

Detailed Response to Anonymous Referee #1

We acknowledge anonymous referee #1 for his/her time spent on reading and commenting on the paper, providing comments and helpful suggestions to improve the manuscript.

General

This is a valuable update analysis of the GCP dataset used in the earlier 2016 paper by Saunio et al. This paper now focusses on understanding what is driving variability in methane mole fractions. This work is detailed and thorough, and is a valuable contribution to understanding what causes variability. The key 'missing factor' in the paper is a discussion of the impact of variability in the methane sinks. This gap is acknowledged, but could perhaps be discussed in more detail and paid more attention in qualifying the validity of the results. That said, the paper's implication that a step-change took place in 2006-8 (page 12, line 19) is very interesting and will need much future testing. A key factor not really discussed in much detail in this paper is the time-response factor – how quickly do latitude-zonal methane mole fractions and particularly isotopes respond to a change in either sources or sinks? Overall this paper is a valuable contribution and should be published with minor revision.

Although not addressing fully the contribution of OH to methane changes from 2000 to 2012, we extended the discussion in the text.

A more detailed discussion on the “time-response factor” mentioned by the reviewer would necessitate specific simulations from sector with various tracers and would be more a TRANSCOM-like experiment (model inter-comparison project) and is beyond the scope and objectives of this review on existing simulations and inversions.

Specific Points

Page 3 line 6 – models are not really 'data'.

The sentence has been rephrased as follow: **“The GCP dataset integrates results from top-down studies (exploiting atmospheric observations within an atmospheric inverse-modelling frameworks) and bottom-up models (including process-based models for estimating land surface emissions and atmospheric chemistry), inventories of anthropogenic emissions, and data-driven approaches.”**

Line 9 – mention sinks?

The sink variability and trends are not fully discussed in the paper. A statement on the sink changes is provided at the end of the abstract and a paragraph has been further developed at the end of the paper before conclusion. However, we do not pretend in the paper to fully address the OH related question as stated early in the text.

Line 24 – inconsistency with isotopes needs a little more highlighting here?

The sentence has been modified in order be more clear to the reader without having to read the whole text.

“We apply isotopic signatures to the emission changes estimated for individual studies based on five emission sectors and find that for six individual top-down studies (out of eight) the average isotopic signature of the emission changes is not consistent with the observed change in atmospheric $^{13}\text{CH}_4$. However the partitioning in emission change derived from the ensemble mean is consistent with this isotopic constraint.”

Line 30 – This is the major weakness in the analysis and needs a bit more explanation

This sentence has been re-written has follow to explain why OH sink has not been studied here.

“In most of the top-down studies included here, OH concentrations are considered constant over the years (seasonal variations but without any inter annual variability). As a result, the methane loss (in particular through OH oxidation) varies mainly through the change in methane concentrations and not its oxidants. For these reasons, changes in the methane loss could not be properly investigated in this study, although it may play a significant role in the recent atmospheric methane changes as briefly discussed at the end of the paper.”

Page 4

Line 13 – maybe mention destruction of methane in caves/karsts, as it could be large?

Subterranean methane sinks have been studied at local scale and show, indeed, that these sinks can be large on the local scale. However the impact of the karst sink on the global methane budget is unknown. Besides, the processes involved are far from being totally understood, and, unfortunately, assessed at the global scale. The karst/caves methane sink has not been mentioned in the GCP methane budget ESSD paper, however we keep this (mostly) open question in mind and look forward hearing about regional/global assessment of this sink, so that it could be eventually included in the next methane budget.

Line 19 – mention Rigby et al and Turner et al 2017?

At this line, the list of articles refers to OH derived from climate models. The suggested references do not match this list. However these two recent papers need to be cited in this review, which is done former page 5, line 25, as suggested below.

Line 34 – no trends from wetlands?– this is surely a very counter-intuitive finding given the enormous amount of water transferred onto the land in 2011, so much that the oceans fell (Boening et al, GRL, 39, L19602 ?

Here the trend over 2000-2012 is discussed. This does not mean that wetland emissions have not experienced large year-to-year variations in particular in 2010-2011. Indeed the large year-to-year variations in methane emissions from wetlands make it difficult to find significant trend. Also the statement here is on the global trend in wetland emissions; as discussed later, the quasi “null” trend in global emissions results in increasing wetland emissions in the mid and high latitudes counter balanced by decreasing emissions in the Tropics, over the aforementioned full 13 year-period. We added the sentence: **“This flat trend over the decade is associated to large year-to-year variations (e.g. 2010-11 in the tropics) that limits its robustness together with sensitivities to the choice of the inventory chosen to represent the wetland extend”.**

Page 5 Line 14 – note Sherwood update of isotopic signature, 2017.

The Sherwood et al., 2017 review of isotopic signature has been added and cited along with Schwietzke et al., 2016 study, as follows, former page 5, line 8: **“Schwietzke et al. (2016), using updated estimates of the source isotopic signatures (Sherwood et al., 2017) with rather narrow uncertainty ranges..”**

Line 17 – agreed: ethane/methane is very uncertain and the source ratios may have changed greatly as the energy sources have changed.

Comment that does not require specific answer.

Line 21 – Rigby et al? Turner et al?

These two recent references (not published at the moment of submission) have been added at the end of the paragraph (because they are more recent and need some details (as follows). Rigby et al. has also been added on former page 6 line 25.

“[...] Dalsoren et al. (2016) found constant OH concentrations since 2007, and Rigby et al. (2017) a decrease in OH concentrations, both results possibly contributing to the

observed increase in methane growth rate and therefore limiting the required changes in methane emissions inferred by top-down studies. However Turner et al. (2017) highlight the difficulty in disentangling the contribution in emission or sink changes when OH concentrations are weakly constrained by atmospheric measurements.”

Page 6 Line 13-14 – note that there is important seasonal, regional and latitudinal zonal information in the isotopes: cows - India; wetlands - SH S. America.

Yes, there are different regional and seasonal variations in the emissions that help interpreting the methane signal and its isotopic signal. We completed the sentence in the text: ... **“or to separate regions with a dominant source (e.g. agriculture in India versus wetlands in Amazonia),”**

Line 22 – OH – this is the missing elephant in the paper.

As already answered before, we acknowledge the weakness of this review regarding the lack of discussion on OH changes. Unfortunately, today, atmospheric inversion studies struggle dealing with OH variability over the years. In the present review, the results presented here should be taken as “what would be the emission changes considering constant OH over the years”. However, we added few sentences of discussion at the end of the text before the conclusions. For the future this issue should be addressed.

Page 7 Line 10 – The problem with taking 2000-2012 is that the modelling may effectively seek to smooth over the really sharp year-on-year meteorological changes in the 2007-2011 period.

The choice of the 2000-2012 period responds to the willingness of better understanding the recent changes in atmospheric methane and corresponds to a period of large amount of atmospheric methane observations. Regarding the sharp meteorological year to year changes in the 2007-2011 period, they are accounted for in the atmospheric transport and the models do show some important year to year variations on methane emissions, especially around 2010-2011, as shown for example on Fig 1c (it should be noted that 12 month running means are displayed, smoothing a bit the monthly variations). So we do not see major reasons that the models especially miss some variability between 2007 and 2011.

Page 9 Line 18 – typo ‘anomalies : : :shows’

Thank you for pointing the typo. This has been corrected

Page 10 Line 4 – note that gas use and coal use are heavily and variably dependent on meteorology – cold winter heating in China, or coal/gas fuelled electricity demand for air conditioning in the US and southern China in hot weather, etc etc.

Indeed we missed the potential climate variability of fuel demand. The former sentence, page 10, line 7 has been modified as follows: **“Fossil-fuel exploitation can also be sensitive to rapid economic changes, and meteorological variability may impact the fuel demand for heating and cooling systems.”**

Line 19 – are cow populations in very cattle-rich Kenya, South Sudan, Cameroon, etc etc ‘relatively stable?’ – I doubt it. Are African cow populations increasing continuously? In Zimbabwe for example, cattle populations crashed in 2014.

At the continental scale of Africa, the statistics data show continuously increasing cattle population. However, country specific study of FAO statistics would probably show more year-to-year changes in cattle and buffaloes: for example Kenya experienced a rapid increase in cattle population between 2006 and 2008, though Kenya represents only 5% of the African cattle population. Looking further into FAO statistics per country, one may see that some statistics are missing for some African countries for the earlier years (South Sudan). Regarding Zimbabwe, it should be acknowledge that Zimbabwe represents less than 2% of the African cattle population and that the recent changes (after 2012) are not included in our study.

Page 11 Lines 1-10– all this assumes OH, soil sink, Cl destruction are not major factors.

For most of the models, the soil sink is from climatological estimates. As a result, the entire discussion in the paper is on emission changes assuming constant OH and Cl concentrations, and soil sink. The chemical sink, per se, is not constant as it depends on methane concentrations. In the introduction (formerly page 6, from line 21), we modified our sentences to be clearer from the beginning on this issue and we reinforced the last paragraph of the paper as well.

“However, we do not address the contribution of the methane sinks during this period. Indeed, for most of the models, the soil sink is from climatological estimates and the oxidant concentration fields (OH, Cl, O1D) are assumed constant over the years. The global mean of OH concentrations was generally optimized against methyl chloroform observations (e.g. Montzka et al. (2011)), but no inter annual variability is applied.”

Line 16 – note the major reorganisations in the Chinese coal industry, and modernisation from many small gassy mines to fewer mines with better safety control (methane).

The following sentence has been added to acknowledge this, however including such considerations on modernization of coal exploitation in China will probably not counterbalance the large increase in Chinese coal production.

“This recent period is characterized by major re-organizations in the Chinese coal industry, including evolution from many small gassy mines to fewer mines with better safety and emission control.”

Line 19 – dry years in tropics

This explanation has been added as follows:

“However, between 2002 and 2010, a significant negative trend of -0.5 ± 0.1 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² is found for biomass burning, both from the top-down approaches (Fig. S5) and the GFED3 and GFED4s inventory (Fig. S10), this corresponds to dry years in the tropics. Although it should be noted that almost all inversions use GFED3 in their prior (Table S1) and therefore are not independent from the bottom-up estimates.”

Line 34- note Levin et al comment on Kai et al.

We have added the following sentence to acknowledge the dependency on the data selection made by Kai et al.

“However Levin et al. (2012) showed that the isotopic data selection might bias this result, as they found no such decrease when using background site measurements.”

Page 12 Line 3 – the problem of priors being EDGAR-dependent: : :could be discussed more?

We rephrased this sentence: **“However, the estimated anthropogenic emissions can significantly deviate from this common prior. Similarly, inversions based on the same prior wetland fluxes do not systematically infer the same variations in methane total and natural emissions. These different increments from the prior are constrained by atmospheric observations and qualitatively indicate that inversions can depart from prior estimates.”**

Line 13 – English problem – leads (?us) robustly to infer”

This has been changed to: **“Even using time-constant prior emissions for fossil fuels in the inversions results in robustly inferring increasing fossil fuel emissions [...]”**

Line 19 – key point of the whole paper: : :step change.

This step change in the inversion is discussed in the discussion section in the “Methane sink by OH” part. We have added the following sentence on former page 12 line 20:

“The requirement of a step change in the emissions will be further discussed in Section 4.”

Page 13 Line 5 – note major coal industries in S Africa and Australia, and major Australian gas industry.

It seems hard to enter in such a precision in this part where we present broader results.

Line 9 – lack of tropical observations – point also made by Bousquet et al some years ago – needs emphasis.

The reference has been added here as follows: **“Yet most of inversions rely on surface observations, which poorly represent the tropical continents, as previously noticed by previous individual study (e.g., Bousquet et al. (2011))”**

Line 20 – choice of month – indeed.

We rephrased: **“... sensitive to the choice of the starting and ending dates of the time period”**

Page 14. Line 6 – N America: important point, needs emphasis.

We have added the previous Turner et al (2016?) paper reference and update the Bruhwiler et al reference that have been published since the submission. The paragraph as been changed as follows: **“Also, temperate North America does not contribute significantly to the emission changes. Contrary to a large increase in the US emissions suggested by Turner et al. (2016), none of the inversions detect, at least prior to 2013, an increase in methane emissions possible due to increasing shale gas exploitation in the U.S. Bruhwiler et al. (2017) highlight the difficulty of deriving trends on relatively short term due to in particular inter annual variability in transport.”**

Line 14 – Arctic – another important point, needs emphasis.

Line 18 – ditto.

We rephrased and extended the already existing paragraph about the Arctic: p14 l10-26, as follows:

“Permafrost thawing may have caused additional methane production underground (Christensen et al., 20014) but changes in the out coming methane flux to the atmosphere, possibly hidden in wetland emissions under existing wetlands, has not been detected by continuous atmospheric stations around the Arctic, despite a small increase in late autumn/early winter in methane emission from Arctic tundra, (Sweeney et al., 2016). However, unintentional double counting of emissions from different water systems (wetlands, rivers, lakes) may lead to Artic emission growth in the bottom-up studies when little or none exists (Thornton et al., 2016). The detectability of possibly increasing methane emissions from the Arctic seems possible today based on the continuous monitoring of Arctic atmosphere at few but key stations (e.g., Berchet et al., 2016; Thonat et al., 2017), but this surface network remains fragile on the long-term and would be more robust with additional constraints such as those that will be provided in 2021 by the active satellite mission MERLIN (Pierangelo et al., 2016; Kiemle et al., 2014).”

Page 15 Line 5 – this is very counter-intuitive given the flooding in Bolivia and the Amazon flows!

We agree but this result is mostly driven by the inventory for wetland extent used by all bottom-up models (see Poulter et al., 2017). We recall this in the text:

“[...] mostly due to a reduction in tropical wetland extent, as constrained by the common inventory used by all models, see Poulter et al., 2017)”

Line 30 – maybe earlier estimates are over-dependent on production figures, and does not consider modernisation of mines. See also P 17 L7, which seems more realistic.

We already added this remark in page 11 line 16 comment.

Page 16 Line 4 – 2006-8 step change again.

As discussed previously, the “step-change” might be emphasized by the assumption of constant OH concentrations in the inversions. This is discussed in the discussion section. As we acknowledge this weakness, we decided to not define it as a “step change”.

Line 15 – wetland variability near-zero?? Puzzling, given the la Nina 2011 flooding. – (also discussed on P 17 line 23: maybe it would be an idea to gather all this together?)

Here the “emission change” between the two period is discussed not the “inter annual variability”. There could be no change between the two periods, but inter annual variability within each period, which is the case. And this is why it is hard to derive trend from a signal with large inter annual variability. Due to the importance of the source and its variation, we chose to further discuss it the Discussion Section 4.

Page 18 Line 32-33 – see new Sherwood inventory (ESSD 2017)

Sherwood et al. 2017 as been added as follows on former page 19, line 1: “[...] **while a recent study suggests different globally averaged isotopic signatures (Sherwood et al., 2017), with a lighter fossil fuel...**”

Page 19 Line 14 – typo 20002

This has been corrected

Line 20 – also better latitudinal information, especially in the tropics.

We modified the sentence: **“This problem has more unknowns than constraints, and other pieces of information need to be added to further solve it (such as ¹⁴C, deuterium, or co-emitted species but also better latitudinal information, especially in the tropics).”**

Page 20 Line 6 – it is not clear that fracking in 2017 is now a major growth factor in emissions. Perhaps the opposite is happening. Various studies imply the frackers have really cut their gas losses in the past few years.

Our study ends in 2012. The recent change in fracking cannot be addressed here but might be – if any signal appears, in the next GCP exercise.

Line 20 – ‘even less changes’ – clumsy English. Maybe rewrite whole sentence to make it clearer? Also Line 25 could be in clearer language, especially as it is an important sentence.

This paragraph about methane sinks has been rephrased and extended to include recent papers, as stated several times before.

Conclusion

This is a valuable and interesting analysis of causes of variability. It does not properly address the sink problem, but nevertheless, once that gap is clearly acknowledged, it is a useful and significant contribution that should be published with minor revision.

Detailed Response to Anonymous Referee #2

We acknowledge anonymous referee #2 for his/her time spent on reading and commenting on the paper, providing comments and helpful suggestions to improve the manuscript, in particular the English and phrasing of some sentences, and citations that were missing.

This is a timely, thoughtful, thorough, and important work from the scientific community involved in the Global Carbon Project. This effort focuses on the sub-decadal variability in an effort to the apparent, vexing shifts in the atmospheric growth rate of methane (CH₄). It takes a measured approach to attributing the cause of CH₄ variability in terms of natural (although perhaps perturbed by climate change) and direct anthropogenic sources. It also nicely consolidates the top-down inversions and the bottom-up emission inventories. It does not deal with the possible changes in atmospheric sinks (OH), although the evidence for large variability in the sink are proposed in some recent papers, but remain entirely obscure. This paper takes a balanced approach and could be published as is, or with some minor revisions suggested below. My apologies for the delay in reading/reviewing this manuscript. Request: Can we please all go to continuous line numbering so that it is easy to read sections and refer to them without finding the page number?

P4L18. The refs for OH chemistry models are fine as an overview, but the Holmes et al (2013, you have it later in the paper) is a good example of multi-model assessment of the interannual variability in the OH sink and its possible causes that is not found in the ACCMIP studies.

We thank the reviewer for the additional **reference** that has been **added** at this place of the text.

P5L15. The cryo-ethane history has proven useful in evaluating fossil fuel emissions and inferring ff-CH₄ sources (Aydin et al., Nature 2011, 476:198-201, 2011; Nicewonger, et al. GRL 43:214–221, 2015), and these are more relevant here than the LA-basin study of Wennberg.

We thank the reviewer for these two relevant papers, both using cryo-observations of the atmospheric composition. **These two papers** have been **added** on top of the Wennberg et al., which used in-situ present atmospheric observations.

P6L16-17. I think you mean "the first GCP global methane budget :"

Indeed, it would not be fair to pretend that other methane reviews do not exist. This has been modified.

P6L22ff. I think that this phrase is close but could be better "as most of the inversions used here assume constant OH concentrations over years, generally only optimizing its mean global concentration against methyl chloroform observations (e.g. Montzka et al. (2011))." What the models assume is not constant OH but rather constant CH₄ loss frequency (with respect to OH). These are not the same, since if temperature changes then the constant OH will result in different CH₄ loss. Moreover, the methyl chloroform decay records a mean loss frequency and not a mean OH as is frequently used. I suggest we move on to more accurate statements like: "as most of the inversions used here assume constant methane loss to OH over the time period, consistent with the observed decay of methyl chloroform (e.g. Montzka et al. (2011); Holmes et al, 2013)."

We thank the reviewer for this very interesting comment. Actually, there is probably a misunderstanding in the way MCF and CH₄ inversions are done. In the chemistry transport models used in inverse modeling, the chemical loss of a compound through OH is calculated at each time step using OH (prescribed), the compound concentrations and the reaction constant (driven by the temperature 3D field generally nudged to ECMWF inter-annual reanalyses). For MCF inversions a scaling factor is optimized for the loss, but then it is used to get inter annually varying OH (few inversion) or a seasonally-varying climatological OH

(most inversions), that is then prescribed to CH₄ inversions. Therefore, CH₄ inversions do not prescribe the pre-optimized loss but the MCF-derived OH fields, which may introduce some inconsistency about the impact of temperature changes on the loss. This effect is absorbed in OH variations as it is done currently. It remains probably small when looking only to 1-2 decades but could be significant during large climate events such as El Niño.

This part has been re-written as follows: “ **However, we do not address the contribution of the methane sinks during this period. Indeed, for most of the models, the soil sink is from climatological estimates and the oxidant concentration fields (OH, Cl, O₁D) are assumed constant over the years. The global mean of OH concentrations was generally optimized against methyl chloroform observations (e.g. Montzka et al. (2011)), but no inter annual variability is applied.**”

P9L11-15. You really need to note that if these models used their own OH & T fields that the CH₄ budget would vary by 30% or more. It is because they use an accepted OH-lifetime for methane (e.g., Prather GRL 39:L09803, 2012) that top-down agrees so closely.

This is true that the agreement between the inversions is linked to the use of similar OH concentrations and temperature fields. We have added the following sentence: “**It is to be noted that this rather good agreement between these estimates is linked with the associated rather small range of global sinks. Indeed, most inversions use similar MCF-constrained OH fields and temperature fields.**”

P14L2. typo: constrained to constrain.

This has been corrected

P14L8. While I tend to believe the Bruhwiler paper and not trust the cherry-picked satellite data over the US, you might consider referencing these two papers (Turner, Jacob, et al. GRL, 43:2218–2224, 2016; Schneising et al. Earth’s Future 2:548–558, 2014).

