Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-273-RC2, 2017

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Inverse modelling of European CH_4 emissions during 2006–2012 using different inverse models and reassessed atmospheric observations" *by* Peter Bergamaschi et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 12 June 2017

This study presents a multi-model top-down assessment of European methane emissions using the European measurements network. As mentioned, these measurements are performed with the aim to verify bottom-up inventories reported to the UNFCCC. As such this study can be seen as an assessment of where we are in this process, extending the number of years that were reported in a previous assessment. The results highlight the importance of taking into account natural emissions of methane. Combining natural and anthropogenic emissions the reported total for EU-28 ends up in close agreement with the inventories. The study is a useful reference, and as such it

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

makes a good contribution to ACP. However, as will be explained below, it also misses some useful opportunities to add value to the previous assessment with the potential to substantially increase the significance of this work. Having gone through the major effort of organizing this model inter-comparison already, the points listed under 'discussion' should receive serious consideration in my opinion.

DISCUSSION

In the context of emission verification, testing the EU-28 total is relevant, however, the network probably resolves additional independent pieces of information. The question is how many, and what this means for the capacity of the European network to resolve country scale emissions. This applies not only to average emissions, but also to their trends. One may argue that in the framework of the COP21 climate agreement the ability to evaluate trends is even more important than the average. Looking at the results that are presented, information about trends is clearly visible in the time series, but to my surprise it is not discussed at all. Even if it turns out that these trends are not significant it is useful to quantify and discuss how far we are from this target. It is a bit surprising that the multi-year time dimension, which is the new element of this study compared to the previous one, is left unexplored.

A useful attempt is made to assess biases in transport models using vertical profile measurements. However, what is missing is the link between these biases and the inverted emissions. It is mentioned that those models that overestimate PBL average CH4 should overestimate emissions. In fact, all the ingredients are available to quantify this link and assess the impact of transport biases on emissions. It raises the question why this is not done. Is it an important factor explaining the range of emission that are found or not?

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

page 4, line 6: Which targets are set by the quality control mentioned here? Are they met?

page 5, line 16: Using constant a priori flux uncertainties also? How do these emissions/uncertainties relate to those of the other scenarios?

page 5, line 24: Do the regional models (apart from NAME) prescribe boundary conditions, or allow further optimization?

page 8, line 10-15: It would be good to mention some typical numbers here for the bottom up and top down derived seasonal amplitudes (it is not so clear to see from figure 4)

page 8, line 30-35: How about the seasonality in the energy sector? (domestic heating etc.)

page 9, line 7: The difference between the observed vs simulated amplitude of variability (as used in Taylor diagrams for instance) provides a piece of information that is more independent from correlation as the RMS that is used here.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-273, 2017.