# <sup>1</sup>**Supplementary Information**

# <sup>2</sup>**Near-real-time monitoring of global CO2 emissions**  <sup>3</sup>**reveals the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic**

4

5 Zhu Liu<sup>1\*†</sup>, Philippe Ciais<sup>2†</sup>, Zhu Deng<sup>1†</sup>, Ruixue Lei<sup>3</sup>, Steven J. Davis<sup>4</sup>, Sha Feng<sup>3</sup>, Bo

6 Zheng<sup>2</sup>, Duo Cui<sup>1</sup>, Xinyu Dou<sup>1</sup>, Biqing Zhu<sup>1</sup>, Rui Guo<sup>1</sup>, Piyu Ke<sup>1</sup>, Taochun Sun<sup>1</sup>, Chenxi

7 Lu<sup>1</sup>, Pan He<sup>1</sup>, Yuan Wang<sup>5,6</sup>, Xu Yue<sup>7</sup>, Yilong Wang<sup>8</sup>, Yadong Lei<sup>9</sup>, Hao Zhou<sup>9</sup>, Zhaonan

8 Cai<sup>10</sup>, Yuhui Wu<sup>11</sup>, Runtao Guo<sup>12</sup>, Tingxuan Han<sup>13</sup>, Jinjun Xue<sup>14, 15, <sup>16</sup>, Olivier Boucher<sup>17</sup>,</sup>

9 Eulalie Boucher<sup>17</sup>, Frédéric Chevallier<sup>2</sup>, Katsumasa Tanaka<sup>2,27</sup>, Yimin Wei<sup>18</sup>, Haiwang

10 Zhong<sup>19</sup>, Chongqing Kang<sup>19</sup>, Ning Zhang<sup>20</sup>, Bin Chen<sup>21</sup>, Fengming Xi<sup>22</sup>, Miaomiao Liu<sup>23</sup>,

11 François-Marie Bréon<sup>2</sup>, Yonglong Lu<sup>24</sup>, Qiang Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Dabo Guan<sup>1</sup>, Peng Gong<sup>1</sup>, Daniel

12 M. Kammen<sup>25</sup>, Kebin He<sup>11</sup> and Hans Joachim Schellnhuber<sup>26,1</sup>

13<br>14 1 Department of Earth System Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China.

- 15 2 Laboratoire des Sciences du Climate et de l'Environnement LSCE, Orme de Merisiers, Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- 16 3 Department of Meteorology and Atmospheric Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
- 17 4 Department of Earth System Science, University of California, Irvine, 3232 Croul Hall, Irvine, CA, USA
- 18 5 Division of Geological and Planetary Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA
- 19 6 Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA
- 20 7 Jiangsu Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Environment Monitoring and Pollution Control, Collaborative Innovation

21 Center of Atmospheric Environment and Equipment Technology, School of Environmental Science and Engineering,

22 Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, Nanjing, China

23 8 Key Laboratory of Land Surface Pattern and Simulation, Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources

- 24 Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
- 25 9 Climate Change Research Center, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
- 26 10 Key Laboratory of Middle Atmosphere and Global Environment Observation, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, 27 Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.
- 28 11 School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China<br>29 12 School of Mathematical School, Tsinghua University, Beijing
- 29 12 School of Mathematical School, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China<br>20 13 Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing,
- 13 Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
- 31 14 Center of Hubei Cooperative Innovation for Emissions Trading System, Wuhan, China
- 32 15 Faculty of Management and Economics, Kunming University of Science and Technology, 13 Kunming, China
- 33 16 Economic Research Centre of Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Japan
- 34 17 Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace, Sorbonne Université / CNRS, Paris, France
- 35 18 Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China<br>36 19 Department of Electrical Engineering, the State Key Lab of Control and Simulation of Power
- 36 19 Department of Electrical Engineering, the State Key Lab of Control and Simulation of Power Systems and<br>37 Generation Equipment, Institute for National Governance and Global Governance, Tsinghua University, Beijing, C
- Generation Equipment, Institute for National Governance and Global Governance, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
- 38 20 Jinan University, Guangzhou, China
- 39 21 Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China
- 40 22 Institute of Applied Ecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shenyang, China
- 41 23 State Key Laboratory of Pollution Control and Resource Reuse, School of the Environment, Nanjing University, 42 Nanjing, China
- 43 24 Key Laboratory of Wetland Ecology of Ministry of Education, College of Ecology and the Environment, Xiamen
- 44 University, Xiamen, China<br>45 25 Energy and Resources G 45 25 Energy and Resources Group and Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA
- 46 26 Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam, Germany
- 47 27 Center for Global Environmental Research, National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan
- 48 \* Corresponding authors: zhuliu@tsinghua.edu.cn
- 49 † Authors contributed equally
- 50



