



CO₂
Human
Emissions

Final report on service elements for data assimilation

methodology

Wouter Peters

Maarten Krol



CO₂ Human Emissions

D5.6 Final report on service elements for data assimilation methodology

Dissemination Level:	Public
Author(s): (Wageningen University)	Wouter Peters and Maarten Krol
Date:	02/11//2020
Version:	1.0
Contractual Delivery Date:	30/09/2020
Work Package/ Task:	WP5/ T5.6
Document Owner:	Wageningen University
Contributors:	Nicolas Bousserez and Anna Agusti-Panareda (ECMWF), plus CHE WP leaders.
Status:	Final



CO₂ Human Emissions

CHE: CO₂ Human Emissions Project

Coordination and Support Action (CSA)
H2020-EO-3-2017 Preparation for a European
capacity to monitor CO₂ anthropogenic emissions

Project Coordinator: Dr Gianpaolo Balsamo (ECMWF)
Project Start Date: 01/10/2017
Project Duration: 39 months

Published by the CHE Consortium

Contact:

ECMWF, Shinfield Park, Reading, RG2 9AX,
gianpaolo.balsamo@ecmwf.int



The CHE project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776186.

AIRBUS



Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary.....	6
2.	Introduction	7
2.1.	Background	7
2.2.	Scope of this deliverable	10
2.2.1.	Objective of this deliverable.....	10
2.2.2.	Work performed in this deliverable	10
2.2.3.	Deviations and counter measures	10
3.	Data Assimilation components	10
3.1.	Assimilation Methods	10
3.1.1.	Offline 4DVAR.....	12
3.1.2.	Online 4DVAR.....	12
3.1.3.	Online EnKF.....	13
3.1.4.	Offline EnKF.....	13
3.1.5.	Offline analytical.....	14
3.1.6.	Online Hybrid Ensemble Variational.....	14
3.2.	Control Vector Configuration.....	14
3.2.1.	Direct flux estimation (NWGR)	16
3.2.2.	Dynamic biosphere flux description model for CCDAS (NWGP, NWGR)	16
3.2.3.	Dynamic anthropogenic flux description model for FFDAS (NWGP, NWGR)..	16
3.3.	Error Covariance Statistics	17
3.4.	Examples of Existing Inversion Systems.....	17
3.4.1.	CarbonTracker	19
3.4.2.	CAMS inversion system.....	20
3.4.3.	IFS inversion system.....	20
3.4.4.	Satellite Mass Balance methods	20
3.4.5.	CCFFDAS	21
4.	Latest research developments	22
4.1.	The use of CO ₂ satellite data	22
4.2.	COVID-19 efforts.....	24
4.3.	Multi-species	25
4.3.1	NO _x and CO	25
4.3.2	Other tracers.....	25
4.4.	Multi-scale	26
5.	Recommendations for operational CHE prototype	26
6.	Research priorities.....	31
6.1.	CCFFDAS.....	31
6.2.	Additional tracer constraints.....	31

6.3. Multi-scale Integration System.....	31
8. Conclusions	32
9. Acronyms	32
10. References	34

Tables

Table 1: Accuracy, Computational and Maintenance pros and cons of 4D-Var and EnKF data assimilation methods.....	11
Table 2: Assimilation methods and their components: Observation operators, Control vectors, Background and Observation error covariance matrices, and pros and cons. This table refers to atmospheric transport enabled systems, while a more comprehensive list is provided in Section 3.....	13
Table 3: Choice of control vectors for surface emissions and their pros and cons.....	18
Table 4: State-of-the-art data-assimilation systems for Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). Important pros and cons are listed.	20
Table 5: Immediate development needs linked to the domain (global) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.....	30
Table 6: Immediate development needs linked to the domain (regional) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.....	33
Table 7: Immediate development needs linked to the domain (local) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.....	33
Table 8: Research priorities linked to the domain (global, regional, local) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.....	34
Table 9: List of acronyms.....	35

1. Executive Summary

This report defines the necessary components for a multi-scale and multi-species data assimilation (DA) system that targets anthropogenic CO₂ emissions. This DA system will use multiple streams of observations, including satellite observations. Out of the many viable options to serve as the basis for such a system on the global scale, we see a hybrid 4d-VAR-ensemble approach, implemented in an online transport model, and operated within a Numerical Weather Prediction environment, as a fundamental building block. On top of this, a DA system should use multiple tracers, be adaptable to long- and short windows and optimize both the atmospheric state as well as surface fluxes.

Such a system does not yet exist, and we recommend a number of concrete research and development needs, including to:

- Allow mass-conserving transport in the operational Integrated Forecast System (IFS) of ECMWF
- Improve the treatment of background covariances and building of long-window information transfer in the IFS DA system
- Develop Fossil Fuel DA Systems (FFDAS) and capacity for global and regional scales
- Expand Biospheric Carbon Cycle DA System (CCDAS) and capacity for global and regional scales
- Invest in multi-tracer transport+source modelling on all scales
- Improve the seamless coupling of regional DA systems to the global IFS
- Investigate plume-based methods for fast DA, also in a plume-in-grid approach

Many of these developments are ongoing in the community and to facilitate their uptake in an Monitoring and Verification Support (MVS) system for anthropogenic CO₂, we see an important role for:

- (a) a prototype MVS system built around the IFS and focusing on available high-resolution CO and NO₂ satellite data
- (b) a multi-scale integration tool that allows local- and regional scale DA systems to feed into the global analyses.

In the final report here, we summarize ongoing efforts and define priorities for the further development of data-assimilation capabilities related to a global CO₂ MVS system.

The large drop in CO₂ emissions during the COVID-19 related world-wide lockdowns showed that with current CO₂ measurement infrastructure only, detection of these sizeable reductions is extremely challenging. This difficulty once more highlights the importance of additional information coming from bottom-up inventories and the monitoring of species that are co-emitted with CO₂, like NO₂ and CO. However, since these species are not chemically inert, their atmospheric chemistry has to be accounted for, which represents a challenge for future operational systems.

From a technological point of view, the contours of a pre-operational system become visible. A hybrid ensemble-variational method is currently being developed within the existing IFS system (Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Prediction system, NWGP). This system is currently tested with CO, following the advice of the earlier WP5 progress report. In addition to CO₂ emissions, the system will estimate emissions of two co-emitted species: CO and NO₂. It is proposed to couple this system to Carbon Cycle Fossil Fuel Data Assimilation Systems

(CCFFDAS) building on efforts in WP3 to better constrain prior uncertainties and exploit additional (satellite) data streams.

In addition to a NWGP system, it is proposed to perform a yearly reanalysis of the global carbon cycle (Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Reanalysis (NWGR)). In these re-analyses, multiple models, including the IFS model itself, will be used to “replay” the operational data-assimilation, but now accounting for additional data-streams (e.g. additional surface observations that were not available for Near Real Time (NRT) assimilations), re-processed satellite products, longer assimilation windows and extended chemistry, as well as different optimization strategies.

2. Introduction

2.1. Background

The CHE prototype aims at building a system to monitor the exchange of CO₂ and potentially other important man-made greenhouse gases like CH₄ between the Earth surface and the atmosphere with the use of observations (mostly in the atmosphere), models and prior information, as well as their uncertainties to leverage the different sources of information. The system is designed to support the Paris Agreement and follows the directive of the European Commission CO₂ Task Force (Pinty et al., 2017). The general strategy and rationale for the CHE prototype is provided in CHE D5.9, stemming from the discussions in the first WP5 workshop (Reading, 25-26 September 2019). The main challenges in the approach are:

- **Multi-scale** approach to monitor emission from point sources (power stations or industrial facilities), cities and countries using different model domains from global, regional to local and model resolutions (e.g. from 25km to 100m).
- **Multi-species** approach to detect and attribute the observed atmospheric signal to specific sources/sinks (e.g. natural and anthropogenic emissions with sectorial distribution).
- **Multi-stream** approach to support different applications and users with: 1) a near-real time stream focusing on shorter synoptic timescales designed to provide early warnings and giving feedback to data producers, and 2) a re-analysis stream that uses consolidated quality-controlled data, products and models with their individually associated uncertainties to estimate trends.

This report focuses on data assimilation methodology linking with the modelling and prior components of the prototype (D5.3) and the Earth observations (D5.1). Data assimilation methods can also support uncertainty estimation for posterior error, although a complete consideration of uncertainties is covered by a dedicated report deliverable (D5.7).

The use of atmospheric measurements to constrain CO₂ exchange processes with the Earth surface is called the “source inversion problem”. More specifically, within CHE we are interested in constraining anthropogenic CO₂ emissions. Anthropogenic emissions are generally confounded by CO₂ exchange with the biosphere and oceans on scales larger than individual point sources. Separation of the different exchange processes requires: (1) the use of additional constraints from other trace gases (e.g. NO₂, CO, ¹⁴CO₂, and further observations like that of sun-induced fluorescence (SIF) and other human activity proxies) (2) a multi-scale approach to separate the anthropogenic hotspots from regional and global exchange with the biosphere and oceans.

Several data-assimilation (DA) methods are being employed to solve the source inversion problem considering different options for the optimal assimilation time-window, to trade-off

computational pragmatism with model errors and with observational constraints. Two of the most widely employed techniques are 4-dimensional variational data-assimilation (4D-Var) and the Ensemble Kalman Filter approach (EnKF). Both approaches start with a statistical description of a state-vector. This state-vector \mathbf{x} commonly describes the CO₂ exchange fluxes and the associated error structures. Propagation of this state-vector using an atmospheric transport model produces simulated observations (CO₂ mixing ratios, satellite columns, etc.) which are compared to atmospheric observations. Again, using proper error statistics (measurement errors, model errors) a cost function $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined which quantifies the goodness-of-fit with the observations (Tarantola, 2005).

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_b)^T \mathbf{B}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_b) + \frac{1}{2} (H(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{R}^{-1} (H(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{y}) \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathbf{x} represents the state to be optimized and \mathbf{x}_b represents the prior information. $H(\mathbf{x})$ represents the simulated observations for state \mathbf{x} , and \mathbf{y} are the observations. \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{R} are the matrices that represent the error statistics of the state \mathbf{x} and of the model-data comparison.

