

AR6 WGI Report – List of corrigenda to be implemented

The corrigenda listed below will be implemented in the Supplementary Material during copy-editing.

CHAPTER 9 SUPPLEMENATRY MATERIAL

Document (Chapter, Annex, Supp. Mat...)	Section	Page :Line (based on the final pdf FGD version)	Detailed info on correction to make
9SM	Author list	1: 27	Replace “Hong Kong” with “Hong Kong, China”
9SM	9.SM.5	25	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 4, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	27	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 2, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	27	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 4, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	27	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 7, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	29	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 3, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	35	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 4, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	35	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 5, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	35	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 7, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	36	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 3, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	36	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 5, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	36	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 8, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM	9.SM.5	37	In Table 9.SM.8: Row 2, Column 7: add “ https://github.com/IPCC-WG1/Chapter-9 ”
9SM			Update the Data Table with omitted data citations for climate model data.
9SM	Table 9.SM.5		Caption: Integrated GMSL projections for 2050, relative to 1995-2014, from the post-AR5 literature.
9SM	Table 9.SM.6		Caption: Integrated GMSL projections for 2100, relative to 1995-2014, from the post-AR5 literature.
9SM	Table 9.SM.7		See highlighted changes to be made below
9SM	Table 9.SM.8		See highlighted changes to be made below

Table 9.SM.7 :

	SSP1-1.9	SSP1-2.6	SSP2-4.5	SSP3-7.0	SSP5-8.5	SSP5-8.5 <i>Low Confidence</i>
2050						
Thermal expansion	0.07 (0.06--0.08)	0.07 (0.06--0.09)	0.08 (0.07--0.10)	0.09 (0.07--0.10)	0.09 (0.08--0.11)	0.09 (0.08--0.11)
Greenland	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.04 (0.02--0.14)
Antarctica	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (-0.01--0.12)
Glaciers	0.04 (0.03--0.05)	0.05 (0.04--0.06)	0.05 (0.05--0.06)	0.06 (0.05--0.07)	0.07 (0.06--0.08)	0.06 (0.04--0.08)
Land Water Storage	0.01 (0.00--0.01)	0.01 (0.00--0.01)	0.01 (0.00--0.01)	0.01 (0.00--0.02)	0.01 (0.00--0.01)	0.01 (0.00--0.01)
Total (2050)	0.18 (0.15--0.23)	0.19 (0.16--0.25)	0.20 (0.17--0.26)	0.22 (0.18--0.27)	0.23 (0.20--0.29)	0.24 (0.19--0.40)
2150						
Thermal expansion	0.14 (0.11--0.18)	0.18 (0.14--0.24)	0.30 (0.24--0.38)	0.46 (0.38--0.57)	0.55 (0.45--0.68)	0.55 (0.45--0.68)
Greenland	0.10 (0.08--0.13)	0.13 (0.10--0.17)	0.19 (0.15--0.24)	0.23 (0.19--0.28)	0.27 (0.22--0.35)	0.31 (0.18--0.98)
Antarctica	0.17 (-0.01--0.44)	0.18 (-0.02--0.49)	0.17 (-0.05--0.55)	0.16 (-0.09--0.59)	0.16 (-0.11--0.66)	0.76 (-0.11--3.68)
Glaciers	0.10 (0.06--0.14)	0.12 (0.08--0.17)	0.18 (0.13--0.25)	0.25 (0.17--0.31)	0.29 (0.20--0.31)	0.29 (0.20--0.31)
Land Water Storage	0.05 (0.03--0.06)	0.05 (0.03--0.06)	0.05 (0.03--0.07)	0.07 (0.04--0.09)	0.05 (0.03--0.06)	0.05 (0.03--0.06)
Total (2150)	0.57 (0.37--0.86)	0.68 (0.46--0.99)	0.92 (0.66--1.33)	1.19 (0.88--1.65)	1.32 (0.98--1.88)	1.98 (0.98--4.82)

Table 9.SM.8: Global mean sea-level rise projections for 2000-2300 from literature (m), for different RCP scenarios.

Study	Grouping	RCP 2.6		RCP 4.5		RCP 8.5	
		67%	90%	67%	90%	67%	90%
Kopp et al., (2014)	MED	0.3--2.9	-0.2--4.7	0.7--3.5	0.0--5.3	1.8--5.2	1.0--7.4
Nauels et al., (2017)	MED	0.8--1.4		1.8--2.3		3.4--6.8	
Palmer et al. (2020)*	MED	0.6--2.2		0.9--2.6		1.7--4.5	
Kopp et al., (2017)	MICI	0.8--2.3	0.5--3.0	2.8--6.0	2.1--7.0	9.8--14.1	9.1--15.5
Bamber et al. (2019)†	SEJ	1.2--3.6	0.5--5.3			2.6--6.5	1.8--11.8
Horton et al. (2020)	Survey	0.54-2.15	0.24-3.11			1.67-5.61	0.88-7.83

* Palmer et al. (2020) 5th-95th percentile of simulated projections are constructed to be analogous to AR5/SROCC *likely* ranges and so are presented here as 17th-83rd percentile projections.

† Bamber et al. (2019) 2°C scenario is listed under the RCP 2.6 column, but GSAT does not decline in this 2°C scenario as it does in RCP 2.6. Bamber et al. (2019) “RCP 8.5” scenario assumes GSAT stabilization at 5°C above pre-industrial after 2100 and so becomes cooler than RCP 8.5 over the 22nd and 23rd century. Bamber et al. (2019) is not included in the “Post-AR5 published range” in Table 9.11, as the Bamber et al. (2019) ice sheet projections instead inform the column labelled “SEJ.”

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

Chapter 9: Ocean, cryosphere, and sea level change – Supplementary Material

Coordinating Lead Authors:

Baylor Fox-Kemper (United States of America), Helene T. Hewitt (United Kingdom), Cunde Xiao (China)

Lead Authors:

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Guðfinna Aðalgeirsdóttir (Iceland), Sybren S. Drijfhout (The Netherlands), Tamsin L. Edwards (United Kingdom), Nicholas R. Golledge (New Zealand/United Kingdom), Mark Hemer (Australia), Robert E. Kopp (United States of America), Gerhard Krinner (France/Germany, France), Alan Mix (United States of America), Dirk Notz (Germany), Sophie Nowicki (United States of America/France, United States of America), Intan Suci Nurhati (Indonesia), Lucas Ruiz (Argentina), Jean-Baptiste Sallée (France), Aimee B. A. Slangen (The Netherlands), Yongqiang Yu (China)

Contributing Authors:

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

Cecile Agosta (France), Kyle Armour (United States of America), Mathias Aschwanden (Switzerland), Jonathan L. Bamber (United Kingdom), Sophie Berger (France/Belgium), Fábio Boeira Dias (Finland/Brazil), Jason E. Box (Denmark/USA), Eleanor J. Burke (United Kingdom), Kevin D. Burke (United States of America), Xavier Capet (France), John A. Church (Australia), Lee de Mora (United Kingdom), Chris Derksen (Canada), Catia M. Domingues (Australia, United Kingdom/Brazil), Jakob Dörr (Norway/Germany), Paul J. Durack (United States of America/Australia), Thomas L. Frölicher (Switzerland), Thian Y. Gan (Canada/Malaysia), Gregory G. Garner (United States of America), Sebastian Gerland (Norway/Germany), Heiko Goelzer (Norway/Germany), Natalya Gomez (Canada), Irina V. Gorodetskaya (Portugal/Belgium,Russian Federation), Jonathan M. Gregory (United Kingdom), Robert Hallberg (United States of America), F. Alexander Haumann (United States of America/Germany), Tim H. J. Hermans (The Netherlands), Emma M. Hill (Singapore/ United States of America, United Kingdom), Regine Hock (United States of America, Norway/Germany), Stefan Hofer (Norway/Austria), Romain Hugonnet (France,Switzerland/France), Philippe Huybrechts (Belgium), Akm Saiful Islam (Bangladesh), Laura C. Jackson (United Kingdom), Nicolas C. Jourdain (France), Andreas Käab (Norway/Germany), Nicole S. Khan (China/USA), Shfaqat Abbas Khan (Denmark), Matthew Kirwan (United States of America), James Kossin (United States of America), Anders Levermann (Germany), Sophie Lewis (Australia), Shiyin Liu (China), Daniel Lowry (New Zealand/United States of America), Marta Marcos (Spain), Ben Marzeion (Germany), Matthew Menary (France/United Kingdom), Sebastian H. Mernild (Norway, Denmark/Norway), Philip Orton (United States of America), Matthew D. Palmer (United Kingdom), Frank Pattyn (Belgium), Brodie Pearson (United States of America/United Kingdom), Cécile Pellet (Switzerland), Chris Perry (United Kingdom), Mark D. Pickering (United Kingdom), Johannes Quaas (Germany), Roshanka Ranasinghe (The Netherlands/Sri Lanka,Australia), Roelof Rietbroek (The Netherlands), Malcom J. Roberts (United Kingdom), Alessio Rovere (Germany/Italy), Mathew Koll Roxy (India), Maria Santolaria Otin (Spain,France/Spain), Abhishek Savita (Australia/India), Alex Sen Gupta (Australia/ United Kingdom, Australia), Helene Seroussi (United States of America/France), Sharon L. Smith (Canada), Olga N. Solomina (Russian Federation), Esther Stouthamer (The Netherlands), Fiametta Straneo (United States of America/Italy, United States of America), William V. Sweet (United States of America), Thomas Wahl (United States of America/Germany), Lisan Yu (United States of America), Jiacan Yuan (United States of America/China), Jan David Zika (Australia)

Review Editors:

53
54
55

Unnikrishnan Alakkat (India), Benjamin P. Horton (Singapore/United Kingdom), Simon Marsland (Australia)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Chapter Scientists:

Gregory G. Garner (United States of America), Tim H. J. Hermans (The Netherlands), Lijuan Hua (China), Tamzin Palmer (United Kingdom), Brodie Pearson (United States of America/ United Kingdom)

This Supplementary Material should be cited as:

Fox-Kemper, B., H. T. Hewitt, C. Xiao, G. Aðalgeirsdóttir, S. S. Drijfhout, T. L. Edwards, N. R. Golledge, M. Hemer, R. E. Kopp, G. Krinner, A. Mix, D. Notz, S. Nowicki, I. S. Nurhati, L. Ruiz, J-B. Sallée, A. B. A. Slangen, Y. Yu, 2021, Ocean, Cryosphere and Sea Level Change Supplementary Material. In: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J.B.R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu and B. Zhou (eds.)]. Available from <https://ipcc.ch/static/ar6/wg1>.

