



Estimating 2010–2015 Anthropogenic and Natural Methane Emissions in Canada using ECCC Surface and GOSAT Satellite Observations

- 4 Sabour Baray¹, Daniel J. Jacob², Joannes D. Maasakkers³, Jian-Xiong Sheng⁴, Melissa P. Sulprizio²,
- 5 Dylan B.A. Jones⁵, A. Anthony Bloom⁶, and Robert McLaren¹
- 6 ¹Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry, York University, Toronto, Canada
- 7 ²Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA
- 8 ³SRON Netherlands Institute for Space Research, Utrecht, The Netherlands
- 9 ⁴Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
- 10 ⁵University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
- 11 ⁶Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA
- 12 Correspondence to: Sabour Baray (sabour@yorku.ca)

13 Abstract. Methane emissions in Canada have both anthropogenic and natural sources. Anthropogenic emissions are estimated to be 14 4.1 Tg a⁻¹ from 2010–2015 in the Canadian Greenhouse Gas Inventory. Natural emissions, which are mostly due to Boreal wetlands, are the largest methane source in Canada and highly uncertain, on the order of ~ 20 Tg a⁻¹ in biosphere process models. Top-down 15 16 constraints on Canadian methane emissions using atmospheric observations have been limited by the sparse coverage of both surface 17 and satellite observations. Aircraft studies over the last several years have provided 'snapshot' emissions that have been conflicting 18 with inventory estimates. Here we use surface data from the Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) in situ network and 19 space borne data from the Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite (GOSAT) to determine 2010-2015 anthropogenic and natural 20 methane emissions in Canada in a Bayesian inverse modelling framework. We use GEOS-Chem to simulate anthropogenic emissions 21 comparable to the Canadian inventory and wetlands emissions using an ensemble of WetCHARTS v1.0 scenarios in addition to other 22 minor natural sources. We conduct a comparative analysis of the monthly natural emissions and yearly anthropogenic emissions 23 optimized by surface and satellite data independently. Mean 2010–2015 posterior emissions using ECCC surface data are 6.0 ± 0.4 Tg a^{-1} for total anthropogenic and 10.5 \pm 1.9 Tg a^{-1} for total natural emissions, where the error intervals represent the 1- σ spread in 24 25 yearly posterior results. These results agree with our posterior using GOSAT data of 6.5 ± 0.7 Tg a⁻¹ for total anthropogenic and 11.7 26 \pm 1.2 Tg a⁻¹ for total natural emissions. The seasonal pattern of posterior natural emissions using either dataset shows slower to start 27 emissions in the spring and a less intense peak in the summer compared to the mean of WetCHARTS scenarios. We combine ECCC 28 and GOSAT data to evaluate capabilities for sectoral and provincial level inversions and identify limitations. We estimate Energy + Agriculture emissions to be 5.1 ± 1.0 Tg a⁻¹ which is 59% higher than the National GHG Inventory. We attribute 39% higher 29 30 anthropogenic emissions to Western Canada than the prior. Natural emissions are lower across Canada with large downscaling in the 31 Hudson Bay Lowlands. Inversion results are verified against independent aircraft data in Saskatchewan and surface data in Quebec 32 which show better agreement with posterior emissions. This study shows a readjustment of the Canadian methane budget is necessary 33 to better match atmospheric observations with higher anthropogenic emissions partially offset by lower natural emissions.





34 1 Introduction

Methane is a significant greenhouse gas second to carbon dioxide in terms of its direct radiative forcing (Myhre et al., 2013). 35 36 The mixing ratio of methane has increased from ~720 to ~1800 ppb since pre-industrial times (Hartmann et al., 2013). Present-37 day global methane emissions are well known to be 550 ± 60 Tg a⁻¹ (Prather et al., 2012), however recent trends in atmospheric 38 methane since the 1990s are not well understood (Turner et al., 2019). Anthropogenic methane sources include oil and gas 39 activities, livestock, rice cultivation, coal mines, landfills, and wastewater treatment. Natural methane emissions are dominated 40 by wetlands, but also include seeps, termites and biomass burning (Kirschke et al., 2013). The main sink of methane is 41 oxidation by the hydroxyl radical (OH) resulting in a lifetime of 9.1 ± 0.9 years (Prather et al., 2012). Improving constraints 42 on national methane emissions is a requirement of mitigation policy (Nisbet et al., 2020). Here we use atmospheric methane 43 observations from the Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) surface network and satellite observations from the 44 Greenhouse Gas Observing Satellite (GOSAT) to estimate Canadian methane emissions and disaggregate anthropogenic and 45 natural sources.

46

The growth rate of atmospheric methane levelled off from the 1990's to early 2000's. This hiatus continued until 2007 when 47 48 methane concentrations began a renewed growth continuing to present time (Dlugokencky et al., 2009). Differing hypotheses 49 have attempted to constrain the possible causes of these decadal trends. Associated increases with ethane have attributed recent 50 growth to oil and gas (Hausmann et al., 2016). An increasing trend of isotopically lighter methane has been associated with 51 increasing biogenic emissions from wetlands and agriculture (Nisbet et al., 2016), however decreasing biomass burning 52 emissions may be masking increasing oil and gas emissions in the global isotopic ratios (Worden et al., 2017). Observations 53 of methyl chloroform suggest decreasing OH may have resulted in the renewed growth (Rigby et al., 2017; Turner et al., 2017). 54 Causal attribution of the methane growth rate has continued to be challenging partly because only a 3% source-sink imbalance, or ~20 Tg a⁻¹, can result in the observed rate of increase. Hence changes in the relative contributions from anthropogenic and 55 56 natural sources are key to understanding atmospheric methane.

57

58 Atmospheric observations provide constraints on methane emissions. In the Canadian greenhouse gas inventory, anthropogenic 59 emissions are estimated to be 4.1 Tg a⁻¹ in 2015 with 68% of emissions originating from the Western Canadian provinces of 60 Alberta (42%), Saskatchewan (17%) and British Columbia (9%). Sectoral contributions over the entire country are from three 61 categories: Energy (49%), Agriculture (29%) and Waste (22%) (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2017). Natural 62 emissions, which are mostly due to Boreal wetlands, are highly uncertain, on the order of $\sim 10-30$ Tg a⁻¹ from biosphere process 63 modelling (Miller et al., 2014; Bloom et al., 2017). Studies constraining anthropogenic and/or natural methane emissions 64 within Canada have included the use of surface in situ measurements (Miller et al., 2016; Atherton et al., 2017; Ishiziwa et al., 2019), aircraft campaigns (Johnson et al., 2017; Baray et al., 2018) and satellites (Wecht et al., 2014; Turner et al., 2015; 65 66 Maasakkers et al., 2020). These observations can determine emissions through mass balance methods or be used in conjunction





with a chemical transport model (CTM). Bayesian inverse modelling constrains prior knowledge of emissions based on the mismatch between modelled and observed concentrations. This requires reliable mapping of "bottom-up" inventory emissions for the "top-down" observational constraints to be useful (Jacob et al., 2016). Inverse modelling has been more challenging for Canada than the United States due to a) the sparsity of surface stations and satellite data (Sheng et al., 2018a), b) a factor of ~10 lower anthropogenic emissions (Maasakkers et al., 2019), c) large spatially-overlapping emissions from Boreal wetlands that are highly uncertain (Miller et al., 2014), and d) model biases in the high-latitudes stratosphere (Patra et al., 2011), compromising interpretation of observed methane columns.

74

75 These observing system challenges have made Canadian methane emissions difficult to quantify, however studies have been showing a consistent story across different scales and measurement platforms. Miller et al. (2014, 2016) determined that the 76 77 North American network can successfully constrain Canadian natural emissions and found Boreal wetlands to be lower in 78 2008 when compared to prior fluxes in the WETCHIMP model. Aircraft campaigns over the Alberta oil and gas sector have 79 found higher emissions than inventories in the Red Deer and Lloydminster regions (Johnson et al., 2017) and unconventional 80 oil extraction in the Athabasca Oil Sands region (Baray et al., 2018). Atherton et al. (2017) conducted ground-based mobile 81 measurements of gas production in British Columbia and determined higher emissions than reported, and Zavala-Araiza et al. 82 (2018) conducted similar ground-based measurements in Alberta to show a profile of super-emitters dominating the fugitive 83 methane profile similar to sites in the United States. Ishiziwa et al. (2019) constrained arctic wetlands fluxes to be similar in magnitude to the mean of the WetCHARTS inventory but with better identified seasonal and interannual variability. Satellite 84 85 inversions over North America using the GEOS-Chem CTM and data from SCIAMACHY (Wecht et al., 2014) or GOSAT 86 (Turner et al., 2015; Maasakkers et al., 2019) consistently require upscaling anthropogenic emissions in Western Canada and downscaling natural emissions in Boreal Canada to match observations, even with the use of updated Canadian fluxes in 87 88 Maasakkers et al. (2019) for anthropogenic (Sheng et al., 2017) and wetlands (Bloom et al., 2017) sources. Inverse modelling 89 studies that use both in situ and satellite observations are valuable for intercomparison and for identifying the limits of spatial 90 and temporal discretization that are possible (Lu et al., 2020; Tunnicliffe et al., 2020). The Tropospheric Monitoring Instrument (TROPOMI) launched in 2017 with a data record beginning in 2018 and is expected to provide significant improvements in 91 emissions monitoring through denser observational coverage at a similar precision to GOSAT (Hu et al., 2018). It is necessary 92 93 to build a reliable historical record of Canadian methane emissions as anthropogenic emissions are sensitive to changes in 94 policy and economic activity (Rogelj et al., 2018) and natural emissions in Boreal Canada may be sensitive to climate change 95 (Kirschke et al., 2013).

96

97 In this study we use surface observations from the ECCC GHG monitoring network and satellite data from GOSAT to constrain 98 anthropogenic and natural emissions in Canada. We use the GEOS-Chem CTM to simulate 2010–2015 methane 99 concentrations. The model setup includes the use of an improved bottom-up inventory for Canadian oil and gas emissions 100 (Sheng et al., 2017), the WetCHARTS extended ensemble for wetlands emissions (Bloom et al., 2017) and EDGAR v4.3.2 for





101 other anthropogenic sources. We perform an ensemble forward model analysis which compares six wetlands scenarios to the 102 ECCC surface observation network to assess the influence of process model configurations on Canadian methane. A series of 103 Bayesian inverse analyses are performed that use ECCC and GOSAT data independently and in a joint surface-satellite system. 104 We constrain monthly natural emissions and yearly total anthropogenic emissions from 2010-2015 using ECCC and GOSAT 105 data independently for intercomparison to produce aggregated-source emissions estimates. We test the limitations of the 106 ECCC and GOSAT joint observation system towards constraining emissions by inventory sector and according to provincial 107 boundaries. We demonstrate where the observation system succeeds in providing strong constraints on major emissions sources and quantify the information content of the system to understand the limitations for resolving all minor Canadian emissions. 108

109 2 Data and Methods

We use the GEOS-Chem CTM v12-03 (http://acmg.seas.harvard.edu/geos/) to simulate methane fields from 2010-2015 on a 110 2° x 2.5° global grid and compare to surface observations from the ECCC in situ GHG monitoring network and satellite 111 observations from GOSAT within the Canadian domain. We test for bias in the global model representation of background 112 methane using both surface and aircraft in situ data at Canada's most westerly site Estevan Point (ESP) and using global 113 114 GOSAT data. The sensitivity of simulated methane in Canada to the use of different wetlands flux parametrization is evaluated 115 by comparing an ensemble of WetCHARTS v1.0 configurations to ECCC surface observations. The WetCHARTS ensemble mean along other GEOS-Chem prior emissions are used in the Bayesian inverse analysis which optimizes Canadian sources 116 117 using ECCC surface data and GOSAT satellite data independently for comparative analysis. We show the limitations of the observing system towards subnational level discretization by combining ECCC and GOSAT data in a joint-inversion. Here we 118 119 describe the observations, the model, and the inverse analysis in further detail.

