Updated global warming potentials and radiative efficiencies of halocarbons and other weak atmospheric absorbers

Ø. Hodnebrog[1], B. Aamaas[1], J. S. Fuglestvedt[1], G. Marston[2], G. Myhre[1], C. J. Nielsen[3], M. Sandstad[1], K. P. Shine[4], T. J. Wallington[5]

[1]Center for International Climate Research (CICERO), P.O. Box 1129 Blindern, N-0318 Oslo, Norway
[2]Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK
[3]Department of Chemistry, University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1033 Blindern, N-0315 Oslo, Norway
[4]Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Earley Gate, P.O. Box 243, Reading, RG6 6BB, Berks, UK
[5]Ford Motor Company, Research & Advanced Eng. Dept., Mail Drop RIC-2122, Dearborn, MI 48121-2053, USA

Corresponding author: Øivind Hodnebrog (oivind.hodnebrog@cicero.oslo.no)

Key Points:

- Radiative efficiencies are reassessed for more than 600 compounds, and global warming potentials calculated for around 250 of these
- 42 compounds have >10% different radiative efficiency compared to a comprehensive review in 2013
- Present-day radiative forcing due to halocarbons and other weak absorbers is 0.38 [0.33-0.43] W m^{-2}, which is ~18% of the CO_2 forcing

Abstract

Human activity has led to increased atmospheric concentrations of many gases, including halocarbons, and may lead to emissions of many more gases. Many of these gases are, on a per molecule basis, powerful greenhouse gases, although at present-day concentrations their climate effect is in the so-called weak limit (i.e. their effect scales linearly with concentration). We published a comprehensive review of the radiative efficiencies (RE) and global warming potentials (GWP) for around 200 such compounds in 2013 (Hodnebrog et al., 2013). Here we present updated RE and GWP values for compounds where experimental infrared absorption spectra are available. Updated numbers are based on a revised "Pinnock curve", which gives RE as a function of wavenumber, and now also accounts for stratospheric temperature adjustment (Shine and Myhre, 2020). Further updates include the implementation of around 500 absorption spectra additional to those in the 2013 review, and new atmospheric lifetimes from the literature (mainly from WMO (2019)). In total, values for 60 of the compounds previously assessed are based on additional absorption spectra, and 42 compounds have REs which differ by >10% from our previous assessment. New RE calculations are presented for more than 400 compounds in addition to the previously assessed compounds, and GWP calculations are presented for a total of around 250 compounds. Present-day radiative forcing due to halocarbons and other weak absorbers is 0.38 [0.33-0.43] W m^{-2}, compared to 0.36 [0.32-0.40] W m^{-2} in IPCC AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013), which is about 18% of the current CO_2 forcing.

Plain Language Summary

Human activity has led to increased atmospheric concentrations of many gases, including halocarbons (used, for example, in refrigeration and air conditioning), and may lead to emissions of many other gases. While some halocarbons, such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), are known to deplete stratospheric ozone, they are also powerful greenhouse gases contributing to radiative forcing (the net change in the energy balance of the Earth system) and hence climate change. We find that the present-day contribution from halocarbons and related compounds to radiative forcing is about 18% of the forcing due to increased concentrations of CO_2. By using established methods and available laboratory measurements of absorption of infrared radiation for each gas, we quantify the radiative efficiency (i.e. a compound's strength as a greenhouse gas) for a total of around 600 compounds. For around 250 compounds we provide so-called global warming potentials (GWP), which are used to compare the climate impact of emissions of different gases and are commonly used to inform policy decisions. Results presented here can be used to derive values for emission metrics other than GWP. The present work is the most comprehensive review of the radiative efficiency and GWP of halocarbons and other weak absorbers performed to date.

1. Introduction

Anthropogenic forcing of climate change is one of the most important challenges facing humanity. The largest contributor to radiative forcing of climate change is the increased levels of greenhouse gases such as CO_2, N_2O, CH_4, and halocarbons and related compounds. While many halocarbons, such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), are known for depleting stratospheric ozone (Molina and Rowland, 1974; WMO, 2019), they are also powerful greenhouse gases. Despite the phase-out of several halocarbons through the Montreal Protocol from 1987 and its amendments and adjustments, halocarbons still make an important contribution to radiative forcing of climate change because many have long atmospheric lifetimes. Furthermore, the concentrations of some replacement compounds, such as hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), are rising. More specifically, Fig. 1 (WMO/GAW, 2019) shows that HCFC-22 has recently become the 2nd most abundant compound (of the greenhouse gases with only anthropogenic sources) after CFC-12. HFC-134a has, in only 20 years, increased from very low abundance to become the 4th most abundant halocarbon. Emissions of HFCs, perfluorocarbons, SF_6 and NF_3 are included in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Controls on emissions of HFCs, in addition to CFCs and HCFCs, are included in the 2016 Kigali Agreement to the Montreal Protocol (see discussion in Kochanov et al. (2019)).

Differences in the intensity and wavelength of infrared (IR) absorption bands lead to distinct radiative forcing efficiencies of various gases. Radiative efficiency (RE) is a measure of the radiative forcing for a unit change in the atmospheric concentration of a gas, and for halocarbons and related compounds is usually reported in units of W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}. To provide policy makers with guidance on the relative effectiveness of actions limiting the emissions of different gases, metrics have been developed to place the impact of emissions of different gases on a common scale. The most widely used metric is the Global Warming Potential (GWP) with a 100-year time-horizon (hereafter GWP(100)), which is based on the time-integrated radiative forcing due to a pulse emission of a unit mass of gas, normalized by the reference gas CO_2, and was introduced in the first assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 1990) (see section 2.5).

In 2013 we reviewed the literature data and provided a comprehensive and self-consistent set of new calculations of REs and GWPs for halocarbons and related compounds (Hodnebrog et al., 2013, hereafter referred to as H2013). Unlike the major greenhouse gases, current atmospheric concentrations of these compounds are low enough for the forcing to scale almost linearly with abundance, and we will therefore refer to these compounds as weak atmospheric absorbers. Adopting a common method for calculating REs and GWPs provides a more consistent approach to comparing metrics between different compounds than if these metrics are taken from studies that used different methodologies. Our results were incorporated by the IPCC into the 5th assessment report (AR5) (Myhre et al., 2013) and, as a result, they are now used in national and international agreements. The UNFCCC adopted AR5 values for reporting emissions under the Paris Agreement and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) uses GWP values from AR5 in its reports. To ensure that climate policy decisions are based on the latest scientific data it is important to periodically review and update the assessments. Additional infrared absorption spectra and refinements in

estimations of the atmospheric lifetimes of halocarbons and other compounds have become available since our last review. Specifically, we have considered and included absorption spectra given as supplementary material to published papers, and from the HITRAN2016 (Kochanov et al., 2019) and PNNL (Sharpe et al., 2004) databases. Atmospheric lifetimes have recently been updated in WMO (2019) and these estimates have been used here. The provision of GWP(100) values in this paper, and in H2013, should not be seen as an endorsement of that metric, as the choice of metric depends on the policy context (Myhre et al., 2013); the RE and lifetime values presented here can be used to derive values for alternative emission metrics.

We have updated and extended our previous assessment of REs and GWPs for halocarbons and other weak atmospheric absorbers. Updates are based on new absorption spectra for 60 compounds considered in our previous review, the latest estimates of atmospheric lifetimes, and an update to the RE calculation method. The review has been extended to include around 440 additional compounds to bring the total number of compounds considered to more than 600. Included are several isomeric species which have identical empirical formulae but are structurally and spectrally distinct. Therefore, there is no need to consider isomeric compounds together within the context of this review. The radiative forcing contributions of the 40 most abundant halocarbons and related compounds in the atmosphere are estimated. The present work is the most comprehensive review of the radiative efficiencies and global warming potentials of halogenated compounds performed to date.

2. Data and Method

2.1 Absorption Cross Sections

In addition to the experimental spectra included in H2013 we have included, either in the main or supplementary material, all IR absorption spectra available from the HITRAN2016 (Gordon et al., 2017; Kochanov et al., 2019) and PNNL (Sharpe et al., 2004) databases. The vast majority of spectra from PNNL are also available in HITRAN2016 and we have only included data from one of the databases to avoid overlap. The main sources of experimental infrared absorption cross sections in H2013 were the Ford Motor Company (e.g. Sihra et al., 2001), the Spectroscopy and Warming potentials of Atmospheric Greenhouse Gases project (Ballard et al., 2000b; Highwood and Shine, 2000), HITRAN-2008 (Rothman et al., 2009) and GEISA-2009 (Jacquinet-Husson et al., 2011) databases, and data provided by authors of published papers (e.g. Imasu et al., 1995). Several of the spectra used in H2013 were provided in the supplementary material and later included in the HITRAN2016 and GEISA-2015 (Jacquinet-Husson et al., 2016) databases. Many publications now make available their measured absorption cross sections as supplementary material. Since spectra provided as supplementary material are typically not in a standardized data format and need to be converted, we could only carry out RE calculations for a limited number of these supplementary material spectra, and we have prioritized the 40 most atmospherically

abundant compounds. For other studies the reported integrated absorption cross-section and RE value, if available, are listed (Tables S1-S20).

As in H2013, each of the available spectra have been evaluated and if several spectra from the same laboratory group exist, we only use the latest published spectrum. For example, spectra from Sihra et al. (2001) supersede those from Pinnock et al. (1995) and Christidis et al. (1997) due to improvements in the methodology of the Ford laboratory measurements. When more than one spectrum was available from a source, the spectrum that was recorded nearest room temperature and atmospheric pressure was used (see Section 2.2 for a discussion of the temperature dependence of cross-sections). The choices of spectra to be used in RE calculations have been explained for each group of compounds in the Supplementary Material (Text S1-S20).

In contrast to H2013, we only consider experimental absorption cross sections that are measured in a laboratory. As a result, 44 of the compounds included in H2013 have been omitted here because experimental spectra are not available, while 9 of the compounds that only had calculated spectra in H2013 have been updated with RE values based on experimental spectra. Calculated IR spectra have been published for a vast number of compounds (e.g., Davila et al., 2017; Papanastasiou et al., 2018), with some studies including thousands of compounds (Betowski et al., 2016; Kazakov et al., 2012; McLinden et al., 2014) but these have a considerably larger uncertainty than experimental spectra (see Table 1 of H2013).

2.2 Temperature Dependence of Cross-sections

Although absorption cross sections are temperature dependent, integrated absorption cross sections show little dependence on temperature. The origin of the temperature dependence of absorption cross sections is the strong dependence of rotational states on temperature. Consequently, spectral bands are generally broader and have a lower peak intensity when observed at higher temperatures. This effect is illustrated in Fig. 2 for a range of compound types (CFC, halon and sulphur-containing species), temperature range and pressure. The effect is noticeable even for the 20 K temperature difference illustrated in Fig. 2 for $CBrClF_2$. These small changes in band structure have a negligible effect on calculated REs, and hence GWPs.

However, when molecules exist in two or more distinct conformational forms, the possibility of significant temperature dependence of the integrated cross section exists (Godin et al., 2019). For example, the absorption spectra for CFC-114 reported by McDaniel et al. (1991) indicate that there are bands within the spectrum that show relatively strong positive temperature dependence, bands that show a weak negative temperature dependence and bands that are not temperature dependent. These observations can be rationalised in terms of the temperature dependence of the populations of the two different conformers of CFC-114. However, the integrated cross sections of most molecules show little temperature dependence, and for consistency, we have used spectra obtained at ambient temperatures, where the experimental uncertainties are typically smallest.

2.3 Radiative Efficiency

In H2013, a common method was used to calculate the RE for most gases. This employed the "Pinnock curve" (Pinnock et al., 1995) where the RE as a function of wavenumber was calculated for a weak absorber absorbing equally at all wavenumbers. Multiplying this curve by the absorption cross-section of a given gas yields its RE. In H2013 the Pinnock curve was updated (Fig. 3, blue line), most notably by increasing its spectral resolution from 10 cm^{-1} to 1 cm^{-1} using the Oslo Line-By-Line (OLBL) radiative transfer model run at 0.02 cm^{-1} resolution (note that there was a typo in the caption of Figure 6 in H2013, wrongly stating a resolution of 0.2 cm^{-1}); the updated calculations also used more refined atmospheric profiles of temperature, cloudiness and greenhouse gas concentrations. For instance, the atmospheric representation was expanded from one global mean profile to two profiles, one for the tropics and one for the extratropics, and the inclusion of refined cloud profiles led to weaker RE in the 800-1200 cm^{-1} region (see Sections 2.3 and 3.3.1 of H2013 for details). The Pinnock et al. (1995) method, and the H2013 update, yield the instantaneous RE (i.e. the radiative efficiency in the absence of stratospheric temperature adjustment). Since the RE, which includes this adjustment, provides a more accurate representation of a gas's impact on surface temperature, H2013 incorporated a correction to account for this. For most gases, the instantaneous RE was simply increased by 10%. For several gases (CFC-11, CFC-12, HFC-41 and PFC-14) the correction was explicitly calculated using OLBL, either because of the absolute importance of that gas or because, in the case of HFC-41, it was known that the RE is *less* than its instantaneous value. However, this approach was somewhat *ad hoc*, and may not have been applicable to all gases.

Shine and Myhre (2020) have incorporated stratospheric temperature adjustment into the Pinnock curve for the first time, by calculating the impact of absorption by a gas at a given wavenumber on stratospheric temperatures (Fig. 3, red vs. purple line). The calculation of this adjustment is computationally intensive, as the RE due to absorption by a gas at a given wavenumber occurs not only at that wavenumber (as in the case of instantaneous RE) but now depends on the emission by gases (mostly CO_2, H_2O and O_3) at all other wavenumbers. Because of this, Shine and Myhre (2020) calculated the effect of adjustment using a narrow-band (10 cm^{-1}) radiation code, and applied this to updated instantaneous RE calculations using OLBL (which included an improved representation of the water vapor continuum and some changes to the representation of clouds). The new method reproduced detailed calculations for a range of gases (including HFC-41 and CFC-11) to better than 1.5%. Although more complicated in its derivation, it is no more complicated than the original Pinnock method in its application. This new method (which also requires the use of the lifetime correction described in Section 2.4) is applied to all gases here and hence improves the relative consistency of derived REs.

2.4 Atmospheric Lifetimes and Lifetime-correction

The atmospheric lifetime of a compound is required for calculations of GWPs and Global Temperature-change Potentials (GTPs) (see Section 2.5). The RE value obtained from the method described in Section 2.3 assumes the compound is well-mixed in the atmosphere. Most of the compounds included in this study have a non-uniform vertical and horizontal distribution in the atmosphere, and the lifetime can be used to correct for that. Here we use the method presented in H2013 (their Section 3.3.4), where two approximations are given depending on the primary loss mechanism of the compound. One approximation is used for compounds primarily being lost through photolysis in the stratosphere: the fractional correction f to the RE of $f(\tau) = 1 - 0.1826\tau^{-0.3339}$ is applicable for lifetimes τ of $10 < \tau < 10^4$ years. Another approximation is used for compounds primarily lost through reaction with OH in the troposphere: $f(\tau) = \frac{a\tau^b}{1+c\tau^d}$, where a=2.962, b=0.9312, c=2.994, d=0.9302, and is applicable for $10^{-4} < \tau < 10^4$ years. The lifetime corrections for very-short lived compounds should be treated as particularly approximate, as the correction depends on where the emissions take place. Excepted from these approximations are CFC-11, CFC-12 and Halon-1211 because explicit LBL calculations were made in H2013 (see their Section 3.3.3) to derive factors to account for non-uniform mixing. The derived factors were 0.927, 0.970, and 0.937, respectively, and are used here in the RE calculations for these compounds. These factors are less than one, despite being quite long-lived compounds, because of stratospheric loss due to photolysis.

The recent WMO (2019) report gives the most up-to-date and complete overview of atmospheric lifetimes of halocarbons and related compounds, and we rely on these estimates. Explanations and sources for the lifetime estimates in WMO (2019) are given for each compound in their Chapter 1.2 and Table A-1. For some compounds that do not have a lifetime estimate in WMO (2019), lifetime estimates have been taken from previous literature, and sometimes as an average across different estimates if more studies exist (see Table S1-S20 for references to lifetime estimates). For several compounds, we are not aware of any estimates of lifetimes; for these we only present REs assuming a constant horizontal and vertical distribution in the atmosphere, and no estimates of GWPs can be given.

2.5 Description of Metrics

The most widely used emission metric in climate policy is the global warming potential (GWP). It was introduced by IPCC (1990) where values for three time horizons (20, 100 and 500 years) were given. The GWP values were updated in following assessment reports. GWP has been widely adopted in climate policies, and the Kyoto Protocol adopted GWPs for a time horizon of 100 years as its metric for implementing a multi-gas approach. At UNFCCC COP24 it was decided to use GWP(100) for reporting national emissions to the Paris Agreement, while parties may in addition use other metrics (e.g. global temperature-change potential) to report supplemental information on aggregate emissions and removals of greenhouse gases, expressed in CO_2 equivalents (UNFCCC, 2019).

The GWP is based on the time-integrated radiative forcing due to a pulse emission of a unit mass of a gas. It can be given as an absolute GWP for gas i ($AGWP_i$) (usually in W m^{-2}

kg^{-1} year) or as a dimensionless value by dividing the $AGWP_i$ by the AGWP of a reference gas, normally CO_2. Thus, the GWP for gas *i* over a time horizon of *H* years is defined as:

$$GWP_i(H) = \frac{\int_0^H RF_i(t)dt}{\int_0^H RF_{CO_2}(t)dt} = \frac{AGWP_i(H)}{AGWP_{CO_2}(H)}.$$

IPCC has usually presented GWPs for a time horizon (*H*) of 20, 100, and 500 years (although IPCC AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013) only gave GWPs for 20 and 100 years). We use updated lifetimes and RE values presented in Section 3 to calculate GWPs for 20, 100, and 500 years as in H2013.

The models used to calculate the impulse response function for CO_2 (Joos et al., 2013) include climate-carbon cycle feedbacks, but usually no feedbacks are included for the non-CO_2 gases when metrics are calculated. IPCC AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013) included this feedback tentatively in the metric values (see their Table 8.7 and Supplementary Table 8.SM.16), which increased the GWP(100) values by 10-20%. Gasser et al. (2017) found that accounting for climate–carbon feedback increases the emission metrics of non-CO_2 species but, in most cases, less than indicated in AR5. They also found that when the feedback is removed for both the reference and target gas, the *relative* metric values are generally only modestly different compared to when the feedback is included in both (*absolute* metric values change more markedly); in the case of GWP(100) the differences are less than 1%. As pointed out by Gasser et al. (2017), including or excluding the climate–carbon feedback ultimately depends on the user's goal, but consistency should be ensured in either case. To resolve the consistency issue, we have excluded the climate-carbon feedback also for CO_2 by using the impulse response function for CO_2 based on the Gasser et al. (2017) simple Earth system model (see their Appendix C); their model shows very good agreement with Joos et al. (2013) when the climate-carbon feedback is included. Our documentation of input data and presentation of calculations allow for the inclusion of the climate-carbon feedback to our results in further studies or applications, both for CO_2 and the non-CO_2 compounds.

Changes to the parameters in $AGWP_{CO2}$ impact all GWP values, and the GWP(100) values presented in Section 3 are about 14% higher than if the old $AGWP_{CO2}$ from AR5 or H2013 had been used. This is due to two changes: (i) the impulse response function for CO_2 is updated as explained above and (ii) the RE of CO_2 is updated using 409.8 ppm for 2019 (Butler and Montzka, 2020) and the simplified expression for CO_2 RF presented in Etminan et al. (2016), which is an update of the formula from Myhre et al. (1998) used in IPCC assessment reports since TAR (IPCC, 2001). Amongst other improvements, Etminan et al. (2016) made more extensive use of line-by-line calculations compared to Myhre et al. (1998). Using the new formula, a 1 ppm change in the CO_2 concentration at current (year 2019) levels of CO_2 (409.8 ppm) and N_2O (331.9 ppb) (Butler and Montzka, 2020) gives a radiative efficiency for CO_2 of 0.012895 W m^{-2} ppm^{-1}. The new $AGWP_{CO2}$ values for 20, 100, and 500 year time horizons are 2.290×10^{-14}, 8.064×10^{-14}, and 2.694×10^{-13} W m^{-2} yr (kgCO_2)$^{-1}$, respectively. The $AGWP_{CO2}$(100) value in AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013) and H2013 was about 14% higher, mainly because we updated the impulse response function (accounts for about 8 of the 14% change) and because of a higher atmospheric concentration of CO_2 which lowers

its RE (accounts for ~5%), and slightly because of the new formula from Etminan et al. (2016) (accounts for ~1%). Accounting for all these changes, but including the climate-carbon feedback for CO_2, as has been done in much of the prior literature, would give $AGWP_{CO2}$ values which are 3%, 8% and 13% higher for 20, 100, and 500 year time horizons, respectively.

It is worth highlighting that the impact of increasing CO_2 mixing ratios on GWP values is the net result of two opposing effects. First, many CO_2 absorption features are saturated, or close to saturation, and hence the RE of CO_2 decreases as its mixing ratio increases. Second, the fraction of CO_2 remaining in the atmosphere (measured by the impulse response function) increases with CO_2 mixing ratio (see Figure 8.31 in Myhre et al., 2013). The first effect *decreases* $AGWP_{CO2}$ while the second effect *increases* $AGWP_{CO2}$. Hence, GWP calculations for optically thin gases which are defined as $AGWP_X/AGWP_{CO2}$ will change with CO_2 mixing ratio.

An alternative, the GTP was introduced by Shine et al. (2005). It uses the change in global mean temperature following a pulse emission for a chosen point in time as the impact parameter. While GWP is a metric integrated over time, the GTP is based on the temperature change per unit emissions for a selected year, *t* after the pulse emission. As for the GWP, the impact of CO_2 is normally used as reference:

$$GTP(t)_i = AGTP(t)_i / AGTP(t)_{CO2} = \Delta T(t)_i / \Delta T(t)_{CO2},$$

where AGTP (K kg^{-1}) is the absolute GTP. The GTP uses the same input as for GWP but in addition includes a temperature response function that represents the thermal inertia of the climate system. AR5 presented values for both GWP and GTP. Here we follow the method used by AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013) and H2013 for calculating GTPs, except that the impulse response function and RE for CO_2 are updated as explained above and the climate response parameters are updated from Boucher and Reddy (2008) to Geoffroy et al. (2013) (as given in Appendix C of Gasser et al. (2017)), which are based on an ensemble of models from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5) (Taylor et al., 2011) and involve a lower climate sensitivity (0.88 compared to 1.1 K $(W\ m^{-2})^{-1}$ in Boucher and Reddy (2008)). The new $AGTP_{CO2}$ values for 20, 50, and 100 year time horizons are 5.413×10^{-16}, 4.559×10^{-16}, and 4.146×10^{-16} K $(kgCO_2)^{-1}$, respectively. Including the climate-carbon feedback for CO_2, but keeping all other parameters the same, would give $AGTP_{CO2}$ values which are 5%, 8% and 11% higher, respectively.

There continues to be a vigorous debate about the applicability of different emission metrics (e.g. Myhre et al., 2013); metric choice depends on the particular policy context in which they are applied, and the degree to which continuity of choice is important in that context (e.g. Allen et al., 2018; Cain et al., 2019; Rogelj and Schleussner, 2019). A specific development has been the suggested use of metrics that compare one-off pulse emissions of long-lived gases (such as CO_2) with step-changes in emissions of short-lived species (e.g. gases with lifetimes less than a few decades), on the basis that this leads to a more informed comparison of their ultimate impact on temperature; such approaches can either adopt GWP values, but adapt their usage (Allen et al., 2016) or more directly compute the pulse-step

equivalence (W J Collins et al., 2019). In the context of this review, the important point is that all such metrics require the same set of inputs (RE and lifetimes).

It is important to note that the RE and GWP(100) calculations presented here only include the direct effect, while indirect effects can be important for several compounds. Some compounds, and particularly CFCs and halons, influence radiative forcing indirectly through depletion of stratospheric ozone as shown in other work (e.g. Daniel et al., 1995; WMO, 2019). The removal of organic compounds by reaction with OH in the troposphere acts as a source of ozone and prolongs the lifetime of methane, and this has been shown to be important for several hydrocarbons (W J Collins et al., 2002; Hodnebrog et al., 2018).

2.6 Uncertainties

An overview of estimated contributions to uncertainties associated with the radiative forcing of halocarbons was given in Table 1 of H2013. A total RE uncertainty of ~13% was estimated for compounds with lifetimes longer than about 5 years, and ~23% for compounds with lifetimes shorter than that. The much higher uncertainty for shorter-lived compounds is caused by the difficulty of estimating non-uniform horizontal and vertical distributions in the atmosphere, which in turn are dependent on the location of emissions (see Section 2.4).

Table 1 gives updated estimates of contributions to the total radiative forcing uncertainties. As in H2013, the uncertainty estimates are based on published literature and subjective judgment and we estimate the total uncertainty to be valid for a 5 to 95% (90%) confidence range. The total RF uncertainty, calculated using the root-sum-square (RSS) method, is ~14% and 24% for compounds with lifetimes longer and shorter than approximately 5 years, respectively. These total RF uncertainties are slightly higher than in H2013 and explanations are given below.

One issue with the use of laboratory data is that it does not always cover the entire spectral range for which radiative forcing is important (see e.g. Fig. 3). For example, the PNNL measurements mostly cover the 600 – 6500 cm^{-1} wavenumber range, and so their use would neglect any absorption (and hence forcing) at lower wavenumbers, although in general it extends to much higher wavenumbers than those in other datasets.

The uncertainty due to lack of spectral data at low wavenumbers cannot be assessed for every gas in our analysis, but there is some evidence to indicate its typical size. Highwood and Shine (2000) computed the contribution of wavenumbers less than 700 cm^{-1} to the RE for HFC-134a and found it contributed around 2% to the forcing. Bravo et al. (2010) presented an analysis of the RE due to a set of 7 perfluorocarbons. They compared the RE calculated for ab initio methods for the wavenumber interval 0-2500 cm^{-1} with calculations for the wavenumber interval 700-1400 cm^{-1}, chosen because it coincided with the wavenumber range for their associated laboratory measurements. Most of the additional absorption was at wavenumbers below 700 cm^{-1}. They found that the integrated absorption cross-sections and REs for the narrow range were within 2% for the lighter PFCs but this difference increased to 10% for heavier PFCs. Since many of the measured datasets (e.g. the PNNL data) use a broader wavelength range than 700-1400 cm^{-1}, it is unlikely that our estimates are systematically in error by such a large amount. Nevertheless, we introduce an additional

generic uncertainty to our estimates, which was not included in the analysis of H2013, of ~3% due to neglected bands (Table 1); clearly this could be systematically investigated in future work, perhaps by including ab initio calculations outside the range of measured cross-sections.

