

Notes on IARP report – Billy Pizer – May 14, 2007

1. Overview of IARP

- a. Scope of activities
 - i. Core funding for two IA platforms, at MIT and PNNL
 - ii. Smaller competitive grants for individual projects
 - iii. Support for EMF and Snowmass workshops
- b. Contributions
 - i. Significant role in IPCC, especially working group III
 - ii. Scenario development
 - iii. Climate Change Science Program
 - iv. MIT and PNNL models called on regularly by White House, agencies, members of Congress and stakeholders.
 - v. Provided improved information for US negotiators in UNFCCC
 - vi. Spurred development of government supported models in other countries (now overtaking US expertise)
 - vii. Snowmass workshops as an opportunity for constructive criticism and cross-discipline interaction
- c. Summary suggestions
 - i. Improved integration with earth systems models on high performance computing platforms
 - ii. Improved representation of impacts
 - iii. Use of near-term objectives and metrics
 - iv. Increased attention to validation, evaluation and uncertainty
 - v. Near-term priority on capacity for practical policy implementation

2. Specific charge questions

- a. No change in scope, goals, and objectives.
- b. Greater interaction with climate modeling community and representation of impacts.
- c. Recommend greater specificity of near-term objectives
- d. More specifics:
 - i. Our recommendations
 - ii. Consultations with core teams
 - iii. Snowmass and elsewhere to assemble external recommendations
- e. Regional and local scales beyond IARP scope.
- f. Greater interaction with climate modeling community, particularly use of high performance computing
- g. Improved / continued emphasis on validation, model comparison, uncertainty
- h. Yes! Recommend future emphasis on capacity to model practical implementation (sub-optimal; policy adjustment)
- i. Generally yes. Recommend closer alignment of some smaller investigations to larger IA needs. Also, further funding should support smaller investigations. Leave the door open to a third model, if a promising, complementary platform arises.

3. Conclusions

- a. Summary suggestions
- b. Funding has declined in real terms; need to restore, possibly increase.
- c. OS proper location: better opportunity for integration; core issue is science.