A simultaneous CH$_4$ and CO$_2$ flux quantification method for industrial site emissions from in-situ concentration measurements on-board an Unmanned Aircraft Vehicle
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Abstract
We developed an innovative tool to quantify CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ emissions at the scale of an industrial site, based on a mass balance approach relying on a newly developed light-weight (1.4 kg) open path laser absorption spectrometer operable on-board Unmanned Aircraft Vehicles (UAVs). This spectrometer simultaneously records in situ CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ concentrations at high frequency (24 Hz in this study) with precisions of 10 ppb for CH$_4$ and 1 ppm for CO$_2$ averaged at 1 Hz. The large range of measurable concentrations, up to 1000 ppm for CO$_2$ and 200 ppm for CH$_4$, makes this analyzer suitable for operation on industrial sites at a short distance from the emission sources, therefore avoiding many logistical and legal limits associated with most long-range airborne observations. To quantify the emissions, high spatial resolution atmospheric concentration measurements obtained throughout a plume cross-section downwind of a source within the limited UAV flight period are exploited by calculations using a mass balance approach. This high spatial resolution, allowed by the high acquisition frequency, limits the use of horizontal interpolation, thus gaining in precision compared to current airborne alternative quantification techniques.

A field validation campaign, conducted on the TotalEnergies TADI test platform at Lacq, France, consisted in controlled CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ leak experiments to which several institutes participated with various measurement systems (gas LiDAR, multispectral camera, infrared camera including concentrations and emissions quantification system, acoustic sensors, ground mobile and fixed Cavity RingDown Spectrometers). Our method was proved suitable to detect leaks during controlled release experiments with emission fluxes down to 0.01 g s$^{-1}$, with 24 % of estimated CH$_4$ fluxes within the -20 % to +20 % error range, 80 % of quantifications within the -50 % to +100 % error range and all of our results within the -69 % to +150 % error range. Such precision levels are better ranked than current top-down alternative techniques to quantify CH$_4$ at comparable spatial scales.

Observations across the plume of two offshore oil and gas platforms operated by TotalEnergies in the North Sea were used to quantify the instantaneous greenhouse gases emissions of these facilities and are coherent with reference emissions for these platforms estimated by mass balance and combustion calculations for CO$_2$. The operational deployment of such instruments and quantification methods, on a large scale and on a regular basis, potentially with fully autonomous UAVs, will allow the quantification of the time dependent greenhouse gases emissions of numerous oil and gas facilities.
1 Introduction

After CO$_2$, methane is currently the second most important anthropogenic greenhouse gas in terms of climate forcing (Ettman et al., 2016), with effective radiative effects between 1750 and 2019 of $0.54 \pm 0.11$ W m$^{-2}$ for CH$_4$ compared to $2.1 \pm 0.26$ W m$^{-2}$ for CO$_2$ (Forster et al., 2021). Methane was brought to the centre of the political debate, with new pledges of parties to consider further actions to reduce non-carbon dioxide greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 (Glasgow Climate Pact | UNFCCC, 2021). Due to its short lifetime of 11.8±1.8 years in the atmosphere (Forster et al., 2021), reducing CH$_4$ emissions would be effective in terms of climate mitigation on short timescales (Shindell et al., 2012): fossil CH$_4$ emissions have a global warming potential of 82.5±25.8 over 20 years, but of 29.8±11 over 100 years, in comparison with CO$_2$ with reference global warming potential of 1.0 (Forster et al., 2021). Climate mitigation actions including fast and deep methane emissions reduction would limit climate overshoot linked with concomitant decrease of climate cooling aerosols emissions (Masson-Delmotte et al., 2018). Large uncertainties exist in the variations of many methane anthropogenic and natural sources and sinks (Saunois et al., 2020). A recent study indicates that anthropogenic fossil CH$_4$ emissions may have been underestimated by about 25 to 40 %, representing about 38 to 58 Tg CH$_4$ per year (Hmiel et al., 2020).

According to inventories, Oil and gas (O&G) sector would be responsible for 22 % of the global anthropogenic methane emissions (Saunois et al., 2020). O&G facilities can emit methane from multiple sources (high elevation stacks and flares; common or local vents; fugitive sources) of different nature (process venting; incomplete combustion during flaring, power generation, heating, etc; unintentional leaks) (Oil and Gas Methane Partnership (OGMP) 2.0 Framework, 2022). O&G operators currently report their methane emissions to their stakeholders, based on calculations using bottom-up approaches (Ng et al., 2017), including flow meters inside the plant, emission factors, modelling and Leak Detection And Repair (LDAR) campaigns. Such methods hardly capture temporal variations of emissions, unexpected operations and are furthermore poorly adapted to fugitive or diffuse emissions. This is an important issue as recent estimates suggested that fugitive emissions represent a significant part of emissions from O&G activities and could be strongly underestimated (Alvarez et al., 2018). Fugitive emissions might have been increasing in recent year, which would partly explain the global methane atmospheric concentrations increase observed since the mid-2000s (Worden et al., 2017). Top-down approaches, based on atmospheric measurements, can complement and validate bottom-up flux estimates. Developing techniques able to be implemented on industrial facilities are necessary, either for fast leak detection or for quantification of long-term greenhouse gases emissions. They should be validated via controlled release experiments, which can be organized within intercomparison campaigns (Ravikumar et al., 2019; Feitz et al., 2018). Such controlled release campaigns are for example organized yearly on the TotalEnergies Anomaly Detection Initiatives (TADI) infrastructure in Lacq, southwestern France (43.41°N, -0.64°W), an industrial area dedicated to the simulation of a real-size oil and gas facility, used by international groups to validate their emission detection or quantification techniques (Kumar et al., 2021; Druart et al., 2021). At the facility scale, different top-down emissions quantification approaches already exist, relying on both in situ and remote sensing measurements. Some methods, well adapted to emissions quantification on flat terrains such as landfills, like eddy covariance, stationary mass balance methods, radial plume mapping (Mønster et al., 2019), cannot be adapted to all industrial contexts with complex topography and high elevation sources. In situ atmospheric concentration measurements can be operated from the surface, with analysers at a fix position or on
mobile platforms such as in cars for onshore facilities (Brantley et al., 2014; Ars et al., 2017; Feitz et al., 2018; Yacovitch et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2021) or on-board ships for offshore facilities (Nara et al., 2014; Riddick et al., 2019; Yacovitch et al., 2020). Other methods based on airborne observations have the advantage of measuring concentrations directly inside the plume. Observations can be performed from aircrafts for onshore (Terry et al., 2017; Hirst et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2018; Conley et al., 2016, 2017; Gorcho Negron et al., 2020) or offshore facilities at the scale of an individual platform or of a whole basin (Gorcho Negron et al., 2020; France et al., 2021; Fiehn et al., 2020), but with a high logistical and financial cost, and at a long distance from sources. Observations at a long distance from the source (such as onboard aircrafts), or on slow moving platforms (such as on-board ships or cars) face difficulties linked to the changing plume direction during the measurement period (also limited by the roads infrastructure for cars). Contaminations by nearby sources are also possible in such configurations. UAV-based observations are adapted to the scale of industrial facilities, including offshore, and bring different solutions to the constraints of these different types of solutions: UAVs would operate at lower costs, at high speed and directly inside the plumes at shorter distances from the sources. UAVs being able to operate at short distance from the sources, they have additional advantages compared to observations at higher distances (via aircrafts or boats): they allow an easier validation of the method with controlled release experiments, they induce a gain in sensitivity as the distance to the source can be shortened to lower the effect of dilution of effluents and they have the possibility to fly inside industrial sites which permits to better localize the emission sources.

