

Am I Confused or Is This Confusing?: Deep Ensembles for ENSO Uncertainty Quantification

Devin M. McAfee^{*1} and Elizabeth A. Barnes^{2,3}

¹Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University

²Faculty of Computing and Data Sciences, Boston University

³Department of Earth and Environment, Boston University

Published in *Machine Learning: Earth*

Abstract

Faithful uncertainty quantification (UQ) is paramount in high stakes climate prediction. Deep ensembles, or ensembles of probabilistic neural networks, are state of the art for UQ in machine learning (ML) and are growing increasingly popular for weather and climate prediction. However, detailed analyses of the mechanisms, strengths, and limitations of ensembles in these complex problem settings are lacking. We take a step towards filling this gap by deploying deep ensembles for predictability analysis of the El-Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) in the Community Earth System Model 2 Large Ensemble (CESM2-LE). Principally, we show that epistemic uncertainty, modeled by ensemble disagreement, robustly signals predictive error growth associated with shifts in the distributions of monthly sea-surface temperature (SST), ocean heat content (OHC), and zonal surface wind stress (τ_x) anomalies under a climate change scenario. Conversely, we find that aleatoric uncertainty, which remains a popular measure of model confidence, becomes less reliable and behaves counter-intuitively under climate-change-induced distributional shift. We highlight that, because ensemble performance improvement relative to the expected single model scales with epistemic uncertainty, ensemble improvement increases with distributional shift from climate change. This work demonstrates the utility of deep ensembles for modeling aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in ML climate prediction, as well as the growing importance of robustly quantifying these two forms of uncertainty under anthropogenic warming.

1 Introduction

Climate is *confusing*. A chaotic web of nonlinear interactions between the ocean, atmosphere, and land, Earth's climate is, in many ways, random. The random and confusing nature of the climate system creates aleatoric uncertainty, i.e., unpredictability (Hüllermeier and Waegeman 2021), in the lagged relationships between climate variables. This leads to inevitable error in climate prediction, even if provided optimal model solutions.

In many heavily investigated climate prediction problems, aleatoric uncertainty is dependent on the input state (Mariotti et al. 2020). For instance, consider the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO). ENSO describes quasi-periodic variations in tropical Pacific sea-surfaces temperatures (SSTs), and the coupled atmospheric Walker circulation, on seasonal-to-multiannual timescales. Whether ENSO is in a warm (El Niño) or cool (La Niña) phase has significant influence beyond just the Pacific basin, and modulates the global atmospheric circulation, as well as global surface temperatures (McPhaden et al. 2006). The ENSO signal thereby influences aleatoric uncertainty across a range of climate prediction tasks (Mariotti et al. 2020).

The existence of state-dependent aleatoric uncertainty, e.g., as forced by ENSO, implies that the risk of deterministic climate prediction depends on input. A trustworthy climate forecasting model must robustly quantify the uncertainty of its predictions so that users can anticipate this risk (Gneiting,

*Corresponding author: dmcafee@bu.edu

Balabdaoui, et al. 2007). Indeed, uncertainty quantification (UQ) has long been integral to weather and climate prediction (Murphy 1998), leading to, e.g., the development of ensemble forecasting (Epstein 1969b; Leith 1974; Lewis 2005), data assimilation (Kalnay 2002), and widely used forecast verification methods (Brier 1950; Epstein 1969a; Murphy and Winkler 1977; Bröcker and Smith 2007; Palmer et al. 2006).

In the past decade, deep neural networks have gained significant traction in the world of UQ. Modern neural networks designed for UQ can achieve impressive predictive capacity and reliability (Minderer et al. 2021), and have shown promise across scientific disciplines (Abdar et al. 2021). In the climate domain, probabilistic neural networks, often of modest depth, are an emerging tool for skillful state-dependent aleatoric uncertainty estimation (Mayer and Barnes 2021; Luo et al. 2022; Delaunay and Christensen 2022; Gordon and Barnes 2022). However, in such applications, aleatoric uncertainty estimates are commonly conflated with model confidence, despite the fact that neural networks can predict low outcome uncertainty while unconfident and *confused* (Gal and Ghahramani 2016). Conversely, a skilled model will confidently predict high outcome uncertainty when input conditions are inherently uninformative. For instance, seasonal ENSO prediction is canonically more difficult through boreal spring (Barnston et al. 2012). This deficiency is shared among all ENSO prediction models, both physical and statistical (Ehsan et al. 2024). Thus, if an ENSO prediction model is less accurate during spring, this does not imply that the model is confused and underconfident, or that there exists a different model with a more informed answer. Therefore, in climate prediction, it is useful to quantify a model’s confidence separate from its aleatoric uncertainty estimates (Kendall and Gal 2017; Hüllermeier and Waegeman 2021).

Accurately gauging model confidence is particularly important for prediction under covariate shift. Covariate shift occurs when the input distribution changes at testing relative to training, invariably degrading model performance (Ovadia et al. 2019; Hüllermeier and Waegeman 2021). The most societally relevant mechanism of covariate shift affecting the present Earth system is anthropogenic climate change. By perturbing mechanisms of internal climate variability, climate change has cascading effects across time scales (IPCC 2021). In this work, we demonstrate how shifts in the monthly variability of sea-surface temperature (SST), upper ocean heat content (OHC), and zonal wind stress (τ_x) induced by climate change impact ENSO prediction. Specifically, we train deep ensembles – ensembles of probabilistic neural networks – to predict ENSO in large climate model simulations, and identify decreased predictive skill under a future warming scenario due to projected shifts in input variability. We describe how deep ensembles mitigate risk during these shifts, relative to single models, by accounting for the epistemic uncertainty about their predictions, which we interpret as model confidence. We find that epistemic uncertainty, quantified as ensemble disagreement, provides a coherent signal of climate-change-induced shift, even when the aleatoric uncertainty signal is muted. Along these lines, we argue for deep ensembles as a simple yet robust tool for climate UQ, enabling users to gauge both aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in such high-stakes prediction tasks.

We organize the manuscript as follows. In section 2, we summarize the literature on deep ensembles, which are a state of the art for UQ in ML. In section 3, we describe metrics for quantifying aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty. In section 4, we describe the ENSO prediction task examined in this study. In section 5.1, we show that, by accounting for epistemic uncertainty, deep ensembles outperform single models. In section 5.2, we illustrate the utility of deep ensemble aleatoric uncertainty estimates in characterizing established features of ENSO predictability, for inputs within the training distribution. In section 5.3, we leave the training distribution, and analyze how projected changes in tropical Pacific variability impact estimations of aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in deep ensembles. We conclude with a discussion regarding the importance of modeling epistemic uncertainty as climate changes.

2 Deep Ensembles

The standard approach for quantifying state-dependent aleatoric uncertainty in ML is to treat the target Y as a random variable generated by an underlying probability distribution $p^*(y | \mathbf{x})$ conditioned on predictors \mathbf{x} . A probabilistic forecasting model $p_{\mathbf{w}}(y | \mathbf{x})$ is an approximation of $p^*(y | \mathbf{x})$, with weights \mathbf{w} learned from a training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_N, y_N)\}$ sampled from p^* . In complex climate prediction, all models are wrong. While neural networks are useful for modeling these high-dimensional problems, it is highly unlikely a selected architecture can perfectly represent p^* or, even if so, that gradient descent would find the optimal solution (Błasiok et al. 2023; Wild et al. 2023). Therefore, the

predictions of trained neural networks are influenced by model uncertainty.

Typically, optimization is performed for a fixed neural network architecture, so, rather than representing model uncertainty completely, we instead consider uncertainty in the model weights \mathbf{w} . The Bayesian practice is to describe weight uncertainty through the posterior distribution $p(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{D})$. Each weight vector in the support of the posterior represents a subjective opinion about the data’s aleatoric uncertainty $p_{\mathbf{w}}(y \mid \mathbf{x})$. The posterior describes the relative importance of opinion, determined by ability to generate the training data and prior belief.

$$p(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{D}) = \frac{p_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D})p(\mathbf{w})}{p(\mathcal{D})} \quad (1)$$

The model evidence $p(\mathcal{D})$ involves an integration over the weight space, making (1) computationally intractable for large neural networks. Therefore, for Bayesian deep learning, the posterior must be approximated using less expensive methods. A widely used technique is variational inference, which models the posterior as a simplified distribution; most commonly a Gaussian is assumed (Blundell et al. 2015; Blei et al. 2017). The degree of simplification required to ensure tractability of variational inference is often too significant for this strategy to outperform standard deep ensembles in practice (Ovadia et al. 2019; Ashukha et al. 2020; Izmailov et al. 2021; Wild et al. 2023). This is because, in deep learning, posteriors are highly complex and multimodal (Wilson and Izmailov 2020), an environment where deep ensembles thrive.

