Impact of Climatic Controls on Global Changes in Land-Surface Phenology

# Introduction

The effects of anthropogenic climate change on vegetation dynamics have received increasing attention of the scientific community in the past decades (Schwartz 1999; Richardson et al. 2013), as global and regional changes in land surface phenology (LSP) have been documented (de Jong et al. 2012; Garonna et al. 2014; Jeong et al. 2011; Anwar et al. 2015; Badeck et al. 2004; Julien & Sobrino 2009). To understand the processes underlying these changes in LSP and to be able to make predictions for the future, the feedback loops of phenology and the climate system have to be investigated (Richardson et al. 2012; Richardson et al. 2013). Developing climate based LSP models and comparing them to the effects observed in satellite and field data as an important step to investigate these complex interactions (Schwartz 1999; Jolly et al. 2005).

A promising concept to model phenology is based on climatic factors limiting plant growth, also called climatic controls (Jolly et al. 2005). Jolly et al. developed a Growing Season Index (GSI) based on temperature, vapour pressure deficit (VPD) as a measure of moisture availability and photoperiod to quantify energy availability. Others (Stöckli et al. 2011) have used and extended the GSI to perform a global reanalysis of vegetation phenology, creating global modelled time-series of vegetation indicators such as the Leaf Area Index (LAI). The LAI is defined as half of the green leaf area relative to the ground area, usually with values ranging between 0 and about 8 m2/m2 (Chen & Black 1992; Fernandes et al. 2014).

Most studies on long-term LSP trends based on remotely sensed data (de Jong et al. 2011; Garonna et al. 2014; Jeong et al. 2011) however rely on the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) (Tucker 1979; Rouse et al. 1973). Since the NDVI is merely a proxy of vegetation activity based on the reflectance of visible and infrared radiation, its application for understanding underlying processes is limited (Myneni et al. 1995; Carlson & Ripley 1997; Jiang et al. 2006; Jin & Eklundh 2014). The NDVI does not provide a direct link to biophysical parameters and is therefore not very suitable to model or to compare to field data, which is why a more relatable indicator of leaf-state from remotely sensed data is needed. An increasingly popular indicator which can be derived from remotely sensed data is the LAI, which contrary to the NDVI allows a direct link to ground conditions (Zhu et al. 2013; Jiang et al. 2010). Satellite based LAI products have been available from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) and SPOT/VEGETATION (Baret et al. 2007) platforms for the past decade (Fang et al. 2012) and have been used for short-term LSP studies (Verger et al. 2015; Anderson et al. 2015). Longer LAI time-series have also recently been made possible by linking 30 years of Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) NDVI data to the available MODIS LAI data (Zhu et al. 2013).

With the emergence of long-term LAI time-series, it has become possible to compare modelled LAI datasets such as the reanalysis done by Stöckli et al. (2011) to measured datasets from remotely sensed data. This not only gives us a chance to verify the models, it also allows us to study the impact of the climatic controls underlying the model might or might not have had in the past 30 years. Of particular interest to LSP researchers are parameters indicating the start of spring events called Start Of Season (SOS) and senescence, usually called End of Season (EOS) (Garonna et al. 2014). Quantifying and understanding the changes of climatic controls over the past decades during these events is of particular interest for researchers (Jeong et al. 2011; Richardson et al. 2013).

The focus of this master thesis lies on the analysis of the impact of global changes in climatic controls on global land surface phenology. However, a validation of the underlying data has to be performed first, followed by an analysis of the climatic control changes that happened over the last 30 years, before their impacts on changes in LSP can be investigated. Therefore, each chapter of the thesis will be split into 3 parts to deal with each of the following 3 topics.

First the modelled LAIre has to be compared to the measured LAI3g to validate the climatic controls model. Of major interest for validation are LSP parameters SOS and EOS extracted from the two dataset. The validation will not only justify the use of climatic controls to explain changes in LSP, but by investigating differences in the modelled and measured data, it will also help understand where changes in climatic controls might not be the main drivers of LSP. Therefore, the main question to be answered is: How well do LSP parameters (such as SOS and EOS) extracted from the two datasets correlate and where do they differ?

Then, the three climatic controls, temperature, VPD and radiation, on which the modelled LAIre is based, are analysed to gain an understanding of the changes in global climatic limitations for plant growth. Inter-annual changes in dominating controls are investigated as well as changes in the strength of individual controls over the last 3 decades. This will be used to answer the question: Are there changes in dominating climatic controls or in individual controls over the last 30 years?

Lastly, climatic controls at the time of SOS and EOS and their changes over the last 30 years will be analysed to gain an understanding of the processes influencing these important phenological stages. The 30 days of climatic controls right before SOS and EOS will be looked at. Dominating controls during that time and changes in individual controls will be examined to answer the question: Are there inter-annual changes in global dominating or individual climatic controls at SOS and EOS?

# Data & Methods

## Data

The two LAI datasets used for the analysis, a modelled and a measured one, will be described in this section. The modelled LAI comes from the global reanalysis of vegetation phenology by Stöckli et al. (2011) and will be labelled LAIre, the measured LAI is based on the longest available NDVI time-series, the AVHRR GIMMS NDVI3g (Tucker et al. 2005; Pinzon & Tucker 2014), and will be labelled LAI3g. The data was analysed over a period of 30 years from the years 1982 to 2011.

### LAIre – Modelled LAI

Stöckli et al. (2011) produced a global LAI dataset with a model based on Jolly’s (2005) climatic controls used in the Growing Season Index (GSI). Jolly’s GSI uses two thresholds for each control: a minimum threshold where growth is fully limited, and maximum threshold where plant growth is not limited anymore. In between the minimum and maximum threshold, a linear gradient is assumed. For temperature and photoperiod this gradient goes from 0 at the minimum threshold to 1 at the maximum threshold. For VPD it is inversed since a higher vapour pressure deficit results in less available moisture, and goes from 0 at the maximum threshold to 1 at the minimum threshold. Stöckli et al. used European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) ERA-Interim data to calculate the controls.

Stöckli extended the GSI model into a prognostic phenology model to predict LAI and fractional photosynthetically active radiation (FPAR). To more accurately represent different vegetation types and other land surface covers such as urban areas or water bodies, he included a set of 35 natural and non-natural plant functional types (PFT) and set different thresholds for each type, based on prior research. The percentage of each PFT for each pixel is set based on a combination of several MODIS land cover, vegetation and crop products and is kept static over the years. Finally, MODIS LAI and FPAR data from 2000 to 2009 was used to assimilate the model to actual LAI and FPAR values.

The final LAIre dataset provides daily LAI and FPAR estimates for the past 50 years with a global ½ degree spatial resolution. In addition to the modelled LAI values the dataset also includes daily climatic control factors for temperature, VPD and radiation, on which the model is based.

### LAI3g – Measured LAI

The remotely sensed LAI dataset was derived from the third generation GIMMS AVHRR NDVI dataset (NDVI3g) by Zhu et al. (2013). They used temporally overlapping MODIS LAI data from 2000 to 2009 to train a neural network with the NDVI3g. The resulting LAI3g is a dataset with a global 1/12-degree spatial resolution and a 15-day (bimonthly) temporal resolution for the years 1982 to 2011.

It is important to note that the 15-day temporal resolution of the NDVI3g, and therefore also the LAI3g, is based on an unknown number of actual acquisitions within each 15-day period. Due to the extensive processing of the NDVI to create the NDVI3g, it is then not possible anymore to extract the exact date of each acquisition in order to assess cloud cover or other influencing factors (Pinzon & Tucker 2014).