**Supplementary Figure 1 | Daily thermal generation for countries**. Daily thermal generation (or

total electricity generation, i.e. Russia) in 2019 (grey lines) and 2020 (red lines) in the U.S., India, Russia, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, other EU countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus,

Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania,

- Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden), UK, Brazil, Japan and
- China (grey areas represent the national lockdown periods in 2020).
- 





**Supplementary Figure 2 | Daily CO2 emission changes in the ground (road) transport sector**.

- Daily emission changes in the ground (road) transport sector in the first half year of 2020 (green lines; grey lines for uncertainties; grey areas for the national lockdown periods in 2020).
- 





**Supplementary Figure 3 | Daily variations of surface PM2.5, NO2 and CO concentrations**.

69 Daily variations of surface (a, d)  $PM_{2,5}$ , (b, d)  $NO_2$ , (c, f) CO concentrations from (a-c) China and

(d-f) U.S. during the first quarters of 2019 and 2020. The bold lines are the mean values from all

71 quality-controlled sites, with shadings indicating one standard deviation. The data on February  $29<sup>th</sup>$ 2020 are removed from the plot.



**Supplementary Figure 4 | The relationship between TomTom congestion level with the daily mean car counts.** The relationship between TomTom congestion index and the actual vehicle counts (Q in number of vehicles per hour each day) for Paris. a) the regression between TomTom congestion level (x-axis) and Q (y-axis); b) Q reconstructed based on TomTom congestion indexes (red) and the actual Q.



82 **Supplementary Figure 5 | Monthly series of NO<sub>2</sub>, aerosol optical depth (AOD) and column** 

83 **CO<sub>2</sub> mixing ratio (XCO<sub>2</sub>).** Monthly series of a) NO<sub>2</sub> from OMI, b) aerosol optical depth (AOD)

84 from MODIS and c) column CO<sub>2</sub> mixing ratio (XCO<sub>2</sub>) from GOSAT over China, US, selected EU

85 countries (UK, Germany, Italy and France), and India.

86



88

89 **Supplementary Figure 6 | Tropospheric column NO<sub>2</sub> observation**. Tropospheric column NO<sub>2</sub>

- 90 observation in January May of 2020. Source maps from GSHHG (Global Self-consistent,
- 91 Hierarchical, High-resolution Geography Database)<sup>1</sup>.



93 **Supplementary Figure 7 | Difference of tropospheric column NO2 observation**. Difference of

- 94 tropospheric column  $NO<sub>2</sub>$  observation in January May of 2020. Source maps from GSHHG
- 95 (Global Self-consistent, Hierarchical, High-resolution Geography Database)<sup>1</sup>.



#### **Supplementary Figure 8 | Anomaly of monthly NO<sub>2</sub>.** Anomaly of NO<sub>2</sub> from OMI in the January - May of 2020

The anomaly maps conducted by apply the same algorithm on every grid point. The anomaly

100 defined as the deseasonalized value. For  $NO<sub>2</sub>$  (Supplementary Fig. 8), the anomaly along the

eastern coast of China was negative in January and February 2020, then partially become positive.

About half of the anomalies over U.S. and Europe were positive in January 2020, then most areas

over U.S. and Europe became negative, which also matches the COVID-19 epidemic delays

compared to China. Source maps from GSHHG (Global Self-consistent, Hierarchical, High-

105 resolution Geography Database)<sup>1</sup>.



