Open and Sustainable AI: challenges, opportunities and the road ahead in the life sciences

Gavin Farrell¹, Eleni Adamidi², Rafael Andrade Buono³, Mihail Anton⁴, Omar Abdelghani Attafi¹, Salvador Capella Gutierrez⁵, Emidio Capriotti^{6,7}, Leyla Jael Castro⁸, Davide Cirillo⁵, Lisa Crossman^{9,10}, Christophe Dessimoz^{11,12} Alexandros Dimopoulos^{13,14}, Raúl Fernández-Díaz^{15,16,17}, Styliani-Christina Fragkouli^{18,19}, Carole Goble²⁰, Wei Gu²¹, John M. Hancock²², Alireza Khanteymoori²³, Tom Lenaerts^{24,25,26,27,28}, Fabio G. Liberante⁴, Peter Maccallum⁴, Alexander Miguel Monzon¹, Magnus Palmblad²⁹, Lucy Poveda¹², Ovidiu Radulescu³⁰, Denis C. Shields^{15,16}, Shoaib Sufi²⁰, Thanasis Vergoulis², Fotis Psomopoulos^{18,*}, Silvio C.E. Tosatto^{1,31,*}

*Co-corresponding authors: ¹⁸Institute of Applied Biosciences, Centre for Research and Technology Hellas, Thessaloniki, Greece and ¹Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Padova, Padova, 35121, Italy. **E-mails**: fpsom@certh.gr, silvio.tosatto@unipd.it

- ¹ Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Padova, Via Ugo Bassi 58/B, 35131 Padova, Italy
- ² Athena Research & Innovation Center, Aigialias & Chalepa, 15125, Marousi, Greece
- ³ VIB Data Core, VIB.AI Center for AI & Computational Biology, Technologiepark-Zwijnaarde 75, 9052 Ghent, Belgium
- ⁴ ELIXIR Europe Hub, EMBL-EBI South Building, Wellcome Genome, Hinxton CB10 1SD, United Kingdom
- ⁵ Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC), Plaça Eusebi Güell, 1-3, 08034, Barcelona, Spain
- Department of Pharmacy and Biotechnology, University of Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy
- ⁷ Computational Genomics Platform, IRCCS University Hospital of Bologna, 40138 Bologna, Italy
- ⁸ ZB MED Information Centre for Life Sciences, Gleueler Straße 60, 50931 Cologne, Germany
- ⁹ SequenceAnalysis.co.uk, United Kingdom
- ¹⁰ University of East Anglia, Research Park, Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom
- ¹¹ Department of Computational Biology, University of Lausanne, Genopode 2024.3, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
- ¹² Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Amphipôle, Quartier UNIL-Sorge, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
- ¹³ Institute for Fundamental Biomedical Science, Biomedical Sciences Research Center 'Alexander Fleming', Vari, Greece
- ¹⁴ Department of Informatics & Telematics, School of Digital Technology, Harokopio University, Athens, Greece
- ¹⁵ School of Medicine, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland
- ¹⁶ Conway Institute of Biomolecular and Biomedical Research, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

- ¹⁷ IBM Research Dublin, Dublin D15 HN66, Ireland
- ¹⁸ Institute of Applied Biosciences, Centre for Research and Technology Hellas, Thessaloniki, 57001, Greece
- ¹⁹ Department of Biology, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, 15772, Greece
- ²⁰ Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M19 3PL, United Kingdom
- ²¹ Luxembourg National Data Service, 6, avenue des Hauts-Fourneaux, L-4362 Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
- ²² Institute of Biochemistry and Molecular Genetics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
- ²³ Department of Psychology, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany
- ²⁴ Machine Learning Group, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium
- ²⁵ Artificial Intelligence Lab, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium
- ²⁶ Interuniversity Institute of Bioinformatics in Brussels, ULB-VUB, Brussels, Belgium
- ²⁷ FARI, AI for the common good institute, ULB-VUB, Brussels, Belgium
- ²⁸ Center for Human-Compatible AI, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA
- ²⁹ Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden 2333 ZG, Netherlands
- ³⁰ LPHI, University of Montpellier, CNRS, INSERM, Montpellier, France
- ³¹ Institute of Biomembranes, Bioenergetics and Molecular Biotechnologies, National Research Council (CNR-IBIOM), Bari 70126, Italy

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) has recently seen transformative breakthroughs in the life sciences, expanding possibilities for researchers to interpret biological information at an unprecedented capacity, with novel applications and advances being made almost daily. In order to maximise return on the growing investments in Al-based life science research and accelerate this progress, it has become urgent to address the exacerbation of long-standing research challenges arising from the rapid adoption of AI methods. We review the increased erosion of trust in AI research outputs, driven by the issues of poor reusability and reproducibility, and highlight their consequent impact on environmental sustainability. Furthermore, we discuss the fragmented components of the AI ecosystem and lack of guiding pathways to best support Open and Sustainable AI (OSAI) model development. In response, this perspective introduces a practical set of OSAI recommendations directly mapped to over 300 components of the AI ecosystem. Our work connects researchers with relevant AI resources, facilitating the implementation of sustainable, reusable and transparent Al. Built upon life science community consensus and aligned to existing efforts. the outputs of this perspective are designed to aid the future development of policy and structured pathways for guiding AI implementation.

Introduction

The field of artificial intelligence (AI) has seen a surge in breakthrough advances across scientific domains where researchers are developing AI models at an unprecedented rate, a trend directly reflected in the proliferation of AI focused publications¹. In particular, the life sciences domain has seen a rapid adoption and integration of AI models, spurred on by an

increasing volume of expertly curated biological data through the FAIR movement² and democratised access to powerful hardware such as Graphical Processing Units (GPU). Additionally, landmark successes like AlphaFold 2³, which addressed the decades-old challenge of protein structure prediction, are leading to a snowballing effect in Al adoption⁴. This is evidenced by Al model applications upending traditional biological computational approaches and being integrated into life science databases and tooling^{5,6}.

In spite of this seemingly positive openness to adopt AI in the life sciences, there is a darker, publication-rooted AI methodology crisis^{1,7}, where many recent AI publications are of limited reuse value due to their opaque model descriptions⁸. These failings frequently stem from poor disclosure and provenance of the data, code, and model details, leading to challenges in reusability and reproducibility, such as inaccessible data⁹, incomplete code repositories¹⁰, or missing model information. Researchers outputting these inadequately described publications may be unaware of the importance of these elements, an issue compounded by a lack of dedicated guidance to help researchers action AI model sharing best practices. Furthermore, insufficient recognition for extra efforts to comprehensively describe models, and a low requirement by journals for detailed AI method disclosures act as additional catalysts to the proliferation of poorly described AI publications.