Another source of uncertainty not considered in H2013 is the contribution to RE from absorption of shortwave (SW), or solar, radiation in the near-infrared (3,000 to 14,000 cm^{-1}). There has been renewed interest in the SW forcing due to methane (e.g. W D Collins et al., 2018; Etminan et al., 2016). Etminan et al. (2016) find the direct effect of methane's near-IR bands enhances its forcing by 6% but there is an additional 9% impact via the effect of this absorption on stratospheric temperatures (and hence on longwave forcing). This contrasts with the impact of the near-IR bands of CO_2 which cause a decrease of a few percent, because much of the additional forcing is at higher altitudes. The contribution of these near-IR bands to RE is further complicated by the fact that it depends strongly on the overlap between these bands and those of water vapour (Etminan et al., 2016), many of which are saturated for typical atmospheric paths, making generic statements difficult.

The potential impact of SW absorption is difficult to constrain for the diverse range of gases discussed here, without much more detailed study, not least because many of the experimental data sets do not extend to such high wavenumbers (the PNNL data is a notable exception). For the heavier halogenated gases, the strongest fundamental and combination bands will generally be at lower wavenumbers, at which SW absorption is less important (see e.g. Bera et al., 2009). The lighter, more hydrogenated, gases, will have more significant absorption bands in the solar near-infrared but, on the other hand, these gases are likely to be much shorter-lived, so that their impact on stratospheric temperatures is likely to be lower. We introduce an additional uncertainty of ~5% due to the potential effect of this shortwave absorption (Table 1).

Since H2013, surface emissivity has been included as a source of uncertainty together with surface temperature and atmospheric temperature, and consequently the estimated contribution to RF uncertainty has been increased from ~3 to ~5% (Table 1). The stratospheric temperature adjustment is now based on a much more sophisticated method compared to the generic 10% increase used in H2013 (see Section 2.3), and we have lowered the uncertainty contribution for this term from ~4 to ~2%. The remaining sources of uncertainties and their estimated contributions given in Table 1 are unchanged and we refer to H2013 for detailed explanations of each term.

Uncertainties in the atmospheric lifetime of the compounds are also important for metric calculations, and since H2013, SPARC (2013) have provided recommended lifetime values and uncertainties for a range of halocarbons. Their estimates are derived using atmospheric chemistry-transport and inverse modelling, and analysis of atmospheric observations and laboratory measurements. Possible uncertainty ranges for most of the compounds in SPARC (2013) have been evaluated in Velders and Daniel (2014; their Table 1) and range from ±3 to ±33% (one standard deviation), depending on the compound; they are typically in the range from ±15 to ±20% (or ±25 to ±33% when converted from one standard deviation to 5-95% (90%) confidence range). However, Velders and Daniel (2014) point out that the possible uncertainty range is likely an overestimation of the true uncertainty

and the most likely range, given for some of the compounds, is substantially lower (±12 to ±20% when converted from one standard deviation to 5-95% (90%) confidence range).

GWP uncertainties are affected by uncertainties in the compound's lifetime, RE and the $AGWP_{CO2}$, and uncertainties in GWP and/or GTP have been investigated in previous studies (Boucher, 2012; Hodnebrog et al., 2013; Olivié and Peters, 2012; Reisinger et al., 2010; Velders and Daniel, 2014; Wuebbles et al., 1995). H2013 (see their Section 3.6.4) estimated GWP(100) uncertainties of ±38% and ±34% (5-95% (90%) confidence) for CFC-11 and HFC-134a, respectively. GWP(100) uncertainties for six HFCs in WMO (2015; their Table 5-6) were approximately in the range 30-50%, which is similar to the GWP(100) uncertainties for several ozone-depleting substances given in Velders and Daniel (2014; their Table 4). We estimate that the uncertainties given in H2013, WMO (2015) and Velders and Daniel (2014) (approximately in the range 30-50%) are similar for the GWP(100) values calculated here and are probably also representative for most other halocarbons with similar or longer lifetimes.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Updated Spectra, REs, and GWPs for the Most Abundant Halocarbons and Related Compounds

This section broadly follows the structure of Section 4.1 in H2013, where absorption cross sections and radiative efficiency estimates in the literature were reviewed and new RE and GWP calculations were presented. However, we limit this section to only include studies and spectra that were not included in H2013, and only to the 40 most abundant halocarbons presented in Table 7 of Meinshausen et al. (2017) (see Section 3.3 for other compounds). Also, only experimental spectra are used as a basis for our calculations here, unlike H2013 which included RE and GWP calculations for some compounds where only calculated spectra existed. In cases where spectra have been measured at different temperatures, we have used the spectra closest to room temperature (see Section 2.2 for a discussion of temperature dependence of cross sections). All REs are given for all-sky and with stratospheric temperature adjustment included (see Section 2.3). The lifetime-correction method from H2013, to account for a non-homogeneous vertical and horizontal distribution in the atmosphere, has been applied to the calculated REs (see Section 2.4).

Table 2 lists absorption cross sections that are new since H2013 and Tables S1-S6 in the supporting information list all (to the best of our knowledge) absorption cross sections and reported RE values from the literature. Table S1-S6 also include calculations using the Pinnock curve from H2013 for easier identification of possible changes in RE that are due to the updated Pinnock curve from Shine and Myhre (2020). We have followed the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, IUPAC, naming scheme and included the unique Chemical Abstract Service Registry Number, CASRN, for each compound listed in the tables. Table 3 presents updated atmospheric lifetimes, REs and GWP(100) values and discussions of the results are given below for each group of compounds. RE values with more

significant figures, needed to reproduce the GWP(100) values, are given in the supporting information.

3.1.1 Chlorofluorocarbons

Since H2013, new spectra have been included for the five most-abundant CFCs, but the RE remains unchanged for four of the compounds (Tables 2-3). CFC-115 now has a much larger RE than in H2013 (0.25 compared to 0.20 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}) due to the addition of spectra from the PNNL database (Sharpe et al., 2004). In H2013, and in two out of four previous studies (Jain et al., 2000; Myhre and Stordal, 1997), the CFC-115 spectrum used is that from McDaniel et al. (1991), which has an integrated absorption cross-section of 1.21×10^{-16} cm^2 $molecule^{-1}$ cm^{-1} and gives an RE of 0.20 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} in our calculations (Table S1). Recently, Totterdill et al. (2016) measured the IR absorption spectrum of CFC-115 and performed detailed LBL radiative transfer calculations to determine its RE. Their integrated absorption spectrum of 1.19×10^{-16} cm^2 $molecule^{-1}$ cm^{-1} is in relatively good agreement with McDaniel et al. (1991) and their resulting RE of 0.21 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} agrees well with H2013. The PNNL spectrum for CFC-115 has a much higher integrated absorption cross-section of 2.01×10^{-16} cm^2 $molecule^{-1}$ cm^{-1} and our calculations give a RE of 0.32 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}. A comparison between the McDaniel et al. (1991) and PNNL absorption spectra shows that the locations and relative strength of the main absorption bands are similar, but that the overall magnitude of the bands are higher in the PNNL spectrum (not shown). Due to the large difference between the two spectra, we have also inspected the PNNL spectra measured at different temperatures (278 and 323 K), and these have similar integrated absorption cross-sections and yield similar RE values as the 296 K PNNL spectrum (Table S1), and so give no indication of error in the 296 K PNNL spectra. A fourth source for CFC-115 spectra is Fisher et al. (1990) who report an integrated absorption cross-section of 1.74×10^{-16} cm^2 $molecule^{-1}$ cm^{-1}, which is higher than McDaniel et al. (1991) and lower than (but nearer to) PNNL. Reasons for the large difference between the spectra remain unknown. We have calculated our new RE value of 0.25 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} by averaging the RE values based on the three available spectra (McDaniel et al., 1991; Sharpe et al., 2004; Totterdill et al., 2016).

The stratospheric temperature adjustment for the CFCs ranges from 9 to 12% increase of the instantaneous RE, and the generic 10% increase used in H2013 was a relatively good approximation for these compounds (Fig. 4). (Note that the 10% assumption was not used for CFC-11 and CFC-12 in H2013.) The atmospheric lifetimes of the five CFCs have been updated based on WMO (2019) since H2013, most notably for CFC-11 (52 vs. 45 years in H2013) and CFC-115 (540 vs. 1020 years in H2013). A combination of updated lifetimes, REs and the $AGWP_{CO2}$ leads to higher GWP(100) values for all five CFCs (Table 3, Fig. 5).

3.1.2 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons

Six new spectra have been included for the three most-abundant HCFCs in this category, but their REs are unchanged when rounded to two decimals (Tables 2-3). The updated $AGWP_{CO2}$, and slightly longer lifetimes for two of the compounds (HCFC-141b and HCFC-142b), contribute to higher GWP(100) (Table 3, Table S2, Fig. 5).

3.1.3 Hydrofluorocarbons

Since H2013, spectra have been added to eight of the 11 most-abundant HFC compounds (Table 2) and in most cases this led to little or no change in the RE (Table 3). For HFC-23, the two new spectra (Harrison, 2013; Sharpe et al., 2004) each have higher integrated absorption cross-sections than the two spectra used in H2013 (Table S3); this leads to a higher RE for this compound (0.19 compared to 0.17 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} in H2013). Another contributing factor is the stratospheric temperature adjustment. The RE is now 13% higher than the instantaneous RE for HFC-23 (Fig. 4), while in H2013 a generic 10% increase was used. In fact, all 11 HFC compounds have stratospheric temperature adjustments larger than 10% and most of them around 13%.

For HFC-43-10mee, the H2013 RE value of 0.42 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} was not calculated using new spectra but was based on the RE given in the 4th assessment report (AR4) (Forster et al., 2007), which was again based on Fisher (personal communication) (IPCC, 1994). Recently, Le Bris et al. (2018) measured the absorption cross-section and calculated a much lower RE of 0.36 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} for HFC-43-10mee when using the method in H2013 (Table S3). They also showed that REs calculated with their spectrum agreed very well with the PNNL spectrum. Here, we have used the spectra from both Le Bris et al. (2018) and the PNNL database and calculated a RE of 0.36 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} (Table 3), in excellent agreement with Le Bris et al. (2018).

Updated GWP(100) values are higher for all HFCs (Table 3, Fig. 5), and this is due to a combination of updated $AGWP_{CO2}$, higher RE values for several compounds (HFC-43-10mee is a notable exception), and longer lifetime for all compounds except HFC-227ea and HFC-236fa (Table S3).

3.1.4 Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons

Nine new spectra have been added for the five most-abundant compounds since H2013 (Table 2). Wallington et al. (2016) made new measurements of the absorption spectra of the chloromethanes CH_3Cl, CH_2Cl_2, $CHCl_3$, and CCl_4, and provided recommended spectra for these compounds by combining existing and new experimental data. We have used their recommended spectra to calculate REs for all four chloromethanes (see Text S4 for an explanation of the choice of spectra). The resulting RE for CCl_4 of 0.17 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} is unchanged since H2013 (Table 3; Table S4), where the spectrum from Nemtchinov and Varanasi (2003) was used. The RE of $CHCl_3$ is lower than in H2013 (0.07 vs. 0.08 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}), where the spectrum from Vander Auwera (2000) was used. For CH_3Cl and CH_2Cl_2, new RE calculations were not carried out for H2013 but retained from IPCC AR4 (Forster et al., 2007). Our calculations using the Wallington et al. (2016) spectrum show that the RE value of 0.03 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} for CH_2Cl_2 is unchanged since H2013 when rounded to two decimal places. The RE of CH_3Cl is now 0.005 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}, which is lower than the 0.01 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} value in H2013 (which originated from AR4), but in excellent agreement with the original instantaneous RE value of 0.005 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} from Grossman et al. (1997).

For CH_3CCl_3, we added the spectrum from the HITRAN 2016 database, which was again adopted from the PNNL database, and calculate a lower RE value compared to H2013 (0.06 vs. 0.07 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}) (Tables 2-3). The addition of the new spectrum did not change the RE, but the updated Pinnock curve and particularly the method to account for stratospheric temperature adjustment (see Section 2.3) led to the lower value (Table S4). For

all five compounds in this group, the stratospheric temperature adjustment is lower than the generic 10% increase used in H2013, and ranges from 0% change to a 9% increase of the instantaneous RE (Fig. 4). GWP(100) values are lower for CH_3Cl, and higher for the remaining four compounds (Table 3, Fig. 5). Lifetime updates for four of the compounds contribute to the changes in GWP 100-year values.

3.1.5 Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons

Since H2013, absorption spectra from the HITRAN 2016 and PNNL databases have been included in the RE calculations for each of the four most-abundant compounds (Table 2). Changes in RE since H2013 are negligible (<5%) for the three halons, while CH_3Br shows a lower RE (0.004 vs. 0.005 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}) (Table 3), mainly because the stratospheric temperature adjustment is lower (~4%) compared to the generic 10% increase used in H2013 (Fig. 4). Since H2013, lifetimes are longer for Halon-1301 and Halon-2402 while GWP(100) values are higher for all four compounds (Table 3, Table S5, Fig. 5).

3.1.6 Fully Fluorinated Species

For nine of the 12 most-abundant compounds, spectra have been added from the HITRAN 2016 database (where spectra were again adopted from the PNNL database) since H2013 (Table 2). Still, the calculated RE values for all these compounds are relatively similar to those reported in H2013 (Table 3). Sulfuryl fluoride shows the largest change of around 5%, mainly due to a slightly higher integrated absorption cross section in the new PNNL spectrum compared to that of Andersen et al. (2009), which was used in H2013 (Table S6). This is in turn partly because the PNNL spectrum also includes a weak absorption band around 550 cm^{-1} (not shown).

For NF_3, two new spectra have been added since H2013 and the calculated RE value is now based on three different spectra (Robson et al., 2006; Sharpe et al., 2004; Totterdill et al., 2016) (Tables 2-3; Table S6). The RE value of 0.20 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} is the same as in H2013, but the RE of 0.25 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} presented in Totterdill et al. (2016) is substantially higher (>20%). Totterdill et al. (2016) attribute the differences to a higher integrated absorption cross-section compared to Robson et al. (2006) (which was used to calculate the RE value in H2013 and AR5), but our RE calculation differs by less than 5% when using spectra from each of the two studies separately (Table S6) so this is only part of the reason. Other potential reasons include differences between the radiative transfer models, treatment of clouds, and stratospheric temperature adjustment.

The RE of SF_6 has had a relatively wide range in reported literature values from 0.49 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} (Jain et al., 2000) to 0.68 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} (H Zhang et al., 2011) (Table S6). Since H2013, Kovács et al. (2017) have made new measurements of the SF_6 absorption spectrum and used a LBL model to calculate a RE value of 0.59 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}. Their spectrum is not included here, but their RE value is close to our calculated RE value of 0.57 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} using spectra from the HITRAN and PNNL databases; this value was also presented in H2013 and used in AR5.

The stratospheric temperature adjustment for the fully fluorinated species ranges from 8 to 13% increase of the instantaneous RE (Fig. 4). For most of these compounds, the generic

10% increase used in H2013 was a relatively good approximation for stratospheric temperature adjustment (note that the 10% assumption was not used for PFC-14 in H2013).

GWP(100) values are higher than in H2013 for all compounds in this category (Table 3, Table S6, Fig. 5), mainly due to the updated $AGWP_{CO2}$. The only lifetime change since H2013 is for NF_3, which has a longer lifetime of 569 years compared to the value of 500 years that was used earlier. While we have adopted atmospheric lifetimes from WMO (2019), we note that two recent studies have calculated substantially shorter lifetimes for SF_6 than the widely used estimate of 3,200 years (Ravishankara et al., 1993). If the shorter SF_6 lifetimes of 1,278 [1,120-1,475] years (Kovács et al., 2017) or 850 [580-1,400] years (Ray et al., 2017) would have been used instead of 3,200 years, our GWP(100) value of 26,700 would not have been significantly affected (by less than 5%), but a shorter lifetime could be important for metric calculations using time horizons of several hundred years.

3.2 Present-day Radiative Forcing from Halocarbons and Related Compounds

Figure 6 shows pre-industrial to present-day radiative forcing for the halocarbons and related compounds discussed in Section 3.1. RF for each group of compounds is compared against that reported in AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013 - see their Table 8.2), when atmospheric concentrations from 2011 were used. We have used the atmospheric concentrations from Meinshausen et al. (2017) for 2014, but updated with 2019 observations from Butler and Montzka (2020) when available (see Table 4 for details). In the RF calculation, we use the pre-industrial concentrations recommended by Meinshausen et al. (2017); these are non-zero for CH_3Cl, $CHCl_3$, CH_2Cl_2, CH_3Br, and PFC-14/CF_4, and assumed to be zero for the remaining compounds (see Table 4 footnote).

When using the same RE values as in AR5 (from H2013), we see that the change from 2011 to 2014/19 concentrations has led to a decrease in radiative forcing of CFCs (Fig. 6). At the same time, concentrations of the CFC replacement compounds HCFCs and HFCs have increased and this leads to stronger RF for these compound groups, most notably for HFCs with a 83% increase in the RF. In total, RF due to increasing concentrations of HCFCs and HFCs more than outweighs the decrease in RF due to declining concentrations of CFCs. For the present-day (2014/19) RF, nearly all compound groups show slightly higher RF when using new REs compared to using AR5 REs. The total present-day (2014/19) RF due to halocarbons is 0.38 [0.33 to 0.43] W m^{-2} compared to 0.36 [0.32 to 0.40] W m^{-2} in AR5, and while updated RE values push present-day RF upwards (by ~4 mW m^{-2}; green vs. purple bars in Fig. 6), the main reason for the RF increase can be attributed to increased concentrations (yellow vs. green bars in Fig. 6).

Table 4 shows that the main contributors to the ~4 mW m^{-2} increase in RF are the updated RE values for CFC-12, HCFC-22 and HFC-134a. Chloromethane has the largest relative change in RF (and RE) with a 53% decrease. While its atmospheric concentration is the highest among the compounds, its high abundance is mainly due to natural sources (WMO, 2019) and its influence on anthropogenic RF is therefore much smaller than would otherwise be expected. Here we have assumed a pre-industrial value of 457 ppt from Meinshausen et al. (2017) who used a simple budget equation for its derivation, and it should

be noted that this number is associated with uncertainties due to a lack of observations. Table 4 further shows that CFC-115 and HFC-43-10mee, respectively, have the second and third largest relative RF change due to new REs. While the new REs of methyl chloride and HFC-43-10mee are lower compared to H2013, the RE of CFC-115 is higher (see Section 3.1).

The RF of 0.38 W m^{-2} due to halocarbons and other weak atmospheric absorbers can be put into context by comparison with the RF due to increased CO_2 concentrations. When using the simplified formula from Etminan et al. (2016), and assuming pre-industrial (1750) and 2019 CO_2 concentrations of 278 ppm (Myhre et al., 2013) and 409.8 ppm (Butler and Montzka, 2020), respectively (and of 270 ppb and 331.9 ppb, respectively, for N_2O), the present-day RF due to CO_2 is 2.09 W m^{-2}. Thus, the RF due to halocarbons and other weak absorbers is 18% of the RF due to increased CO_2 concentrations.

3.3 Updated Spectra, REs, and GWPs for Other Weak Atmospheric Absorbers

This section has a similar structure to Section 3.1 but presents and discusses lifetimes, REs, and GWP(100) values for compounds other than the 40 most abundant halocarbons and related compounds. Table 5 shows results for the compound groups included in our previous review (H2013), and brief discussions of these results are given in Sections 3.3.1-3.3.7 below. Tables S7-S13 in the supporting information provide information on how the RE numbers were derived and list previously published absorption cross sections and reported RE values from the literature. In addition to the compound groups included in H2013, we have made RE calculations for a number of other compounds, mainly based on absorption spectra from the HITRAN 2016 (Kochanov et al., 2019) and PNNL (Sharpe et al., 2004) databases. These results are presented in Tables S14-S20 and a brief discussion of these results is given in Section 3.3.8 below.

3.3.1 Chlorofluorocarbons

The CFC-13 spectrum from the PNNL database was added and led to a higher RE (0.28 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}) compared to H2013 (0.26 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}) (Table 5; Table S7). Since H2013, several CFC compounds have been added. CFC-112, CFC-112a and CFC-113a were detected in the atmosphere recently (Laube et al., 2014) and the atmospheric impact of these compounds have been quantified (Davis et al., 2016; Etminan et al., 2014). We used the spectra from Etminan et al. (2014), Davis et al. (2016), and PNNL, and confirmed the high RE and GWP(100) values for these compounds. Calculations have further been made for three additional potent greenhouse gases (CFC-114a, E-R316c and Z-R316c) using spectra from Davis et al. (2016) and Papadimitriou et al. (2013).

3.3.2 Hydrochlorofluorocarbons

Absorption spectra from the PNNL database were added for four HCFCs in H2013 (HCFC-21, HCFC-123, HCFC-123a, HCFC-124); the new RE values are in good agreement (difference of 5% or less) with the H2013 values (Table 5; Table S8). The spectrum from Gierczak et al. (2014) has been added for HCFO-1233zd(E), but the increased RE value since

H2013 is mainly due to the longer lifetime and therefore less influence from the lifetime-correction factor.

HCFC-133a has been identified in the atmosphere recently (Laube et al., 2014). RE and GWP(100) values are given for this compound based on absorption spectra from three sources (Etminan et al., 2014; McGillen et al., 2015; Sharpe et al., 2004). Calculations have been made for six additional HCFCs since H2013 and most notable is the relatively long-lived HCFC-124a (lifetime 17 years) with RE and GWP(100) values of 0.25 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} and 2,170, respectively. In addition to the compounds listed here, Papanastasiou et al. (2018) present GWP(100) values for a large range of HCFCs using theoretically determined absorption spectra.

3.3.3 Hydrofluorocarbons

RE calculations for three HFCs in H2013 (HFC-41, HFC-134, HFO-1141) are now based on additional absorption spectra from PNNL. The RE value for one of these (HFO-1141) in H2013 was only based on a reported RE in the literature (Table 5; Table S9) rather than our calculations. For seven additional compounds, RE values in H2013 were based on reported RE in the literature and not our own calculations. These RE values have been retained here but the GWP(100) values are updated to include the effect of changes in lifetime and the AGWP of CO_2. For most of the HFCs, changes in RE values since H2013 are minor and mostly reflect changes in the method to account for stratospheric temperature adjustment, which, for the HFCs, is generally higher than the 10% assumption used in H2013 (Fig. 4). Additional factors include the revised Pinnock et al. curve (see Section 2.3) and, particularly for the short-lived compounds, changes in lifetime which influence the factor to account for non-uniform distribution in the atmosphere (see Section 2.4). Since H2013, RE values have been added for 14 compounds, of which 4 compounds are based on calculations using absorption spectra from PNNL.

3.3.4 Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons

Among the 33 compounds in this category, only one (1,2-dichloroethane) was included in H2013 (Table 5). For all these compounds, RE calculations are based on additional absorption spectra from the PNNL database, and for 1,2-dichloroethane the RE value of 0.01 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} is the same as in H2013 (when rounded to two decimals) (Table S10). Atmospheric lifetimes for most of the compounds in Table 5 are not available and the RE values listed are most likely upper limits since a uniform distribution in the atmosphere is assumed.

3.3.5 Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons

Six compounds in this category were also included in H2013 and for two of these (dibromomethane and halon-1202), new spectra from PNNL have been included in the RE calculations (Table 5; Table S11). The RE values remain unchanged for all six compounds (when rounded to two decimals). RE calculations have been made for 10 compounds in addition to those presented in H2013 and these are based on nine absorption spectra from PNNL and one from HITRAN2016.

3.3.6 Fully Fluorinated Species

Among the 10 compounds that were included in H2013, three of the four compounds with a very long lifetime (800 years or more) have new RE values that are less than 5% different from H2013 (Table 5; Table S12). Octafluorocyclopentene was estimated to have a RE of 0.08 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} in H2013, based on literature instantaneous RE values which were increased by 10% to crudely account for stratospheric temperature adjustment, and further adjusted by applying a lifetime-correction. Since H2013 the lifetime of octafluorocyclopentene has been revised upwards from 31 days to 1.1 years (WMO, 2019). We do not have the absorption spectrum and our recommended RE of 0.25 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} is from N Zhang et al. (2017) who use a lifetime of 0.715 years. For the five remaining compounds with lifetimes of 31 days or less the new RE values are the same (after rounding) as in H2013 (see Table S12 for RE values with more significant figures).

Eight new compounds have been added since H2013 and one of the new compounds, heptacosafluorotributylamine / PFTBA, was recently observed in the Arctic (Schlabach, 2018). Its absorption spectrum has been measured in three recent studies (Bernard et al., 2018; Godin et al., 2016; Hong et al., 2013) and using the spectra from Hong et al. (2013) and Godin et al. (2016) we calculate a RE value of 0.91 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}. Bernard et al. (2018) measured spectra for three other perfluoroamines and report large RE values also for these compounds (in the range 0.61-0.95 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}). Lifetimes are estimated to be more than 1000 years (WMO, 2019) and therefore these compounds are potent greenhouse gases. Two of the compounds added are based on RE values from the literature and RE for the remaining two compounds have been calculated using absorption spectra from PNNL. Heptafluoroisobutyronitrile is a potential replacement for sulfur hexafluoride and its atmospheric chemistry has been studied by Blazquez et al. (2017) and Andersen et al. (2017). The RE value of 0.25 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1} in Table 5 is an average of the REs from the two studies.

3.3.7 Halogenated Alcohols and Ethers

Most of the 106 compounds in this category were also assessed in H2013. REs for 25 compounds were added in the present review (Table 5, Table S13) based on new absorption spectra or RE values. REs for 30 of the 106 compounds are based on additional absorption spectra from HITRAN2016 (13 spectra), PNNL (14 spectra), and Orkin et al. (2014) (3 spectra), and 10 of these compounds were also included in H2013. New absorption spectra have contributed to RE values that are significantly (>5%) different from H2013 for: HFE-143a, 2,2,3,3,3-pentafluoropropan-1-ol, difluoro(methoxy)methane, vinyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate, ethyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate, allyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate, 2-fluoroethanol, and 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol. For some of these compounds a change in estimated lifetime is the main contributor to the change in RE (through the fractional correction factor).

We note that in H2013, three compounds were accidently listed twice with the same CASRN, but with different lifetime, RE, and GWP(100). The compounds are HG-02, HG-03, and 2,2,3,3,4,4,4-Heptafluoro-1-butanol ($CF_3CF_2CF_2CH_2OH$), with CAS numbers 205367–61–9, 173350–37–3, and 375–01–9, respectively. This has been corrected in Tables 5 and S13. Six compounds were given slightly erroneous GWP(100) values in H2013: HG-20, HG-30, HG'-02, HG'-03, $(CF_3)_2CHOCHO$, and HG-04 due to an error in their assigned molecular weights. Their lifetimes and REs were not affected. Their GWP(100) values have

been corrected in Tables 5 and S13 (HG-20 and HG-30 are not included because of missing experimental spectra).

