

Supplement of

Flexible forecast value metric suitable for a wide range of decisions: application using probabilistic subseasonal streamflow forecasts

5 Richard Laugesen et. al.

Correspondence to: Richard Laugesen (richard.laugesen@bom.gov.au)

- Derivation of relative economic value (REV)
- Derivation of equivalence of relative economic value (REV) and relative utility value (RUV)
- 10 • Additional economic metrics used to quantify forecast value

15 1 Derivation of relative economic value (REV)

This section derives the standard relative economic value (REV) metric using information in the following contingency table (Richardson, 2000).

Table S1: Contingency table for the cost-loss decision problem with expenses from each possible outcome. Here C is the cost of the mitigating action, L_u is the unavoidable portion of loss L from the event occurring, and L_a is avoidable portion of loss from the action.

	Event occurred	Event did not occur
Action taken	Hit rate (h) $C + L_u$	False alarm rate (f) C
Action not taken	Miss rate (m) $L = L_a + L_u$	Quiets/correct rejection rate (q) 0

The expected long run expense for decisions based on forecast information depends on the rate at which each outcome occurred over a historical period. The net expense of that outcome:

$$25 \quad \text{Average net expense} = \sum_{\text{outcomes}} \text{rate of outcome} \times \text{net expense of outcome} \quad (\text{S1})$$

This can be quantified by substituting the terms from Table S1 into Eq. (S1) and noting that the rate and net expense of some elements will be zero. For forecast information this leads to

$$E_{\text{forecast}} = h \cdot (C + L_u) + f \cdot C + m \cdot (L_a + L_u) \quad (\text{S2})$$

A user with access solely to climatological historical average information will take protective action either always or never.

30 It is assumed that the user will choose the action that leads to the smallest net expense according to the climatological frequency $\bar{o} = h + m$ of the event.

$$E_{\text{climate}} = \min(\bar{o}(L_a + L_u), C + \bar{o}L_u) \\ = \bar{o}L_u + \min(\bar{o}L_a, C) \quad (\text{S3})$$

A user with access solely to climatological information will act when $C/L_a < \bar{o}$. That is, a user will either always act or never act depending on whether their particular C/L_a is smaller or larger than the event frequency.

35 If perfect information is available, then the outcome will always be either a hit or correct rejection:

$$E_{\text{perfect}} = \bar{o}(C + L_u) \quad (\text{S4})$$

The Relative Economic Value (REV) metric can be constructed comparing the relative difference between the forecast and perfect information relative to the climatological baseline.

$$V = \frac{E_{\text{climate}} - E_{\text{forecast}}}{E_{\text{climate}} - E_{\text{perfect}}} \quad (\text{S5})$$

40 Noting the climatological frequency of the event, we can rewrite Eq. (S2).

$$E_{\text{forecast}} = \bar{o}L_a + (h + f)C + mL_a \quad (\text{S6})$$

Substituting Eq. (S3), (S4) and (S6) into Eq. (S5).

$$V = \frac{\min(\bar{o}L_a, C) - (h + f)C - mL_a}{\min(\bar{o}L_a, C) - \bar{o}C} \quad (\text{S7})$$

Noting the following parameter which is known as the cost-loss ratio.

$$45 \quad \alpha = \frac{C}{L_a} \quad (\text{S8})$$

Substituting the cost-loss ratio into Eq. (S7) and dividing by L_a leads to the following standard equation for REV (Zhu et al., 2002).

$$V = \frac{\min(\bar{o}, \alpha) - (h + f)\alpha - m}{\min(\bar{o}, \alpha) - \bar{o}\alpha} \quad (\text{S9})$$

50

2 Derivation of equivalence of relative economic value (REV) and relative utility value (RUU)

This section demonstrates the equivalence of the REV metric as detailed in Eq. (S9) and the RUV metric when 5 assumptions are applied to the decision context. We first define the general decision context using expected utility theory, the RUV metric, and then introduce the specific assumptions required to constrain RUV to REV and prove equivalence.

55 Thereby demonstrating that the REV metric can be considered a special case of the more general RUV metric.

2.1 Expected utility framework with cost-loss economic model

The von Neumann-Morgenstern expected utility for a single timestep over M states.

$$U(\tilde{E}_t) = \sum_{m=1}^M p_t^m \mu(E_t^m) \quad (\text{S10})$$

where p_t^m is the probability of state m occurring in timestep t and E_t^m is the outcome associated with that state. The outcome

60 is typically but not necessarily in monetary units.

