The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report WGIII climate assessment of 1

mitigation pathways: from emissions to global temperatures 2

- Jarmo S. Kikstra^{1,2,3}, Zebedee R.J. Nicholls^{1,4,5}, Christopher J. Smith^{1,6}, Jared Lewis^{1,4,5}, Robin D. 3
- Lamboll^{2,3}, Edward Byers¹, Marit Sandstad⁷, Malte Meinshausen^{4,5}, Matthew J. Gidden^{1,8}, Joeri 4
- 5
- Rogelj^{1,2,3}, Elmar Kriegler^{9,10}, Glen P. Peters⁷, Jan S. Fuglestvedt⁷, Ragnhild B. Skeie⁷, Bjørn H. Samset⁷, Laura Wienpahl¹, Detlef P. van Vuuren^{11,12}, Kaj-Ivar van der Wijst¹², Alaa Al Khourdajie³, Piers M. 6
- Forster⁶, Andy Reisinger¹³, Roberto Schaeffer¹⁴, Keywan Riahi^{1,15} 7
- 8 ¹Energy, Climate and Environment (ECE) Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, 9 2361, Austria
- ²The Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment, Imperial College London, London, UK 10
- ³Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, London, UK 11
- ⁴Climate & Energy College, School of Geography, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, The University of Melbourne 12
- 13 ⁵Climate Resource, Melbourne, Australia
- 14 ⁶Priestley International Centre for Climate, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom
- 15 ⁷CICERO Center for International Climate Research, Oslo, Norway
- 16 ⁸Climate Analytics, Berlin, Germany
- ⁹Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Potsdam, Germany 17
- ¹⁰Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany 18
- 19 ¹¹PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague, The Netherlands
- ¹²Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands 20
- 21 ¹³Institute for Climate, Energy and Disaster Solutions, Fenner School of Society & Environment, Australian National
- University, Canberra, Australia 22
- ¹⁴Centre for Energy and Environmental Economics (CENERGIA), COPPE, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), 23
- Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 24
- ¹⁵Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria 25
- 26

28

²⁷ Correspondence to: Jarmo S. Kikstra (kikstra@iiasa.ac.at)

29 Abstract.

30 While the IPCC's physical science reports usually assess a handful of future scenarios, the Working Group III contribution on 31 climate mitigation to the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 WGIII) assesses hundreds to thousands of future emissions 32 scenarios. A key task in WGIII is to assess the global mean temperature outcomes of these scenarios in a consistent manner, 33 given the challenge that the emission scenarios from different integrated assessment models (IAMs) come with different 34 sectoral and gas-to-gas coverage and cannot all be assessed consistently by complex Earth System Models. In this work, we 35 describe the "climate assessment" workflow and its methods, including infilling of missing emissions and emissions 36 harmonisation as applied to 1,202 mitigation scenarios in AR6 WGIII. We evaluate the global mean temperature projections 37 and effective radiative forcing characteristics (ERF) of climate emulators FaIRv1.6.2 and MAGICCv7.5.3, and use CICERO-38 SCM for sensitivity analysis. We discuss the implied overshoot severity of the mitigation pathways using overshoot-degree-39 years, and look at emissions and temperature characteristics of scenarios compatible with one possible interpretation of the 40 Paris Agreement. We find that the lowest class of emission scenarios that limit global warming to " 1.5° C (with a probability 41 of greater than 50%) with no or limited overshoot" includes 97 scenarios for MAGICCv7.5.3 and 203 for FaIRv1.6.2. For the 42 MAGICCv7.5.3 results, "limited overshoot" typically implies exceedance of median temperature projections of up to about 43 0.1° C for up to a few decades, before returning to below 1.5° C by or before the year 2100. For more than half of the scenarios 44 in this category that comply with three criteria for being "Paris-compatible", including net-zero or net-negative greenhouse 45 gas (GHG) emissions, median temperatures decline by about 0.3-0.4°C after peaking at 1.5-1.6°C in 2035-2055. We compare 46 the methods applied in AR6 with the methods used for SR1.5 and discuss their implications. This article also introduces a 47 'climate-assessment' Python package which allows for fully reproducing the IPCC AR6 WGIII temperature assessment. This 48 work provides a community tool for assessing the temperature outcomes of emissions pathways, and provides a basis for 49 further work such as extending the workflow to include downscaling of climate characteristics to a regional level and 50 calculating impacts.

51

52 Short summary (500 characters).

Assessing hundreds or thousands of emission scenarios in terms of their global mean temperature implications requires standardised procedures of infilling, harmonisation and probabilistic temperature assessments. We here present the 'climateassessment' workflow that was used in the IPCC AR6 Working Group III report.

56 1 Introduction

The Working Group III (WGIII) contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) assesses the recent literature on how climate change can be mitigated (IPCC, 2022c). A key part of this assessment uses emissions scenarios (Riahi et al., 2022) that explore a variety of climate change mitigation futures. The Paris Agreement, which specified a long-term global temperature goal (UNFCCC, 2015), strengthened by the Glasgow Climate Pact stressing the 1.5°C temperature level (UNFCCC, 2021), made it ever more relevant to determine global mean surface temperature outcomes in assessments of policy-relevant climate mitigation literature. Until now, the climate assessment process utilised by the IPCC has been described in the report, but never discussed in detail or been made openly available to the community as a software tool. Making the climate assessment process open-source will not only facilitate the reproducibility of the report's scientific findings, but also facilitate future analyses of new data applying a methodology consistent with the AR6 WGIII report.

67 In this paper, we (a) lay out and discuss the methodology used in IPCC AR6 for assessing the global warming 68 implications of scenarios with sufficient emissions quantifications, (b) describe the global mean temperature outcomes of the 69 scenario set available in the AR6 WGIII report's scenarios database (AR6DB; Byers et al., 2022), and (c) document and link 70 to the tools used for this part of the assessment. These temperature projections from Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) 71 scenarios are used across many parts of the WGIII report. The methodology described in this paper was used in a few sections 72 in the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) (IPCC, 2022d), and especially in Chapter 3 on Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 73 Long-Term Goals (Riahi et al., 2022). The description provided here gives further detail on the summary of the methods and 74 analysis already available in Annex III of AR6 WGIII on Scenarios and Modelling Methods (IPCC, 2022a).

75

A comprehensive assessment of the global temperature outcomes of long-term greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions scenarios requires diverse emissions data to be made comparable, gaps in data to be completed, and tools to project global temperature from those emissions that reflect the best available climate science knowledge. After a selection of scenarios that comply with reporting standards and are within ranges of uncertainty ("vetting") is made, global mean temperature outcomes are calculated. The climate assessment workflow we describe here has three core steps: 1) *harmonisation* of emissions, 2) *infilling* of emissions, 3) running one or several emissions-driven reduced-complexity *climate* models (see **Figure 1**).

In the *harmonisation* process, scenarios are made comparable by ensuring they start from the same historical emission levels. This ensures that differences between climate futures resulting from two different pathways are the result of future emissions due to structural change in mitigation scenarios rather than different historical emissions estimates or assumptions.

In the *infilling* step, data gaps in emissions scenarios, such as time evolutions for some individual gas or aerosol species that are not reported by a given IAM, are closed by inferring representative trajectories of those missing species from the wider literature.

In the *climate* run step, reduced complexity climate models (also known as climate emulators) are used to project the physical climate response to emissions. These climate emulators are calibrated to closely reproduce historically observed warming, projections of warming for standard scenarios, and the uncertainty ranges in key physical climate parameters assessed in the IPCC Working Group I (WGI) report (IPCC, 2021a). This close collaboration between WGI and WGIII to ensure consistency of climate assessments across various IPCC AR6 products is a key development compared to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) (IPCC, 2014, 2013) and earlier IPCC Assessment Reports. The AR6 WGIII report is the first 94 IPCC report that uses climate emulators that are fully in line with complex models and other lines of evidence as assessed by 95 the physical science basis of the same cycle.

96

97 A total of 3,131 global and regional scenarios were submitted to the AR6 Scenario Explorer hosted by IIASA (Byers 98 et al., 2022). Out of this set, 1,686 global scenarios were considered to meet minimum quality standards for use in long term 99 scenarios assessment based on the vetting criteria as set out in Annex III of IPCC WGIII. This set was further narrowed down 100 to 1.202 scenarios (IPCC, 2022a) that contained sufficient emission data across gases and sectors to provide full-century 101 climate outcomes. This sub-selection to more complete scenarios ensures that the harmonised and infilled emissions reflect 102 the intention of the prospective modelling in the original scenario submission. For the main text, figures, and tables in this 103 paper, we use this set of 1.202 scenarios. While most of these scenarios contain regional emissions pathways, WGIII AR6 only 104 assessed global climate variables based on global emissions estimates, which is the common level that the used climate 105 emulators operate on. This means that evaluating the regional effects of for instance regional aerosol emissions is beyond the 106 scope of this assessment, having as a primary aim the assessment of global mean surface temperature change.

107

108 In the remainder of this paper, we start by placing the IPCC WGIII AR6 infilling steps, harmonisation procedures 109 and climate assessment in its historical context and present the criteria it aimed to meet. Then, we provide details on the 110 methods applied going from emissions provided by IAMs to outputs from climate emulators. Lastly, we touch upon future 111 development options.

112

122

113 2 History of scenario temperature projections in IPCC WGIII reports and the updated process in AR6

114 2.1 History of climate assessment processes

115 2.1.1 Climate emulators in IPCC reports

Climate emulators have been used by the IPCC from its very start. For instance, the First Assessment Report explains that 116 117 "simpler models, which simulate the behaviour of [General Circulation Models (GCMs)], are also used to make predictions of 118 the evolution with time of global temperature from a number of emission scenarios. These so-called box-diffusion models 119 contain highly simplified physics but give similar results to GCMs when globally averaged." (IPCC, 1992). Emulators, because 120 of their computational simplicity, can be used much more widely than complex GCMs or Earth System Models (ESM).

121 Because of the limited ability in the 1990s to perform long-term coupled atmosphere-ocean runs with a broad coverage of

different GHGs and aerosols and an interactive carbon cycle, the early assessment reports relied heavily on simple climate 123 models, including the WGI reports. A technical overview report about their strength and limitations was published by the IPCC

124 in 1997 (Houghton et al., 1997). With an increasing availability of Earth system models of intermediate complexity (EMICs), 125 coupled atmosphere-ocean general circulation models (AOGCMs) and ultimately the fully-fledged ESMs, the focus shifted in 126 the physical WGI reports towards the use of progressively more complex models. However, in the AR6 WGI report, climate 127 emulators were used to fill in gaps from experiments of interest that are not run by ESMs (e.g., SPM figures 2c and 4b, IPCC, 128 2021b), and also to bridge the gap between expert assessment of the climate system and some of the unconstrained projections 129 resulting from ESMs (Hausfather et al., 2022; Lee et al., 2021; Forster et al., 2021). Multiple lines of evidence in support of 130 the assessment of climate sensitivity and other climate characteristics led to IPCC WGI AR6 adopting a new approach, which 131 also involved calibrating climate emulators to translate the assessment of key climate characteristics into the global mean 132 temperature projections. Additionally, the increased focus on translating insights from WGI to other stakeholders and scientific 133 communities included stronger cross-WG collaboration and triggered a concerted effort for climate emulator calibration on 134 the basis of a wide range of WGI assessment results.

135 In the WGIII report, there are two key reasons for using climate emulators to assess the temperature outcomes of long-136 term climate mitigation scenarios. The first reason is time and resources. With a large number of scenarios available from a 137 wide variety of studies, it would take too much computing time to rapidly simulate all scenarios by one ESM, let alone by a 138 wider set of models such as those that participate in international initiatives like the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 139 (CMIP). For instance, a quick turnaround was required between WGIII's literature cut-off date (11 October 2021) by which 140 scenarios had to be confirmed as published, and WGIII's deadline for Final Government Draft submission by authors (1 141 November 2021). It is computationally not feasible for modern ESMs to run all scenarios in this timespan. Typically, an IPCC 142 report undergoes multiple expert and government reviews. This means that the climate assessment is repeated multiple times 143 over the course of an IPCC report drafting cycle, which for AR6 WGIII AR6 took three years from the first lead author meeting 144 to the approval of the SPM. The second reason mirrors the reasoning in WGI, i.e., using climate emulators to combine multiple 145 lines of evidence to represent the overall best estimate and uncertainty range (Lee et al., 2021). In the WGIII context, a single 146 ESM, or even a set of them, is unlikely to match the best estimate as well as physical climate uncertainty of the assessed 147 temperature response to anthropogenic emissions with a good representation of uncertainty as assessed by WGI and might not 148 even reproduce historically observed global mean temperatures well (Smith and Forster, 2021).

149 2.1.2 Long-term mitigation pathway assessments in previous IPCC WGIII reports

150 This exercise sits within a tradition of large-scale assessments and previous IPCC WGIII reports, though the practice to group 151 mitigation scenarios based on climate emulator outcomes is more recent. Using two models, the First Assessment Report 152 (FAR) WGIII (Houghton et al., 1990) evaluated three mitigation scenarios (SA90) and two reference scenarios, calculating 153 their atmospheric CO₂ and CO₂-equivalent concentrations, but did not directly assess global temperature outcomes related to 154 these scenarios. The 1992 supplement to the FAR (IPCC, 1992) evaluated six alternative emissions scenarios (IS92 a-f) and 155 provided global warming estimates, using the best estimate of climate sensitivity available at that time. In a 1994 follow-up 156 report, the radiative forcing characteristics of the IS92 pathways were assessed in much more detail (IPCC, 1994). The Second 157 Assessment Report (SAR; IPCC, 1996) assessed a wider range of socioeconomic scenarios and used a more extensive set of

- simple climate models (Houghton et al., 1997) but did not use these to assess the temperature implications of the mitigation scenario literature. In similar fashion, WGIII of the Third Assessment Report (TAR; IPCC, 2001) also did not perform its own temperature assessment or grouping of mitigation scenarios by climate categories but used CO₂ concentrations as stabilisation levels for the assessment of the mitigation pathways (e.g. SPM.1 and Table 2.6 in IPCC, 2001).
- 162 The WGIII Fourth Assessment Report (AR4: IPCC, 2007) contained the first IPCC temperature assessment of 163 emissions scenarios from the available literature. 177 scenarios were assessed, covering a mix of CO₂-only and multi-gas 164 studies. Scenario characteristics were compared by grouping them in six categories, based on climate targets as reported in 165 each of the original peer-reviewed articles assessed by the IPCC. Where data was unavailable, scenario characteristics for either CO₂ concentrations or radiative forcing within each category (15th and 85th percentile) were derived using the relationship 166 167 between CO₂ concentrations and radiative forcing, and the relationship between CO₂ concentrations and equilibrium 168 temperature. Only six scenarios fell in the lowest warming category, which was associated with 2.5-3.0 W/m² radiative forcing 169 and CO₂ concentrations of 350-400 ppm in 2100, with a rough estimate of 2.0-2.4 °C global mean surface temperature increase 170 above pre-industrial levels (here referring to the era before the industrial revolution of the late 18th and 19th centuries, while 171 in the rest of the paper pre-industrial refers to the period from 1850-1900) at equilibrium using a climate sensitivity of 3°C per 172 doubling of CO₂ concentrations. The highest category covered the 6.0-7.5 W/m^2 range of forcing and featured only five 173 scenarios. The report was clear about the limitation of this approach, writing in subsection 3.3.5 that "it should be noted that 174 the classification is subject to uncertainty and should thus be used with care" (IPCC, 2007).
- 175 In the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) WGIII report (IPCC, 2014), a larger database of 915 scenarios was available 176 for the assessment of mitigation pathways. These scenarios differed in their design (e.g., ever-growing emissions, climate 177 stabilisation, or peak-and-decline scenarios), as well as in how many gases were included. Despite the methodological 178 difficulties in comparing multiple types of scenarios, AR5 still grouped scenarios in different climate categories to enable 179 comparison of their key characteristics (IPCC, 2014). With the scenario literature at that time often using 2100 radiative forcing 180 targets to design scenarios, including the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs), CO₂-equivalent concentrations in 181 2100 were chosen as a classification indicator (CO₂-equivalent concentrations represent the concentration of CO₂ that would 182 cause the same radiative forcing as a given mixture of CO_2 and other forcing components). The calculation of CO_2 -equivalent 183 concentrations in 2100 from emissions was standardised. All scenarios with at least information on total Kyoto gas emissions 184 were assessed using the climate emulator Model for the Assessment of Greenhouse Gas Induced Climate Change (MAGICC) 185 version 6.3 (Meinshausen et al., 2011b, a). This model version drew on a probabilistic ensemble of which concentration and 186 radiative forcing outcomes were constrained by observations and physical climate parameter uncertainties assessed in AR4 187 (Meinshausen et al., 2009: Schaeffer et al., 2013), with model updates to better reflect the climate sensitivity distribution as 188 assessed in AR5 WGI (Rogelj et al., 2012). To group scenarios, the median CO₂-equivalent concentration of total radiative 189 forcing of this probabilistic ensemble was used. For emissions harmonisation, to avoid artefacts in the temperature projections 190 resulting from differences in model-reported and historical emissions, emissions were set to historical observation values in 191 2010, with the difference to model-reported values linearly declining to zero in 2050 (Krey et al., 2014). At minimum, CO_2

192 from the energy and industrial processes (E&IP) sector (also known as CO₂ from the use of fossil fuels and industry (or CO₂-193 FFI, as used in AR6), and CH₄ and N₂O from E&IP and land use sectors from each individual scenario needed to be available. 194 For emissions infilling of other species, a set of heuristics was applied to fill in any missing F-gas, carbonaceous aerosols, 195 and/or nitrate emissions (Krey et al., 2014). Another set of practical heuristics was developed to classify scenarios that did not 196 report all necessary GHGs and other emissions or did not report emissions until the end of the 21st century. The classification 197 of such scenarios into groups was based on only Kyoto gas forcing (given a lack of total forcing) in 2100, cumulative CO₂ 198 emissions from 2011 to 2100, and cumulative CO₂ emissions from 2011 to 2050, in order of preference. One hundred and 199 fourteen scenarios were classified in the lowest category of 2.3-2.9 W/m² in 2100, with associated 2100 median temperatures 200 ranging from 1.5 to 1.7°C above 1850-1900 levels.

201 The Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (IPCC, 2018) – abbreviated as SR1.5 – featured an extensive climate 202 assessment of emissions scenarios with the most advanced methods so far. After the introduction of temperature targets in 203 international climate policy in the Cancún Agreement of 2010 (UNFCCC, 2010), and the subsequent adoption of the Paris 204 Agreement with its specific long-term temperature goal a stated in Article 2 of the agreement (UNFCCC, 2015), SR1.5 was 205 the first IPCC report where scenarios were categorised based directly on their projected global mean temperature outcomes. 206 This temperature categorisation followed the practice established by the Emissions Gap Reports series of the UN Environment 207 Programme (Hare et al., 2010; Rogelj and Shukla, 2012; Rogelj et al., 2011). SR1.5 only assessed scenarios with information 208 until 2100 for at minimum CO₂ from E&IP and (total) CH₄, N₂O, and sulphur emissions. The SR1.5 approach used the same 209 harmonisation method as AR5, but because an absolute offset harmonisation method would have turned some non-CO₂ 210 emissions pathways negative, SR1.5 rather used a multiplicative ("ratio") method (Forster et al., 2018). For the infilling of 211 emissions species not reported, including F-gases and black carbon (BC), values from the low forcing scenario RCP2.6 (van 212 Vuuren et al., 2011; Meinshausen et al., 2011a) were used, in line with the focus of the report on 1.5°C and 2°C consistent 213 scenarios, A total of 368 scenarios (out of 529 submitted scenarios) were grouped into six temperature categories, five of which 214 were to indicate different categories of below 2°C scenarios (Forster et al., 2018; Rogelj et al., 2018: Table 2.4 and Table 215 2.SM.12). Using a MAGICC6 setup similar to that used in AR5 (Meinshausen et al., 2011b, a; IPCC, 2014), temperature 216 exceedance probability at peak temperature and in 2100 were used to define these categories. In addition, the climate emulator 217 Finite Amplitude Impulse Response (FaIR) version 1.3 (Smith et al., 2018) was used to run all scenarios for a sensitivity 218 analysis, FaIRv1.3 and MAGICC6 produced substantially different temperature and forcing levels for the same emissions 219 scenarios, with FaIRv1.3 typically projecting less warming, and MAGICC6 more, mostly due to effective radiative forcing 220 from non-CO₂ components. MAGICC6 was used for the main classification because it was more established in the literature, 221 provided direct comparability with AR5 in the absence of a more recent IPCC WGI assessment, and had been tested against 222 CMIP5 models (Forster et al., 2018, 2SM-3).

223

AR6, for the first time in IPCC WGIII assessments, used a fully integrated temperature-based classification of mitigation scenarios, with the climate emulators used in WGIII being fully consistent with WGI of the same assessment cycle 226 following an extensive calibration and testing exercise of emulators, building on recent literature (Nicholls et al., 2021a) to 227 assess their suitability to reproduce assessed climate ranges (Forster et al., 2021). The use of climate emulators in WGIII was 228 motivated by several considerations. Firstly, the main physical reason for using a radiative forcing-based measure over 229 temperature in earlier reports, namely an uncertain climate sensitivity (Krey et al., 2014, page 1312 of AR5 WGIII), has been 230 ameliorated by much more robust constraints on both equilibrium climate sensitivity (Sherwood et al., 2020) and the transient 231 climate response (Forster et al., 2021). This allows a more robust estimate of the temperature response from a given emission 232 pathway. Secondly, there was considerable ambiguity in earlier assessments about which forcing agents were included in the 233 radiative forcing classification as sometimes total anthropogenic forcing estimates (or subsets thereof) were used and 234 sometimes only GHGs were included. Thirdly, the "CO₂ equivalent concentration" classification in earlier reports created 235 some confusion for readers in the context of the more widely used, but rather different, concept of "CO₂ equivalent emissions". 236 Finally, and most importantly, the Paris Agreement long-term global temperature goal makes a global temperature 237 classification of emission scenarios directly relevant to inform policy decisions.

238 **2.2 Design criteria for a new process**

The development of this workflow builds on experience from previous IPCC reports. In broad terms, IPCC AR6 WGIII followed the methodology applied in SR1.5, while addressing multiple outstanding issues and knowledge gaps. These include (a) increased reproducibility, openness, and transparency, (b) usage of multiple consistently calibrated and extensively evaluated climate emulators, and (c) more advanced methods to represent non-CO₂ emissions and forcing.

243 2.2.1 Reproducibility, openness, and transparency

During the preparation of AR6, accessibility and reproducibility of scientific results were identified as a key aspect to be addressed in the production of the report. This relies on the transparency and reusability of the products and tools underpinning the production of these scientific results (Pirani et al., 2022).

The long-term global emissions pathways literature largely relies on IAMs, an increasing number of which are becoming accessible via open-source codes and training material for potential users (Skea et al., 2021). In the WGIII report, increased attention has gone into documenting the core assumptions and characteristics of IAMs in order to facilitate their interpretation and reproducibility. These pathways have been published in peer-reviewed articles, and none of them are created by the IPCC itself. What is however done for the IPCC assessment report is the consistent comparative analysis of the temperature outcomes of the different scenarios based on their emissions.

Until now, the climate assessment process utilised by the IPCC has been described in the report, but never discussed in detail or been made openly available to the community as a software tool. Making the climate assessment process opensource will not only facilitate the reproducibility of the report's scientific findings, but also facilitate future analyses of new data applying a methodology consistent with the AR6 WGIII report. Making the climate assessment process open-source can be seen as a continuation and extension of previous efforts such as in AR5 and SR1.5, where the scenario data and climate assessment information were made accessible in a format following community standards (Huppmann et al., 2018b, a; IIASA, 2014). In addition, increased transparency was provided by releasing the calculations to get from the scenario data to the presented figures and tables in SR1.5 (Huppmann et al., 2018c). Moreover, <u>a</u> growing number of studies have analysed emissions pathways and their temperature outcomes including climate-policy target quantification (Höhne et al., 2021; Meinshausen et al., 2022) and grey-literature mitigation scenario assessment (Brecha et al., 2022).

