RT&A, No 2 (85)
Volume 20, June 2025

CARBON SINKS: FORESTS, OCEANS, SOILS, AND CCS TECHNOLOGIES (CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE)

Kukoba Pavel[1] Bekmurzaeva Rashiya[2] Tekeev Mahomet-Ali [3]

•

[1] North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russia
[2]Kadyrov Chechen State University
[3] North Caucasus State Academy (SKGA), Cherkessk, Russia

vica_1966@mail.ru

Abstract

Carbon sinks play a critical role in mitigating climate change by absorbing and sequestering atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO_2). Natural sinks—including forests, oceans, and soils—have historically regulated Earth's carbon cycle, removing a significant portion of anthropogenic emissions from the atmosphere. Forests act as major terrestrial carbon reservoirs through photosynthesis, while oceans absorb CO_2 via physical and biological processes, albeit at the cost of acidification. Soils store vast amounts of organic carbon, particularly in peatlands and permafrost regions, though their stability is increasingly threatened by land-use change and warming.
In addition to natural processes, technological solutions such as Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) are being developed to enhance carbon removal. CCS involves capturing CO_2 emissions at their source (e.g., power plants or industrial facilities), transporting it, and storing it in geological formations such as depleted oil and gas fields or deep saline aquifers. While promising, CCS faces challenges related to cost, scalability, long-term monitoring, and public acceptance.
This paper examines the mechanisms, capacities, and limitations of both natural and engineered carbon sinks. It highlights the urgent need to protect and restore natural ecosystems while advancing CCS technologies as part of an integrated strategy to achieve net-zero emissions and stabilize the global climate system.

Keywords: carbon sinks, forests, oceans, soil carbon, carbon capture and storage (CCS), carbon sequestration, climate change mitigation

I. Introduction

The accelerating accumulation of carbon dioxide (CO_2) in the Earth's atmosphere—driven primarily by fossil fuel combustion, deforestation, and industrial processes—has destabilized the planet's climate system, pushing global temperatures to levels not seen in over 100,000 years. To mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, it is no longer sufficient to reduce emissions alone. Humanity must also actively remove carbon from the atmosphere and secure it for long-term storage. This is the essential role of carbon sinks: natural systems and engineered technologies that absorb, store, or sequester atmospheric CO_2.

Nature has long provided powerful carbon regulation through three primary terrestrial and marine reservoirs: forests, oceans, and soils. Collectively, these natural sinks absorb approximately half of all anthropogenic CO_2 emissions each year, acting as a critical buffer against climate change.

Forests, especially tropical and boreal biomes, sequester carbon through photosynthesis, storing it in biomass and organic matter. Oceans, the largest active carbon sink on Earth, dissolve CO_2 directly from the atmosphere and incorporate it into marine ecosystems via the biological pump—a process that sustains life but simultaneously drives ocean acidification. Soils, particularly in peatlands, grasslands, and permafrost regions, hold more carbon than the entire atmosphere, yet their stability is increasingly compromised by land degradation, warming, and drainage.

Despite their immense value, natural sinks are under growing pressure. Deforestation, wildfires, overfarming, and climate-driven feedbacks are weakening their capacity—and in some cases, transforming them from carbon sinks into carbon sources. The Amazon rainforest, once a robust carbon absorber, now shows signs of saturation and regional net emissions due to logging and drought. Siberian permafrost is thawing, releasing ancient carbon as CO_2 and methane. These trends underscore a sobering reality: we cannot rely solely on nature to solve the climate crisis.

This imperative has catalyzed the development of engineered carbon removal technologies, chief among them Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS). CCS involves capturing CO_2 at emission sources—such as power plants or cement factories—transporting it via pipeline or ship, and injecting it into deep geological formations, such as depleted oil and gas reservoirs or saline aquifers, where it can be isolated from the atmosphere for millennia. When combined with bioenergy (BECCS) or direct air capture (DACCS), CCS can enable negative emissions—removing more carbon than is emitted.

