

1 **Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification for Ocean Alkalinity**

2 **Enhancement**

3 David T. Ho^{1,2}, Laurent Bopp³, Jaime B. Palter⁴, Matthew C. Long^{2,5}, Philip W. Boyd⁶, Griet
4 Neukermans^{7,8}, Lennart T. Bach⁶

5 ¹Department of Oceanography, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, 96822, USA

6 ²[C]Worthy, LLC, Boulder, CO 80302, USA

7 ³LMD/IPSL, Ecole normale supérieure - PSL, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Ecole Polytechnique, 75005 Paris, France

8 ⁴Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Narragansett, RI 02882, USA

9 ⁵Oceanography Section, Climate and Global Dynamics Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO,
10 USA

11 ⁶Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

12 ⁷MarSens Research Group, Department of Biology, Ghent University, 9000 Gent, Belgium

13 ⁸Flanders Marine Institute, 8400 Ostend, Belgium

14 *Correspondence to:* David T. Ho (ho@hawaii.edu)

15 **Abstract.** Monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) refers to the multistep process of monitoring the amount of
16 greenhouse gas removed by a carbon dioxide removal (CDR) activity and reporting the results of the monitoring to a third
17 party. The third party then verifies the reporting of the results. While MRV is usually conducted in pursuit of certification in a
18 voluntary or regulated CDR market, this chapter focuses on key recommendations for MRV relevant to ocean alkalinity
19 enhancement (OAE) research. Early-stage MRV for OAE research may become the foundation on which markets are built.
20 Therefore, such research carries a special obligation toward comprehensiveness, reproducibility, and transparency.
21 Observational approaches during field trials should aim to quantify the delivery of alkalinity to seawater and monitor for
22 secondary precipitation, biotic calcification, and other ecosystem changes that can feed back on sources or sinks of greenhouse
23 gases where alkalinity is measurably elevated. Observations of resultant shifts in the partial pressure of CO₂ ($p\text{CO}_2$) and ocean
24 pH can help determine the efficacy of OAE and are amenable to autonomous monitoring. However, because the ocean is
25 turbulent and energetic and CO₂ equilibration between the ocean and atmosphere can take several months or longer, added
26 alkalinity will be diluted to perturbation levels undetectable above background variability on timescales relevant for MRV.
27 Therefore, comprehensive quantification of carbon removal via OAE will be impossible through observational methods alone,
28 and numerical simulations will be required. The development of fit-for-purpose models, carefully validated against
29 observational data, will be a critical part of MRV for OAE.

30 **1 What is MRV?**

31 In this chapter, we consider monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) for marine CDR (mCDR), confining our
32 focus to determining the amount of additional CO₂ removed from the atmosphere and the durability of that removal. Investment
33 in CDR is motivated by an interest in mitigating climate change, so the value of a CDR purchase stems from its correspondence
34 to genuine removal (Smith et al., 2023). MRV must, therefore, provide estimates of net carbon removal and the uncertainty of
35 those estimates (e.g., Palter et al., 2023). Delivering uncertainty estimates will enable markets to value carbon removal projects
36 appropriately by applying discount factors scaled in accordance with uncertainty (e.g., Carbon Direct and Microsoft, 2023).

37 While we recognize the importance of determining ecosystem impacts of OAE deployments, assessment of OAE
38 effects on ecosystems are covered in Eisaman et al. (2023, this Guide), Iglesias-Rodríguez et al. (2023, this Guide), Riebesell
39 et al. (2023, this Guide), and Fennel et al. (2023, this Guide) and will not be considered MRV in this guide, unless they impact
40 the efficiency of OAE (e.g., biogenic calcification). In addition to monitoring carbonate chemistry parameters for MRV
41 (discussed below), assessing ecosystem impacts would require monitoring other biogeochemical, environmental, or ecological
42 changes that may arise from OAE application, such as changes in nutrient fluxes, particulate loading, and phytoplankton
43 community structure. In the same vein, side benefits (e.g., an increase in pH due to OAE) are also not considered MRV for
44 this contribution. Finally, for this guide, we do not consider life cycle assessment (LCA), which might entail accounting for,
45 e.g., CO₂ emissions from manufacturing, transportation, and deployment. While LCA is extremely important for quantifying
46 the net carbon removed by a CDR strategy, this contribution focuses on MRV following OAE deployment in the ocean.

47 To determine the amount and duration of CO₂ removal, MRV must deliver an assessment of two interrelated metrics:

- 48 1. **Additionality:** The net quantity of CO₂ removal above a counterfactual baseline after OAE has been conducted in the
49 ocean. Additionality should include assessments of phenomena such as precipitation-induced loss of alkalinity or a
50 response in biogenic calcification that could reduce the ability of alkalinity addition to induce CDR.
- 51 2. **Durability:** The average time over which CO₂ is sequestered from the atmosphere by a given deployment. We have
52 minimal concerns about OAE in the context of durability as OAE increases the ocean's buffer capacity and hence its
53 ability to store CO₂ as dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) on timescales associated with alkalinity cycling in the ocean
54 — with residence time far exceeding 10³ years (Middelburg et al., 2020). Therefore, storage durability does not
55 require an explicit methodology for quantification, but rather, we can assume that CO₂ removed via OAE will be
56 stored mainly as bicarbonate (HCO₃⁻) for > 10³ years. For CDR, the depth of where atmospheric CO₂ is stored in the
57 oceans matters when it is stored as dissolved CO₂ (as is the case for macroalgae cultivation or iron fertilization).
58 However, in the case of OAE, CO₂ is stored mainly as HCO₃⁻, which cannot be exchanged with the atmosphere, so
59 surface ocean storage is chemically safe. Keeping alkalinity (and thus HCO₃⁻) in the surface ocean has benefits for
60 ocean acidification, although these are very minor and heavily depend on whether alkalinity-enhanced seawater has
61 been equilibrated with atmospheric CO₂ (see Fig. 3 in Bach et al., 2019). Furthermore, retaining alkalinity (HCO₃⁻)

62 in the surface ocean can enhance durability by limiting interactions with sediments and thus avoiding substantial loss
63 terms to OAE, such as the risk of inducing secondary CaCO₃ precipitation in sediments and the reduction of natural
64 alkalinity release (Fuhr et al., 2022; Moras et al., 2022; Bach, 2023; Hartmann et al., 2023). We acknowledge that
65 there are potential ways to lose alkalinity (HCO₃⁻) in the surface ocean, such as via the induction of biotic calcification.
66 However, there is currently no reason to assume the deep ocean is a much safer place to store atmospheric CO₂ as
67 HCO₃⁻.

68
69 Further, as highlighted above, effective MRV systems must deliver estimates of the uncertainty in these metrics. To
70 quantify these metrics, MRV for OAE must provide quantitative assessments in the context of the following questions:

- 71 1. How much alkalinity was effectively added to seawater? The difficulty of answering this question depends on the
72 technology used for OAE. For example, understanding the dissolution kinetics of mineral particulates is a requirement
73 to quantify alkalinity additions for crushed-rock feedstocks, but much less of a concern for electrochemical techniques
74 and alkalinity added in dissolved form.
- 75 2. Has there been precipitation or biogenic feedback changing the efficacy of the alkalinity addition? Seawater is mostly
76 above saturation in the surface ocean with respect to calcium carbonate; thus, the addition of alkalinity has the
77 potential to induce precipitation of carbonate minerals (Moras et al., 2022), which would reduce the OAE efficiency
78 (i.e., mole of DIC sequestered per mole of TA added). Abiotic CaCO₃ (or MgCO₃) precipitation is very slow but
79 increases when the saturation state increases. Such high saturation states can occur near alkalinity release sites.
80 Furthermore, calcifying organisms in the ocean, such as coccolithophores, can respond to OAE by modifying their
81 growth rate or the relative amount of carbonate mineral production (Bach et al., 2019). Finally, enhanced saturation
82 states could also reduce natural carbonate dissolution; this may have the effect of more effectively transferring
83 alkalinity (in particulate form) from the surface ocean to depth or changing natural alkalinity sources from sediments
84 or coastlines (Bach, 2023). Understanding these feedbacks of OAE via the calcium (magnesium) carbonate cycle is
85 important for OAE MRV.
- 86 3. What is the ensuing perturbation to the air-sea exchange of CO₂ resulting from the OAE deployment? Alkalinity shifts
87 carbonate equilibrium reactions away from aqueous CO₂, thereby reducing seawater *p*CO₂; CDR occurs when the
88 atmosphere equilibrates with the altered surface ocean via air-sea CO₂ exchange. A primary goal for MRV is to
89 quantify this perturbation flux; notably, however, in many envisioned circumstances, the alkalinity addition will be
90 entrained in the ocean flow, causing the OAE signal to be transported away from the injection site and potentially
91 away from the sea surface; coupled with the fact that CO₂ gas equilibration occurs slowly (Jones et al., 2014), the
92 ensuing air-sea flux perturbation will occur over large regions in space and time.

