
TS-ARENA TECHNICAL REPORT - A PRE-REGISTERED LIVE FORECASTING PLATFORM

A PREPRINT

✉ **Marcel Meyer**^{*1}, **Sascha Kaltenpoth**¹, **Kevin Zalipski**¹, **Henrik Albers**¹, and **Oliver Müller**¹
¹Paderborn University, Data Analytics Group

December 25, 2025

ABSTRACT

While Time Series Foundation Models (TSFMs) offer transformative capabilities for forecasting, they simultaneously risk triggering a fundamental evaluation crisis. This crisis is driven by information leakage due to overlapping training and test sets across different models, as well as the illegitimate transfer of global patterns to test data. While the ability to learn shared temporal dynamics represents a primary strength of these models, their evaluation on historical archives often permits the exploitation of observed global shocks, which violates the independence required for valid benchmarking. We introduce TS-Arena, a platform that restores the operational integrity of forecasting by treating the genuinely unknown future as the definitive test environment. By implementing a pre-registration mechanism on live data streams, the platform ensures that evaluation targets remain physically non-existent during inference, thereby enforcing a strict global temporal split. This methodology establishes a moving temporal frontier that prevents historical contamination and provides an authentic assessment of model generalization. Initially applied within the energy sector, TS-Arena provides a sustainable infrastructure for comparing foundation models under real-world constraints. A prototype of the platform is available at <https://huggingface.co/spaces/DAG-UPB/TS-Arena>.

1 Introduction

Recent advances in Time Series Foundation Models (TSFMs) may unlock new forecasting capabilities, but they also risk triggering an evaluation crisis reminiscent of that facing large language models (LLMs) (Liao & Xiao, 2023; Meyer et al., 2025). As foundation-style pre-training becomes central to time series forecasting, concerns emerge about data reuse, information leakage, and inflated performance reporting, issues that recall the test set contamination and memorization effects (Meyer et al., 2025). While LLM research has already acknowledged the consequences of training on much of the Internet, the rapid scaling of TSFMs now exposes similar vulnerabilities in time series benchmark designs, reproducibility, and fairness of comparison.

Time Series Foundation Models, such as Chronos (Ansari et al., 2024), TimesFM (Das et al., 2024), Moirai/Moirai-MoE (Woo et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024), MOMENT (Goswami et al., 2024), or Time-MoE (Shi et al., 2024), inherit both powerful transfer-learning capabilities and the risk of improper data separation from LLMs. Because of ever-growing and obscure datasets, TSFMs may inadvertently train on the same series or temporal segments used later for evaluation, leading to overly optimistic generalization claims (Meyer et al., 2025).

To address these issues, this work introduces a live-data forecasting platform built to exclude information leakage across all stages of the TSFM lifecycle. The platform enables continuous evaluation on streaming data while strictly enforcing temporal ordering, documentation of dataset lineage, and automating tracking of data provenance. By replacing static benchmarks with dynamically updated test sets, the platform establishes a transparent and sustainable foundation for fair TSFM comparison and realistic performance assessment.

We begin this effort within the energy sector, where rich, publicly available time series data and urgent operational needs make it an ideal starting point. With the increasing integration of renewable energy and the emergence of decentralized resources, precise forecasts of load, generation, and prices at different distribution levels and horizons are becoming increasingly important (Haben et al., 2021; Lago et al., 2021; Hertel et al., 2023). In this context, TSFMs have the

^{*}marcel.meyer@uni-paderborn.de

potential to deliver reliable, fast, and accurate forecasts that support more resilient and efficient energy systems. Hence, energy forecasting serves as both a pressing real-world use case and a controlled environment in which the proposed platform’s methodology can be validated and refined.

2 Background

Time Series Foundation Models (TSFMs) are inspired by the architecture and training procedures of foundation models in natural language processing, especially Large Language Models (LLMs) (Liang et al., 2024). In contrast to traditional time series forecasting models, which need to be trained from scratch on the target time series, TSFMs use transfer learning. That is, they are pre-trained on massive amounts of generic and/or domain-specific time series to learn general time series representations such as trends and seasonalities (Liang et al., 2024). This makes it possible to produce zero-shot forecasts with little or no training requirements.

However, pre-training TSFMs on massive amounts of time series data, typically scraped from publicly accessible online repositories, introduces challenges similar to those observed in LLM evaluation. The practice of training LLMs on much of the Internet has led to an LLM “evaluation crisis” (Liao & Xiao, 2023), describing a situation in which most benchmark data has already been exposed to an LLM during pre-training. We argue that similar issues are emerging in the field of (energy) forecasting. For example, the *London Smart Meters*¹ dataset is included in the *BuildingsBench* (Emami et al., 2023) dataset, which is included in the *Large-scale Open Time Series Archive (LOTSA)* (Woo et al., 2024). The LOTSA archive has been collected for pre-training TSFMs, but simultaneously, Chronos (Ansari et al., 2024) uses the London Smart Meters dataset for evaluation. Such nested dataset collections combined with different usage of datasets as pre-training or test datasets lead to test set contamination (Mirzadeh et al., 2024; Ravaud et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024).

