

MAPBIOMAS

ATBD

Algorithm Theoretical Base Document

MapBiomias “Handbook”

Collection 4.0

Version 1.0

General Coordinator

Banchero, Santiago

Team

Santiago Verón

Ana Eljall

Sofia Sarrailhé

Mariana Petek

Edder Ortiz

Fabiana Arévalos

Silvana Castrillo

Andrea Moreno

Araceli Duré

Marcos Baez

Gabriela Barraza

Marisa Suklje

Diego de Abelleira

Saúl Cuellar

Heydi Durán

Marcelo Char

María Jesus Mosciaro

July 2023

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction

1.1. Scope and content of the document

1.2. Overview

1.3. Region of Interest

1.4. Key Science and Application

2. Overview and Background information

3. Algorithm Descriptions, Assumptions, and Approaches

3.1. Legend

3.2. Landsat Mosaics

3.3. Image Processing

3.4. Synthetic Landsat scenes

3.5. Feature space

3.6. Definition of the key period

3.7. Classification

3.7.1. Classification Scheme

3.7.2. Stable samples

3.7.3. Outlier filter

3.7.4. Reference maps

3.7.5. Zonation

3.7.6. Iterative Classification process

3.7.7. Classification of single and multiple crops

3.8. Post-Classification

3.8.1. Gap filter

3.8.2. Spatial filters

3.8.3. Temporal filters

3.8.4. Frequency filters

3.8.5. Transitions maps

3.9. Statistics

4. Validation strategy

5. Concluding remarks and Perspectives

6. References

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MapBiomás Chaco initiative is a collaboration network made up of governmental and non-governmental organizations, research institutes, universities, and companies from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, and Paraguay. This initiative uses advanced remote sensing technology to produce annual series of land use and land cover maps. The MapBiomás Chaco network combines the efforts of the MapBiomás Brazil initiative and the inter-institutional arrangement between the National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA), Guyra Paraguay, The Nature Conservancy, Fundación Amigos de la Naturaleza (FAN), and Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina.

This document describes the theoretical basis, relevance, and methods applied to produce annual land use and land cover (LULC) maps in the Gran Chaco Americano region from 1985 to 2022, representing the MapBiomás Chaco Collection 4. All the MapBiomás Chaco maps and datasets are freely available at the project website (<http://chaco.mapbiomas.org/>).

1. Introduction

1.1. Scope and content of the document

The scope of this document encompasses the entire products' processing chain including the theoretical basis, justification, and methods applied to produce annual maps of land cover and land use (LCLU) in Chaco from 1985 to 2022 of the MapBiomias Collection 4.

1.2. Overview

Details about the classification methods are provided in order to assist the user to gain a general understanding of the technical considerations involved, the definition of intermediate inputs and outputs as well as scientific references supporting each decision. In addition, this document presents a historical context and background information, a general description of the satellite imagery datasets, feature inputs, and the accuracy assessment method applied. This information is intended to inform users about the strengths and limitations of MapBiomias Chaco Collection 4 products. The classification algorithms are available on MapBiomias Github (<https://github.com/mapbiomas-brazil>).

The MapBiomias Chaco initiative was launched in July 2017, aiming to contribute to understanding LCLU dynamics in Chaco. The LCLU annual maps produced in this project were based on the Landsat archive available in the Google Earth Engine platform, encompassing the years from 1985 to the present. Since then, the MapBiomias mapping evolved year by year and was divided into Collections.

- Collection 1: 2000 - 2017 (released in December 2018).
- Collection 2: 2000 - 2019 (released in December 2020).
- Collection 3: 2000 - 2021 (released in September 2022).
- Collection 4: 1985 - 2022 (released in July 2023).

MapBiomias collections aim to contribute to developing a fast, reliable, collaborative, and low-cost method to process large-scale datasets and generate historical time series of LCLU annual maps. All data, classification maps, codes, statistics, and further analyses are openly accessible through the MapBiomias Platform (<http://chaco.mapbiomas.org/>). This is possible thanks to i) Google Earth Engine platform, which provides access to data, image processing, standard algorithms, and the cloud computing facilities; ii) freely available Landsat time-series dataset; and iii) MapBiomias collaborative network of organizations and experts that share knowledge and mapping tools.

The products of the MapBiomias Chaco Collection 4 are the following:

- Annual maps with land use and land cover.
- Pre-Processed feature mosaics generated from Landsat archive collections (Landsat 5, Landsat 7, and Landsat 8).