Date: August 2021

This document is subject to copy-editing, corrigenda and trickle backs.

ACCEPTED VERSION
SUBJECT TO FINAL EDITING

1		
2	Table of Content	
3	9.SM.1 Additional ocean information	4
4	9.SM.1.1 Details for Figure 9.10	4
5	9.SM.2 Additional ice sheet information	4
6	9.SM.3 Additional glacier information	4
7	9.SM.3.1 Details for Figure 9.21	4
8	9.SM.3.2 Details for Figure 9.22	4
9	9.SM.4 Additional sea level information	6
10	9.SM.4.1 Framework for Assessing Changes To Sea-level (FACTS)	6
11	9.SM.4.2 Obtaining Global Mean Thermosteric Sea-Level Rise and Ocean Dynamic Sea-Level	
12	Change from CMIP6	7
13	9.SM.4.3 Global Mean Thermosteric Sea-Level and Ocean Dynamic Sea-Level Projections based on	
14	the Two-Layer Emulator	7
15	9.SM.4.4 Parametric fit to ISMIP6 Greenland Ice Sheet projections	8
16	9.SM.4.5 Parametric fit to GlacierMIP2 projections	9
17	9.SM.4.6 Background rates of relative sea-level change	10
18	9.SM.4.7 Warming Level Scenarios	10
19	9.SM.4.8 Analysis of future changes in extreme sea level return frequency	10
20	9.SM.5 Data Table	14
21		

9.SM.1 Additional ocean information

9.SM.1.1 Details for Figure 9.10

Lower right panel: In all experiments an additional surface freshwater flux (hosing) is applied over the subpolar North Atlantic (regions vary between studies) for a limited time. The total amount of fresh water added is then this flux multiplied by the number of years applied (in Gt). While hosing is applied the AMOC weakens. In some models the AMOC recovers quickly, in other the AMOC hasn't recovered after 200 years, and in some the AMOC is starting to recover after 200 years. These are represented by circles, downward and upward triangles respectively which show the percentage AMOC change after 200 years. Sizes of symbols represent the magnitude of the hosing (from 0.1-1Sv) and colours indicate the different studies these results were taken from (de Vries and Weber, 2005; Stouffer et al., 2006; Yin and Stouffer, 2007; Meehl et al., 2009; Jackson, 2013; Liu and Liu, 2013; Timmermans et al., 2014; Hutchings et al., 2015; Jackson and Wood, 2018; Haskins et al., 2019).

9.SM.2 Additional ice sheet information

[START TABLE 9.SM.1 HERE]

Table 9.SM.1: Observed mass loss of Greenland (The IMBIE Team, 2020, 2021) and Antarctic (The IMBIE Team et al., 2018, 2021) ice sheets for three different periods. Values are expressed as the total loss over each period (Gt) along with the equivalent rate (Gt yr⁻¹) and *very likely* ranges. Periods include both end years. The cumulative mass loss uncertainty from IMBIE is assumed to be zero at the start of each period.

Observed mass loss		1992-1999	2000-2009	2010-2019
Greenland (The IMBIE Team, 2019)	Δ (Gt)	309 [-24 to 642]	1753 [1308 to 2199]	2433 [1968 to 2897]
	Gt yr ⁻¹	39 [-3 to 80]	175 [131 to 220]	243 [197 to 290]
Antarctica (The IMBIE Team et al., 2018)	Δ (Gt)	392 [-18 to 802]	703 [220 to 1187]	1482 [942 to 2022]
	Gt yr ⁻¹	49 [-2 to 100]	70 [22 to 119]	148 [94 to 202]

[END TABLE 9.SM.1 HERE]

9.SM.3 Additional glacier information

9.SM.3.1 Details for Figure 9.21

1960-2019 time series annual and decadal values from (Zemp et al., 2019, 2020). Glacier mass change rates estimated from GRACE 2002-2016 from (Wouters et al., 2019). Glacier mass change rate between 2006-2016 and its respective uncertainty as it was assessed in SROCC (Hock et al., 2019b). Glacier mass change rates between 2000-2009 and 2010-2019 and its respective uncertainty obtained by (Hugonnet et al., 1998)

9.SM.3.2 Details for Figure 9.22

1 Glacier mass relative to 2015 between 1902 and 2100. Glacier change in 20th century is from (Marzeion et
 2 al., 2015). Observed mass change between 1961-2016 from (Zemp et al., 2019). Median and ± 1 standard
 3 deviation (shaded areas) projected mass change between 2015 and 2100 for RCP2.6, RCP 4.6, and RCP8.5
 4 scenarios obtained from GlacierMIP (Marzeion et al., 2020). Data from (Bamber et al., 2018b) included in
 5 some regions
 6

7 **[START TABLE 9.SM.2 HERE]**
 8

9 **Table 9.SM.2:** Regional and global glacier-covered area, glacier mass (presented as potential sea level rise equivalent)
 10 in year 2000, glacier mass change rate in period 2000-2019, and projected glacier mass change between
 11 2015 and 2100. The glacier-covered area is derived from the RGI 6.0 (RGI Consortium, 2017) and
 12 glacier-covered area uncertainties are extracted from (Pfeffer et al., 2014). Glacier mass and
 13 uncertainties are derived from Farinotti et al. (2019), based on RGI 6.0. Recent (2000-2019) mass
 14 change rate is based on (Hugonnet et al., 9998), except: ^a mean of Menounos et al. (2019) and
 15 (Hugonnet et al., 9998); ^b mean of (Aðalgeirsdóttir et al., 2020) and (Hugonnet et al., 9998); ^c mean of
 16 (Schuler et al., 2020) and (Hugonnet et al., 9998); ^d mean of (Davaze et al., 2020), (Sommer et al.,
 17 2020) and (Hugonnet et al., 9998); ^e mean of Shean et al. (2020) and (Hugonnet et al., 9998); and ^f mean
 18 of (Dussaillant et al., 2019) and (Hugonnet et al., 9998). The total projected glacier mass change
 19 between 2015-2100 is derived from (Marzeion et al., 2020). See Figure 9.22 for the time series of
 20 changes in each region.
 21

Region	Glacier-covered area in 2000 (km ²)	Glacier mass in 2000 (mm SLE)	Glacier mass change rate 2000-2019 (kg m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)	Projected glacier mass change between 2015-2100 (mm SLE)		
				RCP 2.6	RCP 4.5	RCP 8.5
Alaska (1)	86700 \pm 4600	43 \pm 11	-770 \pm 60	14 \pm 11	19 \pm 13	25 \pm 15
Western Canada and US (2)	14500 \pm 1400	2.6 \pm 0.7	-490 \pm 170 ^a	1.5 \pm 0.9	2.0 \pm 0.7	2.2 \pm 0.7
Arctic Canada North (3)	105100 \pm 3400	65 \pm 17	-290 \pm 20	10 \pm 10	16 \pm 15	24 \pm 20
Arctic Canada South (4)	40900 \pm 2000	21 \pm 5	-650 \pm 50	5 \pm 5	7 \pm 7	11 \pm 7
Greenland Periphery (5)	89700 \pm 4500	34 \pm 9	-430 \pm 40	9 \pm 10	12 \pm 11	18 \pm 11
Iceland (6)	11000 \pm 300	9 \pm 2	-860 \pm 100 ^b	2 \pm 3	3 \pm 3	5 \pm 3
Svalbard (7)	34000 \pm 1200	17 \pm 4	-270 \pm 180 ^c	7 \pm 7	11 \pm 9	14 \pm 8
Scandinavia (8)	2900 \pm 300	0.7 \pm 0.2	-580 \pm 60	0.3 \pm 0.2	0.4 \pm 0.2	0.4 \pm 0.2
	51600 \pm 1400	32 \pm 8	-200 \pm 20	10 \pm 8	14 \pm 11	20 \pm 12

Russian Arctic (9)						
North Asia (10)	2400 ± 200	0.3 ± 0.1	-500 ± 70	0.2 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.2
Central Europe (11)	2100 ± 200	0.3 ± 0.1	-760 ± 260 ^d	0.2 ± 0.1	0.3 ± 0.1	0.3 ± 0.1
Caucasus and Middle East (12)	1300 ± 100	0.2 ± 0.1	-430 ± 60	0.1 ± 0.05	0.11 ± 0.04	0.13 ± 0.04
High Mountain Asia (13 to 15)	97600 ± 7800	17 ± 3	-205 ± 40 ^e	8 ± 3	11 ± 4	13 ± 5
Low Latitudes (16)	2300 ± 200	0.2 ± 0.1	-450 ± 60	0.13 ± 0.12	0.17 ± 0.12	0.19 ± 0.11
Southern Andes (17)	29400 ± 1700	13 ± 3	-720 ± 230 ^f	3 ± 4	4 ± 3	6 ± 4
New Zealand (18)	1200 ± 100	0.2 ± 0.1	-720 ± 110	0.06 ± 0.06	0.09 ± 0.05	0.13 ± 0.04
Antarctic and Subantarctic (19)	132900 ± 2500	69 ± 18	-170 ± 20	9 ± 15	16 ± 13	20 ± 24
World	705700 ± 33200	324 ± 84	-460 ± 10	79 ± 56	119 ± 75	159 ± 86

[END TABLE 9.SM.2 HERE]

9.SM.4 Additional sea level information

9.SM.4.1 Framework for Assessing Changes To Sea-level (FACTS)

Projections of the probability distributions of global-mean and relative sea-level change are produced using the Framework for Assessing Changes to Sea-level (FACTS), a Python-based modularized framework. Contributors to sea-level change (e.g., ice sheets, ocean dynamics, etc.) are represented as individual modules which are then organized into user-defined projection workflows. The modularity of the framework enables efficient application of the different methodologies described in the chapter. The code for FACTS and its accompanying modules are open source and available through GitHub (<https://github.com/radical-collaboration/facts>). In the application here, the different drivers are treated as conditionally independent given GSAT.

