


Making corrections to your proof

Please follow these instructions to mark changes or add notes to your proof. You can use Adobe Acrobat Reader (download the most recent version from <https://get.adobe.com>) or an open source PDF annotator.

For Adobe Reader, the tools you need to use are contained in **Annotations** in the **Comment** toolbar. You can also right-click on the text for several options. The most useful tools have been highlighted here. If you cannot make the desired change with the tools, please insert a sticky note describing the correction.

Please ensure all changes are visible via the 'Comments List' in the annotated PDF so that your corrections are not missed.




Do not attempt to directly edit the PDF file as changes will not be visible.




Replacing text

To replace text, highlight what you want to change then press the replace text icon, or right-click and press 'Add Note to Replace Text', then insert your text in the pop up box. Highlight the text and right click to style in bold, italic, superscript or subscript.




Inserting text

Place your cursor where you want to insert text, then press the insert text icon, or right-click and press 'Insert Text at Cursor', then insert your text in the pop up box. Highlight the text and right click to style in bold, italic, superscript or subscript.




Deleting text

To delete text, highlight what you want to remove then press the strikethrough icon, or right-click and press 'Strikethrough Text'.



Highlighting text

To highlight text, with the cursor highlight the selected text then press the highlight text icon, or right-click and press 'Highlight text'. If you double click on this highlighted text you can add a comment.



QUERY FORM

JOURNAL: Environmental Research Letters

AUTHOR: R B Jackson *et al*

TITLE: Increasing anthropogenic methane emissions arise equally from agricultural and fossil fuel sources

ARTICLE ID: ab9ed2

Your article has been processed in line with the journal style. Your changes will be reviewed by the Production Editor, and any amendments that do not comply with journal style or grammatical correctness will not be applied and will not appear in the published article.

The layout of this article has not yet been finalized. Therefore this proof may contain columns that are not fully balanced/matched or overlapping text in inline equations; these issues will be resolved once the final corrections have been incorporated.

- Q1: Please check that the names of all authors as displayed in the proof are correct, and that all authors are linked to the correct affiliations. Please also confirm that the correct corresponding author has been indicated. Note that this is your last opportunity to review and amend this information before your article is published.
- Q2: If an explicit acknowledgment of funding is required, please ensure that it is indicated in your article. If you already have an Acknowledgments section, please check that the information there is complete and correct.
- Q3: Please check that the funding information below is correct for inclusion in the article metadata. Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation
- Q4: We have been provided with ORCID iDs for the authors as below. Please confirm whether the numbers are correct. RB Jackson 0000-0001-8846-7147A Tsuruta 0000-0002-9197-3005
- Q5: Reference [Rigby et al. 2017] is cited in text but not provided in the list. Please provide complete publication details to insert in the list, else delete the citation from the text.
- Q6: Please mention whether it is 2016a or 2016b.
- Q7: Please check the details for any journal references that do not have a link as they may contain some incorrect information. If any journal references do not have a link, please update with correct details and supply a Crossref DOI if available.
- Q8: References “Ganesan et al., 2019, IPCC Climate Change 2014” are listed in the references list but are not cited in the text. Please either cite the references or remove those from the references list.

Environmental Research Letters



PERSPECTIVE

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED
6 May 2020REVISED
15 June 2020ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION
22 June 2020PUBLISHED
xx xx xxxxxOriginal content from
this work may be used
under the terms of the
[Creative Commons
Attribution 4.0 licence](#).Any further distribution
of this work must
maintain attribution to
the author(s) and the title
of the work, journal
citation and DOI.

