



The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP): Reviewing project history, evolution, infrastructure and implementation

Paul J. Durack¹, Karl E. Taylor¹, Peter J. Gleckler¹, Gerald A. Meehl², Bryan N. Lawrence³, Curt Covey¹, Ronald J. Stouffer⁴, Guillaume Levavasseur^{5,6}, Atef Ben-Nasser^{5,7}, Sebastien Denvil^{8,a}, Martina Stockhause⁹, Jonathan M. Gregory^{3,10}, Martin Jukes^{11,12}, Sasha K. Ames¹, Fabrizio Antonio¹³, David C. Bader¹, John P. Dunne¹⁴, Daniel Ellis¹⁵, Veronika Eyring^{16,17}, Sandro L. Fiore^{18,b}, Sylvie Joussaume^{5,7}, Philip Kershaw^{19,12}, Jean-Francois Lamarque^c, Michael Lautenschlager^d, Jiwoo Lee¹, Chris F. Mauzey¹, Matthew Mizielinski¹⁰, Paola Nassisi¹³, Alessandra Nuzzo¹³, Eleanor O'Rourke¹⁵, Jeffrey Painter^e, Gerald L. Potter^e, Sven Rodriguez^{5,6}, and Dean N. Williams^f

¹Program for Climate Model Diagnosis & Intercomparison (PCMDI), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Livermore, California, USA

²National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), Boulder, Colorado, USA

³NCAS, Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK

⁴The University of Arizona (UA), Tucson, Arizona, USA

⁵Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL), Paris, France

⁶Sorbonne University (SU), Paris, France

⁷Centre National de Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Paris, France

⁸European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), Reading, UK

⁹German Climate Computing Center (DKRZ), Hamburg, Germany

¹⁰Met Office (MOHC), Exeter, UK

¹¹Kellogg College, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

¹²UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Science & Technology Facilities Council (STFC), Oxfordshire, UK

¹³CMCC Foundation - Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change (CMCC), Lecce, Italy

¹⁴Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA-GFDL), Princeton, New Jersey, USA

¹⁵CMIP International Project Office (CMIP-IPO); European Space Agency Centre for Space Applications & Telecommunications (ESA-ECSAT), Oxfordshire, UK

¹⁶Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR), Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre, Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany

¹⁷University of Bremen, Institute of Environmental Physics (IUP), Bremen, Germany

¹⁸University of Trento, Trento, Italy

¹⁹Centre for Environmental Data Analysis (CEDA), RAL Space, Oxfordshire, UK

^aformerly at: Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL)

^bformerly at: CMCC Foundation - Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change (CMCC)

^cformerly at: National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR)

^dformerly at: German Climate Computing Center (DKRZ)

^eformerly at: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis & Intercomparison (PCMDI)

^fformerly at: Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF), Livermore, California, USA

Correspondence

Paul J. Durack (pauldurack@llnl.gov)



Abstract.

The CMIP6 project was the most expansive and ambitious Model Intercomparison Project (MIP), the latest in a long history, extending back four decades. CMIP has captivated and engaged a broad, growing international community focused on improving our climate understanding. It has anchored our ability to quantify and attribute the drivers and responses of the observed climate changes we are experiencing today.

The project's profound impact has been achieved by combining the latest climate science and technology. This has enabled the production of the latest-generation climate simulations and disseminating their output, which has seen increased community attention in every successive phase. The review emphasizes the pragmatics of progressively scaling up efforts, the evolution of how the MIPs were implemented, and the coordinated international efforts to establish a minimal infrastructure to make that possible, most recently delivering CMIP6.

Keywords. AMIP, CMIP, AMIP1, AMIP2, CMIP1, CMIP2, CMIP3, CMIP5, CMIP6, CMIP6Plus, climate, earth system, modelling, atmosphere, ocean, land, sea ice, land ice, model, intercomparison, science

15 1 Introduction

The Model Intercomparison Project (MIP) concept, a well-worn terminology in climate science, has existed for many decades. Among other things, the MIP era has delivered two critical advancements to climate science. The first is that modelling groups contributing to any MIP have agreed to make their model output available to be scrutinized by the research community. Before the advent of MIPs, this was generally not the case, with model analysis typically performed by individual modelling groups or close collaborators. The second, contributing to a MIP means agreeing to adhere to a defined experimental design, meaning simulation data could be directly compared.

Scientists, stakeholders, and policymakers often refer to the acronyms of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) and Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) interchangeably. However, this incorrectly reflects their independence, which is scientifically and organizationally separate. Historically, CMIP phases were implemented before IPCC phases, which assessed CMIP-enabled climate science. The MIPs further inspired international effort coordination, leading to considerable science collaboration that has enabled breakthroughs, including the building consensus that human influence is "*unequivocal*" in driving the observed climate changes we are experiencing today (see Figure 6; Eyring et al., 2021a). More comprehensive international coordination has marked their development as a way to systematically evaluate observed climate changes, generate plausible future projections driven by varying futures of human development, and assess the fidelity of global climate models (GCMs) and Earth System Models (ESMs) to reproduce past changes and gauge their responses and sensitivities to realistic and idealised climate forcing. The multi-model approach to climate change assessment is now routine, with documented and reproducible experimental protocols and input "forcing" datasets facilitating standardised simulations that can be directly compared across models and with observations to ascertain the externally-forced signal from noise and identify robust model responses versus outliers and anomalies that are not representative of our real world best estimates.



35 To provide context for the most recent phase (CMIP6; Eyring et al., 2016a) and the planning of the project's future, we discuss the efforts dating back to the MIP origins and their contribution to making climate community collaboration what it is today. Small teams or individuals initiated many of the steps taken. While evidence of this history is scattered in the literature, we attempt to bring them together to tell a coherent story of how CMIP got to where it is today. Our emphasis details the pragmatics of what it took to progressively scale up efforts, most recently delivering CMIP6. Thus, this review describes the evolution of how the MIPs were implemented and the coordinated efforts to establish a minimal infrastructure to make that possible.

In section 2, we discuss MIP phases from 1990 to the present. In section 3, we highlight the CMIP6 experimental design, and in section 4, the supporting organizations and infrastructure. We then describe CMIP6 supporting projects in section 5, section 6 attempts to quantify the project's impact, and section 7 summarises the state of CMIP6, its planned completion and ongoing progress. In section 8, we look forward to the upcoming CMIP7 phase and highlight ongoing activity development.

2 CMIP6 in context with the past

CMIP6 is the latest in a long history of internationally coordinated climate modelling intercomparison projects. The activities grew out of self-organizing communities that built collaborations around science questions and the recognition that systematic multi-model evaluation was needed to build confidence in climate models as effective tools for climate change prediction.

50 The scientific motivation for early studies can be linked to coordinated activities organized by the US Department of Energy (DoE), Carbon Dioxide Research Division. In the early 1980s, the DoE CO₂ Climate Research Plan was established (Riches, 1983), which laid out an ambitious proposal to model, detect, and observe CO₂-induced global and regional climate changes, building on a growing international body of climate science extending back to early seminal works (e.g., Arrhenius, 1896; Chamberlin, 1899; Charney et al., 1979). The program commissioned a set of six state-of-the-art reports (e.g., MacCracken and Luther, 1985) highlighting uncertainties in the current-generation atmospheric general circulation models (GCMs), their simplifications and parameterizations, well ahead of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) program which was endorsed by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in December 1988.

This led to a coordination of international efforts, first establishing the Intercomparison of Radiation Codes used in Climate Models project (ICRCCM) in 1982 (Luther et al., 1988; Ellingson and Fouquart, 1991), which evolved into a World Climate Research Program (WCRP) and International Radiation Commission joint working group in 1984. The early work highlighted enormous longwave clear sky discrepancies across codes, of order 30-70 W m⁻². It led to the recommendation that models needed to be validated against observations to prove their utility, and led to the follow-on Spectral Radiance Experiment (SPECTRE; Ellingson et al., 1990) targeted at collecting the necessary observations and co-sponsored by US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA; Ellingson and Wiscombe, 1996). Over 22 participants submitted 29 calculation sets to the project, with 7 GCM configurations contributing (Ellingson et al., 2016). The observational design and much of the SPECTRE proposal were subsequently reused to establish the US DoE Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program (ARM;



U.S. Department Of Energy, 1990), initiated in January 1989. Off the back of this early science momentum, in 1984, the DoE initiated the first international GCM intercomparison project to understand the significant differences across CO₂-forced simulations at the time, the first MIP, FANGIO and its descendants AMIP and CMIP (see subsection 2.1; Ellingson et al., 2016).

These early projects and their evolution to the present day are described in the following sections.

2.1 Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project phases (AMIP1/2)

Intercomparison of near-term weather, as simulated with different atmospheric models, occurred soon after the first global models were developed in the 1950s (e.g., Gates, 1992b; Edwards, 2011). These activities became more coordinated in the early-1970s through the guidance of the Working Group on Numerical Experimentation (WGNE), which was formed in 1967 under the international Global Atmospheric Research Program (GARP), a precursor to the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP; Gates, 1992b). The first internationally coordinated climate model experimentation occurred in the late 1980s with the scientifically targeted Feedback ANalysis of GCMs and In Observations (FANGIO) project. FANGIO was explicitly designed to look at feedback mechanisms, defining a sea surface temperature perturbation that prescribed a defined climate change. This project attracted contributions from 19 distinct atmospheric model configurations, and concluded that the cloud feedbacks across models was the major cause of the differences in modelled climate sensitivity (Cess and Potter, 1988; Cess et al., 1989, 1990; Cess and Hameed, 1991).

The nascent community progress quickly expanded into the first phase of the Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP, hereafter referred to as AMIP1; Gates, 1992a), which was organized under the WGNE purview to help identify systematic errors, narrow the range of model results, and assist in prioritizing model development to reduce those errors. The acronym AGCM (Atmospheric General Circulation Model) was coined to define model configurations for AMIP, with many of the contributing model configurations also including simplified land-surface representations (e.g., Budyko, 1961; Manabe, 1969; Vargas Godoy et al., 2021).

AMIP1 provided a community AGCM experimental protocol with time-varying boundary conditions (later referred to as "forcing") of sea surface temperature (SST) and sea-ice for the 1979-1988 period, in addition to the recommended solar constant (1365 W m⁻²) and carbon dioxide concentration (345 ppm; Gates, 1991). It augmented contributing atmospheric model configurations to 27, with 26 community "diagnostic subprojects" established to analyze the simulations (Gates, 1995).

The project expanded the required model output from simple global and zonal means for the perpetual July experiment requested in FANGIO to monthly mean time series in three dimensions (120 covering the 10-year AMIP1 period). For many participating models, AMIP1 was the first opportunity to run their model longer than one annual cycle, with computer time provided by the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI; see section 4).

Early AMIP1 results were assessed in the IPCC First Assessment Report (FAR; Gates et al., 1990). The successes of AMIP1, including the entrainment of a broader analysis community to assist in model evaluation, motivated the modelling community to revisit the exercise to determine if and how models were improving. To do so, a second phase was established (AMIP2), including an expanded experimental design with improved boundary conditions (Liang et al., 1997; Taylor et al., 2000). The



AMIP2 requested model "Standard Output" (see Table 1 and subsection 4.3) was increased considerably beyond AMIP1, with selected higher frequency data to facilitate process-level analysis. In preparation for AMIP2, an AMIP Panel established by the WGNE reviewed 38 diagnostic subproject proposals (Gleckler, 2001), ultimately leading to comprehensive and systematic model evaluation. As with AMIP1, the AMIP2 community analysis was assessed in the IPCC Second Assessment Report (SAR; Gates et al., 1996), with a focus on assessing mean errors and multi-model consistency across the archive (Gates, 1995).

The core AGCM experiment pioneered by AMIP1/2 is now a de facto modelling community benchmark experiment included in each subsequent phase (e.g., Table A1).

2.2 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phases (CMIP1/2/2+)

In parallel, work continued at modelling centres to expand complexity to incorporate a dynamic ocean, amongst other climate system components, which had begun in the late 1960s and early 1970s (e.g., Manabe and Bryan, 1969; Bryan et al., 1975; Manabe et al., 1975). The AMIP1/2 AGCM experimental protocols, forced with fixed SST and sea-ice, could not simulate future (or past) climate changes. The recognition that climate change cannot be fully simulated without properly considering interactions with other major systems, such as the ocean, led to the establishment of the WCRP Steering Group on Global Coupled Models (SGGCM) in November 1990 (Meehl, 2023).

Over the following years, the activity entrained more oceanographers working in parallel on ocean model development, encapsulated by work hosted by the WCRP CLimate VARIability and Predictability (CLIVAR) project (the CLIVAR Working Group on Ocean Model Development (WGOMD) was subsequently established at the second WCRP Working Group on Coupled Modelling (WGCM) meeting in Melbourne, 1998). The growing coordination led to the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) acronym being defined and the first phase, CMIP1, designed after a workshop at Scripps Institution of Oceanography in October 1994 (Meehl, 1995). The acronym AOGCM (Atmosphere-Ocean General Circulation Model) was coined to define model configurations for this project.

At the same time, the SGGCM established a small CMIP Panel responsible for planning and providing scientific direction for CMIP, and PCMDI committed to hosting the model output. CMIP1 was focused on collecting data and documenting features of AOGCMs of present-day fixed climate, loosely following the AMIP1 protocol and available forcing data (pdctrl; see Appendix A, Table A1). The new MIP data resource led to considerable community attention and model evaluation with the building archive (Lambert and Boer, 2001; Räisänen, 2001; Villwock and Mitchell, 2003).

In September 1995, the CLIVAR decadal-centennial variations and anthropogenic climate change (DecCen/ACC) Numerical Experimentation Group (NEG-2) was established. SGGCM transitioned into CLIVAR NEG-2, which defined an ambitious program of modelling studies, including CMIP (Coughlan, 1996; Villwock, 1996). The project gathered momentum quickly, with a broad expansion in community-proposed diagnostic subprojects leveraging science insights from the growing archive, and a second phase, CMIP2, was planned by the CMIP Panel as part of CLIVAR NEG-2, and announced in January 1997 (Meehl et al., 1997, 2000). CMIP2 broadened the science remit, expanding the focus to include a pre-industrial (~1860) control (pictrl) and transient climate change experiments with CO₂ increasing at 1% per year (1pctCO₂, see Table A1; Meehl et al., 2003; Villwock and Mitchell, 2003).



In parallel to the CMIP growth, there was a recognition that coordinating this activity required a dedicated working group. In April 1997, the WGCM was created at a CLIVAR Scientific Steering Group (SSG) meeting in Washington DC, and the membership of CLIVAR NEG-2 transitioned to WGCM to meet the growing project needs (Detemmerman, 1997) this brought the project structure and hierarchy in line with what we have in place today.

140 As in AMIP, the CMIP model output received considerable attention with the resulting CMIP1 papers assessed, like AMIP, in the IPCC SAR (Gates et al., 1996) and IPCC Third Assessment Report (TAR; McAvaney et al., 2001).

With the growing interest in available model data, a recognition was made that the "standard output" collected to date was only a small subset of model data produced. For the preceding phases, for most variables, time-averaged quantities were collected. In contrast, the time-varying monthly mean information available for a handful of fields (surface temperature, precipitation, and sea level pressure) enabled far broader scientific investigations.

145 Recognizing this opportunity, an augmented phase CMIP2+ was identified and announced in May 2000 (Villwock and Mitchell, 2003; Meehl et al., 2003, 2005a), with a subset of CMIP1/2 contributing modelling groups augmenting their existing data contributions with considerably more variable and time coverage, including daily data, if available (AchutaRao et al., 2004).

150 CMIP2+ enabled research beyond the scope possible with CMIP1 and CMIP2, most notably a comprehensive appraisal of climate models for the US DoE (AchutaRao et al., 2004). However, it soon became apparent that contributors and users would greatly benefit from detailed model output specifications—including uniform data formats and standard variable names, units, dimensions, etc.

At the same time, the culture of climate change research had evolved to make open data sharing an expected practice. These two considerations led to the next phase of CMIP, which the WGCM CMIP Panel formulated, and PCMDI officially agreed to support and host the multi-model data. CMIP3 was formally endorsed by the WGCM members (representing contributing modelling centres) in October 2003.

2.3 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 3 (CMIP3)

The considerable growth in coordinated MIPs continued throughout the early 2000s and led to the development of what became known as the third phase of CMIP, CMIP3 (Meehl et al., 2007a). In the early stages, activities that came to define the project were more identified by discrete subprojects, targeting science questions of ocean realism in comparison to observations (e.g., Orr, 1999; Dutay et al., 2002, 2004), and climate change detection and attribution research targeting the "historical" period (e.g., Hegerl et al., 2003). Subsequently, many of the initial activities evolved into a more coordinated collection of experiments, which entrained an even greater number of contributing modelling groups (Figure 1).

165 The project saw a step-change across numerous facets, driven by growing and emerging science themes (such as climate change commitment) and an increasing appetite from a growing community to access these model data. All contributing models were coupled, simulating the atmosphere, ocean, sea-ice, and in some cases, the first dynamic land components. By this phase, the flux adjustment, used by many CMIP1/2 contributing models, was largely unnecessary for most contributing AOGCM configurations (Durack et al., 2012). There was also a dramatic scientific expansion from the fixed pre-industrial



170 control (picntrl) and idealized 1 percent compounding CO₂ (1pctto2x, 1pctto4x) CMIP2 experiments to include for the first time a "Twentieth-century" simulation ("20th Century Climate in Coupled Models", 20C3M; ~1860-1999), extending from the mid-19th to late 20th centuries, and directly comparable to the growing observational record (Meehl et al., 2007a, Table A1).

The 20C3M experiment, along with parallel 21st century future projection simulations as documented in the Special Report on Emission Scenarios (SRES 2000-2100; Nakićenović et al., 2000) was a CMIP step-change, for the first time providing
175 model data that could be directly compared to the growing observational datasets, and outlining a project design that would be replicated to great effect in subsequent phases (to become the DECK and ScenarioMIP in CMIP6). Partial motivation for the 20C3M experiment was to address the growing science around climate change detection and attribution (Danda; e.g., Santer, 1996; Hegerl et al., 2003) a research focus that was rapidly expanding since the "...discernable human influence on global climate" statement was published in the IPCC SAR (Santer et al., 1996).

180 During the planning phase, there was also the explicit recognition that identified unforced model internal variability needed to be better understood, and multi-member ensembles (or runs) were encouraged to enable variability quantification (Meehl et al., 2007a). The project also began to include more experiments, targeting specialized interests proposed by others, expanding CMIP's scientific horizons.

In 2003, for example, the Cloud Feedback MIP (CFMIP) introduced an instantaneous CO₂ doubling experiment (2xco2)
185 and a control (slabcntl), both relying on an ocean with a well-mixed "slab" layer but without representation of the deeper ocean (Manabe and Stouffer, 1979), which was included as part of the official CMIP3 experiment suite (see also Table A1; McAvaney and Le Treut, 2003; Webb et al., 2017).

The concept of committed warming was also addressed systematically for the first time in CMIP3 experiments with stabilized CO₂ that were run from the end of the SRES scenarios in 2100 out to 2200, and in some cases to 2300. The idea that even
190 if CO₂ concentrations were stabilized, the system would continue to warm came to be recognized as a central property of the climate system for temperature as well as sea level rise (Meehl et al., 2005b). Additionally, the Paleoclimate MIP phase 2 (PMIP2) was underway - PMIP had been operating in parallel to the A/CMIP phases since 1991 (Villwock and Mitchell, 2003; Braconnot et al., 2011; Joussame and Taylor, 2021).

These were just a few of the internationally coordinated activities of the time. At a combined WGCM and International
195 Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) Global Analysis Interpretation and Modeling (GAIM) meeting in Canada in 2002, the combined leadership recognized community confusion at the rapid MIP proliferation. To better communicate and coordinate activities, a catalogue of MIPs was created on the CLIVAR website, with additions and corrections requested to be sent to the WGCM, GAIM, and CLIVAR Project Office leads. The last update listed more than 30 unique activities, in addition to their AMIP and CMIP precedents (Meehl, 2003) and this list continues to be available on WCRP webpages today.

200 Like their A/CMIP counterparts, the CMIP3 model output saw even more attention than previous phases. CMIP3 marked the beginning of a historical new phase of climate science research, whereby state-of-the-art climate model output was made widely available to anyone, ranging from students to senior researchers. Thus, CMIP3 started the modern MIP era of open internet access to multi-model climate data. The CMIP3 results, in addition to the body of literature that current and earlier phases of model simulation archives had facilitated, became the foundation of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4;




Figure 1. Experiments, models, institutions, and countries contributing to completed Model Intercomparison Project (MIP) phases, from 1989 to today. The project’s growth over the most recent phase reflects a growing community appetite for the latest climate data to inform decision-making, a distant evolution from the climate science origins of AMIP1. See Table A1 for an expansion of the experiment lists.

205 Meehl et al., 2007b; Randall et al., 2007), which culminated with the award to the IPCC of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize (Kerr and Kintisch, 2007).

2.4 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 4 (CMIP4)

210 Though the specified CMIP3 experiments were mostly completed by early 2007, the urgent science questions involved with emerging climate change DandA research subsequently compelled the modelling groups to quickly formulate and run so-called single-forcing experiments that were particularly in demand.

These single-forcing experiments held all but one of the 20C3M forcings fixed through the 20th century (e.g., WMGHGs-only, sulphate aerosols-only), and were informally undertaken by several modelling groups. Since these were a relatively small set of experiments being run quickly to rapidly provide output to the growing DandA community, the CMIP Panel decided



that a new CMIP phase was not warranted. Therefore, these runs were never formally contributed to a managed multi-model
215 CMIP archive but were an addendum to the CMIP3 experiment suite (Stouffer et al., 2017). However, these single-forcing
simulations constituted a unique and compelling multi-model dataset that was referred to informally by WGCM membership
as "CMIP4". These single-forcing runs became the precursor to the CMIP6 Detection and Attribution Model Intercomparison
Project (DAMIP; Gillett et al., 2016) that built off early work focused on resolving the regional patterns of greenhouse gas and
sulphate aerosol forcing (Taylor and Penner, 1994; Santer et al., 1995; Hegerl et al., 2000; Gillett et al., 2002; Hegerl et al.,
220 2003).

As planning began for the experiments targeting the next phase of CMIP, whose model simulations would be assessed in the
IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5), it made sense to align the numbering of the next CMIP phase and IPCC report, CMIP5
and AR5 respectively. This additionally also avoided unnecessary confusion with the developing coordinated carbon-cycle
modelling activities, with the Coupled Climate-Carbon Cycle Model Intercomparison Project (C4MIP) an active collaborative
225 project of the WGCM and the IGBP that had been running in parallel to the prior CMIP phases (e.g., Fung et al., 2000; Cox
et al., 2002; Friedlingstein et al., 2006). C4MIP was one of numerous parallel efforts leveraging the science coordination
nurtured by the growing MIP community.

2.5 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5)

Late in CMIP3, during the IPCC AR4 process, it became clear that a profound climate change science paradigm shift would
230 happen. The end of CMIP3 and the publication of the IPCC AR4 in 2007 saw the end of 20 years of relatively coarse grid
AOGCMs, run with climate change non-mitigation scenarios. The new scientific paradigm that was emerging had three el-
ements. First, decadal climate prediction began to use climate models that had been initialized to predict near-term climate
variability over the next decade. Second, Earth System Models (ESMs) with coupled carbon cycle components were being for-
mulated to study longer-term feedbacks past mid-century with new mitigation scenarios. Third, new tangible linkages through-
235 out the climate science community (WCRP, IGBP, IPCC Working Group II [WG2: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability],
and IPCC Working Group III [WG3: Mitigation of Climate Change]) were required to advance the science. Consequently, a
landmark Aspen Global Change Institute (AGCI) session, which reflected this new paradigm, was convened in August 2006, to
formulate CMIP5 with participants consisting of climate modellers, chemistry and aerosol modellers, land surface modellers,
biogeochemistry modellers, Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) scientists, and Impacts-Adaptation-Vulnerability (IAV) re-
240 searchers.

Several "firsts" emerged from the 2006 AGCI session that formulated the CMIP5 experiment design (Hibbard et al., 2007).
CMIP5 marked the first time that the future climate change problem was divided into near-term and long-term timescales,
reflecting a science shift with the emergence of decadal climate prediction and the needs of the stakeholder community for
near-term climate change information. This outcome led to a subsequent 2008 AGCI workshop where the experiment design
245 for coordinated decadal climate prediction experiments for CMIP5 was formulated, launching a new area of climate science
(Meehl et al., 2009). CMIP5 was the first time ESM experiments were included in a CMIP phase, reflecting the rise of the
carbon cycle being included as standard AOGCM components. The CMIP5 planning process marked the first time the Earth



System Modelling (ESM) Community connected with the Integrated Assessment Modelling (IAM) community to agree on new future emission scenarios (Moss et al., 2008).

250 Thus, the marked expansion of activities over preceding decades and an ever-expanding data user base led to a considerable project augmentation for CMIP5 (Meehl and Bony, 2011). By this stage, many climate research subcommunities had identified MIPs as an effective way to scientifically collaborate, addressing the dual purposes of answering scientific questions through coordinated experimentation and identifying opportunities for model improvement by identifying common errors and biases across the multi-model ensembles. The developing data standards and delivery infrastructure also considerably aided
255 collaboration, easing access to obtaining and using CMIP output (see section 4).

For CMIP5, the "core" experiments included CMIP simulations AMIP, piControl, historical (20C3M), 1pctCO2 (previously 1pctto2x, 1pctto4x), and an instantaneous CO₂ quadrupling experiment (abrupt4xCO₂) included, targeting model behaviour assessment and climate sensitivity, preempting the CMIP6 "DECK". In addition, the success and attention of the three future-focused SRES projections included CMIP3 led to an augmentation and four of the next-generation Representative Concentra-
260 tion Pathway (RCP) scenarios being identified for inclusion in CMIP5 (Moss et al., 2010).

The importance of the carbon cycle through land and ocean biogeochemistry had also been recognized, which led to several experiments being included forced with CO₂ emissions (rather than the imposed atmospheric concentrations of the preceding phases) which depended on ESM configurations to contribute (Hibbard et al., 2007; Meehl and Bony, 2011). In addition, anthropogenic aerosol emissions had also been identified as important climate drivers, and were generated and used by a
265 number of modelling groups in model configurations including more complex atmospheric chemistry (e.g., Lamarque et al., 2010).

After considerable input and iterations with the international climate science community, the CMIP5 experiment design was approved by the WGCM in 2008 (Taylor et al., 2012b). The CMIP5 project design evolution already reflected the more formal MIP structure defined in the following CMIP6 phase (see section 3, Table A1). Projected future scenarios rcp45 and rcp85 were
270 defined (Stouffer et al., 2011), with second tier scenarios rcp26 and rcp60 also included (precursors to CMIP6 ScenarioMIP experiments; Hibbard et al., 2011).

CFMIP follow-on experiments included patterned SST experiments sst2030, amip4xCO₂, amipFuture, amip4K, along with the aquaplanet experiments aquaControl, aqua4xCO₂, and aqua4K (Bony et al., 2011). PMIP follow-on paleoclimate experiments included midHolocene, last glacial maximum (lgm) and past1000 (Braconnot et al., 2011). The project also included ex-
275 periments targeting short-lived climate forcers sstClimAerosol and sstClimSulfate (Boucher et al., 2011), precursors to CMIP6 AerChemMIP, and the carbon-cycle focused experiments esmrcp85, esmFixClim1, esmFixClim2, esmFdbk1 and esmFdbk2 (Friedlingstein and Jones, 2011), precursors to CMIP6's C4MIP.

