

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Biogeosciences (BG).
Please refer to the corresponding final paper in BG if available.

**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**

C. Albergel et al.

Observed and modelled ecosystem respiration and gross primary production of a grassland in southwestern France

**C. Albergel, J.-C. Calvet, A.-L. Gibelin, S. Lafont, J.-L. Roujean, C. Berne,
O. Traullé, and N. Fritz**

CNRM/GAME, Météo-France, CNRS, 42 avenue Coriolis, 31057 Toulouse Cedex 1, France

Received: 11 September 2009 – Accepted: 24 November 2009 – Published: 19 January 2010

Correspondence to: J.-C. Calvet (calvet@meteo.fr)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Abstract

In this work, a simple representation of the soil moisture effect on the ecosystem respiration is implemented into the A-gs version of the Interactions between Soil, Biosphere, and Atmosphere (ISBA) model. It results in an improvement of the modelled CO₂ flux over a grassland, in southwestern France. The former temperature-only dependent respiration formulation used in ISBA-A-gs is not able to model the limitation of the respiration under dry conditions. In addition to soil moisture and soil temperature, the only parameter required in this formulation is the ecosystem respiration parameter Re_{25} . It can be estimated by the mean of eddy covariance measurements of turbulent nighttime CO₂ flux (i.e. ecosystem respiration). The resulting correlation between observed and modelled net ecosystem exchange is $r^2=0.63$ with a bias of $-2.18\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. It is shown that when CO₂ observations are not available, it is possible to use a more complex model, able to represent the heterotrophic respiration and all the components of the autotrophic respiration, to estimate Re_{25} with similar results. The modelled ecosystem respiration estimates are provided by the Carbon Cycle (CC) version of ISBA (ISBA-CC). ISBA-CC is a version of ISBA able to simulate all the respiration components whereas ISBA-A-gs uses a single equation for ecosystem respiration. ISBA-A-gs is easier to handle and more convenient than ISBA-CC for practical use in atmospheric or hydrological models. Surface water and energy flux observations as well as gross primary production (GPP) estimates are compared with model outputs. The dependence of GPP to air temperature is investigated. The observed GPP is less sensitive to temperature than the modelled GPP. Finally, the simulations of the ISBA-A-gs model are analysed over a seven year period (2001–2007). Modelled soil moisture and leaf area index (LAI) are confronted with the observed root-zone soil moisture content ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$), and with LAI estimates derived from surface reflectance measurements.

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



1 Introduction

A major component of the global carbon balance is the flux of CO_2 from the soil, also referred to as soil respiration (Raich et al., 2002; Schlesinger et al., 2000). It is a major source of CO_2 entering the atmosphere (20–40% of the total flux, Kicklighter et al., 1994). The soil respiration represents 50 to 80% of the ecosystem respiration, R_{eco} (Janssen et al., 2001; Epron et al., 1999). The soil respiration originates from the decomposition of the soil organic matter (heterotrophic respiration) and from the roots (autotrophic respiration). Soil temperature and soil moisture are the two main factors controlling the rate at which CO_2 is produced in the soil (Singh et al., 1977). The other component of R_{eco} , is the autotrophic respiration produced by the above-ground biomass. Various models have been proposed to describe soil respiration and R_{eco} . Generally, they are based on temperature-dependent relations (Katterer et al., 1998; Kirschbaum et al., 1995; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994) combined with soil-water content estimates (Epron et al., 1999; Joffre et al., 2003).

The ISBA-A-gs (Calvet et al., 1998; Calvet and Soussana, 2001; Gibelin et al., 2006) version of the Interactions between Soil, Biosphere and Atmosphere (ISBA) model (Noilhan and Planton, 1988; Noilhan and Mahfouf, 1996), is able to simulate the Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) of CO_2 , together with plant growth (A-gs stands for net assimilation of CO_2 and stomatal conductance). In ISBA-A-gs, a single equation is used to describe R_{eco} (Rivalland et al., 2005). No distinction is made between autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration. The use of a unique term is justified by its simplicity and its robustness. However, the function used so far in ISBA-A-gs is temperature dependent only, whereas soil moisture constitutes, after temperature, the second factor regulating the soil CO_2 efflux by limiting the respiration under dry conditions (Holt et al., 1990). The parameterisations can be compared and verified with nighttime turbulent eddy covariance measurements (Goulden et al., 1996; Aubinet et al., 2000).

A new Carbon Cycle (CC) version of ISBA, ISBA-CC, was developed by Gibelin et al. (2008) to represent the carbon fluxes and storage terms of the terrestrial carbon

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



cycle. ISBA-CC is able to simulate above-ground and below-ground biomass reservoirs. In a previous study (Gibelin et al., 2008), the simulated energy fluxes (sensible and latent heat) and net ecosystem exchange were validated against in-situ measurements at 26 sites of the FLUXNET network (Baldocchi et al., 2001) with satisfactory results. ISBA-CC requires spin-up simulations to initialise the biomass reservoirs and the different carbon pools simulated by the model, and to reach the equilibrium for all of them. This model can be used for climatology purposes, to analyse retroactions between the climate and the carbon cycle, or to study future climate change scenarios. A more tractable and convenient model like ISBA-A-gs is required for other land surface modelling applications.

In this study, a new formulation of the ISBA-A-gs ecosystem respiration term is proposed, consisting of implementing soil-water content information following Joffre et al. (2003). It is tested over the Surface Monitoring Of the Soil Reservoir EXperiment (SMOSREX) grassland site (De Rosnay et al., 2006). Located at the ONERA (Office National d'Etudes et de Recherches Aéronautiques) site of Fauga-Mauzac, near Toulouse, in southwestern France, the SMOSREX long-term experiment aims at improving the modelling of the microwave L-band emission of the soil-vegetation system as well as improving the understanding of soil-plant-atmosphere interactions. The CO₂ flux observations performed at the SMOSREX site are used to calibrate this formulation for a grassland. As CO₂ flux observations are not available for all the biomes, the possibility to calibrate the ISBA-A-gs ecosystem respiration parameterisation from ISBA-CC simulations is investigated. Energy fluxes like latent and sensible heat fluxes are observed at SMOSREX, and are compared with the simulated fluxes. As ISBA-A-gs can diagnose photosynthesis, or Gross Primary Production (GPP), this variable is compared with GPP estimates derived from the observations. In particular, the GPP response to air temperature is investigated. Finally, R_{eco}, GPP and the net CO₂ flux or Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) are simulated for a seven year (2001–2007) period for the grassland of the SMOSREX site. Soil moisture and LAI are simulated as well and compared with observations.