To address these systemic issues, lessons can be drawn from successful research practice reforms. The FAIR data movement⁶ is a key example of reform in the life sciences, and was in part supported in its wide application through community-developed toolkits (e.g., Research Data Management Toolkit¹¹, Pistoia Alliance Toolkit¹²). These toolkit resources act as central hubs of community maintained knowledge and can host guided implementation pathways for research best practices. In contrast, AI researchers in the life sciences currently lack such dedicated toolkits and face challenges in navigating the fragmented ecosystem of AI components like model registries^{13,14} and metadata standards^{15,16}. Without guiding AI best practice implementation pathways, progress towards widely available reusable and reproducible models will be impeded.

A less visible issue magnified by the low reusability and reproducibility of AI models is environmental sustainability¹⁷. Where a model cannot be reused or extensive experimentation is needed to reproduce it, wasteful resource usage occurs. This, paired with the growth in life scientists adopting more resource-intensive deep learning approaches like biological large language models (LLMs)¹⁸, will exacerbate environmental impacts if not addressed. These issues, compounded by a lack of Green AI¹⁹ development techniques and rare reporting of environmental impacts, demand attention to ensure accountable and sustainable AI in the life sciences.

It has therefore become urgent to anticipate and mitigate the growing risks associated with insufficient descriptions of AI methodologies, which spur poor reuse, reproducibility and impact environmental sustainability. This perspective highlights these risks and challenges from the life sciences point of view, taking into consideration existing global efforts (e.g., Bridge2AI⁸, Model Openness Framework²⁰, FUTURE-AI²¹, REFORMS²², MLCommons²³, FARR-RCN²⁴). The scope of our work addresses key challenges to achieving Open and Sustainable AI (OSAI) model development in the life sciences through improving reuse, reproducibility, and environmental sustainability. We propose an accessible set of guiding OSAI recommendations, with novelty in their mapping to a collection of over 300 AI components that can support their implementation. While acknowledging the wider scope of


Al research challenges, this perspective focuses on areas where there are available solutions to support a collective and international implementation. Therefore, we do not directly address the areas of Explainable Al²⁵, Trustworthy Al²⁶, Ethical Al²⁷ or the wider set of topics within Responsible Al²⁸, which raise complex socio-ethical considerations and often require more nuanced approaches. Our goal is to guide and connect researchers with solutions to enhance sustainable and collaborative Al-based research, accelerating life science discovery.

Current Challenges

Reusability of AI models

Despite the rapid growth in publications of new life science AI methods¹, they face a major lack of reuse such as through adaptation and redeployment. Even within the subset of life science models that do see reuse, there are obstacles to their full exploitation. A notable example is AlphaFold 2³, which was missing crucial model information. This impeded its full reuse potential, which necessitated a more open community reimplementation, OpenFold²⁹, that shared all model relevant code and data. The barriers to reuse of AI models in the life sciences stem from a diverse number of reasons such as: narrow task applicability; the academic requirement for novelty; inequitable resource access; and the lack of explainability and trustworthiness of deep learning based models. While not all these aspects impacting reuse can be addressed, there are a number of more practical issues that can be through researcher best practice reform (Fig. 1). These include absent or restrictive licensing, insufficient metadata, and low rates of dedicated AI registry usage.

Figure 1: Barriers to Open and Sustainable AI in the life sciences



researcher resources
e.g. Non-portable code

Three interlinked challenge areas of reusability, reproducibility and sustainability that must be overcome by researchers to accelerate Open and environmentally sustainable AI model development in the life sciences. Challenge areas have their key issues highlighted with examples, as well as their intersections.

There are many existing community developed recommendations and best practices that can be leveraged to improve AI model publishing such as the DOME Recommendations¹, Schmied et al.'s (2023) bioimaging checklist³⁰, REFORMS²², and Bridge2Al⁸. These resources can guide a researcher to correctly share all relevant model and dataset information. Unfortunately, many of these face low adoption amongst researchers and this issue is compounded by the loose or no journal mandates for Al specific methods disclosures in publications. For publishers, their inclusions for AI model specific software and data are generally loose beyond standard life science database and public software repository links such as GitHub or GitLab. During peer review, dataset and code repository links a researcher provides can often go ignored, with a reviewer instead solely focusing on the publication text. The current emphasis in research publishing involves text-based descriptions taking priority over a comprehensive sharing of the methods for real-world reuse. This leaves the practical considerations for supporting Al model reuse as an afterthought, if they are addressed at all. There are also few motivating incentives to encourage a researcher to take these extra steps despite their value to scientific advancements.

Researchers are also currently faced with too many options and a fragmented AI ecosystem of repositories to document and store their AI datasets, code and models. These include AI domain-agnostic solutions (e.g., Kaggle³¹, Hugging Face³²), life science specific resources (e.g., Kipoi¹⁴, BioImage Model Zoo¹³, Ersilia Model Hub³³), or even trusted non-AI platforms (e.g., Zenodo³⁴, in structured RO-Crates³⁵). This choice forces consideration of the diverse feature sets, user bases, long-term data retention policies, and trustworthiness of different platforms. As a result, this has often led to inconsistent sharing, poor findability, and models not being deposited in a reusable manner beyond basic raw file availability. Furthermore, a lack of trust in a potentially suitable method, due to insufficient information to fully assess it, often hinders reuse and encourages the development of new models rather than reimplementing potentially suitable ones. This can be overcome by addressing the failings of proper technical sharing of AI data, code, models, and their documentation covering important aspects such as their dataset availability and provenance³⁵.

FAIR for AI initiatives³⁶ are looking to support reusability globally across both academia and industry, with organisations like the Research Data Alliance (RDA) FAIR4ML Interest Group¹⁶ developing model metadata (FAIR4ML schema³⁷), Machine Learning Commons (MLCommons)²³ focusing on metadata for model datasets (Croissant¹⁵), and the Pistoia Alliance³⁸ addressing AI-data readiness (DataFairy project³⁹). However, in spite of this initial work, widely available and truly reusable AI models are still not yet prevalent. This is due to a multitude of reasons including the rapid increase in AI adoption outpacing best practice development, and critically, a lack of targeted top-down best practice mandates from funders, policy makers, and journals.

Reproducibility of AI models

Reproducibility is a multifaceted concept and in the context of AI research has various interpretations⁴⁰. We describe the challenge of AI model reproducibility in relation to the

reuse of a method's available data and code to: facilitate a reproduction of an AI model to enhance understanding; and reproduce consistent model benchmarking results to build trust in reported performances. These are vital to extract learnings and validate previous findings from promising research to build upon with future work⁴¹. Highlighting the widespread difficulty of AI model reproducibility in the life sciences, BioModelsML attempted to curate a collection of reproducible models from public sources but faced many time consuming barriers during their efforts⁴². Even in cases where all relevant information towards generating an AI model is openly available and clearly disclosed, software environment requirements can often be prohibitively time consuming and impractical to replicate. Therefore, an AI model can be transparently described, but practically not reproducible due to poor portability. As such, the adoption of solutions that can support standardised reproducibility of AI methods across systems require a broader uptake to address the reproducibility crisis facing researchers.

