ECMWF COPERNICUS REPORT

Copernicus Climate Change Service

# Product Quality Assessment Report (PQAR) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR7 (01.2003-12.2022)

## C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR – Atmosphere

Issued by: Michael Buchwitz, University of Bremen,
Institute of Environmental Physics (IUP)

Date: 17/11/2023

Ref: C3S2_312a_Lot2_D-WP2_PQAR-2023-GHG_MAIN_v7.2

Official reference number service contract: 2021/C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR/SC1

PROGRAMME OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

IMPLEMENTED BY ECMWF

# Contributors

**INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PHYSICS (IUP), UNIVERSITY OF BREMEN, BREMEN, GERMANY**
**(IUP)**
M. Buchwitz
M. Reuter
O. Schneising-Weigel
A. Di Noia
H. Boesch

**SRON NETHERLANDS INSTITUTE FOR SPACE RESEARCH, LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS**
**(SRON)**
A. Barr
T. Borsdorff
O. P. Hasekamp

**CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE (CNRS), LABORATOIRE DE METEOROLOGIE DYNAMIQUE (LMD), PALAISEAU, FRANCE**
**(LMD/CNRS)**
C. Crevoisier
N. Meilhac

# History of modifications

| Version | Date | Description of modification | Chapters / Sections |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3 | 20-October-2017 | New document for data set CDR1 (temporal coverage: 2003-2016) | All |
| 2.0 | 16-October-2018 | Update for data set CDR2 (temporal coverage: 2003-2017) | All |
| 3.0 | 12-August-2019 | Update for data set CDR3 (temporal coverage: 2003-2018) | All |
| 4.0 | 17-September-2020 | Update for data set CDR4 (temporal coverage: 2003-2019) | All |
| 5.0 | 23-April-2021 | Update for data set CDR5 (temporal coverage: 2003-mid2020) | All |
| 6.0 | 04-August-2022 | Update for data set CDR6 (temporal coverage: 2003-2021) | All |
| 6.1 | 14-December-2022 | Update after review (use of new template, several improvements at various places) | All |
| 6.2 | 30-January-2023 | Update after 2nd review. Several improvements at various places. | All |
| 6.3 | 02-March-2023 | Clean version after 2nd review. Minor improvements at various places. | All |
| 7.0 | 24-August-2023 | Update for data set CDR7 (temporal coverage: 2003-2022) | All |
| 7.1 | 30-October-2023 | Update after review | All |
| 7.2 | 17-November-2023 | Minor improvements after review | All |

## List of datasets covered by this document

| Deliverable ID | Product title (*) | Product type (CDR, ICDR) | Version number | Delivery date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | CO2_GOS_OCFP (ANNEX A) | CDR 7 | 7.3 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | CH4_GOS_OCFP (ANNEX A) | CDR 7 | 7.3 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | CH4_GOS_OCPR (ANNEX A) | CDR 7 | 9.0 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | CO2_GO2_SRFP (ANNEX B) | CDR 7 | 2.0.0 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | CH4_GO2_SRFP (ANNEX B) | CDR 7 | 2.0.0 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | CH4_GO2_SRPR (ANNEX C) | CDR 7 | 2.0.1 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | XCO2_EMMA,<br>XCH4_EMMA,<br>XCO2_OBS4MIPS,<br>XCH4_OBS4MIPS (ANNEX D) | CDR 7 | 4.5 | 31-Aug-2023 |
| WP2-FDDP-GHG-v2 | (ANNEX E) (#):<br>CO2_IASA_NLIS,<br>CH4_IASA_NLIS,<br>CO2_IASB_NLIS,<br>CH4_IASB_NLIS,<br>CO2_IASC_NLIS,<br>CH4_IASC_NLIS | CDR 7 | 10.1<br>10.2<br>10.1<br>10.2<br>10.1<br>10.2 | 31-Aug-2023 |

(*) In brackets: see listed ANNEX to this MAIN document for details on listed product(s).
(#) ANNEX E also includes some information on product CO2_AIRS_NLIS (v3.0) but that product has been generated in a precursor project and no assessments have been carried out in this project. Therefore, this product is not listed here.

## Related documents

| Reference ID | Document |
|---|---|
| D1 | **GCOS-154:** Global Climate Observing System (GCOS): SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SATELLITE-BASED DATA PRODUCTS FOR CLIMATE - 2011 Update - Supplemental details to the satellite-based component of the "Implementation Plan for the Global Observing System for Climate in Support of the UNFCCC (2010 Update)", December 2011, prepared by World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), International Council for Science, Doc.: GCOS 154, link: http://cci.esa.int/sites/default/files/gcos-154.pdf, 2011. |
| D2 | **GCOS-200:** The Global Observing System for Climate: Implementation Needs, World Meteorological Organization (WMO), GCOS-200 (GOOS-214), pp. 325, link: http://unfccc.int/files/science/workstreams/systematic_observation/application/pdf/gcos_ip_10oct2016.pdf, 2016. |
| D3 | **ESA-CCI-GHG-URDv2.1:** Chevallier, F., et al., User Requirements Document (URD), ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) GHG-CCI project, Version 2.1, 19 Oct 2016, https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/docs/GHG-CCIplus/URD/URDv2.1_GHG-CCI_Final.pdf, 2016. |
| D4 | **TRD GAD GHG, 2021:** Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Aben, I., Wu, L., Hasekamp, O. P., Boesch, H., Di Noia, A., Crevoisier, C., Armante, R.: Target Requirement and Gap Analysis Document, Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) project on satellite-derived Essential Climate Variable (ECV) Greenhouse Gases ($CO_2$ and $CH_4$) data products, Version 3.1, 19-February-2021, pp. 81, 2021.<br>Latest version:<br>http://wdc.dlr.de/C3S_312b_Lot2/Documentation/GHG/C3S2_312a_Lot2_TRD-GAD_GHG_latest.pdf |
| D5 | **ATBD GHG CDR7, 2023:** Buchwitz, M., Barr, A., Boesch, H., Borsdorff, T., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Landgraf, J., Meilhac, N., Parker, R., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O.: Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR7 (01.2003-12.2022), C3S project C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR, 2023. |
| D6 | **PUGS GHG CDR7, 2023:** Buchwitz, M., Barr, A., Boesch, H., Borsdorff, T., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Landgraf, J., Meilhac, N., Parker, R., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O.: Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR7 (01.2003-12.2022), C3S project C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR, 2023. |
| D7 | **PQAD GHG CDR7, 2023:** Buchwitz, M., Boesch, H., Borsdorff, T., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Landgraf, J., Meilhac, N., Parker, R., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O.: Product Quality Assurance Document (PQAD) for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set Climate Data Record No. 7 (01.2003-12.2022), C3S project C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR, 2023. |

# Acronyms

| Acronym | Definition |
|---|---|
| AIRS | Atmospheric Infrared Sounder |
| AMSU | Advanced Microwave Sounding Unit |
| ATBD | Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document |
| BESD | Bremen optimal EStimation DOAS |
| CAR | Climate Assessment Report |
| C3S | Copernicus Climate Change Service |
| CCDAS | Carbon Cycle Data Assimilation System |
| CCI | Climate Change Initiative |
| CDR | Climate Data Record |
| CDS | (Copernicus) Climate Data Store |
| CMUG | Climate Modelling User Group (of ESA's CCI) |
| CRG | Climate Research Group |
| D/B | Data base |
| DOAS | Differential Optical Absorption Spectroscopy |
| EC | European Commission |
| ECMWF | European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasting |
| ECV | Essential Climate Variable |
| EMMA | Ensemble Median Algorithm |
| ENVISAT | Environmental Satellite (of ESA) |
| EO | Earth Observation |
| ESA | European Space Agency |
| EU | European Union |
| EUMETSAT | European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites |
| FCDR | Fundamental Climate Data Record |
| FoM | Figure of Merit |
| FP | Full Physics retrieval method |
| FTIR | Fourier Transform InfraRed |
| FTS | Fourier Transform Spectrometer |
| GCOS | Global Climate Observing System |
| GEO | Group on Earth Observation |
| GEOSS | Global Earth Observation System of Systems |
| GHG | GreenHouse Gas |
| GHG-CCI | GHG project of ESA's CCI |
| GOME | Global Ozone Monitoring Experiment |
| GMES | Global Monitoring for Environment and Security |
| GOSAT | Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite |
| GOSAT-2 | Second GOSAT satellite |

| | |
|---|---|
| IASI | Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer |
| IMAP-DOAS (or IMAP) | Iterative Maximum A posteriori DOAS |
| IPCC | International Panel in Climate Change |
| IUP | Institute of Environmental Physics (IUP) of the University of Bremen, Germany |
| JAXA | Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency |
| JCGM | Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology |
| L1 | Level 1 |
| L2 | Level 2 |
| L3 | Level 3 |
| L4 | Level 4 |
| LMD | Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique |
| MACC | Monitoring Atmospheric Composition and Climate, EU GMES project |
| NA | Not applicable |
| NASA | National Aeronautics and Space Administration |
| NetCDF | Network Common Data Format |
| NDACC | Network for the Detection of Atmospheric Composition Change |
| NIES | National Institute for Environmental Studies |
| NIR | Near Infra Red |
| NLIS | LMD/CNRS *neuronal* network mid/upper tropospheric CO2 and CH4 retrieval algorithm |
| NOAA | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration |
| Obs4MIPs | Observations for Climate Model Intercomparisons |
| OCO | Orbiting Carbon Observatory |
| OE | Optimal Estimation |
| PBL | Planetary Boundary Layer |
| ppb | Parts per billion |
| ppm | Parts per million |
| PR | (light path) PRoxy retrieval method |
| PUGS | Product User Guide and Specification |
| PVIR | Product Validation and Intercomparison Report |
| QA | Quality Assurance |
| QC | Quality Control |
| REQ | Requirement |
| RMS | Root-Mean-Square |
| RTM | Radiative transfer model |
| SCIAMACHY | SCanning Imaging Absorption spectroMeter for Atmospheric ChartographY |
| SCIATRAN | SCIAMACHY radiative transfer model |
| SRON | SRON Netherlands Institute for Space Research |
| SWIR | Short Wava Infra Red |
| TANSO | Thermal And Near infrared Sensor for carbon Observation |

| | |
|---|---|
| TANSO-FTS | Fourier Transform Spectrometer on GOSAT |
| TANSO-FTS-2 | Fourier Transform Spectrometer on GOSAT-2 |
| TBC | To be confirmed |
| TBD | To be defined / to be determined |
| TCCON | Total Carbon Column Observing Network |
| TIR | Thermal Infra Red |
| TR | Target Requirements |
| TRD | Target Requirements Document |
| WFM-DOAS (or WFMD) | Weighting Function Modified DOAS |
| UoL | University of Leicester, United Kingdom |
| URD | User Requirements Document |
| WMO | World Meteorological Organization |
| Y2Y | Year-to-year (bias variability) |

# General definitions

**Essential climate variable (ECV)**

An ECV is a physical, chemical, or biological variable or a group of linked variables that critically contributes to the characterization of Earth's climate.

**Climate data record (CDR)**

The US National Research Council (NRC) defines a CDR as a time series of measurements of sufficient length, consistency, and continuity to determine climate variability and change.

**Fundamental climate data record (FCDR)**

A fundamental climate data record (FCDR) is a CDR of calibrated and quality-controlled data designed to allow the generation of homogeneous products that are accurate and stable enough for climate monitoring.

**Thematic climate data record (TCDR)**

A thematic climate data record (TCDR) is a long time series of an essential climate variable (ECV).

**Intermediate climate data record (ICDR)**

An intermediate climate data record (ICDR) is a TCDR which undergoes regular and consistent updates, for example because it is being generated by a satellite sensor in operation.

**Satellite data processing levels**

The NASA Earth Observing System (EOS) distinguishes six processing levels of satellite data, ranging from Level 0 (L0) to Level 4 (L4) as follows.

| | |
|---|---|
| L0 | Unprocessed instrument data |
| L1A | Unprocessed instrument data alongside ancillary information |
| L1B | Data processed to sensor units (geo-located calibrated spectral radiance and solar irradiance) |
| L2 | Derived geophysical variables (e.g., $XCO_2$) over one orbit |
| L3 | Geophysical variables averaged in time and mapped on a global longitude/latitude horizontal grid |
| L4 | Model output derived by assimilation of observations, or variables derived from multiple measurements (or both) |

Additional definitions as relevant for this document:

In the following some relevant Target Requirement (TR) related definitions are given. For details please see *TRD (D4), 2017*, *ESA-CCI-GHG-URDv2.1* and *CMUG-RBD, 2010*:

**Systematic error:** component of measurement error that in replicate measurements remains constant or varies in a predictable manner.

Note: "Systematic error" = "Absolute systematic error" (in contrast to "Relative systematic error" defined below).

For satellite GHG ECV products especially the "Relative systematic error" is important. The definition as used here is as follows:

**Relative systematic error:** Identical with "Systematic error" but after bias correction and without considering a possible "global offset" (overall mean bias). Reflects the importance of spatially and temporally correlated errors ("spatio-temporal biases"). Computed from standard deviations of spatial and temporal biases.

**Bias:** estimate of a systematic measurement error (*JCGM, 2008*).

**Precision** is the measure of reproducibility or repeatability of the measurement without reference to an international standard so that precision is a measure of the random and not the systematic error. Suitable averaging of the random error can improve the precision of the measurement but does not establish the systematic error of the observation (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

Note: Precision (as explained in *TRD (D4)*) is quantified with the standard deviation (1-sigma) of the error distribution.

**Stability** is a term often invoked with respect to long-term records when no absolute standard is available to quantitatively establish the systematic error - the bias defining the time-dependent (or instrument-dependent) difference between the observed quantity and the true value (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

Note: Stability requirements cover inter-annual error changes. If the change in the average bias from one year to another is larger than the defined values, the corresponding product does not meet the stability requirement.

Representativity is important when comparing with or assimilating in models. Measurements are typically averaged over different horizontal and vertical scales compared to model fields. If the measurements are smaller scale than the model it is important. The sampling strategy can also affect this term (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

**Threshold requirement:** The threshold is the limit at which the observation becomes ineffectual and is not of use for climate-related applications (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

**Goal requirement:** The goal is an ideal requirement above which further improvements are not necessary (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

**Breakthrough requirement:** The breakthrough is an intermediate level between the "threshold" and "goal" requirements, which - if achieved - would result in a significant improvement for the targeted application. The breakthrough level may be considered as an optimum, from a cost-benefit point of view when planning or designing observing systems (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

**Horizontal resolution** is the area over which one value of the variable is representative of (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

**Vertical resolution** is the height over which one value of the variable is representative of. Only used for profile data (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

**Observing Cycle** (or **Revisit Time**) is the temporal frequency at which the measurements are required (*CMUG-RBD, 2010*).

# Table of Contents

## Scope of document

This document is the Product Quality Assessment Report (PQAR) for the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S, https://climate.copernicus.eu/) component as covered by the greenhouse gas (GHG) sub-project of project C3S2_312a_Lot2 led by DLR, Germany (a follow-on activity of project C3S_312b_Lot2 led by DLR and project C3S_312a_Lot6 led by University of Bremen, Germany), in the following referred to as C3S/GHG project or simply as project.

Within this project satellite-derived atmospheric carbon dioxide ($CO_2$) and methane ($CH_4$) Essential Climate Variable (ECV) data products have been generated and provided to ECMWF for inclusion into the Copernicus Climate Data Store (CDS) from which users can access these data products and the corresponding documentation.

The satellite-derived data products described and quality assessed in this document are:

- Column-averaged dry-air mixing ratios (mole fractions) of $CO_2$ and $CH_4$, denoted $XCO_2$ (in parts per million, ppm) and $XCH_4$ (in parts per billion, ppb), respectively.
- Mid/upper tropospheric mixing ratios of $CO_2$ (in ppm) and $CH_4$ (in ppb).

An overview of the products is given in Table 1 for the $CO_2$ products and in Table 2 for the $CH_4$ products.

Requirements on data quality are formulated in the corresponding Target Requirement and Gap Analysis Document (TRGAD) (*D4*).

The main purpose of this document is to describe the validation / quality assessment of the satellite-derived $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ greenhouse gas (GHG) ECV data products.

The product validation methodology is identical to the methodology as described in the Product Quality Assurance Document (PQAD) (*D7*). This methodology is also described in this PQAR document so that this document contains all relevant information and users do not have to read the PQAD in addition to this PQAR document.

Note that the product validation methodology only describes the high-level validation procedure and main quantities to be computed (e.g., random and systematic errors, etc.) but that validation protocol does not define all details (such as which spatial and temporal colocation criteria to use) to avoid overspecification. Note that more than one validation approach has been used for most products to obtain robust validation results. These different approaches all follow the general validation methodology but differ in several aspects, which are (on purpose) not prescribed by the validation methodology to obtain a small ensemble of validation approaches and corresponding validation results.

For all $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products three validation approaches are used. One of these methods is called “QA/QC approach” (see Reuter et al., 2020) and this approach has been applied to all $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products and detailed results are reported in this Main PQAR document. The second approach is called “EMMA approach” (see also Reuter et al., 2020) and has also been applied to all $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products. In addition, each data provider has also carried out a validation using their “data provider approach” as applied to their product or groups of products. These data provider validation results and the EMMA validation results are described in 5 ANNEXes to this MAIN PQAR document:

- ANNEX A: PQAR for products CO2_GOS_OCFP, CH4_GOS_OCFP, CH4_OCPR (University of Bremen / Leicester GOSAT products)
- ANNEX B: PQAR for products CO2_GO2_SRFP, CH4_GO2_SRFP (SRON’s “full physics” GOSAT-2 products)
- ANNEX C: PQAR for product CH4_GO2_SRPR (SRON’s “proxy” GOSAT-2 $XCH_4$ product)
- ANNEX D: PQAR for products XCO2_EMMA, XCH4_EMMA, XCO2_OBS4MIPS, XCH4_OBS4MIPS (University of Bremen’s merged Level 2 and Level 3 products)
- ANNEX E: PQAR for IASI $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ products and AIRS $CO_2$ product (LMD/CNRS’s IASI and AIRS products)

This MAIN PQAR document describes in detail the validation results as obtained using the QA/QC approach and summarizes the results from other validation approaches. All validation results are combined to obtain the overall validation summary results. This ensemble validation approach has been used in order to obtain robust validation results.

