1 **Satellites unveil easily-fixable super-emissions in one of the**
2 **world's largest methane hotspot regions**

3

4 **Authors:** Itziar Irakulis-Loitxate[1]*, Luis Guanter[1], Joannes D. Maasakkers[2], Daniel Zavala-
5 Araiza[3,4], Ilse Aben[2]

6

7 **Affiliations:**

8 [1]   Research Institute of Water and Environmental Engineering (IIAMA), Universitat Politècnica
9   de València (UPV), 46022, Valencia, Spain.

10 [2]   SRON Netherlands Institute for Space Research, 3584 CA, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

11 [3]   Environmental Defense Fund, Reguliersgracht 79, 1017 LN Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

12 [4]   Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research Utrecht, Utrecht University, 3584 CC Utrecht,
13   The Netherlands.

14

15 * Correspondence to: iiraloi@doctor.upv.es

16

18

Abstract

Reduction of fossil fuel-related methane emissions has been identified as an essential means for climate change mitigation, but emission source identification remains elusive. We combine three complementary satellite data sets to survey single methane emission sources on the west coast of Turkmenistan, one of the largest methane hotspots in the world. We found 29 different super-emitters active in the 2017-2020 time period, 24 of them being inactive flares that are now venting gas. This suggests a causal relationship between the decrease in flaring and the increase in venting. At the regional level, 2020 shows a substantial increase in the number of methane plume detections concerning previous years. Our results reveal that emissions from the west coast of Turkmenistan could be drastically reduced by proper maintenance of infrastructure and operations, and that new satellite methods promise a revolution in the detection and monitoring of methane point emissions worldwide.

Introduction

Methane (CH_4) is the second most important anthropogenic greenhouse gas, with a relatively short lifetime in the atmosphere (9±1 years) and with 86 times the global warming potential of carbon dioxide over 20 years (1). During the past few decades, CH_4 concentrations have risen rapidly (2) to record highs that compromise the 2°C temperature target of the Paris Agreement relative to the pre-industrial era (3). Therefore, the reduction of CH4 emissions has been identified as a key climate change mitigation measure in the short to medium term (4).

Among the sectors with the highest contributions to CH_4 emissions is the oil and gas (O&G) industry. CH_4 emissions from this sector are particularly difficult to quantify because they are often the result of unplanned occurrences, i.e. leaks, equipment malfunctions, or abnormal process conditions, of which quantity, duration, and frequency can differ strongly across regions, operators, and stages of the O&G supply chain (5). These events can result in so-called super-emissions, which disproportionately account for a significant fraction of total emissions (6–9). In addition to unforeseen events, emissions from the sector can come from controlled flaring and venting processes, which are, respectively, the combustion and direct liberation of excess natural gas produced. Flaring and venting are primarily done for safety reasons (10), but may also be for economic or operational reasons (11). The objective of flaring is to avoid the direct release of gas in the atmosphere by burning it. However, numerous studies show that the use of flaring does not always guarantee complete combustion of the gas stream in the flare (12–15). Although the use of flaring is preferable to venting from climate perspective, both are seen as indicators of poor resource utilization, where the use of more economically and environmentally sustainable alternatives for the use of excess gas is preferred (16). The use and regulation of flaring and venting depend on the policies and laws in force in each country or region (16, 17), and only a small number of geographic areas have been subject to transparent and publicly verifiable reviews of emissions. Therefore, the credibility of globally reported industrial CH_4 emissions has recently been highly questioned (5). The IEA (International Energy Agency) Methane Tracker report (18) and the U. N. report (4) conclude that a large fraction of the emission mitigation options are technically feasible and cost-effective, and that oil and gas companies can take considerable low-cost and cost-saving measures to reduce CH_4 emissions from pipelines, drilling and other facilities, but this would require greater control of all phases of O&G extraction, processing and transport.

As CH_4 is an odourless and colourless gas for humans, the detection of emissions requires specific sensors sensitive to the gas. Traditionally, the detection and measurement of emissions have been performed through onsite campaigns focusing on locations where suspected undeclared emissions may be present. In situ measurements of ground-based campaigns can be very costly and, depending on their objective, the data collected will be different. For example, an accurate estimate

71 of emission rates is not necessary for leak detection and repair, whereas for the investigation of
72 region-wide emission rates the detection of individual sources might not be required. Airborne
73 campaigns allow coverage of larger areas, but they can be expensive and not very practical in
74 many cases, like in production fields located in remote places (e.g., in the deserts of the Middle
75 East) or for the detection of leaks from long-distance pipelines. In this context, satellites are capable
76 of emission detection and monitoring at different scales (from local to global) and over long periods
77 of time, as opposed to temporally discrete field measurement campaigns. However, detection from
78 space will be limited to large emissions.

79 Recently, great advances have been made in the detection and quantification of O&G emissions
80 from space. Since 2017, the TROPOMI sensor onboard Sentinel-5P provides daily global CH_4
81 concentration data with a 7x5.5 km^2 pixel resolution (19). This allows detection of CH_4 concentration
82 enhancements at the regional scale (e.g., 17–21), but in general, does not enable the determination
83 of single point sources. On the other hand, the GHGSat instruments and so-called hyperspectral
84 satellite missions like PRISMA, ZY1 AHSI and Gaofen-5 AHSI are able to map CH_4 plumes from
85 single emitters at high spatial resolution (25-50 m GHGSat and 30m the rest) with a detection limit
86 roughly between 100 and 1000 kg/h, suitable to detect medium to strong point emitters worldwide
87 (13, 25, 26). The systematic application of these measurements, however, is limited by their sparse
88 spatio-temporal coverage (see Materials and Methods). The recent realisation of the CH_4 mapping
89 potential of so-called multispectral missions with frequent global coverage holds promise to
90 alleviate this gap (27). Missions like Sentinel-2 (S2) and Landsat 8 (L8) cover the entire world with
91 a relatively high spatial and temporal resolution (20 m and less than 5 days revisit time for S2, and
92 30 m and less than 15 days revisit time for L8), so they are able to continuously monitor CH_4 plumes
93 under favorable conditions (typically, strong emissions over spatially homogeneous areas). In
94 particular, S2 provides a very high spatio-temporal sampling and data volume, which makes it to
95 be the best mission for systematic monitoring of CH_4 sources in those locations where the site
96 characteristics enable CH_4 retrievals with multispectral missions. L8 and its precursors in the
97 Landsat series do not provide such a high density of observations but allow to extend the time
98 series to years and even decades before the S2 era. This recently-developed satellite-based CH_4
99 monitoring scenario allows to detect single point emissions of the largest CH_4 hotspot regions in
100 the world, which are identified with TROPOMI's moderate resolution observations (28).

101 One example of those CH_4 hotspot regions is the west coast of Turkmenistan, located in the Balkan
102 province on the shores of the Caspian Sea, within the South Caspian Basin (SCB). This is a desert
103 area where the main human activity is the production of O&G and derived products, with a residual
104 presence of other possible anthropogenic CH_4 sources such as livestock, rice fields or landfills (29,
105 30) and an abundant presence of mud volcanoes (more than twenty), some of which are associated
106 with O&G seepage (31). According to Scarpelli et al. (29), the country of Turkmenistan is one of
107 the largest emitters of CH_4 from O&G-related sources: eighth in oil-derived emissions (0.88 Tg a^{-1})
108 and ninth in gas emissions (0.52 Tg a^{-1}) in 2016, although the IEA estimates a total of 3.92 Tg a^{-1}
109 of CH_4 emissions in 2020 (almost 3 times more) (18). BP estimates that Turkmenistan has the
110 fourth-largest natural gas reserves in the world with proven reserves of 19.5 trillion cubic meters,
111 nearly 10 percent of the world's total, and is in the top 50 largest oil reserves in the world, with
112 proven reserves of 0.6 thousand million barrels (32). However, its annual production is far below
113 its potential due to the geopolitical situation it maintains (33). Despite this, short-term forecasts
114 indicate that production will increase due to an increase in demand from China in the coming years.
115 Therefore, the country is allocating most of its investments in the energy sector, focusing mainly
116 on the construction of new pipelines, new phases of exploitation in extraction fields, petrochemical
117 plants, and compressor stations (33, 34).

