

This manuscript is a non-peer reviewed preprint submitted to EarthArXiv

IGM v3.2.1: an accessible, modular, differentiable, and GPU-accelerated high-order ice flow model

Guillaume Jouvet^{1,†}, Brandon D. Finley^{1,†,*}, Thomas Gregov^{1,†,*}, Sebastian H. R. Rosier^{2,†},
Tancrède P. M. Leger¹, Lucie Bacchin^{3,4}, Samuel Cook⁵, Thomas Frank⁶,
Andreas Henz², Oskar Herrmann⁵, Fabien Maussion⁷, Gillian M. A. Smith⁸,
Claire-Mathilde Stucki^{9,10}

¹Institute of Earth Surface Dynamics, Université de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

²Department of Geography, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

³ETSI Telecomunicación, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

⁴Arctic Geology, University Centre in Svalbard (UNIS), Longyearbyen, Norway

⁵Institut für Geographie, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

⁶Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

⁷School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁸School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute for Mathematical Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

⁹Université Paris-Saclay, ENS Paris-Saclay, DER de Physique, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

¹⁰Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, INRAE, IRD, Grenoble INP, IGE, 38000 Grenoble, France

[†]*IGM core development team: each made major contributions, together writing most of the code base and documentation.*

**Equal contribution.*

Correspondence: Guillaume Jouvet (guillaume.jouvet@unil.ch)

IGM v3.2.1: an accessible, modular, differentiable, and GPU-accelerated high-order ice flow model

Guillaume Jouvet^{1,†}, Brandon D. Finley^{1,†,*}, Thomas Gregov^{1,†,*}, Sebastian H. R. Rosier^{2,†}, Tancrède P. M. Leger¹, Lucie Bacchin^{3,4}, Samuel Cook⁵, Thomas Frank⁶, Andreas Henz², Oskar Herrmann⁵, Fabien Maussion⁷, Gillian M. A. Smith⁸, and Claire-Mathilde Stucki^{9, 10}

¹Institute of Earth Surface Dynamics, Université de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

²Department of Geography, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

³ETSI Telecomunicación, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

⁴Arctic Geology, University Centre in Svalbard (UNIS), Longyearbyen, Norway

⁵Institut für Geographie, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

⁶Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

⁷School of Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁸School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute for Mathematical Sciences, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

⁹Université Paris-Saclay, ENS Paris-Saclay, DER de Physique, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

¹⁰Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, INRAE, IRD, Grenoble INP, IGE, 38000 Grenoble, France

[†]IGM core development team: each made major contributions, together writing most of the code base and documentation.

^{*}Equal contribution.

Correspondence: Guillaume Jouvet (guillaume.jouvet@unil.ch)

Abstract. We present the Instructed Glacier Model (IGM, v3.2.1), an open-source framework for simulating glacier evolution from single-glacier to mountain-range scales. IGM is built on a single design principle: all physical processes, including ice flow, surface mass balance, thermodynamics, and mass conservation, are expressed as short sequences of operations on raster grids. This workflow runs natively on GPUs and scales efficiently to large domains. Within this framework, higher-order ice flow is handled by a differentiable mapping trained by automatic differentiation to satisfy the Blatter–Pattyn equations, which makes simulations on a single GPU much faster than on multi-core CPUs and permits gradient-based data assimilation. Besides *differentiability*, the framework is structured around five guiding principles: (i) *accessibility*, through a Python package and a simple YAML-based interface; (ii) *modularity*, enabling modelers to extend or replace individual components without modifying the core code; (iii) *reproducibility*, through automated configuration logging and continuous integration; (iv) *scalability*, enabling large-domain simulations on GPU; and (v) *explorability*, facilitating ensemble runs, parameter sweeps, and model calibration. We describe the physical and

numerical foundations of IGM and its software architecture, verify it against community benchmarks, and illustrate these principles with three applications: ensemble calibrations of an Alpine glacier and of a polythermal Arctic glacier, and a high-resolution simulation of a large ice cover over the European Alps.

1 Introduction

Glacier evolution models are essential tools for reconstructing past glacier–climate interactions and for projecting future ice loss (Rounce et al., 2023). Over the last two decades, the glaciological community has devoted substantial effort to developing these models (see Zekollari et al., 2022, for a review). These models are designed to represent a wide range of physical processes, including ice flow, thermodynamics, subglacial hydrology, and their interactions with various factors such as atmospheric conditions (e.g., climate-driven surface mass balance), the Earth’s lithosphere, and the ocean (e.g., iceberg calving or subsurface melting). Prominent examples of such models include those solving the

full set of Stokes equations, such as Elmer/Ice (Gagliardini et al., 2013), which can be applied to any glaciological setting, higher-order models such as PISM (Winkelmann et al., 2011), CISM (Lipscomb et al., 2019), and ISSM (Larour et al., 2012), which solve the first-order approximation of the Stokes equations (often termed Blatter–Pattyn) and are popular in the ice-sheet modeling community, or models based on the zeroth-order, shallow ice approximation (SIA), such as OGGM (Maussion et al., 2019), which were designed for global-scale glacier modeling.

Increasing model complexity and the growing volume of observational data to assimilate adds to the computational burdens associated with glacier modeling, but is necessary to better constrain models and improve the accuracy of their outputs. Parallel computing and automatic differentiation are promising ways to overcome these limitations.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in employing Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) to tackle the computational bottleneck in ice-flow modeling. GPUs, with many more cores than Central Processing Units (CPUs), can achieve substantial speed improvements when numerical methods can be subdivided into massively parallel tasks, a particularly challenging requirement for ice flow because of its viscous, diffusive nature. In glaciology, GPU acceleration has been demonstrated through explicit time integration of the SIA (Višnjević et al., 2020), the second-order SIA (Brædstrup et al., 2014), and the Stokes equations (Räss et al., 2020), as well as through GPU-native solvers such as MALI (Tezaur et al., 2015; Hoffman et al., 2018; Watkins et al., 2023). The rapid development of libraries such as TensorFlow and PyTorch, driven by the rise of artificial intelligence, to massively parallelize operations, has further popularized GPU computing in science. Beyond raw hardware acceleration, automatic differentiation and machine learning are increasingly being leveraged to aid scientific computing more broadly, and the glaciological community has begun to explore their potential. Examples include data-driven emulators for subglacial hydrology (Brinkerhoff et al., 2021; Verjans and Robel, 2024), basal melt (Burgard et al., 2023; Rosier et al., 2023), and ice flow (Jouvet et al., 2022; Koo and Rahnemoonfar, 2025), but also physics-informed neural networks (Riel et al., 2021; Bolibar et al., 2023; Howard et al., 2023; Jouvet and Cordonnier, 2023; Cheng et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025) and hybrid approaches (He et al., 2023).

Building on these advances, the Instructed Glacier Model (IGM), originally introduced by Jouvet et al. (2022), follows a simple design principle. Glacier modeling consists, to a large extent, of operations on large raster fields representing glacier characteristics over a regular spatial grid. Such workloads map naturally onto GPU architectures, but are poorly suited to algorithms that rely on inverting large matrices. IGM therefore organizes each physical component as short sequences of rasterized operations, keeping the sequential, non-parallelizable portion of each update as short as possible. With the exception of ice flow, all components (e.g., ther-

modynamics, surface mass balance, and mass conservation) are naturally solved raster-wise. Ice flow is the one component that does not fit the raster-wise pattern, since solving the higher-order ice-flow equations would normally require inverting a large system. IGM circumvents this by training a physics-informed neural network to satisfy the higher-order ice-flow physics (Jouvet and Cordonnier, 2023; Cordonnier et al., 2023), so that the sequential cost reduces to the depth of the network. Advantageously, this neural formulation also provides automatic differentiation, which enables physics-based training and data assimilation by model inversion (Jouvet, 2023).

While IGM has already been applied by a growing user community (<https://igm-model.org/v3.2.1/gallery>) and specific concepts for efficient ice-flow computation have been published separately, no comprehensive overview of the project exists to date, covering the model as a whole, together with its benchmarks and community development. This paper fills this gap: we present the design of IGM, version 3.2.1, as a stable and benchmarked modeling platform for glaciers, with an emphasis on its physical processes, its numerical methods, its software architecture, its modularity, and its integration with the Hydra (Yadan, 2019) and Optuna (Akiba et al., 2019) frameworks for reproducible ensemble simulations. This paper is structured as follows. Sections 2 and 3 describe the physical model and its numerical discretization. Data assimilation is briefly discussed in Section 4. We then describe the software design in Section 5, and applications in Section 6. Last, Section 7 discusses community aspects and Section 8 discusses IGM’s potential for education, outreach, and visualization. Finally, Section 9 outlines our vision for the ongoing development of IGM and its potential for future applications.

2 Physics

In the following, we write $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, z)$ for the spatial coordinates and t for the time coordinate. We use ∇ for the gradient operator, acting in two or three dimensions depending on context: when applied to fields defined on (x, y) , it denotes (∂_x, ∂_y) ; when applied to fields defined on (x, y, z) , it denotes $(\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)$. We use $b = b(x, y, t)$, $s = s(x, y, t)$, and $h = h(x, y, t)$ to represent the bedrock elevation, the surface elevation, and ice thickness, respectively, with $h = s - b$. Where a glacier terminates in water (ocean or lake), we denote the lower ice surface by $l = l(x, y, t)$, taking it to coincide with the bed where the ice is grounded and, where the ice is floating, assuming local hydrostatic equilibrium, $l = \max(b, z_{wl} - (\rho_i/\rho_w)h)$, where ρ_w and ρ_i are the densities of water and ice, respectively. Marine- and lake-terminating glaciers are beyond the scope of this paper and the subject of ongoing work; here, we only retain the stress condition at a vertical ice front, which enters the ice-flow energy functional. The three-dimensional velocity field of the ice is

written as $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, with components (u, v, w) . We also use $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ for the horizontal components.

We now describe the physical processes represented in IGM (Fig. 1), each implemented as an independent module in IGM (Section 5), including both essential components (such as the ice thickness, surface mass balance, and ice flow), and other components (such as the enthalpy or Lagrangian particles).

2.1 Ice thickness

The glacier geometry evolves according to mass conservation, relating the variation in ice thickness to ice dynamics and mass balance at the upper and lower surfaces:

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\bar{\mathbf{u}}h) = \dot{a}_s + \dot{a}_b, \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{u}}$ denotes the vertically-averaged horizontal velocity, and $\dot{a}_s$ and $\dot{a}_b$ denote the surface and basal mass balances, respectively.

2.2 Mass balance components

The surface mass balance $\dot{a}_s$ is the net rate of mass gain or loss at the glacier surface per unit time. The `smb` module of IGM provides three built-in schemes of increasing physical complexity: (i) a simple altitude-dependent parametrization in which the SMB varies piecewise-linearly with elevation around the equilibrium-line altitude (Meier et al., 1971); (ii) a monthly temperature-index model following OGGM (Mausson et al., 2019), calibrated against geodetic mass balance observations (Hugonnet et al., 2021); and (iii) a positive degree-day (PDD) scheme (Hock, 2003) with explicit snow-pack tracking and separate melt factors for snow and ice. The mathematical formulations of these three schemes are given in Appendix A.

When the thermodynamics module is enabled (Section 2.4), the basal mass balance $\dot{a}_b$ is derived from the enthalpy field through a heat balance at the ice–bed interface (see Appendix C).

2.3 Ice flow

Over long time scales, on the order of years, ice behaves as an incompressible viscous fluid governed by Stokes flow, since inertia in the momentum-balance equation is negligible. Ice flow is therefore described by the following partial differential equations:

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \rho_i \mathbf{g} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (2a)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0, \quad (2b)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ denotes the Cauchy stress tensor and $\mathbf{g}$ is the gravitational acceleration vector. Following Glen's flow law (Glen, 1955), ice is modeled as a generalized Newtonian

fluid with a power-law rheology:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{v}, p) = -p\mathbf{I} + 2\eta\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v}), \quad (3a)$$

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} A^{-\frac{1}{n}} |\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v})|^{\frac{1}{n}-1}. \quad (3b)$$

Here, p is the ice pressure, $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity tensor, η is the effective viscosity, and $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v}) = [\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^\top]/2$ is the strain-rate tensor. The notation $|\cdot|$ denotes the second-invariant norm, defined for any second-order tensor $\mathbf{X}$ by $|\mathbf{X}|^2 = (\mathbf{X} : \mathbf{X})/2$, where $:$ denotes the scalar product. The physical parameters A and $n > 1$ correspond to the Arrhenius factor and Glen's flow-law exponent, respectively. The former depends on the temperature of the ice, so that the thermal state can impact the ice-flow dynamics by modifying the effective viscosity; see Appendix C.

For the boundary conditions, the upper surface of the glacier, corresponding to the ice–air interface, is stress-free (neglecting atmospheric pressure):

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ denotes the outer normal vector to the surface. Along the lower surface of the glacier, which is in contact with the bedrock, we impose the following conditions:

$$\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, \quad (5a)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = -\tau_{\text{ref}} \left(\frac{N}{N_{\text{ref}}} \right)^q \left(\frac{|\mathbf{v}|}{u_{\text{ref}}} \right)^m \frac{\mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{v}|}, \quad (5b)$$

where $m > 0$ is the power-law exponent (in IGM's configuration, the sliding parameter exponent is $1/m$, with default value 3). The first equation is a non-penetration constraint, and the second takes the form of a nonlinear friction law relating the basal velocity to the basal shear stress. Here, we adopt a generalized power-law (Weertman–Budd) friction law (Weertman, 1957; Nye, 1969; Kamb, 1970; Budd et al., 1979; Fowler, 1981), written in terms of a reference shear stress τ_{ref} and a reference sliding velocity u_{ref} : by construction, the basal shear stress equals τ_{ref} when the basal speed equals u_{ref} and $N = N_{\text{ref}}$. The quantity N denotes the basal effective pressure (Section 2.5), N_{ref} is a reference effective pressure, and $q \geq 0$ is the effective-pressure exponent that controls the sensitivity of basal friction to subglacial hydrology. Setting $q = 0$ removes the dependence on N and recovers the classical Weertman law, while $q > 0$ yields a Budd-type law. For $q = 0$, this formulation is equivalent to the classical $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{n} = -c|\mathbf{v}|^{m-1}\mathbf{v}$ with $c = \tau_{\text{ref}}/u_{\text{ref}}^m$, but allows working with physical quantities that have a clear interpretation and direct units, rather than with the more abstract sliding coefficient c . Several friction laws are available in IGM: the Weertman and Budd laws above, a regularized Coulomb law (Schoof, 2005; Gagliardini et al., 2007; Schoof, 2010; Minchew and Joughin, 2020), and a Mohr–Coulomb law coupled to the till water content (Appendix C).

Where a glacier terminates in water (see above), a stress boundary condition is applied along the calving front Γ_{cf} ,




Figure 1. Overview of IGM, with a schematic of a glacier showing the coupled physical processes (left) and the framework’s design principles (right) that together enable efficient glacier evolution simulations.

i.e., the vertical ice face in contact with the water. Denoting by $\mathbf{n}$ the outward horizontal unit normal to Γ_{cf} and by z_{wl} the water level, the ice is subject to hydrostatic water pressure on its submerged portion:

$$\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n} = -p_w \mathbf{n}, \quad (6a)$$

$$p_w := \rho_w g (z_{wl} - z)_+, \quad (6b)$$

where $(\cdot)_+ := \max(\cdot, 0)$. On land-terminating glaciers, $\Gamma_{cf} = \emptyset$ and this condition is absent.

Equations (2)–(6) describe a non-linear Stokes problem in which the unknowns are the 3D velocity field $\mathbf{v} = (u, v, w)$ and the pressure p . To simplify the problem, we make the ‘cryostatic assumption’ and neglect second-order terms in the aspect ratio of the ice domain within the strain-rate tensor (see, e.g., Schoof and Hindmarsh, 2010). By doing so, and invoking the incompressibility equation (2b), both the vertical velocity component w and the pressure p are eliminated from the momentum-conservation equation. The resulting model, commonly referred to as the Blatter–Pattyn model and considered a ‘higher-order’ model, conveniently transforms into a 3D non-linear elliptic equation solely for the horizontal velocity components $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)$ (Herterich, 1987; Blatter, 1995; Pattyn, 2003). This modification makes it easier to solve than the original Stokes model: only two unknowns (u, v) instead of four (u, v, w, p) , and no divergence-free constraint.

