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The Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service (CAMS) provides continuous data and information on atmospheric composition in an operational mode. The CAMS products include analyses/re-analyses of the greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide) for recent years. In this report, we evaluate the quality of the CAMS methane (CH$_4$) products, focusing on the "near real time analyses" of the atmospheric CH$_4$ concentrations (from the ECMWF IFS assimilation system) and the re-analyses of CH$_4$ concentrations and fluxes (from the TM5-4DVAR inverse modelling system, provided by TNO / SRON). The CAMS CH$_4$ products are compared to comprehensive independent observational data sets (from surface monitoring stations, ship cruises, various aircraft programmes, AirCore balloon soundings up to the middle stratosphere, and measurements of column averaged CH$_4$ mole fractions) during 2010-2017. Furthermore, CH$_4$ flux inversions from the JRC TM5-4DVAR system (which was used as prototype of the operational CAMS inversion system) are included in the analysis, providing a benchmark to evaluate the CAMS CH$_4$ flux inversion products.

Overall, the CAMS and JRC inversions show very similar performance and compare well to observations over remote regions near the surface and within the free troposphere, confirming that in general CH$_4$ mole fractions in the background troposphere far from CH$_4$ emissions are realistically simulated. Due to the relatively coarse horizontal resolution of 3$^\circ$ (longitude) x 2$^\circ$ (latitude), however, both CAMS and JRC inversions show clear limitations in simulating regional surface monitoring stations (which are influenced by regional CH$_4$ emissions), in most cases underestimating measured CH$_4$ mole fractions in these areas. Furthermore, the inversions show large differences to the observed CH$_4$ mole fractions in the lower to middle stratosphere at mid to high latitudes, most likely due to shortcomings in simulating the transport and/or chemistry in the stratosphere and the stratospheric-tropospheric exchange.

In contrast to the flux inversions, the CAMS "near real time analyses" show generally large biases (varying in space and time) in the simulated CH$_4$ mole fractions compared to observations in the background troposphere. These large biases are probably mainly due to the assimilation strategy of including only satellite retrievals (but no surface observations) and potential biases in the assimilated satellite products, while the flux inversions assimilate satellite retrievals and surface observations simultaneously and thus correct for biases in the satellite data (along with potential biases of the models to simulate the stratosphere).

The surface CH$_4$ fluxes derived from the CAMS inversion system are in general similar to the JRC estimates. However, the latitudinal gradients of the fluxes are slightly different between the two inversion systems, probably in part due to the two different convection schemes applied.
1 Introduction

Methane (CH₄) is the second most important anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) after carbon dioxide (CO₂), with 28 times the global warming potential of CO₂ over a 100-year time horizon [IPCC, 2013]. Global atmospheric CH₄ concentrations have increased by a factor of ~2.5 since preindustrial times [Etheridge et al., 1998] and contribute to ~17% of the direct anthropogenic radiative forcing of all long-lived GHGs in 2016, relative to 1750 (NOAA Annual Greenhouse Gas Index, AGGI; [Butler and Montzka, 2018]). Monitoring of atmospheric GHGs is essential in order to support international efforts to limit climate change, in particular the Paris Agreement, which aims to hold "the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial level".

To support climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies, but also for efficient management of emergency situations and to improve the security of European citizens, the European Union (EU) has established the Copernicus programme (http://www.copernicus.eu/), the EU's earth observation programme, providing operational data and information services on the state of the environment including land, sea, and atmosphere. These earth observation data are processed by six thematic Copernicus services: Atmosphere, Marine, Land, Climate, Emergency, and Security services. The Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service (CAMS; https://atmosphere.copernicus.eu/), has been developed through the series of pilot projects GEMS ("Global and regional Earth-system (Atmosphere) Monitoring using Satellite and in situ data"), PROMOTE ("PROtocol MONiToring for the GMES Service Element on Atmospheric Composition") and MACC ("Monitoring Atmospheric Composition and Climate"; http://www.gmes-atmosphere.eu/) until July 2015. In operational mode CAMS provides continuous data and information on atmospheric composition, including reactive gases (e.g. carbon monoxide, oxidised nitrogen compounds, sulphur dioxide, ozone), aerosols and GHGs (CO₂, CH₄, and nitrous oxide (N₂O)). The purpose of the CAMS GHG analyses is to provide realistic global 3D fields (as function of time) of the atmospheric CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O mole fractions (e.g. for use as boundary conditions for regional atmospheric models). Furthermore, the CAMS GHG flux inversions aim at estimating global and regional GHG fluxes and their evolution in time.

In this report, we evaluate the quality of the CAMS CH₄ products, focussing on the "near real time analyses" of the atmospheric CH₄ concentrations (from the ECMWF IFS assimilation system) and the re-analyses of CH₄ concentrations and fluxes (from the TM5-4DVAR inverse modelling system, provided by TNO / SRON). The evaluation presented in this report has been performed in the framework of the administrative arrangement "Copernicus 2" between Directorate-General for Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs (DG GROW) and the Joint Research Centre (JRC), which has been established to further support the development of the Copernicus services and to monitor their technical performance. While CAMS already includes some regular validation of the different products, the purpose of this work is to provide a more comprehensive overall evaluation of the CH₄ products by comparison with comprehensive independent observational data sets (from surface monitoring stations, ship cruises, various aircraft programmes, AirCore balloon soundings up to the middle stratosphere, and total column measurements). Furthermore, CH₄ flux inversions from the JRC TM5-4DVAR inversion system (which was used as prototype of the operational
CAMS inversion system) are included in the analysis, providing a benchmark to evaluate the specific model setup and further model updates of the CAMS TM5-4DVAR system.
2 Evaluated products

We evaluate two fundamentally different types of CAMS CH4 products: (1) the CAMS "near real time analyses" that provide 3D fields of CH4 dry air mole fractions based on the ECMWF Integrated Forecasting System (IFS) assimilation system; and (2) the CAMS CH4 flux inversions, that primarily aim to estimate global and regional CH4 fluxes [Segers and Houweling, 2017a; 2017b], but also provide 3D fields of CH4 dry air mole fractions. The TM5-4DVAR inversion system used in CAMS (operated by TNO/SRON) was originally developed by JRC during the GEMS/MACC projects, but includes further model updates and partly different model settings. Therefore, we also include JRC CH4 inversion products in the analysis (based on the current JRC TM5-4DVAR system), to provide a benchmark to evaluate the impact of the specific model setup and model updates of the CAMS TM5-4DVAR system.

