

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Biogeosciences (BG).  
Please refer to the corresponding final paper in BG if available.

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

# Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

**S. A. Henson<sup>1,\*</sup>, J. L. Sarmiento<sup>1</sup>, J. P. Dunne<sup>2</sup>, L. Bopp<sup>3</sup>, I. Lima<sup>4</sup>, S. C. Doney<sup>4</sup>,  
J. John<sup>2</sup>, and C. Beaulieu<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

<sup>2</sup>NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton, NJ, USA

<sup>3</sup>Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, Gif sur Yvette, France

<sup>4</sup>Dept. of Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA, USA

\*now at: National Oceanography Centre, Southampton, UK

Received: 16 October 2009 – Accepted: 23 October 2009 – Published: 11 November 2009

Correspondence to: S. A. Henson (s.a.henson@soton.ac.uk)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Abstract

Global warming is predicted to alter the ocean's biological productivity. But how will we recognise the impacts of climate change on ocean productivity? The most comprehensive information available on the global distribution of ocean productivity comes from satellite ocean colour data. Now that over ten years of SeaWiFS data have accumulated, can we begin to detect and attribute global warming trends in productivity? Here we compare recent trends in SeaWiFS data to longer-term records from three biogeochemical models (GFDL, IPSL and NCAR). We find that detection of real trends in the satellite data is confounded by the relatively short time series and large interannual and decadal variability in productivity. Thus, recent observed changes in chlorophyll, primary production and the size of the oligotrophic gyres cannot be unequivocally attributed to the impact of global warming. Instead, our analyses suggest that a time series of  $\sim 40$  yr length is needed to distinguish a global warming trend from natural variability. Analysis of modelled chlorophyll and primary production from 2001–2100 suggests that, on average, the global warming trend will not be unambiguously separable from decadal variability until  $\sim 2055$ . Because the magnitude of natural variability in chlorophyll and primary production is larger than, or similar to, the global warming trend, a consistent, decades-long data record must be established if the impact of climate change on ocean productivity is to be definitively detected.

## 1 Introduction

Ocean primary production (PP) makes up approximately half of the global biospheric production (Field et al., 1998). Detecting the impact of global warming on ocean productivity and biomass is an essential task. The consequence of increasing global temperatures, in combination with altered wind patterns, is to change the mixing and stratification of the surface ocean (e.g., Sarmiento et al., 2004). Reduced mixing and increased stratification at low latitudes will further limit the supply of nutrients to the

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



euphotic zone, and is predicted to result in reduced PP. At high latitudes, where phytoplankton growth is light limited during winter, decreased mixing may result in earlier re-stratification and a lengthened growing season, resulting in increased PP (Bopp et al., 2001; Doney, 2006). Water temperature also has a direct influence on phytoplankton growth and metabolic rates. Production increases with increasing temperature until a species-specific maximum is reached, after which rates decline rapidly (Eppley, 1972). Rising temperatures will also result in changes to the distribution of phytoplankton species. Some species, adapted to warm temperatures and low nutrient levels (usually small picoplankton) will expand their range, whilst others that prefer turbulent, cool and nutrient-rich waters (mostly large phytoplankton, e.g. diatom species) may migrate poleward as temperatures rise. Polar and ice-edge species will have to adapt to warmer conditions and associated changes in stratification and freshwater input. These shifts in species composition may alter carbon export and the availability of food to higher trophic levels. Large phytoplankton, such as diatoms and coccolithophores, are believed to be responsible for the majority of carbon export (e.g., Michaels and Silver, 1988; Brzezinski et al., 1998). If replaced by smaller warm-water species the export of carbon from surface waters may be reduced. Phytoplankton are also the base of the marine food web and shifts in the dominant species or overall abundance may alter fishery ranges and yields (e.g., Iverson, 1990; Chavez et al., 2003; Ware and Thomson, 2005).

Because of ocean productivity's key role in the global carbon cycle, many studies have sought to quantify the variability and climate response of biomass and/or PP (for a recent review of studies using satellite data, see McClain et al., 2009). The principal source of global, multi-year ocean productivity data are the SeaWiFS and MODIS-Aqua ocean colour instruments. SeaWiFS has been measuring surface chlorophyll from space since September 1997 (continuously until December 2007, and intermittently thereafter), and MODIS-Aqua has been operating since July 2002. In addition, limited ocean colour data is available from the Coastal Zone Color Scanner (CZCS), which operated from 1978–1986 (Madrid et al., 1978), although difficulties cross-calibrating the

---

**Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

CZCS and contemporary records have hampered efforts to study multi-decadal variability (Antoine et al., 2005; Gregg et al., 2003). With over 10 yr of data now available, SeaWiFS products are being used to explore trends in sub-tropical productivity (e.g., Behrenfeld et al., 2006; McClain et al., 2004; Gregg et al., 2005), coastal productivity (Kahru and Mitchell, 2008; Kahru et al., 2009) and extent of the oligotrophic gyres (Polovina et al., 2008; McClain et al., 2004; Irwin and Oliver, 2009). Several of these studies attribute the observed trends to the impact of global climate change. A different conclusion was reached by Yoder et al. (2009), who compared the trends in 8 yr of SeaWiFS chlorophyll to output from a global biogeochemical model. They concluded that trends at 11 selected ocean sites were not unusual in relation to the longer model record.

Models have also been used to investigate the masking of a global warming trend by natural variability. For example, Boyd et al. (2008) demonstrated that, in the Southern Ocean, the magnitude of long-term changes in stratification and mixed layer depth in an earlier version of the NCAR model forced with the A2 scenario were small relative to the interannual variability; and that a definitive climate-warming signal in modelled mixed layer depth could not be detected until ~2040 in Southern Ocean polar waters and no unequivocal trend at all was detected in the sub-polar region (their analysis extended to 2100). Boyd et al. (2008) speculated that the gradual changes in physical properties would result in similarly slow changes in phytoplankton populations. Similarly, an experiment with an earlier version of the IPSL model, forced with a CO<sub>2</sub> doubling scenario, demonstrated that it took between 30 and 60 yr to detect changes in export production in the equatorial Pacific (Bopp et al., 2001).

Here, we use both satellite ocean colour data and output from 3 coupled physical-biogeochemical models (GFDL, IPSL and NCAR) to explore the decadal variability, historical trends and future response of chlorophyll concentration and PP. We examine trends in both chlorophyll (chl) and PP here, as the chl product from the SeaWiFS instrument is better validated and has lower errors than PP. This is partly because the database of in situ observations used to calibrate the algorithms contains many

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

more chl than PP measurements, and partly because chl is more closely related to the water leaving radiances that SeaWiFS actually measures. However, chl can change without corresponding changes in phytoplankton biomass or PP, due to the ability of cells to alter their chlorophyll to carbon ratio in response to light or nutrient stress (e.g., Laws and Bannister, 1980; Geider, 1987). Primary production, on the other hand, is the parameter that will have a more direct impact on the global carbon cycle, but algorithms to derive PP from satellite data are still subject to fairly large uncertainties (e.g., Joint and Groom, 2000).

We first investigate whether the trends in PP, chl and oligotrophic gyre size observed in the satellite record are likely to be reflecting climate change, and conclude that the dataset is not yet long enough to unequivocally detect a global warming trend. A statistical analysis of biogeochemical model output suggests that a PP or chl time series of ~40 yr duration will be needed to distinguish a climate change signal from natural interannual to decadal variability. We also explore predictions of when the impact of global warming on chl and PP will exceed the range of natural variability and become unambiguously detectable. These analyses have significant implications for our ability to recognise the impacts of climate change on ocean productivity, and for strategies for monitoring ocean biology into the future.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Satellite data

Monthly mean level-3 chlorophyll concentration data (derived from algorithm OC4, re-processing v5.2) for September 1997–December 2007 were downloaded from <http://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/>. Chlorophyll (chl) was converted to PP using three different algorithms (Behrenfeld and Falkowski, 1997; Carr, 2002; Marra et al., 2003). Each algorithm has been validated against a database of in situ measurements, but each is formulated somewhat differently. To minimise potential biases or errors associated

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



with any one algorithm, we use the PP estimated from all three methods. Each of these three algorithms produced PP trends of similar magnitude and spatial distribution. A fourth PP algorithm, the Carbon-based Productivity Model (CbPM), was also tested (Behrenfeld et al., 2005). Calculation of PP using the CbPM requires knowledge of the mixed layer depth (MLD). We calculated PP using MLD estimated from the ECCO (Estimating the Circulation and Climate of the Ocean; <http://www.ecco-group.org>) and the SODA (Simple Ocean Data Assimilation; <http://www.atmos.umd.edu/~ocean>) re-analysis programmes, and also using the hybrid MLD data used in Behrenfeld et al. (2005) and described at <http://www.science.oregonstate.edu/ocean.productivity/mld.html>. The sensitivity of the CbPM-derived PP to the MLD product used is detailed in Milutinovic et al. (2009). Our analyses found that each MLD product resulted in substantially different magnitude and spatial distribution of statistically significant trends. Results from the CbPM algorithm were also substantially different from the three other algorithms. The PP derived from this algorithm was excluded from the subsequent analyses.

