ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LETTERS

PERSPECTIVE • OPEN ACCESS

Assessing progress toward the Paris climate agreement from space

To cite this article: Brad Weir et al 2022 Environ. Res. Lett. 17 111002

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

 Erratum: "The GRIFFIN Project—Formation of Star Clusters with Individual Massive Stars in a Simulated Dwarf Galaxy Starburst" (2020, ApJ, 891, 2)

Natalia Lahén, Thorsten Naab, Peter H. Johansson et al.

- Erratum: "Simple Physics and Integrators Accurately Reproduce Mercury Instability Statistics" (2023, ApJ, 944, 190) Dorian S. Abbot, David M. Hernandez, Sam Hadden et al.
- <u>Corrigendum: Air quality and health</u> implications of 1.5 °C-2 °C climate pathways under considerations of ageing population: a multi-model scenario analysis (2021 *Environ. Res. Lett.* 16 045005)

Peter Rafaj, Gregor Kiesewetter, Volker Krey et al.



This content was downloaded from IP address 3.138.124.40 on 03/05/2024 at 20:38

PERSPECTIVE

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LETTERS

CrossMark

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED 20 June 2022

REVISED

16 September 2022

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION 12 October 2022

PUBLISHED 28 October 2022

Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 licence.

Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.



Assessing progress toward the Paris climate agreement from space

Brad Weir^{1,2,*}, Tomohiro Oda^{3,4}, Lesley E Ott² and Gavin A Schmidt⁵

¹ Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD, United States of America

² Global Modeling and Assimilation Office, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, United States of America

³ Earth from Space Institute, Universities Space Research Association, Washington, DC, United States of America

- ⁴ Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Science, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, United States of America
- NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York, NY, United States of America

^{*} Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: brad.weir@nasa.gov

Keywords: carbon dioxide, greenhouse gases, remote sensing, climate change

Since the Industrial Revolution, growing 'atmospheric stocks' of greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations (Joos and Spahni 2008, Dlugokencky and Tans 2022) have led to global average temperature increases of over 1 °C with carbon dioxide (CO₂) the leading contributor, accounting for roughly half the total warming (IPCC 2014). Left unchecked, continued growth in GHG concentrations due to fossil fuel combustion, deforestation, and other human activities is projected to have catastrophic impacts on the Earth's climate and habitability (IPCC 2014). While the impact of human activity on climate may be well understood globally over several decades, the ability to trace more granular activity, e.g. annual fuel usage of individual countries, to changes in GHG concentrations remains a landmark goal needed to support climate change mitigation efforts. This commentary addresses how this goal might be achieved with a focus on transparency, verifiability, and the challenges that lie ahead.

The 2015 Paris Agreement (PA; UNFCCC 2016), reaffirmed by the 2021 Glasgow Pact (UNFCCC 2022a), plans to limit future global temperature increases through coordinated reduction of GHG emissions. These efforts will be evaluated every 5 years during UNFCCC Global Stocktakes (GSTs; PA Article 14) with the first ongoing. GSTs are intended to 'assess collective progress [and] have no individual Party focus' (UNFCCC 2019). Individual Parties are instead expected to assess their own progress through the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF; PA Article 13), a series of biennial reports starting in 2024. Table 1 of the ETF reference manual (UNFCCC 2022b) suggests parties detail how their effort 'contributes to the stabilization of GHG concentrations [...] at a level that would prevent dangerous interference with the climate system.' Observations of

GHG concentrations and derived scientific analyses are thus expected to play a vital role in assessments of mitigation efforts (Matsunaga and Maksyutov 2018, Buendia *et al* 2019, Janssens-Maenhout *et al* 2020).

Our recent study (Weir et al 2021b) showed that NASA's Orbiting Carbon Observatory 2 (OCO-2; Crisp et al 2004, Eldering et al 2017) was able to detect the impact of human activity reductions on atmospheric CO₂ concentrations during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. This achievement marked the first time that monthly, regional changes in fossil fuel emissions were observed in the atmosphere from space. While emissions decreases due to COVID-19 were historically large, the signal in column CO₂ was just 0.14–0.62 ppm, about 0.1% of background values. Nevertheless, year-toyear decreases in CO₂ growth of similar magnitude, if not greater, will be needed to meet even the moderate goal of less than 4.5 °C warming in 2100 (Forster et al 2020, Le Quéré et al 2020). Current spaceborne technology is therefore at or near the threshold for detecting regional impacts of mitigation efforts on GHG levels. Future advances in coverage, resolution, quality, and co-sampled species from planned missions (Crisp et al 2018, Moore et al 2018, Sierk et al 2019, Tsujihara et al 2021), are expected to further improve the capabilities of GHG monitoring systems like our own. For example, the Geostationary Carbon Cycle Observatory (GeoCarb; Moore III et al 2018) mission will observe the Americas twice daily, whereas OCO-2 soundings repeat after 16 days.

