

Responses to Anonymous Referee #1 on submission to Geoscientific Model Development Discussion (doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-22).

Submitted by Anna Harper on behalf of myself and my co-authors.

We thank the referee for your helpful comments on the manuscript and for taking the time to review it. Below we include the referee comments in black and our responses in red. The supplement contains a revised manuscript with red indicating changed sections. All line numbers refer to that version of the manuscript. Note the revised manuscript also includes some edits of minor errors (all in red for traceability).

The paper "Improved representation of plant functional types and physiology in the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES v4.2) using plant trait information" present several improvements of the JULES DGVM. these improvement are first based on increasing the number of PFTs from 5 to 9 to better represent the different types of leaves in the leaf economic spectrum including deciduous and evergreen trees and a separation between climate zones. Second improvement was done in estimation of leaf photosynthesis from leaf nitrogen and improvement of phenology considering a more realistic leaf longevity.

This is an important paper that allow to follow recent developments of the JULES model and perfectly fit to the objective GMD. The changes are sufficiently important to justify the publication of a paper. The paper is well written with a convincing evaluation of new model performances both at site level and at global scale. The results show a clear improvement of the model at different scales. For all these reasons I recommend the paper for publication. Here after are just some minor comments that could help to improve the manuscript:

- There is no real justification of the choice of 9 PFTs except as a minimum to represent the main leaves forms. Obviously, for technical reasons, the number of PFTs cannot be increase indefinitely and then a compromise should be find but it would be interesting to see if including a higher number of PFT should also give higher performances?

One way could be to look to the differences between simulated GPP and NPP and respectively Jung and MODIS maps for each pixels and each PFT. Then we could see if there is spatially coherent systematic bias that could show possible new PFT separation.

It's true that the choice of PFTs is subjective. The 9 PFTs were chosen as they represent the range of deciduous and evergreen plant types with minimal externally determined bioclimatic limits. The distinction between tropical and temperate broadleaf evergreen trees exists to account for the important differences between these types of trees, as described in the Introduction. In particular, measured V_{cmax} for a given leaf N per unit area (N_A) can be lower in tropical evergreen trees than in temperate broadleaf evergreen trees (Kattge et al., 2009), resulting in lower V_{cmax} and maximum assimilation rates for tropical forests. We have added these justifications in the Discussion (Lines 759-763).

Previously JULES was hard-wired for 5 PFTs. An important step in going from 5 to 9 PFTs was removing this hardwiring. Now users can define the number of PFTs, so the 9 documented in this paper are a recommendation but can be adjusted in the future. This is now mentioned at Line 754-756.

However, it is a good suggestion to evaluate in a more objective way if an appropriate number of PFTs has been chosen. One logical way to further subdivide the PFTs is based on the biome maps, which is similar to the reviewer's suggestion. The analysis in the manuscript was based on an

original data set of 14 biomes, where some biomes were combined for a total of 7 biomes. In a new figure (Fig. SM6) we show the biases in JULES5 and JULES9 for 11 of the original 14 biomes (3 biomes are very small and had no visible differences in the maps: Tropical Coniferous forests, Mangroves, and Flooded grasslands/savannas). The area-weighted RMSE is given in the top left of each map. Some biomes do not show an improvement in JULES9 and this gives some indication where extra PFTs might improve the simulation: for example the Boreal Forests/Tiaga; Tundra; Mediterranean woodlands; and Desert/Xeric Shrublands. Also the biases are still very high for the tropical/subtropical forest and grassland biomes. These regions broadly agree with what was mentioned in Section 5.2. We have added a more specific recommendation for development in these regions at Line 770-772.

However we also caution against defining too many PFTs, as there is already overlap between the N_m and LMA traits (Fig. 1c). In developing new PFTs it would be ideal to determine definitions that result in distinctive sets of traits. Future work will address the possibility of more PFTs or improved processes with the new framework for flexible PFTs in JULES.

minor comments on figures:

- Figure 7: what represent the grey zone ?

This is the standard deviation of the observed fluxes, based on the monthly means from all months. This information has been added to the caption.

- Figure 8: The figure is difficult to read mainly because this is tiny figures. Should it be possible to split it to have larger figures ?

We rearranged this figure so the individual panels can be larger.

General comment for reviewers:

Note that in two places we have changed “tuning” to “calibration” as the parameter changes were not really tuned in a strict sense (Line 167, Line 1204). There is a tool for tuning parameters in JULES (adJULES, Raoult et al., 2016), but this was not used in this study. So we believe the change from “tuning” to “calibration” is a more appropriate description of what was done, and will avoid confusion between what can be done with adJULES and the techniques used in this study (adjustment of parameters to correct biases, or more frequently new parameters based on data and literature review). The justification for each parameter change has already been provided in the Methods section.

Lines 167-168: Updated parameters were based on review of literature




Figure 7. Area-averaged seasonal cycles of GPP from the biomes shown in Fig. 3, comparing JULES5, JULES9, and the Jung et al. (2011) MTE. Also shown are the temperature and precipitation from the CRU-NCEP dataset used to force the JULES simulations. The gray shading in the GPP plots shows the MTE GPP ± 1 standard deviation based on the area-averaged standard deviations of monthly fluxes for each grid cell.

— MTE
— JULES9-ALL
— JULES5




Figure 8. Global maps of carbon cycle fluxes from 2000-2012. The observation sources are: MTE (GPP), and MODIS MOD17 (NPP, 2000-2013).




Figure S6a. Differences between JULES5 and JULES9 and the MTE GPP for each of the 11 major biomes from the WWF database (biomes with area > 1,000 km²). The area-average root mean square error is given for each map.




Figure S6b. Differences between JULES5 and JULES9 and the MTE GPP for each of the 11 major biomes from the WWF database (biomes with area > 1,000 km²). The area-average root mean square error is given for each map.




Figure S6c. Differences between JULES5 and JULES9 and the MTE GPP for each of the 11 major biomes from the WWF database (biomes with area $> 1,000 \text{ km}^2$). The area-average root mean square error is given for each map.

Responses to Anonymous Referee #2 on submission to Geoscientific Model Development Discussion (doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-22).

Submitted by Anna Harper on behalf of myself and my co-authors.

We thank the referee for your helpful comments on the manuscript and for taking the time to review it. Below we include the referee comments in black (with the specific questions addressed in bold), and our responses in red. The supplement contains a revised manuscript with red indicating changed sections. All line numbers refer to that version of the manuscript. Note the revised manuscript also includes some edits of minor errors (all in red for traceability).

The authors present a version of the JULES land surface model with a more detailed dynamic vegetation model and show that this gives more accurate carbon fluxes than the traditional version of JULES. It is of great interest and should be published. **My only question is whether you could you have got the same answer by tuning the old version of JULES?** Adding extra PFTs will cause greater complication than tuning parameters, especially when competition between PFTs is turned on. You say you corrected known biases in the model. **Did these same biases get corrected in the original, 5 PFT version, or just the new version?** If not, I think you should have added an extra experiment to assess the relative impact on the flux from adding the additional PFTs and the tuning. **Would just correcting the 5 PFT JULES have had the same impact as adding extra PFTs?** I think that some discussion of this, and ideally an extra experiment, is needed.

First, we address the question of tuning. In this study, we have used observations to constrain the model. This has improved the model and it has helped detect areas of the model that are wrong and require further improvements to representation of processes. The parameter changes that have been made are backed up with data and so we are putting the right values for the right reason. Tuning can give you the right answer but not always for the right reason, and so should be done carefully.

There is ongoing work to tune certain JULES parameters. Another paper is in review with GMD to evaluate the tuning method (Raoult et al., *in review*). The next step in the model's development will be to combine the tuning with the new trait-based representation presented in this study.

We argue that the extra complication that results from the new PFTs is worth the benefit of having more diverse plant types, which should enable more diverse and specific responses to climate change. A follow-up paper is being finalized which analyzes the impacts of the new PFTs when JULES is run with dynamic vegetation, and results are also improved in this mode.

At the same time, it would be good to evaluate the improvements with extra PFTs compared to just improving parameters with 5 PFTs. As the reviewer suggested, we added a third global experiment to test the 5 PFTs with improved parameters, as in Table SM2. The supplemental material now includes this table plus recommendations for running JULES with 5 PFTs and improved parameters.

Table SM2. New trait-based parameters for 5 PFTs that are consistent with TRY data. N_m , LMA, and γ_0 ($=1/[\text{leaf lifespan in years}]$) were calculated directly from the data collected. The slopes and intercept parameters for V_{cmax} (s_v and i_v , respectively) were calculated based on the average of observed values available from Kattge et al. (2009).

	BT	NT	C3	C4	SH
N_m	0.0185	0.0117	0.0240	0.0113	0.0175
LMA	0.1012	0.2240	0.0495	0.1370	0.1023
s_v	25.48	18.15	40.96	20.48	23.15
i_v	6.12	6.32	6.42	0.00	14.71
$V_{\text{cmax},25}$	53.84	53.88	55.08	31.71	56.15
T_{off}	5	-40	5	5	-40
d_T	9	9	0	0	9
γ_0	0.25	0.25	3.0	3.0	0.66
γ_p	20	15	20	20	15
L_{min}	1	1	1	1	1
L_{max}	9	7	3	3	4

We also change the following parameters from their default value in Table 1 to make the parameters consistent with JULES9_{ALL}:

	BT	NT	C ₃	C ₄	SH
D_{crit}	0.09	0.06	0.051	0.075	0.037
f_0	0.875	0.875	0.931	0.800	0.950
f_d	0.010	0.015	0.019	0.019	0.015
$rootd$	3	2	0.5	0.5	1
T_{low}	5	0	10	13	0
T_{opt}	39	32	28	41	32
T_{upp}	43	36	32	45	36
α	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.08
μ_{rl}	0.67	0.67	0.72	0.72	0.67
μ_{sl}	0.10	0.10	1.00	1.00	0.10

The new experiment is called JULES5_{ALL}, since it included as many parameter updates as possible to give a fair comparison between JULES with 5 PFTs and JULES9_{ALL}. Most of the differences in GPP and NPP between JULES5_{ALL} and JULES9_{ALL} were in the tropics. The global GPP was high (135 Pg C yr⁻¹) in JULES5_{ALL}, primarily because V_{cmax} for the average broadleaf tree (53.84 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) was much higher than for the tropical broadleaf evergreen PFT (41.17 $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$). Although tropical GPP was higher in JULES5_{ALL} compared to JULES9_{ALL}, the NPP was lower and closer to the values from MODIS NPP. The reason was the differences in leaf nitrogen, which increased respiratory costs in JULES5_{ALL} compared to JULES9_{ALL}. Both N_A and N_m were higher for the broadleaf tree PFT (1.87 g N m⁻² and 0.0185 g N g⁻¹, respectively) than for the tropical evergreen broadleaf tree PFT (1.77 g N m⁻² and 0.0170 g N g⁻¹, respectively).

We have added an explanation of this simulation, its results, and implications in the manuscript at Lines: 439-442, 679-687, and 759-767. Also the global results are shown in a new figure (Fig. 9) and summarized on a per-biome basis in Table 6.

Table 6a. Area-weighted GPP from each biome ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). The biome total GPP from MTE is given in Pg C yr^{-1} to give perspective of each biome's role in the global total.

Biome	JULES5	JULES9	JULES5-ALL	MTE	MTE total
Tropical forest	2403±217	2295±191	2505±217	2244±297	49.9
Tropical forest: Only BET-Tr.	2924±144	2955±147	3279±178	2790±273	
Tropical savannah	1355±244	1268±223	1320±237	1111±257	21.9
Extratropical mixed forests	947±147	1082±158	1119±167	1119±212	2.9 (13.4*)
Boreal and coniferous forests	514±99	597±118	645±122	650±203	12.1
Temperate grasslands	420±145	465±138	477±140	509±184	8.1
Deserts and shrublands	82±48	91±46	91±47	283±200	4.9
Tundra	86±20	94±20	101±20	279±233	1.9
Mediterranean Woodlands	324±147	407±136	405±140	510±190	1.5

*Value for EMF biome when agricultural mask is not applied.

Table 6b. Area-weighted NPP from each biome ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$).

Biome	JULES5	JULES9	JULES5-ALL	MODIS17
Tropical forest	956±144	1007±125	951±143	786±352
Only BET-Tr.	1141±101	1233±103	1109±126	929±315
Tropical savannah	527±158	591±143	584±152	451±319
Extratropical mixed forests	586±93	631±104	640±110	563±231
Boreal and coniferous forests	307±65	358±77	385±80	350±155
Temperate grasslands	180±94	243±89	242±90	304±247
Deserts and shrublands	16±29	35±29	33±29	111±133
Tundra	52±14	61±13	65±13	136±94
Mediterranean Woodlands	118±94	201±89	195±89	324±184

Further referee comments:

Experiments 4+ are discussed before experiments 1 to 3 in the text. It would be easier to follow if all the experiments were described in the same way and in the same order. Perhaps move the method around line 515 from the results section to before the first mention of experiment 4?

We switched sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 so the Experiments are described in Section 2 in the correct order. We also added further explanation of these experiments at the beginning of Section 2 (~Line 170-172), and of the calculation of the relative statistics (Line 469-470). However now Table 4 is mentioned before Table 3 so these are switched throughout the manuscript.

Table SM 2 gives tuned parameters for the tuned 5 PFT JULES, but I cannot find a reference to that in the text. Is there a missing section?

Yes Table SM2 should be referenced in the text. Thank you for catching this. It is now referred to at Line 176-177. Also extra discussion is added to the supplementary material (see page 3 of SM).

"and updated the model phenology to include a trade-off between leaf lifespan and leaf mass per unit area." - Does your improvement not just change the leaf turnover rate and its impact on the carbon flux rather than the phenology, which is still controlled in the same way as traditional JULES?

It is true that the equations controlling phenology in JULES (Eq. 15-16) were not changed. However, changing the temperature threshold, T_{off} , did change the timing of when leaves grow in the fall and senesce in the fall. The trade-off referred to here is included in JULES by increasing leaf growth in the spring (γ_p) and turnover rates in the fall (γ_0) for leaves with low LMA, while maintaining low turnover rates for the thicker, longer-lived leaves. However it could be misleading to say the phenology was updated since no structural changes were made to the model so we have reworded this sentence in the abstract.

General comment for reviewers:

Note that in two places we have changed “tuning” to “calibration” as the parameter changes were not really tuned in a strict sense (Line 167, Line 1204). There is a tool for tuning parameters in JULES (adJULES, Raoult et al., 2016), but this was not used in this study. So we believe the change from “tuning” to “calibration” is a more appropriate description of what was done, and will avoid confusion between what can be done with adJULES and the techniques used in this study (adjustment of parameters to correct biases, or more frequently new parameters based on data and literature review). The justification for each parameter change has already been provided in the Methods section.

Lines 167-168: Updated parameters were based on review of literature




Figure 9. Differences between modelled and observed GPP (observed = MTE) and NPP (observed=MOD17). a,b) JULES with the standard 5 PFTs and default parameters; c,d) JULES with 5 PFTs and improved parameters; e,f) JULES with 9 PFTs and improved parameters.

Improved representation of plant functional types and physiology in the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES v4.2) using plant trait information

5 Anna Harper¹, Peter Cox¹, Pierre Friedlingstein¹, Andy Wiltshire², Chris Jones², Stephen Sitch³, Lina M. Mercado^{3,4}, Margriet Groenendijk³, Eddy Robertson², Jens Kattge⁵, Gerhard Bönisch⁵, Owen K. Atkin⁶, Michael Bahn⁷, Johannes Cornelissen⁸, Ülo Niinemets^{9,10}, Vladimir Onipchenko¹¹, Josep Peñuelas^{12,13}, Lourens Poorter¹⁴, Peter B. Reich^{15,16}, Nadia Soudzilovskaia¹⁷, Peter van Bodegom¹⁷

10

Affiliations:

¹College of Engineering, Mathematics, and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

²Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK

15 ³College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

⁴Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, UK

⁵Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany

⁶ARC Centre of Excellence in Plant Energy Biology, Research School of Biology, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

20 ⁷Institute of Ecology, University of Innsbruck, Austria

⁸Systems Ecology, Department of Ecological Science, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁹Institute of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Estonian University of Life Sciences, Tartu, Estonia

25 ¹⁰Estonian Academy of Sciences, Tallinn, Estonia

¹¹Department of Geobotany, Moscow State University, Moscow 119991, Russia;

¹²CSIC, Global Ecology Unit CREAF-CSIC-UAB, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

¹³CREAF, Cerdanyola del Vallès, 08193 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

30 ¹⁴Forest Ecology and Forest Management Group, Wageningen University, P.O. Box 6700 AA, Wageningen, The Netherlands

¹⁵Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota, St-Paul, Minnesota, USA

¹⁶Hawkesbury Institute for the Environment, University of Western Sydney, Penrith, New South Wales, Australia.

35 ¹⁷Institute of Environmental Sciences, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Correspondence to: A.B. Harper (a.harper@exeter.ac.uk)

Abstract

Dynamic global vegetation models are used to predict the response of vegetation to climate change. They are essential for planning ecosystem management, understanding carbon cycle-climate feedbacks, and evaluating the potential impacts of climate change on global ecosystems. JULES (the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator) represents terrestrial processes in the UK Hadley Centre family of models and in the first generation UK Earth System Model. Previously, JULES represented five plant functional types (PFTs): broadleaf trees, needle-leaf trees, C_3 and C_4 grasses, and shrubs. This study addresses three developments in JULES. First, trees and shrubs were split into deciduous and evergreen PFTs to better represent the range of leaf lifespans and metabolic capacities that exists in nature. Second, we distinguished between temperate and tropical broadleaf evergreen trees. These first two changes result in a new set of nine PFTs: tropical and temperate broadleaf evergreen trees, broadleaf deciduous trees, needle-leaf evergreen and deciduous trees, C_3 and C_4 grasses, and evergreen and deciduous shrubs. Third, using data from the TRY database, we updated the relationship between leaf nitrogen and the maximum rate of carboxylation of Rubisco (V_{cmax}), and updated the ~~leaf turnover and growth rates model-phenology~~ to include a trade-off between leaf lifespan and leaf mass per unit area.

55

Overall, the simulation of gross and net primary productivity (GPP and NPP, respectively) is improved with the 9 PFTs when compared to Fluxnet sites, a global GPP data set based on Fluxnet, and MODIS NPP. Compared to the standard 5 PFTs, the new 9 PFTs simulate a higher GPP and NPP, with the exception of C_3 grasses in cold environments and C_4 grasses which were previously over-productive. On a biome-scale, GPP is improved for all eight biomes evaluated and NPP is improved for most biomes – the exceptions being the tropical forests, savannahs, and extratropical mixed forests where simulated NPP is too high. With the

60

new PFTs, the global present-day GPP and NPP are 128 Pg C yr⁻¹ and 62 Pg C yr⁻¹, respectively. We conclude that the inclusion of trait-based data and the evergreen/deciduous
65 distinction has substantially improved productivity fluxes in JULES, in particular the representation of GPP. These developments increase the realism of JULES, enabling higher confidence in simulations of vegetation dynamics and carbon storage.

