

Pushing the frontiers in climate modelling and analysis with machine learning

Received: 2 August 2023

Accepted: 18 July 2024

Published online: 23 August 2024

 Check for updates

Veronika Eyring   ^{1,2,29}, William D. Collins   ^{3,4,29}, Pierre Gentine  ⁵, Elizabeth A. Barnes  ⁶, Marcelo Barreiro  ⁷, Tom Beucler  ⁸, Marc Bocquet  ⁹, Christopher S. Bretherton  ¹⁰, Hannah M. Christensen  ¹¹, Katherine Dagon  ¹², David John Gagne  ¹², David Hall  ¹³, Dorit Hammerling  ¹⁴, Stephan Hoyer  ¹⁵, Fernando Iglesias-Suarez  ¹, Ignacio Lopez-Gomez  ^{15,16}, Marie C. McGraw  ¹⁷, Gerald A. Meehl  ¹², Maria J. Molina  ^{12,18}, Claire Monteleoni  ^{19,20}, Juliane Mueller  ²¹, Michael S. Pritchard  ^{13,22}, David Rolnick  ^{23,24}, Jakob Runge  ^{25,26}, Philip Stier  ¹¹, Oliver Watt-Meyer  ¹⁰, Katja Weigel  ^{1,2}, Rose Yu ²⁷ & Laure Zanna  ²⁸

Climate modelling and analysis are facing new demands to enhance projections and climate information. Here we argue that now is the time to push the frontiers of machine learning beyond state-of-the-art approaches, not only by developing machine-learning-based Earth system models with greater fidelity, but also by providing new capabilities through emulators for extreme event projections with large ensembles, enhanced detection and attribution methods for extreme events, and advanced climate model analysis and benchmarking. Utilizing this potential requires key machine learning challenges to be addressed, in particular generalization, uncertainty quantification, explainable artificial intelligence and causality. This interdisciplinary effort requires bringing together machine learning and climate scientists, while also leveraging the private sector, to accelerate progress towards actionable climate science.

The World Climate Research Programme's Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP¹) brings together multi-model climate projections to understand past, present and future climate changes. These simulations are performed with global coupled Earth system models (ESMs) that simulate the physical climate as well as biogeochemical cycles under a wide range of forcings, yet large uncertainties remain, for example in precipitation². This limits the models' ability to accurately project global and regional climate changes, as well as climate variability, extremes and their impacts on ecosystems on decadal and multi-decadal timescales. In addition, the ever-increasing volume of data makes the detection and understanding of patterns of variability and extreme events difficult. New machine learning (ML) methods promise great potential to address these challenges.

ML for Earth system science is rapidly expanding, with ML methods already being applied to a wide range of weather prediction applications^{3,4}, a broad swath of additional climate change questions⁵, and in

diverse solution domains, including mitigation, adaptation, tools for individual and collective action, education, and finance⁶.

For climate modelling and analysis, we argue that breakthroughs with ML can be achieved in multiple ways, in particular by (1) the development of hybrid ESMs where physical modelling is integrated with ML to maintain physical consistency and harvest ML versatility⁷⁻⁹; (2) ML-based emulation, where ML can provide fast and robust climate information including extreme event projections, allowing us to assess the envelope of recent weather possibilities; (3) ML-based detection and attribution of extreme events, where ML can advance understanding of the physical processes that underlie extreme occurrences; and (4) ML-enhanced climate model analysis and understanding of the Earth system, where ML can deliver powerful tools for analysing high-dimensional datasets, which are especially prevalent in Earth sciences, including the development of benchmarks^{10,11}. Although ML has already made substantial contributions to all of these grand challenges,

A full list of affiliations appears at the end of the paper.  e-mail: veronika.eyring@dlr.de; wdcollins@lbl.gov




Fig. 1 | How ML can advance climate modelling and analysis. Each of these key sectors are discussed in this Perspective. While progress has been made, the full potential of ML for climate modelling and analysis remains to be reached.

substantial advances in ML methods are required to fully exploit the potential of ML for climate modelling and analysis. These particularly include physical consistency of hybrid models that demonstrate the ability to realistically extrapolate to unseen climate regimes¹², uncertainty quantification¹³, explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) to move away from ML as a black box¹⁴, and causal inference methods that allow even more information to be extracted from Earth system data on how processes interact causally^{15,16}.

In this Perspective, we focus on these key grand challenges in climate modelling and analysis that can be substantially improved with ML and discuss the fundamental advances in ML techniques that are required to advance across these grand challenges as schematically displayed in Fig. 1 and summarized in Table 1. We also provide a perspective on remaining gaps, opportunities and promising future directions. We argue that to achieve the full potential of ML for improved climate modelling and analysis, collaboration between academia and the private sector will be essential (Box 1).

ML for climate modelling and analysis

ML has great potential to substantially enhance our understanding of the Earth system and to reduce uncertainties in climate projections. In this section, we discuss key approaches in which climate modelling and analysis could be substantially enhanced with ML, in particular hybrid Earth system modelling, emulation of climate model simulations, extreme event detection and attribution, and climate model analysis and benchmarking (Table 1).

Hybrid Earth system modelling

Approaches in which ML methods are combined and integrated into classical climate models, so called hybrid models (Fig. 2), have been

proposed to be able to address many of the long-standing systematic biases and challenges faced by classical climate models^{7,8,17}. Hybrid ESMs can be an integral part of initiatives like CMIP and can enhance classical models at all scales as proposed previously⁹.

ML-based hybrid modelling and subgrid-scale parameterizations have been developed for different Earth system components, with first promising results for the atmosphere, ocean and land already being achieved. Here, we provide some examples.