For quantifying emission fluxes based on airborne concentration measurements, two main approaches are generally adopted. The first approach is based on the inversion of modelled Gaussian plumes (Hirst et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2018; Shah et al., 2020). The Gaussian-based inversion methods are commonly applied to ground mobile observations (Brantley et al., 2014; Kumar et al., 2021) or to localize multiple unknown sources (Hirst et al., 2013; Huang et al., 2015; Brereton et al., 2018). Recent UAV-based experiments relied on a near-Gaussian inversion approach but so far suffer from important uncertainties (Shah et al., 2020), which might be improved in future (adapted measurement protocol or quantification model). The second approach is a mass balance method consisting in comparing the fluxes of gas entering and exiting a box around a source. It does not rely on any atmospheric model but is a direct quantification of the flux based on its integration through a surface. The main difficulties associated with this method are of being able to measure the concentrations throughout the whole plume and of having a precise knowledge of the wind conditions. This type of approach was originally employed for LiDAR Dial quantifications, providing state-of-the-art Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) quantification in complex industrial plant (NF EN 17628, 2022), and was already applied to greenhouse gases emissions quantification at various scales from industrial sites to large cities based on UAV or aircraft observations (Mays et al., 2009; Karion et al., 2015; Nathan et al., 2015; Allen et al., 2019; Fiehn et al., 2020; Morales et al., 2022). Contrary to Gaussian-based inversion models, mass balance does not require the assumptions of constant and continuous emissions creating a steady-state system with normally distributed pollutant concentrations over a flat and uniform terrain, which is often none applicable to onshore or offshore fields.

Identification and quantification of CO₂ and/or CH₄ sources via top-down UAV-based approaches require instruments with high-quality measurements of CO₂ and CH₄ in a large range of concentrations and with a very low response time to operate at high frequency. Different types of methane sensors suitable for UAV-sampling already exist. Metal oxide gas sensors (Neumann et al., 2013; Malaver et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2020; Rivera
Martinez et al., 2021) or cryptophane-A cladded Mach-Zehnder interferometers (Dullo et al., 2015) are compact
and competitive in price but with a relatively high detection limit and low response time (17 ppm of CH₄, 10 s
response time) (Dullo et al., 2015). Miniaturised laser-based sensors also emerged in the last years (Berman et al.,
2012; Khan et al., 2012; Golston et al., 2017, 2018; Nathan et al., 2015; Shah et al., 2020; Rivera Martinez et al.,
2021; Tuzson et al., 2020), but do not necessarily have a large sensitivity range, a low response time and a light
weight below 2 kg and generally measure only one species. Tunable Diode Laser Absorption Spectroscopy
(TDLAS) allows a high selectivity and sensitivity in the gases detection and is considered as the most advantageous
technique for measuring atmospheric gas concentrations (Durry and Megie, 1999). Many applications are already
based on this technique, not only UAV applications, among which Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscopy (CRDS)
(Crosson, 2008; Chen et al., 2010; Rella, 2010), Cavity Enhanced Absorption Spectroscopy (CEAS) (Romanini et
al., 2006), Integrated Cavity Output Spectroscopy (ICOS) (O’Keefe, 1998; O’Keefe et al., 1999) or the most
straightforward Direct Absorption Spectroscopy (DAS) (Xia et al., 2017). Open cavity instruments have the
advantage of increasing the response time compared to closed cavity instruments. DAS is well adapted to in situ
measurements and can be applied to sensors light enough to be embarked on UAVs, which led to the choice of
technology adopted for the development of the sensor presented in this study.

In this study, we present a newly developed UAV-embarked CO₂, CH₄ and H₂O in situ analyser and a methodology
of emissions quantification adapted to the monitoring of O&G facilities. We present the characterization of this
analyser for the environmental conditions of its field applications. Our emissions quantification method has been
validated against CH₄ controlled releases in an intercomparison effort during the TADI campaigns of 2019 and
2021, together with other quantification methods using varied technologies: multispectral camera, ground based
CRDS (fix stations or mobile measurement in a car), wind and gas LiDAR, infrared camera including
concentrations and emissions quantification system, or Tunable Diode LiDAR. As a large part of TotalEnergies
production activities are offshore-based, we present an application of our method to the quantification of emissions
of two offshore gas production platforms in the North Sea.

2 CO₂, CH₄ and H₂O analysers for UAV in situ observations

2.1 Technical description

A new sensor has been developed for in situ CO₂, CH₄ and H₂O observations able to operate on-board UAVs (see
Figure 1): the Airborne Ultra-light Spectrometer for Environmental Application (AUSEA). It is based on the
technical concept of the AMULSE instrument (Joly et al., 2016, 2020). As for the AMULSE instrument, the
AUSEA instrument includes an open-path infrared Laser absorption spectrometer using two DFB interband
cascade laser diodes in the mid-infrared spectral region (NIR): near 4 μm with a direct path of 11 cm to measure
CO₂ concentrations and near 3 μm in a home-made Herriott multipass cell of 3.5 m path length to measure CH₄
concentrations. The measurement frequency is of 24 Hz.

