International Journal of Global Sustainable Research (IJGSR)
Vol.4 No.6, 2026: 617-638

Institutional Resilience and Enforcement Dynamics in the Brazilian Amazon: A Review of IBAMA's Trajectory and Global Lessons for Forest Governance

Loso Judijanto
IPOSS Jakarta
Corresponding Author: Loso Judijanto losojudijantobumn@gmail.com

A R T I C L E I N F O

Keywords : IBAMA, Environmental Enforcement, Forest Governance, Institutional Dismantling, Remote Embargoes, Illegal Deforestation, Brazil, Command and Control, Administrative Sanctions, Bureaucratic Autonomy

Received : 2 April
Revised : 20 May
Accepted: 20 June

A B S T R A C T

The governance of the Amazon rainforest represents a critical frontier in the global struggle against climate change and biodiversity loss. Central to this governance is the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (IBAMA), an agency that has oscillated between global leadership in deforestation control and periods of severe institutional dismantling. This study employs a Qualitative Literature Review (QLR) to synthesise academic and policy narratives from 2020 to 2026, analysing the institutional mechanisms that underpin environmental enforcement. Unlike systematic reviews that quantify publication metrics, this study thematically analyses the "dismantling" (2019–2022) and "rebuilding" (2023–present) phases to distil exportable lessons. The findings reveal that technological superiority—exemplified by the DETER satellite system—is a necessary but insufficient condition for success. Effective enforcement relies on "institutional interoperability" and the "credibility of sanctions." The study identifies key best practices, specifically "remote embargoes" and the "immediate destruction of capital assets," that can be adapted by other tropical nations. Crucially, the analysis delineates the structural prerequisites for these practices, arguing that they require a high-integrity digital land registry, legal autonomy for enforcement agents, and deep integration between environmental data and the financial banking sector. The paper concludes that safeguarding forest governance requires legal frameworks that insulate technical agencies from executive interference

DOI: https://doi.org/10.59890/ijgsr.v4i6.266
ISSN-E: 3026-4677
https://slamultitechpublisher.my.id/index.php/ijgsr/index

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The preservation of the Amazon rainforest is arguably the most significant land-use challenge of the 21st century. As a repository of carbon and biodiversity, the biome's stability is inextricably linked to global climate resilience. However, the governance of this vast territory is besieged by lucrative illegal economies, including timber trafficking, wildcat gold mining (*garimpo*), and the conversion of public forests into private cattle pastures and soy plantations. In this high-stakes theatre, the *Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis* (IBAMA) serves as the primary federal agent of state authority [1], [2], [3], [4], [5].

Created in 1989, IBAMA has historically been the protagonist of Brazil's environmental success stories, particularly during the *Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Legal Amazon* (PPCDAm) era (2004–2012), which saw deforestation rates plummet by over 80%. Yet, the trajectory of Brazilian environmental governance is non-linear. The academic literature published between 2020 and 2025 chronicles a distinct era of "institutional dismantling" followed by a complex "reconstruction" phase. This oscillation provides a unique natural experiment for researchers: a window into how enforcement capacity functions—and fails—under varying degrees of political will [6], [7], [8], [9].

1.2. Problem Statement and Urgency

The central problem addressed in this study is the "implementation gap" in forest governance. Many tropical nations possess stringent environmental laws on paper, but fail to enforce them in the field. Brazil's case is particularly instructive because it possesses both rigorous laws (the 2012 Forest Code) and world-class monitoring technology (INPE's PRODES and DETER systems). Yet, between 2019 and 2022, deforestation rates soared to their highest levels in 15 years. This discrepancy challenges the technocratic assumption that better data leads to better protection [10], [11], [12], [13].

Recent scholarship characterises this period not as a failure of capacity, but as a success of "institutional dismantling"—a deliberate political strategy to hollow out enforcement agencies without formally repealing laws. Understanding the mechanics of this dismantling and the subsequent strategies used to rebuild IBAMA's authority is urgent. Other countries facing similar challenges risk replicating the Brazilian crisis if they rely solely on technology without fortifying their institutional foundations [6], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18].

1.3. Objectives of the Study

This article aims to fill a gap in the literature by moving beyond quantitative deforestation statistics to a qualitative understanding of institutional dynamics. The objectives are:

1. To synthesise the narrative of IBAMA's operational challenges and strategies from 2020 to 2026.
2. To analyse the "ecosystem of enforcement," identifying how technology, law, and human resources interact.
3. To distil **best practices** and their necessary **prerequisites** for export to other national contexts, answering the question: *Under what conditions can the "IBAMA Model" work elsewhere?*

LITERATURE RIVIEW

1. Land Use and the "Command and Control" Paradigm

The dominant theoretical framework for forest enforcement in Brazil is "Command and Control" (C&C). Rooted in the "economics of crime" model [19], C&C posits that illegal land use is a rational economic calculation. Agents (loggers, farmers) will deforest if the expected profit exceeds the *probability of detection* multiplied by the *severity of the punishment* [20].

Literature from 2020 to 2026 has refined this view. It has been argued that in the Amazon, the "probability of detection" is near 100% due to satellite coverage [21], [22]. The failure occurs in the "punishment" variable. The literature describes a "transparency paradox," where the state sees everything but does nothing, breaking the deterrence chain.

2. Institutional Dismantling and Bureaucratic Autonomy

A significant portion of recent literature utilises the "policy dismantling" framework. It has been described how IBAMA faced "dismantling by intensity" [17], [23]. The agency was not abolished; instead, its "bureaucratic autonomy" was eroded. Autonomy refers to the ability of technical staff to make decisions based on legal and scientific criteria rather than political loyalty. The literature highlights how the replacement of career environmentalists with military personnel paralysed the agency's "coercive capacity," transforming proactive enforcement into passive observation [17], [24], [25], [26], [27].

3.The Technological Ecosystem

Contemporary studies emphasise that IBAMA does not act alone. It is part of a technological ecosystem involving the National Institute for Space Research (INPE). It has been explained in detail how the DETER system (Real-Time Deforestation Detection) revolutionised enforcement by allowing for rapid response [28]. However, the literature warns against "technological solutionism," noting that algorithms cannot issue fines or seize tractors without human intervention.

METHODOLOGY

1. Research Design: Qualitative Literature Review (QLR)

This study employs a Qualitative Literature Review (QLR) methodology. Unlike a Systematic Literature Review (SLR), which focuses on exhaustive counting and statistical aggregation of effect sizes, a QLR is interpretive. It is designed to synthesise *narratives*, *mechanisms*, and *complex institutional behaviours* that cannot be quantified. The choice of QLR is justified by the study's aim to understand the *how* and *why* of enforcement dynamics, rather than just the *how much* of deforestation rates [29], [30].

