Ionosphere Modelling Based on the NeQuick Model and GNSS Data Ingestion

Benoît Bidaine¹ - F.R.S.-FNRS - B.Bidaine@ulg.ac.be Prof. René Warnant^{1,2} - R.Warnant@oma.be



¹University of Liège (Geomatics Unit), Belgium www.geo.ulg.ac.be ²Royal Meteorological Institute, Belgium www.meteo.be

2nd International Colloquium, Scientific and Fundamental Aspects of the Galileo Programme October 14th to 16th, 2009 University of Padua, Padova, Italy



Introduction

- **Ionosphere affecting** radio propagation and hence **GNSS**
 - Positioning errors exceeding 100 m in extreme cases
 - Total Electron Content (TEC, integral of the electron density Ne) = main driver
- Importance of **TEC modelling**
 - Crucial especially for single frequency receivers, the most common ones constituting the mass market
 - For GALILEO, by means of a 3D method using the NeQuick model and data ingestion (Orus et al., 2007a)

NeQuick Model

- Empirical model of the electron density Ne
- "Profiler" = several mathematical functions fitted on anchor points corresponding to the maxima of the layers of the ionosphere (Radicella et Leitinger, 2001)
- Peaks and profile characteristics calculated on the basis of monthly median measurements
- New version (NeQuick 2): main modification regarding the description of the higher part of the ionosphere ("topside") \rightarrow two formulas for shape parameter k (each for six months of the year) replaced by a single one (Nava et al., 2008)

B. Bidaine - FNRS/ULg - B.Bidaine@ulg.ac.be — R. Warnant - RMI/ULg - R.Warnant@oma.be — Galileo Colloquium 2009

Data Ingestion

- **Solar activity indices = standard input** of ionospheric models
- Use of "effective" indices to drive a model towards measured values
- **Effective ionization level Az** when applied to NeQuick with TEC data (Nava et al., 2006)
- Minimisation of mismodelling between model and subset of TEC values

Data sets

- Data types
 - Manually validated ionosonde data
 - Slant TEC (sTEC) data levelled using Global Ionospheric Maps (Orus et al., 2007b)
 - Vertical TEC (vTEC) obtained from sTEC mapped to vertical, elevation filter at 61.8° and mean over 15-minute periods
- Tests for mid and high latitudes and high solar activity
 - 12 locations with collocated ionosonde and GPS station grouped in 4 regions
 - Year 2002





Collocated ionosondes and GPS stations



Analysis Method

- Uncoupling NeQuick formulation from underlying data: monthly median measurements replaced by actual ones \rightarrow model constrained by means of ionosonde data
- Ingestion scheme similar to Galileo Sensor Stations operation: daily Az values minimising Root-Mean-Square (RMS) of sTEC difference

$$RMS = \sqrt{\left\langle \left(sTEC_{mod} (Az) - sTEC_{meas} \right)^2 \right\rangle}$$

Statistics of vTEC difference be- $dTEC = TEC_{mod} - TEC_{meas}$ tween NeQuick and GPS TEC: mean ΔTEC and relative standard $\sigma_{\Delta TEC} = \sqrt{\langle (dTEC - \overline{\Delta TEC})^2 \rangle} \quad \sigma_{\Delta TEC, Relative} = \frac{\sigma_{\Delta TEC}}{\langle TEC \rangle}$ deviation $\sigma_{\Delta TEC, Relative}$

B. Bidaine - FNRS/ULg - B.Bidaine@ulg.ac.be — R. Warnant - RMI/ULg - R.Warnant@oma.be — Galileo Colloquium 2009







Ionosphere Modelling Based on the NeQuick Model and GNSS Data Ingestion

Ionosonde Parameters Constrain



Yearly vTEC mean



- Influence of **latitude**: lower mean TEC values at high-latitudes (TEC in TECu = $10^{16} e^{-} m^{-2}$)
- Average TEC underestimation of about 25% but potential bias in GPS TEC data to take into account (Bidaine et Warnant, 2009)
- **Bigger underestimation** with NeQuick 2 (inconsistency for high-latitude Europe and Australia because several months of data missing and improvement from topside modification during that period)
- Lower standard deviation (about 24%) decreasing by about 17%) for NeQuick 2 \rightarrow better behaviour
- Best results in mid-latitude Europe and worst in high-latitude Europe