Following your comment and reviewer#1 comment on this paragraph. The paragraph as been changed as follows: “**Also, temperate North America does not contribute significantly to the emission changes. Contrary to a large increase in the US emissions suggested by Turner et al. (2016), none of the inversions detect, at least prior to 2013, an increase in methane emissions possible due to increasing shale gas exploitation in the U.S. Bruhwiler et al. (2017) highlight the difficulty of deriving trends on relatively short term due to in particular inter annual variability in transport.**”

P14L27. the phrase "are assumed not to contribute" is awkward. At first it sound like this paper assumes this, but what you mean is "are assumed in these model studies not to .."?

This has been rephrased as suggested.

P15L17. awkward end: "emissions occur partly over the same areas:

This has been rephrased to: “**emissions may both occur in the same or neighboring model pixels.**”

P15L18. drop the 'of' to make it a sentence.

This has been corrected.

p15L23. Now you jump from fluxes (Tg/y) in the above to trends/accelerations (Tg/yr²). How about using this line to transition to translate this difference in emissions to a trend: " and 2008-2012, i.e., a trend of about +1.7 Tg CH₄ yr⁻²).

Thank you for pointing this. The suggested change has been done as follows: “**For China, bottom-up approaches suggest a +10 [2-20] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ emission increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012, i.e. a trend of about 1.7 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² (considering a 10 Tg yr⁻¹ increase over 2004-2010), which is much larger than the top-down estimates.**”

P16L2. ?? "change, and this result holds similarly for : : :"

Thank you for the rewriting, this has been modified.

P17L11. typo: "..that the increase in methane emissions between: : :"

This has been corrected.

P17L18ff. Please revise this sentence and make more, shorter ones. I was totally lost at the "although". " The sectorial partitioning from inversions is in agreement (within the uncertainty) with bottom-up inventories (noting that inversions are not independent from inventories), though the top-down ensemble significantly decreases the methane emission change from fossil fuel production and use compared to the bottom-up inventories, although the estimate of the latter should decrease with the upcoming revised version of the EDGAR inventory (see Sect. 3.2.4)."

Indeed... This has been changed to: **"The sectorial partitioning from inversions is in agreement (within the uncertainty) with bottom-up inventories (noting that inversions are not independent from inventories). However the top-down ensemble significantly decreases the methane emission change from fossil fuel production and use compared to the bottom-up inventories. In the coming years, the revised version of the EDGAR inventory (see Sect. 3.2.4) should decrease the estimated change by bottom-up inventories, reducing the difference between bottom-up and top-down estimates."**

P17L31. " the spread of land surface models" Please pick a better word than "spread": these models do not grow like forests:

This has been rephrased to: **"The range of the methane emissions estimated by land surface models driven with the same flooded area extent shows that [...]"**

P18L8. Fix up: " wetland emissions per Meter Square." and put the Poulter ref at the end of the sentence if possible.

The sentence has been rephrased as follows: **"However, no significant trend in tropical surface temperature is inferred over 2000-2012 that could explain an increase in tropical wetland emissions (Poulter et al., in review)."**

P18L16. I think you do not want 'incorrectly' in this sentence, the following clause says it all: "Even though top-down approaches may incorrectly attribute: : :"

'incorrectly' has been removed from the sentence as follows: **"Even though top-down approaches may attribute the emissions increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 to tropical regions (and hence partly to wetland emitting areas) due to a lack of observational constraints, it is not possible, with the evidence provided in this study, to rule out a potential positive contribution of wetland emissions in the increase of global methane emissions at the global scale."**

P19L5. easier to read as: "..changes leads, as expected, to unrealistically: : :"

This has been corrected accordingly.

P19L19. put a comma between the two independent clauses: " than constraints, and other :"

This has been added in the sentence.

P19L21-35. Here is maybe where it is worth looking at the firn-air record showing ethane decreases (Aydin & Nicewonger refs above).

Nicewonger et al. results span only to 1918 and could not provide any insight in this discussion on the recent change. The Aydin study used firn air data and discussed fossil fuel emissions change from 1900 to 2010. This is not completely compatible with the period discussed here so we added a sentence about these historical papers in the introduction:

“The historical record of atmospheric ethane suggests an increase of ethane sources until the 1980s and then a decrease driven by fossil fuel related emissions until the early 2000s (Aydin et al., 2011).”

P20L3-6. This sentence does not really belong in the "Ethane" discussion? " Besides, the recent bottom-up study of Höglund-Isaksson (2017) shows relatively stable methane emissions from oil and gas after 2007: : :."

The Höglund-Isaksson study does not use ethane measurement, however they show constant emission from the oil and gas sector. This result disagrees with the ethane-based study and is worth noting in this context. As a result, we decided to change the paragraph title to **“Oil and gas emissions, and ethane constraint”**

P20L17-29. This OH section is bothersome. I think you mean that models assume constant methane loss frequency – OR if they fix the 3D OH distribution, then the interannual temperature variations will drive changes in methane loss. I think they do the former and hence the correct wording would be "assume constant OH-lifetime for methane" or "assume constant methane loss frequency." These cannot just assume a uniform OH-loss because then they miss the seasonal and latitudinal gradients.

As explained above this is the second statement that occurs in practice in current inversions. Indeed, inverse modellers prescribed climatological OH (with seasonal variations) and compute the loss using varying CH₄ and temperature. This might not be fully consistent but we clarified the method in the text.

I also recommend that the authors also look at the trends in methane's OH-lifetime from the Holmes et al 2013 paper. Several models show no trends from 2006 to 2010. If anything all the models show a decreasing methane OH-lifetime from a high in 2004 to a low in 2010, an 'OH' increase of about 3%. Moreover, one model running both with GEOS MERRA vs. GEOS6 shows different trends. The Dalsøren 2016 paper is very interesting, but it is only one model – further, this Oslo CTM3 shows different trends than the same model in the Holmes paper. I am not sure which is the better result, but some caution is due. Interestingly, all the models get the big increase in OH across the 1997-89 ENSO year.

We acknowledge the caution suggested by the reviewer. **And modified the text accordingly in the last paragraph of the paper.**

P20L26. "However, decreasing OH concentrations since 2008 would require smaller emission changes to explain the observed atmospheric methane increase, also possibly implying .." This is confusing since both the Dalsoren and Holmes papers show a decrease in lifetime (2% possibly) and hence an increase in OH after 2008.

Figure 1 of Holmes 2013 and figure 15 of Dalsoren 2016 are consistent until 2007. Holmes stops in 2009 but Dalsoren shows stabilizing OH after 2007. **We rephrased this paragraph to better show the remaining uncertainties on OH variations.**

P21L27-30. Again, please check that the models kept the methane OH-lifetime (effectively the inverse loss frequency) fixed and did not freeze OH concentrations, allowing the rate coefficient to vary with temperature as it should, because then the temperature fluctuations could drive %-level variability. Also I think you have the Dalsoren paper backwards: their Fig 15 (&18) shows a steadily increasing methane loss frequency (1/lifetime, left scale) since the 1997-98 ENSO and up to 2010; the year 2008 is the only reversal of this. Their calculated change in OH does not match the CH₄ lifetime, and it is the lifetime that determines the annual loss of CH₄.

Again, as explained above, CTMs implied in inversions prescribe OH change and recomputed the loss using inter-annually varying meteorology. **The paragraph was rephrased to better reflect what was done and the remaining uncertainties.**

P21L33. "uncertainties" is odd. I am not sure we know enough to even assess the uncertainty. how about "major disagreements in OH fields simulated by the models."

We agree on this comment and have changed the sentence as suggested to: **"Estimating and optimizing OH oxidation in top-down approaches is challenging due to the major disagreements in OH fields simulated by the models."**

P22L1. It is the fact that we stopped using MCF and it is decreasing rapidly, that makes it a good surrogate for the methane OH-lifetime. When in use the uncertainty in emissions made it difficult to get better than 10-20% accuracy and variability.

We agree and have rephrased this part of the conclusion: **"Although beneficial for the recovery of the stratospheric ozone, methyl-chloroform, which is used as a proxy to derive OH variations, is decreasing rapidly in the atmosphere. MCF is therefore less sensitive to uncertain and larger emissions as in the 1980s and 1990s (e.g. Kroll et al., 2003; Prinn et al., 2001), but within years, will also be less useful to derive OH changes as its atmospheric concentrations are getting as small as the precision and accuracy of the measurements. "**

P22L5. I am not sure that this comparison with CO2 is useful or accurate. There are many thorny problems left with the CO2 budget and climate feedbacks. Stop at "understood."

The sentence has been stopped at "understood" as suggested.

Variability and quasi-decadal changes in the methane budget over the period 2000-2012

Marielle Saunois¹, Philippe Bousquet¹, Ben Poulter², Anna Peregon¹, Philippe Ciais¹, Josep G. Canadell³, Edward J. Dlugokencky⁴, Giuseppe Etiope^{5,6}, David Bastviken⁷, Sander Houweling^{8,9}, Greet Janssens-Maenhout¹⁰, Francesco N. Tubiello¹¹, Simona Castaldi^{12,13,14}, Robert B. Jackson¹⁵, Mihai Alexe¹⁰, Vivek K. Arora¹⁶, David J. Beerling¹⁷, Peter Bergamaschi¹⁰, Donald R. Blake¹⁸, Gordon Brailsford¹⁹, Lori Bruhwiler⁴, Cyril Crevoisier²⁰, Patrick Crill²¹, Kristofer Covey²², Christian Frankenberg^{23,24}, Nicola Gedney²⁵, Lena Höglund-Isaksson²⁶, Misa Ishizawa²⁷, Akihiko Ito²⁷, Fortunat Joos²⁸, Heon-Sook Kim²⁷, Thomas Kleinen²⁹, Paul Krummel³⁰, Jean-François Lamarque³¹, Ray Langenfelds³⁰, Robin Locatelli¹, Toshinobu Machida²⁷, Shamil Maksyutov²⁷, Joe R. Melton³², Isamu Morino³³, Vaishali Naik³⁴, Simon O'Doherty³⁵, Frans-Jan W. Parmentier³⁶, Prabir K. Patra³⁷, Changhui Peng^{38,39}, Shushi Peng^{1,40}, Glen P. Peters⁴¹, Isabelle Pison¹, Ronald Prinn⁴², Michel Ramonet¹, William J. Riley⁴³, Makoto Saito²⁷, Monia Santini¹⁴, Ronny Schroeder⁴⁴, Isobel J. Simpson¹⁸, Renato Spahni²⁸, Atsushi Takizawa⁴⁵, Brett F. Thornton²¹, Hanqin Tian⁴⁶, Yasunori Tohjima²⁷, Nicolas Viovy¹, Apostolos Voulgarakis⁴⁷, Ray Weiss⁴⁸, David J. Wilton¹⁷, Andy Wiltshire⁴⁹, Doug Worthy⁵⁰, Debra Wunch⁵¹, Xiyan Xu^{43,52}, Yukio Yoshida²⁷, Bowen Zhang⁴⁶, Zhen Zhang^{2,53}, and Qiuhan Zhu³⁹.

¹Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE-IPSL (CEA-CNRS-UVSQ), Université Paris-Saclay 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

²NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Biospheric Science Laboratory, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

³Global Carbon Project, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia

⁴NOAA ESRL, 325 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80305, USA

⁵Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Sezione Roma 2, via V. Murata 605 00143 Roma

⁶Faculty of Environmental Science and Engineering, Babes Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania.

⁷Department of Thematic Studies – Environmental Change, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden

⁸Netherlands Institute for Space Research (SRON), Sorbonnelaan 2, 3584 CA Utrecht, The Netherlands

⁹Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research Sorbonnelaan 2, 3584 CA, Utrecht, The Netherlands

¹⁰European Commission Joint Research Centre, Ispra (Va), Italy

¹¹Statistics Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome 00153, Italy

¹²Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali, Biologiche e Farmaceutiche, Seconda Università di Napoli, via Vivaldi 43, 81100 Caserta, Italy

¹³Far East Federal University (FEFU), Vladivostok, Russky Island, Russia

¹⁴Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change, Via Augusto Imperatore 16, 73100 Lecce, Italy

¹⁵School of Earth, Energy & Environmental Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-2210, USA

¹⁶Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis, Climate Research Division, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Victoria, BC, V8W 2Y2, Canada

¹⁷Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK

¹⁸University of California Irvine, 570 Rowland Hall, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹⁹National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, 301 Evans Bay Parade, Wellington, New Zealand

²⁰Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique, LMD/IPSL, CNRS Ecole polytechnique, Université Paris-Saclay, 91120 Palaiseau, France

Marielle Saunois 7/6/2017 11:45

Deleted: 2

- ²¹Department of Geological Sciences and Bolin Centre for Climate Research, Svante Arrhenius väg 8, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
- ²²School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University New Haven, CT 06511, USA
- ²³California Institute of Technology, Geological and Planetary Sciences, Pasadena, USA
- 5 ²⁴Jet Propulsion Laboratory, M/S 183-601, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109, USA
- ²⁵Met Office Hadley Centre, Joint Centre for Hydrometeorological Research, Maclean Building, Wallingford OX10 8BB, UK
- ²⁶Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases program (AIR), International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria
- 10 ²⁷Center for Global Environmental Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies (NIES), Onogawa 16-2, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8506, Japan
- ²⁸Climate and Environmental Physics, Physics Institute and Oeschger Center for Climate Change Research, University of Bern, Sidlerstr. 5, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland
- ²⁹Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, Bundesstrasse 53, 20146 Hamburg, Germany
- 15 ³⁰CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, Victoria 3195 Australia
- ³¹NCAR, PO Box 3000, Boulder, Colorado 80307-3000, USA
- ³²Climate Research Division, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Victoria, BC, V8W 2Y2, Canada
- ³³Center for Global Environmental Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies (NIES), Onogawa 16-2, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8506, Japan.
- 20 ³⁴NOAA, GFDL, 201 Forrestal Rd., Princeton, NJ 08540
- ³⁵School of Chemistry, University of Bristol, Cantock's Close, Clifton, Bristol BS8 1TS
- ³⁶Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, Faculty of Biosciences, Fisheries and Economics, UiT: The Arctic University of Norway, NO-9037, Tromsø, Norway
- ³⁷Department of Environmental Geochemical Cycle Research and Institute of Arctic Climate and Environment Research, JAMSTEC, 3173-25 Showa-machi, Kanazawa-ku, Yokohama, 236-0001, Japan
- 25 ³⁸Department of Biology Sciences, Institute of Environment Science, University of Quebec at Montreal, Montreal, QC H3C 3P8, Canada
- ³⁹State Key Laboratory of Soil Erosion and Dryland Farming on the Loess Plateau, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, Shaanxi 712100, China
- 30 ⁴⁰Sino-French Institute for Earth System Science, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
- ⁴¹CICERO Center for International Climate Research, Pb. 1129 Blindern, 0318 Oslo, Norway
- ⁴²Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Building 54-1312, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
- ⁴³Earth Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
- 35 ⁴⁴Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824, USA
- ⁴⁵Japan Meteorological Agency (JMA), 1-3-4 Otemachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8122, Japan
- ⁴⁶International Center for Climate and Global Change Research, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences, Auburn University, 602 Duncan Drive, Auburn, AL 36849, USA
- ⁴⁷Space & Atmospheric Physics, The Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, U.K.
- 40 ⁴⁸Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA
- ⁴⁹Met Office Hadley Centre, FitzRoy Road, Exeter, EX1 3PB, United Kingdom
- ⁵⁰Environnement Canada, 4905, rue Dufferin, Toronto, Canada.
- ⁵¹Department of Physics, University of Toronto, 60 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
- ⁵²CAS Key Laboratory of Regional Climate-Environment for Temperate East Asia, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029, China
- 45 ⁵³Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Birmensdorf 8059, Switzerland

Correspondance to: Marielle Saunois (marielle.saunois@lsce.ipsl.fr)

Abstract. Following the recent Global Carbon project (GCP) synthesis of the decadal methane (CH₄) budget over 2000-2012 (Saunois et al., 2016), we analyse here the same dataset with a focus on quasi-decadal and inter-annual variability in CH₄ emissions. [The GCP dataset integrates results from top-down studies \(exploiting atmospheric observations within an atmospheric inverse-modelling frameworks\) and bottom-up models \(including process-based models for estimating land surface emissions and atmospheric chemistry\), inventories of anthropogenic emissions, and data-driven approaches.](#)

The annual global methane emissions from top-down studies, which by construction match the observed methane growth rate within their uncertainties, all show an increase in total methane emissions over the period 2000-2012, but this increase is not linear over the 13 years. Despite differences between individual studies, the mean emission anomaly of the top-down ensemble shows no significant trend in total methane emissions over the period 2000-2006, during the plateau of atmospheric methane mole fractions, and also over the period 2008-2012, during the renewed atmospheric methane increase. However, the top-down ensemble mean produces an emission shift between 2006 and 2008, leading to 22 [16-32] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ higher methane emissions over the period 2008-2012 compared to 2002-2006. This emission increase mostly originated from the tropics with a smaller contribution from mid-latitudes and no significant change from boreal regions.

The regional contributions remain uncertain in top-down studies. Tropical South America and South and East Asia seems to contribute the most to the emission increase in the tropics. However, these two regions have only limited atmospheric measurements and remain therefore poorly constrained.

The sectorial partitioning of this emission increase between the periods 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 differs from one atmospheric inversion study to another. However, all top-down studies suggest smaller changes in fossil fuel emissions (from oil, gas, and coal industries) compared to the mean of the bottom-up inventories included in this study. This difference is partly driven by a smaller emission change in China from the top-down studies compared to the estimate in the EDGARv4.2 inventory, which should be revised to smaller values in a near future. [We apply isotopic signatures to the emission changes estimated for individual studies based on five emission sectors and find that for six individual top-down studies \(out of eight\) the average isotopic signature of the emission changes is not consistent with the observed change in atmospheric ¹³CH₄. However the partitioning in emission change derived from the ensemble mean is consistent with this isotopic constraint.](#)

At the global scale, the top-down ensemble mean suggests that, the dominant contribution to the resumed atmospheric CH₄ growth after 2006 comes from microbial sources (more from agriculture and waste sectors than from natural wetlands), with an uncertain but smaller contribution from fossil CH₄ emissions. Besides, a decrease in biomass burning emissions (in agreement with the biomass burning emission databases) makes the balance of sources consistent with atmospheric ¹³CH₄ observations.

[In most of the top-down studies included here, OH concentrations are considered constant over the years \(seasonal variations but without any inter annual variability\). As a result, the methane loss \(in particular through OH oxidation\) varies mainly through the change in methane concentrations and not its oxidants. For these reasons, changes in the methane loss could not](#)

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 10:53

Deleted: The GCP dataset integrates results from top-down studies (exploiting atmospheric observations within an atmospheric inverse-modelling frameworks) and bottom-up models, inventories, and data-driven approaches (including process-based models for estimating land surface emissions and atmospheric chemistry, inventories of anthropogenic emissions, and data-driven extrapolations).

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 10:54

Deleted: Though the sectorial partitioning of six individual top-down studies out of eight are not consistent with the observed change in atmospheric ¹³CH₄, the partitioning derived from the ensemble mean is consistent with this isotopic constraint.

be properly investigated in this study, although it may play a significant role in the recent atmospheric methane changes as briefly discussed at the end of the paper.

1 Introduction

5 Methane (CH₄), the second most important anthropogenic greenhouse gas in terms of radiative forcing, is highly relevant to mitigation policy due to its shorter lifetime and its stronger warming potential compared to carbon dioxide. Atmospheric CH₄ mole fraction has experienced a renewed and sustained increase since 2007 after almost ten years of stagnation (Dlugokencky et al., 2009; Rigby et al., 2008; Nisbet et al., 2014, 2016). Over 2006-2013, the atmospheric CH₄ growth rate was about 5 ppb yr⁻¹, before reaching 12.7 ppb yr⁻¹ in 2014 and 9.5 ppb yr⁻¹ in 2015 (NOAA monitoring network: http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/).

