# Prospects of "Useful" Predictions for Weeks 3 & 4?

## Muthuvel Chelliah Climate Prediction Center/NCEP/NWS

October 22, 2014

NOAA's 39th Annual CDPW, Oct 20-23, 2014, St. Louis, MO

1

This talk is based on a "very simple idea, from the user-perspective and need" and relatively simple calculations, and hopefully with some practical implications towards forecasts for weeks 3-4 (can even be extended to forecasts for days 6-10, & week2)

The 'extended forecast time period' (2-3-4 weeks) in-between the 'deterministic weather' and the 'probabilistic climate' is <u>"Neither weather nor climate"</u> So, we do have to think differently about how to handle this period!

The motivation for this work came from this quote:	
"Rather than work forward from a technology o	r a complex strategy,
work backwards from the needs of customers	
and build the simplest product possible"	<ul> <li>– Eric Ries, author of "The Lean Startup"</li> </ul>



# NOAA Seamless Suite of Forecast Products Spanning Climate and Weather





Weather to climate transition ......

- NOAA's Weather Prediction Ctr (WPC) issues weather forecasts for each of the next 5 (6-7?) days for Temperature and Precipitation (Weather Channel or ACCU Weather may extend this to even 10 days !!)
- The forecasts are issued for <u>Total fields</u> (deg. F, inch(es) of rain, etc). People have no problem understanding this...















Examples of NCEP WPC's QPF -Quantitative Precipitation Forecasts - issued every day.





CPC takes over from day 6 and issues Temp & Precip forecasts over the US for <u>time averages of</u>:

- next 6-10 days (referred to as <u>Week 1P (1 Plus)</u>, in this talk)
- next 8-14 days (week 2), monthly /seasonal/etc
- But the forecasts are issued as probabilities for above/ near/below conditions from some climatology in just the same way as monthly/seasonal forecasts are issued.

So, at least In the context of prediction metric <u>we seem to jump</u> from "TOTAL FIELD" weather metric (next few days) to "CLIMATE ANOMALY" metric at day 6.



<u>NWS started forecast of</u>: 6-10 days (60's/70's ?) & 8-14 days (~2000?) Monthly means – 1970's, Seasonal means – 1990's.

> So, why does the '3-4 weeks hole' in the forecast suite continue to exist? Have the model forecasts in the weeks 3-4 time scale improved with time?

Long-range weather forecasts through numerical and empirical methods,



Fig. 2. The globally averaged r.m.s. error of 500 mbar geopotential forecasts, averaged over the Lorenz block (1 August 1990-6 December 1990) as a function of forecast lead time (Days 1-90).

#### MONTHLY WEATHER REVIEW



FIG. 5. Annual cylce of average skill in (a) the northern extratropics  $(30^\circ-85^\circ N)$ , (b) the southern extratropics  $(30^\circ-85^\circ S)$ , and (c) the tropics  $(30^\circ S-30^\circ N)$ . A five-point symmetric moving-average filter has been applied as described in the text. Both land and sea points are considered. A few typical confidence intervals are plotted to illustrate the range of uncertainty of the skill values obtained.

#### **Probabilistic Verification of Monthly Temperature Forecasts**

ANDREAS P. WEIGEL, DANIEL BAGGENSTOS, AND MARK A. LINIGER

Federal Office of Meteorology and Climatology, MeteoSwiss, Zurich, Switzerland

FRÉDÉRIC VITART

European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, Reading, United Kingdom

#### CHRISTOF APPENZELLER

Federal Office of Meteorology and Climatology, MeteoSwiss, Zurich, Switzerland

(Manuscript received 6 February 2008, in final form 16 April 2008)



T2m GLOBE CFSRR:Dys 1/2/5 & Wks 1P/2/3/4 FCST SKIL



- To evaluate weeks 3-4 predictions we have always mostly used "anomaly/correlation" as the main metric <u>where anomaly is computed as departure from some climatology (base</u> <u>period)</u> We suddenly switch from the immediate weather mode (next few days) and treat this period (weeks 2? 3, 4) as climate, using anomalies from a long term mean!!!
- <u>What then is the appropriate period for the Climatology?</u> Longest period available? <u>50</u> <u>years? WMO's 30 years?</u> <u>15 yrs?</u> <u>OCN?</u> Observed (model analyses) Climatology from the same forecasting model? Or from another model (ECMWF)? What about model biases? Depending on the base –period used, the predicted anomalies will be different?
- No matter what the base period is, do the public understand that? OR Does the public really care? All they need is some 'guidance', some 'educated guess' for how the 'average' weather will be like in the upcoming weeks, so they can go on with their lives!!
- The general public understands: Yesterday's/Today's/Tomorrow's Weather such as <u>Totals</u>: Snow, Rain/More rain/No rain... Heat wave/Cold in numbers 90's upper 60s, 40's ....
- Public understand: <u>Changes from "recent/current weather" that they can remember</u>: <u>If we are NOW in a hot spell, or if in severe cold</u>, <u>or if it has been raining for a while people</u> want to know how soon is this going to change, or if the current conditions (good or bad) stay the same, or will it change in the future?