120 2.1 Observations

121 2.1.1 In situ Surface Observations

122 We use continuous measurements from eight sites in the ECCC greenhouse gas monitoring network from 2010–2015. Figure 123 1 shows a map of the sites and Table 1 provides a descriptive list. The eight sites are Estevan Point, British Columbia (ESP), 124 Lac La Biche, Alberta (LLB), East Trout Lake, Saskatchewan (ETL), Churchill, Manitoba (CHC), Fraserdale, Ontario (FRA), Egbert, Ontario (EGB), Chibougamau, Quebec (CHM) and Sable Island, Nova Scotia (SBL). All sites use Picarro cavity ring-125 126 down spectrometers (G1301, G2301 or G2401) measuring dry-air mol fractions of methane with hourly-average precision 127 better than 1 ppb. For model comparison the measurements are averaged over 4h from 12:00 to 16:00 local time for when the 128 planetary boundary layer is well-mixed. The instruments are calibrated against World Meteorological Organization (WMO) 129 certified standard gases. The western most site, ESP, measures methane continuously from a 40 m tower at a lighthouse station 130 on the west coast of Vancouver Island. ESP is surrounded by forests to the north, east, and south and the Pacific Ocean to the 131 west. ESP is used to evaluate boundary conditions and model bias in the methane background as it is the least sensitive to





Canadian emissions due to prevailing westerly winds. Sites LLB and ETL are the most sensitive to anthropogenic emissions 132 in Western Canada. LLB measures continuously from a 50 m tower located in a region of peatlands and forest ~200 km NE 133 134 of Edmonton and ~230 km S of Fort McMurray. ETL measures from a height of 105 m located ~150 km north of Prince Albert 135 surrounded by Boreal forest. The sites in the Hudson Bay Lowlands (HBL) region, CHC and FRA, are the most sensitive to natural wetlands emissions as this area produces some of the largest methane fluxes in North America. CHC measures 136 137 continuously from a 60 m tower in a small port town on the western edge of Hudson Bay surrounded by flat tundra. FRA measures from a 40 m tower and is located on the southern perimeter of James Bay surrounded by extensive wetlands coverage. 138 The site CHM in Quebec is also sensitive to natural wetlands emissions and is excluded in the inverse analysis to be used to 139 140 verify the posterior results. CHM is substituted by Chapais, Quebec ~50 km away from 2011 onwards. The remaining Central and Atlantic Canada sites EGB and SBL are sensitive to net outflow from Canadian sources, both natural and urban, and some 141 142 emissions from the Eastern United States. EGB is in a small rural village ~80 km north of Toronto and measures from a 25 m tower. SBL is on a remote uninhabited island 275 km ESE of Halifax, Nova Scotia and measures from a height of 25 m. 143

144

145	Table 1: Descriptive	list of ECCC in	situ observation	sites used in	the analysis.
-----	----------------------	-----------------	------------------	---------------	---------------

146

Site Code	Full Name, Province	Latitude	Longitude	Elevation (asl) /
				Sampling Height (agl) (m)
ESP	Estevan Point, British Columbia	49.4° N	126.5° W	7 / 40
LLB	Lac La Biche, Alberta	55.0° N	112.5° W	548 / 50
ETL	East Trout Lake, Saskatchewan	54.4° N	105.0° W	500 / 105
CHC	Churchill, Manitoba	58.7° N	93.8° W	16 / 60
FRA	Fraserdale, Ontario	49.8° N	81.5° W	210 / 40
EGB	Egbert, Ontario	44.2° N	79.8° W	225 / 25
SBL	Sable Island, Nova Scotia	43.9° N	$60.0^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$	2 / 25
$\mathrm{CHM}^{*\dagger}$	Chibougamau, Quebec	49.7° N	74.3° W	383 / 30
$\mathrm{CHA}^{*\dagger}$	Chapais, Quebec	49.8° N	75.0° W	381 / 30

147 *Chibougamau, Quebec is replaced by Chapais, Quebec ~50 km away from 2011 to 2015, overlapping in Fig.1

[†]Site is used to evaluate the posterior inversion results, and is not used in the inversion itself

149

150 2.1.2 GOSAT Satellite Observations

151 The Greenhouse Gas Observing Satellite (GOSAT) was launched in January 2009 by the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency

152 (JAXA). GOSAT is in a low-Earth polar sun-synchronous orbit with an equator overpass around 13:00 local time. The

153 TANSO-FTS instrument on-board GOSAT retrieves column-averaged dry air mol fractions of methane using short-wave





154 infrared (SWIR) solar backscatter in the 1.65 µm absorption band (Butz et al., 2011). Observation pixels in the default mode are 10 km in diameter separated by 260 km along the orbit track with repeated observations every 3 days. Target mode 155 156 observations provide denser spatial coverage over areas of interest. There has been no observed degradation of GOSAT data 157 quality since the beginning of data collection (Kuze et al., 2016). Here we use version 7 of the University of Leicester proxy 158 methane retrieval over land from January 2010 to December 2015 (Parker et al., 2011, 2015; ESA CCI GHG project team, 159 2018). The single-observation precision of GOSAT XCH₄ data is 13 ppb, and the relative bias is 2 ppb when validated against the Total Column Carbon Observing Network (TCCON; Buchwitz et al., 2015). Figure 1 shows the GOSAT observations over 160 Canada used in our analysis within the domain of 45° N-60° N latitude and 50° W-150° W longitude. The observations used 161 have passed all quality assurance flags for a total of 45,936 observations from 2010-2015, or approximately ~7600 162 163 observations per year. Our analysis excludes glint data over oceans, and cloudy conditions are accounted for by the quality assurance flags. We avoid using data above 60° N latitude due to higher uncertainty in the satellite retrieval and the model 164 comparison (Maasakkers et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2015). 165

166



168 Figure 1: ECCC surface (left) and GOSAT satellite (right) observations used in the inverse analysis. A descriptive list of the 169 ECCC sites is shown in Table 1. GOSAT data shown is from a single year in 2013 and is filtered to the Canadian domain 170 within 45°N–60°N latitude and 50°W–150°W longitude. There are ~600 GOSAT observations per month in this domain with

- 171 a minimum Nov–Jan (112–248) and maximum Jul–Sep (872–1098), individual months are shown in the Supplement (Fig. S1).
- 172





173 2.2 Forward Model

174 We use the GEOS-Chem CTM v12-03 at $2^{\circ} \times 2.5^{\circ}$ grid resolution driven by 2009–2015 MERRA-2 meteorological fields from 175 the NASA Global Modeling and Assimilation Office (GMAO). Initial conditions from January 2009 are from a previous GOSAT inversion by Turner et al. (2015) which was shown to be unbiased globally when compared to surface and aircraft 176 177 data. Bottom-up anthropogenic emissions in GEOS-Chem are from the 2013 ICF Canadian oil and gas inventory (Sheng et al., 2017) and the 2012 EDGAR v4.3.2 global inventory for other Canadian and global sources, and the gridded US 2012 EPA 178 179 Inventory for the United States (Maasakkers et al., 2016). For wetlands, six configurations from the 2010–2015 extended 180 ensemble of WetCHARTS (Bloom et al., 2017) are used in the ensemble forward model analysis (Section 3.2) and the ensemble mean is used as the prior for the inverse analysis (Sections 3.3–3.4). Figure 2 shows the spatial distribution of the 181 prior methane emissions in Canada from the major anthropogenic and natural sources. The two largest sources are from the 182 183 ICF oil and gas inventory, (Sheng et al., 2017) and wetlands emissions from the ensemble mean of the WetCHARTS inventory (Bloom et al., 2017), with significant emissions from livestock and waste emissions from EDGAR. Oil and gas are 54% of the 184 anthropogenic total and wetlands are 94% of the natural total. The prior emissions estimates in this simulation are summarized 185 in Table 2, which organizes emissions by Canadian source categories and are compared to sector attribution in the National 186 GHG Inventory (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2017). Our totals for Energy, Agriculture and Waste are 2.4, 1.0, 187 and 0.9 Tg a⁻¹ respectively compared to 2.0, 1.2 and 0.9 Tg a⁻¹ in the National Inventory. In the absence of a spatially 188 disaggregated Canadian inventory for methane, we consider these prior estimates reasonably similar for the purpose of 189 190 comparing our posterior emissions to the National Inventory, however we cannot compare the spatial pattern of emissions 191 which may show less agreement. Emissions from the United States and the rest of the world are included in the model but not 192 optimized in the inversions. Loss of methane from oxidation due to OH is computed using archived 3-D monthly fields of OH 193 from a previous GEOS-Chem full-chemistry simulation (Wecht et al., 2014).

- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197
- 198
- 199
- 200
- 201
- 202
- 203
- •
- 204
- 205





206

- 207 **Table 2:** Mean 2010–2015 prior estimates of Canadian methane emissions used in GEOS-Chem arranged according to
- 208 categories in the National GHG Emissions Inventory (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2017).
- 209

Category		Source Type ^a	Emissions (Tg a ⁻¹) ^a	Total (Tg a ⁻¹) ^a	Inventory (Tg a ⁻¹) ^b
		Oil	0.52		
	Energy	Gas	1.81	2.42	2.00
		Coal	0.09		
Anthropogenic	Agriculture	Livestock	1.00	1.00	1.20
	Waste	Landfills	0.66	-	
		Wastewater	0.19	0.94	0.92
		Other Anthropogenic	0.09		
	Wetlands	-	14.0	14.0	-
Natural	Other Natural	Biomass Burning	0.28		
		Seeps	0.28	0.84	-
		Termites	0.28		

²¹⁰ ^aEmissions inputs for GEOS-Chem. These are shown for the individual source types and summed over the categories

211 Energy, Agriculture and Waste. In Canada, oil and gas are from Sheng et al. (2017), coal, livestock, landfills, wastewater and

212 other anthropogenic are from EDGAR v4.3.2, wetlands are from Bloom et al. (2017). Biomass burning is from QFED

213 (Darmenov and da Silva, 2013) and termite emissions are from Fung et al. (1991). Seeps and other global sources are

214 described in Maasakkers et al. (2019).

215

²¹⁶ ^bEmissions from the National GHG Emissions Inventory (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2017) that correspond

to the Energy, Agriculture and Waste categories. These are used in the discussion of results but are not included in the

218 inverse model.







Figure 2: Prior estimates of anthropogenic and natural methane emissions. Colour bars are in log scale in units of kg CH₄ km⁻² a⁻¹. Most anthropogenic emissions fall under the energy category (A) which are oil and gas in the ICF inventory (Sheng et al., 2017) plus minor emissions from coal in EDGAR 4.3.2. Livestock (B) and waste (C) are from EDGAR. Natural emissions are primarily wetlands from the WetCHARTS inventory (D; Bloom et al., 2017).

224 2.3 Inverse Model Methodology

225 We optimize emissions in the inverse analysis by minimizing the Bayesian cost function J(x) (Rodgers, 2000).

226

219

227
$$J(x) = \frac{1}{2} (x - x_a)^T S_a^{-1} (x - x_a) + \frac{1}{2} (y - F(x))^T S_o^{-1} (y - F(x))$$
(1)

228

Where **x** is the vector of emissions being optimized, \mathbf{x}_{a} is the vector of prior emissions (Table 2), $F(\mathbf{x})$ is the simulation of methane concentrations corresponding to the observation vector **y** of ECCC surface and/or GOSAT data. \mathbf{S}_{a} is the prior error





covariance matrix and S_0 is the observational error covariance matrix. The observational error matrix includes both instrument 231 and model transport error. The GEOS-Chem model relating methane concentrations to emissions F(x) is essentially linear and 232 233 can be represented by the Jacobian matrix **K** such that $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$, where b is the model background. The background 234 includes initial conditions from Turner et al. (2015) and methane from global emissions that are held constant in the inversion. Possible bias in the background is evaluated in detail in Section 3.1 and shown to be minimal. The **K** matrix is of *n* by *m* size 235 236 where n is the number of state vector elements being optimized and m is the number of ECCC surface and/or GOSAT observations being used. The K matrix is constructed using the forward mode of GEOS-Chem and the tagged tracer output for 237 Canadian sources which describes the sensitivity of concentrations to emissions dy/dx in ppb Tg⁻¹. 238

