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Abstract The existence of numerous iron meteorite groups indicates that some planetesimals underwent melting that led to metal-silicate segregation, sometimes producing metallic cores. Meteorite paleomagnetic records suggest that crystallization of these cores generated dynamo magnetic fields. Here we describe the magnetic history of the partially differentiated IIE iron meteorite parent body. This is the first planetesimal for which we have a time-resolved paleomagnetic record constrained by $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar chronometry spanning several tens of million years (Ma). We find that the core of the IIE parent body generated a dynamo, likely powered by core crystallization, starting before 78 ± 13 Ma after solar system formation and lasting at least 80 Ma. Such extended core crystallization suggests that the core composed a substantial fraction of the body ($\gtrsim 13\%–19\%$ core-to-body radius ratio depending on the body’s radius), indicating efficient core formation within some partially differentiated planetesimals.

Plain Language Summary Planetesimals were the first planetary bodies that formed in the solar system and meteorites are fragments of these planetesimals. Within the first million years of the solar system, some planetesimals melted and formed metallic cores overlain by a rocky mantles. The loss of heat and release of buoyant fluids generated through the crystallization of these cores could have caused the residual liquid to churn, generating currents that created a magnetic field by the dynamo effect. Some meteorites contain minerals that align their magnetic moments with such magnetic fields, analogous to a compass needle in Earth’s field. Even though the ancient field disappeared billions of years ago, this alignment can still be retained by meteorites today. Because core solidification and generation of magnetic fields are intrinsically related, the magnetic record of meteorites is a powerful proxy for investigating the solidification and thermal history of planetesimals. Here, we present a time-resolved record captured by three meteorites from the same parent planetesimal of a magnetic field powered by the solidification of their parent planetesimal’s core. It is the most extended record of such fields for which we have absolute ages and supports the hypothesis that some planetesimals efficiently melted and formed significantly large metallic cores.

1. Introduction

Planetesimals were the first generation of 1- to 500 km radius planetary bodies to form in the solar system and are key intermediate stages in planet formation. Due to heating by the decay of the short-lived radioactive isotope $^6$He (Hevey & Sanders, 2006), percolation of Fe-Ni melts variably enriched in sulfur and other light elements initiated differentiation and the formation of metallic cores in a number of planetesimals (Terasaki et al., 2008). Some of these bodies, however, appear to have been only partially differentiated (i.e., durably retaining both chondritic and achondritic materials; Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Weiss & Elkins-Tanton, 2013). The internal structures and modes of formation of partially differentiated planetesimals are incompletely understood despite longstanding interest (Fish et al., 1960; Lovering, 1962; Urey, 1959; Wasserburg et al., 1968). Melting experiments and simulations show that metal percolation is efficient once the volume melt fraction in a metal-silicate mixture exceeds ~2% (Ghanbarzadeh et al., 2017; Terasaki et al., 2008). Partially differentiated bodies could therefore have formed a differentiated interior while preserving or accumulating a chondritic crust (Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011; Neumann et al., 2018; Sahijpal &
Gupta, 2011; Weiss & Elkins-Tanton, 2013). Alternatively, they could have consisted of patchworks of localized differentiation products resulting from late and incomplete melting (Hunt et al., 2018).

A discriminating factor between a differentiated interior overlain by a chondritic crust and a patchwork of localized differentiation products is the existence of a sizable metallic core. One approach to constrain the presence and size of a core is to search for evidence of its putative magnetic field recorded as remanent magnetization in mantle material. For instance, meteorite remanent magnetization has been used to argue that a number of parent bodies generated magnetic fields through the dynamo process (i.e., due to advection of molten metal, Weiss et al., 2010). Purely thermally-driven advection can occur as long as the heat flux across the core-mantle boundary (CMB) remains larger than the adiabatic heat flux within the core. On planetsimals, this mechanism could have persisted up to ~20 Ma after CAI-formation (Bryson et al., 2019b; Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011). Dynamo activity could also have been powered by core solidification, potentially either by the release of light elements into the remaining liquid if solidification occurred outwardly, or by “iron snow” and/or the delamination of a solid layer forming at the CMB if solidification occurred inwardly (Chabot and Haack, 2006; Nimmo, 2009; Neufeld et al., 2019; Rückriemen et al., 2015; Williams, 2009). The duration of such compositional dynamos ultimately depends on the size of the core and direction of solidification. As such, the core size can potentially be constrained by measuring time-resolved paleomagnetic records using multiple meteorites from the same parent body, which would place bounds on the duration of the magnetic activity.

Compositionally-driven dynamos have been measured to explain the natural remanent magnetization (NRM) of five main-group pallasites, one L/LL chondrite, one IVA iron, one H chondrite and two silicate-bearing IIE iron meteorites (Bryson et al., 2019, 2015, 2017; Maurel et al., 2020; Nichols et al., 2016; Nichols, 2017; Shah et al., 2017; Tarduno et al., 2012). Timing for compositional dynamo activity has been proposed for the main-group pallasite parent body (Bryson et al., 2015; Nichols et al., 2016; Tarduno et al., 2012). However, the ages for this record were estimated by combining the meteorites’ measured cooling rates at 500°C with numerical simulations of conductive planetesimal cooling rather than by radiometric dating. It is therefore dependent on model parameters such as the size of the body, its thermal conductivity as a function of depth, and the assumed cooling mechanism (convective or conductive).

Based on a variety of petrographic, geochemical and magnetic data, the parent body of the silicate-bearing IIE iron meteorites has been described as a partially differentiated planetesimal, composed of chondritic and achondritic material (Kruijer & Kleine, 2019; Maurel et al., 2020; Ruzicka, 2014). A number of internal structures have been proposed for this parent body: a partially molten body with an incipient core catastrophically disrupted to form small IIE secondary bodies (Ruzicka, 2014); a body with a differentiated interior overlain by a chondritic layer impacted to form one or several IIE meteorite reservoirs (Maurel et al., 2020); or a body that experienced localized differentiation due to late and incomplete melting (Kruijer & Kleine, 2019).

Here, we build upon a recent paleomagnetic study of the IIE irons Techado and Colomera (Maurel et al., 2020) and measure the NRM carried by the IIE iron Miles. We combine the ^40Ar/^39Ar age of the three meteorites with their magnetic records to constrain potential existence of a sizable core, the temporal evolution of its dynamo, and the onset and duration of its crystallization. We estimate a minimum core-to-body ratio for the IIE parent body and use this to constrain the possible internal structures of partially differentiated bodies.