In subsequent steps, which are different for 4D-Var and EnKF, the cost function is minimized. The 4D-Var method uses an adjoint model to calculate the gradient of \mathbf{J} w.r.t. \mathbf{x} , and to iteratively run the model forward and backward in time, while the EnKF approach spans the uncertainty in \mathbf{x} by an ensemble that is run forward in time in a sequential time-stepping mode. Table 1 summarizes the most important pros and cons for 4D-Var and EnKF.

Table 1: Accuracy, Computational and Maintenance pros and cons of 4D-Var and EnKF data assimilation methods.

Data Assimilation methods	4D-Var	EnKF
Accuracy	(+) accurate solution possible	(-) noise-generation for restricted ensemble size
Computational Cost	(-) poorly scalable on multiple core computers	(+) scalable on multiple core computers
Maintenance Cost	(-) adjoint code needed	(+) no adjoint code needed

The main weakness of EnKF algorithms resides in the low-rank nature of the error covariance matrix represented by the ensemble. Two techniques are commonly employed to mitigate the resulting sampling noise: inflation of the ensemble error variance, and localization of the impact of observations on the analysis (Houtekamer and Mitchell, 2005; Anderson, 2009). Recently, there has been a growing interest in hybrid approaches to DA, leveraging advantages of both ensemble and variational methods. In this report we describe in detail the possible DA configurations based on variational, EnKF and hybrid ensemble-variational approaches that can be used to build a prototype CO₂ source inversion system.

Past efforts in CO₂ DA have mostly focused on the uncertain biosphere and ocean fluxes. Constraining anthropogenic emissions therefore requires a DA system that considers these natural fluxes, but also needs to start from a proper quantification of the anthropogenic fluxes: the so-called bottom up inventories. These inventories are currently derived from proxies like fossil fuel use and activity data, which are not available instantly as required for an operational system. Multiple solutions are investigated (e.g. within CHE) that entail an anthropogenic emission model that is driven by proxies such as night-lights, temperature, etc. This is similar to approaches that biosphere models use to calculate the expected exchange of CO₂ with the biosphere. In combination with DA methods, these approaches are generally called FFDAS (fossil-fuel data-assimilation) and CCDAS (carbon cycle data-assimilation), and here the traditional gridded flux-state \mathbf{x} is replaced by parameters that drive the biosphere and/or anthropogenic emission models.

Another major uncertainty in traditional flux inversions is the quantification of the errors that are associated with atmospheric transport. Ideally, flux inversions are performed with a transport model that accounts for transport errors (e.g. by propagating an ensemble that accounts for uncertainties in fluxes **and** transport), but traditional approaches account for transport errors on the right-hand side of the cost function (in the \mathbf{R} matrix).

Within CHE, multiple challenges for a DA system targeting anthropogenic CO₂ emissions are addressed. Such a system should quantify anthropogenic emissions at the scale of individual hot-spots and countries, but it also needs to account for CO₂ exchange with the biosphere and ocean at global scales. As mentioned above, separation of anthropogenic and natural CO₂ likely requires a multi-scale and multi-species approach, both in modelling and in observations. Candidate tracers that are linked to anthropogenic CO₂ are NO₂, atmospheric potential oxygen, CO and ¹⁴CO₂ (CO₂ produced by burning fossil fuels is void of ¹⁴C). Some of these tracers are chemically reactive and require consideration of atmospheric chemistry and surface processes like fractionation.

The multi-scale aspect refers to the need to quantify emissions from hotspots such as large power-plants. Large CO₂ emitting facilities make up a substantial fraction of the global fossil CO₂ emissions, but are poorly represented in global models (see Deliverable 5.4 of CHE). Therefore, a multi-scale and multi-model DA approach is necessary to provide CO₂ emission products that are relevant for environmental decision-making.

Since the previous progress report (version 19/12/2019), COVID-19 lockdowns have led to an unprecedented drop in CO₂ emissions which provides researchers with the opportunity to investigate to what extent these emission reductions are observable in the atmosphere for CO₂, and also for co-emitted species like NO₂ and CO. Many studies are still ongoing, but as expected, the estimated ~7% reductions in global anthropogenic CO₂ emissions (Le Quéré et al, 2020) are difficult to observe from atmospheric CO₂ observations at background monitoring sites and from XCO₂ satellite data. However, the lockdowns produced a clear imprint in atmospheric NO₂ and they also challenge current bottom-up emission inventories. Although the declined emissions due to Covid-19 lockdowns are already showing a return to before lockdown levels, the unique situation of a rapidly changing emission landscape – with multiple sectors in multiple countries responding at multiple moments with multiple magnitudes – makes this period a highly interesting test case for the methods we develop. So far, the rapid changes in anthropogenic activities, many of which would not be captured in the typical yearly bottom-up reporting cycles, underscore the need for (i) operational products that produce emissions on daily timescales (related to FFDAS) and (ii) a multi-species framework that couples co-emitted species (CO, NO₂, isotopologues of CO₂, COS, for which good-quality satellite products or in-situ observations are available) to the monitoring of CO₂.

In this report we propose solutions to build a CO₂ Monitoring and Verification Support (MVS) capacity that integrates information on CO₂ emissions from a wide range of spatial and temporal scales.

2.2. Scope of this deliverable

2.2.1. Objective of this deliverable

This report summarizes ongoing activities in the different work packages that investigate different aspects of a multi-scale, multi-species, and multi-stream system. Although much of the work is still in progress, this report will also identify priorities that will be followed in the remainder of the CHE project, and in the follow-on CoCO₂ project. This final report focuses on the requirements for the global data assimilation system and its foreseen interfaces to its regional and local counterparts. We do not make a specific set of recommendations for a regional and local scale data assimilation system as there is currently not one single framework for these envisioned and instead numerous (new) approaches will be tested.

2.2.2. Work performed in this deliverable

The work benefitted from the CHE Work-package 1 developments.

2.2.3. Deviations and counter measures

Not applicable.

3. Data Assimilation components

3.1. Assimilation Methods

The following Table 2 presents a number of state-of-the art global/regional DA systems. Specifics of the systems are given below. The table presents the observation operator H , which can be offline (using stored meteorological fields) or online (atmospheric dynamics is solved along with the flux inversion); the control vector x , which can contain fluxes, the initial state, and meteorology (for online H); characteristics of the error matrices B and R ; and the most important benefits and downsides.

Table 2: Assimilation methods and their components: Observation operators, Control vectors, Background and Observation error covariance matrices, and pros and cons. This table refers to atmospheric transport enabled systems, while a more comprehensive list is provided in Section 3.

Method (examples)	Observation operator H	Control vector x	B	R	Pros (+)	Cons (-)

<p>Offline 4DVAR</p> <p>(CAMS) Chevallier et al 2019 & Rödenbeck et al., (2005)</p>	<p>Offline transport + Tangent Linear/Adjoint (TL/AD)</p>	<p>Fluxes, initial conditions</p>	<p>Static model</p>	<p>Transport model error + measurement error</p>	<p>Long window (years-decades) facilitates mass conservation, implicit full rank propagation of error statistics</p>	<p>Uncoupled data assimilation, transport, TL/AD required, error characterisation is challenging</p>
<p>Online 4DVAR (IFS)</p> <p>(Agusti-Panareda et al., 2016)</p>	<p>Online transport TL/AD</p>	<p>Fluxes, initial conditions and meteo</p>	<p>Static or hybrid model</p>	<p>Measurement error</p>	<p>Coupled data assimilation (meteo,flux), transport error implicitly accounted for.</p>	<p>Short window (strong non-linearities), TL/AD required</p>
<p>Online EnKF</p> <p>(Environment Canada GEMS)</p>	<p>Online transport model</p>	<p>Fluxes, initial conditions and meteo</p>	<p>4D-ensemble</p>	<p>Measurement error</p>	<p>No TL/AD required, transport error implicitly accounted for</p>	<p>Short window, sampling noise</p>
<p>Offline EnKF</p> <p>(CarbonTracker)</p>	<p>Offline transport model</p>	<p>Fluxes, initial conditions</p>	<p>4D-ensemble</p>	<p>Transport error + measurement error</p>	<p>No TL/AD required</p>	<p>Limited window, sampling noise</p>
<p>Offline analytical</p> <p>(CHE regional)</p>	<p>Offline transport model + Full Jacobians</p>	<p>Fluxes, initial conditions</p>	<p>Static model or matrix</p>	<p>Transport error + measurement error</p>	<p>Exact solution</p>	<p>Limited size of x and/or observations</p>
<p>Online Hybrid Ensemble variational</p> <p>(IFS, Bousserrez, tech memo)</p>	<p>Online transport model + TL/AD</p>	<p>Fluxes, initial conditions and meteo</p>	<p>4D-ensemble + TL/AD propagation</p>	<p>Measurement error</p>	<p>Coupled DA+ long window +transport error implicitly accounted for +potential to include processes missing from TL/AD</p>	<p>TL/AD</p>

At this stage, it is useful to introduce a distinction between systems that, in analogy to weather prediction, predict the greenhouse gas emissions and distribution: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse gas Prediction (**NWGP**) systems, and systems that re-analyse the emissions using full knowledge of the entire system (e.g. measurements made in a ground network, fossil-fuel use statistics, ..): Numerical Weather and Greenhouse gas reanalysis systems (**NWGR**). Systems like the CAMS system and Carbontracker fall in this latter category, while the online systems are NWGP systems.

3.1.1. Offline 4DVAR

Finding the minimum of the cost function J (equation 1) involves iteratively progressing towards the solution with some optimization software and preconditioning strategy. At each iteration, the following gradient indicates the descent direction:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}J(\mathbf{x})=\mathbf{B}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^b)+\mathbf{H}^T\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) \quad (2)$$

The advantage of such a formulation lies in the fact that all heavy computations (i.e. those that involve square matrices) can be prepared beforehand in a generic way:

- **H** is the forward model and normally exists in a computationally tractable form. Note that **H** may be the tangent-linear code of a non-linear model $H(\mathbf{x})$ where all lines have been analytically derived once and for all, either automatically or by hand.
- the right-multiplication of \mathbf{H}^T with a column vector can be made with the adjoint code of **H** where all lines have been analytically derived and transposed once and for all, either automatically or by hand.
- **B** can be designed in such a way that its inverse is numerically convenient, for instance through singular value decompositions and Kronecker products of correlation matrices in space and time.
- **R** is usually considered to be diagonal. Its potential non-diagonality is the main difficulty of the variational approach, but some solutions exist on a case-by-case basis (e.g., Chevallier 2007).

