

# Exploring the decision-making process in model development: focus on the Arctic snowpack

Cecile B. Menard<sup>1</sup>, Sirpa Rasmus<sup>2,3</sup>, Ioanna Merkouriadi<sup>4</sup>, Gianpaolo Balsamo<sup>5</sup>, Annett Bartsch<sup>6</sup>, Chris Derksen<sup>7</sup>, Florent Domine<sup>8</sup>, Marie Dumont<sup>9</sup>, Dorothee Ehrich<sup>10</sup>, Richard Essery<sup>1</sup>, Bruce C. Forbes<sup>2</sup>, Gerhard Krinner<sup>11</sup>, David Lawrence<sup>12</sup>, Glen Liston<sup>13</sup>, Heidrun Matthes<sup>14</sup>, Nick Rutter<sup>15</sup>, Melody Sandells<sup>15</sup>, Martin Schneebeli<sup>16</sup>, Sari Stark<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Arctic Centre, University of Lapland, Rovaniemi, Finland

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>4</sup> Finnish Meteorological Institute, Helsinki, Finland

<sup>5</sup> European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts, Reading, United Kingdom

<sup>6</sup> b.geos, Korneuburg, Austria

<sup>7</sup> Climate Res Div, Environm & Climate Change Canada, Toronto, Canada

<sup>8</sup> Takuvik International Laboratory, Université Laval and CNRS, Quebec City, Canada

<sup>9</sup> France Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Université de Toulouse, Météo-France, CNRS, CNRM, Centre d'Etudes de la Neige, Grenoble, France

<sup>10</sup> Dept Arctic & Marine Biol, UiT Arctic Univ Norway, Tromso, Norway

<sup>11</sup> Inst Geosci Environm, Univ Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble, France

<sup>12</sup> National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, USA

<sup>13</sup> Cooperat Inst Res Atmosphere, Colorado State Univ, Ft Collins, USA

<sup>14</sup> Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine Research, Potsdam, Germany

<sup>15</sup> Dept Geog & Environm Sci, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, England

<sup>16</sup> WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research (SLF), Davos Switzerland

*Correspondence to:* Cecile B. Menard (cecile.menard@ed.ac.uk)


29 **Abstract.** The Arctic poses many challenges to Earth System and snow physics models, which are commonly  
30 unable to simulate crucial Arctic snowpack processes, such as vapour gradients and rain-on-snow-induced ice  
31 layers. These limitations raise concerns about the current understanding of Arctic warming and its impact on  
32 biodiversity, livelihoods, permafrost and the global carbon budget. Recognizing that models are shaped by  
33 human choices, eighteen Arctic researchers were interviewed to delve into the decision-making process behind  
34 model construction. Although data availability, issues of scale, internal model consistency, and historical and  
35 numerical model legacies were cited as obstacles to developing an Arctic snowpack model, no opinion was  
36 unanimous. Divergences were not merely scientific disagreements about the Arctic snowpack, but reflected the  
37 broader research context. Inadequate and insufficient resources, partly driven by short-term priorities  
38 dominating research landscapes, impeded progress. Nevertheless, modellers were found to be both adaptable to  
39 shifting strategic research priorities - an adaptability demonstrated by the fact that interdisciplinary  
40 collaborations were the key motivation for model development - and anchored in the past. This anchoring and  
41 non-epistemic values led to diverging opinions about whether existing models were “good enough” and whether  
42 investing time and effort to build a new model was a useful strategy when addressing pressing research  
43 challenges. Moving forward, we recommend that both stakeholders and modellers be involved in future snow  
44 model intercomparison projects in order to drive developments that address snow model limitations currently  
45 impeding progress in various disciplines. We also argue for more transparency about the contextual factors that  
46 shape research decisions. Otherwise, the reality of our scientific process will remain hidden, limiting the  
47 changes necessary to our research practice.

48

## 49 1 Introduction

50

51 If the number of mentions in Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Assessment Reports (IPCC AR) can  
52 be used as a proxy to quantify the importance of a component in the climate system, then our understanding of  
53 the key role played by the cryosphere can be dated to the mid-2000s. Cryosphere processes and feedback  
54 covered just 5 pages in the IPCC Working Group 1 (WG1) AR3 (IPCC, 2001), but a 48-page dedicated chapter  
55 in the IPCC WG1 AR4 (IPCC, 2007). By the Sixth Assessment Cycle, an IPCC Special Report focused on the  
56 role of changing oceans and cryosphere under a changing climate (IPCC, 2019). The average number of  
57 mentions per page of the words “Arctic” and “snow” in thirty-one years of IPCC WG1 AR trebled (Fig. 1).  
58 Meanwhile, the Arctic as a whole has warmed at twice, with some regions almost four times, the global rate  
59 (e.g. Serreze et al., 2000; ACIA, 2005; Walsh, 2014; Rantanen et al., 2022).



60

61 *Figure 1: Number of mentions of the words "arctic" (red) and "snow" (black) in each IPCC WG1 AR (IPCC,*  
 62 *1990; IPCC, 1995; IPCC, 2001; IPCC, 2007; IPCC, 2013; IPCC, 2021) (solid line) and number of mentions*  
 63 *normalized by the number of pages in each report (dashed line).*

64

65 The attribution and quantification of climate change by the IPCC WG1 is partly based upon simulations  
 66 provided by Earth System models (ESMs), which are lines of code, written over time by multiple scientists, that  
 67 describe processes relevant to life on Earth. Other types of models are dedicated to investigating specific  
 68 components of the Earth system e.g snow physics models. In both types of models, the “real world” must be  
 69 translated into a numerical language, requiring modellers to make decisions at every stage of the model  
 70 development. Given limited computing capabilities, modellers must decide which processes matter enough to be  
 71 represented, which parametrization of the chosen processes best suits the purpose of their model, which  
 72 language to use, how to select or tune parameter values, how to solve the equations, which input data are used,  
 73 which decisions to leave to users, which metrics to evaluate their model against; the list of “*the choreography of*  
 74 *coded procedures*” (Gramelsberger, 2011) goes on.

75 The representation of snow in ESMs and snow physics models (hereafter, when combined, referred to as “snow  
 76 models”) can take on various levels of complexity (here meaning incorporating increasing number of processes)  
 77 (see e.g. Slater et al., 2001; Largeron et al., 2020). The simplest representation is a soil-snow composite layer in  
 78 which the top soil layer “becomes” snow by adopting some of its attributes when present e.g. albedo, thermal  
 79 conductivity. The next complexity level represents a single snow layer where bulk snowpack properties e.g.,  
 80 snow water equivalent (SWE), depth and density, are simulated. Finally, multi-layer snow models usually allow  
 81 a pre-determined maximum number of snow layers, although some models add snow layers corresponding to  
 82 each snowfall, with their specific thickness, density and other attributes.

83 Most multi-layer snow models use a densification model first developed by Anderson (1976), itself based on  
 84 measurements made by Kojima (1967) in Sapporo and Moshiri, Hokkaido, Japan (hereafter the Anderson-  
 85 Kojima scheme). The model parameters account for compaction due to the weight of the overlying snow, as

86 well as destructive, constructive and melt metamorphism; as such, each layer increases in density with depth.  
87 This snow profile broadly resembles the properties associated with montane forest and maritime snow (Sturm  
88 and Liston, 2021), but is not appropriate to simulate wind-packed snow and depth-hoar, i.e. what Arctic tundra  
89 snowpacks are often almost entirely composed of (Fig. 2). Some snow physics models attempt to simulate  
90 Arctic-specific snowpack processes: the vapour diffusion that leads to depth hoar formation, the internal  
91 snowpack ice layers that commonly occur after rain-on-snow events, the thick ice crust that forms at the surface  
92 of the snowpack following freezing rain (e.g. SNOWPACK in Wever et al., 2016 and Jafari et al., 2020;  
93 SnowModel in Liston et al., 2020; Crocus in Quéno et al., 2018, Touzeau et al., 2018 and Royer et al., 2021).  
94 However, no ESM, i.e. none of the state of the art models that are used by researchers and policymakers  
95 globally to understand the complex interactions in the Earth’s climate system, so far, simulates Arctic-specific  
96 snowpack processes. This is despite many in the climate change scientific community considering these  
97 processes critical for understanding changes in Arctic biodiversity, livelihood, permafrost and the global carbon  
98 budget (e.g. Zhang et al., 1996; Rennert et al., 2009; Descamps, et al., 2016; Domine et al., 2018; Serreze et al.,  
99 2021).

100 The aim of this study is, therefore, to understand why decisions made by the snow modelling community over  
101 the past decades have led to little or no progress in the representation of Arctic snowpack processes, i.e. in the  
102 part of the planet that warms faster than anywhere else. While a systematic literature review would provide  
103 some answers, this study takes a different approach borrowed from Science and Technology Studies (STS), an  
104 interdisciplinary field whereby the scientists themselves are part of the investigation into understanding science  
105 in the making. Although the type of decisions needed throughout the different stages of model construction has  
106 been well documented by epistemologists and philosophers of climate science (e.g. Winsberg, 1999;  
107 Gramelsberger, 2011; Gramelsberger and Mansnerus, 2012; Parker and Winsberg 2018; Morrison, 2021), what  
108 leads to these decisions remains “*mostly hidden from view*” (Winsberg, 2012). Therefore, to address our aim, we  
109 will investigate the construction of snow models by employing qualitative research methodologies, i.e. by  
110 interviewing the individuals who shape the content of snow models in order to uncover the factors that influence  
111 their decisions. The underlying premise of this aim is rooted in the belief that comprehending the cause of a  
112 problem – if indeed the absence of an Arctic snowpack is one – provides a foundation for addressing it and  
113 recommending ways to move forward, which we will do in the Discussion section

114



115

116 Fig 2. High Arctic snowpack with wind slab over depth hoar, taken on Bylot island on 18 May 2015 by Florent  
117 Dominé (left) and near-infrared picture showing a 2 mm ice layer at 26 cm on 16 March 2018 (right). The ice  
118 layer on the right was the result of rain on snow on 15 January. Taken at Trail Valley Creek, Canada, by Nick  
119 Rutter.