10 The growth rate of atmospheric methane is a very accurate measurement of the imbalance between global sources and sinks. Methane is emitted by anthropogenic sources (livestock including enteric fermentation and manure management; rice cultivation; solid waste and wastewater; fossil fuel production, transmission and distribution; biomass burning), and natural sources (wetlands; and other inland freshwater, geological sources, hydrates, termites, wild animals). Methane is mostly destroyed in the atmosphere by hydroxyl radical (OH) oxidation (90 % of the atmospheric sink). Other sinks include
15 destruction by atomic oxygen and chlorine in the stratosphere and in the marine boundary layer for the latter, and upland soil sink by microbial methane oxidation. The changes in these sources and sinks can be investigated by different methods: bottom-up process-based models of wetland emissions (Melton et al., 2013; Bohn et al., 2015; Poulter et al., 2016), rice paddy emissions (Zhang et al. 2016), termite emissions (Sanderson, 1996; Kirschke et al., 2013, supplementary) and soil uptake (Curry, 2007), data-driven approaches for other natural fluxes (e.g., Bastviken et al. (2011); Etiope (2015)),
20 atmospheric chemistry climate model for methane oxidation by OH (John et al. 2012; Naik et al., 2013; Voulgarakis et al., 2013; Holmes et al., 2013), bottom-up inventories for anthropogenic emissions (e.g., EDGAR, EPA, FAO, GAINS), observation-driven models for biomass burning emissions (e.g., GFED) and finally by atmospheric inversions, which optimally combine methane atmospheric observations within a chemistry transport model, and a prior knowledge of sources and sinks (inversions are also called top-down approaches, e.g., Bergamaschi et al. (2013); Houweling et al. (2014); Pison et al. (2013)).

25 The renewed increase in atmospheric methane since 2007 has been investigated in the recent past years; atmospheric concentration-based studies suggest a mostly tropical signal, with a small contribution from the mid-latitudes and no clear change from high latitudes (Bousquet et al., 2011; Bergamaschi et al., 2013; Bruhwiler et al., 2014; Dlugokencky et al., 2011; Patra et al., 2016; Nisbet et al., 2016). The year 2007 was found to be a year with exceptionally high emissions from the Arctic (e.g., Dlugokencky et al. (2009)), but it does not mean that Arctic emissions were persistently higher during the entire period 2008-2012. Attribution of the renewed atmospheric CH₄ growth to specific source and sink processes is still being debated. Bergamaschi et al. (2013) found that anthropogenic emissions were the most important contributor to the

methane growth rate increase after 2007, though smaller than in the EDGARv4.2FT2010 inventory. In contrast, Bousquet et al. (2011) explained the methane increases in 2007-2008 by an increase mainly in natural emissions, while Poulter et al. (in review) do not find significant trends in global wetland emissions from an ensemble of wetland models over the period 2000-2012. This flat trend over the decade is associated to large year-to-year variations (e.g. 2010-11 in the tropics) that limits its robustness together with sensitivities to the choice of the inventory chosen to represent the wetland extend. McNorton et al. (2016b) using a single wetland emission model with a different wetland dynamics scheme also concluded a small increase (3%) in wetland emissions relative to 1993-2006. Associated with the atmospheric CH₄ mixing ratio increase, the atmospheric δ¹³C-CH₄ shows a continuous decrease since 2007 (e.g., Nisbet et al. (2016)), pointing towards increasing sources with depleted δ¹³C-CH₄ (microbial) and/or decreasing sources with enriched δ¹³C-CH₄ (pyrogenic, thermogenic). Using a box model combining δ¹³C-CH₄ and CH₄ observations, two recent studies infer a dominant role of increasing microbial emissions (more depleted in ¹³C than thermogenic and pyrogenic sources) to explain the higher CH₄ growth rate after circa. 2006. Schaefer et al. (2016) hypothesized (but did not prove) that the increasing microbial source was from agriculture rather than from natural wetlands, however given the uncertainties in isotopic signatures the evidence against wetlands is not strong. Schwietzke et al. (2016), using updated estimates of the source isotopic signatures (Sherwood et al., 2017) with rather narrow uncertainty ranges, also find a positive trend in microbial emissions. In a scenario where biomass burning emissions are constant over time, they inferred decreasing fossil fuel emissions, in disagreement with emission inventories. However, the global burned area is suggested to have decreased (-1.2% yr⁻¹) over the period 2000-2012 (Giglio et al., 2013) leading to a decrease in biomass burning emissions (<http://www.globalfiredata.org/figures.html>). In a second scenario including a 1.2 % yr⁻¹ decrease in biomass burning emissions, Schwietzke et al. (2016) find fossil fuel emissions close to constant over time, when coal production significantly increased, mainly from China.

Atmospheric observations of ethane, a species co-emitted with methane in the oil and gas up-stream sector can be used to estimate methane emissions from this sector (e.g., Aydin et al., 2011; Wennberg et al., 2012; Nicewonger et al., 2016). The historical record of atmospheric ethane suggests an increase of ethane sources until the 1980s and then a decrease driven by fossil fuel related emissions until the early 2000s (Aydin et al., 2011). Over the 2007-2014 period, Hausmann et al. (2016) suggested a significant increase in oil and gas methane emissions contributing to the increase in total methane emissions. However, this study, as many others, rely on emission ratios of ethane to methane, which are uncertain and may vary substantially over the years (e.g., Wunch et al. (2016)); yet this potential variation over time is not well documented. The increase in methane mole fractions could also be due to a decrease in OH global concentrations (Rigby et al., 2008; Holmes et al., 2013). Although OH year-to-year variability appears to be smaller than previously thought (e.g., Montzka et al. (2011)), a long-term trend can still strongly impact the atmospheric methane growth rate as a 1% change in OH corresponds to a 5 Tg change in methane emissions (Dalsoren et al., 2009). Indeed, after an increase in OH concentrations over the period 1970-2007, Dalsoren et al. (2016) found constant OH concentrations since 2007, and Rigby et al. (2017) a decrease in OH concentrations, both results possibly contributing to the observed increase in methane growth rate and therefore limiting the

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 11:01

Deleted: Schwietzke et al. (2016), using different estimates of the source isotopic signatures with rather narrow uncertainty ranges,

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 09:32

Deleted: (

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 09:32

Deleted:)

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 09:34

Deleted: Using such a method,

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 09:34

Deleted:

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 09:35

Deleted: these

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 09:35

Deleted: ies

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 22:43

Deleted: which

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 22:44

Deleted: could

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 22:44

Deleted: e

required changes in methane emissions inferred by top-down studies. [However, Turner et al. \(2017\) highlight the difficulty in disentangling the contribution in emission or sink changes when OH concentrations are weakly constrained by atmospheric measurements.](#)

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 13:58

Formatted: Font:10 pt

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 11:39

Deleted: -

Using top-down approaches, an accurate attribution of changes in methane emissions per region is difficult due to the sparse coverage of surface networks (e.g., Dlugokencky et al. (2011)). Satellite data offer a better coverage in some poorly sampled regions (tropics), and progress has been made in improving satellite retrievals of CH₄ column mole fractions (e.g., Butz et al. (2011); Cressot et al. (2014)). Yet the complete exploitation of remote sensing of CH₄ column gradients in the atmosphere to infer regional sources is still limited by relatively poor accuracy and gaps in the data, although progress has been made moving from SCIAMACHY to GOSAT (Buchwitz et al., 2015; Cressot et al., 2016). Also the chemistry transport models often fail to reproduce correctly the methane vertical gradient, especially in the stratosphere (Saad et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2016) and this misrepresentation in the models may impact the inferred surface fluxes when constrained by total column observations. Furthermore, uncertainties in top-down estimates stem from uncertainties in atmospheric transport and the setup and data used in the inverse systems (Locatelli et al., 2015; Patra et al., 2011).

One approach to address inversion uncertainties is to gather an ensemble of transport models and inversions. Instead of interpreting one single model to discuss the methane budget changes, here we take advantage of an ensemble of published studies to extract robust changes and patterns observed since 2000 and in particular since the renewed increase after 2007. This approach allows accounting for the model-to-model uncertainties in detecting robust changes of emissions (Cressot et al., 2016). Attributing sources to sectors (e.g. agriculture vs. fossil) or types (e.g. microbial vs. thermogenic) using inverse systems is challenging if no additional constraints, such as isotopes, are used to separate the different methane sources, which often overlap geographically. Assimilating only CH₄ observations, the separation of different sources relies only on their different seasonality (e.g., rice cultivation, biomass burning, wetlands), on the signal of synoptic peaks related to regional emissions when continuous observations are available, or on distinct spatial distributions. Using isotopic information such as $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ brings some additional constraints on source partitioning to separate microbial vs. fossil and fire emissions, [or to separate regions with a dominant source \(e.g. agriculture in India versus wetlands in Amazonia\)](#), but $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$ alone cannot further separate microbial emissions between agriculture, wetlands, termites or freshwaters with enough confidence due to uncertainties in their close isotopic signatures.

The Global Carbon Project (GCP) has provided a collaborative platform for scientists from different disciplinary fields to share their individual expertise and synthesize the current understanding of the global methane budget. Following the first [GCP global methane budget published by Kirschke et al. \(2013\)](#) and using the same dataset as the budget update by Saunois et al. (2016) for 2000-2012, we analyse here the results of an ensemble of top-down and bottom-up approaches in order to determine the robust features that could explain the variability, and quasi-decadal changes in CH₄ growth rate since 2000. In particular, this paper aims to highlight the most likely emission changes that could contribute to the observed positive trend in methane mole fractions since 2007. [However, we do not address the contribution of the methane sinks during this period.](#)

Indeed, for most of the models, the soil sink is from climatological estimates and the oxidant concentration fields (OH, Cl, O1D) are assumed constant over the years. The global mean of OH concentrations was generally optimized against methyl chloroform observations (e.g. Montzka et al. (2011)), but no inter annual variability is applied. It should be kept in mind that any OH change in the atmosphere will limit (in case of decreasing OH) or enhance (in case of increasing OH) the methane emission changes that are required to explain the observed atmospheric methane recent increase (e.g., Dalsoren et al. (2016), Rigby et al. (2017)), as further discussed in Sect. 4.

Section 2 presents the ensemble of bottom-up and top-down approaches used in this study as well as the common data processing operated. The main results based on this ensemble are presented and discussed in Sect. 3 through global and regional assessments of the methane emission changes as well as process contributions. We discuss these results in Sect. 4 in the context of the recent literature summarized in the introduction, and draw some conclusions in Sect. 5.

2 Methods

The datasets used in this paper were those collected and published in *The Global Methane Budget 2000-2012* (Saunois et al., 2016). The decadal budget is publicly available at http://doi.org/10.3334/CDIAC/Global_Methane_Budget_2016_V1.1 and on the Global Carbon Project website. Here, we only describe the main characteristics of the data sets and the reader may refer to the aforementioned detailed paper. The datasets include an ensemble of global top-down approaches as well as bottom-up estimates of the sources and sinks of methane.

Top-down studies. The top-down estimates of methane sources and sinks are provided by eight global inverse systems, which optimally combine a prior knowledge of fluxes with atmospheric observations, both with their associated uncertainties, into a chemistry transport model in order to infer methane sources and sinks at specific spatial and temporal scales. Eight inverse systems have provided a total of 30 inversions over 2000-2012 or shorter periods (Table 1). The longest time series of optimized methane fluxes are provided by inversions using surface in-situ measurements (15). Some surface based inversions were provided over time periods shorter than 10 years (7). Satellite-based inversions (8) provide estimates over shorter time periods (2003-2012 with SCIAMACHY; from June 2009 to 2012 using TANSO/GOSAT). As a result, the discussion presented in this paper will be essentially based on surface-based inversions as GOSAT offers too short a time series and SCIAMACHY is associated with large systematic errors that need ad-hoc corrections (e.g., Bergamaschi et al. (2013)). Most of the inverse systems estimate the total net methane emission fluxes at the surface (i.e., surface sources minus soil sinks), although some systems solve for a few individual source categories (Table 1). In order to speak in terms of emissions, each inversion provided its associated soil sink fluxes that have been added to the associated net methane fluxes to obtain estimates of surface sources. Saunois et al. (2016) attempted to separate top-down emissions into five categories: wetland emissions, other natural emissions, emissions from agriculture and waste handling, biomass burning emissions (including agricultural fires), and fossil fuel related emissions. To obtain these individual estimates from those inversions

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 11:41

Deleted: However, we do not address in detail the contribution of OH changes during this period, as most of the inversions used here assume constant OH concentrations over years, generally only optimizing its mean global concentration against methyl chloroform observations (e.g. Montzka et al. (2011)).

only solving for the net flux, the prior contribution of each source category was used to split the posterior total sources into individual contributions.

Bottom-up studies. The bottom-up approaches gather inventories for anthropogenic emissions (agriculture and waste handling, fossil fuel related emissions, biomass burning emissions), land surface models (wetland emissions), and diverse data-driven approaches (e.g. local measurement up-scaling) for emissions from fresh waters and geological sources (Table 2). Anthropogenic emissions are from the Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGARv4.1, 2010; EDGARV4.2FT2010, 2013), the United States Environmental Protection Agency, USEPA (USEPA, 2006; 2012) and the Greenhouse gas and Air pollutant Interactions and Synergies (GAINS) model developed by the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) (Höglund-Isaksson, 2012). They report methane emissions from the following major sources: livestock (enteric fermentation and manure management); rice cultivation; solid waste and wastewater; fossil fuel production, transmission, and distribution. However, they differ in the level of detail by sector and by country, and by the emission factors used for some specific sectors and countries (Höglund-Isaksson et al., 2015). The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) FAOSTAT Emissions dataset (FAOSTAT, 2017a,b) contains estimates of agricultural and biomass burning emissions (Tubiello et al., 2013; 2015). Biomass burning emissions are also taken from the Global Fire Emission Database (version GFED3, van der Werf et al. (2010) and version GFED4s (Giglio et al., 2013; Randerson et al., 2012)), the Fire Inventory from NCAR (FINN, Wiedinmyer et al., (2011)), and the Global Fire Assimilation System (GFAS, Kaiser et al., (2012)). For wetlands, we use the results of eleven land surface models driven by the same dynamic flooded area extent dataset from remote sensing (Schroeder et al., 2015) over the 2000-2012 period. These models differ mainly in their parameterizations of CH₄ flux per unit area in response to climate and biotic factors (Poulter et al., in review; Saunio et al., 2016).

Data analysis. The top-down and bottom-up estimates are gathered separately and compared as two ensembles for anthropogenic, biomass burning, and wetland emissions. For the bottom-up approaches, the category called “other natural” encompasses emissions from termites, wild animals, lakes, oceans, and natural geological seepage (Saunio et al., 2016). However for most of these sources, limited information is available regarding their spatiotemporal distributions. Most of the inversions used here include termite and ocean emissions in their prior fluxes; some also include geological emissions (Table S1). However the emission distributions used by the inversions as prior fluxes are climatological and do not include any inter annual variability. Geological methane emissions have played a role in past climate changes (Etiope et al., 2008). There is no study on decadal changes in geological CH₄ emissions on continental and global scale, although it is known that they may increase or decrease in relation to seismic activity and variations of groundwater hydrostatic pressure (i.e. aquifer depletion). Ocean emissions have been revised downward recently (Saunio et al., 2016). Inter decadal changes in lake fluxes cannot be made in reliable ways because due to the data scarcity and lack of validated models (Saunio et al. 2016). As a result of a lack of quantified evidences, variations of lakes, oceans, and geological sources are ignored in our bottom-up analysis. However, it should be noted that possible variations of these sources are accounted for in the top-down approaches in the “other natural” category.

Some results are presented as box plots showing the 25%, 50%, and 75% percentiles. The whiskers show minimum and maximum values excluding outliers, which are shown as stars. The mean values are plotted as “+” symbols on the box plot. The values reported in the text are the mean (XX), minimum (YY) and maximum (ZZ) values as XX [YY-ZZ]. Some estimates rely on few studies so that meaningful 1-sigma values cannot be computed. To consider that methane changes are positive or negative for a time-period (e.g., Fig. 3 and 4 in Sect. 3), we consider that the change is robustly positive or negative when both the first and third quartiles are positive or negative, respectively.

3 Results

3.1 Global methane variations in 2000-2012

Atmospheric changes. The global average methane mole fractions are from four in-situ atmospheric observation networks: the Earth System Research Laboratory from the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (ESRL-NOAA, Dlugokencky et al., 1994), the Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE, Rigby et al., 2008), the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO, Francey et al., 1999) and the University of California (UCI, Simpson et al. (2012)). The four networks show a consistent evolution of the globally averaged methane mole fractions (Fig. 1a). The methane mole fractions refer here to the same NOAA2004A CH₄ reference scale. The different sampling sites used to compute the global average and the sampling frequency may explain the observed differences between networks. Indeed, the UCI network samples atmospheric methane in the Pacific Ocean between 71°N to 47°S using flasks during specific campaign periods while other networks use both continuous and flask measurements worldwide. During the first half of the 2000s, methane mole fraction remained relatively stable (1770-1785 ppb) with small positive growth rate until 2007 (0.6 ± 0.1 ppb yr⁻¹, Fig. 1b). Since 2007, methane atmospheric mole fraction rose again reaching 1820 ppb in 2012. A mean growth rate of 5.2 ± 0.2 ppb yr⁻¹ over the period 2008-2012 is observed (Fig. 1b).

Global emission changes in individual inversions. As found in several studies (e.g., Bousquet et al. (2006)), the flux anomaly (see Supplementary, Sect. 2) from top-down inversions (Fig. 1d) is found more robust than the total source estimate when comparing different inversions (Fig. 1c). The mean range between the inverse estimates of total global emissions (Fig. 1c) is of 35 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (14 to 54 over the years and inversions reported here); this means that the uncertainty in the total annual global methane emissions inferred by top-down approaches is about 6% (35 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ over 550 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). [It is to be noted that this rather good agreement between these estimates is linked with the associated rather small range of global sinks. Indeed, most inversions use similar MCF-constrained OH fields and temperature fields.](#) The three top-down studies spanning 2000 to 2012 (Table 1) show an increase of 15 to 33 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ between 2000 and 2012 (Fig. 1d). Despite the increase in global methane emissions being of the order of magnitude of the range between the models, flux anomalies clearly show that all individual inversions infer an increase in methane emissions over the period 2000-2012 (Fig. 1d). The inversions using satellite observations included here mainly use GOSAT retrievals (starting from mid-2009) and only one inversion is constrained with SCIAMACHY column methane mole fractions (from 2003 but ending in 2012, dashed lines in

Fig. 1d). On average, satellite-based inversions infer higher annual emissions than surface-based inversions (+12 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ higher over 2010-2012) as previously shown in Saunio et al. (2016) and Locatelli et al. (2015). Also it is worth noting that the ensemble of top-down results shows emissions that are consistently lower in 2009 and higher in 2008 and 2010 (Fig. 1c and Fig. S1).

5 **Year-to-year changes.** When averaging the anomalies in global emissions over the inversions, we find a difference of 22 [5-37] Tg CH₄ between the yearly averages for 2000 and 2012 (Fig. 2a). Over the period 2000-2012, the variations in emission anomalies reveal both year-to-year changes and a positive long-term trend. Year-to-year changes are found to be the largest in the tropics: up to +/- 15 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (Fig. 2b), with a negative anomaly in 2004-2006 and a positive anomaly after 2007 visible in all inversions except one (Fig. 1d). Compared with the tropical signal, mid-latitude emissions exhibit smaller anomalies (mean anomaly mostly below 5 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, except around 2005) but contribute a rather sharp increase in 2006-2008 marking a transition between the period 2002-2006 and the period 2008-2012 at the global scale (Fig. 2a and 2c). The boreal regions do not contribute significantly to year-to-year changes, except in 2007, as already noted in several studies (Dlugokencky et al., 2009; Bousquet et al., 2011).

15 When splitting global methane emissions into anthropogenic and natural emissions at the global scale (Fig. 2e and 2f, respectively), both of these two general categories show significant year-to-year changes. As natural and anthropogenic emissions occur concurrently in several regions; top-down approaches have difficulty in separating their contribution. Therefore the year-to-year variability allocated to anthropogenic emissions from inversions may be an artefact of our separation method (see Sect. 2) and/or reflect the larger variability between studies compared to natural emissions. However, some of the anthropogenic methane sources are sensitive to climate, such as rice cultivation or biomass burning, and also, to
20 a lesser extent, enteric fermentation and waste management. Fossil-fuel exploitation can also be sensitive to rapid economic changes, and meteorological variability may impact the fuel demand for heating and cooling systems. However, anthropogenic emissions reported by bottom-studies (black line on Fig. 2e) show much less year-to-year changes than inferred by top-down inversions (blue line of Fig. 2e). China coal production rose faster from 2002 until 2011 when its production started to stabilize or even decline (IEA, 2016). This last period is characterized by major re-organizations in the Chinese coal industry, including evolution from many small gassy mines to fewer mines with better safety and emission control. The global natural gas global production steadily increased over time despite a short drop in production in 2009 following the economic crisis (IEA, 2016). The bottom-up inventories do reflect some of this variation such as in 2009 when gas and oil methane emissions slightly decreased (EDGARv4.2FT2010 and EDGARv4.2EXT, Fig. S7). Methane emissions from agriculture and waste are continuously growing in the bottom-up inventories at the global
25 scale. The observed activity data underlying the emissions from agriculture estimated in this study, as reported by countries to FAO via the FAOSTAT database (FAO, 2017 a,b), exhibit inter annual variabilities that partly explain the variability in methane emissions discussed herein. Livestock methane emissions from America (mainly South America) increased mainly between 2000 and 2004, and remained stable afterwards (estimated by FAOSTAT, Fig. S12). Asian (India, China and, South

Marielle Saunio 12/7/2017 11:40

Deleted: Fossil-fuel exploitation can also be sensitive to rapid economic changes.

and East Asia) livestock emissions mainly increased between 2004 and 2008, and remained also rather stable afterwards. On the contrary, livestock emissions in Africa increased continuously over the full period. These continental variations translate into global livestock emissions increasing continuously over the full period, though at slower rate after 2008 (Fig. S13). Overall, these anthropogenic emissions exhibit more semi-decadal to decadal evolutions (see below) than year-to-year changes as found in top-down inversions.