2. Data Collection Strategy

Data collection followed a purposive sampling strategy targeting high-impact literature published between **January 2020 and early 2026**.

- **Sources:** Scopus, Web of Science, SciELO (to capture regional Brazilian scholarship), and high-level policy reports from organizations like the Climate Policy Initiative (CPI) and Imazon.

- **Search Terms:** "IBAMA," "Environmental Enforcement Brazil," "Deforestation Governance," "Institutional Dismantling," "Remote Embargoes."
- **Inclusion Criteria:** Articles discussing IBAMA's structure, political context, legal frameworks, or field operations.
- **Exclusion Criteria:** Studies purely focused on biological diversity, carbon flux measurements, or remote sensing algorithms that do not discuss the institutional application of the data.

3. Data Analysis

The selected texts were subjected to thematic analysis. The analysis coded for:

1. **Dismantling Mechanisms:** Specific administrative actions that hindered enforcement.
2. **Operational Innovation:** New strategies (e.g., remote embargoes) developed to bypass limitations.
3. **Enabling Conditions:** Contextual factors mentioned as necessary for these strategies to work.

RESULT

The thematic analysis reveals a dramatic narrative arc comprising the hollowing out of the agency, followed by a strategic pivot toward remote and economic enforcement mechanisms.

1. Institutional Characterisation: Mandate, Structure, and Capacity

Before analysing the dynamics of dismantling and reconstruction, the reviewed literature provides a comprehensive profile of IBAMA as the central nervous system of Brazilian environmental governance. The literature characterises the agency through five key dimensions: regulatory authority, institutional design, human resources, leadership dynamics, and inter-agency coordination.

A. Regulatory Framework and Police Power

Established by Law No. 7.735 in 1989, IBAMA is defined in the literature as a federal "autarchy" with administrative and financial autonomy, operating under the Ministry of Environment (MMA). Recent legal analyses highlight that IBAMA's primary enforcement instrument is its "environmental police power" (poder de polícia ambiental), granted by the Environmental Crimes Law (Law No. 9.605/1998) [31], [32], [33].

Scholars emphasise that IBAMA's authority is unique among global environmental agencies because it has the power to impose sanctions immediately, without waiting for a court order. This includes the power to issue fines, place embargoes on properties (prohibiting economic use), seize assets, and destroy equipment used in environmental crimes (Decree 6.514/2008). The literature notes that this "administrative speed" is designed to counterbalance the slowness of the Brazilian judiciary[34], [35].

B. Human Resources and Technical Expertise

A recurring theme in institutional analyses is the high degree of technical specialisation within IBAMA's career staff. The agency's inspectors are described not merely as police officers but as "environmental analysts"—civil servants often holding advanced degrees in biology, forestry, engineering, and law [25], [36], [37].

However, the literature from 2020 to 2024 paints a concerning picture of **chronic understaffing**. It has been documented that a demographic crisis: a significant portion of IBAMA's workforce has retired without being replaced due to hiring freezes imposed since 2014 [23]. By 2020, the number of field agents available for operations in the Amazon had dropped by over 40% compared to the 2010 peak. This "attrition by design" is identified as a structural vulnerability that predated the explicit political dismantling of the Bolsonaro era [28], [36], [38], [39].

C. Leadership and Governance Structure

The governance structure of IBAMA is centralised, with a Presidency appointed by the Federal Executive and five specialised Directorates (e.g., Environmental Protection, Licensing, Sustainable Use). The literature highlights a critical shift in leadership profiles as a determinant of agency performance. During the "golden era" of enforcement (2004–2012), leadership positions were typically held by technical experts or career civil servants. In contrast, studies covering the 2019–2022 period analyse the massive influx of military personnel into these directorships. This "militarisation" is described as creating a clash of organisational cultures: the hierarchical, order-following military ethos conflicted with the discretionary, technical nature of environmental oversight, leading to operational paralysis [40].

D. Historical Achievements and the PPCDAm Legacy

The literature uses the period of the Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Legal Amazon (PPCDAm) as the benchmark for IBAMA's potential. Between 2004 and 2012, IBAMA's integrated enforcement actions are credited with driving an 83% reduction in Amazon deforestation. This achievement is cited globally as proof that command-and-control strategies, when politically backed, are highly effective in tropical forest governance. The current literature frames the post-2019 period not as a lack of capability, but as a deviation from this proven historical baseline [9], [36], [41], [42], [43].

E.. Inter-Agency Coordination (SISNAMA)

IBAMA does not operate in a vacuum. It functions as the executive arm of the National System of Environment (SISNAMA). The literature details its complex interoperability with other bodies:

- **INPE (National Institute for Space Research):** IBAMA relies entirely on INPE for deforestation alerts (DETER system). The literature emphasises that this relationship is the "backbone" of intelligence-led policing [44].
- **Federal Police (PF):** Collaboration is essential for criminal investigations (e.g., money laundering linked to illegal gold) [45].
- **ICMBio:** While IBAMA covers general federal lands, the Chico Mendes Institute (ICMBio) manages specific Conservation Units. Recent studies

point to friction and overlaps when these agencies' mandates are not clearly harmonised [28], [31].

2. The Anatomy of Dismantling (2019–2022)

The literature identifies three primary mechanisms for undermining IBAMA's effectiveness, offering a cautionary tale for other nations.

- **The "Conciliation" Bottleneck:** It has been extensively document the creation of the "Nucleus for Environmental Conciliation" (NUC) [9], [36]. This administrative layer required a reconciliation hearing before any fine could be processed. The result was a catastrophic bottleneck; thousands of fines expired due to the statute of limitations, creating a de facto amnesty for environmental crimes [31].
- **Militarisation of Leadership:** It has been highlighted that the replacement of technical directors with military officers was conducted. This created a "chain of command" culture that conflicted with the decentralised nature of field inspections, leading to the cancellation of planned operations against illegal mining [23].
- **Delegitimisation:** High-level political rhetoric describing IBAMA as an "industry of fines" emboldened offenders. Field agents reported increased physical threats, forcing them to retreat from hostile frontiers [18].

3. Operational Innovations and Rebuilding (2023–Present)

In response to resource constraints and political shifts, the literature notes the emergence of high-efficiency enforcement tactics.

