## Ocean uptake and land use change emissions suppressed atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> growth in the 2015/16 El Niño

\*Masayuki Kondo<sup>1</sup>, Peter Landschützer<sup>2</sup>, Yousuke Iida<sup>3</sup>, Richard Houghton<sup>4</sup>, Stephen Sitch<sup>5</sup>

1. Center for Environmental Remote Sensing, Chiba University, 2. Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, 3. Global Environment and Marine Department, Japan Meteorological Agency, 4. Woods Hole Research Center, 5. University of Exeter

Large variability in El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) induces anomalous  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  fluxes both in biosphere and hydrosphere. In the negative phase of ENSO (i.e., El Niño), dryer climate over lower latitudes decreases productivity of land vegetation and increases vulnerability to biomass burning. At the same time, suppressed upwelling of carbon-rich water near the Pacific South America reduces outgassing of oceanic  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  to atmosphere. In years of a strong El Niño, anomalous land and ocean  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  fluxes account for a large part of interannual variability of the total net  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  flux of the Earth surface. Thus, anomalously large atmospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  growth rates co-occur with periods of El Niño events.

Biomass burning is believed to be the dominant component of variability in atmospheric  $CO_2$  growth rate during El Niño. The 1997/98 El Niño induced the most significant anomalous  $CO_2$  release on record, largely due to forest and peat fires in Southeast Asia. Likewise, a massive fire haze over Southeast Asia was found during the recent 2015/16 El Niño. Despite the seemingly large impact of biomass burning in the two events, the 2015/16 El Niño accompanied substantially less atmospheric  $CO_2$  growth compared with that in the 1997/98 El Niño. It turns out that  $CO_2$  emission from biomass burning in 2015 was substantially less than that in 1997 because precipitation before the peak of fire emission (Sept-Oct) shortened the drought length of 2015.

However, it is still arguable that the insignificant biomass burning is the dominate cause behind no obvious signs of large  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  release in the 2015/16 El Niño. In the recent decades, both biospheric and hydrospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  fluxes has shown trends towards a net sink of  $\mathrm{CO}_2$ , which suggest a possibility of that increasing  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  uptake has suppressed the atmospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  growth in the 2015/16 El Niño. To evaluate this possibility, a synthesis of land-ocean  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  flux over the period of the two El Niño events is necessary. Here, we explore mechanisms behind differences in the atmospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  growth in the 1997/98 and 2015/16 El Niño. The aim of this study is to fully characterize the causes for insignificant atmospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  growth in 2015/16 through analyzing types (anomaly/trend) of relative contributions of land-ocean fluxes to atmospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  growth between the two El Niño events. Through the analysis, we discuss about components that would likely continue to mitigate atmospheric  $\mathrm{CO}_2$  growth in future El Niño.

Keywords: Carbon Cycle, El Nino, Attribution analysis