



Calibrating satellite-derived carbon fluxes for retrospective and near real-time assimilation systems

Brad Weir^{1,2}, Lesley E. Ott², George J. Collatz², Stephan R. Kawa², Benjamin Poulter²,
Abhishek Chatterjee^{1,2}, Tomohiro Oda^{1,2}, and Steven Pawson^{1,2}

¹Universities Space Research Association, Columbia, MD, USA

²NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA

Correspondence: Brad Weir (brad.weir@nasa.gov)

Abstract. The ability to monitor and understand natural and anthropogenic variability in atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a growing need of many stakeholders across the world. Systems that assimilate satellite observations, given their short latency and dense spatial coverage, into high-resolution global models are valuable, if not essential, tools for addressing this need. A notable drawback of modern assimilation systems is the long latency of many vital input datasets, e.g., inventories, in situ measurements, and reprocessed remote-sensing data can trail the current date by months to years. This paper describes techniques for calibrating surface fluxes derived from satellite observations of the Earth's surface to be consistent with constraints from inventories and in situ CO₂ datasets. The techniques are applicable in both short-term forecasts and retrospective simulations, thus taking advantage of the coverage and short latency of satellite data while reproducing the major features of long-term inventory and in situ records. Our approach begins with a standard collection of diagnostic fluxes which incorporate a variety of remote-sensing driver data, viz. vegetation indices, fire radiative power, and nighttime lights. We then apply an empirical sink to calibrate the diagnostic fluxes to match given atmospheric and oceanic growth rates for each year. This step removes coherent, systematic flux errors that produce biases in CO₂ which mask the signals an assimilation system hopes to capture. Depending on the simulation mode, the empirical sink uses different choices of atmospheric growth rates: estimates based on observations in retrospective mode and projections based on seasonal forecasts of sea surface temperature in forecasting mode. The retrospective fluxes, when used in simulations with NASA's Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS), reproduce marine boundary layer measurements with comparable skill to those using fluxes from a modern inversion system. The forecasted fluxes show promising accuracy in their application to the analysis of changes in the carbon cycle as they occur.

Copyright statement. The author's copyright for this publication is transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1 Introduction

As the number and kind of space-based carbon dioxide (CO₂) measurements continue to grow, so too do the capabilities of modeling and data assimilation systems which support carbon monitoring. An eventual goal of these systems is the verification of international climate agreements (Ciais et al., 2015; Peters et al., 2017; Pinty et al., 2017; 2019). However, verification would



require the additional ability to distinguish the signal in atmospheric CO₂ due to changes in anthropogenic emissions from that due to inter-annual variability in biospheric fluxes, transport, and other natural processes. While this functionality matures, there are many other applications that do not require attribution, but do require near real-time (NRT) latencies (i.e., less than a few days), horizontal resolutions finer than several hundred kilometers, and extensive spatial coverage. These include short-term forecasts for field campaigns, identification of times and places of interest for satellite instruments with controllable pointing, (e.g., the Orbiting Carbon Observatory 3), and the production of a priori profiles and/or evaluation datasets for retrieval algorithms. Furthermore, high-resolution, global atmospheric CO₂ monitoring systems with forecasting and assimilation capabilities enable the study of carbon cycle phenomena as they occur, e.g., the impact of the recent coronavirus pandemic, and complement other existing and forthcoming remote-sensing observations of soil moisture, evapotranspiration, and terrestrial biomass (see Stavros et al., 2017 for examples).

The modeling and assimilation system under development at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), coordinated by the Global Modeling and Assimilation Office (GMAO), incorporates an extensive array of satellite observations and Earth system models to estimate carbon fluxes, atmospheric mixing ratios, and their uncertainties (Ott et al., 2015). The “baseline” configuration of this system features a collection of diagnostic surface fluxes derived from remotely-sensed surface properties, e.g., terrestrial biospheric exchange from vegetation indices (Randerson et al., 1996), NRT biomass burning from fire radiative power (Darmenov and da Silva, 2015), and disaggregations of fossil fuel inventories from nighttime lights (Oda and Maksyutov, 2011). High-resolution estimates of atmospheric CO₂ follow from transport simulations with the Goddard Earth Observing System (GEOS) general circulation model, which can reproduce the meteorology of an atmospheric analysis, e.g., the Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications, Version 2 (MERRA-2; Gelaro et al., 2017) with high fidelity (Orbe et al., 2017).

This system is currently being extended to assimilate a collection of CO₂ datasets (Tangborn et al., 2013; Eldering et al., 2017) including retrievals of column averages from the Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite (GOSAT; Kuze et al., 2009), Orbiting Carbon Observatory 2 (OCO-2; Crisp et al., 2004), and the ground-based Total Carbon Column Observing Network (TCCON; Wunch et al., 2011) along with in situ data from the multi-agency collection of data provided in NOAA’s Observation Package (ObsPack; Masarie et al., 2014). The assimilation step has the benefit of synthesizing heterogeneous measurement types, “gap filling” data when and where they are unavailable, and drawing model simulations closer to observed values. In particular, assimilation systems have the potential to correct for errors in the surface flux inputs associated with outstanding questions about how to 1) reconcile bottom-up global budgets derived from inventories and biospheric models with top-down budgets derived from atmospheric measurements (Le Quéré et al., 2018), 2) partition the surface sink between the Tropics and Extratropics (Schimel et al., 2015), and 3) reproduce the response to inter-annual variability in meteorology, for example the impact of El Niño on terrestrial (Liu et al., 2017) and oceanic (Chatterjee et al., 2017) fluxes and drought on semi-arid ecosystems (Poulter et al., 2014). A comprehensive description of current and planned space-based observations of CO₂, along with the scientific questions they hope to address, is available in the report of Crisp et al. (2018).

As the first step in the development of the CO₂ assimilation system, we calibrate the a priori, baseline diagnostic fluxes to satisfy constraints from inventories and in situ measurements. This step reduces the errors of model simulations before



assimilating satellite data, thus increasing the ability of the system to capture other signals of interest in the observations (Dee, 2005). For example, in any given year, estimates of global net biospheric exchange (NBE) from the TRENDY ensemble of terrestrial biosphere models (Sitch et al., 2015) have a range of roughly 4 petagrams of carbon (Pg C). Transported through the atmosphere, this produces a 2 ppm spread in CO₂, which is twice the size of the atmospheric growth rate perturbation of the 2015–2016 El Niño. In addition, an under/over-estimation of NBE leads to an under/over-prediction of the seasonal cycle amplitude of both surface and column-average mixing ratios (Yang et al., 2007; Keppel-Aleks et al., 2012). Among flux inversion systems that ingest in situ data, e.g., those analyzed by Gaubert et al. (2019), the spread in NBE is usually much smaller, about 0.25 Pg C. Nevertheless, flux inversions typically achieve this agreement through their reliance on long-term data records and transport simulations, and can trail the current date by a year or more. Our goal is to achieve a similar error reduction without the resulting latency, allowing the subsequent assimilation of satellite CO₂ data to focus on regional and seasonal errors rather than global budgeting errors.

This paper presents a collection of surface fluxes having both retrospective and forecasting modes that reproduce background CO₂ measurements with comparable skill to a modern flux inversion system. The collection includes an additional, empirically derived land sink to our baseline flux collection to ensure that global flux totals are consistent with observed atmospheric CO₂ growth rates. Empirical adjustments of this kind date back at least to the work of Tans et al. (1990), who showed that their simulations recreated the North-South gradient of CO₂ when they increased terrestrial uptake in the Northern Hemisphere Extratropics. Later, Chevallier et al. (2009) tuned their fluxes to match observed atmospheric growth rates, Keppel-Aleks et al. (2012) adjusted Northern Hemisphere mid-latitude uptake to improve their simulated seasonal cycle amplitude, and Agustí-Panareda et al. (2016) derived an adjustment to fluxes from their prognostic model (i.e., one which does not ingest satellite vegetation data) based on comparisons to a flux inversion system. The method described here is an extension to that of Chevallier et al. (2009), while sharing some features of each of the previously cited works. In retrospective mode, it applies an atmospheric growth rate based on in situ observations in the marine boundary layer (MBL; Dlugokencky and Tans, 2016b). In forecasting mode, when many of the diagnostic flux products and observationally constrained growth rates are unavailable, the fluxes use extrapolation and a method for predicting the growth rate based on sea surface temperature forecasts (Jones and Cox, 2005; Betts et al., 2016). It differs from previous works in its functional form and its application to fluxes diagnosed from satellite measurements instead of those from a prognostic model.

In the work that follows, the construction of the empirical sink is detailed in Section 2. The evaluation of the fluxes against other products and comparisons of transported mixing ratios to in situ measurements is presented in Section 3. In particular, we compare GEOS simulations using the calibrated fluxes and using fluxes from an inversion system to MBL measurements and show the difference in skill is negligible. These findings and their potential scientific impact are summarized in Section 4.

