





Open-ended, high cadence, Kp-like geomagnetic index Hp

Jürgen Matzka¹, Guram Kervalishvili¹, Jan Rauberg¹, Claudia Stolle^{1,2}, Yosuke Yamazaki¹

> ¹ GFZ Potsdam, Germany ² University of Potsdam, Germany

> > http://swami-h2020.eu/



CC

 (\mathbf{i})

BY



Some basics on Kp

Basics: Geomagnetic disturbances index, Kp

- *"Kp* indicates the intensity of **geomagnetic** activity as expression of solar corpuscular **radiation**, for every three-hour interval of the Greenwich day." (Bartels, 1957)
- Based on K values from 13 subauroral geomagnetic observatories
- *Kp*: "planetarische Kennziffer" (= planetary index)
- 3-hourly index, values from 0 to 9, since 1932
- Endorsed by IAGA, derived and distributed here: <u>http://www.gfz-potsdam.de/en/kp-index/</u>











Basics: Local geomagnetic activity index, K







Fig. 1. Record section for 12 h (four 3-h intervals) to illustrate the elimination of the regular daily variation S_R (indicated by the *dashed curve*). The difference between the lower and upper envelopes of the actual trace, parallel to S_R , determines the maximum disturbance range *a* within every 3-h interval

Local K index

- magnetic recoding of X and Y components
- \circ Quiet-day (Sq or S_R) variation removed
- Station-specific *K* index: variation range within **3-hour** time interval for the most disturbed field component, X or Y, is mapped to *K values* according to the station specific range limits

Standardized Ks index

- Normalization of *K* values to avoid (seasonally dependent) LT biases
- Ks index: conversion tables to eliminate these effects

<u>Global Kp index</u>

 \circ mean of *Ks* from 13 observatories







Motivation for an open-ended, high cadence Kp-like index



 $(\mathbf{\hat{e}})$





for Sept. 7 & 8, 2017

Variations of all Kp Stations, 2017-09-07/08 _____ X __





Take away: Strong geomagnetic variations start on Sept. 7 at 22:30 UT and stop about **three hours** later. The *Kp* index by definition (and somewhat misleadingly) shows elevated values for **six hours** (from Sept 7 at 21:00 UT).

EGU General Assembly 2020

Page 6 of 35



(i)

Example: geomagnetic indices Kp, Dst, AE for Sept. 7 & 8, 2017



Subauroral and mid-latitudes Time res.: 3hs

Max. value: 9

Low-latitudes Ring current Time res.: 1h Max. value: n/a

Auroral-latitudes Time res.: 1min Max. value: n/a



Take away: Kp has the lowest time resolution of the indices presented here. It is capped, by definition, at 9, irrespective of the actual magnitude of severe geomagnetic events.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Motivation for a Kp-like index with higher time resolution



- *Kp* and the derived index ap are widely used indices of geomagnetic activity for space weather monitoring, research, modelling, etc.
- Increased temporal resolution of global geomagnetic activity allows for a better better defined start time and end time of solar wind energy input into the upper atmosphere.
- User survey by the H2020 project SWAMI indicated that *Kp* is a heavily used geomagnetic index and many users would prefer a time resolution of 60 minutes.
- The modelling community sometimes interpolates the 3-hourly *Kp* index in lieu of truly high-resolution data, e.g. thermospheric density (Vallado and Finkleman, 2014), TIE-GCM (Quian et al., 2014).





- Provide a *Kp*-like index that is more nuanced in describing the highest levels of geomagnetic activity.
- The range of geomagnetic variations caused by a certain event is dependent on geomagnetic latitude. The discussion below is intended for a geomagnetic latitude of 50°.
 - The maximum value of *Kp* = 9 corresponds to geomagnetic variations exceeding a range of 500 nT. In the ap index, these are assigned an equivalent amplitude of 400 (in units of 2 nT), corresponding to geomagnetic variations with a range of 800 nT.
 - Any event with geomagnetic variations just exceeding 500 nT is assigned Kp = 9 and ap = 400, i.e. a range of 800 nT, which is too large to describe this event properly.
 - Any event with geomagnetic variations significantly exceeding 800 nT is also assigned Kp = 9 and ap = 400, i.e. a range of 800 n,T, which is too small to describe strong events properly.







