



TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in ACP if available.

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1: Assessing the influence of transport and surface fluxes on tropospheric N₂O variability

R. L. Thompson^{1,2}, P. K. Patra³, K. Ishijima³, E. Saikawa^{4,5}, M. Corazza⁶,
U. Karstens⁷, C. Wilson⁸, P. Bergamaschi⁶, E. Dlugokencky⁹, C. Sweeney⁹,
R. G. Prinn⁴, R. F. Weiss¹⁰, S. O'Doherty¹¹, P. J. Fraser¹², L. P. Steele¹²,
P. B. Krummel¹², M. Saunio², M. Chipperfield⁸, and P. Bousquet²

¹Norwegian Institute for Air Research, Kjeller, Norway

²Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et l'Environnement, Gif sur Yvette, France

³Research Institute for Global Change, JAMSTEC, Yokohama, Japan

⁴Center for Global Change Science, MIT, Cambridge, MA, USA

⁵Department of Environmental Studies, Emory University, GA, USA

⁶Institute for Environment and Sustainability, Joint Research Centre, European Commission, Ispra, Italy

⁷Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany

⁸School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



⁹NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Global Monitoring Division, Boulder, CO, USA

¹⁰Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, CA, USA

¹¹School of Chemistry, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

¹²Centre for Australian Weather and Climate Research, CSIRO, Marine and Atmospheric Research, Aspendale, Victoria, Australia

Received: 15 November 2013 – Accepted: 12 January 2014 – Published: 24 January 2014

Correspondence to: R. Thompson (rona.thompson@nilu.no) and
P. Patra (prabir@jamstec.go.jp)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

ACPD

14, 2307–2362, 2014

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Abstract

We present a comparison of chemistry-transport models (TransCom-N₂O) to examine the importance of atmospheric transport and surface fluxes on the variability of N₂O mixing ratios in the troposphere. Six different models and two model variants participated in the inter-comparison and simulations were made for the period 2006 to 2009. In addition to N₂O, simulations of CFC-12 and SF₆ were made by a subset of four of the models to provide information on the models proficiency in stratosphere-troposphere exchange (STE) and meridional transport, respectively. The same prior emissions were used by all models to restrict differences among models to transport and chemistry alone. Four different N₂O flux scenarios totalling between 14 and 17 Tg N yr⁻¹ (for 2005) globally were also compared. The modelled N₂O mixing ratios were assessed against observations from in-situ stations, discrete air sampling networks, and aircraft. All models adequately captured the large-scale patterns of N₂O and the vertical gradient from the troposphere to the stratosphere and most models also adequately captured the N₂O tropospheric growth rate. However, all models underestimated the inter-hemispheric N₂O gradient by at least 0.33 ppb (equivalent to 1.5 Tg N), which, even after accounting for an overestimate of emissions in the Southern Ocean of circa 1.0 Tg N, points to a likely underestimate of the Northern Hemisphere source by up to 0.5 Tg N and/or an overestimate of STE in the Northern Hemisphere. Comparison with aircraft data reveal that the models overestimate the amplitude of the N₂O seasonal cycle at Hawaii (21° N, 158° W) below circa 6000 m, suggesting an overestimate of the importance of stratosphere to troposphere transport in the lower troposphere at this latitude. In the Northern Hemisphere, most of the models that provided CFC-12 simulations captured the phase of the CFC-12, seasonal cycle, indicating a reasonable representation of the timing of STE. However, for N₂O all models simulated a too early minimum by 2 to 3 months owing to errors in the seasonal cycle in the prior soil emissions, which is still not adequately represented by terrestrial biosphere models. In the Southern Hemisphere, most models failed to capture the N₂O and CFC-12 seasonality

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



at Cape Grim, Tasmania, and all failed at the South Pole, whereas for SF₆, all models could capture the seasonality at all sites, suggesting that there are large errors in modeled vertical transport in high southern latitudes.

1 Introduction

Nitrous oxide (N₂O) mixing ratios have been increasing steadily in the atmosphere over the past few decades at an average rate of approximately 0.3% per year, reaching 323 nmol mol⁻¹ (equivalently parts-per-billion, ppb) in recent years (WMO, 2011) compared with circa 270 ppb before the industrial revolution (Forster et al., 2007). The growth rate of N₂O is a direct consequence of the imbalance between the emission and the sink of N₂O. The sink, that is, photolysis and oxidation by O(¹D) in the stratosphere, is thought to have increased at a slower rate than that of the emissions, which have been increasing since the mid-19th century largely due to human activities. N₂O emissions are strongly tied to the amount of reactive nitrogen (ammonium, nitrate and organic forms) in the environment. The global demand for food, and more recently bio-fuels, has led to an increasing production of reactive nitrogen, used in fertilizers, especially in the latter half of the 20th century (Galloway et al., 2008). The increase in N₂O is a major concern because it is a greenhouse gas (GHG) and has the third largest contribution to anthropogenic radiative forcing after CO₂ and CH₄ (Butler, 2011). Additionally, N₂O plays an important role in stratospheric ozone loss and the ozone-depleting-potential weighted emissions of N₂O are now thought to be the largest of all ozone depleting substances (Ravishankara et al., 2009).

Despite the importance of N₂O, there are still many questions concerning the causes of its seasonal and, especially, inter-annual variability in the atmosphere and there are still large uncertainties in its emission. Understanding of the seasonal variability of N₂O has improved in recent years with the recognition of the importance of seasonal stratosphere-troposphere exchange (STE) of air masses on the tropospheric seasonal cycle observed at a number of sites (Nevison et al., 2007, 2011). However, there is

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



still some debate about the additional contribution of surface fluxes and lateral transport to the seasonal cycle and the latitudinal dependence of this (Ishijima et al., 2010). Similarly, inter-annual variability in STE has been suggested to be an important determinant of inter-annual variability in tropospheric N₂O (Nevison et al., 2011), however, a recent studies point to a greater importance of tropospheric transport and variations in surface emissions (Saikawa et al., 2013; Thompson et al., 2013a, b).

N₂O emissions can be estimated from atmospheric observations with the use of an atmospheric chemistry transport model (CTM) to translate between concentrations and fluxes. This is formalized in atmospheric inversions, where the estimated fluxes are those that provide the best fit to the observations while remaining within the bounds of the prior flux estimate and the assigned uncertainties. However, extracting information about N₂O fluxes from atmospheric observations is extremely challenging owing to the small signal to noise ratio of these measurements. For instance, the typical precision on a discrete air sample is about 0.3 ppb while the annual mean inter-hemispheric gradient is 1.4 ppb. In addition, there are complications of atmospheric transport, in particular, STE (Nevison et al., 2011). This is one of the main motivations for this study, i.e., to investigate what can be learnt from atmospheric measurements of N₂O and to what extent these can advance knowledge about surface fluxes. Simulations of N₂O using CTMs can help our understanding of the influence of transport on N₂O spatial and temporal variability. Ultimately though, our knowledge about N₂O emissions through atmospheric inversions will only improve with a quantification of the uncertainties in modelled atmospheric transport and in the prior emissions.

TransCom is a community that was established in the early 1990s primarily to examine the performance of CTMs. Early studies included verification of transport using the anthropogenic tracer SF₆ (Denning et al., 1999) and examining simulations of atmospheric CO₂ (Law et al., 1996, 2008). More recently, there was a TransCom study to investigate the roles of emissions, transport and chemical loss on CH₄ (Patra et al., 2011). In this TransCom study, we examine the influence of emissions, tropospheric transport and STE on the variability in atmospheric N₂O. In particular, we focus on

annual to seasonal time-scales. Additionally, we aim to assess the influence of atmospheric transport errors on modelled N₂O concentrations, which are used in the interpretation of inverse modelling results for N₂O emissions (discussed in a companion paper by Thompson et al., 2013b). Six different models and two model variants are included in this forward inter-comparison study and five atmospheric inversion models were included in the inversion study.

In Sect. 2, we describe the atmospheric observations used in the inter-comparison and give details about the models that participated in this study as well as about the study's protocol. Following this, in Sect. 3.1, we present the inter-comparison of large-scale transport features such as the inter-hemispheric (IH) gradient and cross-tropopause gradient. In Sect. 3.2, we examine the tropospheric N₂O seasonal cycle and use comparisons with SF₆ and CFC-12 to help disentangle the contributions from STE, tropospheric transport and surface emissions on N₂O concentrations. CFC-12 has been previously used as a tracer for STE (Nevison et al., 2007) as it has comparatively well known emissions, which have little seasonal variability but, like N₂O, it is only lost in the stratosphere. SF₆ is a useful tracer for tropospheric transport, as it also has comparatively well known emissions, which are largely in the Northern Hemisphere (NH) and it can be treated as inert since it has an estimated lifetime of between 800 and 3200 yr (Morris et al., 1995, Ravishankara et al., 1993). Lastly, in Sect. 4, we discuss what can be learnt about N₂O emissions from model-observation comparisons and the implications of atmospheric transport uncertainties for N₂O emission estimates from inversions.

2 Observations, models and methods

2.1 Modelling protocol

A schematic overview of the modelling protocol is shown in Fig. 1 with the different components of the model set-up. To facilitate the analysis of the results in terms of

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc



Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



atmospheric transport, all models were requested to use the same prior fluxes (for N₂O, SF₆ and CFC-12) and the same magnitude for the stratospheric sinks of N₂O and CFC-12. On the other hand, each transport model used its own meteorological analysis data or, alternatively, meteorological fields nudged to analysis data in offline atmospheric transport runs (see Table 1). Since each transport model has different vertical and horizontal resolution, each model also used its own initial 3-D mixing ratio fields.