For a state of the world m at a specific timestep t , with damages $d(m)$, cost to mitigate the damages C_t , and amount of damages avoided $b_t(m)$, the outcome is given by

$$E_{t,m} = b_t(m) - d(m) - C_t \quad (\text{S11})$$

The benefit function $b(m)$ specifies the damages avoided from taking action to mitigate them,

$$b_t(m) = \min(\beta \cdot C_t, d(m)) \quad (\text{S12})$$

The optimal amount C_t^π to spend at timestep t can be found by maximising the expected utility

$$C_t^\pi = \underset{C_t}{\operatorname{argmax}} \ U(\tilde{E}_t) \quad (\text{S13})$$

This leads to the following expression for the ex post utility after substitutions Eq. (S11), (S12), and (S13) into Eq. (S10)

$$70 \quad \Upsilon(E_t) = \mu(\min(\beta \cdot C_t^\pi, d(m_t^o)) - d(m_t^o) - C_t^\pi) \quad (\text{S14})$$

where $\Upsilon(E_t)$ is the ex post utility, C_t^π is the spend amount that was found ex ante, m_t^o is the state of the world associated with the observed flow at timestep t .

2.2 Relative utility value (RUU)

RUV is defined as follows

$$\text{RUUV} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^r) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^f) \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^r) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^p) \right]} \quad (\text{S15})$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^*) \right]$ is the expected value of the ex post expected utility from Eq. (S14) over a set of observations and either forecast (f), reference climatology (r), or perfect information (p).

2.3 Equivalence of REV and RUV with specific assumptions

80 In a cost-loss decision problem the two relevant states are "flow above" and "flow below" a decision threshold Q_d .

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \text{above} & \text{if } Q_t \geq Q_d \\ m &= \text{below} & \text{if } Q_t < Q_d \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S16})$$

Assumption 1: A step damage function with binary values of 0 and L is used to specify the losses above and below the decision threshold,

$$d(m) = \begin{cases} L & \text{when } m = \text{above} \\ 0 & \text{when } m = \text{below} \end{cases} \quad (\text{S17})$$

85 To calculate the net outcome when action is taken to mitigate the loss, we substitute Eq. (S12) and (S17) into Eq. (S11) and make a change of notation, which leads to the following net outcomes for the states above and below.

$$\begin{aligned} E_{t, \text{above}} &= \min(\beta \cdot C_t, L_t) - L_t - C_t \\ E_{t, \text{below}} &= -C_t \quad \text{since } \beta \cdot C_t > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S18})$$

Assumption 2: Linear utility function is assumed which implies no aversion to risk,

$$\mu(E) = E \quad (\text{S19})$$

90 Substituting Eq. (S18) into Eq. (S10), applying the linear utility function assumption in Eq. (S19), and simplifying for only two states of the world using p the forecast probability of flow above the flow threshold leads to.

$$\begin{aligned} U(\tilde{E}_t) &= p_t \cdot E_t^{\text{above}} + (1 - p_t) \cdot E_t^{\text{below}} \\ &= p_t \cdot [\min(\beta \cdot C_t, L_t) - L_t - C_t] + (1 - p_t) \cdot [-C_t] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S20})$$

Assumption 3: Probability of flow above the threshold will always be either 1 or 0,

$$p_t \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\text{S21})$$

95 Assumption 3 is required because the core REV formulation is only valid for categorical forecasts. When REV is used with probabilistic forecasts they are quantified by converting them to categorical forecasts using the threshold-approach with a threshold which maximises REV for each value of α . We can now determine the single timestep ex ante utility for the four

possible outcomes; forecast probability is 1 or 0, and an action has been taken or not. The derivation for the case where $p = 1$ and $C \neq 0$ is as follows. Consider the avoided losses to be.

100

$$L_t^a = \min(\beta \cdot C_t, L_t) \quad (S22)$$

Substituting this into Eq. (S20) and noting $L_t = L_t^a + L_t^u$

$$\begin{aligned} U(\tilde{E}_t) &= L_t^a - L_t - C_t \\ &= -(L_t - L_t^a) - C_t \\ &= -(C_t + L_t^u) \end{aligned} \quad (S23)$$

Simplifying Eq. (S20) for the other 3 outcomes and presenting all in a tabular form leads to the following table of ex ante utility value.