**Table 1:** Overview $CO_2$ products. "CRD#" indicates the Climate Data Record Number. Level 2 (L2) products contains information for each individual satellite footprint (ground pixel) whereas Level 3 (L3) products are gridded /averaged spatially and temporally.

| Product ID (Level) | Version | CDR# | Temporal coverage | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CO2_GOS_OCFP (L2) | 7.3 | 7 | 04.2009 – 12.2022 | $XCO_2$ from GOSAT as retrieved with the OCFP algorithm (previously Univ. of Leicester, now Univ. of Bremen). |
| CO2_GO2_SRFP (L2) | 2.0.0 | 7 | 02.2019 – 12.2022 | $XCO_2$ from GOSAT-2 as retrieved with SRON's SRFP (RemoTeC) algorithm. |
| XCO2_EMMA (L2) | 4.5 | 7 | 01.2003 – 12.2022 | Merged L2 $XCO_2$ product using Univ. Bremen's EMMA algorithm. |
| XCO2_OBS4MIPS (L3) | 4.5 | 7 | 01.2003 – 12.2022 | Merged L3 $XCO_2$ product in OBS4MIPS format. |
| CO2_IASA_NLIS (L2) | 10.1 | 7 | 07.2007 – 10.2021 | Mid-tropospheric $CO_2$ mixing ratios as retrieved from IASI/Metop-A using LMD's NLIS algorithm. |
| CO2_IASB_NLIS (L2) | 10.1 | 7 | 02.2013 – 12.2022 | Mid-tropospheric $CO_2$ mixing ratios as retrieved from IASI/Metop-B using LMD's NLIS algorithm. |
| CO2_IASC_NLIS (L2) | 10.1 | 7 | 05.2019 – 12.2022 | Mid-tropospheric $CO_2$ mixing ratios as retrieved from IASI/Metop-C using LMD's NLIS algorithm. |

**Table 2:** Overview $CH_4$ products. "CRD#" indicates the Climate Data Record Number. Level 2 (L2) products contains information for each individual satellite footprint (ground pixel) whereas Level 3 (L3) products are gridded /averaged spatially and temporally.

| Product ID (Level) | Version | CDR# | Temporal coverage | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CH4_GOS_OCFP (L2) | 7.3 | 7 | 04.2009 – 12.2021 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT as retrieved with the OCFP algorithm (previously Univ. of Leicester, now Univ. of Bremen). |
| CH4_GOS_OCPR (L2) | 9.0 | 7 | 04.2009 – 12.2021 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT as retrieved with the OCPR algorithm (previously Univ. of Leicester, now Univ. of Bremen). |
| CH4_GO2_SRFP (L2) | 2.0.0 | 7 | 02.2019 – 12.2021 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT-2 as retrieved with SRON's SRFP (RemoTeC) algorithm. |
| CH4_GO2_SRPR (L2) | 2.0.1 | 7 | 02.2019 – 12.2021 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT-2 as retrieved with SRON's SRPR (RemoTeC) algorithm. |
| XCH4_EMMA (L2) | 4.5 | 7 | 01.2003 – 12.2021 | Merged L2 $XCH_4$ product using Univ. Bremen's EMMA algorithm. |
| XCH4_OBS4MIPS (L3) | 4.5 | 7 | 01.2003 – 12.2021 | Merged L3 $XCH_4$ product in OBS4MIPS format. |
| CH4_IASA_NLIS (L2) | 10.2 | 7 | 07.2007 – 10.2021 | Mid-tropospheric $CH_4$ mixing ratios as retrieved from IASI/Metop-A using LMD's NLIS algorithm. |
| CH4_IASB_NLIS (L2) | 10.2 | 7 | 02.2013 – 12.2022 | Mid-tropospheric $CH_4$ mixing ratios as retrieved from IASI/Metop-B using LMD's NLIS algorithm. |
| CH4_IASC_NLIS (L2) | 10.2 | 7 | 05.2019 – 12.2022 | Mid-tropospheric $CH_4$ mixing ratios as retrieved from IASI/Metop-C using LMD's NLIS algorithm. |

## Executive summary

In this document the validation / quality assessment of satellite-derived atmospheric carbon dioxide ($CO_2$) and methane ($CH_4$) Climate Data Record (CDR) data products as generated via the C3S2_312a_Lot2 project of the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S, https://climate.copernicus.eu/) is described.

These satellite-derived greenhouse gas (GHG) data products are:

- Column-averaged dry-air mixing ratios (mole fractions) of $CO_2$ and $CH_4$, denoted $XCO_2$ (in parts per million, ppm) and $XCH_4$ (in parts per billion, ppb), respectively.
- Mid/upper tropospheric mixing ratios of $CO_2$ (in ppm) and $CH_4$ (in ppb).

The C3S GHG data products are generated from the satellite instruments SCIAMACHY/ENVISAT, TANSO-FTS/GOSAT, TANSO-FTS-2/GOSAT-2 ($XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products) and AIRS and IASI (mid/upper troposphere products). All data products are available as Level 2 (individual ground pixels) products. The $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 products correspond to individual satellite sensors but are also available as merged multi-sensor products. In addition, also merged Level 3 (i.e., gridded) products in Obs4MIPs format are available for the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products. For details on data format etc. please see the Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) document (PUGS, D6).

$CO_2$ and $CH_4$ are important climate-relevant atmospheric gases, so-called greenhouse gases (GHG). Because of their important role for climate, they are classified as Essential Climate Variables (ECVs). The ECV GHG as formulated by GCOS (Global Climate Observing System) is defined as: “Retrievals of greenhouse gases, such as $CO_2$ and $CH_4$, of sufficient quality to estimate regional sources and sinks” (GCOS-154). This definition contains already the main application of these atmospheric data products, namely, to use them (in combination with appropriate (inverse) modelling) to obtain (improved) information on their (primarily surface) sources and sinks.

Both gases, $CO_2$ and $CH_4$, have a long lifetime in the atmosphere. Because of this fact and related human emissions, the atmospheric concentrations of these gases are relatively high compared to other atmospheric trace gases. As a result of this, even a moderate to strong (surface) source or sink typically only results in a relatively small local or regional change (enhancement or depletion relative to the surrounding region) in their vertical columns or their mid/upper tropospheric concentration. The observational requirements are therefore very demanding with respect to random and systematic errors and stability.

Because of their long lifetime and atmospheric transport, elevated (or depleted) atmospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ concentrations can be higher (or lower) relative to the background far away from the surface source (or sink), which has emitted (or taken up) these atmospheric gases. To obtain source/sink information from the atmospheric observations it is therefore required to take atmospheric transport (and - especially for methane - also atmospheric chemistry) into account and to consider the exact time and location of the atmospheric observations. Therefore, the most relevant data products are the Level 2 (L2) products, which contain detailed information (time, location, etc.) for each individual satellite ground pixel. The requirements as formulated in the

Target Requirement and Gap Analysis Document (TRGAD, D4) are, therefore, mostly L2 requirements. However, for $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ also (gridded) Level 3 (L3) products have been generated (in Obs4MIPs format); their validation is also described in this document.

The product validation methodology is identical to the methodology as described in the Product Quality Assurance Document (PQAD) (D7). This methodology is also described in this PQAR document so that this document contains all relevant information and users do not have to read document PQAD in addition to this PQAR document.

The product validation results can be summarized as follows:

**Summary quality Level 2 $XCO_2$ products**:

The achieved single observation random error (or precision) is typically close to 2 ppm and better than approximately 3 ppm for all products. This is better than the required breakthrough requirement (B) of better than 3 ppm but worse than the goal (G) requirement of better than 1 ppm.

The systematic error (relative accuracy) threshold (T) requirement is “better than 0.5 ppm”. The achieved performance is around 0.7 ppm +/- a few 0.1 ppm, depending on product and assessment method. The probability that the threshold requirement is met is 46% for product CO2_GOS_OCFP, 33% for CO2_GO2_SRFP and 68% for XCO2_EMMA.

Stability is very good. No significant linear bias drift has been detected. The probability that the threshold (T) stability requirement of 0.5 ppm/year is met is close to 100% percent for all product except for product CO2_GO2_SRFP (62%).

**Summary quality Level 2 $XCH_4$ products:**

The achieved single observation random error (or precision) is close to 17 ppb, which is the breakthrough (B) requirement, for the GOSAT and the EMMA products. For products CH4_GO2_SRFP and CH4_GO2_SRPR the precision is close to 20 ppb.

The systematic error (relative accuracy) threshold (T) requirement is “better than 10 ppb”. The achieved performance is around 5 ppb.

Stability is very good for all GOSAT products and the EMMA product. For these products no significant linear bias drift has been detected. The probability that the threshold (T) stability requirement of 3 ppb/year is met is close to 100% for these products. The probability is less for the two GOSAT-2 products (58% for the FP product and 57% for the PR product; but note that these products only cover relatively short time periods).

**Summary quality Level 3 $XCO_2$ product:**

The validation of Level 3 product XCO2_OBS4MIPS can be summarized as follows: The overall monthly mean uncertainty is 1 ppm and the mean bias is 0.39 ppm. Relative systematic error, i.e., the spatio-temporal bias, is 0.5±0.6 ppm (1-sigma). The computed linear drift of 0.09±0.23 ppm (1-sigma) is small and not significant. The probability that the 0.5 ppm accuracy requirement is met is 66%. The probability that the 0.5 ppm/year stability requirement is met is 97%. Overall, this product has therefore reasonable accuracy and high stability.

**Summary quality Level 3 $XCH_4$ product:**

The validation of Level 3 product XCH4_OBS4MIPS can be summarized as follows: The overall monthly mean uncertainty is 8.1 ppb and the mean bias is -0.55 ppb. Relative systematic error, i.e., the spatio-temporal bias, is 4.7±6 ppb (1-sigma). The computed linear drift of 0.68±1.1 ppb (1-sigma) is small and not significant. The probability that the 10 ppb accuracy requirement is met is 89%. The probability that the 3 ppb/year stability requirement is met is 98%. Overall, this product has therefore very good accuracy and high stability.

**Summary quality IASI mid-tropospheric Level 2 $CO_2$ products:**

The single measurement precision of product CO2_IASA_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-A) is 1 ppm. The mean bias (global offset) is 1.21 ppm. The estimated relative accuracy is around 1 ppm. The probability that the < 0.5 ppm user requirement is met has been estimated to 50% taking into account the uncertainty of the reference data and assessment method. The product is also very stable (0.03 +/- 0.06 ppm/year (1-sigma)) meeting the requirement for long-term drift stability. The performance of products CO2_IASB_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-B) and CO2_IASC_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-C) is similar.

**Summary quality IASI mid-tropospheric Level 2 $CH_4$ products:**

The single measurement precision of product CH4_IASA_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-A) is 12 ppb. The mean bias (global offset) is approximately 3 ppb. The product appears to meet the “relative systematic error” requirement of better than 10 ppb: the estimated relative accuracy is 3 ppb. The product appears to be very stable but a quantitative analysis could not be carried out due to lack of reference data. The performance of products CH4_IASB_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-B) and CH4_IASC_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-C) is similar.

# 1. Product validation methodology

The product validation methodology is identical with the methodology as described in the Product Quality Assurance Document (PQAD) (D7). This methodology is also described in this PQAR document so that this document contains all relevant information and users do not have to read document PQAD in addition to this PQAR document.

## 1.1 Description of reference data used for validation

### 1.1.1 Reference data for validation of the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 products

#### 1.1.1.1 TCCON network

For validation of satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals the Total Carbon Column Observing Network (TCCON, http://www.tccon.caltech.edu/) has been established (e.g., Wunch et al., 2010, 2011, 2015). This network is the core network used for validation of the satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals. Nevertheless, there are also some limitations as explained in Sect. 1.2.1.4.1.

TCCON provides $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products as retrieved from ground-based Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) observations based on direct sun observations. The TCCON data products can essentially be directly compared with the satellite-derived $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products and TCCON data products have been used for this purpose extensively in the past as shown in many studies and publications (e.g., PQAD (D7) and references given therein). A short overview about these activities is given in Sect. 1.2.1.1.

The uncertainty of the TCCON reference data (see Wunch et al., 2010, but also the discussions of this uncertainty related to the use of TCCON data for the validation of satellite retrievals in Buchwitz et al., 2015, 2016, and Dils et al., 2014) is:

- TCCON uncertainty $XCO_2$: 0.4 ppm (1-sigma)
- TCCON uncertainty $XCH_4$: 4 ppb (1-sigma)

Recently, a new version of the TCCON retrievals has been made available by the TCCON team: Version GGG2020. Details of GGG2020 can be found on the GGG2020 website, where also the changes to the retrieval algorithm between GGG2014 and GGG2020 are described (https://tccon-wiki.caltech.edu/Main/DataDescriptionGGG2020). GGG2014 (https://tccon-wiki.caltech.edu/Main/DataDescription) was the previous version and has been used for the validation of previous GHG CDR data sets. For the planned validation of the new CDR7 data set which of the two versions to be used is not prescribed. Both versions have pros and cons. A disadvantage of the new version GGG2020 is that not all TCCON sites have provided TCCON retrievals using GGG2020.

#### 1.1.1.2 Traceability to standard

As explained in this document, the satellite-derived $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products will be validated by comparison with TCCON $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products, which in turn have been calibrated against the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in situ trace gas measurement scales (see Wunch et al., 2010). This approach ensures that the satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals are linked to the WMO standards for atmospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ measurements.

### 1.1.2 Reference data for validation of the mid/upper tropospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ products

#### 1.1.2.1 Reference data overview

For validation of mid/upper tropospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$, no remote sensing ground-based measurements (such as TCCON) is available. Use is thus made of sparse airborne (aircrafts and balloons) measurements: averaging kernels associated to the retrieved columns are applied to vertical profiles measured by in-situ instruments and the resulting column is compared to columns measured from space.

Validation thus relies on:

- Aircraft data acquired either during regular measurements onboard commercial airliners: CONTRAIL (Comprehensive Observation Network for Trace gases by Airlines: Machida et al., 2008; Matsueda et al. 2008), IAGOS (In-service Aircraft for a Global Observing System, https://www.iagos.org/) in the future.
- Aircraft regular measurements made by research groups: NOAA aircraft network in the US and Canada.
- Aircraft research campaigns: HIPPO (Wofsy et al., 2012), CoMet (https://www.halo.dlr.de/science/missions/comet/comet.html) in the future.
- Balloon measurements: AirCores (Membrive et al., 2016) at various locations (Timmins, Kiruna, Sodankulä, Trainou-Orléans).

#### 1.1.2.2 Traceability to standard

As explained in the following sections, the satellite mid/upper tropospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ will be validated by comparison with aircraft and balloon measurements, which are calibrated against the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) scales. This ensures that the satellite retrievals are linked to WMO standards for atmospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$.

## 1.2 Description of product validation methodology

### 1.2.1 Methods for validation of $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 products

In this section, the validation methodology is described. In the following sections the described methods are applied to the newly generated data sets.

#### 1.2.1.1 Overview validation of GHG-CCI precursor / pre-operational products

Past versions of satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals as obtained from SCIAMACHY/ENVISAT and TANSO-FTS/GOSAT have been extensively validated using TCCON as described in various peer-reviewed scientific publications (e.g., Buchwitz et al., 2013a, 2016; Butz et al., 2010; Cogan et al., 2011; Dils et al., 2004; Parker et al., 2011; Reuter et al., 2011; Schneising et al., 2011; Yoshida et al., 2013), project related reports (e.g., Buchwitz et al., 2017) and other documents (e.g., Buchwitz et al., 2016a, 2017a; Reuter et al., 2016, 2017a).

The latest version of the satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals as generated within the GHG-CCI project of ESA's Climate Change Initiative is called "Climate Research Data Package No. 4" (CRDP4). The quality assessment of that data set is described in the Product Validation and Intercomparison Report, version 5, PVIRv5 (Buchwitz et al., 2017). That GHG-CCI CRDP4 data set is the precursor data set, which has been extended for C3S in the context of the C3S_312a_Lot6 project, a precursor project of the current C3S project. As shown in document PVIRv5 (Buchwitz et al., 2017) the validation of the GHG-CCI CRDP4 precursor $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products has been carried out by comparison with TCCON ground-based $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals. The assessments have been carried out quasi independently by different individuals / teams using (somewhat) different methods (using all or only a sub-set of the TCCON sites, using different criteria for spatio-temporal co-location, using different methods to compute "relative systematic error" and "year-to-year bias variability, using "direct comparison" or the Ensemble Median Algorithm (EMMA, Reuter et al., 2013) to check and ensure robustness of the findings. It had been found that quite similar overall quality assessment results have been obtained using the different methods (see PVIRv5 for details), i.e., robust conclusions have been obtained.

The quality assessment was based on the computation of several quantities (metrics). The most important ones are:

- Single ground pixel random error (or "single measurement precision", 1-sigma): Computed as the standard deviation of the difference of the single satellite measurement with TCCON.
- Mean bias (per site and globally): Computed as the mean difference of the satellite measurements with TCCON (satellite minus TCCON).
- "Relative systematic error" (or "relative accuracy" or "relative bias"): To estimate this quantity the "spatial bias" had been computed as standard deviation of the biases as obtained at the various individual TCCON sites. This value is reported in several peer-reviewed publications (e.g., Dils et al., 2014) but does not consider temporal biases. To

also address temporal biases Dils et al., 2014, also computed the quantities “seasonal mean bias”, “seasonality” and “seasonal relative accuracy” (SRA).
- Stability: Linear bias trend (drift): Computed from the slope (and the error of the slope) as obtained by fitting a straight line to satellite minus TCCON differences.
- Stability: Year-to-year bias variability: Computed as maximum minus minimum bias difference of smoothed (using a one year running average) satellite minus TCCON differences.

#### 1.2.1.2 Data quality assessment methods

The quality assessments, which have been carried out for the newly generated C3S products, are similar as past assessments, which have been carried out for the precursor products (see previous sub-section). However, there are some important differences, in particular those related to Target Requirements (TR) assessments, which have not been carried out for the precursor products. The C3S assessment method is described in the following sub-sections.

##### 1.2.1.2.1 Quantitative assessment methods

For each data product the following quantities have been determined:

Single ground pixel random error (or “single measurement precision”, 1-sigma):
Computed as the standard deviation of the difference of the single satellite retrievals (i.e., for individual ground pixels) with the co-located TCCON reference value. See also document PVIRv5 (Buchwitz et al., 2017) for an assessment of this quantity using the precursor products.

Reported uncertainties (“Uncertainty ratio”):
The satellite-derived Level 2 $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products contain an uncertainty estimate for each single observation. This uncertainty is meant to be the statistical uncertainty (1-sigma, dominated by the random error component of the uncertainty due to instrument noise) associated with that single observation. To assess the quality of these uncertainty estimates they are compared with the standard deviation of satellite minus TCCON retrievals at the various TCCON sites. It is expected that the mean value of the reported uncertainty is similar in magnitude (agreement within a few 10%) as the standard deviation of the difference to TCCON (this should be the case if the reported uncertainty is correct and if the comparison method does not introduce additional errors). Therefore, one expects that the “Uncertainty ratio”, i.e., the ratio of the mean value of the reported uncertainty and the standard deviation of satellite minus TCCON differences is close to unity. Although the exact interpretation of this ratio is difficult, it needs to be determined and reported.

Mean bias:
Computed as the mean difference of satellite minus TCCON retrievals. See also document PVIRv5 (Buchwitz et al., 2017) for an assessment of this quantity using the precursor products.

“Relative systematic error” (or “relative accuracy” or “relative bias” or simply “accuracy”):
To estimate this quantity two values and a combined value are computed and reported:

- The first number is the “spatial bias” computed as standard deviation of the biases as obtained at the various individual TCCON sites. This value is reported in several peer-reviewed publications (e.g., Dils et al., 2014) but does not consider temporal biases (to address this, Dils et al., 2014, computed several quantities: “seasonal mean bias”, “seasonality” and “seasonal relative accuracy”).
- The second number is the “spatio-temporal bias” for a seasonal time scale. There are several options how to compute this number and how to combine it with the first number to get an overall single number for “relative accuracy” and the used method how to exactly compute these numbers has not been fully specified (the most appropriate method may depend on the number of data points, i.e., on the instrument and the applied retrieval algorithm).
- For the QA/QC results presented in this document (and which has been applied to all satellite products discussed in this document) the “spatio-temporal bias”, has been computed as the root-sum-square (RSS) value of the (overall) “spatial bias” and the (overall) “seasonal bias”, i.e., by quadratically adding two numbers.
- The (overall) seasonal bias has been computed based on seasonal biases obtained at the individual TCCON sites. The seasonal bias at a given TCCON site has been computed as the standard deviation of the biases in the four (or at least three) seasons. The overall seasonal bias has therefore been computed similarly as the “seasonality” (parameter “Seas”) reported in Dils et al., 2014.
- Because of the used RSS adding method, the “spatio-temporal bias” is always larger than the “spatial bias”. The “spatio-temporal bias” is a positive (or strictly speaking a non-negative) number, and is identified with “relative accuracy” (as it considers spatial and temporal biases).
- However, also other methods are used to compute “spatio-temporal bias” / “relative accuracy”, e.g., by the data provider (DP) method and by the EMMA method.In any case, for the combined value, i.e., for “relative accuracy”, always the larger of the two individual values (“spatial bias” and “spatio-temporal bias”) has been used to report the overall value for “relative accuracy”.

Stability: Linear bias trend (Long term drift):
Computed from the slope as obtained by fitting a straight line to satellite minus TCCON differences using the entire time series. The 1-sigma uncertainty reported is obtained from the slope fit error.

Stability: Year-to-year bias variability:
Computed as maximum minus minimum bias difference of smoothed (using a one year running average) satellite minus TCCON differences.

1.2.1.2.2 Qualitative assessment methods

As the TCCON network is quite sparse it is important for quality assessment of the global satellite-derived data product to also use other (more qualitative) assessment methods.

Therefore, also the following activities have been carried out:

- Generation of global maps and (regional) time series figures to obtain an overview of the entire data set.
- Comparisons with global models (especially those assimilating accurate surface $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ measurements).