Deep ensembles are groups of probabilistic neural networks trained independently on the same dataset. Generally, deep ensembles have a fixed architecture over their components¹, which only differ by the random seeds of their weight and training batch order initializations (Lee et al. 2015; Lakshminarayanan et al. 2017). At inference, deep ensembles predict a uniform mixture of component distributions.

$$p_{\text{ens}}(y \mid \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M p_{\mathbf{w}_i}(y \mid \mathbf{x}) \quad (2)$$

where M is the ensemble size, $p_{\text{ens}}(y \mid \mathbf{x})$ is the deep ensemble’s predictive distribution, and $p_{\mathbf{w}_i}(y \mid \mathbf{x})$ is the distribution output by the i^{th} ensemble component.

Components are trained the standard way, by minimizing a proper loss function. Proper losses are standard because they are only minimized by the data-generating distribution itself, thereby incentivizing learners to faithfully report uncertainty (Gneiting and Raftery 2007). The most popular example is the negative log-likelihood (NLL), as its minimization equates to maximum likelihood estimation (MLE).

$$\text{NLL}(p, y) = -\log p(y \mid \mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

Overfitting is a concern for MLEs of large neural networks, especially when the training data contains significant aleatoric uncertainty. Thus, we regularize with a prior $p(\mathbf{w})$. The standard approach, and the one in this study, is to simply add an L2 penalty to the NLL loss, which assumes an isotropic Gaussian prior over weights, whose variance determines the regularization constant (see section S1). The isotropic Gaussian is also the standard prior in Bayesian deep learning (Izmailov et al. 2021). The regularized loss is given by

$$L(p_{\mathbf{w}}) = -\sum_{j=1}^N \log p_{\mathbf{w}}(y_j \mid \mathbf{x}_j) + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \quad (4)$$

where N is the number of training samples and σ^2 is the prior variance.

With the inclusion of a prior, the training loss becomes the negative log posterior density $-\log p(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{D})$ (see section S1). Hence, deep ensembles are collections of local modes of $p(\mathbf{w} \mid \mathcal{D})$ (Wilson and Izmailov 2020; Wild et al. 2023), which we illustrate schematically in Fig. 1, an adaptation of Fig. 3 from Wilson and Izmailov (2020). This has spurred debate in the literature over whether deep ensembles should be

¹We use the terminology “ensemble component” for deep ensembles and reserve the more traditional “ensemble member” for the climate model ensemble used for training (see sec 4.1)




Figure 1: Schematic of the deep ensemble framework given a multimodal posterior for a three-class classification problem (probability masses denoted by colored bars). Each component is a potentially unique mode of $p(\mathbf{w} | \mathcal{D})$, which produces potentially unique functional representations of the data.

perceived as “Bayesian” (Wilson and Izmailov 2020; D’Angelo and Fortuin 2021; Wild et al. 2023). Since deep ensembles are mixtures of delta functions at posterior modes, (2) is a discrete approximation of a Bayesian model average (Wilson and Izmailov 2020). However, as components are restricted to lie within local modes, deep ensembles don’t converge to the true posterior in the limit of infinite size (Wild et al. 2023; D’Angelo and Fortuin 2021), so they are not Bayesian in the classical sense. Yet, by exploiting the multimodal structure of the posterior, deep ensembles outperform parametric approaches like variational inference (Wilson and Izmailov 2020; Wild et al. 2023). In fact, even principled ensembling strategies with theoretical convergence guarantees don’t beat naive ensembles (D’Angelo and Fortuin 2021; Wild et al. 2023), which may be a consequence of the bountiful number of explorable local modes in deep learning (Wild et al. 2023; Luo et al. 2022; Fort et al. 2020).

Perhaps the most important property of deep ensembles is that they are guaranteed to mitigate risk compared to training a single model. This is because proper losses are convex, so, by Jensen’s inequality, the loss of the deep ensemble prediction is at most the expected component loss (Abe et al. 2024). That is, for convex loss ϕ , $\phi(\mathbb{E}[p], y) \leq \mathbb{E}[\phi(p, y)]$. Further, in practice, deep ensembles tend to generalize better than all of their individual components (Nixon et al. 2020; Y. Wang and X. Wang 2025), which is also observed in this work.

3 Aleatoric and Epistemic UQ

For each input, we quantify an ensemble’s aleatoric uncertainty estimate, AU, as the component-mean entropy. This approximates the conditional entropy $H(Y | \mathbf{W})$ (Depeweg et al. 2018), or the predictive uncertainty which remains given knowledge of the weights. We deal with classification problems in this work, where each component predicts the parameters of a categorical distribution over $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, K\}$. AU is expressed as

$$\text{AU}(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^K p_{\mathbf{w}_i}(y = k | \mathbf{x}) \log p_{\mathbf{w}_i}(y = k | \mathbf{x}) \quad (5)$$

AU takes values in $[0, \log K]$.

The weight uncertainty modeled by deep ensembles induces functional disagreement among components at each input (Fort et al. 2020). This disagreement captures epistemic uncertainty, corresponding to a range of plausible predictive distributions for a given input. We quantify epistemic uncertainty, EU, using the following metric:

$$\text{EU}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^M (p_{\mathbf{w}_i}(y = k | \mathbf{x}) - p_{\text{ens}}(y = k | \mathbf{x}))^2 \quad (6)$$

EU, which takes values in $[0, \frac{K-1}{K}]$, is the ensemble variance of class probabilities summed across classes. This variance-based definition of disagreement is popular in the literature and can be derived by decomposing the variance of Y using the law of total variance (Depeweg et al. 2018; Duan et al. 2023; Schreck et al. 2024). Importantly, this metric equals the ensemble’s inputwise improvement over its mean-performing component, as measured by Brier score (BS) (Abe et al. 2024, see S2):

$$[y = k] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{BS}(p, y) = \sum_{k=1}^K (p(y = k | \mathbf{x}) - [y = k])^2 \quad (7)$$

Brier score (Brier 1950) is a proper loss (Gneiting and Raftery 2007) and takes values in $[0, 2]$.

We emphasize that, unlike loss functions, AU and EU are defined independently of the true label and thus depend solely on ensemble predictions. That is, being uncertainty measures, AU and EU can be evaluated for unlabeled data, such as in operational forecasting. Further, while defining aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty on different scales is nonstandard (Depeweg et al. 2018; Wimmer et al. 2023), the magnitudes of AU and EU are not compared in this study.

4 Experiments

4.1 Climate Model Data

We use data from the Community Earth Systems Model 2 Large Ensemble (CESM2-LE) (Danabasoglu et al. 2020; Rodgers et al. 2021). This dataset contains simulations from 100 members covering the period [1850, 2100], with historical forcings until 2014 and SSP3-7.0 forcings thereafter (Rodgers et al. 2021). We use monthly fields of sea-surface temperature (SST) and zonal surface wind stress (τ_x) over all marine grid points equatorward of 45 degrees latitude. We define upper ocean heat content (OHC) as the vertically integrated ocean temperature to a depth of 300 meters, as is done in Ham et al. (2019).

We separate the training, validation, and testing datasets based on CESM2 member, which removes temporal dependencies within members. We ensure the training and testing datasets share no micro-perturbed initializations to mitigate the influence of ocean initial condition memory within the first few decades after initialization (Rodgers et al. 2021; Deser et al. 2024). We split among CESM2 members [1, 50], which share biomass burning forcings (Rodgers et al. 2021). To ensure robustness of results, we use CESM2 members [1, 20] for training, [21, 25] for validation, and reserve [26, 50] for testing.

For each variable, we compute standardized monthly anomalies relative to the period [1850, 1949], and detrend by subtracting the CESM2-LE-mean anomaly (with respect to all 100 members) at each time step to produce inputs. Since all CESM2 members are constrained by the same external forcings, the mean of the CESM2-LE distribution estimates the forced response at a month in time (Frankcombe et al. 2018).

We define an ENSO index using the first principal component of the internal variability of tropical Pacific SSTs over the period [1850, 1949] across all CESM2 members. We create categorical labels by quartile binning the ENSO indices. In ascending quartile order, the four classes are hereafter referred to as La Niña (LN), Cold Neutral (CN), Warm Neutral (WN), and El Niño (EN), respectively. Throughout the manuscript, we use the term ENSO “phase” to mean class index.