Furthermore, TSFMs can learn and exploit global patterns, indirect dependencies caused by shared external factors like economic crises or pandemics, that simultaneously influence many time series across training and test sets (Meyer et al., 2025). Unlike direct overlaps, these confounding effects violate the independence assumption essential for robust evaluation (Kapoor & Narayanan, 2023). For example, if a model is trained on gas prices during the European energy crisis triggered by Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, it may inadvertently learn patterns tied to this global shock. When later tested on other out-of-training series from the same period, such as electricity prices that surged due to the rising gas prices (Glachant, 2023), the model gains access to information it would not have at prediction time. Consequently, its performance estimates become overly optimistic. Those overly optimistic or simply wrong estimates may lead to wrong bidding strategies, critically depending on forecasts (Scheidt et al., 2020).

The awareness about these TSFM evaluation challenges is growing, but researchers typically still rely on benchmark methodologies developed from the time before the existence of TSFMs, each with several advantages and drawbacks:

- **Time-based train/test splits** (Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2021; Godahewa et al., 2021; Qiu et al., 2024) are effective in avoiding leakage when training models on individual time series, but typically lack a global split point across multiple time series, allowing models to exploit shared global patterns.
- **Held-out datasets**, such as GIFT-Eval (Aksu et al., 2024), ensure no direct overlap between training and test series. Thus, they allow robust zero-shot evaluation, but do not apply to models pre-trained on other training data (or require resource-intensive retraining). At the same time, they still remain vulnerable to global events affecting both pre-training and test data.
- **Anonymized test sets** (Der et al., 2023) aim to obscure original data points to prevent the simple recall of original data points in case they have been included in the pre-training datasets, yet can often be undermined by standard TSFM pre-processing, like standardization that often mitigates anonymization techniques.
- **Competition-based splits**, similar to Kaggle² and the M-competitions (Makridakis et al., 2022, 2024), use hidden test sets and force a pre-registration of predictions to prevent test set contamination or leakage, but still permit exploitation of global patterns, as they usually use data from the past. In addition, such competitions require substantial administrative resources and lead to lengthy intervals between meaningful benchmarking opportunities. Furthermore, as competitions usually take place infrequently, this slows down research and development activities.
- **Synthetic data** enables the creation of unlimited, novel test sets (Dooley et al., 2023), though its external validity remains uncertain and depends on rigorous validation of the data generation process (Yuezhang et al., 2021).

Meyer et al. (2025) propose eleven requirements for mitigating information leakage in the form of test set contamination and global pattern memorization. Additionally, they include some best practices for benchmarks in general, like

¹<https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/smartmeter-energy-use-data-in-london-households/>

²<https://www.kaggle.com/docs/competitions>

flexibility in training data and openness for past and future models. To fulfill these requirements, they developed the idea of a continuously advancing global temporal split together with pre-registered forecasts. Based on these requirements and idea, we envision an online platform with pre-registered forecasts on live data into the future and subsequent evaluation as unknown future points become known past values.

3 Benchmark Concept

Our proposed platform features several unique differences compared to existing approaches:

1. Unlike traditional benchmarks that rely on static historical datasets, the test data comprises real-time future observations, not existing at the time of pre-registration. This eliminates the risk of information leakage, preventing test set contamination and global pattern memorization.
2. Our platform does not host or force specific training data, but solely provides streaming past-to-present input sequences of (context) length c to enable forecasting. This provides users with full flexibility in selecting data for pre-training their models.
3. In contrast to competitions with predefined deadlines, users pre-register forecasts at time point t_p of horizon h , which are then continuously evaluated using real-time data on a dynamic leaderboard. This provides continuous opportunities for testing new models.




Figure 1. Pre-registered forecasts of future data points.

Three essential factors need to be considered to build and operate the platform (see Figure 1):

- The past context t_{p-c}, \dots, t_p . This defines the available historical time series input that enables forecasting and is provided by a *past-to-present API*. The maximum context length c is constrained by common contexts shared across typical model context sizes, the chosen frequency and forecasting domain.
- The pre-registration time t_p . Limited time for prediction registration, representing the shift from analyzing past observations to making future forecasts.
- The forecast horizon t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{p+h} . Starting at this point, no ground truth data points are known, the forecast extends over the horizon t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{p+h} and is categorized by frequency into short-, mid-, or long-term forecasts.

