

Interactive comment on “The C4MIP experimental protocol for CMIP6” by C. D. Jones et al.

R. J. Stouffer

Ronald.Stouffer@noaa.gov

Received and published: 10 May 2016

General Comments

I found the paper well written and clear. I recommend it be accepted with minor revisions.

Specific Comments

1. Lines 1-5 Introduction – What are error bars on these carbon estimates? The values given have the units (i.e 1 PgC) appearing significant.
2. Page 6 and top of 7 – It is good to have a list of “coming attractions” for CMIP6. It would also be good to mention important things likely to be still missing – Very high ocean resolutions (10 km are finer), improvement in the way Land Use changes are being implemented in models, going away from the so-called big leaf vegetation models toward having multiple vegetation types in a grid cell, etc. Will the new features narrow

or increase the uncertainty of past and/or future estimate of carbon changes? What is the impact on missing processing on the uncertainty estimates for the future? I would like to read the authors' opinions on these questions.

3. Page 18, line 7 – “present” – Do you mean present or a given date (December 31, 2014 as an example). If the later, state the date and not use “present”.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-36, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

