and maps

315316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

314

Figure 6 shows the single-service offered (Fig. 6a to g) and used (Fig.6i to o) GES maps while overall averaged GES levels are synthetized in Figure 7. Globally speaking, the results highlight: i) some services which are generally largely used - in terms of exploitation, management or conservation strategies – compared to their offer (e.g. MM, HAB, GC); ii) some services which are mainly underused – which does not imply a necessity of use – such as MnM, WS, WU, FC; iii) general sustainable uses with potential overuses of the resources (e.g. MM, HAB, GC) but which must be analyzed very carefully according to the methodological choices and the selected indicators. Raw material supply for mining (MM) shows high offered levels along the two greenstone belts (Fig. 6a), although used levels are only higher in the northern belt because of formal interdictions in the southern one, where the Amazonian Park is located (Fig. 6i) and where illegal gold mining is very active (Jébrak et al. 2021). MnM offered levels are higher in all the Quaternary sedimentary formations of the coastal plain (Fig. 6b) – where used MnM levels are mainly located (Fig. 6j) – and in the TTG units (Fig. 2a), particularly in the western area of the territory. Water supply (e.g. WS and WU) and natural habitat regulation (i.e. HAB) are offered almost in the whole study-area (Fig. 6c, d and e). WS and WU are only locally used along the coastal and riverine regions (Fig. 6k and I) while HAB shows moderate to high levels in almost the totality of the territory (Fig. 6m). Despite FC shows moderate levels throughout French Guiana (Fig. 6f), used levels are mainly located in coastal areas (Fig. 6n). GC is supplied in specific spots spread across the whole region (Fig. 6g), mainly in the coastal, eastern and southern regions. The southern areas are less accessible and, therefore, show lower used levels (Fig. 6o). Unlike all offered GES, which show overall higher levels with the exception of MM and GC (Gf_o = 1.3), used GES display globally low levels (Fig. 7). Only HAB differences map highlights multiple areas where offered levels are inferior to the used ones (Fig. 6u). Nevertheless, when averaged over the whole study area, levels are higher for the offered HAB service (Gf_o = 3) than for the used one (Gf_0 = 2.6) (respectively Fig. 6h, p and x).

343

342

344

345

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).

5.3 Geodiversity and geofunctionality hotspots

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

6. Discussion

376377

378 6.1 The added-value of geofunctionality assessment and hotspot analysis: from land planning to landscape planning

380 381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

The assessment of geodiversity results often in the measurement of the heterogeneity of landscapes abiotic features and it is generally influenced by their spatial geometry and distribution within a given area. Switching to a functional dimension is uncontestably critical to concretely enhance planning strategies because it allows to understand the complex relationships between geodiversity-related entities and socio-ecological functioning, needs and uses. As shown in Figures 8d and 8e, geodiversity and geofunctionality do not always follow the same spatial patterns and thus, they must be both accounted when it comes to planning tasks. Geofunctionality relates geodiversity to human activities, which can range from conservation to exploitation or artificialization. Indeed, "land" planning might be defined as the systematic and voluntary assessment of alternatives for land use and a territorial repartition of resources reflecting socio-economic conditions, policy visions (e.g. economic development, landscape protection, equal access to education and culture) and knowledge, in order to adopt the best land use options (Metternicht 2017; Desjardins 2021). Since land uses and human inputs imply a socio-economic and functional dimension of space and time, they dissolve within a "territorial metabolism" (Desjardins, 2021) that goes beyond preservation and conservation purposes alone, including also processes that might alter, exploit, artificialize, transform or even destroy natural resources. Therefore, "landscape" – rather than "land use" – planning implies a holistic and metabolic vision of ecosystem diversity, in both its biotic and abiotic dimensions, and it allows the understanding of the relationships between biodiversity, geodiversity and socio-ecological functioning and needs. Geodiversity and biodiversity should therefore be highlighted as equal and linked concepts (Ren et al. 2021). Because geodiversity finds its synthesis in the landscape (Alexandrowicz and Kozlowski 1999; Serrano and Ruiz-Flaño 2007), its operationalization should encompass the landscape seen as a multifunctional complex unit (Nin et al. 2016; Englund et al. 2017; Metternicht 2017; Miklós et al. 2020). Despite it raises many debates (Schröter et al. 2014), the ES concept appears to be an interesting approach to analyze and assess geofunctionality. This 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. For instance, despite averaged low levels, MM supply shows high offered levels mainly along the two greenstone belts, which host most of the gold deposits (Fig. 4a). Offered WS and WU are spread along the whole region (Fig. 4c and d) confirming the fact that, as its name suggests, Guyana is the "land of many waters" (Clifford 2011). The Quaternary formations of the coastal areas underlaying the Paleoproterozoic basement offer for instance overlapping aquifers, increasing known offered WU levels in such regions (Fig. 7d). These portions of the territory show also the most important potential in hosting natural flood-prone areas and wetlands (Fig. 4f), mainly because of their intertidal positions, the potential influence of sedimentary aquifers and the presence of mangrove ecosystems developed on the coastal sediments. When geofunctionality is combined with human-related threats according to the approach proposed by Bétard and Peulvast, (2019), geofunctionality hotspots maps provide information about the spatial patterns of endangered areas, thus supporting the spatial allocation of lands, priorities of intervention, while integrating the socio-environmental impacts and conflicts with other potential land uses (Nin et al. 2016). Important information could be also added through statistical analysis or generalized additive models to analyze the relationships between land use intensity, geodiversity and geofunctionality as performed by Tukianen et al. (2017). Focusing only on geodiversity hotspots, would neglect potential areas of ordinary abiotic nature or lower geodiversity that are not necessarily less important in terms of ES supply (Bétard and Peulvast 2019).