## Methods

In this section, data pre-processing and the extraction of LSP parameters will be described first, since these form the basis to answering all the three research questions. Then, the methods to answer the three research questions will be described in detail. The data was processed using IDL for temporal and spatial resizing and smoothing of the data, and using R for further processing, extraction of LSP parameters and the statistical analyses.

### Data Pre-processing

Both datasets had to be resampled to the same temporal and spatial resolution in order to be comparable. The temporal resolution of the LAIre was resized from daily to bimonthly using 15-day means to fit the LAI3g dataset. The LAI3g dataset was resized spatially from 1/12-degree to ½-degree using bilinear resampling in a 6 x 6 window. A special case had to be made if a 6 x 6 pixel-window for the LAI3g included pixels with no values. A no-value pixel can either be due to it representing a water body or desert, or if no acquisition could be made during the 15-day window. Excluding all 6x6-windows that include at least one no-value pixel would have resulted in a very large number of excluded pixels. On the other hand, ignoring those no-value pixels would introduce bigger uncertainty in the data. Therefore, a middle way had to be found to deal with no-value pixels. Finally it was decided that if more than half the pixels within the 6 x 6 window had no value, the pixel is excluded. If less than half the pixels had no value, the no-value pixels were set to a LAI of 0 and included in the bilinear resampling. This was done to mimic the LAIre production, which similarly calculates the effect of water or desert-bodies based on the PFT percentage in the pixel.

Due to the half-year shift in growing seasons between the northern and southern hemisphere, both datasets were split by hemisphere. The southern hemisphere was redefined to start in the middle of each year (scene 13 out of 24 bimonthly scenes) and last until the middle of the following year (scene 12 of the following year). Since there was no data for the year 2012 which could be added for the year 2011 in the southern hemisphere, the first 12 scenes of 2011 were added as a substitute to get a complete growing season.

### Extraction of Land Surface Phenological parameters

In order to compare LSP from the two datasets, LSP parameters have to be extracted. This is usually done by first smoothing the dataset to eliminate artefacts from cloudy or dead pixels and by then extracting a Start Of Season (SOS), End Of Season (EOS) and Growing Season Length (GSL) for each year (Garonna et al. 2014; de Jong et al. 2011).

#### Smoothing the dataset

In order to extract LSP indices from the remotely sensed LAI3g dataset, the data had to be smoothed to eliminate outliers due to cloud contamination and sensor errors. This was done using the Harmonic Analysis of NDVI Time-series (HANTS) algorithm (Roerink et al. 2000; Roerink et al. 2003). The algorithm works by applying a Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) to the measured values and extracting first, second and third order sine-functions to produce a smoothed version of the original signal. Even though the algorithm was originally developed for NDVI time-series, it can be used for LAI datasets in the same way (Jiang et al. 2010).

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:methods:example_stöcklidata.png |
| **Fig. 1**: Extreme example of a non-continuous LAI profile near the equator in the LAIre dataset. |

The LAIre does not suffer from cloud-contamination or dead pixels, and therefore produces generally much smoother profiles than the raw LAI3g data. The data was still processed with HANTS, to ensure that no differences due to differing processing chains are introduced. Additionally, the LAIre suffers from non-continuous LAI profiles for some pixels particularly in the tropics (Fig. 1), which are conveniently eliminated by applying HANTS. Otherwise, those pixels would lead to problems in extracting LSP parameters. The exact parameterization used for the HANTS algorithm can be found in Appendix A.

*LSP Parameters*

In the scientific literature there are a variety of methods used to define the SOS (Reed et al. 2003). However, the Midpoint (MP) and Maxincrease (MI) methods (Fig. 2) are generally considered the most suitable to describe measured and modelled phenology (White et al. 2009; Garonna et al. 2014) and are therefore the two methods used in this thesis. The Midpoint method defines SOS as the value halfway between lowest and highest LAI value within one year. The Maxincrease method defines SOS at the point where the LAI curve shows the steepest positive slope – or in other words, where the first derivative of the curve is maximal. The EOS is usually defined as the date after SOS on the LAI curve where the LAI drops below the SOS value again. The Growing Season Length (GSL) is then just the difference between End and Start of Season.

#### Implementation of LSP parameter extraction

Since the extraction of LSP parameters is a fundamental concept of most research in remote sensing of LSP, it warrants a closer look in this thesis.

First, water bodies are masked out and pixels that show a weak intra-annual LAI variability below a threshold of 0.5 are filtered out. This is done mainly in desert areas where no vegetation is present and in tropical areas where vegetation shows no clear seasonality and the LAI remains high all-year long.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:methods:MI-MP-illustration-01.png |
| **Fig. 2**: Illustration of the extraction methods for LSP parameters. The Midpoint (MP) method sets the date of SOSMP at half the total intra-annual peak-to-peak amplitude. The Maxincrease (MI) method sets the date of SOSMI at point of steepest increase in the LAI profile. EOS is set at the point where the curve goes under the SOS value again. |

The Midpoint method uses minimum and maximum LAI for each pixel and year and is calculated with LAIMP=(LAImin + LAImax)/2. Then, the point in time where the LAI-curve first goes above LAIMP is defined as the SOS (Fig. 2).

The implementation of the Maxincrease method is more challenging in its conception since the theoretical definition is based on continuous data rather than the discrete data points that are being processed in practice. In this thesis, an advanced algorithm from Garonna et al. (2014) was used. They use a spline fit to the data points and extract the point of maximum inflection from the spline. The algorithm also uses a more thorough filtering method for pixels where an extraction is not possible.

To understand the mechanisms of LSP parameter extractions, an attempt was made at implementing the MP and MI extraction methods, rather than relying on already available algorithms. While the Midpoint method was implemented as described here, the implementation of the MI method followed a simplified approach based on the assumption that the maximum increase must occur between the two adjacent data points, which have the highest positive difference in LAI between them. The LAIMI can then be defined as LAIMI = (LAIi+LAIi+1)/2. Then the extraction follows as for the Midpoint method.

Even though the MP method showed very similar results as the algorithm used by Garonna et al., the Maxincrease methods showed a bigger variability of the data due to the two different approaches used. To make the results more comparable to other similar studies with NDVI3g datasets (Garonna et al. 2014, Garonna et al. 2015, submitted), it was decided to use the more advanced algorithm for further analysis.

### Comparing LAIre to LAI3g

#### Comparing raw LAI values

To make a first assessment on the comparability of the two datasets, the raw values for each 15-day period were correlated for every year. Since a linear 1:1 relationship is the expected ideal case, Pearson’s r was used for the correlation statistics. Correlation statistics and scatterplots are also done for yearly mean, minimum and maximum values for each pixel to check for any systematic over or underestimations in the modelled or the measured dataset.

#### Comparing Phenological Parameters

A linear regression was performed to compare the extracted LSP parameters SOS, EOS and GSL from the two datasets for both MP and MI extracted parameters. A separate linear regression was performed for the region between 45 degrees and 90 degrees northern latitude to exclude effects from multiple annual growing seasons in the tropics and the Mediterranean zone (Garonna et al. 2014).

Due to the latitudinal and regional effects on phenology, maps showing the absolute difference in days between the parameters extracted from the two datasets were also computed. This allows for a more intuitive comparison on regional agreements and disagreements between the two datasets.