Developing the high-cadence, Kp-like index Hp (open-ended comes later)

Note:

Since we a priori don't know to what extent the increased time resolution could degrade the capability of the index to represent geomagnetic disturbance in the same way as the *Kp*-index, we develop and evaluate three versions with different time resolution (90, 60 and 30 minutes). At the same time, we assume that the indices with 60 minutes (user survey) and 30 minutes (highest time resolution) would be the most useful versions.





Developing the high cadence, local geomagnetic activity indices H, and the high cadence planetary Hp

- Based on data from 1995 2017 (digital 1min values available for all 13 stations since 1995)
- Developed indices Hp90, Hp60, Hp30 (90, 60, 30min cadence)
- Station specific **H90**, **H60**, **H30** indices correspond to **90**, **60**, **30-minutes** time resolution. We slightly changed the definition of range (to also take into account deviations from the quiet curve, details will be presented elsewhere) and changed the range limits until the H value distribution corresponds to that of *K* (principle of assimilation of frequency distribution, Bartels)
- Calculate global high cadence **Hp90, Hp60, Hp30** from corresponding H indices, such that the frequency distribution is assimilated to that of *Kp*.



Take away: As *Kp* is an average based on K from 13 station, Hp is based on H from the same stations. To make the H and Hp index as comparable to *K* and *Kp* as possible, we assimilated their frequency distributions.

EGU General Assembly 2020







Comparing high cadence Hp and Kp (open-ended comes later)



 (\mathbf{i})

CC

Frequency distribution of Kp and Hp is almost identical







Correlation Hp indices vs. Kp: 1995 – 2017







Take away: Frequency distribution (HP60 shown on previous slide) and good correlation of *Kp* and Hp show that *Kp* and Hp have similar properties. Hp90 correlates slightly better with *Kp* than Hp60 and Hp30 do.

EGU General Assembly 2020

Sharing Geoscience Online D3124 | EGU2020-6646 Matzka et al. CC-BY-4.0

Page 14 of 35

Kp (left) and Hp30 (right) vs. AE index, AMPERE Total Current, PC index, Newell coupling function: 1995 – 2017





Take away: Relationship of Kp and Hp30 to other space physics parameters is similar, even for 30 minutes resolution.

CC-BY-4.0

EGU General Assembly 2020

GFZ

Helmholtz Centre

Sharing Geoscience Online D3124 | EGU2020-6646 Matzka et al.

Page 15 of 35



 $(\mathbf{\hat{e}})$

BY

CC

Comparing Hp and *Kp* for five storms (Dst < -300nT)





※ 7 days around the storm (the 3rd day corresponds to the storm main phase)

EGU General Assembly 2020



Comparing Hp and *Kp* for five storms (Dst < -300nT)



Take away: Frequency distribution (previous slide) are very similar and overall agreement of *Kp* and Hp90, Hp60, and Hp30 is very good (R²>95%) during the 5 strongest storms from 1995 to 2017.

EGU General Assembly 2020









Example: Storm of Sept. 7 & 8, 2017 and hemispheric power, an input parameter for TIE-GCM modeling (open-ended comes later)



Kp, Hp90, Hp60, Hp30 indices













Conclusion on high cadence Hp indices





- No systematic degradation of the high cadence index properties with decreasing time resolution of the indices is observed.
- Therefore, development and production of Hp90 with the lowest time resolution is discontinued.
- Hp60 and Hp30 are further developed towards an open-ended indices.







Developing the open-ended, high cadence Hp30 and Hp60

Note:

We evaluated two versions of an open-ended Hp30 and Hp60. The first version (Scale A) is designed to give lower Hp values than the second version (Scale B) for the same event of severe geomagnetic disturbance.





