



Characteristics of Interannual Variability in Space-based XCO₂ Global Observations

Yifan Guan¹, Gretchen Keppel-Aleks¹, Scott C. Doney², Christof Petri³, Dave Pollard⁴, Debra Wunch⁵, Frank Hase⁶, Hirofumi Ohyama⁷, Isamu Morino⁷, Justus Notholt³, Kei Shiomi⁹, Kim Strong⁵, Rigel Kivi¹⁰, Matthias Buschmann³, Nicholas Deutscher¹², Paul Wennberg¹¹, Ralf Sussmann⁸, Voltaire A. Velazco^{12,13}, Yao Té¹⁴

¹Department of Climate and Space Sciences and Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 48105, USA

²Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, 22903, USA

³Institute of Environmental Physics, Physics Department, University of Bremen, Bremen, 28359, Germany

⁴National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, Omakau, 9377, New Zealand

⁵Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, M5S 1A7, Canada

⁶Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research - Atmospheric Trace Gases and Remote Sensing, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, 76344, Germany

⁷National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0053, Japan

⁸Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research - Atmospheric Environmental Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 82467, Germany

⁹Earth Observation Research Center, Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8505, Japan

¹⁰Space and Earth Observation Centre, Finnish Meteorological Institute, Sodankylä, 99600, Finland

¹¹Divisions of Engineering and Applied Science and Geological and Planetary Science, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, 91125, USA

¹²Centre for Atmospheric Chemistry, School of Earth, Atmospheric and Life Sciences, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, 2522, Australia

¹³Deutscher Wetterdienst, Meteorological Observatory, Hohenpeissenberg, 82383, Germany

¹⁴Laboratoire d'Etudes du Rayonnement et de la Matière en Astrophysique et Atmosphères, French National Centre for Scientific Research, Paris, 75016, France

Correspondence to: Yifan Guan (guanyf@umich.edu)

Abstract. Atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) accounts for the largest radiative forcing among anthropogenic greenhouse gases. There is, therefore, a pressing need to understand the rate at which CO₂ accumulates in the atmosphere, including the interannual variations (IAV) in this rate. IAV in the CO₂ growth rate is a small signal relative to the long-term trend and the mean annual cycle of atmospheric CO₂, and IAV is tied to climatic variations that may provide insights into long-term carbon-climate feedbacks. Observations from the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) mission offer a new opportunity to refine our understanding of atmospheric CO₂ IAV since the satellite can measure over remote terrestrial regions and the open ocean where traditional in situ CO₂ monitoring is difficult. In this study, we analyze the IAV of column-averaged dry air CO₂ mole fraction (XCO₂) from OCO-2 between September 2014 to June 2021. The amplitude of IAV variations is up to 1.2 ppm over the continents and around 0.4 ppm over the open ocean. Across all latitudes, the OCO-2 detected XCO₂ IAV shows a clear relationship with ENSO-driven variations that originate in the tropics and are transported poleward. The XCO₂ IAV timeseries shows similar zonal patterns compared to ground-based in situ observations and with column observations from the Total Carbon Column Observing Network (TCCON). At lower degrees of aggregation (i.e., 5°x5° grid cells), there are larger inconsistencies with TCCON suggesting that one or both of the observing systems are affected by bias or



systematic retrieval issues that are of a similar magnitude to the IAV signal. Our results suggest that OCO-2 IAV provides meaningful information about climate-driven variations in carbon fluxes and provides new opportunities to monitor climate-driven variations in CO₂ over open ocean and remote regions.

45

1 Introduction

Increasing atmospheric CO₂ concentration from anthropogenic emissions is the major driver of the observed warming of Earth's climate since the industrial revolution (IPCC, 2021). Although CO₂ accumulation in the atmosphere generally is ~45% of anthropogenic emissions on a multi-year average (Ciais et al., 2013; Friedlingstein et al., 2019), the growth rate shows substantial interannual variability (Conway et al., 1994). The difference between emissions and the atmospheric CO₂ growth rate results from net CO₂ uptake by oceans and terrestrial ecosystems (Prentice et al., 2001; Doney et al., 2009), and the fluctuations reflect variations in the strength of those sinks due to climate variations (Peters et al., 2017; Friedlingstein et al., 2019). Much research has suggested that interannual variability (IAV) in the growth rate is predominantly due to variations in terrestrial ecosystem carbon uptake (Marcolla et al., 2017), even though the average uptake is roughly comparable between land and ocean (Le Quéré et al., 2009). Existing atmospheric CO₂ observations from surface flask sampling and in situ networks have been used to estimate global- and regional-scale interannual variability in CO₂ fluxes (Gurney et al., 2003; Peylin et al., 2013; Keppel-Aleks et al., 2014; Piao et al., 2020). We note, however, that the surface observing network is located primarily on land and coastal sites, and more subtle ocean flux signals may be obscured by the large IAV in terrestrial fluxes.

60

Previous analyses of surface CO₂ IAV has shown a strong relationship with the phase and intensity of El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Le Quéré et al., 2009; Schwalm et al., 2011). ENSO variations originate from coupled ocean-atmosphere dynamics that are reflected in large wind and sea surface temperature anomalies over the central and eastern Pacific Ocean. ENSO affects the climate of much of the tropics and subtropics via atmospheric teleconnections on timescales of 2–7 years (Timmermann et al., 2018). On land, suppressed precipitation and high temperature associated with positive phases of ENSO (El Niño conditions) suppress CO₂ uptake by tropical ecosystems, while promoting fires that further reduce the CO₂ uptake by lands (Feely et al., 2002; McKinley et al., 2004; Piao et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2013). Although of smaller magnitude, the equatorial Pacific Ocean experiences weakening of the easterly trade winds and suppression of ventilation of deep, cold, carbon-rich waters to the surface during an El Niño, reducing the efflux of natural CO₂ to the atmosphere (Patra et al., 2005 ; Chatterjee et al., 2017).

70

Chatterjee et al., (2017) were able to directly observe the ocean flux-driven signal on atmospheric CO₂ from El Niño for the first-time using XCO₂ (column-averaged dry air CO₂ mole fraction) observed over the ocean by NASA's OCO-2 satellite. Space-based observations from OCO-2, which launched in July 2014, provide novel opportunities to characterize the patterns of IAV in XCO₂ in areas that were previously not directly observed by existing monitoring networks. The IAV in XCO₂ is being used implicitly for flux attribution in inverse modeling studies. These exciting

75



results, however, must be tempered by an awareness that atmospheric CO₂ IAV is a relatively small signal. For example, IAV in the surface network is about 1 ppm in scale compared to a seasonal amplitude of around 10 ppm in northern high latitudes. OCO-2 measures column averaged CO₂, so its measurements are sensitive to variations in the boundary layer mole fraction, which is in direct contact with the land or atmospheric fluxes, but also variations in the free troposphere and stratosphere, where flux signals are generally smaller than those observed at the surface (Olsen and Randerson, 2004). Furthermore, variations in the free troposphere are expected to have relatively long correlation length scales due to efficient mixing, making it important to consider the spatial scales at which XCO₂ observations provide unique information. This is especially important in light of analysis which suggests that the error variance budget in OCO-2 observations is large and contains substantial spatially coherent signal (Torres et al., 2019; Mitchell et al., submitted).

In this paper, we analyze XCO₂ from OCO-2 to characterize spatiotemporal patterns in IAV at near-global scale, over both land and ocean, and relate XCO₂ variations to ENSO conditions. We contextualize the information contained in OCO-2 observations by comparing with ground-based TCCON XCO₂ and with surface measurements of CO₂. Finally, we use these comparisons to emphasize the spatial scales at which the IAV signal emerges from instrumental noise.

2 Data and Methods

2.1 Datasets

2.1.1 OCO-2 observatory

We analyzed IAV in dry air, column-average mole fraction XCO₂ inferred from OCO-2 satellite observations. The OCO-2 observatory was launched in July 2014 and has measured passive, reflected solar near infrared CO₂ and O₂ absorption spectra using grating spectrometers since September 2014 (Eldering et al., 2017). XCO₂ data are retrieved from the measured spectra using the Atmospheric CO₂ Observations from Space (ACOS) optimal estimation algorithm, which is a full physics algorithm that takes into account XCO₂ and other physical parameters, including surface pressure, surface albedo, temperature, and water vapor profile in its state vector (Crisp et al., 2010; O'Dell et al., 2018). The satellite flies in a polar and sun-synchronous orbit that repeats every 16 days, with three different observing modes of OCO-2, namely nadir (land only, views the ground directly below the spacecraft), glint (over ocean and land, views just off the peak of the specularly reflected sunlight), and target (typically for comparison with specific ground-based or airborne measurements) (Crisp et al., 2012; Crisp et al., 2017). We use the version 10 OCO-2 Level 2 bias-corrected XCO₂ data product from Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center (GES DISC) Archive: https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/datasets/OCO2_L2_Lite_FP_10r/summary), which has been validated with collocated ground-based measurements from the Total Carbon Column Observing Network (TCCON; discussed in more detail in Section 2.2). After filtering and bias correction, the OCO-2 XCO₂ retrievals agree well with TCCON in nadir, glint, and target observation modes, and generally have absolute median differences less than 0.4 ppm and Root Mean Square differences less than 1.5 ppm (O'Dell et al., 2012; Wunch et al., 2017).