#### Decadal Change

To complete the comparison of the two datasets, a trend analysis was conducted for all three extracted LSP parameters, the SOS, EOS and GSL. The rate of change of the three LSP parameters was expressed in days/decade for each pixel as was done in Garonna et al. (2014). To get this rate of change, a linear regression model was applied and the slope of the resulting linear fit taken. Pixels which did not show a significant change according to the analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a significance level of *α = 0.05* were discarded. If more than 1/3 of observations (more than 10 years of data) or either the first or last year of observation were missing, the pixel was also discarded. For pixels with less than 10 years of data missing, the missing values were linearly interpolated. This was done to minimize effects of short-term changes in trends, which might otherwise skew the results if a significant part of observation was linearly interpolated rather than actually observed.

***2.2.3 Analysing Climatic Controls***

To investigate changes in dominant controls, the yearly dominating climatic control for each pixel was extracted. For every pixel, the magnitude of each daily climatic control factor was integrated over the whole year. The climatic control with the lowest total sum was then chosen as the most limiting factor for each year. It is a simplified version of the approach described in Jolly et al. (2005) but was found to produce comparable results. This method does not adequately represent areas where two climatic controls are almost equally dominating in their limitation, however, when analysed in a time series, those areas are easily identified since the two dominating controls both tend to show up alternating between years. To identify those areas more easily, the maps were analysed on changes per pixel over the 30 years. Pixels were then grouped into 3 classes: those that only have 1 dominating control over all years, those changing only between two specific climatic factors and those showing changes between all 3 climatic factors over the observed time period.

To show inter-annual changes in climatic controls for different times of the year, bimonthly means of each climatic control were extracted for each year. Then a trend analysis was performed for 15-day period similar to the decadal change method used in the LSP trend-analysis before. Instead of days/decade for LSP parameters, the climatic controls change is then expressed in percentage-points/decade. Finally, 6 bimonthly scenes each were aggregated to quarterly scenes to allow for a more intuitive analysis of seasonal effects.

### Influence of Climatic Controls on Phenology

To assess the effect climatic controls might have on SOS and EOS, 30-day mean values for each climatic control were extracted for the 30 days prior to SOS and EOS (see Fig. 3). 30 days was chosen as a time frame since it corresponds to the temporal uncertainty caused by the bimonthly resolution of the LAI3g. The extraction of climatic controls was done for LSP parameters extracted from both the LAI3g and LAIre dataset. Only the LSP parameters extracted with the MP method were used however, because the shift of LSP parameters extracted from MI and MP methods are very similar, so a distinction between the two will not produce significantly different results. Additionally, the MP method has proven to give more stable results and is therefore more useful for this trend analysis of climatic controls by being less sensitive to outliers.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:methods:30_day_extraction.png |
| **Fig. 3**: SOS and EOS are extracted from LAI profile (black) and then climatic controls (red, blue, green, taken from Jolly et al., 2005) in the 30 days prior to SOS/EOS can be extracted. |

With the extracted 30-day climatic control means, the dominating factors for each year were computed for both the 30-day period before SOS and before EOS, analogous to the methods described in 2.2.3. This can then be used to study dominant factors during SOS and EOS as well as to study the effects of changes in climatic controls extracted in chapter 2.2.3 on the changes in LSP extracted in chapter 2.2.1.

A trend analysis for the individual changes in climatic controls in the 30-day window prior to SOS and EOS was also computed tested on significance on the 10% level. A significance level of 10% was chosen in this analysis since the dependence on trends in both LSP parameters and climatic controls for the observed periods and for such a coarse resolution results in a much bigger year-to-year variability.

# Results

## Dataset validation: comparing LAIre to LAI3g

### Comparing raw LAI data

Correlating mean bimonthly LAI values resulted in an average person’s correlation coefficient of *r = 0.78* with a standard deviation of 0.02. There is a significant break between December 1983 and January 1984 (see Fig. 4). The average correlation coefficient from 1982 to 1983 is at 0.82 whereas the period from 1984 to 2011 is at the total average of 0.78. The correlations show a periodical minimum in the first half of September visible in all years, deviating up to 0.08 from the average.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:results:raw_corr_LAIre3g.png |
| **Fig. 4:** Correlation coefficients between LAIre and LAI3g for each 15-day period from 1982 – 2011 |

Yearly maxima show an average correlation coefficient of 0.86 and an average covariance of 1.82. Yearly minima show an average correlation of 0.83 and an average covariance of 0.74 and yearly means show an average correlation of 0.90 and an average covariance of 1.23. Scatterplots of yearly mean and minimum LAI values show a distinct outlier group where LAIre pixels have a higher value than the corresponding LAI3g pixels (see Fig. 14).

### Comparing LSP parameters

The LSP parameter extraction for the LAI3g was successful for 14’220 pixels on average per year and excluded 6’740 non-water pixels on average every year due to a weak intra-annual variability or missing data. For the LAIre, 18’850 pixels were successfully processed and 1’840 non-water pixels were excluded. There were no significant differences in number of pixels extracted between the MI and MP extraction methods.

The annual correlation coefficients for the LSP parameters extracted with the MI method were on average around 0.38 for the GSL and EOS, and below 0.22 for SOS globally. Correlation coefficients from the MP method were around 0.55 for GSL And EOS and around 0.3 for SOS.

The lowest differences in SOS between LAIre and LAI3g can be found for the high northern latitudes with differences below 15 days for both extraction methods. This also shows in the correlation coefficients for the latitudes 45 to 90 degree north, with an average correlation coefficient of *r = 0.74* for the MP method and *r = 0.67* for the MI method. Only a few regions in the northern hemisphere show a later date for SOS for the LAIre of up to 60 days with the exception of India and east Asia where the LAIre shows an earlier SOS compared to the LAI3g. South of the tropics, the differences are more pronounced than in the northern hemisphere with differences in SOS of up to 60 days. In the tropics the differences go above 180 days. Because much of the land mass of the southern hemisphere is tropical, the correlation coefficient is around or well below 0.3 for both the MI and MP method for all 30 years.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:1_LAI_comparison:maps:plots:SOS_diff:MP:SOS_diff_LAIre-LAI3g_MP_1996_MP.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:1_LAI_comparison:maps:plots:EOS_diff:MP:EOS_diff_LAIre-LAI3g_MP_1996_MP.png |
| **Fig. 5**: Differences in SOS (left) and EOS (right) estimations between LAIre and LAI3g (LAIre-LAI3g) for 1996 extracted with the midpoint method | |

The EOS shows a much higher global variability between LAIre and LAI3g, with parts of Eastern Europe and central Asia where the LAIre shows both earlier and later dates for EOS of up to 60 days compared to the EOS from the LAI3g. The high variability leads to zero correlation for the high northern latitudes between the two datasets. The same can be seen for parts south of the Sahara in Africa and eastern Asia, albeit less pronounced, where correlation coefficients are below 0.3 for every year for both extraction methods.

The differences in GSL show growing seasons up to 60 days longer for the LAIre in the northern hemisphere, particularly in eastern Europe where the LAIre shows up to 120 days longer growing season lengths. The northernmost parts of Eurasia and America however show a shorter GSL for the LAIre of up to 60 days for some years. The southern hemisphere shows more variation with no clear large-scale over- or underestimations.