On the software side, several well-established resources exist to facilitate AI model portability and computational reproducibility. Many of these solutions span the areas of software containerisation (e.g., Docker⁴³), environment control (e.g., Conda⁴⁴), and workflow management (e.g., Nextflow⁴⁵, Snakemake⁴⁶, Galaxy⁴⁷). These solutions supporting portable deployment across systems, provide simpler reproductions of complex computational runs with far less overhead⁴⁸. While these solutions help reduce the barriers to life science computing reproducibility, their prevalence and use for AI models is still variable amongst publications⁴². Even though many of these reproducibility-enabling tools cover AI needs, many AI methods only share a disjoint repository of scripts with limited instructions to easily reproduce their entire runs. Therefore, AI model reproducibility is time consuming due to the infrequent and inconsistent application of tools capable of orchestrating complex model generation runs. Reasons for their underutilisation may include the time and training needed to leverage them, as well as a misunderstanding by researchers of the overheads involved to reproduce an AI model across diverse computational environments.

Beyond software approaches for ensuring reproducibility of AI methods, there is also the aspect of diverse physical hardware that must be considered. Computational infrastructure requirements can range drastically in developing and deploying AI models, from use of a simple laptop CPU or Google Colab⁴⁹ instance to requiring a cluster using hundreds of GPUs. Consequently, correct documentation of compute infrastructure used and configuration file sharing is important for reproducibility⁴⁰ but often lacking in life science AI model sharing. This oversight means that attempting to run and reproduce an AI method may be impossible, even when access to the required compute infrastructure is not a limitation. Moreover, when using commercial cloud solutions for exploring AI model reproducibility, undisclosed hardware needs for intensive workloads can lead to prohibitive costs. This creates unforeseen access challenges for researchers wishing to reproduce and build upon existing AI methods. Therefore, it is crucial for researchers to closely consider transparently documenting all infrastructure and related configuration requirements in addition to taking software measures to provide portable reproducibility.

Sustainability of AI models

The challenges of poor AI method reusability and reproducibility directly impact environmental sustainability, due to the need to repeat heavy energy expenditures such as

retraining models, which increases carbon emissions¹⁷. This "Red Al"¹⁹ issue is compounded by the escalating resource needs of modern Al systems, particularly deep learning models. Their adoption by a wider number of life scientists intensifies the growing energy demand⁵⁰ and raises Responsible Al concerns about the global north's disproportionate environmental impact⁵¹. Furthermore, where models are not made available and preserved, this adds to irresponsible Al energy waste. Therefore, environmental sustainability of Al systems requires accountable model development in ways that minimise negative environmental impacts while maximising societal outcomes, a principle reflected in initiatives like the European Green Deal⁵², which closely considers Al impacts.

Despite these Red AI concerns, there is not yet a prominent focus in life science research on mitigating it through the adoption of Green AI⁵³ approaches. This is partly because applying AI to biological data is already an inherently challenging and interdisciplinary task, often leaving less pressing Green AI considerations like measuring and reporting environmental sustainability impacts a lower priority. The implementation and routine reporting of energy usage metrics, especially outside large-scale HPC sites, is not standard practice. This lack of monitoring and reporting often stems from insufficient requirements by organisations or funders, as AI sustainability is frequently a less visible concern. While individual projects may seem to have a small footprint, the collective global growth in the adoption of energy-intensive deep learning represents a largely unmonitored aggregate impact, necessitating better tracking. Even where large HPC centres track and report their overall consumption (e.g., EMBL-EBI energy consumption reports⁵⁴), environmental impact accounting attributable to specific AI model development often remains unaddressed at the individual lab and researcher level.

Compounding these issues, even when individual researchers are conscious of Al sustainability impacts, they may find it difficult to know what to measure, in what format, and where to report it. Consequently, they may face challenges in identifying and understanding the limitations of common sustainability measures like CO₂ equivalent or energy consumption, each varying in accuracy and applicability (Table 1). This situation is exacerbated by a lack of accessible tooling designed for life science researchers to correctly plan, track, and measure the sustainability impact of their Al methods. Furthermore, for reporting measures there is an absence of journal requirements and reporting templates.

Table 1: Metrics a researcher could use to measure Al model computation and energy usage to infer environmental impact.

| Measure | Description | Measurement limitation | Unit |
|---|--|---|--|
| CO ₂ e (CO ₂ equivalent) | Estimated greenhouse gas emissions associated with the energy consumed, based on grid carbon intensity. | An estimate, highly dependent on location, time, and accuracy of the energy measurement and carbon intensity factor used. Doesn't include hardware's embodied carbon. | Kilograms CO ₂ e (kg CO ₂ e) Tonnes CO ₂ e (t CO ₂ e) |
| Energy consumption | Total electrical energy consumed by the hardware during the computation. Direct measure of resource use. | Can be difficult to measure accurately without dedicated power meters. Software estimates may be inaccurate or incomplete (do not account for RAM, cooling, etc.). | Watt-hours (Wh) Joules (J) |

| Floating-point operations | Count of arithmetic operations on floating-point numbers; proxy for algorithmic complexity. | Hardware-independent, doesn't directly measure time or energy. Ignores data movement costs (memory input output). Efficiency (FLOPs/Watt or FLOPs/second) varies vastly across hardware. | FLOPs (e.g., Giga-FLOP) |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| GPU/CPU hours | Total time specific compute units (GPU cores, CPU cores) were allocated or actively used for the task. | Doesn't account for varying utilisation levels (idle vs. 100%). Different hardware has vastly different power consumption per hour. Poor indicator of actual energy used. | Hours (h) core-hours (e.g., GPU-hours) |
| Power draw | Instantaneous rate at which electrical energy is consumed by the hardware components. | Fluctuates significantly during computation. Average power needed for energy calculation. Thermal design power is often a limit, not actual usage. Software estimates vary in accuracy. | Watts (W) kilowatts (kW) |
| Total runtime | Wall-clock time elapsed from the start to the end of the computation process. | Highly dependent on specific hardware used. Doesn't distinguish computation vs. idle/wait time. Doesn't directly measure energy or computational work performed. | Seconds (s) Minutes (min) Hours (h) |

Beyond measuring and reporting, a critical implementation gap exists in the life sciences concerning the adoption of methods to reduce Al's environmental impact, such as through Green Al model development. Many approaches exist such as Frugal Al⁵⁵, which considers energy efficient model complexity reduction, and Green AutoML techniques⁵⁶ for optimising architecture while minimising computational cost. However, such techniques remain underutilised, leading to inefficient resource use.

Overall, while wider Responsible Al governance is visible in the life sciences, often with a strong Ethical, Legal and Societal Implications (ELSI)57 emphasis on human data privacy (e.g., GRAIMatter highlighting AI privacy leakage risks⁵⁸), specific mandates for AI environmental sustainability are frequently overlooked when not driven by institutional and governing bodies. A possible factor in this context may include the ethical dilemma of attempting to balance conscious energy use against vital research often justified for societal good like cancer studies or drug discovery. This highlights the need to carefully manage the between important research freedom alongside mitigating environmental sustainability concerns. Encouragingly, initiatives like the FUTURE-Al consortium²¹ and the AHEAD project⁵⁹ are beginning to develop broader assessment frameworks applicable to Al in the life sciences that include technical, clinical, socio-ethical, and legal dimensions, which may pave the way for more holistic environmental sustainability evaluations. Furthermore, emerging project initiatives considering Green AI (e.g., in the ELIXIR STEERS project⁶⁰, SustAInML EU project⁶¹) or community driven sustainable software accreditations (e.g., Green DiSC Certification⁶²) signal a positive direction for integrating environmentally conscious solutions to meet urgently needed Green AI needs in the life sciences.

