3rd ODIP II Workshop
7 March 2017, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

Update:
Ecological Marine Units (EMU) Project



Dawn Wright, Chief Scientist, Environmental Systems Research Institute (aka Esri)
Affiliated Professor, Oregon State University
dwright@esri.com

Roger Sayre (USGS), Sean Breyer, Kevin A. Butler, Keith VanGraafeiland (Esri), Kathy Goodin (NatureServe), Maria Kavanaugh (WHOI), Mark Costello (U. of Auckland), Noel Cressie (U. of Wollongong), Zeenatul Basher (USGS), Peter T. Harris (GRID-Arendal), John M. Guinotte (USFWS)



The work to produce the map and data was commissioned by the Group on Earth Observations, a mini "United Nations" of sorts consisting of almost 100 nations collaborating to build the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) in 9 Societal Benefit Areas (Agriculture, Biodiversity, Climate, Disasters, Ecosystems, Energy, Health, Water, and Weather). The global ecosystem mapping task, as defined here, is a key program within the GEO Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON) and the GEO Ecosystems Initiative (GEO ECO).

One impt thing to mention is that the ELUs were released and launched as an earlier contribution to the President's Climate Data Initiative.
The ELUs are now on that list of Climate Data Initiative (CDI) resources, and of course are registered on data.gov. Now the EMUs should be considered a similar contribution but for the marine environment. Since Fabien was and is apparently still engaged with the CDI, this is a major hook into White House interest.

EMU is now under the new **GEO Global Ecosystems initiative (GECO)** arising from the **GEO 2016 Transitional Workplan**. The former Ecosystems Societal Benefit Area and the former Biodiversity Societal Benefit Area have been combined into a new Biodiversity and Ecosystems Sustainability SBA.
The GECO is a new task, and it has four pieces to it related to 1) the European Horizon 2020 ECOPOTENTIAL project, 2) the H2020 SWOS (Satellite-based Wetlands Observation System) project, 3) global EMUs, and 4) global EFUs.



So why do we need a global ecosystem map anyway? Such a map, and more importantly, the data, will provide scientific support for planning and management, and enable understanding of impacts to ecosystems from climate change and other disturbances. The map and data should also prove useful as an ecologically meaningful spatial accounting framework for assessments of the economic and social values of ecosystem goods and services.

- Should aid in REPEATABLE landscape mgmt - a platform for geo-accounting (instead of reducing so much by national boundaries, we are using real ecological units)

A standard repeatable accounting framework

A global view of environmental diversity

Ecosystems defined by humans for humans as opposed to ecosystem HEALTH, a healthy ecosystem vs a service that the ecosystem provides - the next level to resilient ecosystems rather than ecosystem services
Research goal in future? what are the indicators that if merged together in a better way would provide better services; one can still be SICK and provide services
Example – indicators may be relative to the status of the fish stock but not indicators as to how the ecosystem is working.

Specific needs include:
•*Assessments of Economic and Social Value of Ecosystem Goods and Services*
•*Biodiversity Conservation Planning*
•*Analysis of Climate Change Impacts to Ecosystems* (*and other impacts e.g. fire, invasive species, land use, etc*.)
•*Resource Management*
•*Research*

Bioclimate, Landform, and Lithology = Drivers of Ecological Character (physical setting)
Land Cover = Response to the Physical Setting

We found 48,872 unique combinations aggregated to 3923 ELUs. In 2015 106,959 unique combos thanks to the updated land forms and land cover, 2010 epoch, Global Land Cover, v. 1.4
Bioclimate, Landform, and Lithology = Drivers of Ecological Character (physical setting)
Land Cover = Response to the Physical Setting
Bioclimates - Global Environmental Stratification (GEnS), U. of Edinburgh **-** 50 year avg of temp/precip from met stations throughout world
30 arc sec raster, down-sampled to 250-m raster
Landforms – USGS – 250-m raster, derived from GMTED2010
Surficial Lithology - Global Lithological Map (GLiM), Hamburg University, Vector Polygons converted to 250-m raster
Land Cover - GlobCover, 2009, European Space Agency - MARIS satellite, 300 m rez resampled to 250 m
Version 2 recently released in 2015 with updated land cover, 2010 epoch, Global Land Cover, v. 1.4
Only layer that we had an option: GlobCover 2009, GlobeLand30 or MDA's NaturalVue
GlobCover 2009 offered a richer, more flexible classification, which is compatible with USGS NLCD
NaturalVue was too old.
Both had significant quality issues relative to broad audience acceptance
Today, there are more options. Globeland30 continues to be improved. MDA has produced BaseVue