For simulations of N₂O, it was necessary to account for the loss of N₂O in the stratosphere due to photolysis (circa 90 % of the loss) and oxidation by O(¹D) (circa 10 %) (Minschwaner et al., 1993). These processes can be summarized by the following 3 equations:



Losses of N₂O were calculated on the basis of these equations within each CTM for every grid-cell and time-step. Although the exact photolysis and oxidation rates varied between models, these were suggested to be scaled such that the global annual total loss of N₂O was approximately 12.5 Tg N, consistent with estimates of the atmospheric abundance and the lifetime of N₂O, which is estimated to be between 124 and 130 yr (Prather et al., 2012; Volk et al., 1997). Similarly, for models participating in the CFC-12 inter-comparison, it was necessary to account for photolysis of CFC-12 in the stratosphere (R4), which accounts for 93 to 97 % of the total loss (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998). This was done in the same way as for N₂O, that is, the photolysis rates were scaled to be consistent with a CFC-12 lifetime of circa 100 yr.



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Model simulations were made using meteorology and surface emissions for the period from 1 January 2005 to 31 December 2009, with 2005 being considered as a “spin-up” year and was, therefore, not included in the analysis. A 1 yr spin-up was considered sufficient as all models started already with their best-estimated initial conditions taken from previous model integrations.

2.2 Prior fluxes

Four different N₂O emission scenarios were provided to investigate the influence of varying terrestrial and ocean fluxes. All scenarios were comprised of fluxes from the terrestrial biosphere, oceans, biomass burning, waste, fuel combustion and industry and differed only in the estimate of either the terrestrial biosphere or the ocean fluxes (see Tables 2 and 3). Each component flux used to build the scenarios is described below (these were originally provided at monthly temporal and 1.0° × 1.0° spatial resolution unless otherwise stated):

1. Terrestrial biosphere: includes fluxes from natural and cultivated ecosystems from the Orchidee O-CN terrestrial biosphere model (Zaehle and Friend, 2010). The model is driven by climate data (CRU-NCEP) and inter-annually varying N inputs. Data were originally provided at 3.75° × 2.5° (longitude by latitude) resolution. These fluxes are referred to as OCN.
2. Natural ecosystem: fluxes from uncultivated ecosystems from the empirical model of Bouwman et al. (2002). These fluxes are annual only and are a climatological mean.
3. Agriculture: fluxes from cultivated ecosystems from EDGAR-4.1 at annual resolution (Emission Database for Greenhouse gas and Atmospheric Research, available at: <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/index.php>). These fluxes together with the natural ecosystem fluxes of Bouwman et al. (2002) are referred to as BMW.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

4. Waste, combustion and industry: fluxes from fossil fuel combustion, industrial solvents, solid and water waste provided by EDGAR-4.1 at annual resolution (data available at: <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/index.php>).

5. Ocean: three different flux estimates were used. The first estimate, PIC, was taken from the ocean-biogeochemistry model, PISCES (Aumont and Bopp, 2006) with an original non-regular resolution of approximately 2° longitude × 1° latitude. The second and third estimates were based on extrapolations of observations of N₂O partial pressure anomalies in the surface ocean that have been coupled to air-sea gas exchange coefficients. The N95 fluxes use the Nevison et al. (1995) estimate at 1.0° × 1.0° resolution, while the N04 fluxes use the Nevison et al. (2004) estimate at 0.5° × 0.5° resolution.

6. Biomass burning: fluxes from GFED-2.1 (Global Fire Emissions Database; (van der Werf et al., 2010)).

The four flux estimates were then formed using one of the terrestrial biosphere fluxes, OCN or BWM, and one of the ocean fluxes, PIC, N95 or N04, plus the fluxes from biomass burning, waste, combustion and industry. The scenario, OCNPIC, was used as the control scenario and was used for all model-observation comparisons unless otherwise stated.

Emissions of CFC-12 were provided based on the EDGAR-2 estimate but were scaled to the annual global totals estimated by McCulloch et al. (2003). The global emission in e.g. 2006 was 40 Ggyr⁻¹. SF₆ emissions were based on the EDGAR-4.1 estimate and were scaled to the top-down global annual totals of Levin et al. (2010). The global emission in 2006 was 6.3 Ggyr⁻¹. Both CFC-12 and SF₆ emissions were at 1.0° × 1.0° spatial resolution and were linearly interpolated to monthly temporal resolution.

2.3 Transport models

Six models and two of their variants participated in the forward N₂O inter-comparison experiment and all of these models have also been included in at least one previous TransCom experiment (Law et al., 2008; Patra et al., 2011). The salient features of each transport model, i.e. the horizontal and vertical resolution and meteorological input are given in Table 1. All models used meteorological fields from weather forecast models (MERRA, NCEP, JRA25, and ECMWF) either by interpolating (offline models) or by nudging towards fields of horizontal winds and temperature (online models). Model output was generated at each site used in the analysis (see Sect. 2.4): as an hourly average (ACTMt42I32, ACTMt42I67), a 1.5 hourly average (TM5), an interpolation to the observation time-step (TM3-NCEP, TM3-ERA), or at the closest model time-step to the observation time (LMDZ4, TOMCAT). Additionally, 3-D fields of monthly mean N₂O mixing ratios were archived (higher temporal resolutions were not requested since this study only looks at seasonal and longer timescales and owing to the large file sizes).

2.4 Observations and data processing

Atmospheric observations of N₂O dry-air mole fractions were pooled from three global networks: NOAA CCGG (Carbon Cycle and Greenhouse Gases), NOAA HATS (Halocarbons and other Atmospheric Trace Species), and AGAGE (Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment), as well as from regular aircraft transects made by NOAA (see Table 4 and Fig. A2). Discrete air samples (flasks) taken in the NOAA CCGG network and in aircraft profiles were analysed for N₂O using GC-ECD (Gas Chromatography with an Electron Capture Detector) and are reported on the NOAA-2006A calibration scale (Hall et al., 2007) and have a reproducibility of 0.4 ppb based on the mean difference of flask pairs. Both NOAA HATS and AGAGE operate networks of in-situ GC-ECD instruments. NOAA HATS data are reported on the NOAA-2006A scale and have a repeatability of approximately 0.3 ppb (Thompson et al., 2004) and data from AGAGE are reported on the SIO-1998 scale and have a preci-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



sion of approximately 0.1 ppb (Prinn et al., 2000). In addition, observations of CFC-12 and SF₆ mole fractions (pmol mol⁻¹, equivalently parts-per-trillion, ppt) were used from the NOAA HATS and AGAGE networks. Both NOAA HATS measurements were made using in-situ GC-ECD while AGAGE measurements of CFC-12 were made using GC-ECD and SF₆ measurements were made with GC-MS. CFC-12 data are reported on the NOAA-2008 (NOAA HATS) and SIO-2005 (AGAGE) scales and SF₆ data are reported on the NOAA-2006 (NOAA HATS) and SIO-2005 (AGAGE) scales.

Surface measurements were filtered for outliers using an iterative filter removing values that were outside two standard deviations of the mean over a time interval of three months for flask measurements and three days for in-situ measurements. Data were provided to the modellers at hourly resolution for in-situ data and approximately two-weekly resolution (depending on availability) for flask data. For N₂O, calibration offsets between networks, and even between in-situ GCs within a network, are considerable compared to the measurement precision; therefore, prior values of these offsets were estimated by comparing timeseries from different networks (see Table 5).

Mean seasonal cycles were calculated for N₂O, CFC-12 and SF₆ by first removing the multi-annual trend, fitted as a second-order polynomial for N₂O and SF₆ and as a third-order polynomial for CFC-12, and then filtering the timeseries for high-frequency noise using a Butterworth filter. The residuals for each month were then averaged over all years. This method was chosen preferentially over methods involving fitting harmonic curves as these parameterizations impose a strong prior form on the seasonal cycle, which may be unrealistic at sites where the cycle has small amplitude and/or is irregular.

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

the models with low vertical resolution (LMDZ4 with only 19η layers) and those with few stratospheric layers (ACTMt42I32 and TM3-NCEP) (see Fig. A1).

The stratosphere can be classified into upper and lower realms to better describe STE. The upper stratosphere (the so-called “overworld”) lies entirely above the 380 K isentrope, while the lower stratosphere has the tropopause as its lower bound and the 380 K isentrope as its upper bound. Isentropic surfaces intersect the tropopause in the extra-tropics, lying partly in the lower extra-tropical stratosphere and partly in the troposphere. Air masses can thus be mixed adiabatically between the troposphere and lower stratosphere along isentropes that intersect the tropopause (Holton et al., 1995). Since on annual timescales there is no net change in the mass of the lower stratosphere, exchange across the 380 K isentropic surface can be considered as representative of the net STE (Schoeberl, 2004). This is a particularly useful simplification for species such as N_2O and CFC-12, which have a source to the troposphere and stratospheric sink. Table 6 shows the height of the tropopause and the gradients across the tropopause and the 380 K isentropic surface in each model. Tropopause heights were calculated as the height at which the temperature lapse rate becomes less than 2 K km^{-1} (Reichler et al., 2003). The height of the tropopause and 380 K isentrope is fairly consistent between all models, i.e. within $\pm 4\%$ and $\pm 12\%$ of the mean, respectively. LMDZ4 has the strongest gradients across 380 K isentrope in the tropics and extra-tropics owing to the low vertical resolution, while TM3-NCEP has the weakest gradients owing to strong vertical mixing.