4.2 Problem Setup and Deep Ensemble Design

As illustrated in Figure 2, to examine the behavior of uncertainty across forecast lead time, we task each deep ensemble component to predict the ENSO index over months $(t + 1, \dots, t + 24)$ months) from SST, OHC, and τ_x during months $(t - 2, t - 1, t)$. All metrics, including uncertainty measures and losses, are calculated separately for each lead time. Forecasting across multiple lead times aligns with operational practice and is thus standard for statistical ENSO prediction in the literature (Ham et al. 2019; Ehsan et al. 2024; Q. Chen et al. 2025). We train components to predict each lead time simultaneously, as done in, e.g., H. Wang et al. (2024), instead of building a unique ensemble for every lead time, to facilitate large ensemble training. Our ensembles are considerably larger ($M = 100$) than those typically trained for ENSO prediction to allow for robust comparison of component and ensemble generalization. We reproduce our main findings using the alternative fixed lead training approach with $M = 10$ ensembles in section S3, and discuss discrepancies between the two approaches where relevant.




Figure 2: Illustration of the study’s problem setup using an example prediction from a component of *premodern* initialized in January. A ResNet-18 model ingests the last three months of anomalies (in units of standard deviations) and outputs categorical distributions over ENSO classes for the next 24 months. The highlighted distributions are for leads 1, 3, 6, . . . and 24 months, and the faint distributions are for the remaining leads.

We employ a modified ResNet-18 (He et al. 2015) as the component architecture. ResNet-18 is a deep convolutional neural network, which makes use of skip connections to obtain a smoother loss surface,

resulting in more stable optimization (Li et al. 2017). To the base ResNet-18 architecture, we prepend a nontunable circular padding layer, which pads a fixed number of zeros around each input channel to prevent dilution of features at the spatial domain edges, and a tunable reduction layer, a convolutional layer which compresses the nine input channels into three channels which can be input to ResNet-18. The output of ResNet-18 is fed into a fully-connected layer, which outputs 4-class logit vectors for each lead time. A softmax activation is then applied to obtain categorical parameters for each lead.

We train three $M = 100$ ensembles:

1. The *premodern* ensemble is trained with inputs from [1850, 1949].
2. The *modern* ensemble is trained with inputs from [1850, 2024].
3. The *scenario* ensemble is trained with inputs from [1850, 2098].

We perform inference with each ensemble for all inputs ([1850, 2098]) of the testing set.

5 Results

5.1 Ensemble Improvement




Figure 3: (a-c) Performance and (d) EU for the period [1850, 1949], averaged across leads, as a function of ensemble size for *premodern*, *modern*, and *scenario*. Shadings cover the range of scores from random subsampling of ensemble components without replacement, and curves represent the mean scores across subsamples.

In this section, we analyze the performance of *premodern*, *modern*, and *scenario* on the premodern period [1850, 1949] of the testing set, for in-distribution performance comparison across the ensembles. The remainder of the testing time series is reserved for the covariate shift analysis in section 5.3. Unless otherwise stated, all temporal averages are also averaged across CESM2 testing members.

The skill of each ensemble improves with increasing size, as shown in Figure 3, which is a canonical property of deep ensembles (Lakshminarayanan et al. 2017; Y. Wang and X. Wang 2025). Importantly, this performance improvement aligns with increases in EU, indicating that, unsurprisingly, the ensembles benefit from incorporating epistemic uncertainty in their predictions. UQ performance and accuracy (of the top-label prediction) improve up to ~ 10 -20 components, where skill plateaus. *scenario* outperforms *modern*, which outperforms *premodern*, because increasing the volume of training data decreases epistemic uncertainty. This is shown in Figure 3d, where EU decreases from *premodern* to *modern* to

scenario across ensemble sizes. Since EU measures ensemble improvement, this suggests that the value of ensembling increases as data becomes limited.




Figure 4: Mean testing scores, averaged across leads, for ensemble components (histograms) and deep ensembles (stars) over the premodern period.




Figure 5: Difference in performance between ensemble and best performing component on the testing set over the premodern period.

Figure 4 shows that each ensemble outperforms all of its components when averaged over lead times. As shown in Figure 5, this ensemble improvement is present across lead times in accuracy but, surprisingly, not in NLL or Brier Score, particularly for leads within 3 months. We do not observe this contradiction when using the fixed lead approach, indicating this result is partially an artifact of training interference from longer, noisier leads (see Figure S3). However, the discrepancy between the improvement in accuracy and worsening of NLL suggests that ensemble predictions are miscalibrated relative to their components at short leads, and this miscalibration is also observed in the fixed lead scheme. We discuss this calibration bias in greater depth in section S4. In brief, it is a consequence of (1) the ensembles’ improved accuracy over all components, (2) ensemble predictive entropy being upper bounded by AU, and (3) components being well calibrated within distribution (Rahaman and Thiery 2021; Wu and Gales 2021). In essence, an ensemble’s predictions cannot sharpen to compensate for its improved accuracy, yielding miscalibration unless the components themselves are miscalibrated, which is common when optimizing for accuracy instead of proper loss (Guo et al. 2017). We highlight that deep ensembles are not uniquely vulnerable to this artifact and that it generalizes to all UQ methods which improve accuracy by averaging over near-calibrated predictions, such as variational inference or Bayesian ensemble methods. Fortunately, this calibration bias, and its negative impacts on NLL and Brier Score at short




Figure 6: Mean AU and accuracy as a function of input ENSO phase and lead time.

leads, is effectively corrected by applying temperature scaling to the ensemble predictive distributions (Rahaman and Thiery 2021) (see Figures S14 and S15).

5.2 AU In-Distribution

For inputs near the training distribution, a trustworthy climate UQ model should produce state-dependent aleatoric uncertainty estimates which align with established patterns of climate predictability. In this section, we qualitatively assess the ability of AU from each ensemble in diagnosing known features of ENSO predictability for testing inputs in the premodern period. In the following section, we contrast this with the degradation of AU as inputs shift away from the training distribution due to climate change.

Figure 6 shows the variability of AU across input ENSO conditions, represented by the ENSO phase at prediction time. Each ensemble is roughly equivalent in its in-distribution AU characteristics. AU identifies a rapid decrease in predictability with lead time, which is a universal property of chaotic climate prediction. Because the components are well calibrated (see section S4), accuracy rises as AU decreases with shortening lead time. The ensembles are considerably more accurate than chance (which, for quartile prediction, is also climatology) for all lead times, maintaining at least 34.9% accuracy for two-year prediction in the premodern period. ENSO evolution is least predictable from neutral conditions which are characterized by muted Pacific SST anomalies and weakened ocean-atmosphere coupling compared to the strong phases. For leads within one year, AU is lower and decreases more slowly with increasing lead for LN inputs than EN inputs. This is consistent with the higher instability, i.e., shorter persistence timescale, of El Niño relative to La Niña (Okumura and Deser 2010). Conversely, AU plateaus between leads ~ 12 and 18 months for EN inputs. As a result, beyond one year, predictions from EN inputs have lower AU than those from LN inputs. The lag autocorrelation of ENSO-related Pacific anomalies falls to zero at 12 months in CESM2 (Capotondi et al. 2020), after which uncertainty related to phase transition is maximal. Hence, the observed difference in long-range AU between EN and LN inputs aligns with existing evidence that the transition from El Niño to La Niña is more predictable than from La Niña to El Niño. This asymmetry is tied to stronger meridional ocean heat transport—and induced OHC anomalies—in the western tropical Pacific following mature El Niño than La Niña, which is a key precursor of ENSO transition (Planton et al. 2018; Sharmila et al. 2023) (see Figure S16).

In Figure 7, we show the seasonal variability of AU and accuracy. Within ~ 5 months, ensemble




Figure 7: Mean AU and accuracy as a function of forecast month and lead time.

accuracy is maximal for forecasts beginning in boreal winter, during which AU is appropriately minimal. This is a known characteristic of ENSO predictability and is primarily due to seasonal phase locking, or the tendency for ENSO events to peak during boreal winter (H.-C. Chen et al. 2021), enhancing short-range predictability. Decreased AU for winter-initialized forecasts extends out a few months in lead time before meeting the spring predictability barrier. In Figure 7, the sharp diagonal gradient in AU and accuracy, within roughly 10 months, associated with forecasts through boreal spring is the classic signal of the spring predictability barrier (Barnston et al. 2012). This barrier is partially a consequence of the higher prevalence of neutral conditions outside of winter due to phase locking but still remains after conditioning on neutral phase inputs (see Figure S17), potentially due to stochastic forcing from westerly wind bursts (Lopez and Kirtman 2014), in addition to model deficiencies. Accuracy increases with lead time in parts of Figure 7, a peculiar feature not unique to our ENSO model (Lou et al. 2023; Q. Chen et al. 2025). Specifically, for forecasts initialized during El Niño in boreal winter, ensemble AU (accuracy) rapidly increases (decreases) through the following spring, due to the spring predictability barrier. AU then plateaus before decreasing into the following autumn and winter, coinciding with increasing accuracy, due to phase locking and the aforementioned predictability of El Niño-to-La Niña transition (see Figure S18).