For the atmosphere, the largest sources of uncertainties in climate projections stem from the representation of clouds, aerosols and their interaction, with significant structural biases remaining for example for the simulation of precipitation¹⁸. Advances in computing now allow for global storm-resolving model simulations of months to a few years¹⁹, but not century-long projections, while low-level clouds and aerosols will continue to depend on parameterizations for their representation⁹. In this context, ML-based parameterizations have been developed to represent subgrid-scale physics as simulated by higher resolution model simulations^{20,21}, including stochastic parametrizations²². Hybrid modelling has also shown remarkable success in correcting structural errors stemming from unresolved atmospheric processes in the bias-correction setting, producing stable, accurate multi-year simulations across a range of climates²³. Several challenges of these approaches were identified early on, such as poor out-of-climate generalization²⁴, instabilities caused by interactions with the resolved dynamics of the parent model, disparities between offline skill (ML parameterization performance on the test set) and online skill (that is, hybrid model performance)²⁵, and the violation of conservation laws²⁴. Solutions to several of these problems have since been proposed, including architecture-based constraints to ensure conservation laws²⁶, incorporating symmetry to improve generalization²⁷, coupled online

Table 1 | The challenges and potential ML-based solutions for hybrid Earth system modelling, emulation of climate model simulations, extreme event detection and attribution, climate model analysis and benchmarking, and cross-cutting ML method developments

Challenges	Potential of ML-based solutions
Hybrid Earth system modelling	
Long-standing systematic errors and large uncertainties in climate projections in state-of-the-art climate and Earth system models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of hybrid models, where physical modelling consistency and harvest ML versatility
Inhibitive computational expense of global storm-resolving model simulations and of coarser models on empirical parametrizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ML-based hybrid modelling and subgrid-scale parameterizations and Earth observations
Poor out-of-climate generalization of hybrid models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporation of symmetries to improve generalization Data-driven equation discovery Transfer learning and climate-invariant inputs to improve generalization Symbolic expressions generated by the equation discovery Architecture-based physical constraints to ensure consistency
Instabilities caused by interactions between different parameterizations and resolved dynamics	Instabilities caused by interactions between different parameterizations and resolved dynamics
Disparities between offline and online learning to prevent instabilities and inconsistencies	Disparities between offline and online learning to prevent instabilities and inconsistencies
Violation of conservation laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Architecture-based physical constraints to ensure conservation Data-driven equation discovery with physical constraints Custom losses that penalize physically inconsistent
Incorporation of the effects of mesoscale onto the large scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Momentum-conserving CNNs
Data availability, sparsity and uncertainties/biases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model abstractions that learn new tasks from sparse data effectively
Constraints on processes and models	
Accurate simulation of extreme events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More comprehensive analyses and metrics regarding the (for example, on extremes) Interpretable and explainable ML for understanding extremes Custom losses to weigh extremes more without compromising interpretability Custom frameworks that normalize data using extreme value theory
Emulation of climate model simulations	
Uncertainty quantification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solutions to the trade-off between computational efficiency and fidelity of the simulation output and learning Use of ML emulators to generate a massive ensemble of members to better capture internal weather and climate variability
Separation of different sources of uncertainty and physical conditions that affect projections	Separation of different sources of uncertainty and physical conditions that affect projections
Sampling of very rare extreme events	Sampling of very rare extreme events
Improvement in projections and predictions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer learning
Extreme event detection and attribution	
Objective and rapid searches through petabytes of climate model projections for detecting extremes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep learning approaches for rapid detection Human-labelled datasets combined with deep learning and CNNs Convolutional long-shot term memory methods Quantifiable and objective measures with threshold-free Bayesian detection methods calibrated with Markov chains Topological data analysis combined with support vector machines
Harmonization of highly diverse methods of extreme event detection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ML methods to study a wide variety of severe weather events
Generalization from present-day to future conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deep learning methods to generalize from ML into the physical world will change in future projections Extensive hyperparameter grid searches to find appropriate applications of deep learning methods to generalize from present-day to future climatic conditions
Difficulty of sampling long-term climate model simulations for model assessment and scaling methods with ML to parameterized physical processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ML methods to considerably accelerate projections of climate model simulations
Climate model analysis and benchmarking	
Exhibition of surprising features of ML-based online climate model simulations that perform well in offline test set evaluations when coupled within a climate model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation methods of ML-based online climate model simulations Development of metrics, datasets and tools to benchmark consistent ways Data-centric AI to improve ML results by identifying data

Table 1 (continued) | The challenges and potential ML-based solutions for hybrid Earth system modelling, emulation of climate model simulations, extreme event detection and attribution, climate model analysis and benchmarking, and cross-cutting ML method developments

Challenges	Potential of ML-based solutions
Process-oriented model evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Causal model evaluation comparing causal dependencies ones from climate models^{72,73} XAI to identify prototypical behaviour linked to physical science applications⁷⁴
Tighter constraints on uncertainty projections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paradoxical sense of causality in climate models⁷³ amenable to causal discovery Nonlinear, multi-variable ML-based emergent constraints for regional projections⁷⁵
Availability and quality of Earth system models to develop targeted observational	
Analysis and evaluation of data-intense high-resolution simulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ML-based approaches based on nonlinear dimensionality Climate networks reconstructed from statistical correlation used together with measures from information theory to detect hidden structures in climate data⁷⁶
Cross-cutting challenges in ML method developments	
Physical consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Custom losses that penalize physically inconsistent predictions⁷⁷ Architectures that strictly enforce physical constraints⁷⁸
Enhancement of robustness predictions for out-of-distribution samples ¹²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robustness of machine learning models can be improved using custom loss functions without compromising mean predictions⁷⁷ Custom frameworks that normalize data using extreme value theory⁷⁹ Robustness tests adding adversarial interventions¹⁵ to stationarity⁸⁰
Uncertainty quantification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combination of aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty to address generalization issues⁸⁰ Quantification of uncertainties through Perturbations in the initialization via deep ensemble⁸², neural network weights via dropout⁸¹, and datasets⁸³ via bootstrapping Bayesian methods for example for variational autoencoders⁸⁴
Obtaining the right answers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of the physical impacts of climate change⁸⁵ Analysis of the physical impacts of climate change⁸⁶ Measures to ensure physical consistency with the true process⁸⁷
Gaining insights from XAI in the hybrid model simulation of interpretable models that are built to process of the ML algorithm explicitly into their structure to be understood without post-hoc methods ⁹²	
Challenges for causal inference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges in the collaboration between method developers and domain experts for methods may lead to incorrect assumptions into causal methods⁹³ Development of benchmarks for evaluating methods on causal inference^{10,11}
assumptions for methods may lead to incorrect conclusions ^{15,30} for example:	
• Assuming a causally stationary process when in practice many real-world processes are non-stationary	
• Assumption of an acyclic causal model, which may not be true in the presence of feedback loops	
• Structural rather than coincidental interdependencies	

learning to prevent instabilities and biases²⁸, input restrictions to improve stability²³, causally informed deep learning to respect the underlying physical processes¹⁶, data-driven equation discovery^{29,30}, and the use of transfer learning and climate-invariant inputs to improve generalization¹². Results from these efforts are extremely promising. For example, ref. 16 showed that a coarse-scale hybrid model aquaplanet simulation could accurately represent the Intertropical Convergence Zone and latitudinal patterns of precipitation and net radiation as represented by the high-resolution simulation (Fig. 3).

