

Response to Anonymous Referee #1 (RC1).

General comments

This paper presents novel AirCore measurements of several halocarbons in the stratosphere, and analyses trends in stratospheric trace gases, particularly focusing on CFC- 11. The paper is interesting, timely, and the measurement technique shows great promise. I think the paper should be published in ACP, following some (mostly minor) changes.

Author response

We thank the referee for taking the time to review this manuscript in detail and particularly appreciate the many constructive suggestions.

Reviewer comment

In general, I think there is quite a lot of material in the supplement that should be in the main text. Particularly given that one of the main purposes of this paper is to introduce a new measurement technique, I would encourage the authors to move the experimental details to the main paper, and some of the validation. I think that Tables S2 and S3 should be in the main text, as S2 demonstrates the repeatability of this new technique (which is referred to as a key conclusion of the paper), and the results of S3 are discussed at some length in the main text. Similarly, the brief description of the model setup could also be in the main text, as it is important for readers not familiar with this particular model.

Author response

We agree and have moved Tables S2 and S3 to the main manuscript. The first paragraph on CLaMS in the Supplement was moved to the end of the Methods section in the main manuscript:

“The Chemical Lagrangian Model of the Stratosphere (CLaMS) is a Lagrangian chemical transport model, with advective transport calculated from three-dimensional forward trajectories and an additional parameterisation for small-scale turbulent mixing (McKenna et al., 2002). Potential temperature is used as vertical coordinate throughout the stratosphere with vertical velocity

estimated from the total diabatic heating rate. Further model details and the chemistry scheme used are described in Pommrich et al. (2014). For the simulations used in this study CLaMS was driven with horizontal winds and diabatic heating rates from three alternative meteorological reanalysis data sets: ERA-Interim (from European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, ECMWF), JRA-55 (from Japan Meteorological Agency), and MERRA-2 (from NASA)."

The relevant section on AirCores was expanded by moving over some information from the Supplement. Previous version:

"The balloon-based AirCore technique was developed further mainly through the use of specially-designed tubing that maximises the amounts of air collected in the stratosphere, as well as through a novel subsampling technique that minimises the use of contamination-prone materials. The amount of retrievable stratospheric air is however still more than two orders of magnitude smaller than from aircraft-based sampling techniques. With laboratory analytical improvements compensating for this, the AirCore measurements show good precisions (ranging from 0.2 to 3.3 % compared with 0.4 to 1.1 % for aircraft samples) and excellent agreement with the aircraft data. More details can be found in the supplement. All samples were processed with a previously described analytical system and methodology (Laube et al., 2010 and 2012,) using cryogenic extraction and pre-concentration, followed by gas chromatographic separation and detection with a high-sensitivity mass spectrometer."

Modified version:

"The balloon-based AirCore technique was developed further mainly through the use of specially-designed tubing that maximises the amounts of air collected in the stratosphere, as well as through a novel subsampling technique that minimises the use of contamination-prone materials. The amount of retrievable stratospheric air is however still more than two orders of magnitude smaller than from aircraft-based sampling techniques. With laboratory analytical improvements compensating for this, the AirCore measurements show good precisions (ranging from 0.2 to 3.3 % compared with 0.4 to 1.1 % for aircraft samples, see Table 1) and excellent agreement with the aircraft data. The other important challenge for AirCore measurements of halocarbons is to ensure that the air is not contaminated throughout the entire sampling and sub-sampling process. Contaminations can arise from leakages and/or halocarbon-emitting materials (such as organic polymers) in the AirCore itself, in the CO₂-analyser system including the pump, or in the subsampling system. Importantly, for all compounds reported here mixing ratios in the stratosphere are much lower than in even remote tropospheric regions, let alone near sources of these gases. In addition, almost all of the contamination possibilities would affect the entire profile as an AirCore is essentially one air sample. This would become apparent in the correlations of the species with each other, which are very compact in the stratosphere. In the absence of such correlation breakdowns (See Figures 1, 2, and S1 to S4) we therefore conclude that such contaminations are at undetectable levels in the data set presented here. More details can be found in Table 1 and the supplement."

Reviewer comment

The title needs to mention that changes in halocarbons are being referred to.

Author response

We have changed the title to “Investigating stratospheric changes between 2009 and 2018 with trace gas data from aircraft, AirCores, and a global model focusing on CFC-11”.

Reviewer comment

L34 – 35: “required” is used twice in the same sentence

Author response

Thank you! The first one has been removed.

Reviewer comment

L40: this first line is too vague. It doesn’t really say anything. I suggest starting with the current second line.

Author response

We disagree that one of the main motivations for this work (i.e. the fact that many trace gases are strong greenhouse gases and/or enhance the depletion of stratospheric ozone) “doesn’t really say anything”. We have however changed the beginning of the sentence to specify that we are referring to “halogenated trace gases” here.

Reviewer comment

L42: “low to very low” could just be replaced by “low”

Author response

Done.

Reviewer comment

L45: “upper limit is around 50km”? Is this suggesting that the stratosphere extends to 50km? Not clear as written.

Author response

The statement was changed to “This is modest considering that the stratosphere extends to around 50 km.”

Reviewer comment

Section 2 heading: “Methods” are a sub-section of “Results”? I suggest separating these two sections.

Author response

We agree with the referee and have created a new section “2 Methods”. The new section 3 has been renamed to “Results and discussion” to better reflect its content and now starts with sub-section “3.1 Observational data overview and comparisons”.

Reviewer comment

L75 and elsewhere: I’m not 100% sure about the grammar here, but I would have thought that a colon followed by a list separated by commas would be more appropriate here (after “platforms”)

Author response

We agree and have replaced the first comma with a colon and also removed the “i.e.”

Reviewer comment

L80 – 83: As mentioned above, I think this needs much more explanation, and I would bring in a lot of the supplementary information.

Author response

As outlined in our response to comment 2 by RC1 we have followed this advice.

Reviewer comment

L84: “good precision” needs quantifying. Perhaps compare to the precision of other measurement techniques and say whether it is comparable or not (avoid subjective terms like “good”).

Author response

We agree with the referee and have added the following after “good precisions” to be more quantitative: “(ranging from 0.2 to 3.3 % compared with 0.4 to 1.1 % for aircraft samples)”.

Reviewer comment

L88: AoA is defined later on (L125). Needs to be introduced here. Furthermore, I would suggest a brief paragraph here explaining the concept, and calculation method.

Author response

We have replaced “AoAs” with “mean Ages of Air (AoAs, i.e. average stratospheric transit times, see section 3.1 for more details)”.

Reviewer comment

L90: I found this description too hard to follow. When were second or third order polynomials used? What exactly was being fitted? What is the purpose of “quintupling” the data, etc.? I think you need to walk the reader through this more gently. A figure may help to demonstrate the technique.

Author response

We agree that some crucial information was missing here. The original statement

“Stratospheric trends at AoA surfaces were derived by using second- and third-order polynomial fit functions to interpolate onto these surfaces for each flight. To test the uncertainty of this method, the data for each flight was first quintupled by adding and subtracting the mixing ratio and mean age uncertainties and then drawing 500 random samples (repeats possible) at each AoA surface with a bootstrap algorithm (as in Laube et al., 2013). The derived mixing ratios were subsequently used to produce linear regressions over time, including a weighting by the inverse uncertainties of the individual CFC mixing ratios. The bootstrapping algorithm was used again to ensure that the derived

slope uncertainties were not underestimated and that individual high or low points did not bias the slope estimates.”

was modified and expanded to:

“Stratospheric trends at AoA surfaces were derived by fitting second- and third-order polynomials (depending on whether an inflexion point was observed) to the respective correlations of mixing ratios and AoAs. The formulas of the polynomials were then used to interpolate onto the AoA surfaces (1, 2, 3, and/or 4 years, depending on which AoA range was covered) for each flight. To test the uncertainty of this method, the data for each flight was first quintupled by adding and subtracting the mixing ratio and mean age uncertainties. This resulted, for each data point, in the average plus minimum and maximum value for both mixing ratio and AoA. Subsequently 5n (n being the number of data points available for each flight) random samples were drawn (repeat draws possible) with a bootstrap algorithm as in Laube et al., 2013, and a second or third order polynomial again fitted. This procedure was repeated 500 times for each flight resulting in an average mixing ratio and an uncertainty range at each AoA surface. The derived mixing ratios were subsequently used to produce linear regressions over time, including a weighting by the inverse uncertainties of the individual CFC mixing ratios. The bootstrapping algorithm (500 repeat draws, repeat draws possible) was used again to ensure that the derived slope uncertainties were not underestimated and that individual high or low points did not bias the slope estimates.”

With the added explanation we do not feel that an additional figure is required to explain this approach.

Reviewer comment

L134: what does “times inside the stratosphere” mean? Do you mean AoA?

Author response

Yes. “(AoAs)” was added after “times” to clarify this.

Reviewer comment

L174: Given that this line is at the start of a paragraph, I think you need to re-state what each part of the sentence refers to. I.e. a positive trend in what? Explain “all observation based cases”.

