Limited impact of climate forcing products on future glacier evolution in Scandinavia and Iceland
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Abstract

Due to climate change, worldwide glaciers are rapidly declining. The trend will continue into the future, with consequences for sea level, water availability and tourism. Here, we assess the future evolution of all glaciers in Scandinavia and Iceland until 2100 using the coupled surface mass-balance ice-flow model GloGEMflow. The model is initialised with three distinct past climate data products (E-OBS, ERA-I, ERA-5), while future climate is prescribed by both global and regional climate models (GCMs and RCMs), in order to analyze their impact on glacier evolution. By 2100, we project Scandinavian glaciers to lose between 67 ± 18% and 90 ± 7% of their present-day (2018) volume under a low (RCP2.6) and a high (RCP8.5) emission scenario, respectively. Over the same period, losses for Icelandic glaciers are projected to be between 43 ± 11% (RCP2.6) and 85 ± 7% (RCP8.5). The projected evolution is only little impacted by both the choice of climate data products used in the past and the spatial resolution of the future climate projections, with differences in the ice volume remaining by 2100 of 7 and 5%, respectively. This small sensitivity is attributed to our model calibration strategy that relies on observed glacier-specific mass balances and thus compensates for differences between climate forcing products.

Introduction

Due to climate change, glaciers are expected to lose a substantial fraction of their volume in the coming decades (Marzeion and others, 2012; Radić and Hock, 2014; Huss and Hock, 2015; Kraaijenbrink and others, 2017; Hock and others, 2019; Marzeion and others, 2020; Rounce and others, 2020a). Even though glaciers contain <1% of the ice volume on Earth (here we use the term ‘glaciers’ to refer to all land ice masses separated from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets), their mass loss has been estimated to be a major contributor to 20th century sea-level rise (IPCC, 2019). Moreover, their retreat is anticipated to have severe impacts on water availability (e.g. Kaser and others, 2010; Huss and Hock, 2018; Pritchard, 2019), hydro-power production (e.g. Farinotti and others, 2019b; Schaefl and others, 2019), natural hazards (e.g. Gilbert and others, 2015; Kääb and others, 2018), and tourism (e.g. Fischer and others, 2011; Stewart and others, 2016; Törhallsdóttir and Ólafsson, 2017).

The future evolution of individual Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers has been the focus of a number of local studies, including studies in which the ice flow is treated by flowline models (e.g. Oerlemans, 1997; Laumann and Nesje, 2009a, 2009b), two-dimensional (2-D) (vertically integrated) models (e.g. Flowers and others, 2005; Marshall, 2005; Åkesson and others, 2010; Andreason and Oerlemans, 2009; Åkesson and others, 2010; Aakjeelberget and others, 2011; Laumann and Nesje, 2014; Åkesson and others, 2017) or 3-D models (e.g. Schmidt and others, 2020). Whilst all of these studies agree that glaciers will lose a significant part of their volume in the future, the glacier-specific characteristics determining glacier evolution mean that the findings cannot easily be extrapolated to region-wide projections of glacier changes.

For Scandinavia and Iceland, global-scale models with varying degrees of complexity (e.g. Raper and Braithwaite, 2006; Radić and Hock, 2011; Marzeion and others, 2012; Slangen and others, 2012; Giesen and Oerlemans, 2013; Hirabayashi and others, 2013; Radić and Hock, 2014; Huss and Hock, 2015; Hock and others, 2018; Marzeion and others, 2020) have been used. Most global-scale glacier models, however, do not explicitly account for the effects of ice-flow dynamics or glacier geometry, and none of the related studies calibrated the glaciers’ mass balance with glacier-specific data so far. Similarly, large-scale studies that account for ice dynamics using the Shallow Ice Approximation (SIA) (Hutter, 1983) now exist (Clarke and others, 2015; Maussion and others, 2019; Zekollari and others, 2019), but the future evolution of Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers was never addressed with such a framework. Although recognising that flowline-based models might fail to capture some important
dynamics for ice caps, e.g. such as the temporal migration of ice divides, such simplified approaches are still necessary for regional-scale studies.

Future glacier evolution is strongly governed by the surface mass balance, which is driven by climatic conditions. Climate forcing products, comprising both past climate data products (E-OBS, ERA-I and ERA-5) and future climate projections (RCMs and GCMs), are evolving continuously by offering an increasing spatial resolution or by taking advantage of improved assimilation methods and enhanced parameterisations (Jacob and others, 2014; Stouffer and others, 2017; Sørland and others, 2018; Hersbach and others, 2019). Most often, global glacier modelling studies aim at using the most up-to-date climate forcing product of their time. This makes individual studies differ in terms of climate forcing, which makes it difficult to directly compare the results of individual models (Hock and others, 2019). And since glacier evolution is directly driven by climate, it is crucial to know how various climate forcing products affect modelled glacier response. In this paper, we model the future evolution of all Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers (Fig. 1) using the Global Glacier Evolution Model with an ice-flow component (GloGEMflow, Zekollari and others, 2019), introduce a new glacier-specific geometry initialisation procedure, and quantify the effect that different climate forcing products have on the modelled glacier evolution. The surface mass-balance model is calibrated with observations of glacier-specific geoidic ice volume changes (Zemp and others, 2019), and the results are validated against an extensive set of independent data including ice-flow velocities retrieved from remote sensing (Gardner and others, 2019; Nagy and Andraassen, 2019), length-change observations (WGMS, 2019) and in-situ mass balances that were acquired with the glaciological method (WGMS, 2019).

Although ca. 95% of the ice volume in Iceland is found in ice caps, which would be better treated by explicit 3D modelling, Scandinavia and Iceland are chosen because extensive observational data document their recent glacier changes, the two regions have substantially different glacier characteristics (i.e. glacier volume, area, ice thickness etc.; see Fig. 1), and the share of debris-covered glaciers is small (3.4% for Scandinavian and 2.9% for Icelandic glaciers, Scherler and others, 2018). The latter simplifies the relation between climate forcing and glacier response (Kraaijenbrink and others, 2017), making the results easier to interpret. Furthermore, detailed climate forcing products exist for both past and future. A gridded observational data set (E-OBS) as well as an ensemble of high-resolution regional climate models (RCMs) simulations (EURO-CORDEX) exist for the two regions, thus providing the means of a detailed assessment of their influence. More specifically, we consider E-OBS and two re-analysis products (ERA-I and ERA-5) for the period 1979–2018 (1950–2018 for E-OBS), and use both high-resolution RCM from EURO-CORDEX (Jacob and others, 2014) and global circulation models (GCMs) included in the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) for the period 2018–2100. These climate forcing products are consistent with what was used in several large-scale glacier-evolution studies (e.g. Anderson and Mackintosh, 2012; Giesen and Oerlemans, 2013; RADIć and others, 2014; Huss and Hock, 2015; Kraaijenbrink and others, 2017; Sakai and Fujita, 2017; Farinotti and others, 2019b; Schaefer and others, 2019; Zekollari and others, 2019; Marzeion and others, 2020; Rounce and others, 2020a), thus allowing for our results to be compared. The ensemble of products also allows us to assess the differences in modelled future glacier evolution caused by the choice of climate product versions (ERA-5 versus ERA-I) and origins (observational versus reanalysis data).

