UNIVERSITY^{OF} BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

A climate risk analysis of Earth's forests in the 21st century

Anderegg, William R. L.; Wu, Chao; Acil, Nezha; Carvalhais, Nuno; Pugh, Thomas A. M.; Sadler, Jon P.; Seidl, Rupert

DOI: 10.1126/science.abp9723

License: Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Anderegg, WRL, Wu, C, Acil, N, CarvaÍhais, N, Pugh, TAM, Sadler, JP & Seidl, R 2022, 'A climate risk analysis of Earth's forests in the 21st century', *Science*, vol. 377, no. 6610, pp. 1099–1103. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abp9723

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here by permission of the AAAS for personal use, not for redistribution. The definitive version was published in Science on Vol 377, Issue 6610, 1 Sep 2022, DOI: 10.1126/science.abp9723.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.

•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?) •Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1	
2	A climate risk analysis of Earth's forests in the 21st century
3	William R. L. Anderegg ^{1,2*} , Chao Wu ² , Nezha Acil ^{3,4} , Nuno Carvalhais ^{5,6} , Thomas A. M.
4	Pugh ^{3,4,7} , Jon P. Sadler ^{3,4} , Rupert Seidl ^{8,9}
5	
6	¹ Wilkes Center for Climate Science and Policy, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84103
7	USA; ² School of Biological Sciences, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84103 USA; ³ School
8	of Geography Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK;
9	⁴ Birmingham Institute of Forest Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, U.K.; ⁵ Max
10	Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Jena, Germany; ⁶ Departamento de Ciências e Engenharia
11	do Ambiente, DCEA, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, FCT, Universidade Nova de Lisboa,
12	2829-516 Caparica, Portugal; ⁷ Department of Physical Geography and Ecosystem Science,
13	Lund University, Lund, Sweden; ⁸ School of Life Sciences, Technical University of Munich,
14	Freising, Germany; ⁹ Berchtesgaden National Park, Berchtesgaden, Germany.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Short title: Climate risks to forests
21	Key words: Carbon cycle feedback, drought, wildfire, disturbance, nature-based climate solutions
22	One Sentence Summary: A multi-method synthesis of climate risks to forests globally.
	Global forest climate risks – Manuscript – 1

23 Abstract

24	Earth's forests harbor extensive biodiversity and are currently a major carbon sink. Forest
25	conservation and restoration can help to mitigate climate change. Yet climate change could
26	fundamentally imperil forests in many regions and undermine their ability to provide such
27	mitigation. The extent of climate risks facing forests has not been synthesized globally, nor have
28	different approaches to quantifying forest climate risks been systematically compared. Here we
29	combine outputs from multiple mechanistic and empirical approaches to modeling carbon,
30	biodiversity, and disturbance risks to conduct a synthetic climate risk analysis for Earth's forests
31	in the 21 st century. Despite large uncertainty in most regions, we find some forests consistently at
32	higher risk, including southern boreal forests, western North America, and parts of the Amazon.
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	

46 Main text

47 Earth's forests store carbon, support enormous terrestrial biodiversity, and provide 48 trillions of dollars each year in ecosystem goods and services to society (1, 2). Due to forests' 49 potential carbon sequestration capacity and co-benefits, there is widespread and growing interest 50 in leveraging forests for climate mitigation through nature-based climate solutions (3, 4). Yet the 51 future of forests globally is uncertain due to both land-use decisions and climate change (5–7). 52 Forests face substantial climate risks that could trigger carbon-cycle feedbacks, accelerating 53 climate change and fundamentally undermining their role in climate mitigation (7-9). Critical 54 climate-sensitive risks to forest stability, biodiversity, and long-term carbon storage include 55 disturbance triggered by extreme weather (e.g. fire, drought, hurricanes), biotic agents and 56 invasive species, and large-scale demographic shifts (e.g. elevated mortality rates, species 57 turnover, physiological limits to growth or regeneration) (7, 10-12).

58 The large-scale and cross-biome patterns of climate risks to forests are not well-59 understood. With respect to ecosystems, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 60 defines risk as the potential for adverse consequences for ecological systems and highlights that 61 risk results from the dynamic interaction of climate-related hazards, exposure, susceptibility and 62 (lack of) adaptive capacity of a system (5, 13). Three major approaches have been used to 63 examine key determinants of forest risk, each considering different processes, with distinct 64 uncertainties and limitations. First, global mechanistic vegetation models, such as those included 65 in Earth system models, simulate forest carbon fluxes and pools, climate impacts on those 66 processes, some key climate-sensitive disturbances such as fire, and dynamic growth and 67 recovery after disturbances (14, 15). Second, 'climate envelope' approaches use empirical 68 models based on relationships between observed climate patterns and forest attributes, such as

69 biomass, species presence/abundance, or ecoregion/life-zone presence (16-18). Third, empirical 70 assessments of climatic controls on stand-replacing disturbances, typically based on satellite data 71 of forest loss or meta-analyses of field studies, are other common approaches (11, 19). These 72 major approaches roughly capture different 'axes' of forest climate risk to: (i) carbon 73 stocks/storage (hereafter 'C risk'), (ii) species composition changes ('species risk'), and (iii) 74 disturbance regime change ('disturbance risk'). These approaches have different inherent 75 strengths and weaknesses, but a synthesis of approaches at a global scale is lacking. A multi-76 method analysis to quantify risks spatially and estimate which regions may be particularly 77 vulnerable in future climates is urgently needed to inform land management, conservation, and 78 climate mitigation efforts.