1.2.1.3 Methods for comparison of the achieved performance with the user requirements

The results obtained with the "Quantitative assessment methods" are compared with the Target Requirements (TRs) as given in the Target Requirement Document (TRD) (*D4*).

To obtain a statement if a certain TR is met or not - or if it is "partially met" - several uncertainties are considered as good as possible:

- The uncertainty of the estimated parameter (e.g., the uncertainties of the obtained values for "accuracy" and "stability").
- The uncertainty of the reference data (here: TCCON) (if not already included in the uncertainty of the obtained values for "accuracy" and "stability").
- The uncertainty of the comparison method (e.g., considering imperfect collocation of the satellite data and the reference data) (if not already included in the uncertainty of the obtained values for "accuracy" and "stability").

The following discussion is limited to "accuracy" and "stability" as these are the most critical / important data quality "figures of merit" and because TRs have been defined for them.

The TRs are the following (see also Target Requirement Document (*TRD, D4*)):

- (Relative) Accuracy $XCO_2$: < 0.5 ppm (1-sigma)
- Stability $XCO_2$: < 0.5 ppm/year
- (Relative) Accuracy $XCH_4$: < 10 ppb (1-sigma)
- Stability $XCH_4$: < 3 ppb/year

*(Relative) Accuracy:*

As explained earlier, the term "accuracy" as used here means "relative accuracy" or "relative bias". The reason for this is that a possible "global offset" is not critical for the main application of the data products, which is to use them to obtain information on (regional) sources and sinks. What is critical is the bias difference between different locations and time periods ("spatio-temporal bias"). Nevertheless, the "global offset" (a single number per product) has been determined and is reported in this document (and can be considered by the users if needed).

"Accuracy" is essentially estimated from standard deviations of the biases at TCCON validation sites. The estimated value is therefore a positive (strictly speaking a non-negative) number. It is assumed for the following (in line with the description as given in Sect. 1.2.1.2.1) that the value obtained for accuracy has been estimated (for each product and each applied assessment method) assuming error free TCCON observations and an error free comparison method (these errors are considered in a later step).

To compute the probability that the accuracy requirement is met, it is required to have at least a rough estimate of the uncertainty ("UNC_ACC") of the reported achieved accuracy value ("ACC"). This uncertainty comes from the uncertainty of the reference data (here TCCON) and the uncertainty of the comparison method (e.g., colocation method and its representativity error).

The uncertainty of the TCCON reference data (see Wunch et al., 2010, but also the discussions of this uncertainty related to the use of TCCON data for the validation of satellite retrievals in Buchwitz et al., 2015, 2016, and Dils et al., 2014) is:

- TCCON uncertainty $XCO_2$: 0.4 ppm (1-sigma)
- TCCON uncertainty $XCH_4$: 4 ppb (1-sigma)

These uncertainties are increased by 50% to also consider other error sources, especially error of the comparison method such as the "representativity error". The assumed uncertainty ("UNC_ACC") of the estimated accuracy value ("ACC") are therefore:

- UNC_ACC $XCO_2$: 0.6 ppm (1-sigma)
- UNC_ACC $XCH_4$: 6 ppb (1-sigma)

In summary, we now have ACC +/- UNC_ACC (1-sigma) for the estimated relative accuracy or spatio-temporal bias and its uncertainty. These values are interpreted as the mean and the standard deviation of an underlying probability density function (pdf).

ACC is a non-negative number and the Target Requirement (TR) for accuracy defines an "acceptable range" or interval of "acceptable" accuracy values: [0, TR[, i.e., in order to meet the requirements ACC shall be smaller than TR but will be larger than (or equal to) zero. Because of this "non-negativity", ACC cannot be distributed according to a Gaussian ("normal") probability density function (pdf) (esp. if the mean is much smaller than the standard deviation) but it may be reasonable to assume that the overall distribution is a lognormal distribution[1], with parameters selected such that the lognormal pdf is very similar as a Gaussian pdf if the mean is on the order or larger than the standard deviation.

[1] https://de.mathworks.com/help/stats/lognormal-distribution.html (last accessed 15/11/2023)

The probability density function (pdf) of the lognormal distribute is:

$$y = f(x|\mu,\sigma) = \frac{1}{x\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left\{\frac{-(\log x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\}, \quad \text{for } x > 0. \qquad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

The lognormal distribution has parameters μ and σ, which are related to parameters mean m = ACC and variance v = UNC_ACC as follows:

$$\mu = \log\left(m^2/\sqrt{v+m^2}\right) \qquad \text{Eq. (2a)}$$

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\log(v/m^2+1)} \qquad \text{Eq. (2b)}$$

The cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the lognormal distribution is:

$$p = F(x|\mu,\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_0^x \frac{1}{t}\exp\left\{\frac{-(\log t-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\}dt, \quad \text{for } x > 0. \qquad \text{Eq. (3)}$$

This function is used to compute the probability, that the accuracy requirement is met, see Figure 1 for $XCO_2$ and Figure 2 for $XCH_4$.

**Figure 1** - Probability that the $XCO_2$ accuracy TR is met as a function of the achieved accuracy.




**Figure 2** - Probability that the $XCH_4$ accuracy TR is met as a function of the achieved accuracy.



*Stability:*

For the TR assessment, the stability assessment is limited to "Linear bias trend / drift" (i.e., the year-to-year bias variability is also determined as explained above but not used for the TR assessment).

As for "accuracy" it is assumed that the value for stability has been obtained assuming error free TCCON observations and an error free comparison method. In contrast to "accuracy" it is assumed that the uncertainty of the stability value is known (it corresponds to the (1-sigma) slope (SLO) error of the linear fit). The result of the stability assessment is: STA +/- UNC_SLO.

To consider the uncertainty of the reference data we assume that the TCCON data approximately meet the following stability requirements:

- $XCO_2$ stability: 0.2 ppm/year
- $XCH_4$ stability: 1 ppb/year

These uncertainties need to be added quadratically (via Root-Sum-Square (RSS)) to UNC_SLO to obtain the overall uncertainty UNC_STA.

As shown in Table S-1 for $XCO_2$ and Table S-2 for $XCH_4$ in column "Long-term drift" in document PVIRv5 (*Buchwitz et al., 2017*) typical values for STA +/- UNC_SLO are (if the uncertainty is converted to 1-sigma):

- $XCO_2$: +0.1 +/- 0.07 (1-sigma) ppm/year
- $XCH_4$: -0.8 +/- 0.4 (1-sigma) ppb/year

These values are listed here only for illustration (the exact value depends on product and assessment method).

Quadratically adding the assumed TCCON uncertainty gives for this example for STA +/- UNC_STA:

- $XCO_2$: +0.1 +/- 0.21 (1-sigma) ppm/year
- $XCH_4$: -0.8 +/- 1.08 (1-sigma) ppb/year

In contrast to ACC, STA can also be negative and we use a Gaussian probability density function N(x, mean=STA, sigma=UNC_STA) to compute the probability that the stability TR is met. This probability is the integral of N over the interval as defined by the stability TR requirement, i.e., interval ]-TR, +TR[, or simply the difference between two different values of the cumulative distribution function Nc(x, mean=STA, sigma=UNC_STA) (namely at x=TR and x=-TR). The probability P that the stability TR is met for $XCO_2$ for a given value of STA is therefore for this example: P(STA) = Nc (+0.5, mean=+0.1, sigma=0.2) – Nc(-0.5, mean=+0.1, sigma=0.2) = 97%. This means that in these cases it is almost certain that the stability TR is met.

Figure 3 shows typical probability functions.

**Figure 3** – Probability functions used to obtain the probability that the stability requirement is met. Top: for $XCO_2$. Bottom: for $XCH_4$.






### 1.2.1.4 Known limitations

#### 1.2.1.4.1 TCCON

The TCCON network (https://tccondata.org/) consists of the sites as shown in Figure 4. As can be seen, it is relatively dense in the USA, in Europe and in Japan but overall, the TCCON network is relatively sparse (e.g., no or only very few sites in Russia, South America and Africa) and does not cover all conditions, which affect or can affect the quality of the satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals (e.g., deserts due to their high surface albedo combined with potentially high amounts of specific aerosol types such as desert dust storm mineral aerosols).

**Figure 4** - Location of TCCON sites. Source: https://tccondata.org/.




The TCCON network is the core network for the validation of the satellite $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals and is therefore essential for this part of the C3S service.

It would therefore be highly beneficial for this service:

- if the TCCON network were expanded to better cover all geophysical conditions relevant for the quality assessment of the satellite retrievals.
- if the TCCON $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ retrievals were available faster (current availability: one year after observation).

As a minimum, it needs to be guaranteed that the existing network remains in place but unfortunately even this is currently not guaranteed.

### 1.2.2 Methods for validation of $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 3 Obs4MIPs products

The gridded Level 3 $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products are in Obs4MIPs format.

The main applications of these products are comparisons with climate models as shown in, e.g., Lauer et al., 2017, presenting a comparison of the version 1 $XCO_2$ Obs4MIPs data product (see also Reuter et al., 2016). The version 1 $XCH_4$ Obs4MIPs product is described in Buchwitz et al., 2016a. In February 2017, version 2 of the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Obs4MIPs data products has been generated in the framework of the GHG-CCI project covering the period 2003-2015 (Buchwitz et al., 2017a; Reuter et al., 2017).

These products have now been re-generated for C3S and they are extended in time (now covering 2003-2016 (version 3)).

The $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Obs4MIPs products are based on the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 products described in this document. The quality of the Obs4MIPs products therefore depends on the quality of the underlying Level 2 products.

Note that the data quality user requirements for the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ products (TRD, D4) are requirements for Level 2 products. Explicit data quality requirements for Level 3 products do not exist.

### 1.2.3 Methods for validation of $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ Level 2 mid/upper troposphere products

#### 1.2.3.1 Overview of existing methods as applied to precursor data sets

Past versions of satellite mid/upper tropospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ obtained from IASI have been validated using aircraft or, more recently, balloon measurements of atmospheric profiles.

The previous version of the satellite mid/upper tropospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ IASI retrievals as generated within the GHG-CCI project of ESA's Climate Change Initiative is called "Climate Research Data Package No. 4" (CRDP4). The quality assessment of this data set is described in the Product Validation and Intercomparison Report, version 5, PVIRv5 (Buchwitz et al., 2017). This GHG-CCI CRDP4 data set is the precursor data set, which has been extended for C3S in the context of the C3S_312a_Lot6 project and its follow-on projects including the current project C3S2_312a_Lot2. As shown in document PVIRv5 (Buchwitz et al., 2017) the validation of the GHG-CCI CRDP4 precursor $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ mid/upper tropospheric data products has been carried out by comparison with aircraft and balloon-borne AirCores in-situ profile measurements. These comparisons have been used to validate global trend, growth rate and amplitude of the seasonal cycle. However, due to the scarcity of the measurements, quantity such as single retrieval precision or accuracy remains limited and may be derived only in specific regions where enough measurements are available.

### 1.2.3.2 Methods applied to the C3S ECV CDR data set

#### 1.2.3.2.1 Quantitative assessment methods

Essentially the same methods have been applied as described in Sect. 1.2.1.2.1 for the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products, when the number of available aircraft or AirCore measurements of vertical profiles allows the computation of the quantities.

#### 1.2.3.2.2 Qualitative assessment methods

The same methods have been applied as described in Sect. 1.2.1.2.2 for the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products.

### 1.2.3.3 Methods for comparison of the achieved performance with the user requirements

Essentially the same methods have been applied as described in Sect. 1.2.1.2.1 for the $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ data products.

### 1.2.3.4 Known limitations

The main limitation is the scarcity of measurements in the mid and upper troposphere of $CO_2$ and $CH_4$. Moreover, aircraft profiles are generally available up to 6-8 km, which means that the above part of the profile need to be taken from atmospheric transport simulation. This could result in a regional/seasonal bias, which is not well known. Recently developed AirCores, which provide 0-30 km profiles of $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ by flying under meteorological balloons, provides a means to fully validate the gas columns retrieved from space, provided that enough measurements are available (less than 20 profiles are currently available worldwide).

For this service, it would thus be highly beneficial:

- If AirCores could be launched regularly at various locations (for instance at existing TCCON/ICOS stations).
- If extensive aircraft campaigns could be organized to collect information in several places where no measurements are currently available (tropical and boreal regions).
- If measurements from IAGOS could include $CO_2$ and $CH_4$.

# 2. Validation results

In this section, detailed validation results are shown. The first two sub-sections present results for validation of the Level 2 $XCO_2$ (Sect. 2.1) and $XCH_4$ (Sect. 2.2) data products respectively. The following sub-sections show the validation results for the $XCO_2$ Level 3 product (Sect. 2.3), for the $XCH_4$ Level 3 product (Sect. 2.4) and for the Level 2 mid-tropospheric products (Sect. 2.5). In Sect. 4 the results are summarized including comparisons with the user requirements.

For each data product a set of well defined "figures of merit" (FoMs) are computed to summarize the validation results and to compute the probability that the TR is met as explained in Sect. 1.2. This has been done using different approaches depending on, for example, the chosen co-location criteria and other "filters" such as required number of successful co-locations required to "accept" a certain set of FoM (if the number of co-locations is too small than the obtained FoMs may not be regarded as significant or robust enough).

## 2.1 Validation results for Level 2 $XCO_2$ products

In this sub-section detailed results from one of the validation approaches for the Level 2 $XCO_2$ products are presented. This approach is called "QA/QC approach" (see Reuter et al., 2020) and has been developed and used for the validation of all C3S $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 data products.

In addition, also other validation approaches are used, namely the data provider validation approaches (as applied by each data provider to his/her product) and the EMMA approach (see Reuter et al., 2020). These somewhat different approaches are described in the ANNEXes to this Main PQAR document.

This means that an ensemble of validation methods is used to make sure that the overall validation summary results are robust and do not depend on a single method. Note that the same "ensemble approach" for validation has also been used for the GHG-CCI products in the framework of the GHG-CCI project (see Buchwitz et al., 2017).

For the QA/QC method the following so-location criteria have been used:

- Temporal: +/- 2 hours
- Spatial: +/- 2° latitude, +/- 4° longitude

Similar but not necessarily identical criteria have been used for the other validation approaches.

### 2.1.1 Validation results for product CO2_GOS_OCFP

As a first step, the satellite product is compared with the corresponding TCCON product at each TCCON site separately. Only results from those sites are accepted for further processing if comparisons at least 30 days are possible (note that one day corresponds to one satellite overpass).

Figure 5 shows the comparison at the TCCON site Lamont ("LAM"), Oklahoma, USA. Please see the figure caption for a detailed explanation of the Figures of Merit (FoMs) resulting from this comparison.

As can be seen from Figure 5, also FoMs for seasonal bias and stability are computed. These FoMs are only computed if the time series is "long enough" (at least 3 years) with, for example, enough co-locations per season (at least 10 days) and per year (at least 20 days). For Lamont these conditions are fulfilled.

From the results obtained at the individual TCCON sites a single "Product Quality Summary Figure" is produced which is shown as Figure 6 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP. The top right part shows a table listing of the FoMs as obtained for the individual TCCON sites (the Lamont (LAM) results are shown in Figure 5). Listed are

- the TCCON site ID (e.g., LAM_01 for Lamont),
- the random error or single measurement precision (in ppm, 1-sigma),
- the uncertainty ratio "UncR", which is the ratio of the reported $XCO_2$ uncertainty (as reported in the data product for each individual satellite ground pixel) and the estimated uncertainty as computed from the standard deviation of the difference of the individual observations to TCCON (note that a value not too far away from 1.0 is expected for reliable, i.e., "good quality" reported uncertainties),
- the bias in terms of mean bias and seasonal bias (see Figure 5) and
- FoMs characterising stability in terms of drift and year-to-year bias variability (see caption Figure 5 for details).

The FoMs obtained from the individual sites are used to compute "overall quality FoMs" listed directly below the table of the individual TCCON site results. These overall quality FoMs are obtained by computing (i) the "Mean" and (ii) the standard deviation ("StdDev").

A subset of these FoMs is used to report the final FoMs for the CO2_GOS_OCFP product, which are listed in the yellow marked box in the bottom right of Figure 6:

- Single measurement precision (1-sigma)
- Uncertainty ratio ("UncR")
- Relative accuracy computed as standard deviation of the site-to-site biases as a measure of "regional bias" and also as seasonal bias to include a time dependence
- The global offset or mean bias
- The linear drift component of stability and its 1-sigma uncertainty
- The year-to-year bias component of stability and its 1-sigma uncertainty

Also listed are the probabilities that the accuracy TR and the stability (drift) TR is met (see Sect. 1.2.1.3 for details). These final FoMs are used for Table 3, which summarizes the quality assessment results for this product. For the abbreviations of the various TCCON sites as used in Figure 6 please see detailed information as given in Table 3 of Reuter et al., 2020.

**Figure 5** - Comparison of satellite $XCO_2$ product CO2_GOS_OCFP (red symbols in top panel) with TCCON $XCO_2$ (semi-transparent grey symbols in top panel appearing black in the time series). Top: Daily satellite and TCCON $XCO_2$ (the number of days is listed (in blue) as Ndays). Also listed are the following figures of merit (in blue): the systematic error (mean bias satellite single observations minus TCCON), mean value of the single observation random error, the number of satellite observations (Nobs) used for the comparisons, the uncertainty ratio "UncRatio", which is the ratio of the reported uncertainty (1-sigma, per ground pixel) and the estimated uncertainty as computed from satellite minus TCCON differences, and the linear correlation coefficient of the daily averaged data ("R(daily)"). Bottom: Daily differences satellite minus TCCON (red symbols). The blue symbols show the 3-monthly biases. The light green line shows the biases at yearly resolution (obtained by smoothing the daily biases). The dark green line shows the linear trend. The corresponding plot statistics are listed at the bottom (reported as mean value and standard deviation) using the same colors as used for the x-y plot: daily bias (in red), 3-monthly bias and overall seasonal bias (blue), linear trend (dark green) and year-to-year bias variability (light green; here the reported value is the peak-to-peak difference and its estimated uncertainty in ppm/year).



**Figure 6** - Product Quality Summary Figure for product CO2_GOS_OCFP. Please see the main text for a detailed explanation. For details on the TCCON sites please see Tab. 3 of Reuter et al., 2020.







