1 **Assessing the Global Environmental Sources Driving the Geobiosphere:**
2 **A Revised Emergy Baseline.**
3

4 **Mark T. Brown** (corresponding author)

5 Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences

6 University of Florida

7 mtb@ufl.edu

8
9 **Sergio Ulgiati**

10 Department of Sciences and Technologies

11 Parthenope University of Napoli & School of Environments Beijing Normal University, Beijing,

12 China

13
14 **Abstract**
15

16 The empower that is derived from solar radiation, tidal momentum and geothermal sources
17 drives the productive processes of the geobiosphere and is responsible for developing gradients
18 of potential energy transformed into secondary energy and tertiary sources. In this paper we
19 establish the geobiosphere emergy baseline (GEB) based on earlier methods proposed by [Odum](#)
20 (2000) and refinements by [Brown and Ulgiati \(2010\)](#). After revising the solar exergy input and
21 our previous interpretation of the sources and magnitudes of geothermal exergy, we compute a
22 revised solar equivalent exergy and Solar Equivalence Ratios (SERs) of geothermal and tidal
23 inputs to the geobiosphere dynamic.

A Monte Carlo simulation that includes the revised solar exergy flow of geothermal inputs and uncertainty in the flows yields SERs of 26,300 seJ J⁻¹ and 5500 seJ J⁻¹ for tidal and geothermal sources respectively. The solar exergy remains 3.6 E24 seJ y⁻¹, while the solar equivalent exergy of tidal and geothermal sources were 3.1 E24 seJ y⁻¹, and 5.4 E24 seJ y⁻¹ respectively, resulting in a GEB of 12.1 E24 seJ y⁻¹.

Key Words: Emergy, Geobiosphere Emergy Baseline, Global Exergy Sources

INTRODUCTION

For several years more than one geobiosphere emergy baseline (GEB) has been promoted by various researchers ([Odum, 2000](#); [Campbell et al. 2005](#); [Brown and Ulgiati, 2010](#)). based on different quantification or inclusion of emergy sources driving the biosphere. The different GEB thus calculated were used by emergy practitioners resulting in different values of emergy indicators of products and processes, partially generating confusion and concern. After the Eighth Biennial Emergy Conference (January, 2014), the need for revisiting the procedures and assumptions used to compute the Geobiosphere Emergy Baseline emerged very clearly as an urgent target to strengthen the emergy accounting method and remove sources of potential misunderstanding. The goal was to develop a synthesis document to clarify the baseline issue, potentially resulting in adoption of a single baseline (or baseline range). Several different approaches to the computations, carried out by a number of emergy practitioners, are likely to allow for accommodation of different perspectives and postulations related to integration of the three driving energies (solar, geothermal, and tidal momentum) into a single emergy baseline. Of course, given the significant uncertainty that exists in our understanding of the geobiosphere system as well as in the available data about global processes, we should not expect that each

approach would yield the same baseline, but rather that results achieved through different procedures and assumptions may fall within an acceptable range of values showing the same order of magnitude. In so doing, a single agreed upon baseline could be selected to reflect a reconciliation of different perspectives within a scientifically sound uncertainty estimate.

When developing the emergy approach, H.T. Odum, at first, focused on solar radiation as the ultimate driving source of planetary dynamics and life on Earth (Odum, 1976). All calculations of resource convergence through planetary metabolism to yield “embodiment” factors (previously named transformities) were based on an estimate of the total solar radiation on Earth, after albedo was subtracted (Brown and Ulgiati, 2004). With the publication of Environmental Accounting (Odum, 1996) two more global sources were included as co-responsible of Earth phenomena, namely the gravitational potential energy of the Earth-Moon-Sun system (responsible for sea and earth tides and a portion of oceanic currents as well) and the heat flow from crustal weathering and erosion, radioactive decay in the mantle, and residual heat from the Earth’s formation (primordial heat) in the Earth core (called deep heat). This solar budget was referred to as the solar emergy baseline and quantified as $9.44\text{E}+24 \text{ sej yr}^{-1}$. Modeling the simultaneous support of these three energy sources yielded a new estimate of the biosphere baseline as $15.8\text{E}+24 \text{ sej yr}^{-1}$ (Odum, 2000) as the starting point for calculation of the transformities of solar radiation, heat crustal flow, and tide momentum. Finally, Brown and Ulgiati (2010) performed new calculations using the same driving energies, but based on updated estimates of Earth sources and their expression as available energy (exergy), according to Odum’s definition of emergy (Odum, 1996), yielding a baseline of $15.2\text{E}+24 \text{ sej yr}^{-1}$.