264 **2.2.2 The inclusion of multiple climate emulators**

265 The two emulators used in SR1.5 exhibited substantial differences in the near-term warming and it was unclear how much of 266 these differences were structural and how much was from different calibrations (Forster et al., 2018). Since then, emulator 267 diversity and the understanding of differences between emulators have improved. Structural uncertainties have been probed 268 by comparing idealised simulations of a range of emulators with different physical characteristics all run with the same best-269 estimate climate sensitivity (Nicholls et al., 2020). Emulators were able to simulate global mean surface temperatures of more 270 complex models within a root-mean-square error of 0.2 °C over a range of experiments across a range of scenarios. As the 271 ESMs themselves have structural differences, the emulator with the best fit to a given ESM varied. Because it is not known 272 which ESM best captures reality, these results present an inherent structural uncertainty. This structural uncertainty is therefore 273 best explored by using a diverse range of emulators to assess the climate response across scenarios. Diversity comes from both 274 how emulators capture the emissions to radiative forcing relationship across considered emissions and from how the transient 275 surface temperature response to a given forcing is represented. To allow for a multi-model assessment, four emulators were 276 calibrated to the same set of WGI AR6 physical responses (Forster et al., 2021). The calibration approach varied amongst the 277 emulators (Smith et al., 2021). Nevertheless, they produced a similar best estimate and range of responses to the assessment 278 they were trying to match. Newly developed techniques (Nicholls et al., 2021a) were applied to evaluate the probabilistic 279 distributions of each emulator. Based on these techniques, WGI concluded that FaIRv1.6.2 and MAGICCv7.5.3 were generally 280 able to match the best estimates of multiple climate indicators, including the change in global mean surface temperature to 281 within 5% and match the very likely ranges to within 10% (Forster et al., 2021). AR6 WGIII, including Chapter 3, used 282 MAGICC for characterising the median estimates of global warming projections. The difference between FaIRv1.6.2 and 283 MAGICCv7.5.3 is greatly reduced and much better understood (Nicholls et al., 2022) compared to the largely unexplained 284 differences that existed at the time of SR1.5.

285 2.2.3 Increased detail for non-CO₂ greenhouse gases and aerosols

 CO_2 is the dominant driver of long-term global climate change, but non- CO_2 GHG emissions and aerosols play a significant role on different time scales and reducing warming from non- CO_2 related emissions is important to meet climate targets. IPCC WGI (IPCC, 2021a) found that historical CO_2 -induced warming was $0.8^{\circ}C$ (1850-1900 to 2010-2019), while methane-induced warming was 0.5° C and sulphate aerosol-induced cooling 0.5° C, with additional changes from other emission components and sources. Therefore, while cumulative CO₂ is the strongest determinant of temperature outcomes, particularly because of its long-lived nature and high emissions, non-CO₂ emissions pathways including short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs) are important when analysing temperature projections under different scenarios (Damon Matthews et al., 2021; Samset et al., 2020; Rogelj et al., 2015, 2018; Allen et al., 2009).

Historically, IAMs have predominantly focussed on modelling CO₂ emissions, with other major GHG emissions like methane receiving less attention. Other emissions including minor GHGs, aerosols, and aerosol precursors are covered by fewer models. Some gases that are represented in climate emulators are not modelled for any long-term global scenario IAM considered in AR6, though these particular emissions have relatively small projected impact on climate change. To maximise the richness and diversity of scenarios available in a given assessment (Guivarch et al., 2022), a process of infilling scenarios with missing emission data is performed. There is, however, no unique way to infill scenarios with missing data.

300 Previous assessments (section 2.1) already undertook a process of infilling, but due to limited available peer-reviewed 301 literature and tools, these methods were rather simple and did not include emissions-species-specific methods or scenario-302 specific infilled pathways. As an example, in IPCC SR1.5, missing data was taken from SSP1-2.6, on the basis that the 303 assessment was focused on 1.5°C and 2°C scenarios rather than the full range including baseline scenarios. This means that 304 there can be an inconsistency between infilled and original IAM emissions in terms of the implicit underlying socio-economic 305 drivers or compound emissions. Particularly in the short term, SLCFs can have a significant effect on temperature. With new 306 literature and tools available (Lamboll et al., 2020), the AR6 WGIII scenario workflow adopted a more systematic approach 307 to infilling that captures more detail in non-CO₂ emissions of scenarios (IPCC, 2022a).

308 3 Methods

The 'climate-assessment' workflow as visualised in Figure 1 was implemented using the Python programming language (Van Rossum and Drake Jr, 1995), and is available as an open-source Python package from <u>https://github.com/iiasa/climate-</u> assessment (Kikstra et al., 2022a), with the latest release being v0.1.1, and detailed documentation available at: <u>https://climate-</u> assessment.readthedocs.io.

313 3.1 Scenario vetting

Global scenarios used to assess climate mitigation options were extensively vetted to ensure minimum reporting of relevant variables and check that reported values in the model base years fall within ranges of uncertainty as specified in **Supplementary Table 1**. Whilst IAMs report a large number of sectoral variables, for the purposes of this assessment the vetting was limited to global emissions and energy related variables. This process was repeated during the call for scenarios such that model teams had the opportunity to review the results of the vetting process, diagnose results and correct reporting errors. As a minimum, IAM teams needed to report global emissions for CO_2 , CH_4 , N_2O through the period 2015 to 2100 for a scenario to be included in the temperature assessment. Values for specific technologies were also checked for nuclear, CCS,
 solar and wind power as well as primary energy. For emissions, interpolated, modelled emissions for 2019 were checked
 against the 2019 values from two emissions data sets (Minx et al., 2021; Nicholls et al., 2021a).

From 2266 global scenarios considered in the AR6 Scenarios Database with at least a relevant emissions or energy variable, about three quarters passed the energy and emissions criteria, whilst only 1202 passed all vetting criteria and minimum emissions reporting requirements (IPCC, 2022a). The most exclusionary criteria were those for nuclear and solar and wind electricity production in 2020, where for each criterion 266 and 377 scenarios were out of range, respectively.

327 **3.2 Harmonisation of emissions pathways**

Emissions harmonisation refers to the process used to align modelled GHG and air pollutant pathways with a common source of historical emissions. This capability enables a common climate estimate across different models, increases transparency and robustness of results, and allows for easier participation in intercomparison exercises by using the same, openly available harmonisation mechanism (Gidden et al., 2019). In the AR6 climate assessment workflow the open-source Python software package 'aneris' (Gidden et al., 2018) was used for harmonisation.

333 In principle, many methods to align modelled results with historical emissions could be used. In past IPCC 334 assessments, ratio (multiplicative) methods (AR5) and offset (additive) methods (SR1.5) have been employed. Gidden et al. 335 (2018) introduced a common approach for choosing which methods should be applied in different contexts (the so-called 336 'default decision tree'). In AR6, this approach was used where suitable. For some species, however, a specific method was 337 chosen in AR6. (see Table 1 provides an for the full-overview of the applied methods). by emissions species, with more detail 338 on all emissions and climate variable names as found in the AR6DB in Supplementary Tables 3-5. For CO₂-FFI, a ratio-339 based method was used with convergence in 2080, in line with the application of aneris for the CMIP6 process (Gidden et al., 340 2019). The convergence for 2080 is later than in SR1.5, which used 2050 (Forster et al., 2018). A later convergence year was 341 seen as more suitable when considering scenarios across a wider range of mitigation futures than was considered in SR1.5. For 342 CO_2 from AFOLU, an offset method with a convergence target in 2150 was used as the preferred method to deal with high 343 historical interannual variability and large uncertainty in historical emissions estimates (Dhakal et al., 2022) leading to 344 similarly large differences in historical emissions estimates from separate IAMs (IPCC, 2022d). All other emissions species 345 with high historical variance are harmonised using a ratio method with a convergence target in 2150. Remaining F-gases are 346 harmonised at the individual species level, increasing the detail compared to SR1.5, but because of low model reporting 347 confidence a constant ratio harmonisation method is used. For all other emissions species, we use the default settings of 348 (Gidden et al., 2018, 2019).

For harmonisation, AR6 WGIII used the same historical emissions that were also used for the emissions-driven CMIP6 (Gidden et al., 2019) and RCMIP (Nicholls et al., 2020, 2021a) emissions-driven runs. This dataset is a combination of historical emissions databases. A significant share comes from the Community Emissions Data System (CEDS) database (Hoesly et al., 2018), but additional sources and methods have been used (for full detail, see Nicholls et al. (2020, 2021a), Gidden et al. (2019), and Kikstra et al. (2022)). The year 2015 was taken for harmonisation in line with CMIP6. In the case that IAM-reported values are not available for 2015, but were available for 2010 and 2020 emissions, the difference from historical data in 2010 was used to infer a 2015 value before harmonising. The benefit of using a similar dataset and methods as for emissions-driven CMIP6 and RCMIP, which informed the assessment by WGI, is that this leads to consistency between modelled temperature outcomes for emissions scenarios assessed by WGIII and the assessment of physical climate science by WGI, and thus a stronger coherence across IPCC Working Groups within the AR6.

359 **3.3 Infilling of emissions pathways not reported by scenarios submitted to AR6 database**

If, for instance, a modelled scenario reports most climate relevant species but not black and organic carbon, which are required by climate emulators to project temperature outcomes, the infilling process will supplement the model reported results with an estimate of how black and organic carbon could develop along that modelled scenario. Infilling thus ensures that all climaterelevant anthropogenic emissions are included in each climate run for each scenario. This makes the climate assessment of alternative scenarios more comparable and reduces the risk of a biased climate assessment, because not all climatically active emission species are reported by all IAMs. The infilling process in AR6 was performed using an open-source Python software package called 'silicone' (Lamboll et al., 2020), integrated in the climate assessment workflow (Kikstra et al., 2022a).

367 Different infilling methods result in different levels of proportionality, consistency, and stability to small changes. In 368 AR6, the quantile rolling windows ("QRW") approach was chosen for most reported emissions gases (aerosol precursor 369 emissions, volatile organic compounds and GHGs other than F-gases) because of the preference for high stability to small 370 changes in the database. This is a conservative approach that cannot result in infilled pathways being more extreme than the 371 database from which one infills (the "infiller database"). To avoid artefacts for the QRW method with a biased emissions space 372 distribution in the infiller database, chlorinated and fluorinated gases are infilled based on a pathway with lowest root mean 373 squared difference ("RMS-closest"), ensuring a resulting emissions trend with consistency over time even when given few 374 input emissions scenarios. See Table 1, and Supplementary Tables 3-5 for full details.

Where possible, missing emissions species are infilled from the harmonised AR6DB. Where the AR6DB does not cover the emissions species, the CMIP6-emissions SSP dataset was used (**Table 1**).

377 Missing emission pathways from a scenario are infilled based on their relationship with CO₂-FFI. If CO₂-FFI is 378 strongly mitigated, the algorithm fills in pathways of other emission species from other scenarios in the AR6DB where CO₂-379 FFI is mitigated similarly. This process is done based on emissions pathways that have already been harmonised. The AR6 380 WGIII report acknowledges that there is uncertainty in using this method, and therefore chose to only use the climate results 381 from scenarios where models natively provided at least CO₂-FFI, CO₂-AFOLU, CH₄, and N₂O. In principle, however, it would 382 be possible to produce a climate assessment for a scenario that only reports CO₂-FFI, but while this would increase model 383 diversity, such scenarios would still not be able to reflect the effect of policy choices that influence non-CO₂ emissions and 384 hence climate outcomes from sectors such as AFOLU, waste, and industrial use of N₂O and F-gases.

385 **3.4 Climate emulators**

386 An extensive calibration and testing exercise of emulators to assess their suitability to reproduce assessed climate ranges has 387 been undertaken in AR6 WG1 and reported in Cross-Chapter Box 7.1 of IPCC AR6 WGI (Forster et al., 2021; Smith et al., 388 2021). The precedent for this exercise was the Reduced Complexity Model Intercomparison Project (RCMIP), where Phase 2 389 of this project compared emulators' performances when constrained to hit predetermined ranges of variables including 390 equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS), transient climate response (TCR), observed global mean surface temperature, ocean 391 heat content change, transient climate response to cumulative emissions of carbon dioxide (TCRE), and radiative forcing for 392 species such as CO₂, CH₄ and aerosols (Nicholls et al., 2021a). One condition for an emulator to be used in the AR6 WGI 393 emulator analysis was that the emulator needs to comprise an interactive carbon cycle and other gas cycle parameterisations 394 so that it can run from emission timeseries rather than from concentrations. In this exercise, emulators were driven by emission 395 timeseries of around 40 GHGs (with CO₂ broken down into CO₂-FFI and CO₂-AFOLU, components), short-lived climate 396 forcers, aerosol and ozone precursors, and external forcing from solar variability and volcanic stratospheric aerosol optical 397 depth. Four emulators contributed to the AR6 WGI exercise: MAGICCv7.5.3, FaIRv1.6.2, CICERO-SCM and OSCARv3.1.1. 398 While we look at annual mean temperatures, these emulators do not aim to capture any unforced internal variability of the 399 climate system.

400 MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2 were found to be able to reproduce Working Group I assessed climate variables to 401 within small error, with CICERO-SCM and OSCARv3.1.1 providing useful supporting information but with larger deviation 402 from the temperature changes as assessed by WGI (Forster et al., 2021). Of these four, three (MAGICCv7.5.3, FaIRv1.6.2 and 403 CICERO-SCM) connected to the workflow using the OpenSCM-runner interface (Nicholls et al., 2021b) and participated in 404 the AR6 WGIII process. The climate assessment workflow provides 52 emissions species (see Table 1). Only information 405 from MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2 were used in the Summary for Policymakers, and in the results section of this study we 406 follow this focus on MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2, while we do some comparison with the climate outcomes from CICERO-407 SCM. The scenario classification and reported medians are based on MAGICCv7.5.3, while reported ranges were based on 408 both MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2. As written in the WGI report, MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2 represent the WGI 409 assessment typically to within $\pm 5\%$ for central estimates of key climate change indicators, for instance for global warming in 410 1995-2014 compared to 1850-1900, warming estimates along SSPs in the 21st century, current ERF compared to 1750 ERF 411 estimates, CO₂ airborne fractions under idealised experiments, and ocean heat content change between 1971 and 2018 (Forster 412 et al., 2021, Cross-Chapter Box 7.1, Table 2). For the upper and lower ranges, the difference with the WGI assessment is 413 within $\pm 10\%$ across more than 80% of metric ranges (Forster et al., 2021). Despite some identified limitations like the lack of 414 an interactive carbon cycle, and projecting lower warming than the best assessment along SSPs (e.g. -14% for SSP1-2.6 in 415 2081-2100 relative to 1995-2014), CICERO-SCM was assessed to represent historical warming very well, and can be used for 416 sensitivity analyses (Forster et al., 2021).

417 **3.4.1 MAGICC**

418 MAGICC (Model for Assessment of Greenhouse gas Induced Climate Change) v7.5.3 is an emissions-driven Earth system 419 model emulator. Its atmosphere is represented as four interconnected boxes (northern and southern hemisphere ocean, northern 420 and southern hemisphere land). The ocean boxes are coupled to a 50-layer upwelling-diffusion-entrainment ocean model. A 421 full description of MAGICC can be found in Meinshausen et al., (2011b), with updates as described in Meinshausen et al., 422 (2020) and Nicholls et al., (2022, 2021a). MAGICCv7.5.3 was calibrated using the Monte Carlo Markov Chain technique 423 described in (Meinshausen et al., 2009), with an updated step to reweight the derived posterior to improve the match with the 424 WGI assessed ranges. The probabilistic distribution used in the climate assessment uses 600 ensemble members, balancing 425 computational costs with ensemble size. As also described in the documentation of the climate assessment workflow, the 426 MAGICCv7.5.3 binary and probabilistic distribution are packaged separately from the climate assessment workflow and can 427 be accessed at https://magicc.org/download/magicc7 for use with the climate assessment workflow.

428 3.4.2 FaIR

429 FaIR (Finite-amplitude Impulse Response model) v1.6.2 is a fully open-source emissions-driven atmospheric model emulator 430 with a state-dependent carbon cycle coupled to a two-ocean layer climate response module (Smith et al., 2018; Millar et al., 431 2017). The calibration for AR6 was performed using a 1-million-member prior ensemble. Parameters for the carbon cycle and 432 climate response are derived from distributions based on CMIP6 models (Leach et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2018) and 433 assessments made in AR6 WGI (Forster et al., 2021). This prior ensemble is simultaneously constrained on historical 434 temperature (1850-2019), ocean heat content change (1971-2018), near-present-day (2014) CO₂ concentration, and airborne 435 fraction of CO₂ in idealised 1% per year CO₂ increase experiments at the time of doubled CO₂, the latter of which is assessed 436 by Chapter 5 of WGI (Canadell et al., 2021). Post-constraint checks are performed to ensure that ECS, TCR, and future 437 warming lies close to the AR6 assessed ranges. The constrained ensemble used for probabilistic assessment contains 2,237 438 ensemble members. The calibrated, constrained ensemble for running FaIR is packaged separately from the climate assessment 439 package and is available as a JSON file from https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5513022 (Smith, 2021a).

440 **3.4.3 CICERO-SCM**

The CICERO simple climate model (CICERO-SCM, Skeie et al., 2017) is also an emission-driven climate model emulator. The emulator consists of a carbon cycle model (Joos et al., 1996), simplified expressions relating emissions of components to forcing, either directly or via concentrations (Etminan et al., 2016; Skeie et al., 2017) and an energy balance/upwelling diffusion model (Schlesinger et al., 1992; Schlesinger and Jiang, 1990; Schlesinger et al., 1992). The ensemble was based on a previously calibrated 30,400-member ensemble (Skeie et al., 2018). A 600-member subset of this ensemble was chosen to best fit the assessment made in WGI (Smith et al., 2021), with a technique also described in Nicholls et al. (2021a). For AR6 the ensemble was calibrated to the current temperature change from 1850-1900 to 1995-2014, with additional cut-offs for unrealistically low aerosol forcing or ECS values. The constrained ensemble for the climate assessment contains 600 members
 and is provided in a JSON file that is available with the climate assessment workflow code (Kikstra et al., 2022a). CICERO-

450 SCM has also recently been ported to Python, facilitating use on multiple computer operating systems.

451

452 **3.5 Climate categorisation of scenarios**

453 **3.5.1 Scenario classification used in AR6**

454 The extensive climate assessment process provides increased confidence compared to previous assessments in the relationship 455 between probabilistic temperature outcomes and the original modelled scenario. Therefore, the AR6 assessment used, like in 456 SR1.5, a temperature-based set of classification rules, which are shown in **Table 2**. These categorisation criteria and their 457 associated likelihoods are always associated with limits to global warming, looking at the simulated peak warming in the 21st 458 century and the global mean surface temperature in 2100. For the categories that limit the global median temperature increase 459 to less than 2°C above 1850-1900 levels (C1-C4), the categorization rules follow the same scheme as in SR1.5. Beyond these, 460 AR6 WGIII includes categories relevant for higher emissions scenarios that cover the 2-2.5°C (C5), 2.5-3°C (C6), 3-4°C (C7) 461 and 4°C and higher (C8) global warming ranges, looking at modelled pathways until 2100. As already noted in SR1.5, 462 temperature-based categorisation is affected by uncertainty in future warming, uncertainty in past warming and the reference 463 period against which temperature levels are compared to (e.g., whether 'pre-industrial', which has a variety of interpretations, 464 or specifically 1850-1900 is taken as a reference period; Chen et al., 2021), but the relative difference between warming levels 465 and thus between temperature categories is more robust (IPCC, 2018).

466 **3.5.2 Overshoot-Degree-Years**

467 The categories C1 ("limit warming to 1.5° C (>50%) with no or limited overshoot") and C2 ("return warming to 1.5° C 468 (>50%) after a high overshoot") are separated based on their level of overshoot of 1.5° C. This separation in the classification 469 used in the IPCC report is purely based on the probability of overshoot (IPCC, 2022a), regardless of its magnitude or duration. 470 In practice, however, the separation based on probability also corresponds to the peak temperature of overshoot. Here, we 471 characterise this difference in overshoot for scenarios in more detail.

The extent and duration of the overshoot and the rate of change in overshoot temperatures are important for climate impacts (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2018). Temperature levels may be largely independent of the path dependence of CO₂ emissions and removals (Tokarska et al., 2019) under limited overshoot with limited permafrost feedbacks (Gasser et al., 2018), but many climate impacts are not (Seneviratne et al., 2018; Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2018), including sea-level rise and species extinction (IPCC, 2022b). For some impacts, the peak temperature during overshoot may be the most important factor, whereas in others it is rather the integral of overshoot (i.e., the magnitude of the overshoot combined with the duration of overshoot), such as sea-level rise in 2300 (Mengel et al., 2018). To further analyse the characteristics of scenario categories beyond the analysis in AR6 we use the concept of overshoot-degree-years (ODY), which is similar to what was shown as "overshoot severity" in Table 2.SM.12 in SR1.5 (Forster et al., 2018), and was included in the metadata of the SR1.5 scenario database (Rogelj et al., 2018; Huppmann et al., 2018b) as "exceedance severity". Inspired by (Geden and Löschel, 2017) and recent scenario studies investigating temperature overshoot (Drouet et al., 2021; Riahi et al., 2021; Johansson, 2021; Tachiiri et al., 2019), we add an analysis of the overshoot severity of all assessed pathways of the AR6WGIII report as the cumulative years above a certain global warming level, multiplied by the projected average annual climatic °C overshoot in each year.

486 In this study, we look at ODY_{1.5} (in $^{\circ}$ C·years) as the cumulative overshoot degree-years above 1.5 $^{\circ}$ C relative to 1850-1900 from the start of each scenario until 2100, or the year specified otherwise: $\sum_t \max(0, T_t - T_{\theta})$, where T is the annual 487 mean climatic global warming above 1850-1900, t is the year, and T_{θ} is the overshoot threshold temperature. The indicator 488 489 could allow for defining limits for overshoot targets and thus be related to net-negative emissions in scenarios that return to 490 below 1.5°C. Additionally, it could be useful in studies that investigate the irreversibility of certain climate change impacts 491 and could be an indicator of the resilience of a system. For instance, in the case that some human system or ecosystem is unable 492 to adapt permanently but would be able to withstand up to 10 $ODY_{1.5}$, either through limited resilience or by using temporary 493 adaptation measures, this would indicate when, under a certain scenario, the system may collapse. The AR6 Working Group 494 II (WGII) report on Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability (IPCC, 2022b) states with medium confidence that shorter duration 495 and lower levels of overshoot are projected to come with less severe impacts. ODY is not an indicator that can be used for all 496 purposes, as for some questions the rate of temperature change, or the level of peak warming reached in a given scenario may 497 be more relevant. Still, at the very least an indicator like this acknowledges that not only the magnitude of overshoot, but also 498 the timescales, are important when assessing overshoot risks (Ritchie et al., 2021) and bridges the gap with stylized overshoot 499 scenarios (Huntingford et al., 2017). Analysing IAM scenarios in this way could be a useful link to the broader tipping points 500 literature (Lenton et al., 2019), and potentially inform climate change policy, impact, and adaptation studies.

501 **3.5.3 Alternative policy-relevant scenario classifications**

502 There are multiple possible indicators that can be chosen to classify and group scenarios (see the discussion above and e.g., 503 Table 3.4 in AR4 WGIII; IPCC, 2007). AR4 discussed this mainly as a matter of stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations 504 using a specific indicator as a proxy along the chain from mitigation costs, through emissions to impacts. In response to the 505 introduction of temperature goals in international policy decisions and the spearheading of a temperature-aligned approach in 506 science-policy reports by the UN Environment Programme (Hare et al., 2010; Rogelj and Shukla, 2012; Rogelj et al., 2011), 507 SR1.5 and AR6 WGIII based their classifications on global warming levels. Global warming levels were used as one of the 508 integrating dimensions in the AR6 WGI report (Chen et al., 2021) and in the AR6 WGII report, as well as across WGs. 509 However, it is also possible to append such a classification with a mix of indicators, for instance to reflect a global climate 510 agreement like the Paris Agreement. For example, the IPCC WGIII AR6 report also reports a sub-category, C1a, of C1 511 scenarios (IPCC, 2022d). The additional criterion for this sub-category is that net-zero GHG emissions are attained, generally in the second half of this century, which can be interpreted to reflect Article 4.1 of the Paris Agreement (Fuglestvedt et al., 2018; Rogelj et al., 2021). Related examples of such mixed classifications exist in the literature. For example, one recent paper proposes a specific interpretation of the Paris Agreement (Schleussner et al., 2022), proposing that pathways can be seen as "Paris-compatible" if they (a) "[do] not ever have a greater than 66% probability to overshoot 1.5°C", (b) "[are] *very likely* (90% chance or more) ... not ever exceeding 2°C", and (c) achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions using global warming potentials with a 100 year time horizon (GWP100).