2. Formation and Magnetic Mineralogy of IIE Iron Meteorites

In the scenarios proposed to explain the nature of the IIE parent body (Section 1), the IIE irons form within the first few tens of Ma after CAI formation through one or several impacts that mixed silicates and metal together without catastrophically disrupting (Kruijer & Kleine, 2019; Maurel et al., 2020; Ruzicka, 2014). We note, however, that the idea that the body was disrupted and reaccreted during such impacts cannot be ruled out. Buoyancy-driven segregation of the molten metal-silicate mixture would have been prevented by exposure to near-surface temperatures and rapid cooling (>2.5°C h^-1) at 850–1000°C as indicated by the presence of silicate glass; Ruzicka, 2014). Following the impact, the source regions for the meteorites would have been buried under tens of km of material (Maurel et al., 2020) to explain the presence of metallographic microstructures that form at slow cooling rates (<10,000°C Ma^-1) below ~600°C, Ruzicka, 2014).
Slow cooling enabled the formation of cloudy zones (CZs), nanoscale intergrowths of Ni-rich ferromagnetic islands embedded in a Ni-poor paramagnetic matrix (Blukis et al., 2017; Yang et al., 1996). CZs form by spinodal decomposition of taenite with a composition ranging from ~41–30 wt.% Ni and are separated from the ~5 wt.% Ni kamacite by a μm-thick rim with ≥48 wt.% Ni (Figure S1). The rim and adjacent CZ islands are initially composed of taenite, which upon slow cooling (≤5,000°C Ma⁻¹) through 320°C undergoes crystallographic ordering and forms tetrataenite. The resulting increase in magnetocrystalline anisotropy causes the magnetic state of CZ islands to change from that of a vortex to two domains (Einsle et al., 2018). The tetrataenite rim, on the other hand, remains in the magnetic multidomain state due to its larger size. Recent micromagnetic simulations suggest that the combination of an external magnetic field and magnetostatic interactions between islands subsequently de-nucleates the domain wall in these islands, forming an ensemble of single-domain islands with average magnetization biased toward the external field direction (Einsle et al., 2018; Yeem and Harrison, 2019). At this point, any prior NRM that may have been acquired by the parent taenite phase in CZ islands is replaced by the NRM of tetrataenite without apparent inheritance (Einsle et al., 2018). Single-domain tetrataenite CZ islands, with a magnetic coercivity >1 T (Uehara et al., 2018), can preserve their NRM over the age of the solar system.

It was previously shown that Techado and Colomera cooled through ~350°C at 4.6 ± 1.9 and 2.5 ± 1.4°C Ma⁻¹, respectively (Maurel et al., 2020). By comparing a cloudy zone formation model (Maurel et al., 2019) to the average island size and Ni content in a given region of the CZ (Text S1 and S2), we estimate that Miles cooled through this temperature at 3.8 ± 2.6°C Ma⁻¹. At these cooling rates, the Ar closure temperature of average island size and Ni content in a given region of the CZ (Text S1 and S2), we estimate that Miles has the potential to extend the known paleomagnetic record for the IIE body by >60 Ma.

The fact that Techado's and Colomera's CZs recorded magnetic activity around their ⁴⁰Ar/³⁹Ar ages of 78 ± 13 and 97 ± 10 Ma after CAI-formation (Bogard et al., 2000) was interpreted as evidence that the IIE parent body generated a compositionally driven dynamo (Maurel et al., 2020). The late timing of this activity rules out early field sources such as the solar nebula (Wang et al., 2017) and a thermally driven dynamo (Bryson et al., 2019b; Elkins-Tanton et al., 2011), while the long duration over which tetrataenite acquired its magnetization rules out transient or quickly time-varying sources such as impact-generated plasma fields (Hood & Artemieva, 2008), core mechanical stirring by impacts (Le Bars et al., 2011), and the solar wind (Oran et al., 2018). It also implies that the field must have been directionally stable over the period of magnetization acquisition. A crustal field, resulting from the magnetization of an H-chondrite-like crust acquired during earlier magnetic activity of the parent body, would also have been orders of magnitude too weak to explain the results obtained (Maurel et al., 2020). With an ⁴⁰Ar/³⁹Ar age of 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation (Bogard et al., 2000), As such, Miles has the potential to extend the known paleomagnetic record for the IIE body by > 60 Ma.

3. Experimental Method

Our measurements followed the experimental method of Bryson et al. (2019) and Maurel et al. (2020). A 3 × 6 × 1 mm sample of Miles from the Harvard Museum of Natural History collection was polished manually down to 0.3 μm. We selected two areas located ~1 mm apart, encompassing kamacite, tetrataenite rim and CZ (hereafter called K–T interfaces; Figures S2 and S3). To measure the three components of remanent magnetization at the submicrometer scale, we used three-axis X-ray photoemission electron microscopy (XPEEM) performed at beamline 11.0.1.1 at the Advanced Light Source (Berkeley, CA). The original experimental protocol of this technique only yielded one component of magnetization (Bryson et al., 2015; 2017; Nichols et al., 2016; 2018), but it was recently improved to enable all three components to be recovered, providing more accurate relative paleodirections and paleointensities (Bryson et al., 2019; Maurel et al., 2020). The sample was first Ar-sputtered for a total of 15 h to remove surface damage caused by polishing. XPEEM images were then collected with a 10-μm field-of-view along 260 and 290 μm of K–T interface 1 and 2, respectively (Figure S3). At each location, four images were acquired with alternating right- and left-circularly polarized X-rays, first tuned to the Fe L₃ absorption edge (707.4 eV; Figure 1a) and then off-edge (702 eV). The operation was repeated four times to average identical images and minimize the effect of high-frequency noise. After data were collected on both K–T interfaces, the sample was rotated ~120° around its surface normal twice (Figures 1b and 1c), with the same measurement sequence repeated each time.
For each on-edge image, the following pixel-by-pixel operation was first conducted to remove both the background intensity caused by nonresonant X-ray absorption from atoms other than Fe and the effect of surface topography from the signal:

\[
I_{\text{corr}} = \left( I_{\text{on-edge}}^+ - I_{\text{off-edge}}^- \right) / I_{\text{off-edge}}^-
\]  

where \( I_{\text{on-edge}}^+ \) and \( I_{\text{off-edge}}^- \) are the pixel intensities of the corresponding on-edge and off-edge images for each polarization; + and − refer to the right- and left-circular beam polarization directions. The X-ray flux absorbed by the sample depends on the angle between the local surface magnetization and the helicity of the X-ray. This introduces a contrast between images collected with right- and left-circularly polarized X-rays called X-ray magnetic circular dichroism (XMCD; Stöhr et al., 1993). XMCD contrast maps, whose intensity \( I_{\text{XMCD}} \) depends on the direction of the surface magnetization relative to the X-ray beam direction, are calculated from corrected XPEEM images \( I_{\text{corr}} \):

\[
I_{\text{XMCD}} = \left( I_{\text{corr}}^+ - I_{\text{corr}}^- \right) / \left( I_{\text{corr}}^+ + I_{\text{corr}}^- \right)
\]  