Compared to the AMULSE instrument, the AUSEA instrument has been adapted to reduce its weight, to adapt its
sensitivity range to industrial applications (up to 1000 ppm in CO₂ and up to 200 ppm in CH₄), to limit the effect
of vibrations, air turbulences, magnetic perturbations and to implement air-ground communication for a real time
visualisation of the concentrations by the operators. It has a power consumption of 8 to 15 W in most usual cases,
depending on the external temperature (with maximal power consumption of 30 W during less than 1 s at start-
up). It can be powered either with dedicated batteries for an average lifetime of 1.5 hours or directly by the UAV. The instrument also embarks an IMET 4 from InterMet Systems (modified to fit in the instrument) to record air temperature, pressure and relative humidity at 1Hz frequency, a LiDAR Lightware LW20/C to measure the distance to the ground and a GPS for position and time recording. Altogether, the weight of the AUSEA sensor has been optimized down to 1.4 kg, including all previously listed hardware.

Two AUSEA instruments (hereafter named AUSEA111 and AUSEA112) have been used for laboratory tests and field applications presented in this study, in order to verify the reproducibility of performances between several analysers.

### 2.2 In-lab CO₂ and CH₄ analysers characterisation

In-lab characterisation of the stability and linearity was performed independently on AUSEA111 and AUSEA112 instruments, and repeated at different periods in 2021 and 2022. For these experiments, each AUSEA instrument was placed in a custom-made atmospheric chamber in which air is continuously mixed and homogenised (using fans) and temperature is regulated (at laboratory temperature).

#### 2.2.1 Stability

The stability experiments consisted in measuring the same air sample within the closed atmospheric chamber by the AUSEA instrument over several hours. For AUSEA112, two experiments are exploited (conducted on 2022-04-19 for a duration of 3 hours and 2 minutes and of 1 hour and 13 minutes); while four experiments are exploited for AUSEA111 (two were conducted on 2022-06-08 for respective durations of 1 hour and 35 minutes and of 15 hours and 12 minutes and two were conducted on 2022-03-23 for respective durations of 50 minutes and 1 hour and 50 minutes).

Allan deviation, calculated from those experiments for both analysers, are presented in Figure 2 and Table 1. The precision of our measurements can be derived from these experiments: for CH₄, precisions are below 20 ppb at 2 Hz, below 10 ppb at 1 Hz, below 1 ppb at 10 s and below 0.2 ppb at 1 minute; for CO₂, precisions are below 2 ppm at 2 Hz, below 1 ppm at 1 Hz, below 0.1 ppm at 10 s and of 0.01 ppm at 1 minute. We note a minimum of precision for the instrument AUSEA112 at 60 seconds with a stagnation of performances for longer averaging periods, contrary to the instrument AUSEA111 which has a better longer-term stability.

#### 2.2.2 Linearity

To evaluate linearity, air samples of varying concentrations were simultaneously measured by the AUSEA analyser placed in the atmospheric chamber and by a reference instrument pumping air from the atmospheric chamber. An air with high CH₄ concentration was initially injected in the atmospheric chamber and progressively mixed with room air, thus spanning a continuous range of concentrations from the initial sample up to ambient air levels. Variations of CO₂ concentrations were simply generated by natural variations of the CO₂ values in the laboratory air. The reference instrument used was a Cavity Ring-Down Spectrometer (Picarro Inc. model G2401), hereafter referred as Picarro, with an operating range certified by the manufacturer from 0 to 1000 ppm for CO₂ and from 0 to 20 ppm for CH₄. The Picarro has been validated through the ICOS Atmospheric Thematic Center protocol (Yver Kwok et al., 2015) and was calibrated using the standard procedure for ICOS atmospheric monitoring stations with 4 calibration standards of known CO₂ and CH₄ concentration ranging from 396.05 to
504.16 ppm for CO$_2$ and 1807.7 to 2346.5 ppb for CH$_4$ (ICOS RI, 2020). AUSEA and Picarro analysers data were compared at the Picarro temporal resolution of 5 seconds. Linearity experiments were conducted on 2022-03-23 and 2022-06-08 for AUSEA111 and on 2021-04-15 and 2022-04-19 for AUSEA 112. Linearity experiment covered CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ concentrations ranging from 429.0 to 861.4 ppm of CO$_2$ and from 2.1 to 20.00 ppm of CH$_4$ (within the reference instrument certified linearity domain).

The results of the linearity experiments are presented on Figure 3 and Table 2. An excellent linearity was observed for both species for each experiment: linear regressions provide excellent coefficients of determination R$^2$ of 1.0 for CH$_4$ and CO$_2$, with p-values (probability of obtaining tests results at least as extreme as the results actually observed) well below 10$^{-5}$, so with high statistical validity. Low residuals are observed for each linear regression (difference between measured values and linear regressions): within 0.02 ppm of CH$_4$ and 1.5 ppm of CO$_2$ (Figure 3), which corresponds to the precisions of the instruments and do not reveal deviations from a linear distribution. We observed relatively low variations of the slopes and intercepts of the linear regressions between repeated experiments over the course of several months (Table 2), therefore of the instrument response (slopes and intercepts variations respectively below 2.3% and 0.16 ppm for CH$_4$ and 1.6% and 7 ppm for CO$_2$).

The linearity of our AUSEA sensor was experimentally validated for CO$_2$ concentrations between 429.0 and 861.4 ppm and CH$_4$ concentrations between 2.1 and 20 ppm, against the guaranteed linearity domain of a reference instrument validated top-of-the-art metrology standards (Yver Kwok et al., 2015). However, the sensitivity domain of our AUSEA sensor exceeds these limits: the chosen pathlength for the CH$_4$ measurements, has been determined to reach saturation around 200 ppm. Given the saturation of the CO$_2$ absorption spectrum, the maximum of measurable concentration is limited to 1000 ppm (but this limit can be easily adapted by modifying the CO$_2$ laser-to-detector pathlength). Therefore, we believe the linearity domains also exceed the range of concentrations tested in the laboratory, up to 1000 ppm for CO$_2$ and above 100 ppm for CH$_4$. The lack of a reference instrument with a comparable certified linearity domain in our laboratory did not allow us to validate this limit so far. However, additional linearity experiments conducted with the same reference CRDS instrument, not presented here, for CH$_4$ concentrations up to 100 ppm also depicted an excellent linearity (also with R$^2$ of 1.0 and p<10$^{-5}$ for 24975 data points), therefore giving confidence in the linearity of our AUSEA sensors, even for concentrations out of the CRDS instrument manufacturer’s certified linearity domain. This confidence is also motivated by the fact that the same type of CRDS analysers were also employed for the quantification of industrial emissions of CH$_4$ with peaks up to approximately 90 ppm (Kumar et al., 2021; Jackson et al., 2014).