- **Remote Embargoes:** It has been highlighted that the shift toward "remote" administrative sanctions. By cross-referencing DETER satellite alerts with the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR), IBAMA began digitally embargoing properties. This prevents the landowner from selling cattle or accessing credit without an inspector ever visiting the site [46], [47], [48].
- **Destruction of Capital Assets:** The reinstatement of Decree 6.514/2008, allowing agents to burn heavy machinery (excavators, tractors) found in illegal areas, is cited as the single most effective deterrent [21]. It imposes an immediate, non-refundable cost on the offender, bypassing the slow judiciary.
- **Operation "Norte" and Inter-Agency Cooperation:** The return of the Federal Police to support IBAMA agents has been pivotal. The literature emphasises that enforcement in the Amazon is not just about environmental law but also about countering organised crime syndicates that have infiltrated the logging and mining sectors [49], [50], [51].

DISCUSSION

This section synthesises the findings to answer the core research objectives: identifying best practices and the prerequisites for their global application.

1. Synthesis: The Primacy of "The Credibility of Sanctions."

The overarching lesson from the Brazilian experience is that the "certainty of punishment" matters more than the "severity of the law." During the dismantling era, the laws remained severe, but the certainty of punishment evaporated due to the "conciliation" hearings. The rapid drop in deforestation in

late 2023 and 2024 correlates directly with the resumption of machinery destruction and remote embargoes—actions that restored the immediate economic risk of illegal behaviour.

2. Best Practices for Global Implementation

Based on the IBAMA experience, three specific "Best Practices" emerge as highly effective for controlling illegal land use in tropical nations.

Best Practice 1: The "Remote Embargo" Mechanism

Instead of relying solely on physical patrols, which are expensive and dangerous, the state uses digital tools to block the offender's economic life.

- **Mechanism:** When satellites detect deforestation, the state automatically places an "administrative block" on the land title.
- **Impact:** The land cannot be used to issue transport permits for cattle or timber; banks cannot issue loans for that purpose; meatpackers cannot legally buy from it. This effectively creates a "commercial death" for the property until environmental compliance is restored.

Best Practice 2: Summary Destruction of Crime Instruments

Addressing the "impunity loop" where seized equipment is often returned to offenders by corrupt local judges.

- **Mechanism:** Field agents are legally authorised to destroy heavy equipment (bulldozers, skidders, dredges) *in situ* if removal is logistically impossible or if it poses an environmental risk.
- **Impact:** This capitalizes on the "sunk cost" theory. Illegal mining requires expensive machinery. If the risk involves losing a $200,000 excavator instantly, the barrier to entry rises significantly, altering the economic calculation of the crime.

Best Practice 3: The "Dirty List" Transparency

Publicising the names and tax IDs of environmental offenders to leverage market forces.

- **Mechanism:** IBAMA maintains a public list of embargoed areas and offenders.
- **Impact:** Supply chain actors (supermarkets, soy traders, slaughterhouses) use this list to scrub their supply chains to avoid reputation risk, effectively privatizing enforcement. This forces the private sector to act as a secondary regulator.

3. Prerequisites for Effective Implementation

A critical contribution of this study is the identification of **Enabling Conditions**. Simply copying IBAMA's tactics will fail if the receiving country does not possess specific structural prerequisites. The following analysis outlines what is required for other nations to adopt these practices.

Prerequisite A: The Integrated Digital Cadastre

- **For Best Practice 1 (Remote Embargoes)**
- **The Constraint:** You cannot embargo a pixel if you do not know who owns it. Many tropical nations suffer from chaotic, paper-based, or overlapping land registries.
- **The Prerequisite:** A unified, geo-referenced land registry similar to Brazil's **CAR (Rural Environmental Registry)**.

- *Implementation Requirement:* The country must invest in a digital mapping system where land claims are self-declared but validated by satellite. Without a link between a GPS coordinate and a Tax ID, remote enforcement is impossible.

Prerequisite B: Administrative Autonomy & Legal Shielding

- **For Best Practice 2 (Asset Destruction)**
- **The Constraint:** Destroying private property (even if illegal) is legally perilous. Agents fear personal lawsuits or criminal charges for "abuse of authority."
- **The Prerequisite:** Explicit legislative protection for field agents.
  - *Implementation Requirement:* Legislation must explicitly authorise the destruction of assets used in environmental crimes when seizure is impossible. Furthermore, agents must have "qualified immunity" to protect them from civil litigation by offenders. Without this legal shield, agents will hesitate to act.

Prerequisite C: Financial Sector Integration

- **For Best Practice 1 & 3 (Embargoes & Dirty Lists)**
- **The Constraint:** Embargoes are useless if the banking sector ignores them.
- **The Prerequisite:** Central Bank regulations that mandate environmental due diligence.
  - *Implementation Requirement:* Similar to Brazil's **Central Bank Resolution 4.327**, other nations need banking regulations that prohibit the issuance of agricultural credit to properties with active environmental embargoes. This requires data interoperability between the Ministry of Environment and the Banking Federation.

Prerequisite D: Data Sovereignty and Independence

- **For General Enforcement**
- **The Constraint:** If the enforcement agency also produces the deforestation data, there is a conflict of interest and a temptation to manipulate statistics to show "success."
- **The Prerequisite:** Separation of Data Production and Data Action.
  - *Implementation Requirement:* An independent scientific body (like Brazil's **INPE**) must be responsible for monitoring and publishing deforestation data. This transparency forces the enforcement agency (IBAMA) to be accountable. Countries attempting to replicate this must ensure their monitoring agency is scientifically independent from the political executive.

4. Cadastral Intelligence: The Foundation of Digital Enforcement

The synthesis of the Brazilian experience reveals that modern environmental enforcement is fundamentally a data problem, specifically a problem of *attribution*. The literature emphasises that knowing *where* deforestation occurs (via satellite imagery) is useless unless the state knows *who* is responsible. This linkage is what scholars term **"Cadastral Intelligence"** [31].

Cadastral intelligence refers to the integration of land tenure data with environmental monitoring systems. In Brazil, this is operationalised through the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR). The CAR is a mandatory, self-declaratory electronic registry in which all rural properties must be georeferenced.

- **Substantive Mechanism:** When the CAR is integrated with the DETER satellite system, it allows for "precision enforcement." Instead of sending a truck to a deforestation site—which is costly, slow, and dangerous—the system automatically identifies the tax ID (CPF/CNPJ) associated with the deforested coordinates.
- **Strategic Value:** This transforms deforestation from an anonymous crime into a liability attached to a legal entity. It enables the state to target the *asset* (the land) rather than just the *actor* (who might flee). Recent studies argue that without this "digital cadastre," remote embargoes are impossible, and enforcement remains trapped in the 20th-century model of physical policing [52], [53], [54].
- **Global Implication:** For other nations, the lesson is that investing in a digital, unified land registry is not just an agrarian administrative task; it is the *prerequisite* for environmental rule of law [55], [56], [57], [58].

