Is the biosphere carbon limited?

Christian Körner Institute of Botany University of Basel, Switzerland



"Impacts of climate change", EXPO 2015 Milano, 23 June 2015

In Geneva 210 years ago:

'The primary plant food comes from air'

- Nicolas-Théodore de Saussure (1804) Recherches chimiques sur la Végétation. Paris.

Paving the road:

- Jan Ingenhousz (1779)

Experiments upon vegetables, discovering their great power of purifying thecommon air in the sun-shine, and of injuring it in the shade and at night. P. Elmsly and H. Payne, London, UK.

- Jean Senebier (1783)

Recherches sur l'nfluence de la lumière solaire pour métamorphoser l'air fixe en airpur par la vegetation. Barthelemi Chirol, Geneva, Switzerland.



Grave par Tardiau Taine, Rue de Sorbonne N.38.



1-2 Gt C

7-8 Gt C





Sequestration = Storage

650 Gt C

2400 Gt C



$180 \longrightarrow 280 \longrightarrow 380 \longrightarrow 580 \text{ ppm } \text{CO}_2$ Atmospheric CO_2



Climate effects

Direct biological effects

Indirect effects

50 % of plants = C

0	50	100 150 200	250 Mrd t C
		Tropical rainforest	41.6 %
		Subtropical forest	14.1 %
		Boreal forest	13.0 %
		Temperate deciduous for	est 11.4 %
		Temperate evergreen for	est 9.5 %
		Savanna	3.2 %
		Shrubland	2.7 %
		Wetlands	1.6 %
		Temperate grassland	0.8 %
		Farmland	0.8 %
		Semideserts	0.7 %
		Tundra	0.3 %
	Forest		100 % =

Non-forest



3 %For C-storage3 %in biomass only7 %trees matter3 %(>86 %)

100 % = 652 Mrd t C



C source activity rarely controls sink activity









Source (photosynthesis)

Transport of building material

Sink (growth)



Körner C (2012) Biologie in unserer Zeit 4:238 Körner C (2013) Nova Acta Leopoldina NF 114, 391:273



The ecosystem carbon cycle is driven by the nutrient cycle and other growth 'facilitators'



Horticular systems are decoupled from the natural nutrient cycle

Growth rate should never be confused with C-storage

... the more older trees the more carbon

The C-capital (storage) is controlled by tree demography (residence time of C)

Growth, NPP

Change of pool size f (input-output)

NEP

 CO_2

Finite storage capacity f (soil, climate, taxa, vigor)



Fluxes do not

scale to pools

Harvest Mortality Recycling

Körner C (2006) New Phytol 172:393 Bugmann H, Bigler C (2011) Oecologia 165:533

→ Rates (productivity, growth) versus [cash flow] → Pools (biomass, C-storage) [capital]



Körner C (2006) New Phytol 172:393

23 MAY 2003 VOL 300 SCIENCE

www.sciencemag.org

PERSPECTIVES Atmospheric science

Slow in, Rapid out—Carbon Flux Studies and Kyoto Targets

- All trees grow until trees die.
 - \rightarrow We do not need science to prove this.
 - → That is why we have foresters!
- A growing tree does not sequester C unless the mortality or harvest of another tree is prevented.

Is carbon a limiting resource?



No change in growth of 100 year old decidous trees



in elevated CO₂, Swiss web-FACE

- Elevated CO₂

Bader MKF *et al* (2013) J Ecol 101:1509 and similar results by Sigurdsson BD *et al* (2013) Tree Physiol 33:1192

No growth effect of elevated CO₂ on *Picea abies*



Conclusions for CO₂ effects on plants

- Carbon sinks control C sources (mostly).
- Forest productivity is not C limited.
- C sequestration in forests requires a longer residence time of C (tree demography matters).



Priority in theory and modeling of plant growth or NPP

<u>Old model</u> (sources control sinks)



CO₂ acquisition has priority over any other growth control <u>New model</u> (sinks control sources)



Meristem activity determines C-demand, and thus, C uptake

Körner C (2015) Curr Opin Plant Biol 25:107 Fatichi S *et al* (2014) New Phytol 201:1086 The enhanced greenhouse effect can be mitigated

- 1) by reduced carbon release
- 2) by carbon capture and storage
 - → technologically
 - biologically
- by substitution of fossil carbon by renewable energy sources
 - technologically
 - biologically

Pretentious claims for mitigation by C storage

- Afforestation takes 100-200 years to pay the debth of cutting
 → don't cut in the first place
- Enhanced storage by stocking (more C by unit land area)
 - → limited, can be done only once, risk of windthrow



'Replacing fossil by renewable C? 'Fuel crops'?

The total fossil C-savings are close to zero, when the total environmental footprint is accounted for.

11 fossil oil for 11 rape oil

Zah R et al (2007) EMPA, BFE Bern



Substitution potential in % of fossil C emission (100%)



3-5 % of bio-fuel-carbon (substitution) corresponds to driving with 6.1 (D) or 6.3 (CH) instead of 6.6 litres gasoline per 100 km.

Körner C (2004) Nova Acta Leopoldina NF 91, 339:287-303

© Ch Körner

Energy crops should be forbidden!

- They allocate food production elsewhere
- They rise food prices
- They are commonly not produced sustainably
- They lead to N₂O emission and groundwater pollution if productive
- They commonly require pesticide application

Pretentious claims in the context of green options to mitigate the climate change

The net saving of the fossil energy is very small:

- Afforestation: better don't clearcut in the first place
- Fuel crops: not efficient, compete with food
- Bioenergy: effects are tiny (mainly waste combustion)





... fully accounting for all costs and benefits there is little potential for substituting fossil energy with bioenergy by more than 3-5 % of current total consumption. The future is solar ... The current biosphere is carbon saturated.

 There is no 'benefit' of a CO₂-rich atmosphere.

 There is no 'green solution' to the CO₂-problem.