## 2.2 Global physical-biogeochemical models

Three coupled physical-biogeochemical models are used to define long-term trends in PP and chl: GFDL-TOPAZ (Dunne et al., 2005, 2007), IPSL-PISCES (Aumont and Bopp, 2006) and NCAR-CCSM3 (Doney et al., 2006). For the hindcast runs, ocean-only versions of the different models are used. Air temperature and incoming fluxes of wind stress, freshwater flux, shortwave and longwave radiation are prescribed as boundary conditions from the CORE version 2 reanalysis effort (for the GFDL and NCAR models), which covers the period 1958–2006 (Large and Yeager, 2004, 2009), and from NCEP forcing for the IPSL model, from 1948–2007 (Kalnay et al., 1996). The CORE forcing dataset is based on the NCEP forcing, with additional satellite data incorporated. The forcing datasets thus contain recent signals of climate change, e.g. rising air temperatures. Running the models in hindcast mode means that the modelled interannual and decadal variability is directly comparable to the variability in the

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

### Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



data, rather than just in a statistical sense (as is the case for the global warming simulations in the coupled models). For the future global warming runs, the full coupled climate-biogeochemistry versions of the different models are used. These future global warming runs all use historical forcing (greenhouse gases and aerosols emissions or concentrations) from 1860–2000 and the IPCC A2 scenario (Nakicenovic and Swart, 2000) from 2001–2100. The A2 scenario envisages continued population growth and an increasing economic gap between the industrialised and developing nations, resulting in high cumulative carbon emissions. Each model's biogeochemistry is parameterised differently, and so results from all three models are compared in order to minimise potential errors and biases associated with any one model.

### 2.2.1 GFDL model

A biogeochemical and ocean ecosystem model (TOPAZ), developed at GFDL, has been integrated with the MOM-4 ocean model (Griffies et al., 2004; Gnanadesikan et al., 2006). MOM-4 has 50 vertical z-coordinates and spatial resolution is nominally 1° globally, with higher 1/3° resolution near the equator. The TOPAZ biogeochemical model includes all major nutrient elements (N, P, Si and Fe), and both labile and semi-labile dissolved organic pools, along with parameterizations to represent the microbial loop. Growth rates are modelled as a function of variable chl:C ratios and are co-limited by nutrients and light. Photoacclimation is based on the Geider et al. (1997) algorithm, extended to account for co-limitation by multiple nutrients and including a parameterisation for the role of iron in phytoplankton physiology (following Sunda and Huntsman, 1997). Loss terms include zooplankton grazing and ballast-driven particle export. Remineralisation of detritus and cycling of dissolved organic matter are also explicitly included (Dunne et al., 2005). The model includes highly flexible phytoplankton stoichiometry and variable chl:C ratios. Three classes of phytoplankton form the base of the global ecosystem. Small phytoplankton represent cyanobacteria and picoeukaryotes, resisting sinking and tightly bound to the microbial loop. Large phytoplankton represent diatoms and other eukaryotic phytoplankton, which sink more rapidly. Di-

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



azotrophs fix nitrogen directly rather than requiring dissolved forms of nitrogen. Wet and dry dust deposition fluxes are prescribed from the monthly climatology of Ginoux et al. (2001) and converted to soluble iron using a variable solubility parameterisation (Fan et al., 2006). TOPAZ includes a simplified version of the oceanic iron cycle including biological uptake and remineralisation, particle sinking and scavenging and adsorption/desorption. Application of the TOPAZ model to determining global particle export and phytoplankton bloom timing have been detailed in Dunne et al. (2007) and Henson et al. (2009), respectively. The hindcast simulations were spun-up for 250 yr using a repeat annual cycle of physical forcing, prior to initiating the interannually varying forcing.

For the coupled runs, the GFDL Earth System Model (ESM2.1) includes atmospheric (AM2.1) and terrestrial biosphere (LM3) components (Anderson et al., 2004), in addition to the TOPAZ biogeochemistry model. The physical variables in GFDL's ESM2.1 were initialized from GFDL's CM2.1 (Delworth et al., 2006). The control run based on 1860 conditions was spun-up for 2000 yr. Biogeochemical parameters were initialized from observations from the World Ocean Atlas 2001 (Conkright et al., 2002) and GLO-DAP (Key et al., 2004). This model was spun up for an additional 1000 yr, with a fixed CO<sub>2</sub> atmospheric boundary condition of 286 ppm. For an additional 100 yr, the atmospheric boundary condition was switched to a fully interactive atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> tracer. Simulations were then made based on the IPCC AR4 protocols (A2 scenario).

### 2.2.2 IPSL model

The IPSL PISCES biogeochemical model (Aumont and Bopp, 2006) is coupled to the NEMO-OPA ocean general circulation model (Madec, 2008) in a configuration that here has 30 vertical levels and a horizontal resolution of 2° × cos(latitude) in the extratropics, with enhanced resolution of 0.5° at the equator. Phytoplankton growth in the PISCES model can be limited by temperature, light and five different nutrients (NO<sub>3</sub>, PO<sub>4</sub>, Si, Fe and NH<sub>4</sub>). Two phytoplankton and two zooplankton size classes are represented: nanophytoplankton, diatoms, microzooplankton and mesozooplank-

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



ton. The diatoms differ from the nanophytoplankton by requiring silica for growth, by having higher requirements for iron (Sunda and Huntsman, 1995) and by higher half-saturation constants. For all species, the C:N:P ratios are assumed constant at the values proposed by Takahashi et al. (1985), but the internal ratios of Fe:C, chl:C and Si:C of phytoplankton are prognostically simulated. There are three non-living components of organic carbon: semi-labile DOC, and large and small detrital particles that differ by their vertical sinking speeds. The microbial loop is also implicitly represented. Nutrients are supplied to the ocean from three sources: atmospheric deposition, rivers and sedimentary sources. Iron is supplied by aeolian dust deposition, estimated from the monthly modelled results of Tegen and Fung (1995). Iron is also supplied from sediments following the method of Moore et al. (2004). Iron concentrations at the surface are restored to a minimum of 0.01 nM. This baseline concentration, which represents non-accounted sources of iron that could arise from processes not explicitly taken into account in the model, has been shown to greatly improve the representation of the chlorophyll tongue and the iron-to-nitrate limitation transition zone in the Equatorial Pacific (Schneider et al. 2008). An alternative version of PISCES (Tagliabue et al., 2009), taking into account Fe speciation, is able to represent the zonal extent of Equatorial Pacific chlorophyll without needing to include an unconstrained Fe source, but is not used in this study. The PISCES model has previously been used for a variety of studies concerned with paleo, historical and future climate. A full description and an extended evaluation against climatological dataset can be found in Aumont and Bopp (2006).

For the hindcast simulations, the initial conditions for nutrients and inorganic carbon are prescribed from data-based climatologies and the model is spun-up for 150 yr using ERA-40 interannually varying forcing, prior to initiating the NCEP interannually varying forcing in 1948. For the global warming simulations, we used an offline version of the PISCES model that is forced with monthly outputs of a coupled climate simulation carried out with the IPSL-CM4 model as described in Bopp et al. (2005). IPSL-CM4 consists of an atmospheric model (LMDZ-4; Hourdin et al., 2006), a terrestrial biosphere component (ORCHIDEE; Krinner et al., 2005) and the OPA-8 ocean model and

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



### 2.2.3 NCAR model

The Community Climate System Model (CCSM-3) ocean biogeochemistry model, consisting of an upper-ocean ecological module (Moore et al., 2004) and a full-depth ocean biogeochemistry module (Doney et al., 2006), is embedded in a global physical ocean general circulation model (Collins et al., 2006). The ecosystem module is based on the traditional NPZD (nutrients-phytoplankton-zooplankton-detritus) type models, expanded to include multiple nutrients that can limit phytoplankton growth (N, P, Si and Fe) and specific phytoplankton types (Moore et al., 2004). Three phytoplankton classes are represented: diatoms, diazotrophs and small plankton (pico/nanoplankton). Diazotrophs fix their required nitrogen from  $N_2$  gas; small plankton exhibit rapid and very efficient nutrient recycling; and the diatom group represents large, bloom-forming phytoplankton. Growth rates are determined by available light and nutrients and photoadaptation is parameterised with variable chl:C ratios. The model has one zooplankton class which grazes on phytoplankton and large detritus. The biogeochemistry module includes full carbonate system thermodynamics and air-sea  $CO_2$  and  $O_2$  fluxes (Doney et al., 2004, 2006), nitrogen fixation and denitrification (Moore and Doney, 2007) and a dynamic iron cycle with atmospheric dust deposition, scavenging and a lithogenic source (Moore et al., 2006). For the hindcast simulations, the initial conditions for nutrients and inorganic carbon are prescribed from data-based climatologies (e.g., Key et al., 2004). The biogeochemistry model is spun up for several hundred years using a repeat annual cycle of physical forcing, prior to initiating the interannually varying forcing. Model ecosystem components converge within a few years (Doney et al., 2009a,b).

For the coupled runs, the NCAR model (CCSM3.1) includes, in addition to the ocean biogeochemistry and ecosystem components, a prognostic carbon cycle and coupled terrestrial carbon and nitrogen cycles (Thornton et al., 2009) embedded into a land biogeophysics model (Dickinson et al., 2006). Details of the initialisation, spin-up and overall behaviour of this version of the model can be found in Thornton et al. (2009).

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



In brief, a sequential spin-up procedure was employed, similar to one previously described by Doney et al. (2006), to reduce the magnitude of drifts in the carbon pools when carbon and nitrogen are coupled to the climate of the coupled model. The ocean component was branched from the end of the ocean-only spin-up simulation mentioned above and which was forced with an observationally based physical atmospheric climatology and fixed atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> held at a preindustrial value. Several incremental coupling steps are performed over several hundreds of years of model simulation to bring the system gradually to a stable initial condition in both surface temperature and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. A 1000-yr long preindustrial control simulation was then performed, and the historical and A2 simulations were branched from the middle of the pre-industrial control simulation.