Michael.Buchwitz@iup.physik.uni-bremen.de, 29-Jun-2023 coloc:2/2/4 corr:YY

| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 2.08 | 0.93 | 0.18 | | -0.17+/-0.06 | |
| BUR_01 | 1.78 | 0.95 | 0.93 | | 0.44+/-0.17 | |
| CAL_01 | 2.16 | 0.83 | -0.78 | 0.51 | 0.03+/-0.01 | 1.57+/-0.32 |
| EDW_01 | 2.12 | 0.84 | 0.40 | 0.32 | 0.04+/-0.01 | 1.05+/-0.28 |
| ETL_01 | 2.00 | 1.01 | 0.51 | | 0.01+/-0.11 | 1.11+/-0.36 |
| GAR_01 | 1.88 | 1.09 | 0.49 | | -0.02+/-0.04 | |
| HEF_01 | 1.80 | 1.29 | 1.39 | | 0.06+/-0.15 | |
| KAR_01 | 2.21 | 0.89 | 0.18 | 0.73 | 0.14+/-0.05 | 1.72+/-0.39 |
| LAM_01 | 1.50 | 1.22 | -0.24 | 0.23 | 0.08+/-0.01 | 1.92+/-0.45 |
| LAU_02 | 2.43 | 0.71 | 0.85 | 1.19 | -0.22+/-0.13 | |
| LAU_03 | 2.19 | 0.73 | 0.86 | 1.51 | -0.34+/-0.15 | 3.01+/-0.73 |
| NIC_01 | 1.47 | 1.27 | 0.05 | | 0.68+/-0.50 | |
| ORL_01 | 1.85 | 1.00 | -0.07 | 0.62 | -0.02+/-0.04 | 1.19+/-0.33 |
| PAR_01 | 2.33 | 0.80 | -0.09 | 1.43 | -0.00+/-0.08 | 1.41+/-0.34 |
| PFA_01 | 1.82 | 1.10 | -0.59 | 0.36 | -0.02+/-0.02 | 2.26+/-0.60 |
| REU_01 | 0.98 | 1.12 | 0.52 | | -0.16+/-0.10 | |
| RIK_01 | 1.91 | 1.07 | -0.45 | | 0.07+/-0.14 | |
| SAG_01 | 1.93 | 1.07 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.18+/-0.03 | 2.52+/-0.65 |
| SOD_01 | 1.80 | 1.21 | -0.81 | | -0.08+/-0.04 | |
| TSU_02 | 1.94 | 1.12 | 0.53 | 0.42 | 0.04+/-0.06 | 1.19+/-0.31 |
| XIA_01 | 2.17 | 1.01 | 0.62 | 0.59 | 0.40+/-0.14 | 1.89+/-0.58 |
| Mean | 1.92 | 1.01 | 0.24 | 0.71 | 0.05 | 0.10 1.74 0.44 |
| StdDev | | | 0.58 | | 0.22 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 1.92 UncR: 1.01

Global offset (mean bias): 0.24 (sgl.) / -0.00 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 0.58 Seas.: 0.71 Spat.-temp.: 0.92

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 0.05 +/- 0.10

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 1.74 +/- 0.44

TR accuracy: p(ACC<0.5ppm; 0.92+/-0.60): 24%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-0.5ppm/yr; 0.05+/-0.22): 97%

**Table 3** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CO2_GOS_OCFP as obtained by comparison with TCCON reference data using the QA/QC assessment method. The listed requirements are the threshold (T) requirements as given in *TRD (D4)*. For precision (i.e., single observation statistical uncertainty or random error) also the corresponding breakthrough (B) and goal (G) requirements are listed. For the achieved performance of (relative) "Accuracy" two values are listed: The first one is the spatial component of the bias and the second one is the spatio-temporal bias, computed by also considering seasonal biases. The spatio-temporal bias is our estimate of "relative accuracy". TR refers to "target requirement" and reported is the probability that the corresponding TR is met, i.e., the probabilities that accuracy is better than 0.5 ppm and stability is better than 0.5 ppm/year.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CO2_GOS_OCFP<br>Level: 2, Version: 7.3, Time period covered: 4.2009 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppm] | 1.9 | < 8 (T)<br>< 3 (B)<br>< 1 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 1.01 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppm] | 0.24 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppm] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 0.58 – 0.92 | < 0.5 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 24% | - |
| Stability: Drift [ppm/year] | 0.05 +/- 0.10 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | Probability that stability TR is met: 97% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppm/year] | 1.7 +/- 0.4 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | - | - |

### 2.1.2 Validation results for product CO2_GO2_SRFP

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product CO2_GO2_SRFP.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product CO2_GO2_SRFP is shown as Table 4.

**Figure 7** - As Figure 5 but for product CO2_GO2_SRFP.



**Figure 8** – As Figure 6 but for product CO2_GO2_SRFP.




| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 3.04 | 1.03 | -0.60 | | -0.72+/-0.89 | |
| BUR_01 | 2.13 | 0.96 | 1.80 | | -0.55+/-0.41 | |
| CAL_01 | 2.92 | 0.64 | -0.38 | 1.08 | 0.03+/-0.15 | 2.94+/-0.73 |
| EDW_01 | 2.70 | 0.70 | 0.66 | 0.46 | 0.29+/-0.12 | 1.38+/-0.40 |
| ETL_01 | 3.73 | 1.08 | 1.00 | | 0.85+/-0.47 | |
| EUR_01 | 4.85 | 0.63 | -1.27 | | 6.88+/-3.44 | |
| GAR_01 | 2.82 | 0.97 | 0.95 | | 1.45+/-0.57 | |
| HEF_01 | 1.83 | 1.18 | 0.91 | | -1.12+/-1.16 | |
| KAR_01 | 3.23 | 0.83 | 1.07 | | 1.05+/-0.34 | |
| LAM_01 | 2.88 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 1.29 | -0.53+/-0.19 | 3.32+/-0.75 |
| LAU_03 | 3.79 | 0.76 | 1.50 | 1.47 | -0.33+/-0.26 | 2.70+/-0.80 |
| NIC_01 | 2.42 | 0.87 | 0.49 | | 0.73+/-0.62 | |
| ORL_01 | 2.48 | 0.93 | 0.70 | | -0.27+/-0.55 | |
| PAR_01 | 3.01 | 0.77 | 0.48 | | -0.24+/-0.43 | |
| PFA_01 | 3.63 | 0.84 | 1.12 | | -0.73+/-0.34 | |
| REU_01 | 2.20 | 0.84 | 0.22 | | -3.79+/-1.04 | |
| RIK_01 | 3.42 | 0.79 | 0.92 | | -0.09+/-0.84 | |
| SAG_01 | 3.37 | 0.64 | 1.63 | 0.41 | 0.80+/-0.26 | 3.38+/-0.94 |
| SOD_01 | 2.62 | 1.51 | -0.49 | | -0.61+/-0.71 | |
| TSU_02 | 2.63 | 1.03 | -1.28 | | -0.33+/-0.64 | |
| XIA_01 | 3.08 | 0.70 | 0.35 | 0.49 | 1.22+/-0.38 | |
| Mean | 2.99 | 0.88 | 0.50 | 0.87 | 0.19 | 0.66 2.74 0.72 |
| StdDev | | | 0.84 | | 1.84 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 2.99 UncR: 0.88

Global offset (mean bias): 0.50 (sgl.) / 0.45 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 0.84 Seas.: 0.87 Spat.-temp.: 1.21

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 0.19 +/- 0.66

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 2.74 +/- 0.72

TR accuracy: p(ACC<0.5ppm; 1.21+/-0.60): 5%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-0.5ppm/yr; 0.19+/-0.69): 52%

**Table 4** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CO2_GOS_SRFP. Please see detailed additional info in caption of Table 3.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CO2_GO2_SRFP<br>Level: 2, Version: 2.0.0, Time period covered: 02.2019 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppm] | 3.0 | < 8 (T)<br>< 3 (B)<br>< 1 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 0.88 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppm] | 0.50 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppm] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 0.84 – 1.21 | < 0.5 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 5% | - |
| Stability: Drift [ppm/year] | 0.19 +/- 0.66 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | Probability that stability TR is met: 52% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppm/year] | Time series too short | < 0.5 | - | - |

### 2.1.3 Validation results for product XCO2_EMMA

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product XCO2_EMMA.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product XCO2_EMMA is shown as Table 5.

**Figure 9** - As Figure 5 but for product XCO2_EMMA.



**Figure 10** - As Figure 6 but for product XCO2_EMMA.







Michael.Buchwitz@iup.physik.uni-bremen.de, 16-Aug-2023 coloc:2/2/4 corr:YY

| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 1.59 | 1.19 | 0.97 | | -0.03+/-0.04 | |
| BUR_01 | 1.18 | 1.33 | 0.85 | | 0.09+/-0.12 | |
| CAL_01 | 2.06 | 0.82 | -0.15 | 0.30 | -0.03+/-0.01 | 1.91+/-0.34 |
| EDW_01 | 1.86 | 0.91 | 1.02 | 0.14 | -0.04+/-0.02 | 1.76+/-0.35 |
| ETL_01 | 1.27 | 1.28 | 0.95 | 0.38 | -0.01+/-0.08 | |
| GAR_01 | 2.36 | 0.77 | 1.33 | 0.44 | 0.02+/-0.03 | |
| HAR_01 | 1.46 | 1.02 | 1.04 | | -1.33+/-1.18 | |
| HEF_01 | 1.99 | 0.94 | 1.62 | | 0.05+/-0.11 | |
| KAR_01 | 1.91 | 0.88 | 0.65 | 0.56 | 0.10+/-0.05 | 1.71+/-0.30 |
| LAM_01 | 1.41 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 0.14 | 0.04+/-0.01 | 1.40+/-0.26 |
| LAU_02 | 1.30 | 1.23 | 0.84 | 0.10 | -0.13+/-0.07 | 1.03+/-0.35 |
| LAU_03 | 1.40 | 1.11 | 0.42 | 0.17 | -0.14+/-0.12 | 1.40+/-0.27 |
| NIC_01 | 1.65 | 1.02 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.74+/-0.42 | |
| ORL_01 | 1.68 | 1.03 | 0.91 | 0.51 | 0.03+/-0.03 | 1.07+/-0.26 |
| PAR_01 | 1.85 | 0.91 | 0.85 | 0.59 | -0.03+/-0.06 | 0.85+/-0.27 |
| PFA_01 | 1.66 | 1.05 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.01+/-0.02 | 2.36+/-0.62 |
| REU_01 | 0.93 | 1.52 | 1.02 | 0.48 | -0.28+/-0.06 | 1.48+/-0.56 |
| RIK_01 | 1.17 | 1.27 | 0.70 | | 0.33+/-0.07 | |
| SAG_01 | 1.37 | 1.15 | 0.95 | 0.27 | 0.19+/-0.03 | 2.55+/-0.75 |
| SOD_01 | 1.77 | 1.08 | 0.02 | | -0.16+/-0.04 | |
| TSU_02 | 1.83 | 1.01 | 0.53 | 0.18 | 0.16+/-0.05 | 1.17+/-0.29 |
| XIA_01 | 1.94 | 0.91 | 1.02 | 0.41 | 0.33+/-0.12 | 1.36+/-0.40 |
| Mean | 1.62 | 1.07 | 0.78 | 0.36 | -0.00 | 0.12 1.54 0.39 |
| StdDev | | | 0.39 | | 0.36 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 1.62 UncR: 1.07

Global offset (mean bias): 0.78 (sgl.) / 0.63 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 0.39 Seas.: 0.36 Spat.-temp.: 0.53

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): -0.00 +/- 0.12

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 1.54 +/- 0.39

TR accuracy: p(ACC<0.5ppm; 0.53+/-0.60): 65%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-0.5ppm/yr; -0.00+/-0.24): 97%

**Table 5** - Product Quality Summary Table for product XCO2_EMMA.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: XCO2_EMMA<br>Level: 2, Version: 4.5, Time period covered: 01.2003 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppm] | 1.62 | < 8 (T)<br>< 3 (B)<br>< 1 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 1.07 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppm] | 0.78 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppm] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 0.39 – 0.53 | < 0.5 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 65% | - |
| Stability: Drift [ppm/year] | 0.0 +/- 0.12 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | Probability that stability TR is met: 97% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppm/year] | 1.54 +/- 0.39 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | - | - |

## 2.2 Validation results of Level 2 $XCH_4$ products

In this sub-section detailed results from one of the validation approaches for the Level 2 $XCH_4$ products are presented. This approach is called “QA/QC approach” (see Reuter et al., 2020) and has been developed and used for the validation of all C3S $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 data products.

In addition, also other validation approaches are used, namely the data provider validation approaches (as applied by each data provider to his/her product) and the EMMA approach (see Reuter et al., 2020). These somewhat different approaches are described in the ANNEXes to this Main PQAR document.

This means that an ensemble of validation methods is used to make sure that the overall validation summary results are robust and do not depend on a single method. Note that the same “ensemble approach” for validation has also been used for the GHG-CCI products in the framework of the GHG-CCI project (see Buchwitz et al., 2017).

For the QA/QC method the following so-location criteria have been used:

- Temporal: +/- 2 hours
- Spatial: +/- 2$^o$ latitude, +/- 4$^o$ longitude

Similar but not necessarily identical criteria have been used for the other validation approaches.

### 2.2.1 Validation results for product CH4_GOS_OCFP

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product CH4_GOS_OCFP.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GOS_OCFP is shown as Table 6.

**Figure 11** - As Figure 5 but for product CH4_GOS_OCFP.



**Figure 12** - As Figure 6 but for product CH4_GOS_OCFP.




| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 12.75 | 1.16 | 2.42 | | -0.64+/-0.35 | |
| BUR_01 | 10.31 | 1.31 | 5.85 | | 0.36+/-1.15 | |
| CAL_01 | 16.03 | 0.87 | -3.80 | 0.76 | -0.00+/-0.10 | 10.58+/-2.33 |
| EDW_01 | 16.40 | 0.85 | 5.95 | 0.71 | 0.01+/-0.12 | 10.65+/-2.35 |
| ETL_01 | 13.89 | 1.03 | 8.93 | | 0.33+/-0.72 | 6.76+/-2.56 |
| GAR_01 | 13.33 | 1.12 | 5.92 | | -0.26+/-0.28 | |
| HEF_01 | 16.52 | 0.90 | 11.47 | | -0.11+/-1.39 | |
| KAR_01 | 12.20 | 1.20 | -0.98 | 2.55 | 0.40+/-0.28 | 8.41+/-2.31 |
| LAM_01 | 12.46 | 1.09 | 2.28 | 2.07 | -0.12+/-0.12 | 6.40+/-1.38 |
| LAU_02 | 12.24 | 1.08 | 6.25 | 3.93 | -1.69+/-0.62 | |
| LAU_03 | 10.73 | 1.21 | 6.10 | 1.96 | -1.02+/-0.68 | 7.18+/-1.48 |
| NIC_01 | 13.79 | 0.98 | -1.52 | | 6.55+/-5.91 | |
| ORL_01 | 10.72 | 1.33 | -0.65 | 1.25 | -0.27+/-0.20 | 6.08+/-1.11 |
| PAR_01 | 11.55 | 1.22 | -2.51 | 6.23 | -0.94+/-0.36 | 7.59+/-1.76 |
| PFA_01 | 12.45 | 1.17 | 4.23 | 4.19 | -0.37+/-0.16 | 9.69+/-3.00 |
| REU_01 | 9.07 | 1.07 | 9.46 | | 0.52+/-0.91 | |
| RIK_01 | 11.41 | 1.27 | 4.91 | | -0.83+/-0.69 | |
| SAG_01 | 12.11 | 1.18 | 3.51 | 1.77 | 0.49+/-0.21 | 9.06+/-2.21 |
| SOD_01 | 12.42 | 1.27 | 5.93 | | -0.03+/-0.26 | |
| TSU_02 | 12.89 | 1.22 | 3.45 | 2.56 | 0.24+/-0.39 | 7.53+/-2.29 |
| XIA_01 | 14.90 | 0.95 | 1.26 | 7.23 | -0.16+/-1.23 | 7.60+/-1.84 |
| Mean | 12.77 | 1.12 | 3.74 | 2.93 | 0.12 | 8.13 |
| StdDev | | | 3.95 | | 1.54 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 12.77 UncR: 1.12

Global offset (mean bias): 3.74 (sgl.) / 2.19 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 3.95 Seas.: 2.93 Spat.-temp.: 4.92

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 0.12 +/- 0.77

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 8.13 +/- 2.05

TR accuracy: p(ACC<10ppb; 4.92+/-6.00): 89%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-3ppb/yr; 0.12+/-1.26): 98%

**Table 6** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GOS_OCFP.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CH4_GOS_OCFP<br>Level: 2, Version: 7.3, Time period covered: 04.2009 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppb] | 12.8 | < 34 (T)<br>< 17 (B)<br>< 9 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 1.12 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppb] | 3.7 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppb] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 4.0 – 4.9 | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 89% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | 0.12 +/- 0.77 (1-sigma) | < 3 | Probability that stability TR is met: 98% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppb/year] | 8 +/- 2 (1-sigma) | < 3 | - | - |

### 2.2.2 Validation results for product CH4_GOS_OCPR

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product CH4_GOS_OCPR.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GOS_OCPR is shown as Table 7.

**Figure 13** - As Figure 5 but for product CH4_GOS_OCPR.



**Figure 14** - As Figure 6 but for product CH4_GOS_OCPR.




| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 11.97 | 0.93 | 9.85 | | -0.20+/-0.23 | |
| BUR_01 | 10.59 | 0.89 | 13.57 | 2.73 | -1.29+/-0.54 | 9.59+/-2.75 |
| CAL_01 | 14.04 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 0.70 | 0.60+/-0.08 | 10.88+/-2.37 |
| EDW_01 | 14.35 | 0.77 | 11.81 | 1.62 | 0.79+/-0.09 | 10.43+/-2.79 |
| ETL_01 | 17.40 | 0.72 | 11.81 | 2.19 | 1.26+/-0.37 | 11.82+/-2.90 |
| EUR_01 | 21.77 | 0.67 | 22.71 | | 2.60+/-1.01 | |
| GAR_01 | 15.20 | 0.77 | 8.26 | 2.98 | 0.43+/-0.15 | 12.82+/-2.70 |
| HAR_01 | 12.64 | 0.88 | 10.48 | | 16.96+/-4.34 | |
| HEF_01 | 16.38 | 0.68 | 14.18 | 3.24 | 0.48+/-0.81 | |
| KAR_01 | 13.67 | 0.83 | 3.52 | 2.19 | 0.48+/-0.20 | 10.51+/-2.41 |
| LAM_01 | 11.94 | 0.88 | 8.38 | 1.16 | 0.43+/-0.09 | 8.57+/-1.90 |
| LAU_01 | 10.35 | 0.94 | 11.63 | | -19.62+/-12.30 | |
| LAU_02 | 9.52 | 1.10 | 6.78 | 0.41 | 0.07+/-0.28 | 4.19+/-1.05 |
| LAU_03 | 9.99 | 1.06 | 9.86 | 0.06 | 2.03+/-0.36 | 9.84+/-2.71 |
| NIC_01 | 10.46 | 1.02 | 8.48 | 1.79 | 1.09+/-1.98 | |
| NYA_01 | 17.98 | 0.77 | -1.61 | | 0.04+/-1.12 | |
| ORL_01 | 12.13 | 0.92 | 8.11 | 3.28 | 0.36+/-0.14 | 9.74+/-1.53 |
| PAR_01 | 12.51 | 0.89 | 6.39 | 3.61 | 0.11+/-0.27 | 4.70+/-1.18 |
| PFA_01 | 13.16 | 0.90 | 10.36 | 2.08 | 0.50+/-0.08 | 10.97+/-2.49 |
| REU_01 | 12.35 | 0.55 | 8.16 | 4.76 | -0.50+/-0.48 | 8.60+/-1.68 |
| RIK_01 | 15.43 | 0.75 | 15.77 | 3.25 | 1.92+/-0.45 | 16.11+/-4.18 |
| SAG_01 | 13.22 | 0.83 | 5.29 | 2.77 | 1.08+/-0.14 | 16.29+/-3.90 |
| SOD_01 | 14.81 | 0.84 | 8.73 | | 0.63+/-0.16 | 7.36+/-2.16 |
| TSU_02 | 12.64 | 0.92 | 2.81 | 1.09 | 0.88+/-0.25 | 9.68+/-2.52 |
| XIA_01 | 19.09 | 0.61 | 6.30 | 2.68 | 2.31+/-0.90 | 10.07+/-2.75 |
| Mean | 13.74 | 0.84 | 8.90 | 2.24 | 0.54 | 1.07 10.122.44 |
| StdDev | | | 4.86 | | 5.27 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 13.74 UncR: 0.84

Global offset (mean bias): 8.90 (sgl.) / 7.80 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 4.86 Seas.: 2.24 Spat.-temp.: 5.35

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 0.54 +/- 1.07

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 10.12 +/- 2.44

TR accuracy: p(ACC<10ppb; 5.35+/-6.00): 87%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-3ppb/yr; 0.54+/-1.47): 95%

**Table 7** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GOS_OCPR.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CH4_GOS_OCPR<br>Level: 2, Version: 9.0, Time period covered: 4.2009 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppb] | 14 | < 34 (T)<br>< 17 (B)<br>< 9 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 0.84 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppb] | 8.9 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppb] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 4.9 – 5.3 | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 87% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | 0.54 +/- 1.07 (1-sigma) | < 3 | Probability that stability TR is met: 95% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppb/year] | 10 +/- 2 (1-sigma) | < 3 | - | - |

### 2.2.3 Validation results for product CH4_GO2_SRFP

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product CH4_GO2_SRFP.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GO2_SRFP is shown as Table 8.

