Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2019-98-AC4, 2019

Geoscientific Model Development Discussions

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: 19 September 2019

1. All those who responded want a title change. Our revised/proposed title is "A process to facilitate the design and documentation of numerical experiments as applied in support of CMIP6." 2. We will try and remove any implications that the ES-DOC team designed the CMIP6 experiments, that was clearly not what happened, and not what the text intended to say. We will however, continue to make it clear where the ES-DOC team contributed to the iterative development of experiments by requesting and adding clarity, and harmonising approaches across MIPS through the provision of a common format and vocabulary for the technical descriptions of the experiments. 3. There were corrections requested to the scientific content of tables 3 and 5, we have made those corrections in the source ES-DOC documents and will re-generate the tables for the

paper. 4. We intend to re-order and rewrite the front material to more clearly address the benefits to all parties of the ES-DOC approach. In doing so, we will a. review figure 1, and either modify it, or rewrite the caption and accompanying text to make more clear who did what, and clarify responsibilities, and b. address the comment that the paper is addressing metadata colleagues not the wider community. 5. We note that the experiment descriptions themselves are also available in a GitHub repository, and the code provided actually retrieves the JSON versions directly - however, the text doesn't explicitly say that. The revised version will include clear signposting as to how to find the source content. 6. SC2 requested that we remove table 4, but provided no rationale. We included this table as an example of how the ES-DOC repository can be used to extract a complete tabular description of CMIP6 from the documentation within (and the code provided shows how this was done). It is not clear why this use-case should be excluded, and in fact we think it shows how the ES-DOC documentation could be used in future CMIP (or similar) activities to keep a dynamic and up-to-date description of agreed experiments/MIPs. Accordingly, we will leave it in unless the Editor suggests differently. 7. There are many other minor corrections and useful suggestions for improvement throughout the comments. We intend to address nearly all these as suggested, and will itemise how we did that alongside the revised version of the manuscript.

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