For the ocean, large uncertainties remain due to mesoscale eddies and other turbulent processes that are not fully resolved in most climate models³¹. Mesoscale eddies are turbulent features that play a key role in tracer transport, ocean heat uptake and thermosteric sea level changes². To correctly capture the effect of ocean turbulence forcing on the large-scale and reduce associated uncertainties in climate projections, hybrid modelling approaches have been introduced^{32,33}. A similar approach to that in the atmosphere is taken, where data-driven ML parameterizations are learned from high-resolution climate model simulations, to augment existing coarse-resolution simulations. In this context, momentum-conserving convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and equation discovery have been studied to capture the effects of ocean mesoscale onto the large-scale. CNNs are known to capture complex structures^{32,34,35} while equation discovery facilitates

interpretable models. The generalization ability is best for symbolic expressions generated by the equation discovery model or sparse regression^{32,36}. These models perform better than state-of-the-art physics-based negative viscosity energetically constrained methods. These results encourage further development of hybrid ML ocean models in the long term. In the short term, these approaches will allow us to distil simple algebraic forms from the data through equation discovery, rendering more manageable models, and allowing us to capture the true physics, improve our understanding and formalize previously purely empirical equations^{32,36}.

For land, uncertainties in the terrestrial carbon cycle, such as projections in the land carbon sink, remain a major challenge³⁷. These uncertainties can in part be tackled by automated and systematic reduction of uncertainties in land model structure and parameters³⁸. Compared with the atmosphere or ocean, there is no equivalent to high-resolution, high-fidelity simulations for the land component, such that the main ways to improve models are through process representation and the use of observations. Land processes are further complicated by the fact that extremes are critical to land carbon and water cycles, dominating interannual variability and also the long-term carbon sink³⁹. Hybrid modelling for the land provides a unique opportunity to combine ML with physical constraints or laws to better simulate and project terrestrial processes^{8,40}. The power of hybrid modelling lies

BOX 1

Collaboration between academia and the private sector




Fig. 2 | Schematic diagram for integrating ML with process modelling. **a**, Clouds, convection and gravity waves where subgrid-scale atmospheric processes are learned from short high-resolution simulations with ML. Similar approaches exist for the ocean. **b**, Modelling biological regulation processes

(opening of the stomatal ‘valves’ controlling water vapour flux from the leaves) with a recurrent neural network (RNN) further coupled to a diffusion model. Figure adapted with permission from: **a**, ref. 7, Wiley; **b**, ref. 8, Springer Nature Ltd.

in its ability to utilize existing and new observational data, coupled with physical understanding constraining land processes across a range of time scales. Fast processes, such as photosynthesis, can be constrained by data and are a good target for ML-based parameterizations, while slow processes, such as carbon allocation, do not have frequent observations and thus need to rely on physical knowledge as they cannot be derived from data alone. The advantage of hybrid modelling is its capacity to extrapolate and generalize beyond the scope of the observational data. This approach was recently developed for estimating ecosystem evapotranspiration⁴¹, where a hybrid model showed a greater ability to generalize during extreme events compared to a pure ML model. Other successful cases of hybrid modelling for the land have combined traditional hydrologic modelling with ML to increase skill in predicting flood risk⁴² and groundwater flow⁴³. An ML component was also integrated within a physical model to learn total water storage with a neural network⁴⁴. While these studies show early success in employing hybrid modelling for the land, there are several important considerations for future work. First, capturing extreme events on land (for example, wildfires, floods and droughts) in the context of a changing climate is a high priority⁴⁵. Second, data availability, sparsity and observational uncertainties remain ongoing issues for land modelling. Variations across land datasets, unequal geographic distributions, and spatial and climatic biases in observations are key challenges for the use of data at scale, potentially biasing the retrievals⁴⁶.

Hybrid modelling, as described above, also introduces new challenges, such as stability after coupling²⁵, differences between offline and online behaviour^{25,28} and generalizability. The latter describes the question whether the models will be able to accurately project warming and extremes when they were trained against the current climate, rather than future climates. There may be unknown physical processes arising and the distribution of the data is likely changing with climate change. Thus, it is necessary to understand when models diverge and fail and take corrective actions. More comprehensive

detection, analyses and metrics regarding their out-of-climate generalization and performance beyond time-averaged errors (for example, on extremes) are needed. Ideally, the community will increasingly draw on the advances made in interpretable and explainable ML and other ML challenges to further advance hybrid models as we further discuss below.

Emulation of climate model simulations

For climate modelling, many challenges remain including the relationship of model error and resolution^{47,48} and limits on near-term predictability due to internal variability of the climate system⁴⁹. The emulation of weather and climate models with ML has demonstrated potential to accelerate resolution of these challenges and has therefore become a rapidly evolving field^{3,4,10,50}. Those algorithms aim to emulate a physically based weather or climate model at a small fraction of its cost. In substantial part, this speed-up arises by eliminating the mathematical condition that higher spatial resolution requires shorter time steps governing classical models that solve the full equations of motion. Some important applications are the use of those emulators to generate massive weather forecast and climate projection ensembles to better capture internal variability. Because the number of emulated simulations is several orders of magnitude larger than in the initial weather or climate forecast models, this is opening unique perspectives in the assessment of extreme events or very rare events (1st or 99th percentiles of the distribution), which often cannot be captured by the tens of ensemble members in the weather forecast or climate models. There is hope that much larger ensembles generated with emulators could capture such very rare events. There are caveats to the use of those emulator-based ensembles, especially related to checking whether they correctly capture the distribution generated by the emulated chaotic physical model. Emulators can also be used to answer scientific questions that would require running many climate model simulations and would therefore be computationally infeasible. Applications include




Fig. 3 | Potential for reducing systematic errors in hybrid Earth system models. Zonal average climatologies of precipitation (left) and net radiative fluxes at the top of the atmosphere (right). Note that the causally informed neural network simulation (red line) clearly captures both zonal-mean precipitation

(within the 95% confidence interval) and its variability (red dashed line) compared with the high-resolution SPCAM (Super parameterized Community Atmospheric Model) simulation (black dashed line). Figure adapted with permission from ref. 16, Wiley.

the characterization of extreme event evolution or sampling^{10,51} and the emulations of regional-scale events^{52,53}. Again, in this context, care needs to be taken to systematically check that the emulator respects both the physical response and statistics of the host physical model. Advancing beyond emulation, climate models and observations have been optimally merged using a technique called transfer learning to better predict El Niño⁵⁴ or to better project climate change⁵⁵. Transfer learning can improve the accuracy of climate predictions and projections spanning the past to the future by reducing systematic errors and increasing correlation to key observables in the recent climate record.

