



**HAL**  
open science

# Uncertainties in Shoreline Projections to 2100 at Truc Vert Beach (France): Role of Sea-Level Rise and Equilibrium Model Assumptions

Maurizio D'Anna, B. Castelle, D. Idier, J. Rohmer, G. Le Cozannet, R. Thieblemont, L. Brichenon

► **To cite this version:**

Maurizio D'Anna, B. Castelle, D. Idier, J. Rohmer, G. Le Cozannet, et al.. Uncertainties in Shoreline Projections to 2100 at Truc Vert Beach (France): Role of Sea-Level Rise and Equilibrium Model Assumptions. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 2021, 126 (8), pp.e2021JF006160. 10.1029/2021JF006160 . hal-03411178

**HAL Id: hal-03411178**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03411178v1>**

Submitted on 2 Nov 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1     **Uncertainties in Shoreline Projections to 2100 at Truc Vert beach (France): Role of**  
2     **Sea-Level Rise and Equilibrium Model Assumptions**

3  
4     **M. D’Anna<sup>1,2\*</sup>, B. Castelle<sup>2</sup>, D. Idier<sup>1</sup>, J. Rohmer<sup>1</sup>, G. Le Cozannet<sup>1</sup>, R. Thieblemont<sup>1</sup>,**  
5     **and L. Bricheno<sup>3</sup>**

6     <sup>1</sup>BRGM, French Geological Survey, Orléans, France.

7     <sup>2</sup>Université de Bordeaux, UMR EPOC, CNRS, Pessac, France.

8     <sup>3</sup>National Oceanography Center, Liverpool, UK.

9  
10    Corresponding author: Maurizio D’Anna ([m.danna@brgm.fr](mailto:m.danna@brgm.fr))

11    \*BRGM, 3 Avenue Guillemin, 4060, Orléans, France.

12  
13    **Key Points:**

- 14       • Ensemble-based simulations of future shoreline evolution to 2100, including sea-level  
15       rise driven erosion, are performed and analysed
- 16       • Future shoreline projections uncertainties are initially controlled by modelling  
17       assumptions and after 2060 by sea-level rise uncertainties
- 18       • The choice of wave-driven equilibrium modelling approach and incident wave  
19       chronology are critical to short/mid-term shoreline projections  
20

## 21 **Abstract**

22 Sandy shorelines morphodynamics responds to a myriad of processes interacting at different  
23 spatial and temporal scales, making shoreline predictions challenging. Shoreline modelling  
24 inherits uncertainties from the primary driver boundary conditions (e.g. sea-level rise and wave  
25 forcing) as well as uncertainties related to model assumptions and/or misspecifications of the  
26 physics. This study presents an analysis of the uncertainties associated with future shoreline  
27 evolution at the cross-shore transport dominated sandy beach of Truc Vert (France) over the 21<sup>st</sup>  
28 century. We explicitly resolve wave-driven shoreline change using two different equilibrium  
29 modelling approaches to provide new insight into the contributions of sea-level rise, and free  
30 model parameters uncertainties on future shoreline change in the frame of climate change. Based  
31 on a Global Sensitivity Analysis, shoreline response during the first half of the century is found to  
32 be mainly sensitive to the equilibrium model parameters, with the influence of sea-level rise  
33 emerging in the second half of the century (~2050 or later), under several simulated scenarios. The  
34 results reveal that the seasonal and interannual variability of the predicted shoreline position is  
35 sensitive to the choice of the wave-driven equilibrium-based model. Finally, we discuss the  
36 importance of the chronology of wave events in future shoreline change, calling for more  
37 continuous wave projection time series to further address uncertainties in future wave conditions.  
38 Our contribution demonstrates that unmitigated climate change can result in shoreline retreat of  
39 several tens of meters by 2100, even for sectors that have been stable or slightly accreting over the  
40 last century.

## 41 **1 Introduction**

42 Ongoing climate change is one of the largest concerns of our time, and its largest impacts on the  
43 world's environment are yet to come. Global mean sea-level rise is accelerating since 1870, and  
44 is expected to continue rising over the 21<sup>st</sup> century, although acceleration may be avoided if the  
45 Paris Agreement 'below 2°C climate warming' target is met (Church et al., 2013; Oppenheimer et  
46 al., 2019). In addition, global wave power is adapting to the sea surface temperature since the late  
47 1940's (Reguero et al., 2019), and is expected to change along with storminess by 2100 (Morim  
48 et al., 2020).

49 Sandy beaches provide precious natural, structural and social-economical resources to coastal  
50 communities (Ghermandi & Nunes, 2013; Poumadère et al., 2015), and constitute about one third  
51 of the ice-free coasts worldwide (Luijendijk et al., 2018). Open sandy beaches constantly evolve  
52 in response to multiple environmental drivers occurring on different time scales, making sandy  
53 shoreline dynamics strongly sensitive to sea-level rise and wave climate change (Ranasinghe,  
54 2016, 2020). Meanwhile, the expected growth of population density in low-lying coastal areas  
55 during the twenty-first century (Merkens et al., 2016; Neumann et al., 2015) increases the need for  
56 efficient adaptation plans of coastal communities (Oppenheimer et al., 2019).

57 The spatial heterogeneity of sea-level rise (SLR), wave-climate change, time scales of adaptation,  
58 and vulnerability of coastal communities raises the need for shoreline projections with their related  
59 uncertainties that provide full support to risk-informed decision making process (Hinkel et al.,  
60 2019; Losada et al., 2019; Toimil et al., 2018, 2020; Wainwright et al., 2015). However, limits in  
61 our understanding and modelling capacity of the primary processes driving shoreline change,  
62 together with the uncertainties associated to the future climate (e.g. carbon emission scenario, SLR,  
63 storminess, etc.), undermine the confidence in future shoreline estimates proportionally to the time  
64 scale of application (Ranasinghe, 2020; Toimil et al., 2020). Many studies focused on the effects  
65 of SLR uncertainties (Athanasidou et al., 2020; Le Cozannet et al., 2016, 2019; Thiéblemont et al.,  
66 2021; Vousdoukas et al., 2020) and changes in storminess based on data extrapolation and/or  
67 empirical models (Allenbach et al., 2015; Casas-Prat et al., 2016; Toimil et al., 2017; Vousdoukas  
68 et al., 2020) on future shoreline uncertainties. However, these studies do not explicitly resolve  
69 wave-driven shoreline change, and it is advocated that new methods have to be developed to  
70 predict the impacts of SLR on the coast (Cooper et al., 2020). Short- and long-term variability in  
71 wave energy, as well as the chronology of storm events, can strongly affect future shoreline

72 patterns (Besio et al., 2017; Cagigal et al., 2020; Coco et al., 2014; Dissanayake et al., 2015;  
73 Vitousek et al., 2021). Recently, Cagigal et al. (2020) developed and used a stochastic climate-  
74 based wave emulator to generate ensembles of wave time series at several beaches, and addressed  
75 shoreline response to different wave chronologies. Based on the same emulator, Vitousek et al.  
76 (2021) analytically investigated the uncertainties in shoreline predictions associated to the inherent  
77 variability of the wave climate in the context of equilibrium shoreline modelling. Kroon et al.  
78 (2020) showed the significant effects of wave-climate variability and model uncertainty on the  
79 short-term (1 year) probabilistic assessment of coastline change at the Sand Engine (Netherlands).  
80 The authors used a one-line model, i.e. resolving wave-driven longshore sediment transport  
81 gradients and resulting shoreline evolution, as this stretch of coast is longshore transport  
82 dominated.

83 Currently, there are no studies addressing the time evolution of the effects that uncertainties in  
84 future SLR and model parameters have on shoreline projections to the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> century while  
85 explicitly resolving wave-driven shoreline response. The recent development of equilibrium  
86 shoreline models opened the way to skilful simulation of wave-driven shoreline response on cross-  
87 shore transport dominated sites, which are ubiquitous worldwide, on time scales from hours (storm  
88 events) to decades, with low computational cost (Antolínez et al., 2019; Davidson et al., 2013;  
89 Lemos et al., 2018; Robinet et al., 2018; Splinter et al., 2014a; Vitousek et al., 2017; Yates et al.,  
90 2009). Equilibrium shoreline models are based on the principle that the shoreline dynamically  
91 moves towards a time-varying equilibrium condition (Wright & Short, 1984), which can be  
92 expressed as a function of the current shoreline position (Yates et al., 2009) or antecedent wave  
93 conditions (Davidson et al. 2013). While the two latter equilibrium formulations show similar skill  
94 against shoreline observations on a multi-year timescale (Castelle et al., 2014; Montaña et al.,

95 2020), the accuracy of one approach over the other in different wave forcing scenarios is unclear,  
96 particularly on long timescales (multi-decadal). In addition, in this type of models, sediment  
97 transport processes are described by semi-empirical relationships that require site-specific  
98 calibration against observed shoreline data, introducing further uncertainty (D'Anna et al., 2020;  
99 Splinter et al., 2013). Implementations of cross-shore equilibrium models into probabilistic  
100 frameworks recently showed that uncertainties in the calibration of model free parameters  
101 (D'Anna et al., 2020) and in future wave conditions (Vitousek et al., 2021) have a significant  
102 impact on model predictions. In addition, recent studies found an inherent connection between the  
103 seasonality of wave climate and shoreline model parameters that defines the frequency of shoreline  
104 response, for several beaches along the Australian coast (Ibaceta et al., 2020; Splinter et al., 2017).  
105 SLR-driven shoreline retreat is often estimated using the Bruun (1962) model. This model relates  
106 the rate of shoreline erosion to the SLR rate and the average slope of the active beach profile,  
107 defined between the seaward and landward limits of cross-shore sediment exchange. The seaward  
108 limit of the active beach profile is commonly identified by the depth of closure (Hallermaier,  
109 1978). As local scale bathymetric surveys are scarce and the estimation of the depth of closure is  
110 essentially empirical, the active beach profile slope is typically associated with large uncertainties  
111 (Nicholls, 1998; Ranasinghe et al., 2012).

112 In this work, we aim at deepening our understanding in the role and impact of different  
113 uncertainties in shoreline projections. We perform a Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA) (Saltelli  
114 et al., 2008) to unravel the respective contributions of SLR, depth of closure, and shoreline model  
115 free parameters uncertainties. The framework is applied to the cross-shore dominated Truc Vert  
116 beach (SW France) using two different wave-driven shoreline models, the Bruun model, and state-  
117 of-the-art SLR and wave projections for two future Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP)

118 scenarios. The likely range provided along with median SLR estimates in IPCC reports does not  
119 cover the full uncertainty range of mean sea level projections. Hence, there remains a probability  
120 of up to 33% that sea-level rise exceeds the likely range. Therefore, we also assess shoreline  
121 projections in the deterministic high-end SLR scenario, which remains unlikely but plausible and  
122 is associated with large impacts (Stammer et al 2019). The remainder of this paper includes: an  
123 outline of Truc Vert beach, the data, the shoreline models, and the method (Section 2); a  
124 description of the GSA input variables' probability distributions and the numerical modelling setup  
125 (Section 3); and the presentation of the results (Section 4). Discussion and conclusions are  
126 provided in Section 5 and 6, respectively.

## 127 **2 Study site, data and method**


### 128 2.1 Truc Vert beach

129 Truc Vert is a meso-macrotidal wave dominated sandy beach located in the south of the Gironde  
130 coast, southwest France, which extends roughly 100 km between the Gironde river estuary and the  
131 south of the Arcachon basin (Figure 1a,b). Truc Vert is backed by a high (~20 m) and wide (~250  
132 m) coastal dune system (Robin et al., 2021). The wave climate is characterized by strong seasonal  
133 energy fluctuations, and strong interannual winter energy variability (Castelle et al., 2018a;  
134 Charles et al., 2012; Robinet et al., 2016), the latter associated to large-scale climate patterns of  
135 atmospheric variability in the northeast Atlantic region (Castelle et al., 2017). Monthly-averaged  
136 significant wave height ranges from 1.1 m in August with dominant W-NW direction to 2.4 m in  
137 January with dominant W direction. Truc Vert beach has been intensively monitored since 2003  
138 with monthly to bi-monthly topographic DGPS surveys, with additional daily topographic surveys  
139 and high-resolution bathymetric surveys collected during the ECORS'08 field campaign (Parisot  
140 et al., 2009), see Castelle et al. (2020) for detailed description of the datasets. Since 2017, high-  
141 resolution digital elevation model covering 4 km of beach-dune are also derived seasonally from  
142 photogrammetry of UAV images (Laporte-Fauret et al., 2019).

143 The beach morphology is highly dynamic and responds primarily to cross-shore processes driven  
144 by the temporal variability of the incident wave climate (Castelle et al., 2014; Robinet et al., 2016,  
145 2018). Overall, this segment of coastline has been observed to be reasonably stable over the past  
146 decades (Castelle et al., 2018b), although the interannual distribution of winter wave energy may  
147 result in episodic severe beach and dune erosion (Castelle et al., 2015; Masselink et al., 2016).



148



149

150 **Figure 1** (a) Location of Truc Vert beach (green), wave hindcast grid point co-located with the  
 151 CANDHIS in situ wave buoy (red), and wave projections grid point (yellow); (b) Picture of Truc  
 152 Vert beach and dune landscape (photo by V. Marieu); (c) 4 km alongshore-averaged beach-dune  
 153 profile from merged 2008 topo-bathymetry (submerged beach) and 2018 UAV-photogrammetry  
 154 digital elevation model (emerged beach and dune); (d) Mean shoreline (1.5-m beach profile  
 155 elevation proxy) positions between 2011 and 2020 derived from the bimonthly topographic  
 156 surveys.

## 157 2.2 Wave data: historical and projections

158 While a dataset of future waves is required to simulate future shoreline change, hindcast wave data  
 159 were also needed for the present study in order to: (1) run the shoreline models on the past period  
 160 and estimate the distribution of the model parameters; and (2) support the correction of the wave  
 161 projection dataset.