239

240 GEOS-Chem continuously simulates global emissions with a global source-sink imbalance of +13 Tg a⁻¹ in the budget as 241 described in Maasakkers et al. (2019). We show in Section 3.1 that this configuration of the model reliably reproduces the global growth rate in atmospheric methane with adjustments only needed for 2014 and 2015 primarily due to differences in 242 tropical wetland emissions (Maasakkers et al., 2019). A high resolution inversion over North America over the 2010–2015 243 244 time-period using the same prior has shown adjustments to US emissions near the Canadian border are also relatively minimal, 245 (Maasakkers et al., 2020), so we treat US emissions as constant. This gives a well-represented background for methane which 246 is checked using global GOSAT data and in situ data at Canadian background site ESP. Hence, we can attribute the modelobservation mismatch (y - F(x)) using observations limited to Canada to Canada emissions which are optimized in the 247 inversion. Here we show three inversions with a different number of state vector elements: a) the monthly inversion (n = 78)248 249 optimizes monthly natural emissions in Canada and yearly anthropogenic emissions from 2010-2015, b) the sectoral inversion 250 (n = 5) optimizes emissions according to the major inventory categories in Table 2 done individually for each year, and c) the 251 provincial inversion (n = 16) optimizes emissions according to subnational boundaries which is also repeated for each year. 252 The monthly inversion provides high temporal resolution to constrain the seasonality of natural emissions, assuming the spatial 253 distribution is correct. The sectoral inversion provides direct constraints on inventory categories, and the provincial inversion 254 provides higher spatial resolution for subnational attribution. Substituting $F(x) = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x}$ in eq. 1 and subtracting the background b, the analytical solution of the cost function dJ(x)/dx = 0 yields the optimal posterior solution \hat{x} (Rodgers, 2000): 255

256

257
$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_a + \mathbf{S}_a \mathbf{K}^T (\mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}_a \mathbf{K}^T + \mathbf{S}_o)^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x}_a)$$
 (2)

258

The analytical solution provides closed-form error characterization, the posterior error covariance $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ of the posterior solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is given by:

261

262
$$\hat{S} = (K^T S_o^{-1} K + S_a^{-1})^{-1}$$
 (3)

263

264 The averaging kernel matrix A is used to evaluate the surface and satellite observing systems and is given by:





- 265 266 $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_{n} - \hat{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{S}_{a}^{-1}$ (4)
- 267

268 where \mathbf{I}_n is the identity matrix of length *n* corresponding to the number of state vector elements. The averaging kernel matrix A describes the sensitivity of the posterior solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ to the true state x ($\mathbf{A} = d\hat{\mathbf{x}}/d\mathbf{x}$). The trace of A provides the degrees of 269 270 freedom for signal (DOFS), which is the number of pieces of information of the state vector that is gained from the inversion (DOFS $\leq n$). The diagonal values of **A** provide information on which Canadian state vector elements can be constrained by 271 ECCC surface and GOSAT satellite observations above the noise, and higher DOFS closer to n correspond to better constrained 272 273 sources in total. As a further diagnostic of the inversion we conduct a singular value decomposition of the prewhitened Jacobian $\mathbf{\check{K}} = \mathbf{S}_0^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}_a^{1/2}$ (Rodgers, 2000). The number of singular values greater than one is the effective rank of $\mathbf{\check{K}}$, which shows the 274 independence of the state vector elements and the number of pieces of information above the noise that are resolved in the 275 276 inversion (Heald et al., 2004). The comparison between this eigenanalysis and the DOFS are discussed in the Supplement and is used to inform the limitations of the observation system. 277

278

279 We construct the prior error covariance matrix S_a based on aggregated error estimates for source categories and regions. We use 50% error standard deviation for the aggregated anthropogenic emissions which includes the Sheng et al. (2017) oil and 280 281 gas inventory other EDGAR sources, 60% for wetlands emissions from the Bloom et al. (2017) WetCHARTS inventory and 282 100% for non-wetlands natural sources. We assume no correlation between state vector elements so that S_a is diagonal. 283 Anthropogenic emissions have been shown to be spatially uncorrelated (Maasakkers et al., 2016) however wetlands show 284 spatial correlation (Bloom et al., 2017). Here we optimize broadly aggregated categories, so our method assumes the spatial pattern of each state vector element is correct, however correlations between state vector elements in the eigenanalysis are 285 used to assess the limitations of source discretization in the observing systems. 286

287

288 We construct the diagonal observation error matrix S_0 which captures instrument and model error using the relative residual error method (Heald et al., 2004). In this approach the vector of observed-modelled differences $\Delta = y_{\text{GEOS-Chem}} - y_{\text{observations}}$ is 289 290 calculated and the mean observed-modelled difference $\Delta = y_{\text{GEOS-Chem}} - y_{\text{observations}}$ is attributed to the emissions that will be optimized. Hence, the standard deviation in the residual error $\Delta' = \Delta - \overline{\Delta}$ represents the observational error and is used as 291 the diagonal elements of S_0 . For our Canadian inversion we find positive model-observation biases in the warmer months 292 293 (April to September) and negative biases in the colder months (October to March). We calculate the relative residual error for growing and non-growing seasons separately, such that Δ' is partitioned into Δ'_{g} (October to March) and Δ'_{ng} (April to 294 295 September) which is then used to calculate the diagonal elements of S_0 . For surface observations the mean observational error 296 is 65 ppb. Since the instrument error is <1 ppb for afternoon mean methane measurements, the observational error is entirely 297 attributed to transport and representation error of surface methane in the model grid pixels. For satellite observations the mean





298 observational error is 16 ppb where the instrument error is 11 ppb, showing most of the observational error is from the 299 instrument rather than the forward model representation of the total column. Column-averaged methane concentrations are 300 less sensitive to surface emissions resulting in the lower model error (Lu et al., 2020).

301 3 Results and Discussion

302 3.1 Evaluation of Bias in the Global Model

303 The left panel of Figure 3 shows the comparison of monthly mean GEOS-Chem surface methane concentrations and methane measured at the ECCC station ESP from 2009 to 2015. ESP is located at the west coast of Vancouver Island (Fig. 1); this site 304 is used as an evaluation of background methane and tests the bias in the global model as it is the least sensitive to Canadian 305 emissions due to westerly prevailing winds. The model reliably reproduces surface observations at this station and the growth 306 rate in background methane due to the source-sink imbalance of +13 Tg a⁻¹ in the model global budget (Maasakkers et al., 307 308 2019) with a small mean model-observation bias of 5.3 ppb. The right panel of Figure 3 shows the comparison of modelled 309 methane to NOAA aircraft profiles at the same site. Aircraft profiles occur approximately once a month continuously over the 310 study period. The data is not averaged here and is directly compared to GEOS-Chem simulated grid boxes at the pressure level of the measurement. The reduced mean axis (RMA) regression shows a slope of 0.86 and a coefficient of regression $r^2 = 0.67$ 311 which shows a reasonable model representation of the measurements. These statistics are consistent with previous inversions 312 313 using GEOS-Chem that showed relatively unbiased conditions against NOAA surface stations globally (Turner et al., 2015; 314 Maasakkers et al., 2019). A high resolution inversion over North America over the same 2010-2015 time-period using the 315 same prior have shown adjustments to US emissions near the Canadian border are relatively minimal (Maasakkers et al., 2020), so we treat US emissions as constant in the inversion. The acceptable reproducibility of background methane at this site allows 316 us to attribute much larger differences observed at other sites, up to a maximum of ~1000 ppb in the summer (Figure 6), to 317 318 Canadian emissions which are optimized using Canadian observations while holding other global emissions constant.

- 319
- 320









Figure 3: Time-series comparison (left) from 2009–2015 of surface GEOS-Chem simulated methane (red) and measured in situ methane (black) at site ESP off the west coast of British Columbia. Comparison to NOAA aircraft profiles (right) from 2009–2015 at the same site using a reduced major axis (RMA) regression along with the 1:1 line (black).

326

The GEOS-Chem simulation of column averaged methane shows three global biases previously discussed in the literature: (1) a latitude-dependent bias, (2) a seasonal bias and (3) a background change for 2014 and 2015 due to differences in the global source-sink imbalance in these two years (Turner et al., 2015; Saad et al., 2018; Maasakkers et al., 2019; Stanevich et al., 2019). We apply these corrections to the simulated column of methane on a global basis to produce an unbiased background for our target Canadian domain (45° N to 60°N, 50° W to 150° W). The latitude-dependent bias (1) is likely due to excessive polar stratospheric transport (Stanevich et al., 2019). We correct for this bias by fitting the model-GOSAT difference for global $2^{\circ} \times 2.5^{\circ}$ grid cells according to a second-order polynomial as shown in Figure 4:

334

335
$$\xi = (2.2\theta^2 - 34\theta) \times 10^{-3} - 2.7$$
 (5)

336

where ξ is the resulting bias correction in ppb and θ is latitude in degrees. The correction in this work for the latitude bins of 337 our target domain $(45^{\circ} \text{ N to } 60^{\circ} \text{ N})$ is between 0.3 to 2.9 ppb. This correction is lower than what has been shown previously 338 339 (Turner et al., 2015; Maasakkers et al., 2019) and we attribute this improvement to our use of a 2°x2.5° gridded simulation 340 instead of a $4^{\circ}x4.5^{\circ}$ as recommended by Stanevich et al. (2019) to reduce transport errors. A seasonally oscillating bias (2) remains after this correction. The seasonal bias has an amplitude of ± 4 ppb with repeating maxima in June and minima in 341 342 December. It is not clear whether this seasonal bias is due to emissions and/or transport errors. In our base case we remove the seasonal bias on a monthly basis following Maasakkers et al. (2019) and show a sensitivity test without the correction for our 343 344 inversion of monthly natural emissions in Canada (Supplement 1.3). Inversion results using GOSAT data with and without 345 bias corrections in the model simulation of total column methane do not show major differences (Fig. S3). These scenarios all





show agreement with the posterior emissions adjustments determined using ECCC in situ data – which is a useful benchmark 346 since modelled methane at the surface is not subject to any bias corrections. The background change (3) that appears in the 347 348 simulated methane column from 2014 onwards is corrected for in Maasakkers et al. (2019) by optimizing emissions, emissions 349 trends and trends in OH using a global inversion. In that work correction factors do not appear over Canada and the United States that would significantly influence the global change in atmospheric methane, and the main adjustment in 2014 and 2015 350 351 were to tropical wetlands emissions and OH. Here we treat this as a background change and apply a uniform correction to the 352 simulated column since emissions outside of Canada and changes in OH are treated as fixed in our Canada-focused inversion. The background change (3) is 5 ppb in 2014 and 10 ppb in 2015. The right panel of Figure 4 shows the latitude dependent bias 353 354 correction and the left panel shows the resulting global time-series of GEOS-Chem total column methane from 2010-2015 after corrections are applied. The global GEOS-Chem - GOSAT differences in the methane column can be limited globally to 355 356 within 10 ppb without including the seasonal bias correction, and within 5 ppb with its inclusion. This shows a steady background in methane for the entire time period from 2010-2015 so global emissions do not affect the optimization of 357 Canadian emissions. While biases within 10 ppb have been treated as acceptable for methane inversions (Buchwitz et al., 358 359 2015), we evaluate our GOSAT inversion results against inversions with independent ECCC in situ measurements that do not 360 require any bias corrections in the model (Section 3.3) to produce more robust emissions estimates.







Figure 4: Time series (left) from 2010–2015 of the difference between GEOS-Chem simulated total column methane and 364 GOSAT observations after applying bias corrections, showing a consistent global background for methane. Data used in the 365 inversion for Canada is from 45° N to 60° N (purple line) and shows acceptable differences within 5 ppb over the entire 366 global latitude band. To produce the left figure, the latitude-dependent bias (right) is shown with the polynomial correction 367 that is applied (gray dash) that is within a magnitude of 0.3 to 2.9 ppb for the same latitude. 368





370 3.2 Evaluation of WetCHARTS Extended Ensemble for Wetlands Emissions in Canada

Wetlands are the largest methane source in Canada with uncertainties in the magnitude, seasonality, and spatial distribution of 371 372 emissions. Our inverse analysis constrains the magnitude and seasonality of emissions with observations. Ideally, the prior 373 emissions in the model should be the best possible representation of emissions to reduce error in the optimization problem 374 (Jacob et al., 2016). Table 2 shows 2010–2015 mean wetlands emissions in Canada to be 14.0 Tg a⁻¹ from the mean of the WetCHARTS v1.0 inventory (Bloom et al., 2017). These emissions are more than three times the total of anthropogenic 375 376 emissions 4.4 Tg a⁻¹. The much larger signal from wetlands emissions poses a difficulty for constraining anthropogenic 377 emissions (Miller et al., 2014). In this section, we evaluate our use of the mean of the WetCHARTS v1.0 extended ensemble 378 by running a series of forward model runs using alternate ensemble members in GEOS-Chem and comparing model output to 379 ECCC in situ observations.

