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HCFC-22 (CHClF\textsubscript{2}) and HFC-134a (CH\textsubscript{3}F\textsubscript{2}CF\textsubscript{3}) are two major gases currently used worldwide in domestic and commercial refrigeration and air conditioning. HCFC-22 contributes to stratospheric ozone depletion, and both species are potent greenhouse gases. In this work, we study in situ observations of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a taken from research aircraft over the Pacific Ocean in a 3-yr span [HiPower-Pole-to-Pole Observations (HIPPO) 2009–2011] and combine these data with long-term ground observations from global surface sites [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE) networks]. We find the global annual emissions of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a have increased substantially over the past two decades. Emissions of HFC-134a are consistently higher compared with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) inventory since 2000, by 60\% more in recent years (2009–2012). Apart from these decadal emission constraints, we also quantify recent seasonal emission patterns showing that summertime emissions of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a are two to three times higher than wintertime emissions. This unforeseen large seasonal variation indicates that unaccounted mechanisms controlling refrigerant gas emissions are missing in the existing inventory estimates. Possible mechanisms enhancing refrigerant losses in summer are (i) higher vapor pressure in the sealed compartment of the system at summer high temperatures and (ii) more frequent use and service of refrigerators and air conditioners in summer months. Our results suggest that engineering (e.g., better temperature/vibration-resistant system sealing and new system design of more compact/efficient components) and regulatory (e.g., reinforcing system service regulations) steps to improve containment of these gases from working devices could effectively reduce their release to the atmosphere.
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CFC-12 (dichlorodifluoromethane, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}F\textsubscript{2}), HCFC-22 (chlorodifluoromethane, CHClF\textsubscript{2}), and HFC-134a (1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane, CH\textsubscript{3}F\textsubscript{2}CF\textsubscript{3}) are major coolants used in domestic and commercial refrigeration and air conditioning. Because of their ubiquitous use, these three gases are the most abundant of the halocarbon gases, with global warming potentials (GWPs) of 1,760 and 1,300 on a 100-yr time scale (2). The production of HFC-134a is anticipated to continue, and its emissions will very likely increase, until transition is made to refrigerants with low ODPs and GWPs (3).

Country-based annual consumption and production magnitudes for the HCFCs and emission data for HFC-134a have been collected since the 1990s, by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), respectively. National-scale emissions are difficult to accurately quantify from these consumption and production data (4). First, there is usually a delay time from production of these gases to actual atmospheric release. This delay, known as the bank effect, ranges from near zero to decades, depending on how the chemicals are used (5). Second, production and emission data from reporting countries are neither audited nor independently verified under the Montreal and the Kyoto Protocols (6, 7). Finally, HFC emissions reported by the UNFCCC do not represent global totals because they do not currently include emissions from developing countries.

In contrast to these “bottom–up” estimates, a number of other studies have used observations of atmospheric concentrations, atmospheric transport models, and inversion methods to derive...
regional-scale emissions. These so-called “top–down” studies can improve the spatial and temporal distribution of bottom-up inventories and provide insights on the associated emission mechanisms that may be used as information for climate change mitigation. Most recent top–down studies of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a indicate lower US emissions and higher emissions in Europe, Australia, and Asia than in the existing inventories (8–11). The seasonal variation in the emissions has been generally overlooked in the past. Refrigerant leakage studies suggest neither the gradual leaks (i.e., regular emissions) nor the immediate release (i.e., break of the air conditioning system) have significant seasonal dependences (12, 13). In contrast, a few regional atmospheric studies suggest that emissions of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a may be seasonal due to weather-dependent patterns in refrigerator and air conditioner use (14–19). This uncertainty in seasonality indicates incomplete knowledge of the underlying mechanisms that lead to atmospheric release. Effective emission control strategies depend on understanding the processes that cause these refrigerant emissions.