3.1.2 Growth rate and lifetime

The tropospheric growth rate of N_2O is determined by the sum of the surface emissions and the net flux of N_2O across the tropopause and, on annual timescales, across the 380 K isentrope. Since all models use the same prior fluxes (OCNPIC), differences in the modelled growth rates are due directly to differences in the net cross-tropopause N_2O flux, which depends on the upward and downward mass fluxes and on the above and below tropopause N_2O mixing ratios. Table 7 shows the annual mean (2006–2009)

TransCom N_2O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



5 tropospheric N₂O growth rates, total abundance, total sink, and the atmospheric lifetime of N₂O. Tropospheric growth rates were calculated in both the models and the observations as the mean growth rate at background surface sites (these were: ZEP, BRW, ALT, SHM, MHD, THD, IZO, KUM, MLO, RPB, CHR, SEY, SMO, ASC, EIC, CGO, TDF, HBA, and SPO, for a description of the sites see Table 4). The total sink was calculated directly by adding up the loss at each timestep (except in ACTMt42I32 where it was calculated as the difference between the total source and the change in total burden) and the lifetime was calculated as the atmospheric N₂O abundance up to approximately 10 50 hPa divided by the global annual loss. Most models have tropospheric growth rates close to the observed rate of 0.84 ppbyr⁻¹ with the exceptions of ACTMt42I32 and LMDZ4, which have substantially lower rates. Figure 3 shows the relationship between growth rate and lifetime for the observations and models. Although in ACTMt42I32 the low growth rate can be explained by the anomalously large sink (16 TgNyr⁻¹) and correspondingly short lifetime (92 yr), in LMDZ4 it is not so straightforward. LMDZ4 has been shown to be a relatively diffuse model with fast venting of the Planetary Boundary Layer (PBL) (Geels et al., 2007), which results in N₂O being mixed too rapidly into higher altitudes and insufficient accumulation of N₂O in the PBL. TOMCAT, despite capturing the growth rate, has a shorter lifetime owing to the low abundance of N₂O in the troposphere and stratosphere. The problems in LMDZ4 and TOMCAT could be 20 rectified at least to some extent by using longer spin-up times, which would bring the vertical gradients closer to steady-state.

3.2 Tropospheric transport

3.2.1 Vertical gradients

25 Vertical mixing ratio gradients represent the combined influence of surface fluxes and atmospheric transport. For N₂O, the surface fluxes are largely from the land and these are predominantly positive, therefore, the mixing ratio generally decreases with altitude. Sites located in the interior or downwind of continents show stronger gradients

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



than those downwind of ocean basins owing to the stronger influence of land fluxes. However, at sites where there are only weak surface fluxes, the gradient may be heavily influenced by lateral transport and in some cases become positive in the troposphere. Figure 4 shows the seasonal and annual mean modelled (using the OCNPIC flux scenario) and observed vertical gradients of N₂O mixing ratio at the NOAA GMD aircraft profiling sites: Raratonga (RTA, 21° S, 160° E), Hawaii (HAA, 21° N, 158° W), Ulaanbaatar (ULB, 47° N, 106° E) and Poker Flats (PFA, 65° N, 147° W). For all vertical gradients (from the surface to 6000 m), the mean modelled/observed tropospheric mixing ratio at each station has been subtracted. At RTA, located in the South Pacific, a strong positive N₂O gradient of approximately 0.8 ppb (0 to 6000 m) is observed in June–August, as well as in the annual mean, while no significant gradient is observed in December–February. A similar feature is also seen in the SF₆ profiles at this site (not shown). The seasonal change in gradient corresponds with the north-south oscillation of the inter-tropical convergence zone (ITCZ). In the NH summer the ITCZ lies north of the equator, thus air from the NH tropics, which has a higher N₂O mixing ratio, is mixed into the southern Hadley cell and descends in the SH sub-tropics. Only the two ACTM models and TOMCAT approximately capture the strength of the gradient but in TOMCAT, the maximum mixing ratio occurs at too low altitude. The other models (MOZART4, TM5, TM3-NCEP, TM3-ERA, and LMDZ4) all underestimate the June–August and annual mean gradients to varying degrees. This appears not to be simply related to the Inter-Hemispheric (IH) exchange time, as TM5 has a long IH exchange time, while in LMDZ4 it is relatively short and in MOZART4 it is close to that observed (Patra et al., 2011). At HAA, located in the North Pacific, the air column above the PBL is very well mixed owing to the absence of strong local sources and to vigorous vertical mixing. All models are able to reproduce the observed vertical profile at this site. ULB is a mid-latitude station in central Mongolia. A negative vertical gradient is observed in all seasons, except autumn when it is positive, and has an annual mean value of approximately 0.4 ppb (from 1500 to 4000 m). The gradient is underestimated by all models (with the exception of TOMCAT in June–August) suggesting that either the emissions

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



are underestimated in central Asia or that the modelled vertical mixing for this region is too strong. Although we cannot rule out the first possibility, the later is consistent with previous studies, which found a systematic over-estimate of vertical mixing in the troposphere in northern mid-latitudes by CTMs (e.g. Stephens et al., 2007). At the high northern latitude site, PFA in Alaska, weak negative gradients are observed, approximately 0.2 ppb (1000 to 6000 m) for the annual mean. The gradient becomes stronger in December–February above 5000 m owing to the descent of N₂O-poor air from the lower stratosphere. At this site, the shape and strength of the gradient is fairly well reproduced by all models, a feature which is discussed further in Sect. 3.3.1 in relation to the N₂O seasonal cycle in the high northern latitudes.

3.2.2 Meridional gradients

Meridional gradients and IH differences are some of the most commonly used constraints on tropospheric transport (Gloor et al., 2007; Patra et al., 2011). Patra et al. (2011) showed that most state-of-the-art transport models agree closely in the IH gradient of SF₆ (for which the emissions are fairly well known) as well as in the IH exchange rate. This study similarly finds good agreement with the observed SF₆ IH difference for all models that provided SF₆ simulations; however, the agreement is much poorer for N₂O (Figs. 5 and 6). Here the IH difference is calculated as the difference between the mean of all mixing ratios at background sites between 20–90° S and 20–90° N. All transport models underestimate the N₂O IH difference, regardless of which prior flux scenario is used (Table 8 and Fig. A3). The scenario BWMN04 results in the lowest IH differences for all models, while differences among the “OCN” scenarios are small and not consistent for all models. Considering the good agreement, or in some cases even overestimate, for SF₆, the poor agreement in the IH difference for N₂O is likely due to an inaccurate distribution of emissions between the NH and SH and/or too strong stratosphere to troposphere transport (STT) in the NH relative to the SH. The ocean N₂O flux estimates from Nevison et al. (1995, 2004) have been shown to overestimate the net ocean-atmosphere flux in the Southern Ocean (Hirsch

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



et al., 2006; Huang et al., 2008) but this overestimate alone is not sufficient to explain the model-observation mismatch in the IH difference. Approximately, a difference of 6.5 Tg N between the NH and SH emissions is needed to explain the observed IH mixing ratio difference of 1.44 ppb. With all models underestimating the observed gradient by at least 0.33 ppb (23 %), which is equivalent to a mass of approximately 1.5 Tg N, and assuming the overestimate of the Southern Ocean emissions to be approximately 1.0 Tg N (Hirsch et al., 2006) leaves an unexplained north-south difference of 0.5 Tg N. This could be due to errors in STT in the NH or it could be that there is still a bias in NH vs. SH emissions, which could be corrected by a combination of reducing SH emissions and increasing NH emissions. The distribution of emissions within each hemisphere also influences how well each model captures the meridional gradient. The interplay between emissions and transport errors in each model explains why the models do not all respond in the same way to the different flux scenarios, with respect to the IH difference and meridional gradient.

3.3 Factors determining the seasonality of N₂O

The seasonality of N₂O is determined by a combination of STT, tropospheric transport and surface fluxes (Ishijima et al., 2010). However, the importance of each of these determinants, and how this changes with latitude, remains uncertain. Nevison et al. (2007, 2011) have demonstrated the importance of seasonality in STT for the N₂O seasonal cycle in the troposphere but this mechanism appears to be less important in mid to low latitudes where seasonality in the surface fluxes appears to dominate (Ishijima et al., 2010). We examine the varying influences on the tropospheric N₂O seasonal cycle focusing on seven sites, which cover a wide range of latitudes: BRW, MHD, THD, MLO, SMO, CGO, and SPO (see Table 4). While most are background sites, MHD, CGO, and THD are affected by local to regional-scale fluxes. MHD is periodically influenced by transport from the European continent (Biraud et al., 2002; Manning et al., 2011) and CGO is occasionally influenced by transport from southeastern Australia (Wilson et al., 1997). THD is affected by transport from the North American continent and, in

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



the case of N₂O, by N₂O emissions from upwelling along the Californian coast (Lueker et al., 2003). THD is also a difficult site to model owing to the strong land/sea breeze cycle. Although this is not reproduced in global models, we expect the error in the simulated N₂O due to transport to be considerably smaller than for CO₂ since there is no significant diurnal cycle in N₂O fluxes, thus there is no diurnal rectifying effect.

Only ACTMt42I67, TM3-ERA, LMDZ4 and TOMCAT participated in the CFC-12 and SF₆ inter-comparisons, thus we have results for all three species from only these four models. The results of the inter-comparisons are presented in the following sections.

3.3.1 Influence of STT and tropospheric transport

To examine the influence of STT on the tropospheric seasonal cycle, we compare with CFC-12 because, like N₂O, the CFC-12 seasonal cycle is strongly influenced by STT (Liang et al., 2009; Nevison et al., 2007) but, unlike N₂O, the seasonality in the surface fluxes is likely to be only very small. The phase of the modelled seasonal cycle, i.e. the month of the minimum, for CFC-12 (upper panel) and N₂O (lower panel) is shown as a function of latitude and pressure in Fig. 7. In all models, the NH CFC-12 and N₂O minima develop in the lower stratosphere and upper troposphere in winter and reach the lower troposphere in May–June in the low to mid latitudes and in July–August in the high latitudes (TM3-NCEP is an exception as the minima occur about 1 month earlier compared to the other models). In the SH, the modelled minima develop in the lower stratosphere and upper troposphere in the austral spring to early summer, following the breakup of the polar vortex (except in TM3-NCEP where it is circa 2 months later). There is a lag of circa 1 to 3 months for the minima to reach the lower troposphere, where it occurs between January–April. We first examine the modelled seasonality in the lower troposphere by comparing with observations of N₂O, CFC-12 and SF₆ from the AGAGE and NOAA surface networks, and second, examine the N₂O seasonality at altitude by comparing with observations from NOAA flight profiles. Figure 8 shows the mean seasonal cycle (2006–2009) in N₂O, CFC-12 and SF₆ at AGAGE and NOAA

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



surface sites. The seasonal cycle amplitudes have been normalized by the mean tropospheric abundance of each species to simplify the comparison between them.