380

381 The WetCHARTS extended ensemble for 2010–2015 contains an uncertainty dataset of 18 possible global wetlands configurations as described in Bloom et al. (2017). These depend on three processing parameters which are: three CH4:C 382 temperature-dependent respiration fractions ($q_{10} = 1, 2, and 3$; where 1 is the highest temperature dependency), two inundation 383 extent models (GLWD vs. GLOBCOVER; where GLWD corresponds to higher inundation in Canada) and three global scaling 384 factors for global emissions to amount to 124.5, 166 or 207.5 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (3×2×3=18). We find using the scaling factors 385 corresponding to 124.5 and 207.5 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ within GEOS-Chem results in an imbalance in the global budget beyond what 386 387 is observed in our measurements and degrades the representation of background methane, so we limit the extended ensemble 388 to six members which depend on three temperature parameterizations and two inundation scenarios ($3 \times 2=6$). Figure 5 shows the magnitude and spatial distribution of wetlands emissions in the six scenarios. The total wetlands emissions within Canada 389 show nearly an order of magnitude difference between ensemble members from 3.9 Tg a⁻¹ to 32.4 Tg a⁻¹. Compared to the rest 390 391 of North America, Boreal Canada shows the largest variability between ensemble members, with the Southeast United States 392 as the second most uncertain (Sheng et al., 2018b).

393

394 We use ECCC in situ observations to better constrain the range of wetlands methane emissions in the ensemble members. All 395 six configurations are used in GEOS-Chem to produce a series of forward model runs for a subrange of years between 2013– 396 2015. Figure 6 shows GEOS-Chem simulated methane concentrations using the six WetCHARTS configurations and compares 397 to four ECCC in situ measurement sites in Canada (LLB, ETL, FRA, EGB). This subset of available data is representative of 398 sites sensitive to both anthropogenic and natural emissions. Most of Canadian anthropogenic emissions are from Western 399 Canada (Fig. 2), which we use sites LLB and ETL to evaluate (Fig. 1), and a significant amount of Canadian natural emissions are from region surrounding the Hudson's Bay Lowlands, which we use sites FRA and EGB to evaluate. Methane 400 concentrations from GEOS-Chem show large differences when compared to ECCC observations, ranging from +1050 to -150 401 402 ppb. The boundary-condition site ESP (Fig. 3) showed a mean bias of 5.3 ppb for all of 2010–2015. Since there is no similar





403 mismatch in the global representation of methane, these biases up to 1050 ppb can therefore be attributed to misrepresented 404 local Canadian emissions plus associated transport and representation error. Two types of biases with opposite signs appear 405 from this comparison. The first type is a positive summertime bias where the modelled methane concentrations significantly 406 exceed the observations; this bias is more pronounced in sites FRA (Fig. 6-C) and EGB (Fig. 6-D), which are in Ontario and 407 sensitive to the Hudson Bay Lowlands. The bias is also visible in the western sites LLB (Fig. 6-A) and ETL (Fig. 6-B) to a 408 lesser extent. As we use a smaller magnitude of wetlands methane emissions corresponding to the ensemble members in Figure 5 (from 32.4 Tg a^{-1} to 3.9 Tg a^{-1}), this summertime bias decreases proportionately. Therefore, we can attribute these large 409 positive summertime biases to growing season wetlands emissions that are overestimated in the process model configurations. 410 411 The second type of bias is a year-long negative bias that appears most in site LLB (Fig. 6-A) and is magnified with the use of lower-magnitude wetlands emissions. This suggests the presence of year-round anthropogenic emissions in Western Canada 412 413 that are underestimated in the prior, or that winter-time wetland emissions could also be underestimated in WetCHARTS due to the lack of explicit soil water and temperature dependencies. The inverse modelling results in the next section attribute this 414 415 bias to anthropogenic emissions.

416

Miller et al. (2016) conducted a study constraining North American Boreal wetlands emissions from the WETCHIMP 417 418 inventory modelled in WRF-STILT by comparing to observations in 2008. Their study included the use of three of the ECCC 419 stations described here (CHM, FRA and ETL). The model comparison to observations in that study showed a similar pattern of modelled methane exceeding observations in the summer and a low bias at ETL. They suggested wetlands emissions were 420 overestimated in most model configurations and that the wetlands bias may be masking underestimated anthropogenic 421 422 emissions. These conclusions are corroborated by the 2013–2015 comparison shown here, we show high wetlands emissions 423 configurations in WetCHARTS produce a high bias that exceed measured summertime methane concentrations, and the use 424 of lower wetlands configurations reveal a year-long low bias apparent in Western Canada. Our results suggest the combined 425 use of higher inundation extent and lower temperature dependencies (GLWD and $q_{10} = 3$), or the use of lower inundation extent and higher temperature dependencies (GLOBCOVER and $q_{10} = 1$) best reproduce observations near the mean of the 426 427 range of emissions, although the ensemble forward model analysis is unable to specify more detailed process model constraints. 428

429 The forward model analysis in this section is a direct evaluation of wetlands configurations. This approach allows us *manually* 430 tune wetlands scenarios and diagnose the sensitivity of the modelled-observed differences to the process modelling parameters. 431 The inverse analysis shown subsequently is a statistical optimization that applies scaling factors to emissions based on the 432 same model-observation differences. The inverse analysis can be viewed analogously as an *automatic* approach. These results 433 show the challenge with optimizing Canadian methane emissions when wetlands emissions are largely uncertain. Our approach 434 of optimizing anthropogenic and natural emissions simultaneously in an inversion is useful because attempting to constrain 435 either emissions category, anthropogenic or natural, obfuscates the analysis on the other. We exploit the different pattern of 436 anthropogenic and natural emissions in time and space (Fig. 6). Natural emissions peak in the summertime and are concentrated





in Boreal Canada, while anthropogenic emissions are persistent year-round and are concentrated in Western Canada (Fig. 2). Hence when optimizing the model-observation mismatch in a Bayesian inverse framework, some elements of the observation vector will correspond to high biases from summertime observations in Boreal Canada and some elements will correspond to low biases in Western Canada. As the choice of prior for the inversion we use the mean of the WetCHARTS configurations (14.0 Tg a⁻¹) which corresponds to the middle of the range shown shaded in red in Figure 6. The 60% range of uncertainty in the prior error covariance matrix S_a appropriately excludes the extreme scenarios in Fig. 5 and 6.









Figure 5: Ensemble members from the WetCHARTS v1.0 inventory (Bloom et al., 2017) with totals for wetland methane emissions within Canada for each configuration shown in Tg CH₄ a⁻¹. Ensemble members vary according to the use of three CH₄:C q_{10} temperature dependencies and two inundation extent scenarios (GLWD vs. GLOBCOVER) for 3×2=6 scenarios.







Figure 6: Time series of 2013–2015 modelled and observed methane concentrations. Monthly-mean methane from ECCC in situ observations (black) are shown and compared to six GEOS-Chem simulations differing in the use of WetCHARTS ensemble members for wetlands emissions. The six configurations are labelled GCXY where first digit (X=1,2,3) corresponds to the CH4:C q₁₀ temperature dependency, which decreases the sensitivity of emissions to temperature with increasing value. The second digit (Y=3,4) corresponds to the model used for inundation extent (3 = GLWD, 4 = GLOBCOVER) where GLOBCOVER produces lower emissions in Canada. Emissions configurations are those shown in Fig. 5 in order of magnitude from red to purple lines, with the shaded red showing the range of concentrations. Sites are LLB, Alberta (A), ETL, Saskatchewan (B), FRA, Northern Ontario (C) and EGB, Southern Ontario (D).





468 3.3 Comparative analysis of inversions using ECCC in situ and GOSAT satellite data

469 We optimize 2010–2015 emissions in Canada using an n = 78 state vector element inversion setup with GOSAT and ECCC 470 data independently. Elements 1–72 of the inversion are monthly total natural emissions (wetlands + other natural) from 2010– 471 2015 and elements 73-78 are yearly total anthropogenic emissions (energy + agriculture + waste) for the same years. These 472 categories correspond to the emissions shown in Table 2. We do not optimize emissions according to clustered grid boxes like other satellite inversions using GEOS-Chem (Wecht et al., 2014; Turner et al., 2015; Maasakkers et al., 2019) and instead 473 474 scale the amplitudes of these two aggregated categories. This approach is a trade-off of time for space, giving up finer spatial 475 resolution for finer temporal resolution. This is useful for optimizing Canadian methane emissions since a) anthropogenic 476 emissions are largely concentrated in Western Canada and require less spatial discretization over the entire country and b) natural emissions are the largest source and have an uncertain seasonality – as shown in the previous section – and require 477 478 finer temporal discretization. The limitations of this method are that natural emissions are very unlikely to be spatially 479 homogenous and vary due to hydrological differences even at the microtopographic level (Bubier et al., 1993). Perfectly resolving Canadian emissions sources in time and space is challenged by the sparsity and precision of the observing system 480 and the model representation of the observations. We show the limitations of the combined ECCC and GOSAT observing 481 system towards resolving subnational emissions in more detail in the subsequent section. 482

483

484 Figure 7 (top) shows 2010-2015 posterior emissions using this 78 state vector approach with ECCC in situ data (blue) and 485 GOSAT satellite data (green). Error bars are from the diagonal elements of the posterior error covariance matrix \hat{S} . Posterior 486 anthropogenic emissions averaged over the 6 year period are 6.0 ± 0.4 Tg a⁻¹ (1 σ year-to-year variability) using ECCC data and 6.5 ± 0.7 Tg a⁻¹ using GOSAT data. Posterior estimates are 36% and 48% higher than the prior of 4.4 Tg a⁻¹ for ECCC 487 and GOSAT results, respectively. There does not appear to be a significant year-to-year trend above the noise for the 488 489 anthropogenic emissions optimized by either dataset. The posterior anthropogenic emissions using ECCC and GOSAT data 490 show agreement with each other in each year but 2011, where the GOSAT derived emissions are statistically higher. The error 491 from the diagonal of the posterior error covariance matrix $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ may be overly optimistic, particularly for GOSAT data. This is due to the observational error covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_{0} being treated as diagonal when realistically there are correlations between 492 493 GOSAT observations that are difficult to quantify (Heald et al., 2004). Our results for anthropogenic emissions show agreement 494 with top-down aircraft estimates of methane emissions in Alberta that are higher than bottom-up inventories (Johnson et al., 495 2017; Baray et al., 2018) and previous satellite inverse-modelling studies over North America that upscale emissions in 496 Western Canada (Turner et al., 2015; Maasakkers et al., 2019; Maasakkers et al., 2020; Lu et al., 2020). We show source 497 attribution through a sectoral and subnational scale analysis of anthropogenic emissions in the subsequent section.

Inversion results for monthly natural emissions from 2010–2015 are also shown in Figure 7 (bottom). The total of posterior natural emissions averaged over the 6 year period is 10.5 ± 1.9 Tg a⁻¹ using ECCC data and 11.7 ± 1.2 Tg a⁻¹ using GOSAT





501 data. The prior for natural emissions is 14.8 Tg a⁻¹ from the mean of the WetCHARTS extended ensemble (14.0 Tg a⁻¹) plus other natural (biomass burning + termites + seeps = 0.8 Tg a^{-1}). There is some interannual variability in the prior due to higher 502 503 emissions in 2010 and 2015. Posterior results averaged over the six years are 29% lower than the prior using ECCC data and 504 21% lower using GOSAT data, with both posterior results showing agreement with each other. These results are within the 505 uncertainty range of the WetCHARTS extended ensemble, and we show the magnitude of emissions from the larger uncertainty 506 dataset (3.9 to 32.4 Tg a⁻¹) can be better constrained with both ECCC and GOSAT observations. While our results show lower natural emissions in all years, a linear fit to the posterior annual emissions using ECCC data shows a trend of increasing natural 507 emissions at a rate of ~ 1.0 Tg a⁻¹ per year from 2010–2015. The posterior with GOSAT data does not corroborate this result, 508 509 the overall emissions trend using GOSAT data is not robust and shows a decreasing trend of ~ 0.2 Tg a⁻¹ per year. The lack of corroboration of trends between ECCC and GOSAT data may be reflective of the lower overall sensitivity of total column 510 511 methane to these surface fluxes (Sheng et al., 2017; Lu et al., 2020) or the inability of this inverse system to constrain trends 512 sufficiently. Poulter et al. (2017) estimated global wetlands emissions using biogeochemical process models constrained by inundation and wetlands extend data. They estimated mean annual emissions over all of Boreal North America to be $25.1 \pm$ 513 514 11.3 Tg a^{-1} in 2000–2006, 26.1 ± 11.8 Tg a^{-1} in 2007–2012 and 27.1 ± 12.5 Tg a^{-1} which suggests a small increasing trend. 515 Observational constraints over longer timescales are necessary to investigate the possibility of trends in Canadian natural 516 methane emissions. Improvements to the observation network and a better understanding of climate sensitivity in 517 WetCHARTS are necessary to understand how wetlands methane emissions will evolve in future climates.