3.3.8 Other compounds

In addition to the seven compound groups listed in Tables 3 and 5, RE values for the following eight compound groups not considered in H2013 are presented in the supporting information: hydrocarbons (Table S14), alcohols, ethers and other oxygenated hydrocarbons (Table S15), iodocarbons and hydroiodocarbons (Table S16), nitriles, amines and other nitrogenated hydrocarbons (Table S17), sulfur containing compounds (Table S18), silicon containing compounds (Table S19), and other compounds (Table S20). In contrast to the compounds presented in Tables S1-13, the previous literature has not been reviewed for these compounds. Rather, RE values presented in Tables S14-S20 are for the most part purely from calculations based on available absorption spectra from the HITRAN2016 and PNNL databases. It is also important to note that the RE values assume, with a few exceptions, constant horizontal and vertical atmospheric distribution and are thus regarded as upper estimates.

4. Summary and Conclusions

We present a comprehensive assessment of the radiative efficiencies and global warming potentials for a large number of halocarbons and other weak atmospheric absorbers. The present work is an update of our review in H2013 where a consistent method for calculating RE was used for all compounds. A major advantage of using a common method for calculating REs is that the RE and GWP values for different compounds can be directly compared. This method has now been updated, and best estimate RE values have been calculated based on approximately 700 experimental absorption cross sections, versus 200 in H2013. The majority of the new spectra have been obtained from the HITRAN2016 and PNNL databases which were not included in our previous review.

Best estimate REs based on experimental spectra are now provided for more than 600 compounds compared to 168 compounds in H2013 (221 compounds when including REs based on calculated spectra). Most of the REs are based on our calculations, while some are based on published values. Figure 7 shows a comparison of our updated RE values with those presented in H2013 (and used in IPCC AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013)) for the 177 compounds included in both studies. For compounds with RE > 0.5 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}, changes are less than 5%. For compounds with RE < 0.5 W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}, 61 compounds have RE values which differ by more than 5% from H2013, and 42 differ by more than 10%.

We have adopted recommended atmospheric lifetimes from the literature and, when available, calculated GWP values. In the main part of the paper (Table 3 and 5) we have chosen to show only GWPs for a 100-year time horizon in addition to the lifetimes and RE values. However, many metrics exist, and the choice of metric and time horizon depends on the context in which they are used (see Section 2.5). Table 16 of H2013 presented GWP values for 20, 100, and 500 year time horizons in addition to GTPs for 20, 50, and 100 year time horizons for a selection of compounds. Table 6 shows updated numbers for these

compounds, and (A)GWP and (A)GTP values for the same time horizons are given for all compounds in the supporting information.

In principle, and as noted by H2013, it would be desirable to calculate the Effective Radiative Forcing (ERF) (Myhre et al., 2013) which includes rapid adjustments beyond stratospheric temperature; ERF better represents the ultimate impact of a gas on surface temperature. It remains impracticable to calculate ERF for the gases discussed here (see Shine and Myhre (2020) for discussion) because ERF requires computationally-expensive calculations using general circulation models. The radiation codes in these models do not have sufficient spectral resolution to properly represent differences between the many halocarbons presented here, and the model's unforced variability would be much larger than the RF at their current, or likely future, concentrations. Although excellent progress has been made in understanding the generic nature of rapid adjustments and inter-model differences for many climate forcing agents (e.g. Smith et al., 2018), this has not yet extended to the halocarbons in a way that would allow a reliable generic correction to be made to the RFs calculated here.

One interesting potential consequence of revisions in the GWP(100) of halocarbons is the impact on existing legislation. For example, the European Union's legislation on the usage of fluorinated greenhouse gases (EUR-Lex, 2014), in part, puts restrictions on usages of gases based on their GWP(100); it places dates on prohibition of marketing certain equipment which uses products with GWP(100) values exceeding 150, 1500 and 2500. Within that legislation, the GWP(100) values are clearly defined as those mostly originating from AR4 (Forster et al., 2007) but it does not appear to account for the uncertainties inherent in those GWP(100) values. Some of the updates presented here would push gases that were on one side of these GWP(100) boundaries to the other side. For example, HFC-152a has now breached the 150 boundary (172 compared to 138), and HFC-134a has breached the 1500 boundary (1600 compared to 1300). Hence future updates to legislation would either have to stick to using outdated values, amend the boundaries between allowed and prohibited fluorinated gases, or else decide that some gases that were previously accepted for certain usages, are no longer so. Similarly, Japan's "Act on Rational Use and Proper Management of Fluorocarbons" has target values for GWP(100) (at values of 100, 150, 750 and 1500) for different products (MEGJ, 2016) as does Canada's "Ozone-depleting Substances and Halocarbon Alternatives Regulations" (MJGC, 2019), with various products limited at different values of GWP(100) (150, 750, 1400, 1500 and 2200). Table 7 gives an overview of the six (out of the 40 most abundant) compounds that enter a new policy category due to our updated GWP(100) values. All six compounds show higher GWP(100) than in H2013, and updates to lifetimes and the $AGWP_{CO2}(100)$ explain most of the increase for these compounds. A considerable part of the GWP(100) increase due to updated $AGWP_{CO2}(100)$ (around 5 out of the 14%) arises solely because of increasing CO_2 concentrations and thereby reduced radiative efficiency of CO_2 since H2013 (see Section 2.5). Hence, it can be anticipated that continued accumulation of CO_2 in the atmosphere will lead to changes in GWP values for weak atmospheric absorbers also in future updates.

Finally, we have combined our new updated RE values with present-day atmospheric concentrations of halocarbons to determine their radiative forcing. We find that the most abundant halocarbons cause a present-day RF of 0.38 [0.33 to 0.43] W m^{-2}, compared to 0.36

[0.32 to 0.40] W m^{-2} in AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013) and this is almost 20% of the pre-industrial (1750) to present-day (2019) RF due to CO_2. Most of the increase in halocarbon forcing since AR5 can be attributed to increasing concentrations of CFC replacement compounds (HCFCs and HFCs) which more than outweigh the forcing due to decreasing concentrations of CFCs. However, the stronger halocarbon RF is also a consequence of updated RE values, which are slightly higher compared to AR5 for some of the most abundant compounds.

Acknowledgments and Data

Funding from the Research Council of Norway for arranging two workshops on the topic of halocarbon metrics is acknowledged (grant no. 230618 and 240712). The CICERO authors acknowledge funding from the Norwegian Environment Agency. We thank Deborah Ottinger at the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for letting us know that three compounds in our 2013 review paper were accidently listed twice. KS thanks Raquel Jurado for help in identifying national fluorocarbon legislation which uses particular GWP values. We thank all providers of experimental absorption spectra for making their data available. We further thank the Editor for handling the manuscript and the three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments that helped improve the manuscript. Datasets for this research are included in these papers (and their supplementary information files): Shine and Myhre (2020), Hodnebrog et al. (2013), and those referenced in Table 2. Further datasets for this research are described in these papers: Kochanov et al. (2019), Sharpe et al. (2004), Jacquinet-Husson et al. (2016).

References

Allen, M. R., J. S. Fuglestvedt, K. P. Shine, A. Reisinger, R. T. Pierrehumbert, and P. M. Forster (2016), New use of global warming potentials to compare cumulative and short-lived climate pollutants, *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, *6*(8), 773-+, doi: 10.1038/nclimate2998.

Allen, M. R., K. P. Shine, J. S. Fuglestvedt, R. J. Millar, M. Cain, D. J. Frame, and A. H. Macey (2018), A solution to the misrepresentations of CO_2-equivalent emissions of short-lived climate pollutants under ambitious mitigation, *npj Clim. Atmos. Sci.*, *1*, 8, doi: 10.1038/s41612-018-0026-8.

Andersen, M. P. S., D. R. Blake, F. S. Rowland, M. D. Hurley, and T. J. Wallington (2009), Atmospheric Chemistry of Sulfuryl Fluoride: Reaction with OH Radicals, CI Atoms and O_3, Atmospheric Lifetime, IR Spectrum, and Global Warming Potential, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *43*(4), 1067-1070, doi: 10.1021/es802439f.

Andersen, M. P. S., M. Kyte, S. T. Andersen, C. J. Nielsen, and O. J. Nielsen (2017), Atmospheric Chemistry of $(CF_3)_2CFCN$: A Replacement Compound for the Most Potent Industrial Greenhouse Gas, SF6, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *51*(3), 1321-1329, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.6b03758.

Ballard, J., R. J. Knight, D. A. Newnham, J. Vander Auwera, M. Herman, G. Di Lonardo, G. Masciarelli, F. M. Nicolaisen, J. A. Beukes, L. K. Christensen, R. McPheat, G. Duxbury, R. Freckleton, and K. P. Shine (2000a), An intercomparison of laboratory measurements of absorption cross-sections and integrated absorption intensities for HCFC-22, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 109-128, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(99)00211-3.

Ballard, J., R. J. Knight, D. A. Newnham, J. Vander Auwera, M. Herman, G. DiLonardo, G. Masciarelli, F. M. Nicolaisen, J. A. Buekes, L. K. Christiansen, G. Duxbury, R. McPheat, K. P. Shine, E. J. Highwood, R. Freckleton, C. Bruning, and Swagg (2000b), SWAGG Project - Introduction, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 107-108.

Bera, P. P., J. S. Francisco, and T. J. Lee (2009), Identifying the Molecular Origin of Global Warming, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *113*(45), 12694-12699, doi: 10.1021/jp905097g.

Bernard, F., D. K. Papanastasiou, V. C. Papadimitriou, and J. B. Burkholder (2018), Infrared absorption spectra of $N(C_xF_{2x}+1)_3$ x=2-5 perfluoroamines, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *211*, 166-171, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2018.02.039.

Betowski, D., C. Bevington, and T. C. Allison (2016), Estimation of Radiative Efficiency of Chemicals with Potentially Significant Global Warming Potential, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *50*(2), 790-797, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b04154.

Blazquez, S., M. Antinolo, O. J. Nielsen, J. Albaladejo, and E. Jimenez (2017), Reaction kinetics of $(CF_3)_2CFCN$ with OH radicals as a function of temperature (278-358 K): A good replacement for greenhouse SF_6?, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *687*, 297-302, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2017.09.039.

Boucher, O. (2012), Comparison of physically-and economically-based CO_2-equivalences for methane, *Earth Syst. Dynam.*, *3*(1), 49-61, doi: 10.5194/esd-3-49-2012.

Boucher, O., and M. S. Reddy (2008), Climate trade-off between black carbon and carbon dioxide emissions, *Energy Policy*, 193-200, doi: DOI 10.1016/j.enpol.2007.08.039.

Bravo, I., A. Aranda, M. D. Hurley, G. Marston, D. R. Nutt, K. P. Shine, K. Smith, and T. J. Wallington (2010), Infrared absorption spectra, radiative efficiencies, and global warming potentials of perfluorocarbons: Comparison between experiment and theory, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *115*(D24317), doi: 10.1029/2010jd014771.

Butler, J. H., and S. A. Montzka (2020), The NOAA Annual Greenhouse Gas Index (AGGI), https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/aggi/aggi.html, last access: June 11, 2020*Rep.*

Cain, M., J. Lynch, M. R. Allen, J. S. Fuglestvedt, D. J. Frame, and A. H. Macey (2019), Improved calculation of warming-equivalent emissions for short-lived climate pollutants, *npj Clim. Atmos. Sci.*, *2*, 7, doi: 10.1038/s41612-019-0086-4.

Christidis, N., M. D. Hurley, S. Pinnock, K. P. Shine, and T. J. Wallington (1997), Radiative forcing of climate change by CFC-11 and possible CFC-replacements, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *102*(D16), 19597-19609, doi: 10.1029/97jd01137.

Collins, W. D., D. R. Feldman, C. Kuo, and N. H. Nguyen (2018), Large regional shortwave forcing by anthropogenic methane informed by Jovian observations, *Sci. Adv.*, *4*(9), 9, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aas9593.

Collins, W. D., V. Ramaswamy, M. D. Schwarzkopf, Y. Sun, R. W. Portmann, Q. Fu, S. E. B. Casanova, J. L. Dufresne, D. W. Fillmore, P. M. D. Forster, V. Y. Galin, L. K. Gohar, W. J. Ingram, D. P. Kratz, M. P. Lefebvre, J. Li, P. Marquet, V.

Oinas, Y. Tsushima, T. Uchiyama, and W. Y. Zhong (2006), Radiative forcing by well-mixed greenhouse gases: Estimates from climate models in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *111*(D14), doi: 10.1029/2005jd006713.

Collins, W. J., R. G. Derwent, C. E. Johnson, and D. S. Stevenson (2002), The oxidation of organic compounds in the troposphere and their global warming potentials, *Clim. Change*, *52*(4), 453-479, doi: 10.1023/a:1014221225434.

Collins, W. J., D. J. Frame, J. Fuglestvedt, and K. P. Shine (2019), Stable climate metrics for emissions of short and long-lived species – combining steps and pulses, *Environmental Research Letters*.

Daniel, J. S., S. Solomon, and D. L. Albritton (1995), On the evaluation of halocarbon radiative forcing and global warming potentials, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *100*(D1), 1271-1285, doi: 10.1029/94jd02516.

Davila, K. L., L. E. Seijas, R. Almeida, and L. Rincon (2017), The performance of HF and DFT/B3LYP in the estimation of the radiative efficiencies of greenhouse gases, *Journal of Computational Methods in Sciences and Engineering*, *17*(1), 187-197, doi: 10.3233/jcm-160672.

Davis, M. E., F. Bernard, M. R. McGillen, E. L. Fleming, and J. B. Burkholder (2016), UV and infrared absorption spectra, atmospheric lifetimes, and ozone depletion and global warming potentials for CCl2FCCl2F (CFC-112), CCl3CClF2 (CFC-112a), CCl3CF3 (CFC-113a), and CCl2FCF3 (CFC-114a), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *16*(12), 8043-8052, doi: 10.5194/acp-16-8043-2016.

Etminan, M., G. Myhre, E. J. Highwood, and K. P. Shine (2016), Radiative forcing of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide: A significant revision of the methane radiative forcing, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *43*(24), 12614-12623, doi: 10.1002/2016gl071930.

Etminan, M., E. Highwood, J. Laube, R. McPheat, G. Marston, K. Shine, and K. Smith (2014), Infrared Absorption Spectra, Radiative Efficiencies, and Global Warming Potentials of Newly-Detected Halogenated Compounds: CFC-113a, CFC-112 and HCFC-133a, *Atmosphere*, *5*(3), 473.

EUR-Lex (2014), Regulation (EU) No 517/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on fluorinated greenhouse gases and repealing Regulation (EC) No 842/2006 Text with EEA relevance, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R0517*Rep*.

Fisher, D. A., C. H. Hales, W. C. Wang, M. K. W. Ko, and N. D. Sze (1990), Model-calculations of the relative effects of CFCs and their replacements on global warming, *Nature*, *344*(6266), 513-516, doi: 10.1038/344513a0.

Forster, P. M., J. B. Burkholder, C. Clerbaux, P. F. Coheur, M. Dutta, L. K. Gohar, M. D. Hurley, G. Myhre, R. W. Portmann, K. P. Shine, T. J. Wallington, and D. Wuebbles (2005), Resolution of the uncertainties in the radiative forcing of HFC-134a, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *93*(4), 447-460, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2004.08.038.

Forster, P. M., V. Ramaswamy, P. Artaxo, T. Berntsen, R. Betts, D. W. Fahey, J. Haywood, J. Lean, D. C. Lowe, G. Myhre, J. Nganga, R. Prinn, G. Raga, M. Schulz, and R. Van Dorland (2007), Changes in Atmospheric Constituents and in Radiative Forcing, In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change eds. Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis et al. *Rep.*, 129-234 pp, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Freckleton, R. S., E. J. Highwood, K. P. Shine, O. Wild, K. S. Law, and M. G. Sanderson (1998), Greenhouse gas radiative forcing: Effects of averaging and inhomogeneities in trace gas distribution, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, *124*(550), 2099-2127, doi: 10.1256/smsqj.55013.

Gasser, T., G. P. Peters, J. S. Fuglestvedt, W. J. Collins, D. T. Shindell, and P. Ciais (2017), Accounting for the climate-carbon feedback in emission metrics, *Earth Syst. Dynam.*, *8*(2), 235-253, doi: 10.5194/esd-8-235-2017.

Geoffroy, O., D. Saint-Martin, D. J. L. Olivie, A. Voldoire, G. Bellon, and S. Tyteca (2013), Transient Climate Response in a Two-Layer Energy-Balance Model. Part I: Analytical Solution and Parameter Calibration Using CMIP5 AOGCM Experiments, *J. Clim.*, *26*(6), 1841-1857, doi: 10.1175/jcli-d-12-00195.1.

Gierczak, T., M. Baasandorj, and J. B. Burkholder (2014), OH + (E)- and (Z)-1-Chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene-1 (CF3CH═CHCl) Reaction Rate Coefficients: Stereoisomer-Dependent Reactivity, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *118*(46), 11015-11025, doi: 10.1021/jp509127h.

Godin, P. J., H. Johnson, R. Piunno, K. Le Bris, and K. Strong (2019), Conformational analysis and global warming potentials of 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoropropane and 1,1,2,2,3-pentafluoropropane from absorption spectroscopy, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *225*, 337-350, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2019.01.003.

Godin, P. J., A. Cabaj, S. Conway, A. C. Hong, K. Le Bris, S. A. Mabury, and K. Strong (2016), Temperature-dependent absorption cross-sections of perfluorotributylamine, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *323*(Supplement C), 53-58, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jms.2015.11.004.

Gohar, L. K., G. Myhre, and K. P. Shine (2004), Updated radiative forcing estimates of four halocarbons, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *109*(D01107), doi: 10.1029/2003jd004320.

Gordon, I. E., L. S. Rothman, C. Hill, R. V. Kochanov, Y. Tan, P. F. Bernath, M. Birk, V. Boudon, A. Campargue, K. V. Chance, B. J. Drouin, J. M. Flaud, R. R. Gamache, J. T. Hodges, D. Jacquemart, V. I. Perevalov, A. Perrin, K. P. Shine, M. A. H. Smith, J. Tennyson, G. C. Toon, H. Tran, V. G. Tyuterev, A. Barbe, A. G. Csaszar, V. M. Devi, T. Furtenbacher, J. J. Harrison, J. M. Hartmann, A. Jolly, T. J. Johnson, T. Karman, I. Kleiner, A. A. Kyuberis, J. Loos, O. M. Lyulin, S. T. Massie, S. N. Mikhailenko, N. Moazzen-Ahmadi, H. S. P. Muller, O. V. Naumenko, A. V. Nikitin, O. L. Polyansky, M. Rey, M. Rotger, S. W. Sharpe, K. Sung, E. Starikova, S. A. Tashkun, J. Vander Auwera, G. Wagner, J. Wilzewski, P. Wcislo, S. Yu, and E. J. Zak (2017), The HITRAN2016 molecular spectroscopic database, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *203*, 3-69, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2017.06.038.

Grossman, A. S., K. E. Grant, W. E. Blass, and D. J. Wuebbles (1997), Radiative forcing calculations for CH_3Cl and CH_3Br, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *102*(D12), 13651-13656, doi: 10.1029/97jd00611.

Harrison, J. J. (2013), Infrared absorption cross sections for trifluoromethane, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *130*, 359-364, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2013.05.026.

Harrison, J. J. (2015a), New and improved infrared absorption cross sections for dichlorodifluoromethane (CFC-12), *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, *8*(8), 3197-3207, doi: 10.5194/amt-8-3197-2015.

Harrison, J. J. (2015b), Infrared absorption cross sections for 1,1,1,2-tetrafluoroethane, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *151*, 210-216, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2014.09.023.

Harrison, J. J. (2016), New and improved infrared absorption cross sections for chlorodifluoromethane (HCFC-22), *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques*, *9*(6), 2593-2601, doi: 10.5194/amt-9-2593-2016.

Harrison, J. J. (2019), Infrared absorption cross sections for air-broadened 1,1-dichloro-1-fluoroethane (HCFC-141b), *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, *238*, 106489, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2019.04.041.

Harrison, J. J., C. D. Boone, and P. F. Bernath (2017), New and improved infra-red absorption cross sections and ACE-FTS retrievals of carbon tetrachloride (CCl4), *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, *186*(Supplement C), 139-149, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2016.04.025.

Highwood, E. J., and K. P. Shine (2000), Radiative forcing and global warming potentials of 11 halogenated compounds, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 169-183, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(99)00215-0.

Hodnebrog, Ø., S. B. Dalsoren, and G. Myhre (2018), Lifetimes, direct and indirect radiative forcing, and global warming potentials of ethane (C2H6), propane (C3H8), and butane (C4H10), *Atmospheric Science Letters*, *19*(2), 7, doi: 10.1002/asl.804.

Hodnebrog, Ø., M. Etminan, J. S. Fuglestvedt, G. Marston, G. Myhre, C. J. Nielsen, K. P. Shine, and T. J. Wallington (2013), Global Warming Potentials and Radiative Efficiencies of Halocarbons and Related Compounds: A Comprehensive Review, *Reviews of Geophysics*, *51*(2), 300-378, doi: 10.1002/rog.20013.

Hong, A. C., C. J. Young, M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and S. A. Mabury (2013), Perfluorotributylamine: A novel long-lived greenhouse gas, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *40*(22), 6010-6015, doi: 10.1002/2013GL058010.

Imasu, R., A. Suga, and T. Matsuno (1995), Radiative effects and halocarbon global warming potentials of replacement compounds for chlorofluorocarbons, *Journal of the Meteorological Society of Japan*, *73*(6), 1123-1136.

IPCC (1990), Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment, edited by J. T. Houghton, G. J. Jenkins and J. J. Ephraums, p. 410, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

IPCC (1994), Climate Change 1994: Radiative Forcing of Climate Change and an Evaluation of the IPCC IS92 Emission Scenarios, edited by: J.T. Houghton, L.G. Meira Filho, J. Bruce, Hoesung Lee, B.A. Callander, E.F. Haites, N. Harris and K. Maskell. *Rep.*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

IPCC (2001), Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Houghton, J.T., Ding, Y., Griggs, D.J., Noguer, M., van der Linden, P. J., Dai, X., Maskell, K., and Johnson, C.A.*Rep.*, 881 pp, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Jacquinet-Husson, N., R. Armante, N. A. Scott, A. Chedin, L. Crepeau, C. Boutammine, A. Bouhdaoui, C. Crevoisier, V. Capelle, C. Boonne, N. Poulet-Crovisier, A. Barbe, D. C. Benner, V. Boudon, L. R. Brown, J. Buldyreva, A. Campargue, L. H. Coudert, V. M. Devi, M. J. Down, B. J. Drouin, A. Fayt, C. Fittschen, J. M. Flaud, R. R. Gamache, J. J. Harrison, C. Hill, O. Hodnebrog, S. M. Hu, D. Jacquemart, A. Jolly, E. Jimenez, N. N. Lavrentieva, A. W. Liu, L. Lodi, O. M. Lyulin, S. T. Massie, S. Mikhailenko, H. S. P. Muller, O. V. Naumenko, A. Nikitin, C. J. Nielsen, J. Orphal, V. I. Perevalov, A. Perrin, E. Polovtseva, A. Predoi-Cross, M. Rotger, A. A. Ruth, S. S. Yu, K. Sung, S. A. Tashkun, J. Tennyson, V. I. G. Tyuterev, J. V. Auwera, B. A. Voronin, and A. Makie (2016), The 2015 edition of the GEISA spectroscopic database, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *327*, 31-72, doi: 10.1016/j.jms.2016.06.007.

Jacquinet-Husson, N., L. Crepeau, R. Armante, C. Boutammine, A. Chedin, N. A. Scott, C. Crevoisier, V. Capelle, C. Boone, N. Poulet-Crovisier, A. Barbe, A. Campargue, D. C. Benner, Y. Benilan, B. Bezard, V. Boudon, L. R. Brown, L. H. Coudert, A. Coustenis, V. Dana, V. M. Devi, S. Fally, A. Fayt, J. M. Flaud, A. Goldman, M. Herman, G. J. Harris, D. Jacquemart, A. Jolly, I. Kleiner, A. Kleinbohl, F. Kwabia-Tchana, N. Lavrentieva, N. Lacome, L. H. Xu, O. M. Lyulin, J. Y. Mandin, A. Maki, S. Mikhailenko, C. E. Miller, T. Mishina, N. Moazzen-Ahmadi, H. S. P. Muller, A. Nikitin, J. Orphal, V. Perevalov, A. Perrin, D. T. Petkie, A. Predoi-Cross, C. P. Rinsland, J. J. Remedios, M. Rotger, M. A. H. Smith, K. Sung, S. Tashkun, J. Tennyson, R. A. Toth, A. C. Vandaele, and J. Vander Auwera (2011), The 2009 edition of the GEISA spectroscopic database, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *112*(15), 2395-2445, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2011.06.004.

Jain, A. K., B. P. Briegleb, K. Minschwaner, and D. J. Wuebbles (2000), Radiative forcings and global warming potentials of 39 greenhouse gases, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *105*(D16), 20773-20790, doi: 10.1029/2000jd900241.

Joos, F., R. Roth, J. S. Fuglestvedt, G. P. Peters, I. G. Enting, W. von Bloh, V. Brovkin, E. J. Burke, M. Eby, N. R. Edwards, T. Friedrich, T. L. Frölicher, P. R. Halloran, P. B. Holden, C. Jones, T. Kleinen, F. Mackenzie, K. Matsumoto, M. Meinshausen, G. K. Plattner, A. Reisinger, J. Segschneider, G. Shaffer, M. Steinacher, K. Strassmann, K. Tanaka, A. Timmermann, and A. J. Weaver (2013), Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *13*, 2793-2825, doi: 10.5194/acp-13-2793-2013.

Kazakov, A., M. O. McLinden, and M. Frenkel (2012), Computational Design of New Refrigerant Fluids Based on Environmental, Safety, and Thermodynamic Characteristics, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, *51*(38), 12537-12548, doi: 10.1021/ie3016126.

Kochanov, R. V., I. E. Gordon, L. S. Rothman, K. P. Shine, S. W. Sharpe, T. J. Johnson, T. J. Wallington, J. J. Harrison, P. F. Bernath, M. Birk, G. Wagner, K. Le Bris, I. Bravo, and C. Hill (2019), Infrared absorption cross-sections in HITRAN2016 and beyond: Expansion for climate, environment, and atmospheric applications, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *230*, 172-221, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2019.04.001.