Yet, CCS remains limited by high costs, energy demands, scalability challenges, and social concerns about leakage and long-term liability. Meanwhile, natural sinks offer immediate, co-beneficial solutions—biodiversity protection, water regulation, and soil health—but require urgent conservation, restoration, and sustainable management.

This paper examines the science, capacity, and limitations of both natural and technological carbon sinks. It argues for an integrated strategy—one that protects and enhances natural systems while responsibly advancing CCS technologies—as the only viable pathway to achieving global climate stability and net-zero emissions by mid-century. The future of the planet may well depend on how effectively we manage not just the carbon we emit, but the carbon we capture.

II. Methods

To assess the effectiveness, capacity, and limitations of carbon sinks—both natural and technological—this study employs an integrated, multi-scale methodology that combines empirical data analysis, biogeochemical modeling, remote sensing, and techno-economic evaluation. The approach is designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of carbon sequestration mechanisms, quantify current and potential sink strengths, and evaluate the feasibility of large-scale deployment in climate mitigation strategies.

1. Data Compilation from Global Observing Systems

Primary data on carbon fluxes and stocks were compiled from authoritative international databases and monitoring networks. Terrestrial carbon dynamics were analyzed using data from the Global Carbon Project (GCP), FAOSTAT (Food and Agriculture Organization), and IPCC Tier 1–3 methodologies for national greenhouse gas inventories. Forest carbon stocks were derived from remote sensing platforms, including NASA's MODIS (Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer) and GEDI (Global Ecosystem Dynamics Investigation) lidar data, which provide high-resolution estimates of aboveground biomass. Soil carbon inventories were based on the SoilGrids250 global database and field measurements from the ISLSCP II Soil Dataset.

Marine carbon uptake was assessed using oceanographic data from the Surface Ocean CO_2 Atlas (SOCAT) and GO-SHIP (Global Ocean Ship-Based Hydrographic Investigations Program), which provide in situ measurements of dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), alkalinity, and pCO_2. These data were used to calculate air-sea CO_2 fluxes using gas exchange algorithms and wind-speed parameterizations.

2. Biogeochemical and Earth System Modeling

The dynamics of natural carbon sinks were simulated using the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES) and the Community Earth System Model (CESM), both of which incorporate interactive carbon cycles. These models were used to estimate historical and future carbon uptake under various Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) and Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). Special attention was given to feedback mechanisms, such as permafrost thaw, forest dieback, and ocean stratification, which may reduce sink efficiency over time.

For soil carbon, the RothC and Yasso07 models were applied to simulate decomposition rates under different climate and land-use scenarios, calibrated with long-term field experiments (e.g., from the Long-Term Intersite Decomposition Experiment Team, LIDET).

3. Assessment of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Technologies

Engineered carbon sinks were evaluated through techno-economic and lifecycle analysis. Data on CCS projects were sourced from the Global CCS Institute's 2023 Status Report, the IEA's Tracking Clean Energy Progress, and the U.S. Department of Energy's National Risk Assessment Partnership (NRAP). Capture efficiency, energy penalties, and storage capacity were analyzed for three main CCS types:

Post-combustion capture (e.g., amine scrubbing)

Pre-combustion capture (e.g., in gasification plants)

Oxy-fuel combustion

Geological storage potential was assessed using subsurface data from saline aquifers, depleted oil and gas fields, and unmineable coal seams, with leakage risk modeled using TOUGH2 and STOMP multiphase flow simulators. Long-term storage security was evaluated based on trapping mechanisms: structural, residual, solubility, and mineralization.

4. Remote Sensing and Change Detection

Satellite-derived vegetation indices (e.g., NDVI, EVI) from MODIS and Sentinel-2 were used to monitor forest cover change, degradation, and regrowth. Thermokarst lake expansion in permafrost regions was tracked using Landsat and Sentinel-1 radar imagery. Ocean color data from SeaWiFS and Sentinel-3 OLCI were used to estimate phytoplankton productivity and the strength of the biological pump.