### 162 2.1.1 Hindcast wave data (1994-2020)

163 Historical wave data ( $H_s$ ,  $T_p$ , and  $D_m$ ), from January 1994 to January 2020, was extracted from the  
164 NORGAS-UG regional hindcast model (Michaud et al., 2016) at the grid point co-located with the  
165 in situ CANDHIS wave buoy (44°39'9" N; 1°26'48" W) moored in ~50 m depth offshore of Truc  
166 Vert beach (Figure 1a). The NORGAS-UG model covers the French Atlantic coastal area using an  
167 unstructured mesh grid with resolution of 10 km offshore, increasing to 200 m nearshore. The  
168 wave model was validated against several French and international wave buoy data, and showed  
169 0.96-0.99 correlations coefficients, 0.15-0.21 m RMSE, and -0.02 to 0.04 m bias (Michaud et al.,  
170 2016). The hindcasted wave time series (1994-2020) shows the typical seasonal and interannual  
171 modulation of the incident wave climate at Truc Vert beach (Figure 2a).

#### 172 2.2.2 Future wave climate (2020 - 2100)

173 Wave-driven shoreline change at cross-shore transport dominated sites is controlled by the  
174 variability in incident wave energy including temporal clustering and chronology of storm wave  
175 events (Splinter et al., 2014b; Dissanayake et al., 2015; Angnuureng et al., 2017). Thus, the  
176 assessment of future shoreline evolution at Truc Vert requires a continuous wave time series with  
177 high resolution (e.g. few hours). Bricheno and Wolf (2018) (hereafter BW18) provide state-of-the-  
178 art wave projections throughout the 21<sup>st</sup> century in the Northeast Atlantic region for the RCP8.5  
179 and RCP4.5 scenarios. As part of the Coordinated Ocean Wave Climate Project (COWCLIP),  
180 BW18 wave data belong to an ensemble of global and regional wave climate projections, forced  
181 with several Global Climate Models and using different wave models. Within COWCLIP, changes  
182 were found to be robust in the North Atlantic region, suggesting a slight decrease of annual mean  
183  $H_s$  and a clockwise rotation of waves off the Aquitanian coast that is more pronounced for high  
184 climate forcing (Morim et al., 2019). However, amongst the COWCLIP ensemble, to our  
185 knowledge, only BW18 produced uninterrupted time series of wave data with sufficient spatial

186 resolution to properly reproduce the wave climate offshore our study site. The continuous hourly  
187 time series of wave conditions was produced by BW18 using a dynamical downscaling approach  
188 and a nested setup of the WaveWatchIII® spectral wave model (Tolman, 2009). The wave model  
189 covers the Northwest European coastal area with a grid resolution of  $0.083^\circ$  ( $<9$  km) and was  
190 forced with the downscaled EC-Earth global climate model (Hazeleger et al., 2012). For both RCP  
191 scenarios, BW18 model is run from 2006 to 2100 in a regional atmospheric model configuration  
192 ( $\sim 0.11^\circ$  resolution), in the context of the EURO-CORDEX project. BW18 also provide the results  
193 of a *historic* model run, forced with the EC-Earth model climate, for the period 1970-2004. Such  
194 simulation is needed to estimate relative change between past and future wave climate or for the  
195 correction of the potential biases between the modelling results and reference wave data (e.g. wave  
196 buoy data or modelled wave hindcast), which result from climate models bias (see e.g. Charles et  
197 al., 2012). From the BW18 modelling, we extracted wave data ( $H_s$ ,  $T_p$ , and  $D_m$ ) over 2020-2100  
198 (for shoreline projections) from the nearest grid point to the CANDHIS wave buoy ( $\sim 3$  km North-  
199 East; Figure 1a), in  $\sim 50$  m depth, for both RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios. To reduce the bias in  
200 modelled future waves, we analysed the seasonal quantiles of the 1994-2004 portion of BW18  
201 *historic* wave time series (extracted at the same location as the 2020-2100 wave data) and the  
202 seasonal quantiles of the NORGAS-UG hindcast, and set-up a seasonal *quantile-quantile*  
203 correction that we applied to the 2020-2100 wave dataset (details in Text S1 of Supporting  
204 Information). The corrected BW18 wave time series for RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios are shown  
205 in Figure 2b and Figure 2c, respectively. Hereon, we refer to BW18 as the corrected wave time  
206 series.



207

208

209

210

211

212

213

**Figure 2** Wave data offshore of Truc Vert, including: time series of  $H_s$  (black lines) and 3-month averaged  $H_s^2 T_p$  (red lines) for (a) the 1994-2020 wave hindcast from NORGAS-UG model ( $44^{\circ}39'9''$  N;  $-1^{\circ}26'48''$  W), and (b) RCP8.5 and (c) RCP4.5 scenarios corrected 2020-2100 Bricheno and Wolf (2018) wave projections; linear trends (solid lines) of annual (d) summer and (e) winter mean  $H_s$  (dashed lines) of 2020-2100 corrected Bricheno and Wolf (2018) wave projections, for RCP4.5 (blue) and RCP8.5 (orange) scenarios. For RCP8.5 (RCP4.5), the trend of

214 summer and winter mean  $H_s$  are -2 mm/year (-1 mm/year) and -0.05 mm/year (-0.05 mm/year).  
215 These trends were tested to be statistically significant (more than 99% significance) using  
216 Student's t-tests. (f) Quantile-quantile comparison between RCP4.5 and RCP8.5's 3-month  
217 average of  $H_s^2 T_p$  projections for the four seasons (black crosses) and for the full datasets (grey  
218 circles).

219

220 Here, we adopted  $H_s^2 T_p$  ( $m^2s$ ) as a representative variable for deep-water wave energy. The  
221 RCP8.5 and 4.5 2020-2100 wave series show a strong interannual modulation of incident wave  
222 energy, which is in line with current wave climate characteristics offshore of Truc Vert. Both  
223 scenarios of the BW18 wave projections show several peaks of the 3-month average  $H_s^2 T_p$  that are  
224 comparable to the 2013-2014 outstanding high-energy winter ( $H_s^2 T_p = 178 m^2s$ ) experienced at  
225 Truc Vert (Figure 2a-c). For the RCP8.5 (RCP4.5) scenario, the projected 3-month average  $H_s^2 T_p$   
226 reaches at least 90% of the 2013-2014 peak in 2030, 2080, 2086, and 2099 (2060, 2068, 2073 and  
227 2085) (Figure 2b,c). While characterized by similar integrated intensity, these winters are preceded  
228 by different multi-annual energy trends, with the RCP8.5 (RCP4.5) 2080, 2086 and 2099 (2060  
229 and 2068) winters following a positive trend of wave energy (similarly to the 2013-2014 winter),  
230 and the 2030 (2060 and 2068) winter following a negative trend of winter energy. Although in  
231 both RCP scenarios the incident wave energy fluctuates with a similar interannual period with  
232 nearly the same average  $H_s^2 T_p$  (52 and 54  $m^2s$  for RCP8.5 and RCP4.5, respectively), the RCP4.5  
233 scenario associates slightly higher energy during Autumn, Summer and Spring (Figure 2f). The  
234 2020-2100 summer mean wave height ( $\overline{H}_{summer}$ ) fluctuates between 0.9 m and 1.7 m, with a  
235 statistically significant decrease of 2 mm/year (1 mm/year) rates for the RCP8.5 (RCP4.5) (Figure  
236 2d). Future winter mean wave height ( $\overline{H}_{winter}$ ), which is a key driver of cross-shore wave-  
237 dominated shoreline evolution (Dodet et al., 2019), varies between 1.5 m and 3 m with a

238 statistically significant decreasing trend under 0.05 mm/year in both RCP scenarios (Figure 2e).  
239 This is consistent with previous regional projections (Charles et al., 2012; Perez et al., 2015;  
240 Morim et al., 2019).

## 241 2.3 Mean sea level and vertical land motion

### 242 2.3.1 Past mean sea level reconstruction

243 As SLR-driven shoreline retreat is explicitly accounted for in the calibration of the shoreline  
244 models, past MSL information is required. We reconstructed the geocentric MSL change in the  
245 Bay of Biscay over the period 2012-2020 using a Kalman filter approach assimilating available  
246 tide gauge records in this region (Rohmer & Le Cozannet, 2019). The resulting SLR rates are  
247 roughly constant at  $2.1 \pm 0.1$  mm/year (median  $\pm \sigma$ ). Local relative MSL change at Truc Vert beach  
248 was calculated by adding the effect of vertical land motion to the relative regional sea level  
249 estimate. Vertical land motion in Truc Vert area was estimated using the near Cap-Ferret  
250 permanent GNSS station from the SONEL database (Santamaria-Gomez et al., 2017), which  
251 provides data from 2005 to 2012, when the station was decommissioned. The GNSS station  
252 measures the effects of Glacial Isostatic Adjustment and current gravitational, rotational and  
253 deformation changes associated to ongoing glaciers and ice-sheets melting (Frederikse et al.,  
254 2020). We subtract their effects from the observed GNSS records over the observation period to  
255 assess residual vertical ground motions obtaining a subsidence rate of  $1.2 \pm 0.6$  mm/yr. This results  
256 in a roughly constant SLR rate of  $3.3 \pm 0.7$  mm/yr over the past decade (see Figure S5 of Supporting

257 Information). The observed lowering ground might be due to slow subsidence of the former Leyre  
258 riverbed (Klingebiel & Legigan, 1992).

259 The pointwise Cap-Ferret GNSS station information may not be exactly that of the surrounding  
260 area. This is part of the residual uncertainties of our study.

### 261 2.3.2 Future mean sea level projections

262 State-of-the-art GMSL projections until 2100 are available from the *Special Report of Ocean and*  
263 *Cryosphere in a Changing Climate* (SROCC, Oppenheimer et al., 2019). SROCC estimates build  
264 on the *Fifth Assessment Report* (AR5, Wong et al., 2014) with a revised assessment of the Antarctic  
265 dynamics contribution based on new evidence on marine ice-sheets instabilities since the AR5.  
266 SROCC provides median values of each sea level change contribution with associated *likely range*  
267 for several RCP scenarios. Unlike other IPCC reports, the SROCC defines the likely range as the  
268 17<sup>th</sup>-83<sup>rd</sup> percentiles of the distribution of sea-level rise (Oppenheimer et al., 2019). We reproduced  
269 the SROCC global MSL projections to Truc Vert beach following Thiéblemont et al. (2019) and  
270 considering the regional fingerprints of each mechanism contributing to sea-level changes,  
271 including the effect of Glacial Isostatic Adjustment (Slangen et al., 2014). This results in regional  
272 relative 2020-2100 SLR estimate (median and likely range) of  $0.63 \pm 0.26$  m and  $0.37 \pm 0.16$  m for  
273 the RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios, respectively.

274 Residual vertical land motion, which is assumed to be due to slow-ongoing geological processes  
275 (see subsection 2.3.1 and Klingebiel & Legigan, 1992), is assumed to remain constant ( $1.2 \pm 0.6$   
276 mm/yr) over the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Due to the large uncertainty (0.6 mm/yr) of the subsidence rate, the  
277 stability of the area is not excluded, but has a very low probability (2.1%). The inclusion of ground  
278 motion results in a local relative MSL rise of  $0.73 \pm 0.27$  m and  $0.47 \pm 0.17$  m from 2020 to 2100

279 for RCP8.5 and RCP4.5 scenarios, respectively (see Figure S5 in Supporting Information). Further  
280 detail on future SLR is provided in Section 3.1.

## 281 2.4 Shoreline change models

282 Here, we use two equilibrium-based models to assess wave-driven shoreline response: the Yates  
283 et al. (2009) model, and an adaptation of the *ShoreFor* model (Davidson et al., 2013; Splinter et  
284 al. 2014a). As the Truc Vert bathymetry iso-contours are essentially shore-parallel, breaking wave  
285 conditions were computed directly from offshore wave conditions using the Larson et al. (2010)  
286 formula. Chronic shoreline retreat induced by SLR was estimated using the Bruun (1962) model.  
287 As shoreline change at Truc Vert is known to be dominated by cross-shore sediment transport with  
288 negligible gradients in longshore transport (Castelle et al., 2014; Splinter et al., 2014a), we did not  
289 compute longshore sediment transport. The following subsections describe the two wave-driven  
290 shoreline models and the Bruun model.

### 291 2.4.1 Wave-driven shoreline models and free parameters

292 Equilibrium shoreline models are based on the principle that local wave climate drives the  
293 shoreline towards a time-varying equilibrium position at a rate that depends on the instantaneous  
294 wave thrust (e.g. wave power or energy) available to move the sediment, and the dynamic  
295 disequilibrium state of the beach (Wright & Short, 1984). The Yates et al. (2009) model and  
296 *ShoreFor* differ primarily in the formulation of the respective disequilibrium conditions.