Author response

We have altered the sentence from

“While there is substantial variability we do find a positive trend (increases from 3 to 10 %) from 2009 to 2018 in all observation-based cases.”

to

“While there is substantial variability of mixing ratios at these AoA surfaces over time, we do find a positive trend (increases from 3 to 10 %) from 2009 to 2018 for all observation-based (aircraft and AirCore) estimates.”

Reviewer comment

Figure 3: The conclusions drawn from this analysis, namely that there has been no trend, or a positive trend, seems highly dependent on a small number of points in 2009 – 2011. Can the authors comment on this? Are we really confident that the observations can provide strong conclusions about the overall trend, given that there are large periods of these time series with no data (i.e. nothing between 2011 and 2016)? Some softening of the discussion of the observation-based trend would seem warranted to me.

Author response

We agree and have added the following statement to the end of the relevant paragraph:

“However, it should be noted that the limited temporal and spatial coverage of the observation-based and especially the gap between 2011 and 2016 introduces an additional uncertainty that is only partly reflected in the derived slope uncertainties.”

In addition, we would like to point out that the following two statements were already included in the Conclusions:

“In a qualitative sense, and keeping in mind the regional nature of these measurements and the uncertainties related to the calculation of stratospheric transport times, this would point towards increasing mass fluxes of CFC-11 being transported back to the troposphere.”

“However, any further quantification of the stratospheric part of the CFC-11 story is prevented firstly by the non-global and intermittent nature of sufficiently precise observations...”

Reviewer comment

L175: as stated above, having Table S3 in the main text seems important to understand this sentence.

Author response

As outlined in our response to comment 2 by RC1 we have followed this advice.

Reviewer comment

L187: For clarity, I suggest adding: “In contrast, in the stratosphere, we find: : :”

Author response

Done.

Reviewer comment

L195 – 204: I must admit to finding it very challenging to follow this explanation, despite reading over it three or four times. I realise it's a complicated business, but I suggest that the authors re-word, or, better, provide a schematic outlining their argument.

Author response

We feel that a schematic or figure would give too much weight to this small and speculative part of the manuscript. We have however rephrased the explanation to explain the possibility better:

Original paragraph: “The only straight-forward possibility to generate positive CFC-11 trends in the stratosphere between 2009 and 2018 would be an increase in the air fractions that have younger and older residence times than the inferred mean age. If the older air has already lost virtually all of the shorter-lived gases (H-1211 and CFC-11), but not the longer-lived ones (CFC-12 and HCFC-22), then an increase of its share should lead to a decrease of CFC-12 (but not necessarily HCFC-22 which is much longer-lived) without being accompanied by a decrease in H-1211 or CFC-11. To maintain a similar mean age, the younger fraction of the air would also need to have an increased share, leading to generally higher mixing ratios of all gases – and disproportionately so for HCFC-22 as it continues to increase. Such a change to the stratospheric transit time distributions could be considered as the simplest case that would qualitatively explain our observations.”

Changed to: “The only straight-forward possibility to generate positive CFC-11 trends in the stratosphere between 2009 and 2018 would be an increase in the air fractions that have younger and older residence times than the inferred mean age. Such a two-fold increase would maintain the same AoA, but would influence the mixing ratios observed at the AoA surfaces in different ways. If the increased older air fraction had been in the stratosphere for long enough, it would have already lost virtually all of its content of shorter-lived gases (H-1211 and CFC-11). However, if this older air fraction at the same time would be in an AoA range where the longer-lived gases (CFC-12 and HCFC-22) are still present in significant amounts, then an increase in its share should lead to a decrease in CFC-12 and HCFC-22 mixing ratios (but less so for the latter as it is much longer-lived in the stratosphere). To balance this increase in the older air fraction and maintain a constant mean age, the younger fraction of the AoA spectrum would also need to have an increased share. Younger air generally contains higher mixing ratios of all four gases – and disproportionately so for HCFC-22 as its tropospheric mixing ratios continue to increase. If the increases in the two fractions of the AoA spectrum would be in the right AoA range, the overall effect would then be an increase of mixing ratios of CFC-11, H-1211, and HCFC-22 over time at a given AoA surface, accompanied by a decrease in CFC-12 mixing ratios. This would then be entirely consistent with the changes we observed at almost all AoA levels between 2009 and 2018. Therefore such a change to the stratospheric transit time distributions could be considered as the simplest case that would qualitatively explain our observations.”

Reviewer comment

L197: I suggest: “: : : HCFC-22, which is much longer lived in the stratosphere” (it’s shorter lived overall).

Author response

Agreed and done.

Reviewer comment

Section 2.4: I’m sure this highlights my ignorance, but doesn’t it seem counterintuitive to have an increased mass flux from the stratosphere to the troposphere at the same time as an increase in stratospheric CFC-11? Can you add a couple of sentences explaining why this would be?

Author response

An increased mass flux from the stratosphere to the troposphere would likely be accompanied by an increased troposphere-to-stratosphere mass flux. If the latter increase would not go through the main CFC-11 sink region in the tropical lower stratosphere it could happen at the same time as stratospheric mixing ratio increases of CFC-11. One possibility here would be an increased fraction of air reaching the northern hemispheric stratosphere through the Asian Summer Monsoon. The following statement was added to explain this possibility:

“Such a flux increase could be consistent with the observed increases in CFC-11 mixing ratios on AoA surfaces (Section 3.3) if accompanied by an increased fraction of air entering the stratosphere without passing through the main CFC-11 sink region in the lower tropical stratosphere (and instead entering e.g. through the Asian Summer Monsoon).”

Reviewer comment

L230: “ratio”, rather than “ratios”

Author response

Changed, thanks!

Reviewer comment

Figure 4 caption: Specify which direction the flux is in (I think it strat to trop?).

Author response

It is indeed and we have added that.

Response to Anonymous Referee #2 (RC2).

Reviewer comment

This paper is very well written and well referenced. It makes important contributions to; 1) evaluating comparisons of halocarbon measurements from different sampling platforms over a 10 year period, 2) the use of halocarbon measurements to evaluate stratospheric dynamics in a global model using different meteorological reanalyses, and 3) exploring the use of model derived atmospheric dynamics to examine reasons for the reduction in CFC-11 global mixing ratio decreases.

Overall this paper is high quality and should be accepted after addressing the few suggestions noted below.

Author response

We thank the referee for reviewing this manuscript and very much appreciate the constructive suggestions.

Reviewer comment

Line 41: The phrase “allow to gauge” is awkward and should be revised.

Author response

We have changed this to “allow to constrain”.

Reviewer comment

Line 88: This is the first use of AoAs and it should be spelled out.

Author response

“AoA” was changed to “Ages of Air (AoAs, i.e. average stratospheric transit times, see section 3.1 for more details)”.

Reviewer comment

Line 90: Polynomial fit functions of what? I suggest adding in “of AoA vs mixing ratio of each species” or something like that.

Line 93: The bootstrap method isn't explained fully in Laube et al., 2013 so I suggest including Volk et al., 1997 with the Laube et al., 2013 reference here. A bit more explanation would also be helpful.

Author response

The explanation and reference have been added, alongside with an expanded explanation of the methodology, please see our response to RC1 (comment on L90).

Reviewer comment

Line 108: I suggest including a reference to Figures S5 and S6 here.

Author response

Good idea! This has been added.

Reviewer comment

Line 112: I suggest referencing Table S2 for the measurement uncertainties.

Author response

Done. As outlined in our response to comment 2 by RC1 we have also moved Table S2 to the main manuscript.

Reviewer comment

Lines 114-115: The authors state here that Figure 1 illustrates improved temporal density from 2016, which it does, but goes on to say especially at altitudes above 15 km. There is no indication of altitude in Figure 1. As the authors mention, the lower values are from higher altitudes, but there is nothing that says what those altitudes are, and in fact, the values in Figure 1 are not from the highest altitudes: : see next comment re Figure 1.

Figure 1: The mixing ratios for all compounds do not reflect the full range of the combined measurements. The full range for CFC-11 and CFC-12 are seen in Figure 2 and for the other compounds in Figures S1-S4. Please indicate in Figure 1 why this is the case.

Author response

We agree and have modified the caption of Figure 1 to include the relevant information: “For all gases except SF6 some higher altitude data are not shown to better demonstrate the good comparability of near-tropopause data to the NOAA time series. The complete corresponding data including uncertainties can be found in the supplement (see also Figures S1 to S4).”

Reviewer comment

Line 146: The authors state the MERRA-2 based data stands out producing higher transport times at similar stratospheric CFC-11 mixing ratios. It should read “higher mean ages”, rather than higher transport times. As the authors say in line 148, this results from slower transport times.

Author response

Changed, thanks!

Reviewer comment

Line 176: I suggest including Figure S7 in the main text so the readers can see all four years rather than going to the Supplementary section for 2 of the 4 years. Line 1 S12 and S13 Figure captions should be MERRA-2 rather than JRA-55.

Author response

We agree and have implemented the requested changes. Figure S7 is now part of Figure 3.

Reviewer comment

Line 217: 2.5 Mass flux estimates of CFC-11 (this labeled 2.4 in the text)

Author response

This has been adjusted alongside with the restructuring of the section in response to RC1 (comment on the Section 2 heading).