The impact of COVID-19 is just one application of our broader effort to maintain and distribute results from a quasi-operational GHG monitoring system. To support scientific and stakeholder needs, we provide 16 day, column-average CO_2 concentrations, anomalies, and uncertainties on a





nominally 50 km global grid through the trilateral NASA/ESA/JAXA Earth observing (EO) dashboard (https://eodashboard.org) and other NASA assets (Weir and Ott 2022a, 2022b). These fields are the result of assimilating OCO-2 data into NASA's Goddard EO System (GEOS; Molod et al 2015, Ott et al 2015, Weir et al 2021b), a product we call OCO-2/GEOS, using the Constituent Data Assimilation System (Wargan et al 2020, Weir et al 2021a) capabilities of GEOS. Data assimilation synthesizes the best available science and observations to infer the state of a system, in our case time-varying fields of atmospheric CO₂ concentrations on a spatial grid. Combined with additional, 'bottom-up' simulations and independent verification data, assimilated products enable inferences about plausible driving processes behind observed changes and uncertainties in GHG concentrations, where the term 'process' is applied as broadly as possible, including human activity, natural variability, and any other phenomena affecting GHGs (figure 1). Notably, in figure 1 all information meets at GHG concentrations where simulations of different processes (center, yellow), assimilated fields (left, blue), and verification data (right, red) are comparable in the same space. A further ability to study interactions across the Earth system (top and bottom center arrows) is possible through ongoing efforts to couple and integrate model components, e.g. sharing biospheric models in GEOS and the Goddard Institute for Space Studies' ModelE (Kelley et al 2020).

A mitigation assessment with a strong focus on atmospheric concentrations over surface fluxes has several advantages. First, an assessment based on surface fluxes alone would be challenging because fluxes are unverifiable with atmospheric data except within a few kilometers of a few hundred measurement sites (Raczka et al 2013) or during intensive aircraft campaigns (Hannun et al 2020). Instead, the primary means for 'verifying' surface fluxes at broad scales is indirect (Schuh et al 2019, Peiro et al 2022): concentrations produced from gridded fluxes and an atmospheric transport model are verified against in situ measurements (Masarie et al 2014) and remotesensing data (Wunch et al 2011) referenced to a calibration scale maintained by the World Meteorological Organization (Hall et al 2021). In the case of fossil fuels, the gridded fluxes are outputs of a spatial disaggregation of inventory totals (transition from processes to gridded fluxes in figure 1), a process with its own uncertainties (Oda et al 2019, 2021). Attribution is even more challenging, causing fossil fuel flux estimates derived from atmospheric observations to thus far rely on additional isotope (Basu et al 2020) or tracer (Reuter et al 2019, Pickers et al 2022) data. Second, under almost any circumstances, concentration analyses can run at higher resolutions than flux inversions. Among an intercomparison of several analyses, many running at horizontal resolutions of a few 100 km, only OCO-2/GEOS was able to reproduce observed gradients in column CO₂ from Pasadena to Edwards, California, a distance of roughly 100 km (Schuh et al 2021). This gradient, due to emissions trapped in the Los Angeles basin, is one of the clearest urban-to-background gradients in the world, and underscores the importance of high native resolution if a system hopes to capture signals from fossil fuel emission changes. Third, concentration analyses will always be needed as boundary conditions for yet higher-resolution analyses over limited domains. Such studies are likely necessary at urban (1 km) and finer scales for the foreseeable future due to resource constraints of even the



most powerful supercomputers. Finally, concentration analyses can easily integrate multi-species and heterogeneous datasets of almost any size, supporting the coordinated implementation of sustainable development goals through synergies with air quality analyses (Miyazaki *et al* 2020, Keller *et al* 2021). For example, our system grew out of a meteorological system monitoring ozone (Wargan *et al* 2017) and the recovery of the Antarctic ozone hole due to the Montreal Protocol, avoiding a duplication of effort.