Introduction

The net exchange of carbon dioxide between the vegetated land and the atmosphere is predominantly the result of two large and opposing fluxes: uptake by photosynthesis and efflux by respiration from soils and vegetation. CO₂ can also be released by land ecosystems due to vegetation mortality resulting from human and natural disturbances, such as changes in land use practices, insect outbreaks, and fires. Vegetation models are used to quantify many of these fluxes, and the evolution of the terrestrial carbon sink strongly affects future greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere (Friedlingstein et al., 2006, 2015; Arora et al., 2013). A subset of vegetation models also predict both compositional and biogeochemical responses of vegetation to climate change (dynamic global vegetation models, DGVMs), one of these being the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES). JULES was the land component of the UK Hadley Centre Earth System Model (ESM) (Best et al., 2011; Clark et al., 2011), and evolved from the Met Office Surface Exchange Scheme (MOSES: Cox et al., 1998, 1999; Essery et al., 2001). Within JULES, the TRIFFID model (Top-down Representation of Foliage and Flora Including Dynamics; Cox et al., 2001) predicts changes in biomass and the fractional coverage of five plant functional types (PFTs: broadleaf trees, needle leaf trees, C₃ grass, C₄ grass, and shrubs) based on cumulative carbon fluxes and a predetermined dominance hierarchy. DGVMs such as JULES are essential for planning ecosystem management, understanding carbon cycle-climate feedbacks, and evaluating the potential impacts of climate change on global ecosystems. However, the use of DGVMs in ESMs is relatively rare. For example, in the nine coupled carbon cycle-climate models evaluated by Arora et al. (2013), only three distinct DGVMs interactively simulated changes in the spatial distribution of PFTs (the SEIB-DGVM, JSBACH, and JULES/TRIFFID).

JULES predecessor, MOSES2.2 (Essery et al., 2003), represented the land surface in the HadGEM2-ES and HadGEM2-CC simulations, and JULES will represent the land surface in the next generation UKESM. Previous benchmarking studies of JULES and MOSES identified certain areas needing improvement, such as: the seasonal cycle of evaporation, GPP, and total respiration in regions with seasonally frozen soils and in the tropics; too high growing season respiration; and too low GPP in temperate forests (Blyth et al., 2011); and too high GPP in the tropics (20°S-20°N) (Blyth et al., 2011; Anav et al., 2013). ~~the seasonal cycle of evaporation, GPP, and total respiration in regions with seasonally frozen soils and in the tropics (Anav et al., 2013); too high growing season respiration and too low GPP in temperate forests (Blyth et al., 2011); and too high GPP in the tropics (20°S-20°N) (Anav et al., 2013).~~ In 21st Century simulations, JULES vegetation carbon was sensitive to climate change. In particular, the tropics were very sensitive to warming, with large simulated losses of carbon stored in the Amazon forest ~~occurring in the model~~ when the climate became very dry and hot (Cox et al., 2000, 2004, 2013; Galbraith et al., 2010; Huntingford et al., 2014).

Based on these previous results, our study addressed three potential improvements in the parameterisation and representation of PFTs in JULES. First, the original five PFTs (Table 1) did not represent the range of leaf lifespans and metabolic capacities that exists in nature, and so trees and shrubs were split into deciduous and evergreen PFTs. In a broad sense, the differences between evergreen and deciduous strategies can be summarized in a leaf economics spectrum, where leaves employ trade-offs in their nitrogen use (Reich et al., 1997; Wright et al., 2004) (Fig. 1). When photosynthesis is limited by CO₂, the photosynthetic capacity of a leaf is dependent on the maximum rate of carboxylation of Rubisco (V_{cmax}). Plants allocate about 10-30% of their nitrogen into synthesis and maintenance of Rubisco (Evans 1989), while a portion of the remaining nitrogen is put toward leaf structural

components; hence the strong relationship between photosynthetic capacity and leaf nitrogen concentration (e.g. Meir et al., 2002; Reich et al., 1998a; Wright et al., 2004) and leaf structure (Niinemets 1999). On average, evergreen species have a lower photosynthetic capacity and respiration per unit leaf mass (Reich et al., 1997; Wright et al., 2004; Takashima et al., 2004), higher leaf mass per unit area (LMA) (Takashima et al., 2004; Poorter et al., 2009), allocate a lower fraction of leaf N to photosynthesis (Takashima et al., 2004), and exhibit lower N loss at senescence (Aerts 1995; Silla and Escudero 2003; Kobe et al., 2005) than deciduous species. There is also a positive relationship between LMA and leaf lifespan (Reich et al., 1992, 1997; Wright et al., 2004). Leaves with high nutrient concentration tend to have a short lifespan and low LMA. They are able to allocate more nutrients to photosynthetic machinery to rapidly assimilate carbon at a relatively high rate (but they also have high respiration rates). Conversely, leaves with less access to nutrients use a longer-term investment strategy, allocating nutrients to structure, defence, and tolerance mechanisms. They tend to have longer life spans, low assimilation and respiration rates, but high LMAs.

Second, we distinguished between tropical broadleaf evergreen trees and broadleaf evergreen trees from warm-temperate and Mediterranean climates, based on fundamental differences in leaf traits, chemistry, and metabolism (Niinemets et al., 2007; Xiang et al., 2013; Niinemets et al., 2015). For example, measured V_{cmax} for a given leaf N per unit area (N_A) can be lower in tropical evergreen trees than in temperate broadleaf evergreen trees (Kattge et al., 2011), resulting in lower V_{cmax} and maximum assimilation rates for tropical forests (Carswell et al., 2000; Meir et al., 2002, 2007; Domingues et al., 2007, 2010; Kattge et al., 2011). Collectively, the evergreen/deciduous and tropical/temperate distinctions resulted in a new set of nine PFTs for JULES: tropical broadleaf evergreen trees (BET-Tr), temperate broadleaf evergreen trees (BET-Te), broadleaf deciduous trees (BDT), needle-leaf evergreen trees

(NET), needle-leaf deciduous trees (NDT), C₃ grasses, C₄ grasses, evergreen shrubs (ESh), and deciduous shrubs (DSh) (Table 2).

145 Last, several parameters relating to variation in photosynthesis and respiration have not been updated since MOSES was developed in the late 1990's. We used data on LMA (kg m⁻²), leaf N per unit mass, N_m (kg N kg⁻¹), and leaf lifespan from the TRY database (Kattge et al., 2011; accessed Nov. 2012). The new parameters for leaf nitrogen and LMA were used to calculate a new V_{cmax} at 25°C, and to update phenological parameters that determine leaf
150 lifespan. Other parameters related to leaf dark respiration, canopy radiation, canopy nitrogen, stomatal conductance, root depth, and temperature sensitivities of V_{cmax} were revised based on a review of recently available observed values, which are described in Section 2.

The purpose of our paper is to document these changes, and to evaluate their impacts on the
155 ability of JULES to model CO₂ exchange for selected sites and globally on the scale of biomes, with a focus on the gross and net primary productivity. Specifically, we explore the consequences for carbon fluxes on seasonal and annual timescales of switching from the current 5 PFTs to a greater number of PFTs (9) that account for growth habit (evergreen versus deciduous) and temperate/tropical ~~plant types~~ **biomes**.

160

2. Model description

Full descriptions of the model equations are in Clark et al. (2011) and Best et al. (2011). Here we briefly describe relevant current equations in JULES, associated changes in terms of updated parameter values, and document new equations and parameters. The revisions
165 discussed in our study fall into three categories: 1) Changes to model physiology based on leaf trait data from TRY; 2) adjustment of parameters to account for the properties of the new

PFTs (evergreen/deciduous, tropical/temperate); and 3) **calibration tuning** of parameters based on known biases in the model **and a review of the literature**. Parameters for the standard 5 PFTs and for the new 9 PFTs are given in Tables 1 and 2, respectively, and a summary of all parameters are in Table SM1. **For the site-level simulations, we incrementally made changes to the model to determine whether or not changes improved the simulations. This resulted in a total of eight experiments (Table 3).** The version of JULES with 5 PFTs (Experiment 0) is kept as similar as possible to the configuration used in the TRENDY experiments, which are a set of historical simulations to quantify the global carbon cycle (e.g. Le Quéré et al., 2014; Sitch et al., 2015) that have been included in several recent publications. **In the supplement, we provide a set of recommended parameters and guidance for users who wish to run JULES with the original 5 PFTs (Table SM2).**

2.1 JULES model

In JULES, leaf level photosynthesis for C_3 and C_4 plants (Collatz et al., 1991, 1992) is calculated based on the limiting factor of three potential photosynthesis rates: W_l (light limited rate), W_e (transport of photosynthetic products for C_3 and PEPCarboxylase limitation for C_4 plants), and W_c (Rubisco limited rate) (see Supplemental Material). W_e and W_c depend on V_{cmax} , the maximum rate of carboxylation of Rubisco, which is a function of the V_{cmax} at 25°C ($V_{cmax,25}$):

$$V_{cmax} = \frac{V_{max,25} f_T(T_C)}{[1 + \exp(0.3(T_C - T_{upp}))][1 + \exp(0.3(T_{low} - T_C))]} \quad (1)$$

where T_c is the canopy temperature in Celcius, and

$$f_T(T_C) = Q_{10,leaf}^{0.1(T_C - 25)} \quad (2)$$

T_{upp} and T_{low} are PFT-dependent parameters. $Q_{10,leaf}$ is 2.0.

JULES has several options for representing canopy radiation. Option 5, as described in Clark et al. (2011), includes a multi-layer canopy with sunlit and shaded leaves in each layer, two-stream radiation with sunflecks penetrating below the top layer, and light-inhibition of leaf respiration. Additionally, N is assumed to decay exponentially through the canopy with an extinction coefficient, k_n , of 0.78 (Mercado et al., 2007). $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ is calculated in each canopy layer (i) as:

$$V_{\text{max},25,i} = n_{\text{eff}} N_{l0} e^{-k_n(i-1)/10} \quad (3)$$

assuming a 10-layer canopy. The parameter N_{l0} is the top-leaf nitrogen content (kg N kg C^{-1}), and n_{eff} linearly relates leaf N concentration to $V_{\text{cmax},25}$.

200

Leaf dark respiration is assumed to be proportional to the V_{cmax} calculated in Eq. 1:

$$R_d = f_d V_{\text{cmax}} \quad (4)$$

with a 30% inhibition of leaf respiration when irradiance is $> 10 \mu\text{mol quanta m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ (Atkin et al. 2000; Mercado et al., 2007; Clark et al. 2011). Plant NPP is very sensitive to f_d , and since the vegetation fraction depends on NPP when the TRIFFID competition is turned on, the distribution of PFTs can also be sensitive to f_d . The parameter was modified from 0.015 (Clark et al., 2011) to 0.010 for all broadleaf tree PFTs in this study, based on underestimated coverage of broadleaf trees in previous versions of JULES. Leaf photosynthesis is calculated as:

$$A_l = (W - R_d)\beta \quad (5)$$

where W is the smoothed minimum of the three limiting rates (W_l , W_e , W_c), and β is a soil moisture stress factor. The factor β is 1 when soil moisture content of the root zone (θ : $\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$) is at or above a critical threshold (θ_{crit}), which depends on the soil texture. When soil water content drops below θ_{crit} , β decreases linearly until θ reaches the wilting point (where $\beta=0$) (Cox et al., 1998).

215

Stomatal conductance (g_s) is linked to leaf photosynthesis:

$$A = \frac{g_s(C_s - C_i)}{1.6} \quad (6)$$

where C_s and C_i are the leaf surface and internal CO_2 concentrations, respectively. The
 220 gradient in CO_2 between the internal and external environments is related to leaf humidity
 deficit at the leaf surface (D) following Jacobs (1994):

$$\frac{C_i - \Gamma^*}{C_s - \Gamma^*} = f_0 \left(1 - \frac{D}{D_{\text{crit}}} \right) \quad (7)$$

Here, Γ^* is the CO_2 compensation point – or the internal partial pressure of CO_2 at which
 photosynthesis and respiration balance, and D_{crit} is the critical humidity deficit (f_0 and D_{crit}
 225 are PFT-dependent parameters). In JULES, the surface latent heat flux (LE) is due to
 evaporation from water stored on the canopy, evaporation of water from the top layer of soil,
 transpiration through the stomata, and sublimation of snow. Any change to LE will also
 impact the sensible heat and ground heat fluxes, since these are linked to the total surface
 energy balance (Best et al., 2011).

230

Total plant (autotrophic) respiration, R_a , is the sum of maintenance and growth respiration
 (R_{pm} and R_{pg} , respectively):

$$R_{\text{pm}} = 0.012R_d \left(\beta + \frac{N_r + N_s}{N_l} \right) \quad (8)$$

and

$$235 \quad R_{\text{pg}} = r_g(GPP - R_{\text{pm}}) \quad (9)$$

where r_g is a parameter set to 0.25 (Cox et al., 1998, 1999), and the nitrogen concentration of
 roots, stem, and leaves are given by N_r , N_s , and N_l , respectively. When using canopy radiation
 model 5 in JULES, these are calculated as:

$$N_l = N_{l0} \sigma_l * LAI \quad (10)$$

$$N_r = N_{l0} \sigma_l \mu_{rl} * L_{bal} \quad (11)$$

$$N_s = N_{l0} \mu_{sl} \eta_{sl} h * L_{bal} \quad (12)$$

where σ_l is specific leaf density ($\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ LAI}^{-1}$), h is the vegetation height in meters, L_{bal} is the balanced LAI (the seasonal maximum of LAI based on allometric relationships, Cox et al., 2001), μ_{rl} and μ_{sl} relate N in roots and stems to top-leaf N, and η_{sl} is $0.01 \text{ kg C m}^{-1} \text{ LAI}^{-1}$.

In Eq. 10-12, N_{l0} , σ_l , μ_{rl} , and μ_{sl} are PFT-dependent parameters.

The net primary productivity (NPP) is:

$$NPP = GPP - R_a \quad (13)$$

For each PFT in JULES, the NPP determines the carbon available for spreading (expanding fractional coverage in the grid cell, only relevant when the TRIFFID competition is turned on) or for growth (growing leaves or height). The net ecosystem exchange (NEE; positive flux from the land to the atmosphere) is:

$$NEE = R_{eco} - GPP \quad (14)$$

where R_{eco} is the total ecosystem respiration.

Phenology in JULES affects leaf growth rates and timing of leaf growth/senescence based on temperature alone (Cox et al., 1999; Clark et al., 2011). When canopy temperature (T_c) is greater than a temperature threshold (T_{off}), the leaf turnover rate (γ_{lm}) is equal to γ_0 . When $T_c < T_{off}$, the turnover rate is modified as in Eq. 15a (where T_{off} , γ_0 , and d_T are PFT-dependent parameters):

$$\gamma_{lm} = \gamma_0 \{1 + d_T (T_{off} - T_c)\} \quad \text{for } T_c \leq T_{off} \quad (15a)$$

$$\gamma_{lm} = \gamma_0 \quad \text{for } T_c > T_{off} \quad (15b)$$

The leaf turnover rate affects phenology ($p = \frac{LAI}{L_{bal}}$) by triggering a loss of leaf area for $\gamma_{lm} > 2\gamma_0$, and a growth of leaf area when $\gamma_{lm} \leq 2\gamma_0$:

$$265 \quad \frac{dp}{dt} = \gamma_p(1 - p) \quad \text{for } \gamma_{lm} \leq 2\gamma_0 \quad (16a)$$

$$\frac{dp}{dt} = -\gamma_p \quad \text{for } \gamma_{lm} > 2\gamma_0 \quad (16b)$$

where γ_p is the leaf growth rate.

2.2 Updated leaf N, $V_{\text{cmax},25}$, and leaf lifespan (Experiments 1-2)

270 Essentially, with the revised trait-based physiology, the parameter σ_1 (Eq. 10-11) and N_{l0} (Eq. 3, 10-12) were replaced with LMA and N_m , respectively, from the TRY database. ~~Values for the two new parameters were derived from the TRY database.~~ N_{l0} and N_m both describe the nitrogen content at the top of the canopy, but the former is N per unit carbon, while the latter is the more commonly observed N per unit dry mass. N_m can be converted to N_{l0} using leaf
275 carbon content per dry mass (C_m). Historically, C_m was 0.4 in JULES (Schulze et al., 1994), but we updated it to 0.5 in all versions of JULES evaluated in this study (Reich et al., 1997; White et al., 2000; Zaehle and Friend, 2010).

We also changed the equation for $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ from a function of N_{l0} (Eq. 3) to a function of leaf
280 N per unit area, N_a , a more commonly observed leaf trait, calculated as the product of the observed leaf traits LMA (kg m^{-2}) and N_m (kg N kg^{-1}):

$$N_a = N_m * LMA \quad (17)$$

and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) is:

$$V_{\text{cmax},25} = i_v + s_v N_a \quad (18)$$

285 where parameters i_v ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) and s_v ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ gN}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) were taken directly from Kattge et al. (2009 – hereafter K09) (see also Medlyn et al., 1999), with two exceptions. First, the V_{cmax} parameterisation from K09 was based on the leaf C_3 photosynthesis model. C_4 plants have high CO_2 concentration at the site of Rubisco, and therefore require less Rubisco than C_3 plants (von Caemmerer and Furbank 2003). C_4 species typically have 30-50% as

290 much Rubisco per unit N as C₃ species (Sage 1987; Makino et al., 2003; Houborg et al., 2013). We chose a slope (s_v) for C₄ to give a $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ that is half of that for C₃ grass, and set the intercept (i_v) to 0. This resulted in a $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ of 32 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for C₄ grass, which is similar to observed values in natural grasses (Kubien and Sage 2004; Domingues et al., 2007) and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ in seven other ESMs (13-38 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$; Rogers 2013). Second, K09
295 reported a separate $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for tropical trees growing on oxisols (old tropical soils with low phosphorous availability) and non-oxisols. For the BET-Tr PFT, we calculated a weighted mean slope and intercept from their Table 2 to represent an “average” tropical soil.

The new $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for canopy level i is calculated as (replacing Eq. 3):

$$300 \quad V_{\text{max},25_i} = i_v + s_v N_a e^{-K_n(i-1)/10} \quad (19)$$

The leaf, root, and stem nitrogen contents are (replacing Eq. 10-12):

$$N_l = N_m LMA * LAI \quad (20)$$

$$N_r = N_m LMA \mu_{rl} * L_{bal} \quad (21)$$

$$N_s = \frac{N_m}{C_m} \mu_{sl} \eta_{sl} * h * L_{bal} \quad (22)$$

305

Four phenological parameters (T_{off} , d_T , γ_0 , and γ_p , Eq. 15-16) were adjusted to capture the trade-off between leaf lifespan and LMA. We set T_{off} to 5°C for deciduous trees and shrubs, to -40°C for BET-Te, NET, and ESh, and to 0°C for BET-Tr. The latter reflects the fact that many tropical evergreen tree species cannot tolerate frost (Woodward and Williams, 1987;
310 Prentice et al., 1992). For the other evergreen PFTs, the value of -40°C ensured that plants only lose their leaves in extremely cold environments. Second, we changed d_T to 0 for grasses to attain constant leaf turnover rates (Eq. 15). This fixed an unrealistic seasonal cycle in LAI of grasses and makes grasses more competitive in very cold environments (Hopcroft and Valdes, 2015). Third, we adjusted γ_0 for grasses and evergreen species to reflect the

315 median observed leaf lifespan in the TRY database. Last, we changed γ_p from its default
value of 20 yr^{-1} to 15 yr^{-1} for the PFTs with the thickest leaves (NET, ESH, BET-Temp,
BET-Trop) and to 30 yr^{-1} for the PFT with the thinnest leaves (DSH). The parameter γ_p
controls the rate of leaf growth in the spring and senescence at the end of the growing season
(Eq. 16b). To reduce an overestimation of uptake during the spring with the new phenology
320 for grass, the maximum LAI for grasses was reduced from 4 to 3.

2.3 Other updates to JULES parameters with new PFTs (Experiments 3-6)

Additional changes to JULES were made to account for the properties of the new PFTs, to
incorporate recent observations, and to correct known biases in the model. These fall into
325 four categories: radiation, stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and respiration, and plant
structure. For the site-level evaluation of JULES, we incrementally added these changes
(Table 3).