The six possible magnetization directions of tetrataenite, oriented along the <100> directions of the parent taenite phase, correspond to six quantized values of \( I_{\text{XMCD}} \) (three positive/negative values corresponding to the positive/negative vector projections onto the X-ray beam; Figures 1d–1f). These six values are visible within the homogenous μm-sized domains in the tetrataenite rim. The CZ islands, which have the same crystallographic orientation as the rim, also adopt one of these six magnetization directions during tetrataenite formation. However, because Miles’ CZ islands (≤110-nm in size; Text S1) are not readily distinguishable in XMCD images due to insufficient spatial resolution, we used the rim to determine the six possible XMCD values of the six possible magnetization directions for each image and each sample rotation.

Figure 1. (a–c) XPEEM images of one location along K–T interface 1 (Figure S2). These images were obtained with right-circularly polarized X-rays at 707.2 eV (Fe L₃ absorption edge) for three different in-plane rotations of ~120° of the sample. The gray scale quantifies the relative flux of electron captured in the optics. The in-plane azimuth of the beam is shown; it arrives at 30° out of the plane of the image (d–f) Corresponding XMCD contrast maps. A typical region-of-interest in the CZ is shown by a rectangle on panel (d). The tetrataenite rim is marked by the black lines. (g) Equal area projection showing the average relative direction of the paleofield estimated from the two K–T interfaces analyzed in Miles. Ellipses show the 95% confidence intervals accounting for the measurement uncertainty and counting statistical uncertainty. The reference frame refers to that of Figure S2. CZ, Cloudy zone; XMCD, X-ray magnetic circular dichroism; XPEEM, X-ray photoemission electron microscopy.
To estimate the three components of the paleofield from the XMCD maps acquired along each K–T interface, we combined (1) the six XMCD values measured from the tetrataenite rim and (2) the average XMCD value within each 0.5×9 µm region-of-interest in the CZ (Figure 1d), under the assumption that the islands’ magnetization directions follow a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution (Bryson et al., 2014):

$$I_{\text{XMCD,CZ}}^j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{6} I_{\text{XMCD}}^i \exp(\alpha B_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{6} \exp(\alpha B_i)}$$

where $j = R1:R3$ denotes the sample rotations with respect to the beam, $i = 1:6$ denote the six possible magnetization directions ($\pm x$, $\pm y$ and $\pm z$), $B_i$ are the components of the ancient external field in these directions, $I_{\text{XMCD}}^i$ are the XMCD intensities for each direction collected in the tetrataenite rim for one sample rotation and $I_{\text{XMCD,CZ}}^j$ is the XMCD intensity of the region of interest in the CZ. We also have $\alpha = M_s V / k_B T$, where $M_s$ is the saturation magnetization of tetrataenite (1300 kA m$^{-1}$), $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant and $V$ is the volume of the islands at $T = 320^\circ$C, the tetrataenite formation temperature. Using a numerical model of CZ formation, and the local Ni content of the CZ regions of interest (Text S1), we estimate that islands were ~78% of their present-day size at 320 °C (Text S2; Maurel et al., 2019). The Maxwell-Boltzmann assumption does not account for the magnetostatic interactions that exist between islands (Einsle et al., 2018) and introduces an uncertainty in the paleointensity estimates (see Section 4). With the XMCD intensities collected for the three sample rotations, Equation 3 becomes a system of three equations that can be solved for $B_x$, $B_y$, $B_z$.

4. Results

Solving Equation 3, we calculated the paleodirections for each region-of-interest selected in the two CZs. Each K–T interface was analyzed using electron backscattered diffraction to mutually orient the paleodirections in a known reference frame (Text S3; Figure S5). We found that both sets of paleodirections are biased (Text S4a), indicating that each CZ likely formed in the presence of a paleo field with substantial intensity. This result is supported by Watson’s test for randomness (Watson, 1956) showing that the paleodirections are not drawn from a uniform distribution (Text S4b). Using the $V_\alpha$ statistic (Watson, 1983), we also cannot reject at 95% confidence the hypothesis that both K–T interfaces exhibit a common average paleodirection (Figure 1g; Text S4b). These observations indicate that Miles cooled in the presence of a magnetic field sufficiently strong to impart a resolvable bias in CZ island magnetization directions, as previously interpreted for Techado and Colomera (Maurel et al., 2020). Using Equation 3, we also calculated the magnitude of the vector $(B_x, B_y, B_z)$ and estimated a paleointensity of $32 \pm 15 \mu$T and $34 \pm 11 \mu$T (2 s. e.) for K–T interfaces 1 and 2, respectively.

The uncertainties on the relative paleodirections (Figure 1g) and paleointensities were estimated considering the measurement noise (due to time-dependent drifts of the X-ray beam and the varying resolution of the instrument’s electron optics) and the counting statistical uncertainties associated with the limited number of islands included in each XPEEM data set (Text S4c). Two additional sources of uncertainty were also considered.

First, the spatial arrangement of single domain islands in the CZ causes magnetostatic interactions (Blukis et al., 2020). These interactions are intrinsic to one CZ and do not influence other spatially distinct CZs. Given that we recover similar paleodirections from both CZs, we estimate that these interactions have a minor effect on paleodirection. However, like for most closely packed configuration of single domain grains, interactions will typically yield an underestimation of the paleointensity (Dunlop & Özdemir, 1997), possibly by up to an order of magnitude (Harrison & Lascu, 2014).

Second, the IIE irons most likely cooled in a metallic reservoir, where dominant low-coercivity kamacite grains could add an induced component to the field experienced by the CZs. The induced field would likely be spatially homogenous across the two CZs analyzed and therefore not affect the relative paleodirection uncertainty; it could, however, yield an overestimation of the paleointensity by a factor of ~3 (Maurel et al., 2020). The field produced by another metallic reservoir that acquired a remanent magnetization earlier in time would be unlikely to magnetize the three IIE irons given the decay of remanent field intensity.
We note that the multidomain kamacite surrounding the CZs could acquire a thermoremanent magnetization at \( \sim 780°C \). We do not know whether the remanent field of the kamacite could be responsible for the magnetization of the CZ, and therefore cannot rule out this possibility. However, it would not invalidate the fact that the IIE parent body generated a dynamo field but rather shift backward the time of the record.