Extreme event detection and attribution

Low-likelihood high-impact (LLHI) extremes are a class of phenomena where the high but unknown risks of substantial and negative societal and environmental effects are mismatched with inconsistent evidence and limited consensus regarding how LLHIs will evolve under global warming⁵⁶. Two of the major obstacles to reducing the uncertainty in how LLHIs will change in warmer climates are the need to objectively yet rapidly search through petabytes of climate model projections while simultaneously harmonizing across highly diverse methods for detecting these extremes⁵⁷. ML exhibits considerable promise to address these challenges. Deep learning approaches have enabled training algorithms to find and track extremes in climate model output at exascale speeds⁵⁸, and ML methods have been successfully deployed to study a wide variety of severe weather⁵⁹. In addition, projections of LLHI evolution accompanied by quantifiable and objective measures of uncertainty can be generated using threshold-free Bayesian detection methods calibrated with Markov chain Monte Carlo⁶⁰. Extreme phenomena have been identified using human-expert-labelled data-sets of tropical cyclones, atmospheric rivers and weather fronts in climate model output combined with deep⁶¹ and CNNs⁶². Topological data analysis combined with support vector machines provide a threshold-free method for identifying atmospheric rivers in climate projections produced under a wide range of horizontal resolutions and climate scenarios⁶³. Persistent phenomena, such as hurricanes, can readily and accurately be tracked using convolutional long short-term memory methods⁶⁴. ML can also provide insights into the physical drivers of extreme phenomena and how these drivers will change in future projections⁶⁵. In addition, certain applications of deep learning

methods have shown the capability of generalizing from present-day to future climatic conditions, provided an extensive hyperparameter grid search is performed to find appropriate model hyperparameters⁶⁶. Successful demonstrations that physical mechanisms can be learned from data rather than prescribed include analyses of the extreme precipitation circulation patterns and strongly rotating thunderstorms⁶⁶. ML algorithms have also been used to emulate classical downscaling methods to enhance the horizontal spatial resolution of climate model simulations⁶⁷. ML methods are exhibiting substantial potential to considerably accelerate projections of extremes in warmer climates. Recent applications include prediction of heat waves⁶⁸ and droughts⁶⁹. These approaches advance addressing several long-standing challenges involving LLHIs, including the difficulty of sampling LLHIs from observations and climate model simulations of insufficient duration, and biases in projecting LLHIs involving physical processes that are under-resolved or highly parameterized in ESMs.

Climate model analysis and benchmarking

ML-based parametrizations that perform well in evaluations where they are not yet coupled online into the host ESM but rather trained, validated and tested offline on high-resolution model data, may exhibit surprising failure modes when coupled online within a climate model²⁵. This all needs to be carefully tested. Tools such as the Earth System Model Evaluation Tool (ESMValTool)⁷⁰ facilitate the evaluation of ML-based online climate model simulations against Earth observations and other climate models. In addition, as ML for climate modelling efforts have matured, the community has recognized a growing need to develop metrics, datasets and tools to benchmark ML performance in more rigorous and consistent ways^{10,11}. Another approach is data-centric AI, which focuses on how ML results can be improved by identifying ways to increase the quality and diversity of training data.

On the analysis side, climate networks reconstructed from statistical correlations of time series at grid points have been used together with measures from information theory to detect hidden structures in climate data⁷¹. ML has started to demonstrate its great potential to enhance climate model analysis through the application of causal inference, XAI, nonlinear multi-variate emergent constraints and the development of more targeted observational products for model evaluation. Causal discovery algorithms learn causal dependencies beyond

traditional correlation and regression methods¹⁵. Causal model evaluation compares causal dependencies as learned from observational data to the ones from climate models, thus enhancing process-oriented model evaluation^{72,73}. XAI can be applied to identify prototypical behaviour linked to physics-based processes from images for Earth system science applications and with this provide a new approach for model evaluation⁷⁴. ML methods have also been used to constrain uncertainties in multi-model projections based on process analysis and causal discovery⁷⁵ or the combination of emergent constraints on the global scale to reduce uncertainties on the regional scale⁷⁵, which is often more relevant for policymakers. In addition, ML-based approaches based on nonlinear dimensionality reduction with variational autoencoders could help evaluating data intense high-resolution simulations⁷⁶.

Cross-cutting challenges in ML method developments

Addressing key challenges in climate modelling and analysis with ML as discussed in the previous section does not only benefit from the application of current ML methods, but also requires addressing several challenges in ML method development that are shared by all these different applications. In this section, we focus on four ML challenges that have seen recent breakthroughs, but for which more work is needed in order to utilize full potential (Table 1). This particularly will require further progress in physical consistency and generalization, uncertainty quantification, explainable AI and causal inference.

Physical consistency and generalization

Physical models are designed to be valid in a broad range of regimes, while ML models are usually trained to best fit a specific training set. Therefore, ML models can make inconsistent predictions when tested on out-of-distribution samples¹², such as warmer climates. There has been notable progress on making the quality of ML-based inference less sensitive to changes in the data, broadly referred to as robustness. Performance on outliers and extremes can be improved using custom losses that weigh extremes more without compromising mean predictions⁷⁷, or custom frameworks that normalize data using extreme value theory⁷⁸. Physical consistency can be improved using custom losses that penalize physically inconsistent predictions⁷⁹ or architectures that strictly enforce physical constraints^{26,29}. Overall, although improving robustness is application dependent, we encourage conducting out-of-distribution tests over out-of-sample tests that are still independent and identically distributed with respect to the training data, addressing non-stationarity in the data if possible¹², and considering tests to ask whether the ML model can properly predict a causal intervention¹⁵. Making robustness tests a standard component of benchmark datasets for weather and climate would help establish the most generalizable ML frameworks on distinct cases, paving the way towards their routine use in climate science.