As for any ice-flow model, the Blatter–Pattyn model can be written as an energy-minimization problem (see Appendix B; Colinge and Rappaz, 1999; Jouvet, 2016), which means it satisfies $\langle \mathcal{J}'(\mathbf{u}), \delta \mathbf{u} \rangle = 0$ for all admissible variations $\delta \mathbf{u}$, where the associated convex functional $\mathcal{J}$ is de-

fined by:

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u}) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{2A^{-\frac{1}{n}}}{1 + 1/n} |\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{u})|^{1+\frac{1}{n}} d\Omega \quad (7a)$$

$$+ \int_{\Gamma_b} \frac{\tau_{ref} u_{ref}}{1 + m} \left(\frac{N}{N_{ref}} \right)^q \left(\frac{|\mathbf{u}|_b}{u_{ref}} \right)^{1+m} d\Gamma \quad (7b)$$

$$+ \int_{\Omega} \rho_i g \nabla s \cdot \mathbf{u} d\Omega \quad (7c)$$

$$- \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} [\rho_i g (s - z) - p_w] \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} d\Gamma, \quad (7d) \quad 35$$

where Ω denotes the glacier volume, Γ_b is the basal surface of the ice in contact with the bedrock, Γ_{cf} is the calving front (if there is one), and $|\mathbf{u}|_b$ is the norm of the basal velocity, accounting for bed slope. The four terms represent, respectively: (i) the viscous energy dissipated by internal ice deformation, (ii) the frictional energy dissipated by basal sliding, (iii) the gravitational driving energy, i.e., the work done by gravity as ice flows down the surface slope, and (iv) the optional calving-front energy, which accounts for the work done at the calving front against the ice overburden pressure and the hydrostatic water back-pressure. Note that the minimization formulation (7) was used in the IcePack model; however, it was there referred to as an action principle (Shapero et al., 2021).

Minimization of $\mathcal{J}$ yields the horizontal velocity field $\mathbf{u}$. The vertical velocity component w can then be recovered by vertical integration of the incompressibility condition (2b).

2.4 Enthalpy and Arrhenius factor

In many modeling applications, ice is treated as isothermal with prescribed, possibly spatially varying, values of the Arr-

Arrhenius factor A and the sliding parametrization τ_{ref} that control the ice dynamics. However, for glaciers in which the thermal regime plays a significant role, such as polythermal glaciers or ice sheets, IGM can optionally compute the ice thermodynamics based on the enthalpy formulation (Aschwanden et al., 2012), largely inspired by its implementation in the Parallel Ice Sheet Model (PISM; Khroulev and the PISM Authors, 2020). This approach unifies the treatment of cold and temperate ice within a single advection–diffusion equation for the enthalpy field E , avoiding the need to explicitly track the cold–temperate transition surface. In cold ice, the enthalpy is proportional to the temperature $T = T(\mathbf{x}, t)$; in temperate ice, it encodes the water content $\omega = \omega(\mathbf{x}, t)$. The enthalpy equation accounts for heat advection by the ice flow, vertical diffusion, viscous dissipation, and water drainage. Boundary conditions at the surface are set by the climate forcing, while basal conditions depend on the local thermal and hydrological state. The thermal state feeds back into the ice dynamics in two ways: through the Arrhenius factor A , which is diagnosed from the enthalpy field, and, when the till-based closure of Section 2.5 is used, through the basal melt rate, which feeds the till water budget of the subglacial hydrology module and hence the effective pressure N entering the friction law. Note that the enthalpy model requires two boundary conditions: the air temperature on the top surface and the geothermal heat flux at the bedrock interface. The full mathematical formulation, including the enthalpy equation, boundary conditions, basal melt rate, subglacial hydrology, and the coupling to ice dynamics, is provided in Appendix C.

2.5 Subglacial hydrology

The effective pressure N is a key variable depending on the subglacial hydrology in the basal friction law, as it controls the coupling between the ice and the bedrock. Physically, N is the difference between the ice overburden pressure and the basal water pressure, $N = \rho_i g h - p_w$. While the modeling of N can be user-defined, IGM provides several built-in simple parametrizations: (i) *Water-connected closure*: the basal water pressure equals the hydrostatic water pressure at the bed, $p_w = \rho_w g (z_{\text{wl}} - b)_+$; this corresponds to an assumption of perfect conductivity with an ocean or lake for water-terminating glaciers. (ii) *Fixed fraction of overburden*: $p_w = \delta \rho_i g h$, with $\delta \in [0, 1]$ prescribing the basal water pressure as a constant fraction of the ice overburden. (iii) *Till-based closure*: N is set to the till effective pressure N_{till} predicted by the subglacial hydrology model of Bueler and van Pelt (2015) described in Appendix C, which couples N to the basal melt rate and the till water storage.

2.6 Lagrangian particles

While IGM components are formulated in an Eulerian framework, the model also includes a Lagrangian utility that tracks

the trajectories of (physical or virtual) particles advected by the ice flow. This capability is particularly useful for studying the age and properties of ice (e.g., Licciulli et al., 2020), how rocks and debris are carried along, how long they persist in or on the ice, and the thickness of debris coverage on the ice (e.g., Scherler and Egholm, 2020; Verhaegen and Huybrechts, 2026). The trajectory $\mathbf{p}(t)$ of a particle that passes through $\mathbf{p}_0$ at time t_0 satisfies the following ordinary differential equation:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{p}}{dt}(t) = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}, t), \quad (8a)$$

$$\mathbf{p}(t_0) = \mathbf{p}_0. \quad (8b)$$

Each particle can carry associated state variables (e.g., age or chemical composition) that are advected along the trajectory. Particle seeding is user-defined: for instance, subglacially as a function of ice-flow speed to represent glacial erosion, or supraglacially as a function of surrounding slopes to represent debris accumulation (Leger et al., 2026; Hardmeier et al., 2026).

3 Numerics

All fields in IGM are discretized on a regular horizontal grid of $N_x \times N_y$ nodes (x_i, y_j) with uniform spacing Δx . This design choice is central to the computational efficiency of IGM: computation is parallelized over the horizontal grid, which can be very large, whereas dimensions that cannot be easily parallelized (time stepping, vertical layers, neural network depth) are kept as shallow as possible. Accordingly, the fields h , b , s , and τ_{ref} are represented as tensor fields:

$$\mathbf{h}_H, \mathbf{b}_H, \mathbf{s}_H, \boldsymbol{\tau}_H \in \mathbb{R}^{N_y \times N_x}, \quad (9)$$

where $(\mathbf{h}_H)_{ji} := h(x_i, y_j)$; the other fields are defined similarly. We now describe the numerical treatment of each physical component with a particular focus on the ice flow.

3.1 Ice thickness

To solve equation (1), we employ an explicit upwind finite-volume scheme. Ice transport is computed from edge-defined fluxes, derived from depth-averaged velocities and ice thickness in the upwind direction. To reduce numerical diffusion while preserving monotonicity, a piecewise-linear reconstruction of the ice thickness at cell edges is performed using the Superbee slope limiter (Roe, 1986), which ensures greater accuracy while satisfying the total variation-diminishing property. The scheme is mass-conserving and readily parallelizable by virtue of its explicit structure, but is subject to a Courant–Friedrichs–Lewy (CFL) condition that imposes an upper bound on the time step, ensuring that no cell transfers more than its entire content to a neighbor within a single iteration. The time step Δt is therefore constrained through $\|\bar{\mathbf{u}}\|_{L^\infty} \Delta t / \Delta x \leq C$, where C is the CFL number that must be chosen below 1.

3.2 Mass balance components

By construction, computing the SMB amounts to evaluating pointwise functions of local fields, as in equations (A1)–(A2), and is therefore intrinsically parallel on the GPU. The sole exception is the PDD scheme with explicit snowpack tracking (Appendix A), which must be integrated sequentially in time; its computational cost scales linearly with the number of time steps. In practice, using weekly or monthly time steps enables capturing seasonality while avoiding excessively fine temporal resolutions (e.g., daily) that would create a computational bottleneck offsetting the efficiency gains of GPU parallelism elsewhere in the model.

3.3 Ice flow

Computing ice velocities is often the most expensive step in glacier evolution simulations, as it requires solving the three-dimensional, non-linear Stokes momentum-balance equation (2). This step therefore offers the greatest potential for acceleration.

3.3.1 Vertical discretization

We introduce the terrain-following coordinate ζ , defined by $\zeta := (z - b)/h$ (Fig. 2). Vertical derivatives must then be transformed accordingly in this coordinate system (e.g., Pattn, 2003; Shapero et al., 2021). For the velocity field, we use the nodal/modal expansions

$$u(x_i, y_j, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_z} (\mathbf{u}_H)_{kji} \phi_k(\zeta(z)), \quad (10)$$

and similarly for v , where $\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H \in \mathbb{R}^{N_z \times N_y \times N_x}$ denote the corresponding degrees of freedom. Several families of basis functions $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{N_z}$ may be employed, including default Lagrange basis functions, for which the degrees of freedom coincide with nodal velocity values, as well as polynomial bases such as Legendre polynomials (Shapero et al., 2021), the MOLHO polynomials (Dias dos Santos et al., 2022), and the depth-averaged SSA basis ($N_z = 1$); see Fig. 2. For Lagrange discretization, the N_z vertical nodes can be distributed in a non-uniform manner to ensure finer discretization near the ice–bed interface, where the steepest gradients are expected, and coarser near the ice–surface interface following the strategy proposed in PISM (Khroulev and the PISM Authors, 2020).

3.3.2 Setting the minimization problem

The discretized version of the minimization of the functional $\mathcal{J}$ described in (7) reads as follows:

$$(\mathbf{u}_H^*, \mathbf{v}_H^*) = \arg \min \{ \mathcal{J}_H(\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H) \mid (\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H) \in \mathcal{X}_H \} \quad (11)$$




Figure 2. Vertical discretization schematic. The terrain-following coordinate $\zeta = (z - b)/h$ maps the ice column to $[0, 1]$. Four vertical basis types are shown: Lagrange (piecewise linear polynomial interpolation), Legendre (polynomial expansion; Shapero et al., 2021), MOLHO (SIA profile; Dias dos Santos et al., 2022), and SSA.

in which $\mathcal{J}_H$ is the numerical approximation of $\mathcal{J}$ and $(\mathbf{u}_H^*, \mathbf{v}_H^*)$ denotes the numerical solution to this optimization problem, and $\mathcal{X}_H$ is the discrete approximation space $\mathcal{X}_H = \mathbb{R}^{2 \times N_z \times N_y \times N_x}$. In the spirit of the Ritz–Galerkin method, the key idea is to replace the full (infinite-dimensional) function space $\mathcal{X}$ by a finite-dimensional space $\mathcal{X}_H$, and to seek the minimizer within that subspace. In IGM, the horizontal integrals are evaluated on each grid cell using one of several available quadrature rules: (i) a single cell-centered evaluation point (default); (ii) a 2×2 Gaussian quadrature on bilinear (Q1) elements; (iii) a P1 triangulation that splits each quadrilateral cell into two triangles with centroid evaluation; and (iv) a marker-and-cell (MAC) staggered-grid scheme that evaluates gradients at edge mid-points. The first is the least expensive but may admit checkerboard zero-energy modes, while the latter three eliminate such spurious modes, at the cost of increased computational overhead. The vertical integrals are computed with quadrature points and weights consistent with the chosen vertical basis (Lagrange, Legendre, MOLHO, or SSA).

In IGM, the ice flow is parametrized as follows:

$$(\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H) = \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{I}_H), \quad (12)$$

in which $\mathcal{M}$ is a differentiable mapping, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ denotes trainable weights, and $\mathbf{I}_H$ denotes the set of inputs describing the ice-flow parameters and the glacier geometry, namely $\boldsymbol{\tau}_H, \mathbf{A}_H, \mathbf{h}_H$, and $\mathbf{s}_H$ (Fig. 3). For a given input $\mathbf{I}_H$, the mapping $\mathcal{M}$ defines an approximation space spanned by weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}$:

$$\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{M}} = \{ \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{I}_H) \mid \boldsymbol{\theta} \}. \quad (13)$$

The ice-flow problem is then solved by minimizing the energy functional over this approximation space $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{M}}$ rather than over the full discrete velocity space $\mathcal{X}_H$ as in (11). Specifically, the optimization problem (11) becomes

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg \min \{ \mathcal{J}_H(\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{I}_H)) \mid \boldsymbol{\theta} \}, \quad (14)$$

and the solution to the ice-flow problem is then given by:

$$(\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H) = \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{I}_H). \quad (15)$$

The framework defined by equations (12)–(15) provides flexibility:




Figure 3. Schematic of the ice-flow computation framework. The degrees of freedom for the horizontal velocity are parametrized as $(\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H) = \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, where $\mathcal{M}$ denotes a differentiable mapping and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ represents the trainable weights. This framework encompasses both the ‘classical’ approach to solving ice flow, taking $\mathcal{M}$ as the identity mapping $\mathcal{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H)$ so that the trainable weights are given directly by the velocity degrees of freedom, and a neural approach, in which $\mathcal{M}$ is a neural network $\mathcal{N}$ mapping glacier inputs $(\tau_H, \mathbf{A}_H, \mathbf{h}_H, s_H)$ to $(\mathbf{u}_H, \mathbf{v}_H)$. In the latter case, the weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ correspond to the neural-network weights.

- If $\mathcal{M}$ is the identity mapping with respect to the weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, so that the weights coincide with the velocity degrees of freedom themselves, then we recover the optimization problem (11). This direct approach is computationally expensive and is used to manufacture reference solutions for verification and testing.
- The mapping $\mathcal{M}$ may also take the form of a neural network parametrized by inputs $\mathbf{I}_H$ (Fig. 3). In this case, the weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ over which the cost $\mathcal{J}_H \circ \mathcal{M}$ is minimized correspond to those of the neural network, and we recover the approach described by Jouvet and Cordonnier (2023) and Cordonnier et al. (2023). This approach is known in the literature as the Deep Ritz Method (E and Yu, 2018) because it minimizes the energy associated with the variational problem, in contrast to more classical physics-informed neural-network approaches, which minimize directly the norm of the residuals of the equations. While Jouvet et al. (2022) originally proposed $\mathcal{M}$ as a convolutional neural network, the framework (12)–(15) allows for other architectures, such as Fourier neural operator networks (Li et al., 2021).
- The mapping $\mathcal{M}$ could also take a hybrid form, e.g., polynomial expressions of the input fields inspired by the analytical structure of simplified models such as the SIA, with trainable coefficients optimized within (14). While this approach has not yet been investigated, the framework readily accommodates it.

3.3.3 Solving the minimization problem

To solve problem (14), IGM supports first-order methods such as Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2015), as well as second-

order methods such as L-BFGS (Liu and Nocedal, 1989) and SOAP (Vyas et al., 2024). The latter two are increasingly favored in scientific machine learning because they account for the geometry of the loss landscape during training (e.g., Müller and Zeinhofer, 2023, 2024; Jnini et al., 2026). The optimization problem (14) can be solved in two regimes.

- In the *offline* regime, the mapping $\mathcal{M}$ is trained once on a large glacier catalog in a data-driven fashion (Jouvet et al., 2022; Rosier et al., 2026), yielding a generic network that is then applied to any geometry and set of ice-flow parameters without further retraining. Generalization typically requires a large network, and accuracy is ultimately bounded by its representational capacity (Section 6.2). In practice, training is significant work carried out separately, but the resulting trained networks are then distributed to IGM users together with the IGM code (Rosier et al., 2026).
- In the *online* regime, $\mathcal{M}$ is retrained continuously in a physics-informed fashion alongside the time-stepping of the glacier evolution model (Jouvet and Cordonnier, 2023; Cordonnier et al., 2023; Gregov et al., 2026). Retraining can be triggered periodically or adaptively in order to mitigate training costs while maximizing accuracy. Because the network is specialized to a single simulation, a lightweight architecture is usually sufficient, and accuracy can be improved by increasing the retraining effort.