2.1.2 TCCON

We corroborate patterns of XCO₂ IAV from OCO-2 with those from TCCON, a ground-based network of Fourier transform spectrometers that measure direct solar absorption spectra in the near infrared (Wunch et al., 2011). Retrievals of XCO₂ and other gases are computed using the GGG algorithm, a nonlinear least-squares spectral fitting algorithm. The TCCON retrievals are tied to the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) X2007 CO₂ scale via calibration with aircraft and AirCore profiles above the TCCON sites (Karion et al., 2010; Wunch et al., 2010). This ensures an accuracy and precision of ~0.6 ppm(1sigma) throughout the network (Washenfelder et al., 2006; Messerschmidt et al., 2010; Deutscher et al., 2010, Wunch et al., 2010). TCCON has been used widely as a validation standard by providing independent measurements to compare with multiple satellite XCO₂ retrievals including OCO-2. In previous work Sussmann and Rettinger (2020) have demonstrated a concept to retrieve annual growth rates of XCO₂ from TCCON data, which are regionally to hemispherically representative in spite of the non-uniform sampling in time and space inherent to the ground-based network. In our study, we focus on IAV in the XCO₂ timeseries from 26 TCCON sites (Table 1, Fig.1) that have at least 3 years of observational coverage within the period from September 2014 to June 2021. These TCCON data have been filtered using the standard filter that is based on a measure of cloudiness and limits the solar zenith angle. Data are publicly available from the TCCON Data Archive (<https://tccodata.org/>) hosted by the California Institute of Technology.

Table 1. TCCON Column-Averaged Dry-Air Mole Fractions of CO₂ (GGG2014 Data)

Region	Site	Acronym	Latitude	Longitude	Start Date	End Date	Publication
Polar Northern Hemisphere (60-90°N)	Eureka (NU)	eu	80.05	-86.42	2010-07	2020-07	Strong, K. et al., 2017
	Ny Ålesund	sp	78.90	11.90	2014-04	2019-09	Notholt, J. et al., 2019
	Sodankylä (FI)	so	67.37	26.63	2009-05	2020-10	Kivi, R. et al., 2017
Temperate Northern Hemisphere (20-60°N)	East Trout Lake(SK)	et	54.35	-104.99	2016-10	2020-09	Wunch, D., et al., 2017
	Białystok (PL)	bi	53.23	23.03	2009-03	2018-10	Deutscher, N. et al., 2017
	Bremen (DE)	br	53.10	8.85	2010-01	2020-06	Notholt, J. et al., 2017
	Karlsruhe (DE)	ka	49.10	8.44	2010-04	2020-11	Hase, F. et al., 2017
	Paris (FR)	pr	48.97	2.37	2014-09	2020-06	Te, Y. et al., 2017
	Orléans (FR)	or	47.97	2.11	2009-08	2020-06	Warneke, T. et al., 2017
	Garmisch (DE)	gm	47.48	11.06	2007-07	2020-06	Sussmann, R. et al., 2017
	Zugspitze (DE)	zs	47.42	10.98	2015-04	2020-06	Sussmann, R. et al., 2018
	Park Falls (US)	pa	45.95	-90.27	2004-06	2020-12	Wennberg, P. O. et al., 2017
	Rikubetsu (JP)	rj	43.46	143.77	2013-11	2019-09	Morino, I. et al., 2017
	Lamont (US)	oc	36.60	-97.49	2008-07	2020-12	Wennberg, P. O. et al., 2017
	Anmyeondo (KR)	an	36.58	126.33	2015-02	2018-04	Goo, T.-Y. et al., 2017
	Tsukuba (JP)	tk	36.05	140.12	2011-08	2019-09	Morino, I. et al., 2017
	Edwards (US)	df	34.96	-117.88	2013-07	2020-12	Iraci, L. et al., 2017
	Caltech (US)	ci	34.14	-118.13	2012-09	2020-12	Wennberg, P. O. et al., 2017
	Saga (JP)	js	33.24	130.29	2011-07	2020-12	Shiomi, K. et al., 2017
	Izana (ES)	iz	28.30	-16.50	2007-05	2021-02	Blumenstock, T. et al., 2017



Tropical Northern Hemisphere (0-20°N)	Burgos (PH)	bu	18.53	120.65	2017-03	2020-03	Morino, I., et al., 2018
Tropical Southern Hemisphere (0-20°S)	Ascension Island (SH)	ae	-7.92	-14.33	2012-05	2018-10	Feist, D. G. et al., 2017
	Darwin (AU)	db	-12.46	130.94	2005-08	2020-04	Griffith, D. W. T., et al., 2017
Temperate Southern Hemisphere (20-60°S)	Réunion Island (RE)	ra	-20.90	55.49	2011-09	2020-07	De Maziere, M. et al., 2017
	Wollongong (AU)	wg	-34.41	150.88	2008-06	2020-06	Griffith, D. W. T. et al., 2017
	Lauder (NZ)	ll	-45.04	169.68	2010-02	2018-10	Sherlock, V. et al., 2017




Figure 1. Map showing the locations and the acronyms of the TCCON sites.

2.1.3 Marine Boundary Layer Observations

To explore differences in surface and column-average CO₂ IAV, we analyze IAV in the surface CO₂ mole fraction at marine boundary layer (MBL) sites in the NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) cooperative sampling network. At these sites, boundary layer CO₂ is measured using weekly flask samples (Masarie and Tans, 1995; Dlugokencky et al., 2016). MBL sites are typically far away from anthropogenic sources and regions of active terrestrial exchange, so they provide an estimate for large-scale patterns in the global background CO₂ concentration. The surface MBL dry air mole fraction data has an accuracy level of about 0.1 ppm. In this study, we select 16 sites with at least 80% data coverage for the approximately 7-year period overlapping with OCO-2 (Table 2, Fig.2), and the data are aggregated into four north-south zones for comparison with OCO-2 XCO₂: northern and southern hemisphere tropical (0 - 20°) and Northern Hemisphere/Southern Hemisphere extratropical zones (20-60°). Each belt contains at least three MBL sites. Higher latitudes (60-90°) are not considered in this comparison due to the gaps remaining in the OCO-2 XCO₂ record in high latitudes during wintertime and shouldering seasons.



Table 2. Marine Boundary Layer stations within the NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory CO₂ sampling network

Region	Station	Acronym	Latitude	Longitude	Start Date	End Date
Temperate Northern Hemisphere (20-60°N)	Mace Head, Ireland	MHD	53.3	-9.9	2014-01	2020-07
	Shemya, AK	SHM	52.7	174.1	2014-01	2020-07
	Terceira Island Azores	AZR	38.8	-27.4	2014-01	2020-07
	Tudor Hill, Bermuda	BMW	32.3	-64.9	2014-01	2020-07
	Sand Island, Midway	MID	28.2	-177.4	2014-01	2020-07
	Key Biscayne, FL	KEY	25.7	-80.2	2014-01	2020-07
Tropical Northern Hemisphere (0-20°N)	Cape Kumukahi, HI	KUM	19.5	-154.8	2014-01	2020-07
	Mariana Islands, Guam	GMI	13.5	144.7	2014-01	2019-08
	Ragged Pointed, Barbados	RPB	13.2	-59.4	2014-01	2020-07
	Christmas Island, Republic of Kiribati	CHR	1.7	157.2	2014-01	2019-08
Tropical Southern Hemisphere (0-20°S)	Seychelles	SEY	-4.7	55.2	2014-01	2020-07
	Ascension Island	ASC	-8.0	-14.4	2014-01	2020-07
	Tutuila, America Samoa	SMO	-14.2	-170.6	2014-01	2020-07
Temperate Southern Hemisphere (20-60°S)	Cape Grim, Australia	CGO	-40.7	144.7	2014-01	2020-07
	Baring Head	BHD	-41.4	174.9	2014-01	2020-07
	Crozet Island	CRZ	-46.5	51.9	2014-01	2020-07

150




Figure 2. Map showing the locations and the acronyms of the Marine Boundary Layer stations within the NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory CO₂ sampling network.

2.1.4 Multivariate ENSO Index (MEI)

We use the bi-monthly Multivariate El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO) index (MEI; downloaded from Physical Sciences Laboratory: <https://psl.noaa.gov/enso/mei/>) to explore the relationship between CO₂ IAV and ENSO. The MEI is the time series of the leading combined Empirical Orthogonal Function of five different variables (sea level pressure, sea surface temperature, zonal and meridional components of the surface wind, and outgoing longwave radiation) over the tropical Pacific basin. These ENSO-related variables are obtained from the Japanese 55-year

160



Reanalysis (JRA-55) (Kobayashi et al. 2015) and NOAA Climate Data Record of Monthly Outgoing Longwave Radiation. Positive values in the MEI indicate El Niño conditions, while negative values indicate La Niña conditions, and the magnitude reflects the relative strength. Unlike other ENSO indices which use only one climate metric (e.g., the sea level pressure difference between Tahiti and Darwin or the sea surface temperature anomaly within a pre-defined box), the MEI provides for a more complete and flexible description of the ENSO phenomenon than traditional single variable ENSO indices and has less vulnerability to errors (Klaus Wolter et. al, 2011).

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Spatial Aggregation

We aggregate daily XCO₂ observations from the version 10 OCO-2 Level 2 lite product to monthly scale, exploring patterns of IAV at three spatial scales: gridcell-level, zonal averages over 5° of latitude, and broad zonal belts. Aggregating soundings reduces random noise in the observations, mitigates the impact of data gaps due to cloud cover, and partly mitigates effect from low winter sunlight levels in polar regions. For gridcell level analysis, we aggregate data equatorward of 45° to 5°x5° bins since these data are not limited by polar night or degraded by high solar zenith angles during winter. Poleward of 45° in both hemispheres, we aggregate the satellite observation to a latitude-longitude resolution of 5°x10° to compensate for fewer and noisier soundings in these latitudes, especially during winter and its shoulder seasons. Within each 5°x5° or 5°x10° gridcell, only months that have more than 5 soundings are included in the analysis. Our criteria for aggregation are based on sensitivity experiments in which we modulated the grid cell resolution from 1°x1° to 15°x15° (Fig. S1 and Fig. S2) and varied the threshold on the required number of soundings within a month from 1 to 25 (Fig.S3, Fig.S4 and Fig.S5). Our goal was to reduce noise but maintain high spatial coverage (Fig.S6 and Fig.S7).