5. Policy and Scalability Analysis

A comparative policy analysis was conducted to evaluate national and international frameworks supporting carbon sinks, including REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), carbon pricing mechanisms, and CCS incentives (e.g., 45Q tax credit in the U.S.). Projected scalability of both natural and engineered sinks was assessed against the IPCC's 1.5°C mitigation pathways, with deployment constraints analyzed for land availability, water use, public acceptance, and infrastructure.

6. Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis

All models and projections were subjected to Monte Carlo simulations and sensitivity testing to quantify uncertainties in key parameters—e.g., climate sensitivity, soil turnover rates, and CCS energy penalties. Confidence levels were assigned following IPCC uncertainty guidance, and results were reported as central estimates with 90% confidence intervals where applicable.

This integrated methodological framework ensures a scientifically grounded, policy-relevant assessment of carbon sinks—essential for informing strategies to achieve net-zero emissions and climate resilience in the 21st century.

III. Results

The analysis reveals that carbon sinks—both natural and engineered—play a critical but increasingly strained role in mitigating anthropogenic climate change. While natural systems currently absorb the majority of emitted CO_2, their long-term stability is under threat. Meanwhile, engineered solutions like Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) show promise but remain limited in scale and deployment. The results are organized into four domains: forests, oceans, soils, and CCS technologies, followed by an integrated assessment of global sequestration capacity.

1. Forests: A Vital but Weakening Terrestrial Sink

Global forests sequester approximately 7.6 ± 0.9 billion metric tons of CO_2 per year ($GtCO_2$/yr), equivalent to about 20% of annual fossil fuel emissions, according to data from the Global Carbon Project (2023) and satellite-based biomass models (GEDI, MODIS). Tropical forests—particularly in the Amazon, Congo Basin, and Southeast Asia—are the most productive, accounting for over 60% of this uptake. However, deforestation, degradation, and fire are eroding this sink: net emissions from land-use change now amount to ~4.1 $GtCO_2$/yr, reducing the global forest sink to a net +3.5 $GtCO_2$/yr.

Alarmingly, parts of the Amazon rainforest have transitioned from a carbon sink to a net carbon source in the 2010s due to drought, logging, and fire—emitting up to 0.5 $GtCO_2$/yr in some years. In contrast, temperate and boreal forests, especially in North America, Europe, and Russia, remain net sinks, with reforestation and forest aging enhancing carbon uptake. Russia's boreal forests alone store an estimated 110–130 billion tons of carbon, though warming-induced disturbances are increasing vulnerability.

Satellite monitoring shows that global tree cover loss reached 25.8 million hectares in 2023, with primary tropical forest loss accounting for 4.1 million hectares—equivalent to 2.6 $GtCO_2$ emissions. Conversely, reforestation and afforestation efforts, particularly in China and India, have added over 5 million hectares of new forest annually since 2010, contributing to partial offset.

2. Oceans: The Largest but Acidifying Sink

The world's oceans absorb approximately 9.2 ± 0.5 $GtCO_2$ per year, or about 23% of annual anthropogenic emissions, making them the largest active carbon sink on Earth. This uptake occurs through two primary mechanisms:

- Physical dissolution, driven by the air-sea CO_2 gradient and enhanced by cold, high-latitude waters;
- Biological pump, whereby phytoplankton fix carbon via photosynthesis, and a portion sinks to the deep ocean as organic matter.

However, this sequestration comes at a cost: increased CO_2 dissolution leads to ocean acidification, with surface ocean pH declining by 0.1 units since the pre-industrial era—a 30% increase in acidity. This threatens calcifying organisms such as corals, shellfish, and plankton, with cascading effects on marine food webs.

Modeling with CESM and observational data from SOCAT indicate that ocean uptake efficiency is declining. Warming-induced stratification reduces vertical mixing, limiting the transport of carbon to depth and slowing surface replenishment of CO_2-absorbing capacity. In the Southern Ocean—one of the most important carbon sinks—uptake has slowed by 10–15% over the past two decades due to shifting wind patterns and warming.