Training (problem (14)) is the computational bottleneck of the framework, with GPU memory being the most critical constraint: automatic differentiation requires storing the activations of the entire forward pass to propagate gradients backwards, so memory scales with both network depth and the size of each training input. In contrast, inference (problem (15)) through $\mathcal{M}$ is a plain forward pass and has a modest memory footprint. This asymmetry between expensive training and inexpensive inference also frames the trade-off between the two regimes: the *offline* regime amortizes a large one-time training cost over many simulations at the price of a sizeable, generic network, whereas the *online* regime keeps the network lightweight and problem-specific but pays a training cost at each retraining step.

3.4 Enthalpy

When active, the thermodynamics module takes as input the ice velocity field computed in Section 3.3 together with boundary conditions (surface temperature and geothermal heat flux), and returns the three-dimensional enthalpy field, from which temperature and water content are deduced, as well as the basal melt rate, thereby coupling the thermal state back to the ice dynamics. Internally, the enthalpy equation (C4) is discretized on a vertically stretched Lagrange grid. Time integration follows an operator-splitting approach:

horizontal advection is treated explicitly with upwind finite differences, while vertical advection–diffusion is solved implicitly. Because the implicit step contains no horizontal coupling, it reduces to $N_x \times N_y$ independent tridiagonal systems of size $\tilde{N}_z$ (one per ice column), each solved in parallel using the Thomas algorithm. Note that the vertical discretization for the enthalpy may differ from the ice-flow one, justifying the introduction of $\tilde{N}_z$. The computational cost of this step therefore scales as $\mathcal{O}(N_x \times N_y \times \tilde{N}_z)$ and is fully parallelizable over the horizontal grid. Full details of the discretization are given in Appendix C.

3.5 Lagrangian particles

The particle-trajectory equation (8) is integrated in time using an explicit forward Euler scheme. Because particle positions generally do not coincide with grid nodes, the velocity field must be interpolated to the particle locations. Bilinear interpolation is performed by a dedicated CUDA kernel called from Python, which enables the simulation of very large numbers of particles at modest computational and memory cost. As a demonstration, the trajectories of 50 million particles were computed in a high-resolution simulation of the glaciers in the European Alps during the last glacial cycle, with a 25% overhead compared to the full simulation (see Fig. 4 in Leger et al., 2026). The particle-tracking module also provides mapping utilities between the Lagrangian and Eulerian representations; particle-borne quantities can be scattered back onto the grid, by accumulating them in the cell that contains each particle, to produce Eulerian fields, as used for instance by Hardmeier et al. (2026) to reconstruct a supraglacial debris-thickness field from the particle ensemble.

4 Data assimilation

Beyond solving the forward ice-flow problem, formulating the velocity as a differentiable mapping $\mathcal{M}$ offers another key advantage for model inversion: since $\mathcal{M}$ is differentiable with respect to its inputs $\mathbf{I}_H$ as well as its weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, one can back-propagate through $\mathcal{M}$ not only to assimilate the physics by training $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, but also to assimilate observational data by optimizing the input fields $\mathbf{I}_H$ (e.g., glacier geometry or ice-flow parameters) so as to minimize the misfit to measurements (Jouvet, 2023), yielding a unified physics- and data-assimilation framework (Jouvet and Cordonnier, 2023). Yet, simultaneously minimizing physics and data misfit poses significant challenges, as the joint optimization landscape can be complex with conflicting gradient directions — a problem that remains under active investigation. An alternative, more tractable approach consists of using an offline-trained ice-flow mapping $\mathcal{M}$ with fixed weights $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, which reduces the inversion to a data-only optimization, substantially sim-

plifying the problem and making it more suitable, e.g., for ice-thickness inversion to match surface ice velocity data.

In addition, IGM integrates a complementary, non-gradient-based inversion framework that uses IGM as a forward model and, within a single forward time loop, nudges one or more control fields — surface mass balance, basal sliding coefficient, ice thickness, surface elevation or bedrock topography — so as to drive the discrepancy between modeled and observed quantities (ice-thickness change rate, surface elevation or surface velocity) toward zero. This “time relaxation” generalizes the ice-thickness-change-rate bedrock inversion of Frank and van Pelt (2024) and recovers, as special cases, the broader family of nudging/time-relaxation schemes such as PISM-style force-to-thickness (Khroulev and the PISM Authors, 2020) and basal-sliding inversion from surface misfit (Pollard and DeConto, 2012).

5 Software design

Besides differentiability, treated in Sections 3 and 4, the software design of IGM is built around five other pillars: accessibility, modularity, reproducibility, computational scalability, and parameter explorability. We describe below how each is realized in practice.

5.1 Accessibility

5.1.1 Installation, dependencies, and hardware

A common challenge among scientific computing software is accessibility, starting with installation. To facilitate this, we offer several ways a user can install IGM. First, researchers who want a stable version can install the latest tagged release from PyPI (`pip install igm-model`). Second, users who wish to contribute to the development and have access to the latest changes can instead install IGM directly from the source repository (Section 5.3).

Importantly, both methods of installing IGM automatically resolve TensorFlow’s CUDA requirements, resulting in an effortless GPU installation which only requires a sufficiently up-to-date NVIDIA driver. If no NVIDIA GPU is available, the same installation runs on the CPU.

IGM is built around various Python packages (Fig. 5) including TensorFlow (Abadi et al., 2015) for GPU-accelerated computations and automatic differentiation, Hydra (Yadan, 2019) for configuration management, Optuna (Akiba et al., 2019) for hyperparameter optimization, Xarray for handling I/O, and OGGM (Maussion et al., 2019) for glacier data retrieval and preprocessing. As such, we recommend that users have a dedicated virtual environment to contain all dependencies in a consistent manner.

IGM is hosted on GitHub (<https://github.com/instructed-glacier-model/igm>) and developed under an

open-source policy, encouraging community contributions through issues, pull requests, and a Discord server.

5.1.2 Interface

The main interface to IGM is a YAML configuration file that describes the simulation to be performed. This file specifies which input, assimilation, process, and output modules are used, the order in which they are called, and any parameter values that should differ from the model defaults. Separating the experiment configuration from the source code allows standard simulations, parameter perturbations, and component substitutions to be carried out without editing the numerical implementation itself.

A simulation is launched from the command line as `igm_run +experiment=[NAME]` where `[NAME]` is the name of the experiment configuration file `experiment/[NAME].yaml`, given without its extension. After this command is executed, Hydra resolves the user-defined configuration together with the default IGM settings. IGM then initializes the selected components, enters the time loop, updates the model state by calling each process component (Fig. 4) in the prescribed order, writes the requested outputs, and finalizes the run. A more detailed description of this execution sequence is given in Appendix F.

This configuration-driven interface is intended to make the coupling between model components explicit. For example, adding a thermo-mechanical coupling, a specific diagnostic output, or modifying a forcing parameter is done by changing the configuration file rather than by editing the main simulation loop. At the same time, the resolved configuration is written to the run directory together with the model output, so that the exact setup of each experiment is retained for later inspection or reproduction (Section 5.3).

An example configuration is shown in the box on this page (`parameters.yaml`). It selects local input and output components, combines several process components, and overrides a small number of default parameter values. The example is intended to illustrate the structure of the interface rather than define a fixed template, since the available components and parameter names may evolve between IGM versions.

5.2 Modularity

5.2.1 Exchangeability

For a researcher using scientific computing software, being able to freely explore physical parameters and create experiments is vital. However, many scientific codebases contain highly coupled code, acting as a limitation as one change in the code might inadvertently affect another. This then ultimately restricts the researcher’s freedom to explore.

One way to reduce this coupling is to organize the model around self-contained components with clearly defined responsibilities. This is the approach taken, for example, in

parameters.yaml

YAML

```
# Required: Specify IGM components
defaults:
  - override /inputs:
    - local
  - override /processes:
    - smb
    - iceflow
    - time
    - thk
  - override /outputs:
    - local

# Optional: Overriding default values
inputs:
  local:
    filename: aletsch.nc
processes:
  time:
    start: 2000.0
    end: 2100.0
    save: 10.0
  smb:
    method: simple
```

Landlab (Barnhart et al., 2020; Hutton et al., 2020; Hobley et al., 2017), where model behavior is assembled from independent components that can be combined, reordered, or replaced depending on the application. Such a structure is particularly useful for glacier modeling, where different experiments may require different choices of surface mass balance, ice dynamics, hydrology, forcing, or output diagnostics, without requiring changes to the rest of the codebase.

Following this convention, our decoupled components are called “modules” (Fig. 5), which are organized into four distinct categories: “inputs”, “assimilations”, “processes”, and “outputs” (Fig. 4). Input and output modules handle I/O, e.g., utilizing Xarray to load georeferenced rasters or OGGM to retrieve glacier data. Assimilation modules are an optional intermediate step following the input modules, including data assimilation methods such as “*field_inversion*” or “*time_relaxation*”, which aim to optimize spatial fields (e.g., ice thickness) to match observations (Section 4). Processes, encapsulating a broader definition, represent a physical state change through time. This can be the time itself, the ice thickness, the subglacial hydrology, or the precipitation at any given time through the simulation. As this is dynamically updated at each time step, it allows for low memory usage and efficient exporting through one of the I/O modules. The main process modules shipped with IGM are summarized in Appendix G.




Figure 4. Overview of the IGM modular architecture: Gridded glacier geometry and climate variables are read from georeferenced files in “input” modules and optionally adjusted in “assimilation” modules to match observations (e.g., ice surface speed, surface elevation, thickness). A configurable chain of “process” modules—color-coded by earth-system component—is then evaluated; each box gives the process name and its module identifier (e.g., `smb`, `thk`, `iceflow`). Results are written, plotted, or visualized as gridded glacier variables in “output” modules.

This design decouples the overall complexity of the model: each module encapsulates one physical or technical aspect, with its own parameters, source code, and documentation, and can therefore be developed, tested, and documented independently of the rest. This modularity also facilitates community development, as contributors can add or extend modules (see Section 5.2.2) without needing to understand the entire codebase.

5.2.2 Extensibility

A modular model structure is only useful if individual components can also be replaced or extended in practice. In glacier modeling, this is often necessary because different applications require different process representations. For example, a regional-scale experiment may use a simple temperature-index surface mass balance scheme, whereas a more targeted study may require additional feedbacks, alternative forcing corrections, or new diagnostic quantities. Directly modifying the core source code for each such experiment would make the model harder to maintain and would also make it more difficult to identify which changes were responsible for a given result.

IGM therefore allows users to add custom components outside the core package. A user-defined component follows the same structure as the default components and can be selected in the YAML configuration file in the same way as any built-in input, assimilation, process, or output module. For instance, a user who wishes to test an alternative surface mass balance formulation can copy the default component, modify only the relevant update routine, place the new version in the `user/` directory, and reference it in the experi-

ment configuration. During model execution, this component is then initialized, updated, and finalized through the same mechanism as the standard components.

This approach keeps experiment-specific developments separated from the maintained source code, while still allowing them to use the standard IGM infrastructure for configuration (e.g., time stepping or input/output). It also makes such developments easier to version-control and archive together with the simulations that depend on them. The layout of the IGM source package is given in Appendix F, the project folder layout in Appendix E, and a concrete user-component example in Appendix H. This design supports individual model experimentation, while also providing a clear path for useful extensions to be contributed back through the open-source development workflow described in Section 5.3.

5.3 Reproducibility

IGM records the information needed to repeat a simulation as part of each run directory. The resolved Hydra configuration, including command-line overrides, is written to a `.hydra` folder. In addition, IGM records the installed version of the package or, for installations from source, the git commit hash used for the simulation. This provides a direct link between a model result, the parameter set used to generate it, and the source code version that was executed.

Furthermore, IGM follows a continuous integration and continuous deployment (CI/CD) workflow: GitHub Actions automatically rebuilds and publishes the documentation (<https://igm-model.org/>) each time a commit is pushed to the main branch or a release is tagged. This ensures that users can always access documentation corresponding to their in-




Figure 5. Schematic of the IGM software architecture. Simulations are assembled from input, assimilation, process, and output modules selected in a YAML configuration file. Input components populate the model state from local files or external glacier data sources; process components update state variables on a raster grid during the time loop; and output components write fields, diagnostics, or visualizations. Internally, spatial fields are represented as TensorFlow tensors, while file-based input and output are handled through Xarray.

stalled version of IGM. Together, resolved configurations, version tracking, and continuously updated documentation support reproducible simulation workflows and make parameter studies easier to inspect, rerun, and archive.

5.4 Computational scalability

In glacier modeling, large spatial and gridded domains are commonplace. However, computations on such domains can quickly become limiting on classical hardware, especially when the model state consists of several large raster fields that are updated repeatedly through time. IGM addresses this by representing spatial fields internally as TensorFlow tensors (Abadi et al., 2015), allowing array operations on structured grids to make use of GPU-optimized kernels where possible. When needed, IGM can also use CPU-based execution, for example for algorithms or environments where GPU execution is not appropriate.

By default, a single IGM simulation currently runs on one GPU. Domain decomposition across multiple GPUs for a single simulation is not yet supported. However, independent simulations can be assigned to different devices, and multiple small-domain simulations can share a GPU when memory permits. This latter capability is useful for ensemble and optimization workflows, but it should be interpreted as task-level parallelism rather than multi-GPU scaling of a single numerical simulation.

As GPU hardware and libraries continue to evolve, IGM can benefit from improvements in accelerator performance and memory capacity, enabling increasingly efficient simulations over large spatial domains.

5.5 Parameter explorability

Beyond individual simulations, glacier modeling often requires systematic exploration of uncertain parameters, forcing choices, or process representations. Such workflows are needed for sensitivity analysis, uncertainty quantification, and calibration against observations. IGM supports these workflows through two complementary mechanisms: ensemble simulations using the Hydra library and optimization-based calibration using the Optuna library.

5.5.1 Ensemble simulations

IGM leverages Hydra’s *multirun* feature to run ensembles of simulations over user-defined parameter combinations. This allows users to vary selected parameters from the command line while keeping the rest of the configuration fixed and recorded. For example, the following command runs a 3×3 ensemble in which only the precipitation and temperature factors vary from the original parameter file:

```
igm_run +experiment=params \
  processes.precip.factor=100,200,300 \
  processes.temp.factor=0.5,1.0,1.5 \
  hydra/launcher=joblib --multirun
```

Each member of the ensemble is executed as a separate simulation with its own resolved configuration and output directory. This makes ensemble results easier to inspect and reproduce, since the parameter values used for each run are stored together with the corresponding outputs. Depending on the available hardware and launcher configuration, ensemble members can be run sequentially or distributed across available CPU or GPU resources.

5.5.2 Optimization-based calibration

For calibration problems in which the aim is to minimize an objective function rather than enumerate a fixed parameter grid, IGM provides an interface to Optuna (Akiba et al., 2019). In this workflow, the user defines the parameters to be sampled in a dedicated parameter file and specifies an objective function, for example through a user-defined function as described in Section 5.2.2. After each simulation, the objective function evaluates the model result, and Optuna proposes new parameter combinations based on the history of previous trials.

This workflow allows users to perform single- or multi-objective calibration experiments while relying on IGM for model execution, configuration handling, and output generation. Optuna studies can also be stored and resumed, allowing failed or interrupted calibration experiments to continue without discarding completed simulations. Progress and results can be monitored interactively through the external Optuna dashboard, which provides real-time visualization of trial histories, the relative importance of parameters, and Pareto fronts for multi-objective problems. A practical demonstration is presented in Section 6.

6 Applications

In this section, we demonstrate the capabilities of IGM through real-world applications. We first show how IGM's efficiency, Hydra and Optuna can be used to carry out large ensembles of simulations, and perform a calibration of Aletsch Glacier against surface observations. We then test IGM's scalability on GPU assessing the necessary costs that come with grid refinement on a large-scale application. We then use a similar workflow to calibrate the thermal structure of a polythermal Svalbard glacier against englacial radar observations, illustrating the coupling of the enthalpy, hydrology and ice-flow modules together with user-defined modules. Note that IGM also ships with a test suite that exercises every module and validates the ice-flow and enthalpy modules against reference solutions; results are shown in Appendix D. All the results presented here were obtained with a single NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU (24 GB).

