

Is Fig 3 ≈ Fig A2



"control" is confusing. Just call it what it is RCP 2.6 scenario.

## Earth system feedbacks following large-scale tropical forest restoration

Alexander Koch<sup>a,c</sup>, Chris Brierley<sup>a</sup>, and Simon L. Lewis<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Geography, University College London, Gower Street, WC1E 6BT London, UK

<sup>b</sup>School of Geography, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT Leeds, UK

<sup>c</sup>now at Department of Earth Sciences, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, HKSAR

**Correspondence:** Alexander Koch (akoch@hku.hk)

**Abstract.** To achieve the Paris Agreement requires aggressive mitigation strategies alongside negative emission technologies. Recent studies suggest that increasing tree cover can make a substantial contribution to negative emissions, with the tropics being the most suitable region from a biogeophysical perspective. Yet these studies typically do not account for subsequent carbon cycle and climate feedback processes of large-scale land use change. Here we quantify the maximum potential temperature and CO<sub>2</sub> benefits from pantropical forest restoration, including earth system feedbacks, using a fully-coupled, emission-driven Earth System Model (HadGEM2-ES). We perform an idealised experiment where all land use in the tropics is stopped and vegetation is allowed to recover, on top of an aggressive mitigation scenario (RCP 2.6). We find that tropical restoration of 1529 Mha increases carbon stored in live biomass by 130 Pg C by 2100 CE. Whilst avoiding deforestation and tropical restoration in the tropics removes 42 Pg C compared to RCP 2.6, feedback processes mean that carbon in the atmosphere only reduces by 18 Pg C by 2100. The resulting, small CO<sub>2</sub> (9 ppm) benefit does not translate to a detectable reduction in global surface air temperature compared to the control experiment. The greatest carbon benefit is achieved 30–50 years after restoration before the Earth System response adjusts to the new land-use regime and declining fossil fuel use. We identify three model-independent key points: (i) the carbon benefit of restoration is CO<sub>2</sub>-scenario dependent, (ii) in a world that follows Paris Agreement emission cuts restoration is best deployed immediately, and (iii) the ocean carbon feedbacks will reduce the efficacy of negative emissions technologies. We conclude that forest restoration can reduce peak CO<sub>2</sub> mid-century, but can only ~~be a~~ modest contribution to negative emissions.

9

→ unclear

Afforestation ✓  
Reforestation ✓  
Restoration ?

### 1 Introduction

Only a limited quantity of additional carbon can be added to the atmosphere before temperatures exceed the threshold of 2°C above the pre-industrial levels specified in the Paris Agreement on Climate Change (Allen et al., 2009; United Nations Treaty Collection, 2016). The most comprehensive assessment gives a remaining budget of 318 Pg C for a 67% chance to remain within 2°C, albeit excluding some Earth System feedbacks such as permafrost thawing (Rogelj et al., 2018). ~~They~~



atmos. CO<sub>2</sub>

To stay within 2°C, net-zero emissions need to be achieved ~~within this carbon budget~~, or if overshoot, ~~reduced by~~ negative emissions thereafter. Increasing the land carbon sink via natural climate solutions, such as forest restoration, particularly in the tropics, ~~are~~ <sup>will be needed</sup> often seen as a low-cost alternative to carbon capture and storage technologies, or at least as a bridge until these technological negative emissions can be achieved (Griscom et al., 2017; Busch et al., 2019). However, there is much uncertainty and controversy over the role of large-scale forest restoration in sequestering carbon, often because the carbon cycle and energy balance responses of the Earth System to widespread land-use change are not considered (Bastin et al., 2019; Friedlingstein et al., 2019a; Lewis et al., 2019b,a; Veldman et al., 2019).

rewood

The impact of an increased land carbon sink on atmospheric carbon is mediated by its response to temperature changes and the global carbon cycle feedback via ocean carbon uptake and CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation impacts (e.g. Joos et al., 1999). Hence, the efficiency of proposed natural climate solutions such as tropical forest restoration should be considered in an Earth System context. The tropics are generally considered most suitable for large-scale forest restoration due to their high above ground biomass (AGB) potential and biogeophysical response to increased tree cover, via enhanced evaporative cooling and limited albedo changes (Claussen et al., 2001; Arora and Montenegro, 2011). The potential carbon and temperature benefit of increasing tropical tree cover has been explored using various approaches that do not include the feedbacks <sup>between the</sup> of a changing climate and CO<sub>2</sub> <sup>C cycle</sup> (Houghton et al., 2015; Houghton and Nassikas, 2018; Bastin et al., 2019; Busch et al., 2019), alongside being modeled in pre-industrial CO<sub>2</sub> conditions (Bathiany et al., 2010) and high-CO<sub>2</sub> conditions with Earth System Models (Arora and Montenegro, 2011). However, no model experiment has been conducted that includes large scale tropical forest restoration, interactive land use emissions, and Earth System feedbacks in a scenario that would limit warming to 2°C. This is an important omission from the literature because large scale restoration is most likely to occur as part of a set of measures designed to meet commitments in the Paris Agreement.

make it a separate sentence

Here we explore the potential climate benefits of pan-tropical natural restoration until the end of the century in an Earth System Model (HadGEM2-ES) under an aggressive mitigation scenario (RCP 2.6) that limits warming to below 2°C. This scenario sees a rapid and sustained <sup>reduction</sup> removal of fossil fuel emissions, in part through replacement by an expansion of bioenergy crops. Based on an emission-driven RCP 2.6 control simulation (*control*) with dynamic vegetation (Jones et al., 2013) we performed a simulation where all anthropogenic land use in the tropics (19.375°S–23.125°N) is stopped after two years and set to zero thereafter (2008–2100 CE). We call this experiment, where natural vegetation is then allowed to regrow, the restoration simulation (*restore*).

### 1.1 HadGEM2-ES

contributed results to

after 2 years of WHAT?

The Earth System Model used here, HadGEM2-ES, (Collins et al., 2011) ~~featured in~~ the last IPCC report (AR5, IPCC, 2013) and was part of phase 5 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5, Jones et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2007). HadGEM2-ES includes a land and ocean carbon cycle, optionally with interactive land use emissions, as well as a land surface scheme (MOSES II) with a dynamic global vegetation model (TRIFFID). The atmosphere and land components have a resolution of 1.25° latitude and 1.875° longitude with a vertical atmosphere resolution of 38 layers up to 39 km in altitude.



If  $E_{DEFOR}$  is deforested biomass flux then it can't be used in eqn (1) since the actual flux comes from decomposition of wood product pools.

The ocean component has a horizontal grid of varying resolution, increasing from around  $1^\circ$  in the extratropics to  $1/3^\circ$  at the equator, and a vertical resolution of 40 unevenly spaced layers that increase towards the sea surface.