**Data**

Our study focuses on all 3411 glaciers in Scandinavia (3143 in Norway and 268 in Sweden) and all 568 glaciers in Iceland included in the Randolph Glacier Inventory version 6 (RGI 6.0; RGI Consortium, 2017, Fig. 1). The RGI is a globally complete inventory of glacier outlines, typically dating from the early 21st century (1999–2006 for Scandinavia, and 1999–2004 for Iceland; see Table S1). For Scandinavia, those data are taken from various regional sources (e.g. Andraassen and others, 2008; Paul and Andraassen, 2009; Paul and others, 2011). All three studies used LANDSAT Thematic Mapper scenes but refer to different points in time and different regions: Andraassen and others (2008) used a scene from 2003 to map 417 glaciers in the Jotunheimen and Breheimen regions (Southern Norway); Paul and Andraassen (2009) used scenes from 1999 to map 489 glaciers in the Svaltisen region (Northern Norway); and Paul and others (2011) used a scene from 2006 to map 1450 glaciers in the Jostedalsbreen region (Southern Norway). For Iceland, majority of the outlines were extracted from 1999–2004 ASTER and SPOT5 imagery (Sigurðsson and others, 2014).

The glacier ice thickness derivation is derived from the consensus estimate by Farinotti and others (2019a), which is a multi-model ensemble providing estimates for all glaciers within the RGI 6.0. For each glacier, both the glacier geometry and the ice thickness are aggregated to surface elevation bands of 10 m (Huss and Hock, 2015). All tributary glaciers are included in a given elevation band, i.e. they are not treated separately.

For forcing the model in the past (1950–2018 for E-OBS; 1979–2018 for ERA), we use monthly 2-m air temperature and total precipitation from (i) the ensemble daily gridded observational dataset (E-OBS) v.19.0 (Cornes and others, 2018), (ii) the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Interim re-analysis (ERA-Interim, hereafter referred to as ERA-I) (Dee and others, 2011) and (iii) ERA-5 (Hersbach and others, 2019). The three climate data products for the past (Fig. 2) have a different time coverage and spatial resolution, as given in Table 1. For the future (2018–2100), we use monthly outputs from both CMIP5 GCMs (70 model members), and EURO-CORDEX RCMs (51 model members) (Jacob and others, 2014; Kotlarski and others, 2014, Table 1). GCM and RCM simulations are driven with different Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5). RCP2.6 is a scenario implying stringent greenhouse gas mitigation, RCP8.5 is a scenario without reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and RCP4.5 is an intermediate scenario (IPCC, 2013). We modelled all glaciers based on 70 GCMs, 51 RCMs and for three climate data products each, i.e. the evolution of every glacier was simulated 363 times.

To merge the past and future monthly series of air temperature and precipitation, a de-biasing scheme is applied (Huss and Hock, 2015). The scheme aims at avoiding sudden change between past climate data products (E-OBS, ERA-I and ERA-5) and future climate projections (GCM, RCM), and ensures consistency of the climatic forcing over time. In the first step, the additive (temperature) and multiplicative (precipitation) monthly biases between the past and future climate projections are calculated over the time period 1980–2010, which is the period covered by both past climate products and future projections. These biases are then superimposed on the future climate projections, thus assuming the biases to remain constant in time. In the second step, consistency in the interannual variability of temperature is ensured. This is done in a two-step procedure. First, the standard deviation of the time series is calculated for each month (m) of both the past climate product ($\sigma_{m}$) and the future climate projection ($\sigma_{m}$). Note that also the future climate projections have data of the past. Then, the
interannual temperature variability of the future climate projection $T_{m,t}$ is corrected as:

$$T_{m,t,\text{corr}} = T_{m,25} + (T_{m,t} - T_{m,25})(\sigma_{p,m} - \sigma_{f,m}),$$

(1)

where $T_{m,25}$ is the mean temperature in a 25-year period around $t$ (see Huss and Hock, 2015, for more details). This procedure yields a continuous and homogeneous time-series spanning from 1950/79 to 2100. By applying this approach whilst using the high spatial resolution offered by the past climate products as reference, moreover, the GCMs are downscaled to this finer horizontal resolution. In particular, the information on small-scale spatial climate variability provided by the past climate products is transferred to the GCMs.

For model calibration, we rely on a comprehensive data set of geodetic mass balances that cover both the Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers (Zemp and others, 2019). We rely on all entries provided by the World Glacier Monitoring Service (WGMS) data base (WGMS, 2019), which is a collection of worldwide mass-balance observations. The database was substantially expanded recently, when >10,000 glacier-specific elevation change measurements for Scandinavia and Iceland were included. These measurements often include multiple time periods per glacier, and are derived from photogrammetrical evaluation of Advanced
Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER) imagery (Girod and others, 2017; Zemp and others, 2019). When multiple geodetic mass change estimates are available for the same glacier, the information on annual mass-balance variability provided from glaciological observations is used to align the estimates during the period 2003–2014 (i.e. the period covered by most observations) and the estimates are then averaged (see Zemp and others, 2019, for details). This allows to obtain geodetic volume changes for 70% (2064 km²) of the total glacier area of Scandinavia and 79% (8737 km²) of the total glacier area of Iceland. For glaciers with no observations, data from a nearby glacier is chosen. This is done by selecting the glacier that minimises the metric $P = d^2(A)/A_0$, where $d$ is the horizontal distance between the two glaciers (in km), $A_0$ is the area in difference between the two glaciers and $A_k$ is the area (in km²) of the glacier with no observation (Zekollari and others, 2019). This approach aims at accounting for both climate patterns (by considering the distance between glaciers) and glacier characteristics (by considering the glacier area).

### Methods

GloGEMflow is a combined mass-balance and ice-flow model. In the first step, the mass balance of each glacier is calculated (Huss and Hock, 2015). In the second step, the glacier’s ice flow is modelled with a 1-D model (details follow below). The glacier geometry is divided into elevation bands, where the glacier cross-section within each elevation band is parameterised by using an isosceles trapezoid with 45° base angles (see Zekollari and others, 2019, for details). The limited influence of the base angles on the glacier evolution was shown in the same publication, whilst a discussion of the applicability of the assumption to ice caps follows in discussion section.