**Figure 15** - As Figure 5 but for product CH4_GO2_SRFP.



**Figure 16** - As Figure 6 but for product CH4_GO2_SRFP.




| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 20.52 | 0.86 | -0.30 | | 10.76+/-5.73 | |
| BUR_01 | 14.38 | 0.83 | 16.73 | | -1.13+/-2.75 | |
| CAL_01 | 19.11 | 0.69 | 4.35 | 4.85 | -0.12+/-0.97 | 13.03+/-3.69 |
| EDW_01 | 19.73 | 0.67 | 14.99 | 2.67 | 1.88+/-0.85 | 10.46+/-2.80 |
| ETL_01 | 21.18 | 0.96 | 8.01 | | 5.64+/-2.46 | |
| EUR_01 | 18.65 | 1.12 | 5.75 | | 21.78+/-12.27 | |
| GAR_01 | 18.14 | 0.87 | 11.34 | | 8.91+/-3.02 | |
| HEF_01 | 20.20 | 0.72 | 16.52 | | 18.11+/-14.08 | |
| KAR_01 | 18.09 | 0.86 | 5.68 | | 7.98+/-1.70 | |
| LAM_01 | 17.90 | 0.71 | 9.05 | 7.06 | -0.14+/-1.09 | 10.10+/-2.67 |
| LAU_03 | 18.31 | 0.84 | 13.85 | 3.22 | 1.00+/-1.20 | 15.98+/-3.70 |
| NIC_01 | 16.43 | 0.83 | 5.49 | | -0.63+/-3.95 | |
| ORL_01 | 16.73 | 0.87 | 6.23 | | 3.38+/-3.50 | |
| PAR_01 | 16.96 | 0.86 | 0.44 | | 3.70+/-2.13 | |
| PFA_01 | 18.19 | 0.90 | 10.43 | | -0.78+/-1.55 | |
| REU_01 | 15.75 | 0.68 | 6.75 | | -0.69+/-14.99 | |
| RIK_01 | 19.48 | 0.76 | 14.08 | | 3.50+/-4.76 | |
| SAG_01 | 20.64 | 0.71 | 15.07 | 3.96 | 5.33+/-1.64 | 18.30+/-5.08 |
| SOD_01 | 16.08 | 1.26 | 0.59 | | -1.80+/-3.56 | |
| TSU_02 | 15.24 | 1.19 | 5.30 | | -0.64+/-3.43 | |
| XIA_01 | 23.09 | 0.63 | 5.71 | 10.84 | 16.11+/-3.06 | |
| Mean | 18.32 | 0.85 | 8.38 | 5.43 | 4.86 | 4.22 13.573.59 |
| StdDev | | | 5.17 | | 6.66 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 18.32 UncR: 0.85

Global offset (mean bias): 8.38 (sgl.) / 9.93 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 5.17 Seas.: 5.43 Spat.-temp.: 7.50

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 4.86 +/- 4.22

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 13.57 +/- 3.59

TR accuracy: p(ACC<10ppb; 7.50+/-6.00): 78%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-3ppb/yr; 4.86+/-4.34): 30%

**Table 8** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GO2_SRFP.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CH4_GO2_SRFP<br>Level: 2, Version: 2.0.0, Time period covered: 02.2019 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppb] | 18.3 | < 34 (T)<br>< 17 (B)<br>< 9 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 0.85 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppb] | 5.2 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppb] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 5.2 – 7.5 | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 78% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | 4.9 +/- 4.2 (1-sigma) | < 3 | Probability that stability TR is met: 30% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppb/year] | Time series too short | < 3 | - | - |

### 2.2.4 Validation results for product CH4_GO2_SRPR

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product CH4_GO2_SRPR.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GO2_SRPR is shown as Table 9.

**Figure 17** - As Figure 5 but for product CH4_GO2_SRPR.



**Figure 18** – As Figure 6 but for product CH4_GO2_SRPR.




| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 19.81 | 0.80 | 10.51 | | 8.45+/-3.08 | |
| BUR_01 | 18.92 | 0.61 | 23.83 | 8.01 | 6.24+/-2.30 | |
| CAL_01 | 17.84 | 0.65 | 8.06 | 1.92 | 1.77+/-0.54 | 7.56+/-2.54 |
| EDW_01 | 18.98 | 0.61 | 20.54 | 2.54 | 2.92+/-0.51 | 12.33+/-3.38 |
| ETL_01 | 20.57 | 0.88 | 21.33 | 3.73 | 5.07+/-1.23 | 17.30+/-6.01 |
| EUR_01 | 16.99 | 1.25 | 21.54 | | 4.08+/-5.81 | |
| GAR_01 | 20.16 | 0.73 | 23.36 | 0.24 | 3.93+/-2.07 | |
| HAR_01 | 21.69 | 0.67 | 25.28 | | 3.81+/-12.73 | |
| HEF_01 | 21.84 | 0.67 | 23.95 | | -1.74+/-9.72 | |
| KAR_01 | 19.70 | 0.76 | 14.55 | 4.13 | 4.53+/-0.94 | 17.98+/-5.97 |
| LAM_01 | 17.48 | 0.64 | 16.53 | 0.82 | 2.21+/-0.67 | 10.56+/-3.15 |
| LAU_03 | 17.04 | 0.79 | 18.97 | 3.47 | 2.50+/-0.71 | 9.73+/-3.08 |
| NIC_01 | 17.55 | 0.69 | 17.18 | 3.60 | 5.50+/-2.78 | |
| ORL_01 | 19.61 | 0.73 | 11.93 | | 10.02+/-2.45 | |
| PAR_01 | 19.28 | 0.74 | 10.03 | 2.44 | 7.05+/-1.47 | 16.62+/-6.44 |
| PFA_01 | 20.02 | 0.79 | 19.94 | 2.43 | 3.43+/-1.01 | 12.12+/-3.94 |
| REU_01 | 15.57 | 0.83 | 5.10 | | 9.95+/-12.08 | |
| RIK_01 | 17.79 | 0.76 | 24.65 | | 8.78+/-2.48 | |
| SAG_01 | 17.32 | 0.78 | 19.19 | 2.39 | 3.21+/-0.88 | 13.63+/-3.48 |
| SOD_01 | 21.52 | 0.85 | 16.56 | | -2.52+/-2.60 | |
| TSU_02 | 18.55 | 0.93 | 13.04 | | 0.12+/-2.74 | |
| XIA_01 | 20.38 | 0.72 | 8.91 | 3.53 | 5.12+/-1.15 | 16.85+/-5.19 |
| Mean | 19.03 | 0.77 | 17.04 | 3.02 | 4.29 | 3.18 13.474.32 |
| StdDev | | | 5.87 | | 3.27 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 19.03 UncR: 0.77

Global offset (mean bias): 17.04 (sgl.) / 16.16 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 5.87 Seas.: 3.02 Spat.-temp.: 6.60

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 4.29 +/- 3.18

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 13.47 +/- 4.32

TR accuracy: p(ACC<10ppb; 6.60+/-6.00): 82%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-3ppb/yr; 4.29+/-3.33): 33%

**Table 9** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CH4_GO2_SRPR.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CH4_GO2_SRPR<br>Level: 2, Version: 2.0.1, Time period covered: 02.2019 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppb] | 19.0 | < 34 (T)<br>< 17 (B)<br>< 9 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 0.77 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppb] | 17.0 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppb] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 5.9 – 6.6 | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 82% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | 4.3 +/- 3.2 (1-sigma) | < 3 | Probability that stability TR is met: 33% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppb/year] | Time series too short | < 3 | - | - |

### 2.2.5 Validation results for product XCH4_EMMA

Similar figures as shown in Sect. 2.1.1 for product CO2_GOS_OCFP are shown in this section but for product XCH4_EMMA.

The Product Quality Summary Table for product XCH4_EMMA is shown as Table 10.

**Figure 19** - As Figure 5 but for product XCH4_EMMA.



**Figure 20** – As Figure 6 but for product XCH4_EMMA.




| Site | Random (sgl.meas.) | UncR | Bias mean | Bias seas | Stability linear drift (+/- 1-sigma) | Stability year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRE_01 | 15.60 | 0.91 | 3.53 | | -0.42+/-0.30 | |
| BUR_01 | 11.33 | 0.99 | 6.19 | | -2.32+/-0.81 | 12.20+/-4.15 |
| CAL_01 | 15.11 | 0.82 | -2.12 | 0.96 | 0.88+/-0.10 | 14.31+/-3.41 |
| EDW_01 | 15.49 | 0.80 | 9.80 | 1.18 | 1.10+/-0.11 | 15.87+/-3.66 |
| ETL_01 | 14.92 | 0.95 | 7.17 | 3.35 | 0.29+/-0.49 | 6.30+/-1.81 |
| GAR_01 | 35.41 | 0.65 | 8.88 | 1.22 | -0.27+/-0.35 | 14.34+/-3.29 |
| HAR_01 | 11.43 | 1.17 | 7.02 | | 16.14+/-5.83 | |
| HEF_01 | 15.49 | 0.90 | 8.03 | 4.72 | 1.39+/-0.87 | |
| KAR_01 | 13.18 | 1.02 | 0.26 | 1.73 | 0.80+/-0.22 | 8.64+/-2.52 |
| LAM_01 | 12.11 | 0.94 | 2.15 | 1.39 | 0.19+/-0.10 | 8.13+/-1.50 |
| LAU_02 | 11.33 | 1.05 | 1.70 | 1.74 | -0.23+/-0.49 | 6.88+/-1.61 |
| LAU_03 | 12.22 | 1.01 | 5.33 | 2.54 | 1.31+/-0.54 | 9.97+/-2.63 |
| NIC_01 | 12.09 | 1.04 | 4.45 | 4.14 | 4.14+/-2.01 | |
| ORL_01 | 13.19 | 1.04 | 2.67 | 1.32 | 0.06+/-0.15 | 7.53+/-1.28 |
| PAR_01 | 12.23 | 1.05 | 1.11 | 2.95 | -0.08+/-0.30 | 6.93+/-1.91 |
| PFA_01 | 40.61 | 0.75 | 4.08 | 1.86 | 0.18+/-0.17 | 18.37+/-3.71 |
| REU_01 | 10.50 | 0.88 | 2.76 | 3.68 | -1.47+/-0.49 | 10.18+/-2.68 |
| RIK_01 | 13.42 | 0.98 | 12.48 | 3.52 | 0.65+/-0.48 | |
| SAG_01 | 14.07 | 0.94 | 4.43 | 1.91 | 1.50+/-0.17 | 21.21+/-5.18 |
| SOD_01 | 13.25 | 1.12 | 3.73 | | 0.58+/-0.19 | 7.38+/-2.83 |
| TSU_02 | 13.05 | 1.11 | 0.20 | 2.29 | -0.24+/-0.35 | 10.56+/-2.67 |
| XIA_01 | 18.74 | 0.77 | -2.20 | 2.64 | 4.22+/-1.06 | 17.71+/-4.47 |
| Mean | 15.67 | 0.95 | 4.17 | 2.40 | 1.29 | 0.71 11.562.90 |
| StdDev | | | 3.67 | | 3.54 | |

Sgl.meas.precision (1-sigma): 15.67 UncR: 0.95

Global offset (mean bias): 4.17 (sgl.) / 3.31 (daily)

Relative accuracy: Spat.: 3.67 Seas.: 2.40 Spat.-temp.: 4.38

Stability: Drift (+/- 1-sigma): 1.29 +/- 0.71

Stability: Year-to-year (+/- 1-sigma): 11.56 +/- 2.90

TR accuracy: p(ACC<10ppb; 4.38+/-6.00): 91%

TR stability (drift): p(STA:+/-3ppb/yr; 1.29+/-1.23): 92%

**Table 10** - Product Quality Summary Table for product XCH4_EMMA.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: XCH4_EMMA<br>Level: 2, Version: 4.5, Time period covered: 01.2003 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppb] | 15.7 | < 34 (T)<br>< 17 (B)<br>< 9 (G) | - | - |
| Uncertainty ratio) in [-]: Ratio reported uncertainty to standard deviation of satellite-TCCON difference | 0.95 | - | - | No requirement but value close to unity expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppb] | 4.2 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppb] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 3.7 – 4.4 | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 91% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | 1.3 +/- 0.7 (1-sigma) | < 3 | Probability that stability TR is met: 92% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppb/year] | 11.6 +/- 2.9 (1-sigma) | < 3 | - | - |

## 2.3 Validation results for Level 3 $XCO_2$ product

In order to validate this product, it has been compared with the Total Carbon Column Observation Network (TCCON, Wunch et al., 2011) ground-based $XCO_2$ retrievals using version GGG2014 (Wunch et al., 2015) or the recently (end of April 2022) released version GGG2020 (https://tccon-wiki.caltech.edu/Main/GGG2020DataChanges) (Laughner et al., 2021).

The validation has been done in a similar way to the Level 2 products but with some exceptions, e.g., the monthly mean product has been directly compared with monthly mean TCCON data. Figure 21 shows an overview of all validation results whilst Table 11 shows the product quality summary table for this product.

The validation of Level 3 product XCO2_OBS4MIPS can be summarized as follows:

The overall monthly mean uncertainty is 1 ppm and the mean bias is 0.39 ppm. Relative systematic error, i.e., the spatio-temporal bias, is 0.5±0.6 ppm (1-sigma). The computed linear drift of 0.09±0.23 ppm (1-sigma) is small and not significant.

The probability that the 0.5 ppm accuracy requirement is met is 66%.

The probability that the 0.5 ppm/year stability requirement is met is 97%.

Overall, this product has therefore reasonable accuracy and high stability.

**Figure 21** – Overview validation results product XCO2_OBS4MIPS.




**Table 11** – Product Quality Summary Table for product XCO2_OBS4MIPS.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: XCO2_OBS4MIPS<br>Level: 3, Version: 4.5, Time period covered: 01.2003 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Overall uncertainty [ppm] | 1.0 | - | - | No requirement but small value expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppm] | 0.39 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppm] | Spatio-temporal bias:<br>0.5 +/- 0.6<br>(1-sigma) | < 0.5 | Probability that accuracy TR is met:<br>66% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppm/year] | 0.05 +/- 0.21<br>(1-sigma) | < 0.5 | Probability that stability TR is met:<br>97% | - |

## 2.4 Validation results for Level 3 $XCH_4$ products

In order to validate this product, it has been compared with Total Carbon Column Observation Network (TCCON, Wunch et al., 2011) ground-based $XC_{H4}$ retrievals using version GGG2014 (Wunch et al., 2015) or the recently (end of April 2022) released version GGG2020 (https://tccon-wiki.caltech.edu/Main/GGG2020DataChanges) (Laughner et al., 2021).

The validation has been done similarly as for the Level 2 products but with some exception, e.g., the monthly mean product has been directly compared with monthly mean TCCON data.

Figure 22 shows an overview of all validation results.

Table 12 shows the product quality summary table for this product.

The validation of Level 3 product XCH4_OBS4MIPS can be summarized as follows:

The overall monthly mean uncertainty is 8.1 ppb and the mean bias is -0.55 ppb. Relative systematic error, i.e., the spatio-temporal bias, is 4.7±6 ppb (1-sigma). The computed linear drift of 0.68±1.1 ppb (1-sigma) is small and not significant.

The probability that the 10 ppb accuracy requirement is met is 89%.

The probability that the 3 ppb/year stability requirement is met is 98%.

Overall, this product has therefore very good accuracy and high stability.

**Figure 22** – Overview validation results product XCH4_OBS4MIPS.




**Table 12** – Product Quality Summary Table for product XCH4_OBS4MIPS.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: XCH4_OBS4MIPS<br>Level: 3, Version: 4.5, Time period covered: 01.2003 – 12.2022 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Overall uncertainty [ppm] | 8.1 | - | - | No requirement but small value expected for a high quality data product. |
| Mean bias [ppb] | -0.55 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppb] | Spatio-temporal bias:<br>4.7 +/- 6.0<br>(1-sigma) | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met:<br>89% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | 0.68 +/- 1.11<br>(1-sigma) | < 3 | Probability that stability TR is met:<br>98% | - |

## 2.5 Validation results for Level 2 mid-tropospheric products

Detailed validation results are given in Annex E to this document. A summary of the validation results is given in Table 13 and Table 14.

Summary quality IASI $CO_2$ products:

The single measurement precision of product CO2_IASA_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-A) is 1 ppm. The mean bias (global offset) is 1.21 ppm. The estimated relative accuracy is around 1 ppm. The probability that the < 0.5 ppm user requirement is met has been estimated to 50% considering the uncertainty of the reference data and assessment method. The product is also very stable (0.03 +/- 0.06 ppm/year (1-sigma)) meeting the requirement for long-term drift stability. The performance of products CO2_IASB_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-B) and CO2_IASC_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-C) is similar.

Summary quality IASI $CH_4$ products:

The single measurement precision of product CH4_IASA_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-A) is 12 ppb. The mean bias (global offset) is approximately 3 ppb. The product appears to meet the “relative systematic error” requirement of better than 10 ppb: the estimated relative accuracy is 3 ppb. The product appears to be very stable, but a quantitative analysis could not be carried out due to lack of reference data. The performance of products CH4_IASB_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-B) and CH4_IASC_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-C) is similar.

**Table 13** - Product Quality Summary Table for product CO2_IASA_NLIS.

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CO2_IASA_NLIS<br>Level: 2, Version: 10.1, Time period covered: 7.2007 – 10.2021 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppm] | 0.99 | < 8 (T)<br>< 3 (B)<br>< 1 (G) | - | - |
| Mean bias [ppm] | 1.21 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high-quality data product. |
| Accuracy: Relative systematic error [ppm] | Spatial – spatiotemporal: 0.96 / 1.09 | < 0.5 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 50% | - |
| Stability: Drift [ppm/year] | 0.03 ± 0.06 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | Probability that stability TR is met: 100% | - |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppm/year] | 2.07 ± 0.58 (1-sigma) | < 0.5 | - | - |

**Table 14** - Product Quality Summary Table for products CH4_IASA_NLIS (NC stands for Not computed due to lack of available data).

| Product Quality Summary Table for Product: CH4_IASA_NLIS<br>Level: 2, Version: 10.2, Time period covered: 7.2007 – 10.2021 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parameter [unit] | Achieved performance | Requirement | TR | Comments |
| Single measurement precision (1-sigma) in [ppb] | 11.8 | < 34 (T)<br>< 17 (B)<br>< 9 (G) | - | - |
| Mean bias [ppb] | 2.93 | - | - | No requirement but value close to zero expected for a high-quality data product. |
| Accuracy: relative systematic error [ppb] | 2.93 | < 10 | Probability that accuracy TR is met: 90% | - |
| Stability: Linear bias trend [ppb/year] | NC | < 3 | NC | Time series of available aircraft/AirCore obs are not long enough to compute these 2 parameters |
| Stability: Year-to-year bias variability [ppb/year] | NC | < 3 | - | |

# 3. Application(s) specific assessments

The new data products validated in this document and its ANNEXes have not yet been used for application specific assessments in terms of peer-reviewed publications.

# 4. Compliance with user requirements

The user requirements are listed in the Target Requirement and Gap Analysis Document (D4).

This section summarizes the achieved data quality including comparisons with the required data quality.

## 4.1 Summary data quality Level 2 $XCO_2$ products

Figure 23 shows a summary of the achieved performance in terms of single measurement precision, (relative) accuracy (in terms of spatial and spatio-temporal biases) and stability (in terms of linear bias drift / trend).

Note that this figure contains for completeness results from previous assessments (for data set CDR5 carried out in a previous project) for products not updated for data set CDR7. These products are the SCIAMACHY products and the SRON GOSAT products. See corresponding CDR5 documents (ATBD GHG, 2021; PQAR GHG, 2021; PUGS GHG, 2021).

The achieved single observation random error (or precision) is typically close to 2 ppm and better than approximately 3 ppm for all products. This is better than the required breakthrough requirement (B) of better than 3 ppm but worse than the goal (G) requirement of better than 1 ppm.

The systematic error (relative accuracy) threshold (T) requirement is “better than 0.5 ppm”. The achieved performance is around 0.7 ppm +/- a few 0.1 ppm, depending on product and assessment method. The probability that the threshold requirement is met is 46% for product CO2_GOS_OCFP, 33% for CO2_GO2_SRFP and 68% for XCO2_EMMA.

Stability is very good. No significant linear bias drift has been detected. The probability that the threshold (T) stability requirement of 0.5 ppm/year is met is close to 100% percent for all product except for product CO2_GO2_SRFP (62%).