Q4

Increasing anthropogenic methane emissions arise equally from agricultural and fossil fuel sources

R B Jackson¹ , M Saunois², P Bousquet², J G Canadell³, B Poulter⁴, A R Stavert⁵, P Bergamaschi⁶ , Y Niwa^{7,8}, A Segers⁹ and A Tsuruta¹⁰ ¹ Department of Earth System Science, Woods Institute for the Environment, and Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-2210, United States of America² Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE-IPSL (CEA-CNRS-UVSQ), Université Paris-Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France³ Global Carbon Project, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia⁴ NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, Greenbelt, MD 20771, United States of America⁵ Global Carbon Project, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, VIC 3195, Australia⁶ European Commission Joint Research Centre, 21027 Ispra (Va), Italy⁷ Center for Global Environmental Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8506, Japan⁸ Meteorological Research Institute, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0052, Japan⁹ TNO, Dept. of Climate Air & Sustainability, NL-3508-TA Utrecht, The Netherlands¹⁰ Finnish Meteorological Institute, FI-00101 Helsinki, FinlandE-mail: rob.jackson@stanford.edu

Climate stabilization remains elusive, with increased greenhouse gas concentrations already increasing global average surface temperatures 1.1 °C above pre-industrial levels (World Meteorological Organization 2019). Carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from fossil fuel use, deforestation, and other anthropogenic sources reached ~ 43 billion metric tonnes in 2019 (Friedlingstein *et al* 2019, Jackson *et al* 2019). Storms, floods, and other extreme weather events displaced a record 7 million people in the first half of 2019 (IDMC 2019). When global mean surface temperature four million years ago was 2 °C–3 °C warmer than today (a likely temperature increase before the end of the century), ice sheets in Greenland and West Antarctica melted and parts of East Antarctica's ice retreated, causing sea levels to rise 10–20 m (World Meteorological Organization 2019).

Methane (CH₄) emissions have contributed almost one quarter of the cumulative radiative forcings for CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O (nitrous oxide) combined since 1750 (Etminan *et al* 2016). Although methane is far less abundant in the atmosphere than CO₂, it absorbs thermal infrared radiation much more efficiently and, in consequence, has a global warming potential (GWP) ~86 times stronger per unit mass than CO₂ on a 20-year timescale and 28-times more powerful on a 100-year time scale (IPCC 2014).

Global average methane concentrations in the atmosphere reached ~1875 parts per billion (ppb) at the end of 2019, more than two-and-a-half times preindustrial levels (Dlugokencky 2020). The largest methane sources include anthropogenic emissions

from agriculture, waste, and the extraction and use of fossil fuels as well as natural emissions from wetlands, freshwater systems, and geological sources (Kirschke *et al* 2013, Saunois *et al* 2016a, Ganesan *et al* 2019). Here, we summarize new estimates of the global methane budget based on the analysis of Saunois *et al* (2020) for the year 2017, the last year of the new Global Methane Budget and the most recent year data are fully available. We compare these estimates to mean values for the reference 'stabilization' period of 2000–2006 when atmospheric CH₄ concentrations were relatively stable. We present data for sources and sinks and provide insights for the geographical regions and economic sectors where emissions have changed the most over recent decades.

1. Methods

We use the same data and approaches to estimate CH₄ emissions as in Saunois *et al* (2020.) One approach we use is a top-down (TD) ensemble of 11 inversions using atmospheric CH₄ concentrations to constrain total possible emissions and partition them to primary sources. The TD inversions were constrained by surface observations for the period 2000–2006, and by surface and/or satellite observations in 2017. Prior fluxes, treatment of observations, and optimization configurations varied somewhat across the 11 inversions as described in the supplementary material of Saunois *et al* (2020). Most of the inversions considered the same OH field, constant over time, attributing changes in methane atmospheric concentrations to altered emissions rather than to

Q1

Q2

Q3

Q5

atmospheric oxidative capacity. Consequently, the inferred changes in methane emissions would be higher if OH is increasing in the atmosphere, as suggested by chemistry climate models (e.g. Zhao *et al* 2020) or lower if OH is decreasing in the atmosphere, as suggested by some methyl chloroform-based studies (e.g. Rigby *et al* 2017). Uncertainties in regional and sectoral partitioning vary across models based on transport errors, prior flux ratios, and inversion baselines. Our TD ensemble derived an estimated uncertainty of $\pm 5\%$ on total global emissions, a range larger than for transport model errors alone of $\pm 2\%$ – 3% attributable to different inversion systems (Locatelli *et al* 2013). We were unable to include uncertainties in TD total emissions attributable to uncertainties in the methane chemical sink; uncertainty on the global burden of OH is about 10%–15% and translates to an uncertainty of approximately $\pm 9\%$ on total global emissions (Zhao *et al* 2020).