79 Here, we compare results from these three types of approaches to provide a global 80 assessment of climate risks facing Earth's forests in the 21st century. We ask: i) what are the 81 mean and uncertainty in projections of forest carbon storage and potential forest carbon losses in 82 mechanistic vegetation models included in Earth system models (e.g. 'C risk'), ii) what do 83 empirical 'climate envelope' and 'climate-sensitive disturbance' approaches estimate for spatial 84 and temporal climate risks to forests (e.g. 'species risk' and 'disturbance risk'), and iii) what 85 broader risk patterns emerge from the synthesis and comparisons of these three different axes of 86 risks?

We first examined simulations of the live carbon in vegetation in forested areas ('C risk')
from mechanistic vegetation models from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project – Phase 6
(CMIP6: 23 models total, 13 with prognostic fire and 6 with dynamic vegetation, Table S1),
removing the direct influences of human land use change, to contextualize overall forest carbon
changes (20). Comparing 2081-2100 with 1995-2014, these models on average show carbon
Global forest climate risks – Manuscript – 4

gains in currently forested areas in both high and low emissions scenarios (Fig. 1, Fig. S1). The
multi-model mean was positive across most of the world, but with very high variation and
uncertainty across models, particularly in the tropics and swaths of the boreal forests (Fig. 1A,
1B, Fig. S1). We examined relative agreement in spatial patterns of carbon gains and losses
across models and found that spatial correlations across models for carbon changes were modest,
with an average of r=0.30 across the 23 models considered here (Fig. S2).

98 We calculated two complementary metrics of potential climate C risk from these models 99 as: 1) the number of models with carbon losses by 2081-2100 compared to 1995-2014 and 2) the 100 percent change from tree functional types to other vegetation in a grid cell between those two 101 periods for the subset of models (N=14) that reported data on vegetation change (20). The first 102 metric uses the inherent variability in the model ensemble and assumes that the higher the 103 number of models with C loss, the greater the risk, whereas the second metric directly calculates 104 forest loss in models where it is represented. With the first metric, large areas of the Neotropics, 105 the Mediterranean region and eastern Europe, as well as southwestern North America show 106 notable risk (Fig. 1C). With the second metric, subtropical and southern boreal regions were 107 more likely to lose tree functional types (Fig. 1D). We further found that these two metrics 108 showed similar patterns of higher projected risk in southern boreal and drier regions in the 109 Amazon and African tropics. Spatial patterns of carbon changes and climate risks were broadly 110 similar between emissions scenarios (Fig. 1, Fig. S1) and between models with versus without 111 prognostic fire simulated (Fig. S3).

We then examined forest 'species risk', estimated via empirical climate envelope models in three recently published papers. Using observed climate relationships at global scales, two papers estimated ecoregion/life-zone transitions (i.e. shifts from one ecoregion/life-zone to

115 another) and the third modeled changes in forest species richness within a biome (17, 21, 22). 116 Ecoregion transitions were projected to be most likely at current biome boundaries (sub-tropic – 117 temperate, temperate – boreal, and tropical – subtropical biomes; Fig. 2A, 2B). We note that 118 there could be similarly large transitions in terms of species composition within individual 119 biomes, but that by their inherent ecoregion-focused structure the underlying analyses in Fig 2A-120 B would not capture community-level changes. Considering the third paper's analyses, risk of 121 species loss estimates were highest in boreal regions and western North America and generally 122 lower in tropical regions (Fig. 2C).

123 To quantify climate-sensitive 'disturbance risk', we used two complementary methods: 1) 124 an empirical random-forest model linking observed climate to stand-replacing disturbance 125 estimates based on satellite data from 2002-2014 with human land-use conversion removed (but 126 harvest included, (20)), and 2) upscaled climate-dependent rates of disturbance in 103 protected 127 areas from temperate and boreal biomes (19). For both methods, the models were built with 128 observed relationships in the historical period. We estimated the change in stand-replacing 129 disturbance rates using climate model output from the same 23 climate models we used for C 130 risk for 2081-2100, with a moderate climate scenario (SSP2-4.5). The model of stand-replacing 131 disturbances indicated that if current forests were exposed to projected future temperatures and 132 precipitation, the largest increases of disturbance would be expected to occur in the tropics and 133 southern boreal forests (Fig. 3A, 3B), whereas upscaled relationships from protected areas 134 indicated high disturbance vulnerability broadly across boreal forests, although this dataset did 135 not include tropical forests (Fig. 3B).

We emphasize that these three distinct axes of risk are capturing different aspects and
 dimensions of climate risks to forests, all of which are generally considered important responses
 Global forest climate risks – Manuscript – 6