In this study, we quantify the seasonality of emissions and derive total global emission budgets for HCFC-22 and HFC-134a, using top–down approaches. The current study advances previous top–down efforts by using a full tropospheric (i.e., latitudinal and altitudinal) observation dataset over the Pacific Ocean from the HIaper-Pole-to-Pole Observation (HIPPO) aircraft campaign to complement ground-based measurements, to better constrain global spatiotemporal emission patterns for HCFC-22 and HFC-134a during 2009–2011. A 3D atmospheric chemistry-transport model (ACTM) (SI Materials and Methods) with independently validated chemistry and transport is used for model/data comparison and emission optimization (20).

**Data Overview and Top–Down Approach**

The global atmospheric observation data used in this study come from both long-term remote surface observation sites and aircraft campaigns. The ground measurements were made by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Earth System Research Laboratory (NOAA ESRL) (21, 22) and by the Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE) (23, 24) networks from the late 1970s to the present. Results from earlier years are provided from firn air measurements (25) or the analysis of archived air samples (beginning in the late 1970s) and later from an ongoing collection of samples at up to 21 (present) surface sites over the globe for HCFC-22 and HFC-134a (locations in Fig. S1).

In addition to these ground sites, the HIaper-Pole-to-Pole Observation of Carbon Cycle and Greenhouse Gases Study (HIPPO) provides aircraft observations of atmospheric composition over the Pacific Ocean, in different seasons between 2009 and 2011 (HIPPO-1, January 2009; HIPPO-2, October/November 2009; HIPPO-3, March/April 2010; HIPPO-4, June/July 2011; and HIPPO-5, August/September 2011) (26). Observations span from 57° North to 67° South latitude with vertical profiles approximately every 2.2° in latitude. These profiles span from near the surface (150 m) to a maximum of 15 km altitude (flight tracks in Fig. 1 and Fig. S1). A total of 2,370 flask and 3,663 gas chromatography (GC) sampling data for HCFC-22 and 2,485 flasks and 3,344 GC samples for HFC-134a were collected during all five HIPPO missions (SI Materials and Methods).

Each HIPPO mission lasted about 1 mo with near pole-to-pole coverage. The good agreement between results from HIPPO (at low altitudes) and those from ground sites (monthly averages) indicates the global representation of the HIPPO gas composition measurements in both temporal changes and latitudinal gradients (Fig. S2). In addition, HIPPO measurements provide the opportunity to study atmospheric transport and chemistry mechanisms in the upper troposphere. Fig. 1 shows typical HIPPO observations during March 2010 and corresponding model simulations for both refrigerant species. HIPPO observations reveal detailed height–latitude atmospheric distribution features. These features include evidence for major emissions in the northern hemisphere, transported by vertical motions and zonal and meridional winds. The data show sharp horizontal concentration gradients at air mass boundaries, with relatively weak vertical gradients, notably in the tropics.

In this study, we optimize existing HCFC-22 and HFC-134a emissions estimates such that modeled atmospheric mixing ratios match atmospheric observations, known as a top–down approach. As a first step, we use the surface observations (i.e., all available sites from NOAA and AGAGE) to examine historical changes in emissions. To accomplish this, we estimate a single global scaling factor in each year for the existing or converted emission inventories [i.e., Global Emission Inventory Activity (GEIA), UNEP, and UNFCCC] (Fig. S3 and SI Materials and Methods) for each species between the 1980s and 2012, to best match the corresponding observed atmospheric mixing ratios and growth rates at all AGAGE and NOAA sites (Fig. S4 and SI Materials and Methods). We then conduct separate inversions for each of the four HIPPO missions over 53 land regions (Fig. S5 and SI Materials and Methods). Long-term observations from NOAA and AGAGE surface sites ensure accurate annual emission trends for the recent 3-y HIPPO sampling period, a prerequisite for our seasonal emission inversions. Surface observations are also used for independent validations of our derived emissions. Meanwhile, HIPPO provides data-dense upper tropospheric snapshots that are ideal for estimating the spatial and seasonal distributions of emissions.