- Image processing infrastructure and algorithms (scripts in Google Earth Engine and source code).
- LCLU transitions' statistics and spatial analysis within administrative units, watersheds, protected areas, and other land tenure categorical maps.
- Quality assessment of the Landsat mosaics. Thus, each pixel in a given year was characterized according to the number of available cloud and aerosol free observations (varying from 0 to 23 observations per year).
- Temporal analysis (stable areas and number of classes).

1.3. Region of Interest

The “Gran Chaco Americano” is a forest ecoregion of exceptional environmental and social diversity. With 1,100,000 km², it is the second-largest woodland ecoregion in South America after the Amazon and includes territories of Argentina (62.19%), Paraguay (25.43%), Bolivia (11.61%), and Brazil (0.77%). In this region, deforestation for agriculture or cattle ranching is the dominant land-cover change. Potential ecological consequences include forest fragmentation, changes in primary productivity, carbon balance, and loss of biodiversity among others.

1.4. Key Science and Application

The scientific applications derived from an annual time-series history of LCLU maps produced include:

- Mapping and quantifying LCLU transitions.
- Quantification of gross and net forest cover loss and gain.
- Monitoring of regeneration and secondary growth forests.
- Monitoring agriculture and pasture expansion.
- Regional planning.

2. Overview and Background information

New features of Collection 4 include i) the extension of the time series now spanning from 1985 to 2022, ii) the synthesis of Landsat scenes when available scenes did not allow the computation of the mosaic -i.e. feature space- for a given year and iii) an improved validation dataset where samples were labeled by at least 2 different experts.

3. Algorithm Descriptions, Assumptions, and Approaches

3.1. Legend

The legend is described in three organizational levels and includes 15 land cover and land use classes (Table 1). Details of the description of each class can be found in the Legend document (see Annex 2).

Table 1. Land cover and land use categories considered for digital classification of the Landsat mosaics for Gran Chaco in Collection 4.

COLLECTION 4 - CLASSES	ID	Hexadecimal code	Color
1. Woody Natural Vegetation	1	1F4423	
1.1. Closed Natural Woodlands	3	006400	
1.2. Open Natural Woodlands	4	00FF00	
1.3. Sparse Natural Woodlands	45	E04CFA	
1.4. Flooded Natural Woodlands	6	76A5AF	
2. Herbaceous Natural Vegetation	10	BBFCAC	
2.1. Grassland	12	B8AF4F	
2.1.1. Open Grassland	42	CCA0D4	
2.1.2. Closed Grassland	43	D082DE	
2.1.3. Sparse Grassland	44	CD49E4	
2.1.4. Flooded Grassland	11	45C2A5	
3. Agricultural Areas	14	FFFFB2	
3.1. Pasture	15	FFD966	
3.2. Agriculture	18	E974ED	
3.2.1. Annual crops	19	D5A6BD	
3.2.1.1. Simple Crop	57	CC66FF	
3.2.1.2. Multiple Crops	58	FF6666	
3.3. Shrub Plantations	36	F3B4F1	
3.4. Woody Cultivated	9	935132	
4. Non vegetated areas	22	EA9999	
5. Water bodies	26	0000FF	
6. Not observed	27	D5D5E5	

3.2. Landsat Mosaics

As usual in MapBiomass Chaco, Collection 4 relied on Landsat images. Thus, we processed all available images from Landsat 5 (L5), Landsat 7 (L7) and Landsat 8 (L8) from 1985 to 2022, to produce the mosaics from which the feature space was generated. In years where available Landsat scenes were not enough to generate the mosaics we applied a cubic interpolation method to model the 23 Landsat scenes using all per pixel available observations from up to 2 years after the target year (see section 3.4).

3.3. Image Processing

The Gran Chaco Americano encompassed 76 path-row combinations (Figure 1), potentially representing 62,920 Landsat scenes during the study period. For all sensors, we used Collection 2, Tier 1, Level 2 atmospherically corrected surface reflectance image collections

available at Google Earth Engine. Each scene was cropped to avoid known artifacts at the borders that hampered seamless mosaicking. Additionally, the QA index was used to filter cloudy pixels. Finally, we generated annual image stacks by mosaicking all remaining scenes - including all 30 m resolution spectral bands - and considering the calendar year (i.e. January to December).




Figure 1. Distribution of Landsat path-rows for MapBiomass Chaco.