2.3.1 Stomatal conductance (Experiment 3)

330 JULES stomatal conductance is related to the leaf internal CO_2 , where C_i/C_s is proportional to
the parameters f_0 and $1/D_{\text{crit}}$ (Eq. 7). For vapour pressure deficits (D) greater than D_{crit} , the
stomata close. For $D < D_{\text{crit}}$, stomata gradually open in response to a reducing evaporative
demand. Needle-leaf species in JULES have a lower D_{crit} than other trees, grasses, and
shrubs. The lower D_{crit} increases the likelihood of the stomata being closed – similar to
335 Mediterranean conifers which tend to close their stomata earlier than angiosperms (Carnicer
et al., 2013) – and it tightly regulates the stomatal aperture, making plants more sensitive to
increasing D . This is analogous to plants conserving water at the expense of assimilation. We
use updated f_0 and D_{crit} from a synthesis of water use efficiency at the Fluxnet sites (M.
Groenendijk, pers. comm.). Compared to the standard 5 PFT parameters, the D_{crit} was

decreased for BET-Te, NDT, C₃ grass, and shrubs. The parameter f_0 was increased for these PFTs, which increased C_i for all $D < D_{crit}$.

2.3.2 Radiation (Experiment 4)

The light-limited photosynthesis rate (W_i) is proportional to α * [absorbed PAR], where α is the quantum efficiency of photosynthesis (mol CO₂ [mol quanta]⁻¹). We reduced α from 0.08 to 0.06 for C₃ grass and evergreen PFTs typical of semi-arid and arid environments, and from 0.06 to 0.04 for C₄ grass, where previously the model over-predicted GPP for a given PAR. Quantum efficiency was set at 0.10 for NDT. These values are still within the range reported in Skillman (2008). An example of the changes is shown in the Supplemental Material, Fig. S1. Decreasing the α for BET-Te and ESh PFTs helped reduce a high bias in the GPP at low irradiances at Las Majadas (Spain – a savannah site), while increasing α for NDT improved the light response of GPP at Tomakai (Japan – a Larch site).

2.3.3 Photosynthesis and respiration parameters (Experiment 5)

The leaf dark respiration is calculated as a fraction, f_d , of V_{cmax} (Eq. 4). In testing JULES, we found that C₃ grasses were overly productive and tended to be the dominant grass type even in tropical ecosystems where we expected C₄ dominance. Therefore, we increased the f_d for C₃ (from 0.015 to 0.019) and decreased the f_d for C₄ (from 0.025 to 0.019) so the two grass PFTs would have similar R_d rates for a given V_{cmax} .

Preliminary evaluation of JULES GPP at the Fluxnet sites in Table 4 revealed the need for a higher (lower) $V_{cmax,25}$ for the BET-Tr and NDT (BET-Te) PFTs than the mean value reported in K09. For these PFTs, the slope parameter (s_v) was adjusted to result in the final

$V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for each PFT (black bars, Fig. 2), using the mean \pm standard deviation of $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ from

365 K09 as an upper limit.

T_{upp} and T_{low} were also modified, as optimal V_{cmax} can occur at temperatures near 40°C (Medlyn et al., 2002), and the previous optimal temperature for V_{cmax} was 32°C for BT and 22°C for NT. A study of seven broadleaf deciduous tree species found T_{opt} for V_{cmax} ranging
370 from 35.9°C to >45°C (Dreyer et al., 2001), and maximum V_{cmax} can occur at temperatures of at least 38°C in the Amazon forest (B. Kruijt, pers. comm.). Therefore, we changed T_{opt} from 32°C to 39°C for all broadleaf trees and from 22°C to 33° and 32°C for NET and NDT, respectively. C₃ grass T_{opt} was decreased from 32°C to 28°C to help reduce the high productivity bias in grasses.

375

Additionally, the ratio of nitrogen in roots to leaves (μ_{rl}) was updated following the relationships in Table 1 of Kerkhoff et al. (2006). However, instead of assigning a separate μ_{rl} for each PFT, we assigned the mean values for trees/shrubs and grasses (0.67 and 0.72, respectively).

380

2.3.4 Plant Structure (Experiment 6)

There is evidence that larch trees (NDT) can be tall with a relatively low LAI compared to needle-leaf evergreen trees (Ohta et al., 2001; Hirano et al., 2003) and compared to broadleaf deciduous trees (Gower and Richards 1990). In JULES, canopy height (h) is proportional to

385 the balanced LAI, L_b :

$$h = \frac{a_{wl}}{a_{ws} * \eta_{sl}} L_b^{b_{wl}-1} \quad (23)$$

The parameter a_{wl} relates the LAI to total stem biomass, and for trees it is 0.65. Hirano et al. (2003) found $h=15$ m and maximum LAI=2.1, which would imply $a_{wl}=0.91$, and Ohta et al.

(2001) found $h=18$ m and $LAI=3.7$, implying $a_{wl}=0.75$. Therefore we adjusted a_{wl} for NDT to
390 0.75, which was an important change for allowing NDT to out-compete BDT in high
latitudes.

We also changed the root depths, although these changes were constrained by the 3 m deep
soil in the standard JULES setup. Previously, root depths were 3 m for broadleaf trees, 1 m
395 for needle-leaf trees, and 0.5 m for grasses and shrubs (Best et al. 2011). With the new PFTs,
roots are shallower for BET-Te and BDT (2 m), and deeper for NET (1.8 m), NDT (2 m), and
shrubs (1 m) (Zeng 2001).

3. Methods

3.1 Data

We analysed leaf N_m , specific leaf area ($=1/LMA$), and leaf lifespan from the TRY database
(accessed in Nov. 2012). Data was translated from species level to both the standard five and
new nine PFTs based on a look-up table provided by TRY, and screened for duplicate entries.
We only selected entries with measurements for both ~~SLA~~LMA and N_m . This resulted in
405 9,372 ~~SLA~~ LMA / N_m pairs and 1,176 leaf lifespan measurements (Supplemental Material).

To evaluate the model performance we used GPP from the Model Tree Ensemble (MTE) of
(Jung et al., 2011), MODIS NPP from the MOD17 algorithm (Zhao et al. 2005; Zhao and
Running, 2010), and GPP and NEE from 13 and 14 Fluxnet sites, respectively (Table 4).
410 Using the net exchange of CO_2 observed at the Fluxnet sites, NEE was partitioned into GPP
and R_{eco} . Assuming that night-time $NEE=R_{eco}$, R_{eco} was estimated as a temperature function
of night-time NEE (Reichstein et al., 2005; Groenendijk et al., 2011).

3.2 Model simulations

415 We performed two sets of simulations to evaluate the impacts of the new PFTs in JULES
v4.2. First, site-level simulations used observed meteorology from 14 Fluxnet towers – these
include the nine original sites benchmarked in the study of Blyth et al. (2011), plus an
additional five to represent more diversity in land cover types and climate. The vegetation
cover was prescribed as in Table 4, and vegetation competition was turned off. The changes
420 described in Section 2.2 and 2.3 were incrementally added to evaluate the effect of each
group of changes (Table 3). Full results are shown in the Supplemental Material, but for the
main text we focus the discussion on JULES with 5 PFTs (JULES5); JULES with 9 PFTs and
updated N_m , LMA, $V_{\text{cmax},25}$, and leaf lifespan from the TRY database (JULES9_{TRY}); and
JULES with 9 PFTs and all updated parameters described in Section 2.3 (JULES9_{ALL}). These
425 are, respectively, Experiments 0, 2, and 7 in Table 3.

Soil carbon takes more than 1000 years to equilibrate in JULES, so we used an accelerated
method that only requires 200-300 years of spin up (depending on the site). JULES has four
soil pools (decomposable and resistant plant material, long-lived humus, and microbial
430 biomass), and the decomposable material pool has the fastest turnover rate (equivalent to ~ 10
 yr^{-1}) (Clark et al. 2011). For each experiment, soil carbon was spun up using accelerated
turnover rates in the three slower soil pools for the first 100 years. The rates of the resistant,
humus, and biomass pools were increased by a factor of 33, 15, and 500, respectively, so all
pools had the same turnover time as the fastest pool. This resulted in unrealistically depleted
435 soil carbon pools. The second step of the spin up was to multiply the pool sizes by these same
factors, and then allow the soil carbon to spin up under normal conditions for an additional
100-200 years.

Second, global simulations were conducted for JULES5 and JULES9_{ALL}. It could be argued that similar model improvements might be gained with the original five PFTs with improved parameters. We tested this hypothesis with a third global experiment, JULES5_{ALL}, with 5 PFTs but improved parameters (Table SM2). The global simulations followed the protocol for the S2 experiments in TRENDY (Sitch et al., 2015), where the model was forced with observed annual-average CO₂ (Dlugokencky and Tans, 2013), climate from the CRU-NCEP data set (v4, N. Viovy, pers. comm.), and time-invariant fraction of agriculture in each grid cell (Hurtt et al., 2011). Vegetation cover was prescribed based on the European Space Agency's Land Cover Climate Change Initiative (ESA LC_CCI) global vegetation distribution (Poulter et al., 2015, processed to the JULES 5 and 9 PFTs by A. Hartley) (Fig. 3a). JULES did not predict vegetation coverage in this study, which enabled us to evaluate JULES GPP and NPP given a realistic land cover. The evaluation of vegetation cover and updated competition for 9 PFTs will be evaluated in a follow-up paper. Since the land cover was prescribed based on a 2010 map, we also set the agricultural mask based on land use in 2010, and enforced consistency between the two maps such that fraction of agriculture could not exceed the fraction of grass in each grid cell. During the spin-up (300 years with 100 years of accelerated turnover rates as at the sites), we used atmospheric CO₂ concentration from 1860 and recycled climate from 1901-1920. The transient simulation (with time-varying CO₂ and climate) was from 1901-2012. The model spatial resolution was N96 (1.875° longitude x 1.25° latitude).

3.3 Model Evaluation

The model evaluation is presented in two stages. First, using the site-level simulations, we evaluated GPP and NEE with the ~~daily~~ root mean square error (RMSE) and ~~the~~ correlation coefficient, r , based on daily and monthly averaged fluxes, respectively. Site history can

result in non-zero annual NEE, but JULES maintains annual carbon balance, so it is not
 465 realistic to expect the simulated annual NEE to match the observations. Therefore, we
 compared anomalies of NEE instead.

We summarized the changes in RMSE and r using relative improvements for each
 experiment in Table 4, i . The statistics were calculated such that positive values denote an
 470 improvement compared to JULES5 (Experiment 0):

$$RMSE_{rel_i} = \frac{RMSE_{5pfts} - RMSE_i}{RMSE_{5pfts}} \quad (23)$$

$$r_{rel_i} = \frac{r_i - r_{5pfts}}{r_{5pfts}} \quad (24)$$

Second, we compared the model from global simulations to biome-averaged fluxes in eight
 475 biomes based on 14 World Wildlife Fund terrestrial ecoregions (Olson et al., 2001) (Fig. 3b,
 Table S3). Fluxes were averaged for the land in each biome in both the model and the
 observations. We evaluated seasonal cycles of GPP from the MTE (Jung et al., 2011), and
 annually averaged GPP (from the MTE) and NPP (from MODIS). The tropical forest biome
 includes regions of tropical grasslands and pasture – in the ESA LC_CCI data set, the BET-
 480 Tr PFT is dominant in only 38% of the biome and grasses occupy 36%. Therefore, we only
 included the grid cells where the dominant PFT in the ESA data is BET-Tr. The extratropical
 mixed forest biome has a large coverage of agricultural land, and as a result 46% of the
 biome is C₃ grass, while BDT and NET only cover 14% and 8% of the biome, respectively.
 We omitted grid cells with >20% agriculture in 2012 to calculate the biome average fluxes.

4 Results

4.1 Data analysis of leaf traits

With the previous 5 PFTs, only the **needle-leaf tree NT** PFT occupied the “slow investment” end of the leaf economics spectrum (high LMA and low N_m) (Fig. 1). The new PFTs were
 490 given the median N_m and LMA from the TRY dataset (Fig. 1c), and these exhibit a range of deciduous and evergreen strategies, although there is substantial overlap between PFTs. The needle-leaf evergreen trees, evergreen shrubs, and temperate broadleaf evergreen trees have low N_m and thick leaves, but their N_A (shown in the legend of Fig. 1a,c) is relatively high (>2 g m⁻²), which has been long known for species with long leaf lifespans (>1 year) (Reich et al.,
 495 1992). These traits on aggregate indicate that they use the “slow investment” strategy of growing thick leaves with low rates of photosynthesis per unit investment of biomass.

Compared to the evergreen PFTs, the deciduous shrubs and broadleaf deciduous trees have higher N_m , thinner leaves, lower N_A (1.3-1.7 g N m⁻²), and leaf lifespans of less than six
 500 months. The tropical broadleaf evergreen trees have a moderate N_m and leaf thickness, with an average lifespan of 11 months, reflecting a mixture of successional stages in the database. The grasses have the shortest leaf lifespans. C₄ grasses have high LMA, low N_m , and a high N_A ; while the thinner C₃ grasses have a high N_m and low N_A . Figure 1 also shows the impacts of **changing** the ~~new~~-phenological parameters (T_{off} , d_T , γ_0 , and γ_p , Eq. 15-16) on median leaf
 505 lifespan during a 30-year global simulation, where now JULES captures the observed leaf lifespans.

Based on the new N_A , $V_{cmax,25}$ was updated using the new parameters i_v and s_v (Eq. 18; Fig. 2). The values calculated from the TRY data are shown with asterisks, and these were used in
 510 the JULES9_{TRY} experiments. The black bars show the final $V_{cmax,25}$ after adjusting s_v for the two broadleaf evergreen tree PFTs and the needle-leaf deciduous trees (see Section 2.3.3). Within the trees, the temperate broadleaf evergreen PFT has the highest $V_{cmax,25}$, while the

needle-leaf deciduous and tropical broadleaf evergreen PFTs have the lowest. Because the JULES C₃ and C₄ PFTs are assumed representative of natural vegetation, they have relatively low $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ (compared to the range from K09 for C₃). The N_A calculated from median N_m and LMA in this study (1.19 g N m⁻²) is lower than the average N_A reported in K09 (1.75 g N m⁻²). However, the C₃ $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ (51.09 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) is close to values reported for European grasslands (41.9±6.9 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and 48.6±3.5 $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for graminoids and forbs, respectively, in Wohlfahrt et al., 1999). In comparison to JULES5, the new $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ is higher for all PFTs except for C₃ grass. Previously, the $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ was lower than the observed range for all non-tropical trees, but now the $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for all PFTs is within the range of observed values.

4.2 Site level simulations

In most cases, the higher V_{cmax} from trait data increased the GPP and NPP, and resulted in higher respiration fluxes due to both autotrophic (responding to higher GPP) and heterotrophic (responding to higher litterfall due to higher NPP) respiration. First, we compared JULES with 5 PFTs (JULES5) to JULES with 9 PFTs and the TRY data (JULES9_{TRY}) (Experiments 1 and 2, respectively, in Table 3) at the sites listed in Table 4. The results are summarized in Figure 4, where yellows and reds indicate increased correlation (Fig. 4a, b) or reduced RMSE (Fig. 4c, d) in each experiment compared to JULES5. Using the N_m , LMA, and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ data from TRY improved the seasonal cycle of GPP at the two tropical forest sites, the evergreen savannah, and the crop site, and decreased the daily RMSE at one NET site (Tharandt), all grass sites, and the NDT site (Tomakai) (Experiment 1, Fig. 4). Enforcing the LMA-leaf lifespan relationship further improved the seasonal cycle at both savannah sites, the two natural C₃ grass sites (the seasonal cycle was worse at the crop site), and the NDT site, and further reduced RMSE at the deciduous

savannah site and one BDT site (Harvard) (Experiment 2, aka JULES9_{TRY}). In comparison, applying all parameter changes summarized in Table 3 further reduced the RMSE at every site except the two tropical forests and further increased r at every site except the tropical forests and the evergreen savannah (Experiment 7, aka JULES9_{ALL}).

Overall, the carbon and energy exchanges were best captured with JULES9_{ALL}. Compared to JULES5, the RMSE for GPP in JULES9_{ALL} decreased by more than 40% at Kaamanen (C3 grass), Tharandt (NET), and Tomakai (NDT); the daily RMSE of NEE decreased at eight sites; and r increased for NEE at 11 sites. The only sites without an improvement in either metric for NEE were Manaus (BET-Tr) and Bondville (Crop). The improvements to NEE were large at Tharandt (r from 0.61 to 0.76), Fort Peck C₃ grass (0.05 to 0.38), and Tomakai (0.09 to 0.93), and RMSE for NEE decreased by more than 35% at Kaamanen and Tomakai.

Respiration and latent heat fluxes are discussed in the Supplemental Material.

On an annual basis, GPP was higher in JULES9_{ALL} than in JULES5 at every site except for the Tapajos K77 pasture, El Saler (NET), Tonzi (savannah), and Kaamanen, and NPP was higher at every site except for Tapajos K77, El Saler, and Kaamanen (Table 5). Total GPP was improved at every site except for Hyytiala (NET) and Las Majadas (savannah), where annual GPP was too high in JULES5, and at El Saler and Tonzi, where the modelled GPP was too low. However, for every site except Hyytiala, JULES9_{ALL} was within the range of observed annual GPP. We now explore some site-specific aspects of the carbon cycle results.

4.2.1 Broadleaf forests

Both GPP and NPP were higher in JULES9_{ALL} than JULES5 for broadleaf forests due to a higher T_{opt} of V_{cmax} and a higher $V_{\text{cmax},25}$. Simulated GPP was similar to observations in the

absence of soil moisture stress. The increase in GPP occurred year-round at Manaus, but only during the wet season at Tapajos K67 (Fig. 5). GPP was similar in all JULES simulations during the dry season (Oct.-Dec.), when soil moisture deficits limited photosynthesis. The soil moisture stress factor, β , was <0.7 during these months, while it was >0.87 all year at Manaus (recall that a higher β indicates less stress). The reduction in GPP during the dry season at both sites is in contrast to the observations, which show an increase from Aug.-Dec. As a result, the simulated seasonal cycle of GPP was incorrect at both sites, and although the annual total GPP was closer to observations, the monthly RMSE was higher in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5. The simulated NPP was too low in JULES5 at both sites. In JULES9_{ALL}, the NPP was too high at Manaus (by $187 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and too low at Tapajos (by $396 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$).

At the two BDT sites (Harvard and Morgan Monroe), the peak summer GPP was closer to observations in JULES9_{ALL}. GPP was very well reproduced at Harvard (BDT), where the average JJA temperature was 4°C cooler than at Morgan Monroe (29°C compared to 33°C), and, due to differences in the soil parameters, the soil moisture stress factor was higher ($\beta > 0.8$ at Harvard compared to $0.5 < \beta < 0.7$ at Morgan Monroe). At Morgan Monroe, the observed GPP was nearly zero from Nov.-Mar., but all versions of JULES simulated uptake during Nov.-Dec., when the average temperatures were still above freezing, possibly due to leaves staying on the trees for too long in the model. The RMSE of NEE decreased (Fig 5b), but the amplitude of the seasonal cycle was too small at both BDT sites.

4.2.2 Needle-leaf forests

The seasonal cycle of GPP improved at the needle-leaf forests, but JULES9_{ALL} underestimated GPP during mid-summer at the larch site (Tomakai) and during the summer

at a Mediterranean site (El Saler), and overestimated summertime GPP at a cold conifer site (Hyytiala). Although there was a large improvement in the seasonal cycle at El Saler in
 590 JULES9_{ALL}, the GPP was still underestimated during the dry months of June-Oct. During this period, β reduced to a minimum of 0.17 in August, and the GPP was too low by an average 1.83 g C m⁻² d⁻¹. At all sites there was shift toward stronger net carbon uptake during the summer months with the new PFTs, which increased the correlation with observed NEE. At El Saler, the RMSE of NEE increased due to a change in the seasonal cycle of leaf dark
 595 respiration (R_d , Eq. 8) resulting from the higher T_{opt} . At Hyytiala, the RMSE of NEE increased due to higher rates of soil respiration during the winter months (Fig. S3; where soil respiration is the difference between total and autotrophic respiration).

