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 (suboptimal; 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.