2 The LoFI flux collection

The Low-order Flux Inversion (LoFI) is a collection of carbon fluxes driven by remote-sensing data calibrated to reproduce given atmospheric and oceanic growth rates. We use the term “low-order” to distinguish it from a modern flux inversion system.



To demonstrate the impact of the empirical sink, we also consider a “baseline” flux collection similar to that used in Ott et al. (2015) with the empirical land sink removed. All products in both the LoFI and baseline collections are conservatively regrided to the $0.5^\circ \times 0.625^\circ$ dateline and pole centered grid used by GEOS for many applications including the MERRA-2 reanalysis, which is used for the meteorological inputs needed by the fluxes. All fluxes have a daily timestep, except the land biosphere which has a 3-hourly timestep to resolve the diurnal cycle. In retrospective mode, the LoFI collection trails the current date by up to a year. It forecasts fluxes for the current and next year using the approach described in Section 2.1. As a rough metric of truth/plausibility, we compare both collections to widely-used ensembles of terrestrial biospheric, ocean biogeochemical models, and flux inversions. These choices and the components of the LoFI fluxes are detailed below and summarized in Table 1.

100 The LoFI flux collection consists of the following six components:

Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) — An implementation of the **Carnegie Ames Stanford Approach** (CASA; Randerson et al., 1996) and **Global Fire Emissions Dataset version 3** (GFED 3; van der Werf et al., 2003; 2010) referred to here as CASA-GFED 3. CASA-GFED 3 uses satellite-based measurements of land cover and vegetation changes along with meteorology from MERRA-2 to constrain carbon stocks and fluxes, viz. net primary productivity (NPP), which is determined from measurements of normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI; Pinzon and Tucker, 2014), and biomass burning, which is determined from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectrometer (MODIS) burned area estimates (Giglio et al., 2010). This version is available on a 0.5 degree grid with a monthly timestep. More details about our particular implementation and its use in GEOS are available in Ott et al. (2015).

110 **Biofuel** — **CASA-GFED 3** also produces an estimate of the anthropogenic burning of harvested wood (van der Werf et al., 2010), which we refer to here as biofuel. The emissions have no seasonality and are calculated as the population density times national per capita fuel consumption estimates while being constrained by the total available coarse woody debris at each model time step.

115 **Biomass burning** — The **Quick Fire Emissions Dataset** (QFED; Darmenov and da Silva, 2015), an NRT product, which determines emissions based on MODIS fire radiative power (FRP) estimates using a technique similar to the Global Fire Assimilation System (GFAS; Kaiser et al., 2012). QFED is produced on a 0.1 degree grid for every day with a climatological diurnal cycle applied.

120 **Fossil fuel combustion** — The **Open-source Data Inventory for Anthropogenic CO₂** (ODIAC; Oda and Maksyutov, 2011, 2015; Oda et al., 2018). ODIAC is a global, monthly, high-resolution ($1 \text{ km} \times 1 \text{ km}$) fossil fuel CO₂ gridded emission data product based on the disaggregation of country-level fossil fuel CO₂ emission estimates using a global power plant database and satellite observations of nighttime lights. It is updated on an annual basis upon the availability of updated global fuel statistical data (Oda et al., 2018). This work uses the 2016 version which covers 2000–2015. For all but the two most recent years (here, 2014 and 2015), ODIAC uses global and country estimates from the Carbon Dioxide



Information and Analysis Center (CDIAC; Boden et al., 2018). Estimates for the two most recent years are projected using BP's Statistical Review of World Energy 2016.

125 **Ocean exchange** — An extension to the monthly climatology of Takahashi et al. (2009) that restores inter-annual variability. This approach reapplies the global mean climatological growth rate estimate of $1.5 \mu\text{atm/yr}$ of the partial pressure of CO_2 in seawater (pCO_2^{sw}) that Takahashi et al. (2009) use to derive their climatology. For the partial pressure in the atmosphere ($\text{pCO}_2^{\text{atm}}$), we use weekly values of zonal-mean surface CO_2 from the NOAA MBL reference (Masarie and Tans, 1995; Dlugokencky and Tans, 2016a) for the partial pressure of CO_2 in the atmosphere ($\text{pCO}_2^{\text{atm}}$). Given the two
 130 partial pressures, estimates of the surface flux follow from the expression (Wanninkhof, 2014)

$$F = kCU_{10}^2(\text{pCO}_2^{\text{sw}} - \text{pCO}_2^{\text{atm}}),$$

where k is a constant, U_{10} is the 10-meter wind speed, and C is the fractional sea-ice coverage. To complete the flux calculation, we use daily, observationally-constrained estimates of U_{10} and C from MERRA-2. This approach has been used by a number of previous studies and is derived from one of the ocean priors in the NOAA CarbonTracker System
 135 (see footnote b, Table 1). More information is available in Sections 3.1 & A3.

Empirical land sink — An additional, empirical sink following the “poor man’s inversion” approach of Chevallier et al. (2009) that constrains the global atmospheric growth rate of the combined LoFI flux package. The empirical sink decreases heterotrophic respiration (HR) in months where the 2-meter air temperature (T), meant as a rough proxy for soil temperature, increases from the previous month. This is designed to concentrate the correction to the Northern Extratropics during
 140 the spring and summer, where the neutral biosphere assumption of CASA is thought to be most problematic (discussed in Section 3.2). For the m -th month of each year, the sink S_m has the form

$$S_m = \alpha \cdot \Delta^+ T_m \cdot \text{HR}_m, \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta^+ T_m = \max(T_m - T_{m-1}, 0),$$

where $\Delta^+ T_m$ denotes the temperature increase from the previous month, and α is a scaling factor computed such that
 145 the total fluxes match a specified atmospheric growth rate. In retrospective years (those preceding the current), we use growth rates derived from the NOAA MBL reference (Dlugokencky and Tans, 2016b), and in NRT years (the current and following) we use projections based on seasonal forecasts of sea surface temperature described in Section 2.1. For more information about the construction and evaluation of the empirical sink, see Sections 3.2 & A3.

This separation assumes that, added together, biomass burning and biofuel emissions account for emissions from both natu-
 150 rally occurring wildfires and burning due to gross land-use/land-cover change. Furthermore, emissions from ethanol, biodiesel, and other short-cycle fuels used for transportation are potentially underestimated since they are not included in the ODIAC fossil fuel and CASA-GFED 3 biofuel emissions, yet the sink due to the corn and soybean harvest in the Midwestern United States is included in CASA-GFED 3 (derived from USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service data for 2005). Excluding



Table 1. The components of our fluxes and the different ensembles used for evaluation.

Name	Type	References
<i>LoFI flux components</i>		
CASA-GFED 3	NEE & biofuel	van der Werf et al. (2003; 2010) ^a
QFED	Biomass burning	Darmenov and da Silva (2015)
ODIAC	Fossil fuel	Oda et al. (2018) ^b
LoFI Takahashi	Ocean	Section 3.1 ^c
LoFI Land sink	Empirical NEE adj.	Section 3.2 ^d
<i>Top-down ensemble</i>		
CarbonTracker 2016 & 2017	NBE & Ocean	Peters et al. (2007) ^e
CarbonTracker Europe 2016	NBE & Ocean	Peters et al. (2007) ^f
CAMS v17r1	NBE & Ocean	Chevallier et al. (2011)
Jena CarboScope v4.1 S93 & S04	NBE & Ocean	Rödenbeck et al. (2003)
<i>Bottom-up ensemble</i>		
GCP 2018 (TRENDY V7)	NBE	Sitch et al. (2015) ^g
GCP 2018	Ocean	Le Quéré et al. (2018) ^h

^a Implementation in GEOS described by Ott et al. (2015).

^b Available at <http://db.cger.nies.go.jp/dataset/ODIAC/>.

^c See https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/carbontracker/CT2017_doc.pdf for a more detailed description of a nearly identical approach used as an ocean prior in the NOAA CarbonTracker flux inversion system.

^d See Chevallier et al. (2009) and Agustí-Panareda et al. (2016) for examples of similar approaches.

^e Updates documented at <http://carbontracker.noaa.gov>.

^f Updates documented by van der Laan-Luijkx et al. (2017).

^g Updates documented by Le Quéré et al. (2018).

^h Global, annual totals only.

the lateral transport of significant amounts of carbon over continental scales, we do not expect these assumptions to have a noticeable effect on the comparisons to follow since they consider only NBE, the sum of these factors, and not their individual contributions.