2.1 CAMS "near real time analyses" of CH4 concentrations

The CAMS assimilation system was developed during the series of MACC research projects [Agusti-Panareda et al., 2017; Massart et al., 2014], based on the ECMWF IFS, including 4DVAR data assimilation. The system assimilates CH4 satellite retrievals in 12-hour assimilation windows. Within each single assimilation, the initial 3D fields of CH4 concentrations ("initial state of the atmosphere") at 00, 06, 12, and 18 UTC are optimised using the available satellite observations during the 12 hours assimilation window. The CAMS IFS assimilation system uses prescribed CH4 emissions, similar to those used in the CAMS inversion system and described in the following Section.

The IFS system assimilates XCH4 retrievals from the TANSO ("Thermal And Near-infrared Sensor for carbon Observation") instrument onboard GOSAT, using the "proxy retrievals" based on the RemoTeC algorithm [Butz et al., 2010]. In addition, also CH4 retrievals from the IASI (Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer) instruments on board the Metop family of satellites are assimilated [Crevoisier et al., 2009; Crevoisier et al., 2013], providing mainly information about mid- to upper-tropospheric CH4 concentrations in the tropics.

In this report, we analyse the CAMS "near real time analyses" (also called "delayed-mode production stream") during 2016-2017, covered by the CAMS assimilation experiment IDs gg5m, gm3p, and gqiq (Table 1), denoted "CAMS_assim" in this report. Some further details ("Change log") are given at the ECMWF / CAMS website: https://atmosphere.copernicus.eu/gda-global-production-log-files#delayed.

Table 1: CAMS near real time analyses ("delayed-mode production") production streams evaluated in this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment ID</th>
<th>Spatial resolution (km x km x nlevel)</th>
<th>Period of outputs used in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gg5m</td>
<td>39 x 39 x 137</td>
<td>20151201 - 20161122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gm3p</td>
<td>30 x 30 x 137</td>
<td>20161101 - 20170802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gqiq</td>
<td>30 x 30 x 137</td>
<td>20170101 - 20171231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Flux inversions

CAMS and JRC inversion products are generated using the TM5-4DVAR inverse modelling system [Bergamaschi et al., 2013; Meirink et al., 2008; Segers and Houweling, 2017a; 2017b]. This system is built around the atmospheric transport model TM5 [Krol et al., 2005] and its adjoint and uses a 4DVAR variational technique that iteratively minimises the cost function. The inversion system uses surface measurements and satellite retrievals as observational constraints to optimise emissions from individual grid cells of four source categories (wetlands\textsuperscript{1}, rice, biomass burning, and "other" CH\textsubscript{4} emission sources (mainly anthropogenic sources)). The inversion system takes into account a priori information on emissions from available emission inventories (as detailed below) and uses prescribed 3D fields of photochemical CH\textsubscript{4} sinks in the troposphere (OH) and stratosphere (OH, Cl, and O(\textsuperscript{1}D)) [Bergamaschi et al., 2013]. The meteorological fields used by the TM5 model are from ECMWF ERA-Interim reanalyses [Dee et al., 2011].

Since the CAMS TM5-4DVAR system is largely based on the TM5-4DVAR system developed by JRC during the GEMS/MACC projects, the current CAMS and JRC systems share the main components and are very similar. However, there are several model updates and differences in the model settings. The most important differences are:

- Both the CAMS and JRC inversions have now increased horizontal resolution of 3\textdegree~(longitude) \times 2\textdegree~(latitude) (compared to 6\textdegree~x 4\textdegree~of the MACC inversions). Furthermore, the vertical resolution of the CAMS inversions has been increased (34 vertical layers, compared 25 layers of the JRC inversion).
- The CAMS inversions use archived convective mass fluxes from ERA-Interim [Dee et al., 2011], while the JRC inversions used in this report still apply the convection parameterisation of Tiedtke [1987].
- The CAMS inversions apply the a priori emission inventories as described by Bergamaschi et al. [2013], including the wetland emission inventory of J. O. Kaplan [Bergamaschi et al., 2007]. In contrast, the JRC inversions analysed in this report use as prior for the wetland emissions the mean values of seven wetland inventories from the WETCHIMP ("Wetland and Wetland CH\textsubscript{4} Intercomparison of Models") project [Melton et al., 2013].
- Both the CAMS and JRC inversions are run in 2 iterations: First, a coarse resolution (6\textdegree~x 4\textdegree) inversion is run consecutively in yearly blocks (plus 6-monthly spin-down periods; and for CAMS also including 6-monthly spin-up periods [Segers and Houweling, 2017a; 2017b] to generate a consistent inversion over the entire target period. Optimised 3D fields of CH\textsubscript{4} mole fractions from these coarse resolution inversions are then used as initial fields for the high-resolution inversions run over 3 years (plus 6 months spin-up and spin-down) for the CAMS inversion, and over 1 year (plus 6 months spin-down) for the JRC inversion.
- For the inversions which include satellite retrievals in addition to the surface measurements from the NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory (ESRL) global cooperative air sampling network, different bias corrections are applied to account for biases in the satellite retrievals as well as model transport biases. The CAMS inversion applies a bias correction based on the comparison of GOSAT

\textsuperscript{1} excluding emissions from permafrost thawing
XCH$_4$ with a TM5-4DVAR inversion using only NOAA surface observations (CAMS$_{\text{inv S1(NOAA)}}$), as described by Pandey et al. [2016]. The same bias correction (as function of latitude and month) is applied for all years and is not further optimised in the CAMS inversion. In contrast, the JRC inversion derives the bias correction (as function of latitude, month, and year) during the inversion of the satellite data [Bergamaschi et al., 2013].

- The CAMS GOSAT inversions exclude GOSAT retrievals over Antarctica (south of 60°S) and include all retrievals at high northern latitudes, while the JRC inversions only include retrievals between 50°S and 50°N. Furthermore, the CAMS inversions include GOSAT retrievals over the ocean, while they are excluded in the JRC inversions.

The different inversion products evaluated in this report are compiled in Table 2 and briefly summarized in the following Section.