### Trend analysis 1982 – 2011

Both datasets show a slightly earlier onset of the growing season for northern Europe and a later onset in southern America. The LAIre also shows a later onset south of the Sahara where the LAI3g lacks data. The LAI3g shows an earlier onset of SOS for China, which is much less pronounced in the LAIre.

For GSL South America as well as in the east of southern Africa show a shortening in both datasets. They also both show a lengthening of GSL in northern Europe and China and in the west of southern Africa. Differing results are seen south of the Sahara with the LAI3g indicating a slight GSL lengthening and the LAIre showing a shortening (see Fig. 6).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:1_LAI_comparison:decade_change:plots:LAI3g_changeperdec_GSL_MP.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:1_LAI_comparison:decade_change:plots:LAIre_changeperdec_GSL_MP.png |
| **Fig. 6**: Trends in in Growing Season Length from 1982 – 2011 for LAI3g (left) and LAI3g (right) in days/decade. Differences are visible particularly in the Sahel. | |

A trend of a later EOS can be seen for southern Africa as well as in southern America in both datasets. The LAI3g shows a later EOS for northern Europe, which is not visible in the LAIre dataset. The LAIre however shows a trend towards an earlier EOS for Central Asia, which is not visible in the LAI3g dataset due to lack of data.

## Climatic Controls

### Yearly Dominating Control

Temperature is the dominating yearly control factor for the higher latitudes of the northern hemisphere. Radiation is shown to be the main control factor for the eastern USA, Europe and East Asia. Moisture is the dominating control for the Middle East and most of Africa as well as most of Australia. The tropics are controlled by radiation, as is most of South America.

Changes in the dominating yearly control factor over 30 years can mainly be found along the borders of areas of different dominating controls (see Fig. 7 and Fig. 16). Exceptions to this small-scale variability are South America and Scandinavia. Large regions in Brazil show a clear shift in domination from radiation to moisture between 1982 and 2011 (Fig. 7). Scandinavia shows large-scale inter-annual variations of dominating controls, changing between radiation- and temperature-dominated years. A domination change between all 3 controls can only be seen in Central Asia, where areas of all three domination controls meet.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:yearly_dominating:plots:1982_dominating_control.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:yearly_dominating:plots:2010_dominating_control.png |
| **Fig. 7**: Yearly dominating controls in 1982 (left) and 2010 (right) showing large-scale change in moisture control in Brazil | |

### Quarterly Trends for Climatic Controls

#### Temperature

The analysis of the bimonthly change of temperature control per decade showed almost no increase in temperature control globally. The only exceptions are eastern Australia and South-western Canada during the second quarter of the year, where an increase in control of around 3% can be observed.

A strong decrease of temperature control can be observed in the first quarter of the year for the Middle East and central Asia with decadal change of over 20% in some parts. The second quarter shows a decrease of temperature control in the northern latitudes, particularly Greenland and north-eastern Siberia with changes of around 15% to 20% per decade. For the third quarter, the same can be observed for the high latitudes of northern America. The fourth quarter shows a decrease in temperature control factor of around 10% in Eastern Europe.

#### Moisture

The moisture control shows a decrease of about 10% per decade for southern Africa in the first quarter of the year. Starting around March until May, the Middle East and he Sahel show an increase in moisture control of around 10% per decade. The second quarter also shows an increase in moisture control for the Gobi desert of over 10%. The third and fourth quarter shows an increase in control for South America, mainly around Brazil of over 10% per decade. Also in the fourth quarter an increase in control of over 10% for the south-eastern edge of the Sahara can be seen.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_TEMP_FAC_6.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_TEMP_FAC_12.png |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_TEMP_FAC_18.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_TEMP_FAC_24.png |
| **Fig. 8:** Changes in temperature limitation by quarter | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_MOIST_FAC_6.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_MOIST_FAC_12.png |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_MOIST_FAC_18.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:2_controls:bimonthly_changes:plots:quarter_MOIST_FAC_24.png |
| **Fig. 9:** Changes in moisture limitation by quarter | |

## Influence of Climatic Controls (CC) on Phenology

The analysis of climatic controls in the 30 days prior to SOS and EOS showed similar results for LSP parameters extracted from either dataset. The main differences can be found in the exact spatial extent and intensity of observed shifts, but do not affect the general trends found in the data. Therefore, the results presented here apply to both datasets, except where explicitly stated otherwise.

### Dominating Climatic Control during SOS and EOS

#### Dominating controls at Start of Season

At SOS the dominating control for the northern hemisphere is mainly temperature for higher latitudes and radiation for lower latitudes. Moisture is the dominating limiting factor in the subtropics and radiation in the tropics. In the southern hemisphere the main limiting factor is moisture in the subtropics and radiation in the south of Africa, south of Australia and some parts of southern America. Only small parts of southwest America and south-eastern Australia are affected by temperature controls.

The time-series of dominating controls during the SOS shows that the areas unaffected by changes in dominating controls, apart from desert and high mountainous areas, are in Siberia and parts of Canada, where the dominating control is temperature over all 30 years. A lot of inter-annual variability can be observed in Europe and central Asia where the dominant control varies between temperature and moisture control. The southern hemisphere mainly shows small variations in the extent of moisture-controlled and radiation-controlled areas.

#### Dominating Controls at End of Season

At EOS the northern hemisphere is dominated by radiation for most parts of central and eastern Europe, east and south Asia and the east of north America. Central Asia, the Middle East and the north of Africa are dominated by the moisture control during EOS, as is the western part of the USA. The temperature control only dominates very high northern latitudes. The southern hemisphere is also mostly radiation controlled at EOS with the exception of Australia and southern Africa, which are mainly moisture controlled.

The time-series over the last 30 years showed a lot of large-scale annual changes between all 3 controls for most of the higher northern latitudes. The rest of the world only shows small variations around the border regions of dominating controls, mainly between moisture and radiation controlled areas.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:yearly_dominating:plots:LAIre:EOS_dominating_control_1991.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:yearly_dominating:plots:LAIre:EOS_dominating_control_1992.png |
| **Fig. 10**: Dominating controls at EOS for the years 1991 (left) and 1992 (right) showing big variability particularly for Europe and Northern America | |

### Shift in Climatic Controls during SOS and EOS

#### Moisture

At SOS a strong increase in influence of the moisture control can be seen in southern America of around 5% to 10% per decade, and in some areas even up to 14% per decade. A strong increase in control can also be observed south of the Sahara with an increase of about 10% per decade. A decrease in control can be observed in western Africa, along the eastern Indian coast as well as north East Asia, particularly in the LAIre dataset. Almost no change in the influence of moisture control during the growing season for the northern hemisphere can be observed.

At EOS a slight increase in moisture control for the northern hemisphere (around 1% – 5% per decade) and some areas in central and eastern Asia (over 13% per decade) can be observed. A slight increase in moisture control can also be seen in southern America with a rate of about 3-9% per decade. In southern Africa and eastern Australia a decrease in moisture control of around 10% can be seen.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:monthly_decadal_change_signf:plots:LAIre_decadal_change_SOS_MOIST_FAC.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:monthly_decadal_change_signf:plots:LAIre_decadal_change_EOS_MOIST_FAC.png |
| **Fig. 11:** Shifts in moisture limitation at SOS (left) and EOS (right) from 1982 – 2011 based on SOS/EOS extracted from LAIre | |

#### Temperature

The temperature control shows a decline in influence at SOS of up to 15%/decade in Scandinavia, parts of central and eastern Asia as well as Brazil and southern Africa. An increase of temperature control was only observed around the Gobi desert (-13% per decade) and in north-eastern America (-5%/decade). At EOS a decline in temperature limitation can mainly be seen in the northern hemisphere with no significant major changes in the southern hemisphere.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:monthly_decadal_change_signf:plots:LAIre_decadal_change_SOS_TEMP_FAC.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:monthly_decadal_change_signf:plots:LAIre_decadal_change_EOS_TEMP_FAC.png |
| **Fig. 12**: Shifts in temperature limitation at SOS (left) and EOS (right) from 1982 – 2011 based on SOS/EOS extracted from LAIre | |

#### Radiation

In the northern hemisphere, radiation becomes a stronger control at SOS with a rate of up to 10% per decade, except for parts of northern America where the effect is not as strong with only about 1-5% increase in control. Southern Africa shows a strong decrease in radiation control at SOS of about 10% per decade. A decrease at SOS can also be seen in southern America where the increase is up to 8% per decade.