120

## 121 2 Methods

122

123 This study originated from discussions between the first three authors of this paper (CM, SR, and IM  
124 respectively) during which the representations, shortfalls and progress in snowpack modelling were debated.  
125 Our understanding was that current snow models fell short of representing all the Arctic snowpack processes  
126 needed by our project collaborators on the interdisciplinary project CHARTER, which aims at enhancing the  
127 adaptive capacity of Arctic communities to climatic and biodiversity changes (CHARTER, 2023). For example,  
128 for reindeer husbandry and investigations into the Arctic food web, CHARTER partners required accurate  
129 snowpack density profiles and information on spatial distribution and hardness of ice layers formed by rain on  
130 snow events (see e.g. Laptander et al., 2024, for details). Recognising that we had had these types of  
131 conversations with other colleagues over the years, we concluded that a different approach was needed to  
132 understand why any Arctic snowpack processes were yet to be included in most snow models. We opted to use  
133 qualitative research methodologies because they “*place emphasis on seeking understanding of the meanings of*  
134 *human actions and experiences, and on generating accounts of their meaning from the viewpoints of those*  
135 *involved*” (Fossey, 2002). As such and in accordance with qualitative research participant selection  
136 methodology, we compiled a shortlist of participants, both within and outside CHARTER, “*who c[ould] best*  
137 *inform the research questions and enhance understanding of the phenomenon under study*” (Sargeant, 2012).  
138 The shortlist was split into five so-called “expert” groups:

- 139 1. Snow modeller collaborators (SMC). Participants with research expertise in Arctic fauna and flora  
140 biodiversity.
- 141 2. Field scientists (FS). Participants whose field campaigns focus on snow-related processes and whose  
142 field work supports the development of remote sensing and snow physics models.
- 143 3. Remote sensing scientists (RSS). Participants involved in the development of satellite products or of  
144 remote sensing models for snow.
- 145 4. Snow physics modellers (SPM). Participants who have developed and/or who are involved in the  
146 development a snow physics model.
- 147 5. Large scale modellers (LSM). Participants with expertise in ESMs, in the land surface component of  
148 ESMS, and/or in numerical weather prediction (NWP).

149 The shortlist initially included three participants in each of the five so-called “expert” groups. Potential  
150 participants were emailed with a request for participation that included a participant information sheet and  
151 consent form (see supplementary material); all those contacted accepted to participate. The groups were broadly  
152 split between stakeholders (SMC, FS and RSS), i.e. users of snow models whose needs may influence the  
153 development priorities in snow model, and snow modellers (SPM and LSM), here meaning those who make the  
154 decisions about which developments are prioritised in the snow models they are involved in. The expertise

155 classification was somewhat artificial and, as we discovered during some interviews, distinctions between  
156 groups were sometimes negligible. For example, all but LSM had extensive field experience, one FS had  
157 expertise in Arctic biodiversity, one RSS had been involved in the development of a snow physics model, one  
158 SPM had contributed to the development of a land surface model and so on. These overlaps prompted the  
159 addition of four more participants to the shortlist to ensure comprehensive representation of expertise within  
160 some of the groups.

161 In total, nineteen one-to-one interviews lasting between 40 and 65 minutes took place on Microsoft Teams or  
162 Zoom between August 2022 and January 2023. One SMC withdrew from the study shortly after the interview  
163 and their data are not used. All interviews, which were conducted by CM, were individual in-depth semi-  
164 structured interviews, a qualitative data collection method in which a set of predetermined open-ended  
165 questions, as well as themes emerging from the dialogue between interviewer and participants, are discussed  
166 (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree, 2006).

167 The description of Arctic snowpack processes and of their effects on various aspects of the Earth System was  
168 kept intentionally short in the introduction section of this paper. Implicit within the rationale for this study, is the  
169 assumption that opinions about the importance of including Arctic snowpack characteristics in snow models  
170 differ otherwise it would be no topic for debate within the Arctic snow community (here meaning all disciplines  
171 where Arctic snow is significant, thus encompassing all of this study's participants). As all participants were  
172 asked to explain the significance of snowpack structure in their research and to articulate their understanding of  
173 the importance of representing Arctic snowpacks in snow models, the implications of Arctic snowpack  
174 processes not being represented are presented, throughout the paper, in the participants' own words.

175 Some questions asked by CM differed between groups to reflect the expertise of the participants. SMC, FS, and  
176 RSS were interviewed to understand the diverse applications of Arctic snow (e.g. snow as a habitat, snow as an  
177 insulating medium, snow as water resource, snow as a complex microstructure etc) and to evaluate if limitations  
178 in snow models constrained their research. Interviews with individual group members followed in sequence (i.e.  
179 group 3 after 2 after 1 etc) so that SMC, FS and RSS could suggest questions to SPM and LSM. SPM and LSM  
180 were then asked about their decision-making process e.g. how do they prioritise model developments? What are  
181 the limitations of their model and how do they affect our understanding of Arctic snow processes?

182 All interviews were video recorded and transcribed. The data (i.e. the interview transcripts) were analysed by  
183 conducting a thematic analysis (Braun and Clark, 2006; Rapley, 2011). This qualitative analytical approach  
184 consists in identifying codes, i.e. semantic content or latent features in interviews, and then collating them into  
185 overarching themes. In our study, one or multiple codes were attributed by CM to each statement in the  
186 transcripts. Iterative coding was conducted in NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software that facilitates the  
187 classification and visualisation of unstructured data. Three iterations were necessary to identify all codes and to  
188 classify codes into themes. Codes had to be identified in multiple conversations in order to be included in the  
189 final themes. Each theme is analysed separately in the Findings sections and provided the heading of each third  
190 level subsection (i.e. 3.x.x.). The quotes that best illustrated the themes are the ones included in the manuscript  
191 and are used throughout the paper. For readability (1) speech dysfluency in quotes was edited (2) the group of  
192 the participant who is quoted is indicated before or after the quote, generally between square brackets.

193 Qualitative researchers must declare “*the position they adopt about a research task and its social and political*  
194 *context*” (Holmes, 2020) because it influences both how research is conducted and evaluated (Rowe, 2014).  
195 “Positionality” statements are necessary in qualitative research because one of the purposes they serve is to  
196 establish whether the researchers undertaking the study are “insiders” or “outsiders” to the culture under  
197 investigation (Holmes, 2020). As qualitative methods were employed to comprehend decision-making processes  
198 within a quantitative field, the positions of CM, SR, and IM as either insiders or outsiders in relation to the  
199 expertise of the participants is presented here: CM has been a model developer on snow physics and large scale  
200 models. SR and IM have been users of snow physics models. All have conducted winter and summer field work  
201 in the Arctic. All have collaborated or currently collaborate closely with all groups represented.

202 Finally, as was stated on the consent form signed by the participants before each interview, all participants were  
203 invited to be co-authors on this paper. This practice is becoming increasingly customary in qualitative research  
204 because it recognises that participants are joint contributors to the findings of a research project (Given, 2008;  
205 Pope, 2020). All but two accepted the invitation.

206

### 207 3 Findings: Separating the content from context

208

209 By opting for the semi-structured interview format, our aim was to use a medium, the conversation, in which  
210 using “I” was natural. The working title of this study in the participant information sheet was “*A multi-*  
211 *perspective approach to snow model developments*”, thus implicitly alluding to the fact that, by approaching a  
212 single issue from multiple angles, this study sought to elicit diverse responses. This certainly turned out to be the  
213 case. All participants provided important information related to their field – information that is presented in  
214 subsections 3.1.n –, but they also ventured where few scientists do, at least in their publications: they offered  
215 opinions. No opinion was unanimous; in fact, every statement made by each participant was contradicted by a  
216 statement made by another participant. As such, none of the quotes are endorsed by all authors and, by  
217 extension, it is expected that readers will also inevitably disagree with some quotes.

218 Some opinions were offered cautiously and reflected the participants’ professional expertise. Others were more  
219 personal: “*I’m sick of modelers who think the world is a computer screen*”, “*the scientific community is very*  
220 *conservative, so as soon as you try to change the paradigm, you have outcry and everyone hits each other*”,  
221 “*The[se] models spend so much time doing things that aren’t very important that for lots of applications, they’re*  
222 *kind of worthless*”, “*other groups have said we’re going to start over, and that is also totally fraught*”. Such  
223 open and candid comments do not (usually) make it to publications, but we argue that such statements are a  
224 manifestation of the participants’ research identity, a concept examined extensively in education studies (e.g.  
225 Valimää, 1998; Clegg, 2008; Fitzmaurice, 2013; Borlaug et al. 2023), defined by McCune (2019) as “*the*  
226 *dynamic interplay over time of personal narratives, values and processes of identification with diverse groups*  
227 *and communities*”. These processes of identification are clear in the participants’ choice of words which echo  
228 McCune’s definition: the participant who qualifies the scientific “community” as conservative, distances  
229 themselves from this community, as does the other one from “groups” whose strategy they reject.

230 The participants' research identity also manifested itself in their interpretation of the Arctic under discussion.  
231 There are many definitions of Arctic, some of which are based on the Arctic circle, treeline, climate, permafrost  
232 and so on (ACIA, 2005). CM began each interview by describing Arctic snowpack processes absent in existing  
233 models, but did not define "Arctic" beyond land snow processes, causing varied interpretations. SMC, FS and  
234 RSS, all of whom had extensive field experience, generally defined the type of Arctic they meant when  
235 describing a process, even if their description was at times itself open to interpretation: "*proper Arctic*", "*entire*  
236 *Arctic*", "*high Arctic*", "*Canadian Arctic*", "*tundra*", "*sub and low Arctic*", "*Scandinavian Arctic*", "*polar*  
237 *snowpack*", "*Finnish snowpack but not high Arctic*", "*pan Arctic*". Only two SPM and one LSM (out of four in  
238 each group) specified what Arctic they meant. No retrospective definition is provided because, despite these  
239 different interpretations, all participants knew of processes that snow models could not represent in "their"  
240 Arctic. Examples include rain-on-snow-induced ice layers, which predominantly occur in Fennoscandian  
241 oroarctic tundra, or internal snowpack thermal gradients and vapour fluxes, which are more relevant in the high  
242 Arctic.