118 Within the country, CH_4 emissions are not equally distributed. In recent years TROPOMI has
119 detected strong CH_4 concentration enhancements in the western coastal belt belonging to the SCB.
120 In this region there are 26 active fields, 21 onshore and 5 offshore, producing crude oil, condensate,
121 liquefied natural gas (LNG), and gas in different proportions (see Fig. 1). The SCB is also the only

122 basin producing mainly crude oil in Turkmenistan, in contrast to the other basins, the Kushka and
123 Amu-Dar'ya Basins (35, 36), which mainly extract gas.

124 In this work, we generate a satellite-based high spatial and temporal resolution survey of CH_4 point
125 emissions over the west coast of Turkmenistan based on the hotspot locations provided by the
126 TROPOMI observations. This survey covers an area of approximately 21500 km^2 and the time
127 period between January 2017 and November 2020. Our analysis relies on three different types of
128 space-based CH_4 measurements, which are used synergistically: TROPOMI data facilitate the
129 delimitation of the study area and the identification of the most active regions; the hyperspectral
130 images from PRISMA and ZY1 AHSI allow the identification of medium-to-strong emitters and the
131 accurate quantification of emission rates for those regions in a limited set of days; finally, the
132 multispectral data from S2 and L8 enable the constant monitoring of the emissions from the
133 emission points unveiled by the hyperspectral data (see Materials and Methods). We choose the
134 west coast of Turkmenistan for this study because it offers an ideal combination of extreme CH_4
135 emissions with a bright and relatively homogeneous surface. This allows us to best evaluate this
136 unprecedented combination of CH_4 data streams as well as to extract its full potential.
137
138
139 **Results**
140
141 ***Analysis of emission sources***

142 Combining the hyperspectral and multispectral high spatial resolution satellite data, we have
143 detected 29 emission points with activity between January 2017 and November 2020 (Fig. 2). The
144 areas with the highest density of point sources in our high-resolution survey coincide with the
145 strongest CH_4 enhancements over the west coast of Turkmenistan, as seen in the regional-scale
146 maps generated from TROPOMI moderate resolution data (Fig. 1)

147 The 20-30 m sampling of the hyperspectral and multispectral satellites in combination with very
148 high-resolution imagery from Google Earth, Bing Maps and Esri (<2.5m/pix) provide sufficient
149 information to determine the coordinates of emission sources with high precision, especially for
150 those emitters with many detected plumes (see Materials and Methods). Combining these data, we
151 have identified the sources of 26 of the 29 points. We find that the vast majority of the emitters (24
152 of them) are inactive flares that vent gas. Several of them have flaring activity before 2017
153 according to the historical record of the S2, Landsat 5, 7, and 8 satellites, and Google Earth, Bing
154 and Esri images, and three of them had an active flare at the beginning of the study period (Fig.
155 S1), followed by CH_4 emissions as soon as the flare disappeared. The flaring activity is discussed
156 in more detail in the following sections.

157 The 24 emitting flares are distributed across different onshore fields of the SCB with a higher
158 density in the Goturdepe, Barsa-Gelmez and Korpeje fields (Fig. S2, and labeled with emitters A.X,
159 B.X and D.X, respectively in Fig. 2). These three fields have the highest production (Table 1) and
160 are also three of the oldest ones in the basin. This coincides with the 2013 Carbon Limits report,
161 which indicates that most of the flares are concentrated in fields built before 1990 (37). Most of the
162 emitters are in fields where the predominant activity is crude oil and condensate production, except
163 for the Korpeje field that extracts mainly gas (see Table 1). Two of the emitting flares are around
164 an oil power plant linked to the Goturdepepe field. The fields where we have detected emissions
165 are directly managed by two large state companies, which at the same time control most of the
166 Turkmenistan fields (35). Although all SCB fields have been analyzed, no emissions have been
167 recorded between January 2017 and November 2020 from the fields managed by the other five
168 companies operating in the area, which are based in other countries.

169 Regarding the two other emitters with a known origin, the plumes from points A.10 and E.2 (see
170 Fig. 2) are due to pipeline leaks that persist over several months. In the case of A.10, the leak is
171 active for more than a year between 2019 and 2020, while at E.2, we observe emissions from April

4

172   to October 2018. It has been possible to confirm that these two emissions are due to leaks because
173   the start of the emission coincides with anomalies in the surface (visible in RGB images), and the
174   CH_4 plumes seem to originate in pipelines. In E.2, it is also possible to see a liquid spill emanating
175   from the leak (see Fig. S3).

176   In the case of the three remaining emission points (A.8, A.9 and B.1), it is difficult to attribute them
177   to a particular source. Leaks are the most likely origin, given that the three points are located just
178   above pipes, that the facilities are old in these fields and that, according to the 2013 Carbon Limits
179   report, the pipeline network (controlled by the national gas company Turkmengas) "is characterised
180   by its old and inefficient equipment" (37). However, we do not have access to records of incidents
181   or leaks recorded by the operators and cannot confirm the source of the emissions because the
182   very high-resolution imagery available is not sufficiently up to date to support this hypothesis, and
183   the resolution of S2 and Landsat imagery is not sufficient in these cases to distinguish a clear
184   change in the surface in visual imagery. Regarding the temporal evolution of these emissions, point
185   A.9 only shows emissions during September 2020, which would indicate either that the emission
186   source has already been fixed or that the emission rates have decreased below the S2 detection
187   limit. Point A.8 shows emissions since 2017, whereas point B.1 has been emitting at least since
188   2015, according to L8 detections. Both have maintained emissions at least until the end of our
189   study period in November 2020.

190   None of the detected emitters is linked to mud volcanoes despite those being potential sources of
191   CH_4 and having a high presence in the area.

192   *Magnitude of the emissions*

193   We have developed methods to quantify CH_4 concentration enhancements and flux rates from the
194   hyperspectral data (13). Using the hyperspectral data, we have detected 25 plumes from 12 of the
195   emitters on different dates (see Materials and Methods). The estimated emission fluxes vary
196   considerably, with 1.400 ± 400 kg/h being the lowest emission and 19.600 ± 8.000 kg/h the largest
197   detected emission (see Fig. S4).

198   The coincident overpass time of S2, PRISMA and ZY1 (2 - 5 minutes difference) has enabled us
199   to capture emissions concurrently with S2 and the hyperspectral systems (see Fig. S5). Using the
200   accurate CH_4 concentration enhancement maps from the hyperspectral systems as a reference,
201   we can assess the detection limits of the substantially lower signal-to-noise ratio S2 observations.
202   This exercise shows that S2 can detect emissions of at least 1800 ± 200 kg/h for the Turkmenistan
203   desert scenes, as this is the smallest emission for which we have a coincident detection with the
204   hyperspectral data. This is the minimum flux rate that we set for the plumes detected by S2 (944
205   plumes in total) between January 2017 and November 2020 (Fig. S4).

206   We have estimated the approximate annual flux emitted from the 29 emitters identified in the study
207   area, i.e., the total CH_4 flux emitted from the sources that we sample in our study. This calculation
208   is based on an average flux rate estimated from the 25 plumes detected with the hyperspectral
209   data and the average emission frequency calculated from the multispectral data set. Further details
210   of the annual calculation are given in Materials and Methods. As a result, we have obtained a
211   resulting integrated flux of 0.28 Tg a^{-1} (0.25-0.31 Tg a^{-1} 95% confidence interval).