### 2.3 Statistical analyses

The linear trend in monthly anomalies of SeaWiFS PP data was calculated using a simple model, which can be formally stated as:

$$Y_t = \mu + \omega X_t + N_t \quad (1)$$

where  $Y_t$  is the data,  $\mu$  is a constant term (the intercept),  $X_t$  is the linear trend function (here time in months),  $\omega$  is the magnitude of the trend (the slope) and  $N_t$  is the noise, or unexplained portion of the data. The noise,  $N_t$ , is assumed to be autoregressive of the order 1 (i.e. AR(1)), so that successive measurements are autocorrelated,  $\phi = \text{Corr}(N_t, N_{t-1})$ . Large values of autocorrelation, as often found in geophysical variables, increase the length of trend-like segments in the data, confounding the estimate of the real trend.

For the global warming simulations, we also tried fitting an exponential curve to the PP time series, of the form:

$$Y_t = \alpha \exp(\omega X_t) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mu = \ln(\alpha)$ . The coefficient of determination and standard deviation of the residuals were compared for the linear and exponential fits. In the vast majority of cases the two fits had similar statistics, so in the interests of parsimony we used the linear trend model.

5 The number of years required to detect a trend above natural variability is calculated by the method of Tiao et al. (1990) and Weatherhead et al. (1998). More details of the origin of this equation can be found in Appendix A. The number of years,  $n^*$ , required to detect a trend with a probability of 90% is:

$$n^* = \left[ \frac{3.3\sigma_N}{|\omega|} \sqrt{\frac{1+\phi}{1-\phi}} \right]^{2/3} \quad (3)$$

10 where  $\sigma_N$  is the standard deviation of the noise (i.e. the residuals after the trend has been removed),  $\omega$  is the estimated trend and  $\phi$  is the autocorrelation of the AR(1) noise. The number of years required to detect a trend when a data gap is present,  $n^{**}$ , is:

$$n^{**} = n^* \frac{1}{[1 - 3\tau(1 - \tau)]^{1/3}} \quad (4)$$

15 where  $\tau = (T_0 - 1)/T$  and  $T$  is the total length of the time series and  $T_0$  is the time of the interruption. For an interruption half-way through the data collection period,  $\tau = 0.5$  and  $n^*$  is increased by a factor of 1.59.

## 2.4 Biome definition

20 For ease of presentation, the calculated trends are averaged within 14 biomes (marked in contours on Fig. 1). The biomes are designed to reflect very large-scale contrasts in primary productivity. Thus, the mid to high latitude biomes are defined as the regions in which phytoplankton growth is seasonally light limited (>6 months/yr when depth-averaged irradiance is  $< 21 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ ; Riley, 1957). The equatorial regions are those in

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



which annual mean net heat flux is  $<30 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$  (ocean gaining heat). The remaining areas are classed as oligotrophic. These differ from previous definitions and result in biomes which are considerably larger, but more spatially coherent than, for example, Sarmiento et al. (2004). Mixed layer depth data used to define the biomes came from the SODA programme; photosynthetically available radiation data came from the SeaWiFS project (<http://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov>); and net heat flux data was calculated using NCEP-NCAR Reanalysis Project fields (<http://www.cdc.noaa.gov/data/gridded/>). The biomes are further divided by hemisphere and ocean basin, and finally the low latitude Indian Ocean is separated into Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal biomes.

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 Global warming trend or decadal variability?

As a measure of the change in ocean productivity in the last 10 yr, the linear trend in monthly anomalies of SeaWiFS chl and PP for the period September 1997–December 2007 was calculated (Fig. 1). Only those regions where the trend is statistically significant at the 95% level are plotted. The strong El Niño event at the start of the SeaWiFS record in 1997/1998 is worth noting here, as linear trends in short data records can be sensitive to the values at the beginning and end of the time series. There are several large, coherent patches of significant trend in both chl and PP, particularly in the oligotrophic gyres of all three ocean basins, whilst at high latitudes there are a few smaller patches of significant trend. The typical magnitude of trends in chl is  $\sim \pm 0.002 \text{ mgm}^{-3}/\text{yr}$ , with peak values of  $\pm 0.04 \text{ mgm}^{-3}/\text{yr}$ . For PP, typical trend magnitudes are of the order  $\sim \pm 1 \text{ mgCm}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}/\text{yr}$ , with extrema of  $\sim \pm 30\text{--}40 \text{ mgCm}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}/\text{yr}$ . The strongest negative trend is in the northern North Atlantic, and strongest positive trend is south and east of Australia. The trends in the sub-tropics have been interpreted as reflecting the impact of global warming on PP (Polovina et al., 2008; Gregg et al., 2005; Kahru et al., 2008). However, to positively attribute these trends to climate

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



change it has to be demonstrated that a 10-yr record is able to capture a real trend, rather than just natural interannual to decadal variability.

The SeaWiFS trends are compared to those estimated from three different biogeochemical models run using reanalysis forcing. The modelled chl and PP is split into overlapping 10-yr sections (i.e. the trend for the period January 1958–December 1967 is calculated, then the trend for the period January 1959–December 1968, etc.), in order to examine the effect of using the relatively short time series of SeaWiFS observations to define trends. The 10-yr trends calculated from the models are compared to the SeaWiFS chl trend in Fig. 2 and SeaWiFS PP trend in Fig. 3. (Note that analysis of different periods, e.g. September 1959 to December 1968, and so on, in the models, or January 1998 to December 2007 in the SeaWiFS data, did not significantly change the results). For ease of presentation the trends are reported as the average in each biome (biomes marked on Fig. 1). The trends and variability are similar in all 3 models, particularly in low latitudes, despite each model having differently parameterised physics and biogeochemistry. The trends in PP for each of the three different SeaWiFS algorithms are plotted as red stars in Fig. 3, and are generally similar. The high latitude North Pacific has the largest difference between the three algorithms, with the Behrenfeld and Falkowski (1997) algorithm showing a small positive trend in PP and the Carr (2002) and Marra et al. (2003) algorithms exhibiting a negative trend. In the other regions, the calculated trend is relatively insensitive to the algorithm used to estimate SeaWiFS PP.

The ability of the models to reproduce the observed variability can be evaluated by comparing the trends in SeaWiFS data with the final datapoints of the modelled results in Figs. 2 and 3. In some biomes, e.g. the equatorial Pacific, the modelled trends overlap with the trends in SeaWiFS data, but in other regions the modelled and data trends diverge (e.g., the oligotrophic North Atlantic). This may arise from the models' lack of skill in reproducing the observed interannual variability. Of particular importance is the models' ability to reproduce the chl or PP response to the 1997/1998 El Niño. The models' coarser resolution, as compared to the data, errors in spatial

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

positioning of circulation features, e.g. upwelling regions, and variability in the trends within each biome (Fig. 1), may also result in mismatch between modelled and data-derived trends, when averaged within the biomes. We use the modelled trends here to place the SeaWiFS data in a longer-term context and provide an estimate of variability in previous decades.

If a global warming trend were dominating the chl or PP signal, Figs. 2 and 3 would show consistently positive or negative trends. Instead, the sign of the trend in the 10-yr long sections of modelled chl and PP switches between positive and negative on decadal timescales. The 10-yr trend in SeaWiFS chl and PP is of similar magnitude to trends of previous decades, suggesting that the magnitude of decadal variability in chl or PP is currently larger than, or similar to, the response to global warming. This influence of decadal variability on determining the apparent trends in relatively short time series is particularly evident in the low latitude biomes. For example, in the oligotrophic North Pacific, strong decadal variability is evident in the regular switching between periods of positive and negative trends. Seen in this longer-term context, it appears that the negative trend in the oligotrophic gyres observed in the last 10 yr of SeaWiFS data (Polovina et al., 2008; Gregg et al., 2005) is likely reflecting decadal variability, rather than a global warming response.

For both chl and PP, the trends in the 10 yr of SeaWiFS data fall within the bounds of trends in previous decades in most biomes in at least two of the models (i.e. the 95% confidence intervals overlap). The exceptions for chl are the high latitude North Atlantic and the Arabian Sea (Fig. 2). In the Arabian Sea, the SeaWiFS chl trend is greater than previous trends in all three models. For primary production the recent trend in the Arabian Sea is also strongly positive (see Fig. 3), but not unusual in a longer-term context. The modelled trend in chl in the 10-yr period starting 1998 is positive in all three models, although the magnitude is smaller than in the satellite data, i.e. the models are probably capturing the trend correctly, but possibly not the magnitude of the variability. As the most recent model trends in the Arabian Sea are not anomalous with respect to previous decades, the results do not suggest a long-term trend in chl in

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

this region.

In the high latitude North Atlantic, the SeaWiFS trend in both chl and PP is far greater than trends in previous decades in the GFDL and NCAR models, but is of similar magnitude to trends in the early 1990's in the IPSL model. It may be that, in contrast to the IPSL model, the GFDL and NCAR models under-represent the interannual variability in PP and chl in the high latitude North Atlantic. Indeed, in a recent inter-comparison study of the NCAR, IPSL and other coupled ocean-atmosphere models, Schneider et al. (2008) found that only the IPSL model was able to reproduce the magnitude and frequency of interannual variability in global PP observed in satellite data (note that the GFDL model was not included in the study and that the NCAR simulations were from an earlier version of both the physical and marine biogeochemical model). Inter-model differences in the magnitude of variability may also arise from the different forcing applied to the models (CORE for GFDL and NCAR models and NCEP for the IPSL model). The magnitude of the variability in the IPSL model may be most realistic, but nevertheless all three models predict a trend close to zero in the high latitude North Atlantic for the 10-yr period starting in 1998, compared to a trend of  $\sim -4 \text{ mgCm}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1} / \text{yr}$  in the SeaWiFS data. This suggests that none of the models are able to capture the mechanisms of interannual variability in PP in the high latitude North Atlantic. We are unable to conclude definitively whether the strong negative trend in the high latitude North Atlantic region is unprecedented in recent decades. In all other biomes, the trends in the 10 yr of SeaWiFS chl and PP are not unprecedented when viewed in a longer-term context.

