

Advancing our understanding of the impacts of historic and projected land use in the Earth System



## The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP)

Chairs: David Lawrence (NCAR) and George Hurtt (University of Maryland)

SSG: Almut Arneth, Victor Brovkin, Kate Calvin, Andrew Jones, Chris Jones, Peter Lawrence, Julia Pongratz, Sonia Seneviratne, Elena Shevliakova

with input from many from Earth System Modeling, Integrated Assessment Modeling, and historical land use communities

https://cmip.ucar.edu/lumip



Advancing our understanding of the impacts of historic and projected land use in the Earth System



## The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP)

Much about the impact of land use and land-use change in climate and the carbon cycle remains uncertain ...

# ... as highlighted by LUCID ...



- 30-50% of variation in land-use climate signal attributed to differences in specified land use change
- Uncertainty in LULCC impact on T larger than for CO<sub>2</sub>
- Models do not agree on sign of impact on evapotranspiration
- Models ignore relevant processes, e.g. irrigation

de Noblet-Ducoudré et al. 2012, Boisier et al. 2012

## ... and with respect to the carbon cycle (LUCID-CMIP5)

**Changes in land carbon storage** 



- Disparity across CMIP5 models in terms of LCC impact on C, even in scenario where prescribed LCC was relatively small (RCP8.5)
- And, many CMIP5 models represent land use simplistically (w/o wood harvest, crop management, irrigation, fertilization, shifting cultivation)
- Indirect C impacts as big or bigger than direct (Mahowald et al. 2016)

# **LUMIP Goals**

What are the effects of land use and land-use change on climate and biogeochemical cycling (past-future)?

What are the impacts of land management on surface fluxes of carbon, water, and energy and are there regional land-management strategies with promise to help mitigate against climate change?

- Fossil fuel vs. land use change
- Biogeochemical vs. biogeophysical impact of land use
- Impacts from land-cover change vs land management
- Modulation of land use impact on climate by land-atmosphere coupling strength (LS3MIP)

- Modulation of global CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization by LULCC
- Direct vs indirect carbon consequences of LULCC
- Total radiative forcing from LULCC

CMIP6 Questions:	How does Earth System respond to forcing?
WCRP Grand Challenge:	Biospheric forcings and feedbacks,
	Water Availability, Climate Extremes

# **LUMIP** Activities

## Data standardization

- Repeat and mature land use harmonization process → enhanced land-use data set for CMIP6, passing maximum amount of common information between relevant communities (Historical, IAMs, ESMs)
- Provide additional required land management datasets
- Data output: new variables, subgrid land-use tile variables
- Model experiments
  - Experiments designed to isolate, quantify, and understand land use and land management effects on climate
- Model metrics and diagnostics
  - Develop metrics to assess/quantify model performance with respect to land use impacts on climate
  - Synthesis activity to document existing metrics

## Land Use Harmonization Dataset (LUHv2)

0.25° resolution 850 to 2100

#### **New History**

Hyde 4-based Landsat F/NF constraint Multiple crop types (5) Multiple pasture types (2) Updated forest cover/ biomass Updated wood harvest Updated shifting cultivation

#### **New Management Layers**

<u>Agriculture</u> % cropland irrigated % cropland flooded % cropland fertilized (industrial) Industrial Fertilizer application rates %cropland for biofuels Crop rotations <u>Wood Harvest</u> % used for industrial products % used for commercial biofuels % used for fuelwood





1800

2015

1600

Global Agricultural Area: HYDE 3.2\* and HYDE 3.1



# LUMIP Experimental Design

## 1. Idealized global deforestation (GCM, Tier 1)



- Remove 20 million km<sup>2</sup> forest over 50 years from top 30% forest area grid cells, starting from 1850 control
- Controlled assessment of coupled model response to deforestation