Change rates during the EOS show less agreement between the two datasets. The two regions where they agree are eastern Asia and southern Africa, where an increase of radiation control at around 5% per decade can be seen at EOS. The LAI3g also shows an increase in radiation control of about 7% for many parts of North America, Europe as well as the Sahel, where the LAIre does not show any major change in control factor. The LAIre however shows a decrease of the radiation control of around 7% per decade in central Asia.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:monthly_decadal_change_signf:plots:LAIre_decadal_change_SOS_LIGHT_FAC.png | Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Documents:Uni:Masterarbeit:3_cc-LAI:monthly_decadal_change_signf:plots:LAIre_decadal_change_EOS_LIGHT_FAC.png |
| **Fig. 13**: Shifts in radiation limitation at SOS (left) and EOS (right) from 1982 – 2011 based on SOS/EOS extracted from LAIre | |

# Discussion

In this chapter, the results and the methodology will be discussed. First, the results and their limitations for the three research questions will be examined, followed by a more general discussion of challenges and limitations of the approach presented in this thesis.

## Dataset validation: comparing LAIre to LAI3g

### Comparing raw LAI data

The high correlation coefficients between raw bimonthly LAIre and LAI3g data as well as mean, min and max proofs that the model created by Stöckli et al. (2011) produces LAI values similar to remotely sensed data and can therefore be used for further analysis. Variations between the two datasets can be explained mainly due to the pre-processing of the data. The resampling of the LAI3g led to the biggest differences between the two datasets. These differences can be found in coastal areas due to it being a mix of water and land pixels (see Fig. 14). A further uncertainty comes from the way the 15-day LAI values were produced. In the LAIre dataset, a bimonthly value represents a mean of daily, modelled LAI values. In the LAI3g dataset on the other hand, a bimonthly value represents the mean of an unspecified number of acquisitions for each 15-day period. Furthermore, atmospheric effects and the saturation of values at higher LAI in densely vegetated areas can play a role (Zhao et al. 2012). This is particularly evident when looking at a scatterplot between two datasets (Fig. 14) where a group of pixels in the tropics show a bigger LAI in the LAIre dataset whereas the LAI3g shows a saturation effect and therefore smaller LAI values.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:scatterplot.png |
| **Fig. 14**: Scatterplot of raw values from LAI3g and LAIre for the period of September 1. – 15. 1985. Green: Differences due to resampling of LAI3g dataset (coastal areas). Red: Saturation effect of LAI3g in the tropics where LAIre estimates higher values. |

### Comparing LSP parameters

Even though the very low correlation coefficients for all extracted LSP parameters might suggest that there is little agreement between the two datasets, a visual analysis of where the differences are show a different picture. The two datasets agree well in regions where there is one distinct growing season per year, for example in high and moderate northern latitudes, as proven by very high correlation coefficients for the SOS between 45 to 90 degrees northern latitude. For those regions, small differences of around 15 to 30 days are expected due to the temporal resolution of the datasets of 15 days.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:EOS_extraction_variability.png |
| **Fig. 15**: Vulnerability of EOS-date extraction to small changes in LAI-value of SOS/EOS due to the gentler slope during senescence |

The low correlation coefficients for EOS suggest that more complex factors are at play in autumn. The main factor leading to extremely low correlation coefficients is that the LAIre does not show one clear trend towards over- or underestimating the EOS, but rather shows a lot of variability in both directions. However, there are some factors specific to the EOS, which also add to the variability and the bigger absolute differences observed. On the one hand, climatic factors such as temperature have been shown to influence autumn phenology several months in advance of actual EOS (Jeong et al. 2011), which is not taken into account in the modelled LAIre. On the other hand, the extraction of the EOS itself is subject to much more variability than that of the SOS because the LAI profile usually has a steep slope during SOS, but a much gentler slope during EOS. This makes the EOS-extraction much more susceptible to small differences in EOS-value leading to big differences in extracting the date of EOS (see Fig. 15).

Tropical, subtropical and Mediterranean regions show more variability in extracted LSP parameters which corresponds to prior findings (White et al. 2009; Garonna et al. 2014) and should therefore be used with caution when trying to verify the modelled LAIre. Growing patterns and the LSP extraction methods mainly explain the differences in those regions. In tropical regions for example, where there is no clear start and end of season, small differences in data can lead to LSP shifts of half a year. Similarly, Mediterranean regions may show more than one distinct growing season, which can lead to differences in LSP parameter extraction.

The effect of different LSP extraction methods can also be seen when comparing the results from the MI method to the MP method. The correlation coefficients for the LSP parameters extracted with the MI method are only half as high as correlation coefficients for the MP method. This corresponds to prior findings where the MI method showed more variability from year to year compared to the more stable MP method (Garonna et al. 2014). This would also suggest that the MP method is more useful when trying to validate a dataset.

### Trend analysis 1982 – 2011

The trend analysis for both dataset shows similar regional patterns for all three LSP parameters. The decadal change rates for the LAI3g dataset are however much stronger compared to the LAIre. This is particularly true for areas in China, where the LAI3g shows a strong shift in SOS towards an earlier day of the year, whereas the LAIre shows almost no change in those areas over the last 30 years. This difference in measured data and modelled data suggests that non-climatic factors might be responsible for the observed change. Improved agricultural productivity to support economic and population growth (Cao & Birchenall 2013) most likely caused these particular shifts, which the LAIre is unable to model.

A big difference in the two datasets can also be seen in the ecotone between savannah and desert in the Sahel. The big differences in GSL are due to different trends observed for SOS and EOS in the two datasets. The LAIre shows a much later onset of SOS than the LAI3g, which leads to a shortening of the GSL in the LAIre data. The LAI3g however shows a trend towards slightly later onset of EOS, leading to an increase of the GSL. Satellite based observations and matching field observations of increased vegetation activity in the Sahel in the last 30 years were already described by Dardel et al. (2014) and others (de Jong et al. 2011; Anyamba & Tucker 2005). The difference in modelled and remotely sensed observations most likely arises from re-greening of the Sahel in the past 30 years and therefore the changes in land-cover type (Foody 2001; Dardel et al. 2014; Mishra et al. 2015) which are not taken into account in the modelled LAIre. This would suggest that dynamic land cover estimations are needed to model the changes in ecotones, particularly along deserts where land cover change is a prerequisite for changes in LSP.