In earlier work, [Campbell et al. \(2005\)](#) suggested that more than one baseline is justified and proposed $9.26 \text{ E24 sej yr}^{-1}$ as an alternative to the baseline computed by Odum (2000). Also [Campbell \(2000\)](#) in another analysis suggested two baselines $9.26 \text{ E24 sej yr}^{-1}$ and $10.58 \text{ E24 sej yr}^{-1}$ for short and long period processes respectively. More recently [Campbell, Bastianoni, and Lu \(2010\)](#) have argue that the $9.26 \text{ E24 sej yr}^{-1}$ baseline is the most appropriate because it assumes that only the sun and deep heat are responsible for generating geologic processes. [Raugei \(2013\)](#) proposed a scalar baseline where the three fundamental inputs of exergy to the geobiosphere (sunlight, tidal momentum, and geothermal) are kept separate at all times, not unlike the three independent axes of Cartesian space.

Conflicting Baselines

Currently, the geobiosphere emergy baseline used in the emergy methodology is composed of the solar exergy received by Earth, geothermal exergy, and the exergy from dissipation of tidal momentum that results from the interaction of the earth, sun, moon system. From these three exergy sources the qualities of all other forms of exergy are computed. The conflicting baselines that have been proposed over the years have increased the difficulty of comparing results from one evaluation to another.

THE GEOBIOSPHERE EMERGY BASELINE (GEB)

The three main driving forces of sunlight, geothermal exergy and the dissipation of gravitational potential provide the total exergy (available energy, work potential) contribution to the

geobiosphere¹. These three driving sources are referred to as the *global tripartite* and are the primary sources of renewable exergy that support geobiosphere processes. By definition, the total exergy used up by a system process, expressed in common units, is the emergy of the final product or service (Odum, 1996). In order to represent tidal exergy and geothermal exergy on the same basis with solar exergy, we use a method of equivalence that expresses these two sources as solar equivalent exergy by means of appropriate *solar equivalence ratios* (SER). In so doing the three flows can be added to yield the Geobiosphere Emergy Baseline (GEB).

When represented on the same solar basis, tidal and geothermal exergy are no longer actual exergy, but instead are *solar equivalent exergy*. The units of solar equivalent exergy are solar equivalent joules abbreviated seJ (note the capital J). Instead, all other emergy flows computed from the GEB (rain, wind, down to human made products) are expressed in solar emjoules, abbreviated sej (note the small j). The difference arises for consistency with the international energy and exergy nomenclature: according to International System of Units (S.I.: NIST, 2015) the word joule is never capitalized, but the abbreviation for the unit is capitalized (J); therefore, units of equivalent joules are abbreviated using a capital “J”. On the other hand, emergy is no longer actual energy or exergy carried by a flow or item and cannot do further work or be degraded like exergy, for it is not measured using joule, but emjoule. The emjoule is the memory of joules used in the past, thus the ‘j’ in abbreviation for emjoule is not capitalized (sej).

¹ While a concept put forth by Odum (1996), others have suggested that “all activity on Earth derives from four primary reservoirs of exergy that have existed since the formation of the solar system: fusible atoms in the Sun, fissionable atoms on Earth, the thermal energy of the Earth’s interior, and the gravitational potential energy and relative kinetic energy of celestial bodies.” (Hermann 2005). Szargut (2007) describes the driving exergy as follows: Besides exergy losses derived from human activity, huge losses within the biosphere result from the irreversibility of natural phenomena (the absorption of solar radiation, the emission of thermal radiation, the irreversible heat transfer from inside the Earth to its surface and the braking of the planetary motion.”

In conclusion, we are suggesting the following convention. The exergy inflows of the tripartite are expressed in units called solar equivalent joules, abbreviated as seJ. This inflowing exergy is available to drive geobiosphere processes and it's availability is "destroyed" as it is used up and assigned as emergy to secondary and tertiary renewable flows as well as to all the downstream chain of products. By definition, 1 seJ (solar equivalent exergy), when destroyed translates into 1 sej (solar emjoule); that is to say, one solar equivalent joule of inflowing exergy that drives the secondary, tertiary, etc. processes of the geobiosphere, when destroyed, becomes one solar emjoule, i.e. a record of the exergy destroyed. Mathematically, the conversion of unit from seJ (solar equivalent exergy) to sej (emergy) is as follows:

$$X \text{ seJ} \times \frac{1 \text{ sej}}{1 \text{ seJ}} = X \text{ sej} \quad (\text{Eq.1})$$

where the quantitative amounts of flows (X) are derived from calculations.