Open and Sustainable AI: Recommendations

In direct response to the three pressing and interlinked challenges of reusability, reproducibility and environmental sustainability, we propose nine practical and achievable OSAI recommendations that life science researchers should implement. These

recommendations are designed to address the most overlooked but impactful considerations to creating OSAI outputs and advancing AI-based research. We recognise the pre-existing body of work to guide researchers leveraging AI such as Bridge2AI⁸ for biomedical research AI-data readiness and the domain-agnostic REFORMS²² AI disclosure checklist. However, our recommendations offer a targeted and implementation oriented approach for the broader life sciences, specifically addressing the urgent challenges concerning both AI models and their datasets that are prevalent across the entire domain. We provide novelty with our recommendations through their support for application with a mapping back to a non-prescriptive collection of over 300 AI ecosystem components, such as AI specific metadata, registries and tools (https://dome-ml.org/ai-ecosystem). This ensures researchers are both informed of the best practice recommendations and linked with the existing solutions to accomplish OSAI.

Reusability

R1: Generate and share standardised Al metadata for models and datasets

Standardised metadata is essential to aid both human and machine understanding of Al models and their datasets for reuse. Al metadata adoption enables programmatic findability, supports interoperability, and ensures correct disclosure of key model and dataset attributes. We recommend generating and exposing metadata for both Al models and their respective datasets. For model annotation, a possible standard includes the recently launched FAIR4ML schema³⁷ from the RDA FAIR4ML Interest Group¹⁶. For Al dataset annotation, the Croissant¹⁵ standard from MLCommons²³ is a suitable example due to its layered approach and domain extensibility (e.g., GeoCroissant for geospatial Al datasets⁶³). Both are open, community-driven standards and cover diverse metadata fields such as key information like licensing and provenance. Other Al metadata standards also exist such as Model Cards⁶⁴ and Dataset Cards⁶⁵. Additional considerations include leveraging dedicated Al ontologies like Machine Learning Sailor Ontology (MLSO)⁶⁶ to help standardise metadata vocabulary.

R2: Leverage AI registries as central hubs for sharing and discovering reusable AI models and datasets

There is a growing number of AI model and dataset registries, with over 30 identified in our AI ecosystem landscaping. They support depositing, registering and sharing these valuable research objects for community reuse. While choosing the most suitable one can be difficult, a wider adoption by researchers will enhance visibility, aid co-development and functionality convergence to serve life science needs. The primary choice consideration relates to choosing either a suitable life science specific registries (e.g., BioImage Model Zoo¹³ for bioimaging, Kipoi¹⁴ for genomics) or a domain-agnostic registries (e.g., Hugging Face³², Kaggle³¹). Additional considerations supporting this choice include the AI registry provider's commitment to Open Science, long-term data preservation, and support for exposing standardised model and dataset metadata.

R3: Host, promote and share training and guidance on correct deposition of Al research objects for reuse

There are many evolving Al model deposition considerations such as metadata, hosting registries and related checklists, making it difficult for researchers to keep up with best

practices to support AI model and dataset sharing. It is therefore crucial that research groups and institutions begin to develop, host and promote training and guidance on correct AI model deposition. This will aid researchers to comprehensively share models and maximise reuse value. While AI model deposition training material examples are limited, there are institutional model deposition guidance examples such as the Swedish SciLifeLab lightweight and nationally focused guidance for model sharing⁶⁷, which reuses existing frameworks such as the Model Openness Framework²⁰. Furthermore, to democratise the availability of these materials, we recommend hosting them in existing open infrastructure like training material hosting resources (e.g., Glittr⁶⁸, Data Carpentry⁶⁹) or Turing Way⁷⁰ modelled toolkits (e.g., RDMkit¹¹). This will be essential to democratise model sharing knowledge and maximise reusability.

Box 1. Recommendations to aid Al model reuse

| | Reusability | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| No. | Recommendation | Explanation | | |
| R1 | Generate and share standardised Al metadata for models and datasets | Adopt and share standardised metadata using community-driven schemas for both datasets and models to enhance machine readability, findability, and interoperability for reuse. | | |
| R2 | Leverage AI registries as central hubs for sharing and discovering reusable AI models and datasets | Deposit and register models and datasets in established Al registries, considering choice between domain-specific or general-purpose options to maximise visibility and accessibility for the research community. | | |
| R3 | Host, promote and share training and guidance on correct deposition of AI research objects for reuse | Develop and disseminate training materials on best practices for AI model and dataset deposition, utilising dedicated training resource platforms to build community capacity and ensure proper sharing for reuse. | | |

Reproducibility

R4: Ensure transparent disclosure, clear documentation and sharing of all model relevant information

Transparent reporting of all model-relevant information is crucial to facilitate understanding and reproducibility, even if complete computational reproducibility is challenging. This includes sharing comprehensive details on model architecture and weights, preprocessing steps, model architecture, training procedures, datasets, evaluation metrics, and ideally complemented by access to relevant reproducibility files (e.g., ONNX⁷¹). Such information should be readily available across a publication's methods sections, supplementary materials, or alongside code in repositories. These disclosures should be guided by the use of comprehensive checklists (e.g., Model Openness Framework²⁰, REFORMS²²) and where possible supported by their hosting in reporting platforms like the DOME Registry⁷², which provides structured information access and persistent identifiers for this information. Ultimately transparent disclosure is crucial for ensuring clear access to information to aid reproducibility.

R5: Provide portable code and reproducible environments to facilitate smooth reuse

To enable practical reproduction of models from training to inference across diverse computational systems, researchers should leverage readily available components. These include using software containers (e.g., Docker⁴³, Apptainer⁷³), environment control (e.g., Conda⁴⁴), and workflow management systems (e.g., Nextflow⁴⁵, Snakemake⁴⁶). These should then be made available for use through open platforms (e.g., DockerHub⁷⁴, Dockstore⁷⁵). While simpler methods like online and interactively hosted scripts (e.g., Google Colab⁴⁹, Code Ocean Capsules⁷⁶) can be useful, sharing dedicated reproducibility components within well-annotated code repositories alongside all necessary configuration files represents best practice. Choice of tooling should consider longevity and support for components used to ensure long-term reproducibility.