6.1 Ensemble calibration simulations of Aletsch Glacier from 1880 to 2020

Building on earlier modeling of the Great Aletsch Glacier (Jouvet et al., 2011), we showcase IGM's multi-objective calibration capability with an Optuna sweep of ~ 600 simulations over the 1880–2020 period at a resolution of 100 m (132×225 cells), using the pretrained, frozen (offline) ice-flow emulator (Rosier et al., 2026). The forward model is forced by a temperature-index mass balance scheme driven by daily meteorological data, and is calibrated against two observational constraints: (i) surface DEMs available in

1926, 1957, 1980, 1999, 2009 and 2017 (the 1880 DEM providing the initial geometry), and (ii) the present-day satellite-derived surface velocity field (Millan et al., 2019). Apart from these velocities, all input data (bed topography, DEMs, daily meteorological series and mass balance parameters) are taken from Jouvet et al. (2011). Six parameters among the most uncertain ones are optimized: the accumulation and ablation scaling factors $w_{\text{acc}}, w_{\text{abl}} \in [0.5, 3.0]$ applied everywhere, three corrections of the accumulation between 0.8 and 1.2 in the three main firm basins (Aletschfirn, Jungfrau-firn, Ewigschneefeld), and the reference basal shear stress $\tau_{\text{ref}} \in [0.08, 0.5]$ MPa of a Weertman sliding law, defined at the reference sliding speed $u_{\text{ref}} = 100 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$. Two scalar misfits are evaluated: the RMSE of modeled minus observed surface elevations, averaged over the six DEM dates and computed over the union of the modeled and observed ice extents, and the RMSE of modeled vs. observed surface speeds in 2020 over all observed pixels. The two objectives are minimized jointly with the NSGA-II optimizer (Deb et al., 2002). The trials are distributed over ten parallel workers sharing one Optuna study on a single GPU, made possible by the modest grid size, and the sweep completes in ~ 100 min of wall-clock time (~ 6 trials/min). Along the Pareto front (Fig. 6a), τ_{ref} clusters between 0.31 and 0.41 MPa and alone trades the two objectives, whereas the accumulation and ablation multipliers lock onto nearly single values ($w_{\text{acc}} \approx 1.30$, $w_{\text{abl}} \approx 1.51$ – 1.58) and the three basin corrections remain within 1.02–1.18. For the prescribed ice rate factor, this range of τ_{ref} corresponds to a glacier-wide basal sliding fraction u_b/u_s of about 30 to 40 %. Along the front, reducing the surface elevation misfit from 37 to 32 m costs less than 1 m yr^{-1} in surface speed (18.5 to 19.2 m yr^{-1}), so that a whole family of configurations fits both data sets well. We retain the knee-point configuration ($\tau_{\text{ref}} = 0.38 \text{ MPa}$, $w_{\text{acc}} = 1.30$, $w_{\text{abl}} = 1.51$) in the middle of this range. It recovers the surface elevations with an RMSE of $\approx 34 \text{ m}$ (mean absolute bias $\approx 7 \text{ m}$) and the surface speeds with an RMSE of $\approx 19 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ (Fig. 6b,c): a good simultaneous fit of the 140-year geometric evolution of the largest glacier of the Alps, at a relatively modest computational cost. This calibration of a few scalar parameters is a deliberately simple showcase of data assimilation: more elaborate, spatially distributed inversions that optimize entire fields such as ice thickness or basal friction (Section 4; Jouvet, 2023) would probably fit the observations better.

6.2 Scalability test: an Alps-wide ice cover simulated at up to 200 m resolution

To assess how the computational cost of IGM grows with problem size, we ran the same 500-year transient simulation of the European Alps ($900 \times 600 \text{ km}$ domain, inset of Fig. 7a) on grids obtained by coarsening a 100 m bed topography by integer factors, from $\Delta x = 6 \text{ km}$ (1.5×10^4 cells) to 200 m ($4500 \times 3000 = 1.4 \times 10^7$ cells). This bed is the SRTM digi-




Figure 6. Calibration of Aletsch Glacier from 1880 to 2020 with a ~ 600 -trial NSGA-II sweep. (a) Pareto front, zoomed on its extent: dominated trials (blue) and Pareto-optimal trials (red) are semi-transparent, so that repeated parameter sets appear darker; the gray staircase is the Pareto front and the shading marks the region it dominates. The triangles mark three witness trials: the knee, and the Pareto-optimal trials with the lowest and highest basal shear stress τ_{ref} . The inset shows all trials over their full range, with the extent of the main panel outlined. (b) Modeled – observed surface elevation of the knee run at three DEM dates (1880 being the initial state), over the union of the modeled and observed ice extents; the black line is the modeled ice margin. (c) Observed and modeled surface speed in 2020, and their difference, over all observed pixels. The dashed boxes give the RMSE and mean bias of each misfit map.

tal elevation model (Farr et al., 2007) minus the present-day estimated ice thickness of Farinotti et al. (2019). The simulation starts from ice-free conditions and is forced by a constant surface mass balance whose equilibrium-line altitude is lowered to 2300 m: it is not intended to represent a realistic situation, but to trigger the onset of a glaciation of the Alps, so that ice extent, speed and hence time step evolve during the run. We compare the two regimes, each in the configuration it is meant for: *online*, with a lightweight network (3.2×10^4 trainable parameters) retrained with one Adam iteration at every time step (Gregov et al., 2026), and *offline*, with the large generic network distributed with IGM (4.6×10^5 parameters), evaluated only (Rosier et al., 2026). Unless stated otherwise, all simulations use the MOLHO vertical basis with $N_z = 2$ and the same basal sliding parameters. The two configurations reach a comparable accuracy: against a reference solution at $\Delta x = 300$ m (direct solver, without network), the L^2 error of the depth-averaged ice speed over the grid is 5.2 m yr^{-1} online and 2.3 m yr^{-1} offline, and the ice volume agrees within 1.0 % after 200 years (see Gregov et al., 2026; Rosier et al., 2026, for a detailed assessment). This comparison is, however, not strictly like-for-like, as neither network was tuned for this accuracy: although the two regimes perform similarly in computing time here, determining which one outperforms the other is beyond the scope of this paper. Rather, it illustrates the respective strengths and limitations of the two regimes in terms of computational scaling, memory requirements and accuracy; we refer to Gregov et al. (2026) and Rosier et al. (2026) for an in-depth analysis. The time step follows the CFL condition, and we report the ice-flow time (median per step; Fig. 7).

Two regimes of GPU usage appear. Below about 10^5 cells ($\Delta x \approx 2.4$ km), the cost per step does not depend on the number of cells $M = N_x \times N_y$: the GPU is latency-bound, i.e., under-occupied. Above about 2×10^6 cells ($\Delta x \approx 500$ m), the cost becomes proportional to M (log–log slope 1.00), at a sustained 31 million cells per second online. The two regimes then cost about the same per step (~ 0.2 s at 6×10^6 cells, $\Delta x = 300$ m): while the offline regime eliminates retraining costs, it also uses a larger network. A distinction between offline and online regimes is the memory usage (Fig. 7b, top): training needs 3.3 GiB per million cells and fills the 24 GB card at 6×10^6 cells ($\Delta x = 300$ m), whereas inference needs about 1.1 GiB per million cells and reaches the 200 m grid (1.4×10^7 cells). Resolving the vertical with ten layers ($N_z = 10$, Lagrange basis) instead of MOLHO costs only about 10 % more (Fig. 7b).

Halving Δx multiplies M by 4 and, through the CFL condition, the number of time steps by about 2, so the cost of a fixed-duration run should grow by a factor of about 8. Figure 7b shows that this holds only at high resolution: from 1200 to 600 m and from 600 to 300 m the cost of the online run grows by factors of 8.1 and 7.9. The step count grows faster than 2 from 1200 to 600 m ($\times 2.8$), because the maximum velocity increases as narrow outlet glaciers become re-


solved, and by about 2 from 600 to 300 m ($\times 2.0$). On coarse grids, halving Δx costs only $\times 1.4$ – 2.0 , since the added cells are absorbed by the idle GPU and the time step is capped. The offline network was trained on grids of 50–250 m (Rosier et al., 2026): outside this range (faded in Fig. 7b), its cost only indicates the slope, and its error grows from 2.3 to 99 m yr^{-1} between 300 and 1200 m (Fig. 7b, bottom), as expected from an emulator, whereas the online network, retrained at each resolution, keeps a moderate error. At 400 m, the 500-year simulation takes about 6 minutes on the GPU, about 120 times less than on a 32-core CPU. At 200 m, the 500-year simulation on the 4500×3000 grid takes less than one hour on the GPU in the offline regime. Overall, once the GPU is fully used, the cost of IGM grows almost linearly with the number of grid cells, and refining the grid costs close to the theoretical factor of eight per halving of Δx , i.e., close to the best achievable with an explicit, CFL-limited time-stepping scheme.

Figure 7a illustrates the level of detail that becomes affordable: at $\Delta x = 200$ m the whole Alpine domain is resolved glacier by glacier, down to the tributaries of the main valley glaciers, whose outlets flow at several hundred meters per year. After 500 years, the ice covers about $35\,000 \text{ km}^2$ and extends over nearly 700 km from west to east, with thicknesses of up to 1400 m. To our knowledge, a higher-order ice-flow simulation on a grid as large as 4500×3000 cells, run on a single GPU, has not been reported before.

6.3 Calibration of the thermal structure of Drønbreen, Svalbard, against radar-detected cold–temperate transition surfaces

Here we illustrate the use of IGM’s thermo-mechanical coupling to model Drønbreen glacier (Nordenskiöld Land, Svalbard), a polythermal glacier in which a basal layer of temperate ice is overlain by cold ice, the two being separated by the cold–temperate transition surface (CTS). The CTS was mapped along ten ground-penetrating radar (GPR) transects in March 2022 (Mannerfelt et al., 2025), providing a direct observation of the glacier’s thermal structure against which the enthalpy module (Section 2.4, Appendix C) can be calibrated. The model runs on an 81×91 grid at 100 m resolution over 1900–2022 with a fixed present-day geometry, so that only the thermal state evolves, and chains the ice-flow, enthalpy, Arrhenius and till-storage subglacial hydrology modules with a user-defined climate module (Appendix H) that derives the surface air temperature from the Copernicus Arctic Regional Reanalysis (CARRA; Køltzow et al., 2022). Because IGM does not explicitly model meltwater refreezing in the firn, the dominant source of temperate ice on such glaciers, this module replaces the surface temperature forcing the enthalpy equation above an equilibrium-line altitude z_{ELA} by a constant T_{ELA} , a proxy for the latent heat released in the accumulation area. As the annual-mean surface temperature is capped at the melting point, any $T_{\text{ELA}} \geq 0^\circ\text{C}$

a) Resolution scalability using an Alps-wide simulation



b) Performance scalability (GPU memory, run time and accuracy)




Figure 7. Scalability of IGM on one GPU for a 500-year simulation of a glaciation onset in the Alps. (a) Modelled surface ice speed after 500 years at $\Delta x = 200$ m over a 192×188 km part of the domain; top-left inset: whole 900×600 km model domain with the extent of the map (red box); circle: close-up magnified $\times 4$. (b) Peak GPU memory (top), run time (middle; ice-flow solver time over the whole simulation) and L^2 error of the depth-averaged ice speed after 500 years against a reference solution on a 160×134 km sub-domain (bottom) versus grid spacing Δx , online (small network retrained at every time step) and offline (large pretrained network), both with MOLHO ($N_z = 2$), and online with a Lagrange basis ($N_z = 10$; cost and memory only). The online runs do not fit in memory at 200 m ($N_z = 2$) and below 400 m ($N_z = 10$). Faded: offline outside its 50–250 m training distribution. Grey line: Δx^{-3} , from where this regime starts (bracket). Dotted line: memory of the 24 GB GPU.

yields a temperate surface above z_{ELA} . Three parameters controlling the heat supplied from above and from below are calibrated: $z_{\text{ELA}} \in [650, 720]$ m, $T_{\text{ELA}} \in [-0.5, 2.0]$ °C, and the geothermal heat flux $q_{\text{geo}} \in [0.03, 0.08]$ W m $^{-2}$. To calibrate these, a misfit is defined as the mean over the ten transects of the per-transect RMSE between modeled and observed CTS elevations, and is minimized with Optuna’s Tree-structured Parzen Estimator over 64 trials of ~ 2 min each on the GPU. The best trial ($z_{\text{ELA}} = 666$ m, $T_{\text{ELA}} = 0.42$ °C, i.e., a temperate surface above z_{ELA} , $q_{\text{geo}} = 0.044$ W m $^{-2}$) reaches a mean misfit of 18.8 m, half that of an entirely cold glacier (37.4 m), and recovers 89 % of the observed temperate ice cross-section summed over all transects (Fig. 8), although the per-transect view reveals compensating errors (e.g., T5 and T7 too cold, T6 too temperate). As for Aletsch Glacier, the sweep also exposes a parameter degeneracy: 30 trials lie within 1 m of the optimum, and while they span

only 20 % of the z_{ELA} range, they cover more than 70 % of the q_{geo} range, and all have $T_{\text{ELA}} > 0$ °C, i.e., a temperate surface above z_{ELA} , whereas trials with a colder surface fit much worse. The radar thus tightly constrains z_{ELA} and requires temperate conditions in the accumulation area, but only weakly constrains the geothermal heat flux.

7 Community building

The long-term sustainability of IGM depends on an active user and developer community that can maintain, extend, and critically evaluate the model. To this end, several channels for collaboration and engagement have been established:

- The code is openly hosted on GitHub (<https://github.com/instructed-glacier-model/igm>) and welcomes contributions via pull requests, with continuous integration ensuring that proposed changes pass the existing test




Figure 8. Calibration of the thermal structure of Drønbreen, Svalbard, against the CTS observed along ten GPR transects (Mannerfelt et al., 2025). (a) Ice thickness of the fixed model geometry with the ten radar tracks T1–T10 (dashed) and the featured transect T3 (orange), whose upper and lower ends are marked A and B; inset: location on Svalbard. (b) Modeled temperate (magenta) and cold (light blue) ice along T3 for the best trial, drawn from A to B so that ice flows left to right; the modeled CTS is the boundary between the two fills, and the dashed black line is the observed CTS. Where the observed CTS runs through cold (temperate) ice, the model produces too little (too much) temperate ice. (c) Cross-sectional area of temperate ice observed (dark purple) and modeled (magenta) along each transect, on light-blue bars giving the total ice cross-section; T3 is framed. The column on the right gives the per-transect RMSE of the modeled CTS elevation, whose mean of 18.8 m is the Optuna objective.

suite before merging (Section 5.3). In October 2026, the IGM repository counts 16 code contributors, over 1,700 commits, 47 pull requests, 14 tagged releases from v2 (September 2023) to v3.2.1 (October 2026), and 39 forks.

- A public website (<https://igm-model.org/>) provides user-oriented documentation, including parameter descriptions and configuration guides, alongside more detailed material such as examples and tutorials.
- A dedicated Discord server offers a low-barrier space for discussion and troubleshooting among users and developers.

These resources aim to lower the entry barrier for new users and coordinate development. Community interactions have also catalyzed scientific exchange, through regular IGM meetings held online or at the EGU General Assembly, and through a joint OGGM–IGM workshop

held in Switzerland in 2024 (<https://oggm.org/2024/01/19/8th-workshop-announcement/>), which brought together researchers from complementary glacier-modeling communities.

We plan to establish a clearer contributor governance structure as the community grows, while placing particular emphasis on training events and summer schools to onboard new users.

8 Education, outreach, and 3D visualization

Beyond research, IGM has been used in teaching and outreach. At the Université de Lausanne, it supports a Master-level glaciology course in which students explore glacier dynamics through hands-on numerical experiments (<https://jouvetg.github.io/glamod>). Thanks to the OGGM Shop (Maussion et al., 2019), which provides pre-processed glacier data for every glacier in the world, each student

is assigned a different glacier and carries out a complete modeling exercise, ranging from a Little Ice Age reconstruction to future projections under various climate scenarios. IGM has also been used to run simulations that communicate how glaciers may change under climate warming to broader audiences, for example within the IceAge-Cam (<https://swiss-time-machine.org/>) or FROST projects (<https://www.glacier-evolution.nat.fau.de/>). The latter makes use of a browser-based 3D visualization tool (Plotly/Dash), available in IGM via the `igm_viz` command, which converts model output into an interactive web application with a time slider and user-selectable fields displayed as a textured bedrock overlain by the glacier surface. This wide range of applications has been made possible by the design philosophy underpinning IGM, making it user-friendly and simple to install and use.