Northern Hemisphere

In the mid to high northern latitudes, a minimum in N₂O and CFC-12 is observed on average in August but for N₂O the timing varies from July to September depending on the year. At BRW and MHD, a considerable phase shift in the modelled N₂O seasonal cycle can be seen with respect to the observations, with the modelled minimum occurring between 2 and 4 months too early (Fig. 8). For CFC-12, however, the modelled seasonality coincides with the observations at MHD and is only circa 1 month too early at BRW (one exception is TM3-ERA at MHD, which has no clear seasonal cycle). The good agreement for CFC-12 for most models indicates that transport of air from the lower stratosphere into the troposphere in the high northern latitudes is adequately represented and, therefore, suggests that the model-observation phase shift in N₂O at these two sites is at least in part due to incorrect seasonality in emissions in the northern mid to high latitudes (this will be discussed further in Sect. 3.3.2). At THD the observed and modelled seasonality in CFC-12 closely resembles that at MHD and BRW, whereas for N₂O the seasonality observed at THD has only circa half the amplitude and the phase is quite different with respect MHD and BRW. This points to a significant influence of N₂O surface fluxes on the observed seasonal cycle at this site, as also found by Nevison et al. (2011), and is most likely out-of-phase with the STT influence (also discussed further in Sect. 3.3.2). In the tropics, at MLO, the observed seasonality in N₂O and CFC-12 has the same phase but only circa quarter of the amplitude of that seen at BRW while the modelled N₂O cycle, in contrast, has approximately the same amplitude as at BRW.

From the comparison of the observed seasonal cycles in the NH, a small shift to later CFC-12 and N₂O minima with increasing latitude was found (see Table 9) (THD is an exception as the N₂O seasonal cycle is strongly influenced by local land and ocean fluxes). The shift to later minimum with increasing latitude is also reproduced by

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



most of the models (Fig. 7) and is consistent with the current understanding of STT. Air masses from the lower stratosphere are more strongly mixed into the troposphere in the extra-tropics where the transport can occur adiabatically along isentropes intersecting the tropopause (James et al., 2003; Stohl et al., 2003). Furthermore, once air masses cross the tropopause, they can be rapidly transported to the lower troposphere in the downward branch of the Hadley cell around 30° (James et al., 2003). Therefore, the minimum is observed earlier in the mid latitudes than in the high latitudes where the rate of vertical transport is slower. Stratospheric air masses are then transported with the mean tropospheric meridional circulation towards higher latitudes. Considering this, the small phase shift in modelled CFC-12 (and part of the N₂O phase shift) compared with the observations at BRW may in fact be due to too rapid transport within the troposphere rather than too rapid or too early mixing across the tropopause.

Southern Hemisphere

In SH high-latitudes, the observed N₂O and CFC-12 seasonal cycles differ significantly to those of the NH (i.e. they are not 6 months out-of-phase). Most models predict the minima at SPO in January–February, i.e. too early by circa 2 months (ACTMt42l32 is an exception where the N₂O minimum is about 2 months too late). However, for SF₆, the models match the observed cycle reasonably well at CGO and SPO. This can be understood in that the SF₆ seasonal cycle in the SH is largely due to seasonality in IH exchange and the strong meridional gradient in the atmosphere (Denning et al., 1999; Prinn et al., 2000), which appears to be satisfactorily represented in the models. On the other hand, the N₂O and CFC-12 seasonal cycles are strongly modulated by STT and, in the case of N₂O, weakly modulated by ocean fluxes. The importance of STT has been shown previously at CGO using measurements of CFC-11 and CFC-12 (Nevison et al., 2005) and δ¹⁸O and δ¹⁵N isotopes in N₂O (Park et al., 2012). The model-observation mismatch for N₂O and CFC-12 points to a deficiency in modelling STT in the SH. However, it is not easy to explain why the maximum influence of STT (resulting in a minimum in N₂O and CFC-12) is seen in April–May, which is 2 to 3 months

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



later than one would expect given the winter (May to August) maximum in diabatic STT, the spring increase in tropopause height, and the spring break-up of the polar vortex, and points to gaps in our knowledge about STT in the SH. The observed seasonal cycles of N₂O and CFC-12 at SMO are closely in phase with that of SF₆, which can be explained in terms of IH transport and the north-south mixing ratio gradient and is consistent with previous studies (Nevison et al., 2007).

Altitude changes

To further investigate the influence of STT, we compare the modelled seasonal cycles at 4 different altitude ranges, from the lower troposphere to the tropopause, with NOAA aircraft data (unfortunately there is insufficient data coverage at RTA to be able to compare the seasonal cycles at this site). Figure 9 shows the observed and modelled N₂O as monthly means with the growth rate subtracted (as given in Table 7). At PFA, the influence of STT is seen between 6000 and 10 000 m with an observed minimum occurring in late June. The timing of this minimum appears to be inconsistent with a winter maximum in diabatic STT due to the Brewer Dobson Circulation. However, as pointed out by Schoeberl (2004), most of the mass-exchange between the lower stratosphere and troposphere can be related to changes in the tropopause height with the maximum mass transfer to the troposphere actually occurring in spring as the tropopause height is increasing. In which case, allowing for the lag time for vertical and horizontal transport within the troposphere of approximately 2 months according to Liang et al. (2009), a June minimum is not unexpected. Another consideration for the timing of the minimum is the seasonal cycle of N₂O in the stratosphere itself, which must be convolved with that of STT to explain the influence on tropospheric seasonality (Liang et al., 2009). Since N₂O is destroyed photochemically, extra-tropical stratospheric loss of N₂O has a maximum in summer and minimum in winter, thus the phase of the seasonal cycle in the stratosphere will lead to a later minimum in the troposphere (as compared to no seasonality in the stratosphere). Below 6000 m, the minimum occurs significantly later again, in August. The reason for the August minimum is likely twofold: (1) owing to the

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

time needed to transport the STT influence in the mid latitudes (where most STT occurs) to the high northern latitudes and (2) owing to the increase in PBL height, which means the fluxes are mixed into a greater volume of air, thereby decreasing the mixing ratio. Although all models predict a too early minimum above 6000 m (by circa 2.5 months), the phase shift between the modelled and observed minima is fairly constant across all altitudes, consistent with the finding that the modelled vertical gradient at this site agrees with observations (see Fig. 4).

At ULB, the influence of STT can be seen between 4000 and 6000 m with a minimum in July but the amplitude of the cycle decreases at lower altitudes suggesting a weaker influence of STT in the lower troposphere at this latitude. Although the phase of the cycle in the 4000–6000 m altitude range is fairly closely captured by most models, they overestimate its amplitude below 4000 m. Lastly, at HAA, the observed seasonal cycle is consistent in amplitude and phase from 500 to 6000 m, owing to vigorous vertical mixing. However, all models predict a too early minimum below 6000 m and overestimate the amplitude suggesting that the modelled influence of STT at this latitude is too strong.

3.3.2 Influence of surface fluxes

The influence of changing the surface fluxes of N₂O on the seasonal cycle in the lower troposphere was investigated by performing four different transport model integrations with each of the four prior flux estimates: OCNPIC, OCN95, OCN04 and BWMN04 (see Tables 2 and 3 for details and Fig. A4 for Hovmöller plots of the flux components). Figure 10 compares the observed and modelled seasonal cycles at each site (BRW, MHD, THD, MLO, SMO, and CGO) as a separate panel, and the four subplots within each panel are for each of the four flux scenarios. Also shown within each subplot, is the area weighted mean N₂O flux for an area of 10° × 30° (latitude by longitude) centred on the site. At BRW, the best match to the observed cycle was provided by the BWMN04 fluxes while the other three (all using OCN terrestrial biosphere fluxes) were very similar in phase and amplitude. Around the site itself, the flux is very low and there

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

is little difference between the BWM and OCN terrestrial fluxes (the flux difference is solely due to the choice of ocean flux estimate). The improved fit to the seasonal cycle in the mixing ratio at BRW, therefore, must result from the difference between OCN and BWM in the mid northern latitudes; OCN predicts a late summer maximum while there is no seasonal cycle in BWM. The phase modelled with BWMN04 matches almost exactly (correlation coefficient $R^2 \geq 0.95$) for all models except TM3-NCEP. Furthermore, considering that for CFC-12 at this site has a phase shift of only approximately 1 month, the mismatch in the OCN simulations is unlikely to be from transport model errors. Similarly at MHD, BWMN04 provides the best fit to the observations ($R^2 \geq 0.79$, except TM3-NCEP). These results show that the inclusion of a seasonal cycle in the OCN terrestrial fluxes does not improve the fit to the observations but rather makes it worse, indicating that the seasonality, in particular the late summer maximum, in OCN is not realistic. From what is known about the processes driving the terrestrial biosphere N₂O flux, higher emissions are expected during the growing season owing to warmer soil temperatures leading to increased microbial activity and higher reactive nitrogen turnover rates. However, OCN most likely overestimates the late summer emissions while underestimating the emissions in spring and early summer. This is due to lack of a vertically resolved soil-layer, which prevents the realistic simulation of the impact of rain events and tends to predict anoxic soil conditions, necessary for N₂O production via denitrification, predominantly in summer rather than distributed throughout the year as would be more realistic (personal communication, S. Zaehle, 2012). This result highlights the complexity of modelling terrestrial ecosystem N₂O fluxes and the need for independent validation. Again at THD, BWMN04 gives the closest fit to the observed seasonal cycle matching the amplitude but still resulting in a too early minimum by circa 3 months. Since THD is also strongly influenced by N₂O emissions from upwelling along the Californian coast (Lueker et al., 2003), this model-observation mismatch may also indicate deficiencies in the coastal N₂O fluxes.