### 1.1.1 Met Office Surface Exchange Scheme version 2 (MOSES II)

The land surface scheme in HadGEM2-ES is the Met Office Surface Exchange Scheme (MOSES II, Essery et al., 2001), which simulates the fluxes of carbon as well as biogeophysical <sup>processes</sup> parameters associated with the land surface. MOSES II employs a tiling approach that differentiates between nine different surface types: urban, water, ice, bare soil, and the five plant functional types (PFTs):  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  grasses, shrubs, broadleaf and needleleaf tree. There is no explicit crop surface type in the land surface scheme, meaning crops, and pastures, are <sup>represented</sup> allocated as  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  grasses depending on environmental conditions. Agricultural activity is represented by a disturbance mask, where shrubs and trees are removed and prevented from growing. The resulting bare soil is allocated to crops, i.e.  $C_3$  or  $C_4$  grasses (Collins et al., 2011). Harvesting cycles and consequences of intensive agriculture such as nutrient depletion and fertilizer input are not considered in the model. This means abandoned agricultural land is of the same "quality" as natural grassland and succession is not impacted by previous land use activities (e.g. soil nutrient depletion). After the cessation of agricultural activity, shrubs and trees regrow depending on the <sup>local climate</sup> climatological suitability of the region for each PFT and inter-PFT competition. Arrested succession (e.g. from plant diseases, fires, invasive species) is not considered in the model. <sup>Land use change?</sup>

Land use emissions are calculated interactively in the model following the land use dynamics specified in RCP 2.6. Both simulations have continued land use outside the tropics. Only emissions from the removal of woody PFTs (i.e. deforestation) are considered as a separate land use flux ( $E_{DEFOR}$ ). <sup>Deforested</sup> ~~Thereby cut-down~~ woody vegetation <sup>↑ biomass</sup> is allocated to wood product pools ~~via~~ ( $F_{WP}$ ) with a fixed turnover of 1, 10, and 100 years, with the fraction allocated to each pool depending on the woody PFT type (Jones et al., 2011). The carbon flux from the regrowth from abandoned areas, as well as the annual growth cycle of grasses/crops within <sup>regions</sup> ~~the~~ agriculture ~~mask~~, are included in the natural land carbon fluxes ( $F_{LA}$ , Jones et al., 2011; Liddicoat et al., 2013). This means  $E_{DEFOR}$  is not directly comparable with land use emissions from, for example the Global Carbon Budget (Le Quéré et al., 2018). The land-to-atmosphere flux ( $F_{LA}$ ), as the difference between carbon uptake through NPP and the release of carbon into the atmosphere through  $R_h$ , excludes anthropogenic emissions but includes carbon uptake from regrowing vegetation following the cessation of anthropogenic disturbance. <sup>Choose another word.</sup> <sup>Somewhat confusing</sup> ~~but not~~  $E_{DEFOR}$ . Correct?

### 1.2 RCP 2.6

The IPCC AR5-scenario that comes closest to a  $2^\circ\text{C}$  world is the Representative Concentration Pathway 2.6-3PD (Peak-Divide, for simplicity RCP 2.6, van Vuuren et al., 2011). In this scenario atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations achieve a peak radiative forcing of  $3.0 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  by 2050 CE and decline to  $2.6 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  by the end of the century. This corresponds to a warming of just under  $2^\circ\text{C}$  in HadGEM2-ES, (CMIP5 mean:  $2^\circ\text{C}$ , Jones et al., 2013). To achieve this in RCP 2.6,  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions need to decrease rapidly from 2020 CE onwards through a combination of measures, including bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) (Smith et al., 2016; van Vuuren et al., 2011). ~~The~~ <sup>F</sup> emissions from fossil fuels are projected to peak by 2020 and turn negative by the end of the century (Liddicoat et al., 2013; van Vuuren et al., 2011). Peak net carbon emissions from

↓  
in this scenario



"land use area" is very vague term



LULCC in RCP 2.6 are small ( $< 2 \text{ Pg C year}^{-1}$ ) compared to fossil fuel emissions ( $9.2 \text{ Pg C year}^{-1}$ ). With the widespread implementation of BECCS tropical land use area is expected to increase by 286 million ha (Mha) by 2100 in RCP2.6 (van Vuuren et al., 2011). New bioenergy crops are primarily allocated near existing land use areas (Hurt et al., 2011; van Vuuren et al., 2011).

This simulation uses carbon emissions from the fossil fuel industry and land use to interactively calculate atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  rather than prescribing  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations (i.e. it is "emission driven"). The fossil fuel emissions were computed by a RCP 2.6 concentration driven HadGEM2-ES simulation (Liddicoat et al., 2013).

$$E_{FF} + E_{DEFOR} = G_{ATM} + F_{OA} + F_{LA}$$

Introduce this eqn. properly and explain its terms (1)

All forcing data, except the scenario related fossil fuel and land use/disturbance mask have been implemented in HadGEM2-ES as described in (Jones et al., 2011). The urban (20 Mha), inland water (330 Mha) and the ice fraction (163 Mha) remain constant throughout both simulations. In addition to the land carbon fluxes  $E_{DEFOR}$  and  $F_{LA}$ , the carbon cycle in HadGEM2-ES includes the flux from ocean to atmosphere ( $F_{OA}$ ), fossil fuel emission ( $E_{FF}$ ) and the atmospheric growth rate of carbon ( $G_{ATM}$ ) (Equation 1).

### 1.3 Biomass scaling

A doubling in biomass would be caused by either an increase in NPP and no change in litter flux, or no change in NPP and a decline in litter flux, causing no change in soil carbon and  $R_h$ , meaning the ratio between NPP and  $R_h$  increases, leading to an increase in tropical  $F_{LA}$  also by a factor of two (83.6 Pg C). Scaling this by the ratio between  $F_{LA}$  (tropics) and  $F_{LA}$  (global) (Table 1) gives the global  $F_{LA}$  from doubling tropical biomass (46.8 Pg C). Scaling by the ratio between  $F_{OA}$  and  $F_{LA}$  (Table 2) results in a cumulative net flux to the atmosphere of 30 Pg C, equal to 15 (14.2–16) ppm  $\text{CO}_2$  (based on  $2.00 \pm 0.12 \text{ Pg C} = 1 \text{ ppm CO}_2$  in HadGEM2-ES). This estimate assumes a linear carbon cycle response to increasing biomass and excludes any climate-carbon cycle feedbacks.

## 2 Results

### 2.1 Restoration impacts on land cover 2006–2100 CE

In the control simulation (*control*), broadleaf forest declined globally by 107 Mha from 2006–2100 CE and by 213 Mha in the tropics. In the restoration simulation (*restore*), ending human land use led to an increase in broadleaf forest of 671 Mha globally, and 572 Mha in the tropics (Fig. 1A). Unsurprisingly, the largest differences between *control* and *restore* in all five plant functional types (PFTs) used in the model (Cox, 2001) are located in the tropics (Table A1). Anthropogenic disturbance increases in *control* over the 94 years, as do  $\text{C}_3$  grasses (and crops) and to a smaller extent shrubs, while tree PFTs and  $\text{C}_4$  grasses decline. By contrast, in *restore* anthropogenic disturbance of 1529 Mha in the tropics abruptly ends, with shrubs

acronym not defined so far  
say it explicitly what this means.  
Do u mean forests are replaced by bioenergy crops?

presented here  
use of

the standard  
why didn't u use RCP 2.6 emissions

I'm completely  
LOST. What's the context.

why r u talking about biomass doubly out of the blue


WHY?