A global warming trend may be present in the data, in addition to the natural variability. However, within the relatively short length of the satellite ocean colour time series, the decadal variability is of a greater, or similar, magnitude than the trend. With a longer time series and more sophisticated analyses than linear regression, such as inclusion of spatial patterns via EOF or optimal fingerprint analysis (e.g., Hasselmann, 1993), or Bayesian methods to detect changes in the phase of the seasonal cycle (e.g., Dose and Manzel, 2004), we may be able to detect global warming-related changes in chl or PP. However, linear trends in PP or chl estimated from the SeaWiFS record

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



cannot be separated from interannual to decadal variability, and cannot be attributed unequivocally to the impact of global warming.

### 3.2 Expansion of the oligotrophic gyres

The negative trends in SeaWiFS chl in the oligotrophic gyres (Fig. 1) have been attributed to global warming-related increases in SST and stratification (Polovina et al., 2008; Behrenfeld et al., 2006). The models again allow the recent observed trends in the areal extent of oligotrophic waters to be put into a longer-term context. The size of the oligotrophic regions are estimated as the area ( $\text{km}^2$ ) of the ocean where  $\text{chl} < 0.07 \text{ mgm}^{-3}$ , following Polovina et al. (2008) and McClain et al. (2004). The time series from 1958–2006 of oligotrophic gyre size, both globally and regionally, in each of the three models is plotted in Fig. 4. In all three models, the global extent of oligotrophic waters has distinct multi-decadal variability, with a period of reduced size from 1958–1977, and increased area from 1977–1996. There is a local minimum in 1998, after which the global oligotrophic area increases again.

Regionally, the North Pacific gyre size has pronounced variability with a period of 4–6 yr and reflects the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO) cycle. During El Niño events equatorial upwelling is curtailed, resulting in a temporary expansion of the region of low productivity, and vice versa during La Niña years. The size of the South Pacific gyre has a distinct step change around 1977, coinciding with the well-documented regime shift of the North Pacific ecosystem (Francis et al., 1998; McGowan et al., 1998). Superimposed on this increase of  $\sim 8 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$  is substantial interannual variability. In the GFDL and NCAR models, the South Atlantic gyre has a more gradual decline in size with a transition around 1990 to an oligotrophic area  $\sim 1 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$  smaller than in previous decades. The North Atlantic has an increasing trend in oligotrophic area with large decadal variability superimposed in the GFDL and NCAR models. No trend in the North or South Atlantic gyre size is evident in the IPSL model. This may be due to the implementation of a minimum iron concentration in the IPSL model, which has the effect of dampening the variability of iron and corresponding variability in PP.

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



In most oligotrophic regions, and in the global total, a local minimum occurs around 1998, after which the size of the low chlorophyll area increases again. The minimum is likely driven by the strong ENSO event which occurred in 1997/1998, and which happened to coincide with the start of the SeaWiFS data record. This is the likely origin of the increasing trend in gyre size observed in the SeaWiFS data (Polovina et al., 2008; Irwin and Oliver, 2009). Evidently, large decadal variability in the extent of the oligotrophic waters confounds attempts to extract trends from the 10-yr satellite record. The models provide the needed context and suggest that in some regions, and some models, the size of the low chlorophyll area may have a long-term trend (in some areas increasing and in others decreasing), in addition to decadal variability. More certain is that ENSO events, regime shifts, and decadal variability have a pronounced influence on the size of the oligotrophic gyres.

### 3.3 Modelled trends in productivity in global warming simulations

So far the analysis has used output from hindcast model simulations for the contemporary period. The results generally indicate that any global warming trend in the 10 yr of satellite-derived chl or PP is not yet distinguishable from the natural interannual to decadal variability. Clearly, 10 yr is not enough, but how many years of observations will we need to detect a trend? To answer this question, we use output from coupled ocean-atmosphere models run into the future under global warming conditions.

For the rest of the analysis, we turn to simulations forced with the IPCC global warming scenario, A2. The modelled trends in chl and PP for the period 2001–2100 for all three coupled models are plotted in Fig. 5. For detailed inter-comparisons of modelled global warming response in chl and PP see also Schneider et al. (2008) and Steinacher et al. (2009). The models generally show a decreasing trend in chl in the oligotrophic gyres and high latitudes, and increasing trends in the Southern Ocean. Uniquely, the GFDL model shows an increasing trend in chl in the high latitude North Atlantic, Northeast Pacific and equatorial Pacific. The global, multi-model mean trend in chlorophyll is  $\sim -2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mgm}^{-3}/\text{yr}$ , dominated by trends in the IPSL

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



model. Generally, the models show a decrease in PP in the Northern Hemisphere and oligotrophic gyres of  $\sim 1\text{--}2\text{ mgCm}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}/\text{yr}$ , and an increase in the Southern Ocean of  $\sim 0.5\text{--}1\text{ mgCm}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}/\text{yr}$ . The GFDL model, and to a lesser extent the NCAR model, show increases in the equatorial Pacific of  $\sim 1\text{--}2\text{ mgCm}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}/\text{yr}$ , whereas the IPSL model shows a strong decrease. The global, multi-model mean magnitude of the trend in PP is  $-0.15\text{ mgCm}^{-2}\text{d}^{-1}/\text{yr}$ , dominated by the strong decreasing trend in the IPSL model. The expansion of the oligotrophic regions under global warming conditions is clear, particularly in the IPSL model and in the North Pacific (all models).

### 3.4 How many years of data are needed to detect a trend in ocean productivity?

The output from the global warming simulations can be used to investigate the length of time series needed to detect a trend above the natural variability. We employ a method that calculates the signal-to-noise (i.e. trend-to-natural variability) ratio of a time series and, accounting for auto-correlation, estimates the number of data points necessary to detect a real trend (Eq. 3; Weatherhead et al., 1998). The method is applied to output from the three models run under the IPCC A2 scenario. The number of years required to detect a trend above the natural variability in chl and PP is plotted in Fig. 6. The minimum length time series required is at least 15 yr, but in many regions a time series of 50–60 yr or more is needed (see Table 1 for biome mean values). All three models suggest relatively short detection time ( $\sim 20\text{--}30$  yr) for chl in the North Pacific and equatorial regions. Longest detection times for chl ( $\sim 50\text{--}60$  yr) occur in parts of the Southern Ocean. The global warming trend in PP in the IPSL model is the most rapidly detectable, with a mean of  $\sim 33$  yr. All three models suggest shorter detection times ( $\sim 20\text{--}30$  yr) for PP in the North Pacific, equatorial regions (including the Arabian Sea) and the South Atlantic. Longest detection times ( $\sim 50\text{--}60$  yr) for PP occur in parts of the Southern Ocean and in the Arctic north of Iceland. Globally, the average length of time series required to unequivocally detect a trend in chl is 39 yr or 41 yr for PP. The satellite ocean colour dataset is currently 30 yr short of that target.

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



In order to extend the ocean productivity dataset, the CZCS data (1978–1986) have been reprocessed to be consistent with SeaWiFS, creating a quasi 31-yr dataset. However, two different methodologies have been developed, each of which gives different results. One method yields a 6% decrease in global chl between the 1980's and the early part of the SeaWiFS period (Gregg et al., 2003); the other method indicates a 22% increase (Antoine et al., 2005). The obvious technical difficulties in producing a consistent time series from two differently designed instruments that did not overlap in time sounds a clear note of caution about potential future gaps in the satellite ocean colour record.

If there is a gap in the ocean colour time series, there are not only cross-calibration issues to face; the number of years required to detect a trend will also increase. If the data gap occurs roughly halfway through data collection, the number of years required would increase by ~50% (Eq. 4; Weatherhead et al., 1998). So in the case of ocean PP or chl, if a data gap arises due to the failure of SeaWiFS and MODIS-Aqua, the mean length of time needed to detect a global warming response would increase from ~40 to ~60 yr.