Ideally, a FACTS module contains a sample-generation method through some sort of statistical or process-based model for the particular component. For example, the module for projecting thermal expansion and dynamic sea-level generates samples from statistical distributions calibrated within the module itself. For modules that use externally-provided ensembles for this report, which include the Emulated ISMIP6 ice sheets simulations, Emulated GlacierMIP glaciers simulations, the LARMIP-2 Antarctic ice sheet simulations, the Marine Ice Cliff Instability Antarctic ice sheet simulations, and the Structure Expert Judgement ice sheets simulations, a bootstrap sampling approach is used. This provides a consistent number

1 of samples across all modules within an integrated projection workflow. However, due to this sampling
2 method, the number of samples in the provided ensemble for the module, and the seed value for the random-
3 number generator, small differences may exist between the values of the FACTS produced projections and
4 the values published in the paper for a particular method.
5
6

7 **9.SM.4.2 *Obtaining Global Mean Thermosteric Sea-Level Rise and Ocean Dynamic Sea-Level Change*** 8 ***from CMIP6*** 9

10 We obtained monthly mean values for the CMIP6 variables ‘zos’ (sea-surface height above geoid), ‘zostoga’
11 (global mean thermosteric sea-level change) and ‘psl’ (air pressure at sea level; required to apply the inverse
12 barometer effect). The data files were extracted from the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) database
13 between 22-30 September 2020. Data were obtained for both the historical experiment (1850-2014) and the
14 five core SSPs (2015-2100 and up to 2300 where available) with corresponding variant labels (‘ripf’
15 identifier). Additionally, models were required to provide the pre-industrial control output from which the
16 ‘zos’ and ‘zostoga’ experiments were initialized, so that ‘zos’ and ‘zostoga’ simulations could be corrected
17 for model ocean drift (Gupta et al., 2013; Hobbs et al., 2016b). Thus, the total number of available models
18 used for each emissions scenario depends on the availability of these simulations (and of grid information
19 required to carry out the preprocessing steps detailed in the next paragraph, such as ocean grid cell area
20 ‘areacello’). We obtained all available data with an experiment variant with a realization equal to one (‘ripf’
21 having ‘r’=1). For each model, we use the first of the remaining experiment variants for which most SSP
22 experiments are available, and the first alternative experiment variant for the SSPs for which that variant is
23 not available. For UKESM1-0-LL, the air pressure sea level field yielded an anomalously large inverse
24 barometer effect, so this was model not included.
25

26 Then, the timeseries of ‘zos’ and ‘zostoga’ were corrected for ocean model drift (Gupta et al., 2013; Hobbs
27 et al., 2016b). This was done by fitting a linear trend to the full pre-industrial control run of each model, and
28 subtracting the resulting linear trend from the historical and scenario runs. Since the drift in ‘zostoga’ is
29 nearly linear for most CMIP6 models, quadratic or linear drift correction yields little difference compared to
30 the magnitude of projected GTE under the emissions scenarios (Hermans et al., 2021). Additionally, the
31 area-weighted mean of the ‘zos’ field was removed at each timestep for each model, since ‘zos’ is defined as
32 the sea-surface height above a time-invariant geoid. Next, ‘zos’ and ‘psl’ were bilinearly interpolated to a
33 common regular 1° by 1° grid using the ESMValTool regridding routine (Eyring et al., 2020). Finally, the
34 inverse barometer effect was derived from sea-level pressure anomalies with respect to the area-weighted
35 ocean mean sea-level pressure (following Stammer and Hüttemann, 2008) and applied to ‘zos’ in order to
36 obtain ocean dynamic sea-level fields (Gregory et al., 2019). Note that the inverse barometer effect due to
37 sea-ice (e.g., Lyu et al., 2020a) was not applied here.
38
39

40 **9.SM.4.3 *Global Mean Thermosteric Sea-Level and Ocean Dynamic Sea-Level Projections based on*** 41 ***the Two-Layer Emulator*** 42

43 To convert the ocean heat content projections based upon the AR6 assessment of equilibrium climate
44 sensitivity and transient climate response (Appendix 7.A.2) to global mean thermosteric sea-level rise
45 projections, the emulated ocean heat content projections were multiplied with expansion coefficients
46 estimated from CMIP6. A distribution of expansion coefficients was derived by fitting drift-corrected global
47 mean thermosteric sea-level rise (9.SM.4.2) from individual CMIP6 GCMs against total ocean heat content
48 output of a two-layer emulator configured with CMIP6 calibration parameters (Smith et al., 2020b). Both
49 thermosteric sea-level rise and ocean heat content were referenced to their mean values in 1995-2014. The
50 two-layer model was forced with scenario-dependent effective radiative forcing from the RCMIP protocol
51 (Nicholls et al., 2020) for the SSPs. Expansion coefficients were derived through linear regression with a
52 fixed 0-intercept for the period 2015-2100 for all SSPs combined.
53

54 The resulting distribution was clipped based on the root mean square error cumulative across scenarios
55 between the GSAT projections of individual CMIP6 models and the GSAT projection of the two-layer

1 model calibrated to that model. Only the expansion coefficients of models with an RMSE less than or equal
 2 to the 85th percentile of the cumulative distribution function of RMSEs were considered. Thus, the expansion
 3 coefficients for CNRM-ESM2-1 and EC-Earth3-Veg were dropped. Expansion coefficients were then
 4 randomly drawn from a normal fit to the distribution of remaining expansion coefficients, which has a mean
 5 and standard deviation of 0.113 ± 0.013 m/YJ.
 6

7 To produce ocean dynamic sea-level projections consistent with the global mean thermosteric projections
 8 described in this section, we follow the approach of (Kopp et al., 2014). We fit a multivariate t-distribution to
 9 the ocean dynamic sea-level terms from CMIP6 (9.SM.4.2), and drawing from this distribution, combine the
 10 ocean dynamic sea-level terms with the emulator-based global mean thermosteric projections, accounting for
 11 the underlying correlation between global mean thermosteric sea-level rise and ocean dynamic sea-level
 12 change in CMIP6. While if the CMIP6 ensemble represented a complete representation of all relevant
 13 uncertainties, its 5th-95th percentile range would represent a *very likely* range, it is not a perfect
 14 representation, so following practice in the AR5, we treat its 5th-95th percentile range as a *likely range* (i.e., a
 15 17th-83rd percentile range). We therefore scale the standard deviation of the t-distribution of ocean dynamic
 16 sea-level change by 1.64, so that ± 1 standard deviation of the scaled fitted distribution corresponds to a
 17 central 66% *likely range*. To account for identifiable, model-specific problems in specific grid cells (e.g., in
 18 inland seas), projections for a grid cell are removed if they have an amplitude in 2099 more than ten times
 19 the median local amplitude. In cases where, after removal of extreme outliers, the standard deviation of
 20 projections in 2099 is greater than 20 cm, we also remove models that deviate from the mean by more than
 21 three standard deviations.
 22
 23

24 9.SM.4.4 Parametric fit to ISMIP6 Greenland Ice Sheet projections

25
 26 Since the ISMIP6 emulator does not account for temporal correlation, a polynomial fit to the ISMIP6 results
 27 is employed to calculate rates of change. The parametric fit is a cubic fit to temperature and a quadratic fit
 28 over time:
 29

$$30 \quad \frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T + \beta_2 T^2 + \beta_3 T^3 + \beta_4 t + \beta_5 t^2$$

31
 32 Where s indicates the sea-level equivalent contribution in mm, T is GSAT in °C, and t is time in years. For
 33 the purposes of fitting this function, T and t are anomalies to their respective values in year 2015. Fitting is
 34 done using maximum a posteriori estimation.
 35
 36

37 [START TABLE 9.SM.3 HERE]

38 **Table 9.SM.3:** Parameters for the fit to the ISMIP6 Greenland Ice Sheet models.
 39

GROUP	Model	β_0	β_1	β_2	β_3	β_4	β_5
UCIJPL	ISSM1	0.11	0.68	-0.16	0.03	-0.009	1.5E-04
UAF	PISM1	0.11	2.23	-0.69	0.08	-0.046	4.7E-04
NCAR	CISM	0.31	1.60	-0.44	0.06	-0.030	2.7E-04
MUN	GSM2601	0.26	1.92	-0.64	0.07	-0.048	5.4E-04
AWI	ISSM1	0.15	0.57	-0.06	0.02	-0.002	2.6E-05
JPL	ISSMPALEO	0.08	0.67	-0.13	0.02	-0.016	1.9E-04
BGC	BISICLES	0.15	0.82	-0.24	0.04	-0.017	2.2E-04
GSFC	ISSM	0.17	1.94	-0.62	0.08	-0.035	3.8E-04
UCIJPL	ISSM2	0.22	0.34	0.05	-0.02	-0.004	8.5E-05