138 of forests to climate change (20). The spatial and cross-biome relative risk patterns within each 139 approach are likely what is most insightful and important in these comparisons, rather than the 140 absolute values. Thus, we compared the spatial correlations in relative projected risk patterns 141 with a correlation matrix and computed spatial covariation of risk percentiles across all metrics. 142 Strikingly, none of the different metrics were significantly spatially correlated with each other 143 (p>0.05), leading to high variability across risk metrics in many regions (Fig. S4), and the 144 mechanistic vegetation model projections tended to be slightly negatively correlated with the 145 other approaches (Fig. 4B). Despite this broad-scale disagreement, identification of regions that 146 are at relatively higher or lower risk in a majority of approaches can still provide useful 147 information for risk management. Aggregating risk metrics by the average percentile across all metrics with data in a given grid cell, southern boreal regions (e.g. central Canada) and drier 148 149 regions of the tropics (e.g. southeast Amazonia) emerged as regions with higher than average 150 risk across metrics, consistent with multiple observational studies (e.g. 23, 24). By contrast, 151 eastern North America, western Amazonia, and southeast Asia exhibited lower than average risk 152 (Fig. 4A, Fig. S5); a recent pan-tropical study also observed lower vulnerability in southeast 153 Asian tropics (25). These regional patterns were generally robust in a sensitivity analysis that 154 sequentially excluded individual risk maps (Fig. S6). Considering biome-wide patterns, tropical 155 forests had slightly higher average median risk percentiles (51% ile and 62% ile for tropical moist 156 broadleaf and tropical/subtropical dry broadleaf forests, respectively) than boreal (44% ile) or 157 temperate (35% ile and 42% ile for broadleaf and coniferous, respectively) forests (Fig. S7). 158 All of the different approaches to estimating forest climate risk have limitations and 159 different uncertainties that are worth bearing in mind. Mechanistic model projections (C risk 160 axis) include the benefits of rising atmospheric CO₂ concentrations on forest productivity (i.e.

161 CO₂ fertilization), as well as coarse estimates of climate sensitivities of plant functional types 162 and fire disturbance. However, these models are generally thought to be lacking a substantial 163 range of key impacts of climate on tree mortality and other disturbances, making it likely that 164 risk estimates from this approach are overly conservative and carbon gains may be overestimated 165 (26). Furthermore, these models do not realistically capture current tropical forest carbon 166 dynamics (27) and the potential for biome shifts remains very uncertain in these models (14, 28), 167 in part because they frequently neglect processes of tree regeneration (29).

168 The empirical species distribution and ecoregion biome transition models (species risk 169 axis) are correlative in nature and do not directly include mechanistic processes of growth, 170 mortality, CO₂-related effects, or disturbance. They are, nevertheless, widely used across the 171 globe for conservation planning efforts (16, 30), as they provide a powerful approach to estimate 172 the species pool under given climatic conditions. Empirical disturbance models (disturbance risk 173 axis) capture only one key component of forest carbon cycling and do not account for regrowth, 174 species turnover, and other dynamics. Nonetheless, a broad body of literature has demonstrated 175 that changes in disturbance regimes have strong leverage on forest carbon cycling in many 176 ecosystems globally (9, 12, 28). Finally, all of these approaches treat direct human impacts of 177 land-use change and management distinctly. Forest management, as a key disturbance and arbiter 178 of forest risk, is included implicitly or explicitly in all methods here. Whilst we have made 179 extensive efforts to screen out changes due to land conversion (20), land management remains an 180 important uncertainty and caveat in these analyses. A previous global risk analysis for forest loss 181 using a single, older mechanistic vegetation model (31) projected highest forest loss in the 182 eastern Amazon, eastern North American boreal, and broad areas of the European and Asian

183	boreal forests, which is partially consistent with the species turnover and biome transition
184	estimates presented here (e.g. Fig 2A) and the multi-method aggregate map.

185 Ultimately, our analysis reveals a strikingly divergent set of projections when comparing 186 across a wide range of methods and approaches to examine the vulnerability of Earth's forests to 187 climate risks. If forests are tapped to play an important role in climate mitigation, an enormous 188 scientific effort is needed to better shed light on when and where forests will be resilient to 189 climate change in the 21st century. These results highlight an urgent need for more detailed 190 treatment of climate-sensitive disturbances in mechanistic vegetation models, more extensive 191 benchmarking of those models against disturbance and mortality datasets, and better 192 identification of agents of change in observational datasets to underlie more nuanced empirical 193 approaches. Continuing the long-term monitoring efforts that enable such work will be 194 fundamental to improving such models. Our results also underscore key needs to focus on 195 climate-driven biome transitions. Currently, enormous uncertainty remains about the spatial and 196 temporal patterns of forest vulnerability to climate change. They further emphasize that the 197 effectiveness of nature-based climate solutions currently under discussion (3, 4) are faced with 198 great uncertainties, given the profound climate impacts on forests expected in the 21st century. 199 200 201 202 203