For natural sources, the mean anomaly of the top-down ensemble suggests year-to-year changes ranging $\pm 10 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, lower than but in phase with the total source mean anomaly. The mean anomaly of global natural sources inferred by top-down studies is negative around 2005 and positive around 2007 (Fig. 2f). The year-to-year variation in wetland emissions inferred from land surface models is of the same order of magnitude but out of phase compared to the ensemble mean top-down estimates (Fig. 2f). However, some individual top-down approaches suggest anomalies smaller than or of different sign to the mean of the ensemble (Fig. S2). Also some land surface models show anomalies in better agreement with the top-down ensemble mean in 2000-2006 (Fig. S11). The 2009 (2010) negative (positive) anomaly in wetland emissions is common to all land surface models (Fig. S11), and is the result of variations in flooded areas (mainly in the Tropics) and temperature (mainly in boreal regions) (Poulter et al., in review). Overall, from the contradictory results from top-down and bottom-up approaches it is difficult to draw any robust conclusions on the year-to-year variations in natural methane emissions over the period 2000-2012.

Decadal trend. The mean anomaly of the inversion estimates shows a positive linear trend in global emissions of $+2.2 \pm 0.2 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$ over 2000-2012 (Fig. 2a). It originates mainly from increasing tropical emissions ($+1.6 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, Fig. 2b) with a smaller contribution from the mid-latitudes ($+0.6 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, Fig. 2c). The positive global trend is explained mostly by an increase in anthropogenic emissions, as separated in inversions ($+2.0 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, Fig. 2e). This represents an increase of about 26 Tg CH_4 in the annual anthropogenic emissions between 2000 and 2012, casting serious doubt on the bottom-up methane inventories for anthropogenic emissions, showing an increase in anthropogenic emissions of $+55 [45-73] \text{ Tg CH}_4$ between 2000 and 2012, with USEPA and GAINS inventories at the lower end and EDGARv4.2FT2012 at the higher end of the range. This possible overestimation of the recent anthropogenic emissions increase by inventories has already been suggested in individual studies (e.g., Patra et al. (2011); Bergamaschi et al. (2013); Bruhwiler et al. (2014); Thompson et al. (2015); Peng, et al. (2016); Saunois et al. (2016)) and is confirmed in this study as a robust feature. Splitting the anthropogenic sources into the components identified in the method section, the trend in anthropogenic emissions from top-down studies mainly originates from the agriculture and waste sector ($+1.2 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, Fig. 3a). Adding the fossil fuel emission trend almost matches the global trend of anthropogenic emissions (Fig. 3b). It should be noted here that the individual inversions all suggest constant to increasing emissions from agriculture and waste handling (Fig. S3), while some suggest constant to decreasing emissions from fossil fuel use and production (Fig. S4). The latter result seems surprising in view of large increases in coal production during 2000-2012, especially in China. [However, this recent period is characterized by major re-organizations in the Chinese coal industry, including evolution from many small gassy mines to fewer mines with better safety and emission control.](#) The trend in biomass burning emissions is small

but barely significant between 2000 and 2012 ($-0.05 \pm 0.05 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, Fig. 3). This result is consistent with the GFED dataset (both versions 3 and 4s) for which no significant trend was found over this 13-year period. However, between 2002 and 2010, a significant negative trend of $-0.5 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$ is found for biomass burning, both from the top-down approaches (Fig. S5) and the GFED3 and GFED4s inventory (Fig. S10), this corresponds to dry years in the tropics. Although it should be noted that almost all inversions use GFED3 in their prior (Table S1) and therefore are not independent from the bottom-up estimates. Over the 13-year period, the wetland emissions in the inversions show a small positive trend ($+0.2 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$) about twice the trends of emissions from land surface models but within the range of uncertainty ($+0.1 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, Poulter et al., in review). As stated previously, the wetland emissions from some land surface models disagree with the ensemble mean of land surface models (Fig. S11).

Quasi-decadal changes in the period 2000-2012. According to Fig. 2a, the period 2000-2012 is split into two parts, before 2006 and after 2008. Neither a significant nor a systematic trend in the global total sources (among the inversions of Fig. 1d) is observed before 2006, likewise after 2008 (see Fig. S6 for individual calculated trends); although large year-to-year variations are visible. Before 2006, anthropogenic emissions show a positive trend of $+2.4 \pm 0.2 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$, compensated by decreasing natural emissions ($-2.4 \pm 0.2 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$) (calculated from Fig. 2e and 2f), which explains the rather stable global total emissions. Bousquet et al. (2006) discussed such compensation between 1999 and 2003. The behaviour of the top-down ensemble mean is consistent with a decrease in microbial emissions in 2000-2006, especially in the northern hemisphere as suggested by Kai et al. (2011) using $^{13}\text{CH}_4$ observations. However, Levin et al. (2012) showed that the isotopic data selection might bias this result, as they found no such decrease when using background site measurements. Indeed, some individual top-down studies still suggest constant emissions from both natural and anthropogenic sources (Fig.

S2, S3 and S4) over that period as found by Levin et al. (2012) or Schwietzke et al. (2016), both using also $^{13}\text{CH}_4$ observations. The different trends in anthropogenic and natural methane emissions among the inversions highlight the difficulties of the top-down approach to separate natural from anthropogenic emissions and also its dependence on prior emissions. All inversions are based on EGDAR inventory (most of them using EDGARv4.2 version, Table S1). However, the estimated anthropogenic emissions can significantly deviate from this common prior. Similarly, inversions based on the same prior wetland fluxes do not systematically infer the same variations in methane total and natural emissions. These different increments from the prior are constrained by atmospheric observations and qualitatively indicate that inversions can depart from prior estimates. Contrary to the ensemble mean of inversions, the land surface models gathered in this study show on average a small positive trend ($+0.7 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$) during 2000-2006 (calculated from Fig. 2f), with some exceptions in individuals models (Fig. S11). Recently, Schaefer et al. (2016), based on isotopic data, suggested that diminishing thermogenic emissions caused the early 2000s plateau, without ruling out variations in the OH sink. However another scenario explaining the plateau could combine both constant total sources and sinks. Over 2000-2006, no decrease in thermogenic emissions is found in any of the inversions included in our study (Fig. S4). Even using time-constant prior emissions for fossil fuels in the inversions results in robustly inferring increasing fossil fuel emissions after 2000, although less than when using inter-annually varying prior estimates from inventories (e.g., Bergamaschi et al. (2013)).

30

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 11:44

Deleted: However, between 2002 and 2010, a significant negative trend of $-0.5 \pm 0.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-2}$ is found for biomass burning, both from the top-down approaches (Fig. S5) and the GFED3 and GFED4s inventory (Fig. S10), though it should be noted that almost all inversions use GFED3 in their prior (Table S1) and therefore are not independent.

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 11:45

Deleted: However,

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 12:46

Deleted: However, the inversions based on the same prior wetland fluxes do not systematically infer the same variations in methane total and natural emissions, illustrating the freedom of the inversions to deviate from their prior.

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 12:47

Deleted: leads to robustly infer

All inversions show increasing emissions in the second half of the period, after 2006. For the period 2006-2012, most inversions show a significant positive trend (below 5 Tg CH₄ yr⁻²), within 2-sigma uncertainty for most of the available inversions (see Fig S6). Most of this positive trend is explained by the years 2006 and 2007, due to both natural and anthropogenic emissions, but appears to be highly sensitive to the period of estimation (Fig S6). Between 2008 and 2012, neither the total anthropogenic nor the total natural sources present a significant trend leading to rather stable global total methane emissions (Fig. 2e and 2f). Overall, these results suggest that emissions shifted between 2006 and 2008, rather than continuously increasing emissions after 2006. [The requirement of a step change in the emissions will be further discussed in Section 4.](#) Because of this, in the following section, we analyse in more details the emission changes between two time periods: 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 at global and regional scales.

3.2 The methane emission changes between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012

3.2.1 Global and hemispheric changes inferred by top-down inversions

Integrating all inversions covering at least three years over each 5-year period, the global methane emissions are estimated at 545 [530-563] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ on average over 2002-2006 and at 569 [546-581] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ over 2008-2012. It is worth noting some inversions do not contribute to both periods leading to different ensembles being used to compute these estimates.

Despite the different ensembles (seven studies for 2002-2006 and ten studies for 2008-2012), the estimate range for both periods are similar. Keeping only the five surface-based inversions covering both periods leads to 542 [530-554] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ on average over 2002-2006 and 563 [546-573] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ over 2008-2012, showing remarkably consistent values with the ensemble of the top-down studies and also not showing significant impact in the emission differences between the two time periods (see Table S3).

The emission changes between the period 2002-2006 and the period 2008-2012 have been calculated for inversions covering at least three years over both 5-year period (5 inversions) at global, hemispheric, and regional scales (Fig. 4). The regions are the same as in Saunois et al. (2016). The region denoted as “90°S-30°N” is referred as the tropics despite the southern mid-latitudes (mainly from Oceania and temperate South America) included in this region. However, since the extra tropical Southern Hemisphere contributes less than 8% to the emissions from the “90°S-30°N” region, the region represents primarily the tropics.

The global emission increase of +22 [16-32] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ is mostly tropical (+18 [13-24] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, or ~80% of the global increase). The northern mid-latitudes only contribute an increase of +4 [0-9] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, while the high-latitudes (above 60°N) contribution is not significant. [Yet most of inversions rely on surface observations, which poorly represent the tropical continents, as previously noticed by former individual study \(e.g., Bousquet et al. \(2011\)\).](#) As a result, this tropical signal may partly be an artefact of inversions attributing emission changes to unconstrained regions. Also the absence of a significant contribution from the Arctic region means that Arctic changes are below the detection limit of inversions. Indeed, the northern high latitudes emitted about 20 [14-24] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ of methane over 2002-2006 and 22 [15-31] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ over

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 12:53

Deleted: Yet most of inversions rely on surface observations, which poorly represent the tropical continents.

2008-2012 (Table 3); but keeping inversions covering at least three years over each 5-year period leads to a null emission change in boreal regions.

The geographical partition of the increase in emissions between 2000-2006 and 2008-2012 inferred here is in agreement with Bergamaschi et al. (2013) who found that 50-85 % of the 16-20 Tg CH₄ emission increase between 2007-2010 compared to 2003-2005 came from the tropics and the rest from the northern hemisphere mid-latitudes. Houweling et al. (2014) inferred an increase of 27-35 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ between the 2-years periods before and after July 2006, respectively. The ensemble of inversions gathered in this study infers a consistent increase of 30 [20-41] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ between the same two periods. The derived increase is highly sensitive to the choice of the starting and ending dates of the time period. The study of Patra et al. (2016) based on six inversions found an increase of 19-36 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in global methane emissions between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012, which is consistent with our results.

3.2.2 Regional changes inferred by top-down inversions

At the regional scale, top-down approaches infer different emission changes both in amplitude and in sign. These discrepancies are due to transport errors in the models and to differences in inverse setups, and can lead to several tens of percent of differences in the regional estimates of methane emissions (e.g., Locatelli et al. (2013)). Indeed, the recent study of Cressot et al. (2016) showed that, while global and hemispheric emission changes could be detected with confidence by the top-down approaches using satellite observations, their regional attribution is less certain. Thus it is particularly critical for regional emissions to rely on several inversions, as done in this study, before drawing any robust conclusion. In most of the top-down results (Fig. 4), the tropical contribution to the global emission increase originates mainly from tropical South America (+9 [6-13] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) and, South and East Asia (+5 [-6-10] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). Central North America (+2 [0-5] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) and Northern Africa (+2 [0-5] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) contribute less to the tropical emission increase. The sign of the contribution from South and East Asia is positive in most studies (e.g., Houweling et al. (2014)), although some studies infer decreasing emission in this region. The disagreement between inversions could result from the lack of measurement stations to constrain the fluxes in Asia (some have appeared inland India and China but only in the last years, Lin et al. (2017)), and also from the rapid up-lift of the compounds emitted at the surface to the free troposphere by convection in this region, leading to surface observations missing information on local fluxes (e.g., Lin et al. (2015)).

In the northern mid-latitudes a positive contribution is inferred for China (+4 [1-11] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) and Central Eurasia and Japan (+1 [-1-6] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). Also, temperate North America does not contribute significantly to the emission changes. Contrary to a large increase in the US emissions suggested by Turner et al. (2016), none of the inversions detect, at least prior to 2013, an increase in methane emissions possible due to increasing shale gas exploitation in the U.S. Bruhwiler et al. (2017) highlight the difficulty of deriving trends on relatively short term due to in particular inter annual variability in transport.

The inversions agree that emissions changes remained limited in the Arctic region but do not agree on the sign of the emission change over the high northern latitudes, especially over boreal North America. However, they show a consistent

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 21:35

Deleted: month

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 21:35

Deleted: beginning and

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 21:35

Deleted: the

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 09:52

Deleted: ed

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 12:57

Deleted: Also, temperate North America does not contribute significantly to the emission changes, as none of the inversions detect, at least prior to 2013, an increase in methane emissions due to increasing shale gas exploitation in the U.S. (Bruhwiler et al. accepted).

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 21:40

Deleted: ;

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 21:40

Deleted: h

small emission decrease in Russia. This lack of agreement between inversions over the boreal regions highlights the weak sensitivity of inversions in these regions where no or little methane emission changes are found to have occurred over the last decade. Changes in wetland emissions associated with sea ice retreat in the Arctic are probably only a few Tg between the 1980s and the 2000s (Parmentier et al., 2015). Also decreasing methane emissions in sub-Arctic areas that were drying and cooling over 2003-2011 have offset increasing methane emissions in a wetting Arctic and warming summer (Watts et al., 2014). Permafrost thawing may have caused additional methane production underground (Christensen et al., 2004) but changes in the out coming methane flux to the atmosphere, possibly hidden in wetland emissions under existing wetlands, has not been detected by continuous atmospheric stations around the Arctic, despite a small increase in late autumn/early winter in methane emission from Arctic tundra, (Sweeney et al., 2016). However, unintentional double counting of emissions from different water systems (wetlands, rivers, lakes) may lead to Arctic emission growth in the bottom-up studies when little or none exists (Thornton et al., 2016). The detectability of possibly increasing methane emissions from the Arctic seems possible today based on the continuous monitoring of Arctic atmosphere at few but key stations (e.g., Berchet et al., 2016; Thonat et al., 2017), but this surface network remains fragile on the long-term and would be more robust with additional constraints such as those that will be provided in 2021 by the active satellite mission MERLIN (Pierangelo et al., 2016; Kiemle et al., 2014).

3.2.3 Emission changes in bottom-up studies.

The top-down approaches use bottom-up estimates as *a priori* values. For anthropogenic emissions, most of them use the EDGARv4.2FT2010 inventory and GFED3 emission estimates for biomass burning. Their source of priori information differs more for the contribution from natural wetlands, geological emissions, and termite sources (Table S1). Here we gathered an ensemble of bottom-up estimates for the changes in methane emissions between 2000-2006 and 2008-2012 combining anthropogenic inventories (EDGARv4.2FT2010, USEPA and GAINS), five biomass burning emission estimates (GFED3, GFED4s, FINN, GFAS and FAOSTAT) and wetland emissions from eleven land surface models (see Sect. 2 for the details and in Saunio et al. (2016) and Poulter et al. (in review)). As previously stated, other natural methane emissions (termites, geological, inland waters) are assumed in these model studies not to contribute significantly to the change between 2000-2006 and 2008-2012, because no quantitative indications are available on such changes and because at least some of these sources are less climate-sensitive than wetlands.

The bottom-up estimate of the global emission change between the periods 2000-2006 and 2008-2012 (+21 [5-41] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, Fig. 4) is comparable but possesses with a larger spread than top-down estimates (+22 [16-32] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). Also, the hemispheric breakdown of the change reveals discrepancies between top-down and bottom-up estimates. The bottom-up approaches suggest much higher increase of emissions in the mid latitudes (+17 [6-30] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) than inversions and a smaller increase in the tropics (+6 [-4-13] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). The main regions where bottom-up and top-down estimates of emission changes differ are tropical South America, South and East Asia, China, USA, and central Eurasia and Japan.

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 21:44

Deleted: no significant long-term trends in methane emission have been observed yet

While top-down studies indicate a dominant increase between 2000-2006 and 2008-2012 in tropical South America (+9 [6-13] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹), the bottom-up estimates (based on an ensemble of 11 land surface models and anthropogenic inventories), in contrast, indicate a small decrease (-2 [-6-2] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) over the same period (Fig. 4). The decrease in tropical South American emissions found in the bottom-up studies results from decreasing emissions from wetlands (about -2.5 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, mostly due to a reduction in tropical wetland extent, as constrained by the common inventory used by all models, see Poulter et al., 2017) and biomass burning (about -0.7 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹), partly compensated by a small increase in anthropogenic emissions (about 1 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, mainly from agriculture and waste). Most of the top-down studies infer a decrease in biomass burning emissions over this region, exceeding the decrease in a priori emissions from GFED3. Thus the main discrepancy between top-down and bottom-up is due to microbial emissions from natural wetlands (about 4 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ on average), agriculture and waste (about 2 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ on average) over tropical South America.

The emission increase in South and East Asia for the bottom-up estimates (2 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) results from a 4 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ increase (from agriculture and waste for half of it, fossil fuel for one third and wetland for the remainder) offset by a decrease in biomass burning emissions (-2 [-4-0] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). The inversions suggest a higher increase in South and East Asia compared to this 2 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, mainly due to higher increases in wetland and agriculture and waste sources; the biomass burning decrease and the fossil fuel increase being similar in the inversions compared to the inventories.

In tropical South America and South and East Asia, wetlands and agriculture and waste emissions may both occur in the same or neighboring model pixels, making the partitioning difficult for the top-down approaches. Also, these two regions lack surface measurement sites, so that the inverse systems are less constrained by the observations. However, the SCIAMACHY-based inversion from Houweling et al. (2014) also infers increasing methane emissions over tropical South America between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012. Further studies based on satellite data or additional regional surface observations (e.g., Basso et al. (2016); Xin et al. (2015)) would be needed to better assess methane emissions (and their changes) in these under-sampled regions.

For China, bottom-up approaches suggest a +10 [2-20] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ emission increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012, i.e. a trend of about 1.7 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² (considering a 10 Tg yr⁻¹ increase over 2004-2010), which is much larger than the top-down estimates. The magnitude of the Chinese emission increase varies among emission inventories and appears essentially to be driven by an increase in anthropogenic emissions (fossil fuel and agriculture and waste emissions). Anthropogenic emission inventories indicate that Chinese emissions increased at a rate of 0.6 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² in USEPA, 3.1 Tg yr⁻² in EDGARv4.2 and 1.5 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² in GAINS between 2000 and 2012. The increase rate in EDGARv4.2 is too strong compared to a recent bottom-up study that suggests a 1.3 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² increase in Chinese methane emissions over 2000-2010 (Peng et al., 2016). The revised EDGAR inventory v4.3.2 (not officially released when we write these lines) with region-specific emission factors for coal mining in China gives a mean trend in coal emissions of 1.0 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² over 2000-2010, half the value from the previous version EDGARv4.2FT2010 (Fig. S14). These new estimates are more in line with USEPA inventory and with the top-down approaches (range of 0.3 to 2.0 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² for the total sources in China over 2000-2012), in agreement with Bergamaschi et al. (2013) who inferred an increase rate of 1.1 Tg CH₄ yr⁻² over 2000-2010.

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 14:02

Deleted: partly occur over same areas

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 10:18

Deleted: of

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 22:10

Deleted: yet

Finally, while bottom-up approaches show a small increase in U.S. emissions (+2 [-1-4] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹), top-down studies do not show any significant emission change, [and this result holds](#) similarly for central Eurasia and Japan.