The second approach is a detailed bottom-up (BU) accounting method that uses global inventories and biogeochemical modeling that provides a more detailed attribution to sources but lacks the total atmospheric growth rate constraint that accompanies TD approaches. BU trends in methane emissions are available for anthropogenic emissions using four global inventories (EDGARv4.3.2, CEDS, GAINS and EPA2012), for biomass burning using three fire products (GFEDv4.1s, QFED, and FINN) and for wetlands calculated by 13 biogeochemical models (see Saunio *et al* 2020). However, estimates for other natural sources such as geological, termites, permafrost, rivers, lakes, and reservoirs available in the literature do not provide any temporal changes in methane emissions and trends cannot be calculated for these sources. Uncertainties in ‘natural emissions’ for wetlands plus all other inland waters arise from factors that include wetland flux density, seasonal to interannual variability in wetland extent, and some double-counting of wetland and small inland waters, contributing to higher BU estimates for natural sources than in the TD inventory. For the 2000–2017 methane budget (Saunio *et al* 2020), the Wetland Area Dynamics for Methane Modeling dataset (WAD2 M) was developed to avoid some double counting by removing inland waters from surface inundation data to estimate these fluxes separately, combining Landsat-based (Pekel *et al* 2016) and radar-based observations (Jensen and McDonald 2019).

2. Global and latitudinal sources and sinks of methane

Average estimated global methane emissions for 2017 were 596 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (figure 1, table 1) based on 11 top-down atmospheric inversions, with an ensemble max.-min. range of 572–614 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹. This value is 9% (50 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) higher than the average

for the period 2000–2006 (546 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, range 538–555), with the increase attributable primarily to greater anthropogenic emission sources (table 1). Anthropogenic sources also contributed 61% of total TD global methane emissions in 2017. The estimate from the BU approach yielded an increase of 51 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹, from 696 (560–834) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2000–2006 to 747 (602–896) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2017 (table 1). Anthropogenic sources contributed an estimated 51% of total global BU emissions in 2017. The difference of ~ 150 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in total global emissions between TD and BU methods arises primarily from a divergence in estimates of natural sources, particularly from freshwater and geological ones (table 1) and from the absence of TD atmospheric constraints for BU approaches (see below).

The latitudinal attribution of methane emissions highlights the role of tropical and temperate sources relative to boreal and Arctic systems (figure 2). Based on TD methods in 2017, tropical sources (<30°N) emitted 64% (383 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹; 351–405) of global methane emissions and northern mid-latitude sources (30°N–60°N) contributed 32% (185 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹; 171–209). High-latitude (>60°N) systems yielded only 4% of global methane emissions (24 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹; 21–28).

Increased methane emissions from 2000–2006 to 2017 arose primarily from tropical and temperate latitudes (figure 3). Average methane emissions increased by 29 and 32 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in the tropics (<30°N) for TD and BU approaches, respectively, and by 15 and 23 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in northern mid-latitudes (30°N–60°N) (figure 3). In contrast, we find no evidence to date for increasing methane release from the Arctic. Despite rapidly warming air temperatures (World Meteorological Organization 2019), methane emissions from northern high-latitude systems (>60°N) were virtually unchanged in 2017 relative to the average value for 2000–2006: -0.4 and -1.6 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD and BU methods, respectively.

The average global atmospheric and soil methane sink estimated for 2017 increased to 571 (540–585) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ from 546 (531–555) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for the 2000–2006 average based on the TD approaches. Partitioning the global methane sink into components in the atmosphere (CH₄ destruction from tropospheric OH and Cl and total stratospheric losses) and soil (microbial consumption) for 2017 yields an average TD atmospheric sink of 531 (502–540) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ and an average soil sink of 40 (37–47) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (table 1).