#### Mass-balance model

In the surface mass-balance model, accumulation is determined by solid precipitation, which is distinguished from liquid precipitation based on the temperature: all precipitation occurring at the temperatures below 0.5°C (above 2.5°C) is considered to be solid (liquid), with a linear transition in between. The precipitation given by the input climate forcing product for the grid cell closest to the glacier is distributed across the glacier surface with a rate of 1.5% for each 100 m of elevation gain. This elevation gradient is chosen such as to maximise the agreement with the WGMS accumulation data (WGMS, 2019). Ablation is computed by using a temperature-index melt model (Hock, 2003) and assuming that melt occurs at days where temperature is above 0°C. Ice, firn and snow are discerned by using different degree-day factors (DDFs), with a ratio of 2 between the DDF for ice and the DDF for snow, and a ratio of 1.5 between the DDF for ice and the DDF for firn (see Discussion for an analysis of these ratios). For E-OBS, which provides 2-m air temperature, the temperature lapse rate is determined from the relation between temperature and elevation for all grid cells within a radius of 50 km of the glacier. For ERA-I and ERA-5, providing monthly temperature fields at various geopotential heights, the temperature lapse rate is obtained by determining the average rate of temperature change with elevation for each grid cell. In both cases, the lapse rates are derived at a monthly resolution (i.e. at the time resolution of the past climate product), and are kept constant to ensure consistency when transitioning from past to future climatic conditions. For Scandinavia, the procedure results in yearly mean lapse rates of $-0.59 \pm 0.09, -0.54 \pm 0.04$ and $-0.54 \pm 0.04°C (100 m)^{-1}$ for E-OBS, ERA-I and ERA-5, respectively. For Iceland, the corresponding lapse rates are of $-0.62 \pm 0.08, -0.57 \pm 0.04$ and $-0.56 \pm 0.03°C (100 m)^{-1}$. Refreezing of melt water and liquid precipitation in the first 10 m of snow/firn/ice below the surface is computed based on temperatures of the sub-surface as estimated from heat conduction (see Huss and Hock, 2015, for details). However, the refreezing contribution to overall accumulation is very small (<1% for both regions). Following Huss and Hock (2015), frontal ablation of glaciers with bedrock elevation below sea-level glaciers is accounted for by adopting an adapted version of the approach by Oerlemans and Nick (2005). Frontal ablation is modelled as a function of the water depth, the slope of the glacier within 100 m of elevation from the calving front, and the height and width of the calving front (see Huss and Hock, 2015, for more details). Frontal ablation of lake-terminating glaciers (i.e. above the sea level) was not accounted for, due to uncertainties related to existing and future lake geometries. Note that among all the glaciers that were modelled in this study, only seven Icelandic glaciers have bedrock elevations reaching below present-day sea level. Therefore, frontal ablation was only modelled for these seven glaciers. For the period 1990–2020, we estimate that frontal ablation contributed to ~3.5% of the total ablation of these glaciers (see Fig. S2). In the near future (2025–50), this rate is anticipated to locally increase to up to 20%. This is due to the retrograde bedrock slopes that cause increasing water depths at the calving fronts as glaciers retreat further. After ~2050, however, the glaciers will have retreated out of the deepest bedrock sections, thus resulting in a reduction and, eventually, cessation of calving. This temporal evolution is consistent with results obtained from local studies (Björnsson and others, 2001; Jóhannesson and others, 2020).

To account for the actual sensitivity of each glacier to climate (Rounce and others, 2020b), a glacier-specific calibration of the mass-balance model is needed (Fig. 3). For each glacier, the precipitation correction factor (first step), the degree-day factor (second step) and the air temperature (third step) are adjusted, until the difference between modelled and observed geodetic mass balance is within ±0.1 m w.e. a⁻¹ (see Fig. 3). The second and the third steps, respectively, are only required when no agreement is found during the first step. In the first step, the precipitation is multiplied by an enhancement factor, which is varied between 0.8 and 2.0 for Scandinavia, and between 1.8 and 3.0 for Iceland (for consistency, the same factors as in Huss and Hock, 2015, were used). This factor is meant to account for the local-scale precipitation patterns that are not captured by the climate forcing products, as well as for snow drift and avalanches (e.g. Machguth and others, 2006; Helfricht and others, 2015). For each glacier, the precipitation enhancement factor is chosen to minimise the misfit with annual mass balance over the period covered by geodetic surveys. In this case, the $DDF_{snow}$ is generally set to 3 mm w.e. d⁻¹ K⁻¹. If the misfit exceeds the ±0.1 m w.e. a⁻¹ threshold, the precipitation enhancement factor is fixed at either the maximum or the minimum of the permitted range and, in the second step, $DDF_{snow}$ is adjusted to minimise the misfit. To do so, $DDF_{snow}$ is varied between 1.75 and 4.50 mm d⁻¹ K⁻¹, corresponding to the literature values Hock (2003). If at this stage the

---

**Table 1.** Climate forcing products used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data set</th>
<th>Spatial cov.</th>
<th>Time cov.</th>
<th>Spatial res.</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-OBS Europe</td>
<td>1950–2018</td>
<td>0.1°</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA-I Global</td>
<td>1979–2018</td>
<td>0.75°</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA-5 Global</td>
<td>1979–2018</td>
<td>0.30°</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCM Global</td>
<td>1850–2100</td>
<td>1.1–2.8°</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCM Europe</td>
<td>1950–2010</td>
<td>0.11°</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GCMs have different spatial resolutions. ‘cov.’ stands for ‘coverage’. ‘Members’ indicates the number of model realisations per data set.
difference between modelled and observed mass balance is still larger than ±0.1 m w.e. a⁻¹, the mass balance at the glacier-site cannot be modelled with a realistic parameter range. This indicates a bias in the local or regional climatic conditions, i.e. that the latter are inconsistent with the observed glacier changes. Hence, the third step adjusts the temperature until an agreement between observed and modelled glacier mass balance is reached. The results of this glacier-specific calibration are summarised in Supplementary Table S2.

Ice-flow model

We model ice flow explicitly for all glaciers with an area larger than 1 km² in the RGI. This corresponds to 93.4 and 99.9% of the ice volume for the Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers, respectively. For the remaining glaciers, the geometry evolution is modelled using the Shallow-Ice Approximation (SIA) (Hutter, 1983) along the elevation-dependent parameterisation (Huss and others, 2010), in which local ice thickness changes are imposed based on an elevation-dependent parameterisation (this corresponds to the original version of GloGEM by Huss and Hock, 2015). We thus assume that ice flow plays only a secondary role for the geometry evolution of glaciers smaller than 1 km².

For glaciers larger than 1 km² ice flow is modelled by applying the Shallow-Ice Approximation (SIA) (Hutter, 1983) along the previously-defined elevation bands (see Data section). Ice flux is expressed through a diffusivity equation whilst the continuity equation for ice thickness is used to calculate the glaciers’ temporal evolution. The model has been described in detail in Zekollari and others (2019), where details on time stepping, spatial discretisation, and model implementation can be found. Using this method, the ice flow depends on a deformation-sliding factor, which accounts for both ice deformation and basal sliding (again, see Zekollari and others, 2019, for details). We thus follow the method of Zekollari and others (2019) in which the components are treated together. The argument is that both deformation and sliding are strongly linked to the local ice thickness and surface slope, thus resulting in similar spatial patterns (e.g. Zekollari and others, 2013). The same approach has been used in various studies (e.g. Gudmundsson, 1999; Clarke and others, 2015).

To initialise the model, an iterative procedure is used to generate a glacier-specific, transient state referring to the glaciers’ inventory date. In the procedure, the model is first forced with a constant climate until the glacier reaches a steady-state geometry. The constant climate corresponds to a mean climate over a time period $\Delta t$, which is chosen for the cumulative glacier mass balance over this period to be close to zero (see text in Supplementary Material S1 for the details of this procedure). For this period, the glacier mass balance is computed using the calibrated mass-balance model. After that, starting from this initial steady-state geometry, a transient simulation with E-OBS, ERA-I or ERA-5 data is performed for half of the glacier’s response time ($t_r$) from $t_i - t_r/2$ on until $t_i$, where $t_i$ is the date of the glacier inventory for the glacier (see Fig. S1). After that, resulting glacier volume and length are compared to observations. In order to match the glacier volume and length at the inventory date, the deformation-sliding factor and the geometry of the initial steady-state glacier are modified, respectively. The geometry of the initial steady state is modified by adding a mass-balance bias on the top of the constant climate which is used to reach a steady-state geometry (through an ELA perturbation). As the time interval between the steady-state geometry and the transient geometry is relatively limited (corresponding to half of the glacier response time), the steady-state geometry directly affects the geometry at the inventory date (and its length). This two-step calibration procedure is repeated iteratively until the observations are matched (difference below 1%). Supplementary Chapter S1 offers more details on this initialisation procedure.