518

519 Figure 8 shows the 2010–2015 average seasonal pattern of natural emissions in the prior and posterior results. The seasonality 520 of natural methane emissions in the prior shows a sharp peak in July with a narrow methanogenic growing season. The posterior with ECCC data shows a peak 1-month later in August in most years instead of July, with lower than prior emissions in the 521 spring months before the peak (March to May) and similar emissions to the prior in the autumn months after the peak 522 523 (September to November). Posterior emissions with GOSAT show a peak in July and corroborates the pattern of slower-to-524 begin spring emissions and the lower intensity summer peak seen from the ECCC inversion. The posterior results show the seasonality of emissions is not symmetrical around the temperature peak in July. August emissions are higher than June, 525 September emissions are higher than May, and October emissions are higher than April. This pattern around July is present in 526 the prior emissions from WetCHARTS, however the inversion results constrained by ECCC or GOSAT observations intensify 527 528 the relative difference between emissions before and after July. Miller et al. (2016) found a similar seasonal pattern of 529 emissions in the Hudson Bay Lowlands using an inverse model constrained by 2007–2008 in situ data. They found a less narrow and less intense peak of summertime emissions with higher autumn over spring emissions. Warwick et al. (2016) used 530 a forward model and isotopic measurements of δ^{13} C-CH₄ and δ D-CH₄ from 2005–2009 to show northern wetlands emissions 531 532 should peak in August-September with a later spring kick-off and later autumn decline. This is further corroborated by Arctic methane measurements (Thonat et al., 2017) and high latitude eddy covariance measurements (Peltola et al., 2019; Treat et al., 533 534 2018; Zona et al., 2016) that show a larger contribution from the nongrowing season. Our inverse model results using ECCC





and GOSAT data both show agreement with slower to start emissions in the spring and a less intense summertime peak forCanadian wetlands emissions.

537

538 Several mechanisms have been proposed to describe a larger relative contribution from cold season methane emissions. 539 Pickett-Heaps et al. (2011) attributed a delayed spring onset in the HBL to the suppression of emissions by snow cover. The 540 temperature dependency in WetCHARTS is based on surface skin temperature (Bloom et al., 2017), however subsurface soil temperatures may continue to sustain methane emissions while the surface is below freezing. When subsurface soil 541 temperatures are near 0°C, this "zero curtain" period can further continue to release methane for an extended period (Zona et 542 543 al., 2016). Subsurface soils may remain unfrozen at a depth of 40 cm even until December (Miller et al., 2016). Alternatively, 544 field studies in the 1990's suggested the seasonality of emissions may be more influenced by hydrology than temperature, with large differences between peatlands sites (Moore et al., 1994). The WetCHARTS extended ensemble inundation extent variable 545 is constrained seasonally by precipitation. While this does not directly constrain water table depth and wetland extent it 546 provides an aggregate constraint on hydrological variability (Bloom et al., 2017). We show the mean seasonal pattern of both 547 548 air temperature and precipitation from climatological measurements in subarctic Canada are similarly asymmetrical about the 549 July peak (Fig. S2 in the Supplement). August is warmer and wetter than June, September is warmer and wetter than May, and October is wetter and warmer than April - with wetness being more persistent into the autumn than air temperature. Our 550 inversion results showing a delayed spring start in the seasonal pattern of natural methane emissions in Canada may suggest a 551 lag in the response of methane emissions to temperature and precipitation. This may be due to lingering subsurface soil 552 553 temperatures and/or more complex parametrization necessary for hydrology.

554

The overall agreement between ECCC and GOSAT inversions shows robustness in the results. While the same model, prior emissions and inversion procedure are used for assimilating ECCC and GOSAT data, the two datasets are produced with very different measurement methodologies (in situ vs. remote sensing) and sample different parts of the atmosphere (surface concentrations or the total vertical column). The posterior error intervals shown from \hat{S} reflect assumptions about the treatment of observations and may insufficiently account for correlations, however the comparative analysis provides a useful sensitivity test of the posterior emissions since the datasets reflect different treatment of these assumptions.









Figure 7: Comparative analysis of inversion results optimizing annual total Canadian anthropogenic emissions (top) and monthly total natural emissions (bottom) in an n = 78 state-vector element setup. The posterior emissions determined using ECCC in situ (blue) and GOSAT satellite (green) data are compared to the prior (gray). Error bars are from the diagonal elements of the posterior error covariance matrix.





571



572

Figure 8: Mean 2010–2015 seasonal pattern of natural methane emissions in Tg month⁻¹. The annual total emissions are 14.8 Tg a^{-1} (prior, gray), 10.5 ± 1.9 Tg a^{-1} (posterior ECCC, blue) and 11.7 ± 1.2 Tg a^{-1} (posterior GOSAT, green). The posterior results are within the uncertainty range provided by the WetCHARTS extended ensemble (3.9–32.4 Tg a^{-1} for Canada).

577 3.4 Joint-inversions combining ECCC in situ and GOSAT satellite data

We combine the ECCC and GOSAT datasets in two policy-themed inversions: (1) optimizing emissions according to the 578 579 sectors in the national inventory (n = 5 state vector elements; corresponding to the categories in Table 2) and (2) optimizing emissions by provinces split into anthropogenic and natural totals (n = 16) and show the results in Figure 9. These inversions 580 581 are under-determined and show the limitations of the ECCC+GOSAT observing system towards constraining very small 582 magnitude emissions in Canada. We conduct the inversions for each year from 2010–2015 individually and present the average from these six samples. Since these two policy inversions use a low number of state vector elements, they are vulnerable to 583 584 both aggregation error and overfitting of the well-constrained state vector elements and do not necessarily benefit from using 585 a larger data vector from all six years. We discuss the diagnostics and information content for these inversions in detail in 586 Section 1.4 of the Supplement. The error bars are the 1σ standard deviation of the six yearly results and therefore represent both noise in the inversion procedure and year-to-year differences in the state (emissions and/or transport). Here we do not 587 588 apply a weighting factor to either dataset, the observations are treated equivalently for the cost function in eq. (1). While there are about 5 times more GOSAT observations than ECCC observations for use in our analysis, the in situ observations have 589





larger observational error in S_a (due to model error) are much more sensitive to surface fluxes which offset overweighing the larger amount of GOSAT data. As further diagnostics we show the inversions using GOSAT and ECCC individually (Table S3 and S4) which show general agreement between the datasets. We also use a singular value decomposition eigenanalysis (Heald et al., 2004) to evaluate the independence of the state vector elements and to demonstrate which sectoral categories and provinces can be reliably constrained above the noise in the system (Fig. S4 and S5 in the Supplement).

595

Figure 9 (top) shows the sectoral inversion corresponding to categories in the national inventory (Table 2). The prior emissions 596 with 50% error estimates (60% for wetlands) are 2.4 Tg a^{-1} (Energy), 1.0 Tg a^{-1} (Agriculture), 0.9 Tg a^{-1} (Waste), 14.0 Tg a^{-1} 597 (Wetlands) and 0.8 Tg a⁻¹ (Other Natural). The posterior emissions are 3.6 ± 0.9 Tg a⁻¹ (Energy), 1.5 ± 0.4 Tg a⁻¹ (Agriculture), 598 0.6 ± 0.3 Tg a⁻¹ (Waste), 9.4 ± 1.1 Tg a⁻¹ (Wetlands), and 1.7 ± 0.9 Tg a⁻¹ (Other Natural). The degrees of freedom for signal 599 600 and singular value decomposition (Fig. S4) show 3-4 independent pieces of information can be retrieved, which are differentiated in the figure by solid and hatched bars. The singular value decomposition shows strong source signals 601 602 corresponding to wetlands and energy with signal-to-noise ratios of ~37 and ~5, respectively. These are the two largest 603 emissions sources in Canada and show the inverse system can successfully disentangle the major anthropogenic and natural 604 contributors. Emissions from waste have a signal-to-noise ratio of ~ 2 and can be constrained despite the low magnitude of 605 emissions. This is likely due to waste emissions being more concentrated in Central Canada and away from the influence of 606 large energy and agriculture emissions in Western Canada. Emissions from other natural sources are at the noise limit and 607 show a moderate correlation with wetlands, which shows that these two sources are not completely independent. Agriculture 608 emissions are below the noise in the system and highly correlated with energy emissions. This is likely due to the high spatial overlap of energy and agriculture emissions in Western Canada. As a result of these limitations, we present the total of energy 609 and agriculture as 5.1 ± 1.0 Tg a⁻¹ and the total of wetlands and other natural as 11.1 ± 1.4 Tg a⁻¹. Our results for total natural 610 and total anthropogenic emissions are consistent with the results from the previous monthly inversion, with the added benefit 611 612 of identifying which sectors are responsible for the higher anthropogenic emissions at the cost of lower temporal resolution. 613 Waste emissions are 36% lower than the prior and 35% lower than the National GHG Inventory. The total for energy and agriculture is 49% higher than the prior and 59% higher than the total in the inventory. These results show that energy and/or 614 agriculture are the sectors that are responsible for the higher anthropogenic emissions. 615

616

Figure 9 (bottom) shows the provincial inversion corresponding to the six largest emitting provinces (BC British Columbia, AB Alberta, SK, Saskatchewan, MB Manitoba, ON Ontario, QC Quebec) and two aggregated regions (ATL Atlantic Canada, NOR Northern Territories). These regions are further subdivided into total anthropogenic and total natural methane emissions, with below detection limit anthropogenic emissions from Atlantic Canada and Northern Territories. This inversion especially challenges the limitations of the ECCC+GOSAT observation system, as only about 8 of 16 independent pieces of information are retrieved. This means that half of the posterior provincial emissions are below the noise, and we are unable to constrain province-by-province emissions. The singular value decomposition identifies which regions are well constrained (Fig. S5).





For the anthropogenic emissions AB and ON are strongly constrained. For the natural emissions AB, ON, SK and MB are well constrained. BC shows correlation between its own anthropogenic and natural emissions and cannot be completely disaggregated. As a result, we group elements together in Western Canada (BC + AB + SA + MB) and Central Canada (ON + QC) for interpretation. The total for Western Canada anthropogenic emissions is 4.6 ± 0.6 Tg a⁻¹ which is 39% higher than the prior of 3.3 Tg a⁻¹. The total for Central Canada is 0.8 ± 0.2 Tg a⁻¹ which is 11% lower than the prior of 0.9 Tg a⁻¹.

629

Each of our top-down inversion results show higher total anthropogenic emissions than bottom-up estimates. This is consistent 630 regardless of the observation vector incorporating ECCC data, GOSAT data or ECCC+GOSAT data. The subnational scale 631 632 emissions are limited in their ability to provide full characterization of minor emissions across Canada but can successfully 633 constrain major emissions for source attribution. The sectoral inversion attributes higher anthropogenic emissions to energy 634 and/or agriculture and applies a small decrease to waste emissions. The provincial inversion attributes higher anthropogenic emissions to Western Canada and a small decrease to Central Canada. These results suggest that anthropogenic emissions in 635 Canada are underestimated primarily because of higher emissions from Western Canada energy and/or agriculture. This 636 637 interpretation is consistent with previous satellite inverse modelling studies over North America that apply positive scaling 638 factors to grid box clusters in Western Canada to match observations (Maasakkers et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2015; Wecht et 639 al., 2014). Aircraft studies in Alberta have also shown higher emissions from oil and gas in Alberta than bottom up estimates 640 (Baray et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2017). Atherton et al. (2017) estimated higher emissions from natural gas in north-eastern British Columbia using mobile surface in situ measurements (Atherton et al., 2017). Zavala-Araiza et al. (2018) showed a 641 642 significant amount of methane emissions in Alberta from equipment leaks and venting go unreported due to current reporting 643 requirements and in some regions a small number of sites may be responsible for most methane emissions. Our inverse modelling results from 2010–2015 suggest a consistent presence of under-reported or unreported emissions which require a 644 645 policy adjustment to reporting practices.