212   *Temporal evolution of the emissions*

213   The monitoring of emissions during 2017-2020 using S2 data has shown a remarkable difference
214   in the number of detected plumes from each emitter over time. In general, 2018 was the year with
215   the fewest detected emissions, while 2020 has been the year with the most detected emission
216   plumes, double the number detected in 2018 (see Fig. 4 and Table 1). This relationship also holds
217   when we normalize the number of emissions by the number of clear-sky observations in each
218   period.

219   Not all fields have had the same evolution. Figure 4 shows the examples of the Goturdepe, Korpeje
220   and Gogerendag fields (labelled in Fig. 2 with emitters A.X, D.X and C.X, respectively) as
221   representative cases of different temporal evolution patterns. Goturdepe is one of the fields with
222   the highest number of identified emitters, and its temporal evolution clearly shows a decrease in
223   the number of emissions between 2018 and the beginning of 2019, while in the years 2017 and
224   2020, the emission density is notably higher. Regarding the Korpeje field, Varon et al. reported in
225   2019 emissions from three different points (25), one of which is named in this paper as D.7.
226   Immediately after the article submission (May 2019) emissions stopped from that source, but both
227   our analysis and the one by Varon et al. (2021) (27) show that emissions resumed after a few
228   months (according to our observations in September 2019, see Fig. S6 emitter D.7). Finally, the
229   Gogerendag field stands out for the direct relationship between the end of the use of flaring and
230   the start of emissions, i.e., at the beginning of the monitoring period, emitters in this field had flaring
231   activity, but CH_4 emission events began to occur right after the flaring signal was no longer visible.
232   In the second half of 2019, it can be seen how after several months of flaring inactivity, both emitters
233   released CH_4 on the same day, and then a flare is observed intermittently at C.1 before it remains
234   off at least until the end of our study period. Once flaring was inactive, the number of CH_4 emissions
235   detected by S2 increased. This same flaring-emission relationship is repeated at point F.3, which
236   shows an intense flaring signal at the beginning of the study, but in July 2018, the flaring
237   disappears. In July 2019, CH_4 emissions start to be observed intermittently until the end of the
238   study period (Fig. S6 emitter F.3).

239   Analysing the emitters individually, we also see that there is wide variability in their emitting
240   frequency. Of the 29 points, 6 show emissions on only between 1 and 3% of the observed clear-
241   sky days, i.e., they rarely present emissions above our 1800 kg/h detection limit. On the opposite
242   side, 5 points show emissions in more than 38% of the observed days. For example, Figure 3
243   shows a S2 detection series from A.3 (29% emission frequency) whose emissions persist during
244   the entire 2017-2020 period. The low frequencies imply that we have detected large CH_4 emissions
245   between 1 and 7 times during the whole observation period, these emissions could be explained
246   by emergencies or well purging, that are very unusual events, and where the law allows the venting
247   of large amounts of gas from flaring systems for a short period. However, the more frequent emitters
248   would conflict with the "Rules for the Development of Hydrocarbon Fields" of the Turkmen law,
249   which bans continuous gas flaring and venting (37). Detailed information on the frequency of
250   emissions is provided in Table S1 and Figure 2, and the temporal evolution of each emitter in Fig.
251   S6.

252   We also look at the emissions of the region before our 2017-2020 core study period. First, the
253   longer time series of L8 satellite data reveal that at least 15 of the 29 emitters identified in the study
254   period were already emitting large amounts of CH_4 before January 2017, as shown in Figure 3 (first
255   window, right-hand side panel) and Fig. S7. Second, the SCIAMACHY sensor onboard ENVISAT
256   (38) also provides information on the history of emissions in the area, in this case, at the regional
257   scale. Comparing the distribution of our single detections with the regional XCH_4 map from
258   TROPOMI (Figs. 1-2), we can infer that the CH_4 enhancement observed by TROPOMI in the
259   northern part of the study area is the result of many moderate to high-frequency emitters, while in
260   the south the areas of CH_4 enhancement are related to one or a few very high-frequency emitters
261   (Fig. S8). This relationship holds in older data from SCIAMACHY. Between 2003-2010
262   SCIAMACHY already observed a higher CH_4 concentration in the northern area of the SCB, over
263   the Goturdepe and Barsa-Gelmez fields (emitters A.X and B.X) and another hot spot over the
264   Korpeje (D.X) and Gamyshlja Gunorta (E.X) fields but did not observe a CH_4 enhancement over
265   the southernmost Keymir (F.X) and Akpatlavuk (G.X) fields. If we look at the year of installation of
266   the facility, we find that most of the emitters in the first four fields already existed before 2010, but
267   emitter F.1, which is the one with the highest frequency in Keymir, was built just in 2010, according
268   to Landsat images, and emitter G.1, the only one in Akpatlavuk, was built in 2015. So, these two
269   points did not contribute to the average result of the data collected by SCIAMACHY (Fig. S8). On

270 the other hand, emitters F.1 and G.1 did not exist during that time, and thus their emissions are
271 only reflected in the TROPOMI data set.

272 Occasional lookups of Landsat 5 (L5) historical data reveal that emissions have been present in
273 these fields since, at least, 1987. Figure 5 shows emissions from three active sources in the past,
274 other than those identified between 2017-2020. The first (P.1) is located about 200 m from source
275 A.6 and records emissions from 1987 to, at least, 1999 very frequently. Two years after the last
276 observed emission from P.1, the P.2 emitter, about 350 m north of A.6, began emitting continuously
277 from June through, at least, September 2001. Finally, the third source (P.3) is 1.15 km from emitter
278 A.4, and we have only identified one emission in the Landsat searches. As we do not have very
279 high-resolution data for these dates, nor detailed information about the infrastructure, we have not
280 attributed these emissions to any specific infrastructure.

281 All these data demonstrate that this type of emission has been occurring for many years and that
282 the origin of these long-term CH_4 enhancements is in the venting of gas, mainly from oil and
283 condensate fields.

284 *Flaring*

285 According to VIIRS data, flaring has been progressively decreasing over the SCB since 2016. For
286 example, the flare volume in 2019 was about 40% lower than in 2012 (Fig. S9). This trend is the
287 same if we look at the state-level data, where the flare volume has continuously decreased since
288 VIIRS records have been kept, and in 2019 it is almost half of what it was in 2012 (2.42 billion cubic
289 meters in 2012 and 1.34 billion cubic meters in 2019) (39).

290 As we previously discussed, several of the CH_4 emitters detected in our survey follow this trend of
291 flaring reduction. In particular, C.1, C.2 and F.3 have flaring activity at the beginning of the
292 monitoring but then change from flaring to gas emission. In addition, we have observed that at least
293 six other emitters had an active flame in the past, but vented gas later (Fig. S1). The fact that
294 several of the emitters currently venting CH_4 showed flaring activity in the past suggests a
295 relationship between the decrease in flaring at the expense of an increase of venting.

296 The effect of the use of flaring can also be noticed in the TROPOMI data where, for example, we
297 see the influence of point E.1 (high-frequency emitter of the Gamyshlja-Gunorta field). This emitter
298 kept showing flaring activity until 2005 while it is emitting CH_4 during the TROPOMI monitoring
299 period. On the other hand, we hardly see the influence of the two Gogerendag emitters (C.1 and
300 C.2), which kept the flare active until 2019, and their emissions are still not noticeable in the
301 TROPOMI data (Fig. S8).