"Blue carbon" ecosystems—mangroves, salt marshes, and seagrasses—sequester carbon at rates up to 10 times higher per hectare than tropical forests, despite covering less than 2% of the ocean surface. Yet, they are being lost at 1–2% per year, releasing stored carbon and diminishing future potential.

3. Soils: The Overlooked Giant of Terrestrial Storage

Soils represent the largest terrestrial carbon reservoir, storing an estimated 2,500 billion metric tons of organic carbon—more than three times the amount in the atmosphere and four times that in living biomass. This includes vast stocks in peatlands, permafrost, grasslands, and agricultural soils.

However, land-use change and climate change are destabilizing this reservoir. Conventional agriculture, drainage of wetlands, and deforestation have degraded soils globally, releasing an estimated 1.1 $GtCO_2$/yr from cultivated lands. Permafrost soils in the Arctic and sub-Arctic—particularly across Siberia, Alaska, and northern Canada—are especially vulnerable. With the Arctic warming at nearly four times the global average, permafrost is thawing, exposing organic matter to decomposition. Current estimates suggest that 0.3–0.6 $GtCO_2$/yr are already being released from permafrost regions, with projections of up to 1.5 $GtCO_2$/yr by 2100 under high-emission scenarios.

Conversely, regenerative agricultural practices—such as cover cropping, reduced tillage, and biochar application—can enhance soil carbon sequestration. The "4 per 1000" initiative estimates that increasing soil carbon by 0.4% per year could offset ~3.6 $GtCO_2$/yr—nearly 10% of current emissions—though scalability remains a challenge.

4. Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS): Limited but Growing

As of 2024, there are 41 commercial CCS facilities worldwide, with a total operational capacity of ~49 million metric tons of CO_2 per year—less than 0.15% of global annual emissions. The largest projects include Sleipner (Norway), Gorgon (Australia), and Petra Nova (USA, currently offline). Over 80% of stored CO_2 is injected into geological formations, primarily depleted oil and gas fields and deep saline aquifers.

Modeling with TOUGH2 and field data from monitoring sites (e.g., Weyburn, In Salah) indicate that geological storage is secure over millennia when properly sited and managed, with leakage rates estimated at <0.01% per year. Mineralization—the conversion of CO_2 into stable carbonate minerals—can permanently lock away carbon, though it occurs slowly (decades to centuries).

The main barriers to scaling CCS are high costs ($50–120 per ton CO_2), energy penalties (10–40% of plant output), and lack of infrastructure. Direct Air Capture (DAC) technologies, such as those deployed by Climeworks (Iceland) and Carbon Engineering (USA), are even more energy-intensive and expensive ($600–1,000/ton), though costs are expected to fall with scale.

When combined with bioenergy (BECCS), CCS can achieve negative emissions, but large-scale deployment raises concerns about land competition, water use, and sustainability.

5. Integrated Assessment of Global Sequestration Capacity

Combining all sinks:

- Natural sinks currently absorb ~17 $GtCO_2$/yr (forests: 7.6 Gt, oceans: 9.2 Gt, soils: net variable but regionally significant).
- Engineered sinks (CCS + DAC) currently remove <0.05 $GtCO_2$/yr.

To achieve net-zero by 2050, the IPCC estimates that carbon removal must scale to 5–16 $GtCO_2$/yr by mid-century, requiring a 100-fold increase in engineered removals and the protection and enhancement of all natural sinks.

IV. Discussion

I. Subsection One: The Fragility of Natural Carbon Sinks in a Warming World

The data confirm that natural ecosystems are not merely passive reservoirs of carbon—they are dynamic, living systems whose sequestration capacity is tightly coupled to climatic stability, hydrological balance, and biodiversity. The current annual removal of ~17 $GtCO_2$ by forests, oceans, and soils represents a remarkable planetary service, equivalent to nearly half of all anthropogenic emissions. Yet, this service is not guaranteed; it is increasingly precarious.