#### 297 2.4.1.1 *ShoreFor* model

298 The *ShoreFor* model (hereafter SF) adopts a disequilibrium condition based on the wave history,  
299 expressed as a disequilibrium of dimensionless fall velocity ( $\Delta\Omega$ ) and its standard deviation ( $\sigma_{\Delta\Omega}$ ).  
300 The governing equation for shoreline change rate reads:



$$\frac{dY}{dt} = k_s^{+/-} P^{0.5} \frac{\Delta\Omega}{\sigma_{\Delta\Omega}} + b \quad (1)$$

where,  $k_s^{+/-}$  ( $\text{m s}^{-1}\text{W}^{-0.5}$ ) is a response rate parameter,  $P(W)$  is the wave power at breaking, and  $b$  ( $\text{m/s}$ ) is a linear term trend. Following Robinet et al. (2018), the disequilibrium term  $\Delta\Omega$  at a given time is defined as the difference between the equilibrium dimensionless fall velocity ( $\Omega_{\text{eq}}(\Phi)$ ) and the offshore dimensionless fall velocity ( $\Omega_o$ ), where  $\Omega_{\text{eq}}(\Phi)$  is a function of the sediment size, prior wave conditions, and the free parameter  $\Phi$ . The parameter  $\Phi$  (days) is a site-specific ‘beach memory’, and defines the time over which a given wave event has an impact over the equilibrium state of the beach. The  $k_s^{+/-}$  parameter is the shoreline response rate, and assumes different values for accretion ( $k_s^+$ ,  $\Delta\Omega > 0$ ) and erosion ( $k_s^-$ ,  $\Delta\Omega < 0$ ) events, which are driven by different processes associating different time scales. The values of the  $k_s^{+/-}$  parameter for accretion and erosion conditions are considered proportional through a coefficient  $r$  ( $k_s^- = rk_s^+$ ). The  $r$  coefficient is not a model free parameter but is defined by the wave forcing, and is such that no trend in wave forcing results in no trend in the modelled shoreline position over the simulated period:

$$r = \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \langle F^+ \rangle}{\sum_{i=1}^N \langle F^- \rangle} \right| \quad (2)$$

$$F = P^{0.5} \frac{\Delta\Omega(\Phi)}{\sigma_{\Delta\Omega}} \quad (3)$$

where  $N$  is the full length of the simulated period,  $F^+$  and  $F^-$  are the forcing during accretion ( $\Delta\Omega > 0$ ) and erosion ( $\Delta\Omega < 0$ ) events, respectively, and  $\langle . \rangle$  denotes an operation that removes the linear trend. Here, the sign of  $\Delta\Omega$  does not change the absolute value of  $F^{+/-}$ . For an extended description of SF the reader is referred to Davidson et al. (2013) and Splinter et al. (2014a). In SF, the model free parameters to be calibrated at a given site are  $k_s^+$ ,  $\Phi$  and  $b$ . Physically, the  $k_s^{+/-}$  ( $\text{m s}^{-1}\text{W}^{-0.5}$ ) is a measure of the efficiency of wave forcing to drive shoreline change (as described by Splinter et al., 2014a), which can also be interpreted as a time scale of shoreline response (Vitousek et al.,

2021). Indeed, a low efficiency corresponds to a slow shoreline response and a longer time scale, and vice versa.  $\Phi$ (days) is a time scale for the duration of the impact that past waves exerted on the beach, and provides the ability for the model equilibrium condition to evolve along with long-term wave energy trends. The parameter  $b$ (m/s) is a linear term that encapsulates the effect of slow processes, other than wave-driven equilibrium based, which may drive chronic shoreline change (e.g. wind driven sediment transport) and that are not explicitly resolved in the model. We note here that, while accounting for the effects of slow processes using a constant linear trend (i.e.  $b$ ) can improve the model skill for simulated periods within the decade, the application of such trend over longer time scales (decades to centuries) becomes increasingly inaccurate (D'Anna et al., 2020). Therefore, given the long time scale of our application and the absence of secondary processes (e.g. longshore gradients in sediment transport) that may drive long-term shoreline trends at Truc Vert, we set  $b=0$ .

#### 2.4.1.2 Yates model

In Yates' model (hereafter Y09) the disequilibrium condition is defined as a function of the current shoreline position, and the cross-shore rate of shoreline change is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{dY}{dt} = k_y^{+/-} E^{0.5} (E_{eq}(Y) - E) \quad (4)$$

where  $E$  ( $m^2$ ) is the wave energy,  $k_y^{+/-}$  ( $m^2 s^{-1}/m$ ) is the response rate parameter,  $Y$ (m) is the present shoreline position, and  $E_{eq}(Y)$  is the wave energy in equilibrium with the current shoreline position  $Y$  through a linear relationship:

$$E_{eq}(Y) = a_1 Y + a_2 \quad (5)$$

where  $a_1$  ( $m^2/m$ ) and  $a_2$  ( $m^2$ ) are free model parameters. The  $k_y^{+/-}$  parameter is analogous to  $k_s^{+/-}$  of SF in that it represents the efficiency rate of the incident wave forcing to shoreline change, or a time scale parameter (see the analytical derivation of the Y09 time scale of shoreline response in

346 Vitousek et al., 2021). In the Y09 model no assumption is made on a possible relationship between  
347 the  $k_y^+$  and  $k_y^-$ , which are both considered model free parameters and, as well as  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , require  
348 specific calibration for each field site application. Contrarily to SF, here the equilibrium state  
349 formulation (Equation 5) does not depend on recent wave conditions, making this model  
350 insensitive to wave-climate variability on timescales longer than the calibration period. Instead,  
351 Equation 5 depends on the current shoreline position ( $Y$ ), introducing the potential for feedbacks  
352 between Y09 and shoreline change induced by other cross-shore processes (e.g. SLR). Herein,  
353 such processes are resolved independently and linearly superposed, so that no feedback is enabled.  
354 Physically,  $k_y^{+/-}$ , once again is a measure of the shoreline reactivity to the incident wave forcing,  
355 and is expressed in ( $\text{m s}^{-1}/\text{m}$ ). Although the dimensions of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are ‘energy/meter’ and  
356 ‘energy’, respectively, the role of these parameters in the model is purely empirical. A  
357 rearrangement of the terms in Equations 2-3 results in combinations of model parameters that are  
358 representative of equilibrium time and spatial scales (Vitousek et al., 2021). However, here we use  
359 Y09 in its original form, where  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are treated as empirical parameters.

#### 360 2.4.2 Sea-level driven shoreline recession

361 We include SLR-driven shoreline recession using the Bruun (1962) model, which is based on the  
362 equilibrium beach concept and cross-shore balance of sediment volume. While the reliability of  
363 this model is highly debated for its oversimplification of the reality (Cooper & Pilkey, 2004;  
364 Ranasinghe, 2012), its simple linear formulation has been extensively used worldwide. In addition,  
365 Truc Vert beach is a relatively undisturbed beach-dune environment with large accommodation  
366 space, which makes this sites in line with most of the Bruun Rule underlying assumptions. The  
367 Bruun model assumes that under rising sea level, on time scales larger than years, the average  
368 beach profile translates upwards and landwards. The resulting shoreline retreat ( $dY_{\text{SLR}}/dt$ ) depends

369 on SLR and the average slope of the active beach profile, here extending from the dune crest down  
 370 to the depth of closure (DoC), defined as the depth beyond which sediment exchange is considered  
 371 negligible (Bruun, 1988; Wolinsky & Murray, 2009):

$$372 \quad \frac{dY_{SLR}}{dt} = \frac{SLR_{rate}}{\tan\beta} \quad (6)$$

373 where  $SLR_{rate}$  is the rate of SLR (m/time), and  $\tan\beta$  is the average profile slope defined between  
 374 the DoC and the dune crest. We estimated the DoC according to Hallermeier (1978), and the  
 375 corresponding  $\tan\beta=0.023$  using the beach profile reported in Figure 1c.

## 376 2.5 Global Sensitivity Analysis

377 Numerical modelling of shoreline change inherits the uncertainties associated to input variables  
 378 and their complex interactions, affecting the robustness of the shoreline projections. While  
 379 numerical modelling provides a ‘key-hole’ to observe the explicit interactions among defined sets  
 380 of variables, sensitivity analysis provides a way to understand the role of input variables  
 381 uncertainties in shoreline predictions. Here, we use the framework proposed by D’Anna et al.  
 382 (2020), who used a variance-based Global Sensitivity Analysis (GSA) (Saltelli et al., 2008; Sobol’,  
 383 2001) to investigate the relative contributions of the uncertainties affecting input variables to the  
 384 uncertainties of modelled shoreline predictions, and their evolution in time. The method consists  
 385 in propagating the input uncertainties through the model obtaining a probabilistic estimate of the  
 386 shoreline projections, and performing a GSA which decomposes the variance of model results into  
 387 several contributions, each one associated with an input variable. Each of these contributions is  
 388 used to estimate a measure of the model results sensitivity to the input uncertainties with a  
 389 sensitivity index known as *first-order Sobol’ index* ( $S_i$ ). The  $S_i$  (0-1) quantifies the ratio of output’s

390 variance associated with the uncertainties of a given input  $X_i$ , i.e. the reduction in the output  
 391 variance that would occur if the uncertain input  $X_i$  was set to its true value, and is defined as:

$$392 \quad S_i = \frac{\text{Var}(E(Y|X_i))}{\text{Var}(Y)} \quad (7)$$


393 where  $\text{Var}$  is the variance operator,  $E$  is the expectation operator,  $Y$  is the modelled shoreline  
 394 position, and  $X_i$  is the  $i$ -th uncertain input variable. Further details on GSA and  $S_i$  are provided in  
 395 Text S3 of Supporting Information.

396 Here, we address the relative impact of uncertainties associated to SLR, DoC and of model free  
 397 parameters on shoreline projections ( $Y$ ) and their evolution in time for the two different modelling  
 398 approaches described in Section 2.4. Identifying the main source of model results uncertainties  
 399 through time is a fundamental step towards improving the reliability of long-term shoreline  
 400 projections. Following D’Anna et al. (2020), we computed the  $S_i$ s using the modularized sample-  
 401 based approach by Li and Mahadevan (2016), which allows accounting for the statistical  
 402 dependence between model free parameters, and we estimate  $S_i$ s for the purpose of “Factors’  
 403 Prioritization” (as defined by Saltelli et al., 2008). At a given time, the Factors’ Prioritization  
 404 identifies the main driver of model results uncertainty (associating the largest  $S_i$ ), that is, the  
 405 uncertain input variable that would most reduce the output’s variance when fixed to its true value.

406 The method can be summarized in three steps:

- 407 1) Definition of probability distribution associated to each stochastic input variable (SLR,  
 408 DoC and model free parameters);
- 409 2) Generation of ensemble modelled shoreline projections, by means of a Monte-Carlo-based  
 410 procedure (with accounts for dependence among the input parameters); and
- 411 3) Computation of first-order Sobol’ index time series for each uncertain input variable.

412 The GSA results are interpreted as the repartition of the variance of shoreline projections into  
 413 normalized portions (between 0 and 1) imputed to the uncertain input variables. For instance, at a  
 414 given time,  $S_{i,SLR} = 0.3$  means that uncertainties in future SLR alone are responsible for 30% of the  
 415 variance in shoreline projections. However, the magnitude of a  $S_i$  alone is not sufficient to identify  
 416 the main driver of the shoreline projections' variance, which is defined by comparing the values  
 417 of  $S_i$  for all input variables and ranking them in terms of importance.  
 418 Figure 3 synthesizes the generalized method and details for the Truc Vert probabilistic applications  
 419 (excluding the additional high-end SLR deterministic scenario).



421 **Figure 3** Flowchart of the method applied herein, summarized for a general case (black box), and  
 422 for the Truc Vert application (red box) in the four application scenarios.

### 423 **3 Input probability distributions for future projections**

#### 424 3.1 Probabilistic sea-level rise

425 Sea-level projections inherit uncertainties associated with physical unknowns and modelling of the  
 426 contributing processes. While many efforts were dedicated to assess such uncertainties, there is no

427 single approach to define MSL probability distributions yet (Jackson & Jevrejeva, 2016; Jevrejeva  
428 et al., 2019; Kopp et al., 2014). We produced probabilistic relative MSL projections, conditional  
429 to the RCP8.5 and 4.5 scenarios, defining time varying normal probability distributions  
430 characterized by the yearly median and standard deviations obtained in Section 2.3.2 (Figure 4a,b),  
431 following Hunter et al. (2013). In the high-emission scenario (RCP8.5), the large uncertainty  
432 associated with Antarctic ice sheet dynamics generates a skewness of the distributions in the  
433 second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, enhancing the amount of possible extreme SLR (Grinsted et al.,  
434 2015; Jackson & Jevrejeva, 2016; Kopp et al., 2014). The upper tail of the skewed probability  
435 distribution is very much debated (Jevrejeva et al., 2019) and is not represented by the Gaussian  
436 distributions. Therefore, in addition to the Gaussian distribution reflecting the SROCC assessment  
437 (Oppenheimer et al., 2019), we consider a high-impact, low probability high-end sea level scenario  
438 that might take place for high greenhouse gas emissions (RCP8.5; black line in Figure 4b)  
439 following the same assumptions as Thiéblemont et al. (2019) (see Text S2 in Supporting  
440 Information for details).

441 The possibility that the subsidence rate revealed by the Cap-Ferret GPS station is not representative  
442 of the Truc Vert area (located at 8 km distance) constitutes a residual uncertainty that cannot be  
443 quantified, and is not accounted in this study due to the lack of quantitative information supporting  
444 an alternative scenario for residual vertical ground motions.

### 445 3.2 Depth of closure

446 The active beach profile slope is critical to SLR-driven erosion rate (Section 2.4), and strongly  
447 depends on the depth of closure (DoC). The DoC was calculated from the wave climate using the  
448 Hallermeier (1978) formula. Given that DoC depends on the period of time over which the  
449 Hallermeier formula is applied (Nicholls, 1998), we iteratively applied the Hallermeier formula

450 over a 1-year moving window of the future wave climate with a 30-days step. For both RCP8.5  
451 and RCP4.5 scenarios, the latter procedure generated an ensemble of possible DoC values well  
452 fitted by a Gaussian distribution (Figure 4c). The DoC probability distribution shows higher  
453 median and standard deviation values in the RCP4.5 ( $\mu = 17.2$  m;  $\sigma = 1.75$  m) than in the RCP8.5  
454 ( $\mu = 16.3$  m;  $\sigma = 0.95$  m). This results from the more frequent occurrence and larger wave heights  
455 associated to isolated extreme events in the RCP4.5 scenario, compared to the RCP8.5 scenario.