2.1 Forecasting fluxes

A number of products used in the above fluxes are unavailable until a few months to years following the end of a given year. In particular, the fossil fuel inventory data used by ODIAC and NOAA MBL growth rate require data collection and analysis that must necessarily trail real time. Simulations during the current year, in particular NRT runs, are thus only possible with some type of extrapolation and/or statistical model applied to past values. For all flux components except biomass burning and the empirical sink, we produce estimates during NRT years by first extrapolating a linear fit through the retrospective



values for each point and each month. This choice allows different regions and different seasons to have different trend lines. While more complex choices are possible, this is meant as a simple first step as we work to reduce the latency of our baseline
165 satellite-derived flux products.

The primary motivation for using QFED biomass burning instead of GFED was QFED's ability to produce NRT estimates. This ability is particularly important for biomass burning emissions whose inter-annual variability is comparable in magnitude to its annual mean and seasonal cycle amplitude and is much greater than its long-term trend. While the removal of terrestrial carbon by QFED fires does not match the corresponding fire loss in CASA carbon stocks, QFED emissions are calibrated to
170 GFED (Darmenov and da Silva, 2015), resulting in a difference that is minor compared to that of the empirical sink (see the Supplementary Section A3).

For the empirical sink, we switch from using an atmospheric growth rate derived from in situ data in retrospective years to a linear functional fit to seasonal SST anomalies and anthropogenic emissions (Jones and Cox, 2005; Betts et al., 2016). This approach estimates the growth rate of CO₂ in ppm, ΔCO₂ as

175
$$\Delta\text{CO}_2 = 0.069 + 0.442N + 0.205E, \quad (2)$$

where N is the average of SST anomalies in the Niño 3.4 region from October of the previous year to September of the current year in units of degrees Kelvin, and E is the total anthropogenic emissions from fossil fuels and net land-use/land-cover change in units of Pg C. For the SST anomalies, we use the Reynolds analysis (Reynolds et al., 2007) until the last month it is available and fill in the remaining months with SST forecasts from the GEOS Subseasonal to Seasonal (S2S) forecast system (Molod et
180 al., 2020), and for the anthropogenic emissions we use extrapolated totals from the Global Carbon Project (GCP) 2018 budget.

The coefficient 0.205 multiplying the anthropogenic term in the growth rate forecast (Equation 2) represents a constant airborne fraction of 0.44 when converted using a factor of 2.124 Pg/ppm, roughly in line with the findings of Raupach et al. (2014). Historical data records tend to show that the long-term trend in the airborne fraction is insignificant compared to its inter-annual variability (Knorr 2009; Ballantyne et al., 2012), but there is some indication of significant multi-decadal trends,
185 including the possibility of a recent decrease (Keenan et al., 2016).

3 Flux and transport simulation analysis

Our primary method for evaluating the LoFI flux package, along with the baseline fluxes, are comparisons to the ensembles of bottom-up terrestrial biosphere and ocean biogeochemistry models and top-down flux inversions outlined in Table 1 and described in more detail in the Supplemental Section A2. It is important to note that the bottom-up ensembles and top-down
190 ensemble are not directly comparable: riverine input of carbon from the terrestrial biosphere to the ocean causes the top-down ensemble to infer a greater terrestrial sink and smaller oceanic sink than the biospheric model ensemble (Le Quéré et al., 2018). Jacobson et al. (2007) used fluxes from a global erosion model (Amiotte Suchet and Probst, 1995; Ludwig et al., 1996) to estimate a riverine contribution of 0.45 ± 0.18 Pg C (all uncertainties reported here are 1σ). Recently, Resplandy et al. (2018) showed that relationships between ocean heat and carbon transport to derive an estimate of 0.78 ± 0.20 Pg C. Since there is so



195 much uncertainty about this discrepancy, in particular about its distribution in time and space, we do not make any corrections to the ensemble ranges used in the comparisons, and this choice should be kept in mind in the interpretation of the following results. In any case, the most appropriate ensemble for our purposes is the top-down ensemble, while the bottom-up ensembles indicate a greater range of plausibility.

There are a number of other possible flux evaluation metrics, each with different limitations. For example, fluxes can be measured directly from towers with eddy covariance techniques (Dabberdt et al., 1993), but the spatial footprint of a flux tower is typically much smaller than ten kilometers (Raczka et al., 2013), and upscaling flux tower data to a global, gridded product has thus far been unable to produce reliable global NBE budgets (Jung et al., 2011). Eddy covariance measurements from aircraft (Desjardins et al., 1989), e.g., NASA's Carbon Airborne Flux Experiment (CARAFE; Wolfe et al., 2018), are representative of much longer horizontal length scales than towers, but the currently available campaign data are sparse in space and time. As shown in Section 3.3, another choice is to transport our fluxes through the atmosphere with the GEOS general circulation model (GCM) and compare the simulated CO₂ mixing ratios with atmospheric observations. While this evaluation is able to test the ability of the fluxes to reproduce large-scale, long-term signals, it is susceptible to the misinterpretation of a transport error as a flux error.

3.1 Ocean exchange

210 Over the past few decades, global pCO₂^{sw} has increased by roughly 1.5 μatm/yr, yet with considerable regional differences (Takahashi et al., 2009). At the same time, pCO₂^{atm} has increased at an even greater pace, driving an increasing ocean sink. Deviations from these trends are predominantly limited to the Tropical Pacific, where the El Niño, Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is the dominant driver of interannual variability (Rödenbeck et al., 2015), and the Southern Ocean, where the net ocean sink switched from increasing to decreasing in the early 1990s and switched back in the early 2000s (Landschützer et al., 2015).

215 By imposing observed trends in pCO₂^{sw} and pCO₂^{atm}, our ocean exchange fluxes produce a sink that is generally consistent with the inversion ensemble and GCP 2018 ocean biogeochemical model ensemble (Figures 1 and A1), again with the provision that the biogeochemical model ensemble does not include outgassing due to riverine input. Averaged over 2000–2010, our mean ocean sink is 1.55 Pg C. This is consistent with annual budgets based on atmospheric measurements of a combination of O₂ and CO₂ called atmospheric potential oxygen (APO; Stephens et al., 1998): Keeling and Manning (2014) estimate an ocean sink of 2.50 ± 0.60 Pg C for 2000–2010, which reduces to 1.72 ± 0.60 Pg C after removing 0.78 Pg C to account for riverine input (see discussion above). The pCO₂^{sw} based products of Landschützer et al. (2016) and Rödenbeck et al. (2014), which do not require a riverine adjustment, produce sinks of 1.37 and 1.74 Pg C (averages from GCP 2018; Le Quéré et al., 2018), also in line with our budgets (several more comparable estimates are available in Jacobson et al., 2007). Even during the strong ENSO of 2015–2016, the constant growth in pCO₂^{sw} that we impose is able to reproduce a global sink within the ranges of the top-down and bottom-up ensembles (Figure 1). While linear growth is not appropriate for simulations of several decades, over which pCO₂^{sw} increases exponentially (Raupach et al., 2014), it is sufficient for our 15-year study period and something we hope to address in future developments.




Figure 1. Global annual totals of LoFI ocean exchange fluxes (solid blue) for 2003–2017. Min-to-max ranges of the inversion ensemble (dark grey) and GCP 2018 ocean biogeochemical model ensemble (light grey) are provided for comparison.

3.2 The empirical land sink

In comparison to the flux inversion ensemble and the TRENDY Version 7, Simulation 3 (Sitch et al., 2015) ensemble of
 230 dynamical global vegetation models (DGVMs), the baseline fluxes consistently underestimate NBE—the sum the sum of
 NEE, biofuels, and biomass burning—by over 3 Pg C (see Figure 2a and Table 2). This is due to the assumption of a neutral
 biosphere in CASA-GFED, which thus has no long-term net sink. In the Northern Hemisphere, this assumption causes CASA
 to systematically underpredict seasonal cycle amplitudes in comparison to measurements from flux towers (Carvalhais et al.,
 2008) and a combination of aircraft and ground-based remote-sensing retrievals (Yang et al., 2007). This effect is seen in the
 235 diagnostic fluxes as an underprediction of the global sink strength in March through July (Figure 2) limited primarily to the
 Northern Extratropics (Figure 3, first column). In contrast, including the empirical sink in the LoFI fluxes moves its annual
 totals and seasonal cycle significantly closer to the ranges of the comparison ensembles.