The addition of near-term or initialized prediction experiments was also new to CMIP, with these short-running experiments focused on predicting climate states from the next few years through to a couple of decades (Meehl et al., 2009; Doblas-Reyes
280 et al., 2011). These were identified by sets of initialised hindcast experiments (decadalXXXX and noVolcXXXX) with start years back to at least 1970 (many groups provided coverage back to 1959) to evaluate 10-year prediction skill, as well as near-term future predictions (to at least 2015), precursors to the CMIP6 DCP activity.



Table 1. The Model Intercomparison Projects (MIPs), through time

Planning begins	1989	1993	1995	1997	2003	2008	2013	2022
Project	AMIP1	AMIP2	CMIP1	CMIP2/2+	CMIP3	CMIP5	CMIP6	CMIP6+
Experiment count	1	1	1	2	12	37	322	~
"historical" period	1979-1988	1979-2001	~	~	~1860-1999	1850-2010	1850-2014	1850-2022
Data volumes	~1 GB [†]	~500 GB [†]	~1 GB [†]	~500 GB [†]	39 TB	1.5 PB [‡]	>16 PB [‡]	~5 PB
Standard output variables/ Tables	32/4 ¹	114/8 ²	23/5 ³	28/5 ⁴	143/6 ⁵	986/18 ⁶	2062/44 ⁷	~
Host infras-structure	PCMDI FTP	PCMDI FTP	PCMDI FTP	PCMDI FTP	PCMDI FTP; ESG-CET	ESGF, 30 nodes	ESGF, 30 nodes	ESGF
Data formats	Fortran formatted binary	Fortran formatted binary, GRIB → P-DRS	GRIB → P-DRS	GRIB → P-DRS	CF netCDF-3	CF netCDF-4 "classic"	CF netCDF-4	CF netCDF-4
Data licenses	Registered subprojects	Registered subprojects	Registered subprojects	Registered subprojects	Registered subprojects/Open	Open	Open, CC-BY 4.0/CC0	Open, CC-BY 4.0/CC0
Operations begin	1989	1996	1996	1999	2004	2011	2018	2024

Notes: sources for "Experiment count" are documented in Appendix A and Table A1. A visual representation of the growth of data volumes is captured in Figure B1.

[†]Volume estimates are difficult to quantify, as the provided source and the final archived data differ. GRIB and similar precursor formats were reprocessed to netCDF-3.

[‡]Volume estimates are for unique project data only. For ESGF federated projects, data was replicated across multiple nodes. Current replicated totals are 5.3 and 27.5 PB for CMIP5 and CMIP6 projects respectively (see subsection 4.10).

Sources for "Standard output variables/Tables" noted by superscripts (1-7) are documented in Appendix B and Table B1.

CC = Creative Commons copyright licenses; CC-BY 4.0 = Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International; CC0 = Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication; for more information, see <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/licenses/>.

CF = NetCDF Climate and Forecast Metadata Conventions (Eaton et al., 2024). P-DRS = PCMDI Data Retrieval and Storage software library, a precursor to NetCDF. FTP = File Transfer Protocol, a common data transfer protocol. GRIB = General Regularly-distributed Information in Binary format, a precursor to NetCDF, which is still used by the weather community today.



3 The CMIP6 Project Design

Given the success of the 2006 AGCI session in formulating CMIP5, it was decided to convene an AGCI session in 2013 to
285 plan CMIP6 and bring together climate scientists, IAM modellers, and IAV researchers recognizing the breadth of science
represented and the broad and growing community of contributors and users these activities were serving. The 2013 CMIP6
planning workshop reflected the rapid advances in climate science three years before the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6)
schedule was announced in 2016, with a CMIP6 anticipated start date of 2015 extending through 2020. Even though it was
unclear in 2013 whether there would even be an AR6, the CMIP6 schedule reflected the state of the science, and was also
290 designed to provide advanced planning in case yet another IPCC assessment cycle commenced, to avoid last-minute demands
on the modelling groups to run a lot of experiments over a short period.

As with all previous CMIP phases, an initial exercise was performed to gauge community interest and to assess whether the
modelling groups wanted another CMIP phase (Stouffer et al., 2017). This is because CMIP is a community-driven activity, and
there is no CMIP without contributing modelling groups engagement and support. If the groups did not believe CMIP science
295 was worth the effort, CMIP would end. The AGCI CMIP6 planning workshop led to a new framing for CMIP in response to
community input whereby it was desired that CMIP6 be a more continuous and distributed activity (Meehl et al., 2014b) with
coordinated experiments for decadal climate prediction experiments formulated at a second AGCI workshop (Meehl et al.,
2014a).

The proposed experiment design led to broad community consultation involving the modelling centres whose simulations
300 are the tangible substance of CMIP, and the broad and growing communities that rely on CMIP model output for their work
(Eyring et al., 2016a). The formal development of a core suite of experiments was the result, focused on model evaluation,
connecting the activity to the preceding CMIP and AMIP phases. These experiments are referred to as the CMIP DECK (Di-
agnostic, Evaluation, and Characterization of Klima; "klima" being the German word for "climate"). The four primary DECK
experiments, which provided continuity with the experimental protocol of preceding phases, were named amip, 1pctCO₂,
305 abrupt-4xCO₂, and piControl. These, along with a historical simulation (1850-2014) and ESM variants of the control and
historical experiments (esm-piControl, esm-hist), were the CMIP6 contributing modelling group entry cards (Eyring et al.,
2016a). The reason for selecting these experiments was that those simulations are typically run by modelling groups during the
model development cycle and, therefore, are not only valuable for benchmarking model performance but also for comparing
different model versions. These were previously considered CMIP5 "core" experiments (Stouffer et al., 2011).

310 The interest in CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs continued, and the initially endorsed number was 21 (Table 2; Eyring et al., 2016a). It
was recognized that better coordination was needed to align the growing parallel and sometimes overlapping activities with an
awareness of the demands imposed on modelling group resources. In planning CMIP6, the CMIP Panel distributed an open call
for scientifically-focused "community" MIP proposals in April 2014 to encourage and enhance synergies across activities to
address this concern. To reduce duplication and burden on contributing modelling groups, a further standardization around the
315 common standards and infrastructure developed and delivered in CMIP5 was recommended (Eyring et al., 2016a). The revised



MIP proposals were reviewed in the 2015 Northern Hemisphere summer to prioritize activities that addressed the WCRP Grand Challenges in climate science.

320 A key feature of the new distributed structure of CMIP6, in response to community and modelling group feedback, was that modelling group participation in CMIP6 was totally elective. The only requirement for participating in CMIP6 was that each group had to run the DECK experiments. After that, a modelling group could pick from the menu of MIPs and choose to run either none, all, or any number in between. On the WGCM and CMIP Panel side, a MIP could only be approved if a minimum of eight modelling groups committed to running the specified experiments in a given MIP. Once again, this was totally elective on the part of the modelling groups, thus removing the pressure to run and contribute to all experiments like groups had felt obligated to in CMIP5.

325 Embodying the federated design of MIPs and autonomy, after the Eyring et al. (2016a) CMIP6 overview paper was published, MIP growth and additional experiment registrations were received, augmenting the experiment count from 190 to well over 200 experiments (Balaji et al., 2018). The project growth continued in the following years with two new CMIP6-Endorsed MIPs, the Climate Dioxide Removal (CDRMIP; Keller et al., 2018) and Polar Amplification (PAMIP; Smith et al., 2019) registered in 2018 (see Table 2). During the process of the IPCC AR6 assessment, the development of the COVID pandemic and some additional science questions led to a further augmentation of CMIP6 official experiments, with the Zero Emissions Commitment MIP (ZECMIP; Jones et al., 2019) and COVIDMIP (Lamboll et al., 2021) being defined, and their experiments were folded into C4MIP and DAMIP, respectively (Table 2). In addition, in early 2020 some sensitivity experiments were also added to the DECK and ScenarioMIP (Durack et al., 2024), enabling a single modelling group to contribute simulations comparing the impact of changed climate forcing from CMIP5 to CMIP6 in a single model large ensemble (e.g., Fyfe et al., 335 2021; Holland et al., 2024).

By March 2020, the CMIP6 project included 322 experiments, contributed across 22 MIPs (Table 2). Compared to the prior phases, this order of magnitude growth marked enhanced participation and complexity (Figure 1), reflecting an expansion of climate science and the successful federation of the project structure and management.

340 CMIP6 also embodied changes that occurred as the climate community itself evolved. In early phases, model simulation and analysis were carried out within or in collaboration with a small subset of individual groups. Today, modelling groups develop models and routinely release state-of-the-art model output for public scrutiny, with most of the analysis taking place outside the contributing centres. As such, CMIP planning now involves climate modelling groups, the communities that comprise MIPs and their science foci, and the community of scientists and stakeholders analyzing results. These perspectives are routinely included in ongoing consultation and next-phase planning (Stouffer et al., 2017).

345 While community consultation underpins the CMIP project planning and development to answer pertinent science questions of the day, in the end, as noted above, it is the contributing modelling groups that decide what experiments to prioritize and simulation data to provide for broader community consumption. Subsequently, expanding research and stakeholder communities determine what aspects of available model data will be analysed. The CMIP project's central goal is to advance scientific understanding of the Earth system and its responses to ongoing natural and anthropogenic forcing agents. It aims to provide a



350 valuable and tangible resource for national and international climate assessments, including the United Nation's IPCC reports and the Global Stocktake (Stouffer et al., 2017).

4 CMIP supporting infrastructure and organisations

The early FANGIO success and the developing appetite to improve climate change understanding led to the establishment by the US DoE of the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) in 1989. PCMDI was created to develop improved methods and tools for the diagnosis, validation, and intercomparison of global climate models. LLNL was selected to host the PCMDI to leverage the co-location of the US DoE Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC) computing resource (1974-1996) and the pre-existing DoE-supported atmospheric climate modelling efforts that were already underway (e.g., MacCracken and Luther, 1985; Potter et al., 2011).

The existence of the NERSC high-performance computing infrastructure delivered a significant opportunity to the program, enticing 12 international modelling groups to participate in AMIP1 and providing compute cycles to run their codes to develop simulations. These groups ran the ten simulation years (1979-1988), storing their output on the same system (Gates, 1991, 1992a). By 2000, there was a recognition that supporting infrastructure, data standards, software, and hardware development was essential for project success. The infrastructure facilitated data delivery and was becoming heavily relied upon to serve the growing MIP-contributing communities and downstream users. As such, "MIP" infrastructure was now of equal importance to the parallel intercomparison, science coordination, and experimental protocol activities that it served, with the "I" in the MIP acronym interchangeable across *intercomparison* and *infrastructure* terms (Gleckler, 2001).

Before CMIP5, PCMDI and its collaborators managed all the data distribution responsibilities for AMIP and CMIP (see subsection 4.4). Early in CMIP5 planning it became clear that PCMDI could not manage the expected number of data producers and consumers alone. PCMDI requested help from the Global Organisation of Earth System Science Portals (GO-ESSP; see Williams et al., 2009), to help design and deliver a globally distributed data infrastructure. The resulting internationally-federated infrastructure became the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF), with the name itself an evolution, like the software, of the preceding DoE "the Earth System Grid" initiative (see subsection 4.4; Williams et al., 2009).

With scale and the advent of the ESGF, the entire CMIP process began to depend more on the underpinning technical infrastructure (which, as is covered below), expanded well beyond the ESGF data publication and dissemination alone. To coordinate infrastructure development and delivery, the WGCM established the WGCM Infrastructure Panel (WIP) in 2014, working in parallel and in collaboration with the CMIP Panel, facilitating the production and consumption of CMIP data products. The WIP maintains the necessary standards and policies for model data sharing and ensures that the various infrastructure components are integrated and function smoothly. Its work was critical to the success of CMIP6.

For CMIP5, and since, many independently-funded efforts contributed to the supporting infrastructure. Amongst them, key roles were played by the Climate and Forecast (CF) Metadata Conventions (subsection 4.1), used to standardize the content of model output files, and the CMIP Controlled Vocabularies (CVs; subsection 4.2), which defined a limited set of terms used to describe and uniquely identify datasets and to aid in searching for data of interest. These standards are now integral to



Table 2. The CMIP6-Endorsed Model Intercomparison Projects (MIPs), their science focus, and citation

Count	MIP identity	MIP Description	Science focus	Citation
1	AerChemMIP	Atmospheric Aerosols and Chemistry	Short-lived climate forcers	Collins et al. (2017)
2	C4MIP	Climate-Carbon Cycle	Carbon cycle	Jones et al. (2016)
3	CDRMIP	Carbon Dioxide Removal	Carbon dioxide removal	Keller et al. (2018)
4	CFMIP	Cloud Feedback	Cloud feedbacks	Webb et al. (2017)
5	CMIP	Diagnostic, Evaluation and Characterisation of Klima (DECK)	Core evaluation, link model evolution across A/CMIP eras	Eyring et al. (2016a)
6	DAMIP	Detection and Attribution	Climate change detection and attribution	Gillett et al. (2016)
7	DCPP	Decadal Climate Prediction Project	Initialized climate prediction	Boer et al. (2016)
8	FAFMIP	Flux-Anomaly Forced	Idealised forced ocean responses	Gregory et al. (2016)
9	GeoMIP	Geoengineering	Geoengineering intervention	Kravitz et al. (2015)
10	GMMIP	Global Monsoons	Monsoon climatology, variability, prediction and projection	Zhou et al. (2016)
11	HighResMIP	High Resolution	High resolution (<50 km)	Haarsma et al. (2016)
12	ISMIP6	Ice Sheet	Ice sheet (Greenland & Antarctica)	Nowicki et al. (2016)
13	LS3MIP	Land Surface, Snow and Soil moisture	Land-only simulations	Van Den Hurk et al. (2016)
14	LUMIP	Land Use	Land-use and land-cover change	Lawrence et al. (2016)
15	OMIP	Ocean	Ocean-only simulations (physics)	Griffies et al. (2016)
-	OMIP	Ocean	Ocean-only simulations (biogeochemistry)	Orr et al. (2017)
16	PAMIP	Polar Amplification	SST, sea-ice roles in polar warming	Smith et al. (2019)
17	PMIP	Paleoclimate	Climate of the deep past	Kageyama et al. (2018)
18	RFMIP	Radiative Forcing	Radiative forcing, transfers and model responses	Pincus et al. (2016)
19	ScenarioMIP	Scenarios	Future climate change projections	O'Neill et al. (2016)
20	VolMIP	Volcanic forcing	Volcanic forcing climate responses	Zanchettin et al. (2016)

Table 2 continued overpage..

Notes: MIPs 1 through 20 above are registered in the CMIP6 Controlled Vocabulary (CMIP6_CVs) GitHub repository, the primary source of CMIP6 registered information. Due to inflexible infrastructure, experiments defined by MIPs 21 and 22 were registered under an existing MIP (C4MIP and DAMIP, respectively).



Table 2. The CMIP6-Endorsed Model Intercomparison Projects (MIPs), their science focus, and citation (continued)

MIPs (added as an existing MIP subactivity)

21	C4MIP: ZECMIP	Zero Emissions Commitment	CO ₂ emissions and remaining carbon budget	Jones et al. (2019)
22	DAMIP: COVIDMIP	Modifying emissions to account for COVID-19	Updated GHG, aerosols, ozone, and optical properties in response to COVID-19 lockdowns	Lamboll et al. (2021)

Diagnostic MIPs (requesting output from CMIP6 experiments, but having no MIP child experiments, and no data published to the ESGF CMIP6 project)

	WCRP CORDEX	WCRP COordinated Regional Downscaling EXperiment	Regional downscaling related variable request	Gutowski Jr. et al. (2016)
	DynVarMIP	Dynamics and Variability	Momentum and energy transport and model bias related variable request	Gerber and Manzini (2016)
	SIMP	Sea-Ice MIP	Sea-ice related variable request	Notz et al. (2016)
	VIACSAB	Vulnerability, Impacts, Adaptation and Climate Services Advisory Board	Climate change impacts related variable request	Ruane et al. (2016)
Count	MIP identity	MIP Description	Science focus	Citation

Notes: MIPs 1 through 20 above are registered in the CMIP6 Controlled Vocabulary (CMIP6_CVs) GitHub repository, the primary source of CMIP6 registered information. Due to inflexible infrastructure, experiments defined by MIPs 21 and 22 were registered under an existing MIP (C4MIP and DAMIP, respectively).

interpreting and accessing the growing model data archives. PCMDI developed software (the Climate Model Output Rewriter; CMOR) to impose the use of these conventions and vocabularies in data production, and the process of putting data into the right format with the correct information became known as "CMORization" whether or not CMOR was used.

Data conforming to the necessary standards can be published into the ESGF, which is findable and accessible worldwide. A subset of the CMIP archive is also replicated at the IPCC Data Distribution Centre (IPCC DDC; subsection 4.5), where augmented with extra metadata, it is expected to be preserved and made available indefinitely.

Additional initiatives to collect and organize model and experiment documentation (see subsection 4.7), to establish a data citation service (issuing DOIs for published datasets; subsection 4.8), and to make errata information about the data (subsection 4.11) all also fell under the purview of the WIP.

4.1 Climate and Forecast (CF) Metadata conventions

By the early 1990s, interest in sharing the output of climate models with researchers outside the originating groups gained momentum. This led to greater attention to clearly defining the model output quantities, ensuring that datasets were self-describing to avoid misinterpretation, standardising their digital formats to ease data transfers and use, and documenting the model configurations that produced the data. In parallel, there were computer science developments focused on generating




Figure 2. Growth of the CMIP6 project over time, with data sizes (PB) identified by colours for each of the CMIP6 endorsed MIPs (see Table 2) from the initial date of data publication (9th May 2018) through to the latest publication (9 December 2024). The legend denotes MIP project sizes in Terabytes (TB). The largest data contributions in CMIP6 are from the CMIP (light blue) and ScenarioMIP (dark grey) activities, comprising 8.4 PB of the >15 PB total. Data growth fluctuated throughout the project’s life, with current 2024 publication rates of 2.1 PB/yr (prorated). This compares to previous years: 0.8 in 2023, 3.3 in 2022, 1.8 in 2021, 3.1 in 2020, 3.3 in 2019, and 0.1 PB in 2018.



digital formats that met the needs of growing meteorological data streams, with an aspiration to develop portable and self-describing file formats (where data and metadata that described it were co-contained in files). These developments led to numerous early releases of the network Common Data Format (netCDF) through the late 1980s and early 1990s. In May 1997, netCDF 3.3 was released, which included a new type-safe interface for the C and Fortran languages. In March 2001, netCDF 3.5.0 was released, which integrated a new Fortran90 interface, making this library suitable for integration with climate model libraries primarily written in Fortran (University Corporation of Atmospheric Research, 2021). netCDF was explicitly designed to meet the goal of self-describing data, to be used in conjunction with community-developed conventions in development, and to facilitate progress; the Unidata Program Center (Unidata, US) hosted a directory of these evolving efforts.

In parallel to the netCDF digital format and language interface development, the ability to store rich, self-describing meta-data within the file led to considerable work on data conventions. Of climate data relevance, the first was developed by the Cooperative Ocean/Atmosphere Research Data Service (COARDS), a US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and US university cooperative aimed at sharing and distributing global atmospheric and oceanographic research datasets. COARDS 1.0 was released in February 1995 and laid out data variable conventions such as assigning spatial dimension/coordinate attributes (height, latitude, longitude) and data variable attributes (long_name, missing_value, units), in addition to some required global attributes (e.g., title) providing descriptive context for the data. Much of the COARDS work aided the Ferret visualization and analysis environment development, with Ferret 4.0 released in March 1995 (NOAA PMEL, 1995). This data standardisation aided the coordination of software efforts, reducing parallel development into a couple of well-supported packages targeting the evolving COARDS conventions.

By 1997, the large and growing MIP archives had accumulated tens of thousands of output files from dozens of model configurations. The diverse and growing international community interested in analyzing and applying results from the models was hampered by the diversity of data formats, structures, and nomenclatures that climate modelling centres had adopted. There would be obvious benefits in standardizing the data. To fill the void, the Gregory, Drach, and Tett (GDT v1.4; Gregory et al., 1999) standards were first introduced in June 1997. The GDT standard expanded markedly on COARDS, focusing on better enabling GCM output to be self-describing and to conform to standard conventions. These conventions enabled the explicit definition of the location and sizes of the grid cells, coordinates specified by tuples [CF "formula_terms"], multiple coordinate systems for a given data variable [CF "grid_mapping"], provisions for time series and vertical profiles at points and trajectories [CF "discrete sampling geometries"], and metadata describing subgrid variation [CF "cell_methods"].

In parallel with the development of GDT, work had been going on the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR, US) on the Community Climate System Model (CCSM) netCDF Conventions (CCSM netCDF Conventions). Both conventions were superseded following a meeting in December 1999 at NCAR, when it was decided to merge these efforts, leading to a collaboration of a larger group of authors who began work developing what became known as the NetCDF Climate and Forecast (CF) Metadata Conventions. Building on and going far beyond COARDS, GDT, CCSM netCDF Conventions, and similar efforts, version 1.0 of the CF Conventions was released in October 2003 (e.g., Eaton et al., 2024).

Subsequently, the CF conventions were adopted by CMIP, starting in phase 3. Since that time, CF gained in popularity across climate sciences and beyond. By 2006, the contributor community was rapidly growing, and a formal governance structure



was established in response (Lawrence et al., 2006). Today, an ever-expanding group of volunteers maintains and continues to augment these conventions (see <https://cfconventions.org>). The evolution (while maintaining backward compatibility) has been ongoing through several releases, the latest being version 1.12-draft. The stability of CF, the vibrant community supporting it, and the development of software that can interpret CF data have been foundational to the widespread use of CMIP data.

From the inception of CF, in parallel with the elaboration of the conventions, work has proceeded on compiling the CF standard name table. Originating in the "quantity" concept of the preceding GDT conventions (Gregory et al., 1999), a standard name is a self-explanatory phrase identifying a particular geophysical quantity. CF currently defines about 4900 standard names. Standard names have become an element of CMIP controlled vocabularies, work which began with AMIP1, and were formalised during CMIP3 (see subsection 4.2).

From the inception of CF, parallel work continued compiling the CF standard name table. This idea originated as a "quantity" concept in the preceding GDT conventions (Gregory et al., 1999). This ongoing work led naturally to the development of CMIP Controlled vocabularies, which were formalised during CMIP3 (see subsection 4.2).

4.2 Controlled Vocabularies (CVs)

As coordinated international climate science activities grew from AMIP1 and 2 through the early CMIP phases, it was recognized that imposing increasingly detailed requirements on the data reported would facilitate its use and increase its value. Early on, it was decided that rather than store multiple variables in a single file, the model output should be organized such that each file contained a single variable. This was done to reduce data download volumes since most analysts of the CMIP data were expected to consider only a small number of variables.

Beginning with CMIP3, each requested variable was assigned a unique name (e.g., "ts" for surface temperature and "pr" for precipitation rate), and all data were written compliant with the CF conventions (e.g., Taylor et al., 2009). Additionally, the names of the coordinates and their ordering were standardized, and certain CF optional attributes were made mandatory (e.g., "cell_methods"; Eaton et al., 2024). Standardisation simplified analysis codes, which could now ingest data produced by multiple models in a common way. In addition, specific metadata were required to be recorded in each file identifying the source of the data (institution, model name, version) and experiment conditions (e.g., experiment name). Thus, the detailed specifications for CMIP3 (see Taylor and CMIP Community, 2005) imposed uniformity on the format and structure of the data and metadata that facilitated its use.

The first collection of controlled vocabularies (CVs) was also introduced in CMIP3 (e.g., Taylor and CMIP Community, 2005). In its simplest form, a CV lists the terms used to describe a specific dataset attribute. In CMIP3, there were CVs for variable names (e.g., "pr", "tas", "ua", this subsequently evolved into "standard output" see subsection 4.3), experiments (e.g., "amip", "picntrl", "SRESB1"), institutions and models (e.g., "BCC-CM1", "GFDL-CM2.1", "UKMO-HadGEM1"), and table names (e.g., "O1", "A1", "A2", "A3", see Table B1). The table names identified collections of variables reported at a common "frequency" (1 = monthly, 2 = daily, 3 = 3-hourly) and were all associated with either the atmosphere (A) or ocean (O). The CVs were used to construct the directory structure for the data archive, with output from different experiments, models, and variables placed in separate sub-directories. The structure ensured that although the loosely defined template for naming files



would not ensure name uniqueness across the entire CMIP3 archive, it would ensure that the names were unique within each lowest-level sub-directory.

The increased uniformity of the CMIP3 data requirements facilitated subsequent research. Still, it burdened modelling groups, who were required to rewrite their data in a new way and a format unfamiliar to some. To assist groups in complying with the model output requirements, the Climate Model Output Rewriter software (CMOR1; Taylor et al., 2006) along with the CMIP3-CMOR-Tables (Doutriaux and Taylor, 2005) were developed and made available. In the tables, the 143 requested variables (see Table 1) were grouped so variables likely to be processed under a common procedure appeared together (e.g., ocean and atmosphere variables were found in separate tables). The detailed data specifications and the clearly defined variables were documented in the CMIP3-CMOR-Tables and an "output requirements" document (Taylor and CMIP Community, 2005). Once the modelling groups prepared their output according to the specifications, it was collected and organized on the PCMDI computing system in an easily searchable directory structure. The data could be searched and downloaded directly via anonymous FTP or the ESG web-based data service.

In CMIP5, the trend toward further standardization continued as the project expanded to include additional specialized MIPs, 26 modelling groups, and 37 experiments (Table 1, Figure 1). The original CMOR1 FORTRAN software was revised and recast as C code with FORTRAN and Python interfaces (Doutriaux and Taylor, 2011). New CMIP5-CMOR-Tables (Doutriaux and Taylor, 2013) were defined to accommodate the dramatic increase in the variables requested, which now totalled 986 (see Table 1). The data requirements were inherited mainly from CMIP3 but were augmented with additional required attributes, some with values drawn from CVs (e.g., "frequency" and "modelling_realm").

A major advance in enabling communication among the various components of software infrastructure supporting CMIP5 was the development of a "Data Reference Syntax" (DRS; Taylor et al., 2012a). The DRS relied on several dataset descriptors and associated CVs that uniquely defined each dataset contributing to the CMIP5 archive. For example, the DRS elements were used to define the CMIP5 directory structure and to construct filenames that were guaranteed to be unique across the entire archive. The DRS was also essential for communication and sharing among the data nodes, which comprised a now federated ESGF data distribution infrastructure (subsection 4.4; Williams et al., 2011). The DRS dataset descriptors were supplemented with dataset version information assigned during the data preparation and ESGF publication processes, which greatly aided the replication of datasets across the major federated ESGF data nodes.

For CMIP6, the evolution of the data standards, CVs, and supporting infrastructure continued as the project ballooned in size to include 22 specialized "endorsed MIPs" (now referred to as "Community MIPs"), 49 contributing modelling groups, and 322 experiments (Table 2, Table 1, Figure 1). Due to the broadening of model diversity and configurations and the concomitant increase in variables of interest, a new approach to defining the data request was tried whereby the needed variables were placed in a database that could be accessed via an API or displayed in different human-readable forms (see subsection 4.3). In total, 2062 variables were requested across all experiments, and these were all transferred into the CMIP6-CMOR-Tables (Nadeau et al., 2017) and were relied on by a revised CMOR3 (Mauzey et al., 2024) (also see Table D1).