5.3 AU and EU under Climate Change Shift

We now present the key results of this study. Beginning with Figure 8a, we find that component-mean performance deteriorates starting around the early-to-mid 21st century for each ensemble across lead times. From Figure 8b, we observe that EU also increases incrementally across leads, in line with NLL, beginning around 2040. This EU increase suggests that covariate shift is the primary mechanism of the observed performance deterioration. As shown in Figure 10, EU and NLL increase is distinguishably larger in *premodern* and *modern* than in *scenario*. That is, EU effectively identifies the knowledge deficits of *premodern* and *modern* relative to *scenario* under future climate change. *scenario* is also impacted by the covariate shift, as the shifted period makes up a small fraction of its training data, but is harmed less than *premodern* and *modern*, for which the projected shift is unfamiliar.

Ensemble improvement scales with epistemic uncertainty, as shown in Figure 9, because EU measures Brier Score improvement. The incremental growth of NLL improvement indicates that the ensembles deteriorate more slowly under intensifying shift than their components on average. Hence, the utility of deep ensembles to signal covariate shift, via increases in EU, is also what provides protection for ensemble




Figure 8: Each ensemble’s (a) component-mean NLL and (b) EU averaged over CESM2 testing members; darker lines are 12-month moving averages. The y-axis scaling varies between rows to better highlight temporal trends for each lead.

predictions, relative to the expected component, when subject to damaging shift.

In Figure 10c, we plot the change in AU from the premodern period to the shifted period. We find that, counterintuitively, for leads beyond ~ 10 months, mean AU decreases under covariate shift, i.e., component predictions become slightly sharper, even in *premodern* and *modern*. Fundamentally, this is because AU estimates aleatoric uncertainty, not model confidence, and is thus not designed to recognize performance deterioration under covariate shift. Further, as component performance degrades, AU becomes less reliable at representing aleatoric uncertainty. Consequently, the observed decreases in AU for leads beyond six months under shift do not imply decreased aleatoric uncertainty at those leads – otherwise performance would improve. Likewise, in Figure 10c, the AU increases for leads within \sim




Figure 9: As in Figure 8, but showing ensemble improvement, i.e., the difference between the component-mean NLL and the ensemble NLL.

6 months do not necessarily indicate that short-range ENSO predictability decreases under projected climate change, even though short-range performance worsens due to increased epistemic uncertainty.

We further juxtapose the behavior of EU and AU under covariate shift in Figures 11 and 12. Notably, as shown in Figure 11, although internal variability leads to spread in the EU change between CESM2 members, EU consistently increases when comparing samples from a member’s premodern period with those from another member’s shifted period (as indicated by the positive mean shift of the red EU histograms relative to the blue). A similar positive AU shift at short leads is present but muted relative to the EU signal, and, unintuitively, the AU change reverses direction at moderate leads. Due to the counterbalancing positive and negative AU changes across lead times, the distribution of lead-time-averaged AU is largely unchanged when comparing the premodern and shifted periods across input ENSO phases, as indicated by the overlapping AU histograms in Figure 12. This AU invariance contradicts the NLL and accuracy deterioration observed for each phase, which is further evidence of the decreased reliability of AU under covariate shift.

Although we observe that, unlike AU, EU robustly signals damaging shift, we emphasize that EU predicts ensemble improvement, not component generalization error itself. For instance, while at each lead time, EU elevations under covariate shift correlate with worsening NLL, Figure 10 illustrates that the pattern of relative EU increase across leads has dissimilarities with the degradation of NLL. For instance, EU increases at leads ~ 5 -10 months correspond to larger relative increases in NLL than the more substantial EU growth seen at shorter leads. Further, as shown in Figure 12, increases in the mean and variance of EU under shift are similar across input ENSO phases. Conversely, while performance worsens for all phases, NLL and accuracy deterioration is most notable for LN inputs under shift, as shown in Figure 12. Further, forms of distributional shift which have no influence on the input distribution, and are therefore undetectable by EU in the supervised setting (Malinin 2019), can occur in tandem with covariate shift and influence component performance. Hence, EU is a tool for signaling the presence of harmful covariate shift but is not designed for predicting the resultant model errors.

The roughly linear EU and NLL increases in Figure 8, while delayed, resemble the linear forced responses of the global means of SST and OHC under SSP3-7.0 (IPCC 2023). This is despite the fact that the model inputs are anomalies relative to the CESM2-LE mean, and therefore do not contain the forced response. Evidently, the CESM2-LE mean is imperfect at representing the forced response (Frankcombe et al. 2018), because climate change also influences the variability of the CESM2-LE distribution (Gunnarson et al. 2024; Gu et al. 2024). Specifically, in Figure 13, we document substantial changes in the anomaly variance of each input variable under projected climate change. Since the covariate distribu-




Figure 10: (a) Component-mean NLL, (b) EU, and (c) AU averaged over CESM2 testing members and time, for the premodern and shifted periods, and the fractional increases in each metric from the premodern to shifted periods.

tion is the joint distribution over input variables, these large, spatially non-uniform changes in marginal variance capture key aspects of the encountered covariate shift.

Although the shifts in extratropical variance in Figure 13 are compelling (we refer to Gunnarson et al. 2024 and Gu et al. 2024 for relevant discussions), we focus on the tropical Pacific, i.e., the ENSO region, as it has dominant influence on component predictions (see section S5). Though we consider different periods and a subset of the CESM2-LE, the SST variance changes in Figure 13 are similar to those identified in Gunnarson et al. (2024). The SST variance changes in the tropical Pacific resemble the anomaly signature of El Niño, with decreased variance in the western tropical Pacific, perhaps related to eastward expansion of the Indo-Pacific warm pool (Leung et al. 2022), and an increase in variance over the eastern tropical Pacific, especially along the equator, perhaps driven by weakening of the Walker Circulation (Held and Soden 2006), as evidenced by increases in equatorial τ_x variance. In contrast to SST, the variance of OHC increases substantially over a broad region of the western tropical Pacific, bridged along the equator with another region of increased OHC variance in the eastern tropical Pacific. The spatial patterns of projected variance change in the tropical Pacific are similar for τ_x and OHC and are potentially linked through ocean-atmosphere coupling.




Figure 11: Using the *premodern* ensemble predictions, for each CESM2 testing member, we compute the fractional change in AU and EU (relative to the member’s own premodern period) when compared against the premodern and shifted periods of every other testing member. Red histograms show comparisons of a testing member’s premodern period with the shifted period of another member, while blue histograms show comparisons between premodern periods of different members.




Figure 12: For *premodern*, the distribution of component-mean NLL and fraction correct (i.e., the fraction of components which correctly predict the target class), as well as EU and AU over the premodern and shifted periods. For this plot, each metric is averaged over lead times. The mean of the fraction correct distribution is the component-mean accuracy.




Figure 13: The change in anomaly variance for each input variable from the premodern to shifted period averaged over CESM2 testing members.

6 Discussion

We explore the utility of deep ensembles for ENSO uncertainty quantification. We train ensembles of 100 components – much larger than what is typical in the literature – to demonstrate that ensemble performance cannot be replicated by single optimizations of the same architecture. Beyond this, Y. Wang and X. Wang (2025) find that ensembling overfit components provides unique benefits to scaling single model complexity, but it is unclear if these powers remain when components are calibrated.

Well-calibrated components are necessary to ensure in-distribution quality of AU which, in our experiments, properly identifies known characteristics of ENSO predictability, such as the spring predictability barrier and asymmetries in transition uncertainty. However, AU degrades in quality under covariate shift (Valdenegro-Toro and Saromo 2022), as predictive uncertainty becomes increasingly epistemic. This is demonstrated in our results, where ensembles exposed to internal variability under an unseen climate change scenario experience a considerable degradation in performance associated with a significant increase in EU. These findings are supported by González-Abad and Baño-Medina (2023), who train an $M = 10$ ensemble of CNNs for downscaling of surface temperature in a global climate model and observe performance deterioration under a future warming scenario, in their case without removing the forced response. Although González-Abad and Baño-Medina (2023) did not report epistemic uncertainty, ensemble improvement, as in our findings, increases under the climate change scenario, indicating that ensemble disagreement scales with intensifying shift.