205

204

 $Global\ forest\ climate\ risks-Manuscript-9$

206 References

- G. B. Bonan, Forests and climate change: Forcings, feedbacks, and the climate benefits of forests. *Science*. 320, 1444–1449 (2008).
- 209 2. FAO and UNEP, "The State of the World's Forests 2020. Forests, biodiversity and people"
 210 (Rome, 2020).
- B. W. Griscom, J. Adams, P. W. Ellis, R. A. Houghton, G. Lomax, D. A. Miteva, W. H.
 Schlesinger, D. Shoch, J. V. Siikamäki, P. Smith, Natural climate solutions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 114, 11645–11650 (2017).
- S. Roe, C. Streck, M. Obersteiner, S. Frank, B. Griscom, L. Drouet, O. Fricko, M. Gusti, N. Harris, T. Hasegawa, Contribution of the land sector to a 1.5° C world. *Nat. Clim. Change*, 1–12 (2019).
- 5. IPCC, Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change
 Adaptation. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel
 on Climate Change (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New
 York, NY, USA, 2012).
- T. J. Brodribb, J. Powers, H. Cochard, B. Choat, Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought.
 Science. 368, 261–266 (2020).
- W. R. Anderegg, A. T. Trugman, G. Badgley, C. M. Anderson, A. Bartuska, P. Ciais, D.
 Cullenward, C. B. Field, J. Freeman, S. J. Goetz, Climate-driven risks to the climate
 mitigation potential of forests. *Science*. 368 (2020).
- P. Friedlingstein, M. Meinshausen, V. K. Arora, C. D. Jones, A. Anav, S. K. Liddicoat, R. Knutti, Uncertainties in CMIP5 Climate Projections due to Carbon Cycle Feedbacks. *J. Clim.* 27 (2014).
- W. A. Kurz, C. C. Dymond, G. Stinson, G. J. Rampley, E. T. Neilson, A. L. Carroll, T.
 Ebata, L. Safranyik, Mountain pine beetle and forest carbon feedback to climate change. *Nature*. 452, 987–990 (2008).
- C. D. Allen, A. K. Macalady, H. Chenchouni, D. Bachelet, N. McDowell, M. Vennetier, T.
 Kitzberger, A. Rigling, D. D. Breshears, E. H. Hogg, P. Gonzalez, R. Fensham, Z. Zhang,
 J. Castro, N. Demidova, J. H. Lim, G. Allard, S. W. Running, A. Semerci, N. Cobb, A
 global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate
 change risks for forests. *For. Ecol. Manag.* 259, 660–684 (2010).
- R. Seidl, D. Thom, M. Kautz, D. Martin-Benito, M. Peltoniemi, G. Vacchiano, J. Wild, D.
 Ascoli, M. Petr, J. Honkaniemi, Forest disturbances under climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change.* 7, 395 (2017).
- I. A. Wang, A. Baccini, M. Farina, J. T. Randerson, M. A. Friedl, Disturbance suppresses the aboveground carbon sink in North American boreal forests. *Nat. Clim. Change.* 11, 435–441 (2021).
- I. Lecina-Diaz, J. Martínez-Vilalta, A. Alvarez, M. Banqué, J. Birkmann, D. Feldmeyer, J.
 Vayreda, J. Retana, Characterizing forest vulnerability and risk to climate-change
 hazards. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 19, 126–133 (2021).
- R. A. Fisher, C. D. Koven, W. R. Anderegg, B. O. Christoffersen, M. C. Dietze, C. E.
 Farrior, J. A. Holm, G. C. Hurtt, R. G. Knox, P. J. Lawrence, Vegetation demographics in Earth System Models: A review of progress and priorities. *Glob. Change Biol.* 24, 35–54 (2018).
- 250 15. S. Hantson, D. I. Kelley, A. Arneth, S. P. Harrison, S. Archibald, D. Bachelet, M. Forrest,

252 simulations with fire-enabled vegetation models from the Fire Model Intercomparison 253 Project. Geosci. Model Dev. 13, 3299-3318 (2020). 254 16. J. Elith*, C. H. Graham*, R. P. Anderson, M. Dudík, S. Ferrier, A. Guisan, R. J. Hijmans, 255 F. Huettmann, J. R. Leathwick, A. Lehmann, J. Li, L. G. Lohmann, B. A. Loiselle, G. 256 Manion, C. Moritz, M. Nakamura, Y. Nakazawa, J. McC. M. Overton, A. Townsend 257 Peterson, S. J. Phillips, K. Richardson, R. Scachetti-Pereira, R. E. Schapire, J. Soberón, 258 S. Williams, M. S. Wisz, N. E. Zimmermann, Novel methods improve prediction of 259 species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography*. **29**, 129–151 (2006). 17. S. Z. Dobrowski, C. E. Littlefield, D. S. Lyons, C. Hollenberg, C. Carroll, S. A. Parks, J. T. 260 261 Abatzoglou, K. Hegewisch, J. Gage, Protected-area targets could be undermined by 262 climate change-driven shifts in ecoregions and biomes. Commun. Earth Environ. 2, 1-11 263 (2021).264 18. S. R. Coffield, K. S. Hemes, C. D. Koven, M. L. Goulden, J. T. Randerson, Climate-driven 265 limits to future carbon storage in California's wildland ecosystems. AGU Adv., 2(3), 266 e2021AV000384 (2021). 267 19. R. Seidl, J. Honkaniemi, T. Aakala, A. Aleinikov, P. Angelstam, M. Bouchard, et al, Globally consistent climate sensitivity of natural disturbances across boreal and 268 269 temperate forest ecosystems. *Ecography*. **43**, 967–978 (2020). 270 20. See Supplementary Methods and Materials. A. S. Mori, L. E. Dee, A. Gonzalez, H. Ohashi, J. Cowles, A. J. Wright, M. Loreau, Y. 271 21.

