

Radio and Space Plasma Physics Group

Cluster and SuperDARN observations of flux transfer events from the Cluster 10,000 km seasons

R. C. Fear, S. E. Milan University of Leicester

E. A. Lucek, Imperial College London

A. N. Fazakerley Mullard Space Science Laboratory, UCL

Overview

- Motivation
- Case studies

 27th January 2006
 27th March 2007
- Summary and Conclusions



Motivation

Small scale



e.g. Fear et al. (2007)



Motivation



27th January 2006





Tetrahedron expanded x2

FTE signatures

- Several bipolar signatures are observed in B_N component
- These are 'standard' polarity (+/-) indicating northward motion
- Three FTEs are observed by all four spacecraft, although the C4 signatures are weak
- C2 observed magnetosheath FTE plasma signatures
- C1&3 observed magnetospheric FTE plasma signatures
- C4 observed no plasma signatures – draping only



Fear et al., 2008a, in press



Pulsed ionospheric flows



 Kodiak observed pulsed ionospheric flows (PIFs) in the convection throat at earlier local times

 Cluster 2 PEACE data shows that the FTE is connected to the southern hemisphere, despite being observed in the northern hemisphere

• Multi-spacecraft timing gives us a velocity predominantly poleward

• Multi-spacecraft timing gives us a velocity predominantly poleward

- Duration of electron signature at Cluster 3 gives us poleward scale
 - This structure extends further azimuthally than poleward

 \mathbf{O}

FTE shape: model comparison

 The FTE shape is suggestive of the single or multiple X-line models, rather than the elbowshaped flux tube proposed by Russell & Elphic

FTE shape: model comparison

- The FTE shape is suggestive of the single or multiple X-line models, rather than the elbowshaped flux tube proposed by Russell & Elphic
- Furthermore, since there is a B_M field component both sides of the magnetopause, a Russell & Elphic flux tube would form a 'V'
 - The location of Cluster 4 is not consistent with observing the magnetospheric 'arm'

FTE shape: model comparison

- The FTE shape is suggestive of the single or multiple X-line models, rather than the elbowshaped flux tube proposed by Russell & Elphic
- Furthermore, since there is a B_M field component both sides of the magnetopause, a Russell & Elphic flux tube would form a 'V'
 - The location of Cluster 4 is not consistent with observing the magnetospheric 'arm'
- However, the Russell & Elphic model could still apply if the flux tube relaxed into a 'U'.
- To investigate this further, we need an event with no azimuthal field either side of the magnetopause, near local noon

27th March 2007

Solar wind conditions

Strong poleward flows

Poleward Moving Radar Auroral Forms

Magnetospheric FTEs

University of Leicester

Magnetospheric FTEs

- Also significant differences between C1 and C2
- Most azimuthally separated spacecraft
 - C2 nearer MP than C1, but normal separation of tetrahedron only 1200 km

Implies some more spatially patchy FTEs

Summary and Conclusions

- SuperDARN observations show that dayside reconnection was occurring over a significant section of the magnetopause
 - Large Cluster separation allows in situ structure to be investigated
- Cluster observations from the 27th January 2006 (Fear et al., 2008a, in press) provide the first evidence that an FTEs azimuthal scale can be significantly larger than its poleward scale
 - Inconsistent with a simple interpretation of the Russell & Elphic model, it is not possible to rule out this model completely
- On the 27th March 2007, (Fear et al. 2008b, in preparation) the crossmagnetopause shear was much closer to 180°, allowing this ambiguity to be removed
 - 2 azimuthally extended FTEs
 - Several more spatially patchy FTEs

