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)

4.88 or 4.96 or 3.03 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 112 days lead time (so that I can go all the way to Sep 30th), then compute mean for Sept = 4.88

2) Persist the absolute anomaly from May to Sept (using NSIDC monthly value, not mean of daily). Sept = 4.96

3) Persist the standard normal deviate from May to Sept (using NSIDC monthly). Labeled as "Variance Persistence". Sept = 3.03

None of these methods have true skill at this long lead time. For April-June the daily persistence at 112-day lead time looks like a nice forecast (and is giving better results than a 50-day lead time), however, this is pure coincidence.

These methods are different from the “damped persistence” that Ed Blanchard-Wrigglesworth calculates (as I have no damping mechanism built in) .... I/we should throw that one in there as well.
5. Projection uncertainty/probability estimate (only required if available with the method you are using)

Large error!

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 112-day or 4 month lead time. The methods contain no real skill at this timescale.