Compared to JULES5 (with a needle-leaf PFT), both GPP and respiration were improved
 600 with the new NDT PFT at Tomakai, primarily due to an improved seasonal cycle of GPP with the deciduous phenology (Experiment 2). In JULES5, the LAI at the site was 6.0 m² m⁻², compared to a summer maximum of ~3.5 m² m⁻² with the deciduous phenology and to a reported average LAI of larch of 3.8 m² m⁻² (Gower and Richards, 1990). The new deciduous PFT also improved the seasonal cycle of NEE, and reduced errors in LE and SH (Fig. S4).
 605 The magnitude of maximum summertime GPP was still underestimated, but this could be because the site is a plantation, where trees are evenly planted to optimize the incoming radiation, rather than a natural larch forest.

4.2.3 Grasses

610 GPP and NEE were improved for temperate grasslands (Kaamanen and Fort Peck) and NEE was improved at a tropical pasture (Tapajos K77). Compared to JULES5, productivity in JULES9_{ALL} was higher at a temperate C₃ site (Fort Peck), and lower at a cold C₃ site

(Kaamanen) and the tropical C₄ site. In terms of GPP, these changes brought JULES9_{ALL} closer to the observations (Table 5). With the new PFT parameters, grasses had higher year-round LAI due to the removal of phenology, and GPP increased earlier in the year at Kaamanen, Bondville, and Fort Peck in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5. Net uptake also occurred 1-2 months earlier in JULES9_{ALL} (compared to JULES5), which decreased RMSE and increased *r* for NEE at the three natural grassland sites. JULES9_{ALL} underestimated productivity at Bondville (crop site), but this is not surprising given that the PFT is meant to represent natural grasses. There is a separate crop model available for JULES (Osborne et al., 2015).

The Tapajos K77 pasture was not included in the set of sites with GPP/R_{eco} partitioning. The simulated GPP was lower in JULES9_{ALL} than in JULES5 due to the lower quantum efficiency (Fig. S3c). The seasonal cycle of NEE was close to observed during most months (Fig 5b), and in terms of *r* and RMSE JULES9_{ALL} was better than JULES5. In JULES5, the GPP and NPP were higher at the Tapajos K77 pasture than at the Tapajos K67 forest site despite being driven by the same meteorology (Table 5). In JULES9_{ALL}, GPP was higher at the forest site than at the pasture, and the NPP was similar.

4.2.4 Mixed vegetation sites

Las Majadas and Tonzi are savannah sites dominated by evergreen and deciduous plants, respectively (assumed in the simulations to be an equal mix of trees, shrubs, and C₃ grass, Table 4). Both GPP and NPP were better simulated with JULES9_{ALL} at both sites, and the annual GPP was within the range of the observations (although it was too high at Las Majadas and too low at Tonzi).

At Las Majadas, the GPP increased in JULES9_{ALL} (compared to JULES5) during the wet spring (Jan.-Apr.) due to high GPP from the BET-Te and C₃ grass PFTs. The former had a
640 higher year-round LAI ($\sim 4.6 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$), $V_{\text{cmax},25}$, and T_{opt} for V_{cmax} compared to the BT from the 5 PFTs (which had maximum summer LAI of $3.8 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$). For C₃ grass, the new $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ and T_{opt} were lower in JULES9_{ALL}, but the removal of phenology (setting d_T to 0) increased the LAI during the cool, mild winter months when photosynthesis could still occur. Grid-cell mean GPP was also slightly higher during the hot, dry summer, again owing to the BET-Te
645 PFT. The simulated seasonality NEE was similar to observations ($r=0.70$), but the April-May uptake was too strong and resulted in an overestimation of the annual GPP.

At Tonzi, GPP was similar to observations except during April-July, when it was too low. The modelled photosynthesis began to decline after March, coinciding with a rapid increase
650 in simulated soil moisture stress and stomatal resistance. Moving from a generic to a deciduous shrub resulted in a large decrease in simulated GPP at this site. The shrub LAI decreased from $\sim 3.3 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ to a maximum of $1.5 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$, and the $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for the DSh was slightly lower than the $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for the generic shrub. Slightly compensating for the lower shrub GPP was a higher broadleaf tree GPP, with a higher $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ and T_{opt} compared to the
655 previous values in JULES5.

4.3 Global results

In this section, we analyse the impact of the PFT-specific biases and improvements on biome-scale GPP and NPP fluxes in global simulations. The area-weighted fluxes are
660 displayed in Table 6 and Figure 6 for the biomes shown in Fig. 3, and seasonal cycles are shown in Figure 7. GPP increased in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5 in all extratropical biomes, but it decreased in the two biomes with significant coverage by C₄ grass. For all

biomes, the representation of GPP in JULES9_{ALL} was closer to the observed (MTE) value. NPP increased in every biome, and this was an improvement (relative to MOD17) in five
665 biomes (boreal and coniferous forests, temperate grasslands, deserts/shrublands, tundra, and Mediterranean woodlands), but NPP was too high in tropical biomes and extratropical mixed forests.

In the tropical forests, the biome-average GPP and NPP increased in JULES9_{ALL} compared to
670 JULES5, and both fluxes were $\sim 200 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ higher than their respective observational value. The seasonality of rainfall in the Tropics has a hemispheric dependence. Splitting the biome into the northern and southern hemisphere revealed that the seasonal cycle in Fig. 7a was most similar to the southern hemisphere in terms of the climate and fluxes. In both hemispheres, the JULES GPP was higher than the MTE GPP during the transition period
675 from the wet to the dry season and the early dry season. This is in contrast to the results at the two Brazilian Fluxnet sites, where JULES GPP was lower than observed during the ~~dry~~ ~~wet~~ season.

Most of the differences between JULES5_{ALL} and JULES9_{ALL} were in the tropics (Fig. 9,
680 Table 6). The global GPP was relatively high (135 Pg C yr^{-1}) in JULES5_{ALL} (compared to 127 Pg C yr^{-1} for JULES9_{ALL}), primarily because V_{cmax} for the generic broadleaf tree was much higher than for the tropical broadleaf evergreen PFT, based on the data from K09. Although tropical GPP was higher in JULES5_{ALL} compared to JULES9_{ALL}, the NPP in tropical forests was lower and closer to the values from MODIS NPP. The reason was the
685 differences in leaf nitrogen, which increased respiratory costs in JULES5_{ALL} compared to JULES9_{ALL}. Both N_A and N_m were higher for the broadleaf tree PFT than for the tropical evergreen broadleaf tree PFT.

Over the tropical savannah biome, the GPP decreased in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5
 690 due to lower productivity from C₄ grasses, and GPP was within the uncertainty range of the
 MTE GPP, although slightly higher. The overestimation occurred during most of the year
 (Fig. 7b), except during the late dry season/early wet season (Oct.-Dec.). Although C₄ grasses
 had a lower NPP in JULES9_{ALL}, a significant fraction of the biome is composed of C₃ grass,
 BDT, ESh, and DSh in the ESA data, which all had higher NPP in JULES9_{ALL}. For this
 695 reason, biome-scale NPP was higher in JULES9_{ALL} than in JULES5, and simulated NPP was
 140 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ higher than the MOD17 value. In the temperate grasslands biome, both GPP
 and NPP were higher in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5, and closer to the MTE and
 MOD17 values. However, compared to the MTE, the JULES9 GPP increased one month
 early, it was too low in the mid-summer, and it declined too slowly in the autumn.

700 The biome-scale GPP in the extratropical mixed forests improved in JULES9_{ALL} compared to
 JULES5, and was very close to the MTE estimate. The simulated GPP was overestimated
 during the autumn (Sept.-Oct.) and underestimated during the winter. Simulated NPP was
 very close to the MOD17 NPP in JULES5, but it is too high by ~100 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ in
 705 JULES9_{ALL}. The predominant vegetation types in the “boreal and coniferous forests” biome
 are NET (26% coverage), C₃ grass (20%), and NDT (14%). Shrubs, deciduous broadleaf
 trees, and bare soil cover the remaining 40% of the biome. There was a large increase in
 summertime GPP in this biome, bringing JULES9_{ALL} closer to the MTE GPP than JULES5.
 The NPP increased in JULES9, compared to JULES5, and was within 10 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ of the
 710 MOD17 NPP.

Deserts/shrublands and tundra are both dry environments with annual average GPP of $\sim 280 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ according to the MTE dataset. Although GPP increased in both biomes in JULES9_{ALL} relative to JULES5, it was much lower than the MTE value. In the tundra biome, GPP was underestimated during the entire growing season, and it was underestimated all year in the desert biome. The simulated NPP was also significantly lower than MOD17 in these two biomes, although it was slightly improved in JULES9_{ALL}. These results indicate that the JULES plants struggle in extremely cold and arid environments.

In the Mediterranean woodlands, GPP increased by $90 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and NPP increased by $80 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5, but both fluxes were still $\sim 100 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ lower than the MTE GPP and MOD17 NPP. The simulated GPP (in JULES9_{ALL}) was close to the MTE value during most of the year except the dry season, when it declined more in the model than in the MTE estimate.

On a global scale, JULES9_{ALL} had a similar GPP but higher NPP compared to JULES5 (Fig. 8). In both simulations, the global GPP was $128\text{-}129 \text{ Pg C yr}^{-1}$ (average from 2000-2012), compared to the MTE average of $122 \pm 8 \text{ Pg C yr}^{-1}$. GPP was higher in JULES9_{ALL} compared to JULES5 in the core of the tropical forests, but lower in tropical/subtropical South America, Africa, and Asia. These are regions with significant grass coverage (Fig. 3a), especially C₄ grasses. Poleward of 30° , GPP was higher in JULES9_{ALL} due to higher productivity in trees. In JULES5, the global NPP (55 Pg C yr^{-1}) was close to the value from MODIS NPP (54 Pg C yr^{-1}). In JULES9_{ALL}, the NPP was higher than JULES5 almost everywhere (except for southern Brazil where C₄ grasses are dominant), and the global NPP was 62 Pg C yr^{-1} .

5. Discussion

5.1 Impacts of trait-based parameters and new PFTs

Including trait-based data on leaf N, $V_{\text{max},25}$, and leaf lifespan improved the seasonal cycle of GPP at seven sites, especially sites with C₃ grass and NDT. Parameterizing leaf lifespan
740 correctly has been shown to be important, even within biomes (Reich et al., 2014). Our study confirms this, as the simulation of GPP improved at fewer sites in the simulations without the improved leaf lifespan. However, compared to the standard 5 PFTs, the RMSE of GPP was only improved at four sites in JULES9_{TRY}. Despite this, the new PFTs with the new trait data include observed trade-offs between leaf structure and lifespan. These trade-offs are
745 important for enabling JULES to represent observed vegetation distribution and for predictions of future fluxes.

Incorporating more data and accounting for evergreen and deciduous habits further improved the model, as indicated by the closer model-data comparison obtained with JULES9_{ALL} at
750 both the site and global level. The distinction between the tropical and temperate broadleaf evergreen trees provided mixed results. While there was no improvement in the seasonal cycles at the two tropical forest sites, both GPP and the seasonal cycle of NEE were improved at the warm-temperate evergreen savannah site (Las Majadas). This study has laid the groundwork for further improvements to JULES GPP and plant respiration by
755 incorporating trait-based physiological relationships and allowing for a flexible number of PFTs. Future development can focus on more biome-specific data-model mismatches than was possible with the generic set of 5 PFTs.

The 9 PFTs were chosen as they represent the range of deciduous and evergreen plant types
760 with minimal externally determined bioclimatic limits. The distinction between tropical and temperate broadleaf evergreen trees account for the important differences between these

types of trees (e.g. a lower V_{cmax} for a given N_A in tropical broadleaf evergreen trees: Kattge et al., 2009). The comparison of JULES5_{ALL} and JULES9_{ALL} indicates that even using improved parameters with 5 PFTs based on the TRY data and the literature reviewed in this study will give improved productivity fluxes in JULES. However, an important caveat is JULES was not run with dynamic vegetation for this analysis. The additional PFTs enable more diverse and specific dynamic responses to climate change.

5.2 Future development priorities

The biome-level evaluation of GPP and NPP provides insight into potential areas for improvement in JULES: in particular boreal forests, tundra, Mediterranean woodlands and desert/xeric shrublands (Fig. SM6). GPP was systematically underestimated in regions experiencing seasonal soil moisture stress, such as the tropical forests, summer at Morgan Monroe, and the dry season at El Saler. A similar result was seen with the arid biomes and in the Mediterranean biome during summer. The fact that the model did not match the seasonal cycle of GPP at the two tropical forest sites with improved parameters indicates that processes such as the representation of plant water access and/or soil hydraulic properties need to be addressed in JULES. However, the dry season bias was not present when JULES was compared to the biome-scale MTE GPP. This underscores the complexity of modelling tropical forest productivity and the need to evaluate multiple data sources. High latitude grasses were underproductive, which also contributed to an underestimation of soil carbon (not shown). Further development of a tundra-specific PFT(s) could improve the carbon cycle in these regions.

A side effect of the trait-based parameters was increased respiration, and comparison to both Fluxnet sites and the MTE suggest it is now too high for most biomes. Total ecosystem

respiration was higher than observed at Manaus, Harvard, Morgan Monroe, Tharandt, Hyytiala, Kaamanen, Las Majadas, and Tonzi (75% of the sites with respiration data) (Fig. S3). As this study has focused primarily on improving the GPP, the next step should be to include a more mechanistic representation of growth and maintenance respiration in JULES to improve the net productivity (e.g. using data from Atkin et al., 2015). Comparison to the MTE respiration also suggests that JULES soil respiration is too high during the winter in the temperate and boreal biomes. In the latter, both versions of JULES predicted positive respiration flux during the winter, while the MTE product showed negligible fluxes (Fig. S5). The average winter temperatures in the biome were $<-13^{\circ}\text{C}$, yet soil respiration continued during these months because the Q10 soil respiration scheme has a very slow decay of soil respiration flux at sub-zero temperatures (see Fig. 2 of Clark et al., 2011). A similar result was seen at Hyytiala (Fig. S3b), which further indicates that winter-time respiration might be too high.

Last, the simulation of GPP could be further improved by replacing the static $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ per PFT. Simultaneous with this study, there is work to include temperature acclimation for photosynthesis JULES, which is more realistic than a set T_{opt} for each PFT. Also, the data exhibits large within-PFT variation in $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ (Fig. 2) and photosynthetic capacity can depend on the time of year. Recent work relating photosynthetic capacity to climate variables, environmental factors, and soil conditions shows promise for better capturing the dynamic nature of this parameter (e.g. Verheijen et al., 2013; Ali et al., 2015; Maire et al., 2015).

6. Conclusions

We evaluated the impacts on GPP, NEE, and NPP of new plant functional types in JULES. At the base of the new PFTs was inclusion of new data from the TRY database. N_m and LMA replaced the parameters N_{l0} and σ_l . These were used to calculate new $V_{\text{cmax},25}$, which was higher for all of the new PFTs compared to the original five, except for C_3 grasses. The higher $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ resulted in higher GPP. The GPP did not increase for C_4 grasses due to a lower quantum efficiency, or for cold grasslands due to a lower optimal temperature for V_{cmax} . Increases in NPP generally followed on from the increases in GPP.

A trade-off between LMA and leaf lifespan was enforced by changing parameters relating to leaf phenology, growth and senescence. The new parameter values changed the turnover rate of leaves on trees in the spring and fall, therefore altering the leaf lifespan in JULES in a manner consistent with observations. In JULES9_{TRY}, the median leaf lifespan of grasses and shrubs were reduced, which improved the seasonal cycle at the relevant sites (Las Majadas, Tonzi, Fort Peck, Kaamanen, and Tomakai). The exception was the Bondville crop site.

Including the full range of updated parameters (in JULES9_{ALL}) resulted in an improved seasonal cycle of GPP at ten sites and reductions to daily RMSE at 11 sites (out of 13 sites with GPP data) compared to JULES9_{TRY}. The annual GPP was within the range of the Fluxnet observations at every site except for one (Hyytiala). On a biome-scale, we compared GPP to the MTE product of Jung et al. (2011) and NPP to the MODIS17 product. GPP was improved in JULES9 for all eight biomes evaluated, although for the tundra and desert/shrubland biome the GPP was much lower than the MTE value. The global NPP was slightly higher than observed, but JULES9 was closer to MOD17 in most biomes – the exceptions being the tropical forests, savannahs, and extratropical mixed forests where

835 JULES9 was too high. The biome-averaged NPP from JULES9 was within the range of
MOD17 NPP for all biomes.

Overall, the simulation of gross and net productivity was improved with the 9 PFTs. The
present study can be thought of as a “bottom-up” approach to improving JULES fluxes, with
840 new parameters being based on large observationally based datasets. The next step for
improving PFTs in JULES is to evaluate the 9 PFTs when the dynamic vegetation is turned
on. This will be addressed in a follow-up paper. A complimentary, “top-down” method for
reducing uncertainty in JULES is to optimise PFT parameters based on minimising errors
between simulated and observed fluxes. This is currently being done with adJULES, an
845 adjoint version of JULES (Raoult et al., 2016). Future model development within JULES will
have more flexibility for improving the model with more PFTs, and the improvements
presented in this study increase our confidence in using JULES in carbon cycle studies.

Code Availability

850 The simulations discussed in this manuscript were done on JULES version 4.2. The exact
code is available from Dropbox at:
https://www.dropbox.com/s/ydt4lxe1320fhty/JULES4.2_PFTs.tar.gz?dl=0, along with
namelist files for the Fluxnet simulations.

855 Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge all funding bodies. AH was funded by the NERC Joint Weather
and Climate Research Programme and NERC grant NE/K016016/1. The study has been
supported by the TRY initiative on plant traits (<http://www.try-db.org>). The TRY initiative
and database is hosted, developed and maintained by J. Kattge and G. Bönisch (Max Planck

860 Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany). TRY is currently supported by
 DIVERSITAS/Future Earth and the German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research
 (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig. OA acknowledges the support of the Australian Research Council
 (CE140100008). Met Office authors were supported by the Joint DECC/Defra Met Office
 Hadley Centre Climate Programme (GA01101). ~~VO was supported by RNF (Project 14-50-~~
 865 ~~00029). VO was supported by RNF (RSF) (Project 14-50-00029).~~ JP acknowledges support
 from the European Research Council Synergy grant ERC-SyG-2013-610028, IMBALANCE-
 P, and ÜN from the Advanced grant ERC-AdG-322603, SIP-VOL+. We also thank Andrew
 Hartley (UK Met Office), who processed the ESA Land Cover data to the 5 and 9 PFTs, and
 Nicolas Viovy (IPSL-LSCE), who kindly provided the CRU-NCEP driving data.

870

References

- Aerts, R.: The advantages of being evergreen, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 10(10), 402-407, 1995.
- Ali, A.A., Xu, C., Rogers, A., McDowell, N.G., Medlyn, B.E., Fisher, R.A., Wullschlegel,
 875 S.D., Reich, P.B., Vrugt, J.A., Bauerle, W., Santiago, L.S., Wilson, C.J.: Global scale
 environmental control of plant photosynthetic capacity, *Ecological Applications*, 25 (8),
 2349–2365, DOI: 10.1890/14-2111.1, 2015.
- Anav, A., Friedlingstein, F., Kidston, M., Bopp, L., Ciais, P., Cox, P.M., Jones, C.D., Jung,
 M., Myneni, R., and Zhu, Z.: Evaluating the land and ocean components of the global
 880 carbon cycle in the CMIP5 earth system models, *Journal of Climate*, 26, 6801-6843,
 doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00417.1, 2013.
- Arora, V., Boer, G., Friedlingstein, P., Eby, M., Jones, C., Christian, J., Bonan, G., Bopp, L.,
 Brovkin, V., Cadule, P., Hajima, T., Ilyina, T., Lindsay, K., Tjiputra, J., and Wu, T.:
 Carbon-concentration and carbon-climate feedbacks in CMIP5 Earth system models, *J.*
 885 *Climate*, 26, 5289-5314, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00494.1, 2013.