Uncertainty quantification

Another challenge to be addressed in the ML space is uncertainty quantification of the predictive performance of ML models. Systematic uncertainties arise due to the choice of the ML model itself, and the variability of its predictions, for example, due to the stochastic gradient descent methods used for training. Stochastic (statistical) uncertainty is also present due to noise in the data used for training, and the choice of predictive variables being an incomplete representation of the Earth system⁴⁹. Therefore, even the best model of the Earth system cannot produce definitive predictions. However, stochastic and systematic uncertainty are not mutually exclusive and can be combined to address data sparsity and out-of-distribution generalization issues⁸⁰. It is known that deep neural networks alone are not providing uncertainty estimates and tend to produce overconfident predictions. Therefore, uncertainty quantification is receiving growing interest in ML⁸¹.

There are roughly two types of uncertainty quantification methods in deep learning. The first one focuses on robustness via employing parameterized distributions to describe stochastic uncertainty sampling over solutions to the loss minimization procedure during training or bootstrapping to approximate parent distributions. Perturbations are made to the inference procedure in initialization via deep ensemble⁸², neural network weights via Monte Carlo dropout⁸¹, and datasets via bootstrapping⁸³. The other type is Bayesian, such as variational autoencoders⁸⁴, which aims to model posterior beliefs of connection weights given the data. Bayesian methods are typically more robust in mean prediction, while confidence levels obtained from frequentist methods provide more extensive coverage over data variations¹³.

Uncertainty quantification presents distinctive challenges for weather and climate projection. For weather forecasting, much progress has been made to ensemble forecasts, leading to increased forecast skills and more reliable probabilistic estimates. For climate projection, despite the effort in multi-model ensembles to quantify systematic uncertainty, the multi-scale nature of the system and its internal variability make it challenging to produce and validate reliable uncertainty estimates and risk assessments. Deep learning has also been used to create ensemble forecasts, including for medium-range weather systems⁴, typically through Monte Carlo dropout⁸¹ or deep ensembles⁸². Specifically, multiple deep learning models are trained by varying the dropout units or training data and then generate forecasts jointly. Recently, deep generative models have also been used for probabilistic forecasts^{4,85}. The accelerated inference enabled by deep learning emulators can in principle enable very large ensembles to quantify the uncertainty due to natural variability in weather forecasts, but also in climate projections⁸⁶.

Explainable artificial intelligence

Although most ML techniques have previously been viewed as 'black boxes', XAI methods have the potential to change how these tools are viewed and used in climate science by assisting scientists to determine whether the ML approach is obtaining the right answers for the right reasons¹⁴. XAI approaches are beginning to appear more frequently in ML climate studies, including for identifying sources of predictability within the climate system⁸⁷ and analysing the physical impacts of climate change⁶⁶. XAI methods can be used to ensure that neural network models are physically consistent with the true dynamics of the climate system⁸⁸. Such model interpretation and visualization can help ML methods capture the physically salient aspects of a problem, operate within the limits of the training data, and help identify new scientific hypotheses¹⁴. For example, neural networks and their explainability tools can be harnessed to identify patterns of the forced signal within combined fields⁸⁹. XAI can identify which oceanic patterns of sea surface temperature anomalies lead to the largest gains in predictability⁹⁰. The applicability of XAI approaches originally trained for image classification are now being tested on climate prediction tasks. The sensitivity to the choice of XAI method and its specific parameters is still being resolved⁹¹. Furthermore, XAI methods are applied post-hoc to an otherwise black box model, and so, gaining insights from XAI into the decision-making process of the ML algorithm requires simplifications of the model itself^{92,93}. As an alternative, scientists should therefore consider developing interpretable models which are built to incorporate the decision-making process explicitly into their structure in order to be completely understood by a human without the need for post-hoc methods⁹².

Causal inference

Standard ML methods, including deep learning, excel at learning highly nonlinear statistical relationships from complex, large-scale datasets and are being increasingly applied in Earth and environmental sciences⁸. However, research questions in climate science are often about causal relationships rather than purely statistical associations.

Causal inference provides the theoretical foundations to utilize assumptions about the underlying system to answer causal questions from data¹⁵. Two main strands of causal inference are causal discovery, where the goal is to learn a qualitative causal graph from data, and causal effect estimation, where one assumes qualitative causal knowledge in the form of a graph and then quantifies the effect of hypothetical interventions, for instance, by utilizing causally informed ML models. Thus, causal inference complements ML well³⁰. Causal methods have been employed in various contexts in climate science, see ref. 15 for an in-depth overview.

Causal inference is currently used to tackle two major challenges in climate modelling and analysis. Firstly, causal models can inform subgrid-scale parameterizations in hybrid modelling to better respect the underlying physical processes in the ML model¹⁶, which is crucial for modelling climate change. To this end, causal discovery¹⁵ can be performed to estimate causal graphs from high-resolution models or observational data. This qualitative information can then help choosing which input variables to include in ML-based parametrizations, which is a formal way of feature selection. Second, causal inference can be used to evaluate and compare climate model output from projects such as CMIP (refs. 72,73), with possible implications for reducing uncertainties of climate projections. Here the approach is to learn causal graphs separately from observational data as well as model output and then utilize graph comparison metrics to identify which physical models better simulate the causal relationships as learned from the observations. One may also directly assume a causal graph and compare the causal effect estimated.

Beyond the statistical challenges shared with pure ML methods, such as dealing with high-dimensional and spatially correlated data³⁰, the advantages and challenges of causal inference methods lie in the reliance on expert knowledge about the underlying system, from the presence of hidden confounders and the complexity of nonlinear processes occurring across timescales, to the basic but often challenging problem of defining the causal variables of interest¹⁵ or possible loss of causality when coarse-graining. More specifically, key challenges in causal inference, calling for advanced method development, are associated with the assumptions on which these methods often rest on: (1) the data is generated from a causally stationary process when in practice many real-world processes are non-stationary; (2) the data-generating causal model is acyclic, which may well not be true, especially, in the presence of feedback loops; and (3) interdependencies are not coincidental but structural, and violations of this assumption may lead to incorrect conclusions^{15,30}. Tackling these challenges requires close collaboration between method developers and domain experts to define and incorporate assumptions into causal methods, as well as to develop benchmarks for evaluating methods on ground truth data^{10,11}. If these challenges can be met, the primary advantages of causal methods lie in the intuitive interpretation of the causal graphs, their transparent way of stating assumptions, and their potential for better out-of-distribution performance, which increases trustworthiness in climate change projections.