243 In Section 3.1, we will outline the scientific reasons given by the participants for the lack of development of an  
244 Arctic snowpack based on the content of the interviews. In Section 3.2 we will examine the statements that deal  
245 with the context in which the participants' research is undertaken. By content we refer to the actual information  
246 being communicated, while context refers to the circumstances that help interpreting that content.

247

### 248 **3.1 Content**

249

250 This section presents the participants' reflections on the scientific reasons why few snow model developments  
251 have accounted for properties relevant to Arctic snow.

252

#### 253 **3.1.1 Scale, heterogeneity and internal consistency**

254

255 The most often cited challenges impeding the implementation of an Arctic snowpack in large scale models were  
256 related to scale, sub-grid heterogeneity and the interplay of processes within the models. The difficulty in  
257 reconciling this triad when prioritizing model developments was captured by one participant: "*[large scale*  
258 *models] try to represent all land processes that are relevant to all around the world for all different problems*  
259 *and snow, of course, is just one of however many processes that we need to be considering*" [LSM]. Therefore,  
260 "*by necessity, you have to make some trade-offs*" [FS].

261 These "*trade-offs*" vary in nature. One trade-off is to rank errors according to the perceived importance of the  
262 missing process as per this example: "*the spatial variability of snow depth is so high that with respect to the*  
263 *energy exchange with the soil below, the error that you make if you get your snow depths wrong by a few*  
264 *centimetres is much larger than if you miss an ice layer*" [SPM]. Another trade-off aims to maintain internal  
265 consistency in terms of complexity between the modelled processes: "*Why would I have the perfect snow model*  
266 *and, at the same time, I would simplify clouds?(...) I want the model to be of the same degree of complexity in*



267 *all its domains*” [LSM]. Related to this is the opinion that “*it is undesirable in global models to have regionally*  
268 *specific parameterizations*” [SPM], as the inclusion of Arctic-specific processes was seen to be by some  
269 participants. This argument was countered by others who argued that, in models, solving the Arctic snowpack  
270 was not a geographical issue but a physical one: “*the physics doesn't care where it is. [Getting the physics right]*  
271 *should make the model work wherever*” [FS]. Finally, the last identified trade-off, which all LSM mentioned, is  
272 error compensation. Sometimes modellers know that a parameter “*is completely wrong, but it helps compensate*  
273 *an error in [another process. So] you have that resistance against improving a parametrization because you*  
274 *know that you have the error compensation*” [LSM]. For instance, for this LSM, “*in the final stages of model*  
275 *tuning for CMIP, I realized that error compensations had been broken away by improving the snow albedo. (...)*  
276 *So we [backtracked and decided not to] simulate snow albedo over the Antarctic. [We set it to] 0.77 full stop;*  
277 *it's completely wrong but it helped compensate an error in the downwelling long wave*”.

278 Issues of scale are further complicated by the fact that some models are being repurposed and operate at scales  
279 that they were not intended to. Examples include models initially developed for context-specific usage now  
280 being applied globally (“*a lot of snow models are being used now in land surface schemes as broadly applicable*  
281 *snow models for all snow climate classes. But, I mean Crocus, it's an avalanche model, right?*” [RSS]) and  
282 large scale models increasing their resolution even though “*the physics may not be anymore realistic. It's just a*  
283 *little sexier to be able to say you can run an earth system model globally at 25 kilometers compared to what you*  
284 *used to run so*” [RSS]. Although increasing resolution means that “*processes that were before negligible are not*  
285 *so much so now*” [LSM], LSM ranked improving the representation of albedo or of sub-grid heterogeneity due  
286 to shading and orography was higher in the priority list than e.g. vapour fluxes.

287

### 288 **3.1.2 Data availability**

289

290 Model developments are supported by and evaluated against observations: “*Everything always starts at field site*  
291 *level in terms of testing a new model parameterization*” [LSM]. Participants from all groups (which isn't to say  
292 all participants) mentioned that more data were needed to understand the processes typical of an Arctic  
293 snowpack formation before being able to implement them in a model: “*we need to be out there when it's really*  
294 *happening*”, “*we have very few sites across the Arctic*” so “*it's not easy with the available data. We're looking to*  
295 *the observations people to provide the information on the Arctic snow*” [SPM, RSS, SPM].

296 While the scale at which the models of the participants operate differed, all but one participant identified data  
297 gaps as being a limit to model developments. “*If you don't have site data to attribute a process to, it is difficult*  
298 *to defend its implementation. For example, I'm not aware of sites that we could use to tackle wind compaction*”  
299 [LSM]. Other participants highlighted the difficulty in parametrizing ice layer formation: “*when you find an ice*  
300 *crust in the snow pit, you don't know whether it is from rain on snow or wind compaction*” so “*for starters, you*  
301 *need the precipitation to be right*” [RSS, LSM]. While some snow physics models attempt to simulate depth  
302 hoar formation (e.g. Crocus in Vionnet et al., 2012; SnowModel in Liston and Elder, 2006; SNOWPACK in  
303 Jafari et al. 2020), data against which to evaluate the thermal gradients and vapour transport that contribute to  
304 depth hoar formation are limited; to the authors' knowledge only one such dataset, which provides both driving

305 and evaluation data, at a single site exists (Domine et al, 2021 at Bylot Island, Canada). However, “*it's a pretty*  
306 *high bar before something changes in [large scale models] based on a bit of experimental work. So, just because*  
307 *we get to show it at one site, that's not going to be good enough. You've got to show it over multiple sites,*  
308 *multiple regions*” [FS].

309 However, there is one area where snow physics models were judged to be lagging behind data availability. Five  
310 participants mentioned that the Micro-CT (Heggli et al., 2011), which allows measurements of the 3-D  
311 snowpack architecture, was a “*step-change*” [RSS] in understanding internal snowpack properties. “*Model[s are*  
312 *trying] to catch up with [the available data] because they now have something which is higher resolution and*  
313 *more objective than people looking through the microscopes handle lenses and trying to measure snow crystals*  
314 *on the grid, which was hugely subjective to compare to*” [RSS].

315

### 316 **3.1.3 The historical development of snow models**

317

318 Ten participants began the interview by providing some background about snow model developments, using this  
319 as a historical justification for Arctic snowpack properties not being included in snow models. For “*the first 30*  
320 *years, [snow physics models were] driven by climate system processes and hydrology, snow for water resources*  
321 *applications*” or “*were designed to understand and predict avalanches*” [SPM, FS]. As for large scale models  
322 “*what [they] want to know about polar climate is when it influences where people live. There are people living,*  
323 *of course, in the high latitude, but most of the people live in the mid latitudes*” so “*every parameterization in*  
324 *every [large scale] model was developed for mid latitudes. And some of them work in the Arctic and some of*  
325 *them don't*” [LSM, LSM]. The historical legacy of model development impedes the implementation of Arctic-  
326 specific processes because the stratigraphy used in the Anderson-Kojima scheme makes it numerically  
327 challenging to adapt existing models. “*[Models] are limiting the number of [snow] layers for computational*  
328 *stability and efficiency so they are not respecting the way in which the snow pack is actually built up i.e. in*  
329 *episodic snowfall events, which will form different layers (...)* That structure couldn't represent ice layers; it  
330 *would refreeze meltwater or rain on snow, but in layers that are thicker than you'd observe. With numerical*  
331 *diffusion, these layers would spread out so there won't be a strong density contrast*” [SPM]. “*Numerically, it's*  
332 *just messy [to simulate the formation of an ice layer] because all of a sudden you have a new layer in the middle*  
333 *of other layers*” [SPM].

334

## 335 **3.2 Context**

336

337 This section draws on the arguments and opinions provided by the participants in Section 3.1., but with a focus  
338 on understanding the factors that influence them. Here, the arguments and opinions are framed within the  
339 context within which the participants evolve and which the participants either implied or explicitly mentioned,  
340 As such, this section relates more to the research environment than to the science itself.

341

### 342 3.2.1 The scale of needed resources

343


344 With the exception of error compensation, which is a numerical exercise, the trade-offs discussed in Section  
345 3.1.1 are only necessary because developments perceived to be most important needed to be prioritized.  
346 Prioritisation itself is only necessary because human, financial and computational resources are limited: “*when I*  
347 *speak to large scale modellers about rain on snow, the feedback is usually ‘we are aware that something needs*  
348 *to be done, but we have other priorities and we don’t have resources for this’. It’s not straightforward” [RSS].*

349 The “*few people called ‘academic scientists’ [are but] a tiny group among the armies of people who do*  
350 *science” (Latour, 1979). These “armies” include stakeholders, governmental research agencies, funders,*  
351 *taxpayers, and others, all capable of influencing funding decisions. While participants generally accepted the*  
352 *competitive nature of funding stoically (“We’ve had trouble getting funding to do the work”, [but] “really good*  
353 *and important science will not always be funded because there’s not enough money to go around” [SPM,*  
354 *SPM]), participants from all groups voiced concerns about the inadequate resources allocated to modelling*  
355 *centres given the high expectations placed on them: “we have two groups running two different land surface*  
356 *schemes within the same government department on a small budget. That makes no sense”, “that just means*  
357 *we’re distributing our resources way too thin. Every group is tasked with doing everything - and there’s a huge*  
358 *number of things to do in land modelling. (...) I don’t think we’re that far off from having a crisis situation.*  
359 *These models desperately need to be modernized” [RSS, LSM]. National modelling capabilities “need a lot*  
360 *more software engineering support to be able to rebuild these models, make them sleek and flexible enough that*  
361 *we actually have the ability to make changes more quickly without causing bugs” [LSM].*