Evaluation of model performance

The model performance is evaluated against a comprehensive set of independent data, including surface mass balances (seasonal glacier-wide observations and measurements specified for elevation bands), glacier length changes, as well as in-situ and satellite-based observations of the surface flow speed. As performance metrics, we use the bias (i.e. the difference between observations and modelled results), the root-mean-square error (RMSE), the coefficients of determination ($r^2$) and the mean absolute deviation divided by the standard deviation. The latter (we call it MASD) is a relative metric providing information on how the average model misfit compares against the typical variability of the observational data. A MASD value of ‘1’, thus, indicates that the average misfit is as large as the data’s intrinsic variability. If not stated otherwise, the values provided in the following subsections and in Table 2 refer to an average over all glaciers and over the three past climate data products (E-OBS, ERA-I, ERA-5) that are used to drive the model simulations in the past.

Past climate forcing data

To evaluate the effect that the different past climate data products have on model performance, a ranking system is used. First, the system individually ranks the model performance as quantified by the six indicators mentioned above (i.e. winter, annual and elevation-band mass balance; length change; maximal and mean flow velocity) based on the four considered metrics (i.e. bias, RMSE, $r^2$ and MASD). This gives rise to $6^4 = 24$ individual rankings in which the three past climate data products are ranked. The average rank is then used to characterise the average performance of each past climate data product. When combining all indicators, the best model performance for Scandinavia is achieved when ERA-5 is used as past climatic driver. In our ranking system, the past climate data product achieves an average rank of 1.6, whilst ERA-I and E-OBS have an average rank of 2.0 and 2.3, respectively. For Iceland, instead, the best results are obtained with ERA-I (average rank = 1.4), followed by ERA-5 and E-OBS (average ranks of 2.1 and 2.4, respectively). Even if this would suggest that those datasets show better results compared to the others, the ranking system does not take into consideration that the difference is often small. Therefore, affirming that one dataset absolutely gives better results, is a too hard statement.
Table 2. Evaluation of model performance against various observations including surface mass balance, length changes and ice-flow velocity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\bar{B}_s$</th>
<th>$\bar{B}_w$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>E-OBS</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERA-1</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERA-5</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>E-OBS</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERA-1</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERA-5</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | $n$ | Bias | RMSE | $r^2$ | MADS | $n$ | Bias | RMSE | $r^2$ | MADS | Bias | RMSE | $r^2$ | MADS |
| Length change   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Scandinavia    | E-OBS | 125 | -0.57 | 120.9 | 0.15 | 1.23 | 6 | 3.7 | 53.4 | 0.80 | 0.42 | 9.4 | 15.2 | 0.59 | 0.50 | 2.3 |
|                | ERA-1 | 107 | -59.2 | 129.8 | 0.34 | 0.98 | 6 | 9.18 | 45.4 | 0.82 | 0.42 | 10.5 | 15.7 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 2.0 |
|                | ERA-5 | 107 | -60.4 | 129.8 | 0.42 | 0.86 | 6 | 8.0 | 49.7 | 0.81 | 0.44 | 10.3 | 17.5 | 0.58 | 0.51 | 1.6 |
| Iceland        | E-OBS | 96 | 130.9 | 317.9 | 0.37 | 0.60 | 27 | 24.2 | 66.6 | 0.88 | 0.40 | -14.9 | 22.9 | 0.76 | 0.52 | 2.4 |
|                | ERA-1 | 82 | 49.8 | 233.0 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 27 | 21.8 | 51.8 | 0.90 | 0.29 | -17.7 | 27.4 | 0.70 | 0.54 | 1.4 |
|                | ERA-5 | 82 | 109.0 | 301.5 | 0.49 | 0.54 | 27 | 10.2 | 57.1 | 0.82 | 0.26 | -28.8 | 44.2 | 0.71 | 0.60 | 2.1 |

For every data set, the number of samples $n$, the bias, the RMSE, $r^2$ and the MADS is given. The bias is computed as the average difference between observations and model results. $\bar{B}_s$ and $\bar{B}_w$ are annual and winter glacier-wide surface mass balances, respectively. For Iceland, no information on elevation band surface mass balance is available. ‘Max velocity diff’ compares the 99th quantile of the observed and modelled velocities. ‘MB’ stands for the mass balance. The ranking is used to determine which of the past climate data products results in the best agreement between observations and modelling (best agreement = rank 1; worst agreement = rank 3).

**Surface mass balance**

The modelled mass balances are evaluated against independent in-situ surface mass-balance observations. We use all observations included in the WGMS database (WGMS, 2019), which itself comprises data from a number of regional sources (NVE, 1964-2019; Björnsson and others, 1998, 2002; Sigurðsson and others, 2007; Pálsson and others, 2012; Björnsson and others, 2013; Andreaussen and others, 2016; Kjöllmoen, 2017; Andreaussen and others, 2020; Jóhannesson and others, 2020). In total, WGMS provides glacier-wide surface mass balances available for 62 Scandinavian and 16 Icelandic glaciers, and elevation-band mass balances for 37 Scandinavian glaciers.

The modelled surface mass balance of the Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers is generally in good agreement with observations (Fig. 4 and Table 2). In total, the MODIS-based mass balance of the study area is in good agreement with observations (1.61 m w.e. a$^{-1}$ on average), with a bias of only −0.09 m w.e. a$^{-1}$.

**Length change**

As for surface mass balance, the model’s ability to reproduce glacier length changes is assessed against observations provided by the WGMS (WGMS, 2019). We use length-change observations for the period 1996–2016 (period where all glacier were transi-tionally modelled). For each glacier with observations, comparisons are performed over time frames ranging between 10 and 15 years (Fig. 5). The time-frame length is chosen such that both modelled and observed geometry changes are statistically relevant and is meant to increase the number of comparisons (since not every glacier has an observation every year).

The observed overall trend in negative length changes is well reproduced, albeit with a large spread in the values for individual glaciers (Fig. 5). The average RMSE is 127 m for Scandinavia and 281 m for Iceland, with an average bias of −59 and +97 m, respectively (equivalent to 37 and 30% of the average length change observed in the two regions). These biases in length changes indicate a slight underestimation of glacier retreat for Scandinavia and a tendency to somewhat overestimate the retreat for Iceland. The corresponding $r^2$ values are 0.30 and 0.45. The MADS is 1.02 for Scandinavia and 0.55 for Iceland, indicating better model performance for the latter region. Some particularly large outliers occur both in term of length change overestimation and underestimation. For some larger glaciers, in Iceland, the chosen horizontal model resolution, defined as 1/100th of the glacier length, is relatively coarse (i.e. between 200 and 500 m), and might in part explain the mismatch between observed and modelled length changes (dashed grey rectangle in Fig. 5).