**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**C. Albergel et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Land surface model

ISBA is a land surface model developed at Météo-France and implemented into atmospheric weather forecast models, hydrological models and global climate models (Noilhan and Mahfouf, 1996). In the ISBA version used in this study, the soil-water balance and the surface-energy balance are solved at a 5-min time step. The soil is represented by one bulk reservoir corresponding to the maximum rooting depth, including a thin surface layer and, regardless of the actual root development, according to Deardorff (1978). Mahfouf and Noilhan (1996) have introduced a drainage below the root zone. The various soil-water and heat coefficients depend on soil texture. Surface temperature, soil moisture in the root zone, surface soil moisture and the water and energy fluxes are the main surface variables simulated by ISBA. While only one energy balance equation is solved, a separation of soil evaporation and plant transpiration is done on the basis of the vegetation coverage. Radiation, temperature, air vapour pressure deficit and soil moisture allow to define the stomatal conductance. Different surface variables and parameters are required as input to ISBA such as the surface albedo, LAI and vegetation height, as well as the soil texture, wilting point and field capacity.

2.1.1 ISBA-A-gs and ISBA-CC

On the basis of ISBA, Calvet et al. (1998) developed ISBA-A-gs. It is a CO₂ responsive version of ISBA which accounts for the effect of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration and for the interactions between all environmental factors on the stomatal aperture. In the A-gs version of ISBA, photosynthesis and its coupling with stomatal conductance at a leaf level is accounted for. The vegetation net assimilation is computed and used as an input to a simple growth sub-model able to predict LAI. ISBA-A-gs is able to simulate GPP, NEE, LAI, the energy and mass fluxes such as sensible and latent heat fluxes,

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



and soil moisture. ISBA-A-gs was implemented in SURFEX (Martin et al., 2007; Le Moigne et al., 2009), the modelling platform of Météo-France. In this study, SURFEX is used “offline”, i.e. without coupling the land surface with an atmospheric model. The values of the main soil and vegetation parameters used in the ISBA-A-gs simulations over the SMOSREX grassland site are presented in Table 1. They are derived from the simulation of Calvet (2000) for the Monitoring the Usable soil Reservoir Experimentally (MUREX) test site and from Gibelin et al. (2006). For herbaceous vegetation, ISBA-A-gs is able to simulate the above-ground biomass. However, it does not represent the other carbon reservoirs in the roots and in the soil. ISBA-CC was developed in order to have a more detailed representation of the carbon fluxes and of carbon storage (Gibelin et al., 2008). ISBA-CC and ISBA-A-gs share the same photosynthesis and leaf biomass growth sub-models. In ISBA-CC, the carbon allocation and respiration terms are more detailed, by considering six biomass reservoirs. Following Parton et al. (1987), a heterotrophic respiration module accounts for five soil organic matter pools. The autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration modelling is described in detail in Gibelin et al. (2008).

In this study, several simulations of ISBA-CC and ISBA-A-gs over the SMOSREX site are analysed for a seven year period (2001–2007).

2.1.2 Modelling the ecosystem respiration with ISBA-A-gs

In ISBA-A-gs, R_{eco} is modelled by a temperature-dependent relation, a well-known Q_{10} function, expressed by Eq. (1) (Rivalland et al., 2005).

$$R_{\text{eco}} = R_{e25} \times Q_{10}^{\left(\frac{T_2 - 25}{10}\right)} \quad (1)$$

where R_{e25} is the value of R_{eco} at 25°C, T_2 is root zone temperature and Q_{10} is set to 2. Joffre et al. (2003), proposed to account for the soil moisture effect by introducing a scaling factor, $f(w_g)$. The $f(w_g)$ term is expressed as the ratio of soil moisture to field

capacity (F_C):

$$f(w_g) = \frac{w_g}{F_C} \quad (2)$$

For values of w_g higher than F_C , $f(w_g)$ is forced to 1:

$$f(w_g) = \min_value\left(\frac{w_g}{F_C}, 1\right) \quad (3)$$

5 R_{eco} is now expressed as:

$$R_{eco} = Re_{25} \times f(w_g) \times Q_{10}^{\left(\frac{T_2-25}{10}\right)} \quad (4)$$

From the NEE values observed at SMOSREX, together with the observed surface soil moisture (w_g , 0–6 cm) and soil temperature (T_2 , 20 cm), it is possible to calibrate the Re_{25} parameter of the R_{eco} parameterization. The Re_{25} parameter, is best fitted by
10 minimising the root mean square error (RMSE) between R_{eco} estimates from Eq. (4) and nighttime NEE observations sorted according to wind direction (between 225 and 315 degrees), the absence of water deposition, and a sufficient turbulent exchange rate for the application of the method (friction velocity, u^* , greater than 0.16 ms^{-1}). It is necessary to verify that under these conditions, there is a sufficient variability of w_g
15 and T_2 . Figure 1 shows the probability density functions of NEE, w_g and T_2 , for pooled daytime and nighttime observations. The w_g values range from 0.05 to $0.50 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ and T_2 ranges from 276 to 300 K.

Also, Eq. (4) can be calibrated from ISBA-CC simulations of ecosystem respiration. Four different simulations were performed with ISBA-A-gs, one for each best-fit Re_{25}
20 parameter, corresponding to either observed or modelled R_{eco} and to either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4).