The way ahead

Innovative machine learning methods are rapidly providing new and transformative ways of modelling and projecting climate change and extracting information from massive data volumes. These are timely topics given the start of the IPCC's Seventh Assessment cycle and the initiation of CMIP7. Although the full potential of hybrid modelling will certainly not be reached in time for CMIP7 contributions, some proof-of-principle hybrid ESMs might well be ready to participate. This could include models where a subset of the physical or empirical parametrizations is replaced with ML-based parametrizations, for example for cloud cover and convection. The structure of CMIP is such that any climate model that can perform the DECK (Diagnostic, Evaluation and Characterization of Klima) and CMIP historical simulations can contribute to CMIP (ref. 1). The upcoming CMIP7 ensemble can benefit

from these developments to include some of these first ML-based hybrid ESMs, but also from the use of emerging ML techniques such as uncertainty quantification, XAI and causal inference to interpret simulations from these models in comparison to Earth observations. It will be important to benchmark the class of ML-based hybrid ESMs against classical climate models to assess potential improvements and to exploit ML-based nonlinear multi-variate and transfer learning combined with other approaches to constrain uncertainties in climate projections with Earth observations.

ML shows great potential to improve ESMs by learning important subgrid-scale processes from high-resolution simulations and Earth observations, producing stable multi-year simulations with encouragingly small systematic errors. However, as we discussed in this Perspective, trust and generalizability of the ML models need to be further improved by introducing climate invariant variables, physical constraints or equation discovery, and by further developing some of the main ML challenges including XAI, uncertainty quantification, and causality (see also Table 1). The increasing speed and fidelity of emulators will enable the creation of huge ensembles of hindcasts and forecasts. The unprecedented sampling of plausible but counterfactual climates could transform our understanding of the drivers and consequences of LLHI extremes. Stability in coupled-model simulations upon replacement of a numerical model component or parameterization with an ML-based parameterization, and improved coupled-model skill and projection capability, are benchmark activities that we foresee as being critically important as ML for climate continues to advance as a field.

To sustain this rapidly evolving field, different communities need to work together. The full potential of ML for climate modelling and analysis with ML can only be met using an interdisciplinary approach, where the climate science community works closely with the ML community. Beyond this collaboration, this will demand new collaboration opportunities to be seriously approached between academia and the private sector (Box 1). As the ML community becomes more aware of the potential of algorithms in society-relevant climate and Earth system research, large technology companies are increasingly interested in applying their capabilities to climate via interdisciplinary research with climate scientists, who are either employed directly or collaborate from academia. Private sector research may also be a valuable element in the development of more computationally efficient and scalable climate models as well as the developments of digital twins of the Earth which have been defined as “an information system that exposes users to a digital replication of the state and temporal evolution of the Earth system constrained by available observations and the laws of physics”^{94,95}. As these applications venture into the realm of unseen climates, input from academic domain experts will become increasingly essential, opening new opportunities for joint efforts to push the frontiers of climate science.

The use of ML to better understand, model and project the Earth system is a challenging but promising research field with accelerating progress in the past 5 years. Additional research efforts could have a high impact both to advance science and to address topics of critical importance and high relevance for society. These topics include the need for much more reliable and localized predictions of near-term global environmental change and projections of the many options for mitigating this change under investigation. With enhanced ML-based climate modelling and analysis capabilities as discussed in this Perspective, we can look forward to substantial advancement of Earth system sciences to accelerate scientific understanding, modelling, as well as projecting climate change towards desperately needed actionable climate science.

References

1. Eyring, V. et al. Overview of the C Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experiment. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **9**, 1937–1958 (2016).

2. Lee, J. - *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis* (eds Masson-Delmotte, V. et al.) 24. Rasp, S., Pritchard, M. S. & Gentine (eds Masson-Delmotte, V. et al.) 5. *Sub-grid processes in climate models*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, 9684–9689 (2018).

3. Lam, R. et al. Learning skillful 25. *Deep learning to predict weather machine learning forecasting*. *Science* **382**, 1416–1421 (2023).

4. Price, I. et al. GenCast: diffusion 26. Beucler, T. et al. Enforcing analytical medium-range weather. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.01253> (9.6).

5. Monteleoni, Computational 27. Wang, R., Walters, R. & Yu, R. Intelligent Data Analysis for Sustainable Development (eds Yu, T. et al.) 2013).

6. Rolnick, D. et al. Tackling 28. *Deep learning to predict weather machine learning as a climate change problem*. *Workshop on ACM Comput. Surv.* **55**, 42 (2022).

7. Gentine, P., Eyring, V. et al. Deep 29. Beucler, T. et al. *Enforcing analytical learning for the parametrization of subgrid processes in climate models* (Camps-Valls, G. et al.) Ch. 21, 2907–2914.

8. Reichstein, M. et al. Deep learning 30. *Machine learning to predict weather machine learning as a climate system science*. *Nature* **566**, 195–204 (2023).

9. Eyring, V., Gentine, P., Camps-Valls, G. et al. AI-empowered next-generation climate modelling for mitigation and adaptation. *Nat. Geosci.* **16**, 2023–003763 (2024).

10. Watson-Parris, D. et al. Climate 31. Couldrey, M. P. et al. What causes data-driven climate projections. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **14**, 2021MS002954 (2022).

11. Yu, S. et al. ClimSim: an open 32. Zanna, L. & Bolton, T. Data-driven high-resolution physics emulators in hybrid multi-scale climate 33. Zhang, C. et al. Implementation and simulators. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/learnedK1mesoscaleeddyparameterization> (2023).

12. Beucler, T. et al. Climate 34. Guilloumin, A. P. & Zanna, L. Stochastic machine learning. *Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **10**, 2021MS002874 (2021).

13. Wu, D. et al. Quantifying 35. Bolton, T. & Zanna, L. Applications uncertainty in climate forecasting. In *Proc. 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* 1841–1851 (Association for Computing Machinery, 2021).

14. McGovern, A. et al. Making the 36. Ross, A., Li, Z., Perezhigin, P., F. understanding the physical implications of machine learning. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **100**, 2175–2199 (2019).