How did we make the map? Again, we define ecosystems as distinct physical environments and their associated vegetation, so we map ecosystems by first mapping, and then combining in a GIS, global bioclimates, global landforms, global geology, and global land cover.
1. Characterize the principle ecological land components of the terrestrial surface of the earth in a micro-scale, bottom-up, hierarchical classification process.
2. Subdivide the land surface of the earth into macro-scale physiographic (geomorphological) areas in a top-down, hierarchical regionalization process.
3. Combine the physiographic regionalization process with the ecological classification process to develop a hierarchical, ecophysiographic segmentation of the planet.
4. Weightings of 4 layers: 3, 3, 2, 1



Instead of reflecting JUST researchers perceptions and local experiences, our EMUs provide quantifiable definitions for these such as epipelagic, mesopelagic, bathypelagic, etc.



Where do we get the best "physical setting" for the ocean, which will in turn drives its ecological character? WOA is probably the best available set of "objectively analyzed climatologies" for the major physical parameters of the world's oceans (interpolated mean fields at standard depth levels).
From NOAA NCEI (formerly NODC), http://www.nodc.noaa.gov/OC5/woa13/

SPATIALLY
WOA 2013 at finest rez of ¼ degree (27 km at equator) for all variables save for nutrients at 1 km (subsampled nutrients so there is a slight source of error there)
¼ deg horiz and vertical, **102 depth zones ranging in thickness from 5 m at surface to 500 m in deep ocean**

TEMPORALLY
WOA 2013 has 5 or 6 decadal averages
- 1 point in our mesh is the avg of a 57-year period, so it's an average of an average of the prominent mean over 50 years
- trying to conceptualize regions as long-term historical average, possibly stable
- WOA has seasonal averages – we are not dealing with those – we assume that these are already part of the annual/decadal
- but this is the next logical step, to do clustering on monthly avgs as part of a later study; once we understand the decadal we can apply to quarterly/seasonal intervals



NOAA administrator Kathryn Sullivan likens this to a "christmas tree" that we ALL can hang ornaments on now. In GIS-speak this means additional Feature Attributes

1. Step 1 - Build 3-D framework (point mesh), where we extracted the World Ocean Atlas data into a global point mesh framework created from 52,487,233 points, each with at least 6 WOA attributes

2. Step 2 - Attribute mesh points with 6 WOA physical/chemical parameters, in addition to the x, y, and z coordinates (more attributes possible)

3. Step 3 – Used k-means statistical clustering algorithm to identify **physically distinct, relatively homogenous, volumetric regions in the water column (EMUs). Backwards stepwise discriminant analysis** to determine if all of six variable contributed significantly to the clustering – all six were significant. **pseudo F-statistic gave us the optimum # of clusters at 37.** Then used **canonical discriminant analysis** to verify that all 37 clusters were significantly different from one another and they were.

4. Compare/combine surface-occurring EMUs with other sea surface partitioning efforts using ocean color, etc. (e.g., Longhurst, Oliver and Andrew, MBON, Seascapes, etc.)

5. Compare/combine bottom-occurring EMUs with seafloor physiographic regions and features, etc. (e.g., Harris et al.)

6. Assess relationship between physically distinct regions and biotic distributions (e.g., OBIS Biogeographic Realms, etc.), and maybe combine to incorporate biotic dimension into the EMUs

[In the weeds: A globally comprehensive subset (25,000 points) of all points was used for the determination of the optimum cluster number using the pseudo F-statistics, yielding an optimum of 37 clusters. For the approach, the approximately 52 million global points were then clustered in a series of sequential iterations where the number of clusters requested ranged from 5 to 500, increasing the cluster number by ten for each successive iteration.]