For instance, consider the electricity system grid load of the bidding zone DE-LU (Germany and Luxembourg). After a pre-registration start time of $t_p = \text{December 14, 2025 12:00}$ (CET), a user accesses historical hourly load from $t_c = \text{November 14, 2025 12:00} - \text{December 14, 2025 12:00}$ via the *past-to-present API*³. The user then submits a

³The data for the past-to-present API is streamed from the SMARD-API: <https://www.smard.de/home>




Figure 2. Ranking of models based on their participated challenges in the last 7 days. On the top different filterings options are available to see model performances at specific horizons, frequencies or domains. The current results are not yet meaningful and are therefore pixelated.

forecast for the horizon t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{p+24} , corresponding precisely to the 24-hourly load for December 14, 2025, 13:00 to December 15, 2025, 12:00, which is unknown even to the system grid providers at that point. The instantiation of this process is shown in Figure 3. As actual load becomes available through the SMARD feed, the platform evaluates the pre-registered forecasts in real time and updates the dynamic leaderboards. This design mirrors operational short-term load forecasting requirements, where forecasts are used to determine the generation needed while not knowing the actual values of generation. Furthermore, it rigorously prevents any leakage of future information into the training process or exploitation of overlapping global events, thereby ensuring fair and robust benchmarking of any approaches, including TSFMs.

4 Implementation

4.1 Architecture Overview

The platform is a live, leakage-resistant forecasting arena that turns future observations into the only valid test data. Two public-facing interfaces define the core interaction: (i) a past-to-present API that serves a validated historical context window $[t_{p-c}, \dots, t_p]$, and (ii) a pre-registration API that accepts forecasts for the future horizon $[t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{p+h}]$ at the pre-registration time t_p . Under the hood, ingestion services continuously pull live observations from external providers, a historization layer records what was known at what time (SCD2), and a challenge orchestrator creates, announces, and runs different challenges throughout the day. An evaluation service computes metrics as actuals arrive, and a leaderboard service displays rolling results across multiple time windows and filtering scopes. This end-to-end design enforces strict temporal separation, provenance tracking, and reproducible evaluation while operating on live data.




Figure 3. Different Time Series Foundation Models predicted the future market price of Germany/Luxembourg. The actual values (punctual grey line) were collected after registration for the forecasting challenge was closed.

4.2 Data Ingestion and Historization

Live data are sourced from multiple external APIs (currently the SMARD API and the EIA API), with ongoing integration of new providers. Ingestion workers are idempotent, rate-limited, and timezone-aware; they normalize and validate incoming records, attach provenance metadata (provider, endpoint, pull time), and write to an append-only store.

To precisely reconstruct “what was available when,” we implement SCD2 historization: every record carries `valid_from`, `valid_to`, and a `created_at` timestamp. This enables exact reconstruction of the view available at any t_p , preventing retroactive corrections from leaking into earlier contexts. Alternatives considered were whole-dataset snapshots per pull (excessive storage and I/O) and delta logs without validity windows (insufficient for exact reconstruction). SCD2 provides precise temporal lineage with manageable storage growth and supports full audits of any challenge.

4.3 APIs and Leakage Controls

The past-to-present API serves a validated context window $[t_{p-c}, \dots, t_p]$ with a maximum context c constrained by the common history across selected frequency and domain. The pre-registration API accepts forecasts for $[t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{p+h}]$ and enforces submission strictly before t_{p+1} . Both APIs are backed by the SCD2 store and return only records valid at t_p . All requests are timestamped using server-side time while original time-zones are stored to ensure correct reconstruction. We record client submission time and challenge t_p to audit any timing disputes. For random challenges, series metadata is pseudonymized and revealed only after registration closes to reduce opportunities for external data matching during registration.

4.4 Challenge Orchestration

From a pooled set of time series, the orchestrator produces “challenges” parameterized by:

- Frequency (e.g., 15 minutes, hourly, daily). Very short frequencies are possible only if model inference time does not exceed the frequency. If inference is slower than the frequency, participation is possible only when the horizon is sufficiently longer than the frequency and earliest slices can be excluded from evaluation (a potential future feature).
- Forecast horizon (expressed in time delta from start of the challenge; e.g., a day-ahead horizon at 15-minute frequency requires 24×4 steps).
- Domain and subdomain (initially energy with load, generation, and price; extensible to finance, weather, traffic, and more granular taxonomies).
- Selection method: fixed (named series, enabling longitudinal tracking) or random (sampled from a bucket; names pseudonymized until registration closes).

Each challenge progresses through four stages: announced (visibility for participation decisions), registration (predefined context is provided; forecasts must be pre-registered within registration window), active (actuals begin to arrive; partial evaluation starts), and closed (full horizon observed; final evaluation computed). The system automatically creates multiple challenges throughout the day rather than a single daily batch. This distributes compute and increases diversity of cut points (start/end times).