As new services that provided centralized access to extensive model documentation (see subsection 4.7) and enabled formal data citation (see subsection 4.8) began supplementing CMIP's basic service of providing access to CMIP data through ESGF



and the IPCC DDC (see subsection 4.4 and subsection 4.5), the CVs became more critical for maintaining consistency across the infrastructure components. The earlier practice of publishing simple human-readable lists of descriptors to identify CMIP datasets had resulted in different parts of the infrastructure replicating this CV information in different specialized formats more suitable for specific purposes. In some cases, the information needed to populate a CV was gathered independently by
505 different components of the infrastructure (e.g., the acronyms used to identify each CMIP experiment), which led to some inconsistency in CV content that hampered transparency and communication across the infrastructure and sometimes confused users of the CMIP data. Consequently, the WIP decided that for CMIP6, a reference repository of CVs would be established, and all infrastructure components would rely on this reference source (Durack et al., 2024). The CVs were in JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) files, which humans and machines read easily. Building on the CVs relied on in CMIP5, a few new ones
510 were added. Still, the main advance was providing a definitive source for defining the terms used to uniquely identify CMIP6 datasets and managing them transparently on GitHub.

4.3 Variable request and standard output

For any simulation, models produce fields of climate- and weather-relevant information covering temporal scales from minutes to centuries. Not all information of conceivable interest can be archived due to resource constraints regarding post-processing
515 effort and available storage. Experiment planners must anticipate how essential each model-produced field will be for achieving its objectives and decide whether the fields should be reported at annual, monthly, daily, or sub-daily time-intervals. The challenge is to limit the "standard output" requested from a model experiment to the minimum required and then request, at a lower priority, other variables of interest that are not critical to achieving the primary objectives.

In the pre-MIP era (see Table 1), the FANGIO experiments were focused almost entirely on a single objective: to determine
520 whether clouds were responsible for the range of global climate sensitivities found in models. The narrow objective meant that the required output was limited to a few fields and, primarily, to their global means.

When AMIP was proposed, the potential scope of objectives expanded considerably, spanning both time-scales and spatial scales, driven by a growing contributor community. The most popular and readily analysed climate variables were monthly means. Still, even in the early days of AMIP1, scientists were interested in process-level analyses to understand model re-
525 sponses, which required daily or even higher temporal frequency fields.

In AMIP1, storage and resource limitations were a primary concern in defining the "standard output" list. The requested output was agreed upon following extended discussion and negotiation involving the WCRP WGNE, PCMDI, contributing modellers, and other keenly-engaged scientists. Enough temporal mean data was saved to serve the numerous subprojects that were subsequently established to systematically evaluate a diversity of model characteristics (Gates, 1995).

530 Seeing the interest in AMIP grow, modelling groups realized it would be beneficial to expand the set of model outputs requested to enable a broader range of analyses. Thus, in AMIP2, the standard output more than tripled (from 32 to 114; Table 1) and for the first time included 6-hourly data, which was particularly useful in studying weather phenomena. In addition, the monthly mean covariances needed to evaluate a model's Lorenz energy cycle were reported. These covariances enabled the intended analysis (Boer and Lambert, 2008), but modelling groups felt that given their limited use, the effort required in



535 computing them was unwarranted. Since AMIP2, covariances have not been part of the routine output request and have only been saved for targeted studies.

Compared with AMIP2, CMIP1's standard output list was modest, with just 23 variables requested (Table 1). The sole CMIP1 experiment was a control run focusing on mean climatology, and most variables requested were summer and winter mean fields. There were, however, three multi-year monthly mean surface fields requested: surface air temperature, precipita-
540 tion, and mean sea level pressure. As in AMIP, the scientists directly involved in organizing CMIP1, primarily the members of the SGGCM/WGCM (see subsection 2.2) and PCMDI, decided which variables would be archived. Also, as in AMIP, the initial standard output list would inevitably grow over subsequent phases as its scientific impact became apparent.

Although CMIP2 saw only a tiny increase in CMIP's scope, in CMIP3, the number of experiments and the standard output requested increased by more than a factor of five. CMIP3 output was expected to serve an increasingly wide diversity of
545 scientific analyses, and the historical and future scenario experiments would begin serving those studying climate impacts. For such purposes, the variables of most interest to those developing models were augmented with variables characterizing changes near the surface and climate "extreme indices" that might be used to assess impacts. Like the AMIP2 covariance statistics, the requested extreme indices proved challenging to compute and were eliminated from subsequent standard output lists. This set a good precedent for subsequent phases. Still, culling variables from the standard output based on usage statistics should perhaps
550 be pursued more vigorously in future phases even though data popularity is only one of several criteria that must be considered.

As in earlier phases, the CMIP Panel and PCMDI coordinated the effort to define the CMIP3 output, but input was sought from those with specialized scientific expertise in areas such as clouds (e.g., regarding model variables required for the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project [ISCCP] simulator needed by those involved in the Cloud Feedbacks Model Intercomparison Project [CFMIP]) or impacts (e.g., regarding extreme indices).

555 CMIP5 represented a second step change in the size and complexity of the standard output request. The number of experiments tripled to 37, and the number of different variables increased by a factor of 6 to 986 (Table 1). For the first time, CMIP attempted to coordinate the experiments designed by multiple, independently managed MIP communities (and all experiments were briefly described by the CMIP5 overview paper, Taylor et al., 2012b, also see Table A1). As in CMIP3, a common set of standards was imposed on model output. A single comprehensive list of variables was compiled and organized into 6 tables and 13 sub-tables (Table 1, Table B1; Taylor and CMIP Community, 2013).
560

For each MIP experiment defined, whole groups of variables were requested by specifying a subset of the defined tables; all the variables in a requested table were expected to be reported for specified portions of each simulation (most commonly the entire simulation). Each table contained variables that, with rare exceptions, were all produced by a single model component (e.g., atmosphere, ocean, sea ice, or land) and reported at a single frequency (e.g., 3-hourly, daily, monthly). CFMIP had an
565 interest in many specialized variables from a small subset of the MIP experiments, and five special tables were defined to meet CFMIP's unique needs (divided into ten sub-tables; Table B1). All CMIP5 variable tables were accessible as spreadsheets or as machine-readable text files. The mapping of experiments to the tables/variables that were requested could only be done by a person reading the spreadsheet, which poorly served automated data preparation job streams.



For CMIP6, fewer limits were imposed on what experiments and which variables requested would be accommodated. Models were also increasingly becoming more comprehensive, evolving, and improving with fewer physical parameterisations and incorporating atmospheric chemistry and biological components necessary to quantify carbon cycle changes. With more experiments and scientists with varied interests involved and using the downstream data, the requested output became transformed from being defined by a limited but dedicated group of experts guided by the CMIP Panel and PCMDI to one involving more extensive community consultation led by the UK Centre for Environmental Data Analysis (CEDA) and taking input from the contributing Endorsed MIP Co-chairs. The CMIP Panel and those preparing the standard output list sought engagement with those studying the impacts of climate change and planning adaptation strategies. That broad community was represented by a Vulnerability, Impacts, Adaptation and Climate Services Advisory Board (VIACS AB; Ruane et al., 2016), which requested that some 477 variables be saved from specific CMIP6 experiments. The standard output list and the mapping of subsets of that list to particular CMIP6 experiments became known as the "Data Request" (Juckes et al., 2020). The rapid and accelerating growth of MIPs (Table 2) and experiments defined across the phases doubled the total variables requested to 2062 (Table 1).

The ambitious CMIP6 data request was largely successful because the number of variables contributed by at least three modelling groups more than doubled from about 670 in CMIP5 to 1500. Still, it is disappointing that two or fewer groups provided some 562 CMIP6 requested variables, and no one provided 185. Although in CMIP5, there were also many under-reported variables, the fraction of these rose in CMIP6: variables reported by no model increased from 4% in CMIP5 to 9% in CMIP6, and the fraction reported by fewer than two groups increased from 22% to 27%. A partial explanation for this may be found in the tight timelines imposed on CMIP6 and the complexity of the task of the data request, which was coordinating requested contributions from models that themselves were becoming more comprehensive in replicating Earth processes. This meant that no single individual from a modelling centre or anyone of the experts coordinating CMIP infrastructure could provide a careful, comprehensive review of the data request. Consequently, several variables that were difficult to produce or thought by modelling groups to be of insufficient interest to warrant inclusion, cannot be found in the data archive. Given the CMIP5 and CMIP6 record of under-reported variables and given that the value of an intercomparison involving results from two or fewer modelling centres is limited, it is suggested that future data requests devote more effort determining which variables are likely to be under-reported so that those variables can be eliminated from the request. This would avoid the extra efforts undertaken by exceptional groups to honour the request. More generally, a clear communication of the importance of each variable and why it is being requested would, perhaps, animate modelling groups to contribute a larger fraction of the requested variables.

4.4 The Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF)

While addressing current climate science questions through coordinated experimentation has been CMIP's core focus, facilitating data access and use by a rapidly expanding international community has also been a central project priority. As data standards and controlled vocabularies were being defined and with standard output being requested, a system was developed to host, manage, and make available the data.



For AMIP1/2 and early CMIP phases, the requested standard output was shipped from modelling centres on hard drives or, in some cases, transmitted via FTP to PCMDI. To facilitate management and analysis, PCMDI developed data formats and software packages for storing and visualizing gridded climate data. Rather than attempt to read data stored in several different native formats and structures, the contributed data was rewritten into the PCMDI "standard" DRS (Data Retrieval and Storage; Drach and Mobley, 1995) format, a netCDF file format precursor, and these data were made available to AMIP subproject registrants through a PCMDI file transfer protocol (FTP) server (see Table 1; Gates, 1995).

By 2000, there was recognition in the US that connecting parallel climate science activities and the associated data archives across institutes could maximize investments across independently funded projects. Besides the PCMDI single-site archive of internationally-contributed AMIP and CMIP data, other institutes were beginning to share data proactively. Activities of this kind were underway at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR, US) with the Community Climate System Model (CCSM) and the Carbon-Land Model Intercomparison Project (C-LAMP) hosted at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL, US), and copies of data produced by several projects were hosted on the NERSC system at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL, US; 1996-). These groups began collaborating to develop a federated US infrastructure supporting data sharing and archival. This became known as the "Earth System Grid" (ESG I; Bernholdt et al., 2007) and was supported by DoE. It quickly gathered momentum with an extension of support from the DoE Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program in 2002 in a second phase (ESG II; Williams et al., 2009). By late 2004, ESG II began distributing the CMIP3 data in preparation for the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4). By the conclusion of CMIP3 in 2009, the 39 TB archive of model data (see Table 1) had accumulated an order of magnitude more downloads (470 TB; Ananthakrishnan et al., 2007; Williams et al., 2009). Throughout the project's lifetime, the hardware hosting the CMIP3 archive had occasional failures, and there was a recognition that the centralized dependence on a single operational system was unsustainable in the long term, particularly with the growing demand to access and download these data.

By 2006, planning for the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) was underway, and with it, CMIP5 (subsection 2.5). The previous ESG successes led to the development of the next-generation Earth System Grid Center for Enabling Technologies (ESG-CET), which involved an expanded collaboration of institutions including Argonne National Laboratory (ANL, US), Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL, US), National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory (NOAA-PMEL, US) and the University of Southern California Information Sciences Institute (US) (Ananthakrishnan et al., 2007), supported by the US DoE Offices of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) and Biological and Environmental Research (OBER).

By 2008, infrastructure planning for CMIP5 had commenced, and the need for a global data infrastructure was clear because PCMDI could not manage the volume of data and community of users, even with ESG-CET support. Recognition was building that there might be opportunities to connect the somewhat US-centric ESG-CET with complementary efforts elsewhere (e.g., Williams, 2011; Williams et al., 2009, 2011). An agreement was signed in December 2008 between PCMDI, the British Atmospheric Data Centre (BADC and, subsequently, CEDA, UK), and the World Data Centre for Climate, German Climate Computing Centre (WDCC DKRZ, Germany), committing to development and support of the international Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF), which would, as a primary responsibility, serve the needs of CMIP and related activities. The two European



centres were leads of the IPCC Data Distribution Centre (IPCC DDC; subsection 4.5), collating and archiving the climate model data to prepare previous IPCC Assessment Reports. The ESGF goal was to develop a distributed federated architecture with dedicated storage resources at each of the three centres to facilitate the publication of CMIP5 model data at the most convenient location. This data could then be replicated across the federation, allowing the users to download or access CMIP5 data from whatever ESGF node served them best (Williams et al., 2011). In addition to the three core centres, additional ESGF nodes were established at the National Computational Infrastructure (NCI, Australia), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Jet Propulsion Laboratory (NASA-JPL, US), NERSC (LBNL, US), ORNL, and NCAR. During peak interest in CMIP5, the ESGF had 30 active nodes publishing data from contributing modelling groups (see Table 1; Williams et al., 2016).

In 2013, as CMIP6 planning commenced, the international ESGF collaboration leaders became concerned that it would be difficult to meet the expectations placed on it to deliver a federated robust operational system for supporting an archive of CMIP data that would serve without interruption many hundreds of users and perhaps several thousands. To scope how the expectations might be met, the WIP prepared a series of white papers describing not only the requirements for ESGF but for the many related services (including documentation and citation) that would interact with it (Balaji et al., 2018). The challenge facing ESGF developers was that there were no expectations that funding to support an operational system would materialize. Despite this, the ESGF leadership together with the WIP formed a CMIP Data Node Operations Team (CDNOT), which would provide a means of testing the next generation ESGF software and facilitate communication between the software development team and those who were implementing the software at sites (nodes) around the world (Petrie et al., 2021).

In the first half of 2018, the CDNOT organized a series of five "data challenges", designed to ensure that all the ESGF sites participating in the distribution of CMIP6 data would be ready to accept CMIP6 data. As the data challenge activity advanced through its phases, an increasingly complex software ecosystem was tested, and the data volumes the system was required to handle expanded. Such a systematic approach to preparing the quasi-operational software support for CMIP was a major advance. It enabled ESGF to successfully test and install its software at sites maintained by those not directly involved in its development. This ensured a smoother provision of services once CMIP6 data became available for dissemination.

The fully federated ESGF system, now supported by several independently funded groups, has been successfully published and serves over 25 PB of CMIP6 data. Still, it was recognized that, on a tight timeline, ESGF would be expected to serve a CMIP7 phase that was already being planned. A major review of the software system was undertaken with a fundamental reassessment of its requirements, which would guide the development of a new overall system architecture (Kershaw et al., 2020). The redesign was initiated due to challenges around maintaining its existing software and the changing technological landscape. The plans arising from the review were a simplified deployment system, the adoption of broader community standards to facilitate integration with other systems, and the replacement of the data search service.

4.5 The IPCC Data Distribution Centre (IPCC DDC)

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Data Distribution Centre (IPCC DDC) was established in September 1997, at the Thirteenth session of the IPCC in the Maldives. The stated goal was to reduce the barriers to accessing and using CMIP



670 future scenario datasets, with a particular focus on serving the needs of the IPCC WG2. Since its initiation, this scope has expanded to provide a long-term, persistent archive of the datasets used by IPCC authors indefinitely, ensuring reproducibility.

Since its inception, the IPCC DDC has evolved with numerous contributing institutions and partnerships. In the initial phase, a partnership was arranged between the German Climate Computing Center (DKRZ) and the UK Climate Research Unit (CRU), with the Finish Meteorological Institute (FMI) to contribute guidance and training. The DKRZ took responsibility
675 for the CMIP model data, and began archiving the AMIP and CMIP model data used in the prior IPCC Assessment Report (SAR, 1995). This work continued in the early 2000s in preparation for the IPCC TAR, with atmospheric near-surface variables collected, aggregated, and disseminated through DKRZ infrastructure (Stockhouse and Lautenschlager, 2022).

The scope expanded during the IPCC TAR and following the AR4 period, with additional IPCC WG1 requests to augment the DKRZ archive to include most of the CMIP3 archive, including the new SRES future projection simulations that were made
680 available at the time (see subsection 2.3). The British Atmospheric Data Centre (BADC) took over the UK contribution formerly provided by CRU. In parallel, the remit of the IPCC DDC expanded to meet the augmented needs of the WG2 and WG3, with a requirement to collate the growing socio-economic data and scenarios that were being developed and underpinned the development of the SRES scenario suite for CMIP3 (Nakićenović et al., 2000). This led to the expansion of IPCC DDC partners, including the US Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), based at Columbia University.

685 Work continued over the AR5 cycle, with the far larger CMIP5 project design (see subsection 2.5) leading to two orders of magnitude growth in the DKRZ reference archive size, comprising 1.7 PB and 910000 datasets at completion, in contrast to 1500 datasets and 1 TB, and 400 datasets and 10 GB for AR4 and SAR/TAR respectively (Stockhouse and Lautenschlager, 2022). During this phase, an augmentation of the data quality control procedures was implemented, and Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) were assigned, making these data citable (Stockhouse et al., 2012).

690 For the AR6 cycle, a considerable augmentation occurred. With the recent development of the Findability, Accessibility, Interoperability, and Reusability guidelines (FAIR; Wilkinson et al., 2016), the additional aim of enhancing the transparency of the AR6 report, especially the traceability of the figures, was added and implemented (Stockhouse et al., 2019). Building on the CMIP5 success, DOIs were issued for CMIP6 datasets upon publication to the ESGF (see subsection 4.8). This citation information was embedded alongside the data, made available in the ESGF search results, and used for the CMIP6 data subset
695 preserved in the DDC long-term archive (Stockhouse and Lautenschlager, 2017).

The CMIP6 data augmentation is also linked with improved transparency across observational data products used to produce analyses and figures in the AR6 report.

4.6 Infrastructure for the European Network for Earth System Modelling (IS-ENES)

In parallel to the building coordination across institutions and agencies in the US (see subsection 4.4), a similar coordinated
700 approach was being developed in Europe across CMIP contributing institutions and agencies. The InfraStructure for the European Network for Earth System modelling (IS-ENES) consortium was officially established in March 2009 supported by the European Commission Capacities Programme.



Over three phases of the project, extending from 2009 through 2023, the project coordinated the activities of 30 contributing institutions across 15 countries. Many of these projects led or collaborated on the activities summarised in the preceding and following sections (e.g., subsection 4.1 through subsection 4.3, subsection 4.7 through subsection 4.10, and subsection 5.3).

IS-ENES aimed to coordinate European activities across climate modelling, computer science, data management, climate impacts, and climate services and was responsible for much of the coordinated infrastructure work that led to the delivery of the European contribution to the CMIP5 and CMIP6 phases. It led to the development of common models and tools and the efficient use of High-Performance Computing across contributing infrastructure. The project also paved the way for exploiting model data by the Earth system science community, the climate change impact community, and the climate service community, with much of this work continuing through original member institutions today.

4.7 Model (and data) documentation

Before model intercomparisons were firmly established community exercises, high-level model documentation was intermittently provided in peer-reviewed publications, with more detailed institutional gray literature reports commonplace. Early in AMIP, it was recognized that improved documentation could help analysts better interpret their results. A first attempt to coordinate model documentation was made available for the AMIP1 simulations on the PCMDI website (Phillips, 1996).

During the planning for CMIP5, the WGCM endorsed an attempt to formally collect model documentation under the auspices of the European “Metafor” project, initiated in 2008 (Guilyardi et al., 2011; Lawrence et al., 2012). Building on work for the US “Curator” project, which began in 2005 (Dunlap et al., 2008), a complex metadata system was designed and built to capture provenance activities in the entire process, from experiment design through model description and execution to data delivery.

The system provided was delivered late and was complex to use, so the system maintainers entered much of the information after CMIP5 rather than the modelling groups during the project. The resulting model descriptions were used for the IPCC AR5 model evaluation chapter (Flato et al., 2013). Many technical lessons were learned during this period, and a new system was designed and built for CMIP6. Unfortunately, it was also delivered late, although the construction of experiment documentation proved helpful (Pascoe et al., 2020).

Without comprehensive model documentation, important initiatives to understand the impact of model structure on simulated climate variability and change have had to rely on a painstaking and incomplete analysis of the available public information (e.g. Boé, 2018) or post-hoc analysis of results (e.g., Masson and Knutti, 2011; Knutti et al., 2013). The need for an improved and simpler system, delivered early so that documentation can be populated during the data publication process to ESGF, is clear.

4.8 Data citation

With exponential growth in the climate community using data, the archive of CMIP model output over phases, and the expanding list of CMIP MIPs and their experiments (see Table 1, Table 2), the need to more explicitly assign credit to modelling groups, in addition to uniquely identifying model data used for downstream analyses, tracking errata, and enabling reproducible



science, was needed. Indeed, this was the main request of the modelling groups after CMIP5 (Williams and Lautenschlager, 2016).

For CMIP5, the three primary ESGF nodes at PCMDI (US), DKRZ (Germany), and CEDA (UK), shared the hosting role for the CMIP5 archive - distributed across nodes and not complete at any one centre (subsection 4.4). Data federation led to a more complex task of uniquely identifying datasets and their downstream downloads and broader use. To solve this problem, DKRZ led an effort to both quality control and assign Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) to CMIP5 datasets (subsection 4.5; Stockhouse et al., 2012), delivered alongside the long-term archival as part of the IPCC Data Distribution Centre (IPCC DDC, subsection 4.5; Stockhouse and Lautenschlager, 2022). However, these DOIs were maintained in the IPCC DDC long-term archive managed by the DKRZ, and were not made available alongside the data that was hosted and made available for download on the ESGF.

Following CMIP5, for CMIP6, a more ambitious plan was established to meet the needs of IPCC DDC archived data and the evolving data real-time (Stockhouse and Lautenschlager, 2017). Considering the CMIP project evolution across phases and the federated design that underpinned CMIP6 (see section 3; Eyring et al., 2016a), data citation needed to account for model configurations that were targeted across the 22 MIPs that published data to the project (Table 2). The DKRZ, began a process to identify and generate CMIP6 DOIs that provided two levels of citation support, leveraging the CMIP6 Controlled Vocabularies (see subsection 4.2; Durack et al., 2024). One targeted the upper level, a single model (`source_id`) for a unique MIP (`activity_id`) configuration published in the ESGF CMIP6 archive, and another at the lower experiment (`experiment_id`) level, allowing users to attribute the dataset used more tightly - identifying a unique dataset matching a model, MIP and experiment.

To date, 2,727 CMIP6 DOIs have been generated, with the first issued in June 2018 to the first CMIP6 dataset published in May 2018 (see Figure 2). In addition, DKRZ also provided DOI support for the input4MIPs project, minting 210 DOIs for the forcing datasets being used by modelling groups to meet CMIP6 experimental protocols (see subsection 5.1). Currently, more than 6700 recorded citations have been made against these ESGF datasets, approximately the same counts recorded against the CMIP6 overview paper (see section 6; Eyring et al., 2016a).

4.9 Data replication

Since the establishment of the federated ESGF system for CMIP5, users have been able to access data through multiple ways. Either through direct downloads using the web-based search interface, or through command-line tools using standard HTTP or, more recently, using the Globus GridFTP protocol, enabling high-throughput transmission of large data volumes - precisely what is needed considering the petabyte scale of recent projects (Table 1).

As the data archives and their construction became more clearly defined through the modern phases (see subsection 4.1 through subsection 4.4), the need for more systematic and reusable tools was required, making data easy to download, and replicate across primary ESGF nodes facilitating the federated CMIP5 and CMIP6 archives.

To serve these needs, the "synchronize data" (or, more familiarly, "Synda") software, developed by the Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL) in 2011, was created to facilitate large-scale ESGF data downloads (Denvil et al., 2020). This tool aimed to solve an ESGF evolving software usability problem, which made data discovery and download challenging. Synda,



770 enabled IPSL to create a mirror of the CMIP5 data serving numerous IPCC authors within Europe who had access to the
IPSL systems. When the ESGF software began production in late 2011, with a new SOLR-based index and the esg-search API
(<https://esgf.github.io/esg-search>), synchro-data was updated, becoming Synda by mid-2012.

Challenges accessing CMIP-scale data are rooted in the limitations of traditional download methods, such as manual down-
loads, point-and-click interfaces, or interactive "wget" scripts. Throughout CMIP5, Synda continuously evolved to address effi-
775 cient large-scale downloads and meet the demands of high-volume scientific workflows. A key Synda innovation was tracking
download histories and only downloading new files matching a predefined query. This allowed the primary ESGF replication
nodes, and many institutional infrastructures to replicate CMIP data subsets efficiently. With the addition of GridFTP protocol
support, Synda became the official software used by the ESGF Tier 1 nodes, enabling cross-continental CMIP replication and
improving archive accessibility.

780 By 2023, much of Synda's code had become obsolete and needed deep refactoring. The IPSL released the "esgpull" suc-
cessor in early 2024 (Rodriguez et al., 2024). "esgpull" offers similar functionality with lower latency based on asynchronous
technologies and streamlined implementation. It facilitates data managers seeking to replicate data across ESGF nodes and reg-
ular users searching and downloading specific datasets. "esgpull" was also integrated into the data synchronisation workflow
between ESGF and the subset of climate projections provided to Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S).

785 **4.10 Data downloads**

As the infrastructure collating and serving the building multi-model archives became better coordinated, questions began to
be raised, how much data was there, how was it distributed across contributing experiments, and by download requests, what
were users targeting for download. For CMIP3, this was simple, as a single location and ESG II system hosted the complete
archive (see subsection 4.4), statistics were readily available for both the total project data volume (see Table 1) and for total
790 downloads (see Figure 5), which by the end of the project in 2009 (first data publication occurred in late 2004, Table 1) were
well more than an order of magnitude larger than 39 TB total project footprint (470 TB; Ananthakrishnan et al., 2007; Williams
et al., 2009).

As the ESGF federated design was realised, in preparation for CMIP5 (see subsection 4.4), the added complexity - no one
ESGF node would initially host the data, and users downloading data could download from any node, not just a single one -
795 brought a new challenge for CMIP infrastructure, how best to quantify project size by modelling group contributions, and the
user demands. This new challenge was a focus of discussions at the just commenced annual ESGF international Face-to-Face
meetings, and by late 2011, the need for a dashboard documenting the number of published data, downloads and user metrics
identified as a high priority improvement for the coming months (Williams, 2011).

With the support of IS-ENES (see subsection 4.6) in collaboration with DoE, ESGF contributors from the Italian CMCC
800 Foundation (Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change) developed a metrics and dashboard capability. By 2015, the
first version of the ESGF dashboard was live, providing project statistics for CMIP5, in addition to the smaller supporting
projects obs4MIPs (see subsection 5.2) and CORDEX-CMIP5 (Williams and Lautenschlager, 2016). This service captures a
comprehensive set of data usage and archive metrics for a single ESGF node, and at the cumulative federation level. The data



usage information provides the number of successful downloads and distinct downloaded files, with a granularity that enables
805 an interrogation of these metrics by project, variable, institution, model, and experiment. In addition, data archive information
is available per project, quantifying the total number of published datasets, data volume, and granular information related to
the CMIP project's contributing models and institutions.