IMAU	IMAUICE2	0.20	2.30	-0.71	0.09	-0.044	4.5E-04
VUB	GISMHOMv1	0.39	0.85	-0.19	0.04	-0.002	-1.1E-05
IMAU	IMAUICE1	0.28	0.84	-0.13	0.03	-0.002	-7.9E-06
MUN	GSM2611	0.32	0.39	0.15	-0.04	-0.016	2.1E-04
UAF	PISM2	0.22	0.22	-0.03	0.02	0.002	-1.0E-05
VUW	PISM	0.00	1.54	-0.52	0.06	-0.037	4.6E-04
AWI	ISSM2	0.15	0.58	-0.06	0.02	-0.001	1.6E-05
ILTS_PIK	SICOPOLIS2	0.23	0.64	-0.06	0.02	-0.005	6.9E-05
ILTS_PIK	SICOPOLIS1	0.18	1.83	-0.52	0.07	-0.036	3.7E-04
AWI	ISSM3	0.09	2.12	-0.65	0.08	-0.042	4.2E-04
JPL	ISSM	0.20	0.73	-0.13	0.03	-0.004	4.9E-05
LSCE	GRISLI2	0.22	0.39	-0.04	0.02	-0.006	5.7E-05

1
2 **[END TABLE 9.A.3 HERE]**
3
4

5 **9.SM.4.5 Parametric fit to GlacierMIP2 projections**
6

7 Since the GlacierMIP2 emulator does not account for temporal correlation and terminates, along with the
8 GlacierMIP2 simulations, in 2100, we employ a power law fit to the GlacierMIP2 simulations (Marzeion et
9 al., 2020), with a functional form similar to that employed by the AR5, to calculate rates of change and
10 extrapolate changes beyond 2100 (up to a maximum potential contribution of 0.32 m). As in the AR5
11 (Church et al., 2013), the glacier contribution is the integral of $fI(t)^\rho$, where $I(t)$ is the time integral of GSAT
12 from 2006 to time t in degrees Celsius year, and the constants f and ρ used for each glacier model are shown
13 in Table 9.SM.4. The spread of the results around this median projection has a coefficient of variation
14 (standard deviation divided by the mean) σ which is determined on a per-model basis. As in the AR5, this
15 variation is incorporated by taking for each Monte Carlo sample a normally distributed random number. This
16 number is multiplied by the time-dependent standard deviation and added to the sample. All models are
17 equally weighted.
18
19

20 **[START TABLE 9.SM.4 HERE]**
21

22 **Table 9.SM.4:** Parameters for the fit to the global glacier models.
23

Global Glacier Model	f (mm °C ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	ρ	σ
GLIMB	3.7	0.66	0.21
GloGEM	4.08	0.72	0.16
JULES	5.5	0.56	0.19
MAR2012	4.89	0.65	0.14
OGGM	4.26	0.72	0.16
RAD2014	5.18	0.71	0.14
WAL2001	2.66	0.73	0.21

24
25 **[END TABLE 9.SM.4 HERE]**
26
27

1 **9.SM.4.6 Background rates of relative sea-level change**

2
3 Background rates of RSL change, including glacial-isostatic adjustment as well as other factors contributing
4 to long-term vertical land motion, are estimated from tide-gauge data following the Gaussian-process
5 regression method of Kopp et al. (Kopp et al., 2014). The method was applied to annual-mean tide-gauge
6 data downloaded from the Permanent Service for Mean Sea Level (Holgate et al., 2013) on 18 October 2020.
7 As in Kopp et al. (Kopp et al., 2014), RSL is represented as the sum of three Gaussian processes: (1) a
8 regionally varying, temporally linear process, (2) a globally-uniform process, and (3) a regionally varying,
9 temporally autocorrelated non-linear process. The posterior estimate of the first (temporally linear) process is
10 used as the estimate of the background rate. The analysis is conducted separately for each of 15 regions:
11 Iceland/Svalbard, Scandinavia, Northern Europe, Russia, Mediterranean/Africa, US Pacific, US Atlantic,
12 Gulf of Mexico, Northeastern Canada, Alaska, Latin America, Oceania, Japan, South/East Asia, and
13 Antarctica (see Kopp et al., 2014, for details). Within each region, available tide-gauge data are used
14 together with the GMSL curve of (Dangendorf et al., 2019) (treated as a noisy observation of the second
15 term) to estimate the Gaussian-process model.
16

17 **9.SM.4.7 Warming Level Scenarios**

18
19 Because GMSL projections are more strongly related to integrated warming rather than to instantaneous
20 warming, warming-level-based scenarios cannot be defined based on the time-slice method used for
21 atmospheric variables (Cross-Chapter Box 11.1). Instead, consistent with the approaches of (Jackson et al.,
22 2018; Rasmussen et al., 2018), all available SSP-based projections are pooled, then assigned to temperature
23 levels based on the 2081-2100 GSAT anomaly projected by the two-layer energy budget emulator, using a
24 $\pm 0.25^\circ\text{C}$ window around the targeted temperature level. For example, the 2.0°C projections are based on all
25 realizations from all scenarios where 2081-2100 GSAT falls between 1.75°C and 2.25°C . A certain warming
26 level may therefore include a mixture of one or more SSP scenarios.
27
28
29

30 **9.SM.4.8 Analysis of future changes in extreme sea level return frequency**

31
32 Frequency amplification factors for the 1% average annual-probability of extreme still-water levels are
33 computed by combining the projected regional sea-level change (Section 9.6.3.3) with historical distributions
34 of observed extreme events derived from the Global Extreme Sea Level Analysis 2 (GESLA2;(Woodworth
35 et al., 2016b)), following the approach of the SROCC and (Frederikse et al., 2020a). GESLA2 stations are
36 included in the analysis when hourly mean data was available for at least 6,000 hours per year (250 days) for
37 at least 20 years. For each station, the annual means were removed before fitting a General Pareto
38 Distribution (GPD) to the hourly mean GESLA2 data using a peak-over-threshold (POT) method with a
39 threshold of 99.7%. The extremes are de-clustered using a minimum of 72 hours between subsequent
40 extremes. The estimated GPD location (the 99.7% threshold), scale and shape parameters are generally in
41 agreement with (Frederikse et al., 2020a). We note that our results are sensitive to the statistical method used
42 (Wahl et al., 2017) and may therefore differ from previous analyses.
43

44 Following the SROCC and (Frederikse et al., 2020a), we computed an ensemble of historical return curves
45 for each station using the location parameter in combination with 50,000 random pairs of the shape and scale
46 parameters drawn from the mean estimated shape and scale parameters and their covariance matrices. To
47 compute the future return curves, we use the same scale and shape parameter samples but increase the
48 location parameter at each station by the local projected mean sea-level change, effectively shifting the
49 return curve up. The uncertainty in the local projected mean sea-level change is estimated by drawing 50,000
50 samples from the projected probability distribution of local mean sea-level change, clipped at its 5th and 95th
51 percentiles. This differs from SROCC, where sea-level change samples were drawn from a normal
52 distribution using the central value and a standard error.
53

54 Using the resulting 50,000 future return curves for each station, we calculated the frequency amplification
55 factor of a 1% average annual-probability (i.e., once in 100 years) of extreme still-water level by dividing the

1 frequency of that water level in the future return curves by the historical frequency. This resulted in a
 2 probability distribution of frequency amplification factors that represents both the uncertainty in projected
 3 sea-level change and in the historical distribution of extremes.

4
 5 Using the POT method, the frequency of extreme events is only defined for water levels above the POT
 6 threshold. If the projected sea-level change for a given location is higher than the exceedance of the
 7 historical location parameter by the historical 1% annual probability event, the historical 1% annual-
 8 probability event would have a return level below the future location parameter. Thus, for the stations where
 9 this occurs the frequency amplification factor cannot be fully determined. Therefore, we used the approach
 10 of (Buchanan et al., 2016) to describe the return frequency of return heights below the POT threshold. We fit
 11 a Gumbel distribution between Mean Higher-High Water (MHHW) and the location parameter, assuming the
 12 frequency of exceedance of the MHHW to be 182.6/year. The MHHW was estimated from the GESLA2 data
 13 as the long-term mean of 2-daily maxima for each location. Therefore, by construction, the maximum
 14 projected frequency amplification factor in our analysis is 18,262.5.

15
 16
 17 **[START TABLE 9.SM.5 HERE]**

18
 19 **Table 9.SM.5:** Integrated GMSL projections for 2050, relative to 1996-2014, from the post-AR5 literature.
 20

Study	Grouping	RCP 2.6		RCP 4.5		RCP 8.5	
		67%	90%	67%	90%	67%	90%
Bakker et al., 2017	MED		0.16-- 0.29		0.18-- 0.31		0.20-- 0.34
Kopp et al., 2014	MED	0.19-- 0.27	0.16-- 0.31	0.19-- 0.29	0.16-- 0.33	0.22-- 0.32	0.19-- 0.36
Mengel et al., 2016	MED		0.10-- 0.20		0.11-- 0.21		0.12-- 0.25
Nicholls et al., 2018	MED						0.16-- 0.29
Kopp et al., 2017	MICI	0.14-- 0.31	0.10-- 0.39	0.16-- 0.34	0.12-- 0.41	0.20-- 0.38	0.15-- 0.46
Wong et al., 2017	MICI		0.18-- 0.31		0.20-- 0.33		0.23-- 0.38
Jackson and Jevrejeva, 2016	SEJ					0.19-- 0.34	0.15-- 0.45
Bamber et al., 2019	SEJ					0.25-- 0.45	0.19-- 0.59

21
 22 All projections are adjusted to a 1995-2014 baseline and 2050 end year. For projections baselined to 1986-
 23 2005 or to 2000, adjustments are made assuming a 3 mm/yr rate. For projections ending in 2046-2065,
 24 adjustments are made assuming a constant acceleration from 1996-2014 to the end year.