This approach has been designed to get the mode of the posterior distribution of \mathbf{x} . It also gives access to the first eigenvectors of the inverse of the covariance of this posterior distribution (Fisher and Courtier, 1995), but if the eigenvalue spectrum converges slowly, this information is of little use (Chevallier et al., 2005). Alternatively, ensembles of variational inversions can be designed to reconstruct the posterior distribution of \mathbf{x} (Chevallier et al., 2007).

For atmospheric inversion (where **H** is mainly a transport model, or a linearized version of it), the target surface fluxes include the time dimension directly in the control vector \mathbf{x} , while for the 4D-Var systems designed for Numerical Weather Prediction (next section), the control vector is mainly the state of a model at the initial time step, the later states being obtained through the transport model. With the future Copernicus CO₂ support service, the two approaches may merge together in a single system, with equal importance given to the initial state of the atmosphere and to the surface boundary conditions. Examples of current variational global atmospheric inversion systems are CAMS (Section 3.4.2) and Jena-Carboscope (Rödenbeck, 2005).

3.1.2. Online 4DVAR

An online 4D-Var system allows the variational system described in 3.1.1 to optimize jointly emissions with meteorological variables. In that context, the control vector and its associated **B** matrix include both the CO₂ emissions and prognostics meteorological variables of the numerical weather prediction system. The forward model $H(\mathbf{x})$ corresponds to the integration

of the equations of motion of the atmosphere together with the transport of atmospheric tracers after emissions (e.g., CO₂). Such a system presents several advantages. For instance, it implicitly accounts for model transport errors associated with uncertainties in initial meteorological conditions. It also enables transport adjustment based on observed CO₂ concentrations in a statistically and dynamically consistent manner. One disadvantage of such technique is the cost associated with the non-quadratic minimization of the variational cost function, as well as the need to define a short assimilation window to mitigate the effect of non-linearities on the convergence performance of the algorithm (i.e., the presence of multiple minima can severely hamper the efficiency of the variational optimization).

3.1.3. Online EnKF

In the papers of Kang et al. (2012) and Liu et al. (2016) a Local Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter DA system for the combined atmospheric state (weather and CO₂ mole fractions) and surface flux (CO₂) was demonstrated. Using a DA window of only 6-hours and an observation network representing a GOSAT + AIRS unbiased satellite view, the authors were able to retrieve detailed surface fluxes successfully over time-scales of a few days, for a full year. An important role was played by the background error covariance matrix: it evolved dynamically because of the full atmospheric state, and contained covariances between the weather variables (specifically winds), and transported CO₂ mole fractions, allowing for updates to the CO₂ mole fractions based on extensive weather observations. In turn, error covariance between CO₂ mole fractions and CO₂ fluxes allowed the update of fluxes across all spatial scales contained in the background covariance. This effectively was the synoptic scale (high- and low-pressure areas and associated fronts), thus projecting local CO₂ observation information out to scales much larger than covered in the DA window. Tests presented in 2012 were done at coarse atmospheric transport and flux resolution (T32). In recent years, Environment and Climate Change Canada has worked to develop a similar capacity (Polavarapu et al., 2016), at 0.9 degrees global resolution.

3.1.4. Offline EnKF

The offline ENKF for carbon flux estimation was introduced in Peters et al. (2005), where the offline component refers to both (a) transport in the observation operator, and (b) propagation of the state vector. In this type of application, the observation operator is a full atmospheric transport model to turn CO₂ fluxes into simulated mole fractions, driven by offline archived mass-fluxes from a parent model. This approach is efficient because offline transport modelling is a convenient way to reproduce atmospheric tracer transport, without the need to solve the full Navier-Stokes equations nor for full data assimilation of observed weather. This allows mass-conserving advection schemes, including two-way nesting, to be used within a large ensemble (N>100). Moreover, it facilitates large DA windows of several weeks that are impossible in an online DA system. Large windows in turn can include explicit transport between fluxes and mole fractions over large scales, reducing the dependence on a statistical representation of the covariance matrix that is typical for the online systems. A downside of this approach is that propagation of transport errors, as well as of background covariance, is not done with a physical state model, but rather with a simple now-casting. This limits the power of the ENKF to improve the state estimate over many consecutive cycles. Like the online ENKF, this approach offers an alternative to the explicit representation of the relation between local CO₂ mole fractions and surface fluxes (i.e. transport Jacobians), which in the community had been leveraged in atmospheric inversions with windows ranging from weeks to years.

3.1.5. Offline analytical

In the presence of Gaussian probability density functions and of a linear forward model, it can also be shown that the most likely values of the control variables can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{x}^a = \mathbf{x}^b + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H}^T (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R})^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x}^b) \quad (3)$$

or equivalently as:

$$\mathbf{x}^a = \mathbf{x}^b + (\mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{B}^{-1})^{-1} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{R}^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x}^b) \quad (4)$$

Similar expressions exist for the error covariance matrix of \mathbf{x}^a (Tarantola, 2005).

Depending on the respective dimension of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , one may prefer one of the two equivalent formulations. However, in both cases, square matrices have to be multiplied together and one intermediate square matrix needs to be inverted. The way that \mathbf{H} is used also suggests that it has to be stored as a (potentially large) Jacobian matrix before the computation.

Atmospheric inversions have used this approach a lot in the past (e.g., Gurney et al., 2002) until the need for higher resolution inversions (large \mathbf{x}) assimilating time series of in situ or satellite observations with little averaging (large \mathbf{y}) made the computation of \mathbf{H} problematic. Its algorithmic simplicity and its efficiency, after \mathbf{H} has been obtained, make it still interesting for some applications, like Observing System Simulation Experiments (OSSEs, as is done in WP3 and WP4 of CHE, or, e.g., in Bousquet et al., 2018). Note that \mathbf{H} can be obtained in a parallel way by repeated runs of the tangent-linear or adjoint codes of H , or by finite-differences perturbations of H , or by finite-differences perturbations of H , or using Lagrangian transport model (e.g., Pisso et al., 2019).

3.1.6. Online Hybrid Ensemble Variational

An online hybrid ensemble-variational system has been proposed to implement an efficient joint state/source DA system in the IFS that would allow to both extend the current operational 12-hour assimilation window and to include chemical mechanisms in the variational minimization algorithm (currently only the transport and physical processes are included in the TL/AD for CAMS). The method is based on: 1) hybridization of ensemble information with full-rank statistical modelling by combining an ensemble-based increment with an adjoint-based increment propagation, allowing one to increase current spatial resolution and/or include forward model processes missing from the adjoint integration (for instance, chemical reactions and processes); 2) combination of tangent-linear and adjoint solvers with ensemble-based least-square approximations of transport Jacobians to construct a long-window 4D-Var with timescales relevant to greenhouse gas source inversion. The proposed methodology is non-intrusive in the sense that the main structure of the current IFS incremental 4D-Var algorithm remains unchanged, while the additional computational cost associated with the source inversion component is minimized. This methodology is described in detail in Boussez (2019) [Tech Memo].

3.2. Control Vector Configuration

The control vector \mathbf{x} of a DA system plays a very important role. It needs to be balanced between the desired detail of information needed, and the observational density available to constrain the problem, while avoiding aggregation errors. To estimate anthropogenic (and biogenic) CO₂ fluxes a number of choices have demonstrated to be successful, being (i) direct flux estimation on a grid, (ii) estimation of model parameters that control the fluxes, and (iii) joint estimation of atmospheric CO₂ state and fluxes.

Whereas (i) offers a reanalyses of the variable targeted for interpretation, (ii) offers a better compromise between observational capacity and the number (and nature) of the unknowns, while (iii) allows atmospheric transport patterns to be included in the background covariance

which allows efficient spatial extrapolation of local results. Each of these approaches has been used in published applications, however, they have not, or very scarcely, been applied to estimating anthropogenic CO₂ emissions. Option (iii) is also least developed scientifically because of the large task involved in DA of full atmospheric states, and thus the need to have a NWP centre involved. Some of these properties are summarized in the Table 3 below, followed by a more explicit description of the type of flux representations possible.

Table 3: Choice of control vectors for surface emissions and their pros and cons.

Control Vector Choice	Description of state	Pros (+)	Cons (-)
Direct flux estimation	Each emission represents an unknown in a gridded structure	+ Most direct path to target variable, least assumptions	- No process information, requires dense observational network
Parameter optimization	Underlying unknowns in a dynamic model that generates CO ₂ fluxes	+ Efficient interpolation of observations to smaller scales + extra observable information can be added (e.g., energy, traffic, and consumer statistics) + Dependency between weather and CO ₂ exchange can be leveraged	- Model structural errors need to be handled - Propagation of model parameters often non-physical
Joint atmospheric state and flux/parameter optimization	The 4D structure of the atmospheric CO ₂ field is optimized along with the underlying emissions of CO ₂	+ Representation of large-scale atmospheric structures in background covariance possible + Allows short-windows through statistical relation between fluxes and mole fractions	- Requires full NWP setting, only a few groups can deliver - Mass-conservation can be difficult to maintain - Approximation of large background covariance structure with small ensemble number, how well does it work?

Generally, there is consensus that to estimate anthropogenic emissions from satellite observations, the state vector needs to keep track of the full atmospheric 4D mole fractions of CO₂, but it should also contain information about auxiliary tracers and their relation to the

emissions. Because anthropogenic emissions will occur at spatial scales below those resolved by the global transport models we employ (at least for the next decade), it is also likely that we need them to be represented not as individual flux elements, but as the result of a dynamical model that generates emission estimates based on activity data (also observable), emission factors (measurable), and variations in driver data (temperature, wind, solar radiation). In that case it is also important to include a bias correction term to account for structural model errors. Currently, the optimal stratification in space/time of model parameters is not yet known, but it is being investigated in projects such as VERIFY.