Increasingly, modern flux inversions tend to predict a persistent, net sink in the Northern Extratropics (NE), with the Tropics
 and Southern Extratropics (T+SE) in near balance with considerably more inter-annual variability than the NE (Gaubert et al.,
 240 2019). Stephens et al. (2007) first showed that inversions with neutral T+SE fluxes compared better to profiles of in situ aircraft
 data than inversions with a significant T+SE source. Inversions from the Regional Carbon Cycle Assessment and Processes
 (RECCAP; Canadell et al., 2011) intercomparison also showed a clear separation between neutral and source T+SE budgets,
 with the difference being due to the decision to average observational data over month-long intervals (Peylin et al., 2013).
 For the RECCAP inversions that used data varying within the month, Peylin et al. (2013) found a sink over 2001–2004 of
 245 1.85 ± 0.25 Pg C in the NE and -0.34 ± 0.27 Pg C in the T+SE. The agreement has become even stronger across more modern
 inversion systems, with those covering 2004–2014 finding a NE sink of 2.17 ± 0.36 Pg C and 0.06 ± 0.11 Pg C in the T+SE
 (Gaubert et al., 2019). Over this same time period, the LoFI fluxes have a NE sink of 2.50 Pg C and a T+SE sink of -0.41




Figure 2. Global total NBE from fluxes excluding (baseline; dash-dot red) and including (LoFI; solid blue) the empirical sink: (a) annual averages and (b) the seasonal cycle climatology for 2003–2015. Min-to-max ranges of the inversion ensemble (dark grey) and TRENDY V7 ensemble (light grey) are provided for comparison.

Table 2. Comparison of 2004–2014 NBE budgets over the Northern Extratropics (NE) and Tropics and Southern Extratropics (T+SE).

Product	NE (Pg C)	T+SE (Pg C)
Baseline	0.07	−1.24
LoFI	2.50	−0.41
Inversions ^a	2.27 ± 0.36	-0.10 ± 0.28
TRENDY V7 ^{a,b}	1.27 ± 0.65	0.00 ± 0.48

^a Ranges are the 2004–2014 average of the 1σ uncertainties across all products.

^b Requires adjustment for riverine export, e.g., 0.78 Pg C added to the NE budget.

Pg C, suggesting possibly a slight overestimation of the T+SE source, yet still within a reasonable range of uncertainty (see Table 2 for comparable ranges from the TRENDY and inversion ensembles).

250 The net terrestrial sink found by inversions has been shown to be consistent with growth in temperate and boreal terrestrial ecosystems driven primarily by carbon fertilization and forest regrowth (Schimel et al., 2015; Fernández-Martínez et al., 2019) with the possibility of an additional contribution from agriculture (Zeng et al., 2014). Notably, the forest inventory analysis of Pan et al. (2011) estimated a 2000–2007 sink of 1.28 ± 0.17 Pg C in boreal and temperate forests (mostly in the NE) and -0.08 ± 1.17 Pg C in tropical forests. Further evidence for a persistent NE sink and a weak sink or source in the T+SE can be
 255 found in estimates of aboveground biomass change derived from vegetation optical depth (VOD; Liu et al., 2015), a product of remotely-sensed microwave radiation, and DGVM simulations constrained with forest demography data (Pugh et al., 2019),




Figure 3. Climatologies (2003–2015) of NBE from the fluxes excluding (baseline) and including (LoFI) the empirical sink. The first row depicts annual averages and each subsequent row depicts averages over different seasons. In the left column, zonal mean NBE from the baseline fluxes (dash-dot red) and LoFI fluxes (solid blue) are plotted along with the ranges of the inversion ensemble (dark grey) and the TRENDY V7 ensemble (light grey); while the middle and right columns show maps of the LoFI fluxes (middle) and the magnitude of the empirical sink (right), i.e., the difference between the LoFI and baseline fluxes. Note that the scale of the annual average plots is three times smaller than that of the seasonal average plots.



the Global Forest Age Database (GFAD; Poulter et al., 2019). In particular, Pugh et al. (2019) find a significant sink in the Eastern United States, which is produced by our empirical sink as well (Figure 3, third row, third column). These studies do differ with Pan et al. (2011) in important ways, including the attribution of a greater percentage of the net tropical sink to gains in shrublands and savannas than to forest regrowth (Liu et al., 2015) and estimating a significantly smaller tropical regrowth sink (Pugh et al., 2019).

Taken together, the findings described above suggest an empirical sink proportional to the CO₂ growth rate (e.g., driven by carbon fertilization) and monthly temperature increase (e.g., focused to the extratropical growing season). The choice of the last remaining factor in Equation 1, heterotrophic respiration (HR) over, for example, Net Primary Production (NPP), requires further investigation. Since boreal forests allocate a much greater percentage of biomass below ground than tropical forests do (Pan et al., 2011), it seems more suitable to focus the correction on HR rather than NPP. Furthermore, the NDVI driver data of CASA tends to put a strong, observationally-driven constraint on NPP. In any case, adjustments to HR or NPP are both likely to drive the long-term, hemispheric and seasonal corrections we look for in the empirical sink.

Even after adding the empirical sink, the LoFI fluxes have some discrepancies with the comparison ensembles worth noting. In particular, the LoFI fluxes predict a sink from 0°S to 15°S during JJA (Figure 3, fourth row), while the comparison ensembles predict neutral fluxes. The opposite difference, although less noticeable, is present during DJF (Figure 3, second row). It is unclear, however, how accurate either ensemble is in this case: the inversions are hindered by the limitation of in situ data and uncertainties in transport over this latitude band, while the biospheric models are potentially hindered by inaccuracies in meteorological driver data and deficiencies in the representation of disturbance (Molina et al., 2015; van der Laan-Luijkx et al., 2015).

3.3 Transport simulations

Ultimately, a major goal of this effort is to develop a realistic collection of fluxes that improves the ability of transport simulations to reproduce measurements and support retrospective and NRT studies. As a test of this skill, we transport the LoFI fluxes through the atmosphere with the GEOS GCM and compare the results to in situ measurements from NOAA MBL sites available in NOAA ObsPack GlobalView+ v4.2.2 (Masarie et al., 2014; Cooperative Global Atmospheric Data Integration Project, 2019). We do the same with NOAA's CarbonTracker 2016 (CT2016; Peters et al., 2007, with updates documented at <http://carbontracker.noaa.gov>) fluxes, which functions as a benchmark of the ability of the GEOS GCM to reproduce NOAA MBL measurements when using fluxes from a modern inversion system.

All transport simulations are run using the Heracles 4.0 GEOS GCM version on a $0.5^\circ \times 0.625^\circ$ regular latitude-longitude grid with 72 vertical levels, a timestep of 15 minutes, and output instantaneous fields every 3 hours. The run uses the GEOS replay approach to reproduce the effect of the meteorological data assimilation system without having to rerun it (see Orbe et al., 2017 for the most up to date description). In this configuration, the large scale circulation, temperature, and moisture are constrained by analysis fields every six hours, while physical processes such as convection, turbulence, and radiative transfer are recalculated at a high temporal resolution. This computationally efficient framework provides the ability to simulate realistic meteorology with a tight coupling between fine scale atmospheric transport processes and trace gas emissions. For the analyzed



meteorology, we use MERRA-2, resulting in a transport simulation sharing many of the properties of that used by Ott et al. (2015).

The evaluation of the two model runs (one with LoFI fluxes, the other with CT2016 fluxes) against the NOAA MBL surface sites is shown in Figure 4. Neither of the runs is clearly superior. This suggests that, at least in terms of aggregate statistics over multiple years, the empirical sink is able to reproduce a correction to the baseline, diagnostic fluxes with a similar skill as running a formal inversion system based on MBL data. Moreover, at this level of agreement with the surface sites, it is difficult to say if errors from the transport or any single component of the surface fluxes dominate the errors from another. Further refinement of any single component then runs the risk of confusing errors in one component with those from another.

3.4 Growth rate forecasts

At the start of 2016, the LoFI fluxes switch from retrospective mode to NRT. While it would be possible to extend retrospective mode to 2018 at the time of writing, we pick 2016 as an interesting test case where we must forecast a growth rate during a strong El Niño. In practice, NRT runs are limited to two years since the flux products in the LoFI collection have at most a two year latency. For 2016 and 2017, Equation 2 predicts growth rates of 2.93 ppm and 2.63 ppm, while the current NOAA MBL reference values are 2.85 ppm and 2.15 ppm. These small differences do not appear to significantly impact the ability of NRT LoFI model runs to reproduce in situ measurements at Mauna Loa (Figure 5)—while there is a notable error near the start of 2016, it is comparable in size to errors during the 2010–2011 El Niño and all errors after 2016 stay below 1 ppm in magnitude. This suggests that mis-representations of the spatial and temporal variability of El Niño may have a greater impact on our ability to represent the Mauna Loa data record than errors in the growth rate forecast.

