HFIP 2012 Annual Review: Preliminary Forecast Verification

John Cangialosi and James L. Franklin National Hurricane Center

December 2012





Introductory Remarks

- * Evaluations are based on preliminary best track data. Only Atlantic results presented here.
- * Standard verification rules (system must be a tropical cyclone at the forecast time and at the verification time).
- Except as noted, 12-hr interpolations (e.g., COT2) are verified if the 6-hr interpolation (e.g., COTI) is not available.

Verifications shown here use data provided to NHC in real time. However, the early (interpolated) Stream 1.5 intensity guidance was regenerated post-storm using the interpolator we had hoped to apply operationally (the GFDLtype interpolator that decays the intensity offset to zero).

HFIP Baselines and Goals



HFIP Baselines and Goals



HFIP Goals In Terms of Skill

Atlantic Basin					
VT (h)	Trk 20%	Trk 50%	Int 20%	Int 50%	
0					
12	46.1	66.3	25.8	53.6	
24	57.3	73.3	29.7	56.1	
36	63.2	77.0	34.1	58.8	
48	66.2	78.9	31.9	57.5	
72	66.7	79.2	28.1	55.1	
96	64.7	77.9	31.2	57.0	
120	62.5	76.5	29.5	56.0	

East Pacific Basin					
VT (h)	Trk 20%	Trk 50%	Int 20%	Int 50%	
0					
12	37.6	61.0	22.3	51.4	
24	47.6	67.3	25.7	53.5	
36	53.1	70.7	27.8	54.9	
48	55.2	72.0	29.3	55.8	
72	57.3	73.3	28.9	55.6	
96	52.0	70.0	28.7	55.4	
120	46.8	66.7	29.7	56.0	

2012 HFIP Stream 1.5 Models

*	Tra	ck:
	пч	

- * AHWI
- * FM91
- * GPMI
- * G011
- * APSI

Intensity:
AHWI
COTI
APSI
APSI
UWNI
SPC3
GPMI
G01I

Shading indicates models meant to be used in consensus only.



Among the operational dynamical models, GFS was the best performer, with ECMWF close behind.

Second tier comprises the regional models, CMC and UKMET. NOGAPS trails. BAMM beat the more sophisticated members of this group at longer ranges.

FSU Superensemble best consensus model.



FM9I was excluded because of the small sample (n=2) at 120 h.

AHWI was not competitive with the best operational models.



Adding the FM9I (note no sample at 120 h).

For this sample, FM9I was a good performer, better than the other Stream 1.5 models and close to the skill of the best operational models.



GFDL ensemble mean was very similar to the control.

Unbogused ensemble member had a little more skill than the control.



Evaluated only for cases where there was a Stream 1.5 track model.

The skill of TV15 was similar to TVCA through 48 h, then slightly worse.



A4PI (radar) omitted due to sample size.

UWNI, COTI were poor performers and much worse than all of the operational models.

SPC3 beat DSHP and LGEM but still had little skill.



GFDL mostly was not skillful.

GFDL ensemble mean not consistently better than the control (better early, worse late).

Unbogused ensemble member a little worse than the control.



PSU radar runs (APSI):

Presenting error rather than skill because the sample of radar cases is so small.

Although APSI was much better than the statistical guidance, it was similar to the dynamical guidance.



Adding the rest of the Stream 1.5 model suite.

Homogeneous (but ridiculously small) sample.

Even radar data didn't give errors as low as GHMI.



Stream 1.5 intensity models did contribute positively (although improvements were tiny) to the consensus early, but degraded it late.

Conclusions

- * For track, no breakthroughs, but the FM9I global model was competitive with the best current operational track guidance.
- * For intensity, the consensus aid SPC3 was an improvement over its individual members. The other Stream 1.5 models generally performed poorly.
- * Stream 1.5 models did contribute positively to the intensity consensus early.