

Question 1

Typically, verification methods must be adapted to cope with a mismatch between forecasts and observations. This adaptation often is less than ideal.

Wouldn't it be more reasonable for forecasts to be designed to match the available observations? Why can't they?

Another way to say this is, Are there feasible ways (new variables; new presentations of variables) that model output can be made more "verifiable"?

Examples: Gridded precipitation; AIRMETS

Question 2

Are high-resolution models truly better than lower-resolution models? How can this be demonstrated through verification?

Question 3

For some variables, there is a long history of operational verification with a set of standard verification measures.

When new verification approaches are demonstrated to provide superior information, should the standard measures be replaced?

Question 4

How should verification of operational use of a forecast be related to meteorological verification of the forecast?

Do users need both types of information?

Question 5

Allan Murphy once said that developing appropriate verification tools is just as hard as developing forecasting tools.

Why, in the real world, is verification development always the "poor cousin" of forecast development?

Question 6

Pilot users of aviation products have asked for “Confidence Level” information on the products to help them decide how much to believe, or which product to believe.

How can the goodness of a product be expressed simply and in manner, which is intuitive to pilots?

Question 7

What are the pressing needs for mesoscale/smaller scale verification?

New methods or better data?

Question 8

Who should do verification?
Developers? Users?

Should verification be done
“independently” of the
forecaster/developer?

Why or why not?

Question 9

What kinds of information about forecast quality do end users want and what information can they actually use?

How can we find out?

Question 10

Should model initializations be verified?

Question 11

What should a perfect forecast model produce as a function of true state of the atmosphere?

Question 12

There seems to be overkill in verification of precipitation. Why not look at state variables (p , T , etc.)?

Is it useful? To whom?

Question 13

How can trust be built between forecasters/developers and verifiers?

(e.g., Holzmann quote from Brooks' talk)

Question 14

In my opinion verification scores should continue to be presented to forecasters because after a long time the forecasters will eventually accept the scores and use them.

Does the panel (or audience) have comments?

Question 15

What verification information is needed to truly lead to forecast improvements?

Question 16

Is there a way to handle conflicting scores?

Does it make sense to combine, weight scores or derive a new one that measures both features?

Question 17

Can human-generated and algorithmic/model-based forecasts be compared?

What are the constraints in making these comparisons?

Question 18

How can a forecast verification system reconcile the differing needs of different users?

Question 19

How can we tackle the verification training issue. What is the best way to deliver the verification knowledge to forecasters?

Or – can we do it?

Question 20

How important is it to develop a useful hourly precipitation analysis for verification?

Question 21

Statistical significance in meteorological verification – is it abused or underused?