Accounting for the quantifiable uncertainties, the paleointensity recorded by Miles could range from 10 to 300 \( \mu \text{T} \), indistinguishable from paleointensity ranges estimated for Techado (10–360 \( \mu \text{T} \)) and Colomera (5–150 \( \mu \text{T} \)) (Maurel et al., 2020). As for Techado and Colomera, the relatively high paleointensity, young age and long duration of CZ NRM acquisition indicate that Miles also most likely recorded a dynamo-generated magnetic field powered by core crystallization on its parent body. The magnetic records of the three meteorites indicate that the dynamo was active on the IIE parent body for >80 Ma, initiating before 78 \( \pm 13 \) and lasting until at least 159 \( \pm 9 \) Ma after CAI-formation. This is the most extended radiometrically dated record of a planetesimal’s dynamo activity to date (Figure 2).

5. Discussion

5.1. Evidence for the Late Solidification of Some Planetesimals

Our results indicate that the crystallization of the IIE parent body’s core lasted at least until Miles recorded its NRM, which implies that the IIE parent planetesimal contained a partially liquid, advecting metallic core until > 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation. In comparison, existing \(^{108}\text{Pd}/^{109}\text{Ag}\) model ages (which date when iron meteorites cooled through 700–500 °C; e.g., Matthes et al., 2020) suggest that some meteorites from the IIAB, IID and IIIAB iron groups crystallized by 11 Ma after CAI-formation (Matthes et al., 2015; 2020).
For the IIIAB irons, where the greatest number of samples have been analyzed (four meteorites), these ages were interpreted as evidence for early core excavation by collisions (Matthes et al., 2020). On the other hand, our results support recent numerical studies of planetesimal thermal evolution arguing for long-lived molten cores up to several hundred Ma after CAI formation in objects that largely retained their mantles (e.g., Bryson et al., 2019b). For example, Vesta’s core has been predicted to have remained partially liquid up to or beyond ∼200 Ma after CAI formation (Neumann et al., 2014). Importantly, these types of numerical studies are also able to reproduce short core solidification timescales akin to that recovered from $^{108}$Pd/$^{109}$Ag ages for parent bodies that experienced core-excitation events (Neufeld et al., 2019).

5.2. Constraints on the Size of the IIE Parent Body

The fact that core crystallization on the IIE parent body lasted at least until 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation can provide a lower limit on the size of the body. Bryson, Neufeld, and Nimmo (2019) used a one-dimensional approach to model the convective and conductive cooling of planetesimals with differentiated interiors and chondritic crusts. This two-stage accretion model varied the time of accretion between 0 and 4.5 Ma after CAI-formation and the size of the simulated objects from 20 to 500-km radius; core-to-body radius ratio ranged from 2% to 50% (upper limit imposed in the simulations), and the thickness of the unmelted layer from 0% to 94% of the body’s radius. As an upper limit on the end of core crystallization, this study reported the time when the core reached the FeS eutectic temperature (∼988°C; e.g., Buono & Walker, 2011) and the total latent heat of crystallization was extracted from the core. Among the aforementioned parameters (e.g., accretion time, final body radius, core-to-body ratio, and thickness of chondritic layer), the end of crystallization is controlled predominantly by the body radius (Bryson et al., 2019b). These simulations do not account for impact event(s) akin to the IIE-forming event(s). However, given that these event(s) most likely occurred tens of Ma before the epoch investigated here, we assume that temperatures would have re-equilibrated to produce a regular temperature gradient with depth throughout the body.

According to this model, the IIE parent body would have been ≥220-km in radius for its core to have entirely solidified later than 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation (Figure 3). Moreover, this model suggests that Techado, Colomera and Miles cooled at depths ranging from ∼30 and ∼80 km (Text S5). We explored whether regolith, with a thermal diffusivity two orders of magnitude smaller than chondritic material (Haack et al., 1990), could delay appreciably the end of crystallization. However, a regolith layer akin to that of the asteroid Vesta (on average ∼1 km; Denevi et al., 2016) added after accretion only delays the end time of crystallization by 0.75 Ma (Text S6), which is negligible given the other uncertainties of the model, such as the discrete accretion scenario and the treatment of the CMB heat flux (Bryson et al., 2019b).

The fact that the core must have started to crystallize prior to 78 ± 13 Ma after CAI formation does not readily translate into an upper size limit due to the uncertainty in the concentration and action of sulfur in planetesimal cores. Nonetheless, using core thermal profiles simulated with the model of Bryson, Neufeld, and Nimmo (2019), we can roughly estimate that with a core S content of ≤26 wt.%, a planetesimal as large as 500 km in radius could have reached FeS solidus earlier than Techado’s $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar age (Text S7). This is in agreement with S contents of ≤20 wt.% estimated from compositional measurements of iron meteorites (Goldstein et al., 2009). It is worth noting that the collisional lifetime of such large planetesimal exceeds the age of the solar system (Bottke et al., 2005). Unless it was at some point ejected from the solar system, the IIE parent body is not likely to have been as large as 500 km in radius.

5.3. Internal Structure of the IIE Parent Body

To constrain the core-to-body radius ratio for the IIE parent body, we compared our data to the simulations conducted for different values of this ratio by Bryson, Neufeld, and Nimmo (2019). For a planetesimal radius <250 km, 90% of simulations have the core of the IIE parent body being ≥19% of the body’s total radius (>0.7 vol.%) for complete core crystallization to have occurred later than 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation (Figure 3). This decreases to ≥14 and ≥13% if we include planetesimals up to 350 and
450 km in radius, respectively. The lower limits on the core-to-body radius ratios are consistently smaller than the core sizes estimated from the metal content of ordinary chondrites (∼43%, ∼34% and ∼27% radius ration for H, L and LL chondrites, respectively; Figure 3) calculated assuming complete differentiation (Krot et al., 2014). The presence of an H-chondrite-like silicate crust—based on the isotopic and compositional affinity between IIE silicates and H chondrites—restricts the core-to-body radius ratio to <43%. These observations are consistent with the core-to-body radius ratio of Vesta (∼41%–43%), the only core size inferred directly from both bulk density measurements and geochemical constraints (Russell et al., 2012).