362 Short-termism was also perceived to hinder progress. “*It’s very difficult to make [an Arctic snowpack] model*  
363 *and there are also very few measurements detailing the complexity of the stratigraphy. (...) It’s a long term task*  
364 *and it needs interdisciplinary working” [FS]. Some participants believed that their governmental or institutional*  
365 *strategies impeded progress: “[This government agency] has lots of short term goals. ‘I need results for this*  
366 *project in six months’. Developing new tools is not part of the strategy” [FS]. In addition, there was a*  
367 *recognition that short-term funding meant that modelling groups had to rely on cheaper labour in short-term*  
368 *employment, such as PhD students and junior postdoctoral researchers. For some participant, this meant that the*  
369 *type of scientific expertise required for model developments could not be met: “You need that longevity of*  
370 *funding within one area. I mean, the idea that you’re going to create an arctic snow model in a PhD is [follows*  
371 *a non-verbal expression interpreted by CM as “mindboggling”]” [SPM]. For others, the short-termism of*  
372 *precarious employment impeded continuity in model building: “you get a PhD student, (...) [they] do great*  
373 *work, (...) then [they’re] done and [they] go on to a postdoc somewhere else” [RSS]. The value of what is*  
374 *considered long-term project funding (5 years) was highlighted by an SPM: “[this model development] would*  
375 *not be possible with a two to three years project. Even in five years we won’t be finished, but it’s still long*  
376 *enough to investigate the problem (...) [and to] trigger some collaborations. We are building [collaborations]*  
377 *between labs which will stay for longer [than our project]”.*

378 Limited resources are also the reason why data are not available although they are not the only reason. Most  
379 Arctic research is conducted by researchers who are not based in the Arctic, which is a logistical reason why  
380 “*the number of detailed measurements in the Arctic during the entire winter season is close to 0” [FS]. “If you*

381 *want to study alpine snow* [e.g Col de Porte, France, and Davos, Switzerland, which were set-up to support the  
382 local tourism industry], *you get out of your home, walk in the field or take your car, drive 15 minutes and you*  
383 *see it. If you want to look at arctic snow, it's more complex*" [FS]. The nature of this complexity is manifold.  
384 Firstly, although no participant mentioned that meteorological instruments are prone to malfunctioning at low  
385 temperatures (see e.g. Fig. 3), it was understood to be the implicit reason why some measurements were not  
386 available. Secondly, "*we need to find people willing to do this work in total darkness*" [FS]; polar nights and  
387 harsh winter meteorological conditions make access to Arctic sites difficult, which is why field campaigns often  
388 take place in Spring and Summer time. However, "*we need to observe how this happens in the real world. I*  
389 *mean, we certainly have snow pits and we see ice lenses there, but we need to be out there when it's really*  
390 *happening*" [SPM].



391

392 *Figure 3: Meteorological station covered with rime before maintenance in Reinhauger, Varanger peninsula, Norway. Photo*  
393 *taken on 23 January 2020 by Jan Erik Knutsen.*

394

### 395 **3.2.2 Adaptability**

396

397 Public funding is granted to projects that fall within the strategic objectives and research priorities of  
398 government funding agencies. As such, "*the right to research*" (Henkel, 2005) is conditional upon scientists  
399 adapting and responding to an evolving funding landscape. Although much literature argues that there is a  
400 conflict between academic freedom and solution-based or applied science (e.g. Henkel, 2005; Winter, 2009;  
401 Skea, 2019 etc), we found instead that adaptability and shifting priorities was integral to the modellers' research  
402 identities. "*To some degree, we follow what is being hyped, you know, if something is being hyped in Nature*"

403 [LSM]. Model developments were presented as being responsive and at the service of others: “*There is no*  
404 *master plan. It's opportunity driven, it depends on projects that come in, (...) on what some of the users want to*  
405 *do. It's kind of nice*” [SPM]. When questioned about what the priorities for snow model developments are, one  
406 SPM answered “*It's not just the snow modellers who can answer that. It is the people who want to use the snow*  
407 *models*”. Arguably, performance-based research funding systems like the UK Research Excellence Framework  
408 have been in place long enough in some countries for researchers to have adapted to the constraints of the  
409 “publish or perish”, “be funded or fade out” and “impact or pack in” culture.

410 In fact, interdisciplinary collaborations were the key motivation for model development, demonstrating the  
411 modellers' adaptability. The reasons for interdisciplinary collaborations driving snow model developments were  
412 manifold. First, they are necessary to address research questions: “*Permafrost, snow, wildlife biology (...) These*  
413 *fields have evolved independently over the last 30 or 40 years or whatever (...) [Now] we're working together to*  
414 *do a better job of answering all these interdisciplinary questions*” [SPM]. Second, they drive innovations in all  
415 fields involved: “*if you don't have a good physical snow modelling capability, you can't maximize the value of*  
416 *new [satellite data] retrieval algorithms*” [RSS]. Third, they allow model developments to be relevant to a wide  
417 range of stakeholders, as is, for example, the case with progress on the many sectors that rely on numerical  
418 weather predictions. Fourth, they generate funding: “*We wouldn't have enough base funding to pay for a master*  
419 *plan [for model developments] so we are depending on projects that come in and on the interest of individual*  
420 *people*” [SPM].

421 A particularly topical illustration of the significance of interdisciplinary collaborations for snow model  
422 development at the time of the interviews was the IVORI project (IVORI, 2023), which aims to develop a new  
423 type of snow model that will be able to model the snowpack processes existing models cannot. IVORI was  
424 mentioned spontaneously by eight participants other than the project lead (herself a participant in this study).  
425 “*We had a consultation meeting at [a conference] in 2016. It was really mostly the snow community just saying,*  
426 *'hey, we want something better' (...) The ice core community was also pushing in this direction (...) [as well as]*  
427 *the remote sensing community [because] no model correctly represents snow microstructure [they need]*”  
428 [SPM]. Although all participants were cautious not to oversell a model at a very early stage of its development,  
429 there was a lot of excitement around the project: “*[IVORI] is trying to basically rethink the whole snow*  
430 *modelling issue from scratch and come up with a new model that will be the future*” [SPM other than the IVORI  
431 project lead].

432 Finally, collaborations provide human resources, especially when models are open-source. From the developers'  
433 perspective, open-source means that “*the majority of the development work is done external[ly]. For example,*  
434 *for the most recent release, we had 50 people involved from 16 different institutions*” [LSM]; for the users, it  
435 makes models “*easy to use. You can just pick up examples and test the model for yourself (...)*” and “*if*  
436 *something doesn't work or if you have questions, you always find support*” [RSS, LSM].

437

### 438 **3.2.3 The anchoring bias**

439

440 Some participants in all but the SMC group argued that many developers misjudged or did not understand the  
441 importance of snow when modelling Arctic processes. Four participants stressed the need to design and to  
442 implement a long-planned snow model intercomparison project (SnowMIP) focusing on tundra (in both Arctic  
443 and Antarctic) snow processes because *“the first thing it would do is alert the modelers to the difficulties that*  
444 *they have in the Arctic that, in the absence of these evaluations, they wouldn't even know about... In my sense,*  
445 *large scale climate modellers aren't sufficiently aware of snow. (...) There are so many people who don't care*  
446 *about that”* [LSM].

447 One of the reasons why some modelers *“wouldn't even know about (...) the difficulties that they have in the*  
448 *Arctic”* is because their existing models served as “anchors” or benchmarks. Anchoring is a common cognitive  
449 strategy where individuals, including experts, rely too heavily on an initial piece of information that they use to  
450 assess risk and uncertainty, leading to systematic errors in judgements (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974). Within  
451 our context, it means that even though some participants acknowledged that existing models represented Arctic  
452 snow processes poorly or not at all, the fact that they represented snow at all meant that some participants  
453 preferred not taking the risk of investing resources into new models or time-consuming complex developments.

454 For example, when an SPM said a *“model is never perfect, but is it good enough for what is being done with*  
455 *it?”*, what they interpret as being “good enough” is contextual. It depends on the research question to be  
456 addressed, on the data, time and funding available, on the extent to which what is expected of the model  
457 measures against the anchor. As such, what is “good enough” is dynamic and evolves as the anchor or reference  
458 point shifts. For one LSM, the anchor shifted during the interview: *“I understand now what you [CM] have been*  
459 *talking about, how far we are from what people who live in the Arctic really care about”*. This insight, along  
460 with the historical development context outlined in Section 3.1.3, suggests that the anchoring bias in snow  
461 modelling partly reflects non-epistemic values (hereafter simply referred to as values), i.e. ethical and social  
462 considerations that help scientists make decisions which do not rely on expertise alone (see e.g. Rudner, 1953;  
463 Winsberg, 2012). For instance, the historical context outlined in Section 3.1.3 echoes value judgments prevalent  
464 in early model evolution that prioritized serving the majority of people who live in the mid-latitudes.

465 The anchor, or benchmark against which to evaluate model priorities, also shifts as a result of community efforts  
466 such as MIPs, which motivate developments because they *“distil the information and tell [modellers] what are*  
467 *the priorities and what are the sites good for. (...) [SnowMIP] brings together observation experts and other*  
468 *models and modellers. We all learn enormously”* [LSM]; *“the community does a reasonably good job of trying*  
469 *to develop, incrementally, through different research groups”* [FS]. Nevertheless, as *“models are not [currently]*  
470 *very well tested for the Arctic, it is not easy to know what they do well”*[SPM], anchoring bias plays an  
471 important part in the assessment of whether models are “good enough” or not.