### 3.5 When could the global warming signal exceed natural variability in productivity?

Although we need many more years of data before a trend in chl or PP can be unequivocally ascribed to global warming, is it possible that climate change is already altering ocean productivity? The modelled chl and PP provides an estimate of the year when the global warming signal exceeds the natural variability of the system, represented by the standard deviation of the models' control runs (i.e. no external CO<sub>2</sub> forcing is applied). The year when the global warming signal exceeds the variability is defined here as the year when the chl or PP in the warming run exceeds the standard deviation of the control run for at least a decade (each annual mean value within a decade must meet this criterion). An example is shown in Fig. 7a, where the warming signal exceeds the variability in PP during the decade 2033–2043. By our criteria, the trend would not

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



be distinguishable from natural variability until 2043. The global maps are presented in Fig. 8, where purple and dark blue regions are areas in which the trend exceeded the natural variability within the time period of satellite ocean colour observations (1978–2009). For chl in the GFDL model, this occurs in the Mediterranean Sea and patches of the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean, which also appear in the IPSL model. The IPSL model also has dark blue regions in parts of the Arctic and mid-latitude North Atlantic, whilst the NCAR model has patches in the Caribbean and equatorial Atlantic. For PP, regions where the trend exceeded the natural variability within the time period of satellite ocean colour observations are relatively few in the NCAR and GFDL models. In the GFDL model, patches occur in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean and in the Indian Ocean between Madagascar and western Australia. The IPSL model suggests that the global warming signal in PP may be detectable within the satellite era in the equatorial and low latitude Atlantic. Biome mean values for all three models are shown in Table 2. In general, even if the extended CZCS-SeaWiFS dataset were used, the observed shifts in chl or PP are unlikely to exceed the natural variability, and therefore cannot be unequivocally attributed to global warming. Note also that there are extensive regions where the changes in chl or PP remain smaller than the natural variability throughout the time frame of this analysis (which extends to 2100). An example from the oligotrophic Pacific (Fig. 7b) demonstrates how a global warming signal may be masked by vigorous interannual and decadal variability. As a global average, the climate change trend in chl does not exceed natural variability until ~2052 and not until ~2057 for PP.

## 4 Discussion

The launch of the SeaWiFS ocean colour instrument in September 1997 ushered in a new era of biological oceanography. For the first time, daily high resolution images of surface phytoplankton distributions became publicly available, resulting in a substantial leap forward in our understanding of ocean productivity patterns from the global scale

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

### Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



to the mesoscale and in temporal variability from days to years. Ten-plus years of ocean colour data have provided unprecedented coverage of changes in ocean productivity – but are the observed changes reflecting global warming or just variability?

Our analyses suggest that 10 yr of ocean colour data alone are not enough to unequivocally ascribe a trend in PP or chl to global warming. Decadal variability in chl and PP is sufficiently large that it confounds attempts to determine trends in the relatively short time series available. Indeed, decadal variability can appear to reverse a global warming trend when 10-yr datasets are examined. Consider the time series of PP from a global warming simulation shown in Fig. 7c. If a satellite with a 10-yr life span were launched in 2007, we might be tempted to assume that there was a positive trend in PP. However, if a satellite were launched instead in 2016, we would observe a decreasing trend in PP. Ocean productivity has multiple time scales, responding as it does to variability in physical forcing on seasonal, interannual and decadal scales. In order to detect a long-term trend, a dataset that is considerably longer than the time scale of natural variability is necessary. In the case of ocean productivity, 10 yr of data is insufficient.

The strong interannual and decadal variability in chl and PP masks any global warming trend that may be present in the current satellite dataset. This effect has been noted previously in modelling studies that examined the timescales over which the global warming response exceeds the natural variability. Boyd et al. (2008) concluded that global warming induced changes in mixed layer depth in the Southern Ocean could not be separated from the natural variability until ~2040; and Bopp et al. (2001) found that 30 to 60 yr of data are necessary to detect global warming signals in modelled export production. The time scales for trend detection in chl and PP found in our analysis are consistent with both of these studies.

Our analysis of future model simulations suggests that ~40 yr of data are needed to distinguish a global warming trend from natural variability. This conclusion depends on the ability of the models to simulate both natural variability and the biological response to global warming conditions. The models clearly do well at simulating current

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



conditions, as evidenced by their success at reproducing the variability and trends in chl, PP and oligotrophic gyre size (Figs. 2, 3 and 4). Confidence in the predictions of the response to global warming is lower. Potentially, a model's accuracy under high CO<sub>2</sub> conditions could be assessed by validating results against reconstructions of past marine biogeochemical conditions from sedimentary records. For example, an earlier version of the IPSL model was successfully evaluated against glacial-interglacial changes using a global compilation of paleoceanographic indicators from marine sediments (Bopp et al., 2003). In addition to the problem of validating simulations of future conditions, there are also some potentially climate-sensitive biological processes that the models do not represent, such as the complete spectrum of phytoplankton species, zooplankton and higher trophic level dynamics, or the evolution or acclimation of primary producers to changing conditions.

There are potentially large (and mostly unquantifiable) uncertainties in the models' predictions of future conditions. Clearly, more data is needed to continue testing and validating biogeochemical models in order to improve confidence in the predictions. It could be that a global warming trend in PP or chl will be detectable considerably sooner (or considerably later) than the models suggest. Also, other indicators of the biological response to climate change may be more rapidly detectable than the change in PP or chl, such as shifts in biome boundaries (e.g., Sarmiento et al., 2004) or changes in phenology (Edwards and Richardson, 2004). As demonstrated by our analysis and others (e.g., Chavez et al., 2003; Behrenfeld et al., 2006; Henson and Thomas, 2007), the magnitude of interannual to decadal changes in physical forcing can be large and result in substantial year-to-year variability in productivity. On the other hand, the models suggest that global warming may result in more gradual changes in conditions, potentially allowing time for phytoplankton populations to adapt or acclimate. If ecosystems are very plastic, there may be only small changes in the phytoplankton community due to the resident populations' ability to adapt to changing conditions over many years or decades (Boyd et al., 2008). Alternatively, a new ecosystem structure may develop as conditions at a particular location change (e.g., Boyd and Doney, 2002; Bopp et al.,

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2005). However, rather than a gradual change, ocean ecosystems may instead reach a “tipping point” and undergo rapid alterations, such as observed in regime shifts. For example, the 1976/77 North Pacific shift saw basin-scale alteration of the entire ecosystem, from phytoplankton to fish (e.g., Francis and Hare, 1994; deYoung et al., 2008; Alheit, 2009). This possibility points to the necessity of understanding the mechanisms of present day variability in ocean productivity – not only might it provide an indication of the ecosystem response to future changes, but it may also aid in separating natural variability from the global warming trend. For example, if one suspected that the El Niño-Southern Oscillation was a dominant source of the decadal variability evident in the SeaWiFS data, one could add an El Niño index term to Eq. (1), assuming a linear response is appropriate. This could assist in separating the decadal variability from the trend and might permit even a trend of small magnitude, relative to the variability, to be examined.

All of these considerations point to the absolute necessity of continued global monitoring of ocean productivity. Climate change will almost certainly have a significant impact on ocean ecosystems, but it will be difficult to distinguish natural variability from a global warming trend without a substantially longer time series of data. The 10-plus years of ocean colour data currently available are not sufficient. Unfortunately, SeaWiFS and MODIS-Aqua, the two US ocean colour satellites and primary sources of data for the research community world-wide, are both well past their operational lifetimes, and there could potentially be a long wait before the next ocean colour instrument with similar capabilities is launched. The potential gap in the time series of ocean colour data will severely compromise our ability to detect and quantify ocean biology’s response to global warming.

The possibility of an imminent gap in ocean colour data has led to the proposal of alternative monitoring strategies. The use of “sentinel sites” – point locations where comprehensive, regular sampling is carried out and which are intended to be representative of large ecological provinces – has been suggested as a strategy for detecting the biological response to climate change. The substantial spatial variability revealed

---

**Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

by this analysis suggests however that this is unlikely to be an effective strategy and that global monitoring is necessary to detect the PP or chl response to global warming. Current ocean colour satellites are limited to measuring surface properties, but changes will occur throughout the water column, altering plankton community composition and trophic dynamics. Therefore, an integrated observing strategy consisting of satellites, time series stations, gliders, floats and moorings will be necessary to detect the full suite of biological responses to global warming.

## Appendix A

### Trend detection

We provide an abbreviated derivation of Eq. (3) here. The interested reader is referred to Appendix 3 of Weatherhead et al. (1998) for the full derivation. The unexplained portion of the data after fitting a trend (Eq. 1),  $N_t$ , is assumed to be autoregressive, so that  $N_t = N_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$ , where  $\varepsilon_t$  is white noise (zero mean and variance  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$ ). The variance of the noise  $N_t$  is related to the variance of the white noise process as  $\sigma_N^2 = \sigma_\varepsilon^2 / (1 - \phi^2)$ .

The estimate of the trend,  $\omega$  in Eq. (1), has a standard deviation associated with it,  $\sigma_\omega = \sqrt{\text{Var}(\omega)}$ . The exact form of  $\sigma_\omega$  is given as Eq. (A5) in Weatherhead et al. (1998). It simplifies to:

$$\text{Var}(\omega) \approx \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2 12^3}{\{(1 - \phi)^2 T(T^2 - 1)\}} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $T = 12n$  denotes the number of months of data. Therefore,

$$\sigma_\omega \approx \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon}{(1 - \phi)} \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} = \frac{\sigma_N}{n^{3/2}} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \phi}{1 - \phi}}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



The commonly used rule is adopted, that a real trend is indicated at the 95% confidence level if  $|\omega/\sigma_\omega| > 2$ , i.e. the trend is twice the standard deviation,  $z > 2 - |\omega/\sigma_\omega|$ . From standard normal tables,  $z = -1.3$  for a probability of detection of at least 90%, therefore  $|\omega/\sigma_\omega| > 3.3$  (Tiao et al., 1990). The minimum number of years to detect a trend,  $n^*$ , is thus (rearranging Eq. A2):

$$n^* \approx \left[ \frac{3.3\sigma_\varepsilon}{|\omega|(1-\phi)} \right]^{2/3} = \left[ \frac{3.3\sigma_N}{|\omega|} \sqrt{\frac{1+\phi}{1-\phi}} \right]^{2/3} \quad (\text{A3})$$

The derivation of the additional time needed to detect a trend if an interruption is present,  $n^{**}$  (Eq. 4), is outside the scope of this paper, and so the interested reader is referred to Appendix 3, Eq. (A4) in Weatherhead et al. (1998).