302
303 **Discussion**
304
305 In this study, we have used a combination of satellites to produce a large-scale survey of individual
306 CH_4 emitters active between 2017 and 2020 on the west coast of Turkmenistan, one of the world's
307 largest CH_4 hotspot regions as shown by TROPOMI observations. First, areas of interest within the
308 region have been identified using medium-resolution data from TROPOMI. Two types of high-
309 resolution data (multi- and hyperspectral) have then been used to detect, quantify, and monitor the
310 activity of the identified 29 strong CH4 emitters over time. In particular, hyperspectral satellites have
311 mapped plumes with fluxes between 1.400 ± 400 kg/h and 19.600 ± 8.100 kg/h, which indicates
312 that the emissions from Turkmenistan are often extremely high; the S2 multispectral satellite has
313 enabled the systematic monitoring of emissions above 1800 kg/h, showing an increase in the
314 number of detections in 2020 compared to the previous years, and the longer time series of the L5
315 and L8 missions (1984-2012 and 2013-today respectively) has shown that several emitters have
316 been venting CH_4 beyond the S2 observation period.
317

The main results of this study reveal that the large amounts of CH_4 emitted in this region are mainly due to the venting of gas from oil fields. We find that venting is related to the decrease in the use of flaring as a method to treat excess gas. Secondly, the emissions not related to venting are linked to the bad condition of the installations, concretely of the pipelines, which have gas leaks during long time periods. These emissions could be easily and rapidly fixed: in the case of inactive flares it would be sufficient to activate the flares, although other more sustainable methods as gas capture would be preferable (40); in the case of pipeline leaks, it is necessary to improve maintenance and surveillance. Identifying these high emitting sources is fundamental for any mitigation strategy, as their elimination would result in an important reduction of CH_4 emissions. In particular, we estimate that the emissions identified in this study amount to 0.28 Tg a^{-1} (0.25-0.31 Tg a^{-1} 95% confidence interval), which could be easily avoided. It is unknown how these numbers would scale to the global scale, but we can already speculate that a massive amount of CH_4 emissions could indeed be avoided if greater control actions were taken on oil and gas extraction operations.

The emitting sources found in the study only represent emitters above the detection limit of the satellites used in this work. In these cases, synergy with a regional mapper (and inverse modelling) such as TROPOMI or the upcoming MethanSAT missions could provide the full picture of emissions for the basin. In addition, rapid source identification and data interpretation can provide valuable clues to understand the problem in each case, and thus select appropriate methods for effective mitigation of smaller emissions.

High-resolution satellites capable of detecting CH_4 emissions, in combination with mid-resolution satellites with daily global coverage such as TROPOMI and its successor Sentinel-5 instruments, bring a new era in the monitoring of industrial emissions, both locally and globally, with the potential to provide early warnings in near real-time. In addition to the already operational high-resolution satellites (GHGSat, PRISMA, ZY1, S2 and Landsat), new missions such as MethaneSAT, EMIT, Carbon Mapper, EnMAP, CHIME or SBG are expected to reinforce possible monitoring systems even further.

Our results also point to the risks of penalizing flaring without effective measures to control venting. The possibility of flaring cessation at the expense of venting is a problem that has been discussed in the past (40) since monitoring flaring is easy to carry out by satellites, but venting was easy to hide until now. Furthermore, the methods we use here can also be applied to track the progress of flare reduction strategies in other areas of the world.

Materials and Methods

Definition of the study area with TROPOMI XCH$_4$ data

The TROPOspheric Monitoring Instrument (TROPOMI) sensor onboard ESA's Sentinel-5P satellite (19) provides daily global coverage of CH_4 data with 7 km x 7 km (since August 2019 5.5 km x 7 km) pixel resolution in nadir that allows finding areas with high CH_4 concentration enhancements. The approximate location of the strongest sources in the study area has been identified using the wind rotation method introduced by Maasakkers et al. (2021) (28). After identification of an area with large CH_4 concentrations, data from individual days is rotated around a possible target point using the wind direction at the location. In this manner, the scenes are rotated so that the wind vector is always pointing northward, these rotated scenes are then averaged. By doing these exercises for a full grid of points, the location can be determined where the mean downwind concentrations are most significantly enhanced compared to the mean upwind concentrations, resulting in the most likely location of the source (28). TROPOMI pinpointing identified five key points (see Fig. S10) where we started the search for point sources of emission. In addition, the Korpeje area was already known for its strong and frequent point source emissions (25).

High-resolution Hyperspectral & Multispectral data

This study has used both hyperspectral and multispectral satellites, which are complementary for the detection and monitoring of CH_4 emissions. Hyperspectral instruments offer a relatively high sensitivity to CH_4 thanks to tens of spectral channels located around the strong CH_4 absorption feature around 2300 nm, but acquisitions are made upon request and their coverage is sparse in space and time. In turn, multispectral systems provide frequent and spatially-continuous observations over any region on Earth, but with very limited sensitivity to CH_4.

Use of hyperspectral data for CH_4 detection and quantification

For this study, we have collected data from the ZY1 AHSI and PRISMA missions, which are the only two hyperspectral satellite missions sampling the 2300 nm spectral region and with an open data policy. The Chinese ZY1 mission was launched in September 2019 and has onboard the AHSI sensor whose images cover a 60X60 km^2 area, while the Italian PRISMA mission, launched in March 2019, provides images with 30X30 km^2 coverage. Both missions have a spatial resolution of 30 m.

All hyperspectral data acquisitions took place during 2020 (the last year covered by this study). Acquisition requests were first made with a focus on the key points identified by TROPOMI, and then those were extended to other possible key areas (see the following subsection). Due to the difficulty to obtain data from these sensors in the short term, we could not cover some areas in that time range. Many PRISMA images have been acquired from the catalogue, while others have been obtained based on requests for targeted locations. In total, we have obtained 12 images from PRISMA and one from ZY1 (see Fig. S11).

The hyperspectral images have allowed us to observe CH_4 emissions with 30m spatial resolution and quantify the emissions using the matched filter method (13). The quantification has been done with the integrated mass enhancement (IME) method (41), and we have used 1-h average 10-m wind ($U10$) data from the NASA Goddard Earth Observing System-Fast Processing (GEOS-FP) meteorological reanalysis product at 0.25°× 0.3125° resolution (42) to get the Flux Rates (Q). The details of our processing of hyperspectral data are provided in Guanter et al. (2021) (43).

Use of multispectral data for CH_4 monitoring

For the temporal monitoring of emissions, we have used the Sentinel-2 Level 2A (L2A) product from both S2-A and B satellites of ESA's Copernicus program, whose data are openly available on the Copernicus Open Access Hub official portal.

The S2 CH_4 detection limit and the estimation of the emissions detected in S2 monitoring has been defined using the quantified plumes coincident with S2 detections, as the three satellites have approximately the same overpass time with a few minutes difference (between 2 and 5) in the observations used. We have identified nine simultaneous plumes indicating that the detection limit of S2 is close to 1800 kg/h (see Fig. S5). This relationship holds if the plume maintains concentrations above ~3800 ppm m. For example, in cases where the wind speed is very high, and the emitted gas disperses rapidly, the plume tail disappears, and the pixels in the plume have lower concentrations despite being associated with a high emission flux. There are several examples of this in Figure S4, where hyperspectral sensors detect plumes on 2020-07-31 and 2020-09-11 that S2 missed, i.e., S2 has not detected emissions with fluxes lower than 1800 kg/h that PRISMA and ZY1 have with a few minutes difference. This detection limit value is slightly lower than Varon et al. (2021) (27) indicated (~3000 kg/h) for the most optimal surfaces, as is the case in most of Turkmenistan.