472 Finally, eight participants spontaneously discussed the risks and benefits of starting models from scratch in view  
473 of ongoing projects undertaking this task (e.g. CliMA, 2023, a novel type of climate model, and IVORI). While  
474 the time and effort of such an undertaking were the main causes for concern (*“With respect to the new model,*  
475 *what I see is that this quest for purity (...) makes things extremely slow”*; *“the effort of rewriting a climate*  
476 *model [is huge]. I'm not saying it's not worth it (...) but I can understand why people don't do it”* [SPM, LSM]),  
477 it is because the participants were weighing the value of starting from scratch against, instead, a reference or

478 anchor point i.e. the existing models, that one concluded that starting from scratch was “*totally fraught because*  
479 *you're probably talking about a five year project to get even close to the capability of what the current models*  
480 *have. And at the moment, who wants to give up their capabilities?” [LSM]. On the other side of the argument, a*  
481 *FS argued that “trying to improve the candle did not invent electricity. [For tundra snow], existing snow models,*  
482 *there's one thing to do with them. Trash”. Somewhere in the middle, more nuanced opinions were presented:*  
483 *“The community should be endorsing IVORI, but there is such a lag between activities like this and the current*  
484 *suite of models, which people use in high impact papers, that we also need to spend time understanding what*  
485 *the limitations are and how we can get some improvement out of these models” [RSS].*

486

## 487 4 Discussion and moving forward

488

489 As mentioned in the Introduction, the premise of this study was rooted in the belief that comprehending the  
490 cause of a problem would provide a foundation to address it. The premise found echoes in this RSS’s  
491 quote: “[*You*] *should never keep doing what you're doing because that's the way it's always been done. (...)*  
492 *What are the priorities? What do we need to learn? What do we need to do that's new?”*. Sections 3.1. and 3.2  
493 showed conflicting answers, opinions and perspectives to these three questions. In this Discussion section, we  
494 aim not to reconcile these opinions, but, based on our reflections of the findings, we will aim to start answering  
495 these questions to propose ways forward.

496

### 497 4.1 Opening-up research

498

499 As mentioned in Section 3.2.3, values have contributed to deciding priorities for snow models development over  
500 time, such as the importance attributed to their relevance to where “*most of the people live*” [LSM] e.g for their  
501 survival (e.g. water resources) or leisure (e.g. avalanche forecasting). As mentioned in Section 2, SMC, FS, and  
502 RSS were interviewed to provide a broad picture of the range of Arctic snow applications and to understand  
503 how the absence of an Arctic snow model constrained their own research. Because of the different role that the  
504 Arctic snowpack plays in their research, these participants reframed snow models away from their historical  
505 model legacies into research areas seen as being underexplored by the Arctic snow community. They proposed  
506 how efforts to represent Arctic snowpack processes could pave the way for new interdisciplinary collaborations,  
507 yielding benefits such as innovation, stakeholder involvement and funding:

508 Permafrost-carbon feedback “*Snow is a kind of blind spot in the international climate modelling community. We*  
509 *know that snow is wrong, but people are not coordinated, people are not really working together” [LSM]. “At*  
510 *the moment, snow structure is not considered for permafrost modelling. It's only how thick the snow is and*  
511 *whether the temperature decouples from the ground or not” [RSS]. Participants from all groups highlighted the*  
512 *importance of snowpack structure to understand soil winter processes. “It's clear that the winter climate is*  
513 *changing even more than the summer climate” [SMC]. For example, “when there is rain-on-snow, the short-*  
514 *term warming to the ground influences the entire following winter history. What is the magnitude of the impact?*  
515 *Knowing the temperature at the base of the snow is the really crucial information” [RSS]. One participant*

516 stressed the importance of upscaling the many *in situ* soil experiments with the help of suitable snow models:  
517 “What manipulation experiments show is that whether we have less snow, or shorter winters or we have ice  
518 layers or something else will have very different, even opposite, effects on soil processes, gas exchanges, plant  
519 and soil ecology. (...) For example, when you have ice layers, the ice is disturbing the gas exchange between the  
520 soil and atmosphere, but it's still active (...) [so] you get carbon dioxide accumulation. We also found that soil  
521 microbes are resilient to late snowpack formation and earlier melt, but the growing season started earlier than  
522 usual. (...) [What we now need] is to translate the results of that experiment to larger landscape level” [SMC]

523 Arctic food webs Upscaling is also needed to translate local scale findings to ecosystem scale when  
524 investigating fauna biodiversity. “When the snow gets very hard [e.g. after a ROS event or refreezing],  
525 lemmings don't move as well through the snow; they cannot access their food anymore and then they starve (...)   
526 [Many] specialized Arctic predators depend on lemmings to survive (...) or to reproduce successfully [e.g.  
527 snowy owls, pomarine skuas, Arctic foxes]. (...) They also eat a lot and influence the vegetation (...) If a snow  
528 model could reconstitute the snowpack in a reliable way, we could see if there a relationship at the large scale  
529 between cyclic lemming populations and snow conditions? (...) and address a row of other ecological  
530 hypotheses” [SMC].

531 Reindeer husbandry For reindeer herders, obtaining near real time spatial information on the structure of the  
532 snowpack could save their livelihood and their lifestyle: “During the winters of 2020 and 2021, we had thawing,  
533 raining and refreezing in January and there was already a lot of moisture at the ground from the previous Fall.  
534 So the reindeer have to dig through all that and then there's a layer of ice on the ground. The lichens,  
535 blueberries, everything is encased in ice. So there's two options. They starve or they short circuit their digestive  
536 system because they eat the ice-encrusted vegetation get too much of water in their rumen. The Sami herders say  
537 that kills the animal anyway. (...) If the herders could get a heads up (...) Can I go move my herd? East. West.  
538 Where is soft snow?” [SMC].

539 Remote sensing applications Remote sensing products are used to tackle many environmental issues, including  
540 the three described in this section and their development is intrinsically linked with physically-based models.  
541 “Remote sensing doesn't work everywhere all the time so we need to combine information from a model and  
542 from satellite data. We need to improve the physical snow models, but in step with developing the remote  
543 sensing. If you do one without the other then you're not gonna be able to maximize the value of both” [RSS]. For  
544 example, “snow has a confusing effect on retrieval estimates. Some of the signal comes from the atmosphere  
545 [e.g. clouds], some comes from the snow, and if you can't disentangle what comes from what then you just throw  
546 away millions of satellite data that could potentially be used for numerical weather prediction, better weather  
547 forecasts” [RSS].

548

## 549 **4.2 A plurality of strategies**

550

551 Discussions about trade-offs in model building (as in Section 3.1.1) precede the development of the first general  
552 circulation models (Manabe, 1969), the core components of ESMs, which already included snow. In 1966,  
553 Levins argued that, given computational constraints that remain valid six decades later, models could not be



554 general, precise and realistic at the same time; when designing their model building strategy, modellers had to  
555 choose which property to trade off. Levins concluded that as no single model strategy could represent a complex  
556 system, a plurality of models and model strategies was necessary to provide a more comprehensive picture of  
557 the system.

558 The different opinions expressed throughout this paper suggest that the participants support different strategies.  
559 The strategies they endorse are partly dictated by different local epistemologies, i.e. assumptions, methodologies  
560 and aims specific to a community (Longino, 2002), and disciplinary identities, i.e. discipline-specific socio-  
561 historical norms (Dressen-Hammouda, 2008). For example, ESMs must sacrifice realism and so must, by  
562 extension, LSM: ESMs are precise because they use equations that provide precise outputs, general because  
563 these equations must be applicable globally, but have unrealistic internal processes (e.g. see error compensation  
564 in Section 3.1.1). However, within groups disagreements and between groups agreements also show that  
565 disciplinary identity and local epistemologies do not always dominate the research identity narrative of the  
566 participants. As noted in Sections 3.2.2 and 4.1, collaborations are drivers for model developments and, when  
567 interdisciplinary, these collaborations will also shape the research identities by exposing them to different  
568 disciplinary identities and local epistemologies. For example, as mentioned in Section 3, one FS declared  
569 that they are “*sick of modelers who think the world is a computer screen (...). If you haven't been in the field (...),*  
570 *you just don't understand what's going on*”. However, another FS declared that “*there are people doing*  
571 *fantastic snow modelling work who don't really see a lot of snow, but they've got the appreciation of*  
572 *understanding what the detail is. It helps to see [on the field] what you're looking at [on your screen], but it's*  
573 *not an absolute essential*”. The two FS manifest clear differences in their value judgments, with the first one  
574 valuing empirical evidence and lived experience over theoretical knowledge and the second having “*become a*  
575 *bit more nuanced in [their] thinking*” after having been “*exposed to different types of models*”. Historically, the  
576 notion linking value-free science with objectivity and impartiality has prevailed (Pulkkinen et al., 2021) and was  
577 an obstacle to bridging the gap between our personal identity, reflected in our values, and our research identity,  
578 reflected in our professional decisions (Staddon, 2017). However, the role that non-epistemic values play in  
579 climate science was recognised in a dedicated subsection (1.2.3.2) of the IPCC WG1 AR6 (IPCC, 2021), thus  
580 providing a space for these conversations to occur in a field historically dominated by epistemic values (e.g.  
581 truth, accuracy, falsifiability, replicability).

582 While Levins' plurality of model strategies was originally aimed at model building in population biology, its  
583 relevance has been extended to climate science by, amongst others, Parker (2011), Lloyd (2015), Morrison  
584 (2021), Walmsley (2021) and Winsberg (2021). They argue that diversity of opinions, values, epistemic  
585 pluralities and strategies do not need to be resolved, but, on the contrary, that a plurality of models that  
586 investigate the same phenomenon from different representational perspectives is necessary. One of the most  
587 prominent examples in which climate science exploits this plurality is via MIPs, which aim to assess “*the*  
588 *robustness, reproducibility, and uncertainty attributable to model internal structure and processes variability*”  
589 (IPCC, 2021).

590 However, considered together, existing snow models do not provide this plurality of representational  
591 perspectives necessary to understand a complex system. Instead, many of these models are interdependent  
592 (Essery et al., 2012) and, rather, provide a plurality of representational complexities all based on the same

593 Anderson-Kojima scheme. Aligning with epistemologists of science, we argue that developing a snow model  
594 adapted to Arctic snowpack processes to complement existing models is, therefore, arguably necessary to  
595 provide the diversity in model strategies needed to understand complex Arctic processes and interactions.

596

### 597 **4.3 Snow model intercomparison projects**

598

599 The Earth System Modelling – SnowMIP (ESM-SnowMIP; Krinner et al, 2018), the fourth snow model  
600 intercomparison in 24 years (Slater et al, 2001; Etchevers et, 2004; Essery et al., 2004; Rutter et al, 2009; Essery  
601 et al., 2009) is a community effort that aims to evaluate snow schemes in ESMs and to improve our  
602 understanding of snow-related feedback in the Earth System. Out of the ten planned exercises, only two have  
603 taken place so far (Menard et al, 2021; Essery et al., 2021). During the first exercise, little progress in snow  
604 models was found to have occurred since the previous snow MIPs (Menard et al., 2021) because of scientific  
605 reasons as well as contextual circumstances that resonate with the findings in this study.