First show the original land use in the RCP 2.6 scenario. Does crop area increase in this scenario?

due to WHAT?

what does this means?  
Does this area doesn't get deforested

Is this fire or LUC?  
or both



**Figure 1.** (A) Change in land cover 2006–2100 CE in control (left) and restoration (right) simulation. Urban (0.1%), inland water (1.9%), and ice fraction (9.7%) are constant and not included. Anthropogenic disturbance is added on top of other land cover types, replacing woody PFTs with bare soil and preventing woody PFTs from replacing grassy PFTs (see Methods 1.1.1). (B) Spatial difference in land cover in the restoration simulation relative to the control simulation over the 2090s.

respond rapidly in the first decade after the cessation of land use at the expense of C<sub>3</sub> grasses (and crops), followed by a long-term increase in broadleaf trees. The successional cycle after the cessation of anthropogenic disturbance is characterised by an increase in shrub PFTs within seven years, before slowly declining again towards the end of the century, making way for tree PFTs.

The spatial pattern of land cover change shows that the largest change, 786 Mha, is new broadleaf trees, mostly located on the edges of the Amazon and Congo basins, and the periphery of the SE Asian and Australasian tropics where broadleaf trees more than doubled by the 2090s (Fig. 1B). The only region in the tropics with substantially fewer broadleaf trees in restore is located at the Brazilian Atlantic coast, likely due to simulated warmer and dryer conditions. Most of the smaller 10 Mha

*Is this global change in the area of BDL trees over 2008 - 2100?*

*How about ST plots over 2008 - 2100 period 5 to confirm this?*



land use change vs. land cover change  
They are not the same.

https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-432  
Preprint. Discussion started: 30 November 2020  
© Author(s) 2020. CC BY 4.0 License.

Biogeosciences  
Discussions



NPP is usually reported in  $gC/m^2 \cdot year$ .  
You've reported its cumulative value and that too multiplied by area. Very hard to follow.

**Table 1.** Cumulative terrestrial carbon fluxes for NPP, litterfall ( $F_{SC}$ ), flux to the wood product pools ( $F_{WP}$ ), soil respiration ( $R_h$ ), net change in living biomass ( $NPP - F_{SC} - F_{WP}$ ), net change soil carbon ( $F_{SC} - R_h$ ) and the net land to atmosphere carbon flux ( $F_{LA}$ ) over the period 2006–2100 CE in the control and restoration simulation, as well as their difference. Global, tropical, and extratropical fluxes are presented. Negative  $F_{LA}$  indicates a net terrestrial sink. Values may not completely add up due to rounding.

Use million km<sup>2</sup> or km<sup>2</sup>

	Global			Tropics			Extratropics		
	Control (Pg C)	Restoration (Pg C)	Difference (Pg C)	Control (Pg C)	Restoration (Pg C)	Difference (Pg C)	Control (Pg C)	Restoration (Pg C)	Difference (Pg C)
NPP	7855.0	7070.9	-784.1	3969.1	3275.6	-693.5	3885.9	3795.2	-90.7
$F_{SC}$	7853.6	6949.6	-904.0	3987.7	3169.9	-817.8	3865.9	3779.7	-86.2
$F_{WP}$	14.4	4.3	-10.1	10.2	0.2	-10.0	4.1	4.1	0.0
$R_h$	7711.7	6904.2	-807.5	3959.9	3224.7	-763.0	3751.8	3679.5	-72.3
$\Delta$ Biomass	-13.0	117.0	130.0	-28.9	105.5	134.4	15.9	11.5	-4.4
$\Delta$ Soil carbon	141.9	45.4	-96.5	27.8	-54.8	-82.6	114.1	100.1	-14.0
$F_{LA}$	-143.3	-166.7	-23.4	-9.2	-51.0	-41.8	-134.2	-115.7	18.5

But LUC is externally specified, isn't it? Oh! You mean due to change in climate?  
increase in needleleaf trees in the tropics is located around the edges of the Amazon and Congo basin in *restore*. Shrubs also substantially increased in the tropics by 409 Mha in *restore* compared to *control* (Table A1). These increases in tree and shrub cover in *restore* compared to *control* in the tropics, were at the expense of  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  grasses (including crops).

130 Abruptly stopping anthropogenic land use in the tropics led to vegetation changes outside the tropics. Broadleaf trees declined, by 8 Mha, mostly in the high latitudes of North America and East Asia, being replaced by needleleaf trees. Shrubs declined in total, particularly along the eastern edge of the Arabian peninsula.  $C_3$  grasses declined overall, with a complex spatial pattern: increases in Australia, southern Africa, and central Asia, but almost 100% decreases in western Asia and the mid-western U.S.  $C_4$  vegetation increases in Australia and the mid-western U.S., leading to a net increase in  $C_4$  grasses in the extratropics. Overall, tropical land use change altered patterns of vegetation cover globally by 2100 CE.


135 The final land use change is deforestation. Overall global deforestation emissions,  $E_{DEFOR}$ , correspond to the episodes of land use expansion in RCP 2.6, with deforestation halted in the tropics only in *restore*. The pattern is reflecting waves of deforestation until 2035 CE, after which emissions decline rapidly and remain low for the rest of the century (Fig. 2). In *control*, these deforestation emissions are largest in the tropics, particularly the Amazon, central Africa, and south-east Asia (Fig. A1). In *restore*, tropical deforestation is halted, but extratropical deforestation occurs at a modest level until 2035 CE  
140 under RCP 2.6. Overall, global cumulative  $E_{DEFOR}$  are 16.1 Pg C (*control*) and 6.5 Pg C (*restore*), resulting in an emission reduction of 9.6 Pg C from halting deforestation alone.

## 2.2 Land carbon response to tropical restoration

The terrestrial carbon cycle responds to the tropical land cover change with an increase in net carbon uptake, driven by an increase in biomass in the tropics. Overall, there is a decline in net primary productivity (NPP), but there is also a stronger decline in litterfall (flux of dead plant matter) into the soil. The flux of carbon into the atmosphere from soil respiration is

WHY?

In RESTORE simulation - is future LUC stopped in addition to making additional deforested area available for tree growth.



