### Helmholtz Centre POTSDAM www.gfz-potsdam.de

GFZ

# THE FIRST INVESTIGATION OF THE HP INDEX A KP-LIKE, HIGH-CADENCE INDEX AVAILABLE WITH 90, 60 AND 30 MINUTES TIME RESOLUTION

Yosuke Yamazaki, Guram N. Kervalishvili, Claudia Stolle, Jürgen Matzka and Jan Rauberg GFZ German Research Centre For Geosciences, Potsdam, Germany



16th European Space Weather Week, 18-22 November 2019, Liège, Belgium

## INTRODUCTION

#### Geomagnetic activity indices Kp and K

GFZ is in charge of deriving and disseminating the geomagnetic **Kp** index that dates back to 1932 and is endorsed by the International Association of Geomagnetism and Aeronomy (IAGA).

- "Kp indicates the intensity of geomagnetic activity as an expression of solar corpuscular radiation, for every three-hour interval of the Greenwich day" – Bartels (1957);
- A three-hourly geomagnetic disturbance (range) index with values from 0 (quiet), ..., 3+ (moderate active), ... to 9 (very active/disturbed);
- The local K (single station) index: the maximum disturbance range in the horizontal field components observed at 13 subauroral stations (see Figs. 1.2 & 1.2).
- The **standardized Ks** (single station) **index**: normalized for seasonal and local time effects;
- The **Kp index** is the (weighted) average of a number of Kp-stations' Ks values.

#### **New Hp indices**

The improved geomagnetic indices are derived by algorithms developed for the 3-hourly Kp and ap indices but will be of higher temporal resolution: Hp90 (90 min), Hp60 (60 min) and Hp30 (30 min). The ap90, ap60 and ap30 indices are derived the same way from Hp as ap from Kp.

• **Rescale** the range of magnetic variation that corresponds to a local K index (so-called Ktable, Bartels, 1957). The new local high cadence indices are called H indices (H-table). By rescaling, we aim for equal occurrence distribution of K and H indices (see Fig. 1.3 for the example of Niemegk observatory);







Fig. 1.1: Locations of 13 sub-auroral Kp-observatories.

Fig. 1.2: From Siebert (1996).

Fig. 1.3: Normalized frequency distribution of K and H30 indices for the Niemegk observatory.

**The rescaled H** values were defined based on the statistical distribution of K values during the last 22 years from 1995 to 2017. This was done for each contributing observatory and Hp index separately.

## **RESULTS 1**

#### Hp vs Kp during geomagnetic storms

We first examine whether the occurrence distributions of Kp and Hp are in agreement during geomagnetic storms. Five strongest storm events are selected during 1995-2017 (see Fig.2.1).

- Overall agreement between Kp and Hp are very good,  $R^2 > 95\%$  (Fig. 2.2)
- The occurrence distributions of Hp indices resemble that of Kp (Fig. 2.3).









## **RESULTS 2**

#### Hp vs other parameters (1995-2017)

- Hp and Kp indices are interpolated to 1-min values. The indices are assumed to be constant within the time interval of the range calculation (e.g., 90 min for Hp90).
- For comparisons with other parameters, the linear version of the Kp index, ap (<u>https://www.gfz-potsdam.de/en/kp-index/</u>), is used (i.e., ap90, ap60, ap30, as well as traditional ap).