3. Regional attribution and anthropogenic emissions

Specific regions contributed the most to greater methane emissions in 2017 compared with 2000–2006. Three regions (Africa and the Middle East; China; and South Asia and Oceania) each

Table 1. Mean global methane emissions by source type in Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for the period 2000–2006 (middle column) and 2017 (right column) using bottom-up (BU) and top-down (TD) approaches. Because top-down models cannot fully separate individual processes, only five categories of emissions are provided (see Saunio *et al* 2020). Uncertainties are reported as [min-max] range of reported studies. Differences of 1 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in the totals can occur due to rounding errors. ‘Total chemical loss’ includes atmospheric loss from tropospheric OH and Cl as well as stratospheric loss.

Period of time	2000–2006		2017	
	BU	TD	BU	TD
Natural sources				
Wetlands	146 [102–176]	184 [166–196]	145 [100–183]	194 [155–217]
Other natural sources	222 [143–306]	36 [21–47]	222 [143–306]	39 [21–50]
Freshwaters	159 [117–212]			
Geological	45 [18–65]			
Wild animals	2 [1–3]			
Termites	9 [3–15]			
Permafrost soils (direct)	1 [0–1]			
Biogenic ocean (open and coastal)	6 [4–10]			
Total natural sources	368 [245–482]	220 [198–243]	367 [243–489]	232 [194–267]
Anthropogenic sources				
Agriculture and waste	189 [176–203]	203 [194–213]	213 [198–232]	227 [205–246]
Enteric ferm. and manure	102 [99–108]		115 [110–121]	
Landfills and waste	59 [54–61]		68 [64–71]	
Rice cultivation	28 [23–34]		30 [24–40]	
Fossil fuels	106 [90–123]	92 [70–113]	135 [121–164]	108 [91–121]
Coal mining	29 [22–39]		44 [31–63]	
Oil and gas	72 [59–83]		84 [72–97]	
Industry	2 [0–5]		3 [0–8]	
Transport	4 [1–10]		4 [1–13]	
Biomass and biof. burn.	33 [26–49]	30 [27–36]	29 [24–38]	28 [25–32]
Biomass burning	20 [15–35]		16 [11–24]	
Biofuel burning	12 [9–14]		13 [10–14]	
Total anthropogenic sources	328 [315–352]	324 [308–341]	380 [359–407]	364 [340–381]
Total sources	696 [560–834]	546 [538–555]	747 [602–896]	596 [572–614]
Sinks				
Total chemical loss		510 [501–515]		531 [502–540]
Soil uptake	30 [11–49]	35 [30–41]	30 [11–49]	40 [37–47]
Total sinks		546 [531–555]		571 [540–585]

increased emissions by ~10–15 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ assessed using both TD and BU methods (figure 3). The next-largest changes occurred in North America, with growth of 6.7 and 5.0 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD and BU approaches, respectively (figure 3), mostly from the United States (5.1 and 4.4 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD and BU, respectively). Europe was the only region where CH₄ emissions appear to have decreased in 2017 relative to 2000–2006, with emissions down –1.6 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD methods and –4.3 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for BU methods.

Anthropogenic sources are estimated to contribute almost all of the additional methane emitted to the atmosphere for 2017 compared to 2000–2006 (table 1). TD estimates of mean anthropogenic emissions in 2017 increased 40 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (12%) to 364 (range 340–381) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (table 1). Agriculture and Waste contributed 60% of this increase and Fossil Fuels the remaining 40%, with a slight decrease estimated for Biomass and Biofuel Burning. Based on BU methods, anthropogenic emissions in 2017 rose 52 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (16%) to 380 (range 359–407) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ (table 1), with 56% of the increase coming from Fossil Fuels and 44% from Agriculture and Waste sources

(table 1). Increasing emission estimates from anthropogenic sectors over the past two decades are consistent with previous work from Saunio *et al* 2017, although the relative contribution of fossil fuel and agriculture and waste sectors differs across studies (e.g. Schwietzke *et al* 2016) owing to different time periods, modelling systems, and data included.

