

Interactive comment on “Towards improved and more routine Earth system model evaluation in CMIP” by Veronika Eyring et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 17 August 2016

General Comments.

This article describes the ambition to develop a number of standardized evaluation tools for calculating performance metrics to inter-compare model simulations made within CMIP6 and future CMIP cycles. The paper further proposes that these evaluation tools will be developed to run directly on CMIP6 data, stored on a limited number of ESGF super data-nodes, allowing multi-model analysis to be performed “where the data resides” rather than requiring numerous data downloads to local machines prior to analysis.

The authors contend such evaluation tools will:

1. Speed up and make easier the analysis of CMIP multi-model ensembles.
2. Reduce duplication of effort across the international Earth system model analysis community.

3. As a result of (2), free up time within the research community to allow more effort to be expended on model development, thereby accelerating the improvement of Earth system models. 4. Reduce the amount of data download presently occurring with respect to CMIP data. 5. Allow modelling groups to do on-the-fly evaluation of developing models within their local model development cycles. 6. Lead to a significant improvement in the overall level of evaluation of Earth system models.

All of these potential benefits are highly laudable and should be supported. But, I am not totally convinced the path to these outcomes will be as smooth as envisaged in the paper. I expand on a few of these reservations later in this review.

While the 2 main aims outlined in the paper; (i) developing a community evaluation tool to calculate standard performance metrics on CMIP6 data and (ii) developing such tools as open-source code to run directly on data stored on the ESGF at the storage location, are both excellent aims, the paper does not really present any solid information on how this will be done, nor what type of metrics will be included or how users should go about either using the tools or contributing diagnostic code to them. The paper is very aspirational in content, making a lot of quite reasonable observations of how the present mode of developing and analysing multiple ESMs is not optimal, but there are very few concrete details on what will be done to alleviate these problems. Rather there are a lot of generalized recommendations and, in some places, the paper actually reads more like a lobbying document, e.g. for more funding to be put into either ESGF or ESM development (p 3 lines 7-15). While I support both of these points, I don't think a scientific article is where such lobbying should appear. This makes we feel the paper should (i) be significantly reduced in content and (ii) submitted more as an opinion piece, or something analogous, to a journal where such articles more regularly appear (e.g. the AGU EoS Transactions is one example). Equally, the article could be repackaged as a forward-look/recommendation paper from the WGNE Climate Model Metrics Panel (which is referred to a number of times in the article).

In its present form I do not feel the paper contains sufficient new material or findings to

warrant publication as a scientific article, to achieve this the paper should (i) be shortened in terms of general recommendations and (ii) contain a more actual examples of the type of analysis that can/will be performed with the tools and (iii) details of how the application of these tools directly on the ESGF will be realized.

More specific comments:

1. With respect to modelling groups using such generalized evaluation tools in their model development cycles.

This is possible, but it assumes groups do not already have such systems locally. Many do, the problem with them is they have been developed over a long time period, assuming a single (local) approach to model output, file naming and file formatting. This makes these analysis systems highly specialised to one model (or modelling institute) but also potentially quite efficient within that institute. The downside is that because institutes have (historically) developed different approaches to model output/format/filenaming inter-comparison across models is not possible with these localised tools. This is the great benefit that CMIP has brought to the multi-model aspect of Earth system modelling, enforcing a single and common set of diagnostics, format and filenaming, allowing the potential for one evaluation tool to be able to analyse and inter-compare multi-model output. In itself a common output from all models is an enormous step forwards as is a single (all-encompassing) model evaluation tool that could be used by all modelling centres. To realize this aim requires either that modelling centres (i) modify their mode of standard (internal) output to follow CMIP conventions or (ii) the evaluation tools include some form of data converter to convert model output type X into CMIP compliant format, or (iii) with the developers of the evaluation tools, each modelling centre develops an interface between their preferred (local) model output and the required (CMIP-compliant) input to these evaluation tools. Option (i) may gradually happen, although the size of this task should not be underestimated. The authors might like to sound out a number of the larger modelling centres to gauge interest in these 3 options.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



2. Standardized evaluation tools will free up time for more effort on model development.

If this was achieved it would be an excellent outcome, unfortunately I don't really see this being a natural result of a standardized evaluation tool. Such a tool might free up time for more in-depth evaluation of models across different processes and this in itself would be a good thing. The problem with a lack of model developers is that such work does not easily lead to publications and in the present mode of research funding it therefore becomes very difficult to successfully seek funds for purely a model development/improvement activity. Furthermore, the required skills are not directly transferable; e.g. someone engaged in model analysis cannot just directly switch to model development, such a switch implies a significant change in tasks, required expertise and takes time to achieve.

I feel there is a general misconception in the article as to the amount of effort that goes into converting and quality checking ESM output before it is published on the ESGF. Lines 30-33 on p.13 gives the impression modelling groups do this as a routine exercise. This is not the case and the effort to quality check and publish data onto the ESGF is very significant. Clearly, this level of effort may decrease in the future if models begin to produce CMIP-compliant output directly, but I imagine it will still remain a fair effort and may limit the ease by which groups "routinely" publish data onto the ESGF.

3. Standardized evaluation tools will lead to radically improved model evaluation efforts.

Where I do see such standardized evaluation tools contributing is in making somewhat quasi-regular (standard) analysis of multi-model performance more rapid and easier to produce. This could help areas such as IPCC assessments to progress more smoothly and reduce some of the burden on CLAs/LAs. It may be that standardized evaluation tools also leads to an overall improvement in ESM evaluation and/or more novel evaluation methodologies being developed. This will depend on the level of take-up of these tools in place of existing analysis tools already in use at various institutes. Such an

uptake will be sensitive to; (i) the ease of use of these new tools, (ii) the ease by which new evaluation methods/metrics can be implemented into these tools, (iii) the flexibility of the tools in terms of what platforms they can run on and what software/libraries are assumed available and (iv) the quality of the output generated (e.g. in terms of publication quality graphics). Some examples of the chain of tasks from model output to publishable figures/results, as well as how one goes about running and implementing new diagnostics into these tools could be useful although I am not sure the latter point lends itself easily to a science article.

4. A more general concern I have with the use of performance metrics and these being (i) rapidly produced and compared across models on the ESGF and (ii) modelling groups potentially checking these metrics before submission of results, is the risk of models being tuned to “look good” on such metric figures. As the authors acknowledge, while performance metrics do carry useful information on model performance they can be misleading in that good metrics can occur through error compensation. Furthermore, if the metrics are not sufficiently broad in scope (e.g. variables, model domains and processes sampled, time and spatial scales sampled, importance in future feedback response etc) then models that are less ambitious/complete in terms of including important Earth system processes (in particular processes underpinning potential future feedbacks that might be less well constrained by observations, such as carbon cycle feedbacks) may look better on such metric plots than more ambitious/process-complete models. This may lead to the opposite effect to the one aspired to, in that the degree of modelling ambition in terms of Earth system process-completeness, may be reduced if the resulting performance metrics show such models in a poor light relative to competitor models (that are more conservative). Such risks need to be acknowledged and carefully considered. The authors partially acknowledge this, for example they briefly make the point that model performance quality, as measured against present day observations/processes, does not necessarily equate to a model being reliable in terms of future projections. There is also a comment on this risk on p14, lines 9-10. Some more discussion as to how this risk will be mitigated seems important.



5. Along similar lines to point 4, performance metrics normally lead to the ensemble mean (of a multi-model ensemble) being judged “the best model”. This is because the metrics used are typically based on variables averaged over large spatial and temporal scales (e.g. continental and decadal). This is for done for good reasons (e.g. to average out natural variability and emphasize the evaluation of statistics rather than weather events). A problem arises when models are chosen (based on these performance measures) for driving impact models. Often it is the representation and change (or not) of extreme events (weather variability) that is crucial for impacts. Neither time and space, nor ensemble averaged, variables are suitable for use in impact models. Hence for these models there is an even greater risk that performance metrics (as presently developed) give an erroneous guide to model suitability. Impact models definitely should not use the ensemble mean of ESMs as input, even if this appears the “most accurate”. These potential problems also need discussion.

6. With respect to evaluating ESMs from the perspective of future projection reliability.

The authors introduce the concept of emergent constraints, which offers the potential to link the ability of models to represent key aspects of present day (observed) variability to the reliability of simulated future feedbacks. Unfortunately, the authors do not describe how such constraints will actually be used in model evaluation. This point could be expanded on to bring more scientific content.

7. P11, lines 16-20: It is true that coupled ESMs cannot be compared in a temporal evolution sense against observations (i.e. simulated natural variability is not necessarily aligned temporally with reality) but the individual components of an ESM (e.g. atmosphere, ocean, land models) can all be run in a constrained setting and successfully compared to observations following a real-calendar time.

8. With reference to the statement (p3, lines 7-9). This is a worthwhile aim but it is never explained how this will be achieved.

9. With reference to the statement (p3, lines 11-12). Same as point 7.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



10. With references to the statement p9, lines 20-21. Again this is true but it is just a wishful statement.

ESDD

11. Line 7. It is assumed all these institutional acronyms are known by all readers. Maybe they need defining? Likewise on p11, line 2, it is assumed everyone knows what WIP stands for.

Interactive comment

12. P 13, lines 4-7 and 8-11. Both true statements, but so what, this is known and accepted.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., doi:10.5194/esd-2016-26, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