518 **3.6 Evaluating the effects of each step of the climate assessment workflow**

The approach to emissions processing in AR6 WGIII was based on a combination of previous literature (Lamboll et al., 2020; Gidden et al., 2018) and expert evaluation of the submitted pathways. The objective of this approach is to obtain an unbiased, comparable, and plausible set of climate outcomes, in which each climate timeseries outcome reflects the original pathway as truthfully as possible. To facilitate expanding and improving the methods, it is worth evaluating the appropriateness of the set of tools in a quantitative manner. In this work, we provide an initial analysis by showing the effect on the total Kyoto gases using a CO₂-equivalent emission indicator (based on GWP100), for both harmonisation and infilling for each category.

525 4 Results

526 **4.1 Characteristics of the full database.**

The 1202 scenarios for which a climate assessment is available in AR6DB span a wide range of emissions pathways (**Figure 2A**). The three climate emulators CICERO-SCM, FaIR, and MAGICC translate the set of infilled pathways in similar ways for atmospheric concentrations, with most distinctive differences for N₂O (**Figure 2B**). Global mean surface temperatures above 1850-1900 levels are relatively similar between MAGICC and FaIR, while CICERO is colder (**Figure 2C**). Global mean surface temperature change in IPCC WGIII AR6 (and here) is defined as degrees Celsius above the 1850-1900 mean, normalised to the best estimate of 0.85° C global warming for the period 1995-2014, as given by AR6 WGI.

In this manuscript, we focus on the median simulated climate outcomes of each scenario, with percentiles generally indicating percentiles over the selected scenario set. However, each climate variable, also including variables not discussed in this article such as ERF, ocean heat uptake, and CO_2 and CH_4 fluxes, as well as non- CO_2 warming for MAGICCv7.5.3, is available for each scenario for percentiles 5, 10, 16.7, 25, 33, 50, 67, 75, 83.3, 90, and 95 (Byers et al., 2022). The full AR6DB thus enables rich future studies of the uncertainty in multiple climate indicators for a large scenario set.

The database has scenarios (across all categories C1 to C8) with a very wide range for 2100 temperature outcomes, with its 5th to 95th percentile range stretching from 0.9-1.3°C to 3.2-3.8°C across scenarios, with the range for both the 5th and 95th percentiles arising from the differences across the three climate emulators. In 2050, the temperature outcome range is much smaller, covering a range of 1.4-1.6°C to 2.0-2.2°C above 1850-1900 (**Table 3**). The database thus covers a very broad spectrum of scenarios, going from groups of scenarios that reduce emissions fast enough to let temperatures decline in the second half of the century to scenarios that project increasingly fast warming. Still, it is noteworthy that the extreme ends of the range are covered by only a few scenarios with scenarios reaching 4°C warming this century reflect less than 5% of the scenarios in the AR6DB, and only very few scenarios in the database that stay below 1.5°C by mid-century (except for when assessed using CICERO-SCM, which is cooler and features a larger set of scenarios staying below 1.5°C, and was used as a sensitivity case in the AR6 WGIII full report but was not included in the summary of results reported in the Summary for Policymakers).

549 **4.2 Differences in climate emulators**

The temperature classification in IPCC AR6 WGIII was done based on MAGICC. In high emissions scenarios MAGICC generally projects higher median outcomes than the other two emulators for the same set of scenarios (**Figure 3A**). The CICERO AR6-calibrated version projects the lowest amount of warming of the three emulators for all scenario categories.

553 For the two scenario categories with the most stringent temperature limits (C1 and C2), the medians of MAGICC and 554 FaIR in 2100 are very close to each other. However, for these two categories MAGICC projects faster near-term warming than 555 FaIR for the same emissions and thus MAGICC projects higher peak temperatures. Together, this implies a more negative 556 zero emissions commitment (ZEC) in MAGICC compared to FaIR.

557 One way to investigate the difference in climate emulators is to look at the same scenario set and compare the relative 558 contributions of different emissions species to warming using median ERF. Looking at the ERF across scenarios for the 559 AR6DB split up in lower (C1-C4) and higher (C5-C8) temperature categories, it is clear that MAGICC and FaIR perform very 560 similarly, with slightly stronger negative aerosols forcing in MAGICC, and slightly stronger positive CO_2 forcing in FaIR 561 (**Figure 4A**). CICERO shows clearly lower CO_2 forcing than the other two emulators, while also having less negative aerosol 562 forcing.

Looking not at the ranges across scenarios, but rather at the climate uncertainties for each scenario in 2030, we see that also the uncertainty ranges projected by FaIR and MAGICC are similar, though MAGICC projects somewhat higher uncertainty ranges on near-term forcing from F-gases and aerosols (**Figure 4B**). CICERO does not have an interactive carbon cycle representation and only represents uncertainties in aerosols, which are much smaller than in MAGICC and FaIR, where uncertainty in aerosol-related ERF is especially large.

568 **4.3 Characteristics of scenario categories**

A multi-emulator comparison reveals that the temperature categorisation of a specific scenario can be quite sensitive to small differences in how emissions are translated to global warming (**Figure 3B**). This is especially the case for the C1 and C2 categories, with many scenarios in the AR6DB aiming at 1.5°C targets while warming is already 1.1°C for the period of 2011-2020 over 1850-1900 (IPCC, 2021a). FaIR and MAGICC were assessed to cover the AR6 WGI assessment and its uncertainties very well, which can be interpreted as generally approximating best estimate warming with an error up to 0.1°C difference. While small in the broader context of uncertainty in the physical climate system, a 0.1°C difference in projected 575 peak temperature covers a non-trivial part of the difference between C1 and C2. Since FaIR projects slightly lower peak 576 temperatures than MAGICC, the number of scenarios classified in the AR6 temperature category C1 would double if the 577 classification would be repeated using FaIR. However, the number of scenarios in the wider set of 1.5°C and 2°C consistent 578 categories (C1-C4) is much more similar, with 758 for FaIR versus 687 for MAGICC.

579 In the supplementary material, we perform sensitivity experiments to explore the sensitivity to changes in absolute 580 warming level estimates of the number of scenarios within temperature categories C1-C3 (Supplementary Figure 1). Such 581 changes could happen for instance due to a change in the best estimate of historical warming since 1850-1900, an update of 582 the best estimate of CO_2 or aerosols forcing, or even due to choosing different harmonisation and infilling methods. If the peak 583 temperature estimates of all scenarios would have been 0.1°C higher, virtually no scenarios would be categorised as C1, while 584 the number would roughly double if peak temperature level estimates would be about 0.1°C lower (Supplementary Figure 585 1A-B). Furthermore, small variations in the scenarios included in a category can have a marked impact on the median net-zero 586 GHG timing in C1, while the effects on net-zero CO₂ in all categories and on net-zero GHG in C2 and C3 are less sensitive 587 (Supplementary Figure 1C-D). This simple sensitivity analysis on the level of global temperatures gives a sense of how much 588 scenario categorisation is related to uncertainty in climate projections of emissions pathways. This can be connected to the 589 change in categorisation that may come with a potential change in harmonisation and infilling methods, but it is not 590 immediately obvious what effect a change in harmonisation or infilling would have on categorisation. In section 4.7 of this 591 article, we discuss the temperature change that can be attributed to changes in climate assessment methods between SR1.5 and 592 AR6, providing an initial analysis by showing the magnitude of the changes between the two applications. However, a full 593 analysis of the uncertainties in the climate assessment workflow is beyond the scope of this paper and remains a topic for 594 further research.

595 **4.4 Temperature overshoot**

596 Almost all scenarios are projected by MAGICC to overshoot 1.5°C, even in C1, with C3-C8 median warming estimates never 597 returning to below 1.5°C this century (Figure 5A-D). The duration of overshoot in most C1 scenarios is limited to a few 598 decades, generally starting in the 2030s, while some C2 scenarios are projected to have global warming of more than 1.5°C 599 for most of the century (Figure 5B-C). The peak of overshoot in C1 scenarios is generally limited to up to 0.1°C, while scenarios in C2 are generally in the 0.1-0.4°C range. Hence even though categories C1 and C2 are defined solely based on 600 601 their probability of exceeding 1.5°C, these scenarios are also practically distinguished by the amount by which they overshoot 602 1.5°C, which may be more relevant for climate change impact, vulnerability, and adaptation studies. Notably, there is some 603 overlap in ODY1.5 between categories. For instance, there are scenarios in the C2 and C3 categories that have lower ODY1.5 604 than a number of scenarios in C1.

605 Using ODY_{1.5} until 2100, we see that the severity of temperature exceedance above 1.5° C is also clearly differentiated 606 by category, with different rates of increase of cumulative exceedance of 1.5° C after 2030 (**Figure 5E-F**). For instance, using 607 the median of temperature estimates from MAGICC, we find that about three quarters of the scenarios in C1 stay below 2 608 $ODY_{1.5}$, and the 95th percentile across scenarios is slightly below 3 $ODY_{1.5}$ (Figure 5E). If the warming response is on the higher end of the spectrum, at 33% probability (67^{th} percentile of warming range), the ODY₁₅ interguartile (25^{th} to 75^{th}) 609 610 scenario range is about 5 to 9, meaning a risk for significant overshoot even for C1. Only if the warming response would be 611 on the lower end of the spectrum (67% probability at 33rd percentile of warming range), overshoot could be avoided for all C1 612 scenarios, C4 scenarios are more likely than not below 2°C but do not return back to below 1.5°C. Their median ODY therefore 613 steadily grows to over 20 $ODY_{1.5}$ by end-of-century for more than half of the scenarios. For more than half of the scenarios in 614 C4 more than 10 ODY₁₅ by 2100 is projected with at least 67% chance, and about 33% chance that it would be more than 30 615 $ODY_{1.5}$. In higher temperature categories, $ODY_{1.5}$ increases ever-faster over time because temperatures keep increasing, 616 resulting in median values of about 50 and 100 $ODY_{1.5}$ in 2100 for C6 and C8 in 2100, respectively (Figure 5F).

617 **4.5 "Paris-compatible" scenarios using FaIR and MAGICC**

618 Using FaIR, 89 scenarios in the AR6DB would meet the three criteria for "Paris-compatibility" from Schleussner et al. 619 (2022)Schleussner et al., (2022) described in section 3.5.3. Using MAGICC, 29 scenarios meet these criteria (Figure 6A). In 620 this subset of scenarios, net-zero CO_2 in the MAGICC scenario subset is reached around 2050, and before 2060 in the FaIR 621 subset, looking at the interquartile range, with the median of both subsets being close to 2050. Net-zero GHG timing has a 622 wider range across scenarios, with the medians across scenario subsets being about 15-20 years later than net-zero CO₂ (Figure 623 6B). Compared to the "Paris-compatible" set, IPCC C1 category has a much wider range for GHG net-zero timing, with a few 624 scenarios that do not have net negative GHG emissions but do have projected warming of less than 1.5°C in 2100. For net-625 zero CO_2 timing, the difference is small. The interquartile ranges for cumulative CO_2 emissions until net-zero CO_2 are 520-626 680GtCO₂ for FaIR and 480-560GtCO₂ for MAGICC. How remaining carbon budgets relate to temperature outcomes is 627 strongly dependent on the level of non-CO₂ mitigation (Canadell et al., 2021; Riahi et al., 2022; IPCC, 2022a). However, even 628 with the strongest non-CO₂ mitigation, no scenario with more than 1000GtCO₂ cumulative emissions before reaching net-zero 629 is deemed Paris-compatible according to these criteria using FaIR, or no more than 800GtCO₂ using MAGICC.

630 The main climate difference between the "Paris-compatible" scenarios and the full C1 category is the amount by 631 which temperature declines after its peak at 1.5-1.6°C in 2035-2055 (Figure 6E). For more than half of the scenarios in the 632 sub-group of 29 scenarios the temperature decline after 2040 is 0.3-0.4°C until 2100, whereas more than half of the other C1 633 scenarios see less than 0.2°C temperature decline post-2040 in this century (Figure 6F). The temperature decline in the "Paris-634 compatible" ($\sim 0.06^{\circ}$ C/decade) subset is about 2 times faster than the C1 subset that is not "Paris-compatible" ($\sim 0.03^{\circ}$ C/decade, 635 Figure 6G). Such lower temperatures, which are also implied to decline beyond 2100 if no abrupt changes in emissions levels 636 and trends are assumed, come with lower risks related to, for instance, sea level rise and stresses related to heat extremes and 637 drought, given that temperatures would return towards current levels during the 22nd century. Conversely, some scenarios that 638 are in C1 but not classified as "Paris-compatible" are characterised by even stronger CO_2 reductions by 2030 than the already 639 very rapid reductions in the "Paris-compatible" set. Those scenarios thus project even more rapid near-term reduction to limit 640 warming while avoiding reducing the need for net-negative CO₂ emissions present in the second half of the century in scenarios

that reach net-zero GHG emissions, as illustrated by Figure 6 panel D.

642

643 **4.6 The effects of emissions processing in the AR6 workflow**

644 The effects of harmonisation and infilling on input emissions pathways is small, when taken over the entire scenario database. 645 looking at GHGs for Kyoto Gases using GWP100 to calculate CO₂-equivalent values for N₂O, CH₄, and F-gases. The median 646 effect of harmonisation and infilling over the full scenario database is about 1GtCO₂-eq/yr upwards in 2015, trending down to 647 zero towards the end of the scenario in 2100 (Figure 7A). However, some scenarios are affected by these processing steps much more than others, with the 5th to 95th percentile range of about -2 to 4GtCO₂-eq/yr in 2020 (compared to total modelled 648 649 emissions of around 55GtCO₂-ea/yr in 2020) to -1 to 4GtCO₂-ea/yr in 2100. Investigating in which scenarios such changes 650 occur, and for which emissions species, helps understand differences with other harmonisation and infilling methods as 651 discussed in the next section.

652 While the harmonisation effect decreases over time, the upper bound does not change much because it is dominated 653 by infilling effects in the second half of the century. Such a high infilling is almost always the result of high emissions scenarios 654 lacking detail in reporting F-gases, which can grow to more than 5 GtCO₂-eq/yr in 2100 in a set of high emissions scenarios. 655 As shown in **Figure 7A-C**, about half of the total effect on the outer ranges is due to the harmonisation of CO₂-AFOLU, for 656 which a large model spread exists, much in line with the uncertainty in historical databases (Dhakal et al., 2022). For methane, 657 and for all other long-lived greenhouse gases combined (N₂O and F-gases), the median of harmonisation is slightly positive. 658 Most scenarios require little to no infilling for Kyoto GHGs measured in CO₂-equivalence, but that does not mean that they 659 are unaffected by infilling as they may still need significant infilling for aerosols and precursor emissions. We do not find 660 evidence that harmonisation and infilling introduce any particularly strong bias across the climate categories used in the IPCC 661 AR6 WGIII report (Figure 7E-F). For harmonisation, for each category except C8 (which has the smallest number of 662 scenarios), the zero line falls well within the interguartile range, with the C2 median being most negative, and the C4 median 663 being the most positive (Figure 7E). In terms of infilling, only the C3 and C7 median effect across scenarios show values 664 larger than 0.3GtCO2-eq/yr due to infilling before 2040 (Figure 7F). The emissions processing also affects climate forcers 665 beyond the Kyoto Gases, which are not readily expressed in GWP100 CO2-equivalent values. Most evaluated scenarios model 666 non-Kyoto climate forcers such as black carbon (BC), organic carbon (OC) and sulfur, and thus there is no infilling effect for 667 most scenarios for these emissions species. However, the relative difference in reported past emissions can be quite large 668 leading to a harmonisation effect, with a small fraction of outliers for OC (Figure 7D).

The total cumulative effect of infilling and harmonisation for the 2020-2100 period is relatively small too (**Figure 7G and Figure 8**). More than half of the scenarios in the AR6DB (738) have higher cumulative Kyoto gases emissions until 2100 after harmonisation and infilling, and 464 scenarios are lower, indicating that the infilling effect is not dominating the harmonisation effect. In part, the infilling effect is offset due to a large number of scenarios which report CO₂-AFOLU emissions levels higher than the ~3.5GtCO₂/yr harmonised value in 2015, in combination with the late convergence target year for CO₂-AFOLU. Virtually all scenarios fall well within the +-500GtCO₂-equivalent band (**Figure 8B**), with the majority of scenarios being affected less than 100GtCO₂-equivalent. All except 8 of the C1-C5 scenarios fall within the +-250GtCO₂equivalent band (**Figure 8A**). Thus, this analysis does not show a clear pattern or bias pushing emissions up or down across categories. Rather, the harmonisation and infilling effect is mostly model-dependent, and the distribution of scenarios from certain IAM frameworks is not constant across temperature categories (**Supplementary Table 2**).

679 4.7 Changes in methods between SR1.5 and AR6 WGIII and their implications

680 The most recent and most rigorous scenario assessment until AR6 was done in SR1.5. Insights from IAM-based 681 assessment have influenced the global science-policy discourse (van Beek et al., 2020, 2022) and are even referred to in 682 outcomes from informed ambitions in the Glasgow Climate Pact (UNFCCC, 2021). The results of SR1.5 have been influential 683 in the academic literature, influenced public debate around the world, and legitimised as well as challenged climate policy 684 (Hermansen et al., 2021; Livingston and Rummukainen, 2020). It is thus crucial to understand how the AR6 assessment 685 methods differ from the methods applied in SR1.5. Here we provide additional insights to Annex III.II.3.2.1. "Climate 686 classification of global pathways" of AR6 WGIII (IPCC, 2022a). The analysis performed allows for isolating the approximate 687 differences between SR1.5 and AR6 WGIII pertaining to each of the separate methodological steps of the climate assessment 688 workflow, namely harmonisation, infilling, and climate emulation. The same set of emissions scenarios was run with five 689 different configurations that are summarised in Table 4.

- Analysing the scenarios available both in the AR6 database as well as in the SR1.5 database (see also IPCC (2022a)),
 using the climate emulator MAGICC, shows the effect that is due to partly compounding, partly offsetting changes in each
 stage of the climate assessment (Figure 9A and Figure 9B).
- The effect of the climate emulator update and recalibration (MAGICC6 in SR1.5 versus MAGICCv7.5.3 in AR6 WGIII) means a slightly higher peak temperature for near-term temperature peaks (in C1 and C2), and a lower 2100 temperature for all scenario categories in AR6. The lower warming in 2100 in AR6 is more in line with the best estimate based on multiple lines of evidence in AR6 WGI, as expressed by a lower transient climate response in MAGICCv7.5.3 (Nicholls et al., 2022).
- The median harmonisation effect for C1 and C3 results in about 0.05° C lower temperature in the AR6 method, which may in part be explained by the difference in harmonisation year (2010 in SR1.5 versus 2015 in AR6 WGIII), as well as a later chosen convergence date for CO₂-AFOLU. However, an explicit analysis of these separate factors is beyond the scope of this paper.
- The change in infilling methods results in slightly lower 2100 temperatures in AR6 for C1, but virtually zero for C3, and positive for high warming categories (particularly C7 and C8). This is not surprising because in SR1.5 infilling was done using RCP2.6, which is roughly consistent with C3. Scenarios in C1 see stronger mitigation, and thus the infilling method applied in AR6 WGIII also sees more strongly declining emissions from other GHGs that are being infilled.

706 Overall, the effect of updating climate assessment methods is typically less than 0.2°C, and for most scenarios less 707 than 0.1° C (Figure 9A). This difference is small but non-negligible compared to the precision of the climate emulators. If we 708 only look at the projected warming since 1995-2014 (which was calibrated to 0.85°C above pre-industrial), the effect of the 709 change in methods is always less than 25% of the projected warming in each scenario, and typically less than 10% for both 710 peak temperatures and 2100 temperatures (Figure 9B). Only for the C1 and C2 categories is the change in 2100 more 711 substantial when expressed as a percentage of recent and future warming; this is due to the limited warming that occurs overall 712 in this category, so that even small changes result in a more substantive percentage change of about 30% in the median of C1. 713 This, however, still only corresponds to an absolute median temperature difference of about 0.1°C.

There are a few outlier scenarios in C1 and C2, where the relative effect on projected warming in 2100 relative to 1995-2014 is more than 50%. These differences, both when negative and positive (up to ±0.2°C change) are mostly caused by a different infilling effect for scenarios that have a low projected warming until 2100, sometimes combined with a slightly more negative temperature drawdown after peak from the climate emulator. The effects are strongly scenario dependent. For instance, the change in 2100 projected temperature due to changes in infilling is opposite for AIM/CGE (AR6 infilling results in higher temperatures than SR1.5 infilling) and WITCH-GLOBIOM CD-LINKS_NPi2020_400 (AR6 infilling results in lower temperatures than SR1.5 infilling) scenarios.

Lastly, to understand the differences in reported summary characteristics across SR1.5 and AR6 WGIII, it is important to know the distributions of global warming that it is associated with. For instance, the scenarios in the lowest category in AR6 (C1) generally have higher peak and 2100 temperatures than the scenarios that featured in the analogous category in SR1.5 (**Figure 9C**). This reflects the continued growth seen in emissions in the past years, and therefore higher warming for the same (maximum feasible) rate of reductions in newer IAM scenarios published since SR1.5.

726 **5 Discussion**

727 5.1 Advancements in the AR6 report and where to go for AR7

728 The IPCC Sixth Assessment cycle saw important advancements in the climate assessment of the emissions scenario literature: 729 from a concentration and forcing based approach in AR5 to a temperature based approach in SR1.5 and AR6 that more closely 730 reflects policy needs; from the use of ad-hoc methods with important limitations for the completion and harmonisation of 731 emissions in AR5 and SR1.5 to a carefully designed and more robust emissions scenario assessment across WGs in AR6; from 732 the use of a single climate emulator in AR5 to the coordinated approach where WGI assessed and identified a set of emulators 733 that most faithfully reflect the state-of-the-art understanding of global warming and its uncertainties. These have put the AR6 734 mitigation scenario assessment on a new level compared to earlier reports, but opportunities for further improvements in the 735 next assessment cycle remain.

736 5.1.1 Moving beyond a binary quality vetting process

737 New methods could be devised to advance the methods used to vet scenarios that are considered. Vetting scenarios for instance 738 for their historical alignment and variable coverage is important to allow for a certain level of confidence that the modelled 739 climate outcomes are internally consistent with the full modelled scenario given the methods of the climate assessment 740 workflow (see Supplement for more detail). In the current AR6 process, a scenario was either found fit-for-purpose or not 741 considered in the analysis of global temperature outcomes. Future assessments could attempt to move beyond such a binary 742 procedure and for example look at assigning relative weights to scenarios based on how well they match recent trends, and to 743 increase the diversity of the evidence-base, with the global scenarios with a climate assessment in the AR6DB being dominated 744 by only a handful of modelling frameworks (Supplementary Table 2). In the report, it could lead to more information being 745 available for partial assessments of scenarios. For the climate assessment, knowing which emissions trajectories are more in 746 line with past trends could be used as information to determine how to infill a trajectory when it is missing. Moreover, new 747 methods and evidence are required to assess the performance of emissions-driven climate emulators with higher confidence. 748 Most of the CMIP exercises run concentration-driven experiments, instead of the emission-driven runs that would most directly 749 inform emulator calibration and improvement. This research gap is particularly wide for understanding the climate 750 consequences of scenarios with net negative CO₂ and GHG emissions.

5.1.2 Towards improving understanding of the role of aerosols in climate mitigation pathways

The role of aerosol and aerosol precursor emissions in warming projections of scenarios remains uncertain. This is in part due to large climate uncertainties that remain in the various aerosol-climate interactions and in emission inventories, and in part because of a lack of a broadly representative set of scenarios for regional aerosol emissions. There is also still a relatively modest focus of the IAM community on modelling alternative effects of aerosol and precursor emission processes, with aerosols generally not being part of scenario protocols in multi-model IAM studies.

