

**NWS Hydrology Forecast Verification Team
Teleconference Notes
06/24/2008**

Agenda

- Presentation of the CNRFC verification case study by Alan Takamoto
- Presentation on archiving issues and next team meetings by Julie Demargne

Questions and Comments

CNRFC verification case study

This case study is a post-event analysis on 6 basins for the 2006 New Year's flood event. In order to analyze the potential improvement of the HAS forecasts on the HPC forecasts, it would be desirable to select other similar events (at least for a couple of basins for which the forecast data are available). It is recommended not to pool the forecast-observed pairs for all lead times (even if IVP gives the flexibility to do so) since the forecast performance is likely to vary with lead time. The discussion on what graphics should be used for post-event analysis will be part of the verification workshop in November. These graphics are likely to be different from the graphics to produce for diagnostic verification when using a large sample of forecast-observation pairs. One of the primary graphics for post-event analysis is the time series plot.

Julie's presentation

Slide #4: the archiving system is the first component for a functional verification system; therefore there is a very high priority on designing a new robust archiving system to support verification as well as future science requirements.

Slide #5: this archive survey is not finalized yet and should become available online in early July. The RFCs will have a month to fill it out.

Slide #6: the HEP report on data archiving requirements has been sent to the NWS verification team on 06/19.

Slide #7: the list of tasks to be supported by the archiving system will be finalized after analyzing the results of the RFC archiving survey.

Slide #9: this list includes all the data that should be ideally archived to support current and future verification and hindcasting needs. For metadata (i.e. information on data), it is currently very difficult to archive this information since there are no standards for formats. The NWS should use the international/national standards and if possible available tools to generate standardized metadata.

Action: Julie Demargne will contact Anna Milan for NCDC to discuss metadata standards and available tools.

Slide #10: it is very important to document the archiving system deficiencies and provide feedback to the RFC Archive Team to put a high priority on the new archiving system. Meanwhile, the RFCs should find ways to archive the high priority data for verification. The list of data provided here does not include all the data described on the previous slide. Some of the forecasts/simulations could be retroactively generated in the future with a hindcasting capability. Archiving raw model forecasts (without any MODs or with very basic MODs included) is desirable. However a hindcasting capability can reproduce raw model forecasts without any MODs.

Slide #11: The RFCs will receive an email asking them the following: 1) to describe when their office installed or will install the form-fit-function upgrades and whether they evaluated what impact it has on the system performance; 2) to see if their office is currently archiving all the high priority data listed on the previous slide.

Action: the 13 RFCs will send their answers to Julie D. before the next team meeting on 07/10/08.

Slide #12: for the EVS exercises please use the verify-hydro list to send questions. For the COMET verification training module, the finalized and narrated version of the module will be available in the next couple of weeks.

Slide #13: For the 2nd RFC verification workshop, WGRFC offered to host the workshop. Therefore there are 3 potential locations: MB-, CB-, and WG-RFC. Jeff Zimmerman will start working on the logistics in August 08.

The next teleconference will be on **Thursday, July 10 at 1 pm EST.**