

Interactive comment on “Designing and Documenting Experiments in CMIP6” by Charlotte Pascoe et al.

Charlotte Pascoe et al.

charlotte.pascoe@ncas.ac.uk

Received and published: 4 September 2019

We thank Veronika and her co-authors for their review of our paper.

It is clear that our working title has misled this group as well (as seen in RC1 and our response). The paper does not outline a concept for the documentation, it outlines the *existing methodology*, and the outcomes of the *data repository* documentation of CMIP6 which has been produced *thus far*. It is most certainly not intended as a formal manifest for what should be done in the future, although it does include some recommendations which reflect the opinions of the authors. We will ensure that along with the title change, we will re-word where possible to make this distinction clear.

There are two sorts of comment within this review: those which pertain to the technical

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



content, and those which pertain to the governance of the CMIP process. We will itemise our response to the former (technical content) in our consolidated response to all the reviews and comments. With respect to the governance, we *recommend that they should be dealt with elsewhere i.e. not in academic literature*; such issues are itemised here:

1) We did not intend to "describe ES-DOC as the place where experiments are designed and documented", we had intended to describe the ES-DOC role in harmonising experimental design, and to describe the documentation itself. We will endeavour to make this more clear in the revised version. The issue of which repository is considered to host the authoritative documentation is a governance issue, which we will not address here, but we will simply note that formal metadata (not published papers) describing the data are a requirement for some of the ESGF data repository funding, so ES-DOC metadata is a necessary *component* of CMIP support.

2) The authors of this short comment have confused a plan for the future (regarding the collection, *harmonisation*, and recording of documentation), discussed offline with *some* of the authors of this paper, with this paper, which as outlined above, is a description of what has been done for CMIP6, not what might be done for future CMIP phases. We do not intend to rewrite this paper to turn it into a position paper, the work and methodology done is what it is.

3) The CMIP panel may wish to avoid a data-user rather than data-provider imposed definition of norms and standards, but that is not currently possible given much of the funding which supports the CMIP process. How that is resolved is clearly a governance issue beyond the scope of this technical paper.

4) We had not submitted this paper to the CMIP6 special issue, and do not see the need for it to appear there, but it is a paper about the technology and processes which have supported CMIP6 *thus_far*, and so we do not think it should be altered to use a different example.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2019-98>, 2019.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