3.4. Synthetic Landsat scenes

To avoid large areas with missing information due to lack of cloud free observations -in particular between 1985 and 1987- we synthesized Landsat scenes. Synthetic scenes were generated by applying a cubic interpolation (Descals et al. 2020) to all cloud free observations from the target year and the following two years. Thus, an “artificial” calendar year was created by subtracting 365 days to each observation of the following year and 730 days to every observation of the target year +2 years. The time lag -i.e. subperiods over which the

cubic model was applied- used was 40 days. The resulting synthesized Landsat scenes had six bands (blue, green, red, NIR, SWIR1, SWIR2) with a time interval of 16 days (23 scenes per year). We acknowledge and make explicit that filling the target year missing data with observations from up to 2 years later does introduce errors due to land use and land cover changes that might have occurred within that period. However, we judged this was an unavoidable outcome if we were to produce maps for areas that were not observed -or observed very few times- during the target year.

3.5. Feature space

From the annual mosaics we calculated several variables that were used in the feature space to characterize each pixel. These variables described different aspects of the spectral behavior from a central tendency metric (i.e. median) of a particular period to variability metrics (i.e. range, standard deviation and coefficient of variation) from the full period or calendar year (Table 2).

In turn, we used bands, indexes, fractions, slopes and accumulated values as proxies of different features of the spectral behavior. While some of these variables were already available (e.g. spectral bands) others (e.g. fractions) were obtained from spectral unmixing methods (Souza *et al.*, 2003), involved arithmetic operations with different spectral bands (e.g. indexes), or were calculated from linear models fitted to the relationship between a given index (GCVI, NDVI and NDFI) and time (e.g. slope) or as the summation of each index value along a two-year timeframe .

Table 2. Selection of variables, calculation formula and measures of central tendency and dispersion according to time extension that were initially taken into account for the generation of the attribute space. This attribute space allows characterizing the spectral and phenological behavior of each entity/pixel and assigning it to one of the classes for which training data is available through the Random Forest classification algorithm.

			Key Period	Full Period	
Variables Types	Names	Formula	Median	Range	Standard Deviation
Bands	Blue	B1 (L5 and L7); B2 (L8)	x		
	Green	B2 (L5 and L7); B3 (L8)	x		
	Red	B3 (L5 and L7); B4 (L8)	x		
	Near Infrared (NIR)	B4 (L5 and L7); B5 (L8)	x		
	Shortwave Infrared 1 (SWIR1)	B5 (L5 and L7); B6 (L8)	x		

	Shortwave Infrared 2 (SWIR2)	B7 (L5), B8 (L7); B7 (L8)	x		
Fractions	GVS		x	x	x
	NPV		x	x	x
	Soil		x	x	x
	Cloud		x	x	x
	Shade	100 - (gv + npv + soil + nubes)	x	x	x
Indexes	NDVI	$(\text{NIR} - \text{red}) / (\text{NIR} + \text{red})$	x	x	x
	EVI2	$(2,5 * (\text{NIR} - \text{red}) / (\text{NIR} + 2,4 * \text{red} + 1))$	x	x	x
	CAI	$(\text{IM2} / \text{IM1})$	x	x	x
	NDWI	$(\text{NIR} - \text{IM1}) / (\text{NIR} + \text{IM1})$	x	x	x
	GCVI	$(\text{NIR} / \text{green} - 1)$	x	x	x
	HALL Index	$(-\text{red} * 0,0017 - \text{NIR} * 0,007 - \text{IM2} * 0,079 + 5,22)$	x	x	x
	PRI	$(\text{blue} - \text{green}) / (\text{blue} + \text{green})$	x	x	x
	SAVI	$(1+L) * (\text{NIR} - \text{red}) / (\text{NIR} + \text{red} + 0,5)$	x	x	x
	GVS	$\text{gv} / (\text{gv} + \text{npv} + \text{soil} + \text{cloud})$	x	x	x
	NDFI	$(\text{gvs} - (\text{npv} + \text{soil})) / (\text{gvp} + (\text{npv} + \text{soil}))$	x	x	x
	SEFI	$(\text{gv} + \text{npv}_s - \text{soil}) / (\text{gv} + \text{npv}_s + \text{soil})$	x	x	x
	WEFI	$((\text{gv} + \text{npv}) - (\text{soil} + \text{shade})) / ((\text{gv} + \text{nov}) + (\text{soil} + \text{shade}))$	x	x	x

