Estimates of balance mass flux and the depth-averaged ice velocity through the cross-section aligned with the equilibrium line are produced for each of six drainage systems in Greenland. (The equilibrium line, which lies at approximately 1200 m elevation on the ice sheet, is the boundary between the area of net snow accumulation at higher elevations and the areas of net melting at lower elevations around the ice sheet.) Ice drainage divides and six major drainage systems are delineated using surface topography from ERS radar altimeter data. The net accumulation rate in the accumulation zone bounded by the equilibrium line is 399 Gt/yr and net ablation rate in the remaining area is 231 Gt/yr. (1 GigaTon of ice is 10^9 km^3.) The mean balance mass flux and depth-averaged ice velocity at the cross-section aligned with the modeled equilibrium line are 0.1011 Gt km^-2/yr and 0.111 km/yr, respectively, with little variation in these values from system to system. The ratio of the ice mass above the equilibrium line to the rate of mass output implies an effective exchange time of approximately 6000 years for total mass exchange. The range of exchange times, from a low of 3 ka in the SE drainage system to 14 ka in the NE, suggests a rank as to which regions of the ice sheet may respond more rapidly to climate fluctuations.
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Abstract. Estimates of balance mass flux and depth-averaged ice velocity through the cross section aligned with the equilibrium line are produced for each of six drainage systems in Greenland. The estimates are based on a model equilibrium line fitted to field data and on a revised distribution of surface mass balance for the conterminous ice sheet. Ice drainage divides and six major drainage systems are delineated using surface topography from ERS radar altimeter data. Ice thicknesses at the equilibrium line and throughout each drainage system are based on the latest compilation of airborne radar sounding data described elsewhere. The net accumulation rate in the area bounded by the equilibrium line is 399 Gt a \(^{-1}\), and net ablation rate in the remaining area is 231 Gt a \(^{-1}\). Excluding an east central coastal ridge reduces the net accumulation rate to 397 Gt a \(^{-1}\), with a range from 42 to 121 Gt a \(^{-1}\) for the individual drainage systems. The mean balance mass flux and depth-averaged ice velocity at the cross-section aligned with the modeled equilibrium line are 0.1011 Gt km \(^{-1}\) a \(^{-1}\) and 0.111 km a \(^{-1}\), respectively, with little variation in these values from system to system. In contrast, the mean mass discharge per unit length along the equilibrium line ranges from one half to double the overall mean rate of 0.0468 Gt km \(^{-1}\) a \(^{-1}\). The ratio of the ice mass in the area bounded by the equilibrium line to the rate of mass output implies an effective exchange time of approximately 6 ka for total mass exchange. The range of exchange times, from a low of 3 ka in the SE drainage system to 14 ka in the NE, suggests a rank as to which regions of the ice sheet may respond more rapidly to climate fluctuations.

1. Introduction

Ice sheets interactions with the atmosphere, ocean, and Earth's crust are part of feedback processes that are important components in studies of global change [e.g., Warrick and Oerlemans, 1990; Warrick et al., 1996]. Reliable modeling of ice sheet dynamics is essential to those studies. Description of boundary conditions of ice sheets at or near steady state, i.e., equilibrium between mass input and output rates or a net mass budget of zero, is critical for model development [e.g., van der Veen and Whillans, 1990; Huybrechts and De Wolde, 1999].

In this paper, estimates of balance mass flux (Gt km \(^{-2}\) a \(^{-1}\)) at cross sections aligned with the equilibrium line are derived for six major drainage systems in Greenland. Related quantities, the balance mass discharge per unit length across the equilibrium line (Gt km \(^{-1}\) a \(^{-1}\)) and the depth-averaged balance velocity (km a \(^{-1}\)) at the equilibrium line are estimated. The equilibrium line is chosen for analysis, because in effect, all the ice added in the accumulation zone above the equilibrium line of the ice sheet passes through the cross section at the equilibrium line. Although modified by transverse convergence or divergence, the balance mass discharge (of ice) per unit length tends to increase from high elevations to a maximum at the equilibrium and then decrease toward the margins of the ice sheet. Moreover, the ratios between the total ice mass for the area bounded by the equilibrium line and the balance mass output (Tt (Gt a \(^{-1}\)) \(^{-1}\) = ka) for the various drainage systems suggest which part or parts of the ice sheet would react more rapidly to climate fluctuations and changes in boundary conditions. For these purposes we compile new descriptions of the location of the
equilibrium line and revise a recent distribution surface balance. We also delineate drainage divides, estimate the area of the cross section aligned with the equilibrium line, and estimate the ice mass of each drainage system.

