



The Empirical Canadian High Arctic Ionospheric Model (E-CHAIM): NmF2

David R. Themens^a and P.T. Jayachandran^a

^a Department of Physics, University of New Brunswick

Outline

- o Introduction of the dataset.
- o Climatological Model Parameterization
- Validation of the Climatological Model and Comparisons to the IRI.
- o Storm Model Parameterization
- Examples of Storm Model Performance and Comparisons to the IRI.

Empirical-CHAIM

- An empirical climatological model designed to replace the use of the IRI at high latitudes.
- We make use of a decade worth of IRI validation studies to avoid identified issues in empirical ionospheric modeling, adapting the IRI approach to reflect these issues.
- The horizontal structure of the ionosphere is represented by a Spherical Cap Harmonic Expansion.
- Built from topside sounder, Ionosonde, Incoherent Scatter Radar, and Radio Occultation data.

Data: Ionosonde



Over 28 million ionosonde observations from 82 instruments operated between 1931 and 2016 and gathered from 8 different data portals.

Quality Control and Analysis

- Every data source has a different data format and applies different processing methods.
- Only a select few data sources provide error estimates or quality control indices.
- Ionosonde data is traditionally very difficult to automatically process, particularly at high latitudes.
- Suspect data points are identified automatically and were manually assessed (~10% of the dataset).

Data: Radio Occultation

- CHAMP, GRACE, and COSMIC GPS Radio Occultation electron density profiles.
- Gathered all profiles from above 45N geomagnetic latitude (736,828 profiles).
- Profiles with negative values anywhere above 100km are discarded.
- Noise-dominant profiles are identified and removed by evaluating RMS errors with respect to a fitted vary-Chap profile.
- Profiles with multiple maxima are removed.

Challenges: Coordinate System, Diurnal Variability, and Dataset Size

- At high latitudes, ionospheric dynamics are strongly driven by both solar factors and coupling to the magnetic field.
- Separation of the geographic and geomagnetic poles thereby does not allow us to make a local time coordinate simplification.
- With a dataset this large, processing the whole dataset at once is very computationally challenging.
- Solution: Fit 24 separate models (one for each UTC hour)

The Model: NmF2

$$\log(NmF2) = G + \sum_{l=0}^{L} \sum_{m=0}^{\min(l,M)} \left[A_{lm} \cos\left(\frac{\pi m}{180}\lambda\right) + B_{lm} \sin\left(\frac{\pi m}{180}\lambda\right) \right] P_{lm}(\eta)$$

$$\eta = \cos\left((90 - \varphi) \frac{\pi}{45} \right) \qquad L = 5, M = 4, c = 4$$

$$A_{lm}, B_{lm} = (\gamma_{lm}F_1 + \delta_{lm}F_2) \cdot \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi \cdot DoY}{365.25}\right) + (C_{lm}F_1 + D_{lm}F_2)$$

$$C_{lm}, D_{lm} = \sum_{c=1}^{4} \alpha_{lm}^c \cos\left(\frac{2\pi c \cdot DoY}{365.25}\right) + \beta_{lm}^c \sin\left(\frac{2\pi c \cdot DoY}{365.25}\right)$$

$$G = \frac{1}{2} \left[G + \frac{1$$

 $F10.7 \cdot (a_1 \cos(\chi) + a_2 \sin(\chi)) + \sqrt{F10.7} \cdot (a_3 \cos(\chi) + a_4 \sin(\chi)) + IG \cdot (a_5 \cos(\chi) + a_6 \sin(\chi)) + a_7F10.7^2 \cos(\chi) + a_8IG^2$

 $F_1 = F10.7_{81}$ $F_2 = (F10.7_{81})^{(1/1.9)}$



foF2 (MHz)

Comparison to IRI and Ionosonde





Validation: RMS Performance



Ionospheric Storms

- The IRI features an adjustment to account for storm-time ionospheric variability.
- While climatological models such as the IRI and E-CHAIM cannot be expected to fully capture these variabilities (particularly those on short timescales), storm adjustments should constitute some improvement over the climatology.

