

# Physical processes and linkages to carbon uptake

# Marina Lévy

LOCEAN-IPSL, Paris, France

OCB 2016 summer workshop

# Carbon fluxes into the ocean









Equilibrium :

Net physical fluxes of DIC = biological pump Net air-sea flux is close to zero





Equilibrium : Net physical fluxes of DIC = biological pump Net air-sea flux is close to zero

Are the gross fluxes of DIC much larger than the biological pump ?

How large is subduction of OC compared to sedimentation ?

What are the regional distribution of these carbon fluxes ?



CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the atmosphere have increased due to anthropogenic emissions

Ocean has absorbed between 1/3 and 1/4 of this excess carbon emissions

Ocean uptake is saturating

Ocean circulation and productivity have not drastically changed

Oceanic uptake of anthropogenic CO2 is achieved by physical fluxes: subduction of DIC



CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the atmosphere have increased due to anthropogenic emissions

Ocean has absorbed between 1/3 and 1/4 of this excess carbon emissions

Ocean uptake is saturating

Ocean circulation and productivity have not drastically changed

Oceanic uptake of anthropogenic CO2 is achieved by physical fluxes: subduction of DIC

How and where is subduction operating ?

What is the contribution of meso/submesoscale features ?

What will be the effect of a change in circulation ?

What will be the effect of a change in physiology / ecosystem / C:N ratio ?



- 1) Change of CO<sub>2</sub> in atmosphere Unperturbed circulation, unperturbed biological pump
- 2) Change in ocean circulation
  - -> change in N supply
  - -> change in biological pump

Unperturbed circulation, perturbed biological pump

- 3) Change in physiology, ecosystem structure, C/N ratio
  - -> change in biological pump

Perturbed circulation, perturbed biological pump

How will these different changes modify the uptake in the future ?

## Pre-industrial ocean





IPCC, 2007, 2013





Carbon cycling in the ocean



Besides for a few regional studies, very little is know on

the physical transport between surface and deep ocean



# Carbon fluxes into the ocean



Meaningful boundary for biological pump: euphotic depth

Meaningful boundary for physical fluxes: surface boundary layer Or mixed-layer depth







Instantaneous flux across the time varying mixed-layer depth

$$S_{\text{ann}}^{\text{TR}} = \int_0^{365} \left( -c_h \cdot w_h - c_h \cdot \vec{u}_h \vec{\nabla h} - c_h \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} - A_z^h \cdot \frac{\partial c_h}{\partial z} \right) dt_t$$

Annual Subduction / Obduction rate



OCEAR

Instantaneous flux across the time varying mixed-layer depth

$$S_{\text{ann}}^{\text{TR}} = \int_0^{365} \left( -c_h \cdot w_h - c_h \cdot \vec{u}_h \vec{\nabla h} - c_h \cdot \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} - A_z^h \cdot \frac{\partial c_h}{\partial z} \right) dt_t$$

Annual Subduction / Obduction rate

Extremely difficult to estimate from observations

Models offer a framework where all the fields are consistent and the fluxes can be estimated



Flux across the winter mixed-layer depth: estimates based on observations





- 1. Pre-industrial carbon transfers in the global ocean (Levy et al., GBC, 2013)
- 2. Antropogenic carbon penetration in the global ocean (Bopp et al., GRL, 2015)
- Role of (sub-)mesoscales in the North East Atlantic (Karleskind et al., JGR 2011a, Oce. Mod. 2011b)



### **1. OGCM: ORCA2-PISCES**

climatological simulation for the pre-industrial ocean

**2. Global climatological data** 

DIC (GLODAP), Wind (CORE2), U (AVISO), MLD (De Boyer Montegut)



# Subduction and obduction of DIC

a. Horizontal advection b. Vertical advection ∑ S S 50N mixed-layer base х, у 100W 100E 0E 0E horizontal advection vertica dy mixing c. Vertical m vertica entrainement diffusion detrainement 50S 509 100W 0E 100E 100W 0E 100E DIC physical transfer molC/m²/y subduction obduction -200, -160, -120, -80, -40, 0, 40. 80. 120, 160, 200,



# Subduction and obduction of DIC

a. Horizontal advection



b. Vertical advection



c. Vertical mixing







DIC physical transfer subduction molC/m²/y obduction

-200. -160. -120. -80. -40. 0. 40. 80. 120. 160. 200.