## Representation of convective trigger alters

## land-cover change response

the lower Mississippi River Basin





\* indicates significant change at the 95% confidence level



Chen et al., 2016; Chen et al., submitted

## 2. No LULCC experiments: Historic period 1850-2015 Coupled and land-only

- Assess impact of LULCC in historical period for water, carbon, energy fluxes and climate (C4MIP, LS3MIP)
- Assess land-only vs coupled response to historic LULCC (LS3MIP)
- Assess how land-atmosphere coupling strength modulates climate, weather, extremes response to LULCC (LS3MIP)
- Relevant for detection and attribution (DAMIP)



# Land management

Consensations



~80% non-ice land area under land management

~25% non-ice land area undergone anthropogenic land-cover change

Erb et al., GCB, 2016

## 3. Land cover change vs land management experiments (Tier 2)

Set of land-only historic simulations (variants of LMIP-Hist) with one-at-atime modification of particular aspects of land management; Evaluate impact of land use on fluxes of water, energy, and carbon

- ) Year 1700 instead of 1850 start
- ) No LULCC change
- ) Alternate land use histories
- No shifting cultivation
- 5) Crop and pasture as unmanaged grassland
- 6 Crops with crop model but no irrigation/fertilization
- 7 No irrigation
- 8 No fertilization
  - ) No wood harvest
  - ) No grazing on pastureland

- 10 No human fire ignition/suppression
- 11 Constant 1850 CO<sub>2</sub> (N dep?)
- 12 Constant climate



#### **Present-day irrigation mitigates heat extremes**





**TH** zürich

- Only ~40% of irrigated water used by increased ET
- 60% lost to runoff
- Very likely not realistic

	Land-Use Scenario			
Main Scenario	SSP1-2.6 Afforest	SSP3-7 Deforest	SSP5-8.5 Weak Deforest	
SSP1-2.6	ScenarioMIP Concdriven			
SSP3-7		ScenarioMIP Concdriven		
SSP5-8.5			<b>C4MIP</b> Emissions-driven	

	Land-Use Scenario			
Main Scenario	SSP1-2.6 Afforest	SSP3-7 Deforest	SSP5-8.5 Weak Deforest	
SSP1-2.6	ScenarioMIP Concdriven	LUMIP Concdriven		
SSP3-7	LUMIP Concdriven	ScenarioMIP Concdriven		
SSP5-8.5			<b>C4MIP</b> Emissions-driven	

Biogeophysical climate impacts of LULCC; assess land management for regional climate mitigation

Assess how LULCC impact differs at different climate change and CO<sub>2</sub> levels

	Land-Use Scenario			
Main Scenario	SSP1-2.6 Afforest	SSP3-7 Deforest	SSP5-8.5 Weak Deforest	
SSP1-2.6	ScenarioMIP Concdriven	LUMIP Concdriven		
SSP3-7	LUMIP Concdriven	ScenarioMIP Concdriven		
SSP5-8.5	LUMIP Emissions-driven		C4MIP Emissions-driven	

Biogeophysical climate impacts of LULCC; assess land management for regional climate mitigation

Assess how LULCC impact differs at different climate change and CO<sub>2</sub> levels

Full effects of LULCC through both biogeophys and biogeochem processes

## Land-use change impact metrics Example: Daytime versus nighttime response to deforestation



Lejeune et al., J. Clim, 2017

#### past • present • future

Search

Home

LUMIP | Land Use Model Intercompanion Project

Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 2973-2998, 2016

www.geosci-model-dev.net/9/2973/2016/

© Author(s) 2016. CC Attribution 3.0 License.