4.5 Random Sampling Policy

Random challenges are sampled within domain–frequency–horizon buckets (e.g., Energy, 15 minutes, 24-hour horizon). Within a bucket, a fixed number of series (for example, 10) is drawn per challenge. This preserves comparability within similar forecasting conditions while mitigating targeted overfitting to known series. Fixed challenges complement this by enabling continuous, longitudinal evaluation on specific assets.

4.6 Participation Modes

Two complementary modes balance rigor and inclusivity:

1. Containerized inference: participants submit a Docker template with model and forecast code; we run inference and provide identical context to all models. Several prominent TSFMs are pre-implemented and automatically join relevant challenges. Advantages are strict control over context parity and full reproducibility; the trade-offs are higher infrastructure burden and the need for secure sandboxing.
2. BYOP (bring-your-own-predictions): participants receive an API key, pull contexts during registration, run their own inference, and upload forecasts. A minimal model “card” is required at registration, including at least:
 - (a) model identifier/version
 - (b) architecture class
 - (c) approx. model size
 - (d) whether external data was used for this forecast

This improves scientific transparency without imposing full reproducibility packages.

Model versioning is explicit: a new version or updated model must be registered as a new model, ensuring that forecasts from different versions remain separable and comparable over time.

4.7 Evaluation and Metrics

As actuals arrive, the evaluation service computes point-forecast metrics incrementally, updating results during the active stage and producing a consolidated score at closure. The primary metric is MASE due to its scale-free comparability across heterogeneous series. By default, per-challenge scores aggregate series-level MASE via a simple average; additional aggregation schemes can be added if needed. Planned extensions include probabilistic forecasting with CRPS and the provision of multiple metrics. While participants may compute auxiliary metrics locally, leaderboard rankings are tied to a fixed, challenge-declared primary metric for stability and fairness.

4.8 Leaderboard Design and Fairness

Leaderboards are rolling and time-windowed with four tabs: last 7 days (rapid feedback), last 30 days (stability), last 90 days (medium-term impact) and last 365 days (long-term impact). Each tab includes only challenges whose closed timestamps fall within the window. To discourage selective participation (e.g., repeatedly submitting only at favorable timestamps), we apply a participation-aware adjustment:

$$\text{Adjusted MASE} = \frac{\text{MASE}}{\text{Participation Rate}} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{Participation Rate} = \frac{n_{\text{participated}}}{n_{\text{available}}}.$$

There are no hard thresholds. A model that participates in all available challenges within the relevant scope has a participation rate of 1 and is unaffected. Participating in only half of the available challenges doubles the score (worse). Crucially, evaluation scopes are not only time-based but also filtered by domain, frequency, and horizon. A model specialized for, say, energy at 15 minutes is not penalized in the energy–15-minute leaderboard for not participating outside that scope. We display both the raw and adjusted scores, alongside the coverage count, for transparency.

4.9 Operational Considerations

Time handling is standardized in UTC, with explicit conversions only for display. Daylight-saving transitions are normalized to avoid off-by-one errors. Data quality checks are limited to verifying the availability of recent data in the time series. No additional preprocessing steps, such as missing value handling, are performed. Containerized runs execute on separate infrastructure and are internally handled like a BYOP participant. BYOP endpoints are authenticated and rate-limited.

4.10 Consequences

The combination of live data, SCD2 historization, and bucketed randomization delivers a platform that is inherently leakage-resistant and audit-ready. Frequent challenges diversify cut points and distribute compute. The hybrid participation model widens access while preserving a rigorous comparison path. Finally, the rolling, scope-aware leaderboard with participation-adjusted metrics rewards both performance and breadth of participation without penalizing legitimate specialization.

5 Discussion

This section evaluates the proposed live-data, pre-registration benchmark against the eleven requirements outlined by Meyer et al. (2025), situating it relative to existing strategies discussed in Sections 2. Overall, transforming the test set into the yet-unseen future eliminates major leakage pathways that have become acute with TSFMs (Meyer et al., 2025). At the same time, the platform maintains flexibility for diverse models and training regimens, and it scales operationally beyond one-off competitions (Makridakis et al., 2022, 2024). Below, we discuss each requirement in turn.

5.1 Requirement 1: Prevention of Information Leakage

By definition, the platform evaluates only on observations that do not exist at pre-registration time t_p . Unlike time-based splits within static archives (Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2021; Godahewa et al., 2021; Qiu et al., 2024; Aksu et al., 2024), there is no possibility that test points were used during pre-training or fine-tuning, closing the door to direct test set contamination. SCD2 historization enforces “what was known when” to ensure reproducibility even when past data points are getting corrected (but were not available to the models at inference time). This surpasses anonymization-based tactics (Der et al., 2023), which can be undermined by TSFM preprocessing, and improves on held-out datasets (Aksu et al., 2024), which complicate and limit evaluations by the necessary analysis of all train and test datasets.