4 Conclusions

This paper presented an adjustment to a diagnostic collection of surface fluxes designed to calibrate its sink strength to observations. In each year, we adjusted the magnitude of the sink so that the fluxes match the global atmospheric and oceanic growth rates. Among the inversion ensemble, the spread in estimated growth rates is quite small, usually less than 0.25 Pg C. On the other hand, the spread in growth rates among biospheric models can be 4 Pg C or more. In a transport simulation, a 4 Pg C error in surface fluxes will produce a roughly 2 ppm response in atmospheric mixing ratios. Errors of this magnitude are greater than the signal of many of the anomalies a monitoring system would hope to capture. The 2015–2016 El Niño, for example, produced an anomaly of only about 1 ppm in the global growth rate. An accurate reproduction of the global growth rate is thus an essential first step in the development of a modeling and assimilation system that can reproduce the response of atmospheric mixing ratios to anomalies in the carbon cycle.

For the empirical sink, we chose a functional form that was the product of the monthly increase in temperature and the heterotrophic respiration. This choice was motivated by the timing and structure of the differences of the bottom-up fluxes with the inversion ensemble, which were the greatest in April through July in the extra-tropics. This is by no means the only possible form for the empirical sink, but it is simple and manages to bring the fluxes into close agreement with the inversions. The net




Figure 4. Box-and-whisker plots of observation minus forecast (OMF) statistics for 2003–2015 from model simulations using CT2016 fluxes (green) and using LoFI fluxes (blue). The comparison sites are all of the stations from the marine boundary layer collection and are ordered by latitude along the y -axis. For each site, the circular target denotes the median, the solid box denotes the range between the 25th and 75th percentiles, whiskers denote a range of roughly 99 percent of the data, and boxes denote values outside this range.

result is to adjust the NBE of the baseline fluxes, which on average are neutral the Extratropics and Tropics, into calibrated fluxes with an average sink strength of 2 Pg C in the Northern Extratropics and zero elsewhere. Since these totals include NEE
 325 and land use change emissions, this does not contradict the possibility of a net sink in NEE and an offsetting land use change source in the Tropics.

Using the fluxes calibrated with the empirical sink in transport simulations reproduced atmospheric measurements with the same skill as transport simulations using one of the fluxes in the inversion ensemble. In particular, the annual total errors at a




Figure 5. Time series comparisons of model simulations using CT2016 fluxes (green) and using LoFI fluxes (blue) to observations (black) at the Mauna Loa observatory. The left panel depicts all samples, while the right is a 3-month mean of the observation minus model differences. The solid black line at 2016 indicates the switch from retrospective to NRT modes in the LoFI fluxes.

collection of sites in the marine boundary layer of the transport simulations with the calibrated fluxes were consistently less
 330 than a ppm, with the true value falling within a quartile of the differences. Globally, the errors are on the order of a few tenths of
 a ppm. The empirical sink thus enables the study of carbon cycle anomalies, like the 2015–2016 El Niño, whose perturbation
 to atmospheric mixing ratios is just a couple ppm.

There are several benefits to using this approach to calibrate a system’s surface fluxes. In comparison to a flux inversion
 system, it is exceedingly simple to implement. It is also less susceptible to errors due to the particular transport model, data
 335 selection, and error covariance models. For example, constraining the global growth rate alone requires few, if any, assumptions
 about atmospheric transport or decorrelation times and lengths. When used in simulations or as a prior in an assimilation
 system, this approach significantly reduces biases due to mis-specification of the growth rate. Failing to remove such a bias
 before assimilating data limits the ability of the assimilation system to account for other signals of interest in the observations
 (Dee, 2005), e.g., synoptic-scale variations due to passing weather systems, regional and seasonal anomalies due to drought,
 340 and changes in anthropogenic emissions.

Since observational estimates of the global growth rate are currently only available at the end of each year, using the empirical
 sink developed here in an NRT atmospheric monitoring system requires a prediction of the global growth rate. We projected
 growth rates in 2016 and 2017 based on forecasts and analyses of SST (Jones and Cox, 2005; Betts et al., 2016). The values of
 2.93 and 2.63 ppm were reasonable estimates of the values measured in the MBL of 2.85 and 2.15 ppm which are unavailable
 345 until a few months after the year’s end. The predicted CO₂ mixing ratios showed comparable skill in reproducing in situ
 observations. Combined with the future ability to assimilate satellite retrievals of CO₂ lagging real time by just a few days, we
 expect to be able to monitor and predict growth rates in NRT.



Data availability. The LoFI fluxes are available upon request from the corresponding author. NOAA CarbonTracker, CarbonTracker Europe, and the CAMS flux inversions are all publicly available from their institutions websites. All other data products used in this work (viz., the TRENDY ensemble and the Jena CarboScope flux inversion) must be obtained from the respective project leads.

Appendix A: Supplementary material

A1 The downscaling algorithm

Because of the rectifier effect, if a model transport simulation hopes to reproduce the observed latitudinal gradient, it must use surface fluxes with a diurnal cycle (Denning et al., 1995). To resolve the diurnal cycle of the fluxes, we first downscale the monthly LoFI fluxes to daily using the the algorithm described below. We stop at daily for all fluxes other than terrestrial NEE, which is the difference of ecosystem respiration (ER) and GPP. Daily terrestrial ER and GPP are downscaled to 3-hourly following the approach of Olsen and Randerson (2004) with the slight modification of starting from daily instead of monthly fluxes. This approach is quite similar to the downscaling approach used by NOAA's CarbonTracker system. It has the advantage of avoiding the noticeable discontinuities at monthly boundaries that are present in the monthly to 3-hourly downscaling, but the disadvantage of possibly missing synoptic scale disturbances that occur over multiple days since the downscaling from monthly to daily uses interpolation.

When necessary, fluxes are downscaled to a higher resolution either spatially or temporally by finding the smoothest interpolant that preserves the averages at the original, coarser resolution. This interpolant is found by minimizing a quadratic cost function subject to a linear constraint. The quadratic cost function is the square of the discrete approximation to the Laplacian of the downscaled field. When interpolating in space, we use the spherical Laplacian, which takes the shrinking distance between grid boxes near the poles into account. The linear constraint is that the averages of the downscaled field at the coarser resolution be the original values. It is imposed using Lagrange multiplier, which transforms the problem into an unconstrained quadratic optimization problem on a higher-dimensional space.

A2 The evaluation ensembles: further details

We evaluate our fluxes using a top-down ensemble of modern flux inversion systems and bottom-up ensembles of terrestrial biosphere and ocean biogeochemical models. The flux inversion ensemble consists of the 2016 and 2017 versions of NOAA CarbonTracker (CT2016 and CT2017; Peters et al., 2007, with updates documented at "<http://carbontracker.noaa.gov>"), CarbonTracker Europe (CTE) version 2016 (van der Laan-Luijkx et al., 2017), Copernicus Atmospheric Monitoring Service (CAMS) version 17r1 (Chevallier et al., 2011), and the S93 and S04 runs of Jena-CarboScope (JCS) version 4.1 (Rödenbeck et al., 2003). The bottom-up model ensembles are the same as those used in the Global Carbon Project, 2018 (GCP 2018; Le Quéré et al., 2018): the terrestrial model ensemble is all TRENDY Version 7, Simulation 3 (Sitch et al., 2015) dynamical global vegetation models except LPJ-GUESS, which did not submit monthly results, and the ocean model ensemble is the collection of global annual ocean exchange totals reported in GCP 2018. While comparison to these ensembles is not a true validation of our fluxes, and is susceptible to uncertainties in lateral exchanges between the land and ocean, we do expect it to indicate when



380 and where our surface flux product is an outlier compared to other estimates. In particular, we use the ensembles to identify coherent, systematic surface flux errors over wide zonal bands and multiple months.

The ensemble comparisons only consider net biospheric exchange (NBE), the sum of net ecosystem exchange (NEE), biomass burning emissions, and all other emissions not due to the combustion of fossil fuels. For the inversion ensemble, we compute NBE by subtracting a common fossil fuel product, which we use in our diagnostic fluxes, from the total surface
385 flux. No distinction is made here between changes in NEE and biomass burning due to natural effects or to anthropogenic activities such as land use change. To avoid issues associated with statistics on small sample sizes or bias due to over representation of certain model configurations, we use only the range of the minimum and maximum values over each ensemble.

A3 LoFI ocean and land fluxes: further details

Figure A1 shows the differences of the LoFI ocean fluxes with the inversion ensemble. In general, the LoFI fluxes are within
390 the range of values from the inversions.

The main motivation behind replacing GFED in CASA-GFED with QFED is to avoid having to extrapolate biomass burning emissions in the forward processing product. Unlike other flux components, we do not expect the construction of a month-by-month linear climatology to have much skill for biomass burning. Rather than switching from GFED to QFED in the switch from reanalysis to forward processing fluxes, we chose to use QFED at all times. This prevents the introduction of a jump in
395 the fluxes and allows a more direct comparison of averages, but has the downside of introducing a biomass burning component that is not in balance with the carbon stocks of CASA. In any case, as is shown in Figures A2 and A3, the difference between QFED and GFED biomass burning emissions is quite small at almost every time and place. The only noticeable difference is that the baseline fluxes are slightly lower in the Amazon and Congo rain forests during JJA. Still, this difference is minor in comparison to the empirical sink.