### 456 3.3 Model parameters

457 Numerical models are associated with uncertainties owing to the choice of modelling approach  
458 and to the estimation of model free parameters. We accounted for the uncertainty conditional to  
459 the choice of modelling approach assessing the shoreline projections using the Y09 and the SF  
460 models described in Section 2.4.1, in two separated scenarios. Both models rely on shoreline  
461 observations to calibrate the respective free parameters, and inherit uncertainties due to the quality  
462 and amount of available data (Splinter et al., 2013), to possible non-stationarity of the parameters  
463 in respect to the wave climate (Ibaceta et al., 2020), and to the optimization method. Uncertainties  
464 affecting model free parameters of the Y09 model ( $k_y^{+/-}$ ,  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ) and the SF model ( $k_s^+$ ,  $\Phi$ ) are  
465 synthesized by their associated joint probability distribution. We follow the approach developed  
466 in D'Anna et al. (2020), who calibrated the SF model free parameters using the Simulated  
467 Annealing algorithm (Bertsimas & Tsitsiklis, 1993), and determined their joint probability  
468 distribution by fitting an empirical multivariate distribution (multivariate kernel function) on an  
469 ensemble of model parameters combinations. The authors built the latter ensemble selecting all  
470 parameters combinations that produced a RMSE  $< 10$  m against observed shoreline data during  
471 the optimization process. Unlike D'Anna et al. (2020), here we calibrated the models between  
472 January 2012 and December 2019, where no long-term trend in shoreline position is observed, in




473 line with the assumption of the SF parameter  $b=0$  (see Section 2.4.1). In addition, we used the  
 474 Nash-Sutcliffe (Nash & Sutcliffe, 1970) efficiency score ( $NS$ ) instead of the RMSE to determine  
 475 the models' performance (as for instance in Kroon et al., 2020). The  $NS$  measures the model skill  
 476 in comparison to the 'mean model' (defined as the observed mean shoreline position), based on  
 477 the error's variance, and it is calculated as follows:

$$478 \quad NS = 1 - \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N (Y_m^n - Y_o^n)^2}{\sum_{n=1}^N (\bar{Y}_o - Y_o^n)^2} \quad (8)$$

479 where  $N$  is the number of observations,  $Y_m^n$  and  $Y_o^n$  are the n-th modelled and observed shoreline  
 480 positions, respectively, and  $\bar{Y}_o$  is the mean of the observed shoreline positions. The  $NS$  coefficient  
 481 can range between  $-\infty$  and 1, where  $NS = 1$  corresponds to a model perfectly reproducing the  
 482 observations,  $NS = 0$  to a model with skill comparable to the 'mean model', and  $NS < 0$  corresponds  
 483 to models less skilful than the 'mean model'. We obtained the probability distribution using  
 484 combinations of parameters that resulted in a  $NS \geq 0.25$  (compared to the maximum  $NS = 0.63$ ),  
 485 which corresponds to a max RMSE of  $\sim 10$  m consistently with D'Anna et al. (2020). We defined  
 486 the latter threshold with the iterative procedure described in Text S4 of Supporting Information.  
 487 This procedure results in the probability distributions of  $k_y^{+/-}$ ,  $a_1$ , and  $a_2$  for Y09, and  $k_s^+$  and  $\Phi$  for  
 488 SF shown in Figure 4d,e, with the range of possible parameters values reported in Table 1.

489



490  
 491 **Figure 4** Probability distributions of: relative mean sea level over the period 2020-2100, including  
 492 the likely (dark shaded areas) and 5<sup>th</sup> to 95<sup>th</sup> percentile (light shaded areas) ranges, for (a) RCP4.5  
 493 and (b) RCP8.5 scenarios, with deterministic high-end sea-level projections based on 2100 high-

494 end ‘highest-modelled’ estimates following Thiéblemont et al. (2019) (black line); (c) Gaussian  
 495 distributions of depth of closure values calculated over the 2020-2100 wave time series for RCP4.5  
 496 (blue curve) and RCP8.5 (red curve) scenarios; and empirical joint probability distributions of (d)  
 497 *ShoreFor* [ $k_s^+$ ,  $\Phi$ ] parameters, and (e) *Yates* [ $k_y^{+/-}$ ,  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ ] parameters, obtained fitting a kernel  
 498 density function (with bandwidths estimated from the marginal kernel density function for each  
 499 variable) on 6000 combinations of model parameters producing  $NS > 0.25$  against shoreline data.

500

501 **Table 1** Optimised combinations of cross-shore model free parameters, and respective range of  
 502 variation in the probability distributions.

Model	Model parameter	Optimised value	Distribution range
<i>ShoreFor</i>	$k_s^+$ [ $m^{1.5} s^{-1} W^{0.5}$ ]	$4.4 \times 10^{-8}$	$[2; 7.4] \times 10^{-8}$
	$\Phi$ [days]	1193	[400; 1423]
<i>Yates</i>	$k_y^+$ [ $m^2 s^{-1} / m$ ]	0.87	[0.24 ; 2]
	$k_y^-$ [ $m^2 s^{-1} / m$ ]	0.5	[0.1 ; 1.5 ]
	$a_1$ [ $m^2/m$ ]	-0.008	[-0.02 ; -0.004]
	$a_2$ [ $m^2$ ]	0.49	[0.33 ; 1]

503

#### 504 3.4 Model setup of shoreline projections

505 Four ensembles of 3000 possible shoreline trajectories from 2020 to 2100 were generated using  
 506 the SF and Y09 shoreline change models, and the Bruun Rule, for the two RCP8.5 and RCP4.5  
 507 scenarios (Table 2). Wave-driven shoreline response (short-term) and SLR (long-term) were  
 508 computed individually and then linearly combined, so that no feedback mechanisms occur between  
 509 the models, in line with previous applications (D’Anna et al., 2020; Vitousek et al., 2017).

510 For each model and RCP scenario, 3000 simulations were run with different combinations of  
 511 model free parameters, DoC and SLR time series, sampled from the respective probability  
 512 distributions. Shoreline change was computed with a 3-hour time step from the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2020  
 513 to the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2099 starting from the same shoreline position ( $Y_0=0$ ), and model outputs  
 514 were recorded with a 2-weeks resolution. As the characteristics of the MSL probability distribution  
 515 are time-dependent, we randomly sampled percentile values and extracted the corresponding MSL  
 516 at each year. The ensemble projections character was synthetized by the *likely range*, defined here  
 517 at each time step as the variance, and the *envelope* (min and max) of modelled shoreline positions,  
 518 acknowledging that the latter is dependent on the number of simulations and the tails of the  
 519 probability distributions. The impact of individual winters on shoreline projections is qualitatively  
 520 discussed observing the distributions of shoreline positions corresponding to the most seaward and  
 521 landward median shoreline position within each simulated annual cycle (1<sup>st</sup> September to 31<sup>th</sup>  
 522 August). We analysed the decadal shoreline trends by filtering the modelled shoreline time series  
 523 with a 5-year running mean. In addition, for RCP8.5 scenario, a deterministic high-end-SLR  
 524 simulation was run with both shoreline models using the optimized model parameters (Table 1)  
 525 and the median DoC. It is to be noted that the GSA results (i.e.  $S_i/s$ ) are calculated on the likely  
 526 range (variance) of the model results, regardless of the envelope of modelled shoreline positions.

527

528 **Table 2** Probabilistic future scenarios for two Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) and  
 529 two different wave-driven modelling approaches, using the Bruun Rule and 3000 different  
 530 combinations of model parameters, SLR percentile and DoC.

<b>Future scenario</b>	<b>SLR-driven shoreline change</b>	<b>Wave-driven shoreline change</b>	<b># Combinations of uncertain variables</b>
RCP 4.5	Bruun Rule	<i>ShoreFor</i> (SF)	3000

		<i>Yates</i> (Y09)	3000
RCP 8.5	Bruun Rule	<i>ShoreFor</i> (SF)	3000
		<i>Yates</i> (Y09)	3000

531

532

533 **4 Results**

## 534 4.1 Shoreline projections

535 The four future scenarios in Table 2 resulted each one in 3000 shoreline evolution simulations  
536 spanning 2020-2100 (Figure 5 and Figure 6). Figure 5c,d and Figure 6c,d represent the distribution  
537 of 3000 modelled shoreline positions at each recorded output time. All scenarios show a net erosion  
538 by 2100, mostly driven by SLR (Table 3). All model ensembles also show large interannual  
539 variability that is essentially enforced by the interannual variability in incident winter-mean wave  
540 height (Figure 5a,b and Figure 6a,b). In the RCP8.5 (RCP4.5) scenario we observe a long-term  
541 shoreline change pattern responding to alternating sequences of high- and low-energy winters with  
542 a period of ~20 years (~10 years) and even longer (Figure 5a,e,f and Figure 6a,e,f).


543 Figure 5c,d (Figure 6c,d) show several episodes of rapid erosion driven by isolated extreme energy  
544 winters, for instance for the RCP8.5 (RCP4.5) scenario in winter 2030, 2076, and 2086 (2068,  
545 2073 and 2085). The two wave-driven shoreline models (Y09 and SF) produce consistent short-  
546 and long-term shoreline cycles, with larger tendency to accretion in SF than in Y09 during  
547 extended periods of low energy winters, for instance during 2050-2055 for RCP4.5 and 2060-2070  
548 for RCP8.5 (Figure 5c,d and Figure 6c,d).

549 In the RCP4.5 emission scenario, the modelled 2020-2100 Truc Vert shoreline trend leads to a  
550 likely (envelope) retreat of 15 to 33 m (4 to 75 m) with Y09, and 10 to 23 m (6 to 65 m) with SF.

551 On a yearly time scale, the shoreline position is likely (envelope) to be farther landward from the  
552 initial position, by 76 m (123 m) with Y09, and 43 m (74 m) with SF (Figure 5c,d, Table 3). Indeed,  
553 the occurrence of extreme winters can produce significant landward shifts of the envelope of  
554 shoreline positions, as observed during the 2084-2085 winter (Figure 5c,d).

555

ACCEPTED VERSION



556  
 557 **Figure 5** (a) Time series of winter mean wave height of the BW18 RCP4.5 projections (dashed  
 558 line) with corresponding 5-year average (solid line); (b) BW18 RCP4.5 wave height time series  
 559 (black line), and 3-month average  $H_s^2 T_p$  time series (red line); RCP4.5 scenario 2020-2100  
 560 shoreline projections at 14-days resolution obtained using (c) Y09 and (d) SF; and 5-year running  
 561 mean shoreline projections modelled with (e) Y09, (f) SF, and the standalone Bruun Rule (green  
 562 bars). Dark (light) blue shaded areas indicate the likely (envelope) range, i.e. variance (min-max),  
 563 of shoreline position, and solid light line median shoreline position. The dashed vertical line


564 indicates the most landward shoreline position over the simulated period. Yellow shaded areas  
565 indicate examples of years including high-energy winters.

566 When forced with RCP8.5 scenario's wave and MSL projections, from 2020 to 2100 simulations  
567 indicate an average likely (envelope) erosion of 27 to 48 m (16 to 83 m) using Y09, and 14 to 33  
568 m (2 to 67 m) using SF (Figure 6d,e). In this scenario, over the simulated period the likely  
569 (envelope) most landward shoreline position reaches up to 70 m (108 m) from the initial shoreline  
570 position with Y09 model, and 48 m (76 m) with SF (Figure 6c,d, Table 3). Similarly to the RCP4.5,  
571 here we observe for both models some important shifts in shoreline position distribution owing to  
572 extreme winters such as 2086's winter (Figure 6c,d).

573 In the high-end SLR scenario, both models predict a shoreline position within the envelope of  
574 probabilistic projections until 2090, before the shoreline moves further inland during the last  
575 decade (Figure 6d,e). The modelled 5-year averaged shoreline position in 2100 is of 88 and 74 m  
576 for Y09 and SF, respectively (Table 3). The most landward shoreline position observed throughout  
577 the simulation is 107 m with Y09, and 86 m with SF (black dashed line in Figure 6c,d).

578 The likely (envelope) ranges erosion produced by the combined Y09+Bruun models at the end of  
579 the simulated period are comparable (larger) to the standalone application of the Bruun Rule (Table  
580 3, and in Figure 5,6,e,f with Bruun model predictions in green). With the combined SF+Bruun  
581 models, the likely (envelope) ranges of shoreline positions obtained show ~10 m (~15 m) less  
582 erosion than the Bruun Rule.





583  
 584 **Figure 6** (a) Time series of winter mean wave height of the BW18 RCP8.5 projections (dashed  
 585 line) with corresponding 5-year average (solid line); (b) BW18 RCP8.5 wave height time series  
 586 (black line), and 3-month average  $H_s^2 T_p$  time series (red line); RCP8.5 scenario 2020-2100  
 587 shoreline projections at 14-days resolution obtained using (c) Y09 and (d) SF; and 5-year running  
 588 mean shoreline projections modelled with (e) Y09, (f) SF, and the standalone Bruun Rule (green  
 589 bars). Dark (light) shaded areas indicate the likely (envelope) range, i.e. variance (min-max), of

590 shoreline position. Black solid lines indicate shoreline projections in the RCP8.5 high-end SLR  
 591 scenario. The dashed vertical line indicates the most landward shoreline position over the  
 592 simulated period. Yellow shaded areas indicate examples of years including high-energy winters.

593  
 594 **Table 3** Likely (modelled shoreline variance) and envelope (min-max) values of the 5-year  
 595 averaged projected shoreline position in 2100, and 2020-2100 most landward shoreline position,  
 596 obtained using the standalone Bruun Rule (B), and the combined B with Y09 and SF equilibrium  
 597 shoreline models, for the RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 probabilistic scenarios, and the deterministic high-  
 598 end SLR scenario.