	FNS	$((gv + shade) - soil) - ((gv + shade) + soil)$	x	x	x
Coefficient of variation	CV(GCVI)	$(stdDev_gcvi / median_gcvi)$	x		x
	CV(NDVI)	$(stdDev_gcvi / median_gcvi)$	x		x
Elevation based	Terrain slope	The same for all years			

3.6. Definition of the key period

The selection of periods determines the temporal extension over which a subset of the variables in the feature space are calculated. The definition of the period represented a trade-off between the probability of maximizing differences in spectral behavior of classes and the availability of cloud-free images. Since photosynthetic activity varies over time in different ways according to vegetation characteristics, the ability to discriminate between classes will depend on the period of the year under consideration.

To characterize the spectral behavior of Woody Vegetation, Agriculture, Pastures and Grasslands, 300 polygons were randomly sampled from each zone (see Section 3.7.5). NDVI for the year 2018 was used to calculate the euclidean distance as a measure of the separability between classes on a monthly basis. Quarterly euclidean distances were then calculated as the average distances of the three corresponding months. Additionally, we quantified the amount of good quality observations for each polygon for the year 2018 available monthly.

3.7. Classification

3.7.1. Classification Scheme

The classification of the Gran Chaco Americano results from an iterative process represented in Figure 2. Most of the steps were implemented in the Google Earth Engine platform. Preliminary supervised classifications were generated annually using training samples obtained from the maps of MapBiomass Chaco Collection 3 and annually generated Landsat mosaics. For these preliminary classifications, a set of stable pixels - i.e. pixels that remained in a single class throughout the study period - were selected using a stratified random sampling. These samples were filtered using reference information (previously generated vectors of land cover). At each zone, a second classification was performed with these stable samples wherein new complementary samples were added in an iterative way. Complementary samples were selected from hotspot areas - i.e. places where there was an evident mismatch between classification output and actual land cover/land use. Post-classification temporal, spatial and frequency filters were applied sequentially. The validation was performed with independent random samples obtained annually using visual interpretation of satellite images using an ad-hoc Google Engine app.




Figure 2. Classification scheme for MapBiomas Collection 4 in the Gran Chaco Americano.

3.7.2. Stable samples

From the preliminary classifications from 2000 to 2021, stable pixels -i.e. those that were classified as the same class over the years in Collection 3- were masked. A stratified random sampling process was performed over these masks to generate new training samples for the 1985 to 2022 set of annual classifications.

3.7.3. Outlier filter

The set of stable samples were filtered through a threshold of outliers. Isolation Forest (IF) was used, this unsupervised algorithm can directly detect anomalies based on the concept of isolation without using any metrics (Liu, 2012). In this way, the samples were ordered by score generated by IF. The threshold to define if a sample can be an outlier was then established by visual interpretation for each class and year (Figure 3). This process was done to reduce the presence of miss-labeled visual interpretation samples.




Figure 3. Application toolkit to define a specific threshold for year and class. 1) display settings to filter samples for year and class. Also, this display allows setting a quantile to get a score value used to make a rule of decision. 2) Histogram of IF scores values where the vertical black line identifies a score threshold. 3) NDVI time series centered on the year of analysis. 4) Points evaluated on the Landsat mosaic of the analyzed year.

3.7.4. Reference maps

To capitalize spatially explicit information, we surveyed available land use land cover maps from official, academic, and ONG sources. The maps used are listed in Annex 1. Reference maps assisted in the identification of stable areas where stable samples were generated.

3.7.5. Zonation

The rationale underlying the zonation process is that supervised land use land cover classifications perform better on smaller and more homogeneous areas wherein training samples are more representative of class characteristics than over larger and more heterogeneous areas. In this sense, the study area was divided into 13 zones, wherein classifications were run independently (Figure 4). Zones were defined through a segmentation process using the Simple Non-Iterative Clustering (SNIC) algorithm (Achanta & Susstrunk, 2017). This algorithm is based on the formation of groups of pixels with similar characteristics called "super-pixels". We used seven biophysical data layers (i.e. evapotranspiration, annual precipitation, drought severity, maximum and minimum temperatures, albedo, and elevation taken from Proyecto Euroclima, 2020) as inputs for the clustering algorithm. Each superpixel represents a zone where the biophysical characteristics

are relatively similar and different from other superpixels. The use of homogeneous zones resulted in higher overall accuracies and less occurrence of artifacts (e.g. sharp linear discontinuities in land use land cover classes) that could be detected by the naked eye.