Mean annual methane emissions rose sharply in some sectors from 2000–2006 to 2017 (figure 4). Increased agricultural emissions predominated in South Asia/Oceania, Africa, and South America, with increases of 9–10 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in South Asia/Oceania and 7–9 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in Africa (figure 4). By comparison, Europe’s agricultural methane emissions decreased –1.4 to –2.8 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD and BU methods, respectively. Increased emissions from the fossil fuel sector were the largest in China (5.3 and 12.2 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD and BU, respectively) and North America, Africa, and South Asia and Oceania (4 to 6 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in all three regions and using both approaches). Fossil fuel-related methane emissions in the United States increased 3.4 to 4.0 Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for TD and BU estimates, respectively, approximately




Figure 1. The global methane budget for year 2017 based on top-down methods for natural sources and sinks (green), anthropogenic sources (orange), and mixed natural and anthropogenic sources (hatched orange-green for ‘biomass and biofuel burning’).




Figure 2. Methane emissions (Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹) for 2017 by region, source category, and latitude. The mean estimates shown arise from the ensemble of top-down inversion models described in Sauniois et al (2020).



80% of the total increase for North America from 2000–2006 to 2017.

4. Natural methane sources

Global methane emissions estimated from natural sources are relatively unchanged from 2000–2006 to 2017, albeit with large uncertainties (table 1). Mean top-down estimates for natural methane sources were 232 (194–267) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2017 compared with 220 (198–243) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for 2000–2006 (table 1); mean bottom-up estimates were substantially higher: 367 (243–489) and 368 (245–482) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ for

the two periods, respectively. Natural sources remain more poorly constrained than anthropogenic ones, with divergent estimates for the bottom-up and top-down emissions. Vegetated wetlands contributed 194 (155–217) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ of the total, about 83% of natural sources based on TD methods (table 1). In contrast, BU methods estimate vegetated wetland emissions to be 145 (100–183) Tg CH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2017, a value unchanged from the 2000–2006 average but only three-quarters of the TD estimate (that also includes inland water emissions).

Wetlands and freshwater systems more broadly are the largest source of methane but also the greatest



source of uncertainty to the global methane budget. Their inclusion in BU methodologies leads to a difference of roughly $150 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ when compared to the atmospheric constraint. Wetland definitions and challenges in properly understanding the location of wetlands have led to ‘double counting’ of inland waters and vegetated wetlands in previous studies. Our use of the Wetland Area Dynamics for Methane

Modeling (WAD2M) dataset reduced the effect of double counting by $\sim 35 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ compared to the previous budget in Saunio *et al* (2016), with vegetated wetlands accounting for $101\text{--}179 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. However, the inland waters estimate is revised to a range of $117\text{--}212 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, higher than in Saunio *et al* (2016) due to newer studies that measured higher emission factors in freshwater systems

(Delsontro *et al* 2018, Saunois *et al* 2020). Reconciling the wetland methane emissions flux requires continued attention and the use of independent lines of data from isotopes, flux towers, and satellite observations (e.g. Knox *et al* 2019).

Another source of uncertainty is the amount of methane released from natural geological sources, particularly seeps and mud volcanoes. The new global BU estimate for natural geological sources (terrestrial and marine) of 45 (range of 18–65) Tg CH₄ (Etiopie *et al* 2019, Saunois *et al* 2020) is 7 Tg CH₄ smaller than the value in Saunois *et al* (2016a). However, recent studies analyzing radiocarbon methane (¹⁴CH₄) in ice cores have concluded that pre-industrial emissions of thermogenic (i.e. ancient or ‘fossil’) methane were close to zero (~0–5.4 Tg CH₄; Hmiel *et al* 2020)—substantially less even than the 15.4 Tg CH₄ estimated for the abrupt warming event that occurred between the Younger Dryas and Preboreal intervals ~11 600 years ago (Petrenko *et al* 2017). Hmiel *et al* (2020) also conclude that current estimates of CH₄ emissions from the fossil fuel industry are therefore too low by 30 to 40 Tg CH₄ (Lassey *et al* 2007). However, the uncertainties in isotopic budget studies remain substantial due to the uncertainties in the isotopic signature of the sources.