At MLO, the regional flux differences are due to differences between the ocean flux models, PIC, N95 and N04. However, an improvement in the modelled seasonal cycle

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



in N₂O mixing ratio only occurs when the BWM terrestrial fluxes are used ($R^2 \geq 0.27$, except TM3-NCEP, compared with no correlation with the other fluxes). This shows that the seasonality at MLO is also influenced by NH terrestrial fluxes as has also been previously shown (Patra et al., 2005). For SMO, the modelled seasonality is very similar for all flux models (N04 results in a small phase shift to a later minimum), which can be understood in that this site is strongly affected by IH exchange rather than the seasonality of surface fluxes in this latitude. In the southern mid-latitudes, at CGO, OCNPIC and OCNN95 give the best agreement to the observed seasonal cycle. Replacing the terrestrial biosphere fluxes, OCN, with BWM made no significant difference, as expected since this site is only very weakly influenced by land fluxes. For SPO, changing the fluxes had negligible influence on the modelled mixing ratios (this site is not shown), highlighting again the importance of STT at this site.

4 Summary and conclusions

This TransCom study has investigated the influence of emissions, tropospheric transport and Stratosphere–Troposphere Exchange (STE) on the variability in atmospheric N₂O, focusing on seasonal to annual time-scales. In particular, our aim has been to examine the influence of errors in atmospheric transport vs. errors in prior fluxes on modelled mixing ratios by comparing simulated mixing ratios with atmospheric observations of N₂O as well as CFC-12 to assess the ability of models to reproduce STE and, additionally, of SF₆ to assess the tropospheric transport in the models. Knowledge about prior flux and transport errors has important implications for the set-up of inverse models for estimating N₂O surface emissions and for the interpretation of their results. In total, six different transport models and two model variants were included in this inter-comparison.

To assess the representation of global-scale transport and, in particular, inter-hemispheric transport, we compared the modelled and observed IH gradients of N₂O and SF₆. We found good agreement between the modeled and observed south to north

gradient and IH difference for SF₆ in line with previous studies (e.g. Patra et al., 2011), which indicates that the models adequately capture the rate of IH mixing as well as mixing between tropical and extra-tropical regions. For N₂O, however, the IH difference was underestimated compared to the observations in all models by at least 0.33 ppb, equivalent to approximately 1.5 Tg N. Assuming that emissions in the Southern Ocean are overestimated by approximately 1. Tg N (Hirsch et al., 2006) leaves an unexplained north-south difference of 0.5 Tg N. This most likely indicates a larger NH to SH source ratio than prescribed in the prior emissions but an over-estimate of the influence of STT in the NH may also still contribute to the model-observation difference in the IH gradient.

Using a combination of aircraft profiles (NOAA flights) and surface sites (NOAA and AGAGE networks), we have compared the modelled and observed N₂O seasonal cycles from the surface to the upper troposphere and the CFC-12 and SF₆ seasonal cycles at the surface. We found that all models that simulated CFC-12 accurately matched the phase and amplitude of the CFC-12 cycle at MHD and were only circa 1 month out-of-phase at BRW. In contrast, modelled N₂O seasonal cycles were all 2–3 months out-of-phase at both sites. The model–observation mismatch in the N₂O seasonal cycle at NH sites is, thus, likely not to be due to errors in atmospheric transport, which on the basis of the CFC-12 comparison are in the order of the measurement precision (i.e. 0.1 ppb), but rather due to errors in the N₂O flux. Additionally, when the simulations using the BWM terrestrial ecosystem fluxes (as opposed to OCN) were compared, a much better agreement with the observations was found for BRW, MHD, THD and MLO. While the BWM fluxes have no seasonal component, OCN predicts a late summer maximum. Even after considering the seasonality of STT, a late summer maximum in the surface N₂O fluxes in the mid to high northern latitudes is inconsistent with observations. Late summer emissions are likely overestimated in OCN, while emissions in spring and autumn are likely underestimated. Furthermore, the timing of the N₂O mixing ratio minimum in the upper troposphere in the extra-tropical northern latitudes (in June–July) occurs too late to be predominantly due to the winter maximum in diabatic

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

STT i.e., driven by the Brewer Dobson circulation as previously suggested (Nevison et al., 2007, 2011) but rather is consistent with the effect of increasing tropopause height in spring (Schoeberl, 2004). This spring maximum in mass transfer, convoluted with the seasonality of N₂O loss in the stratosphere and the lag time for this signal to be transported in the troposphere (circa 2 months) more likely explains the phase of the observed signal.

In the southern low latitudes, at SMO, the influence is mostly from IH transport as previously found for SF₆ (Denning et al., 1999; Prinn et al., 2000) and N₂O (Nevison et al., 2007, 2011). While in the SH mid to high latitudes, CGO and SPO are strongly influenced by STT and weakly influenced by meridional transport and ocean surface fluxes, as previously shown (Park et al., 2012). The error at these sites due to transport is significant for all models, greater than 0.2 ppb, and thus will result in errors in the seasonality and, with seasonal dependence of atmospheric transport, in the location of emissions estimated from atmospheric inversions.

To conclude, the comparison of modelled and observed N₂O mixing ratios has been shown to provide important qualitative constraints on the broad spatial distribution of N₂O emissions and, in the NH, on their seasonality. However, modelled N₂O mixing ratios are sensitive to non-random model transport errors, particularly, in the magnitude of STT, which will contribute to errors in N₂O emissions estimates from atmospheric inversions. In the SH mid to high latitudes, the influence of transport errors on modelled N₂O mixing ratios is even more important, again largely due to errors in STT, and means that current estimates of seasonality and, to some extent, the location of N₂O emissions in the SH from atmospheric inversions may not be reliable.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank C. Nevison, S. Zaehle, L. Bouwman, L. Bopp, and G. van der Werf for providing their N₂O emissions estimates. We also thank F. Chevallier and S. Zaehle for their comments, which improved this manuscript. Additionally, we would like to acknowledge everyone who contributed to the measurements of N₂O without which we would not have been able to make this inter-comparison study.

References

- Aumont, O. and Bopp, L.: Globalizing results from ocean in situ iron fertilization studies, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 20, GB2017, doi:10.1029/2005gb002591, 2006.
- Biraud, S., Ciais, P., Ramonet, M., Simmonds, P., Kazan, V., Monfray, P., O'Doherty, S., Spain, G., and Jennings, S. G.: Quantification of carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and chloroform emissions over Ireland from atmospheric observations at Mace Head, *Tellus B*, 54, 41–60, 2002.
- Bouwman, A. F., Boumans, L. J. M., and Batjes, N. H.: Modeling global annual N₂O and NO emissions from fertilized fields, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 16, 1080, doi:10.1029/2001GB001812, 2002.
- Butler, J. H.: The NOAA Annual Greenhouse Gas Index, available at: <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/aggi/> (Januar 2014), 2011.
- Chipperfield, M. P.: New version of the TOMCAT/SIMCAT off-line chemical transport model: intercomparison of stratospheric tracer experiments, *Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 132, 1179–1203, 2006.
- Corazza, M., Bergamaschi, P., Vermeulen, A. T., Aalto, T., Haszpra, L., Meinhardt, F., O'Doherty, S., Thompson, R., Moncrieff, J., Popa, E., Steinbacher, M., Jordan, A., Dlugokencky, E., Brühl, C., Krol, M., and Dentener, F.: Inverse modelling of European N₂O emissions: assimilating observations from different networks, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 2381–2398, doi:10.5194/acp-11-2381-2011, 2011.
- Denning, A. S., Holzer, M., Gurney, K. R., Heimann, M., Law, R. M., Rayner, P. J., Fung, I. Y., Fan, S.-M., Taguchi, S., Freidlingstein, P., Balkanski, Y., Taylor, J., Maiss, M., and Levin, I.: Three-dimensional transport and concentration of SF₆: a model intercomparison study (TransCom 2), *Tellus B*, 51, 266–297, 1999.
- Emmons, L. K., Walters, S., Hess, P. G., Lamarque, J.-F., Pfister, G. G., Fillmore, D., Granier, C., Guenther, A., Kinnison, D., Laepple, T., Orlando, J., Tie, X., Tyndall, G., Wiedinmyer, C., Baughcum, S. L., and Kloster, S.: Description and evaluation of the Model for Ozone and Related chemical Tracers, version 4 (MOZART-4), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3, 43–67, doi:10.5194/gmd-3-43-2010, 2010.
- Forster, P., Ramaswamy, V., Artaxo, P., Bernsten, T., Betts, R., Fahey, D. W., Haywood, J., Lean, J., Lowe, D. C., Myhre, G., Nganga, J., Prinn, R., Raga, G., Schultz, M., and Van Dorland, R.: Changes in atmospheric constituents and in radiative forcing, in: *Climate Change*

ACPD

14, 2307–2362, 2014

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

2007: the Physical Science Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007.

5 Galloway, J. N., Townsend, A. R., Erisman, J. W., Bekunda, M., Cai, Z., Freney, J. R., Martinelli, L. A., Seitzinger, S. P., and Sutton, M. A.: Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends, questions, and potential solutions, *Science*, 320, 889–892, 2008.