In our analysis, we also aggregate data to zonal averages. At intermediate spatial scales, we average all data around the 5° latitude bins described above. For comparison with TCCON and MBL data, which are spatially sparse, we further aggregate XCO₂ data into four broad zonal belts – each of which contains at least 1 TCCON or 3 MBL stations -- (delineated in Table.1 and Table.2) to assess IAV patterns among the datasets. Keppel-Aleks et al., (2014) showed that drivers of IAV (i.e., temperature, drought stress, or fire) could be attributed when surface CO₂ were aggregated into similar broad zonal belts, whereas process-level attribution was not possible with global averaging. We therefore analyze broad zonal belts to gain a large-scale understanding of how three CO₂ datasets are similar and where differences lie.

2.2.2 Deriving interannual variations

We use a consistent process to calculate IAV (Equation 1) from the raw OCO-2, TCCON and MBL timeseries. The methodology is based on approaches used in Keppel-Aleks et al. (2013) and NOAA curve fitting methodology (Thoning et al, 1989). We decompose the raw time-series data into a long-term trend (which is a function of location



(x, y) and time (t)), a seasonal cycle (which is a function of location and calendar month (m)), and IAV anomalies using Equation 1:

$$IAV(x, y, t) = Raw(x, y, t) - Trend(x, y, t) - Seasonal(x, y, m) \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

We first fit a third order polynomial to the Raw timeseries to calculate the observed trend at each location (Fig. 3a). After removing the trend calculated at each gridcell (Fig. 3b), we calculate a mean seasonal cycle by taking the mean value of all January, February, etc. data (Fig. 3c). Particularly at high latitudes, some months are systematically under
 205 sampled. For these gridcells, we must have at least two years with sufficient observations to calculate a climatological mean for that month, otherwise, that calendar month is assumed to have insufficient data to infer the IAV. Finally, we remove the mean seasonal cycle from the detrended timeseries at each gridcell to obtain the IAV anomaly timeseries (Fig. 3d). Given the short data record, we quantify the uncertainty in our calculation of the climatological seasonal cycle as the standard error for each calendar month (blue shading in Fig. 3c), and this uncertainty is propagated to the
 210 corresponding IAV timeseries (Fig. 3d).




Figure 3. Methodology to calculate the CO₂ interannual variability timeseries, using OCO-2 XCO₂ data at the 5-deg grid cell at 20°N, 155°W, which contains Moana Loa, as an example. (a) 5° resolution monthly mean raw OCO-2 XCO₂ and the associated 3rd order polynomial trend. (b) detrended monthly XCO₂ after removing the long-term trend with a repeating 12-month annual cycle obtained from calculating the mean for each month. The light blue shading gives the uncertainty of the seasonal cycle, which is derived by calculating the standard deviation across all Januarys, Februarys, etc. (c) 12-month mean annual cycle together with the uncertainty range plotted in (b). (d) Resulting interannual variability, when mean annual cycle is removed from detrended timeseries.



3 Results

3.1 Temporal-Spatial Variations based on OCO-2 observations

When averaged into broad zonal belts representing the tropics and mid-latitudes, the OCO-2 XCO₂ IAV timeseries anomalies range between -0.5 to 0.75 ppm (Fig. 4). All latitude bands show increasing IAV during positive MEI (El Niño) and decreasing IAV during negative MEI (La Niña), although the phasing varies among latitudes. During the strong 2015–2016 El Niño, which began around March 2015 and reached its peak at the start of 2016, XCO₂ showed the largest IAV. The Southern Hemisphere extratropical regions have larger and more rapid response in the IAV associated with ENSO compared to other zones, especially for a second, smaller El Niño at the beginning of 2020 when the MEI peaked and the XCO₂ IAV timeseries had an anomaly nearly twice as large as that of other latitude belts. During both El Niño events, the IAV timeseries in the NH tropics zone peaks nearly six months after the maximum MEI value.





Figure 4. IAV timeseries averaged for zonal bands between 60 °N and 60 °S from three different observing strategies. (a) Space-based OCO-2 XCO₂, (b) Surface CO₂ observations from NOAA’s marine boundary layer (MBL) sites, (c), Ground-



based TCCON XCO₂. For all panels, the background shading indicates the Multivariate ENSO Index (MEI), which is positive during El Niño phases.

235 The differences in temporal phasing between the broad zonal belts (Fig. 4a) associated with El Niño events can be linked to transport of El Niño-driven CO₂ flux anomalies away from the tropics when zonal means are calculated from OCO-2 observations at 5° latitude resolution (Fig. 5). For the two El Niño periods in 2015-2017 and late-2018 to 2021, high IAV values originate in the tropics and a smooth transition to high IAV values is seen at higher latitudes as time progresses (Fig. 5a). We note that fluxes outside the tropics may also be influenced by ENSO-related climate

240 variability, yet the transport of tropical-driven anomalies appears to dominate. This 7-year study period also captures the half-year lags for atmospheric transport or climate-ecological teleconnections that impacts XCO₂ variations in the far North.



245 **Figure 5. Hovmöller Diagrams diagram showing zonal mean OCO-2 XCO₂ IAV timeseries for 5° latitude bins (a) and the zonal standard deviation of XCO₂ IAV (b), which gives an estimate of coherence in the IAV patterns among grid cells in the 5° zonal belt.**



We quantify coherence in CO₂ IAV within a latitude circle by taking the standard deviation across gridcell-level IAV anomalies within each 5° latitude zone. The standard deviation among gridcells is highest in the far North, with values as high as 1 ppm poleward of 45°N and as low as 0.2 ppm in the Southern Tropical bands (Fig. 5b), indicating that IAV is less spatially coherent in the Northern Hemisphere. This may be consistent with studies that show greater IAV in terrestrial ecosystem fluxes (concentrated in the northern hemisphere) (Zeng et al., 2005) relative to ocean fluxes, or may reflect that our IAV timeseries also retains the imprint of sampling, measurement, and retrieval errors, which become more pronounced at higher latitudes. In general, there is not a time-dependent or ENSO-related pattern for the longitudinal variation of IAVs (no obvious changes during the two El Nino periods), which suggests the variation within each 5° band may be approximately stable and does not change substantially with interannual climate events.




Figure 6. XCO₂ IAV amplitude, determined as the standard deviation of the IAV timeseries. Data equatorward of 45° are averaged at 5° by 5° resolution, and data poleward of 45° are averaged at 5° by 10° resolution. Shaded regions indicate gridcells that lack mean annual cycle data for at least two calendar months due to polar night or related retrieval challenges.

The XCO₂ IAV amplitude (the standard deviation of the IAV timeseries) is notably larger over continental gridcells compared to ocean gridcells (Fig. 6). In both hemispheres, the IAV amplitude over subtropical ocean basins is less than 0.4 ppm, while the IAV amplitude over tropical land in Southeast Asia, Congo forests and Amazon Basin is about 1 ppm. In higher latitudes, the XCO₂ IAV amplitude can exceed 1.2 ppm above deciduous and boreal forests in North America and Eurasia. Higher values over land likely occur due to the active CO₂ exchange between terrestrial ecosystem and the atmosphere, but we cannot rule out that retrievals over land show more variance due to complex topography, albedo, etc., which are elements of the retrieval state vector. Nevertheless, over land areas with low carbon exchange (e.g., Australia, the Middle East, the Sahara Desert), the XCO₂ IAV amplitude is nearly of the same low level as the ocean basins. It is worth noting that for high latitude regions, including both Northern continents and Southern Ocean, OCO-2 does not obtain observations over a full calendar year (stippled gridcells in Fig. 6) due to polar nights, low light levels, and high solar zenith angles. The XCO₂ IAV amplitudes are less zonally coherent




Figure 7. Latitudinal profile for zonal mean of IAV amplitude and the standard deviation among land (green) or ocean (blue) gridcells in each latitude band (shaded area). Individual points represent all grid cells valid IAV record within the certain zonal band.

275




Figure 8. Correlation coefficient between local grid cell IAV timeseries and the corresponding 5° zonal mean XCO₂ IAV timeseries.

280 through these regions than those in the tropics and mid-latitudes, for both land and ocean. When averaging all ocean or land grid cells around a latitude circle, the zonal mean IAV amplitude over the ocean ranges from 0.3 to 1.0 ppm, while the land IAV amplitude ranges from 0.4 to 1.1 ppm (Fig. 7). Both the land and ocean profiles have similar north-south patterns, with higher IAV amplitude in the Northern Hemisphere and lower IAV amplitude in the Southern Hemisphere, and the small IAV amplitudes in the subtropics of both hemispheres, with more scatter among land



285 gridcells than ocean (Fig. 5b and Fig. 7), suggesting either the influence of local flux IAV on land or greater error associated with retrievals on land. We note better coherence between the XCO₂ IAV timeseries of each local grid cell and that of zonal mean XCO₂ IAV timeseries for ocean, with correlation coefficients of approximately 0.8. In contrast, land gridcells are generally correlated with the zonal mean at around 0.4 to 0.6 (Fig. 8).

