#### **#IWGGMS18** Present at the booth: 9:00 – 12:00 EEST



LMATIETEEN LAITOS METEOROLOGISKA INSTITUTET FINNISH METEOROLOGICAL INSTITUTE









Aki Tsuruta<sup>1</sup>, Ella Kivimäki<sup>1</sup>, Hannakaisa Lindqvist<sup>1</sup>, Leif Backman<sup>1</sup>, Janne Hakkarainen<sup>1</sup>, Tomi Karppinen<sup>1</sup>, Oliver Schneising<sup>2</sup>, Michael Buchwitz<sup>2</sup>, Sander Houweling<sup>3</sup>, Rigel Kivi<sup>1</sup>, Huilin Chen<sup>4</sup>, Justus Notholt<sup>2</sup>, Debra Wunch<sup>5</sup>, Johanna Tamminen<sup>1</sup> and Tuula Aalto<sup>1</sup> 1. Finnish Meteorological Institute, Finland, aki.tsuruta@fmi.fi; 2. Institute of Environmental Physics (IUP), University of Bremen, Germany; 3. Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research Utrecht, Utrecht University, the Netherlands; 4. Centre for Isotope Research, University of Groningen, the Netherlands; 5. Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Canada

## INTRODUCTION

Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is a second most powerful anthropogenic greenhouse gas after carbon

# NORTHERN HIGH LATITUDE CH4 EMISSIONS

Monthly total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions over 45°N>, 2018

--- Prior 12 -

• NHL CH<sub>4</sub> emissions have clear seasonal cycle with

dioxide.

- Northern high latitude (NHL) is a source of CH<sub>4</sub>, and rapid changes in its climate due to global warming may increase CH<sub>4</sub> emissions significantly.
- In NHL, surface CH<sub>4</sub> concentrations are mostly measured in rural areas – limited information on anthropogenic source signals.
- Satellite data has a good spatial coverage, providing a great potential to help understand NHL CH<sub>4</sub> budgets more in detail.
- TROPOMI data is yet new to be used in the atmospheric inversions.
- We will examine the potential of TROPOMI to estimate spatial and temporal distribution of NHL CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes.





### Main tool

- CTE-CH<sub>4</sub><sup>[7]</sup> atmospheric inverse model
- Fluxes are optimized at  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ} \times 3$ -day resolution over NHL

### Assimilated observations

- **SURF:** High precision surface (tropospheric) CH<sub>4</sub> observations from ground-based stations
- WFMD\*: Total column-averaged dry air mole fraction of CH<sub>4</sub> (XCH<sub>4</sub>) retrieval from Sentinel-5P TROPOMI, WFM-DOAS v1.2 retrieval<sup>[5,6]</sup>
- **OPER\*:** XCH<sub>4</sub> retrieval from TROPOMI, operational v1.0 data<sup>[2]</sup>

\*Data are preprocessed by taking  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ} \times$  daily averages \*See also IWGGMS presentation by Lindqvist et al.

#### **Spatial differences between the inversions**

- The low emissions found in TROPOMI inversions are mostly due to differences in central Europe, southern Canada and Russia.
- Over Fennoscandia, islands in North Sea and Kara Sea, and in Kazakhstan, **TROPOMI** inversions show higher emissions.
- Note: we did not find significant spatial differences between WFMD and OPER inversion for annual totals.



12

Differences in total CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes between inversions using WFMD retrievals (InvWFMD) and surface data (InvSURF) (left) and WFMD vs OPER (right), averaged over 2018.

## **MODEL EVALUATION**

- Tropospheric CH<sub>4</sub> is overestimated during early summer and winter, and underestimated during late summer to autumn when TROPOMI data is assimilated.
- XCH<sub>4</sub> anomalies compared to TCCON/GGG2020 data also show overestimation in the TROPOMI inversions during spring and early summer, and underestimation during autumn.

### • Prior fluxes

- Anthropogenic: EDGAR v6.0 inventory<sup>[10]</sup>
- Biospheric (wetlands + soil sinks): LPX-Bern v1.4 ecosystem model<sup>[3]</sup>
- Biomass burning: GFED v4.2 inventory<sup>[8]</sup>
- Termites & other microbial sources: Saunois et al. (2020)<sup>[4]</sup>
- Geological sources: Etiope et al. (2019)<sup>[1]</sup>
- Ocean: Weber et al. (2019)<sup>[9]</sup>

• In both cases, TROPOMI inversions show later summer minima than the observations and surface inversion.



#### **References**

- [1] Etiope, G., Ciotoli, G., Schwietzke, S. & Schoell, M. Gridded maps of geological methane emissions and their isotopic signature. Earth System Science Data 11, 1–22 (2019).
- [2] Hu, H. et al. The operational methane retrieval algorithm for TROPOMI. Atmospheric Measurement Techniques 9, 5423–5440 (2016).
- [3] Lienert, S. & Joos, F. A Bayesian ensemble data assimilation to constrain model parameters and land-use carbon emissions. *Biogeosciences* 15, 2909–2930 (2018).
- [4] Saunois, M. et al. The Global Methane Budget 2000–2017. Earth System Science Data 12, 1561–1623 (2020)
- 5] Schneising, O. et al. A scientific algorithm to simultaneously retrieve carbon monoxide and methane from TROPOMI onboard Sentinel-5 Precursor. Atmospheric Measurement Techniques 12, 6771–6802 (2019).
- [6] Schneising, O. et al. Remote sensing of methane leakage from natural gas and petroleum systems revisited. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 20, 9169–9182 (2020)
- [7] Tsuruta, A. et al. Global methane emission estimates for 2000–2012 from CarbonTracker Europe-CH<sub>4</sub> v1.0. GMD **10**, 1261–1289 (2017).
- [8] van der Werf, G. R. et al. Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016. Earth System Science Data 9, 697–720 (2017).
- [9] Weber, T., Wiseman, N. A. & Kock, A. Global ocean methane emissions dominated by shallow coastal waters. Nat Commun 10, 4584 (2019).
- [10] EDGAR: https://edgar.jrc.ec.europa. eu/overview.php?v=verify h2020, EDGAR-v6