2. Equilibrium Line Location and Surface Balance

The location of the equilibrium line is variable from year to year and is regionally dependent on complex feedbacks discussed in preceding compilations [e.g., Benson, 1962; Reeh, 1985; Weidick, 1995]. It has been described on the basis of single elevation and latitude schemes applied to the whole ice sheet, typically with caveats on the differences between eastern and western flanks, as well as between north- and south-facing slopes [e.g., Warrick and Oerlemans, 1990; Giovinetto and Zwally, 1995]. Our new compilations of equilibrium line altitude (ELA) as a function of latitude, one each for eastern and western Greenland (Figure 1), are based on ELA data summarized in the preceding compilations [Benson, 1962; Reeh, 1985; Weidick, 1995] supplemented by additional reports [Lister, 1956; Blatter and Ohmura, 1991; van de Wal et al., 1995]. First, we defined an "interpolated" equilibrium line using linear variations of the ELA between data sites. Second, we define a "model" equilibrium line, a function of latitude derived by second-order polynomial fits to the same field data:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ELA}_e &= 32759.680 + (1001.782 \times L) - (7.331 \times L^2) \quad R=0.998; R^2=0.997; \text{RMS} = 50, \\
\text{ELA}_w &= 23201.445 + (746.249 \times L) - (5.640 \times L^2) \quad R=0.819; R^2=0.671; \text{RMS} = 298,
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \text{ELA}_e \) and \( \text{ELA}_w \) are the elevation (in meters) of the equilibrium line along the eastern and western regions, respectively, \( L \) is latitude (in degrees), \( R \) and \( R^2 \) are the coefficients of correlation and determination, respectively, and RMS is the root-mean-square residual (in meters). As expected, the RMS values are large, but are representative of the interannual variability observed in the field [e.g., LaChapelle, 1955; Thomsen et al., 1988; van de Wal et al., 1995]. Although higher-order polynomials produce slightly improved \( R \) values (but not the RMS values), the paucity of the data does not justify a more complex formulation. Both the interpolated and the model equilibrium lines are an improvement over the single generalized relationship applied to both eastern and western regions in a preceding study (i.e., a linear variation from 300 m at 81°N to 1800 m at 62°N [Giovinetto and Zwally, 1995; Zwally and Giovinetto, 2000]). However, we consider the modeled line to be a better representation of the equilibrium by its averaging over interannual variability included in the field data. Although a single second-order polynomial model for both the eastern and the western regions (\( \text{ELA}_{ew} \), in meters):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ELA}_{ew} &= 21741.018 + (701.096 \times L) - (5.292 \times L^2) \quad R=0.862, R^2=0.743, \text{RMS} = 264 \text{ m},
\end{align*}
\]

is more robust than a simple linear regression model \((R=0.717, R^2=0.514, \text{RMS} = 347 \text{ m})\), the separate equations may better represent the east and west variations with latitude.

In this study we use the model equilibrium line to revise the distribution of surface balance in relatively narrow zones above and below the equilibrium line (Figure 2) and estimate the respective areas in the accumulation and ablation zones. The estimate of surface balance is based on 50 km grid values (Plate 1) obtained from a combination of three sources, each applied to particular zones defined by glacial facies [Zwally
Surface balance values are obtained differently in three zones. For the zone above the intrapercolation line (dry snow plus upper percolation facies) the balance is derived from passive-microwave and surface temperature data using the model of Zwally and Giovinetto [1995]. The model was developed as a best fit to field data from sites in the area bounded by the dry snow line. For the zone between the intrapercolation and equilibrium lines, the balance is obtained by visual interpolation from the accumulation isopleth pattern of Ohmura and Reeh [1991] drawn on the basis of interpolation and extrapolation of field data. For the ablation zone below the equilibrium line, the balance is a function of surface elevation and latitude from the ablation nomogram of Braithwaite [1980], which is based on a parameterization of the rate of ablation and surface energy balance for the zone below the equilibrium line. Although the ablation model was developed for western Greenland, we use it for all of Greenland.

Surface balance values for grid point locations closest to either side of the equilibrium line are adjusted following the format of the rate change over distance, as described elsewhere for the area below the ELA [van de Wal et al., 1995] and for the area above the ELA [Zwally and Giovinetto, 2000]. The 682 grid points that sample the area of the conterminous ice sheet are distributed over 49 grid lines and 126 grid squares form the perimeter. Surface balance values were adjusted for approximately one half of the 250 grid point locations that lie closest to either side of the equilibrium line.

