How strict selection of the raw eddy-covariance data influences gpp estimation of a temperate beech forest

Bernard B. Longdoz, Patrick Gross, André A. Granier

HOW STRICT SELECTION OF THE RAW EDDY-COVARIANCE DATA INFLUENCES GPP ESTIMATION OF A TEMPERATE BEECH FOREST

LONGDOZ Bernard, GROSS Patrick, GRANIER André
UMR Ecologie et Ecophysiologie forestière, Centre INRA Nancy, 54280 Champenoux
longdoz@nancy.inra.fr

1.Abstract

The **data quality** and the **selection** of the correct Eddy Covariance (**EC**) records become an important step in the CO_2 flux determination procedure. An **innovative combination** of existing assessment **tests** is used to give a relatively complete evaluation of the **net ecosystem exchange** measurements. For the 2005 full-leaf season at the Hesse site, the percentage of **bad quality** data is relatively high (**59.6%**) especially during night-time (68.9%). This result strengthens the importance of the data gap filling method. The **filtering** used does **not lead to** a real **improvement** of the accuracy of the relationship between the CO2 fluxes and the climatic factors. The **soil respiration spatial heterogeneity** (on a site with relatively homogenous vegetation pattern) seems to be too important to allow this improvement. However, the **data rejected** present some common characteristics. Their removal lead to a **10% increase** in the total amount of CO2 respired (**Reco**) and photosynthesised (**GPP**) during the 2005 full-leaf season. Consequently the application of our combination of multiple quality tests is able improve the inter-annual analysis. The question of a systematic application on the large database like the CarboEurope and FLUXNET is legitimate.

2.Hesse site

- Hesse beech (90%) plot
- Age: 39 years
- Height: 17 m
- Precipitation: 950 mm yr^{-1}
- Mean annual temp. : 10.1°C
- Soil type : Luvisol/Stagnic luvisol
- Soil texture: Sable 7%; Limon 64%; Argile 29%

Fig. 1

Fig. 2



3.Material

EDDY-COVARIANCE SYSTEM
- Tower (Fig. 2)
- IRGA LI6262 at soil level (Fig. 3)
- Sonic anemometer Gill R2 (Fig. 4)
- Tubing from sonic to IRGA (30 m)

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

4.Method

Raw data tests (on high frequency [CO_2] and wind measurements)
- Anemometer or IRGA problems: spikes, discontinuities of mean or variance, unrealistic data, large skewness, kurtosis and standard deviation (Vickers & Mahrt, 1997)
- Mass Flow Controller (MFC) anomalies: constant airflow rate in the EC tubing

CO_2 EC fluxes (Fc, computed each half-hour) tests
- Flux stationarity during the half-hour (Foken & Wichura, 1996)
- Footprint, Fc flagged if 10% comes out of Hesse beech forest (Soegaard et al., 2003)
- U* threshold to dismiss horizontal advection periods

5.Results

Quality test	% flagged
Anemometer problems	1.6
IRGA problems	33.3
MFC problem	0.1
Stationarity	23.9
Footprint	1.5
U*	9.9
Total	**59.6**

Table 1

Quality test	% flagged
Spikes	0.1
Mean discontinuities	1.9
Variance discontinuities	2.1
Absolute limits	0.1
Skewness	14.5
Kurtosis	31.9
Standard Deviation	3.4
Total	**33.3**

Table 2

Table 1 : Percentages of half-hours flagged for the different tests
Table 2 : Percentages of half-hours flagged for the different IRGA problems

- Two tests appear to be highly **restrictive**: the **CO_2 IRGA kurtosis** anomalies and the **stationarity**
- The stationarity flag percentage is close to the one estimated by Rebmann et al. (2005) for the Hesse summer 2000 (28%).
- In Vickers and Mahrt (1997), the kurtosis test is also the more efficient among the IRGA problems ones (with % higher than here)
- The sum of all the % of the different tests exceeds the total value because of multi-flagged data.

- The data elimination changes the relationship between the CO_2 fluxes and the environmental factors
  ⇒ **Reco**, **GPP** and **NEE** for the 2005 full-leaf season vary all by about **10%**, with **more** important **photosynthesis** exchanges, **more** CO_2 produced by **respiration** processes and a **higher** net **sequestration when quality tests are applied**
- The selection of the non flagged data doesn't really improve the fit of Reco with soil t° function (R^2 stable) and water content function (R^2 gains less than 5%) except for the u* test
  ⇒ **Unexplained temporal Reco variations** after u* filtering don't **come** from problems by the tests but rather **from different footprint** area **combined with** large **soil respiration heterogeneity**