T. Hickler, G. Lasslop, F. Li, Quantitative assessment of fire and vegetation properties in

251

- Hautier, T. Newbold, P. B. Reich, Biodiversity–productivity relationships are key to
 nature-based climate solutions. *Nat. Clim. Change.* 11, 543–550 (2021).
- 274 22. P. R. Elsen, E. C. Saxon, B. A. Simmons, M. Ward, B. A. Williams, H. S. Grantham, S.
 275 Kark, N. Levin, K.-V. Perez-Hammerle, A. E. Reside, Accelerated shifts in terrestrial life
 276 zones under rapid climate change. *Glob. Change Biol.* 28, 918–935 (2022).
- 277 23. M. Michaelian, E.H. Hogg, R.J. Hall, E. Arsenault, Massive mortality of aspen following
 278 severe drought along the southern edge of the Canadian boreal forest. *Glob. Change Biol*,
 279 17, 2084-2094 (2011).
- 24. L.V. Gatti, L.S. Basso, J.B. Miller, M. Gloor, L. Gatti Domingues, H.L. Cassol, H. L., ... &
 R.A. Neves, Amazonia as a carbon source linked to deforestation and climate change. *Nature*, **595**, 388-393 (2021).
- 283 25. Saatchi S, Longo M, Xu L et al. Detecting vulnerability of humid tropical forests to
 284 multiple stressors. *One Earth*, 4, 988-1003 (2021)
- 285 26. B. M. Sanderson, R. A. Fisher, A fiery wake-up call for climate science. *Nat. Clim.*286 *Change.* 10, 175–177 (2020).
- 287 27. A. Koch, W. Hubau, S. L. Lewis, *Earths Future*, 9(5), e2020EF001874 (2021).
- 288 28. T. A. Pugh, A. Arneth, M. Kautz, B. Poulter, B. Smith, Important role of forest
 289 disturbances in the global biomass turnover and carbon sinks. *Nat. Geosci.* 12, 730–735
 290 (2019).
- 29. K. Albrich, W. Rammer, M. G. Turner, Z. Ratajczak, K. H. Braziunas, W. D. Hansen, R.
 Seidl, Simulating forest resilience: A review. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* 29, 2082–2096
 (2020).
- 294 30. L. L. Porfirio, R. M. Harris, E. C. Lefroy, S. Hugh, S. F. Gould, G. Lee, N. L. Bindoff, B.
 295 Mackey, Improving the use of species distribution models in conservation planning and

- 296 management under climate change. *PLoS One*. **9**, e113749 (2014).
- 31. M. Scholze, W. Knorr, N. W. Arnell, I. C. Prentice, A climate-change risk analysis for
 world ecosystems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 103, 13116–13120 (2006).
- 32. M. A. Moritz, M.-A. Parisien, E. Batllori, M. A. Krawchuk, J. Van Dorn, D. J. Ganz, K.
 Hayhoe, Climate change and disruptions to global fire activity. *Ecosphere*. 3, 1–22
 (2012).
- 302 33. W. Knorr, A. Arneth, L. Jiang, Demographic controls of future global fire risk. *Nat. Clim.* 303 *Change.* 6, 781 (2016).
- 304 34. G. C. Hurtt, L. Chini, R. Sahajpal, S. Frolking, B. L. Bodirsky, K. Calvin, J. C. Doelman, J.
 305 Fisk, S. Fujimori, K. Klein Goldewijk, Harmonization of global land use change and
 306 management for the period 850–2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 13, 5425–
 307 5464 (2020).
- 308 35. M. Hansen, P. Potapov, R. Moore, M. Hancher, S. Turubanova, A. Tyukavina, D. Thau, S.
 309 Stehman, S. Goetz, T. Loveland, High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest
 310 Cover Change. *Science*. 342, 850–853 (2013).
- 36. A. J. Meddens, J. A. Hicke, A. K. Macalady, P. C. Buotte, T. R. Cowles, C. D. Allen,
 Patterns and causes of observed piñon pine mortality in the southwestern United States. *New Phytol.* 206, 91–97 (2015).
- 314 37. Y. Qin, J. T. Abatzoglou, S. Siebert, L. S. Huning, A. AghaKouchak, J. S. Mankin, C.
 315 Hong, D. Tong, S. J. Davis, N. D. Mueller, Agricultural risks from changing snowmelt.
 316 *Nat. Clim. Change.* 10, 459–465 (2020).
- 317 38. L. R. Holdridge, Life zone ecology. Life Zone Ecol. (1967).
- 318 39. C. Parmesan, Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annu Rev* 319 *Ecol Evol Syst.* 37, 637–669 (2006).
- 40. M. C. Urban, Accelerating extinction risk from climate change. *Science*. 348, 571–573
 (2015).
- 322 41. R. G. Pearson, Species' distribution modeling for conservation educators and practitioners.
 323 *Synth. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.* **50**, 54–89 (2007).
- 42. L. L. Porfirio, R. M. Harris, E. C. Lefroy, S. Hugh, S. F. Gould, G. Lee, N. L. Bindoff, B.
 Mackey, Improving the use of species distribution models in conservation planning and
 management under climate change. *PLoS One.* 9, e113749 (2014).
- 43. D. M. Olson, E. Dinerstein, E. D. Wikramanayake, N. D. Burgess, G. V. Powell, E. C.
 Underwood, J. A. D'amico, I. Itoua, H. E. Strand, J. C. Morrison, others, Terrestrial
 Ecoregions of the World: A New Map of Life on Earth: A new global map of terrestrial
 ecoregions provides an innovative tool for conserving biodiversity. *BioScience*. 51, 933–
 938 (2001).
- 44. ESA, "Land Cover CCI Product User Guide Version 2" (Tech. Rep., 2017), (available at maps.elie.ucl.ac.be/CCI/viewer/download/ESACCI-LC-Ph2-PUGv2_2.0.pdf).
- 45. H. Hersbach, B. Bell, P. Berrisford, G. Biavati, A. Horányi, J. Muñoz Sabater, J. Nicolas,
 C. Peubey, R. Radu, I. Rozum, ERA5 hourly data on single levels from 1979 to present. *Copernic. Clim. Change Serv. C3S Clim. Data Store CDS.* 10 (2018).
- 337 46. S. A. Spawn, C. C. Sullivan, T. J. Lark, H. K. Gibbs, Harmonized global maps of above
 338 and belowground biomass carbon density in the year 2010. *Sci. Data*. 7, 1–22 (2020).
- 339 47. F. Kimura, A. Kitoh, Downscaling by pseudo global warming method. *Final Rep. ICCAP*.
 340 4346, 435 (2007).