*Acknowledgements.* SeaWiFS data were provided by GSFC/NASA in accordance with the SeaWiFS Research Data Use Terms and Conditions Agreement. S. A. H. was supported by NASA grants NNG06GE77G and NNX07AL81G. J. L. S. and C. B. acknowledge support from the Carbon Mitigation Initiative funded by BP Amoco. S. C. D. and I. L. were supported by NSF grant EF-0424599. L.B. acknowledges support from the ANR-GlobPhy and FP7-MEECE projects.

## References

- Alheit, J.: Consequences of regime shifts for marine food webs, *Int. J. Earth Sci.*, 98, 261–268, 2009.
- Anderson, J. L., Balaji, V., Broccoli, A. J., Cooke, W., Delworth, T., Dixon, K., Donner, L. J., Dunne, K. A., Freidenreich, S. M., Garner, S. T., Gudgel, R. G., Gordon, C. T., Held, I. M., Hemler, R. S., Horowitz, L. W., Klein, S. A., Knutson, T. R., Kushner, P. J., Langenhorst, A. R., Lau, N. C., Liang, Z., Malyshev, S. L., Milly, P. C. D., Nath, M. J., Ploshay, J. J., Ramaswamy, V., Schwarzkopf, M. D., Shevlikova, E., Sirutis, J. J., Soden, B. J., Stern, W. F., Thompson, L. A., Wilson, R. J., Wittenberg, A. T., and Wyman, B. L.: The new GFDL global atmosphere and land model AM2-LM2: Evaluation with prescribed SST simulations, *J. Climate*, 17, 4641–4673, 2004.

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Antoine, D., Morel, A., Gordon, H. R., Banzon, V. F., and Evans, R. H.: Bridging ocean color observations of the 1980s and 2000s in search of long-term trends, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, C06009, doi:10.1029/2004JC002620, 2005.
- Aumont, O. and Bopp, L.: Globalizing results from ocean in situ iron fertilization studies, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 20, GB2017, doi:10.1029/2005GB002591, 2006.
- Behrenfeld, M. J., Boss, E., Siegel, D. A., and Shea, D. M.: Carbon-based ocean productivity and phytoplankton physiology from space, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 19, GB1006, doi:10.1029/2004GC002299, 2005.
- Behrenfeld, M. J. and Falkowski, P. G.: Photosynthetic rates derived from satellite-based chlorophyll concentration, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 42, 1–20, 1997.
- Behrenfeld, M. J., O'Malley, R. T., Siegel, D. A., McClain, C. R., Sarmiento, J. L., Feldman, G. C., Milligan, A. J., Falkowski, P. G., Letelier, R. M., and Boss, E. S.: Climate-driven trends in contemporary ocean productivity, *Nature*, 444, 752–755, 2006.
- Bopp, L., Aumont, O., Cadule, P., Alvain, S., and Gehlen, M.: Response of diatoms distribution to global warming and potential implications: A global model study, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L19606, doi:10.1029/2005GL023653, 2005.
- Bopp, L., Kohfeld, K. E., and Le Quere, C.: Dust impact on marine biota and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> during glacial periods, *Paleoceanography*, 18, 1046, doi:10.1029/2002PA000810, 2003.
- Bopp, L., Monfray, P., Aumont, O., Dufresne, J.-L., Le Treut, H., Madec, G., Terray, L., and Orr, J. C.: Potential impacts of climate change on marine export production, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 15, 81–99, 2001.
- Boyd, P. W. and Doney, S. C.: Modelling regional responses by marine pelagic ecosystems to global climate change, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 29, 1806, doi:10.1029/2001GL014130, 2002.
- Boyd, P. W., Doney, S. C., Strzepek, R., Dusenberry, J., Lindsay, K., and Fung, I.: Climate-mediated changes to mixed-layer properties in the Southern Ocean: assessing the phytoplankton response, *Biogeosciences*, 5, 847–864, 2008, <http://www.biogeosciences.net/5/847/2008/>.
- Brzezinski, M. A., Villareal, T. A., and Lipschultz, F.: Silica production and the contribution of diatoms to new and primary production in the central North Pacific, *Mar. Ecol.-Prog. Ser.*, 167, 89–104, 1998.
- Carr, M.-E.: Estimation of potential productivity in Eastern Boundary Currents using remote sensing, *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II*, 49, 59–80, 2002.
- Chavez, F. P., Ryan, J., Lluch-Cota, S. E., and Niquen, M. C.: From anchovies to sardines and

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- back: multidecadal changes in the Pacific Ocean, *Science*, 299, 217–221, 2003.
- Collins, W. D., Blackmon, M., Bitz, C. M., Bonan, G. B., Bretherton, C. S., Carton, J. A., Chang, P., Doney, S. C., Hack, J. J., Kiehl, J. T., Henderson, T., Large, W., McKenna, D., and Santer, B. D.: The community climate system model: CCSM3, *J. Climate*, 19, 2122–2143, 2006.
- 5 Conkright, M. E., Locarnini, R. A., Garcia, H. E., O'Brien, T. D., Boyer, T. P., Stephens, C., and Antonov, J. I.: *World Ocean Atlas 2001: Objective analyses, data statistics and figures*, CD-ROM documentation, National Oceanographic Data Center, Silver Spring, MD, 2002.
- Delworth, T., Broccoli, A. J., Rosati, A., Stouffer, R., Balaji, V., Beesley, J. A., Cooke, W., Dixon, K., Dunne, J. P., Dunne, K. A., Durachta, J. W., Findell, K. L., Ginoux, P., Gnanadesikan, A., Gordon, C. T., Griffies, S. M., Gudgel, R. G., Harrison, M. J., Held, I. M., Hemler, R. S., Horowitz, L. W., Klein, S. A., Knutson, T. R., Kushner, P. J., Langenhorst, A. R., Lee, H. C., Lin, S. J., Lu, J., Malyshev, S. L., Milly, P. C. D., Ramaswamy, V., Russell, J., Schwarzkopf, M. D., Shevlikova, E., Sirutis, J. J., Spelman, M., Stern, W. F., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A. T., Wyman, B. L., Zeng, F., and Zhang, R.: GFDL's CM2 global coupled climate models. Part 1: Formulation and simulation characteristics, *J. Climate*, 19, 643–674, 2006.
- 10 de Young, B., Barange, M., Beaugrand, G., Harris, R., Perry, R. I., Scheffer, M., and Werner, F.: Regime shifts in marine ecosystems: detection, prediction and management, *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 23, 402–409, 2008.
- Dickinson, R. E., Oleson, K. W., Bonan, G. B., Hoffman, F. M., Thornton, P., Vertenstein, M., Yang, Z.-L., and Zeng, X.: The community land model and its climate statistics as a component of the Community Climate System Model, *J. Climate*, 19, 2302–2324, 2006.
- Doney, S. C.: Oceanography – Plankton in a warmer world, *Nature*, 444, 695–696, 2006.
- Doney, S. C., Lima, I. D., Feely, R. A., Glover, D. M., Lindsay, K., Mahowald, N., Moore, J. K., and Wanninkhof, R.: Mechanisms governing interannual variability in upper-ocean inorganic carbon system and air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes: physical climate and atmospheric dust, *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II*, 56, 640–655, 2009a.
- 20 Doney, S. C., Lima, I. D., Moore, J. K., Lindsay, K., Behrenfeld, M. J., Westberry, T. K., Mahowald, N., Glover, D. M., and Takahashi, T.: Skill metrics for confronting global upper ocean ecosystem-biogeochemistry models against field and remote sensing data, *J. Marit. Sys.*, 76, 95–112, 2009b.
- 30 Doney, S. C., Lindsay, K., Caldeira, K., Campin, J.-M., Drange, H., Dutay, J.-C., Follows, M., Gao, Y., Gnanadesikan, A., Gruber, N., Ishida, A., Joos, F., Madec, G., Maier-Reimer, E.,