The revised distribution of the accumulation and ablation rates and new estimates of surface balance are given in Table 1. The bulk accumulation and ablation rates are the rates integrated over the respective accumulation or ablation zones. The estimates of area and accumulation are based on the number of grid points sampling a particular area, and all estimates are weighted by the actual area of each grid square. The grid point locations in the 50 km grid database are determined on a polar stereographic projection with a standard line at 71°N. Each point location is centered on a grid square with a nominal area of 2500 km$^2$ which is adjusted for projection deformation. The actual area of a grid square (AGS) (in square kilometers) is obtained using

$$AGS = \left[ -0.132 + (0.026 \times L) - (1.441 - (L/2)) \right] 2500. \tag{4}$$

The changes from the revisions are summarized as follows:

1. The area of the accumulation zone decreases from 91% to 88% of the total area of the conterminous ice sheet ($N = 682, 1.6913 \times 10^8$ km$^2$), i.e., from $N = 620$ to $N = 597$ or from 1.5415 x 10$^8$ km$^2$ to 1.4840 x 10$^8$ km$^2$. The mean rate of accumulation for the area bounded by the equilibrium line increases by 2% (from 263 to 267 kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$), and due to the decrease in area, the estimate of bulk accumulation decreases by 1% (from 405 to 399 Gt a$^{-1}$).

2. The area of the ablation zone increases from 9% to 12% of the total area of the conterminous ice sheet, i.e., from $N = 62$ to $N = 85$, or from 0.1497 x 10$^8$ km$^2$ to 0.2073 x 10$^8$ km$^2$. The mean rate of ablation for the area decreases by 14% (from -1239 to -1086 kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$), and due to the increase in area, the bulk ablation estimate increases by 23% (from -188 to -231 Gt a$^{-1}$).

3. Overall for the conterminous ice sheet ($N = 682, 1.6913 \times 10^8$ km$^2$), the estimate of surface balance decreases by 23% (from 128 to 99 kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$), and the estimate of bulk accumulation decreases by 22% (from 216 to 168 Gt a$^{-1}$). The discrepancy in the percent value is due to using round-off numbers in the integration.

Using equations (1) and (2) for ELA as a function of latitude, the location of both the modeled and the interpolated
equilibrium lines (Plate 3) are traced on the ice sheet topographic sheets with contour increments of 100 m produced from the ERS-1 database [Zwally and Brenner, 2001] at a scale of approximately 1: 2 x 10^6. In regions such as the NE and SE the location of the lines are practically coincident. In others, such as the SW at 66°N, the interpolated line is approximately 300 m higher than the model line, and the horizontal difference is approximately 40 km. The variations in location of the lines determine the first accumulation isopleth that can be drawn with confidence along the periphery of particular sectors. This and other limitations are imposed by the small scale of the Figure 2 map and by the coarse 50 km database, which make it impossible to draw isopleths at regular increments everywhere. We also make small revisions to the isopleths pattern drawn in the interior (but no changes in grid point values) relative to that shown in a preceding study [Zwally and Giovino, 2000].

3. Drainage Divides and Systems

The drainage divides (Plate 3) are delineated on the basis of ERS radar altimeter data analyzed to yield surface maximum slope gradient and direction at a 5 km grid resolution [Zwally and Brenner, 2001]. The six major drainage systems selected each include a minimum of three subbasins, as shown by a flow line scheme based on a 20 km grid interpolated from the 5 km ERS-I grid (Figure 3) (W. L. Wang, personal communication, 2000). However, considerably more data on accumulation, and particularly on ice thickness as well as bed topography, would be required to produce the same type of estimates at subbasin scale.

The drainage divide along the main N-S ridge is joined by divides that originate in distinct localities near the periphery of the conterminous ice sheet. The primary criterion for the selection of the localities is that the divides split the flanks of the ice sheet in entities of relatively homogeneous surface-slope orientation, as this will determine other important characteristics such as orographic influence on precipitation. Among secondary criteria, we considered coherence relative to distance to open ocean, as this has influence on the rate of accumulation [e.g., Zwally and Giovino, 1997] and area size. We list below the points at or near the ice terminus of each drainage divide, because unlike divide-intersection points in the interior these points are difficult to identify on topographic maps: 1 and 2: 80.70°N, 27.0°W, thence NE to the ice terminus; 2 and 3: 75.00°N, 23.0°W, thence ESE to the ice terminus; 3 and 4: 66.70°N, 35.9°W, thence SW to the ice terminus; 4 and 5: 76.21°N, 68.5°W, thence WSW to the ice terminus. The area of each system is estimated on the basis of the number of grid points that lie within the boundaries set by the divides, adjusted as per equation (4).

