JOURNAL OF GLACIOLOGY

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THIS MANUSCRIPT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE JOURNAL OF GLACIOLOGY AND HAS NOT BEEN PEER-REVIEWED.

Mass loss of the Greenland ice sheet until the year 3000 under a sustained late-21st-century climate

Journal:	*Journal of Glaciology*
Manuscript ID	JOG-21-0089
Manuscript Type:	Letter
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Jul-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Greve, Ralf; Hokkaido University, Institute of Low Temperature Science Chambers, Christopher; Hokkaido University Institute of Low Temperature Science, Glaciology
Keywords:	Ice-sheet modelling, Arctic glaciology, Climate change, Ice and climate
Abstract:	We conduct extended versions of the ISMIP6 future climate experiments for the Greenland ice sheet until the year 3000 with the model SICOPOLIS. Beyond 2100, the climate forcing is kept fixed at late-21st-century conditions. For the unabated warming pathway RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5, the ice sheet suffers a severe mass loss, which amounts to ~ 1.8 m SLE (sea-level equivalent) for the twelve-experiment mean, and ~ 3.5 m SLE (~ 50% of the entire mass) for the most sensitive experiment. For the reduced emissions pathway RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6, the mass loss is limited to a two-experiment mean of ~ 0.28 m SLE. Climate-change mitigation during the next decades will therefore be an efficient means for limiting the contribution of the Greenland ice sheet to sea-level rise in the long term.

Journal of Glaciology, Vol. xx, No. xx, 2021

Mass loss of the Greenland ice sheet until the year 3000 under a sustained late-21st-century climate

Ralf GREVE,[1,2] Christopher CHAMBERS[1]

[1]*Institute of Low Temperature Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan*

[2]*Arctic Research Center, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan*

Correspondence: Ralf Greve <greve@lowtem.hokudai.ac.jp>

ABSTRACT. We conduct extended versions of the ISMIP6 future climate experiments for the Greenland ice sheet until the year 3000 with the model SICOPOLIS. Beyond 2100, the climate forcing is kept fixed at late-21st-century conditions. For the unabated warming pathway RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5, the ice sheet suffers a severe mass loss, which amounts to ∼ 1.8 m SLE (sea-level equivalent) for the twelve-experiment mean, and ∼ 3.5 m SLE (∼ 50% of the entire mass) for the most sensitive experiment. For the reduced emissions pathway RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6, the mass loss is limited to a two-experiment mean of ∼ 0.28 m SLE. Climate-change mitigation during the next decades will therefore be an efficient means for limiting the contribution of the Greenland ice sheet to sea-level rise in the long term.

For Peer Review

1 INTRODUCTION

Global warming, also referred to as climate change, is the observed rise in the average temperature of the Earth's climate system and its related effects. It is established scientific consensus that the climate system is warming, and that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century (e.g., IPCC, 2013). A major consequence of global warming is sea-level rise, currently occurring at a global mean rate of 3.6 ± 0.5 millimetres per year (for the period 2006–2015; Oppenheimer and others, 2019). The main sources are melting/discharge of ice sheets, ice caps and glaciers, and thermal expansion of ocean water. In the long term, the two ice sheets of Antarctica (AIS) and Greenland (GIS) are the largest potential contributors to global sea-level rise because of their enormous volumes, together amounting to $\sim 65\,\mathrm{m}$ SLE (sea-level equivalent) (Morlighem and others, 2017, 2020). The ice sheets have therefore been the focus of intensive observational as well as modelling efforts.

