Using correlations between atmospheric CO₂ and CO to improve inverse analyses of carbon fluxes

Chris Wilson

M. Chipperfield, N. Richards, F. Chevallier

NCEO/CEOI-ST joint science conference June 26th 2014







Uncertainty in CO₂ fluxes



S. Quegan, BIOMASS: ESA User Consultation Meeting, Lisbon, Portugal, 20-21 Jan 2009

Previous CO₂ inversion studies



CO₂:CO correlations



Correlation coefficients (r) between CO and CO₂ mixing ratios measured during TRACE-P campaign in East Asia (from Palmer et al., 2006).

CO₂:CO correlations



Ratio of a posteriori CO₂ surface flux error between a joint CO₂-CO inversion and a CO₂-only inversion in January 2006 (top) and July 2005 (bottom) (from Wang et al., 2009).

Inverse Modelling

AIM: "to minimise atmospheric model-observation differences of a species whilst remaining close to prior knowledge of fluxes"

$$J(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{2} (\underline{\mathbf{x}} - \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{a})^{\mathsf{T}} \mathsf{B}^{-1} (\underline{\mathbf{x}} - \underline{\mathbf{x}}_{a}) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathsf{T} \underline{\mathbf{x}} - \underline{\mathbf{y'}})^{\mathsf{T}} \mathsf{R}^{-1} (\mathsf{T} \underline{\mathbf{x}} - \underline{\mathbf{y'}})$$

Different methods of solving this:

- 1) Bayesian synthesis inversion
- 2) Kalman filter (e.g. Ensemble KF)
- 3) Variational inversion (4D-Var)

4D-Var:

- retrieves fluxes on model grid scale, reduces aggregation error
- reduces J(x) iteratively (see right), rather than directly, as in other methods
- requires an adjoint model

Below: 2D example of iterative reduction of $J(\underline{x})$ in 4D-var



INVICAT

- A 4D-Var inverse model based on the CTM TOMCAT
- Includes TOMCAT and ATOMCAT (the adjoint version of TOMCAT)
- ATOMCAT finds the gradient of the cost function J(<u>x</u>)
- Technical paper in GMDD describing deveopment & performance of INVICAT (Wilson et al., 2013)
- Has been used in the past for methane inversions with in-situ and satellite data (from GOSAT)



ATOMCAT propagates model/obs differences backwards through time to find sensitivities...



CO₂:CO error correlations in TOMCAT



2010 correlation [CO transport error v CO2 transport error]



Scale mismatch of CO and CO₂



AIM: to improve the rate of minimisation by scaling <u>x</u>:

Ideally, we'd use:	$\underline{\mathbf{z}} = (\mathbf{J}'' \underline{\mathbf{x}})^{-1/2} \underline{\mathbf{x}}$
--------------------	--

But, in practice:

$$\underline{z} = \mathbf{B}^{-1/2}(\underline{x} - \underline{x}_b)$$

- Performed two 3-month inversions (starting in July 2010), with and without error correlations included
- All CO₂ emissions are multiplied by 10 initially
- Sampled standard model output as per the TES satellite, and added random noise
- Cut CO emissions by 20% and CO_2 emissions by 50% for use as a priori
- Tried to retrieve 'true' surface fluxes









Conclusions

- Inverse modelling of CO₂ emissions is difficult due to large observation errors and small concentration gradients
- CO₂:CO error correlations should help to constrain CO₂ emission inventories using inverse modelling
- The INVICAT 4D-Var system was adapted in order to perform simultaneous inversions of the two species
- However, scale mismatch between the two causes problems for iterative solver in 4D-Var
- Preconditioning helps a little, but 'background only' preconditioner is not enough
- Test inversions performed with 10x CO₂ emissions, but inclusion of correlations currently seems to slow down convergence globally
- More work is required probably in finding appropriate preconditioner in order to allow 4D-Var method make use of CO₂:CO correlations