"The important thing in science is not so much to obtain new facts as to discover new ways of thinking about them."

- William Lawrence Bragg (youngest ever Nobel Laureate in physics)



I propose we compute the Tendency correlation (f-i correlated with v-i), where the forecast is framed in terms of something else we know, which is the current weather (instead of from some arbitrary climatology). Why? Because,

"If we keep asking the same question, and if we keep getting the same answer (we don't like ☺) for a long time, then we have to also consider asking the question differently or ask a different question"

But some may think this will lead to inflated correlations, since these two quantities (f-I and v-i) are generally highly correlated!!

### Correlation of Differences or Tendency Correlation (Thanks to Tim Delsole of COLA/GMU)

Let *i*, *v*, *f*, and c be the initial condition, verification, forecast and climatology respectively. Let us call the well known traditional anomaly (from climatology) correlation coefficient as  $cor_{Tr}$ , which can be defined as

$$cor_{Tr} = cor[v-c, f-c] = \frac{cov[v-c, f-c]}{\sqrt{var[v-c]var[f-c]}}$$

Under the null hypothesis of no predictability, it is obvious that  $cor_{Tr} = 0$ .

However, if one considers the correlation  $cor_D$  between the forecast f and verification v as differences relative to the initial condition i, then the correlation skill of differences  $cor_D$  is defined as (which can also be called as correlation skill in the tendency field)

 $cor_{D} = cor[v - i, f - i] = \frac{cov[v - i, f - i]}{\sqrt{var[v - i]var[f - i]}} \quad Under the null hypothesis of no predictability: v and$ *i* $are independent (cov[v,i] = 0), the forecast has no skill (cov[f,v] = 0), and the forecast is uncorrelated with the initial condition (cov[f,i] = 0). It then follows that
<math display="block">cor_{D}[v - i, f - i] = \frac{cov[v,f] - cov[v,i] - cov[f,i] + var[i]}{\sqrt{var[v - i]var[f - i]}} \qquad (3)$   $= \frac{var[i]}{\sqrt{(var[v] + var[i])(var[f] + var[i])}} \qquad (4)$ 

If the system is stationary, then var[v] = var[i]. Also when the forecast ensemble members are not large  $var[f] \sim var[i]$ ,  $cor_{D}[v - i, f - i] = \frac{var[i]}{\sqrt{(2 var[i])(2 var[i])}} = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5$  (Tim Delsole argues this value is 0.7 argues when var(f) =0)















Muthuvel Chelliah/CPC/NCEP







### In summary:

- In spite of the enormous progress that has been made in modeling , physical parameterizations, and data assimilation that lead to significant advances in weather prediction, real progress in the extended range a few weeks to seasons remain very slow. If we do not have an open mind and are not willing to think differently about how we make and verify forecasts in particular in the elusive weeks 3-4 time scale, then fifteen/twenty years from now, I am not sure whether we will be in a different place than we are now!
- But if we are willing to experiment with, and think outside the box, and consider to also generate "alternate" form of skillful Tendency forecasts, for some sort of 'guidance' for 'weeks 3 & 4', even on an 'experimental basis', <u>this study offers a new proposal to make and evaluate forecasts in the weeks 1P, 2, 3 4 range</u>, and let the public be the judge of whether these "forecasts" are of 'any value' to them. (<u>No need for expensive long-term hindcasts</u>, or delays in implementing model improvements)
- I am making and updating in a 'real time' basis, and put these experimental forecasts and recent skill scores in my experimental/personal cpc website with appropriate caveats of course at \_\_\_\_\_\_

(can't see it ? Google: products muthu forecast)

- Prelim. write-up of this work is available online at (<u>http://www.nws.noaa.gov/ost/climate/STIP/Collections.htm</u>)
- A manuscript is under preparation.

The END. Thanks for listening!