606 The next planned phase, which aims to test models in the tundra, has suffered a number of setbacks, not least  
607 because *“the models are not very well tested for the Arctic so it is not easy to know what they do well and it's*  
608 *not easy to ask that question with the available data”* [SPM]. In line with discussions about responsible  
609 modelling in other sectors (e.g. Saltelli et al., 2020; Nabavi, 2022), we argue that by involving stakeholders (e.g  
610 as represented here by SMC, FS and RSS) in future snow MIPs, the models would be better prepared to tackle  
611 research questions that currently remain unanswered (although there have been attempts to do so with the  
612 existing models), thereby unlocking opportunities in new research domains and motivate the collection of the  
613 new type of data needed to test models in the Arctic (Sections 3.1.2 and 3.2.1). The research questions identified  
614 in Section 4.1 should contribute to determining the focus of the next snow MIP rather than the next snow MIP  
615 determining what questions can be answered given the current modelling constraints, the latter approach failing  
616 to challenge the notion that existing models are “good enough”.

617 Another consideration would be what legacy a tundra SnowMIP would want to leave behind. In the past,  
618 SnowMIP participants were required to provide model results. However, if a tundra SnowMIP is to advance  
619 snow modelling, the obstacles that limit the implementation of Arctic tundra snow processes (see subsections  
620 **Error! Reference source not found.**.x) should be directly addressed. One suggestion mentioned by  
621 participants, although not within a SnowMIP context, was that moving forward, *“shareable modules would be*  
622 *strategies that would allow us to make better progress”* because *“it will be easier for people to take your*  
623 *parameterization, take your model compartment and put it in their model to see what it does”*. We argue that  
624 future snow MIPs should be vehicles to foster more direct collaborations between modelling teams and with  
625 users by advocating for sharing of, amongst others, code, results and configuration files. This would avoid  
626 duplication of efforts and accelerate the model developments required to tackle Arctic snow challenges.

627 However, *“a modelling centre doesn't get money to do a MIP, but they want to do it because it's important to*  
628 *them. So, they end up being involved, but they get MIP-saturated and that's when the errors arise (...)* At the  
629 *very least, future SnowMIP-like projects need dedicated people whose main responsibility is to take this on, to*  
630 *say ‘I have funding to do it, I can dedicate time to it’”* [RSS]. Lack of funding towards MIPs participation is one

631 of the many contextual factors Menard et al. (2021) identified as hindering the first ESM-SnowMIP exercise.  
632 Unless the context in which MIPs, SnowMIP or otherwise, operate is reconsidered, the same factors will  
633 continue hindering community efforts.

634

#### 635 **4.4 Modeller accountability and empowerment**

636

637 Models are not only the representation of a situation, but also the product of many socio-political interactions  
638 (Nabavi, 2022). Even when models lack core government funding, the ability of modellers (as defined here in  
639 Section 2) to secure competitive funding underscores their alignment with strategic research priorities that often  
640 reflect political agendas. Heymann and Dahan Dalmedico (2019) argued that the IPCC ushered in a new era of  
641 expertise in which scientists are conditioned and formalized by politically relevant issues; as architects of ESMs,  
642 this implies that modellers become vehicles for political agendas.

643 Participants in this study have provided various reasons for not having prioritised the development of an Arctic  
644 snowpack model: data availability, historical context, human resources, lack of funding, competing research  
645 priorities, strategic priorities of government agencies and so on. In Section 4.2, we discussed the role of values,  
646 which are situated within a social and political context, in these decisions. We argue that they warrant more  
647 transparency in revealing the position of modellers within these contexts. We suggest that, following Bourdieu  
648 (2001) who argued that scientists should not take a position without acknowledging that they are doing so,  
649 natural scientists should position themselves as “insiders” and “outsiders” within the context of the research they  
650 conduct and publish (CM, SR and IM followed this advice themselves in Section 2). “Coming clean” (Lincoln,  
651 1995) about our positionality in our publications would foster a more responsible research environment and  
652 contribute to the ongoing discussion about the role of values in climate science, as explored Section 4.2. For  
653 instance, weaknesses in the reviewing process as described below may be avoided if positionality statements  
654 allowed journal editors to identify gaps in the authors’ expertise: “*Some papers (...) don't make the effort to*  
655 *quantify what the sensitivity of their key result is to how snow is characterized in the model. [For example, if the*  
656 *paper is] (...) about carbon budgets across the Arctic for over 12 months seasonal cycle, [the review] always*  
657 *goes towards the growing season community (...).So [these papers] don't get scrutinized the way they should”*  
658 [RSS].

659 Finally, a “*unique practice of sensitive wording*” (Gramelsberger et al., 2020) was developed in climate science  
660 to describe the information produced by climate models. This practice satisfies the socio-political expectations  
661 of climate science to produce trusted information in decision-making, as well as acting as a barrier to accidental  
662 or intentional misinterpretation of the same information by climate deniers. An example of such sensitive  
663 wording is the “likelihood language” used to describe scientific uncertainties (Landström, 2017; Moss &  
664 Schneider, 2000). We suggest that another instance of sensitive wording is the separation between the model  
665 and the modeller, which contributes to presenting the information produced as objective and impartial. For  
666 example, the IPCC WG1 AR6 mentions “*model(s)*” 12666 times, but “*modeller(s)*” three times. Such wording is  
667 invisibilising the role of modellers in the decision-making process of model development and evaluation, and  
668 arguably, in some of the information produced in climate science. Yet, models are a product of one or multiple  
669 modelers’ vision. This was reflected in the interviews during which more participants referred to Richard’s

670 model, Glen's model or Marie's model rather than to FSM, SnowModel and IVORI respectively. David  
671 Lawrence was named by all participants who mentioned CLM, as was Michael Lehning for SNOWPACK.  
672 Crocus was the only model that a large majority of participants did not associate with any particular modeller.  
673 The research identity of many modellers is, whether they want it or not, intertwined with their model; inviting  
674 authors to reflect about their positionality would allow them to regain control over their own narrative and  
675 research identity.

676

## 677 5 Conclusion

678

679 As per more conventional review papers, the novelty in this paper is not in its content, but in the medium it  
680 chooses to present that content. What participants said, they had said, but not necessarily written, before.  
681 Conferences, workshops, meetings and end-of-day visits to more informal venues are places where  
682 disagreements about the limits and motivations to model development *are* debated. But while the written history  
683 narrated by our publications does record the arguments presented here in the content section, it does not record  
684 what is presented in the context section.

685 In fact, the medium is not novel either. Science and technology studies examine the context within which  
686 science is constructed and philosophers of science have long debated the decision-making process of scientists.  
687 As such, much of what is non-Arctic snowpack-specific could probably be found in many of these disciplines'  
688 seminal texts. However, although one of the participants directly quoted one of Thomas Kuhn's, a pioneer of  
689 STS, concepts when they advocated for a change in paradigm (Kuhn, 1962), STS is practiced by outsiders  
690 looking in on a field, as is philosophy of science. These positions hinder the dissemination of their findings to,  
691 and the acceptance of their recommendation by, insiders.

692 Therefore, the novelty here is that it is an insider's job. It is a reflective exercise which, we hope, will be the  
693 start rather than the end point of the conversation. The comments of the participants-turned-co-authors at the  
694 paper writing stage certainly suggested so much: "*it's interesting that nobody commented on the conventional*  
695 *wisdom that modelling tundra snow is "too hard"?*"; "*discussions about digital Earth twins are shaking the*  
696 *[LSM] community. Some suggest that many resources, on continental or even global level, should be bundled to*  
697 *create the one big model. Others think this is a recipe for disaster, and some that is "scientific colonialism"*";  
698 "*the next step in modelling should be an evolutionary one: we should take the best of each*".

699 The participants were interviewed in their role (or identity) as researchers, but all will have been reviewers of  
700 papers and grants, some (co-)editors of journals and some will have influenced policy-makers. We argue that it  
701 is our role as insiders to motivate the change to our own practice. We also argue that it is our role as researchers  
702 to be more transparent about the contextual factors that influence and restrict our decisions. More importantly, it  
703 is our role as reviewers, editors and policy-makers to allow for such transparency to happen and to challenge  
704 openly the idea that short-term funding can lead to ground-breaking science, that Arctic data can be collected  
705 without engaging the people who live there, that 40-year old models are good enough to tackle challenges we  
706 knew nothing about ten years ago. If we fail to take on these roles, the reality of our scientific process will  
707 remain invisible and silent, and by virtue of it being hidden, unchanged.

708

709 **6 Code / data availability**

710 The transcripts are not available as they contain sensitive and personal information.

711

712 **7 Author contribution**

713 CM, SR and IM conceptualised the research. CM conducted the interviews and analysed the data. CM prepared  
714 the original draft with contributions from SR and IM. All other co-authors were interviewed for the research and  
715 contributed to the final version of the manuscript.

716

717 **8 Competing interests**

718 At least one of the (co-)authors is a member of the editorial board of The Cryosphere.

719

720 **9 Acknowledgement**

721 CM, SR and IM thank all co-authors, Michael Lehning, Juha Lemmetyinen and the one anonymous participant  
722 who withdrew from the study for being interviewed. We thank Jan Erik Knutsen for providing the photo used in  
723 Fig. 3. This project was funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 programme (CHARTER, grant Nr.  
724 869471). Marie Dumont has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European  
725 Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (IVORI; grant no. 949516)

726

727 **10 References**

728 ACIA, Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, ACIA Overview report, Cambridge University Press.,  
729 Cambridge, 1020 pp, 2005.

730 Anderson, E. A., Development and testing of snow pack energy balance equations, *Water Resour. Res.*, 4(1),  
731 19–37, <https://doi.org/10.1029/WR004i001p00019>, 1968.