**Emission Changes over Time in Response to the Montreal Protocol**

Emissions of HFC-134a and CFC-12 changed quickly after implementation of the Montreal Protocol (Fig. 2). In particular, we find that emissions of CFC-12 dropped shortly after the initial signing of the Montreal Protocol in 1987 (about 50% decrease over the following 5 y). Furthermore, emissions of both CFC-12 and HCFC-22 showed step changes in 2005 (15 Gg/y reduction and 35 Gg/y increase, respectively, in response to the corresponding UNEP production changes; ozone.unep.org/new_site/en/ozone_data_tools_access.php), a year when developing countries were first required to make reductions (50%) of CFC-12 production by the Montreal Protocol. However, we do not find abrupt emission changes in either species in 1996 or 2010, the required CFC-12 phase-out deadlines from developed and developing
optimized global total emissions of HCFC-22, HFC-134a, and CFC-12 based on global surface monitoring site observations and ACTM simulations. Our results are compared with earlier studies derived from similar observations (11, 18, 34, 35) or inventories (UNFCCC) (4).

countries, respectively. These results are consistent with the gradually declining CFCs production data from UNEP. The results also suggest that countries phased out production well ahead of the mandated deadline; bank storage likely dominated CFC-12 emissions in more recent years (27).

Emissions of HFC-134a have increased consistently and indeed accelerated, from 1990 through 2012. Our emission estimates disagree with and become higher than the magnitudes reported to UNFCCC after year 2000 (by more than 60% in 2009–2012). Because most non-Annex I parties (i.e., developing countries) in UNFCCC are not obliged to report their emissions, this discrepancy is likely due to the unreported contribution from developing countries. This emission discrepancy could also be partly due to inaccuracies in reporting from Annex-I countries (i.e., developed countries), which are predominantly inventory based (28).

Seasonal Trends in Emissions

Seasonal Discrepancies Between the Model and Observations. We observe persistent seasonal variations in HCFC-22 and HFC-134a atmospheric concentrations measured at surface sites. A number of factors could account for the observed seasonal cycles: seasonality in the emissions, changes in atmospheric oxidation (via the OH fields), and seasonal changes in atmospheric transport (e.g., stratosphere–troposphere exchange, boundary layer trapping, interhemispheric exchange, large-scale horizontal transport, and mixing in the upper troposphere). The relative contribution of each process varies globally.

The atmospheric model simulates a seasonal cycle at most northern hemisphere ground sites that is very different from what is observed. The surface station at Barrow (BRW), Alaska, provides a useful case in point (Fig. 3A). Observations at BRW show a broad winter maximum and summer minimum. Model seasonality (using the aseasonal GEIA and the United Nations (UN)-derived emission inventories), in contrast, has a larger amplitude and is phase shifted compared with the observations. The seasonality in the model is dominated by the increased scavenging through the OH radical reaction and seasonality in the transport. However, these two factors alone cannot explain the seasonal features in the observations. Model-simulated methyl chloroform (CH$_3$Cl), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF$_6$) match their observed seasonal cycles fairly well at BRW ($r = 0.98$ and 0.86, respectively).

The model/data mismatch for the refrigerants also applies for other northern hemisphere (NH) sites, such as Mace Head (MHD) (Ireland) shown in Fig. 3A, and Trinidad Head (THD) (California), Mauna Loa (MLO) (Hawaii), and Ragged Point (RPB) (Barbados) shown in Fig. S6A. Meanwhile in the southern hemisphere where emissions are small [e.g., American Samoa (SMO), Cape Grim (CGO) (Australia), and South Pole (SPO)], both target gases show good model/data agreement (Fig. S6A). To this end, we believe that emissions are the largest cause of the discrepancies between observed and simulated seasonal cycles of refrigerants.