There are, nevertheless, cases when a posteriori gridded surface flux estimates may be convenient and/or necessary. Surface fluxes are certainly easier to store and manipulate than concentrations that resolve an additional vertical dimension. Furthermore, anomaly analyses of concentrations must account for transport variability in a non-trivial way (see materials and methods of Weir et al 2021a). When surface fluxes are necessary, they do follow from atmospheric concentrations through simple mass balance relationships (Crevoisier et al 2010). Quantifying the uncertainty of these relationships would likely require, at the very least, a sporadic, baseline surface flux estimate. But even if the exact surface fluxes of every Party to the PA were known, we would be far from its ultimate goal. Effective mitigation requires the ability to assess and predict how different socioeconomic pathways/processes impact GHG concentrations and the subsequent responses of the Earth's climate and biosphere.

To be truly useful for mitigation purposes, any assessment of surface fluxes must have some attribution ability, at the very least distinguishing between natural and anthropogenic origins. Again owing to limitations in direct flux verification, this is currently only possible to the extent that different attributions are evident in concentration data. Figure 2 shows an example of our system successfully detecting and assessing the impact of human activity on GHG concentrations: on 15-30 April 2020, while many countries were under COVID-19 lockdowns, we detected notable decreases (negative anomalies) in CO₂ growth relative to a 2017-2019 baseline. The panels depict the following anomalies: (A) observationbased total CO₂ from our concentration analysis, OCO-2/GEOS, which assimilates OCO-2 into GEOS (Weir *et al* 2021a), (B) simulated fossil-only CO_2 from a companion GEOS run using CarbonMonitor near real time fossil fuel emissions estimates (Liu *et al* 2020), (C) simulated total CO_2 from a GEOS run using CarbonMonitor fossil fuel from B and a version of Lund, Potsdam, Jena-Wald, Schnee, Landschaft (LPJ-wsl; Zhang et al 2018) biospheric fluxes, and (D) the same as C, but with catchmentcarbon and nitrogen (Catchment-CN; Kolassa et al 2020) instead of LPJ-wsl (see Weir et al 2021a for more details). Hatching in panel (A) indicates areas where the biospheric signal 'dominates' fossil fuels, defined here as when the absolute value of the difference of (C) and (D) is greater than (B). Even during a historic short-term decline in emissions, the atmospheric signal of activity reductions is small compared to natural variability over much of the Earth: compare (B), (C), and (D). Nevertheless, over the Eastern United States, Europe, India, and China, the observation derived total CO₂ anomalies (A) compare well with the two simulations of total anomalies (C) and (D), with (A) and (C) agreeing well across the globe. These results suggest that (a) OCO-2 detected regional signals driven by short-term changes in human activity,

B Weir et al

(b) the corresponding CarbonMonitor fossil fuel emissions are consistent with the observed signal, and (c) the system has skill making assessments in general.

While our qualitative analysis suggests OCO-2 and CarbonMonitor produced consistent estimates of a historically large signal, we have thus far stopped short of making quantitative emissions estimates. This step still requires significant advances in our understanding of remote-sensing (O'Dell et al 2018), natural surface flux variability (Ott et al 2015, Weir et al 2021b, Peiro et al 2022), atmospheric transport (Schuh et al 2019, 2022), atmospheric chemistry (Wang et al 2020), and several other factors (Andres et al 2014, Oda et al 2019, Schuh et al 2021). In figure 2, for example, the observational analysis (A) suggests a much smaller signal over India than estimated by CarbonMonitor (B). Yet this is an area with considerable biospheric variability, apparent as differences between (C) and (D), and one in which consistently high aerosol loadings often prevent space-based observations and can introduce retrieval biases (more discussion in Weir et al 2021a). Successful quantitative attribution to fossil fuel emissions will likely require integration of several observational constraints including those from isotopes (Basu et al 2020), atmospheric potential oxygen (Pickers et al 2022), and nitrogen dioxide (Reuter et al 2019).