3 Source emissions quantification

A mass balance method has been developed to quantify source emissions from atmospheric concentration measurements. It relies on the airborne monitoring of atmospheric concentrations of the species of interest from UAV and of the wind speed and direction at the elevations of the UAV.
3.1 Monitoring method

3.1.1 Measurements on-board Unmanned Aircraft Vehicles

The AUSEA instrument is embarked on a low-weight (below 8 kg payload) commercial multicopter. Several models of UAVs have been employed (DJI M200, DJI M210, DJI M300, and a non-commercial drone), able to fly under wind speeds up to 12 m s\(^{-1}\), with autonomies of 20 to 45 minutes. The instrument was always integrated between both UAV landing gears, below the propellers level (see Figure 1). Concentration measurements are remotely monitored in real-time by the operators on the ground (usually a pilot and a co-pilot), allowing to locate the plume and optimize the trajectory of the UAV to fit to the flight plan requirements of the emissions quantification method.

3.1.2 Wind profiles meteorological parameters measurements

Wind speed and direction profiles are recorded by a commercial ZX300 Doppler wind LiDAR (from ZX LiDARs Inc.), equipped with an AIRMAR weather station at 2.5 m above ground level (or m.a.g.l.). The LiDAR records wind speed and direction at 10 elevations between 11 and 300 m.a.g.l., completed by wind measurements at the AIRMAR station, thus covering the range of altitudes of the UAV tracks. The AIRMAR station also records temperature, relative humidity and air pressure. Wind speed measurements have an approximate 15 to 20 s time resolution and a precision of 0.1 m s\(^{-1}\) and 0.5°. The wind speed and direction are interpolated at the elevations of the UAV. For elevations below the first height of LiDAR measurements, a logarithmic interpolation with assumption of null wind speed at the ground level is used, following the shape of a neutral wind profile. For levels above the first LiDAR measurement height, the interpolation is linear.

3.1.3 UAV flight protocol

Our protocol for UAV-based atmospheric concentrations monitoring was designed for our quantification model. The UAV flight plan should meet the conditions described hereafter (see Figure 4). Concentration measurements are performed under the wind of the sources, within a vertical plane crossing the plume, later referred as the observational plane. The observational plane must be as close as possible to a plume cross-section, therefore orthogonal to the prevailing wind direction. Several horizontal transects covering the entire plume and part of the surrounding background are recorded within this plane, with elevations distributed from below (or closest to the ground possible) to above the plumes. A precise wind speed and direction monitoring covering the range of altitudes of the UAV must be conducted simultaneously.

3.2 Emissions quantification model

In the mass balance approach, the emission rate \(Q\) (in g s\(^{-1}\)) is estimated from a flux through the observational plane crossing the plume of emissions. It assumes constant emissions during the monitoring period and no degradation of effluents through chemical reactions over the monitoring period, which is reasonable for CO\(_2\) and CH\(_4\). The referential \(x, y, z\) is defined by the observational plane (see Figure 4), with \(x\) in the horizontal direction orthogonal to the plane, \(y\) in the horizontal direction along the plane and \(z\) in the vertical direction. \(Q\) is equal to
the integral across the plane, of the wind speed component along \( x \), \( u_x(y, z) \) (in m s\(^{-1}\)) multiplied by the differential of volume concentrations between the plume \( c_p(y, z) \) and the background \( c_{bg}(y, z) \):

\[
Q = \iint_{\mathcal{P}} u_x(y, z) \cdot [c_p(y, z) - c_{bg}(y, z)] \, dy \, dz ,
\]

(1)

Background concentrations are assumed spatially uniform, \( c_{bg}(x, y, z) = c_{bg} \) and estimated from the concentrations measured outside the plume. Wind speed is assumed horizontally uniform: \( u_x(y, z) = u_x(z) \). As the wind direction might fluctuate over the complete monitoring period, we consider the average wind over the duration of each transect. Noting \( \alpha(z) \) the angle, often non-negligible in practice, between the wind direction and the orthogonal to the transect, the component \( u_x(z) \) of the wind speed can be expressed as a function of the total wind speed \( U(z) \), as follows: \( u_x(z) = \cos(\alpha(z)) \cdot U(z) \). Altogether, Eq. (1) becomes:

\[
Q = \int_{x} U(z) \cdot \cos(\alpha(z)) \cdot \left[ \int_{y} (c_p(y, z) - c_{bg}) \, dy \right] \, dz .
\]

(2)

We note \( q(z) = U(z) \cdot \cos(\alpha(z)) \cdot \left[ \int_{y} (c_p(y, z) - c_{bg}) \, dy \right] \) the flux component at each horizontal transect level. The integral of \( q(z) \) along \( z \), is calculated from interpolated values of \( q(z) \), assuming negligible vertical variations of the plume compared to the vertical gap between successive transects.

This method can be applied in a wide range of meteorological conditions (limited by UAV maximum wind speeds limits), but is poorly adapted to low wind speeds and unstable wind directions, where measurement uncertainty can strongly rise.

### 3.3 Validation of emissions quantification method

#### 3.3.1 Field validation protocol

Two validation campaigns were conducted from 1 to 10 October 2019 and from 07 to 10 September 2021 on the TotalEnergies Anomaly Detection Initiatives (TADI) platform in Lacq, in southwestern France (43.41°N, -0.64°W). The TADI platform, already described in the literature (Kumar et al., 2021, 2022), is an approximately 2000 m\(^2\) almost flat rectangular area (Figure 5), surrounded by agricultural land and rural settlements, and important chemical and industrial plants on the east of the platform. Multiple obstacles for dispersion are created by tents where other instruments are located, decommissioned oil and gas equipment and other small infrastructures. A road surrounding the north and east borders of the site cannot be flown over, limiting the area of UAV operations.