Reviewer comment

Figure 4: What are the “two corresponding time series of tropospheric CFC-11 mixing ratios”? The grey solid line represents the NOAA measurements but it’s not clear what the grey dashed line represents.⁸⁴: Please reference Figures S8-S13 for this discussion.

Author response

The respective statement in the figure caption was modified to “Shown in grey and on the right hand y-axis are the two corresponding time series of tropospheric CFC-11 mixing ratios (i.e. the real one, solid, and the one with the forced decrease, dashed).”

Investigating stratospheric changes between 2009 and 2018 with trace gas data from aircraft, AirCores, and a global model focusing on CFC-11

Johannes C. Laube^{1,2*}, Emma C. Leedham Elvidge^{2,3}, Karina E. Adcock², Bianca Baier^{4,5}, Carl A.M. Brenninkmeijer⁶, Huilin Chen⁷, Elise S. Droste², Jens-Uwe Grooß¹, Pauli Heikkinen⁸, Andrew J. Hind², Rigel Kivi⁸, Alexander Lojko^{2,9}, Stephen A. Montzka⁵, David E. Oram², Steve Randall¹⁰, Thomas Röckmann¹¹, William T. Sturges², Colm Sweeney⁴, Max Thomas², Elinor Tuffnell², and Felix Ploeger^{1,12}

¹Institute of Energy and Climate Research: Stratosphere, Jülich Research Centre, Jülich, 52428, Germany

²School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom

³Faculty of Science, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom

⁴Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado-Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309, USA

⁵Global Monitoring Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, CO 80305-3337, USA

⁶Air Chemistry Division, Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz, 55128, Germany

⁷Center for Isotope Research, University of Groningen, Groningen, 9747 AG, The Netherlands

⁸Finnish Meteorological Institute, Sodankylä, 99600, Finland

⁹Department of Climate and Space Sciences and Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2143, USA

¹⁰Random Engineering Ltd., Felixstowe, IP11 9SL, United Kingdom

¹¹Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, 3508 TA, The Netherlands

¹²Institute for Atmospheric and Environmental Research, University of Wuppertal, Wuppertal, 42119, Germany

Correspondence to: Johannes C. Laube (j.laube@fz-juelich.de)

Abstract. We present new observations of trace gases in the stratosphere based on a cost-effective sampling technique that can access much higher altitudes than aircraft. The further development of this method now provides detection of species with abundances in the parts per trillion (ppt) range and below. We obtain mixing ratios for six gases (CFC-11, CFC-12, HCFC-22, H-1211, H-1301, and SF₆), all of which are important for understanding stratospheric ozone depletion and circulation. After demonstrating the quality of the data through comparisons with ground-based records and aircraft-based observations we combine them with the latter to demonstrate its potential. We first compare it with results from a global model driven by three widely used meteorological reanalyses. Secondly, we focus on CFC-11 as recent evidence has indicated renewed atmospheric emissions of that species relevant on a global scale. Because the stratosphere represents the main sink region for CFC-11,

30 potential changes in stratospheric circulation and troposphere-stratosphere exchange fluxes have been identified as the largest
source of uncertainty for the accurate quantification of such emissions. Our observations span over a decade (up until 2018)
and therefore cover the period of the slowdown of CFC-11 global mixing ratio decreases measured at the Earth's surface. The
spatial and temporal coverage of the observations is insufficient for a global quantitative analysis, but we do find some trends
that are in contrast with expectations; indicating that the stratosphere may have contributed to the slower concentration decline
35 in recent years. Further investigating the reanalysis-driven model data we find that the dynamical changes in the stratosphere
required to explain the apparent change in tropospheric CFC-11 emissions after 2013 are possible, but with a very high
uncertainty range. This is partly caused by the high variability of mass flux from the stratosphere to the troposphere, especially
at time scales of a few years, and partly by large differences between runs driven by different reanalysis products, none of
which agree with our observations well enough for such a quantitative analysis.

40 1 Introduction

Many **halogenated** trace gases are strong greenhouse gases and/or are involved in the ongoing depletion of the ozone layer,
therefore observations of these in the stratosphere are valuable. Moreover, measurements of some of these species allow to
constrain changes in stratospheric circulation and transport across the tropopause. An analytical challenge is posed by the **low**
abundances of many such gases, in combination with the low ambient pressures found in this region of the atmosphere. Another
45 challenge is the ability to reach the stratosphere as even the highest-flying research aircraft can only reach altitudes just above
20 km (Schauffler et al., 2003, von Hobe et al., 2013). **This is modest considering that the stratosphere extends to around 50**
km. Large high altitude balloons can reach altitudes of up to about 36 km (Engel et al., 2009, Ray et al., 2017) but due to the
heavy payloads are increasingly difficult to fly given the risks for people living in landing areas and the cost or risk from lifting
gases such as helium or hydrogen. Satellite (or aircraft) remote sensing plays an important role and can offer a global picture
50 for some gases (Stiller et al., 2008, Santee et al., 2013, Harrison et al., 2019), but measurement precisions and altitude resolution
are often limited. They are also indirect observations and require continued validation through independent *in situ* methods.
Generally, the mentioned platforms are rather expensive, ranging from costs on the order of € 10,000 per flight hour for aircraft,
to satellite costs of millions of Euros. The relatively recently developed AirCore technique (Karion et al., 2010), with flight
costs of below € 2,000 (depending on the setup) offers a cost-effective alternative. AirCores, which were named due to
55 similarities to ice cores extracted from glaciers, are based on the concept of flying a very long lightweight coiled piece of
stainless steel tubing on a weather balloon. The tube is open on one end and therefore empties naturally upon ascent as ambient
pressures decrease. During descent a full vertical profile of air is collected between the balloon's burst altitude (up to 36 km)
and ground level. This technology has been demonstrated before, but for providing measurements of only a handful of higher
abundance trace gases such as CO₂ and CH₄ (Karion et al., 2010, Membrive et al., 2017, Engel et al., 2017) and their isotopic
60 composition (Mrozek et al., 2016, Paul et al., 2016).

However, due to the limited amount of air that is captured by AirCores, no ozone-depleting substances (ODSs) have been investigated yet, as their abundances are well below one part per billion. The importance of such observations is however demonstrated by the following example. The recent work of Montzka et al. (2018) on renewed emissions of CFC-11 has received much attention since it indicates a substantial and ongoing breach of the global treaty designed to prevent the destruction of the stratospheric ozone layer: the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. According to their study, global CFC-11 emissions increased by 13 ± 5 Gg yr⁻¹ when comparing periods before and after 2012 with the caveat that up to 50 % of that derived emission change might actually be attributable to changes in stratospheric processes or dynamics. More recently, Rigby et al., (2019) found similar global increases of 11-17 Gg/year over 2014-2017 vs the 2008-2012 average, and also pinpointed a concurrent emissions increase source of 7.0 ± 3.0 Gg yr⁻¹ to eastern mainland China. However, they found no emission increases in other parts of the world covered by regular ground-based observations. This could mean that some of these emission increases have arisen in regions where no such measurements are available. An alternative explanation, i.e. the possibility of a sustained change to the amount of CFC-11 exchanged between the troposphere and the stratosphere as the driving mechanism for at least a part of the anomaly, has however not been ruled out so far.

2 Methods

Dry air mole fractions of halogenated trace gases were derived from air samples collected on board three different platforms: a passenger aircraft (CARIBIC, Brenninkmeijer et al., 2007) flying at altitudes of 8-13 km (11 flights, 2009-2016), a research aircraft (Leedham Elvidge et al., 2018) accessing higher altitudes of 9-21 km (M55 Geophysika, five campaigns, 2009-2017), and the first measurements of such gases with the relatively recently developed AirCore methodology (Karion et al., 2010, 8-30 km, 15 flights in Finland and the UK, 2016-2018). The aircraft data have partly been published before (Leedham Elvidge et al., 2018, Laube et al., 2013). The balloon-based AirCore technique was developed further mainly through the use of specially-designed tubing that maximises the amounts of air collected in the stratosphere, as well as through a novel subsampling technique that minimises the use of contamination-prone materials. The amount of retrievable stratospheric air is however still more than two orders of magnitude smaller than from aircraft-based sampling techniques. With laboratory analytical improvements compensating for this, the AirCore measurements show good precisions (ranging from 0.2 to 3.3 % compared with 0.4 to 1.1 % for aircraft samples) and excellent agreement with the aircraft data. The other important challenge for AirCore measurements of halocarbons is to ensure that the air is not contaminated throughout the entire sampling and subsampling process. Contaminations can arise from leakages and/or halocarbon-emitting materials (such as organic polymers) in the AirCore itself, in the CO₂-analyser system including the pump, or in the subsampling system. Importantly, for all compounds reported here mixing ratios in the stratosphere are much lower than in even remote tropospheric regions, let alone near sources of these gases. In addition, almost all of the contamination possibilities would affect the entire profile as an AirCore is essentially one air sample. This would become apparent in the correlations of the species with each other, which are very compact in the stratosphere. In the absence of such correlation breakdowns (See Figures 1, 2, and S1 to S4) we

therefore conclude that such contaminations are at undetectable levels in the data set presented here. More details can be found in Table 1 and the supplement.