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2.2 The SMOSREX experimental site

Part of the SMOSREX experimental site is covered by a grassland of about $3.2 \times 10^4 \text{ m}^2$ (180 m \times 180 m), mown once a year at wintertime. In this study, half-hourly SMOSREX data are used, covering a 7-year period (2001–2007). At SMOSREX, all the atmospheric forcing variables required to run ISBA-A-gs or ISBA-CC are measured: atmospheric pressure, air humidity, air temperature, long-wave and short-wave incident radiation, rain rate, wind speed. Soil moisture is observed at ten depths, 0–6, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90 cm with an half hourly time step. From those measurements it is possible to estimate the root-zone soil moisture content $w_2 \text{ (m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}\text{)}$, integrated over the root-zone profile (0–95 cm). Temperatures are observed at different depth in the soil, 1, 5, 20, 50, 90 cm, and at 2 m above the ground. Also, surface temperature is measured using a Heitronics infrared thermometer. Surface shortwave reflectances are determined thanks to two CIMEL radiancemeters.

2.2.1 CO₂ flux measurements and GPP estimations

At the SMOSREX site, the CO₂ flux measurements are done through the eddy covariance micrometeorological method (Moncrieff et al., 1997; Aubinet et al., 2000). The wind speed components are measured at 3.5 m above the ground with an Ultrasonic 3-D anemometer (GILL Instruments, VEN100 Horizontal Research 1199 HS 50 GHz). Water vapour and carbon dioxide concentrations are measured with an IRGA (Infra Red Gas Analyser) analyser (Li-Cor, CHM200 75H-0477 20 GHz). Eddy covariance measurements of the CO₂ efflux are processes on a half-hourly basis and are available for the period from May 2005 to December 2007.

In order to ensure a sufficient fetch, the flux station was installed at the eastern edge of the grassland field, i.e. downstream of the dominant westerly winds. Therefore, the flux values are used for wind direction between 225 and 315°, only. Moreover, the flux station is exposed to an outdoor environment and the sensors may be affected by water deposition through rainfall or dew. Heusinkveld et al. (2008) showed that the presence

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



of dew on the optical windows of the IRGA analyser greatly decreases the data quality. Since the presence of liquid water on the surface is measured at SMOSREX (Wetness sensing grids 237, Campbell Scientific Ltd.), those lower quality observations can be removed. Water deposition affects about 39% of the flux measurements already filtered for wind direction. The distribution of the filtered CO₂ flux observations is presented in Fig. 1 (top).

From these measurements, R_{eco} could be estimated at nighttime under specific conditions. Indeed, the lack of turbulence may affect the observation of the NEE (Goulden et al., 1996). Under a friction velocity threshold, in calm and stable nighttime conditions, CO₂ storage may occur in the air layer below the eddy flux system. Hence, measurements under those conditions are not considered. In this study, this threshold is fixed to $u^* = 0.16 \text{ms}^{-1}$ for the whole considered period (2005–2007). From this nighttime database, it is possible to calibrate the parameterisation of the R_{eco} function of ISBA-A-gs. From the latter, an estimation of the observed half-hourly GPP can be obtained: first, R_{eco} is derived from Eq. (4), with the observed soil moisture and temperature values; second, R_{eco} is removed from the half-hourly NEE observations, in order to estimate the amount of CO₂ that is fixed by the plant through photosynthesis, i.e. the GPP.

2.2.2 Water and energy flux measurements

Net radiation (Rn) has been measured at SMOSREX since 2001 with an half hourly time step. Sensible heat (H) and latent heat (LE) fluxes have been measured since 2005, and for H, two methods are used. In addition to the eddy covariance method, sensible heat is measured by the aerodynamic method, also. The former is based on the device used for the MUREX experimental site (Calvet et al., 1999). As for NEE, LE and H fluxes derived from the eddy covariance method have to be filtered for wind direction and water deposition.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2.2.3 Surface reflectance measurements

Incoming solar radiation at several wavelengths and the upward luminance reflected by the surface at a 40° incidence angle are measured over the grassland thanks to two CIMEL radiancemeters. From those measurements, it is possible to determine the surface reflectance at five wavelengths, from the visible to the shortwave infrared (blue: 430–470 nm, green: 506.5–591.5 nm, red: 621.5–674.5 nm, near infrared: 792–883 nm and shortwave infrared: 1557.7–1722.5 nm). A method developed by Roujean and Lacaze (2002) permits the production of LAI, from the surface reflectances. Destructive observations of the vegetation characteristics (LAI, green and brown biomass) were performed from 2001 to 2006, also.

2.3 Comparison between observed and simulated variables

The modelled CO₂ fluxes are compared with two groups of observations: (1) sorted by wind direction (between 225 and 315 degrees) and sufficient turbulent exchange ($u^* > 0.16 \text{ ms}^{-1}$), (2) sorted by wind direction, sufficient turbulent exchange and the absence of water deposition. For each group of observations, model scores are calculated: squared correlation coefficient (r^2), the root mean square error (RMSE) and the bias (observed data minus modelled data). The RMSE is used to set the Re₂₅ parameter in Eqs. (1) and (4).

3 Results

3.1 Investigating NEE, R_{eco} and GPP

The Re₂₅ values of Eqs. (4) and (1) were set to $5.22 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and $3.63 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively, by minimising the RMSE between the ecosystem respiration derived from Eqs. (4) and (1) and the observed filtered values of CO₂ measure-

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



ments (see above). Another calibration of Eqs. (4) and (1) was done with R_{eco} modelled by ISBA-CC, and gave similar results: Re_{25} best-fit values of $5.00 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ for Eq. (4) and $3.18 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ for Eq. (1). The calibration results are summarised in Table 2.

Figure 2 presents monthly NEE simulations by ISBA-A-gs, based on R_{eco} calculations from either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4). Table 3 presents a comparison of the half-hourly NEE simulated by ISBA-A-gs with the two groups of observations described in Sect. 2.3.