Our results support the existing evidence regarding the limitations of single model predictive uncertainty under covariate shift (Gal and Ghahramani 2016; Valdenegro-Toro and Saromo 2022; Yang et al. 2024; Hein et al. 2019) in the context of ENSO prediction under future climate change. We find that AU appropriately identifies covariate shift only when increases in EU are substantially large, which occurs mostly for leads within 6 months in our experiments. Contrarily, for longer, less predictable leads, where in-distribution AU is relatively high, components fail to lower their confidence – and even become increasingly confident – at unfamiliar inputs. This is coincident with the observation that, at short lead times, where mean AU is low, there is a moderate correlation between AU and EU – consistent with, e.g., the $M = 20$ ensemble of Schreck et al. 2024 in a low AU hydrometeor classification problem – while this correlation breaks down and reverses as AU increases with progressing lead (see Figure S19). Many relevant problems in climate have high aleatoric uncertainty. Our results suggests that, in such scenarios, not accounting for epistemic uncertainty under covariate shift can be particularly costly.

Aside from variational inference, further exploration into cheap single model alternatives to ensembles for joint aleatoric and epistemic UQ is warranted. For instance, evidential deep learning (EDL) (Sensoy et al. 2018), also known as Prior Networks (Malinin and Gales 2018), tasks a neural network to model a Dirichlet distribution over predictive categoricals, where the spread of the Dirichlet captures epistemic uncertainty. EDL performs well on benchmark datasets and shows promise in Schreck et al. (2024) for meteorological tasks. However, the family of loss functions used in these techniques can lead to undesirable properties of the learned epistemic uncertainty, like an insensitivity to training size (Bengs et al. 2023; Shen et al. 2024). A related approach is ensemble distribution distillation (Malinin and Gales 2018; Ryabinin et al. 2021), which attempts to distill the epistemic distributions of a deep ensemble in a single model to save time on inference computation. This method has shown performance improvements over traditional knowledge distillation but struggles to capture increases in epistemic uncertainty away from the training distribution (Malinin and Gales 2018). Beyond deep ensembles, the investigation of more theoretically grounded frameworks for deep UQ, e.g., Bayesian deep ensemble methods (D’Angelo and Fortuin 2021; Wild et al. 2023), is a promising avenue for future research at the intersection of ML and climate.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this project was provided in part by grants AGS-2210068 and AGS-1749261 from the National Science Foundation. We thank John Fasullo at the National Center for Atmospheric Research for providing the OHC data.

Open Research

Code for this project is available at <https://github.com/dev-mcafee/deepensembles>.

References

- Abdar, Moloud et al. (2021). “A review of uncertainty quantification in deep learning: Techniques, applications and challenges”. In: *Information Fusion* 76, pp. 243–297. ISSN: 1566-2535. DOI: 10.1016/j.inffus.2021.05.008. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2021.05.008>.
- Abe, Taiga et al. (2024). “Pathologies of Predictive Diversity in Deep Ensembles”. In: *ICLR 2024*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2302.00704. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.00704>.
- Ashukha, Arsenii et al. (2020). “Pitfalls of In-Domain Uncertainty Estimation and Ensembling in Deep Learning”. In: *ICLR 2020*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2002.06470. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.06470>.
- Barnston, Anthony G. et al. (2012). “Skill of Real-Time Seasonal ENSO Model Predictions during 2002–11: Is Our Capability Increasing?” In: *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 93.5, pp. 631–651. ISSN: 1520-0477. DOI: 10.1175/bams-d-11-00111.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00111.1>.
- Bengs, Viktor, Eyke Hüllermeier, and Willem Waegeman (2023). “On Second-Order Scoring Rules for Epistemic Uncertainty Quantification”. In: *ICML 2023*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2301.12736. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12736>.
- Błasiok, Jarosław et al. (2023). “When Does Optimizing a Proper Loss Yield Calibration?” In: *NeurIPS 2023*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.18764. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18764>.
- Blei, David M., Alp Kucukelbir, and Jon D. McAuliffe (2017). “Variational Inference: A Review for Statisticians”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112.518, pp. 859–877. ISSN: 1537-274X. DOI: 10.1080/01621459.2017.1285773. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2017.1285773>.
- Blundell, Charles et al. (2015). “Weight Uncertainty in Neural Networks”. In: *ICML 2015*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1505.05424. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.05424>.
- Brier, Glenn W. (Jan. 1950). “Verification of Forecasts Expressed in Terms of Probability”. In: *Monthly Weather Review* 78.1, pp. 1–3. ISSN: 1520-0493. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0493(1950)078<0001:vofeit>2.0.co;2. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1950\)078%3C0001:VOFEIT%3E2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1950)078%3C0001:VOFEIT%3E2.0.CO;2).
- Bröcker, Jochen and Leonard A. Smith (2007). “Increasing the Reliability of Reliability Diagrams”. In: *Weather and Forecasting* 22.3, pp. 651–661. ISSN: 0882-8156. DOI: 10.1175/waf993.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/WAF993.1>.
- Capotondi, A. et al. (2020). “ENSO and Pacific Decadal Variability in the Community Earth System Model Version 2”. In: *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 12.12. ISSN: 1942-2466. DOI: 10.1029/2019ms002022. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2019MS002022>.
- Chen, Han-Ching et al. (2021). “ENSO Dynamics in the E3SM-1-0, CESM2, and GFDL-CM4 Climate Models”. In: *Journal of Climate*, pp. 1–59. ISSN: 1520-0442. DOI: 10.1175/jcli-d-21-0355.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-21-0355.1>.
- Chen, Qi et al. (2025). “Toward long-range ENSO prediction with an explainable deep learning model”. In: *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* 8.1. ISSN: 2397-3722. DOI: 10.1038/s41612-025-01159-w. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41612-025-01159-w>.
- D’Angelo, Francesco and Vincent Fortuin (2021). “Repulsive Deep Ensembles are Bayesian”. In: *NeurIPS 2021*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2106.11642. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11642>.
- Danabasoglu, G. et al. (2020). “The Community Earth System Model Version 2 (CESM2)”. In: *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 12.2. ISSN: 1942-2466. DOI: 10.1029/2019ms001916. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001916>.
- Delanay, Antoine and Hannah M. Christensen (2022). “Interpretable Deep Learning for Probabilistic MJO Prediction”. In: *Geophysical Research Letters* 49.16. ISSN: 1944-8007. DOI: 10.1029/2022gl098566. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098566>.

- Depeweg, Stefan et al. (2018). “Decomposition of Uncertainty in Bayesian Deep Learning for Efficient and Risk-sensitive Learning”. In: *ICML 2018*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1710.07283. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.07283>.
- Deser, Clara et al. (Dec. 2024). “Effects of macro vs. micro initialization and ocean initial-condition memory on the evolution of ensemble spread in the CESM2 large ensemble”. In: *Climate Dynamics* 63.1. ISSN: 1432-0894. DOI: 10.1007/s00382-024-07553-z. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00382-024-07553-z>.
- Duan, Ruxiao et al. (2023). “Evidential Uncertainty Quantification: A Variance-Based Perspective”. In: *WACV 2024*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2311.11367. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.11367>.
- Ehsan, Muhammad Azhar et al. (2024). “Real-time ENSO forecast skill evaluated over the last two decades, with focus on the onset of ENSO events”. In: *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* 7.1. ISSN: 2397-3722. DOI: 10.1038/s41612-024-00845-5. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41612-024-00845-5>.
- Epstein, Edward S (1969a). “A Scoring System for Probability Forecasts of Ranked Categories”. en. In: *J. Appl. Meteorol.* 8.6, pp. 985–987.
- (Dec. 1969b). “Stochastic dynamic prediction”. en. In: *Tellus* 21.6, pp. 739–759.
- Fort, Stanislav, Huiyi Hu, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan (2020). *Deep Ensembles: A Loss Landscape Perspective*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1912.02757. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.02757>.
- Frankcombe, Leela M. et al. (2018). “On the Choice of Ensemble Mean for Estimating the Forced Signal in the Presence of Internal Variability”. In: *Journal of Climate* 31.14, pp. 5681–5693. ISSN: 1520-0442. DOI: 10.1175/jcli-d-17-0662.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0662.1>.
- Gal, Yarin and Zoubin Ghahramani (2016). “Dropout as a Bayesian Approximation: Representing Model Uncertainty in Deep Learning”. In: *ICML 2016*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1506.02142. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.02142>.
- Gneiting, Tilmann, Fadoua Balabdaoui, and Adrian E. Raftery (2007). “Probabilistic Forecasts, Calibration and Sharpness”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 69.2, pp. 243–268. ISSN: 1467-9868. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2007.00587.x. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2007.00587.x>.
- Gneiting, Tilmann and Adrian E Raftery (2007). “Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and Estimation”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 102.477, pp. 359–378. ISSN: 1537-274X. DOI: 10.1198/016214506000001437. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1198/016214506000001437>.
- González-Abad, Jose and Jorge Baño-Medina (2023). *Deep Ensembles to Improve Uncertainty Quantification of Statistical Downscaling Models under Climate Change Conditions*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.00975. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.00975>.
- Gordon, Emily M. and Elizabeth A. Barnes (2022). “Incorporating Uncertainty Into a Regression Neural Network Enables Identification of Decadal State-Dependent Predictability in CESM2”. In: *Geophysical Research Letters* 49.15. ISSN: 1944-8007. DOI: 10.1029/2022gl098635. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2022GL098635>.
- Gu, Qinxue et al. (2024). “Wide range of possible trajectories of North Atlantic climate in a warming world”. In: *Nature Communications* 15.1. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-024-48401-2. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-48401-2>.
- Gunnarson, Jacob L., Malte F. Stuecker, and Sen Zhao (2024). “Drivers of future extratropical sea surface temperature variability changes in the North Pacific”. In: *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* 7.1. ISSN: 2397-3722. DOI: 10.1038/s41612-024-00702-5. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41612-024-00702-5>.
- Guo, Chuan et al. (2017). *On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1706.04599. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04599>.
- Ham, Yoo-Geun, Jeong-Hwan Kim, and Jing-Jia Luo (2019). “Deep learning for multi-year ENSO forecasts”. In: *Nature* 573.7775, pp. 568–572. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-019-1559-7. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1559-7>.
- He, Kaiming et al. (2015). “Deep residual learning for image recognition”. In: eprint: 1512.03385 (cs.CV).
- Hein, Matthias, Maksym Andriushchenko, and Julian Bitterwolf (2019). “Why ReLU networks yield high-confidence predictions far away from the training data and how to mitigate the problem”. In: *CVPR 2019*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1812.05720. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.05720>.