The ability to assess national and subnational emissions in a transparent and verifiable way remains a landmark, unsolved, long-term scientific goal. The greatest difficulty is posed by the fact that national emissions estimates, and thus stock changes, are not directly verifiable. Atmospheric stocks/concentrations of GHGs, conversely, are verifiable across spatial and temporal scales, especially so with the growing satellite constellation (Crisp and Munro et al 2018) and multi-institution collections of in situ measurements (Masarie et al 2014). When used to evaluate different potential driving processes, we have demonstrated how concentration analyses are powerful tools for mitigation assessments. Even with an improving ability to connect atmospheric observations to surface fluxes, global atmospheric concentration analyses with quantified uncertainties and verified against independent data, such as our own (Weir and Ott 2022a), will continue to serve as a verification baseline for new observations and models. Finally, among all stocks (land, ocean, etc), the atmospheric GHG stock controls the temperature changes (Hansen et al 2010, Gelaro et al 2017, AIRS 2019, Lenssen et al 2019) the PA aims to limit, making it perhaps the most essential climate variable.

Data availability statement

No new data were created or analysed in this study.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the two anonymous reviewers, Sourish Basu, David Crisp, and Andrew Schuh for comments and suggestions that helped improve this manuscript. They also thank NASA Center for Climate Simulation (NCCS) and NASA Science Visualization Studio (SVS) for computational and visualization support for this research. This work was funded by NASA's Carbon Monitoring System (NNH20ZDA001N-CMS 20-CMS20-0011) and the Science Team for the OCO Missions (NNH17ZDA001N-OCO2 17-OCO2-17-0010).

ORCID iDs

Brad Weir (a) https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6160-0577 Tomohiro Oda (a) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8328-3020

References

- Andres R J, Boden T A and Higdon D 2014 A new evaluation of the uncertainty associated with CDIAC estimates of fossil fuel carbon dioxide emission *Tellus* B **66** 23616
- Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS) Project 2019 Aqua/AIRS L3 monthly standard physical retrieval (AIRS-only) 1 degree × 1 degree V7.0 *Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center* (*GES DISC*) (Greenbelt, MD) (https://doi.org/10.5067/UBENJB9D3T2H)
- Basu S, Lehman S J, Miller J B, Andrews A E, Sweeney C, Gurney K R, Xu X, Southon J and Tans P P 2020 Estimating US fossil fuel CO₂ emissions from measurements of ¹⁴C in atmospheric CO₂ Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 117 13300–7
- Buendia E C et al 2019 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories ed D Gómez and W Irving (available at: www.ipcc.ch/report/ 2019-refinement-to-the-2006-ipcc-guidelines-for-nationalgreenhouse-gas-inventories/)
- Crevoisier C, Sweeney C, Gloor M, Sarmiento J L and Tans P P 2010 Regional US carbon sinks from three-dimensional atmospheric CO₂ sampling *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **107** 18348–53
- Crisp D et al 2004 The orbiting carbon observatory (OCO) mission Adv. Space Res. 34 700–9
- Crisp D *et al* 2018 A constellation architecture for monitoring carbon dioxide and methane from space (Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) Atmospheric Constellation Greenhouse Gas Team (201820)) (available at: https://ceos.org/document_management/Meetings/Plenary/ 32/documents/CEOS_AC-VC_White_Paper_Version_1_ 20181009.pdf)
- Dlugokencky E and Tans P 2022 The marine boundary layer reference (available at: www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/mbl/ mbl.html) (Accessed 14 June 2022)
- Eldering A *et al* 2017 The Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2: first 18 months of science data products *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* **10** 549–63
- Forster P M *et al* 2020 Current and future global climate impacts resulting from COVID-19 *Nat. Clim. Change* **10** 913–9
- Gelaro R *et al* 2017 The modern-era retrospective analysis for research and applications, version 2 (MERRA-2) *J. Clim.* **30** 5419–54

Hall B D, Crotwell A M, Kitzis D R, Mefford T, Miller B R, Schibig M F and Tans P P 2021 Revision of the World Meteorological Organization Global Atmosphere Watch (WMO/GAW) CO₂ calibration scale Atmos. Meas. Tech. 14 3015–32

4

Hannun R A et al 2020 Spatial heterogeneity in CO₂, CH₄, and energy fluxes: insights from airborne eddy covariance measurements over the Mid-Atlantic region Environ. Res. Lett, 15 035008