Scenario		2100 5-year averaged shoreline position		Most landward shoreline position	
		likely range (m)	envelope (m)	likely (m)	envelope (m)
RCP 4.5	Y09+B	-15 – -33	-4 – -75	-76	-123
	SF+B	-10 – -23	-6 – -52	-43	-74
	B	-21 – -33	-17 – -60	-33	-60
RCP 8.5	Y09+B	-27 – -48	-16 – -83	-70	-108
	SF+B	-14 – -33	-2 – -65	-48	-76
	B	-28 – -49	-21 – -86	-49	-86
<b>Deterministic scenario</b>		<b>2100 5-year averaged shoreline position (m)</b>		<b>Most landward shoreline position (m)</b>	
High-end RCP 8.5	Y09+B	-95		-111	
	SF+B	-74		-84	
	B	-81		-81	

599

## 600 4.2 Global Sensitivity Analysis


601 In both RCP8.5 and 4.5 scenarios and for both shoreline model applications, the GSA shows that  
 602 over the first 30 years of simulation the variance of modelled shoreline projections is driven  
 603 primarily by the uncertainties in model free parameters, while the effects of SLR uncertainties on  
 604 shoreline position become increasingly significant after 2050 (Figure 7 and Figure 8). The  $S_i$ s of  
 605 the Y09 and SF response rate parameters ( $k_y^{+/-}$  and  $k_s^+$ , respectively) and the SF beach memory

606 parameter ( $\Phi$ ) show seasonal (6 months) and decadal modulation with a decreasing trend as  
607 shoreline projections become more sensitive to SLR (Figure 7c,d and Figure 8c,d). Variations in  
608  $k_y^{+/-}$  and  $k_s^+$  are the primary source of shoreline projection uncertainties during accretion periods.  
609 However, the response rate parameters' uncertainties have a stronger impact on seasonal scale  
610 when using the Y09 model (Figure 7c), and a larger impact on interannual scale when using the  
611 SF model (Figure 8c), due to the different response of the models to incident wave energy  
612 variability. Seasonal modulation is also observed for the  $S_i$ s of the Y09 empirical parameters ( $a_1$   
613 and  $a_2$ ), although the correlation between the variability in incident wave conditions and the  
614 parameters'  $S_i$ s, (both filtered of their seasonal signal with a 1-year running mean) is negligible  
615 ( $R^2 \sim 0.06$  for  $a_1$ , and  $R^2 \sim 0.03$  for  $a_2$ ). However, the estimated  $a_1$ 's and  $a_2$ 's  $S_i$ s remain below  
616 20% during most of the simulated period with occasional peaks up to 45% (Figure 7e,f). The  
617 primary effects of SLR uncertainties emerge at different times, which depend both on the RCP  
618 scenario and on the shoreline model. When using Y09, a positive trend in SLR's  $S_i$  emerges in the  
619 2050-2060 period, with SLR's  $S_i$  exceeding those of model parameters since approximately 2060-  
620 2070, for both RCP scenarios (Figure 7g). Instead, with SF in the RCP8.5 (RCP4.5) scenario, such  
621 quasi-monotonic trend appears later, approximately during the 2070s' (2060s') and only exceeds  
622 the model parameters'  $S_i$ s after 2085 (2080) (Figure 8e). For all scenarios, DoC's  $S_i$  slowly  
623 increases, with similar trends as SLR's  $S_i$ , and reaches approximately 5% and 10%, in the RCP8.5  
624 and 4.5 scenarios, respectively. This difference is probably due to the larger uncertainties of SLR  
625 in the RCP8.5 scenario (Figure 4b), and to the larger variance of the DoC probability distribution  
626 obtained for the RCP4.5 scenario (Figure 4c).



627  
 628 **Figure 7** Global Sensitivity Analysis results over the period 2020-2100 using the *Yates* model in  
 629 the RCP4.5 (blue lines) and RCP8.5 (orange lines) scenarios. (a) RCP4.5 and (b) RCP8.5  
 630 Ensemble shoreline projections (shaded areas) over 2020-2100; First-order Sobol' index time

631 series for (c)  $k_y^+$ , (d)  $k_y^-$ , (e)  $a_1$ , (f)  $a_2$ , (g) sea-level rise, and (h) depth of closure, with respective  
 632 linear fit (solid straight lines).



633  
 634 **Figure 8** Global Sensitivity Analysis results over the period 2020-2100 using the *ShoreFor* model  
 635 in the RCP4.5 (blue lines) and RCP8.5 (orange lines) scenarios. (a) RCP4.5 and (b) RCP8.5  
 636 Ensemble shoreline projections (shaded areas) over 2020-2100; First-order Sobol' index time  
 637 series for (c)  $k_s^+$ , (d)  $\Phi$ , (e) sea-level rise, and (f) depth of closure, with respective linear  
 638 straight lines).

## 639 **5 Discussion**

### 640 5.1 Sea-level rise

641 While observed shoreline erosion in Aquitaine is not yet attributed to SLR, sooner or later a SLR-  
642 driven signal will emerge from the current shoreline change variability, as sea levels are committed  
643 to rise by meters over the coming centuries (Anderson et al., 2015; Oppenheimer et al., 2019). Our  
644 results suggest that these times of emergence of a SLR-driven erosive trend could be visible during  
645 the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, possibly by 2070. This is consistent with the fact that uncertainty  
646 (17<sup>th</sup> -83<sup>th</sup> percentiles) in future sea level grows from roughly 15 cm by the mid 21<sup>st</sup> century to 30  
647 cm (RCP4.5) and 50 cm (RCP8.5) in 2100. Yet, this result relies on our modelling assumptions,  
648 including the Bruun Rule and the *Yates* or *ShoreFor* models.

649 The GSA applications to four simulated scenarios indicate that uncertainties in the modelled 2020-  
650 2100 shoreline projections at Truc Vert are primarily caused by uncertainties in model free  
651 parameters between the present day and 2050. The effects SLR uncertainties always emerge as a  
652 significant contribution to the shoreline change uncertainties in the second half of the century. We  
653 also observed that the time evolution of  $S_i$ s and the onset of SLR uncertainties effects are  
654 conditional to the RCP scenario (in agreement with Le Cozannet et al., 2019), the choice of  
655 shoreline model, and the variability of forcing wave climate.

656 The shoreline trajectory obtained in the deterministic high-end SLR scenario exceeds the envelope  
657 of probabilistic projections in the last simulated decade. Truc Vert beach is remote and backed by  
658 a high (~20 m) and wide (~250 m) dune system, so that shoreline retreat is not limited by non-  
659 erodible geological outcrops or coastal structure. While such large erosion does not threaten any  
660 human assets close to Truc Vert beach, such scenario, though unlikely, questions adaptation  
661 planning in other eroding urbanised coastal areas with limited accommodation space in southwest  
662 France.

## 5.2 Shoreline models

663 While the SF and Y09 models are both based on the equilibrium beach concept, the respective  
664 model structures and parameters associate different physical interpretations and shoreline  
665 behaviours (Section 2.4.1). Therefore, the uncertainty associated with the choice of the equilibrium  
666 modelling approach cannot be measured by direct confrontation of the  $S_i$ s obtained with the two  
667 models, but requires consideration of the different model responses to the forcing conditions.

669 The results obtained for the two disequilibrium approaches (Y09 and SF) show similar seasonal  
670 and interannual shoreline cycles, although with notably different amplitudes. Such behaviours are  
671 rooted in the different expressions of the equilibrium physics adopted in the two wave-driven  
672 models (i.e. the mechanism that would drive the shoreline to an equilibrium position under  
673 constant wave conditions). Vitousek et al. (2021) analytically show that the type of equilibrium  
674 condition is critical for the short- and long-term response of the shoreline model. On one hand,  
675 Y09's equilibrium condition depends on the current shoreline position, and is not influenced by  
676 storm events that occurred prior to a given time scale that is implicitly defined by the model  
677 calibration (see 'Appendix A' of Vitousek et al., 2021). On the other hand, SF's equilibrium state  
678 is determined by the (time varying) past wave conditions with an explicit 'beach memory'  
679 function, and evolves in time accordingly. This means that, in absence of other processes, the Y09  
680 modelled shoreline oscillates persistently around the same position regardless of the temporal  
681 variability of wave energy. Instead, SF can only achieve such a stable mean shoreline trend when  
682 forced with a periodic long-term wave climate (Vitousek et al., 2021). Hence, in presence of long-  
683 term trends of wave energy, Y09 emphasizes the short-term shoreline erosion/accretion in order  
684 to re-establish the equilibrium shoreline position, while SF adapts to the wave climate pattern. The  
685 latter results in larger amplitudes of seasonal fluctuations and in attenuation of long-term  
686 fluctuations, compared to SF.

687 The combined Y09 and Bruun models simulated shoreline ranges at 2100 are overall comparable  
688 to the ranges of the standalone Bruun Rule, indicating that in this scenario the net erosion modelled  
689 by 2100 is essentially driven by SLR. In fact, Y09 constrains the shoreline response to long-term  
690 wave climate shifts to a limited range (as described above) while the linearly added contribution  
691 of the Bruun model determines the shoreline trend. Instead, SF can produce wave-driven long-  
692 term shoreline trends that are combined with the Bruun retreat. This effect is observed in both  
693 RCP4.5 and 8.5 scenarios, where the decreasing wave energy trend (Figure 2d,e) is translated by  
694 SF into shoreline accretion trends, resulting in less erosion than the Bruun model alone (Table 3).  
695 Such properties of the two model behaviours highlight the different model sensitivities to long-  
696 term variability of the wave climate, which can have implications on the uncertainties in shoreline  
697 projections. Including the uncertainty of long-term wave climate variability in the ensemble  
698 projections would allow investigating the uncertainties related to the different behaviours of the  
699 shoreline models.

### 700 5.3 Model free parameters

701 Resolving process-based shoreline response to time-varying incident wave energy revealed that  
702 uncertainties in model parameters have the largest impact over the first simulated 30 years,  
703 regardless of the cross-shore shoreline model choice. Over this period, Y09 and SF uncertainties  
704 in response rate parameters ( $k_y^{+/-}$  and  $k_s^+$ , respectively) are responsible for most of the results  
705 uncertainties, which increases during low energy winters (on seasonal scale), and is particularly  
706 emphasized for SF in correspondence of extended low energy periods. This suggests that the  
707 assumption of a linear relationship between SF's response rate parameters ( $k_s^- = r k_s^+$ ) may not  
708 hold in the context of long-term simulations, as it might depend on the evolution of waves  
709 properties (Ibaceta et al., 2020). In fact, Ibaceta et al. (2020) found that, such relation is not



710 necessarily linear, indicating that the value of  $r$  may vary dynamically with changes in wave  
711 regimes. While the  $S_i$ s of the remaining model parameters ( $\Phi$  for SF;  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  for Y09) show a  
712 definite seasonality, their variability on longer time scales is unclear. However,  $\Phi$ 's  $S_i$ , which  
713 exhibit relatively high values (up to 90%) at the beginning of the simulation, shows an overall  
714 decaying trend for both RCP scenarios applications. The  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ 's  $S_i$ s remain weak, though not  
715 negligible, (<20%) over all the simulated period.

716 The behaviour of the model free parameters'  $S_i$ s highlights, once again, the importance of wave  
717 energy variability in determining the impact of the parameters uncertainties on shoreline  
718 projections. This was also observed in previous studies, which showed that changes in wave  
719 regime can alter the model parameters and the functional relations between them (Ibaceta et al.,  
720 2020; Splinter et al., 2017). As a perspective of future work, one way to reduce the effects of model  
721 free parameters' uncertainties on modelled shoreline may be to employ non-stationary parameters  
722 that can adjust to changes in wave-climate regimes (Ibaceta et al., 2020). The use of non-stationary  
723 parameters would also imply a dynamic value of the  $r$  parameter, reducing uncertainties associated  
724 to the assumption of a linear relationship, between SF's response rate parameters. In addition,  
725 rearranging the Y09 parameters so that the new parameters have a similar order of magnitudes  
726 may increase the efficiency of model calibration, reducing model parameters uncertainties  
727 (Vitousek et al., 2021).

#### 728 5.4 The role of wave time series

729 Our results indicate that the shoreline erosion is not only associated with large winter energy, but  
730 also depends on the trends of past winter wave energy and the internal variability of high-energy  
731 events within the season. For instance, in the RCP4.5 scenario the winters 2084-2085 and 2059-  
732 2060 show similar 3-month averaged  $H_s^2 T_p$  peak (164 m<sup>2</sup>s and 172 m<sup>2</sup>s, respectively), but they are

733 preceded by several years of negative and positive winter energy trend, respectively (Figure 2b).  
734 This results in the winter 2084-2085 producing a rapid landward shift of shoreline position  
735 distribution, and the winter 2059-2060 driving more moderate annual changes while contributing  
736 to a long-term erosive trend (Figure 5c,d). We also observe that the interannual patterns of  
737 shoreline evolution are clearly correlated to those of winter wave energy. These behaviours  
738 underline the critical role of high/low energy winters interannual cycles, as well as storms  
739 sequencing, in wave-driven shoreline response, in line with previous studies (Dissanayake et al.,  
740 2015; Besio et al., 2017; Dodet et al., 2019). In addition, the temporal variability of wave climate  
741 (e.g. seasonal distribution of storm events) has been observed to affect the frequency (or ‘mode’)  
742 of shoreline response (Splinter et al., 2017; Ibaceta et al., 2020).  
743 Therefore, we further investigated the potential role of future waves uncertainties in shoreline  
744 projections performing the GSA on an additional ensemble of 3000 simulations forcing the Y09  
745 and SF models with 100 different wave time series. We generated 100 random synthetic wave  
746 series using the method proposed by Davidson et al. (2017), which consists in building continuous  
747 series of wave conditions by sampling 1-month portions from a reference dataset of existing wave  
748 data (e.g. historic wave data) at a given location. The method generates synthetic wave time series  
749 with random, though realistic, chronology of wave events, while maintaining the seasonal and  
750 yearly character of the wave climate. However, this assumes a long-term stationarity of the  
751 generated wave time series. We used the BW18 projections for the RCP8.5 scenario as reference  
752 wave data. We individually applied the Davidson et al. (2017) method over 8 windows of 10 years  
753 from 2020 to 2100 in order to preserve the long-term (>10 years) characteristics of the reference  
754 time series while providing enough sampling reference data (Figure 9a). For instance, all the

755 synthetic events from 2030 to 2040 were generated using monthly samples from the 2030-2040  
756 reference dataset.