**Figure 23** - Overview data quality assessment results for Level 2 $XCO_2$ data products. The green bars refer to the "Quality Assessment / Quality control" (QA/QC) results as described in this document. The red bars refer to results obtained by the data providers (DPs), as described in separate Annexes (see Sect. 6). The blue bars result from an assessment using the EMMA method (see Sect. 2.1.3). For "Accuracy" and "Stability" also the numerical values for the "Probability that TR is met" are given (computed as mean value if more than one value (bar) exists). Also listed (in grey on the right-hand side) is the uncertainty of the reference data as used for the Target Requirements (TR) assessment. The listed values for products generated in previous C3S projects (products CO2_SCI_BESD, CO2_SCI_WFMD and CO2_GOS_SFFP) are listed here for completeness but have not been updated (for details see *PQAR GHG, 2021*).



## 4.2 Summary data quality Level 2 $XCH_4$ products

Figure 24 shows a summary of the achieved performance in terms of single measurement precision, (relative) accuracy (in terms of spatial and spatio-temporal biases) and stability (in terms of linear bias drift / trend).

Note that this figure contains for completeness results from previous assessments (for data set CDR5 carried out in a previous project) for products not updated for data set CDR7. These products are the SCIAMACHY products and the SRON GOSAT products. See corresponding CDR5 documents (ATBD GHG, 2021; PQAR GHG, 2021; PUGS GHG, 2021).

The achieved single observation random error (or precision) is close to 17 ppb, which is the breakthrough (B) requirement, for the GOSAT and the EMMA products. For products CH4_GO2_SRFP and CH4_GO2_SRPR the precision is close to 20 ppb.

The systematic error (relative accuracy) threshold (T) requirement is “better than 10 ppb”. The achieved performance is around 5 ppb.

Stability is very good for all GOSAT products and the EMMA product. For these products no significant linear bias drift has been detected. The probability that the threshold (T) stability requirement of 3 ppb/year is met is close to 100% for these products. The probability is less for the two GOSAT-2 products (58% for the FP product and 57% for the PR product; but note that these products only cover relatively short time periods).

**Figure 24** - Overview data quality assessment results for Level 2 $XCH_4$ data products. The green bars refer to the "Quality Assessment / Quality control" (QA/QC) results as described in this document. The red bars refer to results obtained by the data providers (DPs), as described in separate Annexes (see Sect. 6). The blue bars result from an assessment using the EMMA method (see Sect. 2.2.5). For "Accuracy" and "Stability" also the numerical values for the "Probability that TR is met" are given (computed as mean value if more than one value (bar) exists). Also listed (in grey on the right-hand side) is the uncertainty of the reference data as used for the Target Requirements (TR) assessment. The listed values for products generated in previous C3S projects (products CH4_SCI_WFMD, CH4_SCI_IMAP, CH4_GOS_SRFP and CH4_GOS_SFPR) are listed here for completeness but have not been updated (for details see *PQAR GHG, 2021*).



## 4.3 Summary data quality Level 3 $XCO_2$ product

The validation of Level 3 product XCO2_OBS4MIPS can be summarized as follows:

The overall monthly mean uncertainty is 1 ppm and the mean bias is 0.39 ppm. Relative systematic error, i.e., the spatio-temporal bias, is 0.5±0.6 ppm (1-sigma). The computed linear drift of 0.09±0.23 ppm (1-sigma) is small and not significant.

The probability that the 0.5 ppm accuracy requirement is met is 66%.

The probability that the 0.5 ppm/year stability requirement is met is 97%.

Overall, this product has therefore reasonable accuracy and high stability.

## 4.4 Summary data quality Level 3 $XCH_4$ product

The validation of Level 3 product XCH4_OBS4MIPS can be summarized as follows:

The overall monthly mean uncertainty is 8.1 ppb and the mean bias is -0.55 ppb. Relative systematic error, i.e., the spatio-temporal bias, is 4.7±6 ppb (1-sigma). The computed linear drift of 0.68±1.1 ppb (1-sigma) is small and not significant.

The probability that the 10 ppb accuracy requirement is met is 89%.

The probability that the 3 ppb/year stability requirement is met is 98%.

Overall, this product has therefore very good accuracy and high stability.

## 4.5 Summary data quality Level 2 mid-tropospheric $CO_2$ products

The single measurement precision of product CO2_IASA_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-A) is 1 ppm. The mean bias (global offset) is 1.21 ppm. The estimated relative accuracy is around 1 ppm. The probability that the < 0.5 ppm user requirement is met has been estimated to 50% considering the uncertainty of the reference data and assessment method. The product is also very stable (0.03 +/- 0.06 ppm/year (1-sigma)) meeting the requirement for long-term drift stability. The performance of products CO2_IASB_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-B) and CO2_IASC_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-C) is similar.

## 4.6 Summary data quality Level 2 mid-tropospheric $CH_4$ products

The single measurement precision of product CH4_IASA_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-A) is 12 ppb. The mean bias (global offset) is approximately 3 ppb. The product appears to meet the “relative systematic error” requirement of better than 10 ppb: the estimated relative accuracy is 3 ppb. The product appears to be very stable, but a quantitative analysis could not be carried out due to lack of reference data. The performance of products CH4_IASB_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-B) and CH4_IASC_NLIS (from IASI on Metop-C) is similar.

## 4.7 Overall summary data quality all products

Table 15 provides and overview of all products and their estimated data quality in terms of Target Requirement (TR) assessments.

**Table 15** - Overview quality assessment results of products in terms of Target Requirements (TRs). For additional quality assessment results see Figure 23 and Figure 24. The table is continued on the next page.

| Product ID | Level | Description | Probability that TR is met | | Details see Sect. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Accuracy | Stability | |
| $XCO_2$ products | | | Required: < 0.5 ppm | Required: < 0.5 ppm/year | |
| CO2_GOS_OCFP | 2 | $XCO_2$ from GOSAT retrieved using Univ. Bremen/Leicester OCFP algorithm | 46% | 97% | 3.1.1 |
| CO2_GO2_SRFP | 2 | $XCO_2$ from GOSAT-2 retrieved using SRON's SRFP (RemoTeC) algorithm | 44% | 97% | 3.1.2 |
| XCO2_EMMA | 2 | Merged multi-satellite $XCO_2$ via Univ. Bremen's EMMA algorithm | 68% | 97% | 3.1.3 |
| XCO2_OBS4MIPS | 3 | Merged multi-satellite $XCO_2$ via Univ. Bremen's OBS4MIPS algorithm | 66% | 97% | 3.3 |

| Product ID | Level | Description | Probability that TR is met | | Details see Sect. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Accuracy | Stability | |
| $XCH_4$ products | | | Required: < 10 ppb | Required: < 3 ppb/year | |
| CH4_GOS_OCFP | 2 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT retrieved using Univ. Bremen/Leicester OCFP algorithm | 89% | 99% | 3.2.1 |
| CH4_GOS_OCPR | 2 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT retrieved using Univ. Bremen/Leicester OCPR algorithm | 91% | 97% | 3.2.2 |
| CH4_GO2_SRFP | 2 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT-2 retrieved using SRON's SRFP (RemoTeC) algorithm | 89% | 58% | 3.2.3 |
| CH4_GO2_SRPR | 2 | $XCH_4$ from GOSAT-2 retrieved using SRON's SRPR (RemoTeC) algorithm | 90% | 57% | 3.2.4 |
| XCH4_EMMA | 2 | Merged multi-satellite $XCH_4$ via Univ. Bremen's EMMA algorithm | 93% | 96% | 3.2.5 |
| XCH4_OBS4MIPS | 3 | Merged multi-satellite $XCH_4$ via Univ. Bremen's OBS4MIPS algorithm | 89% | 98% | 3.4 |

… continued on next page …

… continued from previous page:

| Product ID | Level | Description | Probability that TR is met | | Details see Sect. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Accuracy | Stability | |
| Mid/upper troposphere $CO_2$ products | | | Required: < 0.5 ppm | Required: < 0.5 ppm/year | |
| COS_IASA_NLIS | 2 | LMD's product from IASI/Metop-A | 50% | 100% | 3.5 |
| CO2_IASB_NLIS | 2 | LMD's product from IASI/Metop-B | - | - | 3.5 |
| CO2_IASC_NLIS | 2 | LMD's product from IASI/Metop-C | - | - | 3.5 |
| Mid/upper troposphere $CH_4$ products | | | Required: < 10 ppb | Required: < 3 ppb/year | |
| CH4_IASA_NLIS | 2 | LMD's product from IASI/Metop-A | 90% | - | 3.5 |
| CH4_IASB_NLIS | 2 | LMD's product from IASI/Metop-B | - | - | 3.5 |
| CH4_IASC_NLIS | 2 | LMD's product from IASI/Metop-C | - | - | 3.5 |

# 5. Acknowledgement

We acknowledge previous funding by the European Space Agency (ESA) via Climate Change Initiative (CCI) project GHG-CCI. This funding significantly enhanced the quality of the retrieval algorithms and related documentation. This resulted in more mature data products as needed for an operational project such as the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S). We also acknowledge the availability of GOSAT and GOSAT-2 data products via the ESA GOSAT Third Party Mission (TPM) archive.

We are also very grateful to the GOSAT/GOSAT-2 teams in Japan comprising the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA), the National Institute for Environmental Studies (NIES), and the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for providing access to the GOSAT and GOSAT-2 Level 1 and Level 2 data products.

We also acknowledge the availability of OCO-2 Level 1 and Level 2 ($XCO_2$) data products from NASA, which have been used for the generation on the XCO2_EMMA and XCO2_OBS4MIPS products. These products also include OCO-2 $XCO_2$ retrieved at Univ. Bremen with the FOCAL algorithm. The FOCAL activities would not have been possible without funding from University of Bremen, from the EU H2020 projects CHE (grant agreement ID: 776186) and VERIFY (Grant agreement ID: 776810), from ESA via project GHG-CCI+ and from EUMETSAT project FOCAL-CO2M.

Finally, we acknowledge the availability of TCCON data via the TCCON data archive (https://tccondata.org/).

# 6. List of ANNEXes

The ANNEXes to this main document are the following ANNEXes A – E:

## 6.1 ANNEX A: PQAR for products CO2_GOS_OCFP, CH4_GOS_OCFP, CH4_OCPR

Describes the validation of the GOSAT $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 products generated by University of Leicester, UK.

## 6.2 ANNEX B: PQAR for products CO2_GO2_SRFP, CH4_GO2_SRFP

Describes the validation of the GOSAT-2 $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Full Physics (FP) Level 2 products generated by SRON, The Netherlands.

## 6.3 ANNEX C: PQAR for product CH4_GO2_SRPR

Describes the validation of the GOSAT-2 $XCH_4$ Proxy (PR) Level 2 product generated by SRON, The Netherlands.

## 6.4 ANNEX D: PQAR for XCO2_EMMA, XCH4_EMMA, XCO2_OBS4MIPS, XCH4_OBS4MIPS

Describes the validation of the multi-sensor multi-algorithms merged $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ Level 2 and 3 products generated by University of Bremen, Germany.

## 6.5 ANNEX E: PQAR for IASI $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ products

Describes the validation of the mid-tropospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ products from the IASI instrument series generated by LMD/CNRS, France.

*These ANNEXes and the corresponding data products are / will be available via the Copernicus Climate Data Store (CDS):*
*https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/#!/home*

*See also Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S):*
*https://climate.copernicus.eu/*

*pdf versions of all documents (including previous versions) are (also) available from*
*https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/cg_data.html#C3S_GHG*

## References

**Alexe et al., 2015:** Alexe, M., P. Bergamaschi, A. Segers, R. Detmers, A. Butz, O. Hasekamp, S. Guerlet, R. Parker, H. Boesch, C. Frankenberg, R. A. Scheepmaker, E. Dlugokencky, C. Sweeney, S. C. Wofsy, and E. A. Kort, Inverse modeling of CH4 emissions for 2010–2011 using different satellite retrieval products from GOSAT and SCIAMACHY, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 113–133, doi:10.5194/acp-15-113-2015, 2015.

**ATBD GHG, 2017:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., Anand, J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Detmers, R. G., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document, C3S project C3S_312a_Lot6_IUP-UB – Greenhouse Gases, 2017.

**ATBD GHG, 2018:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., Anand, J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Detmers, R. G., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document, C3S project C3S_312a_Lot6_IUP-UB – Greenhouse Gases, v2.0, 2018.

**ATBD GHG, 2019:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 3 (2003-2018), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v3.0, 2019.

**ATBD GHG, 2020:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 4 (2003-2019), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v4.0, 2020.

**ATBD GHG, 2021:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 5 (01.2003-06.2020), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v5.0, 2021. Access: All documents: https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/cg_data.html#C3S_GHG; this document: https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/docs/C3S/CDR5_2003-mid2020/C3S_D312b_Lot2.1.3.2-v3.0_ATBD-GHG_MAIN_v5.0.pdf

**ATBD GHG, 2023:** Buchwitz, M., Barr, A., Boesch, H., Borsdorff, T., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Landgraf, J., Meilhac, N., Parker, R., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O.: Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR6 (01.2003-12.2021), C3S project C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR, v6.2, 2023.

**Bergamaschi et al., 2009:** Bergamaschi, P., Frankenberg, C., Meirink, J. F., Krol, M., Villani, M. G., Houweling, S., Dentener, F., Dlugokencky, E. J., Miller, J. B., Gatti, L. V., Engel, A., and Levin, I.: Inverse modeling of global and regional $CH_4$ emissions using SCIAMACHY satellite retrievals, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D22301, doi:10.1029/2009JD012287, 2009.

**Bergamaschi et al., 2013:** Bergamaschi, P., Houweling, H., Segers, A., et al., Atmospheric CH4 in the first decade of the 21st century: Inverse modeling analysis using SCIAMACHY satellite retrievals and NOAA surface measurements, J. Geophys. Res., 118, 7350-7369, doi:10.1002/jrgd.50480, 2013.

**Boesch et al., 2011:** Boesch, H., D. Baker, B. Connor, D. Crisp, and C. Miller, Global characterization of $CO_2$ column retrievals from shortwave-infrared satellite observations of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 mission, Remote Sensing, 3 (2), 270-304, 2011.

**Bovensmann et al., 1999:** Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Buchwitz, M., Frerick, J., Noël, S., Rozanov, V. V., Chance, K. V., Goede, A. H. P. (1999), SCIAMACHY - Mission objectives and measurement modes, J. Atmos. Sci., 56 (2), 127-150, 1999.

**Bovensmann et al., 2010:** Bovensmann, H., Buchwitz, M., Burrows, J. P., Reuter, M., Krings, T., Gerilowski, K., Schneising, O., Heymann, J., Tretner, A., and Erzinger, J.: A remote sensing technique for global monitoring of power plant $CO_2$ emissions from space and related applications, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 3, 781-811, 2010.

**Buchwitz et al., 2000:** Buchwitz, M., Rozanov, V. V., and Burrows, J. P.: A near-infrared optimized DOAS method for the fast global retrieval of atmospheric $CH_4$, CO, $CO_2$, $H_2O$, and $N_2O$ total column amounts from SCIAMACHY Envisat-1 nadir radiances, J. Geophys. Res. 105, 15,231-15,245, 2000.

**Buchwitz et al., 2005:** Buchwitz, M., R. de Beek, J. P. Burrows, H. Bovensmann, T. Warneke, J. Notholt, J. F. Meirink, A. P. H. Goede, P. Bergamaschi, S. Körner, M. Heimann, and A. Schulz, Atmospheric methane and carbon dioxide from SCIAMACHY satellite data: Initial comparison with chemistry and transport models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 941-962, 2005.

**Buchwitz et al., 2007:** Buchwitz, M., O. Schneising, J. P. Burrows, H. Bovensmann, M. Reuter, J. Notholt, First direct observation of the atmospheric $CO_2$ year-to-year increase from space, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 4249-4256, 2007.

**Buchwitz et al., 2013a:** Buchwitz, M., M. Reuter, O. Schneising, H. Boesch, S. Guerlet, B. Dils, I. Aben, R. Armante, P. Bergamaschi, T. Blumenstock, H. Bovensmann, D. Brunner, B. Buchmann, J. P. Burrows, A. Butz, A. Chédin, F. Chevallier, C. D. Crevoisier, N. M. Deutscher, C. Frankenberg, F. Hase, O. P. Hasekamp, J. Heymann, T. Kaminski, A. Laeng, G. Lichtenberg, M. De Mazière, S. Noël, J. Notholt, J. Orphal, C. Popp, R. Parker, M. Scholze, R. Sussmann, G. P. Stiller, T. Warneke, C. Zehner, A. Bril, D. Crisp, D. W. T. Griffith, A. Kuze, C. O'Dell, S. Oshchepkov, V. Sherlock, H. Suto, P. Wennberg, D. Wunch, T. Yokota, Y. Yoshida, The Greenhouse Gas Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): comparison and quality assessment of near-surface-sensitive satellite-derived $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ global data sets, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2013.04.024, http://authors.elsevier.com/sd/article/S0034425713003520, 2013.

**Buchwitz et al., 2013b:** Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Bovensmann, H., Pillai, D., Heymann, J., Schneising, O., Rozanov, V., Krings, T., Burrows, J. P., Boesch, H., Gerbig, C., Meijer, Y., and Loescher, A.: Carbon Monitoring Satellite (CarbonSat): assessment of atmospheric $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ retrieval errors by error parameterization, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6, 3477-3500, 2013.

**Buchwitz et al., 2014:** Buchwitz, M., et al.: ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) Product Specification Document (PSD) for the Essential Climate Variable (ECV) Greenhouse Gases (GHG), 6-June-2014, Version 3, 2014.

**Buchwitz et al., 2015:** Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Schneising, O., Boesch, H., Guerlet, S., Dils, B., Aben, I., Armante, R., Bergamaschi, P., Blumenstock, T., Bovensmann, H., Brunner, D., Buchmann, B., Burrows, J.P., Butz, A., Chédin, A., Chevallier, F., Crevoisier, C.D., Deutscher, N.M., Frankenberg, C., Hase, F., Hasekamp, O.P., Heymann, J., Kaminski, T., Laeng, A., Lichtenberg, G., De Mazière, M.,

Noël, S., Notholt, J., Orphal, J., Popp, C., Parker, R., Scholze, M., Sussmann, R., Stiller, G.P., Warneke, T., Zehner, C., Bril, A., Crisp, D., Griffith, D.W.T., Kuze, A., O'Dell, C., Oshchepkov, S., Sherlock, V., Suto, H., Wennberg, P., Wunch, D., Yokota, T., Yoshida, Y., The Greenhouse Gas Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): comparison and quality assessment of near-surface-sensitive satellite-derived CO2 and CH4 global data sets. Remote Sens. Environ. 162:344–362, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.04.024, 2015.

**Buchwitz et al., 2016:** Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Schneising, O., Hewson, W., Detmers, R. G., Boesch, H., Hasekamp, O. P., Aben, I., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Butz, A., Chevallier, F., Dils, B., Frankenberg, C., Heymann, J., Lichtenberg, G., De Mazière, M., Notholt, J., Parker, R., Warneke, T., Zehner, C., Griffith, D. W. T., Deutscher, N. M., Kuze, A., Suto, H., and Wunch, D.:, Global satellite observations of column-averaged carbon dioxide and methane: The GHG-CCI $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ CRDP3 data, Remote Sensing of Environment (in press), Special Issue on Essential Climate Variables, DOI: 10.1016/j.rse.2016.12.027, (link: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.12.027), 2016.

**Buchwitz et al., 2016a:** Buchwitz, M.; Reuter, M.; Aben, I.; Boesch, H.; Butz, A.; Detmers, R.G.; Frankenberg, C.; Hasekamp, O.P.; Parker, R.; Schneising, O.; Somkuti, P., ESA Greenhouse Gases Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): Merged SCIAMACHY and GOSAT Level 3 gridded atmospheric column-average methane ($XCH_4$) product in Obs4MIPs format, Centre for Environmental Data Analysis, 10 October 2016, doi:10.5285/C965E4AC-D2AF-4BAA-9E99-A234E9BA0193, pp. 11, 2016.

**Buchwitz et al., 2017:** ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) Product Validation and Intercomparison Report (PVIR) for the Essential Climate Variable (ECV) Greenhouse Gases (GHG) for data set Climate Research Data Package No. 4 (CRDP#4), Version 5.0, 9. Feb. 2017, 2017.