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

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

438 439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

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.

A service relates to a demand and it is indeed often combined with built, human or social capital in terms of inventory and/or management activities (Jones et al. 2016). This can be particularly observed in two complementary dimensions of GES supply. For instance, the supply of raw materials for mining (MM) and quarrying (MnM) implies, on one hand, the construction of exploitation infrastructures and human workforce that are able to provide the final service. On the other hand, the location of the supply related to such activities is often regulated by mandatory frameworks, such as the Quarrying Regional Plan (QRP) or the Departmental Mining Plan (DMP) in French Guiana, which state where extraction can or cannot take place according to different criteria (e.g. sensitive areas, minimum distance to populated areas). Also, MnM levels are often concentrated especially along the coastal strips (Fig. 4j), since the sandy, lateritic and hard-rock materials are more accessible and closer to human settlements where on-going construction projects are located (Fig. 4j). Surface and groundwater supplies are often located next to populated areas (Fig. 4k and I), since the used service would be non-existent otherwise. Access to geoheritage areas is provided by a network of roads except for the southern areas of French Guiana, where environmental protection measures limit some human interventions (Fig. 4o). Globally, the highest levels of used geofunctionality seem to follow human population distribution, suggesting that the concept of "used" service, depending on the type of service, might be tightly related to human activities requiring interventions other 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. Protected areas show in some cases even higher "used" levels than "offered" ones (Fig. 4m and u). The overall higher values for this service and the spatial mismatches between its offered and used levels, might imply that land planners give a priority to biodiversity conservation objectives in inner French Guiana, compared to other land uses. In such protected areas, which are also considered by the DMP, land uses such as mining are therefore forbidden because conflictual with the objectives of local and national strategies. This might explain for instance the difference between offered and used MM levels in the gold deposits of the southern greenstone belt (Fig.6 q). It must not be forgotten indeed that the supply of multiple ES depends on their management and it can result in synergies and trade-offs between single services. For instance, management strategies targeting MM or MnM supply could lead to decreasing surface or groundwater supply, because of the widely known impacts of extraction activities on water quality (Castello and Macedo 2016) and quantity (Northey et al. 2019). However, such considerations should highlight the existence of informal and illegal activities, such as illegal gold mining, which participate to the production of "used" services – for instance in the southern greenstone belt – but increasing negative impacts and trade-offs with other services (e.g. water quality, natural habitat support). The inclusion of informal human inputs and the related fuzzy-data should be considered in such approaches. For better implementations within landscape planning, indicators selection should then fit the cascade model and it might be necessary to clearly distinguish between offered services indicators, used services indicators and management indicators. As example, Rendon et al. (2022) propose a list of non-regulatory management indicators to analyze pressures on soilrelated ES, mainly in terms of agricultural practices, although management indicators should cover all the dimensions of human inputs. Table 4 attempts to satisfy such distinction for further improvements of the current study proposing a list of management indicators and their

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

objectives for the services considered in this study. Management indicators could vary in terms

of management "intensity", which can range from preliminary screening, inventory and baseline data acquisition, to advanced tasks of land allocation, zoning and planning. Such indicators, sometimes unlike the ES they are related to, tend to be complementary rather than discordant. For instance, management tools related to mining and water planning are often compatible and harmonized. In French Guiana, the DMP and the SDAGE (Table 4) are explicitly supportive and interrelated between each other. Management indicators, ideally, should be the result of adequate strategies where planners accounted for ES synergies and trade-offs so 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 in the future all the dimensions of human inputs in ES production chain to support prospective studies for ES assessment, monitoring and landscape planning.