Today, the CMCC ESGF Dashboard continues to provide metrics across the ESGF projects: CMIP6, CMIP5, CORDEX-
CMIP5, input4MIPs (see subsection 5.1) and obs4MIPs (Fiore et al., 2019). The service collates project data and downloads
810 statistics from a subset of the total contributing nodes across projects (see Table 1). For the CMIP5 project, 7 ESGF nodes
are currently reporting data and download statistics, and for CMIP6, 9 nodes are reporting, with temporal coverage from 2018
through to the present. This is a subset of the total 30 nodes currently (CMIP6) or were (CMIP5) publishing data to the archive.

The CMCC-provided dashboard statistics (2018-), in addition to archived ESG II statistics from the single LLNL/PCMDI
CMIP3 project portal (2004-2009), have been used in the preparation of Figure 5.

815 **4.11 MIP errata**

The growing coherence across successive CMIP archives allowed for more complete data tracking and the development of an
errata list documenting user-reported problems. For CMIP3 and CMIP5, user reports via email were captured by PCMDI, and
the tabulated information was hosted on an external-facing website and reported to the relevant modelling centre. The slow
process yielded a collated error list representing issues across the archive, which led to several data revisions (see Table C1).
820 For CMIP3, user-reported errors led to the retraction of all simulations from a single modelling centre, as a significant bug was
found in the model formulation, rendering its output obsolete.

Simultaneously, many modelling centres maintained their inventories of problems affecting their outputs, ranging from
minor issues to critical errors that could compromise data usability. However, these inventories were not always public, and
when they were, they were often not easily accessible and regrettably not co-located with the user-reported issues.

825 Building on its experience in organising and tracking issues with its datasets, the Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL)
decided after CMIP5 to develop an errata database, providing a standardised interface to document both user-reported and
modelling centre-reported issues. In late 2013, a proof-of-concept was developed and proposed to the ESGF community. To
enhance documentation, the initial version of an operational errata system was implemented within the ES-DOC (Earth System
Documentation; see subsection 4.7) ecosystem in 2015 (Pascoe et al., 2020).

830 This service was significantly enhanced for CMIP6, leveraging the Controlled Vocabularies (see subsection 4.2; Durack
et al., 2024). In June 2018, a new version hosted at IPSL was launched, designed to be project-agnostic and support CMIP6,
CMIP5, CORDEX-CMIP5, and input4MIPs data from the outset. The service introduced a centralized hub for documenting
issues, with a standardised issue creation form to ensure consistently harmonised reporting across modelling centres. This
standardisation, combined with automated data checks and integration with third-party tools such as quality assurance systems
835 and persistent identifier frameworks, made the service highly interoperable and adaptable to various workflows. In addition,
the system also allowed for the issue severity to be identified, partitioning minor metadata issues from more severe problems
that could impact a downstream analysis. For CMIP6, more than 460 issues have been identified to date, with more than half



of these resolved by the responsible modelling group by providing additional metadata or rectifying and recreating the errored dataset.

840 While the service gained traction, its adoption was somewhat limited compared to the scale of CMIP6 datasets, particularly concerning the number of retracted versions (less than a quarter of the modelling groups taking part in CMIP6 used the errata). This outcome reflects the voluntary nature of errata documentation and the time constraints faced by those responsible for its implementation (typically data managers within modelling centres).

Further developments led to the release of version 2.0 in July 2023. This version introduced the ability for all users to
845 contribute errata entries for issues identified in the CMIP and CORDEX data catalogues, with submissions moderated by the corresponding data providers/modelling group representatives. By incorporating crowdsourcing, this approach aims to enhance coverage across the data pool while ensuring documentation quality through moderation.

5 CMIP6 supporting projects

In addition to the core infrastructure that has delivered past CMIP phases, several uniquely identifiable supporting projects
850 have developed over the past decades. Below is a brief overview of a number of the more clearly defined activities that have served CMIP6 or preceding MIP phases.

5.1 input4MIPs: climate forcing for MIP experiments

As the scientific scope and experiment count broadened through MIP phases (Figure 1, Table 1), the need for climate "forcing" datasets to guide simulation evolution continued to increase. For the initial AMIP1 experiment (1979-1988; AGCM), green-
855 house gas concentration and solar irradiance were preset as fixed fields (CO_2 345 ppm, and 1365 Wm^{-2} respectively), with time-varying sea surface temperature (SST) and sea ice boundary conditions imposed. As model and experiment complexity increased, more and more complex suites of forcing agents needed to be collated for modelling centre use.

AMIP2 incorporated additional greenhouse gases, ozone, aerosols, and more complex interactive land components (e.g., Gleckler, 1996; Liang et al., 1997). In CMIP1 and CMIP2/CMIP2+, an interactive ocean and sea-ice removed the need for SST
860 and sea-ice boundary forcing, extending the experiment end date to 2001 (see Table 1).

With the definition of the CMIP3 20C3M/historical experiment (~ 1850 -2000; Meehl et al., 2007a), considerable augmentation occurred, with the first historical period datasets hosted by PCMDI alongside existing early AMIP/CMIP data. These data mainly addressed the SRES future scenarios (2001-2100/2200/2300; Nakićenović et al., 2000), but did include a small number of historical period forcings including those that had already been collated for the AMIP2 experiment period (1979-2001;
865 Table 1). Additional forcing needs were met independently by each contributing modelling group and model configuration.

For CMIP5, increased model complexity (many models included atmospheric chemistry by this stage) necessitated a far more comprehensive approach to meet the historical experiment forcing needs (1850-2005; Taylor et al., 2012b), and to share the workload, considerable coordination across modelling groups occurred. For anthropogenic emissions of short-lived climate forcers (SLCFs 1850-2000; e.g., CO, NO_x, etc), dataset creation was led by NCAR, with contributions from a broad community



870 including observationalists and climate modellers (Lamarque et al., 2010). This effort was also extended to cover nitrogen and sulfur deposition over the historical and future period (e.g., Lamarque et al., 2013). A similar community effort was taken with tropospheric and stratospheric ozone, led by the German Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt, Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre (DLR; Cionni et al., 2011). Well-mixed greenhouse gas concentrations (WMGHGs; 1765-2300) were also community-developed, however, this dataset development was dovetailed with the generation of the RCP future scenario data
875 extending out to 2300 and consequently also entrained and even broader Integrated Assessment Modelling (IAM) community tasked with scenario development (Meinshausen et al., 2011). The concentrations and the anthropogenic emission datasets were developed to span both the historical and future projection periods, which for the first time necessitated harmonizing these quantities across the historical-RCP 2005-2006 transition. Additional dataset development contributed to the project fell back to an existing community of researchers involved in forcing production for early phases.

880 However, during CMIP5, there was limited standardisation of forcing datasets, particularly those used in the historical and piControl experiments, which differed markedly across modelling groups due to the lack of a centralised and coordinated approach. As an example of forcing differences across the historical simulations, the NOAA-GFDL GFDL-CM3 (Donner et al., 2011) used solar variability (Fröhlich and Lean, 2004), volcanic stratospheric aerosol emissions (Stenchikov et al., 2006) and land-use changes (Hurtt et al., 2006). Whereas NASA-GISS GISS-E2 (Miller et al., 2014) used solar variability (Wang
885 et al., 2005), with spectral variations (Lean et al., 2003, updated 2009), volcanic stratospheric aerosol emissions (Sato et al., 1993, updated), and land-use changes (1850-1900; Pongratz et al., 2008) and HYDE3.0 (e.g., Klein Goldewijk et al., 2011) thereafter.

For CMIP6, it was recognised that forcing dataset coordination was needed. The input datasets for model intercomparison projects (input4MIPs) ESGF project was established in 2016, and the collation of forcing data required for the CMIP6 DECK
890 experiments commenced. In addition, the collation of additional data supporting 14 other Community MIPs was also published and made available to participating groups (Durack et al., 2018). The input4MIPs project collated next-generation forcing datasets extending from 1850 to 2014 for SLCFs (Hoesly et al., 2018; Feng et al., 2020), biomass burning (e.g., fire; van Marle et al., 2017), land use changes (Hurtt et al., 2020), WMGHGs (Meinshausen et al., 2017), volcanic stratospheric aerosol optical depth (e.g., Thomason et al., 2018), ozone (Checa-Garcia et al., 2018), nitrogen deposition (Hegglin et al., 2016), solar
895 irradiance (Matthes et al., 2017), SSTs and sea ice boundary conditions (Durack and Taylor, 2018) and anthropogenic aerosol optical properties (e.g., Fiedler et al., 2019).

5.2 obs4MIPs: observations for model evaluation

The fundamental role of large-scale, gridded observational products for climate model evaluation was recognized before the advent of organized MIPs. It became a crucial part of the AMIP1 (Gates, 1992a) and AMIP2 (Gleckler, 1996) phases, with a
900 heavy independence on the ECMWF and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis products at that time.

Modelling groups and analysts continue collecting observational data for their specific needs, typically ad-hoc, with limited coordination.



The observations for Model Intercomparison Projects (obs4MIPs) activity was established to facilitate model evaluation via the technical alignment of gridded observational products with CMIP standards (see subsection 4.1 and subsection 4.2). It is accomplished by metadata/data integration across projects, facilitating side-by-side data delivery through ESGF (subsection 4.4). The project originated from a PCMDI and NASA collaboration (Gleckler et al., 2011) and was later internationalized by the WCRP Data Advisory Council (WDAC; Teixeira et al., 2014). An international workshop helped identify critical pathways to improve the effort in preparation for CMIP6 (Ferraro et al., 2015). Many of these recommendations remain relevant and are being addressed today, for example, with the inclusion of higher frequency, process-relevant gridded data and in-situ station measurements, and a detailed obs4MIPs progress update during CMIP6 was published (Waliser et al., 2020).

During the late stages of CMIP6, obs4MIPs was revitalized (<https://pcmdi.github.io/obs4MIPs>), with efforts striving to ensure that obs4MIPs can accelerate model evaluation, research, and development in future phases of CMIP and related modelling activities.

5.3 Coordinated climate model evaluation

AMIP made model output available to analysts with diverse expertise, allowing for more varied and in-depth model evaluation. It established a benchmark against which new and possibly improved models could be evaluated, emphasizing the simulated mean climate and variability assessment on large to global scales. A primary goal was to systematically document errors across a suite of similar models, which had never been done before, and to advance and improve the simulation of physical processes and phenomena (Gates, 1992b). Recognizing the value of a community-based approach to routine model evaluation, the WGNE created the Standard Diagnostics of the Mean Climate, to be used in AMIP/CMIP, and in parallel, the Standard Diagnostics of Variability in use by numerical weather prediction (e.g., WMO World Climate Research Programme, 2003, p. 10). The community definition of model evaluation diagnostics, naturally led to an augmentation of the standard output requested to meet these analysis needs (see subsection 4.3).

By 1994, this philosophy was the explicit science driver behind CMIP1, "intercomparison makes for a better climate model" (Meehl et al., 1997). Since the early days, much progress has been made, with "systematic community evaluation" achieved across every MIP phase since FANGIO. The most prominent examples are the dedicated climate model evaluation chapters that have featured in every IPCC Assessment Report since the FAR in 1990, targeting evaluation of the model generation of the corresponding MIP phase (e.g., Gates et al., 1990, 1996; McAvaney et al., 2001; Randall et al., 2007; Flato et al., 2013; Eyring et al., 2021a). As model and evaluation complexity increased, so has the chapter content, expanding from 39 to 130 pages FAR to AR6 (Gates et al., 1990; Eyring et al., 2021a), or including the AR6 model annex (Gutierrez et al., 2021) and supplementary (Eyring et al., 2021b), 359 pages (noting AR6 Chapter 3 also covered climate change detection and attribution, which in previous reports had a dedicated chapter).

The development of internationally coordinated MIP activities naturally nurtured collaborative community evaluation by the active participants, a feature of many activities running parallel to CMIP (e.g., C4MIP, CFMIP, PMIP, etc; Carbon-Land Model Intercomparison Project (C-LAMP): Hoffman et al., 2007; Ocean Carbon-Cycle Model Intercomparison Project (OCMIP): Orr, 1999; Dutay et al., 2002, 2004).



Outside the IPCC model evaluation chapters, the concept of coordinated evaluation by MIP non-participants was uncommon. With the open access and enhanced standardisation of CMIP3 (see subsection 2.3, section 4), in addition to the availability of model simulations that were directly comparable to the coincident observational record, this led to more routine and comprehensive evaluation being undertaken. The project advancement nurtured a more diverse and extensive data user group engagement, leading to several seminal contributions that previously would not have been possible (e.g., Eyring et al., 2006; Gleckler et al., 2008; Waugh and Eyring, 2008) and which were heavily cited in the subsequent IPCC AR5 model evaluation chapter (Flato et al., 2013).

Through CMIP5, this progress continued, with the aspiration of climate model systematic evaluation leading to the development of several dedicated analysis packages targeting the CMIP DECK (Eyring et al., 2016b). The ESMValTool (Earth System Model Evaluation Tool; Eyring et al., 2016c; Righi et al., 2020; Eyring et al., 2020) is a coordinated effort that supports the analysis and evaluation of Earth system models by collating a wide array of observational datasets and defining diagnostics that allows for the direct comparison of model simulation output with observations. This effort grew out of the precursor CCMVal-Diags (Chemistry-Climate Model Validation Diagnostic tool; Gettelman et al., 2012), which had channelled earlier work (Eyring et al., 2006; Waugh and Eyring, 2008) into reproducible analysis. The PCMDI Metrics Package (PMP) is another key tool, which built on the pioneering work from CMIP3 (Gleckler et al., 2008), providing a standardized climate model evaluation framework, comparing their outputs with observations curated by the obs4MIPs project (subsection 5.2) across a range of space- and time-scales and variables focused on physical climate mean states and their modes of variability (Gleckler et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2024). The ILAMB (International Land Model Benchmarking) package grew out of the earlier C-LAMP activity (Hoffman et al., 2007) and is focused on assessing the land surface sub-models, offering comprehensive diagnostics and benchmarking to evaluate land-atmosphere interactions (Collier et al., 2018). Additional packages that also facilitate and leverage community engagement include the climate process-oriented NOAA Model Diagnostic Task Force (NOAA-MDTF; Neelin et al., 2023), and NCARs Climate Variability Diagnostics Package (CVDP; Phillips et al., 2014), amongst numerous others.

These and other community-developed tools (e.g., Hoffman et al., 2025) will play increasingly pivotal roles in ensuring climate models are useful tools for climate change prediction and continue to improve through rigorous and systematic community evaluation. It is likely, as the use of CMIP output continues to expand into climate change impacts and adaptation planning, that these tools will be more and more heavily utilized to evaluate simulation data fitness-for-purpose and potentially lead to more advanced methods for model selection and weighting (Eyring et al., 2019).

6 CMIP impact

By establishing benchmark experiments along with innovative targeted experimentation, and by facilitating access to the results, CMIP and the other MIPs relying on its infrastructure have fundamentally changed the expectations and research practices in climate modelling. It has become common practice to assess areas where models should not be trusted by considering where




Figure 3. Web of Science (WoS) citations for key overview papers of each MIP phase, from FANGIO (Cess et al., 1990) through CMIP6 (Eyring et al., 2016a), plotted relative to their year of publication (WoS records queried 9 December 2024). For CMIP6, citations are plotted for the project overview paper (Eyring et al., 2016a), for the cumulative total across each of the satellite Community MIPs that comprise the phase (see Table 2), and for the composite sum of these two sources. Citation counts are an imperfect way to capture MIP impact but reflect a large and strongly growing user community using MIP data across numerous phases.




Figure 4. Web of Science (WoS) citations for the 23 endorsed MIP overview papers contributing to CMIP6 (see Table 2) from their publication to today (WoS records queried 9 December 2024). Black text numbers on each coloured bar denote citation counts. Citation counts are an imperfect way to capture MIP impact, however, reflect the large interest in the ScenarioMIP future climate change projections (O’Neill et al., 2016) and the HighResMIP high-resolution simulations (Haarsma et al., 2016).

their results diverge. Although agreement among models does not imply their results are correct, the multi-model perspective generally enables a richer interpretation than the results from a single model.

During its four decades of operation, the infrastructure supporting MIPs has been essential in building a large and expanding collaborative community (e.g., Figure 1, Table A1). However, this breadth and expansion make it challenging to gauge CMIP’s impact quantitatively, identify the breadth and diversity of downstream users, and apportion recognition to its contributors and participants. The move to an open data paradigm in CMIP3 (and to open data licenses, Table 1) has complicated the interpretation of data downloads as a measure of interest and impact of the project. This problem is compounded by the creation of secondary data repositories where users can download/access data, outside of ESGF’s licensing, access control, and monitoring (e.g., Balaji et al., 2018). In addition, compute services co-located with the primary ESGF replication nodes (e.g., PCMDI, DKRZ, and CEDA), other regional nodes (e.g., NCAR, NCI) and the replication of datasets into the commercial cloud (e.g., PANGEO; Abernathey, 2020), which serve an even larger and more diverse online community, further complicate the assessment of impact based on available data downloads and use statistics (as no downloads are logged for repeat uses of in-place data).

CMIP data are now routinely used outside the physical climate science community and, more broadly, outside the academic community. This is a dramatic shift from the early days of FANGIO/AMIP, which began the climate model intercomparison activities and involved the modelling group participants alone. Consequently, academic literature citations are an imperfect metric for quantifying impact. However, since a representative "overview" paper exists for each phase, it is useful to use the citations of these papers to evaluate the relative impact of each MIP phase (see Figure 3). Similarly to the marked project growth as captured in Figure 1, the project impact, measured through academic citation, has grown dramatically (Figure 3).



To place in context the citations plotted in Figure 3, the seminal work of the Charney report (Charney et al., 1979) has been included. This report relied on idealised climate change predictions from three climate models (two US, NOAA-GFDL, and NASA-GISS, and one UK, MetOffice). It is the beginning of many of the targeted US climate change research efforts (see section 2). The Charney report was published by the US National Academy of Sciences, and consequently, time-evolving Web of Science citation counts are not available; instead, only a single cumulative citation count from Google Scholar (GS) of 889 is available (see Figure 3).

As evident in the figure, starting with CMIP3 (Meehl et al., 2007b) and its open and standardised data approach, CMIP saw far greater interest than the preceding AMIP1/2 and CMIP1/2/2+ phases, with a total of more than 2200 Web of Science (WoS) citations and more than 3400 GS citations to date. Building on CMIP3 momentum, CMIP5 saw an even more dramatic step change in interest. To date, CMIP5 (Taylor et al., 2012b) has received more than 11000 WoS and more than 15000 GS citations.

For the most recent phase, CMIP6, the momentum continues to build with more than 6000 WoS and 8000 GS citations (Eyring et al., 2016a). If we augment these counts to include the 26 articles that define each CMIP6 Community MIP (see Table 2), WoS already exceeds 13000 (CMIP6 Composite 2015-, Figure 3).

The CMIP5 (Taylor et al., 2012b) and CMIP6 (Eyring et al., 2016a) papers are both identified as WoS "highly cited papers," ranking them in the top 1% of Geosciences publications.

Citations of CMIP6-endorsed MIP experiment design papers can be used to gauge interest in individual MIP activities and their experiments (Figure 4). These results show very strong interest in two primary activities: the future-focused ScenarioMIP (O'Neill et al., 2016) and the high-resolution-focused HighResMIP (Haarsma et al., 2016), which received more than 2400 and 700 WoS citations, respectively. Before CMIP6, MIP experiment design papers often appeared in the gray literature, so a systematic analysis of citations over time is impossible. However, it can be claimed that the seminal science enabled by MIP results grew as momentum was built behind the MIP paradigm.

An alternative, although similarly imperfect, impact metric is based on data download statistics. Like citation counts, these provide relevant measures of user interest across CMIP phases, across contributing or endorsed participating MIPs, and across their respective experiments. An advantage of download assessment is that it should capture interest outside the academic community, which may be less inclined to record its use of data through peer-reviewed publications. Before CMIP3, however, no data download records are available, which limits a comprehensive assessment. An additional complexity is that direct comparison across phases is impossible due to the marked increase in activities and experiments over time (see Table 1, Table A1).

Like the literature citations, a clear picture emerges when the download data is assessed comparably across phases (Figure 5). These show an evident repeating dominance of three key experiments, the CMIP/DECK 20C3M/historical (dark orange) and piControl (light orange), and all flavours of the ScenarioMIP experiments (which have been cumulatively pooled, red; CMIP3: 3 SRES; CMIP5: 4 RCPs; and CMIP6: 8 SSPs) dominating downloads. For each of the successive phases, 6 of 12 CMIP3 experiments account for 94.3% of downloads (top), 10 of 37 CMIP5 experiments account for 90.3% (middle), and 16 of 322 CMIP6 experiments account for 90.7% of downloads (bottom). Considering only the top three experiments across phases




Figure 5. Downloads across the three most recent phases of CMIP, for which records are available, presented as a percentage total. Each horizontal stacked plot represents total download counts as percentages from 2018 to 28 November 2024 for CMIP5 and CMIP6, and 2004-2008 for CMIP3. For display, all ScenarioMIP experiments (CMIP3: SRES; CMIP5: RCP; CMIP6: SSP) are presented as cumulative totals across all contributing experiments, with other results displaying single experiment downloads. Top, the CMIP3 (Meehl et al., 2007a) downloads across the top 6 experiments (3x ScenarioMIP) of 12 experiments total (see Table A1), representing 94.3%. Middle, the CMIP5 downloads across 10 experiments (4x ScenarioMIP), representing 90.0%, of 37 experiments that defined the phase (representing 8 MIPs identified in Table A1; Taylor et al., 2012b). Bottom, the CMIP6 downloads across 17 experiments (11x ScenarioMIP), representing 90.4% representing 20 MIPs that published data to ESGF (see Table 2). For CMIP6, almost 45% of downloads were accounted for by the 12 core CMIP/DECK simulations (Eyring et al., 2016a), with 38% accounted for in the 11 ScenarioMIP future projection experiments (O’Neill et al., 2016). This pattern of data download priority is mirrored across the prior phases, CMIP5 (CMIP 61%, ScenarioMIP 25%) and a more dominant 20C3M/picntrl demand in CMIP3 (CMIP 64%, 35% ScenarioMIP).

(with the downloads of all ScenarioMIP experiments pooled), these account for 89%, 80%, and 76% of the total downloads for CMIP3, CMIP5, and CMIP6, respectively. A similar assessment can be made when considering the same download records grouped across activities, with CMIP/DECK and ScenarioMIP again dominating totals (Figure A1).

In an attempt to document the broader climate science impact, chronologically aligned with the MIP phases, Figure 6 displays an approximate time-history of MIP activities and other milestones noted in earlier sections, along with the IPCC assessment attribution statements and international agreements that were made. For each IPCC assessment, the calibrated language likelihood scale (e.g., Mastrandrea et al., 2010) assessment of human influence on climate is noted, beginning with "humankind is *capable* of raising the global-average annual-mean surface-air temperature" in FAR (IPCC, 1990) through to the definitive "It is *unequivocal* that human influence has warmed the atmosphere, ocean and land" in AR6 (IPCC, 2021).

There is sometimes confusion regarding the relationship between CMIP and the IPCC assessments, with some thinking that CMIP and IPCC are interchangeable or that CMIP is somehow "run" by the IPCC. This is, of course, not the case. CMIP (and AMIP before it) was formulated as a scientific research activity whereby the modelling groups performing present-day and future climate simulations could intercompare their results to advance understanding of the climate system and publish their findings in peer-reviewed scientific papers. The IPCC assessments depended directly on the papers emerging from the




Figure 6. A time history of MIPs and their broader impact, with particular relevance to the IPCC Assessment Report phases and statements of human influence on the climate (in parentheses, FAR through AR6; see subsection 2.1 through section 3).

CMIP phases to formulate periodic updates of the current understanding of climate variability and change. However, as the IPCC assessments grew in importance, the modelling groups participating in CMIP were aware of the IPCC process, which motivated, in part, their participation in CMIP and determined the timelines established for each of the latter CMIP phases (CMIP5, CMIP6). Thus, a symbiotic relationship developed between CMIP and the IPCC assessments (Meehl, 2023). However, without CMIP, the IPCC assessments could not have been possible. Without the coordinated community climate science efforts embodied by the AMIP and CMIP phases, progress in Earth’s climate understanding would not have advanced to our present state of knowledge.

7 CMIP phase 6 completion

The CMIP6 project is now mostly complete, with nearly all CMIP modelling groups prioritizing ongoing model development over running CMIP6 simulations. Consequently, the growth of the ESGF CMIP6 archive has markedly slowed (see Figure 2).

CMIP has realized the potential of open-access data, enabling science discovery and reproducibility. It has become a de facto standard and an umbrella project for the distributed special-interest Community MIPs to organize their science and cross-institutional collaborations. More generally, the CMIP-supporting infrastructure is increasingly being relied upon to facilitate and enable coordinated climate science. Any CMIP-contributing modelling group can design an experimental protocol to address some scientific question and, through existing relationships and connections, engage like-minded researchers in collaborating modelling centres to tackle the problem using a multi-model framework (e.g. Jones et al., 2024).



After nearly all CMIP6 simulation results had been published and the IPCC AR6 had been published, the WGCM and the CMIP and WIP Panels undertook a CMIP6 survey to assess project success and gather community feedback (O'Rourke, 2024). For the CMIP-supporting infrastructure, this survey identified some clear priorities, acknowledging CMIP6 progress, but calling for further improvements. In particular, it called for the "CMIP framework", including all supporting infrastructure (see section 4, and section 5) to be maintained and made available in an ongoing capacity, so that this building infrastructure could continue to serve the growing CMIP contributor and downstream user communities.

An interim phase, CMIP6Plus, was initiated to address this need and expand the now well-established data standardisation requirements, data-sharing culture, and collaborative goodwill proven essential to CMIP's success (Mizielinski et al., 2024). The project, led by the WIP, has continued to develop the underlying infrastructure responsible for delivering CMIP6, adapting and modularising it to enable ongoing use with limited additional technical investments by contributing modelling groups or MIP leads. The goal has been to establish consistent data requirements and a sound supporting infrastructure serving to minimise data preparation and publication efforts and enhance scientific productivity and impact. This allows several CMIP6 follow-on activities to continue leveraging the infrastructure in the service of climate science research. The project provides ongoing, but limited support for coordinated model experimentation.

Planning for the 7th phase of CMIP (CMIP7) has now begun with an emphasis on broad community consultation (O'Rourke, 2024). As discussions continue on the core science foci of CMIP7 (e.g., Dunne et al., 2023, 2024), CMIP infrastructure providers are undertaking work (e.g., Kershaw et al., 2020) to modernise and ready services for a relatively small number of CMIP7 AR7 "Fast Track" experiments, which are expected to begin in mid-2025 (Dunne et al., 2024). At that time, new additions to the CMIP6 data archive will cease, and the next-generation simulations based on the latest model versions, updated forcing datasets (subsection 5.1), and refined experimental protocols may begin to be published.

8 Summary

CMIP6 is the latest in a long history of internationally coordinated and scientifically collaborative climate model-based research projects. CMIP has developed standard approaches to evaluate and intercompare climate models and a standardised vocabulary and infrastructure for defining and delivering data to a broad and expanding community. It has ensured that projections of future climate conditions are based on a robust and consistent framework.

It has now been 35 years since a group of experts with an interest in modelling standards and climate model intercomparison met informally in Boulder, Colorado, a meeting that led to the first MIP, AMIP1 (Gates, 1991). Since then, MIPs have captivated and engaged a broad and growing number of researchers who have had a tangible impact in improving our knowledge of Earth's climate system.