**Ice flow velocities**

Modelled velocities are evaluated against velocity data retrieved from remote sensing. For Scandinavia, such data have been...

![Image](https://www.cambridge.org/core)
extracted from optical Sentinel-2 imagery over the period 2015–18 (Nagy and Andreassen, 2019). The observational data are based on feature-tracking algorithms, and are therefore only available for snow-free surfaces. Thus, we perform our comparisons only for glacier ablation areas.

For Icelandic glaciers, measured velocities are available from NASA’s MEaSUREs ITS_LIVE project (Gardner and others, 2019). Here, we use the 120 m resolution composite data set, which covers the 1985–2018 time period.

Modelled surface velocities are compared to velocities derived from remote sensing at the glacier-scale by considering the 99% quantile and the mean modelled velocities (Fig. 6). For Scandinavia (Iceland), comparisons are only performed for glaciers with at least 150 (5000) observation points (i.e. ‘pixels’). This is to avoid underrepresentation of observed velocities. These thresholds are arbitrary and are meant to be a compromise between the requirements dictated by glacier area, grid spacing, data coverage and quality, so that only glaciers with sufficient data are used.

The results of the comparison show that, despite not being calibrated to velocity observations, our model is able to reproduce the observed surface velocities relatively well: considering the 99% quantile velocities, the RMSE is 49 m a\(^{-1}\) for Scandinavia and 59 m a\(^{-1}\) for Iceland. The bias for the two regions, is of 7 and 12 m a\(^{-1}\), respectively, whilst the corresponding \(r^2\) are of 0.81 and 0.84. MASD = 0.55 for Scandinavia and MASD = 0.32 for Iceland. Note that the average of the 99% quantile observed velocity is 73 m a\(^{-1}\) for Scandinavia and 140 m a\(^{-1}\) for Iceland.

Considering the mean velocities, the RMSE is 16 m a\(^{-1}\) for Scandinavia and 31 m a\(^{-1}\) for Iceland. The bias for the two regions, is 10 and -20 m a\(^{-1}\), respectively, whilst the corresponding \(r^2\) are of 0.57 and 0.72. MASD = 0.75 for Scandinavia and MASD = 0.55 for Iceland. When considering that the average of the observed velocities is 40 m a\(^{-1}\) for Scandinavia and 29 m a\(^{-1}\) for Iceland, the performance is rated as satisfactory.

In addition to the velocity data retrieved from remote sensing, we compare the model results to in-situ velocities data obtained from repeated stake measurements. Such data exist for 14 Scandinavian glaciers (including Nigardsbreen, used here as an example) and Hagafellsjökull (eastern Iceland) (Fig. 7). For Nigardsbreen, the RMSE is 12 m a\(^{-1}\), with a bias of 5 m a\(^{-1}\). For one stake (at a distance 9.5 km from the glacier’s terminus) the surface flow speed is considerably underestimated. The glacier is ∼3 km wide at this location and part of the discrepancy may thus be related to the location perpendicular to the ice flow of the observation, which may not be representative for the velocity derived with our 1-D setup. Considering all 137 point velocities available for the 14 Scandinavian glaciers (mean velocity 19 m a\(^{-1}\)) in Nagy and Andreassen (2019), the averaged RMSE is 16 m a\(^{-1}\) and the bias of 11 m a\(^{-1}\).

For Hagafellsjökull, the RMSE between modelled and observed velocity is 11 m a\(^{-1}\), with a bias of 10 m a\(^{-1}\). This is ∼30% of the mean velocity derived from the two available stake measurements.
the area is about 4 times smaller (Farinotti and others, 2019a; RGI Consortium, 2017). This implies a strong difference in mean ice thickness, which in turn results in different response times (Figs S4, S5), see Zekollari and others (2020) for more details.

Glacier evolution in selected subregions

To further investigate spatial differences in glacier response, Scandinavia and Iceland are subdivided into subregions (Fig. 1). For Scandinavia, we rely on the three GTN-G second-order regions (GTN-G, 2017). Subregion 1 in the north and subregion 2 in the south-west have a generally higher winter precipitation compared to subregion 3 in the south-east (Fig. S6). The former two subregions are influenced by a more maritime climate, the variations of which are mainly controlled by the strength of the westerly and by the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) (Laumann and Nesje, 2014). Instead, the winter precipitation in subregion 3 is strongly connected to low pressure systems, which bring moist air to the eastern side of the Scandinavian mountains (Nesje and others, 2008).

For Iceland, the RGI does not provide any subdivision, and we therefore divide the region based on the main climatic pattern. In winter, precipitation prevalently arrives with southerly winds (Björnsson and Pálsson, 2008). As a consequence, SW Iceland has a higher average winter precipitation compared to the NE (Fig. S7). We chose to subdivide Iceland into two subregions: subregion 2 covers the NE (>65N, >21W, while subregion 1 covers the rest of Iceland (<65N, <21W, see Fig 1).

For Scandinavia, a clearly distinct glacier evolution occurs for the three subregions: compared to 2018 and under RCP2.6, the ice volume fraction lost by 2100 in subregions 1, 2 and 3 is expected to be 63 ± 19%, 56 ± 20% and 86 ± 13%, respectively (Fig. 9). The differences between the regions are less pronounced under RCP8.5, as here all regions become largely ice-free by the end of the century. Beyond the different glacier hypsometries (Figs 1, S4 and S5), the difference in the future glacier evolution for the subregions can in part also be attributed to the precipitation patterns during the last decades. Indeed, winter precipitation in Scandinavia’s west (subregions 1 and 2) was more above normal than it was in the inland regions (subregion 3) (Laumann and Nesje, 2014). The above-average precipitation started in the 1960s has been attributed to strong westerlies and a positive
phase of the NAO index (Laumann and Nesje, 2014). This effect is clearly visible in the E-OBS data set (Fig. S6), where the average precipitation over glacierised areas in subregion 2 increased by $\sim 0.1 \text{ m month}^{-1}$ between 1950–70 and 1990–2010. On the contrary, both subregions 1 and 3 showed a lower increase of around $0.06 \text{ m month}^{-1}$.

Also for Iceland, a contrasting behaviour is modelled for the two subregions. Here, the difference in future evolution is mainly driven by the different glacier characteristics (subregion 1 comprises all major Icelandic ice caps, while subregion 2 mainly features small valley glaciers), which influences glaciers responses (Belart and others, 2020), and by the climatic conditions which show higher precipitation for subregion 1 than for subregion 2 (Fig. S7). The different glacier characteristics are most prominent when comparing the average glacier size: despite the similar number of glaciers in subregions 1 and 2 (333 versus 235), the area (10,875 and 148 km²) and volume (3580 and 6 km³) at the inventory year are strongly contrasting. Similar is true for the elevation ranges and the mean ice thickness, with the latter diverging by a factor of about ten between the two regions (Figs 1, S4 and S5). These diverging characteristics also influence the glaciers’ response time to climate variations (Belart and others, 2020), and are reflected in the projected future evolution. For subregion 1, ice volume losses of 41 ± 11% (RCP2.6), 60 ± 12% (RCP4.5)

Fig. 8. Future evolution of (a) Nigardsbreen (Scandinavia), (b) Skeiðarárjökull (Iceland), (c) Storglaciären (Scandinavia) and (d) Þjórsárjökull (Iceland). The 2000–2100 evolution is shown as the average of all RCP4.5 model members using E-OBS for the past and RCMs for the future.