290 3.2 XCO₂ IAV compared to surface and TCCON ground-based sites

Given that the small IAV signal (up to 1 ppm over land, and smaller over ocean) is similar in magnitude to noise and systematic bias in OCO-2 soundings (Torres et al., 2019), we corroborate patterns of IAV from OCO-2 with other datasets. The OCO-2 IAV timeseries in broad latitudinal belts share similarities with those of TCCON XCO₂ and MBL surface CO₂ IAV timeseries, with all timeseries showing similar relationships to MEI. Especially striking is that
 295 all timeseries capture the lagged response in the NH midlatitude belt to the strong 2015/16 El Nino (Fig. 4a-c). Although the patterns are similar, the magnitude of IAV at the MBL sites is almost double the IAV in the OCO-2 XCO₂ timeseries. Given that the atmospheric boundary layer, where surface observations are made, is on average 10% of the total column, this suggests that much IAV in total column observations is present within the free troposphere. For TCCON, the amplitude of IAV is similar to that of OCO-2, since both methods capture total column variations.
 300 We note that the zonal IAV timeseries for MBL and TCCON appear to have more high frequency variations than those from OCO-2 (Fig. S11 & S12), which likely stems from the fact that the zonal composites are developed from sparse ground-based sites (between 1 and 12 observatories) within each latitude belt, whereas the satellite measures at all longitudes within a belt, though with more limited time resolution. The zonal mean OCO-2 observations are correlated with MBL sites within the same latitude band with R between 0.5 and 0.75 (diagonal elements on Fig. 11b).
 305 Correlations between zonal TCCON and OCO-2 observations range between 0.15 and 0.55 (Table. S1). The correlations are weakest in the northern tropics band, where TCCON data were unavailable during the strong El Nino (Fig. 3c). It is noteworthy that OCO-2 zonal averages are more correlated among different latitudes than are MBL or TCCON observations (off-diagonal elements in Fig. 11c, d, e). The greater correlation across latitudes for OCO-2 compared to MBL sites is likely due to the sensitivity of the OCO-2 XCO₂ observations to the free troposphere, where
 310 meridional transport is more rapid than at the surface. While TCCON data are also sensitive to the free troposphere, we hypothesize that the zonal belt averages for TCCON, constructed from only a few sites, are more affected by noise, both instrumental and geophysical, and thus show lower coherence than the OCO-2 XCO₂ averages constructed from the whole latitudinal bands.

315 We further compared the IAV from OCO-2 XCO₂ with TCCON stations at the site level (Fig. 10). Across all sites, the IAV amplitude generally shows good agreement and lies between 0.4 to 1.2 ppm. We note a slight low bias in OCO-2 relative to TCCON for all five sites in the Southern Hemisphere which lie below the one-to-one line. Low OCO-2 IAV amplitudes may be due to the fact that a 5x5 ° gridcell encompassing these near-coastal locations includes both land and ocean OCO-2 soundings, and may be due to specific sources of variance from retrieval bias affected by
 320 surface type for the OCO-2 (e.g., Fig. 7). It is also worth noting that OCO-2 is looking at a region of 5° by 5° gridcell



(or 5° by 10° in higher latitudes) around TCCON sites, so there are different signals affecting the variance between the two types of observations.




Figure 9. Latitudinal profile of regression Slope (panel a) and correlation coefficient (R, panel b) of OCO-2 versus TCCON XCO₂ IAV. The Slope and R values are based on using monthly XCO₂ IAV. The error bars result from a Monte Carlo bootstrapping approach. The colours represent the number of months data which used for the regression calculation, given gaps in both the OCO-2 and TCCON datasets.

We derive the regression slopes and R between OCO-2 and monthly averaged TCCON IAV through bootstrapping Linear Regression fitting techniques to investigate the coherence between IAV signals from space-based and in-situ ground-based observations. We compute the linear regression 1000 times, by iteratively resampling the IAV timeseries with replacement, and calculate the 95% significant level for regression slopes based on the histogram of the sample distributions during the bootstrapping (Fig. S10). Despite having similar IAV amplitudes, the IAV timeseries from OCO-2 are only moderately correlated with those from TCCON (Fig. 9). The regression slopes range from 0.1- 0.6 and R values are generally around 0.1 – 0.5, indicating that less than 25% of the IAV in OCO-2 is explained by IAV measured by TCCON. These R values are, as expected, smaller than the zonal averages shown in Fig. 11b, which average some of the site-level noise for TCCON and gridcell-level noise for OCO-2. The detailed XCO₂ IAV



timeseries of each site (Fig. S11) for OCO-2 and TCCON show that the IAV timeseries in the NH are more variable, which can partly explain the hemispheric difference in amplitude, slope, and correlation coefficients.




Figure 10. Comparison of OCO-2 and TCCON XCO₂ IAV amplitude at individual sites. Colours reflect site latitudes. The grey dashed line is the one-to-one identity line.

4 Discussion

We use seven years of OCO-2 total column carbon dioxide observations from late 2014 to mid-2021 to illustrate the global temporal-spatial patterns of atmospheric XCO₂ interannual variations. The good agreement among the OCO-2 XCO₂ IAV timeseries, TCCON XCO₂ IAV timeseries and the MBL surface CO₂ IAV timeseries in broad zonal belts improves our confidence that we are able to quantify reasonable IAV timeseries from the satellite record. From the space-based and ground-based detection, we are able to characterize the global response of OCO-2 and TCCON XCO₂ or MBL surface CO₂ IAV to ENSO, and track the CO₂ IAV against the positive/negative phase of ENSO, together with the transport of the signal from South to North (Fig. 4). All datasets show consistent patterns in the response to the El Nino periods, although we note that the IAV amplitude is a factor of almost two smaller in the column average mole fraction, which reflects the fact that IAV variations emerge due to surface fluxes in the lower part of the atmosphere (Olsen & Randerson, 2004), but are efficiently transported into the free troposphere which comprises the bulk of the column. When taken together, the use of surface and column data may allow better separation of transport-driven versus local flux driven variations at the interannual timescale.




Figure 11. Correlation coefficient (R) between among mean CO₂ timeseries using three observing strategies. Panel (a) shows the correlation between zonal mean OCO-2 XCO₂ IAV and zonal mean marine boundary layer CO₂. Panel (b) shows the correlation between zonal mean XCO₂ IAV from OCO-2 and TCCON. Panels (c-e) show the correlation in zonal mean IAV timeseries across four latitude bands for a single observing strategy. Panel (c) shows OCO-2 XCO₂, Panel (d) shows MBL CO₂ and Panel (e) shows TCCON XCO₂. For Panels c-e, the diagonal elements are 1 by construction. Zonal bands include tropical (0-20 degree) and NH/SH temperate zone (20-60 degree)



Our results, however, underscore the difficulty in detecting IAV signals from remote sensing of XCO₂ -- while northern hemisphere seasonal amplitudes are typically 10 ppm scale (Basu et al., 2011), the magnitude of OCO-2 detected XCO₂ IAV is almost an order of magnitude smaller (less than 0.4 ppm over ocean and about 1 ppm over continents). The magnitude of IAV is therefore comparable to other components of the XCO₂ variance budget; for instance, Torres et al. (2019) show random noise in individual OCO-2 soundings of about 0.3 ppm in the southern hemisphere and of about 0.7 ppm in the northern hemisphere, and spatially coherent errors in the retrievals ranging from 0.3 to 0.8 ppm (Torres et al., 2019). Moreover, the uncertainty which originally comes from the varying climatological seasonal cycle, can also reach the level of 0.5 ppm (Fig. 3d). Therefore, robust partitioning of IAV from the observed XCO₂ signal at a given location requires a comprehensive variance budget (Mitchell et al., submitted), and efforts to infer interannual variations in fluxes from OCO-2 must take gridcell-level variance into account or leverage zonally averaged data, which is characterized by greater separation between IAV signal and noise.

Our analysis shows that proper spatial averaging of the monthly XCO₂ signal can mitigate the imprint of random noise and systematic effects from weather systems at sub-monthly timescales. Based on sensitivity tests, we recommend averaging low to mid-latitude of XCO₂ (equatorward of 45°) to 5°x5° bins, and 5° latitude x 10° longitude grid cell poleward of 45°, ensuring that each gridcell aggregates at least 5 soundings within a month. At these levels of spatial averaging, the XCO₂ IAV amplitude was comparable to that of the co-located ground based XCO₂ IAV amplitude measured by TCCON (Fig.10). However, the moderate to low correlation between the IAV timeseries from each monitoring platform reveals the discrepancies of the two measurements in sampling, detection or retrieval, suggesting that one or both is still convolving another source of variance with the calculated IAV signal. Based on the good agreement between the two timeseries in broad zonal belts, we expect that random noise in both observations may degrade the comparison.

The smaller coherence in the IAV timeseries in nearby land and ocean gridcells may be due to larger error over land or may reflect that XCO₂ observations over land contain information about heterogeneous local flux IAV. Complete analysis of the variance budget for OCO-2 observations (Mitchell et al., submitted) will elucidate the likely imprint of each process. When using IAV timeseries for flux inference, it will be crucial to account for non-flux imprints on the timeseries, since spurious attribution of IAV will lead to biased fluxes.

5 Conclusions

We examined IAV in OCO-2 data to determine whether the small variations that result from interannual flux variations can be detected in light of other sources of variance in the space-based dataset. Our results show that zonal averages reveal relationships with ENSO that are consistent with those from established ground-based monitoring network. Zonal averages greatly reduce random noise in XCO₂ compared to 5x5° averages. In general, OCO-2 can successfully monitor CO₂ IAV over both land and ocean, contributing important spatial coverage beyond inferences of IAV from existing ground-based networks.



