

Biogeochemical Cycling in the CLM-PPE

persistent uncertainty in the terrestrial carbon sink

Daniel Kennedy, Linnia Hawkins, Katie Dagon, Dave Lawrence and the CLM5-PPE working group

> CESM workshop June 14, 2023

NCAR

This material is based upon work supported by the National Center for Atmospheric Research, which is a major facility sponsored by the National Science Foundation under Cooperative Agreement No. 1852977.

Carbon Cycle Uncertainty in Land Model Projections



NCAR

UCAR

Carbon Cycle Uncertainty in Land Model Projections



NCAR

UCAR

What is a PPE?



4

First pass: vary parameters one-at-a-time

- 1. Identified 200 CLM parameters
- 2. Defined parameter ranges
- 3. Developed low-cost CLM configuration
- 4. Varied parameters one-at-a-time (min/max)





First pass: vary parameters one-at-a-time

- 1. Identified 200 CLM parameters
- 2. Defined parameter ranges
- 3. Developed low-cost CLM configuration
- 4. Varied parameters one-at-a-time (min/max)

webext.cgd.ucar.edu/I2000/PPEn11_OAAT





Multifactor Ensemble

Focused on LAI calibration:

- challenging, but tractable
- foundational variable within CLM5-bgc
- observational constraints





Experimental Design:

- subset 32 relevant parameters
- 500 simulations
- fully transient, 1850-2014
- Latin hypercube (LHC) sampling

Global Average (2005-2014)





Global Average (2005-2014) ensemble 120 default One-at-a-time response 100 kmax - 🕒 leaf_long jmaxb0 · 80 jmaxb1 wc2wjb0 nEns Imr_intercept_a 60 slatop medlynintercept leafcn 40 · froot_leaf 1.50 1.75 2.00 2.25 2.50 Global LAI 20 -0 5 3 1 2 4 Leaf Area Index (m2/m2)



Global Average (2005-2014)





Global Average (2005-2014)





How does LAI variance influence other variables?



global photosynthesis





PPE spread is larger than multi-model spread



Friedlingstein et al. Global Carbon Budget 2022



PPE spread is larger than multi-model spread



Friedlingstein et al. Global Carbon Budget 2022



Are all simulations equally plausible / likely?







Are all simulations equally plausible / likely?













NCAR | LHC ensemble spread

Global annual LAI not a viable constraint on NBP





21

Global annual LAI not a viable constraint on NBP





Global annual LAI not a viable constraint on NBP





Not looking promising...









Next step: extend our simulations





Next step: extend our simulations



How large is the spread?

→ 2100

What information could reduce uncertainty?

- interannual variability?
- trends?



Next step: extend our simulations



How large is the spread?



What information could reduce uncertainty?

- interannual variability?
- trends?
- carbon use efficiency?
- carbon turnover times?



Conclusion

Key points:

- CLM-PPE has generated useful infrastructure and two valuable datasets
- Parameter perturbations generated a wide range of Leaf Area Index
- With accompanying spread in carbon fluxes
- Global annual LAI not a meaningful constraint on the terrestrial carbon sink

Next steps:

- Extend ensemble to 2100 (SSP1-2.6 & SSP3-7.0)
- Test a wider range of observational constraints
- Compare to CAM6+DART reanalysis (observational uncertainty)







Parameter sensitivity



Fourier amplitude sensitivity testing



Parameter sensitivity

Land Sink: GPP-AR-HR-FIRE





Gaussian process emulator validation



Land sink (biome)

Components of land sink (global)



