# A Roadmap for a Lightning Modeling Grand Challenge

### **GLM Science Meeting**

24-26 September 2024

Eric C. Bruning, Texas Tech University

Thanks to the Lightning Modeling Panel for their work on the roadmap: **Amanda Back,** NOAA Global Systems Laboratory **Sonja Behnke,** Los Alamos National Lab **Steve Goodman**, Thunderbolt Global Analytics Thanks to Sandia National Laboratory for instigating and supporting the initial draft of the roadmap

Chris Hogg, Sandia National Laboratory Timothy Lang, NASA Marshall Julia Tilles, Sandia National Laboratory

# No capability exists to predict the many radio and optical signals produced by a thunderstorm.

Do the components of lightning science form a consistent whole? Make an explicit prediction.





## Why a lightning model? Some Stakeholders (USA)

- NSF: basic science of lightning
  - Lightning physics, meteorology of electrification
- NASA/NOAA: optical lightning sensors and climate-scale observations
  - Need for physics-based observing system simulation experiments
- NOAA: Explicit forward modeling of lightning for Numerical Weather Prediction
  - Data assimilation of varied lightning sensor types, hazard modeling
- DOE: Earth-observing platforms and sensors
  - Lightning a near-constant background signal

# Writing the roadmap

- Formed lightning advisory panel to organize an initial workshop
- Held 60-person workshop with a day of invited talks and a day of breakouts
  - Identified requirements, gaps, and recommendations.
  - Strong consensus that computing, observations, and knowledge are mature enough to try integration
  - No need to reinvent focus on stitching together existing models and comparing to observations
- Visited with NSF, NASA, NOAA, DOE, etc. to build awareness of the roadmap effort
- Initial draft of a 5-year roadmap is complete, about 30 pages in length
  - **Practically-focused:** what exists, how can we stitch it together?
  - Inputs, outputs, uncertainties, evaluation methods, next steps



# Major model components



Loose coupling between components is preferred where possible. Ancillary models for chemistry, impacts to human and natural environments, etc. are envisioned.

# **Qualitative Readiness**



Lightning science is fragmented and observation-driven to date. Not possible to make a holistic model-observation comparison. Smaller model-theory-observation loops test some sub-processes, but **need connections** and **full-storm-scale physics**.

**≠ perfect**, but is mature enough for use in an initial end-to-end prediction

### Timeline For the next five years

Continue to build streamer-leader process model Build library of reference electrified cloud simulations Start building cloud-coupled signal propagation models



Advertise to community Circulate to funding agencies

Refine discharge models, esp. for intracloud kA currents Develop data formats and observation comparison approaches

### Implementation will follow a community-governed open source model.

End-to-end prediction and observation comparison Ongoing refinement of model components

## **Community Input** Upcoming events

- Roadmap draft out for review to invited speakers, and available later this fall
- Town Hall Meetings
  - AGU (December 2024)
  - AMS (January 2025)
- Next Workshop
  - 1-3 April 2025, Texas Tech University
- Goals: discuss, refine, and review progress on the roadmap



# Workshop invited speakers

- Joe Dwyer, University of New Hampshire ullet
- Ted Mansell, NOAA National Severe Storms Laboratory
- Amitabh Nag, Los Alamos National Laboratory
- Caitano da Silva, New Mexico Tech •
- Patrick Gatlin, NASA Marshall Space Flight Center
- Matthew Hopkins, Sandia National Laboratory
- Patrick McFarland, Penn State University
- Kristen Rasmussen, Colorado State University
- Xuan-Min Shao, Los Alamos National Laboratory
- Scott Wolff, United States Air Force