3.2.1. Direct flux estimation (NWGR)

When fluxes are placed in the state vector, each element either needs to be observed directly, or its value must be inferred from nearby flux elements that have a co-varying error, as carried in the background error covariance matrix. Typically flux error covariances only span a small spatiotemporal scale though (Chevallier et al., 2007) leaving many degrees of freedom. Because fluxes often change rapidly over time (diurnal cycles of for example traffic emissions, heat generation, and biosphere fluxes) this challenge becomes even larger. Moreover, the representation of anthropogenic emissions, often small point sources, is difficult in a global model with 5-10 km resolution, rendering direct flux estimation for anthropogenic emissions impractical. Since this approach has a very long history in the inverse modelling community that came from continental scale and annual flux estimates, much experience was built around this concept in the last two decades.

3.2.2. Dynamic biosphere flux description model for CCDAS (NWGP, NWGR)

An example of this building block is VPRM or another simple model that feeds off NWP weather variables and/or easily available remote sensing data (LAI, faPAR, SIF, NIRv, NDVI,...). It provides the biosphere exchange at the surface and focuses on the shorter time scales where weather variations cause much of the variability that manifests itself nearly as “noise” for the data assimilation problem. Since this noise is not observable everywhere all the time, the CCDAS allows this to be captured by tuning simple model parameters across space and time. Examples are the light-use efficiency of plants, or the water-use efficiency, or the stomatal VPD-response, or the Q10 factor for respiration. Since these can vary stochastically and respond to the NWP variables, both noise and uncertainty can be captured in CCDAS, and moreover the forecast-analysis cycle of NWP allows for updates to the model over time. For NWGR, this biosphere exchange model could include longer relevant time scales of weeks to perhaps even decades. An important challenge is to propagate information for time-varying parameters through consecutive states, as needed for the DA system: the lack of a dynamical model with realistic error (growth and propagation) puts limits on our ability to keep meaningful structures in space/time, which are needed for the envisioned statistical methods in the hybrid ensemble-variational system to work. For more sophisticated surface flux models, initial values for example for carbon pool sizes can furthermore be included in the state. Examples of recent CCDAS efforts include: Koffi et al., 2012, Santaren et al., 2014, Kaminski et al., 2017 (within CHE).

3.2.3. Dynamic anthropogenic flux description model for FFDAS (NWGP, NWGR)

Similar to the CCDAS, the FFDAS model provides anthropogenic surface fluxes as a function of weather variables from the NWP, as well as other recorded variables such as activity of traffic, power plants, ships, or industry over space and time. The relation between activity and emissions can then be optimized, and is a relevant variable that relates directly to the uncertainties also in national emission reports. Since the underlying parameters can vary stochastically and respond to the NWP variables, both noise and uncertainty can be captured in FFDAS, and moreover the forecast-analysis cycle of NWP allows for updates to the model over time. For NWGR, this anthropogenic exchange model could include longer relevant time

scales of weeks to perhaps even decades. Auxiliary remote sensing data such as NO₂ and CO columns or nightlight data can furthermore be incorporated readily in this system. Examples of recent FFDAS efforts include: Brophy et al, (2018) , Super et al. (2019), and Asefi-Najafa et al. (2014).

3.3. Error Covariance Statistics

Uncertainty representation needs to be carefully considered in the operational prototype. Two critical components of the inversion systems are the prior error covariance and transport (or forward model) error covariance matrices.

Prior flux uncertainties will be first based on the available knowledge from state-of-the-art bottom-up inventories. However, given the high level of uncertainty in those estimates, further adjustments for the prescribed prior error covariance matrix will be needed. In particular, flux error correlations are poorly known in current bottom-up inventories. Within CHE, we will leverage available wavelet-based modelling tools in the IFS to construct an efficient model for the prior error covariance matrix that can account for spatially heterogeneous error correlation structure. The parameters of this **B** matrix will be optimized based on observed CO₂ atmospheric concentrations, using standard high-dimensional adjoint-based optimization techniques.

In the CCFFDAS approach uncertainty on the model parameters must be based as much as possible on the error structure of the underlying data. This consists of (a) Activity data (traffic counts, energy demand, population and livestock density, productivity of factories, etc), and (b) the transfer parameters from Activity to emissions (emission factors, emission ratios, temporal profiles, etc). The latter are often based on literature and laboratory measurements (for vegetation) or from laboratory and in-situ measurements (e.g., emission factors of coal burning). An important aspect mentioned in Table 3 is that both (a) and (b) can be weather-dependent: total energy consumption depends on outside temperature, the need for fossil energy depends on the availability of wind and sunlight for renewable, but also emission factors of traffic are temperature-dependent (cold starts). This means that the **B** matrix can have covariances between such NWP variables and anthropogenic & natural fluxes.

The transport error covariance matrix will be estimated through the use of ensemble information within a Monte-Carlo framework (McNorton et al., submitted). However, such estimations are associated with the forward model parameters uncertainty, and several, non-parametric, additional sources of transport errors remain. Therefore, additional benchmarking based on high-resolution model simulations and in situ comparisons will be necessary to capture model errors not accounted for by the standard ensemble-based methods. More information on the methods to estimate transport error statistics are provided in the CHE WP5 report on uncertainty quantification (CHE D5.7).

Finally, due to the large dimension of the inverse problem, an efficient computational approach is required to approximate the posterior error covariance matrix and related information content diagnostics for the estimated CO₂ fluxes. To this aim, low-rank approximations of the posterior error covariance and model resolution matrices will be used as described in the CHE WP5 report on uncertainty quantification (CHE D5.7). These can be compared to full-rank estimates like provided in the system of Rödenbeck et al. 2005.

3.4. Examples of Existing Inversion Systems

As referred to several times above, relevant experience with DA systems for CO₂ fluxes is available in the scientific community, albeit not at the scale targeted with the prototype MVS. Below, several of the world-wide acknowledged systems are mentioned in the Table 4, and expanded in the text to provide context to the current state-of-the-art.

Table 4: State-of-the-art data-assimilation systems for Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). Important pros and cons are listed.

<i>Name or acronym</i>	<i>NWGP</i>	<i>NWGR</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>+</i>	<i>-</i>
IFS	☑	☑	12-24 hour window with propagation of information from outside the window, demonstrated for CO ₂ atmospheric state	Versatile, shared with NWP	Short assimilations window & Strong dependence on B-matrix and small ensemble for large scales
Carbon-Tracker		☑	Long-window Ensemble Kalman Smoother system, demonstrated for decadal CO ₂ flux reanalyses including satellite XCO ₂ and sun-induced fluorescence (CHE outcome)	Explicit representations of intermediate scales, mass conserving	Max resolution offline and CPU- scalability limited. No transport errors
CAMS		☑	Full-window 4D-VAR system, demonstrated for CO ₂ flux reanalyses including satellite XCO ₂ and sun-induced fluorescence (CHE outcome)	Explicit representations of intermediate +long scales, mass conserving	Max resolution offline and CPU- scalability limited. No transport errors

Satellite Mass-Balance Approach	✓	✓	Direct estimation of point source strengths from satellite images using simple (mass-balance, CHE outcome)	Direct approach using limited additional information	Emission estimates depend critically on wind-speed. Complicated for multiple sources.
CCFFDAS	✓	✓	Parameters from flux models are optimized	Allows easy coupling to NWP models, enables the use of further observational constraints (SIF, FAPAR, nightlights, activity/census data ...)	Error propagation difficult, non-linearity of underlying system hard to include in Gaussian minimizations

3.4.1. CarbonTracker

The CarbonTracker data assimilation system for CO₂ (Peters et al., 2005) was the first of its kind to make use of ensembles of fluxes, and the square-root sequential filter described in Whitaker and Hamill (2001). Directly from its first launch in 2006, it moreover used a large number of global regions (more than 200, later replaced by a gridded state vector) and a weekly time step, providing many more degrees of freedom than systems used before. Its success in assimilating data from the global CO₂ monitoring networks, and especially from semi-continuous tower observations contributed to the wide use of its flux products and atmospheric mole fractions in the community. CarbonTracker has since forked into two development branches, one at NOAA ESRL in the USA, and one in Europe (Peters et al., 2010) which was later incorporated in the python-based CTDAS shell (Laan-Luijkx et al., 2017). CT Europe uses 150 ensemble members to represent the spread of a set of ~9000 linear flux scaling factors across the globe, which are updated every week. Their error covariances scale across distance and across terrestrial ecosystem types, reducing the weekly degrees of freedom to ~1200. It moreover uses a five-week lagged smoother window to allow observations to change scaling factors even at longer travel times of the observed air masses. The system is typically run with a highest resolution of 1x1 degree, and covers two decades in its reanalysis. The TM5 model, driven by offline mass-conserving and positive definite mass-fluxes from the IFS reanalyses (ERA5, and ERA-I) provides transport, and is parallelized to scale well up to hundreds of CPUs, making IO of offline fluxes one of its computational bottlenecks.

3.4.2. CAMS inversion system

For 10 years, the operational Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service (<https://atmosphere.copernicus.eu/>) and its precursor projects Monitoring Atmospheric Composition and Climate have been analysing CO₂, methane and nitrous oxide surface fluxes over the recent decades and over the globe by assimilating near-surface or column mole fraction observations in global atmospheric chemistry-transport models. In the case of CO₂, the system minimizes a Bayesian cost function to optimize the 3.75°×1.9° grid-cell eight-day surface fluxes over the globe (with a distinction between local night-time fluxes and daytime fluxes, but without fossil fuel emissions, that are prescribed) and the initial state of CO₂. To do so, it assimilates a series of CO₂ atmospheric observations over a given time window within an off-line version of the global atmospheric general circulation model of the Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (LMDz, Hourdin et al., 2013) run at global resolution 3.75°×1.9° and nudged towards ECMWF re-analyses. The minimization approach is called 'variational' because it explicitly computes the gradient of the cost function using the adjoint code of LMDz (Chevallier et al. 2005). Thanks to a double parallelisation of the transport model (Chevallier 2013), it allows the inversion window to extend over several decades (currently four) seamlessly, while still producing and delivering the CAMS CO₂ inversion twice per year. Corresponding Bayesian uncertainty statistics are available on request, based on Monte Carlo simulations (Chevallier et al., 2007). Prior information about the surface fluxes is provided to the Bayesian system by a combination of climatologies and other types of measurement-driven flux estimates. Assigned prior error variances vary in space and time, and are associated to temporal and spatial error correlations. Details can be found in Chevallier (2018a). The main CAMS product assimilates near-surface measurements, but a satellite-driven product is now also available. Details about both products can be found in Chevallier (2019).