Figure 4. Zoning from biophysical variables that make up 11 homogeneous zones used for the classification of MapBiomass Chaco Collection 4.

3.7.6. Iterative Classification process

After the classification obtained from the stable training samples, complementary samples were added in hotspot areas after a revision process. New classifications were generated with stable and complementary samples. This process was carried out in an iterative manner until a stable map was obtained without unexpected widespread changes in classes between years.

3.7.7. Classification of single and multiple crops

Discrimination between single and multiple crops was performed by applying a decision rule over a smoothed Landsat NDVI time series. This methodology was carried out on a spatial subset of the Gran Chaco Americano: all the pixels that were classified as annual agriculture or as pasture at least once over the 1985-2022 period. Thus, a cubic interpolation (Descals et al. 2020) was applied to all available Landsat 5, 7 and 8 scenes from each annual time step.

All scenes were cloud and shadow filtered using the F-Mask algorithm information provided in the 'pixel_qa' band. Additionally Landsat 8 and 7 were harmonized using Roy et al. (2016) methodology and Landsat 7 SLC artifacts were filled using a single-scene simple gap-filling algorithm written by Nicholas Clinton (2019). As the fit of the cubic model tended to decrease towards the beginning and end of the time period considered, initially a larger period was selected starting on february 1st and ending december 30th from the following year. Once the cubic interpolation was implemented (using a 50-days lag -i.e. subperiods over which the cubic model was applied) the retrieved NDVI time series (with a timestep of 8-days) were pruned to start on june 22nd of the starting year and to end July 8th from the following year. Then, if the NDVI exceeded (decreased) 0.5 it was considered as the start (end) of the crop the growing cycle. The 0.5 threshold was decided after several trials over different years and zones and was assumed adequate taking into account that annual crops fields undergo substantial NDVI changes -from close to zero after tilling to more than 0.6/0.7 at flowering. Additionally, crop cycles encompassing less than 30 days were ignored. Therefore, only if there was one start and one end of the growing cycle between June 22nd and July 8th, the pixel previously classified as "annual crops" was assigned to the single crop class while pixels with more than one pair of start and end -of the crop growing cycle- were assigned the class 'multiple crops'. Alternatively, crops whose start of the growing cycle occurred before June 22nd and ended after that date were arbitrarily assigned to the actual period considered (June 22nd to July 8th). Finally, to match the calendar year time-step of MapBiomass Chaco Collection 4 output maps, the resulting classification was allocated to the initial year of the time period considered.

3.8. Post-Classification

Collection 4 post-classification activities involved the application of 11 filters. These filters are basically decision rules to reduce the errors of the classification using spatial, temporal, and frequency information in addition to a gap filling filter. The following sections provide a brief description of how these filters work. These filters were applied at three different spatial extents: overall region, zones (see Section 3.7.5), and areas within zones.

3.8.1. Gap filter

The gap filter is intended to fill missing labels in any annual classification. Thus it is implemented at the beginning of the post-classification process and assigns a label to any pixel with missing label based on the previous or posterior classification. In general missing label pixels correspond to very bright areas where the cloud filter erroneously assumes cloud presence all along the year.

3.8.2. Spatial filters

The spatial filters were applied to a mask of continuously connected pixels, patches up to six pixels were processed with a morphological operations filter (focal_mode) with a kernel of 1 pixel. This reduces the salt and pepper effect by modifying isolated pixels.

3.8.3. Temporal filters

Temporal filters were divided into two broad categories according to their functioning: i) extremes (beginning and ending), and ii) regular. While the former only uses a 3-year window, the latter can employ a 3 or 5 years window. Thus, the rule involved in the extreme filters states that if in 1985 (2022) a given pixel is assigned to a class different from the following (antecedent) two years class - and in that two years the pixel was assigned to the same class - then the pixel in 1985 (2022) was reclassified to match the following (antecedent) class. On the other hand, regular filters were applied between 1986 and 2021 and are based on the assumption that a class change between consecutive years which is immediately reverted in the third year is due to a classification error. This decision rule is relaxed when the temporal window encompasses five years, wherein the reversion can also occur in the fifth year - that is, the pixel can be misclassified for two consecutive years (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Temporary filter scheme with both approaches: extreme (beginning and ending) and regular filters.

