

Community-Wide Project: GEM-CEDAR Modeling Challenge

For Space Environment modeling, confidence assessment of model predictions is an essential element

- **Quantitative assessment** of models' capabilities to model storm impact on geo-space system.
- Define **physical parameters** and **metrics formats** relevant to specific space weather applications.
- Address **uncertainties** and **challenges** in model-data comparisons.
- CCMC provides support by archiving results and developing on-line interactive model validation systems, coordinate community tools development.
- Joint publications (> 20 participating models, 10 papers)
- FOCUS SO FAR: Comparison of time series from model and observation at specific locations/trajectories; extending to 2D comparison.



Status of Community-wide Project GEM-CEDAR Modeling Challenge

- Model Validation Projects:
 - Poynting flux/Joule heating
 - Auroral oval boundaries
 - Global TEC
 - Neutral density/Satellite drag
- Role of magnetospheric drivers on IT system
- Climatology Assessment of Ionosphere/Thermosphere Models: (background support study)



- Poynting Flux along the DMSP-15 satellite track from E (derived from measured plasma velocities) and B measurements.
- Modeled PF and Joule Heating from
 - \circ empirical PF models
 - physics-based 3-D ionosphere models
 - ionospheric electrodynamics solvers of magnetosphere models
- Selected six storm events



 Rastätter L., et al. (2016), GEM-CEDAR challenge: Poynting flux at DMSP and modeled Joule heat, Space Weather, 14, 113–135, doi: 10.1002/2015SW001238.



- Started with equatorward boundary using DMSP energy flux data
- Trying to find consistent way to define boundary (e.g., threshold-based)
- Participating models: old Hardy, New Hardy, Ovation Prime, Weimer, coupled global MHD model with Fok ring current model, AMIE
- Correlation between auroral boundaries with
 - Poynting flux,
 - Joule heating,
 - Field-aligned currents,
 - Total electron content,
 - Auroral charging



 Lane, C., A. Acebal, and Y. Zheng (2015), Assessing predictive ability of three auroral precipitation models using DMSP energy flux, Space Weather, 13, 61–71, doi:10.1002/2014SW001085.



Global TEC Study



5° lat × 5° lon × 15 min

- Addressed TEC modeling challenges:
 - TEC data preparation for validation study
 - o biases in TEC data

- Started with 8 longitude sectors for 2006 Dec. event:
 - RMSE, NRMSE, and ratio of max.
 - o dTEC_q = TEC TEC_q(pre-storm)
 - Using 15 simulations from 8 IT models





Neutral Density/Satellite Drag

- Neutral density measurement along the CHAMP orbit
- Model-data comparison using
 - Point value
 - Orbit averaged value
- Baseline removal to remove difference in quiet time reference levels among models, and to quantify variations due to storms.
- Satellite Drag at high altitude (> 600 km)







Role of Drivers

Driver-Swapping (MI Coupling) Patch-Panel Tool



All drivers are converted to a common format.

The tool is called as a KAMELEON subroutine to provide values on the grid:

call kameleon (model, time, mlts, mlats, variables, values_output)

IT Models (CTIPe/TIE-GCM/GITM)



CTIPe runs with different high-latitude electric potential models

(for 2006 Dec. event: Orbit averaged density along the CHAMP orbit)



• All three CTIPe runs use the same model for auroral particle precipitation (Fuller-Rowell & Evans)

Regional TEC Study

TEC Changes during 2013 Mar. Storm



TIEGCM_0004 d_TEC 2013/03/17 20:00:00 UT

80 60 40 20 0 -20 -39 -60 -60 -80

TIEGCM_0004 d_TEC 2013/03/17 20:00:00 UT



GAIM_0001 d_TEC 2013/03/17 20:00:00 UT



GAIM_0001 d_TEC 2013/03/17 20:00:00 UT

VINATED 🕅



0 -4 -8 -12 -16

foF2 for 35 days including 2013 Mar. Storm (doy 076)

DINATED

at Millstone Hill



blue: foF2 – foF2_quiet(30-day median)



Outlook

- Focus on Auroral Region: a hub for GEM-CEDAR joint projects
 - o **boundaries**
 - o conductance
- New observations beyond DMSP data
 - new data comparison:
 e.g., FUV Auroral Images (Yongliang Zhang)
- Boundaries based on different impact
 - \circ auroral charging