- 646
- 647
- 648
- 649
- 650
- 651

- -







654 655

Figure 9: Joint-inversions combining 2010–2015 ECCC in situ and GOSAT satellite data showing how the combined observing system remains limited towards resolving all Canadian sources. Inversions are done for each year and we present the six-year average with error bars showing the 1σ standard deviation of the yearly results. Hatched bars indicate sources that are not well-constrained, these are defined as state vector elements with averaging kernel sensitivities less than 0.8 which are





affected by aliasing with other sources (See Supplemental Fig. S4 and S5). The top panel shows the sectoral inversion 660 according to the categories in the National GHG inventory (Energy, Agriculture, Waste) and two natural categories (Wetlands 661 and Other Natural). As an example, the diagnostics in Figure S4 shows Agriculture emissions are beneath the noise and cannot 662 663 be distinguished from Energy. The bottom panel shows the subnational regional inversion according to provinces (BC British Columbia, AB Alberta, SK, Saskatchewan, MB Manitoba, ON Ontario, QC Quebec) and aggregated regions (ATL Atlantic 664 Canada, NOR Northern Territories) further subdivided according to total anthropogenic and total natural emissions. The 665 diagnostics in Fig. S5 show more than half of the regions are at or below the noise. For anthropogenic emissions, the best 666 constraints are on provinces AB and ON. For natural emissions, the best constraints are on AB, SK, MB and ON. 667

668 3.5 Comparison to Independent Aircraft and In situ Data

We test the robustness of the optimized emissions from each of the three inversions shown (monthly natural, sectoral, and 669 670 provincial) by comparing to independent measurements not used in the inversions. Prior and posterior simulated methane concentrations are compared to measurements from NOAA ESRL aircraft profiles at East Trout Lake, Saskatchewan (Mund 671 et al., 2017) and ECCC surface measurements in sites Chapais and Chibougamau in Quebec, Canada. The surface data was 672 673 averaged to daily afternoon means (12:00 to 16:00 local time) in the same manner as the surface measurements used in the 674 inversion. Aircraft data from the NOAA ESRL profiles coincide spatially with the surface measurements at ETL through a 675 joint analysis program with Environment and Climate Change Canada and have occurred on a regular basis approximately 676 once a month from 2005 until present time. Aircraft measurements reach ~7000 m above the surface with samples at multiple 677 altitudes accomplished using a programmable multi-flask system that is further discussed in Mund et al. (2017), however we 678 limit the comparison to the lowest 1 km above ground since higher altitude measurements are mostly background. The aircraft 679 data is not averaged however the flights occur around the same time in the early afternoon.

680

Figure 10 shows the comparison using reduced-major axis (RMA) regressions with the coefficient of determination (R^2), the 681 slope and the mean-bias shown as metrics to evaluate the agreement. Surface data in CHA, Quebec shows better posterior 682 agreement with observations according to all metrics for each of the three inversions. The R^2 of the prior is 0.36 and improves 683 to a range of 0.44-0.52 for the posterior results, the slope is 1.17 in the prior and improves to a range of 0.91-1.13 and the 684 mean bias is -16.4 ppb in the prior and improves to -11.4 and -4.9 ppb. Since this site in Quebec is particularly sensitive to 685 the Hudson Bay Lowlands, the agreement in all metrics suggests our posterior emissions can better represent wetlands 686 emissions in this region. This includes the reduced peak seasonality of natural emissions in the monthly inversion, the reduction 687 688 of wetlands emissions in the sectoral inversion or the reduction of natural emissions primarily in Central Canada in the provincial inversion. Aircraft data in Saskatchewan shows improvement in the R² and mean bias metrics but slightly degrades 689 the slope in one case. The R^2 of the prior is 0.14 and improves to a range of 0.20–0.33, the mean bias of the prior is -6.8ppb 690 691 and improves to -0.4 and -1.4 ppb. The slope of the prior is 1.15 which slightly degrades to 0.83 in the monthly inversion and





susceptible to representation error at this $2^{\circ}x2.5^{\circ}$ grid resolution. Furthermore, the time-series comparison to surface data at East Trout Lake (Fig. 6) shows overall lower sensitivity to summertime wetlands emissions than Fraserdale and Egbert, and lower sensitivity to anthropogenic emissions from Alberta than Lac La Biche. Hence the modelled methane concentrations at the aircraft measurement points are adjusted less by the change in posterior emissions. However, improvement in the R² and mean bias metrics show there is still a better representation of the variance in the data which suggests the posterior emissions reduce bias due to peak emission episodes.

- 699
- 700
- 701







Figure 10: Evaluation of inversion results with reduced-major axis (RMA) regressions using independent data. The top four panels show the comparison to ECCC surface observations at Chapais and Chibougamau in Quebec, Canada and the bottom four panels show the comparison to NOAA aircraft profiles at East Trout Lake, Saskatchewan. The agreement of observations with prior simulated methane concentrations (blue) are compared to posterior concentrations using optimized emissions from the monthly inversion (green), the sectoral inversion (magenta), and the provincial inversion (orange). The coefficient of determination (\mathbb{R}^2), slope and mean bias are shown as metrics of agreement.





709 4 Conclusions

We conduct a Bayesian inverse analysis to optimize anthropogenic and natural methane emissions in Canada using 2010–2015 710 711 ECCC in situ and GOSAT satellite observations in GEOS-Chem. Methane concentrations are simulated on a 2°x2.5° grid 712 using recently updated prior emissions inventories for energy and wetlands emissions in Canada. Modelled background 713 conditions for the Canadian domain are shown to be unbiased in the comparison to surface in situ data at the western most site 714 in Canada, Estevan point, with agreement within 6 ppb. A forward model analysis shows much larger biases between -100715 ppb and +1050 ppb at surface sites throughout Canada demonstrating the presence of misrepresented local emissions. We 716 show large positive biases (overestimation of emissions) in the summertime are observed at sites sensitive to wetlands 717 emissions, these biases are reduced by using lower magnitude wetlands emissions scenarios with lower CH₄:C temperature sensitivities or lower inundation extent. We also show the opposite case of negative biases (underestimation of emissions) 718 719 observed year-round at sites in Western Canada. The forward model analysis is consistent with the results of the inverse 720 analysis that reduce emissions from natural sources and increase emissions from anthropogenic sources to minimize the 721 mismatch between modelled and observed methane.

722

723 We show three approaches for using ECCC and GOSAT data towards inverse modelling of Canadian methane emissions. 724 These approaches differ according to the temporal and spatial resolution of the solution. We show: (1) a high time-resolution 725 inversion that solves for natural emissions each month from 2010–2015 and anthropogenic emissions as yearly totals, (2) a 726 sectoral inversion that solves for emissions according to categories in the national inventory, (3) a provincial inversion that 727 solves for total anthropogenic and natural emissions at the subnational level. The monthly inversion provides information on 728 the seasonality of natural emissions (which are ~95% wetlands) but does not provide more depth into anthropogenic emissions 729 beyond yearly scaling. The sectoral inversion provides more information on the categories of anthropogenic emissions that are misrepresented in the prior but without spatial detail. The provincial inversion provides the highest level of spatial 730 731 discretization but is largely underdetermined due to the limitations of the observing system towards characterizing very low 732 magnitude emissions from smaller contributing provinces.

733

Inversion results (1) show mean 2010–2015 posterior emissions for total anthropogenic sources in Canada are 6.0 ± 0.4 Tg a⁻ 734 ¹ using ECCC data and 6.5 ± 0.7 Tg a⁻¹ using GOSAT data. Annual mean natural emissions are 10.5 ± 1.9 Tg a⁻¹ using ECCC 735 data and 11.7 ± 1.2 Tg a⁻¹ using GOSAT data. Both inverse modelling estimates are higher than the prior for anthropogenic 736 emissions 4.4 Tg a⁻¹ and lower than the prior for natural emissions 14.8 Tg a⁻¹. Inversion results using both datasets show a 737 738 change in the seasonal profile of natural methane emissions where emissions are slower to begin in the spring and show a less 739 intense peak in the summer. The agreement between two datasets assembled with different measurement methodologies that sample different parts of the atmosphere is a robust result that lends weight to our conclusions. Our results corroborate recent 740 741 studies showing a less-intense and less-narrow summertime peak in North American Boreal wetlands emissions with a higher





relative contribution from the cold season (Miller et al., 2016; Zona et al., 2016; Warwick et al., 2016; Thonat et al., 2017;
Treat et al., 2018; Peltola et al., 2019). These top-down studies using atmospheric observations show biosphere process models
can better account for a more complex response to peak surface soil temperatures.

745

We also conduct combined ECCC+GOSAT inversions that aim to resolve finer resolution emissions corresponding to (2) the 746 747 sectors of the national inventory and corresponding to (3) provincial boundaries. These policy-themed inversions challenge the capabilities of the ECCC+GOSAT observation system and show the system is not capable of resolving many minor 748 emissions in Canada. The degrees of freedom for signal for these inversions are 3-4 out of 5 state vector elements for the 749 750 sectoral inversion and 8 out of 16 for the provincial inversion. The limitation of this inverse approach towards constraining sectoral or regional scale emissions in Canada is due to the low magnitude of these emissions, their overlapping nature in 751 752 concentrated regions, and the sparsity of data available to distinguish them apart. Grouping correlated sectors together, we determine 5.1 \pm 1.0 Tg a⁻¹ for energy and agriculture which is 59% higher than the inventory, 0.6 \pm 0.3 Tg a⁻¹ for waste which 753 is 35% lower than the inventory. For provincial emissions, we show Western Canada is 4.6 ± 0.6 Tg a⁻¹ which is 39% higher 754 755 than the prior and Central Canada is 0.8 ± 0.2 which is 11% lower. Both regions show lower natural emissions. These results 756 show that the higher anthropogenic emissions in the posterior results can be attributed to energy and/or agriculture primarily in Western Canada where most of Canadian anthropogenic emissions are concentrated. Our results are consistent with other 757 758 top-down studies that show higher than reported anthropogenic emissions in Western Canada (Wecht et al., 2014; Turner et 759 al., 2015; Atherton et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2017; Baray et al., 2018; Maasakkers et al., 2019). This may be due to oil and 760 gas emissions that are under-reported or unreported due to current reporting requirements (Zavala-Araiza et al., 2018). These 761 top-down studies show a need for policy readjustment in reporting practices for Canadian anthropogenic methane emissions.

762

This study shows the value of using complementary surface and satellite datasets in an inverse analysis. We emphasize the 763 value of comparative analysis using the datasets independently versus as joint inversions, as minor emissions are too low in 764 magnitude for the observational precision to distinguish finer scale discretization above the noise. The comparative analysis 765 766 has the added benefit of evaluating the datasets against each other and the assumptions that are specific to using either surface or satellite data. The capabilities for combining and intercomparing datasets is expected to improve, with the launch of 767 Copernicus Sentinel-5p satellite (TROPOMI) in 2017 and continued expansions on in situ observation networks. The ability 768 769 for next generation observations to constrain subnational level emissions in Canada will depend on instrument and model 770 precision, as well as the emissions magnitudes and spatiotemporal overlap of the targets. These technical capabilities should be weighed alongside policy needs for improved methane monitoring. 771





Competing Interests 773

774 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

775 **Data Availability**

- GEOS-Chem is from http://acmg.seas.harvard.edu/geos/ which includes links to all gridded prior emissions and 776
- 777 meteorological fields used in this analysis. GOSAT satellite data is from the University of Leicester v7 proxy retrieval is
- available through the Copernicus Climate Change Service https://climate.copernicus.eu/. ECCC in situ data is available 778
- 779 through the World Data Centre for Greenhouse Gases (WDCGG) https://gaw.kishou.go.jp/. NOAA/ESRL aircraft data is
- from the Global Monitoring Laboratory https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/aircraft/. 780

781 **Author Contributions**

- SB, DJJ and RM designed the study. SB conducted the simulations and analysis with contributions from JDM, JXS, MPS, 782
- 783 and DBAJ. AAB provided WetCHARTS emissions and supporting data. SB and RM wrote the paper with contributions
- 784 from all authors. RM was responsible for funding acquisition at York U while DJJ acquired funding at Harvard U.