3.8.4. Frequency filters

The frequency filters used for Chaco were applied to correct noise problems over different natural and anthropic covers. These ad-hoc developed filters allow reclassifying the occurrence of a class that to a large extent remains constant but suffers random changes as a result of some false positives.

3.8.5. Transitions maps

Transitions are defined as a land use/land cover change occurring in a given period. For each pixel we calculated transitions for the following the periods: (A) any consecutive years (e.g. 2001-2002); (B) five-year periods (e.g. 2000-2005); (C) ten-year periods (e.g. 2000-2010); and (D) complete period (1985-2022). The places and the amount of area experiencing transitions are available as maps and Sankey diagrams respectively in the MapBiomias Chaco web-platform. Classes were aggregated in order to calculate the following 6 possibilities:

- Transitions from classes of agricultural areas or non-vegetated areas to forest cover or natural non-forest areas.
- Transitions from any class to water bodies.
- Transitions from water bodies to any other class.
- Transitions from any class to woody natural vegetation.
- Transitions from woody or herbaceous natural vegetation areas to agricultural or non-vegetated areas.
- Areas without transition or transitions that involve unobserved areas or transitions between classes within level 1 of legend.

3.9. Statistics

The area (in has) for each of the different classes in the legend (level 1, level 2, level 3, and level 4) was calculated for different spatial units: biomes, countries, provinces (or departments in Paraguay) and districts as well as protected areas. These data are available to download as an MS Excel spreadsheet in the MapBiomias Chaco web-platform.

4. Validation strategy

Validation was performed through the generation of geolocated points that were assigned to one of the 14 classes (up to level 3 legend excluding simple and multiple crops which were not validated) by experts' visual interpretation of satellite images. Validation was performed for the 19 even years between 1985 and 2022. A random sampling method was used to generate the validation samples taking the classification from 2004 as the stratification layer -i.e from where the proportions of the area occupied by each class were calculated. The number of validation samples was determined using equation 5.1 taken Olofsson *et al.* (2014) where n is the number of the validation samples, $S(O)$ is the standard error of the estimated overall accuracy that would like to be achieved, W_i is the mapped proportion of area of class i , and S_i is the standard deviation of stratum i . As N -the number of pixels in the study area- is a very large number, we ignored the second term in the denominator. The resulting number of overall samples from the 14 classes thus calculated was 3130.

$$n = \frac{(\sum W_i S_i)^2}{[S(O)]^2 + (1/N)\sum W_i S_i^2} \quad (5.1)$$

For this purpose, a tool was developed in the Google Earth Engine platform (Figure 6). This tool allows for each sample point, to assign each class for each year and visualize Landsat images for each year, Landsat time series for the complete period (1985-2022), and links for visualization of Bing and Google Earth maps.




Figure 6. Yearly testing sample collection tool where two criteria are applied, visual interpretation Landsat mosaic and time series analysis.

5. Concluding remarks and Perspectives

The MapBiomass initiative combines people, algorithms, satellite information and large-scale processing in a methodology that has revolutionized the operational large-scale generation of LULC maps. MapBiomass provided an ideal environment to enhance and share skills and

abilities by collaborators from different countries, cultures, languages but similar values: learning by doing. Thanks to Google Earth Engine and open source technology it was possible to access and process large scale datasets of satellite imagery such as the one generated by the MapBiomass project. The next collection of MapBiomass Chaco will include an enhanced legend expanding the conceptual resolution of non-vegetated and agricultural areas.

6. References

Achanta, R., & Susstrunk, S. (2017). Superpixels and polygons using simple non-iterative clustering. In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (pp. 4651-4660).

Clinton, N. (2019). L7 gap filling snippet. Stackoverflow <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/55256739/slc-code-not-filling-all-landsat-7-sr-gaps>

Descals, A., Verger, A., Yin, G. & Peñuelas, J. (2020). "A Threshold Method for Robust and Fast Estimation of Land-Surface Phenology Using Google Earth Engine," in IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, vol. 14, pp. 601-606, doi: 10.1109/JSTARS.2020.3039554.

Liu F. T., Ting K. M., Zhou H.: Isolation-based Anomaly Detection. ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data 6(1), 1556-4681 (2012)

Proyecto Euroclima+ Vivir y producir en el bosque Chaqueño (2020)- Manejo y restauración de bosques en entornos productivos. url: <https://euroclimaplus.org/proyectos-bosques/vivir-y-producir-en-el-bosque-chaqueno> (accessed Dec 1, 2020).