400 *Author contributions.* All authors contributed to the development of the ideas within and the composition of the manuscript. George J Collatz develops and maintains the CASA model and Tomohiro Oda develops and maintains the ODIAC product.

Competing interests. No competing interests are present.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by funding from the NASA Carbon Monitoring System (NNH16ZDA001N). All simulations were performed on the Discover supercomputer at the NASA Center for Climate Simulation (NCCS). The authors would like to thank
405 the Global Carbon Project and TRENDY intercomparison project as well as Stephen Sitch, Pierre Friedlingstein, and Masayuki Kondo in particular for their assistance with the interpretation and analysis of the TRENDY model outputs. We would also like to thank Frederic Chevallier, Andrew Jacobson, and Christian Rödenbeck for their assistance with the flux inversion products in this paper, and Sourish




Figure A1. Climatologies (2003–2015) of ocean exchange from the LoFI fluxes. The first row represents annual averages and each subsequent row represents averages over different seasons. The left column depicts zonal means from the LoFI fluxes (dash-dot red) and the ranges of zonal means from the inversion ensemble (dark grey); and the right column shows seasonal gridded maps of the diagnostic fluxes.

Basu, David Baker, John Miller, and Britton Stephens for their comments and suggestions. Data from the 2017 Global Carbon Budget is archived at <https://www.globalcarbonproject.org>. TRENDY model output was provided by request by Pierre Friedlingstein and Stephen
 410 Sitch. NOAA CarbonTracker CT2016 and CT2017 results were provided by NOAA ESRL, Boulder, Colorado, USA from the website at <http://carbontracker.noaa.gov>. CarbonTracker Europe results provided by Wageningen University in collaboration with the ObsPack partners (<http://www.carbontracker.eu>). CAMS surface fluxes are produced at the Climate and Environment Sciences Laboratory (Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement; LSCE) and are available at <https://apps.ecmwf.int/datasets/data/cams-ghg-inversions/>. Jena CarboScope




Figure A2. Global total NBE from the fluxes using GFED (solid purple) and QFED (dash-dot red) biomass burning: (a) annual averages and (b) the seasonal cycle climatology for 2003–2015. Min-to-max ranges of the inversion ensemble (dark grey) and TRENDY V7 ensemble (light grey) are provided for comparisons.

were provided by Christian Rödenbeck at the Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry and downloaded from <http://www.bgc-jena.mpg.de/>

415 CarboScope/.




Figure A3. Climatologies (2003–2015) of NBE from the fluxes using GFED (solid purple) and QFED (dash-dot red) biomass burning and the LoFI fluxes (solid blue) for comparison. The first row represents the annual total and each subsequent row represents a different season. The left column depicts zonal means of the baseline fluxes using GFED and QFED, the range of the inversion ensemble (dark grey), and range of the TRENDY V7 ensemble (light grey); the middle column depicts the distance of the baseline fluxes using GFED to the range of the inversion ensemble; and the right column the difference of the baseline fluxes using QFED with those using GFED, i.e., the difference of QFED with GFED.



References

- Agustí-Panareda, A., Massart, S., Chevallier, F., Balsamo, G., Boussetta, S., Dutra, E., and Beljaars, A.: A biogenic CO₂ flux adjustment scheme for the mitigation of large-scale biases in global atmospheric CO₂ analyses and forecasts, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16, 10 399–10 418, 2016.
- 420 Amiotte Suchet, P. and Probst, J.-L.: A global model for present-day atmospheric/soil CO₂ consumption by chemical erosion of continental rocks (GEM-CO₂), *Tellus B*, 47, 273–280, 1995.
- Ballantyne, A., Alden, C., Miller, J., Tans, P., and White, J.: Increase in observed net carbon dioxide uptake by land and oceans during the past 50 years, *Nature*, 488, 70, 2012.
- 425 Betts, R. A., Jones, C. D., Knight, J. R., Keeling, R. F., and Kennedy, J. J.: El Niño and a record CO₂ rise, *Nature Climate Change*, 6, 806, 2016.
- Boden, T., Marland, G., and Andres, R.: Global, Regional, and National Fossil-Fuel CO₂ Emissions, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center at Appalachian State University, Boone North Carolina, <https://energy.appstate.edu/CDIAC>, 2018.
- Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., Gurney, K., Le Quééré, C., Piao, S., Raupach, M. R., and Sabine, C. L.: An international effort to quantify regional carbon fluxes, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 92, 81–82, 2011.
- 430 Carvalhais, N., Reichstein, M., Seixas, J., Collatz, G. J., Pereira, J. S., Berbigier, P., Carrara, A., Granier, A., Montagnani, L., Papale, D., et al.: Implications of the carbon cycle steady state assumption for biogeochemical modeling performance and inverse parameter retrieval, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22, 2008.
- Chatterjee, A., Gierach, M., Sutton, A., Feely, R., Crisp, D., Eldering, A., Gunson, M., O'Dell, C., Stephens, B., and Schimel, D.: Influence of El Niño on atmospheric CO₂ over the tropical Pacific Ocean: Findings from NASA's OCO-2 mission, *Science*, 358, eaam5776, 2017.
- 435 Chevallier, F., Engelen, R. J., Carouge, C., Conway, T. J., Peylin, P., Pickett-Heaps, C., Ramonet, M., Rayner, P. J., and Xueref-Remy, I.: AIRS-based versus flask-based estimation of carbon surface fluxes, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 114, 2009.
- Chevallier, F., Deutscher, N. M., Conway, T., Ciais, P., Ciattaglia, L., Dohe, S., Fröhlich, M., Gomez-Pelaez, A., Griffith, D., Hase, F., et al.: Global CO₂ fluxes inferred from surface air-sample measurements and from TCCON retrievals of the CO₂ total column, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, 2011.
- 440 Ciais, P., Crisp, D., van der Gon, H., Engelen, R., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Hiemann, M., and Rayner, P.: Towards a European Operational Observing System to Monitor Fossil CO₂ emissions – Final Report from the expert group, European Commission Joint Research Centre, 2015.
- Cooperative Global Atmospheric Data Integration Project: Multi-laboratory compilation of atmospheric carbon dioxide data for the period 1957–2017; obspack_co2_1_GLOBALVIEWplus_v4.2.2_2019-06-05, <https://doi.org/10.25925/20190605>, https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/obspack/data.php?id=obspack_co2_1_GLOBALVIEWplus_v4.2.2_2019-06-05, 2019.
- 445 Crisp, D., Atlas, R., Breon, F.-M., Brown, L., Burrows, J., Ciais, P., Connor, B., Doney, S., Fung, I., Jacob, D., et al.: The orbiting carbon observatory (OCO) mission, *Advances in Space Research*, 34, 700–709, 2004.
- Crisp, D., Meijer, Y., Munro, R., Bowman, K., Chatterjee, A., Baker, D., Chevallier, F., Nassar, R., et al.: A constellation architecture for monitoring carbon dioxide and methane from space, in: Prepared by the CEOS Atmospheric Constellation Greenhouse Gas Team, Version 1.2, http://ceos.org/document_management/Virtual_Constellations/ACC/Documents/CEOS_AC-VC_GHG_White_Paper_Publication_Draft2_20181111.pdf, 2018.
- 450