Unlike top-down approaches, bottom-up inventories estimate activity and emissions factors separately. In contrast to the results of Hmiel *et al* (2020), a new annual estimate of natural methane emissions from the East Siberian Arctic Shelf alone is 3.0 Tg CH₄, most of it thermogenic methane (Thornton *et al* 2020). A number as small as 5 Tg CH₄ per year for all natural geologic emissions (Hmiel *et al* 2020) seems difficult to reconcile with the results of Thornton *et al* (2020), the work of other researchers more broadly, and with BU approaches generally. Research is needed to constrain geologic sources fully.

Additional focus and monitoring is also needed to track the potential for rapid methane release from the Arctic (e.g. Post *et al* 2019, Zhang *et al* 2019). Average surface temperatures in the Arctic have risen twice as fast as the global average of 1.1 °C over the past two decades (compared to the period 1850–1900; WMO 2019). As a result of permafrost thaw and other changes in peatland ecosystems, many investigators and models predict a substantial increase in Arctic methane emissions this century. However, our latitudinal estimates from TD methods shows no evidence for the start of such a transition through year 2017 (figure 4; see also Saunois *et al* 2020).

5. Conclusions

Methane emissions have continued to rise over the past decade and are tracking concentrations most consistent with the warmest marker scenario of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (RCP8.5, a representative concentration pathway)

that yields an estimated global warming of 4.3 °C by year 2100 (Saunois *et al* 2016b, 2020, Nisbet *et al* 2019). Current trajectories in socioeconomic development also suggest the world is likely to follow IPCC Shared Socioeconomic pathways (SSP) leading to relatively higher emission trajectories over the next decade (Saunois *et al* 2020). Estimates for 2018 and 2019 show increases in atmospheric methane of 8.5 and 10.7 ppb, respectively, two of the four highest annual growth rates since 2000 (Dlugokencky 2020).

Increased emissions from both the agriculture and waste sector and the fossil fuel sector are likely the dominant cause of this global increase (figures 1 and 4), highlighting the need for stronger mitigation in both areas. Our analysis also highlights emission increases in agriculture, waste, and fossil fuel sectors from southern and southeastern Asia, including China, as well as increases in the fossil fuel sector in the United States (figure 4). In contrast, Europe is the only continent in which methane emissions appear to be decreasing. While changes in the sink of methane from atmospheric or soil uptake remains possible (Turner *et al* 2019), atmospheric chemistry and land-surface models suggest the timescales for sink responses are too slow to explain most of the increased methane in the atmosphere in recent years. Climate policies overall, where present for methane mitigation, have yet to alter substantially the global emissions trajectory to date.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the many scientists whose efforts contributed to the new Global Methane Budget released by the Global Carbon Project (globalcarbonproject.org). Our research was supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation through Grant GBMF5439 ‘Advancing Understanding of the Global Methane Cycle’ to Stanford University for the Methane Budget activity of the Global Carbon Project (globalcarbonproject.org). The authors acknowledge additional support from the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University (RBJ), the Australian Government’s National Environmental Science Programme’s Earth Systems and Climate Change Hub (JGC), and Future Earth. The data that support the findings of this study are openly available at globalcarbonproject.org.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available at globalcarbonproject.org.

