INTERACTIVE VERIFICATION PROGRAM (IVP) SOFTWARE SURVEY RESULTS

The survey was filled out at the end of the IVP training by the participants. Below are the results and comments from 13 participants.

A   Software structure and organization:

1. The software is organized logically and the various stages of verification are presented clearly.

   Strongly disagree   Strongly agree

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**0**

Comments:
- The more you "play" with it, the more robust it can become.
- It's too new to me to be able to agree. I need to spend more time using it and looking at examples. I wasn't real pleased with ob 7.2 functionality.
- Need simple 1,2,3 steps to better get a feel how to create some of "basics" at least as starting.
- As far as I can tell.
- May be a learning curve thing.
- It can be a bit confusing at first, but I believe that is largely due to the complexity of it.
- Still confused, but only because of my ignorance. Incredible program.

2. All of the key stages of verification you would expect to see for operational work are present in the software.

   Strongly disagree   Strongly agree

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**1**

Comments:
- Will need more familiarity running the software at my station.
- Again not enough knowledge base or use of software to answer.

- Not enough experience with it to judge, but seems to all be there.
- Better presentation of some text output might be good.
- So many options!!

B   Functionality:

1. The software maintains a good degree of flexibility for selecting which forecasts you would like to verify.

   <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	1	3

   Comments:
   - Based on limited use and experience.
   - As far as I can tell and understand.

2. The software maintains a good degree of flexibility for selecting which verification metrics you would like to compute.

   <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	5

   Comments:
   - Ditto

3. The software has most or all of the functionality you would like to see.

   <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	3

   Comments:
   - Ditto
   - As far as I can tell (2).

C   User interaction:

1. The Graphical User Interface (GUI) is organized logically and is easy to use.

    <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	1

    Comments:
    - Just need to play with it more and get familiar with functions and locations.
    - Seems to be based on limited experience.
    - Too many windows cause confusion.
    - Again, may be a learning curve.
    - About as good as it could be.

2. There are no unacceptable delays while working with the GUI.

    <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4	1	1	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	1

    Comments:
    - There are some database/hardware issues, but it is not the software's fault.
    - It can take a long time to build pairs and pull up original graphics.
    - 80 hours for pairing one month of data!
    - Delay wasn't unacceptable; 10 mins for what we needed was okay.
    - Time will tell if it continues to operate in an acceptable manner as db grows.

3. There are no major bugs or unexpected behaviors.

    <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	0

Comments:
- Haven't used enough to say.
- We didn't encounter any in short exercises.
- User can do some unexpected things that cause IVP to crash.

D   User's manual:

Documentation was not presented at this conference. Scores that are not 'U' come from those who used the OB 8.2 prototype or looked over the OB 7.2 documentation.

1. The user's manual is organized logically and is easy to follow.

<u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	0

Comments

2. The user's manual contains sufficient examples, which are well explained and informative.

<u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Comments

3. The user's manual is sufficiently detailed and is not missing important information.

<u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0

Comments

E   Suitability for operations:

1. You or your colleagues will use this software for verifying operational forecasts.

    <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	7

    Comments:
    - We can't due to performance issues.
    - YES!!
    - Need to get more familiar.

2. You foresee no major problems with using this software for operational verification (consider time issues, data issues, user interface issues, complexity of the verification process, and comment as necessary).

    <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	0	3

    Comments:
    - Am concerned about the learning curve and operational work load.
    - It has taken 3 hours to produce a scatter plot.
    - Probably won't, but we will need lots of practice and familiarization.
    - Time might become more of an issue when I demand more from it. Again, I will have to become more proficient with software.
    - The only problem is the learning curve of using it and figuring out how to interpret the stats. I feel ignorant.
    - For our office at this point it should work ok.

3. No additional functionality or upgrades are required before this software is fit for operational work.

    <u>Strongly disagree</u>   <u>Strongly agree</u>

U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	0	1

- Ob8.2 addresses many issues inherent in my limited use of the early software as far as I can tell at this time.
- The hardware resource must be addressed before the program can be used operationally.
- Insufficient time with package.
- Awesome first pass on software.
- Ob8.2 looks like some significant improvements over current (ob7.2).

F   Training and experience:

1. You understand the basic concepts of deterministic forecast verification and would feel comfortable explaining the basic purpose and functionality of IVP to colleagues.

	Strongly disagree									Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**

Comments:
- Again, just need to spend more time with it.
- A lot of this is really new to me.
- Due to the number of functions available, it will take considerable time to learn.
- Some, but not all.
- Need more training and familiarization with national first.
- In time…
- I think I could use a week long course on IVP and use it for months before I really feel comfortable. So many options.
- Hopefully.

2. You feel sufficiently well trained to perform verification of operational forecasts with IVP, or feel comfortable reaching this level without further, formal, instruction.

	Strongly disagree									Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	**1**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**1**

Comments:

- A COMET course explaining step-by-step use of IVP would be useful. Or a manual with detailed examples of the various statistics that can be generated would be helpful.
- I personally have a way to go on the learning curve. I need to play with the software more and work with more examples.
- Too much info in such a short time. Once we get ob8.2, will take a lot of practice to get comfortable with it.
- Should be able to figure this out on my own, but would need to work with IVP more to better determine.
- Would like a more comprehensive tutorial but will likely become proficient enough with time.

3. Given the time constraints, you feel that the training provided so far has focused on the most important aspects of verification from an operational point-of-view.

	Strongly disagree									Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**2**	**1**

Comments:
- It was a good start and introduction.

Please write any additional comments or suggestions below:

- Right now, we have IVP version 7.2 installed and are testing it. We may want to redo this survey once version 8.2 is installed and we had a chance to test it capabilities.
- Workshop could have used another day (or just a ½) to allow more discussion/work with IVP.
- While I use the 7.2 version of IVP monthly, I feel that sufficient time was not given to the 8.2 version to accurately fulfill this survey.
- At least for myself, I would have liked a lot more time to work with examples with knowledgeable oversight.
- The IVP appears to be a very powerful and flexible tool for verification. However, beta testing at our office has shown that it can't be utilized until performance is significantly improved on our archive server.

- Like everything else this week, more time needs to be spent on both concepts and mechanics.
- Powerful software. Thanks Hank.
- Hank deserves a big award for his work here! This software is an excellent example of the developer listening to the field and making improvements. Big advance in NWS verification efforts!