785 Acknowledgements

- 786 Work at Harvard was supported by the NASA Carbon Monitoring System. We thank the Japanese Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) responsible for the GOSAT instrument, and the University of Leicester for the retrieval algorithm used in
- 788 this analysis. Doug Worthy and the Climate Research Division at Environment and Climate Change Canada are responsible
- 789 for the in situ surface measurements and the NOAA/ESRL program is responsible for the aircraft methane measurements.
- 790





791 References

- Atherton, E., Risk, D., Fougère, C., Lavoie, M., Marshall, A., Werring, J., Williams, J. P. and Minions, C.: Mobile
 measurement of methane emissions from natural gas developments in northeastern British Columbia, Canada, Atmos. Chem.
 Phys., 17(20), 12405–12420, doi:10.5194/acp-17-12405-2017, 2017.
- 795 Baray, S., Darlington, A., Gordon, M., Hayden, K. L., Leithead, A., Li, S.-M., Liu, P. S. K., Mittermeier, R. L., Moussa, S.
- G., O'Brien, J., Staebler, R., Wolde, M., Worthy, D. and McLaren, R.: Quantification of methane sources in the Athabasca Oil
 Sands Region of Alberta by aircraft mass balance, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18(10), 7361–7378, doi:10.5194/acp-18-7361-2018,
- 798 2018.
- 799 Bloom, A. A., Bowman, K. W., Lee, M., Turner, A. J., Schroeder, R., Worden, J. R., Weidner, R., McDonald, K. C. and Jacob,
- 800 D. J.: A global wetland methane emissions and uncertainty dataset for atmospheric chemical transport models (WetCHARTs
- 801 version 1.0), Geosci. Model Dev., 10(6), 2141–2156, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2141-2017, 2017.
- 802 Bubier, J. L., Moore, T. R. and Roulet, N. T.: Methane Emissions from Wetlands in the Midboreal Region of Northern Ontario,
- 803 Canada, Ecology, 74(8), 2240–2254, doi:10.2307/1939577, 1993.
- 804 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., Chédin, A., Chevallier, F., Crevoisier,
 C. D., Deutscher, N. M., Frankenberg, C., Hase, F., Hasekamp, O. P., Heymann, J., Kaminski, T., Laeng, A., Lichtenberg, G.,
- Be Mazière, M., Noël, S., Notholt, J., Orphal, J., Popp, C., Parker, R., Scholze, M., Sussmann, R., Stiller, G. P., Warneke, T.,
- 808 Zehner, C., Bril, A., Crisp, D., Griffith, D. W. T., Kuze, A., O'Dell, C., Oshchepkov, S., Sherlock, V., Suto, H., Wennberg,
- 809 P., Wunch, D., Yokota, T. and Yoshida, Y.: The Greenhouse Gas Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): Comparison and
- 810 quality assessment of near-surface-sensitive satellite-derived CO2 and CH4 global data sets, Remote Sensing of Environment,
- 811 162, 344–362, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2013.04.024, 2015.
- Chanton, J. and Liptay, K.: Seasonal variation in methane oxidation in a landfill cover soil as determined by an in situ stable
 isotope technique, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 14(1), 51–60, doi:10.1029/1999GB900087, 2000.
- 814 Dlugokencky, E. J., Bruhwiler, L., White, J. W. C., Emmons, L. K., Novelli, P. C., Montzka, S. A., Masarie, K. A., Lang, P.
- 815 M., Crotwell, A. M., Miller, J. B. and Gatti, L. V.: Observational constraints on recent increases in the atmospheric CH 4
- 816 burden, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36(18), L18803, doi:10.1029/2009GL039780, 2009.
- 817 Environment and Climate Change Canada: National Inventory Report 1990-2015: Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks in
- 818 Canada, Canada's Submission to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Part 3. Available at:
- 819 http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2018/eccc/En81-4-2015-3-eng.pdf, 2017.





- 820 ESA CCI GHG project team: ESA Greenhouse Gases Climate Change Initiative (GHG_cci): Column-averaged CH4 from
- GOSAT generated with the OCPR (UoL-PR) Proxy algorithm (CH4_GOS_OCPR), v7.0. Centre for Environmental Data Analysis, Available at: https://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk/uuid/f9154243fd8744bdaf2a59c39033e659, 2018.
- 823 Fung, I., John, J., Lerner, J., Matthews, E., Prather, M., Steele, L. P. and Fraser, P. J.: Three-dimensional model synthesis of
- 824 the global methane cycle, J. Geophys. Res., 96(D7), 13033, doi:10.1029/91JD01247, 1991.
- 825 Hartmann, D. L., Tank, A. M. K., Rusticucci, M., Alexander, L. V., Brönnimann, S., Charabi, Y. A. R., Dentener, F. J.,
- 826 Dlugokencky, E. J., Easterling, D. R., Kaplan, A., Soden, B. J., Thorne, P. W., Wild, M., and Zhai, P. M.: Observations:
- 827 atmosphere and surface, in: Climate Change 2013 the Physical Science Basis: Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth
- 828 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- 829 Hausmann, P., Sussmann, R. and Smale, D.: Contribution of oil and natural gas production to renewed increase in atmospheric
- 830 methane (2007–2014): top–down estimate from ethane and methane column observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16(5), 3227–
- 831 3244, doi:10.5194/acp-16-3227-2016, 2016.
- Heald, C. L., Jacob, D. J., Jones, D. B. A., Palmer, P. I., Logan, J. A., Streets, D. G., Sachse, G. W., Gille, J. C., Hoffman, R.
 N. and Nehrkorn, T.: Comparative inverse analysis of satellite (MOPITT) and aircraft (TRACE-P) observations to estimate
 Asian sources of carbon monoxide: COMPARATIVE INVERSE ANALYSIS, J. Geophys. Res., 109(D23),
 doi:10.1029/2004JD005185, 2004.
- Hu, H., Landgraf, J., Detmers, R., Borsdorff, T., Aan de Brugh, J., Aben, I., Butz, A. and Hasekamp, O.: Toward Global
 Mapping of Methane With TROPOMI: First Results and Intersatellite Comparison to GOSAT, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45(8),
 3682–3689, doi:10.1002/2018GL077259, 2018.
- Ishizawa, M., Chan, D., Worthy, D., Chan, E., Vogel, F. and Maksyutov, S.: Analysis of atmospheric CH4 in Canadian Arctic
 and estimation of the regional CH 4 fluxes, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 19(7), 4637–4658, doi:10.5194/acp-19-4637-2019, 2019.
- 841 Jacob, D. J., Turner, A. J., Maasakkers, J. D., Sheng, J., Sun, K., Liu, X., Chance, K., Aben, I., McKeever, J. and Frankenberg,
- 842 C.: Satellite observations of atmospheric methane and their value for quantifying methane emissions, Atmos. Chem. Phys.,
- 843 16(22), 14371–14396, doi:10.5194/acp-16-14371-2016, 2016.
- 844 Johnson, M. R., Tyner, D. R., Conley, S., Schwietzke, S. and Zavala-Araiza, D.: Comparisons of Airborne Measurements and
- 845 Inventory Estimates of Methane Emissions in the Alberta Upstream Oil and Gas Sector, Environ. Sci. Technol., 51(21), 13008–
- 846 13017, doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b03525, 2017.
- 847 Kirschke, S., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Saunois, M., Canadell, J. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., Bergamaschi, P., Bergmann, D., Blake,
- 848 D. R., Bruhwiler, L., Cameron-Smith, P., Castaldi, S., Chevallier, F., Feng, L., Fraser, A., Heimann, M., Hodson, E. L.,
- 849 Houweling, S., Josse, B., Fraser, P. J., Krummel, P. B., Lamarque, J.-F., Langenfelds, R. L., Le Quéré, C., Naik, V., O'Doherty,





- 850 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., Strode, S. A., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., van der Werf, G. R., Voulgarakis, A., van
- 852 Weele, M., Weiss, R. F., Williams, J. E. and Zeng, G.: Three decades of global methane sources and sinks, Nature Geosci,
- 853 6(10), 813–823, doi:10.1038/ngeo1955, 2013.
- Lu, X., Jacob, D. J., Zhang, Y., Maasakkers, J. D., Sulprizio, M. P., Shen, L., Qu, Z., Scarpelli, T. R., Nesser, H., Yantosca,
 R. M., Sheng, J., Andrews, A., Parker, R. J., Boech, H., Bloom, A. A., and Ma, S.: Global methane budget and trend, 2010–
 2017: complementarity of inverse analyses using in situ (GLOBALVIEWplus CH4 ObsPack) and satellite (GOSAT)
 observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2020-775, in review, 2020.
- 858 Maasakkers, J. D., Jacob, D. J., Sulprizio, M. P., Turner, A. J., Weitz, M., Wirth, T., Hight, C., DeFigueiredo, M., Desai, M.,
- 859 Schmeltz, R., Hockstad, L., Bloom, A. A., Bowman, K. W., Jeong, S. and Fischer, M. L.: Gridded National Inventory of U.S.
- 860 Methane Emissions, Environ. Sci. Technol., 50(23), 13123–13133, doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b02878, 2016.
- Maasakkers, J. D., Jacob, D. J., Sulprizio, M. P., Scarpelli, T. R., Nesser, H., Sheng, J.-X., Zhang, Y., Hersher, M., Bloom, A.
 A., Bowman, K. W., Worden, J. R., Janssens-Maenhout, G. and Parker, R. J.: Global distribution of methane emissions,
 emission trends, and OH concentrations and trends inferred from an inversion of GOSAT satellite data for 2010–2015, Atmos.
 Chem. Phys., 19(11), 7859–7881, doi:10.5194/acp-19-7859-2019, 2019.
- 865 Maasakkers, J. D., Jacob, D. J., Sulprizio, M. P., Scarpelli, T. R., Nesser, H., Sheng, J., Zhang, Y., Lu, X., Bloom, A. A.,
- Bowman, K. W., Worden, J. R., and Parker, R. J.: 2010–2015 North American methane emissions, sectoral contributions, and
 trends: a high-resolution inversion of GOSAT satellite observations of atmospheric methane, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
 https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2020-915, in review, 2020.
- 869 Miller, S. M., Worthy, D. E. J., Michalak, A. M., Wofsy, S. C., Kort, E. A., Havice, T. C., Andrews, A. E., Dlugokencky, E.
- 870 J., Kaplan, J. O., Levi, P. J., Tian, H. and Zhang, B.: Observational constraints on the distribution, seasonality, and
- 871 environmental predictors of North American boreal methane emissions, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 28(2), 146-160,
- 872 doi:10.1002/2013GB004580, 2014.
- 873 Miller, S. M., Commane, R., Melton, J. R., Andrews, A. E., Benmergui, J., Dlugokencky, E. J., Janssens-Maenhout, G.,
- 874 Michalak, A. M., Sweeney, C. and Worthy, D. E. J.: Evaluation of wetland methane emissions across North America using
- atmospheric data and inverse modeling, Biogeosciences, 13(4), 1329–1339, doi:10.5194/bg-13-1329-2016, 2016.
- Moore, T. R., Heyes, A. and Roulet, N. T.: Methane emissions from wetlands, southern Hudson Bay lowland, J. Geophys.
 Res., 99(D1), 1455, doi:10.1029/93JD02457, 1994.
- 878 Mund, J., Thoning, K., Tans, P., Sweeny, C., Higgs, J., Wolter, S., Crotwell, A., Neff, D., Dlugokencky, E., Lang, P., Novelli,
- 879 P., Moglia, E. and Crotwell, M.: Earth System Research Laboratory Carbon Cycle and Greenhouse Gases Group Flask-Air





880 Sample Measurements of CO2, CH4, CO, N2O, H2, and SF6 from the Aircraft Program, 1992-Present, , 881 doi:10.7289/V5N58JMF, 2017.