3.4.3. IFS inversion system

As part of CHE and preceding efforts, a global NWGP system was built, based on the IFS model at ~9km spatial resolution. It currently uses a 4D-Var window length of 12-hours, but efforts are well underway to adopt a hybrid ensemble-variational method. This will allow ensemble information to extend the current operational 12-hour window to past and future assimilation windows [Tech Memo N. Bousserez (2019)]. Currently the system has been demonstrated to improve the atmospheric state analysis and 10-day forecast of CO₂ concentrations, but fluxes have not yet been estimated. CHE ensemble nature runs performed with IFS confirm that the signal from the biogenic fluxes is dominant over anthropogenic signals in many areas, and at the resolutions being considered. Therefore, it is deemed critical to: 1) include the biospheric fluxes or CCDAS parameters in the control vector; 2) consider the potential of co-emitters (e.g., NO₂, CO) in disentangling the anthropogenic and biospheric flux signal. Recommendations for next steps in its development are provided in the next section.

3.4.4. Satellite Mass Balance methods

Local point-source emissions, or even city-domes, show strongest signals at scales below what can be resolved by the global or regional systems. Tailor-made approaches to estimate their source strength are needed. Available methodologies include various mass-balance approaches, Gaussian plume modeling, Lagrangian dispersion modeling, and increasingly also machine-learning techniques. Within a DA framework, such approaches can be used as a separate building block to monitor local sources separately, or they can be integrated in the parent global IFS system, e.g. as a plume-in-grid-approach. In the latter, each system would profit from the two-way interactions of meteorology and concentrations. The point-source estimation approach should be scalable from doing a limited (top-N, with N=50-100) number

of large emitters, to a system where the majority of global (observed) point-sources are monitored.

University of Bremen is developing an inversion system aiming at the quantification of CO₂ emissions from localized CO₂ emission sources such as power plants and cities using satellite retrievals of column-average dry-air mole fractions of CO₂ (XCO₂) and NO₂ tropospheric columns (Reuter et al., 2019). For satellite XCO₂, the Level 2 XCO₂ product from NASA's Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) satellite is used. However, regional column-average enhancements of individual point sources are usually small compared to the background concentration and its natural variability, and often not much larger than the satellite's measurement noise. This makes the unambiguous identification and quantification of anthropogenic emission plume signals challenging. NO₂ is co-emitted with CO₂ when fossil fuels are combusted at high temperatures. NO₂ has a short lifetime on the order of hours so that NO₂ columns often greatly exceed background and noise levels of modern satellite sensors near sources, which makes it a suitable tracer of recently emitted CO₂. Based on six case studies (Moscow, Russia; Lipetsk, Russia; Baghdad, Iraq; Medupi and Matimba power plants, South Africa; Australian wildfires; and Nanjing, China), Univ. Bremen demonstrated the usefulness of simultaneous satellite observations of NO₂ and XCO₂. For this purpose, they analyzed co-located regional enhancements of XCO₂ observed by OCO-2 and NO₂ from the Sentinel-5 Precursor (S5P) satellite and estimate the CO₂ plume's cross-sectional fluxes taking advantage of the nearly simultaneous NO₂ measurements with S5P's wide swath and small measurement noise by identifying the source of the observed XCO₂ enhancements, excluding interference with remote upwind sources. This allows to adjust the wind direction and constrains the shape of the CO₂ plumes. They compare the inferred cross-sectional fluxes with the Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), the Open-Data Inventory for Anthropogenic Carbon dioxide (ODIAC), and, in the case of the Australian wildfires, with the Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED). The inferred cross-sectional fluxes range from 31 MtCO₂/year to 153 MtCO₂/year with uncertainties (1 σ) between 23 % and 72 %. For the majority of analyzed emission sources, the estimated cross-sectional fluxes agree, within their uncertainty, with either EDGAR or ODIAC or lie somewhere between them. They assessed the contribution of multiple sources of uncertainty and found that the dominating contributions are related to the computation of the effective wind speed normal to the plume's cross section. The flux uncertainties are expected to be significantly reduced by the planned European Copernicus anthropogenic CO₂ monitoring mission (CO2M), which will provide not only precise measurements with high spatial resolution but also imaging capabilities with a wider swath of simultaneous XCO₂ and NO₂ observations.

An example of a fast mass-balance method, aided by fine-scale transport modeling, was given by Wu et al., (2018), using the column X-STILT Lagrangian dispersion model. In this system, the difference between up- and downwind XCO₂ observations (DXCO₂) from OCO-2 was projected onto the city in between, using X-STILT footprints. This footprint determined the sensitivity of each height represented in the column to the detailed city emission landscape below (resolved at high resolution), and thus allowed the DXCO₂ to correctly scale underlying emissions. Another example is the OSSE study on detecting CO₂ city emissions from Berlin using the CAMS monitoring system (Kuhlmann et al, 2019), and a mass-balance approach from CO₂-M observed (simulated) columns upwind- and downwind of the sources.

3.4.5. CCFFDAS

The Carbon Cycle Fossil Fuel Data Assimilation approach tackles the inverse problem of inferring surface fluxes of trace gases through assimilation of atmospheric and other observations into process models simulating the surface fluxes. The atmospheric transport acts as (part of the) observation operator for the atmospheric observations (Kaminski and Mathieu, 2017). The control space can be any combination of process parameters, initial- and boundary conditions of these process models and the observation operators. In the weak-

constraint (Zupanski, 1997) setup, deviations from the simulated fluxes are added to the control vector (see, e.g., Lewis et al., 2012). Fluxes are then simulated from the posterior control vector. Background on the approach is provided, e.g. by Rayner et al. (2010), Kaminski et al. (2013), and Asefi-Najafabady et al. (2014). We highlight the following aspects of the approach:

- An appropriate choice of the process models implicitly addresses the attribution to flux categories (e.g. sectorial fossil fuel emissions or natural fluxes).
- The process models can be regarded as a way to bring extra information into the assimilation system, in particular if (with appropriate observation operators) they can enable the use of further observations (e.g. nightlights, SIF, or FAPAR) or variables that are provided by the operational system (e.g. to simulate fossil fuel emissions from heating and cooling).
- The (linearised) process models implicitly provide the uncertainty structure in flux space. In this respect the role of the process models is analogous to the role of observation operators for lower level EO products, the uncertainty structure of which is usually much easier. Residual errors in the process models can be addressed by the weak-constraint version. More accurate process model will serve better to remove uncertainty from the inverse problem. This is because they provide lower forecast residual errors, and thus allow lower prior uncertainties. Owing to the non-linearity of the process models, the uncertainty structure in the flux space changes in the course of the minimisation (in contrast to the B matrix in an atmospheric inversion that directly solves for fluxes).

A “light” prototype of a global-scale CCFFDAS was developed in the ESA CCFFDAS study (<http://ccffdass.inversion-lab.com/>) based on existing components, i.e. the Fossil Fuel Data Assimilation System by Asefi-Najafabady et al. (2014), the Carbon Cycle Data Assimilation System by Kaminski et al. (2017), and the Atmospheric Transport model TM3 (Heimann and Koerner, 2003). The prototype is being applied in CHE by Lund and iLab to explore design choices for the operational MVS. A particular asset is the availability of a full Jacobian representation of the modelling chain. The full Jacobian allows, for example, to assess approximations of posterior uncertainties in low-dimensional subspaces of the control space. A limitation is the coarse resolution of the atmospheric transport (4 by 5 degrees) that is currently used, even though an update of this global system to higher resolution is feasible. A regional CCFFDAS prototype is currently being developed within the same ESA study.

4. Latest research developments

4.1. The use of CO₂ satellite data

The release of version 8 of NASA’s XCO₂ retrievals from OCO-2 in 2017 proved to be a major step in quality for satellite retrievals. For the first time, global satellite-driven inversions were found nearly as credible as surface-driven inversions (e.g., Chevallier et al., 2019) at least when using only land retrievals. Efforts within CHE by the Bremen group show that fast-retrievals (FOCAL, Reuter et al., 2017), required when data density will increase by a few orders of magnitude, can produce credible XCO₂ products with low biases compared to TCCON for a fraction of the effort/costs of a full-physics approach.

Although the systematic errors on both retrievals require strong improvements, the possibility to assimilate satellite retrievals alone without any specific tuning has now been demonstrated, which is considered an important step forward. Paradoxically, tests of joint assimilation of surface measurements and OCO-2 retrievals within CHE have not been satisfactory because small inconsistencies remain in the southern hemisphere (SH). In the SH, variability of XCO₂

is relatively small, and the inconsistencies could not be resolved realistically by the inversion system. Also, twin inversions of FOCAL and OCO-2 XCO₂ show that small differences in coverage and values lead to substantial changes in the underlying estimated fluxes (i.e. larger than model-model differences reported in GCP2019, exceeding 1 PgC/yr in the global totals), even if restricting both twin inversions to land-only scenes. In a similar matter, CHE started to address statistical inconsistencies between the retrievals and the atmospheric inversion systems and this work is still on-going.

Other ongoing CHE work concerns the use of satellite data within the Global Carbon Project (GCP). Apart from 7 inversions based on in-situ observations, 2 satellite-based inversions were included, bringing the ensemble considered for the GCP synthesis to a total of 9 inversions. This ensemble provides reanalyses of the global carbon cycle between 2000-2019 (some inversions cover longer periods). When the global carbon sink is considered (this is fossil fuel emissions minus the increment that is observed in the atmosphere) models agree. However, regional differences remain large. For instance, one branch of inversions estimates a Northern extratropical sink in the order of 2.5 PgC/year, and another branch estimates a sink of ~3.5 PgC/year. The inversions resulting in a large Northern sink estimate also a Tropical source, while the others maintain the tropical regions as a sink. Also partitioning between land uptake (0.7 – 2 PgC/year) and ocean uptake (2.4 – 3.5 PgC/year) differs among the models (2015-2019 averages, to include satellite inversions).