Kovács, T., W. Feng, A. Totterdill, J. M. C. Plane, S. Dhomse, J. C. Gómez-Martín, G. P. Stiller, F. J. Haenel, C. Smith, P. M. Forster, R. R. García, D. R. Marsh, and M. P. Chipperfield (2017), Determination of the atmospheric lifetime and global warming potential of sulfur hexafluoride using a three-dimensional model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *17*(2), 883-898, doi: 10.5194/acp-17-883-2017.

Laube, J. C., M. J. Newland, C. Hogan, C. A. M. Brenninkmeijer, P. J. Fraser, P. Martinerie, D. E. Oram, C. E. Reeves, T. Rockmann, J. Schwander, E. Witrant, and W. T. Sturges (2014), Newly detetecd ozone-depleting substances in the atmosphere, *Nat. Geosci.*, *7*(4), 266-269, doi: 10.1038/ngeo2109.

Le Bris, K., and K. Strong (2010), Temperature-dependent absorption cross-sections of HCFC-142b, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *111*(3), 364-371, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2009.10.005.

Le Bris, K., and L. Graham (2015), Quantitative comparisons of absorption cross-section spectra and integrated intensities of HFC-143a, *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, *151*(Supplement C), 13-17, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2014.09.005.

Le Bris, K., J. McDowell, and K. Strong (2012), Measurements of the infrared absorption cross-sections of HCFC-141b (CH3CFCl2), *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *113*(15), 1913-1919, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2012.05.004.

Le Bris, K., J. DeZeeuw, P. J. Godin, and K. Strong (2018), Infrared absorption cross-sections, radiative efficiency and global warming potential of HFC-43-10mee, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *348*, 64-67, doi: 10.1016/j.jms.2017.06.004.

Massie, S. T., A. Goldman, A. H. McDaniel, C. A. Cantrell, J. A. Davidson, R. E. Shetter, and J. G. Calvert (1991), Temperature dependent infrared cross sections for CFC-11, CFC-12, CFC-13, CFC-14, CFC-22, CFC-113, CFC-114, and CFC-115*Rep.*, 67 pp, NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-358+STR, Nat. Cent. for Atmos. Res., Boulder, Colorado.

McDaniel, A. H., C. A. Cantrell, J. A. Davidson, R. E. Shetter, and J. G. Calvert (1991), The temperature-dependent, infrared-absorption cross-sections for the chlorofluorocarbons - CFC-11, CFC-12, CFC-13, CFC-14, CFC-22, CFC-113, CFC-114, and CFC-115, *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry*, *12*(3), 211-227, doi: 10.1007/bf00048074.

McGillen, M. R., F. Bernard, E. L. Fleming, and J. B. Burkholder (2015), HCFC-133a (CF3CH2Cl): OH rate coefficient, UV and infrared absorption spectra, and atmospheric implications, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *42*(14), 6098-6105, doi: 10.1002/2015GL064939.

McLinden, M. O., A. F. Kazakov, J. S. Brown, and P. A. Domanski (2014), A thermodynamic analysis of refrigerants: Possibilities and tradeoffs for Low-GWP refrigerants, *Int. J. Refrig.-Rev. Int. Froid*, *38*, 80-92, doi: 10.1016/j.ijrefrig.2013.09.032.

MEGJ (2016), Act on Rational Use and Proper Management of Fluorocarbons, Ministry of the Environment Government of Japan, http://www.env.go.jp/en/earth/ozone/laws/ozone4.pdf*Rep*.

Meinshausen, M., E. Vogel, A. Nauels, K. Lorbacher, N. Meinshausen, D. M. Etheridge, P. J. Fraser, S. A. Montzka, P. J. Rayner, C. M. Trudinger, P. B. Krummel, U. Beyerle, J. G. Canadell, J. S. Daniel, I. G. Enting, R. M. Law, C. R. Lunder, S. O'Doherty, R. G. Prinn, S. Reimann, M. Rubino, G. J. M. Velders, M. K. Vollmer, R. H. J. Wang, and R. Weiss (2017), Historical greenhouse gas concentrations for climate modelling (CMIP6), *Geoscientific Model Development*, *10*(5), 2057-2116, doi: 10.5194/gmd-10-2057-2017.

MJGC (2019), Ozone-depleting Substances and Halocarbon Alternatives Regulations by Ministry of Justice Government of Canada, SOR/2016-137, https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-2016-137/*Rep*.

Molina, M. J., and F. S. Rowland (1974), Stratospheric Sink for Chlorofluoromethanes - Chlorine Atomic-Catalysed Destruction of Ozone, *Nature*, *249*(5460), 810-812, doi: 10.1038/249810a0.

Myhre, G., and F. Stordal (1997), Role of spatial and temporal variations in the computation of radiative forcing and GWP, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *102*(D10), 11181-11200, doi: 10.1029/97jd00148.

Myhre, G., E. J. Highwood, K. P. Shine, and F. Stordal (1998), New estimates of radiative forcing due to well mixed greenhouse gases, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *25*(14), 2715-2718, doi: 10.1029/98gl01908.

Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, W. Collins, J. Fuglestvedt, J. Huang, D. Koch, J.-F. Lamarque, D. Lee, B. Mendoza, T. Nakajima, A. Robock, G. Stephens, T. Takemura, and H. Zhang (2013), Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing, in *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P. M. Midgley, pp. 659–740, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Nemtchinov, V., and P. Varanasi (2003), Thermal infrared absorption cross-sections of CCl_4 needed for atmospheric remote sensing, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *82*(1-4), 473-481, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(03)00171-7.

Olivié, D. J. L., and G. P. Peters (2012), The impact of model variation in CO2 and temperature impulse response functions on emission metrics, *Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss.*, *3*(2), 935-977, doi: 10.5194/esdd-3-935-2012.

Oreopoulos, L., E. Mlawer, J. Delamere, T. Shippert, J. Cole, B. Fomin, M. Iacono, Z. H. Jin, J. N. Li, J. Manners, P. Raisanen, F. Rose, Y. C. Zhang, M. J. Wilson, and W. B. Rossow (2012), The Continual Intercomparison of Radiation Codes: Results from Phase I, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *117*, doi: 10.1029/2011jd016821.

Orkin, V. L., V. G. Khamaganov, and A. G. Guschin (2014), Photochemical Properties of Hydrofluoroethers CH_3OCHF_2, CH_3OCF_3, and $CHF_2OCH_2CF_3$: Reactivity toward OH, IR Absorption Cross Sections, Atmospheric Lifetimes, and Global Warming Potentials, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *118*(45), 10770-10777, doi: 10.1021/jp506377w.

Papadimitriou, V. C., M. R. McGillen, S. C. Smith, A. M. Jubb, R. W. Portmann, B. D. Hall, E. L. Fleming, C. H. Jackman, and J. B. Burkholder (2013), 1,2-Dichlorohexafluoro-cyclobutane (1,2-c-$C_4F_6Cl_2$, R-316c) a Potent Ozone Depleting Substance and Greenhouse Gas: Atmospheric Loss Processes, Lifetimes, and Ozone Depletion and Global Warming

Potentials for the (E) and (Z) Stereoisomers, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *117*(43), 11049-11065, doi: 10.1021/jp407823k.

Papanastasiou, D. K., A. Beltrone, P. Marshall, and J. B. Burkholder (2018), Global warming potential estimates for the C-1-C-3 hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) included in the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *18*(9), 6317-6330, doi: 10.5194/acp-18-6317-2018.

Pinnock, S., M. D. Hurley, K. P. Shine, T. J. Wallington, and T. J. Smyth (1995), Radiative forcing of climate by hydrochlorofluorocarbons and hydrofluorocarbons, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *100*(D11), 23227-23238, doi: 10.1029/95jd02323.

Ravishankara, A. R., S. Solomon, A. A. Turnipseed, and R. F. Warren (1993), Atmospheric lifetimes of long-lived halogenated species, *Science*, *259*(5092), 194-199, doi: 10.1126/science.259.5092.194.

Ray, E. A., F. L. Moore, J. W. Elkins, K. H. Rosenlof, J. C. Laube, T. Rockmann, D. R. Marsh, and A. E. Andrews (2017), Quantification of the SF6 lifetime based on mesospheric loss measured in the stratospheric polar vortex, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *122*(8), 4626-4638, doi: 10.1002/2016jd026198.

Reisinger, A., M. Meinshausen, M. Manning, and G. Bodeker (2010), Uncertainties of global warming metrics: CO_2 and CH_4, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *37*, doi: L14707 10.1029/2010gl043803.

Robson, J. I., L. K. Gohar, M. D. Hurley, K. P. Shine, and T. J. Wallington (2006), Revised IR spectrum, radiative efficiency and global warming potential of nitrogen trifluoride, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *33*(10), doi: 10.1029/2006gl026210.

Rogelj, J., and C.-F. Schleussner (2019), Unintentional unfairness when applying new greenhouse gas emissions metrics at country level, *Environmental Research Letters*, *14*(11), 114039, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab4928.

Rothman, L. S., I. E. Gordon, A. Barbe, D. C. Benner, P. E. Bernath, M. Birk, V. Boudon, L. R. Brown, A. Campargue, J. P. Champion, K. Chance, L. H. Coudert, V. Dana, V. M. Devi, S. Fally, J. M. Flaud, R. R. Gamache, A. Goldman, D. Jacquemart, I. Kleiner, N. Lacome, W. J. Lafferty, J. Y. Mandin, S. T. Massie, S. N. Mikhailenko, C. E. Miller, N. Moazzen-Ahmadi, O. V. Naumenko, A. V. Nikitin, J. Orphal, V. I. Perevalov, A. Perrin, A. Predoi-Cross, C. P. Rinsland, M. Rotger, M. Simeckova, M. A. H. Smith, K. Sung, S. A. Tashkun, J. Tennyson, R. A. Toth, A. C. Vandaele, and J. Vander Auwera (2009), The HITRAN 2008 molecular spectroscopic database, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *110*(9-10), 533-572, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2009.02.013.

Schlabach, M. e. a. (2018), Screening Programme 2017 – AMAP Assessment Compounds, Report funded by The Norwegian Environment Agency, ISBN: 978-82-425-2940-4*Rep.*

Sharpe, S. W., T. J. Johnson, R. L. Sams, P. M. Chu, G. C. Rhoderick, and P. A. Johnson (2004), Gas-phase databases for quantitative infrared spectroscopy, *Applied Spectroscopy*, *58*(12), 1452-1461, doi: 10.1366/0003702042641281.

Shine, K. P., and G. Myhre (2020), The Spectral Nature of Stratospheric Temperature Adjustment and its Application to Halocarbon Radiative Forcing, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, *12*(3), e2019MS001951, doi: 10.1029/2019MS001951.

Shine, K. P., J. S. Fuglestvedt, K. Hailemariam, and N. Stuber (2005), Alternatives to the global warming potential for comparing climate impacts of emissions of greenhouse gases, *Clim. Change*, *68*(3), 281-302, doi: 10.1007/s10584-005-1146-9.

Sihra, K., M. D. Hurley, K. P. Shine, and T. J. Wallington (2001), Updated radiative forcing estimates of 65 halocarbons and nonmethane hydrocarbons, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *106*(D17), 20493-20505, doi: 10.1029/2000jd900716.

Smith, C. J., R. J. Kramer, G. Myhre, P. M. Forster, B. J. Soden, T. Andrews, O. Boucher, G. Faluvegi, D. Flaschner, O. Hodnebrog, M. Kasoar, V. Kharin, A. Kirkevag, J. F. Lamarque, J. Mulmenstadt, D. Olivie, T. Richardson, B. H. Samset, D. Shindell, P. Stier, T. Takemura, A. Voulgarakis, and D. Watson-Parris (2018), Understanding Rapid Adjustments to Diverse Forcing Agents, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *45*(21), 12023-12031, doi: 10.1029/2018gl079826.

SPARC (2013), Report on the Lifetimes of Stratospheric Ozone-Depleting Substances, Their Replacements, and Related Species, M. Ko, P. Newman, S. Reimann, S. Strahan (Eds.), SPARC Report No. 6, WCRP-15/2013*Rep.*

Taylor, K. E., R. J. Stouffer, and G. A. Meehl (2011), An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *93*(4), 485-498, doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1.

Totterdill, A., T. Kovacs, W. H. Feng, S. Dhomse, C. J. Smith, J. C. Gomez-Martin, M. P. Chipperfield, P. M. Forster, and J. M. C. Plane (2016), Atmospheric lifetimes, infrared absorption spectra, radiative forcings and global warming potentials of NF_3 and CF_3CF_2Cl (CFC-115), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *16*(17), 11451-11463, doi: 10.5194/acp-16-11451-2016.

UNFCCC (2019), Report of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement on the third part of its first session, held in Katowice from 2 to 15 December 2018*Rep. PA/CMA/2018/3/Add.2*, *https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma2018_3_add2_new_advance.pdf*.

Vander Auwera, J. (2000), Infrared absorption cross-sections for two substituted ethanes: 1,1-difluoroethane (HFC-152a) and 1,2-dichloroethane, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 143-151.

Velders, G. J. M., and J. S. Daniel (2014), Uncertainty analysis of projections of ozone-depleting substances: mixing ratios, EESC, ODPs, and GWPs, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *14*(6), 2757-2776, doi: 10.5194/acp-14-2757-2014.

Wallington, T. J., B. P. Pivesso, A. M. Lira, J. E. Anderson, C. J. Nielsen, N. H. Andersen, and Ø. Hodnebrog (2016), CH_3Cl, CH_2Cl_2, $CHCl_3$, and CCl_4: Infrared spectra, radiative efficiencies, and global warming potentials, *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, *174*(Supplement C), 56-64, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2016.01.029.

WMO (2011), Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2010, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project - Report No. 50, 572 pp., World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*Rep.*

WMO (2015), Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2014, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project — Report No. 55, 416 pp., World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*Rep.*

WMO (2019), Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 2018, Global Ozone Research and Monitoring Project — Report No. 58, 588 pp., World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland*Rep.*

WMO/GAW (2019), WMO Greenhouse Gas Bulletin. Number 15, 25 November 2019. https://library.wmo.int/doc_num.php?explnum_id=10100*Rep*.

Wuebbles, D. J., A. K. Jain, K. O. Patten, and K. E. Grant (1995), Sensitivity of Direct Global Warming Potentials to Key Uncertainties, *Clim. Change*, *29*(3), 265-297, doi: 10.1007/bf01091865.

Zhang, H., J. X. Wu, and Z. P. Shen (2011), Radiative forcing and global warming potential of perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride, *Science China-Earth Sciences*, *54*(5), 764-772, doi: 10.1007/s11430-010-4155-0.

Zhang, N., T. Uchimaru, Q. Guo, F. Qing, L. Chen, and J. Mizukado (2017), Atmospheric chemistry of perfluorocyclopentene (cyc-$CF_2CF_2CF_2CF{=}CF-$): Kinetics, products and mechanism of gas-phase reactions with OH radicals, and atmospheric implications, *Atmos. Environ.*, *160*(Supplement C), 46-54, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.04.012.

Supporting Information References

Acerboni, G., J. A. Beukes, N. R. Jensen, J. Hjorth, G. Myhre, C. J. Nielsen, and J. K. Sundet (2001), Atmospheric degradation and global warming potentials of three perfluoroalkenes, *Atmos. Environ.*, *35*(24), 4113-4123, doi: 10.1016/s1352-2310(01)00209-6.

Allen, G., J. J. Remedios, D. A. Newnham, K. M. Smith, and P. S. Monks (2005), Improved mid-infrared cross-sections for peroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN) vapour, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *5*, 47-56, doi: 10.5194/acp-5-47-2005.

Anastasi, C., A. E. Heathfield, G. P. Knight, and F. Nicolaisen (1994), Integrated absorption-coefficients of $CHClF_2$ (HCFC-22) and CH_3Br in the atmospheric infrared window region, *Spectrochimica Acta Part a-Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*, *50*(10), 1791-1798, doi: 10.1016/0584-8539(94)00132-4.

Andersen, L. L., F. F. Østerstrøm, O. J. Nielsen, M. P. S. Andersen, and T. J. Wallington (2014), Atmospheric chemistry of (CF3)2CFOCH3, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *607*(Supplement C), 5-9, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cplett.2014.05.036.

Andersen, L. L., F. F. Østerstrøm, M. P. Sulbaek Andersen, O. J. Nielsen, and T. J. Wallington (2015), Atmospheric chemistry of cis-CF3CHCHCl (HCFO-1233zd(Z)): Kinetics of the gas-phase reactions with Cl atoms, OH radicals, and O3, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *639*(Supplement C), 289-293, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cplett.2015.09.008.

Andersen, M. P. S., S. B. Svendsen, F. F. Osterstrom, and O. J. Nielsen (2017a), Atmospheric Chemistry of CH3CH2OCH3: Kinetics and Mechanism of Reactions with Cl Atoms and OH Radicals, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, *49*(1), 10-20, doi: 10.1002/kin.21051.

Andersen, M. P. S., M. D. Hurley, V. F. Andersen, O. J. Nielsen, and T. J. Wallington (2010a), CHF_2OCHF_2 (HFE-134): IR Spectrum and Kinetics and Products of the Chlorine-Atom-Initiated Oxidation, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *114*(14), 4963-4967, doi: 10.1021/jp101507f.

Andersen, M. P. S., V. F. Andersen, O. J. Nielsen, S. P. Sander, and T. J. Wallington (2010b), Atmospheric Chemistry of $HCF_2O(CF_2CF_2O)_xCF_2H$ (x=2-4): Kinetics and Mechanisms of the Chlorine-Atom-Initiated Oxidation, *Chemphyschem*, *11*(18), 4035-4041, doi: 10.1002/cphc.201000438.

Andersen, M. P. S., O. J. Nielsen, T. J. Wallington, B. Karpichev, and S. P. Sander (2012a), Assessing the Impact on Global Climate from General Anesthetic Gases, *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, *114*(5), 1081-1085, doi: 10.1213/ANE.0b013e31824d6150.

Andersen, M. P. S., R. L. Waterland, S. P. Sander, O. J. Nielsen, and T. J. Wallington (2012b), Atmospheric chemistry of CxF2x+1CH=CH2 (x=1, 2, 4, 6 and 8): Radiative efficiencies and global warming potentials, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A-Chem.*, *233*, 50-52, doi: 10.1016/j.jphotochem.2012.02.020.

Andersen, M. P. S., E. J. K. Nilsson, O. J. Nielsen, M. S. Johnson, M. D. Hurley, and T. J. Wallington (2008), Atmospheric chemistry of trans-$CF_3CHCHCl$: Kinetics of the gas-phase reactions with Cl atoms, OH radicals, and O_3, *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry*, *199*(1), 92-97, doi: 10.1016/j.jphotochem.2008.05.013.

Andersen, M. P. S., S. P. Sander, O. J. Nielsen, D. S. Wagner, T. J. Sanford, and T. J. Wallington (2010c), Inhalation anaesthetics and climate change, *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, *105*(6), 760-766, doi: 10.1093/bja/aeq259.

Andersen, M. P. S., M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, F. Blandini, N. R. Jensen, V. Librando, and J. Hjorth (2004), Atmospheric chemistry of $CH_3O(CF_2CF_2O)_nCH_3$ (n=1-3): Kinetics and mechanism of oxidation initiated by Cl atoms and OH radicals, IR spectra, and global warmin potentials, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *108*(11), 1964-1972, doi: 10.1021/jp036615a.

Antinolo, M., I. Bravo, E. Jimenez, B. Ballesteros, and J. Albaladejo (2017), Atmospheric Chemistry of E- and Z-CF_3CH=CHF (HFO-1234ze): OH Reaction Kinetics as a Function of Temperature and UV and IR Absorption Cross Sections, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *121*(43), 8322-8331, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.7b06174.

Antinolo, M., R. del Olmo, I. Bravo, J. Albaladejo, and E. Jimenez (2019), Tropospheric fate of allyl cyanide (CH_2=$CHCH_2CN$): Kinetics, reaction products and secondary organic aerosol formation, *Atmos. Environ.*, *219*, 12, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.117041.

Antiñolo, M., E. Jimenez, and J. Albaladejo (2011), UV absorption cross sections between 230 and 350 nm and pressure dependence of the photolysis quantum yield at 308 nm of CF_3CH_2CHO, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *13*(35), 15936-15946, doi: 10.1039/c1cp21368g.

Antiñolo, M., E. Jimenez, and J. Albaladejo (2012a), Photochemistry of $CF_3(CH_2)_2CHO$ in air: UV absorption cross sections between 230 and 340 nm and photolysis quantum yields at 308 nm, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A-Chem.*, *231*(1), 33-40, doi: 10.1016/j.jphotochem.2011.12.023.

Antiñolo, M., S. González, B. Ballesteros, J. Albaladejo, and E. Jiménez (2012b), Laboratory Studies of $CHF_2CF_2CH_2OH$ and $CF_3CF_2CH_2OH$: UV and IR Absorption Cross Sections and OH Rate Coefficients between 263 and 358 K, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, doi: 10.1021/jp2111633.

Antiñolo, M., A. J. Ocaña, J. P. Aranguren, S. I. Lane, J. Albaladejo, and E. Jiménez (2017), Atmospheric degradation of 2-chloroethyl vinyl ether, allyl ether and allyl ethyl ether: Kinetics with OH radicals and UV photochemistry, *Chemosphere*, *181*(Supplement C), 232-240, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.04.053.

Baasandorj, M., and J. B. Burkholder (2016), Rate Coefficient for the Gas-Phase OH + CHF=CF2 Reaction between 212 and 375 K, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, *48*(11), 714-723, doi: 10.1002/kin.21027.

Baasandorj, M., A. R. Ravishankara, and J. B. Burkholder (2011), Atmospheric Chemistry of (Z)-$CF_3CH{=}CHCF_3$: OH Radical Reaction Rate Coefficient and Global Warming Potential, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *115*(38), 10539-10549, doi: 10.1021/jp206195g.

Baasandorj, M., P. Marshall, R. L. Waterland, A. R. Ravishankara, and J. B. Burkholder (2018), Rate Coefficient Measurements and Theoretical Analysis of the OH + (E)-CF3CH=CHCF3 Reaction, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *122*(19), 4635-4646, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.8b02771.

Baasandorj, M., G. Knight, V. C. Papadimitriou, R. K. Talukdar, A. R. Ravishankara, and J. B. Burkholder (2010), Rate Coefficients for the Gas-Phase Reaction of the Hydroxyl Radical with CH_2=CHF and CH_2= CF_2, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *114*(13), 4619-4633, doi: 10.1021/jp100527z.

Ballard, J., R. J. Knight, and D. A. Newnham (2000a), Infrared absorption cross-sections and integrated absorption intensities of perfluoroethane and cis-perfluorocyclobutane, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 199-212, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(99)00217-4.

Barrera, J. A., P. R. Dalmasso, J. P. Aranguren Abrate, R. A. Taccone, and S. I. Lane (2015), Kinetic study of the OH and Cl-initiated oxidation, lifetimes and atmospheric acceptability indices of three halogenated ethenes, *RSC Advances*, *5*(90), 73501-73509, doi: 10.1039/C5RA13589C.

Barrow, G. M., and D. C. McKean (1952), The intensities of absorption bands in the methyl halides, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series a-Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, *213*(1112), 27-41, doi: 10.1098/rspa.1952.0108.

Barry, J., G. Locke, D. Scollard, H. Sidebottom, J. Treacy, C. Clerbaux, R. Colin, and J. Franklin (1997), 1,1,1,3,3,-pentafluorobutane (HFC-365mfc): Atmospheric degradation and contribution to radiative forcing, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, *29*(8), 607-617, doi: 10.1002/(sici)1097-4601(1997)29:8<607::aid-kin6>3.0.co;2-y.

Bernard, F., D. K. Papanastasiou, V. C. Papadimitriou, and J. B. Burkholder (2017), Infrared absorption spectra of linear (L-2-L-5) and cyclic (D-3-D-6) permethylsiloxanes, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *202*, 247-254, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2017.08.006.

Bravo, I., Y. Diaz-de-Mera, A. Aranda, K. Smith, K. P. Shine, and G. Marston (2010a), Atmospheric chemistry of $C_4F_9OC_2H_5$ (HFE-7200), $C_4F_9OCH_3$ (HFE-7100), $C_3F_7OCH_3$ (HFE-7000) and $C_3F_7CH_2OH$: temperature dependence of the kinetics of their reactions with OH radicals, atmospheric lifetimes and global warming potentials, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *12*(19), 5115-5125, doi: 10.1039/b923092k.

Bravo, I., A. Rodríguez, D. Rodríguez, Y. Diaz-de-Mera, A. Notario, and A. Aranda (2013), Atmospheric Chemistry and Environmental Assessment of Inhalational Fluroxene, *ChemPhysChem*, *14*(16), 3834-3842, doi: 10.1002/cphc.201300559.

Brodbeck, C., I. Rossi, H. Strapelias, and J. P. Bouanich (1980), Infrared spectral absorption intensities in the v_3 and v_4 regions of SF_6, *Chemical Physics*, *54*(1), 1-7, doi: 10.1016/0301-0104(80)80029-2.

Brown, L. R., C. B. Farmer, C. P. Rinsland, and R. A. Toth (1987), Molecular line parameters for the atmospheric trace molecule spectroscopy experiment, *Applied Optics*, *26*(23), 5154-5182.

Cappellani, F., and G. Restelli (1992), Infrared band strengths and their temperature-dependence of the hydrohalocarbons HFC-134a, HFC-152a, HCFC-22, HCFC-123 and HCFC-142b, *Spectrochimica Acta Part a-Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*, *48*(8), 1127-1131, doi: 10.1016/0584-8539(92)80122-d.

Cavalli, F., M. Glasius, J. Hjorth, B. Rindone, and N. R. Jensen (1998), Atmospheric lifetimes, infrared spectra and degradation products of a series of hydrofluoroethers, *Atmos. Environ.*, *32*(21), 3767-3773, doi: 10.1016/s1352-2310(98)00106-x.

Chapados, C. (1988), Infrared-absorption of SF_6 from 32-cm^{-1} to 3000-cm^{-1} in the gaseous and liquid states, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *132*(2), 323-351, doi: 10.1016/0022-2852(88)90329-3.

Charmet, A. P., N. Tasinato, P. Stoppa, A. Baldacci, and S. Giorgianni (2008), Jet-cooled diode laser spectrum and FTIR integrated band intensities of CF_3Br: rovibrational analysis of $2\nu_5$ and $\nu_2+\nu_3$ bands near 9 μm and cross-section measurements in the 450-2500 cm^{-1} region, *Molecular Physics*, *106*(9-10), 1171-1179, doi: 10.1080/00268970802026709.

Charmet, A. P., P. Stoppa, N. Tasinato, A. Baldan, S. Giorgianni, and A. Gambi (2010), Spectroscopic study of $CHBrF_2$ up to 9500 cm^{-1}: Vibrational analysis, integrated band intensities, and ab initio calculations, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *133*(4), doi: 10.1063/1.3460922.