R6: Use standardised Al-ready datasets and benchmarking evaluation protocols to facilitate reproducible model comparisons

To ensure the validity of model performance claims and enable reproducible comparisons, the use of standardised evaluation benchmark datasets and protocols across models is required. The availability of AI-ready datasets, structured and prepared for direct use by AI models, is core to facilitating reproducible and comparable evaluations. Additionally, rigour in standardising model evaluation protocols, is vital for transparently reporting model performances. Community-driven efforts, such as challenges like CASP⁷⁷ for protein structure prediction or wider collection of DREAM challenges⁷⁸ (e.g., drug sensitivity prediction) are core to agreeing and applying standardised evaluation protocols. These efforts in turn drive scientific discovery and the development of more trustworthy and reliable model assessments. Platforms like OpenEBench⁷⁹ (life science specific) and Kaggle competitions³¹ (domain-agnostic) can aid in discovering and hosting benchmarking challenge results and information on the standardised datasets, and evaluation protocols enabling reliable comparisons.

Box 2. Recommendations to aid Al model reproducibility

| | Reproducibility | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| No. | Recommendation | Explanation | | |
| R4 | Ensure transparent disclosure, clear documentation and sharing of all model relevant information | Ensure transparent reporting by comprehensively documenting all model-relevant information, including data, methods, and configurations, guided by community disclosure checklists and reporting platforms. | | |
| R5 | Provide portable code and reproducible environments to facilitate smooth reuse | Facilitate practical model execution by providing portable code within reproducible environments using software containerisation, environment management tools, and workflow systems. | | |
| R6 | Use standardised Al-ready datasets and benchmarking evaluation protocols to facilitate reproducible model comparisons | Promote model comparability and validate performance claims by using standardised benchmark datasets and community-agreed evaluation protocols, often accessible via public benchmarking platforms | | |

Sustainability

R7: Implement Green Al model development techniques

The diverse set of Green AI model development techniques can greatly reduce energy consumption during model training and boost downstream inference efficiency. Methods such as warmstarting⁸⁰, pruning⁸¹, quantisation⁸², green auto-ML⁸³, knowledge distillation⁸³, and transfer learning⁸⁴ can significantly cut compute needs. The case of the DeepSeek R1 model⁸⁵ exemplifies how optimising development efficiencies can achieve more with less hardware, a practice termed "Frugal AI,"⁵⁵. This demonstrated that a greater use of computation is not always synonymous with better results. Resources like Green Software Patterns⁸⁶ from the Green Software Foundation⁸⁷ can guide researchers in applying these energy-efficient practices throughout the model development cycle.

R8: Choose and optimise hardware to reduce environmental impact

The optimisation and choice of hardware, relating to microchips and location, critically impacts AI sustainability. For on-premises computing, where possible researchers should select energy-efficient modern hardware, optimise energy settings and use chips optimised for specific tasks (e.g., GPUs for deep learning). With cloud computing, options are expanded to make use of data centres in green energy powered zones⁵⁰, scheduling workloads for optimal green energy availability. Although work with sensitive biological data and legal frameworks may limit such choices. For large scale AI projects, considering Top500 Green list facilities⁸⁸, is also recommended as they account for the full carbon life-cycle in their design and operation. Finally, leveraging available HPC optimisation support services (where accessible) like POP CoE in Europe⁸⁹ can also assist with reducing AI workload environmental impacts.

R9: Measure and report Al model environmental impact

The life sciences community must begin to consistently measure and report AI model energy consumption in order to monitor their environmental impact. While no single metric is perfect due to measurement nuances and certain comparability limitations, researchers should aim to report core measures such as total model development runtime alongside hardware, energy consumption (e.g., kWh), and operational carbon emissions (CO₂e). Planning the collection of these measurements in advance is crucial, preferably leveraging active measurement tools (e.g., Carbontracker⁵⁰) or where not possible rough predictive calculators (e.g., ML CO₂ Impact⁹⁰). Measurements of final model inference impacts are also valuable to help researchers consider choice of AI models if planning reuse. Reporting of measures should ideally be made available in a publication's methods, or hosted on life science AI model evaluation platforms (e.g., OpenEBench⁷⁹), or dedicated leaderboards such as the Reinforcement Learning Energy Leaderboard⁹¹.

Box 3. Recommendations to aid Al model sustainability

| Sustainability | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| No. | Recommendation | Explanation | |
| R7 | Implement Green AI model development techniques | Reduce energy consumption by implementing Green AI techniques (e.g., pruning, transfer learning) and adopting Frugal AI principles throughout the model development lifecycle, guided by established best practices. | |
| R8 | Choose and optimise hardware to reduce | Minimise environmental footprint by selecting | |

| | environmental impact | energy-efficient hardware, optimising chip usage for specific tasks, and considering green energy sources or sustainably designed data centres for computations. |
|----|--|--|
| R9 | Measure and report Al model environmental impact | Consistently measure and report key environmental impact metrics (e.g., energy consumption, carbon emissions, runtime) using suitable tooling, and disclose these figures in publications or on dedicated reporting platforms. |

Open and Sustainable Al: Ecosystem Mapping and Pathways

Whilst best practices and recommendations can be impactful, they can also face barriers to adoption by researchers resulting from a lack of clarity on how exactly to implement them. This can lead to a reduction in their overall application across the intended community. Therefore, we have gone beyond an isolated set of recommendations and landscaped over 300 relevant components of the AI ecosystem. With this list of components we have created a non-prescriptive mapping, connecting the OSAI relevant components that can help actualise our recommendations (Fig. 2). The mapping has inbuilt redundancy as it hosts many solutions in the same recommendation can be met, which can avoid situations such as the FAIR principles for AI models by Ravi et al. (2022)⁹², wherein a key component for implementation, DLHub, is no longer available for use.

Sustainability Open & Sustainable Al Components Mapped mmendation $\otimes^{\, \Diamond}$ 0 Registry OpenEBench R6, R9 Reproducibility Open & Sustainable Al Recommendations **Example Pathway: Sustainability** 1 Apply green AI mode development practice 2 Reusability 111 AI **CEB** Green Software Patterns **Y** Carbontracker

Figure 2: Open and Sustainable AI: Recommendations & Ecosystem Components

Open and Sustainable AI (OSAI) recommendations covering nine practical and actionable solutions addressing practical issues across the three challenge areas of reusability, reproducibility and environmental sustainability. These recommendations are directly mapped to the OSAI ecosystem components to support their implementation. The OSAI ecosystem components mapped offer flexibility and inbuilt redundancy with multiple solutions per recommendation across the full list. Both the OSAI recommendations and ecosystem components can further be chained into actionable pathways to best guide researchers to implement AI best practices, as shown with an example pathway covering environmentally sustainable model reporting.

We have designed the AI ecosystem components list to be maintainable by the community in an open GitHub (https://github.com/BioComputingUP/OSAI ecosystem)93. This method is directly modelled after proven community supported resource lists, such as within the Research Software Quality kit (RSQkit)94. In this way our landscaping builds upon the previous efforts shared in static publications, for example FAIR for AI by Huerta et al. (2023)36. This collaborative approach will support longevity and contemporary relevance of the components captured, made possible through ongoing community maintenance.

