

Interactive comment on “The Vulnerability, Impacts, Adaptation, and Climate Services (VIACS) Advisory Board for CMIP6” by Alex C. Ruane et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 5 April 2016

The paper looks great and it covers various issues on the application of CMIP6 coupled models for studies on VIACS. However, CMIP6 models do not include impact models, and without that it would be hard to perform VIA applications. I am happy that the PROVIA be part of this, but as far as I can see vulnerable regions such as SE Asia, Central and South America and Africa (countries other than South Africa) are out of the Advisory Board, as is shown in the paper. May by PROVIA can cover this gap but PROVIA is not the advisory board. The authors wrote that "CMIP6 provided a unique opportunity 35 to facilitate a two-way dialogue between CMIP6 climate modelers and VIACS". however, I can not see how this dialogue would come up in the paper.

In my experience, climate modelers work not so much on societal relevant issues, and the simulation outputs data not always are ready to use for impacts studies. the VIA community sometimes is not familiar with model outputs. So, from what I see in the

C1

paper, the problems may continue, no matter how complex would be CMIP6 models.

Around line 290, "Representatives of the VIACS Advisory Board also participate in major CMIP6 meetings to give voice to the VIACS perspective", what kind of participation?, what kind of voice?. it is the voice of the members of the VIA community that may not be part of this board?. How the VIACS board works with modellers?

Working on VIA myself, I realized that not everything is solved by climate coupled models, as those from CMIP5 or CMIP6, nor by regional climate models. Regional climate models and experiments such as CORDEX and others represent model applications that may generate data that would feed impacts models. The paper describes some sectors in which the VIA focus would be, but the authors would not say how this will be done. There should be a section on impact models and how uncertainties would be assessed. It is my suggestion that this paper's focus should be wider than the advisory committee, and it should reflect a global reality, by adding authors from regions such as India, China, Central or Southern Africa, Central and South America, so the global flavour would be on it. It would be nice that the advisory committee on VIACS be more regionally representative, but at least that paper must reflect the different realities, and I suggest including authors from vulnerable regions.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-71, 2016.

C2