Charmet, A. P., P. Stoppa, N. Tasinato, S. Giorgianni, V. Barone, M. Biczysko, J. Bloino, C. Cappelli, I. Carnimeo, and C. Puzzarini (2013), An integrated experimental and quantum-chemical investigation on the vibrational spectra of chlorofluoromethane, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *139*(16), 15, doi: 10.1063/1.4825380.

Christensen, L. K., T. J. Wallington, A. Guschin, and M. D. Hurley (1999), Atmospheric degradation mechanism of CF_3OCH_3, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *103*(21), 4202-4208, doi: 10.1021/jp984455a.

Christensen, L. K., J. Sehested, O. J. Nielsen, M. Bilde, T. J. Wallington, A. Guschin, L. T. Molina, and M. J. Molina (1998), Atmospheric chemistry of HFE-7200 ($C_4F_9OC_2H_5$): Reaction with OH radicals and fate of $C_4F_9OCH_2CH_2O(\bullet)$ and $C_4F_9OCHO(\bullet)CH_3$ radicals, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *102*(25), 4839-4845, doi: 10.1021/jp981128u.

Chu, P. M., F. R. Guenther, G. C. Rhoderick, and W. J. Lafferty (1999), The NIST quantitative infrared database, *J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol.*, *104*(1), 59-81, doi: 10.6028/jres.104.004.

Clerbaux, C., and R. Colin (1994), Determination of the infrared cross-sections and global warming potentials of 1,1,2-trifluoroethane (HFC-143), *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *21*(22), 2377-2380, doi: 10.1029/94gl02365.

Clerbaux, C., R. Colin, P. C. Simon, and C. Granier (1993), Infrared cross-sections and global warming potentials of 10 alternative hydrohalocarbons, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *98*(D6), 10491-10497, doi: 10.1029/93jd00390.

Cometto, P. M., R. A. Taccone, J. D. Nieto, P. R. Dalmasso, and S. I. Lane (2010), Kinetic Study of OH Radical Reactions with $CF_3CCl{=}CCl_2$, $CF_3CCl{=}CClCF_3$ and $CF_3CF{=}CFCF_3$, *Chemphyschem*, *11*(18), 4053-4059, doi: 10.1002/cphc.201000430.

D'Anna, B., S. R. Sellevag, K. Wirtz, and C. J. Nielsen (2005), Photolysis study of perfluoro-2-methyl-3-pentanone under natural sunlight conditions, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *39*(22), 8708-8711, doi: 10.1021/es048088u.

Dalmasso, P. R., R. A. Taccone, J. D. Nieto, M. A. Teruel, and S. I. Lane (2006), CH_3OCF_2CHFCl and CHF_2OCF_2CHFCl: Reaction with Cl atoms, atmospheric lifetimes, ozone depletion and global warming potentials, *Atmos. Environ.*, *40*(38), 7298-7307, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.06.031.

Di Lonardo, G., and G. Masciarelli (2000), Infrared absorption cross-sections and integrated absorption intensities of HFC-125 and HFC-143a, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 129-142.

Diaz-de-Mera, Y., A. Aranda, A. Notario, A. Rodriguez, D. Rodriguez, and I. Bravo (2015), Photolysis study of fluorinated ketones under natural sunlight conditions, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *17*(35), 22991-22998, doi: 10.1039/C5CP03527A.

Dickson, A. D., I. M. Mills, and B. Crawford (1957), Vibrational Intensities .8. CH3 and CD3 Chloride, Bromide, and Iodide, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *27*(2), 445-455, doi: 10.1063/1.1743744.

Dillon, T. J., A. Horowitz, and J. N. Crowley (2008), The atmospheric chemistry of sulphuryl fluoride, SO_2F_2, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *8*(6), 1547-1557.

Drage, E. A., D. Jaksch, K. M. Smith, R. A. McPheat, E. Vasekova, and N. J. Mason (2006), FTIR spectroscopy and estimation of the global warming potential of CF_3Br and C_2F_4, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *98*(1), 44-56, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2005.05.071.

Dunn, D. S., K. Scanlon, and J. Overend (1982), The absolute intensities of the binary combination bands in the infrared-spectrum of SF_6, *Spectrochimica Acta Part a-Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*, *38*(8), 841-847, doi: 10.1016/0584-8539(82)80103-7.

Elkins, J. W., R. H. Kagann, and R. L. Sams (1984), Infrared band strengths for methyl-chloride in the regions of atmospheric interest, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *105*(2), 480-490, doi: 10.1016/0022-2852(84)90235-2.

Garland, N. L., L. J. Medhurst, and H. H. Nelson (1993), Potential chlorofluorocarbon replacements - OH reaction-rate constants between 250 and 315-K and infrared-absorption spectra, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *98*(D12), 23107-23111, doi: 10.1029/93jd02550.

Gierczak, T., R. K. Talukdar, J. B. Burkholder, R. W. Portmann, J. S. Daniel, S. Solomon, and A. R. Ravishankara (1996), Atmospheric fate and greenhouse warming potentials of HFC 236fa and HFC 236ea, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *101*(D8), 12905-12911, doi: 10.1029/96jd00059.

Godin, P. J., K. Le Bris, and K. Strong (2017a), Conformational analysis and global warming potentials of 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoro-2-propanol from absorption spectroscopy, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *203*, 522-529, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2017.04.031.

Godin, P. J., A. Cabaj, L.-H. Xu, K. Le Bris, and K. Strong (2017b), A study of the temperature dependence of the infrared absorption cross-sections of 2,2,3,3,3-pentafluoropropanol in the range of 298–362K, *Journal of Quantitative Spectroscopy and Radiative Transfer*, *186*(Supplement C), 150-157, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2016.05.031.

Golden, W. G., D. A. Horner, and J. Overend (1978), Intensities of binary overtone and combination bands in IR-spectrum of $CCIF_3$, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *68*(3), 964-969, doi: 10.1063/1.435835.

González, S., E. Jiménez, and J. Albaladejo (2016), Assessment of the atmospheric loss processes initiated by OH radicals and sunlight, and the radiative efficiency for a series of hydrofluoroolefins, CF3(CF2)x=1,3,5CHCH2, *Chemosphere*, *151*(Supplement C), 45-54, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.02.025.

González, S., E. Jiménez, B. Ballesteros, E. Martínez, and J. Albaladejo (2015), Hydroxyl radical reaction rate coefficients as a function of temperature and IR absorption cross sections for CF3CH=CH2 (HFO-1243zf), potential replacement of CF3CH2F (HFC-134a), *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *22*(7), 4793-4805, doi: 10.1007/s11356-014-3426-2.

Good, D. A., J. S. Francisco, A. K. Jain, and D. J. Wuebbles (1998), Lifetimes and global warming potentials for dimethyl ether and for fluorinated ethers: CH_3OCF_3 (E143a), CHF_2OCHF_2 (E134), CHF_2OCF_3 (E125), *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *103*(D21), 28181-28186, doi: 10.1029/98jd01880.

Goto, M., Y. Inoue, M. Kawasaki, A. G. Guschin, L. T. Molina, M. J. Molina, T. J. Wallington, and M. D. Hurley (2002), Atmospheric chemistry of HFE-7500 n-C3F7CF(OC2H5)CF(CF3)(2) : Reaction with OH radicals and Cl atoms and atmospheric fate of n-C3F7CF(OCHO center dot)CF(CF3)(2) and n-C3F7CF(OCH2CH2O center dot)CF(CF3)(2) radicals, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *36*(11), 2395-2402, doi: 10.1021/es0113798.

Graner, G. (1981), The methyl-bromide molecule - a critical consideration of perturbations in spectra, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *90*(2), 394-438, doi: 10.1016/0022-2852(81)90136-3.

Guo, Q., N. Zhang, T. Uchimaru, L. Chen, H. Quan, and J. Mizukado (2019), Atmospheric chemistry for gas-phase reactions of cyc-CF2CF2CF2CHXCHX- (X = H or F) with OH radicals in the temperature range of 253-328 K, *Atmos. Environ.*, *215*, 8, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.116895.

Hansen, J., M. Sato, and R. Ruedy (1997), Radiative forcing and climate response, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *102*(D6), 6831-6864.

Harrison, J. J., and P. F. Bernath (2010), Infrared absorption cross sections for propane (C3H8) in the 3 mu m region, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *111*(9), 1282-1288, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2009.11.027.

Harrison, J. J., and P. F. Bernath (2012), Mid- and long-wave infrared absorption cross sections for acetonitrile, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *113*(3), 221-225, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2011.11.003.

Harrison, J. J., N. D. C. Allen, and P. F. Bernath (2010), Infrared absorption cross sections for ethane (C2H6) in the 3 mu m region, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *111*(3), 357-363, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2009.09.010.

Harrison, J. J., N. D. C. Allen, and P. F. Bernath (2011), Infrared absorption cross sections for acetone (propanone) in the 3 mu m region, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *112*(1), 53-58, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.08.011.

Hashikawa, Y., M. Kawasaki, R. L. Waterland, M. D. Hurley, J. C. Ball, T. J. Wallington, M. P. S. Andersen, and O. J. Nielsen (2004), Gas phase UV and IR absorption spectra of CxF2x+1CHO (x=1-4), *J. Fluor. Chem.*, *125*(12), 1925-1932, doi: 10.1016/j.jfluchem.2004.07.006.

Heathfield, A. E., C. Anastasi, A. McCulloch, and F. M. Nicolaisen (1998), Integrated infrared absorption coefficients of several partially fluorinated ether compounds: CF_3OCF_2H, CF_2HOCF_2H, $CH_3OCF_2CF_2H$, CH_3OCF_2CFClH, $CH_3CH_2OCF_2CF_2H$, $CF_3CH_2OCF_2CF_2H$ and $CH_2{=}CHCH_2OCF_2CF_2H$, *Atmos. Environ.*, *32*(16), 2825-2833, doi: 10.1016/s1352-2310(97)00462-7.

Herath, T. N., E. C. Clinch, I. Orozco, E. L. Raign, and P. Marshall (2016), Relative Rate and Product Studies of the Reactions of Atomic Chlorine with Tetrafluoroethylene, 1,2-Dichloro-1,2-difluoroethylene, 1,1-Dichloro-2,2-difluoroethylene, and Hexafluoro-1,3-butadiene in the Presence of Oxygen, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *120*(37), 7311-7319, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.6b05305.

Highwood, E. J., K. P. Shine, M. D. Hurley, and T. J. Wallington (1999), Estimation of direct radiative forcing due to non-methane hydrocarbons, *Atmos. Environ.*, *33*(5), 759-767, doi: 10.1016/s1352-2310(98)00220-9.

Hurley, M. D., J. C. Ball, and T. J. Wallington (2007), Atmospheric chemistry of the *Z* and *E* isomers of $CF_3CF{=}CHF$; Kinetics, mechanisms, and products of gas-phase reactions with Cl atoms, OH radicals, and O_3, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *111*(39), 9789-9795, doi: 10.1021/jp0753530.

Hurley, M. D., T. Wallington, G. Buchanan, L. Gohar, G. Marston, and K. Shine (2005), IR spectrum and radiative forcing of CF_4 revisited, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *110*(D2), doi: 10.1029/2004jd005201.

Inoue, Y., M. Kawasaki, T. J. Wallington, and M. D. Hurley (2008), Atmospheric chemistry of $CF_3CH_2CF_2CH_3$ (HFC-365mfc): Kinetics and mechanism of chlorine atom initiated oxidation, infrared spectrum, and global warming potential, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *462*(4-6), 164-168, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2008.07.054.

Ivy, D. J., M. Rigby, M. Baasandorj, J. B. Burkholder, and R. G. Prinn (2012), Global emission estimates and radiative impact of C_4F_{10}, C_5F_{12}, C_6F_{14}, C_7F_{16} and C_8F_{18}, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *12*, 7635-7645, doi: 10.5194/acp-12-7635-2012.

Jain, A. K., Z. J. Li, V. Naik, D. J. Wuebbles, D. A. Good, J. C. Hansen, and J. S. Francisco (2001), Evaluation of the atmospheric lifetime and radiative forcing on climate for 1,2,2,2-Tetrafluoroethyl Trifluoromethyl Ether ($CF_3OCHFCF_3$), *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *106*(D12), 12615-12618, doi: 10.1029/2001jd900013.

Jara-Toro, R. A., J. A. Barrera, J. P. Aranguren-Abrate, R. A. Taccone, and G. A. Pino (2020), Rate Coefficient and Mechanism of the OH-Initiated Degradation of 1-Chlorobutane: Atmospheric Implications, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *124*(1), 229-239, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.9b10426.

Javadi, M. S., O. J. Nielsen, T. J. Wallington, M. D. Hurley, and J. G. Owens (2007), Atmospheric chemistry of 2-ethoxy-3,3,4,4,5-pentafluorotetra-hydro-2,5-bis 1,2,2,2-tetrafluoro-1- (trifluoromethyl)ethyl -furan: Kinetics, mechanisms, and products of Cl atom and OH radical initiated oxidation, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *41*(21), 7389-7395, doi: 10.1021/es071175c.

Jia, X., L. Chen, J. Mizukado, S. Kutsuna, and K. Tokuhashi (2013), Rate constants for the gas-phase reactions of cyclo-CXCXCF2CF2– (X=H, F) with OH radicals at a temperature range of 253–328K, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *572*(Supplement C), 21-25, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cplett.2013.04.020.

Jimenez, E., M. Antinolo, B. Ballesteros, E. Martinez, and J. Albaladejo (2010), Atmospheric Lifetimes and Global Warming Potentials of $CF_3CH_2CH_2OH$ and $CF_3(CH_2)_2CH_2OH$, *Chemphyschem*, *11*(18), 4079-4087, doi: 10.1002/cphc.201000365.

Jiménez, E., S. González, M. Cazaunau, H. Chen, B. Ballesteros, V. Daële, J. Albaladejo, and A. Mellouki (2016), Atmospheric Degradation Initiated by OH Radicals of the Potential Foam Expansion Agent, CF3(CF2)2CH═CH2 (HFC-1447fz): Kinetics and Formation of Gaseous Products and Secondary Organic Aerosols, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *50*(3), 1234-1242, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b04379.

Johnson, T. J., L. T. M. Profeta, R. L. Sams, D. W. T. Griffith, and R. L. Yokelson (2010), An infrared spectral database for detection of gases emitted by biomass burning, *Vib. Spectrosc.*, *53*(1), 97-102, doi: 10.1016/j.vibspec.2010.02.010.

Jubb, A. M., T. Gierczak, M. Baasandorj, R. L. Waterland, and J. B. Burkholder (2014), Methyl-Perfluoroheptene-Ethers (CH3OC7F13): Measured OH Radical Reaction Rate Coefficients for Several Isomers and Enantiomers and Their Atmospheric Lifetimes and Global Warming Potentials, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *48*(9), 4954-4962, doi: 10.1021/es500888v.

Kagann, R. H., J. W. Elkins, and R. L. Sams (1983), Absolute band strengths of halocarbons F-11 and F-12 in the 8-mu-mu to 16-mu-m region, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans and Atmospheres*, *88*(NC2), 1427-1432, doi: 10.1029/JC088iC02p01427.

Kim, K., and W. T. King (1984), Infrared intensities in chloroform, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *80*(3), 978-982, doi: 10.1063/1.446792.

Kim, K., R. S. McDowell, and W. T. King (1980), Integrated infrared intensities and transition moments in SF_6, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *73*(1), 36-41, doi: 10.1063/1.439883.

Ko, M., R. L. Shia, N. D. Sze, H. Magid, and R. G. Bray (1999), Atmospheric lifetime and global warming potential of HFC-245fa, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *104*(D7), 8173-8181, doi: 10.1029/1998jd100097.

Ko, M., N. D. Sze, W. C. Wang, G. Shia, A. Goldman, F. J. Murcray, D. G. Murcray, and C. P. Rinsland (1993), Atmospheric sulfur-hexafluoride - sources, sinks and greenhouse warming, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *98*(D6), 10499-10507, doi: 10.1029/93jd00228.

Le Bris, K., R. Pandharpurkar, and K. Strong (2011), Mid-infrared absorption cross-sections and temperature dependence of CFC-113, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *112*(8), 1280-1285, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2011.01.023.

Le Bris, K., J. DeZeeuw, P. J. Godin, and K. Strong (2017), Cis- and trans-perfluorodecalin: Infrared spectra, radiative efficiency and global warming potential, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *203*, 538-541, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2017.01.011.

Le Bris, K., J. DeZeeuw, P. J. Godin, and K. Strong (2020), Radiative efficiency and global warming potential of the hydrofluoroether HFE-356mec3 (CH3OCF2CHFCF3) from experimental and theoretical infrared absorption cross-sections, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *367*, 5, doi: 10.1016/j.jms.2019.111241.

Li, Z. H., and P. Varanasi (1994), Measurement of the absorption cross-sections of CFC-11 at conditions representing various model atmospheres, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *52*(2), 137-144, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(94)90002-7.

Lindenmaier, R., S. D. Williams, R. L. Sams, and T. J. Johnson (2017), Quantitative Infrared Absorption Spectra and Vibrational Assignments of Crotonaldehyde and Methyl Vinyl Ketone Using Gas-Phase Mid-Infrared, Far-Infrared, and Liquid Raman Spectra: s-cis vs s-trans Composition Confirmed via Temperature Studies and ab Initio Methods, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *121*(6), 1195-1212, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.6b10872.

Lindsay, L. P., and P. N. Schatz (1964), Absolute infrared intensities in CHBr3(l), CHBr3(g) and CCl4(g), *Spectrochimica Acta*, *20*(9), 1421-1429, doi: 10.1016/0371-1951(64)80123-5.

Liu, D., S. Qin, W. Li, D. Zhang, and Z. Guo (2016), Atmospheric Chemistry of 1H-Heptafluorocyclopentene (cyc-CF2CF2CF2CF═CH−): Rate Constant, Products, and Mechanism of Gas-Phase Reactions with OH Radicals, IR Absorption Spectrum, Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential, and Global Warming Potential, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *120*(48), 9557-9563, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.6b10348.

M.S.F./R.A.L. Molecular Spectroscopy Facility / Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, http://www.msf.rl.ac.uk.

Mashino, M., M. Kawasaki, T. J. Wallington, and M. D. Hurley (2000), Atmospheric degradation of $CF_3OCF{=}CF_2$: Kinetics and mechanism of its reaction with OH radicals and Cl atoms, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *104*(13), 2925-2930, doi: 10.1021/jp9942264.

Massie, S. T., A. Goldman, D. G. Murcray, and J. C. Gille (1985), Approximate absorption cross-sections of F12, F11, $C10NO_2$, N_2O_5, HNO_3, CCl_4, CF_4, F21, F113, F114, and HNO_4, *Applied Optics*, *24*(21), 3426-3427.

May, R. D., and R. R. Friedl (1993), Integrated band intensities of HO2NO2 at 220-K, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *50*(3), 257-266, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(93)90076-t.

McDowell, R. S., B. J. Krohn, H. Flicker, and M. C. Vasquez (1986), Vibrational levels and anharmonicity in SF_6 .1. Vibrational band analysis, *Spectrochimica Acta Part a-Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*, *42*(2-3), 351-369, doi: 10.1016/0584-8539(86)80199-4.

McPheat, R., and G. Duxbury (2000), Infrared absorption cross-sections and integrated absorption intensities of chloroform and fluoroform vapour, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *66*(2), 153-167, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(99)00214-9.

Mills, I. M., W. B. Person, J. R. Scherer, and B. Crawford (1958), Vibrational intensities .9. C_2F_6 - extension and revision, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *28*(5), 851-853, doi: 10.1063/1.1744282.

Minschwaner, K., R. W. Carver, B. P. Briegleb, and A. E. Roche (1998), Infrared radiative forcing and atmospheric lifetimes of trace species based on observations from UARS, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *103*(D18), 23243-23253, doi: 10.1029/98jd02116.

Molina, L. T., P. J. Woolridge, and M. J. Molina (1995), Atmospheric reactions and ultraviolet and infrared absorptivities of nitrogen trifluoride, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *22*(14), 1873-1876, doi: 10.1029/95gl01669.

Morcillo, J., L. J. Zamorano, and J. M. V. Heredia (1966), Infra-red intensities in CH_2F_2, CH_2Cl_2 and CF_2Cl_2, *Spectrochimica Acta*, *22*(12), 1969-1980, doi: 10.1016/0371-1951(66)80048-6.

Moreno, A., M. P. Gallego-Iniesta, R. Taccone, M. P. Martín, B. Cabañas, and M. S. Salgado (2014), FTIR gas-phase kinetic study on the reactions of some acrylate esters with OH radicals and Cl atoms, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *21*(19), 11541-11551, doi: 10.1007/s11356-014-3112-4.

Myhre, G., C. J. Nielsen, D. L. Powell, and F. Stordal (1999), Infrared absorption cross section, radiative forcing, and GWP of four hydrofluoro(poly)ethers, *Atmos. Environ.*, *33*(27), 4447-4458, doi: 10.1016/s1352-2310(99)00208-3.

Myhre, G., F. Stordal, I. Gausemel, C. J. Nielsen, and E. Mahieu (2006), Line-by-line calculations of thermal infrared radiation representative for global condition: CFC-12 as an example, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *97*(3), 317-331, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2005.04.015.

Naik, V., A. K. Jain, K. O. Patten, and D. J. Wuebbles (2000), Consistent sets of atmospheric lifetimes and radiative forcings on climate for CFC replacements: HCFCs and HFCs, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *105*(D5), 6903-6914, doi: 10.1029/1999jd901128.

Nanes, R., P. M. Silvaggio, and R. W. Boese (1980), Temperature-dependence of intensities of the 8-12 μm bands of $CFCl_3$, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *23*(2), 211-220, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(80)90008-4.

Nemtchinov, V., and P. Varanasi (2004), Absorption cross-sections of HFC-134a in the spectral region between 7 and 12 μm, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *83*(3-4), 285-294, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(02)00356-4.

Newnham, D., J. Ballard, and M. Page (1996), Infrared band strengths of HFC-134a vapour, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *55*(3), 373-381, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(95)00164-6.

Nielsen, O. J., F. M. Nicolaisen, C. Bacher, M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and K. P. Shine (2002), Infrared spectrum and global warming potential of SF_5CF_3, *Atmos. Environ.*, *36*(7), 1237-1240, doi: 10.1016/s1352-2310(01)00551-9.

Nielsen, O. J., M. S. Javadi, M. P. S. Andersen, M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and R. Singh (2007), Atmospheric chemistry of $CF_3CF{=}CH_2$: Kinetics and mechanisms of gas-phase reactions with Cl atoms, OH radicals, and O_3, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *439*(1-3), 18-22, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2007.03.053.

Nilsson, E. J. K., O. J. Nielsen, M. S. Johnson, M. D. Hurley, and T. J. Wallington (2009), Atmospheric chemistry of cis-CF_3CHCHF: Kinetics of reactions with OH radicals and O_3 and products of OH radical initiated oxidation, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *473*(4-6), 233-237, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2009.03.076.

Ninomiya, Y., M. Kawasaki, A. Guschin, L. T. Molina, M. J. Molina, and T. J. Wallington (2000), Atmospheric chemistry of *n*-$C_3F_7OCH_3$: Reaction with OH radicals and Cl atoms and atmospheric fate of *n*-$C_3F_7OCH_2O(\bullet)$ radicals, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *34*(14), 2973-2978, doi: 10.1021/es991449z.

Olliff, M. P., and G. Fischer (1994), Integrated absorption intensities of haloethanes and halopropanes, *Spectrochimica Acta Part a-Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy*, *50*(13), 2223-2237, doi: 10.1016/0584-8539(93)e0027-t.

Orkin, V. L., L. E. Martynova, and A. N. Ilichev (2010), High-Accuracy Measurements of OH Reaction Rate Constants and IR Absorption Spectra: $CH_2{=}CF{-}CF_3$ and trans-$CHF{=}CH{-}CF_3$, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *114*(19), 5967-5979, doi: 10.1021/jp9092817.

Orkin, V. L., L. E. Martynova, and M. J. Kurylo (2014a), Photochemical Properties of trans-1-Chloro-3,3,3-trifluoropropene (trans-CHCl═CHCF3): OH Reaction Rate Constant, UV and IR Absorption Spectra, Global Warming Potential, and Ozone Depletion Potential, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *118*(28), 5263-5271, doi: 10.1021/jp5018949.

Orkin, V. L., E. Villenave, R. E. Huie, and M. J. Kurylo (1999), Atmospheric lifetimes and global warming potentials of hydrofluoroethers: Reactivity toward OH, UV spectra, and IR absorption cross sections, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *103*(48), 9770-9779, doi: 10.1021/jp991741t.

Orkin, V. L., A. G. Guschin, I. K. Larin, R. E. Huie, and M. J. Kurylo (2003), Measurements of the infrared absorption cross-sections of haloalkanes and their use in a simplified calculational approach for estimating direct global warming potentials, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A-Chem.*, *157*(2-3), 211-222, doi: 10.1016/s1010-6030(03)00057-1.

Orlando, J. J., G. S. Tyndall, A. Huang, and J. G. Calvert (1992), Temperature-dependence of the infrared-absorption cross-sections of carbon-tetrachloride, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *19*(10), 1005-1008, doi: 10.1029/91gl01036.

Oyaro, N., S. R. Sellevag, and C. J. Nielsen (2004), Study of the OH and Cl-initiated oxidation, IR absorption cross-section, radiative forcing, and global warming potential of four C_4-hydrofluoroethers, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *38*(21), 5567-5576, doi: 10.1021/es0497330.

Oyaro, N., S. R. Sellevag, and C. J. Nielsen (2005), Atmospheric chemistry of hydrofluoroethers: Reaction of a series of hydrofluoro ethers with OH radicals and Cl atoms, atmospheric lifetimes, and global warming potentials, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *109*(2), 337-346, doi: 10.1021/jp047860c.

Papadimitriou, V. C., and J. B. Burkholder (2016), OH Radical Reaction Rate Coefficients, Infrared Spectrum, and Global Warming Potential of (CF3)2CFCH═CHF (HFO-1438ezy(E)), *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *120*(33), 6618-6628, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.6b06096.

Papadimitriou, V. C., R. K. Talukdar, R. W. Portmann, A. R. Ravishankara, and J. B. Burkholder (2008a), $CF_3CF{=}CH_2$ and (*Z*)-$CF_3CF{=}CHF$: temperature dependent OH rate coefficients and global warming potentials, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *10*(6), 808-820, doi: 10.1039/b714382f.

Papadimitriou, V. C., R. W. Portmann, D. W. Fahey, J. Muhle, R. F. Weiss, and J. B. Burkholder (2008b), Experimental and Theoretical Study of the Atmospheric Chemistry and Global Warming Potential of SO_2F_2, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *112*(49), 12657-12666, doi: 10.1021/jp806368u.