Data availability

The version 10 OCO-2 Level 2 bias-corrected XCO₂ data product is available from Goddard Earth Sciences Data and Information Services Center Archive: https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/datasets/OCO2_L2_Lite_FP_10r/summary. TCCON Data is publicly available from the TCCON Data Archive (<https://tccodata.org/>) hosted by the California Institute of Technology. MBL dry air mole fraction data is available from NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory Earth System Research Laboratories Archive: <https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/mbldata.php>.

Author contribution

Formal analysis: Yifan Guan. Writing – original draft preparation: Yifan Guan. Conceptualization: Gretchen Keppel-Aleks. Supervision: Gretchen Keppel-Aleks. Project administration: Gretchen Keppel-Aleks and Scott C. Doney. Writing – review & editing: Gretchen Keppel-Aleks, Scott C. Doney, Christof Petri, Dave Pollard, Debra Wunch, Frank Hase, Hirofumi Ohyama, Isamu Morino, Justus Notholt, Kei Shiomi, Kim Strong, Kivi Rigel, Matthias Buschmann, Nicholas Deutscher, Paul Wennberg, Ralf Sussmann, Voltaire A. Velazco and Yao Té.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the participants of the NASA OCO-2 mission for providing the OCO-2 data product (From GES DISC Archive: https://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/datasets/OCO2_L2_Lite_FP_10r/summary) used in this study. We thank TCCON partners for providing total column data. We acknowledge NASA support through the OCO Science team and grants 80NSSC18K0897, 80NSSC21K1071, 80NSSC18K0900, and 80NSSC21K1070 to the University of Michigan and University of Virginia. The Paris TCCON site has received funding from Sorbonne Université, the French research center CNRS, the French space agency CNES, and Région Île-de-France. TCCON sites at Tsukuba, Rikubetsu and Burgos are supported in part by the GOSAT series project. Burgos is supported in part by the Energy Development Corp. Philippines, the TCCON site at Reunion Island has been operated by the Royal Belgian Institute for Space Aeronomy with financial support since 2014 by the EU project ICOS-Inwire and the ministerial decree for ICOS (FR/35/IC1 to FR/35/C6) and local activities supported by LACy/UMR8105 and by OSU-R/UMS3365 – Université de La Réunion. The TCCON stations at Garmisch and Zugspitze have been supported by the Helmholtz Society via the research program “Changing Earth – Sustaining our Future”. The Eureka TCCON measurements were made at the Polar Environment Atmospheric Research Laboratory (PEARL) by the Canadian Network for the Detection of Atmospheric Change (CANDAC), primarily supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada, and the Canadian Space Agency.



475 References

- Ahlström, A., Raupach, M. R., Schurgers, G., Smith, B., Arneth, A., Jung, M., Reichstein, M., Canadell, J. G., Friedlingstein, P., Jain, A. K., Kato, E., Poulter, B., Sitch, S., Stocker, B. D., Viovy, N., Wang, Y. P., Wiltshire, A., Zaehle, S. & Zeng, N. (2015). The dominant role of semi-arid ecosystems in the trend and variability of the land CO₂ sink. *Science*, 348, 895–899. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1668>
- Baker, D. F., Bösch, H., Doney, S. C., O'Brien, D. & Schimel, D. S. (2010). Carbon source/sink information provided by column CO₂ measurements from the Orbiting Carbon Observatory. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 4145–4165. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-4145-2010>
- Baker, D. F., Doney, S. C. & Schimel, D. S. (2006). Variational data assimilation for atmospheric CO₂. *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, 58:5, 359–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0889.2006.00218.x>
- Basu, S., Houweling, S., Peters, W., Sweeney, C., Machida, T., Maksyutov, S., Patra, P.K., Saito, R., Chevallier, F., Niwa, Y., Matsueda, H. & Sawa, Y. (2011). The seasonal cycle amplitude of total column CO₂ : Factors behind the model-observation mismatch. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016124>
- Blumenstock, T., Hase F., Schneider M., Garca O.E. & Sep lveda E. (2017). TCCON data from Izana, Tenerife, Spain, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.izana01.R1>
- Byrne, B., Liu, J., Lee, M., Baker, I., Bowman, K. W., Deutscher, N. M., Feist, D. G., Griffith, D. W. T., Iraci, L. T., Kiel, M., Kimball, J. S., Miller, C. E., Morino, I., Parazoo, N. C., Petri, C., Roehl, C. M., Sha, M. K., Strong, K., Velazco, V. A., Wennberg, P. O. & Wunch, D. (2020). Improved Constraints on Northern Extratropical CO₂ Fluxes Obtained by Combining Surface-Based and Space-Based Atmospheric CO₂ Measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 125 (15). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD032029>
- Chatterjee, A., Gierach, M.M., Sutton, A.J., Feely, R.A., Crisp, D., Eldering, A., Gunson, M.R., O'Dell, C.W., Stephens, B.B., & Schimel, D.S. (2017). Influence of El Niño on atmospheric CO₂ over the tropical Pacific Ocean: Findings from NASA's OCO-2 mission. *Science*, 358. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam5776>
- Chevallier, F., Remaud, M., O'Dell, C. W., Baker, D., Peylin, P. & Cozic, A. (2019) Objective 4.1 evaluation of surface-and satellite-driven carbon dioxide atmospheric inversions. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19 14233–51. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-14233-2019>



- Ciais, P., Sabine, C., Bala, G., Bopp, L., Brovkin, V., Canadell, J., Chhabra, A., DeFries, R., Galloway, J., Heimann, M., Jones, C., LeQuéré, C., Myneni, R. B., Piao, S., & Thornton, P. (2013). Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles, in *Climate Change 2013: edited by Stocker et al., The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change* (pp. 1–106).
- Crisp, D., Bosch, H., Brown, L., Castano, R., Christi, M., Connor, B., Frankenberg, C., McDuffie, J., Miller, C. E., Natraj, V., O'Dell, C., O'Brien, D., Polonsky, I., Oyafuso, F., Thompson, D., Toon, G. & Spurr, R. (2010). OCO (Orbiting Carbon Observatory)-2 Level 2 Full Physics Retrieval Algorithm Theoretical Basis, Tech. Rep. OCO D-65488, NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, version 1.0 Rev 4, [http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/acdisc/documentation/OCO-2 L2 FP ATBD v1 rev4 Nov10.pdf](http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/acdisc/documentation/OCO-2_L2_FP_ATBD_v1_rev4_Nov10.pdf), (last access: January 2012).
- Crisp, D., Fisher, B. M., O'Dell, C., Frankenberg, C., Basilio, R., Bösch, H., Brown, L. R., Castano, R., Connor, B., Deutscher, N. M., Eldering, A., Griffith, D., Gunson, M., Kuze, A., Mandrake, L., McDuffie, J., Messerschmidt, J., Miller, C. E., Morino, I., Natraj, V., Notholt, J., O'Brien, D. M., Oyafuso, F., Polonsky, I., Robinson, J., Salawitch, R., Sherlock, V., Smyth, M., Suto, H., Taylor, T. E., Thompson, D. R., Wennberg, P. O., Wunch, D. & Yung, Y. L. (2012). The ACOS CO₂ retrieval algorithm – Part II: Global XCO₂ data characterization. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 5, 687–707. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-5-687-2012>.
- Crisp, D., Pollock, H. R., Rosenberg, R., Chapsky, L., Lee, R. A. M., Oyafuso, F. A., Frankenberg, C., O'Dell, C. W., Bruegge, C. J., Doran, G. B., Eldering, A., Fisher, B. M., Fu, D., Gunson, M. R., Mandrake, L., Osterman, G. B., Schwandner, F. M., Sun, K., Taylor, T. E., Wennberg, P. O. & Wunch, D. (2017). The on-orbit performance of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) instrument and its radiometrically calibrated products. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 10, 59–81. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-10-59-2017>.
- Connor, B., Bösch, H., McDuffie, J., Taylor, T., Fu, D., Frankenberg, C., O'Dell, C., Payne, V. H., Gunson, M., Pollock, R., Hobbs, J., Oyafuso, F. & Jiang, Y. (2016). Quantification of uncertainties in OCO-2 measurements of XCO₂: simulations and linear error analysis. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 9, 5227–5238. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-9-5227-2016>
- Conway, T.J., Tans, P.P., Waterman, L.S., Thoning, K.W., Kitzi, D.R., Masarie, K.A. & Zhang, N. (1994). Evidence for interannual variability of the carbon cycle from the NOAA/CMDL global air sampling network. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 99, 22831–22855. <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JD01951>
- Cox, P.M., Pearson, D., Booth, B.B., Friedlingstein, P., Huntingford, C., Jones, C.D. & Luke, C.M. (2013). Sensitivity of tropical carbon to climate change constrained by carbon dioxide variability. *Nature*, 494(7437):341–4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11882>.