Developing open-ended, high cadence Hp30, Hp60

- The station specific scales for mapping geomagnetic variation ranges to H values are extended to H = 10, 11, 12, etc. This results in open-ended H indices.
- Two different scales are used and will be evaluated:
 - Scale A increases the range limits by a factor of approx. 1.4 to get the lower limits for H = 10, 11, ...
 - Scale B increases the range limits by a factor of 1.35 to get the lower limit for H = 10, 1.30 to get the lower limit of H = 11, and 1.2 to get the lower limits of H = 12, 13, 14, etc.
- The open-ended Hp index is calculated according to the following rules:
 - open-ended Hp < 9 is calculated from H capped to 9
 - open-ended $Hp \ge 9$ is calculated from H according to the new, extended scale
- In this way, the open-ended Hp is identical to the normal Hp up to Hp = 9-.
- Number of events $Hp \ge 9$ for 1995 to 2017:

number \	Hp =	= 9.0	9.3	9.7	10.0	10.3	10.7	11.0	11.3	11.7	sum
scale A,	Нр60	-	4	6	2	1	1	1	-	-	15
scale A,	Нр30	2	5	6	10	7	1	1	-	-	32
scale B,	Нр60	-	2	1	7	2	1	1	-	1	15
scale B,	Нр30	-	3	5	5	5	8	4	-	2	32







Comparing the open-ended, high cadence Hp with the PC index and solar wind parameters





- For evaluation of the open-ended index versions, other open-ended, related parameters are needed to compare with. These are:
 - The composite polar cap index PCC = [(PCN if PCN>0 or else zero) + (PCS if PCS>0 or else zero)]/2, where PCN is the polar cap index in the northern and PCS in the southern hemisphere.
 - Merging electric field E_N after Newell (2007)
 - Merging electric field E_{KL} after Kan and Lee (1979)
- Data from 1995 to 2017
- E_N and E_{KL} are time shifted by 20 minutes (propagation from magnetosphere bow-shock nose to ionosphere)
- PCC, E_N and E_{KL} are averaged over the time interval of Hp (30 or 60 minutes).
- Relation between PCC (or E_N or E_{KL}) and Hp is evaluated for Hp<9 and expressed as third-order polynomial



Open-ended Hp30 versus PCC (Scale A left, Scale B right)







Take away: Scale B fits polynomial prediction of H30p vs. PCC better than Scale A.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Open-ended Hp60 versus PCC (Scale A left, Scale B right)





Take away: Scale B fits polynomial prediction of Hp60 vs. PCC better than Scale A.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Open-ended Hp30 versus E_N (Scale A left, Scale B right)





Take away: Scale B fits polynomial prediction of Hp30 vs. E_N marginally better than Scale A.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Open-ended Hp60 versus E_N (Scale A left, Scale B right)





Take away: Scale B fits polynomial prediction of Hp60 vs. E_N better than Scale A.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Open-ended Hp30 versus E_{KL} (Scale A left, Scale B right)





Take away: Scale B fits polynomial prediction of H30p vs. E_{KL} marginally better than Scale A.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Open-ended Hp60 versus E_{KL} (Scale A left, Scale B right)





Take away: Scale B fits polynomial prediction of Hp60 vs. E_{KL} better than Scale A.

EGU General Assembly 2020



Conclusions on open-ended high cadence Hp30 and Hp60



- Scale B gave better agreement with the composite polar cap index PCC as well as with merging electric field by Newell (2007) and Kan and Lee (1979) than Scale A , for both Hp30 and Hp60.
- The highest value observed in 1995 to 2017 for Scale B was Hp30 and Hp60 = 11.7.
- All our high cadence indices will be distributed in an open-ended version in the future, utilizing Scale B.
- The open-ended indices are identical to the previous version of the high cadence indices for $0 \le Hp < 9$.



Index Distribution





Test dataset available from GFZ since June 2019, see link on: http://swami-h2020.eu/

Content:

- Years 2003,2004,2005,2017
- Hp90, Hp60, Hp30, ap90, ap60, ap30
- Technical note
- DOI: 10.5880/GFZ.2.3.2019.002
- CC-BY 4.0
- This is NOT the open ended version.

Feedback welcome!

Disclaimer to users of the Hp indices test dataset:

Please carefully test and validate all your model output and services for which you use the Hp indices (including the ap90, ap60, ap30) as input parameter. This is especially true when these models and services were originally derived or parameterized with the *Kp* index.

Further years of the data set can be requested from the authors.

Archive back to 1995 and nowcast of the index as well as a publication describing the index are in preparation.

We acknowledge INTERMAGNET and the contributing observatories for providing high quality geomagnetic data.