The Geobiosphere: a frame of reference

Interestingly, there is no standard definition of *geobiosphere* in the scientific literature. The *biosphere* is generally defined as the part of the earth's crust, waters, and atmosphere that supports life. *Geosphere* is the collective name for the lithosphere, the hydrosphere, the cryosphere, and the atmosphere. We therefore define the geobiosphere as "the ecological system that is the sum total of the living (biotic; including humans) components and non living (abiotic; including geologic, hydrologic and atmospheric processes) components of the Earth". The geobiosphere is the system where emergy gradients are generated and degraded, ultimately supporting a multiplicity of matter and energy transformations and storages on Earth.

134 **Spatial Boundary**

135 We define the system boundaries of the geobiosphere to include Earth processes of the crust (to a
136 depth of approximately 100 km) and the atmosphere (to a height of approximately 80 km) (see
137 Brown and Ulgiati, 2010). In this way flows of available energy that cross this boundary are
138 inputs to the geobiosphere.

139

140 When evaluating smaller areas of the Earth system, for example regional systems, or terrestrial
141 ecosystems, it is appropriate to adjust the spatial boundaries to coincide with the temporal and
142 spatial scales of system processes under study. For instance the input of available geothermal
143 energy that affects surface processes within a region probably does not extend deeper than the
144 deepest mines or oil wells. And the atmospheric input of available energy of wind generally does
145 not need to extend higher than the atmospheric boundary layer taken as an average of
146 approximately 1500 m ([Garratt, 1992](#)). If the study area is a single ecosystem (or agro-
147 ecosystem) the lower boundary may only be the rooting depth. In all cases, when doing an
148 energy evaluation, it is absolutely necessary to specify the spatial boundaries of the investigated
149 system.

150

151 **Temporal Boundary**

152 A frame of reference for time is also important. When evaluating a product or service of the
153 geobiosphere system, there must be a temporal frame of reference. In general, the temporal
154 reference frame is related to the system of interest only and does not include all the evolutionary
155 steps that may have gone before. In the energy methodology, the timeframe is usually set by

turnover time² of the system being evaluated. For many systems a time frame of one year is used. In evaluating the tripartite and the GEB, the temporal window is 1 year. For systems that have particular cycles, for instance forestry systems which provide a wood yield every 20 years, the time frame can be expressed as 20 years, but then it is often scaled to one year, by dividing all inputs and outputs over the 20 years by 20. Regardless of what time frame is used in an emergy analysis, the description of the system should include sufficient detail that the time domain is explicitly understood.

Emergy Flows of the Geobiosphere

The three renewable exergy inputs to the geobiosphere (Figure 1) contribute to geologic, climatic, oceanic, and ecologic processes that are interconnected with flows of available energy and materials. In Figure 1, the flows of available energy from air, land, and oceans interconnect these components, forming a mutually reinforcing web. Through these interconnecting pathways the main components of the geobiosphere cycle material and energy and each component receives inputs from and provides outputs to each of the others. After millions of years of self-organization³, the transformations of the driving energies by the atmosphere, ocean, and land are organized simultaneously to interact and contribute mutual reinforcements. This concept of mutual reinforcement is the basis for calculating unit emergy values (UEVs) for all the products of the geobiosphere, whether materials, energies, or information.

² sometimes called replacement time, or the amount of time required for replacement by a system's energy or material through-flow, and is calculated as the ratio of the system's content of that substance to its through-flow rate.

³ Self-organization is the spontaneous emergence of order (Kaufman, 1993). In self-organizing systems, pattern at the global level emerges solely from interactions among lower-level components (Camazine et al. 2003).

In our earlier paper (Brown and Ulgiati, 2010), the available energy of sunlight, tides and geothermal sources were evaluated based on the method first used by Odum (2000). Since Odum's evaluation in 2000, there had been considerable progress in measuring the solar constant and tidal momentum transferred to Earth yielding relatively precise estimates. However, the estimates of heat flow and the sources of that heat were still subject to relatively large uncertainty. In order to deal with this uncertainty, Brown and Ulgiati (2010) developed a Monte Carlo simulation of Odum's method of computing the transformities of the global tripartite that included all the uncertainty. The resulting transformities⁴ were the median values from this Monte Carlo simulation. In the present paper we use the same Monte Carlo simulation with revised data based on our continued evaluation of the literature, especially related to the sources and magnitudes of earth's geothermal exergy.

METHODS

Brown and Ulgiati (2010) revisited

We revisit the assumptions and computations of our earlier work primarily in light of further refinement of the estimates of the magnitudes and sources of geothermal exergy. In addition we have constrained the quantities of heat from the various geothermal sources, which has resulted in a far more stable model. The result is revised computations of the SERs of geothermal and tidal inputs to the geobiosphere. **Figure 2** shows the flows of exergy that are the basis for the re-evaluation of the geobiosphere baseline. Explanations of the changes in exergy flows are summarized below.