- 550 Crowther, T. W., Glick, H. B., Covey, K. R., Bettigole, C., Maynard, D. S., Thomas, S. M., Smith, J. R., Hintler, G.,
 Duguid, M. C., Amatulli, G., Tuanmu, M.-N., Jetz, W., Salas, C., Stam, C., Piotto, D., Tavani, R., Green, S., Bruce,
 G., Williams, S. J., Wiser, S. K., Huber, M. O., Hengeveld, G. M., Nabuurs, G.-J., Tikhonova, E., Borchardt, P., Li,
 C.-F., Powrie, L. W., Fischer, M., Hemp, A., Homeier, J., Cho, P., Vibrans, A. C., Umunay, P. M., Piao, S. L., Rowe,
 C. W., Ashton, M. S., Crane, P. R. & Bradford, M. A. (2015). Mapping tree density at a global scale. *Nature*, 525, 201–
 555 205. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14967>
- De Maziere, M., Sha, M. K., Desmet, F., Hermans, C., Scolas, F., Kumps, N., Metzger, J.-M., Dufлот, V. & Cammas,
 J.-P. (2017). TCCON data from Reunion Island (La Reunion), France, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive*,
CaltechDATA. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.reunion01.R0/1149288>
- 560 Deutscher, N., Notholt, J., Messerschmidt, J., Weinzierl, C., Warneke, T., Petri, C., Grupe, P. & Katrynski, K. (2017).
 TCCON data from Bialystok, Poland, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive*, *CaltechDATA*.
<http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.bialystok01.R1/1183984>
- 565 Dlugokencky, E. J., Lang, P. M., Mund, J. W., Crotwell, A. M., Crotwell, M. J., & Thoning, K. W. (2016).
 Atmospheric carbon dioxide dry air mole fractions from the NOAA ESRL carbon cycle cooperative global air
 sampling network, 1968–2015, version 2016- 08-30, NOAA, available at: [ftp://afjp.cmdl.noaa.gov/data/trace_](ftp://afjp.cmdl.noaa.gov/data/trace_gases/co2/flask/surface/)
[gases/co2/flask/surface/](ftp://afjp.cmdl.noaa.gov/data/trace_gases/co2/flask/surface/)
- 570 Doney, S. C., Lima, I., Feely, R. A., Glover, D. M., Lindsay, K., Mahowald, N., Moore, J. K., & Wanninkhof, R.
 (2009). Mechanisms governing interannual variability in upper-ocean inorganic carbon system and air–sea CO₂
 fluxes: Physical climate and atmospheric dust, *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II*, 56, 640–655.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.12.006>
- 575 Feely, R.A., Wanninkhof, R., Takahashi, T. & Tans, P. (1999). Influence of El Niño on the equatorial Pacific
 contribution to atmospheric CO₂ accumulation. *Nature*. 398, 597–601. <https://doi.org/10.1038/19273>
- Feely, R. A., Boutin, J., Cosca, C., Dandonneau, Y., Etcheto, J., Inoue, H. Y., Ishill, M., Le, Quere C., Mackey, D. J.,
 McPhaden, M., Metzl, N., Poisson, A., & Wanninkhof, R. (2002). Seasonal and interannual variability of CO₂ in the
 580 equatorial Pacific. *Deep-Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 49(13-14), 2443-2469.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645\(02\)00044-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645(02)00044-9)
- Feist, D. G., Arnold, S. G., John, N. & Geibel, M. C. (2017). TCCON data from Ascension Island, Saint Helena,
 Ascension and Tristan da Cunha, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive*, *CaltechDATA*.
 585 <http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.ascension01.R0/1149285>



- Francey, R. J., Tans, P. P., Allison, C. E., Enting, I. G., White, J. W. C. & Trolier, M. (1995). Changes in Oceanic and Terrestrial Carbon Uptake since 1982. *Nature*, 373, 326–330. <https://doi.org/10.1038/373326a0>
- 590 Friedlingstein, P., Jones, M. W., O'Sullivan, M., Andrew, R. M., Hauck, J., Peters, G. P., et al. (2019). Global carbon budget 2019. *Earth System Science Data*, 11(4), 1783–1838. <https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/11/1783/2019/>
- IPCC, 2021: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai P., Pirani A., Connors S.L., Péan C., Berger S., Caud N., Chen Y., Goldfarb L., Gomis M.I, Huang M., Leitzell K., Lonnoy E.,
- 595 Matthews J.B.R., Maycock T.K., Waterfield T., Yelekçi O., Yu R., and Zhou B. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, In press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896>.
- Goo, T.-Y., Oh, Y.-S. & Velazco, V. A.. (2017). TCCON data from Anmeyondo, South Korea, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*.
- 600 <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.anmeyondo01.R0/1149284>
- Griffith, D. W. T., Deutscher, N., Velazco, V. A., Wennberg, P. O., Yavin, Y., Keppel Aleks, G., Washenfelder, R., Toon, G. C., Blavier, J.-F., Murphy, C., Jones, N., Kettlewell, G., Connor, B., Macatangay, R., Roehl, C., Ryzek, M., Glowacki, J., Culgan, T. & Bryant, G.. (2017). TCCON data from Darwin, Australia, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.darwin01.R0/1149290>
- 605 <http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.darwin01.R0/1149290>
- Griffith, D. W. T., Velazco, V. A., Deutscher, N., Murphy, C., Jones, N., Wilson, S., Macatangay, R., Kettlewell, G., Buchholz, R. R. & Riggenbach, M. (2017). TCCON data from Wollongong, Australia, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.wollongong01.R0/1149291>
- 610 <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.wollongong01.R0/1149291>
- Gruber, N., Keeling, C. D. & Bates, N. R. (2002). Interannual variability in the North Atlantic Ocean carbon sink. *Science* 298(5602): 2374–2378. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1077077>
- Gurney, K.R., Baker, D., Rayner, P. & Denning, S. (2008). Interannual variations in continental-scale net carbon exchange and sensitivity to observing networks estimated from atmospheric CO₂ inversions for the period 1980 to 2005. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22, GB3025. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB003082>.
- 615 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB003082>.
- Hase, F., Blumenstock, T., Dohe, S., Gro, J. & Kiel, M. (2017). TCCON data from Karlsruhe, Germany, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.karlsruhe01.R1/1182416>
- 620 <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.karlsruhe01.R1/1182416>



- Humphrey, V., Zscheischler, J., Ciais, P., Gudmundsson, L., Stich, S. & Seneviratne, S. I. (2018). Sensitivity of atmospheric CO₂ growth rate to observed changes in terrestrial water storage. *Nature* 560, 628–631. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0424-4>
- 625 Kivi, R., Heikkinen, P. & Kyro, E. (2017). TCCON data from Sodankyla, Finland, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.sodankyla01.R0/1149280>
- Iraci, L., Podolske, J., Hillyard, P., Roehl, C., Wennberg, P. O., Blavier, J.-F., Landeros, J., Allen, N., Wunch, D., Zavaleta, J., Quigley, E., Osterman, G., Albertson, R., Dunwoody, K. & Boyden, H.. (2017). TCCON data from
 630 Armstrong Flight Research Center, Edwards, CA, USA, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.edwards01.R1/1255068>
- Jones, C.D., Collins, M., Cox, P.M. & Spall, S.A. (2001). The carbon cycle response to ENSO: a coupled climate-carbon cycle model study. *Journal of Climate*, 14, 4113–4129. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(2001\)014<4113:TCCRTE>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2001)014<4113:TCCRTE>2.0.CO;2)
 635
- Karion, A., Sweeney, C., Tans, P. & Newberger, T. (2010). AirCore: An Innovative Atmospheric Sampling System. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 27, 1839-1853. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JTECHA1448.1>
- 640 Keenan, T.F. & Williams, C.A. (2018). The Terrestrial Carbon Sink. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 2018 43:1, 219-243. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-030204>
- Keppel-Aleks, G., Wennberg, P. O., Washenfelder, R. A., Wunch, D., Schneider, T., Toon, G. C., Andres, R. J., Blavier, J.-F., Connor, B., Davis, K. J., Desai, A. R., Messerschmidt, J., Notholt, J., Roehl, C. M., Sherlock, V.,
 645 Stephens, B. B., Vay, S. A., & Wofsy, S. C. (2012). The imprint of surface fluxes and transport on variations in total column carbon dioxide. *Biogeosciences*, 9, 875–891. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-875-2012>
- Keppel-Aleks, G., Wolf, A. S., Mu, M., Doney, S. C., Morton, D. C., Kasibhatla, P. S., Miller, J. B., Dlugokencky, E. J. & Randerson, J. T. (2014). Separating the influence of temperature, drought, and fire on interannual variability in
 650 atmospheric CO₂. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 28 1295–310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GB004890>
- Kivi, R. and Heikkinen, P.: Fourier transform spectrometer measurements of column CO₂ at Sodankylä, Finland, *Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst.*, 5, 271–279, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-5-271-2016>, 2016.
- 655 Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Harada, Y., Ebata, A., Moriya, M., Onoda, H., Onogi, K., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H., Miyaoka, K. & Takahashi, K. (2015). The JRA-55 Reanalysis: general specifications and basic characteristics. *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan*, 93, 5-48. <https://doi.org/10.2151/jmsj.2015-001>