3.2.4 Emission changes by source types

- In Sect. 3.1, we suggest that a concurrent increase in both natural and anthropogenic emissions over 2006-2008 contribute to the total emission increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012. The attribution of this change to different source types remains uncertain in inversions, as methane observations alone do not provide sufficient information to fully separate individual sources (see Introduction). Yet, as in Saunio et al. (2016), we present here a sectorial view of methane emissions for five general source categories, limited at the global scale (Fig. 5), as regional attribution of emission increase is considered too uncertain (Saunio et al., 2016; Tian et al., 2016).
- The top-down studies show a dominant positive contribution from microbial sources (agriculture and waste (+10 [7-12] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ and natural wetlands (+6 [-4-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) as compared to fossil fuel related emissions (+7 [-2-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). Biomass burning emissions decreased (-3 [-7-0] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). Other natural sources show a lower but significant increase (+2 [-2-7] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). These values are estimated based on the five longest inversions. Taking into account shorter inversions leads to different minimum and maximum values, but the mean values are quite robust (Table S4).
- Wetland emission changes estimated by 11 land surface models from Poulter et al. (in review) are near zero but the stability of this source is statistically consistent with the top-down value considering the large uncertainties of both top-down inversions and bottom-up models (Sect. 3.1 and Sect. 4 Discussion). It is worth noting that, for wetland prior estimates, top-down studies generally rely on climatology from bottom-up approaches (e.g., Matthews and Fung (1987); Kaplan (2002)) and therefore the inferred trend are more independent from bottom-up models than anthropogenic estimates, which generally relies on inter-annually prescribed prior emissions.
- The bottom-up estimated decrease in biomass burning emissions of (-2 [-5-0] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) is consistent with top-down estimates albeit smaller. The change in agriculture and waste emissions between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 in the bottom up inventories are in agreement with the top-down values (+10 [7-13] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹), with about two-third of this being increase from agriculture activities (mainly enteric fermentation and manure management, while rice emissions were fairly constant between these two time periods) and one-third from waste (Table S5). The spread between inventories in the increase of methane emissions from the waste sector is much lower than from agriculture activities (enteric fermentation and manure management, and rice cultivation) (see Table S5). Considering livestock (enteric fermentation and manure) emissions estimated by FAOSTAT, about half of the global increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 originates from Asia (India, China and, South and East Asia) and one-third from Africa.
- The changes in fossil fuel related emissions in bottom-up inventories between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 (+17 [11-25] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) are more than twice the estimate from the top-down approaches (+7 [-2-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). Among the inventories, EDGARv4.2 stands in the higher range, with fossil fuel related emissions increasing twice as fast as in USEPA and GAINS. The main contributors to this discrepancy are the emissions from coal mining, which increase at three times as fast as in

EDGARv4.2 than in the two other inventories at the global scale. About half of the global increase in fossil fuel emissions originates from China in the EDGARv4.2 inventory. Thus, most of the difference between top-down and bottom-up originates from coal exploitation estimates in China, which is likely overestimated in EDGARv4.2 as aforementioned (Bergamaschi et al., 2013; Peng et al., 2016; Dalsoren et al., 2016; Patra et al., 2016; Saunois et al., 2016). The release of EDGARv4.3.2 will, at least partly, close the gap between top-down and bottom-up studies. Indeed, in EDGARv4.3.2 coal emissions in China increase by 4.3 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ between 2002-2006 and 2008-2010 instead of 9.7 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in EDGARv4.2FT2010, due to the revision of coal emission factors in China. As a result, the next release of EDGARv4.3.2 should narrow the range and decrease the mean contribution of fossil fuels to emission changes estimated by the bottom-up studies.

10 4 Discussion

The top-down results gathered in this synthesis suggest that [the increase in methane emissions between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012](#) is mostly tropical, with a small contribution from the mid-latitudes, and is dominated by an increase in microbial sources, more from agriculture and waste (+10 [7-12] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) than wetlands, the latter being uncertain (+6 [-4-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). The contribution from fossil fuels to this emission increase is uncertain but smaller on average (+7 [-2-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). These increases in methane emissions are partly counterbalanced by a decrease in biomass burning emissions (-3 [-7-0] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹). These results are in agreement with the top-down studies of Bergamaschi et al. (2013) and Houweling et al. (2014), though there are some discrepancies between inversions in the regional attribution of the changes in methane emissions. [The sectorial partitioning from inversions is in agreement \(within the uncertainty\) with bottom-up inventories \(noting that inversions are not independent from inventories\). However the top-down ensemble significantly decreases the methane emission change from fossil fuel production and use compared to the bottom-up inventories. In the coming years, the revised version of the EDGAR inventory \(see Sect. 3.2.4\) should decrease the estimated change by bottom-up inventories, reducing the difference between bottom-up and top-down estimates.](#)

Wetland contribution. The increasing emissions from natural wetlands inferred from the top-down approaches are not consistent with the average of the land surface models from Poulter et al. (in review). Bloom et al. (2010) found that wetland methane emissions increased by 7% over 2003-2007 mainly due to warming in the mid-latitudes and Arctic regions and that tropical wetland emissions remained constant over this period. Increases of 2 [-1-5] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ and of 1 [0-2] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 are inferred from the eleven land surface models over the northern mid-latitudes and boreal regions, respectively (Table S7, linked to temperature increase). Decreasing wetland emissions in the tropics (mostly due to reduced wetland extent) in the land surface models (-3 [-8-0] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) offset the mid-latitude and boreal increases, resulting in stable emissions between 2002-2006 and 2008 at the global scale. These different conclusions between inversions and wetland models highlight the difficulties in estimating wetland methane emissions (and their changes). [The range of the methane emissions estimated by land surface models driven with the same flooded area extent shows that the](#)

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 14:02

Deleted: the emission

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 14:05

Deleted: The sectorial partitioning from inversions is in agreement (within the uncertainty) with bottom-up inventories (noting that inversions are not independent from inventories), **though the top-down ensemble significantly decreases the methane emission change from fossil fuel production and use compared to the bottom-up inventories, although the estimate of the latter should decrease with the upcoming revised version of the EDGAR inventory (see Sect. 3.2.4).**

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 14:06

Deleted: Also **the spread of land surface models driven with the same flooded area extent shows that**

models are highly sensitive to the wetland extent, temperature, precipitation, and atmospheric CO₂ feedbacks (Poulter et al., in review). The JULES land model used by McNorton et al. (2016b) is one of the three models inferring slightly higher emissions in 2008-2012 than 2002-2006 from the ensemble used in our study (Table S6). Yet, they found larger increases in northern mid-latitude wetland emissions and near zero change in tropical wetland emissions, contrary to the atmospheric inversions. The exponential temperature dependency of methanogenesis through microbial production has been recently revised upwards (Yvon-Durocher et al., 2014). Accounting for this revision, smaller temperature increases are needed to explain large methane emission changes in warm climate (such as in the tropics) (Marotta et al., 2014). However, no significant trend in tropical surface temperature is inferred over 2000-2012 that could explain an increase in tropical wetland emissions (Poulter et al., in review). Methane emissions are also sensitive to the extent of the flooded area and for non-flooded wetlands, and to the depth of the water table (Bridgham et al., 2013). The recurrent La Niña conditions from 2007 (compared to more El Niño conditions in the beginning of the 2000s) may have triggered wetter conditions propitious to higher methane emissions in the tropics (Nisbet et al., 2016). Indeed, both the flooded data set used in Poulter et al. (in review) and the one used in Mc Norton et al. (2016b) based on an improved version of the TOPography-based hydrological MODEL (Marthews et al., 2015), show decreasing wetland extents from the 2000s to the 2010s. However resulting decreasing methane emissions are not in agreement with top-down studies even when constrained by satellite data. Thus, as has been concluded in most land model CH₄ inter-comparisons and analyses, more efforts are needed to better assess the wetland extent and its variations (e.g., Bohn et al. (2015); Melton et al. (2013); Xu et al. (2016)). Even though top-down approaches may attribute the emissions increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 to tropical regions (and hence partly to wetland emitting areas) due to a lack of observational constraints, it is not possible, with the evidence provided in this study, to rule out a potential positive contribution of wetland emissions in the increase of global methane emissions at the global scale.

Isotopic constraints. The recent variation in atmospheric methane mole fractions has been widely discussed in the literature in relation with concurrent methane isotopes. Schaefer et al. (2016) tested several scenarios of perturbed methane emissions to fit both atmospheric methane and δ¹³C-CH₄. For the post 2006 period (2007-2014), they found that an average emission increase of 19.7 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ with an associated isotopic signature of about -59 ‰ (-61 ‰ to -56 ‰) is needed to match both CH₄ and δ¹³C-CH₄ observed trends. After assigning an isotopic signature (δ_i) of each source contribution to the change (ΔE_i), it is possible to estimate the average isotopic signature of the emission change (δ_{ave}) as the weighted mean of the isotopic signature of all the sources contributing to the change, following Equation 1:

$$\delta_{ave} = \frac{1}{\sum_i \Delta E_i} \sum_i \delta_i \Delta E_i \quad (1)$$

However, assigning an isotopic signature to a specific source remains a challenge due to sparse sampling of the different sources and wide variability of the isotopic signature of each given source: for example methane emissions from coal mining have a range of -70 ‰ to -30 ‰ in δ¹³C-CH₄ (Zazzeri et al., 2016; Schwietzke et al., 2016). The difficulty increases when trying to assign an isotopic signature to a broader category of methane sources at the global scale. Schaefer et al. (2016)

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 14:07

Deleted: However, no significant trend in tropical surface temperature is inferred over 2000-2012 (Poulter et al., in review) that could explain an increase in tropical wetland emissions per Meter Square.

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 14:07

Deleted: Even though top-down approaches may incorrectly attribute the emissions increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 to tropical regions (and hence partly to wetland emitting areas) due to a lack of observational constraints, it is not possible, with the evidence provided in this study, to rule out a potential positive contribution of wetland emissions in the increase of global methane emissions at the global scale.

suggest the following global mean isotopic signatures: -60‰ for microbial sources (wetland, agriculture and waste), -37‰ for thermogenic (fossil fuel sources) and -22‰ for pyrogenic (biomass burning emissions); while a recent study suggests different globally averaged isotopic signatures (Sherwood et al., 2017), with a lighter fossil fuel signature: -44‰ for fossil fuels, -62‰ for microbial, and -22‰ for biomass burning emissions (Schwietzke et al., 2016). Also there is the question on the isotopic signature to be attributed to “other natural” sources that include geological emissions (~-49‰, Etiope (2015)), termites (~-57‰, Houweling et al. (2000)), or oceanic sources (~-40‰, Houweling et al. (2000)). Applying either set of isotopic signature to the bottom-up estimates of methane emission changes leads, as expected, to unrealistically heavy $\delta^{13}\text{CH}_4$ signatures due to large changes in fossil fuel emissions (Fig. 6). Most of the individual inversions do not agree with the atmospheric isotopic change between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 (Fig. 6), due to their large increases in fossil fuel or wetland emissions and/or large decrease in biomass burning emissions (Table S4). Most of the inverse systems solve only for total net methane emissions making the sectorial partition uncertain and dependent on the prior partitioning. However, applying Schaefer et al. (2016) isotopic source signatures to the mean emission changes derived from the ensemble of inversions in Eq. 1 leads to an average isotopic signature of the emission change well in agreement with the range of Schaefer et al. (2016), whatever the choice made for the “other natural” sources or the number of inversions selected (Fig. 6). Applying Schwietzke et al. (2016) isotopic source signatures leads to lighter average isotopic signature of the emission change, in the higher range (in absolute value) of Schaefer et al. (2016). In short, the isotopic signature of the emissions change between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 derived from the ensemble mean of inversions seem consistent with ^{13}C atmospheric signals. Yet the uncertainties of these mean emission changes remain very large as shown by the range inferred by inversions. Also, the deviations of most of the individual inversions from the ensemble mean highlight the sensitivity of the atmospheric isotopic signal to the changes in methane sources. To conclude, isotopic studies such as Schaefer et al. (2016) can help eliminate combinations of sources that are unrealistic, but cannot point towards a unique solution. This problem has more unknowns than constraints, and other pieces of information need to be added to further solve it (such as ^{14}C , deuterium, or co-emitted species [but also better latitudinal information, especially in the tropics](#)).

Oil and gas emissions, and ethane constraint. Co-emitted species with methane, such as ethane from fugitive gas leaks, can also help in assessing contributions from oil and gas sources. Indeed, Haussmann et al. (2016) used ethane to methane emission ratios to estimate the contribution from oil and gas emissions to the recent methane increase. For 2007-2014, their emission optimization suggests that total methane emissions increased by 24-45 Tg $\text{CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, which is larger than in our study (Sect. 3.2.1), but the time period covered only partially overlaps with our study and they use a different method. Assuming a linear trend over 2007-2014 leads to an increase of 18-34 Tg $\text{CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ over 2007-2012. Their reference scenario assumes that a mixture of oil and gas sources contributed at least 39% of the increase of total emissions, corresponding to an increase in oil and gas methane emissions of 7-13 Tg $\text{CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ over 2007-2012. Adding up the increase in methane emissions from coal mining (USEPA suggests a 4 Tg $\text{CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ increase between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012, Table S5) would lead to an increase in fossil fuel emission in the upper range of the top-down estimates presented here (7 [-2-16] Tg $\text{CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$). Helmig et al. (2016), using a ethane to methane emission ratio of 10% and assuming it constant, calculated an increase of 4.4 Tg

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 14:46

Deleted:

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 14:46

Deleted: (expected)

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 15:52

Deleted: 0

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 15:00

Deleted: E

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 15:04

Comment [1]: Here add something on Aydin's paper

CH₄ yr⁻¹ each year during 2009-2014, which leads to a cumulative increase inconsistent in regards with both the global atmospheric isotopic signal and the observed leak rates in productive regions. Ethane to methane emission ratios are uncertain (ranging 7.1 to 16.2% in Haussmann et al. (2016) reference scenario and 16.2 to 32.4 % in their pure oil scenario) and could experienced variations (e.g., Wunch et al. (2016)) that are not taken into account due to lack of information.

5 Indeed, ethane to methane emission ratios also largely depends on the shale formation and considering a too low ethane to methane emission ratio could lead to erroneously too large methane emissions from shale gas (Kort et al., 2016). Besides, the recent bottom-up study of Höglund-Isaksson (2017) shows relatively stable methane emissions from oil and gas after 2007, due to increases in recovery of associated petroleum gas (particularly in Russia and Africa) that balances an increase in methane emissions from unconventional gas production in North America.

10 Overall, the mean emission changes resulting from the top-down approach ensemble agree well with the isotopic atmospheric observations but further studies (inversions and field measurements) would be needed to consolidate the (so far) weak agreement with the ethane-based global studies. Better constraints on the relative contributions of microbial emissions and thermogenic emissions derived from the top-down approaches using both isotopic observations and additional measurements such as ethane (with more robust emission ratios to methane) or other hydrocarbons (Miller et al., 2012) would help improve the ability to separate sources using top-down inversions.

15 **Methane sink by OH.** As stated in Sect.2, this paper focuses on methane emission changes. The methane sinks, especially OH oxidation, can also play a role in the methane budget changes. However the results from the inversions presented here, for most of them, assume constant OH concentrations over the period 2000-2012 (though including seasonal variations, Table S2).

20 The methane loss due to these climatological OH is still computed using the meteorology-driven chemical rate in all Models. Before 2007, increasing OH concentrations could have contributed to the stable the atmospheric methane burden in this period (Dalsøren et al., 2016), without (or with less of) a need for constant global emissions. Including OH variability in their tests, Schaefer et al. (2016) found that CH₄ variations can be explained only up to 2008 by changes in OH only and that an isotopic signature of the total additional source of -65‰ is necessary to explain the δ¹³C-CH₄ observations (see their supplementary materials). However a -65‰ isotopic signature of additional emissions would require smaller changes from

25 fossil fuel emissions or more changes from microbial than inferred with climatological OH.

After 2007, McNorton et al. (2016a), based on methyl chloroform measurements, found that global OH concentrations decreased after 2007 (up to -6% between 2005 and 2010, their Fig 1.d). Consistently, Dalsøren et al. (2016) suggested that the recent methane increase is due first to high emissions in 2007-2008 followed by a stabilization in methane loss due to meteorological variability (warm year 2010), both leading to an increase in methane atmospheric burden. Rigby et al. (2017)

30 also infer a decrease in OH. They implement a methyl-chloroform based box model approach to derive a 64–70% probability that a decline in OH has contributed to the post-2007 methane rise. Indeed, decreasing OH after 2007 would limit the need for a step jump of emissions in 2007-2008, and also possibly implies a different partitioning of emission types to match the atmospheric δ¹³C evolution. Such OH decrease would increase the discrepancies between bottom-up inventories and top-down inversions presented in this paper. However, Turner et al. (2017), also inferring a decrease in OH concentrations but

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 20:57

Deleted:

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 22:37

Deleted: even less

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 22:37

Deleted: changes

from 2003 to 2016, note that the under-constrained characteristics of the inverse problem prevents from drawing definitive conclusions on the magnitude of the contribution of OH change to the renewed increase of atmospheric methane since 2007. Investigating the methane lifetime due to its oxidation by tropospheric OH in three different CTMs, Holmes et al. (2013) infer a consistent decrease of this lifetime from 2005 to 2009 in all models and from 2000 for some simulations, implying an increase of OH concentrations over this period of few percents. They do not show results after 2009, but Dalsoren et al., (2016) do, with consistent decreasing methane-OH lifetime until 2007 and more stable OH concentrations afterwards. Overall and beyond the fact that most of these different studies capture the OH increase during the big El Niño of 1997-1998, year-to-year variations and trend of OH concentrations since 2000 still need further investigation to reconcile the small changes inferred by CTMs compare to the larger changes found in MCF-based approaches (Holmes et al., 2013).

5 Conclusions

Following the decadal methane budget published by Saunio et al. (2016) for the time period 2000-2012, variations of methane sources over the same period are synthesized from an ensemble of top-down and bottom-up approaches gathered under the umbrella of The Global Carbon Project – Global Methane Budget initiative. The mean top-down model ensemble suggests that annual global methane emissions have increased between 2000 and 2012 by 15-33 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ with a main contribution from the tropics, with additional emissions from the mid-latitudes, but showing no signal from high latitudes. We suggest that global methane emissions have experienced a shift between 2006 and 2008 resulting from an increase in both natural and anthropogenic emissions. Based on the top-down ensemble mean, during 2000-2006, increasing anthropogenic emissions were compensated by decreasing natural emissions and, during 2008-2012, both anthropogenic and natural emissions were rather stable.

To further investigate the apparent source shift, we have analyzed the emission changes between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012. The top-down ensemble mean shows that annual global methane emissions increased by 20 [13-32] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ between these two time periods with the tropics contributing about 80% to this change, and the remainder coming from the mid-latitudes. The regional contributions are more uncertain, especially in the tropics where tropical South America and, South and East Asia are the main contributors, although contrasting contributions from South East Asia among inversions are inferred. Such regional uncertainties are due to a lack of measurements from surface stations in key tropical regions, forcing inversion systems to estimate emissions in regions without observational constraints. A consistent result among the top-down inverse models is that their inferred global emission increases are much lower than those estimated from the bottom-up approaches. This is particularly due to an overestimation of the increase in the anthropogenic emissions from China.

As methane atmospheric observations alone cannot be used to fully distinguish between methane emission processes, sectorial estimates have been reported for only five broad categories. The ensemble of top-down studies gathered here suggests a dominant contribution to the global emission increase from microbial sources (+16 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ with +10 [7-12] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ from agriculture and waste, and +6 [-4-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ from wetlands), and an uncertain but smaller

philippe bousquet 5/7/2017 23:03

Deleted: In this context, decreasing OH concentrations alone does not seem sufficient to explain all of the recent methane increase. However, decreasing OH concentrations since 2008 would require smaller emission changes to explain the observed atmospheric methane increase, also possibly implying a different partitioning of emission types to match the atmospheric δ¹³C evolution. In a scenario where OH decreases, however, the disagreement between the top-down and bottom-up estimated emission change between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 would increase. .

contribution of +7 [-2-16] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ from fossil fuel related emissions from 2000-2006 to 2008-2012. In the top-down ensemble, biomass burning emissions decreased by -3 [-7-0] Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹. Interestingly, the magnitudes of these mean changes for individual source sectors based on ensemble mean results from top-down approaches are consistent with isotopic observations (Schaefer et al., 2016), while the individual inversions are generally not. Yet the uncertainties of these mean emission changes are very large as shown by the range inferred by inversions.