### **Supplementary Figure 9 | Anomaly of monthly AOD.** Anomaly of AOD from MODIS in the

- January May of 2020
- The anomaly maps conducted by apply the same algorithm on every grid point. The anomaly
- defined as the deseasonalized value. For AOD (Supplementary Fig. 9), the negative anomaly area
- along the eastern coast of China expanded from January to March 2020. For US and Europe, AOD
- anomalies on land did not change too much. The shutdown of COVID-19 may not affect AOD
- over them since their AOD was always Low. Source maps from GSHHG (Global Self-
- 113 consistent, Hierarchical, High-resolution Geography Database)<sup>1</sup>...
- 

### 115 **Supplementary Tables**

### 116 **Supplementary Table 1 | Sectoral changes of CO<sub>2</sub> emission (2020 compared to the same**



Unit: $MtCO2$	<b>Power</b>	Ground	<b>Industry</b>	<b>Residential</b>	<b>Domestic</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Decline</b>
		<b>Transport</b>	(with Process)		<b>Aviation</b>		(%)
<b>China</b>	$-31.3$	$-96.8$	$-40.0$	$-8.0$	$-11.1$	$-187.2$	$-3.7\%$
India	$-83.6$	$-33.6$	$-92.6$	7.0	$-2.3$	$-205.2$	$-15.4%$
U.S.	$-66.3$	$-195.8$	$-36.5$	$-14.7$	$-24.9$	$-338.3$	$-13.3%$
<b>EU27 &amp; UK</b>	$-98.5$	$-43.6$	$-43.5$	$-17.0$	$-3.1$	$-205.7$	$-12.7%$
<b>Russia</b>	$-20.6$	$-8.6$	$-3.3$	$-6.8$	$-1.2$	$-40.5$	$-5.3\%$
<b>Japan</b>	$-16.0$	$-7.9$	$-16.2$	$-2.1$	$-1.0$	$-43.1$	$-7.5\%$
<b>Brazil</b>	1.3	$-17.4$	$-8.3$	0.0	$-1.5$	$-25.9$	$-12.0%$
<b>ROW</b>	$-26.3$	$-209.6$	$-23.1$	$-0.9$	$-9.8$	$-269.6$	$-5.5\%$
<b>International</b>							
<b>Aviation</b>						$-146.0$	$-48.5%$
<b>International</b>							
<b>Shipping</b>						$-89.1$	$-25.0\%$
Sum	$-341.4$	$-613.3$	$-263.5$	$-42.5$		$-54.8 - 1550.5$	$-8.8%$
Decline $(\% )$	$-5.0\%$	$-18.6%$	$-5.5\%$	$-2.2%$	$-35.1%$	$-8.8\%$	

<sup>118</sup> 

### 120 **Supplementary Table 2 | Monthly changes of CO2 emissions in the power sector** (2020

121 compared to the same periods in 2019).



122

123

124

125

<sup>119</sup> 

127 **Supplementary Table 3 | Monthly changes of CO2 emissions in the industry sector** (2020 128 compared to the same periods in 2019).

	China	India	U.S.	<b>EU27 &amp; UK</b>	<b>Russia</b>	Japan	<b>Brazil</b>	<b>ROW</b>	World
Jan	$-6.4%$	1.8%	$-0.7\%$	$-1.2%$	3.9%	$-2.4%$	1.5%	$0.0\%$	$-2.4%$
Feb	$-16.8%$	3.8%	$0.0\%$	$-1.6\%$	4.9%	$-5.6\%$	$-0.4\%$	4.6%	$-4.2%$
Mar	$-8.0\%$	$-22.4%$	$-5.4\%$	$-12.8%$	2.6%	$-5.3\%$	$-4.2%$	$-2.2%$	$-7.3%$
Apr	3.4%	$-67.1%$	$-20.5%$	$-29.6%$	$-9.9\%$	$-15.1%$	$-31.6%$	$-9.7%$	$-11.2%$
May	4.4%	$-39.3%$	$-16.6\%$	$-21.6%$	$-7.2%$	$-26.3%$	$-23.7%$	$-1.1%$	$-5.4%$
Jun	3.8%	$-10.7%$	$-11.1%$	$-18.0%$	$-6.4%$	$-17.7%$	$-10.0\%$	$0.0\%$	$-2.0\%$
Jan-Feb	$-10.9%$	2.8%	$-0.4%$	$-1.4%$	4.4%	$-4.0\%$	0.6%	2.1%	$-3.2%$
Jan-Mar	$-9.7\%$	$-6.1%$	$-2.1\%$	$-5.2\%$	3.7%	$-4.5\%$	$-1.1\%$	0.5%	$-4.7%$
Jan-Apr	$-5.9\%$	$-20.5%$	$-6.7\%$	$-11.3%$	0.1%	$-7.1\%$	$-9.1\%$	$-2.3%$	$-6.5\%$
Jan-May	$-3.4\%$	$-24.3\%$	$-8.6\%$	$-13.4%$	$-1.4%$	$-10.8%$	$-12.3%$	$-2.0\%$	$-6.3\%$
Jan-Jun	$-2.1\%$	$-22.1%$	$-9.1\%$	$-14.1%$	$-2.3%$	$-12.0%$	$-11.9%$	$-1.7%$	$-5.5\%$

130

131

#### 132 **Supplementary Table 4 | Monthly changes of CO2 emissions in the ground**

133 **transportation sector** (2020 compared to the same periods in 2019).