5. Automated Sanctions: Overcoming the "Human Bottleneck."

A critical theme emerging from the analysis of IBAMA's dismantling (2019–2022) is the vulnerability of human-dependent processes. When enforcement relies on inspectors manually writing tickets and adjudicators manually reviewing defences, the system is easily paralysed by budget cuts or bureaucratic strikes. The literature points to **"Automated Sanctions"** as the necessary evolution to bypass these bottlenecks [36].

Automated sanctions function similarly to traffic speed cameras. Just as a speed camera issues a fine automatically based on photographic evidence, environmental systems can issue "remote embargoes" automatically based on satellite evidence.

- **Substantive Mechanism:** The automated sanctions approach shifts the burden of proof. In a manual system, the state must prove guilt, often requiring a site visit. In an automated system, the satellite image serves as *prima facie* evidence of the infraction. The embargo is applied instantly, blocking the property's economic access (credit, markets). The landowner then has the right to appeal and prove that the deforestation was legal, but the sanction remains in effect during the appeal [59], [60], [61].
- **Institutional Resilience:** Automation "pandemic-proofs" and "dismantle-proofs" the agency. Even if the government slashes the travel budget for field inspectors, the "digital inspector" continues to work 24/7. Scholars argue that this shift from "discretionary" to "algorithmic" enforcement reduces corruption opportunities and increases the *perceived risk* for offenders [40].

6. Insulating Technical Leadership: The Legal Firewall

The most painful lesson from the IBAMA crisis is political fragility. The literature consistently demonstrates that the agency's effectiveness did not collapse because of a lack of funds or technology, but because its leadership was captured by political interests hostile to its mission. This leads to the concept of **"Insulated Technical Leadership"** [36].

This concept proposes that environmental enforcement agencies should be legally structured like Central Banks or Independent Regulatory Agencies, rather than as direct subordinates of the political executive.

- **Substantive Mechanism:** To achieve this insulation, the literature suggests three legal safeguards:
    1. **Fixed Mandates:** Directors should serve fixed terms (e.g., 4 years) that do not coincide with the Presidential election cycle, preventing mass firings when a new administration takes power.
    2. **Selection Criteria:** Leadership appointments should be restricted to individuals with proven technical expertise in the field, verified by a public list or legislative confirmation, preventing the appointment of unqualified political allies (e.g., military officers without environmental training).
    3. **Removal Protections:** Directors should only be removable for "just cause" (corruption, negligence) through a formal administrative process, not merely at the "pleasure of the President."
- **Strategic Value:** This "legal firewall" ensures that the "police power" of the state remains guided by law and science, rather than the fluctuating "political will" of the moment. It stabilises the "credibility of sanctions" over the long term, which is essential for deterring investment in illegal deforestation [44].

7. Applicability to Other Tropical Nations: Implementing the IBAMA Model

The "IBAMA Model" of remote embargoes and cadastral intelligence holds transformative potential, particularly in addressing the pervasive issue of illegal oil palm plantations inside the Forest Zone. However, implementing these best practices requires overcoming significant "cadastral opacity." While Brazil's *Rural Environmental Registry* (CAR) is publicly accessible, in many tropical countries, the "One Map Policy" remains operationally fragmented. For the Brazilian model of "Remote Embargoes" to work, it must first meet the prerequisite of **complete transparency of concession data**. Without a unified, publicly verifiable map linking specific corporate entities to forest coordinates, the "digital enforcement" mechanism cannot assign liability, leaving the state dependent on the slower, corruption-prone model of physical field inspections [31].

Furthermore, the effectiveness of IBAMA's "Command and Control" relies heavily on the **immediate economic strangulation** of offenders. The analysis suggests that implementing IBAMA-style asset seizures and automatic sanctions would require a recalibration of the law. The Brazilian experience demonstrates that "pay-to-legalise" schemes often fail to deter future deforestation, particularly when the profits from illegal conversion outweigh the fines. To replicate IBAMA's success, it would need to shift from an "administrative amnesty" approach to a "strict liability" framework in which illegal operations trigger an immediate freeze on commercial access, blocking the offender from the supply chain before any legalisation process begins [62], [63], [64].

A critical prerequisite for this transition is the **interoperability between environmental data and the financial sector**. In Brazil, the "Dirty List" of embargoed properties is consulted by banks and meatpackers. If a satellite detects deforestation in a protected zone, the system should automatically flag the associated company, suspending its sustainability certificate and freezing its access to agricultural credit. Recent studies indicate that while several countries have improved their monitoring capabilities, these systems often function as "passive observers." Transforming them into "active enforcers" requires the regulatory backbone to ensure that a red pixel on a map results in an automatic red light in the banking system [36].

To resolve the massive issue of illegal plantations within the Forest Zone. The "IBAMA Model" of cadastral intelligence holds transformative potential, but its success relies on overcoming "cadastral opacity." While Brazil's *Rural Environmental Registry* (CAR) enables real-time remote monitoring, many tropical countries often operate with fragmented data, with concession of plantation boundaries not aligning with forest gazettement areas. For the Brazilian practice of "Remote Embargoes" to be effectively adopted by other tropical countries, the prerequisite is the **acceleration of interoperability with the One Map Policy**. Each tropical country must possess a unified, legally binding digital map that links specific corporate tax IDs to forest coordinates. Without this, it remains trapped in endless verification disputes, preventing the "digital enforcement" mechanisms that allowed IBAMA to scale its operations [31].

A critical lesson comes from IBAMA's disastrous "Conciliation Phase" (2019–2022), where the introduction of mandatory negotiation hearings created a bottleneck that effectively granted amnesty to offenders. The Brazilian experience warns that "pay-to-legalise" schemes fail if the economic activity is allowed to continue *during* the negotiation. To avoid the "IBAMA Trap," the prerequisite of **"Immediate Economic Strangulation"** must be implemented. Even while a company is processing its administrative fines, its access to commercial markets (certification and export permits) should be frozen. Best practice dictates that the "legalisation phase" should not be a "business-as-usual phase"; the cost of illegality must be felt immediately, not deferred to a future invoice that might never be paid [40].

Furthermore, the effectiveness in various countries depends on the **financial sector integration**, mirroring IBAMA's interoperability with the Brazilian Central Bank. Currently, many tropical countries focus heavily on identifying land overlap, but a crucial prerequisite for effectiveness is the ability to leverage the banking system. Implementing the IBAMA model would require establishing a direct data bridge with the Financial Services Authority. If the audit result flags a plantation as "non-compliant" or "under administrative review," this status should automatically trigger a **credit freeze** across the national banking sector. In some cases, the plantation companies often view administrative fines alone as merely a "cost of doing business." Only by cutting off capital flow—as IBAMA did through remote embargoes—can the tropical countries compel swift compliance from well-funded recalcitrant actors [36].