CMIP has generated profound scientific insights that define how we understand and address climate change and our ability to quantify and attribute the drivers and responses to the observed climate changes we are experiencing today. It has improved climate prediction, provided quantified insights that guide policy and decision making, informed risk and adaptation strategies



1085 and climate change mitigation planning, and improved public awareness and climate education. Its contributions have touched almost every aspect of society and raised awareness of the urgent need for global action on climate change.

Although the project has been a demonstrable success with its focus on the dual goals of facilitating cutting-edge climate research and delivering climate data that enable a broad array of downstream activities, CMIP's growth and broadening community expectations have strained existing resources traditionally devoted to the priorities of modelling centre research staff. 1090 There is some concern that the value of CMIP in meeting the climate information needs of those outside the research community is draining research funds that might be used more productively to develop better models and carry out innovative research. This pressure is not new. After CMIP3, there were calls for a reformulation of efforts to centralize resources across contributors to produce very high-resolution, regionally relevant climate predictions (Shukla et al., 2009, 2010). Somewhat similar calls have been repeated near the end of this most recent CMIP6 phase (Jakob et al., 2023; Stevens, 2024).

1095 Although modelling groups continue to shoulder most of the responsibility for CMIP, the WCRP created in March 2022 a CMIP International Project Office (CMIP-IPO) funded and hosted by the European Space Agency (ESA, UK) to assist the CMIP Panel and the WIP in coordinating the project. The CMIP-IPO is tasked with supporting the design and development of the upcoming CMIP7 project (see <https://wcrp-cmip.org/cmip7>) and facilitating broad and growing engagement of individuals that might participate in it and benefit from its results. CMIP7 is expected to meet the needs of the IPCC AR7 cycle through 1100 a continued federation of activities that will benefit from the lessons learned in CMIP6 (Eyring et al., 2016a). Efforts will be made to reduce modelling group burdens by better consulting the broad community, clarifying needs, and apportioning the limited resources to meet them.

The CMIP project has had a sustained global impact. Its success has depended on the efforts of tenacious individuals or small teams that encouraged and facilitated initial community engagement. These initial steps, coupled with the coordinated 1105 efforts within and across modelling groups, the infrastructure providers, and other contributors, led to the broad community collaboration and coordination which resulted in CMIP's ongoing impact. At its core, the project is a fundamental anchor point of international climate research, facilitating the generation of climate simulations of value to research and climate change planning. In return, modelling groups benefit from coordinated, collaborative activities and community evaluation, which feed back on the climate model development process, suggesting that indeed "intercomparison makes for a better climate model."

1110 *Code and data availability.* Data underpinning figures in the paper, in addition to tabulated additional information can be viewed in a paper-dedicated GitHub repository at <https://github.com/durack1/CMIPSummary>, or online using NBViewer at <https://nbviewer.org/github/durack1/CMIPSummary/blob/main/figuresAndTables.ipynb>.

Appendix A: Defined experiments across MIP phases

There is considerable continuity with experimental protocols across phases. The "amip" AGCM experiment is where MIP 1115 science began, covering the 1979-1988 period for AMIP1, and 1979-2001 for AMIP2. The concept of a fixed climatological




Figure A1. Recorded downloads across the three phases of CMIP, for which download records are available, following Figure 5. Left the top 6 CMIP3 experiment downloads across the 12 experiments that defined phase (Meehl et al., 2007a). Middle the CMIP5 downloads for the top 4 MIPs of the 8 that defined the phase (Table A1; Taylor et al., 2012b). And right the CMIP6 downloads for the top 4 MIPs of the 22 that defined the phase ([see Table 2; Eyring et al., 2016a). For CMIP6, almost 45% of downloads were accounted for by the core CMIP/DECK simulations, and 38% accounted for in the ScenarioMIP future projection experiments (O'Neill et al., 2016). This pattern of data download priority is mirrored across the prior phases, with CMIP5 (CMIP 61%, ScenarioMIP 25%) and a more dominant 20C3M/picntrl demand in CMIP3 (CMIP 64%, 35% ScenarioMIP).

forced "control" experiment identified core experiments between CMIP1 and CMIP2, with the present-day control (pdntrl, ~1995 CMIP1) evolving to include a pre-industrial control (picntrl, ~1850-1860 CMIP2) in subsequent phases. When assessing the "control" experiments, the nomenclature changed a little, with picntrl (before CMIP5) and piControl referring to the same experimental protocols, noting differing "pre-industrial" climatological fixed forcings were used across phases (see subsection 5.1). Idealized experiments were also incorporated in CMIP2, with the 1% compounding (1pctCO2) first included and subsequently identified as 1pctto2x and 1pctto4x (before CMIP5), returning to the single 1pctCO2 identity in CMIP5 onward, and with differing simulation lengths across contributing models (2x 70 years, and 4x 140 years). The historical experiment, with transient time-evolving forcings included, was first defined in CMIP3, identified as 20C3M (climate of the twentieth century, ~1860-1999). This is subsequently the historical experiment (CMIP5 and onward) and was extended to include additional forcing coverage (CMIP5: 1850-2011; CMIP6: 1850-2014). For further details and comparisons, see Table A1, and to visualize the experiment growth over phases, see Figure 1.

Appendix B: MIP variable request, standard output and data growth

The information presented in Table 1 row "Standard output variables/Tables" was collated from numerous live and archived resources available from 1991 through to the CMIP6 CMOR Table files that are still being used today. The earliest resources were published in written form, the AMIP Newsletters (e.g., Gates, 1991), and subsequently, became available on the PCMDI website for AMIP2, CMIP1 and CMIP2/2+ phases. CMIP3 marked a step change, with the development of the CMOR1 software



Table A1. MIP Experiments AMIP1 (1991) through CMIP6

MIP Phase	Citation/Year	Experiment(s)	URL/DOI
AMIP1	Gates (1991)	AMIP: amip	10.5281/zenodo.12109765; https://web.archive.org/web/19970524094021/http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/amip/
AMIP2	Gleckler (1999)	AMIP: amip	10.5281/zenodo.12188729; https://web.archive.org/web/19970524094021/http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/amip/
CMIP1	Meehl (1995)	CMIP: pdcntrl	https://web.archive.org/web/19970824235843/http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip/Cmip.htm
CMIP2	Meehl et al. (1997)	CMIP: pdcntrl, picntrl, 1pctCO2	https://web.archive.org/web/19970825000210/http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip/announ.htm
CMIP3	Doutriaux & Taylor, 2005; Meehl et al. (2007a)	CMIP: 1pctto2x, 1pctto4x, 20C3M, amip, pdcntrl, picntrl; CFMIP: 2xco2, slabentl; ScenarioMIP: commit, SRESA1B, SRESA2, SRESB1	https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/mips/cmip3/experiment.html#Experiments
CMIP5	Taylor et al. (2011, 2012b); Doutriaux & Taylor, 2013	CMIP: 1pctCO2, abrupt4xCO2, amip, historical, piControl; C4MIP: esmControl, esmFdbk1, esmFdbk2, esmFixClim1, esmFixClim2, esmHistorical, esmrcp85; CFMIP: amip4K, amip4xCO2, amipFuture, aqua4K, aqua4xCO2, aquaControl, sst2030 DCPP: decadalXXXX, noVolcXXXX, volcIn2010; DAMIP: historicalExt, historicalGHG, historicalMisc, historicalNat; PMIP: lgm, midHolocene, past1000; RFMIP: sstClim, sstClim4xCO2, sstClimAerosol, sstClimSulfate; ScenarioMIP: rcp26, rcp45, rcp60, rcp85	https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/mips/cmip5/experiment_design.html
CMIP6	Eyring et al. (2016a); Durack et al. (2024)	~190 (2016) to 322 (2024) see CMIP6_CVs; for MIPs contributing to the phase see Table 2	10.5281/zenodo.12197150; https://github.com/WCRP-CMIP/CMIP6_CVs ; https://wcrp-cmip.github.io/CMIP6_CVs/docs/CMIP6_experiment_id.html

Notes: For CMIP3 and CMIP5, no "Endorsed-MIPs" were identified, rather experiments were included without recognizing the community that defined these experiments. To attempt to provide connectivity across CMIP phases, CMIP6-era MIP identities (see Table 2, e.g., CFMIP, ScenarioMIP) have been retrofitted back to prior phase experiments which led to corresponding experiments in CMIP6. In CMIP5, NOAA-GFDL submitted GFDL-HIRAM-C180 simulations for the CFMIP-motivated sst2090 and sst2090rcp45 experiments (as these were single model experiments they are not listed above).




Figure B1. Data growth across all MIP phases, AMIP1 1989 through CMIP6 today. This figure is a visual representation of tabulated data volumes in Table 1. Note a y-axis log-scale, capturing data growth from gigabytes/ 10^9 bytes for AMIP1 and CMIP1 through to the tens of petabyte/ 10^{15} bytes scale in CMIP6.

(Taylor et al., 2006) and CMIP3 Standard Output defined by the more complete CMIP3-CMOR-Tables (Doutriaux and Taylor, 2005). CMIP5 continued this trend with CMOR2 (Doutriaux and Taylor, 2011) and the CMIP5-CMOR-Tables (Doutriaux and Taylor, 2013). For CMIP6, project expansion to include 22 MIPs and 322 experiments (Table 2, Table 1 respectively) required the development of a dedicated CMIP6 Data Request (see subsection 4.3) along with the parallel development of CMOR3 (Mauzey et al., 2024) and the CMIP6-CMOR-Tables (Nadeau et al., 2017). For each tabulated value, superscript-identified links provide live connections to these sources, see Table B1.

1135



Table B1. MIP variable request and standard output AMIP1 (1991) to CMIP6

Table 1 superscript	MIP Phase	Variable Count	CMOR version	Citation/Year	URL/DOI
1	AMIP1	32	~	Gates (1991)	10.5281/zenodo.12109765; https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/mips/amip/OUTPUT/WGNEDIAGS/index.html
2	AMIP2	114	~	1998	https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/mips/amip/OUTPUT/AMIP2/outlist.html
3	CMIP1	23	~	1997	https://web.archive.org/web/19970824233750/http://www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip/diagsub.html
4	CMIP2	28	~	1997	https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/mips/cmip2/
5	CMIP3	143 [†]	1.0	Doutriaux & Taylor, 2005	10.5281/zenodo.12792173; https://github.com/PCMDI/cmip3-cmor-tables
6	CMIP5	986	2.0	Doutriaux & Taylor, 2013	10.5281/zenodo.12792191; https://github.com/PCMDI/cmip5-cmor-tables
7	CMIP6	2062	3.0	Nadeau et al., 2018	10.5281/zenodo.597650; https://github.com/PCMDI/cmip6-cmor-tables
~	CFMIP1	149	1.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/cfmip1-cmor-tables
~	C-LAMP1	88	1.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/c-lamp1-cmor-tables
~	IAEMIP1	146	1.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/iaemip1-cmor-tables
~	CORDEX (CMIP5)	207	2.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/cordex-cmor-tables
~	GEOMIP	1142	2.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/geomip-cmor-tables
~	LUCID	979	2.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/lucid-cmor-tables
~	PMIP3	810	2.0	~	https://github.com/PCMDI/pmip3-cmor-tables
~	CORDEX-CMIP6	565	3.0	Gutowski Jr. et al. (2016)	https://github.com/WCRP-CORDEX/cordex-cmip6-cmor-tables

Notes: [†]In the CMIP3 phase, the total defined A5 table variables were 4, both adjusted/instantaneous shortwave forcing and its clearsky equivalent. This differs from the 223 identities in the table, which identified similar quantities (either top of atmosphere or tropopause, and variations due to unique forcing, e.g., all greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide only, total sulphate aerosol, direct effect only of sulphate aerosol, indirect effect only of sulphate aerosols, "black carbon", ozone, tropospheric ozone only, stratospheric ozone only, vegetation and other land surface changes, all anthropogenic factors, inclusive, volcanic aerosols, solar constant changes, all-natural factors inclusive.



Appendix C: MIP errata

Tabulated entries of CMIP errata based on phase, see Table C1.

Table C1. MIP Errata CMIP3 (2004) to CMIP6

MIP Phase	Errata count (reporting period)	URL/DOI
CMIP3	122 (2004-2011)	http://web.archive.org/web/20150906073117/https://esg.llnl.gov:8443/about/errata.do
CMIP5	84 (2012-2015)	https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/mips/cmip5/errata.html
CMIP6	462 (2018-2024)	https://errata.ipsl.fr

Notes: All values are tabulated from archived or live webpages as of 28th November, 2024.

1140 Appendix D: CMIP6 data preparation tools

During MIP phases, several software tools have been developed and updated to meet augmented phase requirements. These tools build on the MIP nomenclature and digital formats that are now standard. Some prominent packages are tabulated below (see Table D1).

Appendix E: Acronyms

1145 Over the five decades of MIPs, many acronyms and identifiers have been developed and bled into standard nomenclature. Some of these are used repeatedly throughout the text, and we tabulate entries here (see Table E1). Additional identifiers used to describe CMIP6 Community MIPs are detailed in Table 2.

Author contributions. P.J.D. outlined the content, completed the initial outline, and shared responsibility for writing the manuscript. K.E.T. assisted in expanding the outline and shared responsibility for writing the manuscript. P.J.G. provided useful feedback on early drafts, which reformulated the outline. G.A.M provided useful context and feedback on section 2 and section 3. B.N.L. provided useful context and feedback on subsection 4.1, subsection 4.4, and subsection 4.7. C.C. provided useful context and feedback on section 2. R.J.S. provided useful context and feedback on section 2. G.L., A.B-N, and S.D. provided useful context and feedback on subsection 4.9 and subsection 4.11. M.S. provided useful context and feedback on subsection 4.5 and subsection 4.8. J.G. provided useful context and feedback on subsection 4.1. M.J. provided useful context and feedback on subsection 4.3. All authors contributed to the final version of the manuscript.

1155 *Competing interests.* All authors declare no competing or conflicting interests. M.S. is a Topic Editor for Geoscientific Model Development.



Table D1. Software packages developed to aid MIP dataset production (non-exhaustive list)

Software name and version	Software Description	URL	Citation	DOI
CMOR 1.0	The Climate Model Output Rewriter	https://cmor.llnl.gov/archive/cmor1 ; https://github.com/PCMDI/cmor	Taylor et al. (2006)	10.5281/zenodo.12690071
CMOR 2.0	The Climate Model Output Rewriter	https://cmor.llnl.gov ; https://github.com/PCMDI/cmor	Doutriaux and Taylor (2011)	10.5281/zenodo.12690366
CMOR 3.0	The Climate Model Output Rewriter	https://cmor.llnl.gov ; https://github.com/PCMDI/cmor	Doutriaux et al. (2024)	10.5281/zenodo.592733
XIOS	Xml IO Server	http://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/ioserver/chrome/site/XIOS_DOC		
ECE2CMOR3	EC-Earth to CMOR	https://github.com/EC-Earth/ece2cmor3 ; https://github.com/EC-Earth/cmor-fixer		10.5281/zenodo.1051094
CDO CMOR	Climate Data Operators to CMOR	https://code.mpimet.mpg.de/projects/cdo/wiki/CDO_CMOR_Operator		
NORESM2CMOR	NorESM to CMOR	https://github.com/NorESMhub/noresm2cmor		
CCLM2CMOR	COSMO-CLM to CMOR	https://github.com/C2SM-RCM/CCLM2CMOR ; https://github.com/ssilje/CMOR		
FGOALS-g-cmor	FGOALS-g to CMOR	https://github.com/dongli/FGOALS-g-cmor		
PRIMAVERA	HadGEM to CMOR	https://github.com/goord/cmor		
E3SM_To_CMIP	DoE-E3SM to CMOR	https://github.com/E3SM-Project/e3sm_to_cmip		
ACCESS MOPPeR	A Model Output Post-Processor for the ACCESS climate model	https://access-mopper.readthedocs.io/		



Table E1. Acronyms used in this manuscript

Acronym	Expansion and additional information
20C3M	CMIP 20th Century Climate in Coupled Models pilot project (now known as the CMIP historical experiment)
AGCI	US Aspen Global Change Institute; https://www.agci.org
AGCM	Atmospheric General Circulation Model
AMIP	Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (also AMIP1 and AMIP2)
ANL	US Argonne National Laboratory; https://www.anl.gov
AOGCM	Atmospheric and Ocean General/Global Circulation Model
AR4	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, 2007; https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar4/wg1
AR5	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, 2013; https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1
AR6	IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, 2021; https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1
BADC/CEDA	UK British Atmospheric Data Centre (now CEDA; https://www.ceda.ac.uk)
C-LAMP	Carbon-Land Model Intercomparison Project; (now ILAMB; https://www.ilamb.org)
C4MIP	Coupled Climate-Carbon Cycle MIP; https://c4mip.net
CCSM	NCAR Community Climate System Model; https://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/ccsm
CEDA	UK Centre for Environmental Data Analysis; https://www.ceda.ac.uk
CF	NetCDF Climate and Forecast Metadata Conventions; https://cfconventions.org/
CFMIP	Cloud Feedbacks MIP (Also CFMIP1, CFMIP2, and CFMIP3; https://www.cfmip.org)
CIESIN	US Center for Integrated Earth System Information (Columbia University); https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/ddc/
CLIVAR	WCRP Climate Variability and Predictability Core Project; https://www.clivar.org
CMCC	Italian CMCC Foundation (Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change); https://www.cmcc.it
CMIP	Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (also CMIP1, CMIP2, CMIP2+, CMIP3, CMIP5, and CMIP6)
CMIP-IPO	UK CMIP International Project Office; https://wcrp-cmip.org
CMOR	PCMDI Climate Model Output Rewriter (also CMOR1, CMOR2, and CMOR3; https://cmor.llnl.gov/)
COARDS	Cooperative Ocean/Atmosphere Research Data Service conventions
CRU	UK University of East Anglia, Climatic Research Unit; https://www.uea.ac.uk/groups-and-centres/climatic-research-unit

Table E1 continued overpage..



Table E1. Acronyms used in this manuscript (continued)

CV	Controlled Vocabulary
DandA	climate change Detection and Attribution research
DAMIP	Detection and Attribution MIP
DCPP	Decadal Climate Prediction Project (CMIP6 Community MIP, and WCRP ESMO Working Group; https://www.wcrp-climate.org/dcp-overview)
DECK	Diagnostic, Evaluation and Characterisation of Klima (Core CMIP experiment suite)
DoE	US Department of Energy; https://www.energy.gov
DOI	Digital Object Identifier; https://www.doi.org
DKRZ	German Climate Computing Center (Deutsches Klimarechenzentrum; https://www.dkrz.de/en)
DLR	German Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt, Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre; https://www.dlr.de/en
DRS	Data Reference Syntax
ECMWF	European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts; https://www.ecmwf.int
ESA	European Space Agency; https://www.esa.int
ESG	US Earth System Grid (also ESG I, ESG II)
ESG-CET	US Earth System Grid Center for Enabling Technologies
ESGF	Earth System Grid Federation; https://esgf.llnl.gov
ESM	Earth System Model
ESMValTool	A community diagnostic and performance metrics tool for evaluation and analysis of Earth system Models; https://esmvaltool.org
ESMO	WCRP Earth System Modelling and Observations Core Project; https://www.wcrp-esmo.org
FANGIO	Feedback ANalysis of GCMs and In Observations project
FAR	IPCC First Assessment Report, 1990; https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar1/wg1
FMI	Finnish Meteorological Institute; https://en.ilmatieteenlaitos.fi
FTP	File Transfer Protocol (the standard protocol used to transfer files from a server to a client on a network; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File_Transfer_Protocol)
GridFTP	Extension of FTP for grid computing; https://www.globus.org/blog/gridftp-a-brief-history-of-fast-file-transfer
GAIM	Global Analysis Interpretation and Modeling Task Force (IGBP sub-group)
GARP	International Global Atmospheric Research Program (a precursor to the WCRP; 1967-1982)



Table E1. Acronyms used in this manuscript (continued)

GB	Gigabyte (one billion bytes, 10 ⁹)
GCM	General/Global Circulation Model
GDT	Gregory, Drach, and Tett conventions; (see Gregory et al., 1999)
GS	Google Scholar citation service; https://scholar.google.com
HTTP	HyperText Transfer Protocol (the default protocol underlying internet transactions; https://httpwg.org/specs
IAM	Integrated Assessment Model
IAV	Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability research
ICRCCM	Intercomparison of Radiation Codes used in Climate Models project
IGBP	International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (closed in 2015; http://www.igbp.net
ILAMB	ORNL International Land Model Benchmarking; https://www.ilamb.org
IPCC	UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; https://www.ipcc.ch
IPCC DDC	IPCC Data Distribution Centre; https://www.ipcc-data.org
IPO	International Project Office (e.g., CMIP-IPO, https://wcrp-cmip.org/cmip-governance/project-office/
IPSL	French Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace; https://www.ipsl.fr/en/home-en
IS-ENES	Infrastructure for the European Network for Earth System Modelling; https://is.enes.org
JSON	JavaScript Object Notation; text-based format for storing and exchanging data, both human-readable and machine-parseable; https://www.json.org
LANL	US Los Alamos National Laboratory; https://www.lanl.gov
LBNL	US Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; https://www.lbl.gov
LLNL	US Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; https://www.llnl.gov
MIP	Model Intercomparison Project
NASA	US National Aeronautic and Space Administration; https://www.nasa.gov
NASA-JPL	US NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory; https://www.jpl.nasa.gov
NCAR	US National Center for Atmospheric Research; https://ncar.ucar.edu
NCI	Australian National Computational Infrastructure; https://nci.org.au
NERSC	US Department of Energy Research Scientific Computing Center; https://www.nersc.gov

Table E1 continued overpage..



Table E1. Acronyms used in this manuscript (continued)

NOAA	US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; https://www.noaa.gov
NOAA-NCEP	US NOAA National Centers for Environmental Prediction; https://www.weather.gov/ncep
NOAA-PMEL	US NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory; https://www.pmel.noaa.gov
OCMIP	Ocean Carbon-Cycle Model Intercomparison Project; https://www.wcrp-climate.org/modelling-wgcm-mip-catalogue/modelling-wgcm-mips-2/267-modelling-wgcm-catalogue-ocmip
ORNL	US Oak Ridge National Laboratory; https://www.ornl.gov
PB	Petabyte (one quadrillion bytes, 10^{15})
PMIP	CMIP Paleoclimate MIP (also PMIP1, PMIP2, PMIP3, and PMIP4; https://pmip.lsce.ipsl.fr)
PMP	PCMDI Metrics Package; https://pcmdi.github.io/pcmdi_metrics
PCMDI	Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison, LLNL; https://pcmdi.llnl.gov
P-DRS	PCMDI Data Retrieval and Storage software library (digital format; Drach and Mobley, 1995)
RCP	Representative Concentration Pathways scenarios (Circa CMIP5)
SAR	IPCC Second Assessment Report, 1995; https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar2/wg1
SGGCM	WCRP Steering Group on Global Coupled Models (a precursor to WGCM)
SLCF	short-lived climate forcers
SOLR	Apache SOLR, open-source enterprise-search database; https://solr.apache.org
SPECTRE	Spectral Radiance Experiment
SRES	IPCC Special Report on Emission Scenarios (Circa CMIP3)
SST	Sea Surface Temperature
TAR	IPCC Third Assessment Report, 2001; https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar3/wg1
TB	Terabyte (one trillion bytes, 10^{12})
Unidata	US Unidata Program Center (University Corporation of Atmospheric Research); https://www.unidata.ucar.edu
WoS	Clarivate Web of Science Core Collection citation service; https://www.webofscience.com/wos/woscc
WCRP	World Climate Research Programme; https://www.wcrp-climate.org
WDAC	WCRP Data Advisory Council (2011-2020; https://www.wcrp-climate.org/data-wdac)
WG1	IPCC Working Group I (the Physical Science Basis); https://www.ipcc.ch/working-group/wg1



Table E1. Acronyms used in this manuscript (continued)

WG2	IPCC Working Group II (Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability); https://www.ipcc.ch/working-group/wg2
WG3	IPCC Working Group III (Mitigation of Climate Change); https://www.ipcc.ch/working-group/wg3
WGCM	WCRP Working Group on Coupled Modelling; https://www.wcrp-climate.org/ipo-esmo-groups/modelling-wgcm
WGNE	WCRP Working Group on Numerical Experimentation; https://wgne.net
WIP	WCRP WGCM Infrastructure Panel; https://www.wcrp-climate.org/wgcm-cmip/wip
WMGHG	well-mixed greenhouse gases
UN	United Nations; https://www.un.org/en
US	United States
VIACS AB	Vulnerability, Impacts, Adaptation and Climate Services Advisory Board; https://viacsab.gerics.de

Disclaimer. The views and opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, the Department of Energy (DoE), or Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). They shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

1160 *Acknowledgements.* This article is dedicated to W. Lawrence "Larry" Gates, the first PCMDI Director, whose vision, leadership, and skill in building community engagement and consensus garnered acceptance for open and systematic climate model analysis and led to the transformative impact of CMIP.

We acknowledge all past and present members of the WGCM Infrastructure Panel (WIP), CMIP Panel, and Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) and their precedent organizations. Without the collective efforts of these teams, the progress that CMIP embodies would not have been possible. The authors listed in this article represent a tiny subset of the project contributors over time.

1165 We acknowledge all MIP contributing modelling groups, the World Climate Research Programme's (WCRP) Working Group on Coupled Modelling (WGCM) and its WGCM Infrastructure (WIP), and the CMIP Panels for their leadership in defining and delivering multiple CMIP and preceding AMIP phases. The simulation contributions, which now embody petabytes of the latest generation of historical and future climate data, are the tangible substance of the CMIP project across phases.

1170 We acknowledge the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI, US), the Centre for Environmental Data Analysis (CEDA, UK), the Infrastructure for the European Network for Earth System Modelling (IS-ENES), the German Climate Computing Centre (DKRZ, Germany), the Institute Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL, France), Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC, Italy), the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) and Earth System Grid (ESG) contributing organizations and many other infrastructure providers for developing the ecosystem that delivered MIP data across multiple phases.

1175 We gratefully acknowledge Vaishali Naik (NOAA Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton, USA) for helping us better understand the climate forcing experience of modelling groups through the CMIP3, and CMIP5 phases.



We thank numerous colleagues, collaborators, and past AMIP, CMIP, and ESGF contributors for their valuable input and feedback.

The work of P.J.D., K.E.T., P.J.G., C.C., S.K.A., D.C.B., J.L., C.F.M., J.P. and G.L.P. from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) is supported by the Regional and Global Model Analysis (RGMA) program area under the Earth and Environmental System Modeling (EESM) program within the Earth and Environmental Systems Sciences Division (EESDD) of the United States Department of Energy's (DoE) Office of Science (OSTI). This work was performed under the auspices of the US DoE by LLNL under contract DE-AC52-07NA27344. LLNL IM Release: LLNL-JRNL-871359.

The work of G.A.M. is supported by the Regional and Global Model Analysis (RGMA) program area under the Earth and Environmental System Modeling Program (EESM) of the US Department of Energy's Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) under Award Number DE-SC0022070. This work was also supported by the National Center for Atmospheric Research, a major facility sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Cooperative Agreement No. 1852977.

V.E's work is supported by the European Research Council (ERC) Synergy Grant 'Understanding and Modeling the Earth System with Machine Learning' (USMILE) under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme (grant agreement no. 855187) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Prize awarded to V.E. (reference no. EY 22/2-1).