#### **Correlation with other geomagnetic indices**

vs. AE index					vs. SMF	vs. SMR index SMR: Sur			perMAG ring current index (F		N/PCS) PCS: PC index from the Southern-Hemisphere station, Vostok PCC: [(PCN if>0 or else zero) + (PCS if>0 or else zero)]/2				
Corr. Coef.	Nov-Feb	Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	May-Aug	All	Corr. Coef.	Nov-Feb	Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	May-Aug	All	Corr. Coef.	Nov-Feb	Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	May-Aug	All	
ар	0.67	0.65	0.65	0.65	ар	-0.3805	-0.6538	-0.5550	-0.5023	ар	<mark>0.71</mark> (0.69/0.57)	<mark>0.71</mark> (0.66/0.67)	0.69 (0.55/0.64)	<mark>0.70</mark> (0.63/0.63)	
ap90	0.69	0.68	0.66	0.67	ap90	-0.3707	-0.6384	-0.5428	-0.4898	ap90	0.73 (0.72/0.59)	0.73 (0.69/0.70)	<mark>0.70</mark> (0.56/0.66)	<mark>0.72</mark> (0.65/0.65)	
ap60	0.71	0.69	0.67	0.69	ap60	-0.3690	-0.6324	-0.5362	-0.4854	ap60	0.74 (0.73/0.60)	0.74 (0.70/0.71)	<mark>0.70</mark> (0.57/0.67)	<mark>0.73</mark> (0.66/0.66)	
ap30	0.73	0.70	0.68	0.70	ap30	-0.3677	-0.6282	-0.5311	-0.4821	ap30	0.75 (0.75/0.61)	0.75 (0.71/0.72)	<mark>0.71</mark> (0.57/0.68)	<mark>0.74</mark> (0.67/0.66)	
vs. Solar Wind Speed						VS. IMF BZ IMF: interplanetary magnetic field					vs. Merging Electric Field $E_{KL}$ with 20-min Time Lag (w/o Time Lag) $E_{KL} = V_{SW} B_T \sin^2(\theta/2)$ [Kan and Lee, 1979]				
vs. Solar	Wind Spe	ed			vs. IMF B	Z	IMF: interplanetary	magnetic field		vs. Merg 20-min	ing Electri Time Lag (	c Field <i>E</i> ĸ∟ (w/o Time	_ with <sub>EĸL</sub> Lag) <sup>[Kar</sup>	_=V <sub>sw</sub> B <sub>T</sub> sin²(θ/2) n and Lee, 1979]	
vs. Solar <sub>Corr. Coef.</sub>	Wind Spe Nov-Feb	ed Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	May-Aug	All	VS. IMF B Corr. Coef.	Z Nov-Feb	IMF: interplanetary Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	magnetic field May-Aug	All	vs. Merg 20-min <sub>Corr. Coef.</sub>	ing Electric Time Lag ( <sub>Nov-Feb</sub>	c Field E <sub>KL</sub> w/o Time Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	with <sub>Eĸ∟</sub> Lag) <sup>[Kar</sup> May-Aug	=V <sub>sw</sub> B <sub>T</sub> sin²(θ/2) n and Lee, 1979] All	
vs. Solar corr. Coef. ap	Wind Spe Nov-Feb 0.46	ed Mar-Apr Sep-Oct 0.43	May-Aug 0.39	<b>All</b> 0.42	VS. IMF B Corr. Coef. ap	2 <b>X</b> Nov-Feb -0.30	IMF: interplanetary Mar-Apr Sep-Oct -0.34	magnetic field May-Aug -0.30	All -0.31	vs. Merg 20-min Corr. Coef.	ing Electric Time Lag ( Nov-Feb 0.69 (0.68)	c Field E <sub>KL</sub> w/o Time Mar-Apr Sep-Oct	with <sub>EĸL</sub> Lag) <sup>[Kar</sup> May-Aug 0.69 (0.68)	=V <sub>sw</sub> B <sub>T</sub> sin²(θ/2) n and Lee, 1979] All 0.69 (0.68)	
vs. Solar Corr. Coef. ap ap90	Wind Spe     Nov-Feb     0.46	ed Mar-Apr Sep-Oct 0.43 0.43	May-Aug 0.39 0.39	All 0.42 0.42	vs. IMF B Corr. Coef. ap ap90	Z Nov-Feb -0.30 -0.31	IMF: interplanetary Mar-Apr Sep-Oct -0.34 -0.35	magnetic field May-Aug -0.30 -0.31	All -0.31 -0.33	vs. Merg 20-min Corr. Coef. ap	ing Electric Time Lag ( Nov-Feb 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.68)	c Field <i>E</i> <sub>KL</sub> w/o Time Mar-Apr Sep-Oct 0.69 (0.68)	with <sub>EKL</sub> Lag) <sup>[Kar</sup> May-Aug 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.69)	=V <sub>sw</sub> B <sub>T</sub> sin <sup>2</sup> (θ/2) n and Lee, 1979] All 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.68)	
vs. Solar Corr. Coef. ap ap90 ap60	Wind Spe   Nov-Feb   0.46   0.46	ed Mar-Apr Sep-Oct 0.43 0.43 0.43	May-Aug 0.39 0.39 0.39	All 0.42 0.42 0.42	VS. IMF B Corr. Coef. ap ap90 ap60	Z Nov-Feb -0.30 -0.31 -0.31	IMF: interplanetary I Mar-Apr Sep-Oct -0.34 -0.35 -0.35	magnetic field May-Aug -0.30 -0.31 -0.32	All -0.31 -0.33	vs. Merg 20-min Corr. Coef. ap ap90 ap60	ing Electric Time Lag ( Nov-Feb 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.68) 0.70 (0.67)	C Field <i>E</i> <sub>KL</sub> w/o Time Mar-Apr Sep-Oct 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.68)	with Ekl Lag) [Kar May-Aug 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.69) 0.70 (0.68)	=V <sub>sw</sub> B <sub>T</sub> sin <sup>2</sup> (θ/2) n and Lee, 1979] All 0.69 (0.68) 0.70 (0.68) 0.70 (0.67)	

• Hp (ap) indices correlate best with PCC, which is the average of the PC indices derived from the NH and SH. The correlation improves with increasing time resolution of the Hp index.

#### **Correlation with solar wind parameters**

- The correlations with the OMNI solar wind speed and interplanetary magnetic field (IMF) Bz component are poor (R < 0.5).
- The correlation with merging electric field is good with little seasonal dependency, especially when a 20-min time lag is considered for the signal propagation from the magnetosphere to the ionosphere.

#### Table 3.1: Correlation between

## **FUTURE WORK**

#### Hp as potential inputs for TIE-GCM

- Hemispheric Power used in the TIE-GCM (Qian et al., 2014) is empirically derived from the Kp index. We applied the same formula for the Hp indices to calculate the Hemispheric Power with higher temporal resolution (Fig. 4.1).
- The total energy input estimated with the Kp index during 7-8 September 2017 is 1.59x10<sup>7</sup> GJ. When Hp indices are used, the total energy estimates are lower by 3.8-4.6% but temporal variability is improved.



### CONCLUSIONS

- Storm-time behaviour of Hp indices is consistent with Kp.
- Hp indices (ap) correlate well with PCC and merging electric field.

VS PCC index PCN: PC index from the Northern-Hemisphere station, Thule

Hp potentially improves high-latitude forcing of TIE-GCM.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776287.