134

135

136

	<b>Domestic</b>								Intern		
<b>Month</b>	China	India	U.S.	<b>EU27</b> & UK	<b>Russia</b>	Japan	<b>Brazil</b>	<b>ROW</b>	All	ational	World
Jan	2.4%	4.4%	8.5%	0.0%	14.4%	7.2%	6.4%	7.9%	6.8%	3.7%	4.8%
Feb	$-71.2%$	11.6%	12.1%	2.7%	13.1%	10.3%	9.5%	9.2%	$-5.4\%$	$-3.0\%$	$-3.8\%$
Mar		$-56.4\% -18.8\% -13.2\%$		$-44.6%$	6.1%	$-4.0\%$	$-18.3%$			$-20.3\%$ $-22.7\%$ $-39.5\%$ $-33.6\%$	
Apr		$-51.7\% -98.6\% -65.4\%$		$-90.9\%$	$-65.6%$	$-47.3%$	$-87.7\%$			$-80.5\%$ $-67.6\%$ $-83.5\%$ $-78.1\%$	
May		$-34.9\% -93.7\% -64.4\%$		$-87.9\%$	$-64.1%$	$-75.3%$	$-83.2\%$			-77.9% -63.8% -78.8% -73.7%	
Jun		-24.6% -70.8% -53.4%		$-76.5%$	$-36.5%$	$-61.0\%$	$-76.0%$			-64.2% -51.8% -78.5% -69.6%	
Jul		$-14.7\%$ $-70.3\%$ $-41.9\%$		$-48.8%$	$-9.8%$	$-36.9\%$	$-69.7\%$			$-54.1\% -39.6\% -72.0\% -61.3\%$	
Jan-Feb	$-33.7%$	7.8%	10.2%	1.3%	13.8%	8.7%	7.8%	8.6%	0.9%	$0.5\%$	0.7%
Jan-Mar	$-41.2%$	$-1.1\%$	1.6%	$-15.2\%$	11.1%	4.3%	$-0.5\%$	$-1.5\%$			$-7.4\% -13.5\% -11.4\%$
Jan-Apr		$-43.8\% -24.0\% -15.9\%$		$-35.6%$	$-9.1\%$	$-8.5\%$	$-20.4%$			$-21.6\%$ $-22.8\%$ $-31.8\%$ $-28.7\%$	
Jan-May		$-42.0\% -38.4\% -26.4\%$		$-47.2%$	$-21.5%$	$-22.5%$	$-31.7%$			$-33.4\% -31.5\% -41.8\% -38.3\%$	
Jan-Jun		$-39.1\% -43.9\% -31.3\%$		$-52.7\%$	$-24.5%$	$-29.0\%$	$-38.4%$			$-38.8\% -35.1\% -48.5\% -43.9\%$	
Jan-Jul		-35.3% -47.8% -33.0%		$-52.0\%$	$-21.9\%$	$-30.2%$	$-43.2%$			-41.2% -35.8% -52.4% -46.7%	

**138 Supplementary Table 5 | Monthly changes of CO2 emissions in the aviation Sector (2020 compared to the same periods in 2019).** compared to the same periods in 2019).



# 144 **Supplementary Table 6 | The observation of air quality and dry column**  $CO_2 (XCO_2)$







147

# 148 **Supplementary Table 7 | Percentage uncertainty for daily emission 2020**



149

#### **Supplementary Note 1 Comparison of Liu et al. and Le Quéré et al.**

As requested by reviewer and editor, we compared our study with the recently published

- 153 work<sup>2</sup> by Le Quéré et al. that addressed a similar topic although with a different approach when looking in details:
- In short:

156 Le Quéré et al. relied on confinement index intensity to attribute changes of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  emissions

due to COVID-19 pandemic. Le Quéré et al. assumed that emissions reductions scaled

linearly according to activity data for selected periods / countries and established

relationships between % change activity data and confinement indexes severity. These

relationships were then applied with daily confinement indexes to infer emission changes per sector / country.