The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) is a major international climate modelling initiative (Eyring and others, 2016). As a part of this project, the Ice Sheet Model Intercomparison Project for CMIP6 (ISMIP6) brought together a consortium of ice-sheet modellers to explore the sea-level-rise contribution from the GIS and AIS (Nowicki and others, 2016, 2020). ISMIP6 focussed on the CMIP6 period from 2015 until the end of 2100. The main findings for the GIS, when forced by output from CMIP5 global climate models (GCMs), were contributions of 90 ± 50 and $32 \pm 17\,\mathrm{mm}$ SLE for the unabated warming pathway RCP8.5 [RCP: Representative Concentration Pathway] and the reduced emissions pathway RCP2.6, respectively (Goelzer and others, 2020). CMIP6 GCMs generally feature a warmer atmosphere, which results in higher mass loss due to increased surface melt (Payne and others, 2021). For the AIS and CMIP5 climate forcings, ISMIP6 found a mass loss in the range of -7.8 to $30.0\,\mathrm{cm}$ SLE under RCP8.5 (Seroussi and others, 2020). The limited number of results for RCP2.6 fall within this range, and so do the results obtained with CMIP6 climate forcings (Payne and others, 2021). This rather unclear picture for the AIS is a consequence of the counteracting effects of mass loss due to ocean warming and mass gain from increased snowfall.

The full suite of ISMIP6 experiments with both CMIP5 and CMIP6 forcings was carried out with the ice-sheet model SICOPOLIS (“SImulation COde for POLythermal Ice Sheets”, www.sicopolis.net), as documented in detail by Greve and others (2020a,b). Chambers and others (2021) extend the ISMIP6 simulations for the AIS with SICOPOLIS until the year 3000, assuming a sustained late-21st-century climate beyond 2100. Compared to the uncertain response projected over the ISMIP6 period, a radically different picture emerges, demonstrating that the consequences of the high-emissions scenario RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5 [SSP: Shared Socioeconomic Pathway] are much greater in the long term even if no further climate trend is applied beyond 2100.

The response of the GIS to longer-term climate change has also been investigated. Vizcaino and others (2015) carried out simulations until 2300 with a coupled ECHAM5.2/MPI-OM/SICOPOLIS model for the pathways RCP2.6, RCP4.5, and a modified RCP8.5 with a $4 \times \mathrm{CO_2}$ limit. More recently, Aschwanden and others (2019) used projections from four CMIP5 GCMs until 2300 for RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, extrapolated until 3000, to force the ice-sheet model PISM. In this study, we transfer the approach by

For Peer Review

Chambers and others (2021) to the GIS. The objective is to assess its long-term response to late-21st-century climatic conditions for the full ensemble of ISMIP6 climate forcings, which consists of fourteen scenarios from ten different CMIP5 and CMIP6 GCMs.

2 METHODS

The main tool used for this study is the ice-sheet model SICOPOLIS. We apply it to the GIS with hybrid shallow-ice–shelfy-stream dynamics (Bernales and others, 2017), a Weertman-Budd-type sliding law tuned separately for 20 different regions (Greve and others, 2020b), and ice thermodynamics treated by the one-layer melting-CTS enthalpy scheme (CTS: cold-temperate transition surface; Blatter and Greve, 2015; Greve and Blatter, 2016). The horizontal resolution is 5 km. In the vertical, we use terrain-following coordinates (sigma transformation) with 81 layers in the ice domain and 41 layers in the thermal lithosphere layer below. The detailed set-up is described by Greve and others (2020b) and shall not be repeated here.

Following the ISMIP6 protocol, climate forcing from 2015 until the end of 2100 has an atmospheric and an oceanic component. The atmospheric forcing consists of the 1960–1989 reference climatology, plus space-time-dependent anomalies for the surface mass balance (SMB), the surface temperature (ST) and their vertical gradients. The oceanic forcing translates ocean thermal forcing (ambient water temperature relative to the freezing point) at the margin of the GIS to prescribed maps for average retreat rates, specified for seven ice–ocean sectors around Greenland. For further details, see Goelzer and others (2020), Nowicki and others (2020), Payne and others (2021), and references therein.