– For the first group (unfiltered for water deposition), using either Eqs. (1) and (4) leads to rather poor scores: $r^2=0.43$ for both equations, $\text{RMSE}=4.45$ and $4.33 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, $\text{bias}=-2.46$ and $-2.21 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ for Eq. (1) and Eq. (4), respectively. Using Eq. (4) with Re_{25} calibrated from the ISBA-CC ecosystem respiration gives similar results: $r^2=0.44$, $\text{RMSE}=4.29 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and $\text{bias}=-2.10 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$.

– For the second group (filtered for water deposition), better scores are obtained: $r^2=0.58$ and 0.63 , $\text{RMSE}=4.13$ and $3.87 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, $\text{bias}=-2.61$ and $-2.18 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, for Eq. (1) and Eq. (4), respectively. Using Eq. (4) with Re_{25} calibrated from the ISBA-CC ecosystem respiration gives similar results, with $r^2=0.63$, $\text{RMSE}=3.81 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and $\text{bias}=-2.07 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$.

Despite the low bias values found when calibrating the ecosystem respiration parameter (see Table 2), the bias between the half-hourly NEE simulated by ISBA-A-gs and the observations is high. Indeed, the ecosystem respiration parameter is calibrated using nighttime data and Table 3 considers pooled daytime and nighttime data. On the basis of the results obtained with and without water deposition filtering, it can be argued that combining water deposition measurements with eddy covariance measurements is of interest. In the following, water-deposition free, turbulent condition and wind filtered data are only considered.

**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**

C. Albergel et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Seasonal statistical scores show that the impact of implementing $f(w_g)$ varies from one season to another. At springtime (March, April, May), 1551 NEE half hourly observations are available, including 1181 observations with $f(w_g)$ equal to 1 (about 76%). Consequently, the r^2 scores of NEE simulated with R_{eco} estimates from either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4) are similar: 0.79 and 0.81, respectively. In summer (June, July, August), $f(w_g)$ is rarely equal to 1 (27 times in 2608 observations, about 1%, only), and the r^2 scores of NEE simulated with R_{eco} estimates from either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4) are different: 0.41 and 0.56, respectively.

Figure 3 shows the impact of soil moisture on the simulated NEE, using either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4), for two days presenting contrasting soil moisture values, under clear sky conditions. In dry conditions (14 July 2004, with a $f(w_g)$ daily average of about 0.25), Eqs. (1) and (4) provide contrasting results and the NEE estimates using Eq. (4) are much closer to the observations. In wet conditions (25 October 2004, with a $f(w_g)$ daily average of about 0.94), there is less of a difference between the NEE estimates.

Finally, the temperature dependence of GPP was investigated using the observed infrared temperatures, from August 2003 to 2007. Figure 4 illustrates the evolution of the GPP modelled by ISBA-A-gs and the evolution of the GPP derived from the observations (see Sect. 2.2.1) as a function of the binned infrared temperature. The temperature classes correspond to 5% percentile bins, from 0 to 95%, and then above 99%). For both modelled and observed GPP, the median value is presented together with 6 percentiles (5, 10, 20, 80, 90, and 95%). An optimum temperature can be derived from peak GPP median values. For the modelled GPP, the peak median GPP is between classes 85 and 90% and corresponds to an average optimum temperature of about 24°C. The use of the air temperature instead of the infrared temperature leads to a lower optimum temperature, of about 20.5°C (not shown). On the other hand, the temperature response of the GPP derived from the observations is rather flat and it is difficult to identify an optimum temperature. The optimum median value of the observed GPP corresponds to average infrared and air temperatures of 14.8°C and 14.3°C, respectively. These results tend to indicate that the temperature response,

simulated by ISBA-A-gs for this grassland, is too strong and tends to overestimate the optimal temperature.

3.2 Investigating Rn, LE and H

The results are summarised in Table 4. The r^2 between the observed Rn and the simulated one is 0.98 with a bias of about -9.7 Wm^{-2} . Similar scores are found for ISBA-CC (0.97 and -9.0 Wm^{-2} , respectively).

Lower r^2 and bias values are obtained for LE: 0.65 and -2.0 Wm^{-2} for ISBA-A-gs, and 0.59 and -6.4 Wm^{-2} for ISBA-CC, respectively. The sensible heat flux is measured with both aerodynamic and eddy covariance methods. The eddy covariance observations correlate better with the simulations, with $r^2=0.78$ for both ISBA-A-gs and ISBA-CC. In both cases, the bias is greater than 10 Wm^{-2} . The aerodynamic method presents smaller r^2 values: 0.41 and 0.42 for ISBA-A-gs and ISBA-CC, respectively. Biases are high as well. Figure 5 presents the energy and water fluxes measured using the eddy covariance method and modelled with ISBA-A-gs, for one day (under clear sky conditions) for each month from April to September 2007. Although the same seasonal trends are observed, rather large differences occur in the partitioning of energy between H and LE.

3.3 A seven year modelling period with ISBA-A-gs

Figure 6 presents a seven-year (2001–2007) simulation performed by ISBA-A-gs for the SMOSREX grassland. The monthly R_{eco} , GPP and NEE accumulated fluxes are presented. The accumulated R_{eco} and GPP are presented for each year in Table 5. For ecosystem respiration, results for both Eqs. (1) and (4) are presented. Whereas Eq. (4) reduces R_{eco} at summertime when drought limits respiration, the yearly amount is higher than the one derived from Eq. (1). While a near equilibrium between R_{eco} and GPP is observed in 2001, GPP is systematically lower than R_{eco} for the other years (Table 5). In southwestern France, the 2001 annual cycle presented relatively standard

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



conditions in terms of climate, which may explain the near equilibrium between GPP and R_{eco} . In 2002, the summer was particularly wet and, after 2001, 2002 is the year presenting the highest modelled GPP. The greatest difference between R_{eco} and GPP occurred in 2003. In 2003, the spring and summer periods were anomalously dry in southwestern France and a reduction of primary production was observed, as throughout western Europe (Ciais et al., 2005).

The observed and simulated root zone soil moisture (w_2) and LAI are presented in Fig. 7. A good agreement between observed and modelled w_2 values is found: $r^2=0.91$, bias= $-0.004\text{m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$ and RMSE= $0.02\text{m}^3\text{m}^{-3}$.