Considering the impact of assimilating satellite-based XCO₂ observations versus in situ observations, results do not yield an unambiguous conclusion. The ensemble includes 2 satellite-based inversions, one using GOSAT XCO₂ (UoE, University of Edinburgh), and one using OCO-2 XCO₂ (CAMS FT20r1). Both inversions result in a slightly smaller land sink in the Northern extra-tropics compared to similar inversions using in situ observations. However, for the UoE GOSAT inversion this is accompanied by an increased source in the Southern and Tropical land, whereas for CAMS FT20r1 OCO-2 inversion a shift towards increased uptake is observed. With respect to the global land/ocean partitioning both inversions show an opposite effect compared to their in situ equivalent.

CHE efforts are also ongoing to study the impact of the assimilation window-length in combination with OCO-2 XCO₂ data. The hypothesis is that frequent observation by, e.g., satellites, would allow for a shorter assimilation window. Currently the Carbon Tracker Europe (CTE) system uses a state vector that allows one week of fluxes to be scaled five times in a lagging window (covering 5 weeks), implying that atmospheric observations may directly constrain the emissions that occurred up-to five weeks before the observation. Efforts are focused on reducing this state vector to hold as little as 24-48 hours of flux information, forcing much of the XCO₂-driven surface flux adjustments to remain localized near the observed locations. Total lagged-window lengths could be reduced if better background CO₂ mole fractions, or extensive covariance structures were available to go beyond the lagged-window time period.

The current IFS inversion system under development relies on the operational 12-hour assimilation window, which falls short of capturing CO₂ signals whose time scale can span several weeks. Although a joint source inversion of co-emitted shorter-lived tracers such as NO₂ and CO could in principle mitigate this issue, current studies suggest a longer time-window will be necessary to build a reliable NWGP system, especially once data from the CO₂M imager will be available.

Within CHE we decided to investigate the approach where in-situ observations are used first to anchor larger-scale flux patterns (hemispheric, continental) from longer windows, such that extra computing capacity can target the much larger satellite records. In the follow-on CoCO₂ project, the 4D-Var window of the IFS source inversion system will be extended to several weeks in order to accommodate long-lived tracers such as CO₂ or CH₄ (Bousserez, 2019). The sensitivity analysis of the inversion window-lengths being carried out in the context of

CTE will provide guidance to determine the optimal window length for other inversion systems in CoCO₂ (both NWGR and NWGP).

The GCP analysis is still ongoing, and will be reported as part of D1.3 (Reconciliation of top-down and bottom-up estimates of the carbon balance). The yearly GCP analysis is seen as an important part of the Numerical Weather and Greenhouse gas Reanalysis (NWGR), a system that is different from an operational Numerical Weather and Greenhouse gas Prediction system. A development of both systems is important, with a prediction system as operational service for the scientific community (boundary conditions, concentration fields) and early warning, and a reanalysis system to fully integrate observations and provide accurate yearly estimates of CO₂ emissions and other fluxes of the global carbon cycle. On longer time-scales, the use of multiple additional systems in the NWGR addresses a known tendency for each system to produce its own particular preferential large-scale flux distribution (Gaubert et al., 2019). The (Bayesian) incorporation of results from a more diverse ensemble of systems will make the NWGR a valuable additional result, for efforts such as TransCom, and the GCP.

4.2. COVID-19 efforts

After the establishments of COVID-19 lock-downs in March 2020, many scientific studies are focusing on detecting emission changes (e.g. Le Quéré, C. et al., 2020). In general, it appears extremely difficult to detect a signal in background CO₂ observations. This does not come as a surprise, because signals from anthropogenic CO₂ emissions are overwhelmed by signals from the biosphere, and because atmospheric variability makes it difficult to directly compare a situation before and after the lock-downs. Detecting a signal in satellite retrievals of the carbon dioxide (CO₂) column averages is likewise very difficult. A submitted study (Frederic Chevallier, 2020) explored this issue with forward model simulations. Although lockdown-related changes in the column averages of CO₂ are substantial in a few places of the model global grid, the induced gradients are most often less than the random errors of the retrievals. The current necessity to restrict the quality-assured column retrievals to almost cloud-free areas appears to be a major obstacle in identifying changes in CO₂ emissions using satellite retrievals. Indeed, large changes have occurred in the presence of clouds and, in places that were cloud-free in 2020, the comparison with previous years is hampered by different cloud conditions during these years. This study therefore recommends to favor all-weather CO₂ monitoring systems, at least in situ, to support international efforts to reduce emissions.

The difficulty to detect emission changes related to the COVID-19 lockdowns underscores the need for an integrated effort as basis for an MVS. This effort should include an operational CCFFDAS system (WP3) that maps anthropogenic emissions and biosphere exchange based on numerical weather predictions and proxy activity data.

One interesting study that is published in response to the COVID-19 pandemic (Zheng et al., 2020) argues that although bottom-up approaches to estimate daily CO₂ emissions at the country level are emerging, it remains difficult to gain access to reliable daily statistics of sector-specific fossil fuel consumption. Also, temporally varying information, like traffic congestion indices and heating degree days are needed to calculate (relative) changes in emissions. In the study they therefore infer a ten-day moving average of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions from TROPOMI NO₂ merged with bottom-up information. This approach indicates a second important aspect of an integrated MVS approach: the need for a multi-species approach (see next section). In this case, NO_x/CO₂ emission ratios are used in combination with NO₂ satellite columns to arrive at sectoral CO₂ emissions in China.

During the September 2020 ICOS conference, a whole session was dedicated to COVID-19 related emission changes. Philippe Ciais, for instance, presented an impressive effort to combine proxies like, TOMTOM data, flight statistics, but also information about price

variations (oil prices dropping), and variability in wind and solar power, to arrive at time-resolved global sectoral CO₂ emissions during the lock-down period (Liu et al., in review for Nature Communication).

One of the positive outcomes of the COVID-19 pandemic is that scientists now have the unique opportunity to analyze this period in great detail, to test various combinations of bottom-up and top-down techniques.

4.3. Multi-species

4.3.1 NO_x and CO

As outlined in the previous section, an MVS system would benefit from a multi-species approach. Technically, in a NWGP setting such as in the IFS system, this involves a control vector with (coupled) emissions of multiple species (current approach uses CO, NO_x, CO₂). In the context of short assimilation-windows (currently 12 hours for the IFS), satellite column observations of NO₂ and CO may provide further constraints on anthropogenic emissions. Since the atmospheric gradients are much larger for shorter-lived species (lifetime CO₂ > CO > NO_x), more information can be retrieved from NO₂ and CO columns compared to the currently available GOSAT and OCO-2 XCO₂ columns. For CO and NO₂, high-quality satellite products are already used in the operational CAMS system for state (i.e., 3D concentrations) assimilation. During the CHE project, developments at ECMWF have extended the current CAMS configuration with a joint state/emission optimization system. This system will leverage the already existing chemical mechanisms in CAMS to exploit information from co-emitted tracers (NO₂, CO). However, currently the chemical model is used only in the outer-loop (non-linear trajectory) of the 4D-Var system, which means chemical reactions are neglected in the minimization. Therefore, an ongoing activity at ECMWF consists in adding simplified tangent-linear and adjoint models for the chemical mechanisms, in order to better represent the sensitivity of NO₂ observations to underlying NO_x emissions during the optimization procedure. As a first step, this simplified scheme will approximate the O₃/NO_x photochemical equilibrium. Additional, as part of the CoCO₂ project, a hybrid ensemble-variational system will be developed that combines information from a small ensemble of CAMS forward simulations with the IFS 4D-Var optimization to introduce sensitivities accounting for all chemical mechanisms (Bousserez, 2019).

More generally, when building a MVS system including short-lived tracers, the following issues need to be carefully addressed: (1) the use of other sources of, e.g., CO (atmospheric oxidation of volatile organic compounds and methane) and (2) removal by atmospheric oxidation, and (3) light-dependent fast chemical cycles of NO_x (NO + O₃ → NO₂ + O₂). Since atmospheric chemistry is highly non-linear, these issues constitute large computational challenges that need to be addressed. Some preliminary steps have been taken in CHE that need to be continued in CoCO₂, and the proposed hybrid ensemble-variational system will provide a computationally efficient method to address those issues.

4.3.2 Other tracers

CHE and related projects started some work on the co-assimilation of CO₂ observations and carbonyl sulfide (OCS or COS) observations, a promising research topic that could help separating between photosynthesis and respiration fluxes. Our insufficient knowledge of the

other terms of the COS budget keeps us at the moment at an early research stage. Similar useful constraints on GPP are expected to come from sun-induced fluorescence (SIF), with large volumes of new data expected from several missions. Data assimilation of such signals was attempted in CHE (and in the wider the carbon cycle community), with first attempts showing that more efforts must be directed towards the forward modeling of the SIF signals in a complex canopy, and that a hybrid CCFFDAS approach is likely best suited for using SIF. SIF thus remains a tracer with large (but not yet fully proven) future potential for inclusion in IFS.

Another useful tracer for fossil CO₂ emissions is $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$. A recent publication (Basu et al., 2020) describes the usefulness of this tracer as an independent validation of the estimates of CO₂ emissions from fossil-fuel combustion and cement production in the United States. The number of available records for $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$ however remains sparse, which is a similar downside of other tracers that have proven useful in the past such as $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and APO. We note that we currently assess their readiness for data assimilation to be low, but their added value in diagnosing the results from the NWGA to be high, and therefore assess the value to include such tracers in (forward) IFS simulations to be high.

4.4. Multi-scale

The currently proposed MVS system includes an operational system based on near-real-time data (NWGP) and a reanalysis system (NWGR). The NWGP as shaped in CHE will address the global scale on a resolution of ~9 km. The multi-scale aspect will be addressed outside this global system, but the operational system will still provide an important role, by providing:

- Boundary conditions for regional/national efforts;
- Meteorological data for e.g. point-source estimates (e.g. satellite-based mass-balance approaches);
- Ensemble information for later reanalysis efforts and uncertainty characterization (NWGR);
- Further level of integration by treating the local and regional posterior flux products (from e.g. national efforts) as observations in a global IFS-driven CO₂ inversion (Bousserez, 2019).