- Myhre, G.: Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing, in Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution
 of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change., 2013.
- 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,
- 886 A. C., Gloor, E., Worthy, D. E. J., Brunke, E.-G., Labuschagne, C., Wolff, E. W. and Ganesan, A. L.: Rising atmospheric
- 887 methane: 2007-2014 growth and isotopic shift: RISING METHANE 2007-2014, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 30(9), 1356-
- 888 1370, doi:10.1002/2016GB005406, 2016.
- 889 Nisbet, E. G., Fisher, R. E., Lowry, D., France, J. L., Allen, G., Bakkaloglu, S., Broderick, T. J., Cain, M., Coleman, M.,
- 890 Fernandez, J., Forster, G., Griffiths, P. T., Iverach, C. P., Kelly, B. F. J., Manning, M. R., Nisbet-Jones, P. B. R., Pyle, J. A.,
- 891 Townsend-Small, A., al-Shalaan, A., Warwick, N. and Zazzeri, G.: Methane Mitigation: Methods to Reduce Emissions, on the
- 892 Path to the Paris Agreement, Rev. Geophys., 58(1), doi:10.1029/2019RG000675, 2020.
- 893 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,
- 895 S., Meng, L., Palmer, P. I., Prinn, R. G., Rigby, M., Saito, R. and Wilson, C.: TransCom model simulations of CH4 and related
- 896 species: linking transport, surface flux and chemical loss with CH4 variability in the troposphere and lower stratosphere,
- 897 Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(24), 12813–12837, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011, 2011.
- 898 Peltola, O., Vesala, T., Gao, Y., Räty, O., Alekseychik, P., Aurela, M., Chojnicki, B., Desai, A. R., Dolman, A. J., Euskirchen,
- 899 E. S., Friborg, T., Göckede, M., Helbig, M., Humphreys, E., Jackson, R. B., Jocher, G., Joos, F., Klatt, J., Knox, S. H.,
- 900 Kowalska, N., Kutzbach, L., Lienert, S., Lohila, A., Mammarella, I., Nadeau, D. F., Nilsson, M. B., Oechel, W. C., Peichl, M.,
- 901 Pypker, T., Quinton, W., Rinne, J., Sachs, T., Samson, M., Schmid, H. P., Sonnentag, O., Wille, C., Zona, D. and Aalto, T.:
- 902 Monthly gridded data product of northern wetland methane emissions based on upscaling eddy covariance observations, Earth
- 903 Syst. Sci. Data, 11(3), 1263–1289, doi:10.5194/essd-11-1263-2019, 2019.
- 904 Pickett-Heaps, C. A., Jacob, D. J., Wecht, K. J., Kort, E. A., Wofsy, S. C., Diskin, G. S., Worthy, D. E. J., Kaplan, J. O., Bey,
- 905 I. and Drevet, J.: Magnitude and seasonality of wetland methane emissions from the Hudson Bay Lowlands (Canada), Atmos.
- 906 Chem. Phys., 11(8), 3773–3779, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3773-2011, 2011.
- 907 Poulter, B., Bousquet, P., Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., Peregon, A., Saunois, M., Arora, V. K., Beerling, D. J., Brovkin, V., Jones,
- 908 C. D., Joos, F., Gedney, N., Ito, A., Kleinen, T., Koven, C. D., McDonald, K., Melton, J. R., Peng, C., Peng, S., Prigent, C.,
- 909 Schroeder, R., Riley, W. J., Saito, M., Spahni, R., Tian, H., Taylor, L., Viovy, N., Wilton, D., Wiltshire, A., Xu, X., Zhang,





- B., Zhang, Z. and Zhu, Q.: Global wetland contribution to 2000–2012 atmospheric methane growth rate dynamics, Environ.
 Res. Lett., 12(9), 094013, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa8391, 2017.
- 912 Prather, M. J., Holmes, C. D. and Hsu, J.: Reactive greenhouse gas scenarios: Systematic exploration of uncertainties and the
- 913 role of atmospheric chemistry: ATMOSPHERIC CHEMISTRY AND GREENHOUSE GASES, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39(9),
- 914 n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2012GL051440, 2012.
- 915 Rigby, M., Montzka, S. A., Prinn, R. G., White, J. W. C., Young, D., O'Doherty, S., Lunt, M. F., Ganesan, A. L., Manning,
- 916 A. J., Simmonds, P. G., Salameh, P. K., Harth, C. M., Mühle, J., Weiss, R. F., Fraser, P. J., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B.,
- 917 McCulloch, A. and Park, S.: Role of atmospheric oxidation in recent methane growth, Proc Natl Acad Sci USA, 114(21),
- 918 5373–5377, doi:10.1073/pnas.1616426114, 2017.
- 919 Rodgers, C. D.: Inverse Methods for Atmospheric Sounding: Theory and Practice, WORLD SCIENTIFIC., 2000.
- 920 Rogelj, J., Popp, A., Calvin, K. V., Luderer, G., Emmerling, J., Gernaat, D., Fujimori, S., Strefler, J., Hasegawa, T., Marangoni,
- 921 G., Krey, V., Kriegler, E., Riahi, K., van Vuuren, D. P., Doelman, J., Drouet, L., Edmonds, J., Fricko, O., Harmsen, M., Havlík,
- 922 P., Humpenöder, F., Stehfest, E. and Tavoni, M.: Scenarios towards limiting global mean temperature increase below 1.5 °C,
- 923 Nature Clim Change, 8(4), 325–332, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0091-3, 2018.
- Sheng, J.-X., Jacob, D. J., Maasakkers, J. D., Sulprizio, M. P., Zavala-Araiza, D. and Hamburg, S. P.: A high-resolution (0.1°
 × 0.1°) inventory of methane emissions from Canadian and Mexican oil and gas systems, Atmospheric Environment, 158,
 211–215, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.02.036, 2017.
- 927 Sheng, J.-X., Jacob, D. J., Turner, A. J., Maasakkers, J. D., Benmergui, J., Bloom, A. A., Arndt, C., Gautam, R., Zavala-Araiza,
- 928 D., Boesch, H. and Parker, R. J.: 2010-2016 methane trends over Canada, the United States, and Mexico observed by the
- 929 GOSAT satellite: contributions from different source sectors, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18(16), 12257-12267, doi:10.5194/acp-
- 930 18-12257-2018, 2018a.
- 931 Sheng, J.-X., Jacob, D. J., Turner, A. J., Maasakkers, J. D., Sulprizio, M. P., Bloom, A. A., Andrews, A. E. and Wunch, D.:
- 932 High-resolution inversion of methane emissions in the Southeast US using SEAC 4 RS aircraft observations of atmospheric
- 933 methane: anthropogenic and wetland sources, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18(9), 6483–6491, doi:10.5194/acp-18-6483-2018, 2018b.
- 934 Stanevich, I., Jones, D. B. A., Strong, K., Keller, M., Henze, D. K., Parker, R. J., Boesch, H., Wunch, D., Notholt, J., Petri, C.,
- 935 Warneke, T., Sussmann, R., Schneider, M., Hase, F., Kivi, R., Deutscher, N. M., Velazco, V. A., Walker, K. A. and Deng, F.:
- 936 Characterizing model errors in chemical transport modelling of methane: Using GOSAT XCH4 data with weak constraint
- 937 four-dimensional variational data assimilation, preprint, Gases/Atmospheric Modelling/Troposphere/Chemistry (chemical
- 938 composition and reactions)., 2019.





- Sweeney, C., Dlugokencky, E., Miller, C. E., Wofsy, S., Karion, A., Dinardo, S., Chang, R. Y.-W., Miller, J. B., Bruhwiler,
 L., Crotwell, A. M., Newberger, T., McKain, K., Stone, R. S., Wolter, S. E., Lang, P. E. and Tans, P.: No significant increase
 in long-term CH4 emissions on North Slope of Alaska despite significant increase in air temperature: LONG-TERM CH4
 EMISSIONS ON NORTH SLOPE, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(12), 6604–6611, doi:10.1002/2016GL069292, 2016.
- 943 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(13), 8371–8394, doi:10.5194/acp-17-83712017, 2017.
- 947 Treat, C. C., Bloom, A. A. and Marushchak, M. E.: Nongrowing season methane emissions-a significant component of annual
- 948 emissions across northern ecosystems, Glob Change Biol, 24(8), 3331–3343, doi:10.1111/gcb.14137, 2018.
- 949 Tunnicliffe, R. L., Ganesan, A. L., Parker, R. J., Boesch, H., Gedney, N., Poulter, B., Zhang, Z., Lavrič, J. V., Walter, D.,
- Rigby, M., Henne, S., Young, D., and O'Doherty, S.: Quantifying sources of Brazil's CH4 emissions between 2010 and 2018
- 951 from satellite data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 13041–13067, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-13041-2020, 2020. Turner, A. J.

and Jacob, D. J.: Balancing aggregation and smoothing errors in inverse models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15(12), 7039–7048,

953 doi:10.5194/acp-15-7039-2015, 2015.

- 954 Turner, A. J., Jacob, D. J., Wecht, K. J., Maasakkers, J. D., Lundgren, E., Andrews, A. E., Biraud, S. C., Boesch, H., Bowman,
- 955 K. W., Deutscher, N. M., Dubey, M. K., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., Kuze, A., Notholt, J., Ohyama, H., Parker, R., Payne, V.
- 956 H., Sussmann, R., Sweeney, C., Velazco, V. A., Warneke, T., Wennberg, P. O. and Wunch, D.: Estimating global and North
- American methane emissions with high spatial resolution using GOSAT satellite data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15(12), 7049–
- 958 7069, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7049-2015, 2015.
- Turner, A. J., Frankenberg, C., Wennberg, P. O. and Jacob, D. J.: Ambiguity in the causes for decadal trends in atmospheric
 methane and hydroxyl, Proc Natl Acad Sci USA, 114(21), 5367–5372, doi:10.1073/pnas.1616020114, 2017.
- 961 Turner, A. J., Frankenberg, C. and Kort, E. A.: Interpreting contemporary trends in atmospheric methane, Proc Natl Acad Sci
 962 USA, 116(8), 2805–2813, doi:10.1073/pnas.1814297116, 2019.
- Warwick, N. J., Cain, M. L., Fisher, R., France, J. L., Lowry, D., Michel, S. E., Nisbet, E. G., Vaughn, B. H., White, J. W. C.,
 and Pyle, J. A.: Using δ13C-CH4 and δD-CH4 to constrain Arctic methane emissions, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 14891–14908,
 https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-14891-2016, 2016.
- Wecht, K. J., Jacob, D. J., Frankenberg, C., Jiang, Z. and Blake, D. R.: Mapping of North American methane emissions with
 high spatial resolution by inversion of SCIAMACHY satellite data: NORTH AMERICA METHANE EMISSION
 INVERSION, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 119(12), 7741–7756, doi:10.1002/2014JD021551, 2014.





- 969 Worden, J. R., Bloom, A. A., Pandey, S., Jiang, Z., Worden, H. M., Walker, T. W., Houweling, S. and Röckmann, T.: Reduced
- biomass burning emissions reconcile conflicting estimates of the post-2006 atmospheric methane budget, Nat Commun, 8(1),
 2227, doi:10.1038/s41467-017-02246-0, 2017.
- Zavala-Araiza, D., Herndon, S. C., Roscioli, J. R., Yacovitch, T. I., Johnson, M. R., Tyner, D. R., Omara, M. and Knighton,
 B.: Methane emissions from oil and gas production sites in Alberta, Canada, Elem Sci Anth, 6(1), 27,
 doi:10.1525/elementa.284, 2018.
- 975 Zona, D., Gioli, B., Commane, R., Lindaas, J., Wofsy, S. C., Miller, C. E., Dinardo, S. J., Dengel, S., Sweeney, C., Karion,
- 976 A., Chang, R. Y.-W., Henderson, J. M., Murphy, P. C., Goodrich, J. P., Moreaux, V., Liljedahl, A., Watts, J. D., Kimball, J.
- 977 S., Lipson, D. A. and Oechel, W. C.: Cold season emissions dominate the Arctic tundra methane budget, Proc Natl Acad Sci
- 978 USA, 113(1), 40–45, doi:10.1073/pnas.1516017113, 2016.