Geels, C., Gloor, M., Ciais, P., Bousquet, P., Peylin, P., Vermeulen, A. T., Dargaville, R., Aalto, T., Brandt, J., Christensen, J. H., Frohn, L. M., Haszpra, L., Karstens, U., Rödenbeck, C., Ramonet, M., Carboni, G., and Santaguida, R.: Comparing atmospheric transport models for future regional inversions over Europe – Part 1: mapping the atmospheric CO₂ signals, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 3461–3479, doi:10.5194/acp-7-3461-2007, 2007.

10 Gloor, M., Dlugokencky, E., Brenninkmeijer, C., Horowitz, L., Hurst, D. F., Dutton, G., Crevoisier, C., Machida, T., and Tans, P.: Three-dimensional SF₆ data and tropospheric transport simulations: signals, modeling accuracy, and implications for inverse modeling, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D15112, doi:10.1029/2006JD007973, 2007.

Hall, B. D., Dutton, G. S., and Elkins, J. W.: The NOAA nitrous oxide standard scale for atmospheric observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D09305, doi:10.1029/2006jd007954, 2007.

Heimann, M. and Körner, S.: The global atmospheric tracer model TM3, Technical Report 5, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany, 2003.

15 Hirsch, A. I., Michalak, A. M., Bruhwiler, L. M., Peters, W., Dlugokencky, E. J., and Tans, P. P.: Inverse modeling estimates of the global nitrous oxide surface flux from 1998–2001, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 20, GB1008, doi:10.1029/2004GB002443, 2006.

Holton, J. R., Haynes, P. H., McIntyre, M. E., Douglass, A. R., Rood, R. B., and Pfister, L.: Stratosphere-troposphere exchange, *Rev. Geophys.*, 33, 403–439, 1995.

20 Hourdin, F., Musat, I., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Codron, F., Dufresne, J.-L., Fairhead, L., Filiberti, M.-A., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Krinner, G., Le Van, P., Li, Z.-X., and Lott, F.: The LMDZ4 general circulation model: climate performance and sensitivity to parameterized physics with emphasis on tropical convection, *Clim. Dynam.*, 27, 787–813, 2006.

30 Huang, J., Golombek, A., Prinn, R., Weiss, R., Fraser, P., Simmonds, P., Dlugokencky, E. J., Hall, B., Elkins, J., Steele, P., Langenfelds, R., Krummel, P., Dutton, P., and Porter, L.: Estimation of regional emissions of nitrous oxide from 1997 to 2005 using multinet network measure-

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

ments, a chemical transport model, and an inverse method, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D17313, doi:10.1029/2007JD009381, 2008.

Ishijima, K., Patra, P. K., Takigawa, M., Machida, T., Matsueda, H., Sawa, Y., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., Aoki, S., and Nakazawa, T.: Stratospheric influence on the seasonal cycle of nitrous oxide in the tropospheric as deduced from aircraft observations and model simulations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D20308, doi:10.1029/2009JD013322, 2010.

James, P., Stohl, A., Forster, C., Eckhardt, S., Seibert, P., and Frank, A.: A 15 yr climatology of stratosphere–troposphere exchange with a Lagrangian particle dispersion model. 2. Mean climate and seasonal variability, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 8522, doi:10.1029/2002JD002639, 2003.

Law, R. M., Rayner, P. J., Denning, A. S., Erickson, D., Fung, I. Y., Heimann, M., Piper, S. C., Ramonet, M., Taguchi, S., Taylor, J. A., Trudinger, C. M., and Watterson, I. G.: Variations in modeled atmospheric transport of carbon dioxide and the consequences for CO₂ inversions, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 10, 783–796, 1996.

Law, R. M., Peters, W., Rödenbeck, C., Aulagnier, C., Baker, I., Bergmann, D. J., Bousquet, P., Brandt, J., Bruhwiler, L., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Christensen, J. H., Delage, F., Denning, A. S., Fan, S., Geels, C., Houweling, S., Imasu, R., Karstens, U., Kawa, S. R., Kleist, J., Krol, M. C., Lin, S. J., Lokupitiya, R., Maki, T., Maksyutov, S., Niwa, Y., Onishi, R., Parazoo, N., Patra, P. K., Pieterse, G., Rivier, L., Satoh, M., Serrar, S., Taguchi, S., Takigawa, M., Vautard, R., Vermeulen, A. T., and Zhu, Z.: TransCom model simulations of hourly atmospheric CO₂: experimental overview and diurnal cycle results for 2002, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 22, GB3009, doi:10.1029/2007gb003050, 2008.

Levin, I., Naegler, T., Heinz, R., Osusko, D., Cuevas, E., Engel, A., Illmerger, J., Langenfelds, R. L., Neining, B., Rohden, C. v., Steele, L. P., Weller, R., Worthy, D. E., and Zimov, S. A.: The global SF₆ source inferred from long-term high precision atmospheric measurements and its comparison with emission inventories, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 2655–2662, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2655-2010, 2010.

Liang, Q., Douglass, A. R., Duncan, B. N., Stolarski, R. S., and Witte, J. C.: The governing processes and timescales of stratosphere-to-troposphere transport and its contribution to ozone in the Arctic troposphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 3011–3025, doi:10.5194/acp-9-3011-2009, 2009.

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Lueker, T. J., Walker, S. J., Vollmer, M. K., Keeling, R. F., Nevison, C. D., and Weiss, R. F.: Coastal upwelling air–sea fluxes revealed in atmospheric observations of O₂/N₂, CO₂ and N₂O, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 1292–1295, 2003.
- 5 Manning, A. J., O'Doherty, S., Jones, A. R., Simmonds, P. G., and Derwent, R. G.: Estimating UK methane and nitrous oxide emissions from 1990 to 2007 using an inversion modeling approach, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D02305, doi:10.1029/2010jd014763, 2011.
- McCulloch, A., Midgley, P. M., and Ashford, P.: Releases of refrigerant gases (CFC-12, HCFC-22 and HFC-134a) to the atmosphere, *Atmos. Environ.*, 37, 889–902, 2003.
- 10 Minschwaner, K., Salawitch, R. J., and McElroy, M. B.: Absorption of solar radiation by O₂: implications for O₃ and lifetimes of N₂O, CFCl₃, and CF₂Cl₂, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 10543–10561, 1993.
- Morris, R. A., Viggiano, A. A., Arnold, S. T., and Paulson, J. F.: Chemistry of atmospheric ions reacting with fully fluorinated compounds, *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.*, 149–150, 287–298, 1995.
- 15 Nevison, C. D., Weiss, R. F., and Erickson, D. J.: Global oceanic emission of nitrous oxide, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 15809–15820, 1995.
- Nevison, C. D., Lueker, T. J., and Weiss, R. F.: Quantifying the nitrous oxide source from coastal upwelling, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 18, GB1018, doi:10.1029/2003GB002110, 2004.
- Nevison, C. D., Keeling, R. F., Weiss, R. F., Popp, B. N., Jin, X., Fraser, P. J., Porter, L. W., and Hess, P. G.: Southern Ocean ventilation inferred from seasonal cycles of atmospheric N₂O and O₂/N₂ at Cape Grim, Tasmania, *Tellus B*, 57, 218–229, 2005.
- 20 Nevison, C. D., Mahowald, N. M., Weiss, R. F., and Prinn, R. G.: Interannual and seasonal variability in atmospheric N₂O, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 21, GB3017, doi:10.1029/2006gb002755, 2007.
- Nevison, C. D., Dlugokencky, E., Dutton, G., Elkins, J. W., Fraser, P., Hall, B., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., O'Doherty, S., Prinn, R. G., Steele, L. P., and Weiss, R. F.: Exploring causes of interannual variability in the seasonal cycles of tropospheric nitrous oxide, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3713–3730, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3713-2011, 2011.
- 25 Park, S., Croteau, P., Boering, K. A., Etheridge, D. M., Ferretti, D., Fraser, P. J., Kim, K. R., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., van Ommen, T. D., Steele, L. P., and Trudinger, C. M.: Trends and seasonal cycles in the isotopic composition of nitrous oxide since 1940, *Nat. Geosci.*, 5, 261–265, 2012.
- 30 Patra, P. K., Maksyutov, S., and Nakazawa, T.: Analysis of atmospheric CO₂ growth rates at Mauna Loa using CO₂ fluxes derived from an inverse model, *Tellus B*, 57, 357–365, 2005.

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Patra, P. K., Takigawa, M., Dutton, G. S., Uhse, K., Ishijima, K., Lintner, B. R., Miyazaki, K., and Elkins, J. W.: Transport mechanisms for synoptic, seasonal and interannual SF₆ variations and “age” of air in troposphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 1209–1225, doi:10.5194/acp-9-1209-2009, 2009.
- 5 Patra, P. K., Houweling, S., Krol, M., Bousquet, P., Belikov, D., Bergmann, D., Bian, H., Cameron-Smith, P., Chipperfield, M. P., Corbin, K., Fortems-Cheiney, A., Fraser, A., Gloor, E., Hess, P., Ito, A., Kawa, S. R., Law, R. M., Loh, Z., Maksyutov, S., Meng, L., Palmer, P. I., Prinn, R. G., Rigby, M., Saito, R., and Wilson, C.: TransCom model simulations of CH₄ and related species: linking transport, surface flux and chemical loss with CH₄ variability in the tro-
10 posphere and lower stratosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 12813–12837, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011, 2011.
- Prather, M. J., Holmes, C. D., and Hsu, J.: Reactive greenhouse gas scenarios: Systematic exploration of uncertainties and the role of atmospheric chemistry, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L09803, doi:10.1029/2012GL051440, 2012.
- 15 Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., Cunnold, D. M., Alyea, F. N., O’Doherty, S., Salameh, P., Miller, B. R., Huang, J., Wang, R. H. J., Hartley, D. E., Harth, C., Steele, L. P., Sturrock, G., Midgley, P. M., and McCulloch, A.: A history of chemically and radiatively important gases in air deduced from ALE/GAGE/AGAGE, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105, 17751–17792, 2000.
- 20 Ravishankara, A. R., Solomon, S., Turnipseed, A. A., and Warren, R. F.: Atmospheric lifetimes of long-lived halogenated species, *Science*, 259, 194–199, 1993.
- Ravishankara, A. R., Daniel, J. S., and Portmann, R. W.: Nitrous oxide (N₂O): the dominant ozone-depleting substance emitted in the 21st century, *Science*, 326, 123–125, 2009.
- Reichler, T., Dameris, M., and Sausen, R.: Determining the tropopause height from gridded data, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 2042, doi:10.1029/2003GL018240, 2003.
- 25 Saikawa, E., Schlosser, C. A., and Prinn, R. G.: Global modeling of soil nitrous oxide emissions from natural processes, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 27, 972–989, 2013.
- Schoeberl, M. R.: Extratropical stratosphere-troposphere mass exchange. *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 109, D13303, doi:10.1029/2004jd004525, 2004.
- 30 Seinfeld, J. H. and Pandis, S. N.: *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: from Air Pollution to Climate Change*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, USA, 1326 pp., 1998.
- Stephens, B. B., Gurney, K. R., Tans, P. P., Sweeney, C., Peters, W., Bruhwiler, L., Ciais, P., Ramonet, M., Bousquet, P., Nakazawa, T., Aoki, S., Machida, T., Inoue, G., Vinnichenko, N.,