The LAI estimates derived from reflectance measurements are in better agreement with the destructive observations than the modelled estimates: the comparison between observed and modelled LAI (bottom), presents relatively poor statistical scores ($r^2=0.36$, bias= $0.26\text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}$ and RMSE= $0.91\text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}$), whereas the LAI estimated from reflectance measurements correlates better with observed data ($r^2=0.55$, bias= $-0.31\text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}$ and RMSE= $0.88\text{m}^2\text{m}^{-2}$).

4 Discussion

4.1 Impact of soil moisture on R_{eco}

Accounting for the effect of soil moisture into the simple Q_{10} formulation for ecosystem respiration is required to represent the seasonality of R_{eco} . This is particularly important during periods of the year with high temperatures and a limitation by drought of the heterotrophic respiration. Figures 2 and 3 show the seasonal and daily impacts of the new formulation, respectively. In Fig. 2, as the spring and summer of 2005 and 2006 are marked by high temperatures and scarce precipitation, the SMOSREX grassland is a sink of carbon (negative values of NEE) in April–May, only. In 2007, the carbon sink is more pronounced and occurs from May to July. With Eq. (1), the net uptake of carbon starts earlier than with Eq. (4). This is due to the lower Re_{25} values used in

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**C. Albergel et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Eq. (1), inducing lower R_{eco} values when soil moisture is close to field capacity. Eq. (1) is temperature-dependent, only, and the simulated R_{eco} values are higher during the warm seasons (spring, summer, autumn) and lower at wintertime. The use of Eq. (4) produces lower R_{eco} values during the dry periods as it is also controlled by soil moisture. At summertime, the observed soil temperature at 20 cm may reach relatively high values (up to 24°C) and Eq. (1) gives high values of R_{eco} . Nevertheless, during these periods, the low water content available for plant growth and for the decomposition of the soil organic matter does not allow high values for R_{eco} , and this effect is accounted for by Eq. (4). In wet periods, where w_g is close to FC, the R_{eco} values given by Eq. (1) or Eq. (4) are similar. Finally, Table 3 shows that the calibration of Eq. (4) derived from either the modelled R_{eco} of ISBA-CC or from the observed nighttime observations, present similar statistical scores. The similarities between these scores shows that, for this grassland, ISBA-CC can be used to calibrate the ecosystem calibration of ISBA-A-gs.

4.2 GPP response to temperature

The Fig. 4 result on the temperature dependence of the GPP is consistent with a previous study performed by Brut et al. (2009), who showed that the current version of ISBA-A-gs tends to overestimate the optimal temperature for photosynthesis, in the case of mountainous grasslands of southwestern France. Those grasslands grow in cooler and wetter conditions than those observed at SMOSREX. The similar results found in this study for the SMOSREX plain grassland tend to show that this temperature issue might be common to C3 grasslands, irrespective of climate conditions. It must be noted that the temperature response shortcoming of the model may be due to the multispecific composition of a natural grassland. Indeed, the growing cycles of several herbaceous plants overlap, and the GPP temperature response may vary from one species to another.

4.3 Leaf onset simulations

Leaf onset differences are observed in Fig. 7, between the reflectance-derived and the modelled LAI: the growing period starts later in the simulations. Those results are consistent with the lower optimal temperature found with the observed GPP. The SMOSREX grassland starts growing at temperatures far below the optimal temperature used in ISBA-A-gs, inducing this temporal gap between observed and modelled LAI. In order to quantify the contribution of the uncertainty of the simulated LAI on the simulated carbon fluxes, the model was run without the interactive LAI option, i.e. forced by the LAI observations. The LAI estimated from reflectance measurements was prescribed to the model. This modification led to slightly better NEE scores as shown in Table 3 (see the results given for prescribed LAI). The r^2 increases from 0.63 to 0.66, and the RMSE decreases from 3.87 to $3.48 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. The improvement of the simulated NEE (even if it is small) observed, when the model is forced with LAI observations, shows that the use of such data in a Land Data Assimilation Systems (Sabater et al., 2008; Rüdiger et al., 2010) might contribute to improve NEE simulations.

4.4 Impact of uncertainties in the soil profile description

The relatively high RMSE found for LE, and the large bias found for H (Table 4) may be due to the simplified description of the soil hydrology used in the model (2 layers), and to the lack of description of the litter, which is particularly thick at this site. A more detailed description of the different layers of the soil, and of the effect of the litter on the water and heat exchanges might improve the simulations (Gonzalez-Sosa et al., 2001). Figure 8 (left) shows the observed w_g as a function of the modelled w_g at a daily time step, for the 2005–2007 period. The modelled surface soil moisture w_g correlates well with the observations. However, the modelled w_g is too low in wet conditions. In order to assess the impact of this error on the simulated R_{eco} , Fig. 8 presents monthly R_{eco} estimates calculated using Eq. (4) and the observed w_g and soil temperature (at 20 cm), as a function of the R_{eco} derived from the ISBA-A-gs simulations. It seems

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



that the uncertainty on the range of daily w_g is not too detrimental to the monthly R_{eco} simulations.

5 Conclusions

The implementation of a representation of the soil moisture effect in the ecosystem respiration formulation of ISBA-A-gs increased the correlation between observed and modelled NEE for a temperate grassland (the SMOSREX experimental site). Eddy covariance CO_2 flux measurements permitted to estimate the ecosystem respiration parameter (Re_{25}). This study also underlines the necessity of measuring water deposition at the surface (caused by dew, or rain) as it has a significant impact on the quality of eddy correlation observations.

It is shown that the Carbon Cycle version of the ISBA land surface model, ISBA-CC, can be used to estimate the Re_{25} parameter used in the simplified R_{eco} formulation of ISBA-A-gs. Thus, R_{eco} estimates from ISBA-CC could be used to generalise the simplified (and more tractable) Re_{25} parameterisation for other ecosystems and climates, where CO_2 flux measurements are not available.