Large seasonal model–data mixing ratio differences are also apparent in HIPPO (Fig. 4). The model simulates that the NH latitudinal gradients of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a mixing ratios for HIPPO-3 (March 2010) are slightly larger than the corresponding observations. This result suggests that during the boreal winter, the NH mid- to high-latitude emissions are lower than the annual average of the emissions. In contrast to winter and springtime, model simulations of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a during summertime (e.g., HIPPO-5 in August 2011) are consistently lower than observations at all NH latitudes. This result indicates that the northern regional summertime emissions should be higher than the annual average.

Emission Seasonal Cycle Estimated from HIPPO Inversions. In this section, we use the atmospheric observations to quantify global
emissions by season. We conduct inversions over the time between HIPPO deployments, for both HFC-134a and HCFC-22. In short, we initiated monthly pulse emissions from 53 land regions between two adjacent HIPPO missions and tagged the enhanced signals in the ACTM model to form the sensitivity matrices. Then we used a Bayesian approach and set the model-data mismatch covariance matrix to include the measurement uncertainty and the model transport and chemistry errors (inferred from the HIPPO SF$_6$ and CH$_3$CCl$_3$ tracers, respectively). A total of 10,000 inversion realizations are performed in a bootstrap framework for uncertainty estimation (SI Materials and Methods). Table 1 summarizes the resulting seasonal emissions of both species for the globe and two hemispheres, based on all four HIPPO inversions. Fig. 5 shows the latitudinal binned emissions of HFC-134a and HCFC-22 that resulted from the boreal winter period inversion (HIPPO-3) and the boreal summer period inversion (HIPPO-5), separately. Detailed global emission maps derived from inversions and their differences compared with the inventories are shown in Fig. S7.

Our most important finding from HIPPO inversions is that NH summertime emissions are triple the winter emissions for HFC-134a (3.04 [1.28, 5.18]) and more than double for HCFC-22 (2.31 [1.34, 6.27]), a seasonality much larger than estimated in most previous studies and emission inventories (ratios are from paired HIPPO-5 and -3 inversion results, using the same uncertainty estimations in each of the 10,000 realizations; data are presented as median values and the 16th and the 84th percentiles for the confidence interval). This result implies that a temperature- or use-dependent mechanism must control the majority of emissions, a result that contrasts with the assumptions made by existing inventories. A better understanding of the underlying processes could help effectively target and reduce the summertime peak emissions.

Validation Using Surface Observations. We validate the seasonality in emissions derived from HIPPO inversion, by adding this feature to emissions and using them in a forward model simulation to compare with observations at eight global surface sites during 2009–2011 (SI Materials and Methods). These simulations show much better agreement with observations compared with the aseasonal emissions model (Fig. 3B and Fig. S6B), particularly at the NH mid- and high-latitudes closest to the regions with highest HFC-134a and HCFC-22 emissions. For example, at BRW, the emission rates incorporating HIPPO-derived seasonality now simulate the correct amplitude and timing of the HFC-134a seasonal cycle, reducing the model-data disagreement on a monthly timescale by 45% compared with the seasonally invariant inventory (rmse from 2.22 to 1.23). The corresponding improvements