**Figure 2.** Modelled carbon emissions and fluxes 2006–2100 CE for the control run (blues) and restoration simulation (oranges). (A) Deforestation emissions ( $E_{DEFOR}$ ), dark colours are global emissions, light colours are the tropics and dashed lines are emissions outside the tropics. (B) Prescribed fossil fuel emissions ( $E_{FF}$ ) following RCP 2.6 (Liddicoat et al., 2013). (C) Global land-to-atmosphere flux ( $F_{LA}$ ); (D) Global ocean-to-atmosphere flux ( $F_{OA}$ ). Negative values represent a carbon sink. Note the different vertical scales.

smaller than the uptake through NPP, thereby creating a net carbon sink (Table 1). NPP declines globally at first due to the change from grassy vegetation and crops to trees in *restore*, and secondly due to the lower atmospheric  $CO_2$  concentrations in *restore* relative to *control*. The subsequent decline in dead plant matter leads to lower soil carbon stocks in *restore* compared to *control*, which ultimately leads to lower soil respiration (Table 1).

150 The flux of carbon from the atmosphere into the living biomass carbon pool is modulated by the NPP of the different vegetation types. The global trend, variability, and the differences in both simulations are driven by tropical NPP, although extratropical NPP also declines after ~40 years (Fig. A2A). Taken together this results in lower cumulative global NPP at the end of *restore* compared to *control* (Table 1). The main reasons for the greater NPP decline in *restore* is that grassy vegetation has a two to three times greater NPP per unit area than tree PFTs in HadGEM2-ES (Table A2), and a lower  $CO_2$  fertilisation


155 from lower atmospheric  $CO_2$  in the second half of the century.

The carbon flux of dead plant matter into the soil carbon pool ( $F_{SC}$ ) is determined by a temperature and PFT-specific turnover rate, as well as the areal extent and biomass of each PFT. Trends in  $F_{SC}$  have a similar spatial and temporal pattern to NPP (Fig. 3B; Table 1). In *control*, global  $F_{SC}$  increases before it slowly declines from 2040 CE onward. In *restore*,  $F_{SC}$  initially drops,

in the RESTORE vs CONTROL case → Show this in a figure

Good. This explains some of the WHY?





**Figure 3.** Time series of (A) global net primary production (NPP), (B) global carbon flux into the soil ( $F_{SC}$ ), (C) global carbon flux into the wood product pools ( $F_{WP}$ ), (D) global annual change in above ground biomass ( $\Delta$ Biomass), (E) global soil respiration ( $R_h$ ), and (G) global annual change in soil carbon ( $\Delta$ SC) in the restoration (yellow) and control (blue) simulation. (E) Spatial difference in biomass between the restoration and control simulation over the 2090s ( $1 \text{ Mg C ha}^{-1} = 10 \text{ kg C m}^{-2}$ )

before it increases until 2040 CE and then again declines over the second half of the simulation. In both simulations global  
 160  $F_{SC}$  is primarily modulated by the tropics (Fig. A2B). Outside the tropics  $F_{SC}$  gradually increases until 2030 CE, after which  
 it remains constant in *control* but slowly declines in *restore*. The difference in cumulative global  $F_{SC}$  by 2100 CE is driven by  
 its large decrease in the tropics and further amplified by a more modest decline in the extratropics (Table 1). In particular the  
 decrease in tropical  $F_{SC}$  in *restore* is caused by the decline in grassy vegetation. At the same time lower overall production in  
 extratropics leads to decreased  $F_{SC}$  in *restore*. *converted to WHAT?*

165 Finally, some vegetation is converted via deforestation, 458 Mha, as specified in RCP 2.6 in *control*, but only the 172 Mha  
 specified in the extratropics by RCP 2.6 in *restore*. This global carbon flux from deforestation is largely transferred into the  
 wood product pool ( $F_{WP}$ ), and so shows the same pattern as deforestation (Fig. 3C *c.f.* Fig. 2A). *unclear*

The net change in living biomass carbon is the difference between NPP and the combined fluxes into the soil carbon pool and  
 the wood product pool ( $\Delta$ Biomass =  $NPP - F_{SC} - F_{WP}$ ). Globally, in *control*,  $\Delta$ Biomass slowly shifts from net-zero change to  
 170 a small loss by the end of the century. This is because high deforestation before 2040 CE compensates for the initial rise in NPP  
 and litterfall flux ( $F_{SC}$ ; Fig. 3D). In *restore*,  $\Delta$ Biomass moves from a rapid gain in the first decade towards net-zero change by  
 the end of the century, driven by NPP initially exceeding  $F_{SC}$  and no tropical deforestation resulting in a small flux from wood  
 products ( $F_{WP}$ ; Fig. 3D). Again, these differences are driven by changes in the tropics. Here biomass continuously declines in

*↓  
 biomass change not biomass  
 Fig 3D*



Put thick magenta line in Fig 3.

https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-432

Preprint. Discussion started: 30 November 2020

© Author(s) 2020. CC BY 4.0 License.

Biogeosciences

Discussions



Does  $\Delta SC$  also contain changes in the litter pool?

control but peaks and then declines in *restore* (Fig. A2F). In the extratropics,  $\Delta$ Biomass turns from a net gain in the first half of the century into a net loss in the second half of both simulations, although more so in *restore*. The cumulative global biomass difference between both simulations is driven by the increase in biomass in the tropics in *restore*, which is slightly offset by the late decline in extratropical biomass (Table 1). In total the increase in biomass resulting from tropical restoration alone is 134.4 Pg C by 2100 CE, with a total global difference from *control* of 130 Pg C (Table 1). Averaged over the last decade of the simulation, the grid cell by grid cell difference in mean biomass carbon density in the tropics is up to 150 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> between the two simulations (Fig. 3G). Biomass growth mirrors the increase in woody PFTs and is highest around existing forest edges in Amazonia, northern Mexico and the Congo Basin.

In terms of timescales, biomass carbon increases are highest in the first 20–40 years after land use ceases. On a per hectare basis the median carbon accumulation rates over first 20 years after land use cessation is 1.8 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (range 0–5.5 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>), using the grid cells where the share of broadleaf trees increased by at least 30% of the grid box area (n = 224) in *restore* (dark green in Fig. 3G). Thereafter uptake rates decrease to a median of 0.5 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (-3.4 to +3.8 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) for the remaining 71 years. Median biomass increases by 35.4 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> (0.6–86.3 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>) within 20 years of tropical land use stopping and by 81.3 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> (41.6–146.7 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>) over the whole simulation (Fig. A4). By 2100 CE median biomass for these new broadleaf forests is 165.2 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> (62.9–209.7 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>). For comparison, in *control* the same 224 grid cells have a median biomass of 56.3 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> (5.3–134.6 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>) by 2100 CE. The median biomass for all of the tropics is 46.9 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> (0–207.1 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>) in *control* with land use and 105.0 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> (0–210.5 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>) in *restore*. *starting from 2006 or 2008*