### Limitations due to the dependence on MODIS LAI

While the results from the comparison of the two LAI products suggest a generally good agreement of modelled data to remotely sensed data, one has to keep in mind that both the LAI3g and LAIre are connected to the Collection 5 Terra MODIS LAI product and therefore not completely independent from each other. In the case of the LAI3g, MODIS LAI from 2000 to 2009 was used to train the neural network algorithm to link NDVI3g data to MODIS LAI data (Zhu et al. 2013). To produce the LAIre, MODIS LAI was used for data assimilation (Stöckli et al. 2011). A verification of the modelled LAIre with a MODIS-independent product such as the LAI CYCLOPES global product (Baret et al. 2007) would be desirable, once similarly long time series of around 20 to 30 years like the LAI3g are available. For the time being, the LAI3g is, however, the only reliable long-term LAI dataset available and therefore more suitable for a verification of the modelled dataset.

Beside the problem of interdependence of the two products, it is also worth looking at how well the products correspond to actual field data. Fang et al. (2012) compared both, MODIS and CYCLOPES LAI to in-field measurements. They found that while both products achieve good and very similar results, the uncertainties associated with both product are still outside of the requirements for “satellite based data products for climate” by the World Meteorological Organization (GCOS 2011). This is an important limitation at the moment since the LAI could one day be a key measure to connect remotely sensed data directly to biophysical parameters (Fernandes et al. 2014).

## Climatic Controls

### Yearly Dominating Controls

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:discussion:unique_dominating_controls.png |
| **Fig. 16:** Map showing the number of dominating controls from 1982 – 2011. Areas which show 2 dominating controls correspond to ecotones |

The results for yearly dominating controls mirror those of Jolly et al. (2005). In contrast to Jolly, no areas of “no seasonal constraints” in the tropics were defined, instead those areas appear as radiation controlled since photoperiod is the limiting factor. The map of unique dominating factors in the last 30 years (Fig. 16) not only shows where more than one control poses limitations to plant growth, it also coincides with ecotones (Garonna 2015, submitted). This finding could potentially be used to study long-term changes in global ecotones by analysing changes in their spatial extent over time.

Visible and large-scale change of dominating control can be seen in South America where parts of Brazil change from a radiation-control dominated environment in the 1980s to a moisture-controlled environment in the 2000s. This change coincides with several strong drought events in Brazil in the years 2000 – 2010 (Anderson et al. 2015). Since drought events are extreme weather phenomena, the change in dominance should not be overstated just yet, because changes are only really visible from 2000 onwards. Further statistical analysis and longer time series are needed to assess long-term change in climatic controls in this region, independent of extreme events.

Small changes in dominating controls run mainly along borders of areas with different domination controls and vary by year without a clear trend in one direction. An interesting exception is northern Europe, which, even though it is temperature dominated in most years, shows some years (1989/1990, 2000 and 2005) where the radiation control becomes the dominating factor over a large area. A possible explanation of these outliers could be the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), which shows particularly positive NOA-index values for the affected years (Gouveia et al. 2008). However, interactions of ocean currents and LSP are very complex and further research is needed to find and confirm links between the two.

### Quarterly Trends for Climatic Controls

To extend Jolly’s (2005) analysis of how climatic controls vary within a single year, a trend analysis for each quarter of the year gives an insight into how the intra-annual controls change over the years. The radiation control will not be discussed in detail in this section since it showed no significant change over the last 30 years. This is due to the dependence on day-length, which has not changed considerably in the last 30 years.

#### Temperature

As expected based on the latest report from the IPCC (IPCC 2014), global rising temperatures led to a global decrease of influence for the temperature control factor. Because mainly the northern hemisphere is affected by a dominating temperature control, this is also where the change is most visible. Looking at the change from quarter to quarter, a south to north pattern can be observed starting in the Middle East in the first quarter and moving north towards northern Europe in the third quarter. This stratified change in temperature control happens because the control factor only changes when temperatures are within the thresholds of the GSI-factor, roughly around -2 to 5 degrees centigrade, depending on PFT (Stöckli et al. 2011). If temperatures change outside of this window of constraint, it will not be visible in this analysis. Hence, the change of temperature control coincides more or less with the 0-degree-centigrade line as it travels north in spring.

Even though a decrease in influence of temperature was expected, the rate of change particularly in Iran in the first quarter of over 20% per decade is surprisingly large, implying a complete change in dominating factors within a matter of decades. This is particularly interesting since other studies found no significant mean, minimum and maximum temperature change for the first quarter of the year from 1960 to 2010 (Ghasemi 2015; Saboohi et al. 2012). Ghasemi mentions though that a steeper increase starting from the 1990s is expected. It has yet to be proven however if the change observed here is due to Ghasemi’s expected change, if it is an artefact of the ERA-Interim dataset, or if it is a result of severe droughts in Iran in the early 2000s that lead to depleting rivers and lakes (Agrawala et al. 2001), therefore changing land cover types dramatically.

It is also worth looking at the areas where temperature limitation has increased, as is the case in the second quarter in eastern Australia and western Canada. Jacobs et al. (2013) showed that eastern Australia did not show a significant annual warming trend from 1979 to 2010 which makes a slight increase in temperature control intra-annually plausible. Additionally, they found a cooling trend in eastern Australian during La Niña episodes. However, their analysis is also based on ERA Interim data, like the climatic control data in the LAIre dataset, and should therefore be verified with an independent source.

For western Canada, the situation is very different. The literature unanimously shows an increase in mean, minimum and maximum temperatures for all seasons in this period (Bonsal & Prowse 2003; Beaubien & Freeland 2000; BCMoWLAP 2002), making an actual increase in temperature limitation questionable. Closer inspection of the bimonthly climatic data from which the quarterly trends are aggregated shows that an increase in temperature control only shows up in 2 out of the 6 relevant 15-day periods from April to June, each in a slightly different, adjacent region. This increase in temperature control is therefore most likely an artefact of the interpolation of the ERA-Interim dataset and its aggregation into quarterly means and does not correspond to actual conditions on the ground.

#### Moisture

The moisture control trends show a higher global variability than trends in temperature limitation, but many regions show a strong increase in moisture control of up to 10% per decade. As Matsoukas et al. (2011) note, part of the increase in control is due to the ERA Interim data on which the climatic controls are based, showing a faster rise in air temperature T than the rise in dew point temperature Td, leading to increasing estimates for VPD. This would suggest that at least some of the observed increase in VPD control might not correspond to actual changes in VPD on the ground. The variations and very strong increases in VPD control in some regions do suggest though that changes in VPD are not only due to a general increase in the difference of T to Td from the climatic data. This means other factors are at play and a more in-depth analysis of the trends found here is indeed justified.

A lot of the areas showing a strong increase in moisture control are semi-arid and arid regions, which are absolutely dominated by moisture control over most of the year. Increases in moisture-control can only happen in the winter months, where the moisture limitation is not absolute, meaning the moisture control factor is not absolutely 0 in that time. While this change will not have any effect on LSP since there is no vegetation, it is none the less an indicator of the further drying out of semi-arid and arid areas globally. No change is observed in the summer months, when moisture is already as limiting as it can get.

Interesting cases are the regions that are not dominated by moisture control but show an increase in moisture limitation. This is the case in most of Europe for example, which shows an increase in moisture control particularly during the second quarter of the year, when plant growth rates are at a peak. Since this does not coincide with any change in annual dominating controls over the past 30 years, no visible effect on LSP is expected yet. However, if change rates remain at the current 5% per decade, an impact of moisture limitation on LSP could become noticeable in the coming decades.