System 3 is listed twice (Table 2) because the relatively small ice ridge extending ENE from approximately 69.68°N, 29.8°W distorts the comparison with the other systems. Its exclusion is implicit throughout the discussions that follow, unless stated otherwise. We refer herein to system “3 modified” as 3m and to any summary statistics for the whole ice that includes 3m as systems 1-6m. Nevertheless, we list the statistics for both system 3 and systems 1-6 for completeness. In the same context we present details of the estimates of accumulation and ablation produced from the application of the model equilibrium line for each system to facilitate future comparison with results of mass budget studies.
Relative to the total area of the continental ice sheet (systems 1-6: \(1.6913 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2\)), the whole area of each system, i.e., the sum of the areas of net accumulation and net ablation, range between 10% and 25% (from \(0.1683 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2\) in system 4 to \(0.4312 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2\) in system 5, respectively). Relative to the total area bounded by the model equilibrium line (systems 1-6: \(1.4767 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2\)), the range reduced slightly to between 9% and 24%, all systems ranked in the same order (from \(0.1310 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2\) in system 4 to \(0.3516 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2\) in system 5, respectively).

The accumulation values for grid squares (Plate 1) are used to obtain mean values in kg m\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\), or integrated to obtain bulk values in Gt a\(^{-1}\), for the whole area of each system. It should be noted that the area of the ice sheet (systems 1-6) lying above ELA is estimated to be 88% of the total area and that this statistic does not change when the area above ELA for systems 1-6 is considered. However, it shows a relatively large range between 78% in system 4 and 96% in system 1. The size of the range is important because different "placements" of the equilibrium line are generally the principal source for the difference between any two surface balance estimates reported in the literature, regardless of the total area assigned to the ice sheet (Zwally and Giovinetto, 2000). Closely related to this statistic, the ratio between the areas of net ablation and net accumulation also emphasizes the physiographic differences between systems; whereas the ratio for systems 1-6 is 0.14, the range for particular systems range between 0.04 for system 1 and 0.28 for system 4.

An interesting characteristic of our results is the wide variation in the mean accumulation in the area above the equilibrium line among the drainage systems, ranging from 134 to 509 kg m\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\) for systems 2 and 4, respectively. The variation is from one half to twice the mean for all systems (267 kg m\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\)). The bulk accumulations for each drainage system range from 42 Gt a\(^{-1}\) for system 2 to 121 Gt a\(^{-1}\) for system 5. The total bulk accumulation for systems 1-6 is 397 Gt a\(^{-1}\).

4. Equilibrium Line Cross Section and Balance
Mass Output Estimates

Ice thickness determinations are needed to estimate the mean ice depth at the output cross section defined by the equilibrium line and for an area bounded by it. All ice thickness determinations are produced from the 5 km grid PARCA/TUD database (J.L. Bamber, personal communication, 2000) [Bamber et al., this issue]. The mean ice depth at the output cross section is obtained directly from the 5 km grid database. The mean ice thickness for the area bounded by the equilibrium line is estimated in two steps. The first step produces an ice thickness value for each grid point location in our 50 km grid by bilinear interpolation [Research Systems Inc., 1999] from the 5 km grid database. This value applies to the grid point location and is not the mean thickness averaged over the 2500 km\(^2\) area of each grid square. The second step produces the mean ice thickness and total ice mass values for each drainage system from the values compiled in our 50 km grid database. This coarse sampling method is internally consistent with the compilation approach used for many other variables in the 50 km grid database used in this and preceding studies.

The length of the equilibrium line, as well as the mean ice thickness and cross-sectional area at the line, are listed in Table 3. The range of cross-sectional areas is large, from 459 km\(^2\) in system 1 to 1022 km\(^2\) in system 5. The total cross-sectional area for systems 1-6 is 3773 km\(^2\).

Table 3
The balance mass fluxes through the equilibrium line are the ratio of bulk net mass accumulation in the accumulation zones to the area of the cross section at the equilibrium line. In contrast to the factor of 3 range in bulk accumulations, the balance fluxes only range from 0.0907 Gt km\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\) in system 3 to 0.1131 in system 5, which is less than a 20% variation about the mean of 0.1011 Gt km\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\). The depth-averaged balance velocities at the equilibrium line also have a small variation, ranging from 0.100 km a\(^{-1}\) in system 3 to 0.130 km a\(^{-1}\) in system 5, about a mean of 0.111 km a\(^{-1}\) for all systems 1-6.

A simplified characterization of the balance mass flux, which is independent of errors in the estimate of mean ice thickness at the output cross section, is the mass flow per unit length of the equilibrium line. Relative to a weighted mean of 0.0468 Gt km\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\) for all systems 1-6, the values for the separate drainage systems vary from 0.0208 Gt km\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\) for system 1 to 0.0878 Gt km\(^{-1}\) a\(^{-1}\) for system 5.