- Dabberdt, W., Lenschow, D., Horst, T., Zimmerman, P., Oncley, S., and Delany, A.: Atmosphere-surface exchange measurements, *Science*, 260, 1472–1481, 1993.
- Darmenov, A. and da Silva, A.: The quick fire emissions dataset (QFED)—documentation of versions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4, NASA Technical
 455 Report Series on Global Modeling and Data Assimilation, NASA TM-2013-104606, 32, 183, 2013.
- Dee, D. P.: Bias and data assimilation, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131, 3323–3343, 2005.
- Denning, A. S., Fung, I. Y., and Randall, D.: Latitudinal gradient of atmospheric CO₂ due to seasonal exchange with land biota, *Nature*, 376, 240, 1995.
- Desjardins, R., MacPherson, J., Schuepp, P., and Karanja, F.: An evaluation of aircraft flux measurements of CO₂, water vapor and sensible
 460 heat, in: *Boundary Layer Studies and Applications*, pp. 55–69, Springer, 1989.
- Dlugokencky, E. and Tans, P.: The marine boundary layer reference (downloaded early 2016), <https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/mbl/mbl.html>, 2016a.
- Dlugokencky, E. and Tans, P.: Trends in atmospheric carbon dioxide (downloaded early 2016), <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/>, 2016b.
- 465 Eldering, A., Wennberg, P., Crisp, D., Schimel, D., Gunson, M., Chatterjee, A., Liu, J., Schwandner, F., Sun, Y., O'dell, C., et al.: The Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 early science investigations of regional carbon dioxide fluxes, *Science*, 358, eaam5745, 2017.
- Fernández-Martínez, M., Sardans, J., Chevallier, F., Ciais, P., Obersteiner, M., Vicca, S., Canadell, J., Bastos, A., Friedlingstein, P., Sitch, S., et al.: Global trends in carbon sinks and their relationships with CO₂ and temperature, *Nature climate change*, 9, 73, 2019.
- Gaubert, B., Stephens, B. B., Basu, S., Chevallier, F., Deng, F., Kort, E. A., Patra, P. K., Peters, W., Rödenbeck, C., Saeki, T., et al.: Global
 470 atmospheric CO₂ inverse models converging on neutral tropical land exchange, but disagreeing on fossil fuel and atmospheric growth rate, *Biogeosciences*, 16, 117–134, 2019.
- Gelaro, R., McCarty, W., Suárez, M. J., Todling, R., Molod, A., Takacs, L., Randles, C. A., Darmenov, A., Bosilovich, M. G., Reichle, R., et al.: The modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, version 2 (MERRA-2), *Journal of Climate*, 30, 5419–5454, 2017.
- 475 Giglio, L., Randerson, J., van der Werf, G., Kasibhatla, P., Collatz, G., Morton, D., and DeFries, R.: Assessing variability and long-term trends in burned area by merging multiple satellite fire products, 2010.
- Jacobson, A. R., Mikaloff Fletcher, S. E., Gruber, N., Sarmiento, J. L., and Gloor, M.: A joint atmosphere-ocean inversion for surface fluxes of carbon dioxide: 1. methods and global-scale fluxes, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 21, 2007.
- Jones, C. D. and Cox, P. M.: On the significance of atmospheric CO₂ growth rate anomalies in 2002–2003, *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 480 32, 2005.
- Jung, M., Reichstein, M., Margolis, H. A., Cescatti, A., Richardson, A. D., Arain, M. A., Arneth, A., Bernhofer, C., Bonal, D., Chen, J., et al.: Global patterns of land-atmosphere fluxes of carbon dioxide, latent heat, and sensible heat derived from eddy covariance, satellite, and meteorological observations, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 116, 2011.
- Kaiser, J., Heil, A., Andreae, M., Benedetti, A., Chubarova, N., Jones, L., Morcrette, J., Razinger, M., Schultz, M., Suttie, M., et al.: Biomass
 485 burning emissions estimated with a global fire assimilation system based on observed fire radiative power, 2012.
- Keeling, R. and Manning, A.: *Studies of recent changes in atmospheric O₂ content*, Elsevier, 2014.
- Keenan, T. F., Prentice, I. C., Canadell, J. G., Williams, C. A., Wang, H., Raupach, M., and Collatz, G. J.: Recent pause in the growth rate of atmospheric CO₂ due to enhanced terrestrial carbon uptake, *Nature Communications*, 7, 13428, 2016.



- Keppel-Aleks, G., Wennberg, P., Washenfelder, R., Wunch, D., Schneider, T., Toon, G., Andres, R. J., Blavier, J., Connor, B., Davis, K. J.,
 490 et al.: The imprint of surface fluxes and transport on variations in total column carbon dioxide, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 875–891, 2012.
- Knorr, W.: Is the airborne fraction of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions increasing?, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36, 2009.
- Kuze, A., Suto, H., Nakajima, M., and Hamazaki, T.: Thermal and near infrared sensor for carbon observation Fourier-transform spectrometer
 on the Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite for greenhouse gases monitoring, *Applied optics*, 48, 6716–6733, 2009.
- Landschützer, P., Gruber, N., Bakker, D., and Schuster, U.: Recent variability of the global ocean carbon sink, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*,
 495 28, 927–949, 2014.
- Landschützer, P., Gruber, N., Haumann, F. A., Rödenbeck, C., Bakker, D. C., van Heuven, S., Hoppema, M., Metzl, N., Sweeney, C.,
 Takahashi, T., et al.: The reinvigoration of the Southern Ocean carbon sink, *Science*, 349, 1221–1224, 2015.
- Le Quéré, C., Andrew, R. M., Friedlingstein, P., Sitch, S., Hauck, J., Pongratz, J., Pickers, P. A., Korsbakken, J. I., Peters, G. P., Canadell,
 J. G., et al.: Global carbon budget 2018, *Earth System Science Data* (Online), 10, 2018.
- 500 Liu, J., Bowman, K. W., Schimel, D. S., Parazoo, N. C., Jiang, Z., Lee, M., Bloom, A. A., Wunch, D., Frankenberg, C., Sun, Y., et al.:
 Contrasting carbon cycle responses of the tropical continents to the 2015–2016 El Niño, *Science*, 358, eaam5690, 2017.
- Liu, Y. Y., van Dijk, A. I., de Jeu, R. A., Canadell, J. G., McCabe, M. F., Evans, J. P., and Wang, G.: Recent reversal in loss of global terrestrial
 biomass, *Nature Climate Change*, 5, 470, 2015.
- Ludwig, W., Probst, J.-L., and Kempe, S.: Predicting the oceanic input of organic carbon by continental erosion, *Global Biogeochemical*
 505 *Cycles*, 10, 23–41, 1996.
- Masarie, K., Peters, W., Jacobson, A., and Tans, P.: ObsPack: a framework for the preparation, delivery, and attribution of atmospheric
 greenhouse gas measurements, *Earth System Science Data*, 6, 375–384, 2014.
- Masarie, K. A. and Tans, P. P.: Extension and integration of atmospheric carbon dioxide data into a globally consistent measurement record,
Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 100, 11 593–11 610, 1995.
- 510 Molina, L., Broquet, G., Imbach, P., Chevallier, F., Poulter, B., Bonal, D., Burban, B., Ramonet, M., Gatti, L. V., Wofsy, S. C., et al.: On the
 ability of a global atmospheric inversion to constrain variations of CO₂ fluxes over Amazonia, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15,
 8423–8438, 2015.
- Molod, A., Hackert, E., Vikhliav, Y., Zhao, B., Barahona, D., Vernieres, G., Borovikov, A., Kovach, R. M., Marshak, J., Schubert, S., et al.:
 GEOS-S2S version 2: The GMAO high resolution coupled model and assimilation system for seasonal prediction, *Journal of Geophysical*
 515 *Research: Atmospheres*, 2020.
- Oda, T. and Maksyutov, S.: A very high-resolution (1 km × 1 km) global fossil fuel CO₂ emission inventory derived using a point source
 database and satellite observations of nighttime lights, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 543–556, 2011.
- Oda, T. and Maksyutov, S.: ODIAC fossil fuel CO₂ emissions dataset (version name: ODIAC2016), Center for Global Environmental
 Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies, <https://doi.org/10.17595/20170411.001>, 2015.
- 520 Oda, T., Maksyutov, S., and Andres, R. J.: The Open-source Data Inventory for Anthropogenic CO₂, version 2016 (ODIAC2016): a global
 monthly fossil fuel CO₂ gridded emissions data product for tracer transport simulations and surface flux inversions, *Earth System Science*
Data, 10, 87–107, 2018.
- Olsen, S. C. and Randerson, J. T.: Differences between surface and column atmospheric CO₂ and implications for carbon cycle research,
Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 109, 2004.
- 525 Orbe, C., Oman, L. D., Strahan, S. E., Waugh, D. W., Pawson, S., Takacs, L. L., and Molod, A. M.: Large-Scale Atmospheric Transport in
 GEOS Replay Simulations, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 9, 2545–2560, 2017.