Table 2: CAMS and JRC inversion products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Inversion ID</th>
<th>Spatial resolution (lon x lat x level)</th>
<th>Inversion Period</th>
<th>Assimilated observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TNO/SRON</td>
<td>CAMS$_{\text{inv S1(NOAA)}}$(^1)</td>
<td>3° x 2° x 34</td>
<td>2000-2016</td>
<td>NOAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAMS$_{\text{inv S2(GOSAT)}}$(^2)</td>
<td>3° x 2° x 34</td>
<td>2009-2016</td>
<td>NOAA+GOSAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRC</td>
<td>JRC$_{\text{inv S1(NOAA)}}$(^3)</td>
<td>3° x 2° x 25</td>
<td>2009-2016</td>
<td>NOAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JRC$_{\text{inv S2(GOSAT)}}$(^4)</td>
<td>3° x 2° x 25</td>
<td>2009-2015</td>
<td>NOAA+GOSAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1CAMS CH$_4$ release v16r1
2CAMS CH$_4$ release v16r1s
3RUNID: VAR_M07B_ECC_CH4_glb32_NOAA015_E42FI_WETE_G3_TM_EC_V01_I3
4RUNID:VAR_M07B_ECC_CH4_glb32_SRPR238_E42FI_WETE_G3_TM_EC_V01_I3

2.2.1 CAMS CH$_4$ flux inversions

The CAMS CH$_4$ flux inversions are described in detail by Segers and Houweling [2017a; 2017b] and are available through the CAMS data server: http://apps.ecmwf.int/datasets/data/cams-ghg-inversions/

- The first inversion stream (CAMS CH$_4$ release v16r1) only uses NOAA surface observations over the period 2000-2016 (plus spin-down until 06/2017). This stream is denoted "CAMS$_{\text{inv S1(NOAA)}}$" in this report.

- The second inversion stream (CAMS CH$_4$ release v16r1s) uses XCH$_4$ satellite retrievals from GOSAT (PROXY retrieval data set v2.3.8 [Detmers and Hasekamp, 2016] as well as the NOAA surface observations (and is denoted "CAMS$_{\text{inv S2(GOSAT)}}$" in this report). This dataset covers the period 2009-2016 (plus spin-down until 06/2017) for which GOSAT data are available.
2.2.2 JRC CH₄ flux inversions

- Inversion "JRC_inv S1(NOAA)" uses only NOAA surface observations (similar to "CAMS_inv S1(NOAA)") and is run over the period 2009-2016 (plus spin-down until 06/2017).

- "JRC_inv S2(GOSAT)" uses both NOAA surface observations and GOSAT XCH₄ retrievals from SRON (PROXY retrieval data set v2.3.8) in the inversion (similarly as "CAMS_inv S2(GOSAT)") and it covers the period 2009-2015 (plus spin-down until 06/2016).

In this report, we evaluate the products from 2010 until 2017, depending on the availability of the products and observations.
3 Observations

For the evaluation of the different CH$_4$ model products (described in section 2), we use various observational data sets, including measurements at surface monitoring stations, ship cruises, various aircraft programmes, AirCore balloon soundings, and surface based total column measurements. Figure 1 shows the locations of the measurements, and the data sets are described in the following subsections.

![Figure 1: Observational data of atmospheric CH$_4$ mole fractions used for the evaluation of the models. The map shows the locations of NOAA and InGOS surface sampling sites, NOAA aircraft profile sites, TCCON FTS sites, and AirCore sites. Furthermore, the regions of NOAA ship cruises (POC) and aircraft routes of different measurement programs (HIPPO, ORCAS, CARIBIC, and CONTRAIL) are shown.](image)

3.1 Surface observations

To evaluate the model simulations near the surface, we use the NOAA measurements of discrete air samples taken at the NOAA ESRL global cooperative air sampling network (including regular ship cruises through the Pacific Ocean), and quasi-continuous *in situ* measurements at European monitoring stations (using the harmonised data set generated within the European FP7 project InGOS).
Figure 2: Map showing the locations of NOAA and InGOS surface sites. Furthermore, the regions of NOAA ship cruises (Pacific Ocean (POC)) are shown.

3.1.1 NOAA

Figure 2 shows the locations of the discrete air sampling sites of the NOAA ESRL global cooperative air sampling network [Dlugokencky et al., 1994; 2003; 2009]. In order to analyse the performance of the different CH$_4$ model products separately for the remote atmosphere and over the continents, respectively, we have separated the sites into two groups: (1) "background sites", including mainly marine background sites and coastal sites (at which air samples are usually taken under background conditions), and (2) "regional sites" over the continents which are usually affected by regional CH$_4$ emissions.

Furthermore, we use measurements of discrete air samples taken along the lines of regular ship cruises over the Pacific Ocean (POC; Figure 2), which mainly sample air masses over the remote ocean and downwind of continental sources. Due to a gap in time of these measurements, the POC measurements are available only during two periods: 2010-2012 and 2015 to mid-2017 (see Figure 5). The NOAA measurements were calibrated against the NOAA2004 CH$_4$ standard scale, which is equivalent to the WMO-CH$_4$-X2004 CH$_4$ mole fraction scale [Dlugokencky et al., 2005].

3.1.2 InGOS

We also use the quality-controlled and harmonised data set of *in situ* measurements from 18 European atmospheric monitoring stations generated within the European FP7 project InGOS ("Integrated non-CO2 Greenhouse gas Observing System") [Bergamaschi et al., 2018]. The InGOS network includes surface stations and tower sites with quasi-continuous measurements. Most of the
InGOS stations are influenced by regional CH$_4$ emissions and therefore considered as "regional sites" (Figure 2). However, we do not use the full diurnal cycle of the measurements, but only data during 12:00-15:00 Local Time (LT) for stations in the boundary layer and during 0:00-03:00 LT for mountain stations. For the tall towers in the network, which sample at different heights above surface, we use only the measurements from the highest sampling level, which are generally less affected by local sources and can therefore be better represented by the atmospheric models. Here, we use the InGOS "release 2014" data set [Bergamaschi et al., 2018]. The InGOS measurements were also calibrated against the NOAA-2004 standard scale [Dlugokencky et al., 2005].

3.2 Aircraft observations

The aircraft observations used in this report include the regular NOAA aircraft profile measurements, the CARIBIC and CONTRAIL measurements onboard of commercial flights, and the experimental aircraft campaigns HIPPO and ORCAS. The locations of the NOAA aircraft profile sites and the flight routes of the other aircraft measurements are shown in Figure 1.