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Marshall, J. C., Matear, R., Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Najjar, R., Orr, J. C., Plattner, G.-K., Sarmiento, J. L., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R., Totterdell, I. J., Weirig, M.-F., Yamanaka, Y., and Yool, A.: Evaluating global ocean carbon models: the importance of realistic physics, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 18, GB3017, doi:10.1029/2003GB002150, 2004.
- 5 Doney, S. C., Lindsay, K., Fung, I., and John, J.: Natural variability in a stable, 1000-yr global coupled climate-carbon cycle simulation, *J. Climate*, 19, 3033–3054, 2006.
- Dose, V. and Menzel, A.: Bayesian analysis of climate change impacts in phenology, *Glob. Change Biol.*, 10, 259–272, 2004.
- Dunne, J. P., Armstrong, R. A., Gnanadesikan, A., and Sarmiento, J. L.: Empirical and  
10 mechanistic models for the particle export ratio, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 19, GB4026, doi:10.1029/2004GB002390, 2005.
- Dunne, J. P., Sarmiento, J. L., and Gnanadesikan, A.: A synthesis of global particle export from the surface ocean and cycling through the ocean interior and on the seafloor, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 21, doi:10.1029/2006GB002907, 2007.
- 15 Edwards, M. and Richardson, A. J.: Impact of climate change on marine pelagic phenology and trophic mismatch, *Nature*, 430, 881–884, 2004.
- Eppley, R. W.: Temperature and phytoplankton growth in the sea, *Fish. B.-NOAA*, 70, 1063–1085, 1972.
- Fan, S. M., Moxim, W. J., and Levy, H.: Aeolian input of bioavailable iron to the ocean, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L07602, doi:07610.01029/02005GL024852, 2006.
- 20 Field, C. B., Behrenfeld, M. J., Randerson, J. T., and Falkowski, P. G.: Primary production of the biosphere: Integrating terrestrial and oceanic components, *Science*, 281, 237–240, 1998.
- Francis, R. C. and Hare, S. R.: Decadal-scale regime shifts in the large marine ecosystems of the North-east Pacific: a case for historical science, *Fish. Oceanogr.*, 3, 279–291, 1994.
- 25 Francis, R. C., Hare, S. R., Hollowed, A. B., and Wooster, W. S.: Effects of interdecadal climate variability on the oceanic ecosystems of the NE Pacific, *Fish. Oceanogr.*, 7, 1–21, 1998.
- Geider, R. J.: Light and temperature-dependence of the carbon to chlorophyll-*a* ratio in microalgae and cyanobacteria – Implications for physiology and growth of phytoplankton, *New Phytol.*, 106, 1–34, 1987.
- 30 Geider, R. J., MacIntyre, H. L., and Kana, T. M.: Dynamic model of phytoplankton growth and acclimation: responses of the balanced growth rate and the chlorophyll-*a*:carbon ratio to light, nutrient-limitation and temperature, *Mar. Ecol.-Prog. Ser.*, 148, 187–200, 1997.
- Ginoux, P., Chin, M., Tegen, I., Prospero, J. M., Holben, B., Dubovik, O., and Lin, S. J.: Sources

and distributions of dust aerosols simulated with the GOCART model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 20255–20273, 2001.

Gnanadesikan, A., Dixon, K., Griffies, S. M., Balaji, V., Barreiro, M., Beesley, J. A., Cooke, W., Delworth, T., Gerdes, R., Harrison, M. J., Held, I. M., Hurlin, W., Lee, H. C., Liang, Z.,  
5 Nong, G., Pacanowski, R. C., Rosati, A., Russell, J., Samuels, B. L., Song, Q., Spelman, M.,  
Stouffer, R., Sweeney, C. O., Vecchi, G., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A. T., Zeng, F., Zhang, R.,  
and Dunne, J. P.: GFDL's CM2 global coupled climate models. Part 2: The baseline ocean  
simulation, *J. Climate*, 19, 675–697, 2006.

Gregg, W. W., Casey, N. W., and McClain, C. R.: Recent trends in global ocean chlorophyll,  
10 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L03606, doi:10.1029/2004GGL021808, 2005.

Gregg, W. W., Conkright, M. E., Ginoux, P., O'Reilly, J. E., and Casey, N. W.: Ocean primary  
production and climate: Global decadal changes, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, 1809,  
doi:10.1029/2003GL016889, 2003.

Griffies, S. M., Harrison, M. J., Pacanowski, R. C., and Rosati, A.: A technical guide to MOM4,  
15 GFDL Ocean Group Technical Report, Princeton, 2004.

Hasselmann, K.: Optimal fingerprints for the detection of time dependent climate change, *J.  
Climate*, 6, 1957–1971, 1993.

Henson, S. A., Dunne, J. P., and Sarmiento, J. L.: Decadal variability in North Atlantic phyto-  
plankton blooms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, C04013, doi:10.1029/2008JC005139, 2009.

20 Henson, S. A. and Thomas, A. C.: Interannual variability in timing of bloom initiation in the  
California Current System, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, C08007, doi:10.1029/2006JC003960,  
2007.

Hourdin, F., Musat, I., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Codron, F., Dufresne, J.-L., Fairhead, L., Filib-  
erti, M.-A., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Krinner, G., Levan, P., Li, Z.-X., and Lott, F.:  
25 The LMDZ4 general circulation model: climate performance and sensitivity to parameterized  
physics with emphasis on tropical convection, *Clim. Dynam.*, 19, 3445–3482, 2006.

Irwin, A. J. and Oliver, M. J.: Are ocean deserts getting larger?, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36,  
L18609, doi:10.1029/2009GL039883, 2009.

Iverson, R. L.: Control of marine fish production, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 35, 1593–1604, 1990.

30 Joint, I. and Groom, S. B.: Estimation of phytoplankton production from space: current status  
and future potential of satellite remote sensing, *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 250, 233–255, 2000.

Kahru, M., Kudela, R., Manzano-Sarabia, M., and Mitchell, B. G.: Trends in primary produc-  
tion in the California Current detected with satellite data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, C02004,

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



doi:02010.01029/02008JC004979, 2009.

Kahru, M. and Mitchell, B. G.: Ocean color reveals increased blooms in various parts of the world, EOS T. Am. Geophys. Un., 89, 170, 2008.

5 Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W. D., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Leetmaa, A., Reynolds, R., Jenne, R., and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-yr reanalysis project, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 77, 437–471, 1996.

10 Key, R. M., Kozyr, A., Sabine, C. L., Lee, K., Wanninkhof, R., Bullister, J., Feely, R. A., Millero, F., Mordy, C., and Peng, T.-H.: A global ocean carbon climatology: results from GLODAP, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 18, GB4031, doi:10.1029/2004GB002247, 2004.

15 Krinner, G., Viovy, N., de Noblet, N., Ogee, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Sitch, S., and Prentice, I. C.: A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled atmosphere-biosphere system, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 19, GB1015, doi:10.1029/2003GB002199, 2005.

Large, W. and Yeager, S.: Diurnal to decadal global forcing for ocean and sea-ice models: The data sets and flux climatologies, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, Technical Note TN-460+STR, 2004.

20 Large, W. and Yeager, S.: The global climatology of an interannually varying air-sea flux data set, Clim. Dynam., 33, 341–364, 2009.

Laws, E. A. and Bannister, T. T.: Nutrient-limited and light-limited growth of *Thalassiosira* fluviatilis in continuous culture, with implications for phytoplankton growth in the ocean, Limnol. Oceanogr., 25, 457–473, 1980.

25 Madec, G.: NEMO ocean engine, Note du Pole de modélisation, Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL), Paris, No 27, 2008.

Madec, G., Delecluse, P., Imbard, M., and Levy, C.: OPA 8.1 ocean general circulation model reference manual, Notes du Pole de modélisation, Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL), Paris, No 11, 1998.

Madrid, C. R.: The Nimbus 7 users' guide, NASA, Goddard Space Flight Center, 1978.

30 Marra, J., Ho, C., and Trees, C. C.: An alternative algorithm for the calculation of primary productivity from remote sensing data, LDEO #2003-1, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, 2003.

McClain, C. R.: A decade of satellite ocean color observations, Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci., 1, 19–42,

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2009.

McClain, C. R., Signorini, S. R., and Christian, J. R.: Subtropical gyre variability observed by ocean-color satellites, *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II*, 51, 281–301, 2004.

McGowan, J. A., Cayan, D. R., and Dorman, L. M.: Climate-ocean variability and ecosystem response in the northeast Pacific, *Science*, 281, 210–217, 1998.

Michaels, A. F. and Silver, M. W.: Primary production, sinking fluxes and the microbial food web, *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. I*, 35, 473–490, 1988.

Milutinovic, S., Behrenfeld, M. J., Johannessen, J. A., and Johannessen, T.: Sensitivity of remote sensing-derived phytoplankton productivity to mixed layer depth: Lessons from the carbon-based productivity model, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 23, GB4005, doi:4010.1029/2008GB003431, 2009.

Moore, J. K. and Doney, S. C.: Iron availability limits the ocean nitrogen inventory stabilizing feedbacks between marine denitrification and nitrogen fixation, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 21, GB2001, doi:10.1029/2006GB002762, 2007.

Moore, J. K., Doney, S. C., and Lindsay, K.: Upper ocean ecosystem dynamics and iron cycling in a global 3-D model, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 18, GB4028, doi:10.1029/2004GB002220, 2004.

Moore, J. K., Doney, S. C., Lindsay, K., Mahowald, N., and Michaels, A. F.: Nitrogen fixation amplifies the ocean biogeochemical response to decadal timescale variations in mineral dust deposition, *Tellus B*, 58, 560–572, 2006.

Nakicenovic, N. and Swart, R. (Eds.): *Special Report on Emissions Scenarios. A special report of Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

Polovina, J. J., Howell, E. A., and Abecassis, M.: Ocean's least productive waters are expanding, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, 3618, doi:3610.1029/2007GL031745, 2008.

Riley, G. A.: Phytoplankton of the North Central Sargasso Sea, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 2, 252–270, 1957.

Sarmiento, J. L., Slater, R., Barber, R., Bopp, L., Doney, S. C., Hirst, A. C., Kleypas, J., Matear, R., Mikolajewicz, U., Monfray, P., Soldatov, V., Spall, S. A., and Stouffer, R.: Response of ocean ecosystems to climate warming, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 18, GB3003, doi:3010.1029/2003GB002134, 2004.

Schneider, B., Bopp, L., Gehlen, M., Segschneider, J., Frölicher, T. L., Cadule, P., Friedlingstein, P., Doney, S. C., Behrenfeld, M. J., and Joos, F.: Climate-induced interannual variability of

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



marine primary and export production in three global coupled climate carbon cycle models, *Biogeosciences*, 5, 597–614, 2008,

<http://www.biogeosciences.net/5/597/2008/>.

5 Steinacher, M., Joos, F., Frölicher, T. L., Bopp, L., Cadule, P., Doney, S. C., Gehlen, M., Schneider, B., and Segschneider, J.: Projected 21st century decrease in marine productivity: a multi-model analysis, *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 6, 7933–7981, 2009, <http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/6/7933/2009/>.

