

**AN AUTOMATED FRAMEWORK FOR  
PRECIPITATION-RELATED DECISION MAKING**

A. M. H. D. Adikari

(188080F)

Degree of Master of Science (Major Component Research)

Department of Computer Science & Engineering

Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

December 2021

**AN AUTOMATED FRAMEWORK FOR  
PRECIPITATION-RELATED DECISION MAKING**

Adikari Mudiyansele Hasitha Dhananjaya Adikari  
(188080F)

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
of Master of Science in Computer Science & Engineering

Department of Computer Science & Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa  
Sri Lanka

December 2021

## DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgment is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to the University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

### Candidate

2021/12/12

.....

.....

*A.M.H.D.Adikari*

*Date*

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters Dissertation under my supervision.

### Supervisors

2021/12/12

*Dr. H.M.N. Dilum Bandara*

*Date*

12/12/2021

.....

.....

*Dr. Charith Chitraranjan*

*Date*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I wish to thank my evaluation panel members who were more than generous with their expertise and precious time.

Also, I owe my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Dr Dilum Bandar and Dr Charith Chtraranjan of the Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for the invaluable support in providing relevant knowledge, advice and supervision throughout the project. Their continuous guidance, inspiring advice and constructive feedback provided this project with great value. This would not have been possible without their expertise and remarkable support.

Nevertheless, I would like to show my gratitude to my supervisor at the research center (CUrW), Dr Srikantha Herath, Team Leader CUrW, Metro Colombo Urban Development Project, Ministry of Mega polis and Western Development Sri Lanka, for his continuous guidance and constructive feedback provided.

I take this opportunity to convey our gratitude towards my wife and my parents who helped me to do my best towards achieving success during the entire project time period. Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues at CUrW for the domain knowledge and feedback throughout this research. Without them, this project would not have been possible.

Also, I would like to thank the entire academic and non-academic staff of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering for their kindness extended to me in every aspect.

Last but not least, I am grateful for all the people who supported me throughout this research in various means.

## ABSTRACT

With the effects of rapid urbanization and climate change, weather forecasting plays a vital role in disaster risk controlling and mitigation activities. Generating weather forecasts using numerical weather prediction methods is a tedious process as it requires multiple combinations of weather model workflows. Due to the weather's chaotic nature, field experts frequently modify these static workflows to cater to their decision-making requirements. Moreover, infrequent weather events make these workflows more complicated and challenging to handle manually. There is a need for a decision support system (DSS) to build and update workflows dynamically with these circumstances. After studying the architectures of existing DSSs from different fields, we understand that they cannot handle all weather-related decision-making requirements. Therefore, we present a generic decision support system framework to create and control complex and dynamic weather model workflows. The proposed framework supports three types of decision-making conditions: accuracy-based, infrequent-event, and pump/gate control. The framework can terminate or dynamically update weather model workflow paths in accuracy-based decisions. In infrequent-event decisions, the framework identifies the weather events. In pump-control decisions, the framework attempts to find an optimized control strategy that minimizes the flood risk in the given catchment area. In addition to the above decisions, the system provides relevant workflow strategies for handling unexpected weather conditions. To demonstrate the utility of accuracy-based decision-making, we executed four workflow runs over six months (on randomly selected days for each month). We were able to achieve a 100% accuracy level with manual verification. Pump/gate control strategies were tested using the data from the 2010 Flood event in the Kelani basin area in Sri Lanka. Pump strategy decisions also had 100% accuracy on logic evaluation and model selection. The proposed framework is deployed in a Google cloud platform of the Center for Urban Water, Sri Lanka, for flood-related forecasts.

Keywords — decision support system, dynamic workflow management, weather forecasting

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Motivation .....	2
1.3 Problem statement .....	4
1.4 Objectives.....	4
1.5 Outline.....	5
2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	6
2.1 Architectural aspects of existing decision support system implementations	6
2.1.1 Collaborative Adaptive Sensing of Atmosphere (CASA) [6].....	6
2.1.2 Decision Support System for Diagnosing Anemia [9].....	7
2.1.3 A Decision Support System for the Management of the Sacca di Goro (Italy) [7].....	8
2.1.4 Dynamic Decision Support System Based on Bayesian Networks [12]	9
2.1.5 An ontology-based interpretable fuzzy decision support system for diabetes diagnosis [17].....	11
2.1.6 DSS for Reservoirs Operation Based on Execution of Formal Models [8]	12
2.2 Weather models.....	13
2.2.1 Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) Model .....	14
2.2.2 Hydrological Modeling System (HEC-HMS).....	15
2.2.3 FLO-2D model.....	15
2.3 Current CUrW production system.....	17
2.3.1 WRF sub- workflow.....	17
2.3.2 HEC-HMS sub- workflow .....	17
2.3.3 FLO-2D sub- workflow.....	19