At the SMOSREX site, GPP estimates can be derived from the observed NEE and from R_{eco} values obtained from soil temperature and soil moisture observations. It is found that the optimal temperature used in the model for photosynthesis is too high. Whereas the modelled GPP peaks at about $24^\circ C$, the observed GPP presents a weaker response to temperature and the highest values occur below $20^\circ C$. In the same way, the temporal shift between observed and modelled LAI tends to indicate that the optimal temperature used in SURFEX is too high. This is consistent with the analysis of ISBA-A-gs simulations for a mountainous grassland performed by Brut et al. (2009). Finally, a comparison between observed and modelled energy fluxes (R_n , LE and H) leads to satisfactory correlations despite a marked bias for H. Two methods to estimate H were compared (eddy covariance and aerodynamic methods). The eddy covariance method correlates much better with model simulations than the aero-

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



dynamic method.

Acknowledgement. The work of C. Albergel was supported by Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES) and Météo-France. S. Lafont was supported by the GEOLAND2 project, co-funded by the European Commission within the GMES initiative in FP7. The SMOSREX project was co-funded by the "Programme National de Télédétection Spatiale" and by the "Programme Terre Océan Surface Continentales et Atmosphère" (CNES), and by participants to the experiment: CESBIO (CNES, CNRS, IRD, UPS), CNRM/GAME (Météo-France, CNRS), INRA, and ONERA, all in the framework of the SMOS science preparatory program.



The publication of this article is financed by CNRS-INSU.

References

- Aubinet, M., Grelle, A., Ibrom, A., Rannik, Ü., Moncrieff, J., Foken, T., et al.: Estimates of the annual net carbon and water exchange of forests: the EUROFLUX methodology, *Adv. Ecol. Res.*, 30, 113–175, 2000.
- Baldocchi, D., Falge, E., Gu, L., Olson, R., Hollinger, D., Running, S., Anthoni, P., Bernhofer, C., Davis, K., Evans, R., Fuentes, J., Goldstein, A., Katul, G., Law, B., Lee, X., Malhi, Y., Meyers, T., Munger, W., Oechel, W., Paw, K. T., Pilegaard, K., Schmid, H. P., Valentini, R., Verma, S., Vesala, T., Wilson, K., and Wofsy, S.: FLUXNET: a new tool to study the temporal and spatial variability of ecosystem-scale carbon dioxide, water vapour, and energy flux densities, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 82, 2415–2434, 2000.
- Brut, A., Rüdiger, C., Lafont, S., Roujean, J.-L., Calvet, J.-C., Jarlan, L., Gibelin, A.-L., Albergel, C., Le Moigne, P., Soussana, J.-F., Klumpp, A., Guyon, D., Wigneron, J.-P., and Ceschia, E.: Modelling LAI at a regional scale with ISBA-A-gs: comparison with satellite-derived LAI over

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



southwestern France, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 1389–1404, 2009,
<http://www.biogeosciences.net/6/1389/2009/>.

Calvet, J.-C., Noilhan, J., Roujean, J.-L., Bessemoulin, P., Cabelguenne, M., Olios, A., and Wigneron, J.-P.: An interactive vegetation SVAT model tested against data from six contrasting sites, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 92, 73–95, 1998.

Calvet, J.-C., Bessemoulin, P., Noilhan, J., Berne, C., Braud, I., Courault, D., Fritz, N., Gonzalez-Sosa, E., Goutorbe, J.-P., Haverkamp, R., Jaubert, G., Kergoat, L., Lachaud, G., Laurent, J.-P., Mordelet, P., Olios, A., Péris, P., Roujean, J.-L., Thony, J.-L., Tosca, C., Vauclin, M., and Vignes, D.: MUREX: a land-surface field experiment to study the annual cycle of the energy and water budgets, *Ann. Geophys.*, 17, 838–854, 1999,
<http://www.ann-geophys.net/17/838/1999/>.

Calvet, J.-C.: Investigating soil and atmospheric plant water stress using physiological and micrometeorological data, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 103, 229–247, 2000.

Calvet, J.-C. and Soussana, J.-F.: Modelling CO₂-enrichment effects using an interactive vegetation SVAT scheme, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 108, 129–152, 2001.

Ciais P., Viovy, N., Reichstein, M., Ogée, J., Granier, A., Knohl, A., Rambal, S., Sanz, M.-J., Schulze, D., Chevallier, F., and Valentini, R.: An unprecedented reduction in primary productivity of Europe during the summer heatwave in 2003, *Nature*, 437, 529–533, doi:10.1038/nature.03972, 2005.

De Rosnay, P., Calvet, J.-C., Kerr, Y., Wigneron, J.-P., Lemaître, F., et al.: SMOSREX: A long term field campaign experiment for soil moisture and land surface processes remote sensing, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 102, 377–389, 2006.

Deardorff, J. W.: Efficient prediction of ground surface temperature and moisture with inclusion of a layer of vegetation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 83(C4), 1889–1903, 1978.

Epron, D., Farque, L., Lucot, E., and Badot, P.-M.: Soil CO₂ efflux in a beech forest: dependence on soil temperature and soil-water content, *Ann. For. Sci.*, 56, 221–226, 1999.

Gibelin, A.-L., Calvet, J.-C., Roujean, J.-L., Jarlan, L., and Los, S. O.: Ability of the land surface model ISBA-A-gs to simulate leaf area index at global scale: Comparison with satellites products, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D18102, doi:10.1029/2005JD006691, 2006.

Gibelin, A.-L., Calvet, J.-C., and Viovy, N.: Modelling energy and CO₂ fluxes with an interactive vegetation land surface model – evaluation at high and middle latitudes, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 148, 1611–1628, 2008.

Gonzalez-Sosa, E., Braud, I., Thony, J.-L., Vauclin, M., and Calvet, J.-C.: Heat and water

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**C. Albergel et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



exchanges of fallow land covered with plant-residue mulch layer: a modeling study using the three year MUREX data set, *J. Hydrol.*, 244, 119–136, 2001.