For the period from 2101 until the end of 3000, we extend the simulations in a similar way than Chambers and others (2021) do for the AIS. For every year of this extended period, the atmospheric forcing (SMB, ST, vertical gradients) for the 10-year interval 2091–2100 is randomly sampled such that no further trend is applied, but some inter-annual fluctuations remain (similar to Calov and others, 2018). The oceanic forcing (prescribed retreat maps) does not show any notable year-to-year fluctuations, so we simply keep it fixed at 2100 conditions.

An overview of our extended ISMIP6 experiments is given in Table 1. Twelve experiments are for the 21st-century unabated warming pathway RCP8.5 (CMIP5) / SSP5-8.5 (CMIP6), and two are for the reduced emissions pathway RCP2.6 (CMIP5) / SSP1-2.6 (CMIP6) that is largely in line with the commitments of the Paris Agreement (maintaining the global mean temperature well below a 2°C increase above pre-industrial levels). In two experiments, the impact of different sensitivities of the retreat parameteriza-

For Peer Review

tion due to oceanic forcing (“high” and “low” vs. the normal, “medium” sensitivity) is tested. In addition, a control simulation (“ctrl_proj”) employs constant climate conditions based on a 1960–1989 climatology and no explicit oceanic forcing.

3 RESULTS

The simulated mass change of the GIS, expressed as a sea-level contribution, and ice area are shown in Figure 1. The historical run (“hist”) bridges the gap between our initialization year 1990 and the start date of the projections in January 2015 by employing MIROC5/RCP8.5 SMB and ST forcing (Greve and others, 2020b). Like the regular projections, the projection control run (“ctrl_proj”) starts from January 2015 and runs until the end of 3000. In ctrl_proj, the ice sheet remains nearly stable, showing a slight mass gain of 6.4 mm SLE and area loss of $4.7 \times 10^3\,\mathrm{km}^2$ during the 986 years model time, which is of the order of permilles of the present-day values.

For all future projections, the ice sheet keeps losing both mass and extent over the entire period. The largest rate of change occurs typically around the year 2100, beyond which it slows down to some extent; however, without reaching or coming close to a new steady state. This demonstrates that the committed mass loss due to 21st-century climate change extends way beyond the 21st century and impacts the ice sheet on a much longer time scale. Corroborating the findings for the 21st century (Goelzer and others, 2020; Greve and others, 2020b), the GIS responds much more strongly to the ensemble of RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5 simulations than to the two RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6 simulations. By the year 3000, the mass loss amounts to $1.78 \pm 0.80\,\mathrm{m}$ SLE (mean ± 1-sigma range) for RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5, while it is limited to $0.28 \pm 0.12\,\mathrm{m}$ SLE for RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6. In relative terms, the area loss is similar to that of the mass loss.

The influence of the ice retreat due to oceanic forcing is explored by Exps. 5, 9, 10 (MIROC5/RCP8.5 with “medium”, “high” and “low” sensitivity, respectively). The results are shown by the green lines and green-shaded regions in Figure 1. By 3000, the simulated mass loss is $1.63^{+0.039}_{-0.031}\,\mathrm{m}$ SLE. Thus, the uncertainty due to these three calibrations is very small in the long range. Relative to the uncertainty due to the different climate forcings, it is more pronounced for the 21st century (Greve and others, 2020b). This is because the continued retreat of the ice sheet decreases its contact with the ocean, so that the oceanic forcing plays a smaller role in the longer term.

As reported by Greve and others (2020b) and Payne and others (2021), for both the 21st-century RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5 and RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6 pathways, the CMIP6 climate models produce a larger response

For Peer Review

of the ice sheet than the CMIP5 ones. While the significance of this statement is limited in the case of RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6 (only one experiment each), it is more robust for RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5, where the ensemble contains eight and four experiments forced by CMIP5 and CMIP6 models, respectively. By 3000, the mean mass loss for the four CMIP6 SSP5-8.5 experiments is 2.72 m SLE, and the maximum value from Exp. B4 (CESM2/SSP5-8.5) is as large as 3.54 m SLE, almost 50% of the entire present-day ice mass.