5.2 Requirement 2: Unambiguous Data Splits and Transparency

The “split” is the global, moving frontier at t_p : all models receive the same context $[t_{p-c}, \dots, t_p]$ and are scored on $[t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{p+h}]$. This replaces ambiguous or heterogeneous splits that plague static archives (Godahewa et al., 2021) with a single, precise operational definition shared by all participants. Transparency is supported by open and live evaluation, open-source code and clear indications during evaluation time which time series are currently evaluated. Compared to best-practice pre-registration workflows (Hofman et al., 2023), the platform automates key commitments at registration time while retaining optional model cards (Mitchell et al., 2019) to document training data and intended use. Full reproducibility is maximized in the containerized mode and is partially reliant on honest reporting in BYOP, which is a reasonable trade-off to encourage broad participation.

5.3 Requirement 3: Time- and Domain Dimension Evaluation

Temporal robustness is assessed continuously as challenges span different months, seasons, and event regimes; the orchestrator emits many small challenges at varied cut points, yielding coverage across seasonal and weekday/weekend effects without bespoke protocol design. Domain robustness begins in energy (load, generation, price) but the architecture generalizes to other domains such as finance, weather, and traffic. In contrast to fixed historical collections with nonaligned time ranges (Godahewa et al., 2021), the platform’s moving frontier naturally samples across time regimes. A current limitation is domain breadth; until additional feeds are integrated, cross-domain assurance is prospective. The random sampling policy and frequency–horizon bucketing provide a scaffold for stratified evaluation across domains once onboarded.

5.4 Requirement 4: Applicability to Existing and Future Models

Because the test data do not exist at training time, there is no need to retrain and test on curated held-out sets (Aksu et al., 2024). The platform accommodates legacy, current, and future TSFMs, whether open containerized or closed source (BYOP). This avoids the retraining burden and data alignment challenges that would otherwise blunt scaling-law benefits (Edwards et al., 2024). Moreover, explicit model versioning ensures longitudinal comparability as models evolve.

5.5 Requirement 5: Flexibility in Pre-Training Data

Participants face no artificial restrictions on training corpora. This is a central advantage over held-out-set protocols, which necessitate stringent contamination checks when external pre-training data are used (Aksu et al., 2024). Because evaluation targets are future points, open- and closed-source models leveraging arbitrary corpora can compete fairly. To encourage interpretability and responsible use, the platform requests model cards and minimal disclosures (use of external data, architecture class, context length), recognizing that disclosure cannot be fully enforced in BYOP. This trade-off prioritizes inclusivity without reintroducing leakage risk.

5.6 Requirement 6: Mitigation of Global Pattern Memorization

A continuously advancing global temporal split addresses the core pathology highlighted for TSFMs: exploiting correlations induced by shared global shocks between training and test sets (Meyer et al., 2025). Since the test horizon follows t_p , models cannot have observed those specific realizations of a global event. If an event persists into the future, leveraging its dynamics is not leakage but the essence of forecasting under regime change. This is stricter than typical time-based splits lacking a universal cut point across series (Godahewa et al., 2021) and more realistic than anonymization or competitions that still evaluate on past realizations (Makridakis et al., 2022). The remaining limitation for fully fair evaluations is that domain-wide exogenous covariates available at t_p can be used. But on the other hand, this mirrors real operations rather than contaminating evaluation.

5.7 Requirement 7: Scalability and Sustainability

The system operationalizes what prior competitions achieved episodically (Makridakis et al., 2024): frequent, real-future evaluation at scale. Many small challenges distribute compute and reduce coordination overhead. Idempotent ingestion, SCD2 historization, and append-only storage keep data engineering tractable. Containerized inference is sandboxed but optional, lowering infrastructure demands by supporting BYOP. Compared with one-off, human-administered competitions, this reduces administrative burden while offering continuously updated leaderboards. Sustainability risks mainly involve secure container execution and API rate limits, both mitigated by the current architecture. Thus the approach is practical for long-term community use.

5.8 Requirement 8: Real-World Representativeness

The benchmark uses live, heterogeneous, real-world feeds at operational frequencies (15-minute to daily) from the energy sector, where forecasting accuracy has concrete system and market consequences (Haben et al., 2021; Hertel et al., 2023; Meyer et al., 2024). This avoids the external validity concerns of synthetic-only testbeds, and circumvents the fragility of anonymized data for TSFMs (Der et al., 2023). As further domains are integrated, representativeness will broaden, enabling robust generalization assessments unattainable with static archives whose time coverage and domain mix are fixed at curation.

