Table 0-1. *Combined $10^4 \times \sigma(r)$, assuming r=0 after 7 years of observation, keeping only the 28% cleanest part of the sky, assuming no decorrelation and observing efficiency in Chile same as at Pole.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		6.3	5.0	4.5	**4.0**	3.5
6	12	5.5	4.7	**4.3**	3.9	3.5
9	8.7	5.1	**4.5**	4.1	3.8	3.4
12	7.1	**4.8**	4.3	4.0	3.7	3.4
18	**5.7**	4.4	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.3
30	4.4	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.2

Table 0-2. *Same as top, but assuming 50% Chilean efficiency.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		6.3	5.0	4.5	**4.0**	3.5
6	22	5.9	4.9	**4.4**	3.9	3.5
9	15	5.6	**4.8**	4.3	3.9	3.5
12	12	**5.4**	4.6	4.2	3.9	3.5
18	**8.8**	5.1	4.5	4.1	3.8	3.4
30	6.2	4.6	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.3

Table 0-3. *Same as top, but assuming 1% unmodeled foreground residual uncertainty.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		7.0	5.9	5.5	**5.1**	4.7
6	13	6.3	5.6	**5.2**	4.9	4.6
9	9.2	5.9	**5.4**	5.1	4.9	4.6
12	7.8	**5.7**	5.2	5.0	4.8	4.5
18	**6.5**	5.3	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.5
30	5.4	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.4

Table 0-4. *Same as top, but assuming additional foreground decorrelation parameters.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		8.4	6.7	6.0	**5.2**	4.4
6	16	7.3	6.2	**5.6**	5.0	4.3
9	12	6.8	**5.9**	5.4	4.9	4.3
12	9.7	**6.4**	5.7	5.3	4.8	4.2
18	**7.8**	5.8	5.3	5.0	4.6	4.1
30	6.0	5.1	4.8	4.6	4.3	4.0

Table 0-5. *Same as top, but assuming we keep the 58% cleanest part of the full sky*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		6.3	5.0	4.5	**4.0**	3.5
6	11	5.4	4.6	**4.2**	3.8	3.5
9	8.0	5.0	**4.4**	4.1	3.7	3.4
12	6.6	**4.6**	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.3
18	**5.3**	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.2
30	4.1	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.1

Table 0-6. *Combined $10^4 \times \sigma(r)$, assuming r=0.003 after 7 years of observation, keeping only the 28% cleanest part of the sky, assuming no decorrelation and observing efficiency in Chile same as at Pole.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		9.1	7.8	7.2	**6.7**	6.1
6	14	7.9	7.2	**6.8**	6.4	5.9
9	11	7.4	**6.8**	6.5	6.2	5.8
12	9.0	**7.0**	6.5	6.3	6.0	5.7
18	**7.6**	6.4	6.1	5.9	5.7	5.5
30	6.3	5.8	5.6	5.5	5.4	5.2

Table 0-7. *Same as top, but assuming 50% Chilean efficiency.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		9.1	7.8	7.2	**6.7**	6.1
6	24	8.5	7.5	**7.0**	6.5	6.1
9	17	8.2	**7.3**	6.9	6.4	6.0
12	14	**7.8**	7.1	6.7	6.3	5.9
18	**11**	7.4	6.8	6.5	6.2	5.8
30	8.2	6.6	6.3	6.1	5.8	5.6

Table 0-8. *Same as top, but assuming 1% unmodeled foreground residual uncertainty.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		9.7	8.4	7.9	**7.4**	6.9
6	15	8.5	7.8	**7.4**	7.0	6.7
9	11	8.0	**7.4**	7.1	6.8	6.5
12	9.7	**7.6**	7.2	6.9	6.7	6.4
18	**8.4**	7.2	6.9	6.7	6.5	6.3
30	7.2	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.2	6.1

Table 0-9. *Same as top, but assuming additional foreground decorrelation parameters.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		11	9.4	8.6	**7.7**	7.0
6	18	9.6	8.6	**8.0**	7.4	6.8
9	14	9.0	**8.2**	7.8	7.2	6.7
12	12	**8.5**	7.9	7.5	7.1	6.6
18	**9.7**	7.9	7.4	7.1	6.8	6.4
30	7.9	7.0	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.1

Table 0-10. *Same as top, but assuming we keep the 58% cleanest part of the full sky*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		9.0	7.7	7.1	**6.5**	5.7
6	13	7.7	6.9	**6.5**	6.2	5.8
9	9.7	7.0	**6.5**	6.2	5.9	5.6
12	8.2	**6.5**	6.1	5.9	5.7	5.4
18	**6.8**	5.9	5.7	5.5	5.3	5.1
30	5.6	5.2	5.1	5.0	4.9	4.7