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Lloyd, J., Jordan, A., Heimann, M., Shibistova, O., Langenfelds, R. L., Steele, L. P., Francey, R. J., and Denning, A. S.: Weak northern and strong tropical land carbon uptake from vertical profiles of atmospheric CO₂, *Science*, 316, 1732–1735, 2007.

Stohl, A., Bonasoni, P., Cristofanelli, P., Collins, W., Feichter, J., Frank, A., Forster, C., Gerasopoulos, E., Gaggeler, H., James, P., Kentarchos, T., Kromp-Kolb, H., Kruger, B., Land, C., Meloen, J., Papayannis, A., Priller, A., Seibert, P., Sprenger, M., Roelofs, G. J., Scheel, H. E., Schnabel, C., Siegmund, P., Tobler, L., Trickl, T., Wernli, H., Wirth, V., Zanis, P., and Zerefos, C.: Stratosphere-troposphere exchange: a review, and what we have learned from STAC-CATO, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 108, 8516, doi:10.1029/2002JD002490, 2003.

Thompson, R. L., Dlugokenky, E., Chevallier, F., Ciais, P., Dutton, G., Elkins, J. W., Langenfelds, R. L., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Tohjima, Y., Krummel, P. B., Fraser, P., and Steele, L. P.: Interannual variability in tropospheric nitrous oxide, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 1–6, doi:10.1002/grl.50721, 2013a.

Thompson, R. L., Chevallier, F., Crowell, A. M., Dutton, G., Langenfelds, R. L., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Tohjima, Y., Nakazawa, T., Krummel, P. B., Steele, L. P., Fraser, P., Ishijima, K., and Aoki, S.: Nitrous oxide emissions 1999–2009 from a global atmospheric inversion, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 13, 15697–15747, doi:10.5194/acpd-13-15697-2013, 2013b.

Thompson, T. M., Elkins, J. W., Hall, B., Dutton, G. S., Swanson, T. H., Butler, J. H., Cummings, S. O., and Fisher, D. A.: Halocarbons and other Atmospheric Trace Species, Climate Diagnostics Laboratory Summary Report #27, 2002–2003, US Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, CO, 2004.

van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Collatz, G. J., Mu, M., Kasibhatla, P. S., Morton, D. C., DeFries, R. S., Jin, Y., and van Leeuwen, T. T.: Global fire emissions and the contribution of deforestation, savanna, forest, agricultural, and peat fires (1997–2009), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 11707–11735, doi:10.5194/acp-10-11707-2010, 2010.

Volk, C. M., Elkins, J. W., Fahey, D. W., Dutton, G. S., Gilligan, J. M., Loewenstein, M., Podolske, J. R., Chan, K. R., and Gunson, M. R.: Evaluation of source gas lifetimes from stratospheric observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 25543–25564, 1997.

Wilson, S. R., Dick, A. L., Fraser, P. J., and Whittlestone, S.: Nitrous oxide flux estimates for Southeastern Australia, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 26, 169–188, 1997.

WMO: Greenhouse Gas Bulletin: the State of Greenhouse Gases in the Atmosphere Based on Global Observations through 2010, Atmospheric Environment Research Division, Research Department, World Meteorological Organisation, Geneva, 2011.

Zaehle, S. and Friend, A. D.: Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land surface model: 1. Model description, site-scale evaluation, and sensitivity to parameter estimates, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 24, GB1005, doi:10.1029/2009gb003521, 2010.

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 1. Transport model overview.

Model	Institution	Resolution		Meteorology	Max alt. (hPa)	
		Horizontal	Vertical			
MOZART4 ^a	MIT/Emory	2.5° × 1.88°	56 σ^h	MERRA	2	offline
ACTMt42I32 ^b	RIGC	2.8° × 2.8°	32 σ	NCEP2	3	online
ACTMt42I67 ^c	RIGC	2.8° × 2.8°	67 σ	JRA25	0.01	online
TM5 ^d	JRC	6.0° × 4.0°	25 η^i	ERA-interim	0.5	offline
TM3-NCEP ^e	MPI-BGC	5.0° × 3.75°	19 η	NCEP	23	offline
TM3-ERA ^e	MPI-BGC	5.0° × 3.75°	26 η	ERA-interim	1	offline
LMDZ4 ^f	LMD/LSCE	3.75° × 2.5°	19 η	ERA-interim	4	online
TOMCAT ^g	Univ. of Leeds	2.8° × 2.8°	60 η	ERA-interim	0.1	offline

^a Emmons et al. (2010).

^b Patra et al. (2009).

^c Ishijima et al. (2010).

^d Corazza et al. (2011).

^e Heimann and Körner (2003).

^f Hourdin et al. (2006).

^g Chipperfield (2006).

^h σ refers to the sigma terrain-following vertical coordinate system.

ⁱ η refers to the eta coordinate system that smoothly transitions from the sigma coordinate near the surface to a pressure coordinate in the stratosphere.

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Table 2. Overview of the reference prior fluxes (OCNPIC) (totals shown for 2005).

Category	Dataset	Resolution	Total (TgNyr ⁻¹)
terrestrial biosphere	ORCHIDEE O-CN	monthly	10.83
ocean	PISCES	monthly	4.28
waste water	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.21
solid waste	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.004
solvents	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.05
fuel production	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.003
ground transport	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.18
industry combustion	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.41
residential & other combustion	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.18
shipping	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.002
other sources	EDGAR-4.1	annual	0.0005
biomass burning	GFED-2	monthly	0.71
Total		monthly	16.84

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 3. Overview of the additional prior fluxes (totals shown for 2005).

Flux set	Categories	Dataset	Resolution	Total (TgNyr ⁻¹)
OCNN95	terrestrial biosphere	ORCHIDEE OCN	monthly	10.83
	ocean	Nevison et al. (1995)	monthly	3.59
	anthropogenic	EDGAR-4.1 ^a	annual	1.04
	biomass burning	GFED-2	monthly	0.71
	total			16.17
OCNN04	terrestrial biosphere	ORCHIDEE OCN	monthly	10.83
	ocean	Nevison et al. (2004)	monthly	4.44
	anthropogenic	EDGAR-4.1	annual	1.04
	biomass burning	GFED-2	monthly	0.71
	total			17.02
BWMN04	natural ecosystem	Bouwman et al. (2002)	monthly	4.59
	ocean	Nevison et al. (2004)	monthly	4.44
	anthropogenic and agriculture	EDGAR-4.1 ^b	annual	4.54
	biomass burning	GFED-2	monthly	0.71
	total			14.28

^a EDGAR categories: 6B, 6A–6C, 3, 1B, 1A3bce, 1A2–2, 1A4–5, 1A3d, 7.

^b EDGAR categories: 6B, 6A–6C, 3, 1B, 1A3bce, 1A2–2, 1A4–5, 1A3d, 7, 4.

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Table 4. Atmospheric sites used in the analysis.

ID	Station	Network	Type	Latitude	Longitude	Altitude (m a.s.l.) ^a
ALT	Alert	NOAA	F	82.5° N	62.5° W	210
ZEP	Ny-Alesund	NOAA	F	78.9° N	11.88° E	475
BRW	Barrow	NOAA	F, C*	71.3° N	156.6° W	11
MHD	Macehead	AGAGE NOAA	C, C* F	53.3° N	9.9° W	25
SHM	Shemya Island	NOAA	F	52.7° N	174.1° E	40
THD	Trinidad Head	AGAGE NOAA	C, C* F	41.1° N	124.2° W	107
NWR	Niwot Ridge	NOAA	F, C*	40.0° N	105.5° W	3526
IZO	Tenerife	NOAA	F	28.3° N	16.5° W	2360
KUM	Cape Kumukahi	NOAA	F	19.5° N	154.8° W	3
MLO	Mauna Loa	NOAA	F, C*	19.5° N	155.6° W	3397
RPB	Ragged Point	AGAGE NOAA	C, C* F	13.2° N	59.4° W	45
CHR	Christmas Island	NOAA	F	1.7° N	157.2° W	3
SEY	Seychelles	NOAA	F	4.7° S	55.2° E	3
ASC	Ascension Island	NOAA	F	7.9° S	14.4° W	54
SMO	Samoa	AGAGE NOAA	C, C* F	14.3° S	170.6° W	42
EIC	Easter Island	NOAA	F	27.2° S	109.5° W	50
CGO	Cape Grim	AGAGE NOAA	C, C* F	40.7° S	144.7° E	164
TDF	Tierra del Fuego	NOAA	F	54.9° S	68.5° W	20
HBA	Halley Station	NOAA	F	75.6° S	26.5° W	30
SPO	South Pole	NOAA	F, C*	89.98° S	24.8° W	2810
PFA	Poker Flats	NOAA	A	65° N	147° W	0–10 000
ULB	Ulaanbaatar	NOAA	A	47° N	106° E	0–6000
HAA	Hawaii	NOAA	A	21° N	158° W	0–10 000
RTA	Rarotonga	NOAA	A	21° S	160° E	0–10 000

F = flask measurement.