Strong increases in moisture control can also be found in South America over all four quarters. This increase is likely amplified by several major drought events between the years 2000 and 2010 (Magalhães & Martins 2011). The impact of this change in control does not correlate with LAI measurements however (Anderson et al. 2015), suggesting that other biophysical parameters influence phenology more than evaporative stress. Due to the droughts in the early 2000s, doing an analysis of trend breaks would be particularly useful here to assess the influence of short-term trends of climatic controls on LSP.

The decrease of moisture control in southern Africa and north-eastern Australia, which are dominated by moisture control over all 30 years, are also worth discussing. The effective decrease of VPD, or increase in available moisture, has been analysed in prior research for both regions based on modelled as well as remotely sensed data (Dorigo et al. 2012; Chen et al. 2014). While Dorigo et al. point out that precipitation is the main driver for the increase in southern African soil moisture, there is no clear consensus yet how precipitation and soil moisture influence each other in this region (Dorigo et al. 2012; Cook & Pau 2013) or how and how strongly ocean current anomalies such as the ENSO influence southern African precipitation and soil moisture (Reason & Jagadheesha 2005). More research is needed to understand these interactions and to understand their relevance for future trends in LSP.

### Limitations of the climatic control model (extended GSI)

Apart from the limitations regarding regional differences which were discussed before, the model used for the climatic controls as well as the controls themselves have some limitations, which will be discussed here. Firstly, the threshold based Growing Season Index does not work equally well for all land cover types, as Jolly et al. (2005) note. Stöckli et al. (2011) tried to extend the model by setting different thresholds for temperature, VPD and radiation depending on the mix of Plant Functional Types (PFT) present in each pixel. While this adaption definitely allows for a more precise analysis of climatic controls on a global scale, the PFTs used by Stöckli do not change over time. This introduces uncertainties in areas where a significant change of land cover has occurred over the observed 30-year period. A more adaptive algorithm to deal with land cover changes during the observation period would therefore be required to more accurately extract the climatic control factors.

A second uncertainty stems from unknown behaviour of most plants in a changing climate. While a linear threshold model as used by Jolly might be adequate for current conditions, it has yet to be seen how well it works when temperature becomes less of a driver and moisture becomes a more important global limiting factor. Adding to that is the unknown evolutionary adaptive nature of plants in a changing climate. Studies for individual plants have shown rapid evolution in some species to cope with a changing environment (Franks et al. 2007), however very little is known about how most plants or whole ecosystems react to long-term changes in limiting climatic controls.

Looking at the three climatic factors used for this analysis, temperature and radiation can be considered direct measures of a limiting factor, while VPD cannot. As Jolly et al. (2005) note, VPD is used because it can be calculated easily and continuously. They also remark however that plant-climate interactions influencing VPD are complicated and ask appropriately: “does VPD influence phenology or does phenology influence VPD?” A better understanding of the complex nature of the VPD in the climate-LSP model is needed to really understand the impact of the changes observed in this thesis, and how they might affect LSP in the future.

## Climatic Controls compared to Phenology

In this chapter, results from all three research questions are combined to analyse the impact of changes in climatic controls in the 30 days prior to start and end of season.

### Dominating Controls at SOS and EOS

When comparing dominating controls at start and end of season, big differences are visible in the spatial distribution of the controls. During SOS the pattern of dominating controls is very similar to the pattern found in yearly dominating controls (section 3.2.1). This is in strong contrast to the dominating controls at EOS, which show a completely different spatial distribution of dominating controls, particularly for the northern hemisphere. Differences can also be found when looking at the temporal variability of dominating controls during SOS and EOS. For the SOS, the changes over time are small and are located at the borders of different dominating controls. For EOS on the other hand, large scale changes in dominance can be seen from year to year particularly for the northern hemisphere, but also in southern Africa and South America.

### Start of Season in the northern hemisphere

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:NHEM_dominating_tempchange.png |
| **Fig. 17: C**omparison of dominating controls at SOS (a), changes in the temperature limitation during the second quarter of the year (b) and decadal change of SOS from 1982 – 2011 (c) |

For the Start of Season in the northern hemisphere, the temperature domination coupled with decrease of temperature control observed in the second quarter results in an earlier SOS (see section 4.2 and 4.1 respectively). This is a strong indication that temperature was and still is the main driver for plant growth for the northern hemisphere, as has been the general consensus in the literature (Jeong et al. 2011; Badeck et al. 2004). This is further confirmed by the trend analysis of temperature control during Start of Season. It shows very little change during start of season for most of the northern hemisphere, implying that the SOS and minimum temperature change at similar rates (Fig. 18) since minimum temperature directly drives SOS. Exceptions are Scandinavia, Britain, Central Asia as well as China, where influence of temperature control is getting smaller during SOS. This would imply other processes, either climatic or anthropogenic, started having a bigger influence on SOS during the last 30 years in those regions.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:discussion:nhem_shift_LAI_TEMP.png |
| **Fig. 18:** Shift in temperature control (a) and LAI (b) for first half of the year for 1982 and 2011 towards an earlier date in the northern hemisphere |

With rising temperatures and earlier SOS onset, other factors might start having a stronger impact on the Start of Season. As expected, the trend analysis during SOS showed that radiation is an increasingly limiting factor since the SOS moves towards earlier dates and therefore to days with fewer hours of daylight. Due to the rising importance of the moisture control in spring in the northern hemisphere as seen in section 4.2, it could be expected to see an increase in moisture control at Start of Season as well. This was however not the case in the trend analysis. With the earlier onset of SOS, the moisture control factor does neither increase nor decrease in the 30 days prior to SOS. This counterintuitive finding is important since it shows the consequence of connecting LSP to climatic controls, rather than just looking at climatic factors by quarter as done in section 4.2.

|  |
| --- |
| Macintosh HD:Users:davidschenkel:Dropbox:Masterarbeit:geo511:writing:figures:SHEM_dominating_tempchange.png |
| **Fig. 19:** Comparison of dominating controls at SOS (a), changes in moisture limitation in the 3rd quarter (b) and decadal change of SOS from 1982 – 2011 (c) for South America and Africa |

### Start of season in the Southern Hemisphere

For South America, a similar analysis at SOS as in the northern hemisphere can be done. By looking at a combination of dominating controls at SOS, change of moisture in the third and fourth quarter of the year and the shift in SOS during that time (Fig. 9 and Fig. 19), one can find that the shift in SOS towards a later date might be explained by the change in moisture limitation. Moisture is the dominating factor for the affected region and shows an increase in control over the 30 years analysed. With this increase in moisture limitation, a later onset of the growing season is observed. This dependence on moisture has already been shown for seasonal behaviour for certain forest types in Brazil (Funch et al. 2002) but not in a long-range and large-scale trend analysis such as this thesis. Changes in moisture availability and LSP due to large scale logging in the Brazilian amazon rain forest which were found based on MODIS time series analysis (Koltunov et al. 2009) could not be seen in the analysis on this larger spatial and temporal scale. While some change in moisture in the Amazonian rainforest can be seen, a large part of the major increase in moisture control is outside of the rainforest and its causes are therefore likely not directly connected to logging. Similar to the anthropogenic changes observed in China, the changes in LSP caused by logging themselves are most likely not as clear in the modelled data since the LAIre does not take into account changes in land cover as discussed in section 4.1.