Storm Model

$$\log\left(\frac{NmF2}{\overline{NmF2}}\right) = \sum_{l=0}^{L} \sum_{m=0}^{\min(l,M)} \left[A_{lm}\cos\left(\frac{\pi m}{180}\lambda\right) + B_{lm}\sin\left(\frac{\pi m}{180}\lambda\right)\right] P_{lm}(\eta)$$

$$A_{lm}, B_{lm} = \sum_{d=1}^{3} (\alpha_{lm} \sin \theta + \beta_{lm} \cos \theta + (\gamma_{lm} \sin \theta + \delta_{lm} \cos \theta) \sqrt{F10.7}) G_d$$
$$G = e^{Dst'/300}, e^{-ap'/30}, e^{AE'/700}$$
$$\Gamma' = (1 - \tau) [\Gamma_0 + \tau \cdot \Gamma_1 + \tau^2 \cdot \Gamma_2 + \cdots]$$

 $\tau = 0.95, 0.75, 0.95$

Evaluation: May 21 – June 5, 2010



Eielson



Summary

- E-CHAIM constitutes a significant and universal improvement over the IRI in the representation of NmF2.
- Within the polar cap, the use of E-CHAIM constitutes an improvement over the IRI by over 1MHz, particularly during equinox periods.
- The use of the storm perturbation adjustment results in a 15-40% improvement over the climatological E-CHAIM model representation during storm periods.

Current Status

- hmF2 and NmF2 models are complete.
- Topside model is complete.
- Error models for hmF2, NmF2, and topside electron density are complete.
- Fitting of bottomside climatological model is in progress.
- Bottomside perturbation model on the books.
- The model will be made available at <u>http://chain.physics.unb.ca</u> once a distribution is completed. Until then, please send requests by email to david.themens@unb.ca

The Rest of the Model

hmF2

- Similar parameterization to NmF2 but with a F10.7^2.0 as the non-linear solar activity driver.
- No perturbation model has been developed yet: ionosonde data during storms is particularly questionable for hmF2 due to E-F valley conditions and absorption of the low-frequency portion of the profile.
- Spherical Cap expansion is limited to a 3-3 expansion. Spatial structure is nonetheless far more defined than that of the IRI.





hmF2: Complete



Eielson

Cambridge Bay

Resolute

Bottomside Parameterization

- Originally wanted to use Empirical Orthogonal Functions (EOFs) to represent the bottomside vertical structure of the E-CHAIM ionosphere, but E and F1 profile inflections are not sufficiently statistically important with respect to F-layer thickness variability.
- Also, EOFs are not explicitly differentiable, leading to the potential for discontinuities in the profile shape.
- Instead, we'll fit to a Chapman function with variable scale height.
- E and F1 inflections will be fitted separately after the dominant F-region variations are removed.



Scale Height



Topside

- Incoherent Scatter Radar, Topside Sounder, and Radio Occultation electron density profiles have been fitted to a semi-Epstein layer function (beginning with the NeQuick parameterization).
- Only the layer thickness will need to be modeled explicitly.
- This thickness is fitted to a spherical cap expansion in mag. lat and MLT with linear F10.7 flux and AE index driving terms.
- Solar zenith angle is included in the same manner as for NmF2 to help account for UT-dependent variabilities.

The NeQuick Model

• The NeQuick Topside Model is a semi-Epstein layer with varying scale height.

$$N(h) = \frac{4N_{max}}{(1 + \exp(z))^2} \exp(z)$$
$$z = \frac{h - hmF2}{H} \qquad H = H_0 \left(\frac{1 + r \cdot g(h - hmF2)}{r \cdot H_0 + g(h - hmF2)}\right)$$

- Parameters r and g were selected as 100 and 0.125, respectively.
- There is no literature to back the reasoning for these r and g values.
- First attempt will just fit for H0. Further experiments will look at using either a linear H parameterization or adjusting r and g.

192 hours beginning May 30th, 2013

- Plotted in MLT and MLat.
- See UT-dependant diurnal pattern, likely coming from the sol. zen. terms.
- Kp 7 geomagnetic storm begins at hour 44, peaking at hour 56.



Other considerations:



Conclusion

- The first two phases of the E-CHAIM model, namely the NmF2 and hmF2 parameterizations are now complete.
- NmF2 and hmF2 are demonstrating significant performance improvements over the use of the IRI.
- The bottomside and topside parameterization fitting well underway.





Incoherent Scatter Radar













165 km

585 km





Data: Topside Sounder



ALOUETTE I IONOGRAMS

Data: Radio Occultation

 Use data from CHAMP, GRACE, and COSMIC (ePOP for validation)