Goulden, M. L., Munger, J. W., Fan, S. M., Daube, B. C., and Wofsy, S. C.: Measurements of carbon sequestration by long term eddy covariance: methods and a critical evaluation of accuracy, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 2, 169–182, 1996.

Heusinkveld, B. G., Jacobs, A. F. G., and Holtslag, A. A. M.: Effect of open-path gas analyser wetness on eddy covariance flux measurements: a proposed solution, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 148, 1563–1573, 2008.

Holts, J. A., Hodgen, J., and Lamb, D.: Soil respiration in the seasonally dry tropics near Tawnsville, North Queensland, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 28, 737–745, 1990.

Janssens, I. A., Lankreijer, H., Matteucci, G., Kowalski, A. S., Buchmann, N., et al.: Productivity overshadows temperature in determining soil and ecosystem respiration across European forests, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 7(3), 269–278, 2001.

Joffre, R., Rambal, S., and Romane, F.: Local variations of ecosystem function in Mediterranean evergreen oak woodland, *Ann. For. Sci.*, 53, 561–570, 1996.

Katterer, T., Reichtein, M., Andr n, O., and Lomander, A.: Temperature dependence of organic matter decomposition: a critical review using literature data analysed with different models, *Biol. Fert. Soils*, 27, 258–262, 1998.

Kicklighter, D. W., Melillo, J. M., Peterjohn, W. T., Rastetter, E. B., McGuire, D. A., Steudler P. A., and Aber, J. D.: Aspects of spatial and temporal aggregation in estimating regional carbon dioxide fluxes from temperate forest soil, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 1305–1315, 1994.

Kirschbaum, M. U. F.: The temperature dependence of soil organic matter decomposition, and the effect of global warming on soil organic C storage, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 27, 753–760, 1995.

Le Moigne, P.: SURFEX scientific documentation. Note de centre du Groupe de M t orologie   Moyenne Echelle, 87, M t o-France, CNRM, Toulouse, France, 211 pp., online available at: <http://www.cnrm.meteo.fr/surfex/>, (last access: January 2010) 2009.

Lloyd, J. and Taylor, J. A.: On the temperature dependence of soil respiration, *Funct. Ecol.*, 8, 315–323, 1994.

Martin, E., Le Moigne, P., Masson, V., Boone, A., Bogatchev, A., et al.: Le code de surface externalis  SurfEx de M t o-France, Atelier de mod lisation de l'atmosph re, Toulouse (16–18 January 2007), 2007.

Mahfouf, J.-F. and Noilhan, J.: Inclusion of gravitational drainage in a land surface scheme

- based on the force-restored method, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 35, 987–992, 1996.
- Moncrieff, J., Valentini, R., Greco, S., Seufert, G., and Ciccioli, P.: Trace gas exchange over terrestrial ecosystems: method and perspectives in micrometeorology, *J. Exp. Bot.*, 48, 1133–1142, 1997.
- 5 Noilhan, J. and Planton, S.: A simple parameterisation of land surface processes for meteorological model, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 117, 356–549, 1989.
- Noilhan, J. and Mahfouf, J.-F.: The ISBA land surface parameterisation scheme, *Global Planet. Change*, 13, 145–149, 1996.
- Parton, W. J., Schimel, D. S., Cole, C. V., and Ojima, D. S.: Analysis of factors controlling soil organic matter levels in Great Plains grasslands, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 51, 1173–1179, 1987.
- 10 Perrin, D., Laitat, E., Yernaux, M., and Aubinet, M.: Modélisation de la réponse des flux de respiration d'un sol forestier selon les principales variables climatiques, *Biotechnol. Agron. Soc.*, 8(1), 15–25, 2004.
- Raich, J. W., Potter, C. S., and Bhagawati, D.: Interannual variability in global soil respiration, 1984-14, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 8, 800–812, 2002.
- 15 Rivalland, V., Calvet, J.-Ch., Berbigier, P., Brunet, Y., and Granier, A.: Transpiration and CO₂ fluxes of a pine forest: modelling the undergrowth effect, *Ann. Geophys.*, 23, 291–304, 2005, <http://www.ann-geophys.net/23/291/2005/>.
- Rüdiger, C., Albergel, C., Mahfouf, J.-F., Calvet, J.-C., and Walker, J. P.: Evaluation of Jacobians for leaf area index data assimilation with an extended kalman filter, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, doi:10.1029/2009JD012912, in press, 2010.
- 20 Sabater, J. M., Rüdiger, C., Calvet, J.-C., Fritz, N., Jarlan, L., and Kerr, Y.: Joint assimilation of surface soil moisture and LAI observations into land surface model, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 148, 1362–1373, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2008.04.003, 2008.
- 25 Schlesinger, W. H. and Andrews, J. A.: Soil respiration and the global carbon cycle, *Biogeochemistry*, 48, 7–20, 2000.
- Singh, J. S. and Gupta, S. R.: Plant decomposition and soil respiration in terrestrial ecosystem, *Bot. Rev.*, 43, 449–528, 1977.

BGD

7, 429–462, 2010

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Table 1. Main soil and vegetation parameters used for the SMOSREX grassland in the ISBA-A-gs model.

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Value
Soil parameters			
Soil depth	d_2	m	0.95
Sand content	SAND	%	32.0
Clay content	CLAY	%	22.8
Field capacity	w_{fc}	$m^3 m^{-3}$	0.30
Wilting point	w_{wilt}	$m^3 m^{-3}$	0.17
Vegetation parameters			
Mesophyll conductance in well-watered condition	g_m^*	$mm s^{-1}$	1
Critical extractable soil moisture content	θ_c	Dimensionless	0.3
Soil moisture stress response strategy	–	–	Drought-tolerant
Maximum leaf span time	τ_M	Days	150
Minimum leaf area index	LAI_{min}	$m^2 m^{-2}$	0.3
Cuticular conductance	g_c	$mm s^{-1}$	0.25
SLA (specific leaf area) sensitivity to N_L (leaf nitrogen concentration)	e	$m^2 kg^{-1}$	5.56
SLA at $N_L=0$	f	$m^2 kg^{-1}$	6.73
Ecosystem respiration at 25 degree	Re_{25}	$\mu mol m^2 s^{-1}$	Calibrated from observed/modelled data
Leaf nitrogen concentration	N_L	% of dry mass	1.3

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Table 2. Calibration of Re_{25} from (left) nighttime observations of NEE (i.e. ecosystem respiration), filtered by wind direction, u^* above 0.16 ms^{-1} , and the absence of water deposition and (right) using the ecosystem respiration simulated by the ISBA-CC model. The calibration is performed by minimising the RMSE between either Eq. (4) or Eq. (1) and the observations or the ISBA-CC simulations.