5.9 Requirement 9: Support for Zero-Shot and Fine-Tuned Evaluation

With our current benchmark design, the clear distinction between zero-shot and fine-tuned models is difficult to determine, especially for BYOP, since we do not have control over the training data. On the other hand, it is worth considering how important this distinction really is. We believe that other aspects like full flexibility in pre-training data and leakage-free test data are significantly more relevant. Additionally when training data is reported transparently, we could implement this separation in a potential future feature.

5.10 Requirement 10: Inclusivity and Accessibility

The platform promotes broad participation by offering multiple submission pathways tailored to the needs of different research communities. Academic teams can utilize containerized environments to ensure full transparency and reproducibility of their results. Simultaneously, the Bring Your Own Prediction (BYOP) interface allows industrial participants to evaluate proprietary or closed-source models without disclosing sensitive intellectual property. This dual-mode architecture lowers the barrier to entry and encourages wide adoption across the time series research community.

5.11 Requirement 11: Robustness Against Gaming and Overfitting

Pre-registration locks forecasts before any future target exists, eliminating peeking and repeated probing of the same test set (Hofman et al., 2023). Pseudonymization during the registration window reduces the chance of matching series to external identifiers, and random sampling together with the continuous integration of new data sources limits targeted over-optimization. Participation-adjusted leaderboards counter selective submission at favorable times. Residual risks, such as leveraging private exogenous data legitimately available before t_p , reflect real forecasting advantages rather than benchmark exploitation, and the audit trail (context historization, container images, submission times) supports post hoc checks when needed.

In consequence the proposed benchmark design fulfills nearly all requirements, while at requirements like zero-shot vs. fine-tuned evaluation compromises have been made. Additionally, we'll introduce a feature in the future to retrieve historical challenges, including their context and other models' predictions, so developers of new models can quickly iterate and compare against other models before their outputs are benchmark-ready.

6 Conclusion

Time Series Foundation Models challenge the adequacy of static, past-only benchmarks by making leakage through test set contamination and global pattern memorization both likely and consequential. We present a live-data, pre-registration platform that reframes the test set as the yet-unseen future and formalizes “what was known when” via SCD2 historization and server-side timing. This design directly addresses the core vulnerabilities identified in prior work: it prevents direct overlap with pre-training corpora, mitigates exploitation of shared global shocks, standardizes the split through a moving frontier at t_p , and enables continuous, reproducible evaluation at operational frequencies. Unlike held-out sets, episodic competitions, anonymization, or synthetic-only approaches, the platform admits arbitrary pre-training data, including closed-source models, while maintaining fairness and comparability through audited contexts, rolling leaderboards, and participation-aware scoring.

Starting from energy forecasting, where public data streams and high-stakes decision making intersect, the platform demonstrates that practical constraints need not force compromises on the benchmark requirements. It provides immediate and longitudinal feedback, and scales beyond one-off evaluations. Nonetheless, important work remains. Domain coverage must broaden beyond energy to weather, traffic, finance, and other operationally relevant areas; probabilistic evaluation (e.g., CRPS), hierarchical targets, and decision-centric metrics should be incorporated; and governance needs to strengthen transparency and auditability in BYOP mode through community norms for model cards and optional containerized audits. Finally, as participation grows, continued refinement of sampling policies, fairness adjustments, and latency-aware protocols will further harden the benchmark against gaming without curtailing accessibility.

In sum, a continuously advancing global temporal split, operationalized through pre-registered forecasts on live data with rigorous provenance control, offers a viable path out of the evaluation impasse for TSFMs. We invite the community to contribute models, domains, metrics, and governance practices to mature this platform into a shared, sustainable infrastructure for robust, leakage-resistant forecasting evaluation.

7 Current Implementation Status of the Platform

The platform is currently in the pre-release phase. The frontend, which displays the live benchmark rankings and real-time forecasts, is available on Hugging Face at <https://huggingface.co/spaces/DAG-UPB/TS-Arena>. The complete backend implementation is published in a public GitHub repository at <https://github.com/DAG-UPB/ts-arena>. At present, a limited number of data endpoints are integrated, but these will be continuously expanded as live operations proceed. Participation in the challenges is already possible, although it is not guaranteed that forecasts submitted during this prototype phase will be included in the final evaluations once the platform moves beyond its initial pilot stage. Several models have already been implemented (See Table 1), and we are working on implementing additional models.