3.2.1 NOAA regular aircraft

Within the NOAA aircraft program, air samples are collected regularly in vertical profiles (https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/aircraft/). The aircraft profiles sites are located mainly over the US but also include some sites over the Pacific Ocean (Figure 1). Most of the aircraft profiles range between the surface and around 8 km.

3.2.2 HIPPO

Furthermore, we use the measurements of the "HIAPER Pole-to-Pole Observations" (HIPPO) programme (http://hippo.ornl.gov/) [Wofsy et al., 2011]. HIPPO measured cross sections of atmospheric concentrations of GHGs approximately pole-to-pole, from the surface to the lower stratosphere [Wofsy et al., 2011]. We use the HIPPO-3 to HIPPO-5 campaigns, performed in March/April 2010 (HIPPO-3), June/July 2011 (HIPPO-4), and August/September 2011 (HIPPO-5), respectively. HIPPO measurements were carried out mainly over the Pacific Ocean, North America, and the Atlantic Ocean (Figure 1). The CH$_4$ mole fraction measurements were performed onboard of the aircraft at high frequency using a quantum cascade laser spectrometer (QCLS) [Kort et al., 2011; Kort et al., 2012]. In addition, air samples were collected using the NOAA Programmable Flask Package and analysed at NOAA ESRL. The comparison of the QCLS measurements with these flask samplings showed a small average bias of -5.8, -4.4, and -5.0 ppb for HIPPO-3, HIPPO-4, and HIPPO-5, respectively. In this study, we subtracted this bias from the QCLS measurements.

3.2.3 ORCAS

In addition, measurements of the recent aircraft observational campaign in the Southern Ocean ORCAS ("O$_2$/N$_2$ Ratio and CO$_2$ Airborne Southern Ocean Study"; https://www.eol.ucar.edu/field_projects/orcas; Stephens et al. [2017]) have been used. The ORCAS aircraft campaigns took place over the Southern Ocean (35°N - 75°S region; Figure 1) and within 0-13 km altitude during January until early March 2016.
3.2.4 CARIBIC

Aircraft measurements of CH₄ mole fractions provided by the CARIBIC ("Civil Aircraft for the Regular Investigation of the atmosphere Based on an Instrument Container"; http://www.caribic-atmospheric.com/) program are also used. Air samples were collected onboard a Lufthansa Airbus A340-600 passenger aircraft [Brenninkmeijer et al., 2007; Schuck et al., 2010; Schuck et al., 2012; Zahn et al., 2000]. The CARIBIC flights start from Frankfurt (Germany) to various destinations around the world (Figure 1). The air samples were analysed at the Max Planck Institute (MPI) Mainz laboratory and the data were calibrated against the NOAA2004 scale. The CARIBIC measurements cover mainly the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere (8-13 km altitude). We analyse CARIBIC data collected onboard of 222 flights during 2010-2016.

3.2.5 CONTRAIL

Further aircraft measurements of CH₄ mole fractions were provided by the CONTRAIL ("Comprehensive Observation Network for TRace gases by AIrLiner"; http://www.cger.nies.go.jp/contrail/index.html) project, which is jointly conducted by NIES (National Institute for Environmental Studies), the MRI (Meteorological Research Institute), JAL (Japan Airlines), and JAMCO (JAMCO Corporation) and JAL-F (JAL Foundation). The CH₄ mole fractions were measured from an Automatic air Sampling Equipment (ASE) for flask sampling installed onboard Japan Airlines Boeing 747-400 and Boeing 777-200ER aircraft or from a Manual air Sampling Equipment (MSE) carried by operator onboard of Boeing 777-300ER aircraft [Machida et al., 2008; Matsueda et al., 2008; Sawa et al., 2015; Umezawa et al., 2012]. The JAL flights start from Tokyo (Japan) to Asia, Australia, Europe, and Hawaii (Figure 1). The measurements were conducted mainly between 10-12 km altitude and partly below 10 km. We analyse 123 CONTRAIL flights during the 2011-2015 period.

3.3 AirCore measurements

The AirCore instrument developed by NOAA/ESRL is an atmospheric sampling system that can be launched on balloons and that consists of a long stainless steel tube, which can sample the surrounding atmosphere and preserve a profile of the trace gas of interest from the middle stratosphere to the ground (https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/aircore/; Karion et al. [2010]). The AirCore system is open at one end and relies on positive changes in ambient pressure for passive sampling of the atmosphere. The system gradually evacuates the filled air while ascending to a high altitude and collects a sample of the ambient air as it descends. Comparisons of AirCore observations with flask data from aircraft flights indicate a standard deviation of differences of less than 5 ppb for CH₄ concentrations with no apparent bias [Karion et al., 2010; Membrive et al., 2017]. The AirCore measurements are useful for the evaluation of modelled CH₄ mole fractions especially in the lower and middle stratosphere. In this report we use data from NOAA AirCore balloon soundings at two sites in the US (Boulder and Lamont) and one site in Finland (Sodankyla). The site locations are shown in Figure 1.

3.4 FTS: Total column measurements

The Total Carbon Column Observing Network (TCCON; https://tccon-wiki.caltech.edu/) is a global network of ground-based Fourier Transform
Spectrometers (FTS) that record spectra of the sun in the near-infrared. From these spectra, column-averaged abundances of atmospheric constituents including CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ are retrieved [Wunch et al., 2011]. The TCCON data are scaled to the WMO scale by comparison with in situ aircraft profile measurements [Wunch et al., 2010], which however cover only the altitudes between the surface and the lower stratosphere. For consistent comparison of the TCCON column-averaged mixing ratios (XCH$_4$) with model simulations, the TCCON averaging kernels and the a priori profiles are applied to the model fields.
Evaluation of simulated CH$_4$ mole fractions

We evaluate the simulated 3D fields of CH$_4$ mole fractions from the CAMS "near real time analyses" and from the CAMS and JRC inversions by comparing them with the various observational data sets described in the previous Section 3. For a consistent comparison between the models and observations, the model simulations are sampled at the same time and location of the observations, extracted either directly during the model runs (e.g. TM5-4DVAR station output) or extracted from daily (TM5-4DVAR system) or 6-hourly (CAMS "near real time analyses") 3D output fields using 3D linear interpolation in space (i.e. horizontally and vertically) and linear interpolation in time. For the comparison of model simulations with FTS observations, the FTS averaging kernels and a priori profiles (provided by TCCON) are applied.

