

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

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 8 May 2016

General comments

The VIACS Advisory Board is an excellent initiative. It addresses a key gap between climate modellers and the user community, particularly in the context of the CMIP ensembles. This paper describes the VIACS AB, including how it is constituted, its scope, mode of operation, objectives etc. The paper does this well and is a worthy publication, requiring little in the way of significant modification. Following here are some specific comments for the authors and readers to consider. I note that some of these may apply more to the VIACS AB operation in general than to this manuscript in particular. Some minor issues with the manuscript are separately noted.

Specific comments

1. The paper needs to clearly specify its purpose in the abstract and its purpose and

C1

scope in the introduction. As it currently is, it is clear that the paper is about the VIACS AB, but why the paper is needed and what specifically it will cover is not described.

2. Lines 140-141: Australia is a long standing region of VIA research which is not contained within the regions noted.

3. Lines 194-196: The text notes here that one way in which Climate Services are distinguished from meteorological forecast services is the ‘probabilistic nature of most of the climate information’. This isn’t really quite right. Weather forecasts can be probabilistic, and climate information need not be. I think the main thing is that the uncertainties around climate projections are much larger than in weather forecasting, and as a consequence need a different approach.

4. Para at lines 212-221: Description given of figure 2a, the current situation in communication between VIACS and modelling communities. I think this is accurate in general, but in some countries national projection services provide more coordinated lines of communication (e.g. UK, Australia) to VIACS communities (but not back to CMIP). This should be noted.

5. Lines 265-270: Constitution of the Board. How are members appointed?

6. Line 410 – 561: Description of impact sector communities: These seem somewhat uneven, differing more than the nature of the communities would require. Some specific examples in the next two points.

7. Lines 465-480: Water Resources: This sector stood out as looking poorly organised compared to the others. Is that really the case?

8. Lines 536-554: Terrestrial ecosystems: This description is unbalanced in its focus on the US situation as opposed to that elsewhere. Also ‘climate services’ are referred to in this item, but not the previous ones. Is there are real distinction being made between sectors with regard to climate services?

9. Line 700: Recommendations for new data sets. Do the authors mean ‘few recom-

C2

mendations' (as written), or 'a few recommendations'? A number are given, so the latter may be better.

Minor issues

Lines 57-58: 'sell-being' should be 'well-being'

Line 676: 'worth provision of' is an odd expression.

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