## The OCO-2 Model Intercomparison Project Reveals Systematic Transport Model Effects on Inverse Model CO<sub>2</sub> Fluxes

<u>A.R. Jacobson<sup>1,2</sup></u>, A. Schuh<sup>3</sup>, S. Basu<sup>1,2</sup>, B. Weir<sup>4</sup>, D.F. Baker<sup>5</sup>, K. Bowman<sup>6</sup>, F. Chevallier<sup>7</sup>, S. Crowell<sup>8</sup>, K.J. Davis<sup>9,10</sup>, F. Deng<sup>11</sup>, S. Denning<sup>3</sup>, L. Feng<sup>12</sup>, D. Jones<sup>11</sup>, J. Liu<sup>6</sup> and P. Palmer<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES), University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309; 303-497-4916, E-mail: andy.jacobson@noaa.gov

<sup>2</sup>NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Global Monitoring Division (GMD), Boulder, CO 80305

<sup>3</sup>Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523

<sup>4</sup>NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), Greenbelt, MD 20771

<sup>5</sup>Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere (CIRA), Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80521

<sup>6</sup>NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109

<sup>7</sup>Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE), Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace, Orme des Merisiers, France

<sup>8</sup>University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019

<sup>9</sup>Department of Meteorology and Atmospheric Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802 <sup>10</sup>Earth and Environmental Systems Institute, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802

<sup>11</sup>University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

<sup>12</sup>University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

The NASA Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) program has organized an atmospheric inverse model intercomparison activity, in which modeling groups have performed experiments assimilating OCO-2 retrievals and traditional *in situ* carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) measurements. This collection of inverse models is dominated by atmospheric transport simulated by two models: three use the Tracer Model, Version 5 (TM5) and four use Goddard Earth Observing System-Chem (GEOS-Chem). Forward simulations of CO<sub>2</sub> and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) in these two models reveal systematic differences in vertical-meridional transport, suggesting that GEOS-Chem moves tracer mass out of northern midlatitudes more quickly than TM5. In an inverse model framework, the ensemble of GEOS-Chem models retrieves a larger annual cycle of surface CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the large zonal band from the equator to 45°N. Since inverse models frequently simulate a net land sink by amplifying the annual cycle of prior models, one might expect that GEOS-Chem would have a larger net sink in this latitude range, but we find the opposite. The differences between the two models in seasonality and long-term mean fluxes are reversed north of 45°N. We provide potential explanations for these flux differences, and link them to transport processes using SF<sub>6</sub> constraints.



**Figure 1.** OCO-2 MIP fluxes estimated by GEOS-Chem ("GC", blue) and TM5 (red) transport in the latitude bands from the equator-45°N (bottom row) and from 45°N-90°N (top row). These optimized fluxes are derived by assimilation of traditional *in situ* measurements. Seasonality is revealed by monthly fluxes (left column) and the annual means are portrayed in the right column.