93
94 In our assessment, observations alone are unlikely to provide a sufficient basis for quantifying the net carbon removal
95 accomplished by OAE deployments. MRV for OAE requires the development of quantitative estimates of air-sea CO₂

96 exchange. Since the ocean is constantly moving and because CO₂ takes a long time to equilibrate across the air-sea interface,
97 robust MRV would require intensive observations over large areas and over long time periods. High-quality carbon markets
98 will require uncertainty bounds for net carbon removal estimates that would be prohibitively expensive to obtain via investment
99 in direct observing over such scales, except, perhaps in targeted intensive observational arrays. A further complication with
00 observations is that assessments of net carbon removals associated with OAE deployments require quantifying air-sea CO₂
01 flux relative to a counterfactual scenario: The air-sea CO₂ exchange that would have occurred without OAE intervention.
02 Observing a counterfactual scenario is impossible in a strict sense, but it could be possible to use observations to assess
03 counterfactual scenarios by leveraging analogs, such as nearby unperturbed regions, or statistical constructions, such as
04 predicted seawater *p*CO₂ from empirical models built from historical observations of the carbon system and predictor variables
05 like temperature, mixed layer depth, and chlorophyll (e.g., Landschützer et al., 2020; Rödenbeck et al., 2022; Sharp et al.,
06 2022).

07 In practice, comparison with such analogs is a challenging task due to the heterogeneous nature of the ocean air-sea
08 CO₂ flux field, as well as the potential for OAE effects to spread over very large spatial and temporal scales. Notably, the
09 background air-sea CO₂ flux field is highly dynamic on local to global scales. The ocean both absorbs and releases a massive
10 amount of CO₂ each year; the net flux amounts to an uptake of about 10 Pg CO₂ yr⁻¹—but this net flux is a small residual of
11 large gross fluxes (about ±330 Pg CO₂ yr⁻¹) (Friedlingstein et al., 2022). OAE can increase CO₂ flux into the ocean when the
12 alkalinity enhancement reduces seawater *p*CO₂ below atmospheric CO₂. However, OAE can also decrease CO₂ flux into the
13 atmosphere when alkalinity enhancement reduces seawater *p*CO₂ closer to atmospheric *p*CO₂. Both cases will constitute CDR
14 as it leads to a net increase of DIC in the ocean reservoir (Bach et al., 2023). Geographic patterns of CO₂ ingassing and
15 outgassing are controlled by the ocean’s large-scale and subtropical overturning circulations (e.g., Iudicone et al., 2016),
16 mesoscale and submesoscale motions (e.g., Nakano et al., 2011; Ford et al., 2023), variations in winds (e.g., Andersson et al.,
17 2013; Nickford et al., 2022), storms (e.g., Nicholson et al., 2022), upwelling dynamics, local inputs from rivers (e.g., Mu et
18 al., 2023), exchanges with sediments, and biology (e.g., Huang et al., 2023). Outside the tropics, there is pronounced seasonal
19 variability in air-sea CO₂ fluxes mostly driven by phytoplankton blooms that draw down CO₂ in the surface ocean during
20 spring and summer (e.g., Fassbender et al., 2022), and winter mixing that brings carbon-rich waters to the surface. All these
21 dynamics are subject to variations in the climate and ocean circulation caused by internally fluctuating modes of variability or
22 external forcing associated with CO₂ emissions and other human activities.

23 Given the complex nature of the ocean biogeochemical system, robust MRV for high-quality carbon removal markets
24 will presumably depend on model-based approaches when quantifying net CO₂ removals. Ocean biogeochemical models
25 (OBMs) will be a critical tool in this context (see Fennel et al., 2023, this Guide). These models represent the physical,
26 chemical, and biological processes affecting the distribution of carbon, alkalinity, and nutrients in the ocean. OBMs represent
27 inorganic and organic carbon pools, alkalinity, and nutrients as tracers with units of mass per volume (or mass) of seawater.
28 OBMs are based on ocean general circulation models (OGCMs) that represent the movement of tracers mediated by ocean
29 circulation and mixing. Biogeochemical tracers, including DIC and TA, have sources and sinks from processes such as

30 biologically mediated production and remineralization of organic matter. Boundary fluxes for OBM tracers include riverine
31 inputs, aeolian deposition, sediment-water exchange, and air-sea gas exchange. Fennel et al. (2023, this Guide) provide an
32 overview of the most relevant modeling tools for OAE research with high-level background information, illustrative examples,
33 and references to more in-depth methodological descriptions and further examples.

34 **2. Specificities of MRV for marine CDR**

35 The natural ocean carbon cycle is extremely dynamic on a wide range of temporal and spatial scales, typically
36 spanning more than ten orders of magnitude (Sarmiento and Gruber, 2006). These scales range from that of the ocean skin, a
37 thin layer of less than a millimeter in contact with the atmosphere where air-sea CO₂ exchange is controlled by molecular
38 diffusion, to that of the global ocean circulation that typically transports dissolved carbon over more than a thousand years and
39 10,000 km. As such, the ocean represents a challenging environment for MRV, especially compared to MRV of land-based
40 CDR techniques. Three specific time scales are to be considered when discussing challenges for MRV of mCDR, and in
41 particular OAE.

42 The first time scale relates to natural variability in carbonate chemistry, especially *p*CO₂ and alkalinity, due to
43 biological, chemical, and physical processes in the ocean. Such variability can be substantial on daily and seasonal time scales.
44 For example, using in situ observations from 37 stations spanning diverse ocean environments, Torres et al. (2021) showed
45 that in the open ocean stations, the average seasonal cycle of *p*CO₂ was 49 ± 23 μ atm (inter-station mean and standard
46 deviation), and that diurnal variability could also be as high as 47 ± 18 μ atm. Temporal variability at coastal stations where
47 OAE is likely to be deployed — due to proximity to existing infrastructure, energy supply, and human resources — is
48 significantly higher, with seasonal variability in *p*CO₂ being 210 ± 76 μ atm and diurnal variability reaching 178 ± 82 μ atm
49 (Torres et al., 2021). OAE-induced changes in *p*CO₂ are likely to be lower than the range in natural variability, complicating
50 MRV. For example, an increase in alkalinity of 10 μ mol kg⁻¹ would result in a decrease in *p*CO₂ of around 20 μ atm (given
51 temp =20°C; salinity = 35; initial TA = 2200 μ mol kg⁻¹; DIC = 1965 μ mol kg⁻¹ and no secondary precipitation or biotic
52 calcification). Historical carbonate system variability, like the examples given here, can be used in sensitivity studies to assess
53 the detectability of a given OAE perturbation for different observing systems (Mu et al., 2023).

54 The second of these time scales relates to air-sea CO₂ equilibrium. This time scale is particularly relevant for OAE as
55 it determines the time required from an alkalinity-driven shift in surface seawater carbonate equilibria to a new air-sea CO₂
56 equilibrium and the resulting atmospheric carbon uptake. It is well established that the characteristic timescale for air-sea
57 exchange of CO₂ is of the order of 6 months (Sarmiento and Gruber, 2006). But Jones et al. (2014) have shown that the time
58 to reach air-sea CO₂ equilibrium is highly variable at the regional scale, ranging from less than a month to several years, with
59 especially long values in the northern North Atlantic, the Atlantic subtropical gyres, and the Southern Ocean. This regional
60 variability is explained by the dependency of the air-sea CO₂ equilibrium time scale on the gas transfer velocity, the depth of
61 the mixed layer, and the baseline carbonate chemistry of seawater. More precisely, this time scale shortens with higher gas

62 transfer velocities and Revelle factors, but lengthens with deeper mixed layers and larger ionization fractions (i.e., the ratio
63 between DIC and dissolved CO₂).

64 The third of these time scales relates to ocean physical processes and alkalinity and carbon transport away from the
65 injection location. First, horizontal currents, ranging from a few centimeters to a few meters per second, can potentially
66 transport the OAE signal away from the initial injection site, thus complicating MRV. A simple calculation shows that a mean
67 flow of 0.5 m s⁻¹ could transport the alkalinity signal more than 100 km from the initial site in six months. Second, vertical
68 entrainment, mixing, and/or other subduction processes might also transport the OAE signal to depths below the seasonal
69 mixed layer, potentially hindering atmospheric CO₂ uptake and associated MRV.