- Held, Isaac M. and Brian J. Soden (2006). “Robust Responses of the Hydrological Cycle to Global Warming”. In: *Journal of Climate* 19.21, pp. 5686–5699. ISSN: 0894-8755. DOI: 10.1175/jcli3990.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3990.1>.
- Hüllermeier, Eyke and Willem Waegeman (2021). “Aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in machine learning: an introduction to concepts and methods”. In: *Machine Learning* 110.3, pp. 457–506. ISSN: 1573-0565. DOI: 10.1007/s10994-021-05946-3. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10994-021-05946-3>.
- IPCC (2021). “Human Influence on the Climate System”. In: *Climate Change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press. Chap. 3, pp. 423–552.
- (2023). “Future Global Climate: Scenario-based Projections and Near-term Information”. In: *Climate Change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press. Chap. 4, pp. 553–672. ISBN: 9781009157896. DOI: 10.1017/9781009157896.006. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.006>.
- Izmailov, Pavel et al. (2021). “What Are Bayesian Neural Network Posteriors Really Like?” In: *ICML 2021*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2104.14421. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.14421>.
- Kalnay, Eugenia (2002). “Historical Overview of Numerical Weather Prediction”. In: *Atmospheric Modeling, Data Assimilation and Predictability*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Chap. 1.
- Kendall, Alex and Yarin Gal (2017). “What Uncertainties Do We Need in Bayesian Deep Learning for Computer Vision?” In: *NeurIPS 2017*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1703.04977. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.04977>.
- Lakshminarayanan, Balaji, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell (2017). “Simple and Scalable Predictive Uncertainty Estimation using Deep Ensembles”. In: *NIPS 2017*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1612.01474. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.01474>.
- Lee, Stefan et al. (2015). *Why M Heads are Better than One: Training a Diverse Ensemble of Deep Networks*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1511.06314. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06314>.
- Leith, C. E. (1974). “Theoretical Skill of Monte Carlo Forecasts”. In: *Monthly Weather Review* 102.6, pp. 409–418. ISSN: 1520-0493. DOI: 10.1175/1520-0493(1974)102<0409:tsomcf>2.0.co;2. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493\(1974\)102%3C0409:TSOMCF%3E2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1974)102%3C0409:TSOMCF%3E2.0.CO;2).
- Leung, Jeremy Cheuk-Hin et al. (2022). “Differential expansion speeds of Indo-Pacific warm pool and deep convection favoring pool under greenhouse warming”. In: *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* 5.1. ISSN: 2397-3722. DOI: 10.1038/s41612-022-00315-w. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41612-022-00315-w>.
- Lewis, John M. (July 2005). “Roots of Ensemble Forecasting”. In: *Monthly Weather Review* 133.7, pp. 1865–1885. ISSN: 0027-0644. DOI: 10.1175/mwr2949.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/MWR2949.1>.
- Li, Hao et al. (2017). “Visualizing the loss landscape of neural nets”. In: eprint: 1712.09913 (cs.LG).
- Lopez, Hosmay and Ben P. Kirtman (Sept. 2014). “WWBs, ENSO predictability, the spring barrier and extreme events”. In: *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 119.17. ISSN: 2169-8996. DOI: 10.1002/2014jd021908. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021908>.
- Lou, Jiale, Matthew Newman, and Andrew Hoell (2023). “Multi-decadal variation of ENSO forecast skill since the late 1800s”. In: *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* 6.1. ISSN: 2397-3722. DOI: 10.1038/s41612-023-00417-z. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41612-023-00417-z>.
- Luo, Xihaier et al. (2022). “A Bayesian Deep Learning Approach to Near-Term Climate Prediction”. In: *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 14.10. ISSN: 1942-2466. DOI: 10.1029/2022ms003058. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003058>.
- Malinin, Andrey (2019). “Uncertainty Estimation in Deep Learning with application to Spoken Language Assessment”. en. PhD thesis. University of Cambridge. DOI: 10.17863/CAM.45912. URL: <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/298857>.
- Malinin, Andrey and Mark Gales (2018). “Predictive Uncertainty Estimation via Prior Networks”. In: *NeurIPS 2018*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1802.10501. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.10501>.
- Mariotti, Annarita et al. (2020). “Windows of Opportunity for Skillful Forecasts Subseasonal to Seasonal and Beyond”. In: *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 101.5, E608–E625. ISSN: 1520-0477. DOI: 10.1175/bams-d-18-0326.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-18-0326.1>.