- Atkin, O.K., Evans, J.R., Ball, M.C., Lambers, H.: Leaf respiration of snow gum in the light and dark. Interactions between temperature and irradiance, *Plant Physiol.*, 122, 915–923, 2000.
- Atkin, O.K., Bloomfield, K.J., Reich, P.B., Tjoelker, M.G., and co-authors: Global variability
890 in leaf respiration in relation to climate, plant functional types and leaf traits. *New Phytologist*, 206: 614–636, 2015.
- Best, M., Pryor, M., Clark, D., Rooney, G., Essery, R., Ménard, C., Edwards, J., Hendry, M., Porson, A., Gedney, N., Mercado, L., Sitch, S., Blyth, E., Boucher, O., Cox, P., Grimmond, C. and Harding, R.: The Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES),
895 model description – Part 1: Energy and water fluxes, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4(3), 677–699, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-677-2011, 2011.
- Blyth, E., Clark, D., Ellis, R., Huntingford, C., Los, S., Pryor, M., Best, M. and Sitch, S.: A comprehensive set of benchmark tests for a land surface model of simultaneous fluxes of water and carbon at both the global and seasonal scale, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4(2),
900 255269, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-255-2011, 2011.
- von Caemmerer, S. and Furbank, R.T.: The C4 pathway: an efficient CO₂ pump, *Photosynthesis Research*, 77: 191–207, doi: 10.1023/A:1025830019591, 2003
- Carnicer, J., Barbeta, A., Sperlich, D., Coll, M.: Contrasting trait syndromes in angiosperms and conifers are associated with different responses of tree growth to temperature on a
905 large scale, *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 4(409), doi: 10.3389/fpls.2013.00409, 2013.
- Carswell, F.E., Meir, P., Wandelli, E.V.: Photosynthetic capacity in a central Amazonian rain forest, *Tree Physiol.*, 20, 179–186, 2000.
- Clark, D., Mercado, L., Sitch, S., Jones, C., Gedney, N., Best, M., Pryor, M., Rooney, G., Essery, R., Blyth, E., Boucher, O., Harding, R., Huntingford, C. and Cox, P.: The Joint
910 UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES), model description – Part 2: Carbon fluxes

- and vegetation dynamics, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4(3), 701–722, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-701-2011, 2011.
- Collatz, G.J., Ball, J.T., Grivet, C., and Berry, J.A.: Physiological and environmental regulation of stomatal conductance, photosynthesis and transpiration: a model that includes a laminar boundary layer, *Agr. Forest Meteorol.*, 54, 107–136, 1991.
- Collatz, G.J., Ribas-Carbo, M., Berry, J.A.: Coupled photosynthesis-stomatal conductance model for leaves of C4 plants, *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, 19, 519–538, 1992.
- Cox, P., Huntingford, C. and Harding, R.: A canopy conductance and photosynthesis model for use in a GCM land surface scheme, *Journal of Hydrology*, 212–213, 79–94, doi:10.1016/S0022-1694(98)00203-0, 1998.
- Cox, P., Betts, R., Bunton, C., Essery, R., Rowntree, P. and Smith, J.: The impact of new land surface physics on the GCM simulation of climate and climate sensitivity, *Climate Dynamics*, 15(3), 183–203, doi:10.1007/s003820050276, 1999.
- Cox, P., Betts, R., Jones, C., Spall, S. and Totterdell, I.: Acceleration of global warming due to carbon-cycle feedbacks in a coupled climate model, *Nature*, 408(6809), 184–187, doi:10.1038/35041539, 2000.
- Cox, P.M.: Description of the TRIFFID dynamic global vegetation model, [online] Available from: http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/media/pdf/9/h/HCTN_24.pdf, 2001.
- Cox, P.M., Betts, R.A., Collins, M., Harris, P.P., Huntingford, C., Jones, C.D.: Amazonian forest dieback under climate-carbon cycle projections for the 21st century, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 78, 137–156, DOI 10.1007/s00704-004-0049-4, 2004.
- Cox, P.M., Pearson, D., Booth, B.B., Friedlingstein, P., Huntingford, C., Jones, C.D., and Luke, C.: Sensitivity of tropical carbon to climate change constrained by carbon dioxide variability, *Nature*, 494, 341–345, doi:10.1038/nature11882, 2013.
- Domingues, T.F., Martinelli, L.A., Ehleringer, J.R.: Ecophysiological traits of plant

- functional groups in forest and pasture ecosystems from eastern Amazonia, Brazil, *Plant Ecology*, doi: 10.1007/s11258-006-9251-z, 2007.
- Domingues, T.F., Meir, P., Feldpausch, T.R., Saiz, G., Veenendaal, E.M., Schrod, F., Bird, M., Djagbletey, G., Hien, F., and Compaore, H.: Co-limitation of photosynthetic capacity by nitrogen and phosphorus in West Africa woodlands, *Plant, Cell, and Environment*, 33(6) 959-980, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3040.2010.02119.x, 2010.
- Dreyer, E., Roux, X., Montpied, P., Daudet, F. and Masson, F.: Temperature response of leaf photosynthetic capacity in seedlings from seven temperate tree species, *Tree Physiol.*, 21(4), 223–232, doi:10.1093/treephys/21.4.223, 2001.
- Essery, R., Best, M., and Cox, P.: MOSES 2.2 technical documentation, Hadley Centre Technical Note 30, Met Office, Bracknell, UK, 30 pp [Available online at www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/hadleycentre/pubs/HCTN/HCTN_30.pdf], 2001.
- Essery, R., Best, M.J., Betts, R.A., and Taylor, C.M.: Explicit representation of subgrid heterogeneity in a GCM land surface scheme, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 4, 530-543, 2003.
- Evans, J.R.: Photosynthesis and nitrogen relationships in leaves of C3 plants, *Oecologia*, 78, 9-19, doi: 10.1007/BF00377192, 1989.
- Field C.B. and Mooney, H.A.: The photosynthetic-nitrogen relationship in wild plants. In: Givnish, T., ed., *On the economy of form and function*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 22-55, 1986.
- Friedlingstein, P., Cox, P., Betts, R., Bopp, L., von Bloh, W., Brovkin, V., Cadule, P., Doney, S., Eby, M., Fung, I., et al.: Climate–Carbon Cycle Feedback Analysis: Results from the C4MIP Model Intercomparison, *J. Climate*, 19(14), 3337-3353, doi:10.1175/JCLI3800.1, 2006.
- Friedlingstein, P.: Carbon cycle feedbacks and future climate change, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*,

- 373: 20140421, doi: 10.1098/rsta.2014.0421, 2015.
- Galbraith, D., Levy, P.E., Sitch, S., Huntingford, C., Cox, P.M., Williams, M., Meir, P.:
Multiple mechanisms of Amazon forest biomass losses in three dynamic global
vegetation models under climate change, *New Phytologist*, 187, 647-665, doi:
965 10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03350.x, 2010.
- Good, P., Jones, C., Lowe, J., Betts, R. and Gedney, N.: Comparing Tropical Forest
Projections from Two Generations of Hadley Centre Earth System Models, HadGEM2-
ES and HadCM3LC, *J. Climate*, 26(2), 495-511, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00366.1, 2013.
- Gower, S.T. and Richards, J.H.: Larches: deciduous conifers in an evergreen world,
970 *BioScience*, 40(11), 818-826, doi:10.2307/1311484, 1990.
- Groenendijk, M., Dolman, A., van der Molen, M.K, Leuning, R., Arneeth, A., Delpierre, N.,
Gash, J.H.C., Lindroth, A., Richardson, A.D., Verbeeck, H., Wohlfahrt, G.: Assessing
parameter variability in a photosynthesis model within and between plant functional
types using global Fluxnet eddy covariance data, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,
975 151, 22-38, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.08.013, 2011.
- Hirano, T., Hirata, R., Fujinuma, Y., Saigusa, N., Yamamoto, S., Harazono, Y., Takada, A.,
Inukai, K. And Inoue, G.: CO₂ and water vapor exchange of a larch forest in northern
Japan, *Tellus B*, 55(2), 244–257, doi:10.1034/j.1600-0889.2003.00063.x, 2003.
- ~~Hopcroft, P. and Valdes, P.: How well do simulated last glacial maximum tropical
980 temperatures constrain equilibrium climate sensitivity?, *Geophysical Research Letters*,
doi:10.1002/2015gl064903, 2015.~~
- ~~Hopcroft, P.O. and P.J. Valdes: Last Glacial Maximum constraints on the Earth System
Model HadGEM2-ES, *Climate Dynamics*, 45 (5), 1657-1672, doi:10.1007/s00382-014-
2421-0, 2015.~~
- 985 Houborg, R., Cescatti, A., and Migliavacca, M.: Satellite retrievals of leaf chlorophyll and

- photosynthetic capacity for improved modeling of GPP, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorol.*, 177, 10-23, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2013.04.006, 2013.
- Hurtt, G.C., Chini, L.P., Frolking, S., Betts, R.A., and Feddema, J.: Harmonization of land-use scenarios for the period 1500–2100: 600 years of global gridded annual land-use transitions, wood harvest, and resulting secondary lands, *Climatic Change*, 47:504–505, 990 2011.
- Jacobs, C.: Direct impact of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on regional transpiration, Ph.D. thesis, Wageningen Agricultural University, 1994.
- Jung, M., Reichstein, M., Margolis, H., Cescatti, A., Richardson, A., Arain, A., Arneth, A., 995 Bernhofer, C., Bonal, D., Chen, J., Gianelle, D., Gobron, N., Kiely, G., Kutsch, W., Lasslop, G., Law, B., Lindroth, A., Merbold, L., Montagnani, L., Moors, E., Papale, D., Sottocornola, M., Vaccari, F. and Williams, C.: Global patterns of land-atmosphere fluxes of carbon dioxide, latent heat, and sensible heat derived from eddy covariance, satellite, and meteorological observations, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 116(G3), doi:10.1029/2010JG001566, 2011. 1000
- Kattge, J., Knorr, W., Raddatz, T., and Wirth, C.: Quantifying photosynthetic capacity and its relationship to leaf nitrogen content for global-scale terrestrial biosphere models, *Global Change Biology*, 15(4), 976–991, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01744.x, 2009.
- Kattge, J., Díaz, S., Lavorel, C., Prentice, I.C., Leadley, P., Bönsch, G., Garnier, E., 1005 Westoby, M., Reich, P.B., Wright, I.J., et al.: TRY – a global database of plant traits, *Global Change Biology*, 17(9), 2905–2935, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02451.x, 2011.
- Kerkhoff, A., Fagan, W., Elser, J. and Enquist, B.: Phylogenetic and growth form variation in the scaling of nitrogen and phosphorus in the seed plants, *The American Naturalist*, 1010 doi:10.1086/507879, 2006.

- Kobe, R.K., Lepczyk, C.A., Iyer, M.: Resorption efficiency decreases with increasing green leaf nutrients in a global data set, *Ecology*, doi: 10.1890/04-1830, 2005.
- Kubien, D.S. and Sage, R.F.: Low-temperature photosynthetic performance of a C4 grass and a co-occurring C3 grass native to high latitudes, *Plant*, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3040.2004.01196.x, 2004.
- 1015 Le Quéré et al.: Global Carbon budget 2013, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 6, 235-263, doi:10.5194/essd-6-235-2014, 2014.
- Maire, V., Wright, I.J., and Prentice, I.C.: Global effects of soil and climate on leaf photosynthetic traits and rates, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 706-717, doi: 10.1111/geb.12296, 2015.
- 1020 Makino, A., Sakuma, H., and Sudo, E.: Differences between maize and rice in N-use efficiency for photosynthesis and protein allocation, *Plant and Cell Physiol.*, 44(9): 952-956, 2003.
- Malhi, Y., Aragão, L., Metcalfe, D., Paiva, R., Quesada, C., Almeida, S., Anderson, L., Brando, P., Chambers, J., Costa, A., Hutyra, L., Oliveira, P., Patiño, S., Pyle, E., Robertson, A. And Teixeira, L.: Comprehensive assessment of carbon productivity, allocation and storage in three Amazonian forests, *Global Change Biology*, 15(5), 1255–1274, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01780.x, 2009.
- 1025 Medlyn, B.E., Badeck, W.F., de Pury, D.G.G., Barton, C.V.M., Broadmeadow, M., Ceulemans, R., de Angelis, P., Forstreuter, M., Jach, M.E., Kellomäki, S., Laitat, E., Marek, M., Philippot, S., Rey, A., Strassmeyer, J., Laitinen, K., Liozon, R., Portier, B., Roberntz, P., Wang, K., and Jarvis, P.G.: Effects of elevated CO2 on photosynthesis in European forest species: a meta-analysis of model parameters, *Plant, Cell and Environment*, 22(12), 1475–1495, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1999.00523.x, 1999.
- 1030

- 1035 Medlyn, B.E., Dreyer, E., Ellsworth, D., Forstreuter, M., Harley, P.C., Kirschbaum, M.U.F., Roux, X.L., Montpied, P., Strassmeyer, J., Walcroft, A., Wang, K., and Loustau, D.: Temperature response of parameters of a biochemically based model of photosynthesis. II. A review of experimental data, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 25(9), 1167–1179, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.2002.00891.x, 2002.
- 1040 Meir, P., Kruijt, B., Broadmeadow, M., Barbosa, E., Kull, O., Carswell, F., Nobre, A. and Jarvis, P.: Acclimation of photosynthetic capacity to irradiance in tree canopies in relation to leaf nitrogen concentration and leaf mass per unit area, *Plant Cell Environ*, 25(3), 343–357, doi:10.1046/j.0016-8025.2001.00811.x, 2002.
- Meir, P., Levy, P.E., Grace, J., and Jarvis, P.G.: Photosynthetic parameters from two
1045 contrasting woody vegetation types in West Africa, *Plant Ecology*, doi: 10.1007/s11258-007-9320-y, 2007.
- Mercado, L.M., Huntingford, C., Gash, J.H.C., Cox, P.M., Jogireddy, V.: Improving the representation of radiation interception and photosynthesis for climate model applications, *Tellus B*, 59(3), 553–565, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0889.2007.00256.x, 2007.
- 1050 Monk, C.D.: An ecological significance of evergreenness, *Ecology*, 47:504–505, doi: 10.2307/1932995, 1966.
- Niinemets, Ü.: Research review. Components of leaf dry mass per area – thickness and density – alter leaf photosynthetic capacity in reverse directions in woody plants, *New Phytologist*, 144(1), 35–47, doi:10.1046/j.1469-8137.1999.00466.x, 1999.
- 1055 Niinemets, Ü., Portsmouth, A., Tena, D., and Tobias, M.: Do we underestimate the importance of leaf size in plant economics? Disproportional scaling of support costs within the spectrum of leaf physiognomy, *Annals of Botany*, 100: 283–303; doi:10.1093/aob/mcm107, 2007.
- Niinemets, Ü., Keenan, T.F., and Hallik, L.: A worldwide analysis of within-canopy

- 1060 variations in leaf structural, chemical and physiological traits across plant functional types, *New Phytologist*, doi: 10.1111/nph.13096, 2015.
- Ohta, T., Hiyama, T., Tanaka, H., Kuwada, T., Maximov, T., Ohata, T. and Fukushima, Y.: Seasonal variation in the energy and water exchanges above and below a larch forest in eastern Siberia, *Hydrol. Process.*, 15(8), 1459–1476, doi:10.1002/hyp.219, 2001.
- 1065 Olson, D. M., Dinerstein, E., Wikramanayake, E. D., Burgess, N. D., Powell, G. V. N., Underwood, E. C., D'Amico, J. A., Itoua, I., Strand, H. E., Morrison, J. C., Loucks, C. J., Allnutt, T. F., Ricketts, T. H., Kura, Y., Lamoreux, J. F., Wettengel, W. W., Hedao, P., Kassem, K. R. 2001. Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on Earth. *Bioscience* 51(11):933-938.
- 1070 Osborne, T., Gornall, J., Hooker, J., Williams, K., Wiltshire, A., Betts, R., and Wheeler, T.: JULES-crop: a parametrisation of crops in the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 8, 1139–1155, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-1139-2015, 2015.
- Poorter, H., Niinemets, Ü., Poorter, L., Wright, I. and Villar, R.: Causes and consequences of variation in leaf mass per area (LMA): a meta-analysis, *New Phytologist*, 182(3), 565–
- 1075 588, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.02830.x, 2009.
- Poulter, B., MacBean, N. and Hartley, A.: Plant functional type classification for Earth System Models: results from the European Space Agency's Land Cover Climate Change Initiative, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8, 429-462, doi:10.5194/gmdd-8-429-2015, 2015.
- 1080 Prentice, I.C., Cramer, W., Harrison, S.P., Leemans, R., Monserud, R.A., Solomon, A.M.: A global biome model based on plant physiology and dominance, soil properties, and climate, *Journal of Biogeography*, 19, 117-134, 1992.

- Raoult, N.M., Jupp, T.E., Cox, P.M., Luke, C.M.: Land surface parameter optimisation through data assimilation: the adJULES system, *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/gmd-2015-281, in review, 2016.
- 1085 Reich, P.B., Walters, M.B. and Ellsworth, D.S.: Leaf life-span in relation to leaf, plant, and stand characteristics among diverse ecosystems, *Ecological Monographs*, doi: 10.2307/2937116, 1992.
- Reich, P., Walters, M., and Ellsworth, D.: From tropics to tundra: Global convergence in plant functioning, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 94(25), 13730–13734, doi:10.1073/pnas.94.25.13730, 1997.
- 1090 Reich, P., Walters, M., and Ellsworth, D.: From tropics to tundra: Global convergence in plant functioning, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 94(25), 13730–13734, doi:10.1073/pnas.94.25.13730, 1997.
- Reich, P.B., Ellsworth, D.S., Walters, M.B.: Leaf structure (specific leaf area) regulates photosynthesis-nitrogen relations: evidence from within and across species and functional groups. *Functional Ecology*, 12:948-958, 1998a.
- 1095 Reich, PB, R Rich, X Lu, Y-P Wang, J Oleksyn. 2014. Biogeographic variation in evergreen conifer needle longevity and impacts on boreal forest carbon cycle projections. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 111:13703-13708, 2014.
- Reichstein, M., Falge, E., Baldocchi, D., Papale, D., Aubinet, M., et al.: On the separation of net ecosystem exchange into assimilation and ecosystem respiration: review and improved algorithm, *Global Change Biology*, 11, 1424–1439, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.001002.x, 2005.
- 1100 Rogers, A.: The use and misuse of V_{max} in Earth System Models, *Photosynthesis Research*, 114, 3, doi:10.1007/s11120-013-9818-1, 2013.
- Sage, R.F. and Pearcy, R.W.: The nitrogen use efficiency of C₃ and C₄ plants I. Leaf nitrogen, growth, and biomass partitioning in *Chenopodium album* (L.) and *Amaranthus retroflexus* (L.), *Plant Physiology*, 84, 954-958, 1987.
- 1105 Schulze, E.D., Kelliher, F.M., Korner, C., and Lloyd, J.: Relationships among maximum

stomatal conductance, ecosystem surface conductance, carbon assimilation rate, and plant nitrogen nutrition: a global ecology, *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 25, 629-660, doi:10.2307/2097327, 1994.

1110 Silla, F. and Escudero, A.: Uptake, demand and internal cycling of nitrogen in saplings of Mediterranean *Quercus* species, *Oecologia*, doi: 10.1007/s00442-003-1232-5, 2003.