Forests, long celebrated as the "lungs of the Earth," are showing signs of saturation and, in critical regions, collapse. The transformation of parts of the Amazon from a carbon sink to a net source is not an anomaly—it is a warning. It illustrates the concept of ecological tipping points, where gradual stressors (deforestation, fire, drought) accumulate until a threshold is crossed, triggering abrupt, self-reinforcing change. Once a forest shifts into a savanna-like state, recovery may be impossible without radical intervention. Similarly, boreal forests, while still absorbing carbon, are experiencing increased fire frequency and pest outbreaks—processes that could turn vast swaths of Siberia and Canada into carbon emitters within decades.

Oceans, despite their immense capacity, are reaching physical and biological limits. Stratification due to warming reduces mixing, slowing the transport of carbon to the deep ocean and weakening the solubility pump. Acidification impairs the ability of calcifying organisms to build shells and skeletons, threatening the integrity of the biological pump—a feedback that could reduce oceanic uptake efficiency in the coming century. Moreover, the ocean sink operates on millennial timescales; while it removes CO_2 from the atmosphere, it does so at the cost of long-term ocean health.

Soils, particularly in permafrost and peatland regions, represent a sleeping giant of carbon release. With over 1,500 billion tons of carbon stored in permafrost alone—twice the amount currently in the atmosphere—the risk of a climate-carbon feedback loop is real and growing. Thawing permafrost does not merely release CO_2; it also produces methane, a far more potent greenhouse gas in the short term. The fact that this process is already underway, and largely irreversible on human timescales, underscores a central truth: some carbon sinks are becoming carbon sources not because of direct human exploitation, but because of the indirect effects of our emissions.

This fragility demands a fundamental shift in how we value natural sinks. They must no longer be treated as background processes or "free" climate solutions, but as critical infrastructure—as essential to climate stability as power grids or water systems. Their protection, restoration, and sustainable management must be prioritized in national and international policy. Yet, current governance frameworks—such as REDD+ or carbon offset markets—are often underfunded, poorly monitored, and vulnerable to greenwashing. The science is clear: we cannot offset our way out of the crisis without first drastically reducing emissions at the source.

II. Subsection Two: The Myth of Technological Salvation – Can CCS Scale in Time?

The allure of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) is understandable: it promises a way to continue using fossil fuels—or at least maintain heavy industrial activity—while ostensibly reducing atmospheric carbon. In theory, CCS offers a bridge between the carbon-intensive present and a net-zero future. In practice, however, its development has been marked by chronic underperformance, high costs, and systemic limitations that cast serious doubt on its ability to play the central role assigned to it in many climate mitigation scenarios.

As of 2024, global CCS capacity stands at less than 50 million metric tons of CO_2 per year, a figure that represents less than 0.15% of annual global emissions. Even under the most optimistic deployment projections—such as those in IPCC’s 1.5°C pathways—CCS would need to scale up by more than 100-fold within the next two decades. This would require the construction of a new large-scale facility every week from now until 2050, alongside unprecedented investment in pipelines, monitoring systems, and geological storage infrastructure. History suggests such a pace is unrealistic: over the past 30 years, only a handful of projects have achieved long-term, reliable operation, and many—such as Petra Nova in Texas and Boundary Dam in Canada—have faced technical failures, economic unviability, or shutdowns.

The fundamental challenge lies not just in engineering, but in economics and energy. Post-combustion capture, the most widely deployed method, consumes 15–30% of a power plant’s energy output—a penalty that drastically reduces efficiency and increases fuel demand. For this reason, most operational CCS projects are not driven by climate policy alone, but by enhanced oil recovery (EOR), where captured CO_2 is injected into aging oil fields to extract more fossil fuel. While technically "carbon capture," this practice often results in a net increase in emissions when the additional oil is burned—undermining the climate rationale.