Fig. 9. Modelled volume evolution of all glaciers in (a) Scandinavia and (c) Iceland. For every RCP, the thick line represents the mean using all past climate data products and RCM as future climate projection. The transparent bands correspond to the standard deviation of all climate model members. The modelled ice volume fraction that remains in the subregions by 2100 is shown in panels b and d. The percentages are relative to the volume in 2018. The black continuous lines in (a and c), and the black squares in (b and d), represent the committed loss under 1998–2018 climatic conditions. Note that there is one such line and square for each past climate data products.
...and 85 ± 7% (RCP8.5) are modelled between 2018 and the end of the century. For subregion 2, instead, the losses are of 79 ± 19% (RCP2.6), 89 ± 9% (RCP4.5) and 95 ± 3% (RCP8.5), i.e. significantly higher than for subregion 1.

It is also important to note that the strong presence of ice caps in subregion 1 might pose a challenge for the 1-D-setup of our ice-flow model. In particular, the interplay between an ice cap’s neighbouring outlet glacier cannot be captured. Comparison to more specific studies based on full 3-D modelling (see Discussion Section) shows that for ice caps our projections for future volume loss are at the upper end of the spectrum.

**Impact of climate forcing products on future glacier evolution**

The climate described by the past climate data products varies significantly. This is particularly true for winter precipitation (Fig. 2). For Scandinavian glaciers, for instance, the E-OBS 1979–2018 average winter precipitation (1 October–30 April) is 23% lower compared to ERA-I and ERA-5 (the two ERA data sets have roughly the same values). For Icelandic glaciers, instead, the ERA-5 winter precipitation shows 45% higher precipitation than for E-OBS and ERA-I (showing roughly the same values, Fig. 2d). Summer temperatures (1 May – 30 September) on both Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers are more consistent, with a standard deviation of the temperature between the three data sets of 0.39 °C for the period 1979–2018. It is important to note that, due to our calibration procedure, these contrasting precipitation and temperature patterns do not directly affect the computed glacier mass balances. Indeed, fitting of the model parameters to the glacier-specific observations allows for the climate conditions extracted from the relatively coarse-scale past climate data products to be adjusted to the mass changes measured in situ. Yet, the past climate data products affect the evolution of glaciers through (1) its climatic forcing before 2018, which influences the past glacier evolution, and (2) the de-biasing procedure, which adjusts the future climate projections (see Data section).

Fig. 10 shows how Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers are modelled to evolve in the future when different climate forcing products are used as forcing. For both regions and all RCPs, model runs calibrated using E-OBS shows stronger ice volume loss by the end of the 21st century than model runs calibrated with ERA-I or ERA-5, which shows similar volume losses. On average for Scandinavia and Iceland, the differences are of 9.2, 7.7 and 4.5% for RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, respectively. These differences can be attributed to differing temperature and precipitation changes between the calibration period 2003–14 and the future (Fig. S8).

Whilst the past climate data products affect model calibration, the future climate projections directly influence the modelled glacier evolution by determining the future forcing (Fig. 10). GCMs generally show a higher ice volume loss by 2100 compared to RCMs, with differences of 8.7, 2.6 and –4.5% for RCP2.6, RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, respectively (numbers refer to the average over Scandinavia and Iceland). The differences can be attributed to diverging temperature and precipitation projections. Indeed, even if GCMs produce a stronger winter precipitation increase compared to RCMs, they also show a higher summer temperature increase resulting in more negative glacier balances (Fig. S8).

It must be noted, however, that the spread caused by the combination of different climate forcing products is small when compared to the spread between individual model members of the same climate data set (see Fig. 10). Indeed, the standard deviation of the results given by different climate model members is about three times larger than the standard deviation of the results obtained with different climate forcing products.

**Discussion**

**Comparison with other studies**

We compare our results to the outcomes of the Glacier Model Intercomparison Project (GlacierMIP, Marzeion and others,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate product</th>
<th>RCP</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Scandinavia</th>
<th>Iceland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-OBS RCM RCP2.6</td>
<td>−33.7 ± 12.2%</td>
<td>−67.8 ± 14.3%</td>
<td>−20.2 ± 3.6%</td>
<td>−47.7 ± 9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-OBS RCP4.5</td>
<td>−42.8 ± 8.0%</td>
<td>−82.9 ± 7.5%</td>
<td>−21.7 ± 3.7%</td>
<td>−65.1 ± 11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-OBS RCP8.5</td>
<td>−44.5 ± 10.6%</td>
<td>−93.2 ± 4.7%</td>
<td>−23.5 ± 3.6%</td>
<td>−87.0 ± 7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCM RCP2.6</td>
<td>−41.7 ± 9.5%</td>
<td>−75.8 ± 13.0%</td>
<td>−27.9 ± 12.9%</td>
<td>−60.5 ± 27.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCM RCP4.5</td>
<td>−46.4 ± 9.7%</td>
<td>−84.3 ± 12.6%</td>
<td>−30.9 ± 3.4%</td>
<td>−70.2 ± 26.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCM RCP8.5</td>
<td>−49.4 ± 12.7%</td>
<td>−93.4 ± 6.6%</td>
<td>−32.7 ± 15.5%</td>
<td>−80.4 ± 25.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A different combination of climate forcing products is provided separately. The results show the relative ice volume change compared to 2018. The numbers refer to the average and the standard deviation of all climate model members. The AVG in the last set of rows shows the average of all past climate data products.
2020), which include projections of annual glacier mass change for Scandinavia and Iceland from seven different global glacier models (van de Wal and Wild, 2001; Marzeion and others, 2012; Radić and Hock, 2014; Huss and Hock, 2015; Sakai and Fujita, 2017; Maussion and others, 2019; Shannon and others, 2019). These models had different spatial resolutions, and used different methods for calculating the glacier mass balance, for de-biasing the climatic input data (see Data section), or for computing glacier geometry changes.

Our results are generally in the mid-range of the GlacierMIP projections for Scandinavia, while we project a higher mass loss for Iceland (Fig. 11). The higher loss for Iceland can in part be attributed to the fact that most of the region’s ice volume is located in ice caps (Björnsson and Pálsson, 2008), which show a different evolution when compared to mountain glaciers. Indeed, volume-area scaling approaches – used by most of the models included in GlacierMIP (Marzeion and others, 2020) – are designed for glaciers, and generally fail to reproduce ice cap changes. Similarly, the mass conserving retreat parameterisation used by Huss and Hock (2015) and Rounce and others (2020a) for example, assumes that elevation change in the glaciers’ highest parts is minor. This leads to near-constant elevations of ice cap summits even with a warming climate, which in turn causes the mass-balance-elevation feedback (Edwards and others, 2014; Åkesson and others, 2017) to be underestimated. In our approach, glaciers and ice cap geometries are evolving through time, as prescribed by the local ice flow, mass balance and mass conservation. This causes the elevation of ice cap summits to decrease through time as climate warms, resulting in a positive feedback between surface elevation and mass balance, as a lowering of the surface elevation leads to higher temperatures and thus more melt (see Fig. S9). That said, we acknowledge that our SIA approach has limitations for fast-flowing glaciers (Zekollari and others, 2017), which might influence the modelling of outlet glaciers from ice caps. Similarly, the geometrical simplifications that are necessary for 1-D modelling approaches might introduce some biases in the
projected evolution. In this respect, a comparison with the 3-D modelling work by Schmidt and others (2020) suggests that these biases tend towards larger ice loss (see below).