Table 0-11. *Combined $10^4 \times 95$ percent C.L., for r=0 after 7 years of observation, keeping only the 28% cleanest part of the sky, assuming no decorrelation and observing efficiency in Chile same as at Pole.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		14	11	9.7	**8.6**	7.6
6	26	12	10	**9.1**	8.3	7.4
9	18	11	**9.6**	8.8	8.1	7.3
12	15	**10**	9.2	8.6	7.9	7.2
18	**12**	9.3	8.6	8.2	7.7	7.1
30	9.3	8.1	7.8	7.5	7.2	6.8

Table 0-12. *Same as top, but assuming 50% Chilean efficiency.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		14	11	9.7	**8.6**	7.6
6	46	13	10	**9.4**	8.5	7.5
9	31	12	**10**	9.2	8.4	7.5
12	24	**12**	9.9	9.1	8.3	7.4
18	**19**	11	9.5	8.8	8.1	7.3
30	13	9.6	8.8	8.3	7.8	7.1

Table 0-13. *Same as top, but assuming 1% unmodeled foreground residual uncertainty.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		15	13	12	**11**	10
6	27	13	12	**11**	11	9.9
9	20	13	**11**	11	10	9.8
12	16	**12**	11	11	10	9.7
18	**14**	11	11	10	9.9	9.5
30	11	10	10	9.9	9.6	9.3

Table 0-14. *Same as top, but assuming additional foreground decorrelation paramaters.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		18	15	13	**11**	9.5
6	34	16	13	**12**	11	9.3
9	25	14	**13**	12	10	9.2
12	21	**14**	12	11	10	9.1
18	**16**	12	11	11	9.8	8.8
30	13	11	10	9.8	9.2	8.5

Table 0-15. *Same as top, but assuming we keep the 58% cleanest part of the full sky*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		14	11	9.7	**8.6**	7.6
6	24	12	9.9	**9.0**	8.2	7.4
9	17	11	**9.3**	8.6	8.0	7.2
12	14	**9.8**	8.9	8.3	7.7	7.1
18	**11**	8.8	8.2	7.8	7.4	6.9
30	8.5	7.6	7.3	7.1	6.8	6.5

Table 0-16. *Combined detection significance for r=0.003 after 7 years of observation, keeping only the 28% cleanest part of the sky, assuming no decorrelation and observing efficiency in Chile same as at Polee.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		3.7	4.5	4.9	**5.4**	6.0
6	2.2	4.3	4.8	**5.2**	5.6	6.1
9	3.0	4.6	**5.1**	5.4	5.8	6.3
12	3.6	**4.9**	5.3	5.6	5.9	6.4
18	**4.4**	5.3	5.7	5.9	6.2	6.6
30	5.4	6.0	6.2	6.4	6.6	6.9

Table 0-17. *Same as top, but assuming 50% Chilean efficiency.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		3.7	4.5	4.9	**5.4**	6.0
6	1.3	4.0	4.6	**5.0**	5.5	6.0
9	1.9	4.2	**4.8**	5.1	5.5	6.1
12	2.4	**4.3**	4.9	5.2	5.6	6.1
18	**3.0**	4.6	5.1	5.4	5.8	6.3
30	4.0	5.2	5.5	5.8	6.1	6.5

Table 0-18. *Same as top, but assuming 1% unmodeled foreground residual uncertainty.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		3.5	4.1	4.4	**4.8**	5.2
6	2.2	4.0	4.4	**4.7**	5.0	5.3
9	2.9	4.2	**4.6**	4.8	5.1	5.4
12	3.4	**4.5**	4.8	5.0	5.2	5.5
18	**4.0**	4.7	5.0	5.1	5.4	5.6
30	4.7	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.6	5.8

Table 0-19. *Same as top, but assuming additional foreground decorrelation paramaters.*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		3.0	3.6	4.0	**4.5**	5.1
6	1.7	3.5	3.9	**4.3**	4.7	5.2
9	2.3	3.7	**4.1**	4.4	4.8	5.3
12	2.8	**3.9**	4.3	4.6	4.9	5.4
18	**3.4**	4.3	4.6	4.8	5.1	5.6
30	4.2	4.8	5.0	5.2	5.5	5.8

Table 0-20. *Same as top, but assuming we keep the 58% cleanest part of the full sky*

Chile\Pole	0	6	9	12	18	30
0		3.8	4.5	5.0	**5.3**	6.2
6	2.4	4.4	5.0	**5.4**	5.8	6.3
9	3.3	4.9	**5.3**	5.6	6.0	6.5
12	4.0	**5.2**	5.6	5.9	6.2	6.7
18	**4.9**	5.8	6.1	6.3	6.6	7.0
30	6.1	6.6	6.8	7.0	7.2	7.5