

***Interactive comment on “The potential of an observational data set for calibration of a computationally expensive computer model” by D. J. McNeall et al.***

**C. Shaw**

christopher\_shaw@lineone.net

Received and published: 25 April 2013

I must commend you on your efforts to bring deliberation on these very important questions to a wider audience. I am interested in the framing of attempts to constrain projections offered by improved modelling (whether on the basis of observations or any other methodology). I do not believe modelling can provide the answer as to what we should do about climate change - I believe the risks themselves are too disaggregated across time and space to be able to arrive at one definitive policy goal for the whole globe (I think for example of the two degree limit). I think, as I said above, what you are doing is very important but I worry it may be seen as a substitute for more difficult

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

processes of involving the public in deliberations on how much warming is too much. I think this requires other ways of talking about climate change policy to be given validity, the forms of language, narrative and value systems which people use to make sense of the world. I believe these processes have to take place under what are probably irreducible conditions of uncertainty. These discussions do not challenge the validity of your work, but I believe there needs to be space for those value based debates to occur alongside the kind of work you are doing. Cheers

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 6, 2369, 2013.

**GMDD**

6, C430–C431, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C431