⁴ In our 2010 paper (Brown and Ulgiati, 2010) we referred to transformities when describing the ratio of solar equivalent energy to energy. We now realize that this is incorrect, as a transformity has been defined as the ratio of solar energy to energy (sej/J). Since the solar equivalents of tidal dissipation and geothermal heat are not energy, it is more correct to refer to the ratio sej/J as a solar equivalence ratio (SER).

197

198 ***Exergy of Solar Radiation*** – In our earlier paper we reviewed the solar exergy used by
199 researchers in their determinations of global exergy resources. The values varied from
200 160,000 TW to 173,300 TW and depending on the percent albedo (between 30% and 35%),
201 yielded a net solar exergy between 104,000TW and 120,400 TW (Table 1, Brown and Ulgiati,
202 2010). We then took the mean value yielding a solar exergy of $3.6E24 \text{ J y}^{-1}$. We did not find
203 any reason to alter the solar exergy driving the geobiosphere.

204

205 ***Tidal Exergy Dissipated*** – The exergy dissipated on Earth from the combined forces of attraction
206 between the Earth, Moon, Sun system has been relatively well established (Munk and Wunsch,
207 1998) based on astronomical data of 3.7 TW ($1.17 E20 \text{ J y}^{-1}$). We did not find data that would
208 contradict these data in this re-evaluation.

209

210 ***Geothermal Exergy*** – Geothermal exergy is composed of three separate sources of heat: the core
211 or primordial heat (heat left over from the formation of the Earth), the radiogenic heat (heat
212 produced by the radioactive decay of isotopes in the mantle and crust) and the heat flows from
213 surface processes which are derived from tidal dissipation in the solid earth, differentiation of the
214 crust and subduction of organic matter and other oxidized and reduced matter. We revisited the
215 entire basis for geothermal exergy since much progress has been made in recent years regarding
216 estimates of sources of geothermal energy (see Korenaga, 2011; Dye, 2012; and Mareschal et al.,
217 2012). Estimates of total global heat loss still range from 46 TW ([Jaupart et al., 2007](#)) to 47 TW
218 ([Davies and Davies, 2010](#)); of which, ~32TW through the ocean floor and ~14 TW through
219 continental areas. After reevaluation of the heat flows supporting the geobiosphere, we also

revised our previous interpretation of data from Sclater et al. (1980), by constraining the percent of total geothermal energy generated by surface processes from between 8.2 TW ($2.6 \times 10^{20} \text{ J y}^{-1}$) and 27 TW ($2.69 \times 10^{20} \text{ J y}^{-1}$) to between 0.1% and 1.0% (0.05 TW – 0.5 TW), primarily from tidal dissipation in the solid earth, differentiation of the crust and subduction of organic matter and other oxidized and reduced matter. Of the total geothermal energy input (47 TW; $1.5 \times 10^{21} \text{ J y}^{-1}$), we constrained primordial heat to between 4 and 15 TW and added mantle primordial heat of between 7 and 15 TW (Jaupart et al., 2007). Recent data from geoneutrino measurements (Dye, 2012) suggest that radiogenic heat is generated in both the crust (8 +/- 1TW) and mantle (12 +/- 4TW) yielding between 32% and 54% of total (15TW – 25TW) for radiogenic sources. As in our previous study, to express each of these sources as exergy we applied Carnot Ratios $\eta_1 = (4500\text{K} - 288\text{K}) / 4500\text{K} = 0.936$ (based on an average temperature of 4500K) to core heat (Stixrude et al. 1997), $\eta_2 = (2750\text{K} - 288\text{K}) / 2750\text{K} = 0.895$ to mantle heat (based on a average mantle temperature of 2750K), and $\eta_3 = (750\text{K} - 288\text{K}) / 750\text{K} = 0.616$ to surface processes and crust radiogenic sources (based on average of crustal temperature of 750K). reflecting the difference in the temperature of each source (Rudnick et al. 1998; Jaupart and Mareschal, 1999: and Poudjom Djomani et al. 2001). Carnot efficiencies where then applied to each of the sources in the Monte Carlo simulation to convert geothermal energy to exergy.

Finally, to compute the solar equivalent exergy contribution from geothermal sources, we subtracted the heat flows for surface processes from the total geothermal exergy, since to count them would be double counting the surface energy (sun and tide), thus the geothermal input reflects only the exergy of deep heat and radiogenic heat contributions to the geobiosphere. **Table 1** summarizes the re-evaluated earth heat flows used in this simulation. Note that the

exergy data are the inputs we use for the simulation and the computation of geothermal input and its SER.

Oceananic Geopotential Exergy - Our re-evaluation of the literature related to ocean geopotential energy found no new information. In this simulation we continue to use the data from Oort et al, (1989), which is $2.19 \text{ E}20 \text{ J y}^{-1}$.

