




# Learning from Observations: The Case for a New Generation of Land Surface Models

Bart Nijssen, Andrew Bennett, Grey Nearing  
AGU Fall Meeting 2021  
H33B-04



# The Evolution of Land Surface Modeling







# big challenges

parameterizations  
and parameter  
values



CLM5.0






big challenges

parameterizations  
and parameter  
values










NASA Visible earth: Map by Robert Simmon, based on data from the [MODIS Land Cover Group](#), Boston University.





**Table 3 Root zone depths (m) and fraction of roots in each zone for IGBP land cover classes.**

From: [A near-global, high resolution land surface parameter dataset for the variable infiltration capacity model](#)

	Depth(1)	Depth(2)	Depth(3)	Fract(1)	Fract(2)	Fract(3)
Open water	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.44	0.45	0.11
Evergreen needleleaf forest	0.1	0.6	1.1	0.34	0.51	0.14
Evergreen broadleaf forest	0.1	0.6	2.3	0.32	0.44	0.23
Deciduous needleleaf forest	0.1	0.6	1.3	0.34	0.5	0.16
Deciduous broadleaf forest	0.1	0.6	1.3	0.31	0.52	0.17
Mixed forest	0.1	0.6	1.7	0.25	0.52	0.22
Closed shrublands	0.1	0.6	1.8	0.31	0.49	0.21
Open shrublands	0.1	0.6	2.4	0.33	0.43	0.24
Savanna	0.1	0.6	1.7	0.36	0.45	0.19
Woody savanna	0.1	0.6	1	0.37	0.5	0.13
Grasslands	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.44	0.45	0.11
Permanent wetlands	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.44	0.45	0.11
Cropland	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.33	0.55	0.12
Urban	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.44	0.45	0.11
Cropland/natural vegetation mosaic	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.33	0.55	0.12
Permanent snow and ice	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.44	0.45	0.11
Barren	0.1	0.6	3.3	0.22	0.46	0.31

Schaperow, J. R., D. Li, S. A. Margulis, and D. P. Lettenmaier (2021), A near-global, high resolution land surface parameter dataset for the variable infiltration capacity model, *Sci Data*, 8(1), 216, doi:10.1038/s41597-021-00999-4.



THE FUTURE OF EVERYTHING | DATA

# Climate Change Data Deluge Has Scientists Scrambling for Solutions

*As earth-observing satellites, aircraft and ocean buoys churn out ever-rising amounts of information about our planet, data managers turn to cloud computing and artificial intelligence*

**AUTHOR**

ROBERT LEE HOTZ

**PUBLISHED**

DEC. 5, 2021 11:00 AM ET




THE FUTURE OF EVERYTHING | DATA

# Climate Change Data Deluge Has Scientists Scrambling for Solutions

## Climate Data Explosion

The volume of data in NASA's Earth Observing System Data and Information System is expected to soar in coming years.

300 Petabytes



Source: NASA

*lites, aircraft and ocean buoys churn out ever-rising amounts of information about our  
urn to cloud computing and artificial intelligence*

**AUTHOR**

ROBERT LEE HOTZ

**PUBLISHED**

DEC. 5, 2021 11:00 AM ET



**Most of our LSMs are data-hungry, yet not well designed to take advantage of the existing and new sources of observations**

**Most of our LSMs are data-hungry, yet not well designed to take advantage of the existing and new sources of observations**

**Our process parameterizations don't integrate well across the land:  
unclear how to transfer knowledge between locations**





## the case of hydrology

## Looking for Hydrologic Laws

JAMES C. I. DOOGE

*Department of Engineering Hydrology, University College, Galway, Dublin, Ireland*

The search for regularities in hydrologic relationships is discussed against the background of the general types of predictive models used in science. The various approaches to the study of water are compared and contrasted. The ideas discussed are illustrated by examples from the development of techniques in flood hydrology and by personal conclusions on the sources for new hypotheses in flood hydrology and the possibility of their verification.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. *Relation of Hydrology to Science*

Fifty years ago, there was only a handful of books and a handful of journals available to the hydrologist who wished to establish a sound scientific basis for his practical decisions. Today, there is an embarrassing abundance of books, monographs, journals and symposia proceedings clamouring for his or her attention. Is hydrology now an established science? Is hydrologic practice now firmly based on scientific principles?