25
 26 **[END TABLE 9.SM.5 HERE]**
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36

1 [START TABLE 9.SM.6 HERE]
 2
 3
 4

Table 9.SM.6: Integrated GMSL projections for 2100, relative to 1996-2014, from the post-AR5 literature.

Study	Grouping	RCP 2.6		RCP 4.5		RCP 8.5	
		67%	90%	67%	90%	67%	90%
Bakker et al., 2017	MED		0.37-- 0.68		0.51-- 0.94		0.82-- 1.56
Jackson and Jevrejeva, 2016	MED			0.33-- 0.69	0.19-- 0.82	0.51-- 0.95	0.34-- 1.15
Kopp et al., 2014	MED	0.35-- 0.63	0.27-- 0.80	0.43-- 0.75	0.34-- 0.91	0.60-- 0.98	0.50-- 1.19
Kopp et al., 2016	MED	0.26-- 0.49	0.22-- 0.59	0.37-- 0.67	0.31-- 0.83	0.57-- 1.03	0.50-- 1.29
Mengel et al., 2016	MED		0.25-- 0.53		0.34-- 0.74		0.54-- 1.28
Nauels et al., 2017	MED	0.34-- 0.56		0.45-- 0.71		0.65-- 1.06	
Slangen et al., 2014	MED			0.36-- 0.83		0.46-- 1.15	
Le Bars, 2018	MED			0.39-- 0.67	0.31-- 0.82	0.59-- 0.98	0.48-- 1.18
Le Cozannet et al., 2019	MED	0.20-- 0.42	0.14-- 0.49	0.32-- 0.54	0.24-- 0.60	0.55-- 0.80	0.45-- 0.89
Goodwin et al., 2017	MED		0.51-- 0.88		0.52-- 0.79		0.73-- 1.00
Nicholls et al., 2018	MED						0.51-- 0.88
Kopp et al., 2017	MICI	0.35-- 0.76	0.24-- 0.96	0.64-- 1.23	0.48-- 1.56	1.07-- 2.07	0.91-- 2.41
Wong et al., 2017	MICI		0.41-- 0.72		0.54-- 1.28		1.07-- 2.05
Grinsted et al., 2015	SEJ					0.56-- 1.18	0.43-- 1.81
Jackson and Jevrejeva, 2016	SEJ					0.60-- 1.18	0.48-- 1.64
Jevrejeva et al., 2014	SEJ						0.44-- 1.78
Bamber et al., 2019	SEJ					0.77-- 1.72	0.60-- 2.36
Horton et al., 2020	Survey	0.28-- 0.63	0.19-- 0.80			0.61-- 1.30	0.43-- 1.63

5 All projections are adjusted to a 1995-2014 baseline and 2100 end year. For projections baselined to 1986-
 6 2005 or to 2000, adjustments are made assuming a 3 mm/yr rate. For projections ending in 2081-2100,
 7 adjustments are made assuming a constant acceleration from 1996-2014 to the end year.
 8
 9

10 [END TABLE 9.SM.6 HERE]
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15

1 [START TABLE 9.SM.7 HERE]
 2

3 **Table 9.SM.7:** Global mean sea-level projections for 5 SSP scenarios, for total change and individual contributions,
 4 median values, (*likely*) ranges of the process-based model ensemble, for 1995-2014 to 2050 and 2150 in
 5 meters. Average rates for total sea-level change in mm yr⁻¹.

	SSP1-1.9	SSP1-2.6	SSP2-4.5	SSP3-7.0	SSP5-8.5	SSP5-8.5 <i>Low Confidence</i>
2050						
Thermal expansion	0.07 (0.06--0.08)	0.07 (0.06--0.09)	0.08 (0.07--0.10)	0.09 (0.07--0.10)	0.09 (0.08--0.11)	0.07 (0.06--0.09)
Greenland	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.04)	0.03 (0.02--0.10)
Antarctica	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (0.01--0.08)	0.03 (-0.00--0.08)
Glaciers	0.04 (0.03--0.05)	0.05 (0.04--0.06)	0.05 (0.05--0.06)	0.06 (0.05--0.07)	0.07 (0.06--0.08)	0.05 (0.04--0.06)
Land Water Storage	0.01 (0.00--0.02)	0.01 (0.00--0.02)	0.01 (0.00--0.02)	0.01 (0.00--0.02)	0.01 (0.00--0.02)	0.01 (0.00--0.02)
Total (2050)	0.18 (0.15--0.23)	0.19 (0.16--0.25)	0.21 (0.18--0.26)	0.22 (0.19--0.28)	0.23 (0.20--0.30)	0.20 (0.16--0.31)
2150						
Thermal expansion	0.14 (0.11--0.18)	0.18 (0.14--0.23)	0.30 (0.24--0.38)	0.46 (0.38--0.57)	0.55 (0.45--0.68)	0.55 (0.45--0.68)
Greenland	0.10 (0.08--0.13)	0.13 (0.10--0.17)	0.19 (0.15--0.24)	0.24 (0.19--0.28)	0.27 (0.22--0.35)	0.31 (0.18--0.98)
Antarctica	0.17 (-0.01--0.44)	0.18 (-0.03--0.49)	0.18 (-0.05--0.55)	0.17 (-0.07--0.61)	0.17 (-0.09--0.68)	0.77 (-0.09--3.68)
Glaciers	0.10 (0.07--0.14)	0.13 (0.09--0.18)	0.19 (0.13--0.26)	0.27 (0.18--0.32)	0.31 (0.20--0.32)	0.31 (0.20--0.32)
Land Water Storage	0.05 (0.03--0.06)	0.05 (0.03--0.06)	0.05 (0.03--0.07)	0.07 (0.04--0.09)	0.05 (0.03--0.06)	0.05 (0.03--0.06)
Total (2150)	0.57 (0.37--0.85)	0.69 (0.46--1.00)	0.93 (0.67--1.33)	1.21 (0.92--1.67)	1.35 (1.02--1.89)	1.99 (1.02--4.83)

6 [END TABLE 9.SM.7 HERE]
 7
 8
 9

1 [START TABLE 9.SM.8 HERE]

2
3 **Table 9.SM.8:** Global mean sea-level rise projections for 2000-2300 from literature (m), for different RCP scenarios.

4

Study	Grouping	RCP 2.6		RCP 4.5		RCP 8.5	
		67%	90%	67%	90%	67%	90%
Kopp et al., (2014)	MED	0.3--2.9	-0.2--4.7	0.7--3.5	0.0--5.3	1.8--5.2	1.0--7.4
Nauels et al., (2017)	MED	0.8--1.4		1.8--2.3		3.4--6.8	
Palmer et al. (2020)*	MED	0.6--2.2		0.9--2.6		1.7--4.5	
Kopp et al., (2017)	MICI	0.8--2.3	0.5--3.0	2.8--6.0	2.1--7.0	9.8--14.1	9.1--15.5
Bamber et al. (2019)*	SEJ	1.2--3.6	0.5--5.3			2.6--6.5	1.8--11.8
Horton et al. (2020)	Survey	0.54-2.15	0.24-3.11			1.67-5.61	0.88-7.83

5
6 *Bamber et al. (2019) 2°C scenario is listed under the RCP 2.6 column, but GSAT does not decline in this
7 2°C scenario as it does in RCP 2.6. Bamber et al. (2019) "RCP 8.5" scenario assumes GSAT stabilization at
8 5°C above pre-industrial after 2100 and so becomes cooler than RCP 8.5 over the 22nd and 23rd century.
9 Palmer et al. (2020) 5th-95th percentile of simulated projections are constructed to be analogous to
10 AR5/SROCC *likely* ranges and so are presented here as 17th-83rd percentile projections.

11 [END TABLE 9.SM.8 HERE]

12
13
14
15 **9.SM.5 Data Table**

16 [START TABLE 9.SM.9 HERE]

17
18 **Table 9.SM.9:** Input datasets and code in the chapter.

19
20

Figure number	Dataset / Code name	Type	Filename / Specificities	License type	Dataset / Code citation	Dataset / Code URL	Related publications / Software used	Notes
Figure 9.2, panel b	OSCAR third degree resolution ocean surface currents. Ver. 1	Input dataset (observations)		open	10.5067/OSCAR-03D01	https://doi.org/10.5067/OSCAR-03D01	Bonjean, F., and G. S. E. Lagerloef, 2002.	time averaged over 1993-2018
	ETOPO20	Input dataset (topography)		open	doi:10.7289/V5C8276M .	http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/global/etopo2.html	Amante, C.; Eakins, B.W. (2009). "ETOPO1 1 Arc-Minute Global Relief Model: Procedures,	

							Data Sources and Analysis". <i>NOAA Technical Memorandum NESDIS NGDC-24</i> .	
	Permafrost gridded map	input dataset		open		https://data.tpsc.ac.cn/en/data/c66bf4a7-8f20-443c-9412-53ac675bd964/	Brown, J., O. Ferrians, J. A. Heginbottom, E. Melnikov, Tingjun Zhang Tingjun Zhang Tingjun Zhang. Circum-Arctic map of permafrost and ground ice conditions (v2) (1997) . National Tibetan Plateau Data Center, 2011.	all permafrost types combined
	Snow water equivalent map	Input dataset		Open	https://doi.org/10.5067/KIGGFNVROX9V	https://doi.org/10.5067/KIGGFNVROX9V	Brodzik, M. J., R. Armstrong, and M. Savoie. 2007. Global EASE-Grid 8-day Blended SSM/I and MODIS Snow Cover, Version 1. [Indicate subset used]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. doi: https://doi.org/10.5067/KIGGFNVROX9V .	SWE converted to distribution of snowy regions and locations of ice sheets
	Northern Hemisphere sea ice data	Input dataset		Open			Meier, W. N., F. Fetterer, M. Savoie, S. Mallory, R. Duerr, and J. Stroeve. 2017. NOAA/NSIDC Climate	Annual average concentration