6.3 Unavailable data are a matter of landscape planning

513514

543

544

515 516 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. 536 The areas with highest ES levels are located on the coastal and riverine areas of French Guiana, 537 because they are the most explored, accessible and inhabited and data are needed for most of 538 the past and current practical planning challenges. These areas are also the most threatened 539 (Fig. 9a), since human occupation is mainly located here and, based on our assessment, that 540 automatically leads to "very high" sensitivity levels (Fig. 9b, c, d). 541 This means also that applying land use-based metrics for threats identification – such as the 542 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). Unavailability of geoscientific data must be identified and assessed and such gaps represent an undeniable challenge to address for landscape-planning. Through indirect or direct measures, the landscape and its structures should be better acknowledged to identify and apply adequate indicators for ES assessment and management. In lack of adequate indicators, the assessment process risks to be performed with coarse available data since it is the only option, rather than the best one. This is particularly true for regulating services, which provide direct impacts that can be difficult to express through pertinent indicators (Villamagna et al. 20213), unlike provisioning services which are usually more easily available. Therefore, the multi-service combination of ES of different natures could lead to bias, since it combines services assessed based on data that have different levels of availability. A Regional Commission for Geoheritage of French Guiana has been only recently established and geoinventories are still ongoing. Geodiversity features of French Guiana, such as the unique komatiitic-related Dachine diamonds (Smith et al. 2016), a great variety of inselbergs spread across the region (Aertgeerts 2020), such as the Mamilihpann inselberg and its still unknown cave paintings (Fuentes 2022) or else the remarkable Grand Connétable island could be integrated in the assessment of cultural GES. Wetland identification field surveys are still unaccomplished because of the lack of harmonized soil and vegetation data (Blum 2013). Also, water-related services could be proxied by the permeability of lithological formations (Perotti et al., 2019) for instance through hydraulic conductivity or rock porosity (Freeze and Cherry, 1979). The identification of management goals and land planning exercises require an important level of detail, especially at regional and local scales (Gomez-Zotano et al. 2018). As highlighted by Heink et al. (2016), indicator choice "should capture the meaning of the construct that is to be measured" and "the variance between the indicator and the indicandum should be low", meaning that the conceptual model used should be as clear as possible and that indicator

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

selection should stick to it.

6.4 Abiotic services or abiotic indicators?

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

598599

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

Conclusion

600 601

602

603

604

605

606

607

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 609 planning and conservation challenges, highlights the feasibility of such approaches and the 610 heterogeneity of spatial patterns between geodiversity and geofunctionality which thus must 611 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. 622 Despite the revised ES cascade model includes human interventions in the supply of ES, further 623 improvements should focus on a clear-cut distinction of human inputs as ES co-producers, 624 managers but also demanders. 625 Indicator selection is a crucial step in the assessment process and it should satisfy multiple 626 criteria and fit precisely the conceptual model used. However, data unavailability is the main 627 issue in the achievement of such requirements and it must therefore be considered as a matter 628 of land planning that should be quantified. This is particularly true in French Guiana, where 629 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.

608

638

Acknowledgments 640 641 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 (Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, IRD). A particular thank is addressed to Dr. Robin 643 644 Cura (UMR Prodig – Université de Paris 1, Panthéon-Sorbonne) for the review of the maps used in this study. The readers can freely access the data from this paper by contacting the first 645 646 author. 647 Compliance with Ethical Standards and ethical conduct 648 649 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 Conflict of Interest 653 654 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal 655 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper. 656 **Funding** 657 658 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

(Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, IRD) and the funding of the UMR Prodig.

