



# The National NWS QPF Verification Program

# Brett E. McDonald NOAA/NWS/NCEP/HPC/DTB & NOAA/NWS/OCWWS

COMET RFC/HPC Hydromet 01-1 Course 14-21 November 2000 Boulder, Colorado







# Introduction

- "Verification of direct NWP model, statistical, and forecaster value-added QPFs and PoPs is *necessary* to quantify and improve the skill of QPF/PQPF and PoP forecasts, and to assess the value-added to these forecasts at each step of the NWS [End-to-End] Forecast Process." - Office of Meteorology (1999)
- "One of the most important components of an effective national QPF program is a comprehensive objective comparative verification system" National Weather Service (1999)

# <u>Outline</u>

• QPF Verification

Subjective - visually compare area/pattern/magnitude of observed to forecast precipitation

Model Biases - forecaster experience

**Comparison Plots** 

Objective - <u>comparative quantitative statistics</u> (measures of bias, accuracy, and/or skill) <u>to assess the quality</u> (degree of correspondence) <u>of QPFs</u> (Katz & Murphy 1997)

HPC QPF Verification

The National Precipitation Verification Unit (NPVU)

# Subjective Verification

- The NWP models (Eta, AVN/MRF) have been upgraded often over the past few years
- Thus, it has been difficult to isolate consistent biases across model upgrades

# Model QPF Biases

#### by HPC

- AVN convective feedback problems (primarily late spring / early summer)
- AVN produces too much QPF in cold air during either overrunning or precipitation wrapping around back side of non-oceanic lows
- AVN QPF amounts better than Eta in cool season
- Eta is generally too dry with convection and AVN too wet in warm season
- Eta QPF better depiction of convection than AVN in warm season
- Eta too dry in US SW during monsoon season
- Eta spreads out lake effect precipitation too much
- Although both models show little difference in the mass fields during the warm season, MAJOR differences in QPF are still noted. These differences arise from how convection is parameterized in each model.

# Model QPF Biases (cont.)

22km Eta, warm season

- Eta22 does a better job picking up on MCC/MCS events than Eta32
- No convective feedback problems
- Eta22 tends to forecast well small-scale precipitation events in the short range for both heavy and light events
- Does not depict a large enough area of precipitation (seems to be dry around the core of a precipitation area associated with strong forcing mechanisms)
- Eta22 seems a little dry with smaller scale convection associated with weak forcing mechanisms
- Tendency to generate too many light amounts of spotty precipitation near terrain in a moist environment (i.e., the Appalachians)
- Eta22 tends to be too far north with nocturnal convection

### **Comparison Plots**



### Comparison Plots (cont.)



# **Objective Verification**

### • HPC QPF Verification

#### 06-hour QPF Verification

Point verification system

As of Jan. 1999, no high quality CONUS 06-hour gridded precipitation analysis existed

Uniformly distributed (almost) 600+ METAR obs over CONUS

OBS points QC'd by HPC forecasters - have opportunity to modify OBS or designate as missing by comparing reports with EMC Stage IV multisensor precipitation estimates

Concentrate on 0.25" and above - problems with ASOS precipitation reports

Convert All QPFs (HPC, Eta, NGM, AVN, MM5, RUC2) to points via bilinear interpolation

Compute Threshold Statistics beginning at 0.25"

Threat Score, Bias Score, POD, FAR, ETS





OBS6 001105/1800 MARK P061\*100. STID









#### 24-hour QPF Verification - 30+ years

Gridded verification system

Up until Dec. 1998, Polar Stereographic **30 km** Grid with normalization Since Jan. 1999, Lambert Conformal **32 km** Grid with normalization CONUS land areas

First Guess Analysis Field

24-hour gauge-only precipitation observations on IBM SP EMC Stage III analysis algorithm on 4 km national grid Remap 4 km grid to 32 km grid

HPC Manual Modification of First Guess using 24-hr gauge observations CPC data - HYD bulletins, STP Summaries, etc.
METAR & SYN OBS CNRFC & NWRFC QC'd obs Analyze 0.50", 1.00", 2.00", etc. contours

Convert Final Analysis to 32 km Verification Grid NAWIPS "Graph-to-Grid"

Remap All Forecast Products to 32 km Verification Grid HPC, Eta, NGM, AVN, EtaKF, MM5 Area-Preservation Technique (EMC - Mesinger, Baldwin)

Compute Threshold Statistics beginning at 0.50" Threat Score, Bias Score, POD, FAR, ETS















#### 120-hour QPF Verification

Gridded verification system Lambert Conformal **32 km** Grid with normalization CONUS land areas

Gauge-only analysis 120 hours of 24 hour point observations from CPC (Sid Katz) Last 4 days QC'd by CPC (Wayne Higgins) Simple Grid-Averaging to 32 km verification grid with "nudging"