95 All samples were processed with a previously described analytical system and methodology (Laube et al., 2010 and 2012,) using cryogenic extraction and pre-concentration, followed by gas chromatographic separation and detection with a high-sensitivity mass spectrometer. Trace gas measurements from this system as well as mean Ages of Air (AoAs, i.e. average stratospheric transit times, see section 3.1 for more details) calculated from these have been shown to compare very well with those of other internationally recognised measurements over several decades (Leedham Elvidge et al., 2018, Laube et al., 2013, 100 Trudinger et al., 2016).

Table 1. Comparison of average measurement uncertainties (derived as the average one standard deviation from repeated working standard or air sample measurements) of the research aircraft campaign in 2016, all AirCore flights, and some AirCore sample repeats for CFC-11, CFC-12, H-1211, H-1301, HCFC-22, and SF₆. For AirCore uncertainties the average working standard uncertainty over three years was used as it is a) more representative of the entire measurement period and b) generally comparable or worse than precisions derived from sample repeats. AirCore-based precisions are generally slightly worse than those achieved with the larger aircraft-based samples, but still much smaller than mixing ratio gradients observed in the stratosphere.

Trace Gas / Average precision [%]	Aircraft 2016	AirCore 2016-18 Standards	AirCore 2017 Sample repeats
CFC-11 (CFCl ₃)	0.4	0.9	1.2
CFC-12 (CF ₂ Cl ₂)	1.1	1.2	0.8
H-1211 (CF ₂ ClBr)	0.6	1.9	1.0
H-1301 (CF ₃ Br)	0.6	3.3	2.3
HCFC-22 (CHF ₂ Cl)	0.6	0.9	0.2
SF ₆	0.4	0.9	0.6

110 Stratospheric trends at AoA surfaces were derived by fitting second- and third-order polynomials (depending on whether an inflexion point was observed) to the respective correlations of mixing ratios and AoAs. The formulas of the polynomials were then used to interpolate onto the AoA surfaces (1, 2, 3, and/or 4 years, depending on which AoA range was covered) for each flight. To test the uncertainty of this method, the data for each flight was first quintupled by adding and subtracting the mixing ratio and mean age uncertainties. This resulted, for each data point, in the average plus minimum and maximum value for both 115 mixing ratio and AoA. Subsequently 5n (n being the number of data points available for each flight) random samples were

drawn (repeat draws possible) with a bootstrap algorithm (as in Volk et al., 1997 and Laube et al., 2013), and a second or third order polynomial again fitted. This procedure was repeated 500 times for each flight resulting in an average mixing ratio and an uncertainty range at each AoA surface. The derived mixing ratios were subsequently used to produce linear regressions over time, including a weighting by the inverse uncertainties of the individual CFC mixing ratios. The bootstrapping algorithm (500 repeat draws, repeat draws possible) was used again to ensure that the derived slope uncertainties were not underestimated and that individual high or low points did not bias the slope estimates.

Observation-based data were compared to model output from the Chemical Lagrangian Model of the Stratosphere (CLaMS), a Lagrangian chemical transport model with advective transport calculated from three-dimensional forward trajectories and an additional parameterisation for small-scale turbulent mixing (McKenna et al., 2002). Potential temperature is used as vertical coordinate throughout the stratosphere with vertical velocity estimated from the total diabatic heating rate. Further model details and the chemistry scheme used are described in Pommrich et al. (2014). For the simulations used in this study CLaMS was driven with horizontal winds and diabatic heating rates from three alternative meteorological reanalysis data sets: ERA-Interim (from European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, ECMWF), JRA-55 (from Japan Meteorological Agency), and MERRA-2 (from NASA). For more information on methods, calibrations, and modelling as well as additional data please see the Supplementary Information.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Observational data overview and comparisons

Our data are based on measurements of air samples collected in the upper troposphere and stratosphere of the northern hemisphere using aircraft and weather balloons between 2009 and 2018. Figure 1 shows the obtained mixing ratios alongside the northern hemispheric ‘background’ time series derived through the combination of observations at various ground-based stations within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Global Monitoring Division’s Global Greenhouse Gas Reference Network (NOAA/GMD GGGRN). It is apparent that both the aircraft and the balloon data follow the ground-based trends quite well for all six gases. Slightly enhanced mixing ratios can often be observed in the vicinity of the tropopause (see also Figures S5 and S6), mostly due to recent influences from regional emissions (Kloss et al., 2014, Leedham Elvidge et al., 2015, Oram et al., 2017). This is especially pronounced in the research aircraft data from 2017, which belong to a campaign (Höpfner et al., 2019) exploring the atmospheric composition above the polluted Asian Monsoon region (Randel et al., 2010, Vogel et al., 2019). It is however worth noting that most species’ enhancements are not significantly higher than the combined measurement uncertainties, which demonstrates the importance of the consistency of the data sets and therefore the quality of the stratospheric record. Figure 1 also illustrates the much improved temporal density that AirCore observations have provided from 2016 onwards (in comparison to aircraft campaigns), especially at altitudes above 15 km which are out of the reach of all but a few research aircraft.




Figure 1. Aircraft- and balloon-based mixing ratios of six halogenated trace gases in the upper troposphere and stratosphere as compared to the NOAA/GMD ground-based northern hemispheric GGGRN time series (<https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/>). HCFC-22 has a significant sink process in the troposphere and therefore exhibits stronger inner-hemispheric gradients. To illustrate that, we compare against the mid-latitude station at Mace Head, Ireland and the subtropical station at Mauna Loa, Hawaii. Lower mixing ratios generally represent higher altitudes. For all gases except SF₆ some higher altitude data are not shown to better demonstrate the good comparability of near-tropopause data to the NOAA time series. The complete corresponding data including uncertainties can be found in the supplement (see also Figures S1 to S4).

In the stratosphere trace gases typically exhibit compact interspecies correlations (Schauffler et al., 2003, Volk et al, 1997), and some gases (such as SF₆) can be utilised to derive average stratospheric transit times, which are more commonly known as mean Ages of Air (AoA; Engel et al., 2009, Ray et al., 2017, Stiller et al., 2008, Leedham Elvidge et al., 2018). The correlations between CFC-11 and CFC-12 as well as between CFC-11 and AoA derived from observations (see S1.2 for details) are shown in Figure 2. Two things are apparent: firstly, this again demonstrates the consistency and quality of our data as similar correlations are observed for both aircraft- and AirCore-based mixing ratios over the entire range. Secondly, the correlations have not undergone a large shift in the last ten years. Correlations between trace gases are often driven by changes in tropospheric trends, as tropospheric air keeps “feeding” the stratosphere. A large shift in these correlations would therefore not be expected as both CFC-11 and CFC-12 have experienced relatively small negative tropospheric trends in recent years (Montzka et al., 2018, Rigby et al., 2019). However, there are other factors that can change the correlations, namely changes in stratospheric chemistry and transport. The CFC-11-AoA correlation in particular would be affected if e.g. the main transport pathways and or times (AoAs) inside the stratosphere had changed. This possibility is investigated further below.

3.2 Comparisons with model data using different reanalyses

We first focus on a comparison of model simulations with the aircraft and AirCore data. Also shown in Figure 2 are data from simulations with the Chemical Lagrangian Model of the Stratosphere (CLaMS, McKenna et al., 2002, Pommrich et al., 2014). The latter was driven alternatively by three commonly used meteorological reanalyses, i.e. ERA-Interim, JRA-55, and MERRA-2 (Dee et al., 2011, Kobayashi et al., 2015, Gelaro et al., 2017). These newest available meteorological reanalysis datasets provide the best guess of the current state of the atmosphere. We use the differences between them to quantify the uncertainty in our knowledge of the stratospheric circulation and its changes. The model was sampled at coordinates and times coinciding with those of the observations. Results from all three runs are similar to those from observations in the case of the correlation of CFC-11 with CFC-12. The CFC-11-AoA correlation in Figure 2 is a measure of the speed of the main stratospheric overturning circulation as it reflects, in an integrated way, the speed and pathway of trace gas transport through the stratosphere. Here, the model data for both ERA-Interim and JRA-55 remain close to the observed values throughout the range. The MERRA-2-based data does however stand out producing higher AoAs at similar stratospheric CFC-11 mixing ratios and an increasing discrepancy with increasing AoA. As noted by Ploeger et al. (2019) the MERRA-2 reanalysis has a slower stratospheric circulation, and our observational evidence strongly indicates that it is indeed too slow. This is a consistent feature, which is also apparent when comparing with MERRA-2-based data from before 2016 (not shown in Figure 2). The details of the causing mechanisms could be complex and are beyond the scope of this work.




Figure 2. Stratospheric CFC-12 mixing ratios and the mean age of air (AoA) as a function of CFC-11 mixing ratios, as observed in air samples collected by research aircraft (diamonds) and AirCores (circles). Crosses denote the values obtained from the CLaMS model sampled at the same times and coordinates as the observations, but for better visibility only from 2016 onwards. The CLaMS model was run using three different meteorological reanalysis packages: ERA-Interim (black), JRA-55 (blue), and MERRA-2 (red).