Foga, S., Scaramuzza, P.L., Guo, S., Zhu, Z., Dilley, R.D., Beckmann, T., Schmidt, G.L., Dwyer, J.L., Hughes, M.J., Laue, B. (2017). Cloud detection algorithm comparison and validation for operational Landsat data products. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 194, 379-390.

Olofsson, P., Foody, G. M., Herold, M., Stehman, S. V., Woodcock, C. E., & Wulder, M. A. (2014). Good practices for estimating area and assessing accuracy of land change. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 148, 42-57.

Roy, D. P., Zhang, H. K., Ju, J., Gomez-Dans, J. L., Lewis, P. E., Schaaf, C. B., ... & Kovalskyy, V. (2016). A general method to normalize Landsat reflectance data to nadir BRDF adjusted reflectance. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 176, 255-271.

Souza Jr, C., Firestone, L., Silva, L. M., & Roberts, D. (2003). Mapping forest degradation in the Eastern Amazon from SPOT 4 through spectral mixture models. *Remote sensing of environment*, 87(4), 494-506.

Annex 1

Reference maps used in Map Biomas Chaco Collection 4. Some of these maps do not yet have public access because they are in the process of being published. When they are available, its corresponding link will be included to allow the download of the data directly from the original source.

Name of the map	Source/Author	Description	Map data	Link
Annual agriculture of the Paraguayan Chaco 2000/2001	Agrosatélite Geotecnología Aplicada	Map of areas cultivated with soybean in 2000/2001 in the Paraguayan Chaco, based on the interpretation of Landsat images of 30 m spatial resolution.	2001	
Land cover of the Argentine Republic (LCCS- FAO)	INTA	Land cover and land use of the Argentine Republic at exploratory scale (E 1:500.000) using the Land Cover Classification System (LCCS-FAO).	2006-2007	Report https://inta.gob.ar/documentos/cobertura-del-suelo-de-la-republica-argentina.-ano-2006-2007-lccs-fao Cartography http://geoportal.idesa.gob.ar/layers/?limit=100&offset=0&title_i_contains=Cober%20tura%20del%20suelo%20de%20la%20Republica%20Argentina.%20A%C3%B1o%202006-2007%20(LCCS-FAO)%20
Maps of agricultural campaigns	INTA	Annual survey of summer and winter campaigns of extensive crops in Northwest Argentina.	2001-2017	https://inta.gob.ar/documentos/monitoreo-de-cultivos-del-noroeste-argentino-a-traves-de-

				sensores-remotos
Management Unit of the Forest Evaluation System (UMSEF)	Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible	Monitoring of native forests in Argentina for the detection, quantification and follow-up over time of natural and/or anthropogenic processes that modify the structure and/or extent of these ecosystems.	2002-2018	https://www.argentina.gob.ar/ambiente/bosques/umsef
First inventory of native forests in Argentina	Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable (SAyDS)	Vegetation Unit Monitoring for the native forest sector (E 1:250.000)	2005	
Annual agriculture of the Paraguayan Chaco 2006/2007	Agrosatélite Geotecnología Aplicada	Map of areas cultivated with soybean in 2006/2007 in the Paraguayan Chaco, based on the interpretation of Landsat images of 30 m spatial resolution.	2007	
Map of coverage of the Republic of Paraguay	FCA/CIF/FFPRI, 2013	The map was created based on the analysis and interpretation of Landsat 5 (TM) satellite images (E 1:250.000).	2011	http://chmparaguay.com.py/informaciones-ambientales/Datos%20sector%20forestal/MAPA%20DE%20COBERTURA%20DE%20LA%20TIERRA%20%20%20%20%20PARAGUAY%202011.pdf
Land cover of Salta and Jujuy (LCCS-FAO)	Infraestructuras de datos espaciales Salta	2013 update of the Land Cover and Current	2013	http://geoportal.idesa.gob.ar/layers/geonode%3