9 Conclusions, ongoing and future work

We have presented the fundamentals of IGM, an accessible, open-source, and GPU-accelerated glacier evolution model, whose ice-flow and enthalpy solvers have been verified against community benchmarks. IGM's physics-informed deep-learning approach to higher-order ice-flow computation, built on automatic differentiation, delivers the computational efficiency required to simulate large glacier ensembles and high-resolution domains over long time scales. The applications presented here illustrate the principles that guide IGM. *Scalability*: a large ice cover of about 35 000 km² over the Alps was simulated glacier by glacier on a 4500 × 3000 grid (200 m) on a single GPU, at a cost growing linearly with the number of grid cells. *Explorability*: about 600 simulations of 140 years of Aletsch Glacier were calibrated against observations in under two hours on one GPU, and the thermal structure of a polythermal glacier was calibrated against englacial radar data. *Modularity*: the latter experiment coupled a user-defined climate module to the built-in enthalpy, hydrology, and ice-flow modules without modifying the code base. *Accessibility* and *reproducibility*: each experiment is defined by YAML configuration files, each run records its full configuration and code version, and all results of this paper can be regenerated from the accompanying repository. An active community, open development workflow, and comprehensive documentation support the long-term sustainability of the project. Several directions for future development are ongoing. On the methodological side:

– **Ice-flow solving.** Several questions remain open: the trade-off between small, glacier-specific online-trained and large, generalizable, offline-trained neural network surrogates; the systematic assessment of resulting errors; the design of a posteriori error estimators that give users a proxy for the error without requiring a reference solution; the optimal choice of the mapping $\mathcal{M}$ (neural architecture or otherwise) for a given problem; efficient

strategies that maximize accuracy while reducing training effort; and parallelization of training across multiple GPUs.

– **Data assimilation and inversion.** IGM already provides modules for inverting selected parameters, such as basal sliding coefficients (Jouvet, 2023), as well as for training the ice-flow neural network simultaneously with the inversion of these parameters (Jouvet and Cordonnier, 2023). However, jointly assimilating observations and the ice-flow physics within a single differentiable end-to-end framework still lacks robustness in practice, and making such unified inversions reliable is the subject of ongoing work.

– **Implicit time integration.** The current explicit time-stepping scheme limits the maximum allowable time step, which becomes a critical bottleneck for very long simulations such as palaeo-glaciation over glacial cycles or coupled landscape-evolution runs spanning millions of years (Cordonnier et al., 2023). Implicit or semi-implicit schemes could relax this constraint, but their efficient implementation on GPUs is hampered by memory limitations and remains an active area of research (e.g., Aissa et al., 2017; Gaudreault et al., 2018; Kashi and Nadarajah, 2025), including recent work applied to ice flow (Ahlkrona et al., 2026).

On the application side, several promising directions are emerging:

– **Global-scale modeling and uncertainty quantification.** IGM has the efficiency to be deployed at regional to global scales (e.g., Frank et al., 2026). In this context, its tight integration with the Hydra/Optuna workflow opens the door to intensive ensemble-based parameter calibration and uncertainty quantification directly against remote-sensing observations.

– **Paleo-glaciation and landscape evolution.** IGM's scalability to long paleo-glacier simulations has already been demonstrated through Last Glacial Maximum reconstructions across the Alps (Leger et al., 2025). Building on this foundation, ongoing work focuses on coupling IGM with glacial erosion and sediment-transport models to address landscape evolution over geological time (> 1 Myr) scales.

– **Marine ice sheets.** Extending IGM to marine-terminating glaciers and ice sheets is the subject of ongoing work. The first challenge concerns the ice flow itself: where ice meets water, the flow regime switches from shear-dominated to membrane-stress-dominated across the grounding line, a sharp transition that the ice-flow computation specific to IGM, based on a neural network trained on the energy functional, must be able to capture. Further challenges concern the processes at

the calving front (calving, frontal melt) and beneath the ice (grounding-line migration, sub-shelf melt, sub-glacial hydrology).

- **Lagrangian particle tracking.** GPU acceleration allows IGM to advect millions of Lagrangian particles at little additional cost, opening the door to a new class of large-ensemble applications that would be intractable on CPU. Such massive particle populations can be leveraged to trace sediment provenance (Leger et al., 2026), reconstruct englacial layer stratigraphy, track debris (Hardmeier et al., 2026), and more generally to couple glacier dynamics with isotopic or geochemical models.

Code and data availability. IGM is free software distributed under the GNU General Public License v3. The source code is available at <https://github.com/instructed-glacier-model/igm>, and the version described in this paper (v3.2.1) is archived on Zenodo (Jouvet et al., 2026a), together with the pretrained ice-flow emulators distributed with IGM. The associated documentation website can be found at <https://igm-model.org/>. The configuration files, user modules, scripts and data needed to reproduce the simulations and figures of this paper are available at <https://github.com/instructed-glacier-model/igm-core-paper-exp> and archived on Zenodo (Jouvet et al., 2026b).

Appendix A: Surface mass balance schemes

The simplest parametrization assumes a piecewise-linear dependence of the SMB on altitude z , as supported by observations (Meier et al., 1971), controlled by the equilibrium-line altitude z_{ELA} :

$$\dot{a}_s(z) = \begin{cases} \beta_{\text{abl}}(z - z_{\text{ELA}}), & z \leq z_{\text{ELA}}, \\ \min(\beta_{\text{acc}}(z - z_{\text{ELA}}), \dot{a}_{\text{max}}), & z > z_{\text{ELA}}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1a})$$

where $\beta_{\text{abl}} > 0$ and $\beta_{\text{acc}} > 0$ are the ablation and accumulation gradients, and $\dot{a}_{\text{max}}$ is a cap on the maximum accumulation rate. The four parameters z_{ELA} , β_{abl} , β_{acc} , and $\dot{a}_{\text{max}}$ may vary in time and are linearly interpolated from a user-supplied time series.

IGM also provides two climate-driven SMB schemes that compute the mass balance from temperature and precipitation fields.

The first scheme implements the monthly temperature-index model of OGGM (Maussion et al., 2019), whose parameters are calibrated against geodetic mass balance observations (Hugonnet et al., 2021). The annual SMB is computed as

$$\dot{a}_s = \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_i} \sum_{m=1}^{12} [P_m^{\text{sol}} - d_f(T_m - T_{\text{melt}})_+], \quad (\text{A2})$$

where T_m and P_m^{sol} are the monthly air temperature and solid precipitation, T_{melt} is the melting-point threshold, d_f is the

melt factor, and ρ_w/ρ_i converts water to ice equivalent. Solid precipitation is derived from total precipitation assuming full solid fraction below a lower temperature threshold and zero above an upper threshold, with a linear transition in between.

The second scheme extends the model in (A2) with a more elaborate PDD approach (Hock, 2003). It explicitly tracks the snowpack depth and applies distinct melt factors for snow and ice. The PDD integral is evaluated using the semi-analytical expectation-based formulation of Calov and Greve (2005), which accounts for sub-monthly temperature variability through a prescribed standard deviation. Additionally, a fixed fraction of the computed melt is assumed to re-freeze within the snowpack.

Appendix B: Derivation of the Blatter–Pattyn energy

Given the importance of the Blatter–Pattyn energy in our ice-flow solver, we describe here how it can be derived from the original Stokes problem (2)–(6). We closely follow Jouvet (2016) and refer interested readers to that work for additional technical details. The derivation is carried out in two steps: first, we derive a minimization formulation for the Stokes problem, and then we eliminate the vertical velocity component in order to obtain the Blatter–Pattyn energy.

B1 Minimization formulation of the Stokes problem

To derive a minimization formulation, we first recast the Stokes problem in a variational formulation. We therefore introduce the following space of admissible velocities:

$$\mathcal{X} := \{v \in [W^{1,1+1/n}(\Omega)]^3, \nabla \cdot v = 0, v \cdot n|_{\Gamma_b} = 0\}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where the Sobolev space $W^{1,1+1/n}$ guarantees that the problem is well-defined. For the theory presented in this appendix only, we assume $0 < m \leq 1/n$.

Multiplying the momentum-balance equation (2a) by a test function $\varphi \in \mathcal{X}$ and integrating over the glacier domain Ω yields

$$\int_{\Omega} [\nabla \cdot \sigma(v, p)] \cdot \varphi \, d\Omega + \int_{\Omega} \rho_i g \cdot \varphi \, d\Omega = 0, \quad (\text{B2})$$

from which integration by parts gives

$$\int_{\Omega} \sigma : \nabla \varphi \, d\Omega - \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi \cdot \sigma(v, p) \cdot n \, d\Gamma = \int_{\Omega} \rho_i g \cdot \varphi \, d\Omega, \quad (\text{B3})$$

in which $\partial\Omega$ denotes the boundary of the domain Ω .

The first and second terms can be particularized to our problem. First, using (3), we get

$$\sigma : \nabla \varphi = A^{-\frac{1}{n}} |D(v)|^{\frac{1}{n}-1} D(v) : D(\varphi), \quad (\text{B4})$$

in which we have exploited the fact that $\varphi \in \mathcal{X}$ and that $D(v)$ is symmetric. Second, we apply the boundary

conditions (4)–(6). The only remaining contributions are the ones over the basal boundary and the calving front, which gives

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{v}, p) \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\Gamma = - \int_{\Gamma_b} c |\mathbf{v}|^{m-1} \mathbf{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, d\Gamma - \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} p_w \boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\Gamma, \quad (\text{B5})$$

where we have introduced $c := (\tau_{\text{ref}}/u_{\text{ref}}^m)(N/N_{\text{ref}})^q$ to simplify the notations (for $q = 0$, this is the sliding coefficient c of Section 2). Combining these results in (B3) leads to the following variational formulation: find $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} A^{-\frac{1}{n}} |\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v})|^{\frac{1}{n}-1} \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v}) : \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_b} c |\mathbf{v}|^{m-1} \mathbf{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, d\Gamma + \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} p_w \boldsymbol{\varphi} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega} \rho_i \mathbf{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi} \, d\Omega = 0,$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in \mathcal{X}$. A key result is that this formulation is equivalent to the minimization of the following functional (Jouvet and Rappaz, 2011; Jouvet, 2016):

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{v}) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{2A^{-\frac{1}{n}}}{1+1/n} |\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v})|^{1+\frac{1}{n}} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_b} \frac{c}{1+m} |\mathbf{v}|^{1+m} \, d\Gamma \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$+ \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} p_w \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\Gamma - \int_{\Omega} \rho_i \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Omega. \quad (\text{B7})$$

B2 Elimination of the vertical velocity

The functional $\mathcal{J}$ can be written as a function of $\mathbf{u}$ only by applying suitable assumptions. We consider each of its components separately.

The first term involves the strain-rate tensor $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v})$. It can be simplified using the small aspect ratio of ice sheets, which leads to strain rates $\partial_x w$ and $\partial_y w$ that are much smaller than $\partial_z u$ and $\partial_z v$. Consequently, $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{v})$ can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_x u & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_y u + \partial_x v) & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_z u + \partial_x w) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_y u + \partial_x v) & \partial_y v & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_z v + \partial_y w) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_z u + \partial_x w) & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_z v + \partial_y w) & \partial_z w \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x u & \frac{1}{2}(\partial_y u + \partial_x v) & \frac{1}{2}\partial_z u \\ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_y u + \partial_x v) & \partial_y v & \frac{1}{2}\partial_z v \\ \frac{1}{2}\partial_z u & \frac{1}{2}\partial_z v & -\partial_x u - \partial_y v \end{pmatrix},$$

in which we have also used the incompressibility condition (2b) for $\partial_z w$. As this expression depends only on the horizontal velocity, we can abuse notation and write it as $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{u})$. For the second term, we rely on the non-penetration condition (5a) at the base, which yields $w = \nabla b \cdot \mathbf{u}$. Hence, over Γ_b ,

$$|\mathbf{v}|^2 = |\mathbf{u}|^2 + w^2 = |\mathbf{u}|^2 + (\nabla b \cdot \mathbf{u})^2, \quad (\text{B8})$$

which defines a norm for $\mathbf{u}$ that we write $|\mathbf{u}|_b$. Finally, for the last two terms, we successively compute

$$\int_{\Omega} (\nabla s \cdot \mathbf{u} - w) \, d\Omega = \int_{\Omega} \nabla(s - z) \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Omega \quad (\text{B9a})$$

$$= \int_{\partial\Omega} (s - z)(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \, d\Gamma \quad (\text{B9b})$$

$$- \int_{\Omega} (s - z)(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \, d\Omega \quad (\text{B9c})$$

$$= \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} (s - z)(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \, d\Gamma, \quad (\text{B9d})$$

where the last equality follows from the incompressibility condition (2b), the equality $z = s$ on the upper surface, and the non-penetration condition at the lower surface. Hence, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_i \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{v} \, d\Omega = - \int_{\Omega} \rho_i g \nabla s \cdot \mathbf{u} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} \rho_i g (s - z)(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \, d\Gamma. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Because the calving front is vertical, its outward normal has no vertical component, and therefore $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ on Γ_{cf} . Using the previous identity, the contributions in $\mathcal{J}$ associated with the hydrostatic water pressure and the gravity term (the last two terms in (B6)) are given by

$$\int_{\Omega} \rho_i g \nabla s \cdot \mathbf{u} \, d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} [\rho_i g (s - z) - p_w] \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\Gamma. \quad (\text{B11})$$

The term in brackets is the local pressure imbalance between the cryostatic ice pressure and the hydrostatic water pressure at the calving front.

Overall, it follows that the functional $\mathcal{J}$ can be written as a function of $\mathbf{u}$ only:

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{u}) := \int_{\Omega} \frac{2A^{-\frac{1}{n}}}{1+1/n} |\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{u})|^{1+\frac{1}{n}} \, d\Omega + \int_{\Gamma_b} \frac{c}{1+m} |\mathbf{u}|_b^{1+m} \, d\Gamma + \int_{\Omega} \rho_i g \nabla s \cdot \mathbf{u} \, d\Omega - \int_{\Gamma_{cf}} [\rho_i g (s - z) - p_w] \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, d\Gamma.$$

Appendix C: Thermodynamics

C1 Enthalpy formulation

Modeling the thermal state of glaciers is complex, with some regions at the pressure-melting point while others are not (Fowler and Larson, 1978; Hutter, 1982; Blatter and Hutter, 1991; Hewitt and Schoof, 2017). We here use an enthalpy formulation (Aschwandten et al., 2012) implemented in the Parallel Ice Sheet Model (Khroulev and the PISM Authors, 2020). Two ice regimes are typically defined:

- cold ice: $T < T_{\text{pmp}}$ and $\omega = 0$;
- temperate ice: $T = T_{\text{pmp}}$ and $\omega > 0$.




Figure C1. Rationale behind the introduction of the enthalpy. When the ice is cold (blue region), meaning it is below the melting point, the enthalpy is simply proportional to the temperature minus a reference temperature. When the ice is temperate (orange region), the enthalpy continues to increase. In this case, the additional component $L\omega$ accounts for the creation of water content through energy transfer.