Several emission sources were spread over the platform, within a 40x60 m rectangular area classified as “ATEX zone” (Figure 5), out of reach for all participants due to security reasons. Sources were elevated between 0.1 and 6.5 m.a.g.l, originating from a variety of equipment (valve, connector, flange, drilled plug, tank, manhole, corrosion, flare pipe - no combustion, etc.). Either CO\(_2\) or CH\(_4\) or a combination of both species were emitted, but also a mixture including a proportion of C\(_2\)H\(_6\) or C\(_3\)H\(_8\), to test if the method is able to differentiate these species from CH\(_4\). Only CH\(_4\) emissions quantifications results are presented in this study (the low number of CO\(_2\) releases does not allow statistical analysis of our CO\(_2\) quantifications). Release scenarios had durations from 10 to 73 minutes (with two short-lasting leaks of a 15 seconds and 2.5 minutes which were not be monitored with our method), with pauses of approximately 5 minutes between two releases. Mass flow controllers were used to regulate and monitor the controlled CH\(_4\) flow rates, with a large range of values from 0.01 to 150 g s\(^{-1}\). This variety of emission sources, duration and amplitude is representative of the diversity of emission scenarios expected on
industrial facilities. Information about the leaks (locations, species and fluxes) of each experiment can either be communicated (open trials) or withheld (blind tests) from the measurement teams. Results from both open trials and blind tests are presented.

For our UAV-based emission quantification method, one team was operating a DJI M200 in 2019, while two teams were operating either a DJI M300 or a DJI M210 and a non-commercial UAV in 2021. In 2021, all drones were equipped with RTK GPS positioning systems, which was not the case in 2019. Flight durations have been from 10 to 20 minutes. Concentration measurements were performed within a vertical plane distant from the sources from approximately 20 to 80 m. As the sources were at low elevation (below 6.5 m), the plumes were monitored with a varying number of 5 to 15 low elevation horizontal transects distributed between 1 and 12 m.a.g.l. in 2019 and up to 35 m.a.g.l in 2021. Wind speeds and directions were measured at 10 elevations between 11 and 300 m.a.g.l. with the ZX300 wind LIDAR (equipped with the AIRMAR station at 2.5 m.a.g.l.).

3.3.2 Results of validation experiments

CH₄ emissions quantifications of the two TADI campaigns are analysed hereafter and compared to the reference real fluxes derived from mass flow meters at the source. The emissions quantifications for each controlled release experiment are given in the Supplementary Materials on Table S1. Statistical analyses of the results are presented in Figure 6 and Table 3.

During the two TADI campaigns, UAV measurements were conducted during 34 out of 41 controlled releases (among which 15 were blind tests) in 2019 and during 20 out of 24 controlled releases (all blind tests) in 2021. Emission quantifications could be successfully calculated with our method for respectively 26 and 18 controlled release experiments in 2019 and 2021. Some release experiments could not be quantified due to unavailability of the instruments, UAVs or pilots and some of the quantification flights were discarded as the flight paths did not match our standards (e.g. did not cover the complete horizontal or vertical plume section or technical issues were noticed with some of the sensors).

Some of the controlled releases could be monitored by several independent flights (3 by 4 flights, 4 by 3 flights, 19 by 2 flights) and the rest (19 releases) could only be monitored once. The averaged, minima and maxima of all quantifications are presented for each release experiment, as well as the relative errors of the average of quantifications compared to the reference values. Among all 45 quantifications of the TADI campaigns, the average relative error is of 7 %, the median is of -5 %, with a standard deviation of 53% (Table 3). No significant difference can be observed between quantifications of controlled release experiments based on 1, 2, 3 or 4 flights. The dispersion of results seems lower for the quantifications based on 4 flights (minimum and maximum relative errors between 19 % and 26 %), but since there are only 3 controlled release experiments based on the 4 quantifications flights, this result cannot be considered statistically valid. However, one would logically expect an improvement of precision with a higher number of quantification flights for the same source.

Figure 6 presents the averaged quantifications of all controlled release experiments compared to the real fluxes. No specific trend can be observed on the error distribution, which would depict either a decrease of precision or biases for extreme low or high fluxes.

Table 4 presents a classification of the quantifications in terms of performance classes, for different ranges of real CH₄ emission fluxes. The relative errors of our quantification compared to the true values show that out of 45 quantified controlled releases, 24 % relative errors between -20 and +20 % compared to the true values (11 out of
45 controlled releases, cf. Figure 6), and 80% of our quantifications had relative errors between -50% and +100%
(36 out 45 controlled releases, cf. Figure 6). The lowest and highest relative errors are respectively of -69% and +149%. There is no significant change in performance of our quantifications which would depend on the quantity of CH₄ emitted.

Experiments conducted during the TADI campaigns allowed to validate our emissions quantification method, which depicted similar performances for CH₄ emissions on a wide spectrum of fluxes, ranging from order of magnitudes between 10⁻² and 10⁺² g.s⁻¹. Absolute lower and upper detection limits are difficult to determine as they might be influenced by the conditions on the field (potential flight restrictions affecting the horizontal or vertical area covered by measurements, particular wind conditions, etc.). The possibility to modulate the flight plane distance to the source allows to adapt monitoring conditions to the signal-to-noise ratio and to the potential saturations of the concentration monitoring.

If the validation of our method has been done specifically for CH₄ emissions quantification, it can easily be extrapolated to the quantification of CO₂ emissions, as the monitoring of both species concentrations is performed with the same instrument with a sensitivity range adapted to the field applications providing similar signal to noise ratios.

During the TADI campaign, as the emission sources were situated close to the ground and as the measurements were performed at a relatively short distance, thus with low vertical mixing, most flights were performed at low elevations, in particular in 2019 (typically below 12 m.a.g.l.). In such conditions, wind profiles measurements could have been performed with alternative devices such as multiple ultra-sonics wind sensors sprayed along a vertical mast of a few meters, instead of a LiDAR measuring the first level at 11 m.a.g.l. In 2021, the distance between the flight plan and the source being generally longer than in 2019, some of the flights reached higher altitudes (up to 35 m.a.g.l.), thus requiring the use of a LiDAR. For low elevations (below the first LiDAR level) the uncertainties associated with wind speed measurements would be expected to be higher than for a within the range of levels monitored by the LiDAR, furthermore considering the logarithmic distribution of wind speed profiles. This will bring a larger uncertainty in our quantifications in the case of low plumes, such as those encountered during most of the TADI experiments. At higher elevations, we expect lower uncertainties linked with wind speed monitoring.