Our magnetic data provide further evidence that core formation within partially differentiated planetesimals could have been an efficient process. The existence of a substantial core requires significant melting of the IIE parent body. This matches well with the proposed scenario whereby partially differentiated bodies formed by protracted or incremental accretion of chondritic material onto a differentiated planetesimal seed (Sahijpal and Gupta, 2011). It is also consistent with a scenario similar to that proposed for the acapulcoite-lodranite parent body, where a thin chondritic crust is preserved despite the formation of a significant metallic core after a short period of accretion (Neumann et al., 2018). On the other hand, although our results do not exclude IIE metal having formed by partial melting in a chondritic crust (Kruijer & Kleine, 2019), they still require that the deep interior of the planetesimal was differentiated. This contrasts with the scenario of localized melting without formation of a substantial core proposed for some of the IAB iron meteorite parent bodies (Hunt et al., 2018; Worsham et al., 2017). In agreement with this scenario, XPEEM data collected on three IAB irons (main-group, sLL and sLH) show that their parent bodies most likely did not generate a magnetic field at the time of tetrataenite formation (Bryson et al., 2014; Nichols et al., 2018). This supports the idea that multiple mechanisms may have led to the formation of partially differentiated planetesimals.
6. Conclusion

The silicate-bearing IIE iron meteorites likely formed through one or several impact events that created reservoirs of mixed metal and silicates on a partially differentiated planetesimal. The IIE irons Techado, Colomera and Miles cooled in a magnetic field of order of \( \sim 5-360 \mu T \) between 78 ± 13 and 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation, most likely generated by compositional dynamo activity on their parent body. This is the most extended radiometrically-dated record of dynamo activity on a planetesimal described to date. This implies that the crystallization of the IIE parent body’s core lasted >80 Ma and was ongoing 159 ± 9 Ma after CAI-formation. These observations indicate that this planetesimal likely was at least \( \sim 220 \) km in radius and had a core-to-body radius ratio >13%-19% depending on its size. The fact that this planetesimal was partially differentiated restricts the core-to-body radius ratio to <43 %. Together, these findings require efficient metal-silicate segregation and significant melting of the interior of the IIE parent body, achievable with both a protracted or incremental accretion of cold material onto a differentiated planetesimal, or faster accretion with only partial melting. By comparison, it refutes the hypothesis that the IIE parent body was only composed of metal veins and pools without significant metal segregation and core formation. The determination of \(^{40}Ar/^{39}Ar\) ages for unstudied IIE irons could potentially reveal meteorites older than 4,489 Ma (i.e., than Techado), or up to a few hundred Ma younger than 4,408 Ma (i.e., than Miles). This could provide the opportunity to probe the onset or decay of this planetesimal’s dynamo activity.
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S1. Island size and compositional measurements

We imaged two kamacite-taenite (K–T) interfaces in our sample of Miles using the Zeiss Merlin field-emission gun scanning electron microscope (FEG-SEM) in the MIT Materials Science Research and Engineering Center (MSREC). The sample was manually polished using paper and diamond paste down to 0.3-µm before being etched with nital (98 vol.% ethanol, 2 vol.% nitric acid) for ~45 s. We used secondary electrons with a 5-kV, 50 pA electron beam at a 6.4-mm working distance. We manually measured the size of the islands using the Fiji software [Schindelin et al., 2012], averaging over 500-nm wide bands parallel to the tetrataenite rim, within which the Ni concentration is approximately constant (Fig. S1). We collected five images along each of the two K–T interfaces. For each band, we measured the sizes of 100 islands (Table S1).

**Fig. S1.** SEM image of one location on K–T interface 2. The white rectangles show the bands within which the island sizes were measured and averaged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from rim</th>
<th>0 to 0.5 µm</th>
<th>0.5 to 1 µm</th>
<th>1 to 1.5 µm</th>
<th>1.5 to 2 µm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K–T interface 1</td>
<td>111.2 ± 3.1</td>
<td>105.2 ± 2.9</td>
<td>93.2 ± 3.0</td>
<td>83.8 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–T interface 2</td>
<td>116.3 ± 3.6</td>
<td>108.3 ± 3.6</td>
<td>101.5 ± 2.3</td>
<td>94.6 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S1.** Average island size (nm) and 2 standard error (s.e.) as measured at increasing distances from the tetrataenite rim (from 0 to 2 µm by 0.5-µm increments) for K–T interfaces 1 and 2.
The local composition of the CZ was measured using electron dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) on the Zeiss Merlin SEM with an Octane Elect EDS detector. We used a 12-kV, 1 nA electron beam to resolve the K-α emission lines of Fe and Ni (6.4 and 7.4 keV, respectively). The detector was used at its optimal working distance of 10 mm. We measured standards of pure (> 99.5 wt.%) Fe and pure (> 99.95 wt.%) Ni with the same setup to permit quantitative analysis of the composition with the CZs. We used the NIST DTSA-II software \cite{Ritchie et al., 2012} to estimate the interaction depth and conduct quantitative analysis. For a beam energy of 12 kV, the interaction depths in taenite (40 wt.% Ni, 60 wt.% Fe) are ~350 and 300 nm for the K ionization edge of Fe and Ni, respectively, dictating the spatial resolution of our measurements. We conducted quantitative analysis at 1 and 2-µm from the rim on K–T interface 2 (Table S2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normalized Fe (wt.%)</th>
<th>2 s.d. (wt.%)</th>
<th>Normalized Ni (wt.%)</th>
<th>2 s.d. (wt.%)</th>
<th>Analytical total (wt.%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ± 0.3 µm from rim</td>
<td>60.46</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>39.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>101.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ± 0.3 µm from rim</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>101.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S2.** Composition of two regions of K–T interface 2, located at 1 ± 0.3-µm and 2 ± 0.3-µm away from the tetrataenite rim, estimated using the NIST DTSA-II software \cite{Ritchie et al., 2012}. Columns 2-3 and 4-5 indicate the mean mass fraction and their 2 s.d. of Fe and Ni, respectively. The values are normalized to an analytical total of 1; column 6 provides the non-normalized analytical total for reference.

**S2. Cooling rate of Miles at ~350°C**

The cooling rate of Miles has two key effects in this study. Firstly, it enters into the estimation of the paleointensity in the Maxwell-Boltzmann framework [eq. (3) main text] as it influences the volume of the islands when they recorded a remanence. Secondly, it is necessary to calculate the uncertainty in direction and intensity due to counting statistics (Table S4) \cite{Berndt et al., 2016; Maurel et al., 2020}. We used a one-dimensional numerical model of spinodal decomposition to simulate CZ formation during cooling \cite{Maurel et al., 2019}. This model provides the size of the islands at any given temperature. In particular,
this enables us to estimate the island size at 320°C (the temperature of magnetization acquisition). When the system cools below ~200°C, the extremely slow diffusion of Ni effectively prevents any further growth of the islands, such that the island size at this time is essentially that of the present-day [Maurel et al., 2019]. According to this model, for the Ni concentration measured at a distance of 1 ± 0.3 μm from the rim, the islands were ~78 ± 2 % of their present-day size when they cooled through 320°C. Comparing this composition with present-day island size in the same region, we obtain that Miles cooled through ~350°C at a rate of 3.8 ± 2.6°C My⁻¹.