5. Recommendations for operational CHE prototype

- ★ *Details of different configurations/streams can be tested within the next three years to address different temporal/spatial scales and user needs*
- ★ *Incremental step to implementation (emphasizing the added value of each step).*

Each scale on which we need to develop a prototype MVS system is associated with different configurations, and different needs. These require different, but closely coordinated, development strategies.

From the joint efforts in the CHE project and the recent sessions learned from COVID-19 we distil the following recommendation and priorities for future Copernicus operational NWGP & NWGR systems, specifically for the data assimilation capacity. These recommendations are selected from a more extensive assessment of possible improvements to work on across multiple scales, as seen in Tables 5, 6 and 7.

NWGP:

- (1) Demonstrate single-species emission optimization in IFS (CO, with optimization of initial condition and emissions using satellite data also from TROPOMI).
- (2) Build a multi-species data assimilation framework for CO₂, CO & NO₂ in IFS
- (3) Extend the current IFS 12-hour assimilation window to several weeks for CO₂ source inversion using satellite XCO₂ columns.
- (4) Based on the framework (2), develop a prototype CCFFDAS
- (5) Introduce simplified chemistry in TL/AD models coupled to multi-species inversion in IFS
- (6) Build a hybrid ensemble-variational system that accounts for chemical mechanisms in the 4D-Var minimization

NWGR:

- (1) Build a hybrid long-window-short-window assimilation system, with consistent propagation of covariances
- (2) Extend the current IFS 12-hour assimilation window to several weeks for CO₂ source inversion using satellite XCO₂ columns.
- (3) Enable IFS ensemble information (transport and covariances) to be used in replay-mode by other systems

Table 5: Immediate development needs linked to the domain (global) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.

Component	Domain	Stream	Recommendation	Estimated effort (Person Months)
IFS	Global	NWGP	Facilitate use of IFS model to other partners, including capacity to "replay" the forecast ensemble from EPS (online, not through static-fields and massive I/O)	12 months

IFS hybrid ensemble-4dvar	Global	NWGP, NWGR	Demonstrate joint state-flux estimation including propagation of information from outside the 12-hour window. Assimilate high-frequency near-real time observations from satellites and surface network. Use OSSEs, as well as real-world test with CO as tracer.	9 months
IFS hybrid ensemble-4dvar	Global	NWGP, NWGR	Develop long-window inversions using a hybrid ensemble-variational method, estimating joint biospheric/anthropogenic fluxes in a CCFFDAS approach.	6 months
IFS hybrid ensemble-4dvar	Global	NWGP, NWGR	Through OSSEs, assess the requirements, and statistical performance of the ensemble in the DA framework: is the linearization good enough to allow propagation of the state across time scales from hours-to-weeks? How much localization is needed and how to apply it in space/time? Is the low-dimensional (or wavelet) representation of the B-matrix sufficient to assess posterior errors? Do these methods work for long-window re-analyses too?	6 months
IFS multi-scale assimilation	Global	NWGR	Show the feasibility of the multi-scale integration of a reanalysis with 2-3 systems (CTE, CAMS, IFS)	6 months

CarbonTracker	Global	NWGR	Build a hybrid long-window-short-window assimilation system, with consistent propagation of covariances.	6 months, planned under CHE
CarbonTracker	Global	NWGR	Improve numerical satellite-assimilation capacity to handle larger volumes of data.	2 months
CarbonTracker	Global	NWGR	Replace offline meteo with IFS online alternative (+analysis replay-mode)	12 months, partly started for EC-Earth
CAMS	Global	NWGR	Identify and implement innovations to estimate anthropogenic fluxes in re-analysis mode	12 months
CCDAS	Global to regional	NWGP, NWGR	Identify suitable model, and optimizable parameters, decide how to approach slow changes and hysteresis in carbon fluxes. Design a dynamical model for the propagation of the mean state and covariance. Build TL/AD codes.	12 months
FFDAS	Global to regional	NWGP, NWGR	Identify suitable model, and optimizable parameters, decide how to approach. Decide how to approach point-sources and integration into IFS. Design a dynamical model for the propagation of the mean state and covariance. Build TL/AD codes.	12 months
Satellite Data	Global	NWGP, NWGR	Assimilate satellite data to estimate emissions. Real-case scenarios using CO system & TROPOMI. Compare NWGP and NWGR mode and document requirements + path forward for CO ₂ .	8 months

Table 6: Immediate development needs linked to the domain (regional) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.

Component	Domain	Stream	Recommendation	Estimated effort (Person Months)
COSMO	Regional	NWGR	Investigate use of boundary conditions within regional inversions capabilities	6 months
Testbed for components	Regional	NWGR	Identify testbed regions, invest in interface to integrate with NWGP and NWGR within Copernicus, incorporate ICOS resources to facilitate continuous exchange of information	8 months

Table 7: Immediate development needs linked to the domain (local) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.

Component	Domain	Stream	Recommendation	Estimated effort (Person Months)
Bremen approach	Local	NWGR	Investigate application for CO2M mission	6 months
Plume-in-grid	Local	NWGP, NWGR	Investigate split in state-vector: large point-sources are estimated separately and merged with the NWGP & NWGA systems.	9 months
Plume Chemistry	Local	NWGR	Investigate effects of non-linear atmospheric chemistry on NO ₂ lifetime	6 months

6. Research priorities

6.1. CCFFDAS

Within the community, there is increasing recognition that underneath the rapidly changing carbon fluxes across space and time, a smaller number of system “traits” exerts important control over these fluxes. This is true for the biosphere, where physiological *responses* of plants are more constant than the fluxes they result in. But similarly for anthropogenic emissions, *responses* to outside temperature (household, cars) or to cloudiness (solar energy) are more similar than the traffic patterns or energy demand- and hence CO₂ emissions - they result in. A CCFFDAS system that embodies such relationships between fast environmental changes and slower responses will likely offer efficient ways to estimate anthropogenic emissions. From the observational side, it will allow us to tap into the enormous wealth of so-called “activity data” such as traffic patterns, shipping motions, real-time energy demand, and solar/wind production capacity, which also during the COVID19 crisis turned out to be an important resource. We therefore recommend continued R&D on this approach is prioritized alongside the envisioned prototype.

6.2. Additional tracer constraints

The recent covid crisis, developments on the CO₂-M mission, and the new insights from TropOMI make it abundantly clear that the overall goal of getting independent constraints on anthropogenic CO₂ emissions can only be reached when different data streams are integrated. Despite the realization that remote sensing data will bring in the bulk of the signals to assimilate, the value of additional evaluation of DA system results with more sparse surface datasets is recognized strongly in the community. To ensure that the Copernicus systems can tap into the development of new tracer measurements and derived metrics, we recommend research to proceed with the IFS system also on tracers that have a lower promise for inclusion as DA constraints. This means that based on the framework (2), we develop capacity for predictions of atmospheric $\Delta^{14}\text{C}$, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, COS, SIF, and APO from the multi-year flux reanalysis.

6.3. Multi-scale Integration System

A proposed multi-model system could be used to integrate spatiotemporally heterogeneous posterior emission products. This system, outlined by Boussez (2019, Tech Memo), would treat the local and regional posterior flux products as observations in a global IFS-driven CO₂ inversion. In practice, each regional and local inversion outputs to be assimilated in the global multi-model product would be required to provide an ensemble of prior and posterior samples of 4D CO₂ emissions and CO₂ concentrations fields. In order to avoid any detrimental effects from the integration of poorly estimated posterior emissions and/or inaccurately prescribed posterior errors on the multi-model product, a strict quality control mechanism will need to be implemented. The complexity of assimilating inversion products across different spatiotemporal scales in consistent manner may require an efficient integration tool similar to CIF (VERIFY), in particular to standardize model inputs/outputs. Within the IFS global model, the multi-model assimilation algorithm will be implemented using the modular OOPS DA system.

Table 8: Research priorities linked to the domain (global, regional, local) and stream for application in the prototype: Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Gas prediction (NWGP) and Reanalysis (NWGR). An estimate of the effort required is given in person months.

Component	Domain	Stream	Recommendation	Estimated effort (Person Months)
Transport	Global Regional	NWGP, NWGR	Test new transport schemes developed in NWP, e.g. MPDATA advection in FVM IFS (Kühnline et al, 2019)	8 months

8. Conclusions

The specification of the configuration recommended for the data assimilation components at different scales is provided following the work done in WP1.

9. Acronyms

Table 9: List of acronyms

APO	<i>Atmospheric Potential Oxygen</i>
CAMS	<i>Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service</i>
FFDAS	<i>Fossil Fuel Data Assimilation System</i>
CCDAS	<i>Carbon Cycle Data Assimilation System</i>
CCFFDAS	<i>Carbon Cycle Fossil Fuel Data Assimilation System</i>
COSMO	<i>Consortium for Small-scale Modeling</i>
CTE	<i>CarbonTracker Europe</i>
DA	<i>Data Assimilation</i>
ECMWF	<i>European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts</i>
EDGAR	<i>Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research</i>
ENKF	<i>Ensemble Kalman Filter</i>
EO	<i>Earth Observation</i>
FOCAL	<i>Fast Atmospheric Trace gas Retrieval for OCO2</i>
GCP	<i>Global Carbon Project</i>

GFAS	<i>Global Fire Assimilation System</i>
GFED	<i>Global Fire Emissions Database</i>
GPP	<i>Gross Primary Production</i>
ICOS	<i>Integrated Carbon Observation System</i>
IFS	<i>Integrated Forecasting System</i>
IPCC	<i>The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</i>
LAI	<i>Leaf Area Index</i>
LMDz	<i>Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (LMDz) GCM</i>
MVS	<i>Monitoring and Verification Support</i>
NASA	<i>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</i>
NDVI	<i>Normalized Differential Vegetation Index</i>
NIRv	<i>Near-infrared Reflectance</i>
NOAA ESRL	<i>National Ocean and Atmosphere Administration, Earth System Research Laboratory</i>
NRT	<i>Near Real Time</i>
NWP	<i>Numerical Weather Prediction</i>
NWGP	<i>Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Prediction system</i>
NWGR	<i>Numerical Weather and Greenhouse Reanalysis system</i>
OCO-2	<i>Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2)</i>
ODIAC	<i>Open-Data Inventory for Anthropogenic Carbon dioxide</i>
OSSE	<i>Observing System Simulation Experiments</i>
SIF	<i>Solar Induced Fluorescence</i>
STILT	<i>Stochastic Time Inverted Lagrangian Transport</i>
TCCON	<i>Total Column Carbon Observing Network</i>
TL/AD	<i>Tangent Linear/Adjoint</i>
TM5	<i>Transport Model 5</i>
UNFCCC	<i>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</i>
VPD	<i>Vapor Pressure Deficit</i>