The pressure-melting-point temperature T_{pmp} depends on pressure through the Clausius–Clapeyron relation:

$$T_{\text{pmp}} = T_{\text{pmp}}^0 - \beta p, \quad (\text{C1})$$

with $p = \rho_i g(s - z)$ the ice pressure (approximated as cryostatic), $\beta > 0$ the Clausius–Clapeyron constant and T_{pmp}^0 the pressure-melting-point temperature at standard pressure. To avoid dealing with the two variables (T, ω) , it is convenient to introduce the enthalpy $E = E(x, t)$ as follows:

$$E = \begin{cases} E_{\text{pmp}} + c_i(T - T_{\text{pmp}}), & \text{for cold ice,} \\ E_{\text{pmp}} + L\omega, & \text{for temperate ice,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$E_{\text{pmp}} + L\omega, \quad \text{for temperate ice,} \quad (\text{C2b})$$

where c_i and L are the specific heat capacity and latent heat of ice, respectively; see Fig. C1. Importantly, each value of E corresponds to a unique state (T, ω) , so the values of these variables can be inferred once E is known. Since enthalpy can be defined up to an additive constant, we can choose the offset value for E_{pmp} ; here, we choose it in such a way that the enthalpy is zero at a reference temperature T_{ref} :

$$E_{\text{pmp}} = c_i(T_{\text{pmp}} - T_{\text{ref}}). \quad (\text{C3})$$

In the enthalpy formulation, energy conservation takes the form of an advection–diffusion equation for the enthalpy (Aschwanden et al., 2012):

$$\rho_i \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla E \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(K \frac{\partial E}{\partial z} \right) + \Phi - \rho_w L D_w, \quad (\text{C4})$$

where K is the effective diffusivity, Φ is the rate of viscous dissipation, and D_w is a water drainage function; the vertical coordinate z points upward, so that $-K \partial_z E$ is the upward conductive heat flux. The effective diffusivity depends on the thermal state of the ice, and is typically chosen as $K = k_i/c_i$ for cold ice, and $K = \epsilon k_i/c_i$ for temperate ice, with k_i the

thermal conductivity of (cold) ice and in which $\epsilon \ll 1$. The rate of viscous dissipation is given by

$$\Phi = \boldsymbol{\sigma} : \mathbf{D} = 2\eta \mathbf{D} : \mathbf{D}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

The water drainage function is typically parametrized as a simple function of ω (e.g., Greve, 1997; Aschwanden et al., 2012).

Equation (C4) must be supplemented with suitable boundary conditions. At the upper ice surface, the temperature (or equivalently, the enthalpy) prescribed by the climate forcing is imposed as a Dirichlet boundary condition, capped at the pressure-melting point:

$$T = \min(T_s, T_{\text{pmp}}^0). \quad (\text{C6})$$

The conditions at the base are more complex, and result from the interactions between the heat energy balance at the base and the hydrological state (whether there is liquid water at the base). There are four categories (Aschwanden et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2020):

- (a) Cold base and dry bed: $E < E_{\text{pmp}}$ and $h_w = 0$;
- (b) Cold base and wet bed: $E < E_{\text{pmp}}$ and $h_w > 0$;
- (c) Temperate base and no basal temperate layer: $E \geq E_{\text{pmp}}$ at the base but $E < E_{\text{pmp}}$ just above it;
- (d) Temperate base and basal temperate layer: $E \geq E_{\text{pmp}}$ at the base and just above it.

In the implementation, a dry bed ($h_w = 0$) is always treated as cold, so that cases (c) and (d) require $h_w > 0$. This results in the following Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions for the enthalpy at the base, for cases (a)–(d) respectively:

$$K \partial_z E = -(q_{\text{geo}} + \phi), \quad (\text{a}) \quad (\text{C7a})$$

$$E = E_{\text{pmp}}, \quad (\text{b}) \quad (\text{C7b})$$

$$E = E_{\text{pmp}}, \quad (\text{c}) \quad (\text{C7c})$$

$$\partial_z E = 0, \quad (\text{d}) \quad (\text{C7d})$$

Here, ϕ is the frictional dissipation at the ice–bed interface, given by $\phi = c|\mathbf{u}|_b^{m+1}$ for the Weertman friction law.

The thermal state of the ice impacts ice flow at two levels: through the modification of the Arrhenius factor in the effective viscosity, and through a change in the basal conditions.

C1.1 Arrhenius factor

The effect of temperature and water content on the Arrhenius factor follows the Glen–Paterson–Budd–Lliboutry–Duval law (Glen, 1955; Paterson and Budd, 1982; Lliboutry and Duval, 1985):

$$A(T, \omega) = A_0(1 + 181.25\omega) \exp(-Q/RT_{\text{pa}}), \quad (\text{C8})$$

in which A_0 is a prefactor, Q is an activation energy, R is the universal gas constant, and $T_{\text{pa}} := T + \beta p$ is the pressure-adjusted temperature, defined in such a way that the pressure melting point is at T_{pm}^0 . Both A_0 and Q take different values as a function of the temperature, based on empirical relations (see, e.g., Cuffey and Paterson, 2010).

C1.2 Melt rate

At the bed, the melt rate is computed as follows:

$$\dot{a}_b = \frac{1}{\rho_i(1-\omega)L} \left(q_{\text{geo}} + \phi + K \frac{\partial E}{\partial z} \right) + \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_i} \int_b^s D_w(\omega) dz. \quad (\text{C9})$$

The first term stems from a heat balance at the ice–bed interface, and the second one results from the drainage through the full ice column.

C1.3 Till effective pressure

Assuming a simple local storage model, water then accumulates into the till as follows (Bueler and van Pelt, 2015):

$$\partial_t h_w = \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_w} \dot{a}_b - \dot{a}_{\text{dr}}, \quad (\text{C10})$$

in which h_w is the effective thickness of water in the till, and $\dot{a}_{\text{dr}}$ is an aquifer drainage rate. The thickness h_w is further capped at a maximum value $h_w = h_w^{\text{max}}$. The effect of till water content on ice sliding can be modeled by assuming that the reference basal shear stress τ_{ref} follows a Mohr–Coulomb behavior (Hooke et al., 1997; Tulaczyk et al., 2000):

$$\tau_{\text{ref}} = \tan \phi N_{\text{till}}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

in which ϕ denotes a till friction angle and the till effective pressure N_{till} is obtained from the following equations (Bueler and van Pelt, 2015):

$$N_{\text{till}} = N_0 (\delta \rho_i g h / N_0)^{s_{\text{till}}} 10^{(e_0/C_c)(1-s_{\text{till}})}, \quad (\text{C12a})$$

$$s_{\text{till}} = h_w / h_w^{\text{max}}. \quad (\text{C12b})$$

Here, δ is a fixed fraction corresponding to the lower bound for N_{till} with respect to the ice overburden pressure, N_0 is a reference effective pressure, e_0 is the reference void ratio at N_0 , and C_c is the till compressibility.

C2 Numerics

A different vertical discretization is adopted for the enthalpy field, because its vertical structure is typically qualitatively different from that of the velocity. While the velocity profile is generally smooth and well approximated by low-order polynomials, enthalpy often exhibits stronger variations near the bed and a discontinuity in its vertical gradient at the cold–temperate transition surface. We therefore write

$$E(x_i, y_j, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{N}_z} (\mathbf{E}_H)_{kji} \tilde{\phi}_k(\zeta(z)), \quad (\text{C13})$$

where $\mathbf{E}_H \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{N}_z \times N_y \times N_x}$ denotes the enthalpy degrees of freedom. For the basis functions $\{\tilde{\phi}_k\}_{k=1}^{\tilde{N}_z}$, we use Lagrange shape functions defined on a vertically stretched grid whose node density increases quadratically toward the bed in order to better resolve this region. In practice, $N_z, \tilde{N}_z \ll N_x, N_y$.

Finally, the Arrhenius factor is represented as an effective horizontal tensor field $\mathbf{A}_H \in \mathbb{R}^{N_y \times N_x}$, obtained by vertically averaging its value according to the rheological exponent in equation (7):

$$(\mathbf{A}_H)_{ji} := \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_b^s A^{-\frac{1}{n}} dz \right)^{-n} \Big|_{(x,y)=(x_i,y_j)}. \quad (\text{C14})$$

The enthalpy field, discretized as described above and in Section 3.4, is updated by solving the advection–diffusion equation (C4) subject to the boundary conditions (C6)–(C7). This equation is solved with an operator-splitting approach: horizontal advection is treated explicitly in the first step, and vertical advection–diffusion implicitly in the second. Denoting by $E^n(\mathbf{x}) := E(\mathbf{x}, t^n)$ the enthalpy at time t^n , the first step reads:

$$E^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = E^n - \Delta t \left(u \frac{\partial E^n}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial E^n}{\partial y} \right), \quad (\text{C15})$$

where horizontal derivatives are approximated by upwind finite differences at every grid node. The second step reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i \left(\frac{E^{n+1} - E^{n+\frac{1}{2}}}{\Delta t} + w \frac{\partial E^{n+1}}{\partial z} \right) \\ = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(K \frac{\partial E^{n+1}}{\partial z} \right) + \Phi - \rho_w L D_w(\omega^{n+\frac{1}{2}}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C16})$$

where vertical advection is discretized with an upwind scheme and diffusion with a centered scheme. Since equation (C16) contains no horizontal coupling, it decouples into $N_x \times N_y$ independent tridiagonal systems of size $\tilde{N}_z$ (one per ice column), solved in parallel using the Thomas algorithm. Following the enthalpy solve, excess water content in the ice column is drained and added to the basal melt rate via equation (C9). The till water thickness and the till effective pressure are then updated by the subglacial hydrology module according to equation (C10), and the Mohr–Coulomb closure (C11) is evaluated within the ice-flow module when the corresponding friction law is selected.

Appendix D: Benchmarks

To verify the correctness of the core ice-flow and thermodynamics (enthalpy) modules, IGM has been successfully run against standard community benchmarks. Specifically, we reproduce experiment B of the ISMIP-HOM intercomparison (Pattyn et al., 2008), which tests higher-order ice-flow solvers against a full-Stokes reference (Fig. D1), as well

as experiments A and B of the Kleiner et al. (2015) enthalpy benchmark, which assess the transient thermodynamics against reference solutions (Figs. D2, D3). In all cases, IGM’s results agree closely with the reference solutions or expected benchmark behavior, confirming the correctness of the implementation.

Appendix E: Project folder layout

A typical IGM project lives in a single directory containing four subdirectories:

```
10 experiment/params.yaml # config. file
   data/...             # input data
   outputs/             # output directory
   user/...             # opt. user modules
```

experiment/ Holds one or more YAML configuration files (typically `params.yaml`). A single file fully specifies the simulation: which modules to run, their parameters, and any Hydra overrides. Several files can coexist to represent different experiments or sensitivity runs.

data/ Holds the input data required by the selected input modules, such as NetCDF files with bed topography, ice thickness, or surface elevation. The path and filenames are referenced from the YAML configuration.

outputs/ Created by Hydra at run time. By default, Hydra names each run subfolder after the launch date and time (e.g., `outputs/2026-04-15/14-32-07/`; ensemble members go to `multirun/`), so successive runs do not overwrite each other; this pattern can be customized via Hydra’s `hydra.run.dir` setting. Each run folder contains the outputs produced by the output modules together with a `.hydra/` subfolder that records the full, resolved configuration used for that run (Section 5.3).

user/ Optional. Contains user-written modules that extend or replace core modules without modifying the IGM source tree. The internal layout of a user module is detailed in Appendix H.

The simulation is launched from the project root with `igm_run +experiment=params`; Hydra then composes the final configuration by combining built-in defaults, the YAML file, and any command-line overrides (Appendix I).

Appendix F: Core code structure

The `igm_run.py` script is the command-line entry point, invoked as `igm_run` after installation. Using the runner utilities in `common/`, it builds the four module lists (inputs, assimilations, processes, outputs) from the resolved Hydra configuration and then executes the following loop:

```
# build the four module lists from the Hydra cfg
(inputs, assimilations,
 processes, outputs) = setup(cfg, state)

# input modules: load data once
for m in inputs:
    m.run(cfg, state)

# init output modules: e.g., open files
for m in outputs:
    m.initialize(cfg, state)

# init process modules
for m in assimilations+processes:
    m.initialize(cfg, state)

# time loop
while state.continue_run:
    for m in assimilations+processes:
        m.update(cfg, state) # update state
    for m in outputs:
        m.run(cfg, state) # write results

# finalize, e.g. write score
for m in assimilations+processes:
    m.finalize(cfg, state)

This interface defines the contract that each module cate-
gory must respect:
```

- an *input* module must provide a `run(cfg, state)` function (called once to load data into state),
- an *assimilation* or *process* module must provide three functions `initialize(cfg, state)`, `update(cfg, state)`, and `finalize(cfg, state)` (called once before, at every time step, and once after the time loop, respectively),
- an *output* module must provide `initialize(cfg, state)` (called once before the loop, e.g., to open files), `run(cfg, state)` (called at every time step to write the current state), and `finalize(cfg, state)`.

The shared `state` object carries the glacier state as TensorFlow tensors: for instance, `state.thk` is the ice thickness, `state.smb` the surface mass balance, `state.t` the current time, and so on. These fields can be read or assigned freely within a module, and changes propagate to all subsequent modules in the pipeline. The `cfg` object exposes the resolved Hydra configuration as a hierarchically structured parameter tree (e.g., `cfg.processes.time.end`; see Appendix I). A *user module* (Appendix H) reproduces this same layout on a smaller scale inside the project’s `user/` directory, so that user-defined modules can be picked up by the runner exactly as if they were part of the core package, without modifying the IGM source tree.




Figure D1. ISMIP-HOM test case, experiment B (Pattyn et al., 2008). Reference is ‘oga’, corresponding to the full-Stokes submission from the finite-element code Elmer/Ice (Gagliardini and Zwinger, 2008).




Figure D2. Experiment A of Kleiner et al. (2015). Reference corresponds to the numerical solutions shown in Kleiner et al. (2015).




Figure D3. Experiment B of Kleiner et al. (2015). Reference is the analytical solution of the problem.

Appendix G: Core process modules

Table G1 lists the main core process modules (Fig. 4) shipped with IGM, together with the physical or numerical process they handle and their primary I/O fields on the shared state object. Each module is referenced by the name that appears in the Hydra configuration (e.g., `cfg.processes.iceflow`). An up-to-date list of all modules, with complete parameter documentation, is maintained online at <https://igm-model.org>.

Appendix H: Creating a user module

IGM users can easily add custom physical processes without modifying the core source code (Section 5, Appendix F). A user module consists of a Python file (the code) and a YAML file (its default parameters), placed inside the `user/` directory of the project (Appendix E):

```
user/
  code/
    processes/
      mysmb.py      # module code
  conf/
    processes/
      mysmb.yaml    # default params
```

As described in Appendix F, every process module must define three functions `initialize(cfg, state)`, `update(cfg, state)`, and `finalize(cfg, state)`, called once before the time loop, at every time step, and once after the time loop, respectively. All three must be present, even if empty (`pass`). The `cfg` and `state` objects are the same as described in Appendix F: `cfg` provides hierarchical access to the module’s parameters (e.g., `cfg.processes.mysmb.meanela`), and `state`

Table G1. Overview of the main core process modules in IGM (Fig. 4), with their role and key I/O variables on the shared `state` object. For brevity, only the primary fields are listed.

Module	Process modeled	Inputs	Outputs
climate	Climate forcing	usurf	air_temp, air_temp_sd, precipitation
smb	Surface mass balance	air_temp, precipitation	smb
enthalpy	Englacial enthalpy and basal melt	thk, air_temp, arrhenius, U, V, W	E, basal_melt_rate
arrhenius	Arrhenius factor	E	arrhenius
subglacial_hydrology	Subglacial hydrology	thk, topg, water_level	effective_pressure
iceflow	Ice-flow solver	thk, usurf, topg, arrhenius	U, V, W, ubar, vbar
time	Time stepping	ubar, vbar	t, dt
thk	Ice-thickness evolution	thk, topg, ubar, vbar, smb	thk, usurf, divflux
particles	Lagrangian particle tracking	U, V, W, thk	particle

carries the glacier fields as TensorFlow tensors that can be read or assigned freely. As a concrete illustration, we implement a simple SMB module. The Python file `mysmb.py` in `user/code/processes/` reads:

```
5 def initialize(cfg, state):
    pass
```

```
def update(cfg, state):
    ELA = cfg.processes.mysmb.meanela
10 state.smb = state.usurf - ELA
    state.smb *= 0.005
```

```
def finalize(cfg, state):
    pass
```

15 The companion parameter file `mysmb.yaml` sets the default mean ELA:

```
mysmb:
    meanela: 3000.0
```

Finally, the experiment configuration file `params.yaml` registers the user module and inserts it into the process pipeline:

```
defaults:
    - /user/conf/processes@processes: mysmb
25 - override /processes:
    - mysmb
    - iceflow
    - time
    - thk
30 - override /outputs:
    - local
```

The ordering of the process list matters: here, `mysmb` is called before `thk` so that the updated SMB is available when the ice thickness is updated.