In addition, low wind speed conditions were often encountered, which is also challenging for emissions quantification as it is associated to more instabilities of the wind direction and thus an uneasy definition of the measurement plane. Considering these multiple suboptimal conditions, higher precisions could be expected for the monitoring of large and/or high sources such as offshore platforms, stacks or flares which rarely experience low wind conditions.

### 3.3.3 Comparison to other top-down approaches

Our performances estimated from the TADI campaigns can be compared to the performances of other top of the art technologies. As described earlier, our quantification method obtained 24% of results between -20 and +20% relative error compared to the true values, 80% of results between -50% and +100% and all the results were within the range of -69% to +150% compared to the true values. Several technologies using UAVs, airplanes, or mobile ground measurements were tested and compared during the international Stanford/EDF Mobile Monitoring challenge (Ravikumar et al., 2019) at the Methane Emissions Technology Evaluation Center (METEC), in
Colorado, US and at a facility near Sacramento, California, US. The performances of our method are better than the those of the other techniques compared within this challenge: only one method (Seek Ops Inc., based on drone observations) had all quantifications between -90% and 1000%, but with only 36% of quantifications between the -50% to +100% interval; while the best performance on the -50% to +100% interval was achieved by Ball Aerospace plane observations with 53% of quantifications within this range. Emitted fluxes were generally lower for the Stanford/EDF challenge (from 0 to 0.1 g s⁻¹ on METEC and 0 to 7 g s⁻¹ at Sacramento) than for our TADI intercomparison experiments (from 0.01 to 150 g s⁻¹), but, as stated earlier, our results are similar on a subset of experiments focusing on the lowest emitted fluxes.

Other methods for CO₂ and CH₄ sources tracking and emissions quantification include measurements with CRDS analysers from cars. An evaluation of such technique coupled with an atmospheric inversion based on a Gaussian plume dispersion model has been carried out under conditions comparable with our study during a TADI intercomparison campaign in 2018 (Kumar et al., 2021). Results of this validation campaign depicted a good accuracy of the emissions quantification, with estimates of the CH₄ and CO₂ release rates with ~10 to 40 % average relative errors. But only a limited number of 16 out of 50 controlled releases could be monitored, as this technique is constrained by the ability to drive through the plume, which is not possible for high elevation plumes (in cases of high stacks or plume rise) or for wind direction incompatible with the road infrastructure.

A UAV-based CH₄ emissions quantification method with a near-field Gaussian plume inversion model (Shah et al., 2020) obtained large uncertainties compared to our method with respective lower and upper uncertainty bounds on average of 17 ± 10 % (1σ) and 227 % ± 98 % (1σ) of the controlled emission flux. Gaussian approaches rely on hypotheses such as a well-mixed plume (problematic at a short distance from the source), a flat terrain, uniform and constant wind conditions, which are not necessarily true and may be less detrimental for mass balance approaches. The higher acquisition frequency of our analyser compared to this study is also a technical advantage which leads to better spatially resolved measurements and therefore an improved representation of the plume. A recently published UAV-based emission quantification technique also relying on a mass bass approach (Morales et al., 2022), was tested on a short range of release rates (0.26 to 0.48 g.s⁻¹) and obtained average bias of -1 % and RMSE of errors of +69 %. These results are comparable with the average and standard deviation of our residuals (+7 % and +53 %), which supports the validity of the mass balance method for the quantification of greenhouse gases emissions. The main differences compared to our approach was the use of only low-level sonic anemometers to measure wind speed and direction, without a real monitoring of the vertical wind profile, and the quantification of CH₄ emissions exclusively with a heavier sensor (2.1 kg compared to 1.4 kg for our sensor).

3.4 Application to offshore oil and gas facilities emissions quantification

3.4.1 Protocol of offshore platforms monitoring campaigns

A one-day measurement campaign was conducted in the North Sea on April 2019 to quantify the emissions of two offshore platforms (hereafter named P1 and P2). These platforms are equipped with power generators and gas turbines driving the compressors, both emitting CO₂ to the atmosphere. Stacks of gas turbine are at 50 m above sea level (m.a.s.l.) with vertical ejection, stacks of power generator are at 30 m.a.s.l with horizontal ejection. The main source of CH₄ emissions is the gas venting system, at 80 m above the sea surface, emitting mainly methane.
with vertical ejection. Other potential minor sources of CH₄ are expected: fugitive emissions and unburnt CH₄ in the turbine smokes.

Measurements were carried out from a supply boat chartered on purpose by the company from Den Helder harbor, Netherlands (Figure 7.a,b.). The deck was used as a take-off and landing site for the UAV. The wind LiDAR installed on the deck recorded wind profiles at 10 levels between 15 and 300 m.a.s.l. (Figure 7.b). Real-time concentration measurements were visualized by a person assisting the pilot to adapt the UAV trajectory to the position of the plumes and manage wind direction fluctuations. The duration of each flight was of 10 to 20 minutes. Each flight can be assigned to a trial in terms of concentration recording and emission calculation. The first flight is often a detection flight aiming at localizing the plume and not always usable for emission quantification. Respectively 8 and 7 repeated flights and emissions quantifications were conducted for the monitoring of both platforms (see Table S2 in the Supplementary Materials).

Our UAV-based quantifications of CO₂ and CH₄ emissions are presented as relative differences to reference values for each platform, corresponding to the daily averaged emissions calculated by the platforms operator thanks to methods based on real measurements on the day of comparison, using mass balance and processing data (venting) and combustion balance (gas turbines and power generator). This emissions calculation method is expected to be reliable for CO₂ emissions, as it is based on reliable input data (combustion flows, gas composition, CO₂ conversion of hydrocarbons). For CH₄, this calculation method assumes the proper functioning of equipment (e.g. closed valves).

### 3.4.2 Offshore platforms emissions quantifications

During this campaign, the distances between the source and the measurement plane were varying between approximately 150 and 450 m depending on the flight (Supplementary Table S2). To match the vertical distribution of the plumes, originating from sources at typical elevations around 80 m.a.s.l., horizontal transects were performed within the range of 50 to 120 m.a.s.l. Figure 8 presents typical wind conditions for one flight (2_P2) of the offshore platforms emissions monitoring campaign. Stable wind directions were observed during this flight (Figure 8.a) with similar wind directions at for all horizontal transects. The absence of strong shear in the wind direction during our measurements allowed capturing emission plumes within a single measurement plane for each flight. The wind speed profile of this example is typical for this offshore campaign (Figure 8.b), with a logarithmic profile below 40 m and increasing wind speeds above this limit, typical for stable atmospheric conditions.