The ratio of total ice mass above the equilibrium line to the balance mass output (\(T_t (Gt a^{-1})^{-1} = ka\)) in each system provides a basis to infer the relative response time on the drainage systems to climate fluctuations. The effective exchange times, expressed as the number of millennia necessary to attain 100% equivalent throughput, ranges from a low of 3 ka in the southeast system 4 to a high of 14 ka in the northeast system 2 (Table 3). This range in times is from approximately one half to double the 6 ka value for the whole ice sheet. The estimates of mean ice thickness and ice mass for each drainage system are also listed in Table 3.

5. Estimates of Errors

The overall combined error that would apply to mass output estimates, such as flux, discharge per unit length of periphery, and depth-averaged velocity, includes errors on the estimates of area, accumulation, and ice thickness, each of which is a combined error term. All three of these parameters are also dependent on the errors pertaining to determinations of location and length of the equilibrium line. Some of the errors are relatively large. Moreover, the balance mass output estimates are for ice entities of large area and volume with long lapses between variations of mass input and corresponding variations of mass output.

The combined error terms for some of the estimates are readily assessed (e.g., terms introduced by coarse grid sampling affecting area and accumulation estimates). Other terms, however, would require detailed elaboration beyond the scope of this study. Among these are terms pertaining to the location and length of the equilibrium line, which could be assessed using RMS values given for equations (1) through (3), converting elevation change to distance over slope gradients, and terms pertaining to referenced ice thickness databases. Below, we assess some of the error terms and, for brevity, only as they apply to the whole area bounded by the equilibrium line rather than particular systems.

Coarse grid sampling introduces two terms in the combined error. One is in the estimate of area, assessed at one-fourth the area of each outer grid square. The area of systems 1-6 bounded by the equilibrium line (1.4840 x 10^6 km\(^2\)) is covered by 48 grid lines. There are 125 outer grid points and the error estimate is ± 0.0781 x 10^6 km\(^2\) or ± 5 %.

At a mean accumulation rate of 267 kg m\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\) the error in area contributes ± 21 Gt a\(^{-1}\) to the combined error. The other term is an error of approximately ± 6 % relative to the accumulation estimate that could be obtained by detailed area integration of the accumulation rate as shown on isopleth maps (e.g., Giovinetto and Zwally, 2000). At the mean
accumulation rate, this implies an error of ± 16 kg m⁻² a⁻¹ which contributes ± 24 Gt a⁻¹ to the combined error.

The error in the estimate of accumulation is ± 42 kg m⁻² a⁻¹ applicable to the mean rate of 267 kg m⁻² a⁻¹ for the N = 597 data set. The relatively large error of ± 16 % contributes ± 62 Gt a⁻¹ to the combined error. It is the area-weighted mean of two terms, one each for the grid point locations sampling the zones of dry and upper percolation facies (N = 442), and of lower percolation, wetted, and superimposed ice facies (N = 155). The relative error for the N = 442 data set has been assessed at ± 12 % of the mean rate [Zwally and Giovinetto, 1993], or ± 29 kg m⁻² a⁻¹ based on a mean rate of 241 kg m⁻² a⁻¹. The relative error for the N = 155 data set is assumed to be greater by at least a factor of 2 (± 24 %), or ± 82 kg m⁻² a⁻¹ based on a mean rate of 341 kg m⁻² a⁻¹. The assumption attempts to assimilate the composite error inherent to the source compilation and to the procedure we use to obtain the values for the N = 155 data set. As stated in a preceding section, the values are obtained by visual interpolation from the isopleths pattern of Ohmura and Reeh [1991]. The isopleths location are themselves subject to a composite error that includes the error in the determination of the rate at each field data site, the error due to spatial (areal) and temporal variabilities of accumulation because most of the data are unevenly distributed in space and time, and the error of interpolation and extrapolation to draw the isopleths pattern. Furthermore, approximately one half of the accumulation values for the 125 grid point locations that lie closest to the equilibrium line are reduced to reach a value of zero at the line; this modification introduces an error of unknown value that nonetheless must be large.