	(IDESA).	Land Use Map at exploratory scale (E 1: 500.000), using the Land Cover Classification System (LCCS) (Di Gregorio et al., 1998)		Alccs 2013 niij final 03 2017
Soybean crops in Eastern Paraguay	INFONA/SIRT 2014		2014	
Citrus Crops Production Information (SENASA).	Red de información para el Desarrollo Productivo (RIDES). Ministerio de Desarrollo productivo. Gobierno de Tucumán.	Survey of production units by the National Agri-Food Health and Quality Service (SENASA).	2015	http://rides.prod.ucciontucuman.gov.ar/visor/visor/index.html
Blueberry Crop Production Information	Red de información para el Desarrollo Productivo (RIDES). Ministerio de Desarrollo productivo. Gobierno de Tucumán.	Survey of production units by the National Agri-Food Health and Quality Service (SENASA).	2016	http://rides.prod.ucciontucuman.gov.ar/visor/visor/index.html
MapBiomás Chaco Colección 3	Proyecto MapBiomás Chaco	MapBiomás Chaco Colección 3 includes annual land use and land cover data for the period 2000 to 2021.	2000-2021	http://plataforma.chaco.mapbiomas.org/map
Map of land use change in Paraguay	INFONA 2018	Map of land use change between 2016 and 2017, obtained by classification of	2017	

		Landsat 8 imagery.		
Annual agriculture of the Paraguayan Chaco 2016/2017	Agrosatélite Geotecnología Aplicada	Map of areas cultivated with soybean in 2016/2017 in the Paraguayan Chaco, based on the interpretation of Landsat images of 30 m spatial resolution.	2017	https://pecuaria.agroideal.org/py/
Map of use and coverage of the Paraguayan Chaco 2018	DLR/INFONAW WF 2019	Use and coverage map of the Paraguayan Chaco obtained by classification of Landsat 8 OLI images from 2017 and 2018.	2018	

Annex 2

Legend description.

Class level 1	Class level 2	Class level 3	Class level 4	Description
Woody Natural Vegetation	Closed Natural Woodlands			Areas with natural vegetation consisting of trees, shrubs or a mixture of both, with a cover of 65% or more.
	Opened Natural Woodlands			Areas with natural vegetation consisting of trees, shrubs or a mixture of both, with a cover greater than or equal to 20% and less than 65%.
	Sparse Natural Woodlands			Areas with natural vegetation consisting of trees, shrubs or a mixture of both, with a cover of 5% or more and less than 20%.
	Flooded Natural Woodlands			Transition areas between pure terrestrial and aquatic systems, where the water table is usually at or near the surface (waterlogged areas). Natural vegetation cover consisting of trees, shrubs or a mixture of both is significantly influenced by water and/or dependent on flooding.
Herbaceous Natural Vegetation	Grassland	Closed Grassland		Areas with natural vegetation consisting of herbaceous plants with a cover of 65% or more. In this category, the presence of woody plants is allowed, but they must be at a cover between 1-5 and 20%.
		Open Grassland		Areas with natural vegetation consisting of herbaceous plants with a cover of 20% or more and less than 65%. In this category, the presence of woody plants is allowed, but they must be at a cover between 1-5 and 20%.
		Sparse Grassland		Areas with natural vegetation consisting of herbaceous plants with a cover of 5% or more and less than 20%. In this category, the presence of woody plants is allowed, but they must be at a cover between 1-5 and 20%.
		Flooded Grassland		Transition areas between pure terrestrial and aquatic systems, where the water table is usually at or near the surface (waterlogged areas). Natural herbaceous vegetation cover is significantly influenced by water and/or dependent on flooding (e.g. estuaries, marshes, swamps and waterbeds).
Agricultural Areas	Pasture			Areas with crops of herbaceous species for fodder (animal production).
	Agriculture	Annual crops	Single Crop	Areas with only one crop per growing season.

			Multiple Crops	Areas with two or more crops per growing season.
	Shrub Plantations			Areas with bush crops (e.g. blueberries, vines, yerba mate, tea).
	Tree Plantations			Areas with tree crops (e.g. pine plantations, citrus plantations, pome or stone fruits).
Non Vegetated Areas				<p>It comprises two types of covers: Areas with artificial cover resulting from human activities such as urban construction, roads, etc. Also included are extraction or quarrying sites, or where there are materials deposited on top of the original ones such as landfills and other types of deposits.</p> <p>Areas with no vegetation cover and no artificial cover. Includes areas with less than 1-5% vegetation cover. This category includes areas of bare rock, sands and deserts, among others.</p>
Water bodies				Areas covered by water, snow or ice either naturally (rivers, lakes, etc.) or artificially (reservoirs, canals, artificial lakes, etc.). They have conditions that determine that no vegetation is present: depth, rocky bases, rocky and/or steep shores, hard and coarse substrates, non-fertile washed material.
Not observed				It is attributed to missing values or other errors that may arise from the classification process.