Table 1. Recent global emissions of HFC-134a and HCFC-22 based on inventories and inversion results from this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Start time</th>
<th>Inversion season,* boreal</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Posterior</th>
<th>Global emissions, Gg/mo</th>
<th>NH emissions, Gg/mo</th>
<th>SH emissions, Gg/mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFC-134a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-1</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.51[5.41, 8.01]</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>1.23 [0.37, 3.49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-2</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Late winter–early autumn</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>24.75[24.16, 26.63]</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>1.70 [1.16, 6.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-3</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Late autumn–winter</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>12.47 [2.25, 6.27]</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.23 [0.12, 1.63]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-4</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Four seasons</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>11.42 [10.76, 11.51]</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>2.21 [1.12, 2.96]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-5</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>11.06 [8.94, 16.35]</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>1.42 [0.41, 5.42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-134a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC 2009–11</td>
<td>Seasonal invariant</td>
<td>7.89[7.65]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFC-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-1</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.88[27.98]</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-2</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Late winter–early autumn</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>24.75[24.16, 26.63]</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>1.70 [1.16, 6.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-3</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Late autumn–winter</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>12.47 [6.59, 21.51]</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>0.30 [0.16, 1.69]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-4</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Four seasons</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>28.50 [28.16, 28.85]</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>1.19 [0.87, 1.55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPPO-5</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>30.74 [30.00, 33.78]</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>1.90 [1.56, 1.91]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Inversion time period is between this and previous HIPPO mission. See SI Materials and Methods for the detailed inversion setup.
\[Statistical measure of model-data mixing ratio fit before and after the inversion.
\[Data are the median of 10,000 inversion sensitivity run results where the error covariance matrices for the mixing ratio data and for the prior emissions are varied. Emissions results from these inversions are not normally distributed. The 16th and 84th percentiles (equivalent to 1 SD in Gaussian distribution) are in brackets. See SI Materials and Methods for details.
\[Averaged global total between 2009 and 2011. The emission interannual variability during this period (+3% y$^{-1}$ from UNFCCC and +2% y$^{-1}$ from UNEP derived) is well accounted for under the prior uncertainty estimates (6% for HFC-134a and 8% for HCFC-22) in our inversion.

Fig. 4. Tropospheric mean mixing ratios of HCFC-22, HFC-134a, SF$_6$, and CH$_3$CCl$_3$ from HIPPO mission 3 in winter and mission 5 in summer (symbols; weighted by pressure for every 10º latitudinal bin) and corresponding forward ACTM simulations using scaled inventory emissions (lines). Both observation and simulation data have been adjusted by subtracting the global average mixing ratios from corresponding HIPPO observations (indicated in each plot). See Fig. S8 for the complete five HIPPO missions.
and heat stress during use and subsequent deterioration of the seals) and external factors (e.g., car accidents and stone impacts), generally followed by service repairs (13). Two surveys dating and counting the AC-related motor vehicle workshop visits were conducted independently in Germany and California (29, 30). Both showed that the five summer months (May–September) account for ∼70% of the annual total AC service visits, implying more frequent MAC defects during the warmer time of the year. Service and disposal procedures for the MAC system include leak test, charging, refill, and recovery; leaks during these procedures can be large if the service staff or nonprofessional do-it-yourself (DIY) drivers do not follow proper procedures (13, 31). In addition, monthly highway motor vehicle crashes in the United States increase from the seasonal low point in January and February, peak in July and August, and then gradually decrease in the later months of the year (32). Hence accidents represent an additional mechanism leading to slightly enhanced release of HFC-134a in summer compared with HCFC-22.

**Conclusions**

We used atmospheric observations from the NOAA and AGAGE networks and the ACTM model to derive global annual emission budgets for two major refrigerant gases, HCFC-22 and HFC-134a. Seasonal variations of these emissions were obtained by conducting atmospheric inversions over the 3-y HIPPO observations and validated by comparison with data from the surface networks. We find summertime emissions of both species approximately two to three times the wintertime emissions. The emission seasonality implied from HIPPO data leads to a much more accurate model simulation of the seasonally varying atmospheric concentrations of these chemicals observed in the remote atmosphere. The global emissions of HCFC-22 and HFC-134a have increased substantially over the past two decades. Because both gases are potent greenhouse gases (GHGs), there is a clear need to better locate and quantify specific emission sources and to understand the factors promoting release to the atmosphere. Our results showing significant emission seasonality suggest there may be a great potential to reduce these refrigerant gas emissions, if the design and engineering of these refrigeration systems are improved (e.g., better temperature/vibration-resistant system sealing and new system design of more compact/efficient components) (33) and if system service regulations are reinforced.
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