Name	Last modified	<u>Size</u>	
Parent Directory		-	
ALASKA/	09-Oct-2014 17:13	-	
DISCLAIMER	15-Oct-2014 17:37	1.OK	
<pre>FCST.SKILL.for.anoms.from.prev.lday.means/</pre>	17-Oct-2014 10:01	-	
FCST.SKILL.for.anoms.from.prev.7day.means/	09-Oct-2014 16:57	-	
SAMERICA/	09-Oct-2014 17:14	-	
daily.average.info	09-Oct-2014 16:29	74	
from.yesterday.w16mem.next.4wks.Prate.fcst.png	17-Oct-2014 09:31	468K	
from.yesterday.w16mem.next.4wks.T2m+H500.fcst.png	17-Oct-2014 09:31	543K	
from.yesterday.w16mem.next.5days.Prate.fcst.png	17-Oct-2014 09:31	474K	
from.yesterday.w16mem.next.5days.T2m+H500.fcst.png	17-Oct-2014 09:31	569K	
how.fcsts.ending.yesterday.verified/	09-Oct-2014 19:46	-	
when.are.the.plots.updated	09-Oct-2014 16:28	675	
yesterdays.FCSTs.for.WKs.1P-4.as.CHANGES.from.7day.means/	09-Oct-2014 16:53	-	
yesterdays.FCSTs.for.WKs.1P-4.as.CHANGES.from.yesterday/	09-Oct-2014 16:53	-	

For this website, search/Google:

products Muthu weeks.3-4.forecast

On Fri, Sep 12, 2014 at 11:28 AM, Ray Wolf - NOAA Federal <<u>ray.wolf@noaa.gov</u>> wrote: Hello Muthuvel,

I just reviewed your Vlab presentation and wanted to pass on I thought it was brilliant. First, the focus of customer needs vs. needs determined by scientists is something we have long ago learned in NWS WFOs and is an excellent and fruitful approach. It is great to see that philosophy at CPC because I believe it can open the door to so many other service opportunies.

**Equally brilliant was reframing the outlook process by comparison to current conditions vs. climatology**. This is something I have done informally my entire career when sharing the 6-10 day outlook with farmers as far back as the late 1980s. I am pleased to see skill documented for such an approach, and it will reenforce our local efforts in pushing the week 2 outlook as well.

Your approach is exactly how people think. If we are in drought or a serious dry spell, the question is when will the pattern change to a wetter one. Likewise with temperature anomalies. The more extreme or stagnant the pattern, the great the interest becomes in when it will change.

<u>I would encourage you to think further and see if there are any other hazards, such as severe weather, that might show</u> <u>some signal in weeks 3-4</u>. I have seen literature on the MJO and relationship to tornado outbreaks that suggests this is possible. There might also be some applications for wind energy if that variable might have skill (see attached paper). Wind energy is a big deal in our part of the U.S.

In short, I wanted to let you know there is someone in the field who is looking at the potential for sharing useful information like you spoke about for weeks 2-3-4 with our customers. Your presentation has boosted my enthusiasm in doing so.

Regards, Ray Wolf Science and Operations Officer (SOO) NOAA / National Weather Service Davenport (Quad Cities), Iowa weather.gov/dvn On 3-4 Week Forecasts

Steve Lyons Aug 25, 2014

Muthu,

.... I got a copy of your 3-4 week forecasts effort and was pretty interested in it. I am on the operational side now MIC in San Angelo TX....

I think it most important and what we currently (I think) tend to not tout enough are BIG CHANGES in weather/weather patterns that will bring hot/cold/wet/dry. **May I suggest you look at how well you are able to predict the big/bigger events that are most important to our customers.** This might easily be done by verifying situations that exceed 1/1.5/2 sigma across portions/all of the US or any other area (world). **Value in giving a heads up and valuable guidance on the magnitude of the event would be most useful to our customers**. Obviously they care that temps will be average, because they are worried able large departures, but if you can value add on how anomalous you have a winner. Think about orange crops and a big freeze potential in winter, or big freeze or frost for strawberries in spring, etc.

Sincerely, Steve

Dr. Steve Lyons – **MIC WFO San Angelo, TX** Adjunct professor Texas A&M University Tropical & Marine Weather, 325-944-9445 On Wed, Oct 15, 2014 at 1:55 PM, John Eise - NOAA Federal <<u>john.eise@noaa.gov</u>> wrote: .....

I have been very impressed with the work by Dr. Chelliah at CPC. When I first listened to his presentation, <u>I thought "why haven't we thought of this before?" He took a very creative approach to this forecast problem.</u>

I am a strong believer that the Weeks 2-4 period will become a very important part of Impact Decision Support Services in the NWS. <u>The emergency management community</u> <u>including FEMA would benefit greatly from a "heads up" on the types of hazards that they</u> <u>may be looking at to allow for long range planning.</u>

..... Thanks,

John

John Eise, Deputy SSD Chief, Climate Program Manager Central Region Headquarters 7220 NW 101st Terrace Kansas City, MO 64153 (816) 268-3144

GLOBE: PRATE ANOM FCST CORR: Weeks 3 & 4



Muthuvel Chelliah/CPC/NCEP

GLOBE: T2m ANOM FCST CORR: Weeks 3 & 4