Sunda, W. G. and Huntsman, S. A.: Iron uptake and growth limitation in oceanic and coastal phytoplankton, *Mar. Chem.*, 50, 189–206, 1995.

10 Sunda, W. G. and Huntsman, S. A.: Interrelated influence of iron, light and cell size on marine phytoplankton growth, *Nature*, 390, 389–392, 1997.

Tagliabue, A., Bopp, L., Aumont, O., and Arrigo, K. R.: Influence of light and temperature on the marine iron cycle: From theoretical to global modeling, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 23, GB2017, doi:2010.1029/2008GB003214, 2009.

15 Takahashi, T., Broecker, W. S., and Langer, S.: Redfield ratio based on chemical data from isopycnal surfaces, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 90, 6907–6924, 1985.

Tegen, I. and Fung, I.: Contribution to the atmospheric mineral aerosol load from land surface modification, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 18707–18726, 1995.

20 Thornton, P. E., Doney, S. C., Lindsay, K., Moore, J. K., Mahowald, N., Randerson, J. T., Fung, I., Lamarque, J.-F., Feddes, J. J., and Lee, Y.-H.: Carbon-nitrogen interactions regulate climate-carbon cycle feedbacks: results from an atmosphere-ocean general circulation model, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 2099–2120, 2009, <http://www.biogeosciences.net/6/2099/2009/>.

25 Tiao, G. C., Reinsel, G. C., Xu, D., Pedrick, J. H., Zhu, X., Miller, A. J., DeLuisi, J. J., Matteer, C. L., and Wuebbles, D. J.: Effects of autocorrelation and temporal sampling schemes on estimates of trend and spatial correlation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 95, 20507–20517, 1990.

Ware, D. M. and Thomson, R. E.: Bottom-up ecosystem trophic dynamics determine fish production in the Northeast Pacific, *Science*, 308, 1280–1284, 2005.

30 Weatherhead, E. C., Reinsel, G. C., Tiao, G. C., Meng, X.-L., Choi, D., Cheang, W.-K., Keller, T., DeLuisi, J., Wuebbles, D. J., Kerr, J. B., Miller, A. J., Oltmans, S. J., and Frederick, J. E.: Factors affecting the detection of trends: Statistical considerations and applications to environmental data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 17149–17161, 1998.

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Yoder, J. A., Kennelly, M. A., Doney, S. C., and Lima, I. D.: Comparing trends in chlorophyll time series extracted from SeaWiFS imagery with a longer record available from the output of a numerical model, *Oceanologica Sinica*, submitted, 2009.

**BGD**

6, 10311–10354, 2009

---

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

10344



**Table 1.** Length of time series (in years) needed to detect a global warming trend in chlorophyll concentration and primary production (bold) above the natural variability reported for each model as the average within the biomes (see Fig. 1 for biome locations).

Biome	GFDL	IPSL	NCAR	Biome mean
1. High latitude	41	41	41	41
North Pacific	<b>40</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>
2. Oligotrophic	36	37	44	39
North Pacific	<b>38</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>35</b>
3. Equatorial	34	32	49	35
Pacific	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33</b>
4. Oligotrophic	41	36	48	42
South Pacific	<b>43</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>
5. Southern	37	48	45	43
Ocean – Pacific	<b>42</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>44</b>
6. High latitude	40	31	37	36
North Atlantic	<b>41</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>39</b>
7. Oligotrophic	42	34	35	37
North Atlantic	<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>
8. Equatorial	45	26	24	32
Atlantic	<b>45</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>31</b>
9. Oligotrophic	40	35	33	36
South Atlantic	<b>40</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>34</b>
10. Southern	37	43	36	39
Ocean – Atlantic	<b>39</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>39</b>
11. Arabian	37	33	29	33
Sea	<b>37</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>31</b>
12. Bay of	40	31	41	37
Bengal	<b>41</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>37</b>
13. Oligotrophic	48	34	37	40
Indian	<b>52</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>
14. Southern	37	40	44	40
Ocean – Indian	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



**Table 2.** The year when the global warming trend in modelled chlorophyll concentration and primary production (bold) exceeds the natural variability, reported for each model as the average within the biomes (see Fig. 1 for biome locations).

Biome	GFDL	IPSL	NCAR	Biome mean
1. High latitude	2072	2054	2075	2067
North Pacific	<b>2051</b>	<b>2062</b>	<b>2074</b>	<b>2062</b>
2. Oligotrophic	2076	2059	2084	2073
North Pacific	<b>2070</b>	<b>2043</b>	<b>2080</b>	<b>2064</b>
3. Equatorial	2076	2056	2076	2069
Pacific	<b>2063</b>	<b>2052</b>	<b>2079</b>	<b>2065</b>
4. Oligotrophic	2051	2049	2079	2060
South Pacific	<b>2049</b>	<b>2055</b>	<b>2073</b>	<b>2059</b>
5. Southern	2057	2052	2085	2065
Ocean – Pacific	<b>2051</b>	<b>2053</b>	<b>2068</b>	<b>2057</b>
6. High latitude	2055	2033	2072	2053
North Atlantic	<b>2054</b>	<b>2034</b>	<b>2079</b>	<b>2056</b>
7. Oligotrophic	2060	2049	2053	2054
North Atlantic	<b>2061</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2064</b>	<b>2048</b>
8. Equatorial	2055	2043	2042	2047
Atlantic	<b>2060</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2062</b>	<b>2043</b>
9. Oligotrophic	2050	2047	2071	2056
South Atlantic	<b>2051</b>	<b>2043</b>	<b>2072</b>	<b>2055</b>
10. Southern	2052	2054	2081	2062
Ocean – Atlantic	<b>2032</b>	<b>2048</b>	<b>2076</b>	<b>2052</b>
11. Arabian Sea	2063	2078	2063	2068
	<b>2060</b>	<b>2043</b>	<b>2059</b>	<b>2054</b>
12. Bay of	2087	2074	2078	2080
Bengal	<b>2089</b>	<b>2051</b>	<b>2088</b>	<b>2076</b>
13. Oligotrophic	2029	2055	2064	2049
Indian	<b>2031</b>	<b>2043</b>	<b>2066</b>	<b>2047</b>
14. Southern	2052	2059	2066	2059
Ocean – Indian	<b>2054</b>	<b>2062</b>	<b>2074</b>	<b>2063</b>

**Is global warming  
already changing  
ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Fig. 1.** Trend in monthly anomalies of SeaWiFS-derived chlorophyll concentration (top panel) and primary production (bottom panel; mean of three algorithms) for the period September 1997–December 2007. Only points where the trend is statistically significant at the 95% level are plotted. Black contours and large numbers denote the 14 biomes.

## BGD

6, 10311–10354, 2009

### Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.



**Fig. 2.** 10-yr trend in SeaWiFS-derived chlorophyll concentration compared to 10-yr trends in three global biogeochemical models. The mean trend and 95% confidence interval in chl in each biome (see Fig. 1) as calculated from SeaWiFS data and from 10-yr long segments of output from the GFDL, IPSL and NCAR models are plotted. Negative (positive) trends for a particular 10-yr period represent declining (increasing) chl values over that period. The first data point is the trend in modelled chl from January 1958–December 1967 and is plotted at 1958; the second is the trend from January 1959–December 1968 and is plotted at 1959, etc.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Fig. 3.** 10-yr trend in SeaWiFS-derived primary production compared to 10-yr trends in three global biogeochemical models. The mean trend and 95% confidence interval in PP in each biome (see Fig. 1) as calculated from SeaWiFS data and from 10-yr long segments of output from the GFDL, IPSL and NCAR models are plotted. Negative (positive) trends for a particular 10-yr period represent declining (increasing) primary production values over that period. The first data point is the trend in modelled primary production from January 1958–December 1967 and is plotted at 1958; the second is the trend from January 1959–December 1968 and is plotted at 1959, etc.

## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.



**Fig. 4.** Annual mean size of the oligotrophic gyres, plotted as anomalies from the mean, estimated for the GFDL model (black lines), IPSL model (green lines), NCAR model (blue lines) and SeaWiFS data (red lines).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Fig. 5.** Linear trend in modelled chlorophyll concentration (left column) and primary production (right column) for the period 2001–2100 under the A2 global warming scenario, calculated for the GFDL, IPSL and NCAR models. Only points where the trend is statistically significant at the 95% level are plotted.

**Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Fig. 6.** Number of years required to detect a global warming trend in chlorophyll concentration (left column) and primary production (right column) above the natural variability, calculated for the GFDL, IPSL and NCAR models (A2 scenario, 2001–2100). Only points where the trend is statistically significant at the 95% level are plotted.

**Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



## Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?

S. A. Henson et al.



**Fig. 7.** Examples of control and global warming simulations from the GFDL model for 2001–2100 of primary production at point locations in the North Atlantic. Thick lines are the annual mean global warming run primary production; thin solid lines are the control run primary production; thin dashed lines are the mean  $\pm$  one standard deviation of the control run.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back


Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion





**Fig. 8.** The year when the trend in chlorophyll concentration (left column) and primary production (right column) exceeds the natural variability in the GFDL, IPSL and NCAR models, run with the IPCC A2 warming scenario from 1968–2100. White areas are where the trend never exceeds the natural variability. Purple and dark blue areas are where the trend exceeded the natural variability within the time period of contemporary satellite data.

**Is global warming already changing ocean productivity?**

S. A. Henson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