660

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.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-019-01168-5
- 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. https://doi.org/10.3390/d11110216
- Boulet (R.), Fritsch (E.), Humbel (F.-X.). Les sols des terres hautes et de la plaine côtière ancienne en
- Guyane française septentrionale. Organisation en systèmes et dynamique actuelle de l'eau. Cayenne :
- ORSTOM, 1979. 170 p. (Rapport n° P122).
- 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.
- Brilha, J., Gray, M., Pereira, D.I., Pereira, P., 2018. Geodiversity: An integrative review as a contribution to the sustainable management of the whole of nature. Environmental Science & Policy 86, 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.05.001
- Budoc, R.L., 2017. Quelle place pour la Forêt amazonienne dans le développement territorial guyanais ? tem. https://doi.org/10.4000/tem.4295
- 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. https://doi.org/10.2478/eko-2020-0010
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.06.009
- 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
- Choubert, B. (1949). Géologie et pétrographie de la Guyane française. Office de la recherche scientifique outre-mer.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.2478/bgeo-2021-0008
- 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.
- Delor, C., Lahondère, D., Egal, E., Lafon, J.-M., Cocherie, A., Guerrot, C., Rossi, P., Truffert, C., Théveniaut, H., Phillips, D., de AVELAR, V.G., 2003. Transamazonian crustal growth and reworking as revealed.
- Desjardins, X. (2021). L'aménagement du territoire-2e éd. Armand Colin.
- Englund, O., Berndes, G., Cederberg, C., 2017. How to analyse ecosystem services in landscapes—A systematic review. Ecological 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

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

- Ferry, B., Freycon V., Paget D., 2003. Genèse et fonctionnement hydrique des sols sur socle cristallin en Guyane. Rev. For. Fr. 37. https://doi.org/10.4267/2042/5786
- 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 30-38. 21, 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: http://journals.openedition.org/adlfi/114274
- 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 spatial planning. Landscape Research 984-999 to 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 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, C.L.J. (Eds.), Ecosystem Ecology. Cambridge University 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, 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.09.006
- 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

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

, 797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

- Lausch, A., Blaschke, T., Haase, D., Herzog, F., Syrbe, R.-U., Tischendorf, L., Walz, U., 2015. Understanding and quantifying landscape structure - A review on relevant process characteristics, data models and landscape metrics. Ecological Modelling 295, 31-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.08.018
- 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).
- Magnien AP, Plat R, Coste B, Le Chapelain JR (1990) Inventaire minier du département de la Guyane. Avancement des travaux 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.
- Miklós, L., Špinerová, A., Belčáková, I., Offertálerová, M., Miklósová, V., 2020. Ecosystem Services: The Landscape-Ecological Base and Examples. Sustainability 12, 10167. https://doi.org/10.3390/su122310167
- Milesi, J.-P., Lerouge, C., Delor, C., Ledru, P., Lahondère, D., Lasserre, J.-L., Marot, A., Martel-Jantin, B., Rossi, P., Tegyey, M., Théveniaut, H., Thiéblemont, D., Vanderhaeghe, O., 2003. Gold deposits (gold-bearing tourmalinites, gold-bearing.
- 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
- 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 limitations and opportunities? Journal of Cleaner Production 135. 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 across the European Union. Land Use Policy 99, 104840. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104840
- Palvadeau, É. (1998). Géodynamique quaternaire de la Guyane française (Doctoral dissertation, Brest).
- 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
- Rendon, P., Steinhoff-Knopp, B., Burkhard, B., 2022. Linking ecosystem condition and ecosystem services: A methodological approach applied European agroecosystems. Ecosystem Services to https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2021.101387
- 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 descriptor using SRTM-DEM: Mapping terra-firme rainforest environments in Amazonia. Remote Sensing of Environment 112, 3469-3481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2008.03.018
- 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
- Scammacca, O., Bétard, F., Aertgeerts, G., Heuret, A., Fermet-Quinet, N., Montagne, D., 2022a. Geodiversity Assessment of French Guiana: Challenges and Implications for Sustainable Land Planning. Geoheritage https://doi.org/10.1007/s12371-022-00716-6
- Scammacca, O., Fermet-Quinet, N., Bétard, F., Aertgeerts, G., Montagne, D., Heuret, A., 2023a. The functional dimension of geodiversity: geo-ecosystem services assessment for sustainable land-planning in French Guiana (other). display. https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu23-2337
- Scammacca, O., Mehdizadeh, R., Gunzburger, Y., 2022b. Territorial Mining Scenarios for Sustainable Land-Planning: A Risk-Based Comparison on the Example of Gold Mining in French Guiana. Sustainability 14, 10476. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710476
- Scammacca, O., Sauzet, O., Michelin, J., Choquet, P., Garnier, P., Gabrielle, B., Baveye, P.C., Montagne, D., 2023b. Effect of spatial scale of soil data on estimates of soil ecosystem services: Case study in 100 km 2 area in France. European J Soil Science 74, e13359. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejss.13359
- 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., 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, 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. 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/j.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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104316
 - 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/s10980-014-0084-1
 - 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
 - Zwoliński, Z., Najwer, A., Giardino, M., 2018. Methods for Assessing Geodiversity, in: Geoheritage. Elsevier, pp. 27–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809531-7.00002-2