70 Lessons learned from mesoscale in situ ocean iron fertilization (OIF) studies can be applied to MRV for OAE,
71 especially during pilot studies of unenclosed OAE-perturbed patches of surface waters that are upscaled beyond a few km².
72 Ocean circulation and mixing will cause a range of effects that are scale-dependent and will influence MRV strategies as it is
73 used to target pilot studies and, eventually, larger deployments (100 km² scale). This presupposes that elements of MRV will
74 be needed at all spatial scales during the development and testing of an mCDR method.

75 The success of OIF in tracking and the repeated sampling of a coherent patch of perturbed waters over a timescale of
76 weeks was due to the use of SF₆ as an ocean tracer (e.g., Coale et al., 1996), and, in one instance, using a quasi-controlled
77 volume within a mesoscale eddy (Smetacek et al., 2012). For example, the use of SF₆ allowed dynamic upper ocean behavior
78 to be observed during an OIF perturbation, in which the perturbed water was subducted under less dense water in a few days,
79 leading to the termination of the study (Coale et al., 1998). Subduction is a risk for the MRV of OAE trials being conducted
80 in nearshore waters, and the use of tracers such as SF₆ would be crucial for observing this behavior.

81 At larger spatial scales (i.e., for perturbations done in waters not bounded by eddies >100 km²), ocean physics imposes
82 a strain and concurrent rotation of a perturbed patch of ocean; as such, OIF studies revealed the perturbed patch of waters can
83 ‘grow’ in areal extent from 100 km² to > 1000 km² via the entrainment of the surrounding ‘control’ seawater (Law et al., 2006).
84 Such entrainment sets up concentration gradients that lead to fluxes into (in the case of OIF, nutrients are resupplied to the
85 nutrient-depleted patch) and out of (in the case of OIF, chlorophyll which has accumulated due to OIF, and iron that has been
86 added) the perturbed waters. Such artifacts may dilute the more alkaline waters in the patch of unenclosed OAE perturbed
87 waters, which may hinder aspects of MRV such as detection of the OAE signal above a background level, or biological side-
88 effects resulting from OAE.

89 **3. Observation-based techniques for MRV and limitations**

90 OAE depends on multi-step processes to achieve mCDR: First, the intervention raises ocean alkalinity in order to
91 lower seawater *p*CO₂, and then atmospheric CO₂ must equilibrate with the altered waters. These processes point to many of
92 the variables that would ideally be observed in an OAE MRV scheme. Measurements of total alkalinity (TA) and DIC are
93 important to quantify the background state of the carbon system, which determines the *p*CO₂ response per unit change in

94 alkalinity. Further, measurements of TA might help verify that alkalinity has been added effectively, although signal-to-noise
95 ratios may be insufficiently strong to enable robust detection and attribution of TA anomalies (Mu et al., 2023). pH is an
96 important measurement to ensure that the OAE deployment conforms with water quality limits (usually $\text{pH} < 9$) and that the
97 deployment does not create conditions that induce precipitation. Finally, $p\text{CO}_2$ at the ocean's surface is a key control on air-
98 sea CO_2 exchange and is thus an important measurement target. With extensive measurements of these variables along the
99 Lagrangian pathway of a perturbed water mass, a carbon budget could theoretically be closed by constraining the time-rate of
00 change and making inferences about important driving processes such as air-sea gas exchange; such a budget could, in theory,
01 be used to support quantification of CDR for a given OAE deployment. Though appealing in its comprehensiveness, the reality
02 of observing all of the parameters needed to quantitatively close a perturbed carbon budget and compare it against an
03 unperturbed counterfactual is likely impossible in the near to medium-term, even in the context of highly-monitored field trials.
04 The difficulty is inherent in the fact that the patch of water perturbed by the addition of TA is likely to be turbulently dispersed
05 in the ocean, and its signal diluted below the limit of detectability by mixing over the time scale required for CO_2 equilibration
06 (He and Tyka, 2023; Mu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023).

07 This leads to the conclusion that MRV via direct observational approaches should not be expected to completely
08 follow every molecule of additional CO_2 resulting from an OAE deployment - as doing so would set an insurmountable barrier
09 to MRV. Instead, we outline what can feasibly be observed, what questions these observations can answer, and which questions
10 are left to be addressed in statistical and/or prognostic models with their attendant uncertainties.

11 Various autonomous sensors hold promise to inform the results of an OAE deployment, both in field trials and for
12 sampling that might offer constraints on open water applications and data for model validation and/or assimilation.

13 The most direct measurement relevant to OAE experiments is TA, which would reveal if the initially planned
14 perturbation was successful. Though autonomous sensors for TA have been in development for several years (Briggs et al.,
15 2017), they are not commercially available at the time of writing, and the laboratory analysis of bottle samples cannot currently
16 be replaced or even supplemented by sensor-based measurements (see Cyronak et al., 2023, this Guide). Nevertheless,
17 laboratory analysis of TA in bottle samples can be compared to “baseline” measurements taken before the alkalinity is added
18 or outside the expected patch area. It is worth noting that measuring a TA increase near the OAE deployment point may be
19 possible, but once the OAE-perturbed water has dispersed in the ocean flow, the signal-to-noise ratio will likely be too low to
20 make any accurate quantification. This is also the case for attempting to quantify CDR using DIC, as discussed below. The
21 TA in the OAE-influenced patch may also be compared to a predicted counterfactual TA constructed from regression methods
22 built with historical salinity (and other available) data, like the Locally Interpolated Alkalinity Regression (LIAR) method
23 (Carter et al., 2018).

24 In contrast to TA, to determine the ocean uptake of CO_2 , there are effective equilibrator-based autonomous $p\text{CO}_2$
25 systems (e.g., ASVCO₂TM, MAPCO₂) capable of measuring $p\text{CO}_2$ with a nominal accuracy of $2 \mu\text{atm}$ (R. Wanninkhof,
26 Personal Communication), although they are restricted to the top few meters of the surface ocean due to the fact that
27 equilibrators cannot be submerged. There are also in situ $p\text{CO}_2$ sensors that rely on equilibrating seawater $p\text{CO}_2$ with air

28 through a membrane (e.g., Pro-Oceanus CO₂-Pro™ CV, CONTROS HydroC® CO₂) or a pH-sensitive dye (e.g., SAMI-pH),
29 followed by infrared detection or colorimetric spectroscopy. Due to fluctuations in the pressure of equilibration and calibration
30 issues, the real-world accuracy of these instruments is ~5 μatm (R. Wanninkhof, Personal Communication). The existence of
31 autonomous *p*CO₂ sensors is potentially important because while it is difficult to detect changes in the carbon inventory of the
32 ocean with measurements of DIC, it can be done with measurements of *p*CO₂ (Wanninkhof et al., 2013). These *p*CO₂ sensors
33 can be deployed on moorings (MAPCO₂, ProCV) and autonomous surface vehicles like Wave Glider (ASVCO₂) (Chavez et
34 al., 2018) and Saildrone (Sabine et al., 2020; Sutton et al., 2021; Nickford et al., 2022). These sensors have the advantage of
35 being able to collect measurements continuously in harsh weather and with much reduced involvement from skilled analysts
36 relative to field surveys with bottle collection. Most analysis focuses on collecting and analyzing calibration samples and
37 performing quality control on data.

38 Sensors that measure pH on autonomous profiling floats, gliders, or moored platforms could provide additional data
39 useful for MRV. Unfortunately, as demonstrated by Wimart-Rousseau et al. (2023), pH sensors on profiling floats have
40 relatively large uncertainties that may compromise their usefulness for MRV of field deployments. Moreover, these
41 uncertainties are largest near the ocean's surface, where they would be most useful in the MRV context, as knowledge of the
42 surface ocean disequilibrium is needed for CDR. Uncertainties in pH of 0.01 roughly translate to a *p*CO₂ uncertainty of 10
43 μatm (Wimart-Rousseau et al., 2023), but even achieving such accurate pH measurements will require significant advances in
44 sensor accuracy and/or post-processing data analysis tools to correct surface pH data. Nevertheless, a fleet of pH-measuring
45 profiling floats can provide observational data critical for model evaluation and for quantifying baseline carbonate chemistry
46 in the ocean.