The "Institutional Insulation" lesson is also vital for the national authority vis-à-vis local governments. Like IBAMA, which faced sabotage from local mayors protecting illegal loggers, many tropical countries face resistance from local officials who issue conflicting permits on forest land. For tropical countries to succeed, they require a **legal safeguard for federal primacy** in enforcement. This entails a clear regulatory framework where the determinations on forest boundaries legally supersede local spatial plans without the need for prolonged administrative court battles. Without this "supremacy clause," the decisions will be continuously bogged down by regional bureaucratic politics, replicating the paralysis IBAMA suffered when its federal authority was undermined by local political interests [40].

Regarding the illegal mining sector, which often overlaps with the jurisdiction, the Brazilian strategy of **"Summary Asset Destruction"** remains the only viable deterrent for anonymous, mobile actors. IBAMA's experience shows that seizing excavators in remote jungle areas is logistically impossible and prone to "recycling" (where seized equipment is stolen back). To effectively secure forest areas from encroachments that cannot be regularised (e.g., in Conservation Forests), the prerequisite is that **legislative immunity for the** agents must be protected by a decree in Brazil's Decree 6.514, which explicitly authorises the burning of heavy machinery *in situ* as a standard operating procedure, protecting agents from civil liability and counter-lawsuits by illegal operators [36].

Finally, the ultimate prerequisite is **Data Transparency as a Compliance Mechanism**. Brazil's resilience during its crisis was partly due to the public availability of its "Dirty List" of embargoed areas. To replicate IBAMA's effectiveness, it must transition to a **"Public Disclosure Regime."** The list of companies currently under administrative sanction, and their compliance status with fine payments, must be publicly accessible. This transparency allows civil society and global buyers to act as "secondary enforcers," pressuring companies to resolve their status with the officials to avoid reputation damage, thereby reducing the burden on the state to chase every offender [44].

The "Destruction of Assets" strategy, while controversial, offers a necessary deterrent for the **illegal mining** sector, which mirrors the *garimpo* crisis in the Amazon. Brazilian best practices suggest that seizing equipment is often logistically impossible in remote jungle areas; thus, on-site destruction is the only way to decapitalise criminal syndicates. The prerequisite is **explicit legislative immunity for field agents in Brazil**. Enforcement officers often hesitate to destroy heavy machinery due to fears of counter-lawsuits or allegations of human rights violations. Adopting a clear decree in Brazil's Decree 6.514 would provide the necessary legal umbrella, clarifying that machinery found in conservation zones is "an instrument of crime" subject to immediate neutralisation, thereby shifting the financial risk entirely onto the illegal operators [36].

Finally, the ultimate prerequisite for successfully importing these practices is **Civil Society Oversight of Data**. Brazil's resilience during its dismantling phase was due to INPE's data being public; the government could not hide the deforestation spikes. In many tropical countries, data on

deforestation and enforcement actions are often treated as state secrets or internal bureaucratic metrics. To effectively implement a "Remote Embargo" regime, it needs to democratise its forest data, allowing NGOs and the private sector to independently verify whether the government is actually sanctioning the coordinates flagged by satellites. Without this "fire alarm" mechanism provided by civil society, automated enforcement systems risk being quietly turned off or manipulated by political interests, rendering the technology useless [17], [36], [44].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Substantive Conclusion

The case of IBAMA serves as a global laboratory for environmental governance. The literature from 2020 to 2026 demonstrates that ecological protection is fundamentally a political-institutional challenge, not merely a technical one. IBAMA's resilience during the dismantling years was rooted in its career civil service and the external transparency of satellite data. However, its effectiveness collapsed when administrative bottlenecks (like conciliation hearings) were introduced. The recovery phase highlights that **economic strangulation** of offenders—through remote embargoes and asset destruction—is far more effective than traditional criminal prosecution in regions with weak judicial capacity.

The qualitative synthesis of the IBAMA trajectory offers four definitive conclusions regarding the dynamics of environmental enforcement in the Global South. These conclusions challenge prevailing technocratic assumptions and highlight the deep political-institutional roots of forest governance.

Conclusion 1: Technological Capacity is Decoupled from Enforcement Effectiveness without Political Autonomy

The first major conclusion is that "technological solutionism" is a fallacy in the absence of bureaucratic autonomy. The literature conclusively demonstrates that during the height of the deforestation crisis (2019–2022), Brazil's monitoring capacity (DETER/PRODES) remained world-class, yet enforcement collapsed. This "transparency paradox"—where the state sees everything but acts on nothing—proves that high-resolution data is a necessary but insufficient condition for governance. The bottleneck was not the *detection* of illegality, but the political *authorisation* to sanction it. Therefore, the effectiveness of an environmental agency is less correlated with its software budget than with its legal insulation from executive interference. Without statutory protections that prevent the arbitrary replacement of technical directors with political appointees, even the most advanced satellite system becomes merely a "digital archive of destruction" rather than a tool for prevention.

Conclusion 2: "Infralegal" Dismantling is the New Threat to Environmental Governance

The study concludes that modern threats to environmental institutions no longer come primarily from legislative repeals (which attract international outcry), but from "infralegal" administrative sabotage. The analysis of the "Conciliation Phase" (NUC) reveals a sophisticated mechanism of "dismantling

by procedure," in which the law's statute remained unchanged. Still, the *administrative workflow* was deliberately clogged to ensure impunity. By introducing mandatory reconciliation hearings that the agency had no staff to conduct, the state effectively granted a procedural amnesty to thousands of offenders. This finding suggests that researchers and policymakers must look beyond the "law on the books" to monitor the "law in practice," specifically scrutinising internal ordinances and normative instructions that can silently paralyse an agency's coercive power from within.

Conclusion 3: Economic Strangulation is Superior to Territorial Policing

The strategic pivot observed in the post-2023 rebuilding phase confirms that "territorial policing" (sending rangers to guard trees) is an obsolete model for the vastness of the Amazon. The successful resumption of control was driven by a paradigm shift toward "remote economic strangulation." The conclusion is that the most effective enforcement actions are those that sever the offender's link to the formal economy—specifically, **remote embargoes** that block access to credit and **supply chain exclusion** (dirty lists)—rather than criminal prosecution. In regions with weak judicial systems and slow courts, administrative sanctions that impose immediate "commercial death" on a rural property act as a far stronger deterrent than the threat of a prison sentence that may never materialise.

