Atmospheric observation-based global SF<sub>6</sub> emissions: comparison of top-down and bottom-up estimates



 I. Levin<sup>1</sup>, T. Naegler<sup>1</sup>, R. Heinz<sup>1</sup>, D. Osusko<sup>1</sup>, E. Cuevas<sup>2</sup>, A. Engel<sup>3</sup>, J. IImberger<sup>1</sup>, R. L. Langenfelds<sup>4</sup>, B. Neininger<sup>5</sup>, C. v. Rohden<sup>1</sup>, L. P. Steele<sup>4</sup>, A. Varlagin<sup>6</sup>, R. Weller<sup>7</sup>, D. E. Worthy<sup>8</sup>, S. A. Zimov<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>IUP, Univ. Heidelberg, <sup>2</sup>INM Izaña Obs., <sup>3</sup>IAU, Univ. Frankfurt, <sup>4</sup>CMAR, Aspendale, <sup>5</sup>MetAir AG, Hausen, <sup>6</sup>IPEE, Moscow, <sup>7</sup>AWI, Bremerhaven, <sup>8</sup>Env. Canada, Toronto, <sup>9</sup>Cherskii Obs.

### Sulphur Hexafluoride: SF<sub>6</sub>

### ... is a very stable man-made Greenhouse Gas

Mean atmospheric lifetime:  $\approx 3\,000$  years Global Warming Potential:  $\approx 23\,000 \times \text{CO}_2$  (100 yr time horizon)  $\rightarrow \text{Kyoto - reported}$ 

Atmospheric mixing ratio today:  $\approx$  7 ppt (10<sup>-12</sup> mol/mol)

Sources of SF<sub>6</sub>:

- ca. 75% from electrical applications
- Magnesium industry
- adiabatic applications

**Sinks of SF<sub>6</sub>:** only in the Mesosphere > 60 km

- UV Absorption ( $\lambda$  < 130 nm)
- electron reactions

# Heidelberg co-operative network of tropospheric SF<sub>6</sub> observations



& stratospheric profiles from Kiruna, Aire sur l'Adour, Teresina

# Global long-term trend of SF<sub>6</sub> in the troposphere



### Observed tropospheric SF<sub>6</sub> growth rates



Practically no  $SF_6$  sinks:

global mean growth rate  $\cong$  global mean SF<sub>6</sub> emissions

# Atmospheric observation-inferred global SF<sub>6</sub> emissions



How well do the 2009 bottom-up EDGAR estimates compare to our atmospheric observation-based top-down emissions ?

# Atmospheric observation-inferred global SF<sub>6</sub> emissions



### Comparison with new global (bottom-up) EDGAR-estimated SF<sub>6</sub> emissions



How do UNFCCC-reported SF<sub>6</sub> emissions compare to our top-down estimate ?

#### **Problem:**

Only industrialised countries (Annex I) are required to report their GHG emissions to UNFCCC, these are

Western Europe, Canada, U.S.A., Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Eastern Europe, Russia & Turkey

#### Therefore, we separate here into Annex I and non-Annex I

which are newly industrialised countries, i.e. *China, India, Brazil, others* 

### UNFCCC-based and EDGAR estimated Annex I SF<sub>6</sub> emissions



### UNFCCC-based and EDGAR Annex I & non-Annex I SF<sub>6</sub> emissions



Are non-Annex I countries really responsible for the major part of global SF<sub>6</sub> emissions today ?





Are non-Annex I countries really responsible for the major part of global  $SF_6$  emissions today ?

This would require much larger SF<sub>6</sub> emissions per electrical power production in non-Annex I than in Annex I countries



## The SF<sub>6</sub> north-south gradient principally also provides information on the distribution of emissions



### Observed difference between Alert (82°N) and Neumayer (71°S)



### Observed and simulated difference between Alert (82°N) and Neumayer (71°S)



### Observed and simulated difference between Alert (82°N) and Neumayer (71°S)



### Observed and simulated difference between Alert (82°N) and Neumayer (71°S)



 $\rightarrow$  Model transport uncertainties limit constraints on the north-south distribution of emissions, this would also be a concern for high-resolution models !

### Summary

Global atmospheric SF<sub>6</sub> mixing ratio has increased from almost zero in the 1970s to almost 7 ppt today

After a decrease of annual global emissions in 1996-1998,  $SF_6$  sources increase again since 1998

Bottom-up estimates by EDGAR compare well with our inferred emissions, however, for some periods, they are significantly different

Annex I reported emissions are surprisingly low and leave a large gap of non-reported emissions

... but model transport uncertainties and the number of observational sites in our network limit emission apportionment to Annex I or non-Annex I countries

## Thank you !

DIST

Constant algebra i subici manifi al antica antica



### The coarse-resolution GRACE model



### Simulating tropospheric SF<sub>6</sub> with EDGARestimated SF<sub>6</sub> emissions



## Simulating tropospheric SF<sub>6</sub> with observation-inferred emissions