Fig. S2. Reflected-light image of the two K–T interfaces selected. The sample was polished down to 0.3-μm diamond paste and etched for ~45 s with nital (98% ethanol, 2% nitric acid).
Fig. S3. Sketch of a K–T interface, showing the quantities related to XPEEM measurements. A K–T interface is referred to as the area that encompasses kamacite, tetrataenite rim and cloudy zone; beyond the CZ when moving further away from the rim, plessite may be present. The six possible magnetization directions are measured in the tetrataenite rim, which contains spatially resolvable magnetic domains. The regions-of-interest in the CZ, of which we measure the average magnetization, are located near the rim. Several XMCD maps are acquired along a K–T interface. Adapted from Maurel et al. (2020).

S3. Electron backscattered diffraction

Solving eq. (3) in the main text provides the components of the ancient field $B_x, B_y, B_z$ in the reference frame of the tetrataenite easy axes. To mutually orient the paleodirections estimated from two distinct CZ, we must characterize the orientation of the easy axes in each of these CZs. Tetrataenite’s easy axes are aligned with the main crystallographic axes whose orientations can be determined using electron backscattered diffraction (EBSD). For this we used the Zeiss Merlin FEG-SEM in the MIT MSREC, with a 20-kV, 5-nA beam at a working distance of 15 mm, with a sample tilt of 70°. We used the Orientation Imaging Microscopy (OIM) Analysis software to analyze the data. We found that both CZs share the same tetrataenite phase (Fig. S4) and obtained the orientation with respect to the defined sample frame (Fig. S2). Knowing the directions of the incoming X-ray beam in the XPEEM instrument, we can also estimate the orientation of the tetrataenite easy axes in the sample.
frame using XMCD intensities collected in the rim. We verified that there is overall good agreement between the directions estimated from XMCD data and those measured with EBSD (Fig. S4).

**Fig. S4.** Equal area projection of the main crystallographic axes of tetrataenite for both K–T interfaces. Only three of the six directions (e.g., just one direction along each of three axes) are shown. Square symbols show the orientation of the axes as measured with EBSD. Round symbols with 95% confidence ellipses show the directions estimated using XMCD intensities collected in the tetrataenite rims. The reference frame refers to Fig. S2.

**S4. Statistical analysis and uncertainties**

The qualitative and statistical tests, as well as uncertainty estimates presented here are described in detail in the supplementary material of *Maurel et al.* (2020). They are performed using XMCD values collected in the tetrataenite rim and the regions of interest, as well as the paleodirections (Fig. S5) estimated for each region of interest of both K–T interfaces analyzed.
Fig. S5. Equal area projections showing the directions of the paleofield estimated from each 26 and 29 regions of interest analyzed on K–T interface 1 (a) and 2 (b). The reference frame is that of Fig. S2.

a) Directional bias in the CZs

If a CZ grew in the presence of a magnetic field, we expect a bias in the distribution of CZ island magnetizations towards the tetrataenite easy axis oriented closest to the external field direction. If the meteorite cooled in the absence of a field, or in a very weak field, the six tetrataenite easy axes should be uniformly distributed among CZ islands (e.g., Nichols et al., 2016). To test whether such bias is present in our data for at least one orientation of the sample with respect to the X-ray beam, our null hypothesis is that the six possible magnetization directions (and therefore the six possible XMCD intensities) are uniformly distributed among islands. To test whether this is the case, we adopted a bootstrapping approach. First, we draw with replacement $N$ average XMCD intensities from the CZ regions of interest, where $N$ corresponds to the number of locations analyzed along one K–T interface (26 and 29, respectively for interfaces 1 and 2). Second, using the XMCD intensities collected in the tetrataenite rim, we simulate the average XMCD intensity of $N$ identically-sized regions-of-interest under the assumption of uniform distribution among all the easy directions and calculate the average value. We then repeat this process 1000 times and compare the two distributions obtained (Fig. S6). For both K–T interfaces we find that at least for one of the three orientations, the observed average XMCD intensity is
outside the null distribution’s 95% confidence interval. This strongly argues that the CZ islands acquired their magnetization in the presence of a significant external field.

It can be noted that the random distributions are not always centered on a XMCD intensity of zero, as would be expected if it had been constructed from six XMCD intensities symmetrical around zero. By using off-edge images, we are able to improve the symmetry of the XMCD intensities. However, some images remain with a small asymmetry (Table S3). It is possible that the correction does not remove the entire contribution of the background signal from the signal of interest. Also, after the off-edge correction, these values are picked up by hand from images whose resolution and brightness vary slightly over time due to instrument effects. As such, we are not surprised that the average XMCD values found are not perfectly equal. These small offsets are responsible the departure from a distribution centered on zero for the zero-field case (Fig. S6). We choose not to correct artificially for this offset due to the \textit{ad hoc} and unconstrained nature of this task. The only conclusion that should be drawn from Fig. S6 is that, for at least one rotation, the distributions drawn from the data and from the random modeling do not significantly overlap. Artificially correcting for the offset would shift both distributions, but would not alter this conclusion.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figS6.png}
\caption{Distribution of the average XMCD intensity of each region of interest obtained by bootstrapping for the three different sample orientations (red dots) compared to the distribution obtained with a random distribution of the magnetization directions along one}
\end{figure}
of the six easy axis directions (grey dots). Dashed lines show the 95% confidence intervals. The average intensities for the 1000 trials are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K–T int.</th>
<th>Orient.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>-x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>-y</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>-z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.193 ± 0.016</td>
<td>-0.181 ± 0.015</td>
<td>0.098 ± 0.012</td>
<td>-0.088 ± 0.013</td>
<td>0.034 ± 0.009</td>
<td>-0.032 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.152 ± 0.015</td>
<td>0.138 ± 0.019</td>
<td>0.084 ± 0.014</td>
<td>-0.085 ± 0.014</td>
<td>0.092 ± 0.027</td>
<td>-0.111 ± 0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.032 ± 0.009</td>
<td>0.037 ± 0.013</td>
<td>-0.086 ± 0.012</td>
<td>0.088 ± 0.017</td>
<td>-0.143 ± 0.021</td>
<td>0.149 ± 0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.187 ± 0.014</td>
<td>-0.180 ± 0.017</td>
<td>0.102 ± 0.012</td>
<td>-0.083 ± 0.013</td>
<td>0.039 ± 0.008</td>
<td>-0.032 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.142 ± 0.017</td>
<td>0.146 ± 0.014</td>
<td>0.085 ± 0.012</td>
<td>-0.081 ± 0.012</td>
<td>0.120 ± 0.025</td>
<td>-0.119 ± 0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.043 ± 0.010</td>
<td>0.040 ± 0.011</td>
<td>-0.085 ± 0.013</td>
<td>0.091 ± 0.015</td>
<td>-0.168 ± 0.026</td>
<td>0.158 ± 0.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S3.** Mean and standard deviation of XMCD intensities collected in the tetrataenite rim for each K–T interface and each orientation of the sample. The six possible intensities are denoted by x, -x, y, -y, and z, -z.