425   The detection of single plumes from S2 data is often challenging because of its relatively low
426   sensitivity to CH_4 concentration enhancements. We have a priori predetermined areas with potential
427   emitters on which to focus the search of possible plumes. These are: the area near the TROPOMI
428   pinpoints (see Fig. S10), emission points detected in the ZY1 and PRISMA hyperspectral images
429   (see Fig. S4), O&G extraction fields in the SCB according to (35, 36), pipeline crossings, flares that
430   in the past had shown an active flame, and mud volcanoes.
431
432   To detect CH_4 emissions with S2, we have selected bands B11 and B12, with 20 m pixel resolution.
433   The B11 band extends over a set of weak CH_4 absorption lines near 1650 nm, and the B12 band
434   includes stronger absorption lines in the 2200-2300 nm range so that the average optical depth of
435   CH_4 in B12 is five times that of B11 (27). The identification of emissions has been carried out using
436   a dynamic multitemporal method, where we consider all observed days by both the S2 A and B
437   satellites. We have applied the B12/B11 band ratio to the clear-sky days and, using the timelapse
438   tool provided in the online service EO Browser of Sentinel Hub (44), we have obtained the
439   continuous record of the time series of the study area (<3 km^2 in each timelapse). We have
440   discarded cloudy images with an automatic filter available in the EO Browser service and manually
441   sandstorm days that do not allow a clear view of the surface.
442
443   The S2 detection figures shown in this paper (Fig. 3 and Fig. S5) have been obtained applying the
444   B12 and B11 bands ratio of two contiguous days from the same satellite and with the same orbit
445   whenever possible, i.e., the equation described below but ensuring that the detection is taken by
446   the same satellite, S2A or S2B from the same viewing, on both days. In this way, we try to avoid
447   the increase of noise in the result due to miss-registration and viewing differences (45).
448

449
$$R = \frac{B12/B12'}{B11/B11'}$$

450
451
452   where R is the result of the band ratio $B12$ and $B11$ are the bands of the emission day, and $B12'$
453   and $B11'$ are the bands of the nearest clear-sky day observed with the same S2A or S2B satellite
454   on which there is no emission. This method provides the CH_4 plume avoiding the maximum
455   interference in the signal from other surface components.
456
457   The simple B12/B11 band ratios provide an image where CH_4 pixels take low values (<0.9) which
458   contrast with the rest of the surface that is close to 1. The result would be similar to the one
459   proposed by Varon et al. (2021) (27) in the Multi-Band/Single-Pass (MBSP) method, but in this
460   case, without normalising the band ratio and dynamically comparing the emission days with the
461   adjacent days. The comparison of each image with the days immediately adjacent to it using the
462   timelapse allows enhancing the CH_4 signal by minimizing the effect of surface variability since the
463   CH_4 plumes change shape depending on the activity, emission intensity of each day, and the wind
464   direction that normally changes from one day to another. This dynamic method has proven to be
465   the most effective to identify the weakest emissions, which, analysed individually, would go
466   unnoticed, and to lower the detection limit of S2 to about 1800 kg/h on the most optimal surfaces.
467   The 20m pixel resolution of S2 and multiple observations of plumes from the same source have
468   provided sufficient accuracy to identify the emission source.
469
470   We have obtained the results for L5 and L8 in the same way as S2, but in this case, the bands
471   extending over the weak CH_4 absorption lines are B05 in the case of L5 (1550-1750 nm) and B06
472   in the case of L8 (1570-1670 nm), and B07 covers the strong absorption lines in both cases (2080-
473   2350 nm in L5 and 2110-2290 nm in L8) with a 30 m resolution. In the case of L8, the overpass
474   time is about 20 minutes different from ZY1, PRISMA and S2, so that coincident detections on the
475   same day have not been considered valid for empirical comparison. We have used the data from
476   the entire L5 time series (1984-2012) to observe specific locations with high emission potential,

477　and the L8 time series (2013-present) to observe all locations of emitters identified with S2. Both
478　satellites have a revisit cycle of 16 days (46).
479
480　***Annual quantification***
481
482　We have estimated an integrated annual emission rate (Q_a) from all 29 sources detected in this
483　study with S2. For this estimation, we rely on the Q values estimated for the single plumes obtained
484　from the hyperspectral data (Fig. S4) in order to obtain an average hourly flux rate ($\bar{Q}$)
485　characterizing the emissions in the area. This average flux rate is scaled in time using an average
486　emission frequency number ($\bar{f}$) which is obtained from the S2 plume detections (O. E. % in Table
487　S1). The total annual emission rate is then given by:
488
489
490　$$Q_a = 24 \cdot 365 \cdot N \cdot \overline{Q} \cdot \overline{f}$$
491
492
493　where *N* is the number of emitters, i.e., 29 emission sources.
494
495　This estimate is based on statistics from emission intensity and frequency data sampling the four
496　years of monitoring covered in this study. The resulting annual flux only represents the annual
497　emission flux from large emitters, and underestimates the real one, as only emissions above the
498　S2 detection limit are considered in the calculation of the average emission frequency. As a result,
499　we have obtained an annual estimate of 0.28 Tg of CH_4 emitted per year, with a 95% confidence
500　interval between 0.25 and 0.31 Tg a^{-1}.
501
502　The 95% confidence interval was obtained by non-parametric bootstrapping of all the results
503　obtained from combining the Q of each of the 25 plumes with the emission frequencies (f) of each
504　of the 29 identified emitters.
505
506　***Emitter identification***
507
508　The identification of the sources was carried out by inspection of high-resolution visual images from
509　Google Earth, Bing Maps and Esri, depending on the acquisition date available for each area on
510　each platform.
511　In the initial approach of the study, we also considered mud volcanoes as possible sources of CH_4
512　emission. However, after observing the different potential areas, it has not been possible to link any
513　of the observed plumes to a mud volcano.
514　In three cases, we were not able to identify the origin of the emissions due to lack of up-to-date
515　very high-resolution surface imagery (in some southern areas most recent image is from 2015 and
516　Planet's 3m/pix images are not enough for these cases) and insufficient geographic information
517　about Turkmenistan's O&G infrastructure.
518　Regarding the emitters identified as flares, there is a wide variety of flare systems within the O&G
519　sector of which characteristics depend on multiple factors such as calorific power of the burning
520　fuel, physical state (gas, liquid, or mixture), pressure, flow, geographic location for the population
521　or other activities, availability of land for the installations, economic availability, ... In general, we
522　can distinguish two main groups of flares: elevated flares that are mainly used in the burning of
523　gaseous waste in plant emergencies (due to power failures, composition, and fires) and are more
524　oriented to sudden alterations, and ground flares that are generally used for moderate or
525　continuous flow. Linked to the second, we can distinguish a third group, the pit flares, which usually
526　burn liquid or gaseous waste in unpopulated areas to meet environmental standards.
527　In Turkmenistan, we have detected emissions from all three types of flares. Throughout the study,
528　they have all been referred to as the same "flare" emitter type, although in Table S1, there is a
529　more precise classification separating them into the three groups.

530 The identification of the emitters, mainly flares, has been verified by the Carbon Limits group, which
531 has experience in field measurements in Turkmenistan.
532
533 *Flaring signal*
534
535 Flaring can be detected by satellites with bands in the SWIR, due to the flame's strong signal in
536 that spectral region, with the emission peak at 1.6 µm (47).
537
538 In the 2017-2020 period, three of the emission points have shown an intense signal in the B12
539 band of S2 coming from flaring, i.e., those days the excess gas was burning instead of venting it
540 directly to the atmosphere. These three points maintained a constant signal for several months until
541 the flaring signal disappeared, and we started detecting CH_4 emissions (see Fig. 4 Gogerendag
542 case). S2 data are only available as of January 2017, so to check if there had been any faring
543 signal in the past for the rest of the emitters, we have observed with Landsat 8, 7 and 5 data (up to
544 1984) (48), using the Google Earth Engine platform, the historical VIIRS signal (up to 2012) using
545 SkyTruth's flaring maps (39, 49), and FIRMS for MODIS (up to 2000) and additional information
546 from VIIRS. We have also used historical high-resolution Google, Bing and Esri imagery to check
547 if flaring was also used in the past, as the powerful flaring flames can also be seen in the visible
548 (see Fig. S1).
549

References

1. M. Etminan, G. Myhre, E. J. Highwood, K. P. Shine, Radiative forcing of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide: A significant revision of the methane radiative forcing. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* (2016) https:/doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071930.

2. M. Saunois, *et al.*, The global methane budget 2000-2017. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* (2020) https:/doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-1561-2020.

3. E. G. Nisbet, *et al.*, Very Strong Atmospheric Methane Growth in the 4 Years 2014–2017: Implications for the Paris Agreement. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **33**, 318–342 (2019).

