1. *Contributor Name(s)/Group

Mr. Persistence (Andrew Slater)

2. *Type of Outlook projection

___model  _X__statistical  ___heuristic

If you use a model, please specify:
Model Name Multi-Persistence
Components of the model: Atmosphere__, Ocean__, Ice__, Land__, Coupler___
For non-coupled model: Ice _X__, Ocean___, Forcing___

3. *September monthly average projection (in million square kilometers)

5.50  or  5.49  or  4.49 x 10^6 km^2

4. *Short explanation of Outlook method (1-3 sentences)

Persistence can be computed in several ways. I have looked out to Sept. for the sake of comparison and as a very basic benchmark.

1) Daily anomaly persistence at 85 days lead time (so that I can go all the way to Sep 30th), then compute mean for Sept = 5.50

2) Persist the absolute anomaly from June to Sept (using NSIDC monthly value, not mean of daily). Sept = 5.49

3) Persist the standard normal deviate from June to Sept (using NSIDC monthly). Labeled as "Variance Persistence". Sept = 4.49

None of these methods have true skill at this long lead time. "True Skill" is measured in the same way as Schroder et al., (2014).
(Note: this plot includes a longer smoothing window than my operational 50-day forecast and the observed data sets are different – I was also lazy and did not)

5. Projection uncertainty/probability estimate (only required if available with the method you are using)

... one of these days I will calculate this. Error = big! (relative to something with real skill)

7. * “Executive summary” about your Outlook contribution
1-3 sentences, to be used in Outlook summary: say in a few sentences what your Outlook contribution is and why. To the extent possible, use non-technical language.

Three different types of persistence forecasting at 85-day or 3 month lead time. The methods contain effectively no real skill at this timescale (when measured by the same metric as Schroder et al., 2014).