The AI ecosystem components and OSAI recommendations mapping is made available as interactive digital DOME Recommendations an resource on the website¹ (dome-ml.org/ai-ecosystem). In this way, they are designed to be an openly accessible resource for linking researchers to the many possible components enabling OSAI research practice. The ecosystem components captured are not solely restricted to OSAI, and also include important AI research platforms, tools and training, which expands its functionality to aid general Al research solution discoverability. We recognise the diversity across life science sub-domains and organisations, which may adopt varying Al guidance of narrower. wider or overlapping scope to those of our OSAI recommendations. Therefore, the captured Al ecosystem components are openly shared for interoperable reuse by other initiatives. For example they could be repurposed for mapping to existing life science AI research guidance frameworks, or hosted on other AI platforms to aid connecting researchers to relevant supports.

Long-term we envision the development and extension of our OSAI recommendations into guided pathways that make use of practical AI ecosystem component assemblies. These pathways could reuse the successful Turing Way⁷⁰ framework, whereby they are hosted in online toolkits and openly available to guide researchers implement best practices in challenge areas. Alternatively, existing toolkits addressing data^{12,95,96} or software⁹⁴ guidance could be considered for reuse to avoid proliferation of resources requiring large community and financial commitments to create, host and maintain. We view guided pathways as the important next step towards supporting OSAI research practice and propose that global bodies working on mitigating the challenges related to AI research come together to co-develop pathways for life scientists to implement AI best practices.

Conclusion

Our OSAI recommendations offer practical support for researchers, developed with close consideration for both existing life science and domain-agnostic solutions (e.g. from the RDA³⁷, MLCommons²³, Green Software Foundation⁸⁷). They are designed to be complementary to comprehensive frameworks of wider AI scope, and directly focus on supporting research reform towards the production of OSAI research outputs. This work aims to foster a better understanding of OSAI practices and provides researchers with a navigable list of implementable solutions by consolidating the fragmented AI ecosystem components, and connecting them to actionable solutions.

While addressing the urgent challenges in areas of reusability, reproducibility, and sustainability, we recognise the limitations of this work. We acknowledge the lack of coverage on the crucially important area of achieving Al-ready data, but instead refer to the

existing efforts and guidance in this space, such as Bridge2AI⁸, FAIR^{2 97} and other entries captured in our OSAI ecosystem. Furthermore, we do not directly address critical socio-ethical areas such as Equitable, Explainable, Trustworthy or full breadth of Responsible AI, given their complex, and variable requirements across regions. Instead we hope existing and future frameworks addressing these important areas can make use of our catalogue of AI ecosystem components, which is suitable to be repurposed for expanded mappings. We also recognise the initial landscaping of ecosystem components is not exhaustive, and we will rely on open community contributions to ensure for wider coverage, such as to incorporate emerging AI model and dataset deposition trainings as they become available to better support our OSAI recommendation R3.

As a next step, the life sciences community must urgently fill the gap and collaboratively develop guided AI best practice pathways. Our work lays the foundations through expanding the availability of practical recommendations supported by a diverse range of useful OSAI resources. We foresee guided pathways as the necessary next step, potentially hosted in a new or existing toolkit-based resource, to assist life science AI researchers. Ultimately, fostering a truly OSAI landscape necessitates a concerted effort from all stakeholders, including publishers, funders, and policymakers. It will also be important to align our community-driven efforts to emerging policies (e.g., EU AI Act⁹⁸, NAIRR⁹⁹), and next integrate with global networks such as FARR-RCN²⁴ or large-scale projects like AI4EOSC¹⁰⁰.

By embracing our nine OSAI recommendations and leveraging the mapped ecosystem of AI components, researchers can usher in a shift towards reusable, reproducible, and environmentally responsible AI becoming commonplace. This will ensure that life science AI outputs serve as reliable, and sustainable drivers for future life science breakthroughs serving society.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by ELIXIR, the European infrastructure for life science data, through the ELIXIR Machine Learning Focus Group (Strategic Implementation Study 2023-MLstandards). Additional funding from: European Union through NextGenerationEU PNRR project ELIXIRxNextGenIT (IR0000010); Horizon Europe projects EVERSE (GA 101129744) and ELIXIR STEERS (GA 101131096); Funded by the European Union through the Marie Skłodowska-Curie projects AHEAD (grant agreement No 101183031) and IDPfun2 (grant agreement no. 101182949); Innovative Health Initiative Joint Undertaking SYNTHIA (grant agreement No 101172872); COST Action ML4NGP (CA21160), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology). Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the OSAI ecosystem and subsequent discussion as well as the initial draft of this manuscript. G.F. wrote the final draft with the help of the co-authors. All authors edited and refined the final manuscript. G.F., F.P. and S.C.E.T. initiated and coordinated the project.

Competing interests

All authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Correspondence should be addressed to Fotis Psomopoulos or Silvio C. E. Tosatto.

Data availability

- OSAI Ecosystem GitHub: https://github.com/BioComputingUP/OSAI ecosystem
- OSAI Ecosystem Interactive Web Version: https://www.dome-ml.org/ai-ecosystem

References

- 1. Walsh, I. *et al.* DOME: recommendations for supervised machine learning validation in biology. *Nat. Methods* **18**, 1122–1127 (2021).
- 2. Wilkinson, M. D. *et al.* The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci. Data* **3**, 160018 (2016).
- 3. Jumper, J. *et al.* Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* **596**, 583–589 (2021).
- 4. Luo, M. *et al.* Artificial intelligence for life sciences: A comprehensive guide and future trends. *Innov. Life* **2**, 100105 (2024).
- 5. Paysan-Lafosse, T. *et al.* The Pfam protein families database: embracing Al/ML. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **53**, D523–D534 (2025).
- Varadi, M. et al. AlphaFold Protein Structure Database: massively expanding the structural coverage of protein-sequence space with high-accuracy models. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 50, D439–D444 (2022).
- 7. Kapoor, S. & Narayanan, A. Leakage and the reproducibility crisis in machine-learning-based science. *Patterns* **4**, 100804 (2023).
- 8. Clark, T. *et al.* Al-readiness for Biomedical Data: Bridge2Al Recommendations. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.23.619844 (2024).