4. United Nations Environment Programme and Climate and Clean Air Coalition, "Global Methane Assessment: Benefits and Costs of Mitigating Methane Emissions" (2021).

5. U. N. E. P. (UNEP), Oil and Gas Methane Partnership (OGMP) 2.0 Framework | Climate & Clean Air Coalition. 1–18 (2020).

6. R. A. Alvarez, *et al.*, Assessment of methane emissions from the U.S. oil and gas supply chain. *Science (80-.).* **361**, 186–188 (2018).

7. D. Zavala-Araiza, *et al.*, Super-emitters in natural gas infrastructure are caused by abnormal process conditions. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1–10 (2017).

8. A. R. Brandt, G. A. Heath, D. Cooley, Methane Leaks from Natural Gas Systems Follow Extreme Distributions. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **50**, 12512–12520 (2016).

9. T. Lauvaux, *et al.*, Global Assessment of Oil and Gas Methane Ultra-Emitters. *ArVix [Preprint]* (2021) (May 19, 2021).

10. O. S. Ismail, G. E. Umukoro, Global Impact of Gas Flaring. *Energy Power Eng.* **04**, 290–302 (2012).

11. U.S. Department of Energy. Office of Oil and Natural Gas, Natural Gas Flaring and Venting : State and Federal Regulatory Overview , Trends , and Impacts. *U.S. Dep. Energy*, 72 (2019).

12. D. R. Lyon, *et al.*, Aerial Surveys of Elevated Hydrocarbon Emissions from Oil and Gas Production Sites. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* (2016) https:/doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b00705.

13. I. Irakulis-Loitxate, *et al.*, Satellite-based Survey of Extreme Methane Emissions in the Permian Basin. *Sci. Adv.* (2021).

14. A. Gvakharia, *et al.*, Methane, Black Carbon, and Ethane Emissions from Natural Gas Flares in the Bakken Shale, North Dakota. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **51**, 5317–5325 (2017).

15. D. Zavala-Araiza, *et al.*, A tale of two regions: methane emissions from oil and gas production in offshore/onshore Mexico A tale of two regions: methane emissions from oil and gas production in offshore/onshore Mexico. *Environ. Res. Lett* **16**, 24019 (2021).

16. World Bank Group, Global Gas Flaring Reduction A Public-Private Partnership World Bank Group A VOLUNTARY STANDARD FOR GLOBAL GAS FLARING AND VENTING REDUCTION (2004).

17. EUROPEAN COMMISSION, "COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS on an EU strategy to reduce methane emissions" (2020) (April 14, 2021).

18. IEA, "Methane Tracker 2020" (2020) (May 19, 2021).

19. J. P. Veefkind, *et al.*, TROPOMI on the ESA Sentinel-5 Precursor: A GMES mission for global observations of the atmospheric composition for climate, air quality and ozone layer applications. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **120**, 70–83 (2012).

20. D. H. Cusworth, *et al.*, Detecting high-emitting methane sources in oil/gas fields using satellite observations. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **18**, 16885–16896 (2018).

21. Y. Zhang, *et al.*, Quantifying methane emissions from the largest oil-producing basin in the United States from space. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaaz5120 (2020).

22. O. Schneising, *et al.*, Remote sensing of methane leakage from natural gas and petroleum systems revisited. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **20**, 9169–9182 (2020).

23. J. Barré, *et al.*, Systematic detection of local CH_4 anomalies by combining satellite measurements with high-resolution forecasts. *Atmos. Chem. Phys* **21**, 5117–5136 (2021).

618 24. J. A. de Gouw, *et al.*, Daily Satellite Observations of Methane from Oil and Gas Production
619   Regions in the United States. *Sci. Rep.* **10** (2020).
620 25. D. J. Varon, *et al.*, Satellite Discovery of Anomalously Large Methane Point Sources From
621   Oil/Gas Production. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **46**, 13507–13516 (2019).
622 26. D. H. Cusworth, *et al.*, Multisatellite Imaging of a Gas Well Blowout Enables Quantification
623   of Total Methane Emissions. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **48** (2021).
624 27. D. J. Varon, *et al.*, High-frequency monitoring of anomalous methane point sources with
625   multispectral Sentinel-2 satellite observations. *Atmos. Meas. Tech.* **14**, 2771–2785 (2021).
626 28. J. D. Maasakkers, et al., Space-based identification and quantification of methane
627   emissions from landfills [in preparation] (2021).
628 29. T. Scarpelli, *et al.*, A global gridded (0.1° × 0.1°) inventory of methane emissions from oil,
629   gas, and coal exploitation based on national reports to the United Nations Framework
630   Convention on Climate Change. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss.*, 1–21 (2019).
631 30. European Commission Joint Research Centre (EC-JRC), Environmental Assessment
632   Agency (PBL), Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR), release
633   EDGAR v5.0 (1970 - 2015) of November 2019. *Crippa, M., Oreggioni, G., Guizzardi, D.,*
634   *Muntean, M., Schaaf, E., Lo Vullo, E., Solazzo, E., Monforti-Ferrario, F., Olivier, J.G.J.,*
635   *Vignati, E., Foss. CO2 GHG Emiss. all world Ctries. - 2019 Report, EUR 29849 EN, Publ.*
636   *Off.* (2019).
637 31. D. Oppo, R. Capozzi, A. Nigarov, P. Esenov, Mud volcanism and fluid geochemistry in the
638   Cheleken peninsula, western Turkmenistan. *Mar. Pet. Geol.* **57**, 122–134 (2014).
639 32. BP, Statistical Review of World Energy, 2020 | 69th Edition. *Bp* **69** (2020).
640 33. S. Pirani, *Central Asian Gas: prospects for the 2020* (2019).
641 34. *Sustainable Infrastructure for Low-Carbon Development in Central Asia and the Caucasus*
642   (OECD, 2019) https:/doi.org/10.1787/d1aa6ae9-en (March 4, 2021).
643 35. Rystad Energy - Your Energy Knowledge House (April 18, 2021).
644 36. K. Rose, *et al.*, "Development of an Open Global Oil and Gas Infrastructure Inventory and
645   Geodatabase" (2018) https:/doi.org/10.18141/1427573.
646 37. Torleif Haugland, *et al.*, "Associated petroleum gas flaring study for Russia, Kazakhstan,
647   Turkmenistan, and Azerbaijan" (2013).
648 38. C. Frankenberg, *et al.*, Global column-averaged methane mixing ratios from 2003 to 2009
649   as derived from SCIAMACHY: Trends and variability. *J. Geophys. Res.* **116**, D04302
650   (2011).
651 39. SkyTruth | Flaring Volume Estimates (March 5, 2021).
652 40. R. Calel, P. Mahdavi, The unintended consequences of antiflaring policies—and
653   measures for mitigation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **117**, 12503–12507 (2020).
654 41. C. Frankenberg, *et al.*, Airborne methane remote measurements reveal heavy-tail flux
655   distribution in Four Corners region https:/doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1605617113 (August 27,
656   2020).
657 42. A. Molod, *et al.*, The GEOS-5 Atmospheric General Circulation Model: Mean Climate and
658   Development from MERRA to Fortuna. *NASA TM-2012-104606* (2012).
659 43. L. Guanter, *et al.*, Mapping methane point emissions with the PRISMA spaceborne
660   imaging spectrometer arXiv [Preprint] (2021). https://doi.org/10.31223/X5VC9C (May 19,
661   2021)
662 44. Sentinel Hub (May 18, 2021).
663 45. "S2-PDGS-MPC-DQR" (2021).
664 46. Landsat Satellite Missions (June 21, 2021).
665 47. C. D. Elvidge, M. Zhizhin, K. Baugh, F. C. Hsu, T. Ghosh, Methods for global survey of
666   natural gas flaring from visible infrared imaging radiometer suite data. *Energies* **9** (2016).
667 48. M. A. Wulder, *et al.*, Current status of Landsat program, science, and applications.
668   *Remote Sens. Environ.* **225**, 127–147 (2019).
669 49. SkyTruth Flaring Map (March 5, 2021).
670

Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Representation of the study area. Left, oil and gas fields classified according to the type of production activity based on Rystad database (35): oil, gas, condensate, liquefied natural gas (LNG), and the combination of several of them; the location of processing plants, terminals, compressor stations and pipelines along the South Caspian Basin as provided in (36) are also depicted. Right, 0.1º composite of CH₄ concentration in the atmospheric column from TROPOMI data between November 2018 and November 2020. Background satellite image from ESRI.

