



## The terrestrial (high-latitude) carbon cycle

#### Gerhard Krinner, LGGE Grenoble



ILMATIETEEN LAITOS

METEOROLOGISKA INSTITUTET

Laboratoire de Glaciologie et Géophysique de l'Environnement

Thanks to : Philippe Ciais, Martin Menegoz, Isabelle Gouttevin, the Global Carbon Project









### Fossil fuel & cement CO<sub>2</sub> emissions







### Fossil fuel & cement CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (territorial)











### CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by fossil fuel type



Updated from Le Quéré et al. 2009, Nature Geoscience; Data: Boden, Marland, Andres-CDIAC 2011





#### Impact of economic crises on C emissions





Most of recent carbon intensity increase located in China





### $CO_2$ emissions from FF and LUC (1960-2010)





Current LUC emissions ~10% of total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions









### Fate of anthropogenic $CO_2$ emissions (2010)

9.1±0.5 PgC y<sup>-1</sup>



## 0.9±0.7 PgC y<sup>-1</sup>



Global Carbon Project 2010; Updated from Le Quéré et al. 2009, Nature Geoscience; Canadell et al. 2007, PNAS

5.0±0.2 PgC y<sup>-1</sup> 50%



Calculated as the residual of all other flux components











### Decline in the efficiency of CO<sub>2</sub> natural sinks

Fraction of all anthropogenic emissions that stay in the atmosphere









#### Efficiency of land vs ocean sinks

# Land Fraction



## **Ocean Fraction**





Canadell et al. 2007, PNAS



ILMATIETEEN LAITOS Meteorologiska institutet Finnish meteorological institute



### Declining efficiency of the ocean sink



- Part of the decline is attributed to up to 30% decrease in the efficiency of the Southern Ocean sink over the last 20 years.
- This sink removes annually 0.3±0.2 Pg of anthropogenic carbon.
- The decline is attributed to the strengthening of the winds around Antarctica which enhances ventilation of natural carbon-rich deep waters.
- The strengthening of the winds is attributed to global warming and the ozone hole.

Le Quéré et al. 2007, Science





#### Contribution of forests

#### More than 70% of the northern C sink is in forest



Unmanaged forests appear to be significant C sinks





### Stock vs. sequestration: partitioning between vegetation and soil







#### Soil carbon stock is large & vulnerable













### Simulated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>



Always Positive Feedback Large uncertainties









#### Simulated land fluxes



Globally a negative response







#### The land response





ILMATIETEEN LAITOS Meteorologiska institutet Finnish meteorological institute



### Climate factors affecting forest C balance (simplified)









## Missing (or poor) representations in global models: e.g. fire







### Twice the atmospheric C reservoir in permafrost region soils

- Tempting conclusion : Degassing under warming conditions
- Timescale ? Processes ?







#### Permafrost carbon on glacial-interglacial time scales





#### Representation in recent coupled carbon-climate models

Future CO<sub>2</sub> balance : Northern land areas = Large sink because of vegetation growth









#### Many permafrost-related processes not or poorly represented

- Soil freezing
- Impact of soil freezing on hydrology
- Thermokarst
- Peat accumulation
- Snow-vegetation interactions
- Cryoturbation

. . .

• Thermal insulation by organic surface layer

In the following:

Cold region and permafrost-related processes in the ORCHIDEE land-surface model, effect on C reservoir dynamics







#### Basic version (Krinner et al., GBC, 2005)

- Land surface component of the IPSL-CM5 coupled climate model
- IPSL-CM5: Part of current CMIP5 IPCC climate projection exercise
- Land-surface component of an AOGCM, but also stand-alone landsurface model
- Dynamic vegetation model (LPJ)
- Carbon cycle, including soil carbon (CENTURY)









### Soil hydrology and freezing

Multi-level hydrology with freezing : thermal & hydrological effects (Gouttevin et al., The Cryosphere, submitted)









Thermal effect of soil freeze and thaw at 20 cm depth





#### Carbon cycle without and with soil freezing/permafrost

Active layer vs. permafrost : Part of the carbon essentially locked away









#### Active layer vs. permafrost : Need vertically resolved carbon distribution







#### Cryoturbation

Treated by a simple diffusion scheme without advection (Koven et al., 2009)

$$\frac{\partial C_i}{\partial t} = D \frac{\partial^2 C_i}{\partial z^2} \qquad D = \begin{cases} D_0 & \text{for } z < z_{ALT} \\ D_0 \left( 1 - \left( \frac{z - z_{ALT}}{(k-1)z_{ALT}} \right) \right) & \text{for } z_{ALT} < z < kz_{ALT} \\ 0 & \text{for } z > kz_{ALT} \end{cases}$$