- Mayer, Kirsten J. and Elizabeth A. Barnes (May 2021). “Subseasonal Forecasts of Opportunity Identified by an Explainable Neural Network”. In: *Geophysical Research Letters* 48.10. ISSN: 1944-8007. DOI: 10.1029/2020gl092092. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092092>.
- McPhaden, Michael J., Stephen E. Zebiak, and Michael H. Glantz (2006). “ENSO as an Integrating Concept in Earth Science”. In: *Science* 314.5806, pp. 1740–1745. ISSN: 1095-9203. DOI: 10.1126/science.1132588. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1132588>.
- Minderer, Matthias et al. (2021). “Revisiting the Calibration of Modern Neural Networks”. In: *NeurIPS 2021*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2106.07998. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.07998>.
- Murphy, Allan H. (1998). “The Early History of Probability Forecasts: Some Extensions and Clarifications”. en. In: *Weather and Forecasting* 13.1, pp. 5–15.
- Murphy, Allan H. and Robert L. Winkler (1977). “Reliability of Subjective Probability Forecasts of Precipitation and Temperature”. In: *Applied Statistics* 26.1, p. 41. ISSN: 0035-9254. DOI: 10.2307/2346866. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2346866>.
- Nixon, Jeremy, Dustin Tran, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan (2020). “Why Aren’t Bootstrapped Neural Networks Better?” In: *NeurIPS 2020*.
- Okumura, Yuko M. and Clara Deser (2010). “Asymmetry in the Duration of El Niño and La Niña”. In: *Journal of Climate* 23.21, pp. 5826–5843. ISSN: 0894-8755. DOI: 10.1175/2010jcli3592.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2010JCLI3592.1>.
- Ovadia, Yaniv et al. (2019). “Can You Trust Your Model’s Uncertainty? Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty Under Dataset Shift”. In: *NeurIPS 2019*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1906.02530. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02530>.
- Palmer, Tim et al. (2006). “Ensemble prediction: A pedagogical perspective”. In: *ECMWF Newsletter*. DOI: 10.21957/AB129056EW. URL: <https://www.ecmwf.int/node/18024>.
- Planton, Yann et al. (2018). “Western Pacific Oceanic Heat Content: A Better Predictor of La Niña Than of El Niño”. In: *Geophysical Research Letters* 45.18, pp. 9824–9833. ISSN: 1944-8007. DOI: 10.1029/2018gl079341. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079341>.
- Rahaman, Rahul and Alexandre H. Thiery (2021). “Uncertainty Quantification and Deep Ensembles”. In: *NeurIPS 2021*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2007.08792. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.08792>.
- Rodgers, Keith B. et al. (2021). “Ubiquity of human-induced changes in climate variability”. In: *Earth System Dynamics* 12.4, pp. 1393–1411. ISSN: 2190-4987. DOI: 10.5194/esd-12-1393-2021. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5194/esd-12-1393-2021>.
- Ryabinin, Max, Andrey Malinin, and Mark Gales (2021). “Scaling Ensemble Distribution Distillation to many classes with Proxy targets”. In: eprint: 2105.06987 (cs.LG).
- Schreck, John S. et al. (Oct. 2024). “Evidential Deep Learning: Enhancing Predictive Uncertainty Estimation for Earth System Science Applications”. In: *Artificial Intelligence for the Earth Systems* 3.4. ISSN: 2769-7525. DOI: 10.1175/aies-d-23-0093.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/AIES-D-23-0093.1>.
- Sensoy, Murat, Lance Kaplan, and Melih Kandemir (2018). “Evidential Deep Learning to Quantify Classification Uncertainty”. In: *NeurIPS 2018*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1806.01768. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.01768>.
- Sharmila, S. et al. (2023). “Contrasting El Niño–La Niña Predictability and Prediction Skill in 2-Year Reforecasts of the Twentieth Century”. In: *Journal of Climate* 36.5, pp. 1269–1285. ISSN: 1520-0442. DOI: 10.1175/jcli-d-22-0028.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-22-0028.1>.
- Shen, Maohao et al. (2024). “Are Uncertainty Quantification Capabilities of Evidential Deep Learning a Mirage?” In: *NeurIPS 2024*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2402.06160. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06160>.
- Valdenegro-Toro, Matias and Daniel Saromo (2022). *A Deeper Look into Aleatoric and Epistemic Uncertainty Disentanglement*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2204.09308. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.09308>.
- Wang, Haoyu et al. (2024). “The role of sea surface salinity in ENSO forecasting in the 21st century”. In: *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science* 7.1. ISSN: 2397-3722. DOI: 10.1038/s41612-024-00763-6. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41612-024-00763-6>.
- Wang, Yipei and Xiaoqian Wang (2025). “Agree to Disagree: Demystifying Homogeneous Deep Ensembles through Distributional Equivalence”. In: *ICLR 2025*.

- Wild, Veit David et al. (2023). “A Rigorous Link between Deep Ensembles and (Variational) Bayesian Methods”. In: *NeurIPS 2023*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.15027. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15027>.
- Wilson, Andrew Gordon and Pavel Izmailov (2020). *Bayesian Deep Learning and a Probabilistic Perspective of Generalization*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2002.08791. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08791>.
- Wimmer, Lisa et al. (2023). “Quantifying Aleatoric and Epistemic Uncertainty in Machine Learning: Are Conditional Entropy and Mutual Information Appropriate Measures?” In: *UAI 2023*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2209.03302. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.03302>.
- Wu, Xixin and Mark Gales (2021). *Should Ensemble Members Be Calibrated?* DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2101.05397. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.05397>.
- Yang, Jingkan et al. (2024). “Generalized Out-of-Distribution Detection: A Survey”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 132.12, pp. 5635–5662. ISSN: 1573-1405. DOI: 10.1007/s11263-024-02117-4. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11263-024-02117-4>.

S1 Regularization

The addition of a prior $p(\mathbf{w})$ to the NLL objective makes the training loss the negative log posterior density.

$$\begin{aligned}
 L(p_{\mathbf{w}}) &= - \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \log p_{\mathbf{w}}(y_j | \mathbf{x}_j) + \log p(\mathbf{w}) \right) \\
 &= - \left(\log \prod_{j=1}^N p_{\mathbf{w}}(y_j | \mathbf{x}_j) + \log p(\mathbf{w}) \right) \\
 &\stackrel{c}{=} -(\log p_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}) + \log p(\mathbf{w})) \\
 &\stackrel{c}{=} -\log p(\mathbf{w} | \mathcal{D})
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\stackrel{c}{=}$ denotes equality up to an additive constant. The standard approach in Bayesian deep learning assumes a zero-mean, isotropic Gaussian prior; in Izmailov et al. (2021), the isotropic Gaussian yields similar performance to a logistic prior and a mixture of two isotropic Gaussians. This is equivalent to L2 regularization.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \log p(\mathbf{w}) &= \log \prod_{l=1}^{N_w} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{w}^{(l)})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
 &= \sum_{l=1}^{N_w} \log\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{w}^{(l)})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)\right) \\
 &\stackrel{c}{=} -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2
 \end{aligned}$$

where N_w is the number of weights and σ^2 is the prior variance.

S2 EU and Ensemble Improvement

This derivation is also provided in, e.g., Abe et al. (2024).

Let \mathbf{p}_i denote the probability vector predicted by component i of a deep ensemble, given an arbitrary input with target y , and $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ represent the parameters of the ensemble-mean predictive distribution. Brier Score improvement (over the component-mean score) is guaranteed by Jensen's inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \text{BS}(\mathbf{p}_i) - \text{BS}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}) &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^K (\mathbf{p}_i^{(k)} - [y = k])^2 - (\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(k)} - [y = k])^2 \\
 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^K (\mathbf{p}_i^{(k)})^2 - 2[y = k]\mathbf{p}_i^{(k)} + [y = k]^2 - (\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(k)})^2 + 2[y = k]\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(k)} - [y = k]^2 \\
 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^M (\mathbf{p}_i^{(k)})^2 - (\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(k)})^2 + \frac{2[y = k]}{M} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^M (\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(k)} - \mathbf{p}_i^{(k)}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^M (\mathbf{p}_i^{(k)})^2 - (\bar{\mathbf{p}}^{(k)})^2
 \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to equation (6).

For convex loss ϕ , $\phi(\mathbb{E}[p], y) - \mathbb{E}[\phi(p, y)]$ is generally referred to as the Jensen gap, i.e., Brier Score improvement is the Jensen gap with respect to Brier Score. Beyond Brier Score, we expect the Jensen gap of any convex loss to increase under covariate shift if the variance of ensemble probabilities (EU) increases (Liao and Berg 2017; Streeter and Dillon 2023). For example, in Figure 9, the Jensen gap with respect to NLL increases with EU under covariate shift.

S3 Fixed Lead Design

Below, we reproduce the figures of section 5 using the fixed lead time (flt) problem design, where we train independent ($M = 10$) ensembles for leads 1, 6, 12, and 18 months.




Figure S1: As in Figure 3 but for flt design. Increasing ensemble size improves performance of the ensemble-mean predictive distribution by better accounting for epistemic uncertainty.




Figure S2: As in Figure 4 for fit design. When averaging skill across lead times, each ensemble outscores all of its components.




Figure S3: As in Figure 5 for fit design. Each ensemble outperforms all of its individual components for each lead time.




Figure S4: As in Figure 6 for flt design. Predictability is lower for neutral phases and 18 month predictability is higher for EN than LN initializations.




Figure S5: As in Figure 7 for flt design. AU identifies winter phase locking and spring predictability barrier.




Figure S6: As in Figure 8 for fit design. EU and component-mean NLL increase after the mid-21st century.




Figure S7: As in Figure 9 for flt design. NLL improvement increases after the mid-21st century in line with EU.




Figure S8: As in Figure 10 for fit design. AU increases under covariate shift only when EU increase is sufficiently large.




Figure S9: As in Figure 11 for fit design for leads 1, 12 and 18 months. EU better differentiates member samples from the premodern period versus the shifted period than AU.




Figure S10: As in Figure 12 for fit design. Loss and EU increase for each phase, while the AU signal is dampened.

S4 Calibration Bias




Figure S11: (a) Top-label reliability diagrams for each ensemble (stars) and their components (shading) and (b) corresponding expected calibration errors for the premodern period.