EMU 13 Summary

Technical Name:

- Bathypelagic
- Very Cold
- Euhaline
- Hypoxic
- High Nitrate
- Medium Phosphate
- High Silicate

Common Name:

- Deep
- Very Cold
- Normal Salinity
- Low Oxygen
- High Nitrate
- Medium Phosphate
- High Silicate



EMU 13 Summary Statistics

	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Standard Dev.
Temperature (°C)	-0.38	1.93	5.54	0.51
Salinity (unitless)	33.43	34.67	34.93	0.05
Dissolved Oxygen (µmol/l)	1.69	3.26	4.33	0.43
Nitrate (µmol/l)	25.26	37.03	48.49	1.08
Phosphate (µmol/l)	0.53	2.60	3.36	0.12
Silicate (µmol/l)	88.01	138.03	189.63	19.05
Thickness (m)	0.00	90.34	5323.00	36.76
Unit Top Depth (m)	-5500.00	-2955.62	-10.00	998.83

EMU Volume (km^3)	347060603.65
Percent of EMU to Global	25.40%

One summary for each of the 37 – Sean’s favorite EMU


EMU 13 Summary
Technical Name:
Bathypelagic
Very Cold
Euhaline
Hypoxic
High Nitrate
Medium Phosphate
High Silicate
Common Name:
Deep
Very Cold
Normal Salinity
Low Oxygen
High Nitrate
Medium Phosphate
High Silicate
Temperature (°C)
Salinity (unitless)
Dissolved O2 (µmol/l)
Nitrate (µmol/l)
Phosphate (µmol/l)
Silicate (µmol/l)
Surface Area (km2)
Millions
Depth (m)


Vertical Profile App
Ecological Marine Unit Explorer
esri
ATLANTIC OCEAN
EMU 24
Volume 0.85%
Euhaline-Oxic-Warm to Very Warm-Epipelagic with (Low Nitrate-Low Silicate-Low Phosphate) Nutrients
livingatlas.arcgis.com/emu

Paper for peer-reviewed journal *Oceanography*

Full Title:
A Three-Dimensional Mapping of the Ocean Based on Environmental Data

Short title:
A 3D Mapping of the Global Oceans

Author List
Roger G. Sayre[1], Dawn J. Wright[2], Sean P. Breyer[2], Kevin A. Butler[2], Keith Van Graafeiland[2], Mark J. Costello[3], Peter T. Harris[4], Kathleen L. Goodin[5], John M. Guinotte[6], Zeenatul Basher[1], Maria T. Kavanaugh[7], Patrick N. Halpin[8], Mark E. Monaco[9], Noel Cressie[10], Peter Aniello[2], Charles E. Frye[2], and Drew Stephens[2].

[1]Land Change Science Program, United States Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia, United States of America
[2]Esri, Redlands, California, United States of America
[3]Institute of Marine Science, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
[4]GRID-Arendal, Arendal, Norway
[5]NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia, United States of America
[6]United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado, United States of America
[7]Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, United States of America
[8]Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, United States of America
[9]National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland, United States of America
[10]National Institute for Applied Statistics Research Australia, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia

Do Our Depth Findings Support Traditional Ocean Zonation Concepts?

Divisions of the Marine Environment
Figure 9-1



Figure courtesy of Paul R. Pinet, *Invitation to Oceanography*, 5th ed., Jones and Bartlett Publishers



HORIZONTALLY on the LEFT
VERTICALLY on the RIGHT

ON THE LEFT: 37 mutually exclusive EMU clusters (shown with ELUs) representing the maximum global horizontal dimensions of the clusters AT SELECTED DEPTHS AND in different colors

ON THE RIGHT: Vertical profile area graph with depth on Y-axis and cell count for each Cluster/area it covers on X-axis. This graph shows the cluster variety at the top of the water column and through the water **column we can see how each Cluster either slowly disappears with depth or in some cases deep water clusters become more dominant.** It also help illustrate how in some cases the cluster is spread across the CMECS depth terms and we may need a better data-driven depth name for the clusters. Interesting too that there are apparent depths where groups of clusters end -100 to -200m and -500 to -700m and -1400 to -1600m.

In the literature the 200 m depth approximates the edge of the continental shelf of NE Europe and the 200 nautical mile boundary. Due to the dominance of research in this region many texts assume this is a deep-sea boundary. However, the taxonomic experts in the World Register of Deep-Sea Species (WoRDSS) choose 500 m because in a review of deep-sea biology a US based author suggested this was a better boundary. The boundaries for bathyal and abyssal seem to have no clear rationale except to 'follow' a previous author (yet sometimes they are split at 1,000 m apart!).
Our diagram illustrates that there is no simple clear-cut boundary for water attributes – an overlay of depth distribution on it will also be informative



Upper, Middle, and Lower separated out
Instead of reflecting JUST researchers perceptions and local experiences, our EMUs provide quantifiable definitions for these such as epipelagic, mesopelagic, bathypelagic, etc.

