

## ***Interactive comment on “Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organisation” by V. Eyring et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 14 January 2016

This paper describes the changes made for the next stage of the CMIP, CMIP6 and the rationale behind the changes. In CMIP6 there is clear “minimum entry” of basic runs used to calibrate modes (the “DECK” and a simulation with historical forcings) to participate in the rest of CMIPs. The many MIPs have been rationalised by choosing those which map most clearly onto the WCRP “Grand Challenges” (Giving a simpler structure which should also enable a much more efficient use of resources).

Main Comments The paper is generally well written, informative and clear. Given that one of the stated main aims if CMIP6 is to understand “How does the earth system respond to radiative forcing”, I would expect the intercomparison of radiative forcing to

C3695

be part of the minimum requirement, rather than a separate MIP ( RFMIP). In CMIP5 there is wide range of estimates of aerosol forcing in particular over the historical period (even when nominally identical aerosol forcing agents are included) which makes evaluating the relative importance of aerosols problematic. How can one understand the response of models to changes in radiative forcing when a substantial part of the forcing has not been calculated adequately?

Line16 The punctuation (distortion?) of model development cycles may have more to do with the cycle of IPCC Assessments rather than CMIP- I suspect some modelling centres feel under pressure to produce updated models for each Assessment. Aligning CMIP with IPCC assessments, whether deliberately or accidentally may re-enforce this pressure.

Minor comments Can a model which has appeared in CMIP5 and submits the correct DECK and Historical runs is eligible for CMIP6.

Why is the Historical control not part of the DECK? (It is mandatory like the DECK experiments)

Why does the data section on data come after the summary? It should either be part of the main text before the summary. Or in an Appendix

Line 129 It would be useful to have a bit more general information on the MIPs. Is there the opportunity to introduce further MIPS should the need arise during the lifetime of CMIP6? Are there any criteria for winding up MIPs? Will MIPs time expire or at least be reviewed at the end of CMIP6?

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 10539, 2015.

C3696