**Buchwitz et al., 2017a:** Buchwitz, M.; Reuter, M.; Aben, I.; Boesch, H.; Butz, A.; Detmers, R.G.; Frankenberg, C.; Hasekamp, O.P.; Parker, R.; Schneising, O.; Somkuti, P., ESA Greenhouse Gases Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): Merged SCIAMACHY and GOSAT Level 3 gridded atmospheric column-average methane ($XCH_4$) product in Obs4MIPs format version 2 (CRDP#4), Technical Note, pp. 11, 1 February 2017, 2017.

**Buchwitz et al., 2018:** Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Schneising, O., Noël, S., Gier, B., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Boesch, H., Anand, J., Parker, R. J., Somkuti, P., Detmers, R. G., Hasekamp, O. P., Aben, I., Butz, A., Kuze, A., Suto, H., Yoshida, Y., Crisp, D., and O'Dell, C., Computation and analysis of atmospheric carbon dioxide annual mean growth rates from satellite observations during 2003-2016, Atmos. Chem. Phys., Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 17355-17370, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-17355-2018, 2018.

**Burrows et al., 1995:** Burrows, J. P., Hölzle, E., Goede, A. P. H., Visser, H., and Fricke, W., SCIAMACHY—Scanning Imaging Absorption Spectrometer for Atmospheric Chartography, Acta Astronaut., 35(7), 445–451, doi:10.1016/0094-5765(94)00278-t, 1995.

**Butz et al., 2011:** Butz, A., Guerlet, S., Hasekamp, O., et al., Toward accurate $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ observations from GOSAT, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, doi:10.1029/2011GL047888, 2011.

**Butz et al., 2012:** Butz, A., Galli, A., Hasekamp, O., Landgraf, J., Tol, P., and Aben, I.: Remote Sensing of Environment, TROPOMI aboard Sentinel-5 Precursor : Prospective performance of $CH_4$ retrievals for aerosol and cirrus loaded atmospheres, 120, 267-276, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2011.05.030, 2012.

**Chédin et al. 2003:** Chédin, A., Saunders, R., Hollingsworth, A., Scott, N. A., Matricardi, M., Etcheto, J., Clerbaux, C., Armante, R. and Crevoisier, C.: The feasibility of monitoring $CO_2$ from high resolution infrared sounders. J. Geophys. Res., 108, ACH 6-1–6-19, doi: 10.1029/2001JD001443, 2003.

**Chevallier et al., 2005:** Chevallier, F., R. J. Engelen, and P. Peylin, The contribution of AIRS data to the estimation of $CO_2$ sources and sinks. Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, L23801, doi:10.1029/ 2005GL024229, 2005.

**Chevallier et al., 2007:** Chevallier, F., F.-M. Bréon, and P. J. Rayner, Contribution of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory to the estimation of $CO_2$ sources and sinks: Theoretical study in a variational data assimilation framework. J. Geophys. Res., 112, D09307, doi:10.1029/2006JD007375, 2007.

**Chevallier et al., 2009a:** Chevallier, F., R. J. Engelen, C. Carouge, T. J. Conway, P. Peylin, C. Pickett-Heaps, M. Ramonet, P. J. Rayner and I. Xueref-Remy, AIRS-based vs. surface-based estimation of carbon surface fluxes. J. Geophys. Res., 114, D20303, doi:10.1029/2009JD012311, 2009.

**Chevallier et al., 2009b:** Chevallier, F., S. Maksyutov, P. Bousquet, F.-M. Bréon, R. Saito, Y. Yoshida, and T. Yokota, On the accuracy of the $CO_2$ surface fluxes to be estimated from the GOSAT observations. Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, L19807, doi:10.1029/2009GL040108, 2009.

**Chevallier et al., 2010:** Chevallier, F., Feng, L., Boesch, H. Palmer, P., and Rayner, P., On the impact of transport model errors for the estimation of $CO_2$ surface fluxes from GOSAT observations, Geophys. Res. Let., 37, L21803, 2010.

**Chevallier et al., 2014:** Chevallier, F., Palmer, P.I., Feng, L., Boesch, H., O'Dell, C.W., Bousquet, P., Towards robust and consistent regional $CO_2$ flux estimates from in situ and space-borne measurements of atmospheric $CO_2$, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 1065-1070, DOI: 10.1002/2013GL058772, 2014.

**Chevallier et al., 2016b:** Chevallier, F., et al., Climate Assessment Report (CAR), ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) GHG-CCI project, Version 3, 3 May 2016, 2016.

**Ciais et al., 2014:** Ciais, P., Dolman, A. J., Bombelli, A., et al.: Current systematic carbon cycle observations and needs for implementing a policy-relevant carbon observing system, Biogeosciences, 11, 3547-3602, www.biogeosciences.net/11/3547/2014/, doi:10.5194/bg-11-3547-2014, 2014.

**Ciais et al., 2015:** Ciais, P., et al.: Towards a European Operational Observing System to Monitor Fossil $CO_2$ emissions - Final Report from the expert group, http://www.copernicus.eu/main/towards-european-operational-observing-system-monitor-fossil-co2-emissions, pp. 68, October 2015, 2015.

**CMUG-RBD, 2010:** Climate Modelling User Group Requirements Baseline Document, Deliverable 1.2, Number D1.2, Version 1.3, 2 Nov 2010.

**Cogan et al., 2011:** Cogan, A. J., Boesch, H., Parker, R. J., et al., Atmospheric carbon dioxide retrieved from the Greenhouse gases Observing SATellite (GOSAT): Comparison with ground-based TCCON observations and GEOS-Chem model calculations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D21301, doi:10.1029/2012JD018087, 2012.

**Corbin et al., 2008:** Corbin, K. D., A. S. Denning, L. Lu, J.-W. Wang, and I. T. Baker, Possible representation errors in inversions of satellite $CO_2$ retrievals, J. Geophys. Res., 113, D02301, doi:10.1029/2007JD008716, 2008.

**Cressot et al., 2014:** Cressot, C., F. Chevallier, P. Bousquet, et al., On the consistency between global and regional methane emissions inferred from SCIAMACHY, TANSO-FTS, IASI and surface measurements, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 577-592, 2014.

**Crevoisier et al., 2004:** Crevoisier, C., S. Heilliette, A. Chédin, S. Serrar, R. Armante, and N. A. Scott, Midtropospheric $CO_2$ concentration retrieval from AIRS observations in the tropics, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, L17106, doi:10.1029/2004GL020141, 2004.

**Chevallier et al., 2005:** Chevallier, F., R. J. Engelen, and P. Peylin, The contribution of AIRS data to the estimation of $CO_2$ sources and sinks. Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, L23801, doi:10.1029/ 2005GL024229, 2005.

**Crevoisier et al., 2004:** Crevoisier, C., S. Heilliette, A. Chédin, S. Serrar, R. Armante, and N. A. Scott, Midtropospheric $CO_2$ concentration retrieval from AIRS observations in the tropics, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, L17106, doi:10.1029/2004GL020141, 2004.

**Crevoisier et al., 2009:** Crevoisier, C., Chédin, A., Matsueda, H., et al., First year of upper tropospheric integrated content of $CO_2$ from IASI hyperspectral infrared observations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 4797-4810, 2009.

**Crevoisier et al. 2009b:** Crevoisier, C., Nobileau, D., Fiore, A., Armante, R., Chédin, A., and Scott, N. A.: Tropospheric methane in the tropics – first year from IASI hyperspectral infrared observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 6337–6350, doi:10.5194/acp-9-6337-2009, 2009b.

**Crevoisier et al., 2013:** Crevoisier, C., Nobileau, D., Armante, R., et al., The 2007–2011 evolution of tropical methane in the mid-troposphere as seen from space by MetOp-A/IASI, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 4279-4289, 2013.

**Crisp et al., 2004:** Crisp, D., Atlas, R. M., Breon, F.-M., Brown, L. R., Burrows, J. P., Ciais, P., Connor, B. J., Doney, S. C., Fung, I. Y., Jacob, D. J., Miller, C. E., O'Brien, D., Pawson, S., Randerson, J. T., Rayner, P., Salawitch, R. S., Sander, S. P., Sen, B., Stephens, G. L., Tans, P. P., Toon, G. C., Wennberg, P. O., Wofsy, S. C., Yung, Y. L., Kuang, Z., Chudasama, B., Sprague, G., Weiss, P., Pollock, R., Kenyon, D., and Schroll, S.: The Orbiting Carbon Observatory (OCO) mission, Adv. Space Res., 34, 700-709, 2004.

**Detmers et al., 2015:** Detmers, R. G., O. Hasekamp, I. Aben, S. Houweling, T. T. van Leeuwen, A. Butz, J. Landgraf, P. Koehler, L. Guanter, and B. Poulter, Anomalous carbon uptake in Australia as seen by GOSAT, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42, doi:10.1002/2015GL065161, 2015.

**Dils et al., 2014:** B. Dils, M. Buchwitz, M. Reuter, O. Schneising, H. Boesch, R. Parker, S. Guerlet, I. Aben, T. Blumenstock, J. P. Burrows, A. Butz, N. M. Deutscher, C. Frankenberg, F. Hase, O. P. Hasekamp, J. Heymann, M. De Mazière, J. Notholt, R. Sussmann, T. Warneke, D. Griffith, V. Sherlock, D. Wunch :The Greenhouse Gas Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): Comparative validation of GHG-CCI SCIAMACHY/ENVISAT and TANSO-FTS/GOSAT $CO_2$ and $CH_4$ retrieval algorithm products with measurements from the TCCON network, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 7, 1723-1744, 2014.

**ESA-CCI-GHG-URDv2.1:** Chevallier, F., et al., User Requirements Document (URD), ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) GHG-CCI project, Version 2.1, 19 Oct 2016, 2016.

**Frankenberg et al., 2011:** Frankenberg, C., Aben, I., Bergamaschi, P., et al., Global column-averaged methane mixing ratios from 2003 to 2009 as derived from SCIAMACHY: Trends and variability, *J. Geophys. Res*., doi:10.1029/2010JD014849, 2011.

**GCOS-154:** Global Climate Observing System (GCOS): SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SATELLITE-BASED DATA PRODUCTS FOR CLIMATE - 2011 Update - Supplemental details to the satellite-based component of the "Implementation Plan for the Global Observing System for Climate in Support of the UNFCCC (2010 Update)", December 2011, prepared by World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), International Council for Science, Doc.: GCOS 154, link: http://cci.esa.int/sites/default/files/gcos-154.pdf, 2011.

**GCOS-200:** The Global Observing System for Climate: Implementation Needs, World Meteorological Organization (WMO), GCOS-200 (GOOS-214), pp. 325, link: http://unfccc.int/files/science/workstreams/systematic_observation/application/pdf/gcos_ip_10oct2016.pdf, 2016.

**Guerlet et al., 2013:** Guerlet, S., S. Basu, A. Butz, M. Krol, P. Hahne, S. Houweling, O. P. Hasekamp and I. Aben, Reduced carbon uptake during the 2010 Northern Hemisphere summer from GOSAT, Geophys. Res. Lett., doi: 10.1002/grl.50402, 2013.

**Hachmeister et al., 2022:** Hachmeister, J., Schneising, O., Buchwitz, M., Lorente, A., Borsdorff, T., Burrows, J. P., Notholt, J., and Buschmann, M.: On the influence of underlying elevation data on Sentinel-5 Precursor satellite methane retrievals over Greenland, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss. [preprint; final version in Press], https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-102, 2022.

**Hayman et al., 2014:** Hayman, G. D., O'Connor, F. M., Dalvi, M., Clark, D. B., Gedney, N., Huntingford, C., Prigent, C., Buchwitz, M., Schneising, O., Burrows, J. P., Wilson, C., Richards, N., Chipperfield, M., Comparison of the HadGEM2 climate-chemistry model against in-situ and SCIAMACHY atmospheric methane data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 13257-13280, doi:10.5194/acp-14-13257-2014, 2014.

**Hollmann et al., 2013:** Hollmann, C.J. Merchant, R. Saunders, C. Downy, M. Buchwitz, A. Cazenave, E. Chuvieco, P. Defourny, G. de Leeuw, R. Forsberg, T. Holzer-Popp, F. Paul, S. Sandven, S. Sathyendranath, M. van Roozendael, W. Wagner, The ESA Climate Change Initiative: satellite data records for essential climate variables, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society (BAMS), 0.1175/BAMS-D-11-00254.1, pp. 12, 2013.

**Houweling et al., 2004:** Houweling, S., Breon, F.-M., Aben, I., Rödenbeck, C., Gloor, M., Heimann, M. and Ciais, P.: Inverse modeling of $CO_2$ sources and sinks using satellite data: A synthetic inter-comparison of measurement techniques and their performance as a function of space and time, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 4, 523-538, 2004.

**Houweling et al., 2005:** Houweling, S., Hartmann, W., Aben, I., Schrijver, H., Skidmore, J., Roelofs, G.-J., and Breon, F.-M.: Evidence of systematic errors in SCIAMACHY-observed $CO_2$ due to aerosols, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 3003–3013, 2005.

**Houweling et al., 2015:** Houweling, S., D. Baker, S. Basu, H. Boesch, A. Butz, F. Chevallier, F. Deng, E. J. Dlugokencky, L. Feng, A. Ganshin, O. Hasekamp, D. Jones, S. Maksyutov, J. Marshall, T. Oda, C.W. O'Dell1, S. Oshchepkov, P. I. Palmer, P. Peylin, Z. Poussi, F. Reum, H. Takagi, Y. Yoshida, and R. Zhuravlev, An intercomparison of inverse models for estimating sources and sinks of $CO_2$ using GOSAT measurements, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 120, 5253–5266, doi:10.1002/2014JD022962, 2015.

**Hu et al., 2018:** Hu, H., J. Landgraf, R. Detmers, T. Borsdorff, J. Aan de Brugh, I. Aben, A. Butz, O. Hasekamp, Toward Global Mapping of Methane With TROPOMI: First Results and Intersatellite Comparison to GOSAT, Geophys. Res. Lett, Vol. 45, Issue 8, 3682-3689, https://doi.org/10.1002/2018GL077259, 2018.

**Hungershoefer et al., 2010:** Hungershoefer, K., Breon, F.-M., Peylin, P., Chevallier, F., Rayner, P., Klonecki, A., Houweling, S., and Marshall, J., Evaluation of various observing systems for the global monitoring of $CO_2$ surface fluxes, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 10503-10520, 2010.

**IPCC, 2013:** Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis, Working Group I Contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Report on Climate Change, http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/, 2013.

**JCGM, 2008:** JCGM/WG 1, Working Group 1 of the Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, Evalutation of measurement data – Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement, http://www.bipm.org/utils/common/documents/jcgm/JCGM_100_2008_E.pdf, 2008.

**Kirschke et al., 2013:** Kirschke, S., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., et al.: Three decades of global methane sources and sinks, Nat. Geosci., 6, 813–823, doi:10.1038/ngeo1955, 2013.

**Kuze et al., 2009:** Kuze, A., Suto, H., Nakajima, M., and Hamazaki, T. (2009), Thermal and near infrared sensor for carbon observation Fourier-transform spectrometer on the Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite for greenhouse gases monitoring, Appl. Opt., 48, 6716–6733, 2009.

**Kuze et al., 2014:** Kuze, A., Taylor, T., Kataoka, F., Bruegge, C., Crisp, D., Harada, M., Helmlinger, M., Inoue, M., Kawakami, S., Kikuchi, N., Mitomi, Y., Murooka, J., Naitoh, M., O'Brien, D., O'Dell, C., Ohyama, H., Pollock, H., Schwandner, F., Shiomi, K., Suto, H., Takeda, T., Tanaka, T., Urabe, T., Yokota, T., and Yoshida, Y. (2014), Long-term vicarious calibration of GOSAT short-wave sensors: techniques for error reduction and new estimates of radiometric degradation factors, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 52, 3991–4004, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2013.2278696, 2014.

**Kuze et al., 2016:** Kuze, A., Suto, H., Shiomi, K., Kawakami, S., Tanaka, M., Ueda, Y., Deguchi, A., Yoshida, J., Yamamoto, Y., Kataoka, F., Taylor, T. E., and Buijs, H. L.: Update on GOSAT TANSO-FTS performance, operations, and data products after more than 6 years in space, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 9, 2445-2461, doi:10.5194/amt-9-2445-2016, 2016.

**Lauer et al., 2017:** Lauer, A., Eyring, V., Righi, M., Buchwitz, M., Defourny, P., Evaldsson, M., Friedlingstein, P., de Jeu, R., de Leeuw, G., Loew, A., Merchant, C. J., Mueller, B., Popp, T., Reuter, M., Sandven, S., Senftleben, D., Stengel, M., Van Roozendael, M., Wenzel, S., and Willen, U.: Benchmarking CMIP5modelswith a subset of ESA CCI Phase 2 data using the ESMValTool, Remote Sensing of Environment 203, 9-39, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.01.007, 2017.

**Laughner et al., 2021:** Laughner, Joshua L., Toon, G., Wunch, D., Roelhl, C., Roche, S., Wennberg, P. O.: Summary of advancements in the GGG2020 TCCON retrieval, oral presentation given at 17th International Workshop on Greenhouse Gas Measurements from Space (IWGGMS-17), 14–17 Jun

2021, access: https://cce-datasharing.gsfc.nasa.gov/files/conference_presentations/Talk_Laughner_49_25.pdf, 2021.

**Machida et al. 2008**: Machida, T., Matsueda, H., Sawa, Y., Nakagawa, Y., Hirotani, K., Kondo, N., Goto, K., Nakazawa, T., Ishikawa, K., and Ogawa, T.: Worldwide measurements of atmospheric $CO_2$ and other trace gas species using commercial airlines, J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech., 25(10), 1744–1754, doi:10.1175/2008JTECHA1082.1, 2008.

**Massart et al., 2016:** Massart, S., A. Agustí-Panareda, J. Heymann, M. Buchwitz, F. Chevallier, M. Reuter, M. Hilker, J. P. Burrows, N. M. Deutscher, D. G. Feist, F. Hase, R. Sussmann, F. Desmet, M. K. Dubey, D. W. T. Griffith, R. Kivi, C. Petri, M. Schneider, V. A. Velazco, Ability of the 4-D-Var analysis of the GOSAT BESD $XCO_2$ retrievals to characterize atmospheric $CO_2$ at large and synoptic scales, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 1653-1671, doi:10.5194/acp-16-1653-2016, 2016.

**Matsueda et al. 2008:** Matsueda, H., Machida, T., Sawa, Y., Nakagawa, Y., Hirotani, K., Ikeda, H., Kondo, N., and Goto, K.: Evaluation of atmospheric $CO_2$ measurements from new flask air sampling of JAL airliner observation, Pap. Meteorol. Geophys., 59, 1–17, 2008.

**McNorton et al., 2016:** McNorton, J., E. Gloor, C. Wilson, G. D. Hayman, N. Gedney, E. Comyn-Platt, T. Marthews, R. J. Parker, H. Boesch, and M. P. Chipperfield, Role of regional wetland emissions in atmospheric methane variability, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, doi:10.1002/2016GL070649, 2016.

**Meirink et al., 2006:** Meirink, J.-F., Eskes, H. J., and Goede, A. P. H., Sensitivity analysis of methane emissions derived from SCIAMACHY observations through inverse modelling, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 1275-1292, 2006.

**Membrive et al. 2016:** Membrive, O., Crevoisier, C., Sweeney, C., Danis, F., Hertzog, A., Engel, A., Bönisch, H., and Picon, L.: AirCore-HR: A high resolution column sampling to enhance the vertical description of $CH_4$ and $CO_2$, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2016-236, 2016.

**Miller et al., 2007:** Miller, C. E., Crisp, D., DeCola, P. L., et al.: Precision requirements for space-based XCO2 data, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D10314, doi:10.1029/2006JD007659, 2007.

**Nisbet et al., 2014:** Nisbet, E., Dlugokencky, E., and Bousquet, P.: Methane on the rise – again, Science, 343, 493–495, doi:10.1126/science.1247828, 2014.