Slant TEC Ingestion



Yearly vTEC mean

Yearly relative vTEC standard deviation



Bias absorbed thanks to ingestion

underestimation – Lower than for ionosonde parameters constrain Even lower underestimation with

NeQuick 2

Residual errors handled by ingestion Lower (around 16%) than for ionos-

- onde parameters constrain
- 15% decrease with NeQuick 2
- Best and worst cases unchanged
- Effective ionization level Az
 - Larger than solar flux
 - Lower values for NeQuick 2
 - Dependent on latitude (increasing towards high-latitudes)

Ionosphere Modelling Based on the NeQuick Model and GNSS Data Ingestion

Conclusion and Perspectives

- Ingestion = optimisation procedure involving the NeQuick model and GNSS sTEC data
- Intrinsic mismodelling characterised through ionosonde parameters constrain: standard deviation decreasing by 17% to reach about 22% with NeQuick 2
- Slant TEC ingestion absorbing residual errors: standard deviation decreasing by 15% to reach about 15% with NeQuick 2
- Best results in mid-latitude Europe and worst in high-latitude Europe
- Statistics of other ionospheric parameters such as maximum electron concentrations
- Similar analysis with Galileo Single Ionospheric Correction Frequency Algorithm

Signals propagating through the ionosphere



Find material about this poster on http://orbi.ulg.ac.be/handle/2268/19132

Acknowledgements

- Research undertaken under F.R.S.-FNRS fellowship
- Sandro Radicella, Pierdavide Coïsson and Bruno Nava from ICTP in Trieste for providing NeQuick latest version and comments about it
- Iñigo Blanco Alegre from INTA (El Arenosillo), David Altadill from Observatori de l'Ebre (Roquetes), Elise Van Malderen and Luc Lejeune from RMI (Dourbes) for providing ionosonde data and comments about them
- UK Solar System Data Centre staff in Chilton for providing access to and maintaining ionospheric data
- Roberto Prieto Cerdeira and Raul Orus from ESA/ESTEC for providing TEC data and comments about them
- CNES and the University of Liège for their financial support received to attend the colloquium

References

- BIDAINE, B. and R. WARNANT (2009): Measuring Total Electron Content with GNSS: Investigation of Two Different Techniques, Proc. 11th International Conference on Ionospheric Radio Systems and Techniques (IRST 2009). http://orbi.ulg.ac.be/handle/2268/1553
- NAVA, B., S.M. RADICELLA, R. LEITINGER and P. COISSON (2006): A near-real-time model-assisted ionosphere electron density retrieval method, Radio Sc., Vol. 41, RS6S16, doi:10.1029/2005RS003386
- NAVA, B., P. COISSON and S.M. RADICELLA (2008): A new version of the NeQuick ionosphere electron density model, J. Atmos. and Sol.-Terr. Phys., in press, corrected proof. doi:10.1016/j.jastp.2008.01.015
- ORUS, R., B. ARBESSER-RASTBURG, R. PRIETO-CERDEIRA, M. HERNANDEZ-PAJARES, J. M. JUAN and J. SANZ (2007a): Performance of Different Ionospheric Models for Single Frequency Navigation Receivers, Proc. Beacon Satellite Symposium 2007.
- ORUS, R., Lj. R. CANDER and M. HERNANDEZ-PAJARES (2007b): Testing regional vTEC maps over Europe during the 17-21 January 2005 sudden space weather event, Radio Sc., Vol. 42, RS3004. doi:10.1029/2006RS003515
- RADICELLA, S. M., and R. LEITINGER (2001): The evolution of the DGR approach to model electron density profiles, Adv. Space Res., Vol. 27, No. 1, p. 35-40. doi:10.1016/S0273-1177(00)00138-1