47 Another MRV-relevant aspect of OAE that is well suited for sensor measurements is the reduction of OAE efficiency
48 via OAE-induced precipitation of carbonates (see Schulz et al., 2023 for further context). For example, marine calcifiers, such
49 as coccolithophores, may benefit from high alkalinity and pH conditions, thus reducing OAE efficiency (Bach et al., 2019),
50 but this effect is still uncertain (Gately et al., 2023). Autonomous optical sensors for particulate inorganic carbon (PIC) based
51 on the birefringence of calcite and aragonite have been in development for several decades (James, 2009; Bishop et al., 2022).
52 Since the deployment of the first prototype on a profiling float in 2003, this optical PIC sensor has been re-engineered several
53 times, and the most recent versions require further re-engineering to correct for thermal and pressure effects, as well as
54 misalignment effects of the linear polarizers (Bishop et al., 2022). A new autonomous PIC measurement concept was recently
55 proposed by Neukermans and Fournier (2022), which may overcome the aforementioned issues. Such PIC sensors are currently
56 under development and are expected to cover a PIC concentration range of 0.5 to 500 μgC L⁻¹ (Neukermans et al., 2023).
57 These PIC sensors are intended for use on autonomous platforms such as floats profiling up to 2000 m deep, autonomous
58 moorings, tethered buoys, or Saildrones. Such PIC sensors would thus enable careful autonomous monitoring of PIC
59 concentration in the epi- and mesopelagic ocean, as well as in shallow shelf seas. In addition, ocean color satellites can be used
60 to obtain global maps of coccolithophore PIC concentration in the surface ocean at daily frequency using a variety of remote

61 sensing algorithms (see Balch and Mitchell, 2023 for a review of remote sensing PIC algorithms and limitations). Both remote
62 sensing and in situ observations of PIC concentration can contribute to assessing secondary precipitation and OAE efficiency.

63 Other more remote tail risks of OAE include alterations to carbon production and flux, for example, via shifts in
64 phytoplankton community structure (Ferderer et al., 2022) or alterations in the availability of high-density biominerals such as
65 opal or calcite, which may ballast POC flux to the deep ocean (Armstrong et al., 2001; Klaas and Archer, 2002). Ballasting of
66 POC flux by coccolithophore calcite and the resulting increase in the sinking velocity of POC aggregates has been confirmed
67 in many experimental studies and may be an important mechanism in some ocean regions. This potential secondary effect of
68 OAE on POC flux could be monitored from autonomous profiling floats equipped with a PIC sensor (Neukermans et al., 2023).

69 Wind speed should be measured since it is the most common correlate for air-sea gas exchange, and there are wind
70 speed/gas exchange parameterizations that predict gas transfer velocities well in the open ocean (e.g., Ho et al., 2006).
71 Therefore, in these settings, measurements of wind speeds are sufficient to characterize air-sea gas exchange. However, since
72 gas transfer velocities as a function of wind speed differ between the open and coastal oceans (e.g., Dobashi and Ho, 2023),
73 depending on the OAE deployment location, $^3\text{He}/\text{SF}_6$ tracer release experiments might have to be performed to determine this
74 relationship (see Wanninkhof et al., 1993). While it is likely unfeasible to couple every individual OAE operation with a
75 $^3\text{He}/\text{SF}_6$ dual tracer release during the deployment phase, during the testing phase, such experiments will be useful for
76 calibrating and evaluating models that will most likely be used to determine the efficiency and efficacy of CO_2 equilibration.

77 **4. Model-based techniques for MRV and limitations**

78 OBMs can be used to explicitly represent the effects of OAE by conducting numerical experiments in which the
79 model is provided with forcing data that represents alkalinity additions. Developing and validating models in the region/scale
80 of OAE deployment should be a priority to enable functional frameworks for MRV (see Fennel et al., 2023, this Guide).

81 A model integrated forward in time with the alkalinity additions will simulate the transport of the associated mass of
82 alkalinity and its ensuing effect on biogeochemical processes, including air-sea gas exchange. These simulations can be used
83 to evaluate net carbon removal by comparing integrations that include the OAE signal to others in which that forcing is not
84 present — i.e., the baseline counterfactual condition or “control.” If an ensemble of integrations is performed, the variation of
85 net carbon removal across the ensemble can be used to assess uncertainty. Notably, there are different potential sources of
86 uncertainty: If intrinsic variability in ocean dynamics is considered the dominant source of uncertainty, an initial condition
87 ensemble could provide an appropriate representation of uncertainty. If model structure, in contrast, is the dominant source of
88 uncertainty, alternative approaches to ensemble construction could be employed, including perturbing parameters or using
89 multiple models (see Fennel et al., 2023, this Guide for further discussion). Explicit simulation of OAE deployments can be
90 compared to observations, including measurements from background observing systems, as well as bespoke data collection
91 efforts associated with the OAE project. In some cases, explicit data assimilation (DA) procedures may be applied (see Fennel
92 et al., 2023, this Guide), potentially reducing model-data misfits and improving confidence in the model simulations. One

93 challenge of applying DA to MRV is estimating additionality, which requires information about both the actual temporal
94 evolution of the system and the counterfactual condition, i.e., the state of the system that would have occurred in the absence
95 of the CDR intervention. The counterfactual condition is impossible to observe directly, and to the extent that observations
96 contain an imprint of the CDR, DA cannot be used to generate explicit estimates of the baseline state. This raises conceptual
97 issues because simulations conducted with and without DA are not directly comparable; thus, a difference between DA-
98 constrained and free-running models cannot provide a valid estimate of additionality. Further research is needed to understand
99 and address these problems. Potential solutions may rely on the assumption that CDR signals are very small relative to the
00 background variability and, thus, essentially negligible in the context of the constraints on model solutions imposed by DA.
01 Further, if the CDR interventions can be assumed to have negligible impact on physical variables (e.g., temperature, salinity,
02 currents, etc.), it may be possible to use DA selectively on just these variables.

03 **4.1 Modelling alkalinity addition**

04 For the effects of OAE to be properly simulated, models must be supplied with the correct amount of alkalinity applied
05 as forcing. Alkalinity additions, if performed over hours to days, are likely to occur on scales much smaller than the ensuing
06 anomaly generated in air-sea CO₂ exchange, typically occurring over months to years (see Section 2). For this reason, MRV
07 frameworks must invoke a separation of concerns, wherein near-field (i.e., within a few km of the source) processes are treated
08 differently than the broader regional effects. Explicit modeling of near-field dynamics is likely to require different modeling
09 frameworks (e.g., McGillicuddy, 2016) than those simulating the full expression of the OAE effects in the ocean—however,
10 it is not necessarily a requirement to simulate near-field dynamics in the context of MRV. Near-field processes must be
11 constrained by direct observations, and/or their dynamics must be accurately captured in verified parameterizations applied to
12 models too coarse to simulate the local effects explicitly (e.g., Fox-Kemper et al., 2019). Notably, different OAE technologies
13 and feedstocks present different challenges in this regard (see Eisaman et al., 2023, this Guide). Electrochemical techniques,
14 which might produce, for instance, an alkalinity-enhanced stream from an outfall pipe, are different from crushed-rock
15 particulates where dissolution kinetics come into play. Moreover, as discussed in Fennel et al. (2023, this Guide), ancillary
16 constituents (e.g., iron or nickel) associated with rock-derived feedstocks may induce biological responses with impacts on the
17 total efficacy of the OAE process.

18 **4.2 Representing OAE effects**

19 To provide a suitable basis for MRV applied to OAE deployments, models must meet several requirements and
20 provide a sufficiently accurate representation of alkalinity additions. First, models must provide a reasonable representation of
21 ocean circulation and mixing; these processes are critical to determining the residence time of added alkalinity in the surface
22 mixed layer, where gas exchange with the atmosphere is possible. Given that the equilibration time scale for CO₂ via gas
23 exchange is long, the residence time of alkalinity-enhanced water parcels at the ocean surface is likely a primary control on
24 the efficiency of uptake (He and Tyka, 2023). Second, the models must accurately capture the surface ocean pCO₂ anomaly

25 induced by alkalinity additions. This implies having a correct representation of the carbon system thermodynamics (see Fennel
26 et al., 2023, this Guide). Further, since the change in $p\text{CO}_2$ depends on the background DIC:TA ratio (Hinrichs et al., 2023), it
27 is important that the model has a good representation of the mean state prior to perturbation (Planchat et al., 2023). Third,
28 presuming an accurate representation of the change in $p\text{CO}_2$ and the transport of alkalinity following injection, the model must
29 be able to simulate air-sea CO_2 exchange with sufficient accuracy. Notably, the gas transfer velocity is highly uncertain,
30 particularly in coastal environments where many OAE deployments are likely to occur (e.g., Dobashi and Ho, 2023). If surface
31 water residence times are much longer than the gas equilibration timescale, uncertainty in the gas transfer velocity may not
32 contribute substantially to the overall uncertainty—but in intermediate regimes where the two timescales are comparable,
33 uncertainty in the gas transfer velocity may be an important consideration. Finally, a comprehensive assessment of OAE
34 efficacy will depend on accurate characterization of feedbacks in the biological system. If there are changes in the natural
35 distribution of calcification or organic carbon export, this term should be quantified—or its potential magnitude and impact on
36 overall carbon transfer should be assessed as a component of the uncertainty budget. At present, further empirical research is
37 required to enable modeling systems to treat this aspect of OAE effects robustly (Fennel et al., 2023, this Guide).