757 When using the latter approach to generate ensemble waves the SF model shows some limitations.

758 Therefore, here we exploit only the test results obtained with Y09. The results of the SF test

759 application and the aforementioned limitations are illustrated in Text S5 and Figure S4 of

760 Supporting Information.

ACCEPTED VERSION



761

762 **Figure 9** Ensemble of 3000 *Yates* simulations forced using (a) 3-month average energy ( $H_s^2 T_p$ ) of  
 763 100 random wave time series from 2020 to 2100 generated with the Davidson et al. (2017) method  
 764 based on the BW18 wave projections for the RCP8.5 scenario; (b) Ensemble shoreline projections

765 over the analysed period (dark/light shaded areas indicate the likely/envelope range, i.e. variance  
766 (min-max), of shoreline position); First-order Sobol' index time series for (c)  $k_y^+$ , (d)  $k_y^-$ , (e)  $a_1$ , (f)  
767  $a_2$ , (g) sea-level rise, (h) depth of closure, and (i) wave energy, with respective time series  
768 calculated on the 1-year running average of model results (black lines).

769 The GSA shows that introducing uncertainties in the temporal distribution of wave events (Figure  
770 9a) has a large impact on the variance of model results (Figure 9b) and, in turn, on the relative  
771 contributions of the remaining uncertain input parameters (Figure 9c-h). In fact, accounting for  
772 uncertainty in wave events chronology (though in a simplistic way) increases the overall model  
773 variance throughout the entire simulated period (Figure 6c and Figure 9b), and associates a  
774 dominating  $S_i$  (up to 0.3) over the first half of the simulated period (Figure 9i). However, SLR's  
775  $S_i$  still emerges after 2060 and dominate shoreline projections uncertainties over the last two  
776 simulated decades. We also observe that the inclusion of wave chronology uncertainty attenuates  
777 the interannual variability of all  $S_i$ s while preserving the seasonal and 10-year signals (Figure 9c-  
778 h). This is a natural consequence of the method used to generate the wave series ensemble. In fact,  
779 the Davidson et al. (2017) method is designed to preserve the seasonal variability, while its  
780 application to fixed time windows of the reference time series constrains the ensemble members  
781 to maintain the 10-year variability. The black lines in Figure 9c-i show the time evolution of  $S_i$ s  
782 obtained removing the seasonal signal from the model results with a 1-year running average. When  
783 the seasonal variability of the results is removed, the SLR's  $S_i$  compensates the fluctuations of the  
784 model parameter's  $S_i$ s, resulting in an increased trend.

785 The test application illustrated above suggests that including uncertainties in short-term wave  
786 chronology can significantly impact the uncertainties of shoreline projections and the relative  
787 contributions of the remaining uncertain input variables. Further, introducing uncertainties on  
788 long-term non-stationarity of wave conditions would overcome the SF limitations occurring in this

789 specific application, and may unveil new implications of the different Y09 and SF equilibrium  
790 approaches in the context of probabilistic long-term shoreline projections.

### 791 5.5 Assumptions and limitations

792 Wave projections are affected by uncertainties owing to the choice of the Global Climate Model  
793 (Morim et al., 2020) and random variability of wave events. Although our results are based on  
794 deterministic BW18's wave projections, in the northeast Atlantic region the estimated future wave  
795 statistics have been observed to be mostly sensitive to the RCP scenario (Morim et al., 2020). Yet,  
796 the use of deterministic wave projections hides a potentially large impact of the uncertain wave-  
797 climate variability on both shoreline predictions uncertainty and behaviour of the shoreline models.  
798 In addition, accounting for uncertainties in wave projections may also increase the uncertainties in  
799 DoC, which were based on one deterministic wave time series in the present study. However, to  
800 the authors' knowledge there is no other dataset of continuous 2020-2100 wave projections, over  
801 the north Atlantic area, with a sufficient spatial resolution to resolve the site-specific regional scale  
802 processes. This underlines the need of continuous wave time series (obtained with different wave  
803 models of fine enough spatial resolution, different climate models, for different RCP scenarios),  
804 as well as tools allowing generating continuous realistic future wave time series, such as climate  
805 based stochastic wave emulators (Anderson et al., 2019; Cagigal et al., 2020).

806 In the current work, we assumed that MSL 2020-2100 projections are normally distributed.  
807 However, the MSL distribution may be skewed towards higher values due to additional uncertainty  
808 related to Antarctic ice-sheet melting in the RCP8.5 scenario. We simulated a deterministic  
809 RCP8.5 high-end SLR scenario to define a low-probability/high-impact scenario for projected  
810 shoreline erosion. Yet, our high-end SLR scenario is based on a particular combination of high-  
811 end contributions to sea-level rise, which makes no consensus in the scientific community (Bamber

812 et al., 2019; Edwards et al., 2021; Stammer et al., 2019). While this is not included in the GSA,  
813 the use of a skewed probability distribution may lead to an earlier onset of SLR uncertainties in  
814 shoreline projections.

815 The Bruun Rule, used in our application to estimate SLR-driven shoreline recession, builds on  
816 several strong assumptions that reduce the applicability of this model to a limited range of beaches  
817 (Cooper et al., 2020). As the Truc Vert is an uninterrupted natural cross-shore transport dominated  
818 beach, with large sediment availability, most underlying assumption of the Bruun model are  
819 satisfied. However, alternative models to address beach response to SLR, such as *ShoreTrans*  
820 (McCarroll et al., 2020), can be implemented in this framework.

821 Coupling the Bruun Rule with Y09 and SF allows accounting for long-term effects of SLR while  
822 resolving short-term shoreline response to the wave climate. The Y09 and SF models do not  
823 explicitly resolve sediment exchange between the different beach compartments (e.g.  
824 upper beach and dune), and may fail reproducing episodic shoreline changes such as short-term  
825 accretion following to dune erosion events. However, if such events occur during the model  
826 calibration period, as in our applications (i.e. winter 2013-2014), their influence on the bulk  
827 shoreline response is partially accounted.

828 Here, we investigated the main effect of the uncertainties in input variables ( $S_i$ s). While the  
829 estimated  $S_i$  of the DoC remains relatively low over the simulated period, in all simulated  
830 scenarios, the interaction of DoC and SLR uncertainties (i.e. *second-order Sobol' index*) may have  
831 a larger impact. However, estimating robust interaction terms would require a larger ensemble of  
832 simulations (several tens of thousands). Furthermore, in order to rigorously conclude on the  
833 negligible character of some uncertainties, GSA should be conducted within the factors' fixing  
834 setting (i.e., investigating the 'total effect' of uncertain variables, Saltelli et al., 2008). In the

835 presence of dependence among the inputs, more advanced GSA indices should be used for this  
836 purpose. In particular, a method that employs the so-called *Shapley effects* has recently been  
837 proposed and showed very promising results (Iooss & Prieur, 2019). While the direct application  
838 of this method requires computational cost of several order of magnitudes larger than the Sobol'  
839 indices (see Iooss & Prieur, 2019), Broto et al. (2020) successfully implemented a more  
840 computationally efficient sampling-based method for GSA using Shapley indices. This may be an  
841 interesting perspective for future works.

## 842 **6 Conclusions**

843 We performed a Global Sensitivity Analysis on probabilistic 2020-2100 shoreline projections at  
844 the cross-shore transport dominated Truc Vert beach in southwest France. Time varying first-order  
845 Sobol' indices were calculated for sea-level rise, depth of closure, and model free parameters for  
846 two different cross-shore shoreline models (*Yates* and *ShoreFor*) and two RCP scenarios (RCP4.5  
847 and RCP8.5). We show that uncertainties in shoreline projections are initially driven by  
848 uncertainties in model free parameters, with the effects of SLR uncertainties only emerging in the  
849 second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, the relative effects of SLR and model parameters  
850 uncertainties on shoreline projections do not only depend on the shoreline modelling approach and  
851 RCP scenarios, but their time evolution is also related to the forcing wave-climate variability. We  
852 also emphasize the importance of accounting for uncertainties related to the temporal distribution  
853 of wave energy, and therefore the need of ensembles of synthetic wave time series that account for  
854 the inherent variability of the wave climate.

855



856 **Acknowledgments and Data**

857 This work is co-financed by the BRGM and Make Our Planet Great Again (MOPGA) national  
858 program (Grant 927923G) and the BRGM (French Geological Survey). BC funded by Agence  
859 Nationale de la Recherche (ANR) grant number ANR-17-CE01-0014. GLC and RT are supported  
860 by H2020 ERA4CS ECLISEA (Grant 690462).

861 This study includes the monitoring study site of Truc Vert labelled by the Service National  
862 d'Observation (SNO) Dynalit (<https://www.dynalit.fr>) with additional support from Observatoire  
863 Aquitaine de l'Univers (OASU) and Observatoire de la Côte Aquitaine (OCA). The authors thank  
864 the colleagues, including S. Bujan, S. Ferreira and V. Marieu involved in the topographic data;  
865 SONEL for past sea levels and vertical land motion data (<https://www.sonel.org/-GPS-.html>); and  
866 the Integrated Climate Data Center at the University of Hamburg ([https://icdc.cen.uni-](https://icdc.cen.uni-hamburg.de/en/ar5-slr.html)  
867 [hamburg.de/en/ar5-slr.html](https://icdc.cen.uni-hamburg.de/en/ar5-slr.html)) for SLR projections data.

868 The authors are grateful to the reviewers (G. Coco, S. Vitousek and Anonymous reviewer),  
869 Associated Editor and Editor for their constructive remarks, which greatly improved this article.

870 **Data availability statement**

871 All data used (wave, mean sea level and shoreline data) and produced (shoreline projections) in  
872 this work are available at [https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/gnvkx44t63/draft?a=a32c56ba-](https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/gnvkx44t63/draft?a=a32c56ba-f495-4652-9eda-964dea31cec6)  
873 [f495-4652-9eda-964dea31cec6](https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/gnvkx44t63/draft?a=a32c56ba-f495-4652-9eda-964dea31cec6).

874 **Conflicts of interest**

875 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest that could be perceived as prejudicing the  
876 impartiality of the research reported.

877

878 **References**

- 879 Allenbach, K., Garonna, I., Herold, C., Monioudi, I., Giuliani, G., Lehmann, A., & Velegrakis, A.  
880 F. (2015). Black Sea beaches vulnerability to sea level rise. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 46,  
881 95-109. [doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2014.07.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2014.07.014)
- 882 Anderson, T. R., Fletcher, C. H., Barbee, M. M., Frazer, L. N., & Romine, B. M. (2015). Doubling  
883 of coastal erosion under rising sea level by mid-century in Hawaii. *Natural Hazards*, 78(1), 75-  
884 103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1698-6>
- 885 Anderson, D., Rueda, A., Cagigal, L., Antolínez, J.A.A., Méndez, F.J., & Ruggiero, P.  
886 (2019). Time-varying emulator for short and long-term analysis of coastal flood hazard potential.  
887 *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.*, 124(12), 9209-9234. [doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015312](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015312)
- 888 Angnuureng, A.B., Almar, R., Senechal, N., Castelle, B., Addo, K.A., Marieu, V., & Ranasinghe,  
889 R., (2017). Shoreline resilience to individual storms and storm clusters on a meso-macrotidal  
890 barred beach. *Geomorphology*. 290, 265-276. [doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.04.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.04.007)
- 891 Antolínez, J.A.A., Méndez, F.J., Anderson, D., Ruggiero, P., & Kaminsky, G.M. (2019).  
892 Predicting climate driven coastlines with a simple and efficient multi-scale model. *J. of*  
893 *Geophys. Res. Earth Surface* 124, 1596–1624. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JF004790>
- 894 Athanasiou, P., van Dongeren, A., Giardino, A., Vousdoukas, M.I., Ranasinghe, R., & Kwadijk,  
895 J. (2020). Uncertainties in projections of sandy beach erosion due to sea level rise: an analysis at  
896 the European scale. *Sci Rep.* 10, 11895. [doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-68576-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-68576-0)
- 897 Bamber, J.L., Oppenheimer, M., Kopp, R.E., Aspinall, W.P., & Cooke, R.M. 2019. Ice sheet  
898 contributions to future sea-level rise from structured expert judgment. *Proceedings of the National*  
899 *Academy of Sciences*, 116(23), 11195-11200. [doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1817205116](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1817205116)

- 900 Besio, G., Briganti, R., Romano, A., Mentaschi, L., & De Girolamo, P. (2017). Time clustering of  
901 wave storms in the Mediterranean Sea. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 17, 505-514.  
902 [doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-505-2017](https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-505-2017)
- 903 Bertsimas, D., & Tsitsiklis, J. (1993). Simulated annealing. *Statistical Science* 8(1): 10–15.  
904 <https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1177011077>
- 905 Bricheno, L., & Wolf, J. (2018). Future Wave Conditions of Europe, in Response to High-End  
906 Climate Change Scenarios. *J. of Geophys. Res. Oceans* 123(12), 8762-8791.  
907 [doi.org/10.1029/2018JC013866](https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JC013866)
- 908 Broto, B., Bachoc, F., & Depecker, M. (2020). Variance reduction for estimation of Shapley effects  
909 and adaptation to unknown input distribution. *SIAM/ASA Int. J. on Uncertainty Quantification*,  
910 8(2), 693-716. <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1234631>
- 911 Bruun, P. (1962). Sea-level rise as a cause of shore erosion. *J. of the Waterways and Harbors*  
912 *Division*, 88 (1), 117–132.
- 913 Bruun, P. (1988). The Bruun Rule of Erosion by Sea-Level Rise: A Discussion on Large-Scale  
914 Two- and Three-Dimensional Usages. *J. of Coastal Res.*, 4 (4), 627-648. *JSTOR*,  
915 [www.jstor.org/stable/4297466](http://www.jstor.org/stable/4297466)
- 916 Cagigal, L., Rueda, A., Anderson, D., Ruggiero, P., Marrifield, M.A., Montañó, J., Coco, G., et al.  
917 (2020). A multivariate, stochastic, climate-based wave emulator for shoreline change modelling.  
918 *Ocean Modelling*. 154, 101695. [doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2020.101695](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2020.101695)
- 919 Casas-Prat, M., McInnes, K. L., Hemer, M. A., & Sierra, J. P. (2016). Future wave-driven coastal  
920 along the Catalan coast (NW Mediterranean). *Regional Environmental Change* 16(6), 1739-1750.  
921 [doi:10.1007/s10113-015-0923-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-015-0923-x)