3.3 Long-term trends of trace gases in the stratosphere

Focusing on the details of the correlations in Figure 2, we investigate whether there are indications here that might partly explain the recent changes in the tropospheric trend of CFC-11. Most air enters the stratosphere in the tropics and is then transported poleward. CFC-11 and CFC-12 molecules are mostly destroyed in the tropical stratosphere (Douglass et al., 2008). Transport of the remainder of these gases to the poles is much slower than in the troposphere, and takes several years (Kida, 1983, Schmidt and Khedim, 1991) as is reflected in the CFC-11-AoA correlation in Figure 2. In case of an acceleration of parts of the circulation, for which there have been observational indications (Bönisch et al., 2011, Stiller et al., 2012), that correlation should therefore shift. We consequently fitted the CFC-11-AoA correlation with a second or third order polynomial for each individual research aircraft and balloon flight and calculated the mixing ratio of CFC-11 after having spent, on average, one, two, three and four years in the stratosphere. Figure 3 shows examples of the trends at the four residence times from 2009 to 2018, and the full data can be found in the supplement.




Figure 3. The left panel shows a comparison of observation-based CFC-11 mixing ratio trends at mean ages of air of two (blue) and four (red) years with those from the CLaMS model run driven by the ERA-Interim reanalysis (grey and yellow) in the northern hemisphere stratosphere. The latter have been derived as averages between 30 and 90 °N. The dashed and dotted lines correspond to regression lines (weighted by their one σ standard error for observations) and an illustration of their two σ uncertainties over the

time periods displayed. The right panel shows the same comparison, but at mean ages of one and three years. The numerical values can be found in Table 2.

While there is substantial variability of mixing ratios at these AoA surfaces over time, we do find a positive trend (increases from 3 to 10 %) from 2009 to 2018 for all observation-based (aircraft and AirCore) estimates. The trends at an AoA of one and four years are not significantly positive, but the ones at two and three years are; within 2.0 and 1.6 standard deviations of the slope uncertainties respectively (Figure 3, Table 2). These stratospheric trends contrast the tropospheric trend of CFC-11 which has been negative throughout that period (~-6% in total, Figure 1). While there is a certain lag time for air to reach our stratospheric observation points (i.e. 1, 2, 3, and 4 years on average), CFC-11 had been decreasing nearly linearly in the troposphere since the late 1990s. In turn this implies that changes in stratospheric circulation may indeed have played a substantial role in the recent changes to the tropospheric trend of CFC-11 as previously suspected (Montzka et al., 2018). The causes are not explicable with an integrated quantity such as AoA as the underlying distribution of stratospheric transit times cannot currently be inferred from trace gas observations. However, it should be noted that the limited temporal and spatial coverage of the observation-based and especially the gap between 2011 and 2016 introduces an additional uncertainty that is only partly reflected in the derived slope uncertainties.

Table 2. Temporal trends and their two σ uncertainties of CFC-11, CFC-12, HCFC-22, and H-1211 mixing ratios at AoAs of one, two, three, and four years. These slopes correspond to an uncertainty-weighted regression line fitted to the data in Figures 3, and S8-S12, with two exceptions: 1) The data from the Asian Monsoon campaign in 2017 was excluded as this region is not representative of NH stratospheric air and 2) all data at mean ages above 3.5 years from winter campaigns in high latitudes was also excluded as it might contain polar vortex air, which is equally unrepresentative. Model-based slopes were derived over the same period as observational data (2009.8-2018.8), except for JRA-55 and MERRA-2, where data was only available until the end of 2017.

CFC-11/AoA	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years
Slope obs (ppt/year)	0.69	1.77	1.25	0.59
Uncertainty (ppt/year)	1.54	1.81	1.60	2.12
Trend (%/decade)	3.2	10.4	10.2	7.4
Slope ERA-I	-1.35	-0.50	1.15	3.09
Uncertainty	0.22	0.24	0.47	0.61
Slope JRA-55	-1.56	-1.38	-0.08	1.73
Uncertainty	0.21	0.20	0.27	0.62
Slope MERRA-2	-1.69	-1.51	-1.20	-0.55
Uncertainty	0.18	0.23	0.23	0.30

CFC-12				
Slope obs (ppt/year)	-1.96	-0.45	-0.38	-1.33
Uncertainty (ppt/year)	1.90	2.20	2.52	5.36
Trend (%/decade)	-3.6	-0.95	-0.93	-3.9
Slope ERA-I	-3.09	-2.52	-1.52	3.21
Uncertainty	0.37	0.48	0.62	1.20
Slope JRA-55	-3.17	-3.09	-1.37	2.39
Uncertainty	0.28	0.41	0.60	1.08
Slope MERRA-2	-3.26	-3.17	-3.02	-2.40
Uncertainty	0.24	0.39	0.51	0.76
HCFC-22				
Slope obs (ppt/year)	6.15	6.16	5.98	5.67
Uncertainty (ppt/year)	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.18
Trend (%/decade)	30.5	33.4	36.0	38.2
H-1211				
Slope obs (ppt/year)	-0.031	0.000	0.013	0.013
Uncertainty (ppt/year)	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.009
Trend (%/decade)	-9.0	0.2	9.1	22.4

230 For the other three gases that have sufficient measurement precisions for such an analysis (i.e. CFC-12, H-1211, and HCFC-22), we also find a picture that does not agree well with their tropospheric trends (Table 2). Both CFC-12 and H-1211 have been in decline in the troposphere since the mid-2000s and decreased by ~6 and ~20 % respectively between late 2009 and late 2018 (Figure 1); whereas tropospheric HCFC-22 mixing ratios have increased monotonously (and by ~25 % during our observation period) since its appearance in the atmosphere several decades ago, albeit with a recent slowdown. In contrast, in

235 the stratosphere, we find that CFC-12 decreased at all mean age surfaces, but not as much as in the troposphere (-0.9 to -4 %), HCFC-22 increased disproportionally by 30 to 38 %, and H-1211 decreased, but only at a mean age of one year (-9 %), while no significant change occurred at 2 years, and 9 to 22 % increases were observed at 3 and 4 years. For the latter three gases this unexpected behaviour could be partly related to changes in tropospheric trends in the period leading up to 2009, as a significant part of the air at certain mean age levels is much older than the mean age itself. However, these effects should

240 subside over the decade that our observations span, especially for H-1211, which is the shortest-lived gas of the four. In

addition, CFC-11 should not be affected as it has been decreasing for much longer. The underlying mechanisms are likely complex.

245 The only straight-forward possibility to generate positive CFC-11 trends in the stratosphere between 2009 and 2018 would be an increase in the air fractions that have younger and older residence times than the inferred mean age. Such a two-fold increase would maintain the same AoA, but would influence the mixing ratios observed at the AoA surfaces in different ways. If the increased older air fraction had been in the stratosphere for long enough, it would have already lost virtually all of its content of shorter-lived gases (H-1211 and CFC-11). However, if this older air fraction at the same time would be in an AoA range where the longer-lived gases (CFC-12 and HCFC-22) are still present in significant amounts, then an increase in its share should lead to a decrease in CFC-12 and HCFC-22 mixing ratios (but less so for the latter as it is much longer-lived in the stratosphere). To balance this increase in the older air fraction and maintain a constant mean age, the younger fraction of the AoA spectrum would also need to have an increased share. Younger air generally contains higher mixing ratios of all four gases – and disproportionally so for HCFC-22 as its tropospheric mixing ratios continue to increase. If the increases in the two fractions of the AoA spectrum would be in the right AoA range, the overall effect would then be an increase of mixing ratios of CFC-11, H-1211, and HCFC-22 over time at a given AoA surface, accompanied by a decrease in CFC-12 mixing ratios. 255 This would then be entirely consistent with the changes we observed at almost all AoA levels between 2009 and 2018. Therefore such a change to the stratospheric transit time distributions could be considered as the simplest case that would qualitatively explain our observations.

The aforementioned possibility to at least partly explain such trends could include an acceleration of air mass transport through the lower tropical stratosphere (i.e. below the main sink region of CFC-11) as for example CLaMS-ERA-Interim qualitatively 260 shows over the relevant period (Figure S15). However, when compared with ERA-Interim-based model data at the same transport times (Figure 3), the model results show a different CFC-11 trend in the lower stratosphere. In fact the model- and observation-based trends at mean ages of one and two years do not agree within two standard deviations. This discrepancy is likely related to a known problem with ERA-Interim, which generally overestimates the speed of the circulation in that lower stratospheric region (Dee et al., 2011, Ploeger et al., 2012). At larger mean ages we find better agreement between the 265 observations and the model with the model data even reproducing the observed insignificant trend. JRA-55-based model trends are very similar to those from the ERA-Interim-based analysis whereas the MERRA-2 reanalysis shows larger differences to observations, both in terms of mixing ratios and trends (Table 2, Figures 3 and S8-S12). The generally limited comparability of model and observations sheds some light on the ability of current reanalysis products to quantify structural changes in stratospheric circulation patterns.