- Hansen J, Ruedy R, Sato M and Lo K 2010 Global surface temperature change *Rev. Geophys.* **48** RG4004
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Core Writing Team (IPCC) 2014 Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ed R K Pachauri and L A Meyer (Geneva: IPCC) (available at: www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/)
- Janssens-Maenhout G *et al* 2020 Toward an operational anthropogenic CO₂ emissions monitoring and verification support capacity *Bull. Am. Met. Soc.* **101** E1439–51
- Joos F and Spahni R 2008 Rates of change in natural and anthropogenic radiative forcing over the past 20,000 years *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **105** 1425–30
- Keller C A *et al* 2021 Global impact of COVID-19 restrictions on the surface concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and ozone *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **21** 3555–92
- Kelley M et al 2020 GISS-E2.1: configurations and climatology J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst. 12 e2019MS002025
- Kolassa J, Reichle R H, Koster R D, Liu Q, Mahanama S and Zeng F-W 2020 An observation-driven approach to improve vegetation phenology in a global land surface model *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 12 e2020MS002083
- Le Quéré C *et al* 2020 Temporary reduction in daily global CO₂ emissions during the COVID-19 forced confinement *Nat. Clim. Change* **10** 647–53
- Lenssen N, Schmidt G, Hansen J, Menne M, Persin A, Ruedy R and Zyss D 2019 Improvements in the GISTEMP uncertainty model J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. **124** 6307–26
- Liu Z *et al* 2020 Near-real-time monitoring of global CO₂ emissions reveals the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic *Nat. Commun.* **11** 5172
- Masarie K A, Peters W, Jacobson A R and Tans P P 2014 ObsPack: a framework for the preparation, delivery, and attribution of atmospheric greenhouse gas measurements *Earth Sys. Sci. Data* 6 375–84
- Matsunaga T and Maksyutov S (eds) 2018 A Guidebook on the Use of Satellite Greenhouse Gases Observation Data to Evaluate and Improve Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventories Satellite Observation Center (Japan: National Institute for Environmental Studies) (available at: www.nies.go.jp/soc/ doc/GHG_Satellite_Guidebook_1st_12d.pdf)
- Miyazaki K, Bowman K, Sekiya T, Jiang Z, Chen X, Eskes H, Ru M, Zhang Y and Shindell D 2020 Air quality response in China linked to the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) lockdown *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **47** e2020GL089252
- Molod A, Takacs L, Suarez M and Bacmeister J 2015 Development of the GEOS-5 atmospheric general circulation model: evolution from MERRA to MERRA2 *Geosci. Model Dev.* **8** 1339–56
- Moore III B, Crowell S M, Rayner P J, Kumer J, O'Dell C W,
 O'Brien D, Utembe S, Polonsky I, Schimel D and Lemen J
 2018 The potential of the Geostationary Carbon Cycle
 Observatory (GeoCarb) to provide multi-scale constraints on the carbon cycle in the Americas *Front. Environ. Sci.*6 109
- O'Dell C W *et al* 2018 Improved retrievals of carbon dioxide from Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 with the version 8 ACOS algorithm *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* **11** 6539–76
- Oda T *et al* 2019 Errors and uncertainties in a gridded carbon dioxide emissions inventory *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change* 24 1007–50
- Oda T, Haga C, Hosomi K, Matsui T and Bun R 2021 Errors and uncertainties associated with the use of unconventional activity data for estimating CO₂ emissions: the case for traffic emissions in Japan *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16** 084058
- Ott L E et al 2015 Assessing the magnitude of CO₂ flux uncertainty in atmospheric CO₂ records using products

from NASA's Carbon Monitoring Flux Pilot Project J. Geophys. Res. Atmos. 120 734–65