38 **5. The way forward for MRV of OAE**

39 There is much work to be done to establish how to optimize monitoring OAE with respect to which observations are
40 needed and at what spatial and temporal resolution and duration. Nevertheless, early field trials should all monitor the initial
41 increase in alkalinity (i.e., both measured and modeled). Baseline alkalinity measurements should be made so that the range
42 of concentration within its natural variability is known before the deployment of alkalinity. Furthermore, if the enhancement
43 is done via the dissolution of pulverized rocks, the dissolution rate needs to be known under in situ conditions. Knowledge of
44 this rate includes the dependency on various factors such as temperature, salinity, etc. but also to what extent minerals become
45 buried in sediments and how this change in exposure affects dissolution. If the enhancement is done via electrochemistry, the
46 dosing rate of the solution (e.g., containing $\text{Mg}(\text{OH})_2$ or NaOH) should be quantified and reported with complete information
47 about the measurement methods and a thorough accounting of their uncertainties.

48 Furthermore, any potential secondary precipitation caused by the alkalinity enhancement (e.g., if alkalinity is added
49 too quickly, brucite precipitation could occur) should be monitored. Monitoring of secondary precipitation is particularly
50 critical in the non-equilibrated state (i.e., before atmospheric CO_2 influx has occurred) and when the alkalinity-perturbed patch
51 is in close contact with sediments since the risk for secondary precipitation is particularly high under these circumstances (see
52 Eisaman et al., 2023, this Guide; Schulz et al., 2023, this Guide).

53 Finally, the drawdown of CO_2 in the ocean due to alkalinity addition should be measured. Given the potential natural
54 variability in $p\text{CO}_2$, especially in coastal regions, monitoring of $p\text{CO}_2$ should also be done before the OAE deployment.
55 Considering the spatial and time scales discussed above, these measurements will need to be complemented by modeling
56 approaches.

57 MRV of CO₂ influx after the application of OAE will likely depend on fit-for-purpose modeling (see Fennel et al.,
58 2023, this Guide). Exceptions to this may apply if the deployment is made in an enclosed area where the water is confined, or
59 the deployment is made in a heavily instrumented and surveyed area of the ocean. Models used to constrain atmospheric CO₂
60 influx must be calibrated and evaluated with observations. Since CO₂ influx is due to physical and chemical processes, the
61 following observational data to improve the modeling framework includes (but is not restricted to):

- 62 • Observations of ocean currents from acoustic Doppler current profilers (ADCPs), Lagrangian floats, tracers like SF₆,
63 and remote sensing;
- 64 • Observations of air-sea gas exchange from ³He/SF₆ tracer release experiments;
- 65 • Temperature and salinity profile measurements;
- 66 • Measurements of carbonate chemistry parameters (i.e., TA, pH, *p*CO₂, and DIC).

67 While it appears that OBMs will ultimately provide a critical foundation for robust ocean MRV frameworks, they are
68 not currently ready to serve in this capacity (Fennel et al., 2023, this Guide). These models represent complicated systems;
69 Ocean General Circulation Models (OGCMs) are based on fundamental governing equations, but solving these equations
70 numerically requires approximations (e.g., Fox-Kemper et al. 2019). Ocean ecosystems comprise diverse groups of organisms
71 with differing physiological capacities and complex interactions. There are no generally accepted governing equations for
72 these systems; rather, models are built on the basis of empirically determined relationships and theory or hypothesis (e.g.,
73 Planchat et al., 2023). For OBMs to provide a credible basis to support ocean MRV, they must be based on broadly accepted
74 theory or well-constrained parameterizations, and they must be explicitly validated relative to the quantification of gas
75 exchange anomalies arising as a result of perturbations in alkalinity. Models have not yet been robustly validated in the context
76 of these explicit requirements.

77 We note that at this point, we have yet to develop the best modeling tools for OAE MRV (and likely MRV for mCDR
78 in general). A rigorous research and development program to establish OBMs as fit-for-purpose, credible tools for MRV is
79 needed. However, there is currently a major problem with basing MRV on models. OBMs are run on high-performance
80 computing architectures, and because they are big calculations, they are very computationally expensive (and therefore
81 financially expensive). It is unlikely that technological innovation will dramatically reduce this computational cost in the next
82 5-10 years, during which time we will be required to deliver a functional framework for MRV. Therefore, we suggest
83 combining direct model simulations with advanced statistical approaches to overcome the computational challenges. First, we
84 must establish that models can provide credible representations of key CDR processes by ensuring that model output agrees
85 with available observations. Then, we can leverage these models to generate datasets from which to derive robust statistical
86 approximations, including through the application of techniques derived from artificial intelligence and machine learning. For
87 instance, well-calibrated models could be used to produce training data for machine learning algorithms to predict the CDR
88 efficiency of OAE deployments in different locations at different times, i.e., as a function of initial environmental conditions
89 such as water temperature, carbonate chemistry, mixed layer depth such as suggested in Bach et al. (2023).

90 Conducting explicit OAE modeling experiments coupled with field trials are important research milestones necessary
91 to identify the long-term approach to robust MRV. It is likely that the models that can effectively support field trials will use
92 regional OGCMs that are capable of high-fidelity simulations of ocean flows at scales commensurate with those driving the
93 initial dispersion of OAE signal on timescales of weeks to months. Unless alkalinity is continuously applied at a level
94 measurable by long-duration observing platforms, the OAE signals are likely to be diluted and less easily tracked with
95 observations. Critically, it is important to demonstrate that the models provide simulations consistent with the carbonate
96 chemistry and deliberate tracer (e.g., SF₆) observations.

97 Models that compare well to observations can be deemed credible for assessing OAE effects. However, fully explicit
98 mechanistic calculations are computationally intensive and thus unlikely to provide a scalable framework for conducting MRV
99 under the scenario of widespread OAE deployments. On this basis, it is important that research on OAE field trials aims toward
00 building trust in models to develop approaches to MRV that can be accomplished at a reduced computational cost.

01 **6. Key recommendations for MRV of OAE**

02 Early-stage MRV research for OAE may become the foundation on which regulated markets are built. Therefore,
03 such research carries a special obligation toward comprehensiveness, reproducibility, and transparency. To fulfill these
04 obligations, we suggest the following overarching best practice guidelines:

- 05 • Field trials should be co-designed with modelers and observationalists to enable the iterative process of model
06 validation and improvement and dynamically informed data interpretation. In some scenarios, co-design may entail
07 the development of formal Observing System Simulation Experiments, and data-assimilating state estimates (Fennel
08 et al., 2023, this Guide).
- 09 • MRV techniques and results should be well-documented and archived publicly and promptly, without restriction (e.g.,
10 Planetary Technologies, 2023). Ideally, a central registry of OAE experiments would adhere to FAIR (Findable,
11 Accessible, Interoperable, and Reproducible) data standards (Wilkinson et al., 2016). Researchers should eschew any
12 practice that withholds MRV innovation from the community to “build a moat” in support of a commercial mCDR
13 approach.
- 14 • Early field trials are recommended to be as comprehensive as possible, monitoring for obvious, first-order risks like
15 secondary precipitation and more remote tail risks like alterations to export production via shifts in phytoplankton
16 community structure and mineral ballasting.
- 17 • Model evaluation against observations should be tailored to the key processes in question. Fennel et al. (2023, this
18 Guide) argue that models may be used for a long list of purposes, including, for example, simulating ecosystem effects
19 and sediment-water exchanges. Early MRV efforts can expose model skill and deficiencies in simulating these
20 processes if the relevant observations are prioritized.

- 21 • An uncertainty budget should be quantified that includes both known uncertainties (e.g., measurement and mapping
22 errors) and expert estimates of presently unmeasurable risks. A comprehensive assessment of the poorly constrained
23 uncertainties will point to key research areas in the future.