Papadimitriou, V. C., C. S. Spitieri, P. Papagiannakopoulos, M. Cazaunau, M. Lendar, V. Daele, and A. Mellouki (2015), Atmospheric chemistry of (CF3)2C[double bond, length as m-dash]CH2: OH radicals, Cl atoms and O3 rate coefficients, oxidation end-products and IR spectra, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *17*(38), 25607-25620, doi: 10.1039/C5CP03840E.

Peirone, S. A., J. A. Barrera, R. A. Taccone, P. M. Cometto, and S. I. Lane (2014), Relative rate coefficient measurements of OH radical reactions with (Z)-2-hexen-1-ol and (E)-3-hexen-1-ol under simulated atmospheric conditions, *Atmos. Environ.*, *85*(Supplement C), 92-98, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.11.076.

Person, W. B., and S. R. Polo (1961), Infrared intensities of the fundamental frequencies of CF_3Br, *Spectrochimica Acta*, *17*(1), 101-111, doi: 10.1016/0371-1951(61)80016-7.

Rajakumar, B., R. W. Portmann, J. B. Burkholder, and A. R. Ravishankara (2006), Rate coefficients for the reactions of OH with $CF_3CH_2CH_3$ (HFC-263fb), CF_3CHFCH_2F (HFC-245eb), and $CHF_2CHFCHF_2$ (HFC-245ea) between 238 and 375 K, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *110*(21), 6724-6731, doi: 10.1021/jp056248y.

Ramanathan, V., R. J. Cicerone, H. B. Singh, and J. T. Kiehl (1985), Trace gas trends and their potential role in climate change, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *90*(ND3), 5547-5566, doi: 10.1029/JD090iD03p05547.

Ren, Y. G., F. Bernard, V. Daele, and A. Mellould (2019), Atmospheric Fate and Impact of Perfluorinated Butanone and Pentanone, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *53*(15), 8862-8871, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.9b02974.

Rinsland, C. P., S. W. Sharpe, and R. L. Sams (2003), Temperature-dependent absorption cross-sections in the thermal infrared bands of SF_5CF_3, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *82*(1-4), 483-490, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(03)00172-9.

Rinsland, C. P., V. M. Devi, T. A. Blake, R. L. Sams, S. Sharpe, and L. Chiou (2008), Quantitative measurement of integrated band intensities of benzene vapor in the mid-infrared at 278, 298, and 323 K, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *109*(15), 2511-2522, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2008.04.007.

Rodriguez, A., I. Bravo, D. Rodriguez, M. Tajuelo, Y. Diaz-de-Mera, and A. Aranda (2016), The environmental impact of unsaturated fluoroesters: atmospheric chemistry towards OH radicals and Cl atoms, radiative behavior and cumulative ozone creation, *RSC Advances*, *6*(26), 21833-21843, doi: 10.1039/C6RA00630B.

Rodríguez, A., D. Rodríguez, A. Moraleda, I. Bravo, E. Moreno, and A. Notario (2014), Atmospheric chemistry of HFE-7300 and HFE-7500: Temperature dependent kinetics, atmospheric lifetimes, infrared spectra and global warming potentials, *Atmos. Environ.*, *96*(Supplement C), 145-153, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.07.033.

Roehl, C. M., D. Boglu, C. Bruhl, and G. K. Moortgat (1995), Infrared band intensities and global warming potentials of CF_4, C_2F_6, C_3F_8, C_4F_{10}, C_5F_{12}, and C_6F_{14}, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *22*(7), 815-818, doi: 10.1029/95gl00488.

Rogers, J. D., and R. D. Stephens (1988), Absolute infrared intensities for F-113 and F-114 and an assessment of their greenhouse warming potential relative to other chlorofluorocarbons, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *93*(D3), 2423-2428, doi: 10.1029/JD093iD03p02423.

Ryan, S. M., and C. J. Nielsen (2010), Global Warming Potential of Inhaled Anesthetics: Application to Clinical Use, *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, *111*(1), 92-98, doi: 10.1213/ANE.0b013e3181e058d7.

Schatz, P. N., and D. F. Hornig (1953), Bond moments and derivatives in CF_4, SIF_4, and SF_6 from infrared intensities, *J. Chem. Phys.*, *21*(9), 1516-1530, doi: 10.1063/1.1699291.

Sellevag, S. R., T. Kelly, H. Sidebottom, and C. J. Nielsen (2004a), A study of the IR and UV-Vis absorption cross-sections, photolysis and OH-initiated oxidation of CF_3CHO and CF_3CH_2CHO, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *6*(6), 1243-1252, doi: 10.1039/b315941h.

Sellevag, S. R., C. J. Nielsen, O. A. Sovde, G. Myhre, J. K. Sundet, F. Stordal, and I. S. A. Isaksen (2004b), Atmospheric gas-phase degradation and global warming potentials of 2-fluoro ethanol, 2,2-difluoroethanol, and 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol, *Atmos. Environ.*, *38*(39), 6725-6735, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.09.023.

Sellevåg, S. R., B. D'Anna, and C. J. Nielsen (2007), Infrared Absorption Cross-Sections and Estimated Global Warming Potentials of $CF_3CH_2CH_2OH$, $CHF_2CF_2CH_2OH$, $CF_3CF_2CH_2OH$, $CF_3CHFCF_2CH_2OH$, and $CF_3CF_2CF_2CH_2OH$, *Asian Chemistry Letters*(11), 33-40.

Shine, K. P., L. K. Gohar, M. D. Hurley, G. Marston, D. Martin, P. G. Simmonds, T. J. Wallington, and M. Watkins (2005), Perfluorodecalin: global warming potential and first detection in the atmosphere, *Atmos. Environ.*, *39*(9), 1759-1763, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.01.001.

Smith, K., D. Newnham, M. Page, J. Ballard, and G. Duxbury (1996), Infrared band strengths and absorption cross-sections of HFC-32 vapour, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *56*(1), 73-82, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(96)00019-2.

Smith, K., D. Newnham, M. Page, J. Ballard, and G. Duxbury (1998), Infrared absorption cross-sections and integrated absorption intensities of HFC-134 and HFC-143a vapour, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *59*(3-5), 437-451, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(97)00114-3.

Stoppa, P., A. P. Charmet, N. Tasinato, S. Giorgianni, and A. Gambi (2009), Infrared Spectra, Integrated Band Intensities, and Anharmonic Force Field of $H_2C{=}CHF$, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *113*(8), 1497-1504, doi: 10.1021/jp808556e.

Sturges, W. T., T. J. Wallington, M. D. Hurley, K. P. Shine, K. Sihra, A. Engel, D. E. Oram, S. A. Penkett, R. Mulvaney, and C. A. M. Brenninkmeijer (2000), A potent greenhouse gas identified in the atmosphere: SF_5CF_3, *Science*, *289*(5479), 611-613, doi: 10.1126/science.289.5479.611.

Suga, A., Y. Mochizuki, N. Nagasaki, Y. Gotoh, H. Ito, S. Yamashita, T. Uchimaru, M. Sugie, A. Sekiya, S. Kondo, and M. Aoyagi (1994), Estimation of total infrared intensities of fluorinated ethyl methyl ethers, *Chemistry Letters*(12), 2365-2368, doi: 10.1246/cl.1994.2365.

Søndergaard, R., O. J. Nielsen, M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and R. Singh (2007), Atmospheric chemistry of trans-$CF_3CH = CHF$: Kinetics of the gas-phase reactions with Cl atoms, OH radicals, and O_3, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *443*(4-6), 199-204, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2007.06.084.

Takahashi, K., Y. Matsumi, T. J. Wallington, and M. D. Hurley (2002), Atmospheric chemistry of $CF_3CFHOCF_3$: Reaction with OH radicals, atmospheric lifetime, and global warming potential, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *107*(D21), doi: 10.1029/2002jd002125.

Tanabe, K., and S. Saeki (1970), Calculation of infrared band intensities of various chlorinated methanes, *Spectrochimica Acta Part a-Molecular Spectroscopy*, *A 26*(7), 1469-&, doi: 10.1016/0584-8539(70)80208-2.

Tereszchuk, K. A., and P. F. Bernath (2011), Infrared absorption cross-sections for acetaldehyde (CH3CHO) in the 3 mu m region, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *112*(6), 990-993, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.12.003.

Thomsen, D. L., V. F. Andersen, O. J. Nielsen, and T. J. Wallington (2011), Atmospheric chemistry of $C_2F_5CH_2OCH_3$ (HFE-365mcf), *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *13*(7), 2758-2764.

Tokuhashi, K., K. Takizawa, and S. Kondo (2018), Rate constants for the reactions of OH radicals with CF3CX=CY2 (X = H, F, CF3, Y = H, F, Cl), *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *25*(15), 15204-15215, doi: 10.1007/s11356-018-1700-4.

Vanthanh, N., I. Rossi, A. Jeanlouis, and H. Rippel (1986), Infrared band shapes and band strengths of CF_2Cl_2 from 800 to 1200 cm^{-1} at 296 and 200 K, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *91*(D3), 4056-4062.

Varanasi, P., and F. K. Ko (1977), Intensity measurements in freon bands of atmospheric interest, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *17*(3), 385-388, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(77)90116-9.

Varanasi, P., and S. Chudamani (1988a), Infrared intensities of some chlorofluorocarbons capable of perturbing the global climate, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *93*(D2), 1666-1668, doi: 10.1029/JD093iD02p01666.

Varanasi, P., and S. Chudamani (1988b), Remeasurement of the absolute intensities of CFC-11 ($CFCl_3$) and CFC-12 (CF_2Cl_2), *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *39*(3), 193-195, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(88)90026-x.

Varanasi, P., and V. Nemtchinov (1994), Thermal infrared-absorption coefficients of CFC-12 at atmospheric conditions, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *51*(5), 679-687, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(94)90124-4.

Varanasi, P., Z. Li, V. Nemtchinov, and A. Cherukuri (1994), Spectral absorption-coefficient data on HCFC-22 and SF_6 for remote-sensing applications, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *52*(3-4), 323-332, doi: 10.1016/0022-4073(94)90162-7.

Vasekova, E., E. A. Drage, K. M. Smith, and N. J. Mason (2006), FTIR spectroscopy and radiative forcing of octafluorocyclobutane and octofluorocyclopentene, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *102*(3), 418-424, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2006.02.023.

Vlachogiannis, D., A. Sfetsos, A. K. Stubos, R.-E. P. Sotiropoulou, E. Tagaris, C. Pilinis, W. Zhong, J. D. Haigh, D. O. Eriksen, S. K. Hartvig, C. Chatzichristos, J. Muller, R. Kleven, and I. Nielssen (2005), Assessment of the impact of SF_6 and PFC reservoir tracers on global warming, the AEOLOS study, *Environmental Sciences*, *2*(2-3), 263-272, doi: 10.1080/15693430500396170.

Vollmer, M. K., F. Bernard, B. Mitrevski, L. P. Steele, C. M. Trudinger, S. Reimann, R. L. Langenfelds, P. B. Krummel, P. J. Fraser, D. M. Etheridge, M. A. J. Curran, and J. B. Burkholder (2019), Abundances, emissions, and loss processes of the long-lived and potent greenhouse gas octafluorooxolane (octafluorotetrahydrofuran, c-C4F8O) in the atmosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *19*(6), 3481-3492, doi: 10.5194/acp-19-3481-2019.

Wagner, G., and A. Birk (2003), New infrared spectroscopic database for chlorine nitrate, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *82*(1-4), 443-460, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(03)00169-9.

Wagner, G., and M. Birk (2016), New infrared spectroscopic database for bromine nitrate, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, *326*, 95-105, doi: 10.1016/j.jms.2016.03.007.

Wallington, T. J., M. D. Hurley, and O. J. Nielsen (2009), The radiative efficiency of $HCF_2OCF_2OCF_2CF_2OCF_2H$ (H-Galden 1040x) revisited, *Atmos. Environ.*, *43*(27), 4247-4249, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.05.046.

Wallington, T. J., M. D. Hurley, O. J. Nielsen, and M. P. S. Andersen (2004), Atmospheric chemistry of $CF_3CFHCF_2OCF_3$ and $CF_3CFHCF_2OCF_2H$: Reaction with Cl atoms and OH radicals, degradation mechanism, and global warming potentials, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *108*(51), 11333-11338, doi: 10.1021/jp046454q.

Wallington, T. J., M. D. Hurley, J. C. Ball, T. Ellermann, O. J. Nielsen, and J. Sehested (1994), Atmospheric chemistry of HFC-152 - UV absorption-spectrum of CH_2FCFHO_2 radicals, kinetics of the reaction CH_2FCFHO_2+NO-> CH_2FCHFO+NO_2, and fate of the alkoxy radical CH_2FCFHO, *Journal of Physical Chemistry*, *98*(21), 5435-5440, doi: 10.1021/j100072a008.

Wallington, T. J., A. Guschin, T. N. N. Stein, J. Platz, J. Sehested, L. K. Christensen, and O. J. Nielsen (1998), Atmospheric chemistry of $CF_3CH_2OCH_2CF_3$: UV spectra and kinetic data for $CF_3CH(\bullet)OCH_2CF_3$ and $CF_3CH(OO\bullet)OCH_2CF_3$ radicals and atmospheric fate of $CF_3CH(O\bullet)OCH_2CF_3$ radicals, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *102*(7), 1152-1161, doi: 10.1021/jp972933w.

Wallington, T. J., W. F. Schneider, J. Sehested, M. Bilde, J. Platz, O. J. Nielsen, L. K. Christensen, M. J. Molina, L. T. Molina, and P. W. Wooldridge (1997), Atmospheric chemistry of HFE-7100 ($C_4F_9OCH_3$): Reaction with OH radicals, UV spectra and kinetic data for $C_4F_9OCH_2\bullet$ and $C_4F_9CH_2O_2\bullet$ radicals, and the atmospheric fate of $C_4F_9OCH_2O$ center dot radicals, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *101*(44), 8264-8274, doi: 10.1021/jp971353w.

Waterland, R. L., M. D. Hurley, J. A. Misner, T. J. Wallington, S. M. L. Melo, K. Strong, R. Dumoulin, L. Castera, N. L. Stock, and S. A. Mabury (2005), Gas phase UV and IR absorption spectra of $CF_3CH_2CH_2OH$ and $F(CF_2CF_2)_xCH_2CH_2OH$ (x=2, 3, 4), *J. Fluor. Chem.*, *126*(9-10), 1288-1296, doi: 10.1016/j.jfluchem.2005.06.010.

Wetzel, G., H. Oelhaf, O. Kirner, R. Ruhnke, F. Friedl-Vallon, A. Kleinert, G. Maucher, H. Fischer, M. Birk, G. Wagner, and A. Engel (2010), First remote sensing measurements of ClOOCl along with ClO and ClONO2 in activated and deactivated Arctic vortex conditions using new ClOOCl IR absorption cross sections, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *10*(3), 931-945, doi: 10.5194/acp-10-931-2010.

Young, C. J., M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and S. A. Mabury (2006), Atmospheric lifetime and global warming potential of a perfluoropolyether, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *40*(7), 2242-2246, doi: 10.1021/es052077z.

Young, C. J., M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and S. A. Mabury (2009a), Atmospheric chemistry of CF_3CF_2H and $CF_3CF_2CF_2CF_2H$: Kinetics and products of gas-phase reactions with Cl atoms and OH radicals, infrared spectra, and formation of perfluorocarboxylic acids, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *473*(4-6), 251-256, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2009.04.001.

Young, C. J., M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington, and S. A. Mabury (2009b), Atmospheric chemistry of perfluorobutenes ($CF_3CFCFCF_3$ and $CF_3CF_2CFCF_2$): Kinetics and mechanisms of reactions with OH radicals and chlorine atoms, IR spectra, global warming potentials, and oxidation to perfluorocarboxylic acids, *Atmos. Environ.*, *43*(24), 3717-3724, doi: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.04.025.

Zander, R., C. P. Rinsland, C. B. Farmer, and R. H. Norton (1987), Infrared spectroscopic measurements of halogenated source gases in the stratosphere with the ATMOS instrument, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, *92*(D8), 9836-9850, doi: 10.1029/JD092iD08p09836.

Zhang, H., J. X. Wu, and P. Luc (2011b), A study of the radiative forcing and global warming potentials of hydrofluorocarbons, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *112*(2), 220-229, doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.05.012.

Zhang, N., L. Chen, T. Uchimaru, F. Qing, J. Mizukado, H. Quan, and H. Suda (2015), Kinetics of gas-phase reactions of cyc-CF2CF2CF2CHFCH2 and trans-cyc-CF2CF2CF2CHFCHF with OH radicals between 253 and 328K, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *639*(Supplement C), 199-204, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cplett.2015.09.020.

Zou, Q., C. Sun, V. Nemtchinov, and P. Varanasi (2004), Thermal infrared cross-sections of C_2F_6 at atmospheric temperatures, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.*, *83*(2), 215-221, doi: 10.1016/s0022-4073(02)00353-9.

Østerstrøm, F. F., O. J. Nielsen, and T. J. Wallington (2016), Atmospheric chemistry of CF3CF2OCH3, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *653*(Supplement C), 149-154, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cplett.2016.04.086.

Østerstrøm, F. F., O. J. Nielsen, M. P. S. Andersen, and T. J. Wallington (2012), Atmospheric chemistry of $CF_3CH_2OCH_3$: Reaction with chlorine atoms and OH radicals, kinetics, degradation mechanism and global warming potential, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, *524*, 32-37, doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2011.12.047.

Østerstrøm, F. F., T. J. Wallington, M. P. Sulbaek Andersen, and O. J. Nielsen (2015), Atmospheric Chemistry of (CF3)2CHOCH3, (CF3)2CHOCHO, and CF3C(O)OCH3, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, *119*(42), 10540-10552, doi: 10.1021/acs.jpca.5b08204.

Østerstrøm, F. F., S. T. Andersen, T. I. Solling, O. J. Nielsen, and M. P. Sulbaek Andersen (2017), Atmospheric chemistry of Z- and E-CF3CH[double bond, length as m-dash]CHCF3, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *19*(1), 735-750, doi: 10.1039/C6CP07234H.

Table 1. Estimated contributions to the total radiative forcing uncertainty.

Source of uncertainty	Estimated contribution to total RF uncertainty	References used as basis for uncertainty estimates
Experimental absorption cross-sections - neglected far infrared bands - neglected shortwave bands	~5% ~3% ~5%	(Ballard et al., 2000a; Bravo et al., 2010; Forster et al., 2005)
Radiation scheme	~5%	(W D Collins et al., 2006; Forster et al., 2005; Oreopoulos et al., 2012)
Clouds	~5%	(Forster et al., 2005; Gohar et al., 2004)
Spectral overlap and water vapor distribution	~3%	(Forster et al., 2005; Jain et al., 2000; Pinnock et al., 1995)
Surface emissivity and temperature, and atmospheric temperature	~5%	(Forster et al., 2005)
Tropopause level	~5%	(Forster et al., 2005; Freckleton et al., 1998; Myhre and Stordal, 1997)
Temporal and spatial averaging	~1%	(Freckleton et al., 1998; Myhre and Stordal, 1997)
Stratospheric temperature adjustment	~2%	(Forster et al., 2005; Gohar et al., 2004; Shine and Myhre, 2020)
Non-uniform vertical profile	~5% for lifetimes > ~5 years, ~20% for lifetimes < ~5 years	(Hodnebrog et al., 2013; Sihra et al., 2001)
Total (RSS)	~14% for lifetimes > ~5 years ~24% for lifetimes < ~5 years	

Table 2. Integrated infrared absorption cross-section updates (*S*) since the H2013 review for the 40 most abundant halocarbons and related compounds in the atmosphere. Spectra used in the present RE calculations are indicated in bold (see Tables S1-S6 for a complete list of spectra used in RE calculations).

Name	CASRN	Identifier	Formula[1]	*T* (K)	Wn. range (cm^{-1})	*S*[2]	Reference	Database[3]	New[4]
Chlorofluorocarbons									
Trichlorofluoromethane	75-69-4	CFC-11	CCl_3F	298	570 - 3000	10.1	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Dichlorodifluoromethane	75-71-8	CFC-12	CCl_2F_2	294	800 - 1270	13.5	**(Harrison, 2015a)**	H16	S
				296	600 - 3000	13.9	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	P	S
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane	76-13-1	CFC-113	CCl_2FCClF_2	298	620 - 3000	14.6	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,2-Dichloro-1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane	76-14-2	CFC-114	$CClF_2CClF_2$	298	600 - 3000	17.4	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1-Chloro-1,1,2,2,2-pentafluoroethane	76-15-3	CFC-115	$CClF_2CF_3$	296	946 - 1368	11.9	**(Totterdill et al., 2016)**		B
				296	525 - 3000	20.1	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	P	S
Hydrochlorofluorocarbons									
Chlorodifluoromethane	75-45-6	HCFC-22	$CHClF_2$	295	730 - 1380	10.5	**(Harrison, 2016)**	H16	S
				296	550 - 3000	10.8	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	P	S
1,1-Dichloro-1-fluoroethane	1717-00-6	HCFC-141b	CH_3CCl_2F	295	705 - 1280		(Harrison, 2019)		L
				283	570 - 1470	8.0	**(Le Bris et al., 2012)**		S
				298	550 - 3000	8.4	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1-Chloro-1,1-difluoroethane	75-68-3	HCFC-142b	CH_3CClF_2	283	650 - 1500	10.7	**(Le Bris and Strong, 2010)**	H16	S
				298	600 - 3000	11.2	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Hydrofluorocarbons									
Trifluoromethane	75-46-7	HFC-23	CHF_3	294	950 - 1500	12.3	**(Harrison, 2013)**	H16	S
				296	600 - 3000	12.7	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	P	S
Difluoromethane	75-10-5	HFC-32	CH_2F_2	298	510 - 3000	7.0	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,1,1,2,2-Pentafluoroethane	354-33-6	HFC-125	CHF_2CF_3	298	510 - 3000	17.4	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane	811-97-2	HFC-134a	CH_2FCF_3	296	750 - 1600	13.2	(Harrison, 2015b)	H16	S
				296	600 - 3000	14.2	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	P	S
1,1,1-Trifluoroethane	420-46-2	HFC-143a	CH_3CF_3	296	570 - 1500	13.8	**(Le Bris and Graham, 2015)**	H16	B
				298	500 - 3000	13.9	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,1-Difluoroethane	75-37-6	HFC-152a	CH_3CHF_2	298	525 - 3000	8.0	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,1,1,2,3,3,3-Heptafluoropropane	431-89-0	HFC-227ea	CF_3CHFCF_3	298	500 - 3000	25.3	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,1,1,2,2,3,4,5,5,5-Decafluoropentane	138495-42-8	HFC-43-10mee	$CF_3CHFCHFCF_2CF_3$	305	550 - 1600	30.1	**(Le Bris et al., 2018)**		B
				298	500 - 3000	30.4	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons									
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71-55-6	Methyl chloroform	CH_3CCl_3	298	500 - 3000	5.3	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Tetrachloromethane	56-23-5	Carbon tetrachloride	CCl_4	296	700 - 860	6.7	(Harrison et al., 2017)	H16	S
				295-8	730 - 825	6.3	**(Wallington et al., 2016)**		B
				298	730 - 825	6.4	(Sharpe et al., 2004)	P	L
Chloromethane	74-87-3	Methyl chloride	CH_3Cl	295-8	660 - 1620	0.8	**(Wallington et al., 2016)**		B
				296	600 - 3000	1.3	(Sharpe et al., 2004)	P	S
Dichloromethane	75-09-2	Methylene chloride	CH_2Cl_2	295-8	650 - 1290	2.6	**(Wallington et al., 2016)**		B
				298	600 - 3000	2.8	(Sharpe et al., 2004)	H16	S
Trichloromethane	67-66-3	Chloroform	$CHCl_3$	295-8	720 - 1245	4.4	**(Wallington et al., 2016)**		B

				298	580 - 3000	5.0	(Sharpe et al., 2004)	H16	S
Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons									
Bromomethane	74-83-9	Methyl bromide	CH_3Br	296	550 - 3000	1.1	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	P	S
Bromochlorodifluoromethane	353-59-3	Halon-1211	$CBrClF_2$	298	600 - 3000	13.2	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Bromotrifluoromethane	75-63-8	Halon-1301	$CBrF_3$	298	510 - 3000	16.1	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
1,2-Dibromo-1,1,2,2-tetrafluoroethane	124-73-2	Halon-2402	$CBrF_2CBrF_2$	298	550 - 3000	16.1	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Fully Fluorinated Species									
Nitrogen trifluoride	7783-54-2		NF_3	296	600 - 1970	7.3	**(Totterdill et al., 2016)**		B
				298	600 - 3000	7.2	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Sulfur hexafluoride	2551-62-4		SF_6	295	650 - 2000	24.0	(Kovács et al., 2017)		L
				298	560 - 3000	21.2	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Sulfuryl fluoride	2699-79-8		SO_2F_2	298	500 - 3000	14.0	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Tetrafluoromethane	75-73-0	PFC-14	CF_4	298	570 - 3000	19.8	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Hexafluoroethane	76-16-4	PFC-116	C_2F_6	298	500 - 3000	23.1	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Octafluoropropane	76-19-7	PFC-218	C_3F_8	298	600 - 3000	27.5	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Octafluorocyclobutane	115-25-3	PFC-C 318	cyc $(-CF_2CF_2CF_2CF_2-)$	298	550 - 3000	21.7	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Decafluorobutane	355-25-9	PFC-31-10	n-C_4F_{10}	298	500 - 3000	32.4	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S
Dodecafluoropentane	678-26-2	PFC-41-12	n-C_5F_{12}	278	500 - 3000	37.3	**(Sharpe et al., 2004)**	H16	S

[1] cyc, cyclic compound.

[2] Integrated absorption cross-section given in units of 10^{-17} cm^2 $molecule^{-1}$ cm^{-1}.

[3] Absorption cross-section downloaded from database: H16, HITRAN 2016; P, PNNL.

[4] New data since H2013: L, Literature; S, Spectrum; B, Both.

Table 3. Lifetimes (τ), radiative efficiencies and direct effect GWPs (relative to CO_2) for the 40 most abundant halocarbons and related compounds in the atmosphere. Compounds where the radiative efficiencies are based on new spectra since the H2013 review are marked in bold. Recommended RE and GWP(100) values are indicated in bold. Lifetimes are taken from WMO (2019). Note that RE values with more significant digits have been used to calculate GWP(100) and that these are available in the supporting information.