270 3.4 Mass flux estimates of CFC-11

Nevertheless we use the reanalysis-driven model data as the best available means to derive the downward mass flux of CFC-11 through the extra-tropical tropopause, i.e. the quantity describing how much CFC-11 is transported back to the troposphere.

Comparing the three simulations driven with three different reanalyses provides an estimate of uncertainty due to representations of stratospheric circulation changes. A temporal increase of the stratosphere-to-troposphere mass flux could cause changes to the tropospheric trend of CFC-11, which would look like renewed emissions. Such a flux increase could be consistent with the observed increases in CFC-11 mixing ratios on AoA surfaces (Section 3.3) if accompanied by an increased fraction of air entering the stratosphere without passing through the main CFC-11 sink region in the lower tropical stratosphere (and instead entering e.g. through the Asian Summer Monsoon).

The NOAA/GMD tropospheric time series of CFC-11 serves as the boundary condition to the model, and consequently in the absence of stratospheric changes the temporal trend of the mass flux should be similarly negative and of a similar magnitude. The model generally reflects this reasoning over longer time periods as can be seen in Figure 4. We then follow the approach of Montzka et al. (2018) to investigate whether the changes to the tropospheric trend around 2013 might partly be caused by more CFC-11 being transported back into the troposphere. For that purpose we split the data into two periods, before and after 2013. Independent on which definition of the tropopause is being used (see supplement for details), we find an increase in the mass flux of around 37 Gg/year after 2013 for CLaMS-ERA-Interim. This would explain 270 % of the observed slowdown of CFC-11 mixing ratio decreases after 2013 when comparing to the 13 ± 5 Gg/year emission increase inferred by Montzka et al. (2018). At first glance, this very high stratospheric contribution is not consistent with the findings of both Montzka et al (2018) and Rigby et al. (2019), who estimated 40-60 % of the slowdown to belong to renewed emissions. However, the global stratosphere-to-troposphere mass flux is very large compared to the amount of unexplained emissions and a direct quantitative comparison is not possible, as explained in the following. When repeating the same model run, but with an artificial tropospheric CFC-11 trend that continues to decrease linearly after 2013 the mass flux remains very similar to the reference simulation (difference of < 0.6 Gg/year). This translates into a minor influence of recent tropospheric trend changes on these stratospheric fluxes therefore confirming that this signal is indeed driven by stratospheric changes in the ERA-Interim world. However, this pronounced turnaround in 2013 is not a consistent feature for all three reanalyses, as the JRA-55 run, despite producing such a similar picture in the correlation comparisons (Figure 2), in fact shows a further decrease of 0.4 Gg/year (equivalent to -3 % of the new emissions signal) after 2013. The main reason for that discrepancy is that, as opposed to ERA-Interim, JRA-55 does not show a substantial change to the mass flux around 2013. Coming back to the pre- and post-2013 analysis, CLaMS-MERRA-2 results are in between the other two with 18.2 Gg/year (135 %), but have the least credibility as demonstrated by the poor comparability with observations. The main issue connected with such an analysis is illustrated in Figure 4. With annual changes of up to 21 % the variability of the CFC-11 mass flux from the stratosphere to the troposphere is an order of magnitude higher than the 2013 change of 2-5 % that we are trying to quantify. Some of that mass flux variability occurs over several years, which severely limits the capability of quantitatively determining trend changes between an eleven- and a five-year period. It should however be reemphasised that a mass flux trend analysis over longer periods would be expected to work better and this is indeed what we find for ERA-Interim and JRA-55. Between 2002 and 2017 the CFC-11 flux from a linear regression of the model output driven by these two reanalyses decreases by 10.5 and 13.1 % respectively, which is comparable to the ~11 % tropospheric decrease over the same period. MERRA-2 again produces an outlier with only

a 3.2 % decrease during those 16 years. The recent findings of Ray et al. (2020) of the QBO significantly modulating the variability of long-lived trace gases at the surface are qualitatively consistent with our findings for both shorter and longer periods. However, a quantification of this modulation is currently limited by the uncertainties connected to the meteorological reanalyses in the stratosphere. As shown in Figure 4 the mass fluxes from the three CLaMS-reanalysis runs show some covariation on QBO time scales, but at the same time also some significant differences which include offsets, long-term trends, the magnitude of the variations, and the timing of changes.



315 **Figure 4.** The annually averaged **stratosphere-to-troposphere** mass flux of CFC-11 through the tropopause between 2002 and 2018 for CLaMS model runs driven by MERRA-2 (green), JRA-55 (blue) and ERA-Interim (black) reanalyses including a linear

regression for the period until 2013 (dashed). The red line originates from an ERA-Interim sensitivity run for which tropospheric CFC-11 was forced to continue to decrease at the same rate as before 2013. Shown in grey and on the right hand y-axis are the two corresponding time series of tropospheric CFC-11 mixing ratios (i.e. the real one, solid, and the one with the forced decrease, dashed).

320 The annual average has been calculated by applying a 12 month running mean to the time series.

4 Conclusions

To summarise, we present new observations of six halogenated trace gases in the stratosphere obtained from applying a further developed AirCore technology. These observations are consistent with ground-based measurements of the same species at remote locations. They compare well to aircraft-based observations, have good precisions, and offer a viable, low-cost method for directly observing ozone-depleting gases and circulation tracers in the stratosphere at enhanced temporal and spatial resolution. The derived mixing ratios and mean stratospheric residence times both from aircraft and AirCore data enable the assessment of the performance of the three most modern currently available meteorological reanalysis packages. The ERA-Interim- and JRA-55-derived model data compare better whereas the MERRA-2-based data exhibits distinctly slower transport through most of the region covered here.

330 From a further analysis of the observational data at certain stratospheric transport times we also find insignificant to positive trends (within one standard deviation) of CFC-11 mixing ratios in the lower stratosphere between 2009 and 2018 ranging from 3 to 10 %. This is surprising and in contrast to expectation from the tropospheric abundances, which have been decreasing by about 6 % over that period. Similarly derived trends for CFC-12, HCFC-22, and H-1211 are also not in good agreement with their corresponding tropospheric trends. In a qualitative sense, and keeping in mind the regional nature of these measurements and the uncertainties related to the calculation of stratospheric transport times, this would point towards increasing mass fluxes of CFC-11 being transported back to the troposphere. Our observations therefore do support the hypothesis of new emissions being lower than expected from tropospheric trends alone. More generally this is evidence towards a significant and time-dependent role of the stratosphere in the modulation of tropospheric trends of trace gases. However, any further quantification of the stratospheric part of the CFC-11 story is prevented firstly by the non-global and intermittent nature of sufficiently precise observations as well as their limited comparability to model/reanalysis results; secondly by the variability of the CFC-11 stratosphere-to-troposphere mass flux influenced by e.g. QBO, ENSO, volcanic eruptions and also stratospheric transport changes as indicated by the observed trace gas trends on AoA surfaces; and thirdly by the large differences between results from different current meteorological reanalyses; with the quality of the latter currently being the main limitation to refining such calculations.

345 Finally, our observations span ten years, which is a short time in comparison to the long-term climate-change driven stratospheric circulation changes expected from global models, which are on the order of decades (Polvani et al., 2018). Our data however demonstrate the capabilities of the AirCore observations to increase data coverage and better constrain such changes on various time scales.

350 *Data availability.* Observational data are included in the Supplement and the CLaMS model data may be requested from the corresponding author.

Author contributions. J. C. L. conducted the analysis of the overall data set, participated in several campaigns, carried out some of the measurements, and led the writing of the manuscript. E. C. L. E., B. B., H. C., E. S. D., P. H., R. K., A. J. H., A. L., S.
355 R., C. S., M. T., E. T., and W. T. S. contributed to the design of the AirCore and subsampling equipment and the various balloon campaigns with E. C. L. E., E. S. D., and E. T. also involved in the halocarbon measurements and data analysis. C. A. M. B. and D. E. O. were responsible for the CARIBIC and T. R. for the Geophysika aircraft measurement and sampling equipment and related discussions. S. A. M. provided NOAA NH time series and useful respective insights, whereas J.-U. G. and F. P. led the modelling analysis. All authors contributed to the writing process of the manuscript scientific discussions
360 surrounding that.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Acknowledgements. This work was funded by the ERC project EXC3ITE (EXC3ITE-678904-ERC-2015-STG). Johannes C.
365 Laube also received funding from the UK Natural Environment Research Council (Research Fellowship NE/I021918/1) and David E. Oram from the National Centre for Atmospheric Science. We gratefully acknowledge the computing time for the CLaMS simulations granted on the supercomputer JURECA at Jülich Supercomputing Centre (JSC) under the VSR project ID JICG11. Felix Ploeger was funded by the Helmholtz Association (Helmholtz Young Investigators Group A-SPECi, grant number VH-NG-1128). Karina Adcock was funded by the UK Natural Environment Research Council through the EnvEast
370 Doctoral Training Partnership (grant number NE/L002582/1). We thank all who helped with the balloon launches in Finland and the UK, the numerous NOAA station personnel and site scientists for sample flask collection and measurement, Michel Bolder for collecting the Geophysika air samples and acknowledge the work of the Geophysika aircraft team. Related funding came from ESA (PremierEx and FRM4GHG projects), the Forschungszentrum Jülich, the European Commission (FP7 projects RECONCILE-226365-FP7-ENV-2008-1 and StratoClim-603557-FP7-ENV-2013-two-stage, and H2020 project RINGO) and
375 the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO; grant number 865.07.001). We further thank Paul Konopka for carrying out some of the CLaMS simulations used here, Jörn Ungermann for help with code translations, and Rolf Müller for useful discussions.