We now discuss in more detail the results of Exp. 5 (MIROC5/RCP8.5), a typical representative for which the mass loss is close to the ensemble average. Figure 2 shows the components of the global mass balance: surface mass balance (SMB), basal mass balance (BMB), calving and ice volume change ($\mathrm{d}V/\mathrm{d}t$) [all counted as positive for mass gain]. On a mean-annual basis, the residual, $\mathrm{Res} = |\mathrm{SMB} + \mathrm{BMB} + \mathrm{Calving} - \mathrm{d}V/\mathrm{d}t|$, is always less than $10^6\,\mathrm{m}^3\,\mathrm{a}^{-1}$. This is five to six orders of magnitude smaller than the typical range of values in the figure, so that the model conserves mass very well. As already discussed above, the ice sheet keeps losing volume ($\propto$ mass) over the entire period, with maximal rates of change occurring around the year 2100. The SMB is initially positive, but changes its sign in the second half of the 21st century and stays negative beyond that. Calving into the surrounding ocean peaks during 2080–2085, when it contributes approximately the same amount to ice volume loss than negative SMB. After that, calving decreases continuously due to ice-sheet retreat from the coast and becomes almost negligible towards the end of the 3rd millennium. BMB is small over the entire model time. The noise of the volume change is due to the noise of the SMB, which reflects the inter-annual variability of the atmospheric forcing.

Figure 3 shows snapshots of the ice thickness and surface velocity for Exp. 5 for the initial year 2015 and the final year 3000. Comparing the thickness distributions demonstrates nicely that the ice sheet retreats from the coast almost all around its perimeter, and contact to the ocean is very limited by the end of the simulation, which entails the low calving rates mentioned above. By contrast, the ice sheet does not suffer much change in its interior parts north of $\sim 68°$N. The large-scale pattern of the ice flow and the organization of the ice sheet into major drainage basins remain largely intact. However, on the regional scale, more pronounced changes occur. The fast-flowing outlet glaciers in south-western Greenland disappear entirely due to the extreme retreat in this area. The north-western outlet glaciers, including Petermann Glacier, also slow down substantially. The central-western Jakobshavn Ice Stream loses its clear delimitation to the surrounding glaciers, but remains an area of fast-flowing ice. The major features in East Greenland, e.g., the North-East Greenland Ice Stream, Kangerdlugssuaq and Helheim glaciers, are less affected and remain well identifiable.

For Peer Review

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The future climate simulations carried out in this study for the GIS over the 3rd millennium confirm and continue the trends that were reported by ISMIP6-Greenland for the 21st century (Goelzer and others, 2020; Greve and others, 2020b; Payne and others, 2021). The response of the ice sheet is mainly governed by a negative SMB due to increased surface melting near the ice margin. Marine-terminating glacier retreat, triggered by increasing oceanic thermal forcing, constitutes a further negative contribution to the total mass balance, but becomes less important in the longer term. Under the unabated warming pathway RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5, this leads to a severe mass loss during the 3rd millennium, while the loss is much smaller under the reduced emissions pathway RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6. Results obtained with forcings from the newer CMIP6 climate models consistently produce larger mass losses than those obtained with the older CMIP5 models, for SSP5-8.5 in the range of a $\sim$ 25–50% loss of the present-day ice mass (and area) by 3000. For comparison, Aschwanden and others (2019) reported a mass loss of $\sim$ 75–100% by 3000 for their ensemble of RCP8.5 simulations, for which a warming trend is assumed to continue until 2500. Efficient climate change mitigation during the next decades is therefore crucial for limiting the contribution of the GIS to long-term sea-level rise.