The changes in soil carbon ( $\Delta SC$ ) are of the same magnitude as the changes in biomass carbon. In *control*,  $\Delta SC$  increased by 141.9 Pg C by 2100 CE, mostly in the extratropics (114.1 Pg C), because of lower heterotrophic soil respiration relative to the litter influx (Table 1), likely due to cooler temperatures. In *restore*, global soil carbon uptake is much lower at 45.4 Pg C, with a similar strong uptake in the extratropics (100.1 Pg C), but a loss of soil carbon in the tropics (-54.8 Pg C). This is due to land cover change from grass and crops to woody vegetation with lower NPP and litter input (Table 1). The net change of the soil carbon pool is determined by the difference between litter inputs ( $F_{SC}$ ) and heterotrophic soil respiration ( $R_h$ ), the flux from the soil carbon pool into the atmosphere.  $R_h$  itself is a function of temperature, soil carbon and  $F_{SC}$  (Essery et al., 2003), so it increases as  $F_{SC}$  and NPP increase. Therefore, overall  $R_h$  increases to a much higher level in *control* by about 2030 CE, and stays high with a slight decline. By contrast  $R_h$  declines rapidly in *restore* within a decade, and only partially recovers, staying at a lower level until 2100 CE (Fig. 3E). As with the NPP and  $F_{SC}$ , the global differences in  $R_h$  between *control* and *restore* are driven by the decline in tropical  $R_h$  in *restore* and *modulated* amplified by marginal differences in the extratropics (Fig. A2E), ultimately linked to lower atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations leading to less CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation, lower NPP and less litterfall (Table 1). Global  $\Delta SC$  in both *control* and *restore* is net positive but saturates towards the end of the century, with, on average, lower values in *restore* (Fig. 3F). The difference comes from the tropics, where  $\Delta SC$  in *control* varies around zero but is on average  $\sim 1$  Pg C year<sup>-1</sup> lower in *control* (Fig. A2G). Extratropical  $\Delta SC$  slowly declines in both simulations but remains net positive. The driver for the cumulative difference in global soil carbon content is a stronger decline in  $R_h$  over  $F_{SC}$  (Table 1). *compared to restore* *dewood*

in *restore* compared to the *control* simulation.





Both simulations show that the land-to-atmosphere flux ( $F_{LA}$ ) is a strong carbon sink at the beginning of the simulation (average  $3.4 \text{ Pg C yr}^{-1}$  in the 2020s in both simulations), but that this sink is diminishing (Fig. 2C). This is driven by a greater decline in NPP relative to  $R_h$ . In the tropics, terrestrial carbon uptake reduces throughout both simulations and the land turns into a carbon source in the final 50 years of both simulations. In the extratropics, the land is a carbon sink for most of both simulations, only turning into an occasional net source towards the end of the century. Overall, cumulative carbon uptake in *restore* is 16% higher than in *control* (Table 1). The overall increased carbon uptake in *restore* relative to *control* becomes apparent in the difference in cumulative  $F_{LA}$  (Fig. 4C). The difference between the two simulations first grows until 2036 CE, but then declines again after 2066 CE. This pattern is due to a greater change in NPP relative to  $R_h$  in *restore*. First the tropical land cover change increases NPP relative to  $R_h$  in *restore* while in *control* this ratio remains unchanged. In the last part of both simulations NPP then declines relative to  $R_h$ , but more so in *restore* due to lower  $\text{CO}_2$  fertilisation from lower atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  compared to *control*, causing the difference between both simulations to shrink. The global cumulative difference in land to atmosphere flux between *restore* and *control* is  $-23.4 \text{ Pg C}$  (Table 1), with the largest difference at 2031 CE ( $-26.5 \text{ Pg C}$ ).

A large multi-year variability in  $F_{LA}$  is associated with fluctuations between the components of the land-atmosphere carbon flux (Fig. 2C). Global NPP in the simulations exhibits large multi-year variability of  $4 \text{ Pg C year}^{-1}$  throughout both simulations, driven by climate variability (Fig. 3A). This variability of  $\sim 4 \text{ Pg C year}^{-1}$  is also seen in  $F_{SC}$  and translates into a  $\sim 3 \text{ Pg C year}^{-1}$  variability in  $\Delta\text{SC}$  and  $R_h$  (Fig. 3B, E, and F).

### 2.3 Ocean and Atmosphere feedbacks

The ocean net carbon sink (i.e. ocean to atmosphere carbon flux,  $F_{OA}$ ) declines in both *control* and *restore* over the whole simulation period (Fig. 2D). This net sink is smaller in *restore* compared to *control* by  $15 \text{ Pg C}$ , resulting from the lower atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations, leading to a reduced disequilibrium between ocean  $\text{pCO}_2$  and the atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations. This negative feedback limits the impact of restoration on atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$ . The cumulative difference in  $F_{OA}$  increases between both runs between 2014–2036 CE before saturating in the second part of the century (Fig. 4C and Table 2).

The net carbon flux into the atmosphere ( $F_A$ ) peaks in the mid-2040s before turning negative (Fig. 2C). This is driven firstly by the specified RCP 2.6 fossil fuel emission scenario which peaks at 2020 CE (Fig. 2B). The difference between *control* and *restore* is that peak emissions are lower because of the additional forest restoration and halting anthropogenic land use emissions (Fig. 5B). Cumulatively,  $F_A$  is lower by  $18 \text{ Pg C}$  in *restore* than *control* (Table 2).

This  $18 \text{ Pg C}$  difference is equivalent to a benefit of  $9.5 \text{ ppm}$  atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  in *restore*. The maximum difference between both simulations is  $17.1 \text{ ppm}$  at 2037 CE ( $35.1 \text{ Pg C}$ ), with an extended period of relatively lower  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations until 2070s (Fig. 5C), and seen more clearly as decadal means (Fig. 5D). After the 2070s the difference between *control* and *restore* diminishes, caused by a combined decline in ocean and land carbon uptake in *restore* relative to *control*. Both can be explained through the carbon cycle response to lower atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$ : a decrease in the difference in partial pressure of  $\text{CO}_2$  between atmosphere and oceans, and a decline in plant NPP due to lower  $\text{CO}_2$  fertilisation. This results in a  $\text{CO}_2$  sensitivity to forest restoration of  $-0.61 \text{ ppm CO}_2$  per  $10^3 \text{ Mha}$  restored (Table A3).

which you mean until 2036 time period?

in RESTORE compared to CONTROL simulation?

Fig 2C shows  $F_{LA}$  not  $F_A$

I can't follow this para


Fig 5B doesn't show emissions.

I'm missing the message / argument here.




Is  $F_A$  a flux ( $= F_{OA} + F_{LA}$ ) or it is the atmospheric C burden?

https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-432  
 Preprint. Discussion started: 30 November 2020  
 © Author(s) 2020. CC BY 4.0 License.