A similar situation to Brazil can be seen in the south-eastern tip of Africa, where the SOS also shows a trend towards a later date of year in the moisture-control dominated area. While the changes in moisture control observed during the third and fourth quarter of the year (see Fig. 9 and Fig. 19) are very small, the trend analysis for the 30-day period prior to SOS shows a clear increase in moisture while temperature and light controls go down due to the delay of SOS. However, in both South America and south-eastern Africa it cannot be clearly determined if moisture is the driving force behind the change, or if the change in moisture is influence by the change of SOS (see discussion of VPD in previous section and Jolly et al. 2005).

### End of Season in the Northern Hemisphere

Due to inter-annual variability of dominating controls during the End of Season, analysing the impact of the dominant climatic control in that period is not as straightforward as for Start of Season. Because of the frequent changes in dominating control from year to year, connecting the changes of limiting climatic controls to changes in date of EOS cannot be done. For the northern hemisphere in particular, the high variability of dominating controls over the years could be an indication that the climatic factors influencing the End of Season are more complicated and multi-facetted than the temperature dominated Start of Season.

However, it could also be an indication that the main drivers for End of Season happen earlier than the 1-month period studied in this thesis. For the northern hemisphere this seems to be the case according to Jeong et al. (2011) who found that temperature related effects initiating the End of Season can occur up to 4 months before actual EOS. This finding is supported by the analysis of individual trends of climatic controls during EOS. A strong increase in moisture control can be seen for most of the northern hemisphere, which goes against the finding that EOS shows a delay for much of the northern hemisphere particularly in the past 10 years. Therefore it must be concluded that changes of control just prior to EOS did not affect the date of EOS during the past 30 years.

Nonetheless, the big variations in dominating climatic control factors during EOS could be the key to help explain why the rate of delay of EOS has increased in recent years in Europe, while the rate of earlier onset of SOS has remained more or less stable (Jeong et al. 2011; Garonna et al. 2014). The high temporal and spatial variability in dominating controls during EOS also indicate that a more regional analysis based on regional climate models is needed to understand the exact effects on plant senescence. Also, the large-scale increase in moisture control for the northern hemisphere might become an important control for the EOS in the future and should be given particular attention in further research.

### End of Season in the Southern Hemisphere

In the southern hemisphere, the annual variability of dominating controls during EOS is not as high as in the northern hemisphere. The dominating climatic limitation for most areas is radiation, however. Since radiation is mainly a factor of day-length and is therefore not influenced by a changing climate, changes in its limitation are a result of the shift of EOS, rather than causing the shift of EOS. This makes changes in EOS much harder to analyse, since the dominant control factor cannot be used to explain trends.

When looking at individual trends in climatic controls however, an increase in moisture control is observed particularly for South America. Just like the northern hemisphere, this does not translate into observable changes of EOS for the 30 years analysed. However, moisture was the only of the three controls to change significantly in South America during the last 30 years and it could therefore be expected to become an increasingly important factor for the future.

The decrease in moisture control observed for southern Africa coincides with a delay of EOS, expanding findings from section 4.2 and pointing to a more important role of moisture limitation during EOS rather than SOS, where an increase in moisture control did not lead to significant changes of the SOS date. This further supports the recent scientific change of perspective to not only concentrate on the SOS but also study changes in EOS more thoroughly (Garonna et al. 2014; Jeong et al. 2011).

### Limitations

A strong limitation of this analysis is the focus on only 30 days prior to SOS and EOS. While it allows for a general assessment of the effects climatic controls might have on start and end of season, it does not take into account climatic changes that happen outside this 30-day window. Particularly for EOS this might proof to be an important next step of the analysis performed here. Since the EOS generally showed too much variability in dominating controls to find conclusive influences of climatic controls on LSP, it seems likely that drivers of changes in EOS can be found several months before actual EOS (Jeong et al. 2011).

The big challenge in the study of LSP and climate interactions remains the development of quantifiable measures of influence of climate to LSP (Richardson et al. 2013). While this thesis tried to find ways to quantify changes in climatic controls over the past 30 years, understanding the exact effects of these changes on LSP remains difficult. Since only absolute changes for individual controls were analysed, it is not possible to assess the change of relative limitations. Further research, taking into account these relative differences and changes in relative importance, is needed to better understand the processes that drive global LSP. Quantifying LSP-climate interactions requires a good understanding of the underlying processes, yet to study those on a global scale, quantifiable metrics of this interaction are needed. Hence it has to be acknowledged that LSP-climate research is an iterative process by necessity.

Another limitation is that of scale. This thesis approached the topic on a global scale and as such could only take into account large-scale phenomena. It became clear that certain regions particularly in the southern hemisphere and the tropics require a more small scale analysis to get a better understanding of the processes underlying trends in LSP. For the northern hemisphere however, the approached presented here corresponded well to regional analyses and has potential to explain large-scale effects of climate change on LSP.

Lastly, the thesis looked at linear trends within a fixed 30-year window from 1982–2011, which might overlook important short-term or recent trend changes, as reported for the northern hemisphere for the period of 2000 to 2010 for example (Jeong et al. 2011). The importance of trend breaks in the analysis of LSP time-series has been discussed in scientific literature before and algorithms to find those trend breaks have been developed (de Jong et al. 2012). A next step would therefore be to build on the approach presented here and account for such trend breaks to get a more accurate picture of global change of climatic controls and LSP.

# Conclusion and Outlook

The comparison of the model-based LAIre developed by Stöckli et al. (2011) with the remotely sensed LAI3g showed that realistic LAI data can be computed with a phenological model based on climatic controls. LSP parameters extracted from the dataset compare well to LSP parameters extracted from the measured dataset, particularly the Start of Season in the northern hemisphere. This not only allows for an analysis of historical LSP trends based on the three underlying climatic controls of temperature, VPD and incoming radiation, but it also opens up the possibility of modelling future land surface phenology scenarios by using data from global or regional climate models to model LAI. The End of Season showed bigger variability between the two datasets, which suggests that the processes underlying autumn phenology need to be better understood before accurate models and predictions can be made.

The analysis of changes in dominating climatic controls from 1982–2011 shows that Brazil experienced a large-scale change from radiation limitation to moisture limitation over the past 30. For other regions, inter-annual variability along ecotones can be observed without clear long-term changes of domination from one control to another. The individual strength of VPD and temperature control on the other hand has shown significant global change, with temperature showing a global decrease in impact as a limiting factor on plant growth, while VPD is showing a global increase as a limiting factor.

Climatic controls in the 30 days prior to Start and End of Season were extracted to study changes influencing plant growth and senescence. The dominating controls during Start of Season were shown to be much more stable than those during End of Season, indicating a more complex LSP-climate interaction during EOS, compared to SOS.

Individual analysis of climatic controls shows a global increase in moisture-control limitation, affecting the northern hemisphere during EOS and the southern hemisphere during SOS. Temperature is shown to decrease in influence globally during SOS, and for the northern hemisphere during EOS. Radiation shows an increase in limitation during SOS for the northern hemisphere and a decrease in control for much of the southern hemisphere.

## Outlook

Most studies on the global impact of climate change on land surface phenology are focused on temperature as a main driver of plant phenology. The findings presented here suggest that with rising temperatures, moisture and radiation will most likely become more important global limiting factors for LSP in the near future. It has been pointed out before (Richardson et al. 2013) that in order to assess the effects of this change, underlying processes need to be better understood and quantitative metrics of these phenology-climate interactions need to be developed. Particular focus should be put on understanding End of Season processes to more accurately represent the EOS in phenology models.