b) Watson’s test and \( V_\text{w} \) test

We seek to verify that: 1) the paleodirections estimated for each location along a single K–T interface do not follow a uniform distribution over a sphere; and 2) the average paleodirections estimated for both K–T interfaces are not significantly distinguishable from each other.

To address 1), we use Watson’s test. The paleodirections estimated from each location along one K–T interface are compared to a uniform distribution on a sphere [Watson, 1956]. For each interface, we calculate the metric quantifying the distribution of the recovered directions and compare it to the corresponding critical value. We find that, for both interfaces, we can reject at 99% confidence the hypothesis that the paleodirections were drawn from a uniform distribution (Table S4).

To address 2), we use the \( V_\text{w} \) test. We compare the \( V_\text{w} \) statistic calculated for the pair of K–T interfaces to the critical value calculated by bootstrapping from simulated data with the same dispersion as the experimental data and common mean directions [Watson, 1983]. We find that the calculated statistic is smaller than the critical value (Table S4),
which implies that the hypothesis that both K–T interfaces share a common mean direction cannot be rejected at a level of confidence of 95%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watson’s test for randomness</th>
<th>K–T interface</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(3R^2/N)</th>
<th>(\chi^2 \text{ (99% confidence)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V_w statistical test</th>
<th>Pair of K–T interfaces</th>
<th>V_w</th>
<th>Critical V_w (95% confidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S4.** Statistics and critical values for the Watson’s test for randomness (lines 1–4) and the V_w statistical test (lines 5–7). For the Watson’s test, the K–T interface and number of locations included in the XPEEM dataset are given in columns 1 and 2. The statistics given in column 3 is \(\sqrt{3R^2/N}\) where \(R\) is the norm of the vector sum of the \(N\) estimated paleodirections. Column 4 gives the critical value. For the V_w test, columns 2 and 3 give the statistics and critical value, respectively.

c) Uncertainties

The main sources of uncertainty in paleodirection are the measurement noise and the counting statistical uncertainty due to the limited number of magnetic carriers (islands) included in each XPEEM dataset. The uncertainty in the size of the islands at 320°C must also be accounted for when calculating the paleointensity experienced by these islands. The measurement noise is estimated by bootstrapping: we draw \(N\) times with replacement among the sets of XMCD intensities (6 values in the rim and one average value for the CZ region of interest), where \(N\) again corresponds to the number of locations along the K–T interface that we measured. We calculate the paleodirection and paleointensity using main text eq. (3) and repeat the operation 1000 times. The 25th and 975th greatest values provide the 95% confidence ellipse (paleodirection) and interval (paleointensity).

The counting statistical uncertainty in paleodirection (\(\alpha_{95}\)) and paleointensity (\(\delta m\)) are calculated following the analysis of Berndt et al. (2016) using:
\[ \alpha_{95} = \tan^{-1}\left( \frac{8\pi k_B T_B}{3N \mu_0 H_0 V_B M_{s,B}} \right) \] \hspace{1cm} (S1a)

\[ \delta m = \sqrt{\frac{3}{N} \frac{k_B T_B}{\mu_0 H_0 V_B M_{s,B}}} \] \hspace{1cm} (S1b)

where \( \alpha_{95} \) is the half cone 95% confidence directional uncertainty, \( \delta m \) is the 95% confidence uncertainty in paleointensity, \( N \) is the number of CZ islands included in the dataset (estimated from the SEM images of both K–T interfaces, assuming that islands occupy ~90% of the region of interest), \( T_B \) is the blocking temperature (320°C), \( \mu_0 H_0 \) is the intensity estimate for the ancient magnetic field (estimated at ~30 μT for Miles), \( V_B \) is the volume of the CZ islands at tetrataenite ordering temperature (~78% of present-day radius [Maurel et al., 2019], corresponding to ~47% of the present-day volume assuming a spherical shape), \( M_{s,B} \) is the saturation magnetization at blocking temperature (1300 kA m\(^{-1}\)) and \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann’s constant.

Conservatively assuming an uncertainty of ± 1 wt.% on the local Ni concentration of the CZ region-of-interest propagates to a ± 5% uncertainty on the size of the islands at 320°C and a ±15% uncertainty on their volume. This uncertainty is added to the total paleointensity uncertainty. This does not account for the effect of induced field components or magnetostatic interactions between islands (main text section 4; Maurel et al., 2020).

The average paleodirections and paleointensities for both K–T interfaces and their associated uncertainties are listed in Table S5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K–T interface</th>
<th>Declination (°)</th>
<th>Inclination (°)</th>
<th>Measurement uncertainty</th>
<th>Counting statistical uncertainty</th>
<th>Total uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>330.4</td>
<td>-52.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>357.2</td>
<td>-34.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K–T interface</th>
<th>Average intensity (μT)</th>
<th>Measurement uncertainty</th>
<th>Counting statistical uncertainty</th>
<th>Island size estimate uncertainty</th>
<th>Total uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table S5. Average values and associated uncertainties for the paleodirections (lines 1–4) and paleointensities (lines 5–8). Column 1 gives the K–T interface considered. For the paleodirections, columns 2 to 5 show the average declination/inclination, the measurement uncertainty, counting statistics uncertainty and total uncertainty, respectively. For the paleointensities, columns 2 to 6 provide the average value, measurement uncertainty, counting statistical uncertainty, uncertainty on the island size at 320°C and total uncertainty, respectively.

S5. Estimated cooling depth of Techado, Colomera and Miles

Maurel et al. (2020) used one-dimensional convective and conductive cooling simulations based on the work by Bryson et al. (2019b) to estimate the depth at which Techado and Colomera cooled within the IIE parent body using their $^{39}$Ar/$^{40}$Ar ages and their low-temperature cooling rates. Here, we follow the same procedure to estimate the cooling depth of Miles. All the parameters used in the simulations are presented by Bryson et al. (2019b).