Results of the emission quantifications of both offshore platforms are presented in Table 5. The quantified emission fluxes are presented in terms of relative difference compared to reference daily-average fluxes estimated for the platforms by mass balance and combustion calculation, thus non-representative of short-time variations of emissions.

For the quantification of CH₄ emissions, 13 flights were used mong 15 flights (7 for platform P1 and 6 for platform P2), the first flight for each platform being a short test flight to find the plume position. Mean CH₄ emission quantification for all 7 flights for P1 platform presents a 46 % relative difference compared to the reference vent stack expected emissions. This difference is of 12% for the P2 platform. At the time scale of individual flights, large variations in the CH₄ emissions quantification are observed for both platforms, with estimates varying between +8 % and +128 % for the P1 platform, and between -60 and +229 % for the P2 platform, compared to the daily reference emissions. For the P2 platform, the highest estimate of CH₄ emissions corresponds to a single flight
(+229 %) largely above the average and standard deviations value of the other 5 flights (-31 ± 18 %). The vertical profile of CH₄ fluxes by transect levels for this particular flight (not shown) depicts an important flux of CH₄ at an elevation lower than the usual main plume observed for all other flights. It is therefore reasonable to interpret this flux value as a short-time event of emissions from a different source than those used for the reference daily average estimates.

The mean values of the methane emissions quantification for all flights combined are comparable although higher than reference daily averaged emissions (+46% and +12% for P1 and P2). Our quantification method should be representative of the actual emissions of the whole platform, including fugitive emissions. Reference fluxes are based on estimation using emission factors, gas composition and flow rate measurements or estimation. The higher methane emissions of platform P1 from our method compared to the reference emissions led to a review of some of the platform processes during which an unexpected emission was detected and repaired from a defect valve. A significant emission reduction is expected after the repair. Repeated measurements would be helpful to confirm the actual improvement.

Concerning the quantification of CO₂ emissions, 7 flights could be exploited for platform P1, while only 4 flights are used for platform P2, as the CO₂ plume was not entirely captured by our flight plans during some flights, contrary to the CH₄ plume, as different sources are involved for both species. The CO₂ emissions quantifications are expressed as a relative difference to the daily averaged reference emissions. The estimated CO₂ emissions relative difference to the reference emissions are on average for all flights of -21 % for platform P1 and -47 % for platform P2. Emissions quantifications of each independent flight provided variable results, with minimal and maximal values of -39 to +14 % for platform P1, and between -28 % and +2 % for platform P2, thus within the precision of our quantification method. Part of the temporal variability of the CO₂ emissions quantification of platform P1 could also be explained by the presence of a supply vessel which arrived and left the platform during the two flights with the highest emissions quantified. Part of the quantified CO₂ emissions of both flights could therefore be attributed to the emissions of this supply vessel. If only the other 5 flights are considered, the averaged quantification of CO₂ emissions would be of -31 % ± 18 % relative difference compared to the reference value for platform P1, with a maximum value of -20 %.

Altogether, our emissions quantifications depict large variations between the different flights, for CO₂ and more particularly for CH₄ fluxes (Table 5). Such variations can be linked with real short-term variations of the emissions over the monitoring period, which are not reflected by the reference emissions values provided at a daily resolution only.

For some flights of this campaign, the measurements did not properly cover the entire plume cross-section vertically (values of q(z) did not reach zero). Therefore, the plumes vertical boundaries were estimated from gaussian interpolations of the vertical distribution of q(z). Better flight plans including measurements below and above the plumes would be necessary for improved quantifications and will be an important requirement of future monitoring protocols.

4 Conclusions

This study presents an atmospheric emissions quantification technique based on a new atmospheric CO₂ and CH₄ concentration analyser embarked under a UAV associated with a mass balance box model. The controlled release
campaigns on the TADI platform in 2019 and 2021 validated this method independently of the type of source or carrier, and showed better accuracy compared to other current top-of-the-art CO₂ and/or CH₄ emissions quantification techniques using either multispectral camera, ground based CRDS (fix stations or mobile measurement in a car), wind and gas LiDAR, infrared camera including concentrations and emissions quantification system, or Tunable Diode LiDAR (Ravikumar et al., 2019; Shah et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2021; Druart et al., 2021) and comparable performances for a similar technique also relying on UAV laser-based concentrations monitoring associated with a mass balance model (Morales et al., 2022).

This method has a wide range of potential applications, for the quantification of CO₂ or CH₄ sources of diverse anthropogenic or natural origins. It was already applied on the field and extended in 2022 to more than 100 oil and gas facilities, offshore and onshore, from tropical to high latitude environments, as well as biogas plants and landfills, which will be the subject of upcoming publications.

Field applications of our method revealed several assets compared to similar quantification campaigns previously conducted from aircrafts or boats. Compared to aircraft-based monitoring, UAVs have the advantage to fly below 300 m high and close to the facilities (distance around 250 m from offshore platforms), allowing the monitoring of the entire plume and the identification of the main sources. The real time monitoring of the concentration on the ground, associated with the high speed and reactivity of the UAV, provides the possibility for the pilots to adapt the trajectory and fly within the plume despite its meandering. The UAV high speed also allows monitoring of an entire plume within a few minutes, thus representative of a quasi-stationary state, preventing for example double measurements of the same plume when it is meandering, which could occur with measurements conducted from a low-speed vessel. The high frequency of observations (conducted at 24 Hz for these campaigns) allowed us to develop an emissions quantification method which does not require a 2D interpolation of the measured concentration data, but only an interpolation along the vertical direction. This improves the precision compared to methods requiring 2D interpolation based on Kriging techniques.

Nevertheless, our quantifications would benefit from further improvements of the instruments, the monitoring protocol or the modelling.

Our mass balance method provides precise emissions quantifications at low computing costs, but requires concentration measurements throughout an entire plume cross-section. This is not always possible to perform on the field, due to restrictions of the UAV area of operations caused by obstacles or prohibited flight zones. An inverse atmospheric modelling method might provide emissions quantifications for partially monitored plume cross-sections.