This paper deals with the problems raised by the search for regularities and for laws in hydrology. In order to emphasize the challenge implicit in such a search, special attention will be paid to flood hydrology in which the enterprise is particularly difficult. It is proposed to discuss the subject within the context of predictive models and explanatory theories in science generally. Such an approach can be useful not only for the purpose of emphasizing the position of hydrology as one of the earth sciences but also because such an approach could lead to the suggestion of analogies which can be so fruitful in the construction of models and the development of theories [Polya, 1954].

Following an introductory section on the nature of scientific method, an outline is given of the contrasting approaches of analytical mechanics and statistical mechanics and the problems involved in dealing with systems of intermediate size. Attention is then turned to the various approaches to the study of water movement and the problem of parametrizing at a macroscale the effect of microscale processes that are not explicitly included in the macroscale model. Finally, the historical development of current methods of flood hydrology is reviewed against the background of the foregoing material. The purpose of the whole exercise is to provide the context for the formulation of a strategy for the development of a body of hydrologic knowledge that is both scientifically respectable and practically useful.

The term model is used to describe a system which is simpler than the prototype system and which can reproduce some but not all of the characteristics thereof. Accordingly, a model is related to those particular aspects of the behavior of the prototype for which understanding or prediction is required. It is important to realize that a model is not a theory and to distinguish between models that are con-

structed to provide a prediction of system behavior to some specific accuracy and scientific theories developed to provide insight into the nature of the system operation. Though their function is different, predictive models and explanatory theories can be closely related to one another. An hypothesis or a confirmed theory can be used as the basis for the construction of a predictive model and in turn some predictive models which reproduce a prototype behavior accurately can provide insight for the construction of explanatory theories.

For different scientific workers (or for the same scientific worker at different times) the level of interest in explanatory theories and predictive models may vary as shown schematically in Figure 1. A research scientist uses observations primarily as a basis of comparison between the predictions based on alternative hypotheses and combines confirmed hypotheses into a theoretical system enabling him or her to understand nature. An engineer uses observations as a check on the predictions he uses in his efforts "to control the materials and forces of nature for the use and benefit of man" (ICE Charter; see Dennis [1968]). Hydrology, as one of the earth sciences and as the basis of water resources development, is concerned with both of these functions. Understanding and prediction can aid the control of extreme flood events, but perfect understanding and perfect prediction would be small solace if failure to control resulted in a massive human tragedy.

#### 1.2. *Nature of Scientific Method*

There seems at first sight to be all the difference in the world between the scientific method of the physical scientist and the efforts of the hydrologist to understand and predict extreme flood events or other hydrological phenomena. On closer examination, however, it becomes clear that while there are very significant differences, there are also similarities and analogies that may be helpful to the hydrologist in his task. It is clearly insufficient to define scientific method as "what scientists do," but it would be equally wrong to think that all scientists under all circumstances act in accordance with what is known as the scientific method.

In his notable work *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Popper [1959] proposed falsifiability as the criterion of demarcation of empirical science. He requires of any scientific system that 'it must be possible for an empirical scientific system to be refuted by experience.' Popper goes on to develop such principles and rules as will ensure the testability, i.e., the falsifiability of scientific statements.

Copyright 1986 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 6W0295.  
0043-1397/86/006W-0295\$05.00

46S

the case of hydrology



## Looking for Hydrologic Laws

JAMES C. I. DOOGE

Department of Engineering Hydrology, University College, Galway, Dublin, Ireland

The search for regularities in hydrologic relationships is discussed against the background of the general types of predictive models used in science. The various approaches to the study of water are compared and contrasted. The ideas discussed are illustrated by examples from the development of techniques in flood hydrology and by personal conclusions on the sources for new hypotheses in flood hydrology and the possibility of their verification.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Relation of Hydrology to Science

Fifty years ago, there was only a handful of books and a handful of journals available to the hydrologist who wished to establish a sound scientific basis for his practical decisions. Today, there is an embarrassing abundance of books, monographs, journals and symposia proceedings clamouring for his or her attention. Is hydrology now an established science? Is hydrologic practice now firmly based on scientific principles?