Sitch, S., Friedlingstein, P., Gruber, N., Jones, S., Murray-Tortarolo, G., Ahlström, A., Doney, S.C., Graven, H., Heinze, C., Huntingford, C., Levis, S., Levy, P.E., Lomas, 1115 M., Poulter, B., Viovy, N., Zaehle, S., Zeng, N., Arneth, A., Bonan, G., Bopp, L., Canadell, J.G., Chevallier, F., Ciais, P., Ellis, R., Gloor, M., Peylin, P., Piao, S., Le Quéré, C., Smith, B., Zhu, Z., Myneni, R.: Trends and drivers of regional sources and sinks of carbon dioxide over the past two decades, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 653-679, 2015.

Skillman, J.: Quantum yield variation across the three pathways of photosynthesis: not yet 1120 out of the dark, *J. Exp. Bot.*, 59(7), 1647–1661, doi:10.1093/jxb/ern029, 2008.

Takashima T., Hikosaka, K., Hirose T.: Photosynthesis or persistence: nitrogen allocation in leaves of evergreen and deciduous *Quercus* species, *Plant, Cell & Environment* 27, 1047-1054, 2004.

Verheijen, L. M., Brovkin, V., Aerts, R., Bonisch, G., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Kattge, J., Reich, 1125 P.B., Wright, I.J., van Bodegom, P.M.: Impacts of trait variation through observed trait–climate relationships on performance of an Earth system model: a conceptual analysis, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 5497–5515, doi:10.5194/bg-10-5497-2013 , 2013.

White, M.A., Thornton, P.E., and Running, S.W.: Parameterization and sensitivity analysis of the BIOME-BGC terrestrial ecosystem model: net primary production controls, *Earth 1130 Interactions*, 4(3), 2000.

Wohlfahrt, G., Bahn, M., Haubner, E., Horak, E., Michaeler, W., Rottmar, K., Tappeiner, U., Cernusca, A.: Interspecific limitation of the biochemical limitation to photosynthesis

and related leaf traits of 30 species from mountain grassland ecosystems under different land use, *Plant, Cell, and Environment*, 22, 1281-1296, 1999.

- 1135 Woodward, F.I. and Williams, B.G.: Climate and plant distribution at global and local scales, *Vegetation*, 69, 189-197, 1987.

Wright, I., Reich, P., Westoby, M., Ackerly, D., Baruch, Z., Bongers, F., Cavender-Bares, J., Chapin, T., Cornelissen, J., Diemer, M., Flexas, J., Garnier, E., Groom, P., Gulias, J., Hikosaka, K., Lamont, B., Lee, T., Lee, W., Lusk, C., Midgley, J., Navas, M.-L.,
1140 Niinemets, U., Oleksyn, J., Osada, N., Poorter, H., Poot, P., Prior, L., Pyankov, V., Roumet, C., Thomas, S., Tjoelker, M., Veneklaas, E. and Villar, R.: The worldwide leaf economics spectrum., *Nature*, 428(6985), 821–7, 2004.

Xiang, S., Reich, P.B., Sun, S., Atkin, O.K.: Contrasting leaf trait scaling relationships in tropical and temperate wet forest species, *Functional Ecology*, 27, 522-534, 2013

- 1145 Zaehle, S. and Friend, A.: Carbon and nitrogen cycle dynamics in the O-CN land surface model: 1. Model description, site-scale evaluation, and sensitivity to parameter estimates, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 24(1), doi:10.1029/2009GB003521, 2010.

Zeng, X.: Global vegetation root distribution for land modelling, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 2, 525-530, 2001.

- 1150 Zhao, M., Heinsch, F.A., and Nemani, R.R.: Improvements of the MODIS terrestrial gross and net primary production global data set, *Remote sensing of Environment*, 95, 164-176, 2005.

Zhao, M. and Running, S.W.: Drought-induced reduction in global terrestrial net primary production from 2000 through 2009, *Science*, 329, 940-943, 2010.

1155

Tables and Figure captions

Table 1. Parameters used for the 5 PFT experiment (JULES5). The standard PFTs are: broadleaf trees (BT), needle-leaf trees (NT), C₃ grass, C₄ grass, and shrubs (SH). N_m was calculated by dividing the default N_{l0} by C_{mass} (0.5 in this study), LMA was given the same value as σ_L , and s_v was calculated to yield the same $V_{cmax,25}$ as with the default 5 PFTs. All other parameters were taken from Clark et al. (2011).

	BT	NT	C ₃	C ₄	SH
a_{wl}	0.65	0.65	0.005	0.005	0.10
D_{crit}	0.09	0.06	0.10	0.075	0.10
d_T	9	9	9	9	9
f_0	0.875	0.875	0.900	0.800	0.900
f_d	0.010	0.015	0.015	0.025	0.015
i_v	0	0	0	0	0
L_{max}	9	6	4	4	4
L_{min}	1	1	1	1	1
LMA	0.075	0.200	0.050	0.100	0.100
N_a^a	1.73	3.30	1.83	3.00	3.00
N_m	0.023	0.0165	0.0365	0.030	0.030
$rootd$	3	1	0.5	0.5	0.5
s_v	21.33	8.00	32.00	8.00	16.00
T_{low}	0	-10	0	13	0
T_{off}	5	-40	5	5	5
T_{opt}	32	22	32	41	32
T_{upp}	36	26	36	45	36
$V_{cmax,25}$	36.8	26.4	58.4	24.0	48.0
α	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.06	0.08
γ_0	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
γ_p	20	15	20	20	15
μ_{rl}	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
μ_{sl}	0.10	0.10	1.00	1.00	0.10

^aThese are derived from other parameters. Here N_a is g N m⁻².

1165 **Table 2.** Updated parameters used in JULES9_{ALL}. The new PFTs are: tropical broadleaf evergreen trees (BET-Tr), temperate broadleaf evergreen trees (BET-Te), needle-leaf evergreen trees (NET), needle-leaf deciduous trees (NDT), C₃ grass, C₄ grass, evergreen shrubs (ESH), and deciduous shrubs (DSH).

	BET-Tr	BET-Te	BDT	NET	NDT	C ₃	C ₄	ESH	DSH
a_{wl}	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.005	0.005	0.10	0.10
D_{crit}	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.060	0.041	0.051	0.075	0.037	0.030
d_T	9	9	9	9	9	0	0	9	9
f_0	0.875	0.892	0.875	0.875	0.936	0.931	0.800	0.950	0.950
f_d	0.010	0.010	0.010	0.015	0.015	0.019	0.019	0.015	0.015
i_v	7.21	3.90	5.73	6.32	6.32	6.42	0.00	14.71	14.71
L_{max}	9	7	7	7	6	3	3	4	4
L_{min}	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
LMA	0.1039	0.1403	0.0823	0.2263	0.1006	0.0495	0.1370	0.1515	0.0709
N_a^a	1.76	2.02	1.74	2.61	1.87	1.19	1.55	2.04	1.54
N_m	0.017	0.0144	0.021	0.0115	0.0186	0.0240	0.0113	0.0136	0.0218
<i>rootd</i>	3	2	2	1.8	2	0.5	0.5	1	1
s_v	19.22	28.40	29.81	18.15	23.79	40.96	20.48	23.15	23.15
T_{low}	13	13	5	5	-5	10	13	10	0
T_{off}	0	-40	5	-40	5	5	5	-40	5
T_{opt}	39	39	39	33	34	28	41	32	32
T_{upp}	43	43	43	37	36	32	45	36	36
$V_{cmax,25}$	41.16	61.28	57.25	53.55	50.83	51.09	31.71	62.41	50.40
α	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.08
γ_0	0.25	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.25	3.0	3.0	0.66	0.25
γ_p	15	15	20	15	20	20	20	15	30
μ_{rl}	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.72	0.72	0.67	0.67
μ_{sl}	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	1.00	1.00	0.10	0.10

^aThese are derived from other parameters. Here N_a is g N m⁻².

1170

Table 3. Experiments for the Fluxnet site level evaluation.

Experiment Number	Description
0: JULES5	5 PFTs (Table 1)
1	9 PFTs with N_m , LMA, and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ from TRY
2: JULES9-TRY	Exp. 1 + parameters affecting leaf lifespan
3	Exp. 2 + f_0 and D_{crit}
4	Exp. 2 + α
5	Exp. 2 + adjusted f_d , T_{upp} , T_{low} , and s_v
6	Exp. 2 + rootd, a_{wl}
7: JULES9	All new PFT parameters (Table 2)

Table 4. Sites used in the site simulations. Land cover is according to site PI.

Site Name	Location	Simulated years	Land Cover	Dominant PFT(s)
BR-Ma2	Manaus, Brazil	2002-2005	Evergreen broadleaf forest	100% BET
BR-Sa1	Santarem (Tapajos Forest, KM67), Brazil	2002-2004	Evergreen broadleaf forest	100% BET
BR-Sa3	Santarem (Tapajos Forest, KM77), Brazil	2001-2005	Pasture	20% BET, 75% C ₄ , 5% soil
DE-Tha	Tharandt, Germany	1998-2006	Needle-leaf evergreen forest	100% NET
ES-ES1	El Saler, Spain	1999-2006	Needle-leaf evergreen forest	100% NET
ES-LMa	Las Majadas, Spain	2004-2006	Closed shrub	33% Temp-BET, 33% C ₃ , 33% ESh
FI-Hyy	Hyytiala, Finland	1998-2002	Needle-leaf evergreen forest	100% NET
FI-Kaa	Kaamanen, Finland	2000-2005	Wetland (simulated as C ₃ grass)	80% C ₃ grass, 20% bare soil
JP-Tom	Tomakai, Japan	2001-2003	Needle-leaf deciduous plantation	10% BDT, 10% NET, 80% NDT
US-Bo1	Bondville, Ill., US	1997-2006	Crop (rotating C ₃ /C ₄)	40% C ₃ , 40% C ₄ , 20% soil
US-FPe	Fort Peck, Mont., US	2000-2006	Grassland (C ₃)	80% C ₃ grass, 20% bare soil
US-Ha1	Harvard, Mass., US	1995-2001	Broadleaf deciduous forest	100% BDT
US-MMS	Morgan Monroe Forest, US	2000-2004	Broadleaf deciduous forest	100% BDT
US-Ton	Tonzi, Calif., US	2001-2006	Woody savannah	33% BDT, 33% C ₃ , 33% DSh

1180

Table 5. Comparison of simulated and observed annual GPP and NPP at Fluxnet sites, listed in order from most to least productive. Units: $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Results are color-coded so blue shows when there is an improvement. The GPP and NPP are based on similar data processing between the Fluxnet observations and model. Sources: ¹Malhi 2009; ²Gower and Richards, 1990, assuming 0.5gC/g biomass

Site	GPP			NPP		
	JULES5	JULES9	OBS	JULES5	JULES9	OBS
BR-Sa1	2671	2795	3314±600	850	1048	1440±130 ¹
BR-Ma2	2848	3225	3285±835	867	1198	1011±140 ¹
BR-Sa3	3318	2116		1623	1125	
DE-Tha	1364	1876	1923±547	700	1004	
JP-Tom	1306	1361	1723±641	691	747	1100 ²
ES-ES1	1164	1087	1458±383	513	404	
US-MMS	1135	1234	1445±463	603	693	
US-Ha1	1229	1438	1433±531	686	851	
US-Bo1	896	1006	1233±568	457	591	
ES-LMA	1095	1257	1133±305	500	644	
FI-Hyy	1124	1465	1084±324	605	834	
US-Ton	818	794	924±256	365	405	
US-FPe	238	368	354±185	88	192	
FI-Kaa	633	512	297±126	359	311	

Table 6a. Area-weighted GPP from each biome ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). The biome total GPP from MTE is given in Pg C yr^{-1} to give perspective of each biome's role in the global total.

Biome	JULES5	JULES9	JULES5-ALL	MTE	MTE total
Tropical forest	2403±217	2295±191	2505±217	2244±297	49.9
Tropical forest: Only BET-Tr.	2924±144	2955±147	3279±178	2790±273	
Tropical savannah	1355±244	1268±223	1320±237	1111±257	21.9
Extratropical mixed forests	947±147	1082±158	1119±167	1119±212	2.9 (13.4*)
Boreal and coniferous forests	514±99	597±118	645±122	650±203	12.1
Temperate grasslands	420±145	465±138	477±140	509±184	8.1
Deserts and shrublands	82±48	91±46	91±47	283±200	4.9
Tundra	86±20	94±20	101±20	279±233	1.9
Mediterranean Woodlands	324±147	407±136	405±140	510±190	1.5

*Value for EMF biome when agricultural mask is not applied.

Table 6b. Area-weighted NPP from each biome ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$).

Biome	JULES5	JULES9	JULES5-ALL	MODIS17
Tropical forest	956±144	1007±125	951±143	786±352
Only BET-Tr.	1141±101	1233±103	1109±126	929±315
Tropical savannah	527±158	591±143	584±152	451±319
Extratropical mixed forests	586±93	631±104	640±110	563±231
Boreal and coniferous forests	307±65	358±77	385±80	350±155
Temperate grasslands	180±94	243±89	242±90	304±247
Deserts and shrublands	16±29	35±29	33±29	111±133
Tundra	52±14	61±13	65±13	136±94
Mediterranean Woodlands	118±94	201±89	195±89	324±184

Table SM1. List of parameters and symbols in the text.

Symbol	Units	Equation	Description	Default Value ^a
A_l	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	5	Leaf-level photosynthesis	
a_{wl}	kg C m^{-2}	24	Allometric coefficient	
a_{ws}	--	24	Ratio of total to respiring stem carbon	
b_{wl}	--	24	Allometric exponent	1.667
C_i	Pa	6	Internal leaf CO_2 concentration	
C_{mass}	$\text{kg C [kg biomass]}^{-1}$	23	Leaf carbon concentration per unit mass	0.5 for this study
C_s	Pa	6	Leaf surface CO_2 concentration	
D_{crit}	kg kg^{-1}	7	Critical humidity deficit	
d_T	--	16	Rate of change of leaf turnover with temperature	
f_0	--	7	Stomatal conductance parameter	
f_d	--	4	Leaf dark respiration coefficient	
g_s	m s^{-1}	6	Leaf-level stomatal conductance	
i_v	$\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	19	Intercept for relationship between N_A and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$	
k_n	--	3, 20	Extinction coefficient for nitrogen	0.78
h	m	13, 23, 24	Canopy height	
L_{bal}	$\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$	12, 13, 22-24	Balanced leaf area index (maximum LAI given the plant's height)	
L_{max}	$\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$		Maximum LAI	
L_{min}	$\text{m}^2 \text{m}^{-2}$		Minimum LAI	
LMA	kg m^{-2}	18, 21, 22	Leaf mass per unit area (new parameter)	
N_a	kg N m^{-2}	18	Leaf nitrogen per unit area	
n_{eff}	$\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{kg C [kg N]}^{-1}$	3	Constant relating leaf nitrogen to Rubisco carboxylation capacity	
N_{10}	kg N [kg C]^{-1}	3	Top leaf nitrogen concentration (old parameter, mass basis)	
N_m	kg N kg^{-1}	18, 21-23	Top leaf nitrogen concentration (new parameter)	
N_l	kg N m^{-2}	11, 21	Total leaf nitrogen concentration	
N_r	kg N m^{-2}	12, 22	Total root nitrogen concentration	
N_s	kg N m^{-2}	13, 23	Total stem nitrogen concentration	
p	--	17	Phenological state ($\text{LAI}/L_{\text{bal}}$)	
$Q_{10,\text{leaf}}$	--	2	Constant for exponential term in temperature function of V_{cmax}	2
R_a	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	8	Total plant autotrophic respiration	
R_d	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	4, 5	Leaf dark respiration	
r_g	--	10	Growth respiration coefficient	0.25
rootd	m		e-folding root depth	
s_v	$\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ g N}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	19	Slope between N_A and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$	
T_{low}	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	1	Upper temperature parameter for V_{cmax}	
T_{off}	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	16	Threshold temperature for phenology	
T_{opt}^b	$^{\circ}\text{C}$		Optimal temperature for V_{cmax}	
T_{upp}	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	1	Upper temperature parameter for V_{cmax}	
$V_{\text{cmax},25}$	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	1, 9	The maximum rate of carboxylation of	

			Rubisco at 25°C	
W	kg C m ⁻² s ⁻¹	5	Smoothed minimum of the potential limiting rates of photosynthesis	
α	mol CO ₂ [mol PAR photons] ⁻¹		Quantum efficiency	
β	--	5	Soil moisture stress factor	
Γ^*	Pa	7	CO ₂ compensation point	
γ_0	[360 days] ⁻¹	16	Minimum leaf turnover rate	
γ_{lm}	[360 days] ⁻¹	16	Leaf turnover rate	
γ_p	[360 days] ⁻¹	17	Leaf growth rate	20
μ_{rl}	--	12, 22	Ratio of nitrogen concentration in roots and leaves	
μ_{sl}	--	13, 23	Ratio of nitrogen concentration in stems and leaves	
η_{sl}	kg C m ⁻² LAI ⁻¹	13, 23	Live stemwood coefficient	0.01
σ_L	kg C m ⁻² LAI ⁻¹	11, 12	Specific leaf density (old parameter)	

1190 ^aDefault values only provided for non-PFT-dependent parameters.

Table SM2. New trait-based parameters for 5 PFTs that are consistent with TRY data.

	BT	NT	C3	C4	SH
N_m	0.0185	0.0117	0.0240	0.0113	0.0175
LMA	0.1012	0.2240	0.0495	0.1370	0.1023
s_v	25.48	18.15	40.96	20.48	23.15
i_v	6.12	6.32	6.42	0.00	14.71
$V_{cmax,25}$	53.84	53.88	55.08	31.71	56.15
T_{off}	5	-40	5	5	-40
d_T	9	9	0	0	9
γ_0	0.25	0.25	3.0	3.0	0.66
γ_p	20	15	20	20	15
L_{min}	1	1	1	1	1
L_{max}	9	7	3	3	4
D_{crit}	0.09	0.06	0.051	0.075	0.037
f_0	0.875	0.875	0.931	0.800	0.950
f_d	0.010	0.015	0.019	0.019	0.015
<i>rootd</i>	3	2	0.5	0.5	1
T_{low}	5	0	10	13	0
T_{opt}	39	32	28	41	32
T_{upp}	43	36	32	45	36
α	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.08
μ_{rl}	0.67	0.67	0.72	0.72	0.67

1195

Figure 1. Trade offs between leaf mass per unit area (LMA; kg m^{-2}) and (a,c) leaf nitrogen (g g^{-1}), and between LMA and (b,d) leaf lifespan (LL). (a,b) Parameters in the standard JULES, converted from N_0 and σ_l based on 0.4 kg C per kg dry mass (assumed parameter in JULES from Clark et al., 2011). (c,d) Median values from the TRY database for the new 9 PFTs. In (b) and (d), the filled circles show the observed data and the open shapes show the median values from global simulations of JULES from 1982-2012. Vertical and horizontal lines show the range of values between the lower and upper quartile of data.

Figure 2. $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for the new nine PFTs (black), from the comparable PFT from the TRY data (Kattge et al., 2009) (green), and from the standard 5 PFTs (red). Asterisks indicate the $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for JULES9 prior to calibration tuning based on the Fluxnet sites. The standard deviation reported in Kattge et al. (2009) are also shown for the observations with the vertical lines. BET-Tr=Tropical broadleaf evergreen trees, BET-Te=Temperate broadleaf evergreen trees, BDT=Broadleaf deciduous trees, NET=Needle-leaf evergreen trees, NDT=Needle-leaf deciduous trees, C3G= C₃ grass, C4G= C₄ grass, ESh=Evergreen shrubs, DSh=Deciduous shrubs.