- 48. A. South, rworldmap: A New R package for Mapping Global Data. *R J.* 3 (2011) (available at http://www.academia.edu/download/30318942/rjournal_2011-1.pdf#page=35).
- 343 49. R. J. Hijmans, J. van Etten, raster: Geographic data analysis and modeling. *R Package*344 *Version.* 2, 15 (2014).
- 50. P. Michna, M. Woods, RNetCDF–A Package for Reading and Writing NetCDF Datasets.
 346 *Peer-Rev. Open-Access Publ. R Found. Stat. Comput.*, 29 (2013).
- 347 51. A. Liaw, M. Wiener, L. Breiman, A. Cutler, Package "randomForest." *Retrieved Dec.* 12, 2009 (2009).
- 52. T. Wei, V. Simko, M. Levy, Y. Xie, Y. Jin, J. Zemla, Package 'corrplot.' *Statistician*. 56, e24 (2017).
- 351 53. R. Furrer, D. Nychka, S. Sain, M. D. Nychka, Package 'fields.' *R Found. Stat. Comput.* 352 *Vienna Austria Httpwww Idg PlmirrorsCRANwebpackagesfieldsfields Pdf Last Accessed* 353 22 Dec. 2012 (2009).
- 354 54. D. Adler, M. D. Adler, Package 'vioplot' (2021).
- S5. R. Bivand, T. Keitt, B. Rowlingson, E. Pebesma, M. Sumner, R. Hijmans, E. Rouault, M.
 R. Bivand, Package 'rgdal.' *Bind. Geospatial Data Abstr. Libr. Available Online Httpscran R-Proj. Orgwebpackagesrgdalindex Html Accessed 15 Oct. 2017* (2015).
- 358 56. G. Danabasoglu, NCAR CESM2 model output prepared for CMIP6 CMIP historical
 (2019), , doi:10.22033/ESGF/CMIP6.7627.
- 360 57. G. Danabasoglu, J.-F. Lamarque, J. Bacmeister, D. A. Bailey, A. K. DuVivier, J. Edwards,
 361 L. K. Emmons, J. Fasullo, R. Garcia, A. Gettelman, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., in press.
- 362 58. G. Danabasoglu, NCAR CESM2-WACCM model output prepared for CMIP6
 363 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed. Httpsdoi Org1022033ESGFCMIP6*. 10026 (2019).
- 364 59. A. Cherchi, P. G. Fogli, T. Lovato, D. Peano, D. Iovino, S. Gualdi, S. Masina, E.
 365 Scoccimarro, S. Materia, A. Bellucci, Global mean climate and main patterns of variability
 366 in the CMCC-CM2 coupled model. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 11, 185–209 (2019).
- 367 60. T. Lovato, D. Peano, CMCC CMCC-CM2-SR5 Model Output Prepared for CMIP6
 368 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2020), doi:doi:10.22033/ESGF/CMIP6.1365.
- 369 61. R. Seferian, CNRM-CERFACS CNRM-ESM2-1 model output prepared for CMIP6
 370 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed. Httpsdoi Org1022033ESGFCMIP6*. 1395 (2019).
- R. Séférian, P. Nabat, M. Michou, D. Saint-Martin, A. Voldoire, J. Colin, B. Decharme, C.
 Delire, S. Berthet, M. Chevallier, Evaluation of CNRM earth system model, CNRMESM2-1: Role of earth system processes in present-day and future climate. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 11, 4182–4227 (2019).
- J.-C. Golaz, P. M. Caldwell, L. P. Van Roekel, M. R. Petersen, Q. Tang, J. D. Wolfe, G.
 Abeshu, V. Anantharaj, X. S. Asay-Davis, D. C. Bader, The DOE E3SM coupled model
 version 1: Overview and evaluation at standard resolution. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 11,
 2089–2129 (2019).
- 379 64. D. C. Bader, et al, E3SM-Project E3SM1.1 Model Output Prepared for CMIP6
 380 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2020), doi:doi:10.22033/ESGF/CMIP6.15103.
- 381 65. EC-Earth Consortium, EC-Earth-Consortium EC-Earth3-CC Model Output Prepared for
 382 CMIP6 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2021),
 383 doi:doi:10.22032/ESCE/CMIP6.15327
- 383 doi:doi:10.22033/ESGF/CMIP6.15327.
- 84 66. R. Döscher, M. Acosta, A. Alessandri, P. Anthoni, A. Arneth, T. Arsouze, T. Bergmann, R.
 85 Bernadello, S. Bousetta, L.-P. Caron, The EC-earth3 Earth system model for the climate