A more precise recording of the horizontal and vertical UAV positioning has already been introduced with the use of RTK GPS positioning, facilitating data post-treatment. Future technical development of our method will include wind speed measurements directly on-board the UAV, replacing the LiDAR wind profile measurements for an easier and more cost-effective field deployment. This should also improve the wind speed measurements at elevations below the lowest level of wind LiDAR measurements (typically below 10 m.a.g.l.). A fully automatized UAV operation is also being developed, with UAV track adapting to the plume position, aiming at regular quantifications of O&G facilities.

Future improvements will be made to our greenhouse gases sensor. CO concentrations measurements will also be included in future versions of our instrument, allowing the calculation of a complete combustion efficiency balance for various types of sources of the O&G sector, such as flares. Further weight reduction and adaptations of the
instrument will allow it to be embarked by a larger spectrum of air carriers, including VTOLs (Vertical Take-Off and Landing) UAVs, which have a longer autonomy and fly at higher speed. This will open new applications to monitor emissions of larger scale sources such as larger industrial facilities, natural sources or small cities.
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Figure 1. Picture of the AUSEA 112 analyzer mounted on a DJI M300.
Figure 2 Allan deviations calculated for multiple stability experiments with analysers AUSEA_111 and AUSEA_112.

Figure 3. Boxplots of the residuals of the linear regressions for each linearity experiment of the AUSEA sensor against a reference Picarro CRDS analyser in a temperature-controlled environment at a 5 s temporal resolution. Boxplots depict the first and last quartile (lower and upper borders of the boxes), median (orange line) and minima and maxima (lower and upper ticks, defined as the first and last quartile plus or minus 1.5 times the interquartile range), without outliers.
Figure 4. Schematic representation of the observation protocol: general 3D view (a) and top view (b). The source (in red) emits a plume (grey shade). The UAV monitors the concentrations along a flight path (orange arrow), constituted of multiple horizontal transects, within a vertical observational plane, represented by the orange quadrangle in (a) and the orange line in (b). The angle between the orthogonal to the observational plane and the wind direction is noted \( \alpha \). A wind LiDAR (green) measures the wind direction and speed at several elevations.
Figure 5. Aerial view of the TADI platform with location of the emission sources (yellow crosses) and the Explosive Atmosphere area (ATEX zone, depicted as an orange square). Maps Data: Google, ©2022 Maxar Technologies.
Figure 6. Comparison of emissions quantifications as a function of the real CH$_4$ emissions fluxes (in g/s), as blue dots. A log-log scale is used. The plain grey line indicates the 1/1 slope or 0% error. Plain and dashed yellow lines respectively indicate the -20% and +20% relative errors limits. Plain and dotted red lines respectively indicate the -50% and +100% error limits.

Figure 7: Picture of operations nearby offshore platforms in the North Sea on 2019-04-19, showing (a) the UAV equipped with the AUSEA sensor and (b) the deck of the supply vessel serving as take-off and landing site for the UAV, with the wind LiDAR (black circle).
Figure 8. Typical weather conditions for flight 2_P2 of the offshore platform monitoring campaign: a) Distributions of wind directions (percentage, with $20^\circ$ resolution) for different wind speeds classes (color scale, in m/s) during flight measured by the LiDAR at the lowest level. b) Averaged wind speed (m/s) vertical profile (in m a.s.l) over the flight duration, measured by wind LiDAR at each of its monitoring level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Species (unit)</th>
<th>$\sigma_{0.5,s}$</th>
<th>$\sigma_{1,s}$</th>
<th>$\sigma_{10,s}$</th>
<th>$\sigma_{60,s}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-06-08</td>
<td>1 h 35 min</td>
<td>CH₄ (ppb)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-06-08</td>
<td>15 h 12 min</td>
<td>CH₄ (ppb)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-03-23</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>CH₄ (ppb)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA112</td>
<td>2022-04-19</td>
<td>3 h 2 min</td>
<td>CH₄ (ppb)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-06-08</td>
<td>1 h 35 min</td>
<td>CO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-06-08</td>
<td>15 h 12 min</td>
<td>CO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-03-23</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>CO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA111</td>
<td>2022-03-23</td>
<td>1 h 50 min</td>
<td>CO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSEA112</td>
<td>2022-04-19</td>
<td>1 h 13 min</td>
<td>CO₂ (ppm)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Precision of the AUSEA111 and AUSEA112 analyzers at given frequencies (0.5 s, 1 s, 10 s, 60 s) derived from Allan deviations of stability experiments performed at different dates, expressed in ppb for CH₄ and ppm for CO₂.
values), slope and intercept of the linear regressions of the distributions (only values below 20.0 ppm for CH₄) and associated R² values and number of data points at a 5 seconds frequency resolution used for the linear regression.

### Quantifications relative errors (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 1 quantification flight</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-58%</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 2 quantifications flights</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-69%</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 3 quantifications flights</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 4 quantifications flights</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All quantifications</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-69%</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Statistics of the relative errors of quantifications during the TADI campaigns, for the release experiments quantified by 1, 2, 3 or 4 independent flights and for the total of all quantifications.

### Real emitted fluxes categories (g/s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average relative error (%)</th>
<th>[0.01-0.3]</th>
<th>[0.3-1]</th>
<th>[1-2]</th>
<th>[2-5]</th>
<th>[5-151]</th>
<th>[0.01-151]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative error categories</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0.01-0.3]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[0.3-1]</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1-2]</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Statistics of the quantifications results for different categories of real emitted fluxes: between 0.01 and 0.3 g/s, between 0.3 and 1 g/s, between 1 and 2 g/s, between 2 and 5 g/s, between 5 and 151 g/s and for the whole range between 0.01 and 151 g/s. The average relative error is given in % for each category, as well as the number of controlled release experiments for which the quantifications reached relative error categories between -20 and +20 %, between -50 and +100 % and between -69 % and +150 %. Underlined numbers correspond to the total number of controlled release experiment within each real emitted flux category.
Table 5. Statistics of the distribution of quantified emissions for all 7 flights associated to each platform P1 and P2, for CO$_2$ and CH$_4$, expressed as relative differences (in %) to the reference daily average emission rates obtained by mass balance and combustion efficiency calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Relative errors to site calculations (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform (number of flights)</td>
<td>P1 (7 flights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>