doi:10.5194/gmd-9-2973-2016

#### LUMIP

#### LUMIP

LUMIP | L

LUMIP Pr

- Proposed
- LUMIP Ne
- Land Use
  Land Use

#### LUMIP GO

We will upd through this

#### OVERVIEV

Human land properties of activities an energy. CMI climate, for (past-future

# The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP) contribution to CMIP6: rationale and experimental design

David M. Lawrence<sup>1</sup>, George C. Hurtt<sup>2</sup>, Almut Arneth<sup>3</sup>, Victor Brovkin<sup>4</sup>, Kate V. Calvin<sup>5</sup>, Andrew D. Jones<sup>6</sup>, Chris D. Jones<sup>7</sup>, Peter J. Lawrence<sup>1</sup>, Nathalie de Noblet-Ducoudré<sup>8</sup>, Julia Pongratz<sup>4</sup>, Sonia I. Seneviratne<sup>9</sup>, and Elena Shevliakova<sup>10</sup>

gridded land-use dataset (past-future) was developed, linking historical land-use data, to future projections from Integrated Assessment Models, in a standard format required by climate models. Results indicate that the effects of land-use on climate, while uncertain, are sufficiently large and

complex to warrant an expanded activity focused on land

#### PRIMARY CONTACTS

- George Hurtt (gchurtt@umd.edu, U. Maryland)
- Dave Lawrence (dlawren@ucar.edu, NCAR)

#### SCIENTIFIC STEERING COMMITTEE

Almut Arneth (KIT), Victor Brovkin (Max Planck), Kate Calvin (PNNL), Andrew Jones (LBNL), Chris Jones (Hadley Centre), Peter Lawrence (NCAR), Nathalie de Noblet Ducoudré (IPSL), Julia Pongratz (Max Planck), Sonia Seneviratne (ETH-Zurich), Elena Shevliakova (GFDL)



https://cmip.ucar.edu/lumip

LUMIP Google Group (70 members)

# Subgrid land-use tile data request

LUMIP is requesting sub-grid information for four sub-grid categories (i.e., tiles) for selected variables to permit more detailed analysis of land-use induced surface heterogeneity. The four categories are:

- (1) Primary and secondary land
- (2) Cropland
- (3) Pastureland
- (4) Urban

LUMIP LUT vars requested for following expts

- CMIP6 Historical (coupled and land-only)
- ScenarioMIP
- C4MIP scenario expts
- LUMIP

#### STATUS

Lut variables are included in latest CMOR tables versions

#### <u>Selected Subgrid Variables (not the full list, see</u> <u>LUMIP website)</u>

#### **Biogeophysical variables**

tasLut – near-surface air temperature hussLut – near-surface specific humidity hflsLut – latent heat flux hfssLut – sensible heat flux rsusLut – surface upwelling shortwave (albedo) laiLut – leaf area index

**Bigoechemical variables, carbon stocks/fluxes** gppLut – gross primary productivity nppLut – net primary productivity cSoilLut – carbon mass in soil pool cVegLut – carbon mass in vegetation cLitterLut – carbon mass in litter pool

#### **LULCC** fraction changes

fracInLut – fraction transferred into land-use type fracOutLut – fraction transferred out of LUT

## Example aggregation onto Land-Use Tiles for CLM



## Example aggregation onto Land-Use Tiles for CLM





### **Sub-grid impacts**









# LUMIP/LUH2 Timeline

- 2016: October, kickoff webinar
- 2017 through 2018: Model simulations
  - Ideally, groups would run land-only simulation first and benchmark simulated/ imposed land cover time series
  - Also preferred that groups run the idealized deforestation expt early
- 2017 March: Beta versions of LUH2 harmonized datasets for SSPs released
- 2017 Ongoing: Transient land-use and idealized deforest spot checks
- 2017 Fall: begin analysis (coordination through LUMIP SSG, starting summer 2017, ask groups to register interest in analyses)
- 2017 Land-use change impacts metrics/benchmarks synthesis papers
- 2018 Summer: possible LUMIP meeting to present/discuss papers/analysis
  - Aspen AGCI?
- 2018 Fall: possible joint LUMIP, C4MIP, LS3MIP meeting
  - attach to CRESCENDO meeting in September in Paris?
- 2021 IPCC AR6?

Annual Changes in Global Agricultural Area: HYDE 3.2\* and HYDE 3.1