**Figure 4.** Effect of tropical land use stop and secondary succession on cumulative global carbon fluxes (2006–2100 CE) in (A) control and (B) restoration, and (C) cumulative difference between restoration and control simulation for land-atmosphere flux ( $F_{LA}$ , green), ocean-atmosphere flux ( $F_{OA}$ , blue), deforestation emissions ( $E_{DEFOR}$ , brown), atmospheric carbon ( $F_A$ , orange), and fossil fuel emissions ( $E_{FF}$ , grey). The difference in fossil fuel emissions is zero and not plotted. Dashed line indicated zero, fluxes below zero indicate a carbon benefit in the restoration simulation w.r.t. the control simulation. Note the different vertical scales.



**Figure 5.** Impact of tropical land use stop on net carbon flux into the atmosphere and  $CO_2$ , (A) Net carbon flux into the atmosphere ( $F_A$ ), (B) cumulative  $F_A$ , (C) atmospheric  $CO_2$  for restoration (yellow) and control (blue) simulation, and (D) decadal averaged  $CO_2$  difference between the simulations. Note the different vertical scales.



**Table 2.** Cumulative global fluxes of all carbon cycle components: land-atmosphere flux ( $F_{LA}$ ), ocean-atmosphere flux ( $F_{OA}$ ), deforestation emissions ( $E_{DEFOR}$ ), fossil fuel emissions ( $E_{FF}$ ), and total net flux to atmosphere ( $F_A$ ) in the restoration simulation, the control simulation, and their differences.  $F_{LA}$  is the difference between heterotrophic respiration ( $R_h$ ) and NPP. “Interactive” = calculated by the model, “Prescribed” = taken from input data. Negative values represent a carbon sink to the atmosphere.

Carbon fluxes	Definition	Control (Pg C)	Restoration (Pg C)	Difference (Pg C)
$\sum F_{LA}$	$\sum R_h - NPP$	-143.3	-166.7	-23.4
$\sum F_{OA}$	Interactive	-149.0	-134.0	15.0
$\sum E_{DEFOR}$	Interactive	16.1	6.5	-9.6
$\sum E_{FF}$	Prescribed	321.6	321.6	0.0
$\sum F_A$	$\sum F_{LA} + F_{OA} + E_{DEFOR} + E_{FF}$	45.4	27.4	-18.0

*This is interactive as well*

*Only someone who is familiar with literature may understand what this means*

*Do you mean planetary albedo due to reducing snow and sea-ice?*

**2.4 Biogeophysical feedbacks**

Beyond CO<sub>2</sub>, several other Earth System feedbacks may be important for large-scale tropical restoration impacts on global surface air temperatures; change in albedo, evapotranspiration, and precipitation. Surface albedo decreases in both simulations, yet more so in restore. This “darkening” is due to trees with darker canopies replacing grasses and crops. Most of this occurs in the tropics, with surface albedo substantially lower in restore (5%, 2.62 W m<sup>-2</sup>). This has a warming effect on Earth’s surface temperature. Increased forest cover can also lead to increases in cloud cover and thus changes in top of the atmosphere (TOA) albedo. Both global and tropical mean TOA albedo decreases in both simulations at the same magnitude, suggesting no overall impact of large scale forest regrowth on albedo ~~changes~~ from cloud cover in HadGEM2-ES.

Evapotranspiration (ET) of water at, or near, the surface moderates surface temperature through the surface latent heat flux. Increased woody vegetation increases ET and surface latent heat flux, which lowers surface temperature and counteracts the warming effect of lower albedo in the tropics. The total latent heat flux over land in the tropics remains relatively constant in control, but increases with the vegetation change in restore over the first two decades before levelling off for the remainder of the century. The decadal averaged tropical latent heat flux is 0.52 W m<sup>-2</sup> higher in restore than in control in 2090s, and therefore only moderately offsets the 2.62 W m<sup>-2</sup> surface energy surplus from the lowered albedo. The spatial pattern of the combined annual average for the whole simulation period shows a strong latent heat flux in areas with increased abundance in broadleaf trees.

Finally, ET and other land surface properties may affect precipitation. While global precipitation increases in control and restore over the first 40 years, this broadly follows the increase in global temperature. Mean land-only precipitation in the tropics over the whole simulation is 2% higher in restore than in control, but as no persistent pattern is seen over the tropical restoration area it is unclear if this is internal variation or a substantive change.

*due to variability*  
*systematic*  
*robust*  
*spatial*





less than litterfall under restoration, tropical total biomass increases by 105.5 Pg C in *restore* compared to a loss of 28.8 Pg C in *control*, given a net biomass increase of 134.4 Pg C. However, while often neglected, lower CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation reduces biomass growth outside the tropics by 4.4 Pg C, and changes in soil carbon dynamics store 96.5 Pg C less in soils in *restore* over the simulation period, as reductions in  $R_h$  are lower than those in  $F_{SC}$  following restoration. This leaves a net land carbon sink under both simulations, but an additional land carbon benefit from restoration of only 23.4 Pg C. The ocean air-sea carbon exchange responds almost instantaneously to the enhanced land carbon sink through a cumulative reduction in carbon uptake of 15 Pg C over the century following restoration, relative to *control*. The combined effect leads to a reduction in atmospheric carbon of 18 Pg C between both simulations, equivalent to modest a 9.3 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> by the end of the century, given 1529 Mha were allowed to be restored and 286 Mha additional deforestation was avoided. The largest difference is found in the 2040s (30 Pg C; 14.6 ppm CO<sub>2</sub>).

The net global temperature benefit from the combined effect of lower radiative forcing due to lower atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and the biogeophysical responses to land cover change is up to 0.2°C in the decades after restoration, but is minimal (<0.01°C) by the end of the century. Overall, large-scale restoration increases carbon storage on land, and can reduce warming in the decades after restoration. Critically, when combined with aggressive mitigation actions, stopping deforestation and restoring forest in the tropics can limit peak warming later this century. Yet, the carbon sequestration and implied climate benefits are substantially smaller than recent, widely publicised claims of a potential tree restoration carbon uptake of 205 Pg C globally (104 Pg C of that in the tropics) (Bastin et al., 2019, but see Bastin et al., 2020). The difference originates likely from ignoring the full range of Earth System feedbacks.

### 3.1 Restoration timescales and carbon uptake

Generally succession is reproduced in HadGEM2-ES following a grass-shrub-tree cycle, which is likely too slow as observations show that carbon accumulation is driven almost immediately by tree growth in most tropical locations. Meanwhile the absence of fire disturbance in HadGEM2-ES means that succession is never interrupted. Given the slow tree growth in the model it is not surprising that the modelled pantropical median biomass increase of 1.8 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (range 0.5–5.5 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; see SI) for first 20 years is lower than the observed net carbon uptake rates over 20–30 years after the cessation of land use for the tropics (2.5–6.6 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, Bonner et al., 2013; Koch et al., 2019), although values as low as 1.5 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> have been reported (Brown and Lugo, 1992). The median uptake rate of 0.5 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> simulated in later decades is in agreement with other studies from different parts of the tropics (Houghton and Nassikas, 2018; Lewis et al., 2009; Phillips et al., 2009; Poorter et al., 2016). Consequently, the modelled biomass after 20 years (41 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, Fig. A4) is also smaller than the biomass observed in recovering forest in various regions of the Neotropics (135–150 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>, Orihuela-Belmonte et al., 2013; Poorter et al., 2016). The median biomass (165.2 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>) by the end of the simulation is in the range of reported values for the tropics (100–200 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup>, Saatchi et al., 2011). Initial grid-box biomass, however, was already higher in *restore* than biomass found in real world post-disturbance monitoring plots, meaning less modelled biomass growth is sufficient to match observations.

unclear

these are biomass units

there is yr<sup>-1</sup> here indicating this is not biomass unit





The low biomass increase leads to an underestimate in carbon accumulation in the model by a factor of up to 2 (adjusting for  
315 this would equal a 15 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> uptake in *restore* compared to *control*, see Methods). This suggests that assisted restoration,  
i.e. reducing competition from grasses and shrubs, is preferable from a carbon uptake perspective over more natural restoration  
approaches.