24 **Competing interests**

25 DTH and MCL are Co-Founders as well as Director of Science and Executive Director, respectively, of [C]Worthy, LLC, a
26 non-profit research organization focused on building open-source tools to support MRV for marine CDR. DTH is also a
27 Science Advisor at Carbon Direct, Inc., an end-to-end carbon management company. LTB is a scientific advisor to Submarine,
28 a start-up service provider for MRV of marine CDR.

29 **Acknowledgments**

30 This is a contribution to the “Guide for Best Practices on Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research.” We thank our funders the
31 ClimateWorks Foundation and the Prince Albert II of Monaco Foundation. PWB was supported by the Australian Research
32 Council (ARC) through a Laureate (FL160100131). LTB was supported by the ARC through Future Fellowship
33 (FT200100846) and by the Carbon-to-Sea Initiative. GN has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC)
34 under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 853516 CarbOcean),
35 UGent’s Industrial Research Fund (F2020/IOF-StarTT/088), and Special Research Fund (BOF/STA/202002/011). Thanks are
36 also due to the Villefranche Oceanographic Laboratory for supporting the lead authors' meeting in January 2023.

37 **References**

- 38
- 39 Andersson, A. J., L. A. Krug, N. R. Bates, and S. C. Doney (2013), Sea–air CO₂ flux in the North Atlantic subtropical gyre:
40 Role and influence of Sub-Tropical Mode Water formation, *Deep Sea Res. II*, 91, 57-70,
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2013.02.022>.
- 42 Armstrong, R. A., C. Lee, J. I. Hedges, S. Honjo, and S. G. Wakeham (2001), A new, mechanistic model for organic carbon
43 fluxes in the ocean based on the quantitative association of POC with ballast minerals, *Deep Sea Res. II*, 49(1), 219-236,
44 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645\(01\)00101-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645(01)00101-1).
- 45 Bach, L. T. (2023), The additionality problem of Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement, *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 2023, 1-25,
46 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2023-122>.
- 47 Bach, L. T., S. J. Gill, R. E. M. Rickaby, S. Gore, and P. Renforth (2019), CO₂ Removal with Enhanced Weathering and Ocean
48 Alkalinity Enhancement: Potential Risks and Co-benefits for Marine Pelagic Ecosystems, *Frontiers in Climate*, 1(7),
49 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2019.00007>.
- 50 Bach, L. T., D. T. Ho, P. W. Boyd, and M. D. Tyka (2023), Toward a consensus framework to evaluate air–sea CO₂
51 equilibration for marine CO₂ removal, *Limnology and Oceanography Letters*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/lo2.10330>.
- 52 Balch, W. M., and C. Mitchell (2023), Remote sensing algorithms for particulate inorganic carbon (PIC) and the global cycle
53 of PIC, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 239, 104363, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2023.104363>.
- 54 Bishop, J. K. B., V. J. Amaral, P. J. Lam, T. J. Wood, J.-M. Lee, A. Laubach, A. Barnard, A. Derr, and C. Orrico (2022),
55 Transmitted Cross-Polarized Light Detection of Particulate Inorganic Carbon Concentrations and Fluxes in the Ocean Water
56 Column: Ships to ARGO Floats, *Frontiers in Remote Sensing*, 3, <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsen.2022.837938>.
- 57 Briggs, E. M., S. Sandoval, A. Erten, Y. Takeshita, A. C. Kummel, and T. R. Martz (2017), Solid State Sensor for Simultaneous
58 Measurement of Total Alkalinity and pH of Seawater, *ACS Sensors*, 2(9), 1302-1309,
59 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssensors.7b00305>.
- 60 Carbon Direct and Microsoft (2023), Criteria for high-quality carbon dioxide removal. [Accessed: 26 September 2023].
- 61 Carter, B. R., R. A. Feely, N. L. Williams, A. G. Dickson, M. B. Fong, and Y. Takeshita (2018), Updated methods for global
62 locally interpolated estimation of alkalinity, pH, and nitrate, *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 16(2), 119-131,
63 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lom3.10232>.
- 64 Chavez, F. P., J. Sevadjian, C. Wahl, J. Friederich, and G. E. Friederich (2018), Measurements of pCO₂ and pH from an
65 autonomous surface vehicle in a coastal upwelling system, *Deep Sea Res. II*, 151, 137-146,
66 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2017.01.001>.
- 67 Coale, K. H., K. S. Johnson, S. E. Fitzwater, S. P. G. Blain, T. P. Stanton, and T. L. Coley (1998), IronEx-I, an in situ iron-
68 enrichment experiment: Experimental design, implementation and results, *Deep Sea Res. II*, 45(6), 919-945,
69 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645\(98\)00019-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645(98)00019-8).
- 70 Coale, K. H., K. S. Johnson, S. E. Fitzwater, R. M. Gordon, S. Tanner, F. P. Chavez, L. Ferioli, C. Sakamoto, P. Rogers, F.
71 Millero, P. Steinberg, P. Nightingale, D. Cooper, W. P. Cochlan, M. R. Landry, J. Constantinou, G. Rollwagen, A. Trasvina,
72 and R. Kudela (1996), A massive phytoplankton bloom induced by an ecosystem-scale iron fertilization experiment in the
73 equatorial Pacific Ocean, *Nature*, 383(6600), 495-501, <https://doi.org/10.1038/383495a0>.
- 74 Cyronak, T., R. Albright, and L. Bach (2023), Field experiments in ocean alkalinity enhancement research, in *Guide to Best
75 Practices in Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research (OAE Guide 23)*, edited by A. Oschlies, A. Stevenson, L. Bach, K.
76 Fennel, R. Rickaby, T. Satterfield, R. Webb and J.-P. Gattuso, Copernicus Publications, State Planet, <https://doi.org/10.-XXXXX>.
- 77
- 78 Dobashi, R., and D. T. Ho (2023), Air–sea gas exchange in a seagrass ecosystem – results from a ³He/SF₆ tracer release
79 experiment, *Biogeosciences*, 20(6), 1075-1087, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-20-1075-2023>.
- 80 Eisaman, M. D., S. Geilert, P. Renforth, L. Bastianini, J. Campbell, A. W. Dale, S. Foteinis, P. Grasse, O. Hawrot, C. R.
81 Löscher, G. H. Rau, and J. Rønning (2023), Assessing technical aspects of ocean alkalinity enhancement approaches, in *Guide
82 to Best Practices in Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research (OAE Guide 23)*, edited by A. Oschlies, A. Stevenson, L. Bach,
83 K. Fennel, R. Rickaby, T. Satterfield, R. Webb and J.-P. Gattuso, Copernicus Publications, State Planet, <https://doi.org/10.-XXXXX>.
- 84

85 Fassbender, A. J., S. Schlunegger, K. B. Rodgers, and J. P. Dunne (2022), Quantifying the Role of Seasonality in the Marine
86 Carbon Cycle Feedback: An ESM2M Case Study, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycle*, 36(6), e2021GB007018,
87 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GB007018>.

88 Fennel, K., M. C. Long, C. Algar, B. Carter, D. Keller, A. Laurent, J. P. Mattern, R. Musgrave, A. Oschlies, J. Ostiguy, J.
89 Palter, and D. B. Whitt (2023), Modeling considerations for research on Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement (OAE), in *Guide to*
90 *Best Practices in Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research (OAE Guide 23)*, edited by A. Oschlies, A. Stevenson, L. Bach, K.
91 Fennel, R. Rickaby, T. Satterfield, R. Webb and J.-P. Gattuso, Copernicus Publications, State Planet, <https://doi.org/10.-XXXXX>.

92
93 Ferderer, A., Z. Chase, F. Kennedy, K. G. Schulz, and L. T. Bach (2022), Assessing the influence of ocean alkalinity
94 enhancement on a coastal phytoplankton community, *Biogeosciences*, 19(23), 5375-5399, [https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-5375-](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-5375-2022)
95 [2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-5375-2022).

96 Ford, D. J., G. H. Tilstone, J. D. Shutler, V. Kitidis, K. L. Sheen, G. Dall’Olmo, and I. B. M. Orselli (2023), Mesoscale Eddies
97 Enhance the Air-Sea CO₂ Sink in the South Atlantic Ocean, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 50(9), e2022GL102137,
98 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL102137>.