The variation of each balance mass output estimate listed in this study is assumed to be in phase with any variation of mass input, lagging at least from several decades to a few centuries. The annual variability of accumulation has been estimated on the basis of relatively long series determined from core studies (± 25 kg m⁻² a⁻¹ [van der Veen and Bolzan, 1999]) which, if applied to the area bounded by the equilibrium line suggests a variability of ± 37 Gt a⁻¹ and a standard error of the mean of the order of ± 1 Gt a⁻¹. The annual variability estimated from a 10 year net water vapor transport series produced by atmospheric numerical analyses (± 16 % as it can be deduced from a survey of the literature [Calanca and Ohmura, 1994; Chen et al., 1997; Bromwich et al., 1998]) suggests a variability for the area bounded by the equilibrium line of ± 64 Gt a⁻¹ and a standard error of the mean of ± 20 Gt a⁻¹. The second and largest of the two temporal variability assessments, differences in approach withstanding, would contribute a term to the combined error of ± 5 %.

In summary, the combined error in estimates of mass output (the sum of the "standard" errors in the estimate of area (± 5 %), grid sampling approach (± 6 %), accumulation (± 16 %), and long-term temporal variability (± 5 %)) is ± 18 % or ± 73 Gt a⁻¹. In the context of balance flux, discharge and depth-averaged velocity findings of this study, ± 18 % should be considered a minimum error, as we have not made assessments of the terms corresponding to errors in the location of the equilibrium line, and of estimates of its length and ice thickness at the output cross section defined by it. Also excluded from the discussion is the error in the estimate of ice thickness for the area bounded by the equilibrium line, affecting only the estimate of time required for total exchange of mass.

6. Discussion and Conclusions
Important aspects of global change studies, in general, and of glaciological research, in particular, aim at reliable estimates of the mass budget of drainage systems and subbasins. Our purpose is to estimate the balance ice flux at the cross section aligned with the equilibrium line and infer which parts of the ice sheet may respond more rapidly to climate fluctuations and changes in boundary conditions. The total mass exchange rate information, expressed in millennia, suggests that southeastern Greenland (system 4, 2.7 ka) should react more rapidly to climatic fluctuations than northern Greenland (systems 1 and 2, 8.5 and 14.1 ka, respectively).

On the basis of additional field reports on the ELA, a previous linear decrease of ELA with latitude is replaced by a model equilibrium lines from a second-order polynomial fit to the data, one each for eastern and western Greenland. Another line that is linearly interpolated between the field data is also used for comparison. All four descriptions are sensitive to the greater accumulation rates southward of approximately 65°N, which together with other undetermined phenomena, depress the ELA. As an assessment of the effect that changes in the location of the equilibrium line introduce on surface balance estimates, we evaluated the balance for both lines. The model equilibrium line splits the area of the conterminous ice sheet into 88% above and 12% below the ELA. The interpolated equilibrium line splits the area into 89% above and 11% below the ELA. The difference in location of the line alters the distance between the line and the closest grid point locations on either side, thus introducing a large adjustment in the accumulation and ablation values due to the steep gradient of the balance rate. The estimates of net accumulation and net ablation obtained from application of the interpolated line are 399 and 231 Gt a\(^{-1}\), respectively, and those obtained from the application of the model line are 402 and 200 Gt a\(^{-1}\), respectively. The net surface balance estimates (168 Gt a\(^{-1}\) for the model line and 202 Gt a\(^{-1}\) for the interpolated line) indicate that differences of ±20% can be introduced depending on the criteria used to interpret the same ELA field data. To the extent that this difference is related to interannual variability of the ELA captured in the field data, it gives an indication of the large interannual variability in the net surface balance.

Our net surface balance estimate of 168 Gt a\(^{-1}\) is the smallest reported in the last two decades (Table 4) and practically identical in value to that reported by Ohmura et al. [1999]. However, only one other estimate (for the “inner equilibrium line” from Radok et al. [1982]) can be compared directly with ours, because of the common use of net accumulation and net ablation for the areas on either side of an “inner” equilibrium line. As previously discussed [Zwally and Giovinetto, 2000], the net surface balance for the inner equilibrium line from Radok et al. [1982] is larger by a factor of approximately 2. Direct comparison with all other estimates of surface mass balance, including that of Ohmura et al. [1999] is not possible because they are based on the difference between gross accumulation and gross ablation (at the surface) over the whole area of the ice sheet (generally including the area of outlying ice caps). Nevertheless, the difference between our estimate and those reported in three studies [Weidick, 1984; van de Wal, 1996; Ohmura et al., 1999] is relatively small (i.e., between 1 and 55 Gt a\(^{-1}\)). The difference with the results reported in four other studies [Reeh, 1985; Huybrechts et al., 1991; Reeh et al., 1999; Janssens and Huybrechts, 2000] is relatively large (i.e., between 93 and 150 Gt a\(^{-1}\)). As expected, the difference between the various surface balance estimates is largely introduced by differences in the assessment of ablation. The
The split of the whole area of systems 1-6 between zones of accumulation and ablation (1.4840 x 10^6 km^2 and 0.2073 x 10^6 km^2, respectively) is modified for the purposes of this study, excluding a relatively small coastal ridge area in system 3 (it becomes 3m), reducing the respective areas of systems 1-6 to 1.4767 x 10^6 km^2 and 0.1999 x 10^6 km^2. The modification does not change the area split of 88 % and 12 % for the areas of accumulation and ablation, respectively, although the area split varies between 78 % and 22 % for system 5 to 96 % and 4 % for system 1.