757 5.1.3 Connecting to regional climate impact studies and IPCC WGII

758 The advancements in integration of insights and assessments from different scenario research communities across climate 759 mitigation and physical climate sciences in AR6 fell short of being fully reflected in the assessment of climate change impacts 760 in WGII. However, the methods described in this paper could be one way to allow for such further integration. A closer 761 connection between scenarios and the assessment of physical climate science on the one hand, and impacts, vulnerability, and 762 adaptation studies on the other hand could provide an extremely impactful contribution to the next IPCC assessment cycle. For 763 instance, the current climate assessment workflow from emissions to global temperature change could be extended to enable 764 the inclusion of regional emissions details, and effects on regional climate such as from local aerosols forcing. This could for 765 instance come in the form of emulators to provide regionally downscaled mean and extreme temperature projections, using 766 tools such as MESMER (Beusch et al., 2020, 2022; Quilcaille et al., 2022) and ClimateBench (Watson-Parris et al., 2022), or

767 other modelling approaches that utilise regional emissions data available in the AR6DB to enable differentiation between for 768 instance regional aerosol emissions pathways (Figure 10). A natural next step is to move one step further down the cause-769 effect chain from regional climate change to regional climate impacts. Using such a chain of emulators (Beusch et al., 2022) 770 could enable probabilistic assessments of various types of impacts both at different global warming levels and under scenarios 771 not considered by Earth System models, supplementing the evidence base used for adaptation and impact assessments made 772 in IPCC WGII. Even without regional impacts, relevant global metrics can be obtained from this kind of workflow such as 773 global sea-level rise. In turn, the scenario development and IAM community could draw lessons from such studies too, for 774 instance by exploring parts of the impacts, vulnerability, and adaptation space that are found to be understudied.

775 **5.2 Scenario classification approaches**

776 In AR6 and multiple previous IPCC assessments, scenarios were grouped to enable describing the characteristics of a group 777 of scenarios (e.g., emissions reductions) that have a similar relevant feature (e.g., change in global mean surface temperature). 778 Future scenarios classifications can choose to review choices in two elements, namely (i) the chosen relevant feature and (ii) 779 the tools used to evaluate how the chosen relevant feature relates to the scenario characteristic. When it comes to (i), one could 780 for instance include other indicators beyond global temperature projections in the classification scheme when they are policy-781 relevant. This could include indicators on mitigation strategies, emissions trajectories, scenario and model design, other 782 physical responses than global mean temperature, or climate impacts. In addition, the use of the median and 33rd, and 67th 783 percentiles of global mean surface temperature for the classification in AR6, as well as the chosen specific warming levels, 784 should not be seen as set in stone. For instance, one could choose to set the upper bound for category C3 to $<1.8^{\circ}$ C at 50% 785 probability, rather than <2.0°C at 67% probability. For (ii), AR6 WGIII used MAGICC to do the classification of scenarios. It 786 would also be possible to use multiple climate emulators for classification, for instance by using a majority rule, a multi-model 787 mean, or other ways of combining climate emulator distributions. In addition, the availability of information on multiple types 788 of uncertainty (emissions, climate uncertainty within an emulator, multiple emulators) could be utilised to provide a confidence 789 level of the assigned category classification.

Another aspect is the categorisation of scenarios, and the use of descriptive statistics. Describing larger scenario categories comes with further limitations, because summary statistics can conceal the underlying distribution or overemphasise outliers. Further efforts could be made to describe key scenario characteristics by developing methods that correct for potential biases in the underlying scenario database, such as overrepresentation of scenarios from one specific modelling framework, or weightings based on feasibility, historical compatibility, or scenario similarity (Guivarch et al., 2022). Other topics that might be relevant for a more multi-dimensional categorisation could be a separation of scenarios by their temperature decline after their peak, or the associated reliance on net negative emissions to achieve this.

797 **5.3 Improving the understanding of the implications of overshoot**

798 Related to the question of impact is the question of overshoot. From Figure 5E-F we learn that each AR6 temperature category 799 can be distinguished based on their ODY_{1.5} timeseries, with almost all scenarios overshooting 1.5° C at least for a decade when 800 using climate emulator MAGICC. Following the publication of the AR6 WGI, and much more strongly since the publication 801 of AR6 WGII and WGIII, more focus has come on temperature overshoot. Many different peak-and-decline scenarios have 802 been analysed in Chapter 3 of AR6 WGIII (Riahi et al., 2022), some with more pronounced overshoot than others. The 803 discussion of overshoot in global climate policy is expected to be contentious due to its connection to the assumptions related 804 to large-scale carbon dioxide removal or the potential that its presence in scenarios can delay strong mitigation policies while 805 also potentially obscuring impact and feasibility risks of a temperature overshoot strategy (Maher and Symons, 2022; S. M. 806 Smith, 2021b). While overshoot indicators like ODY_{15} may immediately be useful as an indicator to quantify differences in 807 levels of overshoot between scenarios, further research is required to relate absolute levels of ODY to for instance climate 808 impacts, loss and damage, and the risk of passing tipping points (Lenton et al., 2019) to be able to judge whether ODY or other 809 temperature exceedance metrics could be a useful indicator to guide climate policies.

810 5.4 Climate assessment workflow performance diagnostics and limitations, and further development

811 In this manuscript, we have analysed the impact of changes in the climate assessment workflow between SR1.5 and AR6. The 812 changes made between the two assessments drew on an expert judgement of the applicability of available methods, based on 813 the available literature (Lamboll et al., 2020; Gidden et al., 2018, 2019), extensive knowledge of the AR6 scenario database, 814 and experience from previous IPCC reports. To enable assessing the climate outcomes of different climate assessment 815 workflow methods, and to help determine whether such a change in methods is an improvement, a more systematic analysis 816 is required. Such a more systematic analysis could involve establishing a reference case, specify a set of "standard experiments" 817 to be performed, and develop a set of diagnostics to evaluate the differences between method choices. In this manuscript, we 818 have used GWP100 which is available in the AR6DB (Byers et al., 2022) to analyse the impact of the harmonisation and 819 infilling of emissions trajectories. However, such an analysis is limited because it does not capture all climatically active 820 species, like aerosols, and because GWP100 is only one out of multiple possible metrics. Alternative metric choices would not 821 alter the climate outcome for a given GHG emissions pathway but could significantly affect the reported date at which net zero 822 GHG emissions are reached (Dhakal et al., 2022; Figure 2 SM.10). Below, we will discuss two things. First, we point out a 823 few ways to further investigate and improve the quality of the existing elements of the climate assessment workflow as applied 824 for AR6 WGIII. After that, we point out several remaining possible additions in detail and in scope for the development of the 825 'climate-assessment' tool.

826 5.4.1 Improvements for harmonisation

827 This paper has analysed the changes in temperature estimates as the result of different methods using an ad-hoc setup. 828 This setup could serve as inspiration for a future diagnostic tool, and the development of benchmarks. Future work could 829 consider extending or adjusting the decision tree currently available in 'aneris'. For instance, to facilitate earlier convergence 830 times, for CO_2 emissions in scenarios that reach and sustain net-zero CO_2 emissions, the decision tree could incorporate the 831 convergence year dependent on the scenario design. A significant limitation of the harmonisation part of the workflow comes 832 from the uncertainty in historical emissions, and how such uncertainties and corrections are projected into the future. 833 Harmonisation now collapses this uncertainty, sometimes updating emissions estimates that are out-of-date but other times 834 forcing sets of estimates predicated on different measurements to agree with each other. In some cases, the trends of harmonised 835 data can be markedly different to the trends in the original pathways - for instance, if historical emissions of an F-gas were 836 overestimated but are projected to fall over time, the return to the original value can cause a net positive gradient. Going 837 forward, it would be worth investigating the impact of historical emissions choices and uncertainty on results.

838 5.4.2 Improvements for infilling

839 In a similar fashion, infilling performance can also be improved in a few different ways. One way would be to improve 840 upon the infiller database, for instance by simply having a wider variety of modelled scenarios including especially aerosols 841 and individual fluorinated gases, allowing for more differentiated infilled pathways. For some species however, such as 842 aerosols and ozone precursors, more research is needed to confidently select the most reasonable pathways or to infill a 843 trajectory when it is missing. Another more advanced way would be to consider assigning weights to emissions trajectories in 844 the scenario database. Lastly, and perhaps most influentially, future workflows could consider developing an automated 845 infilling method decision tree for each emissions species. In AR6, two different methods and infiller databases are used, but 846 always with the same lead gas, CO_2 from energy and industrial processes. For example, it may be preferable to let black carbon 847 act as lead component for filling in an organic carbon timeseries, when available.

848 5.4.3 The order of emissions processing steps

849 Another particular choice that could be evaluated in future work is the order of emissions processing. In AR6, following SR15, 850 scenario vetting is done first, harmonisation second, and infilling (based on a harmonised set of emissions trajectories) last. 851 Such a strategy ensures that the pathways that are infilled are always starting from a reasonable point and influenced less by 852 differences in historical emissions databases. Moreover, in this way two pathways that are identical except for when they were 853 last harmonised, should have the same infilled emissions. However, it would also be possible to do infilling before 854 harmonisation, which would derive inter-species statistics used for infilling more directly from the modelled processes in the 855 IAMs. This can only be guaranteed if they are infilled after harmonisation to the latest values. Lastly, by reducing the range of 856 projections when using the QRW method, the risk of out-of-sample infilling is reduced.

857 **5.4.4 Potential for further development of a community tool**

858 The 'climate-assessment' workflow is available as an installable open-source Python package with an MIT licence (Kikstra et 859 al., 2022a). The code utilises functions of existing scientific software packages including 'pyam' (Huppmann et al., 2021) and 860 has been parallelised to enable doing runs of many scenarios. It could be used as a community tool for scenario assessment 861 that enables both easier access to well-calibrated climate emulators and the possibility to assess a wider range of scenarios due 862 to the possibility of infilling emissions trajectories. Such access to a climate assessment tool can facilitate the development of 863 socioeconomic scenarios, for instance when new models only have the ability to model a limited number of emission species. 864 Results have already been used to allow for calculating the non-CO₂ contribution to warming which is used to estimate the 865 remaining carbon budget (Lamboll and Rogelj, 2022; Lamboll et al., 2022).

866 There are many ways that the climate-assessment workflow could be extended and applied in future work. Some were 867 already listed in section 5.1.3 and visualised in Figure 10. Here, we highlight additionally the possibility to connect more 868 climate emulators to this workflow as well as newer versions of already connected emulators, through the 'openscm' interface 869 (Nicholls et al., 2021b). Firstly, to enable a robust assessment of climate mitigation pathways, a multi-emulator setup is crucial 870 to understand both differences between the multiple models out there, including those that participated in RCMIP (Nicholls et 871 al., 2021a), and connecting to a common interface can enable easier intercomparisons. Secondly, having a wider set of simple 872 climate models available and connected to this workflow could allow wider applications as the models differ in the detail and 873 methods with which processes are modelled, and thus also differ in what variables can be projected alongside scenarios.

874 6 Conclusions

875 The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report on the Mitigation of Climate Change (IPCC, 2022c) evaluated the climate outcomes of a 876 very broad range of scenarios. This manuscript further documents and evaluates the climate assessment workflow that allowed 877 for this analysis and has further explored elements related to compatibility with the Paris Agreement, temperature overshoot, 878 and the differences between climate emulators. The 'climate-assessment' package introduced with this manuscript can serve 879 as a tool that currently can support modellers to project climate outcomes of scenarios with emissions information, even if 880 only several major emissions species were modelled. Future work could take this work as a start to further expand the coverage 881 of the causal chain from emissions to climate impacts, by extending the workflow beyond global climate characteristics toward 882 regional or local climate change projections of temperature and precipitation and calculated climate impacts.

883 Acknowledgements

- 884 We would like to thank Katherine Calvin, Gaurav Ganti, Philip Hackstock, Daniel Huppmann, Felix Schenuit, and Jim Skea
- for their helpful suggestions and discussions on the development and diagnosis of the climate assessment workflow and this manuscript.
- J.S.K. was supported by the UK Natural Environment Research Council under grant agreement NE/S007415/1. C.J.S. was
 supported by a NERC/IIASA Collaborative Research Fellowship (NE/T009381/1).
- R. L., J.R. and P.M.F. received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under
 grant agreement No 820829 (CONSTRAIN).
- G.P.P. was funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No
 821003 (4C) and No 820846 (Paris Reinforce).
- J.S.K, E.B, K.R, R.S, E.K., D.P.V, acknowledge funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
- 894 programme under grant agreement No 821471 (ENGAGE). Funding from IIASA's National Member Organisations that has
- supported core activities including development of the Scenario Explorer and Database infrastructure is gratefully acknowledged.
- K.R. acknowledges funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research
 and innovation programme (grant agreement No 951542) (GENIE).
- Z.R.J.N., J.L., M.M., and J.R. have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
 programme under grant agreement No 101003536 (ESM2025).
- A.AK was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, United Kingdom. Grant/Award Number:
 EP/P022820/1.

903 Author contribution

- 904 J.S.K. wrote the first draft of the manuscript and produced the figures and tables; J.S.K. and Z.R.J.N. coordinated and
- 905 developed the climate assessment workflow, with considerable help in coding from J.L., and additional work done by R.L., 906 C.J.S., and M.S.; Z.R.J.N., J.L. and M.M. developed MAGICCv7.5.3 and produced the output for this climate emulator; C.J.S. 907 and P.M.F. developed FaIRv1.6.2 and produced the output for this climate emulator; M.S., R.B.S, and B.H.S. developed 908 CICERO-SCM and produced the output for this climate emulator; R.L. and J.R. developed 'silicone' and R.L. implemented 909 its methods in the climate assessment workflow, with support from Z.R.J.N., J.R., and J.S.K.; M.G. developed 'aneris' and 910 supported J.S.K. in implementing its methods in the climate assessment workflow; L.W. professionalised the codebase and 911 supported the documentation of the climate assessment workflow; E.B. was responsible for maintaining and vetting the 912 AR6DB, and calculating extensive metadata for the database, with considerable vetting analysis input from E.K, K.v.d.W. and 913 J.S.K.; K.R. and R.S. coordinated the general use of the climate assessment workflow output and provided expert input on the 914 methods applied during multiple assessment rounds in the IPCC process, in cooperation with E.K., G.P., D.P.v.V., P.M.F.,

- 915 M.M., J.S.F., J.R., A.A.K., A.R., J.S.K., E.B., and Z.R.J.N. who also facilitated the coordination and integration of information
- 916 between WGI and WGIII. All authors contributed to writing and reviewing the manuscript.

917 **Competing interests**

918 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

919 Code availability statement

- The 'climate-assessment' Python package is available on PyPi (<u>https://pypi.org/project/climate-assessment</u>), on GitHub
 (https://github.com/iiasa/climate-assessment), and Zenodo (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6624519).
- 922 The latest code release of the climate assessment workflow as used in this paper at the time of writing is version 0.1.1 of
- 923 'climate-assessment', available at <u>https://zenodo.org/record/6782457</u>, or <u>https://github.com/iiasa/climate-</u> 924 assessment/releases/tag/v0.1.1.
- The full documentation of the AR6 version of the climate assessment package is available at <u>https://climate-assessment.readthedocs.io</u>. The code includes a tutorial Jupyter notebook in which a simple climate assessment workflow run
- 927 with FaIR is performed.

928 Data availability statement

- 929 The scripts and part of the data used to produce the figures and tables in the main text is available at Zenodo 930 <u>https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7304736</u> (Kikstra, 2022), with version 1.0 used for this manuscript.
- 931 The main scenario data is available on the Downloads page of the AR6 Scenario Database hosted by IIASA:
 932 https://data.ece.iiasa.ac.at/ar6, DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5886911 (Byers et al., 2022). In this paper, we used
- 933 version 1.1, which has DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7197970.
- 934 'aneris', 'silicone', and 'openscm-runner', are used directly in the AR6 workflow, with code available at
- 935 <u>https://github.com/iiasa/aneris/releases/tag/v0.3.1</u>, <u>https://github.com/GranthamImperial/silicone/releases/tag/v1.2.1</u>, and
- 936 <u>https://github.com/openscm/openscm-runner/releases/tag/v0.9.1</u>, respectively.
- 937 The used infiller database (version 1.0) is available separately at Zenodo https://zenodo.org/record/6390768 (Kikstra et al., 938 2022b), while the historical emissions database (file "history_ar6.csv") is available with the *climate-assessment* repository as 939 al.. 2022a). GitHub (https://github.com/iiasa/climatedocumented at Zenodo (Kikstra et and on
- 940 assessment/blob/main/src/climate assessment/harmonization/history ar6.csy).
- 941
- 942

943 Emulators:

944 The CICERO-SCM model is available directly through the AR6 workflow, through the *openscm-runner* package.

- 945 The CICERO-SCM calibrated and constrained parameter set is made available with the *climate-assessment* package
- 946 at https://github.com/iiasa/climate-assessment/blob/main/data/cicero/subset_cscm_configfile.json, and on Zenodo
- 947 (file "subset_cscm_configfile.json", Kikstra et al., (2022a).
- 948 The FaIR model is available directly through the AR6 workflow, through the *openscm-runner* package, with code
- 949 available at: <u>https://github.com/OMS-NetZero/FAIR/</u>. The FaIRv1.6.2 calibrated and constrained parameter set is
- 950 available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5513022 (Smith, 2021a), and download instructions are provided with the
- 951 *climate-assessment* package.
- 952
 The MAGICC model with the calibrated and constrained parameter is available at

 953
 https://magicc.org/download/magicc7, and once downloaded and installed can be used with the workflow.
- 954

955 References

956 Allen, M. R., Frame, D. J., Huntingford, C., Jones, C. D., Lowe, J. A., Meinshausen, M., and Meinshausen, N.: Warming 957 by cumulative carbon emissions towards the trillionth tonne, Nature, 458. 1163-1166, caused 958 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08019, 2009.

van Beek, L., Hajer, M., Pelzer, P., van Vuuren, D., and Cassen, C.: Anticipating futures through models: the rise of Integrated
Assessment Modelling in the climate science-policy interface since 1970, Global Environmental Change, 65, 102191,
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102191, 2020.

van Beek, L., Oomen, J., Hajer, M., Pelzer, P., and van Vuuren, D.: Navigating the political: An analysis of political calibration
of integrated assessment modelling in light of the 1.5 °C goal, Environmental Science & Policy, 133, 193–202,
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2022.03.024, 2022.

Beusch, L., Gudmundsson, L., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Emulating Earth system model temperatures with MESMER: from global
mean temperature trajectories to grid-point-level realizations on land, Earth System Dynamics, 11, 139–159,
https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-11-139-2020, 2020.

Beusch, L., Nicholls, Z., Gudmundsson, L., Hauser, M., Meinshausen, M., and Seneviratne, S. I.: From emission scenarios to
 spatially resolved projections with a chain of computationally efficient emulators: coupling of MAGICC (v7.5.1) and
 MESMER (v0.8.3), Geoscientific Model Development, 15, 2085–2103, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-2085-2022, 2022.

Brecha, R. J., Ganti, G., Lamboll, R. D., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Hare, B., Lewis, J., Meinshausen, M., Schaeffer, M., Smith, C. J.,
and Gidden, M. J.: Institutional Decarbonisation Scenarios Evaluated Against the Paris Agreement 1.5°C Goal, Nat Commun,
2022.

Byers, E., Krey, V., Kriegler, E., Riahi, K., Schaeffer, R., Kikstra, J., Lamboll, R., Nicholls, Z., Sandstad, M., Smith, C., van der Wijst, K., Al Khourdajie, A., Lecocq, F., Portugal-Pereira, J., Saheb, Y., Stromann, A., Winkler, H., Auer, C., Brutschin, E., Gidden, M., Hackstock, P., Harmsen, M., Huppmann, D., Kolp, P., Lepault, C., Lewis, Jared, Marangoni, G., Müller-Casseres, E., Skeie, R., Werning, M., Calvin, K., Forster, P., Guivarch, C., Hasegawa, T., Meinshausen, M., Peters, G., Rogelj, J., Samset, B., Steinberger, J., Tavoni, M., and van Vuuren, D.: AR6 Scenarios Database hosted by IIASA, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7197970, 2022.

Canadell, J. G., Monteiro, P. M. S., Costa, M. H., da Cunha, L. C., Cox, P. M., Eliseev, A. V., Henson, S., Ishii, M., Jaccard,
S., Koven, C., Lohila, A., Patra, P. K., Piao, S., Rogelj, J., Syampungani, S., Zaehle, S., and Zickfeld, K.: Global Carbon and
other Biogeochemical Cycles and Feedbacks, in: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working
Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V.,
Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell,
K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., Cambridge University
Press, 2021.

Chen, D., Rojas, M., Samset, B. H., Cobb, K., Diongue Niang, A., Edwards, P., Emori, S., Faria, S. H., Hawkins, E., Hope, P.,
Huybrechts, P., Meinshausen, M., Mustafa, S. K., Plattner, G.-K., and Tréguier, A.-M.: Framing, Context, and Methods, edited
by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis,
M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou,
B., Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of
the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 147–286, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.003, 2021.

Damon Matthews, H., Tokarska, K. B., Rogelj, J., Smith, C. J., MacDougall, A. H., Haustein, K., Mengis, N., Sippel, S.,
Forster, P. M., and Knutti, R.: An integrated approach to quantifying uncertainties in the remaining carbon budget, Commun
Earth Environ, 2, 1–11, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-020-00064-9, 2021.

Dhakal, S., Minx, J. C., Toth, F. L., Abdel-Aziz, A., Figueroa Meza, M. J., Hubacek, K., Jonckheere, I. G. C., Kim, Y.-G.,
Nemet, G. F., Pachauri, S., Tan, X. C., and Wiedmann, T.: Emissions Trends and Drivers, in: IPCC, 2022: Climate Change
2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade, R., Khourdajie, A. A., van Diemen, R.,
McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija, A., Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and Malley, J.,
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.004, 2022.

Drouet, L., Bosetti, V., Padoan, S. A., Aleluia Reis, L., Bertram, C., Dalla Longa, F., Després, J., Emmerling, J., Fosse, F.,
Fragkiadakis, K., Frank, S., Fricko, O., Fujimori, S., Harmsen, M., Krey, V., Oshiro, K., Nogueira, L. P., Paroussos, L.,
Piontek, F., Riahi, K., Rochedo, P. R. R., Schaeffer, R., Takakura, J., van der Wijst, K.-I., van der Zwaan, B., van Vuuren, D.,
Vrontisi, Z., Weitzel, M., Zakeri, B., and Tavoni, M.: Net zero-emission pathways reduce the physical and economic risks of
climate change, Nat. Clim. Chang., 11, 1070–1076, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01218-z, 2021.

Etminan, M., Myhre, G., Highwood, E. J., and Shine, K. P.: Radiative forcing of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide:
A significant revision of the methane radiative forcing, Geophysical Research Letters, 43, 12,614-12,623,
https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL071930, 2016.

Forster, P., Huppmann, D., Kriegler, E., Mundaca, L., Smith, C., Rogelj, J., and Séférian, R.: Mitigation pathways compatible
with 1.5°C in the context of sustainable development supplementary material, in: Global warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special
Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission
pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V.,
Zhai, P., Pörtner, H. O., Roberts, D., Skea, J., Shukla, P. R., Pirani, A., Moufouma-Okia, W., Péan, C., Pidcock, R., Connors,
S., Matthews, J. B. R., Chen, Y., Zhou, X., Gomis, M. I., Lonnoy, E., Maycock, T., Tignor, M., and Waterfield, T., 2018.

Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K., Collins, W., Dufresne, J. L., Frame, D., Lunt, D. J., Mauritsen, T., Palmer, M. D.,
Watanabe, M., Wild, M., and Zhang, H.: The Earth's Energy Budget, Climate Feedbacks, and Climate Sensitivity, edited by:
Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M.
I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B.,
Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021.

- Fuglestvedt, J., Rogelj, J., Millar, R. J., Allen, M., Boucher, O., Cain, M., Forster, P. M., Kriegler, E., and Shindell, D.:
 Implications of possible interpretations of 'greenhouse gas balance' in the Paris Agreement, Philosophical Transactions of the
 Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 376, 20160445, https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0445,
 2018.
- Gasser, T., Kechiar, M., Ciais, P., Burke, E. J., Kleinen, T., Zhu, D., Huang, Y., Ekici, A., and Obersteiner, M.: Path-dependent
 reductions in CO2 emission budgets caused by permafrost carbon release, Nature Geosci, 11, 830–835,
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-018-0227-0, 2018.
- 1029 Geden, O. and Löschel, A.: Define limits for temperature overshoot targets, Nature Geosci, 10, 881–882, 1030 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-017-0026-z, 2017.
- Gidden, M. J., Fujimori, S., van den Berg, M., Klein, D., Smith, S. J., van Vuuren, D. P., and Riahi, K.: A methodology and
 implementation of automated emissions harmonization for use in Integrated Assessment Models, Environmental Modelling &
 Software, 105, 187–200, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.04.002, 2018.