2.4	Apache Airflow .....	20
2.5	Docker .....	21
2.6	Summary .....	22
3	PROPOSED SOLUTION .....	23
3.1	System overview .....	23
3.2	Dynamic workflow components.....	24
3.2.1	Weather model workflows (sub-workflows).....	24
3.2.2	Accuracy checking unit .....	25
3.2.2.1	WRF rainfall forecast accuracy .....	25
3.2.2.2	HEC-HMS water discharge forecast accuracy .....	27
3.2.3	Infrequent event handling unit .....	28
3.2.4	Pump operating unit .....	29
3.3	Rule Engine .....	31
3.3.1	Rule types.....	32
3.3.2	Rule variables .....	32
3.3.3	Rule logic .....	33
3.4	Dynamic workflow creation .....	34
3.5	Dynamic workflow execution .....	36
3.5.1	Workflow scheduler .....	36
3.5.2	Schematic view of dynamic workflow.....	37
4	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION .....	39
4.1	Implementation & Integration .....	39
4.1.1	Model catchment area .....	40
4.1.2	Observed data sources.....	41
4.2	Accuracy-level-based decisions .....	42
4.2.1	Weather model accuracy .....	42
4.2.2	WRF model accuracy .....	43
4.2.3	HEC-HMS model accuracy.....	44
4.2.4	FLO-2D model accuracy.....	46
4.2.5	Results .....	47
4.2.5.1	WRF model decision results.....	49
4.2.5.2	HEC-HMS model decision results .....	50
4.2.5.3	FLO-2D 250m model decision results .....	50

4.3	Infrequent event handling decisions .....	52
4.3.1	Flash floods .....	53
4.3.2	Dam failures .....	57
4.4	Pump operating decisions .....	58
4.4.1	Simulation .....	63
4.4.2	Results .....	63
4.4.2.1	Case 1 .....	63
4.4.2.2	Case 2 .....	64
4.4.2.3	Case 3 .....	65
4.4.3	Analysis .....	66
5	SUMMARY .....	69
5.1	Conclusions .....	69
5.2	Research Limitations .....	70
5.3	Future Work.....	71
	REFERENCES.....	72



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 WRF model execution flow .....	2
Figure 1.2 Cascade relationship between models. ....	2
Figure 2.1 Closed-loop architecture of DCAS. Source: [6] .....	7
Figure 2.2 Feedback model of the management DSS. Source: [7] .....	9
Figure 2.3 Knowledge discovery databases process. Source: [16] .....	10
Figure 2.4 The Causal graph of the Dynamic Bayesian Network. Source: [12] .....	11
Figure 2.5 Hierarchical FRBS system. Source: [17] .....	12
Figure 2.6 Decision flow in the optimization mode. Source: [8] .....	13
Figure 2.7 HEC-HMS model catchments .....	15
Figure 2.8 FLO-2D grids, (a) 30m grid, (b) 150m grid, (c) 250m grid .....	15
Figure 2.9 Initial and boundary conditions of the catchment.....	16
Figure 2.10 Current production system at CUrW .....	17
Figure 2.11 WRF sub-workflow structure .....	17
Figure 2.12 HEC-HMS execution flow.....	18
Figure 2.13 (a) KUB Sub-catchments (b) Thiessen Polygon.....	18
Figure 2.14 FLO-2D input files.....	20
Figure 2.15 FLO-2D model execution workflow.....	20
Figure 2.16 Dag definition in Apache Airflow. Source: [23] .....	21
Figure 2.17 Application containerization. Source: [24] .....	22
Figure 3.1 System overview .....	23
Figure 3.2 Common sub-workflow structure .....	25
Figure 3.3 The Accuracy checking unit structure .....	25
Figure 3.4 WRF forecast time series .....	26
Figure 3.5 WRF forecast comparison .....	26
Figure 3.6 HEC-HMS forecast comparison .....	27
Figure 3.7 Statistical forecast of discharge using the observed discharge .....	28
Figure 3.8 SF discharge vs HEC-HMS discharge.....	28
Figure 3.9 Infrequent Event Handling Unit Structure.....	29
Figure 3.10 Gate locations (a) and Pump locations (b).....	30
Figure 3.11 Pump operating unit .....	30
Figure 3.12 Rule engine structure .....	31
Figure 3.13 Variable scheduler .....	33
Figure 3.14 Variable update scheduling.....	33
Figure 3.15 Variable types .....	33
Figure 3.16 Dynamic task types and their arrangement .....	34
Figure 3.17 Workflow Scheduler .....	37
Figure 3.18 Schematic view of dynamic workflow .....	38
Figure 4.1 Cloud VM allocation .....	39
Figure 4.2 Catchment area (purple-lower catchment, green-upper catchment). .....	41
Figure 4.3 Rain gauges' locations .....	41
Figure 4.4 Water level gauge locations .....	42
Figure 4.5 Flow of accuracy checking .....	42