- 9. Tedersoo, L. *et al.* Data sharing practices and data availability upon request differ across scientific disciplines. *Sci. Data* **8**, 192 (2021).
- Laurinavichyute, A., Yadav, H. & Vasishth, S. Share the code, not just the data: A case study of the reproducibility of articles published in the Journal of Memory and Language under the open data policy. *J. Mem. Lang.* 125, 104332 (2022).
- 11. Fatima, N. *et al.* RDMkit: The Research Data Management Toolkit for Life Sciences. *Proc. Conf. Res. Data Infrastruct.* **1**, (2023).
- Pistoia Alliance. The FAIR Toolkit for Life Science Industry.
 https://fairtoolkit.pistoiaalliance.org/.
- Ouyang, W. et al. BioImage Model Zoo: A Community-Driven Resource for Accessible Deep Learning in BioImage Analysis. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.07.495102 (2022).
- 14. Avsec, Ž. *et al.* The Kipoi repository accelerates community exchange and reuse of predictive models for genomics. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **37**, 592–600 (2019).
- 15. Akhtar, M. et al. Croissant: A Metadata Format for ML-Ready Datasets. in Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop on Data Management for End-to-End Machine Learning 1–6 (2024). doi:10.1145/3650203.3663326.
- 16. Research Data Alliance. RDA FAIR for Machine Learning (FAIR4ML) Ineterst Group. https://www.rd-alliance.org/ https://www.rd-alliance.org/groups/fair-machine-learning-fair4ml-ig/activity/.
- Beam, A. L., Manrai, A. K. & Ghassemi, M. Challenges to the Reproducibility of Machine Learning Models in Health Care. *JAMA* 323, 305 (2020).
- 18. Unsal, S. *et al.* Learning functional properties of proteins with language models. *Nat. Mach. Intell.* **4**, 227–245 (2022).
- Schwartz, R., Dodge, J., Smith, N. A. & Etzioni, O. Green Al. *Commun. ACM* 63, 54–63 (2020).
- 20. White, M. *et al.* The Model Openness Framework: Promoting Completeness and Openness for Reproducibility, Transparency, and Usability in Artificial Intelligence.

- Preprint at https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2403.13784 (2024).
- 21. FUTURE-AI: international consensus guideline for trustworthy and deployable artificial intelligence in healthcare. *BMJ* r340 (2025) doi:10.1136/bmj.r340.
- Kapoor, S. et al. REFORMS: Consensus-based Recommendations for Machine-learning-based Science. Sci. Adv. 10, eadk3452 (2024).
- Machine Learning Commons. MLCommons Better AI for Everyone. https://mlcommons.org/.
- 24. FAIR Advanced Research and Reproducibility (FARR) Research Coordination Network (RCN). FARR RCN https://www.farr-rcn.org.
- 25. Rai, A. Explainable Al: from black box to glass box. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **48**, 137–141 (2020).
- 26. Afroogh, S., Akbari, A., Malone, E., Kargar, M. & Alambeigi, H. Trust in Al: progress, challenges, and future directions. *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.* **11**, 1568 (2024).
- Leslie, D. Understanding Artificial Intelligence Ethics and Safety: A Guide for the Responsible Design and Implementation of AI Systems in the Public Sector. https://zenodo.org/record/3240529 (2019).
- 28. Dignum, V. Responsible Artificial Intelligence -- from Principles to Practice. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.10785 (2022).
- 29. Ahdritz, G. *et al.* OpenFold: retraining AlphaFold2 yields new insights into its learning mechanisms and capacity for generalization. *Nat. Methods* **21**, 1514–1524 (2024).
- 30. Schmied, C. *et al.* Community-developed checklists for publishing images and image analyses. *Nat. Methods* **21**, 170–181 (2024).
- 31. Kaggle. Kaggle: Your Machine Learning and Data Science Community. https://www.kaggle.com/.
- 32. Wolf, T. *et al.* HuggingFace's Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1910.03771 (2019).
- 33. Turon, G., Legese, A., Arora, D. & Duran-Frigola, M. Ersilia Model Hub: a repository of Al/ML models for infectious and neglected tropical diseases. Zenodo

- https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7274645 (2025).
- 34. European Organization For Nuclear Research & OpenAIRE. Zenodo: Research. Shared. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.25495/7GXK-RD71 (2013).
- 35. Leo, S. *et al.* Recording provenance of workflow runs with RO-Crate. *PLOS ONE* **19**, e0309210 (2024).
- 36. Huerta, E. A. *et al.* FAIR for AI: An interdisciplinary and international community building perspective. *Sci. Data* **10**, 487 (2023).
- Castro, L. J. *et al.* FAIR4ML-schema. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.14002310 (2024).
- 38. Pistoia Alliance Organisation Website. *Pistoia Alliance* https://www.pistoiaalliance.org/.
- Scientific Computing World. Pistoia Alliance launches DataFAIRy to drive Al adoption.
 - https://www.scientific-computing.com/news/pistoia-alliance-launches-datafairy-drive-ai-ad option.
- 40. What is Reproducibility in Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Research? https://arxiv.org/html/2407.10239v1.
- Carter, R. E., Attia, Z. I., Lopez-Jimenez, F. & Friedman, P. A. Pragmatic considerations for fostering reproducible research in artificial intelligence. *Npj Digit. Med.* 42 (2019).
- 42. Tiwari, D. D. *et al.* BioModelsML: Building a FAIR and reproducible collection of machine learning models in life sciences and medicine for easy reuse. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.22.540599 (2023).
- 43. Merkel, D. Docker: lightweight Linux containers for consistent development and deployment. *Linux J* 2:2 (2014).
- 44. Anaconda, Inc. Conda. https://anaconda.org/anaconda/conda.
- 45. Di Tommaso, P. *et al.* Nextflow enables reproducible computational workflows. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **35**, 316–319 (2017).

- 46. Köster, J. & Rahmann, S. Snakemake—a scalable bioinformatics workflow engine. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 2520–2522 (2012).
- 47. The Galaxy Community *et al.* The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible, and collaborative data analyses: 2024 update. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **52**, W83–W94 (2024).
- 48. Heil, B. J. *et al.* Reproducibility standards for machine learning in the life sciences. *Nat. Methods* **18**, 1132–1135 (2021).
- 49. Bisong, E. Google Colaboratory. in *Building Machine Learning and Deep Learning Models on Google Cloud Platform* 59–64 (Apress, Berkeley, CA, 2019).
 doi:10.1007/978-1-4842-4470-8_7.
- Anthony, L. F. W., Kanding, B. & Selvan, R. Carbontracker: Tracking and Predicting the Carbon Footprint of Training Deep Learning Models. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2007.03051 (2020).
- 51. Ritchie, H. *et al.* Hardware and energy cost to train notable AI systems. *Our World in Data*https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/hardware-and-energy-cost-to-train-notable-ai-systems (2023).
- 52. Gailhofer, P. et al. The role of Artificial Intelligence in the European Green Deal.

 Policy Dep. Econ. Sci. Qual. Life Policies Eur. Parliam. (2023).
- Bolón-Canedo, V., Morán-Fernández, L., Cancela, B. & Alonso-Betanzos, A. A review of green artificial intelligence: Towards a more sustainable future. *Neurocomputing* 599, 128096 (2024).
- 54. EMBL. Sustainability: Reports and Resources.

 https://www.embl.org/about/info/sustainability/reports-resources/.
- 55. Yamada, T., Tanaka, H., Suzuki, S. & Brian, Z. Frugal Machine Learning: Making Al More Efficient, Accessible, and Sustainable. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.173385981.11102720/v1 (2024).
- 56. Tornede, T. *et al.* Towards Green Automated Machine Learning: Status Quo and Future Directions. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* **77**, 427–457 (2023).