Our depth-averaged balance velocity estimates show general agreement with balance velocity fields described in other studies in which they are compared with those derived using radar interferometry methods. For example, there is general agreement with the results reported by Joughin et al. [1997], Rignot et al. [1995], and Bamber et al. [2000]. However, our mean estimates for drainage systems are generally not suitable for a detailed comparison with the fine-grid resolution analysis used in radar interferometry. Although it is probable that significant differences in the estimates of net accumulation at the surface would be found, accumulation comparisons are not practical because the other papers concentrate on the interferometry analyses rather than the particular accumulation databases used.

Comparison of our balance depth-average estimates are in close agreement (in the order of ±10 m a^1) with the velocities determined by Thomas et al. [1998] for cross sections aligned approximately with the 2000 m surface elevation contour and which serve as discharge gates for an area including most of the area of system 6 as well as the northern one-third area of system 5. Moreover, in the northern part of system 5, at a latitude of 69.5°N and an elevation of 1250 m, surface motion measurements in 1967-1991 show a midrange value of 123 m a^1 [Salbach, 1995]. Our estimate for the system 5 indicates a mean of 130 m a^1.

Further study of subbasins within the six defined drainage systems should show some significant departures from the calculated means. In system 2, for example, the ice stream bifurcates at approximately 77.0°N, 30.5°W, discharging farther downstream through two "gates", which at the cross section aligned with the equilibrium line are centered at approximately 77.6°N, 24.5°W, and 78.6°N, 23.2°W. The combined width of the gates is approximately 170 km and their mean ice thickness is approximately 0.5 km. The subbasin approximately delineated in Plate 3 is sampled by 59 grid points in the 50 km grid, giving an area of 0.15 x 10^6 km^2, a mean accumulation of 135 kg m^-2 a^1, and bulk accumulation of 20 Gt a^1. The flux through the 85 km^2 output section is 0.24 Gt km^-1 a^1, with a discharge rate of 0.12 Gt km^-1 a^1 and a depth-averaged velocity of 0.26 km a^1. These output rates are approximately double those for the total system 2, even though the subbasin area and bulk accumulation are approximately one half the totals for the system.
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Figure captions

Figure 1. Elevation of the equilibrium line in eastern and western Greenland relative to latitude. The "interpolated" equilibrium line is shown with solid lines (circles indicate the location of field data sites). The "model" equilibrium line is shown with diamonds (based on the same field data, each described by a second-order polynomial). The single generalized relationship applied to both eastern and western regions in earlier studies [Giovinetto and Zwally, 1995; Zwally and Giovinetto, 2000] is shown with dashed lines for comparison.

Figure 2. Schematic distribution of accumulation as described in the 50 km grid relative to diagenetic facies and accumulation zones (modified after Zwally and Giovinetto [2000]). The number of grid point locations in the net ablation zone (N = 79) is determined by the location of the model equilibrium line. Grid point accumulation values are obtained from three sources (top bar); values for grid point locations closest and on either side of the equilibrium line are modified following criteria cited in the text.

Plate 1. Distribution of net accumulation at the surface on the conterminous ice sheet based on the 50 km grid database and model equilibrium line (modified after Zwally and Giovinetto [2000]).

Plate 2. Contoured distribution of net mass accumulation at the surface, showing the simplified outer coastline, ice terminus (dashed red line where it is not coincident with the coastline), interpolated and model equilibrium lines (solid orange and solid green, respectively), and accumulation isopleths labeled in kg m\(^{-2}\) a\(^{-1}\) (x 100); rate increments between isopleths are not regular because of map scale limitations (modified after Zwally and Giovinetto [2000]).
Plate 3. Drainage divides and number designation of drainage systems, showing the simplified outer coastline, ice terminus (dashed red line where it is not coincident with the coastline), interpolated and model equilibrium line (solid orange and solid green, respectively), and the approximate delineation of the subbasin corresponding to the main ice stream in system 2 (long dashed lines).