Figure 4.6 Model output time series for accuracy calculation .....	43
Figure 4.7 WRF time series.....	43
Figure 4.8 WRF model result comparison with observed data.....	44
Figure 4.9 Selected WRF model’s accuracy .....	44
Figure 4.10 HEC-HMS time series .....	45
Figure 4.11 HEC-HMS model output comparison with observed data .....	45
Figure 4.12 Selected HEC-HMS model’s accuracy .....	46
Figure 4.13 FLO-2D 250m and 150m catchment areas .....	46
Figure 4.14 Selected location time-series comparison.....	48
Figure 4.15 WRF accuracy decision resource consumption .....	49
Figure 4.16 WRF decision accuracy (RMSE).....	49
Figure 4.17 HEC-HMS accuracy decision resource consumption.....	50
Figure 4.18 HEC-HMS decision accuracy (RMSE). .....	50
Figure 4.19 FLO-2D 250m accuracy decision resource consumption.....	51
Figure 4.20 FLO-2D 250m decision accuracy (Percentage).....	51
Figure 4.21 Total accuracy-based decision latency .....	52
Figure 4.22 Location A flash flood .....	55
Figure 4.23 Location B flash flood .....	56
Figure 4.24 Location C flash flood .....	56
Figure 4.25 Location D flash flood .....	56
Figure 4.26 Flood map without any gates.....	58
Figure 4.27 Dam failure Flood map .....	58
Figure 4.28 Gate (G) and Pump (P) locations .....	58
Figure 4.29 2010 Flood map with existing conditions.....	63
Figure 4.30 Case 3 flood maps for 6 pump configurations .....	66
Figure 4.31 Pump Statistics.....	68

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Resource consumption of weather model execution.....	3
Table 2.1 Weather models.....	13
Table 2.2 Weather model execution requirements.....	14
Table 3.1 Components for dynamic workflow creation.....	35
Table 3.2 Dynamic workflow scheduling components.....	36
Table 4.1 Resource allocation in GCloud VMs.....	40
Table 4.2 Model execution times.....	47
Table 4.3 Total accuracy decision latency in the workflow.....	53
Table 4.4 Logic rule variables for flash flood model triggering.....	54
Table 4.5 FLO-2D 10m models and triggering conditions status.....	55
Table 4.6 Logic rule variables for dam failure model triggering.....	57
Table 4.7 Pump operating modes.....	59
Table 4.8 Single pump operation.....	60
Table 4.9 Simultaneously two pumps operation.....	60
Table 4.10 Simultaneously all three pumps operation.....	60
Table 4.11 Pump logic parameters.....	61
Table 4.12 2010 Flood simulations cases.....	63
Table 4.13 Case 1 pump configuration.....	64
Table 4.14 Case 2 pump configurations.....	64
Table 4.15 Case 3 pump configurations.....	64
Table 4.16 Loss estimation with no pump operating scenario.....	67
Table 4.17 Case 2 pump model results.....	67
Table 4.18 Case 3 pump model results.....	67
Table 4.19 Number of potential people save with each case.....	68

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CPU	Central Processing Unit
CUrW	Center for Urban Water
DAG	Directed Acyclic Graph
DSS	Decision Support System
FTP	File Transfer Protocol
GCP	Google Cloud Platform
GIS	Geographic Information System
KLB	Kelani Lower Basin
KUB	Kelani Upper Basin
NWP	Numerical weather prediction
RAM	Random Access Memory
RMSE	Root Mean Squared Error
SF	Statistical Forecasting
VM	Virtual Machine
WRF	Weather Research Forecasting