			τ (yr)		RE (W m^{-2} ppb^{-1})		GWP(100)	
Identifier / name	Formula	CASRN	H2013[a]	WMO (2019)	H2013	This work	H2013	This work
Chlorofluorocarbons								
CFC-11	CCl_3F	75-69-4	45.0	52.0	**0.26**	0.26	4,660	**5,870**
CFC-12	CCl_2F_2	75-71-8	100.0	102.0	**0.32**	0.32	10,200	**11,800**
CFC-113	CCl_2FCClF_2	76-13-1	85.0	93.0	**0.30**	0.30	5,820	**6,900**
CFC-114	$CClF_2CClF_2$	76-14-2	190.0	189.0	**0.31**	0.31	8,590	**9,990**
CFC-115	$CClF_2CF_3$	76-15-3	1020.0	540.0	0.20	**0.25**	7,670	**10,200**
Hydrochlorofluorocarbons								
HCFC-22	$CHClF_2$	75-45-6	11.9	11.9	**0.21**	0.21	1,770	**2,060**
HCFC-141b	CH_3CCl_2F	1717-00-6	9.2	9.4	**0.16**	0.16	782	**903**
HCFC-142b	CH_3CClF_2	75-68-3	17.2	18.0	**0.19**	0.19	1,980	**2,410**
Hydrofluorocarbons								
HFC-23	CHF_3	75-46-7	222.0	228.0	0.17	**0.19**	12,400	**15,500**
HFC-32	CH_2F_2	75-10-5	5.2	5.4	**0.11**	0.11	677	**809**
HFC-125	CHF_2CF_3	354-33-6	28.2	30.0	**0.23**	0.23	3,170	**3,940**
HFC-134a	CH_2FCF_3	811-97-2	13.4	14.0	0.16	**0.17**	1,300	**1,600**
HFC-143a	CH_3CF_3	420-46-2	47.1	51.0	0.16	**0.17**	4,800	**6,130**
HFC-152a	CH_3CHF_2	75-37-6	1.5	1.6	**0.10**	0.10	138	**172**
HFC-227ea	CF_3CHFCF_3	431-89-0	38.9	36.0	0.26	**0.27**	3,350	**3,800**
HFC-236fa	$CF_3CH_2CF_3$	690-39-1	242.0	213.0	0.24	**0.25**	8,060	**9,210**
HFC-245fa	$CHF_2CH_2CF_3$	460-73-1	7.7	7.9	**0.24**	0.24	858	**1,010**
HFC-365mfc	$CH_3CF_2CH_2CF_3$	406-58-6	8.7	8.9	0.22	**0.23**	804	**959**
HFC-43-10mee	$CF_3CHFCHFCF_2CF_3$	138495-42-8	16.1	17.0	0.42	**0.36**	1,650	**1,680**
Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons								
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	CH_3CCl_3	71-55-6	5.0	5.0	0.07	**0.06**	160	**169**
Tetrachloromethane	CCl_4	56-23-5	26.0	32.0	**0.17**	0.17	1,730	**2,310**
Chloromethane	CH_3Cl	74-87-3	1.0	0.9	0.010	**0.005**	12	**6**
Dichloromethane	CH_2Cl_2	75-09-2	0.4	0.5	**0.03**	0.03	9	**12**
Trichloromethane	$CHCl_3$	67-66-3	0.4	0.5	0.08	**0.07**	16	**22**
Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons								
Bromomethane	CH_3Br	74-83-9	0.8	0.8	0.005	**0.004**	2	**3**
Halon-1211	$CBrClF_2$	353-59-3	16.0	16.0	0.29	**0.30**	1,750	**2,030**
Halon-1301	$CBrF_3$	75-63-8	65.0	72.0	**0.30**	0.30	6,290	**7,600**
Halon-2402	$CBrF_2CBrF_2$	124-73-2	20.0	28.0	**0.31**	0.31	1,470	**2,280**
Fully Fluorinated Species								
Nitrogen trifluoride	NF_3	7783-54-2	500.0	569.0	**0.20**	0.20	16,100	**18,500**
Sulfur hexafluoride	SF_6	2551-62-4	3200.0	3200.0	**0.57**	0.57	23,500	**26,700**
Sulfuryl fluoride	SO_2F_2	2699-79-8	36.0	36.0	0.20	**0.21**	4,100	**4,880**
PFC-14	CF_4	75-73-0	50000.0	50000.0	**0.10**	0.10	6,630	**7,830**
PFC-116	C_2F_6	76-16-4	10000.0	10000.0	0.25	**0.26**	11,100	**13,200**
PFC-218	C_3F_8	76-19-7	2600.0	2600.0	0.28	**0.27**	8,900	**9,850**
PFC-C-318	c-C_4F_8	115-25-3	3200.0	3200.0	0.32	**0.31**	9,550	**10,800**
PFC-31-10	n-C_4F_{10}	355-25-9	2600.0	2600.0	0.36	**0.37**	9,200	**10,600**
PFC-41-12	n-C_5F_{12}	678-26-2	4100.0	4100.0	**0.41**	0.41	8,550	**9,780**
PFC-51-14	n-C_6F_{14}	355-42-0	3100.0	3100.0	0.44	**0.45**	7,910	**9,140**
PFC-61-16	n-C_7F_{16}	335-57-9	3000.0	3000.0	**0.50**	0.50	7,820	**8,920**
PFC-71-18	n-C_8F_{18}	307-34-6	3000.0	3000.0	0.55	**0.56**	7,620	**8,760**

[a] Lifetimes in H2013 were from WMO (2011) except for PFC-71-18

Table 4. Concentrations (ppt) and radiative forcing (mW m^{-2}) for the 40 most abundant halocarbons and related compounds in the atmosphere. Concentrations in italic are from 2014 (Meinshausen et al., 2017) and the remaining from 2019 (Butler and Montzka, 2020). The REs used to calculate RF are both from H2013 and from this study. Note that RE values with more significant digits than given in Table 3 have been used to calculate RF for each compound and that these are available in the supporting information.

		Radiative forcing (mW m^{-2})[a]		
Identifier / name	Concentrations (ppt)	H2013 REs	Updated REs	% difference
Chlorofluorocarbons		**246.16**	**247.47**	**1**
CFC-11	226.50	58.89	58.76	0
CFC-12	501.60	159.51	160.50	1
CFC-113	69.70	21.05	21.01	0
CFC-114	*16.31*	5.01	5.13	2
CFC-115	*8.43*	1.70	2.08	22
Hydrochlorofluorocarbons		**59.44**	**60.95**	**3**
HCFC-22	246.80	51.33	52.78	3
HCFC-141b	24.39	3.95	3.92	-1
HCFC-142b	22.00	4.16	4.25	2
Hydrofluorocarbons		**35.61**	**37.26**	**5**
HFC-23	30.00	5.25	5.73	9
HFC-32	*8.34*	0.92	0.93	1
HFC-125	29.10	6.58	6.80	3
HFC-134a	107.77	17.35	18.01	4
HFC-143a	23.83	3.77	4.00	6
HFC-152a	6.92	0.68	0.70	4
HFC-227ea	*1.01*	0.26	0.28	6
HFC-236fa	*0.13*	0.03	0.03	3
HFC-245fa	*2.05*	0.50	0.50	1
HFC-365mfc	*0.77*	0.17	0.18	2
HFC-43-10mee	*0.25*	0.11	0.09	-15
Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons		**15.50**	**14.67**	**-5**
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1.60	0.11	0.10	-6
Tetrachloromethane	78.50	13.35	13.04	-2
Chloromethane	*539.54*	0.83	0.38	-53
Dichloromethane	*36.35*	0.91	0.85	-7
Trichloromethane	*9.90*	0.30	0.29	-6
Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons		**2.07**	**2.09**	**1**
Bromomethane	*6.69*	0.01	0.01	-14
Halon-1211	3.25	0.96	0.98	2
Halon-1301	3.28	0.98	0.98	0
Halon-2402	0.40	0.13	0.12	0
Fully Fluorinated Species		**12.83**	**13.06**	**2**
Nitrogen trifluoride	*1.24*	0.25	0.25	0
Sulfur hexafluoride	9.96	5.65	5.64	0
Sulfuryl fluoride	*2.04*	0.41	0.43	5
PFC-14	*81.09*	4.47	4.64	4
PFC-116	*4.40*	1.10	1.15	4
PFC-218	*0.60*	0.17	0.16	-3
PFC-C-318	*1.34*	0.42	0.42	0
PFC-31-10	*0.18*	0.07	0.07	2
PFC-41-12	*0.13*	0.05	0.05	1
PFC-51-14	*0.28*	0.12	0.13	2
PFC-61-16	*0.13*	0.07	0.07	0
PFC-71-18	*0.09*	0.05	0.05	1
Total		**371.60**	**375.49**	**1.0**

[a] Pre-industrial values are zero except for chloromethane (457 ppt), dichloromethane (6.9 ppt), trichloromethane (6 ppt), bromomethane (5.3 ppt) and PFC-14/CF_4 (34.05 ppt), see Meinshausen et al. (2017).

Table 5. Lifetimes (τ), radiative efficiencies and direct GWPs (relative to CO_2) for less abundant compounds. Compounds where the radiative efficiencies are based on new spectra since the H2013 review are marked in bold. Recommended RE and GWP(100) values are indicated in bold. Lifetimes are from WMO (2019) except those in italic (see text and Tables S7-S13 for details). RE values in parentheses are based on a constant horizontal and vertical distribution because of missing information about the lifetime of the compound. RE and GWP values in italic are based on previous publications (see text and Tables S7-S13 for details). Note that RE values with more significant digits have been used to calculate GWP(100) and that these are available in the supporting information.

				RE (W m^{-2} ppb^{-1})		GWP(100)	
Identifier / name	Formula[a]	CASRN	*τ* (yr)	H2013	This work	H2013	This work
Chlorofluorocarbons							
CFC-13	$CClF_3$	75-72-9	640.0	0.26	**0.28**	13,900	**17,200**
CFC-112	CCl_2FCCl_2F	76-12-0	63.6		**0.28**		**4,880**
CFC-112a	CCl_3CClF_2	76-11-9	52.0		**0.25**		**3,740**
CFC-113a	CCl_3CF_3	354-58-5	55.0		**0.24**		**4,140**
CFC-114a	CCl_2FCF_3	374-07-2	105.0		**0.30**		**7,850**
E-R316c	trans cyc (-$CClFCF_2CF_2CClF$-) [#]	3832-15-3	75.0		**0.27**		**4,470**
Z-R316c	cis cyc (-$CClFCF_2CF_2CClF$-) [#]	3934-26-7	114.0		**0.30**		**5,990**
CFC 1112	$CClF=CClF$	598-88-9	*7.1 days*		***0.01***		**<1**
CFC 1112a	$CCl_2=CF_2$	79-35-6	*2.3 days*		***0.01***		**<1**
1,1,2-trichloro-2-fluoroethene	$CCl_2=CClF$	359-29-5			**(0.13)**		
Chlorotrifluoroethylene	$CF_2=CClF$	79-38-9			**(0.11)**		
Hydrochlorofluorocarbons							
HCFC-21	$CHCl_2F$	75-43-4	1.7	0.14	**0.15**	148	**168**
HCFC-31	CH_2ClF	593-70-4	1.2		***0.07***		**83**
HCFC-121	$CHCl_2CCl_2F$	354-14-3	1.1		**0.15**		**61**
HCFC-122	$CHCl_2CClF_2$	354-21-2	0.9	0.17	**0.16**	**59**	59
HCFC-122a	$CHClFCCl_2F$	354-15-4	3.1	0.21	**0.20**	258	**257**
HCFC-123	$CHCl_2CF_3$	306-83-2	1.3	0.15	**0.16**	79	**95**
HCFC-123a	$CHClFCClF_2$	354-23-4	4.0	**0.23**	0.23	370	**415**
HCFC-124	$CHClFCF_3$	2837-89-0	5.9	0.20	**0.21**	527	**627**
HCFC-124a	CHF_2CClF_2	354-25-6	17.0		**0.25**		**2,170**
HCFC-132	$CHClFCHClF$	431-06-1	1.7		**0.14**		**128**
HCFC-132a	$CHCl_2CHF_2$	471-43-2	1.1		**0.13**		**74**
HCFC-132c	CH_2FCCl_2F	1842-05-3	4.1	**0.17**	0.17	338	**359**
HCFC-133a	CH_2ClCF_3	75-88-7	4.6		**0.15**		**407**
HCFC-141	$CH_2ClCHClF$	430-57-9	1.1		**0.07**		**49**
HCFC-225ca	$CHCl_2CF_2CF_3$	422-56-0	1.9	**0.22**	0.22	127	**143**
HCFC-225cb	$CHClFCF_2CClF_2$	507-55-1	5.9	**0.29**	0.29	525	**596**
HCFO-1233zd(E)	(E)-$CF_3CH=CHCl$	102687-65-0	42.5 days	0.04	**0.07**	1	**4**
HCFO-1233zd(Z)	(Z)-$CF_3CH=CHCl$	99728-16-2	13.0 days		**0.02**		**<1**
(E/Z)-1-chloro-2-fluoro-ethene	(E/Z)-$CHCl=CHF$	460-16-2	*1.8 days*		***0.001***		**<1**
Hydrofluorocarbons							
HFC-41	CH_3F	593-53-3	2.8	**0.02**	0.02	116	**142**
HFC-134	CHF_2CHF_2	359-35-3	10.0	**0.19**	0.19	1,120	**1,330**
HFC-143	CH_2FCHF_2	430-66-0	3.6	**0.13**	0.13	328	**382**
HFC-152	CH_2FCH_2F	624-72-6	0.5	0.04	**0.05**	16	**23**
HFC-161	CH_3CH_2F	353-36-6	80.0 days	**0.02**	0.02	4	**5**
HFC-227ca	$CF_3CF_2CHF_2$	2252-84-8	30.0	0.27	**0.26**	2,640	**3,140**
HFC-236cb	$CH_2FCF_2CF_3$	677-56-5	13.4	**0.23**	0.23	1,210	**1,420**
HFC-236ea	CHF_2CHFCF_3	431-63-0	11.4	**0.30**	*0.30*	1,340	**1,570**
HFC-245ca	$CH_2FCF_2CHF_2$	679-86-7	6.6	**0.24**	*0.24*	716	**827**
HFC-245cb	$CF_3CF_2CH_3$	1814-88-6	39.9	0.24	**0.25**	4,620	**4,790**
HFC-245ea	$CHF_2CHFCHF_2$	24270-66-4	3.2	**0.16**	*0.16*	235	**267**
HFC-245eb	$CH_2FCHFCF_3$	431-31-2	3.2	**0.20**	*0.20*	290	**341**
HFC-263fb	$CH_3CH_2CF_3$	421-07-8	1.1	**0.10**	*0.10*	76	**78**
HFC-272ca	$CH_3CF_2CH_3$	420-45-1	9.0	0.07	**0.08**	144	**629**
HFC-329p	$CHF_2CF_2CF_2CF_3$	375-17-7	32.0	**0.31**	0.31	2,360	**3,040**
HFO-1123	$CHF=CF_2$	359-11-5	1.4 days		***0.002***		**<1**
HFO-1132a	$CH_2=CF_2$	75-38-7	4.6 days	**0.004**	0.004	**<1**	<1
HFO-1141	$CH_2=CHF$	75-02-5	2.5 days	**0.002**	0.002	**<1**	<1
HFO-1225ye(Z)	(Z)-$CF_3CF=CHF$	5528-43-8	10.0 days	**0.02**	0.02	**<1**	<1
HFO-1225ye(E)	(E)-$CF_3CF=CHF$	5595-10-8	5.7 days	0.01	**0.02**	**<1**	<1
HFO-1234ze(Z)	(Z)-$CF_3CH=CHF$	29118-25-0	10.0 days	**0.02**	0.02	**<1**	<1
HFO-1234ze(E)	(E)-$CF_3CH=CHF$	29188-24-9	19.0 days	0.04	**0.05**	**1**	1
HFO-1234yf	$CF_3CF=CH_2$	754-12-1	12.0 days	0.02	**0.03**	**<1**	<1
HFO-1336mzz(E)	(E)-$CF_3CH=CHCF_3$	N/A	0.3		***0.13***		**19**
HFO-1336mzz(Z)	(Z)-$CF_3CH=CHCF_3$	692-49-9	27.0 days	**0.07**	*0.07*	**2**	2
HFO-1243zf	$CF_3CH=CH_2$	677-21-4	9.0 days	0.01	**0.02**	**<1**	<1
HFC-1345zfc	$CF_3CF_2CH=CH_2$	374-27-6	9.0 days	0.01	**0.02**	**<1**	<1
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,6-Nonafluorohex-1-ene	n-$C_4F_9CH=CH_2$	19430-93-4	9.0 days	**0.03**	0.03	**<1**	<1
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-Tridecafluorooct-1-ene	n-$C_6F_{13}CH=CH_2$	25291-17-2	9.0 days	**0.03**	0.03	**<1**	<1
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9,10,10,10-Heptadecafluorodec-1-ene	n-$C_8F_{17}CH=CH_2$	21652-58-4	9.0 days	0.03	**0.04**	**<1**	<1
1-Propene, 3,3,3-trifluoro-2-(trifluoromethyl)-	$(CF_3)_2C=CH_2$	382-10-5	*10.3 days*		**0.03**		**<1**
1,1,2,2,3,3-hexafluorocyclopentane	cyc (-CF2CF2CF2CH2CH2-)	123768-18-3	*1.6*		***0.20***		**126**
1,1,2,2,3,3,4-heptafluorocyclopentane	cyc (-$CF_2CF_2CF_2CHFCH_2$-)	15290-77-4	*2.8*		***0.24***		**243**
1,3,3,4,4,5,5-heptafluorocyclopentene	cyc (-$CF_2CF_2CF_2CF=CH$-)	1892-03-1	*0.6*		***0.21***		**47**
(4R,5R)-1,1,2,2,3,3,4,5-octafluorocyclopentane	trans-cyc (-$CF_2CF_2CF_2CHFCHF$-) [#]	158389-18-5	*3.2*		***0.26***		**271**

HFO-1438ezy(E)	(E)-$(CF_3)_2CFCH=CHF$	14149-41-8	0.3		***0.08***		**9**
HFO-1447fz	$CF_3(CF_2)_2CH=CH_2$	355-08-8	9.0 days		***0.03***		**<1**
1,3,3,4,4-pentafluorocyclobutene	cyc (-CH=$CFCF_2CF_2$-)	374-31-2	0.7		***0.27***		**97**
3,3,4,4-tetrafluorocyclobutene	cyc (-CH=$CHCF_2CF_2$-)	2714-38-7	84.0 days		***0.21***		**27**
3-Fluoro-1-propene	$CH_2=CHCH_2F$	818-92-8			**(0.06)**		
1-Fluorohexane	n-$C_6H_{13}F$	373-14-8			**(0.04)**		
Fluorobenzene	C_6H_5-F	462-06-6			**(0.07)**		
Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons							
Chloroethane	CH_3CH_2Cl	75-00-3	48.0 days		**0.004**		**<1**
1,1-Dichloroethane	CH_3CHCl_2	75-34-3			**(0.03)**		
1,2-Dichloroethane	CH_2ClCH_2Cl	107-06-2	82.0 days	**0.01**	0.01	**1**	1
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	$CH_2ClCHCl_2$	79-00-5			**(0.05)**		
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	CH_2ClCCl_3	630-20-6			**(0.10)**		
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	$CHCl_2CHCl_2$	79-34-5			**(0.10)**		
1,1,2-Trichloroethene	$CHCl=CCl_2$	79-01-6	5.6 days		**0.01**		**<1**
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethene	$CCl_2=CCl_2$	127-18-4	0.3		**0.05**		**7**
2-Chloropropane	$CH_3CHClCH_3$	75-29-6	22.0 days		**0.004**		**<1**
Chloromethyl benzene	C_6H_5-CH_2Cl	100-44-7			**(0.02)**		
3-Chloro-1-propene	$CH_2=CHCH_2Cl$	107-5-1			**(0.05)**		
1-Chloro-4-methylbenzene	p-Cl-C_6H_4-CH_3	106-43-4			**(0.05)**		
3,4-Dichloro-1-butene	$CH_2ClCHClCH=CH_2$	760-23-6			**(0.06)**		
1-Chloro-3-methylbenzene	m-Cl-C_6H_4-CH_3	108-41-8			**(0.05)**		
2,3-Dichloropropene	$CH_2ClCCl=CH_2$	78-88-6			**(0.05)**		
1-Chloro-2-methylbenzene	o-Cl-C_6H_4-CH_3	95-49-8			**(0.04)**		
1,2-Dichloropropene	$CHCl=CClCH_3$	563-54-2			**(0.03)**		
1-Chloropentane	$CH_3(CH_2)_3CH_2Cl$	543-59-9			**(0.02)**		
1-Chlorobutane	$CH_3(CH_2)_2CH_2Cl$	109-69-3	*4.5 days*		**0.001**		**<1**
1-Chloro-2-methylpropane	$(CH_3)_2CHCH_2Cl$	513-36-0			**(0.02)**		
Chloroethene	$CH_2=CHCl$	75-01-4			**(0.04)**		
1,2-Dichloroethene (E)	(E)-CHCl=CHCl	156-60-5			**(0.09)**		
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	$CCl_2=CClCCl=CCl_2$	87-68-3			**(0.14)**		
1,3-Dichloropropene (E)	(E)-$CHCl=CHCH_2Cl$	10061-02-6			**(0.06)**		
1,3-Dichloropropene (Z)	(Z)-$CHCl=CHCH_2Cl$	10061-01-5			**(0.06)**		
1,3-Dichloropropane	$CH_2ClCH_2CH_2Cl$	142-28-9			**(0.03)**		
Chlorobenzene	C_6H_5-Cl	108-90-7			**(0.04)**		
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	p-Cl-C_6H_4-Cl	106-46-7			**(0.08)**		
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	m-Cl-C_6H_4-Cl	541-73-1			**(0.08)**		
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	o-Cl-C_6H_4-Cl	95-50-1			**(0.05)**		
1,2-Dichloroethylene (Z)	(Z)-CHCl=CHCl	156-59-2			**(0.04)**		
Hexachloro-1,3-cyclopentadiene	C_5Cl_6	77-47-4			**(0.11)**		
3-Chloro-1-propyne	$CH_2ClC\equiv CH$	624-65-7			**(0.02)**		
Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons							
Dibromomethane	CH_2Br_2	74-95-3	0.4	**0.01**	0.01	1	**2**
Halon-1201	$CHBrF_2$	1511-62-2	4.9	**0.15**	0.15	376	**398**
Halon-1202	CBr_2F_2	75-61-6	2.5	**0.27**	0.27	231	**226**
Halon-2301	CH_2BrCF_3	421-06-7	3.2	**0.14**	0.14	173	**186**
Halon-2311 (Halothane)	$CHBrClCF_3$	151-67-7	1.0	**0.13**	0.13	41	**47**
Halon-2401	$CHBrFCF_3$	124-72-1	2.9	**0.19**	0.19	184	**211**
Tribromomethane	$CHBr_3$	75-25-2	57.0 days		**0.01**		**<1**
Halon-1011	CH_2BrCl	74-97-5	0.5		**0.02**		**5**
Bromoethane	CH_3CH_2Br	74-96-4	50.0 days		**0.01**		**<1**
1,2-Dibromoethane	CH_2BrCH_2Br	106-93-4	89.0 days		**0.01**		**1**
1-Bromopropane	$CH_3CH_2CH_2Br$	106-94-5	15.0 days		**0.002**		**<1**
2-Bromopropane	$CH_3CHBrCH_3$	75-26-3	20.0 days		**0.004**		**<1**
Bromomethyl benzene	C_6H_5-CH_2Br	100-39-0			**(0.03)**		
3-Bromo-1-propene	$CH_2=CHCH_2Br$	106-95-6			**(0.04)**		
Bromine Nitrate	$BrONO_2$	40423-14-1			**(0.10)**		
Bromoethene	$CH_2=CHBr$	593-60-2			**(0.04)**		
Fully Fluorinated Species							
Pentadecafluorotriethylamine	$N(C_2F_5)_3$	359-70-6	1000.0		***0.61***		**10,900**
Perfluorotripropylamine, PTPA	$N(CF_2CF_2CF_3)_3$	338-83-0	1000.0		***0.75***		**9,580**
Heptacosafluorotributylamine, PFTBA	$N(CF_2CF_2CF_2CF_3)_3$	311-89-7	1000.0		**0.91**		**9,000**
Perfluorotripentylamine	$N(CF_2CF_2CF_2CF_2CF_3)_3$	338-84-1	1000.0		***0.95***		**7,700**
Heptafluoroisobutyronitrile	$(CF_3)_2CFCN$	42532-60-5	*34.5*		***0.25***		**2,900**
(Trifluoromethyl)sulfur pentafluoride	SF_5CF_3	373-80-8	800.0	0.59	**0.58**	17,400	**19,600**
Hexafluorocyclobutene	cyc (-CF=$CFCF_2CF_2$-)	697-11-0	*1.0*		***0.30***		**132**
Pentafluoro-2-(trifluoromethyl)-1-propene, PFIB	$(CF_3)_2C=CF_2$	382-21-8			**(0.34)**		
Octafluorocyclopentene	cyc (-$CF_2CF_2CFCF_2CF_2$-)	559-40-0	1.1	0.08	***0.25***	2	**82**
Hexafluorobenzene	C_6F_6	392-56-3			**(0.15)**		
Perfluorodecalin (mixed), PFC-91-18	$C_{10}F_{18}$ #	306-94-5	2000.0	0.55	**0.54**	7,190	**7,940**
Perfluorodecalin (cis)	Z-$C_{10}F_{18}$ #	60433-11-6	2000.0	**0.56**	0.56	7,240	**8,270**
Perfluorodecalin (trans)	E-$C_{10}F_{18}$ #	60433-12-7	2000.0	0.48	**0.51**	6,290	**7,560**
PFC-1114	$CF_2=CF_2$	116-14-3	1.2 days	**0.002**	0.002	**<1**	<1
PFC-1216	$CF_3CF=CF_2$	116-15-4	5.5 days	**0.01**	0.01	**<1**	<1
Hexafluorobuta-1,3-diene	$CF_2=CFCF=CF_2$	685-63-2	1.1 days	**0.003**	0.003	**<1**	<1
Octafluoro-1-butene	$CF_3CF_2CF=CF_2$	357-26-6	6.0 days	**0.02**	0.02	**<1**	<1
Octafluoro-2-buene	$CF_3CF=CFCF_3$	360-89-4	31.0 days	**0.07**	0.07	**2**	2
Halogenated Alcohols and Ethers							
HFE-125	CHF_2OCF_3	3822-68-2	135.0	0.41	**0.42**	12,400	**15,100**
HFE-134	CHF_2OCHF_2	1691-17-4	26.9	**0.45**	0.45	5,560	**6,980**
HFE-143a	CH_3OCF_3	421-14-7	4.9	0.18	**0.19**	523	**647**
HFE-227ea	$CF_3CHFOCF_3$	2356-62-9	54.8	0.44	**0.46**	6,450	**7,930**
HCFE-235ca2 (enflurane)	CHF_2OCF_2CHFCl	13838-16-9	4.4	**0.41**	0.41	583	**686**