*↓ generally trees are superior to grasses and shrubs because of their ability to shade them.*

### 3.2 Tropical restoration and carbon cycle feedbacks

Stopping tropical deforestation has a greater carbon benefit on a per unit area basis (0.034 Pg C Mha<sup>-1</sup>) compared to forest  
320 restoration (0.027 Pg C Mha<sup>-1</sup>). Taken together, preventing tropical deforestation of 286 Mha (9.6 Pg C) and the subsequent  
tropical forest restoration (41.8 Pg C) of 1529 Mha has a carbon benefit of 51.4 Pg C over *control* by 2100 CE, excluding  
any feedbacks. This is at the lower end of published uptake estimates when normalised over the renaturalised area (Table 3).  
The difference is primarily influenced by the choice of model (e.g. interactive calculation of biomass vs fixed biomass scaling,  
processes included), CO<sub>2</sub> scenario choice, reference point (time zero, before restoration vs an evolving control simulation)  
325 and the type of renaturalisation. This shows that estimates that do not include carbon cycle and climate feedback processes  
overestimate the carbon uptake potential of natural climate solutions. Our simulations are closest to unguided forest restoration,  
while other studies calculate uptake rates from either simulated reforestation or assisted natural regeneration (without succes-  
sional cycle). Assisted natural regeneration obtains higher carbon uptake rates faster but needs to be actively managed (i.e.  
more expensive) and, if implemented incorrectly, prone to detrimental impacts on biodiversity and other ecosystem functions  
330 (Lewis and Maslin, 2018). The soil carbon response is also important, but is often ignored (Bastin et al., 2019) or uncertain  
(Friedlingstein et al., 2014).

*How were these numbers calculated with restore sim alone?*

The carbon benefit from tropical forest restoration (51.4 Pg C) is partially offset by the Earth System response to lower  
atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. In particular by a lower extratropical uptake in *restore* compared to *control* (18.5 Pg C) and a lower ocean  
carbon uptake (15 Pg C). This leads to 65% of the carbon benefit being overwhelmed by negative feedbacks. This is larger  
335 the 20–50% range found in previous studies employing coupled carbon cycle models (Arora and Montenegro, 2011; Bathiany  
et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2016; Pongratz et al., 2009; Stocker et al., 2011) and the 53% of anthropogenic emissions taken  
up by land and ocean carbon sinks over 1990–2018 (Friedlingstein et al., 2019b). The difference is likely to be down the  
use of dynamically regrowing vegetation vs prescribed land cover, uncertainties in the CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation effect on plants, the  
sensitivity of the land carbon to temperature changes, the sensitivity of ocean carbon to changing temperatures and atmospheric  
340 CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, and different time scales (decades to multiple centuries). The actual carbon benefit when considering the  
Earth System response (18 Pg C) is smaller than the 51.4 Pg C from emission reduction and tropical vegetation uptake alone  
due to changes in soil carbon, CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation, and ocean carbon cycle feedbacks. This is important, as other approaches often do not take  
into account these negative CO<sub>2</sub> feedbacks or the response of the carbon cycle to climate change. Indeed, the most high-profile  
restoration potential estimate Bastin et al. (2019) includes none of these feedbacks, suggesting a CO<sub>2</sub> benefit normalised by  
345 area far higher than all other estimates (Table 3).

*than*

All carbon fluxes and carbon cycle responses combined add up to a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction of 9.3 ppm at the end of the century. A  
prior study utilising a fully-coupled ESM and reforesting 270 Mha cropland in the tropics (compared to 1529 Mha renaturalised

*↓ You are using the word negative because it reduces 51 to 18 Pg C.*





**Table 3.** Carbon uptake estimates for tropical afforestation (affor), reforestation (refor), and forest restoration (restor), normalised by area, cumulative uptake by 2100 CE, renaturalised area, type of renaturalisation strategy, and method for calculation, whether carbon cycle feed-backs (CC), biogeophysical feedbacks (BP), CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation ( $\beta$ ), or plant temperature responses ( $\gamma$ ) were included, successional dynamics, CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in control experiments. ESM = Earth System Model. All values are for tropics only (tropics as specified by each study), except Lewis et al. (2019b) includes some extratropical regions under the Bonn Challenge. Note that Arora and Montenegro (2011) uses the term afforestation for turning present-day cropland that would be forest back into forest, here we label this reforestation.

Carbon uptake (Pg C / Mha)	Cumulative Carbon uptake (Pg C)	Area (Mha)	Type	Method	Feedbacks included	Successional dynamics	CO <sub>2</sub> (ppm)	Study
0.03	27	1052	affor	ESM	CC & BP	no	275	Bathiany et al. (2010)
0.19	50	270	refor	ESM	CC & BP	no	760	Arora and Montenegro (2011)
0.08	85	1036	rest	Bookkeeping	none	no	present-day	Houghton and Nassikas (2018)
0.35	104	295	rest	Extrapolation	none	no	present-day	Bastin et al. (2019)
0.21	19.9 (2050 CE)	94	refor+affor	Extrapolation	none	no	present-day	Busch et al. (2019)
0.12	42	350	rest	Extrapolation	$\beta + \gamma$	no	present-day	Lewis et al. (2019b)
0.03	51.4	1529	rest	ESM	CC & BP	plant competition	450	this study

here) under the SRES A2 scenario finds a CO<sub>2</sub> benefit of more than double: 20 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> (Arora and Montenegro, 2011). Their CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity to tropical vegetation regrowth (CO<sub>2</sub> benefit normalised by the area returned to natural vegetation, Arora and Montenegro, 2011) was substantially higher than both other studies (Claussen et al., 2001; Bathiany et al., 2010) and the sensitivity found by this experiment (Table A3). The higher normalised CO<sub>2</sub> benefit is due to prescribed vegetation, meaning cropland instantaneously becomes forest rather than is converted through secondary succession, the choice of a higher CO<sub>2</sub> scenario resulting in a greater CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation of vegetation, and a 30% lower ocean carbon sensitivity to changes in atmospheric carbon in CanESM2 (Friedlingstein et al., 2014), resulting in a lower reduction in ocean carbon uptake following an increased land carbon sink. This demonstrates that ESM estimates of the benefit of forest restoration vary with model formulation and baseline scenario. The sensitivity found here is within the range of earlier studies (Table A3), and employs the most sophisticated ESM and scenario choice so far used for such an experiment.