In the following, we first analyse the performance of the different CH$_4$ products near the surface, including both the remote atmosphere (by comparing with measurements at the NOAA background sites and along the routes of the NOAA ship cruises) and regions affected by regional CH$_4$ emissions (by comparing with "regional" NOAA discrete air sampling sites and InGOS stations) (section 4.1). In section 4.2, we analyse the ability of the models to simulate the vertical gradients of CH$_4$ concentrations (including the boundary layer, the free troposphere, and the lower stratosphere) by comparison with various aircraft data sets (including NOAA regular aircraft profiles, HIPPO, ORCAS, CARIBIC, and CONTRAIL). In section 4.3, AirCore measurements are used to evaluate the simulated vertical gradients of CH$_4$ concentrations in the stratosphere. Finally, the column-averaged CH$_4$ mole fractions are evaluated by comparison with TCCON FTS measurements (section 4.4).

4.1 Comparison with surface observations

Figure 3 shows the comparison of model simulations with measurements at several selected NOAA background sites. The average bias between model simulations and measurements (using all available NOAA background sites) as function of latitude and time (averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins) is displayed in Figure 4. Both CAMS and JRC "NOAA-only" inversions (CAMS_inv_S1(NOAA) and JRC_inv_S1(NOAA)) show very good agreement with observations during the entire period (2010-2017). In the Southern Hemisphere (SH), the CAMS_inv_S1(NOAA) shows a small positive bias (~4 ppb) during SH summer (Figure 4). The overall very good performance of the CAMS and JRC "NOAA-only" inversions is due to the fact that the observations of most of these sites are used in the inversions. Including the GOSAT retrievals in the inversions slightly reduces the agreement with the NOAA surface measurements. CAMS_inv_S2(GOSAT), however, shows a small positive bias during 2010 and 2011, as diagnosed also in the CAMS validation report ([Segers and Houweling, 2017a; 2017b], Figure 8), potentially either due to the initial CH$_4$ concentrations for the first 3-yearly NOAA+GOSAT inversion [Segers and Houweling, 2017a; 2017b], or to the mean bias corrections applied (see Section 2.2), which cannot correct any inter-annual variations in the biases of the satellite retrievals. In contrast to the inversions, the CAMS "near real time analyses" show significant differences compared with the observations (Figures 3, 4) with large biases (often exceeding 20 ppb) and varying sign (depending on latitude and time) (Figure 4). These large discrepancies compared to the measurements are probably due to the fact that the CAMS "near real time analyses" assimilate only satellite data (which may have some biases), but do not include any surface
measurements. The general picture emerging from the comparison with the NOAA background sites is largely confirmed by the comparison with the NOAA ship measurements in the Pacific, shown in Figure 5. All inversions show excellent agreement with very low average biases, confirming that the inversions represent the background atmosphere at the surface (marine boundary layer) in this area quite well. In contrast, the CAMS "near real time analyses" show significant average biases during 2016 (gg5m), but lower average biases in 2017.

The comparison of model simulations with measurements at regional sites (regional NOAA discrete air sampling sites and InGOS stations) is shown in Figures 6, 7, 8, and 9. At the regional continental sites, CH₄ concentrations typically show large diurnal cycles. These are clearly visible in the continuous measurements from the InGOS stations (Figure 8), but not in the ~weekly NOAA discrete air samples (Figure 6), which selectively sample air under background conditions (conditions with low influence of local/regional sources). Despite this sampling strategy, however, the agreement between the inversions and the measurements is somewhat poorer than that for the background sites. For the comparison of model simulations with InGOS measurements, we use only daytime data (between 12:00 and 15:00 LT) for stations in the boundary layer and only night-time data (between 0:00 and 3:00 LT) for mountain stations [Bergamaschi et al., 2018]. Furthermore, for tall towers with multiple sampling heights, generally only the uppermost level is used (which has the smallest impact from local and smaller-scale regional sources and which should be easier to represent by the models than the lower levels closer to the surface). Although the background CH₄ concentrations observed at the InGOS stations and the regional NOAA sites are in general relatively well represented by the inversions (Figures 6 and 8), some small average biases are visible (for the InGOS sites between 45 and 60° N mainly negative bias; Figure 9). This is partly explained by the fact that the regional stations cannot be very well represented by the relatively coarse spatial resolution (3° x 2°) used in the inversions. The CAMS "near real time analyses" for NOAA regional sites also show significant biases (varying with time; Figures 6 and 7), probably largely related to the significant biases visible at the NOAA background stations (Figures 3 and 4).
Figure 3: Comparison of simulated and observed CH$_4$ mole fractions at NOAA background surface stations.
Figure 4: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions at NOAA background sites as function of time and latitude. Measurements and model simulations are averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins. For CAMS "near real time analyses", when two experiments have overlapping periods, the data for the most recent assimilation stream are shown.
Figure 5: Average latitudinal biases between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions for NOAA measurements on samples collected regularly on commercial ship lines across the Pacific Ocean (POC). Measurements and model simulations are averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins.
Figure 6: Comparison of simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions at "regional" NOAA surface stations.
Figure 7: As Figure 4, but for "regional" NOAA sites.
Figure 8: Comparison of simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions at InGOS stations.
**Figure 9:** Average bias between simulated and observed CH$_4$ mole fractions at InGOS stations as function of time and latitude. The bias is averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins.


4.2 Comparison with aircraft measurements

Figure 10 shows the mean vertical profiles of CH₄ mole fractions at the different NOAA aircraft profile sites during 2016 (the year for which we have data from all models; for JRC_inv_S2(GOSAT), however, only for the first half of 2016 (spin-down period of this inversion)). Figures 11a and 11b show the average bias as function of time and latitude for the boundary layer and for the free troposphere, respectively, while Figure 12 shows the average bias as function of time and altitude. The comparison shows that the optimised CH₄ concentrations from CAMS and JRC NOAA-only inversions are in quite good agreement with the observations in the free troposphere with average biases close to zero. Including the GOSAT retrievals in the inversions results in similarly good agreement with measurements in case of JRC_inv_S2(GOSAT), but shows a small significant positive bias for CAMS_inv_S2(GOSAT), especially during 2010-2011, similarly (but even more pronounced) as the comparison with the global background sites (Figure 4). Within the boundary layer, the average bias between the optimised CH₄ concentrations from the inversions and the measurements is more variable (as function of time and latitude; Figure 11a) and shows on average a tendency to small negative biases (Figure 12), similar to the comparison at the "regional" NOAA sites (Figure 7). Compared to the inversions, the CAMS "near real time analyses" show in general poorer agreement, with significant average biases (of variable sign) (Figures 11a, 11b, and 12) both within the boundary layer (Figures 11a and 12) and the free troposphere (Figure 11b and 12), especially for gg5m, and then slightly decreasing for gm3p (with smaller average positive bias) and gqiq (with bias varying with time).