For Peer Review

Our study is limited to investigating the impact of a sustained late-21st-century climate (without imposing a further trend beyond 2100) on the GIS. However, in reality, climate change will continue beyond 2100 (e.g., Bakker and others, 2016; Lyon and others, 2020). Further, the unidirectional coupling approach (climate model → ice-sheet model) employed by ISMIP6, and thus here, lacks a detailed accounting of feedbacks of the changing ice sheet on the climate. As we explained in Sect. 2, the climate forcing for Greenland includes vertical gradients of the surface mass balance and surface temperature. Therefore, the changing ice-sheet geometry acts back on these climatic forcing fields. However, the linearized approach was derived for small perturbations of the present-day state only, and it cannot be validated for large changes of the ice sheet. This shortcoming becomes more severe in our simulations over almost a millennium compared to the 86-year scope of ISMIP6, adding to the uncertainty of the results.

Therefore, future work in the direction of long-term simulations of ice-sheet response to climate change should aim at employing GCM projections beyond 2100 and improving the representation of feedback processes. The ultimate solution would be to carry out such simulations in a fully coupled way, with the ice-sheet model integrated in the global climate model. This approach has been pursued (e.g., Vizcaino and others, 2015; Gregory and others, 2020); however, fully coupled simulations are demanding and computationally expensive, which makes it difficult to run large ensembles, involving many different climate and ice-sheet models, over long time scales and at adequate resolution. Intermediary, more manageable solutions may consist of involving snapshots of climate-model results combined with more refined parameterizations for the climatic forcing, similar to the approach by Abe-Ouchi and others (2013) for the paleo-glaciation of the Northern Hemisphere.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Jorge Bernales (MARUM Bremen), Reinhard Calov (PIK Potsdam), Takashi Obase (University of Tokyo) and Fuyuki Saito (JAMSTEC Yokohama) for their recent contributions to the development of the SICOPOLIS model, and Ayako Abe-Ouchi for fruitful discussions about ice-sheet and climate modelling. We thank the Climate and Cryosphere (CliC) effort, which provided support for ISMIP6 through sponsoring of workshops, hosting the ISMIP6 website and wiki, and promoting ISMIP6. We acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme, which, through its Working Group on Coupled Modelling, coordinated and promoted CMIP5 and CMIP6. We thank the climate modelling groups for producing their model output and making it available; the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) for archiving the CMIP data and providing access to it; the University at Buffalo for ISMIP6 data distribution and upload; and the multiple funding agencies who support CMIP5, CMIP6, and ESGF. We thank the ISMIP6 steering committee, the ISMIP6 model selection group and ISMIP6 dataset preparation group for their continuous engagement in defining ISMIP6. This is ISMIP6 contribution No. xxx.

Ralf Greve and Christopher Chambers were supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant No. JP17H06323, and by a Leadership Research Grant (Category 2) of Hokkaido University's Institute of Low Temperature Science. Ralf Greve was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. JP17H06104, and by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) through the Arctic Challenge for Sustainability project ArCS II (program grant number JPMXD1420318865).

REFERENCES

Abe-Ouchi A, Saito F, Kawamura K, Raymo ME, Okuno J, Takahashi K and Blatter H (2013) Insolation-driven 100,000-year glacial cycles and hysteresis of ice-sheet volume. *Nature*, **500**(7461), 190–193 (doi: 10.1038/na-

For Peer Review

ture12374)

Aschwanden A, Fahnestock MA, Truffer M, Brinkerhoff DJ, Hock R, Khroulev C, Mottram R and Khan SA (2019) Contribution of the Greenland Ice Sheet to sea level over the next millennium. *Science Advances*, **5**(6), eaav9396 (doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aav9396)

Bakker P, Schmittner A, Lenaerts JTM, Abe-Ouchi A, Bi D, van den Broeke MR, Chan WL, Hu A, Beadling RL, Marsland SJ, Mernild SH, Saenko OA, Swingedouw D, Sullivan A and Yin J (2016) Fate of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation: Strong decline under continued warming and Greenland melting. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **43**, 12252–12260 (doi: 10.1002/2016GL070457)

Bernales J, Rogozhina I, Greve R and Thomas M (2017) Comparison of hybrid schemes for the combination of shallow approximations in numerical simulations of the Antarctic Ice Sheet. *The Cryosphere*, **11**(1), 247–265 (doi: 10.5194/tc-11-247-2017)