References

Bönisch, H., Engel, A., Birner, Th., Hoor, P., Tarasick, D. W., and Ray, E. A.: On the structural changes in the Brewer–Dobson circulation after 2000, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3937–3948, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-3937-2011>, 2011.

- 380 Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Crutzen, P., Boumard, F., Dauer, T., Dix, B., Ebinghaus, R., Filippi, D., Fischer, H., Franke, H., Frieß, U., Heintzenberg, J., Helleis, F., Hermann, M., Kock, H. H., Koeppel, C., Lelieveld, J., Leuenberger, M., Martinsson, B. G., Miemczyk, S., Moret, H. P., Nguyen, H. N., Nyfeler, P., Oram, D., O’Sullivan, D., Penkett, S., Platt, U., Pupek, M., Ramonet, M., Randa, B., Reichelt, M., Rhee, T. S., Rohwer, J., Rosenfeld, K., Scharffe, D., Schlager, H., Schumann, U., Slemr, F., Sprung, D., Stock, P., Thaler, R., Valentino, F., van Velthoven, P., Waibel, A., Wandel, A., Waschitschek, K., Wiedensohler, A., Xueref-Remy, I., Zahn, A., Zech, U., and Ziereis, H.: Civil Aircraft for the regular investigation of the atmosphere based on an instrumented container: The new CARIBIC system, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 4953–4976, doi:10.5194/acp-7-4953-2007, 2007.
- 385 Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E. V., Isaksen, I., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, *Q. J. Roy Meteor. Soc.*, 137, 553–597, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828>, 2011.
- 390 Douglass, A. R., Stolarski, R. S., Schoeberl, M. R., Jackman, C. H., Gupta, M. L., Newman, P. A., Nielsen, J. E., and Fleming, E. L.: Relationship of loss, mean age of air and the distribution of CFCs to stratospheric circulation and implications for atmospheric lifetimes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D14309, doi:10.1029/2007JD009575, 2008.
- Engel, A., Mobius, T., Bönisch, H., Schmidt, U., Heinz, R., Levin, I., Atlas, E., Aoki, S., Nakazawa, T., Sugawara, S., Moore, F., Hurst, D., Elkins, J., Schauffler, S., Andrews, A., and Boering, K.: Age of stratospheric air unchanged within uncertainties over the past 30 years, *Nat. Geosci.*, 2, 28–31, doi:10.1038/Ngeo388, 2009.
- 400 Engel, A., Bönisch, H., Ullrich, M., Sitals, R., Membrive, O., Danis, F., and Crevoisier, C.: Mean age of stratospheric air derived from AirCore observations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 6825–6838, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-6825-2017>, 2017.
- Gelaro, R., McCarty, W., Suárez, M. J., Todling, R., Molod, A., Takacs, L., Randles, C. A., Darmenov, A., Bosilovich, M. G., Reichle, R., Wargan, K., Coy, L., Cullather, R., Draper, C., Akella, S., Buchard, V., Conaty, A., da Silva, A. M., Gu, W., Kim, G.-K., Koster, R., Lucchesi, R., Merkova, D., Nielsen, J. E., Partyka, G., Pawson, S., Putman, W., Rienecker, M., Schubert, S. D., Sienkiewicz, M., and Zhao, B.: The Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for Research and Applications, Version 2 (MERRA-2), *J. Climate*, 30, 5419–5454, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-16-0758.1>, 2017.
- 405 Harrison, J. J., Chipperfield, M. P., Hossaini, R., Boone, C. D., Dhomse, S., Feng, W., & Bernath, P. F.: Phosgene in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere: A marker for product gas injection due to chlorine-containing very short lived Substances, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 46, 1032–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079784>, 2019.

- 410 Höpfner, M., Ungermann, J., Borrmann, S., Wagner, R., Spang, R., Riese, M., Stiller, G., Appel, O., Batenburg, A. M., Bucci, S., Cairo, F., Dragoneas, A., Friedl-Vallon, F., Hünig, A., Johansson, S., Krasauskas, L., Legras, B., Leisner, T., Mahnke, C., Möhler, O., Molleker, S., Müller, R., Neubert, T., Orphal, J., Preusse, P., Rex, M., Saathoff, H., Strohm, F., Weigel, R., and Wohltmann, I.: Ammonium nitrate particles formed in upper troposphere from ground ammonia sources during Asian monsoons, *Nat. Geosci.*, 12, 608–612, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0385-8>, 2019.
- 415 Karion, A., Sweeney, C., Tans, P., and Newberger, T.: AirCore: An Innovative Atmospheric Sampling System, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 27, 1839–1853, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JTECHA1448.1>, 2010.
- Kida, H.: General-Circulation of Air Parcels and Transport Characteristics Derived from a Hemispheric Gcm, 2. Very Long-Term Motions of Air Parcels in the Troposphere and Stratosphere, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.* 61, 510–523, 1983.
- Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Harada, Y., Ebata, A., Moriya, M., Onoda, H., Onogi, K., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H.,
420 Miyaoka, K., and Takahashi, K.: The JRA-55 Reanalysis: General Specifications and Basic Characteristics, *J. Meteorol. Soc. Jpn.*, 93, 5–48, <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2015-001>, 2015.
- Kloss, C., Newland, M. J., Oram, D. E., Fraser, P. J., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Röckmann, T., and Laube, J. C.: Atmospheric abundances, trends and emissions of CFC-216ba, CFC-216ca and HCFC-225ca, *Atmosphere*, 5, 420–434, 2014.
- Laube, J. C., Martinerie, P., Witrant, E., Blunier, T., Schwander, J., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Schuck, T. J., Bolder, M.,
425 Röckmann, T., van der Veen, C., Bönisch, H., Engel, A., Mills, G. P., Newland, M. J., Oram, D. E., Reeves, C. E., and Sturges, W. T.: Accelerating growth of HFC-227ea (1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropane) in the atmosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 5903–5910, doi:10.5194/acp-10-5903-2010, 2010.
- Laube, J. C., Hogan, C., Newland, M. J., Mani, F. S., Fraser, P. J., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Martinerie, P., Oram, D. E.,
430 Röckmann, T., Schwander, J., Witrant, E., Mills, G. P., Reeves, C. E., and Sturges, W. T.: Distributions, long term trends and emissions of four perfluorocarbons in remote parts of the atmosphere and firm air, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 4081–4090, doi:10.5194/acp-12-4081-2012, 2012.
- Laube, J. C., Keil, A., Bönisch, H., Engel, A., Röckmann, T., Volk, C. M., and Sturges, W. T.: Observation-based assessment of stratospheric fractional release, lifetimes, and ozone depletion potentials of ten important source gases, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 2779–2791, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-2779-2013>, 2013.
- 435 Leedham Elvidge, E. C., Oram, D. E., Laube, J. C., Baker, A. K., Montzka, S. A., Humphrey, S., O’Sullivan, D. A., and Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M.: Increasing concentrations of dichloromethane, CH₂Cl₂, inferred from CARIBIC air samples collected 1998–2012, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 1939–1958, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-1939-2015>, 2015.
- Leedham Elvidge, E., Bönisch, H., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Engel, A., Fraser, P. J., Gallacher, E., Langenfelds, R., Mühle, J., Oram, D. E., Ray, E. A., Ridley, A. R., Röckmann, T., Sturges, W. T., Weiss, R. F., and Laube, J. C.: Evaluation of
440 stratospheric age of air from CF₄, C₂F₆, C₃F₈, CHF₃, HFC-125, HFC-227ea and SF₆; implications for the calculations of