15. Runge, J., Gerhardus, A., Varando, 37. Friedlingstein, P. et al. *Earth System Science*. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* **10**, 2023–003258 (2023).

16. Iglesias-Suarez, F. et al. Causal 38. Dagon, K., Sanderson, B. M., Fisher data to improve climate models and projections. *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **129**, 2023–039202 (2024).

17. Eyring, V. et al. Reflections and 39. Humphrey, V. et al. *Soil moisture-advective science*. *Nat. Clim. Change* **11**, 279–285 (2021).

18. Eyring, V. et al. *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis* (eds Masson-Delmotte, V. et al.) 40. Shen, C. et al. Differentiable model (2021).

19. Stevens, B. et al. DYAMOND: the 41. Zhao, W. L. et al. *Physics-constrained general circulation Modelled On Non-5000-5000-2023 Domains*. *Prog. Earth Planet. Sci.* **6**, 61 (2019).

20. Gentine, P., Pritchard, M., Rasp, 42. *Evapotranspiration*. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **46**, a214496–164507 (2019).

21. Grundner, A. et al. Deep learning 43. Wang, N., Zhang, D., Chang, H. & Li 44. Kraft, B., Jung, M., Körner, M., *deadlock?* *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **45**, 5742–5751 (2018).

22. Behrens, G. et al. Improving 45. *Hydrological cycle*. *Hydrol. Earth system models with deep learning ensembles and stochastic parameterizations*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.02041> (9).

23. Bretherton, C. S. et al. Correcting 46. *Hydrological cycle*. *Hydrol. Earth climate models by machine learning from global storm-resolving simulations*. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **14**, 2021MS002794 (2021).

24. *Hydrological cycle*. *Hydrol. Earth system models with deep learning by considering extreme events and monotonic relationships*. *J. Hydrol.* **603**, 127043 (2021).

46.Nathaniel, J., Liu, J. & Gentine, J. *Machine learning for gauging and gauging*. *Sci. Data* **10**, 440 (2023).

47.Pehstorfer, B., Willcox, K. & Gu, Z. *Multi-fidelity methods in uncertainty propagation: the case of daily optimization*. *SIAM Rev.* **60**, 550–591 (2018).

48.Cutajar, K., Pullin, M., Damianou, A. & Opper, M. *Deep Gaussian processes for multi-fidelity modeling*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.25019> (2023).

49.Delaunay, A. & Christensen, H. M. *Probabilistic forecasts of extreme heatwaves using convolutional neural networks in a regime of lack of data*. *Physical Review Fluids* **8**, 040501 (2023).

50.Kurth, T. et al. *FourCastNet: weather forecasting using adaptive Fourier neural operators*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2208.05419> (2022).

51.Beusch, L., Gudmundsson, L. & Seneviratne, S. *System model temperatures with temperature trajectories to grid-point-level realizations on land*. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **11**, 139–159 (2020).

52.Doury, A., Somot, S., Gadat, S. *Climate model emulator based on deep learning: concept and first evaluation of a novel hybrid downscaling approach*. *Clim. Dyn.* **60**, 1751–1779 (2023).

53.Quicaille, Y., Gudmundsson, L., Seneviratne, S. I. *Showcasing MESSIE for climate model evaluation and constrained projections*. *Nature Commun.* **11**, 1415 (2020).

54.Han, Y.-G., Kim, J.-H. & Luo, J.-J. *ENSO for Nature* **573**, 568–572 (2019).

55.Immoloano, F. et al. *Transferring skills in machine learning for primary production with machine learning*. *J. Geophys. Res.* **127**, e2021JD036013 (2022).

56.IPCC. *Summary for Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis* (eds Masson Delmotte, J. & Moore, G. 3rd Edn). Comparing storm via unsupervised machine learning. *Sci. Rep.* **13**, 22365 (2023).

57.O'Brien, T. A. et al. *Increases in the frequency and intensity of the ARTMIP tier 2*. *Geophys. Res. Atmos.* **127**, e2021JD036013 (2022).

58.Kurth, T. et al. *Exascale deep learning for climate forecasting*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1810.01993> (2018).

59.Salcedo-Sanz, S. et al. *Analysis and attribution of extreme atmospheric events with machine learning and deep learning*. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **15**, 1–44 (2024).

60.O'Brien, T. A. et al. *Detection of uncertainty quantification*. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **13**, 6131–6148 (2020).

61.Prabhat, K. et al. *ClimateNet: a climate and deep learning architecture for enabling high-precision analyses of extreme weather*. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **14**, 107–128 (2021).

62.Liu, Y. et al. *Application of deep learning for detecting extreme weather in climate datasets*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501/6a> (2025).

63.Muszynski, G., Kashinath, K. *Data analysis and machine learning for recognizing atmospheric river patterns in large climate datasets*. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **12**, 613–628 (2019).

64.Kim, S. et al. *Deep-Hurricane-Track: a deep learning approach for extreme climate events*. In *2019 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision* 1761–1769 (IEEE, 2019).

65.Molina, M. J. et al. *A review of learning applications for climate variability and weather phenomena*. *Artif. Intell. Earth Syst.* <https://doi.org/10.1175/AIES-D-22-02023.1>

66.Molina, M. J. *Machine learning for gauging and gauging*. *Earth Space Sci.* **6**, 1–10 (2021).

67.Wynne, A. & Gao, Y. *Generalization capabilities of deep learning methods to classify severe convective storms in a changing climate*. *Earth Space Sci.* **6**, 1–10 (2021).

68.Zhu, Z. & Gu, Z. *Learning methods for statistical downscaling: the case of daily precipitation*. *Theor Appl. Climatol.* **137**, 557–570 (2021).

69.Mitroshov, G., Cozian, B., Abry, P. & Seneviratne, S. *Probabilistic forecasts of extreme heatwaves using convolutional neural networks in a regime of lack of data*. *Physical Review Fluids* **8**, 040501 (2023).

70.Eyring, V. et al. *Earth System Model 2019: an extended set of large-scale diagnostics for Earth models*. *Geosci. Model Dev.* **13**, 3383–3438 (2020).

71.Dijkstra, H., Hernandez-Garcia, E. & Ringer, M. *Networks in Climate* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).