Table 1. Overview of implemented time series models

| Category | Model Source | Model ID / Variant |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Statistical | Baseline | Naive Forecast Simple Moving Average Seasonal Average |
| Deep Learning | Nixtla NeuralForecast | NHITS TSMixerX PatchTST TFT TiDE |
| Foundation Models | Google TimesFM | google/timesfm-1.0-200m-pytorch google/timesfm-2.0-500m-pytorch google/timesfm-2.5-200m-pytorch |
| | Amazon Chronos | amazon/chronos-bolt-tiny amazon/chronos-bolt-small amazon/chronos-bolt-base amazon/chronos-bolt-mini amazon/chronos-2 |
| | Salesforce Moirai | Salesforce/moirai-1.1-R-small Salesforce/moirai-1.1-R-base Salesforce/moirai-1.1-R-large Salesforce/moirai-2.0-R-small |
| | AutonLab MOMENT | AutonLab/MOMENT-1-small AutonLab/MOMENT-1-base AutonLab/MOMENT-1-large |
| | Thuml Sundial | thuml/sundial-base-128m |
| | TimeMoE | Maple728/TimeMoE-50M Maple728/TimeMoE-200M |

References

- Aksu, T., Woo, G., Liu, J., Liu, X., Liu, C., Savarese, S., Xiong, C., and Sahoo, D. GIFT-Eval: A Benchmark For General Time Series Forecasting Model Evaluation, November 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10393>. arXiv:2410.10393 [cs].
- Ansari, A. F., Stella, L., Turkmen, C., Zhang, X., Mercado, P., Shen, H., Shchur, O., Rangapuram, S. S., Arango, S. P., Kapoor, S., Zschiegner, J., Maddix, D. C., Wang, H., Mahoney, M. W., Torkkola, K., Wilson, A. G., Bohlke-Schneider, M., and Wang, Y. Chronos: Learning the Language of Time Series, November 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07815>. arXiv:2403.07815 [cs].
- Das, A., Kong, W., Sen, R., and Zhou, Y. A decoder-only foundation model for time-series forecasting, April 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10688>. arXiv:2310.10688 [cs].
- Der, A., Yeh, C.-C. M., Zheng, Y., Wang, J., Chen, H., Zhuang, Z., Wang, L., Zhang, W., and Keogh, E. Time Series Synthesis Using the Matrix Profile for Anonymization. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pp. 1908–1911, 2023. doi: 10.1109/BigData59044.2023.10386948.
- Dooley, S., Khurana, G. S., Mohapatra, C., Naidu, S., and White, C. ForecastPFN: Synthetically-Trained Zero-Shot Forecasting, November 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.01933>. arXiv:2311.01933 [cs].
- Edwards, T. D. P., Alvey, J., Alsing, J., Nguyen, N. H., and Wandelt, B. D. Scaling-laws for Large Time-series Models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.13867>. Version Number: 2.
- Emami, P., Sahu, A., and Graf, P. BuildingsBench: A Large-Scale Dataset of 900K Buildings and Benchmark for Short-Term Load Forecasting. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pp. 19823–19857. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/3f17bf868966df01ca125e5bbc9ee24e-Paper-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.pdf.