The interpretation of changes in atmospheric methane in this study is limited mostly to changes in terms of changes in methane emissions. The results from the inversions presented here mostly assume constant OH concentrations over the period 2000-2012 (though including seasonal variations, Table S2). As a result, changes in methane loss through OH oxidation in the atmosphere and soil uptake of methane, are not addressed here, and their contribution needs to be further investigated to better understand the observed growth rate changes during the analysed period. Indeed, the inferred shift in emissions during 2006-2008 could likely be much smoother if OH concentrations decreased during these three years after a period of increase, as suggested in recent studies (e.g., Dalsoren et al. (2016)). Estimating and optimizing OH oxidation in top-down approaches is challenging due to the major disagreements in OH fields simulated by the models. Although beneficial for the recovery of the stratospheric ozone, methyl-chloroform, which is used as a proxy to derive OH variations, is decreasing rapidly in the atmosphere. MCF is therefore less sensitive to uncertain and larger emission as in the 1980s and 1990s (e.g. Kroll et al., 2003; Prinn et al.2001), but within years also less useful to derive OH changes as atmospheric concentrations are getting as small as the precision and accuracy of the measurements.

and as a result, is becoming much less useful for inferring OH concentration changes. This also implies that we need new proxies to infer and constrain global OH concentrations. Chemistry climate models may be useful to provide OH 4D fields and to estimate its impact on lifetime, though large discrepancies exist, especially at the regional scale (Naik et al., 2013).

The global methane budget is far from being understood. Indeed, the recent acceleration of the methane atmospheric growth rate in 2014 and 2015 (Ed Dlugokencky, NOAA/ESRL (www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/)) adds more challenges to our understanding of the methane global budget. The next Global Methane Budget will aim to include data from these recent years and make use of additional surface observations from different tracers, and satellite data to better constrain the time evolution of atmospheric methane burden.

Acknowledgements

This collaborative international effort is part of the Global Carbon Project activity to establish and track greenhouse gas budgets and their trends. M. Saunois and P. Bousquet acknowledge the Global Carbon Project for the scientific advice and the computing support of LSCE-CEA and of the national computing center TGCC.

We acknowledge the two anonymous reviewers who help improving the manuscript to present the most thorough review of what is known on the recent methane budget changes.

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 15:15

Deleted: uncertainties

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 15:15

Deleted: the 4D fields of

Marielle Saunois 29/6/2017 15:15

Deleted: concentrations used

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 21:51

Deleted: disappearing

philippe bousquet 7/7/2017 21:51

Deleted: from

Marielle Saunois 12/7/2017 14:17

Deleted: to the same level of detail as the CO₂ budget currently is

B. Poulter has been funded by the EU FP7 GEOCARBON project. J. G. Canadell thanks the support from the National Environmental Science Program – Earth Systems and Climate Change Hub. D.R. Black and I.J. Simpson (UCI) acknowledge funding support from NASA (NNX07AK10G). F. Joos, R. Spahni, and R. Schroeder acknowledge support by the Swiss National Science Foundation. C. Peng acknowledges the support by National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) discovery grant and China’s QianRen Program. G. P. Peters acknowledges the support of the Research Council of Norway project 209701. D. Bastviken acknowledge support from the Swedish Research Council VR and ERC (grant no. 725546). Patrick Crill acknowledge support from the Swedish Research Council VR. F. N. Tubiello acknowledges the support of FAO Regular Programme Funding under O6 and SO2 for the developed and maintenance of the FAOSTAT Emissions database. The FAOSTAT database is supported by regular programme funding from all FAO member countries. P.K. Patra is partly supported by the Environment Research and Technology Development Fund (A2-1502) of the Ministry of the Environment, Japan. W.J. Riley and X. Xu were supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research of the US Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC02-05CH11231 as part of the RGCM BGC-Climate Feedbacks SFA. P. Bergamaschi and M. Alexe acknowledge the support by the European Commission Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013) project MACCII under grant agreement 283576, by the European Commission Horizon2020 Programme project MACC-III under grant agreement 633080, and by the ESA Climate Change Initiative Greenhouse Gases Phase 2 project. H. Tian and B. Zhang acknowledge support by NASA Carbon Monitoring Program (NNX12AP84G, NNX14AO73G). H.-S. Kim and S. Maksyutov acknowledge use of the GOSAT Research Computation Facility. N. Gedney and A. Wiltshire acknowledge support by the Joint DECC/Defra Met Office Hadley Centre Climate Programme (GA01101). D. J. Beerling acknowledges support from an ERC Advanced grant (CDREG, 322998) and NERC (NE/J00748X/1).

The CSIRO and the Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology are thanked for their ongoing long-term support of the Cape Grim station and the Cape Grim science programme. The CSIRO flask network is supported by CSIRO Australia, Australian Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Institute of Marine Science, Australian Antarctic Division, NOAA USA, and the Meteorological Service of Canada. The operation of the AGAGE instruments at Mace Head, Trinidad Head, Cape Matatula, Ragged Point, and Cape Grim is supported by the National Aeronautic and Space Administration (NASA) (grants NAG5-12669, NNX07AE89G, and NNX11AF17G to MIT and grants NNX07AE87G, NNX07AF09G, NNX11AF15G, and NNX11AF16G to SIO), the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC, UK) contract GA01081 to the University of Bristol, and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO Australia), and Bureau of Meteorology (Australia).

M. Saunois and P. Bousquet acknowledge Lyla Taylor (University of Sheffield, UK), Chris Jones (Met Office, UK) and Charlie Koven (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, USA) for their participation to land surface modelling of wetland emissions. Theodore J. Bohn (ASU, USA), Jens Greinhert (GEOMAR, the Netherlands), Charles Miller (JPL, USA), and Tonatiuh Guillermo Nunez Ramirez (MPI Jena, Germany) are thanked for their useful comments and suggestions on the manuscript. M. Saunois and P. Bousquet acknowledge Martin Herold (WU, the Netherlands), Mario Herrero (CSIRO,

Australia), Paul Palmer (University of Edinburgh, UK), Matthew Rigby (University of Bristol, UK), Taku Umezawa (NIES, Japan), Ray Wang (GIT, USA), Jim White (INSTAAR, USA), Tatsuya Yokota (NIES, Japan), Ayyoob Sharifi and Yoshiaki Yamagata (NIES/GCP, Japan) and Lingxi Zhou (CMA, China) for their interest and discussions on the Global Carbon project methane. M. Saunois and P. Bousquet acknowledge the initial contribution to the Global Methane Budget 2016 release and/or possibly future contribution to the next Global Methane Budget of Victor Brovkin (MPI Hamburg, Germany), Charles Curry (University of Victoria, Canada), Kyle C. McDonald (City University of New-York, USA), Julia Marshall (MPI Jena, Germany), Christine Wiedinmyer (NCAR, USA), Michiel van Weele (KNMI, Netherlands), Guido R. van der Werf (Amsterdam, Netherlands) and Paul Steele (retired from CSIRO, Australia).

References

- 10 Alexe, M., Bergamaschi, P., Segers, A., Detmers, R., Butz, A., Hasekamp, O., Guerlet, S., Parker, R., Boesch, H., Frankenberg, C., Scheepmaker, R. A., Dlugokencky, E., Sweeney, C., Wofsy, S. C., and Kort, E. A.: Inverse modelling of CH₄ emissions for 2010–2011 using different satellite retrieval products from GOSAT and SCIAMACHY, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 113–133, doi:10.5194/acp-15-113-2015, 2015.
- 15 [Aydin, M., Verhulst, K. R., Saltzman, E. S., Battle, M. O., Montzka, S. A., Blake, D. R., Tang, Q., and Prather, M. J.: Recent decreases in fossil-fuel emissions of ethane and methane derived from firm air, *Nature*, 476, 198–201, doi:10.1038/nature10352, 2011](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10352)
- Basso, L. S., L. V. Gatti, M. Gloor, J. B. Miller, L. G. Domingues, C. S. C. Correia, and V. F. Borges: Seasonality and interannual variability of CH₄ fluxes from the eastern Amazon Basin inferred from atmospheric mole fraction profiles, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 121, 168–184, doi:10.1002/2015JD023874, 2016.
- 20 Bastviken, D., Tranvik, L. J., Downing, J. A., Crill, P. M., and Enrich-Prast, A.: Freshwater Methane Emissions Offset the Continental Carbon Sink, *Science*, 331, 6013, 50, doi:10.1126/science.1196808, 2011.
- Berchet, A., Bousquet, P., Pison, I., Locatelli, R., Chevallier, F., Paris, J.-D., Dlugokencky, E. J., Laurila, T., Hatakka, J., Viisanen, Y., Worthy, D. E. J., Nisbet, E., Fisher, R., France, J., Lowry, D., Ivakhov, V., and Hermansen, O.: Atmospheric constraints on the methane emissions from the East Siberian Shelf, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 4147–4157, doi:10.5194/acp-16-4147-2016, 2016.
- 25 Bergamaschi, P., Houweling, S., Segers, A., Krol, M., Frankenberg, C., Scheepmaker, R. A., Dlugokencky, E., Wofsy, S. C., Kort, E. A., Sweeney, C., Schuck, T., Brenninkmeijer, C., Chen, H., Beck, V., and Gerbig, C.: Atmospheric CH₄ in the first decade of the 21st century: Inverse modeling analysis using SCIAMACHY satellite retrievals and NOAA surface measurements, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118, 7350–7369, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50480, 2013.
- 30 Bridgman, S. D., H. Cadillo-Quiroz, J. K. Keller, and Zhuang, Q.: Methane emissions from wetlands: Biogeochemical, microbial, and modeling perspectives from local to global scales, *Global Change Biol.*, 19, 1325–1346, 2013.
- Bohn, T. J., Melton, J. R., Ito, A., Kleinen, T., Spahni, R., Stocker, B. D., Zhang, B., Zhu, X., Schroeder, R., Glagolev, M. V., Maksyutov, S., Brovkin, V., Chen, G., Denisov, S. N., Eliseev, A. V., Gallego-Sala, A., McDonald, K. C., Rawlins, M. A., Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Tian, H., Zhuang, Q., and Kaplan, J. O.: WETCHIMP-WSL: Intercomparison of wetland methane emissions models over West Siberia, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 3321–3349, doi:10.5194/bg-12-3321-2015, 2015.
- 35 Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Miller, J. B., Dlugokencky, E. J., Hauglustaine, D. A., Prigent, C., Van der Werf, G. R., Peylin, P., Brunke, E. G., Carouge, C., Langenfelds, R. L., Lathiere, J., Papa, F., Ramonet, M., Schmidt, M., Steele, L. P., Tyler, S. C., and White, J.: Contribution of anthropogenic and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability, *Nature*, 443, 439–443, 2006.
- 40 Bousquet, P., Ringeval, B., Pison, I., Dlugokencky, E. J., Brunke, E. G., Carouge, C., Chevallier, F., Fortems-Cheiney, A., Frankenberg, C., Hauglustaine, D. A., Krummel, P. B., Langenfelds, R. L., Ramonet, M., Schmidt, M., Steele, L. P.,

- Szopa, S., Yver, C., Viovy, N., and Ciais, P.: Source attribution of the changes in atmospheric methane for 2006-2008, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 3689-3700, 2011.
- Bruhwieler, L. M., Basu, S., Bergamaschi, P., Bousquet, P., Dlugokencky, E., Houweling, S., Ishizawa, M., Kim, H.-S., Locatelli, R., Maksyutov, S., Montzka, S., Pandey, S., Patra, P. K., Petron, G., Saunio, M., Sweeney, C., Tans, P., and Weatherhead, E. C.: US CH₄ Emissions from Oil and Gas Production: Have Recent Large Increases Been Detected? Submitted to JGR
- 5 Bruhwieler, L., Dlugokencky, E., Masarie, K., Ishizawa, M., Andrews, A., Miller, J., Sweeney, C., Tans, P., and Worthy, D.: CarbonTracker-CH₄: an assimilation system for estimating emissions of atmospheric methane, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14, 8269-8293, 2014.
- 10 Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Schneising, O., Boesch, H., Guerlet, S., Dils, B., Aben, I., Armante, R., Bergamaschi, P., Blumenstock, T., Bovensmann, H., Brunner, D., Buchmann, B., Burrows, J. P., Butz, A., Chedin, A., Chevallier, F., Crevoisier, C. D., Deutscher, N. M., Frankenberg, C., Hase, F., Hasekamp, O. P., Heymann, J., Kaminski, T., Laeng, A., Lichtenberg, G., De Maziere, M., Noel, S., Notholt, J., Orphal, J., Popp, C., Parker, R., Scholze, M., Sussmann, R., Stilller, G. P., Warneke, T., Zehmer, C., Bril, A., Crisp, D., Griffith, D. W. T., Kuze, A., O'Dell, C., Oshchepkov, S., Sherlock, V., Suto, H., Wennberg, P., Wunch, D., Yokota, T., and Yoshida, Y.: The Greenhouse Gas Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): Comparison and quality assessment of near-surface-sensitive satellite-derived CO₂ and CH₄ global data sets, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 162, 344-362, 2015.
- 15 Butz, A., Guerlet, S., Hasekamp, O., Schepers, D., and Galli, A.: Toward accurate CO₂ and CH₄ observations from GOSAT, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, 14, 2-7, doi:10.1029/2011GL047888, 2011.
- 20 Cao, M., Marshall, S., and Gregson, K.: Global carbon exchange and methane emissions from natural wetlands: Application of a process-based model, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 101, 14399-14414, doi:10.1029/96jd00219, 1996.
- [Christensen, T. R., Johansson, T., Åkerman, J., Mastepanov, M., Malmer, N., Friborg, T., Crill, P., and Svensson, B. H.: Thawing sub-arctic permafrost: Effects on vegetation and methane emissions, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, L04501, doi:10.1029/2003GL018680, 2004.](#)
- 25 Cressot, C., Chevallier, F., Bousquet, P., Crevoisier, C., Dlugokencky, E. J., Fortems-Cheiney, A., Frankenberg, C., Parker, R., Pison, I., Scheepmaker, R. A., Montzka, S. A., Krummel, P. B., Steele, L. P., and Langenfelds, R. L.: On the consistency between global and regional methane emissions inferred from SCIAMACHY, TANSO-FTS, IASI and surface measurements, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14, 577-592, doi:10.5194/acp-14-577-2014, 2014.
- 30 Cressot, C., Pison, I., Rayner, P. J., Bousquet, P., Fortems-Cheiney, A., and Chevallier, F.: Can we detect regional methane anomalies? A comparison between three observing systems, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 9089-9108, doi:10.5194/acp-16-9089-2016, 2016.
- Curry, C. L.: Modeling the soil consumption of atmospheric methane at the global scale, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 21, GB4012, doi:10.1029/2006gb002818, 2007.
- 35 Dalsøren, S. B., Isaksen, I. S. A., Li, L., and Richter, A.: Effect of emission changes in Southeast Asia on global hydroxyl and methane lifetime, *Tellus B*, 61, 588-601, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2009.00429.x, 2009.
- Dalsøren, S. B., Myhre, C. L., Myhre, G., Gomez-Pelaez, A. J., Søvde, O. A., Isaksen, I. S. A., Weiss, R. F., and Harth, C. M.: Atmospheric methane evolution the last 40 years, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16, 3099-3126, doi:10.5194/acp-16-3099-2016, 2016.
- 40 Dangal, S. R., Tian, H., Zhang, B., Pan, S., Lu, C., and Yang, J.: Methane emission from the global livestock sector during 1890-2014: magnitude, trends and spatio-temporal patterns (In Revision), *Global Change Biol*, 2017.
- Dlugokencky, E. J., Steele, L. P., Lang, P. M., and Masarie, K. A.: The Growth-Rate and Distribution of Atmospheric Methane, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, 99, 17,021-017,043, 1994.
- Dlugokencky, E. J., Bruhwieler, L., White, J. W. C., Emmons, L. K., Novelli, P. C., Montzka, S. A., Masarie, K. A., Lang, P. M., Crotwell, A. M., Miller, J. B., and Gatti, L. V.: Observational constraints on recent increases in the atmospheric CH₄ burden, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36, L18803, 10.1029/2009GL039780, 2009
- 45 Dlugokencky, E. J., Nisbet, E. G., Fisher, R., and Lowry, D.: Global atmospheric methane: budget, changes and dangers, *Philos T R Soc A*, 369, 2058-2072, 2011.

- EDGARv4.1: European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC)/Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL). Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), release version 4.1. <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu>, (last access: Nov 2014), 2010.
- 5 EDGARv4.2FT2010: European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC)/Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL). Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), release EDGARv4.2FT2010, <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu>, (last access: Nov 10 2016), 2013.
- EDGARv4.2FT2012: European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC)/Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL). Emission Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), release EDGARv4.2FT2012, <http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu>, (last access: Nov 10 2016), 2014.
- 10 Etiope, G., A. V. Milkov, and E. Derbyshire, Did geologic emissions of methane play any role in Quaternary climate change?, *Global Planet. Change*, 61, 79–88, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2007.08.008, 2008.
- Etiope, G.: *Natural Gas Seepage. The Earth's Hydrocarbon Degassing*, Springer International Publishing, 199 pp., 2015.
- FAOSTAT: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. FAOSTAT Emissions-Agriculture, <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/GT> (last Access: Jan 10 2017), 2017a.
- 15 FAOSTAT: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. FAOSTAT Emissions-Land Use, <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/GL> (last Access: Jan 10 2016), 2017b.
- Francey, R. J., Steele, L. P., Langenfelds, R. L., and Pak, B. C.: High precision long-term monitoring of radiatively active and related trace gases at surface sites and from aircraft in the southern hemisphere atmosphere, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 56, 279-285, 1999.
- 20 Giglio, L., Randerson, J. T., and van der Werf, G. R.: Analysis of daily, monthly, and annual burned area using the fourth-generation global fire emissions database (GFED4), *Journal of Geophysical Research - Biogeosciences*, 118, 317-328, doi:10.1002/jgrg.20042, 2013.
- Hausmann, P., Sussmann, R., and Smale, D.: Contribution of oil and natural gas production to renewed increase in atmospheric methane (2007–2014): top-down estimate from ethane and methane column observations, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16, 3227-3244, doi:10.5194/acp-16-3227-2016, 2016.
- 25 Hayman, G. D., O'Connor, F. M., Dalvi, M., Clark, D. B., Gedney, N., Huntingford, C., Prigent, C., Buchwitz, M., Schneising, O., Burrows, J. P., Wilson, C., Richards, N., and Chipperfield, M.: Comparison of the HadGEM2 climate-chemistry model against in situ and SCIAMACHY atmospheric methane data, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14, 13257-13280, doi:10.5194/acp-14-13257-2014, 2014.
- 30 Helmig, D., Rossabi, S., Hueber, J., Tans, P., Montzka, S. A., Masarie, K., Thoning, K., Plass-Duelmer, C., Claude, A., Carpenter, L. J., Lewis, A. C., Punjabi, S., Reimann, S., Vollmer, M. K., Steinbrecher, R., Hannigan, J. W., Emmons, L. K., Mahieu, E., Franco, B., Smale, D., and Pozzer, A.: Reversal of global atmospheric ethane and propane trends largely due to US oil and natural gas production, *Nature Geosciences*, 9, 490-495, doi:10.1038/ngeo2721, 2016
- 35 Hodson, E. L., Poulter, B., Zimmermann, N. E., Prigent, C., and Kaplan, J. O.: The El Niño Southern Oscillation and wetland methane interannual variability, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, L08810, doi:10.1029/2011gl046861, 2011.
- Höglund-Isaksson, L.: Global anthropogenic methane emissions 2005-2030: Technical mitigation potentials and costs, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 12, 9079-9096, doi:10.5194/acp-12-9079-2012, 2012.
- Höglund-Isaksson, L.: Bottom-up simulations of methane and ethane emissions from global oil and gas systems 1980 to 2012, *Environmental Research Letters*, 12, 2, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa583e, 2017
- 40 Höglund-Isaksson, L., Thomson, A., Kupiainen, K., Rao, S., and Janssens-Maenhout, G.: Anthropogenic methane sources, emissions and future projections, Chapter 5 in *AMAP Assessment 2015: Methane as an Arctic Climate Forcer*, p. 39-59, available at <http://www.amap.no/documents/doc/AMAP-Assessment-2015-Methane-as-an-Arctic-climate-forcer/1285>, (last access: Nov 20 2016), 2015.
- 45 Holmes, C. D., Prather, M. J., Søvde, O. A., and Myhre, G.: Future methane, hydroxyl, and their uncertainties: key climate and emission parameters for future predictions, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 285-302, doi:10.5194/acp-13-285-2013, 2013.
- Houweling, S., Dentener, F. and Lelieveld, J.: Simulation of industrial atmospheric methane to constrain the global source strength of natural wetlands, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 105, D13, 17243-17255, 2000.
- Houweling, S., Krol, M., Bergamaschi, P., Frankenberg, C., Dlugokencky, E. J., Morino, I., Notholt, J., Sherlock, V., 50 Wunch, D., Beck, V., Gerbig, C., Chen, H., Kort, E. A., Röckmann, T., and Aben, I.: A multi-year methane inversion