732 Anderson, E. A., A point energy and mass balance model of a snow cover, Tech. Rep. 19, NOAA, Silver Spring,  
733 Md, 1976. Borlaug, S.B., Tellmann, S.M. and Vabø, A. Nested identities and identification in higher education  
734 institutions—the role of organizational and academic identities. *High. Educ.*, 85, 359–377,  
735 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00837-5>, 2023.

736 Bourdieu, P. *Science de la science et réflexivité, Raisons d'Agir*, Paris, 240 pp., ISBN : 978-2-912107-14-5,  
737 2001.

738 Braun, V. and Clarke, V., Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual. Res. Psychol.*, 3, 77-101,  
739 <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>, 2006.

740 Brun,, E, Martin,, E. Simon., V., Gendre., C. and Coleou., C., An energy and mass model of snow cover suitable  
741 for operational avalanche forecasting, *J. Glaciol.*, 35, 333–342, 1989.

742 Chen, D., M. Rojas, B.H. Samset, K. Cobb, A. Diongue Niang, P. Edwards, S. Emori, S.H. Faria, E. Hawkins,  
743 P. Hope, P. Huybrechts, M. Meinshausen, S.K. Mustafa, G.-K. Plattner, and A.-M. Tréguier, 2021: Framing,  
744 Context, and Methods. In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I*  
745 *to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Masson-Delmotte, V., P.  
746 Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M.I. Gomis, M. Huang, K.  
747 Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J.B.R. Matthews, T.K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, and B. Zhou (eds.)].  
748 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 147–286,  
749 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.003>, 2021.

750 CHARTER, <https://www.charter-arctic.org/>, last access: 29 November 2023

751 Clegg, S., Academic identities under threat?, *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 34:3, 329-345,  
752 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701532269>, 2008.

753 CLiMA <https://clima.caltech.edu/>, last access: 29 November 2023

754 Descamps, S., Aars, J., Fuglei, E., Kovacs, K.M., Lydersen, C., Pavlova, O., Pedersen, Å.Ø., Ravolainen, V. and  
755 Strøm, H., Climate change impacts on wildlife in a High Arctic archipelago – Svalbard, Norway. *Glob Change*  
756 *Biol*, 23, 490-502, <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13381>, 2017

757 DiCicco-Bloom, B, Crabtree, BF. The qualitative research interview. *Med. Educ.*, 40, 314-321,  
758 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x>, 2006.

759 Domine, F., Picard, G., Morin, S., Barrere, M., Madore, J.-B., & Langlois, A. Major issues in simulating some  
760 Arctic snowpack properties using current detailed snow physics models: Consequences for the thermal regime  
761 and water budget of permafrost. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11, 34–44,  
762 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001445>, 2019.

763 Domine, F., Lackner, G., Sarrazin, D., Poirier, M., and Belke-Brea, M.: Meteorological, snow and soil data  
764 (2013–2019) from a herb tundra permafrost site at Bylot Island, Canadian high Arctic, for driving and testing  
765 snow and land surface models, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 13, 4331–4348, [https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4331-](https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4331-2021)  
766 2021, 2021.

767 Dressen-Hammouda, D., From novice to disciplinary expert: Disciplinary identity and genre mastery, *Engl.*  
768 *Specif. Purp.*, 27, 233-252, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2007.07.006>, 2008.

769 Essery, R., Morin, S., Lejeune, Y. and Menard, C.B., A comparison of 1701 snow models using observations  
770 from an alpine site, *Adv Water Resour*, 55, 2013, 131-148, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.07.013>,  
771 2013

772 Essery, R., Kim, H., Wang, L., Bartlett, P., Boone, A., Brutel-Vuilmet, C., Burke, E., Cuntz, M., Decharme, B.,  
773 Dutra, E., Fang, X., Gusev, Y., Hagemann, S., Haverd, V., Kontu, A., Krinner, G., Lafaysse, M., Lejeune, Y.,  
774 Marke, T., Marks, D., Marty, C., Menard, C. B., Nasonova, O., Nitta, T., Pomeroy, J., Schädler, G., Semenov,

775 V., Smirnova, T., Swenson, S., Turkov, D., Wever, N., and Yuan, H.: Snow cover duration trends observed at  
776 sites and predicted by multiple models, *The Cryosphere*, 14, 4687–4698, [https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-4687-](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-14-4687-2020)  
777 2020, 2020.

778 Fitzmaurice, M., Constructing professional identity as a new academic: a moral endeavour, *Studies in Higher*  
779 *Education*, 38, 613-622, DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2011.594501, 2013.

780

781 Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F. and Davidson, L., Understanding and evaluating qualitative research,  
782 *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 36, 717-732. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1614.2002.01100.x>, 2012.

783 Given, L. M. (2008). Participants as co-researchers. In: *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research*  
784 *Methods* (pp. 600-601). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909>

785 Gramelsberger, G. What do numerical (climate) models really represent? *Stud Hist Philos Sci*, 42, 296–302,  
786 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2010.11.037>, 2011.

787 Gramelsberger, G., Mansnerus, E., The Inner World of Models and Its Epistemic Diversity: Infectious Disease  
788 and Climate Modelling. In: Bissell, C., Dillon, C. (eds) *Ways of Thinking, Ways of Seeing. Automation,*  
789 *Collaboration, & E-Services*, vol 1. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25209-9\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-25209-9_8),  
790 2002.

791 Gramelsberger, G., Lenhard, J and Parker, W.S. J, Philosophical Perspectives on Earth System Modeling:  
792 Truth, Adequacy, and Understanding, *J Adv Model Earth Sy*, 12, 2019MS001720,  
793 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001720>, 2020.

794 Heggli, M., Köchle, B., Matzl, M., Pinzer, B.R., Riche, F., Steiner, S., Steinfeld, D. and Schneebeli, M.  
795 Measuring snow in 3-D using X-ray tomography: assessment of visualization techniques, *Ann Glaciol*, 52, 231-  
796 236, <https://doi.org/10.3189/1727564117972522022011>, 2017.

797 Heymann, M., & Dahan Dalmedico, A., Epistemology and politics in Earth system modeling: Historical  
798 perspectives, *J Adv Model Earth Sy*, 11, 1139–1152, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001526>, 2019.

799 IPCC, 1990: *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment* [Houghton, J.T., Jenkins, G.J., Ephraums, J.J.  
800 (eds)] Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 414pp.

801 IPCC, 1995: *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change* [Houghton, J.T., Meira Filho, L.G.,  
802 Callander, B.A., Harris, N., Kattenberg, A. and Maskell, K. (eds)] Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,  
803 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 588pp.

804 IPCC, 2001: *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third*  
805 *Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Houghton, J.T., Y. Ding, D.J. Griggs,  
806 M. Noguer, P.J. van der Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell, and C.A. Johnson (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press,  
807 Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 881pp.

808 IPCC, 2007: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth  
809 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z.  
810 Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,  
811 United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 996 pp.

812 IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth  
813 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner,  
814 M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University  
815 Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp.

816 IPCC, 2019: IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C.  
817 Roberts, V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegria, M. Nicolai, A.  
818 Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama, N.M. Weyer (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York,  
819 NY, USA, 755 pp. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157964>.

820 IPCC, 2021: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth  
821 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A.  
822 Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M.I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E.  
823 Lonnoy, J.B.R. Matthews, T.K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu, and B. Zhou (eds.)]. Cambridge  
824 University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2391 pp.  
825 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896>.

826 IVORI, <https://ivori.osug.fr/>, last access: 29 November 2023.

827 Jafari, M., Gouttevin I., Couttet M., Wever N., Michel A., Sharma V., Rossmann L., Maass N., Nicolaus M.,  
828 Lehning M., The Impact of Diffusive Water Vapor Transport on Snow Profiles in Deep and Shallow Snow  
829 Covers and on Sea Ice, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 8, 249, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2020.00249>, 2020.

830 Krinner, G., Derksen, C., Essery, R., Flanner, M., Hagemann, S., Clark, M., Hall, A., Rott, H., Brutel-Vuilmet,  
831 C., Kim, H., Menard, C. B., Mudryk, L., Thackeray, C., Wang, L., Arduini, G., Balsamo, G., Bartlett, P., Boike,  
832 J., Boone, A., Chéruy, F., Colin, J., Cuntz, M., Dai, Y., Decharme, B., Derry, J., Ducharne, A., Dutra, E., Fang,  
833 X., Fierz, C., Ghattas, J., Gusev, Y., Haverd, V., Kontu, A., Lafaysse, M., Law, R., Lawrence, D., Li, W.,  
834 Marke, T., Marks, D., Nasonova, O., Nitta, T., Niwano, M., Pomeroy, J., Raleigh, M. S., Schaedler, G.,  
835 Semenov, V., Smirnova, T., Stacke, T., Strasser, U., Svenson, S., Turkov, D., Wang, T., Wever, N., Yuan, H.,  
836 and Zhou, W.: ESM-SnowMIP: Assessing models and quantifying snow-related climate feedbacks, *Geosci.*  
837 *Model Dev.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-5027-2018>, 2018.

838 Kojima, K. Densification of seasonal snow cover, *Physics of Snow and Ice: Proceedings*, 1, 929-952, 1967.

839 Kuhn, T. S., *The structure of scientific revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 264pp, 1962.

840 Laptander, R., Horstkotte, T., Habeck, J.O., Rasmus, S., Komu, T., Matthes, H., Tømmervik, H., Istomin, K.,  
841 Eronen, J.T., Forbes, B.C., Critical seasonal conditions in the reindeer-herding year: A synopsis of factors and  
842 events in Fennoscandia and northwestern Russia, *Polar Science*, 39, 101016,  
843 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polar.2023.101016>. Largeron C., Dumont M., Morin S., Boone A., Lafaysse M., Metref



844 S., Cosme E., Jonas T, Winstral A., Margulis S.A., Toward Snow Cover Estimation in Mountainous Areas  
845 Using Modern Data Assimilation Methods: A Review, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 8, 325,  
846 <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2020.00325>, 2020.