105

Table S2: Ex ante utility values for a time-step of Expected Utility Theory with REV assumptions

	$p = 1$	$p = 0$
Action taken $C_t \neq 0$	$-(C_t + L_t^u)$	$-C_t$
Action not taken $C_t = 0$	$-L_t$	0

Note that the elements of Table S2 are identical but negative to Table S1 used in the derivation of the REV. Applying Eq. (S13) to Eq. (S20) will lead to an optimal amount C_t^π to spend on the mitigating action for each timestep. By considering 110 that the probability is always either 1 or 0 due to assumption 3 and that all costs and losses are positive values we can formulate C_t^π as follows.

When $p = 0$:

$$C_t^\pi = \operatorname{argmax}_C (-C) = 0 \quad (S24)$$

When $p = 1$:

$$C_t^\pi = \operatorname{argmax}_C \left[\min(\beta \cdot C, L_t) - L_t - C \right] = \frac{L_t}{\beta} \quad (S25)$$

Therefore, for any timestep the cost will be either $C_t^\pi = 0$ when $p = 0$ or $C_t^\pi = \frac{L_t}{\beta}$ when $p = 1$.

The ex post utility for each timestep, shown in Table S3, can be found by substituting these optimal costs back into the elements of Table S2, and letting the probability be conditioned on the state of observed flow above the threshold according to the following.

$$120 \quad p_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } Q_t^o \geq Q_d \\ 0 & \text{when } Q_t^o < Q_d \end{cases} \quad (\text{S26})$$

Table S3: Ex post utility values for a time-step of Expected Utility Theory with REV assumptions

	Event occurred $p_t = 1$	Event did not occur $p_t = 0$
Action taken $C_t = \frac{L_t}{\beta}$	$-\left(\frac{L_t}{\beta} + L_t^u\right)$	$-\frac{L_t}{\beta}$
Action not taken $C_t = 0$	$-L_t$	0

Like the derivation of REV, a contingency table is used since every timestep can be mapped to one of the 4 outcomes in
125 Table S2.

Determining the expected ex post utility for the reference climatology (event frequency) information requires an additional assumption.

Assumption 4: The frequency of the binary decision event \bar{o} is used for the reference baseline.

Since the reference climatology is a single value, the decision-maker will either always take action or never take action.

$$130 \quad \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^r)] = \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^c)]_{\text{never}}, \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^c)]_{\text{always}} \right\} \quad (\text{S27})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^r)]_{\text{never}} &= \bar{o}(-L_t) + (1 - \bar{o})(0) \\ &= -\bar{o}L_t \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S28})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^r)]_{\text{always}} &= -\bar{o} \left(\frac{L_t}{\beta} + L_t^u \right) + (1 - \bar{o}) \left(-\frac{L_t}{\beta} \right) \\ &= -\bar{o}L_t^u - \frac{L_t}{\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S29})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^r)] &= \max \left\{ -\bar{o}L_t^u - \frac{L_t}{\beta}, -\bar{o}L_t \right\} \\
&= -\min \left\{ \bar{o}L_t^u + \frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^u + \bar{o}L_t^a \right\} \\
&= -\min \left\{ \frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a \right\} - \bar{o}L_t^u
\end{aligned} \tag{S30}$$

135 Expected ex post utility for perfect information is

$$\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^p)] = -\bar{o} \left(\frac{L_t}{\beta} + L_t^u \right) \tag{S31}$$

Expected ex post utility for forecast information is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} [\Upsilon(E_t^f)] &= h \left[-\left(\frac{L_t}{\beta} + L_t^u \right) \right] + m[-L_t] + f \left[-\frac{L_t}{\beta} \right] + q[0] \\
&= -h \frac{L_t}{\beta} - hL_u - mL_t - f \frac{L_t}{\beta} \\
&= -(h + f) \frac{L_t}{\beta} - hL_t^u - m(L_a + L_t^u) \\
&= -(h + f) \frac{L_t}{\beta} - (h + m)L_t^u - mL_t^a \\
&= -(h + f) \frac{L_t}{\beta} - \bar{o}L_t^u - mL_t^a
\end{aligned} \tag{S32}$$

where h is the hit rate, m is the miss rate, f is the false alarm rate, and q is the correct rejection (quiets) rate from the 140 contingency table.