35 Although the example above illustrates a process module, user-defined *input* and *output* modules can be added in exactly the same way: they simply have to be placed under `user/code/inputs/` or `user/code/outputs/` (with a matching YAML in `user/conf/inputs/` or

`user/conf/outputs/`) and to implement the functions 40 required by their category, as specified in Appendix F (run for an input module; `initialize` and `run` for an output module).

Appendix I: Parameter management

IGM relies on the Hydra configuration framework (Yadan, 45 2019) to manage all simulation parameters. At run time, Hydra collects the per-module YAML parameter files shipped with the core package as well as those provided by any user modules, applies several levels of overrides (see below), and exposes the resulting hierarchical parameter tree as the `cfg` 50 object passed to every module function (Appendix F). Parameters follow a three-tier override hierarchy, from lowest to highest priority:

1. **Built-in defaults.** Each IGM module ships with a YAML file defining its default parameter values. For ex- 55 ample, the built-in defaults for the surface mass balance module include:

```
smb:
    method: simple
    simple:
        update_freq: 1.0
        file: param.txt
        array: []
```

2. **Experiment file.** The user-written YAML file (e.g., `experiment/params.yaml`) selects which mod- 65 ules to activate via a `defaults` list, and overrides specific parameter values:

```
# @package _global_

defaults:
    - override /inputs:
    - local
    - override /processes:
```

70

```

- smb
- iceflow
- time
- thk
5 - override /outputs:
  - local

processes:
  smb:
10   method: simple
  simple:
    update_freq: 1.0

```

3. Command-line overrides. Any parameter can be overridden at runtime using dot notation:

```

15 igm_run +experiment=params \
    processes.time.end=2200

```

Every IGM run automatically creates a `.hydra/` directory containing the complete, merged configuration:

```

20 .hydra/
    config.yaml # final/merged params
    hydra.yaml # Hydra run settings
    overrides.yaml # CLI overrides applied

```

This record is sufficient to reproduce the simulation exactly: it captures the selected modules and all final parameter values (whether set by defaults, the experiment file, or the command line).

Author contributions. The IGM core development team includes Guillaume Jouvet, Brandon Finley, Thomas Gregov and Sebastian Rosier. G.J. conceived and created IGM, was the main applicant to acquire funding to develop it, and was the primary developer through 2025, writing the bulk of the code modules and documentation, which were subsequently extended and enriched by all co-authors. G.J. wrote most of the manuscript. B.F. led IGM's software engineering from 2024, created the core code design framework, integrated Hydra, created the IGM website, and implemented the automated workflows (CI/CD) for PyPI packaging, website documentation, and unit tests. B.F. made significant performance optimizations and code refactoring for the ice-flow and particle modules. He wrote most of the software design section and contributed to the figures. From 2025 onward, T.G. significantly enhanced the ice-flow and enthalpy modules, improving robustness, code readability, documentation and test coverage. T.G. revised the manuscript (Physics and Numerics sections) to reflect the latest code updates (v3.0.1 → v3.2.1), wrote the ice-flow subsection and Appendix B, ran the benchmark tests, and contributed to the figures. From 2025 onward, S.R. fully redesigned the data assimilation and pretraining modules, improving robustness, code readability, testing and benchmarking. S.R. reviewed the manuscript and provided revisions and comments.

Besides the core development team, the other co-authors have made specific contributions to the IGM codebase, documentation, testing, and provided feedback on the manuscript. In particular, Tancrede Leger wrote part of the climate module and carried out tests of the ice-flow module, Lucie Bacchin improved the enthalpy module and modeled the polythermal Svalbard glacier presented in the

applications, Samuel Cook contributed to the `oggm_shop` module, Thomas Frank contributed to the `time_relaxation` module, Andreas Henz contributed to the `avalanche` module and surface mass balance parametrizations, Oskar Herrmann contributed to the `igm_viz` interactive 3D visualization tool, Fabien Maussion contributed to the `oggm_shop` module and its related data, Gillian Smith helped improve the data assimilation module, and Claire-Mathilde Stucki contributed to the computation of the vertical velocity in the ice-flow module.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Andreas Vieli for his early and continued support of IGM, and for many discussions throughout its development. We gratefully acknowledge Guillaume Cordonnier, who collaborated on the early concepts of ice-flow emulation and helped with the very first implementation of IGM. We thank Ethan Welty and Jürgen Mey for their contributions to the `oggm_shop` and `avalanche` modules, respectively. We acknowledge Flavio Calvo and Margot Sirdey for their support in the early development of IGM. We would like to thank Ludovic Räss for the support in the use of GPUs at the Université de Lausanne, and G. Hilmar Gudmundsson for discussions associated with ice-sheet modeling. An LLM (Claude, Anthropic) was used to assist with code development, setting up and running the numerical simulations, writing the figure-generation scripts, and editing the manuscript. The authors reviewed all outputs and take full responsibility for the content of this paper.

Financial support. B.F., T.G., and S.R. have been supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) grant no. 200021-231427 (PINNACLE) awarded to Guillaume Jouvet and Andreas Vieli. T.L. and A.H. have been supported by the SNSF grant no. 200020-213077 (RECONCILE). G.S. was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) Satellite Data in Environmental Science (SENSE) Centre for Doctoral Training (grant no. NE/T00939X/1). T.F. received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 101187992 (TerraDT). S.C. acknowledges funding from the DeLIGHT Framework through the Elitenetzwerk Bayern. F.M. received support from the Research Software Maintenance Fund, managed by the Software Sustainability Institute and funded by UKRI grant reference AH/Z000114/1 and by the EU FP7 project LIQUIDICE (grant no. 101184962).

References

Abadi, M., Agarwal, A., Barham, P., Brevdo, E., Chen, Z., Citro, C., Corrado, G. S., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Goodfellow, I., Harp, A., Irving, G., Isard, M., Jia, Y., Jozefowicz, R., Kaiser, L., Kudlur, M., Levenberg, J., Mané, D., Monga, R., Moore, S., Murray, D., Olah, C., Schuster, M., Shlens, J., Steiner, B., Sutskever, I., Talwar, K., Tucker, P., Vanhoucke, V., Vasudevan, V., Viégas, F., Vinyals, O., Warden, P.,

- Wattenberg, M., Wicke, M., Yu, Y., and Zheng, X.: TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Systems, <https://www.tensorflow.org/>, software available from tensorflow.org, 2015.
- Ahlkrona, J., Henry, A. C. J., and Löfgren, A.: A fully implicit second order method for viscous free surface Stokes flow – application to glacier simulations, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 19, 2333–2348, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-19-2333-2026>, 2026.
- Aissa, M., Verstraete, T., and Vuik, C.: Toward a GPU-aware comparison of explicit and implicit CFD simulations on structured meshes, *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 74, 201–217, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2017.03.003>, 2017.
- Akiba, T., Sano, S., Yanase, T., Ohta, T., and Koyama, M.: Optuna: A Next-generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework, in: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 2623–2631, ACM, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330701>, 2019.
- Aschwanden, A., Bueler, E., Khroulev, C., and Blatter, H.: An enthalpy formulation for glaciers and ice sheets, *Journal of Glaciology*, 58, 441–457, <https://doi.org/10.3189/2012jog11j088>, 2012.
- Barnhart, K. R., Hutton, E. W. H., Tucker, G. E., Gasparini, N. M., Istanbuluoglu, E., Hogley, D. E. J., Lyons, N. J., Mouchene, M., Nudurupati, S. S., Adams, J. M., and Bandaragoda, C.: Short communication: Landlab v2.0: a software package for Earth surface dynamics, *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 8, 379–397, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-8-379-2020>, 2020.
- Blatter, H.: Velocity and stress fields in grounded glaciers: a simple algorithm for including deviatoric stress gradients, *Journal of Glaciology*, 41, 333–344, <https://doi.org/10.3189/s002214300001621x>, 1995.
- Blatter, H. and Hutter, K.: Polythermal conditions in arctic glaciers, *Journal of Glaciology*, 37, 261–269, <https://doi.org/10.3189/s0022143000007279>, 1991.
- Bolibar, J., Sapienza, F., Maussion, F., Lguensat, R., Wouters, B., and Pérez, F.: Universal differential equations for glacier ice flow modelling, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 16, 6671–6687, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-6671-2023>, 2023.
- Brædstrup, C. F., Damsgaard, A., and Egholm, D. L.: Ice-sheet modelling accelerated by graphics cards, *Computers & Geosciences*, 72, 210–220, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2014.07.019>, 2014.
- Brinkerhoff, D., Aschwanden, A., and Fahnestock, M.: Constraining subglacial processes from surface velocity observations using surrogate-based Bayesian inference, *Journal of Glaciology*, 67, 385–403, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2020.112>, 2021.
- Budd, W. F., Keage, P. L., and Blundy, N. A.: Empirical studies of ice sliding, *Journal of Glaciology*, 23, 157–170, <https://doi.org/10.3189/S0022143000029804>, 1979.
- Bueler, E. and van Pelt, W.: Mass-conserving subglacial hydrology in the Parallel Ice Sheet Model version 0.6, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8, 1613–1635, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-1613-2015>, 2015.
- Burgard, C., Jourdain, N. C., Mathiot, P., Smith, R. S., Schäfer, R., Caillet, J., Finn, T. S., and Johnson, J. E.: Emulating Present and Future Simulations of Melt Rates at the Base of Antarctic Ice Shelves With Neural Networks, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 15, e2023MS003829, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023ms003829>, 2023.
- Calov, R. and Greve, R.: A semi-analytical solution for the positive degree-day model with stochastic temperature variations, *Journal of Glaciology*, 51, 173–175, <https://doi.org/10.3189/172756505781829601>, 2005.
- Cheng, G., Krishna, M., and Morlighem, M.: A Python library for solving ice sheet modeling problems using physics-informed neural networks, PINNACLE v1.0, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 18, 5311–5327, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-18-5311-2025>, 2025.
- Colinge, J. and Rappaz, J.: A strongly nonlinear problem arising in glaciology, *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 33, 395–406, <https://doi.org/10.1051/m2an:1999122>, 1999.
- Cordonnier, G., Jouvet, G., Peytavie, A., Braun, J., Cani, M.-P., Benes, B., Galin, E., Guérin, E., and Gain, J.: Forming terrains by glacial erosion, *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 42, 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3592422>, 2023.
- Cuffey, K. M. and Paterson, W. S. B.: *The Physics of Glaciers*, Academic Press, Burlington, MA, 4 edn., ISBN 9780123694614, 2010.
- Deb, K., Pratap, A., Agarwal, S., and Meyarivan, T.: A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II, *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 6, 182–197, <https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.996017>, 2002.
- Dias dos Santos, T., Morlighem, M., and Brinkerhoff, D.: A new vertically integrated MOno-Layer Higher-Order (MOLHO) ice flow model, *The Cryosphere*, 16, 179–195, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-16-179-2022>, 2022.
- E, W. and Yu, B.: The Deep Ritz Method: A Deep Learning-Based Numerical Algorithm for Solving Variational Problems, *Communications in Mathematics and Statistics*, 6, 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40304-018-0127-z>, 2018.
- Farinotti, D., Huss, M., Fürst, J. J., Landmann, J., Machguth, H., Maussion, F., and Pandit, A.: A consensus estimate for the ice thickness distribution of all glaciers on Earth, *Nature Geoscience*, 12, 168–173, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0300-3>, 2019.
- Farr, T. G., Rosen, P. A., Caro, E., Crippen, R., Duren, R., Hensley, S., Kobrick, M., Paller, M., Rodriguez, E., Roth, L., Seal, D., Shaffer, S., Shimada, J., Umland, J., Werner, M., Oskin, M., Burbank, D., and Alsdorf, D.: The Shuttle Radar Topography Mission, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 45, RG2004, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005RG000183>, 2007.
- Fowler, A. C.: A Theoretical Treatment of the Sliding of Glaciers in the Absence of Cavitation, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 298, 637–681, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1981.0003>, 1981.
- Fowler, A. C. and Larson, D. A.: On the flow of polythermal glaciers - I. Model and preliminary analysis, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 363, 217–242, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1978.0165>, 1978.
- Frank, T. and van Pelt, W. J. J.: Ice volume and thickness of all Scandinavian glaciers and ice caps, *Journal of Glaciology*, 70, e11, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2024.25>, 2024.
- Frank, T., van Pelt, W. J. J., Rounce, D. R., Jouvet, G., and Hock, R.: Global glacier-free topography reveals a large potential for future lakes in presently ice-covered terrain, *Nature Communications*, 17, 3985, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-026-72548-9>, 2026.

- Gagliardini, O. and Zwinger, T.: The ISMIP-HOM benchmark experiments performed using the Finite-Element code Elmer, *The Cryosphere*, 2, 67–76, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2-67-2008>, 2008.
- ⁵ Gagliardini, O., Cohen, D., Råback, P., and Zwinger, T.: Finite-element modeling of subglacial cavities and related friction law, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 112, F02027, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006jf000576>, 2007.
- Gagliardini, O., Zwinger, T., Gillet-Chaulet, F., Durand, G., Favier, L., de Fleurian, B., Greve, R., Malinen, M., Martín, C., Råback, P., Ruokolainen, J., Sacchetti, M., Schäfer, M., Seddik, H., and Thies, J.: Capabilities and performance of Elmer/Ice, a new-generation ice sheet model, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 6, 1299–1318, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-1299-2013>, 2013.
- ¹⁵ Gaudreault, S., Rainwater, G., and Tokman, M.: KLOPS: A fast adaptive Krylov subspace solver for exponential integrators, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 372, 236–255, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2018.06.026>, 2018.
- Glen, J. W.: The creep of polycrystalline ice, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 228, 519–538, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1955.0066>, 1955.
- ²⁰ Gregov, T., Rosier, S., Finley, B., Vieli, A., and Jouvet, G.: Physics-enriched neural solvers for transient ice-flow simulation, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2609.12900>, 2026.
- ²⁵ Greve, R.: A continuum-mechanical formulation for shallow polythermal ice sheets, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 355, 921–974, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.1997.0050>, 1997.
- ³⁰ Hardmeier, F., Miles, E., Muñoz-Hermosilla, J. M., Jouvet, G., and Vieli, A.: The effect of debris supply on glacier evolution: sensitivities and challenges, in: EGU General Assembly 2026, Vienna, Austria, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu26-21688>, 2026.
- ³⁵ He, Q., Perego, M., Howard, A. A., Karniadakis, G. E., and Stinis, P.: A hybrid deep neural operator/finite element method for ice-sheet modeling, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 492, 112428, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2023.112428>, 2023.
- Herterich, K.: On the Flow within the Transition Zone between Ice Sheet and Ice Shelf, in: *Dynamics of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet*, edited by Van der Veen, C. J. and Oerlemans, J., vol. 4 of *Glaciology and Quaternary Geology*, pp. 185–202, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, ISBN 9789400937451, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3745-1_11, 1987.
- ⁴⁰ Hewitt, I. J. and Schoof, C.: Models for polythermal ice sheets and glaciers, *The Cryosphere*, 11, 541–551, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-11-541-2017>, 2017.
- Hobley, D. E., Adams, J. M., Nudurupati, S. S., Hutton, E. W., Gasparini, N. M., Istanbuloglu, E., and Tucker, G. E.: Creative computing with Landlab: an open-source toolkit for building, coupling, and exploring two-dimensional numerical models of Earth-surface dynamics, *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 5, 21–46, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-5-21-2017>, 2017.
- ⁴⁵ Hock, R.: Temperature index melt modelling in mountain areas, *Journal of Hydrology*, 282, 104–115, [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-1694\(03\)00257-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-1694(03)00257-9), 2003.
- Hoffman, M. J., Perego, M., Price, S. F., Lipscomb, W. H., Zhang, T., Jacobsen, D., Tezaur, I., Salinger, A. G., Tuminaro, R., and Bertagna, L.: MPAS-Albany Land Ice (MALI): a variable-resolution ice sheet model for Earth system modeling using Voronoi grids, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 11, 3747–3780, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-3747-2018>, 2018.
- ⁶⁰ Hooke, R. L., Hanson, B., Iverson, N. R., Jansson, P., and Fischer, U. H.: Rheology of till beneath Storglaciären, Sweden, *Journal of Glaciology*, 43, 172–179, <https://doi.org/10.3189/S0022143000002938>, 1997.
- ⁶⁵ Howard, A. A., Perego, M., Karniadakis, G. E., and Stinis, P.: Multifidelity deep operator networks for data-driven and physics-informed problems, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 493, 112462, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2023.112462>, 2023.
- ⁷⁰ Hugonnet, R., McNabb, R., Berthier, E., Menounos, B., Nuth, C., Girod, L., Farinotti, D., Huss, M., Dussaillant, I., Brun, F., and Kääb, A.: Accelerated global glacier mass loss in the early twenty-first century, *Nature*, 592, 726–731, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03436-z>, 2021.
- ⁷⁵ Hutter, K.: A mathematical model of polythermal glaciers and ice sheets, *Geophysical & Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics*, 21, 201–224, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03091928208209013>, 1982.
- Hutton, E., Barnhart, K., Hobley, D., Tucker, G., Nudurupati, S., Adams, J., Gasparini, N., Shobe, C., Strauch, R., Knuth, J., Mouchene, M., Lyons, N., Litwin, D., Glade, R., Giuseppe Cipolla, Manaster, A., Abby, L., Thyng, K., and Rengers, F.: landlab, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.595872>, software, 2020.
- ⁸⁰ Jinini, A., Vella, F., and Zeinhofer, M.: Gauss-Newton Natural Gradient Descent for Physics-informed Computational Fluid Dynamics, *Computers & Fluids*, 307, 106955, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compfluid.2025.106955>, 2026.
- Jouvet, G.: Mechanical error estimators for shallow ice flow models, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 807, 40–61, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jfm.2016.593>, 2016.
- ⁹⁰ Jouvet, G.: Inversion of a Stokes glacier flow model emulated by deep learning, *Journal of Glaciology*, 69, 13–26, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2022.41>, 2023.
- Jouvet, G. and Cordonnier, G.: Ice-flow model emulator based on physics-informed deep learning, *Journal of Glaciology*, 69, 1941–1955, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2023.73>, 2023.
- ⁹⁵ Jouvet, G. and Rappaz, J.: Analysis and Finite Element Approximation of a Nonlinear Stationary Stokes Problem Arising in Glaciology, *Advances in Numerical Analysis*, 2011, 1–24, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/164581>, 2011.
- ¹⁰⁰ Jouvet, G., Huss, M., Funk, M., and Blatter, H.: Modelling the retreat of Grosser Aletschgletscher, Switzerland, in a changing climate, *Journal of Glaciology*, 57, 1033–1045, <https://doi.org/10.3189/002214311798843359>, 2011.
- ¹⁰⁵ Jouvet, G., Cordonnier, G., Kim, B., Lüthi, M., Vieli, A., and Aschwanden, A.: Deep learning speeds up ice flow modelling by several orders of magnitude, *Journal of Glaciology*, 68, 651–664, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2021.120>, 2022.
- Jouvet, G., Finley, B., Gregov, T., Rosier, S., et al.: instructed-glacier-model/igm: v3.2.1, Zenodo [code], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23398788>, 2026a.
- ¹¹⁰ Jouvet, G., Finley, B. D., Gregov, T., Rosier, S. H. R., and Bacchin, L.: Experiments of the IGM v3.2.1 model description paper (GMD), v1.0, Zenodo [code and data set], <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23510929>, 2026b.
- ¹¹⁵