ORCID iDs

R B Jackson

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8846-7147>

P Bergamaschi

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4555-1829>

A Tsuruta

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9197-3005>

References

- Q7** Delsonro T, Beaulieu J J and Downing J A 2018 Greenhouse gas emissions from lakes and impoundments: upscaling in the face of global change *Limnol. Oceanogr. Lett.* **3** 64–75
- Dlugokencky E 2020 NOAA/ESRL (available at: www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends_ch4/)
- Etiopie G, Ciotoli G, Schwietzke S and Schoell M 2019 Gridded maps of geological methane emissions and their isotopic signature *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **11** 1–22
- Etminan M, Myhre G, Highwood E J and Shine K P 2016 Radiative forcing of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide: a significant revision of the methane radiative forcing *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **43** 12614–23
- Friedlingstein P *et al* 2019 Global Carbon Budget 2019 *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **11** 1783–838
- Ganesan A L *et al* 2019 Advancing scientific understanding of the global methane budget in support of the Paris Agreement *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **33** 1475–512
- Q8** Hmiel B *et al* 2020 Preindustrial ¹⁴CH₄ indicates greater anthropogenic fossil CH₄ emissions *Nature* **578** 409–12
- IDMC 2019 *IDMC Mid-Year Figures: Internal Displacement from January to June 2019* (Geneva: IDMC)
- IPCC Climate Change 2014 *Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed O Edenhofer *et al* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Jackson R B, Friedlingstein P, Andrew R M, Canadell J G, Le Quéré C and Peters G P 2019 Persistent fossil fuel growth threatens the Paris Agreement and planetary health *Environ. Res. Lett.* **14** 121001
- Jensen K and McDonald K 2019 Surface water microwave product series Version 3: a near-real time and 25-year historical global inundated area fraction time series from active and passive microwave remote sensing *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.* **16** 1402–6
- Kirschke S *et al* 2013 Three decades of global methane sources and sinks *Nat. Clim. Change* **6** 813–23
- Knox S H *et al* 2019 FLUXNET-CH₄ synthesis activity: objectives, observations, and future directions *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **100** 2607–32
- Lassey K R, Etheridge D M, Lowe D C, Smith A M and Ferretti D F 2007 Centennial evolution of the atmospheric methane budget: what do the carbon isotopes tell us? *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **7** 2119–39
- Locatelli R *et al* 2013 Impact of transport model errors on the global and regional methane emissions estimated by inverse modelling *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **13** 9917–37
- Nisbet E G *et al* 2019 Very strong atmospheric methane growth in the four years 2014–2017: implications for the Paris Agreement *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **33** 318–42
- Pekel J-F, Cottam A, Gorelick N and Belward A 2016 High-resolution mapping of global surface water and its long-term changes *Nature* **540** 418–22
- Petrenko V V *et al* 2017 Minimal geological methane emissions during the Younger Dryas–Preboreal abrupt warming event *Nature* **548** 443–6
- Post E *et al* 2019 The polar regions in a 2°C warmer world *Sci. Adv.* **5** eaaw9883
- Rigby M *et al* 2017 Role of atmospheric oxidation in recent methane growth *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **114** 5373–7
- Saunio M *et al* 2016a The global methane budget 2000–2012 *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **8** 697–751
- Saunio M *et al* 2017 Variability and quasi-decadal changes in the methane budget over the period 2000–2012 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **17** 1135–11161
- Saunio M *et al* 2020 The global methane budget 2000–2017 *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* (accepted) (<https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-128>)
- Saunio M, Jackson R B, Bousquet P, Poulter B and Canadell J G 2016b The growing role of methane in anthropogenic climate change *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11** 120207
- Schwietzke S *et al* 2016 Upward revision of global fossil fuel methane emissions based on isotope database *Nature* **538** 88–91
- Thornton B F, Prytherch J, Andersson K, Brooks I M, Salisbury D, Tjernström M and Crill P M 2020 Shipborne eddy covariance observations of methane fluxes constrain Arctic sea emissions *Sci. Adv.* **6** eaay7934
- Turner A J, Frankenberg C and Kort E A 2019 Interpreting contemporary trends in atmospheric methane *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **116** 2805–13
- World Meteorological Organization 2019 *United in Science* (Geneva, Switzerland: WMO)
- Zhang Z, Zimmermann N E, Stenke A, Li X, Hodson E L, Zhu G, Huang C and Poulter B 2019 Emerging role of wetland methane emissions in driving 21st century climate change *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **114** 9647–52
- Zhao Y *et al* 2020 Influences of hydroxyl radicals (OH) on top-down estimates of the global and regional methane budgets *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* (submitted) (<https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-1208>)