- using SCIAMACHY, accounting for systematic errors using TCCON measurements, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 14, 3991-4012, doi:10.5194/acp-14-3991-2014, 2014.
- IEA, excerpt from Coal Information (2016 Edition), Key coal trends, International Energy Agency, <http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/KeyCoalTrends.pdf>, 2016
- 5 Ishizawa, M., Mabuchi, K., Shirai, T., Inoue, M., Morino, I., Uchino, O., Yoshida, Y., Maksyutov, S., and Belikov, D.: Inter-annual variability of CO₂ exchange in Northern Eurasia inferred from GOSAT XCO₂, *Environmental Research Letters*, 11, 105001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/10/105001, 2016.
- Ito, A., and Inatomi, M.: Use of a process-based model for assessing the methane budgets of global terrestrial ecosystems and evaluation of uncertainty, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 759-773, doi:10.5194/bg-9-759-2012, 2012.
- 10 John, J., Fiore, A.M., Naik, V., Horowitz, L. W., and Dunne, J.: Climate versus emission drivers of methane lifetime from 1860 to 2100, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 12021-12036, doi:10.5194/acp-12-12021-2012, 2012.
- Kai, F. M., Tyler, S. C., Randerson, J. T., and Blake, D. R.: Reduced methane growth rate explained by decreased Northern Hemisphere microbial sources, *Nature*, 476, 194-197, 2011.
- 15 Kaiser, J. W., Heil, A., Andreae, M. O., Benedetti, A., Chubarova, N., Jones, L., Morcrette, J. J., Razinger, M., Schultz, M. G., Suttie, M., and van der Werf, G. R.: Biomass burning emissions estimated with a global fire assimilation system based on observed fire radiative power, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 527-554, 10.5194/bg-9-527-2012, 2012.
- Kaplan, J. O.: Wetlands at the Last Glacial Maximum: Distribution and methane emissions, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29, 1079, 10.1029/2001gl013366, 2002.
- 20 [Kiemle, C., Kawa, S. R., Quatrevalet, M., and Browell, E. V.: Performance simulations for a spaceborne methane lidar mission, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 119, 4365–4379, doi:10.1002/2013JD021253, 2014](#)
- Kim, H.-S., Maksyutov, S., Glagolev, M. V., Machida, T., Patra, P. K., Sudo, K., and Inoue, G.: Evaluation of methane emissions from West Siberian wetlands based on inverse modeling, *Environmental Research Letters*, 6, 035201, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/6/3/035201, 2011.
- 25 Kirschke, S., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Saunois, M., Canadell, J. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., Bergamaschi, P., Bergmann, D., Blake, D. R., Bruhwiler, L., Cameron-Smith, P., Castaldi, S., Chevallier, F., Feng, L., Fraser, A., Heimann, M., Hodson, E. L., Houweling, S., Josse, B., Fraser, P. J., Krummel, P. B., Lamarque, J. F., Langenfelds, R. L., Le Quere, C., Naik, V., O'Doherty, S., Palmer, P. I., Pison, I., Plummer, D., Poulter, B., Prinn, R. G., Rigby, M., Ringeval, B., Santini, M., Schmidt, M., Shindell, D. T., Simpson, I. J., Spahni, R., Steele, L. P., Storde, S. A., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., van der Werf, G. R., Voulgarakis, A., van Weele, M., Weiss, R. F., Williams, J. E., and Zeng, G.: Three decades of global methane sources and sinks, *Nature Geoscience*, 6, 813-823, doi:10.1038/ngeo1955, 2013.
- 30 Kleinen, T., Brovkin, V., and Schuldt, R. J.: A dynamic model of wetland extent and peat accumulation: results for the Holocene, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 235-248, doi:10.5194/bg-9-235-2012, 2012.
- Klimont, Z., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Heyes, C., Rafaj, P., Schöpp, W., Cofala, J., Borcken-Kleefeld, J., Purohit, P., Kupiainen, K., Winiwarter, W., Amann, M., Zhao, B., Wang, S. X., Bertok, I., and Sander, R.: Global scenarios of air pollutants and methane: 1990–2050, (in preparation), 2016.
- 35 Kort, E. A., Smith, M. L., Murray, L. T., Gvakharia, A., Brandt, A. R., Peischl, J., Ryerson, T. B., Sweeney, C., and Travis, K.: Fugitive emissions from the Bakken shale illustrate role of shale production in global ethane shift, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 4617–4623, doi:10.1002/2016GL068703, 2016.
- Levin, I., Veidt, C., Vaughn, B. H., Brailsford, G., Bromley, T., Heinz, R., Lowe, D., Miller, J. B., Posz, C., and White, J. W. C.: No inter-hemispheric $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{CH}_4}$ trend observed, *Nature*, 486, E3, doi:10.1038/nature11175, 2012.
- 40 Lin, X., Indira, N. K., Ramonet, M., Delmotte, M., Ciais, P., Bhatt, B. C., Reddy, M. V., Angchuk, D., Balakrishnan, S., Jorphail, S., Dorjai, T., Mahey, T. T., Patnaik, S., Begum, M., Brenninkmeijer, C., Durairaj, S., Kirubakaran, R., Schmidt, M., Swathi, P. S., Vinithkumar, N. V., Yver Kwok, C., and Gaur, V. K.: Long-lived atmospheric trace gases measurements in flask samples from three stations in India, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 9819-9849, doi:10.5194/acp-15-9819-2015, 2015.
- 45 Lin, X., Ciais, P., Bousquet, P., Ramonet, M., Yin, Y., Balkanski, Y., Cozic, A., Delmotte, M., Evangeliou, N., Indira, N. K., Locatelli, R., Peng, S., Piao, S., Saunois, M., Swathi, P. S., Wang, R., Yver-Kwok, C., Tiwari, Y. K., and Zhou, L.: Simulating CH₄ and CO₂ over South and East Asia using the zoomed chemistry transport model LMDzINCA, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/acp-2016-1056, in review, 2017.

- Locatelli, R., Bousquet, P., Chevallier, F., Fortems-Cheney, A., Szopa, S., Saunois, M., Agusti-Panareda, A., Bergmann, D., Bian, H., Cameron-Smith, P., Chipperfield, M. P., Gloor, E., Houweling, S., Kawa, S. R., Krol, M., Patra, P. K., Prinn, R. G., Rigby, M., Saito, R., and Wilson, C.: Impact of transport model errors on the global and regional methane emissions estimated by inverse modelling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 9917-9937, doi:10.5194/acp-13-9917-2013, 2013.
- 5 Locatelli, R., Bousquet, P., Saunois, M., Chevallier, F., and Cressot, C.: Sensitivity of the recent methane budget to LMDz sub-grid-scale physical parameterizations, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15, 9765-9780, doi:10.5194/acp-15-9765-2015, 2015.
- Marotta, H., Pinho, L., Gudasz, C., Bastviken, D., Tranvik, L.J. and Enrich-Prast, A.: Greenhouse gas production in low-latitude lake sediments responds strongly to warming, *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 467-470, doi:10.1038/nclimate2222, 2014
- 10 Marthews, T. R., Dadson, S. J., Lehner, B., Abele, S., and Gedney, N.: High-resolution global topographic index values for use in large-scale hydrological modelling, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 19, 91-104, doi:10.5194/hess-19-91-2015, 2015.
- Matthews, E., and Fung, I.: Methane emission from natural wetlands: Global distribution, area, and environmental characteristics of sources, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 1, 61-86, doi:10.1029/GB001i001p00061, 1987.
- 15 McNorton, J., Chipperfield, M. P., Gloor, M., Wilson, C., Feng, W., Hayman, G. D., Rigby, M., Krummel, P. B., O'Doherty, S., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Young, D., Dlugokencky, E., and Montzka, S. A.: Role of OH variability in the stalling of the global atmospheric CH₄ growth rate from 1999 to 2006, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16, 7943-7956 doi:10.5194/acp-16-7943-2016, 2016a.
- McNorton, J., E. Gloor, C. Wilson, G. D. Hayman, N. Gedney, E. Comyn-Platt, T. Marthews, R. J. Parker, H. Boesch, and M. P. Chipperfield: Role of regional wetland emissions in atmospheric methane variability, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 11,433–11,444, doi:10.1002/2016GL070649, 2016b.
- Melton, J. R., Wania, R., Hodson, E. L., Poulter, B., Ringeval, B., Spahni, R., Bohn, T., Avis, C. A., Beerling, D. J., Chen, G., Eliseev, A. V., Denisov, S. N., Hopcroft, P. O., Lettenmaier, D. P., Riley, W. J., Singarayer, J. S., Subin, Z. M., Tian, H., Zürcher, S., Brovkin, V., van Bodegom, P. M., Kleinen, T., Yu, Z. C., and Kaplan, J. O.: Present state of global wetland extent and wetland methane modelling: conclusions from a model intercomparison project (WETCHIMP), *Biogeosciences*, 10, 753-788, doi:10.5194/bg-10-753-2013, 2013.
- Melton, J. R., and Arora, V. K.: Competition between plant functional types in the Canadian Terrestrial Ecosystem Model (CTEM) v. 2.0, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 323-361, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-323-2016, 2016.
- 25 Miller, J. B., Lehman, S. J., Montzka, S. A., Sweeney, C., Miller, B. R., Karion, A., Wolak, C., Dlugokencky, E. J., Southon, J., Turnbull, J. C., and Tans, P. P.: Linking emissions of fossil fuel CO₂ and other anthropogenic trace gases using atmospheric 14CO₂, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D08302, doi:10.1029/2011JD017048, 2012.
- Montzka, S. A., Krol, M., Dlugokencky, E., Hall, B., Jockel, P., and Lelieveld, J.: Small Interannual Variability of Global Atmospheric Hydroxyl, *Science*, 331, 67-69, 2011.
- 35 Naik, V., Voulgarakis, A., Fiore, A. M., Horowitz, L. W., Lamarque, J. F., Lin, M., Prather, M. J., Young, P. J., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P. J., Cionni, I., Collins, W. J., Dalsøren, S. B., Doherty, R., Eyring, V., Faluvegi, G., Folberth, G. A., Josse, B., Lee, Y. H., MacKenzie, I. A., Nagashima, T., van Noije, T. P. C., Plummer, D. A., Righi, M., Rumbold, S. T., Skeie, R., Shindell, D. T., Stevenson, D. S., Strode, S., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., and Zeng, G.: Preindustrial to present day changes in tropospheric hydroxyl radical and methane lifetime from the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP), *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 5277-5298, doi:10.5194/acp-13-5277-2013, 2013
- 40 [Nicwonger, M. R., Verhulst, K. R., Aydin, M., and Saltzman, E. S.: Preindustrial atmospheric ethane levels inferred from polar ice cores: A constraint on the geologic sources of atmospheric ethane and methane, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 214–221, doi:10.1002/2015GL066854, 2016.](#)
- Nisbet, E. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., and Bousquet, P.: Methane on the rise-again, *Science*, 343, 493-495, doi:10.1126/science.1247828, 2014.
- 45 Nisbet, E. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., Manning, M. R., Lowry, D., Fisher, R. E., France, J. L., Michel, S. E., Miller, J. B., White, J. W. C., Vaughn, B., Bousquet, P., Pyle, J. A., Warwick, N. J., Cain, M., Brownlow, R., Zazzeri, G., Lanoisellé, M., Manning, A. C., Gloor, E., Worthy, D. E. J., Brunke, E.-G., Labuschagne, C., Wolff, E. W., and Ganesan, A. L.: Rising atmospheric methane: 2007–2014 growth and isotopic shift, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 30, 1356–1370, doi:10.1002/2016GB005406, 2016.
- 50

- Olivier, J. G. J., G. Janssens-Maenhout, G., and Peters, J. A. H. W.: Trends in global CO₂ emissions – 2012 Report. Joint Research Centre of the European Commission and the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL), Netherlands, 2012.
- Olivier, J. G. J., and Janssens-Maenhout, G.: Part III: Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of CO₂ Emissions from Fuel Combustion (2014 ed.), International Energy Agency, Paris, ISBN-978-92-64-21709-6, 2014.
- 5 Parmentier, F. J. W., Zhang, W., Mi, Y., Zhu, X., Huissteden, J., Hayes, D. J., Zhuang, Q., Christensen, T. R. and David McGuire, A.: Rising methane emissions from northern wetlands associated with sea ice decline, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42(17), 7214–7222, doi:10.1002/2015GL065013, 2015.
- 10 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 troposphere and lower stratosphere, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 12,813-812,837, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011, 2011.
- 15 Patra, P. K., Saeki, T., Dlugokencky, E. J., Ishijima, K., Umezawa, T., Ito, A., Aoki, S., Morimoto, S., Kort, E. A., Crotwell, A., Ravikumar, K., and Nakazawa, T.: Regional methane emission estimation based on observed atmospheric concentrations (2002-2012). *Journal of Meteorological Society of Japan*, 94, 85-107, doi:10.2151/jmsj.2016-006, 2016.
- Peng, S. S., Piao, S. L., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Li, B. G., Lin, X., Tao, S., Wang, Z. P., Zhang, Y., and Zhou, F.: Inventory of anthropogenic methane emissions in Mainland China from 1980 to 2010, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 14545-14562, doi:10.5194/acp-16-14545-2016, 2016
- 20 [Pierangelo, C., Millet, B., Esteve, F., Alpers, M., Ehret, G., Flamant, P., Berthier, S., Gibert, F., Chomette, O., Edouard, D., Deniel, C., Bousquet, P., and Chevallier, C.: MERLIN \(Methane Remote Sensing Lidar Mission\): an Overview, EPJ Web of Conferences, 19, 26001, doi: 10.1051/epjconf/20161926001, 2016](#)
- Pison, I., Ringeval, B., Bousquet, P., Prigent, C., and Papa, F.: Stable atmospheric methane in the 2000s: key-role of emissions from natural wetlands, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 11609-11623, doi:10.5194/acp-13-11609-2013, 2013.
- 25 Poulter, B., Bousquet, P., Canadell, J., Ciais, P., Peregón, A., Saunio, M., Arora, V., Beerling, D., Brovkin, V., Jones, C., Joos, F., Gedney, N., Ito, A., Kleinen, T., Koven, C., MacDonald, K., Melton, J., Peng, C., Peng, S., Schroder, R., Prigent, C., Riley, B., Saito, M., Spahni, R., Tian, H., Taylor, L., Viovy, N., Wilton, D., Wiltshire, A., Xu, X., and Zhang, Z.: Global wetland contribution to 2000-2012 atmospheric methane growth rate dynamics, *Environmental Research Letters*, 2016, submitted.
- 30 Randerson, J. T., Chen, Y., van der Werf, G. R., Rogers, B. M., and Morton, D. C.: Global burned area and biomass burning emissions from small fires, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 117, G04012, doi:10.1029/2012jg002128, 2012.
- Rigby, M., Prinn, R. G., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., Langenfelds, R. L., Huang, J., Cunnold, D. M., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Weiss, R. F., O'Doherty, S., Salameh, P. K., Wang, H. J., Harth, C. M., Mühle, J., and Porter, L. W.: Renewed growth of atmospheric methane, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35, L22805, doi:10.1029/2008gl036037, 2008.
- 35 Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Lawrence, D. M., Swenson, S. C., Torn, M. S., Meng, L., Mahowald, N. M., and Hess, P.: Barriers to predicting changes in global terrestrial methane fluxes: analyses using CLM4Me, a methane biogeochemistry model integrated in CESM, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 1925-1953, doi:10.5194/bg-8-1925-2011, 2011.
- 40 Ringeval, B., Friedlingstein, P., Koven, C., Ciais, P., de Noblet-Ducoudre, N., Decharme, B., and Cadule, P.: Climate-CH₄ feedback from wetlands and its interaction with the climate-CO₂ feedback, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 2137-2157, doi:10.5194/bg-8-2137-2011, 2011.
- Rogelj, J., McCollum, D., and Smith, S.: The Emissions Gap Report 2014 - a UNEP synthesis report: Chapter 2. U.N. Environment Programme, Nairobi, Internet: <http://www.unep.org/publications/ebooks/emissionsgapreport2014/>. ISBN: 978-92-807-3413-3, 2014.
- 45 Saad, K. M., Wunch, D., Deutscher, N. M., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., De Mazière, M., Notholt, J., Pollard, D. F., Roehl, C. M., Schneider, M., Sussmann, R., Warneke, T., and Wennberg, P. O.: Seasonal variability of stratospheric methane: implications for constraining tropospheric methane budgets using total column observations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 14003-14024, doi:10.5194/acp-16-14003-2016, 2016.

- Saito, M., Kim, H.-S., Ito, A., Yokota, T., Maksyutov, S.: Enhanced Methane Emissions during Amazonian Drought by Biomass Burning, *PLoS ONE* 11(11): e0166039. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166039, 2016
- Sanderson, M.G.: Biomass of termites and their emissions of methane and carbon dioxide: A global database, *Global Biogeochemical Cycle*, 10, 4, 543-557, 1996
- 5 Saunio, M., Bousquet, P., Poulter, B., Pregon, A., Ciais, P., Canadell, J. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., Etiope, G., Bastviken, D., Houweling, S., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Tubiello, F. N., Castaldi, S., Jackson, R. B., Alexe, M., Arora, V. K., Beerling, D. J., Bergamaschi, P., Blake, D. R., Brailsford, G., Brovkin, V., Bruhwiler, L., Crevoisier, C., Crill, P., Kovey, K., Curry, C., Frankenberg, C., Gedney, N., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Ishizawa, M., Ito, A., Joos, F., Kim, H.-S., Kleinen, T., Krummel, P., Lamarque, J.-F., Langenfelds, R., Locatelli, R., Machida, T., Maksyutov, S., McDonald, K. C., Marshall, J., Melton, J. R., Morino, I., Naik, V., O'Doherty, S., Parmentier, F.-J. W., Patra, P. K., Peng, C., Peng, S., Peters, G. P., Pison, I., Prigent, C., Prinn, R., Ramonet, M., Riley, W. J., Saito, M., Santini, M., Schroeder, R., Simpson, I. J., Spahni, R., Steele, P., Takizawa, A., Thornton, B. F., Tian, H., Tohjima, Y., Viovy, N., Voulgarakis, A., van Weele, M., van der Werf, G., Weiss, R., Wiedinmyer, C., Wilton, D. J., Wiltshire, A., Worthy, D., Wunch, D. B., Xu, X., Yoshida, Y., Zhang, B., Zhang, Z., and Zhu, Q.: The Global Methane Budget 2000–2012, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 8, 697-752, doi:10.5194/essd-8-697-2016, 2016.
- 15 Schaefer, H., Fletcher, S. E. M., Veidt, C., Lassey, K. R., Brailsford, G. W., Bromley, T. M., Dlugokencky, E. J., Michel, S. E., Miller, J. B., Levin, I., Lowe, D. C., Martin, R. J., Vaughn, B. H., and White, J. W. C.: A 21st century shift from fossil-fuel to biogenic methane emissions indicated by ¹³CH₄, *Science*, 352, 80-84, doi:10.1126/science.aad2705, 2016
- 20 Schroeder, R., McDonald, K.C., Chapman, B.D., Jensen, K., Podest, E., Tessler, Z.D., Bohn, T.J., and Zimmermann, R.: Development and Evaluation of a Multi-Year Fractional Surface Water Data Set Derived from Active/Passive Microwave Remote Sensing Data. *Remote Sens.*, 7, 16688-16732, doi:10.3390/rs71215843, 2015
- Schwietzke, S., Sherwood, O. A., Bruhwiler, L. M. P., Miller, J. B., Etiope, G., Dlugokencky, E. J., Michel, S. E., Arline, V.A., vaughn, B. H., White, J. W. C., and Tans, P. P.: Upward revision of global fossil fuel methane emissions based on isotope database, *Nature*, 538, 88-91, doi:10.1038/nature19797, 2016.
- 25 [Sherwood, O. A., Schwietzke, S., Arling, V. A., and Etiope, G.: Global Inventory of Gas Geochemistry Data from Fossil Fuel, Microbial and Biomass Burning Sources, Version 2017, Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-20, in review, 2017.](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-20)
- Simpson, I. J., Sulbaek Andersen, M. P., Meinardi, S., Bruhwiler, L., Blake, N. J., Helmig, D., Rowland, F. S., and Blake, D. R.: Long-term decline of global atmospheric ethane concentrations and implications for methane, *Nature*, 488, 490-494, doi:10.1038/nature11342, 2012.
- 30 Spahni, R., Wania, R., Neef, L., van Weele, M., Pison, I., Bousquet, P., Frankenberg, C., Foster, P. N., Joos, F., Prentice, I. C., and van Velthoven, P.: Constraining global methane emissions and uptake by ecosystems, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 1643-1665, doi:10.5194/bg-8-1643-2011, 2011.
- Sweeney, C., Dlugokencky, E., Miller, C., Wofsy, S., Karion, A., Dinardo, S., Chang, R. Y. W., Miller, J., Bruhwiler, L., Crotwell, A., Newberger, T., McKain, K., Stone, R., Wolter, S., Lang, P. and Tans, P.: No significant increase in long-term CH₄ emissions on North Slope of Alaska despite significant increase in air temperature, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, doi:10.1002/2016GL069292, 2016.
- 35 Tian, H., Xu, X., Liu, M., Ren, W., Zhang, C., Chen, G., and Lu, C.: Spatial and temporal patterns of CH₄ and N₂O fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems of North America during 1979–2008: application of a global biogeochemistry model, *Biogeosciences*, 7, 2673-2694, doi:10.5194/bg-7-2673-2010, 2010.
- Tian, H., Chen, G., Lu, C., Xu, X., Ren, W., Zhang, B., Banger, K., Tao, B., Pan, S., Liu, M., Zhang, C., Bruhwiler, L., and Wofsy, S.: Global methane and nitrous oxide emissions from terrestrial ecosystems due to multiple environmental changes, *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability*, 1, 1-20, doi:10.1890/ehs14-0015.1, 2015.
- 40 Tian, H., Lu, C., Ciais, P., Michalak, A.M., Canadell, J.G., Saikawa, E., Huntzinger, D.N., Gurney, K., Sitch, S., Zhang, B., Yang, J., Bousquet, P., Bruhwiler, L., Chen, G., Dlugokencky, E., Friedlingstein, P., Melillo, J., Pan, S., Poulter, B., Prinn, R., Saunio, M., Schwalm, C.R., and Wofsy, S.C.: The terrestrial biosphere as a net source of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere, *Nature*, doi:10.1038/nature16946, 2016
- 45 Thompson, R. L., Stohl, A., Zhou, L. X., Dlugokencky, E., Fukuyama, Y., Thojima, Y., Kim, S.-Y., Lee, H., Nisbet, E. G., Fisher, R. E., Lowry, D., Weiss, R. F., Prinn, R. G., O'Doherty, S., Young, D., and White, J. W. C.: Methane emis- sions