Using these different estimates of solar radiation received by earth, and the quantity of exergy from geothermal sources, we reran the Monte Carlo simulations using the following equations, which were an adaptation of the equations first used by Odum (2000).

$$\text{Sun } (T_{rS}) + \text{Tide } (T_{rT}) + \text{RadHeat } (T_{rH}) = \text{CrustHeat } (T_{rH}) \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

where:

Sun = exergy of net solar radiation

T_{rS} = transformity of solar exergy, 1.0 by definition

Tide = exergy of tidal momentum

T_{rT} = transformity of tidal exergy

RadHeat = exergy of radiogenic sources

CrustHeat = geothermal exergy flow that is generated from the crust (Carnot ratio ≈ 0.616); constrained to between 0.1% and 1.0% of total geothermal exergy

T_{rH} = transformity of geothermal exergy

Radioactive decay is included in this equation because its contribution is in addition to the sun and tide. The sun and tide are responsible for surface processes that include buried oxidized and reduced substances, friction of plates, and compression of sedimentary deposits.

In Eq 2, the production of oceanic geopotential exergy is a function of all three sources of exergy (solar, tidal, and deep heat) as well as radiogenic sources and thus the second equation is as

follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sun } (T_{rS}) + \text{Tide } (T_{rT}) + \text{RadHeat } (T_{rH}) + \text{DeepHeat } (T_{rH}) \\ = \text{OcnGeoPot } (T_{rT}) \end{aligned} \quad \text{Eq. (2)}$$

where:

DeepHeat = exergy of primordial heat from the Earth's core (Carnot ratio ≈ 0.936) and mantle (Carnot ratio ≈ 0.895)

T_{rH} = transformity of geothermal exergy

OcnGeoPot = oceanic geopotential exergy - ($2.19 \text{ E}20 \text{ J yr}^{-1}$, Oort et al, 1989)

T_{rT} = transformity of tidal exergy

Monte Carlo Simulation

In order to assess the uncertainty of our results, we constructed a simulation model using Equations 1 and 2 in Visual Basic to vary each of the sources of geothermal exergy within the bounds described above. (i.e., total geothermal energy = 47 TW, surface processes = 0.05 TW – 0.5 TW, primordial core heat = 4TW - 15 TW, primordial mantle heat = 7TW - 15TW, radiogenic sources = 15TW – 25TW). Solar radiation and tidal exergy dissipated were set constant at $3.6\text{E}24 \text{ J y}^{-1}$ and $1.17 \text{ E}20 \text{ J y}^{-1}$, respectively. We assumed an equal probability distribution between each of the geothermal bounds since there was no suggestion in the literature of mean values for these sources. The model was run for 100,000 iterations randomly substituting values for each source within the bounds given. In all cases the total geothermal energy did not exceed 47 TW.

RESULTS

Simulation of the Monte Carlo model yielded the results in [Figure 3](#). The top graph ([Figure 3a](#)) shows the model estimated SERs for tidal momentum and geothermal sources for 1000 iterations of the model⁵. The bottom graph ([Figure 3b](#)) shows the solar equivalent exergy of each of the sources and their sum. Each point in the graphs represents one simulation of the model. Since we re-interpreted the source and magnitude of heat flows and reduced the contribution from crustal heat sources to no more than 1% of the total heat flows, the stability of the simulation has been much improved over the simulation in our 2010 paper (Brown and Ulgiati, 2010).

⁵ We only show results for 1000 iterations of the model, while we ran the model for 100,000 iterations, the results were the same as for 1000. For clarity of the graphs, we limit the presentation to 1000 iterations.

The graphs in **Figure 4** are histograms of the output from the Monte Carlo simulation for 1000 iterations of the model. The top two graphs are histograms of tidal and geothermal SERs. Each bar in the histogram represents the number of simulation results that equal the range of SERs. Mean values for Tidal and geothermal SERs were 5500 (+/- 985) seJ J⁻¹ and 26300 (+3800) seJ J⁻¹ respectively. The bottom graph is the histogram for total global empower, whose mean value was 12.1 E24 seJ y⁻¹. Evident in each histogram is a slight right skewness. Even taking into consideration the slight skewness, we used mean values for SERs and the GEB.

