

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

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 12 April 2016

This paper is useful, informative, and well written. I appreciate the work of the authors in putting it together.

The paper is particularly successful at providing an overview of important communities engaged in work at the nexus between climate and VIA research, and in shedding light on recent activities of the VIACS AB in facilitating communication between these different communities.

A few thoughts on how this draft might be improved:

\*\*\*1) I'm not sure that either the abstract or the introduction provides an accurate map of the paper?

I would have expected some early part of this paper to say something like “This paper

C1

describes the motivation that led to the development of the VIACS AB, provides an overview of the various communities it attempts to engage, and summarizes recent activities.” Or something similar. For this reader, it wasn't entirely clear where the paper was going until the end.

\*\*\*2) I'm also curious if this paper could be a bit more ambitious in offering a vision for the VIACS AB?

I see this paper as saying that the VIACS AB will facilitate communication between disparate communities, and then summarizing some recent activities to that end.

This is fine, but I'm wondering if the paper couldn't go a bit further in synthesizing what sorts of information / messages / lessons the VIACS AB has learned from different kinds of communities? And can the paper identify some major questions that need to be resolved or addressed by VIA researchers engaging climate modelers?

Pulling this out of section 4, where the state of work in various communities is described, and out of section 5 (particularly key messages from the prioritization activity) would provide a sense of key issues that this group will need to tackle and a greater perspective on the orientation of the co-chairs. It would also offer a more compelling conclusion, offering a bridge between the summary section and the benefits.

Though it's coming a bit off the cuff, I'm also wondering if there's some way to link that kind of synthesis to the three science questions of CMIP, or their VIA interpretation on p 7?

\*\*\*3) On a related topic, I'm wondering if there's scope to propose future activities for the AB?

I see that the paper suggests establishing a formal link with the GFCS, and that the conclusion section indicates that the VIACS AB will be most successful if it identifies contact points and networks that allow for a broad and inclusive interaction. It may also be that section 5.4 is describing future, rather than present / past, actions.

C2

But I'm wondering if there's something more that can be said? Are the authors able to articulate some priority actions that would give readers a clearer sense of what they see as most important steps? In many cases, this may just be a matter of distilling material that appears earlier, a bit less directly, into the conclusion section.

From my perspective, this kind of distillation would provide readers with a more concrete sense of what the board plans to do, and an easier read.

\*\*\*4) Will there be a follow up paper that addresses how / whether CMIP addressed the guidance it got from the AB?

The key messages section is really interesting . . . I'd be interested as well to hear what actions were taken in response to the advice provided. Is any of that available now?

Addressing a few of these issues would force the authors to synthesize things a bit more, and to offer perhaps a more elaborated view of the role they see the VIACS AB playing in the future. I think this would add value to the paper and provide the reader a better sense of the board members' vision.

---

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