# Subduction and obduction of DIC

a. Horizontal advection



b1. Horizontal Advection (from data)

b. Vertical advection



c1. Vertical Advection (from data)





# Subduction and obduction of OC

a. Horizontal Advection b. Vertical Advection 50N 50N 509 50S 0E 100E 100W 100E 100W 0E d. Eddy mixing c. Vertical mixing 50N 50N 50S 50S 100W 0E 100E 100W 0E 100E

#### Organic Carbon physical transfer (molC/m<sup>2</sup>/y)



-		•	•	
-2.40	-1.20	0.00	1.20	2.40

Obduction



# Carbon fluxes through the ML





# Carbon fluxes through the ML

a. Physical Transfer of DIC

b. Physical Transfer of OC





c. air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> flux



d. Biological Transfer

# Carbon fluxes through the ML



CO<sub>2</sub>

DIC

ocean surface

z

OC



# Revised pre-industrial carbon budget for the ML





AR4, 2007



### For antropogenic carbon flux estimates

### **OGCM: ORCA2-PISCES**

### Historical simulation (1890-2007) with / without trend in atm pCO2

The circulation and biological pump are identical in the two simulations

We look at the difference between the two to access anthropogenic carbon

# Antropogenic fluxes



PgC / y



larger interannual variability in carbon subduction than in air-sea carbon flux







# Antropogenic fluxes

a. Air -Sea C Flux



c. Advection





d. Vertical Mixing





#### e. Eddy-induced





### For antropogenic carbon flux estimates

### **OGCM: ORCA2-PISCES**

### Historical simulation (1890-2007) with trend in atm pCO2

Efficiency of the biological pump is controlled by changing the C:N ratio of PP

$$C/N = 7.625 (1 + x. (CO_2^{t}-CO_2^{1888}) / (CO_2^{2007}-CO_2^{1888}))$$

With x = 0.2, 0.1, -0.1, -0.2

Circulation is the same for all experiments





Bopp et al., work in progress







Sensitivity of Canth upatke to lateral eddy mixing

Gnanadesikan et al., 2015







Subduction of POC and DOC

Omand et al., 2015



# Program Ocean Multidisciplinary MEsoscale

**Objective** : Role of eddies on subduction of NEAMW and on their biogeochemical properties

# Pomme area

- Strong CO<sub>2</sub> sink
- . Mixed-layer depth gradient
- . Spring phytoplankton bloom









50.00 105.00 160.00 215.00 270.00 325.00 380.00 435.00 490.00 545.00 600.00







2 simulations Eddy

Non-eddy

(c) annual mean surface velocity, eddy (d) annual mean surface velocity, non-eddy



Karleskind et al, 2011



(c) Total, non-eddy (f) Total, eddy 44N44N42N 42N 40N 40N 38N 38N 20W 22W 18W 16W 22W 20W

Subduction rate

18W

16W





# Carbon flux estimates from the model



fluxes in molC m-2 y-1

Carbon penetration in the eddy simulation: 96 % subduction of DIC 2 % subduction of Organic carbon 2 % sedimentation of Organic carbon





fluxes in molC m-2 y-1

Carbon penetration in the non-eddy simulation (red): 10 % less subduction of DIC 10 % less subduction of Organic carbon No change sedimentation of Organic carbon



- At temperate latitudes, more than 90% of the carbon flux to the deep ocean due to subduction of DIC, the rest by sedimentation
- 1/3 organic carbon export is through subduction, 2/3 by sedimentation (without contribution of submesoscales)
- Canth air-sea flux and Canth penetration are close in magnitude but do not occur at the same location



- At temperate latitudes, more than 90% of the carbon flux to the deep ocean due to subduction of DIC, the rest by sedimentation
- 1/3 organic carbon export is through subduction, 2/3 by sedimentation (without contribution of submesoscales)
- Canth air-sea flux and Canth penetration are close in magnitude but do not occur at the same location
- Contribution of submesoscales to the export of DIC, DOC, POC and Canth ?
- Vertical structure of the physical export ?
- Interplay between the changes in physical fluxes and of the biological pump efficiency ?