Part 2: Flux inversion

Questions

• What are the strengths/limitations of the inversion approach?

Three approaches to estimate fluxes

- Inventory (bottom-up)
 - e.g. forest inventory, GHG emission, land-use change...
- Processed-based modeling (bottom-up)
 - e.g. terrestrial biosphere models that include physical, biophysical, and biochemical processes (forward modeling)
- Inverse modeling (top-down)

General scheme of flux inversion



Strengths

 It provides top-down flux estimates that can independently verify bottom-up estimates.



Strengths

- Relatively simple, with less inputs compared to process-based models
- It has the potential to accurately estimate fluxes at relatively high spatial and temporal resolutions if we
 - expand the atmospheric monitoring network
 - improve transport models and mathematical methods

 Currently the atmospheric monitoring network is inadequate to effectively constrain fluxes in some regions (e.g. the Tropics)



From CarboScope (http://www.carboscope.eu)

- Inverse methods are sensitive to errors in the setup and transport model, in the data, and in the selection of the sites.
 - Use of different sets of stations may affect the spatial pattern of estimated fluxes



Monitoring stations very close to emission sources could introduce some systematic error.

- Inverse methods are sensitive to errors in the setup and transport model, in the data, and in the selection of the sites.
 - Biases in atmospheric mixing will translate into biases in estimated fluxes



The substantial differences in vertical gradients reflect the biases in atmospheric vertical mixing. (Stephens et al. 2007)

- Inverse methods are sensitive to errors in the setup and transport model, in the data, and in the selection of the sites.
 - inversion setup: a priori standard deviation, spatial correlation scales...
 - resolution of the transport model
- Unclear about the underlying processes driving the spatial and temporal patterns of fluxes

Thank you