A direct comparison between our simulations and modelling studies performed for individual glaciers (e.g. Oerlemans, 1997; Marshall, 2005; Ædalgeirsdóttir and others, 2006; Laumann and Nesje, 2009a, 2009b; Andreassen and Oerlemans, 2009; Giesen and Oerlemans, 2010; Laumann and Nesje, 2014; Schmidt and others, 2020) is not straightforward since different climate scenarios and boundary conditions are used. Still, Table 4 provides a compilation of such individual studies and shows that, in general, our results are in the range of previous findings.

In light of the significance of ice caps in Iceland’s subregion 1, a more detailed comparison was performed for six outlet glaciers of Vatnajökull (the largest ice cap of Iceland) against the study by Schmidt and others (2020). Schmidt and others (2020), forced the 3-D glacier ice-flow model PISM (a model based on the SIA and shallow shelf approximations, 2009) with surface mass-balance time series obtained from the HARMONIE–AROME reanalysis for the past and both the EC-Earth forced HIRHAM5 GCM and the CORDEX ensemble for the future. The results of the two studies differ considerably, with our results showing significantly faster and more pronounced mass loss than Schmidt’s (Fig. S10). We attribute the difference to a combination of reasons: For one, the two studies used different bedrock topographies; Schmidt and others (2020) used a topography including local radio-echo soundings whilst our topography is based on modelled ice-thickness distribution: For Scandinavia, 68 and 74% of the volume is lost for Scandinavia (a) and 3658 ± 611 km³ for Iceland (b). From left to right, the abbreviations (GLIMB, GloGEM, JULES, MAR2012, OGGM, RAD2014, WAL2001) stand for van de Wal and Wild (2001); Marzeion and others (2012); Radić and Hock (2014); Huss and Hock (2015); Sakai and Fujita (2017); Maussion and others (2019); Shannon and others (2019), respectively. Note that the results of this study (far right of each panel) are subdivided for simulations driven by RCM and GCM model output.

**Sensitivity analysis**

Uncertainties in glacier projections can arise from a number of factors. Here, we quantify the sensitivity of our results to variations in (i) initial ice-thickness distribution, (ii) the method of geometry initialisation, (iii) mass-balance calibration data and (iv) model parameters. The sensitivity experiments all refer to results driven by an E-OBS for the past and one selected RCM member for the future. In particular, we use the RCM ‘CCLM4-8-17’ and its realisation ‘r1i1p1’ for RCP4.5, driven at its boundary by the GCM ‘CNRM-CM5-LR’. We chose this particular realisation since it has been identified as to represent a median climate evolution (Jacob and others, 2014; Kotlarski and others, 2014).

**Ice-thickness distribution**

The future evolution of glaciers strongly depends on the initial ice thickness used for modelling (Gabbi and others, 2012; Farinotti and others, 2019a). To test model sensitivity to the initial ice-thickness distribution, we project the future evolution of Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers by assuming two cases: one where the ice is thicker and one where the ice is thinner as compared to the simulations presented so far. To obtain these adjusted distributions, we add (and subtract) the standard deviation of the multi-model ensemble provided by Farinotti and others (2019a) (i.e. 19% for Scandinavia and 23% for Iceland). The discrepancies between individual ensemble members are predominantly due to the sparse observations that are publicly available for the two regions. Indeed, ice-thickness observations are so far retrievable only for ca. 28% of the Scandinavian and 20% of the Icelandic glacier areas (Björnsson and Pálsson, 2008; Andreassen and others, 2015; Welty and others, 2020).

The sensitivity tests indicate that the relative volume loss between 2018 and 2100 is affected only little by the initial ice thickness: For Scandinavia, 68 and 74% of the volume is lost for the thinner and thicker ice, respectively, which is similar to...
### Table 4. List of glacier-specific modelling studies performed for Scandinavia and Iceland, and comparison with results obtained in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glacier</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Applied climate</th>
<th>Previous study</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigardsbreen (Scandinavia)</td>
<td>1-D mass-balance ice-flow model</td>
<td>Linear temperature increase of (1) 0.01°C a⁻¹ and (2) 0.02°C a⁻¹ from 1950 to 2100; constant precipitation</td>
<td>(1) ΔV = −50%</td>
<td>RCP2.6</td>
<td>RCP4.5</td>
<td>RCP8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ΔV = −90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birksdalsbreen (Scandinavia)</td>
<td>1-D mass-balance ice-flow model</td>
<td>SRES scenario (1) B2 (equivalent to RCP4.5) and (2) A2 (equivalent to RCP8.5)</td>
<td>(1) ΔL = −2.5 km</td>
<td>1963–2085</td>
<td>(1) ΔL = −1.5 km</td>
<td>−2.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ΔL = −5.0 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardangerjøkulen (Scandinavia, ice cap)</td>
<td>Coupled distributed mass balance and vertically integrated ice-flow model</td>
<td>Linear temperature change of (1) + 1°C, (2) + 2°C (3) + 3°C for the period 1976–2086 and no precipitation changes</td>
<td>(1) ΔV = −37%</td>
<td>2006–2010</td>
<td>ΔV = −40%</td>
<td>100 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ΔV = −80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) ΔV = −100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardangerjøkulen (Scandinavia, ice cap)</td>
<td>2-D, vertically integrated SIA</td>
<td>Mass-balance perturbation of 0.5 m w.e. from the reference period 1963–2007</td>
<td>ΔV = −30%</td>
<td>2011–2010</td>
<td>ΔV = −82%</td>
<td>−91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatnajökull (Iceland, ice cap)</td>
<td>Coupled model of ice-sheet dynamics, subglacial hydrology and mass balance</td>
<td>Warming of 2.3°C and a precipitation increase of 22% by 2100 compared to 1969–90 mean</td>
<td>ΔV = −20%</td>
<td>1990–2010</td>
<td>ΔV = −42%</td>
<td>−60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coupled 3-D SIA and shallow shelf approximation model and snow pack scheme</td>
<td>Warming of 2.05°C and precipitation decrease of 3.3% by 2100 relative to the 1961–90 mean</td>
<td>(1) RCP 4.5 and (2) RCP 8.5</td>
<td>2016–2010</td>
<td>ΔV = −37%</td>
<td>−57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ΔV = −37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Vatnajökull (Iceland, ice cap)</td>
<td>Finite ice-flow model coupled with a degree day mass-balance model</td>
<td>Temperature increase of (1) 1.5–3.0°C and (2) 2.5–3.5°C (within 100 y), with reference period 1980–2000</td>
<td>(1) ΔV = −50%</td>
<td>2000–2100</td>
<td>ΔV = −37%</td>
<td>−55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ΔV = −64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofsjökull (Iceland, ice cap)</td>
<td>Vertically integrated ice-flow model coupled with a degree-day mass-balance model</td>
<td>Temperature increase of (1) 1.5–3.0°C and (2) 2.5–3.5°C (within 100 y), with reference period 1980–2000</td>
<td>(1) ΔV = −37%</td>
<td>2000–2100</td>
<td>ΔV = −60%</td>
<td>−74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ΔV = −58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The column ‘Previous study’ shows either the volume change ΔV or the length change ΔL for the time period given in the corresponding column. The column ‘This study’, shows ΔV or ΔL in the same time period as the glacier-specific study (or for the period 2000–2100 if ‘Time’ is labelled with an asterisk *) for RCP2.6, 4.5 and 8.5. The column ‘Comp.’ shows a comparison between the two results. The symbols ‘=’, ‘−’ and ‘+’ indicate a difference within ±10 %, < −10 % and > 10 %, respectively.
the reference loss of 71%. For Iceland, the corresponding numbers change to 47 and 57%, which is again similar to the reference loss of 51%. These results thus indicate that the effect of the ice thickness uncertainty is in the range of that of the climate forcing products.