Additional work by Mark Costello, U. of Auckland
1. Mark has produced dendrograms of 37 Clusters. This will show how similar Clusters are to each other based on the present 6 variables. Sean to send mark current-final table means per cluster.
2. Basher will match % of each realm in each cluster, and each cluster in each realm. This will help say which Clusters best match biological realms.
3. provide lat-long-depth for each cluster so can find which species in OBIS occur in which Clusters.



The data can be conceptualized as columnar stacks of cells whose centroids define the point mesh

This is actually a continuous grid of data but we are representing the units as columns so that you can see sideways better into the layers at depth.
One major point is that nutrient and oxygen distributions in particular not only shape but ARE SHAPED by biological processes (physicochemical).

This information will be hugely significant biologically, to be able to see that over a global expanse, where it thins out, where it mixes with other water masses. This is a global framework.

Will soon start time slicing into monthly averages, OBIS has not been added to this yet, but that is in progress.

It will be exciting to be able to continually populate and improve this with data from any cruise or expedition as we go forward in time. NOAA administrator Kathryn Sullivan likens this to a christmas tree that we ALL can hang ornaments on now, and over time really come to a richer understanding of our ocean, while also helping us to understand what’s the next science data or target we should go after to make this more useful, especially for MPA designation or evaluation and CMSP.

EMU Data Products

Open Access
- Ecological Marine Unit Explorer Web App (Mobile App too)
- 3D Point Mesh (Download)
- 3D Point Mesh to OGC Geopackage
- 3D EMU Clusters Optimized (Download)
- 2D TopEMU (Download)
- 2D BottomEMU (Download)
- Data Dictionary (Download)
- Explorer App Source Code (Download)
- EMU Data Sheets (Download)
- Peer Reviewed Journal Article
- USGS/AAG Peer-Reviewed Tech Report

Esri Platform Users

Connected
- 3D Point Mesh – 52M
- 3D EMU Clusters Optimized – 3.9M
- 2D TopEMU – 700K
- 2D BottomEMU – 700K
- Data Dictionary
- EMU Data Sheets
- Explorer App

Offline
- Map Packages
- ArcGIS Pro Project
- Data Dictionary
- EMU Data Sheets

POC may be useful more as a **validation** of the clustering rather than as input (POC data are scattered, hard to obtain from Lutz or to compile from NASA, hard to recalculate for entire global water column)

Ocean Currents



Barnier B., Penduff T., Langlais C., 2011: Eddying vs. laminar ocean circulation models and their applications. *Operational Oceanography in the 21st Century.* Schiller, Andreas; Brassington, Gary B. (Eds.)1st Edition., 2011, X, 450 p., Springer ISBN: 978-94-007-0331-5.

Ocean Currents



Barnier B., Penduff T., Langlais C., 2011: Eddying vs. laminar ocean circulation models and their applications. *Operational Oceanography in the 21st Century.* Schiller, Andreas; Brassington, Gary B. (Eds.)1st Edition., 2011, X, 450 p., Springer ISBN: 978-94-007-0331-5.

Ocean Currents



Barnier B., Penduff T., Langlais C., 2011: Eddying vs. laminar ocean circulation models and their applications. *Operational Oceanography in the 21st Century.* Schiller, Andreas; Brassington, Gary B. (Eds.)1st Edition., 2011, X, 450 p., Springer ISBN: 978-94-007-0331-5.

EMU logo by Esri’s Sean Breyer

Extra Slides



Another line of inquiry to address
Relationship between surface-occurring EMU distributions (colors) and marine biogeographic realms (numbered, outlined polygons). Spatial congruence between biogeographic realms and surface-occurring EMUs is apparent for some realms (e.g. 5, 7, 26, 30, etc.) but not for others (e.g. 18, 21, 22, etc.).


AmeriGEOSS/MBON Contribution
A Pole-to-Pole Map of Americas Marine Ecosystems
Ameri GEOSS