Table 2 lists the data from this revised Monte Carlo simulation (the last set of columns) compared with our previous results (Brown and Ulgiati, 2010) and those of Odum (2000). Overall the total geobiosphere empower of 12.1 E24 seJ y⁻¹ represents a decrease of about 20% (from 15.2 E24 seJ y⁻¹) compared to Brown and Ulgiati (2010). More significant is the distribution of the changes. Solar exergy remained the same (3.6 E24 seJ y⁻¹), the emergy of geothermal sources increased by 65% (3.3 E24 seJ y⁻¹ to 5.4 E24 seJ y⁻¹) and tidal dissipation decreased by 63% (from 8.3 E24 seJ y⁻¹ to 3.1 E24 seJ y⁻¹).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Solar Equivalence vs Solar Emergy

In order to express the exergy from tidal dissipation and geothermal sources on the same basis as solar exergy, we use a method of equivalence that expresses these two sources as solar equivalent energy. Solar equivalent energy is different from solar emergy. It has been pointed out by Raugai (2013) that tidal dissipation and geothermal inputs do not have a solar origin, and therefore, technically cannot be expressed as solar emergy. In fact, the method of computing their SERs and ultimately their contributions as sources to the geobiosphere is a method of

equivalence. The result is solar equivalent joules; the abbreviation for which is seJ (“s”, “e”, capital “J”). The distinction we draw between solar equivalent exergy and emergy is not an arbitrary one, nor is it “splitting hairs”. Solar emergy and solar equivalent exergy are not the same. On the one hand, emergy is the memory of available energy destroyed in the past, both directly and indirectly, to produce matter, energy or information. On the other hand, solar equivalent exergy is not available energy of the past, but is presently available and expressed in equivalence of one form, solar exergy.

Geothermal Unknowns

In our 2010 paper (Brown & Ulgiati, 2010) we developed our model based on the current literature in geosciences. Since that time there has been much additional research and it appears that rather than remove some of the uncertainty, the latest publications have added to it. The most significant unknowns regarding the driving forces of the geobiosphere remain the source and magnitude of geothermal inputs. The literature is still somewhat ambiguous and while the estimate of the total heat flow seems to have been narrowed to 46 or 47 TW (we used 47 TW) the sources of that heat are still much debated and have wide variation. Using the most recent published literature we have revised our original formulation of the heat budget to include much higher radiogenic inputs, much reduced heat from surface processes and from primordial heat. In addition some of the latest research (Dye, 2012; Korenaga, 2011; Mareschal et al. 2012) suggest that radiogenic heat originates in both the crust and in the mantle, resulting in additional uncertainty. The place of origin of radiogenic heat is important since exergy inputs depend on Carnot ratios computed using the temperature differential between the Earth’s surface and the average temperature of the crust and mantle, 487K and 2737K, respectively.

The Algebra of the Equivalence Method

We use a relatively simple method of simultaneously solving two equations with two unknowns (the SERs of heat flow and tide) in a Monte Carlo model that substitutes various values for the different sources of geothermal exergy. We have adapted the method first introduced by Odum (2000) and include the uncertainty of the geothermal inputs to compute SERs and solar equivalent exergy for inputs to the geobiosphere from tidal dissipation and geothermal sources. Our contribution to the method was to separate radiogenic inputs from primordial heat and to introduce the uncertainty of these sources. The model estimates mean SERs and a confidence interval for each, and sums the solar equivalent exergy from the three sources resulting in the GEB.

We have assumed that the quality of the two geothermal sources (primordial heat and radiogenic heat) is the same regardless of its source. In a companion paper in this volume, using a different technique to compute SERs for geobiosphere inputs, the primordial heat and radiogenic heat have different SERs reflecting their different sources and quality (De Vilbiss et al. 2016).

Conclusion

In all, the field of systems ecology that uses emergy as its focus to evaluate energy flow through systems continues to evolve as more and more researchers apply its techniques and question fundamental properties. In this paper we revisited the GEB articulated 5 years ago in our 2010 paper (Brown and Ulgiati, 2010), and provide significant refinements of the SERs for the global tripartite which results in a revised emergy baseline of $12.1 (+/- 1.43) E24 \text{ seJ y}^{-1}$ and revised global SERs for tidal dissipation and geothermal sources of $5500 (+/- 985) \text{ seJ J}^{-1}$ and $26300 (+/- 3800) \text{ seJ J}^{-1}$ respectively.

375

376 **Acknowledgments**

377 The research for this paper was funded in part by grants from the USEPA under contract # PR-
378 ORD-11-00967, technical lead: Cissy Ma, PhD. and the National Science Foundation, project #
379 0504422. We thank the excellent reviews by independent reviewers, which have made the paper
380 stronger.