Conclusion 4: Cadastral Intelligence is the Prerequisite for the Rule of Law

Finally, this review concludes that the "anonymity of the land" is the single most significant enabler of environmental crime. The efficacy of IBAMA's recovery was entirely dependent on the existence of the *Rural Environmental Registry* (CAR), which allowed the state to attribute liability to specific legal entities without needing a physical presence on the ground. This confirms that "Cadastral Intelligence"—the seamless integration of land tenure data with environmental monitoring—is the foundational infrastructure of the environmental rule of law. For other tropical nations, this implies that efforts to stop deforestation will remain largely cosmetic until a unified, digital, and transparent land registry is established to pierce the veil of anonymity that protects illegal actors.

The "IBAMA Model" offers a blueprint for the Global South, but it is not a "plug-and-play" solution. It requires a specific institutional architecture: a digital land registry, independent monitoring, and a legal framework that empowers agents to impose immediate economic costs.

2. Policy Recommendations

Based on the systemic analysis of IBAMA's trajectory, this study proposes three structural policy recommendations designed to enhance the resilience and effectiveness of forest governance institutions globally.

Recommendation 1: Prioritise "Cadastral Intelligence" over General Capacity Building

Governments and international donors must fundamentally shift their investment strategy from soft "capacity building" (e.g., training seminars) to the complex infrastructure of **integrated digital land registries**. The Brazilian experience demonstrates that the most advanced satellite monitoring is operationally useless for enforcement if the state cannot legally attribute a specific forest pixel to one particular tax entity (individual or corporation). Policy

implementation requires the creation of a mandatory, self-declaratory, and geo-referenced land registry—mirroring Brazil's *Rural Environmental Registry* (CAR)—that is fully interoperable with the national tax database. This system must move beyond static paper maps to become a dynamic digital layer in which every square meter of land is inextricably linked to a "liable identity," thereby solving the "anonymity problem" that currently shields illegal deforestation. Without this "cadastral intelligence," enforcement remains reactive and physical, whereas a digital registry enables proactive, massive-scale liability assignment that scales with the size of the forest. Furthermore, this data must be publicly accessible to allow civil society to audit the state's enforcement actions, acting as a crucial check against the selective non-enforcement often observed in opaque land tenure systems.

Recommendation 2: Legally Insulate Technical Leadership from Political Cycles

To prevent the recurrence of "institutional dismantling," national legislation must restructure environmental enforcement agencies to possess **statutory autonomy** similar to that of Independent Regulatory Agencies or Central Banks. This policy entails establishing fixed, non-coincident mandates for agency directors (e.g., four-year terms that do not align with general elections), ensuring that technical leadership cannot be swept away *en masse* by a change in political administration. The selection process for these high-level positions must be legally restricted to candidates with verified technical expertise in environmental management, drawn from a "triple list" approved by legislative or civil society bodies, rather than being treated as political appointments for military or partisan loyalists. Furthermore, the legal framework must explicitly define "just cause" for removal, protecting directors from arbitrary dismissal when they enforce laws against politically powerful economic sectors. This "legal firewall" is essential to convert environmental protection from a fluctuating "government policy" (dependent on the mood of the current executive) into a permanent "state policy" that maintains operational integrity regardless of the prevailing political climate.

FURTHER STUDY

This research still has limitations, so further studies on the topic of Institutional Resilience and Enforcement Dynamics in the Brazilian Amazon: A Review of IBAMA's Trajectory and Global Lessons for Forest Governance are needed to refine this research and add insights for both the writer and the readers.

REFERENCES

A. Abdullah and M. Hatta, "The Application of the Burden of Proof Concept in Indonesia: A Comparative Study," SASI, pp. 458–469, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.47268/sasi.v28i3.1045.

A. Albuquerque Sant'Anna and L. Costa, "Environmental regulation and bail outs under weak state capacity: Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon," Ecol. Econ., vol. 186, p. 107071, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107071.

A. N. Berger, C. Ortega, M. Ossandon Busch, and R. A. Roman, "Banking on deforestation: the cost of nonenforcement," J. Financ. Intermediation, vol. 67, p. 101211, Jul. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.jfi.2026.101211.

A. P. D. Aguiar et al., "Land use change emission scenarios: anticipating a forest transition process in the Brazilian Amazon," Glob. Chang. Biol., vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1821–1840, May 2016, doi: 10.1111/gcb.13134.

A. Y. Martin, M. Roestamy, radif K. Rusli, Warizal, Z. A. Masruri, and W. W. Utami, "Digitalization of Land Certificates and the Imperatives of Justice in the Context of SDGs: An Analytical Review of Indonesia's Land Registration System," J. Law Sustain. Dev., vol. 13, no. 9, pp. 1–24, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://ojs.journalsdg.org/jlss/article/download/4532/2073/16533

B. E. de Amorim and D. Peyerl, "The Brazilian Amazon and the Soveregnist Discourse: old and new storylines," Opinião Pública, vol. 30, 2024, doi: 10.1590/1807-0191202430119.

C. A. Nobre, G. Sampaio, L. S. Borma, J. C. Castilla-Rubio, J. S. Silva, and M. Cardoso, "Land-use and climate change risks in the Amazon and the need of a novel sustainable development paradigm," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., vol. 113, no. 39, pp. 10759–10768, Sep. 2016, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1605516113.

C. H. P. Luiz and V. A. Steinke, "Recent Environmental Legislation in Brazil and the Impact on Cerrado Deforestation Rates," Sustainability, vol. 14, no. 13, p. 8096, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14138096.

C. L. Lopes and J. Chiavari, "An Analysis of the New Legal Framework for IBAMA's Administrative Enforcement Procedures and its Effects on Combating Deforestation in the Amazon," Climate Policy Initiative. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/publication/an-analysis-of-the-new-legal-framework-for-ibamas-administrative-sanctioning-procedure-and-its-effects-on-combating-deforestation-in-the-amazon/

C. Losekann and R. L. Paiva, "Brazilian Environmental Policy: shared responsibility and dismantling," Ambient. Soc., vol. 27, 2024, doi: 10.1590/1809-4422asoc0176r4vu27l1oa.

C. S. A. Moulin, "Building and dismantling organisational capacity and bureaucratic identity: an analysis of Ibama's civil service examinations (1989 – 2022)," Sustain. Debate, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 81–98, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.18472/SustDeb.v14n1.2023.44346.

C. S. A. Moulin, "Capacity-Building, Dismantling Strategies, and Resistance Tactics in Brazilian Environmental Agencies: Changes in Ibama's Authority and Nodality Tools from 2004 to 2022," in Public Policy in Democratic Backsliding: How Liberal Populists Engage with the Policy Process, 1st ed., Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, ch. 10. [Online]. Available: https://www.springerprofessional.de/en/capacity-building-dismantling-strategies-and-resistance-tactics-/50248180

C. Stange Azevedo Moulin, "Clausewitz in the Amazon," Lat. Am. Leg. Stud., vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 279–316, Apr. 2026, doi: 10.15691/0719-9112Vol14n1a7.