- Glachant, J.-M. Reforming the EU internal electricity market in the middle of a huge energy crisis : an absolute short-term emergency or preparation for the future? Working Paper. (2023/03), 2023. URL <https://hdl.handle.net/1814/75239>.
- Godahewa, R., Bergmeir, C., Webb, G. I., Hyndman, R. J., and Montero-Manso, P. Monash Time Series Forecasting Archive. In *Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021.
- Goswami, M., Szafer, K., Choudhry, A., Cai, Y., Li, S., and Dubrawski, A. MOMENT: A Family of Open Time-series Foundation Models, October 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03885>. arXiv:2402.03885 [cs].
- Haben, S., Arora, S., Giasemidis, G., Voss, M., and Vukadinović Greetham, D. Review of low voltage load forecasting: Methods, applications, and recommendations. *Applied Energy*, 304:117798, December 2021. ISSN 0306-2619. doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117798. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0306261921011326>. Publisher: Elsevier BV.
- Hertel, M., Beichter, M., Heidrich, B., Neumann, O., Schäfer, B., Mikut, R., and Hagenmeyer, V. Transformer training strategies for forecasting multiple load time series. *Energy Informatics*, 6(S1), October 2023. ISSN 2520-8942. doi: 10.1186/s42162-023-00278-z. URL <https://energyinformatics.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s42162-023-00278-z>. Publisher: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.
- Hofman, J. M., Chatzimparmpas, A., Sharma, A., Watts, D. J., and Hullman, J. Pre-registration for Predictive Modeling, November 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.18807>. arXiv:2311.18807 [cs].
- Hyndman, R. and Athanasopoulos, G. *Forecasting: Principles and Practice*. OTexts, Australia, 3rd edition, 2021.
- Kapoor, S. and Narayanan, A. Leakage and the reproducibility crisis in machine-learning-based science. *Patterns*, 4(9), 2023. ISSN 2666-3899. Publisher: Elsevier.
- Lago, J., Marcjasz, G., De Schutter, B., and Weron, R. Forecasting day-ahead electricity prices: A review of state-of-the-art algorithms, best practices and an open-access benchmark. *Applied Energy*, 293:116983, July 2021. ISSN 0306-2619. doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116983. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0306261921004529>. Publisher: Elsevier BV.
- Li, Y., Guo, Y., Guerin, F., and Lin, C. An Open-Source Data Contamination Report for Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pp. 528–541, Miami, Florida, USA, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.30. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.30>.
- Liang, Y., Wen, H., Nie, Y., Jiang, Y., Jin, M., Song, D., Pan, S., and Wen, Q. Foundation Models for Time Series Analysis: A Tutorial and Survey. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 6555–6565, August 2024. doi: 10.1145/3637528.3671451. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.14735>. arXiv:2403.14735 [cs].
- Liao, Q. V. and Xiao, Z. Rethinking Model Evaluation as Narrowing the Socio-Technical Gap, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03100>. Version Number: 3.
- Liu, X., Liu, J., Woo, G., Aksu, T., Liang, Y., Zimmermann, R., Liu, C., Savarese, S., Xiong, C., and Sahoo, D. Moirai-MoE: Empowering Time Series Foundation Models with Sparse Mixture of Experts, October 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10469>. arXiv:2410.10469 [cs].
- Makridakis, S., Spiliotis, E., and Assimakopoulos, V. The M5 competition: Background, organization, and implementation. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 38(4):1325–1336, October 2022. ISSN 01692070. doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2021.07.007. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169207021001187>.
- Makridakis, S., Spiliotis, E., Hollyman, R., Petropoulos, F., Swanson, N., and Gaba, A. The M6 forecasting competition: Bridging the gap between forecasting and investment decisions. *International Journal of Forecasting*, pp. S0169207024001079, November 2024. ISSN 01692070. doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2024.11.002. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169207024001079>.
- Meyer, M., Zapata, D., Kaltenpoth, S., and Müller, O. Benchmarking Time Series Foundation Models for Short-Term Household Electricity Load Forecasting, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.09487>. Version Number: 1.
- Meyer, M., Kaltenpoth, S., Zalipski, K., and Müller, O. Time Series Foundation Models: Benchmarking Challenges and Requirements, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.13654>. Version Number: 1.
- Mirzadeh, I., Alizadeh, K., Shahrokhi, H., Tuzel, O., Bengio, S., and Farajtabar, M. GSM-Symbolic: Understanding the Limitations of Mathematical Reasoning in Large Language Models, October 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.05229>. arXiv:2410.05229 [cs].

- Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., Spitzer, E., Raji, I. D., and Gebru, T. Model Cards for Model Reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 220–229, Atlanta GA USA, January 2019. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-6125-5. doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287596. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3287560.3287596>.
- Qiu, X., Hu, J., Zhou, L., Wu, X., Du, J., Zhang, B., Guo, C., Zhou, A., Jensen, C. S., Sheng, Z., and Yang, B. TFB: Towards Comprehensive and Fair Benchmarking of Time Series Forecasting Methods, June 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.20150>. arXiv:2403.20150 [cs].
- Ravaut, M., Ding, B., Jiao, F., Chen, H., Li, X., Zhao, R., Qin, C., Xiong, C., and Joty, S. How Much are Large Language Models Contaminated? A Comprehensive Survey and the LLMSanitize Library, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.00699>. Version Number: 3.
- Scheidt, F. V., Medinová, H., Ludwig, N., Richter, B., Staudt, P., and Weinhardt, C. Data analytics in the electricity sector – A quantitative and qualitative literature review. *Energy and AI*, 1:100009, August 2020. ISSN 2666-5468. doi: 10.1016/j.egyai.2020.100009. URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2666546820300094>. Publisher: Elsevier BV.
- Shi, X., Wang, S., Nie, Y., Li, D., Ye, Z., Wen, Q., and Jin, M. Time-MoE: Billion-Scale Time Series Foundation Models with Mixture of Experts, October 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2409.16040>. arXiv:2409.16040 [cs].
- Woo, G., Liu, C., Kumar, A., Xiong, C., Savarese, S., and Sahoo, D. Unified Training of Universal Time Series Forecasting Transformers, May 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.02592>. arXiv:2402.02592 [cs].
- Yuezhang, L., Li, B., and Chen, Q. Evaluating Adversarial Robustness in Simulated Cerebellum. In Bertinetto, L., Henriques, J. F., Albanie, S., Paganini, M., and Varol, G. (eds.), *NeurIPS 2020 Workshop on Pre-registration in Machine Learning*, volume 148 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 33–50. PMLR, December 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v148/yuezhang21a.html>.