- 660 Landschützer, P., Gruber, N., Bakker, D. C. E., Schuster, U., Nakaoka, S., Payne, M. R., Sasse, T. P. & Zeng, J. (2013). A neural network-based estimate of the seasonal to inter-annual variability of the Atlantic Ocean carbon sink. *Biogeosciences*, 10, 7793–7815. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-7793-2013>
- 665 Landschützer, P., Gruber, N. & Bakker, D. C. E. (2016). Decadal variations and trends of the global ocean carbon sink. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 30, 1396– 1417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GB005359>
- Le Quéré, C., Aumont, O., Bopp, L., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Francey, R., Heimann, M., Keeling, C.D., Keeling, R.F., Khesghi, H., Peylin, P., Piper, S.C., Prentice, I.C. & Rayner, P.J. (2003). Two decades of ocean CO₂ sink and variability. *Tellus B : Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, 55B, p. 649-656. International Carbon Dioxide Conference, 6., Sendai (JPN), 2011/10/01-05.
- 670 Le Quere, C., Raupach, M. R., Canadell, J. G., Marland, G., Bopp, L., Ciais, P., Conway, T. J., Doney, S. C., Feely, R. A., Foster, P., Friedlingstein, P., Gurney, K., Houghton, R. A., House, J. I., Huntingford, C., Levy, P. E., Lomas, M. R., Majkut, J., Metzl, N., Ometto, J. P., Peters, G. P., Prentice, I. C., Randerson, J. T., Running, S. W., Sarmiento, J. L., Schuster, U., Sitch, S., Takahashi, T., Viovy, N., van der Werf, G. R. & Woodward, F. I. (2009). Trends in the sources and sinks of carbon dioxide. *Nature Geoscience*, 2(12), 831-836. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo689>.
- 675 Liu J., Bowman, K. W., Schimel, D. S., Parazoo, N. C., Jiang, Z., Lee, M., Bloom, A. A., Wunch, D., Frankenberg, C., Sun, Y., O'Dell, C. W., Gurney, K. R., Menemenlis, D., Gierach, M., Crisp, D. & Eldering, A.(2017). Contrasting carbon cycle responses of the tropical continents to the 2015-2016 El Niño. *Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam5690>.
- 680 Marcolla, B., Rödenbeck, C., & Cescatti, A. (2017). Patterns and controls of inter-annual variability in the terrestrial carbon budget. *Biogeosciences*, 14, 3815–3829. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-3815-2017>
- 685 Masarie, K.A. & Tans, P.P. (1995). Extension and Integration of Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Data into a Globally Consistent Measurement Record. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 100(D6), 11593– 11610. <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JD00859>
- 690 McKinley, G.A., Rödenbeck, C., Gloor, M., Houweling, S. & Heimann, M. (2004). Pacific dominance to global air-sea CO₂ flux variability: A novel atmospheric inversion agrees with ocean models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 31, L22308. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GL021069>.



- 695 Miller, S. M., Michalak, A. M., Yadav, V. & Tadić, J. M. (2018). Characterizing biospheric carbon balance using
 CO₂ observations from the OCO-2 satellite. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 18, 6785–6799.
<https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-6785-2018>
- 700 Mitchell, K. A., Doney S. C. & Keppel-Aleks G. (2022). Characterizing average seasonal, synoptic, and finer
 variability in Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 XCO₂ across North America and adjacent ocean basins, *Journal of
 Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, submitted.
- Morino, I., Matsuzaki, T. & Shishime, A. (2017). TCCON data from Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan, 125HR, Release
 GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.tsukuba02.R1/1241486>
- 705 Morino, I., Velazco, V. A., Hori, A., Uchino, O., & Griffith, D. W. T. (2018). TCCON data from Burgos, Ilocos Norte
 (PH), Release GGG2014.R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*.
<https://doi.org/10.14291/TCCON.GGG2014.BURGOS01.R0>
- Morino, I., Yokozeki, N., Matsuzaki, T. & Shishime, A. (2017). TCCON data from Rikubetsu, Hokkaido, Japan,
 Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*.
 710 <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.rikubetsu01.R1/1242265>
- Mudelsee, M. (2014). *Climate Time Series Analysis: Classical Statistical and Bootstrap Methods* Second edition.
 Springer, Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04450-7>
- 715 Nassar, R., Jones, D. B. A., Suntharalingam, P., Chen, J. M., Andres, R. J., Wecht, K. J., Yantosca, R. M., Kulawik,
 S. S., Bowman, K. W., Worden, J. R., Machida, T., & Matsueda, H. (2010). Modeling global atmospheric CO₂ with
 improved emission inventories and CO₂ production from the oxidation of other carbon species. *Geoscientific Model
 Development*, 3, 689–716. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-3-689-2010>
- 720 Nevison, C. D., Mahowald, N. M., Doney, S. C., Lima, I. D., van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Baker, D. F.,
 Kasibhatla, P. & McKinley, G. A. (2008). Contribution of ocean, fossil fuel, land biosphere, and biomass burning
 carbon fluxes to seasonal and interannual variability in atmospheric CO₂. *Journal of Geophysical Research:
 Biogeosciences*, 113, G0101. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JG000408>
- 725 Notholt, J., Petri C., Warneke, T., Deutscher, N., Buschmann, M., Weinzierl, C., Macatangay, R. & Grupe, P. (2017).
 TCCON data from Bremen, Germany, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*.
<https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.bremen01.R0/1149275>



- 730 Notholt, J., Warneke, T., Petri, C., Deutscher, N. M., Weinzierl, C., Palm, M., & Buschmann, M. (2019). TCCON
 data from Ny Ålesund, Spitsbergen (NO), Release GGG2014.R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*.
<https://doi.org/10.14291/TCCON.GGG2014.NYALESUND01.R1>
- 735 O'Dell, C. W., Connor, B., Bösch, H., O'Brien, D., Frankenberg, C., Castano, R., Christi, M., Eldering, D., Fisher, B.,
 Gunson, M., McDuffie, J., Miller, C. E., Natraj, V., Oyafuso, F., Polonsky, I., Smyth, M., Taylor, T., Toon, G. C.,
 Wennberg, P. O. & Wunch, D. (2012). The ACOS CO₂ retrieval algorithm—Part 1: Description and validation against
 synthetic observations. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 5(1), 99–121. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-5-99-2012>
- 740 O'Dell, C. W., Eldering, A., Wennberg, P. O., Crisp, D., Gunson, M. R., Fisher, B., Frankenberg, C., Kiel, M.,
 Lindqvist, H., Mandrake, L., Merrelli, A., Natraj, V., Nelson, R. R., Osterman, G. B., Payne, V. H., Taylor, T. E.,
 Wunch, D., Drouin, B. J., Oyafuso, F., Chang, A., McDuffie, J., Smyth, M., Baker, D. F., Basu, S., Chevallier, F.,
 Crowell, S. M. R., Feng, L., Palmer, P. I., Dubey, M., García, O. E., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., Iraci, L. T., Kivi, R.,
 Morino, I., Notholt, J., Ohyama, H., Petri, C., Roehl, C. M., Sha, M. K., Strong, K., Sussmann, R., Te, Y., Uchino, O.,
 and Velasco, V. A. (2018). Improved retrievals of carbon dioxide from Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 with the version
 745 8 ACOS algorithm. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 11, 1–57. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2018-257>
- Olsen, S. C. & Randerson, J. T. (2004). Differences between surface and column atmospheric CO₂ and implications
 for carbon cycle research. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 109, D02301. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JD003968>
- 750 Patra, P. k., Maksyutov, S., Ishizawa, M., Nakazawa, T., Takahashi, T. & Ukita, J. (2005). Interannual and decadal
 changes in the sea–air CO₂ flux from atmospheric CO₂ inverse modeling. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19,
 GB4013. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GB002257>
- 755 Peylin, P., P. Bousquet, C. LeQuere, S. Sitch, P. Friedlingstein, G.A. McKinley, N. Gruber, P. Rayner & P. Ciais
 (2005). Multiple constraints of regional CO₂ flux variations over land and oceans, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19,
 GB1011. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GB002214>
- 760 Piao S., Sitch S., Ciais P., Friedlingstein P., Peylin P., Wang X., Ahlström A., Anav A., Canadell J.G., Cong N.,
 Huntingford C., Jung M., Levis S., Levy P.E., Li J., Lin X., Lomas M.R., Lu M., Luo Y., Ma Y., Myneni R.B., Poulter
 B., Sun Z., Wang T., Viovy N., Zaehle S. & Zeng N. (2013). Evaluation of terrestrial carbon cycle models for their
 response to climate variability and to CO₂ trends. *Global Change Biology*, 19: 2117–2132.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12187>



- 765 Piao S., Wang X., Wang K., Li X., Bastos A., Canadell J. G., Ciais P., Friedlingstein P. & Sitch S. (2020). Interannual variation of terrestrial carbon cycle: issues and perspectives. *Global Change Biology*, 26,300–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14884>
- 770 Poulter, B., Frank, D., Ciais, P., Myneni, R.B., Andela, N., Bi, J., Broquet, G., Canadell, J.G., Chevallier, F., Liu, Y.Y., Running, S.W., Sitch, S. & Van Der Werf G.R. (2014). Contribution of semi-arid ecosystems to interannual variability of the global carbon cycle. *Nature*, 509, 600–603. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13376>
- 775 Prentice, IC., Farquhar, GD., Fasham, MJR., Goulden, ML., Heimann, M., Jaramillo, VJ., Khashgi, HS., Le Quéré, C., Scholes, RJ., & Wallace, DWR. (2001). The carbon cycle and atmospheric carbon dioxide. In J. T. Houghton, Y. Ding, D. J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P. J. V. D. Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell, & C. A. Johnson (Eds.). *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (pp. 183 - 237). Cambridge University Press.
- Randerson, J.T. (2013). Global warming and tropical carbon. *Nature* 494, 319–320, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11949>
- 780 Rödenbeck, C., Bakker, D. C. E., Gruber, N., Iida, Y., Jacobson, A. R., Jones, S., Landschützer, P., Metzl, N., Nakaoka, S., Olsen, A., Park, G.-H., Peylin, P., Rodgers, K. B., Sasse, T. P., Schuster, U., Shutler, J. D., Valsala, V., Wanninkhof, R., & Zeng, J. (2015). Data-based estimates of the ocean carbon sink variability – first results of the Surface Ocean pCO₂ Mapping intercomparison (SOCOM). *Biogeosciences*, 12, 7251–7278. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-7251-2015>
- 785 Rödenbeck, C., Bakker, D. C. E., Metzl, N., Olsen, A., Sabine, C., Cassar, N., Reum, F., Keeling, R. F., & Heimann, M. (2014). Interannual sea-air CO₂ flux variability from an observation driven ocean mixed-layer scheme. *Biogeosciences*, 11, 4599– 4613. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-11-4599-2014>
- 790 Schwalm, C. R., Williams, C. A., Schaefer, K., Baker, I., Collatz, G. J. & Rödenbeck, C. (2011). Does terrestrial drought explain global CO₂ flux anomalies induced by El Niño? *Biogeosciences*, 8, 2493–2506. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-8-2493-2011>
- 795 Shiomi, K., Kawakami, S., Ohyama, H., Arai K., Okumura H., Taura C., Fukamachi T. & Sakashita M. (2017). TCCON data from Saga, Japan, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tccon.ggg2014.saga01.R0/1149283>
- 800 Sherlock, V., Connor B., Robinson J., Shiona H., Smale D., Pollard D. (2017). TCCON data from Lauder, New Zealand, 125HR, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tccon.ggg2014.lauder02.R0/1149298>