This paper deals with the problems raised by the search for regularities and for laws in hydrology. In order to emphasize the challenge implicit in such a search, special attention will be paid to flood hydrology in which the enterprise is particularly difficult. It is proposed to discuss the subject within the context of predictive models and explanatory theories in science generally. Such an approach can be useful not only for the purpose of emphasizing the position of hydrology as one of the earth sciences but also because such an approach could lead to the suggestion of analogies which can be so fruitful in the construction of models and the development of theories [Polya, 1954].

Following an introductory section on the nature of scientific method, an outline is given of the contrasting approaches of analytical mechanics and statistical mechanics and the problems involved in dealing with systems of intermediate size. Attention is then turned to the various approaches to the study of water movement and the problem of parametrizing at a macroscale the effect of microscale processes that are not explicitly included in the macroscale model. Finally, the historical development of current methods of flood hydrology is reviewed against the background of the foregoing material. The purpose of the whole exercise is to provide the context for the formulation of a strategy for the development of a body of hydrologic knowledge that is both scientifically respectable and practically useful.

The term model is used to describe a system which is simpler than the prototype system and which can reproduce some but not all of the characteristics thereof. Accordingly, a model is related to those particular aspects of the behavior of the prototype for which understanding or prediction is required. It is important to realize that a model is not a theory and to distinguish between models that are con-


structed to provide a prediction of system behavior to some specific accuracy and scientific theories developed to provide insight into the nature of the system operation. Though their function is different, predictive models and explanatory theories can be closely related to one another. An hypothesis or a confirmed theory can be used as the basis for the construction of a predictive model and in turn some predictive models which reproduce a prototype behavior accurately can provide insight for the construction of explanatory theories.

For different scientific workers (or for the same scientific worker at different times) the level of interest in explanatory theories and predictive models may vary as shown schematically in Figure 1. A research scientist uses observations primarily as a basis of comparison between the predictions based on alternative hypotheses and combines confirmed hypotheses into a theoretical system enabling him or her to understand nature. An engineer uses observations as a check on the predictions he uses in his efforts "to control the materials and forces of nature for the use and benefit of man" (ICE Charter; see Dennis [1968]). Hydrology, as one of the earth sciences and as the basis of water resources development, is concerned with both of these functions. Understanding and prediction can aid the control of extreme flood events, but perfect understanding and perfect prediction would be small solace if failure to control resulted in a massive human tragedy.

#### 1.2. Nature of Scientific Method

There seems at first sight to be all the difference in the world between the scientific method of the physical scientist and the efforts of the hydrologist to understand and predict extreme flood events or other hydrological phenomena. On closer examination, however, it becomes clear that while there are very significant differences, there are also similarities and analogies that may be helpful to the hydrologist in his task. It is clearly insufficient to define scientific method as "what scientists do," but it would be equally wrong to think that all scientists under all circumstances act in accordance with what is known as the scientific method.

In his notable work *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Popper [1959] proposed falsifiability as the criterion of demarcation of empirical science. He requires of any scientific system that 'it must be possible for an empirical scientific system to be refuted by experience.' Popper goes on to develop such principles and rules as will ensure the testability, i.e., the falsifiability of scientific statements.



Copyright 1986 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 6W0295.  
0043-1397/86/006W-0295\$05.00





## Looking for Hydrologic Laws

JAMES C. I. DOOGE

Department of Engineering Hydrology, University College, Galway, Dublin, Ireland

The search for regularities in hydrologic relationships is discussed against the background of the general types of predictive models used in science. The various approaches to the study of water are compared and contrasted. The ideas discussed are illustrated by examples from the development of techniques in flood hydrology and by personal conclusions on the sources for new hypotheses in flood hydrology and the possibility of their verification.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Relation of Hydrology to Science

Fifty years ago, there was only a handful of books and a handful of journals available to the hydrologist who wished to establish a sound scientific basis for his practical decisions. Today, there is an embarrassing abundance of books, monographs, journals and symposia proceedings clamouring for his or her attention. Is hydrology now an established science? Is hydrologic practice now firmly based on scientific principles?