10. References

- Agustí-Panareda, *et al.*, 2016. "A Biogenic CO₂ Flux Adjustment Scheme for the Mitigation of Large-Scale Biases in Global Atmospheric CO₂ Analyses and Forecasts." *ACP* 16 (16). Copernicus Publications: 10399–418. doi:10.5194/acp-16-10399-2016.
- Anderson, J. L. Spatially and temporally varying adaptive covariance inflation for ensemble filters. *Tellus A* **61**, 72–83 (2009).
- Asefi-Najafabady, S., *et al.*: A multiyear, global gridded fossil fuel CO₂ emission data product: Evaluation and analysis of results, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119, 10,213–10,231, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD021296>, URL <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2013JD021296>, 2014.
- Basu, S. *et al.* Estimating US fossil fuel CO₂ emissions from measurements of 14C in atmospheric CO₂. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **117**, 13300 (2020) Bousseréz, Nicolas. "Towards a Prototype Global CO₂ Emissions Monitoring System for Copernicus." arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11727 (2019).
- Bousseréz, Nicolas. 2019. "Towards a Prototype Global CO₂ Emissions Monitoring System for Copernicus." <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.11727>
- Bousquet, P., C. *et al.*, (2018): Error budget of the MEthane Remote Lidar mission (MERLIN) and its impact on the uncertainties of the global methane budget. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, doi:10.1029/2018JD028907.
- Brophy, K. *et al.* Characterizing Uncertainties in Atmospheric Inversions of Fossil Fuel CO₂; Emissions in California. *Atmos Chem Phys Discuss* 1–44 (2018). doi:10.5194/acp-2018-473
- CHE D5.1: Progress report on service elements for CO₂ Earth observation integration
- CHE D5.3: Progress report on service elements for CO₂ emission and transport models integration
- CHE D5.5: Progress report on service elements for data assimilation methodology
- CHE D5.7: Progress report on service element requirements for uncertainty representation.
- Chevallier, F.: On the parallelization of atmospheric inversions of CO₂ surface fluxes within a variational framework, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 6, 783–790, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-783-2013>, 2013.
- Chevallier, F., *et al.*, 2005: Inferring CO₂ sources and sinks from satellite observations: method and application to TOVS data. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D24309, doi:10.1029/2005JD006390.
- Chevallier, F., 2007: Impact of correlated observation errors on inverted CO₂ surface fluxes from OCO measurements, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L24804, doi:10.1029/2007GL030463
- Chevallier, F., *et al.*, 2007: The contribution of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory to the estimation of CO₂ sources and sinks: Theoretical study in a variational data assimilation framework. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D09307, doi:10.1029/2006JD007375
- Chevallier, F. *et al.* Objective evaluation of surface- and satellite-driven carbon dioxide atmospheric inversions. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 19, 14233–14251 (2019).
- Gurney, K. R., *et al.*: Towards robust regional estimates of CO₂ sources and sinks using atmospheric transport models, *Nature*, 415, 626–630, <https://doi.org/10.1038/415626a>, 2002.
- Heimann, M. and Körner, S.: The global atmospheric tracer model TM3, Tech. Rep. 5, Max-Planck-Institut für Biogeochemie, Jena, Germany, 2003.

- Hourdin, F *et al.*, Impact of the LMDZ atmospheric grid configuration on the climate and sensitivity of the IPSL-CM5A coupled model, *Clim. Dynam.*, 40, 2167–2192, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-012-1411-3>, 2013.
- Houtekamer, P. L. & Mitchell, H. L. Ensemble Kalman filtering. *Q J Roy Meteor Soc* **131**, 3269–3289 (2005).
- Kaminski, T.T., *et al.*, 2013. The BETHY/JSBACH carbon cycle data assimilation system: experiences and challenges. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeo.* 118 (4), 1414–1426. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgrg.20118>.
- Kaminski, T. and Mathieu, P.-P.: Reviews and syntheses: Flying the satellite into your model: on the role of observation operators in constraining models of the Earth system and the carbon cycle, *Biogeosciences*, 14, 2343–2357, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-2343-2017>, URL <http://www.biogeosciences.net/14/2343/2017/>, 2017.
- Kaminski, T., *et al.*: Constraining a terrestrial biosphere model with remotely sensed atmospheric carbon dioxide, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, pp. 109 – 124, <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.08.017>, URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425717303838>, 2017.
- Kang, J.-S., Kalnay, E., Miyoshi, T., Liu, J. & Fung, I. Estimation of surface carbon fluxes with an advanced data assimilation methodology. *J Geophys Res* **117**, n/a–n/a (2012).
- Koffi, E. N., *et al.*, Atmospheric constraints on gross primary productivity and net ecosystem productivity: Results from a carbon-cycle data assimilation system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **26**, (2012).
- Kuhlmann, G *et al.* 2019. “Detectability of CO₂; Emission Plumes of Cities and Power Plants with the Copernicus Anthropogenic CO₂; Monitoring (CO2M) Mission.” *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions*, June, 1–35. doi:10.5194/amt-2019-180. (2019)
- Laan Luijckx, I. T. *et al.* The CarbonTracker Data Assimilation Shell (CTDAS) v1.0: implementation and global carbon balance 2001–2015. *Geosci Model Dev* **10**, 2785–2800 (2017).
- Le Quéré, C. *et al.* Temporary reduction in daily global CO₂ emissions during the COVID-19 forced confinement. *Nature Climate change* 1–8 (2020). doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0797-x
- Lewis, P. E., J. *et al.*, (2012), An Earth Observation Land Data Assimilation System (EOL-DAS), *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 120, 219–235.
- Liu, J., *et al.* Comparison between the Local Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter (LETKF) and 4D-Var in atmospheric CO₂ flux inversion with the Goddard Earth Observing System-Chem model and the observation impact diagnostics from the LETKF. *J Geophys Res Atmos* **121**, 13,066–13,087 (2016).
- Peters, W. *et al.* An ensemble data assimilation system to estimate CO₂ surface fluxes from atmospheric trace gas observations. *J Geophys Res* **110**, D24304 (2005).
- Peters, W. *et al.* Seven years of recent European net terrestrial carbon dioxide exchange constrained by atmospheric observations. *Global Change Biology* **16**, 1317–1337 (2010).
- Pisso, I., Patra, P., Takigawa, M. *et al.* Assessing Lagrangian inverse modelling of urban anthropogenic CO₂ fluxes using in situ aircraft and ground-based measurements in the Tokyo area. *Carbon Balance Manage* 14, 6 (2019) doi:10.1186/s13021-019-0118-8
- Polavarapu, S. M. *et al.* Greenhouse gas simulations with a coupled meteorological and transport model: the predictability of CO₂. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **16**, 12005–12038 (2016).
- Rayner, P.J.P.J., *et al.*, 2010. A new global gridded data set of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion: methodology and evaluation. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* 115 (D19). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2009JD013439>. D19306 n/a–n/a.

- Reuter, M. et al. 2017. “A Fast Atmospheric Trace Gas Retrieval for Hyperspectral Instruments Approximating Multiple Scattering—Part 2: Application to XCO₂ Retrievals From OCO-2.” *Remote Sensing* 9 (11): 1102–23. doi:10.3390/rs9111102.
- Reuter, M. et al. Towards monitoring localized CO₂ emissions from space: co-located regional CO₂ and NO₂ enhancements observed by the OCO-2 and S5P satellites. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **19**, 9371–9383 (2019).
- Rödenbeck, C.: Estimating CO₂ sources and sinks from atmospheric mixing ratio measurements using a global inversion of atmospheric transport, no. 06, Max Planck Institute for biogeochemistry Technical Reports, Max Planck Society, 2005
- Santaren, D., et al., Ecosystem model optimization using in situ flux observations: benefit of Monte Carlo versus variational schemes and analyses of the year-to-year model performances. *Biogeosciences* **11**, 7137–7158 (2014).
- Super, I., et al. Optimizing a dynamic fossil fuel CO₂ emission model with CTDAS (v1.0) for an urban area using atmospheric observations of CO₂, CO, NO_x, and SO₂. *Geosci Model Dev* 1–38 (2019). doi:10.5194/gmd-2019-283
- Tarantola, A.: Inverse problem theory and methods for model parameter estimation, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 89, 339 pp., 2005.
- Whitaker, J. & Hamill, T. Ensemble data assimilation without perturbed observations. **130**, 1913—1924 (2001).
- Wu, D. et al. A Lagrangian approach towards extracting signals of urban CO₂ emissions from satellite observations of atmospheric column CO₂ (XCO₂): X-Stochastic Time-Inverted Lagrangian Transport model ('X-STILT v1'). *Geosci Model Dev* **11**, 4843–4871 (2018).
- Zheng, B., et al., 2020. Satellite-based estimates of decline and rebound in China's CO₂ emissions during COVID-19 pandemic, to appear in *Science Advances*, 2020.
- Zupanski, D.: A general weak constraint applicable to operational 4DVAR data assimilation systems, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 125, 2274–2292, 1997.

Document History

Version	Author(s)	Date	Changes
V0.1	Peters & Krol	04/12/2019	First draft for review
V1.0	Peters & Krol	18/12/2019	Comments from 2 reviewers incorporated, all textual

Internal Review History

Internal Reviewers	Date	Comments
I Pisso (NILU)	15/12/2019	Provided review and assessment
T Kaminski (iLab)	15/12/2019	Provided review and assessment

Estimated Effort Contribution per Partner

Partner	Effort
WU	8 PM
ECMWF	2 PM
Total	10

This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.