Permafrost Vulnerability From Multiple Essential Climate Variables

Final meeting, Feb 1st, 2024

Dr. Alexandra Runge

ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) Fellowship 2021-2023

Alfred Wegener Institute Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research, Potsdam, Germany









Agenda

1.Welcome and introduction
2.Project presentation
3.Questions and discussion
4.Closing remarks on fellowship

Permafrost is warming at global scale



ESA CCI Permafrost data (Obu et al. 2019, Earth-Science Reviews), animation by ESA. 3

Ground thermal conditions – connected to climate, topography, hydrology, and vegetation



Permafrost vulnerability from combined surface trends

	Albedo increase	Ρ	Albedo decrease	
		E	Fire	
Resilience	Vegetation	R M	Vegetation	Vulnerability
	LST decrease	A F	LST increase	+
	Snow cover decrease	R	Snow cover increase	
	Soil moisture increase	S T	Soil moisture decrease	

Increase our understanding of the **permafrost-climate dynamics** by analysing **EO data products** Can we derive information on the **thermal state of permafrost** from **EO-data** of **surface variables**?

- 1. Consistent processing and **spatiotemporal variability assessment** of the **ECVs**
- 2. Identify an appropriate **assessment scale**
- 3. Perform **correlation analysis** and **PCA** to identify **drivers** and **combined impact** of ECVs
- 4. Set up a **ML framework and model** to perform **permafrost vulnerability mapping** based on ECVs

Essential Climate Variables as input

Variable	Parameter	Years	Spatial Resolution	Temporal Resolution	Source
Permafrost	GT 2 m	2000-2019	1 km	annually	ESA CCI
					(Obu et al., 2021)
Land surface	LST	2000-2018	0.05 deg	daily	ESA CCI
temperature					(Ermida and Trigo, 2023)
Land cover	NDVI	2000-2020	500 m	16-days	MODIS (MOD13A1 V6.1)
					(Didan, 2023)
Soil moisture	swvl1	2000-2020	25 km	daily	ERA5 reanalysis
					(Hersbach et al., 2023)
Snow cover	SCFG	2000-2019	1 km	daily	ESA CCI
					(Nagler et al., 2021)
Fire	burned area	2001-2019	250 m	monthly	ESA CCI
					(Chuvieco et al., 2018)
Albedo	ALBB-DH	2000-2020	1 km	10 days	GCOS
					(Climate Change Service, 2018)
Air temperature	t2m	2000-2020	25 km	daily	ERA5 reanalysis
					(Hersbach et al., 2023)
Precipitation	tp	2000-2020	25 km	daily	ERA5 reanalysis
					(Hersbach et al., 2023)

EO-based Essential Climate Variables provide consistent long-term datasets



Ground temperature **trends vary** across the **pan-Arctic**



Wetscapes of the Boreal - Arctic Wetland and Lake Dataset Wetland-rich Tundra Wetland and Lake-rich Yedoma Tundra and Tundra Barrens Wetland and Lake-rich Tund Upland Boreal Upland Tundr 100 rich Wetlands ant Boreal Wetland 80 Boreal Wetlands Sparse Boreal Wetland Landscape Unit [%] Upland boreal 60 Alpine tundra barrens Glaciers Upland tundra Sparse boreal peatlands 40 Lake-rich shields Common boreal peatlands Permafrost peatlands Wetland-rich tundra 20 Wetland and lake-rich tundra Dominant boreal peatlands Rivers Large lakes 0 Wetland and lake-rich yedoma tundra Lake-rich wetlands

Pan-Arctic landscape units: Boreal-Arctic Wetland and Lake Dataset



MAGT PCA: Preci and SM explain 26%, and FI 23%



11

BAWLD PCA: LST explains 26%, Preci and TMP 19%





Permafrost vulnerability mapping with ML

DL: U-net and convolutional LSTM



TUM: Adrian Höhl, 3 mths HIDA stipend, ongoing

Feature attribution with SHAP



Discussion

- Lit. review: TMP and Preci drive permafrost thaw (e.g. Douglas et al. 2020, Smith et al. 2022) MAGT: Preci, SM / FI -> sparse distribution and representation 8 BAWLD: LST / Preci, TMP 🗭 MODIS LST uses in PF model Climate variables > environmental variables **Biases in assessment** 28 MAGT too sparse Time series too short: 20 yrs cannot account for lag period ECVs in northern high latitude Calibration and validation is limited Not working with absolute but with trend data

- 1. Consistent processing and **spatiotemporal variability assessment** of the **ECV**
- 2. Identify an approprioate **assessment scale**
- 3. Perform correlation analysis and PCA to identify drivers and combined impact of ECV
- 4. Set up a **ML framework and model** to perform **permafrost vulnerability mapping** based on ECVs

MAGT vs BAWLD POI1 ↓ ↓ Preci, LST / Preci, SM / FI TMP

ongoing

Take-away

In-situ data is highly valuable → MAGT / GTN-P
 Representative sampling is necessary → e.g. BAWLD
 Tendencies can be derived for warming of permafrost

Open questions

→ Adrian Höhl and I are working on a deep model and explainable Al approach to identify permatrost vulnerability

Impact of static variables such as topography, ground ice content, soil properties → topography and global surface water included in ML
 Lowland vs mountain permafrost?

Reflection on CCI project

- ESA CCI soil moisture
- ESA CCI land cover
- PF GT vs ALT
- MODIS NDVI vs LAI
- Variable aggregation: seasons

Challenges and problems

Scope of the project
Availability and accessibility of CCI data sets



Guido Grosse Annett Bartsch Adrian Höhl Konrad Heidler Bennet Juhls Anna Maria Trofaier Frank Martin Seifert ESA CCI Fellows 2021-23