- 57. Johnson, S. G., Simon, G. & Aliferis, C. Regulatory Aspects and Ethical Legal Societal Implications (ELSI). in *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Health Care and Medical Sciences* (eds. Simon, G. J. & Aliferis, C.) 659–692 (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2024). doi:10.1007/978-3-031-39355-6_16.
- 58. Jefferson, E. *et al.* GRAIMatter: Guidelines and Resources for Al Model Access from TrusTEd Research environments (GRAIMatter). *Int. J. Popul. Data Sci.* **7**, (2022).
- 59. European Commission. Al for Health: Evaluation of Applications & Datasets (AHEAD). *CORDIS* https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101183031.
- 60. European Commission. HORIZON Europe: ELIXIR-STEERS Project. *CORDIS* https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101131096 (2024).
- 61. SustAInML Sustainable AI and Machine Learning. SUSTAIN ML Project https://sustainml.eu/ (2021).
- 62. Software Sustainability Institute. Green DiSC: a Digital Sustainability Certification. https://www.software.ac.uk/GreenDiSC.
- 63. Geoscience and Remote Sensing Society (GRSS), I. GeoCroissant- A Metadata
 Framework for Geospatial ML-ready Datasets. *GRSS-IEEE*https://www.grss-ieee.org/events/geocroissant-a-metadata-framework-for-geospatial-ml-re
 ady-datasets/ (2024).
- Mitchell, M. et al. Model Cards for Model Reporting. in Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency 220–229 (ACM, Atlanta GA USA, 2019). doi:10.1145/3287560.3287596.
- 65. Pushkarna, M., Zaldivar, A. & Kjartansson, O. Data Cards: Purposeful and Transparent Dataset Documentation for Responsible AI. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.01075 (2022).
- 66. Dasoulas, I., Yang, D. & Dimou, A. MLSea: A Semantic Layer for Discoverable Machine Learning. in *The Semantic Web* (eds. Meroño Peñuela, A. et al.) vol. 14665 178–198 (Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 2024).
- 67. SciLifeLab Data Centre. SciLifeLab: Funder requirements and FAIR ML models.

- 68. Van Geest, G., Haefliger, Y., Zahn-Zabal, M. & Palagi, P. M. Using Glittr.org to find, compare and re-use online materials for training and education. *PLOS ONE* **19**, e0308729 (2024).
- 69. Data Carpentry. Data Carpentry Lessons. https://datacarpentry.org/lessons/.
- 70. The Turing Way Community. The Turing Way: A handbook for reproducible, ethical and collaborative research. Zenodo https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15213042 (2025).
- 71. ONNX. ONNX Open Neural Network Exchange. https://onnx.ai/.
- 72. Attafi, O. A. *et al.* DOME Registry: implementing community-wide recommendations for reporting supervised machine learning in biology. *GigaScience* **13**, giae094 (2024).
- 73. Kurtzer, G. M., Sochat, V. & Bauer, M. W. Singularity: Scientific containers for mobility of compute. *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0177459 (2017).
- 74. Docker. Docker Hub Container Image Library. https://hub.docker.com.
- 75. Yuen, D. *et al.* The Dockstore: enhancing a community platform for sharing reproducible and accessible computational protocols. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **49**, W624–W632 (2021).
- 76. Clyburne-Sherin, A., Fei, X. & Green, S. A. Computational Reproducibility via Containers in Psychology. *Meta-Psychol.* **3**, (2019).
- 77. Kryshtafovych, A., Schwede, T., Topf, M., Fidelis, K. & Moult, J. Critical assessment of methods of protein structure prediction (CASP)—Round XV. *Proteins Struct. Funct. Bioinforma.* **91**, 1539–1549 (2023).
- 78. Xiong, Z. *et al.* Crowdsourced identification of multi-target kinase inhibitors for RET-and TAU- based disease: The Multi-Targeting Drug DREAM Challenge. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **17**, e1009302 (2021).
- Capella-Gutierrez, S. et al. Lessons Learned: Recommendations for Establishing Critical Periodic Scientific Benchmarking. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/181677 (2017).
- 80. Ash, J. T. & Adams, R. P. On Warm-Starting Neural Network Training. (2019) doi:10.48550/ARXIV.1910.08475.

- 81. Tmamna, J. *et al.* Pruning Deep Neural Networks for Green Energy-Efficient Models: A Survey. *Cogn. Comput.* **16**, 2931–2952 (2024).
- 82. Krishnan, S. & Faust, A. Quantization for Fast and Environmentally Sustainable Reinforcement Learning. https://research.google/blog/quantization-for-fast-and-environmentally-sustainable-reinfor cement-learning/ (2021).
- 83. Yuan, Y. *et al.* The Impact of Knowledge Distillation on the Energy Consumption and Runtime Efficiency of NLP Models. in *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 3rd International Conference on AI Engineering Software Engineering for AI* 129–133 (ACM, Lisbon Portugal, 2024). doi:10.1145/3644815.3644966.
- 84. Tabbakh, A. *et al.* Towards sustainable AI: a comprehensive framework for Green AI. *Discov. Sustain.* **5**, 408 (2024).
- 85. DeepSeek-Al *et al.* DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2501.12948 (2025).
- 86. Green Software Foundation. Green Software Patterns. https://patterns.greensoftware.foundation//.
- 87. Green Software Foundation. Green Software Foundation. https://greensoftware.foundation/.
- 88. TOP500.org. Green500 List November 2023. https://top500.org/lists/green500/2023/11/.
- 89. Performance Optimisation and Productivity | A Centre of Excellence in HPC. https://pop-coe.eu/.
- 90. Schmidt, V., Luccioni, A., Lacoste, A. & Dandres, T. Machine Learning CO2 Impact Calculator. https://mlco2.github.io/impact.
- 91. Henderson, P. *et al.* Towards the systematic reporting of the energy and carbon footprints of machine learning. *J Mach Learn Res* **21**, 248:10039-248:10081 (2020).
- 92. Ravi, N. *et al.* FAIR principles for AI models with a practical application for accelerated high energy diffraction microscopy. *Sci. Data* **9**, 657 (2022).

- 93. Farrell, G. OSAI Ecosystem Components Data. Zenodo https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15391273 (2025).
- 94. RSQKit Community. Research Software Quality Kit (RSQKit). Zenodo https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.14923572 (2025).
- 95. D'Anna, F. *et al.* A research data management (RDM) community for ELIXIR. *F1000Research* **13**, 230 (2024).
- 96. BY-COVID. Infectious Diseases Toolkit (IDTk). https://www.infectious-diseases-toolkit.org/about/.
- 97. FAIR². FAIR². https://www.fair2.ai.
- 98. European Commission. The EU AI Act.

 https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai (2024).
- 99. National Science Foundation. National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource (NAIRR) Pilot. https://www.nsf.gov/focus-areas/artificial-intelligence/nairr (2024).
- 100. Sáinz-Pardo Díaz, J. et al. Making Federated Learning Accessible to Scientists: The AI4EOSC Approach. in *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Workshop on Information Hiding and Multimedia Security* 253–264 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2024). doi:10.1145/3658664.3659642.