This paper deals with the problems raised by the search for regularities and for laws in hydrology. In order to emphasize the challenge implicit in such a search, special attention will be paid to flood hydrology in which the enterprise is particularly difficult. It is proposed to discuss the subject within the context of predictive models and explanatory theories in science generally. Such an approach can be useful not only for the purpose of emphasizing the position of hydrology as one of the earth sciences but also because such an approach could lead to the suggestion of analogies which can be so fruitful in the construction of models and the development of theories [Polya, 1954].

Following an introductory section on the nature of scientific method, an outline is given of the contrasting approaches of analytical mechanics and statistical mechanics and the problems involved in dealing with systems of intermediate size. Attention is then turned to the various approaches to the study of water movement and the problem of parametrizing at a macroscale the effect of microscale processes that are not explicitly included in the macroscale model. Finally, the historical development of current methods of flood hydrology is reviewed against the background of the foregoing material. The purpose of the whole exercise is to provide the context for the formulation of a strategy for the development of a body of hydrologic knowledge that is both scientifically respectable and practically useful.

The term model is used to describe a system which is simpler than the prototype system and which can reproduce some but not all of the characteristics thereof. Accordingly, a model is related to those particular aspects of the behavior of the prototype for which understanding or prediction is required. It is important to realize that a model is not a theory and to distinguish between models that are con-


structed to provide a prediction of system behavior to some specific accuracy and scientific theories developed to provide insight into the nature of the system operation. Though their function is different, predictive models and explanatory theories can be closely related to one another. An hypothesis or a confirmed theory can be used as the basis for the construction of a predictive model and in turn some predictive models which reproduce a prototype behavior accurately can provide insight for the construction of explanatory theories.

For different scientific workers (or for the same scientific worker at different times) the level of interest in explanatory theories and predictive models may vary as shown schematically in Figure 1. A research scientist uses observations primarily as a basis of comparison between the predictions based on alternative hypotheses and combines confirmed hypotheses into a theoretical system enabling him or her to understand nature. An engineer uses observations as a check on the predictions he uses in his efforts "to control the materials and forces of nature for the use and benefit of man" (ICE Charter; see Dennis [1968]). Hydrology, as one of the earth sciences and as the basis of water resources development, is concerned with both of these functions. Understanding and prediction can aid the control of extreme flood events, but perfect understanding and perfect prediction would be small solace if failure to control resulted in a massive human tragedy.

#### 1.2. Nature of Scientific Method

There seems at first sight to be all the difference in the world between the scientific method of the physical scientist and the efforts of the hydrologist to understand and predict extreme flood events or other hydrological phenomena. On closer examination, however, it becomes clear that while there are very significant differences, there are also similarities and analogies that may be helpful to the hydrologist in his task. It is clearly insufficient to define scientific method as "what scientists do," but it would be equally wrong to think that all scientists under all circumstances act in accordance with what is known as the scientific method.

In his notable work *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Popper [1959] proposed falsifiability as the criterion of demarcation of empirical science. He requires of any scientific system that 'it must be possible for an empirical scientific system to be refuted by experience.' Popper goes on to develop such principles and rules as will ensure the testability, i.e., the falsifiability of scientific statements.




Copyright 1986 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 6W0295.  
0043-1397/86/006W-0295\$05.00







# Dataset & model: A purely data-driven approach




# Learning a general model



# Replacing turbulent heat flux parameterizations in a process-based model




# SUMMA & ML turbulent heat parameterization outperforms original SUMMA





# SUMMA & ML turbulent heat parameterization outperforms original SUMMA



**Learning from Observations:**

**The Case for a New Generation of Land Surface Models**

# Learning from Observations:

## The Case for a New Generation of Land Surface Models

- Take advantage of new observations
- Generalize across locations
- Learn land surface processes at scale

In hydrology: Prediction in ungauged basins

# Learning from Observations:

## The Case for a New Generation of Land Surface Models

- Take advantage of new observations
- Generalize across locations
- Learn land surface processes at scale