While the regular NOAA aircraft profiles are primarily over the US (but covering the entire evaluation period 2010-2017), the HIPPO measurements provide pole-to-pole transects from the surface to the lower stratosphere, but as "snapshots" in time. Figure 13 shows the average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of latitude and altitude (average bias from HIPPO-3, 4, and 5 during 2010-2011), while the comparison for the individual HIPPO campaigns is shown in Annex 1 (Figures A11, A12, and A13). On average, the "NOAA-only" inversions show only very small biases in the free troposphere (but there are some negative biases near the surface over the continent in the Northern Hemisphere between 25°N and 50°N). CAMS_inv_S2(GOSAT), however, shows a significant positive average bias in the NH troposphere, as diagnosed also from the comparison with the regular NOAA aircraft profiles (Figures 11b and 12). Above the tropopause, all inversions show large biases, in most cases significantly overestimating observed CH₄ mole fractions in the lower stratosphere, similar to previous analyses [Alexe et al., 2015; Bergamaschi et al., 2009; 2013], especially at mid to high latitudes.

A similar picture emerges from the comparison with the ORCAS data (Figure 14 and Figures A21-25 in Annex 2). The inversions perform remarkably well within the entire troposphere (including the boundary layer) in the Southern Hemisphere (some varying biases are visible in the NH troposphere; however the NH data are from a single flight only). Above the tropopause, however, significant positive biases are apparent for all inversion products, similarly to the comparison with the HIPPO data. The CAMS "near real time analyses" shows large negative biases (~30 ppb; Figure 14), consistent with the finding that during the period of the ORCAS campaign beginning of 2016 the gg5m "near real time analyses" show significant negative biases in many world regions (e.g. Figures 3, 4, 5, 11a, 11b, 12).
The model deficiencies in simulating the vertical gradients in the stratosphere are also clearly visible in the comparison with the CARIBIC and CONTRAIL data. Figures 15 and 17 show the average bias as function of time and latitude, and Figures 16 and 18 as function of time and altitude for CARIBIC and CONTRAIL, respectively. Within the upper troposphere, the CH$_4$ mole fractions from the inversions show on average small negative biases (which become zero or slightly positive just below the tropopause) and above the tropopause large positive biases. Please note that the tropopause height shows significant seasonal variation (as indicated by the black dotted lines in Figures 16 and 18) - therefore, the average bias within the altitude range of the tropopause reflects comparison of data of varying fractions of tropospheric and stratospheric air masses. The increase of the average bias with latitude visible in Figures 15 and 17 is mainly due to the increase in the fraction of data in the stratosphere with increasing latitude.
Figure 10: Mean vertical profiles of CH$_4$ mole fractions for the different NOAA aircraft sites during 2016. The mean bias (BIAS) and root mean square (RMS) difference between simulated CH$_4$ mole fractions and observations are given below each panel. N pair is the number of available paired data. The model data for JRC_inv_S2(GOSAT) cover only the first half of 2016 (spin-down period of 2015 inversion), and for the CAMS “near real-time analyses” only until 22 November 2016.
Figure 10: continued
Figure 11a: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of time and latitude for NOAA aircraft data within the boundary layer (height < 1500 m). The bias is averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins.
Figure 11b: Same as Figure 11a, but for NOAA aircraft data within the free troposphere (height range: 1500-8500 m).
Figure 12: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of time and altitude for NOAA aircraft data. The bias is averaged in bins of 500 m altitude.
Figure 13: Average bias between simulated and observed CH$_4$ mole fractions as function of latitude and altitude for HIPPO aircraft data (2010-2011). The bias is averaged in bins of 5° latitude and 500 m altitude. The mean tropopause height as diagnosed by the TM5 model is shown by the black dash-dotted line (and minimum and maximum tropopause heights by black dotted lines).
Figure 14: As Figure 13, but for ORCAS data.
Figure 15: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of time and latitude for CARIBIC aircraft data. Measurements and model simulations are averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins.
Figure 16: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of latitude and altitude for CARIBIC aircraft data. The bias is averaged in bins of 5° latitude and 500 m altitude. The mean tropopause height as diagnosed by the TM5 model is shown by the black dash-dotted line (and minimum and maximum tropopause heights by black dotted lines).
Figure 17: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of time and latitude for CONTRAIL aircraft data. Measurements and model simulations are averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins.
**Figure 18:** Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of latitude and altitude for CONTRAIL aircraft data. The bias is averaged in bins of 5° latitude and 500 m altitude. The mean tropopause height as diagnosed by the TM5 model is shown by the black dash-dotted line (and minimum and maximum tropopause heights by black dotted lines).
4.3 Comparison with AirCore measurements

The NOAA AirCore profiles provide measurements of CH₄ mole fractions up to the middle stratosphere, providing a unique data set to evaluate the quality of the model simulations in the stratosphere. The mean vertical profiles at Boulder and Lamont are shown in Figure 19a (2016) and 19b (2017) and the individual AirCore balloon soundings during 2012-2017 in Annex 3 (including also profiles at Sodankyla). The comparison with the mean profiles shows that the models largely overestimate the observed CH₄ concentrations within the stratosphere, with a mean bias of 19-27 ppb at Boulder and 141-147 ppb at Lamont for the flux inversions and 35 ppb at Boulder and 122 ppb at Lamont for the CAMS "near real time analyses" in 2016, while the CAMS "near real time analyses" in 2017 show better agreement with the observations, with a mean bias between 3 and 21 ppb in the stratosphere at the two sites (Figure 19b). However, when considering the data over the 2012-2017 period, the average bias is relatively small (Figure 26), since the biases of the individual profiles show large variations and are varying in sign (Annex 3; Figures A31-A33). Furthermore, the average bias varies as a function of altitude above the tropopause (Figure 20). Both in the troposphere and the stratosphere the AirCore profiles often show significant "fine structures" in the vertical gradients, which are usually not reproduced by the flux inversions with their relatively coarse vertical resolution (CAMS: 34 vertical layers; JRC: 25 vertical layers). Conversely, there are some cases where the CAMS "near real time analyses" (with 137 vertical layers) can partially reproduce the "fine structure" (e.g. at Boulder 01-12-2016). On average, the flux inversions show only relatively small biases in the troposphere (Figures 19a and 20), confirming the good performance of the inversions in simulating the CH₄ concentrations in the troposphere (as evaluated over the US by the regular NOAA aircraft profiles).
Figure 19a: Mean vertical profiles of modelled CH₄ mole fractions and AirCore observations at Boulder (left) and Lamont (right) for 2016. The bias and the root mean square (RMS) difference between the model simulations and observations are evaluated separately for the troposphere and stratosphere, respectively. N pair is the number of available paired data. The mean tropopause height as diagnosed by the TM5 model is shown by the grey line.