381

382 **References**

383

- 384 Brown, M.T. and S. Ulgiati, 2004. Energy quality, emergy, and transformity: H.T. Odum's
385 contributions to quantifying and understanding systems. *Ecological Modeling*. Vol
386 78;1&2 pp201-213
- 387 Brown, M.T., S. Ulgiati, 2010. Updated evaluation of exergy and emergy driving the
388 geobiosphere: A review and refinement of the emergy baseline. *Ecological Modeling*,
389 221(20): 2501-2508.
- 390 Camazine, S. J-L. Deneubourg, N. R. Franks, J. Sneyd, G. Theraulaz, & E. Bonabeau. 2001.
391 Self-Organization in Biological Systems. Princeton University Press, NJ. 560pp.
- 392 Campbell D. E. 2000. A revised solar transformity for tidal energy received by the earth and
393 dissipated globally: Implications for Emergy Analysis. pp. 255-263. In M.T. Brown, S.
394 Brandt-Williams, D. Tilley, S. Ulgiati (eds.) *Emergy Synthesis*, Proceedings of the First
395 Biennial Emergy Analysis Research Conference, The Center for Environmental Policy,
396 Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences, Gainesville, FL.
- 397 Campbell, D.E. ,2015. Emergy Baseline for the Earth: Review of the Science and a New
398 Calculation. *Ecological Modeling* (this issue)
- 399 Campbell, D.E., S. Bastianoni, and F. Lu ,2010. The Emergy Baseline for the Earth: Is it
400 Arbitrary? Poster presented at the 6th Biennial Emergy Analysis and Research
401 Conference, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- 402 Campbell, D.E, S.L. Brandt-Williams, and T Cai. , 2005 Current technical Problems in Emergy
403 Analysis. pp 143-158 in Brown, M.T., D. Campbell, D. Tilley, and S. Ulgiati (eds)
404 *Emergy Synthesis 3: proceeding of the emergy research conference*, Gainesville, FL
405 2001. Center for Environmental Policy, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- 406 Davies, J.H., and D.R. Davies, 2010. Earth's heat flux. *Solid Earth* 1, 5-24.
- 407 De Vilbiss, C., M.T. Brown, E. Seigel, and S. Arden. 2016. A New Approach to the Planetary
408 Emergy Baseline. *Ecological Modelling*,(this issue).

409 Dye, S. T., 2012. Geoneutrinos and the radioactive power of the Earth. *Reviews of Geophysics*,
410 50(3).

411 Garratt, J.R. 1992. *The Atmospheric Boundary Layer. Cambridge Atmospheric and Space*
412 *Science Series*. Cambridge University Press. 316 pp.

413 Hermann, W.A. 2005. Quantifying global exergy resources, *Energy* 31 (2006) 1685–1702

414 Hofmeister, A.M., and R.E. Criss, 2005. Earth's heat flux revised and linked to chemistry.
415 *Tectonophysics* 395, 159-177.

416 Jaupart, C. and J.C. Mareschal. 1999. The thermal structure and thickness of continental roots.
417 *Lithos* 48:93–114.

418 Jaupart, C., and J.C. Mareschal, 2007. Heat flow and thermal structure of the lithosphere.
419 *Treatise on Geophysics*, 6, 217–251.

420 Jaupart C., S. Labrosse, and J. C. Mareschal, 2007. Temperatures, Heat and Energy in the Mantle
421 of the Earth. *Treatise on Geophysics*, 6, 254–298.

422 Kauffman, S. 1993. *The Origins of Order: Self Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford
423 University Press., 641pp.

424 Mareschal, J. C., C. Jaupart, C. Phaneuf, and C. Perry, 2012. Geoneutrinos and the energy budget
425 of the Earth. *Journal of Geodynamics* 54, 43-54.

426 Korenaga, J. 2011. Earth's heat budget: Clairvoyant geoneutrinos. *Nature Geoscience*, 4(9), 581–
427 582.

428 Munk, W., and C. Wunsch, 1998. Abyssal recipes II: Energetics of tidal and wind mixing. *Deep-*
429 *Sea Research I*, 45: 1977-2010.

430 NIST (National Institute of Standards and technology). 2015. International System of Units (SI).
431 Accessed 09/15/2015. <http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Units/index.html>

432 NOAA, 2013. Average global temperature during the 20th century. Retrieved 06/12/14 from
433 <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/global/2013/10>.

434 Odum, H.T., 1976. Energy quality and carrying capacity of the earth. Response at Prize
435 Ceremony* Institute de la Vie* Paris. *Trop. Ecol.* 16 (1), 1–8.

436 Odum, H.T. 1996. *Environmental Accounting Emergy and Environmental Decision Making*.
437 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

438 Odum, H.T., 2000. Emergy of global processes. Folio #2: Handbook of Emergy Evaluation: A
439 Compendium of Data for Emergy Computation Issued in a Series of Folios. Center for
440 Environmental Policy, University of Florida. Gainesville, FL., 28 pp.
441 (<http://www.emergysystems.org/folios.php>).

442 Oort, A.H., S.C.Ascher, S. Levitus, and J.P Peixoto, 1989. New estimates of the available
443 potential energy in the world ocean. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 94 (No. C3), 3187-
444 3200.