15

681
682
Figure 2. Spatial distribution of point emissions in Turkmenistan's South Caspian Basin. The emission frequency corresponds to the number of emissions detected by S2 with respect to the number of clear-sky days with S2 overpasses between 2017 and 2020, where "high" represents an emission frequency range between 48 - 37 %, "medium" 37 - 15 %, "low" 15 - 3 %, and "very low" 3 - 1 %. Emission points are labeled with alphanumeric codes. Codes with the same letter belong to the same field. Background images are extracted from the most recent high-resolution imagery in the ESRI, Google Satellite or Bing Aerial web portals.

690
691

16

692

693
694 **Figure 3.** Examples of emissions detected from the A.3 emission point (see Fig. 2). Left, plume
695 detected by both ZY1 and S2 within a 3-minute time difference. Right, time series of plumes
696 detected at A.3 with the S2 and L8 multispectral satellites. A true-color composite of the emission
697 point, based on visual imagery, is shown in the lower right corner. The background image for all
698 panels is from Bing Aerial.
699
700

Figure 4. Temporal evolution of emissions in the Goturdepe (A.X), Korpeje (D.X) and Gogerendag (C.X) fields, as well as the daily total number of active emissions detected from the 29 sites found in this study. The vertical axis indicates the number of points that were emitting or flaring at the same time on the same day.

Figure 5. Examples of plume detections in the Goturdepe field using historical data from the L5 multispectral satellite mission. On the left, the general map showing the location of P.1, P.2 and P.3 emitters, which were active during the L5 monitoring period, and the nearby emitters (A.4, A.5, and A.6) active during the S2 monitoring period. On the right, some of the detected plumes from P.1, P.2 and P.3. The background image of all panels is from ESRI Satellite.

715 **Table 1.** Classification of oil and gas production fields where emissions have been found. "Field"
716 refers to the name of the field; "Oil and Gas Category" is the type of production activity in each field;
717 "Production" is the amount of production in kbbl/day in the years 2018-2020; "Number of emitters"
718 is the number of emitting points that have been found in each field; "Detected emissions" is the
719 number of days with emissions that have been observed by year; and "Total emissions" is the total
720 number of plumes observed in each field in the entire study period. Oil and Gas category and
721 production data is based on Rystad database (35).

Field	Oil and Gas Category	Production (kbbl/d)			Number of emitters	Detected emissions				Total emissions
		2018	2019	2020		2017	2018	2019	2020	
Goturdepe	Crude Oil	43.014	30.000	30.137	10	138	50	64	141	393
	Condensate	0.001	0.001	0.001						
	NGL	0.060	0.042	0.042						
Barsa-Gelmez	Crude Oil	28.000	20.000	13.667	4	32	39	23	32	126
	Condensate	0.001	0.001	0.059						
	NGL	0.021	0.015	0.029						
Gogerendag	Crude Oil	0.000	0.000	0.007	2	0	0	3	21	24
	Condensate	0.003	0.004	0.009						
Korpeje	Crude Oil	0.003	0.003	0.046	7	45	25	43	74	187
	Condensate	0.002	0.002	0.002						
	NGL	0.160	0.160	0.158						
	Gas	18.919	18.919	18.879						
Gamyshlja Gunorta	Crude Oil	0.004	0.003	0.768	2	7	14	24	28	73
	Condensate	0.003	0.003	0.683						
Keymir	Crude Oil	0.003	0.004	4.648	3	7	17	25	41	90
	Condensate	0.001	0.001	4.212						
	NGL	0.028	0.028	0.650						
Akpatlavuk	Crude Oil	0.004	0.003	0.000	1	21	16	12	2	51
	Condensate	0.003	0.003	0.000						
Total		90.23	69.19	74.00	28	250	161	194	339	944

722

723

724 **Supplementary Information for**

725 Satellites unveil easily-fixable super-emissions in one of the world's
726 largest methane hotspot regions

727

728 Itziar Irakulis-Loitxate[1]*, Luis Guanter[1], Joannes D. Maasakkers[2], Daniel Zavala-Araiza[3,4], Ilse
729 Aben[2]

730

731 * Correspondence to: iiraloi@doctor.upv.es

732

733

734 **This section includes:**

735

736   Figures S1 to S11

737   Tables S1 to S1

738   SI References

739

Fig. S1. Flares with active flaring in the past and current inactive appearance seen in RGB. Bottom right two examples of active flares as seen in the Landsat 7 (L7) B7 and S2 B12 bands (points D.7 and C.2 respectively), i.e. in the CH_4 absorption bands. In the Landsat B7 and S2 B12 bands, the CH_4 absorbs the signal (low values), while the flaring emits a very high signal (very high values) compared to the surface.

745
746

Fig. S2. Distribution of the detected points according to the field they belong to. The area of the fields is based on the data from Rose et al. 2018 (36). The extension of some fields has been manually updated due to their expansion in recent years.

Before emissions (2017/08/23) During emissions (2018/08/23) At the end of the study (2020/12/20)

753

Fig. S3. The evolution of the E.2 emission point seen in RGB before, during and after the emissions derived from a leak. During the emission period a black liquid emanating from the emission point is visible.

754
755
756
757
758

ZY1-AHSI 2020-07-31

A.3
A.6
A.7
A.10
B.3
B.1

0   2 km

A.3: Q=7300 ± 2700 kg/h   A.6: Q=2000 ± 800 kg/h
A.7: Q=4700 ± 1700 kg/h   A.10: Q=1500 ± 600 kg/h
B.1: Q=3700 ± 1400 kg/h   B.3: Q=4900 ± 1800 kg/h

PRISMA 2020-03-27

0   2 km

A.3: Q=17400 ± 5000 kg/h

0   500 m

A.6: Q=1900 ± 600 kg/h   A.8: Q=1400 ± 400 kg/h

PRISMA 2020-09-11

A.6
A.7
A.8+A.9

0   1 km

A.6: Q=1600 ± 100 kg/h
A.7: Q=1800 ± 200 kg/h
A.8+A.9: Q=2800 ± 300 kg/h

0   500 m

B.1: Q=2400 ± 200 kg/h

759

25

PRISMA 2020-04-19
0   2 km
D.2: Q=6600 ± 1300 kg/h

PRISMA 2020-06-22
0   500 m
D.2: Q=7700 ± 3400 kg/h

D.5: Q=5700 ± 2500 kg/h
D.7: Q=6400 ± 2800 kg/h
0   1 km

PRISMA 2020-07-03
0   1 km
D.2: Q=10500 ± 4200 kg/h
D.5: Q=4400 ± 1800 kg/h
D.7: Q=5800 ± 2400 kg/h

PRISMA 2020-07-21
0   2 km
D.2: Q=18300 ± 6800 kg/h

PRISMA 2020-11-14
0   2 km
D.6: Q=13800 ± 3700 kg/h

0   500 m
D.5: Q=3900 ± 1400 kg/h

PRISMA 2020-10-10
0   2 km
D.7: Q=19600 ± 8100 kg/h

0   500 m
D.2: Q=6100 ± 2600 kg/h

ΔXCH_4 (ppm m)
200 1400 2600 3800 5000

ΔXCH_4 (ppm m)
200 3650 7100 10550 14000

ΔXCH_4 (ppm m)
200 900 1600 2300 3000

Fig. S4. All CH_4 plumes detected with the ZY1 and PRISMA hyperspectral satellites in the survey period. The color scale corresponding to each plume is indicated with the color of the map outline (black, red, or green).