Figure 19b: As Figure 19a, but for the year 2017 for which CAMS "near real time analyses" are available for a large part of the year.
Figure 20: Average bias between simulated and observed CH₄ mole fractions as function of latitude and altitude using AirCore data. The bias is averaged in bins of 5° latitude and 500m altitude. The mean tropopause height as diagnosed by the TM5 model is shown by the black dash-dotted line (and minimum and maximum tropopause heights by black dotted lines).
4.4 Comparison with FTS observations

Figure 21 shows the time series of column-averaged CH₄ mole fractions at several TCCON FTS stations. The flux inversions reproduce the FTS observations in general relatively well, including the seasonal variations. However, at Sodankyla, the measurements often show relatively low XCH₄ values during spring, which are not reproduced by the models. Figure 22 displays the average bias as function of time and latitude and shows that the inversions overestimate the column averaged CH₄ mole fractions at high latitudes in the Northern Hemisphere, probably mainly due to the large bias of the models within the stratosphere, as discussed in the previous Sections (4.2 and 4.3). In the Southern Hemisphere (SH), the inversions show a small negative bias, which could partly reflect the small negative bias in the SH upper troposphere seen in the comparison with the aircraft data. Furthermore, the stratosphere (which is not validated independently in the SH, neither for the model simulations nor for the TCCON data) may contribute to the small bias. The bias between the CAMS "near real time analyses" and the FTS data (Figures 21 and 22) largely reflects the bias of the CAMS "near real time analyses" in many areas of the globe, visible in the comparison with the surface and aircraft data (as discussed in sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3).
Figure 21: Comparison of simulated and observed column-averaged CH$_4$ mole fractions (XCH$_4$) at TCCON FTS stations.
Figure 22: Average bias between simulated and observed column-averaged CH₄ mole fractions (XCH₄) as function of time and latitude using TCCON FTS data. Measurements and model simulations are averaged in monthly 5° latitude bins.
5 Evaluation of inverted surface CH₄ fluxes

Figure 23 shows the mean CH₄ emissions derived from the CAMS and JRC inversions, both for the "NOAA-only" inversions and for the inversions which use simultaneously the NOAA observations and GOSAT XCH₄ retrievals. There are some differences in "fine structure" of the spatial distribution of CH₄ emissions between the CAMS and JRC inversions (e.g. over the Hudson Bay Lowlands and over the Amazon), which are probably mainly due to the use of different a priori wetland emission inventories. The additional use of the GOSAT data results in some moderate changes in the spatial emission patterns (both for the CAMS and JRC inversions), e.g. somewhat higher CH₄ emissions over the south-central US and eastern Africa compared to the "NOAA-only" inversions. Compared to the JRC inversions, the CAMS inversions show somewhat higher emissions, especially in the Northern Hemisphere mid latitudes (between 30°N and 60°N, Figure 24). The small differences in the latitudinal distribution of the derived surface CH₄ fluxes could be (at least partly) related to the different convection schemes used in the two inversion systems (see section 2.2), which affects the inter-hemispheric mixing.

![Figure 23](image)

**Figure 23:** Mean CH₄ emissions derived from CAMS (left) and JRC (right) inversions, averaged over the 2010-2015 period. Top: inversions using only NOAA surface observations; bottom: inversions using both NOAA surface observations and XCH₄ satellite retrievals from GOSAT.
Figure 24: Global and regional annual total CH₄ surface emissions derived from the CAMS and JRC inversions.
6 Conclusions

We have evaluated the CAMS CH$_4$ "near real time analyses" (from the ECMWF IFS assimilation system) and the CAMS CH$_4$ flux inversions (from the TM5-4DVAR inverse modelling system, provided by TNO / SRON), using comprehensive observational data sets from surface monitoring stations, ship cruises, various aircraft programmes, AirCore balloon soundings, and FTS measurements of column-averaged CH$_4$ mole fractions. Furthermore, CH$_4$ flux inversions from the JRC TM5-4DVAR inversion system (which was used as prototype of the operational CAMS inversion system) were included in the analysis.

Figures 25 and 26 provide an overview of the performance of the different CH$_4$ products (in terms of simulated CH$_4$ mole fractions) compared to the different observational data sets. In general, the CAMS and JRC flux inversions show very similar performance and compare very well to the observations over remote regions near the surface and within the free troposphere (Figure 25), with an average bias close to zero and typical RMS differences around 10-20 ppb.

Due to the relatively coarse horizontal resolution of $3^\circ \times 2^\circ$, however, both CAMS and JRC inversions show clear limitations in simulating the CH$_4$ mole fractions observed at regional monitoring stations (which are influenced by regional CH$_4$ emissions), showing negative biases (around -10 to -20 ppb) and RMS differences around 50 ppb.

Furthermore, the inversions significantly overestimate the CH$_4$ mole fractions in the lower stratosphere (measured by the different aircraft programmes; Figure 26). The comparison with the AirCore data in the lower and middle stratosphere also shows large differences, but since the biases of the individual profiles are highly variable in time (also varying in sign), the average bias is relatively small, but the RMS differences are around 50-60 ppb (for the comparison of the flux inversions with the AirCore data) and generally larger than ~40 ppb for all observations above the tropopause. The large biases in the stratosphere suggest that the current models have significant shortcomings to simulate the transport and/or chemistry in the stratosphere (and may have deficiencies to simulate the stratospheric-tropospheric exchange).