- halocarbon lifetimes, fractional release factors and ozone depletion potentials, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 3369–3385, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-3369-2018>, <https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/18/3369/2018/>, 2018.
- McKenna, D. S., Konopka, P., Groö, J.-U., Günther, G., Müller, R., Spang, R., Offermann, D., and Orsolini, Y.: A new Chemical Lagrangian Model of the Stratosphere (CLaMS): 1. Formulation of advection and mixing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 4309, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JD000114>, 2002
- Membrive, O. et al. AirCore-HR: A high resolution column sampling to enhance the vertical description of CH₄ and CO₂. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 10, 2163–2181 (2017).
- Montzka, S. A., Dutton, R., Yu, P., Ray, E., Portmann, R. W., Daniel, J. S., Kuijpers, L., Hall, B. D., Mondeel, D., Siso, C., Nance, D. J., Rigby, M., Manning, A. J., Hu, L., Moore, F., Miller, B. R., Elkins, J. W.: A persistent and unexpected increase in global emissions of ozone-depleting CFC-11, *Nature*, 557, 413–417, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0106-2>, 2018.
- Mrozek, D. J., van der Veen, C., Hofmann, M. E. G., Chen, H., Kivi, R., Heikkinen, P., and Röckmann, T.: Stratospheric Air Sub-sampler (SAS) and its application to analysis of ¹⁷O(CO₂) from small air samples collected with an AirCore, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 5607–5620, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-9-5607-2016>, 2016.
- Oram, D. E., Ashfold, M., Laube, J. C., Gooch, L., Humphrey, S., Sturges, W., Leedham Elvidge, E., Forster, G., Harris, N., and Mead, M.: A growing threat to the ozone layer from short-lived anthropogenic chlorocarbons, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 11929–11941, 2017. Paul, D. et al. Radiocarbon analysis of stratospheric CO₂ retrieved from AirCore sampling. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* 9, 4997–500, 2016.
- Paul, D., Chen, H., Been, H. A., Kivi, R., and Meijer, H. A. J.: Radiocarbon analysis of stratospheric CO₂ retrieved from AirCore sampling, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 4997–5006, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-9-4997-2016>, 2016.
- Ploeger, F., Konopka, P., Müller, R., Fueglistaler, S., Schmidt, T., Manners, J., Grooss, J.-U., Günther, G., de Forster, P. M., and Riese, M.: Horizontal transport affecting trace gas seasonality in the Tropical Tropopause Layer (TTL), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D09303, doi:10.1029/2011JD017267, 2012.
- Ploeger, F., Legras, B., Charlesworth, E., Yan, X., Diallo, M., Konopka, P., Birner, T., Tao, M., Engel, A., and Riese, M.: How robust are stratospheric age of air trends from different reanalyses?, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 19, 6085–6105, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-6085-2019>, 2019.
- Polvani, L. M., Abalos, M., Garcia, R., Kinnison, D., & Randel, W. J.: Significant weakening of Brewer-Dobson circulation trends over the 21st century as a consequence of the Montreal Protocol, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 45, 401–409, 2018.
- Pommrich, R., Müller, R., Groö, J.-U., Konopka, P., Ploeger, F., Vogel, B., Tao, M., Hoppe, C. M., Günther, G., Spelten, N., Hoffmann, L., Pumphrey, H.-C., Viciani, S., D’Amato, F., Volk, C. M., Hoor, P., Schlager, H., and Riese, M.: Tropical troposphere to stratosphere transport of carbon monoxide and long-lived trace species in the Chemical Lagrangian Model of the Stratosphere (CLaMS), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7, 2895–2916, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-2895-2014>, 2014.

- Randel, W. J., Park, M., Emmons, L., Kinnison, D., Bernath, P., Walker, K. A., Boone, C., and Pumphrey, H.: Asian Monsoon Transport of Pollution to the Stratosphere, *Science*, 328, 611–613, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1182274>, 20
- Ray, E. A., Moore, F. L., Elkins, J. W., Rosenlof, K., Laube, J., Röckmann, T., Marsh, D. R., and Andrews, A. E.:
 475 Quantification of the SF₆ Lifetime Based on Mesospheric Loss Measured in the Stratospheric Polar Vortex, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 122, 4626–4638, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026198>, 2017.
- Ray, E. A., Portmann, R. W., Yu, P., Daniel, J., Montzka, S. A., Dutton, G. S., Hall, B. D., Moore, F. L., and Rosenlof, K. H.: The influence of the stratospheric Quasi-Biennial Oscillation on trace gas levels at the Earth’s surface. *Nat. Geosci.* 13, 22–27, doi:10.1038/s41561-019-0507-3, 2020.
- 480 Rigby, M., Park, S., Saito, T., Western, L. M., Redington, A. L., Fang, X., Henne, S., Manning, A. J., Prinn, R. G., Dutton, G. S., Fraser, P. J., Ganesan, A. L., Hall, B. D., Harth, C. M., Kim, J., Kim, K.-R., Krummel, P. B., Lee, T., Li, S., Liang, Q., Lunt, M. F., Montzka, S. A., Mühle, J., O’Doherty, S., Park, M.-K., Reimann, S., Salameh, P. K., Simmonds, P., Tunnicliffe, R. L., Weiss, R. F., Yokouchi, Y. and Young, D.: Increase in CFC-11 emissions from eastern China based on atmospheric observations, *Nature*, 569 (7757), 546–550, doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1193-4, 2019.
- 485 Santee, M. L., Livesey, N. J., Manney, G. L., Lambert, A., and Read, W. G.: Methyl chloride from the Aura Microwave Limb Sounder: First global climatology and assessment of variability in the upper troposphere and stratosphere, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 118, 13532–13560, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JD020235>, 2013.
- Schauffler, S. M., Atlas, E. L., Donnelly, S. G., Andrews, A., Montzka, S. A., Elkins, J. W., Hurst, D. F., Romashkin, P. A., Dutton, G. S., and Stroud, V.: Chlorine budget and partitioning during SOLVE, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 4173,
 490 doi:10.1029/2001JD002040, 2003.
- Schmidt, U. and Khedim, A.: In situ measurements of carbon dioxide in the winter Arctic vortex and at midlatitudes: An indicator of the “age” of stratospheric air, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 18, 763–766, 1991.
- Stiller, G. P., von Clarmann, T., Höpfner, M., Glatthor, N., Grabowski, U., Kellmann, S., Kleinert, A., Linden, A., Milz, M., Reddmann, T., Steck, T., Fischer, H., Funke, B., López-Puertas, M., and Engel, A.: Global distribution of mean age of
 495 stratospheric air from MIPAS SF₆ measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 677–695, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-677-2008>, 2008.
- Stiller, G. P., von Clarmann, T., Haenel, F., Funke, B., Glatthor, N., Grabowski, U., Kellmann, S., Kiefer, M., Linden, A., Lossow, S., and López-Puertas, M.: Observed temporal evolution of global mean age of stratospheric air for the 2002 to 2010 period, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 3311–3331, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-3311-2012>, 2012.
- 500 Trudinger, C. M., Fraser, P. J., Etheridge, D. M., Sturges, W. T., Vollmer, M. K., Rigby, M., Martinerie, P., Mühle, J., Worton, D. R., Krummel, P. B., Steele, L. P., Miller, B. R., Laube, J., Mani, F. S., Rayner, P. J., Harth, C. M., Witrant, E., Blunier, T., Schwander, J., O’Doherty, S., and Battle, M.: Atmospheric abundance and global emissions of perfluorocarbons CF₄, C₂F₆,

and C₃F₈ since 1800 inferred from ice core, firn, air archive and in situ measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 11733–11754, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-11733-2016>, 2016.

- 505 Vogel, B., Müller, R., Günther, G., Spang, R., Hanumanthu, S., Li, D., Riese, M., and Stiller, G. P.: Lagrangian simulations of the trans-port of young air masses to the top of the Asian monsoon anticyclone and into the tropical pipe, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 19, 6007–6034, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-724>, 2019.
- Volk, C. M., Elkins, J. W., Fahey, D. W., Dutton, G. S., Gilligan, J. M., Loewenstein, M., Podolske, J. R., Chan, K. R., and Gunson, M. R.: Evaluation of source gas lifetimes from stratospheric observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 25543–25564, <https://doi.org/10.1029/97JD02215>, 1997.
- 510 von Hobe, M., Bekki, S., Borrmann, S., Cairo, F., D’Amato, F., Di Donfrancesco, G., Dörnbrack, A., Ebersoldt, A., Ebert, M., Emde, C., Engel, I., Ern, M., Frey, W., Genco, S., Griessbach, S., Grooß, J.-U., Gulde, T., Günther, G., Hösen, E., Hoffmann, L., Homonnai, V., Hoyle, C. R., Isaksen, I. S. A., Jackson, D. R., Jánosi, I. M., Jones, R. L., Kandler, K., Kalicinsky, C., Keil, A., Khaykin, S. M., Khosrawi, F., Kivi, R., Kuttippurath, J., Laube, J. C., Lefèvre, F., Lehmann, R., Ludmann, S., Luo, B. P.,
- 515 Marchand, M., Meyer, J., Mitev, V., Molleker, S., Müller, R., Oelhaf, H., Olschewski, F., Orsolini, Y., Peter, T., Pfeilsticker, K., Piesch, C., Pitts, M. C., Poole, L. R., Pope, F. D., Ravegnani, F., Rex, M., Riese, M., Röckmann, T., Rognerud, B., Roiger, A., Rolf, C., Santee, M. L., Scheibe, M., Schiller, C., Schlager, H., Siciliani de Cumis, M., Sitnikov, N., Søvde, O. A., Spang, R., Spelten, N., Stordal, F., Suminska-Ebersoldt, O., Ulanovski, A., Ungermann, J., Viciani, S., Volk, C. M., vom Scheidt, M., von der Gathen, P., Walker, K., Wegner, T., Weigel, R., Weinbruch, S., Wetzol, G., Wienhold, F. G., Wohltmann, I., Woiwode,
- 520 W., Young, I. A. K., Yushkov, V., Zobrist, B., and Stroh, F.: Reconciliation of essential process parameters for an enhanced predictability of Arctic stratospheric ozone loss and its climate interactions (RECONCILE): activities and results, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 9233–9268, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-9233-2013>, 2013.