Figure 3. (a) Dominant vegetation type from the ESA LC_CCI data set, aggregated to the new 9 PFTs. (b) Color-coded map of global biomes, based on World Wildlife Fund biomes.

Figure 4. Relative changes in daily RMSE (Eq. 24) and monthly correlation coefficients (Eq. 25) for the JULES experiments in Table 4 compared to JULES5. Yellows and reds indicate an improvement in JULES compared to the Fluxnet observations.

1220 **Figure 5a.** Monthly mean fluxes of GPP. Observations \pm standard deviation from Fluxnet are shown with triangles and vertical lines. The three JULES simulations are: JULES5 with standard 5 PFTs (JULES5, red); JULES with 9 PFTs and new LMA, N_m , and $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ from TRY (JULES9_{TRY}, orange); JULES9-TRY plus new parameters for the PFTs as discussed in Section 2.3 (JULES9_{ALL}, blue). Also shown are the daily root mean square error (rmse) based
 1225 on daily fluxes and the correlation coefficient (r) based on monthly mean fluxes for all years of the simulations. Site information is given in Table 3. All units are in $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$.

Figure 5b. As in 5a but for monthly anomalies of NEE.

1230 **Figure 6.** Annual GPP and NPP for the eight biomes shown in Fig. 3b. Biome abbreviations are: D=Deserts, M=Mediterranean woodlands, TU=Tundra, TG=Temperate grasslands, TS=Tropical savannahs, BCF=boreal and coniferous forests, EMF=Extra-tropical mixed forests, TF=Tropical forests.

1235 **Figure 7.** **Area-averaged** seasonal cycles of GPP from the biomes shown in Fig. 3b, comparing JULES5, JULES9, and the Jung et al. (2011) MTE. Also shown are the temperature and precipitation from the CRU-NCEP dataset used to force the JULES simulations. **The gray shading in the GPP plots shows the MTE GPP ± 1 standard deviation based on the area-averaged standard deviations of monthly fluxes for each grid cell.**

1240

Figure 8. Global maps of carbon cycle fluxes from 2000-2012. The observation sources are: MTE (GPP) and MODIS MOD17 (NPP, 2000-2013).

Figure 9. Differences between modelled and observed GPP (observed = MTE) and NPP
1245 (observed=MOD17). a,b) JULES with the standard 5 PFTs and default parameters; c,d)
JULES with 5 PFTs and improved parameters; e,f) JULES with 9 PFTs and improved
parameters.




Figure 1. Trade offs between leaf mass per unit area (LMA; kg m^{-2}) and (a,c) leaf nitrogen (g g^{-1}), and between LMA and (b,d) leaf lifespan (LL). (a,b) Parameters in the standard JULES, converted from N_{10} and σ_1 based on $0.4 \text{ kg C per kg dry mass}$ (assumed parameter in JULES from Clark et al., 2011). (c,d) Median values from the TRY database for the new 9 PFTs. In (b) and (d), the filled circles show the observed data and the open shapes show the median values from global simulations of JULES from 1982-2012. Vertical and horizontal lines show the range of values between the lower and upper quartile of data.




Figure 2. $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for the new nine PFTs (black), from the comparable PFT from the TRY data (Kattge et al., 2009) (green), and from the standard 5 PFTs (red). Asterisks indicate the $V_{\text{cmax},25}$ for JULES9 prior to tuning based on the Fluxnet sites. The standard deviation reported in Kattge et al. (2009) are also shown for the observations with the vertical lines. BET-Tr=Tropical broadleaf evergreen trees, BET-Te=Temperate broadleaf evergreen trees, BDT=Broadleaf deciduous trees, NET=Needleleaf evergreen trees, NDT=Needleleaf deciduous trees, C3G=C3 grass, C4G=C4 grass, ESh=Evergreen shrubs, DSh=Deciduous shrubs.




Figure 3. (a) Dominant vegetation type from the ESA LC_CCI data set, aggregated to the new 9 PFTs. (b) Color-coded map of global biomes, based on World Wildlife Fund biomes.




Figure 4. Relative changes in daily RMSE (Eq. 24) and monthly correlation coefficients (Eq. 25) for the JULES experiments in Table 4 compared to JULES5. Yellows and reds indicate an improvement in JULES compared to the Fluxnet observations.




Figure 5a. Monthly mean fluxes of GPP. Observations \pm standard deviation from Fluxnet are shown with triangles and vertical lines. The three JULES simulations are: JULES5 with standard 5 PFTs (JULES5, red); JULES with 9 PFTs and new LMA, N_m , and $V_{cmax,25}$ from TRY (JULES9-TRY, orange); JULES9-TRY plus new parameters for the PFTs as discussed in Section 2.3 (JULES9-ALL, blue). Also shown are the daily root mean square error (rmse) based on daily fluxes and the correlation coefficient (r) based on monthly mean fluxes for all years of the simulations. Site information is given in Table 3. All units are in g C m⁻² d⁻¹.




Figure 5b. As in 5a but for monthly anomalies of NEE.




Figure 6. Annual GPP and NPP for the eight biomes shown in Fig. 3b. Biome abbreviations are: D=Deserts, M=Mediterranean woodlands, TU=Tundra, TG=Temperate grasslands, TS=Tropical savannahs, BCF=boreal and coniferous forests, EMF=Extra-tropical mixed forests, TF=Tropical forests.




Figure 7. Area-averaged seasonal cycles of GPP from the biomes shown in Fig. 3, comparing JULES5, JULES9, and the Jung et al. (2011) MTE. Also shown are the temperature and precipitation from the CRU-NCEP dataset used to force the JULES simulations. The gray shading in the GPP plots shows the MTE GPP ± 1 standard deviation based on the area-averaged standard deviations of monthly fluxes for each grid cell.

— MTE
— JULES9-ALL
— JULES5




Figure 8. Global maps of carbon cycle fluxes from 2000-2012. The observation sources are: MTE (GPP), and MODIS MOD17 (NPP, 2000-2013).




Figure 9. Differences between modelled and observed GPP (observed = MTE) and NPP (observed=MOD17). a,b) JULES with the standard 5 PFTs and default parameters; c,d) JULES with 5 PFTs and improved parameters; e,f) JULES with 9 PFTs and improved parameters.

Supplementary Material to “Improved representation of plant functional types and physiology in the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES v4.2) using plant trait information” by A.B. Harper et al.

This supplement contains:

S1. Additional photosynthesis equations for the JULES model

S2. Data for N_{mass} , LMA, and LL.

S3. Energy and respiration results at the Fluxnet sites

Supplemental Tables SM1-SM2

Supplemental Figures S1-S6

Supplemental Data in the zip file TRY_data_PFTs.zip contains summary of data for the standard 5 PFTs and new 9 PFTs.

S1. Additional photosynthesis equations

In JULES, leaf-level photosynthesis (Collatz et al 1991:1992) is calculated based on the limiting factor of three potential photosynthesis rates.

1. A light-limited rate, W_l :

$$W_l = \alpha(1 - \omega)I_{\text{par}} \left(\frac{c_i - \Gamma}{c_i + 2\Gamma} \right) \quad \text{for C3 plants} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$W_l = \alpha(1 - \omega)I_{\text{par}} \quad \text{for C4 plants} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where α is the quantum efficiency of photosynthesis ($\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ mol PAR}^{-1}$) and ω is the leaf scattering coefficient for PAR. I_{par} is the photosynthetically active radiation hitting the leaf ($\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$), Γ is the CO_2 compensation point in the absence of mitochondrial respiration (Pa), and c_i is the internal CO_2 concentration (Pa).

2. A Rubisco-limited rate, W_c :

$$W_c = V_{\text{cmax}} \left(\frac{c_i - \Gamma}{c_i + K_c \left(1 + O_a / K_o \right)} \right) \quad \text{for C3 plants} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$W_c = V_{\text{cmax}} \quad \text{for C4 plants} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where K_o and K_c are the Michaelis-Menten parameters for O_2 and CO_2 , respectively, and V_{cmax} is the maximum rate of carboxylation of Rubisco ($\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$).

3. A rate of transport of photosynthetic products for C3 plants, and PEPCarboxylase limitation for C4 plants, W_e :

$$W_e = 0.5V_{cmax} \quad \text{for C3 plants} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$W_e = 2 \times 10^4 V_{cmax} \frac{c_i}{P_*} \quad \text{for C4 plants} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where P_* is the surface air pressure (Pa).

S2. Data for N_{mass} , LMA, and LL. The table shows the data sources for the TRY data used in this study. For each source, the number of measurements for each source is provided for N_{mass} /specific leaf area (SLA) pairs and for leaf lifespan.

Ref.	Contact	N_{mass} + SLA	Leaf lifespan
Atkin et al., 1997; Campbell et al., 2007	Owen Atkin	218	
Xu and Baldocchi, 2003	Dennis Baldocchi	468	
Cavender-Bares et al., 2006	Jeannine Cavender-Bares	x	
unpublished	F. Stuart III Chapin	50	48
Cornelissen et al., 2004; Cornelissen et al., 2003, 1996; Diaz et al., 2004; Quested et al., 2003	Johannes Cornelissen	690	161
	Will Cornwell (+David Ackerly)	53	
Díaz et al., 2004 (maybe didn't use); Diaz et al. 2010 (definitely used)	Sandra Díaz	70	
Han et al., 2005; He et al., 2006, 2007	Jingyun Fang	148	
Freschet and Cornelissen, 2010; Freschet et al., 2010	Gregoire Freschet (+Hans Cornelissen)	40	
	Eric Garnier (+ Sandra Lavorel)	966	
Kattge et al., 2009	Jens Kattge*	1326	204
Kurokawa and Nakashizuka, 2008	Hiroko Kurokawa	399	89
	Daniel Laughlin	139	
Niinemets, 1999; Niinemets, 2001	Ülo Niinemets	264	33
Ordoñez et al., 2010; Ordoñez et al., 2010	Jenny Ordoñez (+Peter van Bodegom)	282	
Ogaya and Peñuelas, 2007a, 2007b, 2003;	Josep Peñuelas	808	

Ogaya, 2006; Sardans et al., 2008			
Poorter et al., 2009; 2006	Lourens Poorter		x
Reich et al., 2008, 2009	Peter Reich	720	199
Cornwell et al., 2007	Lawren Sack	30	
Shipley and Lechowicz 2000, <i>Ecoscience</i> , 7:183-194	Bill Shipley	603	
2. Meziane and Shipley, 1999, <i>Plant Cell and Environment</i>			
	Enio Sosinski	66	
Soudzilovskaia et al, 2013, <i>PNAS</i>	Nadia Soudzilovskaia	155	
	Peter van Bodegom	x	x
Wright et al., 2011	S. Joseph (Joe) Wright	204	
Wright et al., 2006, 2004	Ian Wright	1673	442

Data was analysed to calculate the parameters N_m and LMA for the new 9 PFTs (Table 2) and for the original 5 PFTs (Table S2). For JULES users who wish to run the model with the standard 5 PFTs but with updated parameters, the recommended parameters are given in Table S2. Additionally, it is important to set both ‘l_trait_phys’ and ‘l_ht_compete’ to True in the jules_vegetation namelist. The former will switch to the trait-based physiology discussed in the main text, and the latter will allow for flexible number of PFTs to compete if the dynamic vegetation mode is used. Results of JULES with the new 9 PFTs and the height-based competition will be discussed in a follow up paper.

References

- Atkin, O. K., Westbeek, M. H., Cambridge, M. L., Lambers, H. and Pons, T. L.: Leaf respiration in light and darkness (a comparison of slow-and fast-growing *Poa* species), *Plant Physiology*, 113(3), 961–965, doi:10.1104/pp.113.3.961, 1997.
- Baker, T. R., Phillips, O. L., Laurance, W. F., Pitman, N. C. A., Almeida, S., Arroyo, L., DiFiore, A., Erwin, T., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T. J., Laurance, S. G., Nascimento, H., Monteagudo, A., Neill, D. A., Silva, J. N. M., Malhi, Y., López Gonzalez, G., Peacock, J., Quesada, C. A., Lewis, S. L., and Lloyd, J.: Do species traits determine patterns of wood production in Amazonian forests?, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 297-307, doi:10.5194/bg-6-297-2009, 2009.

- ~~Baker, TR, Phillips, OL and Laurance, WF: Do species traits determine patterns of wood production in Amazonian forests?, ... [online] Available from: <http://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/17956/>, 2009.~~
- Campbell, C., Atkinson, L., Zaragoza-Castells, J., Lundmark, M., Atkin, O. and Hurry, V.: Acclimation of photosynthesis and respiration is asynchronous in response to changes in temperature regardless of plant functional group, *New Phytologist*, 176(2), 375–389, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.02183.x, 2007.
- Cavender-Bares, J., Keen, A. and Miles, B.: Phylogenetic structure of Floridian plant communities depends on taxonomic and spatial scale, *Ecology*, 87(sp7), S109S122, doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[109:PSOFPC]2.0.CO;2, 2006.
- ~~Cornelissen, J.H.C., Quested, H.M., Gwynn-Jones, D., van Logtestijn, R.S.P., De Beus, M.A.H., Kondratchuk, A., Callaghan, T.V., and Aerts, R. COELISSEN, QUESTED, GWYNN-JONES, LOGTESTIJN, V., BEUS, KONDRATCHUK, CALLAGHAN and AERTS: Leaf digestibility and litter decomposability are related in a wide range of subarctic plant species and types, Functional Ecology, 18(6), 779–786, doi:10.1111/j.0269-8463.2004.00900.x, 2004.~~
- Cornelissen, J.H.C., Diez, P.C. and Hunt, R.: Seedling growth, allocation and leaf attributes in a wide range of woody plant species and types, *Journal of Ecology*, 84(5), 755–765, doi:10.2307/2261337, [online] Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2261337>, 1996.
- Cornelissen, J. H. C., Cerabolini, B., Castro-Díez, P., Villar-Salvador, P., Montserrat-Martí, G., Puyravaud, J. P., Maestro, M., Werger, M. J. A. and Aerts, R.: Functional traits of woody plants: correspondence of species rankings between field adults and laboratory-grown seedlings?, *J Veg Sci*, 14(3), 311–322, doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2003.tb02157.x, 2003.
- Cornwell, W., Bhaskar, R., Sack, L., Cordell, S. and Lunch, C.: Adjustment of structure and function of Hawaiian *Metrosideros polymorpha* at high vs. low precipitation, *Functional Ecology*, 21(6), 1063–1071, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01323.x, 2007.
- Diaz, S., Hodgson, J.G., Thompson, Cabido, Cornelissen, J. H. C., Jalili, Montserrat-Martí, Grime, J. P., Zarrinkamar, Asri, Band, S. R., Basconcelo, Castro-Díez, Funes, Hamzehee, Khoshnevi, Pérez-Harguindeguy, Pérez-Rantomé, M. C., Shirvany, F. A., Vendramini, Yazdani, Abbas-Azimi, Bogaard, Boustani, Charles, Dehghan, Torres-Espuny, Falczuk, Guerrero-Campo, Hynd, Jones, Kowsary, Kazemi-Saeed, Maestro-Martínez, Romo-Díez, Shaw, Siavash, Villar-Salvador and Zak, M. R.: The plant traits that drive ecosystems: Evidence from three continents, *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 15(3), 295–304, doi:10.1111/j.1654-1103.2004.tb02266.x, 2004.
- Freschet, G.T., Cornelissen, J.H.C., van Logtestijn, R.S.P., and Aerts, R.: Substantial nutrient

resorption from leaves, stems and roots in a subarctic flora: what is the link with other resource economics traits?, *New Phytologist*, 186: 879-889, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03228.x, 2010.

Freschet, G., Cornelissen, J., Logtestijn, R. and Aerts, R.: Evidence of the “plant economics spectrum” in a subarctic flora, *Journal of Ecology*, 98(2), 362–373, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2009.01615.x, 2010.

Fyllas, N., Patiño, S., Baker, T., Nardoto, G., Martinelli, L., Quesada, C., Paiva, R., Schwarz, M., Horna, V., Mercado, L., Santos, A., Arroyo, L., Jiménez, E., Luizão, F., Neill, D., Silva, N., Prieto, A., Rudas, A., Silviera, M., Vieira, I., Lopez-Gonzalez, G., Malhi, Y., Phillips, O. and Lloyd, J.: Basin-wide variations in foliar properties of Amazonian forest: phylogeny, soils and climate, *Biogeosciences*, 6(11), 2677-2708, doi:10.5194/bg-6-2677-2009, 2009.

Gutiérrez, A.G. and Huth, A.: Successional stages of primary temperate rainforests of Chiloé Island, Chile, *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 14(4), 243-256, doi:10.1016/j.ppees.2012.01.004.

~~Gutiérrez AG, & Huth A (2012) Successional stages of primary temperate rainforests of Chiloé Island, Chile. Perspectives in plant ecology, systematics and evolution. 14: 243–256~~

Han, W., Fang, J., Guo, D. and Zhang, Y.: Leaf nitrogen and phosphorus stoichiometry across 753 terrestrial plant species in China, *New Phytologist*, 168(2), 377–385, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01530.x, 2005.

He, J., Wang, Z., Wang, X., Schmid, B., Zuo, W., Zhou, M., Zheng, C., Wang, M. and Fang, J.: A test of the generality of leaf trait relationships on the Tibetan Plateau, *New Phytologist*, 170(4), 835–848, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2006.01704.x, 2006.

He, J.-S., Wang, L., Flynn, D., Wang, X., Ma, W. and Fang, J.: Leaf nitrogen:phosphorus stoichiometry across Chinese grassland biomes, *Oecologia*, 155(2), 301–310, doi:10.1007/s00442-007-0912-y, 2007.

Kattge, J., Knorr, W., Raddatz, T. and Wirth, C.: Quantifying photosynthetic capacity and its relationship to leaf nitrogen content for global-scale terrestrial biosphere models, *Global Change Biology*, 15(4), 976–991, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01744.x, 2009.

Kleyer, Bekker, R. M., Knevel, I. C., Bakker, J. P., Thompson, Sonnenschein, Poschlod, Groenendaal, J. M., Klimeš, Klimešová, Klotz, Rusch, G. M., Hermy, Adriaens, Boedeltje, Bossuyt, Dannemann, Endels, Götzenberger, Hodgson, J. G., Jackel, A., Kühn, Kunzmann, Ozinga, W. A., Römermann, Stadler, Schlegelmilch, Steendam, H. J., Tackenberg, Wilmann, Cornelissen, J. H. C., Eriksson, Garnier and Peco: The LEDA Traitbase: a database of life-history traits of the Northwest European flora, *Journal of Ecology*, 96(6), 1266–1274, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2008.01430.x, 2008.