- 386 model intercomparison project 6. *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.*, 1–90 (2021).
- T. Mauritsen, J. Bader, T. Becker, J. Behrens, M. Bittner, R. Brokopf, V. Brovkin, M.
 Claussen, T. Crueger, M. Esch, Developments in the MPI-M Earth System Model version
 1.2 (MPI-ESM1. 2) and its response to increasing CO2. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* 11, 998–
 1038 (2019).
- K. H. Wieners, M. Giorgetta, J. Jungclaus, C. Reick, M. Esch, M. Bittner, V. Gayler, H.
 Haak, P. de Vrese, T. Raddatz, MPI-M MPIESM1. 2-LR model output prepared for CMIP6
 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed. Httpsdoi Org1022033ESGFCMIP6*. **793** (2019).
- 69. Ø. Seland, M. Bentsen, D. Olivié, T. Toniazzo, A. Gjermundsen, L. S. Graff, J. B.
 Debernard, A. K. Gupta, Y.-C. He, A. Kirkevåg, Overview of the Norwegian Earth System
 Model (NorESM2) and key climate response of CMIP6 DECK, historical, and scenario
 simulations. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 13, 6165–6200 (2020).
- 398 70. Ø. Seland, M. Bentsen, D. J. L. Oliviè, T. Toniazzo, A. Gjermundsen, L. S. Graff, J. B.
 399 Debernard, A. K. Gupta, Y. He, A. Kirkevåg, NCC NorESM2-LM model output prepared
 400 for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP ssp585 (2019).
- 401 71. M. Bentsen, D. J. L. Oliviè, y Seland, T. Toniazzo, A. Gjermundsen, L. S. Graff, M.
 402 Schulz, NCC NorESM2-MM model output prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst.*403 *Grid Fed. URL Httpsdoi Org1022033ESGFCMIP6.* 608 (2019).
- W.-L. Lee, Y.-C. Wang, C.-J. Shiu, I. -chun Tsai, C.-Y. Tu, Y.-Y. Lan, J.-P. Chen, H.-L.
 Pan, H.-H. Hsu, Taiwan Earth System Model Version 1: description and evaluation of mean state. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 13, 3887–3904 (2020).
- 407 73. W.-L. Lee, H.-C. Liang, TaiESM1.0 Model Output Prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP.
 408 *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2020), doi:doi:10.22033/ESGF/CMIP6.9688.
- 409 74. T. Ziehn, M. A. Chamberlain, R. M. Law, A. Lenton, R. W. Bodman, M. Dix, L. Stevens,
 410 Y.-P. Wang, J. Srbinovsky, The Australian earth system model: ACCESS-ESM1. 5. J.
 411 South. Hemisphere Earth Syst. Sci. 70, 193–214 (2020).
- T. Ziehn, M. Chamberlain, A. Lenton, R. Law, R. Bodman, M. Dix, K. Druken, CSIRO
 ACCESS-ESM1. 5 model output prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP ssp585. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2019).
- T. Wu, Y. Lu, Y. Fang, X. Xin, L. Li, W. Li, W. Jie, J. Zhang, Y. Liu, L. Zhang, The
 Beijing Climate Center climate system model (BCC-CSM): the main progress from CMIP5
 to CMIP6. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 12, 1573–1600 (2019).
- 418 77. X. Xin, T. Wu, X. Shi, F. Zhang, J. Li, M. Chu, Q. Liu, J. Yan, Q. Ma, M. Wei, in Version
 419 20201101, Earth System Grid Federation (2019).
- 78. N. C. Swart, J. N. Cole, V. V. Kharin, M. Lazare, J. F. Scinocca, N. P. Gillett, J. Anstey, V.
 Arora, J. R. Christian, S. Hanna, The Canadian Earth System Model version 5 (CanESM5.
 0.3). *Geosci. Model Dev.* 12, 4823–4873 (2019).
- 79. N. C. Swart, J. N. Cole, V. V. Kharin, M. Lazare, J. F. Scinocca, N. P. Gillett, J. Anstey, V.
 Arora, J. R. Christian, Y. Jiao, CCCma CanESM5 model output prepared for CMIP6
 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2019).
- 426 80. E. M. Volodin, E. V. Mortikov, S. V. Kostrykin, V. Y. Galin, V. N. Lykossov, A. S.
 427 Gritsun, N. A. Diansky, A. V. Gusev, N. G. Iakovlev, Simulation of the present-day
 428 climate with the climate model INMCM5. *Clim. Dyn.* 49, 3715–3734 (2017).
- 429 81. E. Volodin, E. Mortikov, A. Gritsun, V. Lykossov, V. Galin, N. Diansky, A. Gusev, S.
- 430 Kostrykin, N. Iakovlev, A. Shestakova, INM INM-CM4-8 model output prepared for

- 431 CMIP6 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed. URL Httpsdoi Org1022033ESGFCMIP6.*432 **12321** (2019).
- 433 82. O. Boucher, J. Servonnat, A. L. Albright, O. Aumont, Y. Balkanski, V. Bastrikov, S.
 434 Bekki, R. Bonnet, S. Bony, L. Bopp, *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, in press.
- 435 83. O. Boucher, S. Denvil, G. Levavasseur, A. Cozic, A. Caubel, M. A. Foujols, Y.
 436 Meurdesoif, P. Cadule, M. Devilliers, E. Dupont, IPSL IPSL-CM6A-LR model output
 437 prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP, Version 20200601 (2019).
- 438 84. Y. Kim, et al, KIOST KIOST-ESM Model Output Prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP.
 439 *Earth Syst. Grid Fed.* (2019), doi:doi:10.22033/ESGF/CMIP6.11241.
- T. Hajima, M. Watanabe, A. Yamamoto, H. Tatebe, M. A. Noguchi, M. Abe, R. Ohgaito,
 A. Ito, D. Yamazaki, H. Okajima, Development of the MIROC-ES2L Earth system model
 and the evaluation of biogeochemical processes and feedbacks. *Geosci. Model Dev.* 13,
 2197–2244 (2020).
- K. Tachiiri, M. Abe, T. Hajima, O. Arakawa, T. Suzuki, Y. Komuro, K. Ogochi, M.
 Watanabe, A. Yamamoto, H. Tatebe, MIROC MIROC-ES2L model output prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid Fed. Retrieved Httpcera-Www Dkrz DeWDCCmetaCMIP6CMIP6 ScenarioMIP MIROC MIROC-ES2L* (2019).
- 448 87. A. A. Sellar, J. Walton, C. G. Jones, R. Wood, N. L. Abraham, M. Andrejczuk, M. B.
- 449 Andrews, T. Andrews, A. T. Archibald, L. de Mora, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., in press.
- 450 88. P. Good, A. Sellar, Y. Tang, S. Rumbold, R. Ellis, D. Kelley, T. Kuhlbrodt, J. Walton,
 451 MOHC UKESM1. 0-LL model output prepared for CMIP6 ScenarioMIP. *Earth Syst. Grid*452 *Fed. Httpsdoi Org1022033ESGFCMIP6*. **1567** (2019).
- 453