Blatter H and Greve R (2015) Comparison and verification of enthalpy schemes for polythermal glaciers and ice sheets with a one-dimensional model. *Polar Science*, **9**(2), 196–207 (doi: 10.1016/j.polar.2015.04.001)

Calov R, Beyer S, Greve R, Beckmann J, Willeit M, Kleiner T, Rückamp M, Humbert A and Ganopolski A (2018) Simulation of the future sea level contribution of Greenland with a new glacial system model. *The Cryosphere*, **12**(10), 3097–3121 (doi: 10.5194/tc-12-3097-2018)

Chambers C, Greve R, Obase T, Saito F and Abe-Ouchi A (2021) Extended ISMIP6 projections for the Antarctic ice sheet with the model SICOPOLIS. *Journal of Glaciology*, submitted (preprint at EarthArXiv, doi: 10.31223/X5CP7C)

Eyring V, Bony S, Meehl GA, Senior CA, Stevens B, Stouffer RJ and Taylor KE (2016) Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization. *Geoscientific Model Development*, **9**(5), 1937–1958 (doi: 10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016)

Goelzer H, Nowicki S, Payne A, Larour E, Seroussi H, Lipscomb WH, Gregory J, Abe-Ouchi A, Shepherd A, Simon E, Agosta C, Alexander P, Aschwanden A, Barthel A, Calov R, Chambers C, Choi Y, Cuzzone J, Dumas C, Edwards T, Felikson D, Fettweis X, Golledge NR, Greve R, Humbert A, Huybrechts P, Le clec'h S, Lee V, Leguy G, Little C, Lowry DP, Morlighem M, Nias I, Quiquet A, Rückamp M, Schlegel NJ, Slater D, Smith R, Straneo F, Tarasov L, van de Wal R and van den Broeke M (2020) The future sea-level contribution of the Greenland ice sheet: a multi-model ensemble study of ISMIP6. *The Cryosphere*, **14**(9), 3071–3096 (doi: 10.5194/tc-14-3071-2020)

Gregory JM, George SE and Smith RS (2020) Large and irreversible future decline of the Greenland ice sheet. *The Cryosphere*, **14**(12), 4299–4322 (doi: 10.5194/tc-14-4299-2020)

For Peer Review

Greve R and Blatter H (2016) Comparison of thermodynamics solvers in the polythermal ice sheet model SICOPOLIS. *Polar Science*, **10**(1), 11–23 (doi: 10.1016/j.polar.2015.12.004)

Greve R, Calov R, Obase T, Saito F, Tsutaki S and Abe-Ouchi A (2020a) ISMIP6 future projections for the Antarctic ice sheet with the model SICOPOLIS. Technical report, Zenodo (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3971232)

Greve R, Chambers C and Calov R (2020b) ISMIP6 future projections for the Greenland ice sheet with the model SICOPOLIS. Technical report, Zenodo (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.3971251)

IPCC (2013) Summary for policymakers. In TF Stocker, D Qin, GK Plattner, M Tignor, SK Allen, J Boschung, A Nauels, Y Xia, V Bex and PM Midgley (eds.), *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, 3–29, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA

Lyon C, Saupe E, Smith C, Hill D, Beckerman A, Stringer L, Marchant R, McKay J, Burke A, O'Higgins P, Dunhill A, Allen B, Riel-Salvatore J and Aze T (2020) Climate change research and action must look beyond 2100. *EarthArXiv* (doi: 10.31223/x5qg7d), preprint

Morlighem M, Williams CN, Rignot E, An L, Arndt JE, Bamber JL, Catania G, Chauché N, Dowdeswell JA, Dorschel B, Fenty I, Hogan K, Howat I, Hubbard A, Jakobsson M, Jordan TM, Kjeldsen KK, Millan R, Mayer L, Mouginot J, Noël BPY, O'Cofaigh C, Palmer S, Rysgaard S, Seroussi H, Siegert MJ, Slabon P, Straneo F, van den Broeke MR, Weinrebe W, Wood M and Zinglersen KB (2017) BedMachine v3: Complete bed topography and ocean bathymetry mapping of Greenland from multibeam echo sounding combined with mass conservation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **44**(21), 11051–11061 (doi: 10.1002/2017GL074954)