The CAMS "near real time analyses" show generally large biases in simulated CH$_4$ mole fractions, varying in space and time and visible in almost all global areas evaluated in this report. These large biases are probably mainly due to the assimilation strategy, including only satellite retrievals (but no surface observations) and potential biases in the assimilated satellite products (which are not corrected for in the IFS assimilations, while the flux inversions apply bias corrections for the satellite data). Furthermore, since the IFS assimilation system does not optimize the emissions, the "near real time analyses" are more sensitive (compared to the flux inversions) to errors in emission inventories.

The comparison of the CAMS "near real time analyses" with the AirCore data shows in some cases the benefit of much higher vertical resolution (with 137 vertical layers, as compared to 34 / 25 layers of the CAMS / JRC TM5-4DVAR inversion system). However, despite the higher vertical and horizontal resolution, the CAMS "near real time analyses" show - apart from their bias - also poorer performance to simulate the spatial and temporal variability (compared to the flux inversions) in areas which are affected by regional emissions (e.g. NOAA regional sites, NOAA aircraft), as apparent from the higher standard deviation and lower correlation coefficients (compared to the flux inversions). However, there are some
improvements in the recent "near real time analyses" for 2017 compared to the previous productions streams for 2016 (Figures 25 and 26).

The surface CH$_4$ fluxes derived from the CAMS inversion system are in general similar to the JRC estimates. However, the latitudinal gradients of the fluxes are slightly different between the two inversion systems, probably partly due to the two different convection schemes applied. Furthermore, there are also some differences in the "fine structure" of the spatial distribution of CH$_4$ emissions between the CAMS and JRC inversions, probably mainly due to the use of different a priori wetland emission inventories. In addition, the different bias corrections of the satellite retrievals applied in the CAMS and JRC inversions probably also have an impact on the derived emissions in the GOSAT inversion. The bias corrections (which partly also compensate the deficiencies of the models to simulate the stratosphere), should be further analysed and improved in the future. Furthermore, the improvements of the simulations of the stratosphere are essential to improve the model representation of the satellite retrievals, especially at mid to high latitudes. Despite the differences in the derived emissions, the CAMS and JRC inversions show very similar performance in the comparison of simulated CH$_4$ mole fractions with the different observational data sets used in this report (in terms of mean bias, correlation coefficient, standard deviation and RMS difference). Therefore, from the current analysis no clear conclusions can be drawn about which fluxes are more realistic.
Figure 25: Summary of the evaluation of simulated CH₄ mole fractions of the different CH₄ products (CAMS and JRC flux inversions and CAMS 'near real time analyses’): mean bias, correlation coefficient R, standard deviation (STD), and root mean square (RMS) difference between model simulations and the observations in the troposphere and for the column averaged CH₄ mole fractions (at TCCON FTS sites).
Figure 26: As Figure 25, but for the observations above the tropopause.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASE</td>
<td>Automatic air Sampling Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS</td>
<td>Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIBIC</td>
<td>Civil Aircraft for the Regular Investigation of the atmosphere Based on an Instrument Container</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRAIL</td>
<td>Comprehensive Observation Network for TRace gases by AirLiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECMWF</td>
<td>European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRL</td>
<td>Earth System Research Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTS</td>
<td>Fourier Transform Spectrometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEMS</td>
<td>Global Monitoring for Environment and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO</td>
<td>HIAPER Pole-to-Pole Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASI</td>
<td>Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFS</td>
<td>Integrated Forecasting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InGOS</td>
<td>Integrated non-CO2 Greenhouse gas Observing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAL</td>
<td>Japan Airlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAL-F</td>
<td>Japan Airlines Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMCO</td>
<td>JAMCO Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRC</td>
<td>Joint Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACC</td>
<td>Monitoring Atmospheric Composition and Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeTOp</td>
<td>Meteorological Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>Meteorological Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Manual air Sampling Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCAS</td>
<td>O₂/N₂ Ratio and CO₂ Airborne Southern Ocean Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Pacific Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTE</td>
<td>PROtocol MOntoring GMES Service Element on Atmospheric Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRON</td>
<td>Space Research Organisation Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANSO</td>
<td>Thermal And Near-infrared Sensor for carbon Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCCON</td>
<td>Total Carbon Column Observing Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNO</td>
<td>Toegepast Natuurwetenschappelijk Onderzoek (Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETCHIMP</td>
<td>Wetland and Wetland CH₄ Inter-comparison of Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO</td>
<td>World Meteorological Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexes

Annex 1: Comparison of individual HIPPO campaigns

**Figure A11:** HIPPO-03 campaign (16/03 -16/04/2010): Top left: HIPPO flight track. Top right: measurements as function of latitude and atmospheric pressure. Middle and lower panel: Bias between modelled CH₄ mole fractions and HIPPO measurements. The level of the tropopause (as diagnosed from the TM5 model), is shown by the dashed dot lines.
Figure A12: As Figure A11, but for the HIPPO-04 campaign (07/06 -17/07/2011).
Figure A13: As Figure A11, but for the HIPPO-05 campaign (09/08-09/09/2011).
Annex 2: Comparison of individual ORCAS flights

Figure A21: ORCAS flight RF01 (15/01/2016): Top left: flight route. Top right: Measured CH₄ mole fractions as function of latitude and flight altitude. The subsequent panels show the bias between the simulations for the different models and the measurements. The level of the tropopause, as diagnosed from the TM5 model, is shown by the dashed dot lines.
Figure A22: As Figure A21, but for the flight RF14 (18/02/2016).
Figure A23: As Figure A21, but for the flight RF16 (22/02/2016).
Figure A24: As Figure A21, but for the flight RF19 (29/02/2016).
Figure A25: As Figure A21, but for the flight FF03 (01/03/2016).
Annex 3: Vertical profiles of AirCore data and statistics

Figure A31: Vertical profiles of CH₄ mole fractions and model simulations (JRC and CAMS inversions and CAMS "near real time analyses") and observations collected during AirCore experiments at Boulder. The level of the tropopause, as diagnosed from the TM5 model, is shown by the dashed lines.
Figure A31: Continued
Figure A31: Continued
Figure A32: As Figure A31, but data at Lamont.
Figure A32: Continued
Figure A32: Continued
Figure A33: As Figure A31, but data at Sodankyla.
Figure A34: Summary of the evaluation of the different CH₄ products (CAMS and JRC flux inversions and CAMS "near real time analyses"): mean bias, correlation coefficient R, standard deviation (STD), and root mean square (RMS) difference between model simulations and the AirCore observations during 2016 above the tropopause and for each AirCore site.
Figure A35: As Figure A34, but for the period 2012-2017.
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