99 Fox-Kemper, B., A. Adcroft, C. W. Böning, E. P. Chassignet, E. Curchitser, G. Danabasoglu, C. Eden, M. H. England, R.
00 Gerdes, R. J. Greatbatch, S. M. Griffies, R. W. Hallberg, E. Hanert, P. Heimbach, H. T. Hewitt, C. N. Hill, Y. Komuro, S.
01 Legg, J. Le Sommer, S. Masina, S. J. Marsland, S. G. Penny, F. Qiao, T. D. Ringler, A. M. Treguier, H. Tsujino, P. Uotila,
02 and S. G. Yeager (2019), Challenges and Prospects in Ocean Circulation Models, *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 6,
03 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00065>.

04 Friedlingstein, P., M. O’Sullivan, M. W. Jones, R. M. Andrew, L. Gregor, J. Hauck, C. Le Quéré, I. T. Lujikx, A. Olsen, G. P.
05 Peters, W. Peters, J. Pongratz, C. Schwingshackl, S. Sitch, J. G. Canadell, P. Ciais, R. B. Jackson, S. R. Alin, R. Alkama, A.
06 Arneeth, V. K. Arora, N. R. Bates, M. Becker, N. Bellouin, H. C. Bittig, L. Bopp, F. Chevallier, L. P. Chini, M. Cronin, W.
07 Evans, S. Falk, R. A. Feely, T. Gasser, M. Gehlen, T. Gkritzalis, L. Gloege, G. Grassi, N. Gruber, Ö. Gürses, I. Harris, M.
08 Hefner, R. A. Houghton, G. C. Hurtt, Y. Iida, T. Ilyina, A. K. Jain, A. Jersild, K. Kadono, E. Kato, D. Kennedy, K. Klein
09 Goldewijk, J. Knauer, J. I. Korsbakken, P. Landschützer, N. Lefèvre, K. Lindsay, J. Liu, Z. Liu, G. Marland, N. Mayot, M. J.
10 McGrath, N. Metz, N. M. Monacci, D. R. Munro, S. I. Nakaoka, Y. Niwa, K. O’Brien, T. Ono, P. I. Palmer, N. Pan, D. Pierrot,
11 K. Pocock, B. Poulter, L. Resplandy, E. Robertson, C. Rödenbeck, C. Rodriguez, T. M. Rosan, J. Schwinger, R. Séférian, J.
12 D. Shutler, I. Skjelvan, T. Steinhoff, Q. Sun, A. J. Sutton, C. Sweeney, S. Takao, T. Tanhua, P. P. Tans, X. Tian, H. Tian, B.
13 Tilbrook, H. Tsujino, F. Tubiello, G. R. van der Werf, A. P. Walker, R. Wanninkhof, C. Whitehead, A. Willstrand Wranne, R.
14 Wright, W. Yuan, C. Yue, X. Yue, S. Zaehle, J. Zeng, and B. Zheng (2022), Global Carbon Budget 2022, *Earth Syst. Sci.*
15 *Data*, 14(11), 4811-4900, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-4811-2022>.

16 Fuhr, M., S. Geilert, M. Schmidt, V. Liebetrau, C. Vogt, B. Ledwig, and K. Wallmann (2022), Kinetics of Olivine Weathering
17 in Seawater: An Experimental Study, *Frontiers in Climate*, 4, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2022.831587>.

18 Gatley, J. A., S. M. Kim, B. Jin, M. A. Brzezinski, and M. D. Iglesias-Rodriguez (2023), Coccolithophores and diatoms
19 resilient to ocean alkalinity enhancement: A glimpse of hope?, *Science Advances*, 9(24), eadg6066,
20 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adg6066>.

21 Hartmann, J., N. Suitner, C. Lim, J. Schneider, L. Marin-Samper, J. Aristegui, P. Renforth, J. Taucher, and U. Riebesell (2023),
22 Stability of alkalinity in ocean alkalinity enhancement (OAE) approaches – consequences for durability of CO₂ storage,
23 *Biogeosciences*, 20(4), 781-802, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-20-781-2023>.

24 He, J., and M. D. Tyka (2023), Limits and CO₂ equilibration of near-coast alkalinity enhancement, *Biogeosciences*, 20(1), 27-
25 43, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-20-27-2023>.

26 Hinrichs, C., P. Köhler, C. Völker, and J. Hauck (2023), Alkalinity biases in CMIP6 Earth System Models and implications
27 for simulated CO₂ drawdown via artificial alkalinity enhancement, *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 2023, 1-21,
28 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2023-26>.

29 Ho, D. T., C. S. Law, M. J. Smith, P. Schlosser, M. Harvey, and P. Hill (2006), Measurements of air-sea gas exchange at high
30 wind speeds in the Southern Ocean: Implications for global parameterizations, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L16611,
31 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL026817>.

32 Huang, Y., Andrea J. Fassbender, and Seth M. Bushinsky (2023), Biogenic carbon pool production maintains the Southern
33 Ocean carbon sink, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(18), e2217909120,
34 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2217909120>.

35 Iglesias-Rodríguez, M. D., R. E. M. Rickaby, A. Singh, and J. A. Gately (2023), Laboratory experiments in ocean alkalinity
36 enhancement research, in *Guide to Best Practices in Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research (OAE Guide 23)*, edited by A.
37 Oschlies, A. Stevenson, L. Bach, K. Fennel, R. Rickaby, T. Satterfield, R. Webb and J.-P. Gattuso, Copernicus Publications,
38 State Planet, <https://doi.org/10.-XXXXX>.

39 Iudicone, D., K. B. Rodgers, Y. Plancherel, O. Aumont, T. Ito, R. M. Key, G. Madec, and M. Ishii (2016), The formation of
40 the ocean's anthropogenic carbon reservoir, *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 35473, <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep35473>.

41 James, K. B. B. (2009), Autonomous Observations of the Ocean Biological Carbon Pump, *Oceanography*, 22,
42 <https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2009.48>.

43 Jones, D. C., T. Ito, Y. Takano, and W.-C. Hsu (2014), Spatial and seasonal variability of the air-sea equilibration timescale
44 of carbon dioxide, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycle*, 28(11), 1163-1178, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GB004813>.

45 Klaas, C., and D. E. Archer (2002), Association of sinking organic matter with various types of mineral ballast in the deep sea:
46 Implications for the rain ratio, *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycle*, 16(4), 63-61-63-14, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GB001765>.

47 Landschützer, P., G. G. Laruelle, A. Roobaert, and P. Regnier (2020), A uniform pCO₂ climatology combining open and
48 coastal oceans, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 12(4), 2537-2553, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-2537-2020>.

49 Law, C. S., W. R. Crawford, M. J. Smith, P. W. Boyd, C. S. Wong, Y. Nojiri, M. Robert, E. R. Abraham, W. K. Johnson, V.
50 Forsland, and M. Arychuk (2006), Patch evolution and the biogeochemical impact of entrainment during an iron fertilisation
51 experiment in the sub-Arctic Pacific, *Deep Sea Res. II*, 53(20), 2012-2033, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2006.05.028>.

52 McGillicuddy, D. J. (2016), Mechanisms of Physical-Biological-Biogeochemical Interaction at the Oceanic Mesoscale, *Ann*
53 *Rev Mar Sci*, 8(1), 125-159, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-010814-015606>.

54 Middelburg, J. J., K. Soetaert, and M. Hagens (2020), Ocean Alkalinity, Buffering and Biogeochemical Processes, *Rev.*
55 *Geophys.*, 58(3), e2019RG000681, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000681>.

56 Moras, C. A., L. T. Bach, T. Cyronak, R. Joannes-Boyau, and K. G. Schulz (2022), Ocean alkalinity enhancement – avoiding
57 runaway CaCO₃ precipitation during quick and hydrated lime dissolution, *Biogeosciences*, 19(15), 3537-3557,
58 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-3537-2022>.

59 Mu, L., J. B. Palter, and H. Wang (2023), Considerations for hypothetical carbon dioxide removal via alkalinity addition in
60 the Amazon River watershed, *Biogeosciences*, 20(10), 1963-1977, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-20-1963-2023>.

61 Nakano, H., H. Tsujino, M. Hirabara, T. Yasuda, T. Motoi, M. Ishii, and G. Yamanaka (2011), Uptake mechanism of
62 anthropogenic CO₂ in the Kuroshio Extension region in an ocean general circulation model, *Journal of Oceanography*, 67(6),
63 765-783, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10872-011-0075-7>.

64 Neukermans, G., L. T. Bach, A. Butterley, Q. Sun, H. Claustre, and G. R. Fournier (2023), Quantitative and mechanistic
65 understanding of the open ocean carbonate pump - perspectives for remote sensing and autonomous in situ observation, *Earth-*
66 *Science Reviews*, 239, 104359, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2023.104359>.