*You can't call HadGEM2 the most sophisticated ESM.*

### 3.3 Temperature benefit to low emissions

The permissible carbon budget to stay within 2°C (Rogelj et al., 2018) is 445 Pg C between 2006 CE and 2100 CE, with 139 Pg C already used (Friedlingstein et al., 2019b). The computed carbon emissions in the HadGEM2-ES control ( $E_{FF}$ : 320.4 Pg C;  $E_{DEFOR}$ : 16.1 Pg C) therefore are close to the emissions budget for 2°C. Together with the prescribed RCP 2.6 non-CO<sub>2</sub> radiative forcings and biogeophysical feedback processes in the model warming only amounts to 1.5°C relative to the pre-industrial by the 2090s in both HadGEM2-ES simulations. This is due to a relatively low transient climate response to cumulative emissions (TCRE) of 1.1°C per 1000 Pg C (5–95% range of observational TCRE constraints: (0.7–2.0°C per

*This is just one estimate. There is a ± uncertainty range around this.*

*For HadGEM2 you mean?*

*Please be explicit. ESMs diagnose emissions when 16 simulations are CO<sub>2</sub> concentration driven. Is this what you are referring to?*





Regards of TCRE 18 Pg  $\approx$  9 ppm is not a big number anyway.

365 1000 Pg C, Gillett et al., 2013)). Therefore it is not surprising that the small CO<sub>2</sub> benefit (18 Pg C) in restore relative to the standard RCP 2.6 control does not result in a detectable cooling at the end of the century.

### 3.4 Assessing model dependence

Although

You haven't assessed a high CO<sub>2</sub> scenario

model independent can still be drawn

Our findings are based on a single Earth System Model, despite this three key conclusions are not model-dependent: (i) the carbon benefit of restoration is lower using RCP2.6 vs a scenario with high CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (e.g. RCP8.5), (ii) in a world that follows Paris Agreement emission cuts restoration is best deployed immediately, and (iii) the ocean carbon feedbacks will reduce the efficacy of negative emissions technologies, natural or technological. Replicating this experiment with other ESMs would likely give a smaller or larger carbon benefit from large scale tropical restoration, depending on how the various processes impacting the carbon cycle are represented. The simulation of the biomass increase after the cessation of anthropogenic land use depends on whether dynamic vegetation is included, the variety of PFTs in the model and the implementation of their resource competition (with a greater number of PFTs, however, not necessarily performing better, Koven et al., 2020), the inclusion of fire disturbance, and the balance between productivity and mortality (commonly a challenge for ESMs, Negrón-Juárez et al., 2015). The representation of land use, whether only deforestation emissions or more complex processes are considered, is another factor influencing the carbon benefit in our experimental set up. For example, including processes such as tillage leads to increase historic land use change emissions by 70% (Pugh et al., 2015). The response of vegetation to changes in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> depends on the magnitude of CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation which is limited by nutrient (nitrate and phosphate) availability. Nutrient limitation is not included in HadGEM2-ES, models that include nutrient limitation generally show a weaker CO<sub>2</sub> fertilisation impact on plant productivity (50–100%, Huntzinger et al., 2017; Fleischer et al., 2019) but the magnitude of the effect in the real world is still uncertain (Haverd et al., 2020). The decline of the ocean carbon sink when lowering atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is a robust feature in ESMs (Schwinger and Tjiputra, 2018), its sensitivity to changes in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> (and temperature), however, is between 39% lower and 30% higher than the carbon sink in HadGEM2-ES over the historical period (Friedlingstein et al., 2014). Comparing these processes with HadGEM2-ES, the greater carbon benefit from cutting higher land use emissions would be balanced by the smaller negative impact of lower atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> on extratropical carbon uptake, with an uncertain magnitude in ocean carbon uptake change. A coordinated effort exploring the intermodel spread of earth system feedbacks to nature-based solutions (e.g. in the Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project–CDRMIP, Keller et al., 2018) would be beneficial given the importance of these feedbacks and the policy relevance of nature-based solutions.

This is not a feature but an expected response.

This seems like a list of reasons essentially making the point that models are different.

Compared to WHAT?

### 4 Conclusions

We find small temperature benefits from large-scale tropical forest restoration over a few decades, and no impact in the longer term. Tropical restoration reduces peak atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, but the Earth System response to tropical restoration itself offsets nearly two-thirds of the initial carbon benefit from restoration. This work provides further insight into the Earth System response to negative emissions, particularly under a policy-relevant low CO<sub>2</sub> trajectory. Some of these findings may be model-dependent, due to low modelled NPP of broadleaf trees, large modelled changes in albedo, and lower modelled

You haven't paid any specific attention to -ve emissions as such. Just that your 'restoration' is based on a scenario which happens to have -ve emissions





changes in ET. Given the idealised extent of the forest restoration (1529 Mha) in this experiment, currently pledged restoration (e.g. 350 Mha in the Bonn Challenge, over four times less than the restored area here) would have little noticeable impact on global temperatures in the long-term even if HadGEM2-ES underestimates its impact somewhat. This result does not mean that natural solutions are not important for meeting climate targets. While ecosystem restoration only has a small carbon benefit in the long term and is no alternative to reducing fossil fuel emissions, it can, however, contribute to reducing peak CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and peak temperatures, which may be critical for societal and ecosystem adaptation. Furthermore negative emissions and lower atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations represent a system of diminishing returns.

Land and ocean carbon sinks decline as atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> decreases and thereby erasing up to two thirds of the additional carbon sink from LULCC. While well known in the modelling community (Jones et al., 2016; Schwinger and Tjiputra, 2018), it is also important to consider these negative feedbacks in estimates on the carbon impact of forest restoration to avoid making misleading statements (e.g. Bastin et al., 2019) on the potential of carbon sinks from tropical restoration (Bastin et al., 2020; Friedlingstein et al., 2019a; Lewis et al., 2019a). In short, the more processes are considered in mitigation estimates for negative emission technologies, dynamic vegetation, climate, and carbon cycle response, the smaller their mitigation potential becomes.

However, this idealised experiment shows that in the short to medium term (~30 years) carbon uptake from tropical forest restoration, alongside radical reduction in fossil fuel use can provide a valuable additional time until other negative emission technologies become more widely available to remove countries' remaining residual emissions to meet the societal goal of stabilising the climate by reaching net zero greenhouse gas emissions.

*Code and data availability.* Code and data to recreate figures are available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/j39bw4rzs.1>

415 Appendix A

careful with the phrase 'negative feedbacks'

not decline, there magnitude becomes smaller