- Spring, A., Ilyina, T. & Marotzke, J. (2020). Inherent uncertainty disguises attribution of reduced atmospheric CO₂ growth to CO₂ emission reductions for up to a decade. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15, 114058. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abc443>
- 805 Strong, K., Mendonca J., Weaver D., Fogal P., Drummond J.R., Batchelor R., Lindenmaier R. (2017). TCCON data from Eureka, Canada, Release GGG2014R2. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.eureka01.R2>
- 810 Sussmann, R. & Rettinger, M. (2017). TCCON data from Garmisch, Germany, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.garmisch01.R0/1149299>
- Sussmann, R. & Rettinger, M. (2018). TCCON data from Zugspitze (DE), Release GGG2014.R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/TCCON.GGG2014.ZUGSPITZE01.R1>
- 815 Sussmann, R., and Rettinger, M. (2020): Can We Measure a COVID-19-Related Slowdown in Atmospheric CO₂ Growth? Sensitivity of Total Carbon Column Observations, *Remote Sens.*, 12, 2387, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12152387>
- 820 Takahashi, T., Sutherland, S.C., Feely, R.A. & Cosca, C.E. (2003). Decadal variation of the surface water PCO₂ in the western and central equatorial Pacific. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 302(5646):852-6. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1088570>
- 825 Té, Y., Jeseck, P., and Janssen, C.: TCCON data from Paris (FR), Release GGG2014.R0, <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.paris01.r0/1149279>, 2014.
- Thoning, K. W., Tans, P. P., & Komhyr, W. D. (1989). Atmospheric carbon dioxide at Mauna Loa Observatory: 2. Analysis of the NOAA GMCC data, 1974–1985. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 94(D6), 8549– 8565. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JD094iD06p08549>
- 830 Timmermann, A., An, S.I., Kug, J.S., Jin, F.F., Cai, W., Capotondi A., Cobb, K.M., Lengaigne, M., McPhaden, M.J., Stuecker, M.F., Stein, K., Wittenberg, A.T., Yun, K.S., Bayr, T., Chen, H.C., Chikamoto, Y., Dewitte, B., Dommenges, D., Grothe, P., Guilyardi, E., Ham, Y.G., Hayashi, M., Ineson, S., Kang, D., Kim, S., Kim, W., Lee, J.Y., Li, T., Luo, J.J., McGregor, S., Planton, Y., Power, S., Rashid, H., Ren, H.L., Santoso, A., Takahashi, K., Todd, A., Wang, G., Wang, G., Xie, R., Yang, W.H., Yeh, S.W., Yoon, J., Zeller, E. & Zhang, X. (2018). El Niño–Southern Oscillation complexity. *Nature* 559, 535–545. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0252-6>



- 840 Wang, J., Zeng, N., Liu, Y. & Bao, Q. (2014). To what extent can interannual CO₂ variability constrain carbon cycle sensitivity to climate change in CMIP5 Earth system models? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 3535–3544. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL060004>
- 845 Wang X., Piao, S., Ciais, P., Friedlingstein, P., Myneni, R.B., Cox, P., Heimann, M., Miller, J., Peng, S., Wang, T., Yang, H. & Chen, A. (2014). A two-fold increase of carbon cycle sensitivity to tropical temperature variations. *Nature*, 506, 212–215. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12915>
- 850 Warneke, T., Messerschmidt, J., Notholt, J., Weinzierl, C., Deutscher, N., Petri, C., Grupe, P., Vuillemin, C., Truong, F., Schmidt, M., Ramonet, M. & Parmentier, E. (2017). TCCON data from Orleans, France, Release GGG2014R0. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.orleans01.R0/1149276>
- Washenfelder, R. A., Toon, G. C., Blavier, J.-F., Yang, Z., Allen, N. T., Wennberg, P. O., Vay, S. A., Matross, D. M. & Daube, B. C. (2006). Carbon dioxide column abundances at the Wisconsin Tall Tower site. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111, D22305. doi:10.1029/2006JD007154
- 855 Wennberg, P. O., Wunch D., Roehl C., Blavier J.-F., Toon G. C., Allen N., Dowell P., Teske K., Martin C. & Martin J. (2017). TCCON data from Lamont, Oklahoma, USA, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, hosted by CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.lamont01.R1/1255070>
- 860 Wennberg, P. O., Wunch D., Roehl C., Blavier J.-F., Toon G. C. & Allen N. (2017). TCCON data from California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, USA, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.pasadena01.R1/1182415>
- 865 Wennberg, P. O., Roehl, C., Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., Blavier, J.-F., Washenfelder, R., Keppel-Aleks, G., Allen, N. & Ayers, J. (2017). TCCON data from Park Falls, Wisconsin, USA, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <http://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.parkfalls01.R1>
- 870 Wofsy, S.C., Goulden, M. L., Munger, J.W., Fan, S.M., Bakwin, P.S., Daube, B.C., Bassow, S.L. & Bazzaz, F.A. (1993). Net Exchange of CO₂ in a Mid-Latitude Forest. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*. 260. 1314–7. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.260.5112.1314>
- Wunch, D., Mendonca, J., Colebatch, O., Allen, N., Blavier, J.-F. L., Springett, S., Worthy, D., Kessler, R. & Strong, K. (2017). TCCON data from East Trout Lake, Canada, Release GGG2014R1. *TCCON data archive, CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/tcon.ggg2014.easttroutlake01.R1>



- 875 Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., J.-F.L. Blavier, Washenfelder, R. A., Notholt, J., Connor, B. J., Griffith, D. W. T., Sherlock, V. & Wennberg, P. O. (2011). The Total Carbon Column Observing Network. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 369, 2087–2112. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2010.0240>
- 880 Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., Wennberg, P. O., Wofsy, S. C., Stephens, B. B., Fischer, M. L., Uchino, O., Abshire, J. B., Bernath, P., Biraud, S. C., Blavier, J.-F. L., Boone, C., Bowman, K. P., Browell, E. V., Campos, T., Connor, B. J., Daube, B. C., Deutscher, N. M., Diao, M., Elkins, J. W., Gerbig, C., Gottlieb, E., Griffith, D. W. T., Hurst, D. F., Jiménez, R., Keppel-Aleks, G., Kort, E. A., Macatangay, R., Machida, T., Matsueda, H., Moore, F., Morino, I., Park, S., Robinson, J., Roehl, C. M., Sawa, Y., Sherlock, V., Sweeney, C., Tanaka, T. & Zondlo, M. A. (2010). Calibration of the Total Carbon Column Observing Network using aircraft profile data. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 3, 1351–1362. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-3-1351-2010>
- 885 Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., Sherlock, V., Deutscher, N. M., Liu, C., Feist, D. G. & Wennberg, P.O. (2015). Documentation for the 2014 TCCON Data Release. *CaltechDATA*. <https://doi.org/10.14291/TCCON.GGG2014.DOCUMENTATION.R0/1221662>
- 890 Wunch, D., Wennberg, P. O., Osterman, G., Fisher, B., Naylor, B., Roehl, C. M., O'Dell, C., Mandrake, L., Viatte, C., Griffith, D. W., Deutscher, N. M., Velazco, V. A., Notholt, J., Warneke, T., Petri, C., Maziere, M. D., Sha, M. K., Sussmann, R., Rettinger, M., Pollard, D., Robinson, J., Morino, I., Uchino, O., Hase, F., Blumenstock, T., Kiel, M., Feist, D. G., Arnold, S. G., Strong, K., Mendonca, J., Kivi, R., Heikkinen, P., Iraci, L., Podolske, J., Hillyard, P. W., 895 Kawakami, S., Dubey, M. K., Parker, H. A., Sepulveda, E., Rodriguez, O. E. G., Te, Y., Jeseck, P., Gunson, M. R., Crisp, D. & Eldering, A. (2017). Comparisons of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) XCO₂ measurements with TCCON. *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, 10(6), 2209–2238. <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-10-2209-2017>.
- 900 Yokota, T., Yoshida, Y., Eguchi, N., Ota, Y., Tanaka, T., Watanabe, H. & Maksyutov, S. (2009). Global concentrations of CO₂ and CH₄ retrieved from GOSAT: First preliminary results. *Scientific Online Letters on the Atmosphere*, 5(1), 160–163. <https://doi.org/10.2151/sola.2009-041>
- Zeng, N., Mariotti, A. & Wetzel, P. (2005). Terrestrial mechanisms of interannual CO₂ variability. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19, GB1016. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GB002273>