Morlighem M, Rignot E, Binder T, Blankenship D, Drews G Rand Eagles, Eisen O, Ferraccioli F, Forsberg R, Fretwell P, Goel V, Greenbaum JS, Gudmundsson H, Guo J, Helm V, Hofstede C, Howat I, Humbert A, Jokat W, Karlsson NB, Lee WS, Matsuoka K, Millan R, Mouginot J, Paden J, Pattyn F, Roberts J, Rosier S, Ruppel A, Seroussi H, Smith EC, Steinhage D, Sun B, van den Broeke MR, van Ommen TD, van Wessem M and Young DA (2020) Deep glacial troughs and stabilizing ridges unveiled beneath the margins of the Antarctic ice sheet. *Nature Geoscience*, **13**(2), 132–137 (doi: 10.1038/s41561-019-0510-8)

Nowicki S, Goelzer H, Seroussi H, Payne AJ, Lipscomb WH, Abe-Ouchi A, Agosta C, Alexander P, Asay-Davis XS, Barthel A, Bracegirdle TJ, Cullather R, Felikson D, Fettweis X, Gregory JM, Hattermann T, Jourdain NC, Kuipers Munneke P, Larour E, Little CM, Morlighem M, Nias I, Shepherd A, Simon E, Slater D, Smith RS, Straneo F, Trusel LD, van den Broeke MR and van de Wal R (2020) Experimental protocol for sea level projections from ISMIP6 stand-alone ice sheet models. *The Cryosphere*, **14**(7), 2331–2368 (doi: 10.5194/tc-14-2331-2020)

For Peer Review

Nowicki SMJ, Payne A, Larour E, Seroussi H, Goelzer H, Lipscomb W, Gregory J, Abe-Ouchi A and Shepherd A (2016) Ice Sheet Model Intercomparison Project (ISMIP6) contribution to CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, **9**(12), 4521–4545 (doi: 10.5194/gmd-9-4521-2016)

Oppenheimer M, Glavovic BC, Hinkel J, van de Wal R, Magnan AK, Abd-Elgawad A, Cai R, Cifuentes-Jara M, DeConto RM, Ghosh T, Hay J, Isla F, Marzeion B, Meyssignac B and Sebesvari Z (2019) Sea level rise and implications for low-lying islands, coasts and communities. In HO Pörtner, DC Roberts, V Masson-Delmotte, P Zhai, M Tignor, E Poloczanska, K Mintenbeck, A Alegría, M Nicolai, A Okem, J Petzold, B Rama and NM Weyer (eds.), *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*, 321–445, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva, Switzerland

Payne AJ, Nowicki S, Abe-Ouchi A, Agosta C, Alexander P, Albrecht T, Asay-Davis X, Aschwanden A, Barthel A, Bracegirdle TJ, Calov R, Chambers C, Choi Y, Cullather R, Cuzzone J, Dumas C, Edwards TL, Felikson D, Fettweis X, Galton-Fenzi BK, Goelzer H, Gladstone R, Golledge NR, Gregory JM, Greve R, Hattermann T, Hoffman MJ, Humbert A, Huybrechts P, Jourdain NC, Kleiner T, Munneke PK, Larour E, Le clec'h S, Lee V, Leguy G, Lipscomb WH, Little CM, Lowry DP, Morlighem M, Nias I, Pattyn F, Pelle T, Price SF, Quiquet A, Reese R, Rückamp M, Schlegel NJ, Seroussi H, Shepherd A, Simon E, Slater D, Smith RS, Straneo F, Sun S, Tarasov L, Trusel LD, Van Breedam J, van de Wal R, van den Broeke M, Winkelmann R, Zhao C, Zhang T and Zwinger T (2021) Future sea level change under CMIP5 and CMIP6 scenarios from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets. *Geophysical Research Letters* (doi: 10.1029/2020GL091741), in press