D.E. and E.O's work at the CMIP-IPO is hosted by the European Space Agency, with staff provided on contract by HE Space Operations Ltd.



References

- Abernathy, R.: CMIP6 in the Cloud Five Ways, <https://medium.com/pangeo/cmip6-in-the-cloud-five-ways-96b177abe396>, 2020.
- AchutaRao, K. M., Covey, C. C., Doutriaux, C. M., Fiorino, M., Gleckler, P. J., Phillips, T. J., Sperber, K. R., and Taylor, K. E.: PCMDI Report
1195 No. 71: An Appraisal of Coupled Climate Model Simulations, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 197, <https://doi.org/10.2172/15014011>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Report, 2004.
- Ananthkrishnan, R., Bernholdt, D. E., Bharathi, S., Brown, D., Chen, M., Chervenak, A. L., Cinquini, L., Drach, R., Foster, I. T., Fox, P., Fraser, D., Halliday, K., Hankin, S., Jones, P., Kesselman, C., Middleton, D. E., Schwidder, J., Schweitzer, R., Schuler, R., Shoshani,
1200 A., Siebenlist, F., Sim, A., Strand, W. G., Wilhelmi, N., Su, M., and Williams, D. N.: Building a global federation system for climate change research: the earth system grid center for enabling technologies (ESG-CET), *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 78, 012050, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/78/1/012050>, 2007.
- Arrhenius, S.: XXXI. On the influence of carbonic acid in the air upon the temperature of the ground, *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 41, 237–276, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786449608620846>, publisher: Taylor & Francis
1205 _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786449608620846>, 1896.
- Balaji, V., Taylor, K. E., Jukes, M., Lawrence, B. N., Durack, P. J., Lautenschlager, M., Blanton, C., Cinquini, L., Denvil, S., Elkington, M., Guglielmo, F., Guilyardi, E., Hassell, D., Kharin, S., Kindermann, S., Nikonov, S., Radhakrishnan, A., Stockhouse, M., Weigel, T., and Williams, D.: Requirements for a global data infrastructure in support of CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 3659–3680, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-3659-2018>, 2018.
- 1210 Bernholdt, D., Bharathi, S., Brown, D., Chanchio, K., Chen, M., Chervenak, A., Cinquini, L., Drach, B., Foster, I., Fox, P., Garcia, J., Kesselman, C., Markel, R., Middleton, D., Nefedova, V., Pouchard, L., Shoshani, A., Sim, A., Strand, G., and Williams, D.: The Earth System Grid: Supporting the Next Generation of Climate Modeling Research, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.0712.2262>, arXiv:0712.2262 [cs], 2007.
- Boer, G. J. and Lambert, S.: The energy cycle in atmospheric models, *Climate Dynamics*, 30, 371–390, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-007-0303-4>, 2008.
1215
- Boer, G. J., Smith, D. M., Cassou, C., Doblus-Reyes, F., Danabasoglu, G., Kirtman, B., Kushnir, Y., Kimoto, M., Meehl, G. A., Msadek, R., Mueller, W. A., Taylor, K. E., Zwiers, F., Rixen, M., Ruprich-Robert, Y., and Eade, R.: The Decadal Climate Prediction Project (DCPP) contribution to CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3751–3777, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3751-2016>, 2016.
- Bony, S., Webb, M., Bretherton, C., Klein, S., Siebesma, P., Tselioudis, G., and Zhang, M.: CFMIP: Towards a better evaluation and understanding of clouds and cloud feedbacks in CMIP5 models, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 20–24, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article,
1220 2011.
- Boucher, O., Collier, M., Dufresne, J.-L., Forster, P., Haywood, J., Jeffrey, S., Jones, A., Lohmann, U., Rasch, P., Rotstayn, L., Stevens, B., Taylor, K., and von Salzen, K.: Climate response to aerosol forcings in CMIP5, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 25–27, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
1225
- Boé, J.: Interdependency in Multimodel Climate Projections: Component Replication and Result Similarity, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45, 2771–2779, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076829>, 2018.



- 1230 Braconnot, P., Harrison, S. P., Otto-Bliesner, B., Abe-Ouchi, A., Jungclaus, J., and Peterschmitt, J.-Y.: The Paleoclimate Modeling Intercomparison Project contribution to CMIP5, CLIVAR Exchanges, 56, 15–19, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- Bryan, K., Manabe, S., and Pacanowski, R. C.: A Global Ocean-Atmosphere Climate Model. Part II. The Oceanic Circulation, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 5, 30–46, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485\(1975\)005<0030:AGOACM>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1975)005<0030:AGOACM>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Journal of Physical Oceanography, 1975.
- 1235 Budyko, M. I.: The Heat Balance of the Earth's Surface, *Soviet Geography*, 2, 3–13, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00385417.1961.10770761>, publisher: Routledge _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00385417.1961.10770761>, 1961.
- Cess, R. D. and Hameed, S.: First year progress report on research project on CO₂-induced climate change, Tech. Rep. DOE/ER/60314-4, State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook, NY (United States), <https://doi.org/10.2172/10124657>, 1991.
- Cess, R. D. and Potter, G. L.: A methodology for understanding and intercomparing atmospheric climate feedback processes in general circulation models, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 93, 8305–8314, <https://doi.org/10.1029/JD093iD07p08305>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/JD093iD07p08305>, 1988.
- 1240 Cess, R. D., Potter, G. L., Blanchet, J. P., Boer, G. J., Ghan, S. J., Kiehl, J. T., Le Treut, H., Li, Z.-X., Liang, X.-Z., Mitchell, J. F. B., Morcrette, J.-J., Randall, D. A., Riches, M. R., Roeckner, E., Schlese, U., Slingo, A., Taylor, K. E., Washington, W. M., Wetherald, R. T., and Yagai, I.: Interpretation of Cloud-Climate Feedback as Produced by 14 Atmospheric General Circulation Models, *Science*, 245, 513–516, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.245.4917.513>, publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989.
- 1245 Cess, R. D., Potter, G. L., Blanchet, J. P., Boer, G. J., Del Genio, A. D., Déqué, M., Dymnikov, V., Galin, V., Gates, W. L., Ghan, S. J., Kiehl, J. T., Lacis, A. A., Le Treut, H., Li, Z., Liang, X., McAvaney, B. J., Meleshko, V. P., Mitchell, J. F. B., Morcrette, J., Randall, D. A., Rikus, L., Roeckner, E., Royer, J. F., Schlese, U., Sheinin, D. A., Slingo, A., Sokolov, A. P., Taylor, K. E., Washington, W. M., Wetherald, R. T., Yagai, I., and Zhang, M.: Intercomparison and interpretation of climate feedback processes in 19 atmospheric general circulation models, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 95, 16 601–16 615, <https://doi.org/10.1029/JD095iD10p16601>, 1990.
- 1250 Chamberlin, T. C.: An Attempt to Frame a Working Hypothesis of the Cause of Glacial Periods on an Atmospheric Basis, *The Journal of Geology*, 7, 545–584, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30055497>, publisher: The University of Chicago Press, 1899.
- Charney, J. G., Arakawa, A., Baker, D. J., Bolin, B., Dickinson, R. E., Goody, R. M., Leith, C. E., Stommel, H. M., and Wunsch, C. I.: *Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A Scientific Assessment*, National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., ISBN 978-0-309-33314-6, <https://doi.org/10.17226/19856>, 1979.
- 1255 Checa-Garcia, R., Hegglin, M. I., Kinnison, D., Plummer, D. A., and Shine, K. P.: Historical Tropospheric and Stratospheric Ozone Radiative Forcing Using the CMIP6 Database, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 45, 3264–3273, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076770>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2017GL076770>, 2018.
- Cionni, I., Eyring, V., Lamarque, J. F., Randel, W. J., Stevenson, D. S., Wu, F., Bodeker, G. E., Shepherd, T. G., Shindell, D. T., and Waugh, D. W.: Ozone database in support of CMIP5 simulations: results and corresponding radiative forcing, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 11 267–11 292, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-11267-2011>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2011.
- 1260 Collier, N., Hoffman, F. M., Lawrence, D. M., Keppel-Aleks, G., Koven, C. D., Riley, W. J., Mu, M., and Randerson, J. T.: The International Land Model Benchmarking (ILAMB) System: Design, Theory, and Implementation, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 10, 2731–2754, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001354>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2018MS001354>, 2018.



- 1265 Collins, W. J., Lamarque, J.-F., Schulz, M., Boucher, O., Eyring, V., Hegglin, M. I., Maycock, A., Myhre, G., Prather, M., Shindell, D., and Smith, S. J.: AerChemMIP: quantifying the effects of chemistry and aerosols in CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 585–607, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-585-2017>, 2017.
- Coughlan, M.: Report of CLIVAR NEG-2, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 1, 4–6, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges1.pdf#page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Hamburg, Germany Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 1996.
- 1270 Cox, P., Friedlingstein, P., and Rayner, P.: Modelling climate - carbon cycle feedbacks: a cross disciplinary collaboration priority, *International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) Newsletter*, 49, 12–14, <http://www.igbp.net/download/18.5831d9ad13275d51c098000338/1376383089991/NL49.pdf#page=12>, place: IGBP Secretariat, The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Stockholm, Sweden Publisher: International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) Type: Article, 2002.
- Denvil, S., Vialard, J., Painter, J., Lacinski, L., Levvasseur, G., Ben-Nasser, A., Smith, T. J., Alvarez, E. C., and Petrie, R.: Synchronize Data (Synda) v3.0, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4147466>, place: Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL), Paris, France Series: Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL), Software Type: Software, 2020.
- 1275 Detemmerman, V.: CLIVAR SSG Meets in Washington DC, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 16, 3–4, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges6.pdf#page=2>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Hamburg, Germany Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 1997.
- 1280 Doblas-Reyes, F., van Oldenborgh, G., Garcia-Serrano, J., Pohlmann, H., Scaife, A., and Smith, D.: CMIP5 near-term climate prediction, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 8–11, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- Donner, L. J., Wyman, B. L., Hemler, R. S., Horowitz, L. W., Ming, Y., Zhao, M., Golaz, J.-C., Ginoux, P., Lin, S.-J., Schwarzkopf, M. D., Austin, J., Alaka, G., Cooke, W. F., Delworth, T. L., Freidenreich, S. M., Gordon, C. T., Griffies, S. M., Held, I. M., Hurlin, W. J., Klein, S. A., Knutson, T. R., Langenhorst, A. R., Lee, H.-C., Lin, Y., Magi, B. I., Malyshev, S. L., Milly, P. C. D., Naik, V., Nath, M. J., Pincus, R., Ploshay, J. J., Ramaswamy, V., Seman, C. J., Shevliakova, E., Sirutis, J. J., Stern, W. F., Stouffer, R. J., Wilson, R. J., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A. T., and Zeng, F.: The Dynamical Core, Physical Parameterizations, and Basic Simulation Characteristics of the Atmospheric Component AM3 of the GFDL Global Coupled Model CM3, *Journal of Climate*, 24, 3484–3519, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011JCLI3955.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Journal of Climate, 2011.
- 1285
- 1290 Doutriaux, C. and Taylor, K. E.: CMIP3 CMOR Tables v3.0, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12792174>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Software Type: Software, 2005.
- Doutriaux, C. and Taylor, K. E.: CMOR v2.0 Users Guide (Climate Model Output Rewriter; CMOR2), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12690365>, pages: 82 Place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Software Documentation Type: Software Documentation, 2011.
- 1295
- Doutriaux, C. and Taylor, K. E.: CMIP5 CMOR Tables v5.0, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12792191>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Software Type: Software, 2013.
- 1300
- Doutriaux, C., Taylor, K. E., Mauzey, C., Nadeau, D., and Durack, P. J.: CMOR v3.0 Users Guide (Climate Model Output Rewriter; CMOR3), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.179384>, pages: 128 Place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Software Documentation Type: Software Documentation, 2024.



- Drach, R. and Mobley, R.: Data Retrieval and Storage (DRS) User's Guide, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14195488>, place: Livermore, California, U.S.A. Publisher: Zenodo, 1995.
- 1305 Dunlap, R., Mark, L., Rugaber, S., Balaji, V., Chastang, J., Cinquini, L., DeLuca, C., Middleton, D., and Murphy, S.: Earth system curator: metadata infrastructure for climate modeling, *Earth Science Informatics*, 1, 131–149, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12145-008-0016-1>, 2008.
- Dunne, J., Hewitt, H., Tegtmeier, S., Senior, C., Ilyina, T., Fox-Kemper, B., and O'Rourke, E.: Climate Projections in Next Phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project, <https://library.wmo.int/idurl/4/68557>, <https://wmo.int/media/magazine-article/climate-projections-next-phase-of-coupled-model-intercomparison-project> <https://library.wmo.int/records/item/68557-vol-72-2-2023>, 2023.
- 1310 Dunne, J. P., Hewitt, H. T., Arblaster, J., Bonou, F., Boucher, O., Cavazos, T., Durack, P. J., Hassler, B., Jukes, M., Miyakawa, T., Mizielinski, M., Naik, V., Nicholls, Z., O'Rourke, E., Pincus, R., Sanderson, B. M., Simpson, I. R., and Taylor, K. E.: An evolving Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 7 (CMIP7) and Fast Track in support of future climate assessment, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-3874>, 2024.
- Durack, P., Taylor, K., Eyring, V., Ames, S., Hoang, T., Nadeau, D., Doutriaux, C., Stockhouse, M., and Gleckler, P.: Toward Standardized
1315 Data Sets for Climate Model Experimentation, *Eos*, 99, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EO101751>, 2018.
- Durack, P. J. and Taylor, K. E.: PCMDI AMIP SST and sea-ice boundary conditions version 1.1.4, <https://doi.org/10.22033/ESGF/input4MIPs.2204>, 2018.
- Durack, P. J., Wijffels, S. E., and Matear, R. J.: Ocean Salinities Reveal Strong Global Water Cycle Intensification During 1950 to 2000, *Science*, 336, 455–458, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1212222>, publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2012.
- 1320 Durack, P. J., Taylor, K. E., Mizielinski, M., Doutriaux, C., Nadeau, D., and Jukes, M.: CMIP6 Controlled Vocabularies (CVs), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12197150>, 2024.
- Dutay, J. C., Bullister, J. L., Doney, S. C., Orr, J. C., Najjar, R., Caldeira, K., Campin, J. M., Drange, H., Follows, M., Gao, Y., Gruber, N., Hecht, M. W., Ishida, A., Joos, F., Lindsay, K., Madec, G., Maier-Reimer, E., Marshall, J. C., Matear, R. J., Monfray, P., Mouchet, A., Plattner, G. K., Sarmiento, J., Schlitzer, R., Slater, R., Totterdell, I. J., Weirig, M. F., Yamanaka, Y., and Yool, A.: Evaluation of ocean
1325 model ventilation with CFC-11: comparison of 13 global ocean models, *Ocean Modelling*, 4, 89–120, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1463-5003\(01\)00013-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1463-5003(01)00013-0), 2002.
- Dutay, J. C., Jean-Baptiste, P., Campin, J. M., Ishida, A., Maier-Reimer, E., Matear, R. J., Mouchet, A., Totterdell, I. J., Yamanaka, Y., Rodgers, K., Madec, G., and Orr, J. C.: Evaluation of OCMIP-2 ocean models' deep circulation with mantle helium-3, *Journal of Marine Systems*, 48, 15–36, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2003.05.010>, 2004.
- 1330 Eaton, B., Gregory, J., Drach, B., Taylor, K., Hankin, S., Blower, J., Caron, J., Signell, R., Bentley, P., Rappa, G., Höck, H., Pamment, A., Jukes, M., Raspaud, M., Horne, R., Whiteaker, T., Blodgett, D., Zender, C., Lee, D., Hassell, D., Snow, A. D., Kölling, T., Allured, D., Jelenak, A., Soerensen, A. M., Gaultier, L., Herlédan, S., Manzano, F., Barring, L., Barker, C., and Bartholomew, S. L.: NetCDF Climate and Forecast (CF) Metadata Conventions, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11288138>, publisher: CF Community, 2024.
- Edwards, P. N.: History of climate modeling, *WIREs Climate Change*, 2, 128–139, <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.95>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wcc.95>, 2011.
- 1335 Ellingson, R. G. and Fouquart, Y.: The intercomparison of radiation codes in climate models: An overview, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 96, 8925–8927, <https://doi.org/10.1029/90JD01618>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/90JD01618>, 1991.



- 1340 Ellingson, R. G. and Wiscombe, W. J.: The Spectral Radiance Experiment (SPECTRE): Project Description and Sample Results, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 77, 1967–1986, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1996\)077<1967:TSREPD>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<1967:TSREPD>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 1996.
- Ellingson, R. G., Wiscombe, W. J., Murcray, D., Smith, W., and Strauch, R.: ICRCCM (InterComparison of Radiation Codes used in Climate Models) Phase 2: Verification and calibration of radiation codes in climate models, Tech. Rep. DOE/ER/60971-1, Maryland Univ., College Park, MD (USA). Dept. of Meteorology, <https://doi.org/10.2172/6232336>, 1990.
- 1345 Ellingson, R. G., Cess, R. D., and Potter, G. L.: The Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program: Prelude, *Meteorological Monographs*, 57, 1.1–1.9, <https://doi.org/10.1175/AMSMONOGRAPHS-D-15-0029.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Meteorological Monographs, 2016.
- Eyring, V., Butchart, N., Waugh, D. W., Akiyoshi, H., Austin, J., Bekki, S., Bodeker, G. E., Boville, B. A., Brühl, C., Chipperfield, M. P., Cordero, E., Dameris, M., Deushi, M., Fioletov, V. E., Frith, S. M., Garcia, R. R., Gettelman, A., Giorgetta, M. A., 1350 Grewe, V., Jourdain, L., Kinnison, D. E., Mancini, E., Manzini, E., Marchand, M., Marsh, D. R., Nagashima, T., Newman, P. A., Nielsen, J. E., Pawson, S., Pitari, G., Plummer, D. A., Rozanov, E., Schraner, M., Shepherd, T. G., Shibata, K., Stolarski, R. S., Struthers, H., Tian, W., and Yoshiki, M.: Assessment of temperature, trace species, and ozone in chemistry-climate model simulations of the recent past, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 111, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JD007327>, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2006JD007327>, 2006.
- 1355 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, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 1937–1958, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016>, 2016a.
- Eyring, V., Gleckler, P. J., Heinze, C., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E., Balaji, V., Guilyardi, E., Joussaume, S., Kindermann, S., Lawrence, B. N., Meehl, G. A., Righi, M., and Williams, D. N.: Towards improved and more routine Earth system model evaluation in CMIP, *Earth System 1360 Dynamics*, 7, 813–830, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-7-813-2016>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2016b.
- Eyring, V., Righi, M., Lauer, A., Evaldsson, M., Wenzel, S., Jones, C., Anav, A., Andrews, O., Cionni, I., Davin, E. L., Deser, C., Ehbrecht, C., Friedlingstein, P., Gleckler, P., Gottschaldt, K.-D., Hagemann, S., Juckes, M., Kindermann, S., Krasting, J., Kunert, D., Levine, R., Loew, A., Mäkelä, J., Martin, G., Mason, E., Phillips, A. S., Read, S., Rio, C., Roehrig, R., Senfleben, D., Sterl, A., van Ulft, L. H., Walton, J., Wang, S., and Williams, K. D.: ESMValTool (v1.0) – a community diagnostic and performance metrics tool for routine evaluation of 1365 Earth system models in CMIP, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 1747–1802, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1747-2016>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2016c.
- Eyring, V., Cox, P. M., Flato, G. M., Gleckler, P. J., Abramowitz, G., Caldwell, P., Collins, W. D., Gier, B. K., Hall, A. D., Hoffman, F. M., Hurtt, G. C., Jahn, A., Jones, C. D., Klein, S. A., Krasting, J. P., Kwiatkowski, L., Lorenz, R., Maloney, E., Meehl, G. A., Pendergrass, A. G., Pincus, R., Ruane, A. C., Russell, J. L., Sanderson, B. M., Santer, B. D., Sherwood, S. C., Simpson, I. R., Stouffer, R. J., and 1370 Williamson, M. S.: Taking climate model evaluation to the next level, *Nature Climate Change*, 9, 102–110, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0355-y>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2019.
- Eyring, V., Bock, L., Lauer, A., Righi, M., Schlund, M., Andela, B., Arnone, E., Bellprat, O., Brötz, B., Caron, L.-P., Carvalhais, N., Cionni, I., Cortesi, N., Crezee, B., Davin, E. L., Davini, P., Debeire, K., de Mora, L., Deser, C., Docquier, D., Earnshaw, P., Ehbrecht, C., Gier, B. K., Gonzalez-Reviriego, N., Goodman, P., Hagemann, S., Hardiman, S., Hassler, B., Hunter, A., Kadow, C., Kindermann, S., Koirala, 1375 S., Koldunov, N., Lejeune, Q., Lembo, V., Lovato, T., Lucarini, V., Massonnet, F., Müller, B., Pandde, A., Pérez-Zanón, N., Phillips, A., Predoi, V., Russell, J., Sellar, A., Serva, F., Stacke, T., Swaminathan, R., Torralba, V., Vegas-Regidor, J., von Hardenberg, J., Weigel,



- K., and Zimmermann, K.: Earth System Model Evaluation Tool (ESMValTool) v2.0 – an extended set of large-scale diagnostics for quasi-operational and comprehensive evaluation of Earth system models in CMIP, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 3383–3438, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-3383-2020>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2020.
- 1380 Eyring, V., Gillett, N., Achuta Rao, K., Barimalala, R., Barreiro Parrillo, M., Bellouin, N., Cassou, C., Durack, P., Kosaka, Y., McGregor, S., Min, S., Morgenstern, O., and Sun, Y.: Human Influence on the Climate System, in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., pp. 423–551, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.005>, section: 3 Type: Book Section, 2021a.
- 1385 Eyring, V., Gillett, N., Achuta Rao, K., Barimalala, R., Barreiro Parrillo, M., Bellouin, N., Cassou, C., Durack, P., Kosaka, Y., McGregor, S., Min, S., Morgenstern, O., and Sun, Y.: Human Influence on the Climate System Supplementary Material, in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., pp. 1–177, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_Chapter03_SM.pdf, section: 3 Type: Book Section, 2021b.
- 1390 Feng, L., Smith, S. J., Braun, C., Crippa, M., Gidden, M. J., Hoesly, R., Klimont, Z., van Marle, M., van den Berg, M., and van der Werf, G. R.: The generation of gridded emissions data for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 461–482, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-461-2020>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2020.
- 1395 Ferraro, R., Waliser, D. E., Gleckler, P., Taylor, K. E., and Eyring, V.: Evolving Obs4MIPs to Support Phase 6 of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP6), *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 96, ES131–ES133, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00216.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2015.
- 1400 Fiedler, S., Kinne, S., Huang, W. T. K., Räisänen, P., O’Donnell, D., Bellouin, N., Stier, P., Merikanto, J., van Noije, T., Makkonen, R., and Lohmann, U.: Anthropogenic aerosol forcing – insights from multiple estimates from aerosol-climate models with reduced complexity, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 19, 6821–6841, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-6821-2019>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2019.
- 1405 Fiore, S., Nassisi, P., Nuzzo, A., Mirto, M., Cinquini, L., Williams, D., and Aloisio, G.: A Climate Change Community Gateway for Data Usage & Data Archive Metrics across the Earth System Grid Federation, in: *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Science Gateways*, edited by Stankovski, V. and Gesing, S., vol. 2975 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, p. 6, CEUR, Ljubljana, Slovenia, <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2975/#paper5>, ISSN: 1613-0073 URL pdf: <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2975/paper5.pdf>, 2019.
- 1410 Flato, G., Marotzke, J., Abiodun, B., Braconnot, P., Chou, S., Collins, W., Cox, P., Driouech, F., Emori, S., Eyring, V., Forest, C., Gleckler, P., Guilyardi, E., Jakob, C., Kattsov, V., Reason, C., and Rummukainen, M.: Evaluation of Climate Models, in: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Stocker, T., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P., pp. 741–866, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, ISBN ISBN 978-1-107-66182-0, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.020>, section: 9 Type: Book Section, 2013.



- Friedlingstein, P. and Jones, C.: Climate-carbon interactions in the CMIP5 Earth System models, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 27–29, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK
1415 Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- Friedlingstein, P., Cox, P., Betts, R., Bopp, L., Bloh, W. v., Brovkin, V., Cadule, P., Doney, S., Eby, M., Fung, I., Bala, G., John, J., Jones, C., Joos, F., Kato, T., Kawamiya, M., Knorr, W., Lindsay, K., Matthews, H. D., Raddatz, T., Rayner, P., Reick, C., Roeckner, E., Schnitzler, K.-G., Schnur, R., Strassmann, K., Weaver, A. J., Yoshikawa, C., and Zeng, N.: Climate–Carbon Cycle Feedback Analysis: Results from the C4MIP Model Intercomparison, *Journal of Climate*, 19, 3337–3353, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3800.1>, publisher: American
1420 Meteorological Society Section: *Journal of Climate*, 2006.
- Fröhlich, C. and Lean, J.: Solar radiative output and its variability: evidence and mechanisms, *The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review*, 12, 273–320, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00159-004-0024-1>, 2004.
- Fung, I., Rayner, P., and Friedlingstein, P.: Full-Form Earth System Models: Coupled Carbon-Climate Interaction Experiment (the "Flying Leap"), *International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) Newsletter*, 41, 7–8, <http://www.igbp.net/download/18.316f18321323470177580001401/1376383088452/NL41.pdf#page=7>, place: IGBP Secretariat, The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Stockholm, Sweden Publisher: International Geosphere–Biosphere Programme (IGBP) Type: Article, 2000.
1425
- Fyfe, J. C., Kharin, V. V., Santer, B. D., Cole, J. N. S., and Gillett, N. P.: Significant impact of forcing uncertainty in a large ensemble of climate model simulations, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118, e2016549 118, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2016549118>, company: National Academy of Sciences Distributor: National Academy of Sciences Institution: National Academy of Sciences Label: National Academy of Sciences Publisher: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2021.
1430
- Gates, W., Rowntree, P., and Zeng, Q.-C.: Validation of Climate Models, in: *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment*. Report Prepared for IPCC by Working Group I, edited by Houghton, J., Jenkins, G., and Ephraums, J., pp. 93–130, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, ISBN ISBN 0-521-40720-6, https://archive.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/far/wg_I/ipcc_far_wg_I_chapter_04.pdf, section: 4 Type: Book Section, 1990.
1435
- Gates, W., Henderson-Sellers, A., Boer, G., Folland, C., Kitoh, A., McAvaney, B., Semazzi, F., Smith, N., Weaver, A., and Zeng, Q.-C.: Climate Models - Evaluation, in: *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by Houghton, J., Meira Filho, L., Callander, B., Harris, N., Kattenberg, A., and Maskell, K., pp. 229–284, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, ISBN ISBN 0-521-56436-0, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ipcc_sar_wg_I_full_report.pdf, section: 5 Type: Book Section, 1996.
- Gates, W. L.: AMIP Newsletter No. 1, WCRP WGNE Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP), p. 8, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12109766>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Newsletter, 1991.
1440
- Gates, W. L.: AMIP Newsletter No. 2, WCRP WGNE Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP), p. 8, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12174666>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Newsletter, 1992a.
1445
- Gates, W. L.: AN AMS CONTINUING SERIES: GLOBAL CHANGE–AMIP: The Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 73, 1962–1970, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1992\)073<1962:ATAMIP>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1992)073<1962:ATAMIP>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 1992b.