Remap All Forecast Products to 32 km Verification Grid HPC, MRF, MFX & MRFY, ECMWF, NOGAPS Area-Preservation Technique (EMC - Mesinger, Baldwin)

Compute Threshold Statistics beginning at 0.25" Threat Score, Bias Score, POD, FAR, ETS











# **Objective Verification (cont.)**

• The National Precipitation Verification Unit (NPVU)

Established & administered by the NWS Office of Climate, Water, and Weather Services

Located at & co-managed by the NCEP Hydrometeorological Prediction Center

Purpose is to provide <u>timely & informative</u> QPF verification scores to HPC, RFC, & WFO forecasters, EMC & TDL modelers, and NWS management

# <u>NPVU</u>

• Uniform QPF Verification Program

Prototype development for the QPF Process Assessment & Western Region Follow-on Assessment
Central location where verification statistics are computed in the same manner everywhere
Raw Data decoded into GEMPAK file formats - both types are archived

### • Data Ingest & Archival - Observations

Point Observations:

RFC HYD Bulletins 06- and/or 24-hour amounts Quality Controlled SHEF -> GEMPAK surface files



#### Gridded Quantitative Precipitation Estimates (QPEs):

From the River Forecast Centers
Multi-Sensor Data from Stage III, RFC-Wide, P1, or Mountain Mapper
Quality Controlled
HRAP grid (4 km) resolution of 06-hr amounts
Mosaic RFC QPEs together (using bitmaps of RFC domains) for CONUS - sent out on AWIPS in Build 5.1?
Remap 4 km grids to 32 km verification grid using Grid-Averaging Technique
GRIB -> GEMPAK gridded files

#### Mean Area Precipitation (MAP) Amounts:

From the River Forecast Centers (NPVU does/will not generate MAPs because process differs at each RFC) SHEF? -> GEMPAK surface files









- Data Ingest & Archival Forecasts
  - NWP Model QPFs -

NGM, Eta, AVN Retrieve GRIB files directly from IBM SP on highest resolution grids possible

HPC QPFs -

- Now Receive .vgf & .info files directly -> Run "Graph-to-Grid" -> 32 km Grid
- Future Receive and decode GRIB files

Create point QPFs in WR using bilinear interpolation

#### RFC QPFs -

Creating using NMAP or Mountain Mapper 10-km QPF GRIB files sent to IBM SP via AWIPS Mosaic RFC QPFs together (using bitmaps of RFC domains) for CONUS -> sent out on AWIPS Remap to 32 km verification grid using APT

WR QPF points via SHEF files (QPS)

WFO QPFs - ?

Climatology

PRISM











#### NPVU (cont.) 10.00 8.00 6.00 5.00 4.00 3.00 2.00 1.50 1.00 0.75 0.50 0.25 OHRFC 32-km OPF (in.) 20001109/1200f024: 24-hr period ending at 12Z 10 Nov 2000 Created: Fri Nov 10 18:22:56 UTC 2000 0.10 0.01





- Verification statistics computed from QPFs for possible combinations of the following *as appropriate*:
  - Primary Methodology <u>gridded</u>, with a spatial resolution of ~32 km (Points and MAPs supplemental)
  - Forecast Increments: 6- & 24-hr, etc.
  - Forecast Projections: 1st period, Day1, etc.
  - Spatial Domains: nation, region, RFC domain, etc.
  - Temporal Domains: forecast period, forecast cycle, event, week, month, season, year, etc.

• Performance Measures:

Error Statistics -Mean Error Mean Absolute Error Root-Mean-Squared Error

Threshold Statistics -Threat Score Bias Score Probability of Detection False Alarm Rate Equitable Threat Score

Interval & Threshold Distributions

Other Possible Performance Measures:

Bayesian Informativeness Score Correlation Coefficient Nash-Sutcliffe Sufficiency Score Brier Score Ranked Probability Score Etc.

#### **NPVU – ABRFC – ME**

Oct2000 DAY1 06H GRD (OBS & FOR)



#### NPVU – ABRFC – MAE

Oct2000 DAY1 06H GRD (OBS & FOR)



#### NPVU – ABRFC – MAE

Oct2000 DAY1 06H GRD (OBS)



#### NPVU – ABRFC – RMSE

Oct2000 DAY1 06H GRD (OBS & FOR)



#### NPVU – ABRFC – DIST

Oct2000 DAY1 06H GRD (OBS)



#### NPVU – ABRFC – TS



#### **NPVU – ABRFC – BIAS**



#### **NPVU – ABRFC – POD**



#### NPVU – ABRFC – FAR



#### **NPVU – ABRFC – ETS**



#### **NPVU – ABRFC – DIST**



• Display & Feedback

WWW @

http://www.hpc.ncep.noaa.gov/npvu/

AWIPS?