- in East Asia for 2000–2011 estimated using an atmospheric Bayesian inversion, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 120, 4352–4369, doi:10.1002/2014JD022394, 2015.
- Thonat, T., Saunois, M., Bousquet, P., Pison, I., Tan, Z., Zhuang, Q., Crill, P. M., Thornton, B. F., Bastviken, D., Dlugokencky, E. J., Zimov, N., Laurila, T., Hatakka, J., Hermansen, O., and Worthy, D. E. J.: Detectability of Arctic methane sources at six sites performing continuous atmospheric measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 8371–8394, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-8371-2017>, 2017.
- Thornton, B. F., Wik, M., and Crill, P. M.: Double-counting challenges the accuracy of high-latitude methane inventories, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 12569–12577, doi:10.1002/2016GL071772, 2016.
- Tubiello, F. N., Salvatore, M., Rossi, S., Ferrara, A., Fitton, N., and Smith, P.: The FAOSTAT database of greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture, *Environmental Research Letters*, 8, 015009, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/015009, 2013.
- Tubiello, F.N., Salvatore, M., Ferrara, House, J., Federici, S., Rossi, S., Biancalani, R., Condor Golec, RD, Jacobs, H., Flammini, A., Proserpi, P., Cardenas-Galindo, P., Schmidhuber, J., Sanz-Snachez, M.J., Srivastava, N., and Smith, P., The Contribution of Agriculture, Forestry and other Land -Use activities to Global Warming, 1990–2012. *Glob. Ch. Biol.* doi:10.1111/gcb.12865, 2015.
- 15 USEPA: Global anthropogenic non-CO₂ greenhouse gas emissions: 1990–2020. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington D.C., 2006.
- USEPA: Draft: Global Anthropogenic Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gas Emissions: 1990–2030. EPA 430-R-03-002, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington D.C., 2011.
- USEPA: Global Anthropogenic Non-CO₂ Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990–2030, EPA 430-R-12-006, US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC., 2012.
- 20 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), *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 11,707–711,735, 2010.
- Voulgarakis, A., Naik, V., Lamarque, J. F., Shindell, D. T., Young, P. J., Prather, M. J., Wild, O., Field, R. D., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P., Cionni, I., Collins, W. J., Dalsøren, S. B., Doherty, R. M., Eyring, V., Faluvegi, G., Folberth, G. A., Horowitz, L. W., Josse, B., MacKenzie, I. A., Nagashima, T., Plummer, D. A., Righi, M., Rumbold, S. T., Stevenson, D. S., Strode, S. A., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., and Zeng, G.: Analysis of present day and future OH and methane lifetime in the ACCMIP simulations, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 2563–2587, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2563-2013, 2013.
- 30 Wang, Z., Warneke, T., Deutscher, N., Notholt, J., Karsten, U., Saunois, M., Schneider, M., Sussmann, R., Sembhi, H., Griffith, D. W. T., Pollar, D. F., Kivi, R., Petri, C., Velasco, V. A., Ramonet, M., and Chen, H.: Contributions of the troposphere and stratosphere to CH₄ model biases, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/acp-2016-1041, in review, 2016.
- Watts, J. D., Kimball, J. S., Bartsch, A. and McDonald, K. C.: Surface water inundation in the boreal-Arctic: potential impacts on regional methane emissions, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 9(7), 075001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/7/075001, 2014.
- 35 Wennberg, P. O., Mui, W., Wunch, D., Kort, E. A., Blake, D. R., Atlas, E. L., Santoni, G. W., Wofsy, S. C., Diskin, G.S., Jeong, S., and Fischer, M. L.: On the Sources of Methane to the Los Angeles Atmosphere, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 46, 17, 9282–9289, doi: 10.1021/es301138y, 2012
- Wiedinmyer, C., Akagi, S. K., Yokelson, R. J., Emmons, L. K., Al-Saadi, J. A., Orlando, J. J., and Soja, A. J.: The Fire Inventory from NCAR (FINN): A high resolution global model to estimate the emissions from open burning, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 4, 625–641, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-625-2011, 2011.
- Woodward, F. I., and Lomas, M. R.: Vegetation dynamics – simulating responses to climatic change, *Biological Reviews*, 79, 643–670, doi:10.1017/s1464793103006419, 2004.
- Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., Hedelius, J. K., Vizenor, N., Roehl, C. M., Saad, K. M., Blavier, J.-F. L., Blake, D. R., and Wennberg, P. O.: Quantifying the loss of processed natural gas within California's South Coast Air Basin using long-term measurements of ethane and methane, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 14091–14105, doi:10.5194/acp-16-14091-2016, 2016.
- 45 Xu, X., Riley, W. J., Koven, C. D., Billesbach, D. P., Chang, R. Y.-W., Commane, R., Euskirchen, E. S., Hartery, S., Harazono, Y., Iwata, H., McDonald, K. C., Miller, C. E., Oechel, W. C., Poulter, B., Raz-Yaseef, N., Sweeney, C., Torn, M., Wofsy, S. C., Zhang, Z., and Zona, D.: A multi-scale comparison of modeled and observed seasonal methane emissions in northern wetlands, *Biogeosciences*, 13, 5043–5056, doi:10.5194/bg-13-5043-2016, 2016
- 50

- Yvon-Durocher, G., Allen, A. P., Bastviken, D., Conrad, R., Gudas, C. St-Pierre, A., Thanh-Duc, N., and del Giorgio, P.A.: Methane fluxes show consistent temperature dependence across microbial to ecosystem scales, *Nature*, 507, 488-491, doi:10.1038/nature13164, 2014.
- 5 Zazzeri, G., Lowry, D., Fisher, R. E., France, J. L., Lanoisellé, M., Kelly, B. F. J., Necki, J. M., Iverach, C. P., Ginty, E., Zimnoch, M., Jasek, A., and Nisbet, E. G.: Carbon isotopic signature of coal-derived methane emissions to the atmosphere: from coalification to alteration, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 13669-13680, doi:10.5194/acp-16-13669-2016, 2016.
- 10 Zhang, B., Tian, H., Ren, W., Tao, B., Lu, C., Yang, J., Banger, K. and Pan, S.: Methane emissions from global rice fields: Magnitude, spatiotemporal patterns, and environmental controls, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 30, 1246–1263, doi:10.1002/2016GB005381, 2016.
- Zhu, Q., Liu, J., Peng, C., Chen, H., Fang, X., Jiang, H., Yang, G., Zhu, D., Wang, W., and Zhou, X.: Modelling methane emissions from natural wetlands by development and application of the TRIPLEX-GHG model, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 7, 981-999, doi:10.5194/gmd-7-981-2014, 2014.
- 15 Zhu, Q., Peng, C., Chen, H., Fang, X., Liu, J., Jiang, H., Yang, Y., and Yang, G.: Estimating global natural wetland methane emissions using process modelling: spatio-temporal patterns and contributions to atmospheric methane fluctuations, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 959-972, 2015.
- Zhuravlev, R. V., Ganshin, A. V., Maksyutov, S., Oshchepkov, S. L., and Khattatov, B. V.: Estimation of global CO₂ fluxes using ground-based and satellite (GOSAT) observation data with empirical orthogonal functions, *Atmospheric and Oceanic Optics*, 26, 507-516, doi: 10.1134/S1024856013060158, 2013.

20

Table 1: List of the top-down estimates included in this paper.

Model	Institution	Observation used	Time period	Flux solved	Number of inversions	References
Carbon Tracker-CH ₄	NOAA	Surface stations	2000-2009	10 terrestrial sources and oceanic source	1	Bruhwyler et al. (2014)
LMDZ-MIOP	LSCE/CEA	Surface stations	1990-2013	Wetlands, biomass burning and other natural, anthropogenic sources	10	Pison et al. (2013)
LMDZ-PYVAR	LSCE/CEA	Surface stations	2006-2012	Net source	6	Locatelli et al. (2015)
LMDZ-PYVAR	LSCE/CEA	GOSAT satellite	2010-2013	Net source	3	
TM5	SRON	Surface stations	2003-2010	Net source	1	Houweling et al. (2014)
TM5	SRON	GOSAT satellite	2009-2012	Net source	2	
TM5	SRON	SCIAMACHY satellite	2003-2010	Net source	1	
TM5	EC-JRC	Surface stations	2000-2012	Wetlands, rice, biomass burning and all remaining sources	1	Bergamaschi et al. (2013), Alexe et al. (2015)
TM5	EC-JRC	GOSAT satellite	2010-2012	Natural (wetland, rice, termite), anthropogenic (excluding rice), biomass burning, soil sink	1	Ishizawa et al. 2016);Zhuravlev et al. (2013)
GELCA	NIES	Surface stations	2000-2012	Net source	1	
ACTM	JAMSTEC	Surface stations	2002-2012	Biomass burning, anthropogenic emissions (excluding rice paddies) and all natural sources (including rice paddies)	1	Patra et al. (2016)
NIES-TM	NIES	Surface stations	2010-2012	Net source	1	Kim et al. (2011), Saito et al. (2016)
NIES-TM	NIES	GOSAT satellite	2010-2012	Net source	1	

Table 2: List of the bottom-up studies included in this paper.

B-U models and inventories	Contribution	Time period (resolution)	Gridded	References
EDGAR4.2 FT2010	Fossil fuels, Agriculture and waste, biofuel	2000-2010 (yearly)	X	EDGARv4.2FT2010 (2013), Olivier et al. (2012)
EDGARv4.2FT2012	Total anthropogenic	2000-2012 (yearly)		EDGARv4.2FT2012 (2014), Olivier and Janssens-Maenhout (2014), Rogelj et al. (2014)
EDGARv4.2EXT	Fossil fuels, Agriculture and waste, biofuel	1990-2013 (yearly)		Based on EDGARv4.1 (EDGARv4.1, 2010), this study
USEPA	Fossil fuels, Agriculture and waste, biofuel,	1990-2030 (10-yr interval, interpolated in this study)		USEPA (2006, 2011, 2012)
IIASA GAINS ECLIPSE	Fossil fuels, Agriculture and waste, biofuel	1990-2050 (5-yr interval, interpolated in this study)	X	Höglund-Isaksson (2012), Klimont et al. (2016)
FAOSTAT	Agriculture, Biomass Burning	Agriculture: 1961-2012 Biomass Burning: 1990-2014		Tubiello et al. (2013; 2015)
GFEDv3	Biomass burning	1997-2011	X	van der Werf et al. (2010)
GFEDv4s	Biomass burning	1997-2014	X	Giglio et al. (2013)
GFASv1.0	Biomass burning	2000-2013	X	Kaiser et al. (2012)
FINNv1	Biomass burning	2003-2014	X	Wiedinmyer et al. (2011)
CLM 4.5	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Riley et al. (2011), Xu et al. (2016)
CTEM	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Melton and Arora (2016)
DLEM	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Tian et al., (2010;2015)
JULES	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Hayman et al. (2014)
LPJ-MPI	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Kleinen et al. (2012)
LPJ-wsl	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Hodson et al. (2011)
LPX-Bern	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Spahni et al. (2011)
ORCHIDEE	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Ringeval et al. (2011)
SDGVM	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Woodward and Lomas (2004), Cao et al. (1996)
TRIPLEX-GHG	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Zhu et al., (2014;2015)
VISIT	Natural wetlands	2000-2012	X	Ito and Inatomi (2012)

Table 3: Average methane emissions over 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 at the global, latitudinal, and regional scales in Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, and differences between the periods 2008-2012 and 2002-2006 from the top-down and the bottom-up approaches. Uncertainties are reported as [min-max] range of reported studies. Differences of 1 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in the totals can occur due to rounding errors. A minimum of 3 years was required to calculate the average value over the 5-year periods, and then the difference between the two periods was calculated for each approach. This means that 5 inversions are used to produce these values


5

Period	T-D			B-U
	2002-2006	2008-2012	2012-2008 minus 2002-2006	2012-2008 minus 2002-2006
GLOBAL	546 [530-563]	570 [546-580]	22 [16-32]	21 [5-41]
LATITUDINAL				
90°S- 30°N	349 [330-379]	363 [344-391]	18 [13-24]	6 [-4-13]
30°N-60°N	175 [158-194]	184 [164-203]	4 [0-9]	17 [6-30]
60°N-90°N	20 [14-24]	22 [15-31]	0 [-1-1]	0 [-3-3]
REGIONAL				
Cent. North America	10 [3-15]	11 [6-16]	2 [0-5]	0 [0-1]
Tropical South America	79 [60-97]	94 [72-118]	9 [6-13]	-2 [-6-2]
Temp. South America	17 [12-27]	15 [12-19]	0 [-1-1]	0 [-1-0]
Northern Africa	41 [36-52]	41 [36-55]	2 [0-5]	2 [0-5]
Southern Africa	44 [37-54]	45 [36-59]	0 [-3-3]	1 [-2-4]
South East Asia	69 [53-81]	73 [59-86]	5 [-6-10]	1 [-3-4]
India	39 [28-45]	37 [26-47]	0 [-1-1]	2 [1-3]
Oceania	10 [7-19]	10 [7-14]	0 [0-1]	0 [-1-1]
Contiguous USA	42 [37-48]	42 [33-48]	1 [-2-3]	2 [-1-4]
Europe	27 [21-35]	29 [22-36]	1 [-1-3]	-2 [-2--2]
Central Eurasia & Japan	46 [38-50]	48 [38-58]	1 [-1-6]	5 [2-6]
China	53 [47-62]	56 [41-73]	4 [1-11]	10 [2-20]
Boreal North America	19 [13-27]	21 [15-27]	0 [-3-3]	2 [0-5]
Russia	39 [32-45]	38 [30-44]	-1 [-3-0]	0 [-4-3]


Table 4: Mean values of the emission change (in Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 inferred from the top-down and bottom-up approaches for the five general categories.

	Top-down	Bottom-up
Wetlands	6 [-4-16]	-1 [-8-7]
Agriculture and waste	10 [7-12]	10 [7-13]
Fossil fuels	7 [-2-16]	17 [11-25]
Biomass burning	-3 [-7-0]	-2 [-5-0]
Other natural	2 [-2-7]	-


10



5 **Figure 1: Evolution of the global methane cycle since 2000. (a) Observed atmospheric mixing ratios (ppb) as synthesized for four different surface networks with a global coverage (NOAA, AGAGE, CSIRO, UCI). (b) Global Growth rate computed from (a) in ppb/yr. 12-month running mean of (c) annual global emission (TgCH₄.yr⁻¹) and (d) annual global emission anomaly (TgCH₄.yr⁻¹) inferred by the ensemble of inversions.**



5 **Figure 2:** 12-month running mean of annual methane emission anomalies (in $\text{Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) inferred by the ensemble of inversions (mean as the solid line and min/max range as the shaded area) in grey for (a) global, (b) tropical, (c) mid-latitudes and (d) boreal total sources; in blue for (e) global anthropogenic sources and in green for (f) natural sources. The solid and dotted black lines represent the mean and min/max range (respectively) of the bottom-up estimates: anthropogenic inventories in (e) and ensemble of wetland models in (f). The vertical scale is divided by 2 for the mid-latitude and boreal regions.



10 **Figure 3:** 12-month running mean of global annual methane anthropogenic emission anomalies ($\text{Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) inferred by the ensemble of inversions (only mean values of the ensemble are represented) for (a) total anthropogenic, biomass burning, fossil fuel and, agriculture and waste sources. On the (b) panel, total anthropogenic and, agriculture and waste source anomalies are recalled on top of the sum of the anomalies from agriculture and waste, and fossil fuels sources.






Figure 4: Top: Contribution to the global methane emissions by region (in %, based on the mean top-down estimates over 2003-2012 from Saunois et al. (2016)). Bottom: Changes in methane emissions 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 at global, hemispheric and regional scales in TgCH₄ yr⁻¹. Red boxplots indicate a significant positive contribution to emission changes (first and third quartiles above zero), blue boxplots indicate a significant negative contribution to emission changes (first and third quartiles below zero), grey boxplots indicate not-significant emission changes. Dark coloured boxes are for top-down (five long inversions) and light coloured for bottom-up approaches (see text for details). Median is indicated inside each boxplot (see Methods, section 2). Mean values, reported in the text, are represented with "+" symbols. Outliers are represented with stars. (Note: the bottom-up approaches that provide country estimates (and not maps, USEPA and FAOSTAT) have not been processed to provide hemispheric values. As a result the ensemble used for the three hemispheric regions differs from the ensemble used for the global and regional estimates.)



5 **Figure 5:** Changes in methane emissions between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 in Tg CH₄yr⁻¹ for the five source types. Red boxplots indicate a significant positive contribution to emission changes (first and third quartiles above zero), blue boxplots indicate a significant negative contribution to emission changes (first and third quartiles below zero), grey boxplots indicate non-significant emission changes. Dark (light) coloured boxes are for top-down (bottom-up) approaches (see text for details). Median is indicated inside each boxplot (see Methods, Section 2). Mean values, reported in the text, are represented with "+" symbols.



5 Figure 6: Isotopic signature (in ‰) of the emission change between 2002-2006 and 2008-2012 based on Eq. 1 and the isotopic source signatures from Schaefer et al. (2016) and Schwietzke et al. (2016) in filled and open symbols respectively. The range of the isotopic signature of the emission change derived by the box-model of Schaefer et al. (2016) is indicated as the grey shaded area when assuming constant OH. The isotopic signatures derived from the ensemble of bottom-up estimates are shown with triangle symbol. The individual inversions are shown in colour. The mean inversion estimates are shown with stars and circles, without and with taking into account the “other natural” sources, respectively. The range around the circle indicates the range due to the choice of the isotopic source signature for the “other natural” source between -40 ‰ and -57 ‰ (see text).

The methane loss (in particular through OH oxidation) has not been investigated in detail in this study, although it may play a significant role in the recent atmospheric methane changes.