In this approach, only COVID (confinement) effects on emissions were modeled, not effects

of other factors which also drove actual daily emissions in 2020: changes of weather (cold /

mild winter) or in energy mix for power production, due to low gas price at the same time as

the confinement. When confinement levels returned to zero, real emissions can be reduced or

increased and by construction the approach of Le Quéré et al. cannot track those changes.

In our study, we used daily activity data to quantify emissions for all sectors, which allows

continuing to track daily emission dynamics after the end of the lockdowns. At face value,

our approach gives an assessment of actual emissions changes from all factors, including

dominant effects of COVID during the lockdown but also effect of warm winter weather,

rebounds of industry emissions after confinements, continued depletion of transport

emissions (especially aviation), and changes of energy mix (power sector emissions). Our

- methodology also captures emission reductions during holidays when they happen, which can
- be on different days of the year across different years.
- 

In more details:

We document below some key methodological differences.

Traffic emissions: Le Quéré et al. traffic emissions were scaled linearly with 7-days traffic

TomTom congestion indices, supplemented by data from data from Apple (58 countries), the

US MS2 corporation (20 states) and the UK government. Their approach was to take %

changes of those indices in the week of April 4 at discrete confinement levels (as defined by

policies in place) across the available datasets, and then apply this relationship (% changes of

traffic indices vs discrete confinement level) according to daily confinement index in each

country. The discrete nature of confinement index values explains why there are 'steps' in

- daily changes reconstructed from Le Quéré et al. when the index moves from one discrete
- value to another.

Instead, we used directly TomTom indices as a continuous variable because we accessed

daily data in several cities within each country. We showed this index was a nonlinear

function of the actual car flux (thus emissions) and calibrated and applied this nonlinear

function to infer daily emissions from each country.

- Residential emissions: Le Quéré et al. estimates were based on confinement indexes and
- electricity consumption for the city of London (assuming implicitly that electricity
- consumption may scale with fuel use in buildings). In our study, residential emissions are
- assumed to depend on temperature in cold countries and were estimated based on 2019 fuel
- consumption data with established temperature functions of temperature in 2019 and 2020.
- We adopted this approach after verifying that there has been no effect of confinement
- severity on residential emissions by analyzing actual daily natural gas residential
- consumption data in EU countries, where such data were available.
- Power sector: Le Quéré et al. used daily electricity demand data and did not indicate energy
- mix changes coincident to the COVID period and used power production dataset for US,
- India and European Total (see table below) corrected for temperature. We included daily
- energy mix changes by using thermal production data to calculate power sector emissions and
- consider the changes of fuel mix in thermal production in the uncertainties, with data for 31
- countries. Our emission estimates are provided as actual values, not corrected for temperature
- but we also provide attribution to temperature vs. COVID in the manuscript.
- Aviation emissions Le Quéré et al. used weekly OAG global flight numbers. We used
- individual flight data (thus daily) split into countries between domestic and international emissions
- Industry fuel use: Le Quéré et al. used total coal consumption and we used actual production
- data for China. Le Quéré et al. used confinement indexes for other countries. We used
- production indexes for the other countries and confinement in ROW.
- 
- Importantly, Le Quéré's paper indicated the urgent need and research gap of the real time 215  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  study, which has exactly been addressed by our research:
- 216 "Despite the critical importance of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  emissions for understanding global climate change,
- **systems are not in place to monitor global emissions in real time**." (page 1 paragraph 3 in
- 218 Le Quéré paper<sup>2</sup>)
- 



# 220 **Supplementary Table 8 | Comparison of Liu et al. paper and Le Quéré et al. paper**



#### **Supplementary References:**

- 1. Wessel, Pål; Smith, Walter H. F. A global, self-consistent, hierarchical, high-resolution
- shoreline database. Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth. 101 (B4): 8741–
- 8743(1996). doi:10.1029/96JB00104
- 227 2. Le Quéré, C., Jackson, R.B., Jones, M.W. et al. Temporary reduction in daily global CO2
- emissions during the COVID-19 forced confinement. Nat. Clim. Chang. 10, 647–653 (2020).
- https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0797-x