72.Karmouche, S. et al. *Regime-oriented of Atlantic-Pacific interactions*. *Earth Syst. Dyn.* **14**, 309–344 (2023).

73.Bousk, L., Hwang, M. & Eyring, V. *MESSIE for climate model evaluation and constrained projections*. *Nature Commun.* **11**, 1415 (2020).

74.Barnes, E. A., Barnes, R. J., Martin, J. & Moore, G. *Interpretable neural networks for climate tasks when location matters*. *Artif. Intell. Earth Syst.* **1**, e220001 (2022).

75.O'Brien, T. A. et al. *Extremal flow frequency and intensity for climate forecasting using neural weather models*. *Artif. Intell. Earth Syst.* **2**, 220035 (2023).

76.Kendall, A. & Gal, Y. *What uncertainty represents model uncertainty in deep learning*. In *Proc. 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* 1050–1059 (Proc. ICML, 2016).

77.Gal, Y. & Ghahramani, Z. *Dropout as a Bayesian approximation to deep learning*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.201073> (2020).

78.Korty, S. & Weinberger, K. Q. *Dropout as a continuous space-time super-resolution framework*. In *Proc. International Conference for High-Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (IHCNA)* 1050–1059 (Proc. IHCNA, 2016).

79.Forty, S. & Weinberger, K. Q. *Dropout as a representation of model uncertainty in deep learning*. In *Proc. 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* 1050–1059 (Proc. ICML, 2016).

80.Osband, I., Blundell, C., Pritzel, A. & Lakshminarayanan, D. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (eds Lee, D. et al.) Vol. 29 (CML, 2016).

81.Khalil, M., D. P. & Wellings, M. *Auto-encoder for semi-supervised learning*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2505103> (2025).

82.Cachay, S. R., Zhao, B., Joren, H. & Pritzel, A. *Informative diffusion model for spatio-temporal forecasting*. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2023> (2023).

86. Hall, D. et al. *NVIDIA's Earth-2* brought the *Geotextile* to life with deep learning and its subsystems. In *XXVIII General Assembly of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG)* (2023) of Biological and Environmental Research. <https://doi.org/10.57757/IUGG23-698>

87. van Straaten, C., Whan, K., Coumbe, D., Natiel, M., Schmeits, M. Using explainable machine learning to discover subseasonal drivers of high summer temperatures in Western and Central Weather Rev. **150**, p. 1115–1118 (2022).

88. Malakiss, A., Ebert, U. *AI and Beyond*. 82 OB1a9r6n2e5s-, S. (2022). Andi DOE Advanced Scientific ExplainableAI (eds Holzinger, A. et al) p. 15-18. A springer support was received in 2022.

89. Rader, J. K., Barnes, E. A., Eber, U. *AI and Beyond*. 1749261 and US Department of Energy Detection of forced change with the Moonbeam Model and a Machine Learning Research programme: using explainable neural networks. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **14**, e2021MS002941 (2022).

90. Toms, B. A., Barnes, E. A. & Hur, D. *Hammering the nail* in predictability in an earth-system model using explainable neural networks. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **48**, e2021GL093842 (2021).

91. Malakiss, A., Barnes, E. A. & Eber, U. *AI and Beyond*. 1749261 and US DOE (DE-SC0022070) and NSF (IA 1942021 MS002941) and NSF (ICER-2021MS002941) and the baseline: lessons learned from the Moonbeam Model and research methods for regression tasks in geoscience. *Artif. Intell. Earth Syst.* **2**, 220058 (2023).

92. Rudin, C. Stop explaining black for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* **1**, 206–215 (2019).

93. Mc Grav, M. C. & Barnes, E. A. Measuring climate variability and causality in climate variability studies. *J. Clim.* **31**, 3289–3300 (2018).

94. Bauer, P., Stevens, B. & Hazel, J. *GO4W.71* and the green transition. *Nat. Clim. Change* **11**, 80–83 (2021).

95. *Foundational Research Gaps and Future Directions for Digital Twins* (National Academies Press, 2024)

96. Nguyen, T., Brandstetter, E. J., V. K. B. and W. D. Gupta, n. U. y. K. e. & G. e. v. r. i. t. A. C. l. i. m. a. X: a foundation model for weather and climate prediction and the concept of pushing the frontiers of climate modelling and analysis. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2301.10343> (2023).

97. Bonev, B. et al. Spherical Fourier dynamics on the sphere. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.20283> 8

98. Mardani, M. et al. Residual diffusion modeling for km-scale atmospheric downscaling. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.14244>

99. Breinowitz, N. D. et al. A practical probabilistic benchmark for AI weather models. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.20230> 5

100. Levo, S. et al. Flood forecasting with a machine learning model in an operational framework. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **26**, 4013–4032 (2022).

W. D. C. was supported by the Director, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG) (2023) of Biological and Environmental Research. The authors declare no competing interests. Correspondence should be addressed to Veronika Eyring or Peer review information Nature Climate Change thanks Peter Ba

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the Aspen Global Foundation's support for this workshop. This workshop is part of the Aspen Global Foundation's work on Exploring the Future of Energy with Machine Learning and Big Data, a series of traditionally landmark summer interdisciplinary sessions (<https://www.aspeninstitute.org/future-energy-machine-learning-big-data/>).

Author contributions

V.K. ~~po~~ and W.D. Gajjar, in U. K. ed., *Greenhouse and the Environment: A Handbook on Climate Change and its Implications*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1991, pp. 1-12.

with the following sections of the drafting and writing of the mansion modeling

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interest. A probabilistic benchmark for the *Adaptive K-Space* is available at <http://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/28674>.

Additional information

Correspondence should be addressed to Veronika Eyring or
ViViLitammDchColle learning models in

032

Peer review information *Nature Climate Change* thanks Peter Ba
Peter Gibson and the other, anonymous,
to the peer review of this work.

to the peer review of this work.
e ange Institute for hosting
Project 1649, a joint initiative of the

Reprints and permission information is available at www.nature.com/reprints as part of its terms and conditions.

Publisher's note *NSA/SR* is a *g*er Nature remains neutral to the content of this journal. *NSA/SR* is not a *g*overnmental publication.

to jurisdictional claims in published maps and on the national
affiliations. spherical Administration's
I. Science Foundation's (NSF)

Springer Nature supports institutions in the World. g.
Exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with

The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/ a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

K. W. were also supported by the
© 2024 by the author. All rights reserved.