67 Neukermans, G., and G. R. Fournier (2022), A method to produce a matched pair of polarizing filters and a method and
68 apparatus to determine the concentration of birefringent particles using a pair of polarizing filters, edited.

69 Nicholson, S.-A., D. B. Whitt, I. Fer, M. D. du Plessis, A. D. Lebéhot, S. Swart, A. J. Sutton, and P. M. S. Monteiro (2022),
70 Storms drive outgassing of CO₂ in the subpolar Southern Ocean, *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 158,
71 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27780-w>.

72 Nickford, S., J. B. Palter, K. Donohue, A. J. Fassbender, A. R. Gray, J. Long, A. J. Sutton, N. R. Bates, and Y. Takeshita
73 (2022), Autonomous Wintertime Observations of Air-Sea Exchange in the Gulf Stream Reveal a Perfect Storm for Ocean CO₂
74 Uptake, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 49(5), e2021GL096805, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL096805>.

75 Palter, J. B., J. Cross, M. C. Long, P. A. Rafter, and C. E. Reimers (2023), The science we need to assess marine carbon dioxide
76 removal, *Eos*, 104, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023EO230214>.

77 Planchat, A., L. Kwiatkowski, L. Bopp, O. Torres, J. R. Christian, M. Butenschön, T. Lovato, R. Séférian, M. A. Chamberlain,
78 O. Aumont, M. Watanabe, A. Yamamoto, A. Yool, T. Ilyina, H. Tsujino, K. M. Krumhardt, J. Schwinger, J. Tjiputra, J. P.
79 Dunne, and C. Stock (2023), The representation of alkalinity and the carbonate pump from CMIP5 to CMIP6 Earth system
80 models and implications for the carbon cycle, *Biogeosciences*, 20(7), 1195-1257, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-20-1195-2023>.

81 Planetary Technologies (2023), Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) Protocol for OAE Carbon Removals.
82 [Accessed: 1 September, 2023].

83 Riebesell, U., D. Basso, S. Geilert, A. W. Dale, M. Kreuzburg, and F. Meysman (2023), Mesocosm experiments in ocean
84 alkalinity enhancement research, in *Guide to Best Practices in Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research (OAE Guide 23)*,

85 edited by A. Oschlies, A. Stevenson, L. Bach, K. Fennel, R. Rickaby, T. Satterfield, R. Webb and J.-P. Gattuso, Copernicus
86 Publications, State Planet, <https://doi.org/10.-XXXXX>.

87 Rödenbeck, C., T. DeVries, J. Hauck, C. Le Quéré, and R. F. Keeling (2022), Data-based estimates of interannual sea–air CO₂
88 flux variations 1957–2020 and their relation to environmental drivers, *Biogeosciences*, 19(10), 2627-2652,
89 <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-2627-2022>.

90 Sabine, C., A. Sutton, K. McCabe, N. Lawrence-Slavas, S. Alin, R. Feely, R. Jenkins, S. Maenner, C. Meinig, J. Thomas, E.
91 van Ooijen, A. Passmore, and B. Tilbrook (2020), Evaluation of a New Carbon Dioxide System for Autonomous Surface
92 Vehicles, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Tech.*, 37(8), 1305-1317, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-20-0010.1>.

93 Sarmiento, J. L., and N. Gruber (2006), *Ocean Biogeochemical Dynamics*, Princeton University Press,
94 <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt3fgxqx>.

95 Schulz, K. G., L. T. Bach, and A. G. Dickson (2023), Seawater carbonate system considerations for ocean alkalinity
96 enhancement research, in *Guide to Best Practices in Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement Research (OAE Guide 23)*, edited by A.
97 Oschlies, A. Stevenson, L. Bach, K. Fennel, R. Rickaby, T. Satterfield, R. Webb and J.-P. Gattuso, Copernicus Publications,
98 State Planet, <https://doi.org/10.-XXXXX>.

99 Sharp, J. D., A. J. Fassbender, B. R. Carter, P. D. Lavin, and A. J. Sutton (2022), A monthly surface pCO₂ product for the
00 California Current Large Marine Ecosystem, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 14(4), 2081-2108, [https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-2081-](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-2081-2022)
01 [2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-2081-2022).

02 Smetacek, V., C. Klaas, V. H. Strass, P. Assmy, M. Montresor, B. Cisewski, N. Savoye, A. Webb, F. d’Ovidio, J. M. Arrieta,
03 U. Bathmann, R. Bellerby, G. M. Berg, P. Croot, S. Gonzalez, J. Henjes, G. J. Herndl, L. J. Hoffmann, H. Leach, M. Losch,
04 M. M. Mills, C. Neill, I. Peeken, R. Röttgers, O. Sachs, E. Sauter, M. M. Schmidt, J. Schwarz, A. Terbrüggen, and D. Wolf-
05 Gladrow (2012), Deep carbon export from a Southern Ocean iron-fertilized diatom bloom, *Nature*, 487(7407), 313-319,
06 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11229>.

07 Smith, S. M., O. Geden, G. Nemet, M. Gidden, W. F. Lamb, C. Powis, R. Bellamy, M. Callaghan, A. Cowie, E. Cox, S. Fuss,
08 T. Gasser, G. Grassi, J. Greene, S. Lück, A. Mohan, F. Müller-Hansen, G. Peters, Y. Pratama, T. Repke, K. Riahi, F. Schenuit,
09 J. Steinhäuser, J. Streffler, J. M. Valenzuela, and J. C. Minx (2023), The State of Carbon Dioxide Removal - 1st Edition, *Rep.*
10 Sutton, A. J., N. L. Williams, and B. Tilbrook (2021), Constraining Southern Ocean CO₂ Flux Uncertainty Using Uncrewed
11 Surface Vehicle Observations, 48(3), e2020GL091748, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091748>.

12 Torres, O., L. Kwiatkowski, A. J. Sutton, N. Dorey, and J. C. Orr (2021), Characterizing Mean and Extreme Diurnal Variability
13 of Ocean CO₂ System Variables Across Marine Environments, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 48(5), e2020GL090228,
14 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090228>.

15 Wang, H., D. J. Pilcher, K. A. Kearney, J. N. Cross, O. M. Shugart, M. D. Eisaman, and B. R. Carter (2023), Simulated Impact
16 of Ocean Alkalinity Enhancement on Atmospheric CO₂ Removal in the Bering Sea, *Earth's Future*, 11(1), e2022EF002816,
17 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022EF002816>.

18 Wanninkhof, R., W. Asher, R. Weppernig, H. Chen, P. Schlosser, C. Langdon, and R. Sambrotto (1993), Gas transfer
19 experiment on Georges Bank using two volatile deliberate tracers, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 20237-20248,
20 <https://doi.org/10.1029/93JC01844>.

21 Wanninkhof, R., G.-H. Park, T. Takahashi, R. A. Feely, J. L. Bullister, and S. C. Doney (2013), Changes in deep-water CO₂
22 concentrations over the last several decades determined from discrete pCO₂ measurements, *Deep-Sea Res. I*, 74, 48-63,
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2012.12.005>.

24 Wilkinson, M. D., M. Dumontier, I. J. Aalbersberg, G. Appleton, M. Axton, A. Baak, N. Blomberg, J.-W. Boiten, L. B. da
25 Silva Santos, P. E. Bourne, J. Bouwman, A. J. Brookes, T. Clark, M. Crosas, I. Dillo, O. Dumon, S. Edmunds, C. T. Evelo, R.
26 Finkers, A. Gonzalez-Beltran, A. J. G. Gray, P. Groth, C. Goble, J. S. Grethe, J. Heringa, P. A. C. ’t Hoen, R. Hooft, T. Kuhn,
27 R. Kok, J. Kok, S. J. Lusher, M. E. Martone, A. Mons, A. L. Packer, B. Persson, P. Rocca-Serra, M. Roos, R. van Schaik, S.-
28 A. Sansone, E. Schultes, T. Sengstag, T. Slater, G. Strawn, M. A. Swertz, M. Thompson, J. van der Lei, E. van Mulligen, J.
29 Velterop, A. Waagmeester, P. Wittenburg, K. Wolstencroft, J. Zhao, and B. Mons (2016), The FAIR Guiding Principles for
30 scientific data management and stewardship, *Scientific Data*, 3(1), 160018, <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>.

31 Wimart-Rousseau, C., T. Steinhoff, B. Klein, H. Bittig, and A. Körtzinger (2023), Technical note: Enhancement of float-pH
32 data quality control methods: A study case in the Subpolar Northwestern Atlantic region, *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 2023, 1-
33 26, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2023-76>.

34