D. K. Mozgovoy et al., "Automated detection of deforestation based on multi-spectrum satellite data," J. Phys. Conf. Ser., vol. 1399, no. 4, p. 044101, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1399/4/044101.

D. Kleinschmit, R. Ferraz Ziegert, and L. Walther, "Framing Illegal Logging and Its Governance Responses in Brazil – A Structured Review of Diagnosis and Prognosis," Front. For. Glob. Chang., vol. 4, May 2021, doi: 10.3389/ffgc.2021.624072.

D. M. C. da Silva and V. G. da Vinha, "Environmental dismantling in Brazil: advances and knowledge gaps," Rev. Adm. Pública, vol. 59, no. 1, 2025, doi: 10.1590/0034-761220240178x.

E. F. Bim, "Trends in Brazilian Environmental Law and Enforcement Under the New Administration: Brazilian Environmental Enforcement and IBAMA," Washington DC, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://www.bdlaw.com/content/uploads/2018/08/2020-05-22-Brazilian-Environmental-Enforcement-and-IBAMA.pdf

E. K. Barchok and J. W. Mwangi, "A Comprehensive Assessment of Illegal Activities in Forest Management in Mount Elgon Forest, Bungoma County, Kenya," JAIS J. African Interdiscip. Stud., vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 31–46, 2024, [Online]. Available: https://cedred.or.ke/jais/images/nov-2024/3PDF_Barchok__Mwangi_A_Comprehensive_Assessment_of_Illegal_Activities_in_Forest_Management_in_Bungoma_County_Kenya.pdf

E. M. S. C. Neves, "Mudança, desmonte de políticas e defesa do meio ambiente no Brasil," Sustain. Debate, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 26–57, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.18472/SustDeb.v14n1.2023.46600.

F. Bonelli, A. S. A. Fernandes, and P. L. C. Cavalcante, "The active dismantling of environmental policy in Brazil: paralysis and setbacks of the deforestation inspection and control," Sustain. Debate, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 58–80, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.18472/SustDeb.v14n1.2023.44277.

F. Bonelli, A. S. Fernandes, P. Cavalcante, and S. Araujo, "Environmental Policy Dismantling and Undoing of Bureaucratic Capacities in Brazil," IX Encontro Bras. Adm. Publica, no. 5, pp. 1–15, 2022, [Online]. Available: https://sbap.org.br/ebap-2022/647.pdf

F. S. M. Nunes et al., "Lessons from the historical dynamics of environmental law enforcement in the Brazilian Amazon," Sci. Rep., vol. 14, no. 1, p. 1828, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-52180-7.

G. B. de Oliveira, R. B. Machado, M. F. Siqueira, R. D. Françoso, P. V. Prieto, and J. D. V. Hay, "Is Brazil's biodiversity offset policy effective in conserving the Cerrado?," Environ. Conserv., vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 71–78, Jun. 2025, doi: 10.1017/S0376892925000050.

G. D. Dos Reis and R. I. Corazza, "Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Legal Amazon (PPCDAm): A Scoping Review on Institutionalization, Effectiveness, and Dismantling," Soc. Nat., no. January, pp. 1–16, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.14393/SN-v37-2025-73148x.

G. J. Brandsma, J. Pollex, and P. Tobin, "Overlooked Yet Ongoing: Policy Termination in the European Union," JCMS J. Common Mark. Stud., vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 1360–1376, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.1111/jcms.13468.

G. S. Becker, "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach," J. Polit. Econ., vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 169–217, 1968, [Online]. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1830482?origin=JSTOR-pdf

H. Potter, "Reduced environmental enforcement fueled a vast network of crime in the Amazon," Reporter Brasil 25 Anos. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://reporterbrasil.org.br/2023/09/reduced-environmental-enforcement-fueled-a-vast-network-of-crime-in-the-amazon/

H. Sinaga, "Criminal Liability for Forest Burning in Indonesia," J. Soc. Sci., vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 12–17, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.46799/jss.v4i6.716.

H. Snyder, "Designing the literature review for a strong contribution," J. Decis. Syst., vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 551–558, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1080/12460125.2023.2197704.

H. Snyder, "Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines," J. Bus. Res., vol. 104, pp. 333–339, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

HRW, "Crisis in the Brazilian Amazon: Briefing Paper for US Special Presidential Envoy for Climate John Kerry," Human Rights Watch. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/03/11/crisis-brazilian-amazon

I. Lubis, D. I. S. Lubis, and A. H. Lubis, "A Multidimensional Legal Approach to Combat Land Mafia: Regulation, Digital Systems, and Agrarian Legal Education," JUSTISI, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 153–170, Dec. 2026, doi: 10.33506/js.v12i1.4445.

I. P. Obani, Z. I. Obani, F. C. Anaeto, T. O. Akroh, and C. S. Nwachukwu, "Impact of Deforestation on Carbon Emissions: A Data-Driven Study of the Amazon and Southeast Asia," EJLSS Eur. J. Life Saf. Stab., vol. 50, pp. 17–36, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389738647_Impact_of_Deforestation_on_Carbon_Emissions_A_Data-Driven_Study_of_the_Amazon_and_Southeast_Asia

J. A. P. de Oliveira, "Evolution of the Brazilian Public Administration," Public Adm. Issues, no. 6, pp. 30–43, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.17323/1999-5431-2023-0-6-30-43.

J. Assuncao, C. Gandour, and R. Rocha, "Deforestation Slowdown in the Brazilian Amazon: Price or Policies?," 2015. [Online]. Available: https://climatepolicyinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Deforestation-Slowdown-in-the-Brazilian-Amazon-Prices-or-Policies-Technical-Paper.pdf

J. Assunção, C. Gandour, and R. Rocha, "DETER-ing Deforestation in the Amazon: Environmental Monitoring and Law Enforcement," Am. Econ. J. Appl. Econ., vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 125–156, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1257/app.20200196.

J. Freitas Beyer, M. Köthke, and M. Lippe, "Assessing the Suitability of Available Global Forest Maps as Reference Tools for EUDR-Compliant Deforestation Monitoring," Remote Sens., vol. 17, no. 17, p. 3012, Aug. 2025, doi: 10.3390/rs17173012.

J. Grabs, F. Cammelli, S. A. Levy, and R. D. Garrett, "Designing effective and equitable zero-deforestation supply chain policies," Glob. Environ. Chang., vol. 70, p. 102357, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102357.