							Data Record of Passive Microwave Sea Ice Concentration, Version 3. [Indicate subset used]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NSIDC: National Snow and Ice Data Center. doi: https://doi.org/10.7265/N59P2ZTG .	
	Southern Hemisphere sea ice data	Input dataset		Open			Peng, et al. 2013. https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-5-311-2013	Annual average concentration
	Glacier inventory	Input dataset		Open			RGI Consortium (2017). Randolph Glacier Inventory – A Dataset of Global Glacier Outlines: Version 6.0: Technical Report, Global Land Ice Measurements from Space, Colorado, USA. Digital Media. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7265/N5-RGI-60	
Figure 9.3a (left: paleo panel)Figure 9.3a (left: paleo panel)	Paleo MPWP observations	Input dataset (observations)					Foley, et al. (2019) https://doi.org/10.5066/P9YP3DTV . McClymont, et al. (2020). https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2019-161	Anomalized relative to 1950-1980. These data used a different ‘modern’ period so a +0.2 correction was applied based on HadCM3.
	Paleo LIG observations	Input dataset (observ					Fischer, et al. (2018). https://doi.org/10.103	Anomalized relative to 1950-1980.

	on	ations)					<p>8/s41561-018-0146-0; Turney, et al. (2020). https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-3341-2020; Hoffman et al., 2017</p>	<p>The references used varying ‘modern’ periods so the following corrections were applied; +0.2 for Fischer et al. (2018) and -0.1 for Turney et al. (2020). These corrections were based on HadCM3.</p>
	Paleo LGM observation	Input dataset (observations)					<p>Paul, et al. (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2617-x; MARGO (2009)</p>	<p>Anomalized relative to 1950-1980. The references used varying ‘modern’ periods so the following corrections were applied; +0.2 for Paul et al. (2021) & MARGO (2009) and +0.1 for Tierney et al., 2020. These corrections were based on HadCM3 and PAGES12K (Kaufman et al., 2020) respectively.</p>
	Paleo MPWP Models	Model dataset					<p>Haywood, et al. (2020).</p>	<p>Anomalized relative to 1950-1980. These data used a different ‘modern’ period so a +0.2 correction was applied based on</p>

ACCEPTED VERSION
SUBJECT TO FINAL EDITING

								HadCM3.
	Paleo LIG Models	Model dataset						Otto-Bliesner, et al. (2021). Anomalized relative to 1950-1980. Otto-Bliesner et al. (2021) used a different 'modern' period so a +0.2 correction was applied based on HadCM3.
	Paleo LGM Models	Model dataset						Kageyama, et al. (2021). https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2019-169 Anomalized relative to 1950-1980. Kageyama et al. (2021) used a different 'modern' reference period so the following was applied; +0.2. This correction was based on HadCM3.
Figure 9.3a (middle and right panels)	Hadley Centre Sea Ice and Sea Surface Temperature dataset (HadISST)	Input dataset (observational reanalyses)		Crown Copyright		https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/hadobs/hadisst/	Rayner, et al. (2003), ESMValTool v2	Reformatted with ESMValTool v2.0 (March 20 th 2020)
	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP, HighRes MIP)	Model dataset						
Figure 9.3b	Hadley Centre Sea Ice and Sea Surface Temperature dataset (HadISST)	Input dataset (observational reanalyses)		Crown Copyright		https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/hadobs/hadisst/	See Figure 9.3a (middle and right panels)	Monthly data averaged between 1995 and 2014. Reformatted with ESMValTool v2.0 (March 20 th

								2020)
Figure 9.3c	Hadley Centre Sea Ice and Sea Surface Temperature dataset (HadISST)	Input dataset (observational reanalyses)		Crown Copyright		https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/hadobs/hadisst/	See Figure 9.3a (middle and right panels)	Change rate calculated between the 2005-2014 mean and 1950-1959 mean.
Figure 9.3d	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset						Change rate calculated between the 2091-2100 mean and the 2005-2014 mean.
Figure 9.3e	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset						See Fig. 9.3b
Figure 9.3f	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset						See Fig. 9.3c
Figure 9.3g	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset						Change rate calculated between the 2041-2050 mean and the 2005-2014.
Figure 9.3h	CMIP6 (HighResMIP)	Model dataset						See Fig. 9.3b
Figure 9.3i	CMIP6 (HighResMIP)	Model dataset						See Fig. 9.3c
Figure 9.3j	CMIP6 (HighResMIP)	Model dataset						See Fig. 9.3g
Figure 9.4a,b,d,e,g,h	CERES EBAF v4 (Heat fluxes); OAFux-HR (heat, freshwater and momentum fluxes); GPCP (precipitation)	Input datasets (observation-based products)				https://ceres.larc.nasa.gov/data/ ; http://oafux.whoj.edu/ ; https://rda.ucar.edu/datasets/ds728.3/		Details of dataset merging and trend calculation to be added
Figure 9.4c,f,i	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario	Model datasets						Change rate calculated between

	MIP)							2081-2100 mean and 1995-2014 mean (CHECK THIS). Models include river runoff, observations do not.
Figure 9.5a,b,e,f	Argo Mixed Layers	Input datasets (observations)		Open		http://mixedlayer.ucsd.edu	Holte, et al. (2017).	Climatology of monthly mixed layer depths, Dec 2019 version. MLDs calculated using de Boyer Montégut et al.'s (2004) threshold values. DJF and JJA averages ignore missing gridpoints. Afterward, isolated missing gridpoints infilled as average of four neighbors.
Figure 9.5b,f	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model datasets						Change rate calculated across 1995-2014 period.
Figure 9.5c,d,g,h	CMIP6 (Scenario MIP, CMIP)	Model datasets						Change rate calculated between 2081-2100 average and 1995-2014 average.
Figure 9.6a	Observations (Ishii)	Input dataset (observations)	ishii_ohc_global_1955.txt			https://www.data.jma.go.jp/gmd/kaiyou/english/ohc/ohc_data_en.html (Downloaded 12th Jan.	Ishii et al. 2017	Anomalized relative to 2004-2015 mean.

					2021)		
Hybrid (Zanna)	Input dataset (hybrid)	OHC_GF_1870_2018_Zanna.nc			Zanna, Laure, Khatiwala, Samar, Gregory, Jonathan, Ison, Jonathan, & Heimbach, Patrick. (2019). Global reconstruction of historical ocean heat storage and transport (Version v1) [Dataset]. Zenodo. http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4603700	Zanna, et al. (2019)	Anomalized relative to 2004-2015 mean.
Hybrid (Cheng)	Input dataset (hybrid)	Cheng_2016_Global_OHC_13_Jan_2021.txt			http://159.226.119.60/cheng/images/OHC2000m_annual_timeseries.txt	Cheng, et al. 2019	Anomalized relative to 2004-2015 mean.
Paleo (LIG)	Input dataset (LIG)	Stored in Excel file for Fig 9.9: 9.2.2_AC M_Fig_9.9_OHC_Paleo_Data_update_2020_12_06.xls				Shackleton, S. et al. (2020).	Last Inter-Glacial OHC anomaly relative to preindustrial. This mean is between -129 ka and -116 ka CE, and the timeseries is shown in Fig. 9.9
Paleo (LGM)	Input dataset (LGM)	Stored in Excel file for Fig 9.9: 9.2.2_AC M_Fig_9.9				Baggenstos, D., Häberli, M., Schmitt, J., Shackleton, S. A., Birner,	Last Glacial Maximum OHC anomaly relative to

			_OHC_Paleo_Data_update_2020_12_06.xls				B., Severinghaus, J. P., Kellerahs, T & Fischer, H. (2019). Earth's radiative imbalance from the Last Glacial Maximum to the present. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(30), 14881-14886. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1905447116	preindustrial. This mean is between -23 ka and -19 ka CE, and the timeseries is shown in Fig. 9.9
	Paleo (MH)	Input dataset (MH)	Stored in Excel file for Fig 9.9: 9.2.2_AC M_Fig_9.9_OHC_Paleo_Data_update_2020_12_06.xls				Baggenstos, D. et al. (2019).	Mid-holocene OHC anomaly relative to preindustrial. This mean is between -6.5 ka and -5.5 ka CE, and the timeseries is shown in Fig. 9.9
	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						Timeseries across 1850-2014 (CMIP) and 2015-2100 (ScenarioMIP). Anomalized relative to 2005-2014 mean
Figure 9.6b-g	Observations	Input dataset (observational reanalyses)				https://climate.mri-jma.go.jp/pub/ocean/ts/v7.3/2021-02-01/		0-700m calculated between 1971-2014 and 0-2000m calculated between 2005-2014.
	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset						0-700m Bias calculated across 1971-