C = continuous (in-situ) measurement.

C* = continuous (in-situ) measurement of CFC-12 and SF₆.

A = aircraft flask measurement.

^a m.a.s.l.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)**Table 5.** Calibration offsets relative to the NOAA2006A scale.

Site	Mean offset (ppb)
MHD	0.25
THD	-0.30
RPB	0.00
SMO	0.20
CGO	0.20

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Table 6. Annual mean height of the tropopause (hPa) and the N₂O gradient (ppb) across the tropopause (cross-tropopause CT) and the 380 K isentrope. Tropics are defined as between 10° S and 10° N and extra-tropics are defined as latitudes higher than 30°.

	Tropopause height		CT gradient ^a		Gradient across 380 K ^b	
	Tropics	Extra-tropics	Tropics	Extra-tropics	Tropics	Extra-tropics
MOZART4	103	239	1.0	0.6	1.0	4.2
ACTMt42I32	105	232	0.2	1.0	0.2	3.1
ACTMt42I67	106	233	0.1	0.9	0.1	3.3
TM5	105	233	2.6	1.3	2.6	5.5
TM3-NCEP	101	234	0.5	0.3	0.5	1.5
TM3-ERA	105	236	0.6	0.4	0.6	2.6
LMDZ4	109	226	6.2	0.3	6.2	8.0
TOMCAT	102	238	0.6	1.3	0.6	3.3

^a Normalized to a CT pressure difference of 10 hPa.

^b Normalized to a pressure difference across the 380 K isentrope of 10 hPa.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Table 7. Annual mean (2007–2009) tropospheric growth rate, atmospheric lifetime, atmospheric abundance (up to 50 hPa) and global total sink of N₂O.

	Growth rate (ppbyr ⁻¹)	Lifetime (y)	Abundance (TgN)	Sink (TgNyr ⁻¹)
Observed	0.84	124–130*	–	–
MOZART4	0.99	124	1608	12.6
ACTMt42I32	0.52	92	1489	16.2
ACTMt42I67	0.84	121	1470	12.4
TM5	0.76	125	1544	12.4
TM3-NCEP	0.76	122	1515	12.5
TM3-ERA	0.86	123	1571	12.5
LMDZ4	0.24	119	1496	12.6
TOMCAT	0.86	92	1352	12.5

* Independent estimates of the lifetime (Prather et al., 2012; Volk et al., 1997).

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Table 8. Correlations of modelled and observed zonal mean meridional gradients for different flux scenarios (mean 2006–2009). Also shown are the inter-hemispheric differences (IHD) calculated as the mean of values for all background sites north of 20° N minus the mean all of values for sites south of 20° S. The observed IHD for N₂O and SF₆ were 1.44 ppb and 0.36 ppt, respectively. *R* values in brackets were not significant at the 95 % confidence level.

Model	OCNPIC		OCNN04		OCNN95		BWMN04		SF ₆	
	<i>R</i>	IHD	<i>R</i>	IHD	<i>R</i>	IHD	<i>R</i>	IHD	<i>R</i>	IHD
MOZART4	0.90	0.60	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
ACTMt42I32	0.89	1.00	0.88	1.1	0.85	1.09	0.85	0.96	–	–
ACTMt42I67	0.94	1.11	0.91	1.09	0.89	1.16	0.89	0.97	0.90	0.41
TM5	0.95	1.06	0.93	1.09	0.89	1.16	0.88	0.93	–	–
TM3-NCEP	(–0.04)	–0.18	(–0.26)	–0.27	(–0.27)	–0.20	(–0.42)	–0.31	–	–
TM3-ERA	0.91	0.72	0.85	0.72	0.81	0.79	0.79	0.56	0.99	0.39
LMDZ4	0.58	0.16	0.42	0.11	0.46	0.17	(0.02)	–0.01	0.91	0.69
TOMCAT	0.78	0.98	0.83	0.96	0.84	0.97	0.86	0.76	0.87	0.50

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


Table 9. Day of the year for the occurrence of the minimum in the mean seasonal cycle (2006–2009) of N₂O, CFC-12 and SF₆ at each of the background sites.

Model	Species	BRW	MHD	THD	MLO	SMO	CGO	SPO
Observed	N ₂ O	242	238	276	229	228	135	127
	CFC-12	232	232	217	201	217	113	139
	SF ₆	266	254	248	215	246	39	50
MOZART4	N ₂ O	162	136	78	138	142	122	44
	CFC-12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	SF ₆	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
ACTMt42I32	N ₂ O	189	181	169	141	235	123	185
	CFC-12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	SF ₆	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
ACTMt42I67	N ₂ O	187	176	171	145	228	117	115
	CFC-12	223	233	211	143	270	90	95
	SF ₆	242	241	219	43	186	40	55
TM5	N ₂ O	171	164	154	154	273	85	93
	CFC-12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	SF ₆	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
TM3-NCEP	N ₂ O	136	123	122	125	243	253	173
	CFC-12	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	SF ₆	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
TM3-ERA	N ₂ O	169	152	156	150	250	59	75
	CFC-12	206	233	190	142	249	44	54
	SF ₆	225	57	210	54	190	48	51
LMDZ4	N ₂ O	201	184	173	143	277	294	319
	CFC-12	183	316	170	182	41	149	60
	SF ₆	211	239	189	231	276	41	38
TOMCAT	N ₂ O	167	131	133	178	323	127	97
	CFC-12	235	227	222	219	330	110	97
	SF ₆	255	262	22	18	344	19	44

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion






Fig. 1. Schematic of the TransCom-N₂O modelling protocol.

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#) [Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#) [References](#)

[Tables](#) [Figures](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[Back](#) [Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 2. Simulated zonal and annual mean latitude-altitude cross-sections of N₂O mixing ratio (ppb) from eight models shown for 2007. Superimposed are contours of annual mean potential temperature (K).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 3. Modelled and observed N₂O growth rates (ppbv yr⁻¹) vs. lifetimes (yr). Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42132: blue, ACTMt42167: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 4. Vertical profiles of N₂O (ppb) at RTA, HAA, ULB and PFA (from top to bottom). The mean tropospheric mixing ratio at each site has been subtracted from the vertical profile. DJF = December, January, February; JJA = June, July, August; ANN = annual. Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42I32: blue, ACTMt42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 5. Comparison of the meridional gradients of N₂O (left) and SF₆ (right) using the OCNPIC scenario. Shown are the annual mean mixing ratio at background surface sites (upper panel) and the total zonal and annual prior emission estimate (lower panel). Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42I32: blue, ACTMt42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 6. Comparisons of modelled and observed north-south gradients of N₂O and SF₆. N₂O was simulated using the flux scenario, OCNPIC. Gradients are calculated as the mean of values for all background sites north of 20° N minus the mean of all values for sites south of 20° S. The left panel shows the N₂O (crosses) and SF₆ (circles) gradients for the observations and each model. The right panel shows the N₂O gradient vs. the SF₆ gradient. Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42I32: blue, ACTMt42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 7. Month of minimum in CFC-12 (upper panel) and N₂O (middle and lower panel) shown for each model (the subplots) in 2007.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 8. Comparison of the climatological seasonal cycles (2006–2009) of N₂O (top row), CFC-12 (middle row) and SF₆ (bottom row) for selected background stations (each column). Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42I32: blue, ACTMt42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 9. Comparison of N₂O at different altitudes (along the rows) at the aircraft sampling sites: PFA (left panel), ULB (middle panel; no data were available for altitudes above 6000 m) and HAA (right panel). Data are shown as monthly means with the growth rates (as given in Table 6) subtracted. MOZART4 was adjusted with an offset of -1 ppb to fit the N₂O scale. Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42I32: blue, ACTMt42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. 10. Comparison of observed mean N₂O seasonality (2006–2009) with that modelled using 4 different prior flux models. Each station is shown as a separate panel and within each panel the 4 subplots are for each of the flux models (see Tables 2 and 3 for a description of the fluxes). N₂O mixing ratio is on the left axis and N₂O flux (gray line) is on the right axis. Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTMt42I32: blue, ACTMt42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.





Fig. A1. Simulated zonal mean vertical profiles of N₂O mixing ratio (ppb) for DJF (upper panel) and JJA (lower panel) shown for each model. Superimposed are contours of annual mean potential temperature (K).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1**

R. L. Thompson et al.

**Fig. A2.** Map showing the observations used in this inter-comparison study.[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

TransCom N₂O model inter-comparison – Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. A3. Comparison of the zonal annual mean meridional gradients of N₂O at the surface with the modelled/observed mean mixing ratio subtracted. Shown are the gradients calculated using the flux scenarios: OCNPIC (top left), OCNN04 (top right), OCNN95 (bottom left), and BWMN04 (bottom right). Legend: Mozart4: yellow, ACTM42I32: blue, ACTM42I67: green, TM5: grey-blue, TM3-NCEP: purple, TM3-ERA: red, LMDZ4: magenta, TOMCAT: dark green, observed: black.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)


TransCom N₂O model
inter-comparison –
Part 1

R. L. Thompson et al.




Fig. A4. Hovmöller plots of N₂O fluxes from the terrestrial biosphere in OCN (BWM had no seasonal cycle) and from the ocean in PIC, N95 and N04 (from top to bottom). Fluxes are shown in $\text{gNm}^{-2}\text{yr}^{-1}$.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