J. S. Sze, D. Z. Childs, L. R. Carrasco, and D. P. Edwards, "Indigenous lands in protected areas have high forest integrity across the tropics," Curr. Biol., vol. 32, no. 22, pp. 4949-4956.e3, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2022.09.040.

K. Bersch and G. Lotta, "Political Control and Bureaucratic Resistance: The Case of Environmental Agencies in Brazil," Lat. Am. Polit. Soc., vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 27–50, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1017/lap.2023.22.

K. Cetera, D. T. Ferdyan, C. Karr-Colque, and S. Labaste, "Science is Giving Forest Law Enforcement a New Edge," WRI Indonesia Insights. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://wri-indonesia.org/en/insights/science-giving-forest-law-enforcement-new-edge

K. Khoirunnisa and D. Jubaidi, "Analysis of the Elimination of Strict Liability in the Omnibus Law on Massive Deforestation in Indonesia and its Effect on Global Warming and Climate Change," GIJ Glob. Insight J., vol. 10, no. 1, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.52447/gij.v10i1.7913.

L. G. Bezerra and G. Gomes, "Brazilian Federal Environmental Agency Publishes Ruling on Deforestation Embargo," Mayer Brown Insights. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/insights/publications/2023/06/brazilian-federal-environmental-agency-publishes-ruling-on-deforestation-embargo

M. R. A. Ismail and L. Karjoko, "The Ideality of Implementing Administrative Sanctions Against Environmental Damage," J. Cakrawala Huk., vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 200–211, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.26905/idjch.v14i2.10420.

Muamar and A. A. S. Utari, "Pengaruh Penghapusan Asas Strict Liability dalam Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja terhadap Masif Deforestasi di Indonesia," J. Kertha Negara, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 1–12, 2020, [Online]. Available: https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/documents/detail/1986294

N. M. Koga, P. L. de M. Palotti, J. Mello, and M. M. S. Pinheiro, Eds., Public Policy and Use of Evidence in Brazil: Concepts, Methods, Contexts and Practices, 1st ed. IPEA, 2024. doi: 10.38116/978-65-5635-070-7.

NYT, "With Amazon on Fire, Environmental Officials in Open Revolt Against Bolsonaro," The New York Times: Americas. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/28/world/americas/amazon-fires-brazil.html

P. Handoko, "Law Enforcement On Deforestation Forests Conservation In Indonesia," Int. J. Community Serv., vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 342–352, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.51601/ijcs.v3i4.193.

P. L. C. Cavalcante, "Innovation policy dismantling: strategies and causes in contemporary Brazil," Rev. Adm. Pública, vol. 58, no. 1, 2024, doi: 10.1590/0034-761220220358x.

R. Rajão et al., "The rotten apples of Brazil's agribusiness," Science (80-.)., vol. 369, no. 6501, pp. 246–248, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1126/science.aba6646.

S. L. Santos, A. C. de Araujo Moxotó, and J. M. Dutra, "Illegal Gold Mining in the Brazilian Amazon: Environmental Degradation in Yanomami Indigenous Lands, and Regulatory Failures," Sustain. Dev., no. February, Feb. 2026, doi: 10.1002/sd.70821.

S. M. Thomaz, L. G. Barbosa, M. C. de Souza Duarte, and R. Panosso, "Opinion: The future of nature conservation in Brazil," Inl. Waters, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 295–303, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1080/20442041.2020.1750255.

Sanusi, B. R. Rakhmatullah, E. A. Pratama, F. D. Aryani, and M. Wildan, "Opportunities and Challenges of Land Sale and Purchase Agreement Transactions in the Digital Era in Indonesia," Indones. Law Rev., vol. 15, no. 1, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/ilrev/vol15/iss1/7?utm_source=scholarhub.ui.ac.id%2Filrev%2Fvol15%2Fiss1%2F7&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

T. A. P. West and P. M. Fearnside, "Brazil's conservation reform and the reduction of deforestation in Amazonia," Land use policy, vol. 100, p. 105072, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105072.

T. J. Killeen, "In the Pan Amazon, regulators struggle to punish environmental crimes," Mongabay Brazil Perfect Storm in te Amazon. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://news.mongabay.com/2025/05/in-the-pan-amazon-regulators-struggle-to-punish-environmental-crimes/

T. J. Killeen, "Mineral Commodities: A Small Footprint, a Large Impact and a Great Deal of Money," in A Perfect Storm in the Amazon Wilderness: Success and Failure in the Fight to Save an Ecosystem of Critical Importance to the Planet, 1st ed., Cambridgeshire: The White Horse Press, 2021, ch. 5, pp. 1–244. doi: 10.3197/9781912186228.

T. J. Killeen, "The formula that reduced deforestation in Brazil in the 21st century," Mongabay Brazil Perfect Storm in te Amazon. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://news.mongabay.com/2025/09/the-formula-that-reduced-deforestation-in-brazil-in-the-21st-century/

U. B. Abioke, P. M. Umeasalugo, C. E. Egbordi, O. D. Ikponmwosa, and E. Erezi, "A Narrative Review of the Environmental and Public Health Implications of Carbon Sequestration in the Amazon Rainforest," Jpurnal Glob. Ecol. Environ., vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 91–108, 2026, doi: https://doi.org/10.56557/jogee/2026/v22i210504.

V. Bhatia, C. Daugbjerg, and F. Ohemeng, "Policy termination revisited: theories, processes, and political dynamics," Policy Soc., vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 133–148, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.1093/polsoc/puag001.

V. N. Safriani and I. R. Maruf, "Digital Transformation and Legal Sustainability in Land Deed Registration: A Comparative Study between Indonesia and Brazil," E3S Web Conf., vol. 706, p. 04003, Apr. 2026, doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202670604003.

W. Leal Filho et al., "Managing ecosystem services in the Brazilian Amazon: the influence of deforestation and forest degradation in the world's largest rain forest," Geosci. Lett., vol. 12, no. 1, p. 24, May 2025, doi: 10.1186/s40562-025-00391-9.

World Bank, "Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program," Washington DC, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/104931551714772123-0090022019/render/Allonepagersenglish.pdf

WWF, "Criminal Networks Linked to Illegal Gold Mining in the Brazilian Amazon," World Wildlife Fund, WWF. Accessed: Jun. 03, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.worldwildlife.org/publications/criminal-networks-linked-to-illegal-gold-mining-in-the-brazilian-amazon/

Z. Min, D. Yulu, L. Xiaolu, and D. de Castro, "Brazil's legal and policy framework for combating Amazon deforestation," Trees, For. People, vol. 22, p. 101065, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.tfp.2025.101065.