

Author	Year	Model Type	Model Name	Model Description	Uncertainty	Validation	Notes
NSIC Group Entry	2015	Statistical	Heuristic	Not specified	4.55	0.49	Standard deviation of all entries. The projection is the median of 12 entries by NSIC employees. NSIC employees were asked to submit a guess at the September sea ice extent. All entries were collected and the median was used for the October projection.
Walt Meier, NSIC	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.57	18.24	0.38 million square kilometers. Standard deviation of the estimates using ice loss rates from the years 2003 to 2012.
International Arctic Research Center	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.64	4.64	Upper: 5.123 million sq km, Lower: 1.08 million sq km. The range represents agreement 95th and 5th percent confidence intervals.
Lemont (Luan et al.)	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.69	19.01	0.63. The uncertainty of SIC prediction based on ensemble model experiments to 16 years.
CFOM (D. Schroeder, et al.)	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.7	+/- 0.5 mill. km2	The green uncertainty in the mean forecast error based on forecasts for the years 1988-2011.
Utoyoji (Kumura et al.)	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.71		
Staber-Barnett NSIC	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.75		
Met Office	2015	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Model	Not specified	4.9	4.9 million sq km, 0.4 million sq km.	Two standard deviations of the 42 member ensemble around the ensemble mean.
RASM (Hansen et al.)	2015	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Model	Not specified	4.91	0.02	0.12 million square kilometers. The uncertainty was estimated based on standard deviations of the 38-member ensemble.
NSIC-CPC	2015	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Model	Not specified	4.93	0.88	0.19. The standard deviation is calculated from the 20-member ensemble.
Nice Sun	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.98	0.50	4.93, 4.98-5.04.
Johr Zhang and Axel Schweiger	2015	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Model	Not specified	4.95		
Rignou Wu and Robert Grunbaum	2015	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Model	Not specified	4.96	20.11	
EDMWF SEAS5	2015	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Model	Not specified	4.97		
Alak Pety, NASA-GOCC	2015	Statistical	Statistical	Not specified	4.99	18.4	0.4. The uncertainty represents one standard deviation of the 2010 prediction interval.

CHRM	Dynamic Model	Coupled	4.99	17.81	Arctic 1.021 ; Antarctic 17.81	Arctic 0.26 ; Antarctic 0.16	Statistics are based on the 11-member ensemble.	This outlook has been run with Meteo France "System 0" global seasonal forecasting system. This system is based on CNRM-CM global climate model developed by CNRM and IPSL and an ocean-ice-ice extent conditions produced by Mercator Ocean.	This outlook is a model estimate based on a dynamical ensemble forecast with CNRM-CM global coupled model, initialized from atmospheric states from ECMTF operational analysis and ocean ice ice extent derived from Mercator Ocean operational analysis for a few days before 1 July 2024. A 11-member ensemble is generated by adding statistical perturbations during the simulation.	Model conditions for the ocean and ice (including concentration and thickness) are provided by Mercator Ocean. Basis in the Mercator Ocean operational analysis (MOC-Ocean-CM5-CLM4.5.2) reanalysis.	The VIC analysis is provided by the 17 national grid of CHRM. These fields are used to regrid the ocean ice ice extent of CNRM-CM (MOC-Ocean-CM5-CLM4.5.2) reanalysis in forced mode (from by ECMTF operational analysis). See ice fields (SIC, ST, ...) from the "17-nationals-run" are used to initialize the coupled model (as well as ocean fields from the run).	See above (same as SIC).					