- 922 Castelle, B., Bujan, S., Marieu, V., & Ferreira, S. (2020). 16 years of topographic surveys of rip-  
923 channelled high-energy meso-macrotidal sandy beach. *Sci. Dat.*, 7, 410. [doi.org/10.1038/s41597-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-00750-5)  
924 [020-00750-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-00750-5)
- 925 Castelle, B., Dodet, G., Masselink, & G., Scott, T. (2017). A new climate index controlling winter  
926 wave activity along the Atlantic coast of Europe: The West Europe Pressure Anomaly. *Geophys.*  
927 *Res. Lett.*, 44 (3), 1384-1392. [doi :10.1002/2016GL072379](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL072379)
- 928 Castelle, B., Dodet, G., Masselink, G., & Scott, T. (2018a). Increased winter-mean wave height,  
929 variability and periodicity in the North-East Atlantic over 1949-2017. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 45(8),  
930 3586-3596. [doi:10.1002/2017GL076884](https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076884)
- 931 Castelle, B., Guillot, B., Marieu, V., Chaumillon, E., Hanquez, V., Bujan, S., & Poppeschi, C.  
932 (2018b). Spatial and temporal patterns of shoreline change of a 280-km high-energy disrupted  
933 sandy coast from 1950 to 2014: SW France. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Sci.* 200, 212-223.  
934 [doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2017.11.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.11.005)
- 935 Castelle, B., Marieu, V., Bujan, S., Ferreira, S., Parisot, J., Capo, S., Sénécha, N., et al. (2014).  
936 Equilibrium shoreline modelling of high energy meso-macrotidal multiple barred beach. *Marine*  
937 *Geology*, 347: 85–94. [doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2013.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2013.11.003)
- 938 Castelle, B., Marieu, V., Bujan, S., Splinter, K. D., Robinet, A., Sénéchal, N., & Ferreira, S.  
939 (2015). Impact of the winter 2013–2014 series of severe Western Europe storms on a double-  
940 barred sandy coast: beach and dune erosion and megacusp embayments. *Geomorphology*, 238,  
941 135-148. [doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2015.03.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2015.03.006)
- 942 Charles E., Idier, D., Delecluse, P., Déqué, M., & Le Cozannet, G. (2012). Climate change impact  
943 on waves in the Bay of Biscay, France. *Ocean Dynamics*. [doi.org/10.1007/s10236-012-0534-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-012-0534-8)

- 944 Church, J.A., Clark, P.U., Cazenave, A., Gregory, J.M., Jevrejeva, S., Levermann, A., Merrifield,  
945 M.A., et al., (2013). Sea Level Change. In *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis;*  
946 *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel*  
947 *on Climate Change* ed.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2013.
- 948 Coco G., Senechal N., Rejas A., Bryan K.R., Capo S., Parisot J.P., Brown, J.A., et al. (2014).  
949 Beach response to a sequence of extreme storms. *Geomorphology* 204, 493-501.  
950 [doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2013.08.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2013.08.028)
- 951 Cooper, J.A.G., Masselink, G., Coco, G., Short, A.D., Castelle, B., Rogers, K., Anthony, E., et al.  
952 (2020). Sandy beaches can survive sea-level rise. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 10, 993–995.  
953 [doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00934-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00934-2)
- 954 Cooper, J. A. G., & Pilkey, O. H. (2004). Sea-level rise and shoreline retreat: time to abandon the  
955 Bruun Rule. *Global Planet Change*, 43(3-4), 157-171. [doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2004.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2004.07.001)
- 956 D’Anna, M., Castelle, B., Idier, D., Le Cozannet, G., Rohmer, J. & Robinet, A. (2020). Impact of  
957 model free parameters and sea-level rise uncertainties on 20-years shoreline hindcast: the case of  
958 Truc Vert beach (SW France). *Earth Surf. Proc. and Landf.* 45(8), 1895-1907.  
959 [doi:10.1002/esp.4854](https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4854)
- 960 Davidson, M. A., Splinter, K. D., & Turner, I. L. (2013). A simple equilibrium model for predicting  
961 shoreline change. *Coast. Eng.* 73, 191-202. [doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2012.11.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2012.11.002)
- 962 Davidson, M. A., Turner, I. L, Splinter, K. D., & Harley, M.D. (2017). Annual prediction of  
963 shoreline erosion and subsequent recovery. *Coastal Engineering* 130, 14-25.  
964 [doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2017.09.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2017.09.008)

- 965 Dissanayake, P., Brown, J., Wisse, P., & Karunarathna, H. (2015). Comparison of storm cluster vs  
966 isolated event impacts on beach/dune morphodynamics. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*. 164,  
967 301-312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2015.07.040>
- 968 Dodet, G., Castelle, B., Masselink, G., Scott, T., Davidson, M., Floc'h, F., Jackson, D., et al.  
969 (2019). Beach recovery from extreme storm activity during the 2013–14 winter along the Atlantic  
970 coast of Europe. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 44(1), 393-401. [doi:10.1002/esp.4500](https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4500)
- 971 Edwards, T.L., Brandon, M.A., Durand, G., Edwards, N.R., Golledge, N.R., Holden, P.B., Nias,  
972 I.J. et al. (2019). Revisiting Antarctic ice loss due to marine ice-cliff instability. *Nature* 566, 58–  
973 64. [doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0901-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0901-4)
- 974 Edwards, T.L., Nowicki, S., Marzeion, B., Hock, R., Goelzer, H., Seroussi, H., Jourdain, N.C. et  
975 al. (2021). Projected land ice contributions to 21st century sea level rise. *Nature* (in Press).
- 976 Frederikse, T., Landerer, F., Caron, L., Adhikari, S., Parkes, D., Humphrey, V.W., Dangendorf,  
977 S., et al. (2020). The causes of sea-level rise since 1900. *Nature*, 584(7821), 393-397.  
978 [10.1038/s41586-020-2591-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2591-3)
- 979 Ghermandi, A., & Nunes P.A.L.D. (2013). A global map of coastal recreation values: Results from  
980 a spatially explicit meta-analysis. *Ecological Economics* 86, 1-15.  
981 [doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.11.006)
- 982 Grinsted, A., Jevrejeva, S., Riva, R.E.M., & Dahl-Jensen, D. (2015). Sea level rise projections for  
983 northern Europe under RCP8.5. *Clim Res* 64, 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.3354/cr01309>
- 984 Hallermeier, R.J. (1978). Uses for a calculated limit depth to beach erosion. In Proceedings of the  
985 16th Coastal Engineering Conference. ASCE: New York; 1493–1512.

- 986 Hazeleger, W., Wang, X., Severijns, C., ,Stefănescu, S., Bintanja, R., Sterl, A., Wyser, K., et al.  
987 (2012). EC-Earth v2. 2: Description and validation of a new seamless Earth system prediction  
988 model. *Climate Dynamics* 39(11), 2611– 2629. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-011-1228-5>
- 989 Hinkel, J., Church, J.A., Gregory, J.M., Lambert, E., Le Cozannet, G., Lowe, J., MCInnes, K.L.,  
990 et al. (2019). Meeting user needs for sea level rise information: A decision analysis perspective.  
991 *Earth's Future*, 7, 320-337. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF001071>
- 992 Hunter, J. R., Church, J. A., White, N. J., & Zhang X. (2013). Towards a global regionally varying  
993 allowance for sea-level rise. *Ocean Engineering* 71, 17–27. [doi:10.1016/j.oceaneng.2012.12.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2012.12.041)
- 994 Ibaceta, R., Splinter, K.D., Harley, M.D., & Turner, I.L. (2020). Enhanced Coastal Shoreline  
995 Modeling Using an Ensemble Kalman Filter to include Nonstationarity in Future Wave Climates.  
996 *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 47(22). [doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090724](https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090724)
- 997 Iooss, B., & Prieur, C. (2019). Shapley effects for sensitivity analysis with correlated inputs:  
998 comparisons with Sobol' indices, numerical estimation and applications. *Int. J. for Uncertainty*  
999 *Quantification* 9(5), 493-514. [10.1615/Int.J.UncertaintyQuantification.2019028372](https://doi.org/10.1615/Int.J.UncertaintyQuantification.2019028372)
- 1000 Jackson, L.P., & Jevrejeva, S. (2016). A probabilistic approach to 21st century regional sea-level  
1001 projections using RCP and High-end scenarios. *Global and Planetary Change* 146, 179-189.  
1002 [doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2016.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2016.10.006)
- 1003 Jevrejeva, S., Frederikse, T., Kopp, R. E., Le Cozannet, G., Jackson, L. P., & van de Wal, R. S.  
1004 W. (2019). Probabilistic Sea Level Projections at the Coast by 2100. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 1-24.  
1005 [doi:10.1007/s10712-019-09550-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-019-09550-y)
- 1006 Klingebiel, & Legigan (1992). Carte Géologique et structure du Bassin de la Leyre. *Bull. Inst.*  
1007 *Géol. Bassin Aquitaine*, Bordeaux, 1992, n°51-52, p7-20.

- 1008 Kopp, R.E., Horton, R.M., Little, C.M., Mitrovica, J.X., Oppenheimer, M., Rasmussen, D.J.,  
1009 Strauss, B.H., et al. (2014). Probabilistic 21st and 22nd century sea-level projections at a global  
1010 network of tide-gauge sites. *Earth's Future*, 2(8), 383-406. [doi.org/10.1002/2014EF000239](https://doi.org/10.1002/2014EF000239)
- 1011 Kroon, A., de Schipper, M.A., van Gelder, P., & Arninkhof, S.G.J. (2020). Ranking uncertainty:  
1012 Wave climate variability versus model uncertainty in probabilistic assessment of coastline change.  
1013 *Coastal Engineering*, 158, 103673. [doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103673](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103673)
- 1014 Laporte-Fauret, Q., Marieu, V., Castelle, B., Michalet, R., Bujan, S., & Rosebery, D. (2019). Low-  
1015 Cost UAV for High-Resolution and Large-Scale Coastal Dune Change Monitoring Using  
1016 Photogrammetry. *J. of Marine Science and Engineering* 7(3), 63. [doi:10.3390/jmse7030063](https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse7030063)
- 1017 Larson, M., Hogan, L. X., & Hanson, H. (2010). Direct formula to compute wave height and angle  
1018 at incipient breaking. *J. of Waterway Port, Coastal and Ocean Engineering*, 136(2), 119–122.  
1019 [doi:10.1061/\(ASCE\)WW.1943-5460.0000030](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)WW.1943-5460.0000030)
- 1020 Le Cozannet, G., Castelle, B., Bulteau, T., Ranasinghe, R., Wöppelmann, G., Rohmer, J., Bernon,  
1021 N., et al. (2019). Quantifying uncertainties of sandy shoreline change projections as sea level rises.  
1022 *Sci Rep* 42(9). [10.1038/s41598-018-37017-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-37017-4)
- 1023 Le Cozannet, G., Oliveros, C., Castelle, B., Garcin, M., Idier, D., Pedreros, R., & Rohmer, J.  
1024 (2016). Uncertainties in sandy shorelines evolution under the Bruun rule assumption. *Frontiers of*  
1025 *Marine Science* 3, 49. [doi:10.3389/fmars.2016.00049](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2016.00049)
- 1026 Lemos, C., Floc'h, F., Yates, M., Le Dantec, N., Marieu, V., Hamon, K., & Delacourt, C. (2018).  
1027 Equilibrium modelling of the beach profile on a macrotidal embayed low tide terrace beach. *Ocean*  
1028 *Dynamics*, 68(9), 1207-1220. [doi:10.1007/s10236-018-1185-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-018-1185-1)



- 1029 Li, C., & Mahadevan, S. (2016). An efficient modularized sample-based method to estimate the  
 1030 first-order Sobol' index. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 153, 110-121.  
 1031 [doi:10.1016/j.ress.2016.04.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2016.04.012)
- 1032 Losada, I.J., Toimil, A., Muñoz, A., Garcia-Fletcher, A.P., & Diaz-Simal, P. (2019). A planning  
 1033 strategy for the adaptation of coastal areas to climate change: The Spanish case. *Ocean and Coastal*  
 1034 *Management*, 182, 104983. [doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.104983](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.104983)
- 1035 Luijendijk, A., Hagenaaars, G., Ranasinghe, R., Baart, F., Donchyts, G., & Aarninkhof, S. (2018).  
 1036 The State of the World's Beaches. *Sci Rep* 8, 6641. [doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24630-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-24630-6)
- 1037 Masselink, G., Castelle, B., Scott, T., Dodet, G., Suanez, S., Jackson, D., & Floc'h, F. (2016).  
 1038 Extreme wave activity during 2013/2014 winter and morphological impacts along the Atlantic  
 1039 coast of Europe. *Geophysical Research Letters* 43(5), 2135-2143. [doi:10.1002/2015GL067492](https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL067492)
- 1040 McCarroll, R.J., Masselink, G., Valiente, N.G., Scott, T., Wiggins, M., Kirby, J.A., & Davidson  
 1041 M. (2020). A novel rules-based shoreface translation model for predicting future coastal change:  
 1042 ShoreTrans. (Under Review). <https://doi.org/10.31223/osf.io/y4kmy>
- 1043 Merkens, J.L., Reimann, L., Hinkel, J., & Athanasios, T.V. (2016). Gridded population projections  
 1044 for the coastal zone under the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Global and Planetary Change*  
 1045 145, 57-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2016.08.009>
- 1046 Michaud, H., Pasquet, A., Leckler, F., Baraille, R., Dalphinnet, A., & Aouf, L. (2016).  
 1047 Improvements of the new French coastal wave forecasting system and application to a wave-  
 1048 current interaction study. *SHOM & Météo France*. [doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.13218.02243](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13218.02243)
- 1049 Montañaño, J., Coco, G., Antolínez, J. A.A., Beuzen, T., Bryan, K. R., Cagigal, L., Castelle, B., et  
 1050 al. (2020). Blind testing of shoreline evolution models. *Sci Rep* 10(1), 2137.  
 1051 [doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-59018-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-59018-y)