2020/07/31

A.3 — ZY1 7:31 UTC — Q= 7300 ± 2700
S2 7:28 UTC
A.7 — ZY1 7:31 UTC — Q= 4700 ± 1700
S2 7:28 UTC

2020/09/11

A.9 & A.7 — PRISMA 7:20 UTC — Q= 1800 ± 200 / Q= 2800 ± 300
S2 7:18 UTC
B.1 — PRISMA 7:20 UTC — Q= 2400 ± 200
S2 7:18 UTC

2020/07/03

D.2 — PRISMA 7:14 UTC — Q= 10500 ± 4200
D.5 & D.7 — PRISMA 7:14 UTC — Q= 4400 ± 1800 / Q= 5800 ± 2400
S2 7:19 UTC
S2 7:19 UTC

2020/04/19

D.2 — PRISMA 7:21 UTC — Q= 6600 ± 1300
S2 7:18 UTC

CH_4 (ppm m)
200 / 1400 / 2600 / 3800 / 3000

764

765 **Fig. S5.** Simultaneous detections of Sentinel 2 (S2) CH_4 plumes with PRISMA and ZY1 satellites
766 within minutes of each other.

767

Location A.1 (39.507412, 53.589812)   Days with data: 19%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.2 (39.496867, 53.6367)   Days with data: 22%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.3 (39.496797, 53.637712)   Days with data: 22%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.4 (39.52148, 53.772741)   Days with data: 19%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.5 (39.521368, 53.779028)   Days with data: 19%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.6 (39.473897, 53.742916)   Days with data: 19%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.7 (39.464278, 53.78836)   Days with data: 20%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

Location A.8 (39.46154, 53.775029)   Days with data: 19%

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                    No emission detected   Flaring   Emission

768

28

Location A.9 (39.459653, 53.779208) — Days with data: 19%

Location A.10 (39.44955, 53.68117) — Days with data: 19%

Location B.1 (39.36045, 53.765059) — Days with data: 20%

Location B.2 (39.385844, 53.835162) — Days with data: 20%

Location B.3 (39.378413, 53.8370408) — Days with data: 20%

Location B.4 (39.354982, 53.875092) — Days with data: 20%

Location C.1 (38.855148, 54.234979) — Days with data: 9%

Location C.2 (38.853078, 54.236841) — Days with data: 9%

769

Location D.1 (38.579587, 54.209308)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location D.2 (38.557471, 54.200493)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location D.3 (38.558489, 54.203529)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location D.4 (38.518709, 54.203931)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location D.5 (38.507975, 54.197694)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location D.6 (38.506291, 54.197603)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location D.7 (38.493926, 54.19764)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

Location E.1 (38.33078, 54.02832)   Days with data: 10%

Detections

Jan 1 2017   Jul 1 2017   Jan 1 2018   Jul 1 2018   Jan 1 2019   Jul 1 2019   Jan 1 2020   Jul 1 2020   Dec 1 2020
                                 ı No emission detected   ı Flaring   ı Emission

770

771

Fig. S6. The temporal evolution of the 29 emitters identified during 2017-2020 with S2, where green lines indicate no emission day, red lines indicate emission, and yellow lines indicate active flaring. Cloudy sky days are not included in the series. The Goturdepe (A.X) and Barsa-Gelmez (B.X) emitters contain double data days because two S2 orbits overlap in that area.

776

777

Fig. S7. Some Landsat 8 detections from sources that record emissions prior to Sentinel 2 monitoring period.

Fig. S8. Combination of moderate and low-resolution data from TROPOMI and SCIAMACHY sensors respectively with the emitter points indicated. On the left, the oversampled TROPOMI data between 2018 and 2020 combined with the emitters represented in terms of emission frequency. On the right the SCIAMACHY data oversampled to a 0.1º x 0.1º grid between 2003 and 2010 combined with the emitters found in this study classified according to their possible contribution to the SCIAMACHY data, i.e., whether the emitter existed before 2010 (it could have contributed to the CH_4 enhancement), post-2010 (it could not have contributed), undefined (unidentified emitters) or if it was constructed just in 2010 (it existed in the SCIAMACHY observation period but its contribution should be minimal).

33

792

Fig. S9. VIIRS detected flaring over the years. On the left, inside the blue box, the onshore area of the South Caspian Basin that has been studied in this work, with the points where VIIRS detected flaring between 2012 and 2019. On the right the flared gas volume in that area according to VIIRS records each year (47). These data have been obtained from SkyTruth's Annual Flare Volume map (39).

798
799

800

Fig. S10. The locations pinpointed by TROPOMI (blue triangles), and the emitter points (purple circles) found in the study.

803

804

Fig. S11. Spatial coverage of ZY1 and PRISMA hyperspectral data used in this work.

805
806

807 **Table S1.** Emissions point list. Where "Point ID" is the identifying name assigned to this study. Lat
808 and Long coordinates of the emitter. "Emitter" the type of emitter or source. "O. E. %" is Observed
809 emission %, that is, the percentage of clear-sky days with emissions above the detection limit of
810 S2, and this data is used throughout the document to refer to the emission frequency. "Field" field
811 where it is located.

Point ID	Lat	Long	Emitter	O.E.%	Field
A.1	39.50741	53.58981	Ground flare	29	Goturdepe
A.2	39.49687	53.6367	Ground flare	20	Goturdepe
A.3	39.4968	53.63771	Ground flare	29	Goturdepe
A.4	39.52148	53.77274	Pit flare	1	Goturdepe
A.5	39.52137	53.77903	Ground flare	1	Goturdepe
A.6	39.4739	53.74292	Ground flare	1	Goturdepe
A.7	39.46428	53.78836	Pit flare	21	Goturdepe
A.8	39.4616	53.77502	Undefined	27	Goturdepe
A.9	39.45965	53.77921	Undefined	3	Goturdepe
A.10	39.44955	53.68117	Pipeline	9	Goturdepe
B.1	39.36045	53.76506	Undefined	18	Barsa-Gelmez
B.2	39.38584	53.83516	Ground flare	2	Barsa-Gelmez
B.3	39.37841	53.83704	Ground flare	14	Barsa-Gelmez
B.4	39.35498	53.87509	Ground flare	10	Barsa-Gelmez
C.1	38.85515	54.23498	Ground flare	7	Gogerendag
C.2	38.85308	54.23684	Ground flare	10	Gogerendag
D.1	38.57959	54.20931	Ground flare	1	Korpeje
D.2	38.55747	54.20049	Ground flare	41	Korpeje
D.3	38.55849	54.20353	Pit flare	26	Korpeje
D.4	38.51871	54.20393	Ground flare	7	Korpeje
D.5	38.50798	54.19769	Ground flare	8	Korpeje
D.6	38.50629	54.1976	Ground flare	7	Korpeje
D.7	38.49393	54.19764	Ground flare	39	Korpeje
E.1	38.33078	54.02832	Ground flare	42	Gamyshlja Gunorta
E.2	38.36017	54.03149	Pipeline	10	Gamyshlja Gunorta
F.1	37.90825	53.89857	Elevated flare	48	Keymir
F.2	37.9286	53.91623	Pit flare	12	Keymir
F.3	37.92913	53.92431	Pit flare	15	Keymir
G.1	37.71665	53.92702	Pit flare	38	Akpatlavuk

812
813

SI References

1. K. Rose, *et al.*, "Development of an Open Global Oil and Gas Infrastructure Inventory and Geodatabase" (2018) https:/doi.org/10.18141/1427573.

2. C. D. Elvidge, M. Zhizhin, K. Baugh, F. C. Hsu, T. Ghosh, Methods for global survey of natural gas flaring from visible infrared imaging radiometer suite data. *Energies* **9** (2016).

3. SkyTruth | Flaring Volume Estimates (March 5, 2021).