Monica Isotta, Max Groszfeld	Statistical	Not specified	5.1								Lower uncertainty bound 4.7, upper uncertainty bound 5.5			The forecast scheme for the September sea ice extent is based on a methodology similar to the one used for the seasonal prediction of their circulation. The basic idea of this procedure is to identify regions with stable teleconnections between the predictors and the predictand. The September sea ice extent has been correlated with the potential predictors (June heat content, sea surface temperature, sea level pressure, air temperature) from previous months, up to 8 months lag, in a moving window of 21 years.	NSIDC NASA Team, https://climate.geos.cam.ac.uk/data/ice/sic/ , https://doi.org/10.26108/1301090109		
AWI consortium (Krauer et al.)	Dynamic Model	Ocean sea ice	5.19			4.98 - 5.47	0.14							For the present outlook the coupled ice-ocean model MQSOM has been forced with atmospheric surface fluxes from January 2000 to August 2019 (combination of ECMTF global model output and RCP4.5 and RCP8.5). All ensemble model experiments have been started from the same initial conditions on August 1 2018. The model setup has been changed with respect to the SIC30 2015. We used atmospheric forcing data from each of the years 2008 to 2017 for the ensemble prediction and thus obtain 10 different realizations of potential sea ice conditions for the summer of 2018. The use of an ensemble allows us to estimate probabilities of sea ice extent predictions for September 2018. A seasonal assimilation system (model MQSOM) has been used to initialize the model using the "Best Merged Sea Ice" (BMSI) 2 sea ice thickness product, the University of Bremen's snow depth product, and the OSI SAF ice concentration and sea surface temperature product. Observations from March and April were used. A bias correction scheme for the CryoSat-2 sea ice thickness which employs a spatially variable scaling factor could enhance the skill considerably (Krauer et al., 2022, http://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/2022/170/).	OSI SAF SUMMERTAR SIC4000, March and April 2018	Cryosat-2 from Alfred Wegener Institute of March and April 2018	
Rob Deber	Statistical	Not specified	5.19				380 km^2	Standard deviation of the residuals, as compared with the use of three variables in the regression							My prediction is based on an estimate of how much the Northern Hemisphere albedo during spring and early summer. I use three variables (land snow cover, ice concentration, ice area) that are available in June in a formula which shows particularly strong correlation with land ice ice extent. Regression over the 1982 - 2015 period, the formula predicts 3.10 km^2 for September 2018, with a standard deviation of 380 km^2 . Best performance of this June forecast method for September ice extent over the past 36 years shown in a graph here: https://eric.arctic.noaa.gov/ice/ndbc/ftp/actice-forecast-2018-09-24/actice-forecast-2018-09-24.html . The interesting finding is that the June land snow cover signal is clearly present in the September ice extent numbers, suggesting land snow cover could be used to improve other prediction methods as well.	NSIDC monthly data set for "Arctic" and "sea numbers" (https://climate.geos.cam.ac.uk/data/ice/sic/)	Jungfer Snow Lab Northern Hemisphere monthly land snow cover (http://www.met.fsu.edu/~jungfer/ice/actice/actice_area_dghf_burt_bku_rst01/)
Frank Rosso	Mixed	Not specified	5.2		5.2 km^2	+0.5 km^2	It's the standard deviation of the residuals estimated observed NSIDC September SIC 1979 - 2017	see http://www.eros.noaa.gov/files/272022/ice2022_june_2024.pdf	Just as in the four years before) calculate the value for the September minimum of the Arctic sea ice extent of the year (NSIDC monthly means for September) from the mean temperature (> 10mm depth) requirement during spring of all the years.	https://climate.geos.cam.ac.uk/data/ice/sic/							
Modified CryOSIP	Dynamic Model	Coupled	5.22		5.21	± 4.72 , $\text{mean} \pm 1.5$	1 standard deviation + 0.26, uncertainty + 0.51 (ie, 1.36°C/2)	The uncertainty values were calculated from the ensemble of 20 best SIC anomalies after adding the NSIDC climo of 6.5 km^2 .	Our Outlook of Forecast Total Arctic sea ice extent (SIC), and presented in the "Free Data (FD) and Forecast up Date (FUD)", and presented in the probability (PT) was produced using the Canadian Seasonal to Interannual Prediction System (CSIAPS), but (as in 2021) in a modified experimental mode intended to test general operational updates to the sea ice forecast methodology including changes to the data used to initialize both sea ice concentration (SIC) and sea ice thickness (SIT). Relative to our July 2022 contribution, our results indicate similarly high ice coverage and a shorter open water season. Specifically, our mean SIC forecast value has increased slightly from 5.23 to 5.22 million square kilometers, and our SIP and FUD (FD) forecasts respectively show expansion probability for ice coverage and a shorter open water season in the western Arctic.	CSIAPS combines forecasts from two models, CanM4 and CanCM4, with a total of 20 ensemble members (10 from CanM4, 10 from CanCM4). The Arctic SIC anomaly was calculated for each individual ensemble member relative to the 1981-2012 climatology for the respective model. These anomalies were then added to the NSIDC climatological value of 6.5 million square kilometers, and then averaged over all 20 ensemble members to yield a total SIC of 5.22 million square kilometers.	NSIDC monthly data set for "Arctic" and "sea numbers" (https://climate.geos.cam.ac.uk/data/ice/sic/)	SIT was estimated using the reanalysis model "IMWF" described in Osherson et al., 2012 (https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00467.1). The parameters in IMWF were fit using ROMS SIC and SIT data over the period 2002-2017. The daily NSIDC data described above for July 31 then used as the real time product fed in IMWF to estimate real-time SIT.					