- Kamb, W. B.: Sliding Motion of Glaciers: Theory and Observation, *Reviews of Geophysics and Space Physics*, 8, 673–728, <https://doi.org/10.1029/RG008i004p00673>, 1970.
- Kashi, A. and Nadarajah, S.: On the effectiveness of fine-grain parallel linear iterations for computational aerodynamics on structured grids for graphics processing units, *Computers & Fluids*, 299, 106 714, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compfluid.2025.106714>, 2025.
- Khroulev, C. and the PISM Authors: PISM, a Parallel Ice Sheet Model v1.2: User's Manual, User's manual, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, Alaska, <https://www.pism-docs.org>, 2020.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J.: Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1412.6980>, 2015.
- Kleiner, T., Rückamp, M., Bondzio, J. H., and Humbert, A.: Entalpy benchmark experiments for numerical ice sheet models, *The Cryosphere*, 9, 217–228, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-9-217-2015>, 2015.
- Køltzow, M., Schyberg, H., Støylen, E., and Yang, X.: Value of the Copernicus Arctic Regional Reanalysis (CARRA) in representing near-surface temperature and wind speed in the north-east European Arctic, *Polar Research*, 41, 8002, <https://doi.org/10.33265/polar.v41.8002>, 2022.
- Koo, Y. and Rahnmooonfar, M.: Graph convolutional network as a fast statistical emulator for numerical ice sheet modeling, *Journal of Glaciology*, 71, e15, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2024.93>, 2025.
- Larour, E., Seroussi, H., Morlighem, M., and Rignot, E.: Continental scale, high order, high spatial resolution, ice sheet modeling using the Ice Sheet System Model (ISSM), *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 117, F01 022, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011jf002140>, 2012.
- Leger, T. P. M., Jouvet, G., Kamleitner, S., Mey, J., Herman, F., Finley, B. D., Ivy-Ochs, S., Vieli, A., Henz, A., and Nussbaumer, S. U.: A data-consistent model of the last glaciation in the Alps achieved with physics-driven AI, *Nature Communications*, 16, 848, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-56168-3>, 2025.
- Leger, T. P. M., Jouvet, G., Kamleitner, S., Finley, B. D., Bernard, M., Allegri, B., Herman, F., Vieli, A., Henz, A., and Nussbaumer, S. U.: First Alps-wide reconstruction of LGM glacial sediment transport enabled by GPU-accelerated particle tracking, *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 14, 361–389, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-14-361-2026>, 2026.
- Li, Z., Kovachki, N., Azizzadenesheli, K., Liu, B., Bhattacharya, K., Stuart, A., and Anandkumar, A.: Fourier Neural Operator for Parametric Partial Differential Equations, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations*, <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2010.08895>, 2021.
- Licciulli, C., Bohleber, P., Lier, J., Gagliardini, O., Hoelzle, M., and Eisen, O.: A full Stokes ice-flow model to assist the interpretation of millennial-scale ice cores at the high-Alpine drilling site Colle Gnifetti, Swiss/Italian Alps, *Journal of Glaciology*, 66, 35–48, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jog.2019.82>, 2020.
- Lipscomb, W. H., Price, S. F., Hoffman, M. J., Leguy, G. R., Bennett, A. R., Bradley, S. L., Evans, K. J., Fyke, J. G., Kennedy, J. H., Perego, M., Ranken, D. M., Sacks, W. J., Salinger, A. G., Vargo, L. J., and Worley, P. H.: Description and evaluation of the Community Ice Sheet Model (CISM) v2.1, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12, 387–424, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-387-2019>, 2019.
- Liu, D. C. and Nocedal, J.: On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization, *Mathematical Programming*, 45, 503–528, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01589116>, 1989.
- Lliboutry, L. and Duval, P.: Various isotropic and anisotropic ices found in glaciers and polar ice caps and their corresponding rheologies, *Annales Geophysicae*, 3, 207–224, 1985.
- Mannerfelt, E. S., Enzenhofer, U., Innanen, S., Abderhalden, J., Gillespie, M. K., Ploeg, K., Brunner, J., Kleber, G., Kolar, J., Moholdt, G., Solem, S., and Hodson, A.: Draft dataset publication from Mannerfelt et al., (submitted), <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.17882300>, 2025.
- Maussion, F., Butenko, A., Champollion, N., Dusch, M., Eis, J., Fourteau, K., Gregor, P., Jarosch, A. H., Landmann, J., Oesterle, F., Recinos, B., Rothenpieler, T., Vlug, A., Wild, C. T., and Marzeion, B.: The Open Global Glacier Model (OGGM) v1.1, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12, 909–931, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-909-2019>, 2019.
- Meier, M. F., Tangborn, W. V., Mayo, L. R., and Post, A.: Combined ice and water balances of Gulkana and Wolverine Glaciers, Alaska, and South Cascade Glacier, Washington, 1965 and 1966 hydrologic years, Professional Paper 715-A, U.S. Geological Survey, <https://doi.org/10.3133/pp715a>, 1971.
- Millan, R., Mouginot, J., Rabatel, A., Jeong, S., Cusicanqui, D., Derkacheva, A., and Chekki, M.: Mapping surface flow velocity of glaciers at regional scale using a multiple sensors approach, *Remote Sensing*, 11, 2498, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11212498>, 2019.
- Minchew, B. and Joughin, I.: Toward a universal glacier slip law, *Science*, 368, 29–30, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb3566>, 2020.
- Müller, J. and Zeinhofer, M.: Achieving High Accuracy with PINNs via Energy Natural Gradient Descent, in: *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, edited by Krause, A., Brunskill, E., Cho, K., Engelhardt, B., Sabato, S., and Scarlett, J., vol. 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 25 471–25 485, PMLR, 2023.
- Müller, J. and Zeinhofer, M.: Position: Optimization in SciML Should Employ the Function Space Geometry, in: *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, edited by Salakhutdinov, R., Kolter, Z., Heller, K., Weller, A., Oliver, N., Scarlett, J., and Berkenkamp, F., vol. 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 36 705–36 722, PMLR, 2024.
- Nye, J. F.: A Calculation on the Sliding of Ice over a Wavy Surface using a Newtonian Viscous Approximation, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 311, 445–467, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1969.0127>, 1969.
- Paterson, W. S. B. and Budd, W. F.: Flow parameters for ice sheet modeling, *Cold Regions Science and Technology*, 6, 175–177, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-232X\(82\)90010-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-232X(82)90010-6), 1982.
- Pattyn, F.: A new three-dimensional higher-order thermomechanical ice sheet model: Basic sensitivity, ice stream development, and ice flow across subglacial lakes, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 108, 2382, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002jb002329>, 2003.
- Pattyn, F., Perichon, L., Aschwanden, A., Breuer, B., de Smedt, B., Gagliardini, O., Gudmundsson, G. H., Hindmarsh, R.

- C. A., Hubbard, A., Johnson, J. V., Kleiner, T., Kononov, Y., Martin, C., Payne, A. J., Pollard, D., Price, S., Rückamp, M., Saito, F., Souček, O., Sugiyama, S., and Zwinger, T.: Benchmark experiments for higher-order and full-Stokes ice sheet models (ISMIP–HOM), *The Cryosphere*, 2, 95–108, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2-95-2008>, 2008.
- Pollard, D. and DeConto, R. M.: A simple inverse method for the distribution of basal sliding coefficients under ice sheets, applied to Antarctica, *The Cryosphere*, 6, 953–971, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-6-953-2012>, 2012.
- Räss, L., Licul, A., Herman, F., Podladchikov, Y. Y., and Suckale, J.: Modelling thermomechanical ice deformation using an implicit pseudo-transient method (FastICE v1.0) based on graphical processing units (GPUs), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 13, 955–976, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-955-2020>, 2020.
- Riel, B., Minchew, B., and Bischoff, T.: Data-driven inference of the mechanics of slip along glacier beds using physics-informed neural networks: Case study on Rutford ice stream, Antarctica, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 13, e2021MS002621, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021MS002621>, 2021.
- Roe, P. L.: Characteristic-based schemes for the Euler equations, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 18, 337–365, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.fl.18.010186.002005>, 1986.
- Rosier, S. H. R., Bull, C. Y. S., Woo, W. L., and Gudmundsson, G. H.: Predicting ocean-induced ice-shelf melt rates using deep learning, *The Cryosphere*, 17, 499–518, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-17-499-2023>, 2023.
- Rosier, S. H. R., Gregov, T., Jouvet, G., and Vieli, A.: Cheap and accurate higher-order ice flow emulator for mountain glaciers, *EGUsphere* [preprint], <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2026-5523>, 2026.
- Rounce, D. R., Hock, R., Maussion, F., Hugonnet, R., Kochtitzky, W., Huss, M., Berthier, E., Brinkerhoff, D., Compagno, L., Copland, L., Farinotti, D., Menounos, B., and McNabb, R. W.: Global Glacier Change in the 21st Century: Every Increase in Temperature Matters, *Science*, 379, 78–83, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abo1324>, 2023.
- Scherler, D. and Egholm, D. L.: Production and Transport of Supraglacial Debris: Insights From Cosmogenic ¹⁰Be and Numerical Modeling, Chhota Shigri Glacier, Indian Himalaya, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 125, e2020JF005586, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JF005586>, 2020.
- Schoof, C.: The effect of cavitation on glacier sliding, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 461, 609–627, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2004.1350>, 2005.
- Schoof, C.: Coulomb Friction and Other Sliding Laws in a Higher-Order Glacier Flow Model, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 20, 157–189, <https://doi.org/10.1142/s0218202510004180>, 2010.
- Schoof, C. and Hindmarsh, R. C. A.: Thin-Film Flows with Wall Slip: An Asymptotic Analysis of Higher Order Glacier Flow Models, *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, 63, 73–114, <https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmam/hbp025>, 2010.
- Shapero, D. R., Badgeley, J. A., Hoffman, A. O., and Joughin, I. R.: icepack: a new glacier flow modeling package in Python, version 1.0, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14, 4593–4616, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-4593-2021>, 2021.
- Tezaur, I. K., Perego, M., Salinger, A. G., Tuminaro, R. S., and Price, S. F.: Albany/FELIX: a parallel, scalable and robust, finite element, first-order Stokes approximation ice sheet solver built for advanced analysis, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8, 1197–1220, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-8-1197-2015>, 2015.
- Tulaczyk, S., Kamb, W. B., and Engelhardt, H. F.: Basal mechanics of Ice Stream B, West Antarctica: 1. Till mechanics, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 105, 463–481, <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JB900329>, 2000.
- Verhaegen, Y. and Huybrechts, P.: Coupling debris transport to 3D higher-order ice flow dynamics to model the behavior and climate change response of debris-covered glaciers, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 131, e2025JF008748, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025JF008748>, 2026.
- Verjans, V. and Robel, A.: Accelerating Subglacial Hydrology for Ice Sheet Models With Deep Learning Methods, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 51, e2023GL105281, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023gl105281>, 2024.
- Višnjević, V., Herman, F., and Prasicek, G.: Climatic patterns over the European Alps during the LGM derived from inversion of the paleo-ice extent, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 538, 116–185, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2020.116185>, 2020.
- Vyas, N., Morwani, D., Zhao, R., Kwun, M., Shapira, I., Brandfonbrener, D., Janson, L., and Kakade, S.: SOAP: Improving and Stabilizing Shampoo using Adam, <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2409.11321>, 2024.
- Wang, Y., Zhang, T., Xiao, C., Ren, J., and Wang, Y.: A two-dimensional, higher-order, enthalpy-based thermomechanical ice flow model for mountain glaciers and its benchmark experiments, *Computers & Geosciences*, 141, 104526, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2020.104526>, 2020.
- Wang, Y., Lai, C.-Y., Prior, D. J., and Cowen-Breen, C.: Deep learning the flow law of Antarctic ice shelves, *Science*, 387, 1219–1224, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adp3300>, 2025.
- Watkins, J., Carlson, M., Shan, K., Tezaur, I., Perego, M., Bertagna, L., Kao, C., Hoffman, M. J., and Price, S. F.: Performance portable ice-sheet modeling with MALI, *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, 37, 600–625, <https://doi.org/10.1177/10943420231183688>, 2023.
- Weertman, J.: On the Sliding of Glaciers, *Journal of Glaciology*, 3, 33–38, <https://doi.org/10.3189/S0022143000024709>, 1957.
- Winkelmann, R., Martin, M. A., Haseloff, M., Albrecht, T., Bueler, E., Khroulev, C., and Levermann, A.: The Potsdam Parallel Ice Sheet Model (PISM-PIK) – Part 1: Model description, *The Cryosphere*, 5, 715–726, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-5-715-2011>, 2011.
- Yadan, O.: Hydra - A framework for elegantly configuring complex applications, GitHub, <https://github.com/facebookresearch/hydra>, 2019.
- Zekollari, H., Huss, M., Farinotti, D., and Lhermitte, S.: Ice-Dynamical Glacier Evolution Modeling—A Review, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 60, e2021RG000754, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021rg000754>, 2022.