								2014 mean. 0-2000m Bias calculated across 2005- 2014 mean
	CMIP6 (Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						Change rate calculated between 2091-2100 mean and 2005-2014 mean.
Figure 9.7 1st and 2nd columns	Argo (observat ions)	Input dataset (observ ational reanlyses)				https://ar go.ucsd.e du/		
	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset						
Figure 9.7 3rd and 4th columns	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						Change rate calculated between 2005-2014 mean (CMIP) and 2091-2100 mean (ScenarioMI P).
Figure 9.8 Panels a-f	CMIP5 and observati on based product	Model and observa tion analysis dataset			https://doi.org/1 0.1038/s41586- 020-2573-5	https://do i.org/10. 1038/s41 586-020- 2573-5	Bronselae, B. and Zanna, L., 2020.	These data are the same as used in the paper, but projections are redrawn so as to match the chapter standards
Figure 9.8 Panel g	RAPID array	Input dataset (observ ations)						Version v2015.1 Smeed D. et al. (2016).
	CMIP6 (HighRes MIP)	Model dataset						Roberts, et al. 2020. This analysis is similar to that in the paper but combines multiple panels from the paper into one.
Figure 9.9a,b,d	Ocean heat content (OHC)	Input dataset				Inset OHC updated values	Shackleton et al, 2019; 2020; Baggenstos et	Rebased to PI: Baggenstos et al. (2019)

	estimates					from Levitus et al., 2012; https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/OC5/3M_HEAT_CONTENT/basin_tsl_data.html	al., 2019; Levitus et al. 2012 updated NOAA NODC, 2020	MOT-PI= MOT-1.51; Shackleton et al. (2019) MOT-PI = MOT+0.50 (aligned to Baggenstos et al. 2019); Shackleton et al. (2020) MOT-PI = MOT+0.25 (aligned to Baggenstos et al. 2019); assumption, Baggenstos et al. (2019) at 1000 BP =PI.
	Southern Ocean SST estimates from marine cores	Input dataset					Uemera et al., 2018	Restacked 11 records from average of three low-variability intervals, 4-8 ka, 18-22ka, and 25-29 ka, binned and averaged at 1000-year intervals.
	Southern Ocean SST estimates from ice core source	Input dataset					Uemera et al., 2018	As published, moisture source temperature based on deuterium excess
	OHC from HadCM3	Input dataset				https://crudata.uea.ac.uk/crui/projects/soap/pw/data/model/hadcm3/hadcm3_sealevel.htm	Gregory et al., 2006	Inset only, Natural + Anthropogenic forcing
Figure 9.9c	Model OHC projections	Model dataset					Clark et al., 2016	Projected OHC in response to four GHG emissions scenarios
	Model SAT	Model dataset					Clark et al., 2016	Projected SAT in

								response to four GHG emissions scenarios
Figure 9.10 Top left panel	CMIP6 (PMIP)	Model dataset						
Figure 9.10 Top right panel	CMIP6 (DAMIP, Scenario MIP), CMIP5	Model dataset					Menary, et al., 2020.	
Figure 9.10 Bottom panels	Simulated AMOC changes	Model datasets					Based on literature search from Jackson and Wood, 2018; Yin and Stouffer, 2007; Liu and Liu, 2013; Haskins et al. 2019; De Vries and Weber, 2005; Jackson 2013; Stouffer et al. 2006.	Extracted from timeseries and descriptions of models from these papers.
Figure 9.11 Maps	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						Change rates calculated between 1995-2014 mean (CMIP) and 2081-2100 mean (ScenarioMIP).
Figure 9.11 Right column (scatter plots)	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset					Hu et al., 2015	
Figure 9.12g	AVISO Sea Surface Altimetry	Input dataset (observations)				https://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/en/home.html		Standard deviation across 2005-2014.
Figure 9.12h,i	CMIP6 (OMIP)	Model dataset				HYCOM low-res is from ftp://ftp.coaps.fsu.edu/pub/abozec/OMIP2-GLBt0.7		Standard deviation across last 10 years.

						2/ . HYCOM high-res is from ftp://ftp.coaps.fsu.edu/pub/abozec/GLBb0.08/ .		
Figure 9.12a-f	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						Changes are between 1995-2014 and 2081-2100 means.
Figure 9.13 Left panel	UHH SIA	Input datasets	SeaIceArea__NorthernHemisphere__monthly__UHH__v2019_fv0.01.nc	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International	Doerr, Jakob, Notz, Dirk, & Kern, Stefan. (2021). UHH Sea Ice Area Product (Version 2019_fv0.01) [Data set].	http://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.8559		
Figure 9.13 Left panel	Plotting code	Code	plot_9_13_and_9_15.py					
Figure 9.13 Maps (except right column)	OSISAF/CCI 450	Input datasets			EUMETSAT Ocean and Sea Ice Satellite Application Facility. <i>Global sea ice concentration climate data record 1979-2015</i> (v2.0, 2017),	http://doi.org/10.1577/0/EUMSAF_OS_I_0008	<i>Lavergne et al., 2019</i>	
	OSISAF/CCI 430-b	Input datasets			EUMETSAT Ocean and Sea Ice Satellite Application Facility. <i>Global sea ice concentration interim climate data record 2016 onwards</i> (v2.0, 2019), [Online]. Norwegian and Danish Meteorological Institutes.	http://osisaf.met.no/p/ice/#conc-reproc-v2 [last accessed: 2020-08-14]	<i>Lavergne et al., 2019</i>	at time of writing available at

					ftp://osis af.met.no /reproces sed/ice/c onc-cont reproc/v2 p0/			
	NASA Team and Bootstrap algorithm data as included in the NOAA/ NSIDC Climate data record	Input data set			Meier, W. N., F. Fetterer, M. Savoie, S. Mallory, R. Duerr, and J. Stroeve. 2017. <i>NOAA/NSIDC Climate Data Record of Passive Microwave Sea Ice Concentration, Version 3.</i> [Indicate subset used]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NSIDC: National Snow and Ice Data Center. Cavalieri, D. J., C. L. Parkinson, P. Gloersen, and H. J. Zwally. 1996, updated yearly. <i>Sea Ice Concentrations from Nimbus-7 SMMR and DMSP SSM/I- SSMIS Passive Microwave Data, Version 1.</i> Comiso, J. C. 2017. <i>Bootstrap Sea Ice Concentrations from Nimbus-7 SMMR and DMSP SSM/I- SSMIS, Version 3.</i> Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center.	https://do i.org/10. 7265/N5 9P2ZTG	Cavalieri et al., 1996; Comiso et al., 2017	

Figure 9.13 Right column	Plotting code	Code	plot_Fig_9_13_RIGHT_and_Fig_9_15_RIGHT.py					
Figure 9.13 Right column	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						
Figure 9.14	Plotting code	Code	plot_Fig_9_14.py					
Figure 9.14	CMIP6 Sea-Ice Model Intercomparison Project SIMIP	Model dataset					SIMIP Community, 2020	
Figure 9.15 Left panel	UHH SIA	Input datasets	SeaIceArea_NorthernHemisphere_monthly_UHH_v2019_fv0.01.nc	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International	Doerr, Jakob, Notz, Dirk, & Kern, Stefan. (2021). UHH Sea Ice Area Product (Version 2019_fv0.01) [Data set].	http://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.8559		
Figure 9.15 Left panel	Plotting code	Code	plot_9_13_and_9_15.py					
Figure 9.15 Maps (except right column)	OSISAF/CCI 450	Input datasets			EUMETSAT Ocean and Sea Ice Satellite Application Facility. <i>Global sea ice concentration climate data record 1979-2015</i> (v2.0, 2017),	http://doi.org/10.15770/EUMSAF_OSI_0008	<i>Lavergne et al., 2019</i>	
	OSISAF/CCI 430-b	Input datasets			EUMETSAT Ocean and Sea Ice Satellite Application Facility. <i>Global sea ice concentration interim climate data record 2016 onwards</i> (v2.0, 2019), [Online]. Norwegian and Danish Meteorological	http://osisaf.met.no/p/ice/#conc-reproc-v2 [last accessed: 2020-08-14]	<i>Lavergne et al., 2019</i>	at time of writing

					Institutes.	available at ftp://osisaf.met.no/reprocessed/ice/conc-cont-reproc/v2p0/		
	NASA Team and Bootstrap algorithm data as included in the NOAA/NSIDC Climate data record	Input data set			Meier, W. N., F. Fetterer, M. Savoie, S. Mallory, R. Duerr, and J. Stroeve. 2017. <i>NOAA/NSIDC Climate Data Record of Passive Microwave Sea Ice Concentration, Version 3</i> . [Indicate subset used]. Boulder, Colorado USA. NSIDC: National Snow and Ice Data Center. Cavalieri, D. J., C. L. Parkinson, P. Gloersen, and H. J. Zwally. 1996, updated yearly. <i>Sea Ice Concentrations from Nimbus-7 SMMR and DMSP SSM/I-SSMIS Passive Microwave Data, Version 1</i> . Comiso, J. C. 2017. <i>Bootstrap Sea Ice Concentrations from Nimbus-7 SMMR and DMSP SSM/I-SSMIS, Version 3</i> . Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed	https://doi.org/10.7265/N59P2ZTG	Cavalieri et al., 1996; Comiso et al., 2017	

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION
SUBJECT TO FINAL EDITING

					Active Archive Center.			
Figure 9.15 Right column	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset						
Figure 9.15 Right column	Plotting code	Code	plot_Fig_9_13_RIGHT_and_Fig_9_15_RIGHT.py					
Figure 9.16 Top left panel	Regional Mass Change in Greenland	Input dataset				Colgan et al., 2019; Mougnot et al., 2019	Referenced to 2015	
Figure 9.16 Top right panel	Regional Mass Change in Antarctic	Input dataset				Bamber et al., 2018a; IMBIE Team, 2018	Referenced to 2015	
Figure 9.16 Lower panels	Regional Mass Change in Greenland	Input dataset				Mankoff et al., 2019; Mougnot et al., 2019; King et al., 2020		
Figure 9.17 Top-left panel	Greenland Paleo observations (MPWP)	Input dataset				Dolan et al. (2011); Koenig et al. (2015); Miller et al. (2012); de Boer et al. (2017); Dolan et al. (2015); Contoux et al. (2015)	The mean of each of these studies means is plotted as a circle. The range shows the maximum and minimum of range values across all these studies.	
	Greenland Paleo observations (LIG)	Input dataset				Robinson et al. (2011); Colville et al. (2011); Fyke et al. (2011); Born & Nisancioglu (2012); Quiqet et al. (2013); Dahl-Jensen et al. (2013); Helsen et al. (2013);	The mean of each of these studies means is plotted as a circle. The range shows the maximum and minimum of range values across all these studies.	