**Noël et al., 2021:** Noël, S., Reuter, M., Buchwitz, M., Borchardt, J., Hilker, M., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Di Noia, A., Suto, H., Yoshida, Y., Buschmann, M., Deutscher, N. M., Feist, D. G., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., Kivi, R., Morino, I., Notholt, J., Ohyama, H., Petri, C., Podolske, J. R., Pollard, D. F., Sha, M. K., Shiomi, K., Sussmann, R., Te, Y., Velazco, V. A., and Warneke, T.: $XCO_2$ retrieval for GOSAT and GOSAT-2 based on the FOCAL algorithm, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 14, 3837-3869, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-14-3837-2021, 2021.

**Noël et al., 2022:** Noël, S., Reuter, M., Buchwitz, M., Borchardt, J., Hilker, M., Schneising, O., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Di Noia, A., Parker, R. J., Suto, H., Yoshida, Y., Buschmann, M., Deutscher, N. M., Feist, D. G., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., Kivi, R., Liu, C., Morino, I., Notholt, J., Oh, Y.-S., Ohyama, H., Petri, C., Pollard, D. F., Rettinger, M., Roehl, C. M., Rousogenous, C., Sha, M. K., Shiomi, K., Strong, K., Sussmann, R., Té, Y., Velazco, V. A., Vrekoussis, M., and Warneke, T.: Retrieval of greenhouse gases from GOSAT and GOSAT-2 using the FOCAL algorithm, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 15, 3401–3437, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-15-3401-2022, 2022.

**Pandey et al., 2016:** Pandey, S., S. Houweling, M. Krol, I. Aben, F. Chevallier, E. J. Dlugokencky, L. V. Gatti, E. Gloor, J. B. Miller, R. Detmers, T. Machida, T. Roeckmann, Inverse modeling of GOSAT-retrieved ratios of total column $CH_4$ and $CO_2$ for 2009 and 2010, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 5043–5062, doi:10.5194/acp-16-5043-2016, 2016.

**Parker et al., 2011:** Parker, R., Boesch, H., Cogan, A., et al., Methane Observations from the Greenhouse gases Observing SATellite: Comparison to ground-based TCCON data and Model Calculations, *Geophys. Res. Lett*., doi:10.1029/2011GL047871, 2011.

**Parker et al., 2016:** Parker, R. J., H. Boesch, M. J. Wooster, D. P. Moore, A. J. Webb, D. Gaveau, and D. Murdiyarso, Atmospheric CH4 and CO2 enhancements and biomass burning emission ratios derived from satellite observations of the 2015 Indonesian fire plumes, Atmos. Chem. Phys., Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 10111-10131, doi:10.5194/acp-16-10111-2016, 2016.

**Pillai et al., 2016:** Pillai, D., Buchwitz, M., Gerbig, C., Koch, T., Reuter, M., Bovensmann, H., Marshall, J., and Burrows, J. P.: Tracking city $CO_2$ emissions from space using a high resolution inverse modeling approach: A case study for Berlin, Germany, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16, 9591-9610, doi:10.5194/acp-16-9591-2016, 2016.

**PQAR GHG, 2021:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Product Quality Assessment Report (PQAR) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 5 (01.2003-06.2020), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v5.0, 2021. Access: All documents: https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/cg_data.html#C3S_GHG; this document: https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/docs/C3S/CDR5_2003-mid2020/C3S_D312b_Lot2.2.3.2-v3.0_PQAR-GHG_MAIN_v5.0.pdf.

**PUGS GHG, 2017:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., Anand, J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Detmers, R. G., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document, C3S project C3S_312a_Lot6_IUP-UB – Greenhouse Gases, version 1, 2017.

**PUGS GHG, 2018:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., Anand, J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Detmers, R. G., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document, C3S project C3S_312a_Lot6_IUP-UB – Greenhouse Gases, version 2, 2018.

**PUGS GHG, 2019:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 3 (2003-2018), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v3.0, 2019.

**PUGS GHG, 2020:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 4 (2003-2019), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v4.0, 2020.

**PUGS GHG, 2021:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Wu, L.., Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR 5 (01.2003-06.2020), C3S project C3S_312b_Lot2_DLR, v5.0, 2021. Access: All documents: https://www.iup.uni-bremen.de/carbon_ghg/cg_data.html#C3S_GHG; this document: https://www.iup.uni-

bremen.de/carbon_ghg/docs/C3S/CDR5_2003-mid2020/C3S_D312b_Lot2.3.2.3-v3.0_PUGS-GHG_MAIN_v5.0.pdf

**PUGS GHG, 2023:** Buchwitz, M., Barr, A., Boesch, H., Borsdorff, T., Crevoisier, C., Di Noia, A., Hasekamp, O. P., Landgraf, J., Meilhac, N., Parker, R., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O.: Product User Guide and Specification (PUGS) – Main document for Greenhouse Gas (GHG: $CO_2$ & $CH_4$) data set CDR6 (01.2003-12.2021), C3S project C3S2_312a_Lot2_DLR, v6.2, 2023.

**Rayner and O'Brien, 2001:** Rayner, P. J., and O'Brien, D.M.: The utility of remotely sensed $CO_2$ concentration data in surface inversions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 28, 175-178, 2001.

**Reuter et al. 2011:** Reuter, M., Bovensmann, H., Buchwitz, M., Burrows, J. P., Connor, B. J., Deutscher, N. M., Griffith, D.W. T., Heymann, J., Keppel-Aleks, G., Messerschmidt, J., and et al.: Retrieval of atmospheric $CO_2$ with enhanced accuracy and precision from SCIAMACHY: Validation with FTS measurements and comparison with model results., Journal of Geophysical Research, 116, doi:10.1029/2010JD015047, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2010JD015047, 2011.

**Reuter et al., 2013:** Reuter, M. H. Bösch, H. Bovensmann, A. Bril, M. Buchwitz, A. Butz, J. P. Burrows, C. W. O'Dell, S. Guerlet, O. Hasekamp, J. Heymann, N. Kikuchi, S. Oshchepkov, R. Parker, S. Pfeifer, O. Schneising, T. Yokota, and Y. Yoshida, A joint effort to deliver satellite retrieved atmospheric $CO_2$ concentrations for surface flux inversions: The ensemble median algorithm EMMA, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 1771-1780, 2013.

**Reuter et al., 2014a:** Reuter, M., M. Buchwitz, A. Hilboll, A. Richter, O. Schneising, M. Hilker, J. Heymann, H. Bovensmann and J. P. Burrows, Decreasing emissions of NOx relative to $CO_2$ in East Asia inferred from satellite observations, Nature Geoscience, 28 Sept. 2014, doi:10.1038/ngeo2257, pp.4, 2014.

**Reuter et al., 2014b:** Reuter, M., M. Buchwitz, M. Hilker, J. Heymann, O. Schneising, D. Pillai, H. Bovensmann, J. P. Burrows, H. Bösch, R. Parker, A. Butz, O. Hasekamp, C. W. O'Dell, Y. Yoshida, C. Gerbig, T. Nehrkorn, N. M. Deutscher, T. Warneke, J. Notholt, F. Hase, R. Kivi, R. Sussmann, T. Machida, H. Matsueda, and Y. Sawa, Satellite-inferred European carbon sink larger than expected, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 13739-13753, doi:10.5194/acp-14-13739-2014, 2014.

**Reuter et al., 2016:** Reuter, M.; Buchwitz, M.; Aben, I.; Boesch, H.; Butz, A.; Detmers, R.G.; Hasekamp, O.P.; Heymann, J.; Parker, R.; Schneising, O.; Somkuti, P., ESA Greenhouse Gases Climate Change Initiative (GHG_cci): Merged SCIAMACHY and GOSAT Level 3 gridded atmospheric column-average carbon dioxide ($XCO_2$) product in Obs4MIPs format. Centre for Environmental Data Analysis, 10 October 2016, doi:10.5285/3FAE8371-0CBB-4B21-9EA6-7A1FC293C4A2, pp. 11, 2016.

**Reuter et al., 2017:** Reuter, M., M. Buchwitz, M. Hilker, J. Heymann, H. Bovensmann, J. Burrows, S. Houweling, Y. Liu, R. Nassar, F. Chevallier, P. Ciais, J. Marshall, and M. Reichstein, 2016: How much $CO_2$ is taken up by the European terrestrial biosphere ?, Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00310.1, 24 April 2017, 665-671, 2017.

**Reuter et al., 2017a:** Reuter, M.; Buchwitz, M.; Aben, I.; Boesch, H.; Butz, A.; Detmers, R.G.; Hasekamp, O.P.; Heymann, J.; Parker, R.; Schneising, O.; Somkuti, P., ESA Greenhouse Gases Climate Change Initiative (GHG-CCI): Merged SCIAMACHY and GOSAT Level 3 gridded atmospheric column-average carbon dioxide ($XCO_2$) product in Obs4MIPs format version 2 (CRDP#4), Technical Note, pp. 11, 1 February 2017, 2017.

**Reuter et al., 2019:** Reuter, M., Buchwitz, M., Schneising, O., Noel, S., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Boesch, H., Di Noia, A., Anand, J., Parker, R. J., Somkuti, P., Wu, L., Hasekamp, O. P., Aben, I., Kuze, A., Suto, H., Shiomi, K., Yoshida, Y., Morino, I., Crisp, D., O'Dell, C., Notholt, J., Petri, C., Warneke, T., Velazco, V., Deutscher, N. M., Griffith, D. W. T., Kivi, R., Pollard, D., Hase, F., Sussmann, R., Te, Y. V., Strong, K., Roche, S., Sha, M. K., De Maziere, M., Feist, D. G., Iraci, L. T., Roehl, C., Retscher, C., and Schepers, D.: Ensemble-based satellite-derived carbon dioxide and methane column-averaged dry-air mole fraction data sets (2003-2018) for carbon and climate applications, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2019-398, 2019.

**Reuter et al., 2020:** Reuter, M., Buchwitz, M., Schneising, O., Noel, S., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Boesch, H., Di Noia, A., Anand, J., Parker, R. J., Somkuti, P., Wu, L., Hasekamp, O. P., Aben, I., Kuze, A., Suto, H., Shiomi, K., Yoshida, Y., Morino, I., Crisp, D., O'Dell, C. W., Notholt, J., Petri, C., Warneke, T., Velazco, V. A., Deutscher, N. M., Griffith, D. W. T., Kivi, R., Pollard, D. F., Hase, F., Sussmann, R., Te, Y. V., Strong, K., Roche, S., Sha, M. K., De Maziere, M., Feist, D. G., Iraci, L. T., Roehl, C. M., Retscher, C., and Schepers, D.: Ensemble-based satellite-derived carbon dioxide and methane column-averaged dry-air mole fraction data sets (2003-2018) for carbon and climate applications, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 13, 789-819, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-789-2020, 2020.

**Rodgers, 2000:** Rodgers C. D.: Inverse Methods for Atmospheric Sounding: Theory and Practice, World Scientific Publishing, 2000.

**Ross et al., 2013:** Ross, A. N., Wooster, M. J., Boesch, H., Parker, R., First satellite measurements of carbon dioxide and methane emission ratios in wildfire plumes, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40, 1-5, doi:10.1002/grl.50733, 2013.

**Schaefer et al., 2016:** Schaefer, H., Mikaloff Fletcher, S. E., Veidt, C., Lassey, K. R., Brailsford, G. W., Bromley, T. M., Dlugokencky, E. J., Michel, S. E., Miller, J. B., Levin, I., Lowe, D. C., Martin, R. J., Vaughn, B. H., and White, J. W. C.: A 21st-century shift from fossil-fuel to biogenic methane emissions indicated by $^{13}CH_4$, Science, Vol. 352, Issue 6281, pp. 80-84, doi 10.1126/science.aad2705, 2016.

**Shindell et al., 2013:** Shindell, D. T., Pechony, O., Voulgarakis, A., et al. (2013), Interactive ozone and methane chemistry in GISS-E2 historical and future climate simulations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 2653–2689, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2653-2013, 2013.

**Schepers et al., 2012:** Schepers, D., Guerlet, S., Butz, A., Landgraf, J., Frankenberg, C., Hasekamp, O., Blavier, J.-F., Deutscher, N. M., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., Kyro, E., Morino, I., Sherlock, V., Sussmann, R., Aben, I. (2012), Methane retrievals from Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite (GOSAT) shortwave infrared measurements: Performance comparison of proxy and physics retrieval algorithms, J. Geophys. Res., 117, D10307, doi:10.1029/2012JD017549, 2012.

**Schneising et al., 2011:** Schneising, O., Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., et al., Long-term analysis of carbon dioxide and methane column-averaged mole fractions retrieved from SCIAMACHY, *Atmos. Chem. Phys*., 11, 2881-2892, 2011.

**Schneising et al., 2014a:** Schneising, O., Reuter, M., Buchwitz, M., Heymann, J., Bovensmann, H., and Burrows, J. P., Terrestrial carbon sink observed from space: variation of growth rates and seasonal cycle amplitudes in response to interannual surface temperature variability, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 133-141, 2014.

**Schneising et al., 2014b:** Schneising, O., Burrows, J. P., Dickerson, R. R., Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Bovensmann, H., Remote sensing of fugitive methane emissions from oil and gas production in North American tight geologic formations, Earth's Future, 2, DOI: 10.1002/2014EF000265, pp. 11, 2014.

**Schneising et al., 2019:** Schneising, O., Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Bovensmann, H., Burrows, J. P., Borsdorff, T., Deutscher, N. M., Feist, D. G., Griffith, D. W. T., Hase, F., Hermans, C., Iraci, L. T., Kivi, R., Landgraf, J., Morino, I., Notholt, J., Petri, C., Pollard, D. F., Roche, S., Shiomi, K., Strong, K., Sussmann, R., Velazco, V. A., Warneke, T., and Wunch, D.: A scientific algorithm to simultaneously retrieve carbon monoxide and methane from TROPOMI onboard Sentinel-5 Precursor, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 12, 6771-6802, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-12-6771-2019, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-12-6771-2019, 2019.

**Schneising et al., 2020:** Schneising, O., Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Vanselow, S., Bovensmann, H., and Burrows, J. P.: Remote sensing of methane leakage from natural gas and petroleum systems revisited, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 9169-9182, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-9169-2020, 2020.

**Suto et al., 2021:** Suto, H., Kataoka, F., Kikuchi, N., Knuteson, R. O., Butz, A., Haun, M., Buijs, H., Shiomi, K., Imai, H., and Kuze, A.: Thermal and near-infrared sensor for carbon observation Fourier transform spectrometer-2 (TANSO-FTS-2) on the Greenhouse gases Observing SATellite-2 (GOSAT-2) during its first year in orbit, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 14, 2013–2039, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-14-2013-2021, 2021.

**TRD GHG, 2017:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., Anand, J., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Detmers, R. G., Hasekamp, O. P., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Target Requirement Document, Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) project on satellite-derived Essential Climate Variable (ECV) Greenhouse Gases ($CO_2$ and $CH_4$) data products (project C3S_312a_Lot6), Version 1.3, 20-October-2017, pp. 53, 2017.

**TRD GAD GHG, 2020:** Buchwitz, M., Aben, I., Armante, R., Boesch, H., Crevoisier, C., Hasekamp, O. P., Wu, L.., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Target Requirement and Gap Analysis Document, Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) project on satellite-derived Essential Climate Variable (ECV) Greenhouse Gases ($CO_2$ and $CH_4$) data products (project C3S_312b_Lot2), Version 2.11, 9-April-2020, pp. 80, 2020.

**TRD GAD GHG, 2021:** Buchwitz, M., Reuter, M., Schneising-Weigel, O., Aben, I., Wu, L., Hasekamp, O. P., Boesch, H., Di Noia, A., Crevoisier, C., Armante, R.: Target Requirement and Gap Analysis Document, Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) project on satellite-derived Essential Climate Variable (ECV) Greenhouse Gases ($CO_2$ and $CH_4$) data products, Version 3.1, 19-February-2021, pp. 81, 2021.

**Turner et al., 2015:** Turner, A. J., D. J. Jacob, K. J. Wecht, J. D. Maasakkers, S. C. Biraud, H. Boesch, K. W. Bowman, N. M. Deutscher, M. K. Dubey, D. W. T. Griffith, F. Hase, A. Kuze, J. Notholt, H. Ohyama, R. Parker, V. H. Payne, R. Sussmann, V. A. Velazco, T. Warneke, P. O. Wennberg, and D. Wunch, Estimating global and North American methane emissions with high spatial resolution using GOSAT satellite data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 7049-7069, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7049-2015, 2015.

**Turner et al., 2016:** Turner, A. J., D. J. Jacob, J. Benmergui, S. C. Wofsy, J. D. Maasakkers, A. Butz, O. Hasekamp, and S. C. Biraud, A large increase in U.S. methane emissions over the past decade

inferred from satellite data and surface observations, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, 2218–2224, doi:10.1002/2016GL067987, 2016.

**Veefkind et al. 2012:** Veefkind, J. P., Aben, I., McMullan, K., Förster, H., De Vries, J., Otter, G., Claas, J., Eskes, H. J., De Haan, J. F., Kleipool, Q., Van Weele, M., Hasekamp, O., Hoogeveen, R., Landgraf, J., Snel, R., Tol, P.,Ingmann, P., Voors, R., Kruizinga, B., Vink, R., Visser, H., and Levelt, P. F.: TROPOMI on the ESA Sentinel-5 Precursor: A GMES mission for global observations of the atmospheric composition for climate, air quality and ozone layer applications. Rem. Sens. Environment, 120:70–83, 2012.

**Velazco et al. 2011:** Velazco, V. A., Buchwitz, M., Bovensmann, H., Reuter, M., Schneising, O., Heymann, J., Krings, T., Gerilowski, K., and Burrows, J. P.: Towards space based verification of CO2 emissions from strong localized sources: fossil fuel power plant emissions as seen by a CarbonSat constellation, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 4, 2809-2822, 2011.

**Wenzel et al., 2016:** Wenzel, S., Cox, P. M., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P.: Projected land phtotosynthesis constrained by changes in the seasonal cycle of atmospheric $CO_2$, Nature, 499-501, doi:10.1038/nature18722, 2016.

**Wofsy et al. 2012:** Wofsy, S. C., Daube, B. C., Jimenez, R., et al.: HIPPO Merged 10-second Meteorology, Atmospheric Chemistry, Aerosol Data (R 20121129), Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA, http://dx.doi.org/, 10.3334/CDIAC/hippo 010 (Release 29 November 2012), 2012.

**Wunch et al. 2010:** 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., and Zondlo, M. A.: Calibration of the Total Carbon Column Observing Network using aircraft profile data, Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 3, 1351–1362, doi:10.5194/amt-3-1351-2010, URL http://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/3/1351/2010/, 2010.

**Wunch et al. 2011:** Wunch, D., Toon, G. C., Blavier, J.-F. L., Washenfelder, R. A., Notholt, J., Connor, B. J., Griffith, D. W. T., Sherlock, V., and Wennberg, P. O.: The Total Carbon Column Observing Network (TCCON), Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 369, 2087–2112, doi:10.1098/rsta.2010.0240, 2011.

**Wunch et al. 2015:** Wunch, D., Toon, G.C., Sherlock, V., Deutscher, N.M., Liu, X., Feist, D.G., Wennberg, P.O., The Total Carbon Column Observing Network's GGG2014 Data Version. Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA (available at: doi:10.14291/tccon.ggg2014.documentation.R0/1221662), 2015.

**Yoshida et al. 2013:** Yoshida, Y., Kikuchi, N., Morino, I., Uchino, O., Oshchepkov, S., Bril, A., Saeki, T., Schutgens, N., Toon, G. C., Wunch, D., Roehl, C. M., Wennberg, P. O., Griffith, D. W. T, Deutscher, N. M., Warneke, T., Notholt, J., Robinson, J., Sherlock, V., Connor, B., Rettinger, M., Sussmann, R., Ahonen, P., Heikkinen, P., Kyrö, E., Mendonca, J., Strong, K., Hase, F., Dohe, S., and Yokota, T.:

Improvement of the retrieval algorithm for GOSAT SWIR $XCO_2$ and $XCH_4$ and their validation using TCCON data, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6, 1533–1547, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1533-2013, 2013.

Copernicus Climate Change Service

ECMWF - Shinfield Park, Reading RG2 9AX, UK

Contact: https://support.ecmwf.int/