- Peiro H et al 2022 Four years of global carbon cycle observed from the Orbiting Carbon Observatory 2 (OCO-2) version 9 and in situ data and comparison to OCO-2 version 7 Atmos. Chem. Phys. 22 1097–130
- Pickers P A, Manning A C, Le Quéré C, Forster G L, Luijkx I T, Gerbig C, Fleming L S and Sturges W T 2022 Novel quantification of regional fossil fuel CO₂ reductions during COVID-19 lockdowns using atmospheric oxygen measurements Sci. Adv. 8 eabl9250
- Raczka B M et al 2013 Evaluation of continental carbon cycle simulations with North American flux tower observations *Ecol. Monogr.* 83 531–56
- Reuter M, Buchwitz M, Schneising O, Krautwurst S, O'Dell C W, Richter A, Bovensmann H and Burrows J P 2019 Towards monitoring localized CO₂ emissions from space: co-located regional CO₂ and NO₂ enhancements observed by the OCO-2 and S5P satellites *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **19** 9371–83
- Schuh A E et al 2019 Quantifying the impact of atmospheric transport uncertainty on CO₂ surface flux estimates *Glob.* Biogeochem. Cycles. **33** 484–500
- Schuh A E, Byrne B, Jacobson A R, Crowell S M, Deng F, Baker D F, Johnson M S, Philip S and Weir B 2022 On the role of atmospheric model transport uncertainty in estimating the Chinese land carbon sink *Nature* 603 E13–E14
- Schuh A E, Otte M, Lauvaux T and Oda T 2021 Far-field biogenic and anthropogenic emissions as a dominant source of variability in local urban carbon budgets: a global high-resolution model study with implications for satellite remote sensing *Remote Sens. Environ.* 262 112473
- Sierk B, Bezy J L, Löscher A and Meijer Y 2019 The European CO₂ Monitoring Mission: observing anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions from space Int. Conf. on Space Optics (ICSO) 2018 p 111800M
- Tsujihara H, Isono K, Matsushima A and Tanaka M 2021 The mission overview using the TANSO-3 on GOSAT-GW The 17th Int. Workshop on Greenhouse Gas Measurements from Space (available at: https://cce-datasharing.gsfc.nasa.gov/ files/conference_presentations/Poster_Tsujihara_0_26_25. pdf)
- UNFCCC 2019 Paragraph 14 of decision 19/CMA.1: matters relating to Article 14 of the Paris Agreement and paragraphs 99–101 of decision 1/CP.21 *Report of the Conference of the Parties Serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement on the Third Part of Its First Session, Held in Katowice from 2 to 15 December 2018. Addendum Part Two: Action Taken by the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement* pp 53–58 (available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/ CMA2018_03a02E.pdf)
- UNFCCC 2022a Glasgow Climate Pact, Advance United Version (available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/ cop26_auv_2f_cover_decision.pdf) (Accessed 22 June 2022)
- UNFCCC 2022b Reference Manual for the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement (available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/ v2_ETFreferencemanual.pdf)
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 2016 The Paris Agreement (available at: https:// unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/parisagreement_ publication.pdf)
- Wang J S, Oda T, Kawa S R, Strode S A, Baker D F, Ott L E and Pawson S 2020 The impacts of fossil fuel emission uncertainties and accounting for 3D chemical CO₂ production on inverse natural carbon flux estimates from satellite and *in situ* data *Environ. Res. Lett.* 15 085002
- Wargan K, Labow G, Frith S, Pawson S, Livesey N and Partyka G 2017 Evaluation of the ozone fields in NASA's MERRA-2 reanalysis *J. Clim.* **30** 2961–88
- Wargan K, Weir B, Manney G L, Cohn S E and Livesey N J 2020 The anomalous 2019 Antarctic ozone hole in the

GEOS Constituent Data Assimilation System with MLS observations *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **125** e2020JD033335

- Weir B *et al* 2021a Regional impacts of COVID-19 on carbon dioxide detected worldwide from space *Sci. Adv.* 7 eabf9415
- Weir B, Ott L E, Collatz G J, Kawa S R, Poulter B, Chatterjee A, Oda T and Pawson S 2021b Bias-correcting carbon fluxes derived from land-surface satellite data for retrospective and near-real-time assimilation systems *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 21 9609–28

Weir B and Ott L E (OCO-2 Science Team) 2022a OCO-2 GEOS level 3 daily, 0.5 × 0.625 assimilated CO₂ V10r. Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center (GES DISC) (Greenbelt, MD) (https://doi.org/ 10.5067/Y9M4NM9MPCGH)

- Weir B and Ott L E and OCO-2 Science Team, 2022b OCO-2 GEOS level 3 monthly, 0.5 × 0.625 assimilated CO₂ V10r Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center (GES DISC) (Greenbelt, MD) (https://doi.org/ 10.5067/BGFIODET3HZ8)
- Wunch D, Toon G C, Blavier J-F L, Washenfelder R A, Notholt J, Connor B J, Griffith D W, Sherlock V and Wennberg P O 2011 The total carbon column observing network *Philos. T. Roy. Soc.* A 369 2087–12
- Zhang Z, Zimmermann N E, Calle L, Hurtt G, Chatterjee A and Poulter B 2018 Enhanced response of global wetland methane emissions to the 2015–2016 El Niño-Southern oscillation event *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13 074009