R_{eco} parameter- isation	Calibrated from observations			Calibrated from ISBA-CC simulations		
	RMSE ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Bias ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Re_{25} ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	RMSE ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Bias ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Re_{25} ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)
Eq. (4)	1.36	0.13	5.22	0.71	-0.05	5.00
Eq. (1)	1.63	-0.07	3.63	0.86	-0.17	3.18

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Table 3. Comparison between observed and modelled (ISBA-A-gs) NEE using either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4). The modelled NEE is compared with NEE observations, with and without filtering for water deposition.

Parameterization used for R_{eco} in ISBA-A-gs	Reference used for the calibration of Re_{25}	Observed pooled daytime and nighttime CO_2 flux filtered for wind direction, and $u^* > 0.16 \text{ ms}^{-1}$			Observed pooled daytime and nighttime CO_2 flux filtered for wind direction, $u^* > 0.16 \text{ ms}^{-1}$, and the absence of water deposition		
		r^2	RMSE ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Bias ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	r^2	RMSE ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Bias ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)
Eq. (1) $Re_{25}=3.63$ ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Nighttime NEE observations	0.43	4.45	-2.46	0.58	4.13	-2.61
Eq. (4) $Re_{25}=5.22$ ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	Nighttime NEE observations	0.43	4.33	-2.21	0.63	3.87	-2.18
Eq. (4) $Re_{25}=5.22$ ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) +prescribed LAI	Nighttime NEE observations	0.47	4.10	-2.04	0.66	3.48	-1.92
Eq. (4) $Re_{25}=5.00$ ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$)	ISBA-CC model	0.44	4.29	-2.10	0.63	3.81	-2.07

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production

C. Albergel et al.

Table 4. ISBA-A-gs and ISBA-CC scores for water and energy fluxes: net radiation (Rn), latent heat (LE), and sensible heat (H). For H, eddy covariance and aerodynamic measurements are available. The observations are filtered for wind direction, $u^* > 0.16 \text{ms}^{-1}$, and the absence of water deposition.

	r^2	ISBA-A-gs		r^2	ISBA-CC	
		Bias (W m^{-2})	RMSE (W m^{-2})		Bias (W m^{-2})	RMSE (W m^{-2})
Rn	0.98	−9.7	27.6	0.97	−9.0	28.5
LE eddy covariance	0.65	−2.0	104.6	0.59	−6.4	106.0
H eddy covariance	0.78	10.9	46.5	0.78	15.5	47.6
H aerodynamic	0.41	8.3	58.9	0.42	10.8	60.6

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**

C. Albergel et al.

Table 5. Carbon budget of the SMOSREX grassland derived from the ISBA-A-gs simulations from 2001 to 2007: Yearly amounts of ecosystem respiration (R_{eco}) and gross primary production (GPP).

	R_{eco} (yearly amount g C m^{-2})		GPP (yearly amount g C m^{-2})
	Eq. (4)	Eq. (1)	
2001	731	717	750
2002	753	698	575
2003	761	869	392
2004	743	757	549
2005	712	769	435
2006	744	830	437
2007	697	731	505

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 1. Variability of the net CO₂ flux, w_g and T_2 for wind direction between 225 and 315 degrees, sufficient turbulent exchange ($u^* > 0.16 \text{ ms}^{-1}$), and in the absence of water deposition, for pooled daytime and nighttime data.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 2. Monthly NEE (sum of the net CO₂ flux) simulated by ISBA-A-gs using R_{eco} calculated from either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4) (dashed and solid line, respectively).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 3. Comparison of NEE simulations of ISBA-A-gs based on R_{eco} calculated from either Eq. (1) or Eq. (4) (+ and triangles, respectively), with NEE observations (dots), for two days presenting contrasting soil moisture conditions: (left) 14 July 2004, (right) 25 October 2004.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion






Fig. 4. Response of (top) the simulated GPP and of (bottom) the estimated GPP, to the observed surface infrared-derived temperature. The median difference (dots) is presented together with percentile values. Line: 5–95% percentile, closed box (bottom) 10–20% percentile, closed box (top) 80–90% percentile. GPP statistics are given for 21 temperature classes (T_c) corresponding to 5% percentile intervals.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 5. Observed (top) and simulated (bottom) energy fluxes for 6 daily cycles in April, May, June, July, August, September 2007: Rn (dots), H (thick), LE (fine line).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production**

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 6. A seven-year (2001–2007) simulation by ISBA-A-gs of monthly values of (from top to bottom): R_{eco} , GPP, and NEE.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem
respiration and gross
primary production

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 7. Root-zone soil moisture (w_2), and leaf area index (LAI) of the SMOSREX grassland for a seven year (2001–2007) period, simulated by ISBA-A-gs (black solid lines) and observed (blue dots for soil moisture, green diamonds for LAI estimates derived from destructive measurements, red dots for LAI estimates derived from surface reflectance measurements).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Ecosystem respiration and gross primary production

C. Albergel et al.




Fig. 8. Surface soil moisture and ecosystem respiration (w_g and R_{eco}): observations vs. the ISBA-A-gs simulations for a 3-year period (2005–2007). For w_g (left) daily average values are considered. For R_{eco} (right) monthly accumulated values are considered, based on Eq. (4) used in the ISBA-A-gs model or on Eq. (4) with observed w_g and soil temperature values.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