In Figure S11, we show the top-label (predicted class) calibration of each ensemble and its components (Guo et al. 2017). We group lead times together in this calibration analysis for ease of visualization. Let y_0 represent the prediction of the classifier induced by model p . The model is top-label calibrated if it satisfies:

$$\mathbb{E}[[y = y_0] | p(y_0)] = p(y_0)$$

Top-label calibration requires that, e.g., across all inputs where a model predicts an arbitrary ENSO phase with 60% probability, that phase transpires roughly 60% of the time. Top-label calibration is visualized using reliability diagrams (Murphy and Winkler 1977), where a model’s top-label probabilities over the testing set are grouped into, e.g., equally-populated bins (Pakdaman Naeini et al. 2015), and the accuracy of each bin is plotted against the bin-mean probabilities. The reliability curve of a top-label calibrated model will approximately follow the 1:1 dashed line of the reliability diagram (Bröcker and Smith 2007). The expected calibration error (ECE), or the absolute deviation from the 1:1 line averaged across bins, is a commonly reported metric of top-label calibration and approaches zero at calibration (Pakdaman Naeini et al. 2015).

Figure S11 shows that, across ensembles, the components have good top-label calibration, and the component-mean ECE improves marginally with training size. However, surprisingly, we find in Figure S11b that the ensembles, while still well calibrated, have worse ECE than almost all of their components. This conflicts with the consensus in the literature that deep ensembling improves calibration, as measured by ECE (Ovadia et al. 2019). From Figure S11a, we observe an underestimation bias in top-label ensemble probabilities, predominantly affecting short-range predictions. Although less pronounced, the components also demonstrate slight underestimation bias at short leads, which is likely due to training interference from longer leads. However, Figure S12 shows that this systematic bias in ensemble calibration remains when using the fixed lead strategy.

Deep ensemble underestimation bias is also observed in Rahaman and Thiery (2021) and Wu and Gales (2021), who provide similar explanation for this phenomenon. Informally, this artifact is a consequence of the simultaneous increases in both predictive accuracy and uncertainty when averaging prob-




Figure S12: As in Figure S11 for fit design.

abilistic predictions. Namely, the entropy of the ensemble prediction is at least the component-mean entropy, i.e., AU, according to Jensen’s inequality (Rahaman and Thiery 2021). Likewise, the ensemble’s top-label probability can be no greater than the component-mean top-label probability (Wu and Gales 2021). Thus, while ensemble averaging generally improves accuracy within bins, it simultaneously prohibits the bin-centers from migrating to higher probabilities relative to less-accurate components. This deteriorates ECE unless ensemble components have overestimation bias, which is common in deep learning (Guo et al. 2017; Ovadia et al. 2019), perhaps related to overfitting on insufficient training data (Błasiok et al. 2023). Importantly, this artifact is not specific to deep ensembles and can affect all methods which improve accuracy by averaging over probabilistic predictions, such as VI or Bayesian ensemble methods.

Fortunately, deep ensemble underestimation bias can be effectively corrected post hoc through temperature scaling, which is the standard approach for correcting overestimation bias in overfit single models (Guo et al. 2017). Temperature scaling traditionally operates on logits, but can be implemented for ensemble probabilities, as in Rahaman and Thiery (2021), by applying a simple scaling function S to each probability vector \mathbf{p} predicted by an ensemble.

$$S(\mathbf{p}, T) = \frac{1}{Z} \left((\mathbf{p}^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{T}}, \dots, (\mathbf{p}^{(K)})^{\frac{1}{T}} \right)$$

where Z is the normalizing constant and T is the temperature. $T > 1$ increases the entropy of each predictive distribution and $T < 1$ decreases entropy. Since the underestimation bias is strongly influenced by lead time, we find a vector \mathbf{T} , containing a unique temperature for each lead time, which minimizes NLL on the validation set over the premodern period for each ensemble. We plot \mathbf{T} for each ensemble in Figure S13. In Figure S14, we show the resultant reliability diagrams after temperature scaling. For Figure S14, we also temperature scale the logits of each component (Guo et al. 2017), as the softmax temperature implicitly learned in training can worsen component calibration biases (Ashukha et al. 2020). Temperature scaling effectively mitigates the top-label underestimation bias, bringing the ensemble ECEs to within the distributions of component scores, as shown in Figure S14. Importantly, after temperature scaling of both ensembles and components, the aforementioned short-range performance deficit in NLL and Brier score is corrected, as shown in Figure S15.




Figure S13: Scaled temperatures for each ensemble. Due to component biases, ensemble underestimation bias is largest for leads within 5 months.




Figure S14: As in Figure S11, but for ensembles with temperature scaling.




Figure S15: As in Figure 5, but for ensembles with temperature scaling.

S5 XAI

Integrated Gradients (IG) is an explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) technique, which estimates the importance of input features in determining neural network output (Sundararajan et al. 2017). IG quantifies the relevance of a local anomaly by integrating the gradient of the predicted class logit with respect to the local anomaly along a straightline path from a baseline value to the anomaly. We prescribe a zero baseline, i.e., climatology, and compute IG heatmaps for all testing set predictions of five components of *premodern* for leads 1, 6, and 12 months. The composite heatmaps in Figure S16 suggest that, unsurprisingly, for both the premodern and shifted periods, components primarily focus on anomalies in the tropical Pacific when determining their predictions.




Figure S16: The absolute value of IG relevance averaged over five components of *premodern* for the (a) premodern and (b) shifted periods.

S6 Additional Results




Figure S17: As in Figure 7 separated on input phase for *premodern*. The SPB is muted but remains for CN and WN inputs, as shown in the accuracy plots. However, AU becomes less sufficient at signaling the spring predictability barrier for neutral conditions, especially for WN inputs, suggesting model deficiencies are contributing to the observed SPB.




Figure S18: Mean AU and accuracy for *premodern* ensemble for EN initializations during November.




Figure S19: Linear correlation between AU and EU as a function of lead time for the testing set. The correlation is positive at short ranges, and is negative for the least predictable leads. Part of this behavior follows naturally from the definitions of AU and EU. For long leads, where mean AU is large, increasing AU concentrates ensemble members near the center of the probability simplex, decreasing EU. Whereas, for short leads, where mean AU is low, EU increases when certain components drift towards the center of the simplex away from the component-mean prediction, which also increases AU.

References

- Abe, Taiga et al. (2024). “Pathologies of Predictive Diversity in Deep Ensembles”. In: *ICLR 2024*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2302.00704. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.00704>.
- Ashukha, Arsenii et al. (2020). “Pitfalls of In-Domain Uncertainty Estimation and Ensembling in Deep Learning”. In: *ICLR 2020*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2002.06470. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.06470>.
- Błasiok, Jarosław et al. (2023). “When Does Optimizing a Proper Loss Yield Calibration?” In: *NeurIPS 2023*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.18764. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18764>.

- Bröcker, Jochen and Leonard A. Smith (2007). “Increasing the Reliability of Reliability Diagrams”. In: *Weather and Forecasting* 22.3, pp. 651–661. ISSN: 0882-8156. DOI: 10.1175/waf993.1. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/WAF993.1>.
- Guo, Chuan et al. (2017). *On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1706.04599. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04599>.
- Izmailov, Pavel et al. (2021). “What Are Bayesian Neural Network Posteriors Really Like?” In: *ICML 2021*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2104.14421. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.14421>.
- Liao, J. G. and Arthur Berg (2017). *Sharpening Jensen’s Inequality*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1707.08644. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.08644>.
- Murphy, Allan H. and Robert L. Winkler (1977). “Reliability of Subjective Probability Forecasts of Precipitation and Temperature”. In: *Applied Statistics* 26.1, p. 41. ISSN: 0035-9254. DOI: 10.2307/2346866. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2346866>.
- Ovadia, Yaniv et al. (2019). “Can You Trust Your Model’s Uncertainty? Evaluating Predictive Uncertainty Under Dataset Shift”. In: *NeurIPS 2019*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1906.02530. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02530>.
- Pakdaman Naeni, Mahdi, Gregory Cooper, and Milos Hauskrecht (2015). “Obtaining Well Calibrated Probabilities Using Bayesian Binning”. In: *AAAI 2015* 29.1. ISSN: 2159-5399. DOI: 10.1609/aaai.v29i1.9602. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v29i1.9602>.
- Rahaman, Rahul and Alexandre H. Thiery (2021). “Uncertainty Quantification and Deep Ensembles”. In: *NeurIPS 2021*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2007.08792. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.08792>.
- Streeter, Matthew and Joshua V. Dillon (2023). *Automatically Bounding the Taylor Remainder Series: Tighter Bounds and New Applications*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2212.11429. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.11429>.
- Sundararajan, Mukund, Ankur Taly, and Qiqi Yan (2017). *Axiomatic Attribution for Deep Networks*. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1703.01365. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.01365>.
- Wu, Xixin and Mark Gales (2021). *Should Ensemble Members Be Calibrated?* DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.2101.05397. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.05397>.