- Ott, L. E., Pawson, S., Collatz, G. J., Gregg, W. W., Menemenlis, D., Brix, H., Rousseaux, C. S., Bowman, K. W., Liu, J., Eldering, A., et al.: Assessing the magnitude of CO₂ flux uncertainty in atmospheric CO₂ records using products from NASA's Carbon Monitoring Flux Pilot Project, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120, 734–765, 2015.
- 530 Pan, Y., Birdsey, R. A., Fang, J., Houghton, R., Kauppi, P. E., Kurz, W. A., Phillips, O. L., Shvidenko, A., Lewis, S. L., Canadell, J. G., et al.: A large and persistent carbon sink in the world's forests, *Science*, 333, 988–993, 2011.
- Peters, G. P., Le Quéré, C., Andrew, R. M., Canadell, J. G., Friedlingstein, P., Ilyina, T., Jackson, R. B., Joos, F., Korsbakken, J. I., McKinley, G. A., et al.: Towards real-time verification of CO₂ emissions, *Nature Climate Change*, 7, 848, 2017.
- Peters, W., Jacobson, A. R., Sweeney, C., Andrews, A. E., Conway, T. J., Masarie, K., Miller, J. B., Bruhwiler, L. M., Pétron, G., Hirsch, A. I.,
 535 et al.: An atmospheric perspective on North American carbon dioxide exchange: CarbonTracker, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 18 925–18 930, 2007.
- Peylin, P., Law, R., Gurney, K., Chevallier, F., Jacobson, A., Maki, T., Niwa, Y., Patra, P., Peters, W., Rayner, P., et al.: Global atmospheric carbon budget: results from an ensemble of atmospheric CO₂ inversions, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 6699–6720, 2013.
- Pinty, B., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Dowell, M., Zunker, H., Brunhes, T., Ciais, P., Dee, D., van der Gon, H. D., Dolman, H., Drinkwater,
 540 M., et al.: An Operational Anthropogenic CO₂ Emissions Monitoring & Verification Support capacity – Baseline Requirements, Model Components, and Functional Architecture, European Commission Joint Research Centre, <https://doi.org/10.2760/39384>, 2017.
- Pinty, B., Ciais, P., Dee, D., Dolman, H., Dowell, M., Engele, R., Holmlund, K., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Meijer, Y., et al.: An Operational Anthropogenic CO₂ Emissions Monitoring & Verification Support capacity – Needs and High Level Requirements for in situ measurements, European Commission Joint Research Centre, <https://doi.org/10.2760/182790>, 2019.
- 545 Pinzon, J. and Tucker, C.: A non-stationary 1981–2012 AVHRR NDVI3g time series, *Remote Sensing*, 6, 6929–6960, 2014.
- Poulter, B., Frank, D., Ciais, P., Myneni, R. B., Andela, N., Bi, J., Broquet, G., Canadell, J. G., Chevallier, F., Liu, Y. Y., et al.: Contribution of semi-arid ecosystems to interannual variability of the global carbon cycle, *Nature*, 509, 600, 2014.
- Pugh, T. A., Lindeskog, M., Smith, B., Poulter, B., Arneth, A., Haverd, V., and Calle, L.: Role of forest regrowth in global carbon sink dynamics, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116, 4382–4387, 2019.
- 550 Raczka, B. M., Davis, K. J., Huntzinger, D., Neilson, R. P., Poulter, B., Richardson, A. D., Xiao, J., Baker, I., Ciais, P., Keenan, T. F., et al.: Evaluation of continental carbon cycle simulations with North American flux tower observations, *Ecological Monographs*, 83, 531–556, 2013.
- Randerson, J. T., Thompson, M. V., Malmstrom, C. M., Field, C. B., and Fung, I. Y.: Substrate limitations for heterotrophs: Implications for models that estimate the seasonal cycle of atmospheric CO₂, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 10, 585–602, 1996.
- 555 Raupach, M. R., Gloor, M., Sarmiento, J. L., Canadell, J., Frölicher, T. L., Gasser, T., Houghton, R. A., Le Quéré, C., and Trudinger, C. M.: The declining uptake rate of atmospheric CO₂ by land and ocean sinks, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 3453–3475, 2014.
- Resplandy, L., Keeling, R., Rödenbeck, C., Stephens, B., Khaliwala, S., Rodgers, K., Long, M., Bopp, L., and Tans, P.: Revision of global carbon fluxes based on a reassessment of oceanic and riverine carbon transport, *Nature Geoscience*, 11, 504, 2018.
- Reynolds, R. W., Smith, T. M., Liu, C., Chelton, D. B., Casey, K. S., and Schlax, M. G.: Daily high-resolution-blended analyses for sea
 560 surface temperature, *Journal of Climate*, 20, 5473–5496, 2007.
- Rödenbeck, C., Houweling, S., Gloor, M., and Heimann, M.: CO₂ flux history 1982–2001 inferred from atmospheric data using a global inversion of atmospheric transport, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 3, 1919–1964, 2003.
- Rödenbeck, C., Bakker, D. C., Metzl, N., Olsen, A., Sabine, C., Cassar, N., Reum, F., Keeling, R. F., and Heimann, M.: Interannual sea–air CO₂ flux variability from an observation-driven ocean mixed-layer scheme, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 4599–4613, 2014.



- 565 Rödenbeck, C., Bakker, D. C., Gruber, N., Iida, Y., Jacobson, A. R., Jones, S., Landschützer, P., Metzl, N., Nakaoka, S.-i., Olsen, A., et al.: Data-based estimates of the ocean carbon sink variability—first results of the Surface Ocean pCO₂ Mapping intercomparison (SOCOM), *Biogeosciences*, 12, 7251–7278, 2015.
- Schimel, D., Stephens, B. B., and Fisher, J. B.: Effect of increasing CO₂ on the terrestrial carbon cycle, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 436–441, 2015.
- 570 Sitch, S., Friedlingstein, P., Gruber, N., Jones, S. D., Murray-Tortarolo, G., Ahlström, A., Doney, S. C., Graven, H., Heinze, C., Huntingford, C., et al.: Recent trends and drivers of regional sources and sinks of carbon dioxide, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 653–679, 2015.
- Stavros, E. N., Schimel, D., Pavlick, R., Serbin, S., Swann, A., Duncanson, L., Fisher, J. B., Fassnacht, F., Ustin, S., Dubayah, R., et al.: ISS observations offer insights into plant function, *Nat. ecol. evol.*, 1, 0194, 2017.
- Stephens, B. B., Keeling, R. F., Heimann, M., Six, K. D., Murnane, R., and Caldeira, K.: Testing global ocean carbon cycle models using measurements of atmospheric O₂ and CO₂ concentration, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 12, 213–230, 1998.
- 575 Stephens, B. B., Gurney, K. R., Tans, P. P., Sweeney, C., Peters, W., Bruhwiler, L., Ciais, P., Ramonet, M., Bousquet, P., Nakazawa, T., et al.: Weak northern and strong tropical land carbon uptake from vertical profiles of atmospheric CO₂, *Science*, 316, 1732–1735, 2007.
- Takahashi, T., Sutherland, S. C., Wanninkhof, R., Sweeney, C., Feely, R. A., Chipman, D. W., Hales, B., Friederich, G., Chavez, F., Sabine, C., et al.: Climatological mean and decadal change in surface ocean pCO₂, and net sea–air CO₂ flux over the global oceans, *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 56, 554–577, 2009.
- 580 Tangborn, A., Strow, L. L., Imbiriba, B., Ott, L., and Pawson, S.: Evaluation of a new middle-lower tropospheric CO₂ product using data assimilation, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 4487–4500, 2013.
- Tans, P., Fung, I., and Takahashi, T.: Observational constraints on the global atmospheric CO₂ budget, *Science*, 247, 1431–1438, 1990.
- van der Laan-Luijkx, I., Van der Velde, I., Krol, M., Gatti, L., Domingues, L., Correia, C., Miller, J., Gloor, M., Van Leeuwen, T., Kaiser, J., et al.: Response of the Amazon carbon balance to the 2010 drought derived with CarbonTracker South America, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 29, 1092–1108, 2015.
- 585 van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Velde, I. R., van der Veen, E., Tsuruta, A., Stanislawski, K., Babenhauserheide, A., Zhang, H. F., Liu, Y., He, W., et al.: The CarbonTracker Data Assimilation Shell (CTDAS) v1.0: implementation and global carbon balance 2001–2015, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 2785–2800, 2017.
- 590 van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Collatz, G. J., and Giglio, L.: Carbon emissions from fires in tropical and subtropical ecosystems, *Global Change Biology*, 9, 547–562, 2003.
- Wanninkhof, R.: Relationship between wind speed and gas exchange over the ocean revisited, *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 12, 351–362, 2014.
- Wolfe, G. M., Kawa, S. R., Hanisco, T. F., Hannun, R. A., Newman, P. A., Swanson, A., Bailey, S., Barrick, J., Thornhill, K. L., Diskin, G., et al.: The NASA Carbon Airborne Flux Experiment (CARAFE): instrumentation and methodology, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 11, 1757–1776, 2018.
- 595 Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., Blavier, J.-F. L., Washenfelder, R. A., Notholt, J., Connor, B. J., Griffith, D. W., Sherlock, V., and Wennberg, P. O.: The total carbon column observing network, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 369, 2087–2112, 2011.
- 600 Yang, Z., Washenfelder, R., Keppel-Aleks, G., Krakauer, N., Randerson, J., Tans, P., Sweeney, C., and Wennberg, P.: New constraints on Northern Hemisphere growing season net flux, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, 2007.



Zeng, N., Zhao, F., Collatz, G. J., Kalnay, E., Salawitch, R. J., West, T. O., and Guanter, L.: Agricultural Green Revolution as a driver of increasing atmospheric CO₂ seasonal amplitude, *Nature*, 515, 394–397, 2014.