- 1052 Morim, J., Hemer, M., Wang, X.L., Cartwright, N., Trenham, C., Semedo, A., Young, I., et al.  
 1053 (2019). Robustness and uncertainties in global multivariate wind-wave climate projections. *Nature*  
 1054 *Climate Change* 9, 711–718. [doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0542-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0542-5)
- 1055 Morim, J., Trenham, C., Hemer, M., Wang, X.L., Mori, N., Casas-Prat, M., Semedo, A., et al.  
 1056 (2020). A global ensemble of ocean wave climate projections from CMIP5-driven models. *Sci*  
 1057 *Data* 7, 105. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-0446-2>
- 1058 Nash, J.E., & Sutcliffe, J.V. (1970). River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I-a  
 1059 discussion of principles. *J. Hydrol.*, 10, 282-290. [10.1016/0022-1694\(70\)90255-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(70)90255-6)
- 1060 Neuman, B., Athanasios, T.V., Zimmermann, J., & Nicholls, R.J. (2015). Future Coastal  
 1061 Population Growth and Exposure to Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Flooding - A Global Assessment.  
 1062 *Plos One*, 10(6), e0131375. [doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0131375](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0131375)
- 1063 Nicholls, R.J. (1998). Assessing erosion of sandy beaches due to sea-level rise. *Geological Society,*  
 1064 *London, Engineering Geology Special Publications* 15(1), 71–76.  
 1065 [doi:10.1144/GSL.ENG.1998.015.01.08](https://doi.org/10.1144/GSL.ENG.1998.015.01.08)
- 1066 Oppenheimer, M.B.C., Glavovic, J., Hinkel, R., van de Wal, A.K., Magnan, A., et al. (2019). Sea  
 1067 Level Rise and Implications for Low-Lying Islands, Coasts and Communities. *In: IPCC Special*  
 1068 *Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate* [Pörtner, H.-O., Roberts, D.C.,  
 1069 Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Tignor, M., Poloczanska, E., Mintenbeck, K., Alegría, A., Nicolai,  
 1070 M., Okem, A., Petzold, J., Rama, B., Weyer, N.M. (eds.)]
- 1071 Parisot, J. P, Capo, S., Castelle, B., Bujan S., Moreau, J. M., Gervais, M., Réjas, A., et al. (2009).  
 1072 Treatment of topographic and bathymetric data acquired at the Truc-Vert Beach (SW France)  
 1073 during the ECORS field experiment [Special issue]. *J. of Coastal Research* 56, Proceedings of the

- 1074 10th International Coastal Symposium ICS 2009, Vol. II, 1786-1790.  
1075 [www.jstor.org/stable/25738097](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25738097)
- 1076 Perez, J., Menendez, M., Camus, P., Mendez, F.J. & Losada, I.J. (2015). Statistical multi-model  
1077 climate projections of surface ocean waves in Europe. *Ocean Modelling*, 96, 161-170.  
1078 [doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2015.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2015.06.001)
- 1079 Poumadère, M., Bertoldo, R., Idier, D., Mallet, C., Oliveros, C., & Robin, M. (2015). Coastal  
1080 vulnerabilities under the deliberation of stakeholders: The case of two French sandy beaches.  
1081 *Ocean & Coastal Management* 105, 166-176. [doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.12.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.12.024)
- 1082 Ranasinghe, R. (2016). Assessing climate change impacts on open sandy coasts: A review. *Earth*  
1083 *Sci Rev* 160, 320-332. [doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2016.07.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2016.07.011)
- 1084 Ranasinghe, R. (2020). On the need for a new generation of coastal change models for the 21st  
1085 century. *Sci Rep* 10, 2010. [doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-58376-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-58376-x)
- 1086 Ranasinghe, R., Callaghan, D., & Stive, M.J.F. (2012). Estimating coastal recession due to sea  
1087 level rise: beyond the Bruun rule. *Climatic Change* 110, 561–574. [doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0107-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0107-8)  
1088 [8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0107-8)
- 1089 Reguero, B.G., Losada, I.J., & Mendez, F.J. (2019). A recent increase in global wave power as a  
1090 consequence of oceanic warming. *Nature Communications* 10, 205.  
1091 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-08066-0>
- 1092 Robin, N., Billy, J., Castelle, B., Hesp, P., Nicolae Lerma, A., Laporte-Fauret, Q., Marieu, V., et  
1093 al. (2021). 150 years of foredune initiation and evolution driven by human and natural processes.  
1094 *Geomorphology*, 374, 107516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2020.107516>
- 1095 Robinet, A., Castelle, B., Idier, D., Le Cozannet, G., Déqué, M., & Charles, E. (2016). Statistical  
1096 modeling of interannual shoreline change driven by North Atlantic climate variability spanning

- 1097 2000–2014 in the Bay of Biscay. *Geo-Marine Letters*, 36(6), 479–490. [doi:10.1007/s00367-016-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00367-016-0460-8)  
1098 [0460-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00367-016-0460-8)
- 1099 Robinet, A., Idier, D., Castelle, B., & Marieu, V. (2018). A reduced-complexity shoreline change  
1100 model combining longshore and cross-shore processes: The LX-Shore model. *Environmental*  
1101 *Modelling and Software* 109, 1-16. [doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.08.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2018.08.010)
- 1102 Rohmer, J., & Le Cozannet, G. (2019). Dominance of the mean sea level in high-percentile sea  
1103 levels time evolution with respect to large-scale climate variability: a Bayesian statistical  
1104 approach. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(1). [doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaf0cd](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaf0cd)
- 1105 Saltelli, A., Ratto, M., Andres T., Campolongo, F., Cariboni, J., Gatelli, D., Saisana, M., et al.  
1106 (2008). *Global Sensitivity Analysis: The premier*. The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West  
1107 Sussex PO19 8SQ, England. Jhon Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- 1108 Santamaría-Gómez, A., Gravelle, M., Dangendorf, S., Marcos, M., Spada, G., & Wöppelmann, G.  
1109 (2017). Uncertainty of the 20th century sea-level rise due to vertical land motion errors. *Earth and*  
1110 *Planetary Science Letters*. 473, 24-32. [doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2017.05.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2017.05.038)
- 1111 Sobol', I.M. (2001). Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte  
1112 Carlo estimates. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* 55(1-3), 271-280. [doi:10.1016/S0378-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4754(00)00270-6)  
1113 [4754\(00\)00270-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4754(00)00270-6)
- 1114 Splinter, K., Turner, I.L., & Davidson, M.A. (2013). How much data is enough? The importance  
1115 of morphological sampling interval and duration for calibration of empirical shoreline models.  
1116 *Coastal Engineering*, 77, 14-27. [doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.02.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.02.009)
- 1117 Splinter, K., Turner, I.L., Davidson, M.A., Bernard, P., Castelle, B., & Oltman-Shay, J. (2014a).  
1118 A generalized equilibrium model for predicting daily to interannual shoreline response. *J. of*  
1119 *Geophysical Research Earth Surface* 119(9), 1936-1958. [doi:10.1002/2014JF003106](https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JF003106)

- 1120 Splinter, K., Carley, J.T., Golshani, A., & Tomlinson, R. (2014b). A relationship to describe the  
1121 cumulative impact of storm clusters on beach erosion. *Coastal Engineering*. 83, 49-55.  
1122 [doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.10.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.10.001)
- 1123 Splinter, K., Turner, I. L., Reinhardt, M., & Ruessink, G. (2017). Rapid adjustment of shoreline  
1124 behaviour to changing seasonality of storms: observations and modelling at an open-coast beach.  
1125 *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 42(8), 1186-1194. [doi:10.1002/esp.4088](https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4088)
- 1126 Slangen, A.B.A., Carson, M., Katsman, C.A., van de Wal, R.S.W., Kohl, A., Vermeersen, L.L.A.,  
1127 & Stammer, D. (2014). Projecting twenty-first century regional sea-level changes. *Climatic*  
1128 *Change* 124, 317–332. [doi.org/10.1007/s10584-014-1080-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-014-1080-9)
- 1129 Stammer, D., Van de Wal, R.S.W., Nicholls, R.J., Church, J.A., Le Cozannet, G., Lowe, J.A.,  
1130 Horton, B.P., et al. (2019). Framework for high-end estimates of sea level rise for stakeholder  
1131 applications. *Earth's Future*, 7(8), 923-938. [doi:10.1029/2019EF001163](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001163)
- 1132 Taylor, K.E., Stouffer, R.J., & Meehl G.A. (2012). An Overview of CMIP5 and the experiment  
1133 design. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 93, 485-498. [doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1)
- 1134 Thiéblemont, R., Le Cozannet, G., Rohmer, J., Toimil, A., Alvarez-Cuesta, M., and Losada, I.J.  
1135 (in review, 2021). Deep uncertainties in shoreline change projections: an extra-probabilistic  
1136 approach applied to sandy beaches. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci Discuss.* [preprint].  
1137 [doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-412/](https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-412/)
- 1138 Thiéblemont, R., Le Cozannet, G., Toimil, A., Meyssignac, B., & Losada, I.J. (2019). Likely and  
1139 High-End Impacts of Regional Sea-Level Rise on the Shoreline Change of European Sandy Coasts  
1140 Under a High Greenhouse Gas Emissions Scenario. *Water*, 11, 2607. [doi:10.3390/w11122607](https://doi.org/10.3390/w11122607)

- 1141 Toimil, A., Camus, P., Losada, I.J., Le Cozannet, G., Nicholls, R., Idier, D., & Maspataud, A.  
1142 (2020). Climate Change Driven coastal erosion modelling in temperate sandy beaches methods  
1143 and uncertainty treatment. *Earth Science Reviews*. 202, 103110. [doi:j.earscirev.2020.103110](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2020.103110)
- 1144 Toimil, A., Diaz-Simal, P., Losada, I.J., & Camus, P. (2018). Estimating the risk of loss of beach  
1145 recreation value under climate change. *Tourism Management*, 68, 387-400.  
1146 [doi:j.tourman.2018.03.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.03.024)
- 1147 Toimil, A., Losada, I. J., Camus, P., & Diaz-Simal, P. (2017). Managing coastal erosion under  
1148 climate change at regional scale. *Coastal Engineering*, 128, 106-122. [doi:j.coastaleng.2017.08.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2017.08.004)
- 1149 Tolman, H. (2009). User manual and system documentation of WAVEWATCH III-version 3.14  
1150 (Tech. rep.): NOAA / NWS / NCEP / MMAB Technical Note-276.
- 1151 Vitousek, S., Barnard, P. L., Limber, P., Erikson, L., & Cole, B. (2017). A model integrating  
1152 longshore and cross-shore processes for predicting long-term shoreline response to climate change.  
1153 *J. of Geophys. Res. Earth surface*, 122 (4), 782–806. [doi:10.1002/2016JF004065](https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JF004065)
- 1154 Vitousek, S., Cagigal, L., Montaña, J., Rueda, A.C., Mendez, F.J., Coco, G., & Barnard, P. (2021).  
1155 The application of ensemble wave forcing to quantify uncertainty of shoreline change predictions.  
1156 *J. of Geophys. Res. Earth Surface*, (in Press). [doi.org/10.1029/2019JF005506](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JF005506)
- 1157 Voudoukas, M.I., Ranasinghe, R., Mentaschi, L., Plomaritis, T.A., Athanasiou, P., Luijendijk, A.  
1158 & Feyen, L. (2020). Sandy coastlines under threat of erosion. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 10, 260–263.  
1159 [doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0697-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0697-0)
- 1160 Wainwright, D.J., Ranasinghe, R., Callaghan, D.P., Woodroffe, C.D., Jongejan, R., Dougherty,  
1161 A.J., Rogers, K., et al. (2015). Moving from deterministic towards probabilistic coastal hazard and  
1162 risk assessment: development of a modelling framework and application to Narrabeen Beach, New  
1163 South Wales, Australia. *Coastal Engineering*, 96, 92-99. [doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2014.11.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2014.11.009)

- 1164 Wong, P.P., Losada, I.J., Gattuso, J.P., Hinkel, J., Khattabi, A., McInnes, K.L., Saito, Y. et al.  
1165 (2014). Coastal systems and low-lying areas. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and*  
1166 *Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of working group II to the Fifth*  
1167 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, United*  
1168 *Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. Cambridge University Press, 361-409.*
- 1169 Wright, L.D., & Short, A.D. (1984). Morphodynamic variability of surf zones and beaches: a  
1170 synthesis. *Marine Geology*, 56(1-4), 93-118. [doi:10.1016/0025-3227\(84\)90008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-3227(84)90008-2)
- 1171 Wolinsky M.A., & Murray, A.B. (2009). A unifying framework for shoreline migration: 2.  
1172 Application to wave-dominated coasts. *J. Geophys. Res.* 114, F01009, [doi:10.1029/2007JF000856](https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JF000856)
- 1173 Yates, M.L., Guza, R.T., & O'Reilly, W.C. (2009). Equilibrium shoreline response: Observations  
1174 and modeling. *J. of Geophysical Research Oceans* 114(C9), C09014. [doi:/10.1029/2009JC005359](https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JC005359)