Seroussi H, Nowicki S, Payne AJ, Goelzer H, Lipscomb WH, Abe-Ouchi A, Agosta C, Albrecht T, Asay-Davis X, Barthel A, Calov R, Cullather R, Dumas C, Galton-Fenzi BK, Gladstone R, Golledge N, Gregory JM, Greve R, Hatterman T, Hoffman MJ, Humbert A, Huybrechts P, Jourdain NC, Kleiner T, Larour E, Leguy GR, Lowry DP, Little CM, Morlighem M, Pattyn F, Pelle T, Price SF, Quiquet A, Reese R, Schlegel NJ, Shepherd A, Simon E, Smith RS, Straneo F, Sun S, Trusel LD, Van Breedam J, van de Wal RSW, Winkelmann R, Zhao C, Zhang T and Zwinger T (2020) ISMIP6 Antarctica: a multi-model ensemble of the Antarctic ice sheet evolution over the 21st century. *The Cryosphere*, **14**(9), 3033–3070 (doi: 10.5194/tc-14-3033-2020)

Vizcaino M, Mikolajewicz U, Ziemen F, Rodehacke CB, Greve R and van den Broeke MR (2015) Coupled simulations of Greenland Ice Sheet and climate change up to A.D. 2300. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **42**(10), 3927–3935 (doi: 10.1002/2014GL061142)

For Peer Review

#	exp_id	Scenario	GCM	Ocean forcing	
5	exp05	RCP8.5	MIROC5	Medium	Core experiments (Tier 1)
6	exp06	RCP8.5	NorESM1-M	Medium	
7	exp07	RCP2.6	MIROC5	Medium	
8	exp08	RCP8.5	HadGEM2-ES	Medium	
9	exp09	RCP8.5	MIROC5	High	
10	exp10	RCP8.5	MIROC5	Low	
A1	expa01	RCP8.5	IPSL-CM5A-MR	Medium	Extended ensemble (Tier 2)
A2	expa02	RCP8.5	CSIRO-Mk3.6.0	Medium	
A3	expa03	RCP8.5	ACCESS1.3	Medium	
B1	expb01	SSP5-8.5	CNRM-CM6-1	Medium	CMIP6 extension (Tier 2)
B2	expb02	SSP1-2.6	CNRM-CM6-1	Medium	
B3	expb03	SSP5-8.5	UKESM1-0-LL	Medium	
B4	expb04	SSP5-8.5	CESM2	Medium	
B5	expb05	SSP5-8.5	CNRM-ESM2-1	Medium	

Table 1. Extended ISMIP6-Greenland Tier-1 and 2 future climate experiments discussed in this study. See Nowicki and others (2020) for references for the GCMs.

For Peer Review



Fig. 1. Extended ISMIP6-Greenland historical run (hist), projection control run (ctrl_proj) and Tier-1 and 2 future climate experiments: (a) Simulated ice mass change (counted positively for loss and expressed as sea-level contribution), (b) ice area. The red and blue boxes to the right show the mean ± 1-sigma ranges for RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5 and RCP2.6/SSP1-2.6, respectively; the whiskers show the corresponding full ranges.



Fig. 2. Main components of the global mass balance for Exp. 5 (MIROC5/RCP8.5): Surface mass balance (SMB, red), basal mass balance (BMB, blue), calving (brown) and ice volume change (dV/dt, green). Note the shifted, right axis for the latter. The black and green dashed lines indicate the zero levels for the left and right axis, respectively.



Fig. 3. Ice thickness (panels a, b) and surface velocity (panels c, d) for the initial time (2015; panels a, c) and final time (3001; panels b, d) of Exp. 5 (MIROC5/RCP8.5).