We simulate the cooling of a 240-km radius body that preserved a chondritic crust (100 km thick) on top of a differentiated seed (radius of 140 km), representing a partially-differentiated object. We chose this scenario based on the observation of both melted and unmelted silicate inclusions in the IIE iron meteorites. The body has a core-to-body radius ratio of ~30% and a 100-km thick chondritic layer. Within the ranges investigated here, the size of the parent body or the thickness of the chondritic layer have a minor effect on the estimated depths. The planetesimal forms through two discrete accretion events, the first at 0.5 Ma after CAI formation which involves the generation of the seed body, and the second at 2.4 Ma after CAI-formation, which involved the addition of the 100-km-thick chondritic lid. The first accretion event results in the melting and differentiation of the seed body within ~0.25 Ma of accretion. The timing of this event does not have a significant influence on the resulting structure of the planetesimal as long as it takes place before the decay rate of $^{26}$Al becomes insufficient to further melt the object ($\lesssim$ 1.8 Ma after CAI-
formation [Hevey and Sanders, 2006]). We choose 2.4 Ma after CAI for the timing of the second accretion event because this time leads to peak metamorphic temperatures in the added chondritic material due to the decay of the remaining $^{26}$Al of $\leq 900^\circ$C (i.e., causing no further melting of this material but generating the high temperatures inferred from analysis of IIE silicate inclusions). Note that such a two-step accretion model likely produces similar results as assuming the gradual and continuous accretion of the chondritic material over the time period between the first and second accretion events. Using the diffusion equation $x \approx \sqrt{Dt}$, where $x$ is the distance over which heat is conducted, $D$ is the thermal diffusivity and $t$ is the time, heat diffuses through ~5 km in 1 Ma assuming a typical thermal diffusivity $D = 9 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$; note that this rate decreases non-linearly with time. This rate of < 5 km Ma$^{-1}$ is much slower than the rate of accretion required to form the body prior to ~2.4 Ma after CAI-formation (~50 km Ma$^{-1}$). Therefore, both accretion scenarios should result in a comparable internal structure of the planetesimal at the end of accretion [Bryson et al., 2019b; Maurel et al., 2020].

Following accretion, the body undergoes convective and conductive cooling. In the simulations, core crystallization is complete when the core of the planetesimal reaches the Fe-S eutectic temperature (~988°C; Buono and Walker, 2011) and all the latent heat of crystallization is extracted from the core [Bryson et al., 2019b].

For this 240-km radius body, Techado and Colomera would have cooled at depths between 30- and 55-km; given Miles’ younger $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar age, the meteorite likely originates from a depth between 50 and 80 km (Fig. S7). For reference, at depths between 30 and 80 km, the intensity of the magnetic field is approximately 1.5 to 3 times stronger than the surface field intensity, respectively.
**Fig. S7.** (A) Temperature profiles at depths between 30 and 80 km on a partially-differentiated body of 240 km in radius, with a core-to-body radius ratio of ~30% and a 100-km thick chondritic layer. Markers show the $^{40}$Ar/$^{39}$Ar temperature-age constraints for the three IIEs. The vertical dashed gray line shows when the core has reached the Fe-S eutectic temperature (~988°C) and all the latent heat of crystallization has been extracted from the core. (B) Cooling rates calculated from (A) as a function of time. Markers show the cooling rates for Techado, Colomera and Miles estimated using the numerical model of CZ formation by *Maurel et al.* (2019).

**S6. Effect of a regolith layer on the timing of core crystallization**

We tested whether an insulating regolith layer could influence the end time of core crystallization. We achieved this by adding a 1-km thick regolith layer to the surface of the bodies in the model presented by *Bryson et al.* (2019b). In this model, the first accretion event occurs at 0.5 Ma after CAI-formation, forming a 125-km radius differentiated body. The thermal diffusivity of the achondritic silicate layer in this body is $9 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$. A second accretion event at 2.4 Ma after CAI-formation then forms a 125-km thick chondritic layer (thermal diffusivity $3 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$), with a 1-km thick regolith layer on top with thermal diffusivity equal to 0.005 times the thermal diffusivity of the achondritic layer [*Haack et al.*, 1990]. This regolith thickness is similar to that of asteroid Vesta [*Denevi et al.*, 2016]. Any chondritic material that reaches 700 K throughout this model is assumed to sinter, raising its thermal diffusivity from $3 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ to $9 \times 10^{-7}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$. The chondritic material that does not reach this temperature retains its original low thermal diffusivity and
acts as a megaregolith-like layer. At the end of this simulation, the time of core solidification with the 1-km thick regolith layer is 189.46 Ma after CAI-formation. For the same parameters without this regolith, core solidification ends at 188.7 Ma after CAI-formation. As such, we conclude that within the framework of this model, a Vesta-like regolith layer is unlikely to have an appreciable effect on the timing of core crystallization.

S7. Upper limit on the IIE parent body size

Here we investigate whether the constraint given by Techado’s magnetic record (i.e., that the core of the IIE parent body must have started to crystallize by $78 \pm 13$ Ma after CAI formation) can provide an upper limit on the size of this planetesimal.

We simulated planetesimals of 200, 300, 400 and 500-km radius, always preserving the same ratio between the size of the core and the thicknesses of the melted mantle and chondritic crust as in Section S5” (i.e., approximately 0.3:0.3:0.4). The same accretion times of 0.5 and 2.4 Ma after CAI formation were also used. For a 200-km radius body, the core temperature at 80 Ma after CAI formation is $\sim 1063^\circ$C. For the core to have started crystallizing at this temperature, its S content must have been $\lesssim 30$ wt.%. (e.g., Scheinberg et al., 2016). For planetesimals with radii of 300, 400, and 500 km, the temperature of the core at 80 Ma after CAI formation is $\sim 1210^\circ$C (very similar for all three sizes), implying a core S content $\lesssim 26$ wt.%. The similar core temperatures at 80 Ma after CAI formation for bodies between 300 and 500 km in radius is due to the large thickness of the insulating mantle and crust and the limited cooling undergone by 80 Ma after CAI formation.

It should be noted that the treatment of the core S concentration in this thermal evolution model is only approximate and care should be taken when interpreting these estimates. Nonetheless, the S contents proposed here are all in agreement with those estimated from compositional measurements of iron meteorites, which indicate core S concentrations of $\lesssim 20$ wt% [Goldstein et al., 2009].
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