445

- Poudjom Djomani, Y.H., S. Y. O'Reilly, W.L. Grin, and P. Morgan. 2001. The density structure of sub-continental lithosphere through time. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 184: 605-621
- Raugei, M. A. 2013. A different take on the emergy baseline – Or can there really be any such thing. In Brown, MT, Sweeney, S. (Eds.) *Emergy Synthesis 7, Theory and Applications of the Emergy Methodology*. The Center for Environmental Policy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. pp. 61-66.
- Rudnick R.L., W. F. McDonough and R.J. O'Connell. 1998. Thermal structure, thickness and composition of continental lithosphere. *Chemical Geology* 145:395–411.
- Sclater, J.G., C. Jaupart, and D. Galson. 1980. The heat flow through oceanic and continental crust and the heat loss of the earth. *Reviews of Geophysics and Space Physics*. Vol 18 No 1, pp269-311.
- Stixrude, L., E. Wasserman, and R.E. Cohen. 1997. Composition and temperature of the Earth's inner core. *J. Geophysical Res.* 102-B11:24,729-39.
- Szargut, J. 2007. *Exergy Method: Technical and Ecological Applications*. WIT Press. Billerica, MA ,USA

Figure 1. Earth geobiosphere, a hierarchical web of components connected by flows of available energy, materials, and information that build potential energy and circulate materials.

Figure 2. Systems diagrams describing the relationships between global exergy sources generating (a) the exergy of crustal heat and (b) the exergy of ocean geopotential. Data in the figure refer to Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Figure 3. Results of the Monte Carlo simulation of the geobiosphere energy equations (Eqns 1 & 2). Resulting solar equivalence ratios (top) and Solar equivalent exergy (bottom)

Figure 4. Histograms of the Monte Carlo simulation results showing slight right skewness. Tidal SER (top) Geothermal SER (middle) and total Global Solar Equivalent Exergy (bottom)

491

Table 1. Energy, exergy and percent of total geothermal input for different sources¹.

Source	Energy (TW)	Exergy ² (J y ⁻¹)	Percent ³
Crust			
Surface processes	0.05 - 0.5	9.7E+17 - 9.7E+18	0.1% - 1%
Radiogenic sources	7 - 9	1.4E+20 - 1.7E+20	21% - 27%
Mantle			
Primordial heat	7 - 15	2.0E+20 - 4.2E+20	21% - 44%
Radiogenic sources	8 - 16	2.3E+20 - 4.5E+20	24% - 47%
Core			
Primordial heat	4 - 15	1.2E+20 - 4.4E+20	12% - 44%

492

1. Energy data are a synthesis of data from Hofmeister and Criss, (2005), Jaupart & Mareschal (2007),

493

Jaupart et al. (2007), Davies and Davies (2010), Korenaga (2011), Dye (2012), Mareschal et al. (2012)

494

2. Exergy computed using the following Carnot ratios: Crust = 0.616, Mantle = 0.895, and core = 0.936

495

3. We computed percent of total based on total geothermal exergy of 9.8 E20 J y⁻¹ (31 TW)

496 Table 2. Transformities and empower from previous evaluations compared with SER and solar equivalent exergy of this restudy

Inflow	Energy	Odum (2000)		Brown & Ulgiati (2010)			This Restudy*		
		UEV ^{a.} (seJ J ⁻¹)	Empower ^{b.} (E24 seJ yr ⁻¹)	Exergy	UEV ^{a.} (seJ J ⁻¹)	Empower ^{b.} (E24 seJ yr ⁻¹)	Exergy	SER ^{a.} (seJ J ⁻¹)	Solar Equivalent Exergy ^{b.} (E24 seJ yr ⁻¹)
Solar energy absorbed	3.93E+24	1	3.93	3.59E+24	1	3.6	3.6E+24	1	3.6
Geothermal sources	6.72E+20	12,000	8.06	1.63E+20	20,300	3.3	9.78E+20	5500 (985)	5.4 (0.95)
Tidal energy absorbed	5.20E+19	73,700	3.83	1.17E+21	72,400	8.3	1.17E+20	26300 (3800)	3.1 (0.44)
Total global empower ^{b.}			15.83			15.2			12.1 (1.51)

- 497 a. In the past the term Unit Emergy Value (UEV was applied to the tripartite, but with the publication of this paper, we recognize that the more appropriate
- 498 term is solar equivalence ratio (SER).
- 499 b. Empower was used in the past to refer to the inflow of each of the sources, but with the publication of this paper, we recognize that the more appropriate
- 500 term is solar equivalent exergy.
- 501 * numbers in parentheses are Standard Deviation
- 502

503

504