

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

**G. A. Meehl**

meehl@ucar.edu

Received and published: 1 June 2016

The CMIP Panel is undertaking a review of the CMIP6 GMD special issue papers to ensure a level of consistency among the invited contributions, also in answering the key questions that were outlined in our request to submit a paper to all co-chairs of CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs. We very much welcome the important contribution from the VIACS AB to CMIP6, and below are a few comments:

- Please consistently use the term ‘CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs’ when you refer to other MIPs that are endorsed by CMIP6 (e.g. in line 39, 118, 282, 761) - Please ensure consistency of the experiment short name and other abbreviations with the CMIP6 overview paper (see Eyring et al., 2016) (e.g. line 117: please replace with “Diagnostic, Evaluation and Characterization of Klima (DECK) experiments (klima is Greek for

C1

“climate”)”. - Please ensure consistency with the final abbreviations and full names of the CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs (see Table 3 of Eyring et al., 2016) (e.g. DynVarMIP instead of DynVar; long name ‘Dynamics and Variability Model Intercomparison Project’ / ‘for CMIP6’ removed in long name of the VIACS AB in our Table 3)). - Section 5.3: Some server side calculations are envisaged to provide output on common grids. Please could you specify the list of variables for which such regridding would be most helpful for the VIACS community? - Table 1: Could you please replace ‘Central Set’ with ‘Entry card simulations for CMIP6’? - Table 3: Please specify for which experiments the variables are requested. While Key Message 4 on page 19 includes a list of experiments that are of interest to the VIACS community, the experiments should additionally be specified here. In particular, are the variables requested from all DECK experiments and the CMIP6 historical simulations or only the latter? If in addition these variables are requested for a subset of the CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs, please specify these experiments as well. Are you committing to analyze all the data that you are requesting? - Line 119: Please change ‘drive individual experiments’ to ‘define individual experiments’ since the modelling groups run the simulations, not the CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs themselves. - Line 121ff: please update the paragraph on the WCRP Grand Science Challenges (see Eyring et al., 2016) - Line 202: we suggest adding one more bullet to this list: the definition of variables for the CMIP6 data request that are relevant for the VIACS community. Ensuring the relevant output is included in the CMIP6 data request is a prerequisite for any analysis, so we see this is as a major need for this communication.

References: - Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 1937-1958, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016, 2016.

With many thanks for your ongoing efforts in the CMIP6 process.

The CMIP Panel

---

C2