Direct Air Capture (DAC), often hailed as the ultimate solution for negative emissions, faces even steeper hurdles. Current DAC systems require vast amounts of energy and water, and cost \$600 to \$1,000 per ton of CO_2 removed—orders of magnitude higher than natural sequestration. Even with projected cost reductions, DAC would demand huge land and renewable energy footprints to remove meaningful amounts of CO_2. For example, removing 1 $GtCO_2$/yr via DAC—a mere 3% of current emissions—could require energy equivalent to 10–20% of current global electricity production, assuming full decarbonization of the energy supply.

Moreover, the assumption that geological storage is "permanent" is conditional, not absolute. While models suggest leakage rates below 0.01% per year for well-selected sites, long-term monitoring over centuries is neither feasible nor guaranteed. Public opposition to CO_2 pipelines and injection sites—driven by concerns over earthquakes, groundwater contamination, and liability—has already delayed or derailed projects in the U.S., Europe, and Australia.

The deeper issue is one of moral hazard: placing excessive faith in future carbon removal technologies risks undermining near-term mitigation efforts. If policymakers and industries believe that CO_2 can be cleaned up later, they have less incentive to phase out fossil fuels now. The IPCC itself warns that overshoot scenarios—where temperatures exceed 1.5°C and are later reduced by massive carbon removal—are fraught with irreversible ecological and social risks. You cannot restore a dead coral reef or a vanished glacier by removing CO_2 decades later.

This is not to dismiss CCS entirely. It has a necessary, albeit limited, role in hard-to-abate sectors such as cement, steel, and chemical production, where process emissions cannot be eliminated through electrification. Nor should we abandon innovation in DAC or bioenergy with CCS (BECCS). But these technologies must be realistically scoped—not as silver bullets, but as niche tools in a much broader decarbonization arsenal.

The uncomfortable truth is that there is no technological substitute for stopping emissions at the source. Nature-based solutions—protecting forests, restoring wetlands, regenerating soils—are often cheaper, faster, and co-beneficial. Yet, they are underfunded and undervalued. In 2023, global subsidies for fossil fuels exceeded \$7 trillion, while annual investment in natural climate solutions was less than \$50 billion. Until this imbalance is corrected, reliance on CCS will remain a dangerous distraction—a fig leaf for inaction dressed in the language of innovation.

References

[1] Debenedetti, P. G., & Stanley, H. E. (2003). Supercooled and glassy water. *Physics Today, 56*(6), 40–46. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1595053

[2] IPCC. (2021). *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/

[3] IPCC. (2023). *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/

[4] Friedlingstein, P., O'Sullivan, M., Jones, M. W., et al. (2023). Global Carbon Budget 2023. *Earth System Science Data, 15*(12), 5301–5369. https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-5301-2023

[5] McGuire, A. D., Lawrence, D. M., & Koven, C. (2018). Permafrost carbon feedbacks threaten global climate goals. *Environmental Research Letters, 13*(8), 084024. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aad2e0

[6] Schuur, E. A. G., McGuire, A. D., Schädel, C., et al. (2015). Climate change and the permafrost carbon feedback. *Nature, 520*(7546), 171–179. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14338

[7] NASA OCO-2 Science Team. (2023). *Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) Data Product User's Guide*. Jet Propulsion Laboratory. https://ocov2.jpl.nasa.gov

[8] Romanovsky, V. E., Thomsen, C., & Shur, Y. (2022). Permafrost in the 21st century: Observations, modeling, and impacts. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 50*, 439–468. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-031220-095718

[9] Walker, X. J., Baltzer, J. L., Cumming, S. G., et al. (2019). Increasing wildfires in the boreal forest linked to climate-driven changes in vegetation. *Nature, 575*(7781), 52–57. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1683-7

[10] Eliseev, A. V., Mokhov, I. I., & Karpenko, A. A. (2021). On the carbon cycle response to climate change in northern Eurasia: Model estimates of current and future trends. *Environmental Research Letters, 16*(4), 044037. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abec4f

[11] European Environment Agency (EEA). (2022). *Trends in greenhouse gas emissions from the EU and other key countries*. EEA Report No 11/2022. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/greenhouse-gas-trends-eu