- Gates, W. L.: AMIP Newsletter No. 6, WCRP WGNE Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP), p. 23,
1450 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12188582>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Newsletter, 1995.
- Gerber, E. P. and Manzini, E.: The Dynamics and Variability Model Intercomparison Project (DynVarMIP) for CMIP6: assessing the strato-
sphere–troposphere system, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3413–3425, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3413-2016>, 2016.
- Gottelman, A., Eyring, V., Fischer, C., Shiona, H., Cionni, I., Neish, M., Morgenstern, O., Wood, S. W., and Li, Z.: A community diagnostic
1455 tool for chemistry climate model validation, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 5, 1061–1073, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-1061-2012>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2012.
- Gillett, N. P., Zwiers, F. W., Weaver, A. J., Hegerl, G. C., Allen, M. R., and Stott, P. A.: Detecting anthropogenic influ-
ence with a multi-model ensemble, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 29, 31–1–31–4, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002GL015836>, [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2002GL015836](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2002GL015836), 2002.
- 1460 Gillett, N. P., Shiogama, H., Funke, B., Hegerl, G., Knutti, R., Matthes, K., Santer, B. D., Stone, D., and Tebaldi, C.: The Detection and Attribution Model Intercomparison Project (DAMIP v1.0) contribution to CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3685–3697, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3685-2016>, 2016.
- Gleckler, P., Ferraro, R., and Waliser, D.: Improving use of satellite data in evaluating climate models, *Eos, Transactions American Geophys-
ical Union*, 92, 172–172, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011EO200005>, 2011.
- 1465 Gleckler, P. J.: AMIP Newsletter No. 8, WCRP WGNE Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP), p. 24, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12188692>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Newsletter, 1996.
- Gleckler, P. J.: AMIP Newsletter No. 9, WCRP WGNE Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP), p. 8,
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12188730>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher:
1470 Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Newsletter, 1999.
- Gleckler, P. J.: AMIP Newsletter No. 10, WCRP WGNE Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP), p. 8,
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12188777>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Pro-
gram for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Newsletter, 2001.
- Gleckler, P. J., Taylor, K. E., and Doutriaux, C.: Performance metrics for climate models, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*,
1475 113, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD008972>, [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2007JD008972](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2007JD008972), 2008.
- Gleckler, P. J., Durack, P. J., Taylor, K. E., Zhang, Y., Williams, D. N., and Servonnat, J.: A More Powerful Reality Test for Climate Models,
<http://eos.org/science-updates/a-more-powerful-reality-test-for-climate-models>, 2016.
- Gregory, J., Drach, R., Tett, S., and Taylor, K. E.: GDT netCDF conventions for climate data, v1.4, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis
and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 49, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13314769>, place: Met Office, Bracknell, Berkshire, UK Publisher:
1480 Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Working Paper, 1999.
- Gregory, J. M., Bouttes, N., Griffies, S. M., Haak, H., Hurlin, W. J., Jungclaus, J., Kelley, M., Lee, W. G., Marshall, J., Romanou, A.,
Saenko, O. A., Stammer, D., and Winton, M.: The Flux-Anomaly-Forced Model Intercomparison Project (FAFMIP) contribution to
CMIP6: investigation of sea-level and ocean climate change in response to CO₂ forcing, *Geoscientific Model
Development*, 9, 3993–4017, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3993-2016>, 2016.
- 1485 Griffies, S. M., Danabasoglu, G., Durack, P. J., Adcroft, A. J., Balaji, V., Böning, C. W., Chassignet, E. P., Curchitser, E., Deshayes, J.,
Drange, H., Fox-Kemper, B., Gleckler, P. J., Gregory, J. M., Haak, H., Hallberg, R. W., Heimbach, P., Hewitt, H. T., Holland, D. M.,



- Ilyina, T., Jungclaus, J. H., Komuro, Y., Krasting, J. P., Large, W. G., Marsland, S. J., Masina, S., McDougall, T. J., Nurser, A. J. G., Orr, J. C., Pirani, A., Qiao, F., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E., Treguier, A. M., Tsujino, H., Uotila, P., Valdivieso, M., Wang, Q., Winton, M., and Yeager, S. G.: OMIP contribution to CMIP6: experimental and diagnostic protocol for the physical component of the Ocean Model Intercomparison Project, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3231–3296, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3231-2016>, 2016.
- 1490 Guilyardi, E., Balaji, V., Callaghan, S., DeLuca, C., Devine, G., Denvil, S., Ford, R., Pascoe, C., Lautenschlager, M., Lawrence, B., Steenman-Clark, L., and Valcke, S.: The CMIP5 model and simulation documentation: a new standard for climate modelling metadata, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 42–46, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=42>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- 1495 Gutierrez, J. M., Treguier, A.-M., Durack, P. J., Emori, S., Meinshausen, M., Nowicki, S., and Ruiz, L.: Models, in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., pp. 2087–2137, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.016>, section: Annex II: Models Type: Book Section, 2021.
- 1500 Gutowski Jr., W. J., Giorgi, F., Timbal, B., Frigon, A., Jacob, D., Kang, H.-S., Raghavan, K., Lee, B., Lennard, C., Nikulin, G., O'Rourke, E., Rixen, M., Solman, S., Stephenson, T., and Tangang, F.: WCRP COordinated Regional Downscaling EXperiment (CORDEX): a diagnostic MIP for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 4087–4095, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-4087-2016>, 2016.
- Haarsma, R. J., Roberts, M. J., Vidale, P. L., Senior, C. A., Bellucci, A., Bao, Q., Chang, P., Corti, S., Fučkar, N. S., Guemas, V., Von Hardenberg, J., Hazeleger, W., Kodama, C., Koenigk, T., Leung, L. R., Lu, J., Luo, J.-J., Mao, J., Mizielinski, M. S., Mizuta, R., Nobre, P., Satoh, M., Scoccimarro, E., Semmler, T., Small, J., and Von Storch, J.-S.: High Resolution Model Intercomparison Project (HighResMIP v1.0) for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 4185–4208, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-4185-2016>, 2016.
- Hegerl, G., Meehl, G., Covey, C., Latif, M., McAvaney, B., and Stouffer, R.: 20C3M: CMIP collecting data from 20th century coupled model simulations, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 26, 4, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges26.pdf#page=36>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2003.
- 1510 Hegerl, G. C., Stott, P. A., Allen, M. R., Mitchell, J. F. B., Tett, S. F. B., and Cubasch, U.: Optimal detection and attribution of climate change: sensitivity of results to climate model differences, *Climate Dynamics*, 16, 737–754, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003820000071>, 2000.
- Hegglin, M., Kinnison, D., and Lamarque, J.-F.: CCMi nitrogen surface fluxes in support of CMIP6 - version 2.0, <https://doi.org/10.22033/ESGF/input4MIPs.1125>, 2016.
- 1515 Hibbard, K., van Vuuren, D., and Edmonds, J.: A primer on the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) and the coordination between the climate and integrated assessment modeling communities, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 12–15, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- Hibbard, K. A., Meehl, G. A., Cox, P. M., and Friedlingstein, P.: A strategy for climate change stabilization experiments, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 88, 217–221, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007EO200002>, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2007EO200002>, 2007.
- 1520 Hoesly, R. M., Smith, S. J., Feng, L., Klimont, Z., Janssens-Maenhout, G., Pitkanen, T., Seibert, J. J., Vu, L., Andres, R. J., Bolt, R. M., Bond, T. C., Dawidowski, L., Kholod, N., Kurokawa, J.-i., Li, M., Liu, L., Lu, Z., Moura, M. C. P., O'Rourke, P. R., and Zhang, Q.: Historical



- (1750–2014) anthropogenic emissions of reactive gases and aerosols from the Community Emissions Data System (CEDs), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 369–408, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-369-2018>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2018.
- 1525 Hoffman, F. M., Covey, C. C., Fung, I. Y., Randerson, J. T., Thornton, P. E., Lee, Y.-H., Rosenbloom, N. A., Stöckli, R. C., Running, S. W., Bernholdt, D. E., and Williams, D. N.: Results from the carbon-land model intercomparison project (C-LAMP) and availability of the data on the earth system grid (ESG), *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 78, 012 026, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/78/1/012026>, 2007.
- 1530 Hoffman, F. M., Hassler, B., Beadling, R., Blockley, E., Francis, F., Huang, B., Lee, J., Lembo, V., Lewis, J., Lu, J., Madaus, L., Malinina, E., Medeiros, B., Pokam, W., Scoccimarro, E., Swaminathan, R., and Marquez, A. L.: Systematic Benchmarking of Climate Models: Methodologies, Applications, and New Directions, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, p. 44, <https://www.overleaf.com/project/664c932cdc0a8558bb42a0f4>, 2025.
- Holland, M. M., Hannay, C., Fasullo, J., Jahn, A., Kay, J. E., Mills, M., Simpson, I. R., Wieder, W., Lawrence, P., Kluzek, E., and Bailey, D.:
1535 New model ensemble reveals how forcing uncertainty and model structure alter climate simulated across CMIP generations of the Community Earth System Model, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 1585–1602, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-1585-2024>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2024.
- Hurtt, G. C., Frolking, S., Fearon, M. G., Moore, B., Shevliakova, E., Malyshev, S., Pacala, S. W., and Houghton, R. A.:
1540 The underpinnings of land-use history: three centuries of global gridded land-use transitions, wood-harvest activity, and resulting secondary lands, *Global Change Biology*, 12, 1208–1229, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01150.x>, [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01150.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01150.x), 2006.
- Hurtt, G. C., Chini, L., Sahajpal, R., Frolking, S., Bodirsky, B. L., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Fisk, J., Fujimori, S., Klein Goldewijk, K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Heinemann, A., Humpenöder, F., Jungclaus, J., Kaplan, J. O., Kennedy, J., Krisztin, T., Lawrence, D., Lawrence, P., Ma, L., Mertz, O., Pongratz, J., Popp, A., Poulter, B., Riahi, K., Shevliakova, E., Stehfest, E., Thornton, P., Tubiello, F. N., van
1545 Vuuren, D. P., and Zhang, X.: Harmonization of global land use change and management for the period 850–2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 5425–5464, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-5425-2020>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2020.
- IPCC: Policymakers Summary, in: *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment*. Report Prepared for IPCC by Working Group I, edited by Houghton, J., Jenkins, G., and Ephraums, J., p. 28, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, ISBN ISBN 0-521-40720-6, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ipcc_far_wg_I_spm.pdf, section: SPM Type: Book Section, 1990.
- 1550 IPCC: Summary for Policymakers, in: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S. L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M. I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J. B. R., Maycock, T. K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R., and Zhou, B., pp. 1–31, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.001>, type: Book Section, 2021.
- 1555 Jakob, C., Gettelman, A., and Pitman, A.: The need to operationalize climate modelling, *Nature Climate Change*, 13, 1158–1160, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01849-4>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2023.
- Jones, C. D., Arora, V., Friedlingstein, P., Bopp, L., Brovkin, V., Dunne, J., Graven, H., Hoffman, F., Ilyina, T., John, J. G., Jung, M., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C., Pongratz, J., Raddatz, T., Randerson, J. T., and Zaehle, S.: C4MIP – The Coupled Climate–Carbon Cycle Model Intercomparison Project: experimental protocol for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2853–2880,
1560 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-2853-2016>, 2016.



- Jones, C. D., Frölicher, T. L., Koven, C., MacDougall, A. H., Matthews, H. D., Zickfeld, K., Rogelj, J., Tokarska, K. B., Gillett, N. P., Ilyina, T., Meinshausen, M., Mengis, N., Séférian, R., Eby, M., and Burger, F. A.: The Zero Emissions Commitment Model Intercomparison Project (ZECMIP) contribution to C4MIP: quantifying committed climate changes following zero carbon emissions, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12, 4375–4385, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-4375-2019>, 2019.
- 1565 Jones, C. G., Adloff, F., Booth, B. B. B., Cox, P. M., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Frieler, K., Hewitt, H. T., Jeffery, H. A., Jousaume, S., Koenigk, T., Lawrence, B. N., O'Rourke, E., Roberts, M. J., Sanderson, B. M., Séférian, R., Somot, S., Vidale, P. L., van Vuuren, D., Acosta, M., Bentsen, M., Bernardello, R., Betts, R., Blockley, E., Boé, J., Bracegirdle, T., Braconnot, P., Brovkin, V., Buontempo, C., Doblas-Reyes, F., Donat, M., Epicoco, I., Falloon, P., Fiore, S., Frölicher, T., Fučkar, N. S., Gidden, M. J., Goessling, H. F., Graversen, R. G., Gualdi, S., Gutiérrez, J. M., Ilyina, T., Jacob, D., Jones, C. D., Jukes, M., Kendon, E., Kjellström, E., Knutti, R., Lowe, J.,
- 1570 Mizieliński, M., Nassisi, P., Obersteiner, M., Regnier, P., Roehrig, R., Salas y Méliá, D., Schleussner, C.-F., Schulz, M., Scoccimarro, E., Terray, L., Thiemann, H., Wood, R. A., Yang, S., and Zaehle, S.: Bringing it all together: science priorities for improved understanding of Earth system change and to support international climate policy, *Earth System Dynamics*, 15, 1319–1351, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-15-1319-2024>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2024.
- Jousaume, S. and Taylor, K. E.: PMIP: Looking back to its first phase, *Past Global Changes Magazine*, 29, 64–65, <https://doi.org/10.22498/pages.29.2.64>, 2021.
- 1575 Jukes, M., Taylor, K. E., Durack, P. J., Lawrence, B., Mizieliński, M. S., Pamment, A., Peterschmitt, J.-Y., Rixen, M., and Sénési, S.: The CMIP6 Data Request (DREQ, version 01.00.31), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 201–224, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-201-2020>, 2020.
- Kageyama, M., Braconnot, P., Harrison, S. P., Haywood, A. M., Jungclaus, J. H., Otto-Bliesner, B. L., Peterschmitt, J.-Y., Abe-Ouchi, A.,
- 1580 Albani, S., Bartlein, P. J., Brierley, C., Crucifix, M., Dolan, A., Fernandez-Donado, L., Fischer, H., Hopcroft, P. O., Ivanovic, R. F., Lambert, F., Lunt, D. J., Mahowald, N. M., Peltier, W. R., Phipps, S. J., Roche, D. M., Schmidt, G. A., Tarasov, L., Valdes, P. J., Zhang, Q., and Zhou, T.: The PMIP4 contribution to CMIP6 – Part 1: Overview and over-arching analysis plan, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 1033–1057, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1033-2018>, 2018.
- Keller, D. P., Lenton, A., Scott, V., Vaughan, N. E., Bauer, N., Ji, D., Jones, C. D., Kravitz, B., Muri, H., and Zickfeld, K.: The Carbon Dioxide
- 1585 Removal Model Intercomparison Project (CDRMIP): rationale and experimental protocol for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 1133–1160, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1133-2018>, 2018.
- Kerr, R. A. and Kintisch, E.: Nobel Peace Prize Won by Host of Scientists and One Crusader, *Science*, 318, 372–373, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.318.5849.372>, publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2007.
- Kershaw, P., Abdulla, G., Ames, S., and Evans, B.: ESGF Future Architecture Report (V.1.1), Tech. Rep. LLNL-TR-812915, RAL Space, STFC, Harwell, Didcot (United Kingdom); Lawrence Livermore National Lab. (LLNL), Livermore, CA (United States); Australian National Univ., Acton (Australia), <https://doi.org/10.2172/1643759>, 2020.
- 1590 Klein Goldewijk, K., Beusen, A., van Drecht, G., and de Vos, M.: The HYDE 3.1 spatially explicit database of human-induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years, *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20, 73–86, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00587.x>, eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00587.x>, 2011.
- 1595 Knutti, R., Masson, D., and Gettelman, A.: Climate model genealogy: Generation CMIP5 and how we got there, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40, 1194–1199, <https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50256>, eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/grl.50256>, 2013.
- Kravitz, B., Robock, A., Tilmes, S., Boucher, O., English, J. M., Irvine, P. J., Jones, A., Lawrence, M. G., MacCracken, M., Muri, H., Moore, J. C., Niemeier, U., Phipps, S. J., Sillmann, J., Storelvmo, T., Wang, H., and Watanabe, S.: The Geoengineering Model Inter-



- comparison Project Phase 6 (GeoMIP6): simulation design and preliminary results, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8, 3379–3392, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-3379-2015>, 2015.
- 1600
- Lamarque, J.-F., Bond, T. C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D., Liousse, C., Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M. G., Shindell, D., Smith, S. J., Stehfest, E., Van Aardenne, J., Cooper, O. R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J. R., Naik, V., Riahi, K., and van Vuuren, D. P.: Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: methodology and application, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 10, 7017–7039, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-10-7017-2010>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2010.
- 1605
- Lamarque, J.-F., Dentener, F., McConnell, J., Ro, C.-U., Shaw, M., Vet, R., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P., Dalsoren, S., Doherty, R., Faluvegi, G., Ghan, S. J., Josse, B., Lee, Y. H., MacKenzie, I. A., Plummer, D., Shindell, D. T., Skeie, R. B., Stevenson, D. S., Strode, S., Zeng, G., Curran, M., Dahl-Jensen, D., Das, S., Fritzsche, D., and Nolan, M.: Multi-model mean nitrogen and sulfur deposition from the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP): evaluation of historical and projected future changes, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 7997–8018, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-7997-2013>, 2013.
- 1610
- Lambert, S. J. and Boer, G. J.: CMIP1 evaluation and intercomparison of coupled climate models, *Climate Dynamics*, 17, 83–106, <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00013736>, 2001.
- Lamboll, R. D., Jones, C. D., Skeie, R. B., Fiedler, S., Samset, B. H., Gillett, N. P., Rogelj, J., and Forster, P. M.: Modifying emissions scenario projections to account for the effects of COVID-19: protocol for CovidMIP, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14, 3683–3695, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-3683-2021>, 2021.
- 1615
- Lawrence, B. N., Drach, R., Eaton, B. E., Gregory, J., Hankin, S., Lowry, R., Rew, R., and Taylor, K. E.: Maintaining and Advancing the CF Standard for Earth System Science Community Data, Tech. rep., Zenodo, Harwell, Didcot, UK, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14213197>, 2006.
- Lawrence, B. N., Balaji, V., Bentley, P., Callaghan, S., DeLuca, C., Denvil, S., Devine, G., Elkington, M., Ford, R. W., Guilyardi, E., Lautenschlager, M., Morgan, M., Moine, M.-P., Murphy, S., Pascoe, C., Ramthun, H., Slavin, P., Steenman-Clark, L., Toussaint, F., Treshansky, A., and Valcke, S.: Describing Earth system simulations with the Metafor CIM, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 5, 1493–1500, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-1493-2012>, 2012.
- 1620
- Lawrence, D. M., Hurtt, G. C., Arneth, A., Brovkin, V., Calvin, K. V., Jones, A. D., Jones, C. D., Lawrence, P. J., De Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Pongratz, J., Seneviratne, S. I., and Shevliakova, E.: The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP) contribution to CMIP6: rationale and experimental design, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2973–2998, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-2973-2016>, 2016.
- 1625
- Lean, J. L., Warren, H. P., Mariska, J. T., and Bishop, J.: A new model of solar EUV irradiance variability 2. Comparisons with empirical models and observations and implications for space weather, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics*, 108, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JA009238>, eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2001JA009238>, 2003.
- Lee, J., Gleckler, P. J., Ahn, M.-S., Ordonez, A., Ullrich, P. A., Sperber, K. R., Taylor, K. E., Planton, Y. Y., Guilyardi, E., Durack, P., Bonfils, C., Zelinka, M. D., Chao, L.-W., Dong, B., Doutriaux, C., Zhang, C., Vo, T., Boutte, J., Wehner, M. F., Pendergrass, A. G., Kim, D., Xue, Z., Wittenberg, A. T., and Krasting, J.: Systematic and objective evaluation of Earth system models: PCMDI Metrics Package (PMP) version 3, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 3919–3948, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-3919-2024>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2024.
- 1630
- Liang, Z.-Z., Wang, W.-C., and Boyle, J. S.: PCMDI Report No. 43: Atmospheric ozone climatology for use in general circulation models, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 26, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13835145>, place: Lawrence
- 1635



- Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Report, 1997.
- Luther, F. M., Ellingson, R. G., Fouquart, Y., Fels, S., Scott, N. A., and Wiscombe, W. J.: Intercomparison of Radiation Codes in Climate Models (ICRCCM): Longwave Clear-Sky Results—A Workshop Summary, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 69, 40–48, 1640 <https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477-69.1.40>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 1988.
- MacCracken, M. C. and Luther, F. M.: Projecting the climatic effects of increasing carbon dioxide, Tech. Rep. DOE/ER-0237, USDOE Office of Energy Research, Washington, DC. Carbon Dioxide Research Div.; Lawrence Livermore National Lab. (LLNL), Livermore, CA (United States), <https://doi.org/10.2172/5885458>, 1985.
- 1645 Manabe, S.: CLIMATE AND THE OCEAN CIRCULATION: I. THE ATMOSPHERIC CIRCULATION AND THE HYDROLOGY OF THE EARTH'S SURFACE, *Monthly Weather Review*, 97, 739–774, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1969\)097<0739:CATOC>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1969)097<0739:CATOC>2.3.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Monthly Weather Review, 1969.
- Manabe, S. and Bryan, K.: Climate Calculations with a Combined Ocean-Atmosphere Model, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 26, 786–789, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1969\)026<0786:CCWACO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1969)026<0786:CCWACO>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: 1650 *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 1969.
- Manabe, S. and Stouffer, R. J.: A CO₂-climate sensitivity study with a mathematical model of the global climate, *Nature*, 282, 491–493, <https://doi.org/10.1038/282491a0>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 1979.
- Manabe, S., Bryan, K., and Spelman, M. J.: A Global Ocean-Atmosphere Climate Model. Part I. The Atmospheric Circulation, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 5, 3–29, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485\(1975\)005<0003:AGOACM>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1975)005<0003:AGOACM>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: 1655 *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 1975.
- Masson, D. and Knutti, R.: Climate model genealogy, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL046864>, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2011GL046864>, 2011.
- Mastrandrea, M. D., Field, C. B., Stocker, T. F., Edenhofer, O., Ebi, K. L., Frame, D. J., Held, H., Kriegler, E., Mach, K. J., Matschoss, P. R., Plattner, G.-K., Yohe, G. W., and Zwiers, F. W.: Guidance Note for Lead Authors of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report on Consistent Treatment of Uncertainties, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5_Uncertainty_Guidance_Note.pdf, backup Publisher: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Pages: 6 Place: Geneva, Switzerland Type: Note, 2010.
- 1660 Matthes, K., Funke, B., Andersson, M. E., Barnard, L., Beer, J., Charbonneau, P., Clilverd, M. A., Dudok de Wit, T., Haberleiter, M., Hendry, A., Jackman, C. H., Kretzschmar, M., Kruschke, T., Kunze, M., Langematz, U., Marsh, D. R., Maycock, A. C., Misios, S., Rodger, C. J., Scaife, A. A., Seppälä, A., Shanguan, M., Sinnhuber, M., Tourpali, K., Usoskin, I., van de Kamp, M., Verronen, P. T., and Versick, S.: 1665 Solar forcing for CMIP6 (v3.2), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 2247–2302, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2247-2017>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2017.
- Mauzey, C., Doutriaux, C., Nadeau, D., Taylor, K. E., Durack, P. J., Betts, E., Cofino, A. S., Florek, P., Hogan, E., Kettleborough, J., Nicholls, Z., Ogochi, K., Seddon, J., Wachsmann, F., Weigel, T., and jmrgonza: CMOR v3.9 (Climate Model Output Rewriter; CMOR3), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.592733>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for 1670 Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Software Type: Software, 2024.
- McAvaney, B., Covey, C., Joussaume, S., Kattsov, V., Kitoh, A., Ogana, W., Pitman, A., Weaver, A., Wood, R., and Zhao, Z.-C.: Model Evaluation, in: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Houghton, J., Ding, Y., Griggs, D., Noguer, M., van der Linden, P., Dai, X.,



- Maskell, K., and Johnson, C., pp. 471–523, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, ISBN ISBN 0521-01495-6, <https://archive.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/tar/wg1/pdf/TAR-08.PDF>, section: 8 Type: Book Section, 2001.
- 1675 McAvaney, B. J. and Le Treut, H.: The Cloud Feedback Intercomparison Project: CFMIP, CLIVAR Exchanges, 26, 4, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges26.pdf#page=36>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2003.
- Meehl, G. A.: Global Coupled General Circulation Models, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 76, 951–957, 1680 <https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477-76.6.951>, 1995.
- Meehl, G. A.: Catalogue of Model Intercomparison Projects, <http://web.archive.org/web/20050319232556/http://www.clivar.org/science/mips.htm>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publication Title: CLIVAR Website Type: Webpage, 2003.
- Meehl, G. A.: The Role of the IPCC in Climate Science, in: *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Climate Science*, p. 35, ISBN 978-0-19-022862-0, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228620.013.933>, 2023.
- 1685 Meehl, G. A. and Bony, S.: Introduction to CMIP5, CLIVAR Exchanges, 56, 4–5, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- Meehl, G. A., Boer, G. J., Covey, C., Latif, M., and Stouffer, R. J.: Intercomparison makes for a better climate model, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 78, 445–451, <https://doi.org/10.1029/97EO00276>, 1997.
- Meehl, G. A., Boer, G. J., Covey, C., Latif, M., and Stouffer, R. J.: The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP), *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 81, 313–318, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(2000\)080<0305:MROTEA>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2000)080<0305:MROTEA>2.3.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2000.
- 1690 Meehl, G. A., Covey, C., Latif, M., McAvaney, B., and Stouffer, R. J.: CMIP: The Coupled Model Intercomparison Project, CLIVAR Exchanges, 26, 4, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges26.pdf#page=36>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2003.
- 1695 Meehl, G. A., Covey, C., McAvaney, B., Latif, M., and Stouffer, R. J.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 86, 89–94, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-86-1-89>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2005a.
- Meehl, G. A., Washington, W. M., Collins, W. D., Arblaster, J. M., Hu, A., Buja, L. E., Strand, W. G., and Teng, H.: How Much More Global Warming and Sea Level Rise?, *Science*, 307, 1769–1772, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106663>, publisher: American Association for 1700 the Advancement of Science, 2005b.
- Meehl, G. A., Covey, C., Delworth, T., Latif, M., McAvaney, B., Mitchell, J. F. B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: THE WCRP CMIP3 Multimodel Dataset: A New Era in Climate Change Research, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 88, 1383–1394, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-88-9-1383>, 2007a.
- Meehl, G. A., Stocker, T. F., Collins, W. D., Friedlingstein, P., Gaye, A. T., Gregory, J. M., Kitoh, A., Knutti, R., Murphy, J. M., Noda, A., 1705 Raper, S. C., Watterson, I. G., Weaver, A. J., and Zhao, Z.-C.: Global Climate Projections, in: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L., pp. 747–845, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, <https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar4-wg1-chapter10-1.pdf>, section: 10 Type: Book Section, 2007b.
- 1710 Meehl, G. A., Goddard, L., Murphy, J., Stouffer, R. J., Boer, G., Danabasoglu, G., Dixon, K., Giorgetta, M. A., Greene, A. M., Hawkins, E., Hegerl, G., Karoly, D., Keenlyside, N., Kimoto, M., Kirtman, B., Navarra, A., Pulwarty, R., Smith, D., Stammer,



