

Is there an Optimal CO₂ Partial Column for Flux Inversions?

Sourish Basu, Frédéric Chevallier, Junjie Liu, Prabir Patra, Susan Kulawik, David Baker





10th December 2019
AGU Fall Meeting, San Francisco CA

$$y = H(x) + \epsilon$$


Measurement Transport and observation operator Surface flux Measurement noise

- » Every atmospheric inversion (flux estimation) problem is an attempt to simulate measured concentrations of a tracer from surface fluxes with our best model of atmospheric transport
- » Mismatches to observed y are minimized by changing x , assuming a perfectly known H . If H has errors, we will get errors in x .






- » A model with too fast (slow) vertical mixing will estimate too much (too little) photosynthesis in the summer and respiration in the winter to fit the observed near-surface CO₂
- » Assimilating the column average CO₂ makes the flux estimate much less sensitive to differences in modeled vertical mixing




- » Rayner & O'Brien (2001) suggested that assimilating total column measurements (e.g., from satellites) might mitigate some errors in vertical transport
- » More recently, Basu et al (2018) showed that given the same spatial coverage, assimilating column average CO₂ is indeed less sensitive to the choice of transport model than boundary layer CO₂

Models in a 5°x5° box around Lebanon, KS




- » The lowest 100 mb simulated by 7 transport models
 - Secular increase of ~ 2 ppm/yr
 - Seasonal cycle due to photosynthesis & respiration
 - Spread between models reflects transport difference

Models in a 5°x5° box around Lebanon, KS




- » The lowest 100 mb simulated by 7 transport models
 - Secular increase of ~ 2 ppm/yr
 - Seasonal cycle due to photosynthesis & respiration
 - Spread between models reflects transport difference
- » Column average CO₂ at the same location
 - Same secular increase
 - Seasonal signal is smaller
 - So is the inter-model difference

Models in a 5°x5° box around Lebanon, KS




- » The lowest 100 mb simulated by 7 transport models
 - Secular increase of ~ 2 ppm/yr
 - Seasonal cycle due to photosynthesis & respiration
 - Spread between models reflects transport difference
- » Column average CO₂ at the same location
 - Same secular increase
 - Seasonal signal is smaller
 - So is the inter-model difference


Is there an optimal partial column with the highest signal-to-noise?



- » This is not a purely theoretical exercise
- » For OCO₂ and GOSAT retrievals of CO₂, $DOF > 1$, even though we mostly work with the column average, i.e., use one piece of information
- » Splitting into two columns, one mostly sensitive to the lower troposphere, the other to the upper troposphere and stratosphere, is possible




Model spread and mean around Lebanon, KS



- » Models sampled at 2016-2017 OCO₂ soundings every year, time series binned in bi-weekly bins
- » The secular increase is the same for all partial columns. It is also not the signal we are after from satellites.

Model spread and mean around Lebanon, KS




- » Models sampled at 2016-2017 OCO₂ soundings every year, time series binned in bi-weekly bins
- » The secular increase is the same for all partial columns. It is also not the signal we are after from satellites.
- » The seasonal cycle is a first order signal we are after. While it is reasonably well constrained over North America, the same cannot be said for most of the world.

Estimate the seasonal cycle by fitting three harmonics to each modeled time series

$$x(t) = x_0 + x_1 t + \sum_{n=1}^{n=3} (\alpha_n \cos(n\omega t) + \beta_n \sin(n\omega t))$$


where $\omega = 2\pi / (1 \text{ year})$. The mean amplitude of the harmonic part is the “signal”, the spread in the amplitude the “noise”.

Signal-to-noise in the CO₂ seasonal cycle for different lower partial columns over Lebanon, KS




And the winner is ... 200 mb!

The optimal partial column is location dependent




Elsewhere, the optimal partial column could be shallower or deeper

Optimal partial column for the seasonal cycle on a $5^\circ \times 5^\circ$ grid



The message here is only that there is such a thing as the optimal partial column, rather than the exact numbers on this map



The message here is only that there is such a thing as the optimal partial column, rather than the exact numbers on this map

- » What about other flux signals, like the interannual variability?
- » How would the optimal partial column change for a different satellite instrument?
- » If we add the accuracy of the retrieved partial column into the mix, would that change our picture of the optimality?
- » What are the physical mechanisms behind the patterns on the map?
- » How robust is this to a different specification of the surface flux?
- » We will try to estimate this optimal partial column for OCO_2 CO_2

Yes, but these models are routinely used in CO₂ inversions with satellite data. So the difference between these models affects the uncertainty of flux estimates, or what might be the best partial column to assimilate given these models.

- » Some differences between transport models stem from different histories. These are (in principle) easy to fix/standardize.
 - Different total dry air mass
 - Different radii for the Earth
 - Different molar masses for C and CO₂

- » Some differences are hard to fix *post facto*, but relatively easy to adjust for
 - Different regridding and interpolation schemes for fluxes
 - Different ways of specifying the initial field

- » The remaining differences are what we consider fundamental transport model differences

Model	Gravity (m s^{-2})	Radius of Earth (km)	Dry air mass (kg)	Molar mass of C (g mol^{-1})	Molar mass of air (g mol^{-1})
ACTM	9.806 65	6370	5.1341×10^{18}	12.011 15	28.94
GEOS Chem	9.8	6375	5.0855×10^{18}	12.0	28.97
LMDZ	9.806 65	6400	5.1703×10^{18}	12.0	28.94
PCTM	9.806 16	6371	5.1274×10^{18}	12.011 15	28.97
TM ₅	9.806 65	6371	5.1232×10^{18}	12.011 15	28.94