#### Effect of cryoturbation on simulated soil carbon at Tcherskii

Carbon content in top m decreases, buried below







### Thermal insulation by organic surface layer

Strong effect on soil thermal profiles shown before : dampening of the annual temperature cycle below the surface

-3

8



TG at 230cm, summer



3

-5

-6

-7





#### Effect of thermal insulation on simulated soil carbon at Tcherskii

Cooler soil in summer : slower decomposition







### **Cryoturbation + thermal insulation**

- Positive feedback: more soil carbon, more insulation
- Even top m not in equilibrium after 10000 years



<sup>(</sup>Koven et al., GRL, 2009)





#### Better simulation of top m organic soil carbon after 10000 yrs spinup





NCSCD soil carbon in upper 1m (g/m<sup>2</sup>)



(c) NCSCD SOM





#### Better simulation of active layer thickness









### **Microbial heat generation**

"Compost bomb" ? Positive feedback between soil temperature and microbial activity

Condition : Heat in deep soil generated more quickly than heat diffuses vertically, very high carbon content





S. Zimov in front of a Yedoma section near the Kolyma river

ILMATIETE METEORO FINNISH M

1.6

1

1.2

1.0

0.8

0.6

0.4

0

(a)

Soil Depth (m)

2

3

4

5

6

Precipitation (mm day<sup>-1</sup>)

ILMATIETEEN LAITOS Meteorologiska institutet Finnish meteorological institute











(Khvorostiyanov et al., Tellus 2008a)

Yedoma : 2 GT/yr during 100 yrs in extreme (unrealistic) warming scenario

Possible neglected limitation: nutrient availability

1030 1031 1032 1033 1034







### **Projections of the 21<sup>st</sup> century boreal carbon balance**

- Different soil freezing/permafrost processes activated
- Topmodel and methane emission model for CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from wetlands (Beven and Kirkby, 1979; Walter et al., 2001; Ringeval et al., 2010)
- •10,000 yrs initialization with 20th century climate
- •Yedoma: initialized with estimated present carbon density prior to 10,000 yr spinup
- Suppose SRES A2 scenario warming from IPSL-CM4 CMIP4 run
- Anomaly method used













#### **Experiments**

- •Base : No permafrost
- •Freeze = Base + Frozen soil carbon
- •Permafrost = Freeze + permafrost-specific processes (cryoturbation, insulation)
- •Heat = Permafrost + Microbial heating



NCSCD SOM







#### Simulated average soil carbon profile



*Freeze* case, permafrost grid cells

#### Permafrost

case, permafrost grid cells Permafrost case, Yedoma grid cells

Experiments :

- •Base : No permafrost
- •Freeze = Base + Frozen soil carbon
- Permafrost = Freeze + permafrost-specific processes (cryoturbation, insulation)
- Heat = Permafrost + Microbial heating









Active Layer Thickness, 2090-2100 (m)

#### Simulated permafrost changes

Active Layer Thickness, 1990-2000 (m)



Year









#### **Simulated carbon fluxes**

- Change from sink to source during the 21<sup>st</sup> century when permafrost processes are taken into account
- Difference between Permafrost and Control simulation at the of the 21<sup>st</sup> century: 61 PgC



Fig. 2. Change in carbon fluxes over the model run. (A) Mean fluxes over modeled period. Contemporary budget estimate from McGuire et al. (1) (B) integrated changes. (C) Integrated changes in carbon balance due to rising  $CO_2$  concentration alone. (D) Integrated change in carbon balance due to climate change alone (difference between  $CO_2$ -only and  $CO_2$ +climate change).







Large fluxes from Yedoma area if microbial heating is taken into account



Net  $CO_2$  fluxes due to climate change at the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, gC/m<sup>2</sup>/yr







### **Snow - soil carbon interactions: thermal insulation**



Taiga snow conductivity observed : k=~0.1 W.m<sup>-1</sup>.K<sup>-1</sup>



Tundra snow conductivity observed :  $k=\sim0.3$  to 0.4 W.m<sup>-1</sup>.K<sup>-1</sup>

Delta Tsoil 50cm (deg. C) march S(k=0.1)-s(k=0.4)



50 cm depth soil temperature difference between two simulations performed with k=0.1 and k=0.4





# Lower snow conductivity prescribed in the boreal forest



SNOW CONDUCTIVITY VARIED-CTRL (W/m/K)



Consequence: Less soil carbon in the boreal forest belt