Substitute Eq. (S31), (S32) and (S30) into Eq. (S15) and simplify.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RUV} &= \frac{\left[-\min\left\{\frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a\right\} - \bar{o}L_t^u \right] - \left[-(h+f)\frac{L_t}{\beta} - \bar{o}L_t^u - mL_t^a \right]}{\left[-\min\left\{\frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a\right\} - \bar{o}L_t^u \right] - \left[-\bar{o}\left(\frac{L_t}{\beta} + L_t^u\right) \right]} \\
&= \frac{\min\left\{\frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a\right\} + \bar{o}L_t^a - (h+f)\frac{L_t}{\beta} - \bar{o}L_t^u - mL_t^a}{\min\left\{\frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a\right\} + \bar{o}L_t^u - \bar{o}\frac{L_t}{\beta} - \bar{o}L_t^u} \\
&= \frac{\min\left\{\frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a\right\} - (h+f)\frac{L_t}{\beta} - mL_t^a}{\min\left\{\frac{L_t}{\beta}, \bar{o}L_t^a\right\} - \bar{o}\frac{L_t}{\beta}}
\end{aligned} \tag{S33}$$

Assumption 5: At each timestep the avoided losses are equal to the total possible losses.

$$L_t = L_t^a \quad \text{for } t \in T \tag{S34}$$

145 Applying this assumption by substitution into Eq. (S33) and factoring out L_t leads to.

$$RUV = \frac{\min\left(\frac{1}{\beta}, \bar{o}\right) - (h+f)\frac{1}{\beta} - m}{\min\left(\frac{1}{\beta}, \bar{o}\right) - \bar{o}\frac{1}{\beta}} \tag{S35}$$

Noting the relationship $\beta = \frac{1}{\alpha}$ Eq. (S35) becomes

$$RUV = \frac{\min(\alpha, \bar{o}) - (h+f)\alpha - m}{\min(\alpha, \bar{o}) - \bar{o}\alpha} \tag{S36}$$

which is identical to the definition of the REV metric in Eq. (S9).

150

3 Additional economic metrics used to quantify forecast value

Three metrics were used by Matte et al. (2017) to quantify forecast value.

Utility-difference: the average ex post expected utility using perfect information is subtracted from the average ex post expected utility with forecast information to give a relative measure of utility. A negative value indicates that decisions made using forecast information led to worse utility on average than using perfect information, and a positive value the converse.

$$\text{utility_difference} = \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^f) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[\Upsilon(E_t^p) \right] \quad (\text{S37})$$

Benefits-hirate: the average avoided damages (benefits) over the observed streamflow record using spending decisions based on forecast information relative to average avoided damages with perfect spending decisions. A higher benefits-hirate is better, a value of 1 is equivalent to using observations to make spending decisions which lead to a maximum amount of damages avoided. This should not be confused with the hitrate used in constructing a contingency table. $b_t^f(m_o)$ is the avoided losses for the observed state at timestep t using the optimal cost C_t^π found ex ante using forecast information.

$$\text{nitrate} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[b_t^f(m_o) \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[b_t^p(m_o) \right]} \quad (\text{S38})$$

165

Overspending: the percentage difference of the average forecast spend amount to the perfect spend amount. It is a standard measure of economic performance. An overspend closer to 0 is better which is equivalent to using observations to make perfect spending decisions and a value of 1 is equivalent to overspending by 100% (paying twice what was necessary).

$$\text{overspending} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[C_t^\pi \right] - \mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[C_t^p \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{t \in T} \left[C_t^p \right]} \quad (\text{S39})$$

170 References

Matte, S., Boucher, M.-A., Boucher, V., and Fortier Filion, T.-C.: Moving beyond the cost–loss ratio: economic assessment of streamflow forecasts for a risk-averse decision maker, 21, 2967–2986, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-2967-2017>, 2017.

Richardson, D. S.: Skill and relative economic value of the ECMWF ensemble prediction system, 126, 649–667, <https://doi.org/10.1256/smsqj.56312>, 2000.

175 Zhu, Y. J., Toth, Z., Wobus, R., Richardson, D., and Mylne, K.: The economic value of ensemble-based weather forecasts, 83, 73–+, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(2002\)083<0073:tevoeb>2.3.co;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2002)083<0073:tevoeb>2.3.co;2), 2002.