**Initialisation method and initial steady-state assumption**

Zekollari and others (2019) showed that using a different calibration and initialisation procedure has a minor effect on the 21st century ice loss modelled for glaciers in the European Alps. Here, we further analyse this by comparing the results from our initialisation strategy (see Methods section) to the initialisation method of Zekollari and others (2019). In the work by Zekollari and others (2019), the 1961–90 climatic conditions are used to create an initial, fictive steady state for the year 1990. In our approach, instead, the date of the initial steady state is glacier-specific, and dependent on both the glacier response time and the climate (see Supplementary Chapter S1).

The comparison of the results generated by using the two different approaches shows that the sensitivity to the initialisation procedure is low. Indeed, the differences in modelled 2018–2100 ice loss are of only ca. 2% for Scandinavia, and of <1% for Iceland. This confirms the robustness of both methods, and indicates that the timing of the steady-state period does barely influence the future glacier evolution as long as it is set sufficiently far (typically half the glacier’s response time in our approach or before 1990 in Zekollari and others, 2019) back in the past.

**Surface mass-balance calibration**

The model was calibrated with glacier-specific geodetic ice volume changes that are subject to typical uncertainties of 0.26 m w.e. a\(^{-1}\) (Scandinavia) and 0.32 m w.e. a\(^{-1}\) (Iceland) (Zemp and others, 2019). To investigate the effect of this uncertainty, we randomly varied the geodetic mass balance assigned to every glacier within the stated uncertainties.

This sensitivity test yields a discrepancy in the modelled 2018–2100 relative volume loss of 3% for Scandinavia, and of <1% for Iceland. This indicates that even though the glacier-specific results directly depend on the glacier-specific calibration data, random variations within the observational uncertainty do not systematically influence the regional estimates. We acknowledge that this analysis only considers independent, random uncertainties, whilst spatially correlated uncertainties might exist.

In addition to the above, we performed a dedicated analysis targeting at the sensitivity of our results to the scheme used for assigning geodetic mass balances to unmeasured glaciers. To do so, we use a cross-validation scheme in which we remove the geodetic observations for one-third of all glaciers, and use the interpolation scheme presented in the Data section to assign a mass-balance estimate to them. This procedure is repeated three times, thus yielding an error estimate for every glacier. The analysis shows that the difference in the relative volume loss modelled for 2018–2100 is <1% for Scandinavia, and <3% for Iceland. This indicates that the overall results are only marginally affected by the necessity of interpolating observations to some unmeasured glaciers.

**Model parameters**

Following Huss and Hock (2015), the ratio between $\text{DDF}_{\text{snow}}$ and $\text{DDF}_{\text{ice}}$ was set to 2 in this study. To analyse how this ratio affects the computed mass balances, we re-run the model by using a ratio of 2.5. The results indicate that varying this empirical factor does not significantly impact the modelled 21st century volume loss: changes in projected regional volume loss are <1% in both Scandinavia and Iceland.

In the mass-balance calibration procedure, the precipitation enhancement factor was varied from 0.8 to 2.0 for Scandinavia, and from 1.8 to 3.0 for Iceland. We analyse the effect of changing this range to 1.4–2.6. When doing so and compared to the standard run, differences in modelled 2018–2100 ice loss decrease by 1% for Scandinavia and increase by 4% for Iceland. This shows that also variations in the precipitation enhancement factor do not substantially influence the future evolution of glaciers in these regions. That said, it must be noted that such changes in precipitation can have a more substantial effect on mass turnover (since an enhancement in modelled precipitation can be compensated by enhanced ablation). This can in turn impact the modelled ice-flow dynamics and the corresponding ice-flow velocities (see Fig. 6).

**Conclusions**

In this paper, we modelled the future evolution of all Scandinavian and Icelandic glaciers using a coupled mass-balance–ice-flow model. A new model initialisation procedure was designed, which is glacier specific and accounts for both glacier response time and climate. To analyse the model’s sensitivity to climate input and to assess future mass loss, the model was forced with three different past climate data products (E-OBS, ERA-1 and ERA-5) and with future climate projections obtained from both GCMS and RCMs. Modelled mass balance was calibrated using glacier-specific geodetic mass changes derived from remote sensing, and was evaluated with independent in-situ mass-balance measurements. As a part of the evaluation procedure, we also compared modelled and observed ice-flow velocities and glacier length changes.

Our model results indicated that, compared to 2018, Scandinavian glaciers are expected to lose between 67 ±18% (RCP2.6) and 90 ± 7% (RCP8.5) of their ice volume by 2100. In the same period, Icelandic glaciers are expected to lose between 43 ±11% (RCP2.6) and 85 ±7% (RCP8.5). In both regions, the spread of the results provided by different RCPs is large, and important differences in the future glacier evolution are found between subregions. This is due to differences in both climate conditions and glacier hypsometries. By using different climate forcing, in order to analyse model sensitivity to different climate data sets, our results indicate that the variations induced by different forcing products are a factor of three smaller than the spread between different model members within a given RCP scenario. We attribute this to our model calibration strategy that relies on observed glacier-specific mass balances, as it offsets possible biases in the climate data. This result implies that considering different climate forcing product is only of minor importance when generating projections of future glacier evolution, as opposed to accurate data to calibrate the model at the glacier-specific scale. We cannot exclude, however, that for other regions with a potentially higher discrepancy between climate forcing products, the choice of the data set may have a larger effect.

Apart from Iceland’s ice cap dominated south, where our simplified 1-D model projects substantially higher volume losses than more detailed 3-D studies (e.g. Schmidt and others, 2020), our simulations agree well with earlier, glacier-specific studies. Consequently, our regional estimates are in line with previous results for Scandinavia but show higher mass losses for Iceland. We mainly attribute this to the representation of ice caps. Whilst our results might neglect some of the effects caused by ice dynamics – such as the possible migration of ice divides – our model takes into account the surface-elevation feedback on mass balance. This is different than what was done in previous studies relying on volume-area scaling relations or retreat parameterisations, and shows the importance of taking ice dynamics into account variability.
into account when modelling large glaciers and ice caps. We sug-
gest that such explicit accounting for ice dynamics will be crucial
to improve the estimates of glacier contribution to the 21st cen-
tury sea-level change.

Supplementary material. The supplementary material for this article can
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