							Stone et al. (2013); Colleoni et al., (2014); Robinson & Goelzer (2014); Calov et al., (2015); Dutton et al. (2015); Goelzer et al (2017); Yau et al., (2016) Bradley et al. (2018); Tabone et al. (2018); Plach et al. (2019); Clark et al. (2020)	
	Greenland Pale observations (LGM)	Input dataset					Simpson et al. (2009); Lecavalier et al. (2014); Peltier et al. (2015); Khan et al. (2016); Simms et al. (2019); Stuhne et al. (2015); Argus & Peltier (2010).; Bradley et al. (2018); Tabone et al. (2018)	The mean of each of these studies means is plotted as a circle. The range shows the maximum and minimum of range values across all these studies.
Figure 9.17 Top-right panel	Greenland mass loss historical data	Input dataset					Box and Colgan 2013; Kjeldsen et al., 2015; Mougnot et al., 2019; Bamber et al., 2018b; The UMBIE Team, 2019	
	Greenland mass loss projection (ISMIP6)	Model datasets					Goelzer et al., 2020; Payne et al., submitted	
	Greenland	Model					Edwards et al.,	

	d mass loss projection (ISMIP6 emulation)	dataset					submitted	
Figure 9.17 Bottom panels	Paleo reconstructions (left 3 panels)	Input dataset					Lecavalier et al., 2014; Koenig et al., 2015; Goelzer et al., 2017	
	CryoSat 2 radar altimetry	Input Dataset					Bamber et al., 2018b	
	ISMIP6 projection	Input dataset					Goelzer et al., 2020	
Figure 9.18 Top-left panel	Antarctica Pale observations (MPWP)	Input dataset					Dolan et al (2011); Miller et al. (2012); Pollard et al (2015); de Boer et al. (2015); de Boer et al. (2017); Deconto & Pollard (2016); Yan et al. (2016); Gasson et al. (2016); Golledge et al. (2017)	The mean of each of these studies means is plotted as a circle. The range shows the maximum and minimum of range values across all these studies.
	Antarctica Pale observations (LIG)	Input dataset					Bamber et al. (2009); Dutton et al. (2015); Goelzer et al (2017); Briggs et al. (2014) Clark et al. (2020) Albrecht et al. (2020)	The mean of each of these studies means is plotted as a circle. The range shows the maximum and minimum of range values across all these studies.
	Antarctica Pale observations (LGM)	Input dataset					Whitehouse et al. (2012) Golledge et al. (2012) Golledge et al. (2013) Mackintosh et al. (2011)	The mean of each of these studies means is plotted as a circle. The range shows the

							Golledge et al. (2014) Ivins et al. (2013) Maris et al. (2014) Argus et al. (2014) Simms et al. (2019) Argus et al. (2014) Argus & Peltier (2010)	maximum and minimum of range values across all these studies.
Figure 9.18 Top-right panel	Antarctic mass loss historical data	Input dataset					WCRP Global Sea Level Budget Group, 2018	
	Antarctic mass loss projection (ISMIP6)	Model datasets					Seroussi et al., 2019; Payne et al., submitted	
	Antarctic mass loss projection (ISMIP6 emulation)	Model dataset					Edwards et al., submitted	
Figure 9.18 Bottom panels	Paleo reconstructions (left 3 panels)	Input dataset					Anderson et al., 2002; Bentley et al., 2014; De Boer et al., 2015; Goelzer et al., 2016	
	Restored analog radar records	Input Dataset					Schroeder et al., 2019	
	ISMIP6 projection	Input dataset					Seroussi et al., 2019	
Figure 9.19 Top-left panel	Present-day melt rates (input-output method)	Input dataset					Rignot et al., 2013	
Figure 9.19 Top-middle panel	Present-day melt rates (non-local PIGL)	Input dataset					Jourdain et al., 2020	
Figure 9.19	Present-day melt	Input dataset					Naughten et al., 2018	

Top-right panel	rates (FESOM simulation)							
Figure 9.19 Bottom panels	ISMIP6 projections	Input dataset						Future anomalies are calculated as 2081-2100 minus present-day using the ISMIP6 non-local-MeanAnt and non-local-PIGL parameterizations ((Jourdain et al., 2020) lower left and centre respectively) based on projections from the NorESM1-M CMIP5 model, and the FESOM-MMM projection (lower right).
Figure 9.20	Glacier change rates	Input dataset					Zemp et al., 2019; Zemp et al., 2020; Wouters et al., 2019; Hugonnet et al., submitted	
Figure 9.21	Historical glacier mass	Input dataset					Marzeion et al., 2015; Zemp et al., 2019; Bamber et al., 2018.	
	CMIP6 (Glacier MIP Phase 2)	Model dataset					Marzeion et al., 2020	
Figure 9.22	Global mean annual ground temperature data (GTN-P)	Input dataset			GTN-P, 2018			
Figure 9.22	CMIP6 (CMIP,	Model dataset	pf15m_amip_NH_19	Creative				

Left panel	AMIP, land-hist), CMIP5		79-1998.txt; pf15m_CMIP5historical_NH_1979-1998.txt; pf15m_historical_NH_1979-1998.txt; pf15m_land-hist_NH_1979-1998.txt	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International				
	Observed and reanalysis-based permafrost extent	Input dataset	3 values extracted manually from the cited references	No license required	Obu et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 1999; Gruber et al., 2012	-	Obu et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 1999; Gruber et al., 2012	-
Figure 9.22 Right panel	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset	pfvolbin-3m.tgz	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International			Python, Fortran	Change calculated relative to 1995-2014 over historical period and up to 2100
Figure 9.23	Observed snow trends	Input dataset	Figure directly from publication	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International	Mudryk et al., 2020		Mudryk et al., 2020	Trends and anomalies calculated over 1981-2018.
Figure 9.24 Left panel	Observed snow cover extent	Input dataset	Mudryk_scf_1981-2014.txt	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International	Mudryk et al., 2020	-	Mudryk et al., 2020	
	CMIP6 (CMIP)	Model dataset	snc_clim_CMIP6_historical_1981-2014.txt	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International	Mudryk et al., 2020		Mudryk et al., 2020	1981-2014
Figure 9.24 Right panel	CMIP6 (CMIP, Scenario MIP)	Model dataset	sncbin.tgz	Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International	Mudryk et al., 2020		Mudryk et al., 2020	1850-2100, relative to 1995-2014

				International					
Figure 9.25	Literature global mean sea level projections	Input dataset						<p>Bakker et al. 2017 Jackson and Jevrejeva 2016 Kopp et al. 2014 Kopp et al. 2016 Mengel et al. 2016 Nauels et al. 2017a Slangen et al. 2014 LeBars et al. 2018 LeCozannet et al. 2019 Goodwin et al. 2017 Nicholls et al. 2018 Kopp et al. 2017 Wong et al. 2017 Grinsted et al. 2015 Jackson and Jevrejeva 2016 Jevrejeva et al. 2014 Bamber et al. 2019 Horton et al. 2020</p>	See Appendix Tables 9.A.5 and 9.A.6
Figure 9.26	Sea level projections							See 9.6.3.2, Table 9.7, and Appendix 9.A.4 for methods	
	Figure 9.26 Plotting code	Code	Plot_SL_Contribution_Maps.m						
	Figure 9.26 Plotting Code	Code	Plot_SL_Contribution_Timeseries.m						
Figure 9.27	GMSL projections							See 9.6.3.2, Table 9.7, and Appendix 9.A.4 for methods	
	Figure 9.27	Code	Plot_GMSL_Projecte						

	Plotting Code		d_Scenarios.m					
Figure 9.28	Sea level projections							See 9.6.3.2, Table 9.7, and Appendix 9.A.4 for methods
	Figure 9.28 Plotting Code	Code	Plot_RSL_Scenario_Maps.m					
Figure 9.29	Sea level timing projections							See 9.6.3.2, Table 9.7, and Appendix 9.A.4 for methods
	Figure 9.29 Plotting Code	Code	plot_exceedance_year.r					
Figure 9.30	GMSL commitment (models)	Input dataset					Clark et al., 2016; Van Breedam et al., 2020; Garbe et al., 2020; DeConto and Pollard, 2016; Gregory et al., 2020	
	GMSL Commitment (paleo records)	Input dataset						Assessed in 2.3.3.3
	Figure 9.30 Plotting Code	Code	plot_SLR_commitments.m					
Figure 9.31A	Observed minor tidal flood frequency trend	Input dataset (observations)			Woodworth et al. (2017) ()	Gesla.org ()	Woodworth et al. (2017) ()	Trends determined over 1950-2020
Figure 9.31B	Observed minor tidal flood frequency trend	Input dataset (observations)			Woodworth et al. (2017) ()	Gesla.org ()	Woodworth et al. (2017) ()	Trends determined over 1950-2020
Figure 9.32	Sea level projections	Input dataset					Buchanan et al., 2016; Oppenheimer et al., 2019; Frederikse et al., 2020	See Appendix 9.A.4.8 for methods
	Global Extreme Sea Level Analysis	Input dataset	private_14032017.zip public_11092018.zip			https://www.gesla.org/	Woodworth et al, 2017	Public and private parts of dataset

	2 (GESLA 2)							
	Figure 9.32 Plotting Code	Code	Plot_fig9_ 32_ESL.m					

1
2
3

[END TABLE 9.SM.9 HERE]

ACCEPTED VERSION
SUBJECT TO FINAL EDITING