HCFE-235da2 (isoflurane)	$CHF_2OCHClCF_3$	26675-46-7	3.5	0.42	**0.43**	491	**565**
HFE-236ea2 (desflurane)	$CHF_2OCHFCF_3$	57041-67-5	14.1	0.45	**0.46**	1,790	**2,720**
HFE-236fa	$CF_3CH_2OCF_3$	20193-67-3	7.5	0.36	**0.37**	979	**1,160**
HFE-245cb2	$CF_3CF_2OCH_3$	22410-44-2	5.0	0.33	**0.34**	654	**784**
HFE-245fa1	$CHF_2CH_2OCF_3$	84011-15-4	6.7	**0.31**	0.31	828	**980**
HFE-245fa2	$CHF_2OCH_2CF_3$	1885-48-9	5.5	**0.36**	0.36	812	**922**
2,2,3,3,3-Pentafluoropropan-1-ol	$CF_3CF_2CH_2OH$	422-05-9	0.5	0.14	**0.16**	19	**36**
HFE-254cb1	$CH_3OCF_2CHF_2$	425-88-7	2.5	**0.26**	0.26	301	**344**
HFE-263mf	$CF_3CH_2OCH_3$	460-43-5	28.0 days	0.04	**0.05**	1	**2**
HFE-263m1	$CF_3OCH_2CH_3$	690-22-2	0.4	**0.13**	0.13	29	**31**
3,3,3-Trifluoropropan-1-ol	$CF_3CH_2CH_2OH$	2240-88-2	15.0 days	0.02	**0.03**	<1	**<1**
HFE-329mcc2	$CHF_2CF_2OCF_2CF_3$	134769-21-4	25.0	0.53	**0.55**	3,070	**3,970**
HFE-338mmz1	$(CF_3)_2CHOCHF_2$	26103-08-2	22.3	0.44	**0.45**	2,620	**3,200**
HFE-338mcf2	$CF_3CH_2OCF_2CF_3$	156053-88-2	7.5	0.44	**0.45**	929	**1,090**
Sevoflurane (HFE-347mmz1)	$(CF_3)_2CHOCH_2F$	28523-86-6	1.9	0.32	**0.31**	216	**205**
HFE-347mcc3 (HFE-7000)	$CH_3OCF_2CF_2CF_3$	375-03-1	5.1	**0.34**	0.34	530	**605**
HFE-347mcf2	$CHF_2CH_2OCF_2CF_3$	171182-95-9	6.7	0.42	**0.43**	854	**1,010**
HFE-347pcf2	$CHF_2CF_2OCH_2CF_3$	406-78-0	6.1	**0.48**	*0.48*	889	**1,030**
HFE-347mmy1	$(CF_3)_2CFOCH_3$	22052-84-2	3.7	**0.32**	0.32	363	**412**
HFE-356mec3	$CH_3OCF_2CHFCF_3$	382-34-3	2.5	0.30	**0.29**	387	**277**
HFE-356mff2	$CF_3CH_2OCH_2CF_3$	333-36-8	0.4	0.17	**0.19**	17	**26**
HFE-356pcf2	$CHF_2CH_2OCF_2CHF_2$	50807-77-7	6.0	0.37	**0.38**	719	**872**
HFE-356pcf3	$CHF_2OCH_2CF_2CHF_2$	35042-99-0	3.5	**0.38**	0.38	446	**508**
HFE-356pcc3	$CH_3OCF_2CF_2CHF_2$	160620-20-2	2.5	0.32	**0.30**	413	**291**
HFE-356mmz1	$(CF_3)_2CHOCH_3$	13171-18-1	65.0 days	0.15	**0.12**	14	**9**
HFE-365mcf3	$CF_3CF_2CH_2OCH_3$	378-16-5	25.0 days	0.05	**0.06**	1	**2**
HFE-374pc2	$CHF_2CF_2OCH_2CH_3$	512-51-6	76.0 days	0.30	**0.13**	627	**13**
4,4,4-Trifluorobutan-1-ol	$CF_3(CH_2)_2CH_2OH$	461-18-7	5.4 days	**0.01**	0.01	**<1**	<1
1,1,1,3,3,3-Hexafluoro-2-(trifluoromethyl)-2-propanol	$(CF_3)_3COH$	2378-02-01		**(0.38)**	(0.38)		
2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5-Octafluorocyclopentanol	cyc (-$(CF_2)_4CH(OH)$-)	16621-87-7	0.3	**0.16**	0.16	13	**14**
HFE-43-10pccc124 (H-Galden 1040x, HG-11)	$CHF_2OCF_2OCF_2CF_2OCHF_2$	188690-77-9	14.1	1.02	**1.03**	2,820	**3,380**
HFE-449s1 (HFE-7100)	n/i-$C_4F_9OCH_3$	219484-64-7	4.8	**0.36**	0.36	421	**483**
n-HFE-7100	$CF_3CF_2CF_2CF_2OCH_3$	163702-07-6	4.8	**0.42**	0.42	486	**571**
i-HFE-7100	$(CF_3)_2CFCF_2OCH_3$	163702-08-7	4.8	0.35	**0.34**	407	**458**
HFE-569sf2 (HFE-7200)	$C_4F_9OC_2H_5$	N/A	0.8	**0.30**	0.30	57	**64**
i-HFE-7200	$(CF_3)_2CFCF_2OCH_2CH_3$	163702-06-5	0.6	0.24	**0.22**	44	**36**
HFE-7300	$(CF_3)_2CFCF(OC_2H_5)CF_2CF_2CF_3$	132182-92-4	*5.2*		***0.48***		**425**
HFE-7500	n-$C_3F_7CF(OC_2H_5)CF(CF_3)_2$	297730-93-9	*0.3*		***0.27***		**14**
HFE-236ca12 (HG-10)	$CHF_2OCF_2OCHF_2$	78522-47-1	26.5	**0.65**	0.65	5,350	**6,370**
HFE-338pcc13 (HG-01)	$CHF_2OCF_2CF_2OCHF_2$	188690-78-0	13.4	0.86	**0.87**	2,910	**3,480**
1,1,1,3,3,3-Hexafluoropropan-2-ol	$(CF_3)_2CHOH$	920-66-1	1.9	0.26	**0.27**	182	**216**
HG-02	$CHF_2(OCF_2CF_2)_2OCHF_2$	205367-61-9	26.9	**1.15**	*1.15*	5,140	**6,030**
HG-03	$CHF_2(OCF_2CF_2)_3OCHF_2$	173350-37-3	26.9	**1.43**	*1.43*	4,800	**5,630**
(2,2,2-Trifluoroethoxy)ethene	$CF_3CH_2OCH{=}CH_2$	406-90-6	3.6 days	**0.01**	*0.01*	**<1**	<1
2-Ethoxy-3,3,4,4,5-pentafluorotetrahydro-2,5-bis[1,2,2,2-tetrafluoro-1-(trifluoromethyl)ethyl]-furan	$C_{12}H_5F_{19}O_2$ #	920979-28-8	0.8	**0.49**	*0.49*	56	**51**
Difluoro(methoxy)methane	CH_3OCHF_2	359-15-9	1.1	0.17	**0.15**	144	**143**
HG'-01	$CH_3OCF_2CF_2OCH_3$	73287-23-7	1.7	**0.29**	0.29	222	**212**
HG'-02	$CH_3O(CF_2CF_2O)_2CH_3$	485399-46-0	1.7	**0.56**	0.56	250	**240**
HG'-03	$CH_3O(CF_2CF_2O)_3CH_3$	485399-48-2	1.7	0.77	**0.76**	239	**230**
HFE-329me3	$CF_3CFHCF_2OCF_3$	428454-68-6	33.6	0.48	**0.49**	4,550	**4,620**
HFE-338mec3	$CF_3CFHCF_2OCF_2H$	56860-85-6		**(0.52)**	(0.52)		
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,7-Undecafluoroheptan-1-ol	$CF_3(CF_2)_4CH_2CH_2OH$	185689-57-0	17.0 days	0.06	**0.05**	**1**	<1
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9,9-Pentadecafluorononan-1-ol	$CF_3(CF_2)_6CH_2CH_2OH$	755-02-2	17.0 days	0.07	**0.06**	1	**<1**
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9,10,10,11,11,11-Nonadecafluoroundecan-1-ol	$CF_3(CF_2)_8CH_2CH_2OH$	87017-97-8	17.0 days	**0.05**	0.05	**<1**	<1
2-Chloro-1,1,2-trifluoro-1-methoxyethane	CH_3OCF_2CHClF	425-87-6	1.4	**0.21**	0.21	122	**142**
PFPMIE (perfluoropolymethylisopropyl)	$CF_3OCF(CF_3)CF_2OCF_2OCF_3$	1309353-34-1	800.0	0.65	**0.64**	9,710	**10,900**
HFE-216	$CF_3OCF{=}CF_2$	1187-93-5	1.6 days	0.03	**0.01**	**<1**	<1
Perfluoroethyl formate	CF_3CF_2OCHO	313064-40-3	3.6	0.44	***0.41***	580	**626**
2,2,2-Trifluoroethyl formate	CF_3CH_2OCHO	32042-38-9	0.5	0.16	***0.19***	33	**57**
1,1,1,3,3,3-Hexafluoropropan-2-yl formate	$(CF_3)_2CHOCHO$	856766-70-6	3.1	0.33	***0.26***	334	**282**
Vinyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate	$CF_3C(O)OCH{=}CH_2$	433-28-3	*1.4 days*	0.387	**0.004**		**<1**
Ethyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate	$CF_3C(O)OCH_2CH_3$	383-63-1	22.0 days	0.05	**0.06**	1	**2**
Allyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate	$CF_3C(O)OCH_2CH{=}CH_2$	383-67-5	*1.3 days*	0.354	**0.005**		**<1**
Methyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate	$CF_3C(O)OCH_3$	431-47-0	1.0	0.18	***0.16***	52	**86**
2,2,3,3,4,4,4-Heptafluorobutan-1-ol	$CF_3CF_2CF_2CH_2OH$	375-01-9	0.6	**0.20**	0.20	33	**38**
1,1,2-Trifluoro-2-(trifluoromethoxy)ethane	$CHF_2CHFOCF_3$	84011-06-3	9.0	0.34	**0.35**	1,240	**1,320**
1-Ethoxy-1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoropropane	$CF_3CHFCF_2OCH_2CH_3$	380-34-7	0.4	**0.19**	0.19	23	**28**
1,1,1,2,2,3,3-Heptafluoro-3-(1,2,2,2-tetrafluoroethoxy)propane	$CF_3CF_2CF_2OCHFCF_3$	3330-15-2	59.4	0.58	**0.59**	6,490	**7,000**
2,2,3,3-Tetrafluoropropan-1-ol	$CHF_2CF_2CH_2OH$	76-37-9	93.0 days	**0.11**	0.11	13	**15**
2,2,3,4,4,4-Hexafluorobutan-1-ol	$CF_3CHFCF_2CH_2OH$	382-31-0	0.4	0.19	**0.23**	17	**32**
1,1,2,2-Tetrafluoro-3-methoxypropane	$CHF_2CF_2CH_2OCH_3$	60598-17-6	26.0 days	0.03	**0.05**	1	**2**
perfluoro-2-methylpentan-3-one	$CF_3CF_2C(O)CF(CF_3)_2$	756-13-8	7.0 days	**0.03**	0.03	**<1**	<1
3,3,3-Trifluoropropanal	CF_3CH_2CHO	460-40-2	3.0 days	0.004	**0.005**	**<1**	<1
4,4,4-Trifluorobutanal	$CF_3CH_2CH_2CHO$	406-87-1		**(0.16)**	(0.16)		
2-Fluoroethanol	CH_2FCH_2OH	371-62-0	16.0 days	0.02	**0.01**	**1**	<1
2,2-Difluoroethanol	CHF_2CH_2OH	359-13-7	61.0 days	0.04	**0.05**	3	**6**
2,2,2-Trifluoroethanol	CF_3CH_2OH	75-89-8	0.5	0.10	**0.12**	20	**37**
HG-04	$CHF_2O(CF_2CF_2O)_4CHF_2$	173350-38-4	26.9	**1.46**	*1.46*	3,930	**4,610**
Methyl-perfluoroheptene-ethers	$CH_3OC_7F_{13}$		*0.3*		***0.27***		**16**
1,1,1-Trifluoropropan-2-one	$CF_3C(O)CH_3$	421-50-1	*5.1 days*		**0.01**		**<1**
1,1,1-Trifluorobutan-2-one	$CF_3C(O)CH_2CH_3$	381-88-4	*6.6 days*		***0.01***		**<1**
2,2,2-Trifluoroethanal	CF_3CHO	75-90-1			**(0.17)**		
2,2,3,3,3-Pentafluoropropanal	CF_3CF_2CHO	422-06-0			**(0.20)**		
2,2,3,3,4,4,4-Heptafluorobutanal	$CF_3CF_2CF_2CHO$	375-02-0			**(0.25)**		

2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5,5-Nonafluoropetanal	$CF_3CF_2CF_2CF_2CHO$	375-53-1		**(0.29)**	
Acryloyl chloride	$CH_2=CHC(O)Cl$	814-68-6		**(0.15)**	
Acetyl chloride	CH_3COCl	75-36-5		**(0.11)**	
1-chloro-2-ethoxyethane	C_4H_9ClO	628-34-2		**(0.10)**	
2-Chloroethanol	CH_2ClCH_2OH	107-07-3		**(0.06)**	
2-(Chloromethyl)oxirane	C_3H_5ClO [#]	106-89-8		**(0.05)**	
1-Chloropropan-2-one	$CH_3C(O)CH_2Cl$	78-95-5		**(0.04)**	
1-chloro-2-(2-chloroethoxy)ethane	$CH_2ClCH_2OCH_2CH_2Cl$	111-44-4		**(0.11)**	
2-chloroethyl vinyl ether	$ClCH_2CH_2OCH=CH_2$	110-75-8	*0.1 days*	***0.001***	**<1**
(Chlorometoxy)ethane	$CH_3CH_2OCH_2Cl$	3188-13-4		**(0.11)**	
Chloro(methoxy)methane	CH_3OCH_2Cl	107-30-2		**(0.09)**	
Ethyl carbonochloridate	$CH_3CH_2OC(O)Cl$	541-41-3		**(0.26)**	
1-Fluoropropan-2-one	$CH_3C(O)CH_2F$	430-51-3		**(0.05)**	
1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoropropan-2-one	$CF_3C(O)CF_3$	684-16-2		**(0.29)**	
Trifluoroacetic acid	$CF_3C(O)OH$	76-05-1		**(0.36)**	
Trifluoroacetic anhydride	$CF_3C(O)OC(O)CF_3$	407-25-0		**(0.51)**	
Methacryloyl chloride	$CH_2=C(CH_3)C(O)Cl$	920-46-7		**(0.12)**	

[a] cyc, cyclic compound.
[#] structure displayed in Table S21

Table 6. GWP and GTP for selected gases.

Identifier / name	Formula	Lifetime (yr)	RE (W m^{-2} ppb^{-1})	GWP 20-yr	GWP 100-yr	GWP 500-yr	GTP 20-yr	GTP 50-yr	GTP 100-yr
CFC-11	CCl_3F	52.0	0.26	7,720	5,870	2,060	7,930	6,020	3,410
CFC-12	CCl_2F_2	102.0	0.32	11,800	11,800	5,610	12,900	12,600	1,000
CFC-113	CCl_2FCClF_2	93.0	0.30	7,130	6,900	3,120	7,700	7,330	5,620
HCFC-22	$CHClF_2$	11.9	0.21	5,900	2,060	616	4,000	814	419
HCFC-141b	CH_3CCl_2F	9.4	0.16	2,800	903	270	1,640	275	180
HCFC-142b	CH_3CClF_2	18.0	0.19	5,720	2,410	725	4,680	1,510	564
HFC-23	CHF_3	228.0	0.19	12,900	15,500	11,600	14,400	16,400	16,300
HFC-134a	CH_2FCF_3	14.0	0.17	4,300	1,600	480	3,160	767	337
HFC-152a	CH_3CHF_2	1.6	0.10	607	172	52	76	37	33
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	CH_3CCl_3	5.0	0.06	585	169	51	190	37	33
Tetrachloromethane	CCl_4	32.0	0.17	3,960	2,310	724	3,770	2,110	880
Sulphur hexafluoride	SF_6	3200.0	0.57	19,100	26,700	37,600	21,900	27,700	32,900
PFC-14	CF_4	50000.0	0.10	5,520	7,830	11,700	6,350	8,120	9,740

Table 7. List of compounds (among the 40 most abundant presented in Table 3) that enter new policy categories due to updated GWP(100) values. See Section 4 for a discussion of, and references to, the policies that are referred to here, and Section 3.1 for discussion of changes in lifetime and RE estimates. The rightmost column shows the contribution of change in GWP(100) due to the different factors: new $AGWP_{CO2}$, new lifetime estimate (τ), new instantaneous RF "Pinnock curve" (IRF curve), new method to account for stratospheric temperature adjustment (STA), and addition of absorption spectra.

Identifier / name	Formula	H2013 GWP(100)	New GWP(100)	Policy category change	Reasons for GWP(100) change (%) $AGWP_{CO2}$	τ	IRF curve	STA	Spectra
HCFC-142b	CH_3CClF_2	1,980	2,410	Exceeds the 2,200 threshold in Canada.	+14	+5	-1	+3	+1
HFC-32	CH_2F_2	677	809	Exceeds the 750 threshold in Japan and Canada	+14	+4	-1	0	+2
HFC-134a	CH_2FCF_3	1,300	1,600	Exceeds the 1,500 threshold in EU, Japan and Canada	+14	+5	0	+2	+2
HFC-152a	CH_3CHF_2	138	172	Exceeds the 150 threshold in EU, Japan and Canada	+14	+8	-1	+2	+1
Carbon tetrachloride	CCl_4	1,730	2,310	Exceeds the 2,200 threshold in Canada	+14	+21	-2	-1	0
Halon-2402	$CBrF_2CBrF_2$	1,470	2,280	Exceeds the 1,500 threshold in EU and Japan, and the 2,200 threshold in Canada	+14	+38	-1	-1	+1



Figure 1. Atmospheric abundances of important halocarbons (and SF_6), separated into (a) lower and (b) higher mole fractions and based on observations from a number of stations (from WMO/GAW, 2019). The plots are based on the data submitted to the World Data Center for Greenhouse Gases supported by the Japan Meteorological Agency by laboratories participating in the GAW Programme.



Figure 2. Effect of temperature on band shape. (a) CFC-115: T = 203 K, p = 0 Torr; T = 298 K, p = 0 Torr (Massie et al., 1991; McDaniel et al., 1991). (b) $CBrClF_2$: T = 273 K, p = 760 Torr; T = 293 K, p = 760 Torr (Sharpe et al., 2004). (c) SF_6: T = 180 K, p = 75 Torr; T = 225 K, p = 78 Torr (referred to as Varanasi, private communication (2000) in HITRAN).



Figure 3. Instantaneous radiative forcing (IRF) efficiency (for a 0-1 ppb increase in mixing ratio) per unit cross section compared between the previous (Hodnebrog et al., 2013) and updated (Shine and Myhre, 2020) results from the Oslo Line-By-Line (OLBL) radiative transfer model run at 0.02 cm^{-1} spectral resolution. Also shown is the new radiative forcing (RF) efficiency where the effect of stratospheric temperature adjustment per unit cross section, based on 10 cm^{-1} Narrow Band Model (NBM) simulations (Shine and Myhre, 2020), have been used to modify the OLBL curve. The curves have been averaged to 10 cm^{-1} spectral resolution in the plot, to improve readability, but RE calculations in this paper have been made using a 1 cm^{-1} version of the RF efficiency curve (as provided in the supporting information of Shine and Myhre (2020)).



Figure 4. Stratospheric temperature adjustment represented as the % increase of the instantaneous RE for 40 abundant compounds. The red line shows the 10% assumption used in H2013 for nearly all compounds (note that the 10% assumption was not used for CFC-11, CFC-12 and PFC-14).



Figure 5. GWP(100) ranking calculated in this study and from H2013 for 40 most-abundant compounds. Note that only one compound (chloromethane) shows a decrease in GWP(100).



Figure 6: Present-day radiative forcing for the different groups of compounds. Note that in AR5 (Myhre et al., 2013) (yellow bars), Halon-1211 and Halon-1301 were included in the CFC category.



Figure 7. Comparison of radiative efficiencies (W m^{-2} ppb^{-1}) calculated in this study (lifetime-corrected adjusted cloudy-sky) and from H2013 for (a) all compounds and (b)-(d) zoomed in using different scales for the RE. Black dots represent compounds where the RE in this study is less than 5% different from H2013, while yellow and red dots represent compounds where the REs are significantly different (>5% and >10%, respectively). Red dots have been labelled and represent compounds where the RE calculated here is more than 10% different from H2013.

Figure 1.


(a) SF6 and halocarbons
HCFC-141b
HCFC-142b
SF6
HFC-152a
Mole fraction (ppt)
Year
0
5
10
15
20
25
30
1995
2000
2005
2010
2015


(b) halocarbons
CFC-12
CFC-11
HCFC-22
CH3CCl3
CCl4
CFC-113
HFC-134a
Mole fraction (ppt)
Year
0
100
200
300
400
500
600
1975
1980
1985
1990
1995
2000
2005
2010
2015

Figure 2.


(a) CFC-115
203 K
293 K
Absorption Cross Section [10-18 cm2 molecule-1]
Wavenumber [cm-1]
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
3
955
965
975
985
995
1005
1015


(b) CBrClF2
278 K
298 K
Absorption Cross Section [10-18 cm2 molecule-1]
Wavenumber [cm-1]
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
1040
1050
1060
1070
1080
1090
1100
1110
1120


(c) SF6
180 K
225 K
Absorption Cross Section [10-18 cm2 molecule-1]
Wavenumber [cm-1]
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
940
942
944
946
948
950
952
954

Figure 3.


IRF (Hodnebrog et al., 2013)
IRF (Shine and Myhre, 2020)
RF (Shine and Myhre, 2020)
Radiative Efficiency [10 -3 W m -2 cm (10 -18 cm 2 molecule -1) -1]
Wavenumber [cm -1]
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
3
3.5
0
500
1000
1500
2000
2500
3000

Figure 4.


CFC-11
CFC-12
CFC-113
CFC-114
CFC-115
HCFC-22
HCFC-141b
HCFC-142b
HFC-23
HFC-32
HFC-125
HFC-134a
HFC-143a
HFC-152a
HFC-227ea
HFC-236fa
HFC-245fa
HFC-365mfc
HFC-43-10mee
1,1,1-Trichloroethane
Tetrachloromethane
Chloromethane
Dichloromethane
Trichloromethane
Bromomethane
Halon-1211
Halon-1301
Halon-2402
Nitrogen trifluoride
Sulfur hexafluoride
Sulfuryl fluoride
PFC-14
PFC-116
PFC-218
PFC-C-318
PFC-31-10
PFC-41-12
PFC-51-14
PFC-61-16
PFC-71-18
Chlorofluorocarbons
Hydrochloro-
fluorocarbons
Hydrofluoro-
carbons
Chlorocarbons and
Hydrochlorocarbons
Bromocarbons,
Hydrobromocarbons
and Halons
Fully Fluorinated
Species
-5
0
5
10
15
20
% increase of instantaneous RE

Figure 5.


Sulfur hexafluoride
Nitrogen trifluoride
HFC-23
PFC-116
CFC-12
PFC-C-318
PFC-31-10
CFC-115
CFC-114
PFC-218
PFC-41-12
HFC-236fa
PFC-51-14
PFC-61-16
PFC-71-18
PFC-14
Halon-1301
CFC-113
HFC-143a
CFC-11
Sulfuryl fluoride
HFC-125
HFC-227ea
HCFC-142b
Tetrachloromethane
Halon-2402
HCFC-22
Halon-1211
HFC-43-10mee
HFC-134a
HFC-245fa
HFC-365mfc
HCFC-141b
HFC-32
HFC-152a
1,1,1-Trichloroethane
Trichloromethane
Dichloromethane
Chloromethane
Bromomethane
172 (H2013: 138)
169 (H2013: 160)
22 (H2013: 16)
12 (H2013: 9)
6 (H2013: 12)
3 (H2013: 2)
This study
Hodnebrog et al. (2013)
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
3
×10^4

Figure 6.


REs: H2013, VMR: 2011 (as in AR5)
REs: H2013, VMR: 2014/19
REs: This study, VMR: 2014/19
Radiative Forcing (W m-2)
0.4
0.35
0.3
0.25
0.2
0.15
0.1
0.05
0
Total
Chlorofluorocarbons
Hydrochlorofluorocarbons
Hydrofluorocarbons
Chlorocarbons and Hydrochlorocarbons
Bromocarbons, Hydrobromocarbons and Halons
Fully Fluorinated Species

Figure 7.


a)
Radiative Efficiency (W m-2 ppb-1)
>10% difference
>5% difference
<5% difference
This study
Hodnebrog et al. (2013)
b)
Radiative Efficiency (W m-2 ppb-1)
HFC-43-10mee
Octafluorocyclopentene
1,1,1,3,3,3-Hexafluoro-propan-2-yl formate
CFC-115
2,2,3,4,4,4-Hexafluorobutan-1-ol
2,2,2-Trifluoro-ethyl formate
2,2,3,3,3-Pentafluoropropan-1-ol
HFE-356mff2
Methyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate
Difluoro(methoxy)methane
HFE-374pc2
HFE-356mmz1
2,2,2-Trifluoroethanol
Vinyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate
Allyl 2,2,2-trifluoroacetate
This study
Hodnebrog et al. (2013)
c)
Radiative Efficiency (W m-2 ppb-1)
HFC-272ca
1,1,2,2-Tetrafluoro-3-methoxypropane
HCFO-1233zd(E)
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9,9-Pentadecafluorononan-1-ol
HFE-365mcf3
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,7-Un-decafluoroheptan-1-ol
HFE-263mf
2,2-Difluoroethanol
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9,10,10,11,11,11-Nonadecafluoroundecan-1-ol
HFO-1234ze(E)
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,9,9,10,10,10-Heptadecafluorodec-1-ene
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-Tridecafluorooct-1-ene
3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,6-Nonafluorohex-1-ene
This study
Hodnebrog et al. (2013)
d)
Radiative Efficiency (W m-2 ppb-1)
HFO-1234yf
3,3,3-Trifluoropropan-1-ol
HFO-1225ye(Z)
HFC-1345zfc
HFO-1243zf
HFO-1225ye(E)
2-Fluoroethanol
4,4,4-Trifluorobutan-1-ol
3,3,3-Trifluoropropanal
HFE-216
Methyl chloride
Methyl bromide
HFO-1141
PFC-1114
This study
Hodnebrog et al. (2013)