- Kurokawa, H. and Nakashizuka, T.: Leaf herbivory and decomposability in a Malaysian tropical rain forest, *Ecology*, 89(9), 2645–2656, doi:10.1890/07-1352.1, 2008.
- Medlyn, B.E., Barton, C.V.M., Broadmeadow, M., *et al.*: Stomatal conductance of forest species after long-term exposure to elevated CO₂ concentration: A synthesis, *New Phytologist*, 149(2), 247–264, doi:10.1046/j.1469-8137.2001.00028.x, 2001.
- Medlyn, B.E. and Jarvis, P.G.: Design and use of a database of model parameters from elevated [CO₂] experiments, *Ecological Modelling*, 124(1), 69–83, doi:10.1016/S0304-3800(99)00148-9 [online] Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380099001489>, 1999.
- Medlyn, B.E., Badeck, -W., Pury, D., Barton, Broadmeadow, Ceulemans, Angelis, D., Forstreuter, Jach, Kellomäki, Laitat, Marek, Philippot, Rey, Strassemeier, Laitinen, Liozon, Portier, Roberntz, Wang and Jarvis, P.G.: Effects of elevated [CO₂] on photosynthesis in European forest species: a meta-analysis of model parameters, *Plant, Cell & Environment*, 22(12), 1475–1495, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.1999.00523.x, 1999.
- Niinemets, Ü.: Research review. Components of leaf dry mass per area – thickness and density – alter leaf photosynthetic capacity in reverse directions in woody plants, *New Phytologist*, 144(1), 35–47, doi:10.1046/j.1469-8137.1999.00466.x, 1999.
- Niinemets, Ü.: Global-scale climatic controls of leaf dry mass per area, density, and thickness in trees and shrubs, *Ecology*, 82(2), doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082[0453:GSCCOL]2.0.CO;2, 2001.
- ~~Niinemets Ü. (1999) Research review. Components of leaf dry mass per area – thickness and density – alter leaf photosynthetic capacity in reverse directions in woody plants. *The New Phytologist* 144, 35–47.~~
- ~~Niinemets Ü. (2001) Global-scale climatic controls of leaf dry mass per area, density, and thickness in trees and shrubs. *Ecology* 82, 453–469.~~
- Ogaya, R. and Penuelas, J.: Contrasting foliar responses to drought in *Quercus ilex* and *Phillyrea latifolia*, *Biologia Plantarum*, doi:10.1007/s10535-006-0052-y, 2006.
- Ogaya, R and Peñuelas, J: Leaf mass per area ratio in *Quercus ilex* leaves under a wide range of climatic conditions. The importance of low temperatures, *Acta Oecologica*, 31(2), 168–173, doi:10.1016/j.actao.2006.07.004, [online] Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1146609X06001482>, 2007a.
- Ogaya, R and Peñuelas, J: Tree growth, mortality, and above-ground biomass accumulation in a holm oak forest under a five-year experimental field drought, *Plant Ecology*, 189, 291–299, doi:10.1007/s11258-006-9184-6, 2007b.
- Ogaya, R. and Peñuelas, J.: Comparative field study of *Quercus ilex* and *Phillyrea latifolia*: photosynthetic response to experimental drought conditions, *Environmental and*

Experimental Botany, 50(2), 137148, doi:10.1016/S0098-8472(03)00019-4, 2003.

Ordoñez, JC, van Bodegom, PM, Witte, J.-P., Bartholomeus, R.P, van Hal, J.R., and Aerts, R.:

Plant strategies in relation to resource supply in mesic to wet environments: does theory mirror nature?, *American Naturalist*, 175(2), 225-239, doi:10.1086/649582 [online]

Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/649582>, 2010.

Ordoñez, J., Bodegom, P., Witte, J.-P., Bartholomeus, R., Dobben, H. and Aerts, R.: Leaf habit and woodiness regulate different leaf economy traits at a given nutrient supply, *Ecology*, 91(11), doi:10.1890/09-1509.1, 2010.

Patiño, S., Lloyd, J., Paiva, R., Baker, T. R., Quesada, C. A., Mercado, L. M., Schmerler, J., Schwarz, M., Santos, A. J. B., Aguilar, A., Czimeczik, C. I., Gallo, J., Horna, V., Hoyos, E. J., Jimenez, E. M., Palomino, W., Peacock, J., Peña-Cruz, A., Sarmiento, C., Sota, A., Turriago, J. D., Villanueva, B., Vitzthum, P., Alvarez, E., Arroyo, L., Baraloto, C., Bonal, D., Chave, J., Costa, A. C. L., Herrera, R., Higuchi, N., Killeen, T., Leal, E., Luizão, F., Meir, P., Monteagudo, A., Neil, D., Núñez-Vargas, P., Peñuela, M. C., Pitman, N., Priante Filho, N., Prieto, A., Panfil, S. N., Rudas, A., Salomão, R., Silva, N., Silveira, M., Soares deAlmeida, S., Torres-Lezama, A., Vásquez-Martínez, R., Vieira, I., Malhi, Y., and Phillips, O. L.: Branch xylem density variations across the Amazon Basin, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 545-568, doi:10.5194/bg-6-545-2009, 2009.

~~Patiño, S., Lloyd, J., Paiva, R. and Baker, T.R.: Branch xylem density variations across the Amazon Basin, ... [online] Available from: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/81h2v1g5.pdf>, 2009.~~

Poorter, H., Niinemets, Ü., Poorter, L., Wright, I. and Villar, R.: Causes and consequences of variation in leaf mass per area (LMA): a meta-analysis, *New Phytologist*, 182(3), 565–588, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.02830.x, 2009.

Poorter, L. and Bongers, F.: Leaf traits are good predictors of plant performance across 53 rain forest species, *Ecology*, 87(7), 17331743, doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[1733:LTAGPO]2.0.CO;2, 2006.

Quested, H., Cornelissen, H., Press, M., Callaghan, T., Aerts, R., Trosien, F., Riemann, P., Gwynn-Jones, D., Kondratchuk, A. and Jonasson, S.: Decomposition of sub-Arctic plants with differing nitrogen ecoioies: A functional role of hemiparasites, *Ecology*, 84(12), doi:10.1890/02-0426, 2003.

Reich, P., Oleksyn, J. and Wright, I.: Leaf phosphorus influences the photosynthesis–nitrogen relation: a cross-biome analysis of 314 species, *Oecologia*, 160(2), 207–212, doi:10.1007/s00442-009-1291-3, 2009.

Reich, P., Tjoelker, M., Pregitzer, K., Wright, I., Oleksyn, J. and Machado, J.: Scaling of respiration to nitrogen in leaves, stems and roots of higher land plants, *Ecol. Lett.*, 11(8), 793–801, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01185.x, 2008.

Sardans, J, Peñuelas, J and Ogaya, R: Drought-induced changes in C and N stoichiometry in a *Quercus ilex* Mediterranean forest, *Forest Science*, 54(5), 513-522, [online] Available from:

<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/saf/fs/2008/00000054/00000005/art00006>, 2008.

- Shiodera, S., Rahajoe, J.S., and Kohyama, T.: Variation in longevity and traits of leaves among co-occurring understorey plants in a tropical montane forest, *Journal of tropical ecology*, **24**(2), 121-133, doi: 10.1017/S0266467407004725 ~~... [online] Available from:~~ http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0266467407004725, 2008.
- Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Elumeeva, T.G., Onipchenko, V.G., Shidakov, I.I., Salpagarova, F.S., Khubiev, A.B., Tekeev, D.K., Cornelissen, J.H.C.: Functional traits predict relationship between plant abundance dynamic and long-term climate warming, *Proceedings of the National Academies of Science*, **110**(45), 18180-18184, 2013.
- Tecco, P.A., Diaz, S., Cabido, M., and C. Urcelay: Functional traits of alien plants across contrasting climatic and land use regimes: do aliens join the locals or try harder than them? *Journal of Ecology*. **98**:17-27, DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2745.2009.01592.x, 2010.
- Wright, IJ, Reich, PB, Atkin, OK, Lusk, CH, Tjoelker, M.J., and Westoby, M.: Irradiance, temperature and rainfall influence leaf dark respiration in woody plants: evidence from comparisons across 20 sites, *New Phytologist*, **169**(2), 309-319, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01590.x, 2006.
- Wright, I., Reich, P., Westoby, M., Ackerly, D., Baruch, Z., Bongers, F., Cavender-Bares, J., Chapin, T., Cornelissen, J., Diemer, M., Flexas, J., Garnier, E., Groom, P., Gulias, J., Hikosaka, K., Lamont, B., Lee, T., Lee, W., Lusk, C., Midgley, J., Navas, M.-L., Niinemets, U., Oleksyn, J., Osada, N., Poorter, H., Poot, P., Prior, L., Pyankov, V., Roumet, C., Thomas, S., Tjoelker, M., Veneklaas, E. and Villar, R.: The worldwide leaf economics spectrum., *Nature*, **428**(6985), 821–7, 2004.
- Wright, S., Yavitt, J., Wurzbarger, N., Turner, B., Tanner, E., Sayer, E., Santiago, L., Kaspari, M., Hedin, L., Harms, K., Garcia, M. and Corre, M.: Potassium, phosphorus, or nitrogen limit root allocation, tree growth, or litter production in a lowland tropical forest., *Ecology*, **92**(8), 1616–25, doi:10.1890/10-1558.1, 2011.
- Xu, L. and Baldocchi, D.: Seasonal trends in photosynthetic parameters and stomatal conductance of blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*) under prolonged summer drought and high temperature, *Tree Physiology*, **23**(13), 865–877, doi:10.1093/treephys/23.13.865, 2003.

S3. Energy and respiration results at the Fluxnet sites

The TRY-based parameters give a lower N_{root} and N_{stem} for all PFTs, and a lower N_{leaf} for all PFTs except for C_3 grass and BET-Te (Fig. S2). For C_3 grass, the simulated N_{leaf} in JULES9 is higher during the winter than in JULES5, since a moderate LAI is maintained due to the new phenology.

N_{leaf} is higher for BET-Te due to thicker leaves than previously. The respiration fluxes at BR-Ma2 provide a good example of the impacts of the new PFT parameters (Fig. SM3). The lower N_{stem} and N_{root} in JULES9 compared to JULES5 (Fig. SM2) reduced simulated R_{pm} (Eqn. 8). As a result, the average increase in plant respiration ($46 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) was much smaller than the increase in GPP ($377 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), and NPP increased from $867 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in JULES5 to $1198 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in JULES9, which was higher than the observed value at Manaus of $1011 \pm 140 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Mahli et al., 2009). At Santarem, NPP also increased, but it was lower than the observed value of $1440 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

The higher ecosystem respiration in JULES9 compared to JULES5 that accompanied the increased GPP was less realistic (in terms of RMSE), with 3 exceptions (Fig. SM3), but the seasonal cycle of total respiration was improved at 8 sites. The RMSE decreased at ES-ES1, where lower GPP and R in the fall and winter were more realistic, at JP-Tom, where the switch from generic needle leaf to deciduous needle leaf improved all aspects of the simulation, and at FI-Kaa, where the new phenology of grass also improved the simulation.

In JULES, latent heat flux (LE) is due to evaporation from water stored on the canopy, evaporation of water from the top layer of soil, transpiration through the stomata, and sublimation of snow. The seasonal cycle of LE was improved at nine sites, however r decreased (by <0.03) at BR-Sa1, ES-ES1, BR-Sa3, US-Bo1, and US-FPe, comparing JULES9_{ALL} to JULES5. The RMSE increased by $>4 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ in JULES9_{TRY} compared to JULES5 at DE-Tha and FI-Hyy, and RMSE increased by a further 4 W m^{-2} at DE-Tha when the photosynthesis/respiration parameters were added due to the higher GPP and stomatal conductance. However, the correlation was >0.91 for both sites. At some forest sites, simulated LE (SH) was too high (low) during the winter and spring (DE-Tha, US-Ha1, and US-MMS), however the LE component contributing to the high bias is site-dependent. For example, from Jan.-Mar. the largest source of LE is evaporation from snow/ice (E_i) at Harvard,

canopy evaporation and E_i at Tharandt, and soil evaporation/transpiration at Morgan Monroe. These springtime errors were not affected by the new PFTs. Another consistent bias in the forests was high mid-summer LE (De-Tha, FI-Hyy, US-Ha1, and US-MMS), which in this case always results from the soil evaporation/transpiration. Because the new PFTs tend to increase GPP and stomatal conductance, the errors in summer LE are higher.

Table SM1. List of parameters and symbols in the text.

Symbol	Units	Equation	Description	Default Value ^a
A_l	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	5	Leaf-level photosynthesis	
a_{wt}	kg C m^{-2}	24	Allometric coefficient	
a_{ws}	--	24	Ratio of total to respiring stem carbon	
b_{wt}	--	24	Allometric exponent	1.667
C_i	Pa	6	Internal leaf CO_2 concentration	
C_{mass}	$\text{kg C [kg biomass]}^{-1}$	23	Leaf carbon concentration per unit mass	0.5 for this study
C_s	Pa	6	Leaf surface CO_2 concentration	
D_{crit}	kg kg^{-1}	7	Critical humidity deficit	
d_T	--	16	Rate of change of leaf turnover with temperature	
f_0	--	7	Stomatal conductance parameter	
f_d	--	4	Leaf dark respiration coefficient	
g_s	m s^{-1}	6	Leaf-level stomatal conductance	
i_v	$\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	19	Intercept for relationship between N_{area} and $V_{cmax,25}$	
k_n	--	3, 20	Extinction coefficient for nitrogen	0.78
h	m	13, 23, 24	Canopy height	
L_{bal}	$\text{m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$	12, 13, 22-24	Balanced leaf area index (maximum LAI given the plant's height)	
L_{max}	$\text{m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$		Maximum LAI	
L_{min}	$\text{m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$		Minimum LAI	
LMA	kg m^{-2}	18, 21, 22	Leaf mass per unit area (new parameter)	
N_a	kg N m^{-2}	18	Leaf nitrogen per unit area	
n_{eff}	$\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ kg C [kg N]^{-1}	3	Constant relating leaf nitrogen to Rubisco carboxylation capacity	
N_{l0}	kg N [kg C]^{-1}	3	Top leaf nitrogen concentration (old parameter, mass basis)	
N_m	kg N kg^{-1}	18, 21-23	Top leaf nitrogen concentration (new parameter)	
N_l	kg N m^{-2}	11, 21	Total leaf nitrogen concentration	
N_r	kg N m^{-2}	12, 22	Total root nitrogen concentration	
N_s	kg N m^{-2}	13, 23	Total stem nitrogen concentration	
p	--	17	Phenological state (LAI/L_{bal})	
$Q_{10,leaf}$	--	2	Constant for exponential term in temperature function of V_{cmax}	2
R_a	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	8	Total plant autotrophic respiration	
R_d	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	4, 5	Leaf dark respiration	
r_g	--	10	Growth respiration coefficient	0.25
$rootd$	m		e-folding root depth	
s_v	$\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ g N}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	19	Slope between N_{area} and $V_{cmax,25}$	
T_{low}	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	1	Upper temperature parameter for V_{cmax}	
T_{off}	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	16	Threshold temperature for phenology	
T_{opt}^b	$^{\circ}\text{C}$		Optimal temperature for V_{cmax}	
T_{upp}	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	1	Upper temperature parameter for V_{cmax}	
$V_{cmax,25}$	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	1, 9	The maximum rate of carboxylation of Rubisco at 25°C	
W	$\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	5	Smoothed minimum of the potential limiting rates of photosynthesis	
α	$\text{mol CO}_2 [\text{mol PAR photons}]^{-1}$		Quantum efficiency	
β	--	5	Soil moisture stress factor	
Γ^*	Pa	7	CO_2 compensation point	
γ_0	$[\text{360 days}]^{-1}$	16	Minimum leaf turnover rate	
γ_{lm}	$[\text{360 days}]^{-1}$	16	Leaf turnover rate	

γ_p	[360 days] ⁻¹	17	Leaf growth rate	20
μ_{rl}	--	12, 22	Ratio of nitrogen concentration in roots and leaves	
μ_{sl}	--	13, 23	Ratio of nitrogen concentration in stems and leaves	
η_{sl}	kg C m ⁻² LAI ⁻¹	13, 23	Live stemwood coefficient	0.01
σ_L	kg C m ⁻² LAI ⁻¹	11, 12	Specific leaf density (old parameter)	

^aDefault values only provided for non-PFT-dependent parameters.

Table SM2. New trait-based parameters for 5 PFTs that are consistent with TRY data and updated parameters used in this study.

	BT	NT	C3	C4	SH
N_m	0.0185	0.0117	0.0240	0.0113	0.0175
LMA	0.1012	0.2240	0.0495	0.1370	0.1023
s_v	25.48	18.15	40.96	20.48	23.15
i_v	6.12	6.32	6.42	0.00	14.71
$V_{cmax,25}$	53.84	53.88	55.08	31.71	56.15
T_{off}	5	-40	5	5	-40
d_T	9	9	0	0	9
γ_0	0.25	0.25	3.0	3.0	0.66
γ_p	20	15	20	20	15
L_{min}	1	1	1	1	1
L_{max}	9	7	3	3	4
D_{crit}	0.09	0.06	0.051	0.075	0.037
f_0	0.875	0.875	0.931	0.800	0.950
f_d	0.010	0.015	0.019	0.019	0.015
$rootd$	3	2	0.5	0.5	1
T_{low}	5	0	10	13	0
T_{opt}	39	32	28	41	32
T_{upp}	43	36	32	45	36
α	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.08
μ_{rl}	0.67	0.67	0.72	0.72	0.67

Table SM3. Relationship between WWF ecoregions and the eight biomes used in this study.

WWF ecoregion	Biome for this study
Tropical & Subtropical Moist Broadleaf Forests	Tropical forests
Tropical & Subtropical Dry Broadleaf Forests	Tropical forests
Tropical & Subtropical Coniferous Forests	Tropical forests
Temperate Broadleaf & Mixed Forests	Extratropical mixed forests
Temperate Conifer Forests	Boreal and coniferous forests
Boreal Forests/Taiga	Boreal and coniferous forests
Tropical & Subtropical Grasslands, Savannas & Shrublands	Tropical savannas
Temperate Grasslands, Savannas & Shrublands	Temperate grasslands
Flooded Grasslands & Savannas	Temperate grasslands
Montane Grasslands & Shrublands	Temperate grasslands
Tundra	Tundra
Mediterranean Forests, Woodlands & Scrub	Mediterranean woodlands
Deserts & Xeric Shrublands	Desert
Mangroves	Tropical forests

Supplemental Material: Figures




Figure S1. Daily average GPP versus shortwave radiation on days following rainfall when leaf area index is at or near its seasonal maximum.




Figure S2. Monthly mean leaf nitrogen content (scaled by LAI) at nine sites representative of each of the new PFTs.




Figure S3a. Monthly mean fluxes of GPP, total ecosystem respiration, NEE, autotrophic respiration, and NPP at two tropical forest sites (BET-tr) and two savannah sites (EvSa=Evergreen Savannah, DeSa=Deciduous Savannah). Observations \pm standard deviation from Fluxnet are shown with triangles and vertical lines. All simulations in Table 4 in the main text are shown. Also shown are the daily root mean square error (rmse) based on daily fluxes and the correlation coefficient (r) based on monthly mean fluxes for all years of the simulations. All units are in $\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$.




Figure S3b. As in SM3a but for three needleleaf evergreen (NET) sites.




Figure S3c. As in SM3a but for four grass sites.




Figure S3d. As in SM3a but for two broadleaf deciduous (BDT) sites and one needleleaf deciduous (NDT) site.




Figure S4a. Monthly mean fluxes of latent heat, sensible heat, and evaporative fraction ($=LE/(SH + LE)$) at two tropical forest sites (BET-tr) and two savannah sites (EvSa=Evergreen Savannah, DeSa=Deciduous Savannah). Observations \pm standard deviation from Fluxnet are shown with triangles and vertical lines.




Figure S4b. As in Fig. S4a but for the NET sites.




Figure S4c. As in Fig. S4a but for the grass sites.




Figure S4d. As in Fig. S4a but for the deciduous tree sites.




Figure S5. Seasonal cycles of Reco from the biomes shown in Fig. 3, comparing JULES5, JULES9, and the Jung et al. (2011) MTE. Also shown are the temperature and precipitation from the CRU-NCEP dataset used to force the JULES simulations.

— MTE
— JULES9-ALL
— JULES5




Figure S6a. Differences between JULES5 and JULES9 and the MTE GPP for each of the 11 major biomes from the WWF database (biomes with area > 1,000 km²). The area-average root mean square error is given for each map.




Figure S6b. Differences between JULES5 and JULES9 and the MTE GPP for each of the 11 major biomes from the WWF database (biomes with area > 1,000 km²). The area-average root mean square error is given for each map.




Figure S6c. Differences between JULES5 and JULES9 and the MTE GPP for each of the 11 major biomes from the WWF database (biomes with area > 1,000 km²). The area-average root mean square error is given for each map.