In hydrology: Prediction in ungauged basins

**Make a concerted effort to adopt the use of ML approaches in LSMs**



# Learning from Observations:


## The Case for a New Generation of Land Surface Models

- Take advantage of new observations
- Generalize across locations
- Learn land surface processes at scale

In hydrology: Prediction in ungauged basins

**Make a concerted effort to adopt the use of ML approaches in LSMs**


**FUNDING & RESOURCES**


 [Home](#) [White Papers](#) [Workshop](#) [News](#) [Contact Us](#)

 **Artificial Intelligence for Earth System Predictability**

A multi-lab initiative working with the Earth and Environmental Systems Science Division (EESDD) of the Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) to develop a new paradigm for Earth system predictability focused on enabling artificial intelligence across field lab, modeling, and analysis activities.

**AI2** Allen Institute for AI

 [Climate Modeling](#) [About](#) [Papers](#) [Team](#)



uses GFDL model

Climate Modeling for the future of the planet

 COLUMBIA CLIMATE SCHOOL  
Climate, Earth, and Society

## State of the Planet

[AGRICULTURE](#) [CLIMATE](#) [EARTH SCIENCES](#) [ECOLOGY](#) [ENERGY](#) [HEALTH](#) [SUSTAINABILITY](#)


CLIMATE, GENERAL EARTH INSTITUTE

## Columbia to Launch \$25 Million AI-Based Climate Modeling Center

BY KIM MARTINEAU | SEPTEMBER 9, 2021

    9  Comments


**Some of this is already happening**



**50+ years of development:**

Understanding  
People  
Models  
Code





**50+ years of development:**

**Understanding  
People  
Models  
Code**

UPSTREAM TECH

## HydroForecast

**Water and weather intelligence, at your fingertips**

Manage climate and water risk, and see more clearly into the future with AI-powered forecasts for planning and operations.

<https://www.upstream.tech/hydroforecast>

Google The Keyword Latest stories Product updates Company news


AI

## Expanding our ML-based flood forecasting

Nov 09, 2021 · 3 min read

<https://blog.google/technology/ai/expanding-our-ml-based-flood-forecasting/>





**50+ years of development:**  
**Understanding**  
**People**  
**Models**  
**Code**

Research



6 minute read

## How AI can help predict climate extremes

<https://research.ibm.com/blog/icml-predicting-climate-extremes>

UPSTREAM TECH

# HydroForecast

**Water and weather intelligence, at your fingertips**  
 Manage climate and water risk, and see more clearly into the future with AI-powered forecasts for planning and operations.

<https://www.upstream.tech/hydroforecast>

Google The Keyword Latest stories Product updates Company news


AI

## Expanding our ML-based flood forecasting

Nov 09, 2021 · 3 min read

<https://blog.google/technology/ai/expanding-our-ml-based-flood-forecasting/>





**50+ years of development:**  
**Understanding**  
**People**  
**Models**  
**Code**

Research

IBM

6 minute read

**How AI can help predict climate extremes**

<https://research.ibm.com/blog/icml-predicting-climate-extremes>

UPSTREAM TECH

# HydroForecast

**Water and weather intelligence, at your fingertips**

Manage climate and water risk, and see more clearly into the future with AI-powered forecasts for planning and operations.

<https://www.upstream.tech/hydroforecast>

Google The Keyword

Latest stories

Product updates

Company news



AI


**Expanding our ML-based flood forecasting**

Nov 09, 2021 · 3 min read

<https://blog.google/technology/ai/expanding-our-ml-based-flood-forecasting/>

**NVIDIA to Build Earth-2 Supercomputer to See Our Future**

November 12, 2021 by JENSEN HUANG



<https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/2021/11/12/earth-2-supercomputer/>



30



# What we need:

Ways to incorporate machine learning to take advantage of new data and existing knowledge

Targeted efforts to explore the best use of new data

Critical evaluation of successes and failures of existing models

Identifying opportunities for each modeling approach

Streamlined model workflows and data sets

Collaborations between earth scientists and data scientists

Training and training resources in data science and machine learning

## Learning from Observations:

# The Case for a New Generation of Land Surface Models