Figure 3. Flow lines based on a 20 km grid calculated by W.L. Wang (personal communication, 2000) produced by interpolation from the 5 km grid database derived from ERS-1 radar altimeter data [Zwally and Brenner, 2001].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physiographic Entity</th>
<th>Grid Point N</th>
<th>Area Nominal $10^4$ km$^2$</th>
<th>Area Adjusted $10^4$ km$^2$</th>
<th>Nominal Accumulation Mean kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>s.d. kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Min kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Max kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Adjusted Accumulation Mean kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Bulk Gt a$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry snow$^a$</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1.1075</td>
<td>1.1099</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower percolation facies$^b$</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.4425</td>
<td>0.4316</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of net accumulation</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
<td>1.5415</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of net ablation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.1550</td>
<td>0.1497</td>
<td>-1267</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>-5000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1259</td>
<td>-188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conterminous ice sheet</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>1.7050</td>
<td>1.6913</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>-5000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Includes the zone of upper percolation facies.

$^b$Includes zones of wetted facies and superimposed ice.
Table 2. Distribution of Accumulation by Drainage System (Model Equilibrium Line, 50 km Grid Database)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Grid Point N</th>
<th>Grid Point N</th>
<th>Adjusted Area $10^6$ km$^2$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Nominal Ablation Mean kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Adjusted Ablation Mean kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Bulk</th>
<th>Grid Point N</th>
<th>Adjusted Area $10^6$ km$^2$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Nominal Accumulation Mean kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Adjusted Accumulation Mean kg m$^{-2}$ a$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Bulk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-900</td>
<td>-918</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.2457</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0229</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-1111</td>
<td>-1131</td>
<td>-25.5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.3193</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0270</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>-727</td>
<td>-717</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.2172</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>-691</td>
<td>-682</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.2099</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>-1897</td>
<td>-1759</td>
<td>-70.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.1310</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-1011</td>
<td>-977</td>
<td>-80.6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.3516</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>120.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0302</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-842</td>
<td>-848</td>
<td>-25.4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.2190</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.2073</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-1123</td>
<td>-1086</td>
<td>-230.7</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>1.4840</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>398.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6m</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.1999</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>-1134</td>
<td>-1096</td>
<td>-224.7</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1.4767</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>396.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DrSy Desig.</td>
<td>Gr Pt.</td>
<td>Bulk Acc. Gt/ha</td>
<td>Sampled %</td>
<td>Length km</td>
<td>Ice Thick. km</td>
<td>Area km$^2$</td>
<td>Flux Gt km$^2$ a$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Discharge Gt km$^{-1}$ a$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Ice Movement km a$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Drainage System Ice Area 10$^6$ km$^2$</td>
<td>Drainage System Ice Thickness km</td>
<td>Drainage System Ice Mass Tt</td>
<td>Total Mass Exchange ka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>459.1</td>
<td>0.0910</td>
<td>0.0208</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.2457</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>355.798</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>464.2</td>
<td>0.0911</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.3193</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>595.431</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>843.9</td>
<td>0.0726</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.2172</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td>278.364</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>653.7</td>
<td>0.0907</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.2099</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>278.453</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>638.4</td>
<td>0.1097</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.1310</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>187.461</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>120.6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>1021.5</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>0.0878</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.3516</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>656.613</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>536.8</td>
<td>0.1172</td>
<td>0.0757</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.2190</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>414.895</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>398.9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8964</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>3963.9</td>
<td>0.0956</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>1.4840</td>
<td>1.863</td>
<td>2488.223</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6m</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>396.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8419</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>3773.2</td>
<td>0.1011</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1.4767</td>
<td>1.873</td>
<td>2489.273</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Summary of Surface Balance and Related Estimates (All Values in Gt a\textsuperscript{-1})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Net Accumulation</th>
<th>Net Ablation</th>
<th>Gross Accumulation</th>
<th>Gross Ablation</th>
<th>Surface Balance</th>
<th>Difference From This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study\textsuperscript{a,b}</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Jung-Rothenhäusler et al., (unpub. data, 2000)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janssens and Huybrechts [2000]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwally and Giovinetto [2000]\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohmura et al. [1999]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeh et al. [1999]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van de Wal [1996]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovinetto and Zwally [1995]\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>232\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robasky and Bromwich [1994]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huybrechts et al. [1991]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeh [1985]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weidick [1984]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radok et al. [1982] Inner Equilibrium Line</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Estimate for the area of the conterminous ice sheet; others may include the area of separate ice caps.
\textsuperscript{b}Estimate based on the model equilibrium line.
\textsuperscript{c}Estimate based on the generalized equilibrium line.
\textsuperscript{d}Ablation estimate based on middle range of three estimates [Ambach, 1982; Weidick, 1984; Reeh, 1985].
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