456	Funding:	WRLA	acknowledges	support	from th	e David	and L	ucille P	ackard	Foundation	US
- 50	runumg.		acknowledges	support	monn un			ucine i	achara	i oundation,	$\mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}$

- 457 National Science Foundation grants 1802880, 2003017 and 2044937, and USDA National
- 458 Institute of Food and Agriculture, Agricultural and Food Research Initiative Competitive
- 459 Programme, Ecosystem Services and Agro-Ecosystem Management, grant no. 2018-67019-
- 460 27850. CW acknowledges support from the David and Lucille Packard Foundation. RS, NA and
- 461 TP acknowledge support from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European
- 462 Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (RS: grant agreement No 101001905,
- 463 FORWARD; NA and TP grant agreement No 758873, TreeMort). This study contributes to the
- 464 strategic research areas BECC and MERGE.

466	Author contributions: WRLA designed the study with input from all co-authors. WRLA, CW,
467	and NA analyzed the data. WRLA wrote an initial draft and CW, NA, NC, TAMP, JPS, and RS
468	provided extensive comments and revisions.
469	
470	Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.
471	
472	Data and materials availability: Analysis code and processed data underlying the paper
473	analyses can be found at https://figshare.com/s/b97c7071e2af904955e7. Google Earth Engine
474	code for disturbance analysis can be found at:
475	https://code.earthengine.google.com/?accept_repo=users/NXA807/ForestGlobalClimateRisks
476	All CMIP6 data and datasets underlying the empirical model analysis are publicly available from
477	the CMIP6 data portal or published article reference.
478	
479	
480	Supplementary Content
481	Materials and Methods
482	Figs. S1 to S10
483	Table S1
484	References (32-88)
485	
486	
487	



490 Figure 1: Future forest carbon and climate risk projections from mechanistic vegetation models.

491 All panels analyze the change between 2081-2100 in Shared Socioeconomic Pathway 5-8.5

492 (SSP585) compared to 1995-2014 historical simulations and are masked by present forested

493 areas. Multi-model mean (A) and range (B) of the change in live carbon mass in vegetation

494 (kg*m⁻²) across 23 models. (C) Number of models projecting vegetation carbon losses in a grid

495 cell over the same time period. (D) Multi-model mean spatial patterns of the percent change in

496 fraction of tree plant functional types in a grid cell. Gray hatched areas indicate grid cells

497 removed from analysis due to land use-driven forest loss.



499 Figure 2: Global forest risk estimates from 'climate envelope' approaches. (A) Projected percent



- 501 industrial from Dobrowski et al. 2021¹⁷. (B) Projected percent transition of climate 'life-zones'
- between 1979-2013 and 2061-2080 in a moderate (RCP 4.5) climate scenario from Elsen et al.
- 503 2021²¹. (C) Risk of loss in species richness (quantified as an 'effect size' (ES) of $-1 \times$
- $\log(\Delta Species Richness_{highcc-mitigation}/\Delta SR_{baseline})$ where higher numbers indicate more risk of
- species loss) in the 2070s in a high climate change (RCP 8.5) scenario from Mori et al. 2021^{20} .



Figure 3: Projected change in climate-sensitive disturbance risks. (A) Average change in percent
disturbed in a grid cell from random-forest model projections of Landsat-based stand-replacing
disturbances for 2081-2100 in a moderate climate change scenario (Shared Socioeconomic
Pathway 2-4.5 (SSP245)) compared to 1995-2014. (B) Average change in percent disturbed in a
grid cell from protected area disturbance models for only temperate and boreal ecosystems in
2081-2100 in a moderate climate change scenario (SSP245) compared to 1995-2014. Gray
hatching in grid cells indicates no data from this data source.



Figure 4: Comparisons and syntheses across different climate risk axes. (A) Average percentile
of risk combined across all metrics where 0% ile is lowest climate risk and 100% ile is highest

522 climate risk, averaged across all datasets that covered a given grid cell. (B) Correlation matrix

523 between different climate risk axes and metrics where the size and color are proportionate to

524 correlation strength and magnitude (all correlations n.s.). Risk axes and metrics: number of

525 models showing carbon losses in forested regions in Coupled Model Intercomparison Project

526 Phase 6 data (cmip6-#mod), change in tree fraction in the subset of CMIP6 models (cmip6-dTF),

527 species distribution/climate niche models of ecoregion percent changes from Dobrowski et al.

528 (2021)¹⁷ (sdm-D21), species distribution/climate niche models of life-zone percent changes from

Elsen et al. $(2021)^{20}$ (sdm-E21), species distribution models of loss of species richness from Mori

et al. $(2021)^{21}$ (sdm-M21), random-forest based projections of Landsat-detected stand-replacing

disturbances (dist-LS), and change in percent disturbed in a grid cell from protected area
 disturbance models from Seidl et al. (2020)¹⁹ (dist-S20).

533