847 Latour, B., *Science in Action*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, USA, 288pp, 1979.

848 Levins, R., The Strategy Of Model Building In Population Biology, *American Scientist*, 54, 421–431, 1966.Lincoln,  
849 Y.S. Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive inquiry, *Qual. Inq.*, 1, 275-289,  
850 <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780049500100301>, 1995.

851 Liston, G. E and Elder, K., A distributed snow-evolution modeling system (SnowModel), *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 7,  
852 1259–1276, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM548.1>, 2006.

853 Liston, G. E., Itkin, P., Stroeve, J., Tschudi, M., Stewart, S., Pedersen, S.H., Reinking, A. and Elder, K., A  
854 Lagrangian snow-evolution system for sea-ice applications (SnowModel-LG): Part I – Model description, *J.*  
855 *Geophys. Res.*, 125, e2019JC015913, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015913>, 2020.

856 Lloyd, E.A., Model robustness as a confirmatory virtue: The case of climate science, *Stud. Hist. Phil.Sci. A*, 49,  
857 2015, 58-68, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2014.12.002>, 2015.

858 Longino, H.E., *The Fate of Knowledge*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, USA, 2002.

859 Manabe, S., Climate and the ocean circulation I. the atmospheric circulation and the hydrology of the Earth's  
860 surface. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 97, 739–774, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1969\)097<0739:CATOC>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1969)097<0739:CATOC>2.3.CO;2),  
861 1969.McCune, V. Academic identities in contemporary higher education: sustaining identities that value  
862 teaching, *Teach. High. Ed.*, 26, 20-35, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1632826>, 2019.

863 Menard, C., Essery, R., Krinner, G., Arduini, G., Bartlett, P., Boone, A., Brutel-Vuilmet, C., Burke, E., Cuntz,  
864 M., Dai, Y., Decharme, B., Dutra, E., Fang, X., Fierz, C., Gusev, Y., Hagemann, S., Haverd, V., Kim, H.,  
865 Lafaysse, M., Marke, T., Nasonova, O., Nitta, T., Niwano, M., Pomeroy, J., Schädler, G., Semenov, V.,  
866 Smirnova, T., Strasser, U., Swenson, S., Turkov, D., Wever, N. and Yuan, H. Scientific and Human Errors in a  
867 Snow Model Intercomparison, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 102, E61-E79, 2021.

868 Morrison, M.A., *The Models Are Alright: A Theory of The Socio-epistemic Landscape of Climate Model*  
869 *Development*, PhD Thesis, Indiana University, 2021.

870 Nabavi, E., Computing and Modeling After COVID-19: More Responsible, Less Technical, *IEEE T. Technol.*  
871 *Soc.*, 3, 252-261, 2022.

872 Parker, W.S., When Climate Models Agree: The Significance of Robust Model Predictions. *Philos. Sci.*, 78,579-  
873 600. [doi:10.1086/661566](https://doi.org/10.1086/661566), 2011.

874 Pope, E. M., From Participants to Co-Researchers: Methodological Alterations to a Qualitative Case Study.  
875 *Qual. Rep.*, 25, 3749-3761. [doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.4394](https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.4394), 2020.

876 Quéno, L., Vionnet, V., Cabot, F., Vrécourt, D. and Dombrowski-Etchevers, I., Forecasting and modelling ice  
877 layer formation on the snowpack due to freezing precipitation in the Pyrenees, *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.*, 146, 19-  
878 31, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2017.11.007>., 2018.

879 Rantanen, M., Karpechko, A.Y., Lipponen, A., Nordling, K., Hyvärinen, O., Ruosteenoja, K., Vihma, T. and  
880 Laaksonen, A. The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. *Commun Earth*  
881 *Environ*, 3, 168, doi.org:10.1038/s43247-022-00498-3, 2022.

882 Rapley, T. Some Pragmatics of Data Analysis. In: D. Silverman (ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method &*  
883 *Practice*. Sage, London, UK, 2010.

884 Rennert, K. J., G. Roe, J. Putkonen, and C. M. Bitz, 2009: Soil Thermal and Ecological Impacts of Rain on  
885 Snow Events in the Circumpolar Arctic. *J. Climate*, 22, 2302–2315, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2117.1>.

886 Rowe, W.E., Positionality, in: *The Sage Encyclopedia of Action Research*, edited by Coghlan, D. and Brydon-  
887 Miller, M., Sage, London, United Kingdom, 901 pp., ISBN 978-1-84920-027-1, 2014.

888 Royer, A., Picard, G., Vargel, C., Langlois, A., Gouttevin, I. and Dumont, M. Improved Simulation of Arctic  
889 Circumpolar Land Area Snow Properties and Soil Temperatures, *Front. Earth Sci.*, 9, 685140,  
890 <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2021.685140>, 2021.

891 Rudner, R., The Scientist Qua Scientist Makes Value Judgments. *Philos. Sci.*, 20, 1–6, 1956.

892 Saltelli A., Bammer G., Bruno I., Charters E., Di Fiore M., Didier E., Nelson Espeland W., Kay J., Lo Piano S.,  
893 Mayo D., Pielke R. Jr, Portaluri T., Porter T.M., Puy A., Rafols I., Ravetz J.R., Reinert E., Sarewitz D., Stark  
894 P.B., Stirling A., van der Sluijs J., Vineis P.. Five ways to ensure that models serve society: a manifesto, *Nature*,  
895 582,482-484, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01812-9>, 2020.

896 Sargeant J., Qualitative Research Part II: Participants, Analysis, and Quality Assurance, *J Grad Med Educ.*, 4, 1-  
897 3, <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-11-00307.1>, 2012.

898 Serreze, M.C., Walsh, J.E., Chapin III, F.S., Osterkamp, T., Dyrugerov, M., Romanovsky, W.C., Oechel, J.,  
899 Morison, T., Zhang, T. and Barry, R.G., Observational Evidence of Recent Change in the Northern High-  
900 Latitude Environment. *Clim. Change* 46, 159–207, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:10055040319232000>, 2000.

901 Serreze, M.C., Gustafson, J., Barrett, A.P., Druckenmiller, M.L., Fox, S., Voveris, J., Stroeve, J., Sheffield, B.,  
902 Forbes, B.C., Rasmus, S. Arctic rain on snow events: bridging observations to understand environmental and  
903 livelihood impacts, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 16, 105009, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac269b>, 2021.

904 Slater, A. G., Schlosser, C. A. , Desborough, C. E. , Pitman, A. J. , Henderson-Sellers, A. , Robock, A. ,  
905 Vinnikov, K. Y., Entin, J. , Mitchell, K. , Chen, F. , Boone, A. , Etchevers, P. , Habets, F. , Noilhan, J. , Braden,  
906 H. , Cox, P. M. , de Rosnay, P. , Dickinson, R. E. , Yang, Z., Dai, Y., Zeng, Q. , Duan, Q. , Koren, V. , Schaake,  
907 S. , Gedney, N. , Gusev, Y. M., Nasonova, O. N. , Kim, J. , Kowalczyk, E. A. , Shmakin, A. B. , Smirnova, T.  
908 G. , Verseghy, D. , Wetzel, P. , & Xue, Y. . (2001). The Representation of Snow in Land Surface Schemes:  
909 Results from PILPS 2(d). *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 2(1), 7-25. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541(2001)002<0007:TROSIL>2.0.CO;2)  
910 [7541\(2001\)002<0007:TROSIL>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541(2001)002<0007:TROSIL>2.0.CO;2)

911 Staddon, S. Reflecting on personal and professional energy stories in energy demand research, *Energy Res. Soc.*  
912 *Sc.*, 31, 158-163, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.06.013>, 2017.

913 Sturm, M., Liston, G.E., Revisiting the Global Seasonal Snow Classification: An Updated Dataset for Earth  
914 System Applications. *J. Hydrometeor.*, 22, 2917–2938, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-21-0070.1>, 2021.

915 Touzeau, A., Landais, A., Morin, S., Arnaud, L., and Picard, G.: Numerical experiments on vapor diffusion in  
916 polar snow and firn and its impact on isotopes using the multi-layer energy balance model Crocus in SURFEX  
917 v8.0, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 2393–1185 2418, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-2393-2018>,  
918 2018.

919 Välimaa, J., Culture and Identity in Higher Education Research. *High. Educ.*, 36, 119–138, 1998.

920 Vionnet, V., Brun, E., Morin, S., Boone, A., Faroux, S., Le Moigne, P., Martin, E., and Willemet, J.-M.: The  
921 detailed snowpack scheme Crocus and its implementation in SURFEX v7.2, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5, 773–791,  
922 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-773-2012>, 2012.

923 Walmsley, L.D., The strategy of model building in climate science, *Synthese*, 199, 745–765,  
924 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-020-02707-y>, 2021.

925 Walsh, J.E., Intensified warming of the Arctic: Causes and impacts on middle latitudes. *Glob Planet Change*,  
926 117, 52–63, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2014.03.003>, 2014.

927 Wever, N., Würzer, S., Fierz, C., and Lehning, M.: Simulating ice layer formation under the presence of  
928 preferential flow in layered snowpacks, *The Cryosphere*, 10, 2731–2744, [https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-2731-](https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-2731-2016)  
929 2016, 2016.

930 Winsberg E., Sanctioning Models: The Epistemology of Simulation, *Sci. Context*, 12, 275-292,  
931 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269889700003422>, 1999.

932 Winsberg E., Values and uncertainties in the predictions of global climate models,. *Kennedy Inst Ethics J.*  
933 22,111-137, <https://doi.org/10.1353/ken.2012.0008>, 2012.

934 Winsberg, E. What does robustness teach us in climate science: a re-appraisal, *Synthese*, 198, 5099–5122,  
935 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-018-01997-7>, 2021.

936 Zhang, T., Osterkamp, T. E., and Stamnes, K., Influence of the Depth Hoar Layer of the Seasonal Snow Cover  
937 on the Ground Thermal Regime, *Water Resour. Res.*, 32, 2075–2086, <https://doi.org/10.1029/96WR00996>,  
938 1996.