- Gidden, M. J., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Fujimori, S., Luderer, G., Kriegler, E., van Vuuren, D. P., van den Berg, M., Feng, L.,
 Klein, D., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Frank, S., Fricko, O., Harmsen, M., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Hilaire, J., Hoesly, R.,
 Horing, J., Popp, A., Stehfest, E., and Takahashi, K.: Global emissions pathways under different socioeconomic scenarios for
 use in CMIP6: a dataset of harmonized emissions trajectories through the end of the century, Geoscientific Model
 Development, 12, 1443–1475, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1443-2019, 2019.
- Guivarch, C., Le Gallic, T., Bauer, N., Fragkos, P., Huppmann, D., Jaxa-Rozen, M., Keppo, I., Kriegler, E., Krisztin, T.,
 Marangoni, G., Pye, S., Riahi, K., Schaeffer, R., Tavoni, M., Trutnevyte, E., van Vuuren, D., and Wagner, F.: Using large
 ensembles of climate change mitigation scenarios for robust insights, Nat. Clim. Chang., 12, 428–435,
 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01349-x, 2022.
- Hare, W., Lowe, J., Rogelj, J., Sawin, E., and van Vuuren, D.: Chapter 2: Which Emission Pathways Are Consistent With a
 2°C or 1.5°C Temperature Limit?, in: The Emissions Gap Report Are the Copenhagen Accord Pledges Sufficient to Limit
 Global Warming to 2°C or 1.5°C?, UNEP, 23–30, 2010.
- Hausfather, Z., Marvel, K., Schmidt, G. A., Nielsen-Gammon, J. W., and Zelinka, M.: Climate simulations: recognize the 'hot model' problem, Nature, 605, 26–29, https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-01192-2, 2022.
- Hermansen, E. A. T., Lahn, B., Sundqvist, G., and Øye, E.: Post-Paris policy relevance: lessons from the IPCC SR15 process,
 Climatic Change, 169, 7, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03210-0, 2021.
- 1050 Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Bindi, M., Brown, S., Camilloni, I., Diedhiou, A., Djalante, R., Ebi, K. L., Engelbrecht, F., Guangsheng, 1051 Z., Guiot, J., Hijioka, Y., Mehrotra, S., Payne, A., Seneviratne, S. I., Thomas, A., and Warren, R.: Impacts of 1.5°C of Global 1052 Warming on Natural and Human Systems, in: Global Warming of 1.5°C: An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global 1053 warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of 1054 strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty, 1055 edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pörtner, H.-O., Roberts, D., Skea, J., Shukla, P. R., Pirani, A., Moufouma-Okia, W., 1056 Péan, C., Pidcock, R., Connors, S., Matthews, J. B. R., Chen, Y., Zhou, X., Gomis, M. I., Lonnoy, E., Maycock, T., Tignor, 1057 M., and Waterfield, T., World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2018.
- Hoesly, R. M., Smith, S. J., Feng, L., Klimont, Z., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Pitkanen, T., Seibert, J. J., Vu, L., Andres, R. J.,
 Bolt, R. M., Bond, T. C., Dawidowski, L., Kholod, N., Kurokawa, J., Li, M., Liu, L., Lu, Z., Moura, M. C. P., O'Rourke, P.
 R., and Zhang, Q.: Historical (1750–2014) anthropogenic emissions of reactive gases and aerosols from the Community
 Emissions Data System (CEDS), Geoscientific Model Development, 11, 369–408, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-369-2018,
 2018.
- Höhne, N., Gidden, M. J., den Elzen, M., Hans, F., Fyson, C., Geiges, A., Jeffery, M. L., Gonzales-Zuñiga, S., Mooldijk, S.,
 Hare, W., and Rogelj, J.: Wave of net zero emission targets opens window to meeting the Paris Agreement, Nat. Clim. Chang.,
 11, 820–822, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01142-2, 2021.
- Houghton, J. T., Jenkins, G. J., and Ephraums, J. J.: Climate change: the IPCC scientific assessment, American
 Scientist; (United States), 80, 1990.
- Houghton, J. T., Meira Filho, L. G., Griggs, D. J., and Maskell, K.: An introduction to simple climate models used in the IPCC
 Second Assessment Report, WMO, 1997.
- 1070 Huntingford, C., Yang, H., Harper, A., Cox, P. M., Gedney, N., Burke, E. J., Lowe, J. A., Hayman, G., Collins, W. J., Smith,
- 1071 S. M., and Comyn-Platt, E.: Flexible parameter-sparse global temperature time profiles that stabilise at 1.5 and 2.0 °C, Earth 1072 System Dynamics, 8, 617–626, https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-8-617-2017, 2017.

Huppmann, D., Rogelj, J., Kriegler, E., Krey, V., and Riahi, K.: A new scenario resource for integrated 1.5 °C research, Nature
 Climate Change, 8, 1027–1030, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0317-4, 2018a.

Huppmann, D., Kriegler, E., Krey, V., Riahi, K., Rogelj, J., Rose, S. K., Weyant, J., Bauer, N., Bertram, C., Bosetti, V., Calvin,
K., Doelman, J., Drouet, L., Emmerling, J., Frank, S., Fujimori, S., Gernaat, D., Grubler, A., Guivarch, C., Haigh, M., Holz,
C., Iyer, G., Kato, E., Keramidas, K., Kitous, A., Leblanc, F., Liu, J.-Y., Löffler, K., Luderer, G., Marcucci, A., McCollum,
D., Mima, S., Popp, A., Sands, R. D., Sano, F., Strefler, J., Tsutsui, J., Van Vuuren, D., Vrontisi, Z., Wise, M., and Zhang, R.:
IAMC 1.5°C Scenario Explorer and Data hosted by IIASA, Integrated Assessment Modeling Consortium & International
Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15429, 2018b.

Huppmann, D., Rogelj, J., Kriegler, E., Mundaca, L., Forster, P., Kobayashi, S., Séferian, R., and Vilariño, M. V.: Scenario
analysis notebooks for the IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, https://doi.org/10.22022/SR15/08-2018.15428,
2018c.

Huppmann, D., Gidden, M., Nicholls, Z., Hoersch, J., Lamboll, R., Kishimoto, P., Burandt, T., Fricko, O., Byers, E., Kikstra,
J., Brinkerink, M., Budzinski, M., Maczek, F., Zwickl-Bernhard, S., Welder, L., Alvarez Quispe, E., and Smith, C.: pyam:
Analysis and visualisation of integrated assessment and macro-energy scenarios [version 2; peer review: 3 approved], Open
Research Europe, 1, https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.13633.2, 2021.

- 1088 IIASA: IAMC AR5 scenario database, 2014.
- 1089 IPCC: Climate Change: The IPCC 1990 and 1992 Assessments, Canada, 1992.

1090 IPCC: Climate Change 1994: Radiative Forcing of Climate Change and An Evaluation of the IPCC IS92 Emission Scenarios,

1091 edited by: Houghton, J. T., Meira Filho, L. G., Bruce, J., Lee, H., Callander, B. A., Haites, E., Harris, N., and Maskell, K.,

1092 Cambridge University Press, The Edinburgh Building Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 2RU ENGLAND, 1994.

IPCC: Climate Change 1995: Economic and Social Dimensions of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the
 Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Bruce, J. P., Lee, H., and Haites, E.
 F., Cambridge University Press, 1996.

1095 F., Cambridge University Press, 1996.

IPCC: Climate Change 2001: Mitigation. A Report of Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,
edited by: Banuri, T., Barker, T., Bashmakov, I., Blok, K., Bouille, D., Christ, R., Davidson, O., Edmonds, J., Gregory, K.,
Grubb, M., Halsnaes, K., Heller, T., Hourcade, J.-C., Jepma, C., Kauppi, P., Markandya, A., Metz, B., Moomaw, W., Moreira,
J. R., Morita, T., Nakicenovic, N., Price, L., Richels, R., Robinson, J., Rogner, H. H., Sathaye, J., Sedjo, R., Shukla, P.,
Srivastava, L., Swart, R., Toth, F., and Weyant, J., 2001.

- 1101 IPCC: Climate Change 2007: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment
- Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Metz, B., Davidson, O. R., Bosch, P. R., Dave, R., and
 Meyer, L. A., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2007.
- 1104 IPCC: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report
- 1105 of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324, 2013.

1106 IPCC: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment

Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Edenhofer, O., Pichs-Madruga, R., Sokona, Y., Farahani,
 E., Kadner, S., Seyboth, K., Adler, A., Baum, I., Brunner, S., Eickemeier, P., Kriemann, B., Savolainen, J., Schlömer, S., von

1109 Stechow, C., Zwickel, T., and Minx, J. C., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY,

1110 USA, 2014.

- 1111 IPCC: Global warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial
- 1112 levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat
- 1113 of climate change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pörtner, H. O., Roberts, D., Skea, J., Shukla, P. R., Pirani, A.,

1114 Moufouma-Okia, W., Péan, C., Pidcock, R., Connors, S., Matthews, J. B. R., Chen, Y., Zhou, X., Gomis, M. I., Lonnoy, E.,

1115 Maycock, T., Tignor, M., and Waterfield, T., 2018.

1116 IPCC: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report

- of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan,
 C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R.,
- 1119 Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekci, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., Cambridge University Press, 2021a.
- 1120 IPCC: Summary for Policymakers, in: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I
- 1121 to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P.,
- 1122 Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K.,
- 1123 Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., Cambridge University
- 1124 Press, 2021b.

IPCC: Annex III: Scenarios and modelling methods [Guivarch, C., E. Kriegler, J. Portugal-Pereira, V. Bosetti, J. Edmonds,
M. Fischedick, P. Havlík, P. Jaramillo, V. Krey, F. Lecocq, A. Lucena, M. Meinshausen, S. Mirasgedis, B. O'Neill, G.P.
Peters, J. Rogelj, S, in: IPCC, 2022: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III
to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade,
R., Khourdajie, A. A., van Diemen, R., McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija, A.,
Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and Malley, J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA,
https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.022, 2022a.

IPCC: Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth
Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Pörtner, H.-O., Roberts, D. C., Tignor, M.,
Poloczanska, E. S., Mintenbeck, K., Alegría, A., Craig, M., Langsdorf, S., Löschke, S., Möller, V., Okem, A., and Rama, B.,
Cambridge University Press, 2022b.

IPCC: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment
Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade, R., Al Khourdajie, A., van
Diemen, R., McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija, A., Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and
Malley, J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926,
2022c.

1141 IPCC: Summary for Policymakers, in: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group

- III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade,
 R., Al Khourdajie, A., van Diemen, R., McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija,
- A., Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and Malley, J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA,
 https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.001, 2022d.
- 1145 https://doi.org/10.101//9/8100915/920.001, 2022d.
- Johansson, D. J. A.: The question of overshoot, Nat. Clim. Chang., 11, 1021–1022, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01229 w, 2021.
- Joos, F., Bruno, M., Fink, R., Siegenthaler, U., Stocker, T. F., Le Quéré, C., and Sarmiento, J. L.: An efficient and accurate
 representation of complex oceanic and biospheric models of anthropogenic carbon uptake, Tellus B: Chemical and Physical
 Meteorology, 48, 394–417, https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v48i3.15921, 1996.
- 1151 Kikstra, J. S.: Scripts for "The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report WGIII climate assessment of mitigation pathways: from 1152 emissions to global temperatures,", https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6610604, 2022.
- 1153 Kikstra, J. S., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Lewis, J., Smith, C. J., Lamboll, R. D., Byers, E., Sandstad, M., Wienpahl, L., and Hackstock, 1154 P.: Climate emissions pathways: IPCC assessment of long-term AR6 WGIII version. 1155 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6624519, 2022a.
- Kikstra, J. S., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Lewis, J., Smith, C. J., Lamboll, R. D., Byers, E., Sandstad, M., and Wienpahl, L.: Infiller
 database for silicone: IPCC AR6 WGIII version, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6390768, 2022b.

Krey, V., Masera, O., Blanford, G., Bruckner, T., Cooke, R., Fisher-Vanden, K., Haberl, H., Hertwich, E., Kriegler, E.,
Mueller, D., Paltsev, S., Price, L., Schlömer, S., Ürge-Vorsatz, D., van Vuuren, D., and Zwickel, T.: Annex II: Metrics &
Methodology, in: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth
Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Edenhofer, O., Pichs-Madruga, R., Sokona,
Y., Farahani, E., Kadner, S., Seyboth, K., Adler, A., Baum, I., Brunner, S., Eickemeier, P., Kriemann, B., Savolainen, J.,
Schlömer, S., von Stechow, C., Zwickel, T., and Minx, J. C., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and
New York, NY, USA, 2014.

- Lamboll, R., Nicholls, Z., Smith, C., Kikstra, J., Byers, E., and Rogelj, J.: Assessing the size and uncertainty of remaining carbon budgets, In Review, https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1934427/v1, 2022.
- 1167 Lamboll, R. D. and Rogelj, J.: Code for estimation of remaining carbon budget in IPCC AR6 WGI, 1168 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6373365, 2022.

Lamboll, R. D., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Kikstra, J. S., Meinshausen, M., and Rogelj, J.: Silicone v1.0.0: an open-source Python
package for inferring missing emissions data for climate change research, Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 5259–5275,
https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-5259-2020, 2020.

Leach, N. J., Jenkins, S., Nicholls, Z., Smith, C. J., Lynch, J., Cain, M., Walsh, T., Wu, B., Tsutsui, J., and Allen, M. R.:
FaIRv2.0.0: a generalized impulse response model for climate uncertainty and future scenario exploration, Geoscientific Model
Development, 14, 3007–3036, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-3007-2021, 2021.

Lee, J. Y., Marotzke, J., Bala, G., Cao, L., Corti, S., Dunne, J. P., Engelbrecht, F., Fischer, E., Fyfe, J. C., Jones, C., Maycock,
A., Mutemi, J., Ndiaye, O., Panickal, S., and Zhou, T.: Future Global Climate: Scenario-Based Projections and Near-Term
Information, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y.,
Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi,
O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth
Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021.

- Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W., and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Climate tipping
 points too risky to bet against, Nature, 575, 592–595, https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0, 2019.
- Livingston, J. E. and Rummukainen, M.: Taking science by surprise: The knowledge politics of the IPCC Special Report on
 1.5 degrees, Environmental Science & Policy, 112, 10–16, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.05.020, 2020.

Maher, B. and Symons, J.: The International Politics of Carbon Dioxide Removal: Pathways to Cooperative Global
 Governance, Global Environmental Politics, 22, 44–68, https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00643, 2022.

- 1187 Meinshausen, M., Meinshausen, N., Hare, W., Raper, S. C. B., Frieler, K., Knutti, R., Frame, D. J., and Allen, M. R.: 1188 Greenhouse-gas emission targets for limiting global warming to 2°C, Nature. 458. 1158-1162, 1189 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08017, 2009.
- Meinshausen, M., Wigley, T. M. L., and Raper, S. C. B.: Emulating atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with a simpler
 model, MAGICC6 Part 2: Applications, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 1457–1471, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp 11-1457-2011, 2011a.
- Meinshausen, M., Raper, S. C. B., and Wigley, T. M. L.: Emulating coupled atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with
 a simpler model, MAGICC6 Part 1: Model description and calibration, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 1417–1456,
 https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-1417-2011, 2011b.

Meinshausen, M., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Lewis, J., Gidden, M. J., Vogel, E., Freund, M., Beyerle, U., Gessner, C., Nauels, A.,
Bauer, N., Canadell, J. G., Daniel, J. S., John, A., Krummel, P. B., Luderer, G., Meinshausen, N., Montzka, S. A., Rayner, P.
J., Reimann, S., Smith, S. J., van den Berg, M., Velders, G. J. M., Vollmer, M. K., and Wang, R. H. J.: The shared socioeconomic pathway (SSP) greenhouse gas concentrations and their extensions to 2500, Geoscientific Model Development, 13,
3571–3605, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-3571-2020, 2020.

- Meinshausen, M., Lewis, J., McGlade, C., Gütschow, J., Nicholls, Z., Burdon, R., Cozzi, L., and Hackmann, B.: Realization
 of Paris Agreement pledges may limit warming just below 2 °C, Nature, 604, 304–309, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-02204553-z, 2022.
- Mengel, M., Nauels, A., Rogelj, J., and Schleussner, C.-F.: Committed sea-level rise under the Paris Agreement and the legacy of delayed mitigation action, Nat Commun, 9, 601, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-02985-8, 2018.

 Millar, R. J., Nicholls, Z. R., Friedlingstein, P., and Allen, M. R.: A modified impulse-response representation of the global near-surface air temperature and atmospheric concentration response to carbon dioxide emissions, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 17, 7213–7228, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-7213-2017, 2017.

Minx, J. C., Lamb, W. F., Andrew, R. M., Canadell, J. G., Crippa, M., Döbbeling, N., Forster, P. M., Guizzardi, D., Olivier,
J., Peters, G. P., Pongratz, J., Reisinger, A., Rigby, M., Saunois, M., Smith, S. J., Solazzo, E., and Tian, H.: A comprehensive
and synthetic dataset for global, regional, and national greenhouse gas emissions by sector 1970–2018 with an extension to
2019, Earth System Science Data, 13, 5213–5252, https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-5213-2021, 2021.

Nicholls, Z., Meinshausen, M., Lewis, J., Corradi, M. R., Dorheim, K., Gasser, T., Gieseke, R., Hope, A. P., Leach, N. J.,
McBride, L. A., Quilcaille, Y., Rogelj, J., Salawitch, R. J., Samset, B. H., Sandstad, M., Shiklomanov, A., Skeie, R. B., Smith,
C. J., Smith, S. J., Su, X., Tsutsui, J., Vega-Westhoff, B., and Woodard, D. L.: Reduced Complexity Model Intercomparison
Project Phase 2: Synthesizing Earth System Knowledge for Probabilistic Climate Projections, Earth's Future, 9,
e2020EF001900, https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EF001900, 2021a.

Nicholls, Z., Meinshausen, M., Lewis, J., Smith, C. J., Forster, P. M., Fuglestvedt, J. S., Rogelj, J., Kikstra, J. S., Riahi, K.,
and Byers, E.: Changes in IPCC Scenario Assessment Emulators Between SR1.5 and AR6 Unraveled, Geophysical Research
Letters, 49, e2022GL099788, https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL099788, 2022.

Nicholls, Z. R. J., Meinshausen, M., Lewis, J., Gieseke, R., Dommenget, D., Dorheim, K., Fan, C.-S., Fuglestvedt, J. S., Gasser,
T., Golüke, U., Goodwin, P., Hartin, C., Hope, A. P., Kriegler, E., Leach, N. J., Marchegiani, D., McBride, L. A., Quilcaille,
Y., Rogelj, J., Salawitch, R. J., Samset, B. H., Sandstad, M., Shiklomanov, A. N., Skeie, R. B., Smith, C. J., Smith, S., Tanaka,
K., Tsutsui, J., and Xie, Z.: Reduced Complexity Model Intercomparison Project Phase 1: introduction and evaluation of
global-mean temperature response, Geoscientific Model Development, 13, 5175–5190, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-51752020, 2020.

1227 Nicholls, Z. R. J., Gieseke, R., Lewis, J., Willner, S., and Smith, C. J.: OpenSCM Runner, 2021b.

1228 Pirani, A., Alegria, A., Khourdajie, A. A., Gunawan, W., Gutiérrez, J. M., Holsman, K., Huard, D., Juckes, M., Kawamiya, 1229 M., Klutse, N., Krey, V., Matthews, R., Milward, A., Pascoe, C., Shrier, G. van der, Spinuso, A., Stockhause, M., and Xing, 1230 X.: of FAIR principles in the IPCC The implementation data AR6 assessment process. 1231 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6504469, 2022.

Quilcaille, Y., Gudmundsson, L., Beusch, L., Hauser, M., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Showcasing MESMER-X: Spatially Resolved
 Emulation of Annual Maximum Temperatures of Earth System Models, Geophysical Research Letters, 49, e2022GL099012,
 https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL099012, 2022.

Riahi, K., Bertram, C., Huppmann, D., Rogelj, J., Bosetti, V., Cabardos, A.-M., Deppermann, A., Drouet, L., Frank, S., Fricko,
O., Fujimori, S., Harmsen, M., Hasegawa, T., Krey, V., Luderer, G., Paroussos, L., Schaeffer, R., Weitzel, M., van der Zwaan,
B., Vrontisi, Z., Longa, F. D., Després, J., Fosse, F., Fragkiadakis, K., Gusti, M., Humpenöder, F., Keramidas, K., Kishimoto,
P., Kriegler, E., Meinshausen, M., Nogueira, L. P., Oshiro, K., Popp, A., Rochedo, P. R. R., Ünlü, G., van Ruijven, B.,
Takakura, J., Tavoni, M., van Vuuren, D., and Zakeri, B.: Cost and attainability of meeting stringent climate targets without
overshoot, Nat. Clim. Chang., 11, 1063–1069, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01215-2, 2021.

Riahi, K., Schaeffer, R., Arango, J., Calvin, K., Guivarch, C., Hasegawa, T., Jiang, K., Kriegler, E., Matthews, R., Peters, G.
P., Rao, A., Robertson, S., Sebbit, A. M., Steinberger, J., Tavoni, M., and Van Vuuren, D. P.: Mitigation pathways compatible
with long-term goals., in: IPCC, 2022: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group
III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade,
R., Al Khourdajie, A., van Diemen, R., McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija,
A., Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and Malley, J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA,
https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.005, 2022.

Ritchie, P. D. L., Clarke, J. J., Cox, P. M., and Huntingford, C.: Overshooting tipping point thresholds in a changing climate,
Nature, 592, 517–523, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03263-2, 2021.

Rogelj, J. and Shukla, P. R.: Chapter 3: The Emissions Gap - An Update, in: The Emissions Gap Report 2012 — A UNEP
 Synthesis Report, UNEP, 21–29, 2012.

Rogelj, J., Hare, W., Lowe, J., van Vuuren, D. P., Riahi, K., Matthews, B., Hanaoka, T., Jiang, K., and Meinshausen, M.:
Emission pathways consistent with a 2°C global temperature limit, Nature Clim. Change, 1, 413–418, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1258, 2011.

- Rogelj, J., Meinshausen, M., and Knutti, R.: Global warming under old and new scenarios using IPCC climate sensitivity range
 estimates, Nature Clim. Change, 2, 248–253, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1385, 2012.
- Rogelj, J., Meinshausen, M., Schaeffer, M., Knutti, R., and Riahi, K.: Impact of short-lived non-CO2 mitigation on carbon
 budgets for stabilizing global warming, Environ. Res. Lett., 10, 075001, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/7/075001,
 2015.
- Rogelj, J., Shindell, D., Jiang, K., Fifita, S., Forster, P., Ginzburg, V., Handa, C., Kheshgi, H., Kobayashi, S., Kriegler, E.,
 Mundaca, L., Séférian, R., and Vilariño, M. V.: Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable
 Development, in: Global Warming of 1.5°C: An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above preindustrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to
 the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty, edited by: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai,
 P., Pörtner, H.-O., Roberts, D., Skea, J., Shukla, P. R., Pirani, A., Moufouma-Okia, W., Péan, C., Pidcock, R., Connors, S.,

- Matthews, J. B. R., Chen, Y., Zhou, X., Gomis, M. I., Lonnoy, E., Maycock, T., Tignor, M., and Waterfield, T., World
 Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2018.
- Rogelj, J., Geden, O., Cowie, A., and Reisinger, A.: Net-zero emissions targets are vague: three ways to fix, Nature, 591, 365–368, https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-00662-3, 2021.
- Samset, B. H., Fuglestvedt, J. S., and Lund, M. T.: Delayed emergence of a global temperature response after emission mitigation, Nat Commun, 11, 1–10, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17001-1, 2020.
- Schaeffer, M., Gohar, L. K., Kriegler, E., Lowe, J. A., Riahi, K., and Van Vuuren, D. P.: Mid- and long-term climate projections
 for fragmented and delayed-action scenarios, Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 2013.
- Schlesinger, M., Jiang, X., and Charlson, R.: Climate change and energy policy: Proceedings of the international conference
 on global climate change: Its mitigation through improved production and use of energy, 1992.
- Schlesinger, M. E. and Jiang, X.: Simple Model Representation of Atmosphere-Ocean GCMs and Estimation of the Time
 Scale of C02-Induced Climate Change, Journal of Climate, 3, 1297–1315, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520 0442(1990)003<1297:SMROAO>2.0.CO;2, 1990.
- Schleussner, C.-F., Ganti, G., Rogelj, J., and Gidden, M. J.: An emission pathway classification reflecting the Paris Agreement
 climate objectives, Commun Earth Environ, 3, 1–11, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00467-w, 2022.
- 1281 Seneviratne, S. I., Rogelj, J., Séférian, R., Wartenburger, R., Allen, M. R., Cain, M., Millar, R. J., Ebi, K. L., Ellis, N., Hoegh-
- 1282 Guldberg, O., Payne, A. J., Schleussner, C.-F., Tschakert, P., and Warren, R. F.: The many possible climates from the Paris
- 1283 Agreement's aim of 1.5 °C warming, Nature, 558, 41–49, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0181-4, 2018.
- Sherwood, S. C., Webb, M. J., Annan, J. D., Armour, K. C., Forster, P. M., Hargreaves, J. C., Hegerl, G., Klein, S. A., Marvel,
 K. D., Rohling, E. J., Watanabe, M., Andrews, T., Braconnot, P., Bretherton, C. S., Foster, G. L., Hausfather, Z., von der
 Heydt, A. S., Knutti, R., Mauritsen, T., Norris, J. R., Proistosescu, C., Rugenstein, M., Schmidt, G. A., Tokarska, K. B., and
 Zelinka, M. D.: An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using Multiple Lines of Evidence, Reviews of Geophysics, 58,
 e2019RG000678, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000678, 2020.
- Skea, J., Shukla, P., Al Khourdajie, A., and McCollum, D.: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: Transparency and
 integrated assessment modeling, WIREs Climate Change, 12, e727, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.727, 2021.
- Skeie, R. B., Fuglestvedt, J., Berntsen, T., Peters, G. P., Andrew, R., Allen, M., and Kallbekken, S.: Perspective has a strong
 effect on the calculation of historical contributions to global warming, Environ. Res. Lett., 12, 024022,
 https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa5b0a, 2017.
- Skeie, R. B., Berntsen, T., Aldrin, M., Holden, M., and Myhre, G.: Climate sensitivity estimates sensitivity to radiative forcing time series and observational data, Earth System Dynamics, 9, 879–894, https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-9-879-2018, 2018.
- 1296 Smith, C.: FaIR v1.6.2 calibrated and constrained parameter set, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5513022, 2021a.
- Smith, C., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Armour, K., Collins, W., Forster, P., Meinshausen, M., Palmer, M. D., and Watanabe, M.: The
 Earth's Energy Budget, Climate Feedbacks, and Climate Sensitivity Supplementary Material, edited by: Masson-Delmotte,
 V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M.,
 Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., Climate Change
 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental
- 1302 Panel on Climate Change, 2021.

- Smith, C. J. and Forster, P. M.: Suppressed Late-20th Century Warming in CMIP6 Models Explained by Forcing and
 Feedbacks, Geophysical Research Letters, 48, e2021GL094948, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL094948, 2021.
- Smith, C. J., Forster, P. M., Allen, M., Leach, N., Millar, R. J., Passerello, G. A., and Regayre, L. A.: FAIR v1.3: a simple
 emissions-based impulse response and carbon cycle model, Geoscientific Model Development, 11, 2273–2297,
 https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2273-2018, 2018.
- Smith, S. M.: A case for transparent net-zero carbon targets, Commun Earth Environ, 2, 1–4, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247 021-00095-w, 2021b.
- 1310Tachiiri, K., Herran, D. S., Su, X., and Kawamiya, M.: Effect on the Earth system of realizing a 1.5 °C warming climate target1311after overshooting to the 2 °C level, Environ. Res. Lett., 14, 124063, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab5199, 2019.
- Tokarska, K. B., Zickfeld, K., and Rogelj, J.: Path Independence of Carbon Budgets When Meeting a Stringent Global Mean
 Temperature Target After an Overshoot, Earth's Future, 7, 1283–1295, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001312, 2019.
- UNFCCC: FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1 Decision 1/CP.16 The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc
 Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention, 2010.
- 1316 UNFCCC: Adoption of the Paris Agreement, in: Report No. FCCC/CP/2015/L.9/Rev.1, 1317 http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/l09r01.pdf, 2015.
- 1318 UNFCCC: FCCC/CP/2021/L.13/CP.26 Glasgow Climate Pact, 2021.

van Vuuren, D. P., Edmonds, J., Kainuma, M., Riahi, K., Thomson, A., Hibbard, K., Hurtt, G. C., Kram, T., Krey, V.,
Lamarque, J.-F., Masui, T., Meinshausen, M., Nakicenovic, N., Smith, S. J., and Rose, S. K.: The representative concentration
pathways: an overview, Climatic Change, 109, 5, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0148-z, 2011.

Watson-Parris, D., Rao, Y., Olivié, D., Seland, Ø., Nowack, P., Camps-Valls, G., Stier, P., Bouabid, S., Dewey, M., Fons, E.,
Gonzalez, J., Harder, P., Jeggle, K., Lenhardt, J., Manshausen, P., Novitasari, M., Ricard, L., and Roesch, C.: ClimateBench
v1.0: A Benchmark for Data-Driven Climate Projections, Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, 14,
e2021MS002954, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021MS002954, 2022.

Emission	Henry entry the Method		Infilling	Infiller
species	Harmonisation Method	Reason for chosen method	Method	database
BC	Using default 'aneris' decision tree	Default following Gidden et al.	QRW	AR6 database
CH ₄	Using default 'aneris' decision tree	Default following Gidden et al.	-/QRW*	AR6 database
CO2- AFOLU	Linearly reduce the difference between harmonised and non-harmonised with projected point of convergence in 2150.	High historical variance, but using offset method to prevent diff from increasing when going negative rapidly	-/QRW*	AR6 database
CO2-FFI	Calculate the relative difference in 2015 and linearly reduce this ratio of the difference between harmonised and non-harmonised with projected point of convergence in 2080.	Default following Gidden et al, with ratio to have better performance for negative emissions pathways, 2080 instead of SR1.5 2050 because there is a wider set of scenarios covered, with many scenarios without strong mitigation in the database.	-	AR6 database
СО	Linearly reduce the difference between harmonised and non-harmonised with projected point of convergence in 2150.	High historical variance	QRW	AR6 database
N ₂ O	Using default 'aneris' decision tree	Default following Gidden et al.	-/QRW*	AR6 database
NH ₃	Using default 'aneris' decision tree	Default following Gidden et al.	QRW	AR6 database
NO _x	Using default 'aneris' decision tree	Default following Gidden et al.	QRW	AR6 database
OC	Linearly reduce the difference between harmonised and non-harmonised with projected point of convergence in 2150.	High historical variance	QRW	AR6 database
Sulfur	Using default 'aneris' decision tree	Default following Gidden et al.	QRW	AR6 database
VOC	Linearly reduce the difference between harmonised and non-harmonised with projected point of convergence in 2150.	High historical variance	QRW	AR6 database
HFC134a	Keep the ratio of the difference between the harmonised and non-harmonised pathways constant over the full pathway.	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
HFC143a	Keep the ratio of the difference between the harmonised and non-harmonised pathways constant over the full pathway.	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
HFC227ea	Keep the ratio of the difference between the harmonised and non-harmonised pathways constant over the full pathway.	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database

	Keep the ratio of the difference between the			
HFC23	harmonised and non-harmonised pathways	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	constant over the full pathway.			
	Keep the ratio of the difference between the			
HFC32	harmonised and non-harmonised pathways	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	constant over the full pathway.			
	Keep the ratio of the difference between the			
HFC43-10	harmonised and non-harmonised pathways	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	constant over the full pathway.			
	Keep the ratio of the difference between the			
HFC125	harmonised and non-harmonised pathways	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	constant over the full pathway.			
	Keep the ratio of the difference between the			
SF_6	harmonised and non-harmonised pathways	Low model reporting confidence	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	constant over the full pathway.			
	Linearly reduce the difference between			
CF ₄ (PFC)	harmonised and non-harmonised with	High historical variance	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	projected point of convergence in 2150.			
	Linearly reduce the difference between			
C ₂ F ₆ (PFC)	harmonised and non-harmonised with	High historical variance	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	projected point of convergence in 2150.			
	Linearly reduce the difference between			
C ₆ F ₁₄ (PFC)	harmonised and non-harmonised with	High historical variance	RMS-closest	AR6 database
	projected point of convergence in 2150.			
CCl ₄	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CFC11	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CFC113	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CFC114	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CFC115	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CFC12	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CH ₂ Cl ₂	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CH ₃ Br	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CH ₃ CCl ₃	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CH ₃ Cl	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
CHCl ₃	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
HCFC141b	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs

HCFC142b	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
HCFC22	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
HFC152a	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
HFC236fa	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
HFC365mf c	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
Halon1202	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
Halon1211	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
Halon1301	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
Halon2402	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
NF ₃	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
C ₃ F ₈ (PFC)	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
C ₄ F ₁₀ (PFC)	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
C ₅ F ₁₂ (PFC)	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
C ₇ F ₁₆ (PFC)	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
C ₈ F ₁₈ (PFC)	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
cC ₄ F ₈ (PFC)	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs
SO_2F_2	-	-	RMS-closest	CMIP6-SSPs

Table 1: Harmonisation and Infilling methods by emissions species as applied in AR6 WGIII. An asterisk (*) means that the methods are in place, but not used in the report because these emissions species were available for all 1202 assessed scenarios such that infilling was not necessary. The historical emissions database used for harmonisation was in all cases the database also used for RCMIP (Nicholls et al., 2021a). Gidden et al. refers to (Gidden et al., 2018, 2019). The reasons for varying the infilling method and database are explained in the text of this manuscript, and is purely dependent on the availability of the number of modelled pathways and their independence in each database. ORW is used when a sufficient number of independent pathways is available in the AR6 infiller database (Kikstra et al., 2022b), otherwise RMS-closest is chosen. CMIP6-SSPs is chosen as the database if the gas in question is not represented in the AR6 database.

Description	Classification rules				
Description	(scenarios are classified in the lowest warming category applicable)				
C1: limit warming to 1.5°C (>50%) with no or	${<}1.5^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$ peak warming with ${\geq}33\%$ chance and ${<}1.5^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$ end of century				
limited overshoot	warming with >50% chance				
C2: return warming to 1.5°C (>50%) after a	${<}1.5^{\circ}C$ peak warming with ${<}33\%$ chance and ${<}1.5^{\circ}C$ end of century				
high overshoot	warming with >50% chance				
C3: limit warming to 2°C (>67%)	<2°C peak warming with >67% chance				
C4: limit warming to 2°C (>50%)	$<2^{\circ}C$ peak warming with $>50\%$ chance				
C5: limit warming to 2.5°C (>50%)	<2.5°C peak warming with >50% chance				
C6: limit warming to 3°C (>50%)	$<3^{\circ}C$ peak warming with $>50\%$ chance				
C7: limit warming to 4°C (>50%)	$<4^{\circ}C$ peak warming with $>50\%$ chance				
C8: exceed 4°C warming (≥50%)	\geq 4°C peak warming with \geq 50% chance				

1341 Table 2: Temperature classification rules used in AR6 WGIII, where a scenario is placed in the lowest category where

- 1342 it meets the classification rule.

	Climate emulator	2050	2100
C1			
		1.5 (25)	1.2 (25)
	MAGICCv.7.5.3	1.6 (50)	1.3 (50)
		1.6 (75)	1.4 (75)
C3			
		1.7 (25)	1.6 (25)
	MAGICCv.7.5.3	1.7 (50)	1.6 (50)
		1.8 (75)	1.7 (75)
Full database			
		1.6 (5)	1.3 (5)
		1.7 (25)	1.6 (25)
	MAGICCv.7.5.3	1.8 (50)	1.8 (50)
		1.9 (75)	2.5 (75)
		2.2 (95)	3.8 (95)
		1.4 (5)	0.9 (5)
		1.5 (25)	1.2 (25)
	CICERO-SCM	1.6 (50)	1.4 (50)
		1.7 (75)	1.9 (75)
		2.0 (95)	3.2 (95)
		1.5 (5)	1.3 (5)
		1.6 (25)	1.5 (25)
	FalRv1.6.2	1.7 (50)	1.7 (50)
		1.8 (75)	2.3 (75)
		2.1 (95)	3.5 (95)

Table 3: Median global temperature statistics of the full scenario database, by climate model, with the percentiles over

1347 the scenarios in parentheses for each row.

ID	Name	Harmonisation	Infilling	Climate emulator
(1)	SR1.5 report	SR1.5	SR1.5	MAGICC6 (AR5/SR1.5)
(2)	Climate emulator isolation	SR1.5	SR1.5	MAGICCv7.5.3
(3)	Harmonisation algorithm on top of climate emulator isolation	AR6 algorithm, with scenarios harmonised in 2010 (rather than 2015 as is the default for the AR6 WGIII work)	SR1.5	MAGICCv7.5.3
(4)	AR6 workflow with 2010 harmonisation	AR6 algorithm, with scenarios harmonised in 2010 (rather than 2015 as is the default for the AR6 WGIII work)	AR6	MAGICCv7.5.3
(5)	AR6 workflow	AR6	AR6	MAGICCv7.5.3
	Total	Harmonisation	Infilling	Climate emulator
Calculating	(5) – (1)	(3) - (2) + (5) - (4)	(4) – (3)	(2) - (1)
difference due to		((3) - (2) is the change		

in algorithm, (5) - (4)is the change in harmonisation year)

Table 4: Summary of five climate assessment runs done to isolate the approximate changes in the temperature outcome 1349

1350 attributable to each step of the climate assessment workflow.

1351

method change



- Figure 1: The steps of the "climate assessment workflow". Overview of climate assessment processing steps applied in the Working Group III contribution to the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. *Ocean heat uptake was provided by FaIRy.1.6.2 and MAGICCy7.5.3
- 1355 in AR6.

Key climate characteristics of the WGIII AR6 scenario database



1358Figure 2: Summary statistics (A: emissions, B: atmospheric concentrations, C: global mean surface temperature) over time across1359all scenarios in the AR6DB that received a temperature classification and across scenarios in AR6 temperature categories C1 and1360C3. Panel A shows emissions as modelled by IAMs (Native), after harmonisation (Harmonized), and after infilling missing1361reported emissions (Infilled). Panel B and panel C show climate outcomes per climate model, using the median value of each1362variable from the climate emulator probabilistic distributions.



Ranges indicate 5th-95th scenario range of the AR6 scenario group using MAGICC. thicker lines are the AR6 scenario category medians, using MAGICC (solid), FaIR (dashed), and CICERO-SCM (dotted)

В

Number of scenarios in AR6 category if the classification would have been done using this emulator.



Figure 3: Median global surface temperatures above the mean of 1850-1900 as simulated for scenarios in the AR6DB, with scenarios grouped by the classification as in AR6 WGIII. Medians are shown for all three uses climate emulators (CICERO-SCM: dotted, MAGICCv7.5.3: solid, and FaIRv1.6.2: dashed), while the 5th-95th percentile range is only shown for MAGICCv7.5.3. The number of scenarios classified in each group are shown in the bottom panel. CICERO-SCM numbers are hashed to indicate that AR6 WGI assessed especially the used parameterisations of MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2 to closely reflect the IPCC assessment, with CICERO-SCM for its AR6 calibration being used in WGIII only for sensitivity analysis around to capture climatic uncertainty ranges.

¹³⁶⁴



Effective Radiative Forcing by category and climate emulator



А

Figure 4: Panel A: Effective Radiative Forcing (ERF) statistics across AR6 scenario database subsets as categorised by AR6WGIII 1374 using MAGICC, for CO₂, CH₄, F-gases, and aerosols at different points in time for three climate emulators. Panel B: climate 1375 uncertainty for every scenario as represented in projected ERF in 2030 for each climate emulator, with a range representing the 5th 1376 to 95th range across scenarios. For aerosols this uncertainty in forcing is still relatively unconstrained and depends heavily on the 1377 magnitude and mix of emissions within a scenario.

The duration and magnitude of overshooting 1.5°C (using MAGICCv7.5.3).





1380Figure 5: The duration and magnitude of overshoot and exceedance of $1.5^{\circ}C$ global warming above 1850-1900 for scenarios in the1381AR6 temperature categories. Panel A: projected median global mean surface temperature for scenarios in C1 and C2. Panel B-C:1382magnitude and duration of overshoot of $1.5^{\circ}C$ in C1 and C2 scenario. Panel D: magnitude of $1.5^{\circ}C$ exceedance of scenarios in C3-1383C8. For Panel B-D, scenarios along the y-axis are sorted by total ODY_{1.5} until 2100. Panel E: projected increase of ODY_{1.5} over1384time for temperature categories C1-C4, at 33%, 50%, and 67% probability. Panel F: projected cumulative exceedance of $1.5^{\circ}C$ 1385expressed as ODY_{1.5} in 2100 for temperature categories C1-C8, at 33%, 50%, and 67% probability.



Characteristics of 'Paris-compatible' scenarios compared to IPCC categories, using criteria in Schleussner et al. (2022), for MAGICCv7.5.3 and FaIRv1.6.2. Emissions characteristics of 'Paris-compatible' scenarios

1386

A

Figure 6: Characteristics of "Paris-compatible" scenarios using the FaIR and MAGICC emulators, compared to the C1-C4 categories from IPCC AR6 WGIII which used the MAGICC emulator for classification. 'Paris' here is short for "Paris-compatible" and uses the criteria from (Schleussner et al., 2022), being (a) "not ever have a greater than 66% probability to overshoot 1.5°C", (b) "*very likely* (90% chance or more) ... not ever exceeding 2°C", and (c) achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions using global warming potentials over a 100 year period (GWP100). Panel E-F are based only on MAGICC.



incident processing offect on all comparing

Е



1393

1394Figure 7: Effect of harmonisation and infilling processing steps on Kyoto gases emissions trajectories. Panel A-C: the effect of1395harmonisation and infilling over time on GHGs (Kyoto Gases), CO2 AFOLU, and CH4, for the full AR6DB. Panel D: the relative1396effect of harmonisation and infilling over time on BC, OC, and sulfur emissions, for the full AR6DB. Panel E-F: effects of1397emissions processing by AR6 temperature category. Panel E: the effect on GHGs in 2015 due to harmonisation. Panel F: the effect1398of harmonisation and infilling on GHGs over time. Panel G: the cumulative effect of emissions processing until 2100 over the

1399 projected global warming.



Figure 8: Kyoto gases cumulative 2020-2100 for infilled and model reported by category. Each dot represents one long-term full century scenario. If model input would perfectly align with the used historical database and model all emissions species, or if harmonisation and infilling cancel each other exactly the input GHG emissions would be the same as the GHG emissions after harmonisation and infilling. A spread on both sides of the line would be expected if historical emissions uncertainty would dominate and the use of different modelled historical emissions would not have a particular bias compared to the emissions estimate used for harmonisation. On the other hand, if many scenarios miss information on some important GHGs, dots would appear predominantly on the right of the line.



Changes in warming projections due to changes in assessment methods comparing AR6 climate assessment workflow with SR15

Absolute difference in indicator per scenario

А



Full-century peak

2100

Full-century peak

1410Figure 9: Differences in the AR6 and SR15 climate assessment workflow steps (panels A and B), and the temperature outcome1411distributions (panel C), using MAGICC. In Panel A and B, the AR6 temperature categories for a specific scenario were used. In1412Panel C, we use the categories as reported in the separate IPCC reports. SR1.5 categories "1.5C low overshoot" and "Below 1.5C"1413have been mapped as C1, "1.5C high overshoot" as C2, "Lower 2C" as C3, and "Higher 2C" as C4.

2100

Full-century peak

2100

Full-century peak



- 1415 Figure 10: An overview of the current climate-assessment package (v0.1.1) and its workflow as applied for the IPCC AR6 mitigation
- 1416 scenarios climate, in blue. In orange are a few possible future extensions of this community climate assessment workflow.

1 Supplementary information to:

2 The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report WGIII climate assessment of

<u>3</u> mitigation pathways: from emissions to global temperatures

4	Jarmo S. Kikstra ^{1,2,3} , Zebedee R.J. Nicholls ^{1,4,5} , Christopher J. Smith ^{1,6} , Jared Lewis ^{1,4,5} , Robin D.
5	Lamboll ^{2,3} , Edward Byers ¹ , Marit Sandstad ⁷ , Malte Meinshausen ^{4,5} , Matthew J. Gidden ^{1,8} , Joeri
6	Rogeli ^{1,2,3} , Elmar Kriegler ^{9,10} , Glen P. Peters ⁷ , Jan S. Fuglestvedt ⁷ , Ragnhild B. Skeie ⁷ , Biørn H. Samset ⁷ ,
7	Laura Wiennahl ¹ Detlef P van Vuuren ^{11,12} Kai-Ivar van der Wijst ¹² Alaa Al Khourdaije ³ Piers M
0	Earster ⁶ Andy Deisinger ¹³ Deborte Schooffer ¹⁴ Kaywan Dishi ^{1,15}
2	roister, Andy Keisinger, Koberto Schaener, Keywan Klain
9	¹ Energy, Climate and Environment (ECE) Program, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg,
10	2361, Austria
11	² The Grantham Institute for Climate Change and the Environment, Imperial College London, London, UK
12	³ Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, London, UK
13	⁴ Climate & Energy College, School of Geography, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, The University of Melbourne
14	Climate Resource, Melbourne, Australia
15	⁶ Priestley International Centre for Climate, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom
16	CICERO Center for International Climate Research, Oslo, Norway
17	⁸ Climate Analytics, Berlin, Germany
18	Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Potsdam, Germany
19	¹⁰ Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany
20	^{TT} PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague, The Netherlands
21	¹² Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands
22	¹³ Institute for Climate, Energy and Disaster Solutions, Fenner School of Society & Environment, Australian National
23	University, Canberra, Australia
24	¹⁴ Centre for Energy and Environmental Economics (CENERGIA), COPPE, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ),
25	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
26	¹³ Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria
27	
<u> </u>	

28 Correspondence to: Jarmo S. Kikstra (kikstra@iiasa.ac.at)



30 Supplementary Figure 1: sensitivity to temperature estimate changes of number of scenarios and net zero CO₂ and GHG 31 characteristics.

33 Vetting process for the climate assessment in AR6 WGIII

34 As explained in more detail in Annex III section 3.1 (IPCC, 2022a) of the Working Group III contribution to the IPCC Sixth 35 Assessment Report (AR6 WGIII), a vetting process was undertaken for all scenarios reporting global data. Of the 2266 36 scenarios submitted to the scenario database during the 22-month long open call, about three quarters passed the vetting criteria, 37 while 1202 passed also the additional criteria specified in Annex III section 3.2.1 (IPCC, 2022a). Vetting scenarios was 38 therefore done both to ensure reasonable historical alignment for energy and emissions and minimum variable coverage. For 39 the climate assessment process, the vetting ensures a certain level of confidence that only scenarios with sufficient, quality 40 emissions data remained in the climate assessment. This was done to prevent the harmonization and infilling procedures 41 behaving in unexpected ways for scenarios with either low levels of emissions data or reporting errors. For instance, if important quantitative information on the development of either land-use related emissions or methane mitigation is not 42 43 provided, it would be possible that the climate outcome is not consistent with the storyline because there is uncertainty in 44 whether the infilled emissions pathways are in line with the storyline and these large emissions sources do effect the global 45 mean surface temperature significantly. Another example would be that it is possible that the harmonisation process with very 46 high deltas (i.e., difference of modelled pathway with historical data), certainly several of the used harmonisation methods 47 could project the harmonised data to have very large deviations from original scenario data.

48 To provide an overview of the reason that scenarios were filtered out, we provide three illustrations. Supplementary Figure 49 2 shows by model framework how many scenarios were excluded because of the vetting process, grouped by high-level reason. 50 Supplementary Table 1 shows a disaggregation of the vetting and how many scenarios were affected by these vetting rules. 51 The selected vetting rules and the threshold values come from the assessment of the IPCC writing team, based on their expert 52 judgement. Supplementary Table 2 shows a summary of the number of scenarios that passed vetting by climate category and 53 model framework.



Vetting information for scenarios with a global scope in the AR6 Scenario Database.

Supplementary Figure 2: Vetting information for the scenarios in the AR6 Scenario database (Byers et al., 2022). This figure shows
 how many scenarios of different model framework passed vetting criteria and were suitable to receive a climate assessment in IPCC
 AR6 WGIII (IPCC, 2022b). If a scenario both failed vetting and did not provide information until 2100, it is shown as "No. Not until 2100.".

	Reference Value	Range	Number of scenarios out of range
CO ₂ (total) in 2019	44,251 MtCO2	$\pm 40\%$	23
CO ₂ -FFI in 2019	37,646 MtCO2	± 20%	55
CH4 in 2019	379 MtCH4	± 20%	139
CO ₂ -FFI percentage change 2010-2020	-	0 - 50%	74
CCS from energy in 2020	-	0-250 Mt/CO2	77
Primary Energy in 202	578 EJ	± 20%	73
Electricity Nuclear in 2020	9.77 EJ	± 30%	266
Electricity Solar and Wind in 2020	8.51 EJ	± 50%	377

Model framework	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	Total
AIM	4	3	17	8	13	4	6	0	55
C-ROADS-5.005	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
COFFEE 1.1	1	4	14	15	21	9	1	0	65
GCAM	6	6	13	9	6	1	6	1	48
GEM-E3_V2021	2	10	12	6	5	3	3	0	41
IMAGE	7	9	34	18	22	16	34	2	142
MESSAGE	20	43	59	39	57	20	28	0	266
POLES	4	10	26	24	20	11	19	0	114
REMIND	41	44	84	16	34	19	48	11	297
WITCH	9	2	31	14	24	9	12	14	115
EPPA 6	0	0	1	3	0	1	2	0	7
TIAM-ECN 1.1	0	0	20	6	10	4	5	0	45
MERGE-ETL 6.0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total	97	133	311	159	212	97	164	29	1202

Supplementary Table 2: Overview of number of classified scenarios by modelling framework and temperature classification.

Variable name	Description	Variants reported in	Note
		AR6DB	
AR6 climate diagnostics Atmospheric Concentrations CH4 *	Atmospheric concentration of methane.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Atmospheric Concentrations CO2 *	Atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Atmospheric Concentrations N2O *	Atmospheric concentration of nitrous oxide.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing *	Total effective radiative forcing.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Aerosols *	Effective radiative forcing for all aerosols.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Aerosols Indirect Effect *	Partial effective radiative forcing for all aerosols: the indirect forcing.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Aerosols Direct Effect *	Partial effective radiative forcing for all aerosols: the direct forcing.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Aerosols Direct Effect BC *	Direct effective radiative forcing effect for black carbon.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Aerosols Direct Effect OC *	Direct effective radiative forcing effect for organic carbon.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Aerosols Direct Effect Sulfur *	Direct effective radiative forcing effect for sulfur.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Basket Anthropogenic *	Effective radiative forcing for total anthropogenic emissions caused forcing.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Basket Greenhouse Gases *	Effective radiative forcing for total greenhouse gases.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Basket Non-CO2 Anthropogenic *	Effective radiative forcing for anthropogenic emissions excluding carbon dioxide.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing Basket Non-CO2 Greenhouse Gases *	Effective radiative forcing for total greenhouse gases excluding carbon dioxide.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing C2F6 *	Effective radiative forcing for hexafluoroethane.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing C6F14 *	Effective radiative forcing for perfluorohexane.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing CF4 *	Effective radiative forcing for tetrafluorohexane.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83 3, 90, and 95	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.

AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing CH4 *	Effective radiative forcing for methane.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing CO2 *	Effective radiative forcing for carbon dioxide.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing F-Gases *	Effective radiative forcing for the basket of fluorinated gases.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC125 *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC125.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC134a *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC134a.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC143a *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC143a.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC227ea *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC227ea.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC23 *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC23.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC245fa *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC245fa.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC32 *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC32.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing HFC4310mee *	Effective radiative forcing for HFC43-10.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing N2O *	Effective radiative forcing for nitrous oxide.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Effective Radiative Forcing SF6 *	Effective radiative forcing for sulfur hexafluoride.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Heat Uptake *	Total earth system heat uptake (land, ocean, cryosphere and atmosphere), equivalent to the the energy imbalance at the top of the atmosphere.	Percentiles: 5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, 83.3, 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.
AR6 climate diagnostics Raw Surface Temperature (GMST) *	Raw global-mean air ocean blended temperature change (GMST i.e. a blend of 2m air temperature over land and surface temperatures over the ocean; raw to distinguish it from the GSAT output which is	Percentiles: <u>5</u> , 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67, <u>83.3</u> , 90, and 95.	Available for MAGICC, FaIR, and CICERO.

	adjusted to match the		
	WGI best-estimate		
	historical warming		
	between 1850-1900 and		
	1995-2014).	N	
AR6 climate diagnostics Raw Surface	Raw global-mean surface	Percentiles:	Available for MAGICC,
Temperature (GSAT)	air temperature change	5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67,	FaIR, and CICERO.
	(GSAT i.e. 2m air	83.3, 90, and 95.	
	temperature; raw to		
	distinguish it from the		
	GSAT output which is		
	adjusted to match the		
	WGI best-estimate		
	historical warming		
	between 1850-1900 and		
	<u>1995-2014).</u>		
AR6 climate diagnostics Surface Temperature	Global-mean surface air	Percentiles:	Available for MAGICC,
(GSAT) *	temperature change to be	5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67,	FaIR, and CICERO.
	used for e.g. scenario	83.3, 90, and 95.	
	categorisation (this output		
	has been adjusted to		
	match the WGI best-		
	estimate historical		
	warming between 1850-		
	1900 and 1995-2014).		
AR6 climate diagnostics Net Atmosphere to	Net flux of carbon dioxide	Percentiles:	Available for MAGICC.
Land Flux CO2 MAGICCv7.5.3 50.0th	from the atmosphere to	5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67,	
Percentile	the land (not including	83.3, 90, and 95.	
	AFOLU and other		
	anthropogenic emissions).		
	A positive value indicates		
	uptake of carbon dioxide		
	from the land (i.e. the		
	land is acting as a carbon		
	sink), a negative value		
	indicates release of carbon		
	dioxide from the land (i.e.		
	the land is acting as a		
	carbon source).	D (1	
AR6 climate diagnostics Net Atmosphere to	Net flux of carbon dioxide	Percentiles:	Available for MAGICC.
Ocean Flux CO2 MAGICCV / .5.3 S0.0th	from the atmosphere to	5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67,	
Percentile	the ocean. A positive	83.3, 90, and 93.	
	value indicates uptake of		
	carbon dioxide from the		
	ocean (i.e. the ocean is		
	nagativo valuo indicatos		
	release of carbon diovide		
	from the ocean (i.e. the		
	ocean is acting as a		
	carbon source)		
AR6 climate diagnostics Net Land to	Net flux of methane from	Percentiles:	Available for MAGICC
Atmosphere Flux due to	the land to the atmosphere	5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67	
Permafrost CH4 MAGICCv7.5.3 50.0th	due to the permafrost	83.3, 90, and 95.	
D (1	feedback A positive		

	value indicates release of		
	methane from the land.		
AR6 climate diagnostics Net Land to	Net flux of carbon dioxide	Percentiles:	Available for MAGICC.
Atmosphere Flux due to	from the land to the	5, 10, 16.7, 33, 50, 67,	
Permafrost CO2 MAGICCv7.5.3 50.0th	atmosphere due to the	83.3, 90, and 95.	
Percentile	permafrost feedback. A		
	positive value indicates		
	release of carbon dioxide		
	from the land.		
Supplementary Table 3: Global climate variables reported in the AR6 Scenarios Database hosted by IIASA (AR6DB).			

Variable name	Used as input for the IPCC AR6
	workflow to calculate global
	temperature change?
Emissions BC	Yes.
Emissions BC AFOLU	No.
Emissions BC AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions BC AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions BC Energy	No.
Emissions BC Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions BC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions BC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions BC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions BC Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions BC Energy Supply	No.
Emissions BC Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions BC Other	No.
Emissions BC Waste	No.
Emissions C2F6	No
Emissions/CF4	No
Emissions/CH4	Ves
Emissions/CH4/AFOLU	No
Emissions/CH4/AFOLU/Agriculture	No
Emissions/CH4/AFOLU/Agriculture/Livestock	No
Emissions/CH4/AFOLU/Agriculture/Livestock/Enteric Fermentation	No
Emissions CH4 AFOLU Agriculture Livestock Manure Management	No
Emissions/CH4/AFOLU/Agriculture/Rice	No.
Emissions/CH4/AFOLU/Land	No.
	No.
Emissions CH4 Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions/CH4/Energy/Demand/Recidential and Commercial	No.
Emissions/CH4/Energy/Demand/Residential and Commercial/Commercial	No.
Emissions CH4 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions CH4 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions CH4 Energy Demand Hansportation	No.
	No.
	No.
Emissions CH4 Industrial Processes Chelmeans	No.
Emissions CH4 Industrial Processes Steel	No.
	No.
	NO.
	I es.
	No.
	No.
	No.
	NO.
Emissions CO Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions CO Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions CO Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions CO Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions CO Energy Demand Transportation	INO.
Emissions CO Energy Supply	No.
Emissions CO Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions CO Other	No.
EmissionsICO/Waste	No.

Emissions CO2	Yes. (*)
Emissions CO2 AFOLU	Yes.
Emissions CO2 AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions CO2 AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy	Yes. (*)
Emissions/CO2/Energy and Industrial Processes	Yes.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand	No
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand AFOFI	No
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Industry	No
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Industry Cement	No
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Industry/Chemicals	No
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Industry/Chemicals/Ammonia	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Industry/Chemicals/Ammonia	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Industry Chemicals Itight value chemicals	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Industry/Chemicals/Intenant	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Industry/Chemicals/Other	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Industry/Non-remous metals	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Industry Other	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Industry Pulp and Paper	No.
Emissions[CO2]Energy[Demand[Industry]Steel	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Other Sector	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial Heating	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and	No.
Commercial Commercial Heating Cooking	
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and	No.
Commercial Commercial Heating Space	
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and	No.
Commercial Commercial Heating Water	
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential Heating	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and	No.
Commercial Residential Heating Cooking	
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and	<u>No.</u>
Commercial Residential Heating Space	
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Residential and	No.
Commercial Residential Heating Water	
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Aviation	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Aviation Freight	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Aviation Passenger	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Freight	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Maritime	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Maritime Freight	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Maritime Passenger	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Passenger	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Rail	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Rail Freight	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Rail Passenger	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Road	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Road Freight	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Road Passenger	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Demand/Transportation/Road/Passenger/2W&3W	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Road Passenger Bus	No

Environment CO2/Environment Development all Transment at the instance of the second and LOV	N-
Emissions CO2 Energy Demand Transportation Koad Passenger LDV	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Supply	No.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Supply/Electricity	No.
	No.
Emissions CO2 Energy Supply Heat	NO.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Supply/Liquids	NO.
Emissions CO2 Energy Supply Other Sector	NO.
Emissions/CO2/Energy/Supply/Solids	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes	Yes. (*)
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Cement	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Chemicals	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Chemicals Ammonia	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Chemicals High value chemicals	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Chemicals Methanol	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Chemicals Other	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Non-ferrous metals	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Other	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Pulp and Paper	No.
Emissions CO2 Industrial Processes Steel	No.
Emissions CO2 Other	Yes. (*)
Emissions CO2 Waste	Yes. (*)
Emissions F-Gases	No.
Emissions HFC	No.
Emissions HFC HFC125	Yes.
Emissions HFC HFC134a	Yes.
Emissions/HFC/HFC143a	Ves
Emissions/HFC/HFC227ea	Ves
Emissions/HFC/HFC23	Ves
Emissions/HFC/HFC245fa	No
Emissions/HFC/HFC32	Ves
Emissions/HEC/HEC43-10	Ves
Emissions/HEC/Industrial Processes	No
Emissions/Kyoto Gases	No.
	No.
Emissions N2O	I CS.
	No.
	No.
Emissions N2O AFOLU Agriculture Livestock Manure Management	NO.
Emissions N20 AF0LU Agriculture Managed Solis	NO.
	NO.
	NO.
Emissions N2O Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions N2O Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions N2O Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions N2O Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions N2O Industrial Processes Chemicals	No.
Emissions N20 Other	No.
Emissions N2O Waste	No.
Emissions NH3	Yes.
Emissions NH3 AFOLU	No.
Emissions NH3 AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions NH3 AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions NH3 Energy	No.
Emissions NH3 Energy Demand Industry	No.

Emissions NH3 Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions NH3 Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions NH3 Energy Supply	No.
Emissions NH3 Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions NH3 Other	No.
Emissions NH3 Waste	No.
Emissions NOx	Yes.
Emissions NOx AFOLU	No.
Emissions NOx AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions NOx AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions NOx Energy	No.
Emissions NOx Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions NOx Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions NOx Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions NOx Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions NOx Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions NOx Energy Supply	No.
Emissions NOx Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions NOx Other	No.
Emissions NOx Waste	No.
Emissions OC	Yes.
Emissions OC AFOLU	No.
Emissions OC AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions OC AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions OC Energy	No.
Emissions OC Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions OC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions OC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions OC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions OC Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions OC Energy Supply	No.
Emissions OC Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions OC Other	No.
Emissions OC Waste	No.
Emissions PFC	No.
Emissions PFC C2F6	Yes.
Emissions PFC C6F14	Yes.
Emissions PFC CF4	Yes.
Emissions PM2.5	No.
Emissions SF6	Yes.
Emissions Sulfur	Yes.
Emissions Sulfur AFOLU	No.
_Emissions Sulfur AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions Sulfur AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions Sulfur Energy Supply	No.
Emissions Sulfur Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions Sulfur Other	No.

Emissions Sulfur Waste	No.
Emissions VOC	Yes.
Emissions VOC AFOLU	No.
Emissions VOC AFOLU Agriculture	No.
Emissions VOC AFOLU Land	No.
Emissions VOC Energy	No.
Emissions VOC Energy Demand Industry	No.
Emissions VOC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial	No.
Emissions VOC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Commercial	No.
Emissions VOC Energy Demand Residential and Commercial Residential	No.
Emissions VOC Energy Demand Transportation	No.
Emissions VOC Energy Supply	No.
Emissions VOC Industrial Processes	No.
Emissions VOC Other	No.
Emissions VOC Waste	No.
Supplementary Table 4: Global emissions variables reported by the IAM mod	lelling frameworks as available in the AR6 Sc

73 Database hosted by IIASA (AR6DB), which a mark for the variables used by IPCC AR6 WGIII climate assessment workflow. (*) =

74 only used in exceptional cases if not all information if captured in the combination of "Emissions|CO2|AFOLU" and

75 "Emissions|CO2|Energy and Industrial Processes".
Variable name	Description	Note
AR6 climate diagnostics Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR5-	Total greenhouse gases	Based on IAM-reported emissions,
GWP100)	falling under the Kyoto	i.e. "Emissions ^{*"} .
	Protocol, here calculated as	
	the sum of C2F6, C6F14,	
	CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,	
	HFC134a, HFC143a,	
	HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,	
	HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	
	Calculated using 100-year	
	global warming potential	
	from the IPCC Fifth	
	Assessment Report.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-	Total greenhouse gases	Based on IAM-reported emissions,
<u>GWP100)</u>	falling under the Kyoto	i.e. "Emissions *".
	Protocol, here calculated as	
	the sum of C2F6, C6F14,	
	CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,	
	<u>HFC134a, HFC143a,</u>	
	HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,	
	HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	
	Calculated using 100-year	
	global warming potential	
	from the IPCC Sixth	
	Assessment Report.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions BC	Harmonized anthropogenic	
	black carbon emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions CH4	Harmonized anthropogenic	
	methane emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions CO	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AP6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions CO2	Harmonized anthronogenic	This basket was not used directly for
ARO chinate diagnostics[1annohized[Emissions]CO2	carbon dioxide emissions	climate simulations
AR6 climate	Harmonized anthropogenic	
diagnostics Harmonized Emissions CO2 AFOLU	carbon dioxide emissions	
	from agriculture forestry and	
	other land use (IPCC category	
	$\frac{\operatorname{current materials (in c c current)}}{3).$	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions CO2 Energy	Harmonized anthropogenic	
and Industrial Processes	carbon dioxide emissions	
	from energy use on supply	
	and demand side, including	
	fugitive emissions from fuels	
	(IPCC category 1A, 1B) and	
	industrial processes.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions F-Gases	Harmonized anthropogenic	This basket was not used directly for
	fluorinated gases emissions,	climate simulations.
	including SF6, HFCs, and	
	PFCs.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC	Harmonized anthropogenic	This basket was not used directly for
	hydrofluorocarbons	climate simulations.
	emissions.	
AR6 climate	Harmonized anthropogenic	
diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC125	HFC125 emissions.	

ARD climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/HFC:HFC134a Harmonized anthropogenic HFC134a emissions. ARB climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/HFC:HFC227ca HFC134a emissions. ARB climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC:HFC227ca HFC23a emissions. ARB climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC:HFC227ca HFC23a emissions. ARB climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC:HFC23 Harmonized anthropogenic HFC23 emissions. ARB climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC:HFC32. Harmonized anthropogenic HFC32 emissions. ARB climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC:HFC32. Harmonized anthropogenic HFC32 emissions. ARB climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (ARS-GWP100) Dased on harmonized Emissions/ HFC134a, HFC133a, HFC134a, HFC133a, HFC233, HFC32, HFC134a, HFC133a, HFC233, HFC33, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC233, HFC33, HFC33, HC33, HFC234, HFC133a, HFC234, HFC135a, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC234, HFC135, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC234, HFC135, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC234, HFC135, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC234, HFC135, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC234, HFC134b, HFC1	ARC climate Internative anthropogenic ARG climate Ilarmonized Intropogenic diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[HFC[HFC]34a Ilarmonized anthropogenic diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[HFC[HFC]34a Ilarmonized anthropogenic ARG climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[HFC[HFC]32 ARG climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[HFC[HFC]32 ARG climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[HFC]HFC]32 ARG climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[Kyoto Gases ARG climate filling under the Kyoto Protocol. here calculated asing 100-year global warning potential ARG climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[Kyoto Gases Calculated using 100-year global warning potential Tom di greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol. here calculated asing 100-year global warning potential Tom di greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Calculated using 100-year global warning potential Tom di greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Tom di greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Tom di greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Tom di grecchouse gases falling under the Kyoto <th>AD6 alimata</th> <th>Hammonized on thromogenia</th> <th></th>	AD6 alimata	Hammonized on thromogenia	
Operations namedia and incomposities of the product of the produc	Jack Scimules Jack Columbics ARG climate Jack Columbics diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC[HFC143a HFC143a emissions, HFC147a emissions, HFC147ca emissions, HFC27ca emissions, HFC27ca emissions, HFC27ca emissions, HFC27ca emissions, HFC27ca emissions, HFC27ca emissions, HFC23ca emis	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HEC HEC134a	HEC134a emissions	
AR6 climate Inamination and information and informatin and information and information and information and infor	AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HC[HPC217ca HIFC143a emissions, HIFC143a emissions, HIFC143a emissions, HIFC1472 antibisons, HIFC1472 antibisons, HIFC1474 anthift7474 anthift7474 HIFC1474 antibisons, HIFC1474 antibisons, HI		Here a set a	
Objectives framewized Emissions/IFC (IFC 143a IFC 1493a (Imsoin) ARG climate Immonized anthropogenic diagnostics/I larmonized/Emissions/IFC (IFC 23 emissions. IFC 227ea emissions. ARG climate Immonized anthropogenic ARG climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC (IFC 23 emissions. IFC 23 emissions. ARG climate Immonized anthropogenic diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC (IFC 43-10 Immonized anthropogenic ARG climate Immonized Immonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases ARG climate Immonized Immonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases ARG climate Immonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Intel (24, 10 cmissions, 1e, 12, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 2	Johnsteinstrahmonized/Emissions/IFC/IFC132 IFC132 missions. AR6 climate IIFC227ea AR6 climate IIFC227ea AR6 climate IIFC227ea IIFC227ea missions. AR6 climate IIFC23 IIFC23 missions. AR6 climate IIFC23 IIIFC23 missions. AR6 climate IIIFC23 IIIFC23 missions. IIIFC24 IIIFC23 IIIIFC244 IIIFC234 IIIIC234 IIFC23 IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	diagnostical Lormonized Emissional LEC/LEC142	Harmonized antiropogenic	
AR6 climate Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/IFC/IFC23 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/IFC/IFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/IFC/IFC43-10 HFC23 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases Protocol, here calculated a diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases (AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases (AR6-GWP100) FrC23a, HFC23, HFC23, HFC23, HFC23, HFC23, HFC23, HFC243, D, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year (AR6-GWP100) FrC247 co2, C14, HFC125, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC23, HFC24, HFC243, RFC24, HFC24, HFC243, RFC24, HFC243, RFC243, RFC24, HFC243, RFC243, RFC24, HFC243, RFC24, HFC243, RFC244, HFC243, RFC243, RFC244, HFC243, RFC243,	AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC227ca Harmonized anthropogenic HFC27a emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC23 Harmonized anthropogenic HFC23 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PC/CCF4 Harmonized anthropogenic metaltropogenic errotoro-tons emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PC/CCF4 Harmonized anthropogenic metaltropogenic errotoro-tons emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PC/CCF4 Harmonized anthropogenic errotoro-tons emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PC/CCF4 Harmonized anthropogenic bexaftuoroch	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC143a	HFC143a emissions.	
diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFCHFC22/ea Harmonized anthropogenic HFC23 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFCHFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic HFC32 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC AR6 clim	dagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC32 HFC21/ea emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized/Emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized/Emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gass Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized/Emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/NZ0 Harmonized anthropogenic <td>AR6 climate</td> <td>Harmonized anthropogenic</td> <td></td>	AR6 climate	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC3 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC3 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC43-10 HFC32 missions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC43-10 IIFC43-10 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases (AR5-GWP100) Falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, GC2, HFC23, HFC33, HFC	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFCHFC31 Harmonized anthropogenic HFC32 missions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (CC climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (CC climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (CC climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions FCCCP16 Harmonized anthropogenic (CC climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions FCCCP16 Harmonized anthropogenic (CC climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions FCCCP16 Harmo	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC22/ea	HFC22/ea emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases International and the Kyoto protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C74, C02, C144, HFC123, HFC134, HFC13	AR6 climate diagnostics armonized Emissions IFC IFC32 Ilarmonized anthropogenic HEC32 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics armonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C74, C02, CH4, IFC123, IFC32, HFC134a, IFC1450, HFC143-10 Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics armonized Emissions Kyoto Gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C74, C02, CH4, IFC125, HFC134a, IFC1450, HFC1434a, IFC1450, HFC1434a, IFC1450, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions Kyoto Gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C74, C02, C144, IFC125, HFC134a, IFC1450, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions Kyoto Gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C74, C02, C144, IFC125, HFC134a, IFC1450, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions N2O Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions PFCCCF16 AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions PFCCF2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions PFCCF2F6 AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions PFCCF2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Armonized Emissions PFCCF46	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC23	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic HFC32 emissions. Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions/NZO Total greenhouse gases HFC127ca, HFC123, HFC125, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC125, HFC125, HFC125, HFC125, HFC125, HFC125, HFC125, HFC123, HFC125,	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFCHFC32 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized/Emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized/Emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. Gallary during here Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF125, HFC125, HFC124, HFC125, HFC22, HFC310, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Based on harmonized/Emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nutrous or adarthropogenic nutrous or adarthropogenic nutrous or adarthropogenic nutrous or adarthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCCCF14 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCCCF14 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This		HFC23 emissions.	
HFC32 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gase AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gase AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gase Fotosol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC237ea, HFC23, JHC32, HFC310, N20, SF6. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gase AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Nyoto AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Nyoto HFC227ex, HFC23, HFC32, HFC4310, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NYO Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NYO Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia ediagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC12F6 AR6 climate diagnostics	AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of ZF6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134, HFC143, HFC143, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC23, HFC234, HFC143, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC23, HFC234, HFC143, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC234, HFC143, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC234, HFC143, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC34, HFC237ea, HFC34, HFC34, HFC237ea, HFC34, HFC34, HFC237ea, HFC34, HFC34, HFC237ea, HFC34, HFC34, HFC34310, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the HC257k, HFC344, HFC145a, HFC34310, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the HCC3 kth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/M20 mitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 MA6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Marmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonised emissions/***. "AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Marmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 MA6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 M2 emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC Harmonized anthropogenic marmonized anthropogenic hexafuoroctane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC32	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate Harmonized anthropogenic Giaenostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases "AR6 climate AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases "AR6 climate Giaenostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases "AR6 climate Giaenostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases "AR6 climate Giaenostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases HFC134a,	AR6 climate Harmonized anthropogenic diagnostics HarmonizedEmissions HFCHFC43-10 HFC43-10 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics HarmonizedEmissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions. (AR5-GWP100) Fr0tocol, here calculated as Based on harmonizedEmissions **. (AR5-GWP100) Fr0tocol, here calculated as Based on harmonizedEmissions **. (AR6-GWP100) FrC13a, HFC13a, HFC13a, HFC13a, HFC13a, HFC23a, HFC23, HFC23, HFC23a, HFC23, HFC23a, HFC23A, HFC13a, HFC13a, HFC125, HFC22, HFC23C, HFC23A, HFC123a, HFC243a,		HFC32 emissions.	
diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/HFC/HFC43-10 HFC43-10 HFC43-10 AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC23-10, N20, SF6. Based on harmonised emissions/***. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC23-10, N20, SF6. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Galeulated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic antronized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. Based on harmonized emissions/ **. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This b	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC43-10 HFC23-10 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC23-ea, HFC23, HC23, HFC227ea, HFC23, HC23, HFC23-ea, HFC23, HC23, HFC227ea, HFC23, HC23, HFC23-ea, HC23, HC23, HFC23-ea, HC23, HC32, HFC23-ea, HC23, HC32, HFC33, HC32, HFC33-ea, HC32, HC32, HC32, HC32, HC33, HC33, HC32, HC32, HC32, HC33, HC32, HC33, HC32, HC33, HC33, HC32, HC33, HC32, HC33, HC33, HC32, HC33, HC33, HC33, HC33, HC32, HC33, HC3	AR6 climate	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC13-10, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Fifh Assessment Report. Based on harmonized[Emissions]**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC23, HFC33, HFC237ea, HFC33, HFC32, HFC237ea, HFC33, HFC32, HFC3310, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized emissions]**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized[Emissions]N20 Harmonized anthropogenic ntroux oxide emissions. Based on harmonized emissions]**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized[Emissions]N20 Harmonized anthropogenic munoi a cmissions. Based on harmonized emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[ND20 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized[Emissions]PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized[Emissions]PFC(C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carb	AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[Kyoto Gases (AR5-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, IHFC125, IHFC134a, IHFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC4310, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC FIAh Assessment Report. Based on harmonized[Emissions]**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC23-Re, HFC23, HFC32, HFC23-Re, HFC33, HFC23-Re, HFC23, HFC32, HFC34a, HFC195, Galculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized Emissions]**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[ND2 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized Emissions]**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[ND2 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sumonized anthropogenic perfluoroclasses Total greenhouse gases failing under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the here of the transions. Based on harmonized Emissions[**. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[ND2 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluoroclasses. Total greenhouse gases failing under the K	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions HFC HFC43-10	HFC43-10 emissions.	
(ARS-GWP100) falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2P6, C6F14, CF4, C02, C144, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC123, HFC23, HFC23-10, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. "AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/*". AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2P6, C6F14, CF4, C02, C144, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC1433, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC23, HFC33-10, N20, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Stth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized/Emissions/*". AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, C144, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC23, HFC23, HFC23-10, N20, SF6. Based on harmonized/Emissions/*". AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N20 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic bexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC(CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic bexafluoro	(AR5-GWP100) "AR6 climate falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C5C14, CF4, C02, C114, HIFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC237ea, HFC27ea, HFC27, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC37ea, HFC23, HFC33, HFC37ea, HF	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kvoto Gases	Total greenhouse gases	Based on harmonised emissions, i.e.
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases faignostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases faignostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases faignostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC127ca, HFC23, HFC34, HFC125, CAlculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Based on harmonized Emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized Emissions N13 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulation. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic nemissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC/C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic nemissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulation	Inter Contractory Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC134, HFC125, HFC125, HFC124, HFC135, HFC32, HFC33, HFC32, HFC33, HFC33, HFC33, HFC33, HFC33, HFC33, HC32, HFC33, HFC33, HC32, HFC33, HC32, HFC33, HFC33, HC32, HFC33, HFC33, HC32, HFC33, HF	(AR5-GWP100)	falling under the Kyoto	"AR6 climate
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions V2O Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Total greenhouse gases alling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C24.C103, N2O, SF6. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC123, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC23, GF74, C74, C02, CH4, HFC123, HFC23, GF74, C24, C14, GF74, C24, C02, CH4, HFC123, HFC23, GF74, C24, C02, CH4, HFC123, HFC23, GF74, C24, C02, CH4, HFC123, HFC23, GF74, C24, C02, CH4, HFC123, HFC23, GF74, C24, C143, C144, GF74, C24, C144, C144, GF74, C02, C144, HFC123, HFC23, GF74, C24, C144, GF744, C24, C144, GF74, C24, C144, GF74, C24, C144, G	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 HFC134, HFC143, HFC144, HFC125, HFC144, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC1444, HFC144,		Protocol here calculated as	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions *"
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Science AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Science AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Science Science AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Science Science Science AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Science Sci	AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Total greenhouse gases filling under the Kyoto Statistics/Harmonized/Emissions/Filling AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Total greenhouse gases filling under the Kyoto Fortocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, C14, HFC135, HFC23-10, N2O, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic ntrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/NCO Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC(CF14 Harmonized		the sum of C2E6_C6E14	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Based on harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Based on harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic arbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic anthropogenic arbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbone emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagn	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC1243a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC214a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC214a, HFC125, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized Emissions *". AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized Emissions *". AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbone emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFCCF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorobecane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFCCF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorobecane emissions.		CF4 CO2 CH4 HEC125	
AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O HFC33-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC135, HFC134a, HFC23, HFC33, HFC32, HFC33-10, N2O, SF6. Based on harmonised emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonised emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized/Emissions/**. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized/Emissions/N14 AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emis	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. **AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Total greenhouse gases **AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Total greenhouse gases **AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Total greenhouse gases **AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Total greenhouse gases **AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic **AR6 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic ************************************		HEC124a $HEC142a$	
AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O HFC23-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC135, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC33-10, N2O, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized/Emissions/*** AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Total greenhouse gases the sum of C2F6, C6F14, C74, C02, C14, HFC13, HFC33-10, N2O, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized/Emissions/N2O AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PCC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly i	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic Based on harmonized Emissions Ki AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic "The sum of C2F6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2C Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR		1100000000000000000000000000000000000	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134, HFC135, HFC134, HFC145, HFC134, HFC135, HFC134, H	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic "Ar6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic <td< td=""><td></td><td>HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,</td><td></td></td<>		HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Falling under the Kyoto "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Falling under the Kyoto "AR6 climate Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, "AR6 climate CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC1340, HFC143a, HFC237eA, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenie "Itorus oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenie "This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used dire	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC23-10, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warning potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. "AK6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions, Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions, AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF14 Harmonized		HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC23-R10, N20, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized Emissions **'. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. "AR6 climate AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. "Ar86 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. "Ar86 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NCX Harmonized anthropogenic monia emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic NOX emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorochane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6	aR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ca, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-100, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions *". AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Based on harmonized Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Total greenhouse ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2C Harmonized anthropogenic erganic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC Harmonized anthropogenic erganic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorochane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations.		Calculated using 100-year	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonized emissions, i.e. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases For the Kyoto Based on harmonized Emissions **: HFC237ca, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32, HFC327ca, HFC23, HFC32, HFC327ca, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32-10, N20, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions. Marmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PC Harmonized anthropogenic organic anthropogenic organic arbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate di	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. (AR6-GWP100) Fotal greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. (AR6-GWP100) Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, Based on harmonised emissions, i.e. (AR6-GWP100) Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, General (Emissions)**. (AR6-GWP100) HFC3176, HFC134a, HFC132, HFC3276, HFC32, HFC3176, HFC32, HFC2176a, HFC23, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32, HFC32-10, N20, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic Organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F14 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in <tr< td=""><td></td><td>global warming potential</td><td></td></tr<>		global warming potential	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of CZF6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC32, HFC32, HFC43-10, N20, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic antrous oxide emissions. Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. Harmonized anthropogenic antrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic monia emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC/CEF14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC/CEF14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorochance emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6. C6F14, CF4. CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC23-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. "AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NCX Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC/CEF6 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CEF6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorothane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF6H Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorothane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or		from the IPCC Fifth	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC123, HFC32, HFC23-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonized Emissions **. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic antronized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. Based on harmonized antronized isomonized diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC/CEF614 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC/CEF614 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC125, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC343-10, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Based on harmonised emissions ***. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. "AR6 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. "This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations." AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F614 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infiling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. This basket was not used directly		Assessment Report.	
(AR6-GWP100) falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC33, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC33, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC33, HFC237ea, HFC135a, HFC237ea, HFC135a,	(AR6-GWP100) falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. "AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. "Ar6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PCC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorobexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorobexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. <td>AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases</td> <td>Total greenhouse gases</td> <td>Based on harmonised emissions, i.e.</td>	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Kyoto Gases	Total greenhouse gases	Based on harmonised emissions, i.e.
Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.diagnostics Harmonized Emissions **.AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NDXHarmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions	Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, C02, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC23, HFC3-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warning potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/N2O AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/NOX Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. disenset was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC/C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC/C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PFC/C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. <td><u>(AR6-GWP100)</u></td> <td>falling under the Kyoto</td> <td>"AR6 climate</td>	<u>(AR6-GWP100)</u>	falling under the Kyoto	"AR6 climate
the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC13a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC23-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic morganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic neprfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F61 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions.	the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SPFC CF4		Protocol, here calculated as	diagnostics Harmonized Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NCX Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simul	CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC134a, HFC237ea, HFC232, HFC23-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic monia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic monia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic monia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorotekane emissions. AR6 climate di		the sum of C2F6, C6F14,	
HFC134a, HFC13a, HFC23, HFC32, HFC33-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F64 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions.	HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ca, HFC32, HFC32, HFC43-10, N20, SF6, Calculated using 100-year global warning potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[NN13 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[NOX Harmonized anthropogenic organic arbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic arbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic arbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[PFC]C26F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[PFC]C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[PFC]C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions[PFC]CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions]PFC]CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions]PFC]CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climat		CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,	
HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions.	HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorochane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorothane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized		HFC134a, HFC143a,	
HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthr	HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warning potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic mitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0X Harmonized anthropogenic monia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic monia e missions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monia e missions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic methor perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic methor perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic methor perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic methorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic methorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic methorohexane emissions. <		HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic nonzed anthropogenic nonzed anthropogenic nonzed anthropogenic nonzed anthropogenic nonzed anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic nonzed anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic nervisions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic nervisions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic nervisions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic nervisions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic nervisions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CE4 Harmonized anthropogenic nervisions.	Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.		HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	
arristic of the transmission of the transmission of the transmission of the transmission of transmismet of transmission of transmission of tran	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N13 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N0x Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic Organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in perfluorocarbons emissions. For infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in perfluorocarbons emissions. For infilling or climate simulations. For infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emis		Calculated using 100-year	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NO2 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NO3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NO2 Harmonized anthropogenic NO2 emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic berfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic berfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic berfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic berfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic berfluorohexane emissions.		global warming potential	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic mexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic merfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic merfluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N20 Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic gulfur hexafluorohexane emissions.		from the IPCC Sixth	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. ammonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O Harmonized anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic norganic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroothane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroothane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroothane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions.		Assessment Report	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonized anthropogenic ammonized anthropogenic ammonized anthropogenic ammonized anthropogenic monized anthropogenic NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic herafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic herafluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions N2O	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic ammonia emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NH3 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic Perfluorochane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions. State	Arto eninate diagnostics/Harmonized/Eninssions/1420	nitrous oxide emissions	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluorohane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions. SF6	AP6 alimate diagnostical Harmonized Emissional NH2	Harmonized anthronogenia	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. Organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. For infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic Perfluorohexane emissions. Parmonized anthropogenic Perfluorohexane emissions. Parmonized anthropogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOx Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations	ARO eminate diagnosties mannonized Emissions (1915		
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX Harmonized anthropogenic NOx emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6	ADC 11 and 11 an		
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions NOX	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. Harmonized anthropogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC Harmonized anthropogenic organic carbon emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6		NOX emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. Harmonized anthropogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions OC	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic This basket was not used directly in perfluorocarbons emissions. for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorocarbons emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. This basket was not used directly in for infilling or climate simulations. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6		organic carbon emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC	Harmonized anthropogenic	This basket was not used directly in
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6 Harmonized anthropogenic hexafluoroethane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.		pertluorocarbons emissions.	tor infilling or climate simulations.
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C2F6	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PEC CE4 Harmonized anthropogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14 Harmonized anthropogenic perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.		hexafluoroethane emissions.	
perfluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics/Harmonized/Emissions/PEC/CF4 Harmonized anthronogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC C6F14	Harmonized anthropogenic	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PEC CE4 Harmonized anthronogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4 Harmonized anthropogenic tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.		perfluorohexane emissions.	
The man anglostophumonized missions in Contraction mumorized and topogenic	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 tetrafluorohexane emissions. AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions PFC CF4	Harmonized anthropogenic	
tetrafluorohexane emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6 Harmonized anthropogenic sulfur hexafluoride emissions.		tetrafluorohexane emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics[Harmonized]Emissions]SE6 Harmonized anthronogenic	sulfur hexafluoride emissions.	AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions SF6	Harmonized anthropogenic	
			sulfur hexafluoride emissions.	
			sulfur hexafluoride emissions.	

AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions Sulfur	Harmonized anthropogenic	
	sulfur emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Harmonized Emissions VOC	Harmonized anthropogenic	
	volatile organic compound	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions BC	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic black carbon	
	emissions	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CC14	Infilled (and harmonized)	
And enniate diagnostics/infined/Ennissions/CCI4	anthronogenic CC14	
	antinopogenie CCI4	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CFC11	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CFC11	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CFC113	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CFC113	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CFC114	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CFC114	
	emissions	
AP6 alimate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CEC115	Infilled (and harmonized)	
ARO enimate diagnostics/infined/Eninssions/EFC115	anthronogenia CEC115	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CFC12	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CFC12	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CH2Cl2	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CH2Cl2	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CH3Br	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CH3Br	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CH3CC13	Infilled (and harmonized)	
The enhale diagnostics minica Enhostens eris e ers	anthronogenic CH3CCl3	
	emissions	
ADC alimate dia mantical Infille di Emissional CUI2 Cl	Lufilled (and homeonized)	
	anthren e senie CU2Cl	
	anthropogenic CH5Cl	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CH4	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic methane	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CHC13	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic CHCl3	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CO	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic carbon	
	monoxide emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CO2	Infilled (and harmonized)	This basket was not used directly for
	anthropogenic carbon dioxide	climate simulations
	emissions	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CO2 AFOLU	Infilled (and harmonized)	
And enhale diagnostics/infined/Enhosions/CO2/AFOE0	anthronogenic carbon diovida	
	antihopogenic carbon dioxide	
	forestry and other land use	
	Interstry and other land use	
	(IPCC category 3).	

AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions CO2 Energy and	Infilled (and harmonized)	
Industrial Processes	anthropogenic carbon dioxide	
	emissions from energy use on	
	supply and demand side,	
	including fugitive emissions	
	from fuels (IPCC category	
	1A, 1B) and industrial	
	processes.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions F-Gases	Infilled (and harmonized)	This basket was not used directly for
	anthropogenic fluorinated	climate simulations.
	gases emissions, including	
	SF6, HFCs, and PFCs.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Halon1202	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic Halon1202	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Halon 1211	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic Halon1211	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Halon1301	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic Halon1301	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Halon 2402	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic Halon2402	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HCFC141b	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HCFC141b	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HCFC142b	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HCFC142b	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HCFC22	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HCFC22	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC	Infilled (and harmonized)	This basket was not used directly for
	anthropogenic	climate simulations.
	hydrofluorocarbons	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC125	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC125	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC134a	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC134a	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC143a	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC143a	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC152a	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC152a	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC227ea	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC227ea	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC23	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC23	
	emissions.	

AD(1, the 1, the start of the fill the start of the difference of the start of the	I = f(11 + 1)(1 + 1)(1 + 1)(1 + 1)	
AR6 climate diagnostics/Infilled/Emissions/HFC/HFC236fa	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC236fa	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC 245ca	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HEC245ca	
	antinopogenic In C245ca	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC32	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC32	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HECHEC365mfc	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthread and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC365mic	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions HFC HFC43-10	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic HFC43-10	
	emissions	
ADC alimete diagnostical Infille di Emissional Veneta Cossa	Tatal anarchausa anar	Deard an infilled ancientance is "ADC
AKo chinate diagnostics/infined/Emissions/Kyoto Gases	Total greenhouse gases	Based on minied emissions, i.e. ARO
<u>(AR5-GWP100)</u>	falling under the Kyoto	climate
	Protocol, here calculated as	diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
	the sum of C2F6, C6F14,	
	CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,	
	HEC134a $HEC143a$	
	$\frac{110134a}{1100143a}$	
	HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	
	Calculated using 100-year	
	global warming potential	
	from the IPCC Fifth	
	Assessment Report	
	1 ibbebbillent itepoit.	
AP6 alimete diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyote Cases	Total graanhousa gasas	Pasad on infilled amissions in "AP6
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases	Total greenhouse gases	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14,	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC134a, HFC143a,	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC227ea, UNCO, SEC	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Infilled (and harmonized)	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Infilled (and harmonized) anthronoganic nitrous oxida	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrous oxide	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrous oxideemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrous oxideemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogen	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gases falling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.Assessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N20, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrous oxideemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gases falling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.Assessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gases falling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.Assessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3	Total greenhouse gases falling under the Kyoto Protocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report. Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrous oxide emissions. Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions. Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic antron trifluoride emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC237ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.Assessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic ammonia emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic ammonia emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions *".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	Total greenhouse gases falling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated as the sum of C2F6, C6F14, CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125, HFC134a, HFC143a, HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32, HFC43-10, N2O, SF6. Calculated using 100-year global warming potential from the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic antmonia emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic nitrogen trifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic ammonia emissions.Infilled (and harmonized) anthropogenic ammonia emissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NH3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NH3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NH3	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic ammoniaemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic NOxemissions.	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NH3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NN3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOx AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOx	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic not anthropogenic anthronized)anthropogenic not anthronized)anthropogenic NOxemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic NOxemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N20 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NH3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NNX AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOX AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOX	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic ammoniaemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic noticed)anthropogenic noticed)anthropogenic noticed)anthropogenic anthronized)anthropogenic noticed)anthropogenic anthronized)anthropogenic noticed)anthropogenic organic corbon	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100) AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions N2O AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NF3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NH3 AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOx AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOx AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions NOx	Total greenhouse gasesfalling under the KyotoProtocol, here calculated asthe sum of C2F6, C6F14,CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,HFC134a, HFC143a,HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.Calculated using 100-yearglobal warming potentialfrom the IPCC SixthAssessment Report.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrous oxideemissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic nitrogentrifluoride emissions.Infilled (and harmonized)anthropogenic not not set and the set and the set of the se	Based on infilled emissions, i.e. "AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled [Emissions]*".

AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC	Infilled (and harmonized)	This basket was not used directly for
	anthropogenic	climate simulations.
	perfluorocarbons emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C2F6	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C2F6	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C3F8	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C3F8	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C4F10	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C4F10	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C5F12	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C5F12	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C6F14	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C6F14	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C7F16	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C7F16	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC C8F18	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic C8F18	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC cC4F8	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic cC4F8	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions PFC CF4	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic	
	tetrafluoromethane emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions SF6	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic sulfur	
	hexatluoride emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions SO2F2	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic sulfuryl	
	fluoride emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions Sulfur	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic sulfur	
	emissions.	
AR6 climate diagnostics Infilled Emissions VOC	Infilled (and harmonized)	
	anthropogenic volatile	
ADC 11 and 11 and 11 a Disting and	Tratal and a second emissions.	Develop IAM and the initial
AR6 climate diagnostics Native-with-	folling up day the Kuste	Based on IAM-reported emissions,
Infilied Emissions Kyolo Gases (AK3-GwP100)	Protocol, here coloulated as	i.e. Emissions where reported,
	the sum of C2E6_C6E14	(i.e. "A D6 alimete
	CE4 CO2 CH4 HEC125	diagnostics Infilled Emissional*"
	$HEC134_{2}$ HEC142	where IAM_reported emissions are
	HEC227ea HEC22 HEC22	not available
	HFC43-10 N2O SF6	not uvanable.
	Calculated using 100-year	
	global warming notential	
	from the IPCC Fifth	
	Assessment Report.	

	AR6 climate diagnostics Native-with-	Total greenhouse gases	Based on IAM-reported emissions,
	Infilled Emissions Kyoto Gases (AR6-GWP100)	falling under the Kyoto	i.e. "Emissions *" where reported,
		Protocol, here calculated as	supplemented with infilled emissions
		the sum of C2F6, C6F14,	(i.e. "AR6 climate
		CF4, CO2, CH4, HFC125,	diagnostics Infilled Emissions *")
		HFC134a, HFC143a,	where IAM-reported emissions are
		HFC227ea, HFC23, HFC32,	not available.
		HFC43-10, N2O, SF6.	
		Calculated using 100-year	
		global warming potential	
		from the IPCC Sixth	
		Assessment Report.	
77	Supplementary Table 5: Global emissions variables a	dded to the AR6 Scenarios Database	hosted by IIASA (AR6DB) produced in

78 the climate assessment process in for IPCC AR6 WGIII.

80 References

Byers, E., Krey, V., Kriegler, E., Riahi, K., Schaeffer, R., Kikstra, J., Lamboll, R., Nicholls, Z., Sandstad, M., Smith, C., van
der Wijst, K., Al Khourdajie, A., Lecocq, F., Portugal-Pereira, J., Saheb, Y., Stromann, A., Winkler, H., Auer, C., Brutschin,
E., Gidden, M., Hackstock, P., Harmsen, M., Huppmann, D., Kolp, P., Lepault, C., Lewis, Jared, Marangoni, G., MüllerCasseres, E., Skeie, R., Werning, M., Calvin, K., Forster, P., Guivarch, C., Hasegawa, T., Meinshausen, M., Peters, G., Rogelj,
J., Samset, B., Steinberger, J., Tavoni, M., and van Vuuren, D.: AR6 Scenarios Database hosted by IIASA,
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7197970, 2022.

IPCC: Annex III: Scenarios and modelling methods [Guivarch, C., E. Kriegler, J. Portugal-Pereira, V. Bosetti, J. Edmonds,
M. Fischedick, P. Havlík, P. Jaramillo, V. Krey, F. Lecocq, A. Lucena, M. Meinshausen, S. Mirasgedis, B. O'Neill, G.P.
Peters, J. Rogelj, S, in: IPCC, 2022: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III
to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade,
R., Khourdajie, A. A., van Diemen, R., McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija, A.,
Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and Malley, J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA,
https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926.022, 2022a.

IPCC: Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment
Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Shukla, P. R., Skea, J., Slade, R., Al Khourdajie, A., van
Diemen, R., McCollum, D., Pathak, M., Some, S., Vyas, P., Fradera, R., Belkacemi, M., Hasija, A., Lisboa, G., Luz, S., and
Malley, J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926,
2022b.

99