- D., and Stockdale, T.: Decadal Prediction: Can It Be Skillful?, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 90, 1467–1486, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009BAMS2778.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2009.
- 1715 Meehl, G. A., Goddard, L., Boer, G., Burgman, R., Branstator, G., Cassou, C., Corti, S., Danabasoglu, G., Doblas-Reyes, F., Hawkins, E., Karspeck, A., Kimoto, M., Kumar, A., Matei, D., Mignot, J., Msadek, R., Navarra, A., Pohlmann, H., Rienecker, M., Rosati, T., Schneider, E., Smith, D., Sutton, R., Teng, H., Oldenborgh, G. J. v., Vecchi, G., and Yeager, S.: Decadal Climate Prediction: An Update from the Trenches, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 95, 243–267, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00241.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2014a.
- 1720 Meehl, G. A., Moss, R., Taylor, K. E., Eyring, V., Stouffer, R. J., Bony, S., and Stevens, B.: Climate Model Intercomparisons: Preparing for the Next Phase, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 95, 77–78, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014EO090001>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2014EO090001>, 2014b.
- Meinshausen, M., Smith, S. J., Calvin, K., Daniel, J. S., Kainuma, M. L. T., Lamarque, J.-F., Matsumoto, K., Montzka, S. A., Raper, S. C. B., Riahi, K., Thomson, A., Velders, G. J. M., and van Vuuren, D. P.: The RCP greenhouse gas concentrations and their extensions from 1765
1725 to 2300, *Climatic Change*, 109, 213, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0156-z>, 2011.
- Meinshausen, M., Vogel, E., Nauels, A., Lorbacher, K., Meinshausen, N., Etheridge, D. M., Fraser, P. J., Montzka, S. A., Rayner, P. J., Trudinger, C. M., Krummel, P. B., Beyerle, U., Canadell, J. G., Daniel, J. S., Enting, I. G., Law, R. M., Lunder, C. R., O’Doherty, S., Prinn, R. G., Reimann, S., Rubino, M., Velders, G. J. M., Vollmer, M. K., Wang, R. H. J., and Weiss, R.: Historical greenhouse gas concentrations for climate modelling (CMIP6), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 2057–2116, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2057-2017>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2017.
- 1730 Miller, R. L., Schmidt, G. A., Nazarenko, L. S., Tausnev, N., Bauer, S. E., DelGenio, A. D., Kelley, M., Lo, K. K., Ruedy, R., Shindell, D. T., Aleinov, I., Bauer, M., Bleck, R., Canuto, V., Chen, Y., Cheng, Y., Clune, T. L., Faluvegi, G., Hansen, J. E., Healy, R. J., Kiang, N. Y., Koch, D., Lacis, A. A., LeGrande, A. N., Lerner, J., Menon, S., Oinas, V., Pérez García-Pando, C., Perlwitz, J. P., Puma, M. J., Rind, D., Romanou, A., Russell, G. L., Sato, M., Sun, S., Tsigaridis, K., Unger, N., Voulgarakis, A., Yao, M.-S., and Zhang, J.: CMIP5 historical simulations
1735 (1850–2012) with GISS ModelE2, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 6, 441–478, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013MS000266>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2013MS000266>, 2014.
- Mizielinski, M. S., Durack, P. J., Taylor, K. E., Dunne, J., Ellis, D., Juckes, M., Stockhouse, M., and Turner, B.: CMIP6Plus Whitepaper, Tech. rep., Zenodo, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13768495>, 2024.
- 1740 Moss, R., Babiker, M., Brinkman, S., Calvo, E., Carter, T., Edmonds, J., Elgizoulo, I., Emori, S., Erda, L., Hibbard, K., Jones, R., Kainuma, M., Kelleher, J., Lamarque, J. F., Manning, M., Matthews, B., Meehl, J., Meyer, L., Mitchell, J., Nakicenovic, N., O’Neill, B., Pichs, R., Riahi, K., Rose, S., Runci, P., Stouffer, R., van Vuuren, D., Wyant, J., Wilbanks, T., van Ypersele, J. P., and Zurek, M.: Towards New Scenarios for Analysis of Emissions, Climate Change, Impacts and Response Strategies, <https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/05/expert-meeting-report-scenarios-1.pdf>, backup Publisher: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Pages: 155 Place: Geneva, Switzerland Type: Note, 2008.
- 1745 Moss, R. H., Edmonds, J. A., Hibbard, K. A., Manning, M. R., Rose, S. K., van Vuuren, D. P., Carter, T. R., Emori, S., Kainuma, M., Kram, T., Meehl, G. A., Mitchell, J. F. B., Nakicenovic, N., Riahi, K., Smith, S. J., Stouffer, R. J., Thomson, A. M., Weyant, J. P., and Wilbanks, T. J.: The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment, *Nature*, 463, 747–756, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08823>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2010.



- 1750 Nadeau, D., Mauzey, C., Doutriaux, C., Taylor, K. E., and Durack, P. J.: CMIP6 CMOR Tables v6.8, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.597650>,
place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Inter-
comparison (PCMDI), Software Type: Software, 2017.
- 1755 Nakićenović, N., Davidson, O., David, G., Grubler, A., Kram, T., La Rovere, E. L., Metz, B., Morita, T., Pepper, W., Pitcher, H., Sankovski,
A., Shukla, P., Swart, R., Watson, R., and Dadi, Z.: Summary For Policymakers: Emissions Scenarios, in: Emissions Scenarios: An IPCC
Special Report on Emissions Scenarios, edited by Nakićenović, N. and Swart, R., p. 27, World Meteorological Organization, Geneva,
Switzerland, ISBN 92-9169-113-5, <https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/sres-en.pdf>, 2000.
- 1760 Neelin, J. D., Krasting, J. P., Radhakrishnan, A., Liptak, J., Jackson, T., Ming, Y., Dong, W., Gettelman, A., Coleman, D. R., Maloney,
E. D., Wing, A. A., Kuo, Y.-H., Ahmed, F., Ullrich, P., Bitz, C. M., Neale, R. B., Ordóñez, A., and Maroon, E. A.: Process-Oriented
Diagnostics: Principles, Practice, Community Development, and Common Standards, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*,
104, E1452–E1468, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-21-0268.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the
American Meteorological Society, 2023.
- NOAA PMEL: Version 4.00 Release Notes for Ferret Users Guide, https://ferret.pmel.noaa.gov/static/Documentation/Release_Notes/v400.html, 1995.
- 1765 Notz, D., Jahn, A., Holland, M., Hunke, E., Massonnet, F., Stroeve, J., Tremblay, B., and Vancoppenolle, M.: The CMIP6 Sea-Ice Model
Intercomparison Project (SIMIP): understanding sea ice through climate-model simulations, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3427–
3446, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3427-2016>, 2016.
- Nowicki, S. M. J., Payne, A., Larour, E., Seroussi, H., Goelzer, H., Lipscomb, W., Gregory, J., Abe-Ouchi, A., and Shepherd,
A.: Ice Sheet Model Intercomparison Project (ISMIP6) contribution to CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 4521–4545,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-4521-2016>, 2016.
- 1770 O’Neill, B. C., Tebaldi, C., Van Vuuren, D. P., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Hurtt, G., Knutti, R., Krieglner, E., Lamarque, J.-F., Lowe,
J., Meehl, G. A., Moss, R., Riahi, K., and Sanderson, B. M.: The Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6,
Geoscientific Model Development, 9, 3461–3482, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3461-2016>, 2016.
- O’Rourke, E.: CMIP6 Community Survey Results, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11654909>, 2024.
- Orr, J. C.: On ocean carbon-cycle model comparison, *Tellus B*, 51, 509–530, <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0889.1999.00026.x>, _eprint:
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1034/j.1600-0889.1999.00026.x>, 1999.
- 1775 Orr, J. C., Najjar, R. G., Aumont, O., Bopp, L., Bullister, J. L., Danabasoglu, G., Doney, S. C., Dunne, J. P., Dutay, J.-C., Graven, H., Griffies,
S. M., John, J. G., Joos, F., Levin, I., Lindsay, K., Matear, R. J., McKinley, G. A., Mouchet, A., Oschlies, A., Romanou, A., Schlitzer, R.,
Tagliabue, A., Tanhua, T., and Yool, A.: Biogeochemical protocols and diagnostics for the CMIP6 Ocean Model Intercomparison Project
(OMIP), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 2169–2199, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2169-2017>, 2017.
- 1780 Pascoe, C., Lawrence, B. N., Guilyardi, E., Juckes, M., and Taylor, K. E.: Documenting numerical experiments in support of the Coupled
Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 2149–2167, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-2149-2020>, 2020.
- 1785 Petrie, R., Denvil, S., Ames, S., Levavasseur, G., Fiore, S., Allen, C., Antonio, F., Berger, K., Bretonnière, P.-A., Cinquini, L., Dart, E.,
Dwarakanath, P., Druken, K., Evans, B., Franchistéguy, L., Gardoll, S., Gerbier, E., Greenslade, M., Hassell, D., Iwi, A., Juckes, M.,
Kindermann, S., Lacinski, L., Mirto, M., Nasser, A. B., Nassisi, P., Nienhouse, E., Nikonov, S., Nuzzo, A., Richards, C., Ridzwan, S.,
Rixen, M., Serradell, K., Snow, K., Stephens, A., Stockhouse, M., Vahlenkamp, H., and Wagner, R.: Coordinating an operational data
distribution network for CMIP6 data, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14, 629–644, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-629-2021>, 2021.



- Phillips, A. S., Deser, C., and Fasullo, J.: Evaluating Modes of Variability in Climate Models, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 95, 453–455, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014EO490002>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/2014EO490002>, 2014.
- 1790 Phillips, T. J.: Documentation of the AMIP Models on the World Wide Web, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 77, 1191–1196, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(1996\)077<1191:DOTAMO>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<1191:DOTAMO>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 1996.
- Pincus, R., Forster, P. M., and Stevens, B.: The Radiative Forcing Model Intercomparison Project (RFMIP): experimental protocol for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3447–3460, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3447-2016>, 2016.
- 1795 Pongratz, J., Reick, C., Raddatz, T., and Claussen, M.: A reconstruction of global agricultural areas and land cover for the last millennium, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB003153>, _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2007GB003153>, 2008.
- Potter, G. L., Bader, D. C., Riches, M., Bamzai, A., and Joseph, R.: Celebrating Two Decades of the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 92, 629–631, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011BAMS3018.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2011.
- 1800 Randall, D. A., Wood, R. A., Bony, S., Colman, R., Fichet, T., Fyfe, J., Kattsov, V., Pitman, A., Shukla, J., Srinivasan, J., Stouffer, R. J., Sumi, A., and Taylor, K. E.: Climate Models and Their Evaluation, in: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L., pp. 589–662, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, <https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ar4-wg1-chapter8-1.pdf>, section: 8 Type: Book Section, 2007.
- Riches, M. R.: CO2 climate research plan, Tech. Rep. DOE/ER-0186, USDOE Office of Energy Research, Washington, DC. Office of Basic Energy Sciences, <https://doi.org/10.2172/5443370>, 1983.
- Righi, M., Andela, B., Eyring, V., Lauer, A., Predoi, V., Schlund, M., Vegas-Regidor, J., Bock, L., Brötz, B., de Mora, L., Diblen, F., Dreyer, L., Drost, N., Earnshaw, P., Hassler, B., Koldunov, N., Little, B., Loosveldt Tomas, S., and Zimmermann, K.: Earth System Model Evaluation Tool (ESMValTool) v2.0 – technical overview, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 1179–1199, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1179-2020>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2020.
- 1810 Rodriguez, S., Ben-Nasser, A., and Levavasseur, G.: ESGF data transfer and replication tool (esgpull) v0.7.4, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14228984>, place: Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL), Paris, France Series: Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL), Software Type: Software, 2024.
- 1815 Ruane, A. C., Teichmann, C., Arnell, N. W., Carter, T. R., Ebi, K. L., Frieler, K., Goodess, C. M., Hewitson, B., Horton, R., Kovats, R. S., Lotze, H. K., Mearns, L. O., Navarra, A., Ojima, D. S., Riahi, K., Rosenzweig, C., Themessl, M., and Vincent, K.: The Vulnerability, Impacts, Adaptation and Climate Services Advisory Board (VIACS AB v1.0) contribution to CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3493–3515, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3493-2016>, 2016.
- 1820 Räisänen, J.: CO2-Induced Climate Change in CMIP2 Experiments: Quantification of Agreement and Role of Internal Variability, *Journal of Climate*, 14, 2088–2104, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(2001\)014<2088:CICCIC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2001)014<2088:CICCIC>2.0.CO;2), publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Journal of Climate, 2001.
- Santer, B., Wigley, T., Barnett, T., and Anyamba, E.: Detection of Climate Change and Attribution of Causes, in: *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group I to the Second Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel*



- 1825 on Climate Change, edited by Houghton, J., Meira Filho, L., Callander, B., Harris, N., Kattenberg, A., and Maskell, K., pp. 407–443, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, ISBN ISBN 0-521-56436-0, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ipcc_sar_wg_I_full_report.pdf, section: 8 Type: Book Section, 1996.
- Santer, B. D.: On The Detection of Climate Change, CLIVAR Exchanges, 1, 4–6, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges1.pdf#page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Hamburg, Germany Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 1996.
- 1830 Santer, B. D., Taylor, K. E., Wigley, T. M. L., Penner, J. E., Jones, P. D., and Cubasch, U.: Towards the detection and attribution of an anthropogenic effect on climate, *Climate Dynamics*, 12, 77–100, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00223722>, 1995.
- Sato, M., Hansen, J. E., McCormick, M. P., and Pollack, J. B.: Stratospheric aerosol optical depths, 1850–1990, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 98, 22 987–22 994, <https://doi.org/10.1029/93JD02553>, [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/93JD02553](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/93JD02553), 1993.
- 1835 Shukla, J., Hagedorn, R., Miller, M., Palmer, T. N., Hoskins, B., Kinter, J., Marotzke, J., and Slingo, J.: Strategies: Revolution in Climate Prediction is Both Necessary and Possible: A Declaration at the World Modelling Summit for Climate Prediction, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 90, 175–178, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008BAMS2759.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2009.
- Shukla, J., Palmer, T. N., Hagedorn, R., Hoskins, B., Kinter, J., Marotzke, J., Miller, M., and Slingo, J.: Toward a New Generation of World Climate Research and Computing Facilities, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 91, 1407–1412, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010BAMS2900.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2010.
- 1840 Smith, D. M., Screen, J. A., Deser, C., Cohen, J., Fyfe, J. C., García-Serrano, J., Jung, T., Kattsov, V., Matei, D., Msadek, R., Peings, Y., Sigmond, M., Ukita, J., Yoon, J.-H., and Zhang, X.: The Polar Amplification Model Intercomparison Project (PAMIP) contribution to CMIP6: investigating the causes and consequences of polar amplification, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12, 1139–1164, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1139-2019>, 2019.
- Stenchikov, G., Hamilton, K., Stouffer, R. J., Robock, A., Ramaswamy, V., Santer, B., and Graf, H.-F.: Arctic Oscillation response to volcanic eruptions in the IPCC AR4 climate models, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 111, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006286>, [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2005JD006286](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2005JD006286), 2006.
- 1850 Stevens, B.: A Perspective on the Future of CMIP, *AGU Advances*, 5, e2023AV001 086, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023AV001086>, [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2023AV001086](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2023AV001086), 2024.
- Stockhause, M. and Lautenschlager, M.: CMIP6 Data Citation of Evolving Data, *Data Science Journal*, 16, 30, <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2017-030>, 2017.
- Stockhause, M. and Lautenschlager, M.: Twenty-five years of the IPCC Data Distribution Centre at the DKRZ and the Reference Data Archive for CMIP data, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 15, 6047–6058, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-6047-2022>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2022.
- 1855 Stockhause, M., Höck, H., Toussaint, F., and Lautenschlager, M.: Quality assessment concept of the World Data Center for Climate and its application to CMIP5 data, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 5, 1023–1032, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-1023-2012>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2012.
- 1860 Stockhause, M., Juckes, M., Chen, R., Okia, W. M., Pirani, A., Waterfield, T., Xing, X., and Edmunds, R.: Data Distribution Centre Support for the IPCC Sixth Assessment, *Data Science Journal*, 18, <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2019-020>, 2019.



- Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E., and Meehl, G. A.: CMIP5 Long-term experimental Design, CLIVAR Exchanges, 56, 5–7, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- 1865 Stouffer, R. J., Eyring, V., Meehl, G. A., Bony, S., Senior, C., Stevens, B., and Taylor, K. E.: CMIP5 Scientific Gaps and Recommendations for CMIP6, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 98, 95–105, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00013.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 2017.
- Taylor, K. E. and CMIP Community: PCMDI Working Paper: CMIP3 Model Output Metadata Requirements, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 25, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12764980>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Working Paper, 1870 2005.
- Taylor, K. E. and CMIP Community: PCMDI Working Paper: CMIP5 Model Standard Output, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 50, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12791447>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Working Paper, 2013.
- 1875 Taylor, K. E. and Penner, J. E.: Response of the climate system to atmospheric aerosols and greenhouse gases, *Nature*, 369, 734–737, <https://doi.org/10.1038/369734a0>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 1994.
- Taylor, K. E., Williamson, D., and Zwiers, F.: PCMDI Report No. 60: The sea surface temperature and sea-ice concentration boundary conditions for AMIP II simulations, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 28, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13835219>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Report, 1880 2000.
- Taylor, K. E., Doutriaux, C., and Peterschmitt, J.-Y.: CMOR v1.0 Users Guide (Climate Model Output Rewriter; CMOR1), <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12690071>, pages: 30 Place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Series: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), Software Documentation Type: Software Documentation, 2006.
- 1885 Taylor, K. E., Gleckler, P. J., Stouffer, R. J., Meehl, G. A., AchutaRao, K., Covey, C., Fiorino, M., Latif, M., McAvaney, B., Mitchell, J., Phillips, T. J., and Sperber, K. R.: PCMDI Working Paper: CMIP3 Model Standard Output, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 33, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12765214>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Working Paper, 2009.
- Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: CMIP5 Experiment Design, Tech. rep., Zenodo, Livermore, California, U.S.A., 1890 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14195417>, 2011.
- Taylor, K. E., Balaji, V., Hankin, S., Juckes, M., Lawrence, B., and Pascoe, S.: PCMDI Working Paper: CMIP5 Data Reference Syntax (DRS) and Controlled Vocabularies (CVs), Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI), p. 16, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12764403>, place: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, USA Publisher: Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) Type: Working Paper, 2012a.
- 1895 Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J., and Meehl, G. A.: An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93, 485–498, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1>, 2012b.
- Teixeira, J., Waliser, D., Ferraro, R., Gleckler, P., Lee, T., and Potter, G.: Satellite Observations for CMIP5: The Genesis of Obs4MIPs, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 95, 1329–1334, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00204.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 2014.



- 1900 Thomason, L. W., Ernest, N., Millán, L., Rieger, L., Bourassa, A., Vernier, J.-P., Manney, G., Luo, B., Arfeuille, F., and Peter, T.: A global space-based stratospheric aerosol climatology: 1979–2016, *Earth System Science Data*, 10, 469–492, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-469-2018>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2018.
- University Corporation of Atmospheric Research: NetCDF History - Background and Evolution, https://docs.unidata.ucar.edu/nug/2.0-draft/netcdf_history.html, 2021.
- 1905 U.S. Department Of Energy: Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program Plan, Tech. Rep. DOE/ER-0441, USDOE Office of Energy Research, Washington, DC (USA). Atmospheric and Climate Research Div., <https://doi.org/10.2172/7004715>, 1990.
- Van Den Hurk, B., Kim, H., Krinner, G., Seneviratne, S. I., Derksen, C., Oki, T., Douville, H., Colin, J., Ducharne, A., Cheruy, F., Viovy, N., Puma, M. J., Wada, Y., Li, W., Jia, B., Alessandri, A., Lawrence, D. M., Weedon, G. P., Ellis, R., Hagemann, S., Mao, J., Flanner, M. G., Zampieri, M., Materia, S., Law, R. M., and Sheffield, J.: LS3MIP (v1.0) contribution to CMIP6: the Land Surface, Snow and
- 1910 Soilmoisture Model Intercomparison Project – aims, setup and expected outcome, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2809–2832, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-2809-2016>, 2016.
- van Marle, M. J. E., Kloster, S., Magi, B. I., Marlon, J. R., Daniau, A.-L., Field, R. D., Arneeth, A., Forrest, M., Hantson, S., Kehrwald, N. M., Knorr, W., Lasslop, G., Li, F., Mangeon, S., Yue, C., Kaiser, J. W., and van der Werf, G. R.: Historic global biomass burning emissions for CMIP6 (BB4CMIP) based on merging satellite observations with proxies and fire models (1750–2015), *Geoscientific Model Development*,
- 1915 10, 3329–3357, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-3329-2017>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2017.
- Vargas Godoy, M. R., Markonis, Y., Hanel, M., Kyselý, J., and Papalexioiu, S. M.: The Global Water Cycle Budget: A Chronological Review, *Surveys in Geophysics*, 42, 1075–1107, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-021-09652-6>, 2021.
- Villwock, A.: What is CLIVAR?, CLIVAR Exchanges, 1, 2–3, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges1.pdf#page=2>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Hamburg, Germany Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 1996.
- 1920 Villwock, A. and Mitchell, J. F.: 6th session of the JSC/CLIVAR Working Group on Coupled Modelling (WGCM), CLIVAR Exchanges, 26, 31–33, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges26.pdf#page=31>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2003.
- Waliser, D., Gleckler, P. J., Ferraro, R., Taylor, K. E., Ames, S., Biard, J., Bosilovich, M. G., Brown, O., Chepfer, H., Cinquini, L., Durack, P. J., Eyring, V., Mathieu, P.-P., Lee, T., Pinnock, S., Potter, G. L., Rixen, M., Saunders, R., Schulz, J., Thépaut, J.-N., and Tuma, M.:
- 1925 Observations for Model Intercomparison Project (Obs4MIPs): status for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 2945–2958, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-2945-2020>, 2020.
- Wang, Y.-M., Lean, J. L., and N. R. Sheeley, J.: Modeling the Sun’s Magnetic Field and Irradiance since 1713, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 625, 522, <https://doi.org/10.1086/429689>, publisher: IOP Publishing, 2005.
- Waugh, D. W. and Eyring, V.: Quantitative performance metrics for stratospheric-resolving chemistry-climate models, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 8, 5699–5713, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-5699-2008>, publisher: Copernicus GmbH, 2008.
- 1930 Webb, M. J., Andrews, T., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Bony, S., Bretherton, C. S., Chadwick, R., Chepfer, H., Douville, H., Good, P., Kay, J. E., Klein, S. A., Marchand, R., Medeiros, B., Siebesma, A. P., Skinner, C. B., Stevens, B., Tselioudis, G., Tsushima, Y., and Watanabe, M.: The Cloud Feedback Model Intercomparison Project (CFMIP) contribution to CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10, 359–384, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-359-2017>, 2017.
- 1935 Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., Gonzalez-Beltran, A., Gray, A. J. G., Groth, P., Goble, C., Grethe, J. S., Heringa, J., ’t Hoen, P. A. C., Hooft, R., Kuhn, T., Kok, R., Kok,



- J., Lusher, S. J., Martone, M. E., Mons, A., Packer, A. L., Persson, B., Rocca-Serra, P., Roos, M., van Schaik, R., Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E., Sengstag, T., Slater, T., Strawn, G., Swertz, M. A., Thompson, M., van der Lei, J., van Mulligen, E., Velterop, J., Waagmeester, A., Wittenburg, P., Wolstencroft, K., Zhao, J., and Mons, B.: The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship, *Scientific Data*, 3, 16018, <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>, publisher: Nature Publishing Group, 2016.
- 1940 Williams, D. N.: DOE SciDAC's Earth System Grid Center for Enabling Technologies Final Report, Tech. Rep. LLNL-TR-501976, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Livermore, CA (United States), <https://doi.org/10.2172/1035947>, 2011.
- Williams, D. N. and Lautenschlager, M.: 5th Annual Earth System Grid Federation Face-to-Face Conference report, Monterey, California, December 7-11, 2015, Tech. Rep. DOE/SC-0181, US DOE Office of Science (SC), Washington, D.C. (United States). Biological and Environmental Research (BER), <https://doi.org/10.2172/1471406>, 2016.
- 1945 Williams, D. N., Ananthakrishnan, R., Bernholdt, D. E., Bharathi, S., Brown, D., Chen, M., Chervenak, A. L., Cinquini, L., Drach, R., Foster, I. T., Fox, P., Fraser, D., Garcia, J., Hankin, S., Jones, P., Middleton, D. E., Schwidder, J., Schweitzer, R., Schuler, R., Shoshani, A., Siebenlist, F., Sim, A., Strand, W. G., Su, M., and Wilhelmi, N.: The Earth System Grid: Enabling Access to Multimodel Climate Simulation Data, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 90, 195–206, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008BAMS2459.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2009.
- 1950 Williams, D. N., Taylor, K. E., Cinquini, L., Evans, B., Kawamiya, M., Lautenschlager, M., Lawrence, B. N., Middleton, D. E., and the ESGF contributors: The Earth System Grid Federation: Software Framework Supporting CMIP5 Data Analysis and Dissemination, *CLIVAR Exchanges*, 56, 40–42, <https://www.clivar.org/sites/default/files/documents/Exchanges56.pdf#Page=4>, place: International CLIVAR Project Office, Southampton, UK Publisher: CLIVAR Type: Article, 2011.
- Williams, D. N., Balaji, V., Cinquini, L., Denvil, S., Duffy, D., Evans, B., Ferraro, R., Hansen, R., Lautenschlager, M., and Trenham, C.: A Global Repository for Planet-Sized Experiments and Observations, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 97, 803–816, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00132.1>, publisher: American Meteorological Society Section: Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 2016.
- 1960 WMO World Climate Research Programme: Report of the Nineteenth Session of the CAS/JSC Working Group on Numerical Experimentation, <https://www.wcrp-climate.org/documents/wgne19rpt.pdf>, backup Publisher: World Meteorological Organization Pages: 48 Place: Geneva, Switzerland Type: Note, 2003.
- Zanchettin, D., Khodri, M., Timmreck, C., Toohey, M., Schmidt, A., Gerber, E. P., Hegerl, G., Robock, A., Pausata, F. S. R., Ball, W. T., Bauer, S. E., Bekki, S., Dhomse, S. S., LeGrande, A. N., Mann, G. W., Marshall, L., Mills, M., Marchand, M., Niemeier, U., Poulain, V., Rozanov, E., Rubino, A., Stenke, A., Tsigaridis, K., and Tummon, F.: The Model Intercomparison Project on the climatic response to Volcanic forcing (VolMIP): experimental design and forcing input data for CMIP6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2701–2719, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-2701-2016>, 2016.
- 1965 Zhou, T., Turner, A. G., Kinter, J. L., Wang, B., Qian, Y., Chen, X., Wu, B., Wang, B., Liu, B., Zou, L., and He, B.: GMMIP (v